

# The King's Men from Timiș County (14<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup> Centuries)

---

ZOLTAN IUSZTIN

## Introduction

**T**HE REVALUATION of everyday life in the local *mise en scène* provides the medieval world with a more dynamic image. At first sight, the information regarding this subject might appear insufficient and less visible yet there are direct and numerous signs related to the noblemen mandated by the central authorities and charged with various missions. Documentary sources refer to them as *homines regis* or *homines noster*, according to the commandment's issuer. Thus, if the mission was ordered by the palatine or the curia's judge, they were provided with the appellative of these institutions. Their activity was unfolding within the counties and districts under the protection of the places of authentication. Sometimes their attributions were similar to those of the noble judges yet the king's man did not use to activate alongside the county's institutions but in parallel with these, as indicated by some evidence foregoing the emergence of the nobiliary county.

Despite the numerous pieces of information regarding the appropriation and ennoblement, there are not many studies referring to this topic in the Romanian literature. Among the very few existing articles<sup>1</sup> one can find several relevant contributions such as those signed by Engel Pal<sup>2</sup> or Karoly Vekov<sup>3</sup>. Other information derives from common works; however, most of this is still provided by written sources<sup>4</sup>.

From another perspective, I have described the institution of the king's man as an extension of the central power, more exactly, of royalty at the provincial level<sup>5</sup>. From an executive viewpoint, the hypothesis is truthful since the last stage of the appropriation or ennoblement process, the one concerning the idea of getting hold of something, represented one of the missions. Due to this fact, the king's man had to be a nobleman himself or he was supposed to hold a social status which was similar or superior to those he provided with the property rights. Whether in the case of the 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> centuries the documentary information indubitably certifies the noble condition of these officials in Timiș County<sup>6</sup>, there are misunderstandings concerning the previous periods of time.

The institution did not appear simultaneously with the social and political transformations of the 13<sup>th</sup> century. Arguments expressed two centuries before that time include

information regarding the king's representatives who used to have attributions which were similar to those of the king's man during the Angevin period of time.

Such a document is represented by the gift of King Geza I (1074-1077) offered to St. Benedict's abbey in 1075<sup>7</sup>. Besides the domains around the fortresses of Bihor and Turda, the privileges stipulated that the Benedictine monastery and its abbot were still holding the authority to retain any fugitive, any stray or lost animal, while the representative of the king, of Duke Ladislaus or of any baron could not demand or take it<sup>8</sup>. In this document the king's man is named *nuntius regis*, suggesting the profile of the king's representative<sup>9</sup>. Whether there was an equality among these delegates or not represents an unknown factor which can be revealed only in a certain context.

Evidently, there is no similitude between the *nuntius regis* and the subsequent *homines regis*. Both the social status and the competences are different, however we can guess that we are dealing with the same institution which had already undergone a great deal of transformations over the centuries. Given the limited number of documents, we do not have a lot of information regarding the king's representatives in the 11<sup>th</sup> or 12<sup>th</sup> centuries. There is more and more evidence starting with the reign of King Andrew II (1205-1235); in this context, regarding the donations, we mention the prerogative from 1219, regarding a domain in Transylvania granted to the archbishop of Strigonium and his canons<sup>10</sup>. The one who was meant to take hold of the owners was the voivode of Transylvania defined in the following way: "*ut eos auctoritate nostra induceret in possessionem et dominium terre*"<sup>11</sup>. This statement certifies that, in this case, the voivode used to represent the king; this authority entitled him to position the appointed canons in their new dominion. In order to fulfil his duty, Voivode Neuka appointed his neighbors and those who were interested in the situation of the realm. The reambulation of the dominion took place without any problems. However, there is no reference related to the domain's landmarks. It is certain that the voivode held the role of the king's man in the context in which among those who were granted the land one could mention dignitaries such as the archbishop of Strigonium.

On other occasions, the ones who were responsible for the *livery of seisin* were the counts. The allotment act of Count Sebus, with estates removed from the authority of some fortresses like Trencin, Nitra and Timișoara<sup>12</sup> certifies that the one who was appointed with this mission was Count Nicholas, the brother of deceased Archbishop Ugrin<sup>13</sup>. Being a relative of the first hierarch in Hungary, he was endowed with a social status which was similar to that of Count Sebus.

In general, the documents from the 13<sup>th</sup> century name *pristav* the persons provided with the same tasks like the king's man<sup>14</sup>. There is one document in which we see that this appellative represents the privilege of the Teutonic knights in 1222. Among the multiple benefits and domains they used to get, one can also mention the Land of Bârsa; they were settled under its domination by *pristav Facate Iuna* who, given the order of Voivode Michael, had also settled the landmarks of the property<sup>15</sup>. The king had also appointed another herald in the person of Ban *Ypochz*, meant to settle them in order to master the fortress of Cruceberg, whose domain extended up to the borders of the medieval Romanian polity in South Moldavia<sup>16</sup>. Returning to the previous examples, where the *livery of seisin* was accomplished by characters provided with important functions, we should remember the fact that the attributions of heralds or people delegated by the king

could not be listed among the dignitaries' duties. They were called on by the king since the ones they had to allot had a superior social status. This aspect can be noticed during the subsequent centuries too.

## Attributions

**T**HE EARLIEST evidence suggests that the *livery of seisin* represented the main attribution of the king's man. The hypothesis was also confirmed by the fact that the same mission constituted the major objective of his activity. Yet, during the 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> centuries, the attributions diversify simultaneously with the increasing number of written sources. Of course, we wonder to what extent this institution developed or whether the most numerous sources have revealed more aspects of his activity to us.

