

**Đura HARDI\***

University of Novi Sad

Faculty of Philosophy

Department of History

Novi Sad

Serbia

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9198-0638>

## THE ISSUE OF THE ORIGIN OF MAČVA DURING THE AGE OF ROSTISLAV MIKHAILOVICH IN SERBIAN AND HUNGARIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY

**Abstract:** The paper investigates the issue of the genesis of Mačva in the mid-13<sup>th</sup> century during the reign of its first master, the son-in-law of Hungarian King Béla IV, Prince Rostislav Mikhailovich of Chernigov, in the context of the interpretation of Serbian and Hungarian historiography. The author of the paper affirms that, because Mačva, as an important border area in the Middle Ages, has attracted the attention of Serbian and Hungarian historians until the present, it is necessary to compare their conclusions. Again, the author raises the question whether Béla IV first founded the Banate of Mačva (Banatus de Machou) and then entrusted it to his son-in-law Rostislav and his daughter Princess Anna, or whether Mačva, better known by its older name as Lower Sylvania (Sirmia Ulterior), had a longer dynastic tradition. The language barrier only seemingly accompanied the often-identical conclusions of the two historiographies, though, perhaps, it was not as deep, nor as insurmountable.

**Keywords:** Mačva, Lower Sylvania (Sirmia Ulterior), Banatus de Machou, Rostislav Mikhailovich, King Béla IV.

The term Mačva (Hungarian: *Macsó*; in sources: *Macho/Mazo*), meaning a fortress, area (district), land and banate in the 13<sup>th</sup> and early 14<sup>th</sup> centuries, is a topic connecting Serbian and Hungarian historiography for almost a century and a half. Despite the fact that most of the sources have long been known, this topic continues to attract the attention of historians. Its enduring and inspirational research character is evidenced by the latest works dedicated to Mačva, or Lower Sylvania (Sirmia

---

\* [djurahardi@ff.uns.ac.rs](mailto:djurahardi@ff.uns.ac.rs)

Uterior), as it was formerly known, by Sima Ćirković (2008),<sup>1</sup> Aleksandar Krstić (2010),<sup>2</sup> Ivana and Predrag Komatina (2018),<sup>3</sup> Bálint Ternovác (2017)<sup>4</sup> and Attila Pfeiffer (2017),<sup>5</sup> among others. Finally, Marta Font (2017, 2020) wrote about Mačva and Rostislav Mikhailovich as the ruler of this country in previous years, together with the author of this paper, thus sharing a common theme.<sup>6</sup>

In the aforementioned context, we thought it worthwhile to compare the two historiographies and their views on Mačva during the reign of Rostislav Mikhailovich, its genesis as a separate country and banate, and the Hungarian-Serbian border region in the middle of the 13<sup>th</sup> century. Mačva at that time most likely included the area bounded by the rivers Sava in the north, Drina in the west and hypothetically Tamnava and Kolubara in the southeast.<sup>7</sup> Defining the title of the work, we are obliged to state the following. Before us, Attila Pfeiffer devoted his work to the localisation of the Mačva Banate and the Mačva fortress precisely by means of the analysis of Hungarian and Serbian historiography. Fully respecting the results of his work, we will focus attention to other questions that may still remain unanswered. Also, viewed from the aspect of history and historiography, the importance of Mačva in the later period, i.e. in the 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> centuries in Serbian-Hungarian relations, especially in the circumstances of the emergence of a new power in the Balkans, the Ottoman Turks, would require much wider research and word count that would undoubtedly go beyond the scope of a single paper, which we opted for on this occasion.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Сима Ђирковић, “Земља Мачва и град Мачва”, *Прилози за књижевност, језик, историју и фолклор* 74, 1–4 (2008) 3–20.

<sup>2</sup> Александар Крстић, “Мачва”, у: *Лексикон градова и тргова средњовековних српских земаља*, редактор Синиша Мишић, Београд 2010, 177–179.

<sup>3</sup> Ивана Коматина и Предраг Коматина, “Византијски и угарски Срем од X до XIII века”, *Зборник радова Византолошког института* LV (2018) 141–164.

<sup>4</sup> Bálint Ternovác, “A macsóí és barancsi területek története 1319-ig”, *Micae mediaevales* VI (2017) 227–240.

<sup>5</sup> Attila Pfeiffer, “A Macsóí bánság és a macsóí vár lokalizációjának kérdése a magyar és a szerb történetírásban”, *Világtörténet, Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóközpont Történettudományi Intézetének folyóirata* 7 (39) (2017/1) 125–138.

<sup>6</sup> Márta Font, “Prince Rostislav in the Court of Béla IV”, *Russian History* 44, 4 (2017) 486–504; Márta Font, “Rostislav Dominus de Macho”, у: *Stefan Prvovenčani i njegovo doba*, odgovorni urednik Aleksandar Rastović, urednik izdanja Ivana Komatina, Београд 2020, 309–326; Đura Hardi, *Itinerarij Rostislava Mihailoviča*, Sremska Mitrovica – Novi Sad 2019; исти, “Један прилог питању византијског наслеђа на тлу оностраног Срема (Sirmie Citerior)”, *Зборник радова Византолошког института* LIV (2017) 117–142.

<sup>7</sup> Due to the lack of sources, it is difficult to provide reliable data on the territorial extent and boundaries of Mačva as an area in the 13<sup>th</sup> century, and later on its extent as a banate. The analysis of this issue was given recently by А. Крстић, “Мачва” 177; А. Pfeiffer, “A Macsóí bánság”, 130–133.

<sup>8</sup> On the importance of Mačva in Serbo-Hungarian relations see: А. Крстић, “Мачва”, 177–179; Ђура Харди, “Мачва као област српско-мађарске сарадње у средњем веку”, in: *Magyar-szerb kapcsolatok a történelemben 2001-ig*, Tanulmánykötet, Eötvös József Főiskolai Kiadó, Baja 2011, 41–48.

As much as the work that follows will be limited to a few partial questions or problems, we believe that it will reveal the dynamics and reception of scientific results, and often reach the same conclusions as historians who were not, or perhaps were familiar with the work of their colleagues, but kept quiet about it. Putting Mačva in the context of the analysis of historiography, we are aware that it was not the best solution to conditionally limit ourselves to only two “national historiographies” in the title of the paper, since scientific research certainly does not imply national boundaries. This is rather a research approach, with the aim of confirming one hypothesis, namely, that the results of historiography are based on scientific discoveries that are universal, while the language of writing papers is just a tool on that path. Of course, the language barrier often was and remains fertile ground for some conclusions to become an unquestionable scientific norm and to be passed down from generation to generation of historians. One of such questions is whether the creation of Mačva (fortress and land/region) is primarily related to the establishment of the eponymous banate by the Hungarian kings.

In historiographic terms, and we are here primarily referring to Serbian historiography, to this day it is an almost universally accepted opinion that Mačva, as a banate, was created during the reign of Hungarian King Béla IV, who, after the invasion of the Mongols (1241/2), in the middle of the 13<sup>th</sup> century, established a number of banates on the southern borders of his state with the aim of defending Hungary as military-administrative units. For example, this was the view of Konstantin Jireček, who wrote his *History of the Serbs*, according to whom Béla’s son-in-law, the husband of his daughter Anna, Ruthenian Prince Rostislav Mikhailovich became the first ban of the Mačvan Banate after his defeat in Galicia.<sup>9</sup> It is worth mentioning that Croatian historian Vjekoslav Klaić also stated that Béla IV founded a banate on the southern borders of his state, which would be named Mačva, after the eponymous town, but considering that it was an area in the middle of a very important territory, he did not leave it in the hands of just any nobleman, but of his son-in-law Rostislav.<sup>10</sup> The great names of Serbian medieval studies including Mihailo Dinić,<sup>11</sup> Jovan Radonić,<sup>12</sup> Đorđe Sp. Radojičić,<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Константин Иречек, *Историја Срба, прва књига до 1537. године*, превео Јован Радонић, друго, исправљено и допуњено издање, Београд 1978, 177.

<sup>10</sup> Vjekoslav Klaić, *Poviest Bosne do propasti kraljevstva*, Zagreb 1882, 84–85.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Михаило Динић, *Српске земље у средњем веку, историјско-географске студије*, прир. Сима Ђирковић, Београд 1978, 52, 95, 337; it is worth noting that Dinić regarded Rostislav Mikhailovich as a voivode of Mačva, and Mačva as a voivodeship in one of his earlier papers. Михаило Динић, “Јован Ангел, ‘dominus Sŷrmie’”, *Гласник Историског друштва у Новом Саду* 4 (1931) 301.

<sup>12</sup> Јован Радонић, “Споразум у Тати 1426. и српско-угарски односи од XIII до XVI века”, *Глас СКА* 187 (1941) 127.

<sup>13</sup> Ђорђе Сп. Радојичић, “Јужнословенско-руске културне везе до почетка XVIII века”, *Зборник Матице српске за књижевност и језик* 13/2 (1965) 277.

Jovanka Kalić,<sup>14</sup> Momčilo Spremić,<sup>15</sup> Péter Rokay,<sup>16</sup> also believed that Béla IV founded the Banate of Mačva in the mid-13<sup>th</sup> century. This view was also shared by Sima Ćirković,<sup>17</sup> whose conclusions about Mačva, to which this author devoted a special study, deserve special consideration further in the text.

The idea that the founder of the banate of Mačva was Béla IV is actually relatively old. It was among the first presented by polyhistorian Samuel Timon in 1734, in his work *Imago novæ Hungariæ*, writing the following under the heading *Banatus Matschoviensis*: “Instituit itaque Provinciam Matschoviensem Bela IIII. Rex; qui quondam eam cum honore Ducatus dabat cognatis et affinibus suis”.<sup>18</sup> Timon’s information was adopted by Johann Christian Engel in his *History of Serbia and Bosnia* (1801).<sup>19</sup>

Leaving Timon and Engel aside, Serbian historians certainly had the opportunity in their research to use the works of their Hungarian colleagues, who were already interested in the origin of Mačva. Under the auspices of Hungarian historiography, a pioneering work of great importance was written by Imre Korbuly, dedicated to the research of Ban’s dignity from a historical-legal aspect (1868). In the chapter dedicated to the banates created in the territory of Serbia, Korbuly believed that Béla IV, after the death of Bosnian ban Matej Ninoslav, gave Mačva and Bosnia to his son-in-law Rostislav, and after Rostislav’s death to his daughter Anna and their sons with the princely title of Bosnia and Mačva. According to this author, it was not until the reign of Ladislaus IV Cuman that Mačva had its bans. During the decades of internal crisis in Hungary, Mačva fell under the rule of Serbian rulers, remaining there until 1319, when new Hungarian ruler Charles I returned it to Hungarian possession. Since that time, the Banate of Mačva continuously remained in existence.<sup>20</sup> It is unlikely that, after so much time, this analysis by a legal historian could be fundamentally challenged.

The first archontologies of the Banate of Mačva were compiled by the great historians of their time, Frigyes Pesty (1875)<sup>21</sup> and Mór Wertner (1909).<sup>22</sup> Pesty believed that the Banate of Mačva could have been established during the time of Béla IV, but

---

<sup>14</sup> Јованка Калић-Мијушковић, *Београд у средњем веку*, Београд 1967, 59.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Momčilo Spremić, *Прекинут успон, Српске земље у позном средњем веку*, Београд 2005, 5, 44, 92.

