

UDC 94(439):929.7“12”
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.25.269547

Oleksandr KAZAKOV

Master of History, postgraduate student of the Department of Antiquity, the Middle Ages and History of Pre-modern Ukraine, Uzhhorod National University, 3 Narodna Square, Uzhhorod, Ukraine, postal code 88000 (kazlviv@ukr.net)

ORCID: ????

Lyudmyla KAZAKOVA

PhD (Law), Associate Professor of International Politics Department of Uzhhorod National University, 3 Narodna Square, Uzhhorod, Ukraine, postal code 88000 (luda.kazakova@uzhnu.edu.ua)

ORCID: 0000-0001-7529-9543
Researcher ID: AGX-6533-2022

Олександр КАЗАКОВ

магістр історії, аспірант кафедри Античності, Середньовіччя та історії України домоделної доби ДВНЗ “Ужгородський національний університет”, пл. Народна, 3, м. Ужгород, Україна, індекс 88000 (kazlviv@ukr.net)

Людмила КАЗАКОВА

кандидат юридичних наук, доцент кафедри міжнародної політики ДВНЗ “Ужгородський національний університет”, пл. Народна 3, м. Ужгород, Україна, індекс 88000 (luda.kazakova@uzhnu.edu.ua)

Bibliographic Description of the Article: Kazakov, O. & Kazakova, L. (2022). The Last Arpad on the Hungarian Throne. The Reign of Andrew III under Conditions of Falling Prestige of Royal Power. *Skhidnoievropeyskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 25, 34–45. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.25.269547

THE LAST ARPAD ON THE HUNGARIAN THRONE. THE REIGN OF ANDREW III UNDER CONDITIONS OF FALLING PRESTIGE OF ROYAL POWER

Abstract. *The purpose* is to analyze the period of Andrew III's reign of Hungary (András III), the influence of the Morosini family on the political life of Hungary and the relationship between the monarch and the representatives of the oligarchic top of the kingdom. **The Methodology of the Research.** *Primarily, historical comparative, structural and systemic methods of analysis, a problem-chronological and biographical method of presenting the material have been used.* **The scientific novelty** consists in the fact that for the first time the period of the reign of Andrew III of Hungary has been analyzed in historiography thoroughly, the key issues of the monarch's internal policy have been determined. **The Conclusion.** *The reign of Andrew III of Hungary, the last representative of the male branch of the Arpad dynasty, coincided with one of the most unstable periods in the history of Hungary. The period of Laszlo IV Kuhn's rule led to the loss of part of the north-eastern territories, the independence of large oligarchic estates from the royal power, and the loss of political influence on the international arena. Andrew III of Hungary inherited the internal political system, the foundation of which was laid in the previous years and the essence of which*

was that the King was forced to adhere to a certain political camp of magnates who were turning into oligarchs more and more. Despite his personal charisma and traits of character, Andrew III of Hungary was unable to counteract centrifugal tendencies effectively, which gained momentum in Hungary during the reign of his predecessors and he could not get rid of the dependence of the royal power on the support of powerful baronial groups. Strong financial support from relatives and the Republic of Venice allowed the monarch to create the appearance of power, but did not allow to restore the institutions of royal power, which, under the conditions of the premature death of the childless monarch, plunged Hungary into decades of dynastic wars.

Key words: Andrew III of Hungary, the Arpad dynasty, Hungarian kingdom, Morosini, the Anjou dynasty.

ОСТАННІЙ АРПАД НА УГОРСЬКОМУ ТРОНІ. ПРАВЛІННЯ АНДРАША ІІІ В УМОВАХ ПАДІННЯ ПРЕСТИЖУ КОРОЛІВСЬКОЇ ВЛАДИ

Анотація. Мета статті – проаналізувати період правління Андраша ІІІ, вплив родини Моросіні на політичне життя Угорщини та взаємовідносини монарха з представниками олігархічної верхівки королівства. **Методи дослідження.** Використано порівняльно-історичний, історико-генетичний та структурно-системний методи аналізу, проблемно-хронологічний та біографічний підходи до викладення матеріалу. **Наукова новизна** полягає у тому, що вперше в історіографії найбільш повно проаналізовано період правління Андраша ІІІ, визначено ключові проблеми внутрішньої політики монарха. **Висновки.** Правління Андраша ІІІ, останнього представника чоловічої гілки династії Арпадів, припало на один із найбільш нестабільних періодів історії Угорщини. Роки правління Ласла ІV Куна призвели до втрати частини північно-східних комітатів, усамостійнення від королівської влади великих олігархічних володінь та втрату політичного впливу на міжнародній арені. Андраш ІІІ отримав у спадщину внутрішню політичну систему, фундамент якої був закладений у попередні роки і суть якої полягала у тому, що король змушений був пристати до певного політичного табору магнатів, які все більше перетворювалися на олігархів. Незважаючи на особисту харизму та особисті якості, Андраш ІІІ не зміг ефективно протидіяти відцентровим тенденціям, які набрали обертів в Угорщині за часів правління його попередників та позбулися залежності королівської влади від підтримки могутніх баронських угруповань. Потужна фінансова підтримка з боку родичів та Венеційської республіки дали монархові змогу створити видимість сили, проте не дозволили відновити інституції королівської влади, що в умовах передчасної смерті бездітного монарха, занурило Угорщину в десятиліття династичних воєн.

Ключові слова: Андраш ІІІ, династія Арпадів, Угорське королівство, Моросіні, династія Анжу.

