

The Western Schism and Hungary: from Louis I to Sigismund of Luxembourg

ZSOLT HUNYADI



The issue of the Great Western Schism played a rather marginal role during many decades of Hungarian historiography. However, the following short overview of the scholarly studies of this field may provide several interesting considerations. The first manifest milestone in such historical works was the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century publications. These studies – although had their own limit of scope – are remarkable for many reasons. The first studies by János Karácsonyi (1885)¹, Antal Áldásy (1896)² and Vilmos Fraknói (1901)³ – just to mention the most influential historians – consulted not only the once contemporary European literature but they also collected the relevant sources of the topic, primarily charter materials. Fraknói himself spent several years in Rome collecting the *Hungarica* materials in the Vatican archive. The conclusions of these authors were very close to each other and their influence almost entirely determined the overall appraisal of the role played by the kingdom of Hungary in the Schism. Although they placed this issue into an international context, their ideas were to some extent meliorative and apologetic: at times on behalf of Hungarian royal policy, while sometimes on behalf of the Hungarian church or in favor of some particular members of the Hungarian clergy. Áldásy's work – which basically replaced that of Karácsonyi – covered the first phase of the Schism, that is, until the death of Urban VI. His overall conclusion was that the Roman obedience of Hungary had never been weakened or questioned since 1378. Neither Louis I (1342–1382), the Neapolitan Angevin king of Hungary, nor later Queen Mary (1382–1387) and the mother-Queen Elisabeth did hesitate to recognize the pontificate of the Roman pope. Fraknói, who studied the Hungarian-papal relations well into the end of the Middle Ages, formulated his ideas more cautiously but concerning this early stage he came to the more or less same conclusion. The very novelty of Fraknói's work was

¹ J. Karácsonyi, *Magyarország és a nyugati egyházszakadás*. [Hungary and the Western Schism] Nagyvárad 1885.

² A. Áldásy, *A nyugoti nagy egyházszakadás története VI. Orbán haláláig, 1378–1389*. [A History of the Western Schism until the death of Pope Urban VI, 1379–1389] Budapest 1896.

³ V. Fraknói, *Magyarország egyházi és politikai összeköttetései a római Szent-Székkal a magyar királyság megalapításától a konstanci zsinatig*. [Ecclesiastical and political relations of Hungary with the Holy See from the foundation of the Hungarian Kingdom until the Council of Constance] Budapest 1901.

the analysis of the period of King Sigismund (1387–1437) of Luxembourg at least until the Council of Constance. He was among the first Hungarian historians to emphasize that the turning point in the Hungarian–papal relations is to be sought during the first half of the reign of King Sigismund. He also has drawn the attention that despite the enactment of the bull of the college of cardinals in September of 1417⁴ there was no radical change in the Hungarian Church as far as the papal relations were concerned.

For several decades, Hungarian scholarship took for granted the conclusions of the mentioned two scholars. Right before the Second World War, Elemér Mályusz conducted remarkable research on the medieval Hungarian Church and thus he studied the period of the Schism as well.⁵ He managed to identify the bull of the cardinals of 1417, extant as a mid-fifteenth century copy in the municipal archive of Eperjes, what Fraknói failed to find in the Vatican materials.⁶ By this token, Mályusz focused on the problem of *ius patronatus* of the Hungarian rulers in the 1950s with special regard to the period of the Schism. Since he published his findings in German, his ideas relatively soon found their way into international historiography. During the communist regime, however, the topic was (again) neglected for a long while at least as far as local studies are concerned. Only the late 1980s and saw the reopening of unsettled questions concerning late fourteenth and early fifteenth century medieval Hungarian church, mostly to be found in foreign studies with particular interest in the rule of Sigismund of Luxembourg.⁷ Perhaps one of the rare exceptions was a certain Imre Bard of Hungarian origin, who prepared his doctoral dissertation⁸ in the United States. His dissertation remained unpublished but a seminal article of his appeared in 1979.⁹ Unfortunately, his study appeared in English in Munich thus it had no prompt and great impact on Hungarian historiography of the time.

