THE PRAEDIUM

STUDIES ON THE ECONOMIC HISTORY AND THE HISTORY OF SETTLEMENT OF EARLY HUNGARY*

In the Hungarian Latin usage of the 11th—14th centuries a village or rural settlement is referred to as villa, locus, terra, possessio and praedium. Since earliest times the word villa meant village and had no other connotation in Hungarian usage. Until the end of the 13th century terra and locus — in addition to their main meanings — only secondarily and exceptionally refer to a village. From the last decades of the 13th century possessio was also connoted to village, but since then it became interchangeable with villa.

Praedium, in Roman usage, was an estate and although it did not denote a special type of property, it had a certain distinctive legal quality for it was concerned with eviction and pignus. From the 9th century as feudalism developed, at least in certain cases, in the European Latin usage it expressed the inherited, clan, free or absolute form of property, similarly to hereditas, patrimonium, proprietas, alodium (from which the French aileu was derived) and Eigen. In this sense it is contrasted to beneficium, tied to servitium. It was also recognized as a demesne denoting a mode of production and not simply property. Between the 12th and 14th centuries in the neighbouring Austrian territories this term was used for estates and it frequently signified a certain agricultural administrative area, part of the economic organization of large estates or domains headed first by a villicus and later by an officiarius. In Hungarian historical literature praedium was understood as landed property approximating the size of a well-populated village, the farmstead, the demesne land, the separate manor house (curia), alodium, primitive alodium, smaller settlements and those not fully or undeveloped. In most instances it was regarded as a holding. The variously interpreted praedium had an important role in the formation of Hungarian settlements. Hungarian documents referred to forty-five to fifty percent of the settlements between the 11th and 12th centuries and to 30 percent of those in the first half of the 13th century which had boundaries, sufficiently populated had a separate name similarly villages and later became synonymous with these, as praedica. My studies treating the meaning of praedium agree that this phenomenon is extremely significant in economic and social history and the history of Hungarian settlement.

1 Österreichische Urbare I. Abt. XXXI., III. l/B. LXXXIX. I.
* This study is approximately 1/6 of the original Hungarian manuscript. The last sections treating the decline of praedium and its history as a settlement are rather sketchy.

1 Agrártört. Szemle
Approximately a century after Arpad's conquest we find the start of Latin literature in Hungary which, almost totally and without altering the meanings, accepted the terminology of European Latin usage. In trying to learn about the praedium in Hungary we must remember that the feudal social structure in Western Europe which — unlike the beneficium — regarded the praedium and alodium as a free and unlimited form of landed property is only hardly traceable in Hungary at those times. And even later it did not develop in such an organized way as in Western Europe, especially France. Evidently the word praedium, which appears as early as the 11th century in different Hungarian historical sources was not borrowed as a free and unlimited form of property, the antithesis of beneficium. It is also clear that the Hungarian concept of praedium did not originate in Hungary. This circumstance brings us to the demise of the lord, a different European conception of praedium with a rather restricted meaning. Should we accept this proposition or simply state that in Hungarian historical sources praedium means only landed property in general? It seems unusual that in the documents of 2 to 3 centuries villa, terra, forum and in other instances praedium were randomly used for a place even if the praedium concerned possessed all the characteristics of an actual well-populated settlement and of even rural settlements, called villae. A phenomenon regularly occurring may not be associated with irregularity and capriciousness.

Praedium is found in the first written document, the charter of the abbey of Pannonhalma where it appears to be a collective noun and though infrequently, praedium turns up both in documentary sources and in the gestes as such. As a collective noun praedium is too general a topic to be treated here.

In cases when it occurs as a common noun or appositive together with the names of certain settlements, or when we can find out about the settlement itself, then it is possible to focus on something definite. Already in the 11th century (when Latin literature began in Hungary) our written sources use praedium in such a way for certain settlements. Although only as a common noun, it occurs almost exclusively in documents, similarly to terra and later to possessio. Evidently just as these two it had to have important connotations for the issue of the document and especially for the holder.

In studying settlements described in the sources as praedia it becomes evident that the lord's demesne which began to be known in the Roman territories as villa (that isvilla rustica) and which survived the fall of the Empire, further developed under this name, then later declined and disappeared. Contrary to the differences in the developmental phase this term definitely had to be a part of Hungarian development just as the demesne is traceable in areas of Europe where the villa system did not originally exist. For certain reasons, in Hungary the lord's demesne — the accompanying settlement was called praedium instead of villa. Here it must be added that the association of the word praedium to the lord's demesne is not unusual Latin terminology of the Middle Ages, especially before the complete establishment of the political, judicial, economic and social order of the new states, was uncertain and undetermined. Here we must realize that the new Latin literature of Hungary which in many instances was to express a different economic and social reality had to be even more unambiguous and undetermined. If we want to determine the exact meaning and usage of the concept of praedium as the lord's demesne and as a settlement we must depend on inclusive, almost statistical research of all the settlements known as praedium and not only a few individual data. We must still consider the possibility of praedium being, in certain instances, not more than an estate or landed property in general. This study does not intend to draw a full picture of the early demesne (hardly considered or treated by Hungarian historiography), but rather to illuminate the praedium as a demesne, its nature, economic activity, social basis, and to point out the role of these settlements known as praedium in forming Hungarian villages.

Between the 11th and 13th centuries praedium as the landed property of the feudal lord may be regarded as a kind of alodium. Up to now Hungarian historiography has referred to it in this sense. Naturally we could not equate an economic unit of the 11th to 13th centuries having a different structure, operation and social basis with the alodial agricultural activity of Hungary at the end of the 15th century. The latter was formed centuries later, after the decline of the early demesne.

The opinion of the present author is that it would be more correct to regard those existing between the 11th and 13th centuries as terrae dominicales (demesne lands).