The Problem Statement. Andrew was the son of István Postum (Posthumous) and the grandson of King Andrew II. István's parentage was questioned by some members of the Hungarian political elite, primarily his father's brothers Béla IV and Kalman (Nyáry, 1869, pp. 378–396), who accused Andrew's third wife, Beatrix, of adultery (Zsoldos, 2003, pp. 123, 133) with Denesh (Parnská kronika františkána Salimbeneho, 1938, p. 2107). It is interesting that during his reign, Andrew III of Hungary did not pay much attention to rumors about the flawlessness of his origin. This fact suggests that much information must have been disseminated by his political opponents from Naples. His father's birth coincided with the dramatic circumstances of Beatrix d'Este's escape from Hungary because of persecution by the heir to the throne, Prince Béla, that is why, István, Andrew's father, was born outside the territory of the kingdom (Gombos, 2005, p. 143). István spent most of his life in the north of the Apennines in Este, Ravenna and Venice, trying to assert his rights to the Hungarian throne with the help of Italian relatives. However, his military expedition in Dalmatia was defeated, and the prince had to return to Italy (Chronicon pictum Vindobonense, 1857 – 1858, p. 659). At the same time, he always remained a threat to the ruling family of Hungary, as evidenced

by the fact that during the signing of peace with the Republic of Venice in 1244, King Béla IV put forward a condition for guarantees that the Venetians would not support István's interests (Wenzel, 1874, pp. 155–156). After the death of his first wife, István married Tommasina Morosini, a representative of one of the most influential families in Venice. At the same time, this marriage was beneficial not only to the potential candidate for the throne, but also to the Republic of Venice, since the kinship of one of the wealthiest citizens with the ruling dynasty of the state, with which Venice waged a centuries-old struggle for control of the Dalmatian coast, was seen as extremely useful in the future (Tencajoli, 1930, pp. 63–64). The support of a potential candidate raised in Venice was seen as an extremely effective weapon and held out the hope of establishing control over the disputed coastal areas (Štefánik, 2008, p. 4). István was never able to claim the Hungarian crown, although in his own documents and will he was titled *Dux Sclavoniae* “Duke of Slavonia”, a title traditionally given to the heir to the throne.

The Analysis of Recent Research and Publications. The most famous Hungarian historians who studied the history of the reign of Andrew III are G. Kristó (Kristó, 1978; Kristó, 1979), A. Zsoldos (Zsoldos, 1998; Zsoldos, 2003; Zsoldos, 2010; Zsoldos, 2011), J. Szűcs (Szűcs, 2002), T. Kádár (Kádár, 2013; Kádár, 2018), T. Almási (Almási, 2012). The Slovak historian M. Štefánik (Štefánik, 2008), the Croatian researcher M. Petrović (Petrović, 2015), the Czech scientist R. Pražak (Pražak, 2002), the English researcher P. Engel (Engel, 2001) and an Austrian scientist V. Samanek (Samanek, 1948) published interesting studies. Ukrainian historians M. Troyan (Troyan, 1982) and L. Voytovich (Voytovich, 2011) were also interested in this issue. Taking into account the new research, we will try to point out the most important problems of the reign of the Hungarian king Andrew III.

The purpose of the article is to analyze the period of Andrew III's reign of Hungary (András III), the influence of the Morosini family on the political life of Hungary and the relationship between the monarch and the representatives of the oligarchic top of the kingdom.

The Results of the Research. After István's death, Andrew was brought up by his mother Tommasina, whose role in her son's reign is unfairly downplayed, and by uncle Albertino Morosini together with another family member – Martin Gradenig. Andrew received the support of Venice as a potential candidate for the Hungarian throne, in addition, his mother and relatives directed their economic power to find supporters in Hungary, which was facilitated by the chaotic rule of Laszlo IV. During the latter's lifetime, Andrew made attempts to establish himself in Hungary and accepted the title of Duke of Slavonia (Wenzel, 1874, p. 181), but the chaos during the drastic change of baronial groups did not allow him to start a large-scale campaign to seize the throne (Karbić, 2003, p. 1037).

At the beginning of 1290, Andrew received an invitation from Janos Kyōsogi, who was supported by prelates Sopron, Váš and Eszterhom (Zsoldos, 2011, p. 315), to arrive in Hungary, but Kyōsogi's enemy Arnold Hahot (a son of Palatine Arnold) captured the candidate for the Hungarian throne and handed him over to Duke Albrecht of Habsburg (Skorka, 2019, pp. 60–61, 64). On July 10, 1290, the Cuman nobles Arbots, Tertel and Kemenze killed King Laszlo IV (Engel, 2001, p. 109). The issue of their motivation is still controversial; revenge for anti-Cuman laws or Kopas Borsha's order are among the reasons (Voytovich, 2011, p. 17). Archbishop Lodomer played a decisive role in the coronation of Andrew, who sent two monks of the Benedictine order to Vienna, where the prince was at the beginning of 1290 (Almási, 2012, p. 100). The Austrian Rhyming Chronicle reports that “Andrew enjoyed Duke Albrecht's hospitality in Vienna” (Seemüller von, 1890, pp. 522–523), which is confirmed by Tomáš Kadar, who noted the fact that the pretender to the Hungarian throne was treated

with the respect due to his origin and was at the Duke's court under the unobtrusive care of the Duke's men (Kádár, 2018, p. 114). The ease with which Andrew managed to leave his place of detention and follow the boat along the Danube to Požona (Pauler, 1899, p. 415), near which a squad of supporters was waiting for him (SRH, 1937, pp. 213–214), allow us to assert that the conditions of stay in Vienna were far from prison conditions, as noted by the majority of Hungarian researchers (Érszegi & Solymosi, 1981, p. 173).

Andrew managed to leave his place of imprisonment and arrive in Hungary, where he was crowned by Lodomer in July of 1290 (Homonnai, 2003, p. 18). At the same time, the very date of coronation is not determined and varies between July 13 and 28, 1290. Trying to strengthen his position, he makes the Alliance with Prince Vladyslav I Loketko and becomes engaged to the daughter of Kuyavsky prince Zemomysl – Fenenna (Jasiński, 2001, p. 139), which was a smart political move, because through their family ties, he hoped to normalize relations with the Galicia-Volyn principality, which had been openly hostile since the 70s of the 13th century. The dynastic marriage made it possible to enlist the support of Yuriy Lvovych, who from 1287 was married to Euphemia, the sister of Vladyslav I Loketka (Baumgarten, 1927, pp. 47, 50), and in the long term it caused a split in the Czech-Galician Alliance.

