

Reconstruction of the settlement system in medieval Turopolje

Antonić, Nikolina

Doctoral thesis / Disertacija

2019

Degree Grantor / Ustanova koja je dodijelila akademski / stručni stupanj: **University of Zagreb, University of Zagreb, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences / Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Filozofski fakultet**

<https://doi.org/10.17234/diss.2019.7666>

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://um.nsk.hr/um:nbn:hr:131:591966>

Rights / Prava: [In copyright](#) / [Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-04-16**



Repository / Repozitorij:

[ODRAZ - open repository of the University of Zagreb
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences](#)





Sveučilište u Zagrebu

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

Nikolina Antić

**RECONSTRUCTION OF THE SETTLEMENT
SYSTEM IN MEDIEVAL TUROPOLJE –
EXAMPLES OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES
OF ŠEPKOVČICA AND OKUJE (13th-16th
CENTURIES)**

DOCTORAL THESIS

Zagreb, 2019



Sveučilište u Zagrebu

FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET

Nikolina Antić

**REKONSTRUKCIJA NASEOBINSKOG
SUSTAVA U SREDNJOVJEKOVNOM
TUROPOLJU – PRIMJERI ARHEOLOŠKIH
LOKALITETA ŠEPKOVČICA AND OKUJE
(13.-16. st.)**

DOKTORSKI RAD

Zagreb, 2019.



Sveučilište u Zagrebu

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

Nikolina Antić

**RECONSTRUCTION OF THE SETTLEMENT
SYSTEM IN MEDIEVAL TUROPOLJE –
EXAMPLES OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES
OF ŠEPKOVČICA AND OKUJE (13th-16th
CENTURIES)**

DOCTORAL THESIS

Supervisors:
József Laszlovszky, PhD
Borislav Grgin, PhD

Zagreb, 2019



University of Zagreb

FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET

Nikolina Antić

**REKONSTRUKCIJA NASEOBINSKOG
SUSTAVA U SREDNJOVJEKOVNOM
TUROPOLJU – PRIMJERI ARHEOLOŠKIH
LOKALITETA ŠEPKOVČICA AND OKUJE
(13.-16. st.)**

DOKTORSKI RAD

Mentori:

Dr. sc. József Laszlovszky

Dr. sc. Borislav Grgin

Zagreb, 2019

INFORMATION ABOUT SUPERVISORS

József Laszlovszky

József Laszlovszky is Professor of Medieval Studies at Central European University, Budapest and director of its Cultural Heritage Studies Program. He is also a regular guest lecturer at Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest. He has studied archaeology and history with a specialization in medieval studies at this university. He did a part of his postgraduate studies at New College, Oxford. He has written his PhD dissertation on the problems of English-Hungarian contacts in the 11-13th centuries. His research interest span the archaeology of the countryside and monastic landscapes through the presentation of cultural heritage to the history of English-Hungarian relations in the Middle Ages. His academic publications include studies on medieval military orders, human-nature interaction in historical perspective, medieval settlement systems and landscape archaeology. He has conducted a number of excavations in medieval sites such as the Cistercian grange at Pomáz-Nagykovács and the deserted medieval village at Nagyrév. He was co-director of archaeological excavations or field survey projects at Mont Beuvray, France (Franciscan friary), Ravenna, Italy (Basilica of St. Severo), Koh Ker, Cambodia (Angkorian royal centre) and Visegrád, Hungary (Franciscan friary). He co-authored and co-edited the two-volume English survey of the history and archaeological heritage of Visegrád (*The Medieval Royal Palace at Visegrád* and *The Medieval Royal Town at Visegrád: Royal Centre, Urban Settlement, Churches*). More recently he has co-authored articles on the archaeology and interdisciplinary studies on the impact of the Mongol invasion of Central-Europe in 1241-42 and he is also a co-editor of the first monographic study on *The Economy of Medieval Hungary* (Brill 2018). He is editor of the *CEU Medievalia* publication series and the *Hungarian Archaeology* on-line periodical.

Borislav Grgin

Borislav Grgin is Professor of Late Medieval history at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb. He has studied history and archaeology at the same institution. He did a part of his postgraduate studies at Department of Medieval Studies, Central European University, Budapest. He has written his doctoral dissertation about King Matthias Corvinus of Hungary and Croatia. He was principal investigator of the project for young scholars about Croatian societies in the second half of the fifteenth century. He also participated in the work of projected managed by Prof. Tomislav Raukar, fellow of the Croatian Academy, and Prof. Neven Budak, about Croatian societies in high and late medieval period and on medieval monuments. He also participated in the work of the project about Slavonia, Syrmium and Baranja from the period of late Antiquity to the Ottoman era, under supervision of Prof. Stanko Andrić. He was awarded by National Award for Science for 2007 for popularization of science for humanities for the book on Romanian lands in medieval and early modern period. He authored three book and more than thirty articles and chapters in Croatian and foreign publications. He was a guest lecturer at summer schools in Priština and Graz, and external professor at departments of hisotry in Pula, Rijeka and Split. In 1992 he was awarded a scholarship of Alpe-Adria to spend six months on Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti in Venice. From 2009 to 2013 he was a member of Senat of humanities of the University in Zagreb, since 2009 chair of Ethical comitee of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb.

SUMMARY

Turopolje lies in Zagreb County. The region is bordered on the north and east by the Sava River and the Vukomeričke Gorice hills to the southwest. The aim of this doctoral thesis is to reconstruct the medieval settlement system of the region using historical, archaeological, onomastic, cartographic and ethnographic sources. The idea of this work came out of the attempt of putting two archaeological sites excavated in the highway rescue excavations on the track of Zagreb-Sisak highway in the period 2006-2009 in their medieval environment. These sites, called Šepkovčica and Okuje, were geographically placed in the middle of Turopolje. Although they were just 6 kilometres distant from each other, the ownership structure of the settlements surrounding the sites was different. This has drawn the attention to the complexity of the settlement system of the region. As the sites have remained the spatial focus over which the research was developing, the text of the thesis is divided in two main parts. The first part concerns settlements surrounding the site of Okuje and the second part deals with settlements that surrounded the site of Šepkovčica.

The site of Okuje was surrounded by the estates of various owners of different social status. At the same time, the owners of most of the estates changed over centuries. As was the case with the settlements around the site of Šepkovčica, some settlements that surrounded the site of Okuje were inhabited by the castle warriors of Turopolje. These smaller conditional nobles formed the noble community of Turopolje, an organization by which the history of the region is most known and studied in the scholarly literature. These people were originally the castle warriors of Zagreb castle that had managed to preserve their status of lesser nobles long after the castle system disappeared in the other areas of the Kingdom of Hungary-Croatia. Along with their estates, in the area around the site of Okuje were also estates of the Hospitallers, bans (that is, kings), as well as mid rank (the Ivanović family, the Farkaš family etc.) and high nobility (the Babonići, the Thots, the Hennings, Baltazar Alapić). In this respect, it is shown in this work that the noble community, which until now was the primary focus of the research of historians, was not the only important factor in forming of social, economic and natural environment of medieval Turopolje. At the same time, it was shown that changes of ownership structure in the area around the site were reflections of some major political changes in Zagreb County and the Kingdom of Hungary-Croatia in general. Thus, political history is also important for understanding the changes of the settlement system of this area.

The site of Šepkovčica, on the other hand, was surrounded exclusively by the villages of the nobles of the noble community of Turopolje. As the thirteenth and fourteenth century sources concerning these villages were scarce and not equally extant for each village the research was expanded on the wider area inhabited by the nobles. Primarily through study of spatial data recorded in charters, processes of a division of land between kindreds, breaking up of lands of kindreds into the smaller estates and the emergence of the villages was shown. At the same time, it was shown that due to the noble community kindreds in Turopolje did not cease to exist in the early modern period. Even more, the renewal of the brotherhood of Turopolje 1560 marked a new stage in this process. I hope the data gained through the analysis done in this chapter will contribute to the research of the earliest history of the noble community.

Finally, it should be emphasized that the goal of this work is to create a general framework for studying the settlement system of Turopolje region in the interdisciplinary manner, by studying all the available sources. It is just the first step that should be complemented and most likely corrected with the new data gained both through the further analysis of historical sources and new archaeological research.

Key words: Turopolje, settlement system, noble community of Turopolje, Želin, Vukovina estate

SAŽETAK

Ovaj rad je pokušaj rekonstrukcije srednjovjekovnog naseobinskog sustava Turopolja, regije u Zagrebačkoj županiji, omeđene tokom Sava na sjeveru i istoku, te Vukomeričkim goricama na jugozapadu. Ideja za rad je proizašla iz pokušaja da se dva arheološka lokaliteta, Šepkovčica i Okuje, istraženi tijekom zaštitnih arheoloških istraživanja na trasi autoceste Zagreb-Sisak u periodu 2006-2009, smjeste u srednjovjekovni okoliš te da se na taj način lakše interpretiraju strukture i nalazi pronađeni tijekom istraživanja. U ovom pokušaj rekonstrukcije naseobinskog sustava su uključeni svi dostupni izvori: arheološki, povijesni, onomastički, kartografski i etnografski. Rad je podijeljen u dvije veće cjeline; u prvoj se analizira naseobinski sustav oko lokaliteta Šepkovčica a u drugoj oko lokaliteta Okuje. Iako su dva nalazišta nađena na udaljenosti od samo 6 kilometara i oba u središnjem dijelu Turopolje, vlasnička struktura oko njih je bila drugačija.

Dosadašnje istraživanje Turopolja bilo je u najvećoj mjeri fokusirano na istraživanje povijesti Plemenite općine turopoljske i institucija vezanih uz ovu organizaciju. Neki od posjeda koji su okruživali lokalitet Okuje su pripadali turopoljskom sitnom plemstvu. No, uz njih, na ovom teritoriju je bilo i posjeda koji su pripadali drugim vlasnicima, s tim da se je to vlasništvo i mijenjalo. Ovim radom pokušalo se skrenuti pažnju na činjenicu da povijest Turopolja nije isključivo povijest Plemenite općine turopoljske, već da su različiti akteri sudjelovali u stvaranju prošlosti turopoljskog kraja. Vlasnici prostranih posjeda na ovom prostoru su bili Ivanovci (do 1328), zatim ban, odnosno kralj. Također su tu bili prisutni i pripadnici srednjeg te visokog plemstva. U prvu skupinu spadaju obitelj Farkaš (porijeklom najvjerojatnije iz gorske županije), obitelj koja potječe od zagrebačkog *comesa* Jurka kasnije zvana *de Gepew*, te obitelj Ivanović koja potječe od Jaroslava i Ivana (poznatiji u historiografiji kao knez Okički) sa sjedištem u Brezovici. U drugu skupinu spadaju Babonići, obitelj Széchy, obitelj Toth-Susedgradskih (kasnije Henning), te Baltazar Alapić koji krajem 15. stoljeća formira svoje imanje sa središtem u Vukovini. Promjene vlasništva na ovom dijelu Turopolja reflektiraju neke značajne političke promjene koje su se događale na razini kako zagrebačke županije tako i cijelog Hrvatsko-ugarskog kraljevstva. Tome je također posvećena pozornost; u ovom slučaju promjene u prostoru su promatrane kao refleksija političkih promjena odnosno kroz prizmu političke povijesti. Na kraju ovog poglavlja prezentirani su i podaci dobiveni istraživanjem arheološkog nalazišta Okuje, u prvom redu prostorne promjene koje su se mogle iščitati datiranjem arheoloških struktura i podjelom na horizonte 13., 14. i 16./17. stoljeća.

Zaključno se razmotrilo u kojoj mjeri se povijesni i arheološki izvori nadopunjuju te su se definirala pitanja za buduća istraživanja.

Lokalitet Šepkovčica je bio okružen isključivo posjedima turopoljskog sitnog plemstva. U ranoj fazi istraživanja je shvaćeno da isprave 13. i 14. stoljeća koje se odnose na prostor naselja koja direktno okružuju lokalitet (Donja Lomnica, Kurilovec, Velika i Mala Gorica, Pleso, Velika Mlaka i Hrašće) nisu ravnomjerno sačuvana za sva naselja te da će se potpuniji rezultati dobiti ako se istraživanje proširi na veće područje na kojem su živjeli turopoljski plemići. Tako je i ovo poglavlje podijeljeno na dvije veće cjeline: naselja na sjeverozapadnom i na naselja na jugozapadnom dijelu Turopolje. Analizom ranih izvora, sa naglaskom na reambulacije granica posjeda zapisanih u izvorima koji su iscrtani na kartama, dobiveni su novi podaci o najranijoj povijesti ovog prostora tj. o razdoblju 13. i 14. stoljeća kada se javljaju prvi pisani izvori. Te spoznaje su donekle dopunjene i rezultatima arheoloških istraživanja (koliko je bilo moguće s obzirom na limitiranost i povijesnih i arheoloških izvora). Nove spoznaje odnose se prvenstveno na rasprostiranje teritorija pojedinih rodova, borbe među rodovima koje se reflektiraju u promjenama granica tih teritorija, raspadanje rodovske zemlje na manje cjeline koje teče paralelno sa raspadanjem većih rodovskih zajednica u manje itd. No, uz to, uočeno je da je ovaj proces tekao u smjeru raspadanja do jedne točke, no da istovremeno neka vrsta rodovske organizacije u Turopolju nije prestala postojati praktički do nestanka Plemenite općine, odnosno do 20. stoljeća. Njezin razvoj u novom vijeku zahtijevao bi posebnu studiju, no budući da je srednjovjekovna povijest osnova za to daljnje istraživanje, nadam se da je ovaj rad još jedan prilog povijest Plemenite turopoljske općine.

Na kraju bih željela naglasiti da je cilj ovog rada proučavanje srednjovjekovne povijesti Turopolja na osnovi svih dostupnih izvora. No, iako mislim da su kroz različite vrste izvora dobiveni brojni novi podaci o prošlosti Turopolja, ostavljena su i brojna otvorena pitanja koja upućuju na daljnje istraživanje. Isto tako, koliko god je broj povijesnih izvora korištenih u radu velik sigurna sam da će se s vremenom pojaviti sve više novih izvora; u dokumentima 16. stoljeća koji su generalno slabo obrađeni u arhivima se često nalaze prijepisi dokumenta ranijih stoljeća. Također, određeni broj dokumenata je sačuvan i u vlasništvu obitelji koji su potomci turopoljskih plemića. Uz to, novi podaci će se dobiti i arheološkim istraživanjima. Nadam se da će se time i ovaj rad nadopunjavati i gdje je potrebno, ispravljati.

Ključne riječi: Turopolje, naseobinski sustav, plemenita općina turopoljska, Želin, Vukovinsko imanje

Table of contents

1. Introduction.....	1
2. Sources and Methodology	6
2.1. Archaeological sources and methodology	7
2.2. Historical sources	13
2.3. Cartographic sources, onomastic sources and perambulations	16
3. Historiography	22
3.1. Emilij Laszowski and Juraj Čuk	22
3.2. Historical scholarship	25
3.3. Archaeological scholarship.....	28
3.4. Other fields of study	31
4. The medieval settlement system around Okuje	33
4.1. Introduction.....	33
4.2. Settlement history-written sources, toponyms and maps	35
4.2.1. The thirteenth century.....	35
4.2.1.1. Staro Čiče – Chichan preceptory and <i>libera villa</i>	35
4.2.1.1.1. The estates of the preceptory – the borders and the historical data.....	37
4.2.1.1.1.1. Čičan.....	38
4.2.1.1.1.2. Kravarsko and Peščenica	43
4.2.1.1.1.3. Borders of Jamnica and Kupčina	47
4.2.1.2. Novo Čiče – Želin	51
4.2.1.2.1. Some remarks about the name Čiče-Želin.....	52
4.2.1.2.2. Praedium Selin	54
4.2.1.2.2.1. Consideration of Juraj Čuk on the church of St. John the Baptist and its origin 60	
4.2.1.2.3. Selyn – terra domini bani.....	63
4.2.1.2.4. Comes Ivan of Okić in Želin.....	66
4.2.1.2.5. Želin and the Babonić family.....	74
4.2.1.2.5.1. Building of the castle.....	75
4.2.1.2.5.2. The location of Želin castle	76
4.2.1.3. Mraclin	77
4.2.1.3.1. Terra Mraschyn and Boblach/Doblachmezew	77
4.2.1.3.2. Meaning of toponyms and their correlation.....	81
4.2.1.4. Petrovina.....	83
4.2.1.5. Closing remarks – Functioning of the area in the thirteenth century	84

4.2.1.5.1. Castle-folk: an example from Turopolje.....	86
4.2.2. The fourteenth century	90
4.2.2.1. Želin	90
4.2.2.1.1. Želin and the Babonići until 1327	90
4.2.2.1.2. Staro Čiče - Chichan preceptory until 1328.....	92
4.2.2.1.3. Želin and Čičan - a property of a king	94
4.2.2.1.4. Želin during the time of King Sigismund	96
4.2.2.1.4.1. Fragmentation of the estate.....	96
4.2.2.1.4.2. John Széchy – owner of Želin.....	96
4.2.2.1.4.3. The Toths	97
4.2.2.1.4.4. Spatial data.....	97
4.2.2.1.4.4.1. Novo Čiče	98
4.2.2.1.4.4.2. Staro Čiče	98
4.2.2.1.4.4.3. Lazina Čička	99
4.2.2.1.4.4.4. Hrašće.....	101
4.2.2.1.4.4.5. Kravarsko, Peščenica, Lekenik and Petrovina.....	102
4.2.2.2. Petrovina.....	104
4.2.2.2.1. An estate of the Babonić family	104
4.2.2.2.2. An estate of burgers of Gradec or owners of Želin?	105
4.2.2.2.3. Šiljakovina	109
4.2.2.3. Mraclin	110
4.2.2.4. Trnovec.....	112
4.2.2.4.1. Location	112
4.2.2.4.2. Owners	115
4.2.2.5. Closing remarks – Functioning of the area in the fourteenth century	117
4.2.2.5.1. Želin – the centre of Turopolje?.....	121
4.2.3. The fifteenth century	125
4.2.3.1. Želin	125
4.2.3.1.1. A property of the Toths.....	125
4.2.3.1.2. The Hennings	128
4.2.3.1.3. Spatial data – expansion of the estate.....	129
4.2.3.1.3.1. The northern part.....	129
4.2.3.1.3.2. The southern part	131
4.2.3.1.3.3. The eastern part.....	131
4.2.3.1.4. Names Čičan and Želin in the fifteenth century.....	135
4.2.3.2. Petrovina and Šiljakovina – estates of Gradec or Želin?.....	137

4.2.3.3.	Ternovec	139
4.2.3.4.	Kušanec	141
4.2.3.5.	Mraclin	142
4.2.3.6.	Okuje, Vukovina, Tržec, Obrež, Mišine, Trnovec, Buna, Buševac and Stuchye	144
4.2.3.6.1.	Owners of the estates in the fifteenth century	144
4.2.3.6.1.1.	The Farkaš family	144
4.2.3.6.1.2.	Legal procedure between George Wokomery and Peter and Matthew Varadi	147
4.2.3.6.1.3.	Andrew Both from Bayna.....	149
4.2.3.6.1.4.	Baltazar Alapić buys the estates	149
4.2.3.6.2.	Estates-location and history	157
4.2.3.6.2.1.	Vukovina and Tržec	157
4.2.3.6.2.2.	Okuje	162
4.2.3.6.2.3.	Mišine	163
4.2.3.6.2.4.	Obrež (Ebres)	163
4.2.3.6.2.4.1.	Problems with the location of Obrež.....	163
4.2.3.6.2.4.2.	Obreži of Baltazar Alapić	168
4.2.3.6.2.4.3.	Obrež of the Farkaš family	176
4.2.3.6.2.5.	Ternovec	178
4.2.3.6.2.6.	Brona/Buna	179
4.2.3.6.2.7.	Buševac.....	180
4.2.3.6.2.8.	Stuchye	182
4.2.3.7.	Closing remarks – Functioning of the area in the fifteenth century.....	183
4.3.	The site of Okuje	190
4.3.1.	Results of the archaeological excavations at the site of Okuje	190
4.3.1.1.	Dating and chronology	190
4.3.1.2.	Posthole structures	192
4.3.1.3.	The thirteenth-century features	195
4.3.1.4.	The fourteenth-century features	197
4.3.1.4.1.	Location 1	197
4.3.1.4.2.	Location 2	198
4.3.1.4.3.	Location 3	203
4.3.1.4.4.	Location 4	205
4.3.1.5.	The sixteenth/seventeenth-century features.....	208
4.3.2.	Historical interpretation (charters, toponyms and maps)	210

4.3.2.1.	Okuje or Obrež?	210
4.3.2.2.	Thirteenth- and fourteenth-century charters	211
4.3.2.2.1.	The area of Vukovina	213
4.3.2.2.2.	The area of Okuje	214
4.3.2.2.3.	The area of Mala Buna and Buševac	217
5.	The medieval settlement system around Šepkovčica	224
5.1.	Introduction	224
5.1.1.	Terms	226
5.1.2.	The family of Gurk	229
5.2.	The area of the noble community of Turopolje	233
5.2.1.	Villages of castle warriors in the southwestern part of Turopolje	235
5.2.1.1.	Kindreds	235
5.2.1.1.1.	Terra Mosocha / Borders between the kindred of Vukota and the kindred of Lomnica	235
5.2.1.1.1.1.	Spatial data	236
5.2.1.1.1.2.	Iunosa, Kračun and Andrew	240
5.2.1.1.2.	Borders between Miroslav and the sons of Andrew and Vukota and his kindred	243
5.2.1.1.2.1.	Spatial data	244
5.2.1.1.2.2.	The “graves”	249
5.2.1.1.3.	The borders of Vukota and his kindred from the second half of the thirteenth century	251
5.2.1.2.	Villages	254
5.2.1.2.1.	Hrašće	254
5.2.1.2.2.	Lužje	255
5.2.1.2.3.	Donja and Gornja Lomnica, Mali Obrež and Kostanjevec	257
5.2.1.2.3.1.	Location of Obrež	258
5.2.1.2.3.2.	Location of Topolovec	259
5.2.1.2.3.3.	Location of Kostanjevec	259
5.2.1.2.3.2.	The first owners	263
5.2.1.2.3.3.	Sons of Wlkona	263
5.2.1.2.3.4.	Sons of Vrban	265
5.2.1.2.3.5.	The sons of Opor and their estates	265
5.2.1.2.3.6.	Donja and Gornja Lomnica	268
5.2.1.2.3.7.	Mali Obrež	273
5.2.1.2.3.8.	Kostanjevec – Splitting of the estate	276

5.2.1.2.3.9. Mali Kostanjevec or Novaki	279
5.2.1.2.3.10. Kostanjevec of the noble community	280
5.2.1.2.4. Lukavec and the kindred of Levča	282
5.2.1.2.4.1. The title of new donation	283
5.2.1.2.4.2. Spatial data	286
5.2.1.2.4.3. The kindred of Levča	289
5.2.1.2.5. Vukomeričke gorice	290
5.2.1.2.5.1. Dubranec	295
5.2.1.2.5.2. Vukomerić	295
5.2.1.2.5.3. Rodmanec	296
5.2.1.2.5.4. Gustilnica	296
5.2.1.2.5.5. Jarebić, Cvilkovo, Prvonožec and Ratkov Verh (Petravec)	296
5.2.1.2.5.6. Vojnošec	298
5.2.1.2.5.7. Bukovčak	298
5.2.1.3. Remarks	301
5.2.2. Villages of castle warriors in the northwestern part of Turopolje	311
5.2.2.1. Kindreds	311
5.2.2.1.1. The first charter and the kindred of Budina and Levča	311
5.2.2.1.2. The second generation and the other kindred?	317
5.2.2.2. The villages	321
5.2.2.2.1. Gorica, Rakarje, Pleso, Kobilić and Ilovnjak	321
5.2.2.2.1.1. Rakarje	321
5.2.2.2.1.2. Gorica	325
5.2.2.2.1.3. Kobilić	328
5.2.2.2.1.4. Pleso	330
5.2.2.2.1.5. Ilovnjak	335
5.2.2.2.2. Kurilovec, Trnovec, Kušanec, Zobačlaz, Zamlačje and Vrbanec	337
5.2.2.2.2.1. Kurilovec, Trnovec, Kušanec	338
5.2.2.2.2.2. Vrbanec	342
5.2.2.2.2.3. Zobačlaz and Zamlačje	344
5.2.2.2.3. Velika Mlaka	345
5.2.2.3. Remarks	349
5.3. The site of Šepkovčica	364
5.3.1. Historical interpretation (charters, toponyms and maps)	364
5.3.1.1. Borders of Donja Lomnica and the location of Nowgar	364

5.3.1.2. The area of Šepkovčica	372
5.3.2. Results of the archaeological excavations at the site of Šepkovčica.....	375
6. Conclusion	392
Bibliography.....	397
APPENDIX.....	409
Curriculum vitae.....	416

1. Introduction

Turopolje lies in Zagreb County. The region is bordered on the north and east by the Sava River and the Vukomeričke Gorice hills to the southwest. From the point of view of medieval historians, it is a particularly interesting area to study, primarily because of numerous extant written sources connected with the noble community of Turopolje, an organization of lesser conditional nobility, the descendants of castle warriors (*iobagiones castri*) from the period of the Arpadian Dynasty. The group kept their privileges long after the castle system had fallen apart. In fact, the noble community exists even today, in the form of a cultural organization. In consequence, the area caught the attention of scholars already in the late 19th century. The most famous of them, Emilij Laszowski, gathered and published numerous medieval and modern period written sources in his four-volume publication *Povijesni spomenici plemenite općine Turopolja nekoć "Zagrebačkopolje" zvane. Monumenta historica nobilis communitatis Turopolje olim "Campus Zagradiensis" dictae* (1904-1908).¹ In addition, Laszowski and associates as well as other older and contemporary historians wrote studies on the topic of the noble community.²

The noble community of Turopolje and its institutions certainly deserve this special attention. Taking into consideration that many of all old traditions, particular vernacular architecture as well as toponyms survived in the region up to the present day, the area certainly has much to offer in terms of expanding the scope of research, in the parts of Turopolje that were not inhabited by the members of the noble community as well as providing multidisciplinary data on approaching the history of the noble community and its area. Thus, the considerable number of extant sources, the solid scholarly foundations from the older scholarship, specific land use patterns (many private owners within a relatively small area) offer a good starting point for the continuation of research within the framework of modern scholarly methodology and a holistic approach. Beyond these advantages, the highway rescue excavations conducted over the last twelve years have yielded numerous new data, unavailable to previous scholars. My goal is to use this opportunity and explore the medieval settlement system of the region and changes in it during the period from the thirteenth to the end of the fifteenth century. This reconstruction not only represents an attempt of a new summary of the

¹Emilij Laszowski, *Povijesni spomenici plemenite općine Turopolja nekoć "Zagrebačkopolje" zvane. Monumenta historica nobilis communitatis Turopolje olim 'Campus Zagradiensis' dictae* (henceforth MHNC), 4 vols. (Zagreb: Plemenita općina Turopolje, 1904-1908).

²These studies are listed in the historiography chapter.

medieval settlement history of Turopolje but an attempt to offer a new methodological paradigm for the research on medieval settlement history as a source for understanding social and political changes for any given area. Thus, the aim of this work is to study space, landscape, as well as the environment and its history, combining various and different types of sources.

In brief, this thesis concerns the medieval history of Turopolje, focussing on the areas around two archaeological sites: the site of Šepkovčica, situated between the present-day villages of Donja Lomnica and Gradići and the site of Okuje, situated between the present-day villages Okuje and Mraclin. These sites marked the starting point of my research. Initially, I wanted to learn more about how medieval villages in the Turopolje region operated by studying the material sources. As I had worked with Aleksandra Bugar, an archaeologist from the Zagreb City Museum and my colleagues from the archaeological firm Kaducej d.o.o. on several different sites in Turopolje for four years, this research seemed a logical continuation of this process. My idea was to incorporate the previously mentioned published sources and studies into my thesis in order to develop a general historical framework for these two sites.

However, when I started to work with the written sources, it became clear that not only are there a great number of published charters but also that there is a sizable number of unpublished charters concerning Turopolje. These charters contain many toponyms that can still be found on modern maps or as present-day place-names, thus, offering various possibilities for historical spatial reconstruction. Instead of concentrating on archaeology in the narrow sense, I have focused on the history of the area and on the way the space functioned in general using written sources in the historical context as well as onomastics, old maps, and local ethnographic data. This methodology evolved during my stay at the Central European University and my work with my previous master's thesis and my current doctoral supervisor József Laszlovszky from whom I have learnt a lot on these subjects. This type of interdisciplinary approach has already brought significant new results in settlement studies in Central Europe and is certainly applicable to my research area. My first attempt to use this type of research was in my master's thesis where I concentrated on the research of Turopolje in general and the site of Šepkovčica in particular.³ The research showed that the area is quite suitable for multidisciplinary research. In my PhD dissertation I continued this approach. At the same time, it became clear that, except for the land owned by the nobles of the noble

³Nikolina Antić, *Medieval village in northern Croatia through archaeological and historical sources* (MA thesis, Budapest: Central European University, 2014).

community, property relations in the area of Turopolje in general were very complex and had not been much considered by scholars.

In this respect, the value of perambulations recorded in the charters was particularly intriguing for their power to reconstruct boundaries and past natural environments. In addition, in combination with the genealogical research, perambulations proved to be exceptional sources for detecting the presence of certain noble families (important for Zagreb County in general) in an area that otherwise had not left other traces in the written sources, especially for the period of the thirteenth and fourteenth century when the number of extant sources is limited. This approach deserves to be utilized more in future historical research as it gives new insights into the political history of Zagreb County in this time period. As far as Turopolje is concerned, among other things, mapping of medieval perambulations on present-day maps also provided new insights into the old historiographic debate about the origin of the Turopolje nobility from the time of young King Bela's charter issued in 1225.

The text of this thesis is divided into two main parts: the first part concerns settlements surrounding the site of Okuje and the second part deals with settlements that surround the site of Šepkovčica. These two parts differ structurally because although the two sites were only 6 kilometres distant from each other, the ownership structure of the settlements that surrounded the sites was completely different.

The site of Okuje was surrounded by estates owned by individuals of different social and political ranks and this ownership situation changed over the centuries. Thus, the text is divided chronologically, in the subchapters about the settlements in the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. End of each of those subchapters is dedicated to the functioning of space in general. The goal of this approach was to show the changes in space taking place over the centuries and to write about this area in new ways. Due to the high status of the various changing owners (the Knights Hospitallers, the Babonići, the king, mid-rank and high nobility, etc.), some of these spatial changes reflect the major political changes in the Kingdom of Hungary-Croatia, something also discussed in the text. In the last part of the chapter the archaeological site of Okuje is presented along with a discussion of the way historical and archaeological sources complement each other.

The ownership structure of the settlements around the site of Šepkovčica was stable throughout the whole period (and even later, practically up to the twentieth century). These were all villages owned by the nobles of Turopolje, that is, the noble community. There is no

point of discussing them in the way as the previous case. In addition, in his *History of the Noble Community of Turopolje*, Emilij Laszowski already wrote short monographs about these villages and incorporated the basic historical data known to him.⁴ Of course, this work was written more than hundred years ago and it can be complemented with some additional data, and as will be shown, occasionally corrected. Still, there is no need to repeat in detail the basic historical data about every noble family that lived in each village. It is necessary to approach the development of these noble families from the point of view of modern historiography, but that is a topic for other research.⁵ However, by stating that the ownership situation of the villages surrounding the site of Šepkovčica was stable I do not mean to imply that the inner structure of these villages did not change over the centuries. On the contrary, as will be shown, spatial changes and breaking up of big land portions into smaller units can be detected through careful analysis of the written sources. It was not possible to observe these processes, however, just on the basis of the villages that immediately surround the site of Šepkovčica. There are not enough extant charters from the thirteenth and fourteenth century for each one of these villages to study such processes just on the basis of them. For this reason, I expanded this research to cover the wider area of the Noble community of Turopolje and tried to show the process of breaking up the lands of kindreds into smaller units. I have also established when and how each of those villages developed, up to the point the extant charters allowed. The chapter about the villages that surround the site of Šepkovčica is actually the chapter about the villages in the wider area of the Noble community of Turopolje. It is divided into two bigger subchapters: one about the villages in the northwestern part of Turopolje and one about the villages in southwestern Turopolje. In the last part of the chapter, the archaeological site of Šepkovčica is presented along with a discussion about the way historical and archaeological sources complement each other.

Finally, it should be explained how the time scope of the research was determined. The beginning of the thirteenth century is taken as the starting point because the first extant written sources concerning Turopolje appear in that period. Although some archaeological finds from the two sites discussed in this thesis can be dated to earlier periods, the complex spatial analysis can only be carried out through comparison of written sources and archaeological data. Thus, the chronological starting point of the dissertation is connected to the earliest extant historical

⁴ Emilij Laszowski, "Mjestopisne i povijesne crtice" [Notes on settlements and history], in: E. Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine Turopolja nekoć Zagrebačko polje zvane* [A history of the noble community of Turopolje once called Zagreb Field], vol 1 (Zagreb: Tiskom Antuna Scholza, 1910), pp. 273-407.

⁵ It has been carried out for some of these families, see chapter: Historiography

sources from which charter evidence for settlements can be extracted. Earlier finds will occasionally be mentioned in the analysis, but the settlement system of earlier periods cannot be reconstructed with this methodology for the period prior to the thirteenth century. As far as the endpoint is concerned, the initial idea was to end the analysis with the sixteenth century sources (hence the original title: *Reconstruction of the settlement system in medieval Turopolje, 13th – 16th centuries*). Some features that appeared during excavations at the site of Okuje were dated to the sixteenth/seventeenth century so I decided to complement the analysis of these features with analysis of the sources. However, writing an extensive analysis of the villages that surrounded the site of Okuje in the sixteenth century, as for the previous centuries, proved to be an impossible task at this moment. Namely, I have realized that the number of unpublished extant charters is already considerable for the fifteenth century and even larger for the sixteenth century. To find and analyse all of them would be a separate dissertation topic. Additionally, the social and political changes of the sixteenth century (especially after the incorporation of the Kingdom of Hungary-Croatia into the Habsburg Empire), are too complex to analyse in a single chapter and there seemed little point in writing a partial analysis. The, the analysis ends with 1500. On the other hand, due to the structure of the chapter on the villages of the nobles of Turopolje, it was possible to extend this part of the analysis to the sixteenth century. In this case, 1560 was the end point of the research since that was when the Brotherhood of Turopolje was renewed.

2. Sources and Methodology

The primary sources which I will use in the further text are, by traditional definitions, studied by different scientific disciplines; remains of material culture are studied by archaeologists while written sources are studied by historians. I have divided this chapter into the sub-chapters accordingly, so the text could be more easily followed. Nevertheless, I would like to emphasize that it is not my goal to look at these sources separately, as the sources of different disciplines that give answers to different types of questions. On the contrary, I consider all of them to be historical sources and I will try to integrate them with each other. When I say historical, I do not mean to imply that archaeology is an auxiliary science of history. In this context, a historical source does not mean a source studied by the scholarly discipline of history but a source that testifies about a history of certain space from every possible aspect, being that political history or a way pottery was baked or buildings were built. So, for me, the most important was to use all the sources in a straightforward and practical sense.

Naturally, in most cases, it is more likely that one will find more data about political history in written sources. Likewise, in most cases, it is more likely that one will gain knowledge of a process of pottery production from remains of ovens excavated during archaeological excavations. But, sometimes, a historical source can testify about a production of various objects or about building of features just as an archaeological or an onomastic source can testify about political or social history. For example, a fortification that is not mentioned in written sources but was found during archaeological research testifies about the strength of a local landlord. On the other hand, one charter mentions the part of the estate that certain Paul son of Mavšić from Brokunova Gora (in Zagreb County) gave in pledge to Peter Zrinski and his sons Emerik and Paul in 1492. There was also one building (*aedificium*) on this land. In the case that Paul had not fulfilled his obligations, this building could have been removed (*remouere et asportare*).⁶ This is the clear testimony of “prefabricated building”, which could fall into the category of “archaeological” research topics. But, in most cases, an archaeologist could hardly conclude that one such building stood on a certain area simply from archaeological research. Perhaps one could assume it if one finds irregular postholes. They could point at posts pulled out from the ground but this can be only an assumption. It is not a certain proof of

⁶ Cf. Damir Karbić-Suzana Miljan, *Diplomatarij knezova Zrinskih* [Collection of charters of the counts Zrinski], manuscript.

prefabricated building. A building could have been destroyed and posts pulled out and reused for some other building or fence.

In any case, by using sources from different disciplines the more complete picture can be gained, if one approaches each type of sources with proper questions and methodology. The problems that interdisciplinary research is faced with and how one can overcome them have been extensively analysed by József Laszlovszky in the article “Space and place: Text and object. Human-nature interaction and topographical studies”.⁷ The present dissertation follows this approach in various aspects, particularly in reconstructing the medieval settlement system based on a diverse corpus of data.

Besides all the above written, I have realized that the methodology I will try to apply in the following text it is not easy to classify. The best example for that are maps which I have made in great number on the basis of toponyms recorded in perambulations. Sources that contain toponyms are written sources, charters. The maps provided answers to some “strictly” historical questions. For example, certain changes in ownership of land were a result of “political” situation in Zagreb County or a result of large-scale historical events in Kingdom of Hungary-Croatia. At the same time, mapping of data from perambulations enabled some new insights into natural environment, which is studied by environmental archaeology and even historical geography. Thus, the cartographic sources and the maps created on the basis of other types of source materials (archaeological, historical, ethnographic, etc.) are discussed in the separate part of this methodological overview.

2.1. Archaeological sources and methodology

Archaeological sources that will be used in this thesis are data from the archaeological sites Šepkovčica and Okuje. Both of these sites were excavated during the rescue excavations on the track of Zagreb-Sisak highway. On both of them, remains of medieval settlement features have been uncovered.

The site of Šepkovčica was situated on the northern side of the present day villages Gradići and Donja Lomnica. The excavation started at the end of 2006 and finished in April

⁷ József Laszlovszky, “Space and place: Text and object. Human-nature interaction and topographical studies”, in: *People and Nature in Historical Perspective*, ed. by József Laszlovszky and Peter Szabó (Budapest 2003), pp. 81-101.

2008. The project was coordinated by the Ministry of Culture and directed by Aleksandra Bugar of the Zagreb City Museum. The remains of the medieval horizon of the site spread over an area of 15,000 square meters. They were dated in the period from the 9th to the fifteenth century.⁸

The site of Okuje was situated on the eastern edge of the present-day village Okuje. Most of the area of the site was situated within the cadastre border of Okuje, while the eastern end of the site was situated within the cadastre border of the present day village of Mracilin. The excavation started in June 2008 and finished in March 2009. These excavations were also part of the above-mentioned project coordinated by the Ministry of Culture. Due to technical reasons, a total excavated area of 80.000 m² was divided into eight parts (Okuje 1, Okuje 1a, Okuje 2, Okuje 2a, Okuje 3, Okuje 3a, Okuje 3b, and Okuje 3c). The excavated area followed the track of the highway and of two by-pass roads. The extensive field walk was done in the wider area of the highway. On the basis it, the total area of the site was estimated to be 150-200 000 m².

The excavations in Okuje 1, 1a, 2, and 2a were directed by Aleksandra Bugar of the Zagreb City Museum. The excavations in Okuje 3, 3a, 3b, and 3c were directed by Nikša Vujnović, an archaeologist from the archaeological firm Kaducej d.o.o.⁹ Additional 2040 m², placed on the southern border of the site Okuje, was researched by the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences of the University of Zagreb.¹⁰ This part of the site was named Mrkopolje. The site of Okuje was dated in the period from the eleventh to the sixteenth/seventeenth century.

All the collected data from both Šepkovčica and Okuje are stored in the Zagreb city museum (artefacts gathered during the excavations, documentation from the excavations, plans of the discovered features, drawings of the material, preliminary reports of the excavations,

⁸ Aleksandra Bugar, "Naselje ranog srednjeg vijeka Velika Gorica-Šepkovčica" [Early medieval settlement Velika Gorica – Šepkovčica], in *Zbornik Srednji vek/Arheološke raziskave med Jadranskim morjem in Panonsko nižino*, ed. by Mitija Guštin (Ljubljana: Narodni muzej Slovenije Inštitut za dediščino Sredozemlja Znanstveno-raziskovalnega središča Univerzeta Primorskem, 2008), pp. 179-193.

⁹ Aleksandra Bugar, *Preliminarno izvješće- rezultati arheoloških zaštitnih istraživanja na lokalitetima Okuje (I, Ia, II, IIa, IIb) i Mracinska Dubrava. Muzej grada Zagreba. Autocesta Zagreb-Sisak/koridor A11, dionica Velika Gorica jug-Lekenik* [Preliminary report – results of the archaeological rescue excavations on sites Okuje (I, Ia, II, IIa, IIb) and Mracinska Dubrava, Zagreb City Museum, Highway Zagreb-Sisak, corridor A11, part Velika Gorica jug-Lekenik], Zagreb 2010, unpublished report; Josip Burmaz – Nikša Vujnović, *Zaštitna arheološka istraživanja na lokalitetima Okuje (III, IIIa i IIIc), Preliminarno izvješće. Autocesta Zagreb-Sisak/koridor A11, dionica Velika Gorica (jug)-Lekenik* [Rescue archaeological excavations on sites Okuje (III, IIIa and IIIc), Preliminary report, Highway Zagreb-Sisak/corridor A11, part Velika Gorica (jug) – Lekenik], Zagreb 2010, unpublished report.

¹⁰ Ina Miloglav, *Izvješće sa zaštitnih arheoloških istraživanja na trasi autoceste Zagreb-Sisak, Dionica Velika Gorica (jug) –Lekenik. Lokalitet Mrkopolje* [Report about rescue archaeological excavations at the track of the Zagreb-Sisak highway, Part Velika Gorica (jug) – Lekenik. Site Mrkopolje], Zagreb 2009, unpublished report.

archeozoological analyses, geological analyses, radiocarbon analyses etc.). Results of the excavations at Šepkovčica are partly published. More about that will be said in the chapter about historiography. Results of the excavations at Okuje are unpublished. The unpublished materials were also available and used for the purposes of the research on which the present study is based on.

During the excavations, position of each excavated feature was recorded with a total station and plans of the sites were made in AutoCAD program. Basic processing of the archaeological material was done and features were dated to the prehistoric, Roman and the medieval period. On the basis of this dating, the separate plans of features of each horizon were made.

A complex horizontal stratigraphy of medieval features was present at both Šepkovčica and Okuje. This means that features from different time periods were found in the same geological layer or in two different layers, both of which had been created prior to the medieval period. Pits made in different centuries were often found immediately next to each other. For example, a pit that had been created and used in the eleventh century was discovered next to a pit that had been created and used in the thirteenth century. Obviously, they could have not been used simultaneously but it was not possible to conclude this simply on the basis of their location. In most cases, there was no direct stratigraphic connection between the features (superposition; one feature cutting another feature). Thus, the chronological differentiation of the features could be based primarily on the archaeological material found in their fillings. Processing of particular artefacts uncovered during the excavations is not one of the research questions of my thesis, but, in order to date each particular feature and gain an accurate spatial distribution of features within chronological phases of the settlements, it was necessary to do basic processing of the archaeological material. For the purposes of my master thesis, I have already done this for the site of Šepkovčica.¹¹ Now, I did the basic dating of the material excavated at Okuje.

The dating of the features could have been done primarily based on pottery; altogether approximately two tonnes of pottery material have been gathered. I applied the simplest typochronological method. As the starting point, I have taken finds from the pits dated with the radiocarbon method into the thirteenth, fourteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. There were no coins or some easily datable metal objects that could serve as a base for dating. Most

¹¹ Antić, *Medieval village in Northern Croatia*, pp. 11-16.

of the found metal objects were knives, nails and similar utility objects which are not chronologically sensible. After determining the dating of each particular feature, I have modified the plan of medieval features made during the excavations. On this new plan (see Appendix), the chronological determination of each feature is shown. On the basis of the spatial distribution of the features in each century and the types of the features (for example, ovens, postholes), I have made some general conclusions about each segment of the site up to the point it was possible. In this interpretation, I have also taken into consideration the finds found on each segment of the site (metal objects, slag etc.). This interpretation is general. It would be too extensive text if each feature would be presented and analysed separately, so only some chosen features are presented in a more detailed manner. These are features which contained characteristic materials for a period or features that themselves were important for the analysis of the settlement structure.

The typo-chronology of the pottery material was the basis for chronological determination of each particular feature. Thus, from the methodological point of view, it is important to explain some issues concerning the typo-chronology of pottery in more detail.

Unlike was the case with the pottery from the late medieval horizon of Šepkovčica where there was practically not but the few pieces of fine pottery ware, at Okuje there was a considerable number of these kinds of vessels. In general, fine pottery could be more chronologically sensitive. So, perhaps with more detailed analysis, features in which it was found could be dated more precisely. For example, something which I have dated to the fourteenth century could be dated to the second half of the fourteenth century or the beginning of the fifteenth century. Besides the fact that this is not one of my research questions and the fact that the pottery material from Okuje is so voluminous and various that it would deserve to be a topic of a separate dissertation, I think, that even if one would start to work on this more detailed typo chronology, one could hardly achieve such detailed results at this state of research. This is so for several reasons.

First, there are some general issues concerning the typo-chronological method and its scientific valorisation. In my experience gained through the work with the material from the Turopolje region, broad pottery chronologies are valid. A difference between the 12th-century and the fourteenth-century products is obvious by a plain look at the vessels, even in case of simplest everyday used pots. The difference is noticeable because of the technological

innovation in the production that, depending on the area, started in most cases in the thirteenth century. Both walls and rims of the fourteenth/fifteenth-century vessels are clearly different from walls and rims of earlier vessels. This will become clear by looking at the photos shown in the appendix of the thesis.

The possibility that some “hand-made” pot that looks very similar or even the same as the eleventh- or the 12th-century pot was produced in the fourteenth- or fifteenth-century cannot be completely ruled out. Some uncharacteristic pieces (without decoration, particular fabric or surface treating, no rims) can be found. In most cases, they could be only dated generally as “medieval”.¹² But, from what I have seen so far on the sites in Turopolje, the majority of vessels found in the fourteenth and the fifteenth century features are vessels made on a fast wheel. Still, this is the rule that is worth only for the sites excavated so far. It is possible that in the future one will find a site with pottery that will appear as the 12th/thirteenth-century pottery and results of the radiocarbon analysis will date features in which this pottery will be found in the seventeenth or eighteenth century. In this case, there will be two possible explanations. The first one is that the results of the radiocarbon analysis are false. That can happen, for example, if the sample is damaged. The second one is that pottery indeed looks like the 12th/thirteenth-century pottery (or more precisely, like what we usually consider as the 12th/thirteenth-century pottery) but was indeed produced in the seventeenth/eighteenth century. This kind of “falsely” dating of sites had been happening, for example, in neighbouring Hungary, until it has been realized that the ware in question had been produced in the early modern period. It, however, was not produced or used by local “indigenous” population, but by newcomers, refugees from Bosnia and the rest of the Balkans. Technical skills of production and taste of these people were simply on a different level. Thence, this type of pottery was named “The Bosnian pottery”.¹³ Luckily, this archaic looking “Bosnian” pottery was identified already in the first phase of the pottery research. As soon as more detailed studies were made (with the help of materials with

¹² Clearly, there is a good chance that one can recover potsherds produced in earlier period from pits of the later period (fourteenth-fifteenth century), and that the finding of these earlier potsherds is the result of destruction of earlier features or layers by later features, but that is not what I am talking about here.

¹³ When I was working on the pottery from the Drežnik castle, I have also dated a group of pottery to the thirteenth century on the basis of the parallels from medieval Slavonia. This pottery was found on the layer that was just beneath humus and was above the layers with the fifteenth century pottery. At first I thought that this was simply the layer that was taken from some other place in some later, modern period when the ground had been for some reason levelled. But, using the Hungarian example, I have later realized that this layer stratigraphically could corresponds with the period of the Ottoman occupation of Drežnik and that this was, the most likely, “Bosnian type” pottery. Nikolina Antonić – Dženi Los, *Izveštaj o istraživanju starog grada Drežnika*, 2016. [The report about the investigation of the old town of Drženik, 2016], Zagreb 2017., an unpublished report stored at the Ministry of culture.

clear dating), particular features of this pottery were also defined (fabric, decoration, etc.). So, it became possible to clearly differentiate these sixteenth/seventeenth-century finds from the similar looking 12th- and thirteenth-century potsherds. Thus, in the first phase of typo-chronological studies this material caused problems, but with the systematic survey of such materials, the same type of typo-chronological investigations have produced the dating which was in harmony with the analysis of the pottery materials accompanying the so-called “Bosnian” pottery.¹⁴ As said, the broad typo-chronological method is valid, but it depends on the broader context.

The more precise chronology, on the other hand, is often not easy to make. For example, it is not so easy to specify if something is made in the first or the second half of the fourteenth century because a difference in the technology of production is not obvious or, better to say, usually there is no difference in the technology of production. Still, I am certain that more detailed chronologies can be made on a regional level. As today, the fashion was changing over decades. If it was so with clothes and jewellery, why would it not be so with pottery? Some types of vessels and a way they had been produced and decorated could have stayed the same over centuries (and some really did). In some other cases, both a form and a decoration could have changed. For example, incised wave lines could have been popular from the 1230s to the 1240s while in the 1260s plain straight lines were more interesting. But, we would need a big number of such samples that could be dated within decades, to conclude in which cases this was so. Their dating would need to be supported by very sophisticated radiocarbon analysis, coins or chronologically sensitive metal objects. And along with that, a question of preferences of a local potter should be taken into consideration. Likewise, if we pay attention to a shape of a vessel (for example, if a body of a vessel is round or elongated), there are few factors that should be taken into consideration. It could be that a shape is a matter of taste of either a wider community of consumers or a manufacturer (a potter) or of both. It could also be that a shape is a result of technical skills of a potter. But, it could also be that the shape is conditioned by the function of the vessel. Some vessels were used for serving food, some for cooking and some for storing. Some might have had multiple functions. At the same time, more of these factors could be combined. The technological change of pottery production in the thirteenth/fourteenth

¹⁴ On the so-called “Bosnian” pottery problem see: Tamás Pusztai, “The pottery of the Turkish palisade at Báticasék”, pp. 303-306; Josef Laszlovszky – Judith Rasson, “Post-medieval or historical archaeology: Terminology and Discourses in the Archaeology of the Ottoman Period”, in: *Archaeology of the Ottoman period in Hungary: papers of the conference held at the Hungarian National Museum*, Budapest, 24-26 May 2000., ed. by Ibolya Gereles and Gyöngyi Kovács (Budapest: Hungarian National Museum, 2003), p. 382.

century was not connected only to the change of decoration or rim forms, but also with demands of the emerging clay table-ware culture. As a result of this demand, new types of pottery (jars, jugs, bottles, lids etc.) started to appear in a significant number. In any case, in determining functions of vessels, we can use the ethnographic parallels. Still, I think that the most reliable data could be gained by different sorts of chemical analysis (for example, the lipid analysis). These analyses are nowadays very sophisticated. Unfortunately, they are very expensive and therefore hardly available to archaeologists (especially the ones from our and the surrounding countries).

Finally, as written, a dating of fine pottery is usually considered more precise but even that would not be of much help at this state of research. If the fine ware found at Okuje would have been an import from some other area or some city workshop with well-established chronological phases of production that would facilitate the dating of the features. However, as will be shown, the pottery from Okuje was produced in the local workshop. So, the best way to start with the dating of this pottery is to start from the material found in this workshop. On the basis of the radiocarbon analysis, it can be dated in the fourteenth century or possibly early fifteenth century. This fits with the general picture gained in the previous research. The types of vessels found on the site, both the fine ware and the plain pottery (made on the fast wheel with developed rim forms and without decoration on the walls of the pots) started to be produced in the bigger amount in the fourteenth century both on the territory of medieval Slavonia and the Kingdom of Hungary-Croatia in general.

2.2. Historical sources

As mentioned in the introduction, numerous written sources concerning the Turopolje area, primarily connected with the Noble community of Turopolje, were collected and published by Emilij Laszowski in his seminal work *Monumenta historica nobilis communitatis Turopolje olim "Campus Zagradiensis" dictae* (1904-1908).¹⁵ The edition contains around 1200 diplomatic sources, mainly public and private-legal charters, issued in the period 1225-1895, with greater emphasis on the medieval period.

¹⁵ Emilij Laszowski, *Povijesni spomenici plemenite općine Turopolja nekoć "Zagrebačko polje" zvane. Monumenta historica nobilis communitatis Turopolje olim 'Campus Zagradiensis' dictae* (henceforth MHNC), 4 vols. (Zagreb: Plemenita općina Turopolje, 1904-1908).

Three other important serial editions contain additional charters concerning the area of the Noble community as well as charters that contain information about other landowners in Turopolje (the knights Hospitallers, the Chapter of Zagreb, the burgers of Gradec, mid-rank and high nobles etc.). First is *Diplomatički zbornik kraljevina Hrvatske, Dalmacije i Slavonije. Codex diplomaticus Regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae*.¹⁶ The second is *Povijesni spomenici slobodnog kraljevskog grada Zagreba. Monumenta historica liberae regiae civitatis Zagrabiae*, published by Ivan Krstitelj Tkalčić, and later continued by Laszowski and others.¹⁷ The third is *Povjesni spomenici Zagrebačke biskupije. Monumenta historica episcopatus Zagrabiensis*.¹⁸

Another specific volume for the research of physical environment of Turopolje is *Popisi i obračuni poreza u Hrvatskoj u XV i XVI stoljeću* [Lists and calculations of taxes in Croatia in the fifteenth and sixteenth century]. It is a valuable additional source for economic history and reconstruction of structure of estates at the end of the medieval period. Unfortunately, the lists are not extant evenly, which makes it sometimes difficult to reconstruct changes and continuity in an ownership or a structure of villages or settlements. Therefore, although I have consulted this edition I have not found it as useful for my topic as I have initially expected.

The unpublished sources concerning Turopolje can be found in three main archives in Zagreb: the Croatian State Archive,¹⁹ the Archive of the Archdiocese and the Chapter of Zagreb, and the Archive of Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts. These charters, up to 1526, can also be found on Hungaricana (the website of Hungarian archives, museums and libraries) which I have used extensively.²⁰

The publications of *regestae* (the brief summaries of charters) are the useful tool for the search of the archives. But, the ones published so far are either limited chronologically or

¹⁶ Tadija Smičiklas et al., *Diplomatički zbornik Kraljevine Hrvatske, Dalmacije i Slavonije. Codex diplomaticus Regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae* (henceforth CD), 18 vols. (Zagreb: JAZU/HAZU 1904-1990). Additional charters in the series of general nature can be found too in: Imre Nagy et al., *Hazai Okmánytár. Codex diplomaticus partius*, 8 vols. (Budapest 1865-1891).

¹⁷ Ivan Krstitelj Tkalčić et al., *Povijesni spomenici slobodnog kraljevskog grada Zagreba. Monumenta historica liberae regiae civitatis Zagrabiae* (henceforth MHCZ), vol. 1-19, Zagreb: Slobodni kraljevski grad Zagreb, 1889.-1953.

¹⁸ Ivan Krstitelj Tkalčić et al., *Povjesni spomenici Zagrebačke biskupije. Monumenta historica episcopatus Zagrabiensis* (henceforth MHEZ), vol. 1-7 (Zagreb, 1873-2005).

¹⁹ The archival series titled Plemenita općina Turopolje [The Noble community of Turopolje] is kept in the Croatian State Archive. As far as this fond is concerned, I have not checked it completely in the archive. But, I have read most of the charters from this fond that are available on Hungaricana. On the basis of that, I can conclude that great majority of charters from the period of the thirteenth to the fifteenth century Laszowski published in his *Monummeta*.

²⁰ <https://hungaricana.hu/en/>.

thematically, in the same manner as it was the case with published editions. Hungarian historiography is still in the process of publishing *regestae* for the Angevin period²¹ and that of King and Emperor Sigismund of Luxemburg.²² The main advantage of it is that it contains summaries for the whole archival material of the former medieval realm. Croatian historiography, on the other hand, is still publishing *regestae* of the charters kept in the Archive of Croatian of Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts.²³ I have used these *regestae* in my research. Likewise, I have used the interactive DVD *Collectio diplomatica Hungarica. A középkori Magyarország digitális levéltára. Digital archives of medieval Hungary*, the list of all the charters published on Hungaricana.²⁴ It can be searched through certain keywords. The problem is, however, that keywords can be found only if a *regesta* of a certain charter was written and later digitalized. In the cases of the charters kept in the Croatian State Archive and the Archive of the Archdiocese and the Chapter of Zagreb this was not done. I have “discovered” most of the unpublished charters I used in my research through the targeted but not systematic searches. I am sure that much more could be found if the proper *regestae* would be made. Some of the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century documents kept in the Croatian State Archive contain transcripts of earlier charters. Only when all these documents will be examined and classified, the detailed search can be done. In addition to that, some charters are still in private collections of families that descended from the nobles of Turopolje. So, as much as the number of charters I have used in this research is considerable, I am certain that over time new charters will appear and the data that I have collected will be significantly complemented and corrected.

As far as the methodology by which I have approached the written sources is concerned, I cannot specify it in some particular manner. I have used the general method of critical analysis, evaluating charters in a specific historical context. A fully critical approach, in the context of the authenticity of charters, would require a very high level of knowledge of medieval Latin terminology and language and of the contemporary palaeography. In most cases, it would be a task for a specialist or for a team of experts to decide if something is a forgery or not. Such a critical evaluation should not be made only on the basis of the language. It should also be based

²¹ Gyula Kristó, et al., *Anjou-kori oklevéltár. Documenta res Hungaricas temporer regum Andegavensium illustrantia 1301-1387*, vol. 1- (Budapest – Szeged, 1990-.).

²² Elemér Mályusz et al., *Zsigmondkori oklevéltár*, vol. 1- (Budapest 1951-.).

²³ Miljen Šamsalović – Jakov Stipišić, “Isprave u Arhivu Jugoslavenske akademije,” *Zbornik Historijskog instituta Jugoslavenske akademije* 2 (1959), pp. 289-379; vol. 3 (1960), pp. 563-643; 4 (1961), pp. 465-554; 5 (1963), pp. 533-578. It was later continued for post-Mohács period as well.

²⁴ *Collectio diplomatica Hungarica. A középkori Magyarország digitális levéltára. Digital archives of medieval Hungary* (Budapest 2008).

on a comparative approach based on charters from the other regions of the Kingdom of Hungary-Croatia. With the help of this comparison, one would be able to recognize specific or general patterns in terminology, that is, how common or how unique are certain terms. Actually, with the help of my supervisors and professor Damir Karbić of the Institute of Historical and Social Sciences of the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts, I was able to recognize some particular issues in the terminology of place-names, agricultural terms, landscape features etc. In this context, it is important to mention that in the charters concerning Turopolje, place-names and words for particular features of the landscape are, from the point of view of etymology and languages, mixed. Some of them can be understood with the help of Croatian (and Slavic languages), while some can be detected with the help of Hungarian. Furthermore, special terms (often used in Latin in these charters) can be compared to the particular medieval language usage of Latin in Croatia and in Hungary, respectively. While some of these terms are the same, regional and local patterns also emerged during my research and by using comparative analysis with other areas. In any case, in the work with the written sources, I have mostly concentrated on the spatial data and the perambulations, but sometimes I have also analysed some other terms that were important in the context of social status of a certain person, their family origin etc. In the end, all of these data turned out to be important for the spatial analysis and the broader conclusions that came out of it.

2.3. Cartographic sources, onomastic sources and perambulations

Besides the archaeological and the historical sources presented above, very important parts of this research are cartographic and onomastic sources. They enabled connecting data from the charters with names of land parcels, lakes, and streams that either exist today or no longer exist. Using this method, it is possible to place medieval estates and settlements in the modern environment. Likewise, it is possible to place the excavated archaeological sites in their medieval environment.

The cartographic sources that will be used in the further text are both “old” maps and modern maps that contain toponyms. The modern maps are easily accessible on the Internet, on Geoportal Državne Geodetske uprave [Geoportal of State Geodetic Administration]²⁵ and

²⁵ <http://geoportal.dgu.hr>.

Arkod-.Projekt uspostave sustava identifikacije zemljišnih parcela u RH [Project for establishment of land parcel identification system in the Republic of Croatia].²⁶

The “old” maps are the first precise maps of Turopolje – the Austrian military surveys as well as the first cadastral maps from the 1860s. Military surveys had been made in the second half of the eighteenth and in the nineteenth century. There are three of them: the first (1764-1768), the second (1836-1852) and the third (1868-1880). All these maps and the cadastre are digitalized and easily accessible on an excellent and extremely useful web-page “Historical Maps of the Habsburg Empire”.²⁷ It should be mentioned that, besides helping with placing the sites and estates perambulated in the charters in their medieval and modern environment, these maps are important for one other thing. Although they were made in the modern period, the landscape depicted on them is much closer to the medieval period than to the present day situation. This is the result of the twentieth-century large scale water regulations, transformations of the settlement system and the expansion of urban settlements. Therefore, the Austrian military surveys also help with understanding the medieval natural environment.

The mapping of medieval estates was done on the basis of mapping of toponyms from perambulations recorded in the charters. The perambulations proved to be valuable for the reconstruction of the past natural environment, for understanding the development of the settlement system of the area as well as for gaining new insights into the landowning and political situation in the region. They could have been recorded in different sorts of situations. It could have been done when one bought land or an estate or when neighbours were quarrelling over mutual borders or when one requested confirmation about land or an estate that he already had owned etc.²⁸ These charters could have been issued by different authorities: a king, a ban, a *comes* of Zagreb, a *comes terrestris*, the Chapter of Zagreb etc. In some cases, a perambulation was written immediately after an inspection on a field. This could be a result of attempts of agreement about mutual borders between warring neighbours. Likewise, this could be in cases when one was installed into an estate he had bought or reinstalled into an estate that he already owned for a longer period or as a family legacy. In all those cases, the confirmation was asked from the higher authority, for example, the Chapter of Zagreb as *locus credibilis*, or a king or a

²⁶ <http://preglednik.arkod.hr/ARKOD-Web/>.

²⁷ <http://mapire.eu/en/>.

²⁸ There is an extensive literature about perambulations. One of the most comprehensive work on the topic is certainly: Lajos Takács: *Határjelek, határjárás a feudális kor végén Magyarországon* [Border signs, perambulations at the end of the feudal period in Hungary] (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1987). The problems connected with the issue have also been analysed (in the English) in: Laszlovszky, “Space and Place: Text and Object”, pp. 85-101.

ban. This higher authority would then either send their envoy, *pristaldus*, to supervise a marking of borders or would order some lower level instance to do this, for example, a king would order the Chapter or Zagreb to send their envoys. Some other men of trust as well as neighbours appointed to monitor the process would also be present during the making of the borders. When a purchase of a land was done or confirmed in front of the Chapter or a *comes terrestris* or some other authority, the borders of this land could have also be recorded. In these cases, they were stated by a buyer and a seller, without a direct inspection on the field. Usually, these borders were not recorded in such detail as the ones that had been directly inspected (or in some cases they had not been recorded at all).

Borders recorded in the charters were physical features perceived by people involved as important and permanent features in the environment. These were trees marked with crosses, swamps, streams, rivers, plains, small hills and mountains, roads, other people's lands or estates etc. Sometimes these features had been named by some specific name and sometimes not (it would be simply *aqua*, *riuulus* etc.).

Clearly, reconstruction of all borders is impossible to do absolutely precisely. There are numerous disrupting factors in this process. It is needless to emphasize that in many areas natural environment has changed drastically from both the medieval and the early modern period. This again is the result of the late nineteenth and the twentieth-century industrialization, expansion of urban settlements etc. Turopolje, for example, was the area covered with dense woods and numerous flowing watercourses and standing waters, that is, with lots of swamps and streams which flooded on the regular basis. This is clear both from the perambulations and the archaeological excavations. It is also clearly visible on the military surveys. The flow of two most important rivers of Turopolje, the Sava and the Odra-Lomnica River, has changed drastically. The Sava, the natural northern and eastern border of the area was wild and the unpredictable river that was often changing its course for the few kilometres in the direction of both the north and south (so, in the direction of Turopolje). It was causing large-scale floods and leaving many meanders and bayous. It has been stabilized with the building of the embankments after the big flood in 1964.²⁹ Odra-Lomnica River that flows through the middle of Turopolje, on the other hand, is a calm river of the plain that in the past had many tributaries.

²⁹ About the nature of the Sava, see: Josip Rogalić, *Fizičko geografska obilježja Zagreba i okolice* [Physical geographical features of Zagreb and its surroundings] (Split: Geografsko društvo, 2007), pp. 11-17, 38. About the process of cultivation of the river, see: Branko Vujasinović, "Uloga rijeke Save u povijesnom razvoju grada Zagreba" [The role of the Sava River in the historical development of the city of Zagreb], *Ekonomika I eko historija: časopis za gospodarsku povijest i povijest okoliša* 3 (2007), pp. 142-153.

These smaller streams were pouring into it from Vukomeričke gorice on the south and from the plain on the north. The course of Odra was changed when the Sava-Odra canal was built in 1971. Today most of the tributaries are dried but their flows are still visible both on the military surveys and on modern maps as is the old river bed of Lomnica-Odra.

From both the methodological and the interpretational point of view, it is important to realize that not only these strictly “physical” factors facilitate reconstruction of medieval boundaries. Certainly, if the present-day natural environment would resemble more the medieval natural environment, it would be easier to reconstruct boundaries recorded in perambulations. But, still a modern researcher could do this reconstruction with absolute correctness. A problem also lies in the fact that the perception of space of medieval people was different that is our perception today as was their value system. Their fix points were not simply “spatial” in a way we perceive them today. They also depended on what was perceived important not just by one actor but often by a community in general; personal or communal ownership, positive or negative connotations about a certain place, etc.³⁰

Despite all these problems, I think that in the case of the Turopolje region, possibilities for a historical spatial reconstruction on the basis of perambulations are significant. Contributing factors are the relatively good preservation of toponyms and (even more) the considerable number of extant charters for the relatively small area. Data from different charters could have been connected. Certain toponyms were mentioned in several different charters (sometimes these charters being from different centuries) so by combing these data most of the medieval estates could have been approximately located and their borders could have been approximately shown on a modern map. Furthermore, two different types of areas in the Turopolje region (region of the noble community and the region dominated by other types of landowners) are described in different terms and in different types of documents. This inner division, on the one hand, complicates the analysis. But, on the other hand, it offers an inner comparison, which is particularly useful in the case of similar landscape and environmental features. In such cases, different land ownership patterns can be understood better. This had been demonstrated by Csilla Zatykó. She studied the inner structure of two villages in the Somogy County in western Hungary. These villages were close to each other. The ownership

³⁰ See: Laszlovszky, “Space and place: Text and object.”, pp. 81-101. About this problem in general see also Gyula Kristó, *Tájszemlélet és térszervezés a középkori Magyarországon* [Concept of landscape and spatial organization in medieval Hungary] (Szeged: Szegedi Középkorász Műhely, 2003).

and land-use patterns were, however, completely different as were the types of sources available for the investigation which had an impact on the results achieved by the analysis.³¹

Finally, I am certain that with the further search in the archives and in the private collections of the families in Turopolje, new data will come to light and maps will be complemented and will become more accurate. Along with that, the maps can always be corrected and improved with the field work.

In this work, spatial data derived from the archaeological, historical and cartographic sources were confronted with each other and analysed with the help of a digital platform. This approach has produced significant results as medieval settlement data, landscape features and environmental elements were identified and, with the help of modern digital maps, placed in the context. The most useful program for making maps presented in this thesis proved to be qGIS (I have used version 2.14.2). Some of the features identified in the texts or in the archaeological record are placed as points on these digital maps, while some other features are represented as linear structures (rivers, streams, roads, etc.) or blocks of lands (polygons). First I have made a data basis of vector data; basically, I have drawn all the river and stream flows, roads, boundaries etc. After that, I have combined them as was needed for each map. The AutoCAD data (the plan of the excavated features from Okuje) had been imported in the GIS in the dxf format, which also enabled combining it with the other vector and raster data.

I have mostly used the Croatian topographic map 1: 25000 as the base map because I have found it the most suitable for representation (in the visual sense). But, while I was drawing water flows of streams and rivers, I was combining data from several different maps. Besides the above written, I have used Croatian Basic Map, Croatian Topographic maps 1: 100 000 and 1: 200 000, all accessible on Geoportal³² as well as the Austrian military surveys, because some flows and some toponyms can be found only on some of those maps. I tried to draw the water flows as similar as possible to the ones shown on the Military surveys as the environment depicted on them is more similar to the medieval environment that is the one that surrounds us

³¹ Actually, the situation was very similar as the situation in the area around the sites of Okuje and Šepkovčica. The land in the area of the village Nagycsepely was owned by a number of landlords and ecclesiastical institutions, while the people living in Szakácsi were lesser nobles, probably once royal servitors who later became nobles. But as was the case with castle warriors (*iobagiones castri*), this nobility was conditional, based on the service to a king. In this case, nobles of Szakácsi were royal cooks (szakács means cook in Hungarian). Csilla Zatykó, "Medieval villages and their landscape", in: *People and Nature in Historical Perspective*, pp. 343-375.

³² <https://geoportal.dgu.hr/>.

today and is shown in contemporary maps. Still, more similar does not mean the same and streams and rivers could have changed courses from the medieval period to the period of the second half of the eighteenth and the nineteenth century when the military surveys were made. Besides that, the Military surveys do not use names of water flows consistently; sometimes the same stream is named by one name on the First military survey and by the other name on the Second military survey. Such “problematic” situations will be emphasized in the text.

Another type of data that can be found in perambulations should be mentioned. These are roads. Roads were certainly one of crucial parts of a settlement system of a certain area. The Latin terms that indicate a road are *via* and *strata*. The term *strata* appears only in one charter from Turopolje, the one from 1228.³³ In all others charters, the used term is *via*. It could be either simply *via* or accompanied by some adjective, for example, *via magna*, *via publica* etc. In general, the terminology of roads in the Middle Ages was various, there were different aspects by which the roads could have been classified.³⁴ The network of the medieval roads in Turopolje has never been researched, so data about them recorded in the charters cannot be connected with some exact place on modern maps. In this respect, the roads were not useful in the mapping of perambulations. There is, however, one category of roads that was up to the point useful. These are the Roman roads that had been used in the Middle Ages. The Roman roads have also never been investigated in a detailed way in all parts of Turopolje although there are some works that dealt with the topic and some field investigations have been done (especially in the area around the village Ščitarjevo, under which remains of the Roman *municipium Andautonia* had been found).³⁵ A map of the network of Roman roads in the whole Turopolje area was made by Josip Klemenc, the author of the first archaeological topography of northern Croatia. It was made at the beginning of the twentieth century, but this work is still up-to-date in many aspects.³⁶ Naturally, it can be completely confirmed only by fieldwork. As

³³ MHNC 1, doc. 2, pp. 3-5.

³⁴ For example, in her classification of the medieval roads in the territory of Medieval Transdanubia, Magdolna Szilágyi distinguished eight main categories. These are: length of the road (long-distance, provincial, regional or local roads), legal aspects of the road (public, common or private roads), functional aspects (pilgrims' roads, military roads, trade routes, ecclesiastical roads, agricultural routes, industrial routes), modes of travel and transportation (footpaths, bridle-ways, cart roads, sledge roads), relation to other roads (crossroads, short-cuts, relative position), physical properties (material of which the road was built, morphology), vegetation (plants on or around the road), age of a road (old and new roads). Naturally, these categories overlap. For instance, ecclesiastical roads leading to a certain parish church, were also local roads. Magdolna Szilágyi, *On the road: The history and archaeology of medieval communication networks in east-central Europe*, (Budapest: Archeolingua. Series Minor, 2014.), 86-87.

³⁵ The debates regarding the main tracks of the Roman roads have been summarized in: Burmaz – Vujnović, *Zaštitna arheološka istraživanja*, 39-44. About the Roman roads in the Zagreb area see also: Zoran Gregl, “Pokušaj rekonstrukcije antičke cestovne mreže na području Zagreba”, *Iz starog i novog Zagreba* 6, 7-14.

³⁶ Josip Klemenc, *Archaeologische karte von Jugoslawien. Blatt Zagreb*, (Beograd: F. Pelikan, 1938), 106-117.

will be shown, one route can be slightly modified using the results of the excavations at Okuje. These corrections imply drawing the route of one road some 600 meters to the south from the area where Klemenc had drawn it. A direction of the road, however, still proved to be correct on this segment. So, I have georeferenced the lines of the roads shown on Klemenc's map and I will use these data in the text when roads of the Roman origin will be mentioned in perambulations. Like most of the other data written in the charters these data cannot be shown on the maps with absolute precision but still they give some information about the Roman roads that had been used in the Middle Ages. This could be useful for the further research of both the Roman and the medieval roads.

3. Historiography

In the following lines, publications by different authors, who dealt with political, social, economic and legal history, followed by archaeology, historical geography, onomastics and ethnography of Turopolje will be discussed. The text is organized in subchapters by the fields of research. The goal of this discussion is not to list all relevant studies in chronological order, as a narrative bibliography, but to emphasize the main achievements and works from different fields, which have influenced my work in a particular way. All of these works are helpful for understanding certain aspects of Turopolje in the past and present. But, at the beginning, there are two authors that I must single out for two reasons. First, it is hard to categorize their work as a part of one academic field. Second, I did not use their works just as a theoretical framework or secondary literature for the research. On the contrary, in many cases, data recorded in them proved to be very important primary sources useful for reconstruction of the past environment, the old traditions, toponyms etc. Thus, their scholarly approach, sampling strategy and publication methods are crucial for the source basis of my work.

3.1. Emilij Laszowski and Juraj Ćuk

The unavoidable start of every research of Turopolje is the work of the most known author who dealt with this region – Emilij Laszowski.³⁷ Besides publishing the above

³⁷ Laszowski also dealt with numerous other areas in Croatia. See: Ivan Mirnik, "Emilij pl. Laszowski Szilega. Bibliografija [Bibliography]", source: Adademia.edu; about the life and contributions of Emilij Laszowski to the intellectual and cultural development of Croatia in numerous aspects, see: *Stoljeće nakon Laszowskog, Znanstveno*

mentioned four-volume source collection *Monumenta historica nobilis communitalis Turopolje olim "Campus Zagradiensis" dictae*, Laszowski wrote *Povijest plemenite općine Turopolje nekoć Zagrebačko polje zvane* [A history of the noble community of Turopolje once called the Zagreb Field] in 1910-1911. This edition was written in collaboration with his associates: a church historian Janko Barle, writer and lexicographer Velimir Dežalić, and a geographer Milan Šenoa.³⁸ The work contains various chapters about the medieval, the early modern and modern history of the noble community and its institutions, short historical and ethnographic overviews about certain villages that were inhabited by the nobles of Turopolje, brief geographic remarks about the region and history of church organization. This work was written at the beginning of the twentieth century and some historical interpretations are outdated by now. However, they are still very useful, especially in terms of studying historical geography, onomastics, and ethnography. I will refer to these data extensively in the text. As it is clear from the title of the work, it is focused primarily on the history of the noble community. But, besides that, Laszowski also wrote short articles published in the newspapers about the parts of Turopolje that had not been inhabited by the nobles of Turopolje (Želin-Čiče estate, Čehi, Brezovica etc).³⁹

Unlike the work of Emilij Laszowski, the book written by Juraj Ćuk entitled *Zagrebačka županija oko XIII. stoljeća: na godišnjicu uzpostave Nezavisne Države Hrvatske* [The county of Zagreb around the thirteenth century: on the anniversary of the foundation of the Independent State of Croatia] did not get the attention it deserves.⁴⁰ This book, published in 1942, has been neglected in the historiography. In my opinion, this is unjustified as it is brilliant and innovative work in many aspects. I suppose that the facts that the book was published in 1942 and, even more, that it was dedicated to the foundation of the Independent State of Croatia have contributed to this neglecting. The title is indeed disturbing in this respect but, in the context of studying the thirteenth century history, the content of the book is worth reading. As it is clear from the first part of the title, the topic of the work was the history of Zagreb County in the thirteenth-century. Ćuk was writing about the whole territory of the county (and even wider)

stručni skup i izložba. Knjiga Sažetaka [A century after Laszowski. Scientific expert conference. Book of summaries], ed. by Mario Stipančević and Tajana Pleše (Zagreb 2014).

³⁸ Emilij Laszowski et al., *Povijest plemenite općine Turopolje nekoć Zagrebačko polje zvane* [A history of the noble community of Turopolje once called Zagreb Field.], 2 vols. (Zagreb: Tiskom Antuna Scholza, 1910).

³⁹ Emilij Laszowski, "Brezovica", *Prosvjeta* (Zagreb), 5/1897, 20, 628-631; 21, 660-663.; "Želin-Čiče", *Prosvjeta* (Zagreb), 5/1897, 14, 435-438; 15, 454-456.,

⁴⁰ Juraj Ćuk, *Zagrebačka županija oko XIII. stoljeća: na godišnjicu uzpostave Nezavisne Države Hrvatske* [The county of Zagreb around the thirteenth century: on the anniversary of the foundation of the Independent State of Croatia] (Velika župa Prigorje, 1942).

and about Turopolje, as the part of it. This book is hard to paraphrase in a few lines. According to Ćuk's view, the territory he wrote about was primarily inhabited by kindreds; he classified almost all the people mentioned in the earliest charters as members of certain kindreds. He also defined the territory of each kindred. He did this on the basis of genealogical connections that he had established by analysing the charters as well as on the basis of toponyms, almost all of which he interpreted as derivations of personal names. In this respect, there are lots of problematic interpretations that could not have been confirmed by the critical analysis of both the names from the sources and the toponyms. Still, I must say that I have discovered this book when I have already started to work on the mapping of perambulations. At first, I was very sceptical about most of Ćuk's interpretations. It proved, however, that as much as there are many things in his work that I still consider incorrect, many of the interpretations he offered also proved to be correct. He was indeed familiar with the geography and the onomastics of the whole area of the county. Along with that, he was indeed well acquainted with the content of the charters. His work helped me to place some "problematic" estates in the landscape and to detect the presence of certain families by "decoding" names recorded in perambulations. All of this will be shown in the further text in a detailed way.

Besides that, I have limited my search to the Turopolje region. This region, however, was not isolated from the rest of Zagreb County. Certain noble families had their estates all over the county (and wider). At this point, research of all of these estates would be a too demanding task. Besides that, it would shift attention from the focus of the thesis. Still, it is important to note these facts. Otherwise, one could get an impression that Turopolje was an isolated area in the county and that it functioned separately from the rest of the territory. This was certainly not the case. The complete understanding of the functioning of this space could be achieved only by mapping all estates mentioned in the thirteenth and early fourteenth century sources, for the whole territory of Zagreb County and wider. This interpretation of the history of the county and its wider region should be also based on genealogical and topographic data from the fifteenth- and sixteenth-century sources. As said, at this point, it was not possible to do it but I hope that I will be able to proceed with this research in the future. If so, I will certainly use data written by Juraj Ćuk extensively.

3.2. Historical scholarship

Academic interest in the history of Turopolje started in the eighteenth century, with Adam Baltazar Krčelić. Through the nineteenth century, both Croatian and Hungarian historians were interested in this region in the framework of the research of the county system. In the mid-nineteenth century, under the influence of general political thought of the time, Mihály Horváth and Teodor Botka regarded the inhabitants of Turopolje as descendants of Turkish-Hungarian “tribe” that came in the Carpathian basin together with the rest of Hungarian tribes and settled in Turopolje.⁴¹ This provoked a response of Croatian historians Aleksandar Bresztyenszky and Emilij Laszowski, the first two authors with whom the serious historical research of Turopolje began.

I have already written about the work of Emilij Laszowski. Aleksandar Bresztyenszky was a legal historian who wrote an overview of the legal history of the noble community of Turopolje at the end of the nineteenth century.⁴² It remains the only legal-historical work that focused primarily on the noble community. Later on, various institutions connected with this organization have been researched by legal and social historians alike. Lujo Margetić devoted a chapter in his work to the legal institutions in Turopolje in the section about specific Slavonian law.⁴³ Furthermore, Magdalena Apostolova Maršalevski based her research on an even narrower topic. She tried to answer the debates on the question of filial quarter.⁴⁴ This question was also addressed by Marija Karbić on a more general basis for the whole noble community,⁴⁵ and by Suzana Miljan, who presented one specific case on the example of one noblewoman from Velika Mlaka.⁴⁶

⁴¹ For the overview of the older historiography, cf. Aleksandar Bresztyenszky, *Pravno-povijesni podatci o Turopolju* [Legal-historical data about Turopolje] (Zagreb: Tisak Dioničke tiskare, 1892), footnote 6 on page 5.

⁴² Cf. previous note.

⁴³ Lujo Margetić, *Hrvatsko srednjovjekovno običajno i nasljedno pravo* [Croatian medieval customary and inheritance law] (Zagreb: Narodne novine, 1992).

⁴⁴ Magdalena Apostolova Maršalevski, “*Quarta puellaris* po običajom pravu Turopolja (13.-16. st.)” [*Quarta puellaris* in the customary law of Turopolje, thirteenth to sixteenth century], *Zbornik pravnog fakulteta u Zagrebu* 42/2 (1992), pp. 141-149.

⁴⁵ Marija Karbić, “Property and Family in the *nobilis communitas Campi Zagrabienensis*,” manuscript submitted for the project and edition *Nobility in East and Central Europe* (head researcher Janos M. Bak); “Heiratsstrategien des Kleinadels von Turopolje (Slawonien) im späten Mittelalter,” *East Central Europe. L'Europe du Centre-Est* 29, no. 1-2 (2002), pp. 167-176. She explored kinds of ownership within the noble community as well as marriage strategies of the Turopolje nobility.

⁴⁶ Suzana Miljan, “*Quarta puellaris* prema slučaju Skolastike Jurjeve iz Velike Mlake” [*Quarta puellaris* according to the case of Skolastika Jurjeva from Velika Mlaka], *Lucius. Zbornik radova Društva studenata – povijesti Hrvatskih studija "Ivan Lučić-Lucius"* 5/8-9 (2006), pp. 140-148.

There are several studies on the history of various noble families (again all of them belonging to or connected with the noble community). Ivan Jurković wrote an extensive study about the family of Stephen Berislavić and his son George. Since Stephen was a newcomer in Turopolje, the author used this family as a case-study of migrations of Croatian nobility from the south and of their life in the new areas.⁴⁷ Marija Karbić, on the other hand, wrote a study about the Mikšić family. Unlike the above mentioned Stephan, these people were “natives”. They claimed to be descendants of a man mentioned in the first written evidence on castle warriors of Turopolje, dated in 1225.⁴⁸ Furthermore, Suzana Miljan wrote a study about the family Krupić of Velika Mlaka. She studied a case of integration of noblemen into the noble community of Turopolje in the second generation as well as lives of his descendants.⁴⁹ As my previous research showed, this study proved to be very important for the interpretation of the environment around the site of Šepkovčica as well as the interpretation of the site itself. Suzana Miljan also wrote a study about the officials of German origin who came in Turopolje because of their offices. Some of them integrated into the noble community.⁵⁰

In the last few years, the scope of research has shifted and focused more on the research of lesser conditional nobility from a comparative perspective. As far as the area of the Kingdom of Hungary-Croatia is concerned, the best comparison of the Turopolje region, because of the extant source material and similarities in development, is the area of Spiš in Upper Hungary

⁴⁷ Ivan Jurković, “Raseljena plemićka obitelj za osmanske ugroze: primjer Berislavića de Werhreka de Mala Mlaka (Dio prvi – Stjepan Berislavić Vrhrički i Malomlački)” [A displaced noble family during the Ottoman threat: The example of the Berislavići de Werhreka de Mala Mlaka. First Part – Stephen Berislavić of Vrhrika and Mala Mlaka], *Zbornik Odsjeka za povijesne znanosti Zavoda za povijesne i društvene znanosti Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 20 (2002), pp. 125-164; “Raseljena plemićka obitelj za osmanske ugroze: primjer Berislavića de Werhreka de Mala Mlaka (Dio drugi – Nasljednici Stjepana Berislavića tijekom 16. st.)” [A displaced noble family during the Ottoman threat: The example of the Berislavići de Werhreka de Mala Mlaka, Second part – Stephan Berislavić's heirs during the sixteenth century], *Zbornik Odsjela za povijesne znanosti Zavoda za povijesne i društvene znanosti Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 21 (2003), pp. 119-181.

⁴⁸ Marija Karbić, “Plemićka obitelj Mikšić iz roda Levča do početka 16. stoljeća” [The Noble Mikšić Family of the Levča Kindred to the Beginning of the Sixteenth Century], *Zbornik Odsjela za povijesne znanosti Zavoda za povijesne i društvene znanosti Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 32 (2014), pp. 67-78.

⁴⁹ Suzana Miljan, “Plemićka obitelj Krupić iz Velike Mlake u 15.i 16. stoljeću” [The noble family Krupić from Velika Mlaka in the fifteenth and sixteenth century], *Zbornik Odsjeka za povijesne znanosti Zavoda za povijesne i društvene znanosti Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 29 (2011), pp. 83-125.

⁵⁰ Suzana Miljan, “Nijemci u Turopolju u kasnom srednjem vijeku” [Germans in Turopolje in the late Middle Ages], *DG Jarhbuch* 18 (2011), pp. 29-50.

(present-day Slovakia). Gábor Szeberényi⁵¹ and Tatiana HutYROVÁ with Neven Budak,⁵² wrote the articles on the topic.

Besides these separate studies, the books of Nada Klaić are also very important for the medieval history of the area, specially *Povijest Zagreba* [The history of Zagreb]⁵³ and *Medvedgrad i njegovi gospodari* [Medvedgrad and its Lords].⁵⁴ Along with that, Josip Adamček dealt with the agrarian relations in early modern Croatia in general (mid-fifteenth to the end of the seventeenth century). Thus, he sporadically focused on Turopolje, too.⁵⁵ The economic history of Turopolje is one of the aspects that, unfortunately, did not gain almost any attention in the scholarship. Hopefully, in the future, more attention will be dedicated to this topic. It would be very interesting to find out more about the economic basis as one of the factors that enabled Turopolje nobility to preserve their special status over the centuries.