Between the 11th and 13th centuries praedium after the name of the settlement meant either the settlement (i.e., the dwellings) with the agricultural buildings or all these with the pertinent arable land. At the same time the structural unity gained prominence. The demesne was bound to bring about settlements, since it was necessary to erect buildings and shelter the livestock and equipment in a definite place. The meaning of praedium was for the most part restricted to the settlement. In the first half of the 13th century the praedium Golombok is also referred to in this sense. In the source this praedium was south of the road crossing the village and its owner being watered half of the praedium with two oxen for ploughing, six vineyards, 50 pigs, 20 servants, and ancilli to his wife. The provost's praedium in the village of Told (Somogy county) which belonged to the chapter of Székesfehérvár, may be considered similar. It was located "next to the village" and included meadow, forest, c. 8.5 acres, suitable for vineyards and 3 slaves (sancipia)."
garding ‘Loginhasce novum praedium’ of Moson county, the village, unlike the former case, was situated next to the praedium. In 1291 King Endre, II, confirmed the possession of Tamas, son of |omas. This was perhaps the first of the many holdings there was a part of Somone’s terra (Somoly county) which could be equally used for ploughing, ‘to set up a praedium’ (establishing a settlement) or for other purposes. Today it is difficult to visualize the plan of the settlement of the lord’s demesne in the 11th to 13th centuries. Although excavations did not yet uncover medieval Hungarian villages it is possible that they will be found in the future. At the present time only scanty data from source material are available. By praedium the documents mean, in one case, only houses, in others farm buildings and even orchards or a combination of orchards and farm buildings (praeripio). But when the feverish period of castle construction took start after the Tatar invasion (1241—1242) the praedium was eventually fortified and then it was mentioned as praedium seu castrum. Otherwise it is possible that some sort of primitive fortification (hegervon or earthwork) was usually made around the settlements of the praedium. In many instances by praedium the sources mean curia, curia or even palatium. Curtis or curia have rather concordant meanings in our documents, but curia more exactly denoted the agricultural settlement. Thus it could have eventually become identified with praedium (in a more restricted sense of the word). On the other hand curia and palatium were the dwelling house of the lord. This does not outrule the association of praedium and curia. Just as the lord could hold curia or curia without praedium, every praedium did not necessarily have a curia or curia, especially when the lord possessed more than one. One of the concepts of both curia and curia (regarding holdings with or without praeclis) eventually came to include not only the dwellings but the entire farmstead, the whole estate or even the village. Curtis was not in common in our documents as in those of the western countries and it passed out of use in Latin literature only to be supplanted by curia. But while curia similarly to western European usage and in spite of its ambiguity mainly meant the residence and farmstead, the economic centre of the lord, curia — besides expressing the residence and holding of the nobleman — was associated to law even in Roman usage. It first served as the domestic official of the king, the comes palatinius, and of the judex curiae, but it later became the seat of the feudal lord’s jurisdiction. In observing how curia made curia obsolescent, we must take into account the fact that the early Hungarian demesnes of the lords began to decline in the 13th century. What little information we obtained from the brief descriptions of early sources does not contain much data about the structure of the curia, or the praedium or its curia taken as an agricultural settlement. We find several references to the repair, maintenance or construction of curia being a duty of the people of the oppidum. Though generally rather primitive at that time, the curia could be larger or smaller relatively pretentious or simple. Close to the end of the 14th century, when the specific agricultural system of the praedium became outmoded in Hungary, the members of the noble Bóffy family divided a praedium called Petusházka, located on the estate of Alsóendvás. It was listed with the sessions of the sefcs (jobajones) and referred to as integer. One of the lords received only an old room with other auxiliary buildings, while the other got two cells, and a room occupied by János Tót (likely a servile). Generally praedium had to be considered an agricultural settlement even in those known texts dated to the beginning of the 13th century, which concern the destruction of praedium. Likely the demolishing of the agricultural settlement itself was denoted, implying not only the buildings but everything else on the estate. Thus the destruction was occasionally tremendous. In one case we find that thirty persons of the lord’s serfs died of wight and damage, in other instances they complained about the loss of 20—25 marks. Such claims were — in all likelihood — somewhat exaggerated, but the parties of one agreed to marks compensation, still a significant sum. At the end of the century when the castrum of the praedium of Torna was set afire, the damage amounted to 1000 marks, although the majority of it concerned the castle itself. Praedium did not only mean the agricultural settlement but in most instances the estate with all its implements, buildings and livestock. This is clearly shown by the document of the abbey of Zárti dated to 1067 which distinguishes between the two meanings of the concept. Among the donations we find “possesso in Scenholm”, the boundary of which the diploma defines. Here Scenholm’s curia (versus curia Scenholm), the agricultural settlement, is mentioned. After this we read that the founder, Bailyfe Peter (apud predio i. e. scenholm) donated 10 mans. Considering that both the estate (possessio) and the settlement (curia) are mentioned, the praedium with the donated servants manes (manes) can only mean the “farmstead”. A whole series of other documents prove that the concept of praedium includes all (pertinentio). In certain instances the description of praedium did not mention all these in detail, but in general reference was made to everything on the demesne belonging and
necessary to a praedium, its income, etc. In our sources praedia are particularly mentioned between the 11th and 12th centuries in connection with donations to ecclesiastical bodies and in cases of inheritance. Understandably, it was not enough to mention the belongings in general. They were almost itemized, including the implements, livestock and usually the boundaries, although without a description of the arable land itself which was self-evident and in several instances not even mentioned. Today these inventories are of immeasurable value, for they inform us of the nature of the praedium, its economic role, social structure and the form of the village and praedium. Let us consider first of all the farm hands, the inhabitants of the praedium.

