LEGITIMACY OF A RULER AT THE BEGINNING OF THE 14TH CENTURY: CHARLES I OF HUNGARY AND THE STRUGGLE FOR THE KINGDOM OF HUNGARY*

ANDREJ ONDREJKA

ONDREJKA, Andrej. Legitimacy of a Ruler at the Beginning of the 14th Century: Charles I of Hungary and the Struggle for the Kingdom of Hungary. Historický časopis, 2025, 73, 3, pp. 527-545, Bratislava.

The foundations of the succession rights to the Hungarian throne for Charles I of Hungary (1301/1308/1310–1342) were laid around 1270. While the origin of these claims is relatively clear, determining when the process of Charles' accession to the Hungarian throne was completed is more complicated due to the dynamics of events in the first decade of the 14th century. Upon his accession, Charles faced not only resistance from a significant portion of the Hungarian nobles but also other pretenders claiming the throne of the Kingdom of Hungary. The King of Bohemia, Wenceslaus II, sought to secure the Hungarian throne for his son Wenceslaus, to whom a portion of Hungarian nobility had promised the crown. After the death of the last male member of the Árpád dynasty, King Andrew III († 1301), only a candidate with strong support could succeeded in the complicated environment of the Kingdom of Hungary. The papal curia, pursuing its own political goals, actively intervened in the succession disputes in Hungary. Boniface VIII, the last pope enforcing papal universalism, was closer to the Neapolitan royal court than to the Bohemian. Both young contenders, Charles and Wenceslaus, had to assert the legitimacy of their claims not only before the Hungarian nobility but also before the Roman Church. Ultimately, Charles obtained the Hungarian throne, but he had to fight hard for his inheritance for years. The struggle to assert his legitimacy was, however, won at the beginning of the 14th century. Based on a comparison of data from written sources, particularly of Hungarian and Italian origins from the turn of the 13th and 14th centuries, I am seeking an answer to the question: Since when can Charles I of Hungary be considered the sole legitimate king of the Kingdom of Hungary, and why?

Keywords: Kingdom of Hungary. Charles I of Hungary. Legitimacy. 14th century.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31577/histcaso.2025.73.3.4

* The research on this article was supported by the Slovak Research and Development Agency under the Contract no. APVV-24-0060 – *Antemurale Christianitatis: Hungary as the Bastion of the Christian West*.

The foundations of Charles I of Hungary's[1] dynastic claims to the Hungarian throne were laid as early as around 1270. While the origins of such assertions are relatively well-defined, determining the precise moment at which Charles's accession to the Hungarian throne was complete is rendered more complex by the fluid political dynamics of the first decade of the fourteenth century. Upon his assumption of the Hungarian crown, Charles faced not only the resistance of a substantial portion of the domestic aristocracy, but also the rivalry of additional claimants to rule over the Kingdom of Hungary. It took Charles many years to ascend to the apex of the political elite within the kingdom. Who was responsible for Charles's eventual success? From what point onward can Charles I of Hungary be regarded as the sole legitimate monarch of the Kingdom of Hungary, and on what basis?

As with many other noteworthy developments, the question of succession in the Kingdom of Hungary[2] was closely connected to the papal curia—its

1 The form of Charles's name used in this study is based on the usage found in the Chronicon Pictum, which states: *"*[...] *querit primo in terra sua vocaverunt carobertum qua si carolum robertum; in hungaria autem oblato* [correctly *ablato* (author's note)] *roberto ipsum hungari carolum vocaverunt* [...]*."* For comparison, see: BAK and VESZPRÉMY, eds. *Chronica de gestis Hungarorum e codice picto saec. XIV. Chronicle of the Deeds of the Hungarians from the Fourteenth-Century Illuminated Codex*. Budapest; New York 2018, p. 340. See also: SZENTPÉTERY, ed. *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum tempore ducum regumque stirpis Arpadianae gestarum*. Vol. I. Budapestini 1937, p. 478. As the chronicler indicates, Charles was allegedly referred to in his homeland (i.e., the Kingdom of Naples) as *Carolus Robertus*; however, since the Hungarians had already dropped the name Robert by the fourteenth century, and all royal charters issued by Charles begin the titulature with *Nos Karolus dei gratia rex*, i.e., without *Robertus*, the form Charles I of Hungary will be used throughout this study. The epithet "of Hungary" is employed primarily to distinguish this king from his great-great-grandfather, Charles I of Sicily. Moreover, as indicated in footnote 29 of this document, Charles had no legal claim to the County of Anjou from 1295 onward, and thus, referring to him as "of Anjou" is not accurate.

2 A considerable amount of scholarly literature has been published on this subject; here, only a selection of works directly related to the topic of the present study is provided, each of which includes references to further relevant scholarship: BAK and PÁLFFY. *Crown and Coronation in Hungary 1000–1916 A.D*. Budapest 2020, pp. 31-33; BÁLING. Personal Network of the Neapolitan Angevins and Hungary (1290–1304). In BARABÁS and KISS, eds. *Specimina Nova Pars Prima Sectio Medievalis VIII*. Pécs 2015, pp. 85-93; BREZOVÁKOVÁ. Politický zápas Anjouovcov o uhorskú korunu. In *Historický časopis*, 1991, vol. 33, no. 6, pp. 569-587; CSUKOVITS. *Az Anjouk Magyarországon. I. rész: I. Károly és uralkodása (1301–1342)*. Budapest 2012, pp. 41-57; ENGEL. *The Realm of St. Stephen. A History of Medieval Hungary, 895–1526*. London; New York 2001, pp 107-110, 128-130; ENGEL; KRISTÓ and KUBINYI, eds. *Magyarország története 1301–1526*. Budapest 1998, pp. 41-51; KOZŁOWSKI. Power-Winning Contexts and Strategies of Charles I and Wenceslas III. A Comparison of Their Quest for the Hungarian Throne. In *The New Europe College Yearbook*. Bucharest 2015, vol. 2012–2013, pp. 131-174. MALÉTH. La relation de Charles Ier de Hongrie avec

political interests and its relationship with secular authority. Within the context of the protracted conflict between the Ghibellines and the Guelfs in the *Sacrum Imperium Romanum*, on the Italian Peninsula, it was essential for the papal curia to secure the support of secular rulers willing to advance its agenda.[3] One such opportunity arose following the death of Emperor Frederick II (†1250), who simultaneously ruled over the Kingdom of Sicily. For over half a century, the papal domains in central Italy had been effectively encircled by Hohenstaufen power. Consequently, one of the curia's key priorities was to place on the Sicilian throne—a throne the papacy claimed as a papal fief—a ruler who would further its political interests; in other words, someone who did not belong to the Hohenstaufen dynasty.[4] The successful candidate proved to be Charles I of Anjou, brother of King Louis IX of France. Charles was crowned King of Sicily in Rome on 5 January 1266.

Following the defeat of Manfred at the Battle of Benevento on 26 February 1266 and the subsequent defeat of Conradin at the Battle of Tagliacozzo on 23 August 1268,[5] and after partially consolidating his position within the Kingdom of Sicily, Charles of Anjou was able to turn his attention toward the Eastern Mediterranean. In pursuing his expansionist ambitions, particularly against

---

la papauté (1301–1342). In BARABÁS and KISS, eds. *Specimina Nova Pars Prima Sectio Medievalis IX*. Pécs 2017, pp. 77-94; ZSOLDOS. Kings and Oligarchs in Hungary at the Turn of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries. In *Hungarian Historical Review*. Budapest 2013, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 211-242. For a brief overview, see also: ŠTEFÁNIK. Anjouovská nová monarchia a žigmundovská rovnováha. In ŠTEFÁNIK; STEINHÜBEL et al. *Panovnícka moc v stredoveku*. Bratislava 2022, pp. 24-28.

