



CHAPTER OF THE M. A. THESIS

THE ROLE OF THE CISTERCIANS IN MEDIEVAL HUNGARY: POLITICAL ACTIVITY OR INTERNAL COLONIZATION?

Beatrix Romhányi

The Cistercian reform of the Benedictine order was not only a spiritual endeavor. It involved more down-to-earth matters as well. Traditional historiography emphasized that Cistercians introduced new methods in agriculture, and that their complex estate organization and granges served as models for the development of the manorial system in the region.

Recent research, however, has questioned these assumptions about the Cistercians. As far as economic life is concerned, several scholars¹ believe that the agricultural innovations of the Cistercians were overestimated in many respects. Their main secular activity was not always agriculture, at least not in the traditional sense as it has been presented. Cistercian monasteries possessing a great number of granges often used the already existing system in the region and introduced their own field system which was considered more developed only several decades later.²

¹ Kaspar Elm et al., eds., *Die Zisterzienser. Ordensleben zwischen Ideal und Wirklichkeit* (Cologne, 1980); Winfried Schich, "Zur Rolle des Handels in der Wirtschaft der Zisterzienserklöster im nordöstlichen Mitteleuropa während der zweiten Hälfte des 12. und ersten Hälfte des 13. Jahrhunderts", *Zisterzienser-Studien* 4 (Berlin, 1979); idem, "Beobachtungen und Überlegungen zur Salzgewinnung in Mecklenburg und Vorpommern in der slawisch-deutschen Übergangsperiode", in *Germania slavica* II, ed. W.H. Fritze (Berlin, 1981).

² In the case of Scandinavian monasteries, one could prove that agricultural methods in their villages remained unchanged after the arrival of the Cistercians; their own field system was introduced decades later.



On the other hand, the Cistercian ideal of simplicity was also slightly misinterpreted by historians. It did not refer to a low standard of living or to extreme poverty. It is enough to take a glance at the buildings of the famous Cistercian abbeys of France, Germany, England or even Hungary to realize that these buildings were costly and of a very high standard.³ In this paper, I will examine the location, the economic basis and economic function of the Cistercian monasteries in Hungary in the light of recent research.

Before investigating the settlement features of the Hungarian Cistercian monasteries in detail, I will give a short overview of the abbeys indicating the time and the circumstances of their foundation.

My work embraces the territory of historical Hungary, which included present-day Hungary, Slovakia, western parts of Romania (former Transylvania and Partium), Vojvodina in Yugoslavia, a small part of Croatia (eastern Slavonia) and Burgenland in Austria. In medieval Hungary, there were 25 Cistercian monasteries; three nunneries (Brassó,⁴ Pozsony⁵ and Veszprémvölgy⁶); one hospital (Bács⁷); and two short-lived establishments (Vértesszentkereszt in Hungary and Königshof in Austria). Others were founded in Slavonia (today Western Slavonia in Croatia), which, although belonging to the countries of the Hungarian crown, had a more or less independent administrative system. These fall outside the interest of this paper, as do the "urban institutions" (the hospital and nunneries) of the order, thus I will not deal with them.⁸

³ Ernst Badstübner, *Kirchen der Mönche* (Berlin-East, 1980); George Duby, *Saint Bernard – L'art cistercien* (Paris, 1977).

⁴ Kronstadt, Braşov (Romania). Since different regions of historical Hungary belong today to different countries, and the towns and villages, as well as other geographical features, have several denominations, in the following I will use only the Hungarian names in the main text and I will give the present-day names in footnotes. For Cistercian nunneries, see Ottokár Székely, "A ciszterci apácák Magyarországon" [Cistercian Nuns in Hungary], in *A Ciszterci Rend Budapesti Szent Imre Gimnáziumának évkönyve*, (Budapest, 1942), 7-8.

⁵ Preßburg, Bratislava (Slovakia).

⁶ Veszprém (Hungary)

⁷ Bač (Yugoslavia). György Györffy, *Az Árpád-kori Magyarország történeti földrajza*, [Historical Geography of Hungary in the Age of the Árpadians], 3rd ed. (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1987), 1: 210-213.

⁸ The hospital in Bács was a special institution founded by the archbishop of Kalocsa, Ugrin of the Csák kindred, at the beginning of the 13th century. The hospital did not play any role in internal colonization or in other economic or political activities of the Order. It is interesting only because of the fact that Cistercians accepted to be involved so deeply in urban life. Cistercian nunneries sometimes received large estates as donations,

The first monastery, Cikádor, already existed during the life of St. Bernard in 1142.⁹ Surprisingly enough, other foundations followed considerably later. It was not until during the reign of King Béla III (1172–1196) that other abbeys were established or taken over. Between 1179 and 1196, the king himself founded five abbeys;¹⁰ the sixth came into being due to the generosity of one of his high-ranking officials.¹¹ The king's two sons, King Imre (1196–1205) and King Andrew II (1205–1235), continued to support the order. Before the death of Andrew, seven new monasteries were established,¹² but none of them were directly royal foundations.¹³ The abbeys of Ábrahám (1260–

but their tasks were completely different from those of the monks. Pozsony and Brassó were inside the town, and both were of minor importance (the nunnery of Pozsony overtaken by Cistercian nuns in 1237 from another order – perhaps the Benedictines – had to be given up at the end of the same century, when it became one of the first houses of the sisters of St. Clare); although Veszprémvölgy was in one of the suburbs of Veszprém, it was closely connected to the queen's town. The case of this abbey is interesting also because of the fact that it originated in the beginning of the 11th century; it was probably founded by St. Stephen and taken over by the Cistercians in the 1230s. There are some debates today about its original order; although according to tradition it belonged to Greek nuns. Some scholars doubt it. The question is beyond the subject of this paper, but I will deal with this problem in another part of my work. See: Gyula Moravcsik, "Görög nyelvű monostorok Szent István korában" [Greek Monasteries in the Time of St. Stephen], in *Szent István Emlékkönyv I* (Budapest, 1938). Recently, the archaeologist Endre Tóth expressed his doubts about the subject in a personal discussion.

⁹ Bátaszék (Hungary). For more detailed information concerning the abbeys, see the Catalogue. On the circumstances of the foundation of this first Cistercian abbey on Hungarian territory and the reasons for the above-mentioned gap, cf. László Koszta's article, "A ciszterci rend története Magyarországon a kolostoraik alapítása idején 1142–1270" [The History of the Hungarian Cistercian Order in the Period of Establishing their Monasteries 1142–1270], *Magyar egyháztörténeti vázlatok* 1993/1–2, 115–128. The Cikádor monastery has recently been investigated by Ilona Valter. I am grateful to her for the manuscript of her article "Die archäologische Erschließung des Zisterzienserklosters von Cikádor" that will be published in 1995 in the *Analecta Cistercensia*.

¹⁰ Egres (1179, Igrisi in Romania), Zirc (1182, Hungary), Szentgotthárd (1183, Hungary), Pilis (1184, Pilisszentkereszt in Hungary), Pásztó (1191, Hungary).

¹¹ Borsmonostor (Klostermarienbergr, 1194).

¹² Bélakút (1232), Bél (1234), Esztergom (1200–1204), Kerc (1202), Pornó (1221), Savnik (1216–1222). Although the abbey of Ercsi was given the Order in 1208, the monks were only able to take it into possession after the Mongol invasion. In the same period, "urban institutions" of the Order emerged: a hospital in Bács mentioned for the first time in 1234, and three nunneries in Brassó, Pozsony and Veszprémvölgy.

¹³ Bélakút and Savnik were founded by two sons of King Andrew; Kerc was a daughter-abbey of Egres, but the foundation was supported by the king; the others can be considered "family monasteries".



1270),¹⁴ Hárskút (1240–1243)¹⁵ and Szentjános (1249)¹⁶ were established during the reign of Béla IV. The Benedictine abbey of Szenttrinitás (Baranya county) was the last to be taken over by the Cistercians in 1303. This means that the Cistercians acquired almost all their monasteries in less than 100 years. Most of them were founded for them; they took over only six from other orders, mainly from the Benedictines.¹⁷

The Social Status of the Founders

	King	Prince	Bishop	Clan	Total
–1172	1				1
1172–1196	5			1	6
1196–1235	2,5 ¹⁸	2 ¹⁹	1,5 ²⁰	3,5	9,5
1235–1270	0,5			3	3,5
1270–				1	1 ²¹
Total	9	2	1,5	8,5	21

¹⁴ Dombóvár (Hungary).

¹⁵ Lipovnik (Slovakia).

¹⁶ Sînion (Romania).