⁴ 19 September 1417, National Archives of Hungary (henceforth: MOL) Df.228698. Fraknói sought the text for many years during his stay in Rome but it was only discovered after his death. For the text, see S. Csernus, *Sigismond et la soustraction d'obédience: une doctrine de politique internationale?*, dans *Crises et réformes dans l'église de la réforme grégorienne à la Préréforme*, Actes du 115e congrès national des Sociétés Savantes, Avignon, 1990, Paris 1991, 329–331.

⁵ The manuscript was prepared before the war but the book only was published in 1971. E. Mályusz, *Egyházi társadalom a középkori Magyarországon*. [Ecclesiastical society in medieval Hungary] Budapest 1971 (recent reprint: Budapest 2007).

⁶ Although the charter was calendared in the early 1930s, Hungarian scholars overlooked it for long. E. Mályusz, *Das Konstanzer Konzil und das königliche Patronatsrecht in Ungarn*, Budapest 1959, 8–9. See also A. Csizmadia, "Die Auswirkungen der 'Bulle' von Konstanz auf die Entwicklung des des Oberpatronatsrechts." *Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 2 (1960), 53–82. A. Szentirmai, "De 'iure supremi patronatus' regum Hungariae." *Monitor ecclesiasticus* 86 (1961), 281–291.

⁷ See S. Wefers, *Das politische System Kaiser Sigmunds*. Stuttgart 1989. W. Brandmüller, *Papst und Konzil in Großen Schisma*, Paderborn 1990. P. H. Stump, *The reforms of the Council of Constance (1414–1418)*, Leiden 1994.

⁸ I. Bard, *Aristocratic Revolts and the Late Medieval Hungarian State, 1382–1408*, PhD dissertation, University of Washington, Seattle 1978.

⁹ I. Bard, "The Break of 1404 Between the Hungarian Church and Rome." *Ungarn-Jahrbuch* 10 (1979), 59–69.

The first years of freedom following the collision of the communist regime manifested in "summing up" activity and, in many respect, turning back to the pre-war state of research. Three relevant articles were published on the very topic in the 1990s. First Sándor Csernus¹⁰ provided an important overview of the period which was followed, in 1996, by the studies of the archivist György Rácz¹¹ and Péter Erdő,¹² present-day cardinal and primate of Hungary. Rácz conducted extensive archival research on the Angevin period (1301–1387) and on the basis of his own findings he suggested to reappraise the attitude of the Hungarian court. The thorough analysis of the late fourteenth century, however, was done by another young scholar, Szilárd Süttő who prepared his doctoral dissertation on the political issues of Hungary, including the problem of the Great Schism in the period of 1382–1387. His research, published in 2003,¹³ led to several reconsiderations concerning the attitude of Hungary. He was also the first to go back to an issue which was superficially studied by Áldásy in the *Appendix* of his monograph: the role of the Hospitallers during the Schism.¹⁴ Partly contesting Süttő's view, I myself very recently contributed to the question concerning the role played by the Hospitallers in the schismatic controversy.¹⁵

Péter Erdő overviewed the rule of Sigismund from the point of view of papal relations. Although he reconstructed the political situation in details, his overall approach was of canon law and somewhat preoccupied in favor of the rights of the Church. More general international studies became available on Sigismund almost contemporary to Erdő, first of all, those of Walter Brandmüller¹⁶ or Jörg K. Hoensch¹⁷ who published works not only on Sigismund but also on the Luxembourg dynasty and their relationship to the Schism. Partly this is the reason for focusing now on the period until the rupture of 1404 as the later period is better known for the international scholarship.

¹⁰ Csernus, *Sigismund et la soustraction d'obédience*, 315–331.

¹¹ Gy. Rácz, "Az Anjou-ház és a Szentszék (1301–1387)," [The Angevin dynasty and the Holy See, 1301–1387] in *Magyarország és a Szentszék kapcsolatának ezer éve*, ed. I. Zombori, Budapest 1996, 58–81.

¹² P. Erdő, "A pápaság és a magyar királyság Zsigmond király idején (1387–1437)," [The papacy and the Hungarian Kingdom during the reign of King Sigismund, 1387–1437] in *Magyarország és a Szentszék kapcsolatának ezer éve*, ed. I. Zombori, Budapest 1996, 83–96.

¹³ Sz. Süttő, *Anjou-Magyarország alkonya. Magyarország politikai története Nagy Lajostól Zsigmondig, az 1384–1387. évi belviszályok okmánytárával*. [A political history of Hungary from Louis the Great until Sigismund, with the cartulary of the internal conflicts of the years 1384–1387] Szeged 2003.

