

THE SOCIAL CONTEXT OF HUNGARIAN ROYAL GRANTS TO THE CHURCH IN DALMATIA (1102–1301)

Judit Gál

This paper deals with royal grants which were given to the Church in Dalmatia by the kings and dukes of Hungary between 1102, when Coloman was crowned king of Croatia and Dalmatia, and 1301, when the last king of the Árpád dynasty died. These sources have received little attention in either Hungarian or Croatian historiography even though they provide rich material for examining the Hungarian royal policy in Dalmatia. The aim of this paper is to examine royal grants in the context of urban society in order to show how cities were treated in royal grant giving and the influence a changing society had on the royal policy in Dalmatia. First, I describe a number of royal grants and examine their major territorial and temporal characteristics. Then I address the reception of royal grants, including the symbolic and political aspects. Finally, I will compare the communal development of the towns and concomitant changes in royal grant giving in the thirteenth century.¹

Royal Grants Examined

“Grants” here (approximately 39; see *Table 1*) are defined as grants made by the kings of Hungary, who were dukes of the Kingdom of Croatia and Dalmatia, and also grants made by the bans of Slavonia between 1241 and 1267, a time when the bans were also occasionally dukes of Slavonia and *comes* of Trogir and Split. The definition of grant includes lands which were donated to ecclesiastical institutions and new or confirmed privileges given to monasteries and (arch) bishoprics. The royal grants examined here comprise examples from published primary source collections and holdings of the national archives in Croatia. Before further discussion, it should be mentioned that the scarcity of sources is a serious hindrance to answering complex questions about royal grants. The characteristics of the written culture and the number of surviving sources necessitate drawing conclusions carefully, but this group of royal grants still gives the opportunity to acquire a deeper understanding of the relationship between Dalmatia and the royal court of Hungary.

¹ This paper presents one part of my MA thesis “Hungarian Horizons in the History of the Church in Dalmatia: The Role of the Royal Grants to the Church” (Budapest: Central European University, 2014).

King Coloman (1095–1116) made the first royal grant to a Dalmatian church in 1102.² Coloman was crowned king of Croatia and Dalmatia in that year in Biograd; during his intervention in Dalmatia he had stayed at the convent of Saint Mary in Zadar. During his stay, the king confirmed the previous privileges of the convent. Three years later he seized Zadar (Zara), Trogir (Trau), Split (Spalato), and the islands.³ Coloman confirmed the privileges of the bishopric of Trogir,⁴ and the convent of St. Mary in Zadar,⁵ which he gifted with a tower.⁶ Moreover, from the confirmation of King Béla II (1131–41) from 1138 it is known that Coloman gave the church of Saint Mary to the archbishopric of Split.⁷

This charter of King Béla II also mentions that King Stephen II (1116–31) had confirmed Coloman's grant, which could have been issued after 1105 in one of the years when he visited Dalmatia, as was his custom. This custom meant that after his coronation in Biograd he went to Dalmatia in every third year.⁸ Stephen II's grant was probably given around 1124–1125, when he re-took the city from Venice for a short time.⁹

Géza II (1141–1162) gave grants to the archbishopric of Split at least three times during his reign. He confirmed the rights of the archbishopric over the

² Tadija Smičiklas, *Codex diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Sclavoniae et Dalmatiae*, 18 vols (Zagreb, 1904–1934), II 9. Hereafter CDC.

³ Györffy, György, “A 12. századi dalmáciai városprivilegiumok kritikája” [Critical notes on the privileges of the Dalmatian towns in the twelfth century], *Történelmi Szemle* 10 (1967): 49.

⁴ Vedran Gligo and Hrvoje Morović, *Legende i Kronike* [Legends and chronicles] (Split: Čakavski sabor, 1977), 119.

⁵ Damir Karbić, Mirjana Matijević-Sokol, and James Ross Sweeney, *Thomae archidiaconi Spalatensis Historia Salonitanorum atque Spalatinorum pontificum* (Budapest: CEU Press, 2006), 96. Hereafter *Historia Salonitana*.

⁶ The inscription in the tower reads: ANNO INCAR[NATIONIS] . DOMINI . N[OST]RI . IE[S]V . CHR[IST]I . MIL[LESIMO] . C . V . POST VICTORIAM ET PACIS PRAEMIA . IADERAE INTROITUS . A DEO CONCESSA // PROPRIO SVMPTV . HANC TVRRI[M] S[AN]C[T]AE MARIAE . UNGARIAE . D[AL]MAT[IAE] . CHROA[TIAE] . CONSTRVI . ET ERIGI // IVSSIT REX COLLOMANNVS. See Miroslav Marković, “Dva natpisa iz Zadra” [Two inscriptions from Zadar], *Zbornik radova Srpske akademije nauke* 36 (1953): 101; Ana Marinković, “«Construi et erigi iussit rex Collomannus»: The Royal Chapel of King Coloman in the Complex of St. Mary in Zadar,” *Annual of Medieval Studies at CEU* 8 (2002): 37–64.

⁷ CDC II 47.

⁸ Györffy, “A 12. századi,” 49.