¹⁷ Abbeys taken over: Pásztó (St. Nicholas, 1191), Ercsi (St. Nicholas, 1207, or rather 1242), Vértesszentkereszt (Holy Cross, 1214), Pornó (St. Margaret of Antiochia, 1221), Szentjános (St. John the Baptist, 1249), Szenttrinitás (Holy Trinity, 1303). The last four were from the beginning so-called “clan” or “kindred” monasteries. It is remarkable that they were all short-lived attempts; only Pornó abbey survived in the following centuries. The reason for this can be that it had close links to Szentgotthárd abbey. In the case of Pilis, it is uncertain whether the earlier Benedictine abbey, at the moment of the arrival of the Cistercians, still existed or if it was already abandoned. During the excavations, only minor remains of the earlier building were discovered, so the question remains open. It is uncertain which order originally owned the abbey of Szentjános, but it probably belonged to the Benedictines as well.

¹⁸ The half-foundation refers to Ercsi, which was settled by the Order after 1241.

¹⁹ Although the abbey of Savnik was initiated by Dionysius, an official of the king, the foundation was finished by Duke Coloman, the younger son of King Andrew II; thus I cite the monastery here.

²⁰ Although the abbey of Bél was founded by the bishop of Eger, Cetus, he probably thought it to be the family abbey of his own “clan”. Nevertheless, the diocesan bishops supported it in later centuries, too.

²¹ Out of the five abbeys founded after the Mongol invasion, two disappeared quite soon (Szentjános, Szenttrinitás); Ercsi had problems already a century after it emerged; only Ábrahám and Hárskút survived until the 16th century, but these were the less important monasteries.

Having summarized the circumstances of the foundation of the different monasteries, I now intend to give a more detailed picture of where the Cistercians settled and what estates, belongings and incomes they were granted by the founders. The foundation charter, manorial records and paramutations (in the course of which the territory was measured) are almost all missing because of the stormy centuries of Hungarian history (the Mongol invasion, the Turkish occupation and the Second World War). Fortunately, we can identify the location of each abbey. The scarce surviving documents of one or another abbey help us to reconstruct the economic relations of other Cistercian monasteries as well.

Regarding the settlement locations, all monasteries – with the exception of three – were situated on main commercial routes, such as the most important waterways, the amber road used since ancient times,²² or the road leading from Poland to Buda and to Transylvania. Among the remote ones, the following can be found: Vértesszentkereszt in the Vértes mountains, which was abandoned after a short time; Zirc, which is situated in the Bakony mountains, in the vicinity of the royal town of Veszprém and on the site of a former royal forest centre, also called Bakony, on the Győr–Veszprém road; and the Szenttrinitás abbey, which was the last to be taken over, and which was about ten kilometers from the road leading from Pécs across the Dráva to Nekcse (a central market place in the region),²³ and at a similar distance from Siklós, another important market place in the county.

The relationship between the settlements of the order and commerce is even more remarkable if we consider the privileges of the individual abbeys. For example, the abbey of Pilis, which for a time was regarded as the greatest of the Hungarian abbeys, was granted one-third of the income of two important Danube tolls by the king. Another third of these tolls was owned by Hungary's most important Benedictine abbey, Pannonhalma.²⁴ In 1230, the abbey of Egres²⁵ re-

²² The name of this route did not survive in the Middle Ages, but according to archaeological data, the Roman road was used at least until the end of the 11th century, since coins of this period were found. However, its path remained in later centuries as well.

²³ Našice (Yugoslavia). On the relationship between Cistercian abbeys and roads, see also Koszta, "A ciszterci", 116, 121-122. Koszta writes about the participation of the monasteries in trade, especially in the wine trade, 123-124.

²⁴ F.L. Hervay, *Repertorium historicum Ordinis Cisterciensis in Hungaria* (Rome, 1984), 150.



ceived the privilege of salt trade from Transylvania.²⁶ A few years later, all the other abbeys on the Maros river were granted incomes from the salt trade as well. However, their incomes fixed in 1233 were considerably lower.²⁷ According to the royal charter, the Egres abbey was given a very high share of 30,000 cubes of salt with permission to sell it freely on the Szeged market. On the other hand, the king made a commitment to buy the amount over the afore-mentioned 30,000 cubes transported on the ships of the abbey for 26 marks per cube.²⁸ It must be mentioned that the average amount in the later charter ranged between 5,000 and 10,000 cubes, which means that, with this privilege, Egres gained obviously outstanding economic power. However, King Béla IV probably did not approve of this power, as in 1236, only one year after his father's death, he withdrew some of the estates granted to the monastery by his father, Andrew II. Zirc,²⁹ Cikádor,³⁰ and Bélakút³¹ also received toll incomes, and even the abbey of Heiligenkreuz in Lower Austria was supported by the Hungarian kings.³² This may well have been the reason why, in 1203, the monks of this abbey intended to move their monastery to Hungary near the ancient amber road. The plan was not carried out and the

²⁵ Igrış (Romania).

²⁶ Gusztáv Wenzel, ed., *Codex Diplomaticus Arpadianus continuatus* (Budapest, 1873), 11: 220. Salt played an important role in the economic life of the French, English, German, Austrian and Polish Cistercians, too; cf. W. Schich, "Zur Rolle"; L. Lékai O. Cist, *A ciszterciek. Eszmény és valóság* [The Cistercians. Ideal and Reality], (Budapest, 1991), 307. In the case of Egres, it is uncertain whether the abbey had some salines of its own as well, but it is certain that it was very interested in salt trade. For salt trade in Hungary, see A. Kubinyi, "Königliches Salzmonopol und die Städte des Königreichs Ungarn im Mittelalter", in *Stadt und Salz. Im Auftrag des österreichischen Arbeitskreises für Stadtgeschichtsforschung*, ed. Wilhelm Rausch (Linz/Donau, 1988).

²⁷ *Monumenta ecclesiae Strigoniensis*, ed. F. Knauz (Strigonii, 1874), (Henceforth: MonStrig) 1: 294-295.

²⁸ MonStrig 1: 294. For the salt privileges of other Cistercian abbeys see Koszta (1993), 124.

²⁹ Hervay, *Repertorium*, 213.

³⁰ At the end of the 12th century, in 1197, the first Cistercian abbey of Hungary received a part of the toll of Eszék. It was probably not by chance if the last Cistercian foundation in Szenttrinitás occurred in close proximity to the road leading to that fair and market place.

³¹ Pétervárad, Petrovaradin (Yugoslavia). Miklós Takács, *A bélakúti/pétervárad ciszterci monostor* [The Monastery of Bélakút-Pétervárad], (Újvidék: Forum, 1989), 30.

³² Hervay, *Repertorium*, 104-108.



construction came to a halt. Nevertheless, the abbey remained interested in its estates in Hungary.³³

An analysis of the estate structure of the Cistercian monasteries shows that the majority of the belongings they were given were not in deserted and remote areas of the country, and that the individual estates were relatively small and far from each other. One of the exceptions is perhaps the abbey of Szentgotthárd, which was given larger self-contained regions on the western border of Hungary by Béla III.³⁴ However, even in this case, it can be considered only partly to be "colonization", since our data on the territory are rather late, and only a few settlements can be traced back to Cistercian granges.³⁵ It was Elek Kalász who collected data concerning the estates of Szentgotthárd abbey. Since this is the only publication on the Cistercian economy in Hungary, it is the standard work and is always cited when dealing with the Cistercians or agrarian reform of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Although Kalász created an excellent overview of Cistercian economic ideas, he did not prove in a satisfactory manner that the described system existed in Szentgotthárd as well. Since the evidence concerning the abbey's economy is missing from the first period of its history, we can neither prove nor refute Kalász's view on this basis. Archaeological data known from the region nevertheless suggest that it cannot be considered to be pure colonization on the part of the abbey.³⁶

I would suggest that, in the case of Szentgotthárd, the remarkable feature is precisely that the region had been one of the foremost centers of metallurgy since the Bronze Age. In the eleventh century, iron

³³ During the Turkish wars, as the estates of the monastery were effectively jeopardized, it intensively defended its rights. According to written evidence, both granges were flourishing economic units. For the plan see Hermann Watzl, "Der Plan einer Verlegung der Cisterce Heiligenkreuz von Wienerwald nach Westungarn in den Jahren 1206 bis 1209", in *Jb. für Landeskunde von Niederösterreich*, Band 34 (1958/60), 106-119 and idem, "Über Beziehungen der Abtei Heiligenkreuz zu Altungarn", *Sancta Crux* 33 (1971), 9-17.

³⁴ The estates were larger compared to the other Cistercian monasteries; they were, however, considerably smaller than those of the great Benedictine abbeys. On the estates and the estate structure of Szentgotthárd, see Elek Kalász, *A szentgotthárdi apátság birtokviszonyai és a ciszterci gazdálkodás a középkorban* [The Estates of Szentgotthárd Abbey. Cistercian Economy in the Middle Ages], (Budapest, 1932).