The research of parts of Turopolje which were not solely connected with the noble community had gained far less attention in the scholarly literature. Still, there are some books that should be mentioned as this area is mentioned sporadically in them, as the part of the wider research topics. Such examples are the above-mentioned books of Nada Klaić and Josip Adamček. Along with that, the estates of Hospitallers' in Turopolje were mentioned in the monographs of Lelja Dobronić on Hospitallers in Croatia and Zsolt Hunyadi on the phenomenon in the Kingdom of Hungary-Croatia.⁵⁶ The estates of the Chapter of Zagreb in Turopolje were the focus of the remarkable work of Radovan Gajer, who researched a location and functioning of these estates in the Zagreb county in the fourteenth century. However, the

⁵¹ Gábor Szeberényi, "Noble Communities in Spiš and Turopolje in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries," in *Slovakia and Croatia, Vol. I – Slovakia and Croatia Historical Parallels and Connections (until 1780)*, ed. by Martin Homza, Ján Lukačka, Neven Budak (Bratislava: Department of Slovak History at the Faculty of Philosophy of Comenius University Bratislava and Post Scriptum, 2013), pp. 222-227.

⁵² Tatiana HutYROVÁ and Neven Budak, "A comparison of the privileged communities Campus Zagrabiensis and Parvus comitatus," in *Slovakia and Croatia Vol. I*, pp. 227-231.

⁵³ Nada Klaić, *Povijest Zagreba* [The history of Zagreb] (Zagreb 1982).

⁵⁴ Nada Klaić, *Medvedgrad i njegovi gospodari* [Medvedgrad and its masters] (Zagreb: Globus, 1987). In her other studies, the same author briefly touched on various issues which will be used here, for instance, the system of disintegration of castle system, status of noblemen of Slavonia, etc. Cf. Nada Klaić, *Povijest Hrvata u razvijenom srednjem vijeku* [History of Croats in the High Middle Ages] (Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 1982).

⁵⁵ Josip Adamček, *Agrarni odnosi u Hrvatskoj od sredine XV do kraja XVII stoljeća* [Agrarian relations in Croatia from the middle of the fifteenth to the end of the seventeenth century] (Zagreb: Sveučilišna naklada Liber, 1980).

⁵⁶ Lelja Dobronić, *Templari i Ivanovci u Hrvatskoj* [Templars and Hospitallers in Croatia] (Zagreb: Dom i svijet, 2002); Zsolt Hunyadi, *The Hospitallers in the Medieval Kingdom of Hungary, c. 1150–1387*, METEM Books, 70; CEU Medievalia, 13 (Budapest: Magyar Egyháztörténeti Enciklopédia Munkaközösség, Department of Medieval Studies, Central European University, 2010).

estates of Chapter south of the Sava River (so, in Turopolje) were the smallest of all in the county, so the author did not put much emphasis on them.⁵⁷

This short overview of the historical historiography is certainly not complete. There are many more studies regarding the area of the Kingdom of Hungary-Croatia that will provide a good comparison when needed, but they will be enlisted at the relevant part of this dissertation. Lately there is the growing number of studies focused on castle warriors and lesser nobility in general. They testify about a solid interest in the topic. I hope this thesis will be a contribution to it as well as that it will show the value of studying such topics in an interdisciplinary manner.

3.3. Archaeological scholarship

On the basis of the above presented historical studies, the discrepancy in historical books and articles dedicated to the history of the noble community and the history of the rest of the Turopolje area can be noticed; the first one being significantly predominant. Similarly, the discrepancy can be noticed in the number of historical and archaeological publications, again the first one being significantly predominant. Contrary to historical studies, archaeological research on Turopolje, in general, is neither abundant nor diverse. Before highway excavations in the mid-2000s, there were no bigger excavations of medieval sites in the region.⁵⁸ Two early medieval graveyards, at Velika Gorica and Staro Čiče, have been partly excavated. The third graveyard, dated to the 12th/thirteenth century has been discovered in the churchyard of St. Martin's Church in Ščitarjevo. It has also been partly excavated but the material is unpublished.⁵⁹ Small-scale excavations were also conducted at the multi-layered site of Čiče and around the castle Lukavec. The results of these excavations are also unpublished.

The excavations conducted on a track of Zagreb-Sisak highway and by-passes brought to light new sites. The site of Šepkovčica has been the topic of several articles. Preliminary results of the excavation of the medieval settlement, with the main focus on the early medieval

⁵⁷ Radovan Gajer, "Posjedi zagrebačkog kaptola oko Zagreba u prvoj polovici 14. st." [The estates of the Chapter of Zagreb in the first half of the fourteenth century], *Radovi* 11, pp. 5-102.

⁵⁸ For an overview of the archaeology of Turopolje, from the prehistoric to the medieval period, see *Zagreb prije Zagreba: arheološka baština Zagreba od pretpovijesti do osnutka biskupije 1094. godine* [Zagreb before Zagreb: The archaeological heritage of Zagreb from prehistory to the foundation of the bishopric in 1094], exhibition catalogue, ed. by Ante Rendić-Miočević (Zagreb: Puljko 1995); Ivan Knezović, *Arheologija* [Archaeology], (Velika Gorica: Muzej Turopolja, 2007); Dorica Nemeth-Ehrlich and Dora Kušan Špalj, *2000 godina Andautonije – Od rimskog grada do arheološkog parka* [2000 years of Andautonia – from the Roman town to the archaeological park] (Zagreb: Arheološki muzej u Zagrebu, 2007).

⁵⁹ The village of Ščitarjevo is the most important archaeological site of Turopolje. The village is covering remains of the Roman *municipium* Andautonia.

part of the site, have been published in an article written by Aleksandra Bugar.⁶⁰ In the other article, she also presented the finds from two medieval wells (dated thirteenth-fourteenth and the fourteenth-fifteenth century) discovered in Šepkovčica and analysed the construction of the wells.⁶¹ I have analysed some selected finds and features of the late medieval horizon from Šepkovčica site in my master thesis and in two articles.⁶²

The site of Okuje has not yet been a topic of scientific articles and for now there are only preliminary reports.⁶³

At the end, other sites discovered during the highway excavations have to be mentioned. Except Šepkovčica and Okuje as the biggest portions of medieval settlements that were excavated, there were also several smaller sites: Kobilić 1,⁶⁴ Kobilić 2, Kosnica⁶⁵, Buzin,⁶⁶ Pleso.⁶⁷ Some of them were published in the articles, while others are still in the form of preliminary reports.

In terms of the significance of high-way excavations for the future research of the history of Turopolje (and the other areas), few things should be noted. In general, highway rescue excavations have produced a significant number of sites with many features and with numerous finds. This was so not just in Turopolje but everywhere else where the roads were built, especially in the last twenty years. In this respect, a contribution of rescue excavations to the development of archaeology and historical studies, in general, is indeed significant. At the same

⁶⁰ Aleksandra Bugar, "Naselje ranog srednjeg vijeka", pp. 179-193.

⁶¹ Aleksandra Bugar: "Dva srednjovjekovna bunara s lokaliteta Šepkovčica" [Two medieval wells from the site of Šepkovčica], *Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu* 44 (2011), p. 162.

⁶² Nikolina Antonić, "Combining documents, toponyms, and archaeology in Turopolje, Croatia. GIS in historical research", *Annual of Medieval Studies at CEU* 21 (2015), pp. 211-228; "Late medieval village in Turopolje", in *Secular power and sacral authority in medieval East-Central Europe*, ed. by Kosana Jovanović and Suzana Miljan (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2018), pp. 71-85.

⁶³ Bugar, *Preliminarno izvješće*, unpublished report; Bugar, "Arheometrijske analize i njihova primjena u arheološkoj interpretaciji na primjeru lokaliteta Okuje," *Hrvatski arheološki godišnjak* 8/2011, in press, pp. 741-747; Burmaz – Vujnović, *Zaštitna arheološka istraživanja*, unpublished report.

⁶⁴ Nikolina Antonić – Tibor Ákos Rácz, "Selected Medieval Finds from Site Kobilić 1 in Turopolje," in *Zbornik Instituta za arheologiju br. 6.: 2. međunarodni znanstveni skup srednjovjekovne arheologije "Srednjovjekovna naselja u svjetlu arheoloških izvora"*, ed. by Tajana Sekelj Ivančan, Tatjana Tkalčec, Siniša Krznar, Juraj Belaj (Zagreb, 2017).

⁶⁵ Geoarheo d.o.o. *Izvješće o arheološkom istraživanju na trasi izgradnje priključne prometnice istočne obilaznice Velike Gorice- Zračna luka Zagreb AN I I AN 2* [Report about the archaeological research on the track of building of the by-pass road Velika Gorica-Zračna luka Zagreb], unpublished report, 2016

⁶⁶ Ivan Radman-Livaja et al., "Istraživanje arheološkog lokaliteta Buzin" [Research on the archaeological site Buzin], *Vjesnik arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu* 44 (2011), pp. 261-273.

⁶⁷ Maja Bunčić, "New Early Slavic finds from Zagreb surroundings. Rescue excavation on the Pleso - airport site", a poster, sources: Academia.edu.

time, the character of these excavations is also important for interpretation and evaluation of excavated features.

The uppermost layers of sites excavated in highway excavations were (in most cases) removed by machines. Thus, finds from surface (humus) layers were not completely collected. Likewise, parts of archaeological features located very close to the surface could not have been identified in every case. These facts are important to note and one must be aware of them while interpreting each particular site. But, before proceeding with the further text, I would like to emphasize here that I am not criticizing the method of removing humus layers with machines. On the contrary, I think that, in the given circumstances (time deadlines and financial limitations), this method was completely legitimate. All the more, even if there would not be the restricting circumstances, I would still support a removing of humus layers with machines. In most cases, archaeological features in these layers had already been disturbed or completely destroyed by ploughing or some other activities performed in the modern period, so I do not see any legitimate reason for spending time and financial resources in gathering absolutely every piece of pottery. Financial resources will never be limitless, and, in my opinion, it is more important to spend them on the scientific analysis of the material. On the other hand, there is a possibility that some features close to the surface had not been previously destroyed by ploughing but could have not been identified during excavations because the upper layers were removed with machines. This is always an objective danger, especially in cases when floors (of above-ground structures) were not strongly built or plastered. But, in cases of such fragile structures, it is questionable if one would find them even while removing humus with a shovel. Besides that, the crucial factors for successful excavation of layers with machines are skills of a person who runs a machine and skills of an archaeologist who is monitoring the process (that is, his/her skill of noticing the difference between layers). Still, one has to be aware of the above mentioned potential losses. This aspect is particularly relevant for the area of Turopolje, where the importance of wooden houses erected on the surface is well known due to studies on vernacular architecture.

Additional limiting aspect of highway rescue excavations is that an excavated area is predefined by a route of a road. In case of larger settlements, only parts located in an area of a construction zone of a highway can be excavated. This was the case with both Šepkovčica and Okuje). Besides that, important sites or features indicated by field surveys or through a study of written sources cannot be investigated in the framework of the rescue operation. But, even with all these limiting factors, archaeological sources have been increased in a very significant

way during the last decades precisely due to the high way excavations, opening up new possibilities for the interdisciplinary research.

3.4. Other fields of study

Except for the above-mentioned archaeological and historical studies, there are studies from several other disciplines that are important for understanding both the physical and the cultural environment of Turopolje. One of these disciplines is historical geography. It explains the natural environment and its changes from the medieval to the modern period. Historical geography of Turopolje in particular was discussed by Milan Šenoa, the associate of Laszowski.⁶⁸ In the more recent period, this was also one of the topics discussed in the doctoral dissertation of Borna Fürst-Bjeliš, *Historijsko-geografska analiza prostornog pojma tradicionalne regije Turopolje* [Historical-geographical analysis of the area traditionally considered Turopolje].⁶⁹ Along with these two works, the data about historical geography of Turopolje can be found in several works of geographers dealing with the territory of Northern Croatia.⁷⁰

The other discipline which is very important is onomastics. A considerable number of toponyms that are recorded in Turopolje can be found in the broader area of Central and Eastern Europe. Lots of them have been analysed by experts in different sorts of specialized articles and etymological dictionaries. Two works dealt with toponyms found in medieval charters of Turopolje in particular. First is the doctoral dissertation by Johanna Wippel titled *Die geographischen Namen des Turopolje (Eine sprachwissenschaftliche Untersuchung)*.⁷¹ The second is the article “Zemljopisna nomenkultura u srednjovjekovnoj toponimiji Turopolja” [Geographical nomenclature in the medieval toponymy of Turopolje]“ written by Marko Lukenda.⁷² As some of the local place names are connected to Hungarian words or place-names,

⁶⁸ Milan Šenoa, “Zemljopis i narodopis” [Geography and Ethography], in Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine Turopolje*, pp. 1-33.

⁶⁹ Borna Fürst-Bjeliš, *Historijsko-geografska analiza prostornog pojma tradicionalne regije Turopolje* [Historical-geographical analysis of the area traditionally considered Turopolje], unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Zagreb, 1996.

⁷⁰ For example: Josip Rogalić, *Fizičko geografska obilježja Zagreba i okolice* [Physical geographical features of Zagreb and its surroundings] (Split: Geografsko društvo, 2007).

⁷¹ Johanna Wippel, *Die geographischen Namen des Turopolje (eine sprachwissenschaftliche Untersuchung)*, (Druck: Ernst-Reuter-Gesellschaft, 1963).

⁷² Marko Lukenda, “Zemljopisna nomenkultura u srednjovjekovnoj toponimiji Turopolja” [Geographical nomenclature in the medieval toponymy of Turopolje], *Kaj* 3 (1984), pp. 55-63.

it is also important to mention that the two-volume etymological dictionary of Lajos Kiss offers solutions and comparative materials in a number of cases.⁷³

Ethnographic and art-historical research should also be mentioned. One of the characteristics of the Turopolje area is the traditional wooden architecture. In general, vernacular architecture can always be helpful for better understanding of the features found on the archaeological sites. In this context, it is worth to mention that the wooden houses and churches of Turopolje have been analysed in scholarly literature.⁷⁴

At the end, I would like to mention works of local enthusiasts – Vojko Miklaušić,⁷⁵ Slavko Stepanić⁷⁶ and Slavko Cvetnić.⁷⁷ They wrote down traditional customs of Donja Lomnica and Mraclin which were very helpful in many of their aspects because they reflected the past tradition in their *longue durée*.

⁷³ Lajos Kiss, *Földrajzi nevek etimológiai szótára* [Etymological dictionary of placenames] (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1980).

⁷⁴ Ksenija Marković, “Majstori tesari – graditelji tradicijske arhitekture u Turopolju” [Master carpenters –builders of traditional architecture in Turopolje], *Radovi Instituta za povijest umjetnosti* 12-13 (1988-1989), pp. 286-293; Aleksandar Freudenreich, *Kako narod gradi na području Hrvatske: zapažanja, snimci i crteži arhitekta* [How the folk build in the territory of Croatia: observations, recordings and drawings by architects] (Zagreb: Republički zavod za zaštitu spomenika kulture, 1972), pp. 151-163; Đurđica Cvitanović, “Drvene seoske crkve na području Hrvatske” [Wooden village churches on the territory of Croatia], *Radovi Instituta za povijest umjetnosti* 15 (1991), pp. 286-293.

⁷⁵ Vojko Miklaušić, *Plemeniti puti* [The noble ways] (Donja Lomnica: Matica hrvatska, ogranak Velika Gorica, 1994).

⁷⁶ Slavko Stepanić, *Lomnički riječnik* [Lomnica dictionary], 2012, <https://docs.google.com/document/preview?hgd=1&id=1zhs0JanRpQnWVqd40yQWVIg8SZh5haGZTktuNqp07HI&pli=1>, accessed April, 2014.

⁷⁷ Slavko Cvetnić, *Mraclin: kak je negda bilo: mjestopisne i povijesne crtice* [Mraclin: the way it once was: local and historical notes] (Zagreb: vlastita naklada, 2009).

4. The medieval settlement system around Okuje


4.1. Introduction

The present-day Okuje is a small village placed 4,5 km south of the main city of the Turopolje region - Velika Gorica. The archaeological site called Okuje was located on the eastern edge of the village, by the present-day cadastre border of Okuje and the village Mraclin. Most of excavated part of the site was situated within the territory of the present-day Okuje, while the western end of the site was situated within the territory of Mraclin.

The first extant written source, found so far, in which the estate named Okuje is mentioned dates from 1435. It is a charter issued by the title of new donation by King Sigismund. The king confirmed to George and his father Stephan called Fakraš from Obrež their ownership of the estates (*possessiones*): Obrež, Demerje, Ternovec, Okuje, Samac, Tržec, Podbrežje, Stučje, Lekenik, Brona, Mišine and Buševac (*Ebres, Demerye, Ternouch, Okwyte, Zamacz, Tersecz, Podbresye, Stuchye, Lekenyk, Brona, Mysne et Bwseucz*).⁷⁸ Thus, in 1435, Okuje was a part of the bigger nobleman estate. How it became a part of it, is one of the questions on which I will try to answer in the following analysis. Likewise, I will try to induce if the remains of the medieval and the early modern excavated settlement features are remains of the medieval estate Okuje or of some other estate. But, chiefly, I will try to reconstruct the social and natural environment, that is, the settlement system of the area around the site.

All the nearest surrounding settlements will be included in this analysis. As shown on Map 1, these, present-day existing, settlements are Mraclin on the southeast, Petrovina Turopoljska on the northwest, Vukovina on the northeast, and Staro Čiče north of Vukovina. Although a bit further from Okuje, the area of the village of Novo Čiče, will also be included. In the medieval times this area was called Želin and, as will be shown, the Želin estate is very important for understanding the medieval history of the Turopolje region. Along with the listed villages, charters, toponyms and the military surveys reveal that, in the past, some today not-existing settlements were placed in this area. They will also be mentioned chronologically as they appear in the sources and, when possible, their location in the modern environment will be shown on maps.

⁷⁸ KAZ, ALC 2, no.59.



Map 1-Location of the site Okuje

Data about each settlement will be presented in chronological order, from the thirteenth to the end of the fifteenth century, as they appear in the sources. The history of each settlement in the thirteenth, the fourteenth and the fifteenth century will be analysed in detail, as much as the extant documents allow. First, the analysis of the basic data that can be found in the extant charters for each village will be done. Along with it, if existing, spatial data will be analysed and presented on maps. At the end of each chapter changes in ownership and the functioning of the whole area will be discussed. In the case when some specific legal case or some data that are not often found in the charters appear, they will be accentuated. After of all this will be done for each century, data from historical and onomastic sources will be confronted with data from the archaeological excavations.

I have tried to limit the analysis strictly on the area of the villages that surround the site. However, at the early stage of the research, that proved to be an impossible task. Most of these villages did not function as separate units but were parts of larger units/estates. Consequently, I have started to spread the borders of the area I was trying to analyse. This resulted in studying of the medieval history of a considerable part of the Turopolje region. In many aspects, this analysis can be complemented and, most likely, corrected. Nonetheless, I hope that data gathered in this text, as well as numerous maps, are a good starting point for starting to look at Turopolje not just as the area of the noble community, but as an area with very complex property relations, that offers numerous opportunities for further interdisciplinary research.

4.2. Settlement history-written sources, toponyms and maps

4.2.1. The thirteenth century

Data about areas of four present-day villages that surround the archaeological site Okuje are extant in the thirteenth-century sources. These villages are Staro Čiče and Novo Čiče on the north, Mraclin on the east, and Petrovina on the west. For the areas of Novo Čiče, Staro Čiče and Mraclin, the number of extant thirteenth-century sources is sufficient for making of detailed analysis of owners and borders of medieval estates to which the areas belonged. As far as Petrovina is concerned, there are only two charters that contain perambulations in which the church of St. Peter (that was placed in this village) is mentioned. Thus, except the fact that the church existed in the area of Petrovina already in the thirteenth century, nothing more can be said about this territory on the basis of data from these two charters. So, the charters will just be briefly listed at the end of this chapter. More about Petrovina will be written in the next chapter because the number of extant fourteenth-century charters is bigger than the thirteenth-century ones and the charters are more informative. Besides that, some additional data about the area of Petrovina in the thirteenth century will come out of an analysis that will be done in the chapter about the villages that surround the site of Šepkovčica.

4.2.1.1. Staro Čiče – Chichan preceptory and *libera villa*

The present-day village Staro Čiče is placed around 3.5 km north of the site Okuje. In the thirteenth century, the area of this village was a central part of the Chichan preceptory of the Knights of St. John. *Preceptorium* (or *baiulia*, commandery), administrated by a *preceptor*, was a base of territorial organization of the Hospitallers. A preceptory was both an administrative and an economic unit. On its territory, there could have been a house (*domus*), a hospital, a castle and accompanying buildings (*membra, camerae, grangiae*). One preceptory could have had all of these units or just some of them. Part of incomes of each preceptory had to be sent to the headquarters of the Order. The preceptories were grouped into priories (*prioratus*).⁷⁹

The Chichan preceptory was first time mentioned as *terra Zickuan* in 1238, when King Bela IV confirmed the properties of the Hospitallers in Hungary that had been given to them by Kings Emeric (1196-1204) and Andrew II (1205-1235).⁸⁰ In the thirteenth century, the term

⁷⁹ Hunyadi, *The Hospitallers*, pp. 17-19.

⁸⁰ CD 4, doc. 44, p. 49.

terra could have meant different sorts of lands; a smaller private property, an agricultural land, a village, a bigger estate of a landlord etc. Therefore, it can be discussed if, in 1238, *terra Zichuan* was a formed preceptory or some smaller estate or unit held by the Hospitallers. I think that it was a formed preceptory.⁸¹ This was also an opinion of Lelja Dobronić. She concluded that the Order got it sometime by the end of the 12th or the beginning of the thirteenth century.⁸² This can be confirmed by several additional charters. One of the estates of the Čičan preceptory was called Peščenica. Today, Peščenica is the village in the southeastern part of Turopolje. In the time of the Hospitallers, as shown on the Map 4 in the further text, the name Peščenica referred to a wider area than the area of the present-day village. In 1211, King Andrew II gave big portions of lands to the Cistercians. These lands were partly situated along the southern borders of Turopolje. One of the borders of the Cistercians' estates was Peščenica, *villa fratrum hospitalis*.⁸³ So, by 1211, meaning at least 17 years before *terra Zichuan* was first mentioned, the Hospitallers were the owners of Peščenica. Besides that, there are two extant charters that contain perambulations of borders of the Čičan preceptory, both issued in 1328. The first was issued by the Chapter of Zagreb on the 22nd of March. It contains a perambulation of the borders of Čičan and the appertaining estates as they were in 1328.⁸⁴ The second was issued about a month earlier, on the fifteenth of February, by the Archbishop of Kalocsa Ladislaus, on the request of Ban Micks. The ban asked the archbishop to make a transcript of the charter issued by King Stephan V that contained a transcript of the charter of King Andrew II. So, in the charter issued by archbishop Ladislaus in 1328, the borders of Čičan and its appertaining estates from the period of reign of King Andrew II are extant.⁸⁵ Thus, it can be stated with certainty that the Hospitallers owned the lands of the Čičan preceptory prior to the reign of King Bela IV, that is, prior to 1235 (when Bela IV became the king). Unfortunately, the transcript of the archbishop Ladislaus does not contain the exact date on which King Andrew II issued the original charter. It can only be noticed that some of the bordering lands of the preceptory mentioned in the king's charter appear in some other thirteenth-century charters. For example, *terra Somar*, the bordering land of the Hospitallers' estate Kupčina, is listed as an estate of the Church of Zagreb in 1217.⁸⁶ Lands of *comes* Peter son of Jurk/Gwrk were the

⁸¹ The preceptory is not explicitly mentioned in the charters that will be used in this text, but the *preceptor* is. For example, one of the witnesses present during the sale of land in Kostanjevec in 1279, was certain *comes* Petres son of Petrilo. He was an envoy of the preceptor of Čičan (*pro praeceptore de Chychan*). MHNC 1, doc. 30, p. 33.

⁸² Dobronić, *Templari i Ivanovci*, p. 128.

⁸³ CD 3, doc. 84, p. 104; Ćuk, *Zagrebačka županija*, p. 140; Dobronić, *Templari i Ivanovci*, p. 128.

⁸⁴ CD 9, doc. 316, pp. 383-385.

⁸⁵ CD 9, doc. 311, pp. 378-379.

⁸⁶ CD 3, doc. 131, p. 153.

bordering lands of Čičan, Kupčina and Peščenica. Peter is known from several other contemporary charters. For example, sometime before 1228 or that year, he bought six lands situated in Turopolje.⁸⁷ So, King Andrew's charter must have been issued sometime in this period.

4.2.1.1.1. The estates of the preceptory – the borders and the historical data

In the time of King Andrew II, the estates of the Čičan preceptory were Čičan, Kravarsko, Peščenica, and Kupčina. All the four listed were also the estates of the Hospitallers in 1328. That year, one more estate is mentioned – Jamnica. As said, Čičan was placed in the area of the present-day village Staro Čiče, so in Turopolje. Kravarsko and Peščenica were also placed in Turopolje. These were names of vast portion of lands in the southeastern part of the area. Jamnica and Kupčina, on the other hand, were names of vast portion of lands situated along the southwestern borders of Turopolje. This area is not traditionally considered as a part of Turopolje.

The two charters that contain the description of the borders of the preceptory are important for placing the estates of the Order in the present-day environment. At the same time, they are important as the sources that inform about owners of neighbouring estates of the preceptory. If one takes into consideration that the thirteenth-century sources about the bordering area of the estates of the Hospitallers are very scarce, it becomes clear how valuable the two charters are. For that reason, they will be analysed in detail in the following lines and data from the perambulations will be placed on the modern map. These data will be used extensively in other chapters of the thesis. The texts of both charters can be interpreted more accurately if compared, so the perambulation from the time of King Andrew II and the perambulation from 1328 will be analysed simultaneously. Both texts are shown in the plates, next to each other. The charter from the time of King Andrew II is called the 1st charter and the charter from 1328 is called the 2nd charter. The interpretation of data is written in the right column and, in cases when necessary, elaborated in more detail in the text below the plates. Numbers by which certain points are marked on the map are written in the left column of the plate. After the perambulations of each of the estates are analysed and data from them placed on the modern maps, historical data about the estates, that can be found in some other extant charters, are discussed.

⁸⁷ MNHC 1, doc. 2, pp. 3-5.

Since the borders of the preceptory were very long, the perambulations are not always precise (from the modern point of view). The borders of Kupčina and Jamnica and the southern borders of Kravarsko and Peščenica are not placed in the area which is the focus of my thesis. Therefore, I have drawn them approximately, only on the basis of data from the two perambulations. This gives fairly correct information about the spreading of the Čičan preceptory. I think, however, that the further research of some other documents connected with the area in question as well as a field research, could enable a more detailed mapping of the borders of the Hospitallers estates' in these parts.

4.2.1.1.1. Čičan

Plate 1-Borders of Čičan

No	The 1 st charter ⁸⁸	The 2 nd charter ⁸⁹	Interpretation
1.	The first boundary of Čičan (<i>Chychan</i>) starts at the east from a water (<i>de aqua</i>)	The first boundary of the estate of Čičan (<i>possessio Chychan</i>) begins at the east from its water (<i>aqua sua</i>),	The first starting point cannot be precisely determined. Still, it is clear that the boundary started from “the water”. As the stream (today called) Siget is the present day boundary of Staro Čiče, it could be assumed that some of its dried watercourses or the stream itself was the first boundary (see the text below for further explanations).
	and from that place goes towards the west dividing the boundary with the land Okić (<i>terra Okych</i>)	from there it goes towards the west in the neighbourhood of the land of the Želin castle (<i>terra castri Selyn</i>)	
2.	and going to the water Brezovica (<i>aqua Brezwyca</i>), it goes towards the west to an oak tree,	and surpassing to the water Brezovica (<i>aqua Brezenyca</i>) goes towards the west through the big road (<i>magna via</i>) for a longer distance,	There is no river or stream Brezovica today but there is a toponym of this name, north of Staro Čiče. This could be where the stream of the same name flew in the middle ages.
	from there goes to the other oak-tree where it separates the land Cupzyn (<i>terra Cupzyn</i>),	all the way to the boundaries that were once of the sons of Pycenta that became Culpchyn (<i>ad metas filiorum Pycenta olim, que extitit Culpchyn</i>),	
			The last western point of the boundary was the land called Kupčin. I have not found any such toponym that could specify where the border ended in this direction. I assume it

⁸⁸ CD 9, doc. 311, p 378.

⁸⁹ CD 9, doc. 316, p 384.

			was somewhere around the present-day border of Staro Čiče. ⁹⁰
		from there going back to the north goes over two agricultural lands (<i>terras arabiles</i>) up to two earthen boundaries,	
		from there to the south for a long distance,	The point where the boundary turns south is not specified. I suppose it was also somewhere near the present day boundary.
3.	from there goes towards the east separating from Janzlo (<i>de Janzlo</i>) and going to an earthen boundary falls into the Odra (<i>aqua Odra</i>),	and falls into the water Čičan (<i>aqua Chichan</i>) and going by this water the border comes to the Odra (<i>aqua Odra</i>),	The position of “water Čičan” is unknown today, so it cannot be specified where the boundary entered the Odra River.
4.	by which goes towards the east separating from the land of comes Peter son of Jurk (<i>terra comitis Petri filii Jurk</i>)	by which it goes towards the east sharing the boundaries with John son of Ivan (<i>cum Johanne fillio Ivan</i>), going for a long distance exits where the River Sylena (<i>fluuius Sylena</i>) goes into the Odra (<i>Odra</i>) , where it shares the boundary with Peter and Stephan, sons of Lukač, that once were of Peter son of Gurk (<i>metae Petri et Stephani filiis Lwkach, que condam fuit Petri filii Gwck</i>),	The second charter specifies that the boundary went through the Odra River, up to the point to the point where River Sylena enters Odra. Sylena could be the present day stream Siget (for further explanation see the text below).
	and that way goes to the first boundary.	from here it turns back to the west and comes to the first boundary where it finishes.	For the explanation see the text below.

The approximate location of some of the boundaries mentioned in the perambulation of the estate Čičan, analysed in Plate 1, is shown on Map 2. The present-day cadastre borders of Staro Čiče are shown on the same map.

⁹⁰ There is a toponym Kupišće on the 1861 cadastre map and on modern maps. It is placed along with the southern border of Staro Čiče, in the area of the present-day Vukovina. It could be of the medieval origin but its position is not the same as of the land Kupčín recorded in the charters. It could also be that the name Kupčín referred to a wider area and stayed preserved only in this part until the present day.



Map 2-Čičan

Five watercourses are mentioned in the perambulations. The watercourse from which the boundary started, mentioned in both charters, is called simply *aqua* or *aqua sua* (*sua* probably refers to the one of Čičan). Brezovica and Odra are also mentioned in both charters. The “water” Čičan and the River Sylena are mentioned just in the 2nd charter. Except for the *Sylena*, which is called *fluuius*, the other features are named simply *aqua*. The term *fluuius* does not necessarily imply a river. By the present-day standards, it could also be a stream (which I think is the case here). Still, it does indicate a flowing watercourse. I suppose that *Sylena* is the stream Siget, which is the present-day eastern cadastre border of Staro Čiče. It pours into the Odra River. It seems that Siget is the modern name of the stream. On the Military surveys the same stream is called Želin.

The term *aqua* can mean different things. It can signify a river, a stream, a watercourse, a meander of a dried watercourse which was once connected to a river, a former riverbed in which there is still water (so not a swamp, but more like a lake). Sometimes such earlier watercourses can be identified by using detailed modern maps with contour lines of the elevation or on the military surveys. In this case, I did not find any such watercourse that I could connect with the perambulations with certainty. But, standing waters or smaller steam, that at

one point were functioning and at another not, were common natural features in Turopolje (this is clear both from charters and from the archaeological excavations).

So, even in case of Odra, taking into consideration that both charters use term *aqua Odra*, it does not have to mean that refer to the main course of the river; it could be some of its side courses or meanders. Actually, in the 2nd charter is explicitly written: “going by this water [*aqua Chichan*], the border comes to the *aqua Odra*, by which it goes towards the east sharing the boundaries with John son of Ivan, and going for a long distance it exits where the *fluuius Sylena* goes into the *Odra*”. Thus, it could be that the *aqua Odra* by which the boundary goes to the river *Sylena* is not the main course of the Odra but some standing water of one of Odra’s meanders, and so it is differenced from the *fluuius Sylena* as the running water. According to the last part of the quoted text, the boundary exits where the *fluuius Sylena* pours into the *Odra*. In this case, it is not specified if the river *Sylena* was pouring into the Odra River or again into one of its meanders. But I suppose it was pouring into the main course of Odra. All these data clearly show a limitation of precise mapping of most perambulations recorded in the medieval charters. But, regarding the overall picture of spreading of the medieval estates in the Turopolje region, that I hope will be created through this thesis, these facts do not change conclusions significantly. For example, the Odra’s dried courses were still relatively near the main course of the River, so the conclusion that the centre of the Čičan preceptory was placed in the area of Staro Čiče is still valid.

Somewhere in the area of the central estate Čičan was placed a privileged village called Čičan (*libera villa Chichan*). There was also a castle that, at one point around 1293, burnt down. In fact, a reason for issuing of a charter in which the castle is mentioned was that, together with the castle, disappeared privileges that had been given to the settlers (*hospites libere ville de Chichan*) by *magister* Rembald. So, the settlers asked *vice-magister* Gilermus to issue them a new charter which he did, in 1293.⁹¹ Juraj Čuk concluded that the castle was burned down in wars, during the period of King Andrew III.⁹² The charter does not mention any reason of destruction, except fire, but it does inform that this happened during difficult times (*cum durantibus articulis inpacti temporis*).

⁹¹ CD 7, doc. 113, p. 134.

⁹² Čuk, *Zagrebačka županija*, p. 140.

When and why this castle was built is not known; perhaps it was after the Mongol invasion. Magister Rembled, who gave the privileges to the settlers, was the prior in the period between 1238 - cca. 1259.⁹³ Also, the text of the charter is somewhat unclear in specifying the owners of the castle. It is written that the castle was erected among them [the settlers] (*quondam castrum inter ipsos constructum*), but the owners were probably the Hospitallers. It is not likely that they would allow the settlers to have their own castle in the middle of the headquarter of the preceptory. But, this could mean that the privileged village developed around the castle (in *suburbium* of the castle), which was a typical setting. In any case, this is the only known thirteenth-century castle in Turopolje.

Some other buildings that were in the area of Staro Čiče are also mentioned in the extant documents. There was a monastery (*claustrum*) as well as a *curia* belonging to the Order.⁹⁴ There was also a church dedicated to St. George, mentioned in 1334, in the List of parish churches of the Zagreb Diocese.⁹⁵ By that time, the Hospitallers left Turopolje (in 1328), but they must have used this church. Still, it is not clear who had built it. It could be that the Order had been built it and, after their departure, it started to be used as the parish church. But, it could also be that the church of St. George was primarily a parish church, used by the Hospitallers after forming of the preceptory (which was a standard procedure).

Finally, rare archaeological data from this area will be mentioned. As a chance find, a lead bulla of the Pope Clement IV (1265 - 1268) was found near the stream Siget, in the area where the toponym Gradišće still can be found on the contemporary maps. Lelja Dobronić assumed that the *domus* of the Hospitallers was on this position.⁹⁶ Also, there were some smaller archaeological excavations (trenches) in this territory. Gradišće is an important multi-layered archaeological site with finds from the prehistory to the early modern period. However, the results of the excavations are unpublished.

⁹³ Dobronić, *Templari i Ivanovci*, p. 205.

⁹⁴ CD 7, doc. 113, p. 134.

⁹⁵ MHNC 1, doc. 51, p. 52.

⁹⁶ Dobronić, *Templari i Ivanovci*, pp. 232-233., Ivan Mirnik, "Two recent finds of medieval lead seals," *Folia archaeologica Balcanica I*, pp. 482-484.

4.2.1.1.1.2. Kravarsko and Peščenica

Plate 2-Borders of Kravarsko and Peščenica

No	The 1 st charter	The 2 nd charter	Interpretation
1. 2.	The first boundary of the estates (<i>terrarum</i>) Kravarsko, Peščenica and Kupčina, that are also next to each other (<i>que simul adjacent</i>), starts in a direction of the west from the water Buna (<i>aqua Bwna</i>), sharing the border with the land/estate Craion (<i>terra Craion</i>),	The boundary of the four estates (<i>possessorum</i>), Kravarsko, Jamnica, Peščenica and Kupčina, starts in a vicinity of some road (<i>via</i>), where are two earthen boundaries on top of some valley called <i>Thrystych</i> (<i>vallis Thrystych vocate</i>), where is an oak tree signed with a cross on the northern side, and descends into the Buna River (<i>fluuis Bwna</i>) on the western part,	This border cannot be placed with complete accuracy in the present-day environment, although it is clear that it was placed in the vicinity of the Buna River. For further explanation, see the text below.
3.	From there goes towards the east sharing the border with the land/estate Booru (<i>terra Booru</i>), from there, progresses towards the east, sharing the border with the land/estate of Peter son of Jurk (<i>terra Petri filii Jurk</i>),	from there going towards the east, it touches the borders of the castle warriors, sons of Vukota and their kindred (<i>metas cum filliis Vukota iobagionibus castri et generacionis eorundem</i>), and goes around by this river, constantly by the borders of the mentioned castle warriors,	The same as above, see the text below.
4.	from there goes towards the south through a local road (<i>per viam loci</i>),	thence it exits where the River Bunica (<i>fluuius Bwnyca</i>) pours into the above-mentioned river [Buna], near the small hills on the southern side, and goes by the road called Poy (<i>via Poy</i>),	This is the point where the border turned to the south. I think that it was in the area of present-day village Buševac. The Bunica River, mentioned in the 2 nd charter, does not exist today by such name, but there are several tributaries of Buna in this area. Also, the last “hilly” part at this direction of the border is in this area as is the road that turns to the south; both the contemporary road and the Roman road on the Klemenc’s map. I suppose the roads mentioned in perambulations must have followed the similar, if not the same, track.
5.	and passing through a middle of a wood, it separates land/estate Bauzlo (<i>terra Bauzlo</i>), and decays into the	[and goes by the road called Poy], through a line of trees (<i>per arbores continuatas</i>) signed with crosses, and falls into the River Lekenik	The wood mentioned in the 1 st charter is Veliki Turopoljski lug According to

	water Lekenik (<i>aqua Lekelnyk</i>),	(<i>fluuius Lequenyk(l)</i>), touching the boundaries with John Vitez [Knight], son of Ivan (<i>metas cum Johanne Wythez filio Ivan</i>),	perambulation of this wood from 1249, the road was its eastern border, exactly on this part. ⁹⁷ So, I think this is the same road.
	it goes by the water Lekenik to the south, sharing the border with the land/estate of the Templars of Gora (<i>terra Templariorum de Gora</i>) and goes to a beech tree,	from the river Lekenik, the boundary goes to the south above the <i>praedium</i> Poljana (<i>praedium Polona</i>), where, for the second time, exits to the south, going for a long distance around woods through a line of trees (<i>per arbores continuatas</i>) signed with crosses, sharing the boundary with the land of the Hospitallers of Gora (<i>terra Cruciferorum de Gora</i>), all the way to the boundaries of the land of the Toplica abbey (<i>terre abbatis de Thoplycza</i>),	This part of the borders cannot be reconstructed with certainty just on the basis of data from this charter; it would require further research. I have drawn border approximately on the basis of data of the location of the villages belonging to Želin in 1500. ⁹⁸
6.	from there through the middle of the hill called Pomigno (<i>cuius montis est nomen Pomigno</i>) goes towards the east, sharing the border with the land/estate of the church of Toplica (<i>terra ecclesie de Toplycza</i>), from there it goes towards the south still sharing the boundary with the land of the above mentioned church, and to the foot of this hill where arises the spring called Kroworska (<i>fons nomine Krawarzka</i>).	from there it ascends the hill Pomneno (<i>mons Pomneno</i>) by a big road (<i>magna via</i>), always touching the boundaries with the land/estate of the Abbey of Toplica and comes around the hill where arises the spring by named Kravarska (<i>fons nomine Krawarzka</i>).	Pomigno or Pomneno is the medieval name of Vukomeričke gorice. The spring of the stream Kravarščica can be located: it is in the area of the present-day Gornji Hruševac.

The approximate location of some of the boundaries mentioned in the perambulation of the estates Kravarsko and Peščenica, analysed in the Plate 2, is shown on the Map 3. The interpretation of the western and northern parts of the borders requires further explanation. It is important to discuss it in more detail as these parts of the texts contain data about an enlargement of the estates that had happened in the period between the issuing of the 1st and the 2nd charter.

According to the 1st charter, the boundary “starts in the direction of the west, from the water Buna (*aqua Bwna*), sharing the border with *terra Craion*”. According to the 2nd charter, the boundary “starts in a vicinity of some road (*via*) where are two earthen boundaries on top


⁹⁷ MHNC 1, doc. 5, p. 8.

⁹⁸ MNL, DF-DL 20985.

of some valley called *Thrystych* where is an oak tree signed with a cross on the northern side, and descends into the Buna River (*fluuis Bwna*) on the western part.”

The first thing that can be noticed is that, in the 1st charter, Buna is called *aqua* and, in the 2nd charter, *fluuius*. The problems of interpretation of the term *aqua* have already been discussed. It could be that *fluuius* refers to the main river course of Buna, while *aqua* refers to some side course or meander. However, I think that this is not the case here as all the watercourses, mentioned in the 1st charter, are called *aquae*. So, the scribe who wrote down the text of the 1st charter (or the *pristaldus* who was describing the borders) most likely did not make any distinction between terms for rivers, streams or side courses. Thus, in this case, it is possible that the border went through the main course of the Buna River. The additional problem is that today there are more watercourses in this area (where the borders of the estate Kravarsko were) that could have been called Buna in the medieval period. For example, the stream now called Šiljakovina is the same watercourse as the present-day Buna River. So, again, the exact watercourse mentioned in the charter can only be assumed. But it is clear that, in the time of King Andrew II, the starting point of the boundary was the *aqua Buna*, being it the river Buna or some of its meanders. It is also clear that, in 1328, Buna was not the starting point of the boundary. This leads to a conclusion that the western borders of Kravarsko had expanded until 1328. How this happened will be explained later.

On the other hand, it is clear from the text of the 2nd charter that the Buna River was the northern border of Kravarsko in 1328 (“[the boundary] goes around by this river constantly by the borders of the mentioned castle warriors”). In the 1st charter, this is not specified. It is simply written: “[the boundary] starts in the direction of west from the *aqua Bwna* sharing the border with *terra Craion*, from there goes towards the east sharing the border with *terra Booru*, from there progresses towards the east sharing the border with *terra Petri filii Jurk*, from there goes towards the south through the local road”. So, based on the data from the 2nd charter and the fact that in both perambulations the boundary went towards the south by the same road, leaving the area of the Buna River at the same place, I assume that the *terra Booru* and the *terra Petri filii Jurk* were situated north of the Buna River. However, there is a possibility that the river was not the northern boundary of Kravarsko in the time of King Andrew II and that, by 1328, the northern borders of the estate had expanded, as was the case with the western border.



Map 3-Borders of Kravarsko and Peščenica

The data about the estates Peščenica and Kravarsko from the period when they were owned by the Hospitallers are very scarce. There is only one extant charter that gives some information about Peščenica. It informs that the Order gave the estates called Smaller Peščenica (*Mynor Peschenycha*) and Lekenik (*Lykenik*) to *comes* Perčin from Grič and his brother Anthony, under predial conditions (*iure feudi*), in 1279. These conditions were very favourable, due to the fact that Perčin had previously done numerous favours to the Hospitallers.⁹⁹ Among other things, both Perčin and the people (*populus*) living on the estates were allowed to pasture pigs and take wood for building houses and other usages from the wood of the Order.¹⁰⁰ A renting of estates was a standard practice of the Hospitallers.¹⁰¹ Before *comes* Perčin took over the estates, Small Peščenica had been given in pledge to Borč and Zlojna and their brothers.¹⁰² The last two people, as well as their brothers, were the castle warriors of the Zagreb castle, so,

⁹⁹ Perčin, who by origin was Venetian was very successful businessman who performed many functions (head of royal mint etc.), see: Klaić, *Povijest Zagreba*, pp. 96-100.

¹⁰⁰ CD 6, doc. 123, pp. 137-138.

¹⁰¹ See more about that in: Hunyadi, *The Hospitallers*, pp. 176-181.

¹⁰² CD 6, doc. 123, pp. 138.

the nobles of Turopolje (the term used in the charter is *fratres*, it signifies “proper” brothers as well as closer cousins).¹⁰³ These data are important not just in terms of functioning of the Hospitallers’ estates, but also in terms of connection of Hospitallers’ with the castle warriors. The important question regarding the history of Turopolje in the thirteenth century is: to what extent the Knights influenced the cultural and natural landscape of the area? Unfortunately, due to the lack of sources, not much more can be said about it. Thus, the above-mentioned charter is the only testimony of contacts and business trade between the castle warriors and the Order.

As far as spatial data is concerned, it is clear from this charter that Peščenica, as the big territorial unit, was divided into the smaller units, among which Smaller Peščenica and Lekenik. The present-day village Lekenik is situated 3.5 km southeast of the present-day Peščenica. It was not mentioned as the property of the Hospitallers in neither the 1st nor the 2nd charter. In both charters, however, the stream Lekenik is mentioned as one of the borders of the estate Peščenica. Along with that, the 2nd charter does mention the estate named Lekenik. It is written that no one contradicted the established borders of the preceptory, except Arland, son of Nicholas, who had an objection about the border of a part of the estate called Lekenik (...*quadam particula possessionaria Lequenyk vocata...*).¹⁰⁴ So, the Hospitallers did hold the estate called Lekenik as the part of Peščenica, the bigger territorial unit. Still, in the Middle Ages, the area of the present-day village Lekenik had been divided among different owners, that is, Lekenik was a collective geographical name for portions of lands owned by different owners. This is important to emphasize as this division is important for understanding the development of this area in the later centuries.

4.2.1.1.1.3. Borders of Jamnica and Kupčina

Plate 3-Borders of Jamnica and Kupčina

No	The 1 st charter	The 2 nd charter	
1	By the flow of the spring of Kravarščica, the border goes towards the south, still sharing the border with the church of Topusko, and falls into the Kupa (<i>Culpa</i>),	By the flow of the spring of Kravarščica, the border goes towards the south, still sharing the border with the land of the Abbey of Topusko, and from there it falls into the Kupa (<i>Culpa</i>),	The stream Kravarščica pours into the Kupa River in the area of the village Lijevo sredičko, situated around 7.5 km left of Donja Kupčina.

¹⁰³ MHNC 1, doc. 16, p. 19.

¹⁰⁴ CD 6, doc. 316, p. 384.


2	from there it goes towards the west, sharing the border with the land/estate of the Babonići (<i>terra Bobynyz</i>), and goes into the water Kupčina (<i>aqua Culpchyna</i>),	and from there, ascending and going, comes to the water Kupčina (<i>aqua Culpchyna</i>).	I suppose that the border went through the flow of Kupa. The stream Kupčina pours into the Kupa south of the village Donja Kupčina.
3	and stretching in the Kupčina, it separates from <i>Myrizlo</i> , on the west it separates from the land/estate Samar (<i>terra Samar</i>) and stretching to the water Breznica (<i>aqua Breznycza</i>) goes to the land/estate Samar (<i>terra Samar</i>) [szamár means donkey in Hungarian],	by the Kupčina the border goes up and stretches into the River Breznica (<i>fluius Breznycza</i>), and going to the south, it shares borders with the lands of the Okić Castle (<i>terre Castri Okych</i>),	The present-day streams Kupčina and Breznica.
4	from there goes to the water <i>Skopsyncz</i> (<i>aqua Skopsyncz</i>), from there goes towards the west holding the border with the Samar,	from there it goes to the water Kupinik (<i>aqua Kwpynyk</i>),	The present day stream Kupiniec.
5	stretches to the water <i>Sparen</i> (<i>aqua Sparen</i>),	from there goes again towards the west to the water <i>Pezaryewo</i> (<i>aqua Pezaryewo</i>),	I suppose that both <i>Sparen</i> and <i>Pezaryewo</i> are names of the present-day stream Pisarovac.
	from there, progressing, it separates from the land of Peter son of Gwrk (<i>terra Petri filii Gwrk</i>) and goes to the hill Pomigno (<i>mons Pomigno</i>),	from there, progressing more towards the west, comes by a road to the tree <i>thewel</i> , and near the road that is in common language called <i>Prykrysy</i> , it shares borders with the above mentioned castle warriors,	See explanation in the text below.
		from there it goes back by the road and comes to another big <i>thewel</i> tree, there it turns towards the west,	
6	where as a boundary is an oak-tree under which arises the spring Lučelnica (<i>fons Lexyzycza</i>)	and comes to a turkey oak to the boundary above the spring of Lučelnica (<i>caput Lochylnycza</i>).	There are two streams Lučelnica, called Velika and Mala. I think that the one in question here is Mala Lučelnica. In 1256, Velika Lučelnica was the western boundary of territory owned by grandsons of here mentioned comes Peter. ¹⁰⁵ (see pages. 254-260.)

¹⁰⁵ MHNC 1, doc. 9, p. 12.

7	And falls into the water Kravarščica (<i>aqua Krowaska</i>),	From there, descending through this water (<i>aqua</i>), goes into the water Kravarščica (<i>aqua Krawarzka</i>),	Confluence of the Lučelnica and the Kravarščica streams.
	and by Kravarščica goes towards the south, sharing the border with the mentioned Peter (<i>Petrus</i>),	from there, through this stream Kravarščica, goes further for a long distance up to the hill, further to the home of the castle warrior Elia (<i>domus Elie iobagiones castri</i>), near some swamp (<i>mlaka</i>),	The border from the 1 st charter is easily reconstructed. The border from the 2 nd charter would require further research of the area. In any case, since Kupa is not mentioned as a border in the second charter, the border obviously changed by 1328.
8	and falls into the Kupa (<i>Colpa</i>) and there finishes.	there it turns back and stretches up to the hill, through trees signed with crosses, and comes to the big road (<i>magna via</i>) where is an earthen boundary, from there, going through this road, comes to the tree <i>thewl</i> signed with a cross, from there upwards up to two earthen boundaries and there finishes.	


The approximate position of the borders analysed in Plate 3 is shown on Map 4. The unclear part of the border is the last one (as explained in the plate above) and the one between the stream Pisarovac and the spring of Lučelnica. This part between the Pisarovac and the spring of Lučelnica will be shortly analysed now, as it contains data that could explain why the estate Jamnica is not mentioned in the 1st but is in the 2nd charter.

In the 1st charter, between the two points, the border: “separates from the land of Peter son of Gwrk and goes to the hill Pomigno (*mons Pomigno*) where, as a boundary, is an oak-tree under which arises the spring Lučelnica”. In the 2nd charter, the border: “progressing more towards the west comes by the road to the tree *thewel* and, near the road that is in common language called *Prykrysye*, it shares borders with the above-mentioned castle warriors, from there it goes back by the road, and comes to another big *thewel* tree, there it turns towards the west and comes to a turkey oak to the boundary above the spring of Lučelnica.” It seems that, in the time of King Adrew II, the border went straight from the stream Pisarovac to the hill and then to Lučelnica, while, by 1328, the border spread more to the west, incorporating the land (or part of the land) that was once owned by *comes* Peter. The present-day village Jamnica is placed in the supposed bordering area of the estate Kupčina recorded in the 1st charter. Perhaps by spreading of the border on the territory that had once belonged to *comes* Peter, Jamnica became a separate territorial unit of the preceptory. But, as already written, the more accurate making of these borders would require a separate research of the area in question here.



Map 4-Borders of Jamnica and Kupčina

All the estates of the Čičan preceptory are shown on Map 5. Although the map of the estates is not precise in every detail, the drawn borders are, in general, accurate. Therefore, it can be concluded that the estates of Hospitallers in Turopolje (Čičan, Kravarsko and Peščenica) and the ones placed on the western edge of Turopolje (Jamnica and Kupčina) were vast. The central estate, Čičan, covered the surface of approximately 3 square kilometers. The other estates covered the surface of approximately 220 square kilometres (Peščenica and Kravarsko approximately 100 square kilometres, Jamnica and Kupčina approximately 120 square kilometres).



Map 5-The Čičan preceptory

4.2.1.2. Novo Čiče – Želin

The present-day village Novo Čiče is placed approximately 5 km north of the site Okuje. In medieval times, the area of the present-day village was a smaller part of the larger estate called Želin. In the historical literature, Želin is known chiefly because of the castle (*castrum*) of the same name. Even regardless of the castle, the estate itself was important both for the

history of the whole Turopolje area and for the settlement system around the site of Okuje.¹⁰⁶ For that reason, the history of the whole estate Želin, in the period from the thirteenth to the end of the sixteenth century, will be analysed in the thesis; certain parts of the estate will be mentioned in the chronological order, as they appear in the sources.

The Želin estate was mentioned by different authors, but sporadically, because it was not crucial for their topics.¹⁰⁷ The estate was not a property of the noble community of Turopolje, so Laszowski did not write a separate historical overview about it in his book. He did publish two articles that contain some data about the history of the estate until the beginning of the eighteenth century.¹⁰⁸ Although his studies offer a very valuable overview, his data can be supplemented and corrected. Mostly the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries historical interpretations are problematic.

In this chapter, I will list all data about Želin that can be extracted from the thirteenth-century charters. Some data about spatial distribution will emerge out of this analysis. They will be complemented with data from the maps and with toponyms. At the same time, the changes of an ownership will be shown. But, before all that, it is necessary to mention a problem with the names used in medieval documents for the territory of the Želin estate.

4.2.1.2.1. *Some remarks about the name Čiče-Želin*

Today there are two villages called Čiče – Novo [meaning new in Croatian] Čiče and Staro [old] Čiče. They are next to each other, Staro Čiče is about 1 km south of Novo Čiče (and so closer to the site Okuje). This similarity of their names caused confusion in the previous literature; because of the similarity, the authors equalled the areas of the two villages and this lead to some incorrect conclusions.¹⁰⁹

In the thirteenth-century charters, a distinction between the areas of two villages is clear. The first extant source in which the areas of both villages are mentioned is the already-analyzed charter issued by King Andrew II (and extant in the transcript from 1328) that contain

¹⁰⁶ It should be said that the only author who emphasized the emportantce of Želin for the history of the whole Turopolje region was Juraj Ćuk, in his work about Zagreb County in the thirteenth century. However, in his opinion, the centre of Želin was in the territory of Petrovina or Gradići. This, as will be shown, is wrong. Ćuk, *Zagrebačka županija*, p. 141.

¹⁰⁷ These authors will be quoted in the following text.

¹⁰⁸ Emilij Lazowski, “Želin-Čiče,” *Prosvjeta* (Zagreb), 5 (1897) 14, pp. 435-438; 15, pp. 454-456.

¹⁰⁹ For example: In his article about Čiče-Želin, Laszowski wrote that the oldest owners of the estate were the Hospitallers. He did not discern Čičan from Želin, Laszowski, “Želin-Čiče,” pp. 436-437; similarly: Nada Klaić, *Povijest Zagreba*, p. 122.

perambulation of the estates of the Čičan preceptory. As shown, in the time of King Andrew II, that is, in the period before 1235, the area of Staro Čiče was called *Chychan*. According to the same perambulation, in the area north of Čičan, which is the area of the present-day Novo Čiče (or at least its southern part), was *terra Okych*.¹¹⁰ In 1328, when the other charter that contains perambulation of the Hospitallers' estates was issued, the area of Staro Čiče was still called *Chychan* (*possessio*), but the name of the area of Novo Čiče changed. It became *terra castri Selyn*.¹¹¹ The reason why *terra Okych* became *terra castri Selyn* will be discussed later.

In 1334, the difference in the names was still present; John of Gorica, the author of the first list of parish churches of Zagreb diocese, wrote down that the Church of St. John the Baptist (it still exists in Novo Čiče) was placed in *Selin* and the Church of St. George (it was in Staro Čiče but abandoned at the beginning of the nineteenth century¹¹²) was placed in *Chichan*.¹¹³

Over time, names Čiče and Želin started to be equaled (*Selen alio nomine Chychan*).¹¹⁴ This happened sometime after 1328. That year, the estates of the Hospitallers, with the center in the present-day Staro Čiče, and the estates under the jurisdiction of the castle Želin, joined in the royal hands. How and why this happened will be explained in the following lines. For now, it is just important to keep in mind that, until the second quarter of the fourteenth century, Želin and Čičan were two separate estates of different owners. After 1328, they became part of the vast estate owned by the same owner. Sometime after this merging, the names of Novo and Staro Čiče appear in the extant sources. The first was registered for the first time as *Nowa Chychan* in 1390¹¹⁵ and the second as *Vetus Chichan* in 1496 (in the sources found so far).¹¹⁶

The additional problem with these names is that not just the area of Novo Čiče was called Želin. As said, Želin was the large estate. Its appertaining estates were spreading throughout Turopolje. Except in the sources, this can be seen in the present-day toponyms shown on the Map 6. There is a stream called Želin that flows by Novo Čiče, on its northern and western side. There is a toponym Želinski gaj [Bosket of Želin], some 2.5 km north of Novo Čiče, in the area of the present-day village Lazina Čička. There are also several toponyms Želin

¹¹⁰ CD 9, doc. 311, pp. 378-379.

¹¹¹ CD 9, doc. 316, p. 384.

¹¹² Janko Barlé, "Povijest crkve u Turopolju," in: *Povijest plemenite općine Turopolja* 2, p. 257.


¹¹³ MHNC 1, doc. 51, p. 52.

¹¹⁴ MHCZ 1, doc. 330, p. 308.

¹¹⁵ MHNC 1, doc. 118-119, pp. 123-124.

¹¹⁶ MHNC 2, doc. 121., p. 170.

in the wider area between the rivers Kosnica and Ribnica, 2-3 km east of Novo Čiče, in the area of the present-day village Ribnica.



Map 6-Toponyms Želin and Želinski gaj (source: Geoportal)

Therefore, for all the above-explained reasons, I will not use the name Novo Čiče, but the name Želin in the following text and analyse the whole estate. It was the medieval name of this area. I will try to answer the following questions: which were the borders of the estate, who was the owner of Želin in the thirteenth century, by whom and when the castle of Želin was built and where the castle was located.

4.2.1.2.2. *Praedium Selin*

Želin is mentioned in the historical sources for the first time in 1217 as *terra* or *praedium Selin*. That year, King Andrew was staying in Zagreb. He was on his way to the Holy Land. On the request of Desider, the bishop of Csanád and Ciriak, the provost of the Zagreb's Church, the king freed a man called Giles and his posterity from a servitude to the ban and proclaimed him as *serviens regis*. He also confirmed to Giles' his ownership in seven of his estates, *terrae* or *praedii* (both terms are used in the charter).¹¹⁷ Four of them: *Insula*, *Prevlaka*, *Rucha* and *Selin* were placed in Turopolje; the first three were located along the banks of the Sava River. *Craztenica*, the present-day Hrastelnica, was placed on the right bank of Sava, northeast of Sisak. *Chernelec* was placed north of the Sava, in the slopes of Medvednica, near Jalševac.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁷ CD 3, doc. 132, pp. 157-159.

¹¹⁸ Gajer, *Posjedi zagrebačkog kapotola*, p. 42.

The seventh *praedium*, *Quinquinik*, has been identified as Lekenik in most of the previous literature.¹¹⁹ If this identification would be correct, the estate would also be situated in Turopolje. But, it is wrong. As Juraj Ćuk correctly concluded, *Quinquinik* was placed west of Turopolje, between the spring of the stream Velika, the flow of the stream Kuklenjak and the Lomnica River, in the area between villages Starjak, Grančari and Kraljevec.¹²⁰ This location is confirmed by perambulations of some other estates, in which Giles' land was mentioned as one of the boundaries.¹²¹ Ćuk thought the estate was named by the stream Kuklenjak. The reading of the name could also be Crikvink/Crkvenik (a derivative of the word Crkva [Church]; the Church estate), although, the estate did not become the property of the Church of Zagreb.¹²²

Predium Selin was surely placed south of Novo Čiče, in the area of the present-day village Donje Podotočje. This is a lucky case because the perambulation, recorded in the charter by which King Andrew II confirmed Giles' his estates, is very clear and the landmarks are still visible today. According to it, the first boundary of the estate/land Želin started at the west at the spring called Zlatouzi [Golden mouth] next to the church of St. John the Baptist, then followed the flow of this spring up to the place where the flow divides into two parts. One part went to the south and there was the border and then the flow extended to the Odra River. By the river, it ran down to the east and came to the other flow of the Zlatousti spring and by that flow it came back at the beginning, at the spring.¹²³

¹¹⁹ Gajer, *Posjedi zagrebačkog kapotola*, p. 42, footnote 192; Klaić, *Povijest Zagreba*, p. 26; Georg Heller, *Comitatus Zagrabiensis A-L. (Veröffentlichungen des Finnisch-Ugrischen Seminars an der Universität München Series A, Bd. 11/1.)* München, 1980, p. 193, and in the recent articles, although noticing that the form of the name is not really clear: Danko Dujmović, "Otok svetog Jakova: prilog poznavanju srednjovjekovnoga kulturnog krajolika Zagreba" [The island of St. James: a contribution to our knowledge about medieval cultural landscape of Zagreb], *CCP* 78 (2016), pp. 40-41; Marko Jerković, "Lekenik u svjetlu najstarijih izvora: Jedna mikropovijesna studija" [Lekenik in the light of the oldest sources: A micro history study], in: *Lekenik 1217-2017*, ed. by Božidar Antolec, Stipica Grgić, p. 34.

¹²⁰ Ćuk, *Zagrebačka županija*, p. 134.


¹²¹ The text of the perambulation of *Quinquinik* from 1217 is: "The first boundary begins in *Quinquinik* and descend in the Lomnica, from there ascends in the river called Ses (*fluuium qui vocatur Ses*), from there ascends in the crossroad called Pomneu (*biuium quod dicitur Pomneu*), from there in the River Verica (*fluuium Wericam*), and from there ascends by a valley and comes back in Caluuz"; CD 3, doc.132, p.159. The borders of an estate of the Church of Zagreb called *terra Zomar* also from 1217 were: "The border starts at the River Wilca (*a fluuio Wlica*), from there ascends up all the way to the road Pomneu (*viam Pomneu*) and goes to the boundaries of *comes* Giles (*ad metam Egidii comitis*) and that way returns to the mentioned river."; CD 3, doc. 131, p. 153. So, the northern boundary of the estate Zomar would be the Giles' land. Besides this, *terra Somar* is also mentioned in the perambulation of the Hospitallers estates from the time of King Andrew II, placed in the area where Ćuk had placed it, CD 9, doc. 311, p. 379.

¹²² One more interesting ethnographic data should be mentioned, in the time when Ćuk's book was written (1941), the area east of Kupčina was still call Sambar by the local people (a bit changed version of the name Samar); Ćuk, *Zagrebačka županija*, p. 135.

¹²³ *Prima meta terre que vocatur Selin incipit ab occidentali plaga a fonte qui uocatur Zlatouszti iuxta ecclesia Iohannis Baptiste et descendit in fonte ipso usque ad diuisionem ipsius, una pars ipsius fontis tendit contra meridiionalem partem in qua predicta dirigitur meta, et tendit in alium riuum qui uocatur Odra, per illum*



Map 7-Selin (the 2nd Military survey)



Map 8-Selin (modern map)

descendit uersus orientalem partem et uenitur ad riuum secundum supradicti fontis Zlatousti et tendit in caput ipsius et ibi finitur. CD 3, doc. 132, p. 158.

The data, shown on the modern map (and even more clear on the 2nd military survey), reveal that *praedium Selin* was placed southeast of Novo Čiče (Maps 7 and 8). The dimensions of this area can be calculated: the length is approximately 1 km, the width is approximately 0.5 km, while the total surface is 0.93 square kilometres.

It seems that Giles' estates did not stay in his hands for long. King Andrew II issued another document the same year (1217), in which he confirmed to the Zagreb Church all the estates that given to it in the past. According to this charter, Giles put himself, his estates and people living on them (...*terres et populi in eis commorantibus...*) as well as all tax rights, (...*omnibus eorundem prouentibus in marturinis et in aliis...*) under the jurisdiction of the Church of Zagreb (*ad iurisdictionem ecclesie sepedicte in perpetuum pertinent*).¹²⁴ As noted by Radovan Gajer, he probably had some sort of a deal with the Church. Provost Ciriac requested the king to proclaim Giles as *serviens regis* and, in return, Giles became *praediales* of the Church of Zagreb.¹²⁵ I think that Gajer was right. *Prediales* were free people or nobles of the church. The name is derived from the word *praedium*. These were people who were managing *praedii* and their status was connected to their service to the church. The freedom or nobility was not general (not for the whole kingdom), but for an area, or a territory, and it is connected to the church. So, an individual received an estate for his service to the church under well-defined conditions and in a certain area. The freedom or nobility could have been transferred to the next generations as well.¹²⁶ It seems that, in this case, Giles was originally *serviens regis* so a *serviens* of the king (probably connected to the royal castle administration), and this position and his lands were confirmed by the king. But then, as a part of a deal, he became a "*serviens*" of the church, *predialis*, and his estates were acknowledged by the church as his *praedii*.

Gajer also noted that it seems that Želin, Ruča and *Quinquinik* were not estates of Zagreb's Church as they were not mentioned as such in other documents.¹²⁷ He did not discuss it any further. This opens a question: what happened with Giles' Želin? The problem can be partly solved again by looking at the map of the borders of Čičan from the time of King Andrew II and from 1328.¹²⁸


¹²⁴ CD 3, doc. 131, p. 156.

¹²⁵ Gajer, *Posjedi zagrebačkog kapotola*, p. 42.

¹²⁶ For *praediales* in general see: *praedialis nemes*, *egyházi nemes* [praedialis nobleman, freeman or nobleman of the church], <http://lexikon.katolikus.hu/E/egy%C3%A1lzi%20nemes.html>. For *prediales* of the Chapter of Zagreb, see: Gajer, *Posjedi zagrebačkog kapotola*, pp. 97-100.

¹²⁷ Gajer, *Posjedi zagrebačkog kapotola*, p. 42, footnote 192.

¹²⁸ CD 9, doc. 311, p. 378, doc. 316, p. 384.



Map 9-Staro Čiče, Novo Čiče and preadium Selyn

On the Map 9 are shown: the present-day cadastre borders of Staro Čiče and Novo Čiče, the location of Giles' Želin, and western and northern neighbouring estates of Čičan. The first thing that can be easily noticed is that Giles' Želin, so the first estate named Želin mentioned in the extant sources, was neither in the area of Staro Čiče nor of Novo Čiče, but within the contemporary cadastre borders of the village Donje Podotočje. The second thing that can be noticed is that the western border of Giles' estate is a stream called in the charter "the second stream of spring Zlatousti" (*rius secundus fontis Zlatousti*). That stream is today called Siget and on the military surveys Želin. I suppose that the same stream is mentioned as the river (*fluuius*) Sylena in the perambulation of borders of Čičan in 1328.¹²⁹

The parts of the perambulations of Čičan, important for this discussion, are shown in Plate 4.

¹²⁹ CD 9, doc. 316, p 384.

The 1 st charter	The 2 nd charter
by <i>aqua Odra</i> the boundary goes towards the east separating from the land of <i>comes</i> Peter son of Jurk (<i>terra comitis Petri filii Jurk</i>)	by <i>aqua Odra</i> the boundary goes towards the east sharing the boundaries with John son of Ivan (<i>cum Johanne filio Ivan</i>), going for a long distance exits where the River Sylena (<i>fluuius Sylena</i>) goes into the Odra (<i>Odra</i>) , where it shares boundary with Peter and Stephan, sons of Lukač, that once were of Peter son of Gurk (<i>metae Petri et Stephani filiis Lwkach, que condam fuit Petri filii Gwck</i>),
and that way goes to the first boundary.	from here it turns back to the west and comes to the first boundary where it finishes.

It was explained that *aqua Odra* can mean both the main flow of Odra, one of its meanders etc. The exact point where the boundary entered the Odra River or its meander could not have been specified. According to the 1st charter, from that place, Čičan was bordering with the estate of *comes* Peter son of Jurk on its southern side, along the Odra River and that way returned to the first border. Still, I suppose that the border must have left the Odra River in order to return to its starting point. The 1st charter simply does not use the terms north or south. This can be concluded because it is emphasized in the 2nd charter that: “[the border] exits where *fluuius Sylena* goes into *Odra*, where it shares boundary with Peter and Stephan, sons of Lukač, that once were of Peter son of Gurk, and from here it turns back to the west and comes to the first boundary where it finishes.”¹³⁰ So, in the place where the stream Siget enters Odra, Čičan bordered with the estate of sons of Lukač and before that, with the estates of *comes* Peter. This was the area of Donje Podotočje, so, the area of Giles’ Želin. As will be shown in the later chapters, Peter and Stephan sons of Lukač were direct descendants of *comes* Peter (see pages 240-243).

There are a couple of possibilities how *comes* Peter might have gotten this land from Giles. Giles could have sold Želin to the Chapter of Zagreb and, soon after, the Chapter sold it to *comes* Peter. Likewise, Giles might have not given this estate to the Chapter. In the charter in which is written that he put himself and his estates under the jurisdiction of the Church, the names of the estates were not written.¹³¹ He could have kept some of his estates as his private ownership, and after his family had died out, the estates became the property of the state or some nobleman. Also, he himself could have sold it to or was forced to give it some other owner (for example, his lands could have been confiscated). Finally, it is possible that, after Giles’ death, *comes* Peter inherited some of his estates because the two might have been blood-related.

¹³⁰ CD 9, doc. 316, p 384.

¹³¹ CD 3, doc. 131., p. 156.

It should be noticed here that, according to the perambulation of Kupčina from the time of King Andrew II, one of the neighbouring estates was also the estate of *comes* Peter. This estate was situated in the area of Giles' *Quinquinick*. In any case, the area of Giles' Želin was not a part of the Želin estate in the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth century. It will become that only in 1500.

At the end, few other data, from one of the two 1217 charters, important for spatial reconstruction, will be mentioned. In the same document by which Giles became a *predialis* of the Church, Želin is mentioned in perambulations of two other estates. First, the southern border of an unnamed estate, situated around the River Kosnica, and given to the Church by Ladislav, was the border of Želin (*metam Selin ubi sunt sex mete uersus meridiem*). This could be the area of the present-day villages Jagodno or Lazina Čička, north and east of Staro Čiče. Second, one of the borders of estate Blato was a road that leads to Želin (*via que ducit ad Zelin*). Today Blato is today part of Zagreb. It is situated in the western part of Turopolje, south of the Sava River, 18 km distant from the area of Novo Čiče and Podotočje. The data about the road do not reveal much about the position of Želin. Also, both perambulations do not reveal anything about the owner of the land. That fact alone does not mean much, because, although the perambulations sometimes contain these sorts of data, it is not always the case. Still, even on the basis of these scarce data, it can be concluded that already in 1217, the name Želin referred to a wider territory than the one of Giles' *praedium*.

4.2.1.2.2.1. Consideration of Juraj Čuk on the church of St. John the Baptist and its origin

The 1217 charter that contains perambulation of borders of Giles' Želin, is the first extant document in which the Church of St. John the Baptist (*ecclesia Iohannis Baptiste*) is mentioned. The church is also listed in the first list of parish churches, the *Statuta capituli Zagrabiensis*, written by Ivan Gorički in 1334, as *ecclesia sancti Iohannis baptiste de Selin*.¹³² The church still exists in Novo Čiče. It is placed some 200 meters from the stream Siget, in the past also called Želin, who springs from the spring called in the 1217 charter Zlatousti. A new primary school has been built near it. On the ground between the school and the stream, pieces of the medieval and prehistoric pottery appear, pointing at a possible archaeological site.¹³³

¹³² MNHC 1, doc. 51, p. 52.

¹³³ Field walking was done in April 2016. As the position of the church obviously did not move much from the medieval period, a medieval church cemetery could also be at this position.

Regarding the church and the spring, I would like to mention one interesting observation written by Juraj Ćuk: “In the area of the present-day Čiče...were our first Christian sanctuaries, in the field across the Sava River, but in the period of the first written sources they had been out of use for a long time...”.¹³⁴ He came to this conclusion on the basis of data from two charters.

In Ćuk’s opinion, the name of the spring Zlatousti, recorded in the 1217 charter, associates with “the other St. John...the saint of the eastern liturgy that was named after him”. So, according to Ćuk, the church in Novo Čiče was first dedicated to the “eastern” saint, St. John Chrysostom, and the liturgy served in it could only be in the Old-Slavonic. After that liturgy had been abandoned, the church had to change the patron saint and was named after the one with the closest name- St. John the Baptist. But, the old name was still reflected in the toponym-the name of the stream.¹³⁵


The other charter, on the basis of which, Ćuk made his conclusions about the earliest sanctuaries, was issued in 1267. It contains a perambulation of the land/estate Končan (*terra Conchan*). In the medieval period this area was also called Otok, an island. The land was situated between the rivers Odra and Obdina, in the territory of the present-day villages Kuče and Podotočje, 2-3 kilometres east of the church of St. John the Baptist. Location of Kuče and Podotočje is shown on Map 10. One of the borders of this land was a foundation called Crkvišće, located near the Odra river (*quoddam fundamentum uocatum Circuische*).¹³⁶ The name Crkvišće is derived from the Croatian (Slavic) word crkva, a church. So, this church was obviously abandoned a long time before the thirteenth century, only its ruins remained. At the end, Ćuk concludes: “It is striking that these churches were placed on the islands or among them. The places were strategically chosen so they could be protected as much as possible. There must had been some bigger settlement around them...” This area is still today called Podotočje.¹³⁷

¹³⁴ Ćuk, *Zagrebačka županija*, p. 139.

¹³⁵ Ćuk, *Zagrebačka županija*, pp. 139-140.

¹³⁶ MHNC 1, doc. 20, p. 22.

¹³⁷ Ćuk, *Zagrebačka županija*, pp. 139-140.



Map 10-Kuče and Podotočje

Ćuk's assumptions are, of course, questionable. The name of the spring Zlatousti is indeed very interesting. My first assumption was that the reason of giving such a name to the spring is because it was producing an abundance of water. However, there is one other interpretation that could be more likely. The name might indicate that the stream contained a golden ore or some ore that appeared to the contemporary people as a gold. Even in case that it was actually a proper golden ore it could be one of lower quality, like the one that has been collected in the Drava River for centuries.¹³⁸ There has never been any mentioning of gold in the Turopolje region. Also, I did not find any such or similar toponym in the other charters or on the maps. There are few similar toponyms in Hungary though. A stream called "Aranyosi" [Golden] ditch in Somogy County indeed contain a lot of bog iron ores.¹³⁹ If this was also the case with the stream Želin (Siget) can only be established with a geological analysis.

¹³⁸ Dragutin Feletar, "Zlatari i splavari na Dravi," *Podravski zbornik* 2 (1976), pp. 116-131; Vladimir Bermanec – Ladislav Palinkaš – Marin Šouftek – Vladimir Zebec, "Zlato u Dravi i Muri – geološka geneza i mineraloška analiza" [Gold in the Drava and Mura rivers - geological genesis and mineralogical analysis], *Podravina* 13 (2014), pp. 7-18.

¹³⁹ I thank for this information to an archeometallurgist Adam Thiele, who noticed this in his field surveys.

The ruin Crkvišće, on the other hand, could have been a remain of an old church, but it could also have been a remain of some other stone building which appeared as a ruin of a church to the people who gave name to this place. In the Turopolje area, houses were primarily built of wood. As one fourteenth century source testifies, the church of St. Peter in Petrovina was built of stone.¹⁴⁰ It is not known out of which material the other churches were built in the period of the thirteenth and fourteenth century and prior to it. Perhaps churches were built of stone. In that case, people could have connected the stone building with a church although the building could have been, for example, a Roman *villa rustica* (made of stones).

Still, with all that in mind, the observations of Juraj Ćuk open some important questions that were never properly discussed in the scholarly literature: when was the area Christianised (for the first time) and by whom? Where were the first churches? Was there a glagolitic liturgy here? Glagolitic priests are recorded in the list of parish churches from 1501 in more parish churches in Turopolje.¹⁴¹ This was usually connected with the arrival of new population from the south because of the Ottoman wars. Without concrete proofs about the earlier usage of glagolitic script or liturgy, this remains the only likely explanation in this moment. Still, the possible usage of the Glagolitic liturgy in the Middle Ages is the question for more detailed research. In that respect, Ćuk's observations are worth of noticing.


4.2.1.2.3. *Selyn – terra domini bani*

After the 1217 charters, next extant documents that mention Želin date from the 1260s. The first charter from this period that most probably refers to Želin dates from 1260, so 42 years later than the documents discussed above. This is a purchase contract between *comes* Miroslav from Zagreb and three men: Vukota and Vukoslav, sons of *Iurgis*, and Obrad, son of *Iurenk*, made in front of Tiburcius, *comes* of Zagreb. Miroslav bought some land from Vukota, Vukoslav and Obrad. The land was situated between between some other 22 veretens of the land that was in pledge and the land of *Raduhna* on the other side; also one side of the land starts from the Odra River and through the plain goes to the land of ban (*ad terram domini*

¹⁴⁰ MHCZ, doc. 385.

¹⁴¹ There is also a very interesting article about the sixteenth century glagolitic note book that was written by a priest from Ščitajevo: Zoran Ladić – Goran Budeč, "Glagoljska bilježnica šćitarjevskog župnika od 1524.do 1526. godine. Prilog proučavanju crkvenog i seoskog života u zagrebačkoj okolini u ranom novom vijeku" [The Glagolithic notebook of the parish priest of Ščitajevo from 1524 to 1526. A contribution to the research of the ecclesiastical and rural life in the surroundings of Zagreb in the early modern age], *Zbornik Odsjeka za povijesne znanosti Zavoda za povijesne i društvene znanosti Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 29 (2011), pp. 149-189.

bani).¹⁴² The borders of the land written in these charter could only be understood when the analysis of toponyms of the wider area owned by the castle warriors of Turopolje was done. This is explained in detail in a sub-chapter *Hrašće* (see pages 265-266). In short, the land was situated in the western part of Turopolje, in the territory of the present-day village Hrašće. As will be seen, the fourteenth-century data confirm that one part of this territory belonged to the Želin estate, dislocated from the main territory. Thus, in this case, *terra domini bani* is a land of Želin, placed in the territory of Hrašće.



Map 11-Rakarje, Novo Čiče and the Želin stream on the 2nd Military survey

Similar, but more specific, formulation is used in one other purchase contract from 1278. That year, comes Ivan, son of *Minizlay*, bought from Andrew and his brother Ivan, sons of *Zloyna*, and Ivan son of *Vloyna* two parts of their land called *Rakarje* (*particulas terre ipsorum Rakarya vocate*). One border of the lands was situated near the land called Želin which was the property of Ban N. (*iuxta terram domini N. bani Selyn nuncupatam*).¹⁴³ N. is Ban Nicolas of the Gut-Keled kindred. *Terra Rakarya* is placed in the territory of the village of Rakarje, once a village of the castle warriors of Turopolje and today a part of Velika Gorica. So, this charter refers to the northern border of the Želin estate, placed north of Novo Čiče. The position of

¹⁴² MHNC 1, doc. 13, p. 17.

¹⁴³ MHNC 1, doc. 29, p. 32.

Rakarje in relation to the area of Novo Čiče and the Želin stream is shown on the 2nd military survey (Map 11).

These data from the 1260s are the first data that inform of Želin as a property of bans of Slavonia. Only the two above mentioned charters give information about the spreading of the estate in this period. On the basis of that, it can be concluded that the area of the present-day Novo Čiče or perhaps of Lazina Čička (this village is situated north of Novo Čiče) was called Želin. Likewise, it can be concluded that a part of the Želin estate was situated in the area of the present-day Hrašće. Other thirteenth century charters do not contain any landmarks, but they do contain data about the use of space within the borders of the estate as well as information about a social structure of the estate.

Želin was not some property that bans just nominally owned: they were staying in Želin occasionally, presiding courts and issuing documents. In 1265, Ban Roland confirmed a purchase contract about a sale of the land called *Herchen*, that had previously been issued by the Chapter of Zagreb.¹⁴⁴ In 1270, Ban Henrik II of the Kőszegi kindred settled a dispute about the tithe that occurred between the settlers (*hospites*) of Petrinja and the Chapter of Zagreb. The first ones were not paying the tithe to the Chapter. Ban Henrik ordered them to do it. The settlers promised that they will.¹⁴⁵

These documents were signed: ...*datum in Selyn*... and ...*datum et actum in Selen*...¹⁴⁶ The Želin castle is not mentioned. Likewise, the castle is not mentioned in the documents from 1260 and 1278 in which Želin was mentioned as a border of the lands in Hrašće and Rakarje. In both cases, it was labelled as the land/estate (*terra*) of Ban.¹⁴⁷ Since bans were staying in Želin and held courts there, they could have had some building or *curia* in some settlement or perhaps near it. There is not any reference on it in the charters, so only assumptions can be offered. I think that bans did not stay in the castle, because if the documents had been issued there, it would most probably be mentioned. This leads to the conclusion that the castle was not built until 1278. Still, I did not find enough contemporary documents issued by bans in castles to claim that, as a rule, these documents would be signed: *in castro*. This, by itself, is not sufficient argument, but, as will soon be shown, there is one additional charter that confirms that the Želin castle was certainly not built at least until 1293.

¹⁴⁴ MHNC 1, doc. 15-16, pp. 18-19.

¹⁴⁵ CD 5, doc. 987, pp. 525-526.

¹⁴⁶ MHNC 1, doc. 16, p. 19; CD 5, doc. 987, pp. 525-526.

¹⁴⁷ MHNC 1, doc. 13, p. 17, doc. 29, p. 32.

Finally, one document from the 1260s should be mentioned at the end. In 1267, the above-mentioned Ban Roland presided a court in Zagreb and settled a dispute between people, settlers from Želin (...*populos seu hospites in Selin ad banatum pertinentes*....) and the Church of Zagreb. Petrus Pulcher, the Dean of the Church, complained that the settlers are paying the tithe in money instead in natural products as they had before. The dean as well as Peter, the Archdeacon of Zagreb, the other Peter, the Provost of Čazma and Benedict, the Provost of Gerche, were ready to give an oath that the traditional way of paying tithe was paying in natural products. But, the settlers from Želin said that it was unnecessary, and they promised to pay in natural products in the future.¹⁴⁸

The mentioning of the settlers (*populus seu hospites*) is important for understanding the process of development of the settlement system in the area in the second half of the thirteenth century. This data reveals that new population was invited to settle and to populate and colonize a land. As the area of Želin was (as will soon be shown) big and probably not densely inhabited and so not really used for agriculture, people were invited to settle here under the favourable conditions. In this way, a big land (*terra*) started to have a better value. In the period of the second half of the thirteenth century, a value of a land was not simply connected to a quality and a size of a land, but also to people living and working on it. Thus, bans (just as kings in other areas) invited settlers that could have come from some other areas of the kingdom and they had colonized the land. This often led to disputes with church authorities, as the *hospites* population usually had privileges of which some concerned a paying their church duties.

There is no perambulation that could help with placing a village where the settlers lived precisely in the environment. It could be in the area of Novo Čiče but it could also be in the area of some other villages for which later will become clear that they were parts of the Želin estate. On the other hand, maybe there could have been few smaller villages in the territory of Želin and the charter refers to all of them.

4.2.1.2.4. Comes Ivan of Okić in Želin¹⁴⁹

The next extant document issued in Želin dates from 1281. It is a donation charter by which *comes* Ivan of Okić donated half of his revenues from *portae* and the market of Samobor

¹⁴⁸ CD 5, doc. 900, p. 429.

¹⁴⁹ The English version of the name Ivan is John and so is of the name Iohannes (the Latin version). In the charters connected with the family of comes *Ivan*, names *Ivan* and *Ionannes* appear (in most cases) as two different names. *Comes* Ivan is in most documents called Ivan while his sons were called Ivan and *Iohannes* (two different people). So, I will use the name Ivan for the people called *Ivan* and John for the ones called *Iohannes*.

to the Cistercians of the abbey of St. Jacob (located on Giles' island) for the reparation of the church of St. Helen next to Samobor and the support of the priests staying there. Ivan did so for the salvation of his soul and the souls of his posterity. This charter also does not mention any castle (...*datum in Selin*...).¹⁵⁰

Comes Ivan of Okić was not a ban so it can be asked: why he issued a charter in Želin? As him, his family and their estates are generally important for the interpretation of the environment around the archaeological site of Okuje, both the history of the family and the exact location of their lands (in Turopolje) will be discussed in more detail in this and the following chapters. According to some authors, the presence of *comes* Ivan in Želin in 1281 is a proof that, at that time, Želin was his property. Later, together with the rest of his estates, it got into the hands of the Babonić family. The royal donation charter by which Radoslav Babonić got Želin in 1293 just confirmed the already existing state.¹⁵¹ Prior to the donation, the Babonić family had already owned Želin as well as the other estates of *comes* Ivan of Okić.¹⁵² This is possible. Ivan was a big landowner at the western part of Zagreb County, in the area west of Turopolje. By 1281, his estates had been desolated in wars between the armies of King Otakar II of Bohemia and the kings of Hungary-Croatia. The estates of *comes* Ivan were in the war-zone and he was the one leading the resistance.¹⁵³ So, the king might have given him Želin as a reward for his services. It is, however, also possible that, because his estates had been devastated, he was just temporarily staying in Želin, which was under the jurisdiction of the ban of Slavonia. Besides that, one more option could be taken into consideration. Ivan could have owned a land called Želin, but perhaps not the same Želin as the one of the ban. It has already been concluded that, originally, the name Želin referred to a wider territory and not just to the land that will later be part of the Želin estate. Thus, the question could be asked: in which Želin Ivan of Okić issued the charter in 1281?

The certain answer to the question cannot be given as Ivan's charter from 1281 is the only extant testimony of his stay in Želin. Still, it should be noticed that it seems that Ivan's

¹⁵⁰ CD 6, doc. 341, p. 403.

¹⁵¹ CD 7, doc. 113, p. 134.

¹⁵² Ćuk writes that, after Ban Nikola (Gut-Keled), the Želin estate was separated into several parts and *comes* Ivan got the central part, around Petrovina. Ćuk, *Zagrebačka županija*, p. 141. Hrvoje Kekez concluded, on the basis of the above mentioned document issued by Ivan in 1281, that Želin was the estate of *comes* Ivan in 1281 and later came into the hands of the Babonići, together with his other estates. Hrvoje Kekez, *Pod znamenjem propetog lava. Povijest knezova Babonića do kraja 14. stoljeća* [Under the sign of upstanding lion: history of the counts of Babonići to the end of fourteenth century] (Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2016), p. 349. Nada Klaić also supposed that it was possible that the Babonići took over both Brezovica and Želin. Klaić, *Povijest Zagreba*, p. 65.