3 For further discussion within the context of the present study, see for example: ABULAFIA. The Kingdom of Sicily under the Hohenstaufen and Angevins. In ABULAFIA, ed. *The New Cambridge Medieval History. Volume V c. 1198–c. 1300*. Cambridge 1999, pp. 500-508; ABULAFIA. *The Western Mediterranean Kingdoms, 1200–1500: The Struggle for Dominion*. London 1997, pp. 57-62; DUNBABIN. *Charles I of Anjou*. London 1998, pp. 4-7; MUNDY. *Europe in the High Middle Ages 1150–1300*. London 2000, pp. 224-233; RAPP. *Le Saint Empire romain germanique*. Paris 2003, pp. 169-193; RUNCIMAN. *The Sicilian Vespers*. Cambridge 1992, pp. 18-19; WATT. The Papacy. In ABULAFIA, ed. *The New Cambridge Medieval History. Volume V c. 1198–c. 1300*. Cambridge 1999, pp. 107-163. On the succession in Sicily in the mid-thirteenth century, see also: DUNBABIN, *Charles I*, pp. 55-77; EHLERS; MÜLLER and SCHNEIDMÜLLER. *Die französischen Könige des Mittelalters. Von Odo bis Karl VIII. (888–1498)*. München 1996, pp. 178-182; HÉLARY. French Nobility and the Military Requirements of the King (c. 1260–c. 1314). In JORDAN and PHILLIPS, eds. *The Capetian Century, 1214–1314*. Turnhout 2017, pp. 126-130.

4 On the question of succession in Sicily in the mid-thirteenth century, see, for example: DUNBABIN, *Charles I*, pp. 55-77; EHLERS; MÜLLER and SCHNEIDMÜLLER, *Die französischen Könige*, pp. 178-182; HÉLARY, French Nobility, pp. 126-130.

5 See: ABULAFIA, *The Kingdom of Sicily*, pp. 508-512; MUNDY, *Europe in the High Middle Ages*, pp. 229-230; RAPP, *Le Saint Empire romain germanique*, pp. 167-168.

the Byzantine Empire, Charles required a powerful ally. In a charter dated 15 September 1270,[6] Charles declared his intention *"to form alliances with the most loyal princes, through marriages and betrothals of our children and the children of the aforementioned princes,"* and as at that time there was no prince, *"more distinguished, noble, powerful, and devoted to the faith"* than *"Stephen, by the grace of God exalted King of Hungary* [...] *of the lineage of holy and great kings* [...]*[7] we wish to fully satisfy the aforementioned lord king* [Stephen V] *in all the aforementioned respects, should he desire it, so that now and forever, he and we, our descendants and his descendants, shall be always one and the same."*[8] The King of Sicily subsequently appointed three men, his *"beloved counsellors and familiars"* as plenipotentiaries and envoys, tasked with negotiating and concluding the betrothals and marriages *"between our* [Charles's] *sons and daughters and the sons and daughters of the aforementioned King of Hungary."*[9] The children in question were Ladislaus and Maria, offspring of Stephen V of Hungary, and Elisabeth (Isabella) and Charles, children of Charles I of Anjou,

6 FEJÉR, ed. CDH. Tomus IV, Vol. 3. Budae 1829, pp. 510-512. Fejér dates the charter to the year 1269; however, based on the dating given within the document itself (*XV. Septembris, XIII. Indictionis*), it is reasonable to assume that the charter was in fact issued in 1270. According to the method of calculation, the thirteenth indiction (lat. *indictio*) of the 15-year cycle corresponds to the year 1270. For the computation of the indiction, see: NOVÁK. *Chronológia*. Bratislava 2004, pp. 43-44. Based on this method of calculating the year using the indiction specified in the charter, I likewise consider the dating of the same document in WENZEL, ed. MHH, I. Budapest 1874, no. 20, pp. 24-25, to be incorrect. However, Wenzel provides correct year calculations in other charters where the date must similarly be determined by converting the indiction. See, for example: WENZEL, MHH, I, no. 58, p. 53; no. 78, pp. 64-65; no. 98, pp. 80-81.

7 On the significance of the sacred character of the Árpád dynasty in the context of the accession of a new dynasty to the Hungarian throne at the beginning of the fourteenth century, see, for example: LUCHERINI. The Irruption of the Sacred into the History of Hungarian Kings in the Mirror of the Angevin "Illuminated Chronicle" (around 1358). In VERCAMER and ZUPKA, eds. *Rulership in Medieval East Central Europe. Power, Ritual and Legitimacy in Bohemia, Hungary and Poland*. Leiden 2022, pp. 217-246; KLANICZAY. *Holy Rulers and Blessed Princesses. Dynastic Cults in Medieval Central Europe*. Cambridge 2002, pp. 295-331.

8 *"*[...] *cum fidelissimis Principibus amicitias contrahere, tam per matrimonia et sponsalia liberorum nostrorum, et filiorum et filiarum dictorum Principum* [...] *excellentior et nobilior, polentior et maioris fidei* [...] *Stephanus, Dei gratia, illustris rex Ungarie* [...] *de genere Sanctorum et maximorum Regum* [...] *voIumus predicto Domino regi omnibus modis predictis totaliter assignari, si ei placeat, quod nunc et in perpetuum ipse et nos, nostrique et sui descendentes semper simus vnum et idem* [...]*"* FEJÉR, CDH, IV, 3, p. 510.

9 *"*[...] *dilectorum Consiliariorum, et familiarium* [...] *tractandum et laciendum, et complendum cum Domino dicto rege Ungariae sponsalia et matrimonia inter filios nostros, et filias nostras, et filios et filias dicti regis* [...]*"* FEJÉR, CDH, IV, 3, pp. 510-511.

King of Sicily.[10] On the basis of this double marital alliance, the descendants of Charles I of Anjou acquired a dynastic pretext to claim the throne of the Kingdom of Hungary.

The first claim to the Hungarian throne was made by Maria, daughter of Stephen V and wife of Charles II of Naples.[11] Following the death of her brother, King Ladislaus IV of Hungary, she refused to recognize the claim of Andrew III to the Hungarian throne.[12] In April 1291, Charles II issued a charter addressed *"to all ecclesiastical prelates, counts, barons, knights, and men of the Kingdom of Hungary,"*[13] urging them not to acknowledge *"a certain Andrew of Venice* [Andrew III]*"*[14] as King of Hungary. In the document, Charles states explicitly that *"the succession to this kingdom* [of Hungary]*, which after the death of the aforementioned king* [Ladislaus IV] *rightly passed by law to our dearest wife, the sister of that king, and to her heirs, has been unlawfully seized by this man* [Andrew III]*, who recklessly took possession of the crown of the said kingdom."*[15] Subsequently, on 6 January 1292, Charles's wife Maria transferred

10 On the aforementioned dynastic connection, see for example: BREZOVÁKOVÁ, Politický zápas Anjouovcov, p. 570; CSUKOVITS, *Az Anjouk Magyarországon*, pp. 49-52; KIESEWETTER. *Die Anfänge der Regierung König Karls II. von Anjou (1278–1295): Das Königreich Neapel, die Grafschaft Provence und der Mittelmeerraum zu Ausgang des 13. Jahrhunderts*. Husum 1998, pp. 26-36; KOZŁOWSKI, Power-Winning Contexts, p. 144; PALKO. Uhorsko-české vzťahy v rokoch 1270 – 1272. In *Historia Nova* 14, 2017, p. 10; VLASKO. Počiatky Anjouovcov v Uhorsku. In *Historia Nova* 6, 2013, pp. 26-31; ZSOLDOS, Kings and Oligarchs, pp. 211-212.

11 In the context of the events of 1282 in Sicily (the so-called Sicilian Vespers) and the subsequent incorporation of the island into the Crown of Aragon, the kingdom ruled by the descendants of Charles I of Anjou will be refferred to as the Kingdom of Naples. For a more detailed discussion of this issue, see, for example: ABULAFIA, *The Western Mediterranean Kingdoms*, pp. 66-80; DUNBABIN, *Charles I*, pp. 99-114; RUNCIMAN, *The Sicilian Vespers*, pp. 214-228; THÉRY-ASTRUC. The Pioneer of Royal Theocracy: Guillaume de Nogaret and the Conflicts between Philip the Fair and the Papacy. In JORDAN and PHILLIPS, eds. *The Capetian Century, 1214–1314*. Turnhout 2017, p. 225.

12 WENZEL, MHH, I, no. 94, pp. 76-77. See also: BÁLING, Personal Network, pp. 85-86; BREZOVÁKOVÁ, Politický zápas Anjouovcov, pp. 569-571; ENGEL, *The Realm of St. Stephen*, p. 110; FINE. *The Late Medieval Balkans: A Critical Survey from the Late Twelfth Century to the Ottoman Conquest*. Ann Arbor 1994, pp. 207-208; KIESEWETTER, *Die Anfänge der Regierung*, p. 375.