¹⁴ Áldásy, *A nyugoti nagy egyházszakadás*, 507–518.

¹⁵ Zs. Hunyadi, *The Hospitallers in the Medieval Kingdom of Hungary c. 1150–1387*. Budapest 2010, 62–64, 88–90.

¹⁶ W. Brandmüller, *Papst und Konzil im Großen Schisma (1378–1431)*. Paderborn 1990. idem, *Das Konzil von Konstanz* 2 vols. Paderborn 1991–1997. See also, more recently, W. Brandmüller, *Sigismund – Römischer König, das Schisma und die Konzilien*, dans *Sigismundus Rex et Imperator: Kunst und Kultur zur Zeit Sigismunds von Luxemburg 1387–1437*, Ausstellungskatalog, ed. I. Takács, Mainz 2006, 430–432.

¹⁷ J. K. Hoensch, *Kaiser Sigismund. Herrscher an der Schwelle zur Neuzeit, 1368–1437*. Munich 1996, 162–278. See also idem, *Die Luxemburger. Eine spätmittelalterliche Dynastie gesamteuropäischer Bedeutung, 1308–1437*. Stuttgart 2000, 234–264.

There is a general accord among Hungarian historians that there was no major conflict in the papal-Hungarian relations towards the end of the reign of King Louis I in the 1370s. By the middle of the fourteenth century the canons of the chapter houses reconciled themselves that instead of canonical election either the king claimed his *ius patronatus* or the pope collated his own appointees. There is no fundamental doubt that in the very moment of the Schism in 1378 Louis I did not hesitate to obey the Roman pope, Urban VI. Right after the election in Fondi, Louis I sent a letter to Clement VII, jointly issued with Emperor Charles IV (1355–1378), aiming at convincing him to resign from the pontifical seat.¹⁸ Soon thereafter, following the death of the emperor, Louis I met Wenceslas (1378–1419), the successor of Charles IV on the throne of Bohemia, and they reinforced their obedience towards Rome.¹⁹ According to some historians, it was Wenceslas and Louis who also sent an embassy to the pope in Avignon. There is no manifest sign that Clement remarkably pressed Louis or the members of the Hungarian clergy to sign with him. Moreover, the relations with Urban VI was uninterrupted as it could be deduced from the fact that Cardinal Pileo of Prata, legate of Urban, came from Venice to Hungary to forward the cardinal's *insignia* to the archbishop of Esztergom in December of 1378.²⁰ However, the source of adherence of the Hungarian king was primarily of political nature deriving from his policy concerning Naples since the mid-fourteenth century. His ancient enemy, Joanna of Naples was among the firsts who recognized the pontificate of Clement VII.²¹ Louis I appreciated very much when Urban deposed Joanna. It is tempting to imagine that it was a well prepared plan of the pope and Louis. Soon thereafter he disclaimed his right of inheritance to the Neapolitan throne for the benefit of Prince Charles of Durazzo, his second cousin. Charles was crowned king of Naples by Urban VI in 1381. The cordial relationship which was based on mutual interests of the parties was, however, temporarily weakened. The fight for the throne of the kingdom of Hungary affected the papal-Hungarian relations too.

Since Louis I left no male heir, the question of succession hanged in the air: the future husband of his (second-born) daughter, Mary would be crowned as king of Hungary. In the beginning of 1372 an agreement was settled between Charles IV and Louis I. Accordingly, Sigismund, the second-born son of Charles betrothed Mary, daughter of Louis. Two years later, in 1374, Louis I made the Polish estates to recognize the descent of right to the throne on the female line of the Angevin dynasty in Poland (it meant the succession of Hedwig, his first-born daughter).²² As a consequence of this situation, following the death of Charles IV and Louis I, King Wenceslas of Bohemia wanted Mary for his younger brother and through this planned marriage, he wanted to secure the Polish throne for Sigismund. Opposing this political intention of the Luxembourg dynasty, two political parties

¹⁸ Áldásy, *A nyugoti nagy egyházszakadás*, 342.

¹⁹ G. Wenzel, ed. *Diplomáciai emlékek az Anjou-korból. Acta externa Andegavensia*. 3 vols., Budapest 1874–1876, 3: 183–185.