From the very beginning of his reign, Andrew III of Hungary takes an openly anti-Habsburg position and in his coronation oath he swears to return territories and castles, which were invaded by the Austrian duke during the period from 1287 till 1289 (Kádár, 2013, p. 8). The enmity between the two states was exacerbated by the fact that on August 31, 1290, Rudolph Habsburg gave Hungary to his son Albrecht as an imperial fief.

In an effort to maintain balance in the political system of the kingdom, Andrew III maintains an interesting system of two palatines, which can be characterized as a system of “counterweights”, in which the highest title was simultaneously held by two people. Although, most likely, Andrew III was forced to accept the system that was established during the last chaotic years of the reign of Laszlo IV. The idea that in the political system of those years there was a practice of the activity of two palatines was raised by G. Pauler, who claimed that as early as in 1289, two palatines took part in the meetings of the estates, for the western regions of the kingdom this function was performed by Miklós Kyösogi, for the eastern part – by Reynold Bastei (Pauler, 1899, p. 406). His assumption is based on three charters, namely two charters of King Laszlo IV dated September 9, 1289, regarding the investigation of Palatine Reynold's activities (Árpád-kori új okmánytár, I, 1860, pp. 478, 482–483) and the documents of Miklós Kyösogi dated September 8, 1289 (Pauler, 1899, p. 573). We agree that Andrew III inherited a system in which the reigning monarch was forced to donate the highest positions to the oligarchs who temporarily supported him (Gerics, 1965, p. 655), and which testified to the final fragmentation of the state management system (Kristó, 1979, p. 189), which was actually torn between the western and eastern parts of the kingdom. After the coronation, Andrew III of Hungary appointed Amade Aba as palatine, who by the end of 1290, carrying out the royal order, invaded Poland, assisting Władysław Loketko (Zsoldos, 1998, p. 329). By February of 1291, Miklós Kyösogi was already mentioned as a palatine (CDH, 1830, p. 89), who holds this position at least until the middle of the year (Wertner, 1894, p. 12). Trying to strengthen his influence on Transylvania, Andrew III arrived in Alba-Iulia in March of 1291 and convened the General Congregation, the purpose of which was to carry out a number of reforms (Sălăgean, 2005, p. 241). The main purpose of the King's presence was to conduct negotiations with representatives of the privileged estates of the voivodship and obtain their support. The General Congregation led to the recognition of

the provisions that were proposed by the King and strengthened the royal power temporarily, but laid the foundation for the deterioration of relations between Andrew III and the Borsch family in the future (Bolovan & Pop, 2005, p. 77).

The actions taken by Andrew III during the period from August of 1290 till April of 1291 allowed him to strengthen his position and return to solving the issue of the return of the western counties. The Hungarian King called on Albrecht of Habsburg to surrender the captured castles, and later started a military campaign (Bárány, 2020, p. 50). Troops reinforced by Galician soldiers invaded the territory of the Austrian Duchy in July of 1291. The Austrian duke was forced to withdraw his troops from the cities and fortresses that had once been invaded by the Kyōsogi family, including Pozhon and Sopron. The war ended on August 26, 1291 with the signing of the Peace of Hainburg, as a result of which Albrecht undertook to return previously invaded territories (Skorka, 2019, pp. 68–69). On August 29, a meeting was held in Kopčano, during which the terms of the Peace of Hainburg were confirmed, in addition, Andrew III promised to destroy castles in the liberated territories (Zsoldos, 2003, p. 173). This document was the result of the actions of Archbishop Lodomer and the clergy who supported the King, and contained a model of the perfect Christian government in their eyes “... for powerful monarchs who are not limited by law, the greatest glory ... If they willingly obey the laws and accept the blessed compulsion according to the voice of the Holy Scriptures...” (Gerics, 1987, p. 247).

The provisions of the Hainburg Peace can be interpreted as a purposeful policy aimed at weakening the Kyōsogi family, or rather at dividing its branches. A royal charter from July of 1291 names Michal Szentmagóci as palatine, but already on August 10, two royal documents mention Miklós Kyōsogi in that position (as well as the documents of the Vashvar chapter in September of 1291 (Hazai okmánytár, 1876, p. 374; Hazai okmánytár, 1880, pp. 219–220). But by the end of the year, Miklós loses his position and, after several months of strained relations, supports his brother Janos in a rebellion against the royal authorities.

Meanwhile, political confrontation with the Kingdom of Naples began to intensify as Queen Maria proclaimed her son Charles Martel the King of Hungary in January of 1292 (MDEA, 1874, pp. 81–82). The Anjou family received detailed information about the events at the Hungarian court and the unstable balance of power between the King and the barons who supported his power. Thus, the main hopes rested on the oligarchic families of the southern part of Hungary, such as the Shubychi and the Babonychi (Szűcs, 2002, pp. 457–458), in addition, in the spring of 1292, their ranks were replenished with the Kyōsogi family, whose representative, Janos, declared that he recognized only the King supported by the Holy See (Zsoldos, 2003, p. 178). King Charles II appealed to the prelates, barons and nobles of Hungary with a request to provide army to protect the rights to the throne of his firstborn – Charles Martel (MDEA, 1874, p. 114.). In the spring of 1292, the rebellion began against the power of Andrew III, whom Neapolitan propaganda called “the usurper of the Hungarian throne” (Szűcs 2002. p. 455; Dunbabin, 2000, p. 624), and his followers. In response, Lodomer excommunicated Janos Kyōsogi, expressing his disagreement with the actions of the Holy See and its favorite (Zsoldos, 2003, p. 180). This was the last military action in which Andrew III was opposed by all the Kyōsogi brothers. Miklos unsuccessfully resisted the troops of Mate III Chaka in the Pozhony area (Lukačka, 2003, p. 590), and Janos fought with royal troops on the territory of Vash and Zala counties, which he considered his patrimony. In order to maintain his position, Andrew III appointed Amade Aba as palatine. This is evidenced by the documents of June of 1292, when the final clashes with the enemy took place (Érszegi & Solymosi, 1981, p. 182).

