

**IOBAGIO CASTRI – NOBILIS CASTRI – NOBILIS REGNI.
CASTLE WARRIORS – CASTLE NOBLES –
NOBLEMEN. THE DEVELOPMENT OF A SOCIAL
STRATUM IN COUNTY OF KRIŽEVCI**

*Éva B. Halász**

Keywords: castle warriors, castle nobles, Slavonia, Arpadian-period, Angevin-period

Cuvinte cheie: iobagi de cetate, nobili ai cetății, Slavonia, epoca Arpadiană, epoca Angevină

The county was the mid-level unit of the secular administration in the medieval Kingdom of Hungary and it is written usually as comitatus in the Latin sources (Hung. megye).¹ In the territory of the county were ecclesiastical and private possessions besides the royal ones. In the Arpadian Era the royal possessions were under the royal castle system (Hung. várszervezet), the unit of it is called likewise comitatus usually in the documents (Eng. castle district; Hung. várispánság). The head of it was the comes, who was in the same time the head of the other type of comitatus, the unit of the administrative system. The royal possessions did not lay side by side, thus the territory of the castle district was non-contiguous. The comitatus was changed with time, from the royal one, which had existed in the Arpadian Era, the noble-county was formed, which further developed.² Different authors give different numbers of the Slavonian

* Research Group for Medievalistics (Hungarian Academy of Sciences – National Archives of Hungary – University of Szeged). This work has been supported in part by Croatian Science Foundation under the project IP-2014-09-6547, e-mail: halasz.eva2005@gmail.com

¹ Besides the word comitatus other terms were used, as the provincia, parochia, territorium, districtus, diocesis (frequently) and the partes, pagus, conpages, terra, ambitus and dominium (rarely). Gyula Kristó, *A vármegyék kialakulása Magyarországon* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1988), 139–144.

² István Tringli, “Megyék a középkori Magyarországon,” in Tibor Neumann, György Rácz eds, *Honoris causa. Tanulmányok Engel Pál tiszteletére, Társadalom és művelődéstörténeti tanulmányok 40.* Analecta Medievalia III., (Budapest-Piliscsaba, 2009), 518.

counties, between 14 and 17.³ There are some difference in the history of them, but all of the counties merged into the three noble counties (Zagreb, Križevci and Varaždin) for the 15th century. After the fusion some comitatus did not disappeared totally, but they formed an administrative unit within the county, which had a special position headed by the comes terrestris.⁴

In the Arpadian period several groups with different statuses belonged to the castle system, but all of them were proprii of the king. The castle warriors (Lat. *iobagiones castri*, later *nobiles iobagiones castri*; Hung. *várjobbágyok*) were the most prominent among them. They had wider liberty and lesser service than other groups. The castle warriors had to fulfill military service and pay tax for the castle (namely for the ruler). In the beginning the castle warriors were not the owners of their possessions, only the users of it. The king owned all of the land in the castle system. After the middle of the 13th century the rulers did not want to weaken the status of the castle warriors, who fulfilled military service. Therefore the kings protected the ownership of them.⁵ In Hungary north to the

³ The reasons of the difference are the question of the three counties in Lower-Slavonia (Orbas, Sana and Dubica) and the affiliation of county of Varaždin (Kristó, *A vármegyék*, 309–329; *Korai Magyar Történelmi Lexikon, 9–14. század*, ed., Gyula Kristó (Budapest, 1994), 650–652. (Rokay Péter-Takács Miklós); Gyula Kristó, *Tájszemlélet és térszervezés a középkori Magyarországon*, Szegedi Középkortörténelmi Könyvtár 19 (Szeged, 2003), 78.

⁴ Turopolje was an exception, because in this territory the comes of Turopolje existed besides the comes terrestris. (e.g.: Tadija Smičiklas et al., *Diplomatički zbornik kraljevine Hrvatske, Dalmacije i Slavonije. Codex diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatie ac Slavonie*, 18 vols (Zagreb: CASA 1904–1990), vol. XVII, 291–292, nr. 205).

⁵ The rulers distinguished between the ownership of the castle warriors and the castrenses. In the second half of the 1250's King Béla IV send Chak ensifer to county of Garešnica to separate the possessions of the castle warriors and the castrenses. (Smičiklas, *Codex diplomaticus*, vol. V, 59–60, nr. 581; 61–62, nr. 582; 62–63, nr. 583; 71–73, nr. 591; 73–75, nr. 592; 75–76, nr. 593). Castrenses from Križevci (Demetrius, Marc, Pribk, Chornouch, Pribenuk and their relatives) cited Bartholomew comes and his sons to the royal court in 1268 about the third part of terra Guztowygh. They stated it their own possession, which was occupied unduly. King Béla IV had donated that land to Bartholomew comes earlier, as it is written in the document of Stephan, Ban of Slavonia, who had made the introduction. King Béla IV confirmed the ownership of Bartholomew comes and obliged the castrenses to move another royal possession. Smičiklas, *Codex Diplomaticus*, vol. V, 476–477, nr. 941 and 477–478, nr. 942. King Charles I donated the possessions of castrenses of Moravče with the inhabitants of it to Nicolas of Ludbreg. The castle warriors and the castrenses had possessed their land together (mixtim), which caused problems later. Finally they divided the whole territory and the possessions of the castle warriors in the part of Nicolas of Ludbreg became property of him. Thus the possessions of the castrenses in the part belonged to the castle warriors became the property of them (11 February 1326 National Archives of Hungary Diplomatiikai Fényképgyűjtemény [Diplomatic Collection of Photocopies] (hereafter: DF. 209163. *Anjou-kori oklevéltár. Documenta res Hungaricas tempore regum Andegavensium illustrantia* (Budapest – Szeged, 1990), vol. X, 54).

river Drava the king did not donate lands owned by castle warriors.⁶ In Slavonia there are few examples, when the king donated the land of a castle warrior to ecclesiastical or private possessor, but the protection of the ownership of the *iobagiones castri* was general also in this territory.⁷ The castle warriors held the offices of the castle district.⁸ The *castrenses* (Hung. *várnépbeliek*) had lesser liberty and wider service than the *iobagiones castri*. Generally they provides the care of the castle. Some groups of them had special services, e.g. one group of *castrenses* guarded the prison of the castle and likely one other group fulfilled military service.⁹

The castle system was changed in the last part of the 13th century. In Hungary north to the river Drava the castle districts were disappeared and the castle warriors depending of their own fortune/ fate became serfs or nobles.¹⁰ In Slavonia the story went on other way: in the documents the castle warriors of the Slavonian *comitatus* and later the castle nobles appeared several times. The elected head of the castle district, the *comes terrestris* are mentioned in the documents equally in the 14th and 15th centuries. The question is: do the castle warriors and the castle nobles mean the same social stratum, which changed its name or they were two separated groups? And if they mean the same group, what did changed besides the name?