13 *"*[...] *Prelatis Ecclesiarum, Comitibus, Baronibus, militibus et aliis uniuersis hominibus de Regno Ungarie* [...]*"* WENZEL, MHH, I, p. 76.

14 *"*[...] *quidam de Venetiis Andreatius nomine* [...]*"* WENZEL, MHH, I, p. 76.

15 *"*[...] *cuius successio per obitum dicti Regis ad Reginam consortem nostram carissimam, ipsius Regis germanam, et eius heredes est rationabiliter deuoluta, nequiter occupauit, et assumens improuide diadema Regni predicti* [...]*"* WENZEL, MHH, I, p. 76.

her dynastic rights to their eldest son, Charles Martel, Prince of Salerno and heir to the Kingdom of Naples.[16]

The papal curia supported the claim of Maria and her son, Charles Martel. In a charter dated 2 January 1291, Pope Nicholas IV (1288 – 1292) wrote to John, Bishop of Jesi,[17] stating that he had been informed of disturbances in the Kingdom of Hungary relating to the succession after the death of King Ladislaus IV, since *"various* [pretenders] *assert their right to the throne of the said kingdom."*[18] The Pope further instructed Bishop John that *"it is known that this kingdom in many respects belongs to the Apostolic See,"* and therefore, in the name of the Apostolic See, he should *"openly and publicly declare this claim, so that no one, regardless of rank,* […] *may usurp any rights or undertake anything* [in the Kingdom of Hungary] *to the detriment of us and of the Church itself."*[19] From this it is clear that Nicholas IV regarded the resolution of the Hungarian succession as a prerogative of the papacy. For this reason as well, on 31 January 1291, the Pope addressed a letter[20] to Archbishop Lodomer of Esztergom, reproaching him for failing to send notice to Rome of the death of Ladislaus IV or any report on the state of the kingdom. The Pope informed Lodomer that he had dispatched Bishop John of Jesi to Hungary for the curia to obtain reliable information. In the final lines of the letter to the archbishop, he emphasized that *"this* [Hungarian] *kingdom has from ancient times belonged to the Roman Church."*[21] The papal curia consistently supported the claims of Maria and Charles Martel, who from 1292 onwards styled himself as King of Hungary by the grace of God.[22] Although

16 FEJÉR, CDH, VI, 1, pp. 190-192; SMIČIKLAS, ed. CDC, Vol. VII. Zagreb 1909, no. 59, pp. 67-68; WENZEL, MHH, I, pp. 82-84. For a more detailed account of events in Hungary concerning the succession of Andrew III, see for example: ZSOLDOS. III. András. In SZOVÁK; SZENTPÉTERI and SZAKÁCS, eds. *Szent István és III. András*. Budapest 2003, pp. 119-227; SZŰCS. Az utolsó Árpádok. Budapest 2002, pp. 446-480. From this point onward, Charles Martel dated the beginning of his reign in Hungary. This is evidenced, for instance, by his charter dated 20 June 1295, which includes the dating formula *"Regni nostri anno quarto."* A seal allegedly belonging to this charter depicted Charles Martel as King of Hungary; see further: WENZEL, MHH, I, p. 126.

17 Latin: *diocesis Aesina*; today it forms part of the Archdiocese of Ancona-Osimo in Italy.

18 *"*[...] *diversis aspirantibus ad solium dicti regni* [...]*"* FEJÉR, CDH, VI, 1, p. 81.

19 *"*[...] *regnum ipsum ad apostolicam sedem multipliciter pertinere noscatur* [...] *aperte et publice* [...] *protestando, ut nullus, cuiuscunque sit status* [...] *quomodolibet invadere, occupare, vel usurpare praesumat, aut in nostrum et eiusdem Ecclesiae praeiudicium et grauamen aliquid attentare."* FEJÉR, CDH, VI, 1, pp. 81-82.

20 FEJÉR, CDH, VI, 1, pp. 85-87. A similar letter was addressed by Pope Nicholas IV to John, Archbishop of Kalocsa; see FEJÉR, CDH, VI, 1, pp. 87-88.

21 *"*[...] *regnum ipsum ad Romanam Ecclesiam ab antiquo etiam pertinere noscatur* [...]*"* FEJÉR, CDH, VI, 1, p. 87.

22 See, for example: WENZEL, MHH, I, pp. 88, 98, 114.

Charles Martel sought to win the favour of the Hungarian nobility,[23] he failed to acquire any real power within the kingdom.

A clear opinion regarding the succession after Ladislaus IV was expressed at the beginning of the fourteenth century by the author of the *Anonymi Descriptio Europae Orientalis*:[24]

> *"and because the aforementioned Hungarian king Ladislaus died without an heir* […] *and all his sisters were married to schismatics, except for the Queen of Sicily, she remained a Catholic and inherited the kingdom* [of Hungary]*, bequeathing the said kingdom to her firstborn son, Charles Martel. After his death, the kingdom was inherited by his son Charles* [I of Hungary] *Robert, who now reigns based on the aforementioned reason."*[25]

Awareness of the claims of Maria of Hungary and her descendants to the Hungarian throne was present even among Western European clerics. Likewise, support from the papal curia continued consistently throughout the 1290s.

Following the death of Pope Nicholas IV (and the brief pontificate of Celestine V), the papal throne was assumed by Boniface VIII (1294–1303).[26] He continued the policies of his predecessors and supported the Angevin claim to the Hungarian throne. The situation was then complicated by the premature death of Charles Martel in August 1295, meaning Charles II of Naples lost his firstborn son and heir to the throne.[27] The new heir to the Neapolitan throne became

23 Charles Martel borrowed money to finance his embassies to Hungary; see: WENZEL, MHH, I, p. 90.

24 The name of the author is unknown, but based on the form and content of the work, it can be asserted that he was a cleric—most likely a Dominican—originating from a French milieu, as he refers in several passages with relative precision and detail to connections with the Capetian dynasty. For more on the identification of the author and the dating of the work, see, for example: DEER. Ungarn in der Descriptio Europae Orientalis. In *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, vol. 45, 1931, pp. 1-22; ŽIVKOVIĆ; PETROVIĆ and UZELAC. Anonymi Descriptio Europae Orientalis. In *Sources for Serbian History*, vol. 13. Latin Sources, vol. 2. Belgrade 2013, pp. 13-17.

25 *"*[...] *et quia prefatus rex Hungarie Ladislaus mortuus est sine herede* [...] *ac etiam sorores eius omnes fuerunt nupte scismaticis preter reginam Sicilie, ideo ipsa sicut catholica remansit heres regni et ipsa fecit donationem de dicto regno filio suo primogenito Carolo, scilicet Martello. Quo mortuo successit eidem in regno Carolus Bertus, filius suus, qui nunc regnat ratione iam tacta."* ŽIVKOVIĆ; PETROVIĆ and UZELAC, Anonymi Descriptio, p. 144.

26 As the Dominican Bernard Gui writes in his *Flores Chronicorum*: *"Bonifacius VIII. natione Campanus, de Anagnia civitate, fuit electus in papam in civitate Neapoli* [...] *anno eiusdem 1294* [...]*"* BOUQUET, ed. *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*. Tome 21. Paris 1860, p. 710. As this passage suggests, Boniface VIII originated directly from the Neapolitan environment, and it was therefore to be expected that he would continue the Italian policy of the papal curia in accordance with that promoted by the Neapolitan royal court.

