A R T I C L E S

FORMS OF COMMUNICATION OF THE POLITICAL ELITES IN MEDIEVAL CENTRAL EUROPE (HUNGARY, AUSTRIA AND THE CZECH LANDS 1250–1350)

DUŠAN Z U P K A

ZUPKA, Dušan. Forms of Communication of the Political Elites in Medieval Central Europe (Hungary, Austria and the Czech Lands, 1250–1350). Historický časopis, 2019, 67, 5, pp. 785-808, Bratislava.
The aim of this article is to give an account of the ritualized ways of communication of the ruling communities of the high and later Middle Ages in the Central European region. It focuses on the neighbouring realms of Bohemia, Hungary and Austria in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries (c. 1250 – c. 1350). It argues that the ruling communities were formed from diverse political groups, most prominently represented by the ruler and his entourage (dynasty, court) on the one hand and the elites (both lay and spiritual) on the other. The rule (lordship) over a particular realm was a mixture of co-operation, competition and compromise between these groups. Secondly, these political communities therefore felt the constant need for public representation of their status, rank and symbolic role within the society. Effective ways to express belonging to a political group included a range of symbols, gestures and specific rhetoric.
Key words: Communication. Ruling elites. Power. Central Europe. Rituals.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.31577/histcaso.2019.67.5.1

In this paper we would like to present a new interpretation of the forms of communication and representation of the political elites in the High Middle Ages in the Central European region. We have directed our attention to the territories of Hungary, Austria, Bohemia and Moravia in the 13th and 14th centuries, especially between 1250 and 1350. For our conception of the theme, it is necessary to apply various interdisciplinary approaches to the problem and naturally to under-

take comparative soundings into the source materials from these three countries.[1] This approach starts from two basic premises.

The first is the conviction that the ruling elites were in reality varied political groups, represented by the monarch and those closest to him in physical, social and hierarchical terms, meaning the ruling dynasty and court on the one hand, and the local elites, both religious and secular on the other. These groups had their specific characteristics, structure and above all their ways of presenting their community, exclusiveness and solidarity.[2] In each of these states, government and the exercise of power was a symbiosis of cooperation, competition and compromise between these groups.

The second premise is the view that the political elites had a continual need to present their status, position and symbolic role in the framework of medieval society. The use of a wide range of symbols, gestures and specific rhetoric was an effective way to express membership of particular political groups, create social bonds or to communicate the idea of such a community.[3]

Examination of the forms of communication and ritualized presentation of political groups enables us to answer three basic research questions:

What was the essence and meaning of the rituals and symbols that reflected and represented the ruling strategies of political groups? What role did these groups play in exercising power, including the processes of decision making, ad-

1   On the concept and methodology of this paper see Pohl, Walter. Introduction: Meanings of Community across Medieval Eurasia. In HOVDEN, Eirik – LUTTER, Christina – POHL, Walter (Eds.). *Meanings of Community Across Medieval Eurasia. Comparative Approaches*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2016, p. 1-23. ISBN 9789004311978; LUTTER, Christina. Comparative Approaches to Visions of Community. In *History and Anthropology*, 2015, year 26, no. 1, p. 129-143. ISSN 0275-7206; OEXLE, Otto Gerhard – HÜLSEN-ESCH, Andrea von (Eds.). *Die Repräsentation der Gruppen. Texte – Bilder – Objekte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998. ISBN 9783525354568; LAKE, Justin. Current Approaches to Medieval Historiography. In *History Compass*, 2015, year 13, no. 3, p. 89-109. ISSN 1478-0542.

2   LUTTER, Christina. Social groups, personal relations, and the making of communities in medieval vita monastica. In ROGGE, Jörg (Ed.). *Making Sense as a Cultural Practice. Historical Perspectives*. Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag, 2013, p. 45-61. ISBN 978-3837625318; JUSSEN, Bernhard. Erforschung des Mittelalters als Erforschung von Gruppen. Über einen Perspektivenwechsel in der deutschen Mediävistik. In *Sozialwissenschaftliche Informationen*, 1992, year 21, no. 3, p. 202-209. ISSN 0932-3244; WEILER, Björn. The Tales of the First Kings and the Culture of Kingship in the West (1050–1200). In *Viator*, 2015, year 46, no. 2, p. 101-127. ISSN 0083-5897.

3   SCHMITT, Oliver. Addresing Community in Late Medieval Dalmatia. In *Hovden – Lutter – Pohl*, ref. 1, p. 125-126; STOLLBERG-RILINGER, Barbara – NEU, Tim – BRAUNER, Christina (Eds.). *Alles nur symbolisch? Bilanz und Perspektiven der Erforschung symbolischer Kommunikation*. Köln: Böhlau, 2013. ISBN 9783412211936; KERTZER, David I. *Ritual, Politics and Power*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988. ISBN 9783412211936; WILENTZ, Sean (Ed.). *Rites of Power. Symbolism, Ritual, and Politics Since the Middle Ages*. Philadelphia: Pennsylvania University Press, 1985. ISBN 9780812216950.

vising the monarch and joint exercise of power? What power political strategies were used during the continual dynastic conflicts, succession crises and efforts to legitimize power?

Central European parallels

We will attempt to demonstrate the inter-connections and significance of ruling elites in the society of the period as expressed in ritualized communication by comparing source materials from Hungary, the Czech Lands and Austria.[4] Various reasons led us to define our theme of research in this way. One of them was the conviction that these relationships in all three countries underwent substantial changes in the 13th and 14th centuries. This was caused to a large extent by the fact that in all three monarchies, the "native" dynasty died out: the Babenbergs of Austria in 1246, the Arpáds of Hungary in 1301 and the Přemyslids of Bohemia in 1306.[5] The consolidation and stabilization of the position of the new monarchs and their dynasties – Habsburgs, Angevins and Luxembourgs – in the framework of their new kingdoms or duchy (in the case of Austria) was associated with prolonged conflicts and negotiations with the local aristocratic elites, courts and ecclesiastical and urban communities. New politically influential groups arose in this process, new alliances were formed and innovative power political strategies emerged. Rituals and the ritualized communication of these groups played a significant role in these cases. We will look at their logic, form and course following the examples of all three regions.

The geographical definition of the study was also given by practical considerations. The concept of Central or East Central Europe is a long studied but still controversial theme of historiography. The concept of so-called *Ostmitteleuropa*,[6] of which the Czech, Polish and Hungarian monarchies formed the core prevailed for decades in medieval studies. The region is similarly understood in

---

4   They appear in the local sources under various designations as *communitas ipsarum terarrum* in the *Hausordnung* from 1283 or as *die gemain der landschaft* in a document issued by the Duke of Austria Albert III in 1373. Comp. HÖDL, Günther. *Habsburg und Österreich 1273–1493*. Wien; Köln; Graz: Böhlau, 1988. ISBN 9783205050568, especially p. 13-14. Between about 1280 and 1382 they gradually became usual also in Hungarian, Czech and Polish sources. Comp. GAWLAS, Slawomir. Möglichkeiten und Methoden herrschaftlicher Politik im östlichen Europa im 14. Jahrhundert. In LÖWENER, Marc (Ed.). *Die „Blüte" der Staaten des östlichen Europa im 14. Jahrhundert*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2004, p. 262. ISBN 3447047976.

5   JOHNSON, Lonnie R. *Central Europe: Enemies, Neighbours, Friends*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010 (3), p. 30-35. ISBN 9780195386646.

6   LÜBKE, Christian. Mitteleuropa, Ostmitteleuropa, östliches Europa: Wahrnehmung und frühe Strukturen eines Raumes. In LÖWENER, ref. 4, p. 15-43.

English language literature under the designation *Central Europe*.[7] However, the same term often represents a much larger part of our continent. Apart from the core comprising the historical Czech Lands, Hungary and Poland, it also includes territories of modern Germany, Austria, Slovenia and Croatia.[8] Other authors place a region defined like this and enriched with parts of the Balkans and Eastern Europe under the term East-Central Europe.[9] The aim of this study is not to provide a further definition of Central or East-Central Europe. For the needs of research into forms of communication of medieval elites, it was necessary to limit the field of research to a region enabling the greatest possible degree of comparison.

The number and character of the narrative and diplomatic sources was also not the least important of the considerations leading us to study the Austrian, Hungarian, Czech and Moravian political elites. Relations between Hungary, Austria and the Czech Lands were very close in the 13th and 14th centuries, and each of them often played an important role in the political development of the others. Examples include the conflict between the Czech and Hungarian monarchs over the Austrian succession or the effort of the Přemyslids to gain the crown of Hungary after the Arpád dynasty died out. As a result, events in all these countries were recorded in a similar way in comparable regional sources.

For the Austrian lands we are well informed by the work *Liber certarum historiarum* written by the Abbot of Admont John of Viktring (cca 1270–1345/1347). The work, written in the years 1340–1343 and covering the period 715–1343, offers a detailed picture of events in the Central European region during the period researched by us, namely the second half of the 13th and first half of the 14th centuries. Apart from domestic affairs, the author often mentioned events in Bohemia, Moravia and Hungary.[10] Another useful source is the so-called *Styrian (or Austrian) rhymed chronicle* by Ottokar of Styria (cca 1265 – cca 1318/1322), which includes various details and reports on Hungarian and Czech history preserved in no other contemporary source.[11]

The basic source for the Czech Lands is the chronicle written between the years 1301 and 1339 by the Cistercian abbots Otto of Thuringia († 1314) and

---

7   BEREND, Nora – URBAŃCZYK, Przemyslaw – WISZEWSKI, Przemyslaw (Eds.). *Central Europe in the High Middle Ages. Bohemia, Hungary and Poland, c.900–c.1300.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013, especially p. 1-39. ISBN 9780521781565.