On the other hand, some duties such as the estates' reambulation, regardless of their appropriation, represented earlier responsibilities. There were other attributions such as the investigation of the complaints recorded by various legal forums and, depending on the case, the citation of culprits, which had judicial characteristics. We can also include the execution of the sentences decided by the courts within the same context. The participation of the king's man in the collection of taxes is pretty special. Broadly, the information which contributes to the definition of his role and responsibilities is furnished not only by the ennobling diplomas or certain privileges but also by the orders of the central authorities regarding the investigation of various cases.

## Livery of seisin

**A**S THE written sources certify, the appropriation represented a complex process whose last stage consisted in the beneficiary's actual settlement on the given estate. Its boundaries were delimited in the presence of neighbors and inhabitants living in the neighborhood. The king's man, accompanied by the witness of the place of authentication, ran the whole procedure while drawing up a written report and mentioning if there was any opposition regarding the *livery of seisin* or not. If there were some objectors, they had to be summoned before judges, and the possession became an object of dispute. The resettlement of the beneficiary took place at the end of the trial. If those who were objecting had some good evidence to defend their case, the king's gift was annulled. Charles Robert also experienced such a resistance when he wanted to include an estate in the crown's patrimony. Considering himself certified to appropriate his tenure, *Ewche*, in Timiș County, the king claimed his pre-emption right upon the settlements inhabited by conditioners, yet there were some rightful owners who presented their act of ownership. As a result, the king had to give up his intention and acknowledge the rights of Paul, Iwanka's son and his cousins regarding the *Ewche* estate<sup>17</sup>.

The *livery of seisin* used to take place after laying down the acts of donation which certified the privileges and property rights in a written form. Then they would dispatch the enforcement orders towards the places of authentication. Such an order was provided to the chapter of Arad on 7 June 1318. In the letter issued in Timișoara, the

king asked the chapter to send a trustworthy man in order to accompany Peter Zeel of Budun, on the occasion of an appropriation in Timiș County<sup>18</sup>. The letter is essential in order to understand the development of the whole allotment process.

At the request of Dominic Saar, the viscount of Timiș, who claimed the *Phylupteluke* and *Rygachteluke* properties<sup>19</sup>, which had remained without their owner, the king replied in the affirmative and offered him the property deed as well<sup>20</sup>. Then there was the order addressed to the chapter<sup>21</sup>, which, besides the assurance of the witness, also had to draw up a report regarding the facts which happened on the spot<sup>22</sup>. Within seven days<sup>23</sup> the chapter issued the report which confirmed that he had sent it to Master James, *succentor* of the choir<sup>24</sup>, in order to accompany the man of the king who, after the delivery, returned to the chapter and stated the following: in the presence of neighbors he had invested the viscount with the two estates<sup>25</sup>.

After the events took place, a historian, Karoly Vekov, stated that they were reported under oath, both by the king's representative and the one related to the place of authentication<sup>26</sup>. His statement is based on the second decree of Sigismund of Luxemburg, issued in 1435<sup>27</sup>. Yet, in the case mentioned above, the chapter mentioned that the whole process was related by Peter, the king's man<sup>28</sup>. It is certain that they drew up a single report on the spot, as the following proof certifies. In an affair brought up in Caraș County, a nobleman, Andrew Chep of Ghertenış, advanced his complaint through which he claimed that his familiar and procurator, Konia of Murani, had been hurt during the *livery of seisin*. This clue represents positive evidence that the beneficiary of the allotment could be represented by another person on the spot, but we shall focus our attention on the continuation of the statement from which we find out that the evildoers had taken the man of the king and the one of the chapter of Cenad as prisoners, and the royal order regarding the appropriation has been taken from them. They also emphasized that the two witnesses were mocked, and the man of the chapter had also received a severe beating<sup>29</sup>. Undoubtedly, the increased aversion towards the representative of the places of authentication was related to the more significant role played during the *livery of seisin*. Probably, the chapter's man was the one who preserved the royal order and read it to his neighbors. The fact that the same misfortune had also made it impossible for the places of authentication to respond to the royal order suggests that the witness of the places of authentication was the one who was drawing up the report on the spot. This fact was also certified by the frequent habit of the king's man to add the *litteratus* appellation<sup>30</sup>, which proves that the ability to write inspired a real pride. Intricacies persist in the case of the person who used to present the report before the chapter, which was meant to insert it in the reply to the king. In the absence of direct evidence, one can speculate all kinds of facts, yet, in time, they legalized the *concorditer retulerunt* formula, which confirmed the fact that, when returning, the two delegates were mutually confirming<sup>31</sup>.

In general, it is considered that the *livery of seisin* took three days<sup>32</sup>. However, we notice the differentiation of the period of time when they organized the estates' reambulation and the meeting of neighbors and those related to the new allotment or the delay on the spot to wait for the objectors. Thus, if the domains' reambulation was directly proportional with their surface or the distance among them, the three day interval was provided for in light of possible objections. The document granting to Ban Benedict

Himfy and his brothers the former possessions of nobleman Neacșu certifies the fact that they did not record contestations within a delimited period of time in the following way: “*legittimis diebus tam in facies dictarum possessionum*”<sup>33</sup>. The example is not unique, it represents a standard expression, present in the majority of allotment acts<sup>34</sup>, which reveal the two stages when they could record the objections: the legal days and the days related to the reambulation. The direct evidence is even more revealing. We only refer to the case concerning the chapter of Arad which, as the owner, had faced three contestations during the reambulation in the case of *Ormand* estate. Between 1414 and 1415, its neighbors objected each time and during the livery of seisin they drove away the representatives of the chapter and the king’s man<sup>35</sup>.