27 Pope Boniface VIII expressed his sorrow over the death of Charles Martel, the firstborn son

Robert, the third son of Charles II and Maria of Hungary.[28] In the Neapolitan line of succession, Robert thereby displaced his nephew, the eight-year-old Charles. Unfortunately for the young Charles, his father had renounced his rights to the counties of Anjou and Maine in the Kingdom of France shortly before his death in favour of his sister Margaret.[29] Thus, Charles retained only the inherited claim to the Kingdom of Hungary, a claim whose realization would depend entirely on the support of the papal curia and the court of Naples.[30]

Whereas until this point, the young Charles could be identified in charters only as a child or as the descendant of Maria or Charles Martel, in a charter dated 26 April 1300 he appears under his own name. In this document, Charles II writes *"to all ecclesiastical prelates, counts, barons, and all others in the Kingdom of Hungary, as well as in Slavonia and Dalmatia,"* and announces, among other things, that he will send *"his dearest grandson Charles, son of the late King of Hungary* [Charles Martel]*, our descendant"* to Hungary[31] Further charters

---

and heir of Charles II of Sicily, in a charter dated 30 August 1295; for the regest of the charter, see: POTTHAST, ed. *Regesta pontificum romanorum. Inde ab a. post Christum natum MCXCVIII ad a. MCCCIV*. Vol. II. Berolini 1875, no. 24 173, pp. 1 936-1 937; for the full text of the charter, see the edition by RAYNALDO. *Annales Ecclesiastici Ab Anno MCXCVIII. usque ad Annum MDXXXIV*. Tomus XIV. Rome 1648, § 19, p. 476.

28 Robert became the heir and successor of Charles II in the Kingdom of Naples after his elder brother Louis, the second son of Charles II, decided–following the death of Charles Martel–to renounce all his worldly possessions and rights and entered the Order of St. Francis. For a transcript of the charter dated 29 December 1296 in which this event is mentioned, see: RAYNALDO, *Annales Ecclesiastici*, § 16, pp. 492-493. For more on Robert and the issue of his succession in the Kingdom of Naples, see also, briefly: KRISTÓ. Károly Róbert családja. In *Aetas. Történettudományi folyóirat*, 2006, vol. 20, no. 4, p. 14. Even some of Robert's contemporaries acknowledged the of uncertainty of legitimacy of his succession in Naples; see, for example: VILLANI. *Cronica Nuova*, Book XI, ch. CCXXIII [online]; ALIGHIERI. *Divine Comedy – Paradiso*, IX, p. 51 [online]. Cf. also: KELLY. *Robert of Naples (1309–1343) and Fourteenth-Century Kingship*. Leiden 2003, pp. 275-283.

29 WENZEL, MHH, I, pp. 125-126. Margaret was married to Charles of Valois, brother of King Philip IV of France.

30 King Charles II of Naples and Maria of Hungary continued to confirm donations to their supporters in Slavonia and Croatia in order to secure support for their claim to the Hungarian throne. See, for example: WENZEL, MHH, I, pp. 134-135, 136, 136-137, 139-140, 143. In a charter dated 11 January 1300 addressed to the Doge of Venice and the Venetian city council, Charles II called on the Venetians to support the noble Count George, who held estates in Slavonia and other parts of Hungary and *"is a faithful and devoted vassal of our consort, as well as of one of her offspring, who shall be preferred as King of Hungary on her behalf"* (*quod ipse fidelis atque vassallus nostre consortis eiusdem, et eius ex liberis nostris, qui pro ea in Regem Vngarie pre feretur*); see: WENZEL, MHH, I, no. 172, pp. 141-142. See also: WENZEL, MHH, I, no. 173, p. 142.

31 *"Scriptum est ecclesiarum prelatis, comitibus, baronibus, vniuersitatibus, ceterisque per regnum Ungarie ac partes Sclauonie et Dalmatie* [...] *nepotem nostrum carissimum Karolum*

issued by Charles II in May 1300 clearly indicate that he arranged for an escort,[32] transportation,[33] and resources[34] to ensure the young Charles's successful journey to Hungary. Thanks to the direct support of Charles II and several Hungarian comites and nobles,[35] the young Charles could realistically begin to aspire to rule in the Kingdom of Hungary from the middle of the year 1300.[36]

---

filium bone memorie regis Vngarie nati nostri ad vos ecce transmictimus e vestigio accessurum." WENZEL, MHH, I, no. 176, p. 144. See also the charter dated 6 May 1300, addressed to a loyal knight of Charles II, in which the King of Naples announces that his grandson Charles will soon arrive in Hungary; see WENZEL, MHH, I, no. 177, pp. 144-145.

32 A charter dated 18 May 1300 mentions a Dominican, a chaplain, and a *familiaris* of Charles II who was appointed to accompany Charles to Hungary; see: WENZEL, MHH, I, no. 181, p. 148.

33 Several charters dated 19 May 1300 contain information concerning the captain and the outfitting of ships designated to transport Charles and his entourage to Hungary; see: WENZEL, MHH, I, no. 183, pp. 148-149; no. 184, p. 149; no. 185, p. 150.

34 In a charter dated 18 May 1300, Charles II refers to 300 ounces of gold to provide for Charles's needs in connection with his transfer to Hungary; see: WENZEL, MHH, I, no. 182, p. 148. In another charter dated 20 May 1300, Charles II mentions a loan of 1,300 ounces of gold from a Florentine banker for the same purpose; see WENZEL, MHH, I, no. 186, p. 150.

35 This is evidenced by charters issued by Charles II of Naples to magnates holding lands in the southern regions of the Kingdom of Hungary, particularly in Slavonia and Dalmatia; see, for example: WENZEL, MHH, I, no. 169, pp. 139-140; no. 179, pp. 145-146; no. 180, pp. 146-147. A charter issued in Naples on 5 March 1300 reports envoys of Hungarian prelates and barons, together with a chaplain and *familiaris* of Queen Elizabeth of Hungary (wife of Ladislaus IV), en route to Rome to clarify to the pope the intentions of Charles II, his wife Maria, and the aforementioned kingdom of Hungary; see: WENZEL, MHH, I, no. 174, p. 143. On Maria of Hungary's influence and interests in Dalmatia, see also the earlier papal charter dated 1 May 1298, issued by Pope Boniface VIII, which mentions the construction of a new church in Šibenik, to be funded by resources secured by Maria in collaboration with Count George, administrator of towns in Dalmatia; see: THEINER, ed. VMH, Tomus I. Romae 1860, no. 615, pp. 381-382. See also BÁLING, Personal Network, pp. 87-88.

36 On support for Charles and his claims to the Hungarian throne, see: KRISTÓ. I. Károly király főúri elitje (1301–1309). In *Századok*, 1999, vol. 133, pp. 41-42; KRISTÓ and MAKK. *Károly Róbert emlékezete*. Budapest 1988, p. 9; CSUKOVITS, *Az Anjouk Magyarországon*, pp. 58-61. However, it is not clear that Enikő Csukovits's claim on p. 61 that Charles was sent to Hungary against the will of the pope, referencing a charter of Peter Bonzanus, a supporter of Andrew III (text published in WENZEL, ed. CDAC, vol. V. 1290–1301. Pest 1864, no. 168, pp. 260-261; see also: no. 169, pp. 262-263), is true since no papal charter by Boniface VIII survives to confirm this assertion. Furthermore, Peter himself writes in the charter (WENZEL, CDAC, V, no. 169, p. 262) that the pope was not in Rome at the time, which casts further doubt on the reliability of his claims regarding Boniface VIII's actual position. On support for Charles's claims in Hungary at the beginning of the fourteenth century by the spiritual-military Order of Saint John of Jerusalem, see: FILO. Počiatky proanjouovského postoja Rádu svätého Jána Jeruzalemského v Uhorsku vo svetle johanitskej komunikácie. In *Konštantínove listy*, 2022, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 24-39. For Hungarian-Papal relations see also, for example: MALÉTH. A Magyar Királyság és a Szentszék kapcsolata I. Károly korában (1301–1342).

Following the sudden death of King Andrew III of Hungary in January 1301, events began to unfold rapidly. According to the author of the Zbraslav Chronicle (*Chronicon Aulae regiae*), *"on the feast of the martyr Rufus* [27 August 1301]*, Wenceslas, son of King Wenceslas II of Bohemia, was solemnly crowned King of Hungary with the Holy Crown by the Archbishop of Kalocsa in Székesfehérvár."*[37] This account in the Zbraslav Chronicle can be considered credible, as Pope Boniface VIII expresses surprise and indignation that Wenceslas had allowed his son (the future King Wenceslas III of Bohemia) to be elected and crowned King of Hungary by the Archbishop of Kalocsa in a letter dated 17 October 1301 addressed to King Wenceslas II of Bohemia.[38] The pope had learned of Wenceslas's coronation from Niccolò Boccasini, whom he had dispatched as his legate to the Kingdom of Hungary on 13 May 1301.[39] In the aforementioned letter, Boniface VIII not only reprimands Wenceslas II for the coronation performed by the Archbishop of Kalocsa, who had no authority[40] to carry out

---

Pécs 2020, pp. 143-158; RÁCZ. Az Anjou-ház és a Szentszék. In ZOMBORI, ed. *Magyarország és a Szentszék kapcsolatának ezer éve*. Budapest 1996, pp. 55-81.