<sup>16</sup> Петар Рокаи et al., *Историја Мађара*, Београд 2002, 83–84.

<sup>17</sup> Ћирковић Сима, “Земља Мачва и град Мачва”, *Прилози за књижевност, језик, историју и фолклор*, 6; исти, *Историја средњовековне босанске државе*, Београд 1964, 73; исти, “Српске и поморске земље краља Уроша I”, у: *Историја српског народа*, прва књига, *Од најстаријих времена до Маричке битке (1371)*, ур. Сима Ћирковић, Београд 2000, 349.

<sup>18</sup> Samuel Timon, *Imago novæ Hungariæ, Casoviae 1734*, 31–32; Carolus Andreas Bel refers to Timon, *De archiofficiis Regni Hungariæ, Hungari baronatus vocant, commentatio*, Lipsiae 1749, 30–31.

<sup>19</sup> Johann Christian von Engel, *Geschichte von Serbien und Bosnien: nebst einer Fortsetzung der Denkmäler ungrischer Geschichte und der historischen Literatur der ungrischen Nebenländer*, Halle 1801, 227, 370.

<sup>20</sup> Imre Korbuly *A báni méltóság*, Pest 1868, 183, 192.

<sup>21</sup> Frigyes Pesty, “A macsóí bánok”, *Századok* (1875) 361–381, 450–467.

<sup>22</sup> Mór Wertner, “Az árpádkori bánok”, *Századok* (1909) 480–481.

he did not rule out that it happened before King Emmerich (Imre), who established his rule in Serbia and Bosnia.<sup>23</sup> On the other hand, Mór Wertner believed that the Banate of Mačva was created during the time of King Andrew II and that its beginnings should be linked to the rule of Andrew's sister, the former Byzantine empress and ruler of Thessaloniki, Margareta and her son William over this territory. Also, Wertner argues that it is quite possible that at the time of those Mačvan princes, there were also Mačvan bans as their officials, but that it is impossible to discover their list (pleiad) as their sequence can be traced back only to 1272 and the first mention of a ban at the head of Mačva.<sup>24</sup> We will have an opportunity to refer back to this observation of Wertner's regarding the bans in the service of princes of the ruling family.

Indeed, following in the footsteps of Pesty and Wertner, but also considering numerous new sources, in his *Archontology of Hungary in the Age of Árpád Dynasty*, published in 2011, Attila Zsoldos succinctly states that the first bans of Mačva (as well as neighbouring areas that were part of the "state" of Rostislav's family) appear only in 1272, after the murder of Rostislav and Anna's heir, their son Prince Béla.<sup>25</sup> Bálint Ternovác and Attila Pfeiffer also accept Zsoldos's views, and indirectly those of Korbuly, Pesty and Wertner. Therefore, before 1319, Mačva was definitely organised as a banate only during the 1270s.<sup>26</sup>

Historiography also holds that the first preserved mention of Mačva refers to Rostislav Mikhailovich, when on 28 June 1254, this member of the Rurik dynasty, the son-in-law of Béla IV, was mentioned in a royal charter among other barons of Hungary, with the title: lord of Mačva (*Ratislaus Dux Gallicie, et Dominus de Machou*).<sup>27</sup> Anna, the wife of Rostislav Mikhailovich, to whom he undoubtedly owed the acquisition of Mačva as an exile from his country, bore the following titles: *domina Anna de Galatia, de Machowet de Rodna* (1262),<sup>28</sup> as the widow *Agn Ducissa Galitie, de Bosna et de Mazo domina* (1264),<sup>29</sup> i.e. *domina ac ducissa de Machav* (1275). Their son and heir Béla was addressed with the title *Dux de Machow et de Bozna* (1269, 1271).<sup>30</sup>

<sup>23</sup> F. Pesty, *A macsói bánok*, 362.

<sup>24</sup> M. Wertner, "Az árpádkori bánok", 480.

<sup>25</sup> Attila Zsoldos, *Magyarország világi archontológiája 1000–1301*, Budapest 2011, 50–51; About the murder of duke Béla Rostislavich: Tamás Kádár, "Egy rejtélyes politikai gyilkosság és háttere a XIII. század végi Magyarországon: Béla macsói és boszniai herceg pályája", *Fons, forráskutatás és történeti segéd tudományok* 16, 4 (2009) 411–429.

<sup>26</sup> B. Ternovác, "A macsói és barancsi területek története 1319-ig", 235–236; A. Pfeiffer, "A Macsói banság", 128.

<sup>27</sup> *Codex diplomaticus Hungariae ecclesiasticus ac civilis* [=CDF], IV/2, ed. Georgii Fejér, Budae 1829, 218; *Az Árpád-házi királyok okleveleinek kritikai jegyzéke* [=RA] I–II/1, Szerk. Szentpétery Imre, Budapest 1923–1943; II/2–3; Szerk. Imre Szentpétery & Iván Borsa, Budapest 1961; II/4, Szerk. Borsa Iván, Budapest 1987, RA I/2, 313, no. 1011.

<sup>28</sup> *Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris regni Bohemiae*, V/1, edd. Jindřich Šebánek et Sáša Dušková, Pragae 1974, 512–513.

<sup>29</sup> *Vetera Monumenta historica Hungariam sacram illustrantia* [=VMH] I, ed. Augustus Theiner, Romae 1859, VMH I, 273–273, 276.

<sup>30</sup> 1269: CDF IV/3, 491; RA I/3, 489, no 1605; 1272: VMH I, 303.

In the discussion about the genesis of Mačva, we must inevitably refer to the fact that the land, which would be named Mačva, was ruled by another branch of the Árpád ruling family, descended from former Byzantine Empress Margaret (Maria), before Rostislav and Anna and their heirs. Margaret was the daughter of King Béla III, whose father married her to Byzantine Emperor Isaac II Angelos (1185/6). After decades spent in Constantinople and Thessaloniki, and three marriages, Margaret returned to Hungary in around 1222. From her brother, King Andrew II, she received significant territories in the south of Hungary, which undoubtedly had the function of establishing or strengthening her authority over the lands south of the Sava and the Danube. These were the same territories that once made up her dowry.<sup>31</sup> In the famous letter of Pope Gregory IX, dated 3 March 1229, related to the issue of the organisation of the Srem diocese, it is stated that the sister of the Hungarian king (Margaret) governed two lands, one of which was called Lower Sirmia (Ulterior Sirmia), inhabited by Slavs and Greeks of the Orthodox faith, as well as the other, Upper Sirmia (Citerior Sirmia), which, according to the testimony of Ugrin, the Archbishop of Kalocsa, was part of Hungary.<sup>32</sup>

At this point, we need to make an excursus that relates to our topic in a broader context. Namely, the identification of Lower Sirmia as future Mačva, in relation to Upper Sirmia, as a topographical determinant of the land between the rivers Sava and Danube, was introduced into Serbian historiography by Mihailo Dinić in his famous study *Medieval Srem* in 1931.<sup>33</sup> The question was very important, because in Serbian sources, former Serbian ruler Stefan Dragutin was referred to as the “King of Srem”. Based on this information, some historians came to the conclusion that Dragutin also ruled in the countries north of the Sava. Dinić, however, resolved this dilemma. Dragutin’s Srem was actually Lower Sirmia or Mačva – the land that this Nemanjić, as the husband of Hungarian princess Katalin, received after 1284 from the Hungarian King and his cousin Ladislaus IV Cuman. Before Dinić, however, this problem was already solved by Georgius Pray,<sup>34</sup> Frigyes Pesty,<sup>35</sup>

<sup>31</sup> VMH I, 39; For more details about Margaret see: Mór Wertner, *Az Árpádok családi története*, Nagy Becskerek 1892, 394–412; idem, “Margit császárné fiai”, *Századok* (1903) 593–611; Luigi Tautu, “Margerhita di Ungheria imperatorice di Bisanzio”, *Antemurale* III (1956) 51–79; Божидар Ферјанчић, “Проблем византијског наслеђа у северозападној Србији”, у: Ваљево – постанак и успон градског средишта, Ваљево 1994, 49–58; Петар Рокаи, “Из средњовековне историје Новог Сада”, *Зборник за историју Матице српске* 11 (1975) 105–110; Александар Крстић, *Чланови династија југоисточне Европе у средњовековној Угарској* (doctoral dissertation, Универзитет у Новом Саду, 2014) 55–65; Cf. И. Коматина и П. Коматина, “Византијски и угарски Срем”, 153–157.

<sup>32</sup> VMH I, 88–89; For a review of literature on the source: Ђ. Харди, “Један прилог питању византијског наслеђа”, 121–123; И. Коматина и П. Коматина, “Византијски и угарски Срем”, 154–157.

<sup>33</sup> Михаило Динић, “Средњовековни Срем”, у: исти, *Српске земље у средњем веку, историјско-географске студије*, приредио Сима Ђирковић, Београд 1978, 270–284.

<sup>34</sup> *Specimen Hierarchie Hungaricae*, II, ed. Georgius Pray, Posonii et Cassoviae 1779, 367–369.

<sup>35</sup> Frigyes Pesty, *Az eltűnt régi vármegyék I*, Budapest 1880, 257.

Vjekoslav Klaić<sup>36</sup> and Mór Wertner.<sup>37</sup> Whether or not Mihailo Dinić had their works at his disposal, he did not make a note of it.

It has also been known to historians for a long time that in the 1230s Margaret was succeeded by her sons John Angel/Angelos (son of Emperor Isaac II Angelos) and eventually William, born from Margaret's third marriage with Latin baron Nicholas of St. Omer.<sup>38</sup> Between 1235 and 1242, John Angelos was mentioned in royal charters as the first among secular barons (*series dignitatum*), as a beloved relative of the king who, among other services, held the title of the Lord of Syrmia (*Dominus Sirmii/Dominus Syrmie*).<sup>39</sup> As *Gyletus dux Sirmii*, his younger half-brother William is mentioned in only one document from 1233 – a fragmentary and disputed document recorded in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, allegedly documenting the final part of an unpreserved charter of King Andrew II, which included a list of dignitaries and contained a lot of mistakes.<sup>40</sup>

As for the elder John, today we know that his title of the lord of Syrmia referred to his authority not only in Srem south of the Sava, but also in Srem between the Sava and the Danube where, like his mother, he also held the county of Syrmia. We explained this view in one of our earlier works, though it is not original because it was first brought forth long ago by Gyula Pauler,<sup>41</sup> and later laconically stated as a fact by Attila Zsoldos.<sup>42</sup> Namely, unlike the neighbouring counties, in the county of Syrmia during the three decades of the 13<sup>th</sup> century, between 1222 and 1253, there is no mention of the presence of a prefect, although the county as a territorial organisation existed and was mentioned in documents. John survived the Mongol invasion. He was last mentioned in the sources on 16 November 1242; by 5 July 1250, he was already dead. It is between these two dates that we should look for the time of his death.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> Vjekoslav Klaić, "Sirmia citerior et ulterior", *Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu* 4 (1882) 101–107.

<sup>37</sup> M. Wertner, "Margit császárné fiai", 595.