¹⁵³ Klaić, *Povijest Zagreba*, p. 63.

family owned a land in Turopolje (according to some other sources). Again, the data from the perambulations of the Hospitallers' estate Čičan, from the time of King Andrew II and from 1328, should be discussed. The northern, eastern and southern neighbours of Čičan are shown on Map 12.

The lands that had been placed south of Čičan, in the area of the present-day Vukovina, are important for the topic here. In the time of King Andrew II, the southern neighbour was *Janzlo*, and in 1328, John son of Ivan. Juraj Ćuk interpreted the word *Janzlo* as a personal name Jaroslav, so this would be a land of a person called Jaroslav.¹⁵⁴ I suppose this interpretation can be questioned from the linguistic point of view. But, as far as historical data are concerned, it can be stated with certainty that *comes* Ivan was a son of Jaroslav (*Ivan comes de Oclich, filius Irizlai*).¹⁵⁵ Also, John son of Ivan (*Johannes fillius Ivan*), whose land is mentioned as the bordering land in 1328, was, without doubt, a son of *comes* Ivan and a grandson of Jaroslav. Therefore, I suppose Juraj Ćuk was right and the family of *comes* Ivan had their hereditary estates in this area, at least from the time of Jaroslav (which is the period when the first written sources about Turopolje appear). A hundred years later, in the first quarter of the fourteenth century, the descendants of Jaroslav were still holding the estates that he had owned in the first quarter of the thirteenth century as was the case with the land of *comes* Peter and his descendants, sons of Lukač. But, even if this was not so, the son of *comes* Ivan was the owner of the land south of Staro Čiče. Thus, the family of Ivan owned the land in the area, that John son of Ivan either bought or inherited from his father and grandfather. I suppose the second solution is more likely.

According to the perambulation recorded in the 1st charter, the land placed north of Čičan, in the area of the present-day Novo Čiče, was *terra Okych*. As Ivan was a *comes* of Okić, the association is obvious. However, I have not found any data that could connect the land Okić with *comes* Ivan or his father Jaroslav in the time of King Andrew II. According to the extant sources, Ivan was first mentioned as a *comes* of Okić only in 1280. This is important to emphasize as in most of the previous literature both Ivan and his father Jaroslav were called counts of Okić.¹⁵⁶ Data from the extant charters, however, do not point to this conclusion.

¹⁵⁴ Ćuk, *Zagrebačka županija*, p. 42.

¹⁵⁵ CD 6, doc. 341, p. 403.

¹⁵⁶ For example: Kekez, *Pod znamenjem propetog lava*, p. 327. I have also named Ivan as *comes* of Okić in two articles. Antić, "Late medieval village", p. 83.; Antić-Lyublyanovics, "Prilog proučavanju gospodarstva", p. 29. Since I was referring to event when Ivan and his relatives occupied the wood of the castle warriors in 1249, this is wrong, because in 1249 Ivan was not *comes* of Okić. He is also not called *comes* in that charter but simply Ivan son of Jaroslav (*Ivan filius Irozlai*). MHNC 1, doc. 6, p. 9.



Map 12-Neighbours of Čičan

There are five extant charters from the first half of the thirteenth century in which Jaroslav is mentioned. According to the perambulation from 1217, a land of Jaroslav (*terra Jaroslay*) was a bordering land of the estates of the Chapter of Zagreb called Blato (*terra Blata*) and Otok (*terra Insula*).¹⁵⁷ This land can be placed in the area around Brezovica (the village on the western edge of Turopolje), where the descendants of Jaroslav owned lands in the following centuries. Two other charters mention Jaroslav as a witness of a purchase (in 1228¹⁵⁸) and a *pristaldus* (in 1230¹⁵⁹). In these documents, he is called simply Jaroslav (*Jarozlaus*, *Yarescleau*). In 1234, he (*Jarozlaus*) was among the noble judges at the trail over the land Mosečajna; in this case, he was listed among *nobiles terre*.¹⁶⁰ The last charter in which his name is recorded dates from February 1243; Jaroslav (*Jarozlaus*) was one of many distinguished witnesses of the peace treaty made between the citizens of Senj and the Babonići. He was listed among *nobiles ultra Gozd*.¹⁶¹ Thus, the high position that Jaroslav had among the

¹⁵⁷ CD 3, doc. 131, p. 154, 156; Ćuk, *Zagrebačka županija*, p. 49.

¹⁵⁸ MHNC 1, doc 2, p. 5; Ćuk, *Zagrebačka županija*, p. 49.

¹⁵⁹ CD 3, doc. 294, p. 335; Ćuk, *Zagrebačka županija*, p. 49.

¹⁶⁰ MHNC 1, doc 3, p. 6; Ćuk, *Zagrebačka županija*, p. 49.

¹⁶¹ CD 4, doc. 162, p. 181; Ćuk, *Zagrebačka županija*, p. 49; Klaić, *Povijest Zagreba*, p. 63.

nobles of Slavonia can be recognized on the basis of the data from the charters. At the same time, it is also clear that none of the charters connects Jaroslav with Okić.

The first extant charters in which Jaroslav's son Ivan is mentioned were issued by Ban Stephan in 1249 when he returned the communal wood to the castle warriors of Turopolje and the estate (*terra*) Odra to the sons of Kurilo. Odra had been occupied by Ivan, while the wood had been used by him and his relatives without a permission of the castle warriors. In both charters, Ivan is called Ivan son of Jaroslav (*Ivan filius Irozlai, Ioan filius Iruzlay*).¹⁶² Two years later, King Bela IV gave Ivan the castle (*castrum*) Bregana and a large portion of a land (from Bregana to the Sava), without which the maintenance of the castle would not be possible. The land itself had been exempted from the jurisdiction of the castle Okić (*exemptam a castro de Oclinch*). This was king's reward to Ivan for building the castle Lipovac on his own expense. The castle served "on the honour and the comfort of the Kingdom (*ad honorem et confortacionem regni*)". In this charter, the king called Ivan *comes* (*dilectus et fidelis noster Ivan comes filius Irislai*).¹⁶³ Probably, the facts that the land given with the castle Bregana had previously belonged to the castle of Okić and that Ivan was addressed by King Bela as *comes*, led the authors to conclude that Ivan was *comes* of Okić. But, this is not what was actually written in the charter. In the thirteenth century, *comes* does signify a person of high rank and perhaps that person had been *comes* of some castle district at one point. Nevertheless, it cannot be concluded that someone was, for example, *comes* of some specific county/castle district, unless it is specified so in a text. There are twelve extant charters, issued in the period between 1251 and 1280, that mention Ivan as Ivan son of Jaroslav¹⁶⁴ or *comes* Ivan son of Jaroslav.¹⁶⁵ As was the case with his father, Ivan's high position among Slavonian nobility is unquestionable; in some of these charters he was listed among the *nobiles regni*.¹⁶⁶ However, in none of these charters he is called *comes* of Okić.

Even more, one other person can be identified as *comes* of Okić in that period. One charter issued by King Ladislaus in 1275 reported about the armies the king had sent in the

¹⁶² MHNC 1, docs. 5 and 6, pp. 8-9.

¹⁶³ CD 4, doc. 382, p. 442.

¹⁶⁴ In 1257 he is called simply *Johannes filius Yrozlay*, but it should be noted that the text of the charter in which he is mentioned refers to the past event, prior to 1257; Ivan had sold his portion of the land on the Giles' island (*insula Egidii*) to Peter, archdeacon of Zagreb; CD 5, doc. 584, p. 64. The other charters were issued in 1259; CD 5, doc. 653, p. 144, in 1261; CD 5, doc. 711, p. 206; in 1262, CD 5, doc. 733, p. 229.

¹⁶⁵ In 1266, CD 5, doc. 873, p. 395; in 1267, CD 5, doc. 902, p. 431; in 1270, CD 5, doc. 2, p. 543, MHEZ 1, doc. 144, p. 154; in 1271, CD 5, doc. 52, p. 602; in 1274, CD 6, doc. 86, p. 99; in 1277, MHEZ 1, doc. 187, p. 187; MHEZ 1, doc. 204, p. 187.

¹⁶⁶ In 1261, CD 5, doc. 711, p. 206; in 1262, CD 5, doc. 733, p. 229; in 1270, CD 5, doc. 52, p. 602.

Kingdom of the Czech king. The year when the campaign had happened is not specified in the charter. It can, however, be approximately determined on the basis of some other data that are recorded. The armies had been led by Joachim, Magister of the treasury, Matthew, Vojvoda of Transilvania, who was at that time Ban [at the time he had been leading the army], John and Nicholas Gut-Keled as well as Denis, Master of queen's treasury and *comes* of Zala, who was at that time [he was leading the armies] *comes* of Okić (*de Okluch*).¹⁶⁷ Thus, the campaign happened in the period when Matthew was a ban of Slavonia and Dennis *comes* of Okić. Matthew Čak was Ban in 1272-1273 (until 23rd of May that year, when Henrik Gut-Keled is mentioned as Ban¹⁶⁸), so in that period Denis was the *comes*. In 1274, Denis also became Palatine and still was *comes* of Okić (*Dyonisius palatinus comes de Oclych iudex Comanorum*).¹⁶⁹ As can be seen by the charter issued by King Ladislaus in 1275, that year he was not the *comes* of Okić.

The first charter in which Ivan is signed as the *comes* of Okić was issued by him personally in Zagreb in 1280. Actually, Ivan issued two charters that year (the charters do not contain a date of issuing, only the year). By the first, in which he was signed as *Ivan comes filius Irizlay*, he donated part of his hereditary land Brezovica (*terra nostra hereditaria Brezoicha vocata*) together with one vineyard in Čučerje to the Cistercians' of the Church of St. Jacob situated in Otok (*insula prope Zagabria*), wishing that a convent will be built on this land.¹⁷⁰ By the second charter, in which he is signed as *Iuan comes, filius Irizlai, comes de Okluch*, he donated to the Cistercians of the church of St. Mary that was placed in Brezovica, some land in Samobor, situated next to the church of St. Helen.¹⁷¹

Hence, the only two charters that confirm that Ivan son of Jaroslav was the *comes* of Okić date from 1280 and 1281 (the first one is the above mentioned and the second one is the charter issued in Želin). This title could have been a reward of the king for the effort Ivan had put in defending the western part of the county that had been occupied by the Czech army. In 1274, the king gave Ivan the town of Samobor (*villa Samobor*), the revenue from *portae* as well as the castle that had been erected by the Czechs (*Bohemia regis homines*) and recaptured by

¹⁶⁷ CD 6, doc. 100, p. 114; Ćuk, *Zagrebačka županija*, p. 132.

¹⁶⁸ Klaić, *Povijest Hrvata* 1, p. 252.

¹⁶⁹ CD 6, doc. 58, p. 65.

¹⁷⁰ MHEZ 1, doc. 204, p. 205. According to the charter issued by Ivan in 1277, he had already then donated to the Cistercians the Church of St. Helen in Samobor and some land next to it, the mill and the land for dwelling units and three vineyards as well as his chapel in Brezovica and the land and the vineyard in Čučerje. His wish was also to build a monastery on the place of the chapel. MHEZ 1, doc. 187, p. 187.

¹⁷¹ MHEZ 1, doc. 205, p. 206.

Ivan. The king described Ivan (*comes Ivan filius Irizlay*) as a capable soldier who made a lot of effort in the fights against the Bohemian army as well as the Mongols.¹⁷² In any case, in 1283 Ivan was no longer *comes* of Okić; that year he sold the castle Lipovac and the other estates to Radoslav Babonić. In the purchase contract, he is called again *comes Ivan filius Jarozlau*.¹⁷³

Therefore, I think that *terra Okych*, a land placed in the territory of Novo Čiče in the time of King Andrew II, cannot relate to Ivan or his father Jaroslav. Nevertheless, the name does point to the conclusion that the land belonged to Okić and it can be assumed that it was not a personal name. Okić was first mentioned in 1182, when Kalan, Bishop of Pecs ordered that Dominic, Bishop of Zagreb should receive a tithe from different goods collected for princes of Slavonia (*ad ducats cellaria congregantur*) from the places (*loci*) Krapina, Okić and Podgorja (*Krapina, Okich et Pogoria*).¹⁷⁴ The castle of Okić is first time mentioned in 1242 when King Bela IV gave privileges to Samobor (*Zumbur prope castrum Oclych existentes*).¹⁷⁵ Thus, Okić was some sort of special territorial organization, I suppose a castle district (*županat, várispánság*). This can be confirmed by data written in the purchase contract by which *comes* Ivan and his juvenile son Ivan (*in tenera estate*) sold the castle Lipovac and the belonging estates to Radoslav Babonić. Among the neighbours present were *iobagiones castri de Oclich*.¹⁷⁶

Perhaps it can be assumed that *terra Okych* was an estate under the jurisdiction of the Okić castle, placed in Turopolje. By 1328, the same land became the land of the Želin castle (*terra castri Selyn*). Actually, as shown in the previous text, already by 1278, the area of Novo Čiče became the land of ban called Želin (a border of Rakarje was *iuxta terram domini N. bani Selyn nuncupatam*).¹⁷⁷ As both Okić and Želin were the state estates, the change in ownership (*terra Okych* became *terra Selyn*) might had something to do with a reorganization of the state estates. Perhaps even, the area of Želin had been under the jurisdiction of the castle Okić and then put under the jurisdiction of the castle of Zagreb, as a separate territorial unit called Želin. As will soon be shown, when, in 1293, the king gave Želin to Radoslav Babonić, he had exempted it from the jurisdiction of the Zagreb castle (*et Selyn terra seu possessione castri nostri Zagrabiensis*).¹⁷⁸ For now, these are just assumptions. The relatively scarce thirteenth-

¹⁷² CD 6, doc. 86, p. 99.

¹⁷³ CD 6, doc. 379, pp. 448-451.

¹⁷⁴ CD 2, doc. 224, p. 260; Ćuk, *Zagrebačka županija*, p. 132.

¹⁷⁵ CD 4, doc. 149, p. 164; Ćuk, *Zagrebačka županija*, p. 132.

¹⁷⁶ CD 6, doc. 379, pp. 448-451.

¹⁷⁷ MHNC 1, doc. 29, p. 32.

¹⁷⁸ CD 7, doc. 128, p. 177.

century data do not permit firmer conclusions at this state of research, but, a mapping of toponyms in the wider area of Zagreb County could give some new insights into a problematic of territorial spreading of certain castle districts in the thirteenth century.¹⁷⁹

Finally, two archaeological artefacts will be mentioned here as they could be connected with the wars with the Czechs army and perhaps even with the presence of *comes* Ivan in Turopolje. These are two knives discovered during the archaeological excavations at the site Kobilić 1, dated in the thirteenth/fourteenth century. Both were found in the same pit. The first is the pattern-welded knife that is, so far, the unique such find in the territory of the medieval Slavonia (Photo 1). The closest production centres of pattern-welded knives, in the thirteenth-fourteenth century, were in Bohemia. The second knife was made of a single piece of steel, which is rare in the thirteenth century, and also is a product of an excellent functional quality. The length of its blade is 183 mm, so, it might have been used as a war knife.

The site Kobilić 1 was situated in the area of the present-day village Kobilić. The village was placed along the northern border of the Želin estate. The thirteenth-century charters that concern the area where the site was excavated are scarce, but, since in the later centuries this was the area under the jurisdiction of the Noble community of Turopolje, it can be assumed that it was also the property of the castle warriors in the thirteenth century.¹⁸⁰ How the knives, primarily the pattern welded knife, ended up in Turopolje cannot be explained with certainty. It could be, for example, that it had been acquired by a purchase. But, since it could be of Bohemian origin, it was perhaps connected with the above-mentioned wars and the occupation of the area of Samobor by the Bohemian army. The area was liberated by *comes* Ivan whose presence in Želin, as shown, was testified in 1281. Besides him, the castle warriors of Turopolje, as the king's soldiers, participated in these fights and might had acquired the knife as a war booty from the Bohemian soldiers.¹⁸¹

¹⁷⁹ Some other toponyms recorded in the perambulation of Čičan should be mentioned in this context. They are similar to the toponyms mentioned in the perambulation of Kupčina (the estate of the preceptory west of Turopolje). Kupčina partly bordered with lands of the Okić castle in 1328. For example, the streams called Brezovica were boundaries of both Čičan and Kupčina. The land of the sons of Pycenta that had become *terra Culpchyn* was the boundary of Čičan while the streams *Pezaryewo* and *Kwpnyk* were the boundaries of Kupčina. This was also noticed by Čuk, see: Čuk, *Zagrebačka županija*, pp. 42-43.

¹⁸⁰ See: Antić – Ákos Rácz, "Selected medieval finds," pp. 256-258.

¹⁸¹ More about this see in: Ádám Thiele, Jiří Hošek, Nikolina Antić, Tibor Ákos Rácz, "Metallographic examination of two medieval knives from Kobilić (Republic of Croatia)," *Materials and Manufacturing Processes* (in press), link: <http://www.tanMNL.com/doi/full/10.1080/10426914.2016.123282>.



Photo 1-Pattern welded knife from Kobilić 1 (photo by Borko Rožanković)

4.2.1.2.5. *Želin and the Babonić family*

Between 1293 and 1327(?), Želin was a property of the Babonić family. In the last period of rule of the Árpád dynasty, the Babonići were the most powerful aristocratic family in this part of the medieval Slavonia. Želin was only a part of their vast estates. At the peak of their power, at the end of the thirteenth century, these estates were stretching from the Sava River on the north, the Kapela mountain on the south, the Vrbas River on the east and the Kupa River on the west.¹⁸²

The first Babonić who got Želin was Ban Radoslav. He was rewarded for helping Tomasina Morosini, the mother of King Andrew III, to arrive safely from Dalmatia to Hungary, in 1291. A man named Ugrin had been sent to secure Thomasina, but he was attacked and captured somewhere in Slavonia. Ban Radoslav freed Ugrin. In the battles he lost five of his men and one of his relatives. After that, he escorted Tomasina to Hungary, all on his own expense.¹⁸³ On the eleventh of July 1293, King Andrew III issued a charter by which he awarded Radoslav with Želin, to compensate his costs.¹⁸⁴ So, even before this event, Ban Radoslav Babonić had controlled Želin as the land of the king. After the donation, Želin became

¹⁸² Hrvoje Kekez, "Između dva kralja: plemićki rod Babonića u vrijeme promjene na ugarsko-hrvatskom prijestolju od 1290. do 1309. godine" [Between two kings: the Babonić family in the period of dynastic succession on the Croatian and Hungarian throne, 1290–1310], *Povijesni prilozi* 35, p. 63.

¹⁸³ Mladen Ančić, *Putanja klatna. Ugarsko-Hrvatsko Kraljevstvo i Bosna u XIV. stoljeću* [Swing of the Pendulum. Hungarian-Croatian Kingdom and Bosnia in the fourteenth century] (Zadar – Mostor: Zavod za povijesne znanosti Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti, 1997), pp. 83-84; Kekez, *Između dva kralja*, pp. 72-73.

¹⁸⁴ CD 7, doc. 128.

a private, hereditary land of the Babonić family. In that way, the land that was originally the (royal) land of the Zagreb castle, became a land of a lord.

4.2.1.2.5.1. *Building of the castle*

In some of the previous literature is written that the king gave Radoslav Babonić the estate and the castle Želin. This, however, cannot be concluded on the basis of text written in the donation charter. According to it, the king gave Radoslav the land or the estate Želin. Prior to the donation, the estate was under the jurisdiction of the Zagreb castle: “....*et prefatam terram seu possessionem castri nostri Zagrabiensis Selyn vocatam, memorato Raduozlao bano dilecto et fideli nostro et per eum suis heredibus....dedimus, donavimus et contulimus iure perpetuo possidendam...*”.¹⁸⁵

So, the castle is again not mentioned. I think that, in this case, it would certainly be mentioned, if it had existed.¹⁸⁶ *Prefata terra seu possessio* clearly means that Radoslav Babonić got the estate. The same year, about three months later (on the 27th of September 1293), the Chapter of Zagreb confirmed that Radoslav Babonić got Želin as well as some other estates. In this charter it is written that King Andrew III gave to Radoslav: “.....*possessiones seu terras Vrbas, Galas, Petrina, Vynodol, Selen, Oclich, Podgoria et Zamobor nuncupatas cum castris in eisdem constitutis....*”.¹⁸⁷ This, however, also does not mean that all of these estates had castles, for example, Petrinja did not have it. So, this document also cannot be a proof of an existence of a castle in Želin prior to the period the estate became the property of the Babonić family.

¹⁸⁵ CD 7, doc. 128, p. 177.

¹⁸⁶ Smičiklas mentioned the castle in the *regesta* in front of the document (the donation charter), CD 7, doc. 128. Kekez writes that Radoslav Babonić got both the estate and the castle Želin, quoting the expression *terram seu possessionem castri seu comitatus Zagrabiensis* at the beginning of the charter, Kekez, *Pod znamenjem propetog lava*, p. 97, *Između dva kralja*, p. 73. Although, along with the original source, he quotes Mladen Ančić as the source for this data, Ančić wrote just that Radoslav got the estate Želin, without mentioning the castle, Ančić, *Putanja klatna*, pp. 83-84. The above quoted words refer to the land or estate called Želin that belongs to the castle or the County of Zagreb. Even more, the castle of Zagreb is also mentioned further in the document as the “owner” of Želin: “*et prefatam terram seu possessionem castri nostri Zagrabiensis Selyn vocatam*” and, of that moment, as an “ex-owner”: “*a iurisdictione, potestate, dicti castri seu comitatus Zagrabiensis exceptam penitus et exemptam*”, CD 7, doc. 128. Nada Klaić, on the other hand, wrote that the fort is: “... Želin, the old Čiče [Klaić used the word old in a form of an adjective, not as the full name of the village-Staro Čiče] of the Templars, that when the Order was abolished, was not returned to the Church but governed by bans or directly kings”, Klaić, *Povijest Zagreba*, p. 122. This is also incorrect. This is the confusion caused probably by the mentioned similarity of the names of Staro and Novo Čiče. As shown, there was a fort in Staro Čiče but it was burned down in 1293 and it is not identical with Želin (see the chapters about Staro Čiče). However, Nada Klaić later mentioned Želin in her monography about Medvedgrad. She again wrote that this is placed in the “old Čiče of the Templars”, but this time with the addition that “this castle was most likely built by the Babonići”, Klaić, *Medvedgrad*, p. 99.

¹⁸⁷ CD. 7, doc. 133, pp. 151-152.

The first extant document in which is explicitly written that it was issued *in castro Selyn* dates from 1315. It was issued by Ban Stephan V Babonić.¹⁸⁸ Accordingly, it can be concluded that the members of the Babonić family were the ones who built the castle in Želin. The castle was then named after the land, that is, after the estate on which it had been built. The construction works took place sometime between 1293 and 1315. Nothing more can be written about it because there are no extant charters that could give some additional data. But, new data could come out of an archaeological research, which hopefully will once be conducted. This research could also confirm or confute the above written conclusions about the period of building of the Želin castle.

4.2.1.2.5.2. The location of Želin castle

The Želin castle is depicted on the First military survey (1763-1787) (Map 13-Schloss Želin, in the upper right corner). It was placed on the left bank of the Ribnica River, in the territory of the present-day village of Ribnica. There is no castle in this place today, but there is a toponym Želin.¹⁸⁹ Naturally, it can only be assumed that the castle built by the Babonić family stood on that same place.¹⁹⁰ This is again something that can only be confirmed with an archaeological research. I doubt that the position of the castle would change, so I located the castle on this position in the maps in the further text.



Map 13-Location of Želin castle on the 1st military survey

¹⁸⁸ MNCZ 1, doc. 36, pp. 40-41.

¹⁸⁹ <http://geoportal.dgu.hr>.

¹⁹⁰ In some of the previous literature is written that the exact position of the castle is unknown but that it was probably placed on the curve of the stream Siget, between Staro and Novo Čiče. For example: Kekez, "Plemićki rod Babonića," p. 370.

The Second and Third military survey also have a place name Želin, but without the castle. This would mean that the castle was, for some reason, demolished or it collapsed in the modern period, sometime between the second half of the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth century, which is the period between the production of the First and the Second military survey.

4.2.1.3. Mraclin

The centre of the present-day village Mraclin is placed about 1 km east of the archaeological site of Okuje. The eastern end of the site was located within the present-day cadastre borders of Mraclin. There is a possibility that this part of the site was part of Mraclin in the medieval period. Whether or not is possible to conclude this on the basis of data from extant written sources, will be discussed in the chapter Historical interpretation of the site Okuje (see pages 219-220).

In this chapter, first spatial data from the thirteenth-century written sources that can be related to the area of Mraclin will be analysed and located on a modern map. Afterwards, plausible meanings of toponyms used in the charters will be discussed.

4.2.1.3.1. *Terra Mraschyn and Boblach/Doblachmezew*

In the past, Mraclin was a big and important village of the castle warriors of Turopolje.¹⁹¹ A land/estate of this name was first time mentioned as *terra Mraschyn* in a perambulation recorded in a charter issued by Ban Stephan in 1249. It was one of bordering lands of a communal wood of the castle warriors. They complained to the ban that, despite of their disapproval, Ivan son of Jaroslav and his relatives were pasturing their pigs in the wood.¹⁹² The ban supported the plaintiffs, returned them the wood and forbade anyone of high nobility

¹⁹¹ It should be said that this is not the impression one gets while looking the charters gathered in Laszowski's *Monumenta*. The number of extant charters which concern Mraclin is far less numerous than the number of extant charters for some other villages, for example, for Donja Lomnica or Velika Gorica. However, as explained by Laszowski, this impression is misleading. He wrote down in 1910, that people in Mraclin were telling that the archive of the judicial district of Mraclin which was kept in the wooden chest had burned down some hundred years ago, in a house of certain judge Kovačić. As far as the charters in private possession of certain families were concerned, Laszowski managed to collect only 23 altogether, shown to him by two families. The other families denied having any documents, but Laszowski was convinced that it was not the truth. Most probably they did not want to show him the charters because, at the time, they were engaged in some legal case against the municipality. Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine 2*, p. 111.

¹⁹² MHNC 1, doc. 5, p. 8; Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine 1*, p. 368. This was happening in scope of the restoration of lands alienated from the castle in the period of anarchy after the Mongol invasion and the death of Prince (*herceg*) Koloman. Klaić, *Povijest Zagreba*, pp. 43-44.

(*nobiles*) or anyone who is *de genere servientum regis* to keep their pigs there.¹⁹³ The wood is called simply *silva*, but it is clear from the description of the borders that this was the (still-existing) Veliki Turopoljski lug, the biggest wood of Turopolje, placed south of Mraclin. According to the perambulation, when the border of the wood came to the Buna River, it went upwards through the river and came to the land/estate (*terra*) called *Mraschyn*. Thence, it decayed to the Obdina River, by which going downwards, came to the Odra River.¹⁹⁴ On the basis of this description, it can be concluded that one of the borders of the *terra Mraschyn* was the Buna River, which is also the present-day border cadastre of Mraclin. Whether or not the borders of the land called Mraclin were stretching all the way from the Buna to the Obdina River, as are today, is not clear from the perambulation. The locations of the Buna River, Mraclin and Veliki Turopoljski lug are shown on Map 14). The borders of the wood are drawn according to the data from the perambulation.

The next charter that contains data about the territory of Mraclin was issued in 1258. It is a record of a court procedure between the kindred (*generatio*) of Stanišk and the kindred of Čegul, issued by Alexandar, *comes* of Podgora, vice-ban and judge of Zagreb. The kindreds argued whose property was a land called *Boblachmezew* or *Doblachmezew*. Finally, Alexander appointed it to Stanišk and his kinsmen.

The perambulation of the land was the following: “The first boundary begins below the river called Obdina (*fluuius Oudina*) and, here, in the big road (*magna via*), is an earthen boundary. Thence, it goes to the swamp called *Precowa* (*palus Precowa*) and, in the crossing place (*portus*), is an earthen boundary. Thence, it goes to the swamp and, from the swamp, comes to a hawk’s nest (*nidus accipitris*) and from there transits below a field. From the field, near the wood, comes to a swamp called Bunić (*palus Bwnych*) and there are new and old crosses in trees. From the swamp Bunić comes to a tree called *wcz* in the common language, near which is an earthen boundary. From the tree it goes upwards and decays into a big swamp called Buna (*Bwnna*). Going upwards, through Buna, it comes to a tree called *brezth* and here, near the old tree, are new and old earthen boundaries. Thence, it comes to a bridge. From the bridge, it goes to a big military road (*magna via exercitualis*) and there, on the left side, is a land of Dazlaw and Wlchilow (*terra Dazlaw et Wlchilow*)¹⁹⁵ and, on the right, is the land of

¹⁹³ MHNC 1, doc. 5, p. 8.

¹⁹⁴ MHNC 1, doc. 5, p. 8.

¹⁹⁵ This charter is not extant in the original. Laszowski published the text from a transcript made in 1590, but also added variations of certain words, that is, the version from the other transcript. In the main text this part is: *a sinistra parte est terra Dazlaw et Wlchy loco*, while in the other version is: *et Wlchilow*. I wrote this other version as it makes more sense.


Stanišk and his kindred. By the mentioned military road (*via exercitualis*), the boundary returns and goes to the Obdina River. Going downwards through the Obdina, it exists to a big road called *sceph* in a common language (*magna via wlgo sceph dicta*), to the first boundary and there finishes.”¹⁹⁶

According to the perambulation, *Boblach/Doblachmezew* was located between the Obdina River on the north and the big swamp called Buna on the south. The *magna via exercitualis* was the eastern border of the land. It can be identified as the Roman state road *Poetiovo* (Ptuj) – *Siscia* (*Sisak*), still in use in the Middle Ages. Its direction is recorded on the Klemenc’s map of the Roman roads. Likewise, the direction of the *magna via wlgo schep dicta*, which according to the perambulation was the western starting-point of the border, is shown on the map. This was the Roman road *Emona* (Ljubljana) – *Siscia* (*Sisak*). On its northern part, the border went through the Obdina River, from a place where the first road was crossing over the river, to the place where the second road was crossing over it. Thus, the northern and eastern borders of the land can easily be defined. Its approximate position is shown on Map 14. As can be seen, *Boblach/Doblachmezew* was placed in the territory of the present-day villages Mraclin and Lazi Turopoljski.

The western and southern borders of the land are not easily identifiable in the present-day landscape. It has been shown that the Buna River (*fluuius Buna*) was one of the borders of Veliki Turopoljski Lug; in the area of the Buna, the wood bordered with the *terra Mraschyn*. The estate Doblachmezew was, unquestionably, placed in the territory of Mraclin. Nevertheless, its southern border, the big swamp Buna (*magna palus Bwnna*), is not necessarily equal to the Buna River (*fluuius Bwna*), the border of the *terra Mraschyn*. A word *palus* stands for a swampland, a marsh. It could be that, in this case, it signifies the actual river that was swampy and marshy. It could also be that it signifies a swamp that had been created by a meander cut off from the main river (as a result of a natural process, not of a human intervention). I think that the second solution is more likely as the scribe made a distinction between the river (*fluuius*) Obdina and the big swamp (*magna palus*) Buna. Still, I could be wrong because the medieval charters, in general, are not consistent in a usage of certain terms for natural features. In any case, even if the swamp was not equal to the flowing river, it was still in the vicinity of the river. These kinds of data are worth emphasizing as they do inform about a natural historical landscape of a certain area. They are also helpful for the analysis of both natural and human-made features discovered in certain archaeological sites. As can be read

¹⁹⁶ MHNC 2, doc. 12, p. 15; Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine*, pp. 23-24.

from the perambulation, the area along the western border of *Boblach/Doblachmezew* was swampy. The site of Okuje was located exactly in this area. Therefore, even if the western border cannot be precisely drawn on the modern map, data from the perambulation should be mentioned.



Map 14-Mraclin and Doblachmezew

Between the northwestern starting-point of the boundary, located below the place where the *magna via* called *schep* was crossing the Obdina River, and the southernmost point of the boundary, the big swamp called Buna, were swamps called *Precowa* and Bunić. The last one was obviously named by the Buna River; probably it was also one of its cut off meanders or a partly dried tributary. Perhaps the northern swamp, *Precowa*, was an old meander of the Obdina River. I assume that the root of the word *Precowa* is the Croatian word *preko*, across. The text of the perambulation informs that in this swamp was a crossing-place (*portus*). Such places were made in order that a travel could be shortened. Otherwise one would have to go around

meanders.¹⁹⁷ In all probability, there was a ferry at the crossing place, to take passengers across the water.

4.2.1.3.2. *Meaning of toponyms and their correlation*

Mező is a Hungarian word that signifies a land with some vegetation or a grassland (a meadow). It is more a natural land, not cultivated, or, at least, not cultivated on a permanent basis. Some agricultural fields can be on it, but the emphasis is on its natural (uncultivated) landscape. Boblach or Doblach could be a personal name. If so, the compound word *Boblač/Doblachmezew* could signify a land owned by a man called Boblach or Doblach. In her work about toponyms of the Turopolje region, a German linguist Johanna Wippel offered some other possible explanations. She argued that the word could be connected with a Slavic word *dbol*, a hive. That word, however, does not exist in the Croatian language. Likewise, Johanna Wippel suggested that the word Boblač might be connected to the word *blato*, that is, to the word *blačka* as a derivation of *blato*. *Blato* means a mud in Croatian, but the word *blačka* does not exist.¹⁹⁸ Muddy places are common features in the Turopolje area, so, in this context, the second proposed meaning would not be unusual, but the linguistic explanation is insufficient, as the author herself noticed.

In Emilij Laszowski's opinion, the name Mraclin originated from a personal name Martin or Marcel. He assumed that the area of Mraclin could have been an estate of some Martin or Marcel, or, there could have been a church dedicated to St. Martin or Marcel in this area.¹⁹⁹ In the Dictionary of the academy of science, the name Mraclin is explained as "becoming dark [that would be the meaning of the word] but it is connected with the personal name Mracel [not Marcel!]"²⁰⁰ I do not have any linguistic knowledge to discuss if, from the linguistic point of view, any of these explanations are correct. As far as the historical context is concerned, also not much can be said as there are no extant charters that mention people named Dobláč, Boblač,

¹⁹⁷ An example similar to this one can be found in the foundation charter of the Garamszentbenedek (Hronský Beňadik) Benedictine abbey (1075). There were several meanders of the Tisa River and crossing places over them. One of the crossing places was named *portus aquae Kenglu. Aqua Kenglus*, or Kengyel, was actually a former river meander, which had become swampy by that time. The name had been derived from a shape of the meanders: kengyel means stirrup shaped in Hungarian. For this and the map with suggested reconstructions of the meanders and crossing places see: József Laszlovszky, "*Dedi eciam terram, que adiacet circa aquam, que vocatur Tiza*," in: *Adatok az 1075-ös garamszentbenedeki oklevél helyneveinek lokalizálásához. ZOUNUK - A JÁSZ-NAGYKUN-SZOLNOK MEGYEI LEVÉLTÁR ÉVKÖNYVE 1* (1986), pp. 17-20.

¹⁹⁸ Wippel, *Die geographischen namen*, p. 17.

¹⁹⁹ Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine 1*, p. 368.

²⁰⁰ *Rječnik hrvatskog ili srpskog jezika*, vol 7, ed. Tomislav Maretić (Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1911), p. 33.

Marcel or Mracel. Taking into consideration that these people, if existed at all, must have lived in the first half of the thirteenth century or prior to it, the lack of written record of them is understandable (there are only a few extant charters connected with Turopolje from the first half of the thirteenth century).

On the basis of the above written, it can only be concluded that the meaning of both toponyms is unclear, as is a spatial correlation between *terra Mraschyn* and *Boblač/Doblachmezew*. As shown, the name Mraclin (*terra Mraschyn*) was used for the land north of the Buna River already in 1249. It is recorded some ten years earlier than the name *Boblač/Doblachmezew*. The only extant charter I have found so far in which *Boblač/Doblačmezew* is mentioned, is the one above-analysed, from 1258. In all the other medieval charters, the land in the territory of the present-day Mraclin is called Mraclin and people from this area are nominated as the castle warriors of Mraclin. This could point to the conclusion that originally Mraclin was a joint geographical name of different lands, among which was the *Boblac/Doblachmezew* owned by Stanišk and his kindred. Additional data, that perhaps support this conclusion, are extant in the perambulations of the Hospitallers' estates Kravarsko and Peščenica. The presumable northern border of these estates in the time of King Andrew II was the Buna River. In 1328, the Buna was certainly the northern border of the estates (see pages: 46-48.). Taking into consideration that, in 1249, the land/estate Mraclin bordered with Veliki Turopoljski lug on the Buna River, exactly in the area north of Peščenica, one would expect a land called Mraclin to be mentioned in the perambulations of the Hospitallers' estates.

If *terra Mraschyn* was situated on the northern bank of the Buna, it must have bordered with Peščenica, most likely already in the time of King Andrew II and certainly in 1328. But, none of the perambulations mentions estate of such name. According to the 1st charter, in that area was the land/estate of *comes* Peter son of Jurk (*terra Petri filii Jurk*). According to the 2nd charter, owners of the land north of the river were the castle warriors, sons of Vukota and their kindred. *Comes* Jurk has already been mentioned in the previous chapters. Here is important to emphasize that not him nor his descendants were the castle warriors of Mraclin. A detailed analysis of data concerning the sons of Vukota and their kindred is written in the chapter The medieval settlement system around Šepkovčica (see pages: 245-265.). Here is again important to emphasize that this kindred differed from the kindred of Stanišk. These people were certainly not the castle warriors of Mraclin.

On the basis of all these data, several conclusions can be drawn. The first is that the land around the Buna River was not the property of Stanišk and his kindred. Thus, the big swamp Buna, the southern border of *Boblač/Doblachmezew*, was most likely a swamp made by some meander of Buna, placed north of the flowing river. The second is that, unlike was the case with the area of Gornje Podotočje (Giles' Želin), the descendants of *comes* Peter did inherit his estate in the area north of Buna. At one point, these estates had been taken over by people of the kindred of Vukota. The third is that, even though the name Mraclin was in use in the time of King Andrew II (most likely) and in 1328, it is not mentioned in the perambulations of the Hospitallers' estates. Thus, not the geographical name but the ownership of the land was the determining factor to the people who did perambulations of the borders. Nonetheless, over time, both this area north of Buna and the area of *Boblač/Doblachmezew* became parts of the territory of the village Mraclin. Why and how this happened cannot be specified, due to the lack of sources.

It can, however, be specified that Stanišk and his kindred are the oldest known castle warriors of Mraclin.²⁰¹ They were not explicitly called *iobagiones castri* in 1259, but it is clear from one other charter issued 10 years later. In some period before 1269, one of the members of the kindred intentionally offended Prince (*dominus dux*) Bela (the younger son of King Bela IV, Prince of Slavonia in the period 1261-1269). In consequence, the prince degraded the whole kindred; he demoted them from the castle warriors to the castle folk.²⁰² Later, they successfully returned their noble status.²⁰³ This case is an interesting testimony about the social structure of the thirteenth century Turopolje and more about it will be said in the closing part of this chapter, when the functioning of the space will be discussed.

4.2.1.4. Petrovina

The present-day Petrovina is a small village placed about 3.5 km west of the site Okuje. It is closer to the site Šepkovčica (2.5 km south of it) than to the site Okuje. Regardless of that, it is included in the analysis of the settlement system around the site of Okuje because, in the fourteenth century and later, it was a part of the Želin estate.

²⁰¹ MHNC 1, doc. 12, p. 15.

²⁰² MHNC 1, doc. 23, pp. 24-25.

²⁰³ MHNC 1, doc. 23-24, pp. 24-28.

The village was named after the church of St. Peter. This church does not exist anymore.²⁰⁴ It was first destroyed in the Ottoman attacks in the sixteenth century and finally abandoned by the beginning of the nineteenth century.²⁰⁵ Its position is visible on the First military survey, while on the Second one is missing. Two thirteenth century purchase contracts, from 1276 and 1279, mention this church, that is, a road that leads to it, as a border of the estates Topolovec and Obreš.²⁰⁶ As said in the introduction, some additional data about the area of Petrovina in the thirteenth century will come out of an analysis of the area of the castle warriors of Turopolje in the thirteenth century. The data about the village itself start to appear first in the fourteenth century charters.

4.2.1.5. Closing remarks – Functioning of the area in the thirteenth century

The extant thirteenth-century documents have enabled the analysis of the area of three present-day villages that surround the site of Okuje: Staro Čiče, Novo Čiče, and Mraclin. They were placed on the northern and eastern sides of the site and in total cover the surface of approximately 16 square kilometres. The present-day village Vukovina is not explicitly mentioned in the extant sources, but certain data about owners of its area in the thirteenth century also came through the analysis.

The analysis showed that the owners of the analysed area were of a different legal and social rank. In the bigger part of the territory of Mraclin was a land called *Doblach/Boblachmezew*. Its owners were the castle warriors, Stanišk and his kindred. The area of Staro Čiče was a central part of the Chichan preceptory of the Hospitallers. The village of Novo Čiče was first called *terra Okych*, which indicates that this area might have been a land of županant Okić, therefore, a state property. By 1278, it certainly was a state property, as, by then, it was a part of the Želin estate governed by bans of Slavonia. This changed in 1293 when the king gave the estate to Radislav Babonić. From that time on, the area of Novo Čiče as the rest of the estate became the private property of the Babonić family. Finally, the area of Vukovina was owned by the family of *comes* Ivan. In the thirteenth century, this was one of the most influential families of Zagreb County and they can be considered as high nobles.

²⁰⁴ Present day church is dedicated to St. Mihovil.

²⁰⁵ Barlé, "Povijest Crkve u Turopolju," pp. 330-334.

²⁰⁶ In the first document the road is called just *via* and in the second *via publica*, MHNC 1, doc. 27, p. 30, doc. 31, pp. 35-36.

Different ownership over the estates was also a reason for a diverse social structure of inhabitants of this area in the thirteenth century. People of diverse social ranks can be traced in the written sources. These are *iobagiones castri*, *castrenses*, *populous*, and *populus seu hospites*.

Populus would be the people, a folk. This term is mentioned in 1217 when Giles gave his estates to the Church of Zagreb. With the estates, he gave people (*populi*) living on them, who, as can be seen from the charter had tax obligations. They had to pay marturina, thus, it can be concluded that they were serfs.²⁰⁷ The other places where *populi* are mentioned are the Hospitallers' estates Mala Peščenica and Lekenik that they gave to Perčin and Andrew under predial conditions in 1275.

Populus seu hospites, settlers or "guests", were groups of foreigners (mostly merchants or peasants) who started to settle all over the Kingdom of Hungary, at least from the eleventh century. Their settlements can be found in the lands belonging to castles, to a king, to counts or bishops. They would get a licence to settle on a certain land and then had to pay the fee for that. In case they fulfil all their obligations, they had the right to move away.²⁰⁸ In this area, the settlers were mentioned on the territory of both Želin and the Čičan preceptory. Both charters that mention them also mention their duties, either to the Chapter of Zagreb or to the Hospitallers. In 1267, Petrus Pulcher, Dean of the Church of Zagreb, was complaining because people from Želin were paying the tithe in money instead in natural products, more precisely, in crops and other small things (...*decimas suas cum capeciis in frugibus et alia minuta earumdem*...) as they had before.²⁰⁹ Some of obligations of the settlers in Čičan were to give annually to the preceptor one heifer or 40 denars, three barrels of vine, ten loaves of bread and six chickens.²¹⁰ These data are an important testimony of colonization of the Turopolje area that was happening in the thirteenth century. Obviously, these areas were not densely populated, so both the state and the Hospitallers needed people to work on the land. Actually, the Hospitallers surely did have problems with that; in 1275, when they rented Mala Peščenica and Lekenik to comes Perčin and his brother Anthony from Grič, the estates were empty and almost deserted.²¹¹

²⁰⁷ CD 6, doc. 123, pp. 137-138.

²⁰⁸ Engel, *The realm*, p. 69.

²⁰⁹ CD 5, doc. 900, p. 429.

²¹⁰ CD 7, doc. 113, p. 134.

²¹¹ ... *quasdam terras domus nostre, vacuas et quasi desertas, mynor Peschenycha et Lykenik vocatas* (CD 6, doc. 123, pp. 137-138).

About *iobagiones castri*, or the castle warriors of Turopolje, will be written in the part of the thesis dedicated to the analysis of the area around the site of Šepkovčica, where numerous documents connected with this social group and collected in Laszowski's *Monumnetata* will be analysed. Here, data about one other social group, just as important for the castle system of the Kingdom of Hungary-Croatia during the Arpadian period as the castle warriors, will be mentioned. These are the castle-folk or *castrenes*.

Castrenes were descendants of commoners from the time of the making of the Kingdom. They were free in a way that they could go to a court and have their own legal cases as well as carry arms. But, unlike the castle warriors, they usually did not become nobles. In practice, this meant that they could not have owned a land hereditary and they had tax obligations (first *denarii liberorum* and then *descensus*). They were subjected to *comes* of a castle and to castle warriors.²¹² The castle-folk produced an economic background of the castle system. They lived in their own villages that were administratively separated into hundreds (*centurionatus*) and were mostly engaged in an agriculture. A land on which they worked was considered a property of a castle (*terra castri*) and, in practice, a property of the whole village. They were obliged to carry out different sorts of duties, such as a vine growing, a transportation or a production of honey. As a general rule, every 10 men had to equip one with the arms and that one would go to the army.²¹³

Thus, two main classes formed the base of the castle-system: the castle warriors and the castle folk, the first being the ruling class. A status of a castle-warrior or of a castle-person was determined by birth. However, to what extent all the above written was a general rule and how it functioned within certain counties is a matter of specific research.

4.2.1.5.1. *Castle-folk: an example from Turopolje*

Castrenses are mentioned in only one charter from the *Monumnetata*. There are two reasons why this social group is not mentioned in the other charters collected in this edition. The first reason is the nature of these sources; they concern mostly land transactions of different nature between the castle warriors. The second reason is that the thirteenth-century documents, in general, are not abundant. On the other hand, when, and after 1300, the number of extant charters starts to grow, the castle-folk practically disappeared (in reality and from the sources), the reason being the structural changes established by the new dynasty (*castrenses* will become

²¹² Engel, *The realm*, pp. 70-74.

²¹³ Engel, *The realm*, pp. 70-74; Rady, *Land, nobility and service*, pp. 19-20.

iobagiones).²¹⁴ So, here I would like to point out at that one extant charter that contains data about the castle-folk in Turopolje.

The text of the charter informs about the following: in 1269, Stanišk son *Waracysk* with all his kindred [the owners of *Doblach/Boblachmezew*] came Bihać, where Ban Joakim was staying at the moment, to ask him for help. The problem was that a few years ago, they came to Prince Bela [*dominus dux*, Prince of Slavonia from 1261-1269]. During the conversation, one of Stanišk's kinsman offended the prince. Although the man did this unintentionally, the prince was displeased, and he deposed the whole kindred to the position of the castle folk (...*ex inde in castrenses idem dominus dux Bela eosdem redegisset*...). Their new duty was to carry woods (...*in delaturam lignorum, sew ligniferos condicionarios indicissent*...). Allegedly, according to the story of Stanišk, later the prince wanted to return them their noble status [of the castle warriors]. Unfortunately, he died before doing it. This story was confirmed by all the important people of the County: Thomas, Bishop of Zagreb, M., abbot of Toplica, preceptors of the Templars and the Hospitallers, ten high nobles,²¹⁵ 27 castle warriors of Turopolje and among them their *comes terrestris* Paul. There were also castle warriors from the other places of the County (...*iobagiones castri Ocluch....de Podgoria*...) and lots of other nobles. After that, Stanišk and his kindred got back their noble status that will also be transferred to their posterity (...*ipsi et ipsorum successores ac omnium generacionum suarum heredes titulo iobagionatus castri Zagrabiensis pacifice et perpetuo sicut antea perfruantur*...).²¹⁶ In 1270, Stanišk and his kindred went to King Stephan V and showed him ban's charter. The king confirmed the document and the privileges of Stanišk and his kindred.²¹⁷

The story testifies that, although a social status was given by birth, social borders were flexible. There are lots of law-suits from the other parts of the Kingdom that clearly show that, more than once, castle warriors were suing castle-people for an occupation of their land and their tax-exemptions.²¹⁸ It is interesting to notice the work prince Bela assigned to Stanišk and his kindred when degraded them to the castle-folk; they were supposed to be wood-carriers. This profession is very suitable for Turopolje, known by its dense woods, mostly of oak-trees from which famous wooden *curiae* and churches were built. In the past, Mraclin was

²¹⁴ Engel, *The realm*, p. 174.

²¹⁵ ... *nobiles regni*...; the mentioned nobles belong to the most important high nobility of the Zagreb County. There was count Ivan son Jaroslav (of Okić) and nine nobles of the Ača kindred.

²¹⁶ MHNC 1, doc. 23, pp. 24-25; Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine*, pp. 24-25.

²¹⁷ MHNC 1, doc. 24, p. 26; Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine*, p. 25.

²¹⁸ Rady, *Land, nobility and service*, p. 20.

surrounded by dense woods: Mišine, Kneja, Mraclinska šuma and Mraclinski lug.²¹⁹ Some of them still exist today, while toponyms reveal the position of the ones that no longer exist. At the same time, the wood carrying is a hard work, so it was indeed a severe punishment of Stanišk and his kindred.

As far as the location of villages of the castle-folk in Turopolje is concerned, the degradation of Stanišk and his kindred lasted only for a few years, so the area of Mraclin cannot be taken as an example of such village. Nevertheless, with the help of data from one other extant charter, published in *Codex diplomaticus* and not connected with the noble community, the villages can be traced to the territory of Ban's estate Želin. In 1293, when King Andrew III gave the Želin estate to ban Radoslav Babonić, he gave it together with all its belongings, under its ancient boundaries, inside of which lived the castle folk of the Zagreb Castle (*quibus prefata possessio per castrenses dicti castris nostri Zagrabienensis habita fuerat et possessa*).²²⁰ It would be interesting to know what duties these *castrenses* performed and whether their villages had been organized in hundreds. Due to the lack of written sources, only a systematic archaeological research could give answers to these questions. The same is worth for the question: did their duties change after Radoslav Babonić took over the estate? In any case, they probably participated in the building of the castle Želin.

It is also interesting to notice that the above-mentioned donation charter mentions only the castle-folk as the inhabitants of the Želin estate. Nothing is said about the settlers or "guests" although, according to the charter from 1267, they were also present in Želin.²²¹ What happened to them? There are few options. First, the charter in which the settlers are mentioned is 26 years younger than the donation of King Andrew III. It is possible that, by 1293, there were no more settlers on the estate. The second option is that the king did not give the whole estate Želin but kept part for himself. The third is that this group was insignificant and, therefore, not mentioned in the charter.

As the settlers, the castle warriors were also not mentioned. I think that if they had been present on the Želin estate, they would certainly be mentioned. This shows that the villages of the castle warriors were separated from the ones of the *castrenses* and the other social groups. This separation will continue in the following centuries. The independent ownership of the land

²¹⁹ Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine*, p. 368.

²²⁰ CD 7, doc. 128, p. 147.

²²¹ CD 5, doc. 900, p. 429.

was one of the economic basis of the Noble community of Turopolje, whose members were always trying to stay independent from any landlord.

4.2.2. The fourteenth century

All four estates analysed in the previous chapter: the Želin estate, the Čičan preceptory, Mraclin and Petrovina appear in the fourteenth-century written sources. Data about Petrovina start to grow, so, from this point on, more can be said about this village. In addition to that, one new toponym, Trnovec, is recorded in charters. On the other hand, there is no data about the area of Vukovina from this period.

The fourteenth century brought a large-scale territorial reorganization of the area. The key factors in this reorganization were the Chichan preceptory and the Želin estate. From now on, for the reasons that will soon become clear, both of them will be analysed as a part of one estate - Želin.

4.2.2.1. Želin

4.2.2.1.1. Želin and the Babonići until 1327

The significant event that happened in the area of the Želin estate, in the period when it was owned by the Babonić family, was the construction of the castle. The first extant document in which the castle is mentioned dates from the Silvester day 1315. It was issued by ban Stephan Babonić, in the Želin castle (...*datum et actum in castro Selyn...*). A castle-warrior Peter son of Nepret asked the ban to confirm him an ownership of the *praedium* Siget. Peter was a *praedialis* of the Church of Zagreb. The ban granted his wish.²²²

There is no other direct data about the Želin estate from the first quarter of the fourteenth century. Few charters inform about certain river crossings (*portus*) situated in Turopolje and held by the Babonić family. Because of their geographical position, the crossings must have been connected with the functioning of the Želin estate. The port *Bukenreue* (ferry of Buken, in Hungarian) was given in lease to Stephan, John, Radoslav, and Oton, sons of Baboneg by Michael, Bishop of Zagreb.²²³ The port was most probably situated in the area of the present-day village Bukevje²²⁴, some 5.5 km east of the castle of Želin. *Portus sancti Iacobi* (the crossing of St. Jacob) was situated in the area of the present-day Jakuševac.²²⁵ This settlement

²²² CD 8, doc. 339, p. 417.

²²³ CD 7, doc. 343, p. 391.

²²⁴ Kekez, *Pod znamenjem propetog lava*, p. 113.

²²⁵ Kekez writes that the port was situated in Savska Opatovina (west of the Turopolje area). Kekez, *Pod znamenjem propetog lava*, p. 349. This was also an opinion of Lelja Dobronić, Radovan Gajer and some other authors. Nada Klaić first suggested that the port was placed in the area of Jakuševac, thus, in Turopolje. Her opinion is supported by Danko Dujmović in a recently published article. The Island of St. Jacob was, in fact, Giles' Island. For the origin of the name and all the previous literature, see: Danko Dujmović, "Otok svetog Jakova: prilog poznavanju srednjovekovnoga kulturnog krajolika Zagreba" [The island of St. James: a contribution to our knowledge about medieval cultural landscape of Zagreb], *CCP* 78 (2016), pp. 39-48. I am certain the port was in the area of the present-day Jakuševac and would just like to add that the River Struga, one of the boundaries of

is placed on the southern bank of the Sava River, approximately 12.5 km northwest of the Želin castle. The crossing of St. Jacob was abolished in 1314 because it was proclaimed illegal.²²⁶

The estate and the castle Želin were last mentioned as a property of the Babonić family in 1322, when King Charles Robert confirmed Count John II Babonić his ownership of the estates and castles Samobor and Želin (*possessiones et castra Zamabur et Selyn vocata*).²²⁷ Count John II was a son of the late Ban Stephen Babonić and a nephew and an adopted son of new Ban, John Babonić. The king issued the confirmation charter in a period of preparation of the military campaign against Croatian Ban Mladen II Šubić. He probably wanted to encourage the other members of the Babonić family to join the army of Ban John Babonić.²²⁸ He himself also joined it. The outcome was successful for the king and Ban John. At the battle at Bliska, near Klis, Ban Mladen II Šubić was completely defeated.²²⁹ Despite the victory, Ban John was replaced by Nicolaus of Felsőlendva.²³⁰ This act provoked an open hostility of the Babonić family towards the king, which especially intensified after the arrival of new Ban Mikcs, in Slavonia in 1325. The open conflict ended with the ban's victory; in 1327 his army defeated troops of the sons of late Ban Stephan Babonić. They lost many of their estates, including their main castle of Steničnjak.²³¹

When exactly the sons of Stephan Babonić lost Želin is not known. The last extant document that confirms Želin was their property is the above-mentioned confirmation charter from 1322.²³² In the peace treaty with Ban Mikcs, issued on the sixteenth of September 1327, Želin is not mentioned at all. As far as Turopolje is concerned, only Petrovina and Brezovica

Giles' Island, does not exist anymore but is mentioned in some other charters, for example, in the perambulation of Petruševac, an estate east of Jakuševac. MHNC 1, doc. 58, p. 58.

²²⁶ One of the ports that the Babonići were allowed to keep was *portus regis*. Although the name of the port is not more closely specified, it is possible that this was the royal port in Trnje, so also in Turopolje. Kekez, *Pod znamenjem porpetog lava*, p. 349.

²²⁷ CD 9, doc. 39, pp. 49-50.

²²⁸ Kekez, *Plemički rod Babonića*, pp. 404, 431.

²²⁹ About the battle and the events that preceded and followed it, as well as, the situation during the reign of Ban Mladen II Šubić, see: Damir Karbić, *The Šubići of Bribir: A Case study of Croatian Medieval Kindred*, PhD thesis, Central European University, Budapest, 2000, pp. 77-90.

²³⁰ For possible reasons of the deposition of Ban John, see: Antun Nekić, "Oligarchs and King in Medieval Slavonia, 1301-1342," *Südost-Forschungen* 74 (2015), pp. 1-25.

²³¹ Kekez, *Plemički rod Babonića*, p. 378.

²³² According to Kekez this happened after the battle of Steničnjak when they lost most of their estates north of the Kupa. He also notices that in the perambulation of Čičan from 1328, Želin was not mentioned as a property of the Babonić family. Kekez, *Plemički rod Babonića*, p. 431. It could be that the Babonići lost Želin after the battle, but it could also be that the king had taken Želin away from them before 1327 as he did with Samobor. The perambulation indeed mentions only *terra castri Selyn*, without specifying an owner. But that fact does not mean much in this respect, because owners are not always mentioned in perambulations.

are mentioned. The sons of late Ban Stephan had some estates in these villages and Ban Mikcs allowed them to keep them.²³³

4.2.2.1.2. *Staro Čiče - Chichan preceptory until 1328*

As was the case with Želin, only one extant fourteenth-century charter, issued by the Hospitallers in *domus* in Gora, concerns directly the Chichan preceptory.²³⁴ On the 3rd of July 1327, prior Filip de Gragnana gave the estates Jamnica and Kupčina (...*possessiones nostras Kopiscino et Yamnicza vocatas*...) in pledge to George, Denis and Paul, sons of late Ban Stephan Babonić.²³⁵ They did not hold them for long. Already next year, the Knights gave Jamnica and Kupčina as well as Čičan, Peščenica and Kravarsko to King Charles Robert. In return, the king gave them estates Starča and Trnava (*Ztharcha* and *Thornowa*), in Požega County.²³⁶

What was the reason for this transaction? A few possible answers have been offered in the previous literature. The first reason could be financial troubles of the Order. Emilij Laszowski connected the 1328 exchange with the period of the wars in the first quarter of the fourteenth century when, according to him, the Hospitallers were in big debts. In 1321, Pope John XXII sent a letter to all chapters, bishops and archbishops in Hungary and Croatia, asking them to send their envoys. The envoys supposed to work together with envoys of the Hospitallers, in order to determine which estates of the Order should be sold, rented or given in an eternal pledge. Laszowski concluded that the Čičan preceptory was most likely one of the problematic estates.²³⁷ Similarly, Zsolt Hunyadi, in his book about the Hospitallers in the Kingdom of Hungary, takes into consideration the bad management of the estates of the Čičan preceptory as a reason for the exchange.²³⁸

²³³ CD 9, doc. 296. This lead Juraj Čuk to conclude that in this charter Petrovina actually means Želin (...Želin, now called Petrovina...). Čuk, *Zagrebačka županija*, pp. 141-142. Čuk thought that the centre of the Želin estate was somewhere in the area of the present-day Gradići and Petrovina. As shown in the text so far, this was not so. Besides that, since in all the other charters connected with the Babonići the estate and the castle are called Želin, it is not very likely that only in this charter the name of the castle would be mistaken for the name of the village that is 10 km distant from it.

²³⁴ There are two charters from 1324 that concern the conflict about paying the tithe between Hospitallers and the Chapter of Zagreb. The dispute ended in favour of the Chapter of Zagreb. CD 9, doc. 156-157, pp. 195-197. The conflicts about tithe between the Hospitallers and bishops occurred frequently, see: Hunyadi, *The Hospitallers*.

²³⁵ CD 9, doc. 284, pp. 341-342.

²³⁶ CD 9, doc. 313, p. 380.

²³⁷ Laszowski, "Želin-Čiče," pp. 436-437.

²³⁸ Hunyadi, *The Hospitallers*, p. 133.

In the period after the abolishment of the Templars in 1312, the Hospitallers had many problems. The taking over of Templars' estates did not go smoothly. Actually, it had resulted in significant financial troubles of the Hospitallers. They needed to reorganize their estates and get rid of the ones that were not profitable. The Čičan preceptory could have been one of these estates. In 1275, when the Hospitallers rented Mala Peščenica and Lekenik to *comes* Perčin from Zagreb, those lands were empty and almost deserted.²³⁹ However, this was thirty years prior to the 1328 exchange, and it is not known what was happening with the estates in the meantime.

The other reason for the transaction between the Hospitallers and King Charles Robert was proposed by Juraj Ćuk. According to his opinion, the king conducted this exchange to: "enhance his and the ban's power in Zagreb County, especially against the Babonić family, and to break connections between the Babonić family and the Hospitallers".²⁴⁰

The definite answer to why the exchange happened would require a systematic study both of a profitability of particular estates of the Hospitallers and of relations of the Order, the Babonić family and the king in the first quarter of the fourteenth century generally and in Zagreb County in particular. But, it seems to me that Ćuk's arguments are correct. Perhaps the political situation in Zagreb County was not the sole reason for the transaction, but it most likely did influence the King's decision, at least to some point. The main aim of King Charles Robert in this period was to break the power of the oligarchs in Slavonia (the Babonići and the Kőszegi). Prior to the battle of Steničnjak, the Hospitallers rented their estates Jamnica and Kupčina to the sons of Stephan Babonić, the main opponents of Ban Mikcs. Prior Phillip de Gragnana emphasized that the sons of late ban Stephan got the estates out of gratitude for the services they had previously done for the Order as well as for the ones they promised they will do in the future.²⁴¹ The good connections between the two parties are clear from this charter. Taking that into consideration, it would be logical to conclude that both Ban Mikcs and King Charles Robert wanted to diminish the power of the Babonić family in Zagreb County by removing their allies.

²³⁹ ... *quasdam terras domus nostre, vacuas et quasi desertas, mynor Peschenycha et Lykenik vocatas* (CD 6, doc. 123, p. 137).

²⁴⁰ Ćuk, *Zagrebačka županija*, p. 141.

²⁴¹ CD 9, doc. 283, p. 341.

4.2.2.1.3. *Želin and Čičan - a property of a king*

The above-described events from the first half of the fourteenth century (the Babonići lost Želin sometime after 1322 and the Hospitallers left Turopolje around 1328) had transformed a character of the area. As will be seen through the next sequence of events, the estates of the Čičan preceptory and the Želin estate became the property of the Crown. At the same time, they were merged into one estate. Probably after this merging, over time, the names Čiče and Želin started to be equalled. The first such extant data date from the last quarter of the fourteenth century. In 1387, Želin is for the first time called the *castrum regium Selen alio nomine Chychan*.²⁴²

In the period between 1322 and the mid-fourteenth century, I did not find any charter about Želin. It appears again in the sources in 1358, as a royal castle (*...castri regalis Selyn nuncupati...*),²⁴³ governed by castellans, two of which are known from sources by name. The first is Valentin, son of Vid, both the castellan of Želin and *comes* of Zagreb County. In 1355, he bought one estate in County of Veszprém.²⁴⁴ The second is Stephan called Zeuke. In 1358, he participated in marking of borders between certain estates of the Želin castle and estates called Trnovec and Pusta Dušica.²⁴⁵

Perhaps Stephan called Zeuke was the one who claimed that castle warriors of Mraclin were subjects of the Želin castle. In 1360, Stojko son of Vuk, Milko son of Andrew and Ivan son of Stephan and the others of their kinsmen, all from Mraclin, came to the General assembly of the nobility of the area between Lonja and Gvozd. They complained to Ban Leustace that someone started to claim they were subjects of Želin. It is not specified in the text of the charter that reports about this event who exactly started to claim this (*non de iure, immo tacita veritate congratulari castro Selyn dicebantur subiungi debere seruituri*), but, as Laszowski wrote: “it was probably some violent castellan of Želin, that later can be often found in the sources”.²⁴⁶ Stojko and his kinsmen brought the charter of King Stephan V from 1272, by which the king had confirmed a noble status of Stanišk and his kindred. They presented it to Ban Leustace, as a proof that they had originated from “the true nobles”. The ban also confirmed them a status of noble castle warriors.

²⁴² MHCZ 1, doc. 330, p. 308.

²⁴³ CD 12, doc. 357, p. 463.

²⁴⁴ MNL OL, DL 4513.

²⁴⁵ CD 12, doc. 357, p. 463.

²⁴⁶ MHNC 1, doc. 75, p. 75; Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine*, p. 370.

Except the above-written, not much can be said about the Želin castle in this period. I did not find any charter issued in the castle. There are, however, two charters issued in one other settlement situated in the territory of the Želin estate, in Čičan. The first is a purchase contract, issued *in Ch(ic)ha* by *comes terrestris* Mikec in 1333, when some land in Šep was sold.²⁴⁷ The second is a confirmantion charter issued *in Chichan* by Charles of Durazzo in 1371. At the time, Charles was Duke (*Herceg*) of Slavonia. The castle warriors of Turopolje sent their representatives, led by *comes terrestris* Peter son of Stephan, to the Duke. They showed him a charter issued by King Louis in 1364 and asked him to confirm them their liberties, which he did.²⁴⁸

The stay of such an important person as Duke Charles in Čiče testifies of the importance of this village. The Hospitallers had their central buildings in this area, so perhaps these buildings stayed in use after they had left. It should be noted, taking into consideration that in 1387 the castle Želin is called *Selen alio nomine Chychan*²⁴⁹, it is possible that Duke Charles was staying in the castle and issued his charter there. But, I think, if that had been the case, it would be emphasized that the charter was issued *in castro*.

The importance of Čiče, as some sort of a regional centre, is also clear from the fact that it was a marketplace. Even after the departure of the Hospitallers, the village kept the status of a *libera villa*. There is no data about fairs kept in any other village of Turopolje in this period. The fair in Čiče was mentioned in 1352. George, son of Stephan had stolen some pigs, in the wood below the Buna River (this would be Veliki turopoljski lug). Along with that, he had abducted shepherds. The pigs belonged to the castle warriors of the Field (of Turopolje). They, jointly (*universorum nobilium iobagionum castri Zagrabiensis de Mezeu*), pressed charges against George to King Louis and the king ordered an inquest.²⁵⁰ Peter son of Martin, an envoy of the king, and Paul, Archdeacon of Bekšin, went to the village of Čiče (*villa Chychan*), on the day of the fair. They examined nobles, commoners and others (*noblies et ignobiles et alios*). All of them confirmed the accusations of the castle warriors.²⁵¹

²⁴⁷ MHNC 1, doc. 50, p. 51.

²⁴⁸ MHNC 1, doc. 85, pp. 88-89.

²⁴⁹ MHCZ 1, doc. 330, p. 308.

²⁵⁰ MHNC 1, doc. 67, p. 68.

²⁵¹ MHNC 1, doc. 68, p. 69.

4.2.2.1.4. Želin during the time of King Sigismund

4.2.2.1.4.1. Fragmentation of the estate

A new period in the history of the Želin estate started with the arrival of King Sigismund of Luxemburg to the throne (1387-1437). Already in 1387, on the 7th of August, the king donated Hrašće and Petrovina, two estates of the castle Želin also called Čičan (*possessiones nostras Petrouina et Hrascha vocatas ad castrum regium Selen alio nomine Chychan spectantinem*), to burghers of Gradec.²⁵² This is the first document where Želin is also called Čičan. The king ordered the Chapter of Zagreb to install the burghers into their new estates. This was done, as the Chapter informed the king, by prebendary *magister Barnaba*, some ten days later. Among the neighbours present was the king's man Giles the German (*Giles Thevthonicus*), castellan of Želin.²⁵³

The splitting did not go smoothly. In the following years, the burghers' estates were attacked by different actors. Soon after 1387, King Sigismund donated the Želin estate itself and it became a private property of a landlord. All the future owners of Želin considered Hrašće and Petrovina as a property of Želin, which caused constant tensions between them and the burghers. In addition to that, the burgers had problems with nobles from neighbouring villages of Petrovina and Hrašće. These conflicts were very violent and, in one case, even ended up with a murder. More about them will be said in the chapter about Petrovina.

4.2.2.1.4.2. John Széchy – owner of Želin

One of the conflicts happened in 1396. Nicolas called Heer, *castellan* of Želin, occupied Petrovina and Hrašće, captured twelve people and refused to let them go unless getting a direct order from his lord, John Széchy, to do so.²⁵⁴ Thus, John Széchy, son of late Nicholas Széchy, was the owner of Želin in 1396. In accordance with his general policy, King Sigismund had either donated, sold or gave the estate in a pledge to him. I have not found any extant charter that could explain which of the mentioned happened. In any case, after being some 70 years under the direct jurisdiction of kings (from the period after 1322), by 1396, the estate and the castle Želin again became a private property of the high nobility. It has remained so until the twentieth century.

²⁵² MHCZ 1, doc. 330, p. 308.

²⁵³ MHCZ 1, doc. 133, pp. 114-115.

²⁵⁴ MHCZ 1, doc. 392, pp. 373-374.

Due to the lack of sources, not much can be said about the period when John Széchy owned the estate. Except the charter mentioned above, there is only one other charter that can be dated in this period. It also informs of quarrels in which castellans of Želin participated. Sometime before 1397, the castle warriors of Gorica complained to King Sigismund that castellans of Želin-Čičan (*de Selyn alias de Chychan*) occupied their estates. Gorica is situated on the western side of Staro Čiče, so Čičan and Gorica were the neighbouring estates. The names of the castellans were not recorded. In 1397, the king ordered Martin Der, vice-Ban and *comes* of Zagreb, to investigate the situation. The vice-Ban sent his envoy, judge Peter, to Gorica. Peter had gathered all neighbours and question them, after which, the estates were returned to the castle warriors and borders were recorded.²⁵⁵ In the text of the charter is not exactly specified when this occupation had happened; it is written simply that it had happened during the difficult times that now passed (*temporibus inpactis, nunc retrogressis*). According to Laszowski, that sentence implies the time of the rebellion of the part of the Slavonian nobility against the king.²⁵⁶ Since there is no name of any owner of Želin, it can perhaps be assumed that this happened while Želin was still a royal estate, so before Széchy became the owner but also it could be while he was owning the estate.

4.2.2.1.4.3. *The Toths*

John Széchy did not hold Želin for long. Sometime between 1396 (when Széchy was mentioned as an owner) and 1399, the king gave the castle and the estate to Lawrence, Nicholas and Christopher, sons of Nicholas Toth of Susedgrad. The donation charter is not extant but, in a charter that informs about a conflict over Petrovina in 1399 is written that not long time ago, the king gave Želin to the Toths, as a reward for their numerous accomplishments. They also asked the king to return Petrovina and Hrašće under the jurisdiction of Želin, which he did.²⁵⁷

4.2.2.1.4.4. *Spatial data*

In the chapter about Želin in the thirteenth century was shown that the name Želin referred to the territory wider than the one of Novo Čiče. Data from the fourteenth-century charters reveal borders of the estate more clearly. The areas of the present-day villages Staro Čiče, Novo Čiče, Lazina Čička and Hrašće, north of Odra River, as well as, Kravarsko,

²⁵⁵ MHNC, doc. 153, pp. 145-146.

²⁵⁶ Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine*, pp. 392-392.

²⁵⁷ MHCZ 2, doc. 345, pp. 443-446.

Peščenica, Lekenenik, and Petrovina, south of the Odra, were within the borders of Želin. Spatial data extracted from the charters and their location on a modern map will be analysed in the following lines.

4.2.2.1.4.4.1. *Novo Čiče*

In the time of King Andrew II, the area north of Čičan, that is, the area of the present-day Novo Čiče, was called *terra Okych*. In 1328, the same land was called *terra castri Selyn*.²⁵⁸ Thus, by 1328, the area of Novo Čiče was within the borders of the Želin estate. The possible reasons of this change had already been discussed (see pages 76-77).

The first mentioning of the name Novo Čiče, I have found so far, is written in three purchase contracts, two from 1389 and one from 1390. They were all made between a man called Miren Radenković and his sons Peter and Paul, nobles of Rakitovec (a village east of Mraclin), and nobles from Gorica. Miren, Peter and Paul bought some lands from the nobles. The lands were in Rakitovec.²⁵⁹ The 1389 contracts were made in front of župan Peter son of George in Zagreb, and the 1390 contract in front of the same župan and John Magnus, castellan of Medvedgrad and *comes* of the Field [of Turopolje], also in Zagreb. They were all written by Stephan, a priest (*sacerdos, presbiter*) from Novo Čiče.²⁶⁰

4.2.2.1.4.4.2. *Staro Čiče*


The area of the former centre of the Chichan preceptory, that is, the area of Staro Čiče, was integrated into the Želin estate after 1328. This explains the borders between the Želin estate and the castle warriors of Gorica, made by judge Peter, an envoy of Martin Der, vice-Ban and *comes* of Zagreb in 1397. Apart from trees and swamps or standing waters (*mlaka*), the points where the border passed were: an estate of Peter, son of George from *Babana*, border point called Bezus (*metam Bezus appellatam*) and, as the ending point, a swamp called

²⁵⁸ CD 9, doc. 316., p. 384.

²⁵⁹ On the 3rd of May 1389, Miren and his sons bought a land (*possessione seu porcione*) from Andrew, son of Jacob and his sons, nobles of Gorica. Before they actually bought the land (*possessione*), Andrew and his sons had already built stable on it. Naturally, Andrew and his sons protested, so Miren had to give them money for the land he was already using. A few months later, on the 7th of June, Miren and his sons again bought a land from Andrew. This land was of the same size and cost the same as the previous one. In 1390, Miren and sons bought another big portion of a land in Rakitovec for 10 golden florens from some other nobles from Gorica. MHNC 1, doc. 118-119, pp. 123-123, doc. 122, pp. 126-127. Miren was enlarging his property in that period, there are two more charters, from 1380 and 1388, that confirms that pledged two estates (*particulam possessionis, totalem porcione possessionariam*) in Rakitovec from people from Rakitovec and Kurilovec, MHNC 1, doc. 103 and doc. 110.

²⁶⁰ *Inferius in calce: Stephanus sacerdos scripsit de Nouo Cychan; Inferius in dextr. calce: Stephanus sacerdos scripsit de Nouo Cychan; In calce: Stephanus presbiter de Nouo Chichan scripsit.*

Tuklačeva Mlaka (*Twklachena...Tuklachena Mlaka*).²⁶¹ I do not know where was the estate of Peter, or what was Bezus, but the toponym Tuklačevo can still be found on modern map (Map 15) and on the 1861 cadastre map. It is placed along the eastern side of the present-day cadastre borders of Staro Čiče. It seems that, in this case, the borders have not changed significantly from the period of the late fourteenth century.



Map 15-Toponym Tuklačevo, Staro and Novo Čiče

4.2.2.1.4.4.3. Lazina Čička

In 1333, Ivan son of *Dazlau*, Raden son of *Obrad*, Barnaba son of *Jakša*, Maren son of *Martin*, George son of *Andrew* and Thomas son of *Šćepan* sold their estate *Kosnica* (*possessio Coznicha*) to Črnek son of *Pavša*. The estate was situated below the Sava River (*ultra Zauam*), between estates the estates of Marcus son of *Ladislav*, Nicholas son of *Arland*, Mikec son of *Mikuš* and tenant-peasants of the *Želin* estate (*iobagionum de Selyn*). A more detailed perambulation was also written. Of interest here are its southern borders: “The first boundary starts at the river called *Kosnica* (*fluius Coznicha*) where is a poplar tree. Thence it goes by the flow of this *Kosnica* River and exits at big *Budesen* (*in magnum Budesen*, this word in

²⁶¹ MHNC 1, doc. 153, pp. 145-146.

Hungarian stands for stinking, smelly, so it could have been a swampy river or water). By it, the boundary goes towards the east and comes to *Prezeka* (*ad Prezekam*). By *Prezeka* it goes up and reaches the Ribnica River (*fluuius Ribnicha*), and by this river it goes up and exits at *Letuena* (*ad Letuenam*)...”.²⁶²



Map 16-Lazina Čička

Two villages named Kosnica exist today, Velika and Mala [Big and Small] Kosnica. They are both visible on the Military Surveys, situated on the banks of the Kosnica River. Their southern borders are about 5 km distant from the Ribnica River, which according to the perambulation was one of the southern borders of the estate Kosnica. Today there several other villages in the territory between Velika and Mala Kosnica and the Ribnica. Closer to the River is a village called Črnkovec. Actually, it is situated approximately in the area of the estate Kosnica mentioned in the charter from 1333. Why this is so becoming clear by looking the names at the purchase contract: five people sold their estate called Kosnica to Črnek son of Pavša (*Chernek filius Pause*) and, over time, the estate was named after the owner. The name

²⁶² MHNC 1, doc. 48, p.49.

Črnkovec appears in the sources for the first time in 1412 when Črnek from Črnkovec (*Chernk de Chernkowcz*) is mentioned.²⁶³ Hence, in the thirteenth century, Kosnica was a name of a bigger portion of lands owned by different owners. In 1333, Črnek bought a part of this land. In the next hundred years, his estate had developed into a separate village, named after him. This is a very typical fourteenth-century pattern: there was an estate and somebody, for example, a freeman or a lesser nobleman, moved out to a field to live there. Perhaps there was one house (*curia*) or a small group of houses on this estate and, after some period, this smaller settlement developed into a village, named after the first owner.²⁶⁴

The location of Črnkovec is shown on Map 16. This also determines the northern border of the Želin estate on the area between Kosnica and Ribnica River. The land of the tenant-peasants of Želin was situated north of Črnkovec, on the territory of the present-day village Lazina Čička.

4.2.2.1.4.4.4. Hrašće

On the eighteenth of October 1331, a priest called Denis sold a part of his estate (*quandam particulam possessionis*) called Hrašće (*Hrascha*) to the castle warriors Petko, son of Vidomir and Stephan, son of Mark. The land was situated in a width between the rivers Odra and Globoka and in a length between lands of the castle of Želin and of Petko and his kindred.²⁶⁵ This area is somewhere in the area of the present-day village of Hrašće.

Hrašće is placed in the western part of Turopolje, between Donja Lomnica, Odra and Velika Mlaka. It is one of the villages that surround the site of Šepkovčica and more about it will be written in the next part of the thesis (see pages: 265-267). Here is important to emphasize that this area and all its, the above-mentioned, surrounding villages were densely inhabited by the castle warriors of Turopolje. Obviously, one smaller part of the land stayed directly under the jurisdiction of bans, that is, under the castle of Želin. In 1387, King Sigismund had donated this part of Hrašće to burghers of Gradec (together with Petrovina).²⁶⁶ By 1399, he had taken

²⁶³ MHNC 1, doc. 177, p. 169.

²⁶⁴ For example, in many parts of Transdanubia this process can be reconstructed from charters, and, in many cases, a name of a settlement has derived from a name of a person. It could be simply a name, or often with a suffix like –telke (plot of, field of), –laka or –háza (house of), –falva, –fa (village of).

²⁶⁵ MHNC 1, doc. 47, p. 48.

²⁶⁶ MHCZ 1, doc. 330, p. 308.

both estates away from the burghers and returned them under the jurisdiction of Želin, owned by the Toth family.²⁶⁷

4.2.2.1.4.4.5. *Kravarsko, Peščenica, Lekenik and Petrovina*

The location of the Hospitallers' estates Kravarsko and Peščenica has been shown on Map 3. After 1328, these estates were merged with the Želin estate. In addition to that, two more estates, situated in the area south of the Odra River, were mentioned as appertaining estates of Želin in the fourteenth-century charters. These are Petrovina and Lekenik.

In 1358, Lieutenant (*vicarius totius regni Sclavonie generalis*) Leustce asked the Chapter of Zagreb to participate in making of borders between the estates Pusta Dušica and Trnovec (*Pustadulsyscha* and *Trnovec*) and estates and woods of the royal castle Želin. Pusta Dušica was a *praedium* of the church of Topusko, held by *magister* Ivan son of Ivan of the Zagreb Field (*magister Ivan filius Ivan de Campo Zagrabiensi*). The name of the estate testifies that it had been abandoned (*puszta*). In general, many *predii* were abandoned in the late thirteenth century. Consequently, from the fourteenth century, the term *predium* often indicated an abandoned estate or settlement, usually managed by *prediales*.


The perambulation of Pusta Dušica is long so I will summarize the parts that are the most important for placing the estate on a modern map. A shorted version of the perambulation is the following: "The first border of the estate Pusta Dušica (*possessio Pustadulsyscha*) and its appertaining wood starts from a wood of the estate Poljana (*possessio Polyana*), around the stream Glogova (*rywlus Glogoua*), in a holm-oak tree signed with a cross and a new circled earthen boundary.... thence it goes directly in the wood up towards the south....leaving the land of magister Ivan on the right and the above-mentioned land Poljana on the left.....by one road on the southern part, stretching trough small space, comes to the borders of woods of the village Lekenik (*villa Lekennyk*), around one path called Halazuch,²⁶⁸ and by that earthen path it reflects to the eastern part and comes to the stream called Doben and, by its flow, comes to the river called Odra and on the southern part leaves all the way borders of the estate Pusta Dušica of the mentioned Ivan and on the northern part of the village Lekenik and that way, by the above described borders, distinguishes the estate Pusta Dušica and its wood from the estates and the woods of the Želin castle (*...a possessionibus et siluis castri Selyn antedicti...*).²⁶⁹

²⁶⁷ MHCZ 2, doc. 345, pp. 443-446.

²⁶⁸ The word was derived from Hungarian halaszó, which means a place for fishing.

²⁶⁹ CD 12, doc. 357, p. 464.

Pusta Dušica was placed in the southern part Turopolje, in the area of the present-day village Dužica. The streams Glogova and Doben are still visible on the 1861 cadastre; actually, even the present-day borders are very similar to the ones described in the charter. Thus, Lekenik, that is, one part of it, was the estate of the Želin castle. This estate has already been mentioned as a property of the Hospitallers, as part of the bigger unit-Peščenica. However, along with the Hospitallers different owners had their lands in this area. Two villages called Lekenik are shown on the 1861 cadastre map (Map 17). One is Lekenik Turopoljski [Lekenik of Turopolje], which was a property of the noble community of Turopolje. The other is Lekenik Erdelski, which was a part of the Želin estate. It seems that the borders of this estate were wider than the borders of the Hospitallers' estate Peščenica, a part of which was Lekenik. According to the text of the perambulation of Pusta Dužica, this bigger estate Lekenik was a part of the Želin estate already in the middle of the fourteenth century. How it became so would require further research.




Map 17-Dužica, Lekenik Turopoljski and Lekenik Erdelski (The 1861 cadastre map)

The other estate perambulated in 1358 was Trnovec, owned by *magister* Ivan son of Ivan of the Zagreb Field and the others (*et aliorum*). The border is analysed in the chapter about

Trnovec. Trnovec bordered with Petrovina, an estate of the Želin castle on the western side and with Kravarsko on the southern side.²⁷⁰ The perambulation of Trnovec is analysed in the subchapter Trnovec (see pages 118-121), while its location as well as the location of Petrovina is shown on Map 21.

All the spatial data analysed in this chapter and spreading of the Želin estate that can be recognized on the basis of the extant fourteenth-century sources are shown on Map 18.



Map 18-Spatial data about the Želin estate in the fourteenth-century charters

4.2.2.2. Petrovina

4.2.2.2.1. An estate of the Babonić family

The perambulations from two thirteenth-century sources mention the church of St. Peter that was in the area of Petrovina. The name of the village has been derived from the name of

²⁷⁰ CD 12, doc. 357, p. 465.

the patron saint of the church. These charters do not specify anything about the village, actually, they do not mention any village, or an estate located in this area. The first extant fourteenth-century document, in which Petrovina is mentioned, is the peace treaty between Ban Mikcs and the sons of late Ban Stephen Babonić made in 1327, after the battle of Steničnjak. As a compensation for the loss of Steničnjak, the sons of Stephan got Moslavina and a right to keep some of their legally acquired estates, among which were *Brezouicha et Sancti Petri in campo Zagradiensi*. It is important to emphasize that, according to the peace treaty, the Babonići did not owe all Brezovica and Petrovina but only some estates within the borders of Brezovica and Petrovina. This is clear from the text of charter as it emphasized that the Babonići must respect rights of other ecclesiastical and public authorities in these estates.²⁷¹

It can be confirmed that the sons of late Ban Stephen held the estates in Brezovica in 1331 and 1336.²⁷² On the other hand, their estate in Petrovina is not mentioned in any other extant source. For that reason, it cannot be said how they had acquired the estate in the first place nor how they lost it. Also, it cannot be said who were the other owners of land in the area of this village.

4.2.2.2.2. *An estate of burgers of Gradec or owners of Želin?*

Petrovina is mentioned next time in 1358, as the property of the Želin castle (*...terra vero possessionis Petrouina castri Selyn...*).²⁷³ It had remained so until 1387 when King Sigismund separated the estate from Želin and donated it (and Hrašće) to the burghers of Gradec (who were faithful to him during the rebellion).²⁷⁴ As already mentioned, this caused a lot of problems and conflicts in the following years.

In 1391, Ban Dertik Bubek demanded that tenant-peasants (*iobagiones*) of Petrovina and Hrašće give him *mardurina* and the tithe of pigs. The burghers complained to Queen Mary who ordered an investigation. Finally, she forbade the ban, the vice-ban and their officials to demand these taxes. An investigation conducted by new Ban Ladislav in 1392 confirmed that the tenant-peasants of Hrašće and Petrovina never had to pay these taxes to any ban or vice-ban.²⁷⁵

²⁷¹ CD 9, doc. 296, p. 359.

²⁷² MHNC 1, doc. 45, p. 46; CD 13, doc. 401, pp. 562-563.

²⁷³ CD 12, doc. 357, p. 465.

²⁷⁴ MHNC 1, doc. 108; MNCZ, doc. 330-331, pp. 308-309; Klaić, *Medvedgrad*, p. 99.

²⁷⁵ MHCZ 1, doc. 363, pp. 345-346.