37 *"Eodem autem anno in die Rufi martyris per Colossensem archiepiscopum in civitate Alba Regali regum Ungarie sacro diademate cum preclara solempnitate festive coronatus est* [...]*"* EMLER, ed. Chronicon Aulae regiae. In *Fontes rerum Bohemicarum*, vol. IV. Prague 1884, p. 84. Regarding the location of the coronation, it is worth noting Josef Emler's commentary (note on p. 84), which states that the Jihlava manuscript (designated no. 2) and the Roudnice manuscript (designated no. 4) do not include any reference to the place of Wenceslas's coronation.

38 *"Miramur siquidem et turbamur, quod Serenitas tua substinuit et prestavit assensum, quod dilectus filius W*[*enceslaus*] *natus tuus in Regem Ungarie sit assumptus, et a* [...] *Colocensi Archiepiscopo et nonnullis suis complicibus passus eum fueris coronari."* THEINER, VMH, I, no. 621, p. 387. Cf. EMLER, ed. RBM, Part II. Prague 1882, no. 1 896, pp. 814-815. The coronation of the young Wenceslas likely did not occur earlier, since a letter dated 13 September 1301 from Mario Mariglion of Venice to King James II of Aragon refers only to the assembling of an army to accompany Wenceslas to Hungary. Mario also notes that Pope Boniface VIII had dispatched Niccolò Boccasini to Hungary to secure Charles's accession to the Hungarian throne. In the same letter, Mario reports that Wenceslas had been unanimously elected king by the Hungarian barons—a claim that is untrue, as will be discussed further, and reveals the biased nature of his account; for the letter, see: FINKE, ed. *Acta Aragonensia*, vol. I. Berlin 1908, no. 159, p. 241. The date of Wenceslas's coronation is also contradicted by the Continuatio tertia of Hermann of Altaich, which dates the event to 21 May; see: WAITZ, ed. MGH SS, vol. XXIV. Hanover 1879, p. 57.

39 For the charter regarding the dispatch of Niccolò Boccasini (later Pope Benedict XI) to Hungary by Boniface VIII, see THEINER, VMH, I, no. 619, pp. 385-386. At that time, Boccasini was Bishop of Ostia and Velletri. A similar charter was sent by the pope to King Wenceslas II of Bohemia; see EMLER, RBM, II, no. 1 884, p. 810.

40 *"*[...] *quomodo coronam ab eo recipere debuit, qui auctoritatem Reges Ungarie coronandi non habebat de consuetudine vel iure* [...]*"* THEINER, VMH, I, no. 621, p. 387; EMLER, RBM, II, no. 1 896, p. 814.

such a rite, but also criticizes him for failing to investigate the legal basis or title by which his son was invited to rule in Hungary.[41] The pope also informs Wenceslas II in the same letter that he had sent his legate to Hungary and calls upon the Bohemian king to present any evidence supporting his son's rights to rule in the Kingdom of Hungary to the papal curia. Only then, Boniface wrote, would he consider recognizing Wenceslas's claim to the Hungarian throne. It remains questionable, however, whether the pope ever truly intended to support the Přemyslid claim to Hungary, as there is no evidence indicating a withdrawal of his support for Maria of Hungary and her grandson Charles. A more plausible explanation for this statement is that the pope was already convinced of the legitimacy of Charles's claim, as subsequent developments will demonstrate. In other words, regardless of any evidence Wenceslas might have presented, Boniface would likely have rejected it. This interpretation is supported by the content of a letter sent that same day, 17 October 1301, to Niccolò Boccasini, in which the pope clearly declares that neither succession rights nor any other legal grounds validate Wenceslas's claim to the Hungarian throne.[42] The reason why only the papal curia holds the right to determine who shall be king in Hungary, Boniface VIII traces back to the time of Stephen I of Hungary. To his legate Niccolò, as well as to King Wenceslas II, the pope writes *"mentioned Kingdom of Hungary was devoutly offered and reverently handed over, together with all its rights and powers, by the blessed Stephen, the first Christian king of Hungary, to the most holy Roman Church."*[43]

---

41 *"*[...] *utinam discussisses, ex quo capite, ex quo iure, qua successione, quo titulo prefatus natus tuus ad ipsius Regni regimen sit assumptus* [...]*"* THEINER, VMH, I, no. 621, p. 387; EMLER, RBM, II, no. 1 896, p. 814.

42 *"*[...] *ut non prosequamur ad presens, quo modo nec ex successione seu iure aliquo, quod occurrat, Regnum ipsum debebatur W*[*enceslao*] *nato predicto, super quibus in dubio saltem nos vel te, qui gerebas in illis partibus vices nostras, consulere debuisset* [...]*"* THEINER, VMH, I, no. 622, p. 388. In the same letter, Boniface VIII writes that the prelates and clergy, as well as the barons, nobles, and other people, are divided among themselves. This statement contradicts Mario Mariglion's report of Wenceslas being unanimously elected king by the Hungarians (see note 38). On the contrary, the pope's description of internal division in Hungary is supported by further documents, including a charter of Wenceslas III (see note 53).

43 *"*[...] *memoratum Ungarie Regnum sacrosancte Romane ecclesie a beato Stephano, primo Rege Ungarie christiano, cum omni eius iure ac potestate et devote oblatum fuit et traditum reverenter* [...]*"* THEINER, VMH, I, no. 622, pp. 388-389. Cf. similar wording in the charter addressed to Wenceslas II in EMLER, RBM, II, no. 1 897, pp. 815-816. The papal claim to sovereignty over the Kingdom of Hungary reflects Boniface VIII's broader efforts to assert his authority and gain allies in his conflict with King Philip IV of France. Boniface VIII, the last pontiff to attempt papal universalism and the assertion of secular dominion of the Church over kings and princes, ultimately failed to enforce this policy. On this, see: JORDAN. The Capetians from the Death of Philip II to Philip IV. In ABULAFIA, ed. *The New Cambridge Medie-*

In the same letter, Pope Boniface VIII also refers to the coronation of Charles I of Hungary by the Archbishop of Esztergom.[44] The pope writes:

> *"the noble Charles, grandson of our most beloved son in Christ, Charles* [II]*, the noble King of Sicily, had already been elected by the aforementioned Archbishop of Esztergom—appointed by us to exercise our authority in both spiritual and temporal matters within the Church of Esztergom in the Kingdom of Hungary—and was previously crowned king."*[45]

From the phrase *"fuisset antea coronatus"* it is evident, in the context of the letter, that Charles was crowned prior to Wenceslas. If we accept the date given in the *Chronicon Aulae regiae* for the coronation of Wenceslas (27 August 130), then Charles's coronation must have taken place before that date. At the same time, we know from the report of Mario Mariglion dated 13 September 1301[46] that the papal legate sent to Hungary was tasked with installing Charles on the throne,[47] yet he makes no mention of Charles already being crowned. Since the

---

val History. Volume V c. 1198–c. 1300. Cambridge 1999, pp. 302-314; SACZYŃSKA-VERCAMER. Authority without Power? Papal Rulership over East Central Europe in the Late Middle Ages. In VERCAMER a ZUPKA, eds. *Rulership in Medieval East Central Europe*, pp. 417-418; STRAYER. *The Reign of Philip the Fair*. Princeton 1980, pp. 237-313; WATT, The Papacy, pp. 158-163.

44 Pope Boniface VIII appointed George as administrator of the Church of Esztergom on 1 May 1298; see: THEINER, VMH, I, no. 617, pp. 391-392.