According to the literature the castle nobles were more or less the same with the *praediales*. Unlike other part of Hungary, in Slavonia the castle districts were not disappeared by the middle of the 14th century, but they were donated to ecclesiastical or private possessors by the rulers. The group of the castle warriors also existed, but they changed their name and became castle nobles or *praediales*.¹¹ Dezső Csánki distinguished three groups of *praediales* in county of Križevci: (1) the *praediales* of royal castles (Kalnik and Križevci); (2) *prae-*

⁶ Attila Zsoldos, *A szent király szabadjai* (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1999), 77–89.

⁷ King Andrew II donated county of Gora to the Cistercians in Topusko. See: Gábor Szeberényi, “A gorai *comitatus* a XIII. században. Megjegyzések a „hat gorai nemzetség” és a Babonic-ok korai történetéhez,” in Péter G. Tóth, Pál Szabó, eds, *Középkortörténeti tanulmányok 6* (Szeged, 2010) 233–248. King Charles I donated the castle warriors of Zagreb de genere *Laztech* and *Stankouch* in 1308 to Agustin, bishop of Zagreb (Smičiklas, *Codex Diplomaticus*, vol. VIII, 226, nr. 195; *Anjou-oklt.*, vol. II, 474). For Rovišće see below.

⁸ For Hungary north to the river Drava generally see: Zsoldos, *A szent király*, 57–71. For county of Križevci see: Éva B. Halász, “A körösi várjobbágyok a 13–15. században,” in Attila P. Kiss, Ferenc Piti, György Szabados eds, *Középkortörténeti tanulmányok 7* (Szeged 2012), 315–316.

⁹ Zsoldos, *A szent király*, 72–75.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 158–185.

¹¹ Summary: *Korai Magyar Történeti 556* (by Pál Engel)

diales of the ecclesiastical possessions (e.g.: Gora); (3) praediales of the private possessions (e.g.: Rovišće).¹² For György Bónis the castle nobles meant higher status as the castle warriors and finally the whole group of the castle warriors became castle nobles.¹³

But in the charters castle warriors are mentioned in most of the Slavonian comitatus in the Arpadian period and in the first half of the 14th century, castle nobles existed only in those counties in the second half of the 14th and 15th centuries, which were permanently in royal treatment. Which means, castle nobles were only in county of Križevci, Kalnik, Rovišće (later parts of county of Križevci) and Turopolje (later part of county of Zagreb).¹⁴ Because the situation of the castle warriors of Turopolje was different from the other ones, I do not consider them in this paper.¹⁵ First take a look to the history of some families, which first time are mentioned as castle warriors!

The descendants of comes Pezk belonged to the Matthew kindred in the castle district of Križevci.¹⁶ Pezk himself appeared in the sources in 1269, when he is mentioned as *iobagio castri* in the document of the comes of county of Križevci. Very likely he was comes *terrestris* earlier, because before his name the word comes is written.¹⁷ His great-grandson, Nicolas, son of Míka, was also castle warrior and became noble in 1346. He was elevated in the military camp near Zadar by Nicolas Hahót, Ban of Slavonia-Croatia. Only he and his brothers were exempted, the wider family not.¹⁸ The descendants of them are mentioned as nobles in that charters. The other line of descendents Pezk still

¹² Dezsó Csánki, *Körösmegye a XV-ik században* (Budapest, 1893), 120–122.

¹³ According to him the groups of the praediales, the castle warriors and the castle nobles were the same. György Bónis, *Hűbériség és rendiség a középkori magyar jogban* (Budapest, 2003), 247.

¹⁴ There are some sporadic data about castle nobles from other territories, such as from Zagorje (later part of county of Varaždin) (e.g.: Df. 219006) and from Oklič (in county of Zagreb) (Mályusz Elemér et al., *Zsigmondkori oklevéltár*, vol. I, Budapest 1951 vol. VI, 1003), but they are not enough to form an opinion about them. There are some other castle nobles, who belonged to a castle, which was never center of any comitatus. In 1411 castle nobles existed around castle Ozalj and Ribnik. (Mályusz, *Zsigmondkori*, vol. III, 1035.) Likely they were not descendants of castle warriors, but they were ordered to serve the castles later or volunteered this servitium.

¹⁵ For them generally see: Emilij Laszowski, *Plemenita opcina Turopolje. Zemljopis, Narodopis i povijesni prijedlog*. (Zagreb, 1910.) Comparison with Špiš see: Gábor Szeberényi, “Noble Communities in Spiš and Turopolje in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries,” in Martin Homza, Ján Lukačka, Neven Budak eds, *Slovakia and Croatia. Historical parallels and connections until 1780* (Bratislava-Zagreb, 2013), 222–226.

¹⁶ For the detailed history of the family see: Éva B. Halász, “From castle warrior to noblemen Case Study – The History of Descendants of Comes Pezk,” (under press)

¹⁷ DF. 218519. Smičiklas, *Codex Diplomaticus*. Supplementa vol. I, 298–300, nr. 237.

¹⁸ 6 July 1346 (Smičiklas, *Codex Diplomaticus*, vol. XI, 309–310, nr. 231).

remained castle warriors, in 1380 grandsons and sons of John, son of Fabian, are mentioned in this way in the document of John, son of Benedict, comes terrestris.¹⁹ The member of this line, Valentine, son of George, was ennobled with his family in 1412 because of his military service.²⁰

Ivan, son of Ladina, and his descendants belonged also to the castle district of Križevci, to the Hegen kindred. They are mentioned as *nobiles iobagiones castri* in the charter of Andrew, son of Martin, comes terrestris of Križevci in 1377²¹, as in the document of Valentine, son of Blaise, comes terrestris in 7th May 1408.²² But a month earlier, in 10th Apr in the charter of chapter of Čazma the members of the family are written as *nobiles castri*.²³ After it the descendants of Ladina appeared in the charter as castle nobles in every case.²⁴ There isn't any charter about their ennoblement, likely they were elevated only in 1430, when King Sigismund gave the noble status of the castle nobles of Kalnik and Križevci generally.²⁵ The castle nobles of Križevci are written nobles in the charters after 1430.²⁶

Isan, who belonged to the castle district of Kalnik, appeared in the charters first time in 1339 as castle warrior (*iobagio castri*), when with others took an oath in the borders of a possession.²⁷ He was *pristaldus* in 1342 and 1343²⁸, and he had five sons, who are mentioned as *nobiles iobagiones castri* in 1368.²⁹ One of them is mentioned in 1383 as castle nobles in the document of Thomas, son of Nicolas, castellan and George, son of Malchech, comes terrestris of Kalnik.³⁰

¹⁹ *Diplomatarium comitum terrestrium Crisiensium (1274–1439)* Documents edited and introductory study written by Éva B. Halász and Suzana Miljan (hereafter *Diplomatarium*) (Budapest-Zagreb, 2014), 23.