³⁵ Ilona Valter, "Ciszterci monostorok kutatása" [Excavating Cistercian Monasteries], *Studia Comitatus* 17 (1985), 564; idem, "Die archäologische Erschließung des ungarischen Zisterzienserklosters Szentgotthárd", *Analecta Cisterciensia* 38 (1982), 141-142.

³⁶ For the history of the region, see Géza Érszegi, "Die Entstehung der Wart", in *Die Obere Wart* (Oberwart, 1977).

was the most prominent product;³⁷ the mines were active until the mid-thirteenth century when the production of the Styrian sites became more important.³⁸ About 40 kilometers east of Szentgotthárd on the Rába river lay Vasvár, i.e. the center that coordinated iron production in the region, and collected and delivered the products. Unfortunately, there is no direct evidence of the participation of the monks in metal production or in trade, but I would not exclude this possibility. Archaeological investigation of the monastery area outside the central building itself could eventually help answer this question.³⁹

Another Cistercian monastery, which was probably chosen because of its mineral resources, was Pilis. In this case we have more evidence of the industrial activity of the monks. Mines were found in the vicinity, namely in the Holdvilág Valley, with traces of medieval cultivation,⁴⁰ and the outer courtyard of the monastery was covered with a meter thick slag layer. The archaeologist László Gerevich, who excavated the site, also proved the importance of the metal industry in the life of the monks. According to archaeological evidence, the monks restored and returned to the ovens of Pilis abbey after the first devastation of the monastery by the Turks in 1526, although the water system – similar to the water system of Fontenay – was already out of use.⁴¹ On the other hand, modern statistical investigation of pollen demonstrates the extent to which the monks were involved in agriculture. Whereas evidence of the production of cereals is completely ab-

³⁷ András Kubinyi, "Der Eisenhandel in den ungarischen Städten des Mittelalters", in *Stadt und Eisen*, ed. F. Oppl (Linz/Donau: Beiträge zur Geschichte des Städte Mitteleuropas XI, 1992), 197-206.

³⁸ Heckenast, Nováki, Vastagh and Zoltai, *A magyarországi vaskohászat története a korai középkorban* [The History of Metallurgy in Early Medieval Hungary] (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1968), 142-144.

³⁹ Mining played a large role in the Cistercian economy. Some abbeys were interested in stone, other in different metals (iron, lead, copper, silver), salt or even coal. See Lékai, *A ciszterciek*, 306-307. Unfortunately there is little hope that the larger area of the monastery could be investigated, since it lies today in the middle of the town Szentgotthárd. This town, with an important market, had already emerged in the Middle Ages, when it belonged to the Cistercians.

⁴⁰ Heckenast, Nováki, Vastagh and Zoltay, *A magyarországi, 156; Magyarország régészeti topográfiája* [Archaeological Topography of Hungary], (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó), 7: 198-200

⁴¹ László Gerevich, "Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen in der ungarischen Zisterzienser-Abtei Pilis", *Acta Archaeologica* (1985), 148-149.

sent, the pollen material of various fruit trees, and especially nut trees, is highly represented in the data.⁴²

Unlike in Western Europe, where the Cistercians usually settled in “no-man’s-lands”⁴³, most of the Hungarian abbeys were located in already populated regions, close to the main trading routes. An exception may be Kerc,⁴⁴ whose location would suggest participation in internal colonization. Far away from other abbeys of the order, and apparently also from other settlements, it can be supposed that, in this case, the monks settled according to the expressed ideals of their order. However, the settlement history of the region does not confirm this supposition. The first settlers in this part of the country – in the southern part of Transylvania⁴⁵ – were Saxon *hospites* (“guests”) who were invited by King Géza II. About two decades later, the second important population group arrived, the *Blachi* (probably Romanians), who settled here as border guards.⁴⁶ When the Cistercian abbey was founded in 1202, the estates of the abbey had already been carved out from the “*terra blachorum*”. The Cistercian estates spread from the Olt river to the Alps of Fogaras, between the Árpás and the Kerc rivers; i.e., a relatively small and unfertile area. Even in later times, only two villages appeared there: Apáti beside the abbey itself, and Oláh-Kerc at a point not much higher in the mountains.⁴⁷ Both villages are mentioned in charters as late as after the Mongol Invasion. In the case of Oláh-Kerc, this must have been the time of its foundation as well. Later, the abbey received Földvár in the vicinity as a gift of the Saxons of Nagyszeben.⁴⁸ Contrary to this, other estates were not in the direct vicinity of the abbey, but scattered further afield. Other settlements that were in this area before the Mongol In-

⁴² B. Zólyomi and B.-I. Précsényi, “Pollenstatistische Analyse der Teichablagerungen des mittelalterlichen Klosters bei Pilisszentkereszt”, *ibid.*, 153-158.

⁴³ See Fountains and Rievaulx in England, or Le Thoronet in France.

⁴⁴ Kerz, Cirsa (Romania).

⁴⁵ The historical Transylvania, the western part of present-day Romania, was traditionally a multinational region. From the twelfth and thirteenth centuries onwards when the colonization of this region began, three ethnic groups, Germans (Saxons), Hungarians and Romanians, lived here together. This is the reason why the settlements and other geographical features have several names on this territory. On the history of Transylvania see Béla Köpeczi, ed., *Erdély története I-III* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1988). English translation, abbreviated version: *The Short History of Transylvania* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1990).

⁴⁶ Györffy, *Az Árpád-kori*, 2: 448-449

⁴⁷ Streza Cirșișoara (Romania)

⁴⁸ Hermannstadt, Sibiu (Romania)

vasion (1241) were settled either by the Saxons of the Nagyszeben district or by the *Blachi* border guards.

These villages, together with the abbey, were destroyed by the Mongols in 1241. The Saxon settlements disappeared forever, and the monastery was not restored until two decades after the disaster. The consequences of the catastrophe were felt for decades. A new peak of colonization did not occur until the end of the thirteenth century, but by then neither the Saxons nor the monks were involved in it. It is remarkable that the so called "old colonizers" did not play any role in this process. But this also means that the Cistercians of the Kerc Abbey *never* participated in the colonization of this region. Instead, in the 1270s Slav *locatores* or *kenéz* (settlers) brought Romanian peasants to the territory in increasing numbers. It is very likely that the village of Oláh-Kerc, located near to the ancient abbey, also emerged in this new wave of settlement. Considering these circumstances, we have to look elsewhere for the reasons for the abbey's foundation.

An important motive might have been that the region was covered with valuable forest.⁴⁹ However, the fact that Kerc lay on one of the major commercial routes leading from Transylvania to the Balkans and to Constantinople, and that three important market towns existed in close proximity to the abbey⁵⁰ – such as one of the two major towns of the Saxons, Nagyszeben – suggests once again that the Cistercians were eager to take part in long-distance trade. It is certainly not an accident that the abbey had excellent contacts with the Saxon population, whose interest lay in commerce. From its restoration in the 1260s, to its dissolution in 1474, the abbey is always mentioned in charters together with the Saxons of Nagyszeben. The inhabitants of the estates of the abbey shared the same rights as the Saxons. The Saxon community seems to have acquired the patronage of the abbey as well. We can make this assumption since the town was "automatically" given all the estates and belongings of the monastery after its dissolution by the king. The foundation charter of Kerc has not been preserved, nor do we have later evidence about the donation of tolls or other similar income sources, as in the case of other

⁴⁹ The role of forests in the Cistercian economy has hardly been investigated until now. In Hungary, almost all the monasteries were located on the border of the forest regions (this could be explained by Cistercian ideals); however, it is difficult to imagine that the monks did not use the woods around their abbeys.

⁵⁰ Nagyszeben (Hermannstadt, Sibiu in Romania, 35 km), Talmács (Talmetsch, Talmaciu in Romania, 30 km) and Szombathely (20 km).

abbeys – such as Pilis or Zirc. However, the fact that the Saxons of Nagyszében granted the abbey the market town of Földvár and other estates – which were always in close proximity to the main Saxon settlements,⁵¹ the major trading route and other market towns – testifies to some kind of contact, if not participation, in trade throughout the region.

In this context, the abbey of Savnik⁵² should be mentioned as well. Apart from Szentgotthárd, this is the only case among the Hungarian monasteries where we have evidence of colonizing activity, although, here too, the estates were composed both of already existing villages and unsettled areas.⁵³ The aim of the founder(s) was without doubt internal colonization. This is perhaps the reason why Savnik became a *filia* of the Polish abbey of Wachock and not one of the Hungarian abbeys. However, the location of the monastery allowed participation in North-South trade as well.⁵⁴ In this respect, we also have to take into account that the region was rich in mineral resources, and that the mother-abbey, Wachock, was one of the most influential monasteries in Poland with important mining rights, as well as salt incomes.⁵⁵

The foundation of Pásztó in the Mátra mountains of northern Hungary is interesting for several reasons. The abbey was located in a market town,⁵⁶ which had already existed at the time when Pásztó abbey belonged to the Benedictines. The patron saint, Nicholas, also testifies to the close connection between the monastery and commerce. The investigation of the relationship between commerce and the cult of Saint Nicholas goes beyond the scope of this paper. Nicholas's cult was common in towns, and on roads and ferries – in other words, in places where trade was present. Churches dedicated to Saint Nicholas were sometimes used as storage areas by merchants involved in long distance trade.⁵⁷ In Hungary,⁵⁸ churches of Saint

⁵¹ Cf. Catalogue at the end of this paper.

