Razumijevanje lokalnih prilika u srednjovjekovnoj Slavoniji u prvom desetljeću 15. stoljeća zapravo je nemoguće bez uvida u reperkusije krize koja je izbila 1402. i kulminirala iduće godine, odnosno bez uvida u načine na koje je pobjednička strana ponovno uspostavila svoj narušeni autoritet. U radu se stoga sagledavaju mehanizmi saniranja političke krize kroz prizmu uloge administrativnih praksi utemeljenih na pisanoj riječi u tom procesu, odnosno kroz prizmu registra nevjernih nastalog na općem shodu održanom u Križevcima krajem 1403. i početkom 1404. godine. Štoviše, potraga za slavonskim registrom nevjernih otvorila je uvid i u vrlo sličan mehanizam rješavanja posljedica krize 1403. i na razini čitave Ugarske, gdje je također, početkom drugog desetljeća 15. stoljeća, napravljen registar nevjernih. Oba dokumenta, makar nisu sačuvana, dragocjeni su stoga tragovi za razumijevanje funkcioniranja kraljevskog aparata početkom 15. stoljeća te za sagledavanje modaliteta interakcije lokalnih društava i političkog središta.
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**UVOD**

Još je 1983. godine Petar Rokai u svojoj doktor-skoj disertaciji utvrdio da je *congregatio generalis* održan 1403. u Križevcima potpuno zanemaren i u hrvatskoj i u mađarskoj historiografiji, a isto se može ustvrditi i za registar nevjernih koji je nastao na tom shodu. 2 Ni gotovo četrdeset godina kasnije u tom se pogledu nije promijenilo odveć mnogo. Shod i registar pojavje se i tamo, tek na razini uzgredne primjedbe po pojedinim publikacijama. Koji su mogući razlozi takve neza-interesiranosti, teško je razlučiti, no shod i registar od izvanrednog su značaja za razumijevanje političkih prilika koje su obilježile *Archiregnum Hungaricum* u prvom desetljeću 15. stoljeća. Razumijevanje lokalnih prilika u Slavoniji u prvom desetljeću 15. stoljeća zapravo je nemoguće bez uvida u reperkusije krize koja je izbila 1402. i kulminirala iduće godine, odnosno bez uvida u načine na koje je pobjednička strana ponovno uspostavila svoj narušeni autoritet. Nadalje, izrada registra nevjernih te primjeri njegova kasnijeg korištenja pružaju mogućnost sagledavanja snažnijih političkih kriz u srednjovijekovnom space, a na što je ukazao Ančić 1996: 68; Ančić 1987. Oba dokumenta, makar nisu sačuvali dragocjeni su tragovi za razumijevanje funkcioniranja kraljevskog aparata početkom 15. stoljeća te za sagledavanje modaliteta interakcije lokalnih društava i političkog središta.

* Ovaj je rad sufinancirala Hrvatska zaklada za znanost projektom IP-2019-04-9315 (Anžuvinski archiregnum u srednjoistočnoj i jugoistočnoj Europi u 14. stoljeću: pogled s periferije).

1 Rokai 1983: 567–568. U radu koristim pojam *shod*, a ne *sabor*, kako se donekle ustalilo, jer je najbliži vernakularnom pojmu *sochodon*, čija je uporaba zasjedena u 14. stoljeću, na što je ukazao Ančić 1996: 68; Ančić 1987.

2 Ančić 2009: 55–56.

---

**INTRODUCTION**

Back in 1983, Petar Rokai asserted in his doctoral thesis that the *congregatio generalis* that took place in Križevci in 1403 had been completely ignored by both Croatian and Hungarian historiographies and the same could be said for the Register of Rebels made at that assembly. 2 Almost forty years later, nothing much has changed in this regard. The assembly and register are mentioned now and then merely as footnotes in some publications. It is hard to say what are the reasons for this lack of interest, but the assembly and register are very important for understanding the political state of affairs in the *Archiregnum Hungaricum* in the first decade of the 15th century. It is practically impossible to understand the local state of affairs in the medieval Slavonia in the first decade of the 15th century without examining the repercussions of the crisis that began in 1402 and culminated the following year and the actions that the winning side took to restore its damaged authority. Also, the making of the Register of Rebels and the examples of its subsequent use can help us understand the resolution of the political crisis through the prism of the administrative practices reliant on the written word. Indeed, the quest for the Slavonian register of rebels also yielded clues about the very similar crisis-resolving mechanism used in the Kingdom of Hungary, where a register of rebels was also made in the early second decade of the 15th century. Although not preserved, both documents are valuable for understanding the functioning of the royal apparatus in the early 15th century and for analyzing the modalities of interactions between local societies and the political center.

* The work on this paper was co-financed by the Croatian Science Foundation under the project IP-2019-04-9315 (Angevin Archiregnum in East Central and Southeastern Europe in the 14th Century: View from the Periphery).

1 Rokai 1983: 567–568. In Croatian version of this paper, I am using the term *shod* for “assembly”, instead of *sabor*. While *sabor* is more often used, *shod* is closer to the vernacular term *sochoden* that was in use in the 14th century, as noted by Ančić 1996: 68; Ančić 1987.

2 Ančić 2009: 55–56.
SLAVONIA AND THE STRUGGLE FOR THE THRONE IN 1403

Although the few months spent in captivity in 1401 damaged his authority, Sigismund nonetheless felt safe enough when he left the Kingdom in early 1402. By the end of that year he undertook the steps intended to tighten his grip on power: reshuffling the highest positions at the Court and appointing Albert IV of Austria his heir apparent and the caretaker of the Kingdom in his absence. However, these moves were met with counter-reaction of the nobility, who formed a wide coalition and decided to support Ladislaus of Naples as their king (by the end of 1402, his supporters had already controlled almost entire Dalmatia and Croatia). Among those who turned their back to Sigismund was Emeric Bebek, the Prior of Vrana who, together with Eberhard, Bishop of Zagreb, ruled as Ban of Slavonia, Dalmatia and Croatia from February to early October of 1402, when both of them were replaced by Paul of Bissen and Ladislaus Gordovai. All four of them attended the signing of the 21 September agreement with Albert IV of Austria in Bratislava and were among those who verified it with their seals. Clearly it was then that the decision about the replacement of the two Bans was made. Their reactions to it were different: while Eberhard remained firmly loyal to Sigismund, Emeric switched sides and became a supporter of Ladislaus of Naples. V. Klaić is right in associating Paulus de Paulo’s news about the 11 October surrender of Vrana to Ladislaus’ troops (that had sieged it since early September) with Emeric’s change of loyalty. Emeric Bebek’s switching sides had far-reaching repercussions on the political loyalty of Slavonian nobility, which is reflected in several Sigismund’s charters alleging that Emeric “fere totius ipsius rebellionis et discionis origo fuerat”.

3 Engel 2001: 206–207; Klaić 1985: 344–354; Šišić 1902: 137–154.
4 Engel 1996: 19.
5 Lővei 2009: 149–182.
6 According to Paulus, “castrum Vranae dedit se ipsi domino Aloysio capitaneo” (Šišić 1904: 35); Klaić: 1985: 351, although the argument explaining the change of Emeric’s political attitude is hardly viable.
nekoliko Sigismundovih isprava, prema kojem je Emerik „fere totius ipsius rebellionis et discensionis origo fuerat et causa efficiens”. O tome rječito svjedoči i velik broj onih plemića kojima su nakon studenog 1403. zbog nevjere oduzeti posjedi pri čemu je navedeno da su se nalazili u Emerikovoj službi (v. naprĳed). Zbog različitih, iako ne nužno suprotstavljenih, iskaza u izvorima teško je razaznati je li sam Emerik osobno imao kakvu ulogu u zarobljavanju bana Pavla Bissena, koje se može kronološki smjestiti u veljaču 1403., što je također bio ozbiljan udarac Sigismundovim snagama na terenu.  

Što se događalo s banskom čašću u susljednom periodu? Vrlo je teško suditi o tome jer je izvorna građa oskudna, što je samo po sebi indikativno te govori o (ne)mogućnosti djelovanja bilo koje strane kroz standardne institucionalne poluge kojima se manifestirao i ostvarivao autoritet i vlast političkog središta na lokalnoj razini. Naime, za period između studenoga 1404. i kolovoza 1403. nije sačuvana ni jedna isprava koju je izdao slavonski ban, a znakovita je i praznina u onima koje su izdali visebanovi – sačuvanih isprava izdanih u njihovo ime nema između rujna 1402. i svibnja 1403.  

Jednako tako, gotovo da i nema sačuvanih isprava Zagrebačkog ili Čazmanskog kaptola koje bi svojim sadržajem ukazale na komunikaciju s dvorom, što je u razdoblju bilo mira bio jedan od standardnih mehanizama uredenja lokalnih prilik.  

Evidence of it can be seen in the fact that there were many noblemen whose estates were taken away from them after November 1403 on account of their disloyalty, manifested by their support for Emeric (see further). As the accounts in the sources vary, although they are not necessarily opposing, it is hard to tell whether Emeric was personally involved in the capturing of Ban Paul of Bissen (dated to February 1403), which was a serious blow to Sigismund’s forces in the field.  

So how was the authority of ban exerted in the subsequent period? It is very hard to say because sources are scarce – which, in fact, indicates that none of the parties involved was able to act by using the standard institutional levers through which the political center exercised authority and power on the local level. No charter issued by Ban of Slavonia between November 1402 and August 1403 has been preserved. There is a similar gap when we are talking about charters issued by vicebans – none of them from the period between September 1402 and May 1403 has been preserved. Charters of Zagreb or Čazma Chapters that would indicate communication with the Court – one of standard mechanisms for regulating local state of affairs in times of peace – are also practically non-existent. While it does not mean that bans and vicebans (both those appointed by Sigismund and those appointed by Ladislaus) were not active at the time, it nevertheless suggests that insecurity reigned...
ne znači da djelatnosti banova i vicebanova (kako onih Sigismundovih tako i Ladislavovih) nije bilo, sve to ipak ukazuje na posvemašnju nesigurnost na prostoru Slavonije i na narušavanje ustaljenih administrativnih struktura i praksi. Nažalost, u tom kontekstu teško je razaznati političke prilike u Slavoniji; prve sigurnije informacije stižu s početka travnja 1403. Tada su se, naime, u Slatini okupili prelati, barones, proceres et nobiles regni, Ladislavovi pobornici, o čijim aktivnostima govori još jedna isprava izdana u njihovo ime 24. svibnja u blizini Požege in descensu nostro exercituali.11 Put do Zadra, gdje su se trebali susresti s Ladislavom Napuljksim, prirodnio ih je vodio preko Slatine i gdje su tadašnje prilike uključivale i vojno djeleovanje. S obzirom na prethodno istaknutu vrlo oškudnu gradu za taj period, ošlonac u pokušaju rekonstrukcije tih sukoba, to jest razvoja političkih odnosa, moguće je naći tek u kasnijim Sigismundovim darovnicama. To pak znači da dobivamo jednostrane iskaze koji ne samo da bilježe podatke s vremenskim odmakom već ih bilježe tako da je vrlo teško uspostaviti kronološki slijed događaja koji se opisuju. Uz te ograde može se zaključiti da je Sigismundove interese u međurječju, to jest u Slavoniji, prvenstveno zastupao Ivan Ma-rot, o čemu govori nekoliko narativnih dijelova nje-mu izdanih darovnica. Najbolje je pritom krenuti od darovnice iz studenoga 1405., gdje se vidi da je Em- erik Bubek tražio pomoć od neprijateljskih regija i na svoju stranu privukao mnoštvo slavonskih plemića

11 Klaić 1985: 354. Tko je bio u Slatini, dijelom se može rekonstruirati na temelju pečata pričvršćenih na tamo izdanoj ispravi, kojih je nekoliko bilo - 51, dok ih je danas ostalo sačuvano 46. Zahvaljujući projektu kolega sa Sveučilišta u Debrecenu „Magyarország a középkori Európában“, u bazi podataka vezanoj za projekt, između ostalog, moguće je uvidjeti u fotografije i opise pečata (putem signature AGADW 5542), za koje se također daje i identifikacija njihovih vlasnika, gdje je to bilo moguće (što je učinio Ádám Novák). Zahvaljujući projektu kolega sa Sveučilišta u Debrecenu, specifično u podatkovniku AGADW, sa kojim je upisano već 51 znak, moguće je ovdje i identifikaciju javljati najzadnje dokumente iz iste izdavanje. Rekonstrukcije tih sukoba, to jest razvoja političkih odnosa, moguće je naći tek u kasnijim Sigismundovim darovnicama. To pak znači da dobivamo jednostrane iskaze koji ne samo da bilježe podatke s vremenskim odmakom već ih bilježe tako da je vrlo teško uspostaviti kronološki slijed događaja koji se opisuju. Uz te ograde može se zaključiti da je Sigismundove interese u međurječju, to jest u Slavoniji, prvenstveno zastupao Ivan Ma-rot, o čemu govori nekoliko narativnih dijelova njemu izdanih darovnica. Najbolje je pritom krenuti od darovnice iz studenoga 1405., gdje se vidi da je Emerik Bubek tražio pomoć od neprijateljskih regija i na svoju stranu privukao mnoštvo slavonskih plemića.