At the first opportunity, the charter of the abbey of Zarty (1067) separately treats the praedia. The charters of Pannonhalma and the bishopric of Veszprém both dated to 1002 speak only about villae. The 1055 charter of the abbey of Tihany refers to settlements as villa or loci, although in many instances by this latter we can only surmise that a settlement is indicated. The Zarty charter, in addition to the holdings of two villae, 1 marchia and 4 terrae, mentions 14 praedia. The next document listing the settlements, the charter of the abbey of Garamszentbenedek (1075), still uses villae and terrae, while the repertory of the goods of the abbey of Pannonhalma (1063) calls the settled areas both praedia and loci. The circumstance that the documents of the 11th century make various references to settlement but that one document mostly refers to them in one way means that the terminology of early Hungarian Latin usage was not well-established and distinguished. It is unlikely that the terms of a single document refer to identical types while the various documents signify settlements diversely developing or being at different stages of development. It is hardly conceivable that in 1075, in the enormous grant out of which the convent of Szentbenedek grew there would not have been among the approximately 50 settlements praedia which the document of the abbey of Zarty (1067) and the inventory of the abbey of Pannonhalma, dated to 1093, amply include. It is even less possible when we consider that the documents from the beginning of the 12th century rather clearly and systematically distinguish the praedia from the villae and terrae, even within a single document. In the middle of the 13th century the increasing number of documents less and less frequently mention praedia although the expression does not vanish from our Latin usage. It occurs more often

but as we shall show, with a meaning differing from that used between the 10th and 13th centuries.

The 1067 charter of the abbey of Zarty makes no mention of the inhabitants of 5 praedia of the listed 14. Regarding the other praedia we find mention of manusus, familiae, the people of the praedium who do services in kind and base services. Their categories are listed by occupation, service or duty (pesco- tares, visitoriis, etc.), but in cases the document discusses the number of aratra and crews (domini servit, servi) belonging to the praedium. The documents of the 11th and 13th centuries which include praedia, frequently write about those with a village-like name. We are not informed about their inhabitants, but there are quite a few descriptions of the occupation and services of the people working on the praedium. Before the turn of the 13th century there are 21 more charters, wills, etc., which treat the people of such praedia by their number, social and occupational status; the forty-one documents list a total of 118 praedia. They list 1286 persons according to their social status (clave, libetinus and liber), occupation, services or duties. These are not necessarily their means of subsistence but only a kind of service or duty owed to the lords. In several places the inhabitants of the praedia are referred to as manusio, donus, homo, vir etc., which are seemingly insignificant units of reckoning. In such cases our study focuses on social stratification, the two extremes of which are the free man and the bondsman. We shall compare all the titles employed for the residents of the 118 praedia in order to determine the social organization. A detailed analysis of the names of the various strata will not be attempted since it is rather difficult to list all of them by category. Károly Táthényi definitely asserted that the legal relation between slaves and absolutely free men "cannot be strictly defined" and even today it is difficult to deny this. Since we have decided to approach them not statically but through their development we might try to approximately place them on one of the levels of several problematic strata. From this standpoint, for example, we do not treat the contradictory legal rights of freemen (libertini, liberti, etc.) but concentrate on the fact that they were previously slaves. Thus, after making the proper distinctions they are usually grouped to the slaves when considering the social origin of the residents of a praedium.

Fifty-four and two-tenths percent (58%) of the entire 1286 inhabitants are given such titles as manusio, servus, servus, ancilla, pedesquare which, even in the middle
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We can only state that the residents of the predium are referred to in the treated documents as servi, occidens, libertini, homines serviti, servae, precatorius, dominus. Since the first half of the 13th century when the predium started to lose its original nature and the status of the dwellers began changing. Here let us state that in the first half of the 13th century the status of only three people on the predium was mentioned in the register of László of Várd. Two were called servi and 1 ducenitus, that is, to say, a person of servile origin.1

The present author found that the majority of the residents of the predium were described by Latin words denoting a slave or former slave, while the others may certainly be traced or probably associated to such a former status. Only 5% of them were free and even this figure can be disputed. On the predium it was rare to find those who actually were among the liber. The labour force of the early Hungarian demesne of the lord, the predium, was generally comprised of servi who did the productive work.

How is the word slave used in our sources? What were the personal and real rights of this status and their role in the lord’s demesne from the 11th to the 13th centuries?

The data available make it clear that the Hungarian servi of this period included slaves who were the true chattels of the lord, and under his complete control. Simultaneously there were servi who had their own homes, separate households, farm, family, means of production and even possessed land. They did their own harvesting but also owed great amounts in kind and base services to their lords. They were still servi without essential personal rights. The majority of the servi had to belong to this group which grew steadily while the former decreased. The status of the servi was dual and under continuous change, above all for the latter part. It is essentially the same as in previous centuries and in a modified form existed throughout Europe. Both types were found on the lord’s demesne and the majority of Hungarian servi remained precisely on the predium.

Let us examine those of the first type. The servi without land and house (both male and female) did both menial services for the lord and were active in his demesne, the predium.2 Theoretically the fruit of their labour belonged only to their lords. The laws of King László (1077–1095) declare that regarding tithes those servi and the sons of owners who live in the household of the lord may not be regarded as separate taxpayers; tithe was not their duty but the landowner’s. The Hungarian Latin usage does not make distinctions. They were likely the 10 persons who, in addition to the 9 manu servants on one predium, were referred to as capita servorum non latibentum uzores (1198). In another case 3 vine dressers were listed as servi sine uzores, in contrast to two others who were servi doborum, implying that they owed their lord’s taxes or services (1141 and 1148). In contrast to the latter, the former without wife, family and separate household, likely lived in the household of the lord as menials. They did not pay taxes; they may have been collected only from these servi who „per se libenter domus suscepi”. The former did not produce for their lords but for their lords, implying that the paying of the wages was not their duty but the landowner’s. The Hungarian Latin usage does not make distinctions. They were likely the 10 persons who, in addition to the 9 manu servants on one predium, were referred to as capita servorum non latibentum uzores (1198). In another case 3 vine dressers were listed as servi sine uzores, in contrast to two others who were servi doborum, implying that they owed their lord’s taxes or services (1141 and 1148). In contrast to the latter, the former without wife, family and separate household, likely lived in the household of the lord as menials. They did not pay taxes; they may have been collected only from these servi who „per se libenter domus suscepi”.