Putting together all these aspects, we obtain a clearer image of the stages defining the *livery of seisin*. On the other hand, the written sources outline a stereotyped approach, described by the places of authentication. As a result, the examples can be chosen randomly. During the *livery of seisin* of Szilagi of Horogszeg and his con-divisionals, the chapter of Cenad stated that his man, together with the king’s, showed up, on a Tuesday, after the Epiphany of God, in 1409, at the estates making the object of donation. They gathered the neighbors and owners from the neighborhood and then they settled the new owners. They recorded no objections, neither during the reambulation nor during the legal days of expectation<sup>36</sup>. Broadly, the stages might be the following: 1. Gathering the local people, the neighbors and those interested or targeted by the settlement of boundaries, 2. Reading the royal order to those who were present; 3. Settling the boundaries in the presence of neighbors; 4. Writing the report and waiting for objections.

## Reambulation

**T**HIS WAS achieved not only on the occasion of deliveries. Many conflicts among noblemen were provoked because the integrity of private properties was not respected. Besides the flagrant cases highlighting the illegal seizure of other estates, the noblemen were extending their domains to the detriment of neighbors, cases which demanded the authorities’ intervention. The estate at Recaș and the related possessions represented one of the reasons, as they involved representative delegates of the royal curia, who had renewed the landmarks at least twice within an interval of two years<sup>37</sup>. On the other hand, there were some concerns emphasized by the noblemen; they were related to the collapse or deterioration of landmarks<sup>38</sup>, occasions which were often turned to good accounts by neighbors. Practically, the disappearance of landmarks was similar to the loss of the well-known dimensions of domains. This was also the reason why kings frequently had to order the drawing of their own estates. In 1372 the Bishop of Cenad, together with three other men of the king, was meant to separate the king’s estates from those of the gentlefolk, in two counties, Caraș and Timiș. Unfortunately, they preserved only the report regarding the reambulation in the case of one estate in Timiș County<sup>39</sup>, and therefore we are not aware if all the royal possessions in the two counties had been surveyed.

## Research and investigations

**E**VEN IF, starting with the 14<sup>th</sup> century, the functionality of nobiliary counties stimulated the development of local institutions, the central authorities continued to appeal to the service provided by the king's men. The tasks were focused on different investigations as a consequence both of external call-overs and, as we had already noticed, on their own initiative.

There was a great deal of research which emphasized the current reasons and trials. For example, at the end of 1415, George of *Chechtelek* carried out some investigations in Timiș County, connected to the diversion of the Bârzava river bed. What is interesting is the fact that the research took place one year later than the command, as the document issued by the chapter of Cenad certifies<sup>40</sup>. The answer to the chapter of Arad, pointing out to the same command, was also drawn up then<sup>41</sup>. However, this habit did not represent an exception to the rule since we also notice cases when two identical commands were sent towards the same place of authentication. The chapter of Cenad replied to two such commands in which there were only the names of those proposed as the king's men, confirming the difference between the two acts as the selected person was the same in both reports<sup>42</sup>.

There were other investigations which analyzed the situation of different estates. In 1326 the king's man had the responsibility to locate two possessions of the chatelaine of Lewa. The command had been issued by the king who only wanted to find out whether the estates were situated in Cenad County<sup>43</sup>.

## Citations in court cases

**A**MONG THE competences of the king's representative we can also mention the citation in court cases. This attribution was also completed with the presentation of warning letters named *admonitio*<sup>44</sup>.

Once summoned, the accused were obliged to show up or send a public prosecutor to represent them. In case of contumacy, the citation was resent. If there was no reply succeeding the third citation, the judges pronounced the first sentence announced by the king's man at three public fairs. Regarding the affair between Nicholas, the son of Neagu from Recaș, and Ban Stephen Kórógyi, they respected the same procedures. After his third default, the culprit was cited in three urban centers against the Romanian noble<sup>45</sup>. But again, Ban Stephen Kórógyi did not show up and sent no representative either. As a result, they issued a sentence in behalf of noble Nicholas<sup>46</sup>, which could not be challenged in court as the culprit did not show up for any trial date.

A similar case could be noticed between 1317 and 1320. Given the fact that one of the parties did not show up in court, although summoned six or seven times, or had ignored all the judges' decisions and warnings, the sentence was harsh. The country's judges sentenced all the culprits to death while retaining their whole property<sup>47</sup>.

However, we should mention that the opposition towards a royal donation did not call for a hostile attitude connected to the crown. However, those involved had to provide

the king or any other forum with some explanations. The citation was not carried out against the dynast but against the new owner, that is why the impugment was not a political but a judiciary one. In these cases, the king's man played the role of an usher.

## Participation in the collection of taxes

**T**HERE IS A document from the beginning of the 14<sup>th</sup> century which provides some information regarding the attributions of the king's man. Issued in 1316<sup>48</sup>, the act represents an order of Charles Robert who stipulated that the collection of court expenses and fines paid by the convicts would no longer be left to the representatives of the country's judge, of the palatine, counts or judges; it would occur only through the king's man, accompanied by the witness of a chapter or convent. More exactly, the ones charged with the collection of taxes by the judge of the country or other high officials had to show up, after receiving the order, at the place of authentication. Then, accompanied by the king's man and the witness of a chapter or convent, they went away to the judgement seat of the counts, where they collected the taxes. This was the place where they read the king's letter and the register with the distribution of taxes in the case of the high official who had assigned them<sup>49</sup>. The next stage assumes the establishment of data; the convicts would have to pay the penalties. Those who were paying their fines used to get a guarantee in the form of an act. In the case of noblemen, in order to strengthen the guarantee, the acts were issued by the king's man or the representative of the place of authentication. The same document stipulated that, at the division of goods taken at the place where they used to collect the taxes, the tenth part went to the king's man, of the chapter or convent, while the third part belonged to the counts and noble judges, and two parts were given to the high officials by those charged with the collection of taxes<sup>50</sup>.