8   JOHNSON, ref. 5, p. 3-12.

9   CURTA, Florin (Ed.). *East Central and Eastern Europe in the Early Middle Ages*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2005, p. 1-38. ISBN 9780472114986.

10 Iohannis abbatis Victoriensis Liber certarum historiarum. In SCHNEIDER, Fedor (Ed.). *MGH Script. rer. Germ. 36*, Hannover: Leipzig, 1909–1910.

11 Ottokars Österreichische Reimchronik. In SEEMÜLLER, Joseph (Ed.). *MGH Dt. Chron., 5/1.2*. Hannover, 1890–1893.

Peter of Zittau (1260/1270–1339) at Zbraslav Abbey. The *Zbraslav Chronicle* or *Chronicon Aulae Regiae* is a unique narrative source on the events of the last years of the Přemyslid dynasty and of the beginning of the rule of the Luxembourg dynasty. The chronicle of the period 1253–1338 was planned as a work celebrating the rule of the last Přemyslids, but in its final form it offers a well-rounded picture of social and political development not only in the Czech environment, but also in the neighbouring Austrian and Hungarian realms.[12] The period of the Luxembourg dynasty is very well covered in the works of various court chroniclers of the first half of the 14th century such as Přibík Pulkava of Radenín (†1380) and Beneš Krabice of Weitmile (†1375).[13]

In the case of Hungary, the situation with sources is much more complex because no work comparable to the *Zbraslav Chronicle* or the *Liber certarum historiarum* has survived. For the 14th century we are dependent mainly on the *Chronicle Composition of the 14th Century* written at the Angevin court after 1350 and composed of two main parts: the so-called *Vienna Pictorial Chronicle* and the *Buda Chronicle*.[14] Complementary information, especially on the reign of Louis the Great is found in the so-called *Dubnica Chronicle* (*Chronicon Dubnicense*), which contains shorter historical works (*Chronicle of the Anonymous Minorite or Chronicle of John of Šarišské Sokolovce*).[15] An important source for the 13th century, especially on the emerging idea of the community of the realm (*communitas regni*) is the *Chronicle of Simon of Keza* written between 1282 and 1285. Surviving diplomatic material was another source of information about all three countries. We used it to clarify controversial or less reflected questions.

Bohemia and Moravia

In the Czech Lands, the idea of a political "community" (*communitas regni*) had a long tradition and was already known from the Early Middle Ages. From the beginning of Czech "statehood" it had two main components. The first was the prince and ruling dynasty, which bore the name of the first, mythical Czech prince,

---

12 Chronicon Aulae regiae. Petra Žitavského kronika zbraslavská. In EMLER, Josef (Ed.). *Fontes Rerum Bohemicarum 4*. Praha 1884.

13 Kronika Přibíka Pulkavy z Radenína. In EMLER, Josef – GEBAUER, Jan (Eds.). *FRB V*. Praha 1893; Cronica ecclesiae Pragensis Benessii Krabice de Weitmile. In EMLER, Josef (ed.). *FRB IV*. Praha 1884.

14 DOMANOVSZKY, Alexander (Ed.). *Chronici Hungarici compositio saeculi XIV*. Budapest: Academia Litter. Hungarica, 1937.

15 FLORIÁN, Matyás (Ed.). *Chronicon Dubnicense. Historiae Hungaricae fontes domestici III*. Quinque-Ecclesiis 1884; SOPKO, Július (Ed.). *Kronika uhorských kráľov zvaná Dubnická. (The Chronicle of the Kings of Hungary named after Dubnica).* Budmerice: RAK, 2004. ISBN 8085501139.

Přemysl. The second was the free warriors, who gradually became landowners and "officials" loyal to the prince. The unity and complementarity of these two parts of society was decisive, because together they formed the essence of the Czech realm – the so-called *mír* (*pax* and *ordo*). According to contemporary sources, the attempts of the Přemyslid monarchs to free themselves from this union by obtaining a royal crown by the grace of God and from the hand of the Holy Roman Emperor were perceived as unnatural violations of the rules of political life.[16] In the 11th and 12th centuries, a new idea appeared, according to which the whole community belonged to its heavenly patron and eternal ruler: St. Václav. This idea was officially expressed on coins bearing the inscription: *"Pax Sancti Wenceslai in manu NN"*.[17]

Recent Czech historiography corrects this traditional scheme mainly with regard to the meaning of the "community of Czechs". This community of free leading men figured from the beginnings of Czech history as an essential component of public affairs. The Prague court and assembly of Czechs administered all important matters. The Czech prince presided over the assembly and the elders had the main say in it. Precisely these elders were the bearers of the concept of the Přemyslid principality, because it was they who had concluded an agreement with the legendary Přemysl the Ploughman.[18] The communal assembly (*commune colloquium*) was the place where vitally important matters were decided, including the election of the prince, oaths of allegiance and whether to go to war or make peace. Thus, the leading elders and the prince held the traditionally transmitted knowledge that precisely these *"assemblies of the Czechs"* were the pillar of the constitutional structures of the Czech Principality.[19]

A domestic Czech definition of the ruling community also appeared in a later period. The so-called Dalimil presented it in his 14th century chronicle.[20] The

---

16 TŘEŠTÍK, Dušan. Počátky českého politického myšlení. (The beginnings of Czech political thought). In HEROLD, Vilém – MÜLLER, Ivan – HAVLÍČEK, Aleš (Eds.). *Politické myšlení raného křesťanství a středověku*. Praha: Oikoymenh, 2011, p. 404-446. ISBN 9788072981694.

17 For further details see ANTONÍN, Robert. *Ideální panovník českého středověku*. (*The ideal medieval Czech monarch*). Praha: NLN, 2013, p. 148-149. ISBN 9788074222399.

18 WIHODA, Martin. *První česká království*. (*The first Czech Kingdoms*). Praha: NLN, 2015, especially p. 57-67. ISBN 9788074222788.

19 WIHODA, ref. 18, p. 66-67.

20 PEČIRKOVÁ, Jaroslava. Semantická analýza staročeského slova »obec«. (A semantic analysis of the Old Czech word "obec"). In *Listy filologické*, 1974, year 97, p. 89-100; UHLIŘ, Zdeněk. Pojem zemské obce v tzv. Kronice Dalimilově jako základní prvek její ideologie. (The concept of the land community in the so-called Dalimil Chronicle as a basic feature of its ideology). In *Folia Historica Bohemica*, 1985, year 9, p. 7-28. ISSN 0231-7494; ANTONÍN, Robert. Chronicon Aulae Regiae. Neúspěšný pokus o ustanovení oficiální paměti na poslední Přemyslovce. (The Chronicon Aulae Regiae. An unsuccessful attempt to establish an official

chronicler offers his own vision of the *communitas regni*, using the words *obec* (*community*), *jazyk* (*language*) and *země* (*land*). Thus, the author defined his idea of the ruling elites in geographical and ethnic terms.[21]

The changes of the 13th century also affected the social and political groups traditionally designated as the *nobility* (*nobilitas*, in Slovak: *šľachta*), which began to be internally divided. Various rituals and symbols appeared representing their status, including knightly tournaments, heraldry and so on, which were brought to the Czech Lands by cultural and political influences from the West. Another of the innovations, which reflected these changes, was the establishment of the state court (*zemský soud*, *colloquium generale*), which served these groups as a forum for the application of law and justice, but also for their own representation and as places from which to influence the princely government. On the other side, King Václav II (1278–1305) introduced the ritual of written oaths of allegiance to the king, which were obligatory for higher placed members of the political community. The traditional mythological *mír* (*peace*) changed and was replaced by law, which was sought and found at the state court.[22]

The first joint action of fully developed aristocratic groups happened in 1278 after the death of King Přemysl Ottokar II (1253–1278), when they acted as the most influential pieces on the political chess board during the minority of his heir Václav II. A decisive moment came after the death of the last Přemyslid Václav III (1305–1306) in 1306, when the whole administration of the kingdom was directed by the most influential part of the nobility grouped in a community called the *lords* (*páni*).[23] Those interested in the vacant Czech throne had to take into account the strength and influence of this group if they hoped to successfully achieve their aim.

These changes left significant traces in the contemporary narrative sources. One of the pretenders to the vacant Czech throne was Rudolf III of Habsburg

memory of the last Přemyslids). In NODL, Martin – WECOWSKI, Piotr (Eds.). *Memoria et damnatio memoriae ve středověku*. Praha: Filosofia, 2014, p. 91-107. ISBN 9788070074152.