in Slavonia and that well-established administrative structures and practices were disrupted. Unfortunately, the political state of affairs in Slavonia in this period is hard to see clearly. The first solid facts date from early April 1403, when prelati, barones, proceres et nobiles regni, Ladislaus’ supporters, gathered in Slatina. A charter issued in their name near Požega on 24 May in descensu nostro exercituali tells us about their activities.11 Naturally, the route to Zadar, where they were supposed to meet Ladislaus of Naples, led through Slavonia, where the situation at the time was such that military actions could not be ruled out. As the contemporaneous sources that cast light on this period are very scarce (as has been said above), we have to rely on Sigismund’s donations from a later period to be able to understand these conflicts and political developments. However, this means relying on one-sided accounts that not only record events after a lapse of time but do it in a way that makes it hard to establish the chronology of these events. With these reservations in mind, one can conclude that Sigismund’s interests in Slavonia were primarily represented by John of Maroth, according to some narrative parts of the royal donations issued to him. It is best to begin with the donation issued in November 1405. It states that Emeric Bebek turned to hostile regions for help and managed to enlist in his cause numerous Slavonian noblemen. After John of Maroth had successfully stood up against Bebek’s forces, he rushed to Bratislava where the king was staying in

11 Klaić 1985: 354. The seals attached to the document issued at the occasion (it used to be 51 of them but only 46 have been preserved) can help us identify some of those who attended the Slatina meeting. As the database of the Magyarország a középkori Európában project carried out by colleagues from the University of Debrecen contains photos and descriptions of these seals (document number AGADW 5542), specifying their owners wherever possible (thanks to Ádám Novák), it is known that the following dignitaries were present in Slatina: John of Kanizsa (Archbishop of Esztergom), John Szepesi (Archbishop of Kalocsa), Lukács Órvei (Bishop of Várad), Thomas Ludányi (Bishop of Eger), John Hédervári (Bishop of Győr), Stephen Upori (Bishop of Erdély), Benedikt Makrai (a university professor from Óbuda), Nicholas Csák and Nicholas Marcali (Transilvanian voivodes), Detrik Bebek (former palatine), Nicholas of Kanizsa (magister tavarnicornum), George or Stephen Jakcs (Kusalyi), John Szécsi, Andrew Rohonci (son of Henry), John Rupolyi (son of Thomas), Ladislaus Tottós of Bathmonostor, Michael Mikolai (son of Stephen), John Alsáni (son of George) and Philip Kórógyi.
te sakupio vojsku kojoj se uspješno suprotstavio Ivan Marot, nakon čega je pak pohitao kralju premama Bratislavi, gdje se kralj nalazio krajem srpnja i početkom kolovoza. Sukobi se, dakle, mogu datirati negdje u lipanj i srpanj, a ako je vjerovati sadržaju kraljevskih darovnica, Marot je u njima bio uspješan. Dapače, u darovnicu Ivanu Marotu iz studenoga 1403. veli se da je Ivan uspio razbiti Emerikovu vojsku i odbaciti ga „de regno Sclavonie ad regnum Bozne“. Stošije, Ivan je svojim djelovanjem neke od Emerikovih pobornika zatro, dok je druge vratio na put vjerou pravom kralju, na oba načina urušavajući podršku Ladislavu Napuljskom i njegovim pobornicima. Nemoguće je biti određen u tvrđnji da se to dogodilo u lipnju, to jest srpnju, no sličnosti u iskazu obju darovnice, a koje to smještaju u period nakon što je Pavao Bissen zarobljen, to jest predan Ladislavu Napuljskom koji je u Dalmaciju stigao sredinom srpnja, sugeriraju to kao najtočniju vremensku odrednicu. Osim Ivana Marota izgleda da je u tim sukobima sudjelovao i Nikola Gorjanski za kojeg se kaže da je pokušao osloboditi Pavla Bissena, na što ga je Emerik, bježeći pred Nikolom, odveo u Zadar. Ako se pođe od toga da su Marot i Gorjanski bili uspješni u vojnim djelovanjima, postavlja se pitanje kontrole nad Slavonijom u ljeto 1403. Jer, nasuprot slici političkih odnosa i uspjeha kakvu ocrtavaju Sigismundove isprave, stoji informacija koja je 24. srpnja zabilježena u pismu Firentinca Galeota koji gradu Fiencu daje izvješće o prilikama u kraljevstvu, u kojem se govori da se late June and early July. This is why the conflicts can be dated to June and/or July of that year. If the donation is to be believed, John of Maroth was successful in these conflicts. Corroborating this, a donation to Marot from November 1403 states that he managed to repulse the enemy “de regno Sclavonie ad regnum Bozne”. Indeed, John annihilated some of Emeric’s supporters and won over others, switching their loyalty back to the “true” king. Both of these courses of action weakened support to Ladislaus of Naples and his advocates. We cannot say with absolute certainty that this took place in June and/or July. However, the similarity of the accounts in these two donations that place these events in the period after Paul of Bissen was taken prisoner and handed over to Ladislaus of Naples (who had arrived in Dalmatia in mid-July) suggests it is most likely that the events took place in this particular period. Aside from John of Maroth, it seems that Nicholas Garai also participated in the conflict. He is claimed to have attempted to free Paul of Bissen from captivity, but Emeric, who was fleeing from Nicholas, took Paul to Zadar. If John of Maroth and Nicholas Garai were indeed successful in their military campaigns, the question arises who was in control of Slavonia in summer 1403. A depiction contrary to the political situation and achievements described in Sigismund’s charters can be found in Florentine citizen Galeotto’s letter to the Florence authorities on 24 July. In this letter he reports on the state of the affairs in the Archiregnum, explaining that the entire region south of the Drava River recognizes Ladislaus as its king and that those few who defy him

12 Engel & Tóth, 2005: 80; Dvořáková, 2010: 89.
13 Šišić 1938: 260.
14 Šišić 1938: 232–233.
15 Šišić 1938: 282–283. Još se od Šišićeva primijedbe spominje da je Nikola Gorjanski oslobodio Pavla Bissena (Šišić 1904: 37, bilj. 139) što, na primjer, ponavlja i D. Lovrenović 2006: 126, bilj. 45. Međutim, u ispravi na koju se poziva Šišić stoji da je Nikola Gorjanski bili uspješni u vojnim djelovanjima, poštovu se pitanje kontrole nad Slavonijom u ljeto 1403. Jer, nasuprot slici političkih odnosa i uspjeha kakvu ocrtavaju Sigismundove isprave, stoji informacija koja je 24. srpnja zabilježena u pismu Firentinca Galeota koji gradu Fiencu daje izvješće o prilikama u kraljevstvu, u kojem se govori da se
Ladislavu podvrgavaju svi južno od rijeke Drave, a mali broj onih koji mu se suprotstavljaju, nisu velike snage.\textsuperscript{16} Koji je pak od tih viđenja političkih odnosa bliže stvarnosti, nemoguće je reći, no ne treba isključiti mogućnost fluktuiranja u kontroli i podršci koju je pojedina strana imala u Slavoniji. Pritom se, iz Sigismundova opisa djelovanja Ivana Marota, može razaznati da su vojne pobjede i iskazi vojne sile silno utjecali na raspoloženje lokalnog plemstva i na njihovu političku lojalnost. Lojalnost se nastojalo očuvariti i pozitivnom agitacijom, u kakvu spada i darovnica Emerika Bubeka Adamu i Ladislavu od Čanjevca od 20. kolovoza, izdana u Križevcima, koja još jednom otkriva Emerika Bubeka kao glavnog logističara Ladislavove stranke na prostoru Slavonije.\textsuperscript{17}

Ako je do rujna 1403. postojalo snažno djelovanje Sigismundovih protivnika uslijed kojeg je došlo do Ladislavove krnudbe u Zadru, M. Ančić zgodno primjećuje da je krnudba bila „antiklimaks svih njihovih (ugarskih velikaša i prelata, op. a.) planova i značila je stvarni poraz pa je, uz još poneti trazaj u održavanju pobunjeničke strukture i hijerarhije tijekom ljetnih mjeseci, za njih pobuna okončana u jesen kada je Sigismund svima ponudio amnestiju“.\textsuperscript{18} No prije same amnestije kraljevske su snage izvojale niz važnih pobjeda koje su dodatno omekšale otpor „pobunjenika“ i otvorile put prema ponudi amnestije koja će, kako će se pokušati, razrješiti krizu.\textsuperscript{19} Jesu li se neke od tih borbi odigravale u Slavoniji? Oslonac je potrebno opet tražiti u oskudnim informacijama Sigismundovih darovnica. Jedna od njih spominje ranjavanje Ivana Marota u sukobima pod utvrdom Emerika Bubeka poznatog po imenu \textit{Tornow}, koja se nalazila nedaleko između Nove Gradiške i Okučana. Tom je prilikom Ivan Marot teže ranjen u glavu.\textsuperscript{20} Pretpostavljam da pose no real threat.\textsuperscript{16} It is impossible to say which of these perceptions of the political situation was closer to the truth, but the possibility of fluctuations in the control by and support to either of the conflicting parties in Slavonia cannot be ruled out. It is also clear that the military victories and demonstrations of power had a strong effect on the sentiment and political loyalty of the local nobility, as can be seen in Sigismund’s description of John of Maroth’s actions. Another way of ensuring their loyalty was positive agitation, such as Emeric Bebek’s donation to Adam and Ladislaus of Čanjevac, issued in Križevci on 20 August, which once again presents Emeric Bebek as the chief logistician of Ladislaus’ party in Slavonia.\textsuperscript{17}

Even if until September 1403 Sigismund’s opponents worked hard to overthrow and defeat him, even crowning Ladislaus in Zadar, M. Ančić perceptively observes that the coronation was the “anticlimax of their [Hungarian aristocrats’ and prelates’] plans, effectively signaling their defeat; notwithstanding some further efforts to uphold the structure and hierachy of the rebel camp during the summer months, their revolt was terminated in autumn, when Sigismund offered amnesty to them.”\textsuperscript{18} But before the amnesty, the king’s forces won several important battles that helped overcome the rebels’ resistance and pave the way for the amnesty that, as it would turn out, would resolve the crisis.\textsuperscript{19} Did any of these battles take place in Slavonia? We should once again resort to the scarce information from Sigismund’s donations. According to one of them, John of Maroth was wounded under Emeric Bebek’s fortress known as \textit{Tornow}, that stood somewhere between Nova Gradiška and Okučani, where he received a severe wound on the head.\textsuperscript{20} I presume

\begin{enumerate}
\item[16] Šišić 1938: 209–210.
\item[17] Šišić 1938: 215.
\item[18] Ančić 2009: 74.
\item[19] For the letter, see Šišić 1938: 219; for the battles of Sigismund’s forces, see Engel 2001: 207–208; Hoensch 1996: 112–113; Dvořáková 2010: 91–93; Šišić 1902: 163–164.
\item[20] For identification of the exact location of the fortress, see Engel, 1996, 446 and Engel 2001a: 294; P. Rokai’s suggestion that it was in Tornovo in Lika is much less substantiated; also, while the author analyzes the military activities of John of Maroth in 1403, his exposition could not be used here because the author did not attempt to determine the exact dates of the events, Rokai 1983: 146–153.
\end{enumerate}
je do sukoba moglo doći nakon što se Ivan vratio sa sjevera Ugarske gdje je bio pošao ka kralju u Bratislavu, dakle negdje tijekom kasnog kolovoza ili rujna. Zadobivena ozljeda također objašnjava zašto ga neko vrijeme ne vidimo u vojnim djelovanjima, a inače je bio jedan od ključnih Sigismundovih vojskovoda u cijelom razdoblju krize njegove vlasti. Na samom kraju mjesečar, 30. rujna, u jednom pismu Dubrovčanima Sigismund najavljuje pohod prema Slavoniji gdje se planirao sukobiti sa svojim neprijateljima, no do toga ipak nije došlo – u susretu s pobunjenicima početkom listopada postignut je sporazum koji je rezultirao izdavanjem kraljevske povelje od 8. listopada.21

OD PONUDE KRALJEVSKOG OPROSTA DO REGISTRA NEVJERNIH

Tom poveljom zapravo je, kao i u Pápi 29. listopada 1401., ponuđeno pomilovanje kraljevim protivnicima.22 No, naspram situaciji u listopadu 1401., kada mu je nakon puštanja iz zatvora položaj još bio uzdman, ponuda dvije godine kasnije otkriva daleko odlučnijeg vladara koji je naumio pružiti ruku pomirbe svojim protivnicima, ali pod točno utvrđenim uvjetima. Da bi stekli kraljevsku milost – vrijedi primijetiti da je takav rječnik potpuno odsutan u povelji iz Pápe – pobunjenici su trebali prestati s neprijateljstvima te se podložiti kralju, čime im se garantirao oprost prijašnjih zločina te vraćanje posjeda. Osim toga trebali su se u roku od jedne godine pojaviti pred kraljem da bi iskazali svoju vjernost, o čemu bi bila izdana i kraljevska povelja o milosti. Za one pak koji su nakon isteka roka – u slučaju kraja južno od Drave u roku od 15 dana – nastavili s neprijateljstvima, kraljevska milost nije vrijedila te nisu mogli izbjeći osudu za svoja "zlodjela".23 Čak su i oni poput Bebek i Kaniških koji nisu u dogovorenom roku prihvatili kraljevsku ponudu, ipak to učinili do kraja listopada, što međutim ne znači da su svi uspjeli steći kraljevsku milost. Od samog kraja listopada, to jest početka studenoga, počinje cijeli niz kraljevskih darovnica kojima se kraljevi

21 Šišić 1938: 215.
22 Dőry 1976: 175–179; Šišić 1938: 177–178.
23 Dőry 1976: 175–179.

that the battle took place after John came back from northern Hungary, where he had gone on his way to the king in Bratislava. This would place the battle in late August or September. John’s wounding could explain why he took no part in military activities for a while (he had been one of Sigismund’s leading generals during the crisis of his rule). On 30 September, Sigismund wrote a letter to Dubrovnik authorities, announcing a campaign against his enemies in Slavonia. But it never happened – in early October he reached an agreement with the rebels, declaring it in a royal charter of 8 October.21