Next year, in 1393, George and Paul, sons of Masten, from Čiče began with their attacks on both Petrovina and Hrašće. First, they attacked Hrašće and took 300 oxen and 70 *cubuli* of wheat. Next day they came back, plundered inside the village, captured village judge and some other tenant-peasants (*villicum et alios quam plures iobagiones dicte ville*) and tortured them by putting thorns between their teeth and nails. They also took the royal tax (*dacium regale*) that had been collected. After all that, they went towards Gradec and burned some houses in its territory.²⁷⁶ The city council of Gradec complained to Ban John who informed King Sigismund about the crimes. The king ordered the ban to preside a court about this case,²⁷⁷ which happened on the sixteenth of November 1393. By that time, the sons of Masten had occupied both Petrovina and Hrašće and were changing borders of these estates.²⁷⁸ The city council protested against such behaviour and asked for a compensation. The king ordered the ban to use force against the sons of Masten and compel them to give a compensation to the city council. He also forbade anyone to violate Hrašće and Petrovina, the estates given to the citizens of Gradec by him personally.²⁷⁹ Still, nothing changed. The next incident, this time with more serious consequences, happened in February 1394. One of the brothers, Paul, came in conflict with Andrew Sib, a burgher of Gradec. For some reason, Andrew was in Čiče at that time. Paul captured and tortured him, put him in chains and kept him in cold. Andrew freed himself after paying a ransom but died soon after he had been released. After this case was presented to vice-ban Thomas, he ordered the Chapter of Zagreb to make an investigation. It was done by priest Thomas, who confirmed the above-described events. Unfortunately, there are no documents that could reveal what happened after this.²⁸⁰

The next attack that came from the territory of Želin happened in late 1396; castellan Nicolas called Heer occupied Petrovina and Hrašće and captured twelve people. It is interesting to notice that, in the charter that informs about this event, the captured people are called citizens (*duodecim ex eisdem civibus*). In the other charters, people that were living in Hrašće and Petrovina, are called tenant-peasants (*iobagiones*). Perhaps people here in question were burghers of Gradec that were at the moment staying in the villages. A noble court, presided by vice-Ban Mertin Des, send Peter, son of Stephan (one of the members of the court) and Nicolas, (*protonotarius*), to make an investigation. Castellan Nicholas confirmed that, obeying an order

²⁷⁶ MHCZ 1, pp. XL-XLI.

²⁷⁷ MHCZ 1, p. XLI.

²⁷⁸ MHCZ 1, doc. 367., pp. 348-349.

²⁷⁹ MHCZ 1, page XLI-XLII.

²⁸⁰ MHCZ 1, page XLII.

of his lord John Széchy, he did all the above-written.²⁸¹ He also stated that he will integrate Petrovina and Hrašće to the Želin estate and keep the citizens in prison unless he soon gets the letter from his lord to do otherwise.

It is not known how this ended. Even if Petrovina and Hrašće were integrated to the Želin estate, it did not last for long. As shown in the Chapter about Želin, sometime between 1397 and 1399, the Toths of Susedgrad became owners of the estate. On the fifteenth of June 1399, Lawrence, Nicholas and Christopher, sons of Nicholas Toth together with Stephen, son of Lawrence and Ladislaus, son of Nicholas occupied Petrovina, Hrašće and Šiljakovina (the village situated about 5,5 km south of Petrovina, see in the further text).²⁸² Meanwhile, King Sigismund changed his mind about his donation of Petrovina to Gradec. On the fifteenth of July 1399, he took it from the citizens and annexed it back to Želin.²⁸³ Two weeks later, the Chapter of Zagreb installed the Toths into the estate.²⁸⁴

The owners of Želin were not the only ones causing problems to the burghers. The conflicts with the eastern neighbours of Petrovina, castle warriors of Donja Lomnica, started in June 1395. In this case, borders were the problem. The burghers complained to the king that their neighbours had occupied certain bordering lands that belonged to Petrovina (and the same situation was with Hrašće). The king ordered the Chapter of Zagreb to settle the dispute and make perambulations. But, again, this did not help the burghers. The accused castle warriors of Donja Lomnica were not satisfied with borders the *pristaldus* wanted to make, so the process of making of borders ended up in an open conflict in which some of the city representatives were wounded. In the second half of 1395 and the whole next year, this case was exposed to Court of Ban numerous times and several attempts of agreement regarding the borders were proposed. However, nothing was accomplished.²⁸⁵

The borders in question were recorded in detail in several charters. These pieces of lands cannot be recognized completely on modern maps because the descriptions contain mostly toponyms of minor landmarks, like smaller swamps, that do not exist today. For that reason, I will use the present-day cadastre border between Donja Lomnica and Petrovina and Šiljakovina on the maps (Map 19). As will be explained, the present-day borders of Šiljakovina cover the territory of medieval Petrovina.

²⁸¹ MHCZ 1, doc. 392, pp. 373-374.

²⁸² MHCZ, doc. 414., pp. 399-400.

²⁸³ Šamšalović, Miljen – Jakov Stipišić, "Isprave u Arhivu Jugoslavenske akademije", reg. 1207.

²⁸⁴ Šamšalović, Miljen – Jakov Stipišić, "Isprave u Arhivu Jugoslavenske akademije", reg. 1208.

²⁸⁵ MHCZ 1, pp. XLIII-XLVIII.



Map 19-Present-day borders of Donja Lomnica, Petrovina and Šiljakovina and the position of the church of St. Peter

There are some additional interesting data recorded in one of the perambulations of borders between Petrovina and Donja Lomnica. One of the problematic areas was the one where the church of St. Peter was placed. As written, the church does not exist today, but its position is visible on the First military survey. Thanks to the quarrels a few basic things were recorded about the church: it was built of stone and had a wooden *pignaculum*. Next to it was a *curia* in which lived a priest that served at this church. Along with him, ten tenant-peasants (*iobagiones*) lived on the land belonging to the church. The envoys of Petrovina estimated the value of this land, the church, the tenant-peasants and the *curia*. The land itself, three *aratri* big, was worth 9 marks. The church was worth 25 marks. Each tenant-peasant was worth 1 mark and the priest's *curia* 3 marks.²⁸⁶

Perhaps the fact that the ownership of the church and its area was the reason of dispute can reveal something about Petrovina in the thirteenth century. The castle warriors of Donja Lomnica, noticeably, considered the church and its surrounding area to be their property. There could have been two reasons for that. The first reason could have been that they were lying; they wanted to use the unfavourable circumstances in which the burghers were in that period and seized parts of their land, using the fake ownership as an excuse. Needless to mention, these situations were not unusual in the medieval period just as they were/are not unusual in any other period. The second reason could be that the church and the area was indeed the property of the castle warriors in the thirteenth century. More about this will be written when the area of the castle warriors will be analysed.

4.2.2.2.3. Šiljakovina


Actually, data about Šiljakovina could support the last assumption. They reveal that, in all these conflicts happening in the area in the last decade of the fourteenth century, the burghers were not exclusively the victims of attacks, but also the attackers.

On the 12th of May 1394, a group of castle warriors came to the Chapter of Zagreb and stated that their hereditary estate Šiljakovina (*possessio Sylakowina...ipsios iure haeredetario contingentem*) had been occupied by the owners of Petrovina, the burghers of Grič. In spite of that, the castle warriors decided to donate Šiljakovina to the burghers, the reason being a

²⁸⁶ MHCZ 1, doc. 385., pp. 368-369.

protection the citizens gave them in the past and, hopefully, will give them in the future.²⁸⁷ Next year, the citizens were installed into Šiljakovina and Petrovina.²⁸⁸

The 1394 charter places Šiljakovina between Petrovina and an estate called Kostanjevec (*Kostanewcz*), owned by sons of Michael called Vitez [Knight] (...*filiorum Michaelis dicti Wythez*), next to the Buna River.²⁸⁹ The village Šiljakovina exists today, placed south of Petrovina. Toponym Kostanjevec can be found on modern maps on its eastern side (Map 20).



Map 20-Šiljakovina and toponym Kostanjevec (source: Geoportal)

4.2.2.3. Mraclin

Just as was the case with the thirteenth-century charters, there are only a few extant fourteenth-century charters about Mraclin; more precisely, there are only three of them. One is the already-mentioned charter from 1360, that informs someone started to claim that the castle

²⁸⁷ MHCZ 1, doc. 345, pp. 339-340.

²⁸⁸ MHCZ 1, doc. 345, p. 441.

²⁸⁹ MHNC 1, doc. 135, pp. 133-134. The text of the charter is transcribed as: *quandam possessionem dictorum nobilium castrensiu Sylakowina appellatam, inter possessiones Petrowynam antedictam et Kosthanewecz nuncupatam, filiorum Michaelis dicti Wythez, iuxta fluiuium Buna*. Based on this data, Laszowski concluded Šiljakovina was the property of the sons of Michael the Knight. Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 387. The text is a bit unclear but, taking into consideration data from the other charters, I think that Šiljakovina was a property of the castle warriors who stated in front of the Chapter that they are donating it to the burgers and that Kostanjevec was a property of the sons of Michael.

warriors of Mraclin are under the jurisdiction of the Želin castle, which they strongly rejected.²⁹⁰ More about the relationship of castle warriors and the owners of the Želin estate will be discussed at the closing part of this chapter (see: *Želin-centre of Turopolje*, pages: 128-131).

The other two charters give some information about the land holding patterns in the territory owned by the castle warriors. From the first one, from 1346, we find out that the nobles of Mraclin (*nobiles de Mraczin*) also had their estate on the territory outside of the borders of their village. The land in mentioned in this charter was called *Rakythowecz*, and, as perambulation clearly shows, was situated on the territory of the present-day village Rakitovec. This village is placed 3.5 km east of Mraclin (one of the borders is the stream Glosna, which is in the territory of this village). The nobles of Mraclin redeemed this land which was their hereditary land (*terra heredetaria*) from *Cordozlaus* and his sons Thomas and Nicolaus.²⁹¹ These situations were not unusual, it was customary for the castle warriors of Turopolje to have the estates all around the area and also outside of it.

In 1376, Barnaba and John, sons of Ibro, son of Stojko from Mraclin and John, son of *Methen*, son of Radoslav from Mraclin came to Nicholas de Werthus, *comes* of Zagreb and John son of George, *comes terrestris* of the Field of Zagreb and exposed their problem. Barnaba and John claimed that John, son on Mathen had no share in the quarter of the estate Mraclin (*in quarta parte possessionis Mraczin*).²⁹² Then John son of Mathen presented a letter from an unnamed *comes* of Zagreb and *comes terrestris* of Turopolje. The letter proved that his father Mathen together with his brothers Banko and Matthew (John's uncle) held the shares in the quarter of the territory of Mraclin; in that quarter one third belonged to Mathen, Banko and Matthew. However, they gave that third in pledge to sons of Stojko. *Comes* of Zagreb Nicholas de Werthus and *comes terrestris* of the Field of Zagreb John son of George adjudicated disputable one third of the quarter of the estate Mraclin to John son of Mathen. If he dies without heirs John and Barnaba could redeem this land from the other sons of Stojko.²⁹³ This charter clearly illustrates how complex were the property relations and share inside one village of the castle warriors. What is of interest for the topic now is that the term *possessio* understands the whole territory of Mraclin as a village of different owners. The shares were obviously well known to all parties involved. Also, these shares do not belong to kindred but to families. I will not discuss about that because this topic would require systematic study that can be much

²⁹⁰ MHNC 1, doc. 75, pp. 75-76.

²⁹¹ MHNC 1, doc. 60, pp. 60-61; Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 370.

²⁹² MHNC 1, doc. 92, pp. 96-97.

²⁹³ MHNC 1, doc. 92, pp. 96-97; Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, pp. 370-371.

accurately done for the territory of villages like Donja Lomnica, Velika Gorica or Mlaka due to considerably bigger amount of the extant sources. This fragmentation of the land and decomposition of kindred in the Turopolje area will be the topic of the chapter about the villages of the castle warriors.

4.2.2.4. Trnovec

4.2.2.4.1. Location

The village Trnovec does not exist today. It can, however, be placed in the present-day environment due to the extant perambulation of its western and southern borders.²⁹⁴ In 1358, Lieutenant of Slavonia (*vicarius totius regni Sclavonie generalis*) Leustace from demanded the Chapter of Zagreb to determine the borders between the estates Pusta Dužica and Trnovec (*Puztaducsycha* and *Ternouch*) and certain estates under the jurisdiction of the castle Želin. Trnovec was the property of *magister* Ivan son of Ivan of Zagreb's Field and some other people (*magistri Ivan filii Ivan et aliorum*). The Chapter did the demanded.²⁹⁵

The text of the perambulation of Trnovec is very long. Many of the landmarks are trees and swamps, thus, the landmarks not recognizable in the present-day environment. For that reason, I will just mention the landmarks that can be approximately located. The starting point of the boundary was some road that was leading from Lomnica (*Lumpnycha*) to Kurilovec (*Kurilouch*). The land of *magister* Ivan was located on the right side of the road, all the way to the Odra River. On the left side of the road was a certain small part of the land of the Želin castle. After that, the border came to some other road and then to the crossing place over the Odra river (*fluuius Odra*) called *Peeschenybrod*. After passing the Odra, the border went towards the south through some old road (*per antiquam viam*) between thornbushes and came to the water Lomnica (*aqua Lompnycha*) and passed it. After the Lomnica, the border went towards the south to the water (*aqua*) *Mozuchya* and transited it, thence to the water Črnek (*aqua Chernech*), thence to the stream Ravinščak (*rywlus Hramechnyak*), and crossing over it, after a while it came to some big road leading from Petrovina to Kravarsko (*magna via que transit ad*

²⁹⁴ Laszowski wrote about Trnovec in his book about the history of the noble community, but he did not know its exact location. Nevertheless, he correctly assumed, since Trnovec is often mentioned with Kurilovec and Vrbaneć, it must had been somewhere in the territory of Kurilovec.; Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine*, pp. 387-388. This was indeed so; Trnovec was placed south of Kurilovec. On the 1861 cadastre map, its area was within the borders of Kurilovec. In Laszowski's time, these were also the borders of Kurilovec, while today are the cadastre borders of Velika Gorica. Juraj Ćuk, on the other hand, correctly placed Trnovec in the territory east of Petrovina.; Ćuk, *Zagrebačka županija*, p. 151.

²⁹⁵ CD 12, doc. 357, pp. 463-466.

Petrouina in Cruarzka), and it went through the road to the water Buna (*aqua Buna*). Thus, the border described so far went from the north to the south. On the right side of the border was Trnovec and on the left side Petrovina, an estate of the Želin castle (*possessio castri Selyn*). Thence, through the watercourse of Buna the border went towards the east. On the left side of it was the land of Ivan and on the right side the estate Kravarsko. Thus, Trnovec was located north of the Buna River, that is, north of Kravarsko.

Based on data from the perambulation I have done, up to the extent that it was possible, the reconstruction of the boundaries of Trnovec. They are shown on Map 21. I suppose the boundaries were similar to the present-day eastern borders of Petrovina and Šiljakovina. Basically, the northern border of the estate was the Odra-Lomnica River and the southern border the Buna River. Today south of Buna River is the area of the settlement Velika Buna, but in medieval times this area was a part of Kravarsko.


It should be noticed that only Petrovina is mentioned as the western neighbouring estate, in the whole area from the Odra-Lomnica to the Buna on the south. On the 1861 cadastre map and on modern maps the border of Petrovina covers just 700 meters of the border described in the charter. The rest 5.80 kilometres is the border of Šiljakovina. Šiljakovina was given to the owners of Petrovina, the burghers of Gradec, in 1394 by some castle warriors. At that time, the estate was placed near the Buna River, between Petrovina and Kostanjevec.²⁹⁶ In 1487, Šiljakovina was a smaller estate within the borders of Petrovina.²⁹⁷ Obviously, in the course of the next centuries, the importance of Šiljakovina had grown and of Petrovina had been diminished. This is important for the settlement-system reconstruction, but this happened in the modern period so I will not discuss it any more since it exceeds the time scope of the thesis.

In any case, in the medieval period, as can be seen on the map, the border of Trnovec was west of Okuje, only 3.5 kilometres distant from the archaeological site. This estate was vast, the border was very long, approximately 7 kilometres. Unfortunately, the charter contains only the western border of the estate and not the eastern, the one in the direction of the site Okuje. It can be concluded that the lands on the eastern side of Trnovec did not belong to the Želin castle. Therefore, there was no need to write them down as the purpose of the perambulation was making the borders between the Želin estate and the estates held by Ivan son of Ivan. The closest known owners of land east of Okuje are the castle warriors of Mraclin,

²⁹⁶ MHNC 1, doc. 135, pp. 133-134.

²⁹⁷ MHCZ 2, doc. 345, pp. 464-466.

but whether there were some other estates between Trnovec and Mraclin in the middle of the fourteenth century remains an open question.



Map 21-Location of Trnovec between the present-day cadastre borders of Petrovina, Šiljakovina and Mraclin

4.2.2.4.2. Owners

Except for the above analysed 1358 charter, there are three more fourteenth-century charters in which Trnovec is mentioned. The first is a purchase contract issued by Ban Mikcs on the 27th of August 1334. The ban confirmed that George son of Pazman and his cousins Elias, Thomas and Peter, sons of Vojča sold their estate Trnovec (*possessionum eorum Thernoch*), that they had once bought from Videčec, son of Martin. The buyers were the castle warriors (*nobiles iobagiones castri*) Jacob son of Vukota, Mikec son of Helemens, Miko son of Vuk, Peter, John and Andrew, sons of John, Stephan and Barla, sons of Vrban as well as Peter, son of Thomas and John, son of Stephan [the last two men were sons of the previously mentioned John and Stephan, sons of Vrban]. The charter does not contain perambulation of the estate, but it is written that the estate was placed in the vicinity of the above-mentioned castle warriors.²⁹⁸

The second charter, that contains the perambulation, informs that in 1358 Trnovec was an estate of Ivan, son of Ivan from the Field of Zagreb (*magister Ivan filius Ivan de Campo Zagrabiensi*), but also that he was not the only owner. Trnovec was an estate of Ivan and the others (*...eiusdem magistri Ivan filii Ivan et aliorum Ternouch vocate...*).²⁹⁹

In 1368, an interesting exchange took place in front of the Chapter of Zagreb. *Magister* Michael, son of John the Knight from the Field of Zagreb (*Mychael filius Iohannis militis de Campo Zagrabiensi*), gave away his bought estate Trnovec (*possessio empticia Ternouch*) to Ivčec, son of Radoslav from the kindred of Domagojić (*de generacione Domagoych*), in exchange for two estates in Domagojić and Moluna.³⁰⁰ These estates were placed at the western part of Zagreb County, around Jastrebarsko.³⁰¹ There is no perambulation of Trnovac, it is only emphasized that it was placed *in Campo Zagrabiensi*.³⁰²

In 1397, John, son of Jacob, Lucas and John, sons of Kušan, Matthew, son of Nicholas, Nicholas, son of George and certain Matthew came in front of the Chapter of Zagreb. All of them were castle warriors from Kurilovec. In accordance with some notification already given to the Chapter by Ivan son of Ivan from Brezovica (*magister Ivan filius Ivan de Brezouycza*), the castle warriors redeemed their estate Trnovec (*possessio Ternouech*) from John, Thomas

²⁹⁸ MHNC 1, doc. 52, pp. 52-53.

²⁹⁹ CD 12, doc. 357, p. 464.

³⁰⁰ MHNC 1, doc 84, pp. 87-88.

³⁰¹ Laszowski wrote down interesting data: "From that event [the above-mentioned exchange] there is even today [so, beginning of the twentieth century] a story in the village Domagovići that they originated from Turopolje". Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine*, p. 388.

³⁰² MHNC 1, doc 84, p. 87.

and Jakob, sons of Martin Vrbanić. Sons of Martin inherited this loan, that is, the land they held in pledge, from their father. He and his brother Peter took the land in pledge from the castle warriors, but until 1397, they did not have the money to redeem it.³⁰³

From these four charters is clear that different people had estates called Trnovec. In practice, that means that Trnovec was the collective name for the estates of various owners. As shown, this land was vast; its western border was stretching over an area of some 7 kilometres.

The text of the 1358 charter informs that Trnovec belonged to *magister* Ivan son of Ivan and the others. The others were, according to the data from the other charters, the castle warriors of Turopolje, in the first place from Kurilovec. In the 1387 charter this is explicitly mentioned. In the 1333 charter is written that the land in question was in the vicinity of the castle warriors who bought it which suggests they were from Kurilovec, the first neighbouring village on the northern side of Trnovec.

Except for the castle warriors of Turopolje, as the 1368 charter shows, nobles from the western part of the County also had the estates in the area of Trnovec. These were the members of the kindred of Domagojić that had exchanged lands with *Magister* Michael, son of John the Knight. These nobles are not mentioned in any other charter from Turopolje found so far, thus, it is not clear what happened with this land.

Finally, estates of one important noble family can be identified in Trnovec. These are descendants of Jaroslav and his son Ivan from Brezovica. By the fourteenth century, the family lost most of their estates that were mostly taken over or bought by the Babonić family. They started to be defined as “*nobiles de Campo Zagrabinesi*”.³⁰⁴ Comes Ivan had three sons. These were John (*Iohannes*), Ivan (*Iwan, Ivan*) and Matthew (*Mateus*).³⁰⁵ Thus, Ivan from the Field of Zagreb (*magister Ivan filius Ivan de Campo Zagrabienzi*), mentioned as one of the owners in Trnovec in 1358, was a son of *comes* Ivan and grandson of Jaroslav. His son Ivan III was a *familiaris* of the king.³⁰⁶ Ivan II was holding Pusta Dužica as a *prediales* of the church of Topusko. Except that, as far as the Turopolje area is concerned, he held three more estates as a *prediales* of Chapter of Zagreb. These were Prevlaka, Kosnica and Otok, situated in the

³⁰³ CD 18, doc. 120, p. 170.

³⁰⁴ Klaić, *Povijest Zagreba*, p. 65.

³⁰⁵ CD 10, doc. 88, p. 139.

³⁰⁶ In 1366 King Louis forbid the Chapter of Zagreb to ask for increasing of the payment from Kosnica on the request of *fidelis noster familiaris Iohannes, filius magistri Ivani, filii Ivani militis nostri, in sua et eiusdem patris sui personis*. CD 13, doc. 359.

northern part of the region, below the Sava River.³⁰⁷ But Trnovec was not classified as *praedium*. It was an estate owned by Ivan II and the others.

The other son of *comes* Ivan, son of Jaroslav was John, who was a knight. He was mentioned as the owner of the land south of the Hospitallers' estate of Čičan in 1328, the same land his grandfather Jaroslav was holding in the time of King Andrew II (see pages 72-73). His son was Michael (*Mychael filius Iohannis militis de Campo Zagrabienzi*) who gave away his bought estate Trnovec for in the exchange for the estates in Domagojić and Moluna.³⁰⁸ I suppose he could have also bought one part of the estate Trnovec from some other people and later give it away in the purpose of exchange for the members of Domagojić kindred. As will be seen later, Michael's son John also owned some land in Trnovec. As I will mention this family in the further text, from now on I will refer to them as the Ivanović family from Brezovica (later the descendants of this family did have the last name Ivanović). The systematic study of this family remains to be written.

Finally, all these charters mentioned so far refer to Trnovec as a *possessio*. This term, however, does not tell much about the nature of the property. It can mean both a village and the estate with no dwelling units. There are no individuals from Trnovec mentioned in the fourteenth-century documents, the first person from Trnovec is mentioned in the extant charter from 1462,³⁰⁹ but that does not necessarily mean the area was not populated in the fourteenth century.

4.2.2.5. Closing remarks – Functioning of the area in the fourteenth century

The extant fourteenth-century documents have enabled the analysis of the area of four present-day villages that surround the site of Okuje: Staro Čiče, Novo Čiče, Mraclin, and Petrovina. In addition to that, the estate Trnovec is recorded in the extant sources. The village of such name does not exist today, but its position has been reconstructed; it was placed east of Petrovina. Until the second half of the twentieth century, the area of the former Trnovec was within the cadastre borders of Kurilovec, while today is within the cadastre borders of Velika Gorica. In total, the analysed area is approximately 35 square kilometres large. Only for its central part, the one closest to the site, there are no extant data prior to the fifteenth century.

³⁰⁷ In the charter, issued in 1349, by which archdeacon John of Gorica rented him these estates under predial conditions Ivan is called *nobilis vir comes Ivan filius Ivan filius Iarozlai*; CD 11, doc. 393.

³⁰⁸ MHNC 1, doc. 84, pp. 87-88.

³⁰⁹ MHNC 1, doc. 164, p. 154.

As was the case with the thirteenth-century, the complex ownership situation and the social diversity of inhabitants of the area is clear from the fourteenth-century charters. Significant changes, both in terms of the ownership and the territorial organization, happened in the Želin estate and the Čičan preceptory. After the sons of Ban Stephan Babonić had lost Želin (after 1322), and the Hospitallers had left Turopolje (in 1328), two estates were joined and became a property of the king. The merging resulted in spreading of the borders of the Želin estate. Its central part was situated in the area north of the Odra River, between Novo Čiče and the present-day village of Ribnica. The appertaining estates were spread throughout Turopolje. Those were: a smaller portion of the land in Hrašće on the west, and bigger portions of lands south of the Odra (Petrovina, Lekenik, the areas of Peščenica and Kravarsko). A possible impact of the departure of the Hospitallers on the social structure of their former estates and on the Turopolje region, in general, can be discussed only on the theoretical level as there are no documents that could reveal something about the issue. The data about the fair shows that Chichan remained a *libera villa* as it was in the time of the order. In any case, the village was not insignificant in a newly organized estate; it was the only known market place in Turopolje and the place were important persons, like Charles of Durrazzo, were occasionally staying.

The next significant changes regarding Želin happened in the first period of the reign of King Sigismund. He donated the estate and the castle to John Szechy by 1396 and then to the Toths by 1397. Thus, in the last decade of the fourteenth century, Želin again became the property of high nobility as it was prior to 1322. In addition to that, the king gave Petrovina and Hrašće to the burgers of Gradec in 1387, only to re-annex them to Želin some ten years later. Whether these changes influenced the internal structure of the village or peasant population cannot be said, but it certainly caused numerous violent conflicts in the area that marked the last decade of the fourteenth century and continued in the fifteenth century.

On the other hand, there were no changes in the ownership of the village of Mraclin; it remained the village of castle warriors. Trnovec, on the other hand, was a joint name for estates of different owners. Both the castle warriors of Turopolje and some other people, like the Ivanović family, had their estates in this territory.

Four terms appear in the fourteenth-century charters for inhabitants of the analysed area. Those are *iobagiones castri*, *nobiles iobagiones*, *iobagiones* and *populus*. Basically, they signify two social classes: castle warriors and tenant-peasants.

The terms *nobiles iobagiones* and *nobiles castrenses* marks the same as the term *iobagiones castri* in the previous century – the nobles of Turopolje. Thus, *iobagiones castri* of the Arpadian period, who were higher status people of the royal castle system kept their privileged positions and became *nobiles iobagiones*, lesser nobleman. With this name, they were differenced from the ordinary *iobagiones*, tenant-peasants.

The only village of the castle warriors in the analysed area was Mraclin. Although there are only three extant fourteenth-century charters about it, some basic conclusions about the functioning of the village can be drawn. The kindred bounds between castle warriors were still strong. When, in 1360, Stojko, Milko and Ivan complained to Ban Lustahije that someone wanted to subjugate them to Želin, the complaint was raised in the name of their whole kindred (*..ac ceteri generacionis eorum homines...*).³¹⁰ Soon after that, the ban issued a charter, which is confirmation of their liberties.³¹¹ Likewise, the land in Rakitovec redeemed from *Cordozlaus* and his sons Thomas and Nicolaus in 1346 was a hereditary land of all nobles of Mraclin.³¹² On the other hand, a dispute over the land called Mraclin from 1376, was a dispute between families and it is clear from the document that this is the second generation with such a case.³¹³ Similarly, charters about Trnovec testify about bigger land transactions into which more people were involved, but also not on the kindred level. Thus, basically, the awareness of belonging to a certain kindred was present. At the same time, land was private ownership of an individual or a family and was frequently bought and sold.

Along with *iobagiones castri*, the important part of the thirteenth- century castle system were *castrenses*. That term, however, practically disappeared from sources in the first half of the fourteenth century and began to be replaced with the term *iobagiones*. Its meaning was, more or less, the same throughout the kingdom; *iobagiones* were free tenant-peasants who had the right to move if fulfil their obligations, pay a movement fee (*terragium*), clear all the possible debts, and obtain a permission of a village reeve.³¹⁴ Likewise, in the fourteenth century, the term *populus* is equal to the term *iobagiones*. This can be seen in the example from 1392. Tenant-peasants of the appertaining villages of Gradec were freed from paying taxes to the

³¹⁰ MHNC 1, doc. 75, pp. 75-76.

³¹¹ MHNC 1, doc. 75, pp. 75-76; Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine*, p. 370.

³¹² MHNC 1, doc. 60, pp. 60-61.

³¹³ MHNC 1, doc. 92, pp. 96-97.

³¹⁴ It should mentioned that Pal Engel emphasized that “the right of free movement was generally accepted from the early fourteenth century and practised throughout the kingdom, with the exception of Slavonia where it was to remain unknown until about 1400.” Engel, *The realm*, pp. 174-175. But, according to Nada Klaić the situation in Slavonia was the same as in the rest of the Kingdom: “A tenant-peasant is free and can abandon his lord if he has a better living condition on some other estate”, Klaić, *Povijest Hrvata u razvijenom srednjem vijeku*, p. 556.

Chapter of Zagreb if selling their goods in the city market. These tenant-peasants, among which were people from Hrašće and Petrovina, were called *iobagiones seu populus ipsorum civium*.³¹⁵

As was the case with *castrenses*, the fourteenth-century data about *iobagiones* are scarce. This term was used for inhabitants of Hrašće and Petrovina and also of the Želin estate. In the perambulation of the estate Kosnica from 1333, among the neighbouring parcels, estates of *iobagionum de Selyn* were recorded.³¹⁶ These *iobagiones* could have easily be descendants of the thirteenth-century *castrenses*. On the other hand, some of them might have been newcomers in the area. It is hard to tell if there were any settling in the area of Želin in the fourteenth century as there are no documents.

Along with the tenant-peasants, there were other inhabitants of the Želin estate, not mentioned by any specific name in the extant sources. For example, George and Paul, sons of Masten from Čičan, were certainly not tenant-peasants but the documents mostly do not reveal anything specific about their legal status. They are simply denominated as the sons of Masten from Čičan. Only in two documents, that inform of the capturing of Andrew Sib by Paul, son of Masten, the last one is called *magister Paulus*, which points at higher noble status.³¹⁷ Sons of Masten could have gotten a part of the Želin estate in pledge from King Sigismund or perhaps John Széchy (in case he already owned the estate in 1393/4). In any case, they were never again mentioned in the charters and Čičan remained a part of the Želin estate in the next century.

Besides the violent acts of sons of Masten, violences of castellans of Želin are mentioned on more occasion. Castellans were the most important officials of the client system of the magnates. This system was based on the service which lower and mid-rank nobles provided to nobles of higher rank; this could have included handling of the administration of estates or performing some other administrative, political, and military services. In return, they would get a salary and some other rewards as well as protection when needed. A castellan (mostly one, rarely two) had an administrative and military jurisdiction over subordinates living in appertaining estates of a castle. He was present in a castle in cases when the castle was not a governing seat of his master.³¹⁸ For example, a castellan of Želin Nicholas Heer had captured

³¹⁵ MHCZ 1, doc. 362, p. 343.

³¹⁶ MHNC 1, doc. 48, p. 49.

³¹⁷ MHCZ 1, doc. 370-371, pp. 350-352.

³¹⁸ Suzana Miljan, "Familiaritas i klijentelski sustav unutar plemićkog društva zagrebačke županije za vrijeme vladavine Žigmunda Luksemburškog (1387.-1437.)" [Familiaritas and the client system within the noble society of the county of Zagreb during the reign of Sigismund of Luxemburg (1387-1437)], *Zbornik Odsjeka za povijesne znanosti Zavoda za povijesne i društvene znanosti Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 33 (2015), pp. 105-108.

twelve people from Petrovina and was waiting further orders from his master John Széchy. Obviously, John Széchy was not present in Želin. Nicholas Heer is a good example of how castellans are often mentioned in extant sources; these sources were usually issued as testimonies of court procedures between different noble families and, in them, different sorts of violent acts of castellans are depicted.

Along with the case of Nicholas Heer, the conflicts of castellans of Želin and the castle warriors from Velika Gorica and Mraclin are recorded in the extant sources. It seems that the taking over of the castle by the king as well as King Sigismund's donation of the castle and the estate to Széchy resulted in tensions between the castle warriors of Turopolje and the castellans of Želin, that is, their masters. In this respect, one interesting observation of Juraj Ćuk should be mentioned.

4.2.2.5.1. *Želin – the centre of Turopolje?*

Juraj Ćuk is the only one who emphasized the importance of Želin for the general history of the Turopolje region. He referred to Čiče (without specifying which one, Novo or Staro) as “the centre of old Turopolje”.³¹⁹ This statement is, in my opinion, questionable. More precisely, perhaps it could be valid for the thirteenth century which was the focus of Ćuk's work. Nevertheless, it is very interesting since it draws attention to the important questions regarding both the territorial and the political organization of the area. What were connections between the castle warriors of Turopolje with the bans and afterwards the kings and the high nobles who owned Želin? Did the Želin estate and the castle, play any role in the governing system of the bans over the castle warriors of Zagreb castle (to whom they were subjected)? Naturally, the Želin castle cannot be equalled with Zagreb castle, created for being the military and administrative centre of the County. However, it can be asked to what extent Želin, as the nearest castle, played a role in the life of the noble community of Turopolje.

The thirteenth-century data are scarce. Two charters from the second half of the century testify that bans were occasionally present at the Želin estate; one charter in Želin was issued by Ban Roland in 1265 and the other by Ban Henrik II. of the Kőszegi kindred in 1270.³²⁰ The 1265 charter was issued on the request of the castle warriors who came to Želin, obviously using the opportunity that the ban was staying practically in the neighbourhood. Still, that does

³¹⁹ Ćuk, *Zagrebačka županija*, p. 139.

³²⁰ MHNC 1, doc. 15, p.18; CD 5, doc. 987, p. 525.

not reveal much about the importance of the estate for everyday business of the castle warriors. This is the only such extant charter issued in Želin.

The period of Babonići's rule over the estate is important primarily because of the building of the castle (between 1293 and 1315). Two charters provide some information about the relations of the Babonići and the castle warriors. In 1315, Peter son of Nepert, *iobagio castrī Zagrabīensi*, asked Ban Stephan to confirm that he was holding the estate Siget as a *predialis* of the Chapter of Zagreb. The ban granted his wish and issued the confirmation charter in Želin castle.³²¹ Thus, in this period, the castle, although the private property of the Babonić family, did function as some sort of a seat of bans, supreme commanders of the castle warriors. It was so because Stephan and after him John Babonić were bans. The valuable testimony of the connections of the castle warriors and Ban John is extant in the text of one charter from 1317. Mark from Lomnica was a notary in the service of the ban and he participated in the fights with the Kőszegis. The king awarded him and his cousins and promoted them from the rank of castle warriors probably to the rank of *servientes regis* (this part of the charter is destroyed).³²² Two charters are not enough to make any general conclusions about the connections between the Babonić family and the castle warriors. I suppose Želin becoming the private property of the landlord Radoslav Babonić was not so significant change in terms of relations of the owners of the estate (and then the castle) and the castle warriors in comparison to the period prior to it. After all, in the relatively short period of 30 years (1293-1327?) of the Babonić rule over the estate, three members of the family were bans; Radoslav, Stephan and John.

The first extant data about quarrels between the castle warriors of Turopolje and the castellans of Želin date from the second half of the fourteenth century. By that time, Želin was a royal estate, governed by castellans. In 1360, Stojko son of Vuk, Milko son of Andrew and Ivan son of Stephan and the other of their kinsmen, all from Mraclin, came to the General assembly of the nobility of the area between Lonja and Gvozd. They complained to Ban Leustace that someone started to claim they were subjects of Želin. It is not specified in the text of the charter that reports about this event who exactly started to claim this (*non de iure, immo tacita veritate congratulari castro Selyn dicebantur subiungi debere seruituri*), but, as Laszowski wrote: "it was probably some violent castellan of Želin, that later can be often found in the sources".³²³

³²¹ MHNC 1, doc. 3, pp. 40-41.

³²² MNL OL, DL 255656.

³²³ MHNC 1, doc. 75, p. 75; Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine*, p. 370.

Sometime before 1397, the castle warriors of Gorica complained to King Sigismund that castellans of Želin-Čičan (*de Selyn alias de Chychan*) occupied their estates. Gorica is situated on the western side of Staro Čiče, so Čičan and Gorica were the neighbouring estates. The names of the castellans were not recorded. In 1397, the king ordered Martin Der, vice-Ban and *comes* of Zagreb, to investigate the situation. The vice-Ban sent his envoy, judge Peter, to Gorica. Peter had gathered all neighbours and question them. The estates were returned to the castle warriors and borders were recorded.³²⁴ In the text of the charter is not exactly specified when this occupation had happened; it is written simply that it had happened during the difficult times that now passed (*temporibus inpactis, nunc retrogressis*). According to Laszowski, that sentence implies the time of the rebellion of the part of the Slavonian nobility against the king.³²⁵ Since there is no name of any owner of Želin, it can perhaps be assumed that this happened while Želin was still a royal estate, before Széchy became the owner but also it could be while he was owning the estate.

Thus, on the basis of the extant data seems that the serious problems started when Želin became the property of kings and governed by the castellans who wanted to submit the castle warriors of Turopolje to the jurisdiction of the castle. The response of the castle warriors was a strong resistance (and this also corresponds with the period when the castle system was falling apart). Therefore, starting from the second quarter of the fourteenth century, the castle of Želin did not play a role in the forming of the noble community, at least not in a positive way. On the other hand, occasional external pressure produced by the castellans did play a unifying role in the cohesion of the community. This continued in the following centuries when the castle was a property of the noble families. In that respect, the castle itself was not as important as the fact that Želin was a big estate of a landlord, functioning on completely different grounds than the area that belonged to the noble community. In general, the attitude of the castle warriors towards the owners of Želin was hostile, as it was with the masters of Medvedgrad and Lukavec (when it was taken from the noble community) who all wanted to submit them to their power. Still, I would like to emphasize that, while this statement about hostile attitude really is correct on a general level, the balance of power in a certain time period naturally influenced the behaviour of the members of the noble community. Nevertheless, their main goal always was to avoid being subdued to any landlord.

³²⁴ MHNC, doc. 153, pp. 145-146.

³²⁵ Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine*, pp. 392-392.

Therefore, I think that the statement that Želin was a centre of Turopolje perhaps can be partly correct for the thirteenth and the beginning of the fourteenth century, when it was owned by the bans and the Babonić family. But, after 1327, the estate of Želin and the noble community were separate entities. The connections with the owners of Želin were, in general, hostile; while Želin castle was the centre of the big noble estate, it was certainly not a centre of the noble community of Turopolje.

4.2.3. The fifteenth century

Along with the Želin estate, Petrovina, Trnovec and Mraclin, eight other settlements situated in the area around the site of Okuje are mentioned in the extant fifteenth-century sources. One of them is Kušanec. It does not exist today but is depicted on the Military surveys. The others, present-day existing villages are Okuje, Vukovina, Buna and Buševac and non-existing ones are Mišine, Tržec and Samac.

The structure of this chapter somewhat differs from the structure of the previous chapters, about the settlement system of this area in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The reason for this is that there are no separate charters about Okuje, Vukovina, Mišine, Tržec and Samac. All of them are mentioned in the same charters and in the same context, so more about them can be concluded only if this context is more closely looked at and data about them are analysed together. Therefore, first, data from the fifteenth century written sources about the Želin estate, Mraclin, Trnovec, Petrovina and Kušanec will be analysed. After that, data about Okuje, Vukovina, Mišine, Samac, Tržec, Buna and Buševac will be presented and analysed. Some additional data regarding Trnovec will also be discussed in this part of the chapter. Finally, all the data that will come out of these analyses will be put together and the functioning of the settlement system will be discussed in the closing remarks.

4.2.3.1. Želin

4.2.3.1.1. *A property of the Toths*

At the very end of the fourteenth century, King Sigismund gave the castle and the estate Želin to Laurence, Christopher and Nicholas, sons of Nicholas Toth of Susedgrad. On their request, he also gave them Petrovina. Prior to 1387, Petrovina had been the estate of Želin, but, that year, the king gave it to the burghers of Gradec. The re-annexing of Petrovina to Želin at the end of the fourteenth century was the cause of constant tensions between the Toths and the burghers.

In general, the donation of Želin to the Toths had permanent consequences regarding the ownership situation and the history of whole Turopolje area. Seventy years after the sons of Ban Stephan Babonić had lost Želin and it become the royal property, after the donation, Želin again became one of estates of the noble family and it remained so until the twentieth century. As the Babonići, the Toths were high nobility. They were descendants of the Ača kindred (*de genere Acha*) and the oldest noble family in Zagreb County; it is assumed that Ača was a

nobleman who came to Slavonia with King Ladislaus I and gained large portions of a land in the county.³²⁶ Over time, the kindred of Ača split into numerous branches. Some of them died out, and of some, a power declined. During the time of the Babonić rule in Slavonia, Susedgrad, the main castle of the kindred, was owned by the Babonić family. After the fall of the last, the castle was returned to the descendants of Ača. The renewal of the old family estates was an accomplishment of Nicholas (III), son of George; among other estates, King Louis I gave him back Susedgrad in 1345. Nicholas was a royal knight who served in the armies of Kings Charles Robert and Louis I. His nickname Toth became the family name of his children and grandchildren. In the period after their hereditary estates had been returned, the family split again into two main branches. One branch was gathered around the *castellum* Stubica that they had built on their hereditary land. This branch was not connected with Želin. The other branch was denominated after the castle Susedgrad, their main estate. These were the sons of Nicholas Toth to whom King Sigismund donated Želin. Two of them, Nicholas and Laurence, were the royal knights as was their father, while Christopher was the provost of Glogovnica.³²⁷

Members of a next generation of the Toths that owned Susedgrad and Želin were Laurence's sons Stephan and John as well as Nicholas' son Ladislaus.³²⁸ Stephan died young, without heirs. Ladislav was the most active member of the family in the period of King Sigismund's reign. With Mučin Lipovački, he co-owned the castles Komogovina and Kostajnica.³²⁹ As far as Turopolje and the area of Želin is concerned, there are several extant data from this period that can be connected with Ladislaus. In 1435, he pledged an estate called Otok (*possessio Othok*) from John, Nicholas and Matthias de Gepew. There is no detailed

³²⁶ The only systematic study about the Ača kindred and the noble families that originated from it (the Toths, the Hennings and the Arlands) was written by Ljudevit Ivančan at the beginning of the twentieth century. Ljudevit Ivančan, "Vratislav i pleme Aka", *Vjesnik zemaljskog arhiva* 6 (1904), pp. 10-163; "Potomci plemena Aka", *Vjesnik zemaljskog arhiva* 7 (1905), pp. 6-83. This work is still very valuable, but, naturally, it needs to be complemented both from the modern historiographic point of view and with data from charters that were not known to the author. A summary of the history of the family was also given by Nada Klaić but the more detailed overview was given for the period prior to the fifteenth century. Klaić, *Povijest Zagreba*, pp. 59-62. Likewise, Suzana Miljan analysed data about the Toth family in the period of King Sigismund. However, for the period after 1437, there is no analysis about the family or their estates. I have found more unpublished charters connected with the Toths and the Hennings, for example, the connection of John Henning with Bartholomeus Dragfy de Belthlen (MNL OL, MNL, DF-DL 88650, MNL, DF-DL 16997, MNL, DF-DL 18038, MNL, DF-DL 107056). I am certain that a systematic research on the topic would reveal more new data. This would require a separate study so I will not include the new data in my analysis as I cannot properly evaluate them without the deeper research. I will limit the historical overview only to the most basic data about the Toths and the Hennings established so far in the previous literature. The important for the topic here is that the Želin estate was their property during the whole fifteenth century.

³²⁷ Klaić, *Povijest Zagreba*, pp. 57-62. The fourth son, John, was mentioned in the extant sources after 1362. Miljan, *Plemićko društvo Zagrebačke županije*, p. 227.

³²⁸ Miljan, *Plemićko društvo Zagrebačke županije*, pp. 145-163.

³²⁹ Miljan, *Plemićko društvo Zagrebačke županije*, pp. 34-35.

perambulation of the estate, it is only written that it was placed in Zagreb County, below the Sava River (*in comitatu Zagrabienſi, ultra fluuium Zawe*).³³⁰ The location, however, is closely connected with the area of Źelin, which will be discussed in more detail in the further text. Besides that, one other extant source mentions Nicholas son of Ivan from Kuće, a castellan of Źelin in the service of Ladislaus Toth (*Nicolas filius Ivan de Kuchah, castellanus Ladislai Toth de Selyn*). He was one of the neighbours present during the installation of Stephan and George Farkaš into Okuje and some other estates in 1435.³³¹

The Toths had quarrels with their neighbours in different parts of their estates. The quarrels with the citizens of Gradec are described in the chapter about Petrovina. As far as the rest of Turopolje is concerned, there was probably more than one quarrel with the members of the noble community. There is, however, only one extant charter from 1424 that testifies of a quarrel between the Toths and the family Vukovići or Kobilići from Velika Gorica as well as sons of Vuk son of Matthey from Obrež (*Ebrez*).³³²

John and Ladislaus Toth are last mentioned in 1439. On John's request (and because of his numerous services), King Albert allowed John's daughter Dorothea to inherit both John's and Ladislav's (her uncle's) estates. On 29th of August 1439, the king ordered the Chapter of Čazma to install Dorothea into her properties which they did a month later. She was installed into Susedgrad with its appertaining estates Stubica, *Carponkuz* (?), Novaki, Strmec and Stenjevec (*Stwbycza, et Carponkuz, Nowaki, Ztermech, Ztnowcz*) as well as into the castle of Źelin and the market-place Čičan, Lazina and Kravarsko (*castri Selyn vocati et opidi Chichan appelatti, item Lazyna, Cravarska*).³³³ This is a typical case of perfection, a legal procedure by which kings could give a daughter a right to inherit her father's estates and gets all of a son's rights in these estates.

³³⁰ MNL, DF-DL 218728.

³³¹

³³² MHNC 1, doc. 197., pp. 189-191.

³³³ Charters issued by the king on 29th of August 1439 and the Chapter of Čazma on 29th of September 1439 are extant in a transcript from 1442, made by the Chapter of Zagreb, on a request of Dorothea's layer, Michael, son of Nicholas from Kysgora; MNL, DF-DL 34115. Ljudevit Ivančanin wrote that the installation was done on 24th of September 1439 by the Chapter of Zagreb. He quoted Ferdo Šišić's transcript of some charter (the original was supposedly in Budapest). According to the transcript, Dorothea was installed into Susedgrad, Źelin and Stubica and its appertaining estates. Ivančanin, "Vratislav i pleme Aka," p. 159. But this cannot be correct as Stubica was owned by the other branch of the family. Similarly, in the regestae of the Archive of the Croatian academy is written that the installation was done on the 24th of September by the Chapter of Zagreb and that Dorothea was installed into Susedgrad, Źelin and Stubica. This charter does not exist today, only its eighteenth-century regesta is extant. (JelacicXL, libellus[Zagrabiae]; Cop.saec. XVIII.=RegestumSennag.XLVI.elen.V). J. Stipišić – M. Šamšalović, *Isprave u arhivu Jugoslavenske akademije* (Nastavak – do smrti kralja Matije Korvina), 565. For further explanation, see footnote 118.

4.2.3.1.2. *The Hennings*

By 1442, Dorothea Toth was married to Cernin Henning.³³⁴ The marriage was a bigging of a new branch of the family - the Hennings of Susedgrad. As the Toth, Cernin Henning was a member of a high nobility, mentioned as *miles aule* in the last year of the reign of King Sigismund.³³⁵ After the king's death, he was an opponent of the counts of Cille and a supporter of John Hunyadi. After the death of Urlik of Cille, in November 1456, Cernin was one of two envoys sent by Slavonian nobles to ask King Ladislaus V to revoke ways by which *mandurina* was collected during the period when the counts of Cilli were bans of Slavonia. In February 1457, the king granted the wishes of the nobility. He also appointed Henning as his Master of the Horse (*magister agazonum*). Thus, Henning became one of the most important people in the Court.³³⁶

Already on the 30th of April 1455, the king ordered the Chapter of Čazma to reinstall Hening and Dorothea into the castles Susedgrad and Želin and the districts of Stubica, Kravarsko, Čiče and Brdovec (*...castra Szomzedwar ac Selyn appellata...necnon districtus Zthobicza, Kravraszka, Chichan et Berdovecz vocatas...*). He also gave them all the royal right in these estates (*...totum et omne ius nostrum regni...*). In June 1455, the installation was done.³³⁷ But, soon after, Henning died.

Dorothea got married for the second time, this time to Barthol X. Frankopan.³³⁸ Barthol owned castles Ozalj, Ribnik and Grižane in Vinodol.³³⁹ However, in 1474 Barthol died, so

³³⁴ In 1439 she is referred as *puella*, and in 1422 *nobilis domina Dorothea vocata filia condam Egregii Iohannis Toth de Zomzodwar consors vero Egregii Honnygh*, MNL, DF-DL-34115.

³³⁵ Miljan, *Plemićko društvo Zagrebačke županije*, p. 185.

³³⁶ Klaić, *Povijest Zagreba*, p. 288.

³³⁷ MNL, DF-DL 231376

³³⁸ Laszowski mentioned a document, issued on the 22nd of April 1465, by which Barthol made an oath that he will protect the properties of Hennings, but not alienate them. He promised that, after Dorothea's death, he will give the estates to their lawful inheritors, Dorothea's and Henning's children (John, Elisabeth, Dora and Ursula) or their descendants or, in case that none of them would be alive, to Dorothea's brother Stephan, Archbishop of Kalocsa-Bacs and the royal chancellor. Laszowski, "Želin-Čiče," p. 454. At that time Archbishop was Stephan Várdai. It is not clear to me how he could be Dorothea's brother. Also, if Dorothea had had a brother she would not be perfected into the estates. It is certain that Laszowski did not make up this data or incorrectly read the text of the charter. Such document is mentioned in the regestae of the Archive of the Croatian academy; on the 22nd of April 1465, Bartol promised that he will keep safe Dorothea's goods for her children. So, this is probably what Laszowski saw (J. Stipišić – M. Šamšalović, *Isprave u arhivu Jugoslavenske akademije*, reg. 601). This charter, however, does not exist today. Its summary is extant only in regestae of charters from the eighteenth century, while the original charters disappeared. This is the same as with charter of installation of Dorothea into the castles Susedgrad, Želin i Stubica. Since in both cases the same family is in question, this data could be important data for the research of the history of this family (more versions of the same charters, possible forgeries etc.). Also, any possible connection of archbishops of Kalocsa-Bacs with Zagreb County would be important to establish in the further research because, as will be shown, Archbishop Peter Várdai (1480-1501) owned Okuje and the other estates.

³³⁹ Vjekoslav Klaić, *Krčki knezovi Frankopani. Knjiga prva. Od najstarijih vremena do gubitka otoka Krka (od god. 1118 do god. 1480. [Counts Frankopani of Krk. Book one. From the oldest times until the loss of the island of Krk (from 1118 until 1480)], (Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska, 1901), pp. 265-266.*

Dorothea again became a widow. She is last mentioned in 1482. Her estates were inherited by her and Cernin Henning's son, John Henning. In 1487, John successfully competed in the court with the burgers of Gradec and got a confirmation that Petrovina and Šiljakovina (but not Hrašće) belong to the castle of Želin.³⁴⁰ He died by 1493, leaving two sons - Gašpar and Andrew.³⁴¹ Gašpar died soon after his father, so Andrew stayed the only owner of the Hennings' estates. He was married to Sophia Thuz, a daughter of John Thuz and a niece of Osvald Thuz, the bishop of Zagreb. Thus, the Želin estate was the property of the Toths and their descendants, the Hennings, during the whole fifteenth century.

4.2.3.1.3. *Spatial data – expansion of the estate*

In terms of spatial organization, the important change that happened regarding the Želin estate in the fifteenth century is that its borders expanded. The spreading of the estate at the end of the century can be reconstructed on the basis of data from one document issued in 1500 when Andrew Henning gave Želin and its appertaining estates and villages (*possessiones et villae*) in pledge to his wife Sophia for four thousand florens. These were: Kravarsko (*Kravorska*), Cerje (*Czerie*), Vugrinvića dol (*Vogrynoychadol*), Čakanci (*Csakanczy*), Peščenica (*Pestczenicza*), Lekenik (*Lebenik?*), Poljana (*Polyana*), Korenci (*Korencsy*), Kerlevje (*Kerlevye*), *Rudschega*, Veleševce (*Welesevcz*), Verbovo (*Werbovno*), Dernek (*Dernek*), Črnek (*Cyernecz*), Rugvica (*Horoghvicza*), Zablatje (*Zablathie*), Staro Čiče (*Zthareihyche*), Lazina (*Lazyna*), Novo Čiče (*Novechiche*), Petrovina (*Petrovina*), Šiljakovina (*Syliakovina*) and Otok (*Othok*).³⁴²

Most of these villages exist today or can be found on the Military surveys. They can be broadly divided in the villages in the northern part (north of the Odra River or along the southern bank of the river), the southern part (south of the Buna River) and the eastern part (along the banks of the Sava River).

4.2.3.1.3.1. *The northern part*

The villages in the northern part are Staro Čiče, Lazina (today Čička Lazina) and Novo Čiče, all mentioned in the previous chapters. A village called Jagodno, most likely placed in the territory of the present-day villages of the same name, is also in this group. It is not mentioned in the document from 1500, but it is mentioned as the property of Želin in 1469

³⁴⁰ MHCZ 2, doc. 345., p. 447.

³⁴¹ MHCZ 2, doc. 371., p. 492.

³⁴² MNL, DF-DL 20985.

when people of Dorothea Toth attacked Kraljevec, an estate of the Chapter of Zagreb.³⁴³ Besides that, it was shown that the castle of Želin is visible on the First military survey, placed on the left bank of the Ribnica River, in the territory of the present-day village of Ribnica. This area is also north of the Odra. I have not found the village named Ribnica in the medieval charters, but obviously its territory was the centre of the Želin estate.

The last estate that can be put in this group is Otok. It has been mentioned that Ladislaus Toth pledged the *possessio Othok* from John, Nicholas and Matthias *de Gepew* in 1435. Thus, originally, Otok was not part of the Želin estate. Likewise, it has been mentioned that the contract did not contain a perambulation of the estate; it was only specified Otok was placed *in comitatu Zagrabensi, ultra fluvium Zawe*.³⁴⁴ Now its location will be discussed in more detail. It is interesting as on the basis of its data from the previous chapters can be connected with fifteenth-century data.

In Croatian, Otok means an island. Since it was specified that the estate was placed below (*ultra*) the Sava River, one could easily assume that it was placed somewhere along the southern banks of the Sava. This would be a logical assumption. Before the Sava has been regulated, it was a strong and wild river that had often changed its course, leaving many meanders and side courses. In these areas, islands were often created. Settlements called Veliki and Mali Otok can be seen on the military surveys. They were situated in Turopolje, on the southern bank of the Sava. However, the estate Otok pledged in 1435 was not situated in this area.

In 1482, John Henning, a descendant of Ladislaus Toth, asked to be installed into the estate Otok that he was holding in pledge from Akarius and Ladislaus sons of Gregory from Stubica, grandsons of late John Gepew. As the 1435 charter, the 1482 charter does not contain perambulation, but in it, the estate is named *Othok alio nomine Kwchan*.³⁴⁵ The name reveals an approximate position of the estate. It was placed somewhere in the area around the present-day village Kuče, north of which are villages Gornje and Donje Podotočje. The toponym Podotočje means “below an island”. Thus, the name of the medieval estate Otok is still extant in the present-day name of the villages.

In 1217, in the area of Donje Podotočje was Giles’ estate Želin. In the time of King Andrew II, the area was the property of *comes* Peter son of Gurk. In 1328, it was the property of Peter and Stephan, sons of Lukač, the great-grandsons of *comes* Peter. Along with that, one

³⁴³ MNL, DF-DL 256157.

³⁴⁴ MNL, DF-DL- 218728.

³⁴⁵ MNL, DF-DL 274919.

additional charter, issued in 1272, mentions an island called Prevlaka in the area of Kuče, as a hereditary land of Lukač, Vid, Matthew and Peter, sons of *comes* Andrew (*insula de quadam terra eorum hereditaria falcata Conschan, ad vnum dumtaxat aratrum sufficientia Preloca nuncupata*).³⁴⁶ Lukač is a father of Stephan and Peter, who owned, in 1328, owned the land in the area of former Giles' Želin. So, all the people here mentioned were of the same family, the descendants of *comes* Gurk and so were John, Nicholas and Matthias *de Gepew* from whom Ladislav Toth pledged Otok in 1435 (see the subchapter: the family of Gurk, pages 241-243).

At the end, it can be concluded that the name Želin, first mentioned in 1217, was originally a geographical name of a wider area where different owners owned the land. The only area that could be defined with certainty as Želin in 1217 was the area of Giles' *praedium*, situated in the area of Donje Podotočje. Regardless of that, this area was not a part of the Želin estate of bans, the Babonići, kings or the Toth family in the first period of their rule of the estate. It became so only in 1435 when Ladislaus Toth pledged it from the de Gepews.

4.2.3.1.3.2. *The southern part*

The appertaining estates of Želin situated south of the Buna River were: Petrovina, Šiljakovina, Kravarsko, Cerje, Vugrinovića dol, Čakanci, Peščenica, Lekenik, Korenci, Kerlevje, and *Rudschega*. Petrovina and Šiljakovina had been the property of Želin since the end of the fourteenth century, when King Sigismund had donated the estates, that had been previously owned by the burghers of Gradec, to Laurence, Christopher and Nicolas, sons of Nicholas Toth. The other above-listed estates were placed in the territory of Peščenica and Kravarsko, two territorial units of the Chichan preceptory of the Hospitallers that had been integrated into the Želin estate after 1328. Two of the estates I cannot locate, but I suppose they were situated in this territory. These are Vugrinovića dol and *Korencsy*. Also, I suppose that the village or hamlet *Rudschega* was placed in the area northwest of present-day village Cerje, where toponym Ruškarjevo can be found on the 1861 cadastre map.

4.2.3.1.3.3. *The eastern part*

The estates Veleševac, Verbovo, Dernek, Črnec, Rugvica, and Zablatje, situated alongside the banks of the Sava, were not mentioned in the thirteenth- and fourteenth-century charters connected with Želin. This can be either because charters that mention them are not

³⁴⁶ MHNC 1, doc. 25, p. 27.

extant or the borders of Želin had spread in the fifteenth century. In any case, in that period, the river crossings over the Sava were controlled by the owners of the castle.

The present-day villages Črnek and Rugvica are situated on the right bank of the River. This area is not Turopolje, hence, I will analyse it in detail. Nevertheless, it must be mentioned that the area was a property of the Ača kindred from the beginning of the thirteenth century (or prior to it, but there are no extant sources for that earlier period).³⁴⁷ Therefore, Črnek and Rugvica were hereditary estates of the Hennings, the legal descendants of the Ača kindred.

On the other hand, the present-day villages Dernek, Vrbovo and Veleševac are situated alongside the left bank of the Sava, in Turopolje. This area was first mentioned as a property of the Moslavački family. In 1231, King Andrew II confirmed *comes* Thomas, son of *comes* Marcharei, numerous estates.³⁴⁸ Among them was one land with a wood that had previously belonged to fishermen of Zagreb (*terra cum silva que fiut piscatorum de Zagrabia*). The boundaries of the land were the following: “The first boundary begins from the Odra (*Odra*), where the Ribnica (*Rybnicha*) flows into the Odra. It comes upwards, over the Ribnica, to *Tinamera mlaca*. From *Tinamera mlaca* comes into the Sava. From the Sava it descends downwards and exists from Sava to *Netulsa mlaca*. From *Netulsa mlaka* it goes into the Črnek (*Chyrnich*). From the Črnek it goes downwards and exists from the Črnek to *Golina mlaca*. From *Golina mlaca* it goes to a furnace, in the place where *Golina mlaca* pours into the Sava, and over the Sava goes downwards where exits at *Mortynca strug*. From *Mortynca strug* it goes to the Ruča (*Rusca*) and from the Ruča exits from *Mortynca strug* and comes to Odra and that

³⁴⁷ During the combats between King Emerick and his brother Andrew, Vratislav of the Ača kindred had supported the last, which resulted in a devastation of his estates. As King Andrew II was a final victor, he confirmed Vratislav and his brothers their hereditary estates in 1209. Among other, Vratislav owned a *preadium Horonguza* together with his brothers (*quod est commune fratribus sius*). The *praedium* was situated between the Sava and the Črnek (*inter Zawam et Cherniz*); the border began from the spring (*caput*) of Drenec, where was a boundary of the land, which was shown by *metarius* Baran, and from there it went to the Sava. CD 3, doc. 75, p. 94. By the fourteenth century, the territory of the *preadium* was divided into the area of Rugvica and the area of the settlement Črnek. The whole estate was still a joint property of different members of the Ača kindred. In 1342, it was divided between the descendants of Arland. A two thirds of Črnek (*possessio Churnech*) and two thirds of Rugvica (*possessio Horoguiche*) as well as the estate *Poliche* that was not far away from Rugvica (*possessio Poliche vocata non remota a possessione Horoguicha*) belonged to descendants of Arland's sons Nicholas and Ach. A remaining third of Rugvica and Črnek with the house and curia made in it (*cum domo et curia dominie nunc ibi constituta*) belonged to descendants of Arland's son John. CD 11, doc. 3, pp. 4-5. The Hennings were descendats of the last. The history of these estates would require further study.

³⁴⁸ *Comes* Thomas supported Andrew during his conflict with King Emeric and also during the rebellion of nobles in the time when the king went to the 5th crusade. For more data about Thomas' estates and the Moslavački family in general, see: Zrinka Nikolić, “Obitelj Čupor Moslavački” [The Čupor Moslavači family], *Radovi Zavoda za znanstveno istraživački i umjetnički rad u Bjelovaru* 4, pp. 269-300.

way returns to the first boundary”. The names of the fields (*nomina camporum*) that were on this estate (*terra*) were: *Pola*, *Durnyc*, *Lysnyc*, *Ruffa*, *Pala*, *Polana*, *Crisna*...³⁴⁹

These estates were situated on the left and right banks of the Sava River. Important for the topic here are the estates situated on the left bank, in Turopolje, between the Sava and the Odra River. Some of the written names of the fields can be connected with the names of the existing settlements; *Pola* or *Polana* could be the present-day Poljana Čička (on the First military survey called only Poljana), *Durnyc* is most likely Drenek, while *Ruffa* could be Ruča. For the other three (*Lysnyc*, *Pala*, *Crisna*) I am not sure, perhaps these were situated on the opposite bank of the Sava.

The approximate borders of the estate are shown on Map 22 (it should be emphasized that only the part of the estate that was situated in Turopolje is shown on the map). The northern and southern borders can be determined only approximately. I did not find any toponym that I could connect with *Tinamera mlaca*, which, according to the perambulation, was the northern border of *comes* Thomas’ estate. The southern border was *Mortynca strug*. In this context, toponym *strug* can mean “a water flow, a riverbed or a bayou.”³⁵⁰ The word *Mortynca* could signify a tributary of the Odra called the Mrtva Odra (*mrtva* means dead, so the name implies dead meander). It could also be connected with the name of the settlement Martinska Ves. A parish church of St. Martin situated in this settlement was mentioned as *ecclesia beati Martini ex ista parte Zaue, existens in possessione filiorum Chopor*.³⁵¹ In any case, the border of the land of Makarje was situated somewhere in this area as Mrtva Odra and Martinska Ves are close.

It seems, however, Makarije had lost some parts of his estate by 1249. According to the perambulation of Veliki Turopoljski lug from that year, written when Ban Stephan returned the wood to the castle warriors, the wood was stretching from the Ruča river (*fluuis Roucha*) to the area north of the Ribnica. South of the Ruča was *terra nobilium de Monozlo*.³⁵² The same borders were again confirmed by Ban Stephan in 1255; sons of Makarje (*fili Machareus*) are mentioned as southern neighbours.³⁵³

³⁴⁹ CD 3, doc. 305, p. 348. According to one charter from 1221, Thomas gave some of these estates (*Durnic*, *Lasna*, *Pola* and *Rucha*) to ban Okuč, while the ban gave him his hereditary estate Hrastelnica. But, obviously ban Okuč did not take over or keep the estates.


³⁵⁰ Dickenmann, *Studien de Hydronymie*, pp. 122-123.

³⁵¹ Josip Butorac, *Popis župa Zagrebačke biskupije 1334. i 1501. godine* [List of parishes of Zagreb bishopry in 1334 and 1501], JAZU, 1984., p. 44.

³⁵² MHNC 1, doc. 5, p. 8.

³⁵³ MHNC 1, doc. 7, p. 10.

The approximate borders of Veliki Turopoljski lug are shown on Map 22. They overlap with the borders of Makarije's estate from 1231. It seems that the ban took part of the land from the sons of Makarje and gave it to the castle warriors. According to Juraj Ćuk, this meant that the ban supported the castle warriors against higher nobility. Along with taking away some parts of the estates of the Moslavački family, he took away some lands around Ruča and Lekenik that had belonged to Ivan son of Jaroslav. Ćuk concludes that "probably in the antiquity all the lands inside these borders [within the borders written in the ban's charter from 1249] did belong to the nobles of the County [the castle warriors].³⁵⁴ This could be correct. The lands might have belonged to the fathers and grandfathers of the castle warriors from 1249; when King Andrew II confirmed the estate to Makarije he mentioned that the land had once belonged to fishermen of Zagreb (*terra cum silva que fiut piscatorum de Zagrabia*).³⁵⁵



Map 22-Želin estate in 1500

In any case, Ćuk concluded that the castle warriors did keep the wood but not entirely within the borders made by Ban Stephan. Ruča is mentioned in 1483 as the property of all

³⁵⁴ Ćuk, *Zagrebačka županije*, p. 151.

³⁵⁵ CD 3, doc. 305, p. 348.

nobles of Turopolje.³⁵⁶ But, according to the perambulation from 1249, Dernek, Vrbovo and Veleševac, so the estates that belonged to Želin in 1500, were also within the borders of Veliki Turopoljski lug. So far, I have not found any charter that could explain how the nobles of Turopolje lost these estates and when the estates became the appertaining estates of Želin.

4.2.3.1.4. Names Čičan and Želin in the fifteenth century

In the previous chapters, it has been shown how (for what area/s) the names Želin and Čičan were used in the thirteenth and fourteenth century. Now it will be discussed how they were used in the late medieval period. It was shown that, by the last quarter of the fourteenth century, the names had started to be equal; in 1387 the royal castle was called Želin also called Čičan (*castrum regium Selen alio nomine Chychan*).³⁵⁷ It seems, however, that in the fifteenth century the name Želin referred mostly to the castle, while the name Čičan was used both for the settlement of Staro Čiče and its wider territory, that is, for the whole area under a jurisdiction of the castle north of the Odra River.

The above-stated can be supported with data from two charters with perambulations of the estate Rakarje. The first charter dates from 1278 and the second charter from 1410. In both cases, borders of the same area are recorded. Since the first charter had been issued 120 years prior to the second charter, owners of neighbouring lands had changed. In 1278, one of the borders of *terra Rakarya* was a land called Želin owned by Ban N (*terra domini N. bani Selyn nuncupata*).³⁵⁸ It has been explained that N stands for Ban Nicholas Gut-Kelled and that this border can be placed in the territory of the present-day Novo Čiče. In 1410, the same border was *meta Chychan*.³⁵⁹ By that period, the name Novo Čiče was recorded in the extant sources (1389, 1390³⁶⁰), but obviously, its territory was still considered to be a territory of Čičan. Consequently, it can be concluded that the name Čičan referred to the territory of Novo Čiče equally as to the territory of Staro Čiče.

Čičan is mentioned in some other fifteenth-century documents collected in the Laszowski's *Monumenta*, mostly in perambulations, in cases when roads that were leading to Čičan were borders of certain estates or lands. These data testify of a dense network of roads that were connecting the Želin/Čičan estate with all parts of Turopolje as well as with Zagreb.

³⁵⁶ MHNC 2, doc. 26, p. 29-30.

³⁵⁷ MHCZ 1, doc. 330, p. 308.

³⁵⁸ MHNC 1, doc. 29, p. 32.

³⁵⁹ MHNC 1, doc. 172, p. 163.

³⁶⁰ MHNC 1, doc. 118-119, pp. 123-124, doc. 122, pp. 126-127.

One road was leading straight from Čiče to Hrašće (*via communis de Czicza tendentis directe sursum ad Hrasche*, mentioned in 1467)³⁶¹ and two (probably the new and the old one) from Mlaka to Čiče (*via communis ad Chichanantiqua via ad Chychen similiter tendentis*, mentioned in 1456).³⁶² One road was connecting Čiče with Gorica and Rakarje (*via communis*, 1455).³⁶³ Along with that, Čiče was connected with Kuče, by the road that was passing over a bridge built on the Obdina River (*via communis, qua itur de Chichan versus pontem in fluvio Obdyna.*, mentioned in 1484.).³⁶⁴ Finally, there was a state road that was leading from Zagreb to the village Čiče as well as a certain road that was connecting Čiče and Kurilovec (*via magna et communis de Zagrabia ad villam Chichan appellatam ducentis..viam directe de Korilowch ad eandem Chichan tendentem*, 1424).³⁶⁵

In all these cases, the name Čičan could mean Staro Čiče, *opidum Chichan*, mentioned in the installation charter of Dorothea Toth in 1439 (specially the last example, *villa Chichan*).³⁶⁶ On the other hand, it could also refer to some other part of the territory of the northern group of the villages under the jurisdiction of Želin. As written in the installation charter of Dorothea and Henning from 1455, Čičan was one district (*districtus*) of the Želin estates. In this context, a district probably means a domain, a part of the estate. The centre of this part was certainly in Staro Čiče, as it was *oppidum*, a marketplace and a sort of smaller town. By the end of the fifteenth century, the area of Staro Čiče was more closely determined by this name that has been kept until the present day; the first extant document found so far in which the name of *Vetus Chichan* is recorded dates from 1496.³⁶⁷

It should be added that this usage of the names Čičan and Želin or both for the whole estate could also be connected to the issue of the castle and the castle estate. This connection was not always the same. In one period the castle was perhaps not so much connected to the landed estate, and it had a different name. In some other periods, there was more emphasis on the castle and its estates (which was generally the characteristic feature in the late Middle Ages). So perhaps the connection was stronger in some period, but the two names were still used.

Finally, one charter that contains data about an organization of the parish churches in Staro and Novo Čiče, and consequently testifies of their connection, will be mentioned. In 1493,

³⁶¹ MHNC 2, doc. 6., p. 7.

³⁶² MHNC 1, doc. 313, p. 374.

³⁶³ MHNC 1, doc. 253, p. 268.

³⁶⁴ MHNC 2, doc. 30., p. 34.

³⁶⁵ MHNC 1, doc. 197, p. 190.

³⁶⁶ MNL, DF-DL 34115.

³⁶⁷ MHNC 2, doc. 121., p. 170.

George from Bexin, a vicar of the Zagreb's Church, wrote a letter to numerous bishops as well as to parish priests of some churches in Turopolje. These were parsons of the churches of St. Mark in *Spinis* (Trnje), St. Martin in Ščitarjevo, St. Peter in Petrovina, churches in both Čiče (*utraque Chiche*) and in St. Klara. Thus, the same person was the parish priest of both the church of St. John the Baptist in Novo Čiče and the church of St. George in Staro Čiče. The vicar demanded that the bishops and the parish priests put a pressure on Stephan Berislavić to come to court. At that time, Berislavić was a castellan of Lukavec. Together with some nobles from Mlaka, Lomnica, Pleso and Kurilovec, he attacked a wood in Rakitovec that belonged to the Order of St. Paul. The attackers took a wood prepared for the Remete monastery as well as some pigs that belonged to the Paulines. They killed many of the pigs and also threatened to the tenant-peasants of the Paulines (...*hominibusque et iobagionibus*...).³⁶⁸ It is interesting to notice here that, among the parsons to whom the letter was addressed to, there was no parson of the church of the Blessed Virgin Mary in Velika Gorica. The reason for this lies, probably, in the fact that this church was connected with the noble community of Turopolje. Since the nobles of Turopolje were the attackers, the vicar probably did not think that sending letters to a parson in Velika Gorica would be of much help.

4.2.3.2. Petrovina and Šiljakovina – estates of Gradec or Želin?

Quarrels between the burghers of Gradec and first the Toth family and later the Henning family, over the ownership of Petrovina, Hrašće and Šiljakovina, lasted during the whole fifteenth century. As shown, the estate Šiljakovina was situated south of Petrovina. Initially, it was the property of certain castle warriors from Turopolje. In 1394, they donated the estate to the citizens (who had previously occupied it).³⁶⁹

Already in 1401, the city council of Gradec raised a complaint against the King Sigismund's donation of the estates to the Toths.³⁷⁰ That, however, did not stop King Sigismund and the Toths were installed into the estates next year. This act provoked the burghers to raise another complaint, this time to Vice-ban John, *comes* of Zagreb County and to noble judges of the county.³⁷¹ This again did not help much so the burghers raised three more complaints: to *comes* and the noble judges of Zagreb County in 1423, to the Chapter of Székesfehérvár the

³⁶⁸ MHNC 2, doc. 77., pp. 102-105.

³⁶⁹ MHCZ 1, doc. 345, pp. 339-340.

³⁷⁰ MHCZ 2, doc. 3., pp. 3-4.

³⁷¹ MHCZ 2, doc. 6., pp. 6-7.

same year and to the Chapter of Zagreb in 1426.³⁷² Again, none of the complaints produced results favourable for the plaintiffs. Ten years later, in 1435, they went to Bratislava to complain to the king himself, but Sigismund transferred the case to Ban Herman (of Cilli),³⁷³ who did nothing concerning the issue.

The burghers, however, did not give up. They waited for favourable circumstances to ask a king to return their estates. These came when the Czech war of Matthias Corvin provoked a revolt of the Slavonian nobility against the king.³⁷⁴ In 1472, the burghers went to Buda and asked the king to return them what was rightfully theirs. He satisfied their wish. Emphasizing the fact that they had always been faithful to him as well as that they had helped him with the maintenance of castles in Bosnia, King Corvin returned the burghers what was theirs from antiquity and unfairly alienated from them. He also gave them all the royal rights in the returned estates. These were not just Petrovina, Hrašće and Šiljakovina, but also some other estates in Zagreb County.³⁷⁵ The king ordered the Chapter of Székesfehérvár to perform the installation.

The decision of King Matthias again caused quarrels over the estates. John Henning, the son of Dorothea Toth, openly opposed it. The record of the court procedure held on the 5th of December 1487 is very extensive. Lawyers of both parties brought documents that could prove that either the citizens of Gradec or John Henning were rightful owners of Petrovina, Hrašće and Šiljakovina. The final verdict was the following: although King Sigismund had separated Petrovina and Hrašće from the castle of Želin in 1387 and donated them to the burghers of Gradec, in 1399 he also did take Petrovina and Šiljakovina away from them and gave them to the Toth family for their faithful services. Thus, Petrovina and Šiljakovina were proclaimed to be the properties of John Henning, as he was a rightful inheritor of the Toths, while Hrašće was returned to the burghers of Gradec.³⁷⁶

As can be seen from all the above listed, although the burghers of Gradec had been claiming that they were the rightful owners of Petrovina and Šiljakovina, in practice these estates were under the jurisdiction of the Toths and the Hennings during the whole fifteenth

³⁷² MHCZ 2, docs. 34, 38 and 43. In first two cases the citizens also complained about some other villages in the Zagreb County that belonged to Gradec, but King gave them to the bishop John Alben in 1420. More about this case and the history of these villages in the fifteenth century in: Tkalčić, MHCZ, *Gradski posjedi: Kraljevec, Cerje, Kobiljak, Sviblje i Nart*, pp. XXVI-XXXV.

³⁷³ MHCZ 2, doc. 84., pp. 107-108.

³⁷⁴ About this and in general relationship of Gradec with King Matthias: Klaić, *Povijest Zagreba*, 158-169.

³⁷⁵ MHCZ 2, doc. 272-275., pp. 336-342.

³⁷⁶ MHCZ 2, doc. 345., pp. 447-448.

century. Just as in the previous centuries, in the fifteenth century Petrovina was a part of the Želin estate.

4.2.3.3. Trnovec

The location of Trnovec has been shown in the previous chapter. It was situated on the eastern side of Petrovina, its western border was stretching from the Lomnica to the Buna River (Map 21). Various owners had their estates in its territory. These were the castle warriors of Turopolje, the descendants of Jaroslav and his son Ivan etc.

On the basis of data from the fifteenth-century charters, it can be concluded that at least two separate villages had developed in the territory of Trnovec in the fifteenth century. Besides Trnovec, the villages of Kušanec and Buna are recorded in the extant sources. Data about them are analysed in the separate sub-chapters (see pages 187-190). The reason why I wrote that at least two villages had developed is the fact that the perambulation of Trnovec written in 1358 referred only to its western border, the one with Petrovina. In consequence, it is not clear how far east the estate was stretching. Perhaps the estate Okuje, first mentioned in 1435, also developed in the territory of Trnovec.

Kušanec was situated in the northern part of Trnovec (south of Kurilovec) and Buna in the southern part (on the bank of the Buna River). As a result of the development of these two villages, the surface of the estate (or more precisely, the estates) called Trnovec was narrowed; the western border of the area between Kušanec and Buna measures approximately 4.7 kilometres.

The fifteenth-century sources confirm the complexity of the ownership situation recorded in the earlier sources. The castle warriors of Turopolje and other, mid-rank, nobles owned estates in this area. Data about the estates of the mid-rank nobility are discussed in the next chapter, in which Okuje and other villages that were the part of the same estates are analysed (see subchapter: Trnovec, page 187). Here a few words about the part of Trnovec owned by the castle warriors will be mentioned.

I do not know the exact location of lands in Trnovec owned by the nobles of Turopolje, but I suppose that they were situated south of Kurilovec, in the northern part of Trnovec, next to Kušanec (and around it). There is a toponym Kurilovečka dubrava just south of Kušanec on the First military survey. In medieval charters, estates called Trnovec usually appear in

combination with estates that a certain individual or family had in Kurilovec and Kušanec. Several examples will be mentioned. In 1421, Peter, Briccius, Valentin, Martin and Barnaba from Kurilovec inherited some estates in Trnovec and Kurilovec.³⁷⁷ In 1466, Martin and Nicholas Zurnovčić from Kurilovec sold to Briccius, Thomas and Jacob, sons of župan George from Kurilovec, parts of their estates in Kurilovec, Trnovec and on the mill place (*in porcione molendini*) on the Mostičajna stream in 1466.³⁷⁸ Later, Briccius, Thomas and Jacob were abducted by the Ottomans (*...post seduccionem ipsorum per sevissimos Turcos...*), so, in 1484, their sister Lady Ursula, wife of Paul son of Blasius from Mala Mlaka inherited all of their estates (inherited, bought, or pledged) in Kurilovec, Rakitovec, Kušanec and Ternovec.³⁷⁹ In 1493, Denis and Paul Pogledić from Kurilovec came to the Chapter of Zagreb to prohibit Paul Bušanić from Bužan, a castellan of Lukavec, to occupy their estates in Trnovec and Kurilovec. They also protested against any other possible donation of these estates.³⁸⁰ Finally, a charter that clearly testifies that probably most of the nobles from Kurilovec had their estates in Trnovec (perhaps some of them were held jointly) was issued by Ban John Corvin Vukovina, in 1496. The above-mentioned Paul Pogledić complained to Ban that estates belonging to him and his kinsmen of the kindred of late Kurilo (*ipsius et fratrum suorum generacionalium, generacionis videlicet condam Korylo*) had been occupied by castellans of Lukavec. These estates were situated in Trnovec, Kušanec and Mraclin. Ban Corvin ordered that the estates must be returned.³⁸¹

Although rarely, few people from Trnovec had been mentioned in the extant fifteenth-century sources. A widow (*relictā*) Elizabeth from the village Trnovec (*villa Trinovecz*) is recorded in a tithe list from 1459.³⁸² In 1462, two people claimed to have the right on one dwelling unit (*sessio*) in loan situated in Kurilovec; one was Briccius son of George (once župan) from Kurilovec and the other was Paul from Trnovec (*de Ternowecz*). Comes Janko of Mičevac and *comes terrestris* John ordered the investigation,³⁸³ but it is not known how the conflict ended. In any case, these data prove that, by the fifteenth century, Trnovec was a formed village. More people are mentioned in the sixteenth-century sources. Still, Trnovec has never

³⁷⁷ MHNC 1, doc. 187, p. 179-180.

³⁷⁸ MHNC 1, doc. 354, p. 434-435.

³⁷⁹ MHNC 2, doc. 32., pp. 38-39.

³⁸⁰ MHNC 2, doc. 83, p. 115-116.

³⁸¹ MHNC 2, doc. 119., p. 168.

³⁸² MHNC 1, doc. 325, p. 391.

³⁸³ MHNC 1, doc. 164, p. 154.

developed into a bigger village. Sometime after the sixteenth century, it disappeared from the sources.³⁸⁴

4.2.3.4. Kušanec

A village called Kušanec that had developed in the territory of Trnovec does not exist today, but it can be found on all three military surveys. It was situated east of Petrovina and south of Kurilovec, approximately 3.7 km east of the archaeological site of Okuje. Today this area is a part of Velika Gorica, but toponyms Kušanec and Kušanečko polje [Field of Kušanec] can be seen on modern maps. The village died out sometime in the first half of the twentieth century. It still existed in Laszowski's time; he called it "the smallest village of Turopolje". According to him, the name of the village was derived from a personal name Kuša or Kušan, which is a Croatized version of a name *Cosmas* (Kuzma). This name was frequently mentioned in the fourteenth-century charters; it can be found in the sources that mention people from Gorica, Kurilovec, Lužje, Dubranec. In Laszowski's opinion, some Kuša or Kušan settled in the place of the village of Kušanec that was latter called after him.³⁸⁵



An analysis of data from charters confirmed that Laszowszki was right. Kušanec was mentioned for the first time in two charters from 1455. In the first charter, *terra nobilium de Kusanecz* was mentioned as a boundary of one land situated in Kurilovec.³⁸⁶ Thus, there were no other villages between Kurilovec and Kušanec. The second charter is a purchase contract by which was confirmed that a nobleman Andrew, son of Lucas Kušanić from the village Kušanec (*de Kusa(necz vill)a*) and his sons Andrew, Anthony, Phillip and Paul bought a part of an agricultural land and a part of a brushwood, situated in Kurilovec. The sellers were nobles of Kurilovec.³⁸⁷ Andrew's father Lucas son of Kuša and Andrew's uncle John were the castle warriors of Kurilovec who, together with four other castle warriors of Kurilovec, redeemed their estate Trnovec (*possessio Ternouech*) from John, Thomas and Jakob, sons of Martin Vrbanić in 1397.³⁸⁸ Therefore, it can be concluded that the village Kušanec had developed in the area of Trnovec in the first half of the fifteenth century. The nucleus of the future village were the estates of a family of Kuša, a nobleman from Kurilovec.

As was the case with Trnovec, it seems that first mostly nobles from Kurilovec had the estates in the territory of Kušanec, for example, the already-mentioned Briccius, Thomas and Jacob, sons of župan George from Kurilovec, who were abducted by the Ottoman army³⁸⁹ or certain Phillip who sold some estates he had inherited from his mother to Clement son of Mika from Kravarsko and his sons in 1495.³⁹⁰ These estates included: one dwelling unit in Kurilovec, probably three estates in Velika Gorica³⁹¹ and one dwelling unit and three agricultural lands in Kušanec. At the moment of sale, Phillip lived in Mraclin, but he had inherited his estates from his mother Elena, a daughter of Miko from Kurilovec.

4.2.3.5. Mraclin

As was the case with the thirteenth- and fourteenth-century charters, there are just few extant fifteenth-century charters that concern the territory of Mraclin.³⁹² Two of them, issued

³⁸⁶ MHNC 1, doc. 290, p. 329; Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine*, p. 353.

³⁸⁷ MHNC 1, doc. 294, pp. 336-337.

³⁸⁸ CD 18, doc. 120., p. 170.

³⁸⁹ MHNC 1, doc. 354, pp. 434-435; MHNC 2, doc. 32.

³⁹⁰ MHNC 2, doc. 97., pp. 139-140.

³⁹¹ The text of the charter is unclear on this part; some words are probably missing. It is written: ... *item in locis communibus, scilicet in ecclesia beate virginis in Goricza fundate*. Laszowski added a comment that this it was also written three but was deleted.

³⁹² Except three charters that will be mentioned in this text, Laszowszki mentioned two more charters that concerned some estates in Mraclin, but he did not publish their transcripts. He saw them in the house of George Pogledić in Kurilovec. MHNC 1, doc. 186, p. 186, doc. 205, p. 200. These charters probably refer to some estates that the Pogledić family had in Mraclin.

in 1417 and 1483, concern the land inheritance and do not contain any data regarding spatial organization.³⁹³ The 1417 charter is, however, important for testimony of legal status of children born in marriages between nobles and commoners. Kristijan, son of Ivčec and Blaž Vernić were installed into certain parts of estates (*porciones possessionaries*) in Mraclin that they had inherited from their mothers Magda and Jelka, daughters of a nobleman Vrban from Mraclin. Both were married to commoners (*ignobiles*); Jelka's husband was Ivčec and Magda's Nicholas Mušić. Kristijan and Blaž inherited a quarter of the whole estate of the family Vrbani. The quarter was lawfully separated from the rest of the estate. Along with that, they inherited three smaller parts of the estate that were not next to each other. The lands were given to them by the law of the Kingdom that allows non-nobles to be installed in the estates (*...iuxta regni consuetudinem tanquam ignobilibus provenire debentem statuendam...*). But the estates were given to them and their posterity as to the true nobles (*...tanquam veris nobilibus castrensibus statuissent iure perpetuo possidendas...*). All was approved by their relatives and neighbours.³⁹⁴ Analysis done by Marija Karbić showed that the cases of "mixed" marriages were not rare in the noble community. According to the customary law of Hungary, a child whose mother was noble and a father a commoner was considered a commoner. A practice in the Noble community was the opposite, in such cases, a child was considered to be noble. Pointing at the case described above, Marija Karbić concluded that nobility of these children was preserved exactly by giving them a filial quarter of a land, which again points that "an estate was not only a financial basis of a nobility, but it was an essential condition of nobility". Likewise, the case shows that an approval of members of the community (both relatives and neighbours, so the other nobles) was also essential for these children to be accepted as nobles."³⁹⁵

On the other hand, one example from 1430, testifies that kindreds or, at least, an idea of them were still very much present within the noble community in the fifteenth century. This remained so despite a fragmentation of estates due to a division of lands of kindreds and families. George son of Ivan, Valentin son of Andrew and Stanko from Mraclin asked the Chapter of Zagreb to issue them a transcript of a charter they had brought. This charter was already mentioned in the previous text; it was issued in 1258 by Alexandar, *comes* of Podgora and was a confirmation that the *Boblach/Doblachmezew* had belonged to Stanišk and his kindred. George, Valentin and Stanko asked this in the name of their kinsmen (*in ipsorum ac*

³⁹³ MHNC 1, doc. 182, p. 174; MHNC 2, doc. 27, p. 30-31.

