

PAVOL HUDÁČEK

HUDÁČEK, Pavol. *Silva Bereg*. A Royal Forest in Medieval Hungary. *Historický časopis*, 2017, 65, 5, pp. 809-848, Bratislava.

The author of this study is concerned with researching the Bereg royal estate, which formed part of the frontier regions of the medieval Kingdom of Hungary. In the 11th century Bereg belonged to the great frontier county of Boržava, but formed an independent territory within it. A separate county organization under noble control was established in it only later. Its centre was a royal manor, where the kings of Hungary settled people of German origin in the first half of the 13th century. Its importance mainly lay in the fact that it was a dynastic property of the House of Arpád at least from the 11th century. It was a part of the Carpathian mountains dominated by forests. Members of the Arpád dynasty often went there to hunt. In Western Europe such properties were known as *forestes* and the prerogatives of the monarch prevailed there. It is very probable that forest properties of the dynasty including Bereg were also protected by special rights of the monarch in the Kingdom of Hungary. According to all the evidence, Bereg was a royal forest where members of the Arpád dynasty hunted, and it had an internal organization similar to that known from Western Europe.

Key words: Kingdom of Hungary. House of Arpád. Frontier region. Bereg. Ugoča. Royal forest. Hunting. Dynastic property. *Comitatus* and *districtus*. *Comes* and *procurator*.

In the 11th and 12th centuries Hungary was an extensive kingdom with the Carpathians forming a natural frontier to the north-east. More continuous forest areas were found mainly in the marginal frontier regions.¹ Some medievalists consider that these regions were thinly settled and inhabited mainly by foresters, hunters, fishermen and falconers of Slavonic origin.² In contrast to the more densely settled *medium regni*, which already had

1 On the forests of the Carpathian Basin see: SZABÓ, Péter. Changes in woodland cover in the Carpathian Basin. In SZABÓ, Péter – HÉDL, Radim (eds.). *Human Nature : Studies in Historical Ecology and Environmental History*. Brno : Institute of Botany of the ASCR, 2008, s. 106-115. ISBN 9788086188287; RABB, Péter. Natural conditions in the Carpathian Basin of the middle ages. In *Architecture*, 2007, year 38, no. 2, p. 50-54. ISSN 17893437.

2 KARÁCSONYI, János. Halvány vonások hazánk Szent István korabeli határaitól. (The unclear outline of our frontiers in the time of St. Stephen.). In *Századok* (hereinafter Sz), 1901, year 35, no. 3, p. 1051-1052; SZÚCS, Jenő. *Az utolsó Árpádok*. (The last Arpád dynasty kings.). Budapest : MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1993, p. 39. ISBN 9789633892718; BAKAY, Kornél. Hungary. In REUTER, Timothy (ed.). *The New Cambridge Medieval History III, 900–1024*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1999, p. 540. ISBN 9781139055727; SZÉKELY, Gusztáv. Ugocea vármegye kialakulása az új kutatások tükrében

a large number of churches and monasteries in a varied cultural landscape, these forested regions were thought to be occupied only by vast wild forests. This view is only partly true. It is necessary to recognize that the royal power reached into these outlying parts of the country, although clearly not so strongly as in the western part of the kingdom. The frontier zones were often specified territories both in the political and the socio-cultural senses. They belonged to the ruling dynasty and the royal power had to be militarily and culturally represented precisely there.³ Therefore not only the natural character of the country, but also extensive territories where various cultural, military and commercial contacts soon appeared, formed the natural frontiers of the country (*finēs, confines, termini*). Medieval rulers had a strong interest in the defence and in using their power to support these marginal territories.⁴ They were part of the great frontier counties (*marchia, confinium*)⁵ of the Kingdom of Hungary, and almost all belonged to the dynastic or “private” properties of the Arpád dynasty. The royal power was represented by the manor houses as power centres, chapels, dynastic monasteries⁶, and in the military field by the network of royal defensive castles, defensive measures and frontier guards (*indagines regni, clausura, obstaculum, porta, euri, speculatores* alebo *sagittarii*).⁷ Members of the Arpád dynasty often hunted in these frontier regions, and so they often came under regal law. In Western Europe they were called *forestis/forestum/foresta, silva regis* and the regal or forest law inevitably associated with them was most frequently called *wildbann*.⁸

-
- I. (The creation of the County of Ugocsa as reflected in new research I.). In *Acta Beregsasensis*, 2009, year 8, no. 2, p. 85. ISSN 23101954. On this see: RAJMAN, Jerzy. „In confinio terrae“ : Definicje i metodologiczne aspekty badań nad średniowiecznym pograniczem. (“In confinio terrae”: Definition and methodological aspects of research on medieval frontiers.). In *Kwartalnik Historyczny*, 2002, year 109, no. 1, p. 84-88, 91-92. ISSN 00235903.
- 3 On this see e.g.: BEREND, Nora. Medievalists and the Notion of the Frontier. In *The Medieval History Journal* (hereinafter *MHJ*), 1999, year 2, no. 1, p. 55-72. ISSN 09719458; RODRÍGUEZ-PICAVEA, Enrique. The Frontier and Royal Power in Medieval Spain : A Development Hypothesis. In *MHJ*, 2005, year 8, no. 2, p. 273-293; CASTELLANOS, Santiago – VISO, Inaki Martin. The local articulation of central power in the north of the Iberian Peninsula (500–1000). In *Early Medieval Europe*, 2005, year 13, no. 1, p. 1-42. ISSN 14680254.
- 4 BEREND, Nora. *At the Gate of Christendom : Jews, Muslims and 'Pagans' in Medieval Hungary, c. 1000 – c. 1300*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2001, p. 6-17. ISBN 100521651859; RAJMAN, ref. 2, p. 79, 81-82, 84, 86-87, 94. On this see: POHL, Walter. Soziale Grenzen und Spielräume der Macht. In POHL, Walter – REIMITZ, Helmut (eds.). *Grenze und Differenz im frühen Mittelalter*. Wien : Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2000, p. 11-18. ISBN 3700128967; GOETZ, Hans-Werner. Concepts of realm and frontiers from late antiquity to the early Middle Ages : Some preliminary remarks. In POHL, Walter et al. (eds.). *The Transformation of Frontiers : From Late Antiquity to the Carolingians*. Leiden; Boston : Brill, 2001, p. 73-74, 82. ISBN 9004111148.
- 5 HÓMAN, Bálint. *Geschichte des ungarischen Mittelalters I. : Von dem ältesten Zeiten bis zum Ende des XII. Jahrhunderts*. Berlin : Verlag Walter de Gruyter & Co, 1940, p. 211-212. On the frontiers of Hungary see: BAKAY, ref. 1, p. 540.
- 6 MEZEY, Ladislaus. Ungarn und Europa im 12. Jahrhundert : Kirche und Kultur zwischen Ost und West. In MAYER, Theodor (ed.). *Probleme des 12. Jahrhunderts : Vorträge und Forschungen 12*. Stuttgart ; Konstanz : Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 1968, p. 259-260, 262. ISSN 0452490X.
- 7 GÖCKENJAN, Hansgerd. *Hilfsvölker und Grenzwächter im mittelalterlichen Ungarn*. Wiesbaden : Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH, 1972, p. 12-22. ISBN 351500775X; BEREND, ref. 4, p. 20-22, 24-30.
- 8 HUDÁČEK, Pavol. Kráľovské lesy a dynastické majetky Arpádovcov v 11. – 12. storočí : Porovnanie so západnou Európou. (Royal forests and the dynastic properties of the Arpád dynasty in the 11th and

Hungarian historiography used the term *erdőuraldom* (Ger. *Forstdomäne*). Only later, thanks to more perfect organization did *erdőispánságok* (Ger. *Forstgespanschaften*) develop.⁹ Bereg and neighbouring Ugoča (Ukr. Угоча/Hun. Ugocsa) were also such royal forests, or to be more exact, dynastic forest properties of the ruling dynasty.

Some of the forests of medieval Hungary, namely Igfon, Zvolen, Spiš and Csepe, are mentioned by Anonymous in his well-known work *Gesta Hungarorum* (hereinafter GH). He describes events that occurred in the 9th – 10th centuries, but they are adapted in the period from the end of the 12th and beginning of the 13th centuries, when this source was written. Therefore the majority of the information it gives needs to be taken with some reservations. However, this does not concern the nature of the country at the time. The author aimed to convince the reader of the trustworthiness of the events he described, and so the real country of his time forms part of the story.¹⁰ For this reason, we can consider that the information about the forests is authentic. In the 12th century, the royal forests were not only small wooded areas, but in some cases also larger forested regions.¹¹ For example, the GH contains various mentions of the Havaš Wood (*silva Hovos*, *Howos*) in the north-eastern Carpathians,¹² through which the Magyar nomads came to Pannonia – the Carpathian Basin. An extensive region in this mountain range (*ad partes Hung descenderunt*) belonged to the castle of Uh/Užhorod (*castrum Hung*).¹³ The *Gesta*

12th centuries.). In KOVÁČ, Dušan et al. (eds.). *Slovenské dejiny v dejinách Európy : Vybrané kapitoly*. Bratislava : VEDA, 2015, p. 35, 50, 66-67. ISBN 9788022414487.

- 9 KRISTÓ, Gyula. *A vármegyék kialakulása Magyarországon*. (The formation of counties in Hungary.). Budapest : Magvető Könyvkiadó, 1988, p. 377-383, 391-392, 399, 407-408, 413. ISBN 9631411893; SZŰCS, Jenő. Sárospatak kezdetei és a pataki erdőuraldom. (The beginnings of Sárospatak and Patak forest hunting territory.). In *Történelmi Szemle*, 1993, year 35, no. 1/2, p. 1-57, p. 12-13, 15, 23-24. ISSN 00409634; *Korai magyar történelmi lexikon (9. – 14. század)*. (A dictionary of early Hungarian history (9th – 14th centuries).). (hereinafter *KMTL*). KRISTÓ, Gyula – ENGEL, Pál – MAKK, Ferenc (eds.). Budapest, 1994, p. 194-195, 353-354, 533, 594-595, 680-681, 747. ISBN 9630567229; KÖRMENDY, Adrienne. *Melioratio terrae : Vergleichende Untersuchungen über die Siedlungsbewegung im östlichen Mitteleuropa im 13. – 14. Jahrhundert*. Poznań : Wydawnictwo Poznańskiego Towarzystwa Przyjaciół Nauk, 1995, p. 10-13. ISBN 8370631002; SZABÓ, Péter. *Woodland and Forests in Medieval Hungary*. Oxford : Archaeopress, 2005, p. 26, 87-88, 89-90. ISBN 1841716944; TRINGLI, István. *Megyék a középkori Magyarországon*. (Counties in medieval Hungary.). In NEUMANN, Tibor – RÁCZ, György (eds.). *Honoris causa : Tanulmányok Engel Pál tiszteletére*. Budapest : MTA Történettudományi Intézete; Piliscsaba : Pázmány Péter Katolikus Egyetem Bölcsészettudományi Kara, 2009, p. 494-495, 500-501. ISBN 9789639627253.
- 10 RATKOŠ, Peter. Anonymus *Gesta Hungarorum* a ich pramenná hodnota. (The anonymous *Gesta Hungarorum* and its value as a source.). In *Historický časopis* (hereinafter *HČ*), 1983, year 31, no. 6, p. 851-856. ISSN 00182575; MÚCSKA, Vincent (ed.). *Kronika anonymného notára kráľa Bela : Gesta Hungarorum*. (The chronicle of the anonymous notary of King Bela : *Gesta Hungarorum*.) Budmerice : Vydavateľstvo Rak, 2000, p. 23, 25-26, 27. ISBN 8085501171; MUSIL, František. *Gesta Hungarorum a historicko-zemepisný obraz Slovenska*. (The *Gesta Hungarorum* and the historical – geographical picture of Slovakia.). In *HČ*, 2004, year 52, no. 3, p. 435, 442; VESZPRÉMY, László. The Invented 11th Century of Hungary. In URBAŇCZYK, Przemysław (ed.). *The Neighbours of Poland in the 11th Century*. Warsaw : Wydawnictwo DiG, 2002, p. 141, 144. ISBN 837181271X.
- 11 MUSIL, ref. 10, p. 434, 436.
- 12 NÉMETH, Péter. Borsova határvármegye természeti földrajza. (The geography of the natural boundaries of the County of Boršov.). In *A Nyíregyházi Jónás András múzeum évkönyve, 1969–1971*, 1972, year 12-14, p. 48. ISSN 05470196; *KMTL*, p. 258-259; MUSIL, ref. 10, p. 445.
- 13 P. MAGISTRI, qui Anonymus dicitur, *Gesta Hungarorum*, Cap. 9, 11, 12, 13. BAK, János M. – RADY,

Hungarorum also states that Prince Arpád sent his warriors to take the land between the Tisza and Bodrog as far as Ugoč (*usque ad Vgosam*). At the same time, they surrounded and captured Boržava Castle and sent the prisoners to Uh/Užhorod Castle.¹⁴ The castles of Uh/Užhorod (County of Ung and Boržava (County of Boržava-Bereg) already existed in this part of the Hungarian frontier region around the year 1200, and we know that the castle of Sásvár (County of Boržava-Szatmár-Ugoča) also existed at the time.¹⁵ We do not learn much from the terms used to designate places and territories such as *silva Hovos* – Carpathians, frontier or county castles such as *Castrum Hung*, *castrum Borsoa*, in the case of Ugoča (*Vgosa*),¹⁶ what the locality was like or what type of property. According to the documents from the first half of the 13th century, we know that it was not a castle. However, it had its name, and apparently a separate territory was known by this name. It could have been a royal dynastic property or a royal forest (*silva Vgosa?*) like the forests (*silvae*) of Igfon, Zvolen, Spiš and Csepel. If Anonymous had mentioned the royal property of Bereg in his work and if he had described it in more detail, he might have spoken of the *silva Bereg*, because this is how it is designated in the first half of the 13th century.¹⁷

In 1085, when the deposed King Solomon of Hungary (1063–1081) was released from captivity, he fled to the Pechenegs. He obtained military assistance from their khan and invaded Hungary with Pecheneg warriors. They penetrated into the territory of the *provinciae* of the castles of Uh/Užhorod and Boržava.¹⁸ This is one of the earliest mentions of the frontier County of Boržava. According to mentions from the 13th century we know that the royal forest properties of Bereg and Ugoča were situated in its northern

Martyn Rady – VESZPRÉMY, László (eds.). *Anonymous and Master Roger, Anonymous, Notary of King Béla The Deeds of the Hungarians, Master Roger's Epistle to the Sorrowful Lament upon the Destruction of the Kingdom of Hungary by the Tartars*. Budapest; New York : Central European University Press, 2010, p. XXI-XXIII, 27, 31, 35. ISBN 9789639776561; STEINHÜBEL, Ján. *Nitrianske kniežatstvo : Počiatky stredovekého Slovenska*. (The Principality of Nitra: The beginnings of medieval Slovakia). Bratislava : Rak, 2004, p. 187-188. ISBN 8022408123.

- 14 „*Arpad dux missis exercitibus suis totam terram, que est inter Thisciam et Budrug usque ad Vgosam sibi cum omnibus habitatoribus suis preoccupavit ad castrum Borsoa obsedit et tercio die pugnando apprehendit, muros eius destruxit et milites Salani ducis, quos ibi invenit cathenis ligatos in castrum Hung duci precepit.*“ P. MAGISTRI, qui Anonymus dicitur, *Gesta Hungarorum*, Cap. 14, p. 39; STEINHÜBEL, ref. 13, p. 187-188; KRISTÓ, Gyula. *Hungarian History in the Ninth Century*. Szeged : Szegedi Középkorász Műhely, 1996, p. 191-203. ISBN 9634821138.
- 15 KRISTÓ, ref. 9, p. 493; NÉMETH, Péter. *A középkori szatmár megye települései a XV. század elejéig*. (Medieval settlement of the County of Szatmár up to the beginning of the 15th century.). Nyíregyháza : NKA, 2008, p. XXIX, XXXII. ISBN 9789637220630.
- 16 *KMTL*, p. 696.
- 17 GYÖRFFY, György. *Az Árpád-kori Magyarország történelmi földrajza I*. (Historical Geography of Hungary in the Árpád Period.) (hereinafter ÁMTF I). Budapest : Akadémiai Kiadó, 1963, p. 530-531. ISBN 9630575043.
- 18 „*Dux autem Kutesk inani spe seductus, cum magna multitudine Cunorum invadens Hungariam devenit usque in provinciam castrorum Vng et Borsua.*“ *Chronici Hungarici compositio saeculi XIV*, Cap. 134. (hereinafter Chron. Hung. comp. saec. XIV) In *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum I* (hereinafter SRH). DOMANOVSKY, Alexander (ed.). Budapestini : Academia Litter. Hungarica atque Societate Histor. Hungarica, 1938, p. 408; KÁLTI, Márkus – DERCSÉNYI, Desző (eds.). *The Hungarian illuminated chronicle : Chronica de gestis Hungarorum*. Budapest : Corvina Press, 1969, s. 128. ISBN 0800840151; KRISTÓ, ref. 9, s. 421-422; STEINHÜBEL, ref. 13, p. 188.

and eastern parts.¹⁹ It is impossible to unambiguously prove whether this was already the case at the end of the 11th century. According to the historian Frigyes Pesty, Bereg and Ugoča were originally part of an extensive forest where royal manor houses were found, and so he regards them as an old hunting territory of the Arpád dynasty.²⁰ György Györffy makes this statement more specific saying that already in the 11th century Bereg was a royal hunting territory and belonged to the frontier county (*marchia*) of Boržava. However, these statements are not based on any documents and represent only the guesses of these historians.²¹ The medievalists could not exactly determine when the individual counties of this frontier region of Hungary originated,²² but it is generally accepted that up to the 12th century Bereg, Ugoča, Máramaros and the north-eastern part of Szatmár were part of the great County of Boržava. These territories were gradually separated in the course of the 12th and 13th centuries.²³ This was not an exceptional situation in the context of the territorial administrative division of Hungary. We know of a number of other examples, for example, the counties of Zvolen and *Novum Castrum*.²⁴ It is important to realize that the territories of the great counties contained a varied property structure with county castles, frontier castles, properties of the king, royal and religious institutions, which were reflected in their internal divisions and territorial arrangements.²⁵

Thus Bereg was situated in a frontier region of Hungary (*confinium, marchia*), it was part of a large royal county, it served the kings of Hungary as a hunting area, it had a royal manor house and villages of specialized royal servants connected with hunting. However, we have no information from the 11th – 12th centuries to directly prove that Bereg and Ugoča or the nearby Erdőd in the County of Szatmár,²⁶ were royal forests. The only written evidence that the king was accustomed to hunt in this frontier region of Hungary is found in a document from 1199. Emeric I (1174–1204) granted part of the land

19 KRISTÓ, ref. 9, p. 421-426, 492-497; NÉMETH, ref. 12, p. 46-48.

20 PESTY, Frigyes. *Az eltűnt régi vármegyék I.* (Vanished old castle counties.). Budapest : Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1880, p. 192, 195-196.

21 ÁMTF I, p. 519, 520-522; KRISTÓ, ref. 9, p. 421, 492. On this see: BOTKA, Tivadar. A vármegyék első alakulásáról és őskori szervezetéről III. (On the initial development of counties and their early organization III.). In *Sz*, 1871, year 5, no. 5, p. 393, 396.

22 VESZPRÉMY, ref. 10, p. 144-145. On the assignment of Ugoča in the 11th century see: KRISTÓ, Gyula. Nehány vármegye kialakulásának kérdéséhez. (On the question of the creation of some castle counties.). In *Sz*, 2002, year 136, no. 2, p. 473-475. ISSN 00398098.

23 PESTY, ref. 20, p. 192, 195; ÁMTF I, p. 520-522; KRISTÓ, ref. 9, p. 421-426, 490-492, 492-497; NÉMETH, ref. 15, p. XXVIII-XXIX; SZÉKELY, ref. 2, p. 74-89.

24 BOTKA, Tivadar. A vármegyék első alakulásáról és őskori szervezetéről IV. (On the initial development of counties and their early organization IV.). In *Sz*, 1872, year 6, no. 1, p. 23; KRISTÓ, ref. 9, p. 398-410, 377-383.

25 ÁMTF I, p. 39-49 (an example from Abov); ZSOLDOS, Attila. The First Centuries of Hungarian Military Organization. In VESZPRÉMY, László - KIRÁLY, Béla K. (eds.). *A Millennium of Hungarian Military History*. New York : Social Science Monographs, 2002, p. 7. ISBN 088033519X; BEREND, Nora. Hungary in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries. In LUSCOMBE, David – RILEY-SMITH, Jonathan (eds.). *The New Cambridge Medieval History, Vol. IV/2, 1024–1198*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2004, p. 307-308. ISBN 9781107460638.

