

## STUDIES

### SERF OBLIGATIONS, MANORIAL REVENUES, AND DEMESNE FARMING ON THE MURÁŇ ESTATE BETWEEN 1657 AND 1686

ATTILA ULRICH

ULRICH, Attila. Serf Obligations, Manorial Revenues, and Demesne Farming on the Muráň Estate between 1657 and 1686. *Historický časopis*, 2025, 73, 5, pp. 949-972, Bratislava.

The Muráň estate was one of the significant estates in Gömör County. Various smaller or larger source analyses and studies have been written about its history. Primarily, the estate's 16th-century economy has been explored in more detail, while fewer studies are available from the 17th century. Thus, the economic activity of the Muráň estate during this period remains largely unprocessed.

The primary aim of this study is to present the traditional forms of taxation, the tax system, and the obligations of serfs based on the available urbariums, up to the year 1686. The 34-year period between 1652 and 1686 provides an opportunity to observe the impact of confiscations, as well as the effects of the military and political situation on the population and economic life. Muráň's economic strength can be considered significant until around 1670, although its developmental potential was constrained by the established feudal system and the prevailing economic and political conditions. The taxation and service system of the Muráň estate's serfs developed in accordance with the characteristics of the geographical environment. After the mid-17th century, a stronger trend toward manorialization can be observed. The estate's economy and the diversity of its revenues were shaped by the industrial and enterprises and crafts operating in the area. In animal husbandry, besides cattle farming, sheep breeding was especially dominant. Horse breeding was of smaller volume, although the grazing of Spiš horses was a long-standing custom in the Muráň region. Based on the tax records and knowledge of the taxation system, it can be concluded that the Muráň estate was a significant economic unit within the territory of the Szepes Chamber.

Keywords: Manorial history. Estate revenues. Serf obligations. Leasehold arrangements. Early modern Hungary. Feudal economy.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31577/histcaso.2025.73.5.4>

## Introduction

The Muráň estate was one of the most significant estates in Gömör County. Its history has been the subject of various smaller source analyses and studies. Primarily, it was the 16th-century economic structure of the estate that has been revealed in more detail,<sup>1</sup> which subsequently influenced the organization of labor within the dominion and its continuation of a semi-industrial character. However, for the 17th century, fewer studies are currently available, so the economic activities of Muráň during this period remain largely unexamined.<sup>2</sup> Bálint Ila presented the early modern situation of Gömör County in several studies, in which the Muráň estate also had its place; he even dedicated one of his most important studies to János Hottmár, a significant inspector of the estate.<sup>3</sup>

The fact that for part of the period under examination, Palatine Ferenc Wesselényi became the owner of the estate by marrying the “Venus of Muráň,” Mária Széchy, held decisive significance for later developments. Following the exposure of the palatine-led noble organization – or conspiracy – confiscations of property began, which also affected Muráň.

In the early 1670s, the nobility, forced to flee their places of residence due to the confiscations, left behind a significant gap in estate management and production – not to mention the emerging Kuruc movement and the later liberation of the country from Ottoman control.

The primary aim of the present study is to present the taxation forms based on long-standing traditions, the tax system, and the service obligations of the serfs, based on available urbariums, up to the year 1686. The 34-year period between 1652 and 1686 provides an opportunity to observe how confiscations and the military and political conditions affected the population and the economy.<sup>4</sup> The economic strength of Muráň was considerable up until 1670, but its potential for development was limited by the prevailing feudal system and the economic

- 
- 1 HLODÁK and ŽILÁK. *Panstvo Muráň: hospodárske dejiny*. Kalinovo 2006; SARUSI KISS. *A természet által megerősített vár. Murány végvár és uradalma a 16. század második felében*. Disszertációk. Budapest 2008; SARUSI KISS. *Vasgyártás és vasgazdálkodás Murányban a XVI. században*. In *FONS IV*. 1997, 1. sz., pp. 79-98; HECKENAST. *A magyarországi vas kohászat története a feudalizmus korában. A XIII. század közepétől a XVIII. század végéig*. Budapest 1991.
  - 2 VÁRKONYI. *Wesselényi Ferenc Murányi uradalmának etnikai és kulturális összetétele 1652-ben*. Ed. Lendvai Tímár Edit.... 2019, pp. 189-199. For this, see the works of Bálint Ila cited below.
  - 3 ILA. *Az írásbeliség szerepe a XVII. századi gazdasági igazgatásban*. In *Levéltári Közlemények*, 1946. 24. évfolyam, pp. 27-46; ILA. *A dézsma adminisztrációja*. In *Levéltári Közlemények 18-19. évfolyam*, 1940-41, p. 228, p. 231.
  - 4 The social composition and serfdom of the Muráň estate will be examined in detail in a forthcoming, separate study.

and political conditions. Signs of stagnation can be seen in the economic organization up to the early 1670s, which were further intensified by the change in ownership following the noble conspiracy led by Wesselényi. However, this relative stability seems to have been broken, and by 1685 a decline in population and, more significantly, in productive power (e.g., in the number of draft oxen) had begun.<sup>5</sup> For this reason, we also examined the estate inventories from 1685 and 1686, which indicate that some regeneration had already begun within just one year.

In 1663, within the base period we examined, the Muráň estate comprised 19 settlements, with six held in pledge.<sup>6</sup> Its economic strength was mainly provided by the market towns of Jelšava and Revúca, and the larger peasant villages of Polomka, Lubeník, and Šumiac in the Garam valley. In the villages of the estate, we find iron forges with furnaces, charcoal burning sites, tilt-hammer mills, stamping mills, flour mills, sawmills, and even a glassworks.<sup>7</sup> It can generally be said that the payment of the landlord's ninth (*nona*) was not widespread at the beginning of the examined period, nor was the pig tithe. The recorders usually

---

5 As part of our research, we also processed the data from the 1657, 1664, 1672, 1685, and 1686 surveys with a focus on social composition. These more detailed and aggregated tables will be published in a forthcoming study on the social history of the estate. The data clearly indicate a significant decline in livestock holdings over time. For instance, in Šivetice, the number of oxen dropped from 64 to 20; in the market town of Revúčka, from 244 to 96; in Lubeník, from 60 to 20; and in Magnezitovce, from 66 to 34.

6 1657 – Jelšava and Revúčka market towns, Prihradzany, Šivetice, Muránska Dlhá Lúka, Mokrú Lúka, Podmuráň, Muránska Lehota, Chyžné, Revúčka Lehota, Magnezitovce, Korpáš, Muránska Zdychava, Gemerské Teplice, Revúčka, Šumiac, Polomka, Závadka nad Hronom. 1664 – Jelšava, Revúčka, Prihradzany, Šivetice, Gemerské Teplice, Lubeník, Korpáš, Magnezitovce, Chyžné, Mokrú Lúka, Revúčka, Muránska Zdychava, Muránska Dlhá Lúka, Muránska Lehota, Podmuráň, Šumiac, Závadka nad Hronom, Polomka, Vernár, Telgárt. 1672 – Revúčka, Šivetice, Gemerský Milhosť, Gemerské Teplice, Lubeník, Korpáš, Magnezitovce, Revúčka Lehota, Chyžné, Mokrú Lúka, Revúčka, Muránska Zdychava, Muránska Dlhá Lúka, Muránska Lehota, Podmuráň, Šumiac, Závadka nad Hronom, Polomka, Vernár, Telgárt, Heľpa.

1678 – Revúčka, Šivetice, Gemerské Teplice, Lubeník, Korpáš, Magnezitovce, Revúčka Lehota, Chyžné, Mokrú Lúka, Revúčka, Muránska Zdychava, Muránska Dlhá Lúka, Muránska Lehota, Podmuráň, Šumiac, Závadka nad Hronom, Vernár, Telgárt.

1686 – Revúčka, Šivetice, Gemerské Teplice, Lubeník, Korpáš, Magnezitovce, Revúčka Lehota, Chyžné, Mokrú Lúka, Revúčka, Muránska Dlhá Lúka, Muránska Lehota, Podmuráň, Závadka nad Hronom, Muránska Zdychava, Vernár, Telgárt, Polomka, Heľpa.

