INTRODUCTION

As studies in recent decades have refined the picture of medieval settlement forms, morphological and topographical approaches gained a greater importance in archaeological as well as historical research. However, as it is in the case of many problems, it is difficult to decide whether the application of these methods, or the results of studies on settlement forms, served as a starting point for reconsideration of the relationship between the former typology and the reality of the Middle Ages. While, the view of a wide variety and complexity of villages originated from Great Britain during the 50s and became generally accepted in Western Europe, in Hungary no serious attempts were made to test the validity of the strict system of village types established in the 60s.

The present study aims at, on the one hand, demonstrating how model of a reconstructed village form might be used to provide a basis for new interpretation of Hungarian settlement typology, and on the other hand at introducing methods based on historical, archaeological, historical geographical and ethnographical evidences whose usage can cast some light on the inner structure of medieval Hungarian villages.

Because of the often fragmentary nature of information and the complex interrelationships that make up the forms of villages, this research requires the synthesis of results, methods and sources of different disciplines. The method applied in the work consists of two stages. After making reconstruction of the village pattern relying upon historical, archaeological, historical geographical and ethnographical evidences, we will analyse the image of the settlement and draw further conclusions concerning the structure of the inner area and land usage.

The sources of the research are also taken from different branches of science. Regarding Csepely (county Somogy), the reconstruction is mainly based on the topographical description of its division charter from 1412; however, early maps, historical geographical evidences, observations taken in the landscape and ethnographical analogies are used as well.

The possible results of the present work are limited since the image of the medieval village consists only of fragments of information. Nevertheless, the available sources allow us to give at least a general, but in the case of some elements, even more detailed reconstructions of the settlement.

Although, the present work must be considered to be an initial insight to the problem of the complexity of Hungarian villages, the outcome of our work is an encouragement to expect additional results from the further development of the subject. More detailed studies of this type on different regions and on villages with different social and economic background might give new insights into the research of settlement history as well as village typology.
Before starting this discussion, it is essential to see which disciplines deal with the problem of settlement structure. This can be very profitable not only from the point of view of the state of research, but it might also cast some light on the nature of morphological research. In Hungary four branches of science are interested in the field, namely history, historical geography, ethnography and archaeology.

To begin with, the majority of ethnographic works concentrate on studying settlement forms within the territory of Hungary. Consequently, the system of typology established by ethnography, is based on regional types and remains nearly untouched by the more or less unified international terminology. Ethnography, on the one hand by serving descriptions of outer appearance of recent villages and on the other hand by separating the earlier elements of the settlements, provides useful information for historical, historical geographical and archaeological research as well.

In contrast to ethnographical studies, historical geography is deeply rooted in foreign typologies. In the 1920s Gyula Princz, influenced by the German research, worked out a settlement typology based on regional and ethnic aspects. Following the works of him and other outstanding geologists and historians like Pál Teleki and Zsigmond Bátky, the main types of Hungarian settlements were summarized by Tibor Mendöl on the basis of the German typology. Beside making classifications, he points out that the different categories must be interpreted by functional roles. In other words, the meaning of typology is in the economic and social background behind the physical forms. Recent morphological studies still use his classification which contains the following village forms: farmsteads; group settlements; villages with round layout; street villages; villages with chessboard layout; villages with long plots.

Mendöl’s typology was adopted by historians and became widely accepted in the archaeological research as well. Besides application to the system of categories, historians also treated the ground plans of settlements as starting points of further conclusions. In a wide range of historical studies, the layout of towns and villages are considered as the last phase of development, incorporating many fragmentary elements of earlier forms of the given settlement.

István Györffy was one of the first to apply the topographical method when he traced back the ground-plans of some towns in the Hungarian Great Plain to the nomadic ages, considering the gardens surrounding the core of the settlements as remains of earlier pastures.

The same method was used in the case of several Hungarian towns from the end of the 1950’s. The present town plan was taken as a starting point, and by using historical and archaeological data, the medieval layout of towns became deducible. Erik Fügedi, in the case of Óbuda and András Kubinyi, in his study about economical process of Budafelhévíz, applied to the method the so-called “Verfassungstopographie”. Because of the lack of suitable historical data, inevitably the town layout, its changes and its archaeological features, become sources for the town’s development. Jenő Major on the basis of archaeological and historical data has reconstructed the plan of medieval Sopron. By comparing it with the recent ground-plan he pointed out the phases of town development and the economic, social features behind them.

A short but fundamental paper was published by György Granasztói about the role of Hungarian topographical research. He has given a summary about the tasks (reconstruction, analysis, search for analogy), the subjects (the street network, plot system, market place, town wall) and the possible causes of the topographical evolution (the changes in environment, in municipal law, in trade, etc.).

The next step toward a more elaborate pattern was András Kubinyi’s work about market towns in the Hungarian Great Plain. New types of ground-plans were recognised by him, like the settlement with market structure.
place and the merging town. More importantly, he identified the different forms within one settlement and by using them distinguished the principal stages of the town development.

Reconstructions based on medieval charters were born in the field of village structures simply because they have simpler ground-plans. The initiative was taken by historical geographers, when Jenö Major called the attention to the topographical descriptions of the medieval charters.\(^\text{14}\) He stressed that if spatial connections between the different descriptive elements of a given charter can be clarified, then one has a chance to make a reconstruction about at least a part of the early village. In the case of detailed sources, like the charters about perambulate of bounds or division of estates, a rather complex and exact map can be available. Another novelty of his work is that by identifying certain topographical elements in the recent landscape he was able to deduce the measures of some plots.

Some years later, historians probably influenced by Major’s argument, continued the investigation. One of the most important works is the book written by István Szabó in 1969.\(^\text{15}\) He examined various aspects of the village history including the structures of the settlements and the field systems as well. Many layouts or approximate street networks are given in his work based on medieval charters. By using data of written sources from the thirteenth-fourteenth centuries and comparing them with the present layouts he identified the cores and the later expansion of some villages.

Not only the charters from Middle Ages but the early modern maps too constituted the sources of Ferenc Maksay’s work on medieval villages.\(^\text{16}\) Comparing the plans of recent villages and maps from the eighteenth-nineteenth centuries, he demonstrated that many of the settlements show continuity from the Middle Ages. In his view the early cores of the villages are considered in some way as separate units within the settlements, however he does not ignore the fact that the appearance of later changes can be seen as similar features. Consequently, on the one hand morphology can serve to develop generalized connections between history and topography, but on the other hand it is vital to keep in mind that all cases are different and need careful research.

Because of the small quantity of historical sources concerning the image of settlements from medieval territory of Hungary, the importance of archaeological research must be emphasized. Results of excavations show those situations that are supposed to be deduced from today’s settlement forms by the other disciplines. Nevertheless, attention must be paid to the fact that the majority of the time detailed archaeological surveys can be made only on a part of the area of the given village. Imre Holl collects and analyses the structures of excavated villages from the High Middle Ages in his article and points out how the order of tofts became closed and their size decreased in the course of village development.\(^\text{17}\)

In the area of farming systems, in contrast to the typology of settlements, the first pioneer works were born in agrarian history at the end of the last century.\(^\text{18}\) Tagányi’s book on common field systems was the first work that gave an exact and detailed description about the yearly distributed fields on the basis of written sources.

Historians, setting out mainly from Tagányi’s work, investigate the development of agrarian techniques, forms of landholding and field systems from the fallow system to the two- and three-field systems. The first summaries are given by such influential scholars than István Szabó\(^\text{19}\) and Ferenc Maksay.\(^\text{20}\) Following the results of the geographical historian Tibor Mendöl, they connect the two- and three-field systems with street villages and group settlements, but at the same time they state that different field systems might occur within the township of a village. Whereas Szabó takes over the method, worked out by Jenö Major, with regard to the reconstruction of the plot system, he does not apply it in connection with the cultivated area of settlements.