45 *"*[...] *magnificus vir Carolus, nepos carissimi in Christo filii nostri C*[*aroli*] *Sicilie regis illustris, per dilectum filium* [...] *Strigoniensem electum et administratorem auctoritate nostra in spiritualibus et temporalibus Strigoniensis ecclesie constitutum, in eiusdem regni Ungarie regem fuisset antea coronatus."* THEINER, VMH, I, no. 622, p. 388. The pope recognized the legality of Charles's coronation, despite the fact that it did not meet the three "traditional" requirements for a valid Hungarian royal coronation. For Boniface VIII, the decisive factor was that the coronation was performed by the elected Archbishop of Esztergom—an individual appointed and recognized by the Roman Church. This raises the question of how crucial the other two traditional elements were at the time, especially considering that all three were likewise not fulfilled during the coronation in the summer of 1309. Charles's supporters seemingly did not object, and thanks to a preserved charter dated 4 June 1309, we know that even a former opponent from among the leading Hungarian magnates acknowledged that Charles's coronation would be legal and legitimate even if he were crowned with a crown other than the Holy Crown and in a location other than Székesfehérvár; see *Acta legationis cardinalis Gentilis. Gentilis bíbornok magyarországi követségének okiratai. 1307–1311*. Budapestini 1885, no. LXIV, pp. 303-304. Ambiguity remained even after Charles's 1310 coronation, which did fulfill the three traditional requirements, as he still did not effectively control the entirety of the Kingdom of Hungary, and the greatest struggle to secure his rule still lay ahead.

46 See footnote 38 in this document. For further comparison, see also: FÜGEDI. Coronation in Medieval Hungary. In BAK, ed. *Kings, Bishops, Nobles and Burghers in Medieval Hungary*. London 1986, pp. 178-179.

47 It is important to note another contradiction in the sources at this point. While Mario Ma-

papal legate Niccolò Boccasini was dispatched to Hungary on 13 May 1301, it is most likely that Charles's coronation took place during the summer of 1301.

Thanks to Niccolò Boccasini, Boniface VIII was exceptionally well informed about developments in Hungary. As early as 8 November 1301, he issued a charter responding to the legate's report of the death of the Archbishop of Kalocsa, who had unlawfully crowned the son of Wenceslas II as King of Hungary. Of particular interest in this charter is the mention of the Bohemian king's expressed regret for the actions he had undertaken in Hungary. Although Wenceslas II had failed to achieve the desired outcome in placing his son on the Hungarian throne, he could not withdraw under the circumstances without incurring dishonor.[48] The pope also urged Boccasini to appeal once again to Wenceslas II, imploring him

> *"for the glory of God, for reverence toward us, and for respect for the Holy See, not to allow or wish that, on account of himself or his son or their cause, such a great and Catholic kingdom* [of Hungary] *fall into ruin, spiritual and temporal affliction, and total destruction, to the harm and peril of their souls."*[49]

Since no comparable appeal from this period survives addressed to Charles, this papal admonition to Wenceslas II may be interpreted as further evidence of Boniface's support for Charles I.[50]

Charles continued to receive unwavering support from his grandfather, King Charles II of Naples. A charter dated 8 December 1301 reports that Charles II sent wheat and barley from the reserves in Apulia to his grandson (who was in Slavonia at the time) and his knights.[51] In another charter issued on the same day

---

riglion's report suggests that Niccolò Boccasini was clearly tasked with securing Charles's accession to the throne in Hungary, Pope Boniface VIII in a letter dated 8 November 1301 cites Boccasini's own words, claiming that he had not shown any significant or manifest favor to either of the opposing factions in Hungary (*neutri partium notabile aut manifestum exhibuisti favorem*); see THEINER, VMH, I, no. 626, p. 391.

48 Cf. THEINER, VMH, I, no. 626, p. 391; EMLER, RBM, II, no. 1 900, p. 818.

49 *"*[...] *ut pro divina et nostra et dicte sedis reverentia non permittat aut velit, quod sua vel sui filii occasione vel pretextu, et in eorum salutis dispendium et perditionem omnimodam animarum, tantum et tam catholicum regnum ad exterminium et desolationis angustiam spiritualiter et temporaliter deducatur."* THEINER, VMH, I, no. 626, p. 391. Cf. the letter addressed the same day to Wenceslas II in EMLER, RBM, II, no. 1 899, p. 817.

50 Later papal letters addressed to Charles contain appeals for the restoration and ordering of affairs in Hungary, but differ in character; these letters call for the reorganization of the kingdom as such, not for the renunciation of claims to the throne. Cf. the charter dated 3 June 1303 in THEINER, VMH, I, no. 636, p. 400.

51 *"Karolus Secundus* [...] *ad Karolum de Vngaria nepotem suum* [...] *ad partes Sclauonie ad predictum Karolum pro usu hospitij sui ac equorum suorum frumenti salmas sexcentas, et ordei salmas quatringentas, de victualibus scilicet massariorum Apuli* [...]*"* WENZEL, MHH,

and addressed to the governor of Provence and Forcalquier, Charles II allocated a portion of the taxes collected from these territories for the army of Charles I.[52] These resources evidently served their intended purpose, as in the summer of 1302, Charles I of Hungary was able to lay siege to Buda, where Wenceslas III was also present at the time.[53] This charter also contains the names of several men who had initially supported Wenceslas but, by the summer of 1302, had joined the camp of Charles I.[54]

As the situation in Hungary remained unresolved, in June 1302 Pope Boniface VIII called upon Wenceslas II to appear personally—with his son or through appropriate envoys—in Rome, to present evidence supporting their claim to the Hungarian throne.[55] The same summons was delivered to Charles I through Niccolò Boccasini.[56]

The final resolution of the dispute *de jure canonico* occurred in the spring of 1303. In a charter issued on 31 May 1303 in Anagni, Pope Boniface VIII summarized the situation in the Kingdom of Hungary and his efforts to assess the ongoing conflict over the right to rule Hungary based on the evidence and testimonies presented by both involved parties.[57] After evaluating the submitted documentation, Boniface VIII definitively and unequivocally recognized the claims of Maria of Hungary and her grandson, Charles I of Hungary, to the Hungarian throne.[58] Based on the pope's decision, a charter was issued in the

---

I, no. 207, p. 164.

52 *"*[...] *fogagia pro militia Karoli de Ungaria nepoti nostri."* WENZEL, MHH, I, no. 208, p. 165.

53 This event is recorded in a charter issued by Wenceslas III on 26 September 1302; see: KRISTÓ, ed. *AOklt. I*. Budapest; Szeged 1990, no. 287, p. 167. The original of the charter is preserved in the Hungarian National Archives, Budapest, Q section, Pre-Mohács Collection, *Diplomatikai Levéltár* (hereafter DL), under reference DL 86 892.

54 *"*[...] *quo Karulus cum Ugrino, filio Pous, Stepha*[*no*] *filio Marci, Leukes filio Laurencii, dicti Chece, et Opour ac aliis infidelib*[*us*] *n*[*ost*]*ris* [...]*"* DL 86 892. The same men are also mentioned in a charter dated 24 August 1304, where they are listed among the most prominent supporters of Charles I; see the full text in FEJÉR, CDH, VIII, 1, no. 74, pp. 160-161.

55 For the full text of the charter, see: EMLER, RBM, I, no. 1 924, pp. 827-829.

56 Cf. THEINER, VMH, I, no. 629, pp. 393-394. Maria of Hungary was also summoned to come to Rome to present her claims; however, the pope addressed her separately and provided justification for this in the charter itself.

57 THEINER, VMH, I, no. 635, pp. 397-399.

58 *"*[...] *ac excusatoribus supra scriptis, de fratrum nostrorum consilio decernimus, diffinimus, declaramus et volumus, quod predicta Maria in toto ipso Regno Ungarie et pertinentiis suis omnibus, ac ubique terrarum Regina Ungarie, et dictus Carolus, nepos, Rex nuncupentur, apertis labiis scriptionibusque vulgatis, et in documentis publicis titulentur* [...]*"* THEINER, VMH, I, no. 635, p. 398. The pope sent his decision in the form of letters to Wenceslas II (cf. EMLER, RBM, II, no. 1 964, pp. 843-846), Maria of Hungary (charter dated 3 June 1303; see:

summer of 1303 by the highest Hungarian prelates, led by the elected Archbishop of Esztergom, Gregory, and the Archbishop of Kalocsa, Stephen, addressed to the nobles and clerics of Transylvania. In this document, they announced that the pope had recognized only the coronation *"performed for King Charles by a prelate of the Church of Esztergom."*[59] They further declared that *"we have been instructed to publicize this recognition and confirmation made by the Roman Church throughout the kingdom"* and to call upon all inhabitants of the Kingdom of Hungary *"to obey Lord King Charles as the properly crowned ruler of the kingdom and to show loyalty and faithful service to him and to no one else."*[60] It is reasonable to assume that these appeals did indeed resonate with the Hungarian nobility, as a charter issued in August 1304 lists no fewer than eleven magnates by name who were then supporting King Charles I of Hungary.[61]

Conclusion

By the decision of the papal curia on 31 May 1303, Charles I of Hungary was definitively recognized de jure as the sole legitimate king of the Kingdom of Hungary. Additionally, Pope Boniface VIII unequivocally validated the legality of Charles's first coronation, which had taken place in 1301, and rejected all claims of the future King Wenceslas III of Bohemia to the Hungarian crown. The decision of the papal curia was accepted by the Hungarian prelates, and

---

THEINER, VMH, I, no. 637, p. 400), Charles I of Hungary (charter dated 3 June 1303; see: THEINER, VMH, I, no. 636, p. 400), King Albert of the Romans and his son Rudolf (charter dated 11 June 1303; see: THEINER, VMH, I, no. 639, p. 401), and the Hungarian prelates (charter dated 11 June 1303; see: THEINER, VMH, I, no. 638, pp. 400-401).