26 BOTKA, ref. 21, p. 396; NÉMETH, ref. 15, p. XXIX-XXX, XXXII; PESTY, ref. 20, p. 137-138; KRISTÓ, ref. 9, p. 489-490.

of royal servants in **Pakhe*, a vanished village in the County of Sopron, to his jobagio, the *comes* Laurence for saving his life in an accident during a hunt in Máramaros (*cum in Maramorisio tempore venationis venatum ivissemus*) and other merits.²⁷ In 1272 one of the boundaries of Ugoča went *ad indagines silve Maramorisii*, which was surely the forest where King Emeric had hunted at the end of the 12th century.²⁸ When the King of Hungary hunted in Máramaros, he surely also hunted in nearby Bereg and Ugoča. They were wooded areas of the Carpathian foothills and marginal parts of the frontier County of Boržava.²⁹ Medievalists still state, in agreement with the above mentioned older views, that Bereg and Ugoča were originally hunting territories (*erdőuradalomok*) of the Árpád dynasty, similar to Turňa, Šariš and Patak. In the course of the 12th century, they were organized as *erdőispánságok* – meaning forest lordships or royal forest properties.³⁰

In the second half of the 13th century, Bereg and Ugoča in contrast to all the other *erdőispánságok* were designated by the term *forestae*.³¹ This word was normally used in Western Europe for royal forests protected by forest or regal law. This mention is found in a document of Bela IV (1235–1270) from 1261 concerning the properties and rights of the Bishopric of Eger. The document mentions that the wooded lands of the later counties of Ugoča and Bereg were originally organized as royal forests (*forestae nostrae*). The document was issued to confirm the properties and rights of the Bishopric of Eger, gained from St. Stephen (1000/1001–1038)³² when the bishopric was founded,

-
- 27 WAGNER, Hans et al. (eds.). *Urkundenbuch des Burgenlandes und der angrenzenden Gebiete der Komitate Wieselburg, Ödenburg und Eisenburg I. : Die Urkunden von 808 bis 1270* (hereinafter *UB I*). Graz; Köln : Verlag Hermann Böhlhaus Nachf., 1955, no. 64, p. 36. ISBN 103901517189; BÉLAY, Vilmos. *Máramaros megye társadalma és nemzetiségei : A megye betelepülésétől XVIII. század elejéig*. (Society and nationality in the County of Máramaros: From the settlement of the county to the beginning of the 18th century.). Budapest : Sylvester Nyomda Rt., 1943, p. 6, 10; ZSOLT, Sebestyén. *Máramaros megye helységneveinek etimológiai szótára*. (An etymological dictionary of the place-names in the County of Máramaros.). Nyiregyháza : Bessenyei Könyvkiadó, 2012, p. 5. ISBN 9786155097539; KMTL, s. 442; ZOLNAY, László. *Vadászatok a régi Magyarországon*. (Hunting in the early Kingdom of Hungary.). Budapest : Natura, 1971, p. 93-94. ISBN 0669000252453.
- 28 Magyar nemzeti levéltár Budapest, Diplomatikai levéltára. (National Archives of Hungary, Archival documents.). (ďalej MNL DL), sign. 70 588 (year 1272); FEJÉR, Georgius (ed.). *Codex diplomaticus Hungariae ecclesiasticus ac civilis V/1* (hereinafter *CDH*). Buda : n. p., 1829–1844, p. 177; SZENTPÉTERY, Imre – BORSA, Iván (eds.). *Regesta regum striptis Arpadianae critico-diplomatica II* (hereinafter *RA*). Budapest : Kiadja a Magyar tudományos Akadémia, 1923–1987, no. 2117, p. 116; *ÁMTF IV*, p. 112-113, 124; BOTKA, ref. 21, p. 392; KRISTÓ, ref. 9, p. 426; PESTY, ref. 20., p. 192.
- 29 BOTKA, ref. 21, p. 392-396; *ÁMTF IV*, p. 112.
- 30 KRISTÓ, ref. 9, p. 424, 492; SZÜCS, ref. 2, p. 46; BOGLÁRKA, Weisz. A Felső-Tisza-vidék vámszedése az Árpád-korban II. (Collection of tolls in the upper Tisa basin in the Árpád period II.). In *Szabolcs-Szatmár-Beregi szemle : Társadalom, tudomány, művészet*, 2005, year 3, no. 1, p. 95-97. ISSN 1219092X.
- 31 It is exceptional because in Hungary this term is not regularly used. However, we know of another two cases. When defining the property of Hurbuchan in the County of Zala in 1263 (*vadit per forestas*). *UB I*, no. 430, p. 294; *Codex diplomaticus Arpadianus continuatus VIII* (hereinafter *CDAC*). WENZEL, Gusztáv (ed.). Pest ; Budapest : Kiadja Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1860–1874, no. 34, p. 52-54. When dividing the village of Tarcsa (now Tarcea) in Bihar in 1338 (*vinee in forestam redacte existentem*). DEDEK, Ludovicus Crescens (ed.). *Monumenta Ecclesiae Strigoniensis III*. (hereinafter *MES*). Strigoni : Typis Descriptis Gustavus Buzárovits, 1924, no. 457, p. 317.
- 32 GYÖRFFY, Georgius (ed.). *Diplomata Hungariae antiquissima accedunt epistolae et acta ad historiam Hungariae pertinentia I. (1000–1131)* (hereinafter *DHA*). Budapest : Akadémiai Kiadó, 1992, no. 10, p.

as well as further grants of property by St. Ladislav (1077–1095). The documents from these kings granting privileges were destroyed during the Tartar invasion, so the properties and rights derived from donations and liberties granted by these saintly kings (*per sanctos reges donatas et concessas*) had to be confirmed.³³ Specifically it was about land ownership, tolls, tithes, liberties and rights. The document spoke of *diversis possessi-onibus et piscinas ac multiformis libertatibus* with properties of the bishopric located *in pluribus districtibus et comitatibus*.³⁴ The properties and rights are clearly arranged into three groups. The first is concerned with definition of the land and villages belonging to the bishopric. This is followed by places for catching fish (*piscinas*) belonging to these villages, and then by the various liberties granted by the saintly kings (*libertas enim per predictos sanctos reges...donata hec est*). The most interesting section is the part concerned with rights, liberties, church tithes and revenue (*decimam partem*) from royal tolls. The document ends with a specific statement that Belo III (1173–1196) and Andrew II (1205–1235) granted the Bishopric of Eger a tenth (*decimas*) of the revenue from all the royal forests (*omnium forestarum nostrarum*), from newly formed or cleared and future royal estates – *praedia (novalium prediorum nostrorum fundatorum et fundandorum)*, from the villages of noblemen (!) and royal servants (*servitori nostri*),³⁵ located in the districts of Ugoča and Bereg (*in districtibus de Wgacha et de Beregh*).³⁶ In 1271 Stephen V (1262/1270–1272) confirmed this document at the request of Bishop Lampert of Eger.³⁷ A second variant survives of the 1271 document with different content

60-61 (year 1009). ISBN 9630549522.

- 33 On this see: TRINGLI, István. The Liberty of the Holy Kings : Saint Stephen and the Holy Kings in the Hungarian Legal Heritage. In ZSOLDOS, Attila (ed.). *Saint Stephen and His Country : A Newborn Kingdom in Central Europe: Hungary (Essays on Saint Stephen and his Age)*. Budapest : Lucidus Kiadó, 2001, p. 142-143. ISBN 9638616393; MÚCSKA, Vincent. K otázke vzťahu uhorského kráľa k cirkvi v 11. storočí. (On the question of the relationship of the King of Hungary to the Church in the 11th century.). In ŠIMONČIČ, Jozef (ed.). *Studia historica Tyrnaviensia III*. Trnava : Katedra História Trnavskej Univerzity v Trnave, 2003, p. 338, 340. ISBN 8089074634.
- 34 KONDORNÉ LÁTKÓCZKI, Erzsébet (ed.). *Árpád-kori oklevelek a Heves megyei levéltárban : Diplomata aetatis Arpadiana in archivo comitatus Hevesiensis conservata* (Árpád period documents in the archives of the County of Heves.). (hereinafter *HÁO*). Eger : Heves Megyei Levéltár, 1997, no. 9, p. 23. ISBN 9637242112; *RA II/1*, no. 2123, p. 118-119.
- 35 The Latin terms *servitor* is also interesting. It was also not normally used in 13th century Hungary. SZEKFŰ, Julius. Die Servienten und Familiaren im ungarischen Mittelalter. In *Ungarische Rundschau für historische und soziale Wissenschaften*, 1913, year 2, p. 527-531.
- 36 1261/1271: “*Item Bela proavus noster et Endere pater noster karissimus, felicitum recordationum reges, decimas omnium forestarum nostrarum et novalium prediorum nostrorum fundatorum et fundandorum ac villarum nobilium et nostrorum servitorum universaliter in districtibus de Wgacha et de Beregh existentium ecclesie Agriensi applicarunt et condonarunt, demum et nos applicavimus et condonavimus, perpetuo et irrevocabiliter exigendas.*“ *HÁO*, č. 9, p. 23-29; *RA II/1*, no. 2123, p. 124; *RA I/3*, no. 1267, p. 386; *ÁMTFI*, p. 530; PESTY, ref. 20, p. 196-197; SZÉKELY, György. Településtörténet és nyelvtörténet : A XII. századi magyar nyelvhatár kérdéséhez. (History of settlement and language : On the question of the Hungarian language boundaries in the 12th century.). In BALÁZS, Éva H. – FÜGEDI, Erik – MAKSAI, Ferenc (eds.). *Mályusz Elemér emlékkönyv : Társadalom- és művelődéstörténeti tanulmányok*. Budapest : Akadémiai Kiadó, 1984, p. 321. ISBN 9630532727; SZÜCS, ref. 9, p. 12-13; CSÖRE, Pál. *A magyar erdőgazdálkodás története : Középkor*. (A history of the economic exploitation of Hungarian forests: the Middle Ages.). Budapest : Akadémiai Kiadó, 1980, p. 79. ISBN 9630519143; ZOLNAY, ref. 27, p. 95-97.
- 37 *RA II/1*, no. 2123, p. 118-124; SUGÁR, István. *Az egri püspökök története*. (A history of the bishops

to the first. The part about revenue from tolls in the Diocese of Eger states which counties were involved. This also concerns the counties (*comitati*) of Ugoča and Bereg, and the document specifically states that these were formerly forests of the saintly kings (*qui duo ultimi comitatus, scilicet Wgacha et Bereg fuerunt foreste sanctorum regum*).³⁸ On the basis of this text, F. Pesty states that Ugoča and Bereg were not originally royal counties, but became ones only much later. Since they are still mentioned in the 1271 document as royal forests (hunting grounds of the saintly kings), there appears to have been a wish to indicate a change concerning these territories, which were already organizationally equal to other counties of the Kingdom of Hungary in the second half of the 13th century.³⁹ This is one of the direct pieces of evidence that they had earlier not been royal counties, and before the 13th century they had a specific position in the framework of the royal properties as hunting grounds or royal forests.⁴⁰ However, we cannot satisfactorily explain the use of the term *foresta* in these documents, since it was not normally used in medieval Hungary. Apart from the term *foresta*, the document uses the expression *vasali nobiles*, another term unknown in Hungary.⁴¹ This could have been connected with the writer of the document. It was conceived by the royal vice chancellor Magister Paul, then Provost of Alba Iulia. However, he came from Hungary, so the possibility that he was a foreigner does not come into account. However, he could have been educated abroad. These terms are usual in documents from Western Europe.⁴² In 1271 the Provost of Oradea and royal vice chancellor Magister Benedict wrote a copy based on a document from 1261 and preserving the terms used in the original.⁴³ When Paul used the term *foresta* in the case of Bereg and Ugoča, he certainly did not do it by accident. Everything suggests he knew

of Eger). Budapest : Szent István Társulat az Apostoli Szentszék Könyvkiadója, 1984, p. 77-78. ISBN 9633603927.

- 38 „Item decimam partem omnium tributorum, per quemcunque exhibi consuetorum, in comitatibus videlicet Borsad, Abauywar, Zemplen, Wng, Zabolch, Zarand, Kyuzonuk, Heueswyuar, Bereg et in Wgocha, qui duo ultimi comitatus, scilicet Wgacha et Bereg fuerunt foreste sanctorum regum tradite et donate per predecessores nostros ecclesie Agriensi supradictae in decimis dicandis et persolvendis, prout ceteri comitatus.“ *HÁO*, no. 14, p. 34-38; *HÁO*, no. 38, p. 63 (1284); *CDH V/1*, p. 157; *RA II/1*, no. 2124, p. 124-125; *BOTKA*, ref. 21, p. 393; *PESTY*, ref. 20, p. 192, 195-197; *SZŰCS*, ref. 2, p. 39, 151.
- 39 *PESTY*, ref. 20, p. 196-198.
- 40 *SZŰCS*, ref. 2, p. 23, 39, 46.
- 41 *HÁO*, no. 9, p. 24; *RA II/1*, no. 2123, p. 120. This unusual term was also used in a document from 1284 concerned with the rights, tithes and liberties of the Bishopric of Eger. The context of the record shows that they were noblemen serving the Bishopric of Eger, very probably as soldiers (*nobilium vasallorum suorum*). Therefore they could have been noble vassals of the Church, so-called predialisti. *HÁO*, no. 37, p. 62 (1284).
- 42 For direct use of *vassalli nobiles* see: *The Cartulary of Flavigny : 717–1113*. BOUCHARD, Brittain Constance (ed.). Cambridge ; Massachusetts : The Medieval Academy of America, 1991, p. 91, 98, 112-113. ISBN 100915651181. For *vassallus*, *vasalus* see: *The Cartulary and Charters of Notre-Dame of Homblieres*. EVERGATES, Theodore – CONSTABLE, Giles – NEWMAN, William Mendel (eds.). Cambridge; Massachusetts : The Medieval Academy of America, 1990, p. 40, 58, 63, 69. ISBN 091095688X; KOCH, Walter (ed.). *Die Urkunden Friedrichs II. 1198–1212 : Die Urkunden der deutschen Könige und Kaiser 14/1. : MGH*. (hereinafter *F III/1*). Hannover : Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 2002, p. 7, 316. ISBN 3775220011; *F III/2*, p. 100-101, 114, 416.
- 43 ZSOLDOS, Attila. *Magyarország világi archontológiája 1000–1301*. (Secular archontology of Hungary. 1000–1301.). (hereinafter *MVA*). Budapest : MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 2011, p. 111, 341.

the Latin term normally used abroad to designate this type of royal property or territory, and he used it to designate specific properties of the kings of Hungary intended for hunting. Since only the term *silva* appears in written sources from Hungary,⁴⁴ the word *foresta* probably had the same meaning in these documents as it had in Western Europe, for example in France or the Holy Roman Empire.

Another interesting term in this document is *decima*.⁴⁵ It probably concerned revenue or income of the royal chamber (*fiscus regius*) as part of the royal prerogative (*ius regale*).⁴⁶ They were certainly not church tithes. In the 1261 document, a tenth of the revenues from the royal tolls (*decima pars omnium tributorum*) and a tenth of the income (*decimae*) from the royal forests are mentioned separately in a special part.⁴⁷ There is good evidence for the term *decima* in connection with the revenues of the royal chamber of Hungary. For example, in 1198 King Emeric confirmed that the Archbishopric of Esztergom had the right to all the royal revenues (*de omnibus proventibus regalibus...decimam ad plenum recipere debeat*) already granted by St. Stephen and St. Ladislav (*sicut per sanctos reges erant donate*), and the revenue from royal tolls, which were also designated by the term *decima*.⁴⁸ In 1203 Pope Innocent III, referring to the

44 HUDÁČEK, ref. 8, p. 50-51.

45 *Lexicon latinitatis medii aevi Hungariae : A Magyarországi középkori latinság szótára III.* (Lexicon of Mediaeval Latin of Hungary III.). Budapest : Akadémiai kiadó, 1987–1993, p. 21-22.

46 On the revenues of the Arpád dynasty and royal chamber in medieval Hungary see: BARTA, Gábor – BARTA, János. Royal Finance in Medieval Hungary : The Revenues of King Béla III. In ORMROD, W. M et al. (eds.). *Crises, Revolutions and Self-sustained Growth : Essays in European Fiscal History, 1130–1830*. Stamford : Shuan Tyas, 1999, p. 22-37. ISBN 1871615933.

47 On interpretations of *decima*, *decimacio* as princely revenues see: BALÁSSY, Ferencz. *A megye és a várispánság, vagyis a két intézmény közötti különbség.* (Counties and castle lordships, the difference between two organizational units.). Budapest : Kiadja a Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1893, p. 27; CZIZMADIA, Andor. Die rechtliche des Zehnten (Decima) in Ungarn. In *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte*, 1975, year 61, p. 230. ISSN 03234142; MODZELEWSKI, Karol. *Organizacja gospodarcza państwa piastowskiego X – XIII wiek.* (Economic organization of Piast lordship in the 10th–12th centuries.). Poznań : WPTPN, 1975 (reprint 2000), p. 92-94. ISBN 8370632734; ŽEMLIČKA, Josef. „Decimas trium provinciarum“ pro klášter v Břevnově (K hmotnému zajištění nejstarších klášterních fundací v Čechách). (“Decimas trium provinciarum” for the monastery at Břevnov (On the material securing of the oldest monastic foundations in Bohemia).). In IWAŃCZAK, Wojciech – KUCZYŃSKI, Stefan K. (eds.). *Ludzie, Kościół, wierzenia : Studia z dziejów kultury i społeczeństwa Europy Środkowej (średniowiecze – wczesna epoka nowożytna)*. Warszawa : Wydawnictwo DiG, 2001, p. 126, 128-129, 130-132. ISBN 83 7181 223X; PAUK, Marcin Rafał. Plenariae decimationes św. Wojciecha. O ideowych funkcjach dziesięciny monarszej w Polsce i na Węgrzech w XI – XII wieku. (The Plenariae decimationes of St. Wojtech. On the conceptual functions of the royal tithe in Poland and Hungary in the 11th – 12th centuries.). In DOBOSZ, Józef et al. (eds.). *Gnieźnieńskie koronacje królewskie i ich środkowoeuropejskie konteksty*. Gniezno : Urząd Miejski w Gnieźnie, 2011, s. 196-199. ISBN 9788393423408; JØRGENSEN, Dolly. The Roots of the English Royal Forest. In LEWIS, C. P. (ed.). *Anglo-Norman studies XXXII : Proceedings of the Battle Conference*. Woodbridge : The Boydell Press, 2010, s. 118-119. However, Péter Németh thinks that church tithes were involved. In the second half of the 13th century, the Bishopric of Eger had a dispute with the Bishop of Transylvania about tithes in Ugoča. NÉMETH, ref. 15, p. XXXI. On church tithes see also: MÚCSKA, ref. 33, p. 336-337, 339.

48 MARSINA, Richard (ed.). *Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Slovaciae I* (hereinafter *CDSI*). Bratislava : VEDA, 1971, no. 99, p. 110; MARSINA, Richard (ed.). *V kráľovstve svätého Štefana : Prameň k dejinám Slovenska a Slovákov III* (In the Kingdom of St. Stephen: Sources for the history of Slovakia and the Slovaks.), (hereinafter *PDDS*). Bratislava : Literárne informačné centrum, 2003, no. 25, p. 80.

documents of his predecessors confirmed to Jób Archbishop of Esztergom the privilege with regard to church needs of the kings of Hungary and their court. He also mentions the right to a tenth of the revenues of the royal chamber (*decimas...de camera regis*).⁴⁹ The archbishoprics of Esztergom and Kalocsa reached agreement in 1212 after a long dispute. One of the points settled was the right of the Archbishopric of Esztergom to a tenth (*decima*) of the revenue from the royal mints in the whole of Hungary.⁵⁰ It is clear from these cases that a *decima* was a tenth of the revenue of the royal chamber. Therefore in the document from 1261, it was a tenth (*decimae*) of the revenue from the royal tolls, royal forests and *prediorum nostrorum* (economic income and payments from the royal estates).⁵¹ Interpretation of the revenue from the villages of noblemen (!) and royal servants is problematic. It may have meant specific payments, for example, in marten skins (*marturinae*), which came from the royal servants in the royal lands of Ugoča and Bereg during the reigns of Bela III and Andrew III. A document from 1212 provides help with interpretation of this tenth (*decima*) of the revenue from the royal forests. Sometime at the beginning of the 13th century, Bank Sheriff of Bihar and administrator of the queen's court (*curiali comitis regine*) bought the *terra Szurch* in the County of Szabolcs from the Comes Ypoch. In 1212 Andrew II confirmed the ownership of this property and designated its boundaries. The last part of the document states that the property contains a further 15 villages, which were not under his judicial authority. However, the monarch gave him the right to the royal tax (*tributum*). Every household in these villages had to annually pay him the so-called forest tax (*pro tributo silve*) in the form of one oko (about 54 litres) of grain, two hens and five pieces of cloth. This was a specific payment collected from the royal property in the furthest part of the County of Szabolcs near the river Tisza.⁵²

This north-eastern part – with the villages mentioned in the document from 1212 – was, like Bereg, originally part of the frontier county of Boržava.⁵³ Therefore, it is very probable that the *decima omnium forestarum nostrorum* could also have been such a forest tax (*tributum silve*), which was paid not only in Szabolcs-Boržava, but also in the royal properties in Bereg-Boržava and Ugoča-Boržava. However, we cannot say whether

ISBN 808878829.