In the 1970s besides the summary of medieval agrarian history written by István Szabó, two papers were published about the relationship between the inhabited part of the settlement and the cultivated area of the village. László Földes states\(^\text{21}\) that in the region of “Szepesség” where the plots in the village formed groups, the fields belonging to the given groups laid next each other in the outfield too. In essence, the remains of an earlier
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plot system were still visible in the fifteenth century. With regard to the villages in the mentioned region founded by deforestation, Adrienn Kőrmeny assumes that the movement of German settlers (so-called hospes) was the background of many foundations in the thirteenth-fourteenth centuries.

Both the field system and the structure of the toft system have been described by Jenő Szűcs in his posthumous monograph, published in 1993. In his theory the changes in the village structure and field system are connected on the one hand with the results of the Mongolian invasion and that of internal developments towards to unified peasantry, and on the other hand with the agrarian innovation of the usage of the heavy moulded plough.

Among the ethnographers, the outstanding scholar, Márta Belényesy’s studies provide new aspects for agrarian history and her works partly influenced the historical research as well. Belényesy’s articles contain various aspects of the medieval agriculture; among others, the origins and development of two- and three-field system and the complexity of the land usage. On the basis of systematic examination of historical and ethnographical sources, she was able to reconstruct different field systems.

Ethnography, examining origins of recent field systems, deduce the possible elements of earlier farming system from today’s land usage. In this sense, its methods show close relations with that of landscape archaeology. Indeed, ethnographical descriptions of clearings can be regarded as starting points for the discovery of remains of medieval parcels in archaeology.

Archaeological surveys on relics of early arable land, that began in the 70s, covers the four works of Gyula Novák and István Torma. Their studies provide revealing information about the form and the size of the parcels, about their position in the township and in the landscape and, last but not least, about the relationship between the cultivated land and the inner area of the village. First, Novák came up with evidence of earlier clearings, that remained as terraces and rows of stones in the landscape. The width of the parcels from Nagybörzsöny (county Pest) are between 15 and 35 meters and they are 100-130 meters long. In the case of the deserted medieval village Kosba (county Tolna), that was founded by deforestation, István Torma points out that the parcels have very different sizes ranging 5 to 40 meters. The investigation made in Sarvaly (county Veszprém), first challenged the traditionally accepted theory about the similarity of field patterns in the villages. Equally importantly, in Szentmihály (county Zala), Novák was able to reconstruct a part of the parcels joined to the plots. He also proved that these parcels create the infield, which had been known formerly only from historical evidences.

The present introduction into the state of Hungarian research aims at providing an initial insight into the multidisciplinary nature of the problems and to point what were the first steps on the way to constructing a more colourful image of settlement structures.

2. STUDY ON VILLAGE STRUCTURE AND FIELD SYSTEMS OF MEDIEVAL CSEPELY

2.1. Methods and sources

The reconstruction of medieval Csepely will mainly be achieved on the basis of evidence drawn from the division charter of 1412. The document survived as a copy in a charter from 1436, and was the first conclusion of the lawsuit begun between 1392 and 1396.

The source, considering the very detailed description of the village, is one of the most unique division of estate in comparison with medieval documents in Hungary. Though, the peculiar source is published since 1985 and its use in studying fifteenth century image of the village seems to be obvious, the treatment of the document

22 KŐRMENDY (1974)
23 SZŰCS (1993a) 155–222.
24 BELÉNYESY (1958a)
25 BELÉNYESY (1964); BELÉNYESY (1960)
26 BALASSA (1964); HOFFMANN (1956)
27 NOVÁKI (1975–1977)
28 TORMA (1981)
30 NOVÁKI (1990)
31 MOL. DI. 44118. Published in: BORSA (1985)
remained unaccomplished until recent time. In 1995, István Draskóczy published a map of the inner area and fields of 15th century Csepely on the basis of the document. Although the reconstruction of the inner area made by him is very similar to the reconstruction appeared in the recent work, the image of the 15th century fields shows remarkable differences mainly in the size of arable lands. Nevertheless, the main reason for dealing with the subject is not the different solutions of the reconstructions, but the necessity and possibility of analyzing the drawn image of the village.

We have the chance to reconstruct the ground plan of a medieval village because data of the charter about positions of plots, arable lands, meadows, vines and woodlands, and the description of spatial relations between them give us possibility to deduce the medieval settlement structure. In addition, field names, mentioned in the document and used today as well help to identify some areas of fifteenth century Csepely. For envisioning the basic features of the village form and its later changes, we also rely on the Ordinance Survey from 1784. In apart from historical and historical geographical methods, archaeological field walking and survey clarify the features of the terrain, the sites of the deserted neighbouring villages and relations between the different settlement elements.

Fifteenth century landholders appeared gradually in Csepely during the period between 1138 and 1390. The settlement has been mentioned for the first time in 1138 when King Béla II donated ten vines and twenty vine-workers to the provostship of Dömös in the village. The next reference to Csepely is the charter made out in 1193 for Knights of Saint John in Fehérvár which provides one aratrum land to them. The next landholders in Csepely were the Saint Nicolas collegiate church of Fehérvár, given ten mansiones and five vines in 1215 and the chapter of Fehérvár which received eighteen mansiones with fields in 1229. The Kátai family first appeared in Csepely in 1248 and the Osztopáni family obtained lands for plots, vines, meadows and woodlands in the village in 1276. The first document to mention the treasurer of Fehérvár dates from 1327. The Carthusian prior of Lövölő obtained thirty seven plots in 1390, when King Sigismund exchanged the estate of Karád for the estate of the prior in Baharc. It is not clear from the documents when the bishop of Veszprém first received possessions in Csepely.

All the fifteenth century landholders were present in Csepely for the beginning of the 1390s onwards; and around that time the provost of Dömös applied for marking his possessions held in the village. The Kátai, Osztopáni and Nezsai families protested against the application of the provost and, to strengthen their opposition, introduced earlier donation charters as well. According to the document from 1412, the palatine, Nicolas Garai, ordered his people and delegates of the chapter to take stock of all the plots, arable lands, vines, meadows and woodlands and to distribute the fields among the landholders according to their deeds of ownership.

Apart from the division charter other valuable sources provide data about the topographical elements of Csepely before 1412. First, the documents of the lawsuit taken from 1316 to 1320, in which Paul son of Roland gives a piece of land and three plots to Demeter son of Peter. The description of field boundaries includes the
Fig. 1. Reconstruction based on the document of 1316.

Fig. 2. Reconstruction based on the document of 1339.
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parish church, a meadow situated south of the church and a stream flowing northward toward the church. The discussed section of the document allows us to draw a map of the given territory. (Fig 1.)

Similarly profitable source is the description from 1339, in which Jacob son of Christopher Csepeli sold his toft to Emericus, son of Gwrk (Györk), for 1.5 marks. The document says that west of the plot situates the toft of Saint Laurence church, the parish church. To the south of the sold toft lays the plot of treasurer in Fehérvár, and north of the plot lays the terra fima of Jacob. Thus, the parish church with its street, surrounding plots and meadow becomes identifiable already at the beginning of the fourteenth century. (Fig. 2.)

In the same year, the bishop of Veszprém became embroiled in a lawsuit against the sons of John Várángi for a meadow and a piece of arable land along the boundaries of the villages of Csepely, Váráng and Kötcse.

In the perambulation document of Teleki from 1429, Csepely appears as neighbouring settlement. One of the two roads running southward from Teleki led to Váráng and the other ended in Csepely.

While the population gradually disappeared during the Turkish invasion, the village was not destroyed definitively. According to the Turkish Exchequer Rolls, Csepely contained 8 households in 1563. The village does not appear in the register from 1571 but by 1580 18 households were drawn up in the sources. Consequently, Csepely was resettled very soon after the temporary evacuation of the population during the Turkish wars and by the beginning of the 18th century (1715) the bishop of Veszprém already had 15 plots in the village.

2.2. Reconstructing the inner area

Before starting this section I would like to delineate the geographical area under investigation. Csepely, or Nagycsepely as it called today, lies along the edge of the lower Nagycsepely-valley within the Külső-Somogyi hills in the western part of Hungary. The adjacent villages, Váráng and Fehéregyház, identified by archaeological field-walking, and the northern neighbouring village, Teleki, characteristically lie on the edge between the back of the hill and the valley. In case of Csepely, the village not only assimilates to the form of the valley but also follows the course of the stream called Séd which flows through the village.