³⁹⁴ MHNC 1, doc. 182, p. 174.

³⁹⁵ Marija Karbić, "Marriage strategies of the lesser nobility of Turopolje."

universorum fratrum generacionalium).³⁹⁶ The detailed analysis of the kindreds living on the territory of the noble community of Turopolje will be written in the chapter about the villages of the castle warriors. Here is important to emphasize that, in the first half of the fifteenth century, inhabitants of Mraclin considered themselves to be separate kindred. This fact will be important for the discussion about kindreds.

4.2.3.6. Okuje, Vukovina, Tržec, Obrež, Mišine, Trnovec, Buna, Buševac and Stuchye

4.2.3.6.1. Owners of the estates in the fifteenth century

4.2.3.6.1.1. The Farkaš family

On the eighteenth of August 1435, King Sigismund ordered the Chapter of Čazma to install George and his father Stephan Farkaš from Obrež (*de Ebres*) into their estates (*possessiones*): Obrež, Demerje, Ternovec, Okuje, Samac, Tržec, Podbrežje, Stučje, Brona, Mišine and Buševac (*Ebres, Demerye, Ternouch, Okwye, Zamacz, Tersecz, Podbresye, Stuchye, Lekenyk, Brona, Mysne et Bwseucz*). The installation was done the same year, in the presence of a royal bailiff (*homo regius*) John son of Iprus from Jamnica and a representative of the Chapter of Čazma, the canon Bartholomew. In accordance with an installation procedure, various neighbours were present. These were: Nicholas, son of John from Kuče and Ladislav Toth's castellan of Želin, a noble judge Peter, son of John from Ščitarjevo, Valentin, son of Stephan from Črnkovec, Mark, son of John from Kurilovec, and Benedict, a *literatus* from Okuje.³⁹⁷ The King granted to George and Stephan all of the royal rights (*totum et omne ius nostrum regium*) that he had had in these estates, but the estates themselves were already owned by the Farkaš family. This is a typical case of charters issued by the title of new donation; these sorts of documents were always issued as a confirmation of the already existing ownership of certain estates.

The current state of research does not allow me to write a systematic overview of the history of the Farkaš family. According to the information available from the so far found extant sources, it can be concluded that during the period of King Sigismund they were mid-rank nobles (styled in the sources as *egregii*) with the estates stretching throughout Turopolje and further, south of Turopolje and north of the Kupa River; to the territory of the Berkes kindred, which was under the jurisdiction of the Cistercian Abbey of Topusko. The origin of the Farkaš family is so far not completely clear; they most likely did originate from the Berkes kindred,

³⁹⁶ MHNC 1, doc. 224, p. 231-232.

³⁹⁷ KAZ, ALC 2, no. 59.

that is, from the area around the Kupa River where today are villages Stari Farkašić, north of the river, and Novi Farkašić, south of it. In 1431, *egregius Stephanus Farkasii et filii eius omnesque et singulos fratres generacionis de predicta Berkws* are mentioned as patrons of the church of St. Cosmas and Damian in the village of Ponikve, in the parish district of Brkiševina.³⁹⁸ Thus, according to this text, Stephan and his sons are of the Berkes kindred. However, the first extant charter I have found thus far in which this family is mentioned is a purchase contract from 1401. In this contract, Stephan and his brother Nicholas are denominated as *egregii milites magistri Nicolaus et Stephanus filii Farkasy de Ebres*.³⁹⁹ In another purchase contract, from 1412, Stephan is called *egregius miles magistrus Stephanus Farkasy de Gora*.⁴⁰⁰ In another charter, issued the same, *Farkasius de Ebres* is recorded. He could have been Stephen's father. He was one of the neighbours present at the installation of George Mikšić and Vuk and George Stanilović into the estate of Donji Lukavec.⁴⁰¹ The aforementioned charter of King Sigismund from 1435 denominated Stephan and his son George as being *de Ebres*.⁴⁰² Actually, in all the charters I have found so far George is denominated as being from Obrež. As can be seen by this data, the family was nominated either as being from Obrež, or from Gora, or from the territory of the Berkes kindred. In addition to that, in 1444, George and Stephan as well as certain Matthew Farkašić issued a charter by which they wrote down the rights that they gave their tenant peasants at their estates Vrathecz (today Vratečko, next to Farkašić), *Pretkowina* and *Kalysche*, on the territory of the Berkeš kindred. This charter is extant in a transcript issued in 1526 by the Chapter of Zagreb on the request of Andrew, abbot of Topusko. The abbot came before the Chapter and brought the charter issued by Stephan, George and Matthew that were of *generatio nobilium de Obres*. In the charter, the three called themselves *noblies de Obres*. But they issued the charter in their home in Vinodol (*in domo habitacionis nostris in Wynodol*) (south of Sisak).⁴⁰³ Thus, it can be concluded that the Farkaš family had the estates in different areas and most likely denominated themselves appropriately to the reason of issuing of certain documents. However, the data found so far are not sufficient for a making of a firm conclusion about their primary estate. An additional problem, more about which will be written in the further text, is where the estate Obrež was situated.

³⁹⁸ MHEZ 6, doc. 342, p. 333.

³⁹⁹ MNL, DF-DL 47576.

⁴⁰⁰ MNL, DF-DL 47576.

⁴⁰¹ MHNC 1, doc. 177., p. 169.

⁴⁰² KAZ, ALC 2, no. 59.

⁴⁰³ MNL, DF-DL 36101.

Not much can be said about Farkaš, as he is mentioned only the charter that informs that he was present at the installation of George Mikšić and Vuk and George Stanilović into the estate of Donji Lukavec.⁴⁰⁴ It is even not certain if this man was a father of Stephan and grandfather of George Farkaš. He is listed among the nobles (*noblies*), but his status is not specified more closely. Stephan and his brother Nicholas belonged to the mid-rank nobility (*egregii*) and were knights (*milites*).⁴⁰⁵ George was also a soldier; a retainer of Matko Talovec (*comes* of Kovin and captain of Belgrade and from August 1435 Ban of Slavonia). Among other things, George participated in the military campaign near Bosnia in 1434, because of which the king awarded him with the royal rights in the afore-mentioned estates.⁴⁰⁶ Stephan was also in the service of Ban Talovac; in 1436 he was one of two castellans of castles of Hrastovica.⁴⁰⁷ The family had a good relationship with King Ladislaus. This can be interpreted from one charter from 1443. On the 27th of September that year,⁴⁰⁸ representatives of the noble community, *comes terrestris* Peter son of John from Mlaka, former *comes terrestris* Fabian from Lomnica and one more person, Michael from Lomnica, came to the Chapter of Zagreb. They protested against the possibility that the king gives some of their communal estates and woods Rakitovec, Book and Vratovo (*Wrathowo*) to George, his brothers and his father Stephan Farkaš from Obrež. They also forbade the Farkaš family to accept such donation⁴⁰⁹ George's career continued during the reign of Kings Ladislav the Posthumous and Mathias Corvin; he was a *comes* of Zagreb as can be seen in the numerous documents issued by him between 1449 and 1459⁴¹⁰ (the last document issued by him dates from eighteenth of June that year).⁴¹¹ Last source which I found that he was mentioned in dates from 1469.

Few purchase contracts show that the family worked on expanding their estates. In 1401, Nicholas and Stephan bought some parts of the estates (*particulas terre sive porcionis*

⁴⁰⁴ MHNC 1, doc. 177., pp. 169-170.

⁴⁰⁵ MNL, DF-DL 47576.

⁴⁰⁶ KAZ, ALC 2, no. 59.

⁴⁰⁷ MHEZ VI, doc. 452, p. 333.

⁴⁰⁸ This charter has been published in Laszowski's *Monumenta* dated in 1403 (*millesimo quadringentesimo tercio*), MHNC 1, doc. 165. This date is wrong; in the original charter the year is 1443 (*millesimo quadringentesimo quadragesimo tercio*). Cf. MNL, DF-DL 37586.

⁴⁰⁹ MHNC 1, doc. 165., p. 155.

⁴¹⁰ MNL, DF-DL 231249, MNL, DF-DL 274993, MNL, DF-DL 274946, MNL, DF-DL 275107, MNL, DF-DL 275007, MNL, DF-DL 231260, MNL, DF-DL 231226, MNL, DF-DL 231267, MNL, DF-DL 231268, MNL, DF-DL 231294, MNL, DF-DL 231296, MNL, DF-DL 231295, MNL, DF-DL 275064, MNL, DF-DL 274939, MNL, DF-DL 255585, MNL, DF-DL 255743, MNL, DF-DL 256369, MNL, DF-DL 231315, MNL, DF-DL 274936, MNL, DF-DL 275012, MNL, DF-DL 231331, MNL, DF-DL 275021, MNL, DF-DL 231341, MNL, DF-DL 255612, MNL, DF-DL 275150, MNL, DF-DL 255748, MNL, DF-DL 255733, MNL, DF-DL 256824 (*comes et iudex nob.* 15.05.1458), MNL, DF-DL 231412, MNL, DF-DL 231418, MHNC 1, docs. 272, 276, 277 and 318., pp. 303, 308, 310 and 381.

⁴¹¹ MNL, DF-DL 274982.

possessionarie) Marowazela and Kalytha, together with one hay land. The sellers were John son of George and Paul son of Vuk, who sold it in the name of their relatives, the members of the Berkes kindred. From the perambulation of these estates it is clear that Stephan and Nicholas already had some estates in this area; one of the borders was a road that leads to a wood called *Maurowgay*, owned by the brothers (*viam qua tendit versus silvam qua vocatur Maurowgay que est dictorum magistrorum Nicholai et Stephani*). Along with that wood, one hay-land in the property of Stephan and Nicholas was mentioned.⁴¹² These estates were situated around the Hutina River. In 1412, Stephan again bought some land in this area. It was an unnamed meadow (*quanddam pratum sive particulam terre*) situated between the rivers Kupa and Hutina. The sellers were again members of the Berkes kindred.⁴¹³ George also bought a land in this area from the same kindred; in 1454 he asked from Barnaba, abbot of Topusko, to give him reconfirmation that he had bought the estate *Prethkowina* (*possessines Prethkowyna*).⁴¹⁴ Along with that, he was taking larger parts of land in pledge. On the 12th of March 1465, Ban Emeric Zapolya ordered the Chapter of Zagreb to install George into some of them. These were: the whole estate of Demerje that was owned by Jelka, daughter of John, son of Ivan from Brezovica, five tenant-peasant dwelling units (*sessiones iobagionalies*) that were owned by the above-mentioned John, son of Ivan, the whole estate in Brezovica that belonged to Stephan *literatus*, son of Nicholas, son of Ivan. George also pledged from John called Ivek, son of Nicholas, son of Ivan from Brezovica, all the estates that Ivek owned in Demerje, Grančari, Sterpet, *Kormaclio* (?), Bratina, Upper and Lower Lipnica (*Damerye, Gernczarye, Sterpyth, Kormaclio?, Brathonyy, Superiori et Inferiori Lypnycha*) as well as two tenant-peasant dwelling units in Brezovica.⁴¹⁵ These estates were situated west of Turopolje.

4.2.3.6.1.2. Legal procedure between George Wokomery and Peter and Matthew Varadi

Okuje is next mentioned in 1487. On the 1st of August that year, King Matthias Corvin sent a letter to Ban Matthew Gereb to judge in a law-suit between a noble man (*egregius*) George Wokomery from Dol and Matthew, the brother of Archbishop Peter of Kalocsa, who was at that moment holding some estates in Zagreb County.

⁴¹² It is interesting to mention that the text of the perambulation mentioned that the border begins at one stone oven that was on the bank of the Hutina River. These kind of features are usually not mentioned in the perambulations. This oven was called Peć, which is Croatian word for oven (*in quondam furnace lapidee qua dicitur peeck*).

⁴¹³ MNL, DF-DL 47576.

⁴¹⁴ MNL, DF-DL 47576.

⁴¹⁵ MNL, DF-DL 255628.

Ban's court took place next year, on the thirteenth of February 1488. The representatives were Stephan Herceg from Pribina for George Wokomery and Peter Batha from Mindzenth (Svetačje) for Matthew Varadi. Stephan Herceg claimed that Peter, archbishop of Kalocsa and Bács, with his brothers Matthew and Paul, had occupied the estates owned by or were held in pledge by his client George Wokomery. The first ones (that were owned by George) were Luka and Vratečko (*Lwka et Wracza*), placed in the territory of the Berkeš kindred, in the area under the jurisdiction of the Abbey of Topusko. The second ones, that George held in pledge, were numerous. These were: *Pethkowyna*, *Mawrogay et Kalyschya* also on the territory of the Berkeš kindred and under the jurisdiction of the Topusko abbey, *praedium* Striče, then Tržec, Obrež, Novaki, Podbrežje, Okuje, Buna, Mišine, Trnovec and Demerje (*Thersacz, Ebres, Nowaki, Pobresye, Okarye, Bwna, Mwsyne, Tharrowocz et Domerye*) situated in the Field of Zagreb (*in campo Zagradiensi*), as well as Buševci, Brezovica, Krajčevica, Triborjeve vrzi, Zvinar and Karci (*Bysewychy, Brezowycha, Krayachewczy, Tryboryewrzy, Zwynar, Karczy*) in the belonging of Gora (preceptory of Vrana). There were also parts of the estates in the estates Brezovica, Grančar, Sterpit and Lučelnica (*Brezowycz, Gerwchary, Zterpyth, Lwchylnycza*) in Zagreb County.⁴¹⁶

Peter Batha, Matthew Varadi's representative, denied these accusations against his client and stated that the above-mentioned estates actually belonged to Matthew. He also added that his client cannot do much at the moment because both his brother and the documents that confirm that these estates are the property of the Varadi family are in the captivity of the king.

The next trial took place a year later, on the 21st of March 1489 in Buda, in front of the royal judge Stephan Bathory, who again transferred the case to Ban in Zagreb. What happened later can be only partly reconstructed as there is no extant charter that contains data about the final verdict.

The presence of the Varadi family in Zagreb County would require further research. In any case, they were present as testified with data from two additional charters. In 1483, župan Matthew, George Bartolović, župan Benedict and Paul Filipović from Donja Lomnica in the name of all nobles of Turopolje publicly protested in front of the Chapter of Zagreb against any possible donation of their estate Ruča that could possibly be done by King Matthias. They also prohibited Peter, archbishop of Kalocsa and chancellor of the king, his brother Matthew, John

⁴¹⁶ MNL, DF-DL 37662.

Henning of Susedgrad as well as Paulines from Zagreb and everybody else to occupy Ruča.⁴¹⁷ The other, partly damaged charter, issued in 1488-1489, informs us about on-going court procedure between Matthew Varady and Nicholas Ivanović from Brezovica and his brother Benedict Farkaš over juridical rights in some estates.⁴¹⁸ The names of the estates or their exact location were not recorded.

4.2.3.6.1.3. Andrew Both from Bayna

The next data that refer to some of the above-mentioned estates are from 1492. On the 27th of April that year the following exchange of properties was done in front of King Ladislas: John Corvin gave the estate called Dobolcz in County of Križevci, together with all villages and estates appertaining to it, to Andrew Both from Bayna and his brothers Ambrose and John. In return, the brothers gave to Corvin the estates (*possessiones*) Vukovina, Tržec, Demerje and Vratečko (*Wokowyna, Thersecz, Damerye et Wrathcza*) as well as *praedii Brythkowyna* and Luka (*Brythkowyna et Lwka*) in Zagreb County.

Andrew Both from Bajna, later Ban, was first mentioned in the sources in 1490 as a captain of Medvedgrad (and Lukavec and Rakovec). He made an oath to King Matthias that he will support his son John and at any time surrender the castles to him, if he asks. But, after King Matthias's death, he supported King Maximilian. Then, after Maximilian's defeat, in the spring of 1491, John Corvin replaced Both with Anthony Peki who became a new castellan of Medvedgrad. How Andrew Both and his brothers required the estates in question here remains unknown.

4.2.3.6.1.4. Baltazar Alapić buys the estates

Four years after the above-mentioned exchange, Valentin Palfy from Zenthazyhat, a layer of John Corvin,⁴¹⁹ asked for the transcript of the court procedure between the Varadi family and George Wokomery. This was issued on the 25th of February 1495 by ban Ladislas Kanizsai. Although prince Corvin took over this legal case on behalf of Peter Varadi and his brother, the transcript does not contain any data how the above-mentioned legal conflict with

⁴¹⁷ MHNC 2, doc. 26, pp. 29-30.

⁴¹⁸

⁴¹⁹ Valentin Palfy was one of the busiest layers in the cases from the territory of Slavonia. He was married with the niece of John Česmički. Pálosfalvi Tamás, "Vitézek és Garázdák. A szlavóniai humanisták származásának kérdéséhez," *Turul* 86/1, p. 15.

George Wokmenry ended. But, according to the next sequence of events, it seems that the estates were split into two parts.

John Corvin obviously got the estates because in 1496 he sold them to his faithful associate Baltazar Alapić. Alapić, whose family originated from the village Alap, in County of Feher, probably entered in his service from the time of Korvin's early youth (as Corvin emphasized in one later charter). He is first mentioned in Slavonia in 1492 as Korvin's castellan of Medvedgrad, Rakovec and Lukavec (together with Bernard Turoci). In the following years he performed numerous functions in the Korvin's service, and by the end of 1496, he and Marchinho Predriohti became vice-Bani of Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia. Balthazar remained at this position until Korvin's death in 1506 (with a short interruption in 1497 when Korvin had to leave for Banat).⁴²⁰

As far as the selling that is the focus of the following text is concerned, it should be noted that the transaction that was done was somewhat unusual. Namely, there are two extant charters issued by the Chapter of Zagreb on the very same day, 22nd of October 1496. In the first one, the Chapter confirmed that on that day Ban John Corvin came before them and stated that, because of some financial troubles, he is forced to give in pledge to Baltazar Alapić, his wife Catharine [she was Balthasar's first wife, a daughter of merchant from Gradec] and their daughter Barbara as well as Marčinko *de Dupanroztek* his whole estate Vukovina together with belonging curia, villages and estates (*totalem possessionem nostrum Wokowyna vocatam simul cum curia, villisque et possessionibus*). These appertaining villages and estates were: Tržec, Podbrežje, Mišine, Buna, Okuje, Obrež, Novaki, Damerje, Vratec and Luka (*Thersecz, Podbressye, Myssyne, Bwna, Okwe, Obrees, Nowaky, Damerye, Wrathza et Lwka*). Along with that, ban also gave them in pledge his parts of estates (*possessionibus possessionariis*) in the estates Trnovec, Sterpet, Grančar and Brezovica (*Thernowecz, Stherpythe, Gerncharye et Brezowycha*) in Zagreb County. All these estates were pledged for 1.400 golden florins.

The second document issued by the Chapter on the same day is a purchase contract by which Ban Corvin stated that he sold his estate Vukovina to Baltazar Alapić, his wife Catherine and their daughter Barbara.⁴²¹ The text that numerates what Corvin sold to Baltazar is identical to the one in which is written what he gave him and Marčinko in pledge. This was the estate

⁴²⁰ Tamás Pálosfalvi, *The Noble Elite in the County of Körös (Križevci), 1400–1526*, Monumenta Hungariae. Magyar Történelmi Emlékek, Dissertationes. Értekezések, Budapest: MTA Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóközpont Történettudományi Intézet, 2014., pp. 42-43.

⁴²¹ MNL, DF-DL 261789.

Vukovina with curia, villages and estates Tržec, Podbrežje, Mišine, Buna, Okuje, Obrež, Novaki, Damerje, Vratec and Luka as well as his parts in the estates Trnovec, Sterpet, Grančar and Brezovica.⁴²² The sum for which all this was sold was also identical to the one that it was given in pledge: 1.400 golden florins.

Perhaps the explanation for this transaction could be that Ban Corvin estimated that the estate was worth altogether two thousand and eight hundred golden florins, but Balthazar Alapić did not have enough cash to pay off the whole estate. For that reason, Marčinko added the sum needed and later Balthazar pay him off and bought the rest of the estate from Corvin.

However, as can be seen by one charter issued two years later, Balthazar did not buy the whole of Vukovina and its belonging villages from John Corvin. He bought only part of it because the other part was not Corvin's property. On the 8th of February 1498, a nobleman Nicholas Ivanović sold the estate of Vukovina to Balthazar, Catherine and Barbara. The text in which was written what was sold is again identical to the above-mentioned contracts between Corvin, Mračinko and Balthazar. This estate of Vukovina included a curia, villages and estates (*possessionem Wokowyna vocatam simul cum curia, villisque et possessionibus*): Tržec, Podbrežje, Mišine, Buna, Okuje, Obrež, Novaki, Damerje, Vratec and Luka (*Thersecz, Podbressye, Myssyne, Bwna, Okwe, Obrees, Nowaky, Damerye, Wrathza et Lwka*). Except that, Nicholas Ivanović also sold parts of estates (*possessionibus possessionariis*) in the estates Trnovec, Sterpet, Grančar and Brezovica (*Thernowecz, Stherpythe, Germcharye et Brezowycha*) in the Zagreb County. These estates were sold for five hundred golden florins.⁴²³ This sum is significantly smaller than the one for which Balthazar bought the estates from Corvin; first he pledged it for one thousand and four hundred golden florins to Balthazar and Marčinko and then he sold it for the same amount of money to Balthazar, on the basis of which, as it was explained, could be assumed that the whole estate was worth two hundred and eight thousand florins. So, this is almost six times more expensive than the price paid to Nicholas Ivanović. It can be assumed therefore that the parts of the estates that Ivanović had in these estates were also significantly smaller.

Nicholas Ivanović, who at the time of selling was on his mortal bed, was a last male descendant of the family Ivanović from Brezovica.⁴²⁴ During his life, he performed different functions in a service of King Mathias. The estates ended as his property because of the treason

⁴²² MNL, DF-DL 261789.

⁴²³ MNL, DF-DL 261786.

⁴²⁴ Emilij Laszowski, "Brezovica", *Prosvjeta* (Zagreb), 5/1897, 21, p. 661.

that George Wokmery did against the king. All of his estates were taken from him and his wife; the ones in the County of Dubica were given to Mark Mišlenović from Kamiščak, and the others to Nicholas Ivanović. Although it is not specified which ones were given to him, obviously this included the ones here in question.⁴²⁵

The next extant charters that concern the estates dates from 1500. Balthazar informed the royal judge Peter Gereb about the purchase of the estates and asked to be installed in the following estates (*in dominium totales possessionum*): Obrež, Otok, Novaki, Tržec, Okuje, Podbrežje, Buna, Trnovec, Mišine, Vratic, Demerje and Kupčina (*Ebres, Othok, Nowaky, Thersecz, Okwye, Pobresye, Buna, Thernowecz, Mwsyna, Wrathecz, Demerye et Kupchyna*). On the nineteenth of March Peter wrote to the Chapter of Zagreb to perform the installation.⁴²⁶ The chapter did so on the 30th of March 1500; Baltazar, Catherine and Barbara were installed into the estates: Obrež, Otok, Novaki, Tržec, Okuje, Podbrežje, Buna, Trnovec, Mišine, Vratic, Demerje and Kupčina (*Ebres, Othok, Nowaky, Thersecz, Okwye, Pobresye, Buna, Thernowecz, Mosyna, Wrathecz, Demerye et Kupchyna*). This happened in the presence of several nobles, the representatives of the noble community, among which were Gaspar Kušević from Lomnica, Anthony Šokčević and Blaise Križanić from Mraclin, Paul Kostibolić from Mali Obrež (*Mala Ebres*) and Michael Otalić from Kurilovec.⁴²⁷

It can be noticed that the above-quoted documents do not mention Vukovina, although according to the purchase contracts between Balthasar and Corvin and Balthasar and Nicholas Ivanović, Vukovina was the centre of the estate. Indeed, there were some problems with Vukovina. Beatrix Frankopan, Corvin's wife, had some objection against Balthasar's installation into Vukovina and she raised a complaint on behalf of herself and hers and Corvin's children, Christopher and Elizabeth. The reason for the complaint is not known. In the letter that Corvin himself send on the thirteenth of April 1500 to the Chapter, it is just mentioned that the complaint had happened. Corvin demanded the Chapter to ignore it and install Balthazar Alapić in the estate of Vukovina and its belongings as well as the *castellum* that is build there.⁴²⁸ This is the first time mentioned that there was a *castellum* in Vukovina.

⁴²⁵ MNL, DF-DL 30916.

⁴²⁶ MNL, DF-DL 255507.

⁴²⁷ MHNC 2, doc. 134., pp. 185-186.

⁴²⁸ MNL, DF-DL 255506. In this context, a *castellum* probably means a fortified manor house. On the problem of castellum, what it is, and how it has developed into a typical form of noble residence see: Koppány Tibor: *A castellumtól a kastélyig. A magyarországi kastélyépítés kezdetei*. Művészettörténeti Értesítő, 23. 1974. 4. 285-299.; Koppány Tibor: *A castellumtól a kastélyig*. Historia Antik 2006.; Gábor Virágos: *The Social Archaeology of Residential Sites: Hungarian noble residences and their social context from the thirteenth through to the sixteenth century*, British Archaeological Reports, International Series, Band 1583. 2006.

In 1501, Baltazar went to the King Ladislas to get another confirmation about the estates he bought both from Corvin and Nicholas Ivanović. King did what he asked and also gave him all the royal rights in these estates. He ordered the Chapter of Szekesfehervar to install Balthazar, which they in fact did.⁴²⁹

In Plate 5 are shown the estates of the Farkaš family, the estates mentioned in the legal procedure between the Varadi family and George Wokomery, the estates that the Bath brothers sold to John Corvin, the estates that John Corvin gave in pledge to Baltazar Alapić and Marčinko, the estates that Baltazar Alapić bought from Corvin and Nicholas Ivanović and the estates into which Alapić was installed by the Chapters of Zagreb and Szekesfehervar. The similar combinations of estates mentioned in all those cases are clear from the Plate 6.

Plate 5-Owners of the estates

Estates of the Farkaš family	Estates of Peter Varadi/ George Wokomery	Estates that Andreas Bath sold to John Corvin	Estates that John Corvin gave in pledge to Baltazar Alapić and Marčinko 1496	Estates that John Corvin sold to Baltazar Alapić in 1496	Estates that Nikola Ivanović sold to Baltazar Alapić	Estates in which Baltazar Alapić was installed by the Chapter of Zagreb in 1500	Estates in which Baltazar Alapić was installed by the Chapter of Szekesfehervar in 1501
<i>In Turopolje:</i>							
		Wokowina 1492	Wokowyna 1496	Wokowyna 1496	Wokowyna 1498		Wokowycza (!)
Obrees 1435	Ebres, in pledge 1488.		Obrees 1496	Obrees 1496	Obrees 1498	Ebres 1500	Obrez
Damerye 1435	Domerye, in pledge 1488	Damerye 1492	Damerye 1496	Damerye 1496	Damerye 1498	Demerye 1500	Domerye
Thernowecz 1435	Tharrowcz, in pledge 1488		Thernowecz 1496	Thernowecz 1496	Thernowecz 1496	Themowecz 1500	Thernowecz
Okwye 1435	Okarye, in pledge 1488		Okwye 1496	Okwye 1496	Okwye 1498	Okwye 1500	Okwye
Thersecz 1435	Thersacz, in pledge 1488	Thersecz 1492	Thersecz 1496	Thersecz 1496	Thersecz 1498	Thersecz 1500	Thercez
Pobressye 1435	Pobresye, in pledge 1488		Pobressye 1496	Pobressye 1496	Pobressye 1498	Pobresye 1500	Probresye

⁴²⁹ MNL, DF-DL 33395.

Bwna 1435	Bwna, in pledge 1488		Bwna 1496	Bwna 1496	Bwna 1498	Buna 1500	Bvnna
Myssyne 1435	Mwsyne, in pledge 1488		Myssyne 1496	Myssyne 1496	Myssyne 1498	Mosyna 1500	Mysyne
Stuchye 1435							
Lekenyk 1435							
Bwseucz 1435							
	Nowaki, in pledge 1488		Nowaky 1496		Nowaky 1498	Nowaky 1500	Novaky
				Kupchyna 1496			
						Othok 1500	
<i>The territory of the Werekes kindred and the Abbey of Topusko :</i>							
Wrathecz, 1444	Wracza 1488, owned	Wrathcza 1492		Wrathza 1496	Wrathza 1498		Wrathcza
	Lwka 1488, owned	Lwka 1492		Lwka 1496	Lwka 1498		Luka
Prethkowina 1444,1454	Pethkowyna, in pledge 1488	Brythkowina 1492					
Mawrowazela 1401							
Maurowgay, 1401	Mawrogay 1488, in pledge						
Kalytha 1401, 1444	Kalyschya 1488, in pledge						
	Stryzche (<i>praedium</i>), in pledge 1488						
In comitatu Zagradiensi:							
Sterpyth, in pledge 1465	Zterpyth, in pledge 1488.		Stherpyche 1496	Stherpyche 1496	Stherpythe 1498		Sterpyth
Gernczarye, in pledge 1465	Gerwchary, in pledge 1488.		Gerncharye 1496	Gerncharye 1496	Gerncharye 1498		Germcharye

Brezowicza, in pledge 1465	Brezowycha, in pledge 1488.		Brezowycza 1496	Brezowycza 1496	Brezowycha 1498		Brezowycza
	Lwchylnya, in pledge 1488.						
Lypnicza, in pledge 1465							
Kornacho, in pledge 1465							
Brathany, in pledge 1465							
<i>In pertinenciis de Gora, prioratus aurane:</i>							
	Bysewychy, in pledge 1488.						
	Brezowycha, in pledge 1488.						
	Krayachewczy, in pledge 1488.						
	Tryboryewrzy, in pledge 1488.						
	Zwynar, in pledge 1488.						
	Kraczy, in pledge 1488.						

Based on the analysis done in this chapter, it can be concluded that Okuje and Vukovina were parts of the larger noble estate, the first-known owners of which were George and Stephan of the Farkaš family. The Farkaš family had been holding some parts of the estate in pledge, while the other parts were their own property. The last ones included the estates in the area of Brkiševina and the ones in Turopolje. It is unclear where this family originated from; according to the sources gathered so far it is most likely that they were from Birkiševina as the charter issued in 1431 informs that Stephan Farkaš and his sons and brothers, the patrons of the church of St. Cosmas and Damian in the village Ponikve, in the parish district of Brkiševina, were of the Berkes kindred (*generacio de predicta Berkws*).⁴³⁰ On the other hand, Stephan Farkaš and his brother Nicholas had been denominated as being from Obrež already in 1401. In addition

⁴³⁰ MHEZ 6, doc. 342, p. 333.

to that, in the majority of charters found so far the members of this family define themselves as being from Obrež. As will be discussed in the further text, the location of Obrež is problematic.

In any case, at one point, sometime between 1465 and 1487 the Farkaš family lost the estate. For now, it is unclear how this happened; the family could have died out, or the estates could have been sold or confiscated by the Crown. According to the next extant data, in 1487 the estate belonged either to Peter Varadi, Archbishop of Kalocsa and his brother Matthew Varadi or George Wokomery from Dol. The transcript of the court procedure between those two parties contains several important data. Among other things, George Wokmery claimed the Varadi family occupied his estates and stated that Luka and Vratec were his estates (*ipsam iure perpetuo*) while all the others were pledged (*titulo pignoris concernentes*).⁴³¹ The other estates were the ones in Turopolje, in the territory of Birkiševina and in the western part of Zagreb County. All these estates were once owned or pledged by Stephan and George Farkaš. Thus, it should be asked: from whom George Wokomery pledged the estates? Unfortunately, the question cannot be answered at this moment. It is not unlikely, however, that a charter that could explain it will be found in some future research.

How exactly the legal procedure between the Varadi family and George Wokmery ended is not known, but, according to the next sequence of events, it is clear that none of them kept the estate. It was, most likely, split into two parts; one part got John Corvin and the other Nicholas Ivanović. Besides that, Corvin got Vukovina, Tržec, Demerje, Vratec, Luka and Brithkovina from Andrew Both and his brothers in 1492. How they gained this part of the estate is also unknown. By the very end of the fifteenth century, with the Balthazar Alapić's purchases, the Vukovina estate of the Alapić family was created.

Clearly, there are many questions regarding the transitions of ownership of the estate in the fifteenth century I cannot answer at this moment so I will leave them open for now. On the other hand, the data from all the above-mentioned documents complemented with topographic and onomastic data offer some new insights into the functioning of the settlement system of the area around the site of Okuje. As the analysis in the following lines will show, the data enable detecting locations of several settlements that do not exist today and are very important for an interpretation of the site. The estates included in the analysis are the ones located in the area between the Buna River on the south and the Odra River on the north. These are Vukovina, Tržec, Obrež, Trnovec, Buna and Mišine, that appear in all the above-mentioned charters.

⁴³¹ MNL, DF-DL 37662.

Along with them, Samac, *Stuchye* and Buševac, mentioned just as the property of the Farkaš family, will also be included. Finally, some data about the possible location of Novaki will also come through the analysis.

Demerje, Pobrežje and Lekenik were not placed in the area around the site, so they will not be analysed separately. Lekenik is placed in the southwestern part of Turopolje. Demerje is placed on the western edge of Turopolje, south of Brezovica. I suppose that Pobrežje was located in the area south of the Sava River, where the settlement of such name is depicted on the First military survey.⁴³² Some parts of the estates (*porciones possessionariae*) of Baltazar Alapić located in Pobrežje *in portu Zawe* in Zagreb County are mentioned in 1513.⁴³³ Otok and Kupčina will also not be discussed as they were not the property of the Farkaš family and are not situated in the area in focus here.

4.2.3.6.2. *Estates-location and history*

4.2.3.6.2.1. *Vukovina and Tržec*

The present-day village Vukovina is placed approximately 3.3 kilometres northeast of the site Okuje, between the present-day villages Okuje and Staro Čiče. On the cadastre plan from 1862, Okuje is placed within the cadastre borders of Vukovina. Also, as will be shown, certain toponyms placed within the cadastre borders of this village reveal locations of some other, today not-existing, medieval settlements that had been part of the Vukovina estate.

Although Vukovina was the centre of the estate of Baltazar Alapić, with the *castellum* built in its area, it was not listed as an estate of the Farkaš family nor was it mentioned in the legal procedure between George Wokomery and Peter and Matthew Varadi. The first extant document that I have found in which Vukovina is explicitly mentioned by this name dates from 1492 when Andrew Both from Bayna and his brothers confirmed that they had exchanged some estates with John Corvin and gave him Vukovina, Tržec, Demerje and Vratec as well as *praedii* Luka and *Brathkovyna*. However, one later document, a record of a court procedure between Baltazar Alapić and Count George of Brandenburg from 1513, mentions that people of George of Brandenburg attacked borders and hays of Baltazar Alapić in the place called *Lazyne*, near *Wranopel*, that was placed within borders of the Baltazar's estate Tržec also called Vukovina (...*Tersecz, alio nomine Wokowyna*...).⁴³⁴ Thus, according to this data, Tržec and Vukovina

⁴³² Today this is a part of Novi Zagreb (south of Sopot) and the area is still today called Pobrežje.

⁴³³ MNL, DF-DL 37941.

⁴³⁴ MHNC 2, doc. 206., p. 322.

were the same estate and, according to the above-mentioned charter from 1942 by which Andrew Both and his brothers gave the estates to Corvin, Vukovina and Tržec were two separate estates. Be that as it may, they must have been very close to each other as in 1630 three settlements were under the jurisdiction of the parish church in Vukovina: Vukovina, Tržec and Okuje.⁴³⁵ Still, the exact location of Tržec is not clear. I did not find any such toponym on modern maps, the military surveys or the cadastre plan from 1861. Along with that, there are two other sources valuable for a spatial reconstruction that are closer to the medieval period than the military surveys and the 1861 cadastre. These are two *Urbarii* of the Vukovina estate, written in 1656 and 1660.⁴³⁶ At the period the *Urbarii* were written, Vukovina and Okuje belonged to the nuns of the Order of St. Clare whose Monastery was in Zagreb (Gradec). Among other data, the *urbarii* contain a detailed description of lands that had belonged to a *curia* and to tenant peasants, placed within the borders of Vukovina and Okuje.⁴³⁷ As will be shown in the following text, these toponyms mentioned in the *urbarii* still exist and can be placed in the present-day environment. But there is no mentioning of Tržec, Vranopel or Lazina in them (people of George of Brandenburg attacked borders and hays of Baltazar Alapić in a place called *Lazyne*, near *Wranopel*, that was placed within the borders of Baltazar's estate *Tersecz* also called Vukovina in 1513).

Therefore, as Tržec is mentioned as being under the jurisdiction of the parish church in Vukovina in 1630 and it does not appear in *Urbarii* of the Vukovina estate from 1656 and 1660, it can be concluded that in the scope of some 25 years the name stopped being used. I suppose it does not mean that the settlement named Tržec was abandoned because it could still appear as a toponym. More likely, it was merged with Vukovina. As far as the sixteenth-century documents are concerned, people from Tržec were mentioned, although rarely. For example, in 1520, among people of Baltazar Alapić who attacked the village Kuče and a wood called *Kneye Gaj* were Martin Plazarić and John Tomašić from *Thersez*.⁴³⁸

⁴³⁵ By that period, the chapel of Blessed Virgin Mary in Vukovina took over the role of a parish church that previously had had the church of St. George in Staro Čiče.

Janko Barlé, "Povijest Crkve u Turopolju," p. 259.

⁴³⁶ *Urbarium imania Wkovinskoga preko Szave* [The Urbarium of the Vukovina estate across the Sava River] from 1560 and *Urbarium imania y kmetovi Opatichoga Zagrebehoga klostara Reda Szuete Matere Clare nachine leta 1660* [Urbarium of the estate and the tenant peasants of the Zagreb nunnery of the order of St. Clare] from 1660. These are kept in the Croatian state archive.

⁴³⁷ The first *Urbarium* is divided in sub sections: *Terrae curiales in castello Vukovina, Sequentur foenila colonorum extripata and Kmeti preko Szave na Vukovine portionis Draskouichiana*, and the second: *Terrae curiales in Castello Wkowane, Sequentur foenila colonorum extripata and Na Okuiskom Wkowinsko*. They are both written in combination of Latin and vernacular language.


⁴³⁸ MHNC 2, doc. 271., p. 480.

To summarize the above written: the first extant source in which Vukovina is recorded dates from in 1492. According to this source, the first known owners of the estate were Andrew Both and his brothers, who, according to the same source, were also owners of Tržec. Some later documents equal Vukovina and Tržec. Tržec itself was an estate of the Farkaš family and it is mentioned in the legal procedure between the Varadi family and George Wokomery. Therefore, a question can be asked: did the area of Vukovina also belonged to the Farkaš family but just was not mentioned as such? I think that the answer is affirmative. First of all, Vukovina did not become the centre of the estate when Baltazar Alapić bought the estate. It was the centre of the estate already when John Corvin was the owner. This is clear not only from a charter issued by him in Vukovina on the fifteenth of October 1496 but also from the purchase contract by which he sold the estate to Baltazar Alapić a week later, on the 22nd of October.⁴³⁹ According to the contract, Corvin sold *totalis possessio Wokowyna* together with *curia*, villages (*villae*) and estates (*possessiones*) Tržec, Podbrežje, Mišine, Buna, Okuje, Obrež, Novaki, Damerje, Vratec and Luka as well as parts of the estates (*porciones possessionariae*) Trnovec, Sterpić, Grnčari and Brezovica. On the basis of these data, it could be concluded that Vukovina became the centre of the estate when John Corvin bought it from Andrew Both and his brothers. The problem is that the purchase contract between Baltazar Alapić and Nicholas Ivanović contained the identical formulation as the purchase contract between Corvin and Alapić. Nicholas also sold *totalis possessio Wokowyna* together with *curia*, villages (*villae*) and estates (*possessiones*) Tržec, Podbrežje, Mišine, Buna, Okuje, Obrež, Novaki, Damerje, Vratec and Luka as well as parts of the estates (*porciones possessionariae*) Trnovec, Sterpić, Grnčar and Brezovica to Baltazar. As he probably had inherited the whole estate from George Wokomery (after it had been confiscated), it could be concluded that sometime towards the end of the fifteenth century the name Vukovina started to be used for the area of Tržec, the central part of this area where *curia* of a noble owner stood. Over time, the name Vukovina prevailed and the name Tržec disappeared. There is one possible explanation that perhaps could indicate how the name Vukovina was created. The toponym Vukovina indicates a possession of Vuk or vuk, a wolf (this is word stands both for an animal and for a personal name). The last name of the Farkaš family was obviously Farkaš and Farkas means wolf in Hungarian. Perhaps this is how the name of the estate came into being.

At the end, it should be noted that no *castellum* in Vukovina is mentioned in the purchase contracts by which Baltazar Alapić bought the estate from John Corvin and Nicholas Ivanović.

⁴³⁹ MNL, DF-DL 261789

The first time it was mentioned is in the charter issued on thirteenth of April 1500, when John Corvin asked the Chapter of Zagreb to install Baltazar Alapić to the estate of Vukovina and the *castellum* erected there (*ad possessionem Wokowyna vocatam et castellum ibidem erectum*).⁴⁴⁰ If the *castellum* had existed in the time when Corvin and Ivanović were selling the estate to Baltazar, it would most likely be mentioned. Therefore, it can be concluded that Baltazar was the one who built it, in the centre of his estate to which belonged numerous the above-mentioned villages.⁴⁴¹



Map 24-Toponyms on the 1861 cadastre map

Few words about toponyms in the area of Vukovina will be mentioned as they are important for further discussion. On the cadastre 1861 plan, only two settlements were shown within the cadastre borders of Vukovina: Vukovina and Okuje. Still, certain toponyms, names of agricultural lands, indicate that there were more settlements (or perhaps hamlets) located in this area in the medieval period. They are shown on Map 24. The same names of lands in the territory of Vukovina and Okuje are also written in both Urbarii. These are: *in Misinah*, *pod*

⁴⁴⁰ MNL, DF-DL 255506.


⁴⁴¹ For example, in 1509 the people of Baltazar Alapić are mentioned in one of the court processes as... *aliisque quam pluribus iobagionibus et hominibus prefati Balthasaris Alapi, in dicta Ebres et aliis villis in pertinenciis Wokoyyna habitis commorantibus*. MHNC 2, doc. 173., p. 260.

Gaiem, na Obreskom/in Obresko/Obres/sub Obres/y Obreskom kotaru, Novakeh, na Szelczah, pod Odru, selo Gluhacheco [village of Gluhač]/Gluhački jarak [Gluhač's ditch], *potok Hobdina* [the stream Obdina].

Mišine and Mišinsko polje [The field of Mišine] is the name of lands, stretching in length of 3.4 kilometres, placed in the southern part of the Vukovina estate, next to the cadastre borders of Mraclin. Lands called Novačke sjenokoše [Novaki fayfields] are placed west of Mišine. They could be connected with the toponym Novaki that appears in the *Urbarii*. Novaki was also one of the estates of Baltazar Alapić, but, due to insufficient data, it is not clear in which part of Turopolje this estate was located. Novaki means new people, newcomers and it is a frequent toponym. A settlement of this name was not listed as a property of the Farkaš family, but it mentioned as an estate that the Varady family had occupied, and in all the other charters connected with the Vukovina estate. One document from 1512, testifies about quarrels between people (*familiares populisque et iobagiones*) of Baltazar Alapić and the nobles of Turopolje. One of them happened when the people of Baltazar attacked some hays that had been within boundaries of the estates Zamlačje and Zubačevlaz (*Zamlaczye et Zwbachewlaz*), besides a road leading from Novaki to Okuje (*vltra viam que tendit de possessione Nowak ad possessionem Okoye*).⁴⁴² If one looks at the 1861 cadastre map (see Map 25), one can see that toponyms *Novačke sjenokoše* and *Selištje* above it are placed north of Okuje. The estates Zamlačje and Zobačlaz are placed on the western side of the cadastre border of Vukovina. Based on this data, it could be that estate Novaki was situated in this area. In any case, toponym Novaki that is recorded in the *Urbarii* does indicate a settling of the new people in this area.

Left of the houses of Vukovina is a toponym *Selca*. Along the western cadastre border, that is, west of Mišine is the toponym *Selištje*. These toponyms also clearly point at a place where once houses stood. Perhaps Tržec was located somewhere in this area. Besides that, there are two other toponyms, *Obrež* and *Selištje*, placed southeast of Okuje, next to the cadastre border with Mraclin. This is the area of the archaeological site of Okuje.

⁴⁴² MNL, DF-DL 37906.



Map 25-Novačke sjenokose on the 1861 cadastre map

Finally, one other toponym that does not appear in the medieval charters but does in the *Urbarii* should be mentioned. This is *selo Gluhacheco*, which mean the village of Gluhač in Croatian. On the 1861 cadastre map, a toponym Gluhači is placed south-west of Okuje, along with the cadastre border with Petrovina. *Selo* also points at a settlement, in this context, probably a smaller hamlet that could have developed in the second half of sixteenth century or in the seventeenth century.

4.2.3.6.2.2. Okuje

The settlement Okuje by which the archaeological site was named is first mentioned in the charter from 1435 as the property of George and Stephan Farkaš. This charter contains one more important data about Okuje: one of the neighbours present during the installation of George and Stephan was a *literatus* Benedict from Okuje (*de Okwya*).⁴⁴³ So, besides the Farkaš family, there were some other owners of land in this village. Not much more can be said about this as there are no data in the other fifteenth century extant sources. In the sixteenth century documents, tenant-peasants (*iobagiones*) of Baltazar Alapić from Okuje are often mentioned.

⁴⁴³ KAZ, ALC 2, no. 59.

4.2.3.6.2.3. *Mišine*

A village called Mišine does not exist today, but this estate can be located due to the already mentioned toponyms that appear in the *Urbarii* and on modern maps. Today there is a field called Mišine (*Mišinsko polje*), placed in the southeastern part of the territory within the cadastre borders of Vukovina. In addition to that, a wood named Mišine, can be found on the 2nd and 3rd military surveys and on the 1862 cadastre map, located between Mraclin and Vukovina.

The estate Mišine is first mentioned in 1435. As Okuje, it became an estate of Baltazar Alapić. It can be stated with certainty that in its area was settled in the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth century as people of Baltazar Alpić from Mišine are mentioned in the extant sources, for example in two charters from 1509 and 1520.⁴⁴⁴ I have not found any mentioning of the settlement of this name in the published documents after 1520. Probably a search of data from numerous unpublished sixteenth-century charters could give some additional information and perhaps a later mentioning of the settlement. Still, the *Urbarii* of the Order of Claire mention just hay lands in this area. On the basis of that it can be concluded that, by the middle of the seventeenth century, that is, by 1656, when the first *Urbarium* has been written, there was no more separate settlement or hamlet in this area. Some change in a territorial organization occurred in this area in the second half of sixteenth or the first half of the seventeenth century. It would perhaps be an exaggeration to say that the settlement was abandoned; people could have just moved in the area of the present-day village of Vukovina. Besides that, it is questionable whether Mišine was a proper village or simply a smaller hamlet. In any case, in the course of the following centuries, this was an agricultural area (and also a wood area at one point) as still is today.

4.2.3.6.2.4. *Obrež (Ebres)*

4.2.3.6.2.4.1. *Problems with the location of Obrež*

A village called Obrež Odranski [Obrež of Odra] exists today, situated on the western edge of Turopolje. It is also visible on the Military surveys. While on the First survey two settlements called Gornji and Donji (Upper and Lower) Obrež are depicted, on the Second and the Third there is just one settlement – Obrež, in the same position. This is not unusual, in Turopolje as elsewhere, settlements often have the same name but are distinguished by the

⁴⁴⁴ MHNC 2, docs. 174 and 271., pp. 262 and 480.

adjectives Gornji and Donji (Upper and Lower) or Veliki and Mali (Big and Small), depending on their position or size. Sometimes these settlements have merged into one settlement (for example, Obrež or Mala Gorica which is today the part of Velika Gorica). In other cases, they have stayed separate villages (for example, Gornja and Donja Lomnica).

Emilij Laszowski considered Obrež Odranski to be one of the villages placed in the territory of the noble community of Turopolje in the medieval period. In his History of Turopolje, he wrote a short historical overview of this village as he did for the other villages that were inhabited by the nobles of Turopolje. In his opinion, Obrež Odranski is mentioned in the medieval charters by different names: Obrež, Mali Obrež (Minor, small), Obrež Samec etc.⁴⁴⁵ However, I have come to the conclusion that a precise location of a medieval settlement/estate named Obrež is problematic, respectively, besides the village Obrež that still exists today and whose position is known, there had been other settlements/estates named Obrež, mentioned in the charters, that cannot be equalled with Obrež Odranski.

Obrež is often mentioned in the sources collected in Laszowski's *Monumenta*, in variations *Obres/Obress/Ebres/Ebress/Ebrezz* (first as a *terra* and later as a *possessio* and a *villa*). Along with it, starting from the 1460s, the charters mention nine places named Obrež in combination with some adjective added to it (as a *villa* and a *possessio*). These are: *Obres Cheska* (*villa*), *Obres Maior* (*possessio*), *Obres Mala* (*villa*), *Obres Minor* (*possessio*), *Obres Samecz/Samcze/Samcha/Zamcha* (*villa*), *Obres Suppanicza* (*villa*), *Obersecz/Obresech* (*possessio*), *Obres Balthasaryewa/Balthasar* (*possessio*) and *Obres domini Alapy* (*possessio*?). In addition to that, there is also *Obrescza* (*possessio*), *Obrezyna* (*possessio*) and *Obrežje* (*possessio*).⁴⁴⁶ I think that some of all these listed names can refer to the same estates, for example, *Obrež Mala* (small in Croatian) and *Obrež Minor* are the names of the same settlements. But, certainly, not all these settlements were situated in the territory of Obrež Odranski.

For example, in the *Monumnet*, Obrež is first time mentioned as *terra Obres* in a charter from 1276. The charter contains perambulation, so the estate can be located in the present-day environment. It was not situated in the territory of the present-day Obrež Odranski, but in the area of the present-day Donja Lomnica, south of the Lomnica River. In later fifteenth-century charters, the same estate is also called Mali (*Minor, Mala, Kys*) Obrež. More about Mali

⁴⁴⁵ Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine*, pp. 373-374.

⁴⁴⁶ See: *Index personarum, locorum et rerum momentosarum* in MHNC 2, page 597 and MHNC 3, page 611.

Obrež will be written in the chapter about settlements of the castle warriors in the southwestern part of Turopolje (see the subchapter Mali Obrež, pages 284-288).

As far as the territory of the present-day Obrež Odranski is concerned, it can be stated that, from the second half of the thirteenth century, it was not situated in the territory of the noble community of Turopolje. In a division of territories, made between Vukota and his kindred and sons of *comes* Andrew (who were not the castle warriors of Turopolje) in 1256, the territory of the Obrež came under the jurisdiction of the last (see the subchapter: Borders between Miroslav and the sons of Andrew and the kindred of Vukota, p. 233. etc). Likewise, it can also be stated with certainty that the territory of the present-day Obrež Odranski was not a separate settlement in the fourteenth century, but a part of the village Čehi (this village is today placed north of Obrež Odranski). This is clear from the perambulation of the estate Čehi recorded in 1331 when, obeying an order of King Charles, the Chapter of Zagreb installed Martin, Ladislaus and Nicholas, brothers of deceased Abra well as Abra's son Nicholas into the estate. The text of the perambulation is very long so I will write down just the fixed points that can be easily recognized in the present-day environment: "The boundary begins at the eastern part above the Sava River and goes towards the south....it touches a land (*terra*) of the church of St. George in Odra [the village Odra] and, circling around it, it goes into the Odra Riverit comes to the water Lipnica (*aqua Lybnicha*)....it comes to the water Kuklenjak (*aqua Kukynak*) and, going by it, comes to the Lomnica River, where it comes in the neighbourhood of the estate of the sons of late Ban Stephan [Babonić] called Brezovica....going towards the north it shares the boundary with the estate of the Chapter of Zagreb called Blato and comes back to the Sava."⁴⁴⁷ Thus, the border of Čehi went from the Sava on the north to the Lipnica River and the Kuklenjak stream on the south. Both of these watercourses are tributaries of the Lomnica River, placed on its southern side.

As can be easily seen on the 1861 cadastre map (Map 26) as well as on modern maps, in 1331, the areas of three present-day settlements were incorporated into the estate Čehi. These were the areas of Čehi, Sveta Klara and Obrež Odranski. Because of that, I suppose that Obrež Češka, the name which appears in documents starting from the middle of the fifteenth century, actually refers to this territory of Obrež Odranski, as by that period a separate estate called Obrež had developed in the territory of Čehi.

However, not all Obreži mentioned in the charters can be placed with certainty in the modern environment due to several aggravating circumstances. The first problem is that place-


⁴⁴⁷ MHNC 1, doc. 45., pp. 45-46.

names and toponyms Obrež and Obrežje are can be found all over northern Croatia. The meaning of this term is “on a hill, on a slope of a hill” (*o breg-je*).⁴⁴⁸ The additional problem is that the majority of documents from the Turopolje area in which Obrež (with or without the adjective next to it) is mentioned do not contain information that could help one to locate mentioned estate in the present-day environment. Namely, these documents are mostly not purchase contracts that concern a selling of land in Obrež, but different sort of documents that mention people from Obrež and do not contain perambulations. On top of all that, terms are not used consistently in the charters. It can be seen on the example of *comes terrestris* Matthias son of Giwrkonis from Obrež. His name appears in more charters issued in the period between 1479 and 1490. In four of them is written that Matthias is from Mali Obrež (*de Ebres Minor/de Kis Ebres*).⁴⁴⁹ In seven of them is written that he is from Obreš (*de Ebres*)⁴⁵⁰. The same with tithe lists, where usually several places called Obrež are recorderd (in the same list).

⁴⁴⁸ Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine*, p. 373.

⁴⁴⁹ MHNC 2, docs.15, 30, 32, 54., pp. 16, 33, 38, 70.

⁴⁵⁰ MHNC 2, docs.18, 19, 21, 22, 24, 31, 41., pp. 19, 21, 24, 25, 27, 35 and 51.



Map 26-Obrež Odranski

As can be seen on Plate 5, in which the appertaining estates of Vukovina are shown, an estate called Obrež appears in all combinations except as a property of Andrew Both and his brothers who sold Vukovina, Tržec, Vratec and Demerje to John Corvin in 1492. Besides that, George and Stephan Farkaš were (in most cases) denominated as being from Obrež. Therefore, the questions that should be asked at this point are: from which Obrež were George and Stephan Farkaš and is that the same Obrež mentioned in all the combinations as well as where was this estate located? Unfortunately, I did not find enough data that would enable me to answer these questions with certainty. Nevertheless, the analysis that will be done concerning this issue will offer some possible answers to the questions. At the same time, it will give some new data important for the interpretation of the medieval environment around the archaeological site of Okuje. But, before discussing the possible location of Obrež of the Farkaš family, data about

the estates called Obrež owned by Baltazar Alapić as these later data help understanding the earlier ones.

4.2.3.6.2.4.2. *Obreži of Baltazar Alapić*

When Baltazar Alapić bought the Vukovina estate from John Corvin and Nicholas Ivanović, one of the appertaining settlements of the estate was Obrež. On the other hand, two tithe lists from 1538 list three settlements called Obrež.⁴⁵¹ In the first list, next to a name of the village, names of parish churches under whose jurisdiction villages belonged are listed; *Obres domini Alapi* was in the parish of St. Clare (*ad sanctam Claram*), *Obres Balthasar* was in the parish of Petrovina (*ad Petrovinam*) and *Obres Samchya* was in the parish of Strao Čiče (*ad Vetus Chyche*).⁴⁵² In the second list, *Obres domini Alapi* and *Obres Balthasarye[wa]* are written without specifying a parish to which they belong while for *Obres Samchya* is written that it is the Vukovina parish (*ad Wokowyna*).⁴⁵³ The last probably refers to the chapel of Blessed Virgin Mary in Vukovina that, by 1630, took over the role of a parish church that previously had had the church of St. George in Staro Čiče.⁴⁵⁴ In any case, *Obres Samchya* must have been close to Vukovina or in its area.

Thus, these were three places called Obrež under jurisdictions of three different parish churches and these were certainly three different villages or estates. The church of St. Clare was (and still is) situated in the northwestern part of Turopolje, north of the village Čehi, and below the Sava River. The church of St. Peter in Petrovina does not exist today, but its position, visible on the First military survey was shown in the previous text. The church of St. George also does not exist today but is known that it was placed in Staro Čiče. At least two of the above-mentioned Obreži, situated at two different locations, were owned by Baltazar Alapić: *Obres domini Alapi-ad sanctam Claram* and *Obres Balthasar-ad Petrovinam*. An owner of *Obres Samchya - ad Vetus Chyche*, that is, *ad Wokowyna*, is not specified.

A charter issued in 1509 contains a description of a conflict, that had happened near a road called Zep, between people of Baltazar Alapić and people of the nobles of Turopolje. The names of many people of Baltazar (*familiaries, populusque et iobagiones prefati Balthasar, domini sui*) led by Iambrek, a village judge (*iudex*) from Novak, were recorded. These were: *providi* brothers Stephanus, Michael et Anthony, Peter and his sons Michael et Matthew,

⁴⁵¹ MHNC 3, doc. 41, p. 57, doc. 42, p. 63, doc. 39, p. 45.

⁴⁵² MHNC 3, doc. 41., p. 57.

⁴⁵³ MHNC 3, doc. 42., p. 63.

⁴⁵⁴ Barlé, "Povijest Crkve u Turopolju," p. 259.

Gregorius son of Stephanus Briglewych, Thomas Kamurych, Clement Balych, Nicolaus Beglewych and his brother Peter, Andreas Zethtych, Gregory Soiowych, Nicholas Kerwarych, Clement Solowych, from **Novaki** (*Nowak*); Gregory Barsych, Peter Bwsych and his son Thomas, Anthony Swrarmych, Jacob et Mikula Samecz, Bartol Yendreyeych, Peter Globlych, the other Peter Marynaych, Gregory Czepecz, Emeric Lah, Valentin Zrwanych and his son Peter, Martin Soklych from **Obrež** (*Ebres*); then Augustin and his servants Peter, Thoma and Bedek, Valek Kozel, Vrban Kozel, Blasius Korgach, Matthey, Michael et Gwrkone Gerzelya from **Mišine** (*Myssine*); Gregory Powsych, Paul Gwrenchych, Valentin Gwrenchych from **Okuje** (*Ohkwe*); Gregory Globlych, Peter and his son Gwrkone, Fabian and Paul Trombethasych, Thomas Zegrewych, Thoma Lawhs, Peter Malekowych, Fabian Zwybecz, Anthony Vodogazych, Martin Plazarych, Martin Klarynzeth, John Bryglewych, Michael Pwthkowych from **Obrež** (*Ebres*); John Brechych, Valentin Soklych, Thomas Glwhak and his brother Paul, Gywrko son of Thomes, Gregory son of Glwhak, John Lawhs, Paul Gvvrkowych, Dominic Myklin from **Buna** (*Bwna*); Peter Pwchewych, John and Martin Matnychych, Stephan Kwzinsyn, Georgy and Peter Thkalchych, Gwrkone Perwekowzyn, Peter Petrych, Gwrkone and his son Iwek, Stephan Malechzynowecz, Georgy Domyankowych, Stephan Tacha, Benedict Nemchychazet from **Obrež Čěška** (*Ebres Cheska*); Peter Horwathych, Peter Banschakowych, Iury Gechych, Ivan Brodar, Vrban Zerechych from **Zaprude** (*Zaprodye*); Marc Thwlowych, Iwray Matheyhych, Stephan Ianchechych from **Čehi** (*Chehy*).⁴⁵⁵

The listed people were from Novaki, **Obrež**, Mišine, Okuje, **Obrež**, Buna, **Obrež Čěška**, Zaprude and Čehi. According to these data, Alapić owned three estates called Obrež; two were named simply Obrež and one was named Obrež Čěška. However, if one compares the names of people from one of Obreži recorded in this charter with the names of people from Obrež Samac listed in the tithe lists (in 1501, 1503 and 1538)⁴⁵⁶, it becomes clear that the names are identical. As said, the usage of the terms is not consistent in the documents, so, even in the tithe lists, Obrež Samac is also sometimes written simply as Obrež, for example, *villa Obres* in 1503. Thus, *Peter Marywich* is written as an inhabitant of *Obres* in 1501 and *Peter Maryeuich* as an inhabitant of *Obres Zamcha* in 1503. *Peter Faber* from *Obres*, that is, *Peter Faber* from *Obres Samecz* is mentioned in the lists from 1501 while *Peter Kouach* from *Obres Zamcha* is

⁴⁵⁵ MHNC 2, doc. 174., pp. 262-263.

⁴⁵⁶ MHNC 2, doc. 138, p. 197, doc. 146, p. 214, doc. 147, p. 221; MHNC 3, doc. 41, p. 57, doc. 42, p. 63, doc. 39, p. 45.

mentioned in a list from 1503 (Kovač means the smith in Croatian).⁴⁵⁷ All the names of the people recorded in the charter from 1509 and in the tithe lists are shown on Plate 2.

Plate 6-People from Obrež and Obrež Samac in the tithe lists

People of Baltazar Ebres, 20.12.1509. ⁴⁵⁸	List of wheat, 1501, Villa Obres ⁴⁵⁹	List of millet, Obres Samecz, 1501 ⁴⁶⁰	List of wheat 1503, Villa Obres Szamce, 1503. ⁴⁶¹	List of millet, Obres Zamcha, 1503. ⁴⁶²	Obres Samchya, 1538 ⁴⁶³	Obres Samchya. Ad vetus Chyche. 1538 ⁴⁶⁴	Obres Samchya. Ad Wkowyna. 1538 ⁴⁶⁵
Gregorius Barsych							
Petrus Bwsych	Peter Busich		Peter Bossich	Peter Bozych?			
Thomas Bwsych, filius Petri					Thomas Bwsych	Thomas Bwsych	Thomas Bwsych
Petrus Globlych							
Emericus Lah			Iemrich Lach	Iemrich Lach			
Iacobus Samecz							
Mikula Samecz							
				Ivrko Zamech			
						Mathko Samchych	
Anthonius Swrarmych							
Bartol Yendreyeych							
Petrus Marynaych,	Peter Marywich		Peter Marenicz	Peter Maryeuich	Pether Maryewych	Pether Maryewych	
					Berlek idem	Berlek idem	
Gregorius Czepecz,			Gregor Czipchich				

⁴⁵⁷ MHNC 2, doc. 138, pp. 194-197, doc. 147, p. 221.

⁴⁵⁸ MHNC 2, doc. 174., p. 262.

⁴⁵⁹ MHNC 2, doc. 138., p. 194.

⁴⁶⁰ MHNC 2, doc. 138., p. 197.

⁴⁶¹ MHNC 2, doc. 146, p. 214.

⁴⁶² MHNC 2, doc. 147., p. 221.

⁴⁶³ MHNC 3, doc. 39., p. 45.

⁴⁶⁴ MHNC 3, doc. 41., p. 57.

⁴⁶⁵ MHNC 3, doc. 42., pp. 63-64.

					Emericus Cupecz	Emri Kopaz	
Valentinus Zrwanych	palis. Valent Zancich						
Petrus Zrwanych							
						Mathias Zremych	
Martinus Soklych							
				Iacob Skolech			
					Blas Swklych	Blasius Swklach	
						Emericus Swklych	
			Iurko Franczic h				
			Marko Mikulchi cz				
			Valent Fremicz	Valenth Fremich			
					Ionann es Pawshyc	Ivanus Pawsyh	Iohannes Pawsyh
						Fabyan Fabwsyn	
						Fabian Kochyaschych	
	Peter fabri	Peter faber	Peter Kouach	Peter Kouach			
						Anthol Kowach	
	Iendrei	Iendek					
	Gregur	Grego r	Gre gor	Gregor			
	Gregur			Gregor			
	Gregur						
	Valent	Valentinus	Valent	Valent			
		Valentinus faber hycha					
		Peter					
		Matheus					
			Balthor	Baitor			
				Marko			
					Fabyan		Fabyan
					Iantal		

It can be concluded, therefore, that Baltazar Alapić owned three estates called Obrež situated at three different places: one was in the parish of St. Clare, the other was in the parish of St. Peter in Petrovina and the third was in the parish of Staro Čiče or Vukovina. According to the sources presented so far, one of Baltazar's estates was also called Obrež Samac and the other Obrež Češka. His ownership over three estates called Obrež can easily be explained by the fact that Baltazar was purchasing some estates in the Turopolje area before and after the purchase of the Vukovina estate and then joined them with the Vukovina estates. When and from whom he bought these other estates should be researched separately. Important for the topic here is how he acquired two other estates called Obrež (besides the one bought with Vukovina and Okuje).

Already in 1492, so prior to the purchase of the Vukovina estate, John Corvin gave to Baltazar (at that time his captain of Medvedgrad), his part of the estate in the estate of Veliki Obrež that was under jurisdiction of the castle of Lukavec (*porcionum nostrum possessionariam in possessione Nagh Obres vocata in pertinenciis casteli nostri Lukawecz*).⁴⁶⁶ I have found only one additional document in which Veliki Obrež is mentioned; in 1510, *Obres Maior* is listed as one of the estates under the jurisdiction of the Lukavec castle.⁴⁶⁷ Some additional data would be needed for locating the exact position of this settlement in the present-day environment. I only suppose that it was placed in the territory of the present-day Obrež Odranski. Veliki Obrež, as the name itself says, was big, or at least bigger than Mali Obrež (in the territory of the present-day Donja Lomnica), and the territory of Obrež Odranski is the only possible place in Turopolje I can think of that was big enough and was called Obrež in the fifteenth century. I did not find any other mentioning of some estate called Veliki Obrež in the territory of the noble community, so, this is the only possible solution at this moment. This would also mean that Veliki Obrež was equal to Obrež Češka; it was explained that Obrež Odranski had developed in the territory of the village Čehi. In case that the assumption is correct, this would also be the estate *Obres domini Alapi-ad sanctam Claram*. The settlement called Sveta Klara (St. Clare), also developed in the territory of Čehi and was named after the church dedicated to St. Clare that was founded on its territory in 1366.⁴⁶⁸

As far as Obrež that was under the jurisdiction of the parish church in Petrovina (*Obres Balthasar-ad Petrovinam*) is concerned, I did not find a charter that could explain how Balthasar acquired it. This estate was located in Mali Obrež as Mali Obrež must have been

⁴⁶⁶ MNL, DF-DL 233338.

⁴⁶⁷ MHNC 2, doc. 186, p. 286.

⁴⁶⁸ MHNC 1, doc. 81, pp. 82-84.

under the jurisdiction of the parish church in Petrovina; it was approximately one kilometre distant from it. This can be confirmed by one sixteenth century document. In 1580, King Rudolf ordered the Chapter of Zagreb to reinstall Baltazar's grandsons Gašpar and Nicholas into the *castellum* Vukovina and the estates (*totales possessiones*) Tržec, Pobrežje, Mišine, **Samcha Obreš or Obrež**, Buna, Novaki, Trnovec, **Mali Obrež**, **Veliki Obrež**, Demerje, Sv. Klara, Kupčina, Vratec and Luka⁴⁶⁹, parts of the estates in the estates Čehi, Mala Mlaka, Brezovica, Grnčari, Sterpit, Banja Sela and Kozmačnik⁴⁷⁰, then the whole estate Mikčevac⁴⁷¹ with the noble curia in it, as well as, Jakuševac, Novaki, Orešje and Marinc⁴⁷². The Chapter did as ordered.⁴⁷³ The king also gave Baltazar's grandsons all the royal rights he had had into these estates (a title of new donation).⁴⁷⁴ So, in 1580 both Veliki and Mali Obrež were still parts of the Vukovina estate. In any case, Mali Obrež was initially in the territory of the noble community. It was placed in the territory which is today within the cadastre borders of Donja Lomnica. Baltazar probably bought some part in this estates from some noble of Turopolje.

At the end, the location of the third Obrež owned by Baltazar, Obrež Samac, will be explained. It has already been mentioned that Laszowski wrote that Obrež Samac was one of the variations of the name of the village Obrež (of Odra). The name Samec was derived from the family name Samčić that, according to the sources, appears in 1501.⁴⁷⁵ Still, this is not correct. The problem is that there are no charters that contain a perambulation of Obrež Samac. It is mentioned just in the tithe lists as *Obres Samecz/Samcze/Samcha/Zamcha (villa)*. The tithe lists, however, can also reveal something about its location. In one list from 1501 it is called *villa Obres* and is written after Mraclin, and in the second, issued the same year, it is called *Obres Samecz* and is written between Trnovec and Mraclin.⁴⁷⁶ In 1503 *Obres Zamcha* is again written after Mraclin.⁴⁷⁷ So, it must have been somewhere in the vicinity of Mraclin and Trnovec. Besides this, in the lists from 1538 is written Obrež Samac was in the parish of Staro Čiče (*ad vetus Chiche*), that is, in the parish of Vukovina (*ad Wokowyna*). So, it should be located somewhere in the wider area of Staro Čiče or Vukovina, and between Trnovec and

⁴⁶⁹ *Thersecz, Pobresye, Myssine, Samcha Obres aliter Obrez, Bwna, Novaki, Thernowecz, Kysobres, Nagy Obres, Damerje, Zenth Klata, Kopchyna, Wraccza et Lwka*

⁴⁷⁰ *Cehy, Kismlaka, Brezowycza, Germchary, Sterpyth, Banyatela et Kozmachnyk*

⁴⁷¹ *Mykchewcz aliter Myxovvcz*

⁴⁷² *Jakwsowczy, Nowaky, Oresye et Maryncz*

⁴⁷³ MNL, DF-DL 33398.

⁴⁷⁴ Ivan pl. Bojničić, "Kraljevske darovnice, odnoseće se na Hrvatsku. Iz kraljevskih registraturnih kniga "libri regii". Peti nastavak.", *Vjesnik hrvatsko-slavonsko-damlatinskog zemaljskog arhiva* 11, pp. 23-24.

⁴⁷⁵ Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine*, p. 374.

⁴⁷⁶ MHNC 2, doc. 138., p. 194.

⁴⁷⁷ MHNC 2, doc. 146, pp. 213-214.

Mraclin. I have not found toponym Samac anywhere in his area. There is, however, a small hamlet called Obrež on the western side of the present-day Mraclin. It is now connected with Mraclin. On the Third military survey, it is depicted as a separate hamlet called also Obrež. On the Second military survey, the same hamlet is called *Setištje*. On the First military survey, thus the one which is closest to the medieval period, there is no hamlet of this name, but there is a toponym Obrež, south of Okuje and Mraclin. Toponyms *Setištje* and *Obrs* are depicted on the 1861 cadastre map, in the same place as on the First survey. They are placed within the cadastre borders of Vukovina (as mentioned, the whole area of Okuje was within the cadastre borders of Vukovina in that period).



Map 27-Obrež on the 1st Military survey



Map 28-Setištje on the 2nd military survey



Map 29-Obrež on the 3rd military survey

In addition to that, the *Urbarii* of the Vukovina estate also mentioned a place called Obrež, located along the border with Mracilin. For example, in the first *Urbarium*, written in 1656, is mentioned that the land of John Rakarić is placed on the east and south of the previously mentioned land *versus sessiones in Obres*, or, on the other place: *Item eiusdem Iohannis Rognich terra arabilis unum iuger prope metas Nobilium de Mraczlin in Obres ad meridiem*. Therefore, it can be concluded that the hamlet called Obrež, situated within the borders of the Vukovina estate, near the border between the estate and Mracilin, still existed in the middle of the seventeenth century. I think that exactly in this area Obrež Samac was located.



Map 30-Toponyms Obrš and Selišnje on the 1861 cadastre map

According to the analysis done so far, it can be concluded that Baltazar Alapić owned parts of the estates of perhaps the whole estates in three different places, all called Obreži. One of them was most likely situated in the territory of the present-day Obrež Odranski. This would be Veliki Obrež or Obrež Češka. The other was certainly situated in the territory of medieval Mali Obrež that was placed within the cadastre borders of the present-day village Donja Lomnica. The third, Obrež Samac, was most likely situated along the present-day cadastre border between Okuje and Mraclin. The location of all three estates is shown on Map 13. Still, I must emphasize that although at this state of research these locations seem like the most likely, some additional documents that contain landmarks would be needed to confirm them with certainty.



Map 31-Veliki Obrež (Obrež Odranski), Mali Obrež and Obrež Samac

4.2.3.6.2.4.3. Obrež of the Farkaš family

The last important questions that will be discussed are: which Obrež was initially part of the Vukovina estate and from which Obrež were Stephan and George Farkaš? In this respect, the charter issued by King Sigismund in 1435 contains important data. The king confirmed George and Stephan Farkaš their ownership of the estates: **Obrež**, Demerje, Ternovec, Okuje, **Samac**, Tržec, Podbrežje, Stučje, Brona, Mišine and Buševac (*Ebres, Demerye, Ternouch, Okwye, Zamacz, Tersecz, Podbresye, Stuchye, Lekenyk, Brona, Mysne et Bwseucz*).⁴⁷⁸

Along with Obrež, one of the listed estates is called Samac (*Zamacz*). The estate of such name is not mentioned in any other fifteenth-century charter connected with the Vukovina estate. Be that as it may, the resemblance of names *Zamacz* and Obreš Samac is obvious, and the last one was, unquestionably, the estate of Baltazar Alapić.

⁴⁷⁸ KAZ, ALC 2, no.59.

In 1580, King Rudolf confirmed grandsons of Baltazar their ownership into the Vukovina castle and the appertaining estates and ordered the Chapter of Zagreb to install them into it, which was done. One of the estates was *Zamcha*, but it should be mention that the transcription is not completely clear. Both the charter by which King Ferdinand granted the estates to Baltazar's grandsons and the charter by which the Chapter notified the king about the installation are extant in the transcript from 1589. In the transcript of the king's charter is written: "*Thersecz, Pobresye, Myssine, Samcha, Obres aliter Obrez*". Thus, the comma was put between *Samcha* and *Obres*, which would mean that these were two different estates. In the transcript of the charter of the Chapter is written: "*Thersecz, Pobresye, Myssine, Samcha Obres aliter Obrez*", which would mean that it was one estate called Obreš Samac or Obrež.⁴⁷⁹ I think the second solution is more likely.

Hence, the estate Samac was mentioned as the property of the Farkaš family but it is not mentioned in any other fifteenth-century charter connected with the Vukovina estate. Nevertheless, estate Obrež Samac was the property of Baltazar Alapić and his descendants and it was the part of the Vukovina estate. George and Stephan Farkaš were from Obrež, but the question is, can that Obrež be equalled with Obrež Samac if, in the charter by which King Sigismund listed their estates in 1435, Obrež and Samac are two different settlements? This cannot be answered with certainty, but the following explanation could be taken into consideration. Perhaps there were two settlements/hamlets next to each other, one was called Obrež and the other was called Samac. At one point, they merged into one settlement. This "new" settlement was, in most cases, called simply Obrež and sometimes it was also called Obrež Samac. This Obrež, first situated next to Samac and later merged with it, was most likely initially part of the Vukovina estate, at least, from the time the estate had belonged to the Farkaš family. It could also be that this was the centre of their estates and for that reason they were called the Farkaši of Obrež.

In any case, this is just one possible explanation. In the lack of data from the charters that could confirm the above-written, other options should be considered. Perhaps the Farkaš family had their central estate called Obrež situated somewhere in the territory of the Abbey of Topusko from where they originated, but the toponym is not extant in that area. It could also be that they had their estate in the territory of Obrež Odranski, which in the thirteenth and fourteenth century was a part of the village Čehi. By the late fourteenth century, when the family Farkaš of Obrež appears in the extant sources, their estate might have been separated from Čehi

⁴⁷⁹ MNL, DF-DL 33398.

and became a separate settlement. Finally, there is also an option that they had their central estate in Mali Obrež, placed in the area of the present-day Donja Lomnica. This issue can be clarified only with some additional documents that contain some spatial data on the basis of which the estate could be located precisely in the present-day environment.

4.2.3.6.2.5. *Trnovec*

Data about the location and the owners of the estate Trnovec in the fourteenth and fifteenth century have been discussed in the previous chapters. Initially, Trnovec was the collective geographical name for the area east of Petrovina, where different owners had the estates. In the fifteenth century, the village Kušanec developed in the northern part of this territory and the village Buna in the southern part. Since, due to the lack of sources, the location of the eastern borders of Trnovec is not known, it cannot be said whether villages Okuje and Obrež Samac also developed on its territory.


As far as Trnovec as a part of the Vukovina estate is concerned, I suppose the owners of the Vukovina estate had some smaller portions of agricultural lands, hays or pasture lands in the territory of Trnovec. In the charters connected with the Farkaš family and the Varadi family and George Wokmery, Trnovec is listed as one of the estates (*possessiones*). This could imply that they did not owe just a part of the estate Trnovec, but the whole Trnovec. Nonetheless, taking into consideration the other data about Trnovec and its owners, it can be concluded that the Farkaš family or George Wokomery or the Varadi family did not owe the whole Trnovec.

Actually, the inconsistency in terminology used in the charters can be noticed in texts of the charters connected with the purchases of Baltazar Alapić. In the purchase contracts made between him and Nicholas Ivanović and John Corvin, Trnovec is classified as parts of the estate (*porciones possessionariae*). On the other hand, in the letter by which King Vladislav ordered Peter Gereb, *comes* of Zagreb, to install Baltazar into Ebreš, Otok, Novaki, Tržec, Okuje, Pobrežje, Buna, Trnovec, Mišine, Vratec, Demerje and Kupčina, Trnovec is listed as one of the estates (*possessions*).

One additional data support the assumption that the owners of the Vukovina estate owned smaller portions of agricultural lands, hays or pasture lands in Trnovec and not a land on which their tenant-peasants lived. In numerous documents from the beginning of the sixteenth century, connected with different trails and lawsuits of Baltazar Alapić, there is no mentioning of any tenant-peasants (*iobagiones*) from Trnovec. On the other hand, people from Okuje, Tržec, Mišine, Demerje etc. are often mentioned.

4.2.3.6.2.6. *Brona/Buna*

The estate *Brona* is mentioned in King Sigismund's charter from 1435. I suppose that this is Buna. The estate named *Brona* does not appear in any other charter connected with the Vukovina estate. Buna, on the other hand, appears in all of them except the 1435 charter. The names *Brona* and Buna are similar, that is, *Brona* could be misspelt Buna. Besides that, I have not found any other mentioning of the estate named *Brona* in Turopolje or elsewhere.



Map 32-Mala and Velika Buna (source: Geoportal)

Today there are two villages named Buna. These are Velika and Mala Buna (Big and Small Buna). Mala Buna is placed 3 kilometres south of the site of Okuje, while Velika Buna is placed further to the south, 4 kilometres of the site. The settlements are situated on the northern and southern banks of the Buna River, and, most likely, were named after the river, mentioned on more occasions in the thirteenth- and fourteenth-century charters.⁴⁸⁰ Their position is shown on Map 32.

The first extant charter I have found so far in which the estate Buna is recorded dates from 1412; John, son of late Michael Vitez (*Iohannes filius Michaelis dicti Wytecz*) *de Terseech* gave his estates Buna, Kostanjevec and Trnovec (*Buna, Kostaneuch et Tarnouech*) in pledge to

⁴⁸⁰ MHNC 1, doc. 5, p. 8, doc. 7, p. 10, doc. 12, p. 15, doc. 30, p. 34, doc. 68, p. 69, doc. 90, p. 96, doc. 135, p. 134.

Veronica, wife of Nicholas Toth of Susedgrad.⁴⁸¹ If Michael got Buna back by paying off Veronica Toth is unknown. How this estate became a property of the Farkaš family will be discussed later when the historical environment around the archaeological site of Okuje will be analysed (see pages 219-234).

Thus, Buna and Trnovec appear in the same context. In the 1412 charter, Buna is not defined as Velika or Mala Buna, the estate was simply called Buna. It can be discussed in where it was placed. In 1328 and 1358, the Buna River was the northern border of the Kravarsko estate. In 1328, the owners of the neighbouring lands north of the river were the castle warriors, the sons of Vukota and their kindred.⁴⁸² In 1356, the neighbouring estate was called Trnovec and it was owned by *magister* Ivan son of Ivan and the others.⁴⁸³ Hence, since Mala Buna is situated north of the river and Velika Buna south of it, the two settlements developed in the territories owned by different owners. Velika Buna was formed in the territory of Kravarsko, first an estate of the Hospitallers and, from 1328, a part of the Želin estate. A settlement of such name is not mentioned in any of the extant charters (found so far) connected with either the Hospitallers or the Želin estate. It could have been formed in the modern period. I think that it is not likely that the owners of the Vukovina estate had their estates (unless pledged) in the area of Velika Buna. Mala Buna, on the other hand, is located north of the Odra River, not within the borders of Kravarsko. Thus, the estate mentioned as a property of John, son of late Michael Vitez, was most likely situated in the area north of the Buna River, that is, in the area of the present-day Mala Buna. As will be soon shown, John, son of Michael Vitez, was of the Ivanović family.

4.2.3.6.2.7. Buševac

Buševac is located on the northern bank of the Buna River, some 5 km south-west of Okuje. It was first-time mentioned in the King Sigismund's donation charter from 1435. No other document connected with the Vukovina estate mentions it, based on which can be concluded that somehow it had been exempted from the estate in some period after 1435.

⁴⁸¹ MNL, DF-DL 230880. According to the *regesta* of one charter dated approximately in 1408, Veronica Toth gave Kostanjevec and Trnovec in pledge to certain John Mics.; Stipišić – M. Šamšalović, *Isprave u arhivu JAZU*, reg. 1384, p. 342.; I do not know who the last one is. The name, however, resembles the name of the above-mentioned John son of Michael (Vitez). The problem is that this *regestae* belong to the collection kept in the Archive of the academy of science, were written down in the eighteenth century. The *regestae* are extant, but the original charters are not. And I have already noticed that these *regestae* contain certain data that cannot be confirmed with the historical analysis and that the *regestae* themselves should be a matter of separate research (see chapter: Želin in the fifteenth century).

⁴⁸² CD 9, doc. 316, pp. 383-385.

⁴⁸³ CD 12, doc. 357, pp. 463-466.

Nevertheless, as it was located near the central territory of the Vukovina estate and, at the same time, it is an example of a village that initially was not the property of the noble community of Turopolje but later became a part of it, its history will be briefly discussed.

By 1490, Buševac became an estate of Stephan Berislavić, a very interesting and important figure of the history of Turopolje at the end of fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth century. Stjepan (*de Wehreka* and latter *de Mala Mlaka* or *de Mlaka*) was a descendant of a noble family from Vrh reka (the district of Knin). He was castellan of Lukavec and latter of Medvedgrad. He was in very good relations with John Corvin and, later, with Beatrice Frankopan and her second husband George of Brandenburg (unlike Baltazar Alapić was in constant conflict with them). At the same time, Stephan was also in good relations with the members of the noble community; he was an adopted son of noble Nicholas Mihaljević from Odra (this adoption took place in 1493). Over time, Stephan built his own vast estate with the centre in Mala Mlaka and appertaining estates throughout Turopolje, Babča, Mala Mlaka and Buševac being the first of them.⁴⁸⁴ In 1495, Ban Corvin freed Stephan's estates from the jurisdiction of Medvedgrad and Lukavec.⁴⁸⁵

In 1490, King Matthias confirmed to Stephan the estates that he already owned - Bapča and Buševac together with all his royal rights.⁴⁸⁶ It is said that the ancestors of Stephan held this properties *ab antique* which is, most likely, just the general formula. It is not known how Stjepan acquired Buševac, but it can be confirmed that he bought an estate in Bapča in 1490.⁴⁸⁷ In 1540, Stephan's son Juraj Berislavić sold Buševac to the noble community of Turopolje.⁴⁸⁸

The noble community also did not keep it as their communal property for long. In 1546, they elected Ambroz Gregorijanec for their head-figure (*ztharesyna*). Ambroz was at that time *capitaneus* of the Turopolje.⁴⁸⁹ They donated him Buševac, the estate that consisted of seven serfs' houses (*sessiones*). They also allowed Ambroz to take pigs, which he was holding in his estates at Brezovica and Podotčje, to pasture in their communal woods. His serfs from Buševac got the same permission.⁴⁹⁰ Still, both the Ambroz and the nobles of Turopolje, considered the

⁴⁸⁴ For a detailed analysis of the life and work of Stephan Berislavić and his son George Berislavić see: Jurković, *Raseljena plemićka obitelj*.

⁴⁸⁵ MHNC 2, doc. 120, pp. 168-169.; Jurković, *Raseljena plemićka obitelj* 1, pp. 147-148.

⁴⁸⁶ MHNC 2, doc. 50., pp. 65-66.; There are two other documents from the same year that testify about installation of Stephan in these possessions. The first was done by Turopolje nobles, as ordered by Blasius de Berth, castellan of Lukavec and *comes* of the Field and *comes terrestris* Matthias Kušić. The second was done, as ordered by the king Matthias by the Chapter of Zagreb. Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine*, p. 303.

⁴⁸⁷ Jurković, *Raseljena plemićka obitelj* 1, p. 131.

⁴⁸⁸ MHNC 3, doc. 52., pp. 77-78.

⁴⁸⁹ Klaić, *Medvedgrad*, p. 216.

⁴⁹⁰ MHNC 3, doc. 84., pp. 102-103.

donation and the permission to be a temporary gift. The estate was still considered to be the property of the Noble community that cannot be alienated.