Among the executive missions, one can also mention the execution of various sentences. Although in the case of Timiș County we have not noticed such examples, there is some other evidence like the one provided by the chapter of Arad. In a document from 1416, the place of authentication certified that it had sent its witness in order to assist the delegate of the royal curia in the execution of a sentence dictated by the bishop of Zagreb, after which Ladislav *civis* from Păncota received a part of the estates of Michael of Keer, worth 116 golden forints<sup>51</sup>.

## The Social Condition and the Appointment of the King's Men

**A**S WE have already shown, there was a common element between those who were given the land and the king's men, namely, social status. In fact, we do not have any evidence which might certify that the king's representatives were chosen from among serfs, peasants or other commoners. During the 11<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> centuries those who used to receive such tasks were counts, high officials or the king's sol-

diers. Later, after the formation of the nobility as a distinct social category, the king's men were going to be preponderantly selected from there. However, there were occasions when their missions were carried out by clerics. Thus, in Timiș County, among the king's men one could notice the provosts of the chapters of Cenad and Arad<sup>52</sup>, an archdeacon from Hont and even the bishop of the diocese who had to participate in an estate's reambulation in 1372<sup>53</sup>. Yet, in their case, the affiliation to the status of nobility is certain. There are some doubts emphasized by the notaries sent by the curia; some of them carried out missions in Timiș County, such as Luca the son of Stephen<sup>54</sup>, Sigismund of *Mezcusomlo*<sup>55</sup> and Michael of Zala<sup>56</sup>. The filiation, used as their cognomen (micro-toponyms), indicates a noble condition in the absence of other evidence. There are only insufficient data in the case of parish clerk *Michael* who participates in the estate's reambulation in 1463<sup>57</sup>. Conversely, there is information regarding the social status of George Parvus. The fact that the viscount and chatelaine of Filipo Scolari had taken part in the delimitation and retrocession of goods, which represented the subject of a filial quarter, was less known<sup>58</sup>.

We still have doubts regarding the way they selected the king's men in the 14<sup>th</sup> century. More numerous pieces of information from the following century provide us with a clearer image. The decree from 1486 stipulated that the *homines regis* had to be chosen in each county by the count together with the noblemen's parish, chosen from among the most outstanding noblemen of the county. They were about 10 or 12, or fewer, and the task was established for a whole year. Upon selection, they had to take an oath during the meeting<sup>59</sup>. Regarding the duration of their activity, there are earlier data, starting even with the beginning of the 14<sup>th</sup> century, which certify the stipulation of the decree above<sup>60</sup>. However, most of the documents, especially starting with the second half of this century, nominate more persons, from among whom they select a single man of the king. Concerning this observation, we emphasize the opinion of Engel Pal, who stated that the king's men were named by the applicants for the donation acts. Thus, the ennobled ones suggested to the king and the office the persons who were charged to settle them on the received property<sup>61</sup>. Moreover, there were some relationships of kinship or familiarity between the ennobled one and the *homo regius*<sup>62</sup>. If in cases of *livery of seisin* the king's men were proposed and selected, in many cases from among the neighbors, in some divisions or estates' reambulation<sup>63</sup> each party involved in the dispute could benefit of a king's man.

Consequently, there is the hypothesis that each task is defined by a certain specificity which might facilitate a reply to the questions referring to the selection of the king's men by those allotted or by the community. However, in the context in which we share some written evidence regarding the existence of some persons in each separate county, we still cannot reveal if one of their attributions was connected only to the investigation on the spot or the execution of different sentences. From this viewpoint, the evidence certifying the custom that the document, which represented the royal command, was subsequently completed with the name of the royal representative, the chapter's witness and the place where they had carried out their mission, is not useful<sup>64</sup>.



## Instead of Conclusions

AT FIRST sight, the missions carried in the neighboring counties by the king's men of Timiș County seem new. There is more evidence which shows that, in some cases, they organized simultaneous investigations, in two different counties<sup>65</sup>. However, all this happened because of the underlying circumstances, as proved by cases like the one related to the Himfy family, which lived in the vicinity of Bârzava. Thus a large percentage of their disputes referred to some noblemen from Caraș County. After all these misunderstandings the king's man Gregory of *Chechtelek* provided the noblemen from Gherteniș with three citations in different cases, all against the same family from Timiș<sup>66</sup>.

A rather similar example is suggested by the one experienced by Andrew of *Maiosfalva* who, in 1406, in the space of a few weeks, presented a citation in Caraș County, then took part in some investigations in Timiș County<sup>67</sup>. The justification of these missions is easy in the context in which the estate of Andrew of *Maiosfalva* could be found at the border between the two counties and near the places where he went in order to carry out his duty. Concomitantly, his example proves the fact that the king's man was often selected from among the noblemen in the area that had become the subject of the investigation conducted by the authorities.

Furthermore, in cases of *livery of seisin*, there were more options when the estates lay in different counties. They could choose more men of the king, for each county separately, or the task was accomplished by a single person. When Count Nicholas Csaki and his con-divisionals were granted the estates, they proposed the king's men from Cenad County, although two of these possessions could be found in Timiș. Yet we do not know who had settled them in the two estates as the privilege issued referred only to the possessions in Cenad<sup>68</sup>.