- 49 “...decimas insuper, primitias et incensum, quae de camera regis ecclesiae memoratae debentur...” *CDH II*, p. 416-417.
- 50 “De prouentu monete decima pertineat ad ecclesiam Strigoniensem, ubicunque in regno Hungarie cudatur...” ENDLICHER, Stephan Ladislaus (ed.). *Rerum Hungaricarum monumenta Arpadiana* (hereinafter *RHMA*). St. Gallen : Scheitlin & Zollikofer, 1849, p. 407; PAUK, ref. 47, p. 199-201.
- 51 SZABÓ, István. The Praedium : Studies on the Economic History and the History of Settlement of Early Hungary. In *Agrártörténeti szemle* (hereinafter *Asz*), *Supplementum*, 1963, year 5, p. 1-24. ISSN 00021105.
- 52 „Preterea sciendum est, quod sunt alie ville circumiacentes his predictis metis..., que tamen omnes sint libere a iurisdictione et iudicio premissi Banconis comitis, sibi et suis heredibus pro tributo silve annuatim tenentur persolvere de singulis domibus unum aconem annone, duas gallinas et quinque ligaturas lini.” NAGY, Emericus – IPOLYI, Arnoldus – VÉGHELY, Desiderius. (eds.). *Codex diplomaticus patrius VIII*. (hereinafter *CDP*) : *Hazai okmánytár VIII*. Budapest : Typis societatis Franklinianae, 1865 – 1880, p. 7, p. 12-15; *RA I/I*, no. 214, p. 68, no. 269, p. 86; BOGLÁRKA, Weisz. A Felső-Tisza-vidék vámszedése az Árpád-korban I. (Collection of tolls in the upper Tisza basin in the Árpád period I). In *Szabolcs-Szatmár-Beregi szemle : Társadalom, tudomány, művészet*, 2004, year 2, no. 3, p. 252-253. ISSN 1216092X.
- 53 *ÁMTF I*, p. 520-522; KRISTÓ, ref. 9, p. 418-421, 421-424.

this type of tax could also relate to the *decimas* from the royal *predia*, villages of the nobles and royal servants. It is interesting that when Ladislav I founded the Benedictine monastery at Szentjobb (now Sinjob) in Bihar in 1084–1095, and gave it royal estates (*predia*), people – even royal foresters (*custodes nemorum*) – revenues (*cum certis tributis*) from tolls in Szalacs (Bihar) and Szatmár, other revenues (*alii proventibus*), probably also from these territories, are mentioned.⁵⁴ *Proventus* could also mean payments from forests (the Igfon Wood (?) in Bihar)⁵⁵ or from the royal properties as in the case of the above mentioned *tributum silve* from 1212. Thus, in Hungary, the terms *decima*, *tributum* and *proventus* meant revenue from royal estates or forests, apparently of a tenth of the royal income also in the cases of *tributum* and *proventus*. The record in a document from 1261 about *decimas* from Bereg and Ugoča is also made more meaningful thanks to a financial inventory from 1264 compiled in Venice and concerning debts for luxury goods (cloth, clothes and jewellery) for the needs of the court of the Junior King Stephen. It ends with several records of the payment of debts for the Venetian merchant *Wilamus*, who secured the delivery of these goods to Hungary. In the name of Prince Stephen, the Provost Benedict paid 90 marks, which he obtained from the revenue or profit (*collecta*) of the royal chamber in Sriem, 75 marks from the income of the salt chamber at Szalacs (Bihar, Rumanian Sălacea), and in Buda he was paid 100 marks from the royal income from the silver of Banská Štiavnica. To these payments were added a further 40 marks from Magister Vladimír, *Vicercancellarius* to Stephen. These were revenues from the *silvis de Lompert*,⁵⁶ which were royal forests in Bereg near the village of Luprechzaza/Lampertszász (Hung. Beregszász, Ukr. Бєрєгово) about which we will learn more later. Since in these cases, it was a matter of profits or revenue of the royal prerogative, we can suppose that special forest payments (*tributum silve*, *decima*) collected in money, flowed regularly into the royal chamber from the Forest of Bereg.

The mention of the village of *Perek, a vanished village situated east of Beregújfalú, Бєрєгѹѹфалѹ is also important in the document from 1261.⁵⁷ The record of the properties of the Bisopric of Eger state who gave them to the bishopric. It was either St. Stephen or St. Ladislav. Only *Perek was granted by Andrew II, the monarch whose grant was appealed to in the above mentioned part about revenue from the royal forests. The important thing is mainly that he granted it together with forest and swineherds (*cum porcorum*

54 „...cui eciam predia et cetera necessaria atque populum ad officium ecclesie pertinentem ordinavit cum certis tributis de Zolochy et de Zathmar ac aliis proventibus“. *DHA I*, no. 101, p. 302-303; *ÁMTF I*, p. 668-669. On markets and tolls in this part of Hungary see: BOGLÁRKA, ref. 52, p. 251-257; BOGLÁRKA, ref. 30, p. 92-97.

55 *KMTL*, p. 280-281.

56 „Item LX marcas quas dedit magister Lodomerius eidem syr Wilamo in silvis de Lompert.“ ZOLNAY, László. István ifjabb király számadása 1264-ből. (The accounts of the Junior King Stephen from 1264.). In *Budapest régiségei*, 1964, year 21, p. 82, 88, 106. ISSN 01331892; FEJÉRPATAKY, László. *A királyi kancellária az Árpádok korában*. (The royal chancellery in the Árpád period.). Budapest : Kiadja A. M. T. Akadémia, 1885, p. 119; *ÁMTF I*, p. 532-533; ENGEL, Pál. *The Realm of St. Stephen : A History of Medieval Hungary 895–1526*. London, New York : I. B. Tauris, 2001, p. 250. ISBN 101860640613.

57 MIZSER, Lajos. Bereg megye korai helynevei. (Early place names in the County of Bereg.). In LAKATOS, Ilona P. – SEBESTYÉN, Zsolt (eds.). *Emlékkönyv Mező András tiszteletére*. Nyíregyháza : Bessenyei Könyvkiadó, 2010, p. 88. ISBN 9786155097072; *ÁMTF I*, s. 547. *Perek is still mentioned in 1299 as a property of the Bishopric of Eger. *RA II/4*, č. 4220, s. 215.

pastoribus collata).⁵⁸ It was a village of royal swineherds, and part of the forest divided from the territory of the royal property in Bereg belonged to it. In Western Europe pasturing of pigs in forests was part of the royal prerogative, and it could have been the same in Hungary. It happened in oak or beech forests, especially in royal properties. Fees had to be paid for the possibility to pasture pigs in royal forests.⁵⁹ For example, a falsified document supposed to be from 1015 for the monastery of St. Benedict at Pécsvárad states that Stephen I granted the abbot the right to the revenues from all the forests belonging to the monastery. Specifically this meant fees for the pasturing of pigs (*in tributis porcorum*).⁶⁰ In another falsified foundation charter, that of the monastery of St. Maurice at Bél from 1037/1086, established in the royal forest of Bakon, the monarch granted the abbot the right to freely pasture pigs in this forest (*porci quoque abbatis in eadem libere pascantur*).⁶¹ When Ladislav I confirmed the properties of the monastery of St. Martin at Pannonhalma at the end of the 11th century, he also mentioned villages together with forests. They were granted to the monastery for the salvation of the king's soul. The possession of one of the monastery's properties, located in the forest of *Selez*, was also confirmed. It had 30 settlements of swineherds with 300 pigs and was intended for the pasturing of pigs (*ad pasturam porcorum*).⁶² Finally, one of the points of the *Golden Bull* of 1222 is a rule that the king's pigs cannot be pastured in the forests or meadows of the king's servants (*serviens regis*) without their permission.⁶³ Since one of the points of the bull was also control of forest pastures, it testifies to the importance of rearing pigs in royal properties. The revenues (*decimae*) from the royal forests mentioned in 1261 also include the fees for pasturing pigs in the Bereg forest. The evidence includes the

-
- 58 „Item villa Perek cum silva et aliis suis utilitatibus in comitatu de Bereg, sita per karum patrem nostrum Endere regem felicis memorie cum porcorum pastoribus collata et per nos ex certa scientia confirmata.“ *HÁO*, no. 9, p. 26; *RA II/1*, no. 2123, p. 123; *PESTY*, ref. 20, p. 192, 195-196; *ÁMTF I*, p. 547.
- 59 HUDÁČEK, Pavol. Silva ad pasturam porcorum : Lesné pasenie sviň na kráľovských majetkoch v ranostredovekej Európe. (Silva ad pasturam porcorum: Forest pasturing of pigs in royal properties in early medieval Europe.). In *Historické štúdie : Ročenka Historického ústavu Slovenskej akadémie vied*, 2014, year 48, p. 71-102. ISBN 9788022413954. On the pasturing of pigs in Hungary see: CSÖRE, ref. 36, p. 43-47, 190-194; MAKKAI, László. Östliches Erbe und westliche Leihe in der ungarischen Landwirtschaft der frühfeudalen Zeit (10. – 13. Jahrhundert). In *Asz, Supplementum*, 1974, year 16, p. 4-9, 21-22; KUČERA, Matúš. *Slovensko po páde Veľkej Moravy : Štúdie o hospodárskom a sociálnom vývine v 9. – 13. storočí*. (Slovakia after the fall of Great Moravia: Studies of economic and social development, 9th – 13th centuries.). Bratislava : VEDA, 1974, p. 110-115. ISBN 9788374902557.
- 60 „Silvarum quoque proventum ubique ecclesie pertinencium, ut in tributis porcorum seu arundinetorum, nulli omnino liceat possidere, nisi abbati.“ *DHA I*, no. 12, p. 76.
- 61 *DHA I*, no. 26, p. 119 (falsified). On this see: SZABÓ, ref. 9, p. 139-142; CANTOR, Leonard. Forests, Chases, Parks and Warrens. In CANTOR, M. Leonard (ed.). *The English Medieval Landscape*. Bristol : Typeset by Leaper & Garrd Ltd, 1982, p. 60-63. ISBN 0709907079.
- 62 „Quindecim predium est infra silvam Selez, quod dedit rex L. ad pasturam porcorum cum XXX mansionibus subulcorum et trecentis porcis...“ *DHA I*, no. 100, p. 300 (1093 – 1095).
- 63 „Porci nostri in silvis vel pratis servantur non pascantur contra voluntatem eorum.“ *CDSI I*, no. 270, p. 200; 1222: Cap. XXII. BAK, M. János – BÓNIS, György – SWEENEY, James Ross (eds.). *The Laws of the Medieval Kingdom of Hungary I. 1000 – 1301 : Decreta regni medievalis Hungariae I. 1000–1301* (hereinafter *DRMH I/1*). Idyllwild : Charles Schlacks, Jr. Publisher, 1999, p. 22. ISBN 88445292; BE-SENYEI, Lajos et al (eds.). *De Bulla Aurea : Andreae II. Regis Hungariae MCCXXII*. Verona : Edizioni Valdonega, 1999, p. 23-26, 171-180. ISBN 108885033350.

privilege of Andrew II from 1206 for royal guests in Transylvania. He freed them from paying fees (*tributum vel decima*) for pasturing pigs in the royal forest.⁶⁴ When Belo IV confirmed older properties and rights of the Hospitellers from Székesfehérvár, he also granted them further privileges. They gained freedom from paying *tributum vel decimae porcorum*, which concerned the pasturing of pigs in forests.⁶⁵ It is interesting that in the cases mentioned above, the designation of the royal fees agrees with our statements in the part about the revenues of the royal chamber. In Western Europe, the revenue of the royal prerogative also included fees for construction timber, collection of fallen wood, scything of meadows, founding of new villages and so on.⁶⁶

It is questionable whether similar fees were considered under the term *decimae* from Bereg and Ugoča in 1261. We cannot exclude it because we have evidence from medieval Hungary of similar royal fees relating to royal forests. For example, in 1275, not the king but the Hungarian Hospitellers allowed the *Comes* Perchin to freely pasture pigs in woods belonging to the order's house at Čič, now in Croatia, which also concerned the right to construction timber⁶⁷ Thanks to the privileges granted by Ladislav IV (1272–1290), the guests from Vasvár could obtain wood for their needs such as building and heating, cut grass, collect herbs (?) and use the rivers – for fishing (?) in the royal *silva Raba*.⁶⁸ Ladislav IV in 1283 and 1286 and Andrew III (1290–1301) in 1291 and 1298 granted similar rights, which were part of the royal forest prerogative in this forest.⁶⁹ We learn much more about what is hidden behind permission to use royal forests from a document of Queen Constance of Bohemia, daughter of Bela III of Hungary. In 1228 (!) she granted privileges to German guests in Hodonín. They could collect brushwood, dry

64 MNL DL 30 354; *CDH III/1*, p. 34; JAKÓ, Sigismundus (ed.). *Codex diplomaticus Transsylvaniae : Diplomata, epistolae et alia instrumenta litteraria res Transsylvanas illustrantia I. (1023–1300)*. Budapest : Akadémiai Kiadó, 1997, no. 32, p. 132. ISBN 9636311579.

65 MNL DL 106 180 (1232/1377); *CDH IV/1*, p. 105-106; *RA I/2*, no. 637, p. 194-195; HUNYADI, Zsolt. *The Hospitellers in the Medieval Kingdom of Hungary c. 1150–1387*. Budapest : METEM ; CEU, 2010, p. 34, 37. ISBN 9789639662445.

66 YOUNG, R. Charles. English Royal Forests under the Angevin Kings. In *The Journal of British Studies*, 1972, year 12, no. 1, p. 10-11. ISSN 00219371; NICHOLLS, H. Philip. On the Evolution of a Forest Landscape. In *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 1972, year 56, p. 57-58. ISSN 14755661; CANTOR, ref. 61, p. 58-59; BIRRELL, Jean. Common Rights in the Medieval Forest : Disputes and Conflicts in the Thirteenth Century. In *Past and Present*, 1987, year 117, p. 36-38. ISSN 1477464X.

67 „Preterea in silvis ad domum de Chychan spectantibus, excepta silva Owas vocata, tam porci dicti comitis Perchini...sine aliqua exactione tributi pascantur et ligna tam pro hedeficiis domorum, quam usu recipient...“ MNL DL 924; *CDAC IX*, no. 84, p. 129; *RA II/2-3*, no. 2632, p. 135; On this see: HUNYADI, ref. 65, p. 73-74.

68 „Concessimus etiam, ut in silva Raba ligna recipiendi pro usibus suis necessaria, falcandi fenum et herbas et utendi usu aque sine exactione et impedimento aliquo liberam habeant facultatem.“ POZZA-LINDECK, Irmtraut et al (eds.). *Urkundenbuch des Burgenlandes und der angrenzenden Gebiete der Komitate Wieselburg, Ödenburg und Eisenburg II. : Die Urkunden von 1271 bis 1301 (hereinafter UB II)*. Graz; Köln : Verlag Hermann Böhlau Nachf., 1965, no. 185, p. 131-133; KUBINYI, András (ed.). *Elenchus fontium historiae urbanae, III/2*. Budapest : Balassi Kiadó, 1997, no. 59, p. 71-72. ISBN 9635061692.

69 *UB II*, no. 240, p. 175; no. 281, p. 200; no. 283, p. 201; no. 320, p. 224; no. 369, p. 255; no. 456, p. 317.

wood and herbs (?), pasture their pigs and cattle, but they could not cut the green shoots of oaks after trimming.⁷⁰

According to the document from 1261, the properties of the Bishopric of Eger were located *in pluribus districtibus et comitatibus*.⁷¹ It is interesting that different terms are used to designate these lands, and they are certainly not seen as synonyms. The counties of Heves, Borsod, Szolnok, Csanád, Békés, Zaránd, Zemplin, Abov and Szabolcs are all called by the term *comitatus*. Only Ugoča and Bereg are designated as *districti*. Therefore, it is very probable that the author of the document distinguished “normal counties” from dynastic properties. This is also indicated by the second variant of the document from 1271, which clearly states that Bereg and Ugoča were originally royal forests (*fuerunt foreste sanctorum regum*). Only the village of *Perek was located *in comitatu de Bereg*. The explanation of this exception could be the fact that although the older tradition (!) of designating these lands from the reigns of Bela III and Andrew designated these former royal forests as *districti*, according to the document from 1261 this village was no longer situated *in districtu*, but *in comitatu*. This may indicate a change in the territorial organization of Bereg in the second half of the 13th century, which was also expressed in a different designation of this former royal property, which was already organized in a similar way to older counties.

In the first half of the 13th century the kings of Hungary sometimes stayed in or near Bereg. We know this thanks to documents which state that the king was *in silva que nominatur Bereg* (1233), *apud silvam Berech* (1233), *apud silvam Bereyg* (1233).⁷² The donation of the document of **Chepanfulde*, a vanished village not far from Kisdobrony, Мала Добронь, on the edge of the Bereg area, in 1248 already states that it lay *in comitatu Beregh*.⁷³ Between 1257 and 1261, the land of **Paznan*, a vanished village in the territory of Beregsurány, south-west of Beregszász, is mentioned *in provincia Bereg*.⁷⁴ The 1261 document designates this territory as the *districtus de Beregh*.⁷⁵ In 1263 the

70 „Item kletska, sicca ligna, libere herbasque habeant, excepta viridi quercu. Pastor cum grege vadat libere in eadem sylva.“ *RHMA*, p. 425-426; *CDH VII/5*, no. 124, p. 240.

71 *HÁO*, no. 9, p. 23; *RA II/1*, no. 2123, p. 118-119.

72 In 1233 the king's location was said to be near the Bereg Wood, but the document was issued only in Esztergom: „Actum apud silvam Bereyg...Datum Strigonii...“ THEINER, Augustibus (ed.). *Vetera monumenta historica Hungariam sacram illustrantia I* (hereinafter *VMH*). Roma : Typis Vaticanis, 1859, no. CXCVIII, p. 119; no. CCVIII, p. 124; *ÁMTF I*, p. 522, 530-531; KRISTÓ, ref. 9, p. 424. On the king's meeting with the papal legate in Bereg see: FONT, Márta. Ungarn und Osteuropa zur Zeit des Königs Andreas II. (1205–1235). In GÜNDISCH, Konrad (ed.). *Generalprobe Burzenland : Neue Forschungen zur Geschichte des Deutschen Ordens in Siebenbürgen und im Banat*. Köln; Weimar, Wien : Böhlau Verlag, 2013, p. 53-54. ISBN 9783412210946.

73 NAGY, Imre – NAGY, Iván – VÉGHÉLY, Dezső (eds.). *Codex diplomaticus domus senioris comitum Zichy de Zich et Vasonkeo I. : A zichi és vasonkeői gróf Zichy-család idősb ágának okmánytára* (hereinafter *Zichy Ok.*). Pest : Editio Societatis Histor. Hung, 1871, no. 244, p. 284 (1248/1402); *RA I/2*, no. 887, p. 267; *ÁMTF I*, p. 537; ZSOLT, ref. 27, p. 33-34. Also see the year 1282: „de comitatu Bereg“ *Zichy Ok. I*, no. 53, p. 50; *RA II/2-3*, no. 3190, p. 302 (1282).

74 MNL DL 83 038; *Zichy Ok. I*, no. 8, p. 5-6; SZENTPÉTERY, Imre – ZSOLDOS, Attila (eds.). *Regesta ducum, ducissarum stirpis Arpadianae necnon reginarum Hungariae critico-diplomatica* (hereinafter *RD*). Budapest : MOL, 2008, no. 82, p. 61; *ÁMTF I*, p. 547; ZSOLT, ref. 27, p. 112.