By July, King Andrew III succeeded in defeating the enemy forces and suppressing the Kyösogi rebellion. This was followed by the King's visit to Slavonia, whose position regarding the support of the royal power was already more or less formed, but after the visit to Zagreb, after August 4, 1292 (Lenkey & Zsoldos, 2003, pp. 181–182), he was captured and imprisoned by Janos in Mochon Castle (Zsoldos, 2010, p. 657). The King was forced to remain imprisoned for several months before his supporters sent hostages to free him (Szűcs, 2002, p. 459). The exact date of the King's release is not known, but a royal diploma dated November 26, 1292 indicates the period of captivity which lasted for four months approximately (Kádár, 2018, p. 114). But these events did not bring drastic changes in the balance of power in Hungary, because the steps taken by the Kingdom of Naples to attract the cities of Dalmatia to its side failed. This may have been connected with the death of Pope Nicholas IV, who was mostly on the side of the Anjou family, and after the death of Pope the cities diplomatically refused their support and switched to the side of Andrew III of Hungary (Szentgyörgyi, 1893, pp. 23–24). But the Kyösogi's rebellion and captivity undoubtedly became a personal humiliation for Andrew III, as a result of which he, distrusting the so-called uncertain allegiance of Slavonia and Croatia, appointed his mother, Tommasina Morosini, to manage these territories (Érszegi & Solymosi, 1981, p. 183). Distrust on the part of the King was so strong that during the appointment of Tommasina as the ruler of Dalmatia, Slavonia and Croatia (Codex diplomaticus Arpadianus, X, p. 213), Andrew III did not cross the Drava and during the royal visit did not dare to visit the southern counties of Transdanubia (Kádár, 2018, p. 115).

In the middle of 1294, Roland Borša, the voivode of Transylvania entered into an armed conflict with the bishop of Varada, which was accompanied by the capture of one of the castles belonging to the bishopric (Bunyitay, 1888, p. 24). In response, King Andrew III launched a military campaign against the Borša family, and the personal participation of the King and the approximate dates (August – September of 1294) of the hostilities are evidenced by two royal charters issued in Varada on August 3, 1294 (Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár Országos Levéltára, p. 322) and Hadrian Castle (castro Adorjan) on September 6, 1294 (Az Árpád-házi királyok leveleinek kritikai jegyzéke, 1987, pp. 39–88). After the fall of Hadrian Castle, the main Borša outpost in Transylvania, the family submitted to the royal authority but was removed from governing the voivodship, although they retained their possessions in Zatyssia (Kristó, 1978, pp. 83–96).

At the turn of 1295 – 1296, a rapprochement took place between Andrew III of Hungary and Albrecht Habsburg. After the death of Andrew's first wife, Fenenna, which happened before the end of 1295 (Balzer, 2005, p. 620) and who was unable to give birth to a male offspring, negotiations began between the ruling families regarding the conclusion of a closer alliance, which ended with the wedding of the Hungarian king with Albrecht's sister – Agnes Habsburg. Marriage with Agnes allowed Andrew III to become a full member of the Habsburg family (Lenkey & Zsoldos, 2003, p. 205), although she had no influence on politics and was an extremely shy and modest person (Duggan, 1997, p. 112). In August of 1296, with the support of his father-in-law Albrecht of Habsburg and the Austrian troops, Andrew III opposed a new rebellion of the Kyösogi family. Combat actions were not distinguished by activity, but royal letters (Csánki, 1894, p. 724; Diplomataikai Levéltár, p. 332), issued by Andrew III during the period of September – October of 1296 in Kyösogi Castle, testify to his personal presence on the territory of the family's possessions. And although the royal forces were able to invade only a few fortified points of the enemy (Skorka, 2017, p. 101), Andrew III managed to capture a major strategic victory by separating the political views of Janos and Miklós Kyösogi, resulting in Miklós swearing allegiance to the King (Markó, 2006, p. 236).

In the meantime, an agreement was reached between the Pope Boniface VIII and Charles II the Lame regarding the inheritance of Hungary. In 1297, the Pope confirmed the inheritance of the Kingdom of Naples by the third son of Charles – Robert, by omitting the hereditary rights of Charles Robert, and Charles Robert inherited claims to the Hungarian throne (Petrovic, 2015, p. 13). The reason for this decision lies in the fact that at that time the Kingdom of Naples was at war with Sicily, and Charles II could no longer be considered an effective ruler due to the fact that his health was undermined by the years spent in captivity and numerous injuries (Dunbabin, 1998, p. 112). Prince Robert was about 20 years old at that time (Hoch, 1995, p. 22), so he was a grown up and formed man who could take the throne in case of his father's death, unlike Charles Robert who was still a child. In addition, after the death of his eldest son, Charles II took a rather passive position towards Hungary, so the initiative to continue the dynastic competition was transferred to Boniface VIII, Queen Maria of Hungary and Pal Shubych (Karbić, 2004, pp. 11–19). In contrast to them, Andrew III of Hungary could count on the support of the middle nobility, since he was born in Venice, which was different from politically backward Hungary, and he pursued a fairly liberal policy (Štefánik, 2008, p. 11). He did not suppress the growing demands of the nobility to participate in power, it was under his rule that the meetings of estates began to be convened annually, and in 1298 he went further by allowing the middle and lower nobility to elect representatives to attend meetings of the royal council, completing the process that began during the reign of his grandfather Andrew II (Hóman, 1936, pp. 77–79). With this step, Andrew III gained support of broad strata of the nobility, which he could direct to fight against external and internal opponents. At the beginning of February of 1298, a new meeting between Andrew III of Hungary and Albrecht Habsburg took place in Vienna, during which an agreement was reached regarding the military support given to the latter during the war with Adolf of Nassau (Diplomatikai Levéltár, p. 1497). In order to conclude an even closer alliance between the states, Princess Elizabeth, a daughter of Andrew III from his first marriage, was engaged to the son of the Czech king Václav II, an ally of the Habsburg family – Prince Václav (the future king of Hungary under the name László V the Czech) (OÖR, V.V. pp. 73514–73519). This engagement strengthened the position of Andrew III of Hungary at the Viennese court (Pražák, 2002, p. 7), after all, the mother of Prince Vaclav Huta was the daughter of Rudolph of Habsburg and the sister of Queen Agnes (Maráz, 2007, p. 31). Andrew III ensured the participation of a large Hungarian army in the war, including detachments of the Cuman horsemen, who caused a conflict in Vienna by attacking local women, which led to armed clashes with the Viennese, during which hundreds of people died, including the son of the Cuman voivode Alp (Kovács, 2016, p. 28). The participation of the Hungarian contingent is directly indicated by the charter of Andrew III of Hungary, in which it is stated that the detachments of the Pozhonsky and Zvolensky ishans led by Demetrius Balashi “... fought for the glory of us and the entire Hungarian nation...” (Lenkey & Zsoldos, 2003, p. 205). On July 27, 1298, Albrecht Habsburg was elected King in Frankfurt and later he was crowned in Aachen (August 25, 1298). This allows us to state that by the end of the summer of 1298, the coalition of the King of Hungary and the Habsburgs began to dominate the Kingdom of Naples and its supporters. Stabilization of the situation in the kingdom allowed Andrew III to hold a meeting of the privileged estates in Pest, during which a number of decrees were adopted, which allowed the King to destroy castles built without permission and to reclaim property that had been appropriated during previous years (Sălăgean, 2005, pp. 241–242). After the meeting, Andrew III of Hungary concluded an official alliance with five influential