⁹ Ferenc Makk, *The Árpáds and the Comneni. Political Relations between Hungary and Byzantium in the 12th Century*. (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1988), 20–21.

church of Saint Mary in 1143.¹⁰ In 1158 he gave the church of Saint Bartholomew, the church of Saint Stephen, and the church of Saint Moses to the archbishopric.¹¹ Three years later, Géza II gave a certain property in Solin to the archbishopric.¹² This donation is only known from a short note found in the manuscript heritage of Johannes Lucius.¹³

The same manuscript preserves a note about the confirmation of this grant in Solin by King Stephen III (1162–72) in 1163.¹⁴ The king of Hungary, who had to fight Venice and Byzantium for Dalmatia, also confirmed the privileges of the archbishopric of Split in the same year.¹⁵ It can be stressed that he was also the first king of Hungary to confirm the privileges of the monastery of Saint John in Biograd, which he did in 1166.¹⁶ In 1167, Manuel I Comnenos (1143–80), the Byzantine emperor, seized Dalmatia among other southern territories of the king of Hungary. After Manuel's death, King Béla III regained these territories in the 1180s.¹⁷ He also confirmed Stephen III's grant to the monastery of Saint John in 1188.¹⁸

The year 1197 was a turning point in Hungarian royal policy in Dalmatia. King Emeric (1196–1204) and his brother, Duke Andrew (1197–1205), disturbed the peace of Hungary with their fight for the throne. The struggles between the two brothers and groups of the elite reached Dalmatia as well. Duke Andrew succeeded in getting the rule in Dalmatia, after he had defeated King Emeric in a battle at Mački. The number of royal grants started increasing during the hostile relationship between the king and the duke. King Emeric confirmed the privileges both of the archbishopric of Zadar and the archbishopric of Split in 1198.¹⁹ In the same year, Duke Andrew also confirmed some privileges for both the archbishopric of Split²⁰ and the monastery of Saint John in Biograd.²¹ Two years later King Emeric also confirmed the privileges of the monastery of Saint

¹⁰ CDC II 54.

¹¹ CDC II 87.

¹² Arhiv Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti [hereafter HAZU], LUCIUS XX-12/14. fol. 40.

¹³ Arhiv HAZU, LUCIUS XX-12

¹⁴ Arhiv HAZU, LUCIUS XX-12/14. fol. 40.

¹⁵ CDC II 97.

¹⁶ CDC II 106.

¹⁷ Makk, *The Árpáds*, 114.

¹⁸ CDC II 225.

¹⁹ CDC II 310., CDC II 310–311.

²⁰ CDC II 308., CDC II 309.

²¹ CDC II 293.

John in Biograd²² and the church of Saint Vital to the bishopric of Trogir.²³ King Andrew may have confirmed this grant as king between 1205 and 1210, because Matthew, the ban of the maritime region, mentions in his charter from 1210 that Andrew had issued a royal privilege concerning this church.²⁴ Both Emeric and Andrew donated the property of Biać and Gradac to the bishopric of Trogir before 1202²⁵ and King Emeric gave mills on the Jadro River to the archbishopric of Split during his reign.²⁶

Andrew II (1205–35) confirmed the privileges of the archbishopric of Split in 1207 with special regard to the place of the recently subordinated bishopric of Bosnia.²⁷ Later, in 1210, he again confirmed the privileges of the monastery of Saint John in Biograd.²⁸ He gave a grant to the Church of Trogir²⁹ and a certain piece of land in Solin to the archbishopric of Split when he led a crusade and stayed in the city in 1217.³⁰ Before arriving in Split, King Andrew confirmed his previous grant to the bishopric and the community of Trogir.³¹ Coloman (1226–42), duke of the Kingdom of Croatia and Dalmatia, gave Drid to the bishopric of Trogir in 1226³² and Andrew II confirmed it a year later.³³

King Béla IV, the former duke of the Kingdom of Croatia and Dalmatia, also confirmed this grant in 1242 while he was exiled from Hungary by the Mongols.³⁴ He also tried to seize back Zadar from Venice, and during that time, also in 1242, confirmed the privileges of the monastery of Saint Chrysogonus in Zadar.³⁵ Two years later he donated Cetina County to the archbishopric of Split when he supported Archbishop Ugrin's election.³⁶ In the second half of the thirteenth century the number of royal grants decreased. Three of them were given to the bishopric of Nin by King Stephen V and Roland, the ban and

²² CDC II 358.

²³ Arhiv HAZU, LUCIUS XX-12/11. fol. 27-28.

²⁴ *terram cum omnibus suis pertinentiis confirmatis et corroboratis cum privilegio Domini Regis*, see Arhiv HAZU, LUCIUS XX-12/11. fol. 28–29.

²⁵ CDC III. 16.

²⁶ *Historia Salonitana*, 140.

²⁷ CDC III 70.

²⁸ CDC III 99.

²⁹ Arhiv HAZU, LUCIUS XX-12/11. fol. 28–29.

³⁰ CDC III 160.

³¹ Arhiv HAZU, LUCIUS XX-12/13. fol. 29.

³² CDC III 258.

³³ CDC III 278.

³⁴ CDC IV 153.

³⁵ CDC IV 163.