Over time, nobles of Turopolje started to settle in Buševac; the families *Busseswecz* (*de Bussewecz*) and *Turhan* are first time mentioned in 1520 and 1540.⁴⁹¹ In 1560, King Ferdinand I issued charter by which he confirmed the nobles of Turopolje all of their estates, among which was Buševac.⁴⁹²

4.2.3.6.2.8. *Stuchye*

The estate *Stuchye* is mentioned as a property of George and Stephan Farkaš in 1435. The other charters connected with the Vukovina estate do not mention an estate of such name.


In general, I have found only one additional charter (not connected with the Vukovina estate) that does mention some estate of similar name. In 1483, people of John Henning had built a mill in the Odra River, near some abandoned estate called *Sthwthye* (*prope quandam possessionem dessertam Schwchye vocatam*). The mill was in the territory that was under the jurisdiction of the Lukavec castle, so Henning's men had to transfer it to some other place.⁴⁹³ An abandonment could be the reason why *Stuchye* does not appear as a part of the Vukovina estate after 1435. Still, it is questionable if the estate mentioned in 1483 is the same as the one mentioned in 1435. It is less likely that it was so if the estate was situated in the territory that was under the jurisdiction of the Lukavec castle, which is not explicitly written; perhaps just the mill was in this territory and *Schwchye* was the bordering estate but not in the territory of Lukavec. In any case, on the basis of these scarce data, it is not possible to locate the estate in the present-day environment.

The location of all the estates placed in Turopolje, analysed in this chapter, is shown on Map 33; there are the estates of the Farkaš family recorded in 1435 and the estates of Baltazar Alapić, that is, the appertaining settlements of the Vukovina estate at the beginning of the sixteenth century. As can be seen, the central part of the estate was created in the area surrounded with the villages of the castle warriors and with Želin estate.

⁴⁹¹ MHNC 2, doc. 276, p. 428.; MHNC 3, doc. 54, pp. 78-79.

⁴⁹² Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine*, p. 305.

⁴⁹³ MNL, DF-DL 107056.



Map 33-Estates of the Farkaš family in 1435 and Baltazar Alapić in 1500

Today there are three villages in this area: Okuje, Vukovina, and Mala Buna. In the medieval and the early modern period, along with those three, there were also: Obrež Samac, Mišine, Tržec, Trnovec and most likely Novaki. Thus, space functioned on the basis of the network of smaller settlements, some of which had disappeared in the early modern period. Along with that, in the time when the Farkaš family owned this estate, Buševac and Lekenik were also part of it. Later they were not, but some other villages were incorporated into the estate. The area of Vukovina remained the central part of the estate in the following centuries.

4.2.3.7. Closing remarks – Functioning of the area in the fifteenth century

The extant fifteenth-century documents enabled the analysis of the whole area around the site of Okuje, defined to be analysed in the thesis. It is the area of the present-day villages Novo Čiče, Staro Čiče, Vukovina, Okuje, Mraclin, and Petrovina. In total, it covers the surface of approximately 35 square kilometres. The location of several other today non-existing villages has also been defined. These are Trnovec and Kušanec, that were situated in the area between Petrovina and Okuje, Mišine, that was situated between Mraclin and Vukovina, Obrež Samac,

that was situated between Mraclin and Okuje as well as Tržec whose exact position is unknown but was situated somewhere in the area of Vukovina.

The analysis showed that, basically, there were two types of estates in this area in the fifteenth century; the estates of the nobles of Turopolje and the estates of the mid-rank and high nobility. The first ones were Mraclin, Kušanec and partly Trnovec. The second ones were Staro Čiče, Novo Čiče, and Petrovina as parts of the Želin estate of the Toth family and Vukovina, Okuje, Tržec, Mišine, and Obrež Samac as parts of the Vukovina estate. The owners of Vukovina estate were changing through the course of the century.

The terms are used in the fifteenth century written sources for the inhabitants of the above-analysed area are *nobiles castrenses*, *iobagiones*, *populous*, *ignobiles*, *homines*, *familiares*. The term *nobiles castrenses* (and *nobiles castri*) replaced the terms *iobagiones castri* and *nobiles iobagiones* of the previous centuries. It is used for the nobles of Turopolje.⁴⁹⁴ *Ignobiles*, on the other hand, literary means not nobles. It refers to commoners but the expression is too general to determine the class of the commoners just by it.

The terms *familiares*, *iobagiones*, *homines* and *populis* should be interpreted in the context of the client system, based on a service that lower and mid-rank nobils were providing to magnates. The members on top of the pyramid were *familiares*.⁴⁹⁵ The system functioned also on the lower level; for example, mid-rank nobles could also have had their *familiares*, petty nobles or commoners.⁴⁹⁶ The *familiares* performed different jobs for their masters. For instance, one could be castellan or *comes* of the estate (špan) who most likely supervised an economy of an estate.⁴⁹⁷ Except that, the important duty of *familiares* was a participation in military expeditions of their masters. George Farkaš from Obrež was a *familiaris* of Matko Talovec and participated in different military campaigns with him.⁴⁹⁸

⁴⁹⁴ For more about these terms see: Éva B. Halász, *Iobagio castri – nobilis castri – nobilis regni*. Castle warriors – castle nobles – noblemen. The development of a social stratum in County of Križevci, *Banatica* 26 (2016), 119-134.

⁴⁹⁵ This term started to appear in the sources from the 1380s. It replaces the terms *famuli* (used around the middle of the fourteenth century), which again replaced the earlier term *servientes* (used in thirteenth and the first half of the fourteenth century, Damir Karbić, "Familiares of the Šubići. Neapolitan Influence on the Origin of the Institution of Familiaritas in the Medieval Hungary," in: *La noblesse dans les territoires Angevins à la fin du Moyen Âge*, ed. by Noël Coulet – Jean-Michel Matz (Rome 2000), pp. 134-139.

⁴⁹⁶ About this system in the Kingdom of Hungary in general, see: Engel, *The realm*, pp. 126-126, Fugedi, *Castle and society*, pp. 129-130: for the detailed analysis of the functioning of the client system in the Zagreb County during the period of Sigismund see: Miljan, *The noble society of the Zagreb County*, pp. 126-155; *Familiaritas and the Client System*, pp. 103-132.

⁴⁹⁷ Miljan, *Familiaritas and the Client System*, p. 111.

⁴⁹⁸ KAZ, ALC 2, no.59.

Commoners, peasants or tenant-peasants in service of the nobility were called in the sources *iobagiones*, *homines* and *populi*. They are often mentioned participating in quarrels with people of some other landlords. People living in the estates of Dorothea Toth (including the Želin estate), who had attacked Kraljevec (an estate of the Chapter of Zagreb) in 1469, were nominated as *populus et iobagiones necnon familiares generose domine Dorothea vocate*.⁴⁹⁹ One of the services performed by commoners, mentioned in the extant sources, was the one of *vilicus* or *iudex*, a village judge.⁵⁰⁰ Sometimes these people also did some legal jobs for their masters. In these cases, they are labelled as people who are present *in persona domini sui*.⁵⁰¹ In 1412, a village judge (*iudex*) Benedict Kokot and certain Jacob called Jakša from Petrovina were present at the installation of George Mikšić and Vuk and George Stanilović into the estate of Donji Lukavec. They represented Laurence and Nicholas Toth (*nominibus et in personis egregiorum dominiorum Laurencii et Nicolai Toth de Zomzwedwara, dominiorum scilicet suorum*).⁵⁰² In 1428, when the Chapter of Zagreb did the perambulation of Donji Lukavec, Laurence Toth again sent his deputies from Petrovina. This time, these were a village judge (*iudex*) *providus* Peter Činah and a peasant (*colonus*) John Zalogy.⁵⁰³


⁴⁹⁹ MNL, DF-DL 34115.

⁵⁰⁰ Miljan, *Familiaritas* and the Client System, p. 125.

⁵⁰¹ Miljan, *Familiaritas* and the Client System, p. 120.

⁵⁰² MHNC 1, doc 177, p. 169.

⁵⁰³ MHNC 1, doc 221., p. 224. ; Miljan, *The noble society*, p. 149.



Map 34-The analysed space at the end of the fifteenth century

The important territorial change of the fifteenth century is the development of new settlements in the area of Trnovec. One of them was village Kušanec that had developed in the area that was the property of one noble family and the other Buna, developed on the area first owned by the Ivanović family. In general, there the extant sources about the villages of the nobles of Turopolje in this area (Mraclin, Kušanec and Trnovec) are scarce, so not much can be said about them in terms of a spatial organization.

The important changes, both in terms of the ownership and the spreading of the borders, also happened in the Želin estate. As shown in the chapter about Želin in the fourteenth century, during the period of King Sigismund, the estate became a property of the high nobility. The first known owner was John Széchy, mentioned in 1396, followed by the Toth family in 1399. Thus, by the end of the fourteenth century, the royal estate became the private estate and it remained so until the nineteenth century. This resulted into the enlargement of the estate; the Toths hereditary estates Rugvica and Črnek on the right bank of the Sava River had been joined with Želin. Along with that, the estates Dernek, Vrbovo and Veleševac situated along the left bank of the Sava River, in Turopolje, had been joined with Želin (how this happened remains a question for the further research). With these new parts, the total surface of the estate was approximately 200 square kilometres. It was separated into two large units; the district of Čiče in the northern part and the district of Kravarsko in the southern part, settlements Staro Čiče and Kravarsko being the centres of the districts.⁵⁰⁴ The importance of Čiče as *oppidum* and regional marketplace, recorded from the period of the Hospitallers, continued in the fifteenth century. I did not find any charter in which Kravarsko is called *oppidum*, but in one document from 1512, it mentioned as a marketplace (*forum liber in possessione Krawarzka celebrari solito*).⁵⁰⁵ As far as Petrovina is concerned, although the citizens of Gradec claimed that it was their estate and raised numerous complains in court, in practice this estate was a part of the Želin during the whole fifteenth century. Finally, in 1487, this was legalized as the court adjudicated it to John Henning. In any case, an enlargement of private estates was a general tendency in the high medieval period; a scattered estate structure disappeared in many areas as aristocrats had managed to develop huge estates around castles. In Turopolje this did not happen in the whole territory, mainly because of the privileges of the noble community.

⁵⁰⁴ Some parts of the estate were also given in pledge; in 1468 Nicholas, son of Valentin Čeh from Poljana (*de Polyana*) asked to be installed into the estate Poljana that he was holding in pledge. The estate belonged to the Želin castle (*in pertinenciis castri Selyn*), MNL, DF-DL 275102.

⁵⁰⁵ MHNC 2, doc 195, p. 296.

In the context of interaction between the nobles of Turopolje and the owners of Želin, it should be mentioned that it is recorded in the sources that the nobles sometimes moved to the villages that were parts of Želin estate. In 1461, John, son of Peter, from Novo Čiče was forced to sell one dwelling unit (*sessio iobagionalis*) and one agricultural land, situated in Vrbanec to Blaž Pogledić from Kurilovec. It seems, according to the document that John lived in Novo Čiče, but originated from Vrbanec. He is called *Iohannes filius Petri de Nowa Chychan, nobilis predicti Campi de Wrbanec*.⁵⁰⁶ Likewise, it is also recorded that people living in the area of Želin owned the land in the territory of the noble community. In 1495, Phillip son of late lady Elena from Kurilovec, who at that time was living in Mraclin, sold his estate in Kurilovec (inherited from his mother) to Clemens son of Miko from Kravarsko and his sons Nicholas and John.⁵⁰⁷ Therefore, an interaction of inhabitants of the area of Želin and the nobles of Turopoljes happening on the regular basis can be supposed.

Unlike the Želin estate whose development could be tracked in the sources from the beginning of the thirteenth century, the Vukovina estate appeared in the sources as one compact estate only in 1435, when its owners were George and Stephan Farkaš from Obrež. This estate had not developed around a castle, as there was no castle in this area until Balthasar Alapić built a fortified manor house (*castellum*) at the end of the fifteenth century. Likewise, unlike the owners of Želin, the owners of the Vukovina estate changed during the course of the fifteenth century as were the appertaining estates. Some parts held by the Farkaš family, namely Buševac and Lekenik in the Turopolje area, were not parts of the estate at the end last quarter of the fifteenth century while some others (Mikčevac, Mali Obrež etc.) had been joined to Vukovina. The central part of the estate (the area of Vukovina, Okuje, Mišine, Tržec, Trnovec and Mala Buna) covered the area of approximately 12 square kilometres. It is interesting to notice that this is the small part of the land in the Turopolje area where not the nobles of Turopolje nor the owners of the Želin estate had the land. So, somehow in this part of the land a small separate entity developed. How this could have appened will be analysed in the next chapter, when the possible owners of the land around the site of Okuje in the thirteenth and the fourteenth century will be discussed (see pages 219-234).

Finally, it should be mentioned that the Ottoman attacks on Turopolje had begun in the fifteenth century. The first one recorded in written sources happened sometime before 1422; estates of the Paulines of Zagreb called Pertuševac, Grdovščak (north of Pleso) and Rakitovec

⁵⁰⁶ MHNC 1, doc. 330., p. 403.

⁵⁰⁷ MHNC 2, doc. 97, p. 139-140.

(east of Mraclin) had been devastated.⁵⁰⁸ As far as the area analysed in the thesis here is concerned, it was mentioned that in 1484 Briccius, Thomas and Jacob from Kurilovec had been abducted by the Ottomans and their sister Ursula inherited all the family estates placed in Rakitovec, Kušanec and Trnovec.⁵⁰⁹ However, this is the only document that mentioned the wars. Therefore, the influence of the attacks on the settlement structure of the area cannot be seen in the extant written sources (at least the ones found so far).

⁵⁰⁸ MHNC 1, doc. 188, p. 181; Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 18.

⁵⁰⁹ MHNC 2, doc. 32, p. 38; Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 18.

4.3. The site of Okuje

4.3.1. Results of the archaeological excavations at the site of Okuje

The archaeological site Okuje was excavated in the rescue excavations on the track of Zagreb-Sisak highway, in the period from July 2008 to the end of January 2009. The site was situated on the eastern edge of the present-day village Okuje, along with the present-day cadastre border between Mraclin and Okuje. The eastern end of the site Okuje was located within the cadastre borders of Mraclin. The southern border of the excavating zone of the site was the cadastre border between Okuje and Mraclin. The site, however, was spreading southward of that line, for additional 2016 meters. That part of the medieval settlement, situated in the territory of Mraclin, was investigated by the Archaeological Department of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences. It was named Mrkopolje and will also be mentioned in the further text.⁵¹⁰

The excavated part of the site was placed in the area of the main track of the highway as well as in the area of two side-roads. The length of the site in the area of the main track was 915 meters while the width was limited to approximately 55 metres as that was the width of the road. The length of the site in the area of the left side-road was 220 meters and of the right side-road 250 meters. The width in both parts was 40-50 meters. In total, 80 000 square meters had been investigated. The field walk data indicated spreading of the site on the wider area, of approximately 200 000 square meters. Along with the remains of the medieval settlement features, settlement features from the prehistory (the Litzen culture) and the Roman period had been investigated as were two cemeteries from the period of early Romanization of the area and the remains of the Roman state road *Emona-Siscia* (Ljubljana- Sisak).⁵¹¹

4.3.1.1. Dating and chronology

The medieval (eleventh-fourteenth century) and the early modern (sixteenth/seventeenth century) settlement features have been found in the area of both the main track of the highway and the areas of the side roads. It can be noticed that none of the features is dated to the fifteenth century. It has already explained in the methodology part of the thesis that I have based this dating primarily on the pottery finds, taking as a starting point the finds

⁵¹⁰ I would like to thank Ina Miloglav (Department of archaeology, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences) for giving me the plan of the site Mrkopolje and showing me the excavated material.

⁵¹¹ Burmaz-Vujnović, *Zaštitna arheološka istraživanja*, preliminary report.; Bugar, *Rezultati arheoloških zaštitnih istraživanja*, preliminary report.

from the features dated with the radiocarbon method. One feature on each part of the site had been dated in such a way. None of the analysed samples was dated to the eleventh century but the difference in the technology of production as well as in shape and decoration of these vessels in contrast with the thirteenth- and fourteenth-century vessels is obvious. Also, the finds from Šepkovčica as the nearest site provided good comparative material.⁵¹² Therefore, it was relatively easy to conclude which pottery was produced in the period prior to the thirteenth century.

On the other hand, two radiocarbon dates showed a wide time span – 1300-1410, that is, 1300-1420. The difference in the fourteenth- and fifteenth-century vessels is, in general, not so obvious. Thus, I have dated these parts of the site in the fourteenth century, but there is a possibility that some of the features were actually created in the early fifteenth century. As explained, only a very detailed analysis based on numerous radiocarbon dates would enable such precise dating. Along with that, some pits naturally contain parts of vessels that appear to be the thirteenth-century products along with vessels that appear to be fourteenth-century products. This is to be expected as in time periods both of them could have been used simultaneously.

This dating issue is not an unimportant question. I am emphasizing it is not just because of the pottery material and its chronology but the fact that if there are not the fifteenth-century features in this area that is significant for the spatial analysis. It means that, in the fifteenth century, some change in the spatial organization happened and that the area of the fourteenth-century settlement (or, in this case, perhaps different settlements) was abandoned. At this state of research, it appears to be so. But it is fair to emphasize that these conclusions can be corrected with further research. At the excavations at Okuje numerous medieval features had been excavated and numerous finds were collected. The pottery found at Okuje would indeed deserve to be a topic of a separate dissertation. Also, the reconstruction of the features could be one such topic. Taking that into consideration, the analysis that will be presented in the following lines should be considered the preliminary report and not the final publication. There is still a lot of work to be done on this material and probably dating of some features could be corrected. Nevertheless, for the purpose of this thesis and its focus on spatial analysis, the data presented in the further text, although at the very superficial level, are of use. Even the two mentioned radiocarbon dates that show wide time span (1300-1410, that is, 1300-1420), show the

⁵¹² Bugar, "Naselje ranog srednjeg vijeka", 186-188.

possibility that the samples, even if fifteenth-century, were only from the first quarter of the century.

The total surface of the area in which the medieval and early modern features were excavated measured approximately 46 square meters. All the features are shown on the plan of the site Okuje (see Appendix).

As can be seen on the plan, in some parts of the site, features from different periods were found next to each other. The pits that can be dated prior to the thirteenth century contained only pottery and occasionally animal bones; there were no metal finds in these pits. They will not be analysed separately but it is important to mention them as they prove the area had been occupied prior to the thirteenth century. Besides that, these pits are important for the chronological determination of some of the posthole structures. Since the postholes were the most numerous features found on the site, the problem of their dating will be explained as it is important for the interpretation of certain parts of the site.

4.3.1.2. Posthole structures

The pits created earlier than the thirteenth century were mostly concentrated in the area of the main track of the highway, surrounded with the thirteenth- and fourteenth-century pits. Along with the pits, a significant number of postholes was also found in this area. The postholes clearly indicate existence of above-ground structures that had wooden posts as foundations (either being elevated on the posts or had them as supports on the sides). These could have been houses, barns etc. Likewise, postholes could have been remains of fences. Pits found in the excavations of medieval settlements (especially the ones from the high and late medieval period) were often waste pits or the lowest parts of above-ground structures. Majority of features in these settlements, however, were above-ground structures. In this context, posthole structures are important remains and problems connected with an interpretation of them should be mentioned.

One such problem, that can be easily seen by looking at the plan of the site, is how to connect postholes. Sometimes regular lines can be easily noticed and sometimes there are few solutions that can be offered. Theoretically, in order to see if certain postholes show similar characteristics, a depth, a size and a content of filling (a colour and a composition of soil, finds)


of each posthole could be analysed. Perhaps, on the basis of such data, it could be concluded whether certain postholes were parts of one construction. In practice, however, this means that every posthole should have been excavated “perfectly” which is simply not possible to achieve in most cases. For example, an excavator perhaps excavated a hole few centimetres wider than he/she should have. There is also a factor of weather conditions during excavations; soils of lighter colours are sometimes literally invisible in the bright daylight/sunlight and in the dried earth while after rains and in the cloudy daylight they “appear”, that is, become visible. This also influences an excavation process. In addition to that, a post might have not been of the same size and put into the ground at the same depth in the first place. In any case, perhaps this method can be successful but it cannot be always applied. I have tried to apply it to some parts of the site of Šepkovčica and it did not produce any results. For that reason, the focus on spatial distribution of postholes seems more important.

The other problem is connected with dating of post structures. Fills of postholes are often found empty, or containing traces of carbon, burn earth or small pieces of bones or pottery. Pottery pieces are often very small and fragmented and, as such, not useful for dating. On the other hand, postholes are sometimes found surrounding a pit in regular lines. In such cases, a connection of postholes and a pit (both being parts of the same construction) can be supposed and the post structure can be dated according to finds from the pit. The problem occurs when few pits dated to different time periods are found in the vicinity of a certain posthole structure. Such example is shown on Drawing 1.

As can be seen on the drawing, on this part of the site the postholes were in the regular lines, with not one pottery piece in their fillings. In general, the thirteenth-century pits were predominating (green). On the other hand, the earlier pit (red) and one fourteenth-century feature⁵¹³ were also found as well as pits that cannot be dated as they contained no finds (yellow). My assumption is that the post features were contemporary with the thirteenth-century settlement, a part of which had been excavated in this area. Nevertheless, that is just an assumption. Perhaps if the whole settlement would be investigated, the layout would become clear and it would be obvious if these structures are parts of it (but even that is questionable). So, how can one determine when these structures were used? The only answer is - with a radiocarbon analysis. The standard problem with it is a lack of finances. Both at Šepkovčica and Okuje, a considerable number of samples were given to the analysis. On both sites, along

⁵¹³ Some pottery pieces found in this feature could be dated to the thirteenth century but there were also some typical fourteenth century forms.

with the medieval, numerous prehistoric and Roman period features had been excavated. Consequently, the resources had to be distributed and samples from the most important features were analysed. Naturally, it can always be debated what is the most important, but the Roman necropolis certainly can fall into this category. In the case of the medieval features, the emphasis was put on the features with more complex constructions that contained a considerable number of finds. Still, one experiment regarding dating of postholes was made and it gave an important result that will be explained in the following lines.



Drawing 1-Pits and postholes

In the southernmost part of the site (Okuje IIIa, Map 32), situated on the northern bank of the old stream bed, pits and numerous postholes were discovered. Taking into the consideration that most of the found features were postholes, less than 10% of all the features contained finds. Altogether 27 367 pieces of the fourteenth-century pottery (347 kilograms) and 42 pieces of the Roman pottery (0,5 kg) had been gathered. Only one pit contained pieces of the Roman pottery, but the majority of pottery found in it was medieval, so clearly the pit has been used in the Middle Ages. The rest of the Roman pottery was found in the filling of the old stream bed, again with the medieval pottery, and in few postholes. As was the case with the above-mentioned pit, in this situation, when all pits found at this part of the site were from the fourteenth century, the pieces of the Roman pottery in few postholes do not tell much about the period in which the posts were put in the ground; the postholes could have intersected some older Roman structure or some piece of pottery could have been simply on the surface in which

the whole was dug. Still, the Roman pottery, even in the secondary position, did point at some activities in this area or the nearby area in the Roman period. For that reason, one sample of carbon from the posthole that had no finds (no pottery, animal bones etc.) had been sent to the radiocarbon analysis; the sample was dated in the period between 340 and 430.⁵¹⁴ Radiocarbon analysis can occasionally show false results but, if one takes into consideration this data and the finds of the Roman pottery, even sporadic and in the secondary position, a dating of all postholes found at this part of the site in the medieval period can be debated.

Therefore, the spreading of the features of different centuries shown on the plan of the site is correct up to the point it can be at this state of research. Even with all these methodological problems, after the division of features by time sequences of their use, the changes in the usage of space that had been happening during the centuries in the excavated area are obvious.

4.3.1.3. The thirteenth-century features

The thirteenth-century features were found in several different locations. The majority was found in the area of the central track of the highway. Some of these features were partly excavated as they had been placed partly in the excavating zone and partly outside of it; their location points at spreading of the site in the direction of east. Some pits had also been found in the areas of the side-roads, surrounded with the fourteenth- and the sixteenth/seventeenth-century features. It is possible that these pits were not isolated; a part of the thirteenth-century settlement could have also been placed in this area, but mostly destroyed with the building activities that took place in the fourteenth and sixteenth/seventeenth century.

The pits and the postholes found in the central part prove that the thirteenth-century settlement was placed in this area. The pit dated in the period 1220-1300 is shown on Photos 2-4.⁵¹⁵ It (SU 142/143) was surrounded with two other pits also dated in the thirteenth century (SU 159/160, SU 308/144/366/145). The top of the pit was covered with the dark greyish brown friable sandy clay in which animal bones, the pottery fragments and eight broken metal objects had been found as well as the part of bone. The fill covered numerous pottery pieces thrown in

⁵¹⁴ Burmaz-Vujnović, *Zaštitna arheološka istraživanja*, 48-49.

⁵¹⁵ Laboratory number: Beta-293839, C14 BP 740 ± 40

1 Sigma calibrated result (68% probability): Cal AD 1260 to 1280 (Cal BP 690 to 670)

2 Sigma calibrated result (95% probability): Cal AD 1220 to 1300 (Cal BP 730 to 660)

the western corner of the pit (SU 308) that again covered the broken pieces of bricks and burned soil in the bottom of the pit (SU 325). The primary function of the pit is not clear. Perhaps it was excavated to be used as a garbage pit or it was used as such in the later phase.



Photo 2-SU 143 (photo by Vjekoslav Iličić)




Photo 3-SU 308 (photo by Vjekoslav Iličić)



Photo 4-SU 325 (photo by Vjekoslav Iličić)

The excavated zone is too small to permit any firm conclusion about the location of the excavated part in regard to the rest of the thirteenth-century settlement (was this a central part of the settlement or its edge?). Likewise, it cannot be stated if this was a nucleated settlement or a smaller hamlet. The finds are usual finds of medieval villages; pits contained mostly the pottery fragments, sometimes the animal bones and occasionally the metal objects.

4.3.1.4. The fourteenth-century features

The fourteenth-century features had been discovered in four locations of the excavated area; both in the area of the main track of the highway and in the areas of side-roads.

4.3.1.4.1. Location 1

In Location 1, pit features and numerous postholes had been found. They were situated north and west of the thirteenth-century settlement features. As said, it is likely that the part of the thirteenth-century settlement was placed in this location but might have been destroyed with a later building. This is indicated by the stratigraphic situation around the feature that consisted of two pits dated with the radiocarbon method in the fourteenth century (photo 5).⁵¹⁶

⁵¹⁶ KIA39967 SU 1256; sample no: 139, Radiocarbon Age: BP B616 ± 19

One Sigma Range: cal AD 1302 - 1323 (Probability 28.0 %)
(Probability 68.3 %): 1347 - 1366 (Probability 27.3 %)
1382 - 1392 (Probability 13.0 %)

Two Sigma Range: cal AD 1296 - 1332 (Probability 37.2 %)
(Probability 95.4 %): 1338 - 1397 (Probability 58.2 %)

The top of the feature was covered with the layer of burned earth (SU 1127). Beneath the layer was the dark grey sandy clay that contained fragments of pottery, animal bones, metal objects and pieces of slag. The feature intersected two pits. One pit (SU 1258/1259), on the western side, had no finds. The other pit (SU 1259/2012/1260), on the northern side, was filled with the sandy clay that contained animal bones, slag and the thirteenth-century pottery.

It is visible on the plan of the site that the fourteenth-century features in Location 1 were extending towards the west, that is, towards the area of the western side-road. Most likely, in this area, they had been partly destroyed by the sixteenth/seventeenth-century features.



Photo 5-SU 1127, SU 1258 and SU 1259 (photo by Borko Rožanković)

4.3.1.4.2. Location 2

Location 2 was the highest position in the area of the whole site. The most remarkable features found in the excavations were found at this part of the site. These were the remains of

the big wooden building; the postholes placed in the regular lines (Photo 6). In this case, the layout of the building was obvious.

The total area covered by the building was 328 square meters (the length 21,53 meters, the width 15,23 meters. It was oriented northeast-southwest. Two rows of postholes were placed on its longer side. The posts of the inner and the outer rows, however, had been placed in the ground in a different way. Basically, the outer posts were counterforts as were the two posts placed in front of the walls of the building. All of them supported the walls from the outside. The posts of the inner row as well as the posts on the shorter sides show the line of the walls. The inner area of the building was 20, 20 m long and 9, 40 m wide. As visible on the plan, there were also two postholes found inside this area. These posts probably supported the roof construction.



Photo 6-Building with counterforts (photo by Ina Miloglav)




Photo 7-The posthole (photo by Vjekoslav Iličić)

All posts were approximately 30 centimetres wide but put in the hole that was approximately 90-100 centimetres wide (Photo 7). First, the wider holes had been dug, at least 80 cm deep (that was the depth measured from the excavating surface, but perhaps the walking surface in the Middle Ages was on a higher level). Afterwards, the posts were put in the holes while the soil was put around them, filling the empty space between the posts and the walls of the holes.

A smaller amount of the pottery fragments was found in some of the postholes. On the basis of the analysis of a carbon sample from one posthole, the feature can be dated in the period 1300-1410.⁵¹⁷ This corresponds with the dating of the found potsherds and also with pottery found in the pit intersected by one of the inner posts of the building. Both cannot be dated prior to the fourteenth century. Therefore, the building was most likely built sometime in the fourteenth, possibly early fifteenth century. When it ceased to exist cannot be specified as there are no finds that would illuminate this issue.

Likewise, since there were no findings inside or outside the building (ones that would be contemporary with the building), it is hard to conclude with certainty what was its function.

⁵¹⁷ Laboratory number: Beta-29 3846, C14 BP 600 ± 30

1 Sigma calibrated result (68% probability): Cal AD 1310 to 1360 (Cal BP 640 to 509) and Cal AD 1380 to 1400 (Cal BP 570 to 559)


2 Sigma calibrated result (95% probability): Cal AD 1300 to 1410 (Cal BP 660 to 540)

The “working” hypothesis during the excavations was that the building might have had some public and economic function.⁵¹⁸ I think this is very likely; it could have served as a “granary”, in which agricultural products had been collected. That could explain the usage of the counterforts as an architectural solution for a side-pressure created by weight of collected fruits stored on the first- floor level, below the roof. In that way, grain or other products would be more protected than being stored on the ground-floor level. Besides that, the possibility that this was a house cannot be ruled out. However, the large-scale of the building rather supports the granary/storage building function.

The authors of the preliminary report noted that the locals called this area Crkovnjak. According to the folk narrative, a church once stood in this place.⁵¹⁹ This is not likely. John of Gorica, the author of the first list of the parish churches of the Zagreb diocese (from 1334), does not mention any church in this area nor such church has been mentioned in any other extant written source. Naturally, that argument by itself is not sufficient; it might be simply that a document that mentioned the church is not extant (in case it existed). The more important argument is that, if the building had been a church stood one would expect burials around it. Consequently, it can be concluded with the fair amount of certainty that the remains found at the site are not remains of a church. Nevertheless, burials would not be found if these were remains of a chapel. The topographical position, location of the building on the small mound, can be seen as a place characteristic for a church or chapel. Furthermore, the lack of settlement features and relevant archaeological material in the area of the building and around it could also support this explanation. Thus, this possibility cannot be completely ruled out. On the other hand, there are also arguments against it, one being the form of the building. The elongated square shape with counterforts (buttresses) could be a shape of a chapel, but the eastern end of the building is the most crucial feature. There should be an element of a ground plan which reflects a choir. In the case of wooden architecture, it would most probably be square shaped or 3 or-5 sides octagonal shaped. As can be seen on Drawing 2, it does not seem to be the case with this building.

⁵¹⁸ Burmaz-Vujnović, *Zaštitna arheološka istraživanja*, 56.

⁵¹⁹ Burmaz-Vujnović, *Zaštitna arheološka istraživanja*, 52.



Drawing 2-The building

One other aspect that could be helpful in the final interpretation of the building should be considered; the building intersected some the other post constructions oriented northwest-southeast, opposite the direction of the building. The construction situated on the northern side of the building was at least 17 meters long and 4-5 meters wide. Thus, its length was also considerable and perhaps its function was similar to the function of the building (if both buildings were chapels different orientation would be rather strange). Unfortunately, this feature cannot be dated as the postholes had no finds in their fillings. It could have been placed on the southern edge of the thirteenth-century settlement. On the other hand, it was placed in its vicinity of the eleventh-century pits which makes the previous dating questionable.


In any case, a reconstruction of the building done by experts in vernacular architecture would probably offer some further explanations of its possible function. Still, even that can be done only on a hypothetical level until we get some more comparative material from the surrounding area. At this state of research, the fact is that no one knows how fourteenth-century granaries, noble houses (*curiae*) or chapels look like in the Turopolje region.

4.3.1.4.3. Location 3

Location 3 was situated some 80 meters south of the building, that is, Location 2. A few fourteenth-century pits were found in the area in-between. The sporadic finds of the Roman period pottery found in Location 3 have already been mentioned as has the posthole dated in the late Roman period based on the radiocarbon analysis. Thus, taking into consideration both the pottery pieces and the result of the analysis, it is not possible to chronologically separate all the postholes found at this part of the site.

As can be seen on Drawing 3, this part was situated north of the modern channel, which at the same time marked the southern border of the site of Okuje. The old stream bed was found on the northern side of the channel. The stratigraphic situation in the area around it was complex; different layers were uncovered, and it was not easy to separate where one begins and the other ends. This is understandable as these layers were the product of water fluctuations and floodings in the periods when the above-ground water levels were high. This was not happening just in the medieval period. It also happened during the excavations and created problems with the deadlines of the rescue project schedule. In consequence, not the entire area of the stream bed could have been excavated. Nevertheless, the recorded situation still gives enough information about the direction of the flow of the stream and shows that the fourteenth-century pits existed on its banks.⁵²⁰

⁵²⁰ Radiocarbon analysis is not done for any of these fourteenth-century pits. However, the pottery showed similar characteristics to the pottery from the other fourteenth-century parts of the site as well as to fourteenth-century pottery from the site Mrkopolje, that was dated with the radiocarbon method.




Drawing 3-Location 3

In general, the pits found in the location 3 contained a considerably smaller amount of pottery finds than the pits excavated in the locations 1 and 4. They also contained metal objects, animal bones and slag (especially the pits placed in the nearest vicinity of the original stream bed). Thus, this area was most likely some sort of the working zone, where the activities for which water was required were performed.

Along with that, the considerable number of postholes points at one other possible interpretation of this part of the site; there might have been some sort of bridge in this area and some of the postholes could be remains of posts on which it stood. A bridge might have been used in the Roman period, thus, not necessarily in the Middle Ages although the last also cannot be excluded. In this context, the plan of the site of Mrkopolje, which was situated across the modern channel, should be looked at. As can be seen on Drawing 4, there were practically no postholes in this area. The settlement features uncovered at Mrkopolje are dated in the thirteenth/fourteenth century. Thus, they were contemporary with the pits found at Location 3. In that respect, the absence of postholes at Mrkopolje can be an argument in favour of the above-mentioned assumption about a bridge situated in the area of Okuje, in Location 3. Still, as is the

case with the other parts of the site, the fourteenth-century features were extending outside of the excavated zone of Location 3 and the excavated surface is too small to make any firm conclusions about the functioning of this area in medieval times simply on the basis of it.



Drawing 4-Site Mrkopolje (made by Ina Miloglav)

4.3.1.4.4. Location 4

Location 4 was placed in the area of the western side road, between two modern channels. The western channel is the same channel as the one in the Location 3. It was shown that, in Location 3, the old stream bed was found 10 meters north of the channel. This stream was a flowing watercourse in the medieval period. It can be assumed that the same watercourse was flowing in the Location 4 but destroyed when the modern channel was built. On the opposite side of this part of the site was another modern channel. As can be seen on the plan,

the features were not extending east of it. Perhaps there was also a watercourse on its place in the medieval period. If so, this part of the medieval settlement was placed between two watercourses.



Photo 8-Pit SU 5965 (photo by Vjekoslav Iličić)

Between two channels, pits, fireplaces, postholes and ovens had been found. The finds of the collapsed ovens and fireplaces on several places indicated that this was a working zone, very likely a pottery workshop. For example, in the pit SU 5965, over 40 whole vessels were found along with numerous pieces of other vessels (Photo 8). The reconstruction of ovens would be to extensive task for this text, but the features found in this part of the site are certainly valuable sources for studying of medieval baking techniques. This reconstruction should certainly be done. Even without that, I think it can be stated with certainty that pottery was produced in this place as the enormous amount of both fragments and whole vessels had been found in the pits. Besides that, some pots of deformed shape also point at this conclusion. The reconstruction of the features will show which of them could be used for the pottery production

and which not and gave suggestions for the other activates that could have been performed in this area.



Photo 9-SU 5894 (photo by Vjekoslav Iličić)

Along with few pits that could be dated in the eleventh and the thirteenth century, majority of the features in Location 3 can be dated to the fourteenth century or perhaps the beginning of the fifteenth century, according to the radiocarbon analysis of the sample of the soil that covered the remains of two ovens found next to each other (1300-1420). (SU 5894, shown on Photos 9 and 10).⁵²¹

⁵²¹ Laboratory number: Beta-29 3850, C14 BP 590 \pm 30

1 Sigma calibrated result (68% probability): Cal AD 1310 to 1360 (Cal BP 640 to 590) and Cal AD 1390 to 1400 (Cal BP 560 to 550)

2 Sigma calibrated result (95% probability): Cal AD 1300 to 1420 (Cal BP 650 to 540)



Photo 10-Ovens found beneath SU 5894 (photo by Vjekoslav Iličić)

4.3.1.5. The sixteenth/seventeenth-century features

The sixteenth/seventeenth-century settlement features were found only in the area of the western side-road. They had been spreading in the direction of north, outside of the excavating zone. They are out of the time scope of the thesis and will not be discussed. Nevertheless, their spatial distribution is important as it clearly shows that the area of the medieval settlement was abandoned in the early modern period and probably used as hay or agricultural land.

After dating of the features excavated at the site of Okuje, it became obvious that the use of space in this area was changing through the course of the centuries. The part of the thirteenth-century settlement was placed in the central part of the excavated area. By the fourteenth century, this area was mostly abandoned while new settlement features were built in new locations. Location 1 was situated north of the area of the thirteenth-century settlement. These fourteenth-century features probably partly destroyed the thirteenth-century features as could be seen on the example of the features dated with the radiocarbon method in the fourteenth century (*Photo 5*). Location 2, where the building whose outer walls were supported with counterforts had been found, was situated on the southern edge of the thirteenth-century

settlement. The building also destroyed some earlier posthole features which could not have been dated; they could have been the thirteenth-century features or earlier. Location 3 was situated on the southern edge of the site, around the stream bed. Location 4, where the pottery workshop had been discovered, was situated on the eastern edge of the site. There are no certain signs of life in this area in the fifteenth century, although it cannot be excluded that some of the fourteenth-century features could have also functioned in the fifteenth century. This can also be suggested with two of the radiocarbon dates, whose time scope was from 1300 to 1410/1420. It is also not known when the building with the counterforts had been abandoned. In any case, sometime in the late fourteenth or during the fifteenth century, all four locations had been abandoned. As the sixteenth/seventeenth-century features were found only in the area of the western side-road, it can be concluded that, by the early modern period, the area/s of medieval settlement/settlements had been completely abandoned.


The archaeological data clearly testify of intensive life in the area from the eleventh century until practically the present day. This same is with the site of Šepkovčica and the villages that surround it. The difference, however, is that in case of Šepkovčica was relatively easy to determine of which present-day village the site was part of in the medieval period. Besides that, the ownership of the surrounding villages was stable during the medieval and the modern period; those were all villages of the castle warriors of Turopolje. In this respect, the situation around the site of Okuje is far more complicated. The settlement named Okuje was first time mentioned in the written sources only in 1435.⁵²² The excavations proved that the life in this area began much earlier than the fifteenth century. In this respect, the archaeological data complemented data from the written sources. Likewise, there are some additional historical data that important for the interpretation of the site and the area around it in the thirteenth and fourteenth century that will be analysed in the following lines.

⁵²² KAZ, ALC 2, no.59.

4.3.2. Historical interpretation (charters, toponyms and maps)

4.3.2.1. Okuje or Obrež?

The estate Okuje is first mentioned in 1435 as the property of mid-rank noblemen George and Stephan Farkaš. It was a small part of their estates located in Turopolje, in the area west of Turopolje as well as in the area south of Vukomeričke Gorice, that is, in Pokuplje, from where they most likely originated. Owners of this vast estate, initially owned by the Farkaš family, changed through the course of the fifteenth century. At the very end of the century, the estate became the property of Baltazar Alapić with the centre in Vukovina. The main territory of the Vukovina estate included the areas of the present-day villages Vukovina, Okuje and Mala Buna.



Map 35-Location of the site within the cadastre borders of Okuje and Mraclin

According to data from the written sources, the space of the central area of the Vukovina estate was organized differently than is today, with many smaller scattered settlements on its territory. These were Obrež Samac, Okuje, Mišine, Tržec/Vukovina, Trnovec, perhaps Novaki (first mentioned in 1488), and Buna. Along with that, in the period when George and Stephan Farkaš were the owners, the areas of Buševac and Lekenik (that is, some parts of the area of Lekenik) had also been included in the estate. All the above-mentioned settlements have been

placed on the modern map. Now, as the first step in the process of placing the archaeological site in its medieval environment, these data will be connected with the location of the site. The result is shown on Map 35, together with the present-day cadastre borders of Vukovina and Okuje.


On the basis of this map, it can be concluded that the estate Obrež Samac was placed in the area of the archaeological site in the medieval and the early modern period. Accordingly, it can also be concluded that the remains found at the excavations are not remains of settlement features of medieval Okuje but of (today non-existing) Obrež Samac.

It is also clear from the map that the eastern end of the site was placed within the present-day cadastre border of Mraclin. Correspondingly, it can be discussed if all the remains found at the excavations were placed in the area of Obrež Samac, or perhaps, part of them was placed in the area of medieval Mraclin (or some other estate). The only extant perambulation of the land in the territory of Mraclin (found so far) is the perambulation of *Boblač/Doblačmezew* from 1258 and the data from it can only be placed approximately in the modern environment.⁵²³ Besides that, although *Boblač/Doblačmezew* was in the territory of the present-day Mraclin, it is not clear if it covered the whole territory of the medieval village of Mraclin or just bigger part of it (see page: --). For that reason, it is not possible to state with certainty in which area was the border between Mraclin and Okuje, that is, Obrež Samac, in the medieval period. In any case, the toponym Obrež have stayed in the area until the modern period and, over time, as can be seen on the map, a part of Mraclin has been named after it.

4.3.2.2. Thirteenth- and fourteenth-century charters

The archaeological finds prove that the permanent settlement/settlements existed in the area of the site of Okuje in the thirteenth and the fourteenth century. On the other hand, at this state of research, it is not possible to conclude how was the area of the site called prior to the fifteenth century or to whom it belonged, the reason being the lack of written sources with such information. Nonetheless, there are some charters that can shed some light on these problems and offer some possible solutions and directions for further research. These are the thirteenth- and the fourteenth-century charters that contain perambulations of the neighbouring estates of the territory in question.

⁵²³ MHNC 2, doc. 12, p. 15.



Map 36-Data from the charters and the location of the site Okuje

As far as the nearest surrounding area of the site is concerned, there is only one charter that could refer to it (and even that, as will be shown, is questionable). For that reason, the analysis cannot be focused only on the area of the site. It should be, however, taken into consideration that from the time of the Farkaš family, that is, from the time when both Okuje and Obrež Samac first time appear in the extant sources, they are smaller parts of the larger estate whose core was in the area of the present-day villages Okuje, Vukovina and Mala Buna. It is possible that this whole area did not become one estate at the time of the Farkaš family but that it had been that prior to the period when the Farkaš family became the owners. On the other hand, it is also possible that it was the hereditary estate of this family from the time the area first appears in the extant sources. I will try to answer these questions in the further text.

Most of the charters that will be discussed here have been analysed in the other chapters of the thesis and the data written in the perambulations had been drawn on the maps. In these cases, there is no need to repeat the whole perambulations here as the only parts of them that

are important are the parts that can be connected with the area in question. For that reason, only these parts will be analysed with the reference to the part of the text where the whole perambulation is analysed.

All the data from the different charters are shown on Map 36. The map will be explained in the further text. In order that the text can be more easily followed I have divided it into three parts; about the area of Vukovina, of Okuje and of Mala Buna. In the last part, I have also included data about the area of Buševac as it was the property of the Farkaši.

4.3.2.2.1. *The area of Vukovina*

The earliest charters that contain data about the area of Vukovina are the charters with the perambulation of the borders of the Čičan preceptory from the time of King Andrew II and from 1328.⁵²⁴ Both of these perambulations had been analysed and placed on the contemporary map in the chapter about Čičan preceptory in the thirteenth century. In the time of King Andrew II, in the area of the present-day Vukovina was the estate of *Janzlo* who most likely was Jaroslav of the Ivanović family from Brezovica. In 1328, in the same area was the estate of John son of Ivan (*Johannes filius Ivan*), Jaroslav's grandson. (see pages 68,69). Thus, this land was most likely the hereditary estate of the Ivanović family.

I assume that one additional charter refers to the area in focus here. In 1333, a purchase was confirmed by *comes terrestris* Mikec. Blasius son of *Cihan* with his relatives and kinsmen (*cum suis cognatis et generacionibus suis*) Bracko, *Rachen* son of Raden, *Carnec* son of Malšić and Mladec son of Ozren sold fifteen *veretens* of their hereditary land (*terra sua heredetaria*). The buyers were John (*Iohannes*), Matthey and Ivan, sons of Ivan. This land was situated *in Sep*; the neighbours of the land were Stephan son of Lukač on one side and Andrew son of Berkeš on the other. The charter was issued in Čiče (*in Ch[ic]ha*).⁵²⁵ The buyers can be identified easily as the members of Ivanović family. John son of Ivan is the same John whose estates was mentioned in 1328 as the neighbouring estate of Čičan. As far as the sellers are concerned, this is the only charter I have found in which these people are mentioned. They were obviously of the same kindred and were nobles. It is clear from the introductory part of the charter in which *comes terrestris* stated that all people who came in front of him were nobles (*nobili viri*). Since they asked *comes terrestris* to confirm the sale and Laszowski had found

⁵²⁴ CD 9, docs. 311, pp. 378-139. and doc. 316, pp. 383-385.

⁵²⁵ MHNC 1, doc. 50, p. 51.

this charter in the archive of the noble community, I presume these were *iobagiones castr*i of Turopolje. The place name *Sep* also does not appear in any other charter found so far, but the location can be assumed if we take into consideration the neighbours. Stephan son of Lukač is of the family of *comes* Jurk/Gurk. The land of this family was placed on the right side of Staro Čiče, in the area of the present-day village Donje Podotočje (*metae Petri et Stephani filiis Lwkach, que condam fuit Petri filii Gwck*). Andrew son of Berkes/Berkus was mentioned in the charter from 1346 as the castle warrior of Kuče (*de Kochan*).⁵²⁶ The village Kuče is placed south of the village Podotočje. On the basis of this data, I suppose that the land *in Sep* was placed somewhere in the area of Podotočje or Vukovina and that the Ivanović family was enlarging their estate in this area. As written, the name *Sep* does not appear in any other charter, but it could have been derived from the word *schep*, which signifies a Roman road used in the Middle Ages. The former Roman state road *Poetovio-Siscia* (Ptuj-Sisak) did pass through the area of the present-day Vukovina.

4.3.2.2.2. *The area of Okuje*

A 1258 charter that contains the perambulation of *Doblach/Boblachmezew*, a property of Stanišk and his kindred, would be the most useful for the analysis of the area around the site.⁵²⁷ Unfortunately, the western neighbours of the estate are not mentioned, so, in this context the charter is useless.

The only data that could perhaps be connected with the area of Okuje (but more likely with the area of the present-day village than of the site) dates from 1249. Ban Stephan returned to Wylkin, Mark and Miren, sons of *Coral*a their hereditary land/estate Odra (*terra Odra*) that had been occupied by Ivan son of the Jaroslav.⁵²⁸ This charter is analysed in the chapter about Kurilovec (see pages 353-356). As the Ivanović family owned the land in the area of Vukovina, probably this occupation of *terra Odra* was an attempt to expand the borders of their estate (as can be seen on Map 36 they are practically next to each other).

The important part for the topic here is the southeastern border of *terra Odra*, which is also the only part of the perambulation in which the neighbouring estate is mentioned. This part is: “The border started at the eastern side near the Odra River (*fluius Odra*) at an earthen

⁵²⁶ MHNC 1, doc. 58, p. 59.

⁵²⁷ MHNC 1, doc. 12, pp. 15-16.

⁵²⁸ MHNC 1, doc. 6, p. 9.

boundary, and through successive boundaries it went towards the south for a long while and came to the constructed road called *vttewen* (*via fundata, que vttewen dicitur*) and there bordered with the land/estate Mortun (*terra Mortun*), and from there went to the Ramiščak River (*fluuius Haranichnik*)...”.

Thus, the boundary went south of the Odra for a long while and came to the constructed road *vttewen* and in that place bordered with the land of Mortun. Afterwards, it went to the Ramiščak River, today the Ramiščak stream. The position of the Odra and the Ramiščak can be seen on a contemporary map. The word *vttewen* was used for the former Roman roads, same as the above-mentioned *schep*. One such road passing through this area is shown on the Klemenc's map. As can be seen on Map 36, the estate/land of Mortun was placed somewhere in the area of Okuje.

A man of such name is mentioned in several charters issued in the second half of the thirteenth century. In 1265, Mortun son of Mortun (*Mortunus filius Mortunus!*) was one of *nobiles regni* present at a sale of some land in Hrašće.⁵²⁹ In 1267, Mortun brother of Ača (*Mortunus frater Atha*) was one of the arbiters in a conflict over the land Kuče (*terra Cochana*), that occurred between five castle warriors and the sons of *comes* Andrew.⁵³⁰ In 1271, Mortun (*Mortuum*), Damian, *Cuchnik* and *Cybrianum de genere Atha* were listed among *nobiles regni* who testified that Stanišk and his kindred had always been the castle warriors (until Prince Bela had deposed them to *castrenses*).⁵³¹ Thus, this man called Mortun was of the Ača kindred. The Toths, the owners of the Želin estate in the fifteenth century, were descendants of the same kindred. However, whether Mortun of the Ača kindred had a land in Turopolje in the thirteenth century cannot be recognized on the basis of any of the above-mentioned charters. As there are no other data that could clarify this issue, it is not possible to conclude if the owner of the land situated somewhere in the wider area of Okuje in 1249 was Mortun of the Ača kindred or some other person named Mortun.⁵³²

In the context of placing data from the perambulation of the estate Odra in the present-day environment, the remains of the big Roman-period road discovered in the excavations at Okuje should be mentioned (Photo 11). These were, most likely, the remains of the Roman state road *Emona-Siscia*. The direction of the excavated road was the same as of the road shown on

⁵²⁹ MHNC 1, doc. 17, p. 19.

⁵³⁰ MHNC 1, doc. 20, p. 22.

⁵³¹ MHNC 1, doc. 23, p. 25.

⁵³² MHNC 1, doc. 6., p. 9.

the Klemenc's map, although the excavated road was found some 600 meters south of the supposed location of the road drawn on the map. Such derivations are to be expected; ancient roads can be located in the environment absolutely correctly only by data from archaeological excavations, field walking or with the help of an aerial photography and similar modern methods. In any case, the derivation does not change the fact that the direction of the drawn road was correct. Interesting in this case, however, is that, according to the excavation data, the excavated segment of the road was not used for transport in the Middle Ages, at least not in the thirteenth century. This is clear as some thirteenth-century pits had been found in this part of the site, intersecting the road. Taking that into consideration, it can be asked if the constructed road *vttewen* mentioned in the 1249 charter was the Roman state road *Emona-Siscia* or not. Likewise, it can be discussed whether the remains of the road discovered in the excavations were the remains of the road *Emona-Siscia* or if there were perhaps two Roman roads, one used in the Middle Ages and the other not. I think that it is most likely there was one road and the remains found at the site are there remains of the road *Emona-Siscia* as well as that this road was used in the Middle Ages. The situation found at the site could be explained by the fact that not the whole original track of the Roman road had been used in the medieval period; in some areas the track was slightly changed but generally the direction stayed the same. As already concluded during the excavations, even the modern road follows the track of the Roman road, thus, in both cases, the most suitable position for the track was chosen.⁵³³

The problems of placing data from perambulations in the modern environment have been demonstrated in several places in the previous text. Nevertheless, this case was worth singling out as the written data can be directly confronted with the exact and precise archaeological data. As the result of combing these data, the several facts emerged. Roads called *ettven* were roads of the Roman origin used in the Middle Ages. Often, exact track of each segment of Roman roads is not known. In this case, however, it is known, due to clear and exact archaeological data. Precisely because of the exact data it is possible to conclude that the excavated segment cannot be connected with data from the written sources as it was not used in the Middle Ages. Accordingly, the question where in the area of the site the road called *ettven* was situated remains open. It can only be concluded that in the thirteenth and fourteenth century the road was not placed in the position of the Roman road or of the modern road as the modern road intersected thirteenth-and fourteenth-century features. Following the logic that the tracks

⁵³³ Bugar, Rezultati arheoloških zaštitnih istraživanja, pp. 56-57.

of both the Roman and the modern road were chosen because of the most suitable geographical position, a nearby position of the medieval road can be supposed.

Finally, it should be said that the expected derivations of tracks of the roads drawn on the Klemenc's map do not question the approximate location of *terra Mortun*. Two other borders, the Odra and the Ramiščak stream, confirm that this estate was placed in the wider area of Okuje, as shown on Map 36.



Photo 11-Medieval features and the Roman road at the site Okuje (photo by Ina Miloglav)

4.3.2.2.3. The area of Mala Buna and Buševac

The first charters that contain data about the area north of the Buna River, where the present-day Mala Buna and Buševac are located, are the charters with the perambulations of the estates of the Čičan preceptory. In this case, the northern borders of the Hospitallers' estates Kravarsko and Peščenica are important (see pages 45-48). Opposite to the area of Vukovina that was the property of the same family from the period of King Andrew II to 1328, the owners of the area in focus had changed.

In King Andrew's charter, two lands were recorded in the north or around the Buna River; one was *terra Booru* and the other was *terra Petri filii Jurk*.⁵³⁴ The border between these two estates was not specified, nor it was specified whether the Buna River was the border between the two estates and Kravarsko and Peščenica. I have assumed that on the basis of analogy with the 1328 charter, where the Buna is mentioned as the boundary between the estates of the Čičan preceptory and the castle warriors sons of Vukota and their kindred (*cum filliis Vukota iobagionibus castri et generacionis eorundem*).⁵³⁵ In any case, according to the 1st charter, *terra Booro* was located somewhere in the area of Mala Buna and *terra Petri filii Jurk* somewhere in the area of Buševac. By 1328, the area of both estates became the ownership of sons of Vukota and their kindred.

These changes in the ownership can be explained (at least partially) due to the results of the analysis done in the chapter dedicated to the development of the noble community of Turopolje. Now, some of the results relevant to the present topic will be briefly summarized. Men of the kindred of Vukota were the castle warriors of Turopolje. Their main territory was in the area south of the Lomnica River, west of the area in question here. *Comes* Peter son of Jurk and his family were already mentioned in the previous text. Peter's son *comes* Andrew was a successful warrior, awarded by the king for his achievements in defence of the Kingdom in 1241/2. Andrew, however, died young, while his sons were still children. The castle warriors of Turopolje used the weakness of the sons to occupy some of their hereditary estates, placed in several different locations in the Turopolje area. Among others, Vukota and his kindred used the situation and, in 1256, expanded the western borders of their territory. The sons of Andrew could have lost their hereditary land in the area of the Buna in the same manner, by violent expansion of borders of Vukota and his kindred (although this cannot be confirmed; perhaps the land was simply sold).

The meaning of the word *Booro* is not so easy to decipher. According to Juraj Čuk, the name *Booro* is the form of the name Bori which again is the shortened form of the name Opori or Obori, the kindred that owned lands in the Zagreb area.⁵³⁶ Whether or not his opinion that Opori were some separate kindred is correct should be researched further. Even if not so, it is certain that two men called Paul and *Dazaly*, sons of Opor, had their estates in the area of *terra*

⁵³⁴ CD 9, doc. 311, p 378.

⁵³⁵ CD 9, doc. 316, pp. 383-385.

⁵³⁶ Čuk, *Zagrebačka županija*, 57, 149.

Booro. In the 1270s Paul and *Dazaly* were selling out their lands to the castle warriors of the kindred of Vukota which could have included the area in question here.

The next extant data about the area of the present-day Mala Buna were recorded in 1358 when borders between the estate Trnovec and Petrovina were made. They were stretching from the Lomnica River on the north to the Buna River on the south, where Trnovec bordered with Kravarsko.⁵³⁷

Data about Trnovec and its owners have been analysed extensively in the previous chapters. The location of the border was shown in the chapter about Trnovec in the fourteenth century (see pages: 118-120).

According to the charter from 1358, Trnovec was the estate owned by *magister* Ivan son of Ivan and the others (*magister Ivan filii Ivan et aliorum*). *Magister* Ivan son of Ivan was of the Ivanović family from Brezovica, while “the others” were the castle warriors of Turopolje. Some additional charters confirm that the family owned the lands in this area. In 1368, Ivan’s son, *magister* Michael, gave away his bought estate Trnovec to Ivčec, son of Radoslav from the kindred of Domagojić, in exchange for two estates in Domagojić and Moluna (these estates were around Jastrebarsko).⁵³⁸ The sold parcel of Trnovec was not Michael’s hereditary estate, but the bought one. Apart from it, the family owned some other lands in Trnovec. In 1408, Michael’s son John gave his estates Buna, Kostanjevec and Trnovec (*Buna, Kostaneuch et Tarnoueuch*) in pledge to Veronica, wife of Nicholas Toth of Susedgrad.⁵³⁹ It was already stated that the estate Buna must have been situated north of the Buna River, in the area of the present-day Mala Buna or wider, along the northern banks of the river.

The 1358 charter contains the description of western borders of Trnovec. They were approximately 7 kilometres long. It is emphasized in the text of the charter that Trnovec was the estate of both *magister* Ivan son of Ivan and the others. On the basis of this data cannot be concluded which part of Trnovec was owned by the Ivanović family and which by the castle warriors. As far as the area of Mala Buna is concerned, it can be stated that it was the property of the castle warriors of the kindred of Vukota in 1328 and the property of Michael of the Ivanović family in 1408. Thus, a change in the ownership of the area occurred in the scope of 80 years. The reason for it could have been a purchase of the estate; Michael or some other

⁵³⁷ CD 12, doc. 357, p. 464.

⁵³⁸ MHNC 1, doc 84., pp. 87-88.

⁵³⁹ MNL, DF-DL 230880

member of the Ivanović family could have bought the land from the castle warriors. Likewise, the bought land could have been stretching along the northern bank of the Buna River, from the area of Mala Buna to the area of Buševac. This whole area could have been called Buna; the name Buševac appears only in 1435.

Finally, since the eastern border of the estate Trnovec is unknown, one cannot exclude the possibility that the area of the present-day Okuje, that is, the area of the medieval settlements Okuje and Obrež Samac was also called Trnovec in the thirteenth and fourteenth century while the separate settlements had developed by the beginning of the fifteenth century. In this case, the possibility that the Ivanović family owned this area in the thirteenth and the fourteenth century also cannot be excluded. In like manner, it cannot be confirmed.

Scarce written sources do not allow any firm conclusion about owners of the area of the site Okuje in the thirteenth and the fourteenth century. Nevertheless, the analysis did produce certain results and revealed some, so far unknown, data that could be useful for further research of the history of Turopolje and the forming of the Vukovina estate. It showed that some parts of this estate were owned by the nobles of Turopolje in the fourteenth century. Unlike, however, the rest of the area of the noble community, these parts did not remain their ownership. This can be stated with certainty for the area of Mala Buna and Buševac. Along with that, the analysis revealed the presence of the Ivanović family in the area which was not noted in the previous literature. The central estate of the family was Brezovica, but they also had the hereditary estate in the area of Vukovina, later the centre of the estate of the Alapić family. In this context, one data should be registered. The name Vukovina appears only in 1492, but, as already noticed, a settlement named Tržec is mentioned in all the charters connected with the Vukovina estate, starting with King Sigismond's charter by which he confirmed George and Stephan Farkaš their ownership into Okuje, Teršec and the other estates in 1435. On the other hand, John, son of Michael Vitez who gave Buna, Kostanjevec and Trnovec in pledge to Veronica Toth in 1408 was denominated as being *de Terseech*.⁵⁴⁰ Since this is the only such example, I cannot state it with certainty if this means that Michael was of Tržec, a settlement located in the area of Vukovina but it is not unlikely.

My impression, based on all the analysed data, is that majority of the area of the (future) Vukovina estate was owned by the Ivanović family in the thirteenth and fourteenth century.

⁵⁴⁰ MNL, DF-DL 230880

The core of the estate was in the area of Vukovina. The estate has also been expanded by purchases in the area of Trnovec (around the Buna River). Sometime before 1435, when Okuje, Tržec, Obrež Samac and the other settlements were mentioned for the first time in the extant sources, the estate of the Ivanović family was taken over by the Farkaš family. How this happened, by a purchase or some other way, is unknown.

These, however, were not the only parts of the estate of the Farkaš family that previously had belonged to the Ivanović family. It was so also with the estates of the Farkaš family situated in the area west of Turopolje. The charter issued by Ban Emerik Zapolya in 1465 clearly confirm this statement. Ban ordered the Chapter of Zagreb to install George Farkaš into the estates that he pledged from several different members of the Ivanović family; he pledged the whole estate of Damerje from Jelka, daughter of John, son of John, five tenant-peasant dwelling units from John, son of John, the whole estate in Brezovica from Stephan *literatus*, son of Nicholas, son of John as well as all the estates in Demerje, Grančari, Sterpet, *Kormacchio*(?), Bratina, Upper and Lower Lipnica and two tenant-peasant dwelling units in Brezovica from John called Ivek, son of Nicholas, son of John.⁵⁴¹

Thus, it seems the base estates of the Farkaš family were situated in the around the Kupa River, in the territory of the Berkes kindred. Afterwards, they acquired the estates in Turopolje and west of Turopolje. These parts on the west (Brezovica, Demerje, Grančari etc.), mentioned in later charters as parts of the Vukovina estate, were initially owned by the Ivanović family and pledged from them by George Farkaš. On the other hand, the central area of the Vukovina estate was the property of the Farkaš family and therefore probably bought by them from the Ivanović family (not pledged). It should be noticed, however, that Baltazar Alapić bought two parts of the Vukovina estate from two different owners. One was John Corvin and the other was Nicholas Ivanović from Brezovica. The king probably gave the parts of the estate to Nicholas after he had taken them from the previous owner George Wokomery who was convicted for the treason.⁵⁴² After all these data are put together it can also be assumed that this giving of the parts of the estates to Nicholas had something to do with the fact that they had once belonged to the Ivanović family from Brezovica of whom Nicholas was last male descendant.

The analysis of the written and cartographic sources showed that the area of the archaeological site Okuje is not the area of the medieval settlement Okuje but of Obrež Samac. On the other hand, the analysis of the archaeological sources indicated the territorial

⁵⁴¹ MNL, DF-DL 255628

⁵⁴² MNL, DF-DL 30916.

reorganization that occurred sometime in the late fourteenth or the fifteenth century. Whether this can be connected with the frequent ownership changes cannot be stated. The same is true for the new territorial organization in the sixteenth/seventeenth century and its possible cause in a reorganization of the estate that might have happened when it was taken over by Baltazar Alapić, at the end of the fifteenth century. Although the connection of changes in ownership with the spatial changes cannot be excluded, in my opinion, it is very dubious to connect changes in a spatial organization with the historical facts in this respect, unless one has very strong evidence (for example, written in sources). Ordinarily, more factors can influence the spatial changes; a change of climate conditions, a change of a production on a general level etc.

Likewise, connecting the thirteenth and fourteenth century historical and archaeological data about the site is almost impossible, considering that there are no charters that can be directly connected with this area. It can only be supposed that the area could have been owned by the Ivanović family prior to being the property of the Farkaš family. Can archaeological sources indicate something regarding ownership issue? The thirteenth-century sources cannot; neither the settlement features nor the finds reveal anything specific about the social status of the inhabitants. The same is true for the fourteenth-century features and finds from Location 1 and Location 3 (next to the river bed). Likewise, the pottery workshop could have been placed in the territory owned by the castle warriors of Mraclin as well as in the estate owned by a landlord.

The building with counterforts, however, opens some possibilities for the discussion. In case that it was a house, it was not a house of a tenant-peasant. Again, if it was a granary it would have served for gathering large amounts of products that could not have been collected from an estate of one (average) castle warrior but from a wider area of some bigger estate. Therefore, in both cases, the building indicates that its owner was a person of a higher rank. It was mentioned that the toponym Crkvenjak is still extant in the folk narrative. The lack of graves is the most important argument which ruled out a possibility that the building was a church. However, a possibility that it was a chapel cannot be completely ruled out (although it is also not very likely). In this context, one written evidence on the fourteenth-century chapel founded by a nobleman will be mentioned; the charter issued in 1366 by Peter, archdeacon of the church of Zagreb informs that the nobleman Peter son of Martin from Rakovec founded a chapel of St. Clare in his estate Čehi.⁵⁴³ The estate was situated on the western edge of Turopolje and, as the area around Okuje, it was not part of the noble community of Turopolje.

⁵⁴³ MHNC 1, doc. 81, pp. 82-84.


In any case, at the present moment, since there are no written sources that could illuminate the issue, it can only be guessed whether the building was connected with the Ivanović family or the Farkaš family. Besides that, as mentioned, it is not known how granaries, noble *curiae* or chapels looked like in Turopolje or Zagreb county in general in that period. This problem can be solved by excavating some areas where it can be assumed with the fair amount of certainty that the nobles of Turopolje had their houses. In that way, a comparative material would be gained and it would become clearer if this building is specific and outstanding or not. That would facilitate the interpretation.

At the end, I can only conclude that, although I have used all the sources available to me up to this moment, there are many questions left open regarding both the features excavated at the site of Okuje and the forming of the Vukovina estate. I am certain that new data gained through some future excavations will provide solid comparative material for the excavated features and finds. I am also convinced that new written sources, kept in the archives or the private collections, will eventually “appear” and complement the data gathered so far about the Ivanović family, the Farkaš family as well as answer to some other important questions, for example, the presence of the Varadi family in Zagreb County.

5. The medieval settlement system around Šepkovčica

5.1. Introduction

The archaeological site of Šepkovčica was named after the cadastre parcel called Šepkovčica, where it was excavated. In the excavations, along with features from the prehistoric and the Roman period, remains of the medieval settlement were discovered. The cadastre parcel is situated within the cadastre borders of two present-day villages, Donja Lomnica and Gradići, on their northern edge.⁵⁴⁴



Map 37-Position of the site Šepkovčica

Toponym Šepkovčica was not mentioned in the medieval charters from Turopolje. Likewise, it does not appear on the First military survey, a first precise map of the region. No houses are visible on this map, in the area where the site was discovered. Obviously, there was no settlement in the area of Šepkovčica at the time when the First military survey was created, that is, in the second half of the eighteenth century. Like today, it was a field or agricultural land. The name Šepkovčica first appears on the 1861 cadastre map in the form *Šebkovščece*, as a name of agricultural land.⁵⁴⁵

The analysis of the sources collected in Laszowski's *Monumnta historica noblis communitatis Turopolje* showed that there was no separate village in the area of the

⁵⁴⁴ Aleksandra Bugar, "Preliminarno izvješće – Rezultati arheoloških zaštitnih istraživanja na lokalitetu Šepkovčica," p. 12.

⁵⁴⁵ At least, that is the first mentioning of this name that I have managed to find so far.

archaeological site of Šepkovčica in the high and late medieval period.⁵⁴⁶ On the other hand, almost all settlements that surround the site today appear in the medieval sources. These are villages Donja Lomnica, Velika Mlaka, Hrašće, and Pleso as well as Velika Gorica, today the main town of the Turopolje region (Map 37). The only exception is the village Gradići, which I found first mentioned in the document from 1734 as *Gradich*.⁵⁴⁷ In addition to the above listed, two other villages were surrounding the area of the site in the medieval and early modern period. These were Kurilovec and Mala Gorica. They were separate villages until the twentieth century and then integrated into Velika Gorica. As the extant medieval sources for all these villages are numerous, it was possible to conclude that the archaeological site existed within the boundaries of one of them. It was most likely the closest one – Donja Lomnica.⁵⁴⁸ How I came to this conclusion will be explained in more detail in the further text.

Unlike in the area around the site of Okuje, there were no major changes in the ownership structure of the villages that surround the site of Šepkovčica. From the time the first sources that inform about the area appear, that is, from the second half of the thirteenth century until practically the twentieth century, when the noble community of Turopolje was abolished, these villages were inhabited by the lesser nobility (*iobagiones castri*) of Turopolje. In that respect, two archaeological sites were placed in the areas with completely different historical development, although they are placed in the same geographical area and are just 6 kilometres distant from each other.

Before proceeding with the further text, it must be emphasized that the nobles of Turopolje were not the only owners of the land within the borders of the villages around Šepkovčica. It is clear from the sources that nobles from other areas as well as citizens of Gradec possessed some lands in the villages as well. Nevertheless, their estates did not develop into separate units. On the contrary, these estates remained parts of the villages in which they were originally situated. Naturally, attempts of forming of bigger private estates in the area inhabited by the castle warriors were occurring during centuries. In the long run, however, that did not change the fact that all the villages around Šepkovčica were the villages of the nobles of Turopolje. Even more, owners of these bigger estates, even in cases when they were newcomers in the area, were often integrated into the noble community, by adoption or a marriage. The castle warriors were very liberal in this respect. This is well documented in two excellent

⁵⁴⁶ AntoniĆ, "GIS in historical research," pp. 218-219.

⁵⁴⁷ MHNC 4, 610.

⁵⁴⁸ AntoniĆ, "GIS in historical research," p. 219.

extensive studies, one about Benedikt Krupić written by Suzana Miljan and the other about Stephan Berislavić written by Ivan Jurković.⁵⁴⁹

Considering all the above written, the development of the settlement system around Šepkovčica cannot be analysed in the same manner as the development of the settlement system around Okuje. However, there is one aspect important for the settlement system of this area that has never been analysed. Namely, by the method of locating spatial data from the charters in the present-day environment, one can gain new data about territories of kindreds and the emergence of villages in the area of the noble community of Turopolje. This will be the focus of my analysis. In order to get a clearer picture, I will not limit the analysis just to the villages around the site of Šepkovčica, but also take into consideration the broader territory of the noble community of Turopolje.

This part of the thesis is divided into three main parts. The first part is this introduction; in the following subchapters, the basic terms used in the charters connected with the noble community will be explained and afterwards basic data about one noble family will be presented. The members of this family were not castle warriors of Turopolje but are important for understanding the development of the villages of the castle warriors. The second part is dedicated to the emergence of villages in the area of the noble community; in the first subchapter, the area in the southeastern part of Turopolje is analysed and in the second the area in the northwestern part. At the beginning of each of the subchapters, data about kindreds are discussed. Afterwards, data about the emergence of each village are analysed and further discussed in the closing remarks. The meaning of toponyms is also explained at the closing part of the remarks. In the third part, historical data connected strictly with the nearest vicinity of the site as well as the results of the archaeological excavations are presented, and it is discussed how and if the archaeological and the historical data complement each other.

5.1.1. Terms

From the point of view of contemporary terminology used in charters one has to note an important chronological aspect. It is crucial because some of the terms have changed in a significant way between the thirteenth and the fifteenth century. Regarding the earliest (the thirteenth-century) charters it should be noticed that although there are 34 of them published in

⁵⁴⁹ Miljan, *Plemićka obitelj Krupić*, pp. 83-125; Jurković, *Raseljena plemićka obitelj*, part 1, pp. 125-164.

the *Monumneta historica nobilis communitatis*, only three of them are issued before 1242, one of them in 1242, and thirty others in the period between 1242 to 1300. Thus, as elsewhere in the kingdom the number of extant charters starts to grow from the period after the Mongol invasion.

Basically, the terms used in the charters that concern the area of the noble community were similar to the ones used in the charters connected with the area around the site of Okuje. The difference is that in the first there are no terms like *preadium* or *preceptory*, which can be explained by a different legal status of the lands owned by castle warriors.

The most used term in the thirteenth-century charters is *terra*. As I have already discussed, it stands for all sorts of land; it can mean a private property of an individual, a family, a kindred or it can refer to a village as a whole. In this period, when the term appears in purchase contracts and clearly refers to some smaller parcel of land of an individual or a family, it is usually not added if it is placed within borders of a certain village. Except for *terra*, the term *villa*, a village, appears twice in the thirteenth-century sources.⁵⁵⁰ It was recorded in perambulations of certain *terrae* but, in both cases is not specified to which village it stands for. For example, one of the borders of the land under sale in 1228 *tendit ad unam viam versus occidentem et per eandem viam iuxta villam per metas ad predictem paludem videlicet Sredna Malaca*. In this case, the term *villa* is used in its general meaning, as a village, in a similar way as laws or charters of the period were referring to the most common type of rural settlements, without a particular reference to a legal status of a particular village. On the other hand, in the same perambulation one of the borders is the road that is specified as leading to Gorica (*strata ad Goricam*).⁵⁵¹ Similarly, when the Ban's deputy Levča was making borders between lands of Miroslav and the sons of Andrew and Vukota and his kindred, some fifty *weretens* of land were left for exchange by Vukota and his kindred. So, Levča did not put it *sub villa* of Vukota and his kindred but put it *ante villam filiorum Andre*.⁵⁵² Again, the actual name of the village was not written.

In the fourteenth century, the term *villa*, in context of the villages of castle warriors, appears only in one charter (*antiquam viam, que itur de Zagrabia uersus villam Korilouch*, in

⁵⁵⁰ About the development and the other possible meanings of this term in different contexts, see: StankoAndrić, *Imenica Vas u staroj slavenskoj toponimiji*, CROATICA • Zagreb, XXXVII (2013), p. 57.

⁵⁵¹ MHNC 1, doc. 2, p. 4.

⁵⁵² MHNC 1, doc. 9, p. 12.

1377).⁵⁵³ The new term that appears in this period is *possessio*. Its usage is the same as of *terra* in the previous century; it can mean a land, an estate or a village as a whole. The main emphasis in this term is the fact that a settlement or an estate and its land belong to some person or an institution. Smaller units of an estate are often referred as part of the estate, i.e., *portio possessionaria*. This is clearly shown in the text from one charter from 1411. When the borders of the estate Vrbanec were determined, it is written: *Prima meta possessionum seu porcionum possessionarium dictorum Iohannis, Thome at Iacobi*.⁵⁵⁴ The usage of this particular term here is very relevant, as the estate is divided between three owners. So, basically, estates are set of more parts or units. These smaller units can be dwelling areas, agricultural lands, haylands etc. These terms also start to appear in the fourteenth century. In 1335 a *possessio* called Trnovec was being sold *...cum omnibus suis vtilitatibus videlicet siluis, pratis, vineis, locis molendinorum, stagnis, piscinis, terries arabilibus cultis et incultis ac ceteris suis attinenciis*.⁵⁵⁵ This became the standard formula. Of all this terms, *terra arabilis*, a ploughland most often appears separately, as an object of sale. The term *sessio*, a plot (or a toft) where is a dwelling unit, first appears in 1360.⁵⁵⁶ The charter from 1391 illustrates all written above. When Paul, son of Andrew, and Ladislav, son of Valentin, nobles of Donja Lomnica accepted as their kinsmen George and Giles, sons of Peter, and their nephew Lucas, son of Anthony, they also accepted *porcionibus ipsorum possessionariis in eadem possessione Lomnicha situatis*. They gave them a dwelling unit (*sessionem seu fundum*), a half of a standard size of agricultural land (*medietate terre arabilis*) called *Podoresya*, as well as meadows, forests, and groves (*pratis, siluis et nemoribus*).⁵⁵⁷ The term *fundus*, which also represents a dwelling unit, is rarely used, while *sessio* is the standard. Both *sessio* and *terra arabilis* refer to the standard units of rural settlements and their fields.

The usage of all these terms continued in the fifteenth century. In general, in that period, purchase contracts in most cases do specify the basic nature of property under sale. Along with *sessio* and *terra arabilis*, the term *terra campestra*, a land in the field, appears. In the charters from Turopolje it is rarely mentioned alone. Mostly it appears in a form that can be found in

⁵⁵³ MHNC 1, doc. 93, p. 98.

⁵⁵⁴ MHNC 1, doc. 35, p. 39.

⁵⁵⁵ MHNC 1, doc. 52, p. 52.

⁵⁵⁶ MHNC1, doc. 73., p. 74.

⁵⁵⁷ MHNC 1, doc. 125, pp. 128-129.

the first charter in which it is recorded (from 1427), combined with the *terra arabilis – terra arabilis seu campestris*.⁵⁵⁸

From the fourteenth century, if the term *terra* appears alone it signifies mostly agricultural land, hayland or land in the field. The situation is the same in the fifteenth century. Similarly, the term *possessio* can still be used both for private property and for a village. Along with that, starting from the 1420s the charters start to refer to a territory of a certain village as one unit: *intra meta seu territorium de prefata Korylouch*,⁵⁵⁹ in *predicta Inferiori Lompnycha et eius territorio*.⁵⁶⁰ In terms of spatial reconstruction, this is very helpful. Because of it, the site of Šepkovčica could have been attributed to the village of the castle warriors.

Except for the terminology used for estates, the terms used for kindred should be mentioned. These are *genus* and *generatio*. In general, their meaning is the same and the same person can be denominated by both terms. For example, as shown in the analysis of charters connected with the Šubići done by Damir Karbić, John son of Budislav from the kindred of Šubići is in one charter from 1392 labelled as being *de genere Subich* and in the other from 1393 as being of *generacionis Subich*.⁵⁶¹ In the charters that will be analysed in the following text, the term *generatio* is more often used than the term *genus*. Still, the number of extant charters that used any of these terms is not sufficient to make a conclusion if this can say something more significant about the terminology. Besides that, as will be shown, the same meaning of both of these terms can also be noticed in some cases.

5.1.2. The family of Gurk

Except for the castle warriors of Turopolje, Peter son of Gurk/Jurk, *comes* Andrew and his sons as well as *comes* Miroslav are mentioned in most of the thirteenth-century charters published in Laszowski's *Monumnetas*. These people, that had estates in Turopolje, are members of the same family – the descendants of Gurk or Jurk. The first extant charter in which *comes Gurko* is mentioned dates from 1202; one of the borders of the land Kaian was the land of Abraam, Gurko's cousin (*ab oriente confinisset terre Abraam, cognati Gurconis comitis*).⁵⁶²

⁵⁵⁸ MHNC 1, doc. 206, p. 201.

⁵⁵⁹ MHNC 1, doc. 187, p. 178.

⁵⁶⁰ MHNC 1, doc. 190., pp. 184-185.

⁵⁶¹ Damir Karbić, "Hrvatski plemićki rod i običajno parvo. Pokušaj analize" [Croatian noble kindred and customary law. An attempt of analysis], *Zbornik Odsjeka za povijesne znanosti Zavoda za povijesne i društvene znanosti Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 16 (1999), p. 81.

⁵⁶² CD 3, doc. 14., p. 17.

From one later charter, issued in 1259, after Gurko's death, it is clear that, at one point, he was a *comes* of Zagreb.⁵⁶³ *Comes* Peter was a son of Gurk or, as written in some documents, Jurk. Juraj Ćuk concluded that Peter was a son of the same Gurk who was a *comes* of Zagreb.⁵⁶⁴ I also suppose that it was so, but, due to the scarce data about *comes* Gurk, I cannot confirm that with absolute certainty. Even in the perambulation of the land Kaian, only the land of Gurk's cousin is mentioned. Knowing a position of any of Gurk's lands would enable one to confirm that his descendants had lands in the same area. Unfortunately, there is not extant charter with such a data.⁵⁶⁵

Comes Peter has already been mentioned in a chapter about Okuje. He was the one who inherited Giles' estates Želin and Kuklenjak. As will be seen, he was also buying some other lands from certain castle warriors of Turopolje. Peter is always referred as *comes*, but whether he was at one point *comes* of Zagreb cannot be said due to the lack of extant sources for the first half of the thirteenth century. The title of *comes* does not reveal much in this respect; in the thirteenth century, *comes* can also mean rank and indicate a person belonging to the higher social layer, not necessarily a *comes* of a county, although it cannot be excluded that such person was once a *comes* of a county.

Similarly, Peter's son Andrew was referred to as *comes*. Because of the help he had provided during the Mongol invasion, King Bela IV awarded him with one estate (*terra Dulypcha*) in the County of Križevci.⁵⁶⁶ He died young, leaving four juvenile sons; Lukač, Giles, Matthew and Peter. His early death was a good opportunity for the castle warriors of Turopolje to occupy some of his estates. The sons of Andrew, as will be shown, worked on getting them back.⁵⁶⁷ At this period, activities of one other person, *comes* Miroslav, son of Stephan *de genere Andre*, a cousin of the sons of Andrew, can also be traced in the sources.

Sons of Lukač, son of Andrew, Stephan and Peter can also be found in the fourteenth-century charters having the estates in Turopolje and elsewhere. These estates were, by the

⁵⁶³ CD 5, doc. 659., p. 151.; According to Juraj Ćuk Gurko is the first known *comes* of Zagreb. Ćuk, *Zagrebačka županija*, p. 46. This could be so, as the period when he was *comes* cannot be more closely specified. In 1230, vice-Ban and a *comes* of Zagreb was certain Nemil. CD 3, doc. 294, p. 335.

⁵⁶⁴ Ćuk, *Zagrebačka županija*, p. 46.

⁵⁶⁵ For other charters that mention Peter but not in connection with Turopolje, see: Ćuk, *Zagrebačka županija*, p. 46.

⁵⁶⁶ CD 4, doc. 211., pp. 241-243.

⁵⁶⁷ Klaić, *Povijest Zagreba*, pp. 37-38; Ćuk, *Zagrebačka županija*, p. 46.

1380s, inherited by Stephan's sons Benedict and Michael and his grandsons Nicholas, Stephan, Ladislaus and Gregory.⁵⁶⁸

It is important to emphasize that this is a very short and fragmentary overview of the history of this family. There is no systematic study about them and their estates both in Zagreb County and Križevci County. The only exception is the doctoral dissertation of Suzana Miljan in which the author has analysed the development of the family in the period of the reign of King Sigismund (in this period they were called *de Gepew* and *de Odra* and were mid-rank noblemen, *egregii*).⁵⁶⁹ The members of the family living in the thirteenth and fourteenth century were only sporadically mentioned by Nada Klaić and more extensively by Juraj Ćuk. In any case, as this was one of the oldest families in Zagreb County, with estates in different parts of the County, its history in the period from the thirteenth to the sixteenth century would require a separate systematic study.

At this moment, for the following text is important to notice that the members of this family were not castle warriors of Turopolje. In my opinion, this can be stated with certainty, even by looking only at the sources that will be used in the further text, that is, the selected sources related to this family. However, one thirteenth-century purchase contract that might contradict this statement should be discussed. In 1266, the Chapter of Zagreb confirmed that *iobagiones castri* Lukač and Peter, sons of Andrew bought some lands near the Kosnica River from *iobagio castri* Marco son of Gurda.⁵⁷⁰ Thus, in this document, Lukač and Peter, two sons of *comes* Andrew are labelled as castle warriors. Four years later, in 1271, Ban Joakim returned the status of castle warriors to the kindred of Stanišk, from which they had been deposed by late Prince (*dominus dux*) Bela. All the important people of Zagreb County were present during the event and confirmed that Stanišk and his kindred had always been the castle warriors. There were lots of castle warriors, not just from Turopolje but also from Okić and Podgora, present. The four sons of Andrew (Lucas, Giles, Matthey and Peter) were also present but listed among *nobiles regni*, the highest nobility of the County.⁵⁷¹ According to Nada Klaić, this is an example of the transformation of Slavonian society in the thirteenth century, which I think it certainly is. The author further concludes that "the sons of župan (*comes*) [the sons of Andrew] were born as *iobagiones castri* and, with the help of their father's position, elevated to the rank of

⁵⁶⁸ MHNC 1, docs. 99, 138, 139, 140, 141, 143, 145, pp. 104., 135-141. etc.; For the geneological tree of de Gepew family in the time of King Sigismund, see: *Plemićko društvo Zagrebačke županije*, p. 236.

⁵⁶⁹ See: Miljan, *Plemićko društvo Zagrebačke županije*, pp. 25, 60-63, 80, 236 etc.

⁵⁷⁰ MHNC 1, doc. 19, p. 21.

⁵⁷¹ MHNC 1, doc. 23, p. 25.

the highest nobility of the County. At first, their nobility meant only more prestige. After the first general assembly of Slavonia [in 1273], however, on which the rights of nobles were written down, their social rank and prestige also got the legal basis. Thus, the sons of the župan, to whom the ban also admits their nobility [Ban Joakim who listed them among *nobiles regni*] will differentiate from the *iobagiones castri* of Zagreb. In that way, this fact confirms one more time the constant changes of Slavonian society in the thirteenth century.”⁵⁷²

First of all, it should be said that Nada Klaić was not acquainted with the family background of the sons of Andrew. If she would have been, perhaps her conclusions would be somewhat different. Juraj Ćuk was the first who established the connection between them and Gurk, the *comes* of Zagreb. As said, there are no extant charters based on which could be concluded with absolute certainty that Gurk, the *comes* of Zagreb, was the grandfather of the sons of Andrew, but the option seems very likely. On the other hand, *comes* Peter son of Gurk was, without doubt, their grandfather. Therefore, even at his period, the family had a higher social status. At the same time, it is the fact the sons of Andrew were referred to as *iobagiones castri* in 1266. These data draw attention to some important questions regarding the process of the development of different social status of certain noble families, that is, different ranks of nobility. The question is when this differentiation started. Were the ancestors of sons of Andrew, meaning, *comes* Andrew, his father *comes* Peter and possible grandfather Gurk, the *comes* of Zagreb, castle warriors who performed a certain function, for example, of *comes* of Zagreb or was their social rank higher from the beginning of the emergence of the castle system? Were the sons of Andrew born as *iobagiones castri* or were they deposed to the rank of *iobagiones castri* when they lost most of their hereditary estates after their father died (and them being juvenile were not strong enough to defend the estates from the attacks of the other castle warriors)? It is clear from some charters that the sons of Andrew managed to get some of the estates in the Turopolje back.⁵⁷³ Perhaps the ownership over the land was what helped them to be considered as *nobiles regni*. Likewise, it could be that the status of the family was changing according to their present state of power. If so, this again points at both the flexibility of the social borders in the thirteenth century and at the ownership of the land as the basis of social rank. In any case, as said, the only correct view on the situation can be gained through the complete analysis of all the extant sources connected with this family. As the following analysis will show, the estates of the sons of Andrew and their descendants were different

⁵⁷² Klaić, *Povijest Zagreba*, p. 38.