21 PAUK, Marcin. Der böhmische Adel im 13. Jahrhundert: Zwischen Herrschaftsbildung und Gemeinschaftsgefühl. In HLAVÁČEK, Ivan – PATSCHOVSKY, Alexander (Eds.). *Böhmen und seine Nachbarn in der Přemyslidenzeit*. Ostfildern: Thorbecke, 2011, p. 281-283. ISBN 9783799568746; HLAVÁČEK, Ivan. Politische Integration der Böhmischen Krone unter den Luxemburgern. In MALECZEK, Werner (Ed.). .*Fragen der politischen Integration im mittelalterlichen Europa*. Ostfildern: Thorbecke, 2005, p. 325-374. ISBN 9783799568630.

22 TŘEŠTÍK, ref. 16, p. 445. For a different view on developments in the 13th century see JAN, Libor. *Vznik zemského soudu a správa středověké Moravy*. (*The origin of the State Court and administration of medieval Moravia*). Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2000, p. 9-16 and 128-153, especially p. 133-136. ISBN 8021024801.

23 HLAVÁČEK, ref. 21, p. 324f; BEREND – URBAŃCZYK – WISZEWSKI, ref. 7, p. 462-463.

(1306–1307) son of the King of the Romans Albrecht (1298–1308). According to the contemporary narrative sources (*Iohannis abbatis Victoriensis Liber certarum historiarum*, *Ottokars Österreichische Reimchronik*) Rudolf and Albrecht succeeded in persuading part of the Czech and Moravian nobility to support their candidature at a meeting in Znojmo in 1307. The Habsburgs claimed that inheritance in the female line was not legal in the Czech Lands,[24] so Rudolf did not marry one of the sisters of Václav III, but the widow of Václav II, the Polish Queen Elizabeth/Richeza.[25] Therefore, the resulting ceremony at Znojmo had to emphasize that the Czech kingship was a vassal office granted by the Holy Roman Emperor. Therefore, Rudolf publicly refused the title of king by laying down the flags representing it as an imperial fief. His father Albrecht then returned the flags not only to Rudolf, but also to his brothers standing by him. In this way, Albrecht attempted to change the succession rules of Bohemia. In the event of Rudolf's death, power would automatically pass to one of his brothers. According to the above mentioned sources, the Czech and Moravian lords present in Znojmo had to swear allegiance to all the Habsburg brothers present in Znojmo. At the end, four documents were prepared and signed.[26] One was signed by the prelates, the second by the Czech lords, the third by the Moravian lords and the fourth by the representatives of the towns. The ritualized confirmation of the new rulers of the Czech Lands was an obvious result and symbolic expression of relationships between the ruling dynasty and the local political and social elites.[27]

The other players on the political chess board during the interregnum included the above mentioned sisters of Václav III Anne, Elizabeth and Margaret. In

---

24 *Iohannis abbatis Victoriensis Liber certarum historiarum*, ref. 10, p. 373-374.

25 *Chronicon Aulae Regiae*, Lib. I, cap. 85, ref. 12, p. 110.

26 On the use of documents in rituals see ADAMSKA, Anna – MOSTERT, Marco. The ʻViolent Death' of Medieval Charters: Some Observations on the Symbolic Uses of Documents. In KRAS, Paweł et al. (Ed.). *Ecclesia – cultura – potestas*. Kraków: Societas Vistulana, 2006, p. 699-709. ISBN 8389361949; WEBER, Christoph Friedrich – DARTMANN, Christoph. Rituale und Schriftlichkeit. In ALTHOFF, Gerd – STOLLBERG-RILINGER, Barbara (Eds.). *Spektakel der Macht. Rituale im alten Europa 800–1800*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2008, p. 51-55. ISBN 9783896786340.

27 *"der hantvest wurden viere: diu ein von allen den prelâten, die beidiu lant hâten, Bêheim und Merhærenlant, swie die wâren genant; sô was geschriben der beine von allen c herren gemeine unde von den suppan gar, die Bêheim hâte d sunderbâr; er lie ouch niht belîben, er hiez die dritten schrîben von allen den hern, die dâ wæren gesezzen in Merhæren; der vierte brief und der leste wart gemachet veste von allen den steten, die beidiu lant heten."* Ottokars Österreichische Reimchronik. MGH Dt. Chron., 5/1.2, ref. 11, p. 1181; For more details and sources ANTONÍN, Robert. Probleme bei der Gründung einer neuen Dynastie. In MOŹDZIOCH, Sławomir – Wiszewski, Przemysław (Eds.). *Consensus or Violence? Cohesive Forces in Early and High Medieval Societies (9th – 14th c.)*. Wrocław: Institute of History at the University of Wrocław, 2013, p. 193. ISBN 9788363760090.

an effort to reverse the unfavourable course of events, they also decided to use ritualized means. According to the court chronicler of Charles IV Přibík Pulkava of Radenín, the sisters appeared in front of the Czech barons, fell on their knees (*flexis genibus*) and supplicated (*supplicaverunt*),[28] with the barons not to take away their natural hereditary right. Since the noble lords had already sworn to support Rudolf of Habsburg, the claims and demands of the Přemyslid sisters remained unheard.[29]

The prolonged conflict eventually ended with the victory of John of Luxembourg (1310–1346), who became the new King of Bohemia in 1310. A significant majority of the Czech ruling groups had decided in his favour. In any case, that is the interpretation of the event left to us by Beneš Krabice. According to him, the embassy from Prague to Luxembourg, to offer John the Czech throne was a mission of the great majority of the ruling elite, including the lords, prelates, high aristocrats and burghers. The more impressive this embassy looked, the more legitimate it was in the eyes of John's contemporaries.[30]

However, the whole affair was complicated by the fact that the new king was not willing to stay in Prague for long. For him, the Lands of St. Václav meant mainly a source of wealth to finance his expensive foreign policy. As a result there were repeated disputes between John and the local political elites. At Easter 1318 in Domažlice there was a public reconciliation between King John and the leading men of Bohemia (*maiores Boemie*) mediated by the Holy Roman Emperor, Louis of Bavaria (1314–1347). All the representatives, who had been fighting against John of Luxembourg, swore oaths of allegiance and again received royal favour (*universi barones, qui se fere communiter regi*). In return, John promised to dismiss his German advisers, and in future take all important decisions after discussion with the Council of the Bohemians (*cum Boemorum*

---

28 On the rituals of *deditio* and *supplicatio* compare ZUPKA, Dušan. Symbolické gestá pokory – podrobenie sa a suplikácia. Ritualizované formy riešenia sporov v arpádovskom Uhorsku (11. – 12. storočie). (Symbolic gestures of humility, submission and supplication. Ritualized forms of solution of disputes in Arpád dynasty Hungary (11th – 12th centuries).). In *Historické štúdie. Medzi antikou a stredovekom. Acta historica Posoniensia XIII*. Bratislava: Katedra všeobecných dejín FiFUK, 2010, p. 88-103; in the Early and High Medieval context see also KOZIOL, Geoffrey. *Begging Pardon and Favor. Ritual and Political Order in Early Medieval France*. Ithaca; London: Cornell University Press, 1992. ISBN 9780801477539.

29 *"quod tres prefate sorores flexis genibus coram omnibus baronibus regni Boemie supplicaverunt…" Kronika Přibíka Pulkavy z Radenína*, FRB V, ref. 13, p. 187-188: Comp. ANTONÍN, ref. 27, p. 196.

30 The handing over of power in the Czech Lands to John is presented in the same spirit: *"Die sequenti Iohannes, filius regis Romanorum, indutus regalibus, cum vexillis regni Bohemie, stipatus principum, comitum, baronum nobiliumque magna cum multitudine, regnum Boemie ab imperio in foedum sucipit in civitate predicta." Cronica ecclesiae Pragensis Benessii Krabice de Weitmile*, FRB IV, ref. 13, p. 467. Comp. ANTONÍN, ref. 27, p. 200.

consilio universa regni velit negocia pertractare).[31] Thus, in 1318 John decided on a compromise according to which the administration and judiciary of the Czech Lands were in the hands of the noble groups. In return for this, John of Luxembourg gained money and confirmation of his royal dignity.[32]

Hungary

The 13th century was also a fundamental period for the development of relations between the ruling Arpád dynasty and other relevant political groups.[33] These processes were influenced by various key factors, the most important of which were the repeated dynastic conflicts between the monarchs and their heirs: King Emeric came into conflict with his brother Andrew II; Andrew II with his son Bela IV; Bela IV with his son Stephen V; Ladislas IV fought with the clergy and aristocrats; the aristocrats fought with Andrew III.[34] These conflicts enabled the emerging nobility to exploit the situation to increase their political capital by

---

31 *"Rex namque Romanorum Lodovicus, amicus pacis, Johannem regem cum Elyzabeth regina nec non maiores Boemie, qui auctores discordie fuerant, in Thust civitatem convocavit, ibique in die sancto Pasche, qui tunc in diem beati Georgii evenerat, inter partes contrarias reconciliacionis concordiam sub temporis brevis compendio ordinavit. Ibi Henricus de Lypa, qui pro gracia regis et regine plurimum, ut videbatur, laboraverat, prius denegatam graciam, nunc velud ultro oblatam faciliter obtinebat. Ibi Wilhelmus de Landestein, qui regno dampna fecerat et dampna susceperat, pari facilitate regis graciam obtinebat. Ibi universi barones, qui se fere communiter regi, suo domino, opposuerant, reformati gracie regali se novo iuramento ad fidem regi servandam perpetuam obligabant. Ibi Henricum de Lypa pridie suum adversarium ex communi consilio nobilium rex regni fecit subcamerarium eidem subiciens totaliter se et regnum. Ibi rex Johannes iuravit et statuit, quod omnes Renenses et hospites pugnantes, qui sibi auxilium in bellis prestiterant, a se et a regno debeat excludere, nec alicui externo et advene beneficia recommittere, sed cum Boemorum consilio universa regni velit negocia pertractare." Chronicon Aulae Regiae*, Lib. II, cap. 3, FRB IV, ref. 12, p. 247-248.