From the description of the plot allocation in the charter of 1412, the ground plan of the inner area of the village becomes clear. (Fig. 3.) The division charter, following the order of the landholders' appearance in Csepely, begins with the plots of the provostship of Dömös and says:

„First, namely for lord Peter, the provost of Dömös his shares, thirty mansiones, twenty are habited and ten deserted, namely three mansiones [are situated] on the eastern line, behind the shares of the treasurer of Fehérvár on the southern end, fourteen mansiones are on the same eastern line, [lying] from the shares of the treasurer to the church of Saint Laurence Martyr, ten mansiones on the western line, [lying] from the southern end of the western line toward the north and here are also three mansiones between two streets...“

---
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Fig. 3. Reconstruction of the inner area of Csepely based on the division charter from 1412.

(A = Provostship of Dömös; B = Chapter of Fehérvár; C = Saint Nicolas collegiate church of Fehérvár; D = Osztápáni family; E = Kátai family; F = Laurence, son of Demeter; G = Prior of Lővőd; H = Treasurer of Fehérvár; I = Nicolas Nézsai and Nicolas Csó; J = Bishopric of Veszprémem)
The expression of "between two streets" identifies with the territory between the street of the parish church and the road running parallel with that street, because, with regard to arable lands the source mentions a road situated behind the gardens. Thus, the plots of the provostship align on the eastern side of the main street from the south to the street of the parish church, surrounding the plots of the treasurer in Fehérvár ("two plots with one gate on the eastern line on the south between the shares belonging to the provost in Dömös"). The provostship has thirteen plots on the western side of the main street.

The Saint Nicolas collegiate church has the following plots.

"For the Saint Nicolas the Confessor church ten mansiones, namely six habited ones to the north between two streets, near the well called Hidegkút, three similarly habited mansiones on the north, on the western line between the two field marks accumulated by them, on the first [mansio] lives Peter son of Saoul, on the second [lives] Peter, son of Michael and on the third [lives] Mark the tailor and his son Sebastian; the tenth and last deserted [plot] is situated near possession Varang, over the mentioned well Hidegkút, with their gardens...

According to this extract from the charter, six plots situate on the north, between the two streets, near the well called Hidegkút (Cold well). Hidegkút is today called Hidegtó (Cold pond), lies at the spot where the north-eastern side street turns towards the north. The collegiate church also hold three plots on the western side of the main street and one plot along the eastern side street situated over Hidegkút and near Várang. The village of Várang existed only until the Turkish invasion between the villages Csepely and Kötcse. On the basis of data from written sources, field names (Várangi meadow) and field walking, its site and remains can be identified. With reference to the shares of the chapter in Fehérvár, the document also provides information about the position of the plot on the eastern side of the main street and lays in a north-south direction.

Chapter of Fehérvár holds twenty one plots in the settlement.

"Then, for the provost and chapter of Fehérvár twenty one mansiones, namely six habited mansiones on the western line beginning at and including the mansio of Laurence, son of Demeter to [the plot of] Matthew, the bondsman of the bishop of Veszprém; first [it has] five mansiones, on the eastern line, behind the mentioned Saint Laurence church, beginning next the shares of the mentioned provostship of Dömös on the north, one of them is deserted and the others are habited; [it has] two mansiones, one habited and one deserted, on the western line, south of the shares of the mentioned Saint Nicolas the Confessor Church; furthermore eight deserted mansiones near Varang possession, next the mentioned well Hidegkút and the sessio of Saint Nicolas the Confessor Church whose sessio lies from the south towards the north.

Relying upon the division charter, the chapter has six plots on the western side of the main street. The six habited mansio lie between the plot belonging to the bishop of Veszprém and that of the sons of Dominic Osztépáni. Five plots, among which one is deserted and four are habited, are situated on the eastern line behind and next to the parish church. One habited and one deserted mansio lie on the western line and eight deserted mansio on the eastern side of the main street, between Hidegkút and Várang.
Martin Káta and his son Michael, obtained the following fourteen plots:

"Then for the mentioned Michael, son of Martin from Káta, eleven sessio, seven habited ones on the eastern line beginning from the sessio of Dennis, son of Demeter, bondsman of the mentioned provostship and chapter in Fehérvár, [lying] towards the north to the road; and four deserted [plots] on the western line opposite to those seven sessio, beginning from the sessio of the parish priest towards the north" “three deserted sessio [are situated] on the mentioned western line, next and near to his other plots, towards the north, to the adjacent street.”

Regarding these tofts the document is so clear that there can be no doubt concerning the position of the plots. The Káta family had seven habited plots situated on the eastern line between the road and the plots of the chapter of Fehérvár and another seven plots on the other side of the main street opposite to the former seven plots.

The next landholder is the treasurer of Fehérvár who has “two plots which has one gate [lying] on the eastern line in south, between the shares of the mentioned provostship in Dömös.”

The Carthusian order in Lövöld occupies thirty seven plots in the village.

"Then for the prior of Lövöld thirty seven sessio, namely twenty two habited and fifteen deserted [plots] are situated on both sides of the plots of the mentioned Saint Nicolas the Confessor church, between the two streets, and on the north, opposite to his adjacent plots."

In this case, the charter is not precise enough to make an exact reconstruction of the order of the plots, therefore, the plots are placed on the map according to the sizes of the mentioned territories. The plots are put on both sides of the tofts belonging to the collegiate church of Fehérvár, between the two streets on the north and opposite to those plots in the northwestern part of the village.

Dennis and George, sons of Dominic Osztopáni, owned the following shares:

"Then for the mentioned Dennis and George, sons of Dominic from Osztopáni five sessio, namely three habited and two deserted ones, of them is between the two roads, in the middle of (?) the bondsman of the provostship of Dömös and was inhabited by Demeter, son of Michael, and his son Laurence; four [plots locate] on the western line, two of them are next and north of the share of the mentioned provostship and chapter of Fehérvár in northern part of Csepely.

In other words, the sons of Dominic Osztopáni had one plot between the plots of the chapter of Fehérvár and that of the provostship of Dömös. They possessed two plots situated between the plots of the provost and two plots on the western line, west of the two plots belonging to the chapter in Fehérvár in northern part of Csepely.

Nicolas, son of Thomas Nesai, and Nicolas, son of Andrew Cső, also had shares in the village.
Then for Nicolas, son of Thomas from Nesa and for the other Nicolas, son of Andrew Cső, a piece of land suitable for five plots [situated] under the hill next the road leading from Chepel to Kecke.

The earlier road to Kőtcse could either have lain on the line of today’s concrete road leading towards Kőtcse or the hollow way next to the parish church. At first glance, the expression “under the hill” supports the idea that this road was the hollow way. But this impression is contradicted by the fact that it is not possible to place five plots onto the steep slope south of the church. With regard to the lands belonging to those plots, the charter mentions meadows behind the plots, a location that could only be next the present-day road to Kőtcse.

The next landholder was the bishop of Veszprém who has “two plots with one gate situated to the south of the plot belonging to the parish priest”.

Finally, the document gives the following shares to Laurence, son of Demeter.

Furthermore for the mentioned Laurence, son of Demeter land suitable for one plot [situated] to the east, between the two roads leading from Chepel to Kekche, opposite to the plots belonging to the two Nicolas.

In conclusion, the chapter intended to present the way how far can be used such a detailed medieval description for reconstruction, located into the modern landscape and to show what kind of problems may occur during the work. We may, indeed, hope for more than a simple reconstruction of plots. However, it is essential to look beyond the order of plots, since some of the details mentioned in the document allow us to draw further conclusions concerning the plot system.

2.3. Analysis of the inner area

Although, the allocation of some plots remains questionable, the structure of the village becomes clear in general. There are some uncertain elements in the reconstruction, for instance the distance between the main street and the plots along the road to Kőtcse, or the distribution of plots belonging to the Carthusian monastery.

The reconstruction of the street network is based on the division charter, but its medieval origin is additionally supported by field walking, since some of the streets appear as hollow ways in the landscape. The main street, running in south-north direction, turns to the southwest-northeast direction at the site of the parish church. One of the side-streets, for a time running parallel with the main street, eventually joins the main street from the northeast at the northern part of the village. Near this point, another side street crosses the main street at right angles. The street of the parish church leads into the main street from the east in the southern part of Csepely.