⁵⁷³ MHNC 1, docs. 10, 20, 25, pp. 13-14., 21-22., 27-28.


territorial entities than the territory of the noble community of Turopolje. Likewise, apart from the 1266 purchase contract, in any other charter they or their descendants were not referred to as castle warriors.

5.2. The area of the noble community of Turopolje

In the analysis of the area around the archaeological site of Okuje it has been shown that vast portions of land in the Turopolje region were not owned by the castle warriors. After 1328, when the estates of the Hospitallers and the estates of the Babonić family were merged, the land under the jurisdiction of Želin was stretching in the eastern and southern part of the region. Besides this, a considerable amount of land, mostly in the northern part of Turopolje, along with the southern banks of the Sava River, was a property of the Chapter of Zagreb. Therefore, practically what remains is the area of the western and central part of Turopolje. The focus of this chapter will be the analysis of the settlement system of this area in the medieval period.

Perhaps the best starting point for this analysis would be to look at the charters issued by King Ferdinand in 1560. With these documents he confirmed the nobles of Turopolje their ownership of the following estates: Kobilić (*Kobvlych*), Kurilovec also called Vrbanec (*Korylowcz alias Wrbanecz*), Zobachlaz, Rakarje (*Rakarya*), Ilovnjak (*Ilowenyak*), Pleso (*Plezzo*), Velika Gorica (*Nagh Gorycza*), Mala Gorica (*Kys Gorycza*), Donja Lomnica (*Also Lompnycza*), Gornja Lomnica (*Felsew Lompnycza*), Mali Obrež (*Kys Obres*), Kostanjevec (*Kozthanyewecz*), Donji Lukavec (*Also Lwkawecz*), Gornji Lukavec (*Felsew Lwkawecz*), Lužje (*Lose*), Hrašće (*Hraschya*), Velika Mlaka (*Nagh Mlaka*), Kuče (*Koche*), Rakitovec (*Rakythowcz*), Buševac (*Bwssewcz*), Lazi (*Lazy*), Mraclin (*Mraczyn*), Kušanec (*Kwssanz*), Trnovec (*Thernowcz*), Ratkov vrh (*Rathkowwerh*), Vojnošec (*Woynoszcz*), Jarebić (*Iarebychy*), Cvilkovo (*Czwyłkovo*), Vukomerić (*Wokomerych*), Bukovčak (*Bwkowschyak*), Dragožec (*Dragonoszcz*), Dubranec (*Dobranecz Zenthkathalyn*), Gustelnica (*Gozthylnycza*), Prvonožec (*Perwonoszczy*), Rodmanec (*Rodmanecz*) and Lekenik (*Lekenyk*). Along with the listed estates, he confirmed the nobles their ownership of the agricultural lands Delnice and Zamlaće, situated within the borders of Kurilovec (*Delnyczeet Zamlathye vocatis, intra metas dictae possessionis Korylowcz*).⁵⁷⁴ The location of all the estates/villages is shown on the Map 38.

⁵⁷⁴ MHNC 3, docs. 282 and 283., pp. 315-317.



Map 38-Villages of the nobles of Turopolje in 1560

Thus, at the beginning of the early modern period, the area of these 36 villages was the territory of the noble community of Turopolje. Most of them still exist today. Several of them, on the other hand, disappeared over time or were merged with some other villages, but they can be located. The analysis that will be done in the following lines will focus on a context in which a certain village came into existence or disappeared (in case of villages that do not exist today). As said, up to a point it is possible to connect the data about the emergence of villages with data about a territory inhabited by members of a certain kindred. Following this logic, as well as the geographical location of the villages in the present-day environment, I have geographically divided them into three groups: the villages in the northern part of Turopolje, the villages in the southwestern part and villages in the southeastern part. The villages that surround the site of Šepkovčica partly belong to the group in the northern part and partly to the group in the southwestern part, so these two parts will be the focus of a detailed analysis. The data about Mraclin, one of the villages that belonged to the group in the southeastern part, have already been analysed, while data concerning the other villages situated in this side of Turopolje will be mentioned when necessary for the analysis, but will not be analysed separately.

Data in the extant charters are not equally abundant for all three parts. The largest number of information can be extracted for the area in the southwestern part, so that will be the starting point of the analysis.

5.2.1. Villages of castle warriors in the southwestern part of Turopolje

5.2.1.1. Kindreds

In order to define the borders of the territory of the southwestern part of Turopolje, first I will try to define the borders of territories owned by certain kindreds in this area. For now, the southwestern part of Turopolje refers to the area south of the Lomnica River and west of Kravarsko (the estate of the Čičan preceptory, that is, of the Želin castle). The first kindreds that can be identified in the extant sources owning the land in the area in the middle of the thirteenth century are the kindred of Andrew, the kindred of Kračun (*Crachun*), the kindred of Vukota (*Vukota*) and the kindred of Iunosa. Due to quarrels over land occurring among them, there are few extant charters in which borders of their territories are recorded. None of these charters contains a perambulation of a whole land owned by certain kindred, but only a side of a border that was a reason of dispute. Still, through combining data from different charters with toponyms and maps general borders of the area possessed by one kindred can be recognized. Along with that, names of individuals that can be identified as being members of certain kindred will be written down as these will be important for the further discussion about the development of villages.

5.2.1.1.1. *Terra Mosocha / Borders between the kindred of Vukota and the kindred of Lomnica*

In 1242, the Chapter of Zagreb issued a charter which stated that Andrew and his whole kindred (*Andreas cum tota generatione sua*) as well as Iunosa came to their presence because of a dispute they had over a land called *Mosocha* (*terra Mosocha*). Andrew and his kindred tried to claim the right on this land or were attacking it although the land had belonged to Iunosa and his kindred. This was not explicitly written but can be assumed because, in front of the Chapter, Andrew made a promise that he will leave the land to Iunosa and his kindred (*Iunosa et tota generatione sua*) to own it in peace.⁵⁷⁵ The borders of the land were recorded, but they are not easily recognizable on the Military surveys or contemporary maps. There is, however, one extant charter from 1373 (thus, issued 131 years after the above mentioned one), that can help to locate the borders in the present-day environment. The 1373 charter was also issued by the Chapter of Zagreb on the request of castle warriors of the Field of Zagreb (*nobiles iobagiones castri de Campo Zagradiensi*) who came to them. These were Giles son of Stephan, Ivank son of Ivan and Stane son of Farkaš of the kindred of Lomnica (*de generatione*

⁵⁷⁵ MHNC 1, doc.4., pp.6-7.

Lompnycha) and Vid son of Andrew, George son of Petk, Stephan son of Vukomer, Duch son of Pauk and Peter son of Crikša son of Chernezlau of the kindred of Vukota (*de generatione Vukota*). The present stated that a fight concerning the borders occurred between them but because of the brotherly love they wanted to settle it peacefully. The Chapter sent his envoy magister John brother of Paul *cantor* who did the perambulation on the field according to the borders recorded in some register (*in quodam registro apportauit*).⁵⁷⁶ These borders are the same as the ones from 1242, although some landmarks partly changed in the version from 1373. Likewise, this version is more detailed than the younger one. Obviously, these borders were renewed and recorded on more occasions in the period of 131 years. Still, the border remained constant which shows that the territory of kindred (that is, an awareness about it) did not break up by the last quarter of the fourteenth century. This does not mean that there were no changes and reorganization inside of the borders; that will be seen through the analysis of the emergence of villages.

5.2.1.1.1.1. Spatial data

First, the spatial data from the charters will be analysed and placed on the map. The data from both perambulations are written in Plate 7. Where necessary, an explanation is written in the right column. Some things that should be discussed in more detail are explained in the text below the plate.


Plate 7-Borders of terra Mosocha from 1242 and borders between the kindreds of Vukota and Lomnica from 1373

No.	Terra Mosocha, 1242.	Boundaries between kindred of Vukota and kindred of Lomnica, 1373	Explanation
1.	The boundary starts at <i>Lipownaguel</i> , and from there comes to	The boundary starts at the place (<i>locus</i>) where the course of the Lipnica River pours into the Lomnica River (<i>rivulus seu meatus aque Lipnycha cadit in fluium Lomnycha</i>), through the Lipnica it goes towards the west for a long distance, up to a tree <i>pomes silvestris</i> signed with a cross, and there exits on the left and turning a little bit towards the south comes to an oak tree signed with a cross, from there it goes directly to a briar brush of lime tree and goes directly to	From the 1373 charter is clear that the border starts at the Lomnica River, but the exact place where the course of the Lipnica was flowing into the Lomnica cannot be identified with certainty. The river might have changed the course slightly. I suppose it was the one west of Gornja Lomnica, where the Lipnica was flowing into the Lomnica before the building of the Lomnica-Odra chanal. Today this is also the western most point of the boundary of Gornja Lomnica.

⁵⁷⁶ MHNC 1, doc. 89, pp. 91-93.

	some river called Lukavec (<i>quondam fluium nomine Loguauech</i>),	Lukavec (<i>Locauech</i>), where in the bank of the Lukevec is an earthen boundary and going through a course of Lukavec for a smaller distance	The border went partly through the Lukavec stream, but it is not clear where it entered into it and left it.
	from there exits and comes to an holm oak tree in which is a cross, from there comes to	exits at an oak tree and on the bank is a circled earthen boundary, from there constantly goes directly on the south and comes to	The important part here is that, after leaving the Lukavec, the border goes constantly to the south.
	the boundary (<i>meta</i>) called <i>dobowgurni</i> , from there	the boundary (<i>meta</i>) called <i>dobouvgerm</i> and	This was some wood; <i>dobov grm</i> likely comes from <i>dob</i> , which is a folk name for a common oak (<i>quercus robur</i>), <i>gurni</i> and <i>germ</i> is <i>grm</i> , a bush.
2.	goes through the boundary (<i>meta</i>) called <i>Litiwech</i> towards the south and here, on the right side, is land owned by Andrew (<i>in dominium Endrey</i>) and on the left of Iunosa (<i>sinistra vero Iunosa permanet</i>),	it goes to the south through some wood called Lichuich (<i>quondam silvam que vocatur Lichuich</i>) through some course called Mochar (<i>quondam meatum Mochar</i>), and in his spring is an oak signed with a cross next to big road (<i>magna via</i>),	The waterflow and valley called Močar that were in the wood called <i>Lichuich</i> were probably placed in the area south of the village Lukavec, where on the First military survey one can find a swamp called Mokrice and MOR KRIK as well as toponyms Močkar and Mokrice on a modern map. Mocsár in Hungarian means swamp or marsh. Etymologically it comes from the southern Slavic močar.
	by this road it goes to the boundary (<i>meta</i>) called <i>ternowgurni</i> , from here goes by the road and comes to another old road (<i>vetera via</i>) towards the south through the earthen boundaries, and comes to the spring of some well (<i>caput putei</i>),	by this road it goes to a thorn bush which is signed as a boundary and from there it proceeds to the south, comes to the spring of some well (<i>caput putei</i>),	<i>Ternowgurm</i> is a thorn bush, so this boundary is also the same in both charters as well as is the spring of the well. None of these boundaries can be located (including the roads).
3.	from there through a swamp comes to some big road (<i>ad magnam viam</i>) where is the earthen boundary,	from there it comes to some stream (<i>riuluus</i>), and going to the south opposite of its course, it exits at same valley called Močar (<i>ad vallem Mochar</i>), and by it ascends all the way to an oak tree signed as a boundary that is near some road (<i>iuxta viam</i>),	Toponyms Močkar and Mokrice (see above).
	through the big road it goes towards the south and in this big road the land of Iunosa stays on the east and the land of Andrew on the west	through the road it goes for a longer while to the south and comes to an oak tree signed with a cross,	
4.	from there, going through the big road, comes in a small valley and there ascends a small hill, where is the boundary near an apple tree,	from there it turns towards the east on the side of a hill (<i>per latus cuiusdam montis</i>) up to some big road (<i>magna via</i>), next to which is circled and cross-signed oak tree	This is the first place where the border turns to the east.
	from there through this small hill comes to	then it descends by some water course (<i>meatum</i>) to	

	the River called Suhamozoča (Suchamosocha), from there going towards the south comes to the tree called <i>bugueu</i> and from there to a sorb tree	the Dolboki River (<i>fluuium Dolboki</i>), and going through it, opposite of its course comes to its spring,	After this, at one point the border comes to some small hill and going through it, comes to the river Suhamozoča in 1242 and in the Dolboki in 1373. None of them can be found on the Military surveys or modern maps, at least, not by this name. But, Suhamosoča points at the stream Mostičajna; suha means drie. I think it is not the stream but either one of its tributaries (that were dray at least in some periods of the year) or some earlier, abandoned river course. In any case, probably it was somewhere in the area of the Mostičajna river. I suppose that the name Dolboki, means Duboki, deep. Perhaps that is the stream Peščanjak or Sopotnjak. The border went opposite of its course to its spring. As can be seen on the map there are more courses and all of them spring on the southern side.
	from there comes to the road called Iamnica (<i>via Iamnicha</i>) and that way through the boundaries (<i>per metas</i>)	here exits to the road called Iamnica (<i>via Iamnica</i>) and by this road it goes towards the east up to some oak tree circled as a boundary that is in the plain	<i>Via Iamnica</i> is the road that leads to Iamnica, one of the estates of the Hospitallers situated west of Turopolje. The exact position of this road is unknown, but it was oriented W-E, and, at this part, it goes through the plain.
		from here trough small valley comes to some stream (<i>riuulus</i>) and crosses it and ascends trough a valley	
5.	it comes to some big road called Gorski (<i>magna via nomine Gorsqui</i>), and there finishes next to the land of Kračun (<i>iuxta terram Crachoni</i>).	and it comes to the road called Gorski put (<i>Gorzki pot</i>) and there shares the border with the Kravarsko estate (<i>terra Krauarzka</i>).	<i>Via Gorski</i> is the road that leads to Gora, so it is oriented north-south. The road that can be seen on a modern map, that is the last point of the border, can also be seen on all three military surveys and it does lead to Gora. I think this be the road mentioned in the charters.



Map 39-The 1242 and 1373 borders

Data analysed in the Plate 7 are shown on Map 39. The first thing that can be easily noticed on the map is that the area of the present-day villages Donja and Gornja Lomnica is situated on the right side of the border; in 1242 this was the territory of Iunossa and his kindred and in 1373 the territory of the kindred of Lomnica. Except that, a part of the village Lukavec is also situated on the right side of the border. The exact position of this part of the border cannot be established with certainty. Still, there are several facts that point that the territory of the settlement Donji Lukavec (which, as will be shown, is the eastern part of the present-day Lukavec) belonged, at least partly, to the kindred of Iunossa in 1242 and the kindred of Lomnica in 1373. First, the toponyms Močkar and Mokrice show where the border passed. Second, the present-day border between Lukavec and Donja Lomnica is the Mostičajna stream. The stream is frequently mentioned in medieval charters and if it had been the border in this case it would certainly be mentioned. Third, on modern maps there is a toponym Lomnička dubrava (dubrava means wood, so the wood of Lomnica). This toponym appears both on the side of the border of Donja Lomnica and of Lukavec. I am emphasizing this because it will be important for the discussion about the development of the village Donji Lukavec and the origin of the kindred of Levča (see pages 292-300).

Along with that, on the right side of the border is the village Gudci. This toponym is not recorded in the extant medieval sources and it will not be included in the further analysis. Finally, there were two other medieval villages in this territory, Kostanjevec and Šiljakovina, more about which will be written in the further text.

5.2.1.1.1.2. *Iunosa, Kračun and Andrew*

The 1242 perambulation depicted the western and southern borders of the territory of Iunosa and his kindred (which is not specifically named) while the 1373 perambulation depicted the same borders as the borders of the kindred of Lomnica. This could mean that the two are the same kindred, that is, that Iunosa was the first known member of the kindred of Lomnica. It could also mean the land of Iunosa and his kindred was occupied by some other kindred sometime between 1242 and 1373 and this new kindred defined themselves by the village Lomnica, *de Lomnica*. In order to clarify these questions, other data from the period between 1242 and 1373 should be looked at. So, for now, I will leave the question about the kindred of Lomnica aside.

Besides the western and southern borders of Iunosa and his kindred, the 1242 charter contain information about the lands of Kračun and Andrew. The land of Andrew was situated west of the land of Iunosa, in the territory of Lukavec. The land of Kračun was situated in the southeastern part of the border, near Kravarsko (see Map 39). One additional charter confirms that Kračun had land in this area. This is the charter with the perambulation of Kravarsko, the estate of the Hospitallers, from the time of King Andrew II. According to it: “The border [of Kravarsko] begins on the west from the water Buna (*ad aquam Bwna*) sharing the border with *terra Craion*”. I suppose *terra Craion* was situated somewhere in the area of villages of Ključić brdo or Kozjača. At this state of research, however, I have not defined who Kračun was. As was explained for the family of Gurk, at the beginning of this chapter, in order to understand their genealogy and to locate their estates, the broader picture should be looked at. The same is with Kračun and his kindred. Juraj Ćuk connects Kračun, who owned the land in Turopolje, with the kindred of Kračun, the first known *comes* of Varaždin. This Kračun was a close associate of King Andrew II but committed some treason against the king. For that reason, the king deprived him of the land of St. Martin and gave it to the Templars.⁵⁷⁷ It could be that two men were of the same kindred. Although Ćuk’s statements should be questioned and checked, he was a very good connoisseur of both the earliest charters and toponyms of the area of Northern Croatia and many of his thesis proved to be correct.

In any case, while the spreading of lands of Kračun and his kindred in the wider area of Zagreb County should be analysed separately, few extant data that concern Turopolje will be mentioned. Besides the land next to Kravarsko, Kračun son of Vuk had some land in the area of Mala Mlaka, on the northern bank of the Lomnica River.⁵⁷⁸ Except for the quarrels with the kindred of Andrew, a consequence of which was that Andrew swore in front of the Chapter of Zagreb that he will leave Iunosa and his kindred alone, Iunosa had problems with Kračun. Thus, judging by these few extant charters from the first half of the thirteenth century, it seems that both Kračun and Andrew were showing pretensions on the land of Iunosa and his kindred.


Actually, in 1234, Kračun occupied Iunosa’s estate/land Mostičajna (*terra Mosochana*). The case went to court. Keled, vice-Ban and *comes* of Zagreb, adjudicated the land back to Iunosa. The similarity of the names of *terra Mosocha* from 1242 and *terra Mosochana* is obvious. They are probably both derived from the name of the stream Mostičajna (or the stream

⁵⁷⁷ Ćuk, Zagrebačka županija.

⁵⁷⁸ Kračun’s father Vuk was mentioned owning this land in 1228, MHNC 1, doc. 2., p. 5.

was named after the estate Mostičajna). It is hard to locate *terra Mosochana* precisely in the present-day environment, probably it was a smaller portion of *terra Mosocha*.

The text of the perambulation was the following: “The boundary begins from the water Mostičajna (*aqua Mosochana*) and, on its bank, apple and horn bean trees are the boundary, from there it goes towards the south through the road called *borchi* (*via borchi*), from there to an oak tree where is an earthen boundary, from there to an alder tree, from there it ascends a hill where is an earthen boundary, from there it goes to an oak tree, from there it turns towards the west bordering with the land of *comes Peter* (*terra comes Peter*), from there it descends through the valley called *Iazinne* to the water Mostičajna, and from there, going through this stream, comes to the first boundary.”⁵⁷⁹



Map 40-Terra Mosocha

The description is short, and it is hard to estimate how big the land was. Obviously, the land was partly placed along with the Mostičajna stream (the boundary returns to the first boundary by its flow) and west of it was the land of *comes Peter*. The last data can be connected with the data from the 1242 charter; this land could have been placed somewhere in the territory

⁵⁷⁹ MHNC 1, doc. 4, p. 7.

of Lukavec as shown on Map 40. This brings to the last topic of this chapter, which is defining the territory of the kindred of Andrew.

According to the 1242 charter, the land of Andrew (*terra Endre, in dominium Endrei*⁵⁸⁰) was located on the western side of *meta Litiwech* and on the western side of the big road. After the point where the boundary comes to one small valley on the south and from there ascends the hill, Andrew's land is no more mentioned as the neighbouring land of the territory of the kindred of Iunosa. On the other hand, the land placed along with the western border of the land Mostičajna in 1234 was of *comes Peter*. Thus, it can be concluded that the territory west of the border recorded in 1242 belonged to the family mentioned in the introductory part of this chapter, the descendants of Gurk. In 1234, it was owned by his son *comes Peter* and, in 1242, by his grandson *comes Andrew*.

In this way, the extant data allowed defining the areas of three kindreds in the period up to 1242; the land of the kindred of Iunosa was in the central part of the analysed area, the land of the kindred of Kračun was in the eastern part and the land of the kindred of Andrew on the western part. This situation, however, changed soon.

In the 1373 charter, there is no mentioning of land of any kindred or family in the area once possessed by Andrew and Kračun. The explanation why this is so can be found in the fact that the border from 1373 was made between the kindred of Lomnica and the kindred of Vukota. The last ones were owning the land on the opposite side of the border, where a hundred years earlier were the lands of Andrew and Kračun. In the following text, it will be shown how this change happened.

5.2.1.1.2. *Borders between Miroslav and the sons of Andrew and Vukota and his kindred*

The career of *comes Andrew* must have been at its peak in 1242 when King Bela IV awarded him for his help in the defence of the kingdom during the Mongol invasion. As shown, Andrew tried to expand his estates in Turopolje by occupying the land of other kindred, which he did not succeed. Soon after that, Andrew died. At the time of his death, his four sons, Lukač, Vid, Matthew and Peter were children. Consequently, the power of the family was weakened. The castle warriors of Turopolje used this situation and tried to expand their estates on the land

⁵⁸⁰ MHNC 1, doc. 4, p. 7.

of late Andrew.⁵⁸¹ In this context, the charter from 1256, that will be presented in the following lines, should be analysed.

Ban Stephan send Levča, brother of Budina, to determine the borders between hereditary lands of Andrew's sons and their cousin Miroslav and representatives of one kindred. It should be noted here that Miroslav and the sons of Andrew were not referred to as being a kindred or representatives of a kindred. As this family was not a part of the noble community, I will not discuss here if this data meant the transition from a kindred to a family etc. Still, I wanted to point it out because it could be important for the systematic study that should be done about this family.

The above-mentioned kindred was not defined by any specific name. Only the names of the people who represented *tota generacio eorum* were recorded. These were: Vukota (*Volcuta*) son of Iurgis, Dragoš son of Zdeslay and his brothers, the sons of Vratiša, Volčila, son of Volcumi, Dedomer son of Vukša, Chaduna son of Raduan and Raduhna son of Radomer.

5.2.1.1.2.1. Spatial data

The border determined by *pristaldus* Levča was very long. It was stretching from the Kravarščica stream on the south to the area north of the Lomnica River. Its length was approximately 27 kilometres. The perambulation is written, divided into segments, in the central column of Plate 8. Explanations of certain parts of it that can be placed in the present-day environment are written in the right column, while parts that require further explanation are explained in the text below the plate. Numbers in the left column show where a certain boundary is identified on the contemporary map.

Plate 8-The 1256 borders between Vukota and his kindred and the sons of Andrew and comes Miroslav

No	Data from 1256 charter	Interpretation
1	The boundary begins at the stream Kravarščica (<i>de Croarzka</i>), and goes to the stream Lučelnica (<i>in fluium Locholnycha</i>)	The confluence of the Lučalnica and the Kravarščica can easily be recognized.
2	The border flows along with Lučelnica to the place where the river Sournyak flows into the Lučelnica (<i>ubi fluius Sourouyk cadit in Locholnycha</i>), and then continues by the <i>Sourouyk</i> to its spring;	There are more tributaries of the Lučelnica on its western side, but I did not find toponym <i>Sournyak</i> ; I suppose it is the present-day stream Ratkovec, because today this stream is a western border of the villages Cersovski Vrh, Petravec and Vukomerić and all these villages belonged to the noble community.

⁵⁸¹ Klaić, *Povijest Zagreba*, pp. 37-38; Ćuk, *Zagrebačka županija*, p. 46.

	After the spring of the stream Sournayk, the border climbs to a hill where is an eastern boundary and a cross on an oak tree,	All tributaries of the Lučelnica spring in the valley, and hilly area is placed northeast of them.
	From there it descends to some pear and goes through the Lipnica River (<i>per fluuium Lipnicza</i>),	The exact place where the border enters the Lipnica River cannot be specified
	From there it goes between two vineyards to the grave of Hogye (<i>ad sepulcrum Hogye</i>) which is the boundary,	See the sub-chapter Graves (pages 258-260)
	From the grave it goes by some road called pomgno (<i>viam, que wlgo vocatur pomgno</i>) and going for a short while it declines on the right side and flows into the spring of the Lipnica,	
3.	By the Lipnica it goes downwards (<i>inferius</i>) and afterwards exit from the Lipnica on the right side,	The flow of the Lipnica stream
	From there it goes to the east and from there through crosses to a hill and there comes to some oak tree that is in the middle of a road	
4.	By this road it comes to the spring of the Lukavec and trough the Lukavec it goes opposite of the flow of the spring for a long while,	The flow of the Lukavec stream
5.	There exit at the land called Losan (<i>terra Losan</i>), and near this land Losan, the land of the sons of Andrew is on the right side and the boundaries between the land of sons of Andrew and Vukota are here divided by the Močirad	See the sub-chapter about Lužje (pages 265-266)
6.	From there it goes to the Lomnica where are the eastern boundaries	
	Through a big road (<i>magna via</i>) it goes all the way to the Globlacamaca	See the text below for explanation
	From there it goes a little bit to the eastern side and comes to the place called Curym (<i>ad locum, qui wlgo dicitur Curym</i>)	See the text below for explanation.
	From there it goes to the territory of Vukota, where Vukota and his kindred left 50 veretens of land for exchange (<i>pro concambio</i>); this 50 veretens were given to [in front of] the village of the sons of Andrew (<i>suppleuerunt eas ante villam filiorum Endre</i>).	See the text below for explanation.


On Map 41 are shown both the border drawn according to the data written in the 1256 charter and the location of the villages of the noble community in 1560. It can be easily noticed that all the villages are placed on the eastern side of the border. Thus, the division made in 1256 clearly determined the western borders of the area of the noble community of Turopolje. This also outlines the western border of the territory of the southwestern part of Turopolje. After 1256, the estates that belonged to the sons of Andrew remained outside of this border. They had separate historical development and they will not be included in the further analysis.



Map 41-The 1256 border and the villages of the nobles of Turopolje in 1560

In this context is important to explain the part of the border north of the Lomnica river. I was not able to place the landmarks written in the charter precisely in the contemporary

environment. Therefore, I have marked the border with the interrupted line (Map 42). This part of the perambulation contains some important data. According to the text, after crossing the Lomnica river (going north of the river), the border went through a big road (*magna via*) all the way to *Globlacamaca* and then turned a little bit to the east and came to the place called Curym (*ad locum, qui vlgo dicitur Curym*).⁵⁸² I did not find toponyms *Globlacamaca* and *Curym* on the military surveys or modern maps, but they appear in few other extant medieval charters.



Map 42-The northern part of the 1256 border

Globokamlaka is defined in one charter from 1427 as “a well in the middle of the village Mlaka (*puteus in medio ciusdam ville Mlaka*)”⁵⁸³ and in one charter from 1461 as a river (*fluuius*) that flows through the village Hrašće.⁵⁸⁴ Hence, this was a stream/river flowing from Mala Mlaka to Hrašće. More dried watercourses can be noticed in this area on some more detailed modern maps, but their names were not preserved as toponyms. One of the courses important for this analysis was called Odra in the middle ages. In 1331, one of the borders of the estate Čehi “came to the border of the land of the church of St. George of Odra and circling

⁵⁸² MHNC 1, doc. 9, p. 12.

⁵⁸³ MHNC 1, doc. 210, p. 207.

⁵⁸⁴ MHNC 1, doc. 335, p. 412.

around this estate flowed into the *aqua Odra* and from there going to the south it crossed the Lomnica River”.⁵⁸⁵ Hence, Odra and Lomnica are two different watercourses and the watercourse called Odra was flowing through the village of Odra.

The place called *Curym* (*ad locum, qui vlgo dicitur Curym*) can be connected with the field called *Surina* which is mentioned in the perambulation of the estate Otok (*Insula*). In 1217, Otok belonged to Giles (the first known owner of Želin) and later to the Chapter of Zagreb.⁵⁸⁶ Along with that, a wood called *Churyna* (*silva Churina*) is mentioned as a border of the estate Čehi in 1331; the border of this estate went around the wood *Churyna* to the above-mentioned *aqua Odra*.⁵⁸⁷ Thus, the place called *Curym* was placed somewhere north of the present-day villages Mala Mlaka and Odra.

When making the borders in 1256, *pristaldus* Levča gave 50 veretens of land that Vukota and his kindred left for exchange (*quingaginta vereten illis de eorum porcione pro concambio*) to the sons of Andrew (*suppleuerunt eas ante villam filiorum Endre*).⁵⁸⁸ This land was situated somewhere around the place called *Curyn*, meaning somewhere north of Mala Mlaka and Odra. As can be seen on Map 41, there were no villages of the castle warriors in 1560 in this area.

Besides that, Levča divided their [Vukota kindred's?] hereditary land near the Odra River (*cis fluium Odra*); the part on the left side was given to the sons of Andrew and on the right side to Vukota and his kindred. If the Odra River was passing through the present-day village Odra, somewhere in this area was the new border of the sons of Andrew and Vukota and his kindred. This data explains why the villages of Mala Mlaka and Odra were not listed as a property of the noble community in 1560 – they were owned by descendants of the sons of Andrew as was the area north of it, near the place called *Curin*.

⁵⁸⁵ MHNC 1, doc. 55, p. 55.

⁵⁸⁶ CD 3, doc. 132, pp. 157-158.

⁵⁸⁷ MHNC 1, doc. 55, p. 55.

⁵⁸⁸ The sentence in the charter was the following: “[the border] *deinde vadit ad territorium Volcute, ubi Volcuta et generacio sua demiserunt quingaginta vereten illis de eorum porcione pro concambio, sed quia dimensio illa, scilicet quingaginta vereten sub villa suppleri non potuerunt, postmodum suppleuerunt eas ante villam filiorum Endre fillis Endre memoratis.*” It is not completely clear what *sub* and *ante* signify in this context. The land given in exchange in this deal was too big so it was not possible to give it "below" the village, but it was given "in front of" the village. This, therefore, probably signifies some kind of topographical information.

5.2.1.1.2.2. The “graves”

There is one interesting thing in the above-mentioned perambulation that should be singled out. Somewhere in the area of the spring of the Lipnica River the border went through the two vineyards up to the *sepulcrum Hoyge*, which was also one of the borders. This grave was placed next to the road called *Pomgno*. The name of the road means that the road went through Vukomeričke gorice; *mons Pomingo* is the earliest name of this hills recorded in the extant sources.⁵⁸⁹ I suppose that *Hoyge* is a personal name, probably written in the genitive form. However, I do not know who this person was as I have not found a person of such name in the extant charters. But, since he was obviously dead by 1256 and there are only a few charters for the period prior to the Mongol invasion that is not surprising. There is only one other charter in which a grave, called *sepulcrum Seledini*, is mentioned. It was a boundary mark, located in the vicinity of the Turopolje area. That charter was issued in 1201 by King Emeric and, among other data, it contains perambulation of *terra Odra*, an estate of the Bishop of Zagreb.⁵⁹⁰ According to the analysis of Lelja Dobronić, the grave of Seledin was placed in the area around Sisak.⁵⁹¹

The importance of these data as of potential indicators of possible archaeological sites have already been noticed by Laszowski. In a short article entitled “Six notes from the thirteenth-century charters”, published in the Journal of Archaeological Museum in Zagreb in 1900, he wrote down that these places are interesting as potential archaeological sites and that they must gain special attention (which as far as I know was not done). Along with the two cases described above, Laszowski mentioned *sepulcrae Sclavorum* as the boundary of the estate Vaška (in the Drava region) and *sepulcrum Paxa* as the border of estate Novak (near Slatina). For the *sepulcrae Sclavorum*, the Slavic graves, he was convinced that these were old Croatian graves (this does not necessarily have to be the case; it could be an earlier cemetery of any other ethnic group with some kind of signs on the graves, which made them still visible or the place where people were digging out bones for example during the agricultural works and concluded that it was the locations of some old cemetery). For the other three examples, so the graves of Hoyge, Seledin and Paxa, Laszowski wrote that the experts should interpret what they were.⁵⁹²

⁵⁸⁹ CD 9. doc. 311., p. 378.

⁵⁹⁰ CD 3, doc. 8., p. 10.

⁵⁹¹ For more detailed explanation, see: Lelja Dobronić, Topografija zemljišnih posjeda zagrebačkih biskupa prema ispravi kralja Emerika iz god. 1201. [Topography of estates of bishops of Zagreb according to King Emeric's charter from 1201], Zagreb: JAZU, 1951., p. 279.

⁵⁹² Emilij Laszowszki, “Šest bilježaka iz listina XIII. vijeka [Six notes from the thirteenth century charters]”, *Vjesnik arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 207-208.

I will also add here that I have noticed a toponym Katin grob (the grave of Kata), south of the cadastre border of Donji Lukavec on the contemporary map, but I also do not have an explanation about its meaning.

Graves that appear in perambulations of charters from medieval Hungary in the period from the eleventh to the thirteenth century have been analysed by Gyula Kristó (the author also included the above-mentioned examples from the medieval Slavonia). There are two main types of these graves: individual graves and cemeteries. For example, there are more than few cases in which graves of pagans (*sepulchra paganorum* or *paganser*, *pagansír* in Hungarian) were mentioned as a boundary mark.⁵⁹³ Some researchers were connecting these graves with the Petchenegs but the other pointed that these could also be graves of early Hungarians, Avars etc. The point was that these graves were the graves of pagans to the contemporaries. Naturally, the interpretation depends on the results of the research if the Petchenegs were present in the area or not etc. As far as the individual graves are concerned sometimes just a grave (*sepulcrum*) or a grave of some man (*sepulcrum huiusdam homini*) or girl (*sepulcrum puelle*) is mentioned. But often the graves are marked by personal name, like mentioned *sepulcrum Hoyge* and *sepulcrum Seledini*. Gyula Kristó concluded that the people by whom the graves were named must have been still known to the living so they must have died not too long before the charter where their grave was mentioned had been issued. If they had been dead for a long time before the charter was issued, their names would have been forgotten and the grave would be defined simply as *sepulcrum* or *sepulcrum huiusdam homini*. Besides that, these types of graves must have been isolated, because if they had been placed in the cemetery around the church, the church, as a more important feature, would appear as a landmark in a perambulation. In the context of the law issued around 1100 that prescribed that burials must be performed on the church ground, these burials can be considered pagan, reflecting there for traces of paganism that had survived among the Hungarians after their conversion to Christianity.⁵⁹⁴

⁵⁹³ Laszowski also mentions two more toponyms that contain the adjective *pogani* (pagan) as possible indicators of archaeological sites. One is *Poganenive*, which literary means the pagan fields, as one of the borders of the estate of Lipovac castle. He thought that it could also mean uncultivated fields, especially in the mountain regions. The other is *Pogana gostun* in a perambulation of two lands in Zagorje. For the last one, he considered that perhaps the word *gostun* could be derived from the Hungarian word *gosztány*, golden sand, so this would be the place where once the gold was washed out of the sand. The word *gosztány* which is not used anymore in contemporary Hungarian did mean what Laszowski wrote but it is questionable if the word *gostun* can be equalled with the Hungarian word.

⁵⁹⁴ Gyula Kristó, "Sírhelyek korai okleveleinkben" [Graves in early charters], *Acta Historica* LXXI. (1981), pp. 21-27.

As far as the area of Vukomeričke gorice where the grave of *Hoyge* was placed there were no church mentioned in the medieval charters in that area, so it was most likely placed on the isolated place. As it was used as a landmark, the grave must have been visible in the environment. The most recognizable and so the most suitable in this respect were *tumuli*. But, in case these graves were *tumuli*, the question is if a *tumulus* was built after a person had been buried under it or the already existing, for example, prehistoric *tumulus* was used for a secondary burial. This opinion was given by József Laszlovszky regarding the grave mentioned in the perambulation recorded in the foundation charter of the Benedictine monastery at Garamszentbenedek.⁵⁹⁵

I think that one more option should be taken into consideration. It is possible that the grave of *Hoyge* was not an actual grave. Perhaps a *tumulus* itself did exist but no one was buried there in the medieval period. Still, the well-marked feature in the remote hilly region might have inspired people to start telling stories of some heroic ancestor or some evil man buried there. These types of folk legends are well known even in the twentieth century. In any case, it can be concluded that, unless some new charters that mention a person called *Hoyge* or its grave appear not much more can be concluded based on the data we have so far. And even with new charters, the most efficient way of explaining what this actually was would be, if possible, to identify and excavate this feature.

5.2.1.1.3. *The borders of Vukota and his kindred from the second half of the thirteenth century*

If one looks at Map 43, on which both the borders of *terra Mosocha* from 1242 and the 1256 border are shown, it becomes obvious that the sons of Andrew lost part of the land once held by their father. After 1256, that land belonged to Vukota and his kindred. Obviously, the kindred used the weakness of Andrew's young sons and occupied some of their lands or perhaps returned the jurisdiction over their own lands. By the last one I mean that perhaps these lands were first held by the kindred that, at one point, was subjected to *comes* Peter (and after that his son Andrew). This could have also happened during the time of *comes* Gurk or earlier.

In any case, the western border of the land of Vukota and his kindred was defined in 1256. The southern border was the Kravarščica stream (the border with the lands of the Abbey

⁵⁹⁵ József Laszlovszky, "*Dedi eciam terra*," pp. 9-24, particularly p. 22.


of Topousko). The eastern border was the border with the estate Kravarsko. It was recorded in 1328, when the Hospitallers gave their estates to King Charles Robert.

It has already been shown that in the time of King Andrew II the border of Kravarsko was *terra Craion*, the land of Kračun. The text of the 1328 perambulation was the following: “The border starts near some road where are two earthen boundaries, above a top of some valley called *Thrystych* (*supra caput cuiusdam vallis Thrystych vocate*) where is an oak tree signed with a cross on the northern side, and descends at the Buna River from the western side, it goes towards the east sharing the boundaries with the sons of Vukota, the castle warriors and their kindred (*tenens metas cum filiis Vukota iobagionibus castri et generacionis eorundem*), and circling trough this river, always around the boundaries of the mentioned castle warriors, thence exits where the Bunica river pours into the mentioned river [Buna] near a small hills on the southern side and goes to the road called *Poy* through lines of threes signed with crosses and comes to the Lekenik stream.”⁵⁹⁶

On the basis of the text of the 1328 perambulation can be concluded that, by 1328, there were no more lands of Kračun or his kindred in the area around Kravarsko. This is also confirmed with the text of the perambulation of the border made between the kindred of Vukota and the kindred of Lomnica in 1373. In perambulation of *terra Mosocha*, in 1242 (which, as shown, was the same border as the one from 1373), the border ended at *magna via nomine Gorsqui*, next to the *terra Crachoni*. In 1373, the border ended at *Gorzki pot*, next to *terra Krauarzka*. It seems that the area of Kravarsko expanded on Kračun’s land. Perhaps part of it also became the property of the kindred of the sons of Vukota. They could have bought it, expanded on it by force, or perhaps the descendants of the kindred of Kračun were integrated into the other kindred.

Furhermore, according to the perambulation of the borders of Kravarsko from 1328, the land of the sons of Vukota and their kindred also spread to the east, up to Buševac (that is, up to the part where the border of Kravarsko turns towrads the south). In that area, in the time of King Andrew II, were the land *Booro* (unknown) and the land of *comes* Peter son of Jurk. Thus, in this area, north of the Buna River, the sons of Andrew lost some land once held by their grandfather *comes* Peter, as they did on the western part of Turopolje.

⁵⁹⁶ CD 9, doc. 316, pp. 383-385.



Map 43-Borders of kindreds in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries

One more thing can be read from this perambulation. When *pristaldus* Levča was making borders between the kindred and the sons of Andrew and *comes* Miroslav in 1256, the names of the representatives of the kindred were listed. Vukota's son of Jurgis was one of them, but the kindred itself was not defined by any specific name. In 1328, the border of Kravarsko *tenens metas cum filiis Vukota iobagionibus castri et generacionis eorundem*.⁵⁹⁷ So, again the kindred is not named but the sons of Vukota were recorded as the ones by whom the kindred is recognizable. This shows their father had a significant role in the kindred. By 1373, the kindred was be called *generacio de Vukota*.⁵⁹⁸

Finally, the northern border of the kindred of Vukota was defined in 1373 when the perambulation between them and the kindred of Lomnica was done. As shown this charter was the same as the charter that contained perambulation of kindred of Iunosa in 1242. This situation is complex. Before discussing it the data about the first inhabitants of the certain villages must be looked at.

⁵⁹⁷ CD 9, doc. 316, pp. 383-385.

⁵⁹⁸ MHNC 1, doc. 89, p. 92.

5.2.1.2. Villages

5.2.1.2.1. Hrašće

The village called Hrašće Turopoljsko exists today; it is situated about one kilometre north of the old river bed of the Lomnica River. The area of this village is first mentioned in 1260 when *comes* Miroslav bought 22 vereten of the land (*terra*) from Vukota and Vlkozlou sons of Iurgis and Obrad son of Iurenk. The name of the land is not written, but, due to the perambulation, it can be placed in the territory of the present-day village of Hrašće. It is written that the land was situated between some other 22 veretens of some land in pledge and the land of Raduhna on the other side; one side of the land starts from the Odra River and through a plain goes to the land of ban (*ad terram domini bani*).⁵⁹⁹ The last one refers Želin; it was shown in the previous chapter that a part of the land under the jurisdiction of the Želin castle was in the territory of Hrašće. In 1387, King Sigismund had separated this land from the Želin estate and gave it to the burgers of Gradec. Along with the above-mentioned land, at one point Vukota also gave in pledge some other part of his land (*partuculam terre sue*) fourteen veretens big, located next to *terra Harastya* to Miroslav for four marks. He was supposed to redeem it by the fest of St. Martin, that is, by the 25th of April 1265. But, probably he was not able to do that because on that day he stated in front of *comes* of Zagreb Martin that he gives the land to Miroslav and his successors. Vukota's cousins, George, Cheuetk and Michael, sons of Descyn also agreed with this.⁶⁰⁰ Both of these documents were confirmed by Ban Roland on the 25th of November 1265.⁶⁰¹

The identification of the people mentioned-above is clear. Vukota, son of Iurgis, is the man after whom the kindred of Vukota was named. There was also his brother Vlkozlao, son of Iurgis and their cousin Obrad son of Iurenk. In 126, the brothers of the sellers Sylbunk and Stephan were also present. The term used is *frater*, it can signify both a brother and a close cousin. The other cousins (*proximi*) George, Cheuetk and Michael, sons of Descyn agreed with this transaction. Raduna, whose land was mentioned in perambulation as one of the bordering lands in 1260, is Raduhna son of Radomer, mentioned in 1256. So, all these people holding a land in the territory of Hrašće were of the Vukota kindred. Part of this land was bought by Miroslav of the family of *comes* Gurko.

⁵⁹⁹ MHNC 1, doc. 13, p. 17.

⁶⁰⁰ MHNC 1, doc. 17, pp. 19-20.

⁶⁰¹ MHNC 1, doc. 18, p. 20.

Hrašće is next time mentioned in 1327 as *possessio Hrastha*, a property of a priest Denis (*Dyonisius clericus*). He got a part of the estate, as a reward for his services, from the Chapter of Zagreb. Thus, the Chapter also possessed some land in the area of Hrašće in the thirteenth century. The other part Denis bought himself. In 1327 he gave a part of his estate to lady Srebrna, a widow of Matthias son of Radus from the Field (*de Campo*) and her sons Guren and Matthew. They gave him the estate Petrovac located beneath Medvedgrad. Four years later, in 1331, Denis sold the other part of his land called Hrašće (*particula possessionis sua Hrascha vocatam*) to the castle warriors Petko son of Vidomer son of Chaduna and Stephan son of Mark son of Badoztech. The land was situated between the Odra and the Globoka in length and between the lands of the Želin castle and Petko and his kindred in width.⁶⁰² Petko's grandfather Chaduna was mentioned as a member of the same kindred as Vukota in 1256.

To summarize, according to the earliest sources referring to the territory of the present-day village Hrašće Turopoljsko, the land in this area was owned by three different types of owners: the members of the Vukota kindred, the Ban (part of the Želin estate) and the Chapter of Zagreb. The part that the Chapter held was first given to priest Denis who later sold it to the castle warriors. Vukota and his kinsmen sold or gave some parts of their lands to *comes* Miroslav. The descendants of his family hold that land also in the fourteenth and fifteenth century. Both of these parts as the one under the jurisdiction of Želin were not the property of the nobles of Turopolje. But, the castle warriors also owned one part of the land in the village; in 1560 Hrašće was listed as a village of the Noble community of Turopolje.


5.2.1.2.2. Lužje

The village Lužje does not exist anymore, but its position can be placed in the present-day environment. Lužje was first mentioned as *terra Losan* in 1256 when the division of the borders between Vukota and his kindred and Miroslav and the sons of Andrew was done. The part of perambulation that mentions it is the following: "... and between the Lipnica and the Lomnica is the land called Losan (*terra nomine Losan*), which [unreadable]... and its kindred, in which nor the sons of Andrew nor Miroslav ... [unreadable] ... and near this land Losan is the land of sons of Andrew on the right side and boundaries between sons of Andrew and Vukota, at that place they are divided by the Močirad, from there then by the Lomnica where are earthen boundaries, through a big road (*magna via*), the boundary goes all the way to *Globlacamaca*

⁶⁰² MHNC 1, doc. 47, p. 48.

(...).⁶⁰³ Although at some places the text of the charter was destroyed, it can be concluded from the preserved part that the land Lužje belonged to Vukota and his kinsmen.

Thus, *terra Losan*, that is, the village of Lužje, was situated on the southern bank of the Lomnica River, in the territory of the present-day village of Odra. The toponym of such name can be found on the Military survey as well as on the 1861 cadastre map (Map 44). Laszowski wrote down that, at his time, in that place was a wood called Lužje.⁶⁰⁴



Map 44-Toponym Lužje on the 1861 cadastre map

Over time, more and more families living in Lužje are mentioned in the extant sources. In 1487, one of them is marked as *de Lusan Superior*,⁶⁰⁵ which testifies of the division of the territory of one village into two units, the Upper and (probably) Lower Lužje. But, this was not as permanent division as in the case of Lomnica, Gorica and Lukavec; in 1560 the village is still called simply Lužje. This is probably due to the fact that the territory of Lužje was significantly smaller than the one of the mentioned villages and two “proper” villages did not develop out of it. Again, over time, the number of inhabitants of Lužje was decreasing; by 1792 there were no noble families living there and by 1782 there was one peasant house and one pothouse that was in bad condition.⁶⁰⁶ The First military survey shows just one Maierhof in the

⁶⁰³ MHNC 1, doc. 9, p. 12.

⁶⁰⁴ Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 362.

⁶⁰⁵ MHNC 1, doc. 41, p. 47.

⁶⁰⁶ Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 364.

area of Lužje, while on the Second military survey the area of this village is depicted as being overgrown with the wood.

5.2.1.2.3. *Donja and Gornja Lomnica, Mali Obrež and Kostanjevec*

The earliest data about four villages, Donja and Gornja Lomnica, Mali Obrež and Kostanjevec will be analysed together because the earliest charters that inform about the area and the first inhabitants of these villages appear in similar context. Except that, while the villages of Gornja and Donja Lomnica exist today, Mali Obrež and Kostanjevec do not, but, as will be shown, the whole territory of the medieval village of Mali Obrež, as well as a part of the territory of Kostanjevec, are situated within the present-day cadastre borders of Donja Lomnica. An explanation of why this is so can be found in the medieval charters. Therefore, first, the earliest charters that concern the history of the villages will be analysed and the location of the estates mentioned in them will be shown on a modern map.


In 1276, Stephan and Blaise, sons of Wlcona bought from Turcha and Churnoglau, sons of Stojan and their relative Vukša, son of Marosk ten veretens of their hereditary lands called Obrež (*decem dimensiones terrarum eorum hereditariarum wereten wlgo dictas Obres nuncupatas*).⁶⁰⁷ Three years later, in 1279, the same Stephan and Blaise, sons of Wlcona, castle warriors of the Field from Lomnica (*iobagiones Campi de Lomnicha*) together with their third brother Mark (also a castle warrior from Lomnica) bought from Paul son of Opor a part of Paul's hereditary land Topolovec (*pariculam terre sue hereditarie Topolovech vocate*).⁶⁰⁸ Besides the part of Topolovec, Paul son of Opor, with the assistance of his brother Dazlau, sold a part of his land situated in the estate Kostanjevec (*quondam terram porcionem videlicet sibi in terra Coztaneuch vocate*). The buyer was Paul, son of Vid. Both the buyer and the seller were the castle warriors of Field of Zagreb (*iobagiones campi Zagradiensis*). This purchase also took place in 1279.

All three charters mentioned above contain perambulations of lands that were the object of sale. As they are next to each other, in order to show the content of perambulations more clearly, first the perambulations will be analysed, and these estates will be placed on a modern map.

⁶⁰⁷ MHNC 1, doc.27, pp. 29-30.

⁶⁰⁸ MHNC 1, doc.31, pp. 35-36.

5.2.1.2.3.1. Location of Obrež



Map 45-Obrež and Topolovec

The part of the land Obrež sold in 1276 was situated next to the land of Stephan son of Wlkona (*iuxta terram eiusdem Stephani*), one of the buyers. The borders were the following: “The first border begins on the south next to the water Mostičajna (*aqua Mosucha*) and stretches to Obrež (*ad Obres*), and from there proceeds and turns to the road that goes to the church of St. Peter, and on the right side remains the above-mentioned sellers [the land of the above mentioned sellers], and moving by this road comes to the boundaries of the above-mentioned Tolyas [Tolyas was one of the people who were present during the sale], and at that place shares the border with the hereditary lands of above-mentioned Stephan and finishes.”⁶⁰⁹

The toponym Obrež, next to the Mostičajna stream, is visible on the 1861 cadastre map. The church of St. Peter was on its right side. Thus, it is clear from this perambulation that Obrež was situated in the southern part of the present-day Donja Lomnica (Map 45).

⁶⁰⁹ MHNC 1, doc.27, pp. 29-30.

5.3.1.2.3.2. *Location of Topolovec*

Some of the landmarks recorded in the above-mentioned perambulation of lands in Obrež can also be found in the perambulation of a part of the land Topolovec sold in 1279. This land was situated between two “waters” Lomnica and Černec (*inter duas aquas Lomnicha et Chernech nominatas*). The stream Černec appeared as a landmark in some other charters that contain perambulations of lands in this area. There is no stream of such name on the military surveys or the contemporary maps, but there are more watercourses flowing in this area south of the Lomnica River and parallel with it. So, probably this watercourse has a different name today.

The borders of a part of the land Topolovec were the following: “The border starts on the west, on the place where is a willow tree near the water Lomnica (*aqua Lompnicha*), and by this river goes to the east to a land of Paul’s brother Dazlay, son of Opor, from there stretches to the south, up to the public road (*via publica*) that goes to the church of St. Peter, and passes some stream (the charter uses the term *potok* in Croatian) called *Mozoch*, and by that road goes to the water Černec (*aqua Chernech*), and from there goes to the west up to the land of Tolias, there it turns around an oak tree that was circled and marked with a cross and, progressing, comes to the mentioned water Lomnica, to the first boundary and there finishes.”⁶¹⁰ The same borders as the ones of Obrež are: the public road (*via publica*) that goes to the church of St. Peter, the Mostičajna stream and the land of Tolias. Tolias was again present during this sale, this time as a neighbour. Besides him, there was also Paul’s brother Dazlau. The land Topolovec was situated north of Obrež and south of the Lomnica River. There is a toponym Topolovec on the 1861 cadastre map as well as on the present-day map. The location is shown on Map 45.

5.3.1.2.3.3. *Location of Kostanjevec*

The third estate, Kostanjevec, was situated south of Topolovec and Obrež. The toponym Kostanjevec can be found on present-day maps, placed along with the southern present-day cadastre border of Donja Lomnica. The land sold in 1279 was, however, significantly larger than the area covered by the present-day toponym. As this perambulation is long, its text is divided by segments in Plate 9. In the left column are numbers that are also marked on Map 46, and in the right column are explanations.

⁶¹⁰ MHNC 1, doc. 31, pp. 35-36.


Plate 9-The 1279 perambulation of Kostanjevec

NO	Land in Kostanjevec 1279	Interpretation
1	The boundary begins on the west from the water Mostičajna (<i>aqua Moz[ucha]na</i>), from a willow tree under which is an earthen boundary,	The position of the Mostičajna stream is known, but the exact place where the boundary begins cannot be specified (in N-S direction). Since from the Mostičajna it goes towards the east, sharing the border with the nobles of Lomnica, I suppose it passed south of the area indicated by the toponym Lomnička Dubrava, the wood of Lomnica. For a while the boundary goes towards the east, bordering with the nobles of Lomnica. The exact place where the border of Lomnica finished also cannot be determined.
	From there it proceeds towards the east near the land of the nobles of the Field of Lomnica (<i>terra nobilium campi de Lumnicha</i>) and comes to an oak tree signed with a cross under which is an earthen boundary,	
	From there proceeds towards the east and going through trees signed with crosses comes to one oak tree signed with a cross under which is an earthen boundary,	
	From there proceeds to trees signed with crosses and passing through one swamp called Mlaka (<i>palus Mlaka</i>) comes to one circled willow tree which is the boundary and there finishes the vicinity of the nobles of the field of Lomnica,	
2	From there it goes through some roads towards the east near the land (<i>terra</i>) of Puruos and Radus, sons of Vrban for which they stated that they had bought it from Paul son of Opor, and comes to an oak tree signed with a cross under which is the boundary and proceeding by this road comes to an oak tree signed with a cross under which is the boundary and here finishes with sharing the border with the land of Puruos and Radus, sons of Vrban,	The border still continues towards the east, next to the land of Puruos and Radus, sons of Vrban that they bought from Paul, son of Opor. So, this land is east of the land of Lomnica, probably somewhere at the area south of Petrovina. But, the exact place where it finishes and where it starts cannot be specified.
3	From there it turns to the south and by some road called Clopcha (<i>via Clopcha vocata</i>) it goes towards the south near the land of Dazlay (<i>terra Dazlay</i>), from there it turns a bit to the left and goes still towards the south through some old road (<i>antiqua via</i>) through trees signed with crosses and comes to the water Ramiščak (<i>aqua nomine Hrameznik</i>) where is an earthen boundary under an oak-tree	When the border with the land of sons of Vrban stops, the border of the land Kostanjevec turns to the south. The next point that can be recognized on the map is the stream Ramiščak. By this stream, it goes to the south for a long while. From the point where the border turned to the south and all the way that it flows along with the stream Kostanjevec it borders with the land of Dazlay. Dazly is brother of Paul, son of Opor. So, his land was placed in the area of Petrovina and perhaps Trnovec.
3	From there by the water Ramiščak it goes towards the south for a long while near a land of already mentioned Dazlay,	
4	and comes to another water called Kostanjevec (<i>aqua nomine Coztaneuch</i>),	A stream named Kostanjevec can be found on the 1 st and 3 rd military survey, exactly in the area where today is the toponym Kostanjevec. As shown on the 3 rd survey, its flow was N-S oriented. It is visible on a present-day map that there are lots of smaller streams, tributaries of the Ravinščak and the stream Peščenjak in this area.
5	and leaving it, enters the valley called Cheridol,	The charter does not specify for how long the border flows through the stream Kostanjevec or at which point it leaves this stream. What can be read from the text is that, leaving Kostanjevec, it first enters some valley, then ascend some hill then again descends through some valley then again ascends some hill and then descends to the Buna River. Thus, between the
	From the valley it ascends one hill and comes to an earthen boundary that is near some vineyard,	
	from there it descends from this hill through the line of trees signed with crosses up to a valley called Bukoa,	
	and through this valley it ascends the hill called Peschanicha goricha where is an earthen boundary,	

		stream Kostanjevec and the Buna River, it passes two valleys and two hills. As can be seen on the map, such topography can be found in the place where the border is drawn.
6	and descending through this hill it comes to the water Buna (<i>aqua Buna</i>) and passing to it comes to some watercourse called Bunica (<i>meatum aque Bunicha</i>) and by this course Bunica (<i>aqua Bunicha</i>) ascends a hill, here are two earthen boundaries and they divide a land of the Hospitallers from the land of sons of Opor (<i>terra cruciferorum a terra filiorum Oporis</i>),	The present-day stream Šiljak is probably the water Buna mentioned in the charter. If one looks at the map this stream is the flow of the Buna; this part of the river was named Šiljak in the modern period (by the village Šiljakovina). The smaller course Bunica cannot be identified with certainty. Somewhere in this area was the border between Kravarsko and Kostanjevec.
6	and comes to a land of already-mentioned Paul son of Vid,	Obviously, the buyer Paul son of Vid already had owned some smaller portion of land in this area.
7	from there it proceeds through some road called Gorizka (<i>via Gorizka vocata</i>) and ascends a hill towards the north for a long distance and descending through the same road it lowers up to the right side and enters some small wood where is an earthen boundary,	The road called Gorski has already been mentioned in the previous text. It was a road that was heading to Gora and I think that it can be equalled with the present-day road (see the map). I suppose that the border leaves this road on the position shown on the map as this is where the road lowers up on the right side.
?	from there proceeding through trees signed with crosses comes to the <i>aqua Mossonicha</i> through which it returns to the first boundary.	The last part of the perambulation is unclear. It is not written by which direction the border returns to the first boundary. See the further explanation in the text below.

The borders recorded in this perambulation are not completely clear to me. Obviously, the estate was vast; it was stretching from the borders of Lomnica and from the river Mosečajna on the west to the Buna River and the borders of Kravarsko on the east.⁶¹¹ The part of the border drawn here is approximately 16 kilometres long. But it is not clear how the border returns to the starting point. In the last part of the perambulation is written that the border proceeds through trees and then by the watercourse *aqua Mossonicha* it returns to the first boundary. I suppose that *aqua Mossonicha* is the Mostičajna stream which was the first boundary, but it is not clear where the border enters it on the way back. It can be concluded with certainty that this estate was in the area indicated by the present-day toponym Kostanjevec and the village Šiljakovina (as can be seen on the map that part is “circled”). As far as the other parts are concerned, perhaps the land owned by the sons of Opor and sold in 1279 was just a very narrow zone. For that reason, I have put the land of Dazlau on both sides of this zone as it is not sure to which side the perambulation refers.

⁶¹¹ MHNC 1, doc. 34, p 38.



Map 46-Land in Kostanjevec in 1279

5.2.1.2.3.2. *The first owners*

After connecting data from the perambulations of parts of the estates Topolovec, Obrež and Kostanjevec with toponyms and placing these estates on the contemporary map, data about first known owners will be analysed in the following text. It will be shown whether these people can be connected with a certain kindred. It was concluded in the last chapter that the borders made in 1256 between the sons of Andrew and *comes* Miroslav on one side and Vukota and his kindred on the other side defined the western border of the area of the noble community of Turopolje.⁶¹² After this division, the estates of descendants of Gurk (that is, of his grandsons, the sons of Andrew) remained the separate units with its own historical development. Along with that, until 1328 (when the perambulation of Kravarsko estate was recorded) there were no more lands of Kračun and his kindred in the area of the southwestern part of Turopolje. In that period, the western and northern borders of Kravarsko were the eastern and southern borders of the territory owned by the sons of Vukota and their kindred.⁶¹³ From the data shown so far it is not, however, clear if in the period when the charters that witness about the sale of Topolovec, Kostanjevac and Obrež were issued, so the period of the second half of the 1270s, the kindred of Kračun still owned the estates in this area. Now it will be shown if the charters can clarify the issue.

5.2.1.2.3.3. *Sons of Wlkona*

Stephan, Blasius and Mark who bought the estates in Obrež and Topolovec, in the area of the present-day Donja Lomnica, were sons of Wlkona. I think Wlkona is Vukota (*Wlkota*), son of Iurgis, by whom the kindred of Vukota was named. One later charter, from 1357, mentions Stephan's son Peter, and Stephan is called *Stephanus filius Wlkota*.⁶¹⁴ Also, a man named Jacob, son of Vukota was *comes terrestris* in 1326 and 1333, but I am not sure, because of the time gap, if he was also son of Vukota son of Iurgis or some other Vukota.⁶¹⁵

The parts of the land called Obrež that the sons of Wlkona bought from Turcha and Churnoglau, sons of Stojan and their relative (*cognatus*) Vukša son of Marosk in 1278 were hereditary lands of the sellers. Tolyas son of Radothey (the person mentioned in the perambulation) and Vojislav son of Stojko were also present at the sale. They were neighbours

⁶¹² MHNC 1, doc. 9, pp. 11-13.

⁶¹³ CD 9, doc. 316, pp. 383-385.

⁶¹⁴ CD 12, doc. 497, pp. 662-663.

⁶¹⁵ MHNC 1, doc. 39 and 49, pp. 42-43, 50.

of the sold land as well as relatives and neighbours of both the buyers and the sellers (*cognati et commetanei tam venditorum quam emptorum*). Obviously, all those people were blood related. It is also clear from the perambulation of the sold lands that sons of Wlkona possessed a land in the area prior to the purchase in 1276. Some of the bordering lands of Obrež were Stephan's hereditary lands (*terrae hereditariae*).⁶¹⁶

Stephan son of Wlkona was present during the sale of a part of the estate Kostanjevec in 1279. Actually, there were lots of people present at this sale. This is understandable because the procedure required the neighbours (*vicini et commetanei*) to be there and the estate was vast. These people were denominated as members of two different kindreds (*generationes*), none of which was specifically named. As far as the first kindred is concerned there were only two representatives: Prvoš and Raduš sons of Vrban. The other group was significantly larger. There were ten people. These were: Tvrtko son of Radua, Veliša son of Peter, Isac son of Dezen, Stephan son of Wlkona, Tolias son of Raducha, Iako son of Vukozlay, Chur son of Prvoš, Obrad son of Nezde, Vukša son of Suplizlay and Vačić son of Martin Ventrosus.

If one compares the names of people from the other group present during the sale in 1279 with the names of people who represented their kindred during the division of the borders in 1256 (with Miroslav and the sons of Andrew), the family bonds between some of them can be established. Iako is a son of Vukozlay. Vukozaly son of Iurgis was the brother of Vukota. In 1265, together with Vukota, he sold some land in Hrašće to *comes* Miroslav.⁶¹⁷ So, Iako is the first cousin of Vukota's son Stephan. Tvrtko is a son of Radua who also had a land in Hrašće.⁶¹⁸ At the sale of a land in Obrež, Tolias was labelled as Stephan's cousin.⁶¹⁹ This leads to a conclusion that these people belonged to the kindred that in 1373 will be called the kindred of Vukota. So, the kindred whose lands were surrounding the estate Kostanjevec and to whom the first owners of lands in Mali Obrež belonged has been defined. Besides that, it is without doubt that the sons of Wlkona owned an estate or estates in Lomnica, because in the purchase contract from 1279 they were denominated as *iobagiones campi de Lomnicha*.⁶²⁰ This is also the first mentioning of Lomnica in the extant sources. More about it will be written latter. Now, data about other people mentioned in these charters will be analysed.

⁶¹⁶ MHNC 1, doc.27., p. 30.

⁶¹⁷ MHNC 1, doc. 18, p. 20.

⁶¹⁸ MHNC 1, doc. 17, p. 17.

⁶¹⁹ MHNC 1, doc. 27, p. 30.

⁶²⁰ MHNC 1, doc. 31, p. 35.

5.2.1.2.3.4. *Sons of Vrban*

As far as Prvoš and Raduš, sons of Vrban, so two people who represented the other kindred during the sale of Kostanjevec in 1279, are concerned, I did not find any additional data about them that could help with connecting them with some certain already known kindred. Ćuk thought they belonged to the kindred of Kračun.⁶²¹ Perhaps this is so, but, as far as the area of the southwestern part of Turopolje is concerned there is no obvious connection. After mapping the perambulation of Kostanjevec it became clear that the land of sons of Vrban was situated in the area of Petrovina and not on the western side of the Hospitallers' estate Kravarsko where, in the time of King Andrew II, was the *terra Craion*.⁶²² Besides that, these two people are not crucial for the topic here for two reasons. First, it is written in the perambulation of Kostanjevec that they purchased their land from Paul son of Opor. So, they could be from any kindred whose main territory was outside of the area in question here and could have bought the land in this area. Probably their origin could be determined by examining the charters from a broader area of Zagreb County. Second, and more important for this topic, is the fact that their land was placed on the territory of Petrovina and in 1560 Petrovina was not part of the territory of the Noble community of Turopolje.

5.2.1.2.3.5. *The sons of Opor and their estates*

One important fact can be noticed on Maps 45 and 46, on which the borders of Topolovec and Kostanjevec are shown, is that two brothers, Paul and Dazaly, sons of Opor, held a considerably big amount of land, from the Lomnica River on the north to the Mostičajna stream on the west and the borders of Kravarsko on the south. They had owned the estate Topolovec, situated south of the Lomnica, and sold a part of it to sons of Wlkona. They had owned the estate in Kostanjevec which they sold to Paul, son of Vid. Besides that, as the perambulation showed, Dazlau son of Opor was the owner of a land on the eastern borders of the sold estate, all along with the Ramiščak stream, which is the area of the present-day Petrovina and Šiljakovina (Map 46).

As is the case with the sons of Vrban, the only way to determine the kindred from which the sons of Opor originated would be to analyse their estates in the wider area of both Turopolje and Zagreb County (according to Ćuk they were also from the kindred of Kračun⁶²³). Likewise,

⁶²¹ Ćuk, *Zagrebačka županija*, 150.

⁶²² CD 9, doc. 311, p. 379.

⁶²³ See: Ćuk, *Zagrebačka županija*, pp. 58-59.

as is the case with the estates of sons of Vrban, the important for the topic here is that the territory owned by the sons of Opor was not the territory of the noble community in 1560. Their estates were placed in the area of Petrovina and Šiljakovina. The perambulation of Trnovec was done on the request of Lieutenant (*vicarius totius regni Sclavonie generalis*) Leustce in 1356. He asked the Chapter of Zagreb to participate in the making of the borders that would distinguish these estates that belonged to Ivan son of Ivan from the Zagreb Field (*magister Ivan filius Ivan de Campo Zagrabiensi*) from the estates and woods of the royal castle Želin. The estate Trnovec bordered on its western side with Petrovina, the estate of the Želin castle.⁶²⁴ That border was approximately 7.5 kilometres long and it was stretching from the Lomnica River on the north to the Buna River on the south. Thus, by 1356 the area where the sons of Opor once had the estates was a part of the Želin estate. The western borders of Petrovina, so the borders between Petrovina and Donja Lomnica were recorded in several charters issued in 1395/1396. In this period Petrovina was the estate of the burghers of Gradec (given to them by King Sigismund in 1387). As already explained in the chapter about Petrovina in the fourteenth century (see pages 111-115), the burghers complained to the king that the castle warriors from Donja Lomnica occupied the bordering lands that belonged to Petrovina. The king ordered the Chapter of Zagreb to settle this and make perambulations, but the castle warriors opposed the borders that the *pristaldus* wanted to make. Despite numerous times that this case was exposed to the Court of Ban and several attempts of agreement regarding the borders that were proposed on the field nothing was accomplished.⁶²⁵ The borders in question were recorded in detail in several charters, but they cannot be recognized completely on modern maps because the description contains mostly minor landmarks that. Still it can be recognized from these descriptions that the border was similar to the present-day borders between Donja Lomnica and Petrovina and Šiljakovina on the maps (for more detailed explanation see the chapter about Petrovina in the fourteenth century).

The important issue of these fights between the burgers of Gradec and the castle warriors of Donja Lomnica was the question: to whom the church of St. Peter and its area belonged. This church was situated in the territory of the present-day Petrovina, so obviously the burghers won in this respect and it is not any more important for the topic here since it was not in the area of the noble community. But it is important to accentuate the question of belonging of the church and its area in the thirteenth century and possibly prior to it.

⁶²⁴ CD 12, doc. 357, pp. 463-466.

⁶²⁵ MHCZ 1, pp. XLIII-XLVIII.

Obviously, the castle warriors of Donja Lomnica considered the church and the surrounding area to be their property. As already written (in the chapter about Petrovina) there could be two reasons why they would do that. The first reason could be that they were lying; they wanted to use the unfavourable circumstances in which the citizens were during that period and seized parts of their lands using the fake ownership as an excuse. The second reason could be that it actually was their property and that in thirteenth century this church was a part of the lands owned by the castle warriors. Actually, from the data presented in this chapter it can be concluded that in the thirteenth century the area of the church was most likely owned by the castle warriors, but the question is if these were Vukota and his sons and their kindred or the sons of Opor. It is interesting to notice that, from the fourteenth century, only two out of ten churches listed in a list of parish churches from 1334 in the Turopolje area⁶²⁶ were situated within the territory of the villages of the castle warriors. One was the church of the Blessed Virgin in Velika Gorica and the other the church of St. Catherine in Dubranec (Vukomeričke gorice). I think that these data show something about the development of the settlement system in the area: it seems at this state of research that the churches were not the crucial factor in this development. However, this issue can also be discussed in the other way around. The development of local churches (parish churches) is also connected to the estate and the settlement system. The emergence of many local churches (village churches, later mainly parishes) is often connected with local lords. If the area is owned by a noble community and not by single lords (lay or ecclesiastic) with their estates, it can influence the emergence of new churches in a different way. In any case, these are all important aspects that should be included in the study about Christianisation of the area. The planned archaeological research that could reveal the remains of the church of St. Peter and along with that the period when it was built will certainly contribute to solving of the above-mentioned problems.

The following facts can be concluded from the so far presented: the only parts of the estates of sons of Opor that were the property of nobles of Turopolje in 1560 were the ones that they had sold to the sons of Wlkona in 1276 (Obrež) and Paul son of Vid in 1279 (Kostanjevec). This can be confirmed with one charter issued in 1558. Some people from Petrovina and Šiljakovina, the tenant peasants of George Magdalenić from Mala Mlaka and Christopher Bedeković from Komar, occupied wood that belonged to the estates Kostanjevec, Mali Obrež and Donja Lomnica. These woods were: Kostanjevečka and Lomnička Dubrava (dubrava means wood), Topolovec and Lošec Lomnički. These woods were stretching from

⁶²⁶ MHNC 1, doc.50, pp. 51-52.

Raminščak (*a fluuio Hramychnyak incipiendo*) to Černec and Mostičajna on the north (*ad stagnum Chernenecz vocatum, exinde per medium silve Thopolowecz dicte eundo ad fluvium Mozochanye, in eadem silva decurrentem*).⁶²⁷ For the wood Topolovec it is clear that it was on the territory of Donja Lomnica. The “water” Černec and the Mostičajna stream are also the borders of Topolovec sold in 1279. More about Kostanjevec will be said in the further text.

The other parts of the estates that sons of Opor held in the southwestern part of Turopolje (so the parts that were not sold in 1279) became the property of the Želin castle by 1356. I did not find any extant charter that would explain how this happened, but again the analysis done in a wider context of the Zagreb County could probably reveal the cause of this change. What can be added here is that from the purchase contract of sale of part of Kostanjevec is clear that Paul son of Opor was the castle-warrior of the Field of Zagreb (*ab una parte Paulo filio Oporis, et ab altera Paulo filio Vida, iobagionibus campi Zagrabiensis*).⁶²⁸ However, from the purchase contract of sale of land in Topolovec it is not completely clear if he was also castle warrior of Lomnica. This is important for the question of the development of the villages Donja and Gornja Lomnica, so it will be mentioned in the following text in which the basic facts of development of these two villages will be shown.

5.2.1.2.3.6. Donja and Gornja Lomnica

Both Gornja and Donja Lomnica exist today. Donja Lomnica is significantly larger than Gornja Lomnica. It was one of the most important villages of the castle warriors of Turopolje in the medieval period. It is still densely populated and one of the biggest villages of Turopolje.

The purchase contracts that recorded the sales of lands in Kostanjevec and Topolovec from 1279 are the first extant charters in which both the territory of Lomnica and its inhabitants are mentioned. Stephan, Blasius and Mark, sons of Wlkona were the first known castle warriors of Lomnica, *iobagiones campi de Lomnicha*.⁶²⁹ One of the borders of the sold part of the estate Kostanjevec was *terra nobilium Campi de Lumnicha*.⁶³⁰

As mentioned, it is not completely clear from the purchase contract that informs about the sale of the part of Topolovec whether Paul son of Opor was a castle warrior of Lomnica. It

⁶²⁷ MHNC 3, doc. 256., p. 410.

⁶²⁸ MHNC 1, doc. 30, p. 33.

⁶²⁹ MHNC 1, doc.31, p. 35.

⁶³⁰ MHNC 1, doc.30, pp. 33-34.

is important to try to clarify this issue. The text written by the scribe of the Chapter of Zagreb was the following: *Ad universorum noticiam tenore presencium volumus pervenire, quod Paulo filio Oporis ab una parte, et Stephano filio Wlkona pro se et fratribus suis Blasio et Marco nominates, iobagionibus campi de Lomnica ab altera, coram nobis personaliter constitutis.*⁶³¹ Laszowski thought that all the people mentioned here were from Lomnica, probably because it appeared to him that the sold land was situated in Lomnica (which it is, but I think that it became so only after this sale).⁶³² I would interpret this as the three brothers were castle warriors from Lomnica, and for Paul it is not specified. For some reason, it was necessary to accentuate that the sons of Wlkona were from Lomnica and in that way they had been differentiated from Paul son of Opor.

In general, charters of this period are not consistent in using certain terms. Nevertheless, some logic in the usage can be assumed. For example, when Stephan and Blasius sons of Wlkona were buying the land in Obrež in 1276, so three years earlier, they were not more closely labelled in any way.⁶³³ Perhaps this last fact can also open some questions. For example, perhaps they did not identify themselves as castle warriors from Lomnica in 1276 at all. But, since this charter was issued only three years earlier than the charter where they were named as castle warriors of Lomnica, I think that solution is not likely. More indicative is that all the people present at the sale of the land in Obrež (Stephan, Blasius and Mark as buyers, Churnoglau and Vukša as sellers and the witnesses Tolyas and Vojislav) were relatives. It was explicitly written that the witnesses were *cognati et commetanei tam venditorum quam emptorum*.⁶³⁴ Perhaps this was the reason why it was not important to emphasize that the sons of Wlkona were the castle warriors of Lomnica. Nameily, the others could have also been castle warriors of Lomnica. In any case, obviously, it was not necessary to distinguish these people in any way except by their names (and the names of their fathers).

On the other hand, the sons of Opor were not relatives of the sons of Wlkona. When Stephan, Blasius and Mark bought the part of the land Topolovec from Paul son of Opor, Dazlau, brother of Paul and Tolias, both neighbours (*commetanei et vicini*) were present at the sale.⁶³⁵ Thus, unlike the case with Obrež, a blood connection between the buyers and the sellers is not mentioned in the text.

⁶³¹ MHNC 1, doc.31, p. 35.

⁶³² Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 310.

⁶³³ MHNC 1, doc.27, pp. 29-30.

⁶³⁴ MHNC 1, doc.27, p. 30.

⁶³⁵ MHNC 1, doc.31, p. 35.

Finally, in the perambulation of Kostanjevec, one of the borders was *terra nobilium campi de Lumnicha* and east of it was *terra filiorum Vrbani* that they had bought from Dazlay son of Opor. Therefore, the land of the nobles of Lomnica and the land of the sons of Vrbani, bought from Dazlay, were two separate units. Obviously, Kostanjevec itself was also not within the borders of Lomnica. Still, this also does not have to mean much. As will be shown later, the sons of Vukota had their estates in Vukomeričke gorice that were certainly not a part of Lomnica. The sons of Opor could have had estates both in Lomnica and Kostanjevec. Yet, taking all these data into consideration, I think it can be concluded with a fair amount of certainty that the village of Donja Lomnica was situated in the territory of the kindred called the kindred of Lomnica from 1373. Likewise, it can be concluded that the sons of Wlkona, most likely Vukota, were its first known inhabitants. The estates of the sons of Opor were not a part of Lomnica and they were not castle warriors from Lomnica. The only parts of their estate that are, until the present day, in the territory of Donja Lomnica are the ones they had sold to sons of Vukota in 1276 and 1279 (the parts of Topolovec and Kostanjevec). The other parts of their estates became the property of the Želin castle and are not important for this topic.

On the other hand, from the data presented so far, it seems to me that Lomnica was the “central village” of the kindred of the sons of Vukota. Clearly, these first charters do not differentiate between Donja and Gornja Lomnica. Probably, at that time, this was all still a unified territory, soon after split into two separate units. It is also possible the division had already existed but was still not perceived so important to be mentioned in the document. The first extant charter I have found in which both of those villages are recorded dates from 1365 when Peter, son of Paul from Gornja Lomnica (*Superiori Lomnicha*) sold his estate Kostanjevec (*possessio Kostaneuicha*) to John *literatus* from Donja Lomnica (*Inferiori Lomnicha*).⁶³⁶ From this time, charters, in general, specify a village that one comes from, although occasionally can still be written just Lomnica. For example, there are several charters concerning the quarrels of the castle warriors of Donja Lomnica with the citizens of Gradec over the borders between Petrovina and Donja Lomnica. In few of them from 1395/6 the mentioned people from Lomnica.⁶³⁷ The same people are mentioned in a charter from tenth of June 1395 as from *Alsolumnycha* (Also means Lower in Hungarian).⁶³⁸

⁶³⁶ MHNC 1, doc. 79, p. 80.

⁶³⁷ MHCZ 1, docs. 382-383, 385.

⁶³⁸ MHCZ 1, doc. 378., p. 357.

There are many extant charters about Donja Lomnica. Combined with the possible archaeological research, they would surely enable a detailed study about the history and the territory of this village as well as families that lived there. I will mention just one family important for the further text. The above-mentioned John *literatus*, who bought the estate Kostanjevec in 1365, had sons John and Valentin.⁶³⁹ In 1412, Valentin's son Ladislav from Donja Lomnica came to the Chapter of Zagreb with some letter of King Sigismund addressed to the Chapter. The king instructed the Chapter to examine the letters that Ladislav will show them and, after insuring in their authenticity, to issue him transcripts. The Chapter did as ordered.⁶⁴⁰ The charters that Ladislav brought were the purchase contract by which Stephan, Blasius and Mark sons of Wlkona bought a part of the land Topolovec from Paul son of Opor in 1279 and the purchase contract by which Stephan and Blasius son of Wlkona bought the land in Obres from Thurcha, Chrnoglau and Vukša in 1276. Besides that, one more estate (*possessio*) was mentioned in the king's letter as being a property of Ladislav. The estate was named *Odraelwe*. Elwe is a Hungarian word elve; it means eleje or elött or something, that is, before or in front of something.⁶⁴¹ Therefore, *Odraelwe* signifies "the area in front of us, closer to us before the Odra, that is, the area between us and the Odra River, on our side of the river". Unfortunately, the charter that refers to this estate is not preserved in the 1412 transcript. Also, I did not find any other charter in which the estate is recorded. In any case, Ladislav, grandson of John *literatus* had the original charters from 1276 and 1279, the purchase contracts of the sons of Wlkona. Hence, it can be assumed he was their descendant. This family obviously still lived in Donja Lomnica in the fifteenth century.

Finally, to conclude the story about Donja Lomnica and its territory, it should be mentioned that, in 1449, Ladislav's cousin prebendary Francis of Zagreb sold Topolovec (*possessionem suam Thopolowcz vocatam*) to sixteen nobles of Donja Lomnica. Along with that, Francis gave one part of agricultural land in Topolovec, near the Lomnica River, to Peter Satrić.⁶⁴² In 1446, Francis sold his estate Kostanjevec (*possessionem suam Kozthanyewecz vocatam*) to eleven nobles of Donja Lomnica. He had inherited this estate from his grandfather,

⁶³⁹ Miljan, Plemićko društvo zagrebačke županije, p. 247.

⁶⁴⁰ MHCZ 1, docs. 178 and 179., pp. 170-172.

⁶⁴¹ For example, Erdőelve, is the old name of Erdély (Transylvania). It means an area before the woodland, that is, between us and a woodland).

⁶⁴² MHNC 1, doc.267, p. 297.

John *literatus*.⁶⁴³ The territories of both estates are today within the cadastre borders of Donja Lomnica.

Before starting the analysis of the development of Mali Obrež and Kostanjevec, I would like to mention one note made by Laszowski, important in terms of terminology used for certain social groups in the thirteenth-century charters. The note concerns the corrections put in the selling contracts of Kostanjevec and Topolovec from 1279. In Laszowski's opinion, the corrections were made at the moment of issuing of the charters, by a scribe of the Chapter of Zagreb.

The estate Kostanjevec was sold by Paul son of Opor to Paul son of Vid, both *iobagiones Campi Zagrabiensis*. There were many neighbours present, all *nobiles Campi Zagrabiensis*. The border of the land, among other natural features and estates, went by *terra nobilium campi de Lumnicha* and at one point *finitur vicinitas nobilium campi predictorum de Lumnicha*. Paul son of Opor sold the estate Topolovec to Mark, Blasius and Stephan, sons of Wlkona, *iobagiones campi de Lomnicha*. All the terms put in italics were put as corrections of the earlier text. The terms *iobagiones Campi* and *nobiles Campi Zagrabiensis* were written instead of *vigiles castris*. Likewise, the terms *terra nobilium campi de Lumnicha* and *iobagiones campi de Lumnicha* were written instead of *terra vigilum castris de Lumnicha* and *vigiles castris de Lumnicha*. Laszowski concluded: "This fact suggests that the Chapter probably first put the old denomination for people from Lomnica, that is, it suggests that the people from Lomnica were once guards (*vigiles*) of the town of Zagreb, and out of that they became *iobagiones*. Thus, it was once their duty to keep watch at the town of Zagreb".⁶⁴⁴

As far as I know, the term *vigiles* does not appear in any other charter from the territory of medieval Slavonia or the kingdom in general. There is one possible explanation for it; the scribe might have been an educated man with a solid knowledge of classical Latin. If so, he might have had simply "translated" the term *iobagiones castris* as *vigiles*, guardians of the castle of Zagreb as that is what *iobagiones castris* originally were.

⁶⁴³ MHNC 1, doc. 258, pp. 281-283.

⁶⁴⁴ Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine 1*, pp. 310-311.

5.2.1.2.3.7. *Mali Obrež*

The problems concerning locations of settlements called Obrež that can be found in medieval charters have been explained in detail in the chapter about Okuje (pages 172-176). It is a very common toponym that can be found all over northern Croatia. Its meaning is “on a hill, on a slope of a hill” (*o breg-je*).⁶⁴⁵ The present-day settlement Obrež Odranski, situated on the western edge of the Turopolje area, was in the previous literature connected with *terra* Obrež from earliest medieval charters.⁶⁴⁶ This is not correct (see pages 172-176). As shown, there had been more estates called Obrež (Mali Obrež, Veliki Obrež, Obrež Češka etc.) in the Turopolje area. Thus, it should be discussed whether *terra* Obrež, first owned by Stephan son of Vukota and his brothers and cousins, was situated in the area of Mali Obrež that was listed as an estate of the noble community of Turopolje in 1560. It was certainly so and can be confirmed with data recorded in one charter issued in 1428 that contains the perambulation of the estate Donji Lukavec. The part of the text where Mali Obrež is mentioned was the following: “...from the road it [the border] goes directly to the south through the wood called Lošec (*Losecz*), and on the western side is Donji Lukavec and on the eastern side is Donja Lomnica, after that it enters the river Lukavec (*fluvius Lwkawech*), from which it advances and enters the stream Mozečajna (*rivulus Mozochanya*), that separates the estates Mali Obrež (*possessiones Kysobres*, meaning Little Obres) and the woods; the wood of Mali Obrež and the wood of Donja Lomnica on the east and of Donji Lukavec on the west (...)”.⁶⁴⁷

Hence, the estates (*possessiones*) called Mali Obrež were placed south of the wood called Lošec and between Donja Lomnica and Donji Lukavec. This is exactly the same position of *terra Obres* in 1276. The toponym Lužec (*Losecz*) can still be found both on the First military survey and present-day maps. It was placed on the southern side of the Lomnica River, within the present-day cadastre borders of Donja Lomnica and Donji Lukavec (Map 47).

The only other charter that contains a perambulation of the estate named Obrež can also be mentioned here (there is a considerable amount of charters that mention people from Obrež, but only a few of them with a perambulation). In 1435, lady Agatha, a wife of a butcher from Gradec Giles, was installed into the estates that she had inherited from her father Mark Lacković from Mlaka. These estates were situated in Mlaka, Donja Lominca and *sub Obres*.⁶⁴⁸ The term *sub Obres*, under/beneath Obrež, is equal to Croatian variation of the term Obrež –

⁶⁴⁵ Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine*, p. 373.

⁶⁴⁶ See: Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, pp. 373-374.

⁶⁴⁷ MHNC 1, doc. 221, p. 225.

⁶⁴⁸ MHNC 1, doc. 232, p. 240.