75 *HÁO*, no. 9, p. 23-29.

villages of Szentmiklós (Чинадієво), Szolyva (Свалява), Alsóverecke (Нижні Ворота) up to Mukačevo and the frontier were *in comitatu de Bereg*.⁷⁶ In 1263 the outlying village of *Borod near Mukačevo also lay *in comitatu de Bereg*.⁷⁷ In 1279 the village of Beregsurány was *in comitatu de Bereg*,⁷⁸ and in 1280 the village of Nagymuzsaly (Мужієво) was *in comitatu de Beregh*.⁷⁹ Do all these labels: 1233 *silva*, 1248/1402 *comitatus*, 1257–1261 *provincia*, 1261 *districtus* and from 1263 usually only *comitatus*, represent organizational or administrative changes that happened in the course of the 13th century, or are they synonymous in this period? It is entirely possible that the terms *districtus* or *provincia* could have originally been used to designate a royal property (*predium*) or forest (*silva*) composed of a large continuous territory. On the basis of this, Gy. Györffy supposes that Bereg as a royal forest property (*predium*) with a manorhouse (*curia*) and foresters (*custodes silvarum*) was destroyed during the Tartar invasion, and later the greater part of its population was composed only of the castle *jobagiones* and *castrenses* of Boržava. Therefore this originally royal property was gradually transformed into an independent county and its territory was divided from Boržava. For this reason the designation of Bereg in the second half of the 13th century was still not fixed with *provincia*, *comitatus*, *predium* and *districtus* all appearing.⁸⁰ Evidence that in the first half of the 13th century, *districtus* and *provincia* could really be terms that designated royal lands, can be found in the record of the property of the Arpád dynasty in Šariš, part of the frontier county of *Novum Castrum*. In 1261 the Junior King Stephen granted land with a church dedicated to St. Ladislav King of Hungary to the *Comes Echy*. The land was situated in the territory of the royal property of Solivar (*quamdam terram in districtu predii nostri de Souuar existentem*).⁸¹ Solivar, as a royal *predium*, had its *districtus* or defined territory. Liptov, as part of the great royal domain with its centre at Zvolen, was a royal *predium* mentioned in 1233, 1279 and 1293.⁸² In 1230 Andrew II granted land *in territorio de*

76 MNL DL 552; MNL DL 553; *CDAC VIII*, no. 45, p. 68; *RA II/1*, no. 1809, p. 16; *RA I/3*, no. 1379, p. 422-423; ZSOLT, ref. 27, p. 15, 125, 131; *ÁMTF I*, p. 548, 549, 550.

77 MNL DL 105 776; *CDP VIII*, p. 98, no. 77; *RD*, no. 81, p. 61; ZSOLT, ref. 27, p. 29; *ÁMTF I*, p. 535-536.

78 *RA II/2-3*, no. 2954, p. 234; ZSOLT, ref. 27, p. 126.

79 *RA II/2-3*, no. 3069, p. 266, 1280; TASNÁDI NAGY, Gyula (ed.). *Codex diplomaticus Hungariae Andegavensis VII. : Anjoukori okmánytár VII* (hereinafter *AO*). Budapest : Kiadja a Magyar Történelmi Társulat, 1920, no. 322, p. 602, 1280/1359; ZSOLT, ref. 27, p. 104; *ÁMTF I*, p. 546. See also in 1285: *RA II/2-3*, no. 3397, p. 365.

80 *ÁMTF I*, p. 522-523.

81 Ministry of the Interior of the Slovak Republic, State Archives Prešov, Prešov city authorities collection, sign. 1; *CDAC III*, no. 3, p. 4-5; *CDAC VIII*, no. 7, p. 11-12; ŠMILAUER, Vladimír. *Vodopis starého Slovenska*. (Hydrography of old Slovakia.). Prague; Bratislava : Učená spoločnosť Šafaříková, 1932, p. 218; ULÍČNÝ, Ferdinand. *Dejiny osídlenia Šariša*. (History of the Settlement of Šariš.). Košice : Východoslovenské vydavateľstvo, 1990, p. 369. ISBN 8085174030.

82 The granting of Ifanovo in Liptov: „...sitam et iacentem in Lyptou, que ad predium nostrum pertinebat...“ *CDSI I*, no. 416, p. 304; 1279: „...quod universi populi nostri de predio nostro de Lyptou“. Magyar nemzeti levéltár Budapest, Diplomatikai Fényképgyűjtemény (Photos of archival material held elsewhere) (hereinafter MNL DF), sign. 283 623; *CDAC XII*, no. 216, p. 255; *RA II/2-3*, no. 2978, p. 240. The village of Palúdzka: „...quamdam terram seu villam nostram Kyssew Polughá vocatam in Lypto existentem et ad ipsum predium nostrum de Lypto pertinentem...“ MNL DL 40 218; *CDP VIII*, no. 273, p. 329-340; *RA II/4*, no. 3952, p. 125, 1293. On this see: *ÁMTF IV*, p. 39-52; MALINIÁK, Pavol. *Človek a krajina*

Lyptou.⁸³ In 1263, even the village of Slovenská Ľupča – a considerable distance from the centre of Liptov and on the river Hron south of the Nízke Tatry, is said to be *in provincia Liptouiensi*.⁸⁴ In a dispute from 1289 on the ownership of part of the land of *Sokolče in Liptov witnesses are said to be *de districtu Lypto*.⁸⁵ In 1295 forest above the village of Liptovská Sielnica is said to be *in provincia Lythouiensi*.⁸⁶ In a property exchange in the same year, Demeter son of Paul, a king's man in judicial matters (*homo regius?*), is described as a *homo provincie de Lyptov*.⁸⁷ The territory of the royal property in Liptov in the 13th century is never called a *comitatus*. This was probably because only Zvolen was a *comitatus*. Liptov, Turiec, Šúšolie and Orava, lands that were an integral part of it, were already designated differently in the sources, namely as *districtus* or *provincia*. Apart from Zvolen and Liptov, there was also a royal *predium* in Turiec.⁸⁸ We have a record from 1293 concerning the village of Nedožery-Brezany, which belonged to the royal property (*terrae nostra prediales*) located in *provincia de Turuch*.⁸⁹ We have a mention from the same year of the village of Slovenské Pravno, which *ad praedium nostrum de Turucz pertinentem*, and for more precision it is said to be *in fine districtus de Turuch*.⁹⁰ Even at the end of the 13th century, Andrew III strove to solve the unclear property situation after the preceding extensive grants, by revision and control of the territories of his properties (*predia*) in Zvolen, Turiec and Liptov.⁹¹ Finally also in neighbouring Spiš, which was also a “private” royal property,⁹² the grant of the land of *Miloj in 1255 is said to be *in districto Scepusiensi*. This document states that the king's man Magister Aba carried out a revision of the royal properties with regard to the *terras comitatus Scepusiensis*.⁹³ We also know from a document from 1293 that the king's dog handlers from the village

Zvolenskej kotliny v stredoveku. (Man and the landscape. The Zvolenská Kotlina Basin in the Middle Ages.). Banská Bystrica : Fakulta humanitných vied UMB, 2009, p. 43-48, 54. ISBN 9788080839147.

83 *CDSI I*, no. 361, p. 257.

84 *CDH IV/3*, p. 182-183.

85 *RA II/2-3*, no. 3540, p. 408-409.

86 *RA II/4*, no. 4021, p. 149, 1295; *CDP VII*, no. 195, p. 240-241.

87 MNL DF 248 802; *CDAC X*, no. 88, p. 140; *RA II/4*, no. 4067, p. 165.

88 MÁLYUSZ, Elemér. Die Entstehung des Komitates Turóc. In *Ungarische Jahrbücher*, 1921, year 1, no. 4, p. 298-312.

89 MNL DL 40 215; *RA II/4*, no. 3919, p. 113.

90 MNL DL 57 153; *CDH VI/1*, p. 242-245; *RA II/4*, no. 3908, p. 109.

91 In 1293: „*Quod cum nos, more maiestatis nostri imperii ad videnda seu habitanda seu predia nostra, Zou-lum scilicet, Turuch, et Lyptou accessissemus et in eisdem ea, qua rite acta non fuerant in alienationibus terrarum ad ipsa predia nostra pertinentium, voluissemus emendare et in melius reformare ibique moram traxissemus in manendo propter premissa reformanda, statuimus, ut omnes terre, que a dictis prediis nostris quocumque modo vel quibuscumque per praedecessores nostros collate et donate extitissent, re-ambulantur et statuerentur et restituerunt...*“ MNL DL 65 255; *RA II/4*, no. 3910, p. 109-110; MNL DL 57 153; *CDH VI/1*, p. 242-245; *RA II/4*, no. 3908, p. 109.

92 ZSOLDOS Attila. Vznik Spišského komitátu. (The origin of the County of Spiš.). In ŠTEVÍK, Miroslav (ed.). *K stredovekým dejinám Spiša*. Stará Ľubovňa : Ľubovnianske múzeum, 2003, p. 21, 25-26. ISBN 8096889028.

93 MARSINA, Richard (ed.). *Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Slovaciae II* (hereinafter *CDSI II*). Bratislava : VEDA, 1987, no. 493, p. 343; FEKETE NAGY, Antal. *A Szepesség területi és társadalmi kialakulása*. (The creation of the territory and community of Spiš.). Budapest: MTA, 1934, p. 112, 114-115.

of Smižany came *de districtu de Scepus*.⁹⁴ Therefore, we can conclude that all the great royal properties (*predia*) with a central manor house (*curia, curtis, villa regis*) had their own territories called *districtus, provincia* or *comitatus*. They included villages subject to the royal manor and together formed an integrated territory. The village of **Csernyec* (somewhere near Berzence, County of Somogy) is a good example of the internal organization of a royal property. It is mentioned in the first half of the 13th century in a dispute between Pannonhalma Abbey and the Chapter of Veszprém about tithes in the County of Somogy. However, it was originally a royal manor to which 10 villages belonged (*de villa Chernech, que curia regalis fuit, sed modo donata est nobilibus et decem villarum pertinentium ad eandem curiam et circumadiacentium*).⁹⁵

Bereg also contained a royal *predium*, which is already mentioned in 1232.⁹⁶ The designation of the Bereg territory as a *districtus* or *provincia* is probably connected with the royal property, which could have had this designation at least since the reign of Bela III. However, we cannot say with certainty whether the terms *districtus* or *provincia* were regularly used for all dynastic lands or forests of the Arpád dynasty already in the 12th century. We know a multitude of cases from the 13th century, when the lands of the king or queen were most frequently designated as *comitatus*. For example, the well known royal forest of Bakon is mentioned in the sources as *silva, comitatus* and *districtus*. The frontier royal forests of Erdőd and Szilágy not far from Bereg and Ugoča, are mentioned only as *silvae* in the first half of the 13th century. Ugoča, where there was also a royal *predium*, is mentioned with Bereg as a *districtus* in 1261. By the end of the 13th century, it is also designated as a *comitatus seu districtus* or *provincia*. However, Patak-Sárospatak was always only a *comitatus*. Šariš is mentioned in the 13th century as a *predium* and *comitatus*, and by the beginning of the 14th century regularly as a *districtus*. Turňa was designated in the Middle Ages as a *predium, comitatus* and *districtus* (!). The properties

94 MNL DL 71 627; *RA II/4*, no. 3923, p. 114-115; *CDH VI/1*, p. 245; FEKETE NAGY, ref. 93, p. 94-96.

95 ERDÉLYI, László (ed.). *A pannonhalmi főapátság története I. : A pannonhalmi Szent-Benedek-rend története*. (The history of Pannonhalma Abbey I.: History of the Pannonhalma Benedictines.) Budapest : Stephaneum, A Szent-István-Társulat Nyomdája, 1902, no. 104, p. 691; BOLLA, Ilona. A jobbágytelek kialakulásának kérdéséhez (A „curia“ és „mansio“ terminusok jelentésváltozása az Árpád-korban). (On the question of the development of the serf-plot (the change in meaning of the terms curia and mansio in the Arpád era.). In *Annales Universitatis Scientiarum Budapestinensis de Rolando Eötvös nominatae : Sectio Historica*, 1961, year 3, p. 101. ISSN 05248981; KIS, Péter. *A királyi szolgálónépi szervezet a 13. – 14. században*. (The organization of royal service in the 13th – 14th centuries.). Szeged : Szegedi Középkorász Műhely, 2010, p. 42. ISBN 9789633060803. On the theory of central places see: MOŹDZIOCH, Sławomir. Mjesca centralne Polski wczesnopiastowskiej. Organizacja przestrzeni we wczesnym średniowieczu jako źródło poznania systemu społeczno-gospodarczego. (Central places in early Piast Poland. Spatial organization in the Early Middle Ages as a source of knowledge of the socio-economic system.). In MOŹDZIOCH, Sławomir (ed.). *Centrum i zaplecze we wczesnośredniowiecznej Europie Środkowej*. Wrocław : Werk, 1999, p. 22-24, 26. ISBN 8391113019.

96 MNL DF 253 657 (1232/1360); DOMAHIDI-SIPOS, Zsigmond. A „Keresztyén Urak adománya“. (“The donation of Christian lords.”). In *Magyar nyelv*, 1956, year 52, no. 3, p. 384; SZABÓ, Károly. *Az Erdélyi muzeum eredeti okleveleinek kivonata (1232–1540)*. (A catalogue of the original documents in the Transylvanian Museum (1232–1540).). Budapest : Az Athenaeum R. Társulat Könyvnyomdája, 1889, no. 1, p. 5; *RA I/1*, no. 497, p. 158; *ÁMTF I*, p. 530-531; SZÉKELY, ref. 36, p. 322; HECKENAST, Gusztáv. *Fejedelmi (királyi) szolgálónépek a korai Árpád-korban*. Budapest : Akadémiai Kiadó, 1970, p. 98-99. ISBN 7069137.

of the queen at Segesd (County of Somogy), Verőce (County of Somogy) and Vižol' (County of Abov) are always mentioned in the sources as *comitatus*. It is interesting that in 1276 Segesd is mentioned as *comitatus seu clytium nostrum Segusdiense*. The term *clytium* is used here with the meaning *mensa regia* – a property intended to supply the court of the queen.⁹⁷ This brief selection makes it clear that the word *comitatus* was also used to designate dynastic properties and it appears that in the course of the 13th century it entirely replaced the older terms *districtus* or *provincia*.

In the first half of the 13th century, the royal property of Bereg is mentioned as *silva, provincia, districtus* and *comitatus*.⁹⁸ We think that on the basis of the examples given above, these terms expressed its specific position in the framework of the territorial administrative division of the Kingdom of Hungary. The designation of this territory in royal documents gradually began to change, and in spite of some irregularities, the term *comitatus* became usual in the 13th century. All the dynastic properties found in the territories of royal counties were organized independently. In some cases we can also speak of royal forests, which resembled the organization of forests in France or the Holy Roman Empire (*foresta*). This was probably also the case with Bereg, Ugoča, Erdőd and others.⁹⁹ Since they were not “normal counties”, each with a central castle (*civitas, castrum*), they were not originally designated *comitatus*. However, it is necessary to say that also in the earliest period, various terms such as *pagus, parochia* or *comitatus*, were used for royal counties (*megye-provincia*) and castle lordships (*várispánság-comitatus*), but it is not possible to see in this any rule because they were considered synonymous.¹⁰⁰ In the first half of the 13th century, the designation of these territories was already much more consistent than in the 11th and 12th centuries. It is questionable whether they always distinguished royal counties from the dynastic properties of the Arpád dynasty. They were not always clearly distinguished by the terms used in practice. Therefore, the word *comitatus* did not have to designate only a royal county, it could also be a dynastic property or royal estate (*predium, districtus, provincia, comitatus*), in spite of the fact that it lay within the territory of a royal county.¹⁰¹ In this context, it is necessary to comment that a *comitatus* did not have to be a territory with exact boundaries, but often concerned the exercise of power over a group of people in individual localities or smaller administrative territories. This legal authority of a person appointed by the king related to an

97 KRISTÓ, ref. 9, p. 252-254, 255-259, 261-262, 319-320, 389-393, 407-408 410-411, 413, 488-490, 492-497; SZÚCS, ref. 9, p. 23.

98 KRISTÓ, ref. 9, p. 421-426; *KMTL*, p. 97-98; NÉMETH, Péter. Szatmár vármegye : Történeti áttekintés. (The County of Szatmár. A historical summary.). In *Szabolcs-Szatmár-Beregi szemle : Társadalom, tudomány, művészet*, 2011, year 46, no. 1, p. 8-9. ISSN 1219092X.

99 HUDÁČEK, ref. 8, p. 42-43, 48, 54.

100 On this see: BALÁSSY, ref. 47, p. 11, 13-16; HÓMAN, ref. 5, p. 208-211; BEREND, Nora – URBAŇCZYK, Przemysław – WISZEWSKI, Przemysław. *Central Europe in the High Middle Ages : Bohemia, Hungary and Poland, c. 900 – c. 1300*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2013, p. 152-154. ISBN 9780521786959.

101 GYÖRFFY, György. *Civitas, castrum, castellum*. In *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 1975, year 23, no. 3-4, p. 331-334. ISSN 15882543; ZSOLDOS, Attila. Szent István vármegyéi. (St. Stephen's county.). In KRISTÓ, Gyula (ed.). *Államalapítás, társadalom, művelődés*. Budapest : MTA Történettudományi Intézate, 2001, p. 44, 49. ISBN 9638312734.

individual community – people of the king, queen, church institution or other – in the framework of a larger region, and it is very probable that this also applied in Hungary. It meant an independent jurisdiction, not subject to the central administrative officials such as the sheriff of a county. In Western Europe this also especially concerned royal forests (*forestae*).¹⁰²

These independent territories of the monarch were overseen by special royal administrators, who, for example, in France and the Holy Roman Empire, were called *iudices*, *villici*, *actores*, *praefecti*, *advocati* or *procuratores*.¹⁰³ It is supposed that dynastic properties in Hungary (*predium*, *districtus*, *comitatus*) had administrators appointed by the king. However, they did not fall under the authority of the sheriffs of the counties in which these dynastic properties were situated. It is probable that in the 11th century they were royal *villici*, who administered royal manors (*curia*, *curtis*, *villa*) and the lands surrounding them. They are already mentioned in the oldest Hungarian laws. In the first half of the 13th century, royal *procuratores* appear. They were administrators of royal properties (*predia*) and they appear to have replaced *villici*.¹⁰⁴ Gallus Anonymus in the *Gesta principum Polonorum* from the 12th century mentions princely administrators of castles and royal properties (fortified manor houses (?) – *civitas*) as *villici* and *vicedominii*.¹⁰⁵ Polish medievalists suppose that royal administrators were called *villici* at first and later *procuratores* as in Hungary.¹⁰⁶ It is probable that in the course of the 13th century *procuratores* were replaced by *comites* in Hungary. This could have been connected with the more frequent designation of royal properties as *comitatus*, which was then reflected in the designation of their chief representatives as *comites*. It is questionable whether in the 11th – 13th centuries *villici* and *procuratores* were only administrators of the royal manor house, while administration and justice in its territory was the responsibility of the *comes*, so that there were two “officials” active at the same time in a royal estate. The term *ministerialis* is also interesting in connection with the administration of royal property. For example, Buna son of Narad had this designation. In 1231, on orders from the king, he demarcated a grant of land at Bobrovec in Liptov.¹⁰⁷ He could have been the administrator royal property in Liptov (*ministerialis noster de Lipto*) as there was also a

102 BENJAMIN, Arnold. *Princes and territories in medieval Germany*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1991, p. 114-116. ISBN 52139085.

103 BRÜHL, Carl Richard. *Fodrum, gistum, servitium regis : Studien zu den wirtschaftlichen Grundlagen des Königtums im Frankenreich und in den fränkischen Nachfolgestaaten Deutschland, Frankreich und Italien vom 6. bis zur Mitte des 14. Jahrhunderts I*. Köln, Graz : Böhlau-Verlag, 1968, p. 77-79, 100, 180-183, 381-387, 434, 520. ISBN 5550002840357.

104 HUDÁČEK, ref. 8, p. 37, 44-46, 48.

105 *Gesta principum Polonorum*, Liber I, Cap. XII, XV. KNOLL, W. Paul – SCHAER, Frank (eds.). *Gesta principum Polonorum : The Deeds of the Princes of the Poles*. Budapest; New York : Central European University Press, 2003, p. 64-65. ISBN 9639241407; GÓRECKI, Piotr. *Economy, Society and Lordship in Medieval Poland, 1100–1250*. New York; London : Holmes & Meier, 1992, p. 124-127. ISBN 0841913188.