²⁰ Áldásy, *A nyugoti nagy egyházszakadás*, 20.

²¹ Cf. Rác, "Az Anjou-ház és a Szentszék," 78. H. Kaminsky, "The Great Schism," in *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, ed. M. Jones, Vol. 6. Cambridge 2000, 678.

²² Cf. E. Mályusz, *Kaiser Sigismund in Ungarn, 1387–1437*. Budapest 1990, 10.

emerged in Hungary which played a crucial role in the period of 1382–1387.²³ The first is known as “Angevin” or “courtly” party which harshly opposed Sigismund and its overall objective was the marriage of Mary and Duke Louis of Orleans, the younger brother of King Charles VI of France which came to existence *per procuracionem* in 1385. Certainly, through this marriage Hungary would have changed side and shifted to the Avignon obedience. Opposing both Sigismund and the idea of a French marriage, Slavonian lesser nobles, led by Bishop Paul of Horvát of Zagreb (1379–1386), rebelled against the queens and they took steps to invite Charles of Durazzo to the Hungarian throne.²⁴ There were some Hungarian prelates, headed by the Archbishop of Kalocsa, who supported the Neapolitan claimant but it was not in connection with the Schism. The only prelate who tended towards Clement VII was Bishop William of Győr (1378–1386), of foreign origin, but he has been deprived from his incomes in Hungary very shortly.²⁵

In autumn of 1383, John of Palisna, the Prior of the Hungarian-Slavonian Hospitaller Priory also joined the rebellion. The exact reasons for his joining are obscure; he may have objected to female rule, as suggested by the Croatian Ivan Kukuljević and Neven Budak.²⁶ In any case, he presumably wanted to gain power in southern part of Hungary. There was no sign of Palisna having any political dealings with the Angevin claimant, Charles of Durazzo, who stayed these days in Italy; on the contrary, Palisna had sought recognition from the Master at Avignon, Juan Fernández de Heredia. By November 1383 Queen Mother Elisabeth directed measures against Palisna in order to remove him from the office.²⁷ For the governance of the priory’s goods, ecclesiastical *gubernatores* were immediately appointed by Queen Elisabeth, and by the autumn of 1384 the Provençal Raymond de Beaumont had returned to Hungary where he apparently acted as the legitimate prior and used the priory’s seal. Accordingly, the Romanist “party” had prevailed among the Hospitallers, and Riccardo Caracciolo, the Hospitaller anti-master assigned his followers to several Hungarian preceptories for ten years.²⁸ Szilárd Süttő suggested that the return of Raymond might have been connected to the growing pro-Avignon attitude in the Hungarian court,²⁹ but the Provençal Raymond de Beaumont not only obeyed to Urban VI, and thus followed the Romanist cause but he had personally served Charles of Durazzo in 1381 as his lieutenant.³⁰

²³ Süttő, *Anjou-Magyarország alkonya*, 17–26.

²⁴ Süttő, *Anjou-Magyarország alkonya*, 107–111.

²⁵ Rácz, “Az Anjou-ház és a Szentszék,” 78.

²⁶ I. Kukuljević, “Priorat vranski sa vitezi templari hospitalci sv. Ivana u Hrvatskoj,” [The Priory of Vrana of the Templars and the Hospitallers in Croatia] *Rad Jugoslaven-ske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 81 (1886) 68–69; N. Budak, “John of Palisna, the Hospitaller Prior of Vrana,” in *The Crusades and the Military Orders: Expanding the Frontiers of Medieval Latin Christianity*, ed. Zs. Hunyadi, et J. Laszlovszky, Budapest 2001, 286; Süttő, *Anjou-Magyarország alkonya*, 46.

²⁷ Hunyadi, *The Hospitallers in the Medieval Kingdom of Hungary*, 63.

²⁸ MOL DI.7111.

²⁹ Süttő, *Anjou-Magyarország alkonya*, 136–137.

³⁰ Áldásy, *A nyugoti nagy egyházszakadás*, 411.