This evidence proves that it was not an exception to the rule but a common activity, which also provided the king's man with some missions in other counties than the usual one. In fact, one can notice another perspective regarding the relationship between the king's man and the county's institutions, given that his activity developed in partnership with the places of authentication and, in limited cases, with the judgement seat. This premise even suggests an independent activity of the king's man in regard to the county's institutions. Thus, his missions seem to take place without any implication of the viscounts, noble judges or judgement seats.

However, the identity of the persons who activated as the king's men betrays the connections of this institution with the county's authorities. Some of the king's men from Timiș County had carried out other jobs. Lawrence and George of *Chechtelek*, Blaise of Murani, John of *Mondola* and Gall of Nemeti were noble judges<sup>69</sup>. Other representatives, such as George Parvus, Nicholas Vaidafy of Giarmata, John and Valentine of Firiteaz were viscounts in Timiș<sup>70</sup>, thus they were also connected to the administration of the fortress garrison of Timișoara.

This proves that the institution of the king's man represented a stage related to the *cursus honorum* of the provincial nobility which could be accompanied even by the

holding of an office. From this viewpoint, a higher number of positions in the administration, and not only, provided the provincial nobility, besides some material benefits, with the possibility of social and political ascent.

## ANNEX. KING'S MEN WHO CARRIED OUT VARIOUS MISSIONS IN TIMIȘ COUNTY

- III 1317 Paulus filius Iwanka<sup>71</sup>  
 VI 1318 Petrus dictus Zeel de Budun<sup>72</sup>  
 1327 *Zeyhanum officialem magistri Nicolai comes Tymesiensis*<sup>73</sup>  
 X 1334 Nicolao filius Barth<sup>74</sup>  
 VI 1337 Jacobo de Twrwsd; Johanne fratre comiti Puer<sup>75</sup>  
 III 1338 Andrea filio Simonis<sup>76</sup>  
 V 1341 Stephanus dictus Bogar<sup>77</sup>  
 V 1341 Nicolao filio Baruch<sup>78</sup>  
 XII 1346 Blasio fili Michaelis<sup>79</sup>  
 VII 1361 Nicolao *arbidiacono Hontensi, capellano regio; Nicolao dicto Zudar aule regie juvene*<sup>80</sup>  
 V 1364 Petrus Orodienis et Nicolaus *Chanadiensis ecclesiarum prepositi*<sup>81</sup>  
 1366 Petro de Bok<sup>82</sup>  
 VII 1368 Stephani filio Pouse de Zcer; Petro *preposito et prelato*<sup>83</sup>  
 II 1369 Nicolao dicto Pycher<sup>84</sup>  
 VII 1369 Michaeli dicto pogan<sup>85</sup>  
 III 1370 Johanne filio Nicolai<sup>86</sup>  
 I 1371 Nicolao filio Fabiani Bok<sup>87</sup>  
 V 1372 *Dominicum episcopum ecclesie Chanadiensis; Johannem prepositum ecclesie Budensis, vicecomitem capelle nostre; Stephanum filium Pouse de Zer; Johannem filium Peteu de Zantou*<sup>88</sup>  
 I 1375 Nicolao filio Thome de Bok<sup>89</sup>  
 VII 1375 Ladislao de Chalya<sup>90</sup>  
 IV 1377 Stephanus de Gyertyanus<sup>91</sup>  
 VI 1377 Laurencio de Checheleke<sup>92</sup>  
 VI 1387 Mathia filio Nicolai<sup>93</sup>  
 VIII 1387 Georgio fili Benedicit de Dersfalwa<sup>94</sup>  
 XI 1387 Michaeli filio Nicolai de Heges<sup>95</sup>  
 XII 1387 Petro de Berky<sup>96</sup>  
 VII 1388 Nicolao de Erdewhat *de curia regia*<sup>97</sup>  
 V 1389 Georgio de Chechteleke<sup>98</sup>  
 IV 1390 Georgio Eleuiarow om al vicecomitelui<sup>99</sup>  
 I 1391 Cosma de Cyra<sup>100</sup>  
 IV 1391 Luca filio Stephani *notario curie regie*<sup>101</sup>  
 XI 1392 Andrea filio Nicolai de Moiosfalwa<sup>102</sup>  
 XII 1392 Augustino filio Pauli de Zenthantal 103  
 III 1393 Thomam de Mandla<sup>104</sup>  
 V 1393 Stephanum filium Konya de Muron 105  
 VI 1393 Paulum filium Konya de Muron<sup>106</sup>  
 VIII 1393 Petrum de Thoth<sup>107</sup>  
 X 1393 Magister Corradus Neurmizogh *de curia regia*<sup>108</sup>  
 I 1399 Jacobo literato de Jakabfalwa<sup>109</sup>  
 XI 1399 Nicolao filio Petri de Machedonia<sup>110</sup>