<sup>38</sup> On Margaret's sons see: M. Wertner, "Margit császárné fiai", 593–611; L. Tautu, "Margerhita di Ungheria", 51–79; Петар Рокаи, "О једном наслову Калојана Анђела", *Зборник радова Византолошког института* 19 (1980) 167–171; А. Крстић, *Чланови династија југоисточне Европе*, 65–74; Ђ. Харди, "Један прилог питању византијског наслеђа", 118–136; И. Коматина и П. Коматина, "Византијски и угарски Срем", 156–157.

<sup>39</sup> For an overview of views on John see: Ђ. Харди, "Један прилог питању византијског наслеђа", 125–126.

<sup>40</sup> *Historia critica regum Hungariae stirpis Arpadianae*, tom. V, *complectens res gestas Andreae II. et Belae IV ad cladem usque Tartaricam*, ed. Stephanus Katona, Posonii et Cassoviae 1783, 684–685; *CDF* III/2, 366; *RA* I/2, 163, no 510; П. Рокаи, "Gyletus dux Sirmii", 121–122; Unlike Péter Rokay, Mór Wertner, Imre Sentpetery and Attila expressed doubt regarding the veracity and usability of this fragmentary note. For more details see: Ђ. Харди, "Један прилог питању византијског наслеђа", 123–125.

<sup>41</sup> Gyula Pauler, *A magyar nemzet története az Árpád-házi királyok alatt*, t. II, Budapest 1899, 92.

<sup>42</sup> A. Zsoldos, *Magyarország világi archontológiája*, 207; idem, *Az Árpádok és asszonyaik, A királynéi intézmény az Árpádok korában*, Budapest 2005, 158.

<sup>43</sup> For a review of literature see: Ђ. Харди, "Један прилог питању византијског наслеђа", 127–130.

Certainly, after John's death, Béla IV assigned his uncle's land to his son-in-law Rostislav Mihailovich. Historiography dates this event between 1247 and 1254. Namely, in royal charters on 2 June 1247, Rostislav was referred to as the ban of Slavonia, whereas Hungarian lord Stephen Gutkeled was already in this position in the spring of the following year.<sup>44</sup> In perspective, Rostislav acquired Mačva or Lower Syrmia, certainly before his first and only mention related to this fortress and area, on 28 June 1254.

Writing syntheses of the history of Hungary, Bálint Hóman, Engel Pál and Tibor Almássy noted a direct connection between Rostislav Mikhailovich and the emergence of the banates on the southern borders of Hungary. In summary, these historians, each in their own way, conclude that Rostislav Mikhailovich successfully represented the political interests of his father-in-law, King Béla IV, on the southern borders of the country, towards Bulgaria, Serbia and Bosnia. Béla appointed his son-in-law as the duke of Bosnia and Mačva, and the creation of the banates, such as Mačva, Usora, Soli, Braničevo and Kučevo, is definitely linked to Rostislav's name, which he organised following the example of the Slavonian banate that he previously administered.<sup>45</sup> Judit Gál, an expert on Hungarian and Serbian historiography as well as Hungarian-Serbian relations of the 13<sup>th</sup> century, also notes that Rostislav received the Banate of Mačva from Béla IV, which marked the peak of his career.<sup>46</sup>

Having considered the previous positions of historiography, it seems to us that now is the moment to return to the key question of our work. Indeed, in the middle of the 13<sup>th</sup> century, after the death of his cousin John Angelos, and faced with the consequences of the Mongol invasion, Hungarian King Béla IV established the Banate of Mačva on the territory of Lower Syrmia, which, due to political circumstances, he gifted to Rostislav Mikhailovich and, above all, to his daughter Anna. In other words, did Béla give his son-in-law Lower Syrmia, in which this Rurik prince, allegedly, in synergy with his patron the Hungarian king, and based on an already existing state model, known for example in Slavonia or Severin (Sereny), organised the banate with all its structures, and placed its centre in the Mačva fortress, which gave the banate its name? Another assumption is that Rostislav received Lower Syrmia from his father-in-law and transformed its borderline territories into future Mačva, without the need for him and his protectors at the royal court to emulate the tradition of banates that had existed until then. A historiographical cynic would note that this is a question of which is older, the chicken or the egg.

The above assumptions are hypothetically possible, but there is no direct source for them! One of the few great biographers of Rostislav Mikhailovich, Gusztáv Wenzel,

---

<sup>44</sup> A. Zsoldos, *Magyarország világi archontológiája*, 45.

<sup>45</sup> Bálint Hóman & Gyula Szekfű, *Magyar történet I*, írta Bálint Hóman, Budapest 1939, 565–566; Pál Engel, *Beilleszkedés Európába a kezdetektől 1440-ig*, Budapest 1990, 233–234; idem, *The Realm of St. Stephen, A History of Medieval Hungary 895–1526*, London, New York 2001, 106, 108; Tibor Almási, *A tizenharmadik század története*, Budapest 2000, 127–128.

<sup>46</sup> Judit Gál, "IV. Béla és I. Uroš szerb uralkodó kapcsolata", *Századok* (2013) 478.

concluded in 1887 that Mačva had an important role as a border region, and that it went through various stages of development on the way to becoming a banate. At the time of its creation, which is associated with the name of Rostislav Mikhailovich, it had a great reputation and importance.<sup>47</sup> Acknowledging the views of his predecessors, Emerich Szentpétery put forth as far back as in 1915, in the article *Das Banat von Machow*, several important conclusions. According to this historian, the first Mačva bans appeared only in the second half of the 13<sup>th</sup> century. At the time of John, this area was not called Mačva; rather, its name appeared for the first time in 1254. Namely, after John's death, Béla IV gave Mačva to Rostislav. During the time of John, Rostislav and their successors, Mačva was not a banate. The history of Mačva as a banate began in 1272.<sup>48</sup>

The extent to which the historiographical considerations about Mačva are complex, at least in Serbian historiography, is probably best evidenced by the work of Sima Ćirković. In the *History of the Serbian People (Istorija srpskog naroda)*, based on the chapter of which Ćirković is the author and at the same time the chief editor of the book, Rostislav Mikhailovich is identified as the ban of Mačva in the register of names.<sup>49</sup> However, in Ćirković's study on Mačva (2008), his attitudes are somewhat different. Ćirković indeed accepts the hypothesis that "the origin of the Hungarian banates is attributed to the reform of King Béla IV, at the time of the recovery of the country after the Tatar invasion (1247 or somewhat earlier)". Nevertheless, these banates had special fates both before and later. According to him, Mačva bans were appointed to Mačva only at the beginning of the 14<sup>th</sup> century. Furthermore, Sima Ćirković essentially states that in the Hungarian charters describing the attack of Serbian King Uroš I on Mačva (1268), Mačva is referred to as "land" (terra Machow/Macho), and that there is no mention of a ban or a banate. This leads him to conclude that "from the end of the 12<sup>th</sup> to the end of the 13<sup>th</sup> century, the Banate of Mačva technically did not exist".<sup>50</sup> According to Ćirković, therefore, the territory of the Kingdom of Hungary south of the Sava originally had the character of a dynastic creation linked to certain personalities. In a wider process of its long duration, these personalities included respectively "royal relatives". Among that series of rulers, after the families of Margaret Árpád and Rostislav and Anna Árpád, there was Hungarian Queen Mother Elisabeth the Cuman (1280–1284), and finally her son-in-law, former Serbian King Stefan Dragutin (1284–1316).<sup>51</sup> We are not the only ones who, in recent times, have accepted this opinion as a well-founded historiographical fact. For example, there are also Đorđe Bubalo, Bálint Ternovác, Attila Pfeiffer, Ivana and

<sup>47</sup> Gusztáv Wenzel, *Rosztizlaw galicziai herceg, IV. Béla királynak veje*, Budapest 1887, 10–11.

<sup>48</sup> Emerich Szentpétery, "Das Banat von Machow (Machó)", *Ungarische Rundschau* 4 (1915) 872–876.

<sup>49</sup> С. Ћирковић, "Српске и поморске земље краља Уроша I", 690.

<sup>50</sup> С. Ћирковић, "Земља Мачва", 6; the new chronology of attacks of Uroš I on Mačva is advocated by: Ивана Коматина, "О времену напада краља Уроша I на Мачву и његовом заробљавању", *Зборник радова Византолошког института* 58 (2021) 73–91.

<sup>51</sup> Ibidem, 4–6.

Predrag Komatina.<sup>52</sup> A note should also be included here that this land had a female key, or that it was most likely related to dowry, with the Hungarian rulers giving it as an appanage to their daughters (and mothers), rather than to their sons-in-law. This Hungarian-Serbian dynastic series related to Mačva or Lower Syrmia, as confirmed by the latest studies, was connected in multiple ways. Serbian Queen Jelena, the wife of Uroš I and mother of Stefan Dragutin, was the daughter of John Angel and an offshoot of the Árpád dynasty. In this light, the Serbian claims to Mačva and the conflict that would follow from 1268 could have had a dynastic justification.<sup>53</sup>

The toponym Mačva apparently had pre-Slavic roots. As a country and banate, it was undoubtedly named after the eponymous fortress.<sup>54</sup> If we know that the first mention of Mačva is connected to the name of Rostislav Mikhailovich, it seems quite possible to assume that it was Rostislav who was the builder, or at least a witness to the creation of the Mačva fortress, which over time overshadowed the name of Srem south of the Sava, which we already wrote about earlier.<sup>55</sup> Is it possible, however, that Mačva as a fortress and the area of the same name had existed before the arrival of the former prince of Galicia in the Hungarian-Balkan borderlands? There is a view that it was the younger son of former Byzantine Empress Margaret Árpád, William of St. Omer, who was in fact the first lord of Mačva, or (Lower) Syrmia, before Rostislav. Margaret's son William is mentioned as the prince of Mačva in a posthumous source from 1276, created as a record in the process of canonisation of nun Margaret, the daughter of Béla IV. Among the witnesses of the holy exploits of the princess and saint Margaret there is a mention of her cousin and spiritual sister, also Margaret "filia domini Gulielmi ducis de Maconia", or "de Macotisa".<sup>56</sup> The distinguished nun Margaret was thus presented as the daughter of Duke William, who ruled the country

---

<sup>52</sup> Cf. Ђ. Харди, "Један прилог питању византијског наслеђа", 117–142; Đorđe Bubalo, Katarina Mitrović & Radmila Radić *Jurisdikcija Katoličke crkve u Sremu*, Beograd 2010, 47; B. Ternovác, "A macsói és barancsi területek története 1319-ig", 227, 232–235; A. Pfeiffer, "A Macsói bánság", 127–128; И. Коматина и П. Коматина, "Византијски и угарски Срем од X до XIII века", 141–164.

<sup>53</sup> Ивана Коматина, *Краљ Стефан Урош I Велики и његов век*, Београд 2021, 115–138; Александар Узелац, "Марија де Кајо, сестра краљице Јелене", у: *Између Подунавља и Средоземља, тематски зборник посвећен проф. др Синиши Мишићу поводом његовог 60. рођендана*, ур. Катарина Митровић и Александар Узелац, Пожаревац–Ниш 2021, 187–206; Небојша Порчић, "Марија, сестра српске краљице Јелене", *Историјски часопис* 70 (2021) 31–68; J. Gál, "IV. Béla és I. Uroš", 471–499.