³⁶ CDC IV 243.

duke of the Kingdom of Croatia and Dalmatia.³⁷ King Ladislas IV issued the last known royal grant in the thirteenth century when he donated a certain piece of land to the monastery of Saint Mary in Zadar.³⁸

Concluding the temporal characteristics of the royal grants, it can be said that grant giving was most intense during the reign of King Coloman and between the end of the twelfth century and the beginning of the 1230s. After this period, the number of grants decreased. The territorial distribution of the grants shows that the kings and dukes gave grants to ecclesiastical centers which had great political importance and Benedictine monasteries which were founded by the local elites or the previous royal dynasty of Croatia.

As the main ecclesiastical center in northern and central Dalmatia, the archbishopric of Split received most of the grants.³⁹ It had an important place in Hungarian royal policy and it almost always had a Hungarian archbishop or someone who was closely related to the court during this period.⁴⁰ Both the Church and the city of Trogir enjoyed great favor from the kings, who also took the side of the city many times during its struggle with Split.⁴¹ The bishopric of Nin came to the forefront in the 1260s, but I assume that this process began around 1242, when Béla IV stayed in Dalmatia for several months and a certain Samson from Hungary was elected bishop of Nin.⁴² The fact that Béla IV lost Zadar permanently during the struggle between Hungary and Venice changed the value of Nin due to its location. The convent of Saint Mary in Zadar, founded by Čika, a relative of King Krešimir IV (1059–74), and the monastery of Saint John

³⁷ CDC V 636, 637.

³⁸ CDC VI 533.

³⁹ Josip Buturac and Antun Ivandija, *Povijest katoličke crkve među Hrvatima* [History of the Roman Catholic Church among the Croats] (Zagreb: Hrvatsko književno društvo Sv. Cirila i Metoda, 1973), 43.

⁴⁰ Judit Gál, “Loyalty and Identity of the Bishops and Archbishops in Dalmatia during the Reign of the Árpád Dynasty,” *Hungarian Historical Review* 3 (2014): 471–494.

⁴¹ Nada Klaić, *Trogir u srednjem vijeku* [Trogir in the Middle Ages] (Trogir: Muzej grada Trogira, 1985), 127–135; Ivo Babić, *Prostor između Trogira i Splita* (Trogir: Muzej grad Trogira, 1984), 72–73.

⁴² Samson was mentioned in sources from 1242 to 1269, see CDC IV 202; CDC V 505–6.

in Biograd,⁴³ founded by King Krešimir IV, had royal freedom.⁴⁴ The monastery of Saint Chrysogonus, founded by the powerful and rich Madius family, played an important role in the life of Zadar.⁴⁵

The Reception of Royal Grants

The royal grants which were given to the Church in Dalmatia can be divided into three groups based on the place of issue. Most of them were given during the personal presence of the dukes or kings, as suggested by either the charters themselves or the historical circumstances of the issuing. Some grants were given at the royal court, far from Dalmatia. The place of issue cannot be determined for a number of grants.⁴⁶ Royal visits to Dalmatia were not spontaneous events, neither were the royal entries, which many times went hand in hand with a royal presence in the region. The subject inhabitants of the ruled land had to participate in these events; the cities and the ruler worked together to organize the rituals and spectacles.

The royal presence laid charges on the citizens; the kings expressed their supremacy over the ruled lands and the subjects had to acknowledge the ruler's power over them.⁴⁷ This recognition occurred on different levels of the communication between the kings and the citizens. They expressed their loyalty to the king in words and in ritual actions.⁴⁸ The cities welcomed the king with honor and solemn acts when admitting him inside the walls. A charter issued after Duke Andrew's entry into Trogir around 1200 depicted the following event: "We went to the coasts of Dalmatia and entered the city of Trogir, where on the one

⁴³ The monastery was ruined by the Venetians in 1125, when they took that territory. The monastery and its monks moved to the monastery of Saints Cosmas and Damian in Pašman, which also received grants during this time. See Zvezdan Strika, "Samostan sv. Ivana Evanđelista u Biograd od utemeljenja do 1125. godine" [The Monastery of Saint John the Evangelist in Biograd from its founding until 1125], *Radovi Zavoda za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Zadru* 52 (2010): 149–172.

⁴⁴ Ivan Ostojić, *Benediktinci u Hrvatskoj i ostalim našim krajevima* [Benedictines in Croatia and our other regions] (Split: Benediktinski priorat – TKON, 1964), vol. 2, 216.

⁴⁵ Ostojić, *Benediktinci*, 39–55.

⁴⁶ For a discussion of places the of issues see Gál, "Hungarian Horizons," 7–25.

⁴⁷ Jacoba van Leeuwen, "Introduction," in *Symbolic Communication in Late Medieval Towns*, ed. Jacoba van Leeuwen (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2006), xiv–xv.