Shortly thereafter, the urbanist anti-master Caracciolo began to appoint preceptors to Hungarian houses.³¹ Parallel to these events, Urban VI began to support Queen Mary, while the claimant Charles of Durazzo, having lost good relations, soon became excommunicated. Despite these facts, in August 1385, Charles arrived to occupy the Hungarian throne and he was crowned as Charles (*Parvus*) II at the end of the same year. The Hospitaller prior did not play an active role in the making of the new king; that was the achievement of the rebels known as the Horvats' party. The ambitious Palisna might have taken the opportunity to ensure his own permanent occupation of the priory for decades during the rule of the Angevin Charles. However, there was a rebellion against Charles II in February 1386 and he was murdered a couple of weeks later. Certainly, the "Angevin" party dwelled upon schemes of vengeance and that encouraged Prior Palisna to become one of their adherents in the spring of 1386. He joined the rebellion against the queens, and he, having returned to power, perhaps even mobilized Hospitaller troops in July 1386 when the Angevin party attacked and imprisoned the two queens and their entourage. Although it seems certain that Palisna did not take part in the strangulation of the queen mother in November 1386, he was clearly declared an outlaw from this time onwards. Nevertheless, he was not in any immediate danger of arrest, especially as the rebels were still strong enough in Slavonia to oppose the troops of the new claimant, Sigismund of Luxembourg. Two months later Sigismund was crowned king and took further steps to consolidate his power with arms and promises.

These events led to confusion in the distempered priory, although in the summer of 1386 Riccardo Caracciolo was not aware of any serious disorder in the Hungarian-Slavonian priory. The reason is obvious: the escalation of events had begun a few weeks after the latest news which Caracciolo had received from Hungary, though he was better informed than the Avignonese Hospitallers with whom Palisna had broke all connections following his defection to the Angevin party. All his possessions had been confiscated by Queen Mary in September 1387,³² and two weeks later one of the most powerful supporters of Sigismund, Albert, a member of the Hungarian Losonc kindred, turned up as prior appointed by the new king.³³ The above outlined confused situation was further complicated by the fact that, contrary to the prevailing interpretation in the scholarly literature, the Hungarian-Slavonian priory, like some others, was divided.³⁴ An embarrassingly similar situation can be observed in Bohemia in the course of the Great Schism. The Bohemian priory became divided during the prior tenure of Ziemovit Těšín in 1383–1384.³⁵

³¹ Archives of the Order of St. John, National Library of Malta, Valletta, Vol. 281, f. 86^{r-v}, 92^v, 93^v. Edition: Hunyadi, *The Hospitallers in the Medieval Kingdom of Hungary*, 335–339.

³² M. Kostrenčić, et T. Smičiklas, ed. *Codex diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae ac Slavoniae. Diplomatički zbornik kraljevine Hrvatske, Dalmacije i Slavonije*, 18 vols. Zagreb 1904–1998, 17: 87.

³³ G. Fejér, *Codex diplomaticus Hungariae ecclesiasticus ac civilis*, 11 vols. Buda, 1829–1844, 10/1: 394.

³⁴ Hunyadi, *The Hospitallers in the Medieval Kingdom of Hungary*, 62–64.

³⁵ J. Mitáček, "Ziemovit Těšinský – generální převor řádu johanitů a slezský kníže," [Ziemovit Těšín – the Hospitaller prior and Duke of Silesia] *Studia Historica Brunensia*, 46 (1999), 21–23.

Having surveyed this short but important detour on the Hospitallers, let us turn back to the courtly policy in Hungary. On the succession of Sigismund, no remarkable change is to be detected in the overall attitude of Hungary concerning the obedience. The kingdom was among the first who recognized the pontificate of Boniface IX in 1389.³⁶ King Sigismund observed the papal reservation in Hungary even in case of the institutions under royal advowson. In return, Boniface avoided appointing foreigners for Hungarian ecclesiastical offices. The pope wanted to crown the brother of Sigismund, as emperor but at the same time the French court attempted to win Wenceslas over the obedience of Benedict XIII (what came true in 1398). Moreover, certain leagues of the Hungarian aristocracy objected Sigismund's Czech orientation and relationships thus conspired against him in 1402, arrested him and they invited Ladislas of Naples, son of Charles of Durazzo, to the Hungarian throne.³⁷ The events have been accelerated. Boniface sent a legate to Hungary in the same year in order to facilitate the accession of Ladislas of Naples.³⁸ Upon this intervention, following his release from captivity, Sigismund broke with Boniface IX but it is important to emphasize that he neither obeyed to Benedict XIII. Most likely it was not a clear subtraction as the Hungarian king did not actually change side but, on the other hand, the nineteenth-century view of Karácsonyi and Aldásy on the unflinching Romanist attitude of the Hungarian court should be reconsidered.³⁹ Sigismund started to put the affairs of the Hungarian Church into his own hands. He ordered in 1404⁴⁰ that those ecclesiastical offices which beforehand fell under papal collation should be henceforth required from the king. Moreover, those who gained their offices during the turmoil since 1402 should apply for royal confirmation otherwise they are to lose their incomes. The document also claimed that orders issued by the pope or cardinals, papal legates, auditors and judges delegate regarding benefices, or criminal and private cases should be regarded invalid unless they are confirmed by the Hungarian ruler.⁴¹ It was a very crude manifestation of the *placetum regium* in Hungary. Some historians noted that Sigismund only meant a temporary restriction⁴² but from the document it does not seem so. Although Hungarian churchmen kept referring to Rome even in 1404, what is more, after the death of Boniface IX, Innocent VII kept collating church offices in Hungary,⁴³ Sigismund reserved