Comparing this structure with today’s street network raises similarities and differences. First of all, the spatial coincidence between them is striking. Only today’s cross-street on the southern end of the settlement does not occur in the medieval document. There is another difference between the modern and medieval image of the village. The route of the side-street, that is, the road to Kőtcse, and the territory south of that street, to the north have altered over time. According to the reconstruction, the side-street situates next to Kátai’s plots at right angles to the main street, and can be considered as a continuation of the side street opposite, on the western side of the main street. In contrast, the territory on the eastern side, opposite the plots of Nicolas Kátai is covered by buildings today. One of the intervening stages of the development can be seen on a survey from 1860. At that time on this area there was already plots and houses, and the route of the earlier street is still visible on the map.

Besides the medieval streets, the fifteenth century site of the church opposite to the plot of the parish priest and that of the commonly used well of Hidegkút are also identifiable.

The medieval Saint Laurence parish church, first referred to in the document from 1316, stood on the place of today’s Calvinist church. The construction of the modern church took place in 1784 on a small hillock at

---

61 "Postmodum autem Nicolao filio Thome de Nesa et altero Nicolao filio Andree Chw terram pro quinque sesionibus aptam sub monte iuxta viam de dicta Chepel ad Kekche ducentam..." lines 137-138.

62 "... duas sessiones unam portam habentes iuxta sessionem plebani a meridie..." line 141.

63 "Preterea prefato Laurentio filio Demetrii terram pro una sessione aptam ab oriente inter duas vias de dicta Chepel ad dictam Kekche ducentes ex opposti sessionum dictorum utrumque Nicolati..." line 143.
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the southern part of the settlement and certainly on the remains of the earlier church building. There are other facts which support this impression. First, one can observe that today’s Calvinist church shows two buttresses against the tower, originating from the Middle Ages. In addition, near the church a moulded stone displaying fine medieval profile has been found.

Analysis of the division document distinguishing inhabited and deserted plots gives concrete indications about the proportion of deserted plots. According to the charter, more plots were distributed in 1412 than the total amount existing in the village up to that time. Six of the hundred and twenty seven plots were only piece of land suitable for plots consequently, they were not habited at that time. The position of the newly distributed plots might indicate the direction of village expansion: towards both the north and the east. Among the remaining hundred and twenty one plots, seventy six were inhabited (63%) and forty five plots deserted (37%), a relatively high proportion of deserted plots.

Based on the quantity of inhabited plots I have deduced the number of households and estimated the population size of fifteenth century Csepely. Seventy six of the one hundred twenty seven plots were inhabited, consequently one would suppose that represented the number of households and householders in the village. However, there is an additional method by which the number of householders can be estimated and used as a control for the previous supposition. The fifteenth century charter enumerates the vines belonging to the plots along with the names of their holders, allowing the following list of householders to be compiled. (App. 1.)

OMF Collection, No. 17.643.
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Comparing the list with the number of inhabited plots, is no considerable difference arises between the seventy six tofts and the sixty eight to seventy vine holders. Considering the average number of village households established by István Szabó in the fifteenth century, Csepely had four times more inhabited plots than the average households established at 17.3. The size of the fairly large and populous settlement is more characteristic of a market town than a village.

The number of households allows for an estimation of the population size. To begin this estimate, the average size of the households in fifteenth century Csepely must be determined. Because of the lack of suitable historical evidences, one can not found the detailed system of medieval household types in Hungary. Nevertheless, we can refer to work of Jenő Szűcs, who compares the population of villages before and after the Mongolian invasion and points out that at the end of the thirteenth century, on the one hand the simple family household became dominant and the extended family type also occurred, on the other hand the size of the households increased.

In Csepely, because of the archaic usage of names, where the father’s name serves as the family name, a dominant type of household structure can be deduced. The most characteristic type is the simple family household, but the multiple family type, where three generations live together (George, son of Pethe, and his sons Thomas and Stephen) and the extended family (Stephen and Matthew, sons of Nicolas, or Peter and Nicolas, sons of Michael) can also be found in the village.

For the mean household size, the coefficient 5 is widely used. Not ignoring the fact, that some scholars debate this data, since no other evidence exists for determining the quantity of household members in Csepely, following the normally accepted number we also apply five as a coefficient.

Regarding population size only its limits can be estimated. As it was already pointed out, the number of households was between sixty eight and seventy six. Accordingly, the size of the population is somewhere between three hundred forty and three hundred eighty.

Our document might also help determine the size of plots. The charter gives data for the widths of plots, saying that every mansio is thirty one and a half ulna measured by cloth. The charter for the perambulation of the neighbouring village of Teleki from 1429 clarify the dimension of the unit of measurement. The document claims that the width of the common iugerum is seventeen and a half ulna of Buda. The ulna of Buda, also known as common or cloth ulna, is 58.4 cm long. Using this unit of measurement, the width of a plot in Csepely is 18.3 m long. By comparing the reconstruction of the inner area and the recent 1:10000 scale map, I controlled the result. If there are two points in the village between which distance can be determined and at the same time, the reconstruction is exact between them, then the width of one plot becomes available. The “two points” for my purposes are the site of the parish church and the mouth of the northeastern side street. The distance between them is 240 meters and contains a total of 12 plots laid throughout that area in 1412. Therefore, each plot was 20 meters wide. Although, a discrepancy arises between the two data (18.3 and 20), it is not very significant. Presumably some paths leading to the fields interrupted the row of plots as they stand today. To sum up, the width of a plot in Csepely at the beginning of the fifteenth century could be between 18 and 20 meters long.

The generally accepted measure of a medieval plot in Hungary is the unit of the so-called iugerum regale, that is, 37.7 meters wide and 225 meters long. However, for the late Middle Ages the half of the iugerum regale derived from the longitudinal division in two of the earlier one iugerum plot became widely used. Since the width of this kind of plot (19 meters) is very close to the width of plots in Csepely, it may but not necessarily, be that the measures of the plots in Csepely have the same origins.

Let us return now to the ground plan of Csepely. The result of reconstruction showed a one kilometer long settlement. The southern end of Csepely contains features belonging to the street village type with closed...
Fig. 5. Csepely on the First Ordinance Survey from 1783. (Collo IX. Sectio 22.)

row of plots. The middle part of the village can rank among the agglomerations, while in the north it conforms to villages with green or German type of Angerdorf. The analysis of the village form raises two problems. First, it demonstrates the central point of the so-called problem of typology, in the sense that the majority of villages are made up of characteristics of different types and, consequently do not conform to simple categories of village classification. However, the study of settlement types should not be rejected, but research on village morphology is at the same time complicated and enhanced by the variety of aspects to be found during village investigations. The complexity of village forms should be regarded as end-products of centuries of changes, thus ground plans can be used as sources of village process.

The question is, to what extent the different morphological elements in Csepely can be considered as different phases of the village development. Regarding the development of village structure and distinguishing the original core of the medieval village, the examination of positions of the earliest plots yields controversial results. Before the Mongolian invasion (1241–1242), the provostship of Dömös, the Saint Nicolas collegiate church and the chapter of Fehérvár were present in the village. Their plots are mentioned consistently as mansio, that is, the earlier term for plot, in contrast to the other plots called sessio. All the plots of the provostship of Dömös and the eleven plots of the twenty inhabited and nine deserted plots of the chapter of Fehérvár situated on the southern part of Csepely. Three of the plots of Saint Nicolas collegiate church probably remained on their original site because of their connection to its cultivated fields. However, seven plots laid on the edematous territory between the two streets on the northern part of the village. Since, for 1390 the shares of the first landholders, including the collegiate church, reduced, it may be supposed that during the process of the division of Csepely, the chapter presented their donation charter from 1215 about the ten mansio whereupon they were given ten new plots on the northern area of the settlement.