⁴⁸ Dušan Zupka, "Communication in a Town: Urban Rituals and Literacy in the Medieval Kingdom of Hungary," in *Uses of the Written Word in Medieval Towns: Medieval Urban Literacy II*, ed. Anna Adamska (Turnhout: Brepols, 2014), 341–342.

hand, the clergy, on the other hand, the people of Trogir accepted us with honor and joy, and we received solemn praises.”⁴⁹

A similar form of reception appears in Archdeacon Thomas of Split’s detailed description in his *Historia Salonitana* about Andrew II’s entry into Split in 1217, where he depicts the joyous entry of the king:

All the citizens and foreigners and the whole crowd of his army marched out in procession to meet the lord king, loudly sounding his praises. Then all the clergy robed in silk vestments over their surplices proceeded with crosses and censers as far as the Pistura Square, chanting together in a manner worthy of the king’s majesty.⁵⁰

The royal praises, mentioned in both sources, were probably part of the reception of kings and dukes during the Árpáadian age. These praises were symbolic and public recognition of the royal power by the citizens and the clergy.⁵¹ Only one example of royal praise has been preserved from the centuries studied here, in Zadar from around 1114. This royal praise first lauded the pope, then King Coloman, his son, Duke Stephen, Archbishop Gregory of Zadar, and *Ban Cledin*.⁵² The use of Church liturgy was not an unusual tool for rulers to secure their power over the territories they ruled.⁵³ The kings of Hungary also used the influence of the Church to secure the loyalty of the Dalmatian cities. For instance, the archbishops of Split were supposed to represent the interest of the royal court during most of the period under study here.⁵⁴

⁴⁹ *ad maritimas Dalmaciae partes accessissemus, Traguriensem civitatem intravimus. Ubi [ab] una [parte] a clero, et universo populo cum honore et gaudio recepti, laude hymnidicas honorabili terre cepimus* (my translation). See Arhiv HAZU, LUCIUS XX-12/11, fol. 28–29.

⁵⁰ My translation from *Historia Salonitana*, 161.

⁵¹ Ernst Kantorowicz, *Laudes Regiae. A Study in Liturgical Acclamations of Medieval Rulers* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1946), 147–157; Dušan Zupka, “Power of Rituals, and Rituals of Power: Religious and Secular Rituals in the Political Culture of the Medieval Kingdom of Hungary,” in *Historiography in Motion*, ed. Roman Holec and Rastislav Kožniak (Bratislava: Institute of History of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, 2010), 34–37.

⁵² Georgius Györffy, *Diplomata Hungariae antiquissima accedunt epistolae et acta ad historiam Hungariae pertinentia (ab anno 1000 usque ad annum 1196)*. (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1992), 400.

⁵³ Andrew Brown, “Ritual and State-building: Ceremonies in Late Medieval Bruges,” in *Symbolic Communication in Late Medieval Towns*, 4–5.

⁵⁴ Judit Gál, “*Qui erat gratiosus apud eum. A spliti érsekek az Árpádok királyságában*” [The role of the archbishops of Split in the kingdom of the Árpáds], in *Magister historiae*, ed. Mónika Belucz and Judit Gál (Budapest: Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem, 2014), 54–63.

The detailed reception of kings during their visits was laid down in various orders which had been transmitted from the Carolingian period in Europe.⁵⁵ A royal visit was not only an event to recognize the king's rule, but it also gave a city an opportunity for self-representation. The social hierarchy and the internal political relations of the cities were also apparent during the royal presence. Visits and entries provided a place and time for the local elites to earn the favor of the king. Both the Church and the secular elite of the cities received grants in the presence of the ruler, who rewarded his dependents and received statements of the loyalty of the Dalmatian cities. The kings wanted to take advantage of the political influence of the Church in the cities by engaging them with grants and gifts. The royal grants were tools to express the hierarchy of the realm and the generosity of the almost semi-god king.⁵⁶

Beside grants which were given in their personal presence, the kings gave and confirmed privileges from far away. These long-distance donations and confirmations, as Georg Vogeler shows in his recent study, were not only legal documents, but they were visual proof of royal favor for the Church and the city, and the documents were also part of the communication between the ruler and the ruled city.⁵⁷

The royal grants to the Church were not only issued when the kings felt the need to give a grant, but the citizens and the clergy also applied for them, in both Dalmatia and in other parts of the kingdom. First, they could ask the king personally during a royal visit. Second, they could apply for grants and confirmation in letters, as in 1142, after King Géza II's coronation, when the citizens of Split asked the king to confirm their privileges. Third, when the magistrates and the clergy visited the royal court, they could ask for the favor of the king, as in 1188, when an embassy from Zadar visited the court of Béla III.⁵⁸

The grants were not only tools the royal court used to secure the royal power in the ruled land. The Church and the cities in Dalmatia also used and took advantage of grants to meet their political goals. The example of a struggle

⁵⁵ Ernst Kantorowitz, "The 'King's Advent' and the Enigmatic Panels in the Doors of Santa Sabina," *The Art Bulletin* 26 (1944): 208–209.

⁵⁶ Mladen Ančić, "From the 'Demigod' King to the First Ideas about a 'National Kingdom,'" in *Kolomanov put* [Coloman's path], ed. Mladen Ančić and Jelena Borošak-Marijanović (Zagreb: Hrvatski povijesne muzej, 2002), 70–109.