FROM THE OFFER OF ROYAL PARDON TO THE REGISTER OF REBELS

Just like in Pápa on 29 October 1401, the charter offered royal pardon to the king’s opponents.22 But unlike in October 1401, when his position was still shaky after his release from prison, the offer of pardon two years later reveals a much resolute ruler who intends to make peace with his opponents, but under strictly defined conditions. In order to be restored to royal grace (indicatively, such vocabulary cannot be found in the Pápa charter), the rebels had to cease hostilities and submit themselves to their king; the pardon for their previous misdeeds and regaining their estates would thus be guaranteed. They also had to appear before the king within a year in order to manifest their loyalty to him, upon which a charter of royal pardon would be issued. Royal pardon was not to be granted to those who fail to cease hostilities after expiry of the deadline (15 days for those from the areas south of the Drava River) and there would be no way for them to avoid sentence for their “misdeeds.”23 The ones like Bebek and members of the Kanizsai family, who failed to accept royal pardon on time, did that by the end of October. However, it does not mean all of Sigismund’s enemies managed to be restored to royal grace. Late October and early November saw a flood of royal donations rewarding the king’s supporters with the estates of those who had persisted in their revolt. Many of
pobornici nagrađuju posjedima onih koji su ustrajali u pobuni, a među njima nemali je broj onih koji se tišu Slavonije. Tako je Nikola, sin Martina de Seremio, familijar Stjepana, sina Grgura de Berenche, dobio posjede Zenthmiklos i Buthkafelde u Križevačkoj županiji, koji su pripadali Baltazaru, Petru, Jakovu, Filipu i Demetru, sinovima Konrada de Buthkafelde, a koji su se borili u banderiju priora Emerika.24 Nadalje, 2. listopada izdana je darovnica u korist prethodno spomenutog Stjepana de Berenche te preko njega banu Pavlu Bissenu, Nikoli Bissenu de Hord te Petru de Ezdege, koji su dobili posjede Demetria i Jurja sinova Grgura od Međurića, koji su bili familijari priora Emerika.25 Literat Pavao, sin Lovre de Zenthandras koji se borio pod banderijem bana Ladislava, sina Ladislava od Gordove, a preko njega i njegovi sinovi Nikola i Stjepan te Grgur Ivanov de Pongrachouch, dobili su posjede Ladislava Nikola de Zentiwan koji je bio u banderiju priora Emerika.26 Nadalje, Ladislav Nikolin od Kreštelovca, koji se nalazio u banderiju Nikole Gorjanskog, 4. studenoga dobiva posjede Jakova Gallicusa de Orbowa, Andrije, Franje i Konrada, Lukinih sinova, te Ivana, sina potonjeg Andrije de Hrusowch, Nikole, Ugrinovog sina, Benedikta, Dominika i Boleta, Valentinnovih sinova, Samsena, sina Jurja sinu istog Valentina od Kreštelovca, te Benedikta, sina Petra od Voćina, koji su bili familijari priora Emerika i kalockog nadbiskupa Ivana.27 Petog studenoga kraljevskom su ispravom oduzeti posjedi Jakovu, sinu Blagomnje de Kapolna, nekoć de Kamarcha, koji je bio u banderiju kalockog nadbiskupa, a dobio ih je miles egregius Mathija zvan Zaz de Tomasouche koji se borio u kraljevskom banderiju.28 Istog dana i Ivan Marot dobio je posjede Nikole, Ivanu i Benedikti Demetrijevih, Pavla Nikolina, Ladislava i Ivana Stjepanovih Pekria.29 Šestog studenoga Dominik, sin Tome sin Beke de Dobouche i Sabnicha iz Križevačke županije, familijar priora Emerika, koji je awarded the former estates of Ladislaus of Seremio, son of Martin, the familiaris (retainer) of Stephen of Berenche (son of Gregory), was awarded the Zenthmiklos and Buthkafelde estates in Križevci County that once belonged to Balthasar, Jacob, Philip and Demetrius of Buthkafelde, sons of Korhardus, who had fought in Prior Emeric’s banderium.24 By a royal donation of 2 October, the above-mentioned Stephen of Berenche and, through him, Ban Paul of Bissen of Hord and Peter of Ozdöge, were awarded the former estates of Demetrius and George, sons of Gregory of Međurić, the retainers of Prior Emeric.25 Paul litteratus, son of Lawrence of Zenthandras, who had fought in the banderium of Ban Ladislaus (son of Ladislaus of Gordova), and through him his sons Nicholas and Stephen, and Gregory of Pongrachouch (son of John), were awarded the former estates of Ladislaus of Zentiwan (son of Nicolas), who had been in Prior Emeric’s banderium.26 On 4 November, Ladislaus of Kreštelovac (son of Nicholas), a member of Nicholas Garai’s banderium, was awarded the former estates of Jacob Gallicus of Orbowa, Andrew, Francis and Conrad (sons of Luke), John of Hrusowch (son of the aforementioned Andrew), Nicholas (son of Ugrin), Benedict, Dominic and Boleta (sons of Valentin), Samson (son of George who, in turn, was the son of the aforementioned Valentin of Kreštelovac), and Benedict (son of Peter of Voćin), all of them retainers of Prior Emeric and John, Bishop of Kalocsa.27 By a royal charter of 5 November, estates were taken away from Jacob of Kapolna (son of Blagonja, formerly of Kamarcha), a member of the banderium of Bishop of Kalocsa, and were awarded to miles egregius Mathew de Tomasouche (called Zaz), who had fought in the king’s banderium.28 On the same day, John of Maroth was awarded the estates of Nicholas, John and Benedict (sons of Demetrius), Paul (son of Nicholas) and Ladislaus and John Pekri (sons of Stephen).29 On 6 November, Dominic (son of Thomas, son of
bio i njegov župan Dubice 1403.\textsuperscript{30} izgubio je posjede koji su darovani Andriji, Pavlu i Stjepanu, sinovima Beke de Zawersa te Nikoli literatu, Tomi, Stjepanu i Ivanu, sinovima Petra de Zadorfalwa, familijarima Nikole Totha Susedgradskog i Mućina Lipovečkog.\textsuperscript{31} Sedmog je pak studenog kralj dao posjedovne čestice pobunjenika Pavla de Beche u Križevačkoj županiji Mikuće de Zenthpeter.\textsuperscript{32}

Valja istaknuti da su to tek neki sačuvani primjeri koji otkrivaju pobunjenike u Slavoniji na temelju prvog valu kraljevskih darivanja oduzeteh posjeda; broj je, što će se vidjeti u daljnjem izlaganju, bio daleko veći, no zajedničke su im dvije stvari. Kao prvo, najveći dio njih pratio je priora Emerika Bubeka, što potvrđuje optužbe na njegov račun u Sigismundovim darovnicama, to jest otkriva ga kao glavnog vodu i organizatora Ladislavove stranke u Slavoniji. Kao prior od 1392., zahvaljujući i materijalnim resursima reda kojem je stajao na čelu i banskoj časti tijekom 1402., Emerik je mogao stvoriti gustu mrežu kljenata u Slavoniji koju je onda mogao aktivirati u trenutcima sukoba, a služio je i kao stup za sve one koji su se iz drugih razloga protivili Sigismundovoj vlasti. Kao drugo, gotovo svi koji su izgubili posjede dolaze iz Križevačke županije, iznimno je mali onih iz Zagrebačke.\textsuperscript{33} To može biti povezano s nekoliko činjenica, a prva je smještaj glavnih posjeda priorata, kojih nema na prostoru Zagrebačke županije.\textsuperscript{34} Nadalje, jedan od najvećih slavonskih zemljoposjednika, zagrebački skup, pozicija koju je tada držao Eberhard, cijelo je vrijeme pristajao uz Sigismunda, a aktivan su mu podršku izgleda davali i ranije spomenuti plemići od Zomzedvara i Lipovečki. Kad su u pitanju druge važne obitelji s posjedima u Zagrebačkoj županiji, poput Blagajskih i Zrinskih, njihovu je političku odanost teško razaznati, prvenstveno jer granica između kraljevskih pristaša i pobunjenika nije bila nepromjenjena, ali u ovom je

\textsuperscript{30} Engel 1996: 82.  
\textsuperscript{31} MNL OL, DF 230836, 230835.  
\textsuperscript{32} MNL OL, DF 230838.  
\textsuperscript{33} Za Zagrebačku županiju v. opasku kod Miljan 2015: 196; dok za plemstvo Križevačke v. impresivnu studiju Pálffyfalvi 2014, naročito začuđuju od 342–343.  
\textsuperscript{34} Za utvrde reda v. kartu kod Hunyadi 2010: 66.
kontekstu najvažnije da nisu odveć otvoreno radili protiv Sigismunda.35

Bez obzira na te razlike između Zagrebačke i Križevačke županije prethodne su kraljevske darovnice sa samog kraja listopada ili početka studenoga na diskurzivnoj razini govore o Slavoniji kao o cjelini te su je suprotstavljale Hrvatskoj i Dalmaciji, za koje se naglašava da su u potpunosti izvan dometa Sigismundova autoriteta. No ni sama Slavonija izgleda nije bila do kraja podvrgnuta kontroli, odnosno nekoliko je elemenata koji su pridonosili nesigurnosti. Kažu prvo, određeni i izgleda ne tako mali broj plemića još je ustrajano na sukobima. Osim toga, figure poput Emerika Bubeka, makar su vratile Sigismundov milost i dalje su bile neugodni susjedi. Tako su u lipnju 1404. slavonski banovi uputili nalog Čazmanskom kaptolu da u posjed Ermenvicu uvede Pavla literata i Stjepana Lovrina de Sancto Andrea, koji im je na ime vjernosti dao kralj, no u čiji posjed zbog straha od priora Emerika nisu mogli ući, a sada kada je on pokojni, to čine.36 Neligurnost u drugom pogledu otkriva slučaj Katarine, udovice Jurja Batthyányija, i njezinih maloljetnih sinova Albert, Ladislava i Jurja. Oni su se pred kraljem tužili da su im biskup Eberhard i Ivan Marot (kojeg se tu naziva slavonskim banom, dokaz prije svega da je bio Sigismundov čovjek zadužen za vojne operacije južno od Drave) nepravedno oduzeli slavonski posjed Zenthjacab na račun kraljevske darovnice koja ih prikazuje kao nevjerne. Kralj je pak uvažio njihove pritužbe te ih uzeo u svoju zaštitu.37 Dakle, dok su pobunjenici unosili nered i nesigurnost, jednako su to radili i kraljevi pouzdanici, koristeći priliku da bi se beskrupulozno domogli posjeda.

Iz takve dvostruke nesigurnosti proizlazila je potreba daljnog djelovanja u Slavoniji, koja je tijekom prosinca poprimila specifičan oblik u vidu aktivnosti petorice velikaša – zagrebačkog biskupa Eberharda, mačanskog bana Ivana Marota, this context, what matters the most is that they did not openly side against Sigismund.35

Notwithstanding the differences between Zagreb and Križevci Counties, earlier royal donations (those from late October and early November) perceived Slavonia as a whole at the level of discourse, juxtaposing it against Croatia and Dalmatia (and stating that Sigismund had never established his rule over the latter two). But it seems that Slavonia itself was not completely under his rule and that there were elements which contributed to insecurity in that region. For one thing, a number (rather large, it seems) of noblemen still insisted on continuation of the conflict. Also, figures like Emeric Bebek, although restored to Sigismund’s favor, continued to be objectionable neighbors. Thus, in June 1404, the bans of Slavonia instructed the Chapter of Ćazma to introduce Paul litteratus and Stephen de Sancto Andrea (son of Lawrence) into the possession of Ermenvica estate awarded to them by the king for their loyalty, which had not been done by then for fear of Prior Emeric, but now he was dead.36 There were other manifestations of the abovementioned insecurity, like in the case of Catherine, widow of George Batthyány, and her under-aged sons Albert, Ladislaus and George. They complained to the king that Bishop Eberhard and John of Maroth (the latter being referred to as a Slavonian ban, which can be seen primarily as evidence that he was in charge of Sigismund’s military campaigns south of the Drava) wrongfully deprived them of the possession of their Slavonian estate Zenthjacab because they had been declared rebels in a royal donation. The king upheld their complaint and took them under his protection.37 Clearly, both the rebels and the loyal noblemen created disturbances and insecurity, unscrupulously using the opportunity to get hold of other people’s estates.