32 HLAVÁČEK, ref. 21, p. 345-346; MORAW, Peter. Die Länder der Krone Böhmen. In LÖWENER, ref. 4, p. 155.

33 A detailed summary can be found in VESZPRÉMY, Lászlo. Umwälzungen im Ungarn des 13. Jahrhundert: Vom 'Blutvertrag' zu den ersten Ständeversammlungen. In KERSKEN, Norbert – VERCAMER, Grischa (Eds.). *Macht und Spiegel der Macht: Herrschaft in Europa im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert vor dem Hintergrund der Chronistik*. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz, 2013, p. 383-402. ISBN 9783447068864.

34 SZŰCS, Jenő. *Az utolsó Árpádok*. (*The Last Árpáds*). Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézet, 1993, p. 3-152. ISBN 9789633892718; ENGEL, Pál. *The Realm of St Stephen. A History of Medieval Hungary 895–1526*. London; New York: Tauris, 2005, p. 83-111. ISBN 9781860640612; HERUCOVÁ, Angelika. Vojna o babenberské dedičstvo a Štefan V. (The War of the Babenberg Succession and Stephen V.). In *Historický časopis*, 2017, year 65, no. 1, p. 3-24. ISSN 0018-2575; ZSOLDOS, Attila. Az 1267. évi dekrétum és politikatörténeti hattere IV. Béla és István ifjabb király viszályának utolsó fejezete. In *Századok*, 2007, 141, p. 803-842. ISSN 0039-8098.

supporting one side or the other. The nobility began to constitute itself as an independent and self-conscious entity in the framework of the political community of the realm (*communitas regni*).[35] It was also divided into two main groups – the lower and higher nobility, and the rising importance of the lower nobility – the *servientes regis* was expressed in the granting of the *Golden Bull* by King Andrew II (1205–1235) in 1222.[36]

One of the most note-worthy results of the changes of the 13th century was formulation of the idea of a political community of free men – *communitas*. The originator of this concept was the educated chronicler Simon of Keza in his work *Gesta Hungarorum*.[37] Simon's theory of communitas expressed the demand for a *"general assembly of the realm"*[38] of the lower nobility, which met in the 1270s and 1280s in order to gain access to the application of government and join with the monarch against the anarchic rule of baronial groups and factions. The aim of Simon's political theory was to prove that the ancient Hunnic – Magyar *communitas* had not disappeared entirely with the coming of the Christian Kingdom of Hungary, its power had not been transferred entirely to the kings without *"something remaining in their hands"*.[39] It expressed in a colourful and very readable way the political demand that began to appear around 1280, namely that kings should grant the community of noblemen the right to participate in a *congregatio generalis* to exercise power and pass legislation. On the other hand, the *communitas nobiliorum*,[40] which found its spokesman in Simon of Keza, was

---

35 KISS, Gergely. Regnum et communitas regni: représentations de la 'patrie' dans la littérature légendaire hongroise et dans les chroniques. In *Specimen Nova Pars Prima. Sectio Mediaevalis III*. Pécs 2005, p. 35-59. ISSN 1558-8002; HOLUB, Jozsef. La representation politique en Hongrie au moyen age. In *Études présenteés à la Commission International pour l'histoire des Assemblés d'États*. Louvain: Publications universitaires de Louvain, 1958, p. 88-89; RADY, Martyn C. *Nobility, Land and Service in Medieval Hungary*. London: Palgrave, 2000, p. 39f; 44, 169. ISBN 9780333985342.

36 Comp. KRISTÓ, Gyula. *Az aranybullák évszázada*. Budapest: Gondolat, 1976, p. 58-82. ISBN 9789630964418; GERICS, Jószef. Von den Universi Servientes Regis bis zu der Universitas Nobilium Regni Hungariae. In *Album Elemér Mályusz*. Bruxelles: Les Éditions de la Librairie encyclopédique, 1976, p. 97-108.

37 Simonis de Keza Gesta Hungarorum. In DOMANOVSZKY, Alexander (Ed.). *Scriptores Rerum Hungaricarum tempore ducum regumque stirpis Arpadianae gestarum*. Budapestini: Academia Liter. Hungarica, 1937, p. 129-194.

38 SZŰCS, Jenő. Theoretical elements in Master Simon of Keza's Gesta Hungarorum. In VESZPRÉMY, László – SCHAER, Frank (Eds.). *Gesta Hungarorum: The Deeds of the Hungarians*. Budapest: CEU Press, 1999, p. LXXXVI. ISBN 9789639116313.

39 Ibid., p. XCVIII, XCIX.

40 *Simonis de Keza Gesta Hungarorum*, ref. 37: *"communitas tota"* (c. 95), *"principes et nobiles regni"* (c. 46). Simon of Keza was also ahead of his time on this question. His chronicle is traditionally dated to the years 1282-1283. The concept universitas regni appears in a document from 1299, but the expression universae nobilitatis communitas was accepted into Hungary's

prepared to support and strengthen the central royal power against those, who *"incline towards an idle life"* meaning the magnates.[41]

The weakening of royal power and parallel strengthening of the importance of the aristocratic elites was most visible during the anarchic years of the rule of the last kings of the Arpád dynasty. Government power passed into the hands of several magnate groups. These were definitively broken and subjugated to the central royal power only after the establishment of the new Angevin dynasty on the throne of Hungary after the victorious campaigns of King Charles Robert (1301–1342) in the period 1310–1321.[42]

We can trace an illustrative example of ritualized representation and the role of rituals in political conflicts by looking at the public communication during the famous meeting at Buda in 1304 between King Václav II of Bohemia and his son, the King of Hungary Ladislas V (1301–1305). After coming to Hungary and immediately before the meeting, Václav II decided after obvious consideration that the coming ceremony had to happen exactly according to established customs.[43] Therefore, he requested that his son the king would be dressed in ceremonial clothing and adorned with the royal insignia (*...sub diademate et omnibus indumentis regalibus regni Ungarie solempniter insignitum*). Only after welcoming speeches did the kings of Hungary and Bohemia meet face to face standing on precious rugs and carpets in the presence of various prominent aristocrats (*principibus*, *comitibus ac nobilibus pluribus*). A father's love and wish to see his son after a long separation could not threaten the need to stage a meeting of kings according to the appropriate rules, to demonstrate Ladislas's majesty. This involved the ritual of so-called *crown-wearing* or *Unter-Krone-gehen*.[44] In

---

system of political and legal concepts only after 1330. For details see SZŰCS, ref. 38, p. LXXXVII with references to sources and literature.

41 *"vivere volentes otiose"*, *Simonis de Keza Gesta Hungarorum*, ref. 37, c. 96; SZŰCS, ref. 38, p. XCVIII-IC.

42 ENGEL, Pál. Die Monarchie der Anjoukönige. In LÖWENER, ref. 4, p. 169-181. On the most powerful of the Hungarian oligarchs and his conflict with Charles Robert the most recent work is LUKAČKA, Ján. *Matúš Čák Trenčiansky*. Bratislava: Veda, 2016. ISBN 9788022415323.

43 On the rules for meetings between monarchs and the ceremonies on such occasions, see especially the classic studies by VOSS, Ingrid. *Herrschertreffen im frühen und hohen Mittelalter*. Köln; Wien: Böhlau, 1987. ISBN 9783412080860; KOLB, Werner. *Herrscherbegegnungen im Mittelalter*. Bern: Peter Lang, 1988. ISBN 9783261037961. For Central European parallels the most recent work is ZUPKA, Dušan. *Ritual and Symbolic Communication in Medieval Hungary under the Árpád Dynasty. (1000–1301)*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2016, p. 147-177. ISBN 9789004326392.

44 The events are interpreted in the same spirit by DVOŘÁČKOVÁ-MALÁ, Dana. Dvorský ceremoniál, rituály a komunikace v dobovém kontextu. (Court ceremonial, rituals and com-

precisely this way, the King of Bohemia attempted to strengthen the legitimacy and authority of his son, which was doubted by the majority of the Hungarian political elite.[45]

   In this case, the sources mention an interesting fact. The Styrian chronicler Ottakar aus der Gaal gave a detailed description of the preparations and course of the whole meeting in his *Rhymed chronicle*. In connection with the Hungarian crown placed on the head of the ceremonially dressed Ladislas, the chronicler mentions that this was only allowed on important religious feast days and no more than three times a year.[46] Ottakar adds that King Václav II had to undertake

---

munication in the context of their time). In DVOŘÁČKOVÁ-MALÁ, Dana. (Ed.). *Všední a sváteční život na středověkých dvorech. Dvory a rezidence ve středověku III*. Praha: Historický ústav AV ČR, 2009, p. 45. ISBN 9788072861538. On ceremonial coronations and crown wearing in the Middle Ages generally see JÄSCHKE, Kurt U. Frühmittelalterliche Festkrönungen? Überlegungen zu Terminologie und Methode. In *Historische Zeitschrift*, 1970, year 211, no.3, p. 559-561; BOUMAN, Cornelius A. *Sacring and Crowning. The Developement of the Latin Ritual for the Anointing of Kings and the Coronation of an Emperor before the Eleventh Century*. Groningen; Djakarta: J. B. Wolters, 1957, especially p. 107-126; BRÜHL, Carlrichard. Kronen- und Krönungsbrauch im frühen und hohen Mittelalter. In *Historische Zeitschrift*, 1982, year 234, no.1, p. 1-31. ISSN 0018-2613.