1685 – Podmuráň, Muránska Lehota, Muránska Dlhá Lúka, Muránska Zdychava, Revúčka, Revúčka, Mokrú Lúka, Revúčka Lehota, Lubeník, Chyžné, Magnezitovce, Korpáš, Gemerské Teplice, Šivetice, Závadka nad Hronom, Heľpa, Pohorelá, Šumiac, Telgárt, Vernár

7 For mill architecture, the various types of mills, and their operation, see PONGRÁCZ. Régi malomépítészet, Budapest: Műszaki Könyvkiadó, 1967.

noted this fact during estate inventories, encouraging the landlord to maximize his income.<sup>8</sup>

Later, however, the system of ninth and tithe taxation became more widespread in the villages belonging to the estate. According to an inventory from 1652, it can be stated that taxation practices already followed an established system, which was reflected in census-based taxation, the permanent nature of food taxes, and the consistency of income collected under landlord rights. The amount of tax changed only under extreme circumstances for the peasantry; otherwise, the amounts and kinds of food tax remained constant during the period. Clearly, a system already existing in the 16th century continued in terms of iron production and glassmaking. The region was rich in mills and stamping mills, and in addition to shoemaking in the market towns, pottery was also present within the estate.

### The Revenues of the Estate Based on Urbarium Records

The urbariums contain little data on the estate's revenues, and the primary aim of this study was not to investigate total revenues – that should be addressed in a future study. Nevertheless, let us consider some data regarding the estate-level revenues during the given period. According to one survey, the Muráň estate included 91  $\frac{3}{8}$  full peasant plots, 284 cotters, and 34 free tenants. In the towns of Jelšava and Revúca, 482 households were recorded, which together amounted to 791  $\frac{3}{8}$  plots. Annual cash revenue was 12,993 florins<sup>9</sup> and 86 denars. Tithe income included 3,098 bundles of wheat, 524 of barley, 897 of oats, 16 *köpü*,<sup>10</sup> 14 cheeses, and – if pigs were fattened on mast – 830 pigs and 35 marten pelts.<sup>11</sup> In 1682, the dominion generated 1,024 florins and 58 denars in cash revenue; among the listed estates, only the Spišský Castle Estate yielded a higher income for the Chamber, amounting to 2,219 florins and 2 denars.<sup>12</sup> In contrast, in 1677, reflecting the greater economic strength of the estate at that time, 1,657  $\frac{1}{2}$  Kassa bushell of wheat, 485 of barley, and 1,990  $\frac{3}{4}$  of oats were harvested, alongside a

8 Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár (MNL) Országos Levéltár (OL), Magyar Kamara Archívuma, E.156.a. Urbaria et Conscriptioes U et C Fasc. 25. No. 5. 1663. (in the following MNL OL E.156.a. U et C) *"In the entire Muráň estate, apart from the settlements of Gemerské Teplice, Šivetice, Gemerský Milhost', and Perlacz, no one is subject to the payment of the tithe. However, when acorns yield, they are obliged to pay a tithe in pigs..."*

9 The term florin as used in this study refers to the Hungarian accounting forint valued at 100 denars, rather than the gold-minted coin.

10 The *köpü* was a traditional type of beehive made from a hollowed-out tree trunk, placed upright in a cylindrical form. It was one of the folk forms of the beehive used in rural Hungary.

11 MNL OL E.156.a. U et C Fasc. 90. No. 88. Without a date.

12 MNL OL E.156.b. U et C Fasc. 8. No. 9. 1682. The estates recorded therein, in addition to those in Muráň and Spišský hrad, included Szádvár, Tokaj, Kisvárdá, Putnok, Blh, Trebisov, Ungvár (Uzshorod), Bodókö, Humenné, Vranov nad Topľou, Hrad Veľký Šariš, and Leles.

cash income of 13,163 florins and 83 denars.<sup>13</sup> The following year, 1678, 1,514  $\frac{3}{4}$  bushell of wheat, 464 of barley, and 1,537  $\frac{1}{18}$  of oats were collected, with a cash income of 9,482 florins and 36 denars.<sup>14</sup>

According to the undated document mentioned above, the Jelšava census yielded 3,899 florins and 81 denars (30.01% of total estate revenues); the food tax was 1,202 florins and 87 denars; the taxes on St. George's and St. Michael's days amounted to 42 florins; the mill census contributed 80 florins and 66 denars. Revenues from iron forges totaled 240 florins, from the glassworks 50, from customs 61, from charcoal burning 60, and from cabbage gardens 145. The so-called "Dán" tax on sheep provided 461 florins and 30 denars. Sheep tithes yielded 1,000 thalers (1,800 florins), and the Gömör sheep tithe brought in 394 florins and 12 denars. Among tavern incomes, the two inns at Podmuráň produced 2,300 florins and 4 denars in revenue, the estate tavern at Šumiac brought in 232, the one in Polomka 450, and that in Lubeník 555 florins. Profits from brandy amounted to 100 florins and 5 denars annually, while other revenues totaled 409 florins and 45 denars – showing that tavern income alone constituted one-third (31.34%) of total estate revenue. Other tax income from the villages totaled 971 florins and 40 denars. That year's total cash revenue was 12,993 florins and 86 denars.<sup>15</sup> Based on these figures, the Jelšava census and tavern revenues together accounted for 61.15% of total revenue, illustrating that a developed market town could yield considerable income and that the maintenance of taverns was highly profitable.

According to a revenue summary from the 1670s, census taxes yielded 1,966 florins and 98 denars, food taxes 929 florins and 12 denars, marten tax 27 florins, St. George's and St. Michael's taxes 33 florins and 94 denars, and calf tax 4 florins. Tavern and mill census brought in 111 florins, and customs revenues amounted to 46 florins. Iron forges yielded 258 florins, the glassworks 50 florins, the brewery 21 florins and 60 denars, and the charcoal tax 52 florins and 50 denars.<sup>16</sup>

In 1677, the dominion was appraised by Lipót Vilmos Draheim at 55,313 florins and  $75 \frac{2}{3}$  denars,<sup>17</sup> and by 1686, this value had risen to 98,630 florins and 72 denars.<sup>18</sup>

---

13 MNL OL E.156.b. U et C Fasc. 8. No. 2. 1677.

14 MNL OL E.156.a. U et C Fasc. 25. No.8/b. 1678.

15 MNL OL E.156.a. U et C Fasc 90. No. 88. Without a date.

16 MNL OL. E.156.a. U et C Fasc. 25. No. 35. Dated to the 1670s.

17 MNL OL E.156.a. U et C Fasc. 25. No. 36. A copy from 1697.

18 MNL OL. E.156.a. U et C Fasc. 25. No. 12. 1686.

## Feudal taxation, compulsory labor and monetary tax (census) in the Muráň Estate

In terms of feudal taxation and unpaid labor (compulsory labor services) was a general obligation throughout the dominion. The estate inventories clearly show that the stewards aimed to organize the labor effectively, recording which village was assigned to which estate lands for robot and mowing duties. The urbarium of 1652 specified the number of ploughs (i.e., teams or wagons) per village, the location of the robot labor, and the conditions of the meadows.<sup>19</sup>

Among the estate's villages, the inhabitants of Jelšava cultivated the demesne land located within their own territory, while the serfs and cotters of other villages participated in organized, compulsory labor. According to the 1657 inventory, Revúca could simultaneously plough with 32 teams of oxen, though only 12 were requisitioned that year, along with 60 foot-laboring serfs. Polomka had 17 ploughs and 11 foot-laboring serfs. Across the estate in that year, a total of 95 ploughs and 189 foot-laborers were mobilized for robot services.<sup>20</sup> The mowing of estate meadows was also carefully recorded and strictly divided among the villages.<sup>21</sup> János Hottmár, a prominent estate steward in the mid-17th century, noted in the 1657 inventory: *“As I see, by the blessing of God, the poor man's cattle have multiplied, that he may not waste them without reason...”* As previously noted, the number of draft oxen among the estate's serfs decreased significantly by the mid-1680s.<sup>22</sup>