⁵² Schavnik, Stiavniky (Slovakia).

⁵³ Hervay, *Repertorium*. 178.

⁵⁴ Hervay, *Repertorium*. 179.

⁵⁵ Lékai, *A ciszterciek*, 307.

⁵⁶ Szentgotthárd and Borsmonostor were also founded beside a market place; the first Cistercian abbey in Hungary, Cikádor, emerged close to a flourishing market town near the Benedictine abbey of Bába. Cf. Koszta "A ciszterci", 121-122, 116.

⁵⁷ K.-H. Blaschke, "Nikolaipatrozinien und städtische Frühgeschichte", *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung* 84 (1967).

⁵⁸ Lajos Palovics, "Szent Miklós patrocíniuma és a településtörténet" [The Patrocinium of St. Nicholas and Settlement History], in *Quibus expedit universis* (Budapest, 1972); Beatrix Romhányi, *Az eredeti esztergomi egyházmegye Árpád-kori titulussai* [Church

Nicholas are located either on market places (Esztergom and Nagyszombat⁵⁹) or at road and river tolls (Árva, Krakován and Püspöki).⁶⁰ Pásztó abbey lay in a region had become one of the most famous wine-producing areas by the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. This point should probably be taken into consideration in other cases as well. Since wine was one of the first market-oriented agricultural products, it may be used as an indicator of the trading activity of the Cistercians. Whether wine was already produced in the region in the early Middle Ages cannot be proven.⁶¹ But in other cases, such as those of Pilis and Bélakút, there is clear evidence of vineyards owned by the abbeys: Pilis abbey had vineyards in the regions of Buda, Pozsony⁶² and Dévény;⁶³ Bélakút abbey had some in Kelenföld near Buda, and in Szerém.⁶⁴

In France, research has shown that many Cistercian monasteries were strongly connected with mining, and even more with metal production;⁶⁵ in other cases, with the salt trade.⁶⁶ In Hungary, there is no clear evidence of similar activity. However, this possibility cannot be excluded, for instance in Szentgotthárd (iron), Kerc (stone),⁶⁷ Egres (possible participation in salt production), Borsmonostor and Pásztó⁶⁸

Dedications from the Árpáadian Age in the Original Diocese of Esztergom], (M.A. thesis at ELTE University, Budapest, 1991). Manuscript.

⁵⁹ Tyrnau, Trnava (Slovakia).

⁶⁰ Orava, Krakovany, Biskupice (Slovakia).

⁶¹ Later, wine regions were situated beside Zirc, Borsmonostor, Savnik, Szenttrinitás, Bélakút and Bél. Pilis also owned vineyards, though the monastery itself did not lie in a such region.

⁶² Preßburg, Bratislava (Slovakia).

⁶³ Devín (Slovakia).

⁶⁴ Sirmien, Srim (Yugoslavia). Cf. Catalogue. Wine was the most important product of other Cistercian abbeys as well, such as Cîteaux (it had vineyards on the Côte d'Or in Burgundy) and Eberbach on the Rhine in Germany. Cf. Lékai, *A ciszterciek*, 300-302.

⁶⁵ Lékai, *A ciszterciek*, 306-307; Léon Pressouyre, ed., *L'espace cistercien*. (Paris: Comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques, 1994).

⁶⁶ Schich, "Zur Rolle".

⁶⁷ Unfortunately, the question has not been investigated enough, but there is some evidence that stone was delivered from southern Transylvania for buildings on the Great Hungarian Plain. The trading route was the Olt River and later the Maros River. It would be useful to investigate whether the abbey of Kerc participated in this trade.

⁶⁸ In the case of Pásztó, contact with the iron mines of Gömör is uncertain, but the possibility cannot be excluded. The Benedictine monastery that preceeded the Cistercian monastery produced glass, one of the most exigent products of the time; it was situated on an important commercial route and it is not impossible that they participated in the trading of other goods also, such as metals. Trade was one of the main reasons why the Cistercians took over the abbey, probably inheriting its traditional contacts as well.



(perhaps iron). In order to answer this question, one should investigate the monasteries in the context of their archaeological and geological area, though this is not always possible. However, industrial equipment for the melting of precious metals was discovered in the abbey of Pilis. The waterpipe system of Pilis was similar to that of the Burgundian monasteries. Ovens were constructed in the thirteenth century and were in use as long as the monastery was inhabited.⁶⁹ If the Cistercians did not actively participate in metal production in later times, it was probably due to the fact that the mines lost their importance during the thirteenth century, because of the discovery of new mines in northern and eastern Hungary, and in Styria.⁷⁰ The mines of northern and eastern Hungary (in the region of Besztercebánya⁷¹ and Nagybánya⁷²) were under strict royal control.⁷³

Another monastery that contributed to the colonization process was Heiligenkreuz in Austria. The abbey received large land donations from the Hungarian kings east of Lake Fertő. This region was a deserted area until the end of the twelfth century. Cultivation of the marshland around the lake began only after the monks founded two granges there: Mönchshof and Königshof (today both in Austria). The size of the estate was considerably larger than other land donations given to the Cistercians, almost as extensive as the huge properties of the great Benedictine abbeys in Hungary.⁷⁴

In some cases, we can ask whether the monasteries played a role in the internal colonization of remote areas which they acquired at a

⁶⁹ L. Gerevich, *A pilisi ciszterci apátság* [The Cistercian Monastery of Pilis], (Szentendre, 1984), 105.

⁷⁰ The industrial activity of the Cistercians is nearly unknown even now. But it is probable that specialized craftsmen existed; so the required knowledge was not available for most of the monasteries. Proof of this can be the abandoned glasshouse in Pásztó. Although it is not known whether the Cistercians stopped production immediately after having overtaken the abbey or only somewhat later, it is sure that the glasshouse was no longer in use at the beginning of the 13th century.

⁷¹ Bistritz, Banská Bystrica (Slovakia).

⁷² Baia Mare (Romania).

⁷³ In England, Germany and even France, the Order developed the most when central power was relatively weaker. In Hungary, on the other hand, royal power was stable in this epoch with the exception of shorter periods. Perhaps it is in this context that we can explain the salt privilege of Egres too; the abbey was granted this exceptional donation by the king, who was weak compared to his predecessor as well as his successors (salt was always one of the most important royal monopolies). On the other hand, it is also remarkable that in 1236, Béla IV, who did not at all appreciate the estate politics of his father, withdrew some of the estates of Egres; the pope, of course, did not approve.

⁷⁴ Hervay, *Repertorium*, 104-108.



later time. But the fact that these new donations were already existing villages, and that the plan of Heiligenkreuz to move their monastery to the center of their new estates – probably in order to control them more effectively – does not support this hypothesis, even if this plan was not carried out. It is difficult to imagine a consciously planned settlement strategy of the Cistercian Order, if the estates of almost all the abbeys were so small and divided – with the exception of Heiligenkreuz, Szentgotthárd and Savnik.

What, then, was the reason for the foundation of these monasteries? The connection between royal power and Cistercian settlements in Hungary is striking. A good illustration for this is that King Béla III, who had perhaps the farthest-reaching foreign contacts among the rulers of his time, called the Cistercians into the country. The Cistercian Order played an important role in the foreign policy and the diplomacy of the king, even until the mid-thirteenth century. Cistercian abbots, especially the abbot of Pilis, often functioned as envoys of the Hungarian king abroad, or legates of the pope and the Holy See in Hungary. The Order's internal organization allowed the Cistercians to fulfil such tasks. The Cistercian abbots were probably the best informed people at that time. The royal privileges granted to the Order in Hungary possibly served to establish good contacts with the monks and to insure their support in international policy.⁷⁵

Yet, the Order lost its original *élan* relatively quickly. After a dynamic beginning under the reign of Béla III, at the end of the twelfth century, the time of the great royal foundations quickly came to an end. Andrew II had his first wife, Queen Gertrudis of Meran, buried in Pilis abbey. His and his third wife Jolanta's tombs stood in Egres abbey – this was the abbey which had also received the salt privilege from him. However, the first signs of decline soon appeared. At the

⁷⁵ In this period, we can find a great number of highly qualified clerics in the royal court, who played an important role in political decisions as counselors of the king. Even if the foundations were made by the king himself, we have to take into account the influence of this circle from its background. A prominent member was the archbishop of Esztergom, Job, who was very involved in the new politics of Béla III. The members of this circle were above all clerics who studied at the Sorbonne and whose personal contacts reached as far as England. Cf. József Laszlovszky, *Angol-magyar kapcsolatok Szent Istvántól a XIII. század közepéig* [Anglo-Hungarian Relations from the Age of St. Stephen to the Middle Ages], (Ph.D. dissertation, Budapest, 1991). The English version of the 12th century part: idem, "Nicholaus clericus: A Hungarian student at Oxford University in the 12th century", *Journal of Medieval History* 14 (1988), 217-231. On the subject, see also idem, "Angol-magyar kapcsolatok a 12. század második felében" [Anglo-Hungarian Relations in the Second Half of the 12th century], *Századok* 128 (1994), 223-253.

beginning of the thirteenth century the Order could not settle the abbey of Ercsi on the island of the Danube which it had acquired from the Benedictines. Thus King Béla IV withdrew the gift from them, and granted the buildings which were already in ruins to the Carthusians. It was only when the Carthusian monastery was destroyed by the Mongol invasion that the abbey was finally returned to the Cistercians and they settled there.