<sup>54</sup> Petar Skok, *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika* II, Zagreb 1972, 346; Lajos Kiss, *Földrajzi nevek etimológiai szótára* II, Budapest 1988, 60; Péter Rokay & Miklós Takács, "Macsó". in: *Korai magyar történeti lexikon (9–14. század)*, Főszerk. Gyula Kristó, Szerk. Pál Engel & Ferenc Makk, Budapest 1994, 421; А. Крстић, "Мачва", 177; A. Pfeiffer, "A Macsói bánság", 133–128.

<sup>55</sup> Ђ. Харди, *Итинерариј Ростислава Михаиловича*, 91.

<sup>56</sup> *Monumenta Romana episcopatus Vesprimiensis, A veszprémi püspökség római oklevéltára I, 1103–1276*, ed. József Lukacsics, Budapest 1896, 183, 189.

called *Maconia* or *Macotis*. This William was long ago identified in historiography as the younger son of Margaret Árpád, whereas *Maconia* was identified as Mačva.<sup>57</sup> If we add to this source a fragmentary one that refers to the year 1233, that William or Gyletus, as his name is written, was the *dux Sirmii*, perhaps Rostislav, according to the will of his father-in-law, did indeed arrive at the already-built fortress and the area called Mačva, which previously belonged to another royal relative.

Mór Wertner was the first in historiography to present William as the ruler of Mačva. Considering a reference to William as *duc de Maconia*, Wertner concluded that after his mother's death, William acquired Mačva, i.e. Lower Syrmia, from King Andrew II, and that, therefore, it was he who was the first duke of Mačva, rather than his younger contemporary, Ruthenian prince Rostislav Mikhailovich. At the same time, all things considered, his brother John was left with the rule over Syrmia north of the Sava.<sup>58</sup> Referring to Wertner, Ludovic Tautu went a step further, asserting that while John Angel inherited Kovin, (Upper) Syrmia and Bačka from his mother, William received Mačva.<sup>59</sup> Taking into account an earlier study by Péter Rokay, and apparently without insight into Mór Wertner's work (?), Sima Ćirković stated that Margaret's second son was referred to as *dux Sirmii*, but also as the lord of Mačva.<sup>60</sup>

Based on the analysis of Wertner's research, in his work *Gyletus dux Sirmii* (1983), Péter Rokay presented the identity of William of St. Omer to Serbian historiography. He concluded that the mention from 1276 of the long-dead William as the Prince of Mačva, who passed away three decades before (after 20 April 1242), immediately after the Mongol invasion of Hungary and was buried in Trogir,<sup>61</sup> is in fact an anachronism. Mačva (as a principality) did not yet exist, and the compiler of the testimonies about the miracles of St. Margaret wanted to say that during his lifetime William was the prince of the land that was called Mačva in 1276.<sup>62</sup> Rokay's logical conclusion is accepted by Attila Pfeiffer.<sup>63</sup> Supporting Péter Rokay's position, we have previously presented several additional reasons why William was not the first lord or prince of Mačva, or that he held a title with the name of this country. We consider it meaningful to repeat them once again on this occasion.<sup>64</sup>

The issue of William's position in the Hungarian state government structure is related to the fact that he is mentioned as the Duke of Syrmia in only one contemporary diplomatic source (1233), whose elements of credibility must be accepted with certain reservations. When he died in 1242, on his tombstone (not

<sup>57</sup> M. Wertner, "Margit császárné fiai", 608; П. Рокаи, "Gyletus dux Sirmii", 124–125; С. Ђирковић, "Земља Мачва", 5.

<sup>58</sup> M. Wertner, "Margit császárné fiai", 607–610; M. Wertner, "Az árpádkori bánok", 480.

<sup>59</sup> L. Tautu, "Margerhita di Ungheria", 69.

<sup>60</sup> С. Ђирковић, "Земља Мачва", 5; П. Рокаи, "Gyletus dux Sirmii", 123–127.

<sup>61</sup> M. Wertner, *Az Árpádok*, 408; M. Wertner, "Margit császárné fiai", 605; П. Рокаи, "Gyletus dux Sirmii", 125–126.

<sup>62</sup> П. Рокаи, "Gyletus dux Sirmii", 124–125.

<sup>63</sup> A. Pfeiffer, "A Macsói bánság", 127.

<sup>64</sup> For more details see: Б. Харди, "Један прилог питању византијског наслеђа", 123–126.

preserved today) in the Trogir Cathedral, as befits the character of the distinguished deceased, numerous praises were engraved in poetic verse, yet for some reason a reference to his princely title was missing.<sup>65</sup> On the other hand, in the royal charters on the list of state dignitaries we find only William's older half-brother John Angel. Between 1235 and 1242, John was usually listed first among secular barons, as the king's beloved relative (*dilecto cognato nostro*), who, in addition to other titles, always held the title of the Lord of Syrmia (*Dominus Sirmii/Dominus Syrmie*).<sup>66</sup> The striking silence about William as the prince of Syrmia or Mačva in the royal charters at the same time when his older half-brother John is mentioned in them, only leads us to the conclusion that there was a hierarchy within the family and that Syrmia was not formally divided into two parts of which the southern one bore the new name Mačva. John Angel, in our opinion, as *Dominus Sirmii*, was the ruler of (both the Upper and Lower) Syrmia.<sup>67</sup> This did not mean that there was no "place" for William on his mother's estates, which, based on the right of inheritance through the female line, belonged to him equally, as is probably indicated by the mention of his title *Dux Sirmii* from 1233, at the time when the head of the family, former Queen Mother Margaret was, we believe, still alive.<sup>68</sup>

Recently, the name Mačva has become significant beyond the Hungarian-Serbian border area, to a lesser extent because of the country, but to a larger extent because of its rulers who, as members of the Hungarian ruling family, had a very important role in the royal court, as well as in European politics of the second half of the 13<sup>th</sup> century. The reputation was achieved through the female line of the family of Rostislav Mikhailovich, who passed away before 15 July 1264 (date ante quem),<sup>69</sup> owing foremost to his wife Anna and their daughters, the eldest Anna, who became the

<sup>65</sup> For more details see: M. Wertner, "Margit császárné fiai", 504–605; П. Рокаи, "Gyletus dux Sirmii", 125.

<sup>66</sup> 1235: *CDF IV/1*, 27; *RA I/2*, 186, no. 608; 1238: *CDF IV/1*, 111; *RA I/2*, 194–195, no. 637; 1241: *Codex Diplomaticus Regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae – Diplomatički zbornik kraljevine Hrvatske, Dalmacije i Slavonije [=CDRCr]*, IV, ed. Smičiklas Tadija, Zagreb 1906, 136, no. 124; *RA I/2*, 212, no. 709; 1242: *CDRCr IV*, 158 no. 142; *RA I/2*, 217, no. 721; 218, no. 723; *CDF IV/1*, 264;; A. Zsoldos, *Magyarország világi archontológiája*, 207; M. Wertner, "Margit császárné fiai", 610–611.

<sup>67</sup> In our opinion, there was only one Syrmia for the people of the time in question, a vast plain between Fruška Gora and the Danube in the north, and Cer mountain in the south, in the centre of which was the Sava river and on it the remains of the Roman capital Sirmium, i.e. the two medieval settlements St. Demetrius and St. Irenaeus. The names, Lower Syrmia (Sirmia Ulterior) or the future Mačva, and Upper Syrmia (Citerior Sirmia) were mentioned once in the sources in 1229. The reason for this reference was that the archbishop of Kalocsa wanted to emphasise religious and church circumstances, i.e. the difference between these two parts of Syrmia, of which the one north of the Sava was part of Hungary.

<sup>68</sup> That Margaret most likely died in 1235 see: Ђ. Харди, "Један прилог питању византијског наслеђа", 125–126.

<sup>69</sup> Ђ. Харди, *Итинерариј Ростислава Михаиловича*, 117–121.

Empress of Bulgaria (around 1255), Kunigunda Queen of Bohemia (1261) and Griffina, the Princess of Kraków and Lesser Poland (1265).<sup>70</sup> In this context, the anachronism from the year 1276, when the recorder of the miracle of St. Margaret, referred to William of St. Omer as the prince of Mačva, will be more understandable.

It is without doubt that the Mačva fortress was built on the Sava river, though exactly where, remains unknown, due to the river meandering in its lower course. Owing to Ludwig Thallóczy, beginning in 1895 Hungarian historical geographers place Mačva in the region of today's Valjevo.<sup>71</sup> This mistake was first corrected by Pál Engel, who noticed the news from a royal charter that the army of King Charles Robert, during the successful conquest of the fortress of Mačva in 1317, crossed the frozen river Sava from the direction of the Serbs.<sup>72</sup> Pál Engel's discovery was first presented to Serbian historiography by Sima Ćirković.<sup>73</sup> In anticipation of a new result of (underwater?) archaeology, the potential location of Mačva was analysed by Aleksandar Krstić and Attila Pfeiffer. Krstić quite argumentatively places the town of Mačva on the right bank of the river between Drenovac and Debrč, while Sima Ćirković places it closer to St. Irenaeus, that is, to Mačvanska Mitrovica in the location of Stari Noćaj.<sup>74</sup> In any case, in relation to the fortified towns and churches of St. Irenaeus and St. Demetrius, apparently the newly built fortress of Mačva must have had a strategic and economic importance to give the entire area a new name over time.

As we promised earlier, on this occasion we are obliged to return to another point of historiography that is related to the genesis of Mačva. To repeat, Mór Wertner stated that during the time of the Mačvan princes, there were most likely Mačvan bans as their officials, but that it is impossible to discover a list of their names.<sup>75</sup> Before Wertner, Lajos Thallóczy, compiling the genealogies of the rulers of Bosnia, laconically recorded that Rostislav, the Duke of Mačva, was the governor of upper Bosnia and that Hungarian bans were under him.<sup>76</sup> This assumption appears to be correct. It is known that even though Rostislav's widow, Princess Anna, who after the death of her father Béla IV (3 May 1270) fled to Bohemia with the royal treasures and insignia to her daughter Queen Kunigunda and Czech King Otakar II Przemysl, nevertheless returned from exile. This happened after the death of her brother and enemy Stephen V and after the cruel murder of her son Duke Béla Rostislavich (mid-November 1272).

---

<sup>70</sup> Djura Hardi, O córkach Anny i Rościśława Michajłowicza, in: *Europa Środkowo-Wschodnia w średniowieczu i wczesnej nowożytności. Studia poświęcone pamięci Norberta Miki*, edd. Ewa Mika & Vitaliy Nagirnyy, Kraków 2023, 87–98.

<sup>71</sup> Ludwig Thallóczy, "Bruchstücke aus der Geschichte der nordwestlichen Balkanländer", *Wissenschaftliche Mitteilungen aus Bosnien und der Herzegowina* 3 (1895) 332.

<sup>72</sup> Pál Engel, "Az orszög újraegyesítése, I. Károly küzdelmei az oligarchák ellen (1310–1323)", *Századok* (1988) 115; idem, *Beilleszkedés Európába*, 283; idem, *The Realm of St. Stephen*, 132; A. Pfeiffer, "A Macsói bánág", 133–134.

<sup>73</sup> С. Ђирковић, "Земља Мачва", 4; A. Pfeiffer, "A Macsói bánág", 133–134.