²⁰ 8 or 15 December 1412 (DF. 230922). For the problem of dating, see: Mályusz, *Zsigmondkori*, vol. III, 3051.

²¹ 1 March 1377, *Diplomatarium* 21.

²² *Diplomatarium* 28.

²³ Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár Országos Levéltára Diplomatikai Levéltára [Hungarian National Archive, State Archive, Archive of Diplomas and Charters] (hereafter DL, 38715).

²⁴ e.g. 16 April 1418 (*Diplomatarium* 47.)

²⁵ DF. 231254.

²⁶ There are many details about the history of the families, who lived in Dijankovec. Before 1430 they are written castle nobles in every case. But during the 15th and 16th centuries they are mentioned as nobles. (for the details see: B. Halász Éva, “Nobiles de Diankoucz. Data about the history of the Slavonian castle warriors/nobles,” (under press)

²⁷ 12 October 1339 (Smičiklas, *Codex Diplomaticus*, vol. X, 495–497, nr. 348; *Anjou-oklt.*, vol. XXIII, 627.

²⁸ 21 February 1342 (DF. 279533); 11 Marc 1342 (DF. 230382; Smičiklas, *Codex Diplomaticus*, vol. XI, 46–47, nr. 34)

²⁹ 21 March 1368 (DF. 230523; Smičiklas, *Codex Diplomaticus*, vol. XIV, 124–126, nr. 79).

³⁰ 11 August 1383 (DF. 230628; Smičiklas, *Codex Diplomaticus*, vol. XVI, 384, nr. 304).

Later his brothers are written also as castle nobles in the charters.³¹ The family likely was ennobled only in 1430. There are castle nobles in Kalnik also after 1430, in some cases the continuity of the family is known.³²

The castle warriors and praediales belonged to comitatus Rovišće appeared in the charters from the first half of the 13th century.³³ In Slavonia praediales existed besides Rovišće in counties Čezmice, Garić, Garešnica and Zagreb. They belonged to the castle district as well as the castle warriors, but their status were not the same.³⁴ The castrenses of Rovišće also existed.³⁵ There are fewer charters and data about Rovišće, it is impossible to follow the history of one exact family. But it is generally known, that in the Arpadian and Angevin periods *iobagiones castri* and praediales are mentioned in the charters.³⁶ King Sigismund donated the land of Rovišće to the Ders family,³⁷ and with this donation the status of

³¹ e. g. 16 August 1384 (DF 230641. Smičiklas, *Codex Diplomaticus*, vol. XVI, 482, nr. 362; 24 July 1385 (DF. 230650).

³² Emerik, son of Konthercz (dict.) Philip, is mentioned in 1414 (DF. 231014. Mályusz, *Zsigmondkori*, vol. IV, 2489) and 1440 (DL. 35959) as castle noble.

³³ Coloman, dux of Slavonia donated land Konza belonged to the castle of Rovišće to Dragon, castle warrior of Rovišće and his son in 1232. (Smičiklas, *Codex Diplomaticus*, vol. III, 369, nr. 323. King Béla IV sent Stephan, Ban of Slavonia to review the land of castle Rovišće in 1255. The ban put back some castrenses to their original status, who had stated themselves unduly to be castle warriors or praediales. (Smičiklas, *Codex Diplomaticus*, vol. IV, 596–598, nr. 514).

³⁴ Likely the praediales were free, who entered the service of the castle, but kept some elements from their previous status. (Szeberényi, *A rojcsai*, 296.)

³⁵ Smičiklas, *Codex Diplomaticus*, vol. IV, 596–598, nr. 14.

³⁶ The document, in which King Ladislaw IV exempted all of the castle warriors and praediales from the jurisdiction of the comes of Rovišće, and its pairs, which narrowed it to certain families, were issued in 1279. The authenticity of them is suspicious. In the Arpadian period the term *nobilis* was not used for the castle warriors and praediales. The only example (the charter of Stephan, Ban of Slavonia from 1255 is also suspicious. (Smičiklas, *Codex Diplomaticus*, vol. IV, 613, nr. 30). In Slavonia the term *nobilis iobagio castri* appeared in the charters in the 14th century (see later.) There were castle warriors in Rovišće in the first half of the 14th century: for example Volkan, son of Volkoy cited Petronka, widow of Radozlaus in front of John, son of Paul, comes of Rovišće in 1329 (DF. 228441; *Anjou-oklt.*, vol. XVII, 157.) The charters mentioned *praediales et nobiles iobagiones castri* in the end of the 14th century. (e.g. 12. April 1391, Mályusz, *Zsigmondkori* vol. I, 1968; DL. 33282). But King Sigismund accepted the ennoblement of King Ladislaw IV, when he donated possessions Konchnicha (alio nomine Sawfeld) and Bakpeturfuld to Dominic of Konszka and his sons (*iuxta exemptionem alias domini Ladislai regis nobilitantes, libertantes ac ab omni iugi iobagionatus catrensiu eximentes necnon in evum absolventes*), DL. 33682; Mályusz, *Zsigmondkori*, vol. I, 2257. Similar in the charter of county of Križevci: 18 October 1411, DL. 33512; Mályusz, *Zsigmondkori*, vol. III, 1083.) Very likely some families were ennobled by the rulers, because in the charters some people are written as nobles of Rovišće. (*nobilis/ nobiles* de Riuche/other forms of the name of the county.) This name type was typical among the families, which were ennobled from castle-warrior or castle noble status.