Demesne farms were established in multiple locations. As mentioned, the inhabitants of Jelšava worked their own local demesne. Other demesne lands

---

19 MNL OL E.156.a. U et C Fasc 25. No. 1. 1652.

20 Prihradzaný 5 ploughs and one foot-servant peasant, Šivetice 11 ploughs és 9 foot-servant peasant, Muránska Dlhá Lúka 8 ploughs és 20 foot-servant peasant, Mokrá Lúka 6 ploughs, 11 foot-servant peasant, Podmuráň 5 ploughs, 14 foot-servant peasant, Muránska Lehota 2 ploughs, 6 foot-servant peasant, Chyžné 6 ploughs, 16 foot-servant peasant, Kopras 2 ploughs, 1 foot-servant peasant, Revúcka Lehota 3 ploughs és 11 foot-servant peasant, Magnezitovce 4 ploughs és 6 foot-servant peasant, Muránska Zdychava 4 ploughs, Gemerské Teplice 6 ploughs és 7 foot-servant peasant, Revúčka 3 ploughs és 8 foot-servant peasant, Šumiac 8 ploughs és 15 foot-servant peasant, Polomka 17 ploughs és 11 foot-servant peasant, Závadka nad Hronom 4 ploughs és 4 foot-servant peasant performed corvée labor this year.

21 MNL OL E.156.a. Fasc 25. No. 5. 1663. For example, the Nagyrét meadow near Muráň was harvested by the villages of Podmuráň, Muránska Lehota, Muránska Zdychava, Revúčka, and Muránska Dlhá Lúka. The meadow known as Hajdúcska was harvested by the settlements of Prihradzaný, Šivetice, Gemerské Teplice, Gemerský Milhost', Muránska Lehota, and Podmuráň.

22 MNL OL E.156.a. U et C Fasc. 25 No. 2. 1657, and Fasc. 95. No. 17. 1685. A comparison of the two surveys reveals a clear decrease in the number of draft animals held by the peasant population.

designated for the landlord's exclusive use were established in Šivetice, Polomka, Lubeník, and Podmuráň.

In Podmuráň, a more substantial demesne was formed, including a manor house and barn, and 28 subdivided plots cultivated under a three-field rotation system. In 1672, a meadow in Muránska Dlhá Lúka yielded 4 wagonloads of hay; in Mokrú Lúka, another produced 2 wagonloads. The same urbarium mentions a demesne of 40 bushell in Revúcka Lehota. In Muránska Zdychava, a meadow yielding 18 wagonloads of hay was established. In 1657, the people of Gemerské Teplice were mowing an estate meadow near their village that produced 3 wagonloads of hay. After 1660, a demesne was also formed in Šumiac, carved from surrounding meadows, yielding 4 wagonloads.

In the early 1650s, a new demesne with arable land and meadows was likely formed in Polomka, initially worked by local inhabitants. By 1672, more detailed information is available: the land was cultivated under a three-field system—33 *kassai köböl*<sup>23</sup> of wheat in one field, 35 in another, and 22 in the third. In the Bacsuoszka allodium, oats were sown on land measured at 100 bushell, 90 of which were cultivated. Of the two demesne meadows, one yielded 80 wagonloads and the other two. A manor garden with granary was also established, including both farmland and livestock.

Evidence of allodial expansion is also found in Lubeník, where in 1672, a demesne land of 161.5 *kassai bushell* was cultivated – 59.5 with wheat, and 40 with oats. A granary garden was also created, complete with livestock, a 4-bushell cabbage garden, and four meadows producing 18 wagonloads of hay. The small demesne in Šivetice was cultivated with 12 bushell of sowing over 9 plots in three rotations, and its four meadows yielded 2 wagonloads of hay. Based on the incomplete available data from the 1672 urbarium, the total demesne cultivation area was 412.5 Košice bushell, and the meadows produced an estimated 137 wagonloads of hay.

Between 1652 and 1672, several new allodia were established, increasing the burden on serfs and cotters and further solidifying the existing feudal system.

Among the seigneurial cash income, the census tax played the leading role. Available sources suggest that attempts were made to align this tax with both increasing seigneurial demands and the paying capacity of the serfs. On March 4, 1650, in the market town of Jelšava, the previously imposed tax of 1,500 florins was raised to 2,000 florins, which included 100 florins from leasing cabbage

---

23 The *kassai köböl* (Košice bushell – a regional dry measure unit, approximately 64–74 liters), used in Upper Hungary for grain taxation and storage calculations. In the following section of the study, we use the term *kassai bushell*. In the remainder of the study, the term *bushel* is used as the equivalent of the Hungarian measure bushell, with the clarification that it refers exclusively to the Košice *bushel* as defined for the purposes of this study.

gardens. In Šumiac, a similar revision occurred on September 1, 1643, when the duties of the local glassworks were defined. By 1672, their census amounted to 80 florins.

The data indicate that the total amount of census tax remained largely unchanged between 1650 and 1686, though local adjustments were sometimes made in response to the serfs' declining capacity. In the examined thirty-year period, the increase in serf households may have reduced individual tax burdens – however, in the early 1680s, a relative decline in the number of serfs led to heavier taxation per household. After Jelšava, the town of Revúca paid the second highest tax – 555 florins – followed by Polomka with 400 florins, though by 1678, the latter had been pledged and was no longer part of the estate.

In a few villages, St. George's and St. Michael's day taxes remained, but these were minor compared to the census. For example, Mokrá Lúka paid 16 florins and 64 denars, and Podmuráň 4 florins and 50 denars during the period under review.

#### Census Taxation Between 1657–1686

Settlement	Census in florin	Change in census	St. George & St. Michael Tax	Total Cash Revenue
<b>Jelšava</b>	2000 fl	Pledged after 1657	no	2000 fl
<b>Revúca</b>	555 fl		no	555 fl
<b>Prihradzany</b>	100 fl	Pledged after 1657	no	100 fl
<b>Šivetice</b>	150 fl	75 fl in 1672	no	75 fl
<b>Muránska Dlhá Lúka</b>	200 fl		no	200 fl
<b>Mokrá Lúka</b>	80 fl		16 fl 64 denars	
<b>Podmuráň</b>	no		9 fl	
<b>Muránska Lehota</b>	18 fl		3 fl 50 denars	21 fl 50 denars
<b>Chyžné</b>	150 fl	100 fl (c. 1655), then 150 fl in 1685	no	150 fl
<b>Korpáš</b>	33 fl 33 denars		no	33 fl 33 denars

<b>Revúcka Muránska Lehota</b>	45 fl		10 fl	55 fl
<b>Magnezitovce</b>	66 fl 66 denars		no	66 fl 66 denars
<b>Muránska Zdychava</b>	24 fl	32 fl in 1663; 24 fl in 1685	3 fl	24 fl
<b>Gemerský Milhošť</b>	100 fl	To the Banská Bystrica chamber in 1672	no	100 fl
<b>Gemerské Teplice</b>	10 fl	50 fl (in 1672) <sup>24</sup>	no	50 fl
<b>Revúčka</b>	24 fl		3 fl	27 fl
<b>Šumiac</b>	80 fl		no	80 fl
<b>Polomka</b>	400 fl	Pledged in 1678	no	400 fl
<b>Závadka nad Hronom</b>	21 fl 66 denars			21 fl 66 denars
<b>Lubeník</b>	20 fl 75 denars	32 Ft (in 1672)		32 fl
<b>Vernár</b>	23 fl 23 denars			23 fl 23 denars
<b>Telgárt</b>	18 fl 33 denars			18 fl 33 denars
<b>Pohorelá</b>	40 fl	1685: Paid to Banská Bystrica chamber <sup>25</sup>		40 fl
<b>Heľpa</b>	80 fl	130 fl (in 1672), later 100 fl, 80 Ft (in 1685)	–	80 fl
<b>Šivetice</b>	75 fl	is recorded in the Urbarium of 1685		75 fl

Beyond the census, the food tax – payable in addition to the corvée labor obligations – could represent an even greater burden for the peasantry. The tax

24 The rise in the census figures of Gemerské Teplice was presumably due to its unique obligation to deliver Christmas gifts (e.g., hen, roe deer, calf, bird), a requirement that had disappeared from the records by 1672.