<sup>74</sup> A. Krstić, "Mačva", 177; A. Pfeiffer, "A Macsói bánág", 133–135.

<sup>75</sup> M. Wertner, "Az árpádkori bánok", 480.

<sup>76</sup> Lajos Thallóczy, "Bosnyák nemzedékrendi tanulmányok", *Turul* 13 (1895) 5–17.

The return took place, certainly in new and favourable political circumstances for her, during 1273 or 1274 at the latest, as Emil Jakubovich believed.<sup>77</sup> From then until the end of her life, Anna took over the former power of her family in Mačva and part of Bosnia (she died probably in late 1278 or early 1279).<sup>78</sup>

Anna's return to Hungary and the restoration of her principality marked the end of the short-lived period of existence of the banate, which included, in addition to Mačva and Bosnia, Braničevo, Kučevo, Usora and Soli (1272–1273). These territories were formed after the murder of her son Béla and probably coincided with the former state that belonged to Rostislav and Anna.<sup>79</sup> At the time of Anna's second reign over Mačva and the surrounding lands, the historiography can identify bans in her service. *The Legend of St. Margaret*, a version written in Old Hungarian, testifies to this fact. It refers to Princess Anna, as well as the members of her court who were all actors and witnesses of the miracle of St. Margaret during the events that took place in the summer–autumn of 1276. Among them, two dignitaries of the ban were mentioned in the source: Albert, who is listed as “chycety ban”, and in another place as prefect (ispanya), and Ompud ban of Bosnia (bocynay Ompud ban).<sup>80</sup> Albert was also noted as the ban of Mačva (Albert banus de Machou) in 1275, though in a forged charter.<sup>81</sup> In any case, in the mid-1270s, Albert and Ompud (Ampod?) were in the service of Princess Anne.<sup>82</sup>

Anna returned to Hungary at a time when both her father Béla IV, to whom she was *filia nostra dulcissima*, and her brother Stephen V, were no longer alive, and when at least two baronial parties were busy fighting over the rule of the country in the name of underage King Ladislaus IV Cuman and his mother Queen Elisabeth Cuman.<sup>83</sup> Perhaps in such circumstances, the daughter of Béla IV “surrounded” herself with

<sup>77</sup> Emil Jakubovich, “Kún Erzsébet nőtestvére”, *Turul* 37 (1922–1923) 22.

<sup>78</sup> For a more detailed review of literature see: Đura Hardi, “Nekoliko zapažanja o boravcima Ane, majke češke kraljice Kunigunde, na vladarskom dvoru Přemislavoviča”, in: *Pro pana profesora Libora Jana k životnímu jubileu*, K vydání připravili Bronislav Chocholáč et al., Brno 2020, 233–250.

<sup>79</sup> A. Zsoldos, *Magyarország világi archontológiája*, 50–53; Cf.: P. Engel, *Beilleszkedés Európába*, 233–234; idem, *The Realm of St. Stephen*, 108.

<sup>80</sup> “Szent Margit élete”, in: *Nyelveléktár, Régi magyar codexek és nyomtatványok* 8, Budapest 1879, 69–70; For the interpretation of the source Sándorhegyi, “Albert a “chycheti” bán”, *Századok* (1902) 678–681; Emil Jakubovich, “Kún Erzsébet nőtestvére”, 22–24; Sorin Forțiu, “Banologia (XI): Alberto [Magno] bano de Zeurino (1272)”, *Morisen* 6, 1 (2021) 10–12.

<sup>81</sup> Norbert C. Tóth, “Egy hatalmaskodás lezárása az Árpád-korban”, *Levéltári Szemle* 50 (2000) 31–38; A. Zsoldos, *Magyarország világi archontológiája*, 51.

<sup>82</sup> Historiography made many more references to Albert: Mór Wertner, “Kicsedi Albert bán”, *Századok* (1900) 771–777; Sándorhegyi, “Albert a “chycheti” bán”, 678–681; E. Jakubovich, “Kún Erzsébet nőtestvére”, 22–24; S. Forțiu, “Banologia (XI): Alberto [Magno] bano de Zeurino”, 10–17; A. Zsoldos, *Magyarország világi archontológiája*, 51, 282, 283, 340.

<sup>83</sup> For a more detailed review of literature see: Đ. Hardi, “Nekoliko zapažanja o boravcima Ane, majke češke kraljice Kunigunde, na vladarskom dvoru Přemislavoviča”, 238–250.

nobles to whom she gave the service of a ban, as was recently established in her lands. In this way, bans in Anna's service were a consequence of new political circumstances. Did her husband Rostislav already have bans in his service, though in other circumstances, as Wertner and Thallóczy believed? If that were the case, there would be a continuity of *servitium bani* from the beginning of the creation of Mačva. If we were to invoke the *argumentum ex silentio*, we would be free to reject this assumption. However, as our main goal is to analyse the positions of historiography, we must inevitably at this point remain focused on one question posed by Gyula Pauler.

Analysing Rostislav Mikhailovich's campaign to Galicia and the battle at the Yaroslavl fortress that took place on 17 August 1245, Pauler paid special attention to the Hungarian commander of Rostislav's army.<sup>84</sup> It was nobleman Füle (in the Hungarian language interpretation), named as "Fila banus" in the charter of Hungarian King Béla IV from 1250, or "Филл" in the Galician-Volyn chronicle. Both sources testified that this military lord commander, whom the office of the Hungarian king knew had the title of ban, was captured in the battle and then beheaded by Rostislav's rival, the Prince of Volyn, Daniel Romanovich.<sup>85</sup> In connection with the identity of Fila, Pauler laconically asked a logical question of whether this great man was a Northern or a Mačvani ban?<sup>86</sup> In the preserved sources that referred to the bans of the Severin banate of that time, which was founded in 1227, Fila's name remained unknown.<sup>87</sup> In the case of Mačva, the hypothetical service of this lord brings up several questions that are impossible to answer. Fila could have been the ban of Mačva between the last mention of John Angel as the lord of Syrmia, on 16 November 1242, and his death in Galicia, on 7 August 1245, on the condition that in that relatively short period of time, the Hungarian king's attempt to establish a banate in Syrmia south of the Sava river also took place, while in Syrmia north of the Sava, the work of the Srem county institution was renewed. The issue related to ban Fila is certainly worth mentioning, because this Hungarian nobleman played a prominent role in the Hungarian policy towards Galicia in the previous decades and it was no coincidence that he was the commander of Rostislav's army in 1245. Actually, his

<sup>84</sup> Because of the Ukrainian-Hungarian language barrier, Pauler, like many Hungarian historians after him, did not know the exact year of the battle fought by Mykola Dashkevich and Mihajlo Hrushevsky, which does not diminish Pauler's analysis and the justified doubt in the chronology of events that this great Hungarian historian pointed out. Николай П. Дашкевич, *Княжение Даниила Галицкого по русским и иностранным известиям*, К. 1873, 57; Михайло Грушевський, "Хронологія подій Галицько-Волинської літописи", *Записки Наукового товариства імені Шевченка* 41 (1901) 32–33, 67; Márta Font, *Árpád-házi királyok és Rurikida fejedelmek*, Szeged 2005, 246–249, 262; Ъ. Харди, *Итинерапуј Ростислава Михаиловича*, 78–79.

<sup>85</sup> *Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Slovaciae* II, ed. Richard Marsina, Bratislava 1987, 247–248; RA I /2, 290, no. 939; *Ипатьевская летопись*, Полное собрание Русских летописей II, СПб. 1908, 803–804.

<sup>86</sup> Gy. Pauler, *A magyar nemzet története* II, 215–216, 524–525.

<sup>87</sup> Cf. A. Zsoldos, *Magyarország világi archontológiája*, 49.

connection with Rostislav and the influential Galician boyar elite has deeper roots. Could Fila, in the triangle between Béla IV, Rostislav and Galicia, have been the first ban of Mačva before the summer of 1245?<sup>88</sup>

As for Rostislav Mikhailovich, in those years (1241–1245) he was still preoccupied in his thoughts and actions with the struggle for the princely throne in Galicia. The turning point was Béla IV's decision to give him the hand of his daughter Anna (at the end of 1242, or during 1243), and thus Rostislav became a Hungarian pretender to Galicia. His meeting with Lower Sylvania or Mačva (in the making) will most likely follow only after the Yaroslavl battle, i.e. after the peace and alliance of Hungarian King Béla IV with Rostislav's rival and uncle Daniel Romanovich (Zvolen, September 1246).<sup>89</sup> These circumstances, and the marriage of Béla's second daughter, Konstanza, to Daniel's son, Lev, forever distanced Rostislav from the land of his ancestors, to which he claimed legitimate rights.<sup>90</sup> Therefore, the chronology does not support the hypothesis of Fila's service as the ban of Mačva in Rostislav's service; possibly he was a ban in the service of the Hungarian king, but we have already stated that we have no sources testifying to this.

Summarising what has been said thus far, we can conclude on the basis of numerous opinions of historians and available sources, that during the reign of Rostislav Mikhailovich, Mačva was certainly not a banate, but rather a land ruled by members of the Árpád ruling family. Regarding this position, contemporary studies of Hungarian and Serbian historiography have a consensus. The genesis or emergence of Mačva as a dynastic territory and ruling title is linked to the name of the former prince of Galicia, Rostislav Mikhailovich (1254: *Dominus de Machou*) and his wife Anna, the daughter of Béla IV, and their son Duke Béla. There is clear continuity and connection of the rule over Mačva, or Srem, as it was called by its older name, of the female members of the ruling dynasty of Hungary – the family of Anna and Rostislav Mikhailovich and the previous lords of this land, the daughter of King Béla III, former Byzantine Empress Margaret (Maria) Árpád and her sons John Angel and William. Finally, John and Rostislav bore the identical title of *Dominus*. The help of the Hungarian kings in consolidating the power of their relatives over Sylvania or future

---

<sup>88</sup> The identity of the Hungarian baron, ban Fila requires more research. Cf. A. Zsoldos, *Magyarország világi archontológiája*, 302; Dariusz Dąbrowski, *Król Rusi Daniel Romanowicz O ruskiej rodzinie książęcej, społeczeństwo i kulturze w XIII w.*, Kraków 2016, 287–288; Мирослав Волощук, “Филя древле прегордый” / Fila Supruniensis, Маловідомі сюжети з історії Галицької землі першої половини XIII століття”, in: *Actes testantibus, Ювілейний збірник на пошану Леонтія Войтовича*, Львів 2011, 189–196; idem, “Просопографічні студії битви під Ярославом 17 серпня 1245 року”, in: *Colloquia Russica, Данило Романович і його часи*, за ред. В. Нагірного & М. Волощука, Івано-Франківськ, Краків 2017, 114–115.

<sup>89</sup> Toru Senga, “IV Béla külpolitikája és IV Ince pápához intézett ‘tatár–levele’”, *Századok* 1–2 (1987) 593–594.

<sup>90</sup> For a more detailed review of literature see: Ђ. Харди, *Итинерарий Ростислава Михаиловича*, 58–95.