1124. 1. V. Reg. 84 (no. 87); 1122. Ibid. 270 (no. 33); 1124. Ibid. 302 (no. 379).
11 Érik Molnár states that its a sort of menial servus. A Hungarian társadalmi története az őskorból az Arpádokig (The History of Hungarian Society from Ancient Times to Arpád), Budapest, 1949, 249. They were household slaves doing personal services and in the role of menial servants. This is the opinion of Győrgy Történelmi előzmények, Tulajdonosok a 14. században (Historical Antecedents, Studies on the History of the Hungarian Peasantry in the 14th Century Hungary), ed. György Székely, Budapest, 1953, 14–16.
12 The importance of their work in the lord’s demesne has to be emphasized.

In our sources we find such slaves mentioned when their lord provides them with land, frequently with livestock; tools to till their own farms. Thus the bard used to provide small ploughs and small mighty ropes. The lord’s family refused to comply and after legal action they had to accept the fact that secundum arbitrium the lord’s Doma could select his manu (i.e., a lot, dwelling). In addition they had to provide Doma with two bullocks, four sheep, two sacks of grain for seed. We can generally assume that the servus, manuński, etc., without status and status or other means of production who, in case of grants or bequests, were given by the lords as gifts, who did not have any stated taxes and whose masters had free access to their labour, were for the most part menial servants, i.e., slaves in the classical sense of the word. The number of these slaves steadily decreased as they were provided with land or ceremonially freed. The first half of the 14th century those whose status was outmoded by the social changes, by the development of serfdom in Hungary, were given the so-called servus libertus by their lords.

We do not have sufficient data from this period to clarify whether there were predio where the buildings of the lord’s demesne constituted the only settlement and agriculture was handled exclusively through the sale of home and landless dwelling there. The question is especially difficult to answer because even if there were such predia they had to exist in the beginning of the period under discussion, before these written documents, or in the 11th century from which we have almost no remaining sources.

There are no indisputable traces of any in the 12th and 13th centuries. The servi with house and land can be clearly distinguished by the way in which they were described: certain other categories we described by the term servi. As a rule the servi that the lord’s tenants were paid for the sake of beauty or these individuals were really without house and land. They could be found on the small predia operated by one or two servi, although not on every one of these small predia, as we shall see later, existed much earlier, but their number greatly increased at the beginning of the 14th century due to the distribution of landed property and the resettlement of noble families took place in the 13th century. The landowner establishing a new household moved to such land with one or two servants without house and land. It must be asserted that the servi run by these household servants were not to remain in the future. During the development of feudal servitude, predium, especially those relatively new, small ones, vanished.

Those with their own land and dwelling form a much larger group than the servi without them. The former are mentioned as servus terrae, while the wine producers are servi cum vina. Generally they are to be thought of when the servi mentioned servi in domino. Occupation of a house, generally, but not necessarily implied a household, cultivating land with one’s own implements and at one’s own cost. Not only do we know them from their being actually listed in the diplomas as such but even when they are said to own a certain amount of produce and labour to the landowner, since such services were expected from those with separate households and farms. Slaves without land and house did not owe prescribed services but rather unlimited work. Although they are listed without any defined amount of service or the phrase cum terrae, we generally have to consider the slaves as having a house and land while male servi appear with their families as familia servorum. Menials could not establish a family, although close to the end of the period, in the middle of the 13th century, the number of slaves with families, apparently belonging to the household of their master, steadily increased. Slaves owning house and land are, for the most part, understood when the sources mention mansio servorum.
er. These designations do not always suffice to distinguish those with house and land from those without, for they are not always included in our sources.

The servus owning house and land cultivated the given land with his own implements and harvested the produce for himself. He also had to work for the lord, in addition to services in the household. The serfs who lived in the manors lived in special villages called villicae. The lords constituted a definite advantage, his status was more valuable than that of the later serfs under the feudal lords. The legal status of the servus remained unchanged even after receiving a grant of land, for the peasants even in the times of the Carolingian Empire. The status was given only ad usum.32 The passage of two or three centuries was necessary in order to make a servus: jobago (servo) and the real estate received a servus: jobagomia, and for them to gain full possession over their moveables. There were some who did not even possess beasts of burden and they ploughed with the lord's cattle. The first synod in the reign of King Kalman (1045–1116) makes provision for this situation. If the ecclesiastical servus ploughed with the own cattle they received half of the yield, but if they used the cattle of the church, they owed two-thirds of the produce to the servus who ploughed the lands. Many of the crews on temporal estates were not a better situation. The great share paid by the slaves owning house and land explains why this system had to be more profitable than the work of the menials on the lands directly held by the lord: the demesne required his direct participation and the maintenance of a farm of his own.

In the beginning the rights of a slave with house and land — although his right of possession later increased to finally become identical with those who were originally free — was only to the use and yield of the land. The property continued to remain servus in domino and it was distinguished from the demesne lands only as belonging to his area, or in case of a commune, to his portion.33 When the servus were provided with land only the method of utilization changed, but the rights to it remained unaltered. The lord could take the land or sell the servus after reclaiming the property. There were complaints that the lords were breaking the solemn promise made public before that the purpose of the lord was usually not the reclaiming of land or work animals, but the continuation of the productive economic activity of the servus. Since the mode of production slaves supplied with land became more widespread, the praedium in question usually adopted it and uninterredly practiced praedum servorum. The servus having house and land are not comparable to ancient slaves; the legal aspects of the servus were in reality changed by economic independence. From the 11th to the 13th century the term servus and other expressions for slave had various social significance as the slaves owning house and land were not regarded as slaves even where advances occurred the slowest the ancient concept of slave became outdated. In Hungary the slaves with house and land were progressing from slavery to servitude. The place of a servus was somewhere between the true slave and the free man. In this with mind we have to consider that during this time there were much uncertainty in social terminology. A typical example is Archdeacon Albo who, between 1237 and 1249, took a census of the people of the abbey of Pannonhalma, listing the number of persons on the individual holdings (mostly praedium). On Nul praedium he found it important to refer to a servus sine servio as the "true" servus of the church.34 Let us conclude that the slaves approaching the state of jobagomia should actually be called servants, even if certain servus, especially the menials, can still be regarded as slaves.