- III 1401 Johanne dicto Tatar de Zeldes<sup>111</sup>  
 X 1404 Georgio de Chechteky<sup>112</sup>  
 IV 1405 Vice Comitibus Georgio Parvo *castellano de Themeswar*<sup>113</sup>  
 V 1406 Andrea de Mayosfalua<sup>114</sup>  
 XII 1407 Valentino de Berle<sup>115</sup>  
 I 1408 Johanne dicto Tatar<sup>116</sup>  
 I 1409 Emerico Nigro de Papd<sup>117</sup>  
 I 1409 Lucas de Surk<sup>118</sup>  
 I 1409 Emerico Nigro de Papd<sup>119</sup>  
 I 1409 Emerico Nigro de Papd<sup>120</sup>  
 VI 1411 Ladislao de Kenez<sup>121</sup>  
 X 1411 Sigismundo de Mezeusomlo *notario et homine regio de curia regia*<sup>122</sup>  
 II 1412 Michael de Zala *notario et homine regio de curia regia*<sup>123</sup>  
 X 1414 Blasio de Muron<sup>124</sup>  
 X 1414 Blasio de Mondola<sup>125</sup>  
 IV 1415 Ioan de Mondola<sup>126</sup>  
 VII 1415 Blasio de Mondola<sup>127</sup>  
 IX 1415 Nicolao fili Laurentio de Mondola<sup>128</sup>  
 XII 1415 Georgio de Chechtelek<sup>129</sup>  
 XII 1415 Maius filius Nicolai de Orozopathy<sup>130</sup>  
 III 1416 Stephano de Mwrn<sup>131</sup>  
 IV 1416 Blasio de Mondola<sup>132</sup>  
 V 1416 Francisco de Chanad *homine regio de curia regia*<sup>133</sup>  
 XI 1417 Lorando filio Petro de Kwche<sup>134</sup>  
 X 1418 Johanne de Pijskij<sup>135</sup>  
 X 1418 Nicolao filio Iohannis de Kenez<sup>136</sup>  
 VII 1418 Petro dictus Bogar de Kwche<sup>137</sup>  
 V 1422 Dominico de Guche<sup>138</sup>  
 IV 1423 Jacobo de Mondola<sup>139</sup>  
 VI 1427 Petro de Deed<sup>140</sup>  
 VII 1427 Benedicto filio Demetri de Muron<sup>141</sup>  
 VII 1435 Parvus de Mayosfalwa<sup>142</sup>  
 IX 1440 Paulus de Nagwth<sup>143</sup>  
 X 1441 Georgius de Muron<sup>144</sup>  
 III 1443 Nicolaus filius wayvode de Gyarmath<sup>145</sup>  
 22 I 1444 Johannes literatus de Themerdegeghaz<sup>146</sup>  
 18 VII 1446 Georgius de Gywreugh<sup>147</sup>  
 III 1447 Dominicus de Mondola<sup>148</sup>  
 V 1447 Georgius de Gyuregh<sup>149</sup>  
 III 1451 Sigismundus de Zenthgyurgh<sup>150</sup>  
 II 1453 Valentinus de Fehereghaz<sup>151</sup>  
 II 1453 Ladislaus Bekes de Endred<sup>152</sup>  
 VI 1454 Thomas de Chychked<sup>153</sup>  
 VII 1454 Thomas de Chyczked<sup>154</sup>  
 VIII 1455 Lavus de Nemethi<sup>155</sup>  
 III 1456 Ladislaus de Nagywth<sup>156</sup>  
 III 1458 Johannes Wasky de Adoryanfalwa<sup>157</sup>  
 X 1458 Thoma de Rwdá<sup>158</sup>

- I 1462 Paulus Jako de Hodos<sup>159</sup>  
 VI 1462 Ladislaus de Chomboly<sup>160</sup>  
 IX 1463 Michael cantor<sup>161</sup>  
 VIII 1464 Michael Wrani dicti de Krassomegye<sup>162</sup>  
 VIII 1466 Ladislaus de Besan<sup>163</sup>  
 XII 1468 Ladislaus de Karol<sup>164</sup>  
 IX 1469 Georgius Gala de Hamarady<sup>165</sup>  
 6 IV 1470 Stephanus Kakas de Kenez<sup>166</sup>  
 XI 1470 Thoma de Kenez<sup>167</sup>  
 IV 1482 Benedicto Kaza de Kenez<sup>168</sup>  
 VI 1482 Magistro Emerico Ethele de Sewl *notario personalis presentie Majestatis de curia sua*<sup>169</sup>  
 IV 1483 Stephano de Rabe<sup>170</sup>  
 IV 1486 Gregorius Pethew de Peterd<sup>171</sup>  
 XI 1487 Symone Pap de Kenez<sup>172</sup>  
 VI 1488 Ztanissa/ Zthanilla de Waradya<sup>173</sup>  
 III 1489 Symone Pap de Kenezrekezy<sup>174</sup>  
 X 1489 Symone Pap de Kenezrekezy<sup>175</sup>  
 XI 1489 Nicolao Wrany<sup>176</sup>  
 XII 1489 Benedicto de Ibfalwa *curie regie natario*<sup>177</sup>  
 XII 1493 Andrea Nemes de Kezy<sup>178</sup>  
 III 1498 Ambrosius de Seegh<sup>179</sup>  
 VII 1498 Ladislao Literatho de Baak<sup>180</sup>  
 IX 1498 Martyno literato de Zylas<sup>181</sup>  
 1499 Symonffy de Rekas<sup>182</sup>

□

## Notes

1. Zoltan Iusztin, "Oamenii regelui – aspecte instituționale din prima parte a secolului al XIV-lea de pe teritoriul Transilvaniei și al Banatului medieval", in *Apulum*, XLVIII/2011, passim.
2. Pál Engel, "Királyi emberek Valkó megyében", in *Medievalia Transilvania*, III/1-2, 1999, passim.
3. Károly Vekov, *Locul de adevărare din Alba-Iulia, secolele XIII-XVI* (Cluj-Napoca, ed. Gloria, 2003), passim.
4. Frigyes Pesty, *Krassó vármegye története*, vol. III, (Budapest, 1882); Pesty Frigyes, *Temesvármegye és Temesvár város története. Oklevelek Temesvármegye és Temesvár város történetéhez*, vol. I, ed. T. Ortway (Pozsony, 1896).
5. Zoltan Iusztin, "Oamenii regelui", 65-67.
6. See Annex.
7. Zsigmond Jakó, *Erdélyi Okmánytár*, vol. I (Budapest, ed. Akadémiai Kiadó, 1997), 4, 123-124; *Documente privind istoria României*, C, Transilvania (DIR), vol. I (Bucharest, 1951), 1-2, 355.
8. DIR, vol. I, 2, 355.
9. *Donum cciam dedi deo et sancte Maria sanctoque Benedicto, ego rex Magnus, statuens auctoritate regali, quod omnis vagus et profugus, sive homo, sive iumentum, sive quodcumque animal sit,*