Mačva was implied. Hypothetically, it is possible that in the process of the creation of Mačva, before 1254, an eponymous banate was established, but there are no sources for this claim. The reference to the Hungarian lord Fila with the title of ban, who was also the military commander of Rostislav Mikhailovich (1245), which was pointed out long ago by Gyula Pauler, will have to wait for a future prosopographic research. The appearance of the first bans of Mačva in the service of the Hungarian king, as established by historiography, is related to the short-term loss of power over this land by Rostislav's family (1272–1273). Also, the return of Rostislav's widow, Princess Anna, to Hungary from Bohemia (1273/4–1279), entailed bans in her service, which Emil Jakubovich drew attention to.

## LIST OF REFERENCES

### Published Primary Sources

*Az Árpád-házi királyok okleveleinek kritikai jegyzéke [=RA]* I–II/1, Szerk. Szentpétery Imre, Budapest 1923–1943; II/2–3, Szerk. Imre Szentpétery & Iván Borsa, Budapest 1961; II/4, Szerk. Iván Borsa, Budapest 1987.

*Codex Diplomaticus Regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae – Diplomaticki zbornik kraljevine Hrvatske, Dalmacije i Slavonije [=CDRCr]* I–XIV, ed. Tadija Smičiklas, Zagreb 1904–1916.

*Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris regni Bohemiae* V/1, edd. Jindřich Šebánek & Sáša Dušková, Prae 1974.

*Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Slovaciae* II, ed. Richard Marsina, Bratislava 1987.

*Codex diplomaticus Hungariae ecclesiasticus ac civilis [=CDF]* I–XI, ed. Georgii Fejér, Buda 1829–1844.

*Historia critica regum Hungariae stirpis Arpadianae*, tom. V, *complectens res gestas Andreae II. et Belae IV ad cladem usque Tartaricam*, ed. Katona Stephanus, Posonii et Cassoviae 1783.

*Monumenta Romana episcopatus Vesprimiensis, A veszprémi püspökség római oklevéltára* I, 1103–1276, ed. József Lukcsics, Budapest 1896.

*Specimen Hierarchie Hungaricae* II, ed. Pray Georgius, Posonii et Cassoviae 1779.

“Szent Margit élete”, in: *Nyelvemléktár, Régi magyar codexek és nyomtatványok* 8, Budapest 1879, 1–86.

Tóth, Norbert C., “Egy hatalmaskodás lezárása az Árpád-korban”, *Levéltári Szemle* 50 (2000) 31–38.

*Vetera Monumenta historica Hungariam sacram illustrantia [=VMH]* I, ed. Augustus Theiner Romae 1859.

### Secondary Works

Almási, Tibor, *A tizenharmadik század története*, Budapest 2000.

Bel, Carolus Andreas, *De archiofficiis Regni Hungariae, Hungari baronatus vocant, commentatio*, Lipsiae 1749.

Bubalo, Đorđe, Katarina Mitrović & Radmila Radić, *Jurisdikcija Katoličke crkve u Sremu*, Beograd 2010.

Dąbrowski, Dariusz, *Król Rusi Daniel Romanowicz O ruskiej rodzinie książęcej, społeczeństwie i kulturze w XIII w.*, Kraków 2016.

Engel, Pál, “Az ország újraegyesítése, I. Károly küzdelmei az oligarchák ellen (1310–1323)”, *Századok* (1988) 89–146.

Engel, Pál, *Beilleszkedés Európába a kezdetektől 1440-ig*, Budapest 1990.

Font, Márta, *Árpád-házi királyok és Rurikida fejedelmek*, Szeged 2005.

Font, Márta, “Prince Rostislav in the Court of Béla IV”, *Russian History* 44, 4 (2017) 486–504.

Font, Márta, “Rostislav Dominus de Macho”, у: *Стефан Првовенчани и његово доба*, одг. ур. Александар Растовић, ур. издања Ивана Коматина, Београд 2020, 309–326. [Font, Márta, “Rostislav Dominus de Macho”, u: Stefan Prvovenčani i njegovo doba, odgovorni urednik Aleksandar Rastović, urednik izdanja Ivana Komatina, Beograd 2020, 309–326]

Fortiu, Sorin “Banologia (XI): Alberto [Magno] bano de Zeurino (1272)”, *Morisena* 6, 1 (2021) 5–17.

Engel, Pál, *The Realm of St. Stephen, A History of Medieval Hungary 895–1526*, London, New York 2001.

- Gál, Judit, "IV. Béla és I. Uroš szerb uralkodó kapcsolata", *Századok* (2013) 471–499.
- Hardi, Djura, "O cókach Anny i Rościsława Michajłowicza", in: *Europa Środkowo-Wschodnia w średniowieczu i wczesnej nowożytności, Studia poświęcone pamięci Norberta Miki*, edd. Ewa Mika & Vitaliy Nagirnyy, Kraków 2023, 87–98.
- Hardi Đura, "Nekoliko zapažanja o boravcima Ane, majke češke kraljice Kunigunde, na vladarskom dvoru Přemislavoviča", in: *Pro pana profesora Libora Jana k životnímu jubileu*, K vydání připravili Bronislav Chocholáč, Jiří Malíř, Lukáš Reitingeř & Martin Wihoda, Brno 2020, 233–250.
- Hóman, Bálint & Gyula Szekfű, *Magyar történet I*, írta Bálint Hóman, Budapest 1939.
- Jakubovich, Emil, "Kún Erzsébet nőtestvére", *Turul* 37 (1922–1923) 14–27.
- Kádár, Tamás, "Egy rejtélyes politikai gyilkosság és háttere a XIII. századvégi Magyarországon: Béla macsóí és boszniai herceg pályája", *Fons, forráskutatás és történeti segéd tudományok* 16, 4 (2009) 411–429.
- Kiss, Lajos, *Földrajzi nevek etimológiai szótára I–II*, Budapest 1988.
- Klaić, Vjekoslav, *Poviest Bosne do propasti kraljevstva*, Zagreb 1882.
- Klaić, Vjekoslav, "Sirmia citerior et ulterior", *Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu* 4 (1882) 101–107.
- Korbuly, Imre, *A báni méltóság*, Pest 1868.
- Pesty, Frigyes, *A macsóí bánok*, *Századok* 1875.
- Pauler, Gyula, *A magyar nemzet története az Árpád házi királyok alatt*, t. II, Budapest 1899.
- Pesty, Frigyes, *Az eltűnt régi vármegyék I–II*, Budapest 1880.
- Rokay, Péter & Miklós Takács, "Macsó", in: *Korai magyar történeti lexikon (9–14. század)*, Főszerk. Gyula Kristó, Szerk. Pál Engel & Ferenc Makk, Budapest 1994, 421–422.
- Sándorhegyi, "Albert a "chycheti" bán", *Századok* (1902) 678–681.
- Senga, Toru, "IV Béla külpolitikája és IV Ince pápához intézett 'tatár-levele'", *Századok* 1–2 (1987) 584–612.
- Skok, Petar, *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika I–IV*, Zagreb 1971–1974.
- Szentpétery, Emerich, "Das Banat von Machow (Machó)", *Ungarische Rundschau* 4 (1915) 872–883.
- Tautu, Luigi, "Margerhita di Ungheria imperatorice di Bisanzio", *Antemurale* III (1956) 51–79.
- Thallóczy, Lajos, "Bosnyák nemzedékrendi tanulmányok", *Turul* 13 (1895) 5–17.
- Thallóczy, Ludwig, "Bruchstücke aus der Geschichte der nordwestlichen Balkanländer", *Wissenschaftliche Mitteilungen aus Bosnien und der Herzegowina* 3 (1895) 298–371.
- Wenzel, Gusztáv, *Rosztizlaw galicziai herceg, IV. Béla királynak veje*, Budapest 1887.
- Wertner, Mór, "Az árpád kori bánok", *Századok* (1909) 377–415, 472–494, 555–570, 656–668, 747–757.
- Wertner, Mór, *Az Árpádok családi története*, Nagy Becskerek 1892.
- Wertner, Mór, "Kicsedi Albert bán", *Századok* (1900) 771–777.
- Wertner, Mór, "Margit császárné fiai", *Századok* (1903) 593–611.
- Zsoldos Attila, *Az Árpádok és asszonyaik, A királynéi intézmény az Árpádok korában*, Budapest 2005.
- Zsoldos, Attila, *Magyarország világi archontológiája 1000–1301*, Budapest 2011.
- Волощук, Мирослав, "Просопографічні студії битви під Ярославом 17 серпня 1245 року", in: *Colloquia Russica, Данило Романович і його часу*, edd. за ред. В. Нагірного & М. Волощука, Івано-Франківськ; Краків 2017, 103–122. [Vološčuk, Mirosław, "Prosopografični studii bitvi pod Jaroslavom 17 serpnja 1245 roku", in: *Colloquia Russica, Danilo Romanovič i joogo časi*, edd. za red. V. Nagirnogo & M. Vološćuka, Ivano-Frankivsk; Krakiv 2017, 103–122]
- Волощук, Мирослав, "'Филия древле прегордыи' / Fila Supruniensis, Маловідомі сюжети з історії Галицької землі першої половини XIII століття", in: *Actes testantibus. Ювілейний*

збірник на пошану Леонтія Войтовича, Львів 2011, 189–196. [Vološčuk, Miroslav, “‘Fillja drevle pregordii’ / Fila Supruniensis, Malovidomi sjužeti z istoriji Galickoji zemli peršoji polovini XIII stolittja”, in: *Actes testantibus*, Juvilejnij zbirnik na pošanu Leontija Vojtoviča, Ljviv 2011, 189–196]

Дашкевич, Николай П., *Княжение Даниила Галицкого по русским и иностранным известиям*, К. 1873. [Daškevič, Nikolaj P., *Knjaženie Daniila Galickogo po russkim i inostrannim izvestijam*, K. 1873]

Динић, Михаило, “Браничево у средњем веку”, у: исти, *Српске земље у средњем веку, историјско-географске студије*, приредио Сима Ћирковић, Београд 1978, 84–112. [Dinić, Mihailo, “Branicevo u srednjem veku”, u: isti, *Srpske zemlje u srednjem veku, istorijskogeografske studije*, priredio Sima Ćirković, Beograd 1978, 84–112]

Динић, Михаило, “Западна Србија у средњем веку”, у: исти, *Српске земље у средњем веку, историјско-географске студије*, приредио Сима Ћирковић, Београд 1978, 44–54. [Dinić, Mihailo, “Zapadna Srbija u srednjem veku”, u: isti, *Srpske zemlje u srednjem veku, istorijsko-geografske studije*, priredio Sima Ćirković, Beograd 1978, 44–54]

Динић, Михаило, “Јован Ангел, ‘dominus Syrmie’”, *Гласник Историјског друштва у Новом Саду* 4 (1931) 301. [Dinić, Mihailo, “Jovan Angel, ‘dominus Syrmie’”, *Glasnik Istoriskog društva u Novom Sadu* 4 (1931) 301]

Динић, Михаило, “Средњовековни Срем”, у: исти, *Српске земље у средњем веку, историјско-географске студије*, приредио Сима Ћирковић, Београд 1978, 270–284. [Dinić, Mihailo, “Srednjovekovni Srem”, u: isti, *Srpske zemlje u srednjem veku, istorijsko-geografske studije*, priredio Sima Ćirković, Beograd 1978, 270–284]

Динић, Михаило, *Српске земље у средњем веку, историјско-географске студије* приредио Сима Ћирковић, Београд 1978. [Dinić, Mihailo, *Srpske zemlje u srednjem veku, istorijsko-geografske studije*, priredio Sima Ćirković, Beograd 1978]