It would be incorrect to look for servus only on the lord's demesne (the praedium) because of the great number of servus or people with such an origin living on them. We find servus frequently on the first mappa of the lords and on the diplomas from the 11th to 13th century treating Hungarian rural settlements called villicae. They occurred somewhat less frequently on the servus and

32. 1159. In Kalu, Jozsef ist a visitor with his free wife and son to the chapter of Veszprémi and 4 oxen in proutium usum "inassignavit". HO V. 1.
33. 1181. In the villa of Kesztl the bishop of Veszprémi owned land: "non ex cultum agrorum sicut seruus, sed pure ecclesiæ, quod ecclesiæ sibi habet proprium et ad usum aranum pertinent". ÁUO I. 76; 1186. (5) terra in Nubis, sed ad seruam usque. (11a, op. cit. III. 240.
34. 1237–1240. Pr. I. 771.
praedia together with the herdsmen (eum custode, asperso, pastor, subduc., bubulo, homines); both were the chattle of the lord. It is striking that only twice in the studied data were herdsmen listed as having a family (and only later); in one case a wife and daughter are mentioned in another a herdman and his two sons, all three as herdsmen. However, at earlier times the members of the family of the servi are named or at least numbered since the children of the servants were also the property of the lord and had to be included in the inventory. There is a likelihood that those herdsmen mentioned without family members really single, "nomadic herdsmen" who — even in more recent times — were usually unmarried, although in this period it could also indicate that such married men were menials, slaves in the original sense of the word.

The work animal is usually included together with the plough, the most important farm implement. They have been listed separately in the inventories of goods. The plough is frequently mentioned with the oxen belonging to it. In this case associated as "oxen, plough", while at other times the connection is indicated by the phrase "plough with oxen". Often they are mentioned together as aratrum boum. The expression is an established one, a unit in the repertories of diplomas about the praedia. It certainly means the team of oxen, the plough and the animals belonging to it. Not only does this prove the plough was drawn by oxen but it points out the importance of the plough in a basic work activity on the praedia, and that the plough and yoke did not form a separate unit. Otherwise the compound was probably also important as the result of the use of aratrum as a unit of names.

The plough was listed with or without the beasts of burden, the plough animals, among the equipment of the praedia or in association with a servant or servants. If the plough or plough team was mentioned without a servant it is possible that the lord held it directly. The team of oxen in the abbe of Castrum is sometimes of unknown source, but most commonly the ending of the "praedia" also included the "servi" which list men as belonging to the plough express that through this relation he secondarily belongs to the praedium (1116, Chlunus praedium: "tia aratrum cum V mansio bium XV homini"). He is also mentioned as primarily belonging to the praedium, with the phrase "cut a servant" (Castrum praedium, "tia aratrum cum servus ein", 1116, Verden praedium). In a great many instances, the relation was clearly expressed while in others we can only assume it. In such cases the plough, or plough team was separated from the men by a conjunction: "cum III servis et I. aratro" (1156, Levering praedium). In a few cases we have evidence of the land being "at Servi" they seem to have an even closer association: "quattuor servi, XII mansio" (1141-46, Idrinda praedium). Even in such cases we can conclude from the order and those mentioned in regard to the social structure of the praedia that the plough and praedium, the or the plough and man belong together. There are no grounds for assuming that an association of the two (as traced or concluded from the documents) would then be meaningless. It is also evident that the plough or plough team was listed among the belongings of the praedium even when the data show that it was held by the servants. In such a case the lord owned the man, as the majority of the studied data from the 12th century not only the men but the important implement trusted to his care and the necessary animals were listed among the goods and chattels of the praedia.

Fifteen of the 118 praeda have ploughs, or plough teams, and in one instance the work animals are listed without men. Even these were not necessarily used directly in the production of the lord. In this regard the text is always
clear and the implements could have been held by slaves owning house and land. There are 45 praedia which list the plough or plough team held by servi or mancipis. This means that on the mentioned praedia productive work was done mostly by those servants with house and land and in comparison the importance of land belonging directly to the lord and its cultivation were reduced. From the 11th to 13th centuries the nature of the agricultural activity on the lord's demesne is finally clarified to some extent by both the man and the yoke belonging to the praedium and we should particularly note the frequent, regular occurrence of aratrum and aratrum bonum among the items listed. These show that in the beginning agriculture had a prominent role in the lands of the lord's demesne, apparently being more important than cattle-breeding. Sixty-three of the 118 praedia definitely referred to plough, plough team or servants engaged in ploughing. From the descriptions of the other 55 praedia it is almost certain that they were not based on husbandry. Until 1250 only four praedia which concentrated on cattle breeding were mentioned in our sources. Thus, early developing agriculture in Hungary centered about the praedia based on manorial servants or rather, those with house and land.

Strictly speaking the land of the praedium, since it was the praedium itself, could not be considered a "belonging". Even if the meaning of the word praedium was more restricted (the settlement with the connected buildings) it was generally used in a much broader sense to mean both the settlement and the surrounding arable land. Therefore the arable land was not listed among the possessions, but it was described, measured, confirmed, and if necessary, the boundaries corrected, just as village-type settlements called villae. In the diplomas the limits of such praedia which did not constitute a portio possessivaria but could be regarded independent settlements — although examples of even the former type are found — were carefully stated. When dividing the praedium the boundaries of the separated sections were also given. This took place when the extended family separated. The land belonging to the praedium could have been used in common by the relatives, but if it was a section of the village the description distinguished it from the land of the people of the village (terra pagana). Boundaries were also drawn between the lord and the inhabitants of the praedium progressing toward independence and when the fields were divided between the owner of the praedium and the fairly organized village community. Later when the use of the word praedium became more established in the documents (13th century), the lands were generally listed according to cultivation (arable land, meadow, forest etc.). It is rare to find

12 1993. The abbey of Pannonhalma received Zolni a praedium in Somogy county "ad pastumurium, ex omnium XXX mansibibus subulorum et transectis pratis", PR I, 590; 1135. One of the praedia near the Danube of Comes Lampert which was given by St. István "ad piscendum animalia" is mentioned, CDI, II, 82; 1190. In the Latin renovation of the charter of the manor of Veszprémvölgy we find: "praedium in ipso portu Sild ad opus pecuniae", i.e. in Zöve. A veszprémvölgyi oklevel görög szövege. The Greek Text of the Charter of Veszprémvölgy, Budapest, 1910, 83: 1131-1136. There were sheep with shepherds "in prædicia Forte", CDI, II, 92. If this praedium is not identical to one plough and three manumissions, the Fort here has to be regarded as a sheep-breeding farm; 1229. Jásai praedium "campustea", V. Reg. 288 (no, 556). Between 1248, the dea, and chapter of Széchenyi make provisions for the praedia in the title issue, according to which the "præidia daniacum hominum ubi sunt homines ubi pecunia, pecudes ubi notae in ruralibus et aliumtut.