This double insecurity called for action in Slavonia. In December, it was five barons who took the

---

35 Ančić 2009: 65–69; za drukčiji pogled koji ne ostavlja mjesta dvojbi o političkoj odanosti Zrinskih Sigismundu v. kod Karbić i Miljan 2012: 100–103; te za Blagajske Kekez 2015 koji pak ne konzultira Ančić 2009; za promjene strana pojedinaca nakon što su 1402. prihvatili Sigismundov dogovor o nasljeđivanju s Albertom Habsburškim v. Bard 1978: 26, bilj. 2.
36 Šišić 1938: 242–243.
37 Šišić 1938: 235.
banova Dalmacije, Hrvatske i Slavonije Ladislava od Gordove i Pavla Bissen te Martina Dersa, uz koje se pojavljuje i tavernik Nikola Treutel38 – koji su prema kraljevskom nalogu za kraj godine, 28. prosinca, sazvali shod (congregatio generalis) u Križevcima.39 Kakvo objašnjenje za takav potez daju same isprave izdane tijekom tog shoda? U srži stoji potreba jasnijeg razdvajanja vjernih od nevjernih ili, kako se veli, plemstvo okupljeno na shodu trebalo je pomoći iustos ab inustis fidelesque ab infidelibus sequestrare et manifeste propallare, jer je u procesu dijeljenja kraljevskih darovnica dobar dio njih išao nauštrb onih koji su ostali vjerni Sigismundu, na što ukazuje i ranije spomenuti primjer Batthanyija, ili nauštrb onih koji su se pak pridržavali uvjeta za dobivanje milosti.40 Sve stoga upućuje na probleme koje je dvor imao nakon ponude kraljevske milosti pobunjenicima iz listopada 1403. u razlučivanju „vjernih i nevjernih“, što je komplicirao niz faktora: velikaši su i slavonsko plemstvo denuncirali svoje protivnike te bili nagrađivani njihovim posjedima, a takve optužbe nije se moglo uzmati zdravo za gotovo; neki su plemići dobivali pomilovanje, ali se pokazalo da su i dalje u straju u stvaranju nereda u kraljevstvu, dočim su neki po pomilovanju uistinu odustajali od daljnjeg otpora, ali su im posjedi svejedno bili oduzeti. Sve to stvaralo je ogromnu zbrku i otežavalo raspetljavanje političke krize na mikrorazini, odnosno dvoru je bilo vrlo teško imati pouzdane informacije, a susljedno tome i držati nadzor nad

action: Eberhard (Bishop of Zagreb), John of Maroth (Ban of Mačva), Ladislaus of Gordova and Paul of Bissen (Bans of Dalmatia, Croatia and Slavonia), and Martin Ders, together with magister tavarnicorum Nicholas Treutel.38 By the king’s order, they convened the assembly (congregatio generalis) in Križevci for 28 December.39 The reason for this move can be found in the charters issued during the assembly. In essence, there was a need for establishing a clear line between the rebels and loyal noblemen or, as it was stated in the charters, the assembled noblemen were supposed to help “iustos ab inustis fidelesque ab infidelibus sequestrare et manifeste propallare”, because a number of royal donations were made at the expense of those who had remained loyal to Sigismund (as the case of the abovementioned Batthyány family indicates) or those who had fulfilled the requirements for receiving royal grace.40 All this indicates the problems that the king’s court was facing in telling loyal nobleman from rebels after the royal pardon offered to the rebels in October 1403. These problems were caused by a number of factors: barons and Slavonian nobility were denouncing their opponents and were in return awarded their estates. Such accusations could not be taken for granted. On the one hand, some noblemen were pardoned but it turned out they persisted in creating disorder in the realm; others, on the other hand, really gave up further resistance, but were deprived of their estates nevertheless. All this caused major

38 Šišić 1938: 237.
39 Pet isprava u kojima se spominje shod naveo je Rokai 1983: 566, bilj. 102, a riječ je o regestima br. 2905, 2906, 2907, 3660 i 4704 kod ZsO, II/1.
40 MNL OL, DF 8937: „fideles qui eorum personas possessiones et cuncta bona fortune casibus submittendo pro honoris ipsius domini nostri domini Sigismundi regis augmento et sue sacre corone exaltacione gratissima et laudedigna servicia exhibendo studuerunt complacere“.
lokálnim prilikama u takvim okolnostima. Tako se u gotovo svim darovnicama izdanim tijekom kraja listopada i početka studenoga navodi da recipijen- ti oduzetih posjeda dvoru trebaju javiti broj selišta koja su dobili, što također ukazuje na prijeku po- trebu dvora za raznim vrstama informacija koje je bilo zahtjevno prikupiti. Pritom ne treba smetnuti s umi i iduče: iz pozicije naknadne pameti mo- dernim je povjesničarima jasno da je Sigismund uspješno riješio prijetnju svojoj vlasti, no krajem 1403. to se nije moralo činiti tako izglednim. Slav- onija je predstavljala granicu s područjima koja nisu uopće priznavaли Sigismundovu vlast, to jest s obzirom na prethodnih 20-ak godina teško da je itko mogao zamisliti da će idućih 30-ak godi- na Sigismundove vladavine vladavine proći bez tako velikih izazova njegovu kraljevskom autoritetu. U tom kontekstu poslanstvo petorice velikaša funkciono- ralo je kao demonstracija moći, ali je njihov zada- tak bio i uvođenje reda na lokalnoj razini da bi se izbjegla mogućnost tinjanja ponovnog otpora koji bi mogla generirati nesigurnost i nered nastao, između ostalog, mahanjem ispravama izdanim u kraljevo ime. Što se može razaznati o radu shoda?

U relevantnim se dokumentima navodi da je shod privukao velik broj plemića te da su prisežnici bili dužni zaprsegnutni na raspele, ali i na relijkvije, koje se inače ne pojavljuju kao element u takvim ritualnim radnjama na slavonskim općim shodovima u prethodnom razdoblju.41 Potom je njihov zadatak bio utvrditi tko je zapravo ostao nevjeran Sigis- mundu, to jest utvrditi tko nije zaslužio da se uz njegovo ime veže infidelitatis notam, crimen contagium ac maculam, kako se veli u jednoj ispravi.42 Takvo što uključivalo je i rješavanje praktičnih posjedovnih pravnih pitanja, koja su se na primjer ticala posjeda danih u zalog, a koji su sada bili oduzeti.43 Osmi pak dan održavanja shoda bio je posljednji, te su tog 4. siječnja petorica velikaša izdavala povelje dvostru- kog sadržaja. Jedne su garantirale nečiju vjernost, to jest sklanjale su s njegova imena mogućnost prisiva- nja etikete pobunjenika, a takve su bile na primjer isprave izdan u korist Tome Martinova de Mend- zenth iz Križevačke županije te Ivana Andrijinog de confusion and made the resolution of the political crisis at the micro level more difficult because the Court had large problems obtaining reliable information and thus maintaining control over local state of affairs. For example, in almost every donation issued in late October and early November it is specified that all the recipients of the confiscated estates should inform the court about the number of tenant plots they had received. This also indicates that various types of information were much needed by the court because they were hard to ob- tain. One should also keep in mind that, while it is clear to modern historians that Sigismund was successful in dealing with the threats to his power, the prospects for it may not have seemed so certain in late 1403, especially because Slavonia bor- dered on the regions that did not recognize Sigis- mund’s rule. Given the past 20 years, the contem- poraries must have had hard time believing that the following 30 years of his reign would be free of such major challenges to his royal authority. In this context, the deputation of five barons was a demonstration of power. However, their mission was also to bring order at the local level in order to avoid renewed sparks of resistance resulting from the insecurity and disorder created, among other things, by wielding royal charters. What is known about the assembly itself?

According to relevant sources, a large number of noblemen attended it. Sworn assessors were obliged to swear not only on the crucifix but also on the holy relics. Indicatively, the latter had usu- ally been absent from such rituals at earlier general assemblies in Slavonia.41 Their task was also to es- tablish who had actually remained disloyal to Sigis- mund and who did not deserve to have the stain of unfaithfulness attached to their name (“infidelitatis notam, crimen contagium ac maculam”, as specified in one source).42 This also included solving legal possessory issues – for example, the cases of confiscation of pledged estates.43 On the eighth – final – day of the assembly (4 January), the five noblemen were issuing two kinds of charters. One guaranteed a person’s loyalty and thus eliminated the possibility

41 MNL OL, DL 24705.
42 MNL OL, DF 282216.
43 Šišić 1938: 237–238.
Horzowa i njegovih sinova. Druge su pak potvrđivala nečiju nevjeru te su im oduzimani posjedi. Ivan Marot dobio je posjede Pekrija koje mu je kralj već darovao početkom studenoga, Martin Ders i njegov brat Sigismund dobili su posjede Ladislava Stepanova, Stepana i Ivana, Ivanovi sinova, te Petra Herceka i Sigismunda, sinova Ladislava od Also-lindva, a Ladislav i Adam Kastellanfy dobili su posjede Ivana Tiboldova de Zenche.

Kako bi pak u potpunosti iustos ab iustitis fidelesque ab infidelibus sequestrare et manifeste propallare, osim što je izabran shod kao najjavniji oblik političke komunikacije tog društva, čime se na pojavnoj razini, u smislu fizičke prisutnosti, radila razlika „vjernih” i „nevjernih”, razdjelnica je uspostavljena i u trajnijem obliku, u formi pisane riječi. Naime, na shodu je sastavljen i registar (registrum), koji nije ostao sačuvan, već se u izvori pojavljuje tek nekoliko puta, u koji su unosena imena „nevjernih”, koje su imenovali priseznici određeni na tome shodu. Shod i unos imena u poseban dokument (registrum) dio su rutinskog repertoara kojim se tijekom 14. stoljeća održavao red, odnosno borilo protiv notornih zločinaca (malefactores) koji su narušavali red u lokalnim

44 MNL OL, DF 282216, 230845.
45 ZsO, II/1, dok. 2905, MNL OL, DL 8937.
46 ZsO, II/1, dok. 2906. Prilikom izdavanja darovnica navedeni su velikaši pazili da se, u slučaju da su oni recepinti, njihovo ime ne nade među onima koji podjeljuju darovnicu.
47 ZsO, II/1, dok. 2907, MNL OL, DL 42830. Ivan Tiboldov je pak 28. listopada dobio kraljevske isprave o posebnoj milosti, I. Mažuran 2002: 259.
48 MNL OL, DL 33081: „qui in registro in generali congregatione ex speciali mandato et commissione eiusdem domini nostri regis in regno Sclovonie (…) pro inquirendis et notandis fidelibus et infidelibus regni sui Sclovonie pridem celebrata inter infideles suos in eidem registro conscriptis non inuenerentur”; Lukinović 1992: 286–288: „hi, qui in congregatione generali (…) ex commissione eiusdem regie maiestatis, hic Crisii celebreta, extradari, ac in regesto infidelium quinque sigillis eorundem pretorium et baronum consignato”; MNL OL, DL 32763: „viso et diligenter examinato pretacto regesto in quo scilicet tempore sepefactae congregationis generalis nomina nostrorum infidelium conscripta sunt et intitulata”; „per iuratos assessoris dicte congregationis generalis pro nostris et sacre notoriis infidelibus adeherentibusque ipsius Ladislai filii condam Karoli et suorum sequacium extradati, numerati et reputati”, Mažuran 2002: 326.

44 MNL OL, DF 282216, 230845.
45 ZsO, II/1, doc. 2905, MNL OL, DL 8937.
46 ZsO, II/1, doc. 2906. When issuing the donations, the abovementioned noblemen made sure that, if they were the recipients, their respective names would not be included among those awarding the donation.
47 ZsO, II/1, doc. 2907, MNL OL, DL 42830. John, son of Tibold, received a royal document on special royal grace on 28 October, I. Mažuran 2002: 259.
48 MNL OL, DL 33081: “qui in registro in generali congregatione ex speciali mandato et commissione eiusdem domini nostri regis in regno Sclovonie (…) pro inquirendis et notandis fidelibus et infidelibus regni sui Sclovonie pridem celebrata inter infideles suos in eidem registro conscriptis non inuenerentur”; Lukinović 1992: 286–288: “hi, qui in congregatione generali (…) ex commissione eiusdem regie maiestatis, hic Crisii celebreta, extradari, ac in regesto infidelium quinque sigillis eorundem pretorium et baronum consignato”; MNL OL, DL 32763: “viso et diligenter examinato pretacto regesto in quo scilicet tempore sepefactae congregationis generalis nomina nostrorum infidelium conscripta sunt et intitulata”; “per iuratos assessoris dicte congregationis generalis pro nostris et sacre notoriis infidelibus adeherentibusque ipsius Ladislai filii condam Karoli et suorum sequacium extradati, numerati et reputati”, Mažuran 2002: 326.
of names were part of a regular repertoire used in the 14th century to maintain order and fight notorious criminals (malefactors) who were disturbing peace in local societies. Relying on such crisis-solving mechanism is indicative for the court’s view of the situation in Slavonia in late 1403. One should nevertheless keep in mind that the situation was far from routine; rather, it was a reaction to the aftermath of a serious political crisis. Convening an assembly presided by five barons sent by the court and the presence of holy relics suggest that the regular mechanisms – normally used for separating and punishing those responsible for serious public disturbance – were now used under extraordinary circumstances.

The actions of the royal deputation in late 1403, including the making of the register, had two goals. On the one hand, they were supposed to instill fear and the perception of a responsible and efficient government, thus suppressing any resistance to Sigismund’s authority in a region bordering with the parts of the kingdom that had remained outside his power. They were mostly successful in it – there would be no indications of actions against Sigismund’s authority in the subsequent period. On the other hand, the rewarding/punishing processes had to be put in order and thus provide the court with reliable information about the political loyalty of the Slavonian nobility. This could eliminate the abuses and wrong decisions that had clearly created discontent among those who considered themselves wronged and that could furnish fertile ground for rekindling the resistance. In this respect, the Register of Rebels seems very important for understanding the administrative practice and functioning of both the kingdom and the court, as well as for the delicate issue of separating the loyal noblemen from the rebels even after the assembly in late 1403 which is crucial for understanding the local conditions in Slavonia in the first decade of the 15th century.