Грушевський, Михайло, “Хронологія подій Галицько-Волинської літописи”, *Записки Наукового товариства імені Шевченка* 41 (1901) 1–72. [Gruševskij, Mihajlo, “Hronologija podijj Galicko-Volinskoj litopisi”, *Zapiski Naukovogo tovaristva imeni Ševčenka* 41 (1901), 1–72]

Јиречек, Константин, *Историја Срба, прва књига до 1537. године*, превео Јован. Радонић, друго, исправљено и допуњено издање, Београд 1978. [Jireček, Konstantin, *Istorija Srba, prva knjiga do 1537. godine*, preveo Jovan Radonić, drugo, ispravljeno i dopunjeno izdanje, Beograd 1978]

Калић-Мијушковић, Јованка, *Београд у средњем веку*, Београд 1967. [Kalić-Mijušković, Jovanka, *Beograd u srednjem veku*, Beograd 1967]

Коматина, Ивана, “О времену напада краља Уроша I на Мачву и његовом заробљавању”, *Зборник радова Византолошког института* 58 (2021) 73–91. [Komatina, Ivana, “O vremenu napada kralja Uroša I na Mačvu i njegovom zarobljavanju”, *Zbornik radova Vizantološkog instituta* 58 (2021) 73–91]

Коматина, Ивана, *Краљ Стефан Урош I Велики и његов век*, Београд 2021. [Komatina, Ivana, *Kralj Stefan Uroš I Veliki i njegov vek*, Beograd 2021]

Крстић, Александар, *Чланови династија југоисточне Европе у средњовековној Угарској* (докторска дисертација, Универзитет у Новом Саду, 2014. [Krstić Aleksandar, *Članovi dinastija jugoistočne Evrope u srednjovekovnoj Ugarskoj*, doktorska disertacija, Univerzitet u Novom Sadu, 2014]

Порчић, Небојша, “Марија, сестра српске краљице Јелене”, *Историјски часопис* 70 (2021) 31–68. [Porčić, Nebojša, “Marija, sestra srpske kraljice Jelene”, *Istorijski časopis* 70 (2021) 31–68]

Радојичић, Ђорђе Сп., “Јужнословенско-руске културне везе до почетка XVIII века”, *Зборник Матице српске за књижевност и језик* 13/2 (1965) 261–309. [Radojičić, Đorđe Sp., “Južnoslovensko-ruske kulturne veze do početka XVIII veka”, *Zbornik Matice srpske za književnost i jezik* 13/2 (1965) 261–309]

Радоњић, Јован “Споразум у Тати 1426. и српско-угарски односи од XIII до XVI века”, *Глас СКА* 187 (1941) 117–232. [Radonić, Jovan, “Sporazum u Tati 1426. i srpsko-ugarski odnosi od XIII do XVI veka”, *Glas SKA* 187 (1941) 117–232]

Рокаи, Петар, “Gyletus dux Sirmii”, *Зборник за историју Матице српске* 27 (1983) 121–127. [Rokai Petar, “Gyletus dux Sirmii”, *Zbornik za istoriju Matice srpske* 27 (1983) 121–127]

Рокаи, Петар, “Из средњовековне историје Новог Сада”, *Зборник за историју Матице српске* 11 (1975) 105–110. [Rokai, Petar, “Iz srednjovekovne istorije Novog Sada”, *Zbornik za istoriju Matice srpske* 11 (1975) 105–110].

Рокаи Петар, “О једном наслову Калојана Анђела”, *Зборник радова Византолошког института* 19 (1980) 167–171. [Rokai Petar, “O jednom naslovu Kalojana Andela”, *Zbornik radova Vizantološkog instituta* 19 (1980) 167–171]

Рокаи, Петар, Золтан Ђере, Тибор Пал и Александар Касаш, *Историја Мађара*, Београд 2002. [Rokai, Petar, Zoltan Đere, Tibor Pal i Aleksandar Kasaš, *Istorija Mađara*, Beograd 2002]

Спремић, Момчило, *Прекинут успон, Српске земље у позном средњем веку*, Београд 2005. [Sprević, Momčilo, *Prekinut uspon, Srpske zemlje u poznom srednjem веку*, Beograd 2005]

Ћирковић, Сима, “Земља Мачва и град Мачва”, *Прилози за књижевност, језик, историју и фолклор* 74, 1–4 (2008) 3–20. [Ćirković, Sima, “Zemlja Mačva i grad Mačva”, *Prilozi za književnost, jezik, istoriju i folklor* 74, 1–4 (2008) 3–20]

Ћирковић, Сима, *Историја средњовековне босанске државе*, Београд 1964. [Ćirković, Sima, *Istorija srednjovekovne bosanske države*, Beograd 1964]

Ћирковић, Сима, “Српске и поморске земље краља Уроша I”, у: *Историја српског народа*, Прва књига, *Од најстаријих времена до Маричке битке (1371)*, ур. Сима Ћирковић, Београд 2000, 341–356. [Ćirković, Sima, “Srpske i pomorske zemlje kralja Uroša I”, u: *Istorija srpskog naroda*, Prva knjiga, *Od najstarijih vremena do Maričke bitke (1371)*, ur. Sima Ćirković, Beograd 2000, 341–356]

Узелац, Александар, “Марија де Кајо, сестра краљице Јелене”, у: *Између Подунавља и Средоземља, тематски зборник посвећен проф. др Синиши Мишићу поводом његовог 60. рођендана*, ур. Катарина Митровић и Александар Узелац, Пожаревац–Ниш 2021, 187–206. [Uzelac, Aleksandar, “Marija de Kajo, sestra kraljice Jelene”, u: *Između Podunavlja i Sredozemlja, tematski zbornik posvećen prof. dr Siniši Mišiću povodom njegovog 60. rođendana*, ur. Katarina Mitrović i Aleksandar Uzelac, Požarevac–Niš 2021, 187–206]

Ферјанчић, Божидар, “Проблем византијског наслеђа у северозападној Србији”, у: *Ваљево – постанак и успон градског средишта*, Ваљево 1994, 49–58. [Ferjančić, Božidar, “Problem vizantijskog nasleđa u severozapadnoj Srbiji”, u: *Valjevo. Postanak i uspon gradskog središta*, Valjevo 1994, 49–58]

Харди, Ђура, *Итинерариј Ростислава Михаиловића*, Сремска Митровица – Нови Сад 2019. [Hardi, Đura, *Itinerarij Rostislava Mihailovića*, Sremska Mitrovica – Novi Sad 2019]

## Đura Hardi

### MACSÓ EREDETÉNEK KÉRDÉSE ROSZTYISZLAV MIHAILOVICS IDEJÉBEN A SZERB ÉS A MAGYAR HISTORIOGRÁFIÁBAN

#### Rezümé

Macsó (a források szerint *Macho/Mazo*) mint vár, terület és bánóság a 13. században és a 14. század elején a szerb és a magyar historiográfia másfél évszázadának közös témája. Annak ellenére, hogy az erre vonatkozó források többsége már régtől fogva ismert, Macsó továbbra is foglalkoztatja a történészeket. Aktuális és inspiratív kutatási téma, erről tanúskodnak a legújabb tanulmányok, amelyek Macsóval vagy az ún. Túlsó-Szerémséggel (*Sirmia Ulterior*) foglalkoznak (utóbbi a terület korábbi elnevezése). Jelen tanulmány célja, hogy összehasonlítsa a két historiográfiát, illetve álláspontjukat Macsó keletkezéséről mint különálló térségről és bánásgról, első uralkodóinak, Rosztyiszlav Mihailovicsnak, Galícia hercegének, IV. Béla magyar király vejének és feleségének, Anna hercegnőnek idejében. A historiográfiai kérdések egyike, hogy vajon Macsó (vára és térsége) keletkezése elsősorban a magyar királyok által alapított azonos nevű bánóság létrejöttéhez kötődik-e?

A szerb historiográfiában ma szinte általánosan elfogadott nézet, hogy Macsó bánóság létrejötté IV. Béla uralkodásának idejére tehető, aki a mongol betörések után (1241/2), országának déli határain bánóságokat alapított, azzal a céllal, hogy azok – katonai-adminisztrációs egységekként védelmezzék a Magyar Királyságot (ezt az álláspontot képviselték Konstantin Jireček, Mihailo Dinić, Jovan Radonić, Đorđe Sp. Radojičić, Jovanka Kalić, Momčilo Spremić, Petar Rokai és Sima Ćirković). Ezt az állítást a magyar historiográfiából vették át a történészek. Ugyanakkor a magyar történészek és archontológusok felfigyeltek arra a tényre, hogy a bánóságot vezető bánok csak a 13. század hetvenes éveitől kezdve jelentek meg a forrásokban, míg a Macsói Bánóság története 1319. után folyamatosan nyomon követhető (Korbuly Imre, Pesti Frigyes, Vertner Mór, Zsoldos Attila, Ternovác Bálint, Fajfer Attila). Macsó első uralkodói, Rosztyiszlav Mihailovics (1254-ben szerepel mint *dominus*) és felesége Anna, valamint fiuk, Béla voltak a bánóság élén, és hercegi címet viseltek.

Rosztyiszlav és Anna előtt a későbbi Macsó bánásznak megfelelő terület felett az Árpád-házi uralkodó-család egy másik ágának leszármazottai uralkodtak: Margit (Mária) volt bizánci hercegnőnek, III. Béla lányának utódai. Margit 1222-ben tért vissza a Magyar Királyságba, s ebben az időben országának a Szávától délre eső területeit nem Macsóinak, hanem Túlsó-Szerémségnek nevezték (*Ulterior Sirmia*). Ezt a területet akkor pravoszláv vallású szlávok és görögök lakták. Túlsó-Szerémség Macsóinak való megfeleltetése Mihailo Dinić nevéhez fűződik, aki a Középkori Szerémség (Srednjevekovni Srem) című művében 1931-ben vezette be ezt az elnevezést, Innszóc-Szerémséggel szemben, amely a Duna és a Száva közötti területet jelölte. De még jóval Dinić előtt Praj György, Pesti Frigyes, Vjekoslav Klaić és Vertner Mór, a neves történész elődei megoldották ezt a problémát. Margit fia, a trónörökös Kaloján Ioannész

Angelosz, aki túlélte a mongol inváziót, ő viselte Szerémség uralkodói címét (*dominus*). IV. Béla valóban megalapíthatta a Macsói Bánságot rokona, Kaloján halálát követően, majd a területet vejenek, Rosztjiszlavnak, illetve saját lányának, Annának adományozta 1247 és 1254 között. A bánság székhelyét az (új!?) Macsói várba helyezte, amelyről azután az egész térséget elnevezte. Mindez már egy bejáródott közigazgatási modell alapján zajlott, hiszen Szlavónia már bánsági státuszban volt, de a Szörényi Bánság is példaként szolgálhatott. Ugyanakkor e hipotézis alátámasztására nem létezik egyetlenegy közvetlen forrás sem. Szentpéteri Imre 1915-ben írt cikkében (*Das Banat von Machow*) már arra következtetésre jutott, hogy ez a terület Kaloján uralkodásának idején nem a Macsó nevet viselte, mert ez az elnevezés először 1254-ben jelent meg a forrásokban. Kaloján és Rosztjiszlav idejében Macsó nem volt bánság. Szentpéteri álláspontjával jelen tanulmány szerzője is egyetért.