³⁶ Some years later, clear reference can be found in the charter of the pope himself: 24 April 1394, MOL Df.237407. Fejér, *Codex diplomaticus*, 10/2: 200-203.

³⁷ Mályusz, *Kaiser Sigismund*, 63-69.

³⁸ A. Theiner, ed. *Vetera Monumenta Historica Hungarum Sacram Illustrantia*, 1216-1352, 2 vols. Romae 1859-1860, 2: 172-176.

³⁹ Cf. Süttő, *Anjou-Magyarország alkonya*, 138.

⁴⁰ Edition: F. Döry Ferenc, Gy. Bónis, V. Bácskai, ed. *Decreta regni Hungariae. Gesetze und Verordnungen Ungarns 1301-1457*. Budapest 1976, 180-182. J. M. Bak, et al., ed. *The Laws of the Medieval Kingdom of Hungary, 1000-1490*, 4 vols, Salt Lake City-Los Angeles-Idyllwild, 1992-2005, 2: 29-30.

⁴¹ Cf. Bard, *The Break of 1404*, 60-61. See also, Csernus, *Sigismund et la soustraction d'obédience*, 317-319.

⁴² Cf. Fraknoi, *Magyarország egyházi és politikai összeköttetései*, 292-293. P. Erdő, "A pápaság és a magyar királyság," 85-86.

⁴³ E. Mályusz, ed. *Zsigmondkori oklevéltár*. [Cartulary of the Sigismund era] Budapest 1958, vol. 2/2: nos. 3490, 3493, 3499 (1404), 3595 (1405), etc.

the incomes of most of the vacant offices including the Hospitaller Hungarian-Slavonian Priory. In some cases the king even appointed bishops but he always referred to them as elected bishops.⁴⁴ Certainly, the pope felt strongly about the situation since he did not receive the revenues and it was a major issue for both sides during the decades of the Schism. It seems that Boniface IX did not provide so many concessions as did his Avignonese opponent to his adherents. This is a point of importance as it seems very much that the break between Sigismund and the Roman pope in 1404 was based rather on financial and political matters than spiritual ones.⁴⁵ The disagreement started already in 1400 when Boniface supported the German prince-electors in attempting to depose Wenceslas, the brother of Sigismund and to elect Ruprecht of Pfalz.⁴⁶ The immediate reply from Sigismund was only delayed because of his imprisonment and the 1402 rebellion against him by the leagues of the Hungarian aristocracy, but undoubtedly he decided to cease the Roman obedience no later than 1401. In November of the same year Wenceslas informed Charles VI that Sigismund shows a growing interest in the settlement in the Schism⁴⁷ which meant, in the language of diplomacy, that he dwelled upon turning to the Avignonese obedience. Admittedly, Sigismund himself, while explaining his reasons for the measures launched, seemed to refer to spiritual abuses and misconduct of foreigners those held Hungarian benefices but in fact it was a paltering. The Roman pope openly reacted upon Sigismund's assumed inclination towards Avignon. Boniface refused to receive the envoys of Sigismund sent to him in March of 1402⁴⁸ and a year later he allowed Ladislav of Naples to retain the tithes of the Neapolitan churches in order to finance his accession to the Hungarian throne.⁴⁹ The Hungarian ruler definitively lost his patience when the legate of Boniface IX demanded provision from the Hungarian church, that is, the bishop of Zengg (Segnia), during his stay in the kingdom in order to facilitate the accession of the claimant Ladislav of Naples. The legate was also authorized to absolve those prelates who may rebel against Sigismund and to excommunicate those who remain on the side of the Hungarian king. In reply, Sigismund deposed the "traitorous" prelates and reserved the incomes of most of the vacant offices, especially those of the exiled prelates, and appointed lay governors to collect their revenues. On the whole, this situation resembled to the one in Florence at the very beginning of the Schism when the town subtracted from both sides in terms of the *temporalia* but remained obedient to Rome concerning the *spiritualia*.⁵⁰ Clearly, Sigismund was not interested in abandoning all sorts of relationship with Rome.