25 In addition to its census dues, Pohorelá was required to deliver three guinea fowls each year.

known as *kántorélés* was determined on a settlement basis.<sup>26</sup> Despite its name, which might suggest a quarterly payment (based on *kántor*, meaning quarter), the urbarium of 1657 records the specific month in which it was to be paid. By 1663, in addition to specifying the quantity of foodstuffs owed, the compilers also included their value in florins. However, as the records show, the authorities sought to collect the levied tax primarily in kind. Nevertheless, the accounts also reveal that this was not always successfully enforced, and the remaining amounts were therefore converted into monetary payments.<sup>27</sup>

The delivered livestock (such as calves, lambs, hens, chickens, geese, and other “birds”), along with butter and honey, were intended to supply the lord (or lady) residing in Muráň Castle, as well as the estate staff – similar to how income from local mills was also used.

#### Food Taxation in the Settlements of the Muráň Estate, 1657–1663<sup>28</sup>

Settlement	Calf	Lamb	Goose	Hen	Chicken	Bird	Butter	Honey	Value
Jelšava	6	6	36	100	1000	36		36	235ft
Revúca	3	3	18	46	450	16	16	16	117 Ft 50 d.
Prihradzany	1	1	6	15	200	6	6	6	38 Ft

26 The term *kántorélés* referred to a quarterly in-kind levy of foodstuffs imposed within the estate during the early modern period.

27 The estate recorded the taxes collected between the end of 1662 and the end of 1663. The accounts show that the cantor’s food tax was delivered in a mixed form: partly in cash, and partly in kind. In both cases, András Kulcsár played a significant role; as the steward (*kulcsár*) of the Muráň estate, he oversaw the provisioning of the lord’s household residing in the castle. It was also through him that the estate officials received their allocations. For instance, in this year Magnezitovce owed 3 florins and 43.5 denars, Šivetice 21 florins and 40 denars, Gemerské Teplice 32 florins and 9 denars, and Koprás 3 florins and 60.5 denars in food tax. From the tax of Lubeník, 4 florins and 25 denars were paid to the estate manager. András Kulcsár (he was the steward this period) received 25 hens from the delivery at Muránska Dlhá Lúka as his quittance (*quietantia*). In lieu of the tax from Závadka nad Hronom, András Kulcsár received in Muráň: 4 geese, 2 goslings, 9 hens, 5 chickens, 5 icces (*icce* was a traditional Hungarian unit of liquid volume, approximately 0.85 to 1.0 liters) of rendered butter, 1 lamb, and 36 young hens. From the same tax, György Kisnyai received 13 hens, 14 young hens, 3 geese, and 4 icces of rendered butter. – see MNL OL E.156.a. U et C Fasc 25. No. 5. 1663 statements.

28 Although Lubeník, Vernart, Telgárt, and Pohorelá were under pledge, they were nevertheless subject to the payment of a food tax, amounting to 20 florins and 75 denars, 15–20–40 florins respectively, with a total of 95 florins and 75 denars.

<b>Šivetice</b>	2	2	9	30	300	12	12	12	38 Ft (52 Ft 50 d)
<b>Muránska Dlhá Lúka</b>	1	1	10	20	250	8	8	8	78 Ft 75 d
<b>Mokrá Lúka</b>	2	2	16	40	400	13	13	12	54 Ft 62 d.
<b>Podmuráň Muránska Lehota</b>	1	1	6	20	200	6	6	6	48 Ft
<b>Chyžné</b>	2	2	12	30	300	10	12	10	38 Ft
<b>Korpáš, Magnezi- tovce</b>	2	2	7	20	250	9	9	9	25 Ft 25 d.
<b>Revúčka Lehota</b>	1	1	7	20	175	8	8	8	30 Ft
<b>Muránska Zdychava</b>	1	1	6	14	100	6	6	6	32 Ft 5 d.
<b>Gemerský Milhošť, Gemerské Teplíce</b>	2	2	12	30	300	9	10	10	51 Ft
<b>Revúčka</b>	1	1	6	20	175	6	6	6	25 Ft 25 d.
<b>Šumiac</b>	2	2	12	36	400	10	10	10	95 Ft
<b>Polomka</b>	4	4	20	50	500	20	20	20	154 Ft 96 d.
<b>Závadka nad Hro- nom</b>			4	14	100	6	6	6	40 Ft
<b>In total</b>	31	31	187	505	5100	181	148	181	1101 fl 38 denars

### **Mills and Industrial Facilities in the Muráň Estate**

A significant number of mills operated within the territory of the Muráň estate. Water power was frequently utilized, as several types of mills, as well as iron production, required water for their operation.<sup>29</sup>

29 PONGRÁCZ, *A régi...*, p. 22. Sawmills within the territory of the Kingdom of Hungary

In the case of Jelšava, the taxation records made a clear distinction concerning the estate's presumably significant five-stone mill. According to the 1663 data, the mill was obliged to provide 220 *szapu*<sup>30</sup> of fine white flour and 440 *szapu* of coarse household flour annually to the landlord. These quantities were delivered to the castle bakery, where they were distributed to the lord himself, estate officials, and members of the noble household.

The following table summarizes the presence and types of mills, forges, and other industrial installations in the settlements belonging to the Muráň estate between 1657 and 1686. These included German and Slovak (“Tót” in the sources) iron hammer forges, charcoal production sites, as well as various types of mills (dry mills, fulling mills, stamping mills, sawmills, and glassworks). The number of millstones is indicated where available.

The “Mills” of the Muráň Estate, 1657–1686<sup>31</sup>

Settlement	German forge	Slovak (tót) forge	Charcoal production	Mill units	Fulling mill kalló (karló)	Stamping mill (kölyü)	Saw mill	Glass-work “mill”
Jelšava		2	it is	1	2	2		
Revúca	5		it is	1	1	3		
Šivetice	1		it is	1		1		
Muránska Dlhá Lúka	1 <sup>32</sup>		it is					
Mokrú Lúka	1		it is	1		1		
Podmuráň <sup>33</sup>	1			1		1		
Chyžné			it is <sup>34</sup>	1				

operated exclusively using water power.

30 One *Jelšava szapu* corresponded to 46.56 liters or 34.92 kilograms of wheat in volume and weight, respectively. See: BOGDÁN. *Magyarországi űr-, térfogat-, súly- és darabmértékek 1874-ig*. A Magyar Országos Levéltár Kiadványai IV., Levéltári és történeti forrástudományok 7. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1991, p. 335.

31 PONGRÁCZ, *A régi...*, p. 24. According to their classification, forges also operated on the principle of the “mill.”

32 A forge site located in the uninhabited plains was also mentioned.

33 In 1567, two additional forges were still mentioned.

34 Their own mill.

<b>Revúcka Lehota</b>	1		it is					
<b>Muránska Zdychava</b>				1				
<b>Šumiac</b>				1			1	1
<b>Polomka</b>				2			2	
<b>Závadka nad Hronom</b>				1			2	
<b>Lubeník</b>	2			1		1		
<b>Telgárt</b>				1			1	
<b>Vernár</b>				1				

A significant number of mills operated within the Muráň estate during the period under investigation. Most of these grain mills used a single millstone, although there are documented examples of mills with two stones (e.g., in Revúcka and Šivetice), and even one with five stones in Jelšava. In addition to standard flour mills, the estate also featured stamping mills (*kölyü*), fulling mills (*karló*), and sawmills that resembled medieval mill types in both structure and function.<sup>35</sup>

Taxation on the functioning mills – both dry and water-driven – presented a complex system, reflecting a variety of service obligations. In some cases, millers were required to provide flour alongside the standard census payment, as well as deliver livestock such as fattened pigs or calves. The miller of Revúcka was obligated to pay 1 florin, provide one fattened pig and one calf, and deliver 100 *szapu* of flour. In 1672 and 1685, this obligation was recorded as 30 bushell of grain, along with either two pigs or one calf. In 1678, 57.5 Košice bushell of grain, a calf, and 1 florin were delivered.