45 *"Porro cum iste Wenceslaus pater estuaret desiderio videndi filium, timens eciam, ne eidem aliquod eveniret periculum, congregavit valentem exercitum et anno MCCCIVo mense Junio regnum adiit Ungarorum, Hermannum vero, marchionem Brandeburgensem, suum consangwineum, rex in sua absencia terris suis prefecit capitaneum. Rex autem Deum habens sui itineris ductorem feliciter Ungariam pertransiit, timorque suus super omnes irruit, tandem quoque, ubi filius suus fuit, pervenit. Nolebat autem rex pater, sagacitate usus, regem videre filium nisi sub diademate et omnibus indumentis regalibus regni Ungarie solempniter insignitum. Sic igitur rex, regis filius, ornatus fuit, quemadmodum pater iussit. In loco autem, ubi reges isti fuerant congressuri, strati fuerunt soletenus panni preciosissimi. Circumstantibus autem et cernentibus principibus, comitibus ac nobilibus pluribus, filius primo patri appropinquat et hoc verbum latino eloquio eructabat: Advenisti desiderabilis, quem exspectabamus, quasi in tenebris constituti, te nostra vocabant suspiria ac requirebant lamenta, tu factus es spes, qui tuam exspectabant presenciam, universis. Occurrens autem pater filio ruit in oscula, stringens collum manu ac dulciter filio sic respondet: Fili omnia mea tua sunt, solacium unicum vite mee, sufficit michi te vidisse, sollicitudinem postpone, ego enim tibi gaudium et tu michi. Sicque inter affabilia colloquia erumpebant lacrime, quia se neuter poterat continere. Nec mora longa post hec fit, sed mox ad redeundum in Bohemiam rex pater se disponit et procedit, secumque filium, regem Ungarie, cum omni apparatu et ornatu regni Ungarie deducit."* Chronicon Aulae Regiae, FRB 4, ref. 12, p. 85. For more details on the context see KLANICZAY, Gábor. *Holy Rulers and Blessed Princesses. Dynastic Cults in Medieval Central Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002, p. 324. ISBN 9780521420181.

46 *"...darnâch sazte man im schône ûf sîn houbt die heilic krône, die sant Stephan truoc ûf sîm houbt : diu ist dem kunig erloubt ze tragen niht mêr ? nur sô er got dienen wil sunderbâr, zdem meisten drîstunt in dem jâr."* Ottokars Österreichische Reimchronik. MGH Dt. Chron. 5/2, ref. 11, p. 1091.

prolonged negotiations with the Hungarian magnates to enable his son Ladislas to use the royal insignia during their meeting.

One of the possible explanations of these events is that from the beginning it was a deliberately planned performance staged by Václav II. Organization of a public meeting of kings accompanied by ceremonial crown wearing by the questionable King Ladislas would give Václav an ideal opportunity to gain access to the Hungarian royal insignia. A unique use of a relic, hitherto unprecedented in Hungary, occurred at the meeting. Since the royal orb, a traditional part of the insignia of kings of Hungary, was not available at the time of the meeting in Buda, Václav replaced it with a precious relic of the first King of Hungary, the so-called right arm of St. Stephen (in Hungarian: *Szent Jobb*).[47] The young Ladislas held this relic in his right hand during the whole meeting.[48] These rituals, together with the selection of the name Ladislas and holding of the meeting on St. Ladislas's day, were part of a deliberate strategy intended to legitimize the rule of the young Přemyslid. All the actions pointed to Ladislas's relationship with the Arpád dynasty of which he considered himself the rightful continuer. Thus, we have here a legitimizing ritual, which also enabled Václav II to gain access to the Hungarian coronation regalia, which he and his son took away with them to Prague. In this way, the performance of these rituals symbolically expressed the required ideas and messages, which represented a strong weapon in the political struggle between King Ladislas of Hungary, his powerful allies and father Václav II on one side, and the Hungarian nobility on the other.[49]

After gaining the throne of Hungary, the Angevin monarchs also had to find a way to agree and consolidate peace and cooperation with the Hungarian elites.

---

47 BARTONIEK, Emma. *A Magyar királykoronázások története*. (*The History of Hungarian Coronations*). Budapest: Magyar Történelmi Társulát, 1987, p. 8-84. ISBN 9630544784; *Insignia Regni Hungariae. Studien zur Machtsymbolik des mittelalterlichen Ungarn*. Budapest: MNM, 1983. ISBN 9635630506; BERTÉNYI, Imre. *A magyar korona története*. (*History of the Hungarian Crown*). Budapest: Akadémia, 1978. ISBN 9630916681; KOVÁCS, Eva – LOVAG, Zsuzsa. *The Hungarian Crown and Other Regalia*. Budapest: Corvina, 1988. ISBN 9789631309638. Most recently cf. PÉTER, László. The Holy Crown of Hungary. Visible and Invisible. In *Slavonic and East European Review*, 2003, year 81, no. 3, p. 421-510. ISSN 0037-6795.

48 *"in einer hant er truoc sant Stephans arm, der ist kluoc in lûterm golde verwiert und mit gesteine c geziert." Ottokars Österreichische Reimchronik*. MGH Dt. Chron. 5/2, ref. 11, p. 1091.

49 *Chronicon Dubnicense*, cap. 132, ref. 15, p. 114; *Chronicon Aulae regiae*, FRB 4, ref. 12, p. 85; *Ottokars Österreichische Reimchronik*. MGH Dt. Chron. 5/2, ref. 11, p. 1090. On this remarkable interpretation see BAK, János M. Sankt Stefans Armreliquie im Ornat König Wenzels von Ungarn. In BAK, János M. *Studying Medieval Rulers and Their Subjects*. Farnham: Ashgate Variorum, 2010, p. 175-188. ISBN 9781409408291; BAK, János M. Holy Lance, Holy Crown, Holy Dexter: Sanctity of Insignia in Medieval East Central Europe. In BAK, *Studying Medieval Rulers*, p. 58, 62-63. Compare ZUPKA, ref. 43, p. 175-177.

Charles Robert of Anjou, a monarch coming from a part of Europe that was used to highly ritualized political discourse, did not leave anything to chance.[50] The long period from the coming of Charles Robert to Hungary in 1301 to his definitive recognition as the only legitimate King of the Hungarians in 1310 was marked by prolonged negotiations with local elites.[51] The Angevin had to gain support from the divided political groups of his new kingdom and this communication was often done by means of public assemblies, private meetings or ceremonial events, such as his three coronations (1301, 1308, 1310), the *adventus regis* ritual, swearing of allegiance and so on. Charles Robert had dynastic legitimacy, the right of succession, support from the Papal Curia and from 1308 also the "true" Crown of St. Stephen. However, he became the real and undoubted King of Hungary only after public recognition of his power and legitimacy by the political elites. This usually happened at public meetings in parliaments, synods or military camps and by means of swearing of oaths of allegiance and feudal service.[52] The king not only had to fulfil all the demands placed on any King of Hungary, ability to reach agreement with the most influential political groups in the country was equally important for recognition of his legitimacy and authority. Even after his definitive coronation in 1310, it still took another

---

50 This is excellently shown by a little known description of a visit by Charles Robert and his son Andrew to Apulia and Campania in 1333, captured by the Florentine chronicler Giovanni Villani. On this see LUCHERINI, Vinni. The Journey of Charles I, King of Hungary, from Visegrád to Naples (1333): Its Political Implications and Artistic Consequences. In *Hungarian Historical Review*, 2013, year 2, no. 2, p. 347. ISSN 2063-8647. For more details see LUCHERINI, Vinni. Il potere medievale, la sua narrazione visuale e l'uso strumentale delle immagini. In *Hortus artium medievalium*, 2015, year 21, p. 296-298. ISSN 1848-9702 and LUCHERINI, Vinni. L'arte alla corte dei re "napoletani" d'Ungheria nel primo Trecento: un equilibrio tra aspirazioni italiane e condizionamenti locali. In *Arte di Corte in Italia del Nord. Programmi, modelli, artisti (1330–1402 ca.*). International Conference Proceedings (Lausanne, from 24th to 26th May 2012). Roma: Viella, 2013, p. 371-396. ISBN 9788867280087; LUCHERINI, Vinni. Celebrare e cancellare la memoria dinastica nella Napoli angioina: le tombe del principe Andrea d'Ungheria e della regina Giovanna I. In *Hortus artium medievalium*, 2015, year 21, p. 76-91. ISSN 1848-9702.