13 Zimmermann—Weiner, Vulkundbuch, II, 58. In these last two cases it would be difficult to decide exactly what sort of praedia are understood.

the size of praedium lands included in units of aratrum, iager. In early diplomas no distinction is made between the lands held by the servants and those belonging directly to the lord, expressing that the economic and legal unity is unaffected not only by other owners but also by their servants. Therefore until the distinctions appearing mainly in the 13th century, the size of the praedium given has to be understood as its complete area. The sources studied do not always contain data about this. When the document records land being given to a slave the quantity was always mentioned. We can estimate the proportion of land held by the servants and that belonging directly to the lord if the size of the praedium and the number of servants are supplied. These figures vary. For example, Sar praedium (in Veszprém county) was two aratra (approximately three acres) and contained 4 servants (servus-manum). Two millers, and two mills, while the one in Berek (Somogy county) was six aratra (c. 8.5 acres) with only two servants (servus-manum). In the former less arable and other land belonged directly to the lord, than the latter. Mills are important among the belongings of the praedia. From time to time millers were included in the inventories. If there was no mill, but only a suitable location for one, mention was sure to be made of it. Men were accounted for even when the declining economic activity on the lord's demesne brought their usefulness to an end. Naturally there were mills on other estates too and not only on the praedia, although they were especially common on the earlier praedia. We must keep in mind that among the revenues being established on the feudal estates and later as part of the iura reginis minores, the right to set up and operate a mill was one of the first of the characteristic privileges of the lord.

In our diplomas there are 37 mills on 18 praedia (only until the middle of the 13th century). They are very unevenly distributed among the praedia. They were ten mills whereas the others had none. Such density is explainable by favourable natural conditions for mills and the central location of the praedium. Such feudal rights as holding fairs (tributum uris) and toll collecting (theologum) existed on the praedia. Understandably such rights belonged to the well-populated praedia developing into a village settlement. Otherwise they generally belonged to the feudal estates, and not only to the lord's demesne.

The size of the praedium is ascertainable from the population and the amount of land. These agricultural settlements were usually small. Some of them had five to ten, or 1-2 servants. The donation of Farkas to the cloister included 2 praedia called Selepchen. The larger (c. 18 acres) had 16 libertini mansions. Six servi-mansions and 7 aratores-servi belonged to the "aliud minus praedium Selepchen." The 11 praedia belonging to István, son of Comes Miské, had only 32 servants, and there are only 2-4 mancipi listed for the individual praedia. These with a small number of servi may be regarded as only a shade of the village area, although there were not too many possibilities and — as we shall later see — they vanished as the economic system based on the lord's demense declined.

In contrast to the small praedia, Csátár praedium donated by Comes Márton (1141-1146) to the monastery of Csátár had four ploughs, with 12

31 1206. on Csütorőkőlyki praedium, RO VI. 6.
32 1461. Césnidi I, 101. This praedium was likely a manor.
mansio and 27 other men. The abbey of Thány owned a praedium named Kolon which had 65 serui, 16 agasones and 1 udvarnok. \textsuperscript{55} Villicus Miklós had a
praedium called Mihal with 30 manesiones libertinarum in 1231. \textsuperscript{26} In their own
time such praedia were as important as an even larger and well-populated villages
and were even called villages. In certain instances some holdings were known as
praedia, and in this sense as a rule.\textsuperscript{37} These were probably larger, but without a doubt had to
be the economic centre of the other praedia of the lord, making its role simi-
lar to that of the later caput honorum.

We are not able to ascertain too much about the organization of work
or the management of praedia. Smaller praedia were likely managed by the
owner himself, especially if he had no other. Even if he had several small ones
there was no need for an overseer to manage tiny agricultural settlements
with two or three people. The owner of a larger praedium or several ones might
have provided an overseer called rector, curialis, comes or procurator.\textsuperscript{38} They
were chosen personally from among the feudal subjects (in the west the head
of a similar agricultural unit was called villicus). In 1171 the Overseer of Kaal
praedium was a jobagio. According to our sources the head of one or more
praedia belonging to a bishopric chapter or cloister do not necessarily have
to be chosen from the clergy. The procurator of the praedium of the bishopric
of Csanád was Comes Scultho in 1226. His office seems to be similar to that
of a steward. In another case we learn that the comes curialis of Canon Záhado
of Székesfehérvár was expelled from the Samtov praedium\textsuperscript{39} of this clerical
dignitary by the udvarnok of Eszter. In the middle of the 13th century Master
Simon, the canon of Veszprém, bequeathed his praedium, Kesv to the bishopric
of Veszprém, "ciui et eundo procuratore statuar", but Simon because of his
long illness and weak condition was unable to take care of the estate. He
retired it with 18 libertini to the Bishop. Therefore the bishop later gave some
land, a mill and 4 libertini as compensation to Simon’s two brothers.\textsuperscript{40} More
than a century passed by when the convent of Véra issued a document raising
the rector of Mereno praedium and his half-brothers to the ranks of the noble,
arms-carrying jobagiones of the church.\textsuperscript{41} Otherwise in the middle of the
14th century, after the establishment of feudal jurisdictions the chapter of Veszprém
made provisions for the right of all rectors of its praedia to hold court or partic-
icipate in the administration of justice.\textsuperscript{42} Evidently these data provide no basis
for generalizations on the management of early praedia.