Moreover, another fact reinforces the impression concerning the early origins of village settlement in the southern part of Csepely. Namely the greater certainty in the source’s description of the southern part of the village. Indeed, the charter gives the exact order of plots in the south, in contrast to the often vague information on northern plots. The better defined position of the southern territory indicates that this area was more settled and perhaps at an earlier time than the other parts of Csepely. As seen already, at that time Csepely expanded northward and eastward.

The site of the parish church often located in the Middle Ages, in the center of the village, also testifies to the preeminence and earlier origins.
During the Turkish invasion Csepcely became deserted for a few years. According to the Ordinance Survey from 1784, the northern part of the village was resettled first after the occupation. (Fig. 5.) The construction of the today’s Calvinist church can be seen on the map some hundred meters south of the inhabited part of the eighteenth century settlement. It is certain that after the local Calvinist community received the building, earlier a Catholic church, in 1784, the southern area of Csepcely became gradually resettled.72

In conclusion, the exceptionally detailed description of the fifteenth century charter provides a solid basis for reconstructing the inner area of Csepely. Not only the layout of the medieval village becomes clear, but some of the problems concerning the physical appearance of the settlement can be considered solved. Apart from the questions raised with regard to Csepely itself, we also saw the difficulties in ranking villages to the particular categories of settlement typology.

2.4. Reconstructing the fields

A very important factor of a medieval settlement concerns the territory of fields surrounding the village core. Therefore the problem of village structure cannot be discussed without a reconstruction of the layout of cultivated lands in the area.

The fields are reconstructed in two phases. First, the field names occurring in the source material are identified and located. After this, the names of hills, valleys, woodlands and streams in the medieval document must be identified with recent field names available in the collection of field names in the county of Somogy.73

The next step is the localization of different places. In the cases, where recent names equivalent or close to their medieval counterparts become available, the contemporary regions are considered as analogous to the given fields of the fifteenth century as well. However, if only the medieval field name is available, then the descriptions of spatial relations between different places becomes a starting point for mapping.

The second stage of field reconstruction involves mapping of the places according to their cultivation and vegetation. The different places are presented in a clock-wise succession table beginning from the southern part of the village in order to clarify the references and relations between them.

- **Thelek-Telek**
  - arable land: Michael Kátai: 36 iugerum; in opposite to their plots on the western line, from the north the arable lands of Saint Nicolas collegiate church and from the south the fields of treasurer of Fehérvár
  - arable land: Treasurer of Fehérvár: 6 iugerum; behind the plots, from the north and between the arable lands of Michael Kátai and the Osztopáni family.
  - meadow: Osztopáni family: 13 iugerum; from the north, behind the gardens of Sebastian and Koos to Via magna

- **Halazowapa valley – Halászó**
  - arable land: Saint Nicolas collegiate church: 29 iugerum; from the north, behind the gardens of Peter son of Saul, Mark tailor and Nicolas, son of Michael, to Halazowapa valley (13 iugerum)

- **Baranreth – Bárányréti**
  - arable land: Provostship of Dömös: part of 90 iugerum; on the east, under the small woodland, opposite to Saint Lawrence church, from the field mark and wild pear tree, situated next the fields to Baranreth
  - meadow: Provostship of Dömös: 15 falcastrum;

- **Kenderatho – Road leading to the fish pond. Via magna, Zenthlelekwelge**
  - arable land: Osztopáni family: 6 iugerum; along the Via magna, between the fields of the treasurer of Fehérvár and the chapter of Fehérvár
  - meadow: Treasurer of Fehérvár: 5 iugerum; in the Zenthlelekwelge, west of the road
  - meadow: Provostship of Dömös: 87 iugerum; on the both sides of the road leading to Kenderatho
  - meadow: Provostship of Dömös: 2 falcastrum; next to the pond
  - meadow: Michael Kátai: 5 falcastrum; on the place called Kenderatho, north of the 2 falcastrum meadow belonging to the provostship of Dömös
  - meadow: Saint Nicolas collegiate church: 7 falcastrum; next to the Kenderatho and the road
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Nadasd valley - Nádasdi
arable land: Chapter of Fehérvár: 100 iugerum regale; between the Nadasd valley and Halazowapa valley, next to and north of the road leading to Nadasd valley
Osztopáni family: part of 51 iugerum; on the hillside, on the right of the entrance
Saint Nicolas collegiate church: 11 iugerum;
meadow: Chapter of Fehérvár: 1 iugerum regale; Bishop of Veszprém: 2 falcastrum; on the western side of the valley
Michael Kátaí: 3 falcastrum; east of the meadow of the bishop of Veszprém
Carthusian monastery of Lövöld: 1 falcastrum; between the meadows of Michael Kátaí and the Osztopáni family
Osztopáni family: 5 falcastrum;
Nicolas Nesai and Nicolas Cew: 2 falcastrum; north of the meadow of the Osztopáni family
woodland: Chapter of Fehérvár: 30 iugerum regale; on the left of the hillside

Zabowelgh valley
meadow: Provostship of Dömös: 6 falcastrum;

Pasmaia - Pácsmánd
arable land: Provostship of Dömös: part of 47 iugerum; on the sites of Pasmala and Zabowelgh, between the two roads
Treasurers of Fehérvár: 4 iugerum; between the arable lands of the provostship of Dömös
Chapter of Fehérvár: 40 iugerum regale; on the north of the road, between an elm-bush, a field mark and a field, up to the arable land of Dominicus Osztopáni
Osztopáni family: 3; among the fields of chapter in Fehérvár
Treasury of Veszprém: 1
Nicolas Nesai and Nicolas Cew: 1
Prior of Lövöld: 1
Michael Kátaí: 4
Chapter of Fehérvár: 4.

Főyegh valley - Főzö valley
arable land: Michael Kátaí: 40 iugerum; next to and south of the arable lands of the bishop of Veszprém
Bishop of Veszprém: 28 iugerum; between the arable lands of the prior in Lövöld and the Kátaí family
Prior of Lövöld: 156 iugerum; among the fields of the provostship of Dömös, the chapter of Fehérvár and that of the bishop of Veszprém
Chapter of Fehérvár: part of 138 iugerum regale; from the forest called Chomborg to the road named Althalwath
Laurentius son of Demetrius: 6 iugerum; on the hillside
Treasures of Fehérvár: 8 iugerum;
meadow: Chapter of Fehérvár: 12 iugerum regale;
Treasury of Dömös: 7 falcastrum;
vine: Saint Nicolas collegiate church: 1
Chapter of Fehérvár: 12
Michael Kátaí: 1
Osztopáni family: 1
Prior of Lövöld: 2
Nicolas Nesai and Nicolas Cew: 1
Laurentius son of Demetrius: 1

Tothfiv, Hagyothaya, Monyorosd, Iwanzeleyfely
arable land: Provostship of Dömös: 200 iugerum; on the sites called Tothfiv, Hagyothaya, Monyorosd, Iwanzeleyfely, up to the boundary line of the village Visz marked by field marks erected in the Főyegh valley
meadow: Treasurer of Fehérvár: 2 falcastrum; on the place named Tothfivend
vine: Prior of Lövöld: 1; on Monyorosd hill
Prior of Lövöld: 3; in Monyorosd valley
Chapter of Fehérvár: 2; on Monyorosd hill

Dongach - Dongák
vine: Chapter of Fehérvár: 1
woodland: Laurentius son of Demetrius

Főyegh - Főzö hill
vine: Chapter of Fehérvár: 1
Prior of Lövöld: 1
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Cherdhath – Cserhát
vine:
Provisolship of Dömös: 1
Chapter of Fehérvár: 5
Prior of Lövölö: 2
Osztopáni family: 2

Cherdiallya – Cserédal
arable land:
Chapter of Fehérvár: 5
Prior of Lövölö: 2
Stat Nicolas collegiate church: 41 iugerum; next to Mezővölgy
Provisolship of Dömös: 1

Gollyas valley – Gólya valley
arable land:
Chapter of Fehérvár: 30 iugerum regale; in the valley south of the walnut tree up to the arable land of Saint Nicolas collegiate church in the Cherdiallya valley to the field marks
Chapter of Fehérvár: part of 138 iugerum regale; from the walnut tree to the boundaries of the villages Vizs; Szemes and Teleki

Mezewelgh – Félmezö
arable land:
Chapter of Fehérvár: 3.5 iugerum regale; on the hill between Gollyas valley and Meze valley
Saint Nicolas collegiate church: 15 iugerum;
Michael Kátai: 1
Prior of Lövölö: 5–10

Markushorhafely, Byrch – Szécsákütető
arable land:
Chapter of Fehérvár: 40 iugerum regale; between two field marks, from the road called Thckeresarokeya to the boundary of the village Teleki

Ord valley
arable land:
Prior of Lövölö: 362 iugerum; next the arable lands of Saint Nicolas collegiate church, on the west and from the plots of the chapter situated near Várang to the boundary of the village Teleki, to the east
meadow:
Prior of Lövölö: 36 falcaslrum; north of the plot of George the taylor

Varang – Territory nearby village Váráng
arable land:
Nicolas Nesai and Nicolas Cew: 8 iugerum; on the hill, next to a small forest called Jegenyeerdó (Poplar forest), near Varang

Territory nearby village Kötese
arable land:
Chapter of Fehérvár: 89 iugerum regale; between Chepel and Kekche
Nicolas Nesai and Nicolas Cew: 6 iugerum; north of the road leading to Kekche, opposite the plots situated next to the road
8 iugerum; under the hill, south of the plots situated next to the road
Nicolas Nesai and Nicolas Cew: 3 faleastrum; next to their plots, to the stream
Michael Kátai: 3 falcaslrum; behind and south of his plots, to the stream
Chapter of Fehérvár: 1 iugerum regale; behind the plot of the chapter's bondsman living behind the parish church

meadow:
Chapter of Dömös; the woodland called Urharazthya (Lord's forest), on the south, over the Sed valley, opposite the plots of the provostship
Michael Kátai; next Urharazthya

Nagzo valley – Nacco
arable land:
Provostship of Dömös: 90 iugerum
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Nagzo hill – Nacco
vine: Saint Nicolas collegiate church: 2
Chapter of Fehérvár: 3
Treasurer of Fehérvár: 1
Michael Kátai: 4

Kalasd hill – Kalasdtető
arable land: Chapter of Fehérvár: 13 iugerum regale;
Provostship of Dömös: 6
Chapter of Fehérvár: 8
Michaelis Kátai: 1
Prior of Lövőd: 1

Kezees hill – Kösőhegy?
vine: Prior of Lövőd: 1

Hasallya, Hasmegcallya, Hasmegcallya – Hársadja
arable land: Provostship of Dömös: part of 47 iugerum; under Hasallya hill
Chapter of Fehérvár: 23 iugerum regale; on the top of Hamegefely hill
vine: Prior of Lövőd: 1–5

Benevapaya valley
arable land: Treasurer of Fehérvár: 5 iugerum;
Chapter of Fehérvár: 1
Nicolas Nesai and Nicolas Cew: 1

woodland: Chapter of Fehérvár: 10 iugerum regale;
Treasurer of Fehérvár; on south, next the forest of the chapter

Territory nearby village Fehéregyház
arable land: Michael Kátai: 24 iugerum; east of the road leading to Fejeregáz, on the place called Zygeth (Island)
10 iugerum; near Fejeregáz, on the place called Zygeth
42 iugerum; above Mochuada pond, near Fejeregázh

meadow: Michael Kátai: 3 falcastrum; between Chepel and Kekche, near Fejeregázh

Unidentifiable places
Adamache: Provostship of Dömös: 1 vine
Borsosfence: Osztópáni family: 1 vine
Dobrache: Prior of Lövőd: 1 vine
Fekete mege: Prior of Lövőd: 1 vine
Fodorzeleyfely: Nicolas Nesai and Nicolas Cew: 1 vine
Fothafence: Osztópáni family: 1 vine
Gewliche hill: Provostship of Dömös: 2 vines
Harkalyoldala: Chapter of Fehérvár: 2 vines
Horohzeg: Treasurer of Fehérvár: 1 vine
Michael Kátai: 1 vine
Nicolas Nesai and Nicolas Cew: 1 vine

Oldalasnyar hill: Saint Nicolas collegiate church: 31 iugerum arable lands
Okomlo: Michael Kátai: 2 iugerum arable lands
Silreth: Laurentius son of Demetrius: 1 falcastrum meadow
Thekenewsarnkya valley: Prior of Lövőd: 2–6 vines
Thekenews hill: Prior of Lövőd: 3 vines
Michael Kátai: 1 vine

Thengerde: Bishop of Veszprém: 1 vine
Utus hill: Chapter of Fehérvár: 2 vines
Michael Kátai: 1 vine

Varasfév: Osztópáni family: 8 iugerum woodlands
Vemedevapaya: Chapter of Fehérvár: 1 vine
Verecehereye forest: Bishop of Veszprém: woodland
Zegesey: Provostship of Dömös: 2 vines
Zelekez: Nicolas Nesai and Nicolas Cew: 1 vine
Prior of Lövőd: 1 vine

Zenthbenedekmezey: Nicolas Nesai and Nicolas Cew: 48 iugerum arable lands
Laurentius son of Demetrius: 8 iugerum arable lands
For mapping arable lands, it is essential to determine the size of the so-called *iugerum usuale*, since the charter says that every mansio has fourteen *iugerum* arable land defined by means of average measurement of bondsmen living in neighbouring villages. Besides the official measurements of *iugerum regale* a wide variety of local *iugerum* were used on different territories of medieval Hungary.

The perambulation charter of Teleki from 1429 provides information about the width of *iugerum usuale* where it says that the twenty *iugerum usuale* Septer praedium of Saint Nicolas church, that is, seventeen and a half *ulna* of Buda wide. This sentence raises some questions. First, it must be decided whether the *ulna* is used as *rőf* (58.4 cm) or *őf* (3 m). If *ulna* is applied as *rőf* then the width of *iugerum usuale* is ten and a half meters while in the case of *őf* the result is fifty three meters. Probably, the measurement used in the adjacent village of Teleki a few years later, is suitable for Csepely as well. However, it must be supposed that the perambulation document provides the exact width of the *iugerum usuale*, because it differs from the customary unit of measurement.

In case of the cultivated land, one can also apply the method already practiced in the analysis of the inner area. At the very least the width of the *iugerum usuale* can be established on the basis of the area of a completely cultivated territory and the amount of local *iugerum* within it. Telek, the area behind plots of the western line, suits this kind of analysis. The territory of Telek is delimited by the plots of the provostship of Dömös to the south, and by the road called *via magna* in the west. North of Telek we find the plots of Saint Nicholas collegiate church and east of the area lie the plots of the western line. All together twenty six plots are situated along the place that is four hundred seventy five meters wide. In 1412 three of the landholders had arable lands in Telek. There are thirteen *iugerum* belonging to the Osztópáni family on the south, six *iugerum* belonging to the treasurer of Fehérvár and finally, thirty six *iugerum* held by Michael Kátai on north. These shares are in total fifty five *iugerum*, therefore the width of one *iugerum usuale* is accordingly 8.7 meters. Although this result approximates the *iugerum usuale* of Teleki measured by *rőf*, they are not equal.

For the purpose of further results it is necessary to reconsider the position of the mentioned fields. Presumably, the fifty five *iugerum* land do not sit in perfect alignment to each other. Possibly, Kátai’s arable lands, beside shares of the Saint Nicolas collegiate church, extend not only to the road but to Halászóvölgy, as in the case of the neighbouring collegiate church’s fields. If the statement is correct, then behind the four plots, next to Saint Nicolas collegiate church’s lands should stand eight-eight *iugerum usuale* arable lands, one behind the other. In this situation, forty seven *iugerum* sit along the area of Telek, accordingly, the width of one *iugerum* is 10.12, exactly the same as the 17.5 *rőf*.

Although, there is no information in the source about the length of the *iugerum usuale*, on the basis of available space in Telek, the 1:10 proportion of width and length seems acceptable.

In case of meadow lands, the charter often refers to the measurement of *falcasrnum*. It is widely argued in the literature that the *falcasrnum* usually equalled the size or half of the size of the *iugerum usuale*. Regarding *falcasrnum* there are some references to its size in the source. The twenty one plots of the chapter of Fehérvár belonged to twenty *iugerum regale* of meadow. Seeing that the shares of the chapter were, by mistake, measured by *iugerum regale* instead of *iugerum usuale*, it can be supposed that the twenty *iugerum regale* of meadow meant to be originally twenty *iugerum usuale* or, rather, twenty *falcasrnum*. Moreover, because of the unusually small size of the local *iugerum* in Csepely, measuring *falcasrnum* as half the size of *iugerum* might be useless. As a result, the unit of *falcasrnum* is identified with the size of *iugerum usuale* in my mapping of the area.

The vineyards are listed by numbers in the document. There does not exist even indirect data about the dimensions of vineyards, therefore they are marked only by numbers in the reconstruction of the village.

In two cases the charter gives information about the unit of measurement for woodlands. Since forty *iugerum regale* of woodlands belong to the twenty one plots of the chapter in Fehérvár, and Osztópáni’s five

---

\(^{72}\) *... quantas terras arabiles, prata, silvas et alias utilitates necessarias unus lobagio in vicinaris possessionibus non integum fundum habens, sed mediocris modo more villanorum perseverans usualiter tenet et possident et secundum hunc pro qualibet man­ sjone quatuordecem iugera terre ...* line 87.

\(^{76}\) See note 70.

\(^{78}\) BOGDÁN (1978) 107–108.

\(^{77}\) BOGDÁN (1978) 200.
plots receive eight *iugerum usuale* of woodlands, it is likely that about two local *iugerum* of woods was set aside for every plot. Because those woodlands are part of larger forests, only their locations are distinguished on the map.

There is an additional problem concerning units of measurement. In 1436, the sons of Michael Kátai applied to reopen the case of 1412 for the reason that in that time the fields of the chapter in Fehérvár were measured by *iugerum regale* and hence its shares crossed into the lands of the Kátai family and of the Carthusian monastery. The palatine, Michael Garai, ordered a redistribution of the fields belonging to the chapter by use of the correct measurement. Although the division charter from 1412 includes these lands measured by *iugerum regale*, they are mapped as fields allocated in local measurement.

Inasmuch as the charter does not provide information about the direction and form of the parcels or fields, the reconstruction only indicates the size, cultivation and possessors of the different shares. (Fig. 6.)

It would, of course, be quite wrong to assume that all Hungarian settlements have documents providing such an opportunity to reconstruct their medieval fields in such a detailed way. Nevertheless, the example of Csepely might cast some light on the nature of land usage in the Middle Ages, at least for the region.

### 2.5. Analysis of the fields

We saw at former discussion how the fields were situated within the township of Csepely at the beginning of the fifteenth century. By separation of the different elements, one can establish further conclusions concerning land usage.

The arable lands in the area of medieval Csepely are situated in valleys of the well-formed geography of the village. Different sectors of husbandry were placed on areas that provide favorable conditions for their cultivation. A considerable amount of fields run alongside the Séd stream flowing down from Várang into the pond named Kenderázátó. There are also arable lands along the streams in Nádasdi and the Fűző valley and in the southern part of the village township, where the brook now called Ődöságút viz runs. Meadows predominantly lie in lower territories and can always be found next to streams or the pond, for that reason they are divided into smaller units and aligned near to each other. Most of the vineyards are on hills, presumably on southern slopes.

There are some sources for studying the process of land clearing and medieval silviculture, for example place-names. The name of the valley and the hill called Nacco derives from the word Nagyaszó which refers to a certain method of deforestation. During this procedure, called *aszalás* (drying), the bark of trees are stripped off around the base of the trunk and, as the circulation of sap stops, the trees wither. In the fifteenth century, the sixteen vines planted on the hill and arable lands of the provost of Dömös extended to the valley making necessary a certain amount of deforestation.

One can follow the expansion of deforested areas within village boundaries by examining the medieval cultivation of a place today called *Irtás* (clearing). In the fifteenth century the hill situated west of the village was not cultivated at all. In that time, the area was probably forested or covered brushwood. Only in later centuries, when fields were expanded according to the needs of the village community, the territory of the hill eventually became cleared and cultivated.

Some features of the mapped reconstruction allow us to draw additional conclusions in connection with field systems used in Csepely. Márti Belényesys, examining villages in the county of Zala, directs attention to a special type of land usage named as tanor-system. She observes that arable fields lain continuously behind the plots create an inner ring of arable land surrounding the inhabited area of the village. Despite the fact that those fields belong to landholder’s shares, they are held in severalty, in contrast to other arable lands. The inner zone are cultivated in a so-called permanent one-field system which means that its fields are not under crop control and rotation. Belényesys connects this system to villages founded after clear-cutting and interprets it as the first fields of cultivation for confined townships of early settlements. What follows from her thesis is that villages using the tanor-system have a fairly late founding, their origins going back only to the thirteenth century. How-

---

Fig. 6. Reconstruction of the fields of Csepely based on the division charter from 1412. (A = Provostship of Dömös; B = Chapter of Fehérvár; C = Saint Nicolas collegiate church of Fehérvár; D = Osztopáni family; E = Kátaí family; F = Laurence, son of Demeter; G = Prior of Lévőd; H = Treasurer of Fehérvár; I = Nicolas Népszai and Nicolas Cső; J = Bishopric of Veszprém)
Evidences of the document of 1339 prove the existence of intensive cultivation only in the fourteenth century. According to Jenő Major, the parcels of land align behind the plots continuously. The document from 1339 may cast some light on the inner zone of fields could be used as pastures too, it was well manured and more fertile areas, therefore to leave this land out of crop was not necessary.

A type of land usage similar to the tanor-system can be observed in fifteenth century Csepely as well. At Telek, the parcels of land align behind the plots continuously. The charter covers a trade where Jacob son of Christopher Csepeli sold his plot that lay next the toft of the parish priest, to Emericus, son of Gwrk (Györk). In describing the position of the sold plot, the document says that north of the toft situated the terra fimata of Jacob. (Fig. 2.) Expressions like terra fimata and telek, that is the fifteenth century name of the area, often referred to manured and fertile lands.

On the basis of the reconstruction, it is clear that this territory was cultivated as arable land at the beginning of the fourteenth century; therefore, it might be supposed that Telek included arable fields that were at the same time utilized for inner pasture as well. However, the former argument is not the only explanation for this problem. Evidences of the document of 1339 prove the existence of intensive cultivation only in the fourteenth century. It is difficult to decide whether the same land usage endured up to the beginning of the fifteenth century or the place name of Telek refers to an earlier form of farming and landholding. What is more, places called telek primarily recall fields not under communal regulation and often held in private property. Previous discussion guides us to the conclusion that fields in fifteenth century Telek were themselves or only remains of an area within the village territory where cultivation and landholding occurred in a fashion similar to the tanor-system.

Apart from the mentioned types of field-systems, certain other valuable features of field division demonstrate the complexity of land usage in Csepely. The position of the fields behind the plots of the Saint Nicolas collegiate church indicates the presence of a special type of field-systems often occurring in villages founded by deforestation. German scholars introduced the term Waldhufendorf, to distinguish a village in which all the arable lands belonging to a given toft, were situated as a continuation of the plot immediately behind the inner core of the settlement. Researchers often emphasize that this type of land usage appears together with regular form of the inner area. This classification applies to Hungarian village typology as well and traditionally regarded as characteristic of villages in mountainous regions. According to the normally accepted theory, Waldhufendorftype Hungarian villages are settled by land-clearing and date back to the twelve-thirteen century. In Csepely, behind the three plots of the collegiate church on the western side of the main street are twenty nine iugerum arable lands extending to the Halászó valley, and an additional thirteen iugerum field situate in the valley itself. This means that the continuation of the three plots are all together forty two, namely three times fourteen iugerum. (Fig. 3) As pointed out above, as far as the measure of iugerum usuale is concerned, every plot was given fourteen iugerum of arable land as appurtenance. What follows from this is that, despite the fact that Csepely can not be ranked as a village founded by deforestation and is not situated in mountainous area, it still shows some features of the field-system characteristic of those settlements. More importantly, in spite the fact that the form of the inhabited area shows regular elements, Csepely can not be considered as a regular type of villages.

The division charter provides data pertaining to the presence of a common field system in Csepely. In connection with the fields belonging to the charter of Fehérvár, the document informs us that arable lands of the chapter did not situate together within one boundary, because the fields of neighbouring shares lay mixed up (mixtim), in several places. The argumentation and especially the expression of mixtim, renders the existence of yearly distributed, but at least sub-divided and communally controlled fields probable in the village. For the

---

Footnotes:
- MAJOR (1961)
- For more information about the meaning and usage of the word telek and terra fimata see: BELÉNYESY (1948); FÖLDES (1971); (1983); LASZLOVSZKY (1986)
- For more information see: KOETZSCHKE (1953) 214–215.
- "...ipsum autem terram trium aratterum et triginta iugerum pro eo, quia terre possessionum circumancentium in pluribus locis mixtim adiacent, sub una metatarum distinctione includere non valuit..." lines 105–106.
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reason that no other information suggest the manner of field allocation, it is not clear whether the word mixtim means a functioning common field-system or the remains testify to the last and solidified distribution of fields.

Several place names incorporate personal names. In these cases we meet with those fields which, in accordance with demands of village expansion, were taken under cultivation, after deforestation, by a member or a family of the community. People who cleared and ploughed a piece of forest land or brushy area received the right to hold it as private property and exercise their autonomous usage over it. These places can be interpreted as fields belonging to given persons and, hence are excluded from common or sub-divided fields.*

Although, I have not solved all the questions concerning field systems in the village, a general overview of land usage in fifteenth century Csepely can be drawn. According to the intensity of cultivation, at least two zones of the township can be established. On the one hand, the arable lands immediately behind the plots created an inner core of pastures and ploughed areas, where two different patterns of land usages can be distinguished. On the other hand an “outer zone” of land further from the village supposedly was cultivated in sub-divided fields under cropping control. The third type of lands are enclosures, cleared and brought under cultivation by personal efforts and remaining free of communal regulations and were not among the landholder’s shares.

The above discussed farming systems show similarities, at least in their external appearance with the so-called infield-outfield system demonstrated in the case of many English villages. Put simply, a number of scholars point out that many medieval village townships comprise an inner core of fields around the village itself, and a considerable outer ring of land cultivated and held in contrast with the farming system employed in the inner zone. Infield-outfield combines intensive and extensive cropping patterns, namely constant and shifting cultivation. The infield was the more intensive zone because it was the longer-established of the two and therefore a more fertile nucleus for the settlement. The intensive cultivation of the infield can be considered as prerequisite for the growth of the outfield, which may have appeared either as enclosures or as sub-divided fields. Besides this general view of the infield-outfield, a wide variety of regional types of this system are discovered in different territories of Great Britain. It would be quite wrong to say that in fifteenth century Hungary the same kind of land usage was practiced, nevertheless physical appearance of some elements of the farming system in Csepely shows striking similarities.

In the case of Csepely, the fifteenth century source does not draw distinctions between the two recognizable zones, either in sense of landholding or definite methods of cultivation. Nevertheless, as far as land usage of Telek was discussed, the inner core, at least in the fourteenth century, was cultivated in an intensive way and probable held by severality, in contrast to the fields of the outer periphery. Despite the fact, that we call the two areas zones or even rings, they had irregular forms influenced by various features of the terrain.

The diversity of the field systems within the township allow us to make further conclusions concerning the traditionally accepted typology applied to Hungarian farming systems. The existence of remains of different field systems refers to a shift from one kind of land usage to another. Moreover, results of the present chapter also exemplify how several patterns of farming systems may intimately mingle within one township. Field systems in Csepely, therefore, can not be identified by one particular type of cultivation, but infact they are mixture of different types that, on one hand reflect the changes in village form over the centuries and, on the other hand, adjustment to favorable patterns of land usage.

CONCLUSIONS

In case of Csepely, we can see how studies on village forms, using both ground and historical evidences, can contribute to a better understanding of settlements, and demonstrate the importance of further research in attempting to challenge the traditional approach to village typology.

* The following field names are discussed here: Benevapaya (Bene), Fedoreleyfely (Fodor), Ivanzeleyfely (Iván), Márkushafely (Márkus), Zabowelgh (Szabó)

85 Since we are not guided by evidence referring to the exact manner of land usage in this area, no more can be said other than that two- or three-field system of a kind could exist within the framework of the outer zone.

86 For the whole debate on and regional varieties of infield-outfield system see: DODGSHON (1980) 83–107.

Acta Archaeologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae 49, 1997
In the discussion of Csepely, we saw that its inner area is made up of two different parts that can be connected with forms of particular village types and additional irregular elements can be discerned as well. Within the medieval township of the village, features of four divergent types of land usage were distinguished, including such regular forms as the field system of Waldhufendorf or the tanor-system. What is more, the regular forms of the cultivated land are not always belong to that of the inner area. The results of our research cast some light on the importance of studying both the inner area and cultivated land, since examination of their relationship can further refine the picture of medieval village forms.

Although, there are Hungarian villages that can be said to precisely fit into the typological system established in the 60s, most of the settlement forms are mixture of elements of different types and can be regarded as the last stage of a long complex development. Considering these conditions, further studies on structures of villages are needed to work out a more suitable usage of typology. As Hungarian settlement typology originated mainly from German research, until now it generally follows a strict manner of classification. Though some scholars, for example Mártay Belényesy, pointed out the existence of irregularity within the village township concerning the field systems, their views have not been widely accepted.

Of course, we can not give a definite answer to the problem of Hungarian village typology, nevertheless it might be suggested that synthesis of former studies that debated the traditional categorisation and further studies on different regions and various village forms will be concluded in reconsideration of Hungarian settlement typology.
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APPENDIX

List of householders in Csepely compiled on the basis of the enumeration of vine-holders

1. Ambrus’s son Gregory
2. Ancho’s son Stephen
3. Andrew’s son George
4. Peter Babodi
5. Balázs’s son Thomas
6. (the same) Balázs’s son Benedek
7. Michael Beldeg’s son George
8. Benedek Bonha
9. Demeter Czepeli’s son Laurence
10. Thomas Chok
11. Demeter’s son Gregory
12. Demeter’s son Balázs
13. Demeter’s son Barnaby
14. Stephen Erdély
15. John Erdély
16. Frank’s son Peter
17. Frank’s son Ladislas
18. Thomas Podor
19. GáI’s son Simon
20. George the tailor
21. George’s son Laurence
22. Jacob’s son John
23. Jacob’s son Martin
24. (the same) Martin’s son Benedek
25. John’s son Valentine
26. John’s son Michael
27. Michael Keerei
28. Ladislaus’s son Michael
29. Laurence’s son George
30. Luke’s son Benedek
31. Luke’s son Benedek’s sponsor Peter
32. Mark’s son Andrew
33. Mark’s son Paul
34. Mark and his son Sebastian

Acta Archaeologia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae 49, 1997
35. Martin’s sponsus Andrew
36. Martin’s son Michael
37. Michael the blacksmith
38. Michael’s son George
39. Michael’s son Jacob
40. Michael’s son Nicolas
41. Michael’s son Paul
42. Michael’s son Peter
43. Michael’s son Thomas
44. Nicolas’s son John
45. Nicolas’s son Matthias and Stephen
46. Nicolas’s son Nicolas
47. Paul’s son Anthony
48. (the same) Paul’s son Matthias
49. (the same) Paul’s son Peter
50. Paul’s son Laurence
51. Peter’s son John
52. Peter’s son Jacob
53. Pethe’s son George and his sons Thomas and Stephen
54. John Powch
55. George Rosuago
56. Saoul’s son Peter
57. Simon’s son John
58. (the same) Simon’s son John’s son Peter
59. Stephen’s son Benedek
60. Stephen’s son Michael
61. George Sylow’s son Benedek
62. Thomas the butcher
63. Koos Theke
64. Thomas Varro
65. John Vegh
66. Balázs Vörös
67. Zenthes’s son Michael’s son Matthias
68. (the same) Zenthes’s son Michael’s son George
(69.) ... Michael
(70.) ...’s son George