51 ZSOLDOS, Attila. Kings and Oligarchs in Hungary at the Turn of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries. In *Hungarian Historical Review*, 2013, year 2, no. 2, p. 211-242. ISSN 2063-8647.

52 FEJÉR, Georgius (Ed.). *Codex diplomaticus Hungariae ecclesiasticus ac civilis VIII/1*. Budae 1829–1844, p. 221, no. 105; SEDLÁK, Vincent a kol. *Pod vládou anjouovských kráľov. Pramene k dejinám Slovenska a Slovákov IV.* (*Under the rule of the Angevin kings. Sources on the history of Slovakia and the Slovaks IV.*). Bratislava: LIC, 2002, p. 56, 62-68. ISBN 8088878721. Further examples are given by VLASKO, Vladimír. Počiatky vlády Anjouovcov v Uhorsku. (The beginnings of Angevin rule in Hungary). In *Štúdie o dejinách. Historia Nova 6*. Bratislava: Stimul, 2013 (online), p. 30, 37-39, 46. ISBN 9788081270826.

11 years for Charles Robert to finally break the opposition of his last opponents and gain their loyalty.[53]

The Austrian Lands

The Austrian political elites passed through similar changes to those in Hungary and the Czech Lands. The native Babenberg dynasty died out as early as 1246 after the unfortunate battle on the Leitha river, where Duke Frederick II (1211–1246) died. This was the beginning of a turbulent period of internal conflicts, in which various foreign protagonists participated. In the end, the Habsburgs triumphed, after Rudolf I (German King and King of the Romans 1273–1291) defeated King Přemysl Ottokar II of Bohemia in 1276. The local noble elites also fully entered the political scene in full strength for the first time in precisely this period. They were the most important political force in the Duchy of Austria for many years.[54]

They also formed new political groups and institutions. During the *interregnum*,[55] which lasted from 1246 to 1251, the political importance of the so-called

53   See the descriptions of individual phases in the *Chronicon Dubnicense*, cap. 131-139, ref. 15. The picture of events and the varied forms of communication also appear in diplomatic sources: *Monumenta Vaticana Historiam Regni Hungariae Illustrantia*. Ser. I. tom. II. Budapestini 1886, p. 112, no. 38 and p. 304, no. 65. On the context see KRISTÓ, Gyula. Die Macht der Territorialherren in Ungarn am Anfang des 14. Jahrhunderts. In *Études historiques hongroises publieés à l'occasion de Congrès International des Sciences Historiques. I.* Budapest 1985, p. 597-614. ISBN 9789630505918.

54   WOLFRAM, Herwig (Ed.). *Die Länder und das Reich. Der Ostalpenraum im Hochmittelalter. Österreichische Geschichte im Hochmittealter 1122–1278*. Wien: Ueberreuter, 2003. ISBN 9783800039739; LUTTER, Christina. Negotiated Consent. Power Policy and the Integration of Regional Elites in late 13th Century Austria. In TITONE, Fabrizio (Ed.). *Disciplined Dissent. Strategies of Non-Confrontational Protest in Europe from the Twelfth to the Early Sixteenth Century*. Roma: Viella, 2016, p. 41-64. ISBN 9788867287239.

55   It is a controversial chapter in Austrian history. For the views of older historiography see LHOTSKY, Alphons. *Geschichte Österreichs seit der Mitte des 13. Jahrhundert (1281–1358)*. Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Geschichte Österreichs 1. Wien: Böhlau, 1967; WANDRUSZKA, Adam. *Das Haus Habsburg: Die Geschichte einer europäischen Dynastie*. Stuttgart: Friedrich Vorwerk Verlag, 1956; MOEGLIN, Jean-Marie. Dynastisches Bewusstsein und Geschichtsschreibung. Zum Verständnis der Wittelsbacher, Habsburger und Hohenzollern im Spätmittelalter. In *Historische Zeitschrift*, 1993, year 256, no. 1, p. 616-630. ISSN 0018-2613; KRIEGER, Karl Friedrich. *Die Habsburger im Mittelalter: von Rudolf I. bis Friedrich III*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1994. ISBN 9783170182288; HÖDL, Günther. *Habsburg und Österreich 1273–1493*. Wien; Köln; Graz: Böhlau, 1988, especially p. 13-14. For a classic critical account see GRAUS, František. Přemysl Otakar II – sein Ruhm und sein Nachleben. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte politischer Propaganda und Chronistik. In *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, 1971, year 79, p. 57-110. ISSN 2307-2903; among the newer works especially WELTIN, Maximilian. *Das Land und sein Recht. Ausgewählte Beiträge zur Verfassungsgeschichte Österreichs im Mittelalter*.

Grundherrenverband[56] increased, while the *ministeriales Austriae* represented the whole country and its inhabitants. They were the most important partner for anybody, who wanted to be accepted as the legitimate successors of the Babenbergs.[57] They were a specific group of noblemen, who participated in government during the period when Přemysl Ottokar II ruled Austria, giving him help and advice, as the contemporary sources show.[58] The public ritualized representation of the acceptance of Přemysl Ottokar II on the ducal throne and his alliance with the *ministerialibus Austriae universis* happened at a ceremonial *placitum generale* at Korneuburg in 1251. After gaining the support of the majority of important political groups, the new monarch could accept the country as his own.[59] And thirdly, precisely these local elites were the key allies of the next ruler of Austria: Rudolf of Habsburg, King of the Romans. The first years of his reign involved alternation of conflict and cooperation with the regional ruling groups.[60]

The case of the struggles for the Babenberg succession[61] is an excellent example for the observation of forms of communication between political communities, because in the course of a few years, various actors became actively involved in the hope of gaining power over the duchy. Apart from the local elites, these were the King of Hungary Bela IV (1235–1270), the King of Bohemia Přemysl Ottokar II and the King of the Romans Rudolf of Habsburg, who entered the political arena in an effort to gain influence in the former Babenberg lands. They all had to make repeated efforts to find various ways of solving their conflicts with each other. In the course of this, they used various ritualized tech-

---

Eds. Folker Reichert, Winfried Stelzer. Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung, Ergänzungsband (49). München: Oldenburg, 2006. ISBN 9783486580082; LACKNER, Christian. Das Haus Österreich und seine Länder im Spätmittelalter. Dynastische Integration und regionale Identitäten. In MALECZEK, ref. 21, p. 273-301.

56   It was an exclusive group of the most important land owners. NIEDERSTÄTTER, Alois. *Geschichte Österreichs*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2007, p. 70. ISBN 9783170191938.

57   WELTIN, Maximilian. Landesherr und Landesherren. Zur Herrschaft Ottokars II Premysl in Österreich. In WELTIN, ref. 55, p. 130-132.

58   *"auxilio quorundam nobilium de Austria"*, *"consilio et auxilio quorundam ministerialium"* or *"vocatione magnatum Austrie"* MGH SS 9, p. 643, 792 and MGH SS 17, p. 393. In 1253 Přemysl Ottokar II. said that he had been invited into Austria by the *"nobiles, comites, barones"*. ŠEBÁNEK, Jindřich – DUŠKOVÁ, Sáša (Eds.). *Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris regni Bohemiae* (CDB) IV/1. Praha 1962, p. 583, no. 465.

59   WELTIN, ref. 55, p. 138.

60   Compare MGH Const. III, p. 406, no. 412 (1288 IV, 12 Basel). For a convincing recent account of the problem see LUTTER, ref. 54, p. 41-64.

61   On the Austro – Hungarian dimension, the most recent work is HERUCOVÁ, ref. 34; on the Czech – Austrian dimension HÄRTEL, Reinhard. Böhmens Ausgriff nach Süden. In *Böhmen und seine Nachbarn in der Přemyslidenzeit*. Ostfildern: Thorbecke, 2011, p. 203-245. ISBN 9783799568746.

niques for carrying on political struggles, as can be clearly seen in the conflict between Rudolf I and Přemysl Ottokar II from 1273 to 1278.

In 1274, Rudolf decided to accuse the King of Bohemia at an assembly of princes of refusing to accept his office as a fief from Rudolf's hands, as had been the custom for a long time. The secular and spiritual princes traditionally acted as judges in the disputes of Emperors with kings and magnates.[62] An interesting episode in the on-going dispute occurred in a military camp near Vienna in 1276 in the form of a so-called *arbitrium principum*. Bishop Berthold of Würzburg and Duke Ludwig of Bavaria represented Rudolf, while Bishop Bruno of Olomouc and Margrave Otto of Brandenburg defended the position of Přemysl Ottokar II. They found a joint solution, intended to decide the dispute and present appropriate conditions for both sides.[63] However, the obstinacy of the Czech monarch and his repeated violation of agreements led to a military solution of the situation with its well known end on the Marchfeld in 1278.