\textsuperscript{52} 1214, PR X, 592.
\textsuperscript{53} 1213, CD III, 2, 227.
\textsuperscript{54} 1213, "praedium principicipale, quod Bohunda nunepatur et ab praedi" (12)
\textsuperscript{55} idem participuis", HO VII, 2445. Naryh praedium had to have a similar role.
\textsuperscript{56} It included the village of Naryh and Rábusmány. HO VIII, 45, 1156. One of the three praedia
domated to Vád was known as "magnus", LOC cit. VII, 1214, 1240. Nine villics belonged
\textsuperscript{57} to Salya praedium, HO IV, 95. Near the border of the country there were gigantic but still
\textsuperscript{58} sparsely populated demesnes which were first praedium, but later as they
\textsuperscript{59} became more populated, joined the county.
\textsuperscript{60} 1226, "Vergem", 259 (V. 356). The comes curialis of officialis Gyula Szikló, Ser-
\textsuperscript{61} viesiek és familiaszek (Servientes et familiares), Budapest, 1912, 41.
\textsuperscript{62} 1230, HO IV, 30.
\textsuperscript{63} 1247, Dial. V, 29, Kum. 179.
\textsuperscript{64} 1241, Kum. 124.
\textsuperscript{65} 1255, Kum. 186. It should be mentioned that in this period the lord’s demense
\textsuperscript{66} was generally declining; thus “rector” had to have jurisdiction over the feudal people on
\textsuperscript{67} the property as a sort of manager.

We possess only scanty and frequently ambiguous data from the dis-
cussed period. Only vague outlines of the early demesnes of the lords could be
made, although their nature was determinable even this way. We could state
that the burden of the productive labour on the praedia was placed on the
serui without house or land, but even more so on the people with house and
land originating from slaves or living under conditions similar to slavery. Such
serui — especially the latter — cannot be regarded as true slaves since they
produced for themselves and began progressing toward freedom.

A study of the facts described support those Hungarian researchers
holding the praedia to be a sort of demesne with servants or a kind of noble
curia (László Erdélyi, István György, Bánháti Ila). It especially bears out the
decision of Antal Barthol, dictionary compiler, who after studying contempo-
rary written historical sources defined praedium. In his dictionary the main
meaning is the lord’s demense (allodium) ; secondly it is a slave settlement
and its third meaning was puszta which typified the latter stage of praedium
development. Through these he found the key to the problem which cannot
be disputed because in Hungary praedium meant at the same time both the
lord’s demense and a slave settlement. Praedium actually had a dual meaning.
Now that the data has been presented and analyzed we must admit that
the Hungarian praedium was essentially the same as villa in the Latin usage
of other European countries centuries before. Why did the Hungarian Latin
usage which, in most instances, adopted western terminology, by-pass the
word villa (used in an identical sense) and name a similar Hungarian agricultural
form by the word praedium which was frequently used differently in other
countries? Knowing the European development of villa it is not difficult
to discover why the first masters of Latin in Hungary selected this word.
Their choice proves their faithfulness to the living terminology. The lord’s
demesne, denoted by the dually-used western villa, also between the
5th and 9th centuries. In the villa the small peasant economy, acquiring its own
means of production, became prominent and determined the meaning of the
concept of this settlement. During the 10th century in most parts of Europe
villa meant already a village, became in reality such settlement. Thus when the
Latin terminology of Hungary began to be established in the 11th century, the
word villa was adopted from general use denoting village according to the
actual conditions it referred to, as the Hungarian laws of 11th century
clearly witness. Simultaneously the type of agriculture on the lord’s demense
close to its decline in the west made its appearance in Hungary. From
the beginning the settlement set up in Hungary for this type of agriculture
corresponded to some extent to a village. Therefore the laws and texts — since the
nature of the settlements did not influence the collecting — classified them and
the villages with praedium as villae. The owners of praedia had good reason
to make sure that the settlements belonging to their praedia had a distinctive
name. Praedia characteristically occur in documents, in such legal and eco-
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meaning to beneficium, allodium, praedium had hardly begun, and even later it did not develop as fully as in the characteristic European feudal societies. The meaning which praedium gradually came to signify in Hungary was attained because a similar meaning was formulated in parts of the broad area of European Latin usage. In areas closest to our western border (where feudal development was also late) praedium became associated with the concept of an economic centre. From the 11th to 13th centuries praedia was used in Hungary to mean a farm with the characteristics of the lord’s demesne. But since the actual farm was changing, so did the meaning of the word praedium.

The formation and establishment of the lord’s demesne in early Hungary occurred the same way as it did elsewhere in Europe. The lord distributed his demesne to those of his servants formerly without house and land and to free tenants. Although the slaves with house and land were — in principle — socially and legally treated as slaves, the direct relation between them and the means of production promoted their progress toward their “first liberation”. Sessio, meaning the unity of the fundus of the village and the pertinentiae of the fields and expressing a certain right of disposal of the men holding the latter, became a basic institution of the serfs during the entire period of feudalism. In this sense, sessio as an institution in Hungary attained a more perfect form during the decades following the 13th century. This is when the system of succession of sessio came to be established and when the lasting laws of inheritance and wills began to form around it. In the middle of the 13th century we first find mention of the right of serfs to libera migratio upon payment of terragium. In Hungary such circumstances eroded the differences between those of slave origin and the freemen living under the jurisdiction of the lord and cause no hindrance to their joining a mutual village community. By the middle of the 14th century the stratum of servi, which forms the social basis of the praedium almost totally disappear from Hungarian society. The settlements which had been named praedia inhabited previously by servi were now called villae and had a population of serfs. Occasionally the transition caused a flare up of class struggle and former servi changed their status — not necessarily where they resided up to that time — to that of the serfs. In such cases mention was made of the dispersion of the people of the praedia and escape of the servi. The Tatar invasion (1241—1242) loosened the previous social structure and caused a tremendous shortage of manpower. There was a greater migration of the overburdened people of the praedia. During the agricultural crisis of the lord’s demesne the population of the praedia changed. Even the lords mixed them with liber, jobagio and dozes. This process may be regarded as the victory of the village community over the praedium. The property of servi were finally separated from the closed unit formed by the praedium and became a conventus, the member of the village community. From the first half of the 13th century we find that the land of the praedium is occasionally called commune together with the land of the village (villa).