Meanwhile, the first Cistercian abbeys were emerging which had not been founded directly in connection with the king.⁷⁶ The founders of Savnik in northern Hungary and Bélakút in the south were two sons of the king. Other monasteries founded in the period either belonged to noble families and kindreds, or were founded by bishops (e.g., Gotó⁷⁷ and Bél⁷⁸). These monasteries were probably intended to play a role similar to the German *Eigenkirchen*.⁷⁹ In this development, we can certainly recognize the aim of the major kindreds to imitate the royal family. These abbeys were considerably smaller than the royal foundations. Their estates were less important and they were relatively dependent upon the patron family. The case of Pornó in Western Hungary is a good example. The Cistercians received an earlier Benedictine abbey in 1221 from one of the members of the Ják kindred who had entered the Order. The new abbey was subordinated to the abbey of Szentgotthárd by the general chapter of the Order. In the 1240s, the mother-abbey was granted the village of Pornó together with the right of patronage. Yet, at the end of the thirteenth century, Pornó fell into the hands of the Kopász family, descendants of the founders.⁸⁰ It is also significant that another branch of the same Ják kindred founded the new family monastery of Ják a few years after the Pornó abbey was taken over by the Cistercians. Since family monasteries played a very important role as burial places of the founders and their family, and the Cistercians did not allow anybody

⁷⁶ Although the abbey of Klostermarienbergr was founded by a high-ranking official of King Imre, it was supported by the king too. Even if some of the charters edited in the name of Imre are false, the size and quality of the estates indicate royal support.

⁷⁷ Kutjevo (Croatia)

⁷⁸ Béalapátfalva (Hungary)

⁷⁹ Erik Fügedi, "*Sepelirunt corpus eius in proprio monasterio*. A nemzetségi monostor." [Clan Monasteries], *Századok* 125 (1991).

⁸⁰ It is remarkable that another branch of the same Ják family founded its new monastery in Ják immediately after Pornó was given to the Cistercians. Ják lay just 10 km to the east of Pornó. The reason for this quick reaction was probably the fact that the Cistercians did not allow anybody but kings and their family to be buried in their churches.

else but the king and his family to be buried in their churches, it is obvious that members of the Ják kindred were not very happy when they saw their former monastery given to the Cistercian newcomers, and they thus lost their right to be buried there.

The monastery of Bél is considered to be a transitional case, at least as far as its estate structure is concerned. Its founder was the bishop of Eger, Cletus. Cletus was a member of the Bél kindred. The abbey received large estates from the family goods as well as from the church. However, the bishop probably preferred the idea of founding a family monastery, since at the end of the fourteenth century the members of the Bél kindred explained in a charter that the patronage of the abbey was their heritage, and this was confirmed by the county as well. The privileges and the estates of the monastery were later supported by the bishops of Eger.⁸¹

After the Mongol invasion, there is an obvious threshold. An official of King Béla IV, the palatine Moys, founded a smaller abbey in Ábrahám; the abbey of Ercsi was finally settled, and two former Benedictine monasteries, in Szentjános and Szenttrinitás, were given to the order by the patron families, but both were short-lived attempts. In the same period, the patronage of Pásztó fell into the hands of a noble family.⁸² By the end of the fourteenth century, the king had given the patronage of practically all the other royal abbeys to various noble family.

The question remains as to why the Hungarian Cistercians were so uninterested – with some exceptions – in landowning and internal colonization. A possible explanation may be the different processes of internal colonization in Hungary.

The first wave of internal colonization came at the end of the tenth and during the eleventh century, in which the ecclesiastic institutions, the Benedictines among them, also played an important role. The example of the great abbeys – Pannonhalma, Pécsvárad and Garamszentbenedek – shows that they received immense and partly uninhabited estates from the founders, or later from other donators. Garamszentbenedek seems to have been particularly active in this respect. It received a huge donation of land north of the abbey itself. The abbey was built at the southern entrance of the basin, while an

⁸¹ I. Valter, "Die archäologische Erschliessung des Zisterzienserklosters vom Béalapátfalva" *Analecta Cisterciensia* XXXVIII (1982), 153-154

⁸² Cf. Catalog.

important market town of the abbey, Garamszentkereszt,⁸³ controlled the northern entrance.

The second wave from the mid-twelfth century was completely different. This time, only a few ecclesiastic institutions were granted land in unsettled border regions, and the Cistercians were not given donations. In the county of Szepes, for example, Saint Martin's collegiate church played an important role. Besides the *locatores*, the Transylvanian Saxons received their land as a community from King Géza II. At the beginning of the thirteenth century, the Teutonic Order received the Barcaság (Burzenland)⁸⁴ as a donation, but this was a short-lived and unsuccessful attempt. Although there were already two Cistercian monasteries in the vicinity (Egres and Kerc), none of them gained territories in the wild region "on the other side of the forest" that later became the Székelyföld (Szeklerland).⁸⁵ This phenomenon can perhaps be interpreted as an attempt by the Hungarian kings to centralize royal power. In the border regions, they obviously preferred to have collectively privileged populations that were directly dependent upon the king. Also, the abbeys on the western border were not thought to be centers of internal colonization, but rather to be a means of ensuring the power of the Hungarian kings over this long-disputed territory. This border region was several times a *casus belli* between Hungary and its neighbors. The Cistercian monasteries that emerged due to the generous donations of the Hungarian rulers were to decide this question for Hungary.

Internal colonization once again became important after the Mongol invasion. The crisis affected the Cistercians in that they were no longer in the position to accept new foundations. Some of the earlier royal monasteries were granted to noble families with their patronage. This was also the time of the new orders: the Franciscans, the Dominicans, and, from the beginning of the fourteenth century, increasingly that of the newly founded Hungarian order of the Hermits of Saint Paul. With regard to internal colonization, it was the populations privileged earlier, "contractors" and magnates, who played a

⁸³ Žiar nad Hronom (Slovakia).

⁸⁴ This is the region of Braşov in present-day Romania. The region was of strategic importance because of the Cumans who lived at that time south of the Carpathian mountains and whose troops entered Transylvania several times.

⁸⁵ The Szeklerland is the most eastern part of Transylvania, inhabited by Hungarian (Székely) border guards. These border guards were also privileged as a community, and they were able to preserve their immunity until 1764, when Queen Maria Theresia reorganized the army and the border guards became part of it.

decisive role. Perhaps the Cistercians were not uninterested in receiving new estates, but the political and economic situation in Hungary did not favor them. Contrary to the Benedictines and the Praemonstratensians, the internal structure of the Cistercian Order made it difficult, if not impossible, at least in Hungary, to include family monasteries in a larger number.⁸⁶ Despite royal support, owing to the given circumstances, the Hungarian Cistercians were ultimately rather unsuccessful.

Most of the abbeys can be found in places that seem to correspond to Cistercian ideals: in a valley, deep in a forest, sometimes even at a relatively great distance from the other settlements (Pilis, Borsmonostor, and Zirc). But this is only a superficial impression. In fact, the Cistercians had an economic structure completely different from this ideal. It was based on the market, where they participated mostly without their own production, and depended on toll incomes. The market-oriented economy of the Cistercians is known in other regions of Europe too.⁸⁷ The difference is that the Cistercians in Hungary were primarily active in the secondary economy, and less active in the organization of their own agricultural production. In the majority of cases, their life was based, from the moment of their foundation, on toll incomes and trade, since the size and structure of their estates did not allow for the intensive agricultural production that was traditionally Cistercian (Pilis, Pásztó, Borsmonostor, Bélakút, Egres or even Cikádor just to mention a few). In other cases, they had a sort of mixed economy (Szentgotthárd and Savnik). In these cases, although there was a large coherent estate, it was already at least partly settled, and there was the possibility of mining and trading the mineral resources of the region (mainly iron and salt).