Diplomatic negotiations and military encounters were not the only resources applied during the long conflict between Rudolf and Přemysl Ottokar II. There was also a ceremonial meeting between the two monarchs by the river Danube in the winter of 1276. The basic messages were expressed in ceremonial rituals and the use of symbolic communication, in which Přemysl paid homage to Rudolf as a vassal. After concluding an armistice, the ending of conflict and confirmation of sincere plans for good relations in future by means of planning a marriage between their children, they undertook the last part of their ritualized recon-

---

62 SUCHÁNEK, Drahomír. Role duchovních osob při řešení konfliktů ve středověku a smiřující rituály. (The role of the clergy in solving conflicts in the Middle Ages and peace making rituals). In NODL, Martin – WIHODA, Martin (Eds.). *Rituál smíření. Konflikt a jeho řešení ve středověku*. Brno: Matice moravská, 2008, p. 273-289. ISBN 9788086488486; KAMP Hermann. *Friedensstifter und Vermittler im Mittelalter*. Darmstadt: WBG, 2011. ISBN 3534151674.

63 *"1. Nos Berhtoldus Herbipolensis, Bruno Olomunzensis episcopi, Lůdwicus comes palatinus Reni dux Bawarie, a marchio Brandeburgensis arbitri dominorum Romanorum et Boemie regum super questionibus, que inter ipsos super diversis terris et princi patibus vertebantur, arbitrando pronunciamus, quod revocentur et retractentur, immo revocate sint omnes sentencie proscripcionis, excommunicacionis, interdicti, privacionis et quecumque alie promulgate contra doimnum Otakarum regem Boemie et adherentes sibi quocumque nomine censeantur. 2. Item pronunciando arbitramur, quod inter ipsos Romanorum et Boemie reges plena sit concordia, pax firma et sincera reconciliacio sine qualibet capcione, et servitores utriusque regum quocumque nomine censeantur huiusmodi paci, concordie ac reconciliacioni cum sinceritate firmissima includantur, castris eorum, municionibus, possessionibus et hominibus contra ius ab alterutro regum ipsis ablatis vel a suis cum integritate debita restitutis."* MGH Constitutiones 3, no. 113, p. 103-104; *Regesta Imperii VI*, 1, no. 622b and 623. For more details on the whole conflict ALTHOFF, Gerd. Rudolf von Habsburg und Ottokar von Böhmen. Formen der Konfliktaustragung und – beilegung im 13. Jahrhundert. In ALTHOFF, Gerd. *Spielregeln der Politik im Mittelalter*. Darmstadt: WBG, 1997, p. 88-95. ISBN 9783534264674.

ciliation. After discrete consultation with his aristocratic associates, something the contemporary source did not forget to emphasize, the Habsburg symbolically granted the Přemyslid the right to rule the Czech Lands by handing over flags to him as his vassal.[64] The Austrian sources also recall that this came after the symbolic humbling of the Czech monarch. Rudolf remembered very well how years before, the proud and then very powerful King of Bohemia had ridiculed him for his lowly origin and poverty, repeatedly calling him the *"poor count"*.[65]

In Vienna in 1276, at the peak of his power and political dominance over Přemysl Ottokar, Rudolf appeared dressed only in the simple woollen clothing of his notary. This ritual self-humbling was in sharp contrast to the appearance of the King of Bohemia dressed in clothes made from precious materials and adorned with royal insignia. Ottokar was forced to kneel and accept his rule over Bohemia and Moravia from the hands of the *"poor count"*.[66] We have here the use of another very effective strategy applied in political struggles between medieval ruling groups. A power political aim could be achieved by diplomacy, by force of arms or by performing the appropriate ritual.

The Abbot of Admont and chronicler John of Viktring (cca 1280–1345/1347) left in his work Liber certarum historiarum eloquent proof of the importance of cooperation between the monarch and political groups in ordinary and ceremonial life. He referred to a Biblical text concerning King Salomon from the Book of Proverbs: *"In the multitude of people is the king's honour, but in the want of people is the destruction of the prince"* (*Proverbs 14, 28*).[67] He used these words

---

64 *"Videns itaque rex Otakarus tali confoederatione et amicitia Rudolfo electo se iunctum, ad instantiam ipsius et petitionem, quorundam etiam suorum consilio inductus, sub spe uberioris gratiae obtulit sibi vexilla quinque in signum subiectionis, sperans sibi eadem vexilla cum terris quas resignaverat incontinenti restitui. Rudolfus vero, ut vir providus et discretus, cum suis primatibus interlocutoria habita, usus maturiori consilio regi Otakaro vexilla duo restituit cum terris Boherniae et Moraviae , ponens eum sub spe restitutionis et aliarum terrarum, asserens se necessitatibus et indigentiis ac rerum carentia esse praegravatum."* Annales Otakariani. Ed. Rudolf Köpke, MGH Scriptores 9, Hannover 1851, p. 191.

65 *"Tunc rex dixit: Rex Boemiae griseam vestem meam saepius derisit, nunc autem ipsum mea vestis grisea deridebit."* Chronicon Colmariense. Ed. Philipp Jaffe, MGH Scriptores 17, Hannover 1861, p. 240-270. More details in EICKELS, Klaus van. Tradierte Konzepte in neuen Ordnungen. Personale Bindungen im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert. In SCHNEIDMÜLLER, Bernd – WEINFURTER, Stefan (Eds.).*Ordnungskonfigurationen im Hohen Mittelalter*. Ostfildern: Thorbecke, 2006, p. 93-125. ISBN 9783799568647.

66 For convincing details on ritualized self-humbling see ALTHOFF, Gerd. Humiliatio – Exaltatio. Theorie und Praxis eines herrscherlichen Handlungsmusters. In MÜLLER, Jan (Ed.). *Text und Kontext. Fallstudien und theoretische Begründungen einer kulturwissenschaftlich angeleiteten Mediävistik*. München: Oldenbourg, 2007, p. 37-51. ISBN 9783110446340.

67 *"In multitudine populi dignitas regis et in paucitate plebis ignominia principis."* Compare. *Les entourages princiers à la fin du Moyen Âge. Une approche quantitative.* Ed. Alexandra Beauchamp. Madrid: Casa de Velasquéz, 2013. ISBN 9788496820722. Comp. *Iohannis*

to describe the number, glamour and nobility of all the princes, dukes and magnates, who attended the first royal assembly called by Rudolf I in 1277 so that they could express their loyalty and swear their feudal vows to him.[68]

In the following century, the Habsburgs continued to take all important political decisions and to undertake all important rituals in cooperation with local elites. A constitutive ceremony in this regard was the granting of the Austrian, Styrian or Carinthian lands as feudal holdings. Duke Otto received Austria in 1330 from the hands of the Emperor in Augsburg, and Carinthia in 1335 at Linz. The symbolic handing over of territory always occurred by handing over of flags, and with the assistance of large retinues of aristocrats.[69]

Conclusions

The examples given above from Austrian, Czech and Hungarian sources clearly show the main features of the relations between the ruling groups in Central Europe in the 13th and 14th centuries. In their basic lines and regional details they fall into the framework of elite strategies and political culture familiar in other parts of Europe in this period.[70]

On the basis of these sources we can deduce some conclusions with regard to the forms and functioning of communication between the ruling elites in High Medieval Central Europe between about 1250 and 1350. In spite of the claims of older historiography and the extremely one-sided contemporary sources about the irreplaceable and exclusive role of monarchs and royal dynasties,[71] it is ne-

---

abbatis Victoriensis Liber certarum historiarum, Liber II, ref. 10, p. 237, where the author uses the phrase in multitudine honor regis.

68 *Iohannis abbatis Victoriensis Liber certarum historiarum*, Liber II, ref. 10, p. 237.

69 *"Dux Otto... suscepit feoda terrarum cum LXXX vexillis, ut dicitur, assitentibus sibi multis comitibus et nobilibus in Augusta."* Iohannis abbatis Victoriensis Liber certarum historiarum Lib V, ref. 10, p. 141; *"imperator ... signa precipit erigi vexillula comitibus et aliis nobilibus ferenda consignari"* Iohannis abbatis Victoriensis Liber certarum historiarum, Liber VI, ref. 10, p. 158.

70 The theme is well mapped by WATTS, John. *The Making of Polities: Europe, 1300–1500. Cambridge Medieval Textbooks*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009, p. 43-153. ISBN 9780521792325; FAŁKOWSKI, Wojciech – SCHNEIDMÜLLER, Bernd – WEINFURTER, Stefan (Eds.). *Ritualisierung politischer Willensbildung: Polen und Deutschland im hohen und späten Mittelalter*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2010. For recent works from the point of view of the control of power and communication ALTHOFF, Gerd. *Kontrolle der Macht: Formen und Regeln politischer Beratung im Mittelalter*. Darmstadt: WBG, 2016. ISBN 9783534267842. For German and Polish parallels see VERCAMER, Grischa – WÓŁKIEWICZ, Ewa. *Legitimation von Fürstendynastien in Polen und dem Reich. Identitätsbildung im Spiegel schriftlicher Quellen (12.–15. Jahrhundert)*. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz, 2016. ISBN 9783447105552.

71 WANDRUSZKA, ref. 55; BOSL, Karl. Ruler and Ruled in the German Empire from the

cessary today to understand power and the exercise of power in medieval realms as the parallel operation of a system of interactions, which included cooperation, conflict and compromise between various ruling groups.[72] Structures and relations between groups mattered more than individuals and events.[73]

The communal identity and ideas of the ruling elites were most clearly visible and expressed on particular occasions and specific conditions, especially:[74]

1. When exercising power and taking decisions, including assemblies, councils and provision of assistance to the monarch;
2. In periods of conflicts and controversies, including legitimization of power and succession crises;
3. On ceremonial occasions such as coronations, ceremonial meetings, *convivia* and *adventus regis*.