49 Rady 2000: 166–167; for the example of the assembly register in Szabolcs and Bereg Counties, see Tóth, 2019; for a useful analogy for royal boroughs, see Szende 2018: 151–152, 170; for Slavonian assemblies in the 14th century in general, see Halász 2017.
svibnja u kojoj se navodi da su mu Gašpar i Petar Andrijini de Precezha pokazali kraljevske isprave. U njima je stajalo da je kralj s prelatima i barunima odlučio da se svima onima čije se ime ne može pronaći u registru nevjernih trebaju vratiti njihovi posjedi, pa je tako kralj dvojici banova dao u nalog da uvedu navedene plemiće u njihov posjed koji im kralj vrća jer njihovo ime nije pronašao u navedenom registru. Teško je pobliže vremenski odrediti nastanak takve kraljevske odluke, odnosno kada je nastao i odaslan navedeni nalog banovima, no širi kontekst u kojem ona nastaje pokazuje da problem nije bio samo lokalni, slavonski, već na razini cijelog kraljevstva. Naime, u prosincu 1404. izdan je kraljevski dekret koji je bio odgovor na pritužbe nemalog broja plemića čiji su posjedi bili oduzeti i podijeljeni Sigismundovim privrženicima. Dio njih tvrdio je da je dobio posebnu milost kralja, dio je tvrdio da nije radio protiv kralja sukladno po nudi kraljevske milosti iz listopada 1403., dok se neki nisu ni na kakav način ogriješili o kralja, a svejedno su im posjedi oduzeti i darovani trećima. Navedene pritužbe zapravo ukazuju na poteškoće u rješavanju upravo onih problema koji su se pojavili već nakon studenoga 1403. i koji su, barem dijelom, stajali iza odluke za dje lovanjem u Slavoniji kroz formu shoda i izrade registra. Problemi su to uostalom koji se jasno pokazuju i u Slavoniji, u cjelokupnom rasponu slučajeva navedenom u Sigismundovu dekretu, i iza siječnja 1404. Herman Grebenski, koji je pristajao uz ostrogonskoga nadbiskupa Ivana Kanisskog, u travnju 1404. dobio je kraljevu posebnu milost, no kralj je u travnju 1405. morao dati u nalog slavonskim banovima da ga zaštite jer su njegovi rođaci Nikola i Ivan Petrovi Grebenski na ime kraljevske darovnice zauzeli i držali njegove posjede. Sličan je i primjer Grgura Mihovilova de Gyepew koji je 25. kolovoza 1404. dobio posebnu kraljevu milost, no čije posjede je, između ostalih, zahtijevao zagrebački biskup Eberhard u veljači 1405. pred kraljem. Eberhard se tužio da mu banovi nisu omogućili uživanje posjeda većeg broja slavonskih plemića koji su bili

All mentions of the register – three of them altogether – date from May and June 1406. It is first mentioned in the charter of Herman of Celje of 6 May, stating that Casper and Peter of Precezha, sons of Andrew, presented royal charters to him. The charters specified that the king, prelates and barons had decided that estates should be returned to all those whose names were not in the Register of Rebels and that, since their names were not found in the register, these noblemen should be introduced into the possession of their estate. This king’s decision and his order to the bans to carry it out are hard to date accurately, but the context in which the decision was made indicates that the problem did not concern only Slavonia – it concerned the entire kingdom. As a reaction to the complaints of a large number of noblemen whose estates had been confiscated and awarded to Sigismund’s supporters, a royal decree was issued in December 1404. Some of them claimed they had received royal grace, others claimed they had not worked against the king in accordance with the royal grace offered in 1403, while yet others claimed they had done nothing against the king but their estates had been confiscated nevertheless and awarded to third parties. These complaints reflect the difficulties in solving the problems that arose immediately after November 1403 and that, at least partly, were the reason for convening the assembly and making the register in Slavonia. After all, the entire wide range of cases mentioned in Sigismund’s decree were clearly present in Slavonia even after January 1404. Herman of Greben, who had sided with John of Kaniza, the Bishop of Esztergom, received special royal grace in April 1404. Still, in April 1405 the king was forced to order the Slavonian bans to protect Herman, because his relatives Nicholas and John of Greben (sons of Peter) had taken and kept his estates on the basis of the royal donation. Similar was the case of Gregory of Gyepew (son of Michael). Although he had received special royal grace on 25 August 1404, Eberhard, Bishop of Zagreb, demanded his estates from the king in February 1405. Eberhard complained that the bans refused to let him enjoy the estates of a number of Slavonian noblemen

50 DRMH, II, 31–32.
51 Šišić 1938: 239–240, 246–247.
određeni kao nevjerni na shodu 1403., između ostalih i Grgurovih, a koje mu je kralj darovao. Nadalje, na isti dan kad i Grgu Gypew i Nikola Latkov dobio je kraljevsku milost jer nakon roka nije radio nikakvih zlođjela, ali su svejedno njegovi posjedi darovani Nikoli de Newna. Posljednju kategoriju iz Sigismundova dekreta predstavljaju slučajevi nalik onome ranije spomenutih Gašpara i Petra de Precezha, koji nisu ništa zgriješili. Sve to ukazuje na nesigurnost u posjedovnim pravima koja je u dobroj mjeri bila izazvana kontradiktornim i suprotstavljenim kraljevskim darivanjima posjeda i dijeljenjima milosti. Da je stanje u Slavoniji odgovaralo tonu iz kraljevskog prosinačkog dekreta, ukazuje nadalje kraljeva najava iz studenoga 1405. o planiranom održavanju općeg shoda pod kraljevim predsjedanjem u Slavoniji, no do kojeg očigledno nije došlo. U konačnici, upravo oblik u kojem su kralj i njegovi baruni kao opće pravilo odredili da se posjedi vrate svima onima čije ime nije na registru nevjernika, otkriva da takvih slučajeva nije bilo malo, odnosno nazire se da su upravo takvi problemi značajno opterećivali lokalne prilike te su utjecali na odluke dvora o načinu upravljanja Slavonijom. To otkrivaju i aktivnosti Hermana Celjskog u Slavoniji.

Naime, 7. lipnja u Križevcima, dok je sjedio na sudu sa slavonskim plemstvom, pred njih je došao nemali broj plemića koji su upućivali pritužbe da su im posjedi i posjedovna prava u nedavnim nemirima zauzeta i oduzeta. Na to je Herman, imajući pred očima Boga i njegovu pravdu te brinući se za kraljevu dušu, kako se veli u ispravi, odlučio da oni koji su kralj i njegovi baruni kao opće pravilo odredili da se posjedi vrate svima onima čije ime nije na registru nevjernika, otkriva da takvih slučajeva nije bilo malo, odnosno nazire se da su upravo takvi problemi značajno opterećivali lokalne prilike te su utjecali na odluke dvora o načinu upravljanja Slavonijom. To otkrivaju i aktivnosti Hermana Celjskog u Slavoniji.

King spent most of 1405 south of the Drava and thus had an opportunity to learn directly about the local discontent; for instance, see Engel & Tóth 2005: 83–84. After all, the fact that the king and his barons ordered estates to be returned to those whose names were not in the Register of Rebels indicates that such cases were many and that such problems substantially affected the local state of affairs and court’s administration of Slavonia. The activities of Herman of Celje in Slavonia also reveal this. In Križevci, on 7 June, while he was passing verdicts together with Slavonian nobility, a number of noblemen appeared before him complaining that they had been deprived of their estates and their proprietary rights during recent unrest. According to a charter, Herman decided, with God and His justice on his mind and concerned for the king’s soul, that those whose names had not been entered into the Register of Rebels should be given back their estates and that their rights should be protected. It was explicitly the same agenda as the one espoused in the royal mandate in connection with the Prezechne case. The register was read in public, as can be seen from the case of Nicholas of Buthkafelde (sons of John). Their names had not been entered into the register, which meant...(including Gregory’s) donated to him by the king after the noblemen had been identified as rebels at the assembly of 1403. Nicholas son of Latko received royal grace on the same day as Gregory Gypew, based on the fact that he had committed no crimes after the deadline. Still, his estates were awarded to Nicholas of Newna. The final category of the cases in Sigismund’s decree is the one comprising cases like the one of the abovementioned Casper and Peter of Prezechta, who had committed no crimes whatsoever. All this indicates insecurity in proprietary rights, caused largely by the king’s contradictory donations and royal pardons. King’s November 1405 announcement of a general assembly in Slavonia with him presiding (which obviously never took place) indicates that the situation in Slavonia was pretty much as described in the king’s December decree. After all, the fact that the king and his barons ordered estates to be returned to those whose names were not in the Register of Rebels indicates that such cases were many and that such problems substantially affected the local state of affairs and court’s administration of Slavonia. The activities of Herman of Celje in Slavonia also reveal this.

52 Mažuran 2002: 312; MNL OL, DL 9011. 53 Šišić 1938: 295–296. 54 Laszowski 1904: 258. Occupied with his Bosnian affairs, King spent most of 1405 south of the Drava and thus had an opportunity to learn directly about the local discontent; for his itinerary, see Engel & Tóth 2005: 83–84.
de Buthkafele, čija imena nisu bila zapisana u registar, što je značilo da je njihove posjede nepravedno zauzeo zbog nevjere Nikola Martinov, familijar prethodnog bana, Pavla Bissena, te su uvedeni u njih. Idući slučaj odigrao se istog dana pred banom i slavonskim plemstvom u Križevcima, kada su siročad (orphani) Ladislav pauper studens i Nikola, sinovi Petra de Iwelouch, pokazali Sigismundovu ispravu od 2. lipnja. U njoj je stajalo da su pokojni Dominik Petrov de Beryn i njegova braća dobili njihov posjed tvrdeći da su bili nevjerni, što su oni nazijekali. Nakon toga pregledan je registar i utvrđeno je da se njihova imena ne nalaze u njemu, pa je kralj dao nalog da im se vrati nepravedno oduzet posjed. Ban ističe da je uzeo navedeni registar te je dao da ga se javno pročita pa je, s obzirom na to da u njemu nisu pronađena imena ni navedene siročadi ni njihova oca, dao nalog da ih se, što je i učinjeno, uvede u posjed. Sva tri slučaja u kojima se spominje registar, kasnije određeno u listu regni Slavonie, Dalmacie i Hrvatske, navodi kao – titula bana Slavonije, Dalmacije i Hrvatske.

55 Lukinović 1992: 286–288.
56 MNL OL, DL 32763.
57 U Hermanovoj ispravi od 15. svibnja 1406. navodi se da su neke plemkinje de Prasnicha došle pred Hermana i plemstvo okupljeno u Križevci te pokazale Sigismundove isprave u kojima stoji da je Katica de Prasnicha 10. lipnja, najvjerojatnije 1405., pred kraljevskim vijećem ustala i optužila Ivana de Kozouch i Ivana de Zobochyna da su ih u kolovozu 1404. izbacili iz njihovih posjeda tvrdeći da su ih dobili od kralja na ime nevjere. Kralj je sa svojim vijećem uveo registro i utvrđeno je da se njihova imena ne nalaze u njemu, pa je kralj dao nalog da im se vrati nepravedno oduzet posjed. Ban ističe da je uzeo navedeni registar te je dao da ga se javno pročita pa je, s obzirom na to da u njemu nisu pronađena imena ni navedene siročadi ni njihova oca, dao nalog da ih se, što je i učinjeno, uvede u posjed. Sva tri slučaja u kojima se spominje registar, kasnije određeno u listu regni Slavonie, Dalmacije i Hrvatske, navodi kao – titula bana Slavonije, Dalmacije i Hrvatske.

that their estates were unjustly confiscated from them on account of their disloyalty and awarded to Nicholas (son of Martin), retainer of previous ban Paul of Bissen. They were subsequently introduced into the possession of these estates. The following case was also presented to the Ban and Slavonian nobility in Križevci. The orphans (orphani) Ladislau pauper studens and Nicholas of Iwelouch (sons of Peter) submitted King Sigismund’s charter of 2 June which stated that late Dominic of Beryn (son of Peter) and his brothers claimed that the orphans were rebels and thus acquired the estate of the latter. The orphans claimed otherwise. The register was then consulted and, upon establishing that their names were not in it, the king ordered that their unjustly confiscated estate be returned to them. The ban stated that, upon receiving such an order, he had had the register read in public and, as the names of the said orphans and their father were not in it, he had ordered that they be reintroduced into the possession of their estate, and it was done so. Consequently, all three cases in which the register is mentioned reveal the same thing – that there were noblemen whose name was not in the register (in other words, who were not rebels) but whose estates were nevertheless confiscated by means of royal donation. The ban’s charter emphasizes that quite a number of noblemen appeared before him seeking justice, which implies that there were more cases similar to the three just discussed. Two
zabilježena je prvi put 5. lipnja.\(^{58}\) Kao drugo, kako se može vidjeti iz slučaja siročadi, registar se nalazio na dvoru, da bi potom bio donijet na Slavoniju, najkasnije 7. lipnja kada je javno čitan.\(^{59}\) S obzirom na to dvoje ne čini se kao slučajnost da se praktično u isti trenutak može smjestiti odluka o stalnom rješenju na banskoj časti te slanje registra u Slavoniju uz pomoć kojeg se trebalo riješiti problem koji je očito snažno remetio lokalne prilike.

Nisu li ti problemi bili možda i uzrokom promjene na banskoj časti? T. Palosfalvi ističe da smijenjeni banovi nisu bili nepodobni, s čime se apsolutno moguće složiti, no drži da je reorganizacija uslijedila zbog kraljeve ženidbe, pa je banom imenovan Herman Celjški.\(^{60}\) No, otvoreno je pitanje je li smjena, s kojom je napušten koncept dvojice osoba na banskoj časti, u praksi od 1402., došla kao posljedica ženidbe, ili je ženidba tek utjecala na odabir osobe, dok su uzroci smjene ležali drugdje. Moguće je, naime, da su dotadašnji banovi, Pavao od Peći i Pavao Bissen, postali previše umiješani u lokalne prilike te su se njihovi interesi mogli naći u koliziji s pokušajem dvora da se razriješi problemi koji su izazivali nezadovoljstvo lokalnog plemstva. Iz gornjeg je primjera vidljivo kako je familjar Pavla Bissena, retinari iz Miholca su se 1409. tužili i plemići iz Komarnice.\(^{61}\) Mada je to vratio zauzete posjede, na Pavla od Peći upravo sa njim sadim su se tužili i plemići iz Komarnice.\(^{62}\) Na koji se način reproducirala nesigurnost djelovanjem banova naslučuje se i iz primjere prije spomenutog Grgura od Gyepewa. Naime, na isti dan, 25.