In Šivetice, the watermill built on the Jelšava stream was operated under a one-third ownership system, where the miller gave one calf annually (1657). In 1672, the same ownership structure applied, but the obligations increased to 80 bushell of grain, two pigs, and 1 florin. By 1678, this had decreased to 45 bushell.

In Muránska Dlhá Lúka, two mills operated in 1672. One was leased to the village for 6 florins, the other to a village miller, Péter Mlinár, who is recorded in both 1672 and 1678 as paying the same rental.<sup>36</sup> In 1657, the miller paid 30 *szapu* of flour and provided one calf. In Podmuráň, similar contributions were made: 30

35 PONGRÁCZ., *A régi...*, pp. 121-140. including, for example, fulling mills, pp. 147-154 sawmills, pp. 155-159. description of iron hammer forges.

36 In 1672, the Muránska Lehota mill was also leased by András Mlinár for 6 florins. Between 1672 and 1685, the village mill was rented out for an annual fee of 6 florins.

*szapu* and one calf in 1657; 40 bushell, two pigs or one calf in 1672; and in 1678, two pigs, while in 1685, the obligation returned to 40 bushell and two pigs.<sup>37</sup> In Telgárt, the settlement two mills were taxed at 2 and 3 florins, respectively. The Šivetice mill generated 80 bushell in revenue, of which one-third belonged to the miller, who was also required to fatten two pigs by 1685.

Importantly, mill revenues were not solely directed to the seigneur's private income but were also used to support public institutions such as the school and hospital (*ispotály*) in Jelšava, as well as the local rector and priests. In 1657, income from the Mokrá Lúka mill was directed to the hospital; in 1672, out of 25 Košice bushell of tax, 23 went to the hospital, and 2 to the priest. By 1683, the hospital received only 3 bushell. In Chyžné, revenue from the mill was split equally between the school and hospital; by 1678 and 1685, only the school was receiving 15 bushell annually.

In Lubeník, the lord owned two-thirds of the mill, leaving one-third to the miller. In 1672, 25 Košice bushell were allocated to the school, and 12.5 bushell to the rector. In 1678, 28¾ bushell went to estate officials, and 14¼ to the rector. In Revúca, two stamping mills paid 2 and 3 florins in rent. In Muránska Dlhá Lúka and Podmuráň, the local millers paid 1 florin in cash and also fattened a pig. The mill in Mokrá Lúka provided 1 florin in income, while in Lubeník, the stamping mill was taxed at 1 florin, and later (1685), also required the miller to fatten two pigs.

Another ownership model is seen in Šivetice, where the miller owned one-third of the mill and was responsible for 30 *szapu* of flour and one calf, in addition to 1 florin and a pig for the stamping mill located adjacent to the grain mill. Similar arrangements likely existed in Podmuráň, where 60 *szapu* of flour and a calf were owed for the mill, and 1 florin plus pig fattening for the stamping mill.<sup>38</sup>

A distinct tax pattern appears in Muránska Zdychava, Šumiac, Závadka nad Hronom, and Polomka, where in addition to rent, marten pelts were owed.<sup>39</sup> In Šumiac, the village built its own mill, which paid 5 florins in rent and 3 florins in marten tax. Polomka, with two mills, paid 2 florins and owed two marten pelts.

The fulling mills, important to tanners, played a vital role in local industry.<sup>40</sup> In Jelšava, two fulling mills were used by weavers, who paid the landlord with

37 The rent for the mill in Revúčka was also 6 florins.

38 MNL OL E.156.a. U et C Fasc. 25. No.5. 1663.

39 In Muránska Zdychava and Závadka nad Hronom, the rental fee was 3 florins, and the so-called 'marten money' amounted to an additional 3 florins. In 1672, the mill in Muránska Zdychava was leased by Mihály Matus and György Matus.

40 Fulling mills, also known as *karló* or *kallómalmok*, were used for the thickening and compacting of wet cloth. In addition to the work of Pál Pongrácz, see also: on the etymology of

two bolts of woolen cloth. In Revúca, the cloth-makers paid one bolt. The market town also had a “stupa” (a stamping device), used by tanners who paid 3 florins in rent. In Jelšava, the tanners’ tax was given to the local church.

The Muráň estate also had a glassworks, which functioned in 1657 and possibly in 1663, but later disappeared from estate records. The glassworks paid 50 florins in annual tax, and before September 1, 1643, owed 1,000 glass plates and items; afterward, the obligation doubled to 2,000. Among the products were peasant plates, “good old glass” (250 pieces), and vinegar bottles (100 pieces).

To meet the needs of the estate’s buildings and the castle, sawmills were used to process local timber. In Podmuráň, a sawmill is mentioned in 1678 (“*serra aquatica noviter*”), absent from the 1672 urbarium and no longer listed in 1685.<sup>41</sup> Tax on sawn boards was 1 denar per board, amounting to 50 florins annually, along with an obligation to produce 500 shingles.<sup>42</sup> In Šumiac, sawmill workers serving the castle were paid 1 denar per board between 1657 and 1686. In Polomka, a “Łtithe in boards” was paid – 50 boards annually in 1672. Similar patterns are seen in Závadka nad Hronom, which paid tithed boards in 1657 and 1685. In Telgárt, the annual sawmill tax was also 50 boards.

Pottery was also common in several settlements, such as Šivetice, where peasants provided ceramic goods. In Gemerský Milhost’, most of the serfs were potters according to the 1672 urbarium.

The iron forges (*hámor*) played a central role among the estate’s industrial installations, a topic that has been examined in earlier historical studies.<sup>43</sup> According to the estate records, German-style forges were established across the estate, except in Jelšava, where a Slovak-style forge (*tót hámor*) operated. Each forge was accompanied by two furnaces and charcoal production sites. Estate orders required annual gatherings of the *steller* ironworkers, who reported on their production. On these occasions, the seigneur’s officials provided food and drink to the workers, highlighting the significance of iron production.<sup>44</sup>

The inventories indicate that ironworking became a hereditary craft in certain families, with long-term lessees managing the forges. In Revúca, for instance, the forges were operated by János Petrus of Mokrú Lúka and the local Benkó

---

*kalló*. This type of mill could have functioned either as an ore-crushing mill or as a fulling mill used for compacting cloth. ORTUTAY, ed. *Magyar Néprajzi Lexikon*. II. kötet. Budapest 1979, pp. 727-730.

41 MNL OL E.156.a. U et C Fasc. 88. No. 52. 1678.

42 Based on the 100-denar accounting Hungarian florin, this amounted to 5,000 planks per year!

43 See Heckenast: 56-88. the part concerning the production process, 185-208. the chapter addressing the technological standards of the period, SARUSI KISS, *A vasgyártás és vasgazdálkodás...*, p. 87. The iron revenues of the estate between 1550 and 1573.

44 MNL OL E 156.a. Fasc 25. No.1. 1652.

family. Between 1672 and 1686, János Benkó the younger leased Revúca's most profitable forge.<sup>45</sup>

In Muránska Dlhá Lúka, in 1657, one operating and one idle forge were recorded; in 1678, Menyhért Czelder rented it for 18 florins annually. In Mokrá Lúka, the Petrus family leased a German-style forge between 1672 and 1685 for 25 florins per year.

The forges in Revúcka Lehota and Lubeník were also German in style. In 1672, the forge in Revúcka Lehota was leased by Márton and György Frenyó from the village of Kameňany (Kövi) for 40 florins. In 1678, András Frenyó and György Merkovitz became the lessees, paying the same amount. In Lubeník, three forges were listed, two of which were leased by András and Tamás Frenyó for 20 florins each. The records noted that the forges were previously operated by Salamon Steller and his sons – Salamon, Mihály, and János – suggesting a long-standing family role in local iron production. In 1678 and 1685, the Frenyó family continued leasing the forges from Kameňany.