noblemen – Amade Aba, Istvan Akos, Dominique Rato, Demetri Balashi and Pal Sech, who confirmed their readiness to support the King in his struggle against external and internal enemies, as well as the Pope (Zsoldos, 2003, pp. 211, 213). At the same time, the King lacked the most important element of stability – a male heir and successor. Andrew III solved this problem, declaring Albertino Morosini and Albertino's descendants his successors in 1299, giving him the hereditary possession of Slavonia, which was the prerogative of the heirs to the royal throne (Jászay, 2004, p. 102). Constantia, Albertino's granddaughter, was engaged with the ruler of Srem, Stefan Władysław (CDAC, V, pp. 260–261). Trying to win over one of the influential Kyōsogi brothers, Henrik, Andrew III organized the wedding of his cousin Turco Morosini with his daughter (CDH, 1841, pp. 545–547). Another representative of the Morosini family, Baldo, gained control over large territories of Hungary, and other members of the extended family were representatives of Zadar and Dubrovnik in the Venetian administration (ÁÚO, 1874, pp. 323–325). This allowed the Hungarian King to begin planning a military expedition to Croatia to finally suppress the opposition and end the claims of the Anjou family. Albrecht Habsburg promised to help Andrew III in this military expedition. The passivity of Andrew III during the last year and a half can be explained by the fact that he was suffering from a serious illness and was mainly in Buda and in the territories of Pilish and Esztergom counties (Végh, 2003, pp. 13–14). In January of 1300, the final decision was made in Naples to send Charles Robert to Hungary. This was facilitated by the conclusions that in case of Andrew III's death, a long delay could cause the crown to be lost and that could be in favour of other claimants. Pal Shubych and other barons who supported the party of Anjou were informed about the decision. To form a bridgehead for the landing, King Charles II sent his generals Petrus Sura and Petrus Pilleso at the head of heavily armed galleys to Split. After that, he appointed his close friend Odo as the governor of the castles of Slavonia (MDEA, 1874, p. 144) and confirmed the possessions of the Frankopans (MDEA, 1874, p. 145) and the Babonychiv (MDEA, 1874, pp. 146–147). At that time, Charles Robert was in Apulia (MDEA, 1874, p. 155) and actually did not take part in the preparations for the invasion. Charles Robert arrived in Split in August of 1300 accompanied by a small retinue consisting of two galleys and one small merchant ship, which carried 150 combat horses and a slightly smaller number of armed soldiers (Petrovic, 2015, p. 10). According to the report of the chronicler Micah Madius, a meeting between Charles Robert and Pal Shubych took place in the city, who was supposed to hand him over to the care of Master Ugrinus, who is identified with Ugryn Chak (Korai, 1994, p. 697). But after August of 1300, none of the parties took actions, there were no military companies and significant clashes. After Charles Robert's landing, Pal Shubych did not interfere in his activities at all (Zsoldos, 2015, p. 197).

The passivity of Andrew III can be explained with several facts. Firstly, his illness was really severe and did not allow him to respond to the invasion of a new contender. It is likely that the supporters of the Hungarian King did not fully support the proclamation of Albertino Morosini as the heir to the throne and waited for the death or recovery of Andrew III in order to make the right choice in a possible fight for the crown, because there were much more contenders for the crown. It was the lack of an heir that caused the barons' "oscillating" not stable relationship with the ruling monarch and it was his weak point. The only known reaction of the monarch to the recognition of a part of the Hungarian nobility, Charles Robert, as their king, are the letters of the envoy of Andrew III to Rome, Petrus de Bonzano, who suggested that the suzerain should seize the opportunity and, with the help of Henry Kyōsogi and other loyal barons, capture the pretender (ÁÚO, 1864, pp. 262–263). There is

no information about the reaction of the King's mother Tommasina Morosini, who was the closest person to Andrew III. It is also interesting. There are several theories about the date of her death, but the most likely is the information from Ottakara Chronicler, in which it is stated that the Queen mother died before her son.

In the end, Andrew III of Hungary was unable to meet Robert on the battlefield and take the advice of his envoy, and on January 14, 1301 he died unexpectedly. The news of his death reached Charles Robert in Zagreb, where he was under the protection of the bishop (Schwandtnerus, 1746 – 1748, pp. 638). Later, Andrew III was called the last representative of the “golden branch” of the Arpad family (Engel, 2001, p. 124). His “Achilles heel” was the lack of a male heir, and with his death the male line of the dynasty died and there began a long period of dynastic and reunification wars waged by the new Anjou dynasty.