⁵⁷ Georg Vogeler. "The Distant Emperor. Communication between European and Mediterranean Towns and Frederic II of Hohenstaufen," in *Towns and Communication. Communication between Towns II*, ed. Hubert Houben and Kristjan Toomaspoeg (Galatina: Mario Congedo Editore, 2011), 134–135.

⁵⁸ CDC II 225.

between Split and Trogir from the beginning of the thirteenth century until 1245 shows how the royal grants to the Church were used for such purposes. The cities struggled for jurisdiction over certain lands between Split and Trogir, for territories whose ownership was disputed between the bishopric of Trogir and the archbishopric of Split.⁵⁹ The result was that both the Church and the cities were involved in these fights. First, Archbishop Bernard was able to acquire the villages of Biać and Gradac as a grant from King Emeric and Duke Andrew around 1202.⁶⁰ However, Andrew was more generous towards the bishopric of Trogir while he was the duke. After his coronation he gave grants and confirmations that served the interests of the archbishopric of Split. King Andrew II confirmed land which had previously belonged to the bishopric of Trogir to the archbishopric of Split in 1207. Domald, the *comes* of Split, probably played an important role in this change of Andrew's policy, since he held huge territories in Central Dalmatia and enjoyed the king's favor. Domald's political power could have assuaged the bad personal relationship between the king and Archbishop Bernard.⁶¹ The struggle for the land continued, in 1210, when Matthew, the ban of the maritime region, judged the ownership of the land of St. Vital to the good of Trogir in a dispute between Split and Trogir.⁶²

Duke Coloman gave Drid to the city and Church of Trogir in 1226 when he visited Dalmatia for the first time⁶³ and King Andrew confirmed his grant in 1227.⁶⁴ This territory also lay on the disputed land. King Béla IV's presence during the Mongol invasion fanned the argument between Split and Trogir. He favored the latter city and confirmed Drid to the Church of Trogir in 1242.⁶⁵ War broke out in 1242 over the village of Ostrog and peace was made in 1245 favoring Trogir, which was supported by the king.⁶⁶

⁵⁹ Nada Klaić, *Trogir u srednjem vijeku*, 127–135; Ivo Babić, *Prostor između Trogira i Splita* (Trogir: Muzej Grad Trogira, 1984), 77.

⁶⁰ CDC III 16

⁶¹ Klaić, *Trogir u srednjem vijeku*, 78

⁶² Arhiv HAZU, LUCIUS XX-12/11, fol. 27–28.

⁶³ CDC III 258.

⁶⁴ CDC III 278.

⁶⁵ CDC IV 153.

⁶⁶ Grga Novak, *Povijest Splita* [History of Split], 2 vols. (Split: Matica hrvatska, 1957), 123–124.

The Communal Development of the Dalmatian Towns and Changes in Giving Grants

The examination of communal development here will be confined to the examples of Split and Trogir, which belonged to the Kingdom of Hungary for most of the period studied, even after the mid-thirteenth century, unlike Zadar. Split and Trogir received most of the grants and these cities provide enough sources to examine their development. The self-organization of the citizens of the Dalmatian cities began in the eleventh century. Great assemblies were organized both in Split and Trogir and probably other Dalmatian cities had similar institutions. Urban society was divided into *maiores* and *minores*, nobles and non-nobles, but the assemblies included all the citizens. These were not standing institutions; whenever the city needed to decide an important question or the presence of the assembly was needed, the *comes* called the citizens together.⁶⁷ They decided about the important local questions; they took oaths to foreign rulers, regulated the life of the citizens, elected the *comes* of the city, and made peace in the name of the city.⁶⁸

The communal development and organization of the commune, which began around the twelfth century,⁶⁹ became more intensive around the mid-thirteenth century.⁷⁰ That was the time when the first statute of Split was put down in writing under the rule of *Podesta* Gargano de Arscindis in 1239.⁷¹ Two years later, for the first time in the history of Split, the general assembly made peace in the name of the city with Count Andrew of Zahumlje.⁷²

The formation of a commune separated the ecclesiastical from the secular powers. While for most of this period the Church was dominant in the life of cities,⁷³ in the second half of the thirteenth century the two powers started to separate. The election of the (arch)bishops was not only the right of the Church; the citizens and canons elected the ecclesiastical leader of their city together. Participation in the election was important because, besides the role a bishop played, the bishops and archbishops held their offices for life and the *comes* only

⁶⁷ Novak, *Povijest Splita*, 276.

⁶⁸ Novak, *Povijest Splita*, 275–278.

⁶⁹ Ludwig Steindorff, *Die dalmatinischen Städte im 12. Jahrhundert. Studien zu ihrer politischen Stellung und gesellschaftlichen Entwicklung* (Vienna: Böhlau, 1984), 157–159.

⁷⁰ Novak, *Povijest Splita*, 279; Irena Benyovsky Latin, *Srednjovjekovni Trogir. Prostor i društvo* [Medieval Trogir. Space and Society] (Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2009), 41.

⁷¹ Novak, *Povijest Splita*, 279.

⁷² Novak, *Povijest Splita*, 277.