The active exercise of power and decision making by the monarch and his closest associates was influenced by the idea of the need for collective discussion and consultation with selected persons and groups. These rested on moral and social values as well as on order anchored in traditions and legal customs. The most outward expression of these ideas was the public announcement of decisions by the monarch, normally using ritualized action, which had the role of strengthening his authority. Finally there was the guarantee of the implementation of the decision in the real political struggle, which was also accompanied by numerous rituals and symbols, because the royal power had to be constantly demonstrated in public.[75] Communication between monarchs and other groups with a share in government was based on a close relationship between political decision making, consultation or provision of advice and rituals.[76] These situations called not only for public demonstration of membership of a particular

tenth to the twelfth century. In CHEYETTE, Fredric L. (Ed.). *Lordship and Community in Medieval Europe: Selected Readings*. New York; London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968, p. 357-375. For a critical view see GRAUS, ref. 55, p. 57-110; WELTIN, ref. 55.

72 LUTTER, ref. 54, p. 41-64.

73 WATTS, ref. 70, especially p. 420-425.

74 Compare ZUPKA, Dušan. Rex eris, si recte facias: si non facias, non eris. Panovnícka moc a jej reprezentácia v stredovekej strednej Európe (10. – 13. storočie). (The royal power and its representation in medieval Central Europe (10th – 13th century). In *Forum Historiae*, 2014, year 8, no. 2, p. 225-226. ISSN 1337-6861.

75 WEINFURTHER, Stefan. Rituale, Willensbildung und Entscheidungsprozesse. Zussamenfassung. In FAŁKOWSKI – SCHNEIDMÜLLER – WEINFURTER, ref. 70, p. 261-263.

76 ALTHOFF, Gerd. Kommunikation des Königs mit den Fürsten. In FAŁKOWSKI – SCHNEIDMÜLLER – WEINFURTER, ref. 70, p. 31n; ALTHOFF, Gerd. *Verwandte, Freunde und Getreue. Zum politischen Stellenwert der Gruppenbindungen im früheren Mittelalter*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1990, chapters 4 and 5. ISBN 9783534041251.

social group, but also gave protagonists the possibility to formulate new ideas and form new relationships based on new conditions and circumstances. In this regard, the relations between monarchs and political elites were an on-going and constantly developing dialogue.[77]

The above mentioned examples, taken for the purposes of this study mainly from comparable Central European narrative and diplomatic sources, show that it was more than a regional phenomenon: We found similar practices in materials documenting the situation in Hungary, the Czech Lands and Austria.[78] At the same time, we are concerned with phenomena showing signs of the concept of the *longue dureé*,[79] since we could trace rituals of the ruling groups with essentially the same form and symbolic messages through the 13th and 14th centuries. Basic social and political changes did not have much influence on the meaning, perception and use of ritualized symbolic communication.

The main reason why a highly ritualized discourse was applied in the communication between the various political groups within the medieval ruling elites derives from the essence of ritual as a universal medium of communication with the potential to create common identities or feelings of community and belonging together (*soziale und politische Gemeinschaftsbildung; gemeinschaftstiftendes Potential*).[80] These were essential for the functioning of medieval elites.

---

77 Comp. NODL – WIHODA, ref. 62, p. 9-12, 57-100; BROWN, Waren – GÓRECKI, Piotr (Eds.). *Conflict in Medieval Europe: Changing Perspectives on Society and Culture*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003, p. 1-36. ISBN 9780754609544; ALTHOFF, ref. 63, 21-150. On the role and significance of rituals in succession crises and legitimation disputes, compare the most recent work ANDENNA, Cristina – MELVILLE, Gert (Eds.). *Idoneität – Genealogie – Legitimation: Begründung und Akzeptanz von dynastischer Herrschaft im Mittelalter*. Böhlau: Köln, 2015. ISBN 9783412210533; LACHAUD, Frédérique – PENMAN, Michael A. (Eds.). *Making and Breaking the Rules: Succession in Medieval Europe, c.1000 – c.1600*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2008. ISBN 9782503527437.

78 *Iohannis abbatis Victoriensis Liber certarum historiarum*, ref. 10, Liber V, p. 141; Lib VI, p. 158; Lib II, p. 249; *Chronicon Aulae regiae*, ref. 12, Liber 1, chap. 9, p. 15-16; Liber 1, chap. 74, p. 93; *Chronicon Dubnicense*, ref. 15, chap. 131-132, p. 111-114; chap. 135-136, p. 114-116.

79 LEDUC, Jean. *Historici a čas. Koncepcie, otázky, diela*. (*Historians and time. Conceptions, questions, works*). Bratislava: Kalligram, 2005, p. 24-27. ISBN 8071497827.

80 On the universality of ritualized forms of communication MOSTERT, Marco (Ed.). *New Approaches to Medieval Communication*. Turnhout: Brepols, 1999. ISBN 9782503508146; ALTHOFF, Gerd. The Variability of Rituals in the Middle Ages. In ALTHOFF, Gerd – GEARY, Patrick – FRIED, Johannes (Eds.). *Medieval Concepts of the Past. Ritual, Memory, Historiography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002, p. 71-87. ISBN 9781139052320. On the potential of rituals to really influence society and create or change reality STOLLBERG-RILINGER, Barbara. *Rituale. Historische Einführungen*. Frankfurt am Main; New York: Campus, 2013, p. 11, 117-118. ISBN 9783593510279; SAX, William S. Ritual and the Problem of Efficacy. In SAX, William S. – QUACK, Johannes – WEIN-

By applying modern theoretical concepts and methodologies drawing mainly on Anglo-American and German cultural history and historical anthropology regarding political rituals used by medieval ruling elites, and by their consistent use to analyse and interpret source materials from Central Europe, it is possible to localize and explain the role of the ritualized representation of political communities as one of the important resources for power strategies and public communication. Not the least important aspect is the possibility to place and perceive them in the wider context of the political culture of High and Late Medieval Europe.

FORMEN DER KOMMUNIKATION POLITISCHER ELITEN
IM MITTELALTERLICHEN MITTELEUROPA (UNGARN, ÖSTERREICH, TSCHECHISCHE LÄNDER, 1250–1350)

DUŠAN Z U P K A

Die Beispiele aus den Quellen, die aus der österreichischen, tschechischen und ungarischen Umgebung stammen, zeigen deutlich die wichtigsten Merkmale der Beziehungen zwischen den regierenden Gruppen in Mitteleuropa im 13. und 14. Jahrhundert. Sowohl in den Grundlinien, als auch in den regionalen Details passen diese in die Rahmen der Regierungsstrategien und der politischen Kultur, die aus anderen Teilen ehemaligen Europas bekannt sind, hinein. Aufgrund der Quellenunterlagen können wir also mehrere Beweise bezüglich der Formen und der Funktion der Kommunikation zwischen den herrschenden Eliten im hochmittelalterlichen Mitteleuropa ungefähr zwischen 1250 und 1350 ziehen. Trotz Behauptungen früherer Historiographie und übermäßiger Einseitigkeit der Zeitquellen über die Unentbehrlichkeit und den exklusiven Anteil von Herrschern und Herrscherdynastien daran ist heute die Macht und Ausübung der Macht in den mittelalterlichen Staatsorganen als eine parallel laufende ständige Interaktion zu verstehen, die die Zusammenarbeit, Konflikte und Kompromisse zwischen ver-

---

HOLD, Jan (Eds.). *The Problem of Ritual Efficacy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010, s. 3-4. ISBN 9780195394412. For critical consideration see BÜTTNER, Andreas et al. (Ed.). *Grenzen Des Rituals. Wirkreichweiten – Geltungsbereiche – Forschungsperspektiven. Norm und Struktur 42*. Köln: Böhlau, 2014. ISBN 9783412209209; BOUTE, Bruno – SMÅBERG, Thomas. *Devising Order: Socio-religious Models, Rituals, and the Performativity of Practice*. Leiden: Brill, 2013. ISBN 9789004236745.

schiedenen herrschenden Gruppen umfasst. Mehr als Einzelen und Ereignisse waren also die Strukturen und Beziehungen zwischen einzelnen Gruppen entscheidend. Am besten waren gemeinsame Identität und Ideen der herrschenden Eliten bei bestimmten konkreten Angelegenheiten und unter spezifischen Bedingungen zu sehen und auszudrücken, und zwar vor allem bei der Ausübung der Macht und im Entscheidungsverfahren (einschließlich Versammlungen, Beratungen und Hilfeleistung an die Herrscher); in den Zeiten von Konflikten und Kontroversen (einschließlich Legitimierung von Macht- und Nachfolgekrisen); bei zeremoniellen Angelegenheiten (Krönung, Zeremonien, Convivia, Adventus Regis). Die erwähnten ritualisierten Kommunikationsformen waren offensichtlich bekannt und von den herrschenden Gruppen in allen drei verfolgten Ländern aktiv genutzt.

Mgr. Dušan Zupka, PhD.
Historický ústav SAV
Klemensova 19, 814 99 Bratislava
e-mail: dusan.zupka@savba.sk