\(^{58}\) MNL OL, DL 103410; 101962, za prvi spomen kao bana MNL OL, DF 34053, iako valja dodati da je Herman naveden kao ban Dalmacije, Hrvatske i Slavonije u kraljevskom dignitariju od 11. travnja (Varjú 1908: 504), no kao relevantne uzmim isprave koje je izdao sam Herman jer preciznije odražavaju kako je on vidio svoju poziciju.

\(^{59}\) Relevantna kraljevska isprava (MNL OL, DL 32763) datirana je s 2. lipnja, ali pitanje jest je li zapisana na dan kada se spor našao pred kraljem ili kasnije.

\(^{60}\) Palosfalvi 2004: 46.

\(^{61}\) Lukinović 1992: 324.

\(^{62}\) MNL OL, DF 218641.

\(^{58}\) MNL OL, DL 103410; 101962, za prvi spomen kao bana MNL OL, DF 34053, iako valja dodati da je Herman naveden kao ban Dalmacije, Hrvatske i Slavonije u kraljevskom dignitariju od 11. travnja (Varjú 1908: 504), no kao relevantne uzmim isprave koje je izdao sam Herman jer preciznije odražavaju kako je on vidio svoju poziciju.

\(^{59}\) Relevantna kraljevska isprava (MNL OL, DL 32763) datirana je s 2. lipnja, ali pitanje jest je li zapisana na dan kada se spor našao pred kraljem ili kasnije.

\(^{60}\) Palosfalvi 2004: 46.

\(^{61}\) Lukinović 1992: 324.

\(^{62}\) MNL OL, DF 218641.
from Miholc complained to Andrew, Bishop of Zagreb, about the damage inflicted upon them by the two bans.61 Although Paul of Peć had returned their estates, the noblemen from Komarnica complained of the ban himself precisely at the banal court.62 The earlier mentioned example of Gregory of Gypeuw suggests how the bans’ activities perpetuated insecurity. In Trnava, on the same day when he was pardoned (25 August), Nicholas (son of Vlatko) and Paul de Desniche (son of Dominic), related to Ban Paul of Peć, also received royal pardon. This suggests that Gregory, too, was pardoned at the intervention of Ban Paul.63 This connection would explain why Eberhard and Mikćec of Cirkvena (son of John) complained to the king about the problems he had had with the bans and with control over the estates awarded to them, including the one of Gregory of Gypeuw.64 Such cases indicate that, while far from incurring disfavor, Herman’s predecessors had nevertheless created a network of local relationships that made it hard to bring order to Slavonia. It seems to me that this could have influenced the king’s decision to replace them as bans, particularly if the pressure of those who had been dispossessed despite of their loyalty was rather strong. But even if such interpretation of the bans’ replacement were incorrect, the fact remains that making difference between rebels and loyal noblemen, with all the consequences for individuals, was a problem both in Slavonia and in Hungary. In this context, it is important to point out that the register, while actually meeting the expectations of both modern historians (used to bureaucracy) and the protagonists of that period, was a very efficient administrative instrument, as can be seen from the way how specific disputes were resolved. But the availability of an efficient administrative instrument and the appointment of a new ban whose agenda included dealing with such problems were no guarantee that these problems would actually be solved. For this, the focus should be shifted to another event – the Križevci assembly of 1408.

KRIŽEVAČKI SHOD IZ 1408.

Pod kraljevskim je predsjedanjem u veljači, s početkom 13. veljače, održan shod za Križevačku i Virovitičku županiju. Makar nisu jedini predmeti koji su rješavani na shodu, slučajevi koji su na ovaj ili onaj način repove vukli od 1403. dominiraju među sačuvanom gradom o sporovima vodenima

61 Lukinović 1992: 324.
62 MNL OL, DF 218641.
63 For family links, see Nekić 2017: 194.
64 See n. 52 and 53 here.
na shodu.\textsuperscript{65} Dio njih ne dotiće se pitanja je li netko bio ili nije nevjeran, već se to uzima kao gotovo, ali se pokušava pronaći \textit{modus vivendi} među stranama koje su izgubile posjede i onima kojima su ti isti posjedi darovani.\textsuperscript{66} Nekoliko je pak slučajeva koji su od posebnog interesa za ovu raspravu, gdje srž predstavlja pitanje razdvajanja vjernih od nevjernih.\textsuperscript{67} Sporovi Nikole Vlatkova u sporu s Nikolom de Newna te Pavla Dominikova od Desnice u sporu s rođacima od Desnice, Blažem, Andrijom, Galom i Pavlom, slijede identičan obrazac. Nikola i Pavao ustali su na shodu tvrdeći da su se pridržava- vali ponude milosti iz listopada te su u prilog tome priložili isprave o milosti, dok je druga strana u sporu priložila isprave o kraljevskom darovanju te kaptola o uvođenju u posjede. Suprotstavljenje tvrđnje, srž kojih se ticalo ponašanja nakon ponude milosti, rješavana je pristankom strana u sporu da o tome odluče prisežnici, koji su u oba slučaja svjedočili kako su oštećeni bili nepravedno osuđeni pa su im posjedi vraćeni.\textsuperscript{68} Pored takvih slučajeva u kojima su strane svoje tvrdnje pokušavala potvrđiti pisemnim svjedočanstvima, postoje i one u kojima su određene strane tek utvrdile kako su im posjedi nepravedno oduzeti bez pisane potvrde.

Tako su Ivan Filipov i Jakov Ivanov de Butkhafelde optužili Nikolu Martinovog de Syrimio, familijara Pavla Bissena, da je od kralja tražio njihove posjede na ime nevjere, koje je i dobio kako se vidjelo po kraljevskim poveljama koje je Stjepan Bissen pokazao na shodu. No, plemići od Butkhafelde na to su odvratili da se Ivan odvojio od svog oca – čije se sudjelovanje u pobuni nije dovodilo u pitanje – te da je služio Martina Dersa, dok je Jakov tvrdio da nije bio nevjeran ni tijekom pobune ni nakon nje. Stranke su se potom podložile sudu.

\textbf{KRIŽEVCI ASSEMBLY OF 1408}

Presided by the king, the assembly for Križevci and Virovitica Counties began on 13 February. Although they were not the only disputes being settled at the assembly, the cases dating back to 1403 dominate in the sources preserved.\textsuperscript{65} Some of them were not about loyalty or disloyalty – it was taken for granted – but rather about finding a \textit{modus vivendi} between the parties who had been dispossessed and those who had been donated their estates.\textsuperscript{66} There are several cases at the core of which was the problem of telling rebels from loyal noblemen; these cases are of particular interest for this paper.\textsuperscript{67} An identical pattern can be found in the dispute between Nicholas (son of Vlatko) and Nicholas of Newna and in the one between Paul of Desnica (son of Dominic) and his cousins Blaise, Andrew, Gal and Paul of Desnica. At the assembly, Nicholas and Paul claimed they had abided by the requirements of the royal pardon offered in October, substantiating their claim with charters of pardon. The other party to the case submitted royal donations and Chapter’s certificates of introduction into possession. The opposing claims, whose substance revolved about the question of someone’s behavior after the offer of pardon in October, was resolved in such a way that the parties to the case agreed to accept the ruling of the sworn assessors. As the assessors in both cases testified that the damaged parties had been unjustly convicted, they were given their estates back.\textsuperscript{68} Besides the cases in which the parties tried to substantiate their claims with written evidence, there were also those in which the parties did not offer any written evidence for their claims of unjust dispossession. For example,

\textsuperscript{65} For other cases tried at the assembly, see MNL OL, DL 100365; 103483; ZsO, II/2, 5968; 5976; Laszowski 1904: 261, MNL OL, DL 42959; 34294.

\textsuperscript{66} ZsO, II/2, 6072.

\textsuperscript{67} As not all such cases will be discussed in detail here, see MNL OL, DL 100367, or a case that was initiated at the assembly but was continued before the palatine, MNL OL, DL 100366.

\textsuperscript{68} Šišić 1938: 295–300. There was another case where repossession of an estate was required. In that case, the dispossessed party had been given a special pardon, but only after expiry of the deadline specified in the decree, so the estate had remained in the hands of the party who had been awarded it, MNL OL, DL 288468.
pripješnika, koji su utvrdili kako Ivan i Jakov nisu bili nevjerni te su im posjedi vraćeni. Izuzetak je bio posjedovni dio Ivanova oca, no zauzvrat je Nikola Martinov osuđen in omagis ipsius pro indebita autem inpeticione.69 Sličan je bio i slučaj Ladislava i Ivana Pekrija, kako se otkriva u Sigismundovoj ispravi iz 1414. U veljači te godine pred Žigmunda je došao Ladislav te rekao kako su na općem saboru održanom pod predsjedanjem kralja u Krizevcima pripješnici svjedočili kako on, njegov brat i majka nisu bili nevjerni. Kako su Ladislav i Ivan tada bili maloljetni, a majka pritisnuta starošću, isprave izdane na shodu o njihovoj nevinosti ostavljene su na čuvanje kraljevskom dvoru, to jest kraljevskom protonotaru. Međutim, kada je Ladislav tražio na dvoru da mu se isprave vrate, njegovoj se zamolbi nije moglo udovoljiti jer ih protonotar nije mogao pronaći. Da bi se stvar raščistila, kralj je uputio na log palatinu Nikoli Gorjanskom, s imenima pripješnika iz 1408. kod kojih se trebala provjeriti istinitost Ladislavovih tvrdnji, zahvaljujući čemu imamo prvi put barem djelomičan popis pripješnika s nekog općeg shoda u Slavoniji. Na kraljevu molbu Nikola je u svoju utvrdu Šikloš sazvao one koji su tada još bili živi, Pavla Bisena, Ladislava Mihovilova de Zenthberthalam, Jurja Petrova de Dombo, Ladislava Dominikova de Apostahg te Opoja od Rasinje, koji su ponovno prisegnuli u nevinost iz rođdačkoj skupini (od aktera, Ladislava i Nikole de Iweloucha. Naime, Dominik, sada kraljev sartor, nije odustajao od svojih presenzanja na njihov posjed pa ih je optužio da su ga izbacili iz posjeda. Na to su Ladislav i Nikola priložili prethodno razmatranu Hermanovu ispravu od 20. lipnja, u kojoj je bila prepisana kraljevska isprava od 2. lipnja, pri John (son of Philip) and Jacob of Butkhafelde (son of John) accused Nicholas of Syrimio (son of Martin and retainer of Paul of Bissen), that he had requested from the king to award him their estates on account of their alleged disloyalty – which the king did, according to the royal charters presented to the assembly by Stephen of Bissen. But the Butkhafelde noblemen explained that John had disassociated himself from his father (whose participation in the revolt had not been denied) and that he had served under Martin Ders, while Jacob claimed he had never been disloyal in the first place – neither during nor after the revolt. The parties then submitted themselves to the sworn assessors' ruling. The assessors established that neither John nor Jacob had been disloyal and their estates were returned to them. The only exception was the property owned by John's father; in return, Nicholas (son of Martin) was sentenced in omagis ipsius pro indebita autem inpeticione.69 Similar was the case of Ladislaus and John Pekri, as can be seen in Sigismund's charter from 1414. Ladislaus appeared before Sigismund in February that year, explaining that at the general assembly in Krizevci, presided by the king, sworn assessors testified that he, his brother and his mother had not been rebels. As Ladislaus and John were minors at the time and their mother was incapacitated by old age, the charters on their innocence issued at the assembly were left for safekeeping by the protonotary at the royal court. However, when Ladislaus came to the court to obtain these documents, the protonotary could not find them. In order to shed light on the whole thing, the king gave the palatine Nicholas Garai a list of the sworn assessors from 1408, instructing him to investigate Ladislaus' claims. As a result of this, for the first time, we now have a list – if incomplete – of assessors from a general assembly in Slavonia. At the

69 MNL OL, DL 230875. The disputes in which the Butkhafelde noblemen were involved reveal a pattern of abuse of privilege and royal donations by Sigismund's supporters. There is no evidence that Balthasar, Peter, Jacob, Philip and Demetrius (sons of Orhardus), whose states were awarded to Nicholas (son of Martin) in early November 1403, managed to receive royal pardon. This means that Nicholas acquired their estates (as evidenced in other disputes), using them as a stepping-stone for spreading to those of their kinsmen, to whom their estates were returned in 1406 (based on the register), which was confirmed at the assembly of 1408.