106 WASILEWSKI, Tadeusz. Poland's Administrative Structure in Early Piast Times : Castra Ruled by Comites as Centres of Provinces and Territorial Administration. In *Acta Poloniae Historica*, 1981, year 44, p. 14. ISSN 00016829.

107 *CDS I*, no. 378, p. 270.

royal *predium* there. However, we cannot convincingly prove whether he was equivalent to a *procurator* or *comes*.

Thomas *comes de Lypto* is mentioned in 1249.¹⁰⁸ He was apparently also an administrator of royal property like Buna had been earlier (*ministerialis – comes*). Historians also consider the *comites* of Liptov, Turiec and Devičie, described as *officiales* in the sources, were subordinate to the *comes* of Zvolen. This is often interpreted that they were *comites curialis*, meaning deputy sheriffs. However, they are never referred to as *comites curiales*, but only as *Comites* and as the sheriff's *officialies*.¹⁰⁹ Therefore we think that it is not appropriate to think of them as “deputy sheriffs” of Zvolen, but more as independent administrators of individual royal properties in the framework of the great royal domain of Zvolen. However, they were subordinate to the chief administrator of this royal property, namely the *comes/procurator de Zolum*.

Mescu *comes de Bereg* is already mentioned in 1214 as the chief representative of the royal property in Bereg. At Oradea Mescu acting as judge (*iudex*) and the *pristaldus* Andrew solved a dispute between Vadu and Vulcanus, royal foresters from the *silva Beregu*.¹¹⁰ Therefore he must have held lower judicial authority as the king's administrator of the royal property. In 1232 this post was held by Legyr *procurator predii de Beregh*, who was also *comes*.¹¹¹ Is it possible that when Andrew II sometime before (*olym*) 1232 granted him the village of *Pátroh, separated from the *predium de Beregh*, he was only a *procurator*, but in 1232 he was already the *comes de Beregh*? Or was the *comes* Legyr simply serving as the *procurator predii*? A mention survives from 1263 of Michael son of Mika, former *comes de Bereg*, who received from the king three villages on the frontier in Bereg. Since he died without heirs, the Junior King Stephen granted them for proven services to Aladár, chief treasurer to the queen. Like Legyr and Michael he gained property from the king. However, we cannot say whether this resulted from the function of *comes* of Bereg, or was not connected at all. Some historians regard the oldest known *comites* of Bereg also as sheriffs of Boržava and the sheriffs of Boržava also as sheriffs of Bereg.¹¹² They were led to this by the fact that Bereg was originally part of Boržava.

108 CDSI II, no. 323, p. 225.

109 KUBÍNYI, Ferencz (ed.). *Oklevelek hontvármegyei magán-levéltárákból, Első rész 1256–1399 : Diplomatarium Hontense, Pars prima*. (Documents from private archives from the County of Hont. Part one, 1256–1399.). Budapest : n. p., 1888, no. 7, p. 11-12 (1272); *RA II/2-3*, no. 2670, p. 151 (1275); *MVA*, p. 236-238. On this see: MALINIÁK, ref. 82, p. 52.

110 „*Vadu de custodibus silvae Beregu impetiit convillanum suum, Vulcanum, pro occisione filiae suae per potionem, iudice Mescu comite de Beregu, pristaldo Andrea. Vulcanus iustificatus est.*“ KARÁCSONYI, Joannis – BOROVSZKY, Samuelis (eds.). *Regestrum Varadinense examinum ferri candentis ordine chronologico digestum, descripta effigie editionis A. 1550 illustratum* (hereinafter *RV*). Budapest : Typis Victoris Hornyánszky, 1903, no. 88 (314), p. 184.

111 „...*Andreas rex, terram Legyr, procuratoris predii sui de Beregh nomine Patroh olim ab eodem predio suo sibi collatam, ad idem predium assumpsisset...deinde procederet et convicinaretur metis terre hereditate eiusdem Legyr comitis, ibique terminaretur.*“ MNL DF 253 657; DOMAHIDI-SIPOS, ref. 96, p. 384; SZABÓ, ref. 96, no. 1, p. 5; *RA I/1*, no. 497, p. 158.

112 LEHÓCZKY, Tivadar. Beregvármegyei főispánok. (Sheriffs of the County of Bereg.). In *Sz*, 1871, year 5, no. 9, p. 649; NAGY, Imre. Észrevételek a Bereg vármegyei főispánok névsorára. (Observations on the list of sheriffs of the County of Bereg.). In *Sz*, 1871, year 5, no. 10, p. 719-720.

The most recent of them Atila Zsoldos already makes the distinction, but he definitely sees all the three above mentioned *comites* as chief sheriffs of Bereg.¹¹³ We think that the terms *procurator* or *comes* designated only one royal administrator, and that the *comes de Bereg* cannot be seen as the sheriff of a county. The older medievalists Tivadar Botka and Frigyes Pesty regarded the *comites de Bereg* only as the administrators of royal forest properties, just as in the well-known case of the *comes de Bakon* in the royal forest of Bakon, and in their view they were certainly not the sheriffs of counties.¹¹⁴ This view was also held by Jenő Szűcs, who also mentions other examples from the royal properties in Liptov, Turiec, Zvolen and Patak.¹¹⁵

Therefore, the *procurator* or *comes* of Bereg was the chief administrator of a royal property (*predium*), based at the main manor house located at Nagy Beregh (Великі Береги), or more probably at Beregszász (Берегове), which was the central place of this frontier territory of the Árpád dynasty. He probably oversaw the whole property and had responsibility for the villages belonging to it and the surrounding lands (*districtus, comitatus*), similarly to the sheriff (*comes*) of a royal county or castle lordship.¹¹⁶ A case from the royal forest of Zvolen, also a royal property (*predium*) of the Árpád dynasty gives clear evidence that the *procurator* and *comes* of a royal property or forest was the same person and not two people.¹¹⁷ In 1222 Detrik *comes de Zvolen* is mentioned,¹¹⁸ while a document of Andrew II from 1229 mentions that he was *procurator noster de Zoulum*.¹¹⁹ In 1230 he is again designated as *comes de Zolum*.¹²⁰ Thus, during his time as royal *comes* of Zvolen (1222–1242),¹²¹ he is also designated as *procurator*. People who held this “office” could also be *comites* without being responsible for the administration of a county. It was a common designation of a high ranking person close to the king and his court. In the Early Middle Ages this title expressed a rank or service and it did not matter whether he was active at the royal court, in a county or in a royal property. All bearers of this title were always closely connected with the royal power.¹²² Documents from Hungary also most frequently used the term *comes*. Apart from meaning the sheriff of a county, this title also designated various functionaries at the royal court such as the *comes palatinus* and the chief representatives of the king’s servants, for example, the

113 *MVA*, p. 136.

114 BOTKA, ref. 21, p. 393; PESTY, Frigyes. A bakonyi erdő-ispanság. (The county of Bakony Forest). In *Sz*, 1876, year 10, no. 2, p. 296-297; PESTY, ref. 20, p. 196-197.

115 SZŰCS, ref. 9, p. 22-23.

116 BEREND, ref. 25, p. 307-308.

117 In 1232: „...predium nostrum de Zoulum...” *CDSI I*, no. 392, p. 280.

118 *CDSI I*, no. 277, p. 105 (1222).

119 MNL DL 65 686; *CDH III/2*, p. 133; *CDAC I*, no. 157, p. 163; *RA I/I*, no. 457, p. 147 (1229).

120 *RA I/I*, no. 460, p. 148-149.

121 *CDSI II*, no. 115, p. 76; *MVA*, p. 235.

122 BEREND, ref. 25, p. 307-308; WOLFRAM, Herwig (ed.). *Intitulatio II : Lateinische Herrscher- und Fürstentitel im neunten und zehnten Jahrhundert*. Wien; Köln; Graz : Hermann Böhlau Nachf., 1973, p. 192-207, 235-241. ISBN 9783205084112; ZOTZ, Thomas. In Amt und Würden : Zur Eigenart „offizieller“ Positionen im früheren Mittelalter. In *Tel Aviver Jahrbuch für deutsche Geschichte : Zur Sozial- und Begriffsgeschichte des Mittelalters*, 1993, year 22, p. 1-4, 9-10, 12-14, 18. ISSN 09328408; BENJAMIN, ref. 102, p. 112-114.

comes falconarium regis and *comes venatorum*. In general it was the normal designation for any “royal official” entrusted by the monarch with administration of a territory or with securing the needs of the court of the Arpád dynasty.¹²³ In the Kingdom of Hungary *procuratores* or *comites* were the chief administrators of dynastic lands, namely *predium*, *silva*, *districtus* or *comitatus*. They also oversaw the functioning of the royal manor houses in these properties.¹²⁴ Therefore, if he was the administrator of a royal property or forest, then it is not appropriate to translate the term *comes* as sheriff (in Slovak: župan), because he was not the sheriff of a county (*comes comitatus*), but the king’s chief administrator of a royal property. Historians sometimes call them forest sheriffs (Hungarian: *erdőispánok*, German: *Waldcomites*), which is connected with the designation of the land they administered (*erdőispánság*).¹²⁵

Finally, evidence from the neighbouring *comitatus* or *predium* of Ugoča points to the view that although sources from the first half of the 13th century already mention only the *comes de Hugosa/Ugosi/Ogocha/Vgacha*,¹²⁶ he was not sheriff of a county, but the administrator of a royal property. In 1216, when royal guests of Flemish origin (*Flan-drenses*), who were settled in the village of Batár (now Bratove, Барап) had a dispute with Paul from the village of Nyírbéltek (County of Szatmár) directly according to the royal decree, Ezau *comes* of Ugoča represented them in the case involving trial by ordeal at Oradea.¹²⁷ In 1217 he acted as a judge (*iudex*), like Mescu *comes de Bereg* in 1214, in a dispute between the inhabitants of Halmi (which originally belonged to Ugoča, now Halmeu, County of Szatmár).¹²⁸ In 1220 Paul *comes* of Ugoča also acted as the judge in a dispute between inhabitants of Péterfalva (Пийтерфолво).¹²⁹ The confirmation of the grant of part of the land of the village of Tiszabökény (Тисобикень) to the royal *serviens* Farkaš from 1230 states that it belonged *ad comitatum de Vgacha*, which must be understood as the territory of the royal property. Farkaš legally owned part of the land

123 PROCHÁZKA, Vladimír. Župa a župan. (County and sheriff.). In *Slavia Antiqua*, 1968, year 15, p. 24-25, 31-32, 34-35. ISSN 0080993; BOGUČKI, Ambroży. *Komes w polskich źródłach średniowiecznych*. (The comes in medieval Polish sources.). Waszawa; Poznań : Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1972, p. 17, 33-34, 36. ISBN 8388500198; FODOR, István. Neue Bemerkungen zum Verhältnis von slawisch und ungarisch župan – špan – ispán. In *Ungarn Jahrbuch* (hereinafter *UJ*), 1993/94, year 21, p. 138-139. ISSN 0082755X; MAKK, Ferenc. Megjegyzések a Szent István-i államalapítás történetéhez. (Notes on the foundation of the state by St. Stephen.). In *Aetas*, year 26, 2011, no. 1, p. 125-127. ISSN 15871258.

124 SZÉKELY, ref. 36, p. 320-322; BOLLA, Ilona. Das Dienstvolk der königlichen und kirchlichen Güter zur Zeit des frühen Feudalismus. In *Annales Universitatis Scientiarum Budapestinensis de Rolando Eötvös nominatae : Sectio Historica*, 1976, year 17, p. 15-43. ISSN 05248981.

125 HÓMAN, ref. 5, p. 207-208; *KMTL*, p. 194.

126 *MVA*, p. 215.

127 *RV*, no. 163 (243), p. 212; KOMÁROMY, András. *Ugocsa vármegye keletkezése*. (The origin of the County of Ugocsa.). Budapest : Kiadja a Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1896, p. 16; SZABÓ, István. *Ugocsa megye*. (The County of Ugocsa.). Budapest : Kiadja a Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1937, p. 286-287; NÉMETH, ref. 15, no. 46, p. 26-27.

128 „*Iudex autem huius casuse...*“ *RV*, no. 171 (31), p. 216; KOMÁROMY, ref. 127, p. 16; SZABÓ, ref. 127, p. 363-364.

129 „...*iudice Paulo, comite de Ogocha...*“ *RV*, no. 246 (3), p. 246; SZABÓ, ref. 127, p. 448-449. It is interesting that in all three cases, people from the royal estate in Ugoča were represented by a *comes*, as administrator of the royal property. In all three cases, *pristaldi* were also present and all came from the County of Szabolcs.

on the basis of the grant – in contrast to the king’s servants (*populi regis*) settled in the royal property of Ugoča. Therefore, it seems to be especially emphasized that the *comes de Vgacha* could not disturb him in connection with possession of this land.¹³⁰ Since the villages of Batár, Halmi, Péterfalva were situated near the village of Tiszabökény, which belonged *ad comitatem de Vgacha*, they were also part of the royal property of Ugoča. All of them lay in a marginal part of this territory on the right bank of the Tisza. The centre of the royal property lay to the north of them with the main royal manor house at Királyháza (Королево).

The most important argument in favour of the statement that the *comes* of Ugoča was the administrator of a royal property or royal forest is a document of the Junior King Stephen from 1264 in which he granted various privileges to guests from Szatmár (Satu Mare). On the basis of older complaints of the guests with regard to a dispute about use of the forests, Stephen entrusted *Roch comiti de Vgacha et de Erdeud* (Erdőd) with restoring their use of the Erdőd forest as had previously applied.¹³¹ Only the administrator of the royal property could renew the old right of the guests to part of the forest, which was originally divided from the territory of the royal forest. Roch was *comes* of Ugoča and his legal authority also covered the royal property of Erdőd, which was already included in the County of Szatmár.¹³² Since Ugoča and Erdőd were royal forests (*erdőispánságok*) their *comes* was not the sheriff of a county, but the chief administrator (*comes*) of these two dynastic properties. He was concerned only with the “private property of the dynasty”, and this was why the king entrusted him with solving the request of the guests from Szatmár for use of part of the forest that originally belonged to the Erdőd territory. Álmos, also *comes de Wgocha et de Erdeud*, is mentioned in 1272. For his faithful service, the king granted him some abandoned land in the County of Szatmár, where the king’s beaver hunters (*castorinarii*) had previously lived.¹³³ Further evidence that Ugoča was a royal property¹³⁴ – although in the 13th century it is almost always called a *comitatus* and its chief official is a *comes* – is found in two documents of Andrew III. In Ugoča, as in the cases of Zvolen, Liptov and Turiec, this monarch strove to audit the royal properties. The audit was carried out by Stephen *comes de Wgacha*, and in 1296 it concerned the village of Tiszakeresztúr (Перехрестя), which belonged *ad predium nostrum de Wgacha*.¹³⁵ In this way he got back (*nostris regis manibus reddiderunt, et*

130 *CDP VII*, no. 16, p. 19; *RA I/1*, no. 590, p. 181; SZABÓ, ref. 127, p. 297; SZÉKELY, Gusztáv. Ugočsa vármegye kialakulása az új kutatások tükrében II. (The creation of the County of Ugočsa as reflected in new research II). In *Acta Beregsasiensis*, 2010, year 9, no. 3, p. 133, 137-138. ISSN 23101954.

131 „*Ad hec cum iidem silvis indignissent, sicut nobis sua conquestione demonstrarunt, precepimus Roch comiti de Vgacha et de Erdeud, ut eisdem silvam de Erdeud statueret usui eorumdem sufficientem, qui sicut nobis per suas litteras demandavit silvam ipsis statuisset de Erdeud ad priorem (?) silvam ipsorum...*“ *MNL DL 90 750* (1264/1291); *RA II/4*, no. 3768, p. 62-63; *CDH IV/3*, p. 206-207; *RA II/1*, no. 2133, p. 127-128; NÉMETH, ref. 15, no. 447, p. 281-282.

132 NÉMETH, ref. 15, no. 123-124, p. 78-79.

133 *CDP VIII*, no. 360, p. 438; *RA II/1*, no. 2224, p. 161.

134 SZABÓ, ref. 127, p. 32, 37-38, 45-46, 114, 321-322, 382, 410-411; SZÉKELY, ref. 2, p. 83, 85; SZÉKELY, ref. 130, p. 133, 137-138.

135 „*...terras ad predium nostrum de Wgacha pertinentes...reambulari fecissemus...*“ *CDP VIII*, no. 369, p. 447; *RA II/4*, no. 4048, p. 171; SZABÓ, ref. 127, p. 499-500.

restituerunt pleno iure) the property of Visk, now Вишково, originally part of Ugoča, but later part of Máramaros with a village, castle and toll, which the Huntpoznam family had obtained from Stephen V and Ladislav IV. The document directly states that this property was in *comitatu de Vgacha* and belonged *ad predium suum de Vgacha*.¹³⁶ As a replacement, the Huntpoznam family received from the king the villages of Rakasz (Рокосово), Feketeardó (Чорногісів) and *Nyrteluk (near Tiszaújhely, Нове Село and Tiszaújlak, Вилко and Karácsfalva, Карачин),¹³⁷ which also *ad predium nostrum de Wgacha pertinentes, in eodem comitatu sitas*.¹³⁸ We can interpret this as meaning either that in the framework of a county (*comitatus*) of Ugoča under aristocratic control there was still also a royal property belonging to the *predium Wgacha*, or that the *comitatus* was only a word designating the land belonging to the *predium Wgachu*. On the basis of the above mentioned documents, we can only be certain that the territory (*comitatus, districtus*) of Ugoča extended on both sides of the Tisza¹³⁹ and all these villages belonged to the royal property (*predium*) with its centre at Királyháza, where there was a royal manor house (*domus regalis*).¹⁴⁰

Where further mentions of *comites* of Bereg from the second half of the 13th century (1269, 1273) are concerned, it is interesting that they were men who also served as *comites* of Zvolen, Spiš and Patak.¹⁴¹ The same king's man or representative of his power administered various dynastic properties. It is possible to suppose that in these cases it could have been an honorary function,¹⁴² because he could not really have been active in all these territories at the same time. They must have had deputies in individual properties, who really worked there, as in the case of the deputy sheriffs *comites curiales*) of royal counties. However, we cannot say whether they were designated in royal properties as *comites curiales, ministeriales* or *officiales*. No case is known of a *comes* of royal properties, who was also the sheriff of a royal county (*comes comitatus*). This is further evidence of the specific position and administration of these royal domains. It is interesting that in 1273 Bereg was headed by a man who was also chief representative of the royal teamsters and cup bearers, functions closely connected with the royal court.

136 MNL DL 38 138; *CDH VI/2*, p. 253-254 (1300); *RA II/4*, no. 4319, p. 248.

137 SZABÓ, ref. 127, p. 443-444, 452-453.

138 „...in concambium prefate possessionis Wysk cum castro suo et villa sub eodem existente, quasdam possessiones nostras seu villas, nunc ad predium nostrum de Wgacha pertinentes, in eodem comitatu sitas, Rokož, et Feketheardow, que sunt minime populose, et Nyrteluk...“ MNL DL 38 138; *CDH VI/2*, p. 253-254 (1300).

139 On the right bank of the Tisza: Batár, Halmi, Peturfalva, Tiszabökény, Feketeardó, Visk. On the left bank of the Tisza: *Nyrteluk, Tiszakeresztúr a Rakasz.

140 SZABÓ, ref. 127, p. 382-383; SZÉKELY, ref. 130, p. 135-137.

141 MNL DL 40 160 (1269/1281); *RA II/2-3*, no. 3082, p. 269-270; MNL DL 834 (1273/1383); *RA II/2-3*, no. 2415, p. 58-59; *CDP VI*, no. 205, p. 284 (1282). On this see also: *MVA*, p. 136, 149, 167-168, 179, 188-189, 205-206, 215-216, 235-238; NÓGRÁDY, Árpád. „Magistratus et comitatus tenentibus“ : II. András kormányzati rendszerének kérdéséhez. In *Sz*, 1995, year 129, no. 1, p. 168-170; ZSOLDOS, ref. 92, p. 23-24.

142 ENGEL, Pál. Honor, castrum, comitatus : Studies in the Government System of the Angevin Kingdom. In *Quaestiones mediaevi novae*, 1996, year 1, p. 91-100. ISSN 14274418. On this see: BENJAMIN, ref. 102, p. 116.