The *Steller* family, likely named after their profession, also resided in Lubeník, where Salamon Steller lived as a cotter in 1664, owning six oxen and two cows, along with sons Salamon, Mihály, and Hanisz.<sup>46</sup> He is still listed among the cotters in 1678. Stellers were also present in Kameňany.<sup>47</sup>

The Frenyó family, residents of Kameňany, part of the Szendrő estate, lived roughly 25 km from the leased furnaces. The 1652 inventory of Szendrő noted: "*the Frenyó family's furnace is near Kameňany.*"<sup>48</sup> The family consistently worked in iron production, as evidenced by repeated entries in estate records. In 1670, Mátyás and András appeared with 2 and 4 oxen, respectively; in 1673, the same individuals were listed, though the oxen count for András was struck through. In 1686, András Frenyó was recorded as a serf on a sixteenth plot, owning one ox and having two sons, András and Mihály.<sup>49</sup>

45 MNL OL U E.156.a. U et C Fasc 95. No. 17. 1685. That year, János Petrus and János Benkó each paid an annual rent of 27 florins, whereas the younger Benkó paid 28 florins. HECKE-NAST, *A magyarországi...*, pp. 117-123. See the section on the glassworks located within the Muráň estate.

46 MNL OL E.156.a. Fasc 25. No.6. 1664.

47 MNL OL E 156.a. Fasc 88. No. 52. 1678.

48 MNL OL E.156.a. Fasc. 24. No. 80/a. 1652. In that year, several members of the Frenyó family lived in the village of Kameňany. András Frenyó, together with his son András, as well as András Kotves and Tamás Kotves occupied a full plot including a deserted section. Péter Frenyó, along with István Frenyó, Mihály Frenyó, and János Frenyó, also resided on a full plot, although their sections of the land were uninhabited. Péter Frenyó had seven sons: András, Tamás, Mihály, György, István, Márton, and Lukács. Among them, András had a son named Jakab, Tamás had a son named János, and Mihály had a son named Lőrinc, all of whom still lived with them.

49 MNL OL E 156.a. Fasc. 57. No. 4. 1670, Fasc. 142. No. 43. 1673 and Fasc. 142. No. 44.

The wealthiest forge lessees were members of the Petrus family of Mokrá Lúka. In 1657, István Petrus, his brother Márton, and Márton's son (also named Márton) shared a household on a quarter plot. Their livestock included 8 oxen, 3 cows, 1 horse, and 6 pigs. By 1672, István Petrus, with sons Tamás and Márton, and Petrus János, cultivated 12 acre(s) (*hold*)<sup>50</sup> of land on a quarter plot. István alone owned 12 oxen, 4 horses, 6 cows, 2 heifers, and 14 pigs.<sup>51</sup> In 1678, three separate taxable households on the same quarter plot belonged to István, János, and Márton Petrus, as well as Márton's son István – still ranking among the estate's wealthiest serfs.<sup>52</sup>

In Revúca, the Benkó family was also prosperous. In 1663, Gyurik Benkó and his sons János and Pál, along with András Benkó and his son Máté, and Hanesz Benkó, all lived in the town. Gyurik Benkó owned 6 oxen, 4 cows, 4 horses, 2 steers, 1 heifer, 11 pigs, and 8 *köpi*. In 1672, János Benkó served as mayor of the market town; another János Benkó, living separately with his 16-year-old son Pál, was also recorded.<sup>53</sup> The high number of horses in both the Petrus and Benkó families suggests they engaged in carting and transport, a common occupation in some estate villages.

In Podmuráň, a forge with two furnaces was recorded in 1657 but disappeared from later inventories.

### **Taverns, Customs Duties, and Minor Seigneurial Revenues in the Muráň Estate**

Among the minor seigneurial regalia, taverns and customs duties played a consistent role in the life and economy of the Muráň estate. Three customs stations operated within the domain: in Podmuráň, Polomka, and Telgárt. The Telgárt customs yielded a mere 4 florins annually, indicating that the roads leading

---

1686. In this latter census, Márton Frenyó and Mihály Frenyó were also mentioned among the serfs. A person named Steller appears in all three censuses: in 1670 as Máté Steller, in 1673 as Márton (Martinus), both listed as cotters, and in 1686 as Máté (Mathias) Stelliár, recorded among the serfs.

50 The *hold* (Hungarian acre) was a historical unit of land measurement. In this case, the exact type of hold is not specified, and therefore its precise area remains unknown.

51 MNL OL E 156.a. Fasc 25. No. 7. 1672. János Petrus owned 8 oxen, 4 horses, 3 cows, 1 heifer, and 1 pig.

52 MNL OL. E 156.a. Fasc 88. No 52. 1678. Mokrá Lúka. János Petrus owned 6 oxen, 4 cows, 4 horses, and 4 pigs; another entry for János Petrus records 6 oxen, 2 cows, 1 heifer, and 3 pigs. Márton Petrus possessed 4 oxen, 2 cows, and 2 pigs. Together, they cultivated 4 holds (acre) of land.

53 MNL OL. E. 156.a. Fasc. 25. No. 7. 1672, Revúčka. The judge was recorded as owning 4 oxen, 6 horses, 4 cows, 2 heifers, and 6 pigs. The other Benkó possessed 6 oxen, 4 horses, 3 cows, 2 heifers, 9 pigs, and 2 *köpi*.

to the area were steep, winding, and weather-dependent. The Polomka customs brought in 6 florins per year, while the Podmuráň customs station, located near a well-frequented tavern selling both beer and wine, was more profitable:<sup>54</sup> in 1672, its income was 36 florins, and the tavern itself generated 14 thalers—the same figure recorded in 1678, although by then the tavern had been leased for 25 florins and 25 denars.<sup>55</sup>

The most lucrative taverns in the estate were located in Jelšava and Lubeník. Prior to its pledge, Jelšava was obligated to sell 50 *gönci* barrels<sup>56</sup> of wine and, during Pentecost, 50 Hungarian eimer (*akó*)<sup>57</sup> of *márc* (or *marcz* – a type of unaged wine or fermented mash).<sup>58</sup> In Lubeník, tavern income reached a remarkable 300 florins annually in both 1672 and 1685. Records also survive from Polomka, where in 1672, 24 Hungarian eimer of beer were sold. Taverns operated by serfs in Korpáš and Magnezitovce were open only on feast days, and only if they were deemed “in suitable condition.”<sup>59</sup> The estate’s brewery was located in Podmuráň, and received barley shipments from multiple villages. In 1685, its income was recorded at 150 florins.

Estate urbariums rarely provide detailed revenue data. Only in a few instances do they include actual financial accounts. While this study primarily focuses on the framework of serf taxation, some information regarding seigneurial income does appear. The taverns, whether leased or directly managed by the seigneur, consistently generated substantial revenue. The 1664 urbarium includes several financial records from the fiscal year ending in late 1663. For example, the Šumiac tavern produced 446 florins and 2 denars, with expenses totaling 290

---

54 Among alcoholic beverages, only these two types were mentioned in the taverns of the Muráň estate, suggesting that distilled spirits were probably not sold. According to the sources, only beer was sold in the tavern located at Mokrá Lúka.

55 In 1678, the tavern was essentially leased for 14 thalers. At that time, the Hungarian accounting thaler was valued at 180 denars, that is, 1 florin equaled 180 denars. Thus, the 14 thalers amounted to 2,520 denars, or 25 florins and 25 denars. In 1685, the combined income from tolls and the tavern was calculated at 36 florins. For the value of the thaler, see: HORVÁTH. *A tallér értékváltozásai 1542–1700 között*. In *Numizmatikai Közlöny*, 1963–1964, LXII–LXIII. évfolyam, p. 25–50.

56 The *gönci barrel*: a standard Hungarian wine barrel (~136 liters), widely used in historical wine trade.

57 The *Hungarian eimer* was a traditional Hungarian unit of volume, primarily used for measuring liquids such as wine. Its value varied over time and by region, but it was typically equivalent to approximately 54–62 liters.