⁷³ Ivan Strohal, *Pravna povijest dalmatinskih gradova* [Legal history of the Dalmatian cities] (Zagreb: Dionička tiskara, 1913), 305–310.

ruled for a year.⁷⁴ As the laity influenced the election, so the archbishops also took part in secular affairs and the life of the city. In Trogir, the ecclesiastical and secular powers began to take part in each other's worlds during the twelfth century.⁷⁵ In Split, the archbishops were closely connected to the royal court.⁷⁶ The secular influence of the archbishops of Split reached its peak during Ugrin's tenure of office, when he was not only the ecclesiastical but also the secular leader of the city, as *comes* between 1245 and 1248.

After Ugrin's death, the next bishop, a certain Friar John, was elected only by the suffragans of Split without the participation of the citizens in 1248, but he was never consecrated. The next archbishop, Roger of Apulia, was appointed by the pope, also without asking the opinion of the laity.⁷⁷ Roger kept away from the secular administration and dealt mostly with ecclesiastical matters, according to Archdeacon Thomas.⁷⁸ His absence from the political life of the city was probably a sign of a change among the secular and ecclesiastical powers of Split. By the end of the century, the election of the archbishops was only the right of the canons, and the citizens had no official influence in the process.⁷⁹

In Trogir, the Church participated in the secular life of the city; its influence was not confined only to the ecclesiastical life of Trogir. The Church was dominant in communication with the royal court and competed with the secular power in the city. The bishopric of Trogir enjoyed the kings' and dukes' favor, which was materialized in grants. As the separation of the secular and ecclesiastical powers became more and more significant, bishops were expelled from the secular administration of the city by the end of the thirteenth century,⁸⁰ although the separation of the two powers did not happen without conflicts between the Church and the commune. The social topography of Trogir expressed the changing position of the Church. In the second half of the thirteenth century the commune started transforming the main square of the city, which had been dominated by ecclesiastical buildings until that time. The city demolished the church of St. Stephen in 1272 to have a place for building a new communal palace. A new loggia was built on the place of the church of St. Martin and the

⁷⁴ Novak, *Povijest Splita*, 373.

⁷⁵ Klaić, *Trogir*, 74.

⁷⁶ Gál, "*Qui erat*," 62–63.

⁷⁷ Mirko Sardelić, *Carmen miserabile: Rogerije iz Apulije* [*Carmen miserabile*. Roger from Apulia] (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 2010), 106.

⁷⁸ *Historia Salonitana*, 362.

⁷⁹ Novak, *Povijest Splita*, 373.

⁸⁰ Benyovsky, *Trogir*, 198.

communal administration also rented the building of the monastery of St. John the Baptist for its purposes.⁸¹ The economic and social changes of the thirteenth century influenced the number of grants given by the citizens, too. After the mid-thirteenth century one can hardly find grants where citizens donated land to the Church. Neither (arch)bishoprics nor Benedictine monasteries received new donations of land in the last decades of the century. The local elites invested in commerce and the salt trade and owning land became more and more important.⁸² Land donated to the Church was removed from economic circulation, since it was a perpetual religious gift.⁸³ Moreover, the citizens of Split and Trogir had to pay city taxes to the commune on land plots that were outside the boundary of the city.⁸⁴ Ecclesiastical institutions were excused; they had to pay only papal and episcopal taxes.⁸⁵

The development of the communes and the new concept of communal property resulted in changes in giving grants. The first signs appeared when the great congregation of Split forbade giving lands to the Church around 1160.⁸⁶ After the mid-thirteenth century, in line with the upswing in communal development, the citizens gave hardly any land to the Church. After examining the sources, I assume that the local elites stopped giving grants around the 1240s and only a few new donations were made until the end of the century in territories where the communes were less developed, like Senj.⁸⁷ The halting of further donations generated more income for the communes, and in parallel with this, they started supplanting the Church in the secular administration of the cities.⁸⁸ There were no further donations, moreover, the Church and the commune struggled over ecclesiastical landholdings. For example, an argument between the city and the bishopric of Trogir began in the mid-thirteenth century over the building of the

⁸¹ Irena Benyovsky, “Trogirski trg u razvijenom srednjem vijeku” [The square of Trogir in the High Middle Ages], *Povijesni prilozi* 16 (1997): 12–14.

⁸² Dusa, *Episcopal Cities*, 116.

⁸³ Ilona F. Silber, “Gift-giving in the Great Traditions. The Case of Donations to Monasteries in the Medieval West,” *Archives européennes de sociologie* 36 (1995): 209–243.

⁸⁴ Lujó Margetić, “Dioba općinskog zemljišta u nekim srednjovjekovnim dalmatinskim komunama” [Division of communal land in some Dalmatian communes], *Starine* 56 (1975): 5–36.

⁸⁵ Dusa, *Episcopal Cities*, 116.

⁸⁶ CDC II 93.

⁸⁷ CDC VII 81., 187. etc.

⁸⁸ Novak, *Povijest Splita*, 373.