⁸⁶ It is probably not by chance that Cistercian monasteries did not become *loci fide-digni*. Even if some charters were written in this or another Cistercian abbey, these cases were the exceptions; regular activity cannot be proven. I want to call the reader's attention once again to the fact that most of the short-lived abbeys (Vértesszentkereszt, Szentjános, Szenttrinitás) were family foundations.

⁸⁷ Winfried Schich, "Handel und Gewerbe", in *Die Zisterzienser. Ordensleben zwischen Ideal und Wirklichkeit*, ed. K. Elm et al., (Bonn, 1980), 217-236.; idem, "Der frühe zisterziensische Handel und die Stadthöfe der fränkischen Zisterzienserklöster", in *In Tal und Einsamkeit. 725 Jahre Kloster Fürstenfeld*, 3rd vol., ed. Klaus Wollenberg (Fürstenfeldbruck, 1990); idem, "Zur Rolle des Handels in der Wirtschaft der Zisterzienserklöster im nordöstlichen Mitteleuropa während der zweiten Hälfte des 12. und der ersten Hälfte des 13. Jahrhunderts" (Eine erweiterte Fassung des Habilitationsvortrages, FU Berlin, 1979); Lékai, *A ciszterciek*, 295-307.; *L'espace cistercien* (Paris, 1994).

There were obviously several reasons why royal families, bishops or noble families founded Cistercian monasteries. The spiritual reform of the Cistercians found support all over Europe. Devotion and fashion certainly played a role. But from the beginning it was the movement of the elite. In Hungary, the Cistercians could not fulfill demands that were made by the *loci fide digni*, or the family monasteries. On the other hand, in the time of Béla III and perhaps even under the reign of his two sons, political interests were much more important. Although none of the Cistercian abbeys had regular jurisdiction, their influence can be observed in the language of Hungarian charters.⁸⁸ The Hungarian abbots, with the exception of the abbot of Kerc, had to be present each year in the general chapter, which implies continual contact with the mother-abbeys, and with the abbots from nearly the whole continent and England.

Finally, I would like to mention an interesting personality of the Order, John of Limoges. This monk of French origin was sent by the Order to become the abbot of Zirc from 1208-1218.⁸⁹ After 1218, he went back to Clairvaux and he became prior of Zirc's mother-abbey. John of Limoges was one of the leading personalities of the Order at the beginning of the thirteenth century. He dealt with local politics and politics throughout Europe as well.⁹⁰ His arrival in Zirc is important for two reasons. First, the mother-abbey of Zirc, Clairvaux, had to provide the abbot for the daughter-house even decades after the foundation. Second, the person of John of Limoges insured the closest contacts with the heart of the Order and also to the most developed regions of Europe.

Internal colonization was not the main issue, probably because of the fact that Hungarian abbeys needed supplies from their mother-abbey even decades after their foundation (Egres⁹¹ and Zirc⁹²); they

⁸⁸ A. Kubinyi, "Isten bányáját ábrázoló törvénybeidézõ pecsét (billog)" [Legal Seals Representing the *Agnus Dei*], *Folia Archaeologica* 35 (1984).

⁸⁹ K. Horváth, *Johannes Lemovicensis. Opera Omnia* I-III, in *Zirci könyvek* 2-4 (Veszprém, 1932).

⁹⁰ On the political activity of John of Limoges, see also: J. Leclercq, F. Vandembroucke and L. Bouyer, *La spiritualité du Moyen Age (Histoire de la spiritualité chrétienne 2)* (Paris, 1961).

⁹¹ Coloman Juhász, *Die Stifte der Tschanader Diözese im Mittelalter. Ein Beitrag zur Frühgeschichte und Kulturgeschichte des Banats* (Deutschtum und Ausland 8-9) (Münster i.W., 1927), 220. We know that in Egres half of the members of the convent were still of French origin in the 1230s, i.e. about 60 years after its foundation.

⁹² The arrival of John of Limoges and other monks in 1208 proves it. Horváth, *Johannes Lemovicensis*, 1: 3*s.



did not have enough novices. Permission was granted by the general chapter of 1203 according to which the abbeys of the Hungarian province were allowed to employ servants because of the lack of converts. This also suggests that the Hungarian Cistercians had considerable difficulties as far as personnel was concerned.⁹³ This hypothesis is supported by archaeological data as well; the range of *conversi*⁹⁴ was not found in any of the excavated Cistercian monasteries.

Concerning the monks, the question is more complex. They were certainly not simply businessmen. Their activity cannot be interpreted purely as political play. Their aim was to spread their reform movement and a new type of religious life, and to develop a strong economy for this purpose. How they did it depended on the local circumstances. The last great abbot of Cluny, a contemporary of Saint Bernard, Peter the Venerable, wrote: "The Rule was written in the spirit of Love. Following the challenges of the time, it can be changed as well in the same spirit of Love." Though the Cistercians originally had the strict observance of the Rule in their mind, they took the phrase of the abbot of Cluny seriously. In Hungary, the secondary economy was obviously primary to them. The small number of converts, the estate structure and the privileges prove this. Internal colonization remained the task of other social groups.

CATALOG OF THE CISTERCIAN ABBEYS

1. *Ábrahám* (praedium ad Dombóvár, Hungary) Fundata erat anno 1263 ab officiali regis, Moys magistro tavernicorum, postea palatino, adiuvante Béla IV. non longe a prima fundatione ordinis Hungariae, Cikádor. Ordo accepit definitive anno 1270. Extitit usque ad annum 1543, quando Turci Quinqueecclesias et Simontornya occupaverunt. Possessiones erant in comitatu Tolnensi: in proximitate abbatiae sex possessiones, in regione de Kurd sex possessiones, in parte septemtrionali comitatus quatuor possessiones, necnon aliae in comitatu Simigiensi et Bodrogiensi. Erat filia et monachi venerunt de Pilis.

Bibliography: D. Csánki, *Magyarország történelmi földrajza a Hunyadiak korában* [Historical Geography of Hungary in the Age of the Hunyadis] (Budapest, 1890–1913) [Henceforth: Csánki] II, 658; Csánki, III, 413; Hervay, *Repertorium*, 47–52; Idem: "A ciszterci rend története Magyarországon", in Lékai, *A ciszterciek*, 477.

⁹³ On the social background of this feature cf. Koszta, "A ciszterci", 127.

⁹⁴ Gerevich, *A pilisi*; for Zirc see "Zirc", *Magyarország régészeti topográfiája*, (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó), 4: 266–267.



2. *Bélháromkút* (Bélapátfalva, Hungary) Fundatum erat c.1234 a Cleto episcopo Agriensi de gen. Bél. Erat filia de Pilis. Postea apparet monasterium in patronatu generis Bél, sed et episcopi Agrienses eum adiuvaverunt. Abbatia extitit usque ad saeculum 16, depopolata erat tardissime inter annos 1532 et 1552. Habuit possessiones singulas in regione abbatiae (cf. Hervay, *Repertorium*, p.60). Erat in comitatu de Borsod.
Bibliography: Csánki, I, 169; Györffy, I, 755-758; Hervay, *Repertorium*, 53-62; Valter, "Die archäologische Erschließung".
3. *Bélakút* (Novi Sad, Yugoslavia) Fundatum erat anno 1232 a duce Béla (postea erat rex Béla IV.) prope ad priorem abbatiam Benedictinam de Pétervárad, et consequenter ad vadum Danubii in comitatu de Szerém. Monasterium erat opulentissima inter abbatias Hungariae, inter alias 25 villas in comitatu de Szerém cum vineis, possessiones supra Danubium in comitatu de Bács, necnon ecclesiam parochialem b.Gerhardi in Kelenföld cum decimas et vineis. Populavit monasterium de Acey aut Tribus Fontibus.
Bibliography: Hervay, *Repertorium*, 133-140; Hervay "A ciszterci rend", 476; Vidor Pataki, "A péterváradai ciszterciek a középkori Kelenföldön", *A Ciszterci Rend Budapesti Szent Imre Gimnáziumának évkönyve*, 1942; Takács, *Pétervárad*.
4. *Borsmonostor* (Klostermarienberg, Austria) Fundatum erat anno 1194 a bano Dominico, sed finitum erat tantum a filio suo, Bors, qui et nomen illi dedit. Postea ius patronatus in manus familiae Kőszegi, deinde oppidi Kőszeg, postremum anno 1441 Simonis de Pálócz et Michaelis Országh de Gút devenit. Erat in comitatu de Sopron, aliquoties nominatum et de Kedhel. 1440-1445 erat probabiliter destructum et dislocatum annis 1450-1452, quia AD 1455 nominatum est "de sub monte Mariae". Depopulatio definitiva sub abbate Stephano Magno. Possessiones abbatiae erant in regione eius, fundatores dederunt tres villas et tres praedia, quae postea aucta per emptiones et donationes erant (cf. Hervay 1984, 74-75). Populaverunt monachi de S.Cruce.
Bibliography: *Historische Städte Österreichs I. Donauländer, Burgerland*, (Stuttgart, 1970), [Henceforth: HSÖ] I, 735-736; Valter, "Ciszterci", 158; Hervay, *Repertorium*, 47-52; Reg. Arp., 3791, 4113 and 4114, D. Fránek, *A borsmonostori apátság az Árpádok korában* [The Abbey of Borsodmonostor in the Age of the Arpads] (Eger, 1910); H. Wagner, *Urkundenfaelschungen im Burgerland und in den angrenzenden westungarischen Gebieten bis zum Ende der Regierungszeit König Bélas IV*, (Eisenstadt, 1953).
5. *Cikádor* (Bátaszék, Hungary). Fundatum iam tempore S.Bernhardi de S.Cruce de Austria, erat monasterium primum Hungariae anno 1142. Fundator eius erat rex Geysa II. Est in comitatu de Tolna. Possessiones habuit inter aliis ultra Danubium in comitatu de Bodrog, in comitatu Tolnensi et in comitatu de Baranya. Possessiones eius non erant cohaerentes. Recepit anno 1196 (in litteris anni 1454) et duas partes tributi fori et portus fluvii Dravae de Eszék cum villa Kuni, ad quem illa pertinebant (cf. Hervay 1984, 86-87). Abbatia pro Cistercienses perita est c.1421, quando abbas Emericus OSB eam gubernavit, et etiam monasterium ordini s.Benedicti supeditavit.
Bibliography: Hervay, *Repertorium*, 83-889; Hervay, "A ciszterci rend", 474; Valter, *Die archäologische Erschließung des Zisterzienserklosters von Cikádor* (in print).