58 In medieval Hungary, a popular refreshment at fairs and religious festivals was *márc*, a drink made by boiling one bucket of honey in two buckets of water, adding star anise, and then fermenting the mixture. Before serving, it was sometimes chilled and diluted with water.

59 According to the 1678 urbarium, only beer was sold during tavern operations in Magnezitovce. In Šumiac, beer and wine were sold in 1672, while in 1685 only beer was available.

florins and 63 denars. After adjustments, a balance of 118 florins and 90 denars remained.<sup>60</sup>

In Lubeník, a more heavily trafficked tavern reported 989 florins and 60 denars in revenue, with 775 florins and 38 denars in expenses; the tavern-keeper still owed 142 florins and 43 denars.<sup>61</sup> The Podmuráň customs tavern reported 1,910 florins and 3 denars in income, but also 1,900 florins and 49 denars in expenses, much of which was paid as salaries and provisions for staff. The Lady of the Castle, Mária Széchy, received 125 florins and 27 denars in personal expenses from this budget.<sup>62</sup>

At the Muráň Castle tavern, tavern-keeper Márton Tarjányi accounted for 1,576 florins and 99 denars in income, with 1,660 florins and 93 denars in expenditures – payments to estate officials and servants explaining the deficit. That year, the Lady received 575 florins and 70 denars, Steward Márton Szabó received 96 florins and 60 denars, and 199 florins and 60 denars went to the commission in wine and cash, while 44 florins and 39 denars were paid to skilled workers. Servants received 261 florins and 10 denars in money and wine, 11 florins and 90 denars were spent on tallow, and 6 florins and 34 denars on wax.

These expenses included costs for household needs, wages paid in beverages, religious contributions, and goods purchased for the demesnes, highlighting that estate officials routinely required tavern-keepers to fund various estate expenditures. Accounts were subject to strict audits, especially concerning residual wine and empty barrels, which often could not be properly accounted for.

János Sramkó, the customs officer at Podmuráň, submitted his accounts on October 3, 1663. The majority of goods passing through the customs were salt, planks, shingles, and iron: 29 units of salt, 51 planks, 2,000 shingles, and 10 quintals of iron, bringing in 36 florins. The remaining goods included 2 blocks

---

60 According to the account dated December 1, 1663, the tavern sold wine from Szentpéter, beer from Muráň, and *márc*. The price of an *icce* of wine was 18 denars, while that of *márc* ranged from 4 to 5 denars.

61 In addition to the Szentpéter wine sold at 18 denars per *icce*, another wine appeared priced at 21 denars. The *márc* from Podmuráň cost 3 denars, while those purchased for cash cost between 3 and 4 denars. Beer produced at the brewery in Podmuráň was sold at 3 denars per *icce*.

62 Significant sums were paid to the steward, servants, and craftsmen; for instance, the then steward, Márton Szabó, received 911 florins and 24 denars in cash. Purchases were also made for the needs of the fortress, including hay and paper for 8 florins and 59 denars, and wax for candles at a cost of 4 florins. In addition to the wines from Szentpéter, wines from Gyöngyös also appear, priced at 21 and 24 denars per *icce*. According to the accounts, the wines were in most cases likely transported in, or at least tapped from, *gönci* barrels.

of salt, 37 planks, 1,000 shingles, and 1 quintal of iron, though auditors noted the customs officer was “*still responsible for at least 14,000 shingles.*”<sup>63</sup>

The Podmuráň brewmaster, between October 28, 1662, and October 11, 1663, received 1,495 *szapu* of barley from Štítník, Muráň, Rátka, and other holdings, as well as from grazing payments related to Upper Hungarian horse pastures. He brewed 550 Hungarian eimer of márc (using 40 *szapu* per brew = 440 *szapu*) and 850 Hungarian eimer of beer (30 *szapu* per brew = 510 *szapu*). The remaining 557.5 *szapu* of barley was used to supply taverns in Muráň Castle, Podmuráň, Lubeník, Polomka, Revúcka Lehota, Šumiac, Chyžné, Muránska Dlhá Lúka, Revúčka, and Mokrú Lúka. Only 7.5 *szapu* remained at the year’s end, which was considered fully accounted for, since 2¾ Hungarian eimer of márc had been delivered to the castle captain under formal receipt.

Limited data is available on demesne revenues. In 1663, the steward of the Lubeník allodium, Miklós Csigás, reported harvesting 1,047 sheaves and 1 bundle of wheat. The 1662 yields included: 180 sheaves from the demesne, 447 sheaves and 1 bundle in tithe, and 56 sheaves and 14 bundles in ninths. In 1663, yields were: 90 sheaves (demesne), 237 sheaves and 1 bundle (tithe), and 36 sheaves and 5 bundles (ninths). Barley yielded 110 *szapu* in 1662; 1663 values were not yet threshed. Tithes included 75 sheaves and 8 bundles, and 1 sheaf and 14 bundles from the ninth. Oats yielded 745 *szapu*, with 283 sheaves and 12 bundles still unthreshed in 1663. Additionally, 11 *szapu* of millet, 51 bundles of hemp, and 13 *szapu* of hempseed were reported.<sup>64</sup>

Notable disbursements included 56 and 25 *szapu* of wheat to Lubeník and Podmuráň, 4 *szapu* for hay transporters, and 75 *szapu* to András Kulcsár. Oat expenditures included 190 *szapu* for field use, 20 for pigs, and 18.5 for the Lady’s horses.

In Polomka, livestock listed in 1663 included 66 adult cattle, 78 young heifers and steers, 49 yearling calves, 41 dairy cows, 3 bulls, 13 donkeys, 193 pigs, 103 geese, 48 ducks, and 111 hens, along with 6,000 shingles. The most important part of the account, however, was its convention, in which the steward’s obligations were also defined. For each milking cow, he was required to produce 1,010 *icce* of clarified butter, an additional amount of buttermilk butter worth one florin per cow, four large cottage cheese, and eighty “vesling” curds. Officials emphasized

---

63 Twelve units of salt were allocated for commissions, six for the lady of the estate, and nine were issued for the manorial livestock. As for the iron, two quintals were used for shoeing “winch horses,” and seven quintals (*mázsa*) were used in the manorial farms and for construction purposes.

64 After expenses, the wheat arrears amounted to 2.5 sheaves. Based on threshing records, from the tithe of 33 sheaves and 16 sheaves of barley, and the ninth-share of 2 sheaves and 16 sheaves, a total of 110 *szapu* was obtained. According to Bogdán’s data, the standard unit in the estate was the *Jelšava szapu*, of which two equaled one *Košice bushell* of grain.

accurate record-keeping, especially for animal use and grain allocations. Flour production was to include bran, which had to be retained for local use.<sup>65</sup>

Chrutak Hanczel, the estate's shepherd, submitted his report on December 20, 1663, overseeing 995 sheep and 410 goats, of which 295 were written off –55 consumed in the kitchen, and 240 died, although their skins were accounted for.

In 1663, 160 sheaves and 20 bundles of wheat were harvested in Murán demesne, alongside 140 sheaves of barley and 177 sheaves and 20 bundles of oats. 8 *szapu* of peas yielded 26 *szapu*, and 4 *szapu* of lentils were sown, but final yields were unknown. 7 *szapu* of hempseed produced 11 *szapu*, and 12 *szapu* of buckwheat returned 26 *szapu*, 14 of which were processed into grits, yielding 6.5 *szapu*. Livestock included 75 head of cattle, 34 calves, 162 pigs (down from 228), 84 geese, 54 ducks, and 137 hens (from 203).

The dairy herd produced 504 *icce* of clarified butter and 117.5 *icce* of buttermilk, made available to estate officials. Expected yields per 36 dairy cows were 14 *icce* per cow, with one *icce* of butter from 4 *icce* of sour cream or 8 *icce* of milk.

An additional 1663 report listed: 42 cows with calves, 34 calves, 13 dry cows, 18 heifers, 16 steers, 5 yearling oxen, 11 yearling heifers, and 4 bulls. Poultry included 145 hens, 55 geese, 50 ducks, 80 adult pigs, 3 boars, and 72 piglets. The wildlife park contained 11 deer, and 5 horses were stabled at the manor.