St. Lawrence cathedral. The city and its bishops struggled over Drid and the land of St. Vital for decades during Treguan's and Columban's tenures of office.⁸⁹

Examining the temporal distribution of royal grants to the Church shows that the number of the grants decreased drastically after the mid-thirteenth century. The last royal grant was given to the bishopric of Trogir in 1242 and to the archbishopric of Split in 1244. Moreover, giving grants to the Church after the 1220s became rarer and neither Andrew II, in the last decade of his rule, nor Béla IV, in the first years of his reign, gave grants to Dalmatian bishoprics or monasteries. In contrast, King Andrew II, Béla IV, Stephen V and Ladislav IV were generous to the local secular elites and the cities through the whole century. For example, King Béla gave a piece of land to Marin Blasii for his service in 1243 after he stayed in Trogir during the Mongol invasion.⁹⁰ This Marin belonged to the Andreis family, which was among the most powerful families of the city.⁹¹ The king also gave a piece of land to Trogir in 1251.⁹² King Stephen V confirmed his father's grant to Marin⁹³ and his son, Ladislav IV, issued two grants to Trogir in 1278.⁹⁴

The kings and dukes of Hungary used grants to the Church for political and representative purposes. They expressed their rule, made political connections, and tried to earn the loyalty of the Church, thereby to influence the cities. When communal development and economic changes led to fewer citizens making grants to the Church, the royal policy changed in the same way. After the Church started losing its influence in the cities, the kings preferred to secure the loyalty of the secular elite and the magistrates with their grants.

Surveying the social characteristics of the Dalmatian cities, one can see that the general social processes of this period led to the formation of communes. The importance and the value of landholdings emerged during the economic changes of this period, which caused conflicts between the Church and the commune. The citizens no longer gave land to ecclesiastical institutions and they argued over the ownership of certain properties. Moreover, the secular and ecclesiastical powers separated from each other; the Church had lost its influence on the administration of the cities by the end of the thirteenth century.

⁸⁹ Benyovsky, *Trogir*, 200–203.

⁹⁰ Arhiv HAZU, LUCIUS XX-12/11. fol. 89–90

⁹¹ Mladen Andreis, *Trogijski patricijat u srednjem vijeku* [The patricians of Trogir in the Middle Ages] (Zagreb: HAZU, 2002), 202.

⁹² Arhiv HAZU, LUCIUS XX-12/11. fol. 92–93.

⁹³ Arhiv HAZU, LUCIUS XX-12/12. fol. 51–54.

⁹⁴ Arhiv HAZU, LUCIUS XX-12/12. fol. 85–88.

The kings of Hungary did not influence this social transformation in the cities, since they only visited occasionally, and the coastal cities enjoyed great autonomy. In my view, the kings needed to secure the loyalty of the cities with favors and generosity. Thus, the kings of Hungary accommodated themselves to the social changes in the region. First, they gave grants to the Church when the prelates had great influence in the secular sphere of the cities and they could help the court to secure its rule. Later, when the role of the Church changed because of the development of communes the kings adapted to the political circumstances.

In my opinion, the number of the royal grants to the Church decreased because of the changing social circumstances in Dalmatia. When the society's customs changed in the thirteenth century, the royal policy followed the same patterns. They gave grants to the secular elite and privileges to the cities, but the ecclesiastical institutions enjoyed little of the kings' generosity. The only exception was the bishopric of Nin after the Mongol invasion; the fall of Zadar demonstrated the importance of this city and explains the kings' changed policy. The social characteristics and communal development of Nin also differed from the examples of Trogir and Split. The formation of a commune began later in cities like Nin and Šibenik which had belonged to the territory of the previous Croatian dynasty.⁹⁵ The communal development was slower, and the influence of the Church was still relatively strong after the mid-thirteenth century, so the kings of Hungary used the policy their ancestors had practiced preceding the communal development of Trogir and Split.

Table 1. Royal grants to the Church in Dalmatia, 1102–1285

Year	Who made the grant?	Who received the grant?	What action was taken?	Reference
1102	Coloman	Convent of St. Mary, Zadar	Confirmed privileges	CDC II. 9
1105	Coloman	Convent of St. Mary, Zadar	Confirmed privileges	CDC II. 15
1105	Coloman	Bishopric of Trogir	Confirmed privileges	Farlati, <i>Illyricum sacrum</i> IV. 314

⁹⁵ Ludwig Steindorff, "Stari svijet i nova doba. O formiranju komune na istočnoj obali Jadrana" [The old world and a new age. About the formation of communes on the eastern Adriatic], *Starohrvatska prosvjeta* 16 (1986): 149–150.

The Social Context of Hungarian Royal Grants to the Church in Dalmatia (1102–1301)

Year	Who made the grant?	Who received the grant?	What action was taken?	Reference
1105	Coloman	Convent of St. Mary, Zadar	Donated bell tower	Marković, “Dva natpisa” 101
1105–1116 ⁹⁵	Coloman	Archbishopric of Split	Donated the church of St. Mary	CDC II. 47
1124–1125 ⁹⁶	Stephen II	Archbishopric of Split	Confirmed the church of St. Mary	CDC II. 47
1138	Béla II	Archbishopric of Split	Confirmed the church of St. Mary	CDC II. 47
1143	Géza II	Archbishopric of Split	Confirmed the church of St. Mary	CDC II. 54
1158	Géza II	Archbishopric of Split	Donated the churches of St. Bartholomew, St. Stephen, and St. Moses	CDC II. 87
1161	Géza II	Archbishopric of Split	Donated a certain piece of land near Solin	Arhiv HAZU, LUCIUS XX-12/14. fol. 40
1163	Stephen III	Archbishopric of Split	Confirmed the grant from 1161	Arhiv HAZU, LUCIUS XX-12/14. fol. 40
1163	Stephen III	Archbishopric of Split	Confirmed privileges	CDC II. 97

⁹⁵ This grant is undated and only known from the confirmation of Béla II. Coloman probably visited Dalmatia in every third year as he surely did in 1102, 1105, 1108, and 1111. His grants were issued at those times, so it seems likely that the undated grant was also issued in one of the years after the seizure of Split (1105).