Parallel with the disintegration of the social structure of the praedium, the type of agriculture characteristic of the lord’s demesne also declined. According to the document of the abbey of Pannonhalma (c. 1237—1240) the people of the majority of praedia typically had to do a significant amount of base services for the abbey. After decades of dissatisfaction, King Béla IV, regulated the services of the people of the abbey in 1240. Base services had to be provided for harvesting (one day per year). On another day of the year they also had to store and mow hay (work necessary to keep the animals). A very detailed description of the services in kind was provided (including wheat, rye, oats, flour, bread, oxen, lamb, geese, chickens, eggs, fish, cheese and beer). The abbey used and sold mainly what it got from the services in kind. The proclamation of the King did not speak about servants but craftsmen (smiths, furriers, shoemakers, etc.) and in general uxorici who had to do harvesting and mowing as base services referred to in Latin as: “omnes populo in uxorici, quos et aliis”.64 The peasantry, as a social class, were consolidated, even economically for they lived in such settlements which up to that point were called praedia.

In most instances the lord’s own demesne did not perfectly vanish. The livestock of the lord required some pasture and meadow, and some kind of estate on which cultivation was done. This small-scale production was for immediate consumption and not for the market. Commodity production on the lands held by the lord developed much later, in the second half of the 15th century. The lord’s demesne, as it survived the crisis of the praedia, in the 13th and 14th centuries began to be called allodium and was known as such for centuries after.65

The allodium in Hungary is a new concept. Praedium and allodium characterize different periods. Their basic difference is that the praedium produced for consumption, while the allodium increasingly for the market. Another great distinction between them is constituted by the fact that the praedium included the lands of servi and people of other social origin, while the allodium contained only the lands of the lord which he cultivated for the market. There was also an essential difference between the labour forces on the praedium and allodium. The praedium employed servants with house and land and menial servi, the allodium — in addition to base services — utilized wage labourers who were bound to the land by contracts. They were called mercenarii and mainly did the steady type of labour such as caring for plough animals and beasts of burden. Their stratum became larger and more integrated close to the end of the 15th century. In the diplomas they are listed as familiares, or rather as famulii, servientes servitores and are subject to the jurisdiction of the lord, thus making us aware of the presence of feudal elements, (besides the contractual), in their relation to the lord.

The new commodity-producing land held by the lord was called allodium for another reason: the name praedium was used by those demesnes which became pusztas. Nevertheless the relation between the former praedium and the new allodium was not entirely severed. There were praedia which gradually transformed into allodia, such as that of Comes Kune (1239), which is mentioned in 1333 as praedium seu maiorium, in 1343 as praedium seu allodium and c. 1480 simply as allodium. There are mercenarii listed for it at this last occasion.66 The expression praedium seu allodium is found in other

64 Pr 1. 771.
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65 Ibid. 789.

66 Allodium or allodial land has legal connotations too, but these circumstances are not necessary here.

67 OL. DI. 87702. Dezso Csiki, Kune ispán majom Budán (The Manor of Comes Kune in Budá), Nézzelek 1906. vol. 687. 718.
cases too, in the so-called books of formulae. It is not surprising, therefore, that after the decline of agriculture based on praedia, alodialum is mentioned with curia, or with curia alodialia. In other instances the former praedia cease to operate, became pustae, while alodialum were established independently of the former praedia. The documents of the estate of Alsórendva from 1381, 1389 and 1542 provide a good opportunity for studying the changes. The praedia mentioned in the diploma of 1381 later became villages or vanished, suggesting that the population disappeared. On the other hand, independent alodialum appear in other villages of the large holding, although in the southwestern corner of the country this process is still on a small scale where the area is not crossed by significant lines of communication.

Let us draw our conclusions regarding the history of settlement as well. Up to now we examined only one side of the picture, the lord’s demesne. The developing village constitutes the other. As the economic activity on the demesne lands of the lords declined, the settlement developed into a village. It was called a pusta if it did not become a village but deserted. The praedium became either a village or a pusta.

In many instances the praedium was only part of the village (praedium in villa). In this case its owner shared the land of the village with other owners and the people of the praedium fused with those of the village community. Such praedia contained, for the most part, one or two men, and the praedium of the king’s servientes and the lesser nobility were usually such. The Golden Bull of 1222 exempted them from royal taxes (tributes). Frequently the praedia were separate from all village settlements and were thus independent ones. If these survived the large scale transformations they became villages. It is not surprising therefore that several praedia of the abbey of Pannonhalma were called vilae at the end of the 11th century (praedium nomine… villa episcopalis). They were already developing into a village. Later in the quoted document from the abbey (c. 1237—1240) most of its lands are called praedium in the beginning of the text, but later they are vilae. In other instances the ending falva (village of) which occurs as part of the name of a praedium, or the parallel mention or the church or priest along with this landed property proves the development of the praedium into a village. It is possible to quote several examples from the last decades of the 13th century showing how former praedia were called vilae, possessiones or oppida (market towns).

There is one more side to the history of the early praedium. Many did not become villages but were depopulated. This process took place parallel with the development of the praedium into a village, implying that in this period (from the middle of the 13th to the middle of the 14th century), every praedium mentioned in the documents is problematic. The problem is whether it denotes a demesne of the lord functioning normally, or a village or even a pusta? At this period terminology became ambiguous: the same settlement is successively called praedium, vilae, possessio, oppidum. The word praedium finally dropped out of usage entirely. In the 15th century it usually has one meaning: pusta. The true meaning of the word did not change, only the actual phenomenon denoted by it. If the praedium remained a populated area from that time on they called it a village, but if, after all, it was still named pra-