The Conclusion. Ten years of reign of the last representative of the male branch of the Arpad dynasty could not stop the destruction of the royal power institutions and restore respect for the ruling monarch. The civil war between King Béla IV and his heir Prince Istvan caused a tectonic split in the ranks of the ruling classes of Hungary, who accumulated much wealth in their hands and did not want to obey the last monarchs of the Arpad dynasty. The premature death of Andrew III and the lack of a male heir plunged Hungary into a long dynastic conflict. Further study of the relationship between representatives of the royal family and the magnate elite of Hungary, as well as the participation of the latter in the dynastic struggle at the beginning of the 14th century, is perspective.

Acknowledgement. We express sincere gratitude to all members of the editorial board for consultations provided during the preparation of the article for publishing.

Funding. The author received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Almási, T. (2012). III. András [Andrew III]. In *Gujdár N. & Szatmáry N. (eds.). Magyar királyok nagykönyve: Uralkodóink, kormányzóink és az erdélyi fejedelmek életének és tetteinek képes története* [Encyclopedia of the Kings of Hungary: An Illustrated History of the Life and Deeds of Our Monarchs, Regents and the Princes of Transylvania]. Reader's Digest. [in Hungarian]

ÁÚO. (1864). *Árpád-kori új okmánytár. Codex diplomaticus Arpadianus*. Ed. W. Gusztáv. Vol. V. Pest. [in Hungarian]

ÁÚO. (1874). *Árpád-kori új okmánytár. Codex diplomaticus Arpadianus*. Ed. W. Gusztáv. Vol. XII. Budapest. [in Hungarian]

Az Árpád-házi királyok kleveléinek kritikai jegyzéke. (1987). *Az Árpád-házi királyok kleveléinek kritikai jegyzéke. Regesta regum stirpis Arpadian aecritico diplomatica* [A Critical List of the Letters of the Árpád Kings. Regesta regum stirpis Arpadian aecritico diplomatica]. Budapest. [in Latin]

Balzer, O. (2005). *Genealogia Piastów* [Genealogy of the Piasts]. Kraków: Akademia Umiejętności. [in Polish]

Bárány, A. (2020). Magyarország és Anglia az Európai politikában az 1290-es években [Hungary and England in European Politics in the 1290s]. *Kultúra, művelődés, agrárium Tanulmányok ifj. Barta János (80), születésnapjára*, (pp. 45–75). Debrecen: Kiada a Debreceni egyetem történelmi intézete. [in Hungarian]

Baumgarten, N. (1927). *Genealoges et marriages occidentaux des Rurikides Russes du X-e au XIII-e siècle* [Genealogies and Western Marriages of Russian Rurikids from the X to the XIII-th century]. Roma. [in French]

Bolovan, I. & Pop I.-A. (2005). *Istoriya Rumynii* [History of Romania]. Bukharest. [in Russian]

Bunyitay, V. (1888). Kopasz nádor: életrajz a XIII – XIV. századból [Palatine Kopasz: Biography from the Thirteenth –Fourteenth Centuries]. *Századok*, 22, 15–32. [in Hungarian]

CDH. (1830). *Codex diplomaticus Hungariae ecclesiasticus ac civilis*. Studio et opera G. Fejer. Tomus sextus. Vol. I. Budae: Typis Typogr. Regiae Universitatis Ungaricae. [in Latin]

CDH. (1841). *Codex diplomaticus Hungariae ecclesiasticus ac civilis*. Studio et opera G. Fejer. Tomi VII. Vol. V: Supplementare. Budae: Typis Typogr. Regiae Universitatis Ungaricae. [in Latin]

Chronicon pictum Vindobonense. (1937). *Chronicon pictum Vindobonense* 88. In: *Catalogus fontium historiae hungaricae*. Vol. III. Budapest. [in Latin]

Csánki, D. (1894). *Magyarország történelmi földrajza a Hunyadi korában* [The Historical Geography of Hungary During the Hunyadi Era]. Vol. II. Budapest: Kiadja a Magyar Tudományos Akadémia. URL: <https://www.arcanum.com/hu/online-kiadvanyok/Csanki-csanki-dezso-magyarorszag-tortenelmi-foldrajza-a-hunyadiak-koraban-1/ii-kotet-32A7/>. [in Hungarian]

Diplomatikai Levéltár. (w. d). *Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár Országos Levéltára, Diplomatikai Levéltár* [National Archives of the Hungarian National Archives, Diplomatic Archives]. URL: mol.arcanum.hu/dldf.

Duggan, A. (1997). *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press. [in English]

Dunbabin, J. (1998). *Charles I of Anjou. Power, Kingship and State-Making in Thirteenth-Century Europe*. Bloomsbury. [in English]

Dunbabin, J. (2000). The beginning of the reign of King Charles II of Anjou (1278 – 1295): The Kingdom of Naples, the County of Provence and the Mediterranean area at the end of the 13th century. *International History Review*, 22(3), 623–624. URL: <https://www.webofscience.com/wos/woscc/full-record/WOS:000089452800008> [in English]

Engel, P. (2001). *The Realm of St. Stephen: A History of Medieval Hungary, 895 – 1526*. London: I. B. Tauris Publishers. [in English]

Érszegi, G. & Solymosi, L. (1981). Az Árpádok királysága, 1000 – 1301 [The Monarchy of the Árpáds, 1000 – 1301]. In: *Solymosi, László (ed.). Magyarország történelmi kronológiája, I: a kezdetektől 1526-ig*, (pp. 79–187). Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. [in Hungarian]

Gerics, J. (1962). A királyi bírói jelenlét a XIII–XIV [The Presence of Royal Judges in the XIII – XIV centuries]. *Század fordulóján. Jogtudományi Közlöny: Új évfolyam*, 17, 651–657. [in Hungarian]

Gerics, J. (1987). *A korai rendiség Európában és Magyarországon* [The Early Society of Estates in Europe and Hungary]. Budapest: Akadémia Kiadó. [in Hungarian]