We could find many more similar cases in medieval Hungary. We often encounter such combinations of functions in the case of the sheriffs of royal counties, so we cannot see anything specific in this.¹⁴³ In this context, let us comment that the second variant of the 1261 document, that from 1271, mentions important witnesses, who were selected from the Diocese of Eger, to ascertain the old rights of the Bishopric of Eger. They were all of noble origin (*seniores nobilium*), and came from important families such as *de genere Acus, Aba, Bartyan, Guthkeled, Chaak*. Some of them were *comites*. They included the above mentioned Bartholomew and Felician *comitibus de Beregh et Vgocsa*, but they are the only ones without predicates or indications of their families. This could be explained by them working on royal properties only as administrators so that their social position depended on the administration of these territories, which belonged to the Árpád dynasty. The witnesses did not include a sheriff of a royal county, but only local aristocrats, so the *comites* of Bereg and Ugoča could also have had aristocratic origins. As the representatives of royal power and administrators of dynastic properties they confirmed the old rights of the Bishopric of Eger, which, as we know, also concerned these royal properties. Apart from this, precisely in agreement with the document from 1261, in which tithes from Ugoča and Bereg (*in districtibus de Wgachu et de Beregh*) are mentioned together, the *comites* of the two territories appear together.¹⁴⁴

The oldest information about Bereg from the beginning of the 13th century provides the best evidence that the terms *foresta* or *districtus* correspond to a similar type of royal property known from Western Europe.¹⁴⁵ With its help, we can better interpret the data from the 1261 document and roughly outline the organization of this royal property (*predium regalis, proprium nostrum, regale allodium, predia regalia, terra regia, possessio regalis*).¹⁴⁶ Bereg¹⁴⁷ is mentioned in 1232 as a royal *predium* headed by the king's *procurator predii de Beregh*.¹⁴⁸ In the 12th – 13th centuries it was part of the frontier county of Boržava as an independent *districtus* or *comitatus*, which gradually got smaller as a result of royal grants, mainly in the second half of the 13th century. This was associated with its gradual change into a county controlled by the aristocracy, a process completed in the late 13th and 14th centuries. An important transformation process occurred in Hungary in this period connected with important social changes, which included the break up of the great royal properties.¹⁴⁹

143 „...magistrum Stephanum maiorem plaustrorum suorum regalium comitem de Beregh et de Patak...“ MNL DL 834 (1273/1383). „...magister pincernarum nostrorum comes de Beregh...“ RA II/2-3, no. 2415, p. 58-59; RA II/2-3, no. 2447, p. 68, no. 2531, p. 104; NÓGRÁDY, ref. 141, p. 179-180.

144 „...item Bartholomaeo et Feliciano comitibus de Beregh et Vgocsa...“ CDH V/I, p. 157; RA II/1, no. 2124, p. 124-125.

145 On this see: HUDÁČEK, ref. 8, p. 33-38.

146 RUGONFALVI KISS, István. *Az egységes magyar nemesi rend kifejlődése*. (The development of a unified Hungarian noble estate.). Debrecen : Debreceni M. Kir. Tisza István-Tudományegyetemi Nyomda, 1932, p. 25-33; LEDERER, Emma. *Feudalizmus kialakulása Magyarországon*. (The development of feudalism in Hungary.). Budapest : Akadémiai Kiadó, 1959, p. 93-174; HUDÁČEK, ref. 8, p. 41-42.

147 *ÁMTF I*, p. 530-532; ZSOLT, ref. 27, p. 24-25.

148 SZABÓ, ref. 96, no. 1, p. 5; *ÁMTF I*, p. 530-531; SZÉKELY, ref. 36, p. 322; HECKENAST, ref. 96, p. 98-99.

149 SZÜCS, ref. 9, p. 24; BEREND, ref. 25, p. 313.

On the basis of the two documents from 1232 and 1270 we will attempt to reconstruct the original size of this royal property. When Andrew II granted Legyr *procurator* of Bereg part of the land of Muzsaj (?) in 1232, Legyr had to return the royal land of *Pátröh, which originally belonged to the *predium de Beregh*.¹⁵⁰ *Pátröh was situated somewhere near Muzsaj (Nagymuzsaly, Мужієво, or the vanished *Kismuzsaly), which was not far from Beregszász.¹⁵¹ Both lay in immediate proximity to the centre of the royal property in Bereg. In exchange for *Pátröh, Legyr received the five hides (requiring 5 ploughs) of land of Muzsaj (*quandam terram nomine Muse*), which was detached from the property of Boržava Castle. From the definition of the granted area of land done by the royal *pristaldus* Čák son of Dionýz, we know that it bordered on the village of the sons of the jobagiones from Mezőgecse (Геча), the village of Nagybakta (Велика Бакта) formerly inhabited by the sons of the jobagiones of St. Stephen, the property of Peter from Tornaj (?), a village of the royal servants (*populi regis*) from *Bátor, situated in the south-eastern part of the territory of Beregszász bordering on *Kismuzsaly, and another village of royal servants from *Kismuzsaly (*villa Muse*). Finally, it also bordered on Legyr's inherited property.¹⁵² Since the boundaries are indicated only roughly, according to the surrounding villages and not more thoroughly on the basis of boundary features, rivers and other geographical points, it is not possible to determine the precise location of this land. Some of the mentioned villages later disappeared, and this also prevents more complete localization. In spite of this, we can state the boundary of this part of the land, that originally belonged to Boržava Castle, was probably the river Vérke (Bepke), which flows into the river Boržava near the castle. The Boržava then flows into the Tisza. The land of *Pátröh, which is said to have been part of the royal property, and the royal village of *Bátor located near the royal village of Muzsaj, were properties of the Arpád dynasty and lay on the other side of the river Vérke. Therefore this river must for a long time have divided the territory of the castle lordship or county of Boržava from the royal property of Bereg, although Boržava Castle lay only on the other side of this river. The villages originally belonged to Boržava Castle and later became part of the County of Bereg. According to Gy. Györffy they were Nagybakta, *Cibik, Gecse, Halábor and Muzsaj. However, in contrast to him we think that Muzsaj (Nagymuzsaly and *Kismuzsaly) always belonged to Bereg and the information from 1232 does not relate to this village, but only to the land of the same name and the extent of 5 hides. It could not have been a part divided from the village of Muzsaj. This is not mentioned in

150 „...quod cum idem dominus, Andreas rex, terram Legyr, procuratoris predii sui de Beregh nomine Patroh olym ab eodem predio suo sibi collatam, ad idem predium assumpsisset, in concambium ipsius terre quandam terram nomine Muse, usui quinque aratorum competentem ac a castro de Borsua exceptam, sibi et per eum heredibus suis iure perpetuo contulisset possidendam [et in dominium] ipsius terre per fidelem pristaldum suum Chak, filium Dionisii auctoritate regis ipsum fecisset introduci...” MNL DF 253 657; DOMAHIDI-SIPOS, ref. 96, p. 384.

151 ZSOLT, ref. 27, p. 79, 104; *ÁMTF I*, p. 546.

152 „Cuius prima meta esset cum terra filiorum jobagionum de villa Gwerche, inde teneret metam cum villa Bagotha, que esset filiorum jobagionum Sancti Regis, inde teneret metam cum Petro de genere Thomay, inde teneret metam cum populis regis de villa Batur, inde teneret metas cum populis regis de villa Muse, deinde procederet et convicinaretur metis terre hereditate eiusdem Legyr comitis, ibique terminaretur...” MNL DF 253 657; ZSOLT, ref. 27, p. 19, 22, 52; *ÁMTF I*, p. 529, 530, 539.

the document because according to the description of the boundaries it is clear that this concerned only the territory before the river Verke. If the land had extended beyond the river, it would have been an unusually large property by the standards of the time. Apart from this, there were already villages on the other side of the river (*Pátroh, *Bátor, *Kismuzsaly), so that it would have significantly disturbed the property situation in this part of the royal property. A further possibility is that part of the village of *Kismuzsaly belonged to the king and another part on the other side of the river to Boržava Castle. In 1280 the *comes* Kunch son of Eberhard received the village of Nagymuzsaly *in comitatu de Beregh* from Ladislav IV. On the basis of a later property dispute from 1337, we learn that *comes* Kunch was *iudex* (mayor) *de Luprechzaza* (now Beregszasz), that the village of Nagymuzsaly had boundaries with the royal town of Luprechzaza, the village of *Kismuzsaly, which already belonged to John known as Nylas and finally with Bene (Бене),¹⁵³ property of a certain Aegidius.¹⁵⁴ This was the property situation of part of the former territory of the royal *predium Bereg* close to Boržava Castle. All these villages were located near the river Vérke and their territories did not cross the river. In 1232, when Andrew II took away from Legyr *procurator* of Bereg the territory of *Pátroh, originally part of the *predium Beregh*, he granted as compensation land belonging to Boržava Castle. Apparently he was striving to maintain the integrity of this royal property, so Legyr did not receive another property in Bereg but land belonging to Boržava Castle and situated on the other side of the river Vérke. Apart from this, the five hides had a boundary to the east with Legyr's inherited property already located in the territory of Boržava. The fact that properties belonging to Boržava Castle lay on one side of the river Vérke is also shown by the vanished village of *Cibik, situated south of Gecse (Геча).¹⁵⁵ The royal guests from Luprechzaza claimed this land, which *castro nostro* (Boržava) *continebatur*,¹⁵⁶ in a false document from 1261. A source from 1299 still mentions *quandam terram castrenium Cybek vocatum*, but is already *in comitatu de Bereg*.¹⁵⁷ The village of *Cibik, as well as other villages inhabited by royal jobagiones according to the document from 1232 was located close to Boržava Castle and on its side of the river Vérke. The royal property of Bereg was on the other side of the river.

We can reconstruct another part of the extensive territory called the *predium Beregh* on the basis of Stephen V's document from 1270. The king granted the properties of the traitor Simon, husband of the daughter of the important nobleman Bán Banko,¹⁵⁸ to the *comes* Michael son of Andrew. This property comprised the villages of Lónya (Nagy-lónya, Bereg), Bótrágy (Баградь, Bereg), Bátuú (Батъово, Bereg), Szalóka (County of

153 ZSOLT, ref. 27, p. 23; *ÁMTF I*, p. 530.

154 1280: „...comitis Kunch, filii Eberhardi...quandam villam Mwsey vocatam, in comitatu de Beregh existentem, eidem Konch dedisset...“; 1377: „...quandam possessionem ipsorum aquisititiam Mwsay vocatam, in comitatu de Beregh...cui civitas Luprechzaza reginalis et possessio Johannis dicti Nylas Kysmusay, nec non possessio Egidii Bene vocate iure commutaneitatis vicinarentur...“ *AO VII*, no. 322, p. 602 (1280/1337/1359); *RA II/2-3*, no. 3069, p. 266.

155 *ÁMTF I*, p. 536; ZSOLT, ref. 27, p. 31-32, 52.

156 MNL DL 24 664 (1261/1365/1603); *RA I/3*, no. 1681, p. 508.

157 MNL DL 50 641; *RA II/4*, no. 4278, p. 233.

158 *MVA*, p. 286.

Szabolcs), Lónya (?), Szentmiklós (Чинадієво, Bereg) and Szolyva (Свалява, Bereg).¹⁵⁹ The description of this property also mentions a boundary with the *terra domini regis*. The village of Lónya had a boundary with the royal village of Shom (Шом), north-west of Beregszász, Bótrágy with the royal village of Szernye (Серне), south-west of Mukačevo and Bányu with the royal village of Nagydobrony (Велика Добронь), west of Mukačevo.¹⁶⁰ These villages form an imaginary line along the north-eastern boundary of the royal property of Bereg in the second half of the 13th century. Since there was no clear natural boundary such as a river, mountain range or marsh, the territory could have reached as far as the river Tisza in the 12th century. As a result of grants of marginal parts of the royal property, its boundary changed, gradually shifting towards the centre of Bereg near the present villages of Beregszász and Nagy Beregh.

In the case of the villages of Szentmiklós and Szolyva, there is a specific statement that Simon received them from Andrew II and their boundaries are specified in the document. Perhaps this is because, in contrast to the preceding villages, they were located on the northern margin of Bereg. Clear evidence of the extent of this *districtus* or *comitatus* is found in the definition of the village of Szentmiklós, the territory of which bordered on the royal property (*a terra domini regis Bereg vocata*), which must be understood as the boundary of the *predium de Bereg*. It is probable that the boundary in this part of Bereg was the river Latorica. The village of Szolyva was also a neighbour of the royal property (*adiungitur terre domini regis*) and the river Svalyavka (Свалявка) was the boundary of the *predium de Bereg*, because it is directly mentioned that *remanendo in dextra parte ipsius aque domino regis*.¹⁶¹

Precisely in this part of Bereg between the villages of Duszina and Strojna (Дусино and Стройне), both located south-east of the village of Szolyva, the vanished locality of *Kýralzallafa* (Királyszállása) is mentioned in 1548.¹⁶² In Hungarian király means king and szállás means lodgings, so Királyszállás was originally the site of a hunting lodge of the Arpád dynasty, where the kings of Hungary stayed when they went hunting in the surrounding forests. Similar place names are also found in the royal forests of Patak and Šariš (*locus Keralzalasa, Kýralzallasa*) and they had exactly this meaning.¹⁶³ All these records show that in the 12th – 13th centuries the royal *predium Bereg* or *districtus Bereg* was roughly defined by the rivers Vérke, Tisza, Latorica, Svalyavka, the Carpathian

159 MNL DL 30 577 (1270/1272/1476); *RA II/1*, no. 1907, p. 50-51; *CDAC VIII*, no. 176, p. 260-262; ZSOLDOS, Attila. *Családi ügy : IV. Béla és István ifjabb király viszálya az 1260-as években*. (A family matter: the quarrel between Béla IV and Junior King Stephen in the 1260s.). Budapest : MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 2007, p. 52, 59. ISBN 9789639627154.

160 *ÁMTF I*, p. 538-539, 543-544, 549; ZSOLT, ref. 27, p. 22, 24, 77, 102, 103, 125, 127-128, 131.

161 MNL DL 30 577; *ÁMTF I*, p. 548-549; ZSOLT, ref. 27, p. 127, 131.

162 ZSOLT, ref. 27, p. 44, 71, 133.

163 SZŰCS, ref. 9, p. 15. On the Hungarian term *szállás* see: SZAMOTA, István – ZOLNAI, Gyula. *Magyar oklevél-szótár*. (Hungarian diplomatic dictionary.). Budapest : Kiadja Hornyánszky Viktor Könyvkereskedése, 1902-1906, p. 879; KRISTÓ, Gyula. Szempontok korai helyneveink történeti tipológiájához. (Observations on the historical typology of early place names.). In *Acta Historica*, 1976, year 55, p. 89-90, 94. ISSN 03246965; HUDÁČEK, Pavol. Dynastické majetky Arpádovcov a kráľovské lesy v strednom Šariši. (The dynastic properties of the Arpád family and royal forests in central Šariš.). In *Mesto a Dejiny*, 2015, year 4, no. 2 (in press). ISSN 13390163.

range and the river Boržava. In the second half of the 13th century it was still an extensive territory.

Mentions of royal residences, manor houses or villages (*curia regis, curia regalis, curtis regali, villa regis, curia nostra, villa nostra*).¹⁶⁴ In the first half of the 13th century we do not find a castle in the territory of Bereg, as was usual in counties and castle lordships.¹⁶⁵ The administrative centres of the surrounding counties were the older royal castles of Boržava, Uh/Užhorod and the frontier castle of Sásvár, but the centre of the royal property of Bereg was the main royal manor house (*curia, curtis, villa regis*).¹⁶⁶ It is thought that Bereg Castle was built on the initiative of the king only after the Tartar invasion, to replace the older Boržava Castle, destroyed during the invasion. We first learn of it in 1264, when Princess Anna, daughter of Bela IV and already a widow, complained to the Pope that the castles of Bereg (*castrum Berez*) and Füzér, as well as the villages of Salamon and Boržava had been unjustly taken from her by her brother the Junior King Stephen. The castle may have been built in the territory of Nagy Beregh or Beregszász. Baranka (now Szuhabaranka, Бронька) another royal defensive castle was built deep in the Carpathian foothills sometime before 1263. Nyaláb (Нялаб) Castle¹⁶⁷ was also built on royal initiative in neighbouring Ugoča near the older royal manor house of *Királyház-domus regalis* (1262) in the village of Félzsász (today's Királyháza),¹⁶⁸ sometime in the second half of the 13th century. New castles were also built in this period in other royal hunting properties, for example, Patak Castle in Patak and Szádvár Castle in Turňa. In all cases, it is important that none of these properties was previously a county or a castle lordship.¹⁶⁹ Therefore, the castles built in these royal properties from the second half of the 13th century were the first castles built there under the Arpád dynasty.

The first mention of a royal manor house in Bereg is found in a document from 1264. The Junior King Stephen spent Christmas there with his court and the Bishop

164 HÓMAN, ref. 5, p. 206-207, 221-222, 309-310, 319-325; PESTY, ref. 20, p. 195-197; BAKAY, Kornél. *A magyar államalapítás*. (The foundation of the Hungarian state.). Budapest : Gondolat Kiado, 1978, p. 104-105. ISBN 9632806743. On this see: IVERSEN, Frode. Royal villas in Northern Europe. In CAS-TILLO, Juan Antonio Quirós (ed.). *The archaeology of early medieval villages in Europe*. Bilbao : Universidad del País Vasco, 2009, p. 99, 101-102, 106, 107, 108-109. ISBN 9788498603033.

165 BEREND, ref. 25, p. 307-308.

166 For comparison see: HUDÁČEK, Pavol. Kráľovský majetok a počiatky mesta Veľký Šariš v 13. storočí. (The royal property and beginnings of the town of Veľký Šariš in the 13th century.). In BODNÁROVÁ, Miloslava (ed.). *Príspevky k starším dejinám slovenských miest a mestečiek*. Prešov : Filozofická fakulta Prešovskej univerzity, 2013, p. 87-119. ISBN 9788055508887.

167 FÜGEDI, Erik. *Vár és társadalom a 13. – 14. századi magyarországon*. (Castle and society in 13th–14th century Hungary.). Budapest : Akadémiai kiado, 1977, p. 171. ISBN 9630511525; SZÉKELY, ref. 2, p. 86; SZÉKELY, ref. 130, p. 133, 137-138.

168 *CDH XIII/3*, no. 40, p. 44; *RA III/I*, p. 10, no. 1788; KOMÁROMY, ref. 127, p. 13-15, 23, 25; NÉMETH, ref. 15, p. XXIX.

169 „...quod tu eos de Berez et Fizer castris ac Solomon et de Borsna villis...que dicti ducissa et orphanii se diu iuste et pacifice asserunt possedissee, contra iustitiam spoliasti...eis restituere indebite contradicis...“ *VMH I*, no. 506, p. 276; *ÁMTF I*, p. 534-5, 530-532, 529-530; FÜGEDI, ref. 168, p. 104; FÜGEDI, Erik. *Castle and society in medieval Hungary (1000–1437)*. Budapest : Akadémiai Kiadó, 1986, p. 55, 59. ISBN 9630538024; ZSOLDOS, ref. 159, p. 31, 85; MÓR, Wertner. *Az Árpádok családi története*. (A history of the Arpád dynasty.). Nagy-Becskerekén : Pleitz Fer. Póal Könyvnyomdájá, 1892, p. 463-475.

of Oradea Zozimas also came there, (*in curia domini regis Stephani...de Bereg*).¹⁷⁰ It is most probable that the manor house was situated at Beregszász and not Nagy Beregh. It was the main royal manor house in the renowned Bereg Forest (*silva Bereg* = Bereg manor house) and the central place of the royal *predium*. In spite of the fact that only one mention of this manor house exists, it was certainly an important place, where the kings of Hungary often stayed, when they moved through their properties in this part of the frontier region. Queen Elizabeth wife of Stephen V probably spent Christmas in this royal manor house in 1271. She issued a document *in Beregh* on 24 December 1271.¹⁷¹ Since members of the Arpád dynasty and their courts stayed in this manor house on important Christian festivals, there must have been a royal chapel (*capella regis*) there.¹⁷² We know that at important royal manor houses monarchs always established chapels for their religious needs. In Western Europe and in Hungary the chapel was an essential part of a royal manor house (*curtis nostra cum aedificio*) in addition to the royal residence (*palatium, domus*) and economic buildings.¹⁷³ The royal chapel as an institution meant mainly the chaplains of the Arpád family, who worked at the various royal residences in the dynastic properties, and were subordinate to the Archbishop of Esztergom. For this reason, all the royal monasteries, parishes and chapels were exempt from the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the bishop in whose diocese they were situated.¹⁷⁴ This can be seen in nearby Ugoča, where royal guests from Félzász were settled immediately around the royal manor house (*hospites nostri de villa Felzaz, apud Domum nostram, videlicet in Vgocha constituti*). When Stephen V granted them privileges in 1272 he stated that the Church of St. Peter as a royal chapel (*capella nostra*) was exempt from the jurisdiction of all priests and archdeacons.¹⁷⁵

A provision in a grant of privileges from 1247 to royal guests in Luprechzaza (Beregszász) in the territory of Bereg has a similar meaning. It states that the local church

170 MNL DL 76 144; *Zichy Ok. I*, no. 15, p. 12; *Zichy Ok. I*, no. 16, p. 13; SZŰCS, ref. 9, p. 17. When Zosimas went back to Oradea at the beginning of 1264, he stopped in the property of the *comes* Privard at Gacsály in the County of Szatmár, where he recorded the last will of Privard's wife. NÉMETH, ref. 15, no. 142, p. 89-90.