³⁷ DL. 33468 (Mályusz, *Zsigmondkori*, vol. I, 2949).

the castle warriors (from the beginning of the 15th century they are mentioned as castle nobles³⁸) and praediales was at risk. For the noble family their special type of liberty was disturbing and pursued to make them serfs. The fight ended in a draw in the 1420's: the Ders family confirmed the special status of the castle nobles, but they had to accept the possessor family as their lords.³⁹ The castle warriors of Rovišće became praediales of the noble family.⁴⁰ During the 13th and 14th centuries there surely were some castle warriors, who were elevated by the rulers. For example Little (Parvus) Jacob, son of Michael, and his son, Dominic were nobles of Rovišće. Jacob appeared in the documents from 1332 and Dominic from 1340's. The Ders family attacked their status, but Dominic and his descendants could serve their nobility.⁴¹

As it is apparent from the above brief review the castle warriors are mentioned in the sources as *iobagiones castri*,⁴² and later, from the middle of the 14th century as *nobiles iobagiones castri*.⁴³ The term *nobiles castri* was used

³⁸ The comes terrestris of Rovišće held council unacum universitate nobilium castrensiu provincie predictae in 1409. (6 July 1409, DL. 9229; Mályusz, *Zsigmondkori*, vol. II, nr. 6870). The praediales and castle nobles of Rovišće complained to King Sigismund about Martin Ders in 1417 (Mályusz, *Zsigmondkori*, vol. VI, nr. 775; DL. 33472, DL. 33464, DL. 37361, DL. 10513). Nicolas, son of Matthew introduced *unacum nobilibus castrensiibus* the pars, who was successful in the court, to the won possession. (1 October 1420, DL. 9229, Mályusz, *Zsigmondkori*, vol. VII, 2230). *Praediales seu nobiles castrenses de districtu Rouyche*: 1421, DL. 11119; Mályusz, *Zsigmondkori*, vol. VIII, 870) *Praediales*: 10 May 1423 (DL. 33367, Mályusz, *Zsigmondkori*, vol. X, 571). *Nobiles iobagiones*: 28 September 1423 (DL. 33784; Mályusz, *Zsigmondkori*, vol. X, 1166. *Iobagiones castrenses seu vasalli*: 3 November 1423 (DL. 11428, Mályusz, *Zsigmondkori*, vol. X, 1292 and DL. 33347, Mályusz, *Zsigmondkori*, vol. X, 1293).

³⁹ About the fight of the Ders family and the castle nobles see: Árpád Nógrády, "A Szerdahelyiek és a rojcsai prediálisok," *Történelmi Szemle* XLIII, 1–2 (2001):73–82.

⁴⁰ e.g. the charter of the ban about the donation of Ders, son of Martin Ban to his familiaris, Bereck issued in 1427: *praediales districtus eiusdem* [Roywche] (DL. 34858). The title of the comes terrestris in 1429: *comes terrestris predialium dominorum Ders et Petri filiorum condam Martini Bani de districtu Royche*. (Kálmán Géresi, *A nagy károlyi gróf Károlyi-család oklevéltára*, vol. II (Budapest, 1883), 122–123 (nr. 72).

⁴¹ Szeberényi, *A rojcsai*, 300–306.

⁴² Early examples: Kalnik: before 25 August 1264 (Smičiklas, *Codex Diplomaticus*, vol. V, 304–305, nr. 800). Križevci: after the suspicious data from 1225 (Smičiklas, *Codex Diplomaticus*, vol. III, 247–248, nr. 221). The critic: Imre Szentpétery, *Az Árpád-házi királyok okleveleinek kritikai jegyzéke. Regesta regum stirpis Arpadianae critico diplomatica*, vol. I, part 2 (Budapest, 1927), 176–177, nr. 574). The first certain mention: 1238 – Smičiklas, *Codex Diplomaticus*, vol. IV, 71 (nr. 67). Moravče: castle warriors and castrenses are mentioned first time in 1242. (Smičiklas, *Codex Diplomaticus*, vol. IV, 170–171, nr. 153; DL. 33702). Garešnica: King Béla IV made the revision of the possessions belonged to the castle warriors in 1257. (e.g. Smičiklas, *Codex Diplomaticus*, vol. V, 53–55, nr. 578. Rovišće: the first mention of the castle warriors was in 1232 (Smičiklas, *Codex Diplomaticus*, vol. III, 369, nr. 323).

⁴³ This was connected and simultaneous with the devaluation of the term nobilis. In Križevci

from the second half of the 14th century, for example it is already written in the document of the authorities of castle district of Kalnik in 1368.⁴⁴ In Križevci, Rovišće (and in Turopolje) the change of the terminology occurred later, in the beginning of the 15th century. During the transition the two terms were used parallel.

What is the reason of the changing of the nomination in the charters?

According to the history of the castle warriors of Križevci and Kalnik the people or families in the status of *nobilis iobagio castri* are written in the contemporary or later charters as castle nobles.⁴⁵ The identity of the two groups is certifiable. Maybe a kind of differentiation started among the castle warriors in this time in the basis of the property and authority of the people or the families. But not just the most wealthiest and the prestigious people and families are written in the charters as castle nobles. Some of them appeared only one or two times, that is, they could not be the honored members of their local society.⁴⁶

the *nobilis iobagiones castri* form appeared first in the 1340's. (23 September 1340 *Diplomatarium*, nr. 6). In Kalnik the *nobilis* attribute appeared in the charters associated with the castle warriors in the 1330's, when the comes terrestris led a perambulation around a land *unacum nobilibus, ydoneis et probis omnibus iobagionibus sepedicti castri*. (22 March 1334, DF. 252343; Smičiklas, *Codex Diplomaticus*, vol. X, 155–157, nr. 102), but the exact term is written first time in the 1340's. (21 February 1342, DF. 279533). In Turopolje the appellation of the *nobilis iobagio castri* appeared in 1360. (19 November 1360 Emilius Laszowski, *Monumenta historica nob. communitatis Turopolje olim "Campus Zagrabiensis" dictae*, vol. I–IV, (Zagrabiae 1904–1908), vol. I, 75–76, nr. 75. In the 15th century the *nobilis iobagio castri* and the *nobilis castri* terms were used parallel.

⁴⁴ DF. 230523.

⁴⁵ The same phenomena was also in Turopolje. Chernk (Chernko) and Wlk, sons of John of Kurilovec, appeared in the charters in 1377 as castle warriors (*nobiles iobagiones castri de Korilouch*) [6 July 1377 (Laszowski, *Monumenta historica*, vol. I, 100–101, nr. 104]. For the family tree see: Suzana Miljan, *Plemičko društvo Zagrebačke županije za vladavine Žigmundova Luksemburškog (1387.–1437.)* (Doktorski rad) (Zagreb, 2015), 245. The third brother (Martin) is mentioned in 1388 (26 April 1388, Laszowski, *Monumenta historica*, vol. I, 114–115, nr. 112). Chernk married with Elena, daughter of Iuren of Pleso, and they had two sons and four daughters [21 Marc 1427 (Laszowski, *Monumenta historica* vol. I, 205–206, nr. 209] Chernko (*nobilis iobagio castri*) with sons bought the sessio of sons Gerdalka and Lucas, son of Synrsa of Kurilovec in 1398 (Laszowski, *Monumenta historica*, vol. I, 155, nr. 147). Chernko died before 1427, when his relatives gave the *quarta puellaris* for his three daughters (Cynka, Elena et Margareta junior), who are written in the charter as *nobiles castrenses*. His fourth daughter, Margareta senior was married with Matthew of Kravarsko, and they had two sons: Bereck and Blaise (21 Marc 1427, Laszowski, *Monumenta historica* vol. I, 205–206, nr. 219), whose sessio is mentioned in 1439 (Laszowski, *Monumenta historica* vol. I, 255–256, nr. 242). Likely the descendants of Wlk are mentioned as castle warriors of Gorica in 1424. (Laszowski, *Monumenta historica* vol. I, 189–190, nr. 196).

⁴⁶ John, son of Marc, castle noble of Poljana is mentioned in 1421, when he sold part of his property to grandsons and sons of Stephan of Poljana. (*Diplomatarium*, nr. 49.)

The terms *iobagio castris* and *nobilis castris* were used equally in different charters issued by the comes terrestris of the castle districts, the ban or a chapter. Some people from castle district of Križevci are written as *nobiles castris* in the charter of chapter of Čazma and one month later they are called *nobiles iobagiones castris* in the document of the comes terrestris of Križevci.⁴⁷

In parallel about the general development of the society the term *iobagio* had lost its value in the second half of the 14th century and it expressed only the fact, that the *iobagio* was not the member of the nobility.⁴⁸ The castle warriors believed themselves rather the part of the nobility, than the serfdom.⁴⁹ Therefore the omission of the word *iobagio* from the term *nobilis iobagio castris* was a natural phenomena for them.

As I told it above, the castrensis term had meant in the Arpadian period the social group, which had had lower liberty et much service, than the castle warriors. In the 14th century the variety of the social groups disappeared and in Hungary north to the river Drava the term *iobagio castrensis* appeared in the charters, because the society was not sensitive any more the differences between the status' of the two groups (*iobagio castris* and *castrensis*) and merge them. This fact contributed to the disappearing of the castle warriors.⁵⁰ In Slavonia the situation was a little bit different. Although the word castrensis is written in the charters in connections with the castle warriors, but this did not evaluate the status of them. The castle warriors and castle nobles themselves and the other social groups were aware of the differences between the status' of the castle warriors and the castrenses. Salomon, son of Wlkowy, *nobilis iobagio castrensis* and his wife made last will about their land in front of Big (Magnus) Paul, comes and Nicolas, son of Demeter, *comes terrestris* of Križevci.⁵¹ Deseu, son of Ladislai of Blizna, sold his land in front of the chapter of Čazma in 1388, which was his inherited possession and laid in Rasina (Razyna) inter *nobiles castrenses castris Crisiensis*.⁵² Deseu was married with Chala, daughter of above-mentioned Demeter de genere of Matthew.⁵³

There were castrenses in Slavonia still in the 14th century, and their status was also more favorable in this period, than the status of the castle warriors. In 1360, a kindred of castle warriors from Turopolje was summoned before the *congregatio*

⁴⁷ *Diplomatarium*, 28 and DL. 38715.

⁴⁸ Bolla Ilona, *A jogilag egységes jobbágyságról Magyarországon* (Budapest: Nap Kiadó, 1998), 184.

⁴⁹ They could had serfes as the nobles. (e.g.: *Diplomatarium*, nr. 6.)

⁵⁰ Zsoldos, *A szent király*, 170–171.

⁵¹ 20 September 1356 (DF. 233160, *Diplomatarium*, nr. 9.)

⁵² 18 August 1388 (DL. 86212., Mályusz, *Zsigmondkori*, vol. I, 706).

⁵³ 25 March 1385 (DL. 100206, *Diplomatarium*, nr. 24.)

generalis, because somebody stated they were not *iobagiones castri*, but *castrenses*, thus they would have owned service to the castle of Želín (Lat. Selyn, Hung. Zselin). The accused demonstrated the documents to prove their status.⁵⁴

Above the sameness of the two groups (the [*nobiles*] *iobagiones castri* and the castle nobles) is certified. Was there any other reason for the changing? Did anything changed in the status of the groups besides the name? The status of the castle warriors was similar to other special types of conditional liberty owned by others, but it had some specific elements. In the scholarship are distinguished four of them: (1) military service (2) office holding (3) tax-paying (4) ownership of properties.⁵⁵ Was there any difference in the status of the two groups based on this four points?

1. *Military service*. Well-known that the castle warriors made military service, they were professionals.⁵⁶ Nicolas, son of Mika, belonged to the castle district Křiževci was ennobled because of his military merit in fights around Zadar in 1346.⁵⁷ King Sigismund exempted Valentine of Poljana and his brothers from the status of castle warriors (a *nexu seu iugi iobagionatus castrensis*) in 1411⁵⁸, but George, son of Demeter, from the same kindred is written as castle nobles in 1413.⁵⁹ George, son of Benk of Bogačevo (castle district Kalnik) is written castle nobles in 1368. Thomas, his son left his army in his last will for his sons.⁶⁰ Summarizing the military service was the part of status of the castle warriors and also of the castle nobles.⁶¹

⁵⁴ 19 November 1360 (Smičiklas, *Codex Diplomaticus*, vol. XIII, 64–65, nr. 51). The sons of Isan, castle warriors of Kalnik cited Tomas, son of Jacob, and his sons in front of the authority of Kalnik. The castellan and the comes terrestris of the castle district decided the parts had to take an oath with others. Son of Isan took it with *centum nobilibus castri et centrum quatráginta(!) ignobilibus signanter ad Minus Kemluk pertinentibus et quatuor viris discretis sacerdotibus*. The mentioned *ignobilibus* likely were the *castrenses*. (Smičiklas, *Codex Diplomaticus*, vol. XIV, 124–126, nr. 79).

⁵⁵ For the four characteristics of the castle warriors in Hungary (north to the river Drava) see: Zsoldos, *A szent király*, 46–89. The status of the castle warriors in castle district Křiževci see: B. Halász Éva, “A körösi várjobbágyok 13–15. században,” in Attila P. Kiss, Ferenc Piti, György Szabados, eds, *Középkortörténeti tanulmányok 7* (Szeged: Szegedi Középkorász Műhely, 2012), 313–323.

⁵⁶ Zsoldos, *A szent király*, 46–57. For Křiževci: B. Halász, “A körösi várjobbágyok,” 314–315.

⁵⁷ 6 July 1346 (Smičiklas, *Codex Diplomaticus*, vol. XI, 309–310, nr. 231).

⁵⁸ 8/15 December 1411, DF. 230922., notes: Mályusz, *Zsigmondkori*, vol. III, 3051.

⁵⁹ *Diplomatarium*, nr. 38.

⁶⁰ For George: 17 Jun 1368 (Smičiklas, *Codex Diplomaticus*, vol. XVII, 27–28, nr. 20). Last will of Thomas: 4 March 1420. DF. 252030 (Mályusz, *Zsigmondkori*, vol. VII, 1444.: *Item loncam meam meliorem cum pectorali inferiore ac galea Gregorio, alia arma omnia Valentino lego filiis meis*).

⁶¹ The same situation was in Turopolje. Nicolas of Odra declared in front of the comes terrestris

2. *The office-holding.* The castle warriors held the offices of the castle district. In the beginning *iobagio castri* was that one, who held an office and later they could leave this name to their descendants, what is to say to the whole social group. In Hungary north to the river Drava were several offices in the castle districts, which were unknown in Slavonia. These are the maior exercitus, the maior castri, the maior preconum, the decurio and the maior speculatorum.⁶² In Slavonia the offices of comes terrestris and the centurio were known.⁶³ Before the 15. century the comites terrestres were surely *iobagiones castri*, some of them before or after the office-holding appeared in the charters. But in the 15th century in castle district of Križevci the comites terrestres were chosen from the members of the ennobled families.⁶⁴ There are three known comites terrestres in Kalnik between 1400 and 1430. It is impossible to identify two of them (Laurence, son of Jacob and Thomas, son of George), because only their and their father's names are known. The third one, Kerser Stephen, son of Egidius of Rusinbrod, was praedialis of Zagreb. In this time the possessor of Castle of Veliki Kalnik was queen Barbara. John of Alben, later bishop of Zagreb was close relationship with her. Likely Stephen could hold the office in this way.⁶⁵ After the general ennoblement of the castle nobles of Kalnik the comites terrestres were elected from the members of the elevated families.⁶⁶ The list of the comites terrestres of Rovišće is not complete, but the known office holders were *iobagiones castri* or *nobiles castri* in the 14th and 15th centuries.

There are just few data about the centurio, likely their work was not necessary in those actions, which are written. The centurio of Križevci is mentioned only one time, and George (Gyurak), son of George, appeared only in this charter.⁶⁷ Altogether five centuriones are known from Kalnik: one from the 13th century and 4 from the 14 century. All of the them were castle warriors and

of Turopolje, that he can not fulfill his military and other services any more, because he is old (21 November 1493, Laszowski, *Monumenta historica*, vol. I. dok 87, 120–121).

⁶² For Hungary north to the river Drava see: Zsoldos, *A szent király*, 57–72.

⁶³ For Hungary north to the river Drava see: Ibid. 57–72. For Križevci: B. Halász, "A körösi várjobbágyok," 315–316.

⁶⁴ For the life of the comites terrestres of castle district Križevci see: *Diplomatarium*, 120–127.

⁶⁵ For the praediales status of Stephen: 20 February 1421 and 4 May 1423 (DF. 252387; Mályusz, *Zsigmondkori*, vol. VIII, 177; Ibid., vol. X, 521). The comites terrestres usually were elected by the other castle warriors or castle nobles. In this case the election was very likely formal.

⁶⁶ see: Éva B. Halász, "Archontolija Velikog Kalnika u srednjem vijeku," *Zbornik Odsjeka povijesne znanosti. Zavoda za povijesne i društvene znanosti Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 32 (2014): 27–38.

⁶⁷ *Diplomatarium*, 60. Likely his son was that Lawrence, who appeared in the charter of Peter, son of John, of Poljana comes terrestris in 1423 as neighbor possessor. (*Diplomatarium*, nr. 52.)

mentioned in the charters before and after their office. For example John, son of Martin was centurio in 1336 and 1343, and he asked the authority of the castle district to perambulate his possession in 1342.⁶⁸

The castle warriors actively participated in the administration of a noble county and this fact increased the gravity of their status. The comes himself was the head of the county and also the head of the castle district. The castle warriors held the offices of the castle district and that is why the comes easily could avail their service in the administration of the county. The castle warriors are mentioned as emissary of the comes or sometimes of the ban. The aforementioned Demeter de genere of Matthew was the emissary of Nicolas Hahót, Ban of Slavonia-Croatia in 1343, in the case between the castle warriors of Moravče and Nicolas of Ludbreg.⁶⁹ The work in the administration in the county assisted the castle warriors to believe themselves to be the part of the nobility.

3. *Tax-paying.* In one hand the castle warriors had to fulfill military service and in other hand they had to pay tax.⁷⁰ There are only sporadic data for the tax-paying in the Arpadian and Angevin periods, but the terms *datium* and *servitium* noted it also in this time.⁷¹ Lepsech, son of Ivan, son of Lubizlaus, declared in front of the authority of castle district Kalnik, that he got his relative Blaise, son of Ozul, as his adopted brother and donated half of his possession to him. After the donation Lepsech paid the half of the tax and Blaise the other half.⁷² The castle nobles of Križevci paid the tax by kindreds.⁷³ The exact amount of the tax and differences between the castle districts and the method of the tax paying are unknown.⁷⁴

⁶⁸ DF. 279533; *Anjou-oklt.*, vol. XXVI, 66.

⁶⁹ DF. 230386; Smičiklas, *Codex Diplomaticus*, vol. XI, 105–106, nr. 79). In 1366 a certain Stephen, son of Demetrius, is mentioned as *homo specialis* of the comes of Križevci (DL. 35867; Smičiklas, *Codex Diplomaticus*, vol. XIII, 533–534, nr. 387). It is possible that he is identical to Stephen, son of Demetrius, who was comes *terrestris* of Križevci in 1361 (*Diplomatarium*, nr. 10).

⁷⁰ For Hungary north to the river Drava see: Zsoldos, *A szent király*, 77–89. For Križevci see: B. Halász, “A körösi várjobbágyok,” 316–318. The tax-paying existed also in Turobolje: Nicolas Myhalewchy *vocatus de Odrazenthgergh iam senio proventus ... de porcionibus suis possessionariis infrascriptis ballare et alia servitia consueta exercere non posset et nec valeret* (21 November 1493 Laszowski, *Monumenta historica*, vol. I, 120–121, nr. 87).