6. *Egres* (Igris, Romania) Traditio ordinis refert eum anno 1179 fundatum esse de abbata Pontiniaca. Certe extitit iam anno 1191. Monachi erant incipiente saeculo 13. Franci et Hungari. Fundator erat rex Béla III, donationes divites recepit a filio eius, rege Andrea II. Anno 1233 regina Iolanta, duos annos postea ipse rex inibi sepulti erant. Habuit redditus salis ab anno 1230, possessiones eius erant parvae in vicinitate monasterii et aliae similiter non valde magnae Transilvaniae, ad fluvium Küküllő (Monora, Csanád, Sornsten, Küküllő). Tartari monasterium devastaverunt, sed satis celeriter repopulatum erat. Anno 1202 fundavit Kerc Transsilvaniae et 1266 abbatiam S.Crucis Galiciae. Olim erat in comitatu de Csanád.
Bibliography: Csánki, I, 695; Györffy, I, 855-856; Hervay, *Repertorium*, 90-97; Juhász, *Die Stifte*, 53-61; E. Bósz (Bartók), *Az egresi ciszterci apátság története* [The History of the Cistercian Abbey of Egres] (Budapest, 1911).
7. *Ercsi* (Hungary) Prima fundatio erat 1207-1208, quando Cistercienses abbatiam S.Nicolai ordinis S.Benedicti a rege Andrea II. receperunt. Tamen quia usque ad annum 1238 populare nequiverunt, Béla IV. dedit eum Carthusianis. Postremum Carthusia a Tartaris devastata ordo Cisterciensium locum recepit et populavit. A Cisterciensibus derelecta erat circa 1482, postea reapparet in manu OESA. Possessionum vestigia parva sunt. Est in comitatu de Fejér.
Bibliography: Hervay, *Repertorium*, 98-100; Hervay, "A ciszterci rend", 477; G. Entz, "Az ercsi bencés monostor" [The Benedictine Monastery of Ercs], *Művészettörténeti Értesítő* 14 (1965), 241-246; *Pestmegye Műemlékei* [Monuments of Pest country] (Budapest, 1958), II, 148-151.
8. *Esztergom-Szentmáriamező* (Esztergom, Hungary) Fundatum erat inter 1200-1204 a genere Szente-Mágocs "in campo Beatae Mariae de Strigonio". Capitulum generale ordinis anno 1204 autorizavit monachis Cisterciensibus ad Strigonium commorantibus, ut iuxta capellam B.Virginis moverent. Ubi antea habitaverunt, nescio, sed forsitan habuit ordo domum aliquam in civitate, sed mentio huius nunquam fit. Possibile est populatio et de abbata de Pilis, quae similiter erat in proximitate. (Hoc dicit et Hervay 1984, 40). Probabiliter extiti haec domus usque ad annum 1291.
Bibliography: Györffy, II, 282; Hervay, *Repertorium*, 40.
9. *Gotó* (Kutjevo-Pozaga, Croatia) Fundatum erat anno 1232 ab archiepiscopo Colochensi, Ugrino de genere Chak, sed novam fundationem etiam rex Andreas II. adiuvavit. Anno 1460 ius patronatus erat viduae Ladislai de Gara, postea, ante 1494 Laurentii de Ujlak. Erat in comitatu de Pozsega. Nomen eius erat Honesta Vallis et erat filia de Zirc. Possessiones eius haud notae sunt. Extitit usque ad annum 1535, quando propter incursiones Turcas depopulatum est.
Bibliography: Csánki, II, 409; Hervay, *Repertorium*, 101-103; Hervay, "A ciszterci rend", 476; M. Turković, *Povijest Opatija Reda Cistercita u Hrvatskoj-Slavoniji i Dalmaciji*, (Susak, 1936.), 59-61.
10. *Hárskút* (Lipovnik, Slovakia) Fundatum erat inter 1240-1243 ab aliquo genere in comitatu de Torna. Slivka dicit eam domum Cruciferorum fuisse, quo dubito. Historia aius est tamen incerta. Depopulatum erat circa annum 1450.

Bibliography: Csánki, I, 238; M. Slivka, "Cisterciti na Slovensku" [Cistercians in Slovakia], *Archaeologia historica*, 1991, 101-117.

- ⑪ *Kerc* (Cirta, Romania) Fundatum erat Transsilvaniae in Fogaras anno 1202 de abbata de Egres et roboratum a rege Emerico. Erat devastata a Tartaros. Repopulata erat tantum 1260-1270. Postea devenit forsitan ius patronatus in manus Saxonum de villa Hermanni, quoniam abbata semper cum illis mentita est, postque suppressionem eius omnia ad eam pertinentia a rege Matthia communitati villae Hermanni data erant. Possessiones abbatae erant semper in vicinitate Saxonum: in propinquitate Cibinii, iuxta fluvium Olt, in propinquitate de Segesvár.

Bibliography: G. Entz, "A kerci (cirtai) cisztercita építőműhely" [The Cistercian Construction Workshop of Kerc/Cirta]. *Művészettörténeti Értesítő*, 12 (1963), 121-147; Györffy, II, 451-452; Hervay, *Repertorium*, 112-119; A. Baumgartner, *A kerci apátság a középkorban* [The Abbey of Kerc in the Middle Ages] (Budapest, 1915.)

- ⑫ *Königshof* (Königshof, Austria) Fundatum erāt anno 1203 in comitatu de Moson. Erat prius grangia S.Crucis de Austria, quam de rege Hungariae acceperunt. 1203-1209 monachi S.Crucis hic movere voluerunt, etiam constructiones inceperunt, tamen remansit incompleta, et etiam postea tantum grangia erat.

Bibliography: HSÖ I, 737; Hervay, *Repertorium*, 104-109 (ad Heiligenkreuz).

- ⑬ *Pásztó* (Hungary) Fundatum erat anno 1191, quando Cistercienses abbatiam S.Nicolai ordinis S.Benedicti a rege Béla III. acceperunt. Exeunte saeculo 13. recepit ius patronatus Stephanus filius Dominici, magister agazonum Stephani iunioris regis. Est in comitatu de Heves. Possessiones haud notae sunt, sed habet in villa Tar eiusdem comitatus, in Felvinc Transilvaniae, prope Zember et Tepke in comitatu de Nógrád, et aliae possessiones quarum locus est ignotus. Excavatum erat ab Ilona Valter.

Bibliography: R. Békefi, *A pásztói apátság története* [A History of Pásztó Abbey] I-III, Budapest 1898; Csánki I, 55; Györffy III, 121-123; Hervay, *Repertorium*, 127-132; Valter, "Das Zisterzienserkloster Pásztó" *Analecta Cisterciensia* XXXVIII (1982), 129-138.

- ⑭ *Pilis* (Pilisszentkereszt, Hungary) Fundatum erat anno 1184, die 27. martii a rege Béla III. in comitatu de Pilis, iuxta antiquam viam Romanam, quae probabiliter et illo aevo in usu erat. In ecclesia abbatae erat sepulta regina Gertrudis de Merano a bano Bánk occisa. Secundum historiographum ordinis de saeculo 18. erat hic olim abbata ordinis S. Benedicti totaliter degenerata. Anno 1203 abbas iudex erat inter archiepiscopos Strigoniensem et Colochensem, 1204 erat visitator monasteriorum a domino papa delegatus. Anno 1207, abbata de Topusko a rege Andrea novissime erecta recepit privilegia ad ea de Pilis similia. Tartari combustaverunt aedificia, tamen abbas iam 1244 erat a domino papa delegatus. Anno 1254 habuit abbata vineas et domos in Dewen et Posonio (com. Poson.) et in Buda (com. Pilis), tertiam partem tributorum de Posonio, de Quintoforo (com. Poson.), de Veteri Castro (com. Moson) et de Iaurino. Posonii alteram partem habuit abbas de Sancto Martino, Iaurini abbas de Zirc. Ceterum possessiones monasterii erant relative parvae et in plurimis comitatibus dispersae (com. Pilis, Strig., Komárom, Poson; cf. Hervay, *Repertorium*, p. 149-152). Abbata anno 1526

a Turcis erat combusta, unus monachus erat occisus, alii in abbatiam S. Crucis de Austria fugiverunt. Villa autem, quae tempore Benedictinorum saeculo 11-12. hic extitit, erat post adventum Cisterciensium depopulata. Foundationes abbatae Benedictinae et aliae Cisterciensis a Ladislao Gerevich excavatae erant. Lis ortum erat saeculo 18. super ius possessionis inter Cistercienses & Paulinos. Monachi venerunt ex Acey.

Bibliography: Békefi, *A pilisi apátság története* [A History of Pilis Abbey] I, Pécs 1891; Csánki I, 14-15; Gerevich, *A pilisi*; Hervay, *Repertorium*, 141-153; Rég. Top. VII 19/1, 159-164; "A pilisi ciszterci apátság" [The Cistercian Abbey in Pilis] in *Pannonia Regia, Művészet a Dunántúlon 1000-1541*, (Budapest 1994), 236-241.

15. *Pornó* (Pornóapáti, Hungary) Fundatum erat anno 1221, quando Cistercienses abbatiam S. Margarethae virginis a Stefano de genere Jáke acceperunt. Nova abbatia erat sub abbatia S. Gotthardi. Tamquam Stefanus et possessionem Pornó cum iure patronatu abbatae S. Gotthardo dedit, tamen erat patronus anno 1325 familia Kopász de gen. Jáke. Anno 1455 in patronatu erat Bertholdus Elderbach, postremo in 1496 Thomas Bakócz tunc archiepiscopus Strigoniensis eum a rege recepit. Heredes eius erant membrae familiae Erdődy. Quinque villas possidebat in vicinitate monasterii, tres in regione, sed remotius (cf. Carta in Hervay, *Repertorium*, 169). Est in comitatu de Zala. Ordo originalis erat probabiliter Benedictina. Non est praetermittendum, quod abbatia ordinis S. Benedicti de Jáke eiusdem generis est in vicinitate, tantum pauca milia ad orientem.

Bibliography: Hervay, *Repertorium*, 154-156; Hervay, "A ciszterci rend", 476; Kalász, *Szentgotthárd*; I. Valter, *Romanische Sakralbauten Westpannoniens*, (Eisenstadt, 1985), 214.

16. *Savnik* (Stiavniky, Slovakia) Fundatum erat inter 1216-1222 a magistro tavernicorum regis, Dyonisio filio Ampod, similiter et comite Scepusiensi in comitatu de Szepes non longe de via de Polonia versus meridiem ducentem, ad fluvium Hernád, inter Igló at Poprád. Foundationem dux Colomannus filius regis Andreae II. perfecit. Possessiones habuit in territorio coherenti, et ibi locavit certe quinque, forsitan septem villas, necnon et alias minores colonias. Erat filia abbatae de Wachock (Polonia).

Bibliography: Csánki, I, 266; Hervay, *Repertorium*, 172-180; Hervay, "A ciszterci rend", 476; Slivka, "Cisterciti", 101-117.

17. *Szentgotthárd* (Hungary) Fundatum erat anno 1183 a rege Béla III. in comitatu de Zala. Iam Andreas II anno 1214 patronatui regali denunciavit, et ius patronatus tardissime exeunte saeculo 14. definitive in manus magnatum devenit, quando anno 1391 ex liberalitate regis Sigismundi patroni erant filii palatini Nicolai Séchi. Anno 1467 erat fortificatum contra Turcos. Possedit plurimas villas in regione abbatae in territorio coherenti, necnon alias in comitatu Castriferrei et Saladiensi aliquantulo remotiores (cf Hervay 1984, 166-169). Erat filia directa de Tribus Fontibus.

Bibliography: Hervay, *Repertorium*, 159-171; HSÖ I, 733 and 747; Kalász, *Szentgotthárd*; Valter, *Romanische*, 19 and 249-250; Valter, "Die archäologische Erschließung des ungarischen Zisterzienserklosters Szentgotthárd", *Analecta Cisterciensia* XXXVIII (1982), 139-152.



18. *Szentjános* (Sîntion, Romania) Fundatum erat anno 1249, quando Cistercienses abbatiam S.Johannis Baptistae in comitatu de Bihar a genere Hontpázmány acceperunt. Ordo prior erat probabiliter S.Benedicti. Hervay dicit monasterium ad annum 1259 depopulatum esse. Certum est tamen, quod secundum acta capituli generalis haec abbatia "in personis et rebus multiplices defectus patiatur" (Statuta 1259: 36).
Bibliography: Györffy, I, 667-668; Hervay, *Repertorium*, 41.
19. *Szenttrinitás* (praedium prope Siklós, Hungary) Fundatum erat anno 1303, quando Cistercienses abbatiam SS.Trinitatis ordinis S.Benedicti a familia Siklósi de genere Kán in comitatu de Baranya acceperunt. Secundum Hervay tamen remansit in possessione Benedictinorum, sic eius mentio fit annis 1414 et 1480.
Bibliography: Györffy, I, 391-392; Hervay, *Repertorium*, 42.
20. *Vértesszentkereszt* (Hungary) Fundatum erat anno 1214, quando Cistercienses abbatiam S.Crucis ordinis S.Benedicti a genere Csák in comitatu de Fejér acceperunt. Fundatio erat tamen tantum temporalis, quia invenimus monasterium anno 1240 iterum in manu Benedictinorum, qui eum postea incesse tenebant. Causa foundationis erat probabiliter, quod secunda coniunx Nicolai de genere Csák venit de Francia.
Bibliography: Györffy, II, 415-416; Hervay, *Repertorium*, 120-124; Koszta, "A ciszterci", 119; Éva Kozák, "Vértesszentkereszt", *OMVH*, Budapest 1994.
21. *Zirc* (Hungary) Fundatum erat anno 1182 a rege Béla III. in comitatu de Veszprém, iuxta viam de Iaurino versus Veszprém ducentem. Secundum Chronicis extitit hic domus aestivalis regis, ubi anno 1060 rex Andreas I. post proelium cum fratre suo Bela pugnatum mortuus erat. Eodem tempore erat et locus comitatus silvae de Bocon (Bakony). Aliquoties erat et abbatia de Bakony nuncupata. Anno 1195 rex Emericus exemit abbatiam de iure episcopi Quinqueecclesiensis (!) deditque illi privilegia (Szentpétery 1923,51). Anno 1334 abbas Odo solvit ratione abbatae suae collectoribus 90 grossos. Possessiones eius erant: Zirc, Adásztevel, Olaszfalu, medietas possessionis Bodé, Berénd, Sóly, Szentkirály, Menyeke, Szöllös, Ság et Kőudvar. Habuit tertiam partem redditus telonei Jauriensis et molendinum supra rivulum Tapolca. Ius patronatus postea magnatibus datum erat. Incipiente saeculo 16. patronus erat familia Zápolya, postea, anno 1538 familia Podmaniczky de Podmanin. Incipiente decade 1540 erat devastatum a familia patrona, anno 1549 mentio fit abbatae iam ruinatae. Saeculo 18. erat de novo populatum et extitit usque ad annum 1786. Postea, anno 1802 de novo refundatum egit usque ad dissolutionem anni 1950.
Bibliography: Hervay, *Repertorium*, 208-216; K. Horváth, "A zirci apátság története" [A History of Zirc Abbey], *Zirci könyvek* 1, Veszprém, 1930; Rég. Top. 4 81/2, 266-267.

Aliae temptationes ad abbatias fundendas in hoc catalogo non sunt insertae, quia illae nec tamen ad primam populationem ab ordine venerunt. Ad eas cf. Hervay, *Repertorium*, 40-42.