171 *RD*, no. 92, p. 66.

172 SZŰCS, ref. 9, p. 17.

173 GYÖRFFY, György. *Święty Stefan I : Król Węgier i jego dzieło*. (St. Stephen I: The King of Hungary and his work.). Warszawa : Oficyna Wydawnicza RYTM, 2003, p. 296-297. ISBN 8373990984; GEREVICH, László. The Royal Court (Curia), the Provost's Residence and the Village at Dömös. In *Acta Archaeologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 1983, year 35, no. 3-4, p. 387-389, 409. ISSN 15882551; KÓCKA-KRENZ, Hanna. Palatia wczesnopiastowskie. (Early Piast palaces.). In SKUPIEŃSKI, Krzysztof (ed.). *Średniowiecze w rozjaśnieniu*. Warszawa : Wydawnictwo DiG, 2010, p. 119-120, 126-130. ISBN 9788371816130; ZOTZ, Thomas. Die Goslarer Pfalz im Umfeld der königlichen Herrschaftssitze in Sachsen : Topographie, Architektur und historische Bedeutung. In FENSKE, Lutz (ed.). *Deutsche Königspfalzen : Beiträge zu ihrer historischen und archäologischen Erforschung, Band IV. : Pfalzen – Reichsgut – Königshöfe*. Göttingen : Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996, p. 248-287. ISBN 9783525354360.

174 GYÖRFFY, ref. 173, p. 296-297.

175 „*Praeterea restituimus eisdem, vt ecclesia beati Petri, capella nostra, a iurisdictione omnium plebanorum et archidiaconorum penitus libera habeatur, et exempta.*“ *CDH V/1*, p. 176-177; *RA II/1*, no. 2117, p. 116; BÉLAY, ref. 27, p. 6, 10; ZOLNAY, ref. 27, p. 133-138, 157; SZABÓ, ref. 127, p. 38, 44-45, 382-383.

belongs to the Archbishopric of Esztergom, and the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Eger and of local priests or archdeacons do not apply to it, in spite of the Boržava – Bereg region being part of the diocese of Eger.¹⁷⁶ Therefore this church was originally a royal chapel (*capella regis*) and was also an exempt parish (*exempta parochia, plebania exempta*). The members of the Arpád dynasty founded special ecclesiastical institutions in their properties in the form of royal chapels. These became exempt parishes headed by royal chaplains (*capellanus regis*), and so they did not fall under the jurisdiction of the local bishop.¹⁷⁷ A document from 1284 gives entirely convincing evidence that Luprechzaza and Beregszász as two independent royal chapels,¹⁷⁸ originally also two separate villages in the framework of the dynastic property of Bereg, were really two exempt parishes. Ladislav IV was solving a dispute about jurisdiction and tithes between the Archbishopric of Esztergom and the Bishopric of Eger. He informed the chapter of Esztergom that a copy would be prepared of the document from 1271 about the properties, rights and liberties of the Bishopric of Eger. This copy from 1284 has a part at the end, which directly mentions the parishes (*plebaniae*) in Luprechzaza and Beregszász, at Nagyszöllős (*Asszonyságyszöllős*)¹⁷⁹ in Ugoča, and *Novum Castrum* Sárospatak the centre of the royal forest of Patak¹⁸⁰ – all properties where royal guests were settled – and the Premonstratensian monastery of Jasov, a foundation of the Arpád dynasty. They were all located in the diocese of Eger, but had been placed under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Esztergom.¹⁸¹

As we already mentioned, medievalists suppose that in the 11th – 12th centuries, Bereg and Ugoča were hunting reserves of the Arpád kings.¹⁸² The fact that Bereg was a royal forest, or if we like, a forest lordship (*erdőispánság*), is proved by the following data: Already in 1181 in the furthest part of the County of Szatmár, not far from the

176 „*Ecclesia vero eorumdem ad archiepiscopatum Strigoniensem contineatur et sit sine iurisdictione magistratus.*“ MNL DL 314 (1247/1271/1507); *RHMA*, no. MCCXLVII, p. 471-472; *CDH IV/1*, p. 456-457; *RA I/2*, no. 867, p. 261; *MES I*. Ed. KNAUZ, Ferdinandus. Strigonii : Typis Descripsit Aegydius Horák, 1874, no. 474, p. 369; *ÁMTF I*, p. 532-533; KOVÁCS, Béla. *Az egeri egyházmegye története 1596-ig.* (A history of the Diocese of Eger up to 1596.) Eger : Egyetemi Nyomda, 1987, p. 36-40, 55-56. ISBN 0519000784969.

177 SZÜCS, ref. 9, p. 9-11. On this see: KISS, Gergely. Királyi egyházak a középkori Magyarországon. A királyi kápolna mint lehetséges közös eredet. (Royal churches in medieval Hungary. The royal chapel as a possible common starting point.) In KISS, Attila P. et al. (eds.). *Középkortörténeti tanulmányok 7.* Szeged : Szegedi Középkorász Műhely, 2012, p. 77-82. ISBN 9633061601.

178 The Papal register from 1334 and 1335 still mentions them separately : „*Item plebanus de Luprechzaza, Item plebanus de Bereg, Item de Zeleus* (Nagyszöllős in Ugoča); *Item plebanus de Lempert Zaza, Item de Bereg, Item de Zeleus.*“ *Rationes collectorium pontificorum in Hungaria, Pápai tized-szedők számadásal 1281 – 1375 : Monumenta Vaticana historiam regni Hungariae illustrantia, Series prima, Tomus primus* (hereinafter *Mon. Vat. I/1*). VÁRSZEGI, Asztrik – ZOMBORI, István (eds.). Budapest : METEM, 2000, p. 356, 371. ISBN 9638472480; SZÜCS, ref. 9, p. 9-10; *ÁMTF I*, p. 532-533.

179 *CDAC VIII*, no. 23, p. 31; *RA II/1*, no. 1793, p. 11; SZABÓ, ref. 127, p. 321, 419.

180 SZÜCS, ref. 9, p. 5, 21.

181 „...videlicet plebaniis Beregzaza, Luprethzaza et Azunsagzeuleus, item Potook et una ecclesia collegiata Yazau nominatis, que in dyocesi Agriensi dinoscuntur esse situate et fundate, et in omnibus iurisdictionibus suis ad ecclesiam nostram pertinere...“ *HÁO*, no. 38, p. 63 (1284); SZÜCS, ref. 9, p. 9-10.

182 *ÁMTF I*, p. 519; SZÉKELY, ref. 36, p. 321; SZÜCS, ref. 9, p. 10-11, 12-13, 15, 22-23.

territories of Bereg and Ugoča, foresters are mentioned in the properties of Túristvándi (*Tur*) and Szatmárcseke (*Cheke*) near the river Tisza, which belonged to the Benedictine monastery of the Virgin Mary at Cégénydányád.¹⁸³ They were probably originally royal foresters, who already oversaw the forests or forest properties of the Arpád dynasty in this part of Hungary in the 12th century. Foresters were certainly also active in the nearby royal forest of Bereg at least from this period. However, the first mention of them dates only from 1214 (*custodes silvae Beregu*).¹⁸⁴

Apparently like foresters (*forestarii*) in Western Europe, they oversaw the royal forests, administered the forest rights of the dynasty and supervised their application in this territory. They also provided various services for the king when he came to hunt. They were settled in a village with the characteristic name **Ardow* – Beregardó¹⁸⁵ mentioned in 1332–1335 and later joined to the important royal village of Beregszász.¹⁸⁶ Some medievalists suppose that the record of a village of royal falconers or keepers of birds of prey (falcons or hawks) from 1220 (*villa Dranci* – falconers) could concern the present village of Beregdaróc, which is located near Beregszász.¹⁸⁷ It is mentioned without any doubt in 1284 as *Drauch* (now Beregdaróc)¹⁸⁸ and its inhabitants kept birds of prey and hunted with them for the needs of the kings of Hungary in the Forest of Bereg.¹⁸⁹ A false document giving the date 1255 also deserves attention. According to it, King Stephen V (!) allegedly gave guests from Luprechzaza (Beregszász) the royal land of **Vrkurteleke*, a vanished village west of Beregszász. This was originally inhabited by indefinitely defined royal servants/serfs/slaves (*servi nostri*).¹⁹⁰ In spite of the fact that it is a falsified

183 „*In predio Tur sunt duo custodes silvarum...In predio Cheke...unus custos silvarum, cuius nomen Cheke.*“ *RA I/I*, p. 43-44, no. 133; MAKSAI, Ferenc. *A középkori Szatmár megye.* (The medieval County of Szatmár.) Budapest : Stephaneum Nyomda, 1940, p. 18-19, 120, 123, 126; NÉMETH, ref. 15, p. XXXII, p. 38-39; ROMHÁNYI, Beatrix F. *Kolostorok és társaskáptalanok a középkori Magyarországon.* (Monasteries and collegiate churches in medieval Hungary.) Budapest : Pytheas, 2000, p. 17. ISBN 9789636932398.

184 *RV*, no. 88 (314), p. 184; LEHOCZKY, Tivadar. *Bereg vármegye.* (The County of Bereg.) Budapest, Beregszász : Hatodik Síp Alapítvány, Mandátum Kiadó, 1996, p. 376. ISBN 9638294191 (reprint of a work from 1881–1882); *ÁMTF I*, p. 530; KRISTÓ, ref. 9, p. 424; FÁBIÁN, Ilona K. *A Váradi regestrum helynevei.* (Places in the Oradea register.) Szeged : Szegedi Középkorász Műhely, 1997, p. 42. ISBN 963482174X.

185 Villages originally inhabited by royal foresters are designated by Hungarian place names such *Ardó*, *Ordó* (Hung. Erdőóvó). ZOLNAY, ref. 27, p. 135-137, 175-178, 245-246; GYÖRFFY, György. *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft der Ungarn um die Jahrtausendwende.* Budapest : Akadémiai Kiadó, 1983, p. 71-72, 76-77. ISBN 963053200X.

186 *ÁMTF I*, p. 528; MIZSER, ref. 57, p. 88-89.

187 *RV*, no. 243 (124), p. 244; FÁBIÁN, ref. 184, p. 58.

188 *ÁMTF I*, p. 538; MIZSER, ref. 57, p. 89.

189 *Zichy Ok. I*, no. 70, p. 66; *ÁMTF I*, p. 538; LEHOCZKY, ref. 184, p. 376, 497, 691, 693. On this see: KRISTÓ, Gyula. Settlement Name Giving in the Age of the Arpáds. In MATICSÁK, Sándor (ed.). *Settlement names in the Uralian languages.* Debrecen; Helsinki : Onomastica Uralica, 2005, p. 129-130. ISBN 9634729053.

190 „...*quandam terram Vrkurteleke vocatam, qua servorum nostrorum dignoscebatur exitisse...*“ MNL DL 90 809; NAGY, Imre – DEÁK, Farkas – NAGY, Gyula (eds.). *Hazai oklevéltár 1234–1536.* (Charters of the Homeland 1234–1536.) Budapest : Kiadja A. M. Történelmi Társulat, 1879, no. 26, p.33-34; *RA III/I*, no. 1751, p. 1; ZSOLT, ref. 27, p. 155; *ÁMTF I*, p. 550; SZÚCS, ref. 9, p. 21.

document, the information about the royal servants could be genuine. They may have fulfilled duties connected with the needs of the kings of Hungary when they came to hunt in this part of Hungary's frontier regions, or they provided various services for the nearby royal manor house. Such properties certainly include the above mentioned village of **Perek* (1261), which was originally inhabited by royal swineherds. The document from 1232 also mentions that not far from Beregszász were two villages of royal servants (*populi regis*) **Bator* and *Muzsaj* (**Kismuzsaly*). We can only guess what duties they fulfilled for the king. It is entirely possible that like earlier servants, the inhabitants of these villages carried on economic activities in the royal property of Bereg and probably also fulfilled hunting duties for the king. All these villages are situated near the most important royal properties, namely Beregszász and Nagy Beregh. This was the central part of the great *predium Bereg* and in the earliest period it was the most densely populated.

In the course of the 12th – 13th centuries the kings of Hungary settled large groups of guests (*hospites regni, hospites nostri*) almost always in their royal properties.¹⁹¹ They often settled close to the main royal manor houses, which were the centres of individual territories belonging to the “private property” of the Arpád dynasty. Sometime before 1247 Saxon guests came to Bereg on the basis of royal initiative, and Belo IV granted them extensive privileges. He settled them in the village of Luprechzaza – Beregszász (*hospites nostri de Lwprechzaza*). This village also appears as Beregzaza, Luprechzaza, Szász, Lampertszásza and Luprechtszásza. Originally they were two separate villages of Luprechzaza and Beregszász situated near the main royal manor house in Bereg. It is interesting that in the papal registers from 1334 and 1335, it is mentioned not only as *Luprechtzaza*, but in one case also directly as *Lempert Zaza*.¹⁹² This village is thought to have got its name from Lampert, younger brother of Gejza I and Ladislav I.¹⁹³ From 1050 to 1095 Lampert was Prince of Bihar, which placed him not far from the frontier region of Hungary where Bereg was situated. Gy. Györffy states that it was Lampert who brought the Saxons to this village, and he regards Lampert as its founder.¹⁹⁴

191 FÜGEDI, Erik. Das mittelalterliche Königreich Ungarn als Gastland. In SCHLESINGER, Walter (ed.). *Die deutsche Ostsiedlung des Mittelalters als Problem der europäischen Geschichte*. Sigmaringen : J. Thorbecke, 1975, p. 481-488. ISBN 379956618X; KUBINYI, András. Zur Frage der deutschen Siedlungen im mittleren Teil des Königreichs Ungarn (1200–1541). In SCHLESINGER, Walter (ed.). *Die deutsche Ostsiedlung*, p. 529-544; MARTINI, Friedrich. Der Deutsche Ritterorden und seine Kolonisten im Burzenland. In *UJ*, 1979, year 10, p. 42-56; ZSOLDOS, ref. 25, p. 11, 14-15; BEREND, ref. 25, p. 313. On this see: IVERSEN, ref. 164, p. 99, 101-102, 106, 107, 108-109.

192 MNL DL 314 (1247/1271/1507); *ÁMTF I*, p. 532-533; MIZSER, ref. 57, p. 88; SOLYMOSI, László. Hospeskváltság 1275-ből. (A hospes privilege from 1275.). In KREDICS, László (ed.). *Tanulmányok Veszprém megye múltjából*. Veszprém : Veszprém Megyei Levéltár, 1984, p. 56-57, 60. ISBN 9630145375; *Mon. Vat. I/Is*. 356, 371.

193 *ÁMTF I*, p. 532-533; GYÖRFFY, ref. 173, p. 616; ENGEL, ref. 56, p. 61; KRISTÓ, Gyula. *A XI. századi hercegség története Magyarországon*. (The History of the 11th Century Duchy in Hungary.). Budapest : Akadémiai Kiadó, 1974, p. 62-63, 92-94. ISBN 9630503980; *KMTL*, p. 393. On the names of villages derived from the kings and dynastic saints of the Arpád dynasty (Imrich, Koloman, Stephen, Ladislav) see: MEZŐ, András. *A templomcím a Magyar helységnevekben (11. – 15. század)*. (Church dedications in Hungarian place names (11th – 15th centuries).). Budapest : METEM, 1996, p. 90-91, 109-110, 125-131, 134-141. ISBN 9638472197.

194 On this see: KRISTÓ, ref. 188, p. 98.

We know little about Lampert, but there is information that he and Ladislav I founded and endowed the later important provostry of Titel in the County of Bács.¹⁹⁵ He may really have “founded” or enlarged the village of Luprechzaza. However, it appears to us much more probable that while Lampert was Prince of Bihar he could have built a manor house (*curia regis*) in the Forest of Bereg.¹⁹⁶ Therefore the place was named after him in later tradition. When he hunted or stayed in this part of the frontier region of Hungary, he stayed precisely there. Since the name of the village preserved his name, it could have been his main residence in the dynastic property of Bereg, which was part of the frontier County of Boržava. We already mentioned that the kings of Hungary always settled guests in their dynastic properties, often near their manor houses. We do not think that guests from Saxony were already invited there by Lampert. They came only much later on the initiative of later kings of Hungary, perhaps at the end of the 12th or beginning of the 13th century. However, we cannot entirely exclude the possibility shown by a record from 1216 about German guests (Szatmár) Németi, who settled near Szatmár Castle in the neighbouring County of Szatmár.¹⁹⁷ Andrew II granted them privileges in 1230, but a much older tradition was recorded in this document that they had come already in the time of Queen Gizela (984–1060).¹⁹⁸

If we accept the assumption that as a member of the Arpád dynasty, Lampert also stayed in the royal manor house in Bereg (Luprechzaza), then we have evidence that the royal forest of Bereg was already part of the “private” property of the Arpád dynasty in the 11th century. Considerations of the name of the village of Luprechzaza, named after Prince Lampert, largely start from the record of the above mentioned inventory of goods for the court of the Junior King Stephen in 1264. The part about the payment of debts to the Venetian merchant Wulam mentions Lampert’s forests (*in silvis de Lompert*).¹⁹⁹ These were forests in Bereg, either around the village of Luprechzaza or elsewhere in the property. Since they were named after Prince Lampert and not mentioned as *silvae de Beregh*, it is a strong argument clearly testifying to the activity of Lampert in this part of the frontier region of Hungary. Not only the names of the village with the royal manor house but also the surrounding forests bear his name. This may originally have applied to the whole territory of Bereg. Lampert probably used this district as an area for hunting already in the 11th century. Since it was a dynastic property it could be similarly used by other regional princes and later also by kings of Hungary. Apparently for this reason, thanks to the dynastic memory of the Arpád family, this naming was preserved until the second half of the 13th century.

195 *ÁMTF I*, p. 240-242; *KMTL*, p. 677.

196 Gy. Györfly also later admitted that Lampert had to establish a princely manor house there. GYÖRFFY, György. *Az Arpád-kori Magyarország történelmi földrajza*. (Historical Geography of Hungary in the Arpád Period.). (hereinafter *ÁMTF IV*). Budapest : Akadémiai Kiadó, 1998, p. 115. ISBN 9630575043.

197 NÉMETH, ref. 15, no. 325, p. 199-201, no. 447, p. 281-282.

198 ZIMMERMANN, Harald. *Hospites Theutonici : Rechtsprobleme der deutschen Südostsiedlung*. In ZIMMERMANN, Harald (ed.). *Siebenbürgen und seine Hospites Theutonici : Vorträge und Forschungen zur südostdeutschen Geschichte*. Köln, Weimar, Wien : Böhlau Verlag, 1996, p. 57-58. ISBN 3412127957.

199 „Item LX marcas quas dedit magister Lodomerius eidem syr Wilamo in silvis de Lompert.“ ZOLNAY, ref. 56, p. 82, 88, 106; FEJÉRPATAKY, ref. 56, p. 119.