Podobrežje/Pobrežje (pod is under/beneath in Croatian). The estate Lady Agatha inherited under Obrež was an agricultural land (*terra arabilis*) that was a part of her father's estates in this location (...*terre arabilis in possessionibus...sub predicta Obres habitis*). The land was situated between *Losecz* and the road (*via communa*) that leads to the church of St. George the martyr [this church was (and still is) in the village Odra].⁶⁴⁹ Thus, again, the wood Lužec is mentioned as one of the borders. However, as can be noticed, these estates are called Obrež, not Mali Obrež. This is not an unusual situation. Also, as shown in the previous chapter, the terms that can be found in charters for the estates called Obrež are regularly not consistent. The same settlement is at one document called Obrež, and in the other, for example Mali Obrež. The best example that illustrates this situation is the one of *comes terrestris* Matthias, son of Giwrkonis who appears in more charters in the period from 1479 and 1490. In four out of eleven charters that I have examined, Matthias is denominated as being from Mali Obrež (*de Ebres Minor/de Kis Ebres*)⁶⁵⁰ and in seven from Obreš (*de Ebres*).⁶⁵¹

Along with being the example of inconsistency in the usage of the term Obrež, the charter from 1435 shows that people from other villages had lands in this territory. Mark Lacković, a father of Lady Agatha, was from Mlaka and, besides Mlaka, he obviously had estates in Donja Lomnica and Obrež.⁶⁵² It was common that nobles had lands in different villages. These lands could have been acquired by purchase, a filial quarter of a wife etc.


Thus, it can be concluded that the settlement Mali Obrež had developed in the area inhabited by the kindred of Vukota. The sons of Wlkona and their cousins are the first known owners of land in this area. The question is when the actual settlement with dwelling units developed in this area. From the 1276 charter, it cannot be concluded that there was a settlement in this place in the thirteenth century. At the same time, it cannot be concluded that it was not. The object of the sale were lands, *terre*. As shown on more examples so far, in the thirteenth century, the term *terra* (and its plural form) can mean a big estate, a small estate, an agricultural land etc. Obrež is not mentioned at all in the perambulation of Kostanjevec; the northern border of Kostanjevec was *terra nobilium campi de Lumnicha*. If one looks Map 47 and the position of this border as well as the position of Obrež, it can be concluded that the lands in Obrež were placed within the borders of Lomnica (see the map).

⁶⁴⁹ MHNC 1, doc. 232, p. 241.

⁶⁵⁰ MHNC 2, docs.15, 30, 32, 54.

⁶⁵¹ MHNC 2, docs.18, 19, 21, 22, 24, 31, 41.

⁶⁵² MHNC 1, doc. 232, pp. 239-242.



Map 47-Toponym Obrež and the present-day cadastre border of Donja Lomnica

The next charter in which Obrež is recorded was issued in 1376, a hundred years later than the first one. It is also a purchase contract. A castle warrior Peter son of Porozlaus sold some part of his land five veretens big (*quasdam quinque dimensiones terre in Obres sitam wetern wlgo vocates*) to Blasius and Andrew sons of John.⁶⁵³ This text also does not specify

⁶⁵³ MHNC 1, doc. 83, p. 86.

what kind of land was sold, but most likely it was an undivided land with no dwelling units on it. If one looks at the terminology used in the charters of the last quarter of the fourteenth century, one can see that the terms *sessio* or *possessio* are extensively used for dwelling plots or settlements. On the other hand, *terra* in this period usually signifies agricultural land (or perhaps pastures or hays). Besides that, this charter does not specify the position of the land (except that it was in the vicinity of the lands of buyers). There is a possibility, therefore, that this land was situated in some other place called Obrež.

Two charters are not sufficient for making a conclusion if people were living in the area of Mali Obrež in the thirteenth and fourteenth century. For that, either more charters or archaeological excavations are needed. At this moment, first inhabitants of Obrež can be identified only in the fifteenth-century sources, which suggests that some kind of internal land colonization took place and a small settlement had emerged on a cultivated land. Yet, for confirmation of this statement more data (archaeological or historical) are needed. The area of this village was not big. Most likely there were not many people living on it. From the end of the sixteenth century, Obres is not mentioned in the sources connected with the noble community.⁶⁵⁴ Likewise, there is no settlement of such name in this area on the First military survey. Thus, it can be assumed that the area of the village was abandoned sometime during the seventeenth or the first half of the eighteenth century. The inhabitants could have moved in Donja Lomnica and their former estates could have been used as agricultural lands or were overgrown with woods. By 1861, the area of Donji Obrež was within the cadastre borders of Donja Lomnica, just as it was in the second half of the thirteenth century and from where its first owners were.

5.2.1.2.3.8. *Kostanjevec – Splitting of the estate*

The borders of the estate Kostanjevec (*terra Coztaneuch*), that Paul, son of Opor sold to Paul, son of Vid for 35 marks of Zagreb's denars in 1279, have been shown on Map 46.⁶⁵⁵ This estate did not stay in the family of Paul, son of Vid for long; in 1299 Paul's son George sold a part of the estate Kostanjevec (*porcio terre Coztaneuch*) to Paul, son of Bosin. The whole estate perambulated in the previous (1279) charter was sold; it is written that George was selling the estate his father bought and under the same borders (*per memoratem patrem suum iuxta*

⁶⁵⁴ Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 347.

⁶⁵⁵ MHNC 1, doc. 83, p. 86.

continetiam privilegii eiusdem capituli, a Paulo filio Oporis quondam comparatae, sub signis et metis in eodem privilegio contentis). The term *porcio* indicates that the estate Kostanjevec referred to the wider area than the one owned by George, son Paul. George sold the estate for the same price as the one by which his father bought it from Paul, son of Opor, that is, for 35 marks of Zagreb's denars.⁶⁵⁶

Kostanjevec is mentioned next time in 1365 when Peter, son of Paul from Gornja Lomnica sold his estate Kostanjevec (*quandam possessionem suam Kostanueicha vocatam*) to John *literatus* from Donja Lomnica.⁶⁵⁷ Perhaps Peter was a son of Paul son of Bosin, but the estate he sold to John *literatus* seems to be out of the borders of the estate from 1279. Since different people were owning lands called Kostanjevec, not all the transactions can be seen in the extant sources. In any case, in 1374, the other part of the land Kostanjevec was held by Peter, Gregory and Ladislav, sons of Nicholas from Mala Mlaka.⁶⁵⁸ From that period, the history of two estates had been different but each interesting in its own way.

First, the location of the two estates will be shown (Map 48). The borders of the estate Kostanjevec Ivan *literatus* bought in 1365 were the following: "The first boundary begins in some stream called Kraljičino Mostišće (*riuulus Cralichino Moztische*), from there goes to some crossing place or stream called Krikovec (*transitus sive riuulus Cricouech*), through the stream it goes downwards towards the east for a longer while and comes to some place called Lopatica (*locus, qui Lopaticha dicitur*), from there goes to the oak tree that is called *pogorelech*, from there to some place called Spotkova Mlaka (*locus qui dicitur Spotkoua Mlaka*), from there goes to some stream called Ramiščak (*riuulus Hranechnak*), going through the stream upwards comes to the place called Zlobina draga (*locus Zlobina draga*), from it goes to a big road (*magna via*), and going for a longer while through that big road comes to the western side to the place called Doječe Kališće (*locus qui dicitur Deuyache Calische*), from there comes to already mentioned place Kraljičino brodišće (*locus Cralichino Moztische*), to the first boundary and finishes."⁶⁵⁹

The boundaries of the estate called Mali Kostanjevec or Novaki owned by Peter, Gregory and Ladislav, sons of Nicholas from Mala Mlaka in 1374 were: "The boundary begins from the border of the dwelling-units called Šiljakovina and is near and close to this estate (*a*

⁶⁵⁶ MHNC 1, doc. 34, p. 38.

⁶⁵⁷ MHNC 1, doc. 79, p. 80.

⁶⁵⁸ MHNC 1, doc. 90, pp. 93-96.

⁶⁵⁹ MHNC 1, doc. 79, p. 80.


meta sessionis Sylakowyna vocate, que est prope et iuxta eandem possessionem), and goes directly opposite of the flow of the water of the Buna River (*fluuius Bwna*), and through the same river it goes upwards up to some big road (*magna via*), and it moves quickly from this road up to *Zobobyna draga* that belongs to the boundaries of late župan Ladislav, and so from there goes over to the river Ramiščak (*fluuis Hramylsyak*) and, from it, going for a long distance returns, to the first boundary.”⁶⁶⁰

The perambulations have two same borders, the Ramiščak stream and a place called Zlobina draga, that is, Zobina draga. Kostanjevec was placed west of the Ramiščak and Mali Kostanjevec east of it. The other borders of Mali Kostanjevec are Šiljakovina and the Buna River. It was already mentioned in the perambulation of Kostanjevec from 1279 that the present-day stream Šiljak is the flow of the Buna River that was most likely renamed to Šiljak in the modern period (by the village Šiljakovina). Thus, the borders of Mali Kostanjevec are clear.

On the other hand, the northwestern border of “big” Kostanjevec can be only supposed. This border started at the stream called Kraljičino Mostišće (*riuulus Cralichino Moztische*). A stream of such name cannot be found on modern maps. However, there is one charter from 1428 that contains the perambulation of the estate Donji Lukavec. The border of this estate started in the Pešćanjak river (*fluuius Peschenyak*), in place called Kraljičino Brodišće (*locus Kralychynobrodysche*). The name of the stream Kraljičino Mostišće means the bridge of the queen (most is a bridge in Croatian). Name of the place Kraljičino Brodišće has the same meaning. Although Brodišće is derived from the word *brod*, which today means a ship, in the medieval times it had different meanings. The form *Brodišće*, specific to the Kajkavski dialect of northern Croatia, is parallel with the meaning of “a place where water is crossed” and can refer to “a place where cattle drink water” as well as “a port”.⁶⁶¹ For that reason, I suppose the border of Kostanjevec started somewhere around the Pešćanjak stream.

⁶⁶⁰ MHNC 1, doc. 90, pp. 95-96.

⁶⁶¹ Dunja Brozović Rončević, *Apelativi u hrvatskoj hidronimiji* [Appellatives in Croatian hydronymy], doctoral dissertation, Zagreb: Filozofski fakultet, 1997, pp. 53-54.



Map 48-Kostanjevec, Mali Kostanjevec and the boundary of Kostanjevec from 1279 (red line)

5.2.1.2.3.9. Mali Kostanjevec or Novaki

The first extant charter in which the estate Mali Kostanjevec or Novaki is recorded dates from 1374. It was a hereditary land of *egregii* Peter, Gregory and Ladislav, sons of Nicholas and their juvenile brother Nicholas from Mala Mlaka (*terra seu possessio hereditaria Malykozthanyewcz aliter Nowaky*). These people were not castle warriors of Turopolje just as Mala Mlaka was not a village of the noble community. I suppose they could be descendants of one of the sons of Andrew (so, the family of Gurk), but this can only be confirmed by a further study of this family. In any case, Mali Kostanjevec was also not a property of the nobles of Turopolje in 1560, so I will not write in more detail about its history.

It can be just noticed here that the name Mali Kostanjevec means Small Kostanjevec, indicating that it was smaller than the other Kostanjevec, a property of John *literatus* from Donja Lomnica. Novaki, on the other hand, means new people, newcomers. The name is clear if one looks at the 1374 charter; the estate of Peter, George and Ladislav was almost deserted (*pene desertam*). They had given sixteen dwelling units in that area (*sedecim sessiones*) to people, whose names are listed, who were at the moment living there (*ad presens faceret*

residencias personales) under certain conditions, which were all listed.⁶⁶² This data testifies about the process of land colonization.

It would be interesting to see how this village developed. The 1374 charter, issued by the Chapter of Zagreb, was not preserved in the original, but as a transcript, in the text of one document from 1537. This other document was issued by the Chapter because ten people, six from Mali Kostanjevec or Novaki, two from Šiljakovina, one from Staro Čiče and one from Podotočje came to ask the confirmation and transcription of the first document. The family relation of some people from Nowaki and the settlers from the 1374 charter can be directly established by the surnames. The ones that appear in both charters are *Ladwssych*, *Legywdowych* and *Nychwarych*.⁶⁶³ This last surname also appears in one document, a court procedure from 1517, in which as one of the witnesses is listed *nobilis Stephanus Nycharych de Nowak*.⁶⁶⁴ Thus, the descendants of the fourteenth-century settlers were still owning lands in the village given to their ancestor be certain rights in 1374. A better understanding of these processes would require further analysis.

5.2.1.2.3.10. *Kostanjevec of the noble community*

The estate Kostanjevec (*possessio Kostanueicha*) John *literatus* from Donja Lomnica bought from Peter, son of Paul from Gornja Lomnica in 1365,⁶⁶⁵ was inherited by his grandson prebendary Francis of Zagreb.⁶⁶⁶ In 1428, nobles from Donja Lomnica claimed that they had the right on woods within the borders of this village (*silvae inter metas eiusdem ville Coztaneuch vocate*), but Bishop of Zagreb John Alben adjudicated the wood to Francis.⁶⁶⁷ Francis was installed into the wood and the estate the same year. The borders recored during this installation are identical to the borders of the estate that Francis' grandfather John *literatus* bought from Peter son of Paul in 1365.⁶⁶⁸

However, soon after, the whole estate did became the property of nobles of Donja Lomnica; in 1446, Francis sold it (*possessionem suam Kozthanyewecz vocatam*) to eleven

⁶⁶² MHNC 1, doc.90, pp. 93-95.

⁶⁶³ MHNC 3, doc. 32, p. 36.

⁶⁶⁴ MHNC 2, doc. 244.

⁶⁶⁵ MHNC 1, doc. 79, p. 80.

⁶⁶⁶ MHNC 1, doc. 215, p. 215.

⁶⁶⁷ MHNC 1, doc. 215, pp. 215-217, Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 312.

⁶⁶⁸ MHNC 1, doc. 216, pp. 218-219, MHNC 1, doc. 215, pp. 216-217.

people that all together paid him two hundred golden florens.⁶⁶⁹ In the following years, as can be seen in charters, this was a place with lots of vineyards held by nobles from Donja Lomnica; they were giving them to their tenant-peasants as well as selling them to people from other villages. The area seemed to be densely inhabited, mostly by commoners, although occasionally some nobles are mentioned. Laszowski thought that, although Kostanjevec, stayed the property where the nobles of Turopolje held their vineyards, it was most likely depopulated by the end of the sixteenth century. From that time on, it is no longer mentioned as a village.⁶⁷⁰ Still, although there is no village of such name on the 1st military survey, there are some houses in the area called Kostanjevec on the 1862 cadastre map. This area was within the borders of Donja Lomnica. The houses still exist today on the same place and there is also toponym Kostanjevec on modern maps, also within the borders of Donja Lomnica.

In this chapter I have defined the position of the medieval villages Donja and Gornja Lomnica, Mali Obrež and Kostanjevec and tried to identify their first inhabitants and kindreds to which they belonged. The location of the medieval Donja and Gornja Lomnica is clear as it is more or less similar as the present-day location of these villages. On the other hand, Mali Obrež and Kostanjevec do not exist today, but with the data from the perambulations of these estates their position can be placed in the present-day environment. It can be concluded that all these villages developed in the territory of the kindred of Vukota. The central estate of this kindred was Lomnica while the sons of Vukota were its first known inhabitants. Initially, Lomnica was most likely first a compact territory, later split into two units, Gornja and Donja Lomnica. This process can be documented from the middle of the fourteenth century. The settlement of Mali Obrež also developed in the territory of Lomnica. Although its area it is mentioned in the extant sources from the second half of the thirteenth century, the first inhabitants are mentioned only in the fifteenth century. From the time it first appears in the sources, this estate is closely connected with Lomnica and its inhabitants (sons of Vukota and their relatives). At one point, it had developed into the separate territorial unit (in 1560 it is mentioned as the separate village) but was abandoned by the eighteenth century (the First military survey). Kostanjevec can be first traced in the extant sources as a large area in which different owners had their estates. Most of its territory was owned by the sons of Opor. It would require more detailed research to clarify to which kindred they belonged. However, crucial for

⁶⁶⁹ MHNC 1, doc. 258.

⁶⁷⁰ Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 342.

the topic of this chapter is that the only parts of estates of the sons of Opor that were in the territory of the noble community in 1560 were the ones they had sold to the sons of Vukota (Topolovec) and Paul son of Vid (Kostanjevec), so to the members of the kindred of Vukota. By this, the initial owners of the land of the noble community of Turopolje in the southwestern part of the region have been defined. The villages of the noble community had developed only in the area owned by the kindred of Vukota. Data about the development of Gornji and Donji Lukavec and the settlements in Vukomeričke gorice, that will be shown in the further text, confirm this statement.

5.2.1.2.4. *Lukavec and the kindred of Levča*

The village Lukavec exist today. It is situated west of Donja Lomnica and south of Gornja Lomnica. The first charter I have found in which this settlement is recorded dates from 1363. Deuan son of Skojko and Mikec son of Mikša *de Lukouch de Campo Zagrabienzi* came to the *comites* of Zagreb magister George and Stephan as well as to Peter, son of *comes terrestris* Stephan with the intention to forbid Peter brother of Jakša to take the lands that belonged to the late Dobrouch and Pervoš sons of Maren *de eadem Lokouch*. They also forbade anyone else to buy, take in loan or accept this estate (*porciones possessionarie*). Deuan and Mikec did this in the name of their whole kindred (*in suis et aliorum ipsorum generacionis hominum*).⁶⁷¹ As written by Marija Karbić who analysed the history of the Mikšić family until the beginning of the sixteenth century, this data shows that a kindred still functioned as a unit as well as that in this period kinsmen still had the right to be the first ones who can buy a land in case that one of them dies without heirs.⁶⁷² Two additional things important for the topic here can be noticed in this charter. First, a name of the kindred to whom Deuan and Mikec belonged was not written. Second, by the time of its first appearance in the sources, so by the second half of the fourteenth century, Lukavec is a formed inhabited village.

Just as was the case with Lomnica, there were two settlements of the name Lukavec – Gornji and Donji Lukavec (Upper and Lower Lukavec). Both of these settlements are mentioned for the first time in 1412. On the fifteenth on June that year, King Sigismund ordered the Chapter of Zagreb to install George son of Nicholas Mikšić, Vuk son of Ladislav and Gregory Stanilović into the estate Donji Lukavec (*totalis et integra possession Inferior*

⁶⁷¹ MHNC 1, doc. 76, p. 76.

⁶⁷² Karbić, "Plemićka obitelj Mikšić," p. 69.

Lwkawecz).⁶⁷³ A month and a half later, on the 1st of August, the Chapter issued a charter confirming that the installation was done. Among the neighbours present was Stephan Pedk *de Superiori Lwkawech*.⁶⁷⁴ Obviously, the division between Gornji and Donji Lukavec existed by 1412. Perhaps it also existed in 1363 when the first extant charter in which people from Lukavec are mentioned was issued but it was not important to emphasize it. George son of Nicholas Mikšić who was installed into the estate of Donji Lukavec was a grandson Mikec son of Mikša *de Lukouch de Campo Zagradiensi* mentioned in the charter from 1363.⁶⁷⁵ It should be noted that some other later fifteenth-century charters also do not differentiate between Donji and Gornji Lukavec (the same case is with Donja and Gornja Lomnica). It can, however, be concluded with certainty from the above-mentioned is that King Sigismund's letter addressed to the Chapter and the installation done in 1412 "legalized" the existence of the separate estate in the territory of Lukavec. In 1560, both Gornji and Donji Lukavec were listed as the estates of the noble community of Turopolje. At some point after that year, they again became one territorial unit as they are today (there is no division between Donji and Gornji Lukavec in the present-day cadastre).

5.2.1.2.4.1. *The title of new donation*

The story of forming of the settlement Donji Lukavec is interesting from some other aspects that will now be presented. King Sigismund wrote in his above-mentioned letter addressed to the Chapter of Zagreb in 1412 that George son of Nicholas Mikšić, Vuk son of Ladislav and Gregory Stanilović must be installed into the estate Donji Lukavec that their ancestors had possessed from antiquity. The charters by which this could be proved had existed but were alienated or destroyed during the past times. Also, the king gave Nicholas, Vuk and Gregory all the royal rights in this estate. This was a reward for the help that George, Vuk and Gregory as well as their kinsmen (*iidem unacum fratribus eorum generacionalibus*) provided to the king in the restless past time. The kindred to whom they belonged was called the one of Levča (*generatio Lewcha* or in 1428 *de genere Leucha*)⁶⁷⁶.

The story about the ancestors who possessed the land in the territory of Donji Lukavec from the time of antiquity and the charters proving it that were burned down during some

⁶⁷³ MHNC 1, doc. 176, pp. 166-168.

⁶⁷⁴ MHNC 1, doc. 177, pp. 169-170.

⁶⁷⁵ MHNC 1, doc. 76, p. 76.

⁶⁷⁶ MHNC 1, doc. 219, p. 221.

troublesome times does not necessarily need to be taken literary. These kinds of statements are typical for one specific sort of legal documents that had started to appear from the 1320s. These documents were issued by the title of new donation (*titulo nove donationis*). The pattern of how they could have been gained was the following: a certain group of people would state that they inherited some estate from their ancestors, but charters that could prove it had been destroyed (often the given reason was fire or robbery). The chancellery would usually send their people to investigate the case and question neighbours and other nobles. If a report was positive, that is, if it would be confirmed that petitioners were legal inheritors of an estate, a new charter would be issued *sub titulo nove donationis*. In that way, petitioners would get legal proof of their ownership. Often, if a royal seal would change, a new document as conformation of a previous one would be requested and sometimes it would be again given *sub titulo nove donationis* (the terminology was not absolutely precise in this way). Charters issued by the title of new donation were always given for land already possessed by petitioners.

Although historiographic considerations about purposes of charters issued by the title of new donation can be traced to the time of István Werbőczy, today there are two main views about a purpose and practical implications of this legal instrument. Pál Engel interpreted it as a mechanism of restricting the inheritance right of a kindred and of enabling the inheritance right of direct heirs. According to him, the usage of the title of new donation is a result of changes that were happening in Hungarian society during the 1340s: a shift in land inheritance pattern, from kindred to a specific heirs. Martin Rady, on the other hand, sees it as a mechanism of protection of landowners against any possible pretensions of the Crown or some other people who could use the right of Crown on the estate. The important part of the charters issued by a title of new donation is the statement that the king gives all the royal rights in a certain estate. According to Rady's analysis, by 1387 the title of new donation became a standard formula of all royal gifts, both for those lands whose ownership could be questioned and those whose was certain. He connected this fact with the need for protection of properties in a restless period of Sigismund arrival to the throne.

The study about charters issued by the title of new donation that concern the territory of medieval Slavonia has never been done. Despite the obvious similarities in the structural development of Hungary and Slavonia, without the proper research it is not possible to conclude if certain social changes were developing in both territories in the same way.⁶⁷⁷ For that reason,

⁶⁷⁷ It should be mentioned here that Ivan Majnarić recently wrote a very interesting study "The title of new donation and its role in structuring the society and family in the Kingdom of Croatia in the fourteenth century". The author

I think that at this state of research it is not possible to conclude if hypothesis of Pál Engel (so, title of new donation as limitation of kindreds rights to a certain estate) or Martyn Rady (title of new donation as mechanism of restricting the right of the Crown) can be applied to the charter in question here. This charter issued by Sigismund in 1412 did restrict the inheritance right to descendants of George, Vuk and Gregory of both sexes (*heredes et posteritates utriusque sexus*).⁶⁷⁸ According to Marija Karbić, this is also somewhat unusual situation as, according to Tripartitum, awards for military service could only be given to men as they were the ones who performed military duties. The author supposed that perhaps, in this case, the main reason for confirmation that the land can be inherited by the heirs of both sexes could be that this was the land inherited from the ancestors and the daughters also had certain rights on it.⁶⁷⁹ I think that this is definitely an important factor, but again, to understand the importance of the title of new donation in Sigismund period and prior to it, the study that would include all the extant charters should be done. As far as Turopolje is concerned, it seems to me that the right of the kindred to inherit certain lands from some branch that dies out has never been completely restricted. Some mechanism of prevention of alienation of the land that was the property of the noble community must have been developed as the noble community did last until 1947. This mechanism could be simply biological; lots of families were living in a relatively small territory and in a certain way they were all connected. In any case, these are just the impressions that I gained by working on the history of the area so far. For more reliable conclusions, the land inheritance patterns should be analysed in detail in a wider time span, from the thirteenth to the twentieth century. Hopefully, data gathered in this thesis will also contribute to it.

One additional aspect recorded in the above-mentioned charters is important for kindreds living in this area. It will be explained in the further text. As an introduction to the topic, it should be pointed out that misuses of charters given by the title of new donation were not unusual; already István Werbőczy criticized these misuses and regarded them as a betrayal of brotherhood. I think that the example of Donji Lukavec could be one case of such “betrayal”. In order to explain this, first I will show the location of Donji Lukavec on a modern map. After

analysed cases of several noble families in this context. He himself emphasized that the hypothesis gained through his analysis should be confirmed by the future research and formulated important aspects that the research should focus. In any case this is a very good first step. However, as is the case with Hungary, the social development of Croatia deferred from the one of Slavonia. Ivan Majnarić, “The title of new donation and its role in structuring the society and family in the Kingdom of Croatia in the fourteenth century,” (in press).

⁶⁷⁸ MHNC 1, 176, p. 167.

⁶⁷⁹ Karbić, “Plemićka obitelj Mikšić,” pp. 70-71.

that, I will show data about the kindreds in this area that have been presented in the previous text.

5.2.1.2.4.2. *Spatial data*

On the 24th of April 1428, King Sigismund again issued a charter by which he ordered the Chapter of Zagreb to install three men into their hereditary and ancestral estate Donji Lukavec (*possessio ipsorum hereditaria et avita Inferior Lwkaweck vocata*). These were Denis son of George Mikšić and his cousins Vit son of Vuk and Gregory Stanilović of the Levča kindred (*patrueles suorum de genere Leucha*).⁶⁸⁰ Denis and Vit were sons of George and Vuk of the Levča kindred who got conformation of their right to the estate in 1412.⁶⁸¹ On the twentieth of July, the Chapter issued the charter confirming that the installation was done.⁶⁸²

The perambulation of the estate Donji Lukavec recorded in the above-mentioned installation charter is very long, but the main borders can be easily recognized on a modern map. They are similar to the borders of the estate shown on the 1861 cadastre map. In the following lines, I will write down (and paraphrase) the most important parts of the perambulation. Besides the borders, some of the neighbours of the estate are also important for further text. The perambulation was the following: “The border began in the Peščenjak river (*fluuius Peschenyak*) at the place called Kraljičino brodišće (*locus Kralychyno Brodysche*) (no 1 on the map), where on the right side was the border of Paul *magnus* and the nobles of Gornji Lukavec, it went towards the north for a longer while all the time bordering with the lands of Paul *magnus* and the nobles of Gornji Lukavec, and it came to a place that floods during rains called *Meynemokriczeglawa* (*locum tempore pluviali aquosum*) (no 2), and through this place it went to the north for a long while dividing the land of Donji Lukavec and Gornji Lukavec and Paul *magnus* and came to one rushing stream Rakitovica (*torrens Rakythowycza*), and going through it entered the Lukavec river (*fluuius Lwkaweck*) (no 3), and in this confluence was the border that Stephan Pedk exchanged with Paul *magnus*, from there again the border went towards the north for a longer while and entered the river Dobova mlaka (*fluuius Dobowamlaka*), and going by it towards the east for a short while it came to the boundary called *Pwrdlewzkameya* that divided the boundaries of Gornja Lomnica from the parts of the land (*porciones*) that Stephan Pedk had exchanged with Paul *magnus*, and through this boundary it went towards the north for a longer while, and passing over one road (*via*) it entered the

⁶⁸⁰ MHNC 1, doc. 219., p. 221.


⁶⁸¹ MHNC 1, doc. 176., pp. 166-168.

⁶⁸² MHNC 1, doc. 221., pp. 210-211.

Lominca River (*fluuius Lompnycza*) in the place called Staro Brodišće (*locus Ztharobrodysche*) (no 4), from here by the flow of this river it went towards the east for a long while and came to the crossing on the river (*vadum*, ford or ferry) on the opposite side of some dwelling units (*sessiones*) called *Zthrahowozelo*, from that place exits through some big public road (*magna via publica*) that divides the boundaries and the lands called *Book* that belonged to Donji Lukavec on the right side and the boundaries of Donja Lomnica on the left side, and going near the road the boundary came to the river (*fluuius*) Dobova mlaka and near it this road diverts to the south and then leaves this stream, and goes through the road directly towards the south around the lands (*terras*) of Blaž Kobolth on the left or the eastern side, and by this road it goes directly to the south through the wood called Lošec (*silva Losech*) and entered the Lukavec river (*fluuius Lwkaweck*), from which it entered the Mostičajna river (*fluuius Mozochanya*), that also was dividing the estates Mali Obrež (*possessiones Kysobres*) and the woods (no 5); the wood of Mali Obrež as well as the wood of Donji Lukavec on the right side and Donja Lomnica on the left side, and through the Mostičajna river it went towards the south for a long while and came to the Peščenjak river to the first boundary and there finished.”⁶⁸³

Thus, the boundary started and finished at the place called Kraljičino Brodišće in the Peščenjak stream, in the area where the Mostičajna stream and the Peščenjak stream are connected. The location of the estate is shown on Map 49. This place can be easily recognized on the map (1). On the west, the border went to a place called *Meynemokriczeglawa*. The name of this place is preserved in toponym Mokrice (2). Rushing stream Rakitovica is most likely the stream called Mlinski potok which on the 1861 cadastre is the border of Donji Lukavec. This stream pours into the Lukavec stream, as is written in perambulation (3). The northern border was the Lomnica river (4) and the western border the Mostičajna stream (5). These are also northern and western borders of the present-day Lukavec. The position of the estate is shown on Map 52.

⁶⁸³ MHNC 1, doc. 221., pp. 224-225.



Map 49-Donji Lukavec

5.2.1.2.4.3. *The kindred of Levča*

It has been concluded in the previous chapters that the settlements of the noble community located in the southwestern part of Turopolje developed only in the territory owned by the kindred of Vukota. According to the data shown in this chapter, it seems that this was wrong. When King Sigismund issued the charter by the title of new donation in 1412 he gave all the royal rights in the estate Donji Lukavec to George son of Nicholas Mikšić, Vuk son of Ladislav and Gregory Stanilović (*totalis et integra possession Inferior Lwkawecz*). This estate had been owned by their ancestors from the time of antiquity. All three men were of the kindred of Levča.⁶⁸⁴ Thus, either, along with the kindred of Vukota, one more kindred lived in the southwestern part of Turopolje or the kindred of Vukota split into few branches and one of them was called by a man named Levča.


Both could be logical explanations. Still, there are two problems with the story of the kindred of Levča. Now I will just formulate them because, in order to clarify them, data from some other charters are needed and they will be analysed in the following chapters. In 1373, the envoy of the Chapter of Zagreb did the perambulation of the borders between the kindred of Vukota and the kindred of Lomnica on the basis of the borders recorded in some register.⁶⁸⁵ If one looks Map 52, on which the western border of the kindred of Vukota from 1256, the border between the kindred of Vukota and the kindred of Lomnica from 1373 and the position of Donji Lukavec done 40 years later (1412) are shown, it is obvious that Donji Lukavec was within the borders of the kindred of Lomnica. As I will explain later, the kindred of Vukota and the kindred of Lomnica are of the same origin. But, there is no mentioning of the Levča kindred in any of those earlier charters. Likewise, when in 1363 Mikec son of Mikša, a grandfather of Nicholas Mikšić of the kindred of Levča, asked together with Deuan son of Skojko that no one can buy, take in loan or accept the estate of late Dobrouch and Peruos, they did it in the name of their whole kindred, but the kindred was not named.⁶⁸⁶ Besides that, Levča was a person who lived in the first half of the thirteenth century but the estates of his kindred were not situated in the area of Donji Lukavec. So, I think that George son of Nicholas Mikšić, Vuk son of Ladislav and Gregory Stanilović made up that they originated from Levča, but the context in which this happened will be seen in the next chapter (about the settlements in the northwestern part of Turopolje).

⁶⁸⁴ MHNC 1, doc. 176, pp. 166-168.

⁶⁸⁵ MHNC 1, doc. 89, pp. 91-93.

⁶⁸⁶ MHNC 1, doc. 76, pp. 76-77.

5.2.1.2.5. Vukomeričke gorice



Map 50-Villages in Vukomeričke gorice in 1560

The hilly area of Turopolje is called today Vukomeričke gorice; it was named after the village Vukomerić.⁶⁸⁷ The name Vukomeričke gorice does not appear in the medieval charters; there are two other names instead. The oldest one is recorded in the charter that contains the perambulation of the Hospitallers' estates from the time of King Andrew II. This name is Pomingo (*cuius montis est nomen Pomingo*).⁶⁸⁸ This traditional name was still used in the local folk language in the twentieth century (Pomnena gora).⁶⁸⁹ The other name that appears more frequently in the medieval documents is the Hills of St. Catharine (*Montes sancte Catharinae*). It is first mentioned in 1343, when Matthey son of Matthew and his nephews sold their big vineyard and some land situated in the Hill of St. Catharine to Mark son of Stanomer and his wife Lucia.⁶⁹⁰ The name Hills of St. Catherine was derived from the name of the church of St. Catharine, first mentioned in the list of parish churches from 1334.⁶⁹¹ The church was placed in the village that will be called Dubranec from 1455.⁶⁹²

On Map 50 can be noticed that in the southwestern part of the territory of the noble community, that is, in Vukomeričke gorice, there was a dense network of settlements in 1560. In the area of approximately 25 square kilometers there were altogether 10 settlements: Bukovčak, Vukomerić, Dubranec St. Cathrine, Gustelnica, Rodmanec, Cvilkovo, Prvonožec, Rathovvrh (today Petravec),⁶⁹³ Jarebić, and Vojnošec. These villages were situated on the eastern side of the border defined as the border between Vukota and his kindred and the sons of Andrew in 1256; the area in question here belonged to Vukota and his kinsmen.⁶⁹⁴ Later sources confirm that this area remained the territory of the kindred of Vukota in the following centuries. These were the villages of the noble community *u vrhovlju* (on the peaks). In the following text, the process of development of these villages will be shown.

One of the first extant charters in which the data about the area can be found dates from 1357. It is a donation charter issued by the Chapter of Zagreb by which Peter son of Stephan son of Vukota gave some part of the estate Črnoslavl dol (*particular possessionis Chernozlavl dola*) to Ivko and Ivša sons of Dobran and Peter son of Erixa of the kindred of the late Chernozlai (*de genere condam Chernozlai*) and their brothers (*fraters ipsorum*). The part

⁶⁸⁷ Šenoa, *Narodopis*, p. 5; Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, pp. 403-404.

⁶⁸⁸ CD 9. doc. 311., p. 378.

⁶⁸⁹ Ćuk, *Zagrebačka županija*.

⁶⁹⁰ MHNC 1, doc. 55, p. 55.

⁶⁹¹ MHNC 1, doc. 51, p. 51.

⁶⁹² The Church does not exist anymore, but its location, that is the hill on which it stood, is known. See: Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, pp. 332-334.

⁶⁹³ Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine*.

⁶⁹⁴ MHNC 1, doc. 9, pp. 11-13.

of the estate was situated near the church of St. Catherine the Virgin, within the borders of the estate of Peter son of Stephan. Actually, by the donation charter, Peter son of Stephan returned to Ivko, Ivša and Dobran the land that once had belonged to late Chernozlaus as his hereditary land but had been occupied by the ancestors of Peter son of Stephan. Ivko, Ivša and Dobran, on the other hand, promised they will obey Peter and his descendants the same way as their ancestors had obeyed the ancestors of Peter (*prout progenitore ipsorum progenitoribus dicti Petri fuerunt consueti*).⁶⁹⁵

This charter contains more valuable information. It confirms that Vukota, grandfather of Peter, so the person who can be tracked in the extant sources in the 1250s and 1260s, had imposed himself as the “head” of his kindred that two generations later was called after him. Likewise, the charter confirms his descendants kept this leading role. It has been shown that the sons of Vukota were the first known castle warriors of Lomnica, which, I think, was the central village of this kindred. They also held lands in Vukomeričke gorice, according to this charter around the area of the church of St. Catherine. Chernozlau from whom Peter’s ancestors took the land was, as Vukota, already mentioned in the previous text. He was a relative of Peter’s father Stephan, son of Vukota. In 1276, Chernozlau together with his brother Turcha and their relative Vukša sold a part of the land in Mali Obrež to Stephan and his brother Blasius.⁶⁹⁶

As far as the belonging of an individual to a certain kindred is concerned, it is interesting to notice that in the above-mentioned charter from 1356 it was not specified to which kindred Peter son of Stephan son of Vukota belonged. On the other hand, Ivko and Ivša sons of Dobran and Peter son of Erixa were of the kindred of the late Chrnolai (*de genere condam Chernolai*). When the envoy of the Chapter of Zagreb did the perambulation of the borders in 1373 between the kindred of Vukota and the kindred of Lomnica, the above-mentioned Peter son of Crikša son of Chrnolai was listed among the representatives of the kindred of Vukota (*de generatione Vukota*).⁶⁹⁷ This data clearly shows that the term kindred was used for a kindred in a broader sense of the word as well as for its smaller units, branches which could be defined as extended families. Obviously, it can be seen in the examples used here that the term used for the kindred of Vukota is *de generatione* and for the kindred of Chernolai is *de genere*. But, in general, the previous research has shown that these terms have the same meaning. Also, it has

⁶⁹⁵ CD 12, doc. 497, pp. 662-663.

⁶⁹⁶ MHNC 1, doc.27, pp. 29-30.

⁶⁹⁷ MHNC 1, doc. 89, p. 90.

been shown on the example of the Levča kindred that both the variants *de generatione Leucha* and *de genere Levcha* can be found in the extant sources.

One additional charter confirms that the process of breaking up of land of the kindred of Vukota and its splitting into smaller units owned by the extened families (branches of the kindred) was happening in the second half of the fourteenth century. This charter was issued by *comes* of Zagreb Nicholas de Virtus and his son *comes terrestris* Vid in 1379. It stated that Rode son of Rodmany, John son of Peter and Lucacius son of Hoteny came to them and notified them about the division of their hereditary estates in the Hills of St. Catherine they had made with their brothers (*quod ipsi possessions eorum hereditarias in monticulo sancte Katerine existentes, cum fratribus suis cum metis diviserunt*). The division was done in front of deputies of *comes* and *comes terrestris*, the castle warriors Mark son of Matthew, Vid son of Endre, George son of Pech and John son of Gorden.


The perambulation recorded in the charter is the following: “The boundary begins on the east from one bush called *tilia* (it is written in Croatian: *germ dictus lipow*) and falls down to the hill, and through the hill it goes towards the south, at that place they had divided the boundary and on the eastern side were [the lands] of Rode, John and Lucacius and on the western side of the sons of Vukota (*filiorum Wlkote*), and the boundary proceeds near going to the valley called Zobine, and around the valley it goes up to the hill up to one *cerye* (bushes in Hungarian), and from *cerye* flows one small water (*una aqua procedit parva*) and comes to the water Krečín (*aqua Crechin*), and the border goes up through Krečín and up to the spring of Krečín, and between the vineyards were the boundaries of son of Vukomer and sons of Pauros (*fili Vukomery et filiorum Paruos*), and the border ascends up to the public road (*via publica*) and going through the road comes to the first boundary.” The flows of these streams are shown on Map 54.

Besides this Rode, John and Lucacius got some half on the hill Celebin (probably some part of Vukomeričkegorice), half in Lazina (unknown) and one-third of the agricultural land in Lužje.⁶⁹⁸

Thus, the other “brothers” that owned the estates in this area were the sons of Vukomer, the sons of Paruos and the sons of Vukota. As all these people are named brothers (*fratres*) and it is easy to conclude that they were of kindred of Vukota. Besides that, it can be mentioned that Stephan son of Vukomer was listed as a member of Vukota kindred in 1373 during the

⁶⁹⁸ MHNC 1, doc. 95, p. 102.

division of the borders with the kindred of Lomnica.⁶⁹⁹ Also, it can be added that the term *fratres* is, in general, used both for “proper” brothers as well as cousins, which is obviously the case here.



Map 51-The 1379 division of land in Vukomeričke gorice

I cannot completely reconstruct this border, that is, the exact hill, where it began (Map 51). The valley called Zobine was mentioned both in the perambulation of Kostanjevec John *literatus* bought in 1365 and in the perambulation of Mali Kostanjevec or Novaki from 1374.⁷⁰⁰ It was placed on the southern side of these estates, but it could refer to the whole valley between the southern borders of Kostanjevec to Vukomeričke gorice (if that is the valley Zobine in question here). The water *Crechin* is the present-day stream Rečina that can be seen on the map. So, on the first part of the border, on the western side were the estates of sons of Vukota and on the eastern of Rode, John and Lucius. The estates of Stephan, grandson of Vukota were, according to the charter from 1356 (the first charter mentioned in this chapter) situated around the church of St. Catherine (in the area of the present-day village of Dubranec). I suppose that here is where the border went through. The estates of sons of Vukomer and sons of Puruouš

⁶⁹⁹ MHNC 1, doc. 89, p. 90.

⁷⁰⁰ MHNC 1, doc. 79 and 90, pp. 80 and 96.

were situated on the western side of the stream Rečina. But, even if these borders are not completely accurately shown, the concept of the division of the land is clear. In this context, the first villages in this area emerged. Now, the basic data about their first appearance in the sources will be briefly shown.

5.2.1.2.5.1. *Dubranec*

As written, the church of St. Catherine was in the area of Dubranec. The sons of Vukota had estates in this area. In 1357, Vukota's grandson Stephan gave some part of the estate Črnoslavdol to Ivko and Ivša sons of Dobran and Peter son of Erixa of the kindred of the late Črnozlai and their brothers. The toponym Črnoslav still exist on the area north of the present-day Dubranec.

The village Dubranec, whose name is derived from the name of Dobran, father of Ivko and Ivša, is mentioned by this name for the first time in 1455 as *Debranych*. Most of its inhabitants, mentioned in the 1455 charter, were direct descendants (grandchildren) of Ivša and Kryksa (that is above mentioned Erixa) and were nominated as *nobiles generacionis Dobranych vocate*.⁷⁰¹ Thus, by the middle of the fifteenth century, the descendants of Črnozlaus did not identify themselves by the name of their ancestor but by the name of their village. As will be shown in the later text, in the fifteenth century, the term *generatio* combined with the name of a certain village, will be used also in the case of inhabitants of other villages.

5.2.1.2.5.2. *Vukomerić*

The name of the village Vukomerić is also derived from the personal name - Vukomer. As shown, his sons held their lands in this area. Besides that, Stephan, son of Vukomer was listed among the members of Vukota kindred in 1373.⁷⁰² The first extant charter I have found in which this village is recorded dates from 1456; in a perambulation of some agricultural lands, situated around the Lomnica River is mentioned that there were also some estates of nobles from Vukomerić and nobles from Gustelnica in this area (*uno fine metam nobilium de Gustynnycza ab oriente, et alio fine metam nobilium de Vukomerych ab occidente pertingentem*).⁷⁰³

⁷⁰¹ MHNC 1, doc. 301, p. 349; Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, pp. 323-324.

⁷⁰² MHNC 1, doc. 89, p. 92.

⁷⁰³ MHNC 1, doc. 305, p. 360.

5.2.1.2.5.3. *Rodmanec*

The village named Rodmanec does not exist today. Its exact location is so far unknown (there are probably some unpublished sources that could help with locating it). I suppose that it was placed somewhere around Gustilnica, because, according to the perambulation that testified about the division of the land between sons of Vukota, sons of Vukomer, sons of Puruos and Rode son of Rodmany, John son of Peter and Lucacius son of Hoteny in 1379, the lands of the last were somewhere around Gustelnica, and Rodmanec was probably named by Rodman, father of Rode. The village is first mentioned in 1455. From 1612 it does not appear in the sources.⁷⁰⁴ I suppose it was a smaller hamlet.

5.2.1.2.5.4. *Gustilnica*

The village Gustilnica, placed one kilometre south of Dubranec, was first mentioned in 1428; one of the neighbours present at the installation of Denis and George Stanilović and Vit son of Vuk at the estate of Donji Lukavec was Stojan (*Zthoyan*) de *Gwstinnycza*.⁷⁰⁵ His father was Thomas. This is a common name and, without knowing the name of Thomas' father, I cannot connect it with some person from the other extant charters. Still, according to the perambulation from 1379, this was most likely the part of a land that Rode, son of Rodmany, John son of Peter, and Lucacius son of Hoteny got. This could be supported by some additional data. In the same charter from 1397 is written that they also got one-third of the arable lands in Lužan. In 1456, besides nobles from Lužan and nobles from Vukomerić, nobles from Gustelnica also had some agricultural lands in Lužan, situated around the Lomnica River.⁷⁰⁶

5.2.1.2.5.5. *Jarebić, Cvilkovo, Prvonožec and Ratkov Verh (Petravec)*

Jarebić is first time mentioned in 1424 when Paul son of Stanech *de Iarebich* and his sons bought some estate in Velika Gorica. Therefor, by this period Jarebić is an existing village. Unlike in most of the cases shown above, the name of Jarebić cannot be connected with a person that can be found in the extant sources. Laszowski wrote that the name could be derived from the word jareb, which would be jarebica, a partridge and that could indicate the place "with lots

⁷⁰⁴ Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 386.

⁷⁰⁵ MHNC 1, doc. 221, p. 223.

⁷⁰⁶ MHNC 1, doc. 305, p. 360.

of partridges”. He also considered an option that the name could be derived from Jareb as a personal name Jareb or Jereb.⁷⁰⁷ Perhaps this could also be so, but the person of such name also cannot be found in the extant sources (at least the ones found so far).

In any case, Jarebić was a village out of which the villages Cvilkovo, Prvonožec and Ratkov Verh (Petravec) developed. Prvonožec was named after one family from Jarebić who inhabited this area; Valentin Prvonožec (*Prewonosecz*) from Jarebić is mentioned in the charter from 1466. It was a very small village.⁷⁰⁸ The same family lived in the village Ratkov Vrh; the first people mentioned living in this village were Mark Prvonožec (*Perwonosecz*) and George Petravić (*Petrawych*) in 1549.⁷⁰⁹ This is also when Ratkov Vrh was first time mentioned. By the family Petrović, the village started to be called Ratkov Vrh or Petravski vrh (1645); today it is named Petravec.

Cvilkovo was first mentioned in 1495 when castellans of Lukavec and *comites* of the nobles of the Field of Zagreb Ladislav and Andrew *de Summog* together with *comes terrestris* Benedict from Velika Mlaka issued a charter by which they confirmed that nobles from Jarebić were installed into a half of the estate Cvilkovo that was in the territory of Jarebić (*in dominium medietatis Cwilkooowo vocato, in pertinenciis et territorio prefate Iarebich habitam et existentem*). Cvilkovo does not exist today, but according to the perambulation written in the above-mentioned charter it was placed between Jarebić and Prvonožec (*iuxta porcionem possessionariam nobilium Porwonoschi vocate*).⁷¹⁰ So, Cvilkovo developed in the territory of Jarebić. The village never fully developed as a separate village. It was a hamlet where one family from Jarebić lived. After the end of the sixteenth century it is not mentioned in the sources.⁷¹¹

The 28 nobles from Jarebić (among which two women) that were installed into half of the estate Cvilkovo in 1495 were denominated as the castle warriors of Jarebić and kinsmen of the kindred of Jarebić (*nobiles castrenses de Iarebicz, fratres scilicet patruelis generacionis Iarebichy vocate*).⁷¹² I think that this is the same case as was with the kindred of Dubranec

⁷⁰⁷ Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 335.

⁷⁰⁸ Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 381.

⁷⁰⁹ MHNC 3, doc. 121.

⁷¹⁰ MHNC 2, doc. 112. Laszowski wrote down that the name was preserved in a toponym Cvilkovo, which is one hill of which one half belonged to the village of Jarebić and the other to Gustelnica. Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 309.

⁷¹¹ Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 309.

⁷¹² MHNC 2, doc. 112, p. 159.

mentioned in 1455⁷¹³; originally this was the territory of Vukota kindred (in the thirteenth and fourteenth century), but in the fifteenth century it became usual for the inhabitants of one village (who in practice are almost always related) to be called kindred. As will be shown later, the same process can be seen in the area of the northwestern part of Turopolje.

5.2.1.2.5.6. *Vojnošec*

The southernmost of the settlements that were listed in 1560 in Vukomeričke gorice was Vojnošec. Today this is a village called Cvetković brdo; from the seventeenth century, this last name started to appear instead of Vojnošec. The Cvetkovići were one of the families who had estates in this village.⁷¹⁴ The village is first mentioned in 1427; Gregory son of John *de Woynosech* was one of the noble judges that confirmed that Phillip Raden from Dragonožec and his sons paid for the murder of Mark Černec.⁷¹⁵ The name of the village developed from the personal name *Woyn*: in 1454 *Thomas filius Pauli filio Woyn de Voynosecz was comes terrestris*.⁷¹⁶ Vojn, a grandfather of Thomas must have lived in some period in the middle and the second half of the fourteenth century. Again, around an estate of one family, sometime in the last decades of the fourteenth or the beginning of the fifteenth century, a village was formed. I did not find a person named Voyn in the fourteenth-century charters.

5.2.1.2.5.7. *Bukovčak*

The last in the group of these villages is Bukovčak, placed north of Vukomerić and Dubranec. It was first mentioned in the tithe list of the Chapter of Zagreb in 1459 as *villa Bukowschaky*.⁷¹⁷ The noble family Bukovčak that named itself after this village lived in Vojnošec. It was first mentioned in 1447 (*Thomas Bwkwchiak de Woynesez*).⁷¹⁸ So, probably this village developed around the estates of this family.

In this chapter the development of the villages of the nobles of Turopolje in Vukomeričke gorice (*u vrhovlju*) has been shown. On the basis of the extant data, it can be

⁷¹³MHNC 1, doc. 301, p. 239.

⁷¹⁴Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 308.

⁷¹⁵ MHNC 1, doc. 207, pp. 202-203.

⁷¹⁶ MHNC 1, doc. 282; Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 307.

⁷¹⁷MHNC 1, doc. 325, p. 395.

⁷¹⁸MHNC 1, doc. 261, p. 285; Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, pp. 302-303.

concluded that the land in this area was owned by the kindred of Vukota certainly from 1256 (and perhaps also prior to it).⁷¹⁹ The process of breaking up of land belonging to one kindred into parts owned by the smaller branches of this kindred (extended families) can be traced in the extant sources from the second half of the fourteenth century. The charter issued in 1379, when Rode son of Rodmany, John son of Peter and Lucacius son of Hoteny divided their hereditary estates with their “brothers”, sons of Vukota, sons of Vukomer and sons of Puruous, testify about this process.⁷²⁰ In this context, the data about the appearance of first villages in this territory should be analysed.

The summary of these data is shown in Plate 10. Except that, data about the village Dragonožec, situated north of this group have been added to the plate. I did not analyse the data about this village separately, but as the other villages in question here it developed in the territory of the kindred of Vukota.⁷²¹

Plate 10-Villages in Vukomeričke gorice

	Village	Type of toponym	First appearance in the sources	Last appearance in the sources
1	Bukovčak	Natural feature	1459	Today
2	Dubranec	Personal name	1455	Today
3	Vukomerić	Personal name	1456	Today
4	Rodmanec	Personal name	1455	1612
5	Gustilnica	Natural feature	1428	Today
6	Jarebić	Natural feature or personal name?	1424	Today
7	Cvilkovo	?	1495	End of the sixteenth century
8	Prvonožec	Personal name (last name)	1466	
9	Ratkov Verh (Petravec)	Personal name	1495	Today
10	Vojnošec (Cvetkovičbrdo)	Personal name	1427	Today
11	Dragonožec	?	1427	

⁷¹⁹MHNC 1, doc. 9, pp. 11-13.

⁷²⁰MHNC 1, doc. 95, p. 102.

⁷²¹About Dragonožec see: Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, pp. 320-322.

All the villages in question here appear for the first time in the extant sources in the fifteenth century (starting from the 1420s). I think it is very likely that some additional charters about these villages will eventually “appear” that might change these dates. Nevertheless, it is very likely that none of these villages came into existence before the end of the fourteenth century. Six of them certainly developed out of an estate of one individual person as they were named after that person. These people (so Vukomer, Dobran, Rodman, Voin) can be found in the extant sources. They lived sometime around the first quarter to the middle of the fourteenth century. Their sons were dividing the lands among themselves around the last quarter of the fourteenth century. I suppose that the development of the villages whose names were derived after the natural features (the meaning of these features will be explained in the separate chapter about the toponyms of Turopolje), for example, Gustelnica or Bukovčak, developed in a similar way (over an estate of branch of one family), but for some reason the characteristic of the natural environment prevailed over the name of a person.

The dynamic of the development of the settlement system in this area can be understood through the example of Jarebić. Cvilkovo developed in the territory of Jarebić as a hamlet where one family from Jarebić lived at the end of the fifteenth century. Although in 1560 it was listed as a village of the noble community, by the end of the sixteenth century, it was abandoned. On the other hand, villages Ratkov Vrh and Vojnošec have also emerged in the second half of the fifteenth century when certain families from Jarebić moved there, and they still exist today. It should be mentioned here that names of some villages that exist today and were also placed in the territory of the kindred of Vukota can sometimes be found in the medieval sources but were not listed as the villages of the nobles in 1560. Such examples are *Marcusew Vrih* and *Persinov Verh*, the present-days Markuševec Turopoljski and Peršinovec.⁷²² Both of these villages are situated east of Dragonožec. But, in those villages not the nobles of Turopolje but (most likely) their tenant-peasants were living.

⁷²² MHNC 1., doc. 325, p. 393.

5.2.1.3. Remarks

In this chapter the development of the villages situated in the southwestern part of Turopolje has been analysed. Due to several extant sources that testify about the division of the land between kindreds, it was possible to connect the villages that developed in this territory with one specific kindred, the kindred of Vukota, as well as, with the breaking up of kindred into the extended families and smaller family units. Thus, the data gathered at this chapter they offer insight into the history of kindred whose members were the lesser, conditional nobles, the castle warriors.

The borders of the area discussed in this chapter were defined through the analysis, by using the concept that the villages were inhabited by the members of the kindred of Vukota. These villages were: Lužje, Hrašće, Donji and Gornji Lukavec and Donja and Gornja Lomnica situated in the northern part of the territory in question here, in the plain area of Turopolje as well as the villages in Vukomeričke gorice, situated in the hilly area in the southern part. It can be noticed that the villages in the plain were the first one to develop; apart from Lukavec, they were all mentioned in the extant sources from the second half of the thirteenth century. As far as Lukavec is concerned, by 1363,⁷²³ when it was first time mentioned, it was already a formed settlement, so it must have developed prior to the second half of the fourteenth century. All the villages in the plain were named after natural features.

The villages in Vukomeričke gorice, on the other hand, appear in the extant sources in the fifteenth century. They were formed after the land of the kindred had been divided into the estates of families. As testified by the sources, this process was happening in the last quarter of the fourteenth century. Out of the eleven analysed villages, the names of six of them were derived from personal names. The land colonization of the hilly area probably meant woodland clearing and the emergence of small settlements or settlement nuclei created by individual members of the kindred, who moved out from the central estates of the family group.⁷²⁴ I suppose that the reason for this discrepancy in territorial development between the plain and the hilly area was natural conditions; they were more favourable in the plain part, the area was more densely populated, more suitable both for agriculture and the pig farming (which was the main economic branch of Turopolje). Consequently, the process of a forming the villages

⁷²³ MHNC 1, doc. 76, pp. 76-77.

⁷²⁴ Similar processes were attested in different parts of medieval Hungary, where expansion towards the hilly, woodland covered areas happened in the 2nd half of the thirteenth century and the first half of the fourteenth century. Similarly, to the process of naming of villages in Vukomeričke gorice, the names of these new settlements were derived from personal names in some parts Zala and Vas counties, and also in the northern part of medieval Hungary.

developed faster. Perhaps this area was also first inhabited by the Slavic population after their settling. This, however, is just an assumption that could be confirmed or disproved by archaeological research.

It is important to emphasize that it is clear from the extant thirteenth- and fourteenth-century sources that the members of the Vukota kindred did not have their estates only in the southwestern part of Turopolje; they also owned lands or had estates east of this area, in the southeastern part. According to the perambulation of the Hospitallers' estates Kravarsko and Peščenica from 1328, Kravarsko and Peščenica bordered on the west and north with lands owned by the sons of Vukota and their kindred, up to the point where the border turned to the south going through the road called Poy.⁷²⁵ This means that the sons of Vukota and their kinsmen had the estates in the area east of Petrovina, which is the area of Trnovec, as well as, the area of the villages Buna and Buševac, that developed in the territory of Trnovec. Besides that, the first extant charter in which Trnovec is recorded, the purchase contract from 1334, notify that the sellers George son of Pazman and his cousins Elias, Thomas and Peter, sons of Vojča sold their estate to the eight castle warriors but also that the sellers had previously bought this estate from Videčić, son of Martin *Ventrosus*.⁷²⁶ So, Videčić was the first known member of the land in Trnovec and Vačić, son of Martin *Ventrosus*, was among the representatives of the Vukota kindred at the sale of Kostanjevec in 1279.⁷²⁷ These two people were obviously brothers, thus, belonged to the same kindred. As far as Trnovec is concerned, it cannot be stated that the village that had developed in this territory and was listed among the estates of the nobles of Turopolje in 1560 was connected with the kindred of Vukota. The history of Trnovec has been analysed in detail in a chapter about Okuje and it was shown that it was the territory where different owners (the castle warriors, descendants of count Ivan son of Jaroslav, the Farkaš family and the others) had their estates. People from Trnovec rarely appear in the sources, not prior to the fifteenth century. By their names, it can be seen that they were connected with nobles of Kurilovec and Kušanec and not with descendants of the kindred of Vukota (see the sub chapter *Kurilovec, Kušanec, Trnovec*, pages 350-355). The settlements Buna and Buševac are first mentioned in the extant sources at the beginning of the fifteenth century, not as villages of the castle warriors. Thus, by the beginning of the fifteenth century, the sons of Vukota and

⁷²⁵ CD 9, doc. 316, pp. 383-385.

⁷²⁶ MHNC 1, doc. 52, p. 52.

⁷²⁷ MHNC 1, doc. 30, p. 33.

their kinsmen either sold the lands that they had possessed in this area or the land had been in some way alienated from them.

Along with that, it can be seen in the extant sources that some castle warriors of the kindred of Vukota had their lands in the area of the villages of Kuče and Rakitovec, both situated east of Mraclin. This area is not analysed separately in this thesis, but it can be stated, as Juraj Ćuk noticed, that people of different kindreds had their estates in it. This was so because these two villages developed in the area of Veliki Turopoljski lug, a communal wood that belonged to all castle warriors of Turopolje, already in the thirteenth century as confirmed by a charter issued by Ban Stephan in 1249. The castle warriors raised a complaint because the Ivan son of Jaroslav and his cousins violently brought their pigs to the wood and pastured them (*uiolenter intrantes porcos in eadem pascifacerent*), although the castle warriors did not give them permission. Although the wood is called simply *silva*, it is clear from the perambulation recorded in the charter that this was Veliki Turopoljski lug. Ban returned the wood to the castle warriors and forbid anyone of high nobility (*nobiles*) or anyone who is *de genere servientum regis* to keep their pigs there.⁷²⁸ Therefore, it can be concluded that the specific strategic position of these villages resulted in complex property situation, different than one of the villages that were analysed in this chapter, the villages on the main territory of the kindred of Vukota.

A few facts about the main territory of the kindred should be mentioned. As clear from the earliest sources, the kindred of Vukota was not the only kindred that owned the land in the southwestern part of Turopolje in the first half of the thirteenth century (and most likely prior to it, but not much can be said about that as there are no extant sources). It was shown that Kračun, whose land was mentioned as the bordering area of the Hospitallers' estate Kravarsko in the time of King Andrew II, was of separate kindred. For the sons of Opor, who owned a large portion of the land in the area of Petrovina and Gradići, is not clear to which kindred they belonged. Nevertheless, the villages of the castle warriors in this territory developed exclusively in the territory of the kindred of Vukota; the land of the others became the royal land, the property of Želin. For now, it remains unclear how this happened (whether the land was confiscated or sold, etc.).

By 1256, Vukota and his kindred, using the weakness of juvenile sons of *comes* Andrew, managed to enlarge their territory. According to Juraj Ćuk "the family of *comes* Gurk had

⁷²⁸ MHNC 1, doc. 5, p. 8.

seniority in this kindred [the kindred of Vukota] and, when in 1256 this family separated from the kindred, the family of Vukota took over the seniority”.⁷²⁹ This statement points at some questions about the functioning of the first counties that are worth formulating, although it would take wider research to answer to them. First, I do not think that the kindred of Andrew and the kindred that will be later called of Vukota were the necessarily the same kindred or that, in 1256, the first “separated” from the kindred. It was most likely that they were in some way expelled from the territory of the kindred. It does seem, however, that the family of *comes* Gurk was in some way superior to the other kindred. According to the perambulation of borders that defined the territory of Iunossa and his kindred in 1242, the parts of the land owned by Vukota and his kinsmen in 1256, belonged to Andrew and his kindred in 1242 (the area of Lukavec and south of it). The question is what “seniority” meant? If Gurk was a *comes* of Zagreb he was superior to the castle warriors of the Zagreb castle. Both his son Peter and his grandson Andrew were referred as *comites*, which obviously points at the person of a higher rank, but, due to the lack of sources, it cannot be stated if they were also *comites* of Zagreb at one point. Was the role of *comes* of Zagreb hereditary at this period? Did it also include the seniority over kindreds of the castle warriors? Or were Gurk or his ancestors some sorts of “local chiefs” that had ruled over the wider territories of the County inhabited by different kindreds subordinated to them and for that reason the members of the family were chosen to be *comites* (so the leading role that they already had possessed preceded the rank their gained)? As said, these questions would require the broader research, that should start with mapping all the estates of the family of Gurk in the counties of Zagreb, Križevci etc. Still, it is questionable if they could be answered at all as the extant sources are limited. As far as Turopolje is concerned, I think that it can be stated that the few charters that testify about the quarrels with Andrew and, later, his sons show pattern repeated in the following centuries: the attempts of submission of the castle warriors by nobles of higher rank that were successfully rejected by the first. While Andrew and his kindred obviously held a part of the territory that in 1256 gained Vukota and his kindred, in 1242 Andrew showed pretensions on the territory of kindred of Iunosa, so the territory that was also, as can be seen in the later sources, inhabited by the kindred of Vukota. Probably Andrew used the chaos in the Kingdom caused by the Mongol invasion; it is testified in some other sources that in that period many of the lands of the castle were alienated and the main aim of Ban Stephan of the Gut-Keled kindred (Ban in the period from 1242-1260) was to return them. Andrew’s attempt was unsuccessful; he had to promise that he will not attack Iunossa and his

⁷²⁹ Ćuk, Zagrebačka županija, p. 61.

kindred any more.⁷³⁰ Obviously, there must have been some solid reason for such behaviour; either Iunosa and his kinsmen successfully defended their lands with the armed force, or they had a protection of a higher authority. The charter does not state anything about this, but it should be noted that their land was the castle land.

In any case, it can be said with certainty that the family of Vukota son of Iurgis did take the leading role in their kindred, but it cannot be specified how exactly this happened. In 1256, when the land between the kindred and Miroslav and the sons of Andrew was divided, Vukota was listed first (of his kinsmen) but he was in no way marked as being the “chief” of his kindred.⁷³¹ Also, in charters that testify about the purchases in which Vukota was involved, his leading role was in no way accentuated (for example with the title of *comes*).⁷³² Still, besides the fact that the kindred was later named after him, very important data concerning this issue were recorded in 1357 when Vukota’s grandson Stephan returned part of the estate Črnoslavl dol to Ivko and Ivša, sons of Dobran and Peter son of Erixa of the kindred of the late Črnozlai and their brothers. The last promised that that will obey Peter, son of Stephan, son of Vukota and his descendants the same way as their ancestors had obeyed the ancestors of the same Peter (*prout progenitors ipsorum progenitoribus dicti Petri fuerunt consueti*).⁷³³ Again, what this obedience understood cannot be specified, but the data reveals some new aspects about the society of the castle warriors of Turopolje. It is certain that Črnozlai (so the ancestor of Ivko and Ivša, sons of Dobran and Peter son of Erixa) was not a tenant peasant or serf of the family of Vukota; Črnozlai and his brother Turcha and their relative Vukša sold parts of their hereditary lands in Obrež to sons of Vukota in 1276 which meant that they owned the land hereditary and that was one of the privileges of the castle warriors.⁷³⁴ Besides that, Peter son of Erixa/Crixa son of Černezlau was himself listed among the *nobiles iobagiones castri de Campo Zagradiensi*, in 1373 when the borders between the kindred of Vukota and the kindred of Lomnica had been divided. Still, obviously, in some respect, not all the castle warriors were equal, and it was not the *comes terrestris* who was their only “chief”. Besides that, *comes terrestris* was elected among them and it was not hereditary function based on some ancestor right. In any case, all the above-mentioned data confirmed that a deeper division existed within

⁷³⁰ MHNC 1, doc. 4, pp. 6-7.

⁷³¹ MHNC 1, doc. 9, p. 11.

⁷³² MHNC 1, docs. 17 and 18., pp. 19-20.

⁷³³ CD 12, doc. 497, pp. 662-663.

⁷³⁴ MHNC 1, doc. 27, pp. 29-30.

the society of the nobles of Turopolje but the sources do not reveal in what way this division was manifested in practice.

As far as the kindreds are concerned, it was shown that data about certain kindreds living on the territory of the kindred of Vukota appear in the fourteenth- and the fifteenth-century charters. For example, the above mentioned Ivko and Ivša sons of Dobran and Peter son of Erixa were *de genere condam Chernozlai* and in 1455 their grandchildren were *nobiles generacionis Dobranychy vocate*.⁷³⁵ Also, the nobles of Jarebić were in 1495 denominated as *fratres scilicet patruelis generacionis Iarebichy vocate*.⁷³⁶ This emergence of new kindreds can be explained with splitting of the kindred as a bigger unit into extended family units as well as the spatial reorganization of the area and the fact that the common estate became more important than the memory of a common ancestor.

However, there is one charter that should be mentioned in the end which cannot be completely explained by the above-written patterns. The first extant charter in which the kindred of Lomnica is recorded was issued in 1373 by the Chapter of Zagreb. It confirmed that the envoy of the Chapter did the perambulation of the borders between the kindred of Vukota and the kindred of Lomnica. Two kindreds had some disagreement about the borders, but because of their “brotherly love”, they had decided to settle it peacefully. They brought the text of the perambulation of the borders that were recorded in some register.⁷³⁷ It has already been shown that this border corresponds to the borders of the land of Iunossa and his kindred recorded in 1242, after their conflict with the kindred of Andrew.

First, it should be noticed that the borders determined in 1256 between Vukota and his kindred and the sons of Andrew and their cousin Miroslav were the western borders of the territory of the kindred of Vukota. The eastern borders were not recorded in 1256. The only extant charter that defines these eastern borders is the above-mentioned one, from 1373; from the eastern side of this border was the kindred of Lomnica. This would mean that the villages in Vukomeričke gorice, as well as Gornji and perhaps Donji Lukavec, were situated in the territory of the kindred of Vukota while Gornja and Donja Lomnica, and perhaps Donji Lukavec and Kostanjevec were situated in the territory of the kindred of Lomnica. But, the first known castle warriors of Lomnica were the sons of Vukota (*Vulkona*). It was shown that their descendants lived in Lomnica in the fifteenth century. So, direct descendants of Vukota, by

⁷³⁵ MHNC 1, doc. 301, pp. 350-351; Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, pp. 323-324.

⁷³⁶ MHNC 2, doc. 112., pp. 158-159.

⁷³⁷ MHNC 1, doc. 89, pp. 91-93.

whom the kindred was named, by 1373 considered themselves the kindred different of the one that was named after their ancestor. This can be easily interpreted in the following way: in a territory owned by a certain kindred, by a division of joint land, at one point villages started to develop and a group of people living in them started to call themselves by their main estate. There is, however, one additional problem with this theory. The borders recorded in 1373 were identical to the borders recorded in 1242 when *comes* Andrew made a promise that he will leave in peace Iunossa and his kindred. So, the borders of the territory of the kindred of Iunnosa were identical to the borders of the territory of the kindred of Lomnica. Even more, the charter from 1373 states that the borders were kept into some register. How should all this data be interpreted? Perhaps the following explanation could be offered: the kindred of Vukota and the kindred of Iunossa were two different kindreds. Sometime after 1242, the kindred of Vukota not only freed their territory that was ruled over by Andrew and his sons but also occupied the land of the kindred of Iunossa and their main estate Lomnica. Lomnica then became the main estate of the most important person, the “chief” of the kindred - Vukota and afterwards his sons. Over the period of more than one hundred years (that is, some period until 1373), the kindred of Vukota split into two branches and one of them was called after their main estate Lomnica regardless the fact that the other branch was called after the direct ancestor of the first. The borders of this originally vast estate of kindred of Iunossa (that in 1242 had still not be divided into territories of certain villages) were preserved in a register and now used by these newly formed kindred of Lomnica. Still, this could be just one hypothesis. At this moment, I do not have any other explanation so, for now, I will leave this question open. Regardless of that, I think it was important to mention it as it shows that, although through the analysis of charters and toponyms and the location of certain estates of maps some important aspects of the development of the settlements in this area became clearer, there are still data that open new questions that perhaps with finding of some additional charters and with further research will be answered.

It was shown in the chapter about Vukomeričke gorice that a considerable number of names of villages developed in this area had been derived from personal names. The placenames and some other data from the extant charters confirm that these villages were formed out of personal estates of certain people in the second half of the fourteenth and in the fifteenth century. The villages that can be found in the first extant sources, however, developed earlier, in the thirteenth century or prior to it. Due to the lack of sources, the early process of

their development is less clear. Data that could be gained through systematic archaeological research would certainly help with explaining it. In this respect, as will be shown in the later text, the excavations conducted at Šepkovčica gave some valuable insights. Along with that, at the end of this chapter, I will write down the explanations of the placenames derived after natural features, useful for both for the spatial and the environmental reconstruction.

Donja and Gornja Lomnica were named after the Lomnica River.⁷³⁸ The root of the word Lomnica is *lom*, which can indicate a swampy, muddy place or a curve in a river. In the older Croatian dictionaries, this word is connected with *lom* as *fractura*, breakage (which is also the primary Proto-Slavic meaning of the word).⁷³⁹ Emilij Laszowski probably connected the word with the meaning of *lom*, as a break. According to him, the toponym Lomnica “expresses the feature of water breaking, fast water”.⁷⁴⁰ Lajos Kiss suggested another solution for the place of the same name, Lomnic, in Slovakia. The break, in this case, is connected to stone breaking, even quarrying. This can mean, as in the case of the Lomnica stream, that the meaning is a stone stream (Kőpatak) from which one can quarry or it can indicate a village site where one can quarry stone.⁷⁴¹ The toponym Lomnica is often found in the swampy areas of northern Croatia (Hrvatsko Zagorje, Turopolje, and similarly, as Lovnica, in Bosnia).⁷⁴² Taking that into consideration as well as the fact that the Lomnica-Odra is the calm plain river that does not carry pebbles and rocks, but fine silt and small sand and then deposits them in the plain area, I think that it is the most likely that the name of the river was somehow connected with this (swampy) meaning.

Lukavec was probably named after the stream Lukavec. This word can be connected with the words *luk* (a bend), *luka* (a port) or *lukav* (wily). I think the last word was not connected with the name of the settlement. The first two words could indicate a curve or a turn of the river/stream or flooded meadow.⁷⁴³ The placename *Luka* was often used for lands situated next to watercourses.⁷⁴⁴

⁷³⁸ Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine*, p. 310.

⁷³⁹ Dunja Brozović-Rončević, “Nazivi za blatišta i njihovi toponimij skiodrazi u hrvatskome jeziku [Names for muddy places and their toponymic reflections in the Croatian language]”, *Folia onomastica Croatica* 8, p. 20.

⁷⁴⁰ Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine*, p. 310.

⁷⁴¹ Kiss, *Földrajzinevek*, pp. 385-386.

⁷⁴² Brozović-Rončević, *Nazivi za blatišta*, p. 20.

⁷⁴³ Ernest Dickenmann, *Studien zur Hydronymie des Save systems* II, Heidelberg, 1966., p. 23.

⁷⁴⁴ Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 318.

There are two opinions about the meaning of the toponym Lužje. It can signify a wood (*lug*)⁷⁴⁵ or a swamp, a mud (*luž*).⁷⁴⁶ The word *lug* can also contain both meanings because the primary meaning of the word *lug* (today it means wood) was “a swamp or a wetland overgrown with bush from which a forest develops”.⁷⁴⁷ D. Brozović-Rončević, an expert on the topic of hydronyms, concluded that: “examples like Lužina, Lužane, Lužani, Lužac, Lužak are more likely to be derived from the root *Lug* [than from the root *luž*], which means a wood, that is, a swampy area. It is also important to notice the connection with common oak [*Quercus robur*, in Croatian *hrast lužnjak*], that mostly grows in wet plains. Thus, only by field work the real meaning of this toponym can be determined”.⁷⁴⁸ It can be stated that there were surely oak trees in the area of Lužje as an oak is even today “tree of Turopolje”.

Even more, some two kilometres northwest of Lužje is the village Hrašće. This word is a plural form of the word *hrast* – an oak tree.⁷⁴⁹ However, it is questionable whether this toponym primary meant oak wood or had some other meaning. In old Croatian *hrast* (*hvrast*) can also stand for bushes or shrubs.⁷⁵⁰ Actually, the specialized meaning of *hrast* as an oak tree today can be found in (modern) Croatian, Serbian and Slovenian. In other Slavic languages, however, the word means a bush or brushwood.⁷⁵¹ The word is also used in Hungarian (and its origin is Slavic). It means a young “wood” that naturally emerged after clearing, or in abandoned land, thus, not the “proper” wood but bushes (of course, it can be an oak, if an oak is the basic natural vegetation of the area). This meaning is attested in medieval charters, for example: *in siluulis que vulgo Horosth dicuntur* (1225), *siluularum que vulgo horost dicuntur* (1227), *ad finem fructectorum que vocantur Celg horosta* (1231). The Latin synonyms are: *silva*, *quercetum*, *dumus*, *dumetum* and (in later Latin texts) *virgultum*, *rubetum*. The other meaning, which is probably secondary, is dried vegetation. It can be connected to the fact that naturally emerging woodlands are very dense and, after a while, a part of bushes dries out, while the rest emerges into real big woods. This dry, lower bushy part of woodland vegetation is called

⁷⁴⁵ Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 363.

⁷⁴⁶ Lukenda, *Zemljopisna nomenklatura*, p. 57.

⁷⁴⁷ Brozović-Rončević, *Nazivi za blatišta*, p. 20.

⁷⁴⁸ Brozović-Rončević, *Nazivi za blatišta*, pp. 20-21.

⁷⁴⁹ Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 332; *Hrvatski enciklopedijski rječnik*, p. 450; Lukenda, *Zemljopisna nomenklatura*, pp. 58-59; *Rječnik hrvatskog ili srpskog jezika* 3, pp. 44-45; Wippel, *Die geographischen Namen*, p. 33.

⁷⁵⁰ Alemko Gluhak, *Hrvatski etimološki rječnik* [Croatian etymological dictionary], (Zagreb: August Cesarec, 1993), p. 265.

⁷⁵¹ More about this see in: Petar Skok, *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika* [Etymological dictionary of Croatian or Serbian language], vol. 2 (Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1971-1973), pp. 684-685.

haraszt.⁷⁵² As the meaning bushes or shrubs for *hrast* has been attested in old Croatian, it could be that the land where the settlement Hrašće had developed was, before settlement emerged, not an oak wood but the area overgrown with bushes (although, they could have also been young oaks). In any case, the important data regarding the development of the settlement is that either bushes or wood must have been cleared prior to the settling.

Finally, the rest of the place names mentioned in this chapter, derived from natural features, will be explained. They were not connected with hydronyms as the water was not the prevailing natural characteristic in the hilly area. *Obrež* means “on a hill, on a slope of a hill” (o breg-je).⁷⁵³ The name of Kostanjevec was derived from the word *kesten*, a chestnut, a tree that obviously grew in the area of the later village. Similarly, the name *Bukovčak* is derived from a word *bukva*, a beech.⁷⁵⁴ The only explanation I have found for the name *Gustelnica* or *Gustilnica* was offered by Laszowski. He noticed that the name is written in different forms, such as *Gustimycza*, *Gwstinnycza*, *Gustinicza*, *Guzthilnicha*, *Gustunyczza* etc. The root is the word *gust*, meaning dense, and he suggested that this toponym describes the area where the village emerged as an area covered with dense woods.⁷⁵⁵ I think this explanation is very likely.

Thus, all the toponyms listed above reflect two main natural features of the Turopolje area: water and woods. All of them are common Slavic toponyms, and therefore preserve a memory of how the environment looked like when this new population arrived. The settlements that had developed in this area, on the other hand, testify of the process of clearing of woods and cultivation of the land that was happening through these first centuries as well as later. Nevertheless, perambulations and the First military survey give the impression that swamps, standing waters and numerous smaller watercourses as well as dense woods remained the dominant features of the natural landscape of Turopolje during the whole medieval and early modern period. The significant changes of this landscape took place only with the regulation of the watercourses and the industrialization, in the twentieth century.

⁷⁵² Szamota István – Zolnai Gyula, *Magyar oklevélszótár* [Hungarian charter dictionary] (Budapest, 1902-1906), pp. 347-348.

⁷⁵³ Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 373.

⁷⁵⁴ Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 301; Lukenda, *Zemljopisna nomenklatura*, p. 55.

⁷⁵⁵ Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 330; Wippel, *Die geographischen Namen*, pp. 30-31.

5.2.2. Villages of castle warriors in the northwestern part of Turopolje

In the last chapter the development of the villages situated south of the line Hrašće-Donja Lomnica has been shown. In this chapter, a development of the villages north and east of that line will be analysed. These villages are Velika Mlaka, Velika and Mala Gorica, Kurilovec-Vrbanec, Pleso, Rakarje, Kobilić, and Ilovnjak. First, it will be discussed whether the territory in which these villages had developed can be connected with a territory of some kindred or kindreds. It should be said at the beginning that this analysis cannot be done in such detail as could be one of the villages in the southwestern part of Turopolje. The reason for this is that the extant thirteenth- and fourteenth-century charters that concern the area in focus of this chapter are less numerous than the ones that concern the southwestern part. In addition to that, there are no extant charters that inform about a division of the land between kindreds in this territory. The charters that will be discussed in the following lines are purchase contracts issued when smaller portions of certain land had been sold. Still, with a detailed analysis, some fragmentary data about kindreds can be extracted out of them. Thus, in the following text, I will try to define the territory where these kindreds owned the land as well as names of people of certain kindred, as much as the data from the extant charters allow. After that, data about the development of the settlements in this area will be discussed. Some additional information about kindreds will also come out of this discussion.

5.2.2.1. Kindreds

5.2.2.1.1. *The first charter and the kindred of Budina and Levča*

At the beginning of this chapter, the earliest charter published in Laszowski's *Monumenta* must be mentioned. It is dated in 1225. With it, the young King Bela freed Budina and his brothers Ivan and Levča as well as their relatives George, Ivan son of Ladislav, Priblizlaius, Nicholas, Dobča, Milovan, Rodus, Thola and Koscut and the others of their kindred, out of the servitude to Zagreb *castrum* and proclaimed them the royal servants (*servientes regis*).⁷⁵⁶ The discussion whether this charter was actually issued by Bela or whether it is a later forgery began in the late nineteenth century within the frame of discussion about the

⁷⁵⁶ *Considerantes igitur multitudinem seruiciorum Budune, et fratrum suorum Ivan scilicet et Leucha, nec non et cognatorum suorum, videlicet Georgii, Ivan filii Ladislai, Pribizlai, Nicolai, Dobche, Miluani, Rodus, Thole, Koscut et aliorum iuxta eiusdem generacionis lineam descendencium, ab obligatoria seruitute castri Zagrabiensis eximentes, liberati inferioris officii vinculo gaudeant de honesta societate seruientum regis et concesse libertatis nobilitas in totam successionis eius prosperitatem transfundatur, introducti in participium regalis domus, gloriantur de libertatis munere, quod adepti sunt fidelitatis deuocione.* MHNC 1, doc. 1, p. 1.

origins and legal basis of the noble community of Turopolje. Both Hungarian and Croatian historians participated in it.⁷⁵⁷ Aleksandar Bresztyenszky, a prominent legal historian of his time and a writer of “Legal historical data about Turopolje” (printed in 1892) was one of those who thought that the charter was a later forgery. Some of his arguments were the following: from a diplomatic point of view the charter is more similar to the later charters than the thirteenth-century ones, texts of donation charters are, in general, longer and more informative than is the text of this charter, Bela’s charter is first time mentioned only in the fifteenth century and original in not known etc. Besides that, he thought that people mentioned in the charter could not be freed from the servitude to the *castrum* and then promoted *servientes regis* without coming *iobagiones castri* first. He argued the other charters from Turopolje mentioned nobles only as *iobagiones castri* and not *servientes regis*.⁷⁵⁸ Laszowski, on the other hand, considered the charter to be genuine. Among the arguments he proposed was the fact that the same text as the one written in this charter can be found in the charter by which Bela freed some other people from the servitude to Križevci *castrum* and proclaimed them as *servientes regis*. This charter is preserved in a transcript confirmed by King Charles Robert in 1324.⁷⁵⁹ As far as Turopolje is concerned, the original 1225 charter might had been destroyed during the quarrels with George of Brandenburg in 1516 when many charters were burned. Still, Laszowski also admitted that some parts of the text are suspicious and that some words do not correspond to the contemporary vocabulary of royal charters. He explained this to be a result of a later interpolation added in the text that happened when the charter had been transcribed, probably because the original charter was partly damaged, and the text was not visible. In any case, Laszowski emphasized that the privileges were given to one kindred, and not to all kindreds of Turopolje. The members of the kindred to whom these privileges were given did not have any practical use of it. Actually, it was more opportunistic for them not to emphasize the fact that they became *servientes regis* as, in that case, they would stay isolated among more numerous castle warriors and not be able to enjoy the privileges of the last (for example, the right to use the communal wood Veliki turopoljski lug which Ban Stephan returned to the castle warriors in 1249 and forbade any *nobiles* or the ones who were *de genere servientum regis* to use it.⁷⁶⁰). Thus, according to Laszowski, perhaps even if descendants of the kindred had the original 1225 charter they could have kept it somewhere but not show it because “it [to show it] could be more harmful than

⁷⁵⁷ For more about this see: Bresztyenszky, *Pravno-povijesni podatci*, p. 3-12; Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, pp. 238-239.

⁷⁵⁸ Bresztyenszky, *Pravno-povijesni podatci*, pp. 6-10.

⁷⁵⁹ CD 3, doc. 221., pp. 247-248.

⁷⁶⁰ MHNC 1, doc. 5, p. 8.

useful for them”.⁷⁶¹ Nada Klaić was of a similar opinion; she considered the charter to be genuine and that people mentioned in it were elevated to *servientes regis* but “the other castle warriors considered it as their private thing”.⁷⁶²

As far as the authenticity of Bela’s charter that could be understood through diplomatic analysis is concerned, I cannot say anything about it as I do not have sufficient knowledge to analyse it in such manner. On the other hand, from a historical point of view, I think that both sides had some solid arguments. It is the fact, as Aleksandar Bresztyenszky pointed out, that in any other charter the nobles of Turopolje were not referred to as *servientes regis*. Likewise, it is the fact that the 1225 charter appeared only as a transcript in the charter issued by King Matthias in 1466.⁷⁶³ Therefore, the castle warriors of Turopolje did not consider it to be the legal base of their status in the thirteenth, fourteenth and the first half of the fifteenth century. Until 1466, they had demanded from bans and kings confirmation of the charter issued by ban Nicholas on a first general assembly of Slavonia in 1278 as with this charter the ban confirmed the privileges of *vniversi iobagiones castri Zagradiensis*.⁷⁶⁴ Thence, the legitimate question is: why the 1225 charter was used only in the second half of the fifteenth century and not prior to it if it was the legal foundation of the status of the nobles of Turopolje? I think that it was so because this charter was not the foundation of their legal status. But this again cannot be proof that charter is a later forgery. One solid argument that the charter could be genuine is the fact that Levča, Budina, Tol, Milovan, Dobča and Nicholas, so six people out of twelve mentioned in Bela’s charter, appear in few other contemporary sources. This was emphasized both by Laszowski and Nada Klaić. It must be pointed out that Bresztyenszky and other older historians could not have known about this as these charters were issued in Laszowski’s *Monumnetata* that was published in 1904 (and Bresztyenszky published his discussion about Turopolje in 1892). Nonetheless, even with that, as will be seen in the text, the story about the first charter and the people mentioned in it as ancestors of noble families of Turopolje is not entirely persuasive. The important factor is the context in which this charter appeared. It will be explained in the closing part of this chapter. Before that, it is necessary to analyse the data that can reveal more about the people mentioned in the first charter and see if it is possible to place their estates in a certain part of Turopolje. Although these data are scarce, some general picture can be gained out of them. In the following text, I will call this kindred the kindred of Budina and Levča. This

⁷⁶¹ Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, pp. 237-241.

⁷⁶² Klaić, *Povijest Zagreba* I, pp. 36-37.

⁷⁶³ MHNC 1, doc. 362., pp. 457-459.

⁷⁶⁴ MHNC 1, doc. 28., pp. 30-31.

is my construction. I am using it so the text can be followed easier. It is important to emphasize that the kindred of such name is not mentioned in the extant sources.

In 1228, so three years after Bela's charter had supposedly been issued, twelve people came to the Chapter of Zagreb to confirm they had sold some lands that were property of them and their relatives or kinsmen to *comes* P. son of Gurk. Comes P. can be identified as Peter, a son of *comes* of Zagreb Gurk and a father of *comes* Andrew. Therefore, again, this family and their estates were, in some way, connected with the development of villages in this area as was the case with the villages in the southwestern part of Turopolje. The above-mentioned purchase had been done prior to the arrival of those twelve people to the Chapter. Peter was not present there. All together six lands had been sold.⁷⁶⁵

A land that Peter bought from Bogdozlaus, son of Cuplen as well as Vratislav and their kindred (*tota progenie sua*) was situated between the Odra River (*fluuius Odra*) on the north and the Lomnica River (*fluuius Lomniza*) on the south. Some other mentioned borders were: *terra Wlk*, *terra Boyemorum* and *terra P* (so, a land of Peter son of Gurk). The sold land was situated somewhere in the area between the present-day villages Čehi and Mala Mlaka and the Lomnica River on the south. *Terra Boyemorum* obviously refers to the area of the present-day Čehi. As far as the Odra River is concerned, it has been shown in the previous chapter that there was a watercourse called Odra in this area, north of the Lomnica River. