

PRICE OF HUMAN RESOURCE IN TRANSYLVANIA DURING THE 16TH–17TH CENTURIES*

Livia Magina**

Keywords: estate, serfs/bonds, prices, Transylvania, 16th–17th centuries

Cuvinte cheie: domeniul, iobagi, prețuri, Transilvania, secolele XVI–XVII

A large palette of subjects that might belong to social or economic history or even to anthropology have begun for different reasons a kind of somehow solved problems and have remained by so untouched; transaction of goods on a nobiliary estate, surety, power relations or kinship are only a part of them. Focusing on the Principality of Transylvania, the present writing aims to point out just the question of transactions on nobiliary estates. Enough references on such transactions have been preserved and that's why I use at adventure (from territorial and chronological point of view) samples bellow, so that the phenomenon may be illustrated in its whole complexity.

Peasantry, a collective character in the social history analyses, is simultaneously a key stone in the economic history of the Principality, as being the human capital of every land estate. Peasant, as the human resource of a nobiliary or princely estate, is the main contributor to his lord's wealth and his estate improvement during the 16th–17th century in Transylvania. The social relations during these centuries belong to so-called "second serfdom"¹, set namely on the society vertical axis. Only a random joint is the term in Transylvania as the social relations redefining after 1514 was a prolonged and partly aggravated

* This study has benefited from the financial support offered by the grant CNCS-UEFISCDI, PNII-ID-PCE-2012-4-0579.

** The Museum of the Highland Banat Reșița, bd. Republicii, no. 10, e-mail: liviamagina@yahoo.com

¹ *Second serfdom* or manorialism (feudalism) are the accepted terms to define this time from social and economic point of view in Central and Easter Europe; see: T. K. Dennison, Sheilagh Ogilvie, "Serfdom and social capital in Bohemia and Russia," *Economic History Review* 60, no. 3 (2007): 513–544; for the Hungarian area, see: Zimányi Vera, *Economy and Society in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Hungary (1526–1650)*, translated by Mátyás Esterházy (Budapest, 1987).

shape of the former situation. Given David Prodan's extremely influent opinion the fact was also emphasized in the Romanian historiography during the past century.²

If the goods value/ price seems easily enough to be set considering a series of elements supposed to belong to economy or juncture at that time, or also to a personal situation, namely the own estimation of prices, how easy is to set the price of a human being? How could a lord estimate his serf's life? It is the question on which we have few references yet. May we speak about a market settlement, where the bond's price depends on the buyer, or, simply, about totally autonomous transactions? Even if peasantry was the social capital of an estate and the key stone of its economic development, the documents of transaction seem to show through their large number that the landlords separated easily from their serfs. On the other hand, there is a question on the profit a landlord had after a servant selling. To what extend the labour selling might bring a financial profit or an advantage in selling/ pledging? Were those transactions only under the circumstances of certain pressing pecuniary needs? All the above questions are more or less related to the estate economy development, regularly under external elements and juncture influence, and might have an answer in so far as cases and samples from the whole Transylvania joint in outlining up a specific outlook regarding the human resource transaction on the nobiliary estates. The situation of peasantry in Transylvania is not very different in the main from that one of the serfs a century before. Even if we generally take into consideration the landlords and, more important, speak from their point of view, the serfs' number, respectively, the peasants' one was dominant. Beginning with the 16th century first decades, thousands of inhabitants there were frequently registered under the name of *jobbagiones/jobbagyok*, together with their families, goods and obligations to their masters. According to the *urbaria* of the time we may estimate that the demographic development in Transylvania was a positive one from the end of the 16th century up to the beginning of the 18th one, in spite of wars, famine, and epidemics or poor yields after natural calamities (floods, dryness, and locusts' invasions)³ that afflicted Transylvania similarly to whole Europe. Considering that the population main part lived in the rural settlements and worked there with cattle or manually, and had to pay rents, debts and other obligations according to the local custom, it seems that the serfs' transaction is a direct result of the lack of liquidities.

² David Prodan, *Iobăgia în Transilvania în secolul al XVI-lea*, vol. I-II (București, 1967); Prodan *Iobăgia în Transilvania în secolul al XVII-lea*, vol. I-II (București, 1986).

³ See a very specific synthesis for the 17th and 18th centuries at: Paul Cernovodeanu, Paul Binder, *Cavalerii Apocalipsului. Calamitățile naturale din trecutul României (până la 1800)* (București, 1993).

Given the economic and juridical specific treasures it refers to, the bond's definition as resulting from the law formula of Stephan Werbőczy's *Tripartitum*, after Gheorghe Doja's movement, might be taken for a meaningful one for that time outlook the definition in Part III, Chapter 25, *Station and laws of the peasant we call bond*, focused on three elements: ethnic, religious, and economic/ juridical stations. From the ethnic point of view villains may be Magyars, Saxons or Germans, Czech or Slavs of Christian confession. Others are Romanians and old Ukrainians, and some are Rascians or Serbians and Bulgarians who follow the Greek errors. There are also certain Cumans on the king's lands, who are Christians too.⁴ Juridically, according to Chapter 27, Art 1⁵, any serf or villain without a property can redeem through his oath only a forint and nothing more; he wouldn't absolve or convict anyone due to such an amount. So, the peasant who possessed a plot of land, no matter his confession or ethnic origin, is a serf as long as he is owed to his lord of manor and is bound to him. His juridical situation became manifest with his death as he could bequeath his goods to his sons and to his wife (a third part) if need be.

During the time we've taken into consideration, we might identify a series of factors that integrally influenced the economy of estates and the price of manpower inside an estate. The lands wasting in the second half of the 17th century that lead to the population decreasing, had a positive result in what concerned the bonds' appreciation and their price. Not all the serfs jointed such a social position due to their parents' juridical position. There were situations in the 17th century of peasants who preferred the bondage to an uncertain juridical liberty they had got. They seemed to have secured so their future life at least. Such situations of free men who jointed bondage of their own will might make us to reconsider the social relations in the autonomous Principality of Transylvania. *Providus* Ioan Nagy offers such a history as he *se se in jobbagionem obstringit* in 1622. George Horvát of Szeplak was to become his master. Following their contract, Ioan Nagy had to give to his lord, for his plot of land, a certain amount of grains, eggs, cattle, and hay.⁶ *Jointing* the bondage was a usual practice all along the Transylvanian territory from various reasons, but the documents noted the villain's free will. Of his own free will, for instance, due to his hard life at Batanii Mici (seat of Odorhei), county of Covasna, a villain named Stefan

⁴ Stephen Werbőczy, *The Customary law of the Renowned Kingdom of Hungary: A Work in Three Parts (Tripartitum)*, eds & trans. by János M. Bak, Péter Banyó & Martyn Rady (Idyllwild, CA, & Budapest, 2005) (further DRMH 5), 405.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 413.

⁶ Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár Országos Levéltára hereafter: MNL OL), F 2 Protocolla, vol. II, f. 380.

Olah, also known as Kerekes, jointed the bondage at Mihai Daniel.⁷ In 1664, of his own accord, he gave his wife together with her son (13 years old) to the brickmaker in Fagaras and passed from prince Gabriel Bethlen's estate to that one of Francisc Daniel. Mihail Farkas together with his family became a bond of Francisc Gabor who had promised him a dwelling.⁸

Selling/ buying and pledging were the two well known ways to deal a serf. Obviously, we have in view the rural world that was owned by a prince, a nobleman or by an urban community. Only the free villages are out of that phenomenon, not the free men who could change their social position at any time, under unfavorable circumstances usually. Frequently but not necessarily, the references noted if the serf is sold/ pledged together or not with his plot of land, together or not with his children, or if the new social relation between this one and his lord is a hereditary one or the bondage lasts only up the bond's death. Redemption is another economic formula that refers to the human resource's value. This one might influence the estate economy, similarly to usual transactions, even if it is a specific one and hard to joint a phenomenon. Economically, a general observation is to be noted: for default of liquidities, any other of the owned goods could save the situation. A reason of that poorness of money might be, within the first half of the 17th century at least, the mints reduced activity.⁹ References to an unhappy moment in the life of the one who sells or pledges, namely the owner, were recorded in various suggestive formulas. Two of the frequent formulas are: given an emergency/ to avoid a problem. In 1510, for instance, Francisc from Haranglab (Haranglabi Francisc) pledged three of his bonds in Gaiesti (*Galfalva*), county of Mures, together with their descendants. The receiver was Grigore Apafi (and his descendants) in change of 45 forints he lent to him.¹⁰ So an average price of a serf's family, together with its successors, was of 15 forints. Four years after, a new case of pledging is registered without a specified reason. Another bond from Haranglab (county of Mures) is pledged in 1514 for 20 forints, but there is no data if he was pledged alone ore together with his family.¹¹ We might say that the price advanced with 5 forints within four years. Pledge descended frequently from father to sons. In 1560, Melchior Balogh prolonged a pledge for *unam quadam sessionem jobba-*

⁷ Prodan, *Iobăgia în XVII*, II, 470.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Florin Ciulavu, "Contribuții privind criza monetară din Transilvania în primele trei decenii ale secolului al XVII-lea și reforma monetară a lui Gabriel Bethlen," *Studii și comunicări de numismatică* XVI (2013): 127–143.

¹⁰ Biblioteca Academiei Române, filiala Cluj, fond Fototeca Documente, FT 175 (further: BAC, FT).

¹¹ BAC, FT 176.

gionalem populosam in the village of Hadreu, county of Turda. That plot of land had been pledged to the deceased Petru Gherendi and descended to George, Petru's son, in 1560.¹² By the end of the century, in 1599, May, Ioan Bekes increased with 6 forints the amount that his mother, widow of Ludovic Bekes, had borrowed through pledging two bonds to Nicolae Apafi's widow; after, he added 8 forints more.¹³ We do not have any information on the initial price of that pledge between the two widows, but the same ones signed in March 1599, for 60 forints, a document concerning the pledge of two serfs from Dej (Mures County).¹⁴ A substantial increasing might be noted, of 10 forints/ bond. Less than 10 years after, in 1608, we find a reference on a price of 50 forints for a pledge of 2 bonds, in Craiva (*Kiralypataca*, county of Cluj), county of Alba¹⁵, and that means an average price of 25 forints/ a bond. Nicolae Gaman pledged, in 1608, to Ioan Lugassi, for 150 forints, some wastes at Bintint, with deteriorated houses that had belonged to eight bonds *valachici generis*.¹⁶ We might note that the price of a waste land is lower than that of an inhabited one. Eva Dósza (county of Alba), widow of the one called Mihalcz pledged in 1660 a bond to Mihai Mihalcz (a relative, probably) for 88 forints she had borrowed from that one.¹⁷ A new consistent increasing of the price is to be noted, of 10 forints/ serf at least, if we take into consideration the largest price, of 30 forints, at the end of the 16th century. In 1664, Matei Bálogh received from prince Mihail Apafi for his diplomatic services, 3 bonds and a bond's widow from Gligoresti and Casva (Mures County), all of them for 50 thalers. Two years later, the same Bálogh received for a pledge a named Laurentiu Dumbrava from Hodac (Mures County), for 40 forints, even if at the pledge time, that one had made his escape from the estate.¹⁸ A question rises from that case: would it have been Laurentiu Dumbrava's land of plot the pledge subject or they were sure on his bringing back? Prine Mihail Apafi pledged also, in 1669, to Ioan Dioszegi at Galfalva, two of his bonds (Ion and Oprea Stanciu) escaped from his estate at Porumbacu, for 60 forints¹⁹; two other escaped serfs and their families were pledged by the same prince to Petru Ciszar from Ulies (Cluj County), for 200 forints.²⁰ According to a contract signed in 1607, Margareta Machiasdi, wife of Ioan Nagy from Ilieni

¹² MNL OL, F 4 Cista comitatus, Thorda, fasc. I, no. 26.

¹³ BAC, FT 180.

¹⁴ BAC, FT 179.

¹⁵ BAC, FT 49.

¹⁶ MNL OL, F 2 Protocolla, vol. II, f. 191.

¹⁷ Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyesület, Kézirattár, A hilibi Gál család levéltára (The Transylvanian Museum Association, manuscripts, Gáls' Archive (further: EME, Hilibi cs.), fasc. VII, no. 4.

¹⁸ Prodan, *Iobăgia în XVII*, vol. II, 471.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 474.

²⁰ *Ibid.*

(Mures County), pledged her bond Andrei Nagy from Ilieni together with his wife and cattle, for the tiny amount of 5 forints²¹, an exception related to the time prices, the average price being of 25 as we have already seen forints. Another credit, another pledge, another master. Matei Vicszey, a juryman of the city of Cluj in 1608, pledged to Sofia, *filia egregii quondam Vitalis Olchardy, seminis de Kovachy*, a bond called Mihai Herman, *providi valachi*, for 40 forints to pay a credit he had than.²²

Wills are specific documents to refer to pledges, to debts in fact. There were noted besides buildings and gold objects, pledges of bonds. From the many possible examples, the case of a named George Myske is to be put in light. Georghe Myske from Cisteiu de Mures (*Magyarchyzthwen*), on his deathbed, wrote in his will by the end of 1583 about his debts, one of them being of 50 forints he had borrowed from Kano Matei; in change, he had given to that one two of his bonds, Ioan Gewkeo and Ioan Geslia.²³ We might note that the pledged goods were always liable to be recuperated, so the prices of transactions were temporary estimations and by this they could reflect only a partial and momentary reality.

As for serfs selling or buying, it means, for the lord of manor, that by selling a possession or what he owns, he sells both the natural and the human resources. But there were not a few situations of selling only the land when people had left it either sent away by different conflicts or disappeared through disinheritance. But also it must have existed situations of selling only people to repopulate the wastes. Those wastes were the plots of land where no bond lived there to work them, while the populate ones had their human inventory. Obviously, the price differs between the two categories, as the populated plots had their own capacity to yield while the wastes need investments in bringing there the necessary workers. But the reasons of selling seem to be the same as those of pledging: lack of liquidities, an emergency, or covering of a loan. Gabriel Sombory of Sombor sold to Stefan Thurku alias Zekly, in 1609, Paul Orbán's plot, a bond who had lived there, at Luncani (*Felseogerend*, comitat of Turda), county of Cluj, for 18 forints.²⁴ Comparatively, a nobiliary waste plot of land from Cubulcut (*Keobeolkwth*, county of Cluj), Bihor County, was sold in the same year, with 114 *florenos hungaricales*.²⁵ At Sarateni (*Varaggia*, county

²¹ *Torda vármegye jegyzőkönyvei 1607–1658* (The Protocols of Turda County), vol. I, ed. Dáné Veronka, (Cluj-Napoca, 2009), 37.

²² MNL OL, F 15, vol. XIII, f. 102.

²³ *Az Erdélyi fejedelmek királyi könyvei* (Royal Books of the Transylvanian Princes, hereafter: *Az Erdélyi fejedelmek*), vol. II, 1569–1581, ed. Fejér Tamás, Rácz Etelka, Szász Anikó (Cluj, 2005), 142, doc. 412.

²⁴ MNL OL, F15, vol. XIII, f. 75.

²⁵ MNL OL, F 15, vol. XIII, f. 72.

of Alba), Mures County today, was sold with 50 forints in 1609²⁶, while Stefan Valko of Valcay bought in the same year, a populated plot of land in Săcuieu possession (*Zekelyo*, district of Călata), Cluj County, with 70 forints (*septuaginta hungaricis florenos*).²⁷ In 1585 Ambrus Feyervary from Simonesti declared he had got 20 forints from the juryman of Bistrita City, Gaspar Budaki, for two bonds: Valentin Tucz from Viisoara and Andrei Redler from Sigmir²⁸, namely 10 forints/ a bond. Eight years later, in 1593, Stefan Szentmiklosi sold Savu Lucaciu and his mother as bonds of the town of Dej for ever and it would have been of interest to compare the prices, but the last one wasn't noted, maybe for the clerk's negligence.²⁹ In 1599, Petru Supa sold his serf Opra Toplita from Izvoarele (*Lenczina*), county of Hunedoara, for 12 forints.³⁰ Stefan Kendi sold at his turn, in 1607, his bond Petru Budatan from Sangeorzul Roman (Bistrita) to the city of Bistrita, for 80 forints, in the year that a pledge was of 25 / a bond. A year later, Stefan Kendi played again for a seller. It was bond Simion Doine who was sold for a piece of fabric (named *carazie*)³¹, an enough expensive piece, undoubtedly, to justify such a deal. In 1608, Barbara Vezzeodi *jobbagionem unum vendit Martino Kapronczay* the last one being the manager of the princely court at that time. Bond Ioan Katona *volachum* from the possession of Coslariu (*Koslar*), county of Alba, *olim domum residentialem habente*, together with his present children and the future ones, with his mobile and immobile goods, was sold for 40 forints.³² A serious reduction comparatively to the amount of 80 forints that Stefan Kendi had received in noted in a document of 1611, when Andrei Dozsa bought from Paul Kereztesy, a serf called Albert Pál from Ghindari (*Makfalva*), together with his wife, children, and cattle at a price of only 10 forints.³³ In 1643 for plots belonging to some bonds were sold at Henig (*Henningfalva*, comitat of Alba), a village in the county of Alba, *simulcum uxoribus liberis bonisque suis mobilibus pariter et immobilibus*. Three of the four inhabitants (Stan Muntian, Dragumer Muntian, and Amberisia) "were delivered together" for 130 forints. The fourth plot of land where Sztan Birtha was living was bought with 40 forints *pridem jobbagionum in quadraginta florenis*.³⁴ That Sztan Birtha was the judge of the village of Henig, but his price was lower than that one of the other villains.

²⁶ MNL OL, F 2 Protocolla, vol. II, f. 223.

²⁷ MNL OL, F15, vol. XIII, f. 67.

²⁸ Serviciul Județean al Arhivelor Naționale Cluj, fond Primăria orașului Bistrița, no. 5345.

²⁹ Andrei Veress, *Documente privitoare la istoria Ardealului, Moldovei și Țării Românești*, vol. IV, (București, 1932), 12.

³⁰ MNL OL, F 2 Protocolla, vol. II, f. 43.

³¹ Veress, *Documente*, VIII (București, 1935), 38–39.

³² MNL OL, F 2 Protocolla, vol. II, f. 152.

³³ EME, Hilibi cs, fasc. IV, no. 23.

³⁴ MNL OL, F2 Protocolla, vol. IX, f. 34 v.

Was it a question related to the plot size or to the number of family's members? Hard to say at this time of researching! By the end of the century, in 1690, in the same area of Mures seat, Stefan Donáth sold a bond named Emeric Benkö to Toma Dosa for 51 forints.³⁵ Within the same limit of 50 forints was a deal of 1699 when two noblemen, Petru and Stefan Lukács from Danesci (seat of Ciuc), county of Harghita, sold Balász Biró, an escaped serf, to Nicolae Mihalcz of Turla and his wife, Barbara Sándor, for 8 proved Kremnitz ducats which were equivalent to 40 forints (Hungarian florins) at that time.³⁶

Similar deals are attested also in Walachia with freeholders sold to bondage or with sale and purchase of serfs and slaves. Even if beginning with the 16th century we might find such samples, the price in the area is documented only beginning with 1540. Slaves at an apparently constant price (1,000 akçes about) and serfs were for sale, the last ones with an increasing price within half a century, from 450 akçes in the middle of the 16th century, to 2,400 akçes at the end of it.³⁷ We have not yet a similar global approaching on Transylvania to let us know the human resources' prices fluctuation. Given the currency devaluating and also the cost of living increasing certainly the serfs' price had an ascending line with certain variations to be found in private situations or the events of the time.

Related to political and husbandry circumstances, there was another way to valorize the human resource of an estate: bondage redemption. The main reason was probably the same as in the case of pledging, namely the lord's lack of liquidities. Not so numerous as the ones of pledging or selling, those cases may be self-explanatory. The amounts to pay back the bondage had to contain also the bonds' debts. In 1581 three serfs from Ticusu (*Tywkos*), Brasov County succeeded to be redeemed from Retheny Francisc for different amounts: Gál Adam paid back 60 forints, Herman Grigore, 56, and Hermany Adám, only 40 forints.³⁸ Ladislau Pap from Mociu paid back 200 forints in 1590, from which 150 for his debt as a serf and 50 for the house he had lived in. In fact, his master Ioan Kemény had to pay a credit to Ioan Hoszu, and it was the way to obtain the necessary money.³⁹ For 100 forints paid back, 50 for each one, brothers Nicolae and Petru Peica from Marga, Caras-Severin County, were redeemed in 1617 from their lord Iacob of Marga.⁴⁰ Their new situation was certified a

³⁵ EME, Hilibi cs., fasc. III, no. 47.

³⁶ *Székely Oklevéltár*, vol. VII, ed. Szádeczky Lajos (Kolozsvár, 1898), 39.

³⁷ Damaschin Mioc, "Prețurile din Țara Românească în secolele XV–XVI și dinamica lor," *Revista de Istorie* 33 (1980): 317–325.

³⁸ *Az Erdély fejedelmek*, 79, doc. 143.

³⁹ MNL OL, F15, vol. XI, f. 314v.–315r.

⁴⁰ MNL OL, F1, vol. XII, f. 65–66.

year later by prince Gabriel Bethlen, following Iacob of Marga's proposal. Toma Oprea from Rapa de Sus was also redeemed for 40 forints, a fact that is noted in Hunedoara urbarium on 1648.⁴¹ Even if their lord set them at liberty, he might require that such a release be made on some stipulations generally related to the bonds' handicraft. It is the case of Anton Kovács in Aiud, who paid back 100 forints (*szaz magyari forintert*), in 1653, to his former master, Petru Henter, but annually he had to give him 25 horseshoes.⁴² A similar situation was registered for Matei Varga from Rapolt (Hunedoara County), Varga Toma's son, paid back to his master George Macicas, 62 forints: 28 forints as the equivalent value of some dressed leathers, and 34 forints in ready-money. Prince Gabriel Bethlen certified his redemption in 1698, 9 years after that paying back!⁴³ Another case: Andrei Buda, a serf living at Manarau (Hunedoara) required Nicolae Solyomi to set him at liberty in 1662. For 40 forints he was redeemed, and was registered among the mounted freeholders.⁴⁴ Romanian priest represent a special category. According to the law they were free from certain taxes; having been redeemed, especially if living in areas with Reformed population, they got off paying the taxes to predicator, while the Reformed people did. Romanian priests were registered in urbaria either in the serfs' lists or in autonomous lists. But they originated in that mass of bondmen. As the Orthodox confession didn't belong to the recognized confessions, the Orthodox priests didn't receive privileges. A self-evident case is this of priest Stefan from Tilisca. In 1667 he was redeemed together with his three sons, paying back to Ioan Belpataki 115 forints⁴⁵, at an average price of 28 forints/ any member of the family.

In an economic context, represented through prices means in Transylvania of the 16th–17th centuries, the value of the human resources seems to follow an ascending line either in the temporary formula of pledging or in the definitive one, of bonds selling with their plots of land or *in persona*. The two dealing formulas show a real increasing, from 20 forints/ a serf at the beginning of the time we refer to, to over 80 forints/ a serf by the end of it, if we speak about pledges. It is also visible the selling price increasing during the 17th century, from 10 forints/ a serf to 80 forints. The recorded prices represent on the other hand a specific treasure related to the place and moment the deals were made. Probably, prices were influenced by political and economic factors, and not least, by natural calamities. Was a bond's sale profitable for his lord? It would be hard to say, as long as we do not know exactly the reason of such a deal and the

⁴¹ Prodan, *Iobăgia în XVII*, I, 486.

⁴² MNL OL, F2 Protocolla, XII/2, f. 88.

⁴³ MNL OL, F 1, vol. XVII, f. 64–65.

⁴⁴ Prodan, *Iobăgia în XVII*, I, 96.

⁴⁵ Veress, *Documente*, XI (București, 1939), 79–80.

accountancy of many Transylvanian estates. But it is a sure fact that, by pledging or selling his bonds, the lord succeeded to cover various debts in less favorable moments. He, the serf is an appreciated good within the limits of the time rules, but not so appreciated as a pearl necklace or a cloth of *carazie!*

ANNEXES

1

MNL OL, F 15 Protocolla, Librii regii et Styliionaria, vol. XI, f. 314v–315r.
the 28th of December 1590, Cluj-Mănăştur

Nos, requisitores literarum et literalium instrumentorum in sacristia sive conservatorio Conventus Monasterii Beatae Mariae Virginis de Colosmonstra repositarum ac quarumlibet iudiciariarum deliberationum legitimorumque mandatorum Illustrissimum Principis Transsylvaniae executores, memoriae commendamus tenore presentium significantes, quibus expedit universis, quod egregio Ioanne Kemeny, filio condam egregii Francisci Kemeny de Gyereomonstra ab una parte si quidem, ex altera circumspecto Ioanne Hozzw Colosvariensis coram nobis personaliter constitutis, idem Ioannes Kemeny oraculo vivae vocis spontaneaue sua voluntate fassus est et retulitque in hunc modum, quod annis superioribus vivente adhuc et inhumanis agente quondam generosa domina Elizabet Zentpaly, primum dicti Francisci Kemeny de inde vero Pauli Chyereny de Balasfalva postremo vero Georgi Ombozy de Zowat quondam egregiorum relicta videlicet genitricae eiusdem Ioannis Kemeny tam ipsam dominam Elizabeth maiore ex parte quam etiam idem Ioannes Kemeny in variis ipsorum necessitatibus a dicto Ioanne Hozzw certa pecuniae summam videlicet et ducentos florenos hungaricales monetae currentae aliquot (...) recepissent sub spe (...) restitutionis, quam quidem summam cum ipse Ioannes Kemeny post obitum dictae matris suae solvendo non esset, coactus fuisset ex bonis seu iuris suis possessionariis ipsum Ioannem Hozzw contentare. Itaque in primis pro centum et quinquaginta florenis quidam colonum suum providum scilicet Ladislaum Pap in portione sua possessionaria in possessione Mochy in comitatu Colosiensi existente commorantes, eidem Ioanne Hozzw ex iugo servitutis iobbagonalis coram nobis penitus exenit, perpetuaque libertate donavit et unacum uxore liberis fore in futurum nascitur manumissit numque deinceps ipsum Ladislaum Pap uxoremque eiusdem pro colonis suis reemendo, sed eisdem plenariam immunitatem ubivis locorum habitandi migrandeque potestatem concedendes, absque ulla reductionis et caprinationis formidine. Preterea pro se residua summa hoc est florenis quinquaginta domum eiusdem Ladislai Pap quam idem in eadem possessionem Mochy in pertinentiarum incoleret videlicet in vicinitate domus ab una providi Ladislai Marha, coloni eiusdem Ioannis Kemeny, ab altera vero partibus deserte, cuiusdam domus simulcum universis cuiusdam domus

utilitatibus iurisque et pertinentium quibuslibet, utpote terris arabilibus, cultis incultis, sortibus sylvis, foenetis, pratis, agris, hortis, vineis generaliter vero quarumlibet utilitatum et pertinentiarum suarum integritatibus quovis nominis vocabulo vocitatis ad eandem domum Ladislai Pap spectantes et pertinere debere sub suis veris metis et antiquis limitibus existentes annotato Ioanni Hozzu heredibusque et posteritatibus eiusdem universis dedisset, inscripssisset, perpetuavit et transtulisset, prout coram nobis idem Ioannes Kemeny dedit, inscripsit, perpetuavit ac transtulit pleno cum effectu assumentes nihilominus et obligantes idem Ioannes Kemeny memoratum Ioannes Hozzw, haeredesque et legitimos eiusdem successores in pacifico dominio antelatae domus et pertinentes eiusdem vita dumtaxat ipsius Ioannes Kemeny durante contra quoslibet legitimos impeditores, causidicos et actores propriis suis sumptibus et laboribus protegere, tueri et dispensare, ipso vero Ioanne Kemeny vita functo fratres generationales eiusdem, non prius dictum Ioannes Hozzw vel legitimos eiusdem succesores ex dominio dictae domus cyte non possint, quam summam integram florenorum quinquaginta in paratis eidem vel eisdem reposuerint sicque domum eandem in potestatem suam recipere valeant. In cuius rei fidem et testimonium praesentes literas nostras sigillo huius conventus usitato obsegnatas duximus eidem Ioanni Hozzw concedendas. Datae feriae sexta proxima post festum Nativitatis nostri Iesu Christi iuxta stilum novum, anno eiusdem millesimo quingentesimo nonagesimo.

2

MNL OL, F 2 Protocolla, vol. II, f. 43
the 14th of November 1606

Petrus Supa, jobbacionem unum suum vendit Stephano Zilwasy
Nos, requisitores etc., damus pro memoria per presentes, quod egregii Stephanus Zilwassi de Zilwas ab una ac Petrus Supa de Lenczina partibus ab altera coram nobis personaliter constituti, idem Petrus Supa assumptis in se oneribus et gravaminibus nobilium Michaeli Stephani et Nicolai scilicet Supa, fratrum scilicet suorum carnalium, aliorumque proximorum et consangvineorum suorum, quos videlicet infrascripti tangeret et concerneret, tangere et concernere posset negotium quomodolibet in futurum, matura prius iuxta se deliberatione prehabita sponte et libere oraculo vive vocis in hunc modum, quomodo ipse in anno Domini millesimo quingentesimo nonagesimo nono circa festis Nativitatis Beate Marie Virginis tunc preteritum, urgentibus eius certis et inevitabilibus necessitatibus, potissimum autem causa evitandae, favinis ad hoc inductes in qua ne ipsa familiaque sua tota periclitaretur, a prefato Stephano Zilwasy duodecim florenos hungaricales currentis et usualis monete levasset, quos quia persolvere illi non posset, pro eis unum jobbacionem suum Opra Toplicza vocatum in possessione Lenczina, comitatu Huniadiensis in districtu Haczakiensi personalem residentiam facientes, iure perpetuo et irrevocabiliter tenendas, possidendas pariter et habendas dedisset, vendidisset et abalienasset, nullus ius, nullamine

iuris et dominii proprietatem, si quod et quam idem Petrus Supa in antelato jobbagione Opra haberet vel haeredes suos quomodo libet in futurum habere posse speraret, sibi haeredibusque et posteritatibus suis utriusque sexus. Datum feria tertia proxima post festum Beati Martini Episcopi, anno Domini 1606.

VALOAREA RESURSEI UMANE ÎN TRANSILVANIA SECOLELOR XVI–XVII

Rezumat

În mod similar întregii Europe Centrale, și zona aferentă Principatului Transilvaniei a experimentat la nivel social fenomenul iobăgiei, chiar o perioadă mai lungă de timp. Una dintre caracteristicile legale ale proprietății a fost și aceea a posibilității de tranzacționare a domeniului de către stăpân. De regulă, contractele de vânzare-cumpărare nu specifică decât imobiliarele cu descriere și preț, însă se pot regăsi destule documente care precizează tranzacționarea resursei umane a domeniului împreună cu toate utilitățile acestuia. Prețul iobagilor, tranzacționați cu toate bunurile ce le aparțineau, reprezintă un aspect economic neexploatat la nivelul istoriografiei și poate oferi o serie de aspecte noi privitoare atât la lumea rurală în general precum și la relațiile sociale și evoluția economică a domeniului nobiliar ori princiar.