Gombos, A.F. (ed.). (1937; reprint 2005). *Annales S. Iustinae Patavini*. In: *Catalogus fontium historiae hungaricae*. Tomus I. Budapestini. [in Latin]

Hazai okmánytár. (1876). *Hazai okmánytár* [National Archive]. Vol. VI. Budapest. [in Latin and Hungarian]

Hazai okmánytár. (1880). *Hazai okmánytár* [National Archive]. Vol. VII. Budapest. [in Latin and Hungarian]

Hoch, A. S. (1995). The Franciscan Provenance of Simone Martini's Angevin St. Louis in Naples. *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte*, 58, 22–38. [in English]

Hóman, B. (1938). *Gli Angioini di Napoli in Ungheria, 1290 – 1403* [The Angevins of Naples in Hungary, 1290 – 1403]. Versione dall'ungherese di Luigi Zambra e Rodolfo Mosca. Roma: Reale Accademia d'Itali. [in Italian]

Homonnai, S. (2003). Lodomér esztergomi érsek [Lodomer, Archbishop of Esztergom]. In: *Szentpéteri, József (ed.). Szürke eminenciások a magyar történelemben*, (pp. 16–19). Budapest: Kossuth Kiadó. [in Hungarian]

Jasiński, K. (2001). *Rodowód Piastów malopolskich i kujawskich* [The Lineage of the Lesser Poland and Kuyavian Piasts]. Poznań–Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Historyczne. [in Polish]

Jászay, M. (2004). Ricordi ungheresi di una regina d'Ungheria a Venezia [Hungarian memories of a queen of Hungary in Venice]. In: *Annuario. Studi e documenti italo-ungheresi*, (pp. 99–105). Roma-Szeged. [in Italian]

Kádár, T. (2018). III. András király itineráriuma (1278 – 1290 – 1301) [Itinerary of King Andrew III (1278 – 1290 – 1301)]. *Magyarország középkori történetével foglalkozó kutatás. FONS XXIV, (1)*, 87–124. [in Hungarian]

- Kádár, T.** (2013). Az utolsó Árpád-házi uralkodó, III. András király [The last Árpád ruler, King Andrew III]. *Levéltári Közlemények*, 84, 3–25. [in Hungarian]
- Karbić, D.** (2003). The realm of St. Stephen: A history of medieval Hungary, 895–1526. *Historian*, 65(4), 1037–1038. [in English]
- Karbić, D.** (2004). *Šubići Bribirski do gubitka nasljedne banske časti (1322.)* [Šubići Bribirski Until the Loss of the Hereditary Ban's Honor (1322)]. Zagreb: Zbornik Odsjeka za povijesne znanosti Zavoda za povijesne i društvene znanosti Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti. [in Croatian]
- Korai.** (1994). *Korai magyar történeti lexikon (9–14. század)* [Lexicon of the Early Hungarian History (9–14th centuries)]. Ed. Kristó, G., Engel, P. & Makk, F. Budapest. [in Hungarian]
- Kovács, S., Zimonyi, I., Hatházi, G., Pálóczi, H. A., Lyublyanovics, K. & Marcsik, A.** (2016). Török nyelvű népek a középkori Magyar Királyságban [Turkish-speaking Peoples in the Medieval Kingdom of Hungary]. *Altajisztikai Tankönyvtár*, (6), Szeged, 7–34. [in Hungarian]
- Kristó, G.** (1978). Kán László és Erdély [László Kán and Transylvania]. *Valóság*, 11, 83–96. [in Hungarian]
- Kristó, G.** (1979). *A feudális szétagolódás Magyarországon* [Feudal Fragmentation in Hungary]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. [in Hungarian]
- Lenkey, Z. & Zsoldos, A.** (2003). *Szent István és III. András* [Saint Stephen and Andrew III]. Budapest: Kossuth Kiadó. [in Hungarian]
- Lukačka, J.** (2003). Matthew Csak of Trenchin and his familiars. *Historický časopis*. 51(4), 589–604. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/298875060_Matthew_Csak_of_Trenchin_and_his_familiars [in English]
- Maráz, K.** (2007). *Václav III. Poslední Přemyslovec na českém trůně* [Wenceslas III The last Przemysl on the Czech throne]. České Budějovice: Bohumír Němec–Veduta. [in Czech]
- Markó, L.** (2006). *A magyar állam főméltóságai Szent Istvántól Napjainkig: Életrajzi Lexikon* [Great Officers of State in Hungary from King Saint Stephen to Our Days: A Biographical Encyclopedia]. Budapest: Helikon Kiadó. [in Hungarian]
- MDEA.** (1874). *Magyar diplomáciai emlékek az Anjou-korból* [Hungarian Diplomatic Memories from the Angevin Era]. Monumenta Hungariae historica. Acta Extera. Ed. G. Wenzel. Vol. I. Budapest. [in Latin]
- Nyáry, A.** (1869). Posthumus István, az utolsó Árpád-király atyja [István Posthumus, father of the last King Árpád]. *Századok*, 3, 232–294. URL: http://real-j.mtak.hu/13636/1/Szazadok_1869.pdf. [in Hungarian]
- Parmská kronika františkána Salimbeneho** [The Parma Chronicle of the Franciscan Salimbene]. (1938). Salimbenede Salimbenis. *Chronicaab*, (pp. 1168–1287). Budapest: Catalogus fontium historiae hungaricae. [in Czech]
- Pauler, G.** (1899). *A magyar nemzet története az Árpád-házi királyok alatt* [The History of the Hungarian Nation under the Árpád Kings]. Budapest: Athenaeum(II). [in Hungarian]
- Petrović, M.** (2015). *Popes, Prelates, Pretenders. The Role of the High Clergy of Croatia, Dalmatia and Slavonia in the Fight for the Hungarian Throne in the Fourteenth Century*. Thesis in Medieval Studies. Budapest: Central European University. [in English]
- Pražák, R.** (2002). Vencel [László]. In: *Kristó G. (ed.). Magyarország vegyes házi királyai*, (pp. 7–14). Szeged: Szukits Könyvkiadó. [in Czech]
- Sälägean, T.** (2005). Regnum Transilvanum. The assertion of the Congregational Regime. In: *Pop, Ioan-Aurel; Nägler, Thomas (eds.). The History of Transylvania, Vol. I. (Until 1541)*, (pp. 233–246). Romanian Cultural Institute: Center for Transylvanian Studies. [in English]
- Samanek, V.** (1948, reprint 1971). *Die Regesten Des Kaiserreiches Unter Adolf von Nassau: 1291 – 1298* [The Regesta of the Empire under Adolf von Nassau: 1291 – 1298]. Innsbruck. [in German]
- Schwandtnerus, I. G.** (1746 – 1748). *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum veteres acgeniui*. Vol. I–III. Vindobonae. III. [in Latin]
- Seemüller von, J.** (1890). *Ottokars Österreichische Reimchronik. Deutsche Chroniken und andere Geschichtsbücher des Mittelalters* [Ottokar's Austrian rhyming chronicle. German chronicles and other history books of the Middle Ages]. Band 5. Teil 1. Hannover. URL: <https://play.google.com/books/reader?id=-bsUAAAAQAAJ&pg=GBS.PA4&hl=ru>. [in German]