A Macsóval kapcsolatos historiográfiai dilemmák összetettségére hívja fel a figyelmet Sima Ćirković is. Szerinte a Magyar Királyság Szávától délre eső területeiből összeállt közigazgatási egység először dinasztikus képződmény volt, amely az Árpád-házi uralkodóházzal rokonságban álló személyekhez kötődött. Árpád-házi Margit és Rosztjiszlav valamint Anna után a következő a sorban Kun Erzsébet és veje, Stefan Dragutin volt szerb király voltak. Ezt az elképzelést, amely a dinasztikus folyamatoságra hívta fel a figyelmet, több történész is támogatta: Đorđe Bubalo, Ternovác Bálint, Fajfer Attila, Ivana és Predrag Komatina, Đura Hardi. Vertner Mór, majd őt követően Ludovik Tautu és Sima Ćirković álltak elő azzal a feltételezéssel, hogy még Rosztjiszlav előtt az első macsói uralkodó Margit bizánci császárné fiatalabb fia, Saint-Omeri Vilmos volt. Az ő neve egy hiteles egyházi forrásban szerepel 1276-ból, amint halála után Macsó hercegeként említik. Petar Rokai szerint ugyanakkor ez az említés anakronizmus. Utóbbi véleményével értenek egyet Fajfer Attila és Đura Hardi. Hardi több érvet is felhozott, amelyek az anakronizmus mellett szólnak. Idősebb féltestvérétől Kalojántól eltérően Vilmost nem említik a bárók sorában (*γ series dignitatum*) IV. Béla királyi leveleiben. Időközben Macsó mint cím, elsősorban „tulajdonosainak”, Annának és Rosztjiszlavnak köszönhetően, közismert lett az uralkodói udvarházakban szerte Közép- és Délkelet-Európában. Minden arra utal, hogy Macsó (a vár és a térség) keletkezése Rosztjiszlav Mihailovics idejében zajlott. Rosztjiszlav mindenképpen élvezte apósa támogatását ebben a vállalkozásban.

Thallóczy Lajos, csakúgy mint Vertner Mór szerint Macsó (és Bosznia) első hercegeinek szolgálatában voltak magyar bánok, de – ahogyan azt Vertner megállapította, szinte lehetetlenség feltárni kilétüket. Úgy tűnik, hogy ez a feltételezés igaz lehetett. A források szerint voltak bánok Anna hercegnő, Rosztjiszlav özvegyének udvarában. IV. Béla lánya, testvére és ellensége, V. István halála után, majd fiának Rosztjiszlavljevics Béla hercegnek a kegyetlen meggyilkolását követően (1272. november közepén) a megváltozott politikai körülmények között visszatért a Magyar Királyságba (valószínűleg 1273-ban vagy 1274-ben), amit először Emil Jakubovics erősített meg. Anna Magyar Királyságba való visszatéréseivel, illetve hercegségének visszaállításával véget ért a bánságok rövid története, amelyek közé Macsó és Bosznia mellett több további bánság is tartozott: Barancs, Kucsó, Ózora és a Sói bánság (1272–1273). Ezeket fiának

meggyilkolása után hozták létre, és minden bizonnyal egybeestek az egykori országgal, amely Rosztyiszlav és Anna irányítása alatt állt. Az utókor számára fennmaradt feljegyzés két világi méltóságról Anna hercegnő szolgálatában, Albertról, aki valószínűleg Macsó bánja volt és Ampudról, Bosznia bánjáról (1276). Füle bán személyének azonosítása további kutatásokat igényel. Pauler Gyula a maga idejében lakonikusan fogalmazta meg a kérdést, miszerint Füle szörényi vagy macsói bán volt-e? Rosztyiszlav és Füle azonban minden bizonnyal kapcsolatban álltak, hiszen Füle volt Rosztyiszlav magyar csapatainak parancsnoka a jaroszlavli csatában, ahol foglyul ejtették majd kivégezték (1245).

Ђура Харди

**ПИТАЊЕ ГЕНЕЗЕ МАЧВЕ У ДОБА РОСТИСЛАВА МИХАИЛОВИЧА  
У СРПСКОЈ И МАЂАРСКОЈ ИСТОРИОГРАФИЈИ**

**Резиме**

Мачва (мађарски – *Macsó*; у изворима *Macho/Mazo*) као име тврђаве, земље и бановине у XIII и почетком XIV века, представља тему која спаја српску и мађарску историографију скоро век и по. Упркос околности да је већина извора већ одавно позната, она и надаље привлачи пажњу историчара. Колико је актуелна и инспиративна за истраживање сведоче најновији радови посвећени Мачви или Оностраном Срему (*Sirmia Ulterior*) како је гласило старије име ове земље. Циљ овог рада био је да упореди две историографије и њихове ставове о настанку Мачве као посебне земље и бановине у доба владавине њених првих господара, бившег кнеза Галиције Ростислава Михаиловића, зета угарског краља Беле IV, и његове супруге угарске принцезе Ане. Једно од разматраних историографских питања је било и оно, да ли је настанак Мачве (тврђаве и области) примарно везан за оснивање истоимене бановине од стране угарских краљева?

У српској историографији до данас је скоро општеприхваћено мишљење да је Мачва као бановина настала у време владавине угарског краља Беле IV који је, након најезде Монгола (1241/2), на јужним границама своје државе успоставио низ бановина са циљем да оне, као војно-административне целине, бране Угарску (таквог су мишљења били Константин Јиречек, Михаило Динић, Јован Радонић, Ђорђе Сп. Радојичић, Јованка Калић, Момчило Спремић, Петар Рокаи или Сима Ђирковић). Ова теза је преузета из мађарске историографије. Мађарски историчари, истраживачи Мачве као бановине и њене архонтологије су, међутим, запазили да се банови на њеном челу у изворима срећу тек од седамдесетих година XIII века, а да се историја Мачванске бановине може континуирано пратити заправо након 1319. године (Имре Корбуљ, Фриђеш Пешти, Вертнер Мор, Атила Жолдош, Балинт Терновац, Атила Фајфер). Први владари Мачве, Ростислав Михаиловић (као *dominus* забележен 1254) и његова супруга Ана, те њихов син Бела, носили су титуле господара и кнежева ове земље.

Пре Ростислава и Ане, будућом Мачвом је владала друга грана владарске породице Арпадовића, потекла од бивше византијске царице Маргарете (Марије), ћерке краља Беле III која се у Угарску вратила око 1222. године. У то време, њена земља јужно од реке Саве се није звала Мачва, већ (Онострани) Срем (*Ulterior Sirmia*) који је била насељен Словенима и Грцима православне вере. Идентификацију Оностраног Срема као будуће Мачве, у односу на Овострани Срем као топографску одредницу земље између Саве и Дунава, у српску историографију је увео Михаило Динић у својој студији *Средњовековни Срем*, 1931. године. Пре Динића, међутим, овај проблем су много раније решили

његови претходници Ђерђ Прај, Фриђеш Пешти, Вјекослав Клаић и Мор Вертнер. Маргаретин син и наследник, царевић Јован (Калојан) Анђео, који је преживео монголску најезду, носио је титулу *dominus* Срема. Бела IV је доиста могао да оснује Мачванску бановину, након смрти свог рођака Јована Анђела и да је као територију поклони свом зету Ростиславу и заправо ћерци Ани негде између 1247 и 1254. године. Средиште баната сместио је у (нову!?) тврђаву Мачву, по којој ће цела област понети име. Урађено је то на основу већ постојећег државног модела, познатог на примеру Славоније, када је била у статусу баната, или Северина. Међутим за потврду ове хипотезе не постоји ни један непосредан извор. Имре Сентпетери је сада већ давне 1915. године, у чланку *Das Banat von Machow* закључио да током владавине Јована Анђела ова земља није носила назив Мачва, већ се ово име први пут јавља 1254. године. У време Калојана и Ростислава и његових наследника Мачва није била банат. Са Сентпетеријевим мишљењем слаже се и аутор овог рада.

Комплексност историографских разматрања о Мачви потврђује и Сима Ђирковић. По Ђирковићу, територија Угарске краљевине јужно од Саве имала је првобитно карактер династичке творевине везане за одређене личности из реда краљевских рођака породице Арпадовић. Међу њима се у том низу владара, после породица Маргарете Арпадовић и Ростислава и Ане Арпадовић, нашла угарска краљица мајка Јелисавета Куманка и коначно њен зет, бивши српски краљ Стефан Драгутин. Ово мишљење о династичком континуитету области, подржавају Ђорђе Бубало, Балинт Терновац, Атила Пфајфер, Ивана и Предраг Коматина, Ђура Харди. Вертнер Мор, а после њега и Лудовик Тауту и Сима Ђирковић су изнели тезу да је, још пре Ростислава, први владар Мачве био млађи син бивше царице Маргарете, Виљем од Сент Омера. Он се у једном веродостојном црквеном извору из 1276. године, постхумно помињао као кнез Мачве. Петар Рокаи, на другој страни, сматра да је овај помен био анахронизам. Његово мишљење прихватају Атила Фајфер и Ђура Харди. Харди је изнео више аргумената у прилог тези о анахронизму. За разлику од старијег полубрата Јована Анђела, Виљем се не наводи у *series dignitatum*, списковима барона у краљевским повељама Беле IV. У међувремену, Мачва је као титула, захваљујући пре свега њеним „власницима“, Ани Арпадовић и Ростиславу постала препознатљива на владарским дворovima средње и југоисточне Европе. По свему судећи, генеза Мачве (тврђаве и земље) се збила у време Ростислава Михаиловича. У том подухвату он је свакако уживао помоћ свог таста.

Лајош Талоци, као и Мор Вертнер су сматрали да су у време првих херцега Мачве и (Босне) у њиховој служби постојали угарски банови, али како је констатовао Вертнер, немогуће је открити њихов списак. Ова претпоставка је изгледа била тачна. Извори сведоче о присуству банова на двору кнегиње Ане, удовице Ростислава. Кћи Беле IV, се након смрти свог брата и непријатеља Стефана V, и после окрутног убиства њеног сина херцега Беле Ростислављевича (средином новембра 1272), у измењеним политичким околностима вратила у Угарску (вероватно током 1273. или наредне 1274. године), како је то први

утврдио Емил Јакубович. С Анимим повратком у Угарску и рестаурацијом њене кнежевине, окончан је краткотрајни период постојања бановина, у чији списак су поред Мачве и Босне, улазили Браничево, Кучево, Усора и Соли (1272–1273). Оне су биле образоване након убиства њеног сина и без сумње су се поклапале са некадашњом државом која је припадала Ростиславу и Ани. Сачувани су помени у њеној служби два великодостојника, Алберта који је по свему судећи био бан Мачве, и Омпуда бана Босне (1276). Идентитет бана Филе, захтева додатна истраживања. Давно је Ђула Паулер лаконски поставио питање да ли је Фила био северински или мачвански бан? Веза између Филе и Ростислава је извесна. Овај угарски великаш био је заповедник Ростислављевих угарских снага у бици код Јарославља када је заробљен и погубљен (1245).