59 *"*[...] *quae per praelatum Ecclesiae Strigoniensis in persona Domini regis Karoli facta fuerat* [...]*"* FEJÉR, CDH, VIII, 1, no. 50, p. 134. The pope clearly recognized the legitimacy and validity of the first coronation of Charles I of Hungary in 1301 (see footnote 45).

60 *"*[...] *deditque nobis in mandatis, vt nos in vnum venientes, huiusmodi approbationem et approbationis confirmationem, per ecclesiam Romanam factam, toti regno publicaremus* [...] *vt eidem D*[*omini*] *regi Karolo, tanquam Domino regni et rite coronato, obedirent, fidelitatis seruitia illi et non alteri impendendo* [...]*"* FEJÉR, CDH, VIII, 1, no. 50, p. 134. The charter text immediately continues with a threat of excommunication for anyone who would act in violation of the papal directive. Boniface VIII also threatens excommunication in his letters issued in late May and early June; see the documents referenced in note 58.

61 FEJÉR, CDH, VIII, 1, no. 74, pp. 160-161. For more on the supporters of Charles mentioned in this charter, see: KRISTÓ, Károly király főúri elitje, pp. 45-48. Based on the order in which the magnates are named, Gyula Kristó deduces the relative importance of individual lords within Charles I's circle of supporters. Cf. also: BAK. Lists in the Service of Legitimation in Central European Sources. In DOLEŽALOVÁ, ed. *The Charm of a List: From the Sumerians to Computerised Data Processing*. Newcastle upon Tyne 2009, p. 42. Bak sees the naming of magnate-supporters at the heart of the charter as one of the means of presenting royal authority.

the number of secular magnates recognizing and supporting Charles I as the only legitimate Hungarian king gradually increased. With the backing of his grandparents—King Charles II of Naples and Maria of Hungary—the papal curia, and a growing number of Hungarian nobles, Charles I was well-positioned to begin the *de facto* consolidation of power in the Kingdom of Hungary, which remained mired in internal conflict. This process would take many years, but it was conducted by Charles from the position of a legitimate monarch, as *dei gratia rex Hungariae*.

About the author

Mgr. Andrej Ondrejka
Univerzita Komenského v Bratislave Filozofická fakulta, Katedra všeobecných dejín / Department of General History, Faculty of Arts, Comenius University in Bratislava
Gondova ulica 2, 811 02 Bratislava 1
Slovak Republic
e-mail: ondrejka31@uniba.sk
https://orcid.org/0009-0000-1024-1578

List of references and literature

Primary sources

Editions of Narrative and Diplomatic Sources

Acta legationis cardinalis Gentilis. *Gentilis bíbornok magyarországi követségének okiratai. 1307 – 1311*. Budapestini: Typis Societatis Typographicae, 1885, 510 p.

BAK, János M. and VESZPRÉMY, László, eds. *Chronica de gestis Hungarorum e codice picto saec. XIV. Chronicle of the Deeds of the Hungarians from the Fourteenth-Century Illuminated Codex*. Budapest; New York: Central European University Press, 2018, 435 p.

BOUQUET, Martin, ed. *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*. Tome 21. Paris: Imprimerie Impériale, 1860, 973 p.

EMLER, Josef. Chronicon Aulae regiae. In *Fontes rerum Bohemicarum*, vol. IV. Prague, 1884, pp. 1-337.

EMLER, Josef, ed. *Regesta diplomatica nec non epistolaria Bohemiae et Moraviae*. Pars II. Pragae: Typis Academiae Scientiarum Bohemicae, 1882. 1 483 p.

FEJÉR, Georgius, ed. C*odex diplomaticus Hungariae ecclesiasticus ac civilis* [CDH]. Tomus IV, Vol. 3. Budae, 1829, 560 p.

FEJÉR, Georgius, ed. *Codex diplomaticus Hungariae ecclesiasticus ac civilis* [CDH]. Tomus VI, Vol. 1. Budae, 1830, 400 s.

FEJÉR, Georgius, ed. *Codex Diplomaticus Hungariae Ecclesiasticus ac Civilis* [CDH]. Tomus VIII, Pars I. Budae: Typis Regiae Universitatis Hungaricae, 1832, 626 p.

FINKE, Heinrich, ed. *Acta Aragonensia*. Vol. I. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1908. 714 p.

Giovanni Villani. *Nuova Cronica* [online]. [S.l.]: Archivio Volto Santo, [s.a.] [cit. 2025-05-15]. Dostupné na: http://www.archiviovoltosanto.org/sites/www.archiviovoltosanto.org/files/publications/cronica_-_villani_0.pdf

KRISTÓ, Gyula, ed. *Anjou-kori Oklevéltár. Documenta res Hungaricas tempore regnum Andegavensium illustrantia I* [AOklt. I]. Budapest; Szeged: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1990. 527 p.

POTTHAST, Augustus, ed. *Regesta pontificum romanorum. Inde ab a. post Christum natum MCXCVIII ad a. MCCCIV*. Vol. II. Berolini, 1875, pp. 943-2 157.

RAYNALDO, Odorico. *Annales Ecclesiastici Ab Anno MCXCVIII. usque ad Annum MDXXXIV*. Tomus XIV. Rome, 1648, 479 p.

SMIČIKLAS, Tadija, ed. *Codex diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae* [CDC]. Vol. VII. Zagreb: Tisak Dioničke, 1909, 491 p.

SZENTPÉTERY, Emericus, ed. *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum. Tempore ducum regumque stirpis Arpadianae gestarum*. Vol. I. Budapestini, 1937, 553 p.

THEINER, Augustin ed. *Vetera Monumenta Historica Hungariam Sacram Illustrantia* [VMH]. Vol. I. Romae: Typis Vaticanis, 1859, 837 p.

WAITZ, Georg, ed. *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores* [MGH SS]. Vol. XXIV. Hannoverae: Impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1879. 914 p.

WENZEL, Gusztáv, ed. *Árpádkori új okmánytár. Codex diplomaticus Arpadianus continuatus* [CDAC]. Vol. V. 1290 – 1301. Pest, 1864, 336 p.

WENZEL, Gusztáv, ed. *Monumenta Hungariae Historica. Acta extera I* [MHH I]. Budapest, 1874, 423 p.

WENZEL, Gusztáv, ed. *Monumenta Hungariae Historica. Diplomata* [MHHD]. Vol. I. Pestini: Typis Regiae Universitatis Hungaricae, 1860, 468 p.

ŽIVKOVIĆ, Tibor; PETROVIĆ, Vladeta and UZELAC, Aleksandar. Anonymi Descriptio Europae Orientalis. In *Sources for Serbian History*, vol. 13. Latin Sources, vol. 2. Belgrade 2013, 221 p.

Secondary sources

Monographs

ABULAFIA, David. *The Western Mediterranean Kingdoms, 1200–1500: The Struggle for Dominion*. London: Routledge, 1997, 320 p.

BAK, János M. and PÁLFFY, Géza. *Crown and Coronation in Hungary 1000–1916 A.D*. Budapest: MTA Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóközpont, 2020, 263 p.