Skorka, R. (2017). A “mohó farkas” utóda. Egy Kőszegi Habsburg-szolgálatban [The Heir of the “Greedy Wolf”. A Kőszegi in the Service of the Habsburg Dukes]. *Világtörténet*, 39(1), 93–124. [in Hungarian]

Skorka, R. (2019). Előjáték egy házasságkötéshez. A Habsburgok útja az első magyar házassághoz [Prelude to a Marriage. The Habsburgs' Path to the First Hungarian Marriage]. In: *Királynék a középkori Magyarországon és Európában. Szerk. Szovák Kornél – Zsoldos Attila. Székesfehérvár*, (pp. 59–77). [in Hungarian]

SRH. (1937). *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum tempore ducum regumque stirpis Arpadianae gestarum*. Vol. I. Budapest: Academia Litter. Hungarica atque Societate Histor. [in Latin and Hungarian]

Stéfánik, M. (2008). The Morosinis in Hungary under King Andrew III and the two Versions of the death of the Queen of Hungary Tommasina. *Historický časopis – Historical Journal of the Institute of History of the SAS, Vol. 56. English Supplement*, 3–15. URL: <https://www.webofscience.com/wos/woscc/full-record/WOS:000263532400001> [in English]

Szentgyörgyi, Š. (1893). *Borba Anžuvina za prijestolje ugarsko-hrvatsko do prve krunidbe Karla Roberta* [Anzuvina's struggle for the Hungarian-Croatian throne until the first coronation of Charles Robert]. Zagreb: Knjigotiskarski i litografski zavod C. Albrechta. [in Croatian]

Szűcs, J. (2002). *Az utolsó Árpádok* [The Last Árpáds]. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó. [in Hungarian]

Tencajoli, O. (1930). Due Italiane, regine d'Ungheria [Two Italians, Queens of Hungary]. In: *Corvina. Vol. XIX–XX*, 293 p. URL: http://epa.oszk.hu/02500/02510/00015/pdf/EPA02510_corvina_1930.pdf. [in Italian]

Troyan, M. (1882). *Mukachevskiy zamok* [Mukachevo Castle]. Uzhgorod: Karpati, 56 p. [in Russian]

Végh, A. (2003). A középkori városnegyed a királyi palota előterében [The Medieval Town Quarter in the Forecourt of the Royal Palace]. *A budavári Szent György tér és környezetének története a középkorban*, (issue 31, pp. 7–42). Budapest: Tanulmányok Budapest múltjából. [in Hungarian]

Voytovich, L. (2011). O vremeni vklucheniya Zakarpat'ya v sostav Galitsko-Volynskogo gosudarstva [About the time of the inclusion of Transcarpathia in the Galicia-Volyn state]. *Rusin. Mezhdunarodnyy istoricheskiy zhurnal*, (26), 5–25. [in Russian]

Wertner, M. (1894). Az árpád kori nádorok sorozata [A series of palatines from the Árpád period]. *Történelmi Társulat*, 42(3), 1–14. URL: http://real-j.mtak.hu/4102/1/MagyarTortenelmiTar_1894_42_3_17.pdf. [in Hungarian]

Zsoldos, A. (1998). Tamás fia Sinka érdemei. Elhallgatás és manipuláció oklevelek narratioiban [The merits of Tamás' son Sinka. Silence and manipulation in diploma narratives]. In: *Tanulmányok Borsa Iván tiszteletére. Szerk. Csukovits Enikő*, (pp. 330–347). Budapest, URL: https://library.hungaricana.hu/hu/view/MolDigiLib_VSK_tanulmanyok_borsa/?pg=329&layout=s. [in Hungarian]

Zsoldos, A. (2003). III. András [Andrew III]. In: *Szovák, K., Szentpéteri, J., Szakács, M. (eds.). Szent István és III. András [Saint Stephen and Andrew III]*, (pp. 119–227). Budapest: Kossuth Kiadó. [in Hungarian]

Zsoldos, A. (2010). A Henrik-fiak: A Héder nembéli Kőszegiek “családi története” [The Henrik sons: The “family history” of the Kőszegis of the Héder family]. *Vasi Szemle: Köt.*, 64(6), 651–661. [in Hungarian]

Zsoldos, A. (2011). *Magyarország világi archontológiája. 1000–1301* [The secular archontology of Hungary. 1000–1301]. Budapest: História-MTA Történettudományi Intézete. [in Hungarian]

Zsoldos, A. (2015). Charles I and towns. *Historický časopis*, 63(2), 195–208. URL: <https://www.webofscience.com/wos/woscc/full-record/WOS:000356125700001> [in English]

*The article was received September 19, 2021.
Article recommended for publishing 23/11/2022.*