⁴⁴ DL.72403 (1406), Df.200413 (1406), Df.273135 (1407).

⁴⁵ I. Bard, *The Break of 1404*, 62–63.

⁴⁶ 25 March 1401, J. Weizsacker, ed. *Deutsche Reichstagsakten unter König Ruprecht, 1400–1401*. Vol. 4, Gotha 1882, 22.

⁴⁷ *Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Moraviae*, ed. V. Brandl, Vol. 13, Brünn 1897, 156.

⁴⁸ Cf. J. Weizsacker, *Deutsche Reichstagsakten*, 72.

⁴⁹ V. Fraknói, et al. dir, *Bullae Bonifacii IX. P. M. 1396–1404*, Monumenta Vaticana historiam regni Hungariae illustrantia, Ser. I, vol. 4. Budapest 1889, no. 518.

⁵⁰ Cf. G. Holmes, "Florence and the Great Schism," in *Art and Politics in Renaissance Italy: British Academy Lectures*, ed. G. Holmes, Oxford 1993, 19–40. See also A. W. Lewin, *Negotiating Survival: Florence and the Great Schism, 1378–1417*. Madison 2003, 57–95.

Allegedly, his father, Charles IV, before his death, suggested Sigismund to hold by the Roman pope which proved to be profitable upon his election as king of the Romans and thus *advocatus ecclesiae* in 1410/11; especially, since the Schism reached its next stage after the Council of Pisa in 1409. The predecessor of Sigismund as king of the Romans, Ruprecht of Pfalz remained faithful to Gregory XII but the new ruler inclined towards the successor of the short reigned Alexander V, a certain Baltasaro Cossa who started his pontificate as John XXIII in 1410.⁵¹ He called for an ecumenical council as early as March of 1413 without specifying the place of the meeting. In the arrangements Sigismund played a crucial role by prevailing upon the two other popes, Gregory XII and Benedict XIII and their followers to attend the council as he could be regarded neutral in comparison with Pope John XXIII. However, Sigismund neither wanted John XXIII in the pontifical seat thus he planned to force him to resign, alike Gregory and Benedict.⁵²

All in all, the council, eventually convoked to Constance, met in 1414 and besides of many other issues of the Schism or its abandonment, Sigismund tried to strengthen his own position concerning the *ius patronatus* exercised in Hungary. According to the bull of the college of cardinals present at the council in September of 1417, the king managed to secure his position gained by the *placetum regium* of 1404, but the present-day extant sources⁵³ may reveal that during the pontificate of Pope Martin V all Hungarian vacant ecclesiastical positions have been collated by the Curia. It may well be that Sigismund's behavior was in conformance with his plan in the making of a new Holy Roman Emperor, particularly as the pope was fully indebted from Sigismund's supportive activity.⁵⁴ But it took for him another fifteen years of diplomatic arrangements to reach such heights finally in 1433.

⁵¹ Cf. Brandmüller, *Sigismund – Römischer König*, 430.

⁵² Brandmüller, *Sigismund – Römischer König*, 431.

⁵³ For instance, V. Fraknói, ed. *Monumenta romana episcopatus Wesprimiensis, 1103–1526*, 3 vols. Budapest 1896–1907, Vol. 3: 5. P. Lukcsics, *Diplomata pontificum saec. XV. Martinus papa: 1417–1431*, Budapest 1931, Vol. 1: no. 42.

⁵⁴ *Inter alia*, see Fejér, *Codex diplomaticus*, 10/5: 821.