In Lubeník (June 14, 1663): 30 dairy cows, 13 dry cows, 2 bulls, 16 heifers, 14 steers, 5 yearling heifers, 9 yearling steers, 72 pigs, 60 piglets, 90 geese, and 200 chickens were listed. On Hólya (on the hill), 65 calves grazed, assisted by 10 donkeys.

In Polomka (June 25, 1663): 21 cows, 18 dry cows, 8 three-year-old heifers, 6 yearling heifers, 5 yearling steers, 3 three-year-old steers, 6 bulls, and 13 calves were recorded, along with 100 geese and 100 hens.

In 1678, estate fields received 135 Košice bushell of wheat, 31¼ of barley, and 211 of oats. Harvests produced 1,452 sheaves of wheat, 770 of barley, and 310 of oats. Tithes brought in 124 bushell of wheat, 160 of barley, and 27 of oats.<sup>66</sup>

Four demesnes kept 90 dairy cows, 6 bulls, 87 calves, heifers, and steers, and 204 pigs. The Šumiac demesne recorded 310 sheep, 53 lambs, and 344 fowl.<sup>67</sup> Compared to 1663, the key difference was the emergence of sheep farming at the demesne level, reflecting broader changes in peasant livestock practices.<sup>68</sup>

---

65 After expenses, the livestock in his possession included: 41 old milking cows, 42 calves born that year, 89 mature pigs, 3 old bulls, 49 yearling calves, 50 piglets, 10 donkeys, 60 geese, 130 hens, 25 ducks, and 6 *köpü*.

66 MNL OL. E.156.b. U et C Fasc. 8. No. 17. 1678.

67 MNL OL. E.156.a. U et C Fasc. 25. No. 35. Dated to the 1670s.

68 In terms of sheep breeding, the most significant flocks in 1664 were found in Šumiac (2,408),

## Conclusion

The system of serf taxation and services within the Muráň estate developed in accordance with the geographic and environmental characteristics of the region. From the mid-17th century onward, a marked tendency toward allodialization can be observed. The estate's economy was characterized by its structural complexity and diversity of revenue sources, including industrial operations and specialized trades.

In terms of animal husbandry, cattle farming remained fundamentally important, but sheep breeding played a significant role in the region's livestock management. While horse breeding was of lesser volume, the customary grazing of Spiš horses on Muráň territory formed an important aspect of seasonal land use. In several settlements, carting and transportation appear to have served as supplementary sources of livelihood, as suggested by relatively high numbers of horses.<sup>69</sup>

Despite the ongoing fragmentation of peasant holdings, the number of serfs remained stable up to 1685. Likewise, the estate's operational framework exhibited long-term continuity. However, this stability also underscores the structural limitations of feudal economic performance: over the course of three decades, no significant increase in profitability was achieved. This highlights the inherent constraints of the manorial system in late feudal Hungary.

Nevertheless, the Muráň estate emerged as one of the most significant economic units in Upper Hungary. Its detailed internal social composition will be examined in a forthcoming study.

## Toponyms in historical urbarium records and their contemporary Slovak names

Chyžné – Kisnyó (Hizsnyó)

Gemerské Teplice – Jolsvatapolva

Gemerský Milhost' – Miglész

Hel'pa – Helpa

Jelšava – Jolsva

Korpáš (now a part of the village of Magnezitovce) – Koprás

Lubeník – Lubonik

Magnezitovce – Mujsány

Mokrá Lúka – Vizesrét

Muráň – Murány

Muránska Dlhá Lúka – Hosszúrét

Muránska Lehota – Muránylehota

---

Telgárt (1,730), and Polomka (2,714).

69 According to the data from 1664, higher numbers of horses were observed in the settlements of Muránska Dlhá Lúka (24), Šumiac (47), and Polomka (131).

Muránska Zdychava – Zdicšava  
Podmuráň – Murányalja  
Pohorelá – Pohorela  
Polomka – Polonka  
Prihradžany – Perláz  
Revúca – Nagyrőce  
Revúčka – Kistrőce  
Revúcka Lehota – Umrlehota  
Šivetice – Süvete  
Šumiac – Sümőce  
Telgárt – Telgárt  
Vernár – Vernárt  
Zavadka nad Hronom – Zavadka

### **About the author**

Attila Ulrich, associate professor  
University of Nyíregyháza, Institute of History and Philosophy  
4400 Nyíregyháza, Sóstói út 31/B  
Hungary  
e-mail: [ulrich.attila@nye.hu](mailto:ulrich.attila@nye.hu)  
<https://orcid.org/0009-0008-4989-1867>

## **List of references and Literature**

### **Primary sources**

#### **Archives and Archives sources**

MNL OL E. 156.a. U et C = National Archives of Hungary – National Archives, Archives of the Hungarian Chamber, E.156.a. Urbaria et Conscriptioes, Fasciculus and Numerus  
Fasc. 24. No. 80/a 1652.  
Fasc. 25. No. 1. 1652.  
FAsc. 25. No. 2. 1657.  
Fasc. 25. No. 5. 1663.  
Fasc 25. No. 6. 1664.  
Fasc. 25. No. 7. 1672.  
Fasc. 25. No. 8/b. 1678.  
Fasc. 25. No. 12. 1686.  
Fasc. 25. No. 17. 1685.  
Fasc. 25.No. 35. year 1670's.  
Fasc. 25. No. 36. copy from 1697.  
Fasc. 57. No. 4. 1670.  
Fasc. 88. No. 52. 1678.

Fasc. 90. No. 88. without year.

Fasc. 95. No. 17. 1685.

Fasc. 142. No. 43. 1673.

Fasc. 142. No. 44. 1686.

MNL OL E. 156.a. U et C = National Archives of Hungary – National Archives, Archives of the Hungarian Chamber, E.156.b. Urbaria et Conscriptioes, Fasciculus and Numerus

Fasc. 8. No. 2. 1677.

Fasc. 8. No. 9. 1682.

Fasc. 8. No. 17. 1678.

## Secondary sources

### Monographs

BOGDÁN, István. *Magyarországi úr-, térfogat-, súly- és darabmértékek 1874-ig*. A Magyar Országos Levéltár Kiadványai IV., Levéltári és történeti forrástudományok 7. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1991.

HECKENAST, Gusztáv. *A magyarországi vaskohászat története a feudalizmus korában. A XIII: század közepétől a XVIII. század végéig*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1991.

HLODÁK, Pavol and ŽILÁK, Ján. *Panstvo Muráň: hospodárske dejiny*. Kalinovo: Kermat, 2006.

ORTUTAY, Gyula ed. *Magyar Néprajzi Lexikon*. II. kötet. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1979, pp. 727-730.

PONGRÁCZ, Pál. *Régi malomépítészet*. Budapest: Műszaki Könyvkiadó, 1967.

SARUSI KISS, Béla. *A természet által megerősített vár. Murány végvár és uradalma a 16. század második felében*. Disszertációk. Budapest Főváros Levéltárából, Budapest: 2008.

### Articles in Journals, Chapters in Monographs

HORVÁTH, Tibor Antal. A tallér... In *Numizmatikai Közlöny, LXII–LXIII évfolyam*, 1963–1964, pp. 25-50.

ILA, Bálint. A dézsma... In *Levéltári Közlemények*, 1940-41, 18-19. évfolyam, p. 228, 231.

ILA, Bálint. Az írásbeliség szerepe... In *Levéltári Közlemények*, 1946, 24. évfolyam, pp. 27-46.

SARUSI KISS, Béla. Vasgyártás és vasgazdálkodás... In *FONS*, 1997, IV. évfolyam, 1. szám, pp. 79-98.

VÁRKONYI, Gábor. Wesselényi Ferenc Murányi uradalmának... In *Dimenziók 2*. Szerkesztette LENDVAI TÍMÁR, Edit; BERTA, Erika; LEHOCZKI, Zsuzsanna and PRAVETZ, Beáta. Budapest: Martin Opitz Kiadó 2019, pp. 188-198.