*si in monasterium aut inter familiam, seu inter bestias sancti Benedicti devenierit, in illis non habeat potestatem nuntius regis, neque ducis, neque cuiusquam comitis aut primatis, sed sint in potestate sancti Benedicti et sui abbatis, et secundum consuetudinem Hungarorum faciat abbas et iudicet.*

10. Jakó, *Erdélyi*, 151-152; DIR, vol. I, 171, 373-374.
11. Ibid.
12. DIR, vol. I, 155.
13. Ibid.
14. Ibid., 276-278; 251, 392-393; 392.
15. Jakó, *Erdélyi*, 154-155; Georgius Fejér, *Codex diplomaticus Hungariae ecclesiasticus ac civilis*, III/1 (Budae, 1829), 370-374 (*Fataletum* at Fejér).
16. Jakó, *Erdélyi*, 154-155.
17. *Anjou-kori oklevéltár*, (AO), vol. XIII (Budapest-Szeged, 1999), 371.
18. AO, vol. V, 71.
19. Disappeared settlements in Timiș County.
20. AO, vol. V, 76.
21. Ibid., 71.
22. *Et posthec...nostre personali presencie fideliter rescribatis.*
23. The document is issued at 14 of June 1318: D. f. IV. Prox. P. fe. Penth.
24. *Glosar de termini și expresii din documentele latine privind istoria medie a României*, 182.
25. AO, vol. V, 72.
26. Vekov, *Locul de adevărire*, 80-181.
27. *Corpus Juris Hungarici, Magyar törvénytár. 1000-1526. Evi törvénczykkek*, (CJH) ed. Gy. Nagy, S. Kolosvári, K. Óvári (Budapest, 1899), 1435 évi (II.) VIII törvénczyk ; 1435: 8 § 2: “*Qui quidem, pro hujusmodi testimoniis capitularibus, et conventualibus deputati, priusquam ad faciendas aliquas possessionarias statutiones, metarum reambulationes, revisiones possessionarias, et communes inquisitiones, transmittantur, et procedant, jurare teneantur; ut in eisdem factis, fideliter et recte procedant, et veram relationem, seu fassionem faciant*”.
- § 3: “*Homines autem regii, in praemissis procedentes; tempore reversionis eorum, ac fassionis, seu relationis, coram ipsis, et conventibus fiendis similiter iuramentum praestare teneantur*”.
- § 4: “*Quicumque autem contra suum iuramentum, falsum processum, vel falsam relationem fecisse, repertus fuerit; talis tamquam falsarius, et periurus, poena amissionis beneficii sui (si quod habuerit) puniatur: et insuper, sive beneficiatus, sive non beneficiatus existat; perpetuis carceribus mancipetur*”.
- § 5: “*homo vero regius, si in praemissis possessionariis statutionibus, metarum reambulationibus, et revisionibus, sinistre, vel false processerit; in facto periurii, poena capitis, et amissionis omnium honorum suorum convincatur*”.
28. AO, vol. V, 72.
29. Pesty, Krassó, 94-95.
30. *Zsigmondkori oklevéltár*, (Z.) vol. V (Budapest, 1998), p.502; Frigyes Pesty, *Diplome privind istoria comitatului Timiș și a orașului Timișoara*, vol. II, ed. L. Magina, A. Magina (Cluj-Napoca, 2014), 136-137, 177, 252, 290-291, 427.
31. Pesty, Temes vol. I, 111, 135-136, 137, 159, etc.
32. Vekov, *Locul de adevărire*, 183.
33. Pesty, Temes vol. I, 111.
34. Ibid., 153, 159, 200.
35. Z., vol. V, 577-578.
36. Pesty, Temes vol. I, 407.
37. Ibid., 452,460.

38. Ibid., 57.
39. Ibid., 128-130; Dl.70657.
40. Pesty, Temes vol. I, 517, 489.
41. Ibid., 489.
42. Ibid., 410-411, 413-414.
43. AO, vol. X, 94.
44. Engel, "Királyi emberek", 77.
45. Pesty, Temes, vol. I, 236-237.
46. Ibid., 238.
47. AO, vol. V, 332-333.
48. DIR, vol. III, 246-247.
49. Ibid.
50. Ibid.
51. Z., vol. V, 557.
52. *Documenta Romaniae Historica*, C, Transilvania (DRH), vol. XII (Bucharest, 1985) 166-167.
53. Pesty, Temes, vol. I, 306-307.
54. Ibid., 200, 213.
55. Ibid., 452.
56. Ibid., 460.
57. Pesty, Temes vol.II, 356-357.
58. Pesty, Temes vol. I, 338-339.
59. CJH, 1486 évi VIII. törvénycikk; *Ex potioribus nobilibus*.
60. AO, vol. II, 33, 23.
61. Engel, "Királyi emberek", 82-84.
62. Ibid., 83-86.
63. Pesty, Temes vol. I, 46, 48, 128-130.
64. Ibid., 373; Pesty, Temes II, 357.
65. Dl.92450, Dl.92440; Z., vol. IV, 599.
66. Pesty, Temes vol. I, 504-505, 508-509, 512.
67. Ibid., 373.
68. Ibid., 306-307.
69. Zoltan Iusztin, "The Noble Judges in Timiș County (14<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup> Centuries)", in *Transylvanian Review*, vol. XXII Supplement nr.4/2013, 254-262.
70. Zoltan Iusztin, "Vicecomiș in comitatul Timiș (sec. XIV-XV)", in *Analele Banatului XXI/2013*, 269-271.
71. Pesty, Temes vol. I, 11.
72. Ibid., 33-35.
73. AO, vol. XIII, 371.
74. Dl.40688.
75. Pesty, Temes vol. I, 46, 48.
76. Ibid., 57.
77. Ibid., 68.
78. Ibid., 70.
79. Dl.91375.
80. DRH. C. XII. 166.
81. Ibid., 166-167.
82. DRH. C. XIII. 483.