69 MNL OL, DL 230875. Sporovi vezani za plemiće de Butkhafelde otkrivaju jedan obrazac kako su Sigismundovi poborunci zlouporabili svoj položaj i kraljevska darivanja. Nema naznaka da su Baltazar, Petar, Jakov, Filip i Demetar sinovi Korhardusa, čiji su posjedi početkom studenog 1403. darovani Nikoli Martinovom, uspjeli steci kraljevu milost, to jest Nikola je stekao njihove posjede, što mu je onda predstavljalo odskočnu disku da se, kako pokazuju drugi sporovi, proširili i na posjede njihove rodbine, kojima su posjedi vraćeni 1406. na temelju registra, to jest na shodu 1408.
čemu valja ponoviti da se u obje spominje registar, to jest odluka o njihovom ponašanju za križe donijeta je na temelju registra. No, u kraljevskoj ispravi iz 1408., u prepričavanju tih dvaju isprava uopće se ne spominje registar. U kraljevskoj se ispravi navodi kako su Ladislav i Nikola bili premladili kako bi počinili nevjeru pa da je to razlog što je kralj poslao nalog banu da im vrati to jest uvede ih u posjed!71 Ovaj slučaj, kao i oni prethodno razmatrani zapravo pogađaju u samu bit problema koje je registar trebao rješavati, pa se odmah nameće pitanje što se to dogodilo s registrom nakon što je dopremljen u Slavoniju početkom lipnja 1406.? Drugim riječima, zašto je nemoguće razaznati korištenje registra na shodu iz 1408.? Nažalost, nema nikakvih informacija koje bi dopustile iznose pretpostavki koje ne bi vrlo brzo završile u sferi pukog nagada, pa ta pitanja ostaju potpuno otvorena. No, bez obzira na to valja podcrtati nekoliko zapažanja o shodu 1408.

Šire politički kontekst u kojem se odvijao shod bio je obilježen politikom dvora prema Bosni, to jest prema Hrvoju Vukčiću Hrvatiniću kao najvažnijim političkom akteru na prostoru Bosne i Hrvatske, štoviše to je bio period u kojem se pripremao veliki pohod sredinom iste godine. Pritom dakle opet valja istaknuti položaj Slavonije kao graničnog područja u vrijeme povezanog njezine strateške osjetljivosti. Naznaka kraljeva nezadovoljstva dotadašnjim rješenjima u Slavoniji vidi se iz smjene Hermana s banske pozicije upravo negdje početkom godine, koja je ostala nepopunjena. Velika promjena u upravljanju Slavonijom uslijedila je prepuštanjem najvećeg dijela banovskog honora u Slavoniji kraljici Barbari, no ona je u njihov posjed ušla 1409., pa je vjerovatno takva odluka bila donijeta tek iz pobjede pod Doborom, koja je potpuno redefinirala Sigismundov

71 MNL OL, DL 32764 "Nos enim agnita denique teneram eorum etatem ad committendam infidelitatem aliquam factis vel consilii seu auxilii habentes extitissent et ex eo serenitas nostra iura eorum possessionaria ipsi Dominico sartori racione prima dare minime valuiisset nos enim aginta denique inmaturitate et puerili isporum etate predictas eorum possessions ipsis per spectabilem et magnificum virum dominum Hermann pro tunc banum eidem litteratoria scribendo restatui fecissemus.”

king’s request, Nicholas summoned to his Fort Siklous all the surviving assessors: Paul of Bissen, Ladislaus of Zenthberhalam (son of Michael), George of Dombo (son of Peter), Ladislaus of Apostagh (son of Dominic) and Opoj of Rasinja. They solemnly swore again that the Pekris were innocent.70 The last case I am discussing here is the one involving the already known protagonists – Ladislaus and Nicholas of Ivelouch. Dominic, now king’s sartor, wasn’t giving up his claims on their estate, so he accused them of dispossessing him. Ladislaus and Nicholas responded by submitting the earlier discussed Herman’s charter of 2 June, which included a rewritten copy of the royal charter of 2 June. We should reiterate here that both of them mention the register. In other words, in 1406 the decision on their behavior during the crisis was made on the basis of the register. And yet, a royal charter from 1408 – which retells the contents of these two charters – does not mention the register at all. This royal charter states that Ladislaus and Nicholas were too young to rebel and that this was the reason why the king ordered the ban to reintroduce them into the possession of their estate!71 Just like the cases discussed earlier, this case goes to the very heart of the problem that the register was supposed to solve. This begs the question what happened to the register after it was brought to Slavonia in early June 1406? In other words, why is there no evidence that the register was used at the assembly of 1408? Unfortunately, there is no information that would allow solid assumptions instead of guessing, so these questions remain open. Still, some facts about the assembly of 1408 deserve to be underlined.

The political context of the assembly was marked by the court’s Bosnian policy and its policy towards Hrvoje Vukčić Hrvatinić, the most prominent political protagonist in Bosnia and Croatia. It was also the period in which a large military campaign was
planned for the middle of that year. It is worth noting again here that Slavonia was a borderland and, as such, strategically sensitive. The fact that Herman was replaced as the ban earlier that year and that no new ban was appointed suggests that the king was not satisfied with the up-to-then solutions in Slavonia. A major change in the administration of Slavonia took place when most of the ban’s honor in the region was transferred to Queen Barbara. However, as she took it over in 1409, it is likely that such a decision was made only after the victory at the Battle of Dobor, which completely redefined Sigismund’s authority and power in the southern parts of the Archiregnum. Also, the mere fact that the assembly, announced way back in late 1405, took place indicates that the local situation demanded special attention. Besides the considerable number of the abovementioned related cases known today, another indicator that one of the fundamental problems was the aftermath of the 1403 crisis is the decision that the assembly should take place for Križevci and Virovitica Counties only, and not for the entire Slavonia. For understanding such decision, one should remember that there were only a few known rebels in Zagreb County. According to the sources preserved, the resolve to deal with the aftermath of 1403 and its troubles, manifested by convening the assembly – and with a visible bottom-up impulse for such action – came to fruition. With the exception of a few individual cases, there are no indications that the consequences of 1403 kept affecting the local state of affairs so strongly after 1408. In other words, the large mess created at the local level as a result of the crisis was finally dealt with in 1408. As the assembly was but a single step in that process, the role of the register should be stressed once again, which is why we should focus on the register as an administrative instrument once again, but this time through the prism of another register, also associated with the aftermath of 1403.

THE REGISTER OF REBELS IN THE KINGDOM OF HUNGARY

In September 1415, two noblemen from Zala County submitted to the royal court their dispute about Kysthomay estate in the same county. The
„slavonski“ registar, ni ovome nije posvećeno od-
već puno pažnje.74 No, za razliku od slavonskog,
dakle je teže razrazniti kada i kako je nastao ovaj
registar, te kako je uopće izgledao, kakve infor-
macije je sadržavao. Put k razumijevanju tog re-
gistra, jednako kao i slavonskog, u prvom se redu
prirodno sastoja u pokušaju pronalaska drugih
mogućih spomena registra nevjernih. Taj put pak
vremenski nije išao dublje u prošlost od 1409.,
što može izgledati na prvu ruku čudno s obzirom
na to da se radi o punih šest godina nakon izbijanja
krize koja se, kao što smo vidjeli, u Slavoniji
rješavala između ostalog i izradom registra. No
problom razdvajanja vjernih i nevjernih i dalje je
bio aktualan kako se vidi iz Sigismundovih ispra-
va upućenih u travnju 1409. prema županijama
SZATMÁR, MáRAMAROS, Ugocsan, ZENPLEN i Ung u
kojima se najavljuje da će se održati opći shodovi
na kojima će se provjeravati valjanost kraljevskih
isprava koje su izdali njegovi prethodnici, obra-
čunati s lokalnim notornim zločincima te, što je
za ovaj rad najvažnije, provjeravati tko je među
nevjernima od kralja dobio isprave o milosti.75
Agenda postavljena tada rezultirat će zapravo ne-
vjerojatnom brojkom shodova održanih u župa-
nijama na prostoru cijele Ugarske, i to u periodu
od travnja 1409. do svibnja 1410., za koje se sve
bez iznimke navodi kako ih se održava ex speciali
regio edicto/mandato. Taj zadatak dobrim je dije-
lom stavljen u ruke novog iudex curie, Simona
Rozgonija, no uključit će daleko više broj ljudi:
Pétra Perényija, Nikolu Csaka, Pipu Ozoru, Ivana
Nassija, Simona Szécsényija sina Kónyae, László
Rozgonja, Matu Pálócija, Mihalya Nadasija, La-
dislava de Asszonyfalvaija te samog kralja (sho-
dovi za županije Fejer i Požegu). Takva gustoća
dislava de Asszonyfalvaijija te samog kralja (sho-
dovi za županije Fejer i Požegu). Takva gustoća
ofćih shodova i aktivnosti naravno nije promakla
pažnji povjesničara, noako da njezine reperku-
sije nisu u potpunosti shvaćene.76 Služeci se po-
datcima koje nude radovi G. Istványija i N. Tótha
te dodatnim uvidom u izvorni materijal, dobiva
se zaista impresivna slika aktivnosti definiranih

74 Dvóráková 2010: 94, koja lakonski veli da je taj registar bio
dostupan dugo nakon ustanka 1403., izgleda predmnijevajući
da je tada i nastao.
75 Tóth 2019; ZsO II/2, 6716, 6717.
76 V. radove Istványi 1941; Tóth 2010.

dispute had its roots in 1403, when the estate was
confiscated on account of lèse-majesté. One of the
parties to the dispute claimed that his father had re-
ceived a special royal pardon. He also said that the
charter confirming it had been taken away from him
but that the claim could be verified in “registro nos-
tro regali in domo nostra thavnericali habitu et super
nominibus hominum infidelium nostrorum confec
to”. The court proceedings were postponed sev-
eral times with a remark that the complaining party
should have consulted the register. Eventually, it did
not happen and the sentence was passed on a differ-
ent basis.73 Just like the “Slavonian” register, this regis-
ter has not drawn particular attention.74 But unlike for
the Slavonian one, it is much harder for this register to
establish when and how it was made, what it looked
like and what information did it contain. Naturally,
the attempts to understand this register, just like in
the case of the Slavonian, primarily consisted of a
search for all the mentions of the Register of Rebels.
At first it may sound strange that, chronologically,
this search went back no further than to 1409, as many as
six years after the beginning of the crisis that in Slavo-
nia, as we have seen, had been dealt with by making of
the register, among other things. However, as we can
see from the Sigismund’s charters sent in April 1409
to Szatmár, Máramaros, Ugocsan, Zemplen and Ung
Counties, the problem of telling the rebels from the
loyal noblemen still existed at the time. These char-
ters announced general assemblies at which the valid-
ity of royal charters issued by the king’s predecessors
would be verified, local notorious criminals would
be dealt with and, most importantly for this paper,
the rebels who received pardon charters from the
king would be identified.75 The agenda set at the time
would result in an incredible number of assemblies
convened in counties throughout the Kingdom of
Hungary between April 1409 and May 1410. For all of
them without exception, it is specified that they are
taking place ex speciali regio edicto/mandato. Simon
Rozgonj, the new iudex curie, was entrusted with
most of this task, but many other people will also be

73 ZsO, V, doc. 1031.
74 Dvóráková 2010: 94, who laconically claims that this
register was available for a long time after the revolt of 1403,
probably believing that it was created in that year.
75 Tóth 2019; ZsO II/2, 6716, 6717.
agendom oblikovanom na dvoru. Podatci koje ću iznijeti nemaju za cilj iscrpnost, već će samo – uz neke iznimke – sadržavati mjesto, to jest županiju održavanja shoda te mjesec. 77 Niz započinje u travnju 1409. kada se održava shod za županije Pest i Pilis, 78 Fejer (travanj), 79 Heves (svibanj), 80 Veszprem (svibanj), 81 Saros (svibanj), 82 Borsod (svibanj), 83 Somogy (lipanj), 84 požešku županiju (srpanj), 85 Szabolcs (srpanj), 86 Gomormegye (srpanj), 87 Bihar (kolovoz), 88 Abauj (kolovoz), 89 Chanad (kolovoz), 90 Zemplen (rujan), 91 Tolnu (rujan), 92 Ung (rujan), 93 Hont i Nograd (rujan), 94 Szathmar i Ugosca (listopad), 95 Kraszna (listopad), 96 potom shod za Sekelje (prosinac), 97 županiju Bereg (veljača 1410.). 98 te Sopron (svibanj) 99.

Najveća aktivnost se primjećuje na prostoru sjeverozapadne Ugarske, no shodovi su se zapravo održavali u svim dijelovima kraljevstva. Također, imajući na umu problem sačuvanosti izvornog materijala, može se postaviti pitanje da li shodovi održani i u nekim drugim županijama za koje informacije nisu sačuvane. Drugim riječima, može se naslutiti da je agendom postavljenom na dvoru zapravo smjeralo održati shodove u

77 U nastavku radi praktičnosti navodim samo izvorni materijal, uz naznaku kako su dva rada bila neophodna u kompiliranju. 78 ZsO, II/2, 6734. 79 ZsO, II/2, 26749, 6752. 80 ZsO, II/2, 26768, 6771. 81 ZsO, II/2, 6774. 82 ZsO, II/2, 6787. 83 ZsO, II/2, 6789, 6798, 6804, 6805, 6807, 6808. 84 ZsO, II/2, 6836. 85 ZsO, II/2, 6862. 86 ZsO, II/2, 6962. 87 ZsO, II/2, 6942. 88 ZsO, II/2, 6956. 89 ZsO, II/2, 6967. 90 ZsO, II/2, 6983. 91 ZsO, II/2, 7015. 92 ZsO, II/2, 7018, 7022. 93 ZsO, II/2, 7081. 94 ZsO, II/2, 7088. 95 ZsO, II/2, 7015, 7115, 7123,7130, 7279 96 ZsO, II/2, 7155. 97 ZsO, II/2, 7219. 98 ZsO, II/2, 7340, 7360, 7367. 99 ZsO, II/2, 7628.