⁹⁶ This grant is undated and only known from the confirmation of Béla II. Stephen II (1116–31) lost his Dalmatian territories to Venice in 1116. Around 1124–1125 he secured his rule over the region, but Venice soon seized it back and held it until 1136. In my opinion, the undated grant could have been issued either before the first Venetian capture of the city or, more likely, around 1124 or 1125, when the Hungarian king seized Split. Later examples also show that the Hungarian kings confirmed privileges of churches after recapturing territories in Dalmatia. The fact that only a few months elapsed between the death of King Coloman in February 1116 and the success of Venice in May 1116 also strengthens the possibility of a later issue. Moreover, Stephen II surely confirmed the privileges of Split in 1124.

Year	Who made the grant?	Who received the grant?	What action was taken?	Reference
1166	Stephen III	Monastery of St. John, Biograd (Pašman)	Confirmed privileges	CDC II.106
1188	Béla III	Monastery of St. John, Biograd (Pašman)	Confirmed privileges	CDC II. 225
1198	Duke Andrew	Archbishopric of Split	Confirmed privileges	CDC II. 309
1198	Emeric	Archbishopric of Zadar	Confirmed privileges	CDC II. 310
1198	Emeric	Archbishopric of Split	Confirmed privileges	CDC II. 309–310
1198	Duke Andrew	Archbishopric of Split	Confirmed the churches of Saint Stephen and Saint Moses	CDC II. 308
1198	Duke Andrew	Monastery of St. John, Biograd (Pašman)	Confirmed privileges	CDC II. 293
1200–1204 ⁹⁷	Emeric	Archbishopric of Split	Donated mills next to Jadro River	<i>Historia Salonitana</i> , 140
1200	Emeric	Monastery of St. John, Biograd (Pašman)	Confirmed privileges	CDC II. 358
1200	Duke Andrew	Monastery of St. Chrysogonus, Zadar	Donated Dub	CDC II. 357
1200	Duke Andrew	Bishopric of Trogir	Confirmed the church of St. Vital	Arhiv HAZU, LUCIUS XX-12/14. fol. 27–28
before December 1202	Duke Andrew	Archbishopric of Split	Donated Biač and Gradac	CDC III. 16

⁹⁷ According to Archdeacon Thomas of Split, this grant was issued by the king because his former tutor, Archbishop Bernard, asked him to do so. Bernard became the archbishop of Split around 1200.

The Social Context of Hungarian Royal Grants to the Church in Dalmatia (1102–1301)

Year	Who made the grant?	Who received the grant?	What action was taken?	Reference
before December 1202 ⁹⁸	Emeric	Archbishopric of Split	Donated Biać and Gradac	CDC III. 16
1205–1210	Andrew II	Bishopric of Trogir	Confirmed the church of St. Vital ⁹⁹	Arhiv HAZU, LUCIUS XX-12/11. fol. 28–29
1207	Andrew II	Archbishopric of Split	Confirmed privileges	CDC III. 70
1210	Andrew II	Monastery of St. John, Biograd (Pašman)	Confirmed privileges	CDC III.99
1217	Andrew II	Archbishopric of Split	Donated land in Solin	CDC III. 160
1217	Andrew II	Bishopric of Trogir	Confirmed Biać	Arhiv HAZU, LUCIUS XX-12/13. fol. 29
1226	Duke Coloman	Bishopric of Trogir	Donated Drid	CDC III. 258
1227	Andrew II	Bishopric of Trogir	Confirmed Duke Coloman's grant	CDC III. 278
1242	Béla IV	Bishopric of Trogir	Confirmed Drid	CDC IV. 153
1242	Béla IV	Monastery of St. Chrysogonus, Zadar	Confirmed privileges	CDC IV. 163
1244	Béla IV	Archbishopric of Split	Donated Cetina County	CDC IV. 243
1266	Ban Roland	Bishopric of Nin	Donated Četiglavac	CDC V. 636
1272	Stephen V	Bishopric of Nin	Donated Lika County	CDC V. 637
1272	Stephen V	Bishopric of Nin	Confirmed Ban Roland's grant	CDC V. 637
1285	Ladislas IV	Convent of St. Mary, Zadar	Donated a piece of land in Croatia	CDC VI. 533

⁹⁸ Both Emeric's and Andrew's grants are lost; they are only known from the confirmation of Pope Innocent III from December 1202.

⁹⁹ Maybe Andrew II confirmed the previous grant he had issued as duke, but it is also possible that the later mention of this grant referred to the one from 1200.