⁷¹ The same terms were used for the tax-paying of the *praediales* of Zagreb (Iván Borsa, “A zágrábi püspökség prediálisai a XV század elején,” *Levélári Közlemények* 66, 1–2 (1995): 20).

⁷² 28 April 1355 (Smičiklas, *Codex Diplomaticus*, vol. XII, 289–290, nr. 218).

⁷³ In 1421 the *mardurina* was collected by two castle nobles in Križevci (DL. 35935; Mályusz, *Zsigmondkori*, vol. VIII, 937).

⁷⁴ The castle nobles of Ozalj had to pay *decimae* (DF. 256300; Mályusz, *Zsigmondkori*, vol. III, 1035).

4. *The ownership.* The status of the *iobagiones castr*i qualified them to own lands. They could sell, pawn, leave with last will their properties. This fact was a big difference between the status of the castle warriors and the status of the *castrenses*, because the latter were only users of the land, not the owners.⁷⁵ The owner of a possession with “castle warrior”- status had to pay tax, which was independent from the status of the owner. Therefore noblemen could own land belonged to the castle. If the noble owner did not want to pay tax any more, he had to ask to king to elevate the possession from the castle.⁷⁶ There are some example, when the owner sold his land, but he paid the tax after it, not the new possessor.⁷⁷ The castle nobles were also owner of their possessions in the 15th century, they could also sell, pawn, leave with last will their properties.⁷⁸

The status of the castle warriors and the status castle nobles show bigger difference only in one point: in the question of the office-holding. The castle warriors could be office-holders, they held the office of the castle district. But in the case of the castle nobles, the office-holding is not evident. In castle district of Križevci the members of the earlier ennobled families were the *comites terrestres*, in Kalnik in the 15th century Stephan Kersser, a *praedialis* of Zagreb held the position for long time.

What did the nobility of Slavonia think about the status of the castle warriors and the status of the castle nobles?

Likely the nobility of Slavonia held the status of the castle warriors and castle nobles equal or almost equal with their position. When Matthew, Ban of Slavonia held *generalis congregatio* in 1273 the nobles and the castle warriors

⁷⁵ For Hungary north to the river Drava see: Zsoldos, *A szent király*, 90–101. The king sometimes donated the land of castle warrior, who died without any descendant. E.g.: King Ladislaw IV donated the property of Wlk, son of Donrolych castle warrior of Zagreb to Timot, bishop of Zagreb. (Smičiklas, *Codex Diplomaticus*, vol. VI, 211–214, nr. 186; *Reg. Arp.*, 2769.) Béla, dux Sclavonie-Croatie confirmed the donation of the possessio of Bolesk, *iobagio castr*i Kemluk, who died without any descendants, to Thomas, *specialis notarius* of King Béla IV. (Smičiklas, *Codex Diplomaticus*, vol. V, 478–479, nr. 943). In 1326, after the donation of the possessions of the *castrenses* of Moravče, the new owner, Nicolas of Ludbreg and the castle warriors of Moravče divided the territory. In the part of Nicolas of Ludbreg all the possessions of the *castrenses* and castle warriors belonged to him, but in the part of the castle warriors all possessions of the *castrenses* belonged to them. The *castrenses* had no rights to their land. They were only users (see footnote 5).

⁷⁶ Michael of Raven noble had possessions belonged to the castle. He asked the king to ennoble them. (DF. 231098 and 231099). There are some examples from Szepes for the different status of the land and its owner. (Attila Zsoldos, “Nemes, szepesi nemes, aranyadó (Jogállás és birtokjog, mint lehetőség és eszköz),” *Történelmi Szemle* LI, 3 (2009): 419–429. 422.

⁷⁷ *Diplomatarium*, nr. 42.

⁷⁸ e.g.: *Ibid.*, 38, 42, 47, etc.

asked together the ban to confirm their rights and duties.⁷⁹ In 1352, again in the general meeting the castle warriors of Kalnik asked the ban to issue charters about their oak. They stated their oak equal with the oak of the nobles. After asking the gathered nobles the ban issued privilege to the castle warriors and confirmed their statement.⁸⁰ The castle warriors took part in estimation of possessions and were witness as the nobles.⁸¹

In the everyday life the wealth meant the bigger difference, not the status. The lifestyle of the lesser nobles and the castle warriors (and castle nobles) could be similar. That is why, the marriage between nobles and castle warriors were common phenomena. Demeter, member of Matthew kindred (castle district Križevci) married with the daughter of Budor of Budroc in the first part of the 14th century, likely in the 1310's.⁸² Stephan, son of Isan de Isanovc (castle district Kalnik), got married with daughter of Stephan of Jalsovec, who is written *nobilis domina* in 1396.⁸³ Their descendants were not nobles of the Kingdom automatically, but they were castle warriors/ nobles like their fathers.⁸⁴

Although the status of the castle warriors were not qualify them to hold lands in the second half of the 14th century in Hungary north to the river Drava⁸⁵, there was no any case about their status in Slavonia, in which the plaintiff wanted to get the possession of a castle warrior.

The term (*nobilis*) *iobagio castri* was changed by the term *nobilis castri* in the second half of the 14th century, but the two groups were the same. But it occurred, where the castle warriors existed, where the castle district also existed, in where the special rights and duties of the castle warriors could be interpreted. There was not any castle nobles for example in Moravče, while the

⁷⁹ *in congregatione regni totius Sclavonie generali nobiles et iobagiones castrorum hec iura regni et banatus infrascripta redacta in scriptis nobis exhibuerunt* (19 April 1273 Smičiklas, *Codex Diplomaticus*, vol. VI, 25–28, nr. 26).

⁸⁰ 18 November 1352 (DF. 268253; Smičiklas, *Codex Diplomaticus*, vol. XII, 138, nr. 96).

⁸¹ In the beginning of the 15th century the nobles and the castle nobles were written together, without any differentiation in the list of the gathered people, who took an oath (Mályusz, *Zsigmondkori*, vol. III, 2796).

⁸² The wife likely was Dorothea. For the family tree see: Géza Pálffy, "Egy szlavóniai köznemesi família két ország szolgálatában: a budróci Budor család a XV–XVIII. században," *Hadtörténelmi Közlemények* 115, 4 (2002): 923–1007). The *quarta puellaris* of the wife of Demeter was paid for her sons and grandsons: 3 August 1378 (Smičiklas, *Codex Diplomaticus*, vol. X, 397, nr. 287) and 21 Jun 1380 (Ibid., vol. XVI, 106, nr. 97).

⁸³ 2 May 1396 (DF. 230742, Smičiklas, *Codex Diplomaticus*, vol. XVIII, 116–117, nr. 80).