78 See the works of Istványi 1941; Tóth 2010. 79 For the purpose of practicality, I’ll be citing only the original sources further in the text, while noting that two papers were essential for the compiling. 78 ZsO, II/2, 6734. 79 ZsO, II/2, 26749, 6752. 80 ZsO, II/2, 26768, 6771. 81 ZsO, II/2, 6774. 82 ZsO, II/2, 6787. 83 ZsO, II/2, 6789, 6798, 6804, 6805, 6807, 6808. 84 ZsO, II/2, 6836. 85 ZsO, II/2, 6862. 86 ZsO, II/2, 6962. 87 ZsO, II/2, 6942. 88 ZsO, II/2, 6956. 89 ZsO, II/2, 6967. 90 ZsO, II/2, 6983. 91 ZsO, II/2, 7015. 92 ZsO, II/2, 7018, 7022. 93 ZsO, II/2, 7081. 94 ZsO, II/2, 7088. 95 ZsO, II/2, 7015, 7115, 7123,7130, 7279 96 ZsO, II/2, 7155. 97 ZsO, II/2, 7219.
svakom kutku, to jest županiji kraljevstva. Buđuci da je jedna od njihovih funkcija bilo obračunavanje s malefactores, ne čudi da su sačuvani i neki registri u koji su unošena njihova imena. Tu valja naglasiti da se u njihovu uvodu naročito navodi da je riječ o popisu notornih zločinaca, to jest uz zločine tamo navedenih osoba ne spominje se nota infidelitatis. No, drugi cilj, provjera nevjernih i kraljevskih isprava o milosti, također je uključivao izradu registra. Najjasnije se to vidi iz primjera spora vođenog pred kraljem 1413. kada je jedna od strana u sporu pokazala registrar Šimona Rozgonyija u koji su bila unesena imena nevjernih koja su iznijeli prisječnici na shodu za županiju Bereg, čime je strana u sporu dokazivala svoju tvrdnju da je optuženik za krize 1403. bio familijar određenog plemića te da su oba bila optužena za nevjeru. Naznake da su takvi registri rađeni i u drugim županijama dolaze i iz slučaja županije Heves. Nažalost, ta je isprava, izdana...

100 Može se nazrijeti i za Zalu, kako upućuje spor u kojem se spominje registrar nevjernih u tavernalkom domu, kao i za Nyitrup, MNL OL, DL 49169. Teško je razaznati spadaju li u ovaj niz i neki kasniji shodovi, poput onoga za županiju Bodrog koji se spominje u studenome 1410., u kojem kralj daje nalog mačvanskim banovima da donesu konačnu presudu u jednom slučaju koji je tice nota infidelitatis, Appony 1906: 263.

101 V. Tringli 1997: 399, bilj. 66.

102 MNL OL, DL 283047.

103 MNL OL, DL 10022: u... exhibitionem cuisdam registri capite sigilli prefati comitis Symonis de Rozgon consignati nomina infidelium nostrae maiestatis per iuratos assessores congregationis generalis prefati comitis Symonis de Rozgon feria quarta proxima ante festum purificationis virginis glorioso anno domini millesimo quadringentesimo decimo prope opidum Zaz universitati nobilium comitatus de Beregh per ipsum ex speciali nostri maiestatis commissione celebrato extradatorum seriatim in se continentes, familiarem dicti Johannis filii Georgii Jakch extitisse ac cum eodem in prescriptis regni nostri disturbiorum temporibus contra nostram maiestatem infideliter processisse declarando.

104 To se može naslutiti za još jedan slučaj koji se tico shoda održanog pred predsjedanjem Stribora za Nyitrup, u kojem se spominje u kraljevskoj ispravi iz srpnja 1411.; iz Stiborova itenerara se naslutiti da je shod održan negdje između svibnja i rujna 1410., kada je zabilježena njegova prisutnost na tom području. Dvořáková 2010: 550. Spor koji se spominje tico se reperkusija nota infidelitatis i kraljevsko milosti, a jedna od strana svoj je slučaj željela braniti i putem registra in generali congregatione predicti comitatus confecta, MNL OL, DL 49169.

Bereg (February 1410)98 and Sopron (May)99. The most intensive activity can be seen in northwestern part of the Hungary, but assemblies took place in almost all parts of the kingdom. As the original sources may not have been completely preserved, there is a possibility that assemblies also took place in some other counties. In other words, there are indications that a part of the court’s agenda was to convene assemblies in almost every corner – every county – of the Kingdom. As dealing with malefactores was one of the functions of the assemblies, it is no surprise that the registers containing their names that were made at some of these assemblies have been preserved. In the introductions to these registers it is expressly explained that these are the lists of notorious criminals, that is nota infidelitatis is not mentioned among the crimes associated with these persons. The other goal – verification of rebels and control of royal pardon charters, also included the making of a register. It is clearly observed in a case presented to the king in 1413, when one of the parties submitted the register of Simon Rozgonyi containing the names of rebels as cited by the assessors at the assembly for Bereg County. The party used the register to substantiate their claim that the accused was retainer of a certain nobleman during the crisis of 1403 and that both of them had been accused of disloyalty. A case from...
1409., oštećena. No ipak je vidljivo da su prisežnici na shodu predali registar za koji se ne veli direktno da je registar nevjernih, ali se spominje registar u koji su na temelju svjedočanstva prisežnika unesena imena dvojice plemića koji su bili osuđeni za nevjeru. Na to su pak njih dvojica pred Rozgonyiija i Simona Konyu, koji su presjedali šodom, donijeli kraljevske isprave o podijeljenoj milosti. Ta dva slučaja pružaju uvid u mehanizam nastajanja registra na lokalnoj razoni, pri čemu se zapravo replicira postupak nastajanja registra s popisom notornih zločinaca, gdje su prisežnici davali predsjedatelju popis osoba, u ovom slučaju nevjernih. No ranije razmatrani registar, za koji se kaže da se čuvao in domo tavernicali, nije sadržavao samo popis nevjernih već i onih koji su dobili milost. Zajedno sa slučajem iz Berega, to navodi na pomisao da su nakon nastanka popisa koji su sastavljali prisežnici informacije u njemu revidirane, ovisno je li tko sa njega mogao dokazati svojo nevinost putem valjane kraljevske isprave o milosti.

Dругим riječima, osnova cijele zamislje bila je prikupljanje nijemaca lokalne razini putem održavanja shodova koje su potom integrirane u jedan središnji registar, nastao dakle negdje na samom početku 1410-ih, za koji je teško precizno naslutiti kako je bio uređen, ali koji je očito sadržavao informacije o onima koji su dobili kraljevsku milost te onima koji nisu bili te sreće, i to na razini cijelog kraljevstva. U konačnici, makar je riječ praktično o samo jednom spomenu tog registra, činjenica da se na njega pozivalo, govori da je njegovo postojanje bilo dobro poznato među plemstvom, što i ne čudi ako se uzme u obzir da je njegov nastanak ovisio o mogućnosti intervencije središnje vlasti u lokalnoj znanja i prilike.

Heves County also indicates that such registers were made in other counties. Unfortunalely, the relevant charter issued in 1409 is damaged. However, one can still read in it that the assessors submitted a register, and while it is not expressly said that it is a register of rebels, it is mentioned that the names of two noblemen sentenced as rebels were entered in it based on the assessors’ testimonies. The two responded by submitting to Rozgonyi and Simon Konya, who presided the assembly, the royal pardon charters issued to them. These two cases illustrate how the register was made at the local level, it was actually the same procedure as the one used for the making of the registers of notorious criminals. It was the sworn assessors who would submit the list – in this case, of rebels – to the person presiding the assembly. However, the above discussed register, said to have been kept in domo tavernicali, contained not only a list of rebels, but also a list of those who had received royal pardon. Together with the Bereg case, this suggests that, after the assessors had made the list, changes would be introduced in it if some of the listed noblemen managed to prove their innocence with a valid royal pardon charter. In other words, the idea was to gather information at the local level by convening assemblies. Such information would then be integrated in a single central register, made at the very beginning of the 1410s. Its form is hard to reconstruct precisely, but it clearly contained information about the noblemen from all parts of the Kingdom who had received royal pardon and the ones who had not been that lucky. And finally, although we are talking about a single mention of this register here, the fact that it was...

105 MNL OL, DL 28140.
106 Ili, kako to pokazuje jedan slučaj, čak i ako se nije moglo pokazati isprave o milosti, ljaju nevjere i gubitak posjeda moglo se sa sebe skiniti preuzimanjem obveze vojne službe, to jest polaska na predstojeći pohod s Pipom od Ozora, ZsO, II/2, 6924.

105 Dvořáková 2010: 550. The case in question concerned the rebellions of note infidelitatis and royal pardon; one of the parties involved wanted to make their case by referring to ”registra in generali congregatione predicti comitatus confecta”, MNL OL, DL 49169.
106 MNL OL, DL 28140.
106 Or, as one case shows, even if no pardon charters were submitted, one could clear their name, remove the stigma of disloyalty and avoid confiscation of their estates if one joined the military and participated in the forthcoming campaign together with Pip of Ozora, ZsO, II/2, 6924.
ZAKLJUČAK

Za vladavine Anžuvinaca kraljevski aparat vla-
sti napravio je iskorak u korištenju pisane riječi
kao osnove administrativnog djelovanja, naročito
uporabom registra. U prvom redu odnosi se to
na kontrolu produkcije same kraljevske kancelarije
uvodenjem libri regii za Karla I. Registri su tako-
der korišteni i za uređenje kraljevskih prava, poput
registra koji se ticao kraljevine Hrvatske u drugoj
polovini 14. stoljeća, ili su pak sadržavali informaci-
je o posjedovnim pravima na razini županije, što se
može naslutiti iz registra koji se tica županije Liptó.

Sigismundov dvor u tom je pogledu naslijedio
administrativne prakse temeljene na pisanoj riječi
Anžuvinaca, ali je i proširio spektar uporabe regi-
stara kao specifične forme administrativnog djelo-
vanja, što se vidi iz primjera ovdje razmatranih dva-
ju registara nevjernih. Slavonski registar nevjernih
pokazuje da se postojeći repertoar – praksa uno-
šenja imena notornih zločinaca koje su imenovali
prisežnici na općim shoedovima pojedinih županija
– koristio u izvanrednim situacijama, istovremeno
transformirajući njegov namjenu i narav. Registar
nevjernih za Ugarsku jednako je tako teško zamisli
može naslutiti iz registra koji se ticao županije Lip-
tó. Slavonski registar nevjernih koristio je u izvanrednim situacijama, transformirajući njegov namjenu i narav. Registar nevjernih za Ugarsku jednako je tako teško zamisliti kao „slavonski“ i „ugarski“ registar imaju jednu važnu

CONCLUSION

During the Angevine rule, the royal administrative
apparatus made progress in using written word as the
basis of administrative activities – registers in par-
ticular. This primarily refers to the control of the pro-
duction of royal chancery by introducing libri regii
during the reign of Charles I. Registers were also
used for regulation of the regalia, such as the register
intended for the regnum Croatia in the second half
of the 14th century, or contained information about
proprietary rights at the county level, as the register
for Liptó County indicates. In this, Sigismund’s
court inherited the Angevine administrative practice
based on the written word, but it also extended the
use of registers as a specific form of administrative
activities, as can be seen from the examples of the
two registers of rebels discussed here. The Slavonian
register of rebels shows that the existing repertoire
– the practice of entering the names of notorious
criminals as named by assessors at general assem-
blies at the county level – was used in extraordinary
situations, transforming its purpose and nature at
the same time. The register of rebels for Kingdom
of Hungary is hard to imagine without its Slavonian
equivalent. Like the latter, the former also exhibited
visible extension of the administration technique
repertoire, from ad hoc solutions to administrative
practices that, even though not permanent and in-
titutionalized, could be used as needed. There is
one important similarity between the “Slavonian”

107 Szende 2004: 114–117. 108 For Liptó, see Fügedi 1986: 23; it is impossible to elaborate
here on Mladen Ančić and Mirjana Matijević Sokol’s
discussion on this register; it suffices to say that M. Ančić’s
fundamental conclusion that it is a register of royal estates/
rights is absolutely correct, Matijević Sokol 2008: 237–257;
Ančić 1998: 250–251; Ančić 2005: 12; Ančić 2007: 208–209; Ančić
2007a: 149.
109 For turning ad hoc solutions into institutionalized practice,
see excellent study by Kittel 1991.
and “Hungarian” registers. Both were made on the basis of the testimonies of the sworn assessors at general assemblies, which proved themselves as a very important forum for interactions between the central government and local societies. Gathering information and taking action through such channels enabled the central government to intervene, while the possibility for the local protagonists to protect their interest was still open. There were also substantial differences between the two registers. While the “Slavonian” register was a result of a “one-time” effort, the “Hungarian” one was a part of a comprehensive agenda that had implied central government’s intensive impact on the affairs of the entire kingdom through an impressive series of county assemblies. Another difference was that, while the “Slavonian” register’s authenticity was based on five seals that made it a “closed” document, the “Hungarian” register was created by integrating individual pieces of the mosaic into a single central register (and it seems that revision of the information thus obtained was included in its making).

Administrative activities based on written word constituted a specific form of royal – in this case Sigismund’s – authority. The “Slavonian” register shows that this authority was threatened from two sides – in a very different way, of course. It was threatened by those who revolted against Sigismund and by those who could jeopardize the king’s authority with their actions at the time when his authority was being established. This was yet another situation where the register proved itself as an exceptional instrument of administration – in other words, an instrument for controlling the subjects and keeping them loyal. It was also an instrument for holding to account all those who were supposed to rule these subjects in the king’s name but who unscrupulously used the fact that they had joined the winning side. Much of the court’s interest in keeping order in Slavonia after the royal authority had been established there in late 1403 and early 1404 was largely based on the fact that Slavonia was a borderland and that the regions south of the Sava river were under control of Sigismund’s most dangerous local adversary in these parts – Hrvoje Vukčić Hrvatinić.

110 For administrative practices and authority, see, for example, excellent study by Given 2001.
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