CSUKOVITS, Enikő. *Az Anjouk Magyarországon. I. rész: I. Károly és uralkodása (1301–1342)*. Budapest: MTA Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóközpont, 2012, 154 p.

Dante Alighieri. *Divine Comedy– Paradiso* [online]. Translated and annotated by Henry Wadsworth Longfellow [cit. 2025-09-19]. Available from: https://digitaldante.columbia.edu/dante/divine-comedy/paradiso/paradiso-9/

DUNBABIN, Jean. *Charles I of Anjou*. London: Routledge, 1998, 252 p.

EHLERS, Joachim; MÜLLER, Heribert and SCHNEIDMÜLLER, Bernd. *Die französischen Könige des Mittelalters. Von Odo bis Karl VIII. (888–1498)*. München: C. H. Beck, 1996, 435 p.

ENGEL, Pál. *The Realm of St. Stephen. A History of Medieval Hungary, 895–1526*. London; New York: I. B. Tauris, 2001, 452 p.

ENGEL, Pál; KRISTÓ, Gyula and KUBINYI, András, eds. *Magyarország története 1301–1526*. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó, 1998, 419 p.
FINE, John V. A. *The Late Medieval Balkans: A Critical Survey from the Late Twelfth Century to the Ottoman Conquest*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994, 704 p.
KELLY, Samantha. *Robert of Naples (1309–1343) and Fourteenth-Century Kingship*. Leiden: Brill, 2003, 370 p.
KIESEWETTER, Andreas. *Die Anfänge der Regierung König Karls II. von Anjou (1278–1295): Das Königreich Neapel, die Grafschaft Provence und der Mittelmeerraum zu Ausgang des 13. Jahrhunderts*. Husum: Matthiesen Verlag, 1998, 650 p.
KLANICZAY, Gábor. *Holy Rulers and Blessed Princesses. Dynastic Cults in Medieval Central Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002, 490 p.
KRISTÓ, Gyula and MAKK, Ferenc. *Károly Róbert emlékezete*. Budapest: Európa Könyvkiadó, 1988, 259 p.
MALÉTH, Ágnes. *A Magyar Királyság és a Szentszék kapcsolata I. Károly korában (1301–1342)*. Pécs: Molnár Nyomda Kft, 2020, 497 p.
MUNDY, John H. *Europe in the High Middle Ages 1150–1300*. London: Routledge, 2000, 400 p.
NOVÁK, Jozef. *Chronológia*. Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo Univerzity Komenského v Bratislave, 2004, 292 p.
RAPP, Francis. *Le Saint Empire romain germanique*. Paris: Tallandier, 2003, 384 p.
RUNCIMAN, Steven. *The Sicilian Vespers. A History of the Mediterranean World in the Later Thiteenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992, 368 p.
STRAYER, Joseph R. *The Reign of Philip the Fair*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980. 451 p.
SZŰCS, Jenő. *Az utolsó Árpádok*. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó, 2002, 515 p.

Articles in Journals, Chapters in Monographs

ABULAFIA, David. The Kingdom of Sicily under the Hohenstaufen and Angevins. In ABULAFIA, David, ed. *The New Cambridge Medieval History. Volume V c. 1198–c. 1300*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999, pp. 497-521.
BAK, János M. Lists in the Service of Legitimation in Central European Sources. In DOLEŽALOVÁ, Lucie, ed. *The Charm of a List: From the Sumerians to Computerised Data Processing*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009, pp. 34-45.
BÁLING, Péter. Personal Network of the Neapolitan Angevins and Hungary (1290–1304). In BARABÁS, Gábor and KISS, Gergely, eds. *Specimina Nova Pars Prima Sectio Medievalis VIII*. Pécs: Pécsi Tudományegyetem, 2015, pp. 83-107.
BREZOVÁKOVÁ, Blanka. Politický zápas Anjouovcov o uhorskú korunu. In *Historický časopis*, 1991, vol. 33, no. 6, pp. 569-587.
DEER, Jozef. Ungarn in der Descriptio Europae Orientalis. In *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, 1931, vol. 45, pp. 1-22.
FILO, Jozef. Počiatky proanjouovského postoja Rádu svätého Jána Jeruzalemského v Uhorsku vo svetle johanitskej komunikácie. In *Konštantínove listy*, 2022, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 24-39.
FÜGEDI, Erik. Coronation in Medieval Hungary. In BAK, János M, ed. *Kings, Bishops, Nobles and Burghers in Medieval Hungary*. London: Variorum, 1986, pp. 159-189.
HÉLARY, Xavier. French Nobility and the Military Requirements of the King (c. 1260–c. 1314). In JORDAN, William Chester and PHILLIPS, Jenna Rebecca, eds. *The Capetian Century, 1214–1314*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2017, pp. 115-142.
JORDAN, William Chester. The Capetians from the Death of Philip II to Philip IV. In ABULAFIA, David, ed. *The New Cambridge Medieval History. Volume V c. 1198–c. 1300*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999, pp. 302-314.

KOZŁOWSKI, Wojciech. Power-Winning Contexts and Strategies of Charles I and Wenceslas III. A Comparison of Their Quest for the Hungarian Throne. In *The New Europe College Yearbook*, 2015, vol. 2012–2013, pp. 131-174.

KRISTÓ, Gyula. I. Károly király főúri elitje (1301–1309). In *Századok*, 1999, vol. 133, pp. 41-62.

KRISTÓ, Gyula. Károly Róbert családja. In *Aetas. Történettudományi folyóirat*, 2006, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 14-28.

LUCHERINI, Vinni. The Irruption of the Sacred into the History of Hungarian Kings in the Mirror of the Angevin "Illuminated Chronicle" (around 1358). In VERCAMER, Grischa and ZUPKA, Dušan, eds. *Rulership in Medieval East Central Europe. Power, Ritual and Legitimacy in Bohemia, Hungary and Poland*. Leiden: Brill, 2022, pp. 217-246.

MALÉTH, Ágnes. La relation de Charles Ier de Hongrie avec la papauté (1301–1342). In BARABÁS, Gábor a KISS, Gergely, eds. *Specimina Nova Pars Prima Sectio Medievalis IX*. Pécs: Pécsi Tudományegyetem, 2017, pp. 77-94.

PALKO, Jakub. Uhorsko-české vzťahy v rokoch 1270–1272. In *Historia Nova*, 2017, vol. 14, pp. 7-33.

RÁCZ, György. Az Anjou-ház és a Szentszék. In ZOMBORI, István, ed. *Magyarország és a Szentszék kapcsolatának ezer éve.* Budapest: Historia Ecclesiastica Hungarica Alapítvány, 1996, pp. 55-82.

SACZYŃSKA-VERCAMER, Monika. Authority without Power? Papal Rulership over East Central Europe in the Late Middle Ages. In VERCAMER, Grischa and ZUPKA, Dušan, eds. *Rulership in Medieval East Central Europe. Power, Ritual and Legitimacy in Bohemia, Hungary and Poland*. Leiden: Brill, 2022, pp. 417-445.

ŠTEFÁNIK, Martin. Anjouovská nová monarchia a žigmundovská rovnováha. In ŠTEFÁNIK, Martin; STEINHÜBEL, Ján et al. *Panovnícka moc v stredoveku*. Bratislava: Veda, 2022, pp. 24-33.

THÉRY-ASTRUC, Julien. The Pioneer of Royal Theocracy: Guillaume de Nogaret and the Conflicts between Philip the Fair and the Papacy. In JORDAN, William Chester and PHILLIPS, Jenna Rebecca, eds. *The Capetian Century, 1214–1314*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2017, pp. 219-259.

VLASKO, Vladimír. Počiatky Anjouovcov v Uhorsku. In *Historia Nova*, 2013, vol. 6, pp. 26-47.

WATT, John A. The Papacy. In ABULAFIA, David, ed. *The New Cambridge Medieval History. Volume V c. 1198–c. 1300*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999, pp. 107-163.

ZSOLDOS, Attila. III. András. In LENKEY, Zoltán and ZSOLDOS, Attila, eds. *Szent István és III. András*. Budapest: Kossuth Kiadó, 2003, pp. 119-227.

ZSOLDOS, Attila. Kings and Oligarchs in Hungary at the Turn of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries. In *Hungarian Historical Review*, 2013, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 211-242.