⁸⁴ When a *nobilis domina* married with an *ignobilis*, their descendants became nobles after thier mother's status. But in Hungary north to the river Drava the *ignobilis* husband is noted sometimes in the charters e.g. *post uxorem nobilis* or other forms. (Erik Fügedi, *The Elefánthy. The Hungarian Nobleman and his Kindred* (CEU Press: Budapest, 1998), 45–49).

⁸⁵ Bolla, *A jogilag egységes*, 182–186.

castle district of Moravče disappeared and the castle warriors of it became nobles or serfs.⁸⁶ Despite the change of the status' name, the castle nobles wanted to become noble of the country.⁸⁷ The constant royal tenure gave the chance to the castle warriors/nobles to deserve the grace of the king personally or in group and be nobles.⁸⁸ The castle warriors of Rovišće lost this chance in 1393, when King Sigismund donated the land to the Ders family. The fight between the castle warriors and the possessor family lasted at approximately 30 years. King Sigismund finished it and obliged the Ders family to avow the special status of the castle warriors, and the castle warriors to avow the Ders family as their dominus. But the castle warriors became praediales of the noble family, not castle nobles like the others in Križevci and Kalnik.

The castle nobles of Kalnik appeared in the charters after 1430. What was the reason of it, while the king ennobled all of the castle warriors of Kalnik (and Križevci) in 1430? The castle district could exist after the exemption, while the lands, which were owned by nobles, were not exempted automatically. The comes terrestris had jurisdiction over those possessions, till the king did not elevated it for the request of the owner.⁸⁹ The castle district of Kalnik existed much longer, as also castle warriors, who had to fulfill services to the castle. In some cases the family, whose members are written after 1430 as castle nobles, had be before 1430 also castle noble families. King Matthias I warned the nobles around Kalnik with only one sessio to fulfill their services to the castle.⁹⁰ Some

⁸⁶ King Louis I and prince Stephan ennobled castle warriors of Moravče in the 1350's (King: 1352 DL. 100415; prince: 22 Marc 1354 (Smičiklas, *Codex Diplomaticus*, vol. XII, 238–240. (nr. 181.) The descendents of the ennobled castle warriors of Moravče appeared often in the charters. (e.g.: Jacob, son of Wechezlau and his sons: 17 August 1335 (*Codex Diplomaticus*, vol. X, 232, nr. 166); *Anjou-oklt.*, vol. XIX, 514); 11 March 1339 (DF. 218550; *Anjou-oklt.*, vol. XXIII, 124); 26 October 1343 (DF. 230385; *Anjou-oklt.*, vol. XXVII, 23), 27. October 1343 (DF. 230386; *Anjou-oklt.*, vol. XXVII, 24); 22 December 1352 (Smičiklas, *Codex Diplomaticus*, vol. XII, 141–142, nr. 100); 20 June 1360 (Smičiklas, *Codex Diplomaticus*, vol. XIII, 33–34, nr. 24); DL. 33368).

⁸⁷ This endeavor was usual in the whole history of them. For example King Andrew III exempted sons of Chuetchk from the jurisdiction of castle of Podgorje (*Reg. Arp.*, nr. 4000).

⁸⁸ King Sigismund ennobled castle warriors of Kalnik and Križevci generally in 1430 (DF. 231254) For the earlier exemptions in castle district of Križevci see: Éva B. Halász, "A körösi várjobbágyok útja a nemességbe," in Tóber Márta and Maléth Ágnes eds, *Középkortörténeti tanulmányok 8* (Szeged 2015), 61–67. In Turopolje the development went in other way, the castle warriors wanted to made community and held the charter of Nicolas, Ban of Slavonia issued in 1278 their privilege.

⁸⁹ The last charter of the comites terrestres of Križevci was issued in 1439, likely shortly after it the castle county eliminated. (*Diplomatarium*, nr. 65.) For the exemption of the possessions see the example of Michael of Raven. (DF. 231098 and 231099.)

⁹⁰ Bolla, *A jogilag egységes*, 185. *universi et singuli nobiles unius sessionis in pertinentiis castri*

elevated families grievanced about Andrew Both force them to fulfill services to the castle and litigated him.⁹¹ Probably besides the ennoblement the poorer nobles undertook the service of the castle and the castle offered them some protection. Their history after 1430 will be disclosed in an other paper.⁹²

IOBAGIO CASTRI – NOBILIS CASTRI – NOBILIS REGNI.
IOBAGI DE CETATE, NOBILI AI CETĂȚII, NOBILIME. EVOLUȚIA
UNEI PĂTURI SOCIALE IN COMITATUL KRIŽEVCI

Rezumat

În epoca Arpadiană, societatea din regatul Ungariei a fost divizată în mai multe grupuri. Fiecare grup avea propriul său statut, ceea ce înseamnă că fiecare grup deținea un sistem complex de obligații și drepturi, specifice exclusiv grupului respectiv. Unul dintre acestea a fost statutul iobagilor de cetate (*iobagiones castri*). Pe de o parte, aceștia aveau mai puțină libertate decât nobilii, dar, pe de altă parte, aveau mai puține obligații decât stările numite *castrenses*. Diversitatea socială dispare până în secolul al XIV-lea și diviziunea se reduce la două mari grupuri: nobili și iobagi. În Slavonia însă, iobagii de cetate sunt menționați în documente și în secolul al XIV-lea. În secolul următor apare un nou termen în documente – nobili ai cetății (*nobiles castri*) – și, în paralel, sintagma *iobagiones castri* dispare. Studiul de față analizează și compară caracteristicile celor două straturi sociale și ilustrează evoluția unui grup social distinct, prin similitudini și diferențieri.

nostris Kemlek constituti et commorantes (DF. 233345). For the lesser nobility (Hung. *egytelkes*) generally see: Tibor Neumann, "Egytelkes nemes". Egy középkori fogalom magyarázatához," *Történelmi Szemle* LIV, 2 (2012): 337–345.

⁹¹ DL. 3768.

⁹² After 1430 among the castle nobles of Kalnik started the formation of a noble community, but is never reached the level of the noble community of Turopolje. In the charters they named themselves in the 16th century as nobiles, who live around the castle of Kalnik (e.g. DL. 104225). The noble community of Turopolje could hold their liberty till 1874, Laszowski, *Plemenita opcina*; Péter Rokay, "A Túrmezei kerület," in Radics Kálmán ed. *Vármegyék és szabad kerületek I–II. Hajdú-Bihar Megyei Levéltár közleményei*, (Debrecen, 2001) 307.