83. Ibid., 527.
84. Ibid., 575, 579.
85. Pesty, Temes vol. I, 111.
86. Pesty, Krassó, 93-94.
87. DRH. C. XIV, 4.
88. Pesty, Temes vol. I, 128-130; *Magyar Országos Levéltár, (Dl.) Mohács előtti gyűjtemény*. Dl.70657.
89. DRH. C. XIV, 519, 532.
90. Ibid., 573.
91. Pesty, Temes vol. I, 135-136.
92. Ibid., 137.
93. Ibid., 158-159.
94. Ibid., 153.
95. Pesty, Krassó, 175.
96. Pesty, Temes vol. I, 215.
97. Ibid., 216-217.
98. Krassó 186.
99. Pesty, Temes vol. I, Temes I. 193.
100. Ibid., 199.
101. Ibid., 200, 213.
102. Ibid., 230.
103. Ibid., 228.
104. Ibid., 234.
105. Ibid., 235.
106. Ibid., 235.
107. Ibid., 237.
108. Ibid., 238.
109. Ibid., 284.
110. Ibid., 380.
111. Ibid., 315.
112. Ibid., 342-343.
113. Ibid., 338-339.
114. Ibid., 378.
115. Ibid., 423-424.
116. Wenzel Gusztáv, "Okmánytár Ozorai Pipo Történetéhez", in *Történelmi Tár* 7/1884, 28-29.
117. Pesty, Temes vol. I, Temes I. 404, 407.
118. Ibid., 405.
119. Ibid., 410-411.
120. Ibid., 413-414.
121. Ibid., 451.
122. Ibid., 452.
123. Ibid., 460.
124. Dl.92450; Dl.92440; Z., vol. IV, 599.
125. Z., vol. V, 577.
126. Ibid., 578.
127. Pesty, Temes vol. I, 516.
128. Z., vol. V, 578.
129. Pesty, Temes vol. I, 517.

130. Dl.53867; Pesty, Temes vol. I, 489.
131. Z., vol. V, 468.
132. Pesty, Temes vol. I, 527.
133. Z., vol. V, 578.
134. Z., vol. VI. 312.
135. Pesty, Temes vol. I, 549-550.
136. Z., vol. VI. 588; Dl.10724.
137. Z., vol. VI. 502; Dl.266439.
138. Z., vol. IX, 153.
139. Pesty, Temes vol. I, 579.
140. Gyula Nagy, *A nagymihály és stáray gróf Stáray család oklevéltára*, vol. II, (Budapest, 1889) 262-263.
141. Dl.43709; Dl.92723.
142. Dl.44045.
143. Dl.37599.
144. Dl.86564.
145. Pesty, Temes vol. II, 130, 133.
146. Ibid., 136-137.
147. Ibid., 158.
148. Ibid., 177, 180.
149. Ibid., 182.
150. Ibid., 227, 232.
151. Ibid., 252, 254.
152. Ibid., 253, 255.
153. Ibid., 271, 274.
154. Ibid., 272, 277.
155. Ibid., 290-291.
156. Ibid., 300-301.
157. Ibid., 312-314.
158. Ibid., 315-316.
159. Ibid., 336-337.
160. Ibid., 347, 352.
161. Ibid., 356-357.
162. Dl.30206.
163. Pesty, Temes vol. II, 394, 398.
164. Dl.27047.
165. Pesty, Temes vol. II, 410-411.
166. Ibid., 414, 420.
167. Ibid., 427, 429.
168. Dl.18620.
169. Dl.37653.
170. Dl.18784.
171. Dl.59740.
172. Dl.46073.
173. Dl.30225.
174. Dl.19477.
175. Dl.59769.
176. Dl.59784.



- 177. DI.59782.
- 178. DI.37685.
- 179. DI.88823.
- 180. DI.88826.
- 181. DI.59879.
- 182. DI.67470.

### **Abstract**

#### **The King's Men from Timiș County (14th-15th Centuries)**

One of the many key factors of the medieval state is the institution known as *homo regius*. From a social point of view, this office seems to be a local extension of the monarchy, as the king's man is the representative and even the substitute of the sovereign and the person in charge with passing forward and implementing the ruler's orders. In most cases, documents mention the king's man in relation to issues of ennoblement and conferring proprietary rights, his role being that of claiming ownership in the name of the king and of subsequently reporting the events that took place on the spot. The king's man was usually accompanied by a representative of the chapters or convents which would compile an on-site report of his achievements and submit it to the king. However, the king's man responsibilities were not limited to these issues; in some cases his tasks included reambulations, investigating and reporting the situations of the various domains or properties, establishing and setting their limits and borders, investigating the complaints of the parties involved in court trials, or acting as a witness before the king or the judges in court matters.

### **Keywords**

the king's men, the estates' reambulation, livery of seisin, places of authentication, noble judges