According to the document granting privileges from 1247, the king's guests from Luprechzaza could use the mountains, forests, valleys and waters in their surroundings.²⁰⁰ Apart from this, they also gained the right to pasture their pigs and cattle during certain periods in the Forest of Bereg. It was apparently a matter of feeding their animals during the pannage (autumn) period of pasturing with acorns and beech nuts, and obtaining the wood they needed for building.²⁰¹ Forest pasturing, a part of the royal prerogative, happened regularly in the Forest of Bereg as is shown by the mention of the village of *Perek and its swineherds. The falsified foundation document of the monastery of St. Maurice at Bél (1037/1086) in the royal forest of Bakon mentions the right of the serfs to cut wood for the needs of the monastery (*in silva Bocon ligna incidere*).²⁰² When Stephen II (1116–1131) confirmed in 1121 the foundation of the monastery of the Virgin Mary at Almad by Ogiuz and Misko sons of Band, he also mentioned the right of the monastery to take wood from the royal *silva Selcz*.²⁰³ In the period 1264–1270 Belo IV solved a dispute between the Bakon foresters and the Cistercian nuns from the monastery of the Virgin Mary in Vesprém. They demanded the right to take wood from the royal forests to repair their monastery buildings as Belo IV had already allowed them to do.²⁰⁴ We can see from these examples that to cut wood in a royal forest was a prerogative right of the monarch and the privileges granted to the guests at Luprechzaza concerned precisely this royal right.

A royal manor house or residence of the monarch – *Királyház-domus regalis*, now called Királyháza, in Ugoča, is also mentioned in 1262.²⁰⁵ We have a record from 1272 that royal guests were settled near this manor house *apud domum nostram...in Vgocha constituti*.²⁰⁶ It was the main hunting manor house of the Arpád dynasty in the royal property of Ugoča, where the king and his court stayed during hunting and their con-

200 On the similar privileges regarding the free use of the royal forests by German guests in Transylvania (Burzenland) from 1224 see: ZIMMERMANN, Franz – WERNER, Carl (eds.). *Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte der Deutschen in Siebenbürgen I.* (1191–1342). Hermannstadt : In Kommission bei Franz Michaelis, 1892, no. 43, p. 35.

201 *...ac etiam quantum possunt uno die cum porcibus et pecoribus ad sylvam Beregh pervenire, percipiant sicuti volunt, et in eadem ligna ad edificia mactare.*“ MNL DL 314 (1247/1271/1507); *RHMA*, no. MCCXLVII, p. 472; *CDH IV/1*, p. 456-457; *RA I/2*, no. 867, p. 261; *AMTF I*, p. 532-533. On this see: SOLYMOSSI, László. *A földesúri járadékok új rendszere a 13. századi Magyarországon.* (The new income system of landlords in 13th-century Hungary.). Budapest : Argumentum Kiadó, 1998, p. 66, 102, 118, 183, 187. ISBN 9634460844.

202 *DHA I*, no. 26, p. 119 (falsified). On this see: SZABÓ, ref. 9, p. 139-142; CANTOR, ref. 61, p. 60-63.

203 *...ad silvam Selcz in qua habet securitatem sive ad succidendum...libere et sine aliquibus terminis...*“ *DHA I*, no. 151, p. 413.

204 *...conuentui monialium ecclesie sancte Marie de ordine cystericiens in valle Vessprimiensi existentium ligna in silva Bakon, que pro reparatione curie vel ad rehedificationem ecclesie necessaria fuerint libere et sine quolibet impedimento dari permittas...*“ MNL DL 5983; *CDH VII/1*, p. 362; *RA I/3*, no. 1675, p. 507; *CDH IX/4*, no. 6, p. 44-45. On this see: YOUNG, ref. 66, p. 10-12; CANTOR, ref. 61, p. 59; WILSON, Dolores. Multi-Use Management of the Medieval Anglo-Norman Forest. In *Journal of the Oxford University History Society*, 2004, no. 1, year 2., p. 3-5. ISSN 1742917X.

205 *CDH XII/3*, no. 40, p. 44; *RA III/1*, no. 1788, p. 10; NÉMETH, ref. 15, p. XXIX.

206 *RA III/1*, no. 2117, p. 116; *CDH V/1*, 176; SZABÓ, ref. 127, p. 45-46, 114, 321-322, 382, 410-411; KRISTÓ, ref. 9, p. 492-497; SZÜCS, ref. 9, p. 17; NÉMETH, ref. 96, p. 8-9.

tinual movement around the royal properties.²⁰⁷ This territory is mentioned as *predium nostrum de Wgacha* even at the end of the 13th century.²⁰⁸ The presence of communities of guests at the manor house (Félszász 1272) and in its surroundings shows the importance of this royal property. They are mentioned before 1262 at **Tornatelek*, a vanished village in the present territory of Gödényháza, Гудя and then in Szászfalu (now Sasovo, Сасово).²⁰⁹ Apart from these Saxon communities, the Arpád dynasty settled further guests in the village of Nagyszöllős (Виноградів). It is situated on the other side of the Tisza near the already mentioned royal manor house and village of Félszász, and in 1280 it is even mentioned as *villa nostra regalis*.²¹⁰ In 1262 the Junior King Stephen granted these guests (*hospitibus nostris de villa Zeleus*) privileges concerning the rights and internal organization of their community. They were given permission to hunt deer, wolves and foxes in the surrounding forests and to freely catch fish (*in silvis adiacentibus venari capriolos, lupos, wlpes et in aquis piscari libere possint et secure*). As a result of the larger number of guests they also received land of the royal falconers (keepers of birds of prey for hunting, *terra Droch*) and fishermen, located not far from this village.²¹¹ They were certainly among the older organizations of royal properties in this part of Hungary. Apart from this, it has a royal chapel or queen's chapel, since according to a mention from 1284 it was an exempt parish like Luprechzaza and Beregszász. This is clear evidence that it was a dynastic property of the Arpád family. Gy. Györffy also supposes thanks to a single record of its name as Asszonyságszöllős (*Zeleus*, Nagyszöllős) that this was a village of the queens of Hungary at least from the time of Queen Gizela.²¹² A further document of Stephen V from 1272 granted privileges to royal guests from Félszász, who were settled directly around the royal manor house (*hospites nostri de villa Felzaz, apud domum nostram, videlicet in Vgocha constituti*). They appear to have originally fulfilled various duties for the king. It testifies to the fact that they gained various privileges because of the constant burden from frequent visits by the monarch and the need to entertain him (*ius descensus*) at the nearby royal manor house. The king granted them a forest, the *sylva Stulba*, where they could obtain new soil and freely hunt wild animals of appropriate size such as bears, wild boar and deer. Nobody else had the right to use it in this way. They were also allowed to catch fish in the Tisza up to the boundary of the Máramaros forest.²¹³ Not far from the royal manor house in Ugoča there were also two

207 SZABÓ, ref. 127, p. 32, 37-38, 45, 382.

208 CDP VIII, no. 369, p. 447 (1296); CDH VI/2, p. 523-524 (1300); KRISTÓ, ref. 9, p. 496.

209 „...*terram Tornatelek vocatam in Comitatu Vgocha existentem, in qua antea hospites nostri residebant, nunc vacuam, et habitatoribus destitutam...convicinatur terrae hospitem nostrorum Király háziak vocatorum...versus terram hospitem nostrorum Nogzaz...*“ CDH XII/3, no. 40, p. 44-46; RA II/1, no. 1788, p. 10; SZABÓ, ref. 127, p. 355-356, 479, 521-522.

210 CDAC XII, no. 241, p. 292; RA II/2-3, no. 3080, p. 269; SZABÓ, ref. 127, p. 419.

211 „*Concessimus eciam, quod in silvis adiacentibus venari capriolos, lupos, wlpes et in aquis piscari libere possint et secure...Preterea, ut numerus hospitem nobis serviencium augeatur, dedimus terram Droch et terram piscatorum nostrorum adiacentem eiusdem...*“ CDAC VIII, no. 23, p. 31; RA II/1, no. 1793, p. 11; SZABÓ, ref. 127, p. 321, 419.

212 GYÖRFFY, ref. 173, p. 296-297; SZABÓ, ref. 127, p. 419.

213 „...*quod quia iidem per frequentes descensus nostros quam plurimis sint grauati... Item contulimus eisdem sylvam, Stulba vocatam...in qua araturas exercent, et feras mediocres, videlicet ursos, apros, cervos, et*

villages of royal foresters, who oversaw the forests of the Arpád dynasty in this part of the frontier region of Hungary. They were Szöllősvégardó (Підвиноградів) (*custodes silvarum nostrarum...in comitatu de Ugacha,...possessionum regalis Ordou vocate*)²¹⁴ on the left bank of the Tisza and Feketeardó (Чорнотисів) on the right bank.²¹⁵ These privileges for the royal guests at Nagyszöllős and Félszász are important evidence that Ugoča was a royal forest, where the possibility to hunt animals, catch fish or obtain soil for cultivation were part of the prerogative rights of the Arpád dynasty. Although no such extensive privileges are mentioned for the guests at Luprechzaza or Beregszász, we can suppose that the kings of Hungary had the same prerogative rights in the *predium Bereg* or *silva Bereg*, as those they granted to the guests in Ugoča.

The territory of Bereg was part of the frontier region *confinium* of the Kingdom of Hungary. It was originally a dynastic property of the Arpád family and it probably had been at least since the 11th century. It was a wooded territory in the Carpathians, where members of the Arpád dynasty often went to hunt. We do not have direct evidence of royal hunts, but we know that by the end of the 12th century, the king hunted in the neighbouring forest of Máramaros. We suppose that this also happened in Bereg, and that the surviving documents indirectly testify to it. It is mentioned in the first half of the 13th century as a royal forest (*silva regis*). An autonomous county controlled by the nobility arose there only later. Its territory contained villages of royal servants, who performed duties connected with royal hunts. There were villages of royal foresters (*custodes silvarum*), falconers (*falconarii, accipitres*), and we can suppose that there were other servants such as dog-handlers (*caniferi, leporariferi*) and hunters (*venatores*). Such royal properties were known in Western Europe as *forestes* and the prerogative rights of the monarch (*Wildbann, Forstbann, bannum bestiarum*) applied there. These rights covered hunting, fishing, pasturing of pigs, tolls, extraction of timber, mining of ores and so on. It is probable that these forest rights of the dynasty (in Hungarian: *erdőuradalom, erdőispánság*) also applied in Hungary and that the territory of Bereg was also protected by special rights of the monarch (*ius regis-venatio, piscatio*). In the 11th century Bereg was part of the great frontier County (*marchia*) of Boržava, and formed a distinct *districtus* or *comitatus* within it. Its main centre was the royal manor house (*curia, curtis, villa regis*), close to which the kings of Hungary settled guests of German origin in the villages of Luprechzaza and Beregszász during the first half of the 13th century. An important finding is that Bereg, specifically these two villages had royal or princely chapels (*capella regis*) established by the Arpád dynasty. We know from later documents that they were exempt parishes (*exempta parochia, plebania exempta*) subject directly to the

capellas occidenti (?) liberam habeant facultatem. Ceterum volumus, ut nullus extraneorum usum silvae ipsorum possit recipere violenter...Adhuc concessimus, quod usque ad indagines sylvae Maramarosi de terminis terrae ipsorum incipiendo, piscaturam in Ticia omnimodam possint exercere. "MNL DL 70 588; CDH V/1, p. 176-177; RA II/1, no. 2117, p. 116; BÉLAY, ref. 27, p. 6, 10; ZOLNAY, ref. 27, p. 133-138, 157; SZABÓ, ref. 127, p. 38, 44-45, p. 382-383.

214 CDP VIII, no. 372, p. 453-454; CDAC V, no. 85, p. 136; SZABÓ, ref. 127, p. 489; HECKENAST, ref. 96, p. 92.

215 SZABÓ, ref. 127, p. 336-337.

Archbishop of Esztergom, so that the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Bishop of Eger did not apply to them. This fact also shows that the royal property of Bereg belonged to the “private property of the Arpád dynasty”. It is clear from the unusual naming of the village of Luprechzaza – Lampertszász that Prince Lampert, a member of the Arpád dynasty was involved. It is entirely possible that he had a princely manor house in Bereg. If he really did, it would be one of the few pieces of evidence that Bereg was already part of the dynastic property of the Arpád family in the 11th century. It is also interesting that Bereg and Ugoča were the only royal forests in Hungary to be designated by the term *forestae*, which was not used in Hungary. Apart from this, it is said that *fuertunt foreste sanctorum regum*, which means that members of the Arpád dynasty already used them at least in the 11th century. It is unique evidence that royal properties resembling the *forestis* organization of Western Europe also existed in Hungary. The use of this term in Hungary would confirm the view of older medievalists that when forming their kingdom, the Arpád dynasty significantly drew on the traditions of their neighbours. When organizing and building up their property domains they followed models from France and the Holy Roman Empire. Since Bereg was a separate territory of the dynasty, the legal authority of the county sheriff (*comes comitatus*) did not apply there, in spite of the fact that it was located within the territory of a county. It was designated as a *predium, districtus, provincia or comitatus* in medieval sources. The term *comitatus* prevailed in the course of the 13th century, but not in the sense of a royal county. It is necessary to understand it as a term also used in documents from Hungary to mean the “private property” of the Arpád dynasty. The administrators of these territories were not royal sheriffs that is state officials, but people entrusted by the king, who apparently operated at the royal court. They oversaw royal forest property, were the main representatives of the power of the monarch at the main royal manor houses and they provided special services in the organization of royal hunts. In sources from the first half of the 13th century, they are designated as *procuratores*, but we cannot exclude the possibility that during the 11th – 12th century they were known as *villici*, men who are known to have represented the king in his properties in this period. They probably also fulfilled functions connected with the administration of the forest properties of the dynasty. In the course of the 13th century, they began to be designated with the word *comes*, but not in the sense of sheriff of a county. Such a *comes* was the administrator of a royal forest property.²¹⁶ The term *ministerialis* is also interesting. It could designate a deputy or subordinate “official” of the chief administrator of the dynastic property. The royal *predium, districtus* or *comitatus* of Bereg was an extensive territory with boundaries that can be approximately reconstructed on the basis of documents from 1232 and 1270. In the second half of the 13th century they were roughly defined by the rivers Vérke, Tisza, Latorica, Svalyavka, the Carpathian range and the river Boržava. However, we cannot exclude that its extent was much greater in the 11th – 12th centuries.

* The study was produced in the framework of the grant APVV-0051-12 *Medieval castles in Slovakia: Life, culture and society* and the project VEGA 2/0079/14 *Social and demographic development of towns in Slovakia in the Middle Ages*.

216 HUDÁČEK, ref. 8, p. 38-41, 45-46, 48-49, 53-63, 66-76.

SILVA BEREG (KÖNIGSWALD IM MITTELALTERLICHEN UNGARN)

PAVOL HUDÁČEK

Bereg war im Mittelalter ein Teil des ungarischen Grenzgebiets (*confinium*) und ursprünglich handelte sich es um ein Dynastiebesitz von Árpáden. Es war ein bewaldetes Gebiet (Teil von Karpaten), wo die Mitglieder der Árpáden-Dynastie jagten. Über die königlichen Jagten gibt es zwar keine direkte Beweise, jedoch wir wissen, dass am Ende des 12. Jahrhunderts jagte der König im benachbarten Wald Maramuresch. Wir nehmen an, dass es auch in Bereg üblich war. In der ersten Hälfte des 13. Jahrhunderts wird er als Königswald erwähnt (*silva regis*) und erst später entstand dort ein selbstständiges Komitat oder adeliges Stuhlbezirk. Auf seinem Gebiet befanden sich die Dörfer der königlichen Diener, die die Pflichten rund um die Jagd des Herrschers erfüllten. Es waren die Dörfer der königlichen Forstwächter (*custodes silvarum*) und Züchter der Jagdvogel (*falconarii, accipitres*). Solche königliche Waldbesitze waren in Westeuropa als *forestis* bekannt und es galt dort hinsichtlich der Jagd, des Fischfangs, Schweineweidens, der Maut, Holz- und Erzförderung usw. das Regalrecht des Herrschers (Wildbann, Forstbann, *bannum bestiarum*). Sehr wahrscheinlich auch in Ungarn waren diese Waldbesitze der Dynastie (ung. *erdőuraldom, erdőispánság*), und somit auch das Gebiet Bereg, durch das Sonderrecht des Herrschers (*ius regis-venatio, piscatio*) geschützt. Bereg gehörte im 11. Jahrhundert in das große Grenzkomitat (*marchia*) Borschava, innerhalb dessen er ein selbstständiges Gebiet war (*districtus, comitatus*). Sein Zentrum war der Königshof (*curia, curtis, villa regis*), in dessen Nähe, irgendwann in der ersten Hälfte des 13. Jahrhunderts, die ungarischen Könige die deutschen Gäste in den Dörfern Luprechzaza und Beregszász ansiedelten. Von großer Bedeutung ist die Feststellung, dass in Bereg, konkret in den erwähnten Dörfern, die Árpáden königliche oder fürstliche Kapellen (*capellae regis*) hatten. Aus den späteren Belegen wissen wir, dass es sich um Exempt-Pfarreien (*exempta parochia, plebania exempta*) handelte, die direkt dem Graner Erzbischof unterlagen, und aus diesem Grund standen sie nicht in Rechtsgewalt des Jäger Bischofs. Nach dem außergewöhnlichen Namen des Dorfes Luprechzaza-Lampertszász zu urteilen, handelte sich es um den Fürst Lampert, einen Mitglied der Árpáden-Dynastie. Es ist durchaus möglich, dass er in Bereg seinen Fürstenhof hatte. Wenn es so wäre, würde sich es um einen der wenigen Belege dafür handeln, dass Bereg bereits im 11. Jahrhundert zum Dynastiebesitz der Árpáden gehörte. Es ist interessant, dass nur Bereg, zusammen mit Ugotsch, die einzigen königlichen Wälder in Ungarn waren, die mit dem *Terminus forestae* bezeichnet waren, der sonst in Ungarn nicht gebräuchlich war. Darüber hinaus nannte sie auch als *fuerunt foreste sanctorum regum*, was bedeutet, dass die Árpáden dort zumindest schon im 11. Jahrhundert jagten. Es handelt sich um einen einzigartigen Beleg dafür, dass es auch in Ungarn königliche Besitze gab, die offensichtlich der Organisation von *forestis* in Westeuropa ähnlich waren. Das könnte die Hypothese der älteren Mediävisten belegen, dass sie bei der Entstehung des Königreichs Vieles aus den Traditionen ihrer Nachbarn übernahmen. Bei der Organisation ihrer Besitzdomäne nahmen sie Beispiel vom Fränkischen oder Heiligen Römischen Reich. Weil Bereg ein selbstständiges Dynastiegebiet war, unterlag er nicht der Rechtsgewalt des Gespans vom Komitat (*comes comitatus*), obwohl er auf seinem Gebiet lag. In den mittelalterlichen Quellen wurde er deswegen als *predium, districtus, provincia* oder als *comitatus* bezeichnet. Im Laufe des 13. Jahrhunderts wurde hauptsächlich die Bezeichnung *comitatus* verwendet, jedoch nicht im Sinne des königlichen Komitats. Es muss als ein *Terminus* betrachtet, der in Ungarn auch für die „privaten Besitztümer“ der Árpáden verwendet wurde. Ihre Verwalter waren nicht die königlichen Gespane, sondern vom König beauftragte Diener. Sie verwalteten den königlichen Waldbesitz, waren Vertreter der königlichen Macht am Königshof und erfüllten auch die Sonderdienste bei der Organisation der Königsjagd. In der ersten Hälfte des 13. Jahrhunderts wurden sie als pro-

curatores bezeichnet. Es ist gar nicht ausgeschlossen, dass sie in 11. – 12. Jahrhunderten als villici bekannt waren, über die wir wissen, dass sie zu jener Zeit die Vertreter des Königs auf seinen Besitztümern waren. Höchstwahrscheinlich waren sie auch mit der Funktion der Verwaltung des Waldbesitzes der Dynastie betraut. Im Laufe des 13. Jahrhunderts begann man sie als comites zu bezeichnen, jedoch nicht im Sinne des Gespans vom Komitat, sondern als Verwalter des königlichen Waldbesitzes. Sehr interessant ist auch die Bezeichnung ministerialis, womit wahrscheinlich der Stellvertreter oder den Untergeordneten des Hauptverwalters des Dynastiebesitzes bezeichnet wurde. Der königliche Besitz Bereg (predium, districtus, comitatus) war ein ausgedehntes Gebiet, dessen Grenze sich anhand der Urkunden aus den Jahren 1232 und 1270 ungefähr rekonstruieren lässt. In der zweiten Hälfte des 13. Jahrhunderts stellten die Grenze die Flüsse Vérke, Theiß, Latorica, Svalyavka, Karpaten und der Fluss Borschava dar. Es ist überhaupt nicht ausgeschlossen, dass in 11. – 12. Jahrhunderten sein Gebiet noch weitreichender war.

Mgr. Pavol Hudáček, PhD.
Institute of History of the SAS
P. O. BOX 198, 814 99 Bratislava, Klemensova 19
e-mail: pavolhudacek81@gmail.com