

Csaba Balázs Áldor

MANOR TOKENS USED IN THE 19th CENTURY IN BANAT

Starting from the Middle Ages the serfs, peasant laborers hereditarily attached to the manor in a state of semi-bondage, had several duties to perform for the State, Church and lord, in the form of labor, products and money. Additionally there were also other special contributions for the state, the army, and the Christianity money which put a heavy burden on the peasants.

According to the Urbarial Conscription from 1820, the so-called Cziráky conscription, the serfs had to perform a total of about 8 million days of enforced labor – robota (statute labor), from which 56% manual robota, 29% days of work with 4 yoked animals and 12% days of work with 2 yoked animals. However, the data recorded by the conscription is slightly exaggerated. In the most of cases, the 9-point questionnaire was filled with the data supplied by the peasant and the boyar's representative, and the peasants often considered that it's in their interest to declare that they had worked more days as they really did.

On the 30th of September 1813, Emperor Francis of Austria issued an order for the chancellor of Transylvania, Samuel Teleki, stressing that the peasants are constantly complaining about the excessive robota they have to perform. Four years later, during his Transylvanian visit, the Emperor is bombarded again with complaints by the serfs. As a result, in the summer of the same year, the urbarial issue is presented to the State Council, who passed it to the president of the Hungarian Chamber, Anton Cziráky. The Conscription is launched finally, in the summer of 1820¹.

As the main purpose of this urbarium was to relieve the burdens, the serfs doesn't hesitate and exaggerate most of the figures they declare to be recorded by the conscription, but often are affraid to sign the paper (with an X by their name), as the consequences could be quite harsh for them, while the land owners are interested in keeping the robota on the same level as before.

Although the data recorded by the Conscription is not accurate, these questionnaires are important and interesting documents from those times, as they can be the source of a study regarding the economical and social situation of our villages.

The robota had various forms. In exemple, the serfs of Gy. Vass, from the Alba County, had to perform 3-4 days of manual work, and to scythe day by day for up to 4 weeks. From J. Zudor's serfs in the same county, one had to pay 7 florins as an annual tax and to perform 6 weeks of robota in the summer, while an other had to pay 10 florins, "as they could bargain"². Borsos Zs.'s serf is forced to perform manual labor 8 weeks each year, while Nagy P.'s peasants work 3-4 weeks with the yoked animals, and do other manual work uninterrupted from early spring until the winter³.

The necessity of a fair accountancy of the labor days appeared already in the 17th century, and this way in the early 1700's the first robota-tokens are introduced, as a recognition of the labor performed by the serfs. In accordance with the labor for which they were issued, these can be classified in: manual robota tokens, "sigillum manuale" and tokens for robota with yoked animals, "sigillum iugale"⁴.

As there were only a few serfs who could read, on most of the tokens there was a sign or a letter by which these could be easily identified, for what kind of work they were issued. This way, a scythe, an arm or a hand, or the letter F ("Fuss-robot") were the symbols for the manual labor, while a cart-wheel meant robota with yoked animals. Many of the tokens had a hole, so the peasants could collect them on a string, and show the collection to the lord at the end of each year, as a prove for the fulfilled duties.⁵

If by any reason the serf did not show all the tokens when they was accounted, he had to buy the missing pieces with products or money. In the early 19th century, one day of robota with yoked animals was billed at 20 kreuzers, while one day of manual robota at 10 kreuzers⁶. Although after 1848,

¹ PRODAN, David 1989, 307-308.

² Ibidem, 330.

³ Ibidem, 330-331.

⁴ GOHL, Ödön 1913, 6.

⁵ Ibidem, 1.

⁶ ZOMBORI, Lajos 1996.

according to the IXth Austrian law issued in the same year, there should be no more robota tokens, some of these markers will still be in use for a long time.

The serfdom is canceled in 1848, but the lords still need the workforce on their domains, so probably to account the labor days they have kept the same token-system by which the peasants could prove how many days they have worked.

This article's purpose is to present the tokens used in the 19th century on 3 domains from the former Caraș-Severin county: Domeniile Forazesti (Fărășești), Poganyesti (Pogănești) and Rumunyesti (Românești), wrongly categorized in the literature (GOHL, Ödön 1913; ZOMBORI, Lajos 1996) as robota-tokens. Description of the tokens:

1. Token with nominal value of $\frac{1}{4}$, Fărășești (Zombori KS-I.1, Schäffer 492-1.1). Obverse: Hungarian legend FORAZESTI URADALOM (Fărășești Domains), Winkler de Forazest family arms, without the crown, with \varnothing 4mm center hole, a small crown above and baroque-style decorations in the left and right field. Reverse: above in an oval frame the nominal value, garlands in the left and right. Brass, \varnothing 24 mm⁷.

2. The same as nr. 1, but silvered brass.

3. Token with nominal value of $\frac{1}{2}$, Fărășești (Neumann 28462, Gohl 5, Zombori KS-I.2, Schäffer 492-1.2). Obverse: Hungarian legend FORAZESTI URADALOM (Fărășești Domains), with \varnothing 4mm center hole, below the Winkler de Forazest family arms. Reverse: above in an oval frame the nominal value, garlands in the left and right fields. Brass, \varnothing 24 mm.

4. The same as nr. 3, but silvered brass.

5. Token with nominal value of $\frac{3}{4}$, Fărășești (Neumann 28461, Gohl 6, Zombori KS-I.3, Schäffer 492-1.3). Obverse: Hungarian legend FORAZESTI URADALOM (Fărășești Domains), with \varnothing 4mm center hole, below the Winkler de Forazest family arms, above a small crown, and the bust of a knight in armor. Baroque-style decorations in the left and right fields. Reverse: above in an oval frame the nominal value, garlands in the left and right fields. Brass, \varnothing 27.5 mm.

6. The same as nr. 5, but silvered brass (Fig. 1/5).

7. Token with nominal value of 1, Fărășești (Neumann 28460, Gohl 7, Zombori KS-I.4, Schäffer 492-1.4). Obverse: Hungarian legend FORAZESTI URADALOM (Fărășești Domains), with \varnothing 4.5mm center hole, below Winkler de Forazest family arms. Without decorations in the left and right fields. Reverse: above in an oval frame the nominal value,

garlands in the left and right fields. Brass, \varnothing 27.5 mm. (Fig. 1/6).

8. The same as nr. 7, but silvered Brass.

9. Token with nominal value of $\frac{1}{4}$, Pogănești (Zombori KS-II.1, Schäffer 577-1.1). Obverse: Hungarian legend POGANYESTI URADALOM (Pogănești Domains), with \varnothing 4mm center hole. Reverse: Above is the nominal value in a cartridge which continues in garlands in the left and right fields. Below the Joannovics of Pogănești family arms. Brass, \varnothing 24.3 mm.

10. The same as nr. 9, but silvered brass.

11. Token with nominal value of $\frac{1}{2}$, Pogănești (Gohl 73, Zombori KS-II.2, Schäffer 577-1.2). Obverse: Hungarian legend POGANYESTI URADALOM (Pogănești Domains), with \varnothing 4mm center hole. Reverse: The nominal value in a cartridge below, which continues in garlands in the left and right fields. Below the Joannovics of Pogănești family arms. Brass, \varnothing 24.3 mm. (Fig. 1/7).

12. The same as nr. 11, but silvered brass.

13. Token with nominal value of $\frac{3}{4}$, Pogănești (Zombori KS-II.3, Schäffer 577-1.3). Obverse: Hungarian legend POGANYESTI URADALOM (Pogănești Domains), With \varnothing 4mm center hole. Reverse: the nominal value in a cartridge above, which continues in garlands in the left and right fields. Below the Joannovics of Pogănești family arms. Brass, \varnothing 27 mm.

14. The same as nr. 13, but silvered brass.

15. Token with nominal value of 1, Pogănești (Zombori KS-II.4, Schäffer 577-1.4). Obverse: Hungarian legend POGANYESTI URADALOM (Pogănești Domains), with \varnothing 4mm center hole. Reverse: the nominal value in a cartridge above, which continues in garlands in the left and right fields. Below the Joannovics of Pogănești family arms. Brass, \varnothing 27 mm.

16. The same as nr. 15, but silvered brass.

17. Token with nominal value of $\frac{1}{4}$, Românești (Neumann 28485, Gohl 75, Zombori KS-III.1, Schäffer 590-1.1). Obverse: Hungarian legend RUMUNYESTI URADALOME (property of Românești Domains), with \varnothing 4mm center hole, below the Fábry family arms, baroque-style decorations in the left and right fields, above a small crown and a pelican with outspread wings. Reverse: the nominal value in an oval frame above, garlands in the left and right fields. Brass, \varnothing 23 mm. (Fig. 1/1)

18. The same as nr. 17, but silvered brass (Schäffer 590-2.1).

⁷ We would like to thank Mr. Erwin Schäffer for the pictures of the tokens.

19. Token with nominal value of $\frac{1}{2}$, Românești (Neumann 28484, Gohl 76, Zombori KS-III.2, Schäffer 590-1.2). Obverse: Hungarian legend RUMUNYESTI URADALOME (property of Românești domains), with Ø 4mm center hole, below the Fábry family arms, baroque-style decorations in the left and right fields, above a small crown and a pelican with outspread wings. Reverse: the nominal value in an oval frame above, garlands in the left and right fields. Brass, Ø 23 mm. (Fig. 1/2)

20. The same as nr. 19, but silvered brass (Schäffer 590-2.2).

21. Token with nominal value of $\frac{3}{4}$, Românești (Neumann 28483, Gohl 77, Zombori KS-III.3, Schäffer 590-1.3). Obverse: Hungarian legend RUMUNYESTI URADALOME (property of Românești Domains), with Ø 4mm center hole, below the Fábry family arms, baroque-style decorations in the left and right fields, above a small crown and a pelican with outspread wings. Reverse: the nominal value in an oval frame above, garlands in the left and right fields. Brass, Ø 27 mm. (Fig. 1/3)

22. The same as nr. 21, but silvered brass (Schäffer 590-2.3).

23. Token with nominal value of 1, Românești (Neumann 28482, Gohl 78, Zombori KS-III.4, Schäffer 590-1.4). Obverse: Hungarian legend RUMUNYESTI URADALOME (property of Românești Domains), with Ø 4mm center hole, below the Fábry family arms, baroque-style decorations in the left and right fields, above a small crown and a pelican with outspread wings. Reverse: the nominal value in an oval frame above, garlands in the left and right fields. Brass, Ø 27 mm. (Fig. 1/4)

24. The same as nr. 23, but silvered brass (Schäffer 590-2.4).

The Fărășești (Forazest, Forrásfalva) village today is under the administration of Pietroasa parish, in the Timiș country, east from the town of Făget. It was first mentioned in a 1548 document with the name of Forrásfalva, property of nobleman Ioan de Bozwar. The Domains are in the Crown's possession until 1823, when they are obtained by the brothers Carl și Franz Winkler⁸. Later, at the end of the 19th century the domain is acquired by the Bethlen family⁹, and in the agricultural statistics from 1897 we see the name of the grof Bethlen András as the owner the Fărășești¹⁰.

The presence of the Winkler family arms indicates that these tokens were issued after 1823, while

the fact that Josef Neumann mentions them in "*Beschreibung der bekanntesten Kupfermunzen*" confirms that they were already in use in the 6th decade of the 19th century.

The resemblance between the Fărășești, Pogănești and Românești tokens can only mean that these were made approximately in the same period, in the same workshop, by the same craftsman. They are all almost identical in size: 23-24mm for the ones with nominal value of $\frac{1}{4}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$, respectively 27-27.5 mm for the ones with nominal value of $\frac{3}{4}$ and 1. The stylistic similarities between the three sets are more than obvious: each set is composed of 4 tokens with the same nominal, each token has a Ø 4mm center hole, the reverse of several of the same nominal values from the 3 series are almost identical (i.e. the reverse of the $\frac{3}{4}$ from Românești is the same as the reverse of the $\frac{3}{4}$ from Fărășești, etc.). The family arms of the lord appear on each one, and the manor's name, written in Hungarian. Beside all these, there is also a silvered series for each of the three sets.

The Pogănești tokens could not been in use before 1835. Located at North-East from Lugoj, the domains were donated to the Joannovics family by the Emperor Francisc I at November 6, 1834¹¹. It seems that the one who issued the tokens was lord Joannovics Illés, and this fact limits the issue date to the 1835-1850 period.

This fits also the Românești tokens. At only a few miles from Fărășești, the village joined the Fábry family possessions by the imperial donation to Fábry Janos in 1833, who was probably the issuer of the tokens¹².

The literature (GOHL, Ödön 1913; ZOMBORI, Lajos 1996) presents these markers as robota-tokens, and the authors believe that the nominal values ($\frac{1}{4}$, $\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{3}{4}$, 1) represent days of forced labor. But these markers doesn't show the characteristics of the usual robota-tokens from that period. There is no symbol on them which to suggest the type of labor (sigillum manuale or sigillum iugale), they don't have a crude execution as the other robota-tokens which often were made by blacksmiths, or by prisoners¹³. This is the main reason why the weight of the robota-tokens is usually not mentioned in the literature, as it could vary significantly for pieces issued in the same series. The main criteria which was respected for all the robota-tokens was the simplicity, as most of the serfs could not read.

A special category of tokens in which we could classify these Fărășești, Pogănești and Românești tokens could only be the one of the manor tokens

⁸ GOHL, Ödön 1913, 8.

⁹ Ibidem.

¹⁰ Gazdaczintár 1897.

¹¹ GOHL, Ödön 1913, 15.

¹² ZOMBORI, Lajos 1996.

¹³ Ibidem, 10.

issued for the day-laborers. The manors frequently hired also free peasants for various works. These day-, or season-workers received on several domains tokens in accordance with the performed labor. The manor tokens usually have a more tidy, careful execution, opposite to the robota-tokens, although in some cases the latter ones was used also as manor tokens, but with special countermarks which to indicate that they were issued for day-laborers.

The nominals ($\frac{1}{4}$, $\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{3}{4}$, 1) on the tokens from the three domains can only mean days of labor. It's for sure that these had no cash value, as the $\frac{3}{4}$ would have been a very unusual nominal for this period. The center hole's purpose was for the peasants to collect them on a string.

In conclusion, the Fărășești, Pogănești and Românești tokens were issued and used in the same period. They cannot be considered robota-tokens, and probably were used as manor tokens for the day-laborers. They were issued in the late 1830s and used for at least one decade, being one of the most beautiful tokens from the former Empire.

These little pieces of metal are the witnesses of the last years of the Transylvanian serfdom. The law which put an end to this over 300-year long period comes in 1848, but without a redistribution of the land, recognizing only the former serf as a free peasant and owner of the land from his possession. The definitive abolition of the serfdom comes a few years later, with the imperial patents from 1853-1854.

Balázs Áldor, Csaba – Maros Megyei Múzeum, Marosvásárhely, Horea u. 24., RO-540036; funboywrk@yahoo.com

Bibliography

Gazdaczimtár = *A magyar korona országainak mezőgazdasági statisztikája, 2, Gazdaczimtár*, Magyar Királyi Központi Statisztikai Hivatal, Budapest, 1897.

GOHL, Ödön

1913 Magyar robotjegyek, *Numizmatikai Közöny*, XII (Separatum), Budapest.

NEUMANN, Josef

1858–1872 *Beschreibung der bekanntesten Kupfermünzen*, Praga.

PRODAN, David

1989 *Problema iobăgiei în Transilvania, 1700-1848*, Ed. Științifică și Enciclopedică, București.

SCHÄFFER, Erwin

2003 *Jetoane - semne valorice și mărci*, Editura Corvin, Deva.

ZOMBORI, Lajos

1996 *Magyar robotbárcák, uradalmi pénzek és gazdasági napszámok*, V-Kiadó, Budapest.

19. századi bánsági uradalmi pénzek

(Kivonat)

A jobbágyok munka-, termény- és pénzbeli járandósággal tartoztak az államnak, az egyháznak, a földesúrnak. Az elvégzett munka egybevethető nyilvántartásának igénye már a 17. században felmerült, és az 1700-as évek elejétől ún. robotbárcákkal nyugtázták.

A dolgozat az egykori Krassó-Szörény vármegye három 19. századi uradalmának az uradalmi pénzeit tárgyalja, amelyeket korábban a szakirodalom tévesen robotbárcának tekintett. A három uradalom: Forazesti (Fărășești), Poganyesti (Pogănești) és Rumunyesi (Românești).

A három uradalomban kibocsátott uradalmi pénzek közötti hasonlóság alapján ezeket nagyjából ugyanabban az időszakban gyártották, egyazon mester, egyazon műhelyben. Bár a szakirodalom robotbárcáknak tekinti őket, inkább a napszámosok uradalmi pénzeinek jellegzetességeit mutatják. Nem jelölik rajtuk az ebben az időszakban szokásos módon a munkát, amelynek ellenértékéül kibocsátották, és – ellentétben a Habsburg-birodalom robotbárcáinak többségével, amelyeket gyakran kovácsok vagy éppen rabok készítettek, kezdetleges kivitelezésben – kidolgozásuk figyelmes munkára vall.

Fărășești, Pogănești és Românești uradalmi pénzeit kevéssel 1840 előtt bocsáthatták ki, legkevesebb egy évtizedet voltak használatban, és az egykori Birodalom területén a legszebb uradalmi pénzek közé számíthatók.

Jetoane de moșii utilizate în secolul al XIX-lea în Banat

(Rezumat)

Țăranii iobagi au de îndeplinit obligații – sub formă de muncă, produse și bani - față de Stat, biserică și moșier. Necesitatea unui sistem corect de contorizare a zilelor de muncă s-a impus deja în secolul al XVII-lea, astfel la începutul anilor 1700 apar primele mărci de robotă, acordate iobașilor în semn de recunoaștere a muncii prestate.

Această lucrare își propune să studieze mărcile aflate în uz în secolul al XIX-lea pe trei moșii din fostul comitat Caraș-Severin: Domeniile Forazesti (Fărășești), Poganyesti (Pogănești) și Rumunyesi (Românești), categorizate greșit în literatura de specialitate, ca mărci de robotă.

Asemănările mai mult decât evidente între seriile de mărci emise la Fărășești, Pogănești și Românești ne îndeamnă să credem că ele au fost fabricate aproximativ în aceeași perioadă de timp, de același meșter, în același atelier. Deși literatura de specialitate prezintă aceste mărci ca mărci de robotă, ele prezintă mai degrabă caracteristicile jetoanelor de moșii pentru zilieri. Nu au însemnele folosite în mod uzual pe mărcile de robotă din această perioadă pentru a indica munca pentru care au fost emise. Au o execuție atentă spre deosebire de majoritatea mărcilor de robotă din Imperiul Habsburgic, care, fiind făcute deseori de fierari sau chiar de deținuții din închisori, au un aspect rudimentar.

Mărcile de la Fărășești, Pogănești și Românești eu fost emise cu puțin înainte de 1840 și s-au aflat în uz cel puțin un deceniu, fiind unele dintre cele mai frumoase jetoane de moșii emise pe teritoriul fostului Imperiu.




Figure 1.
Manor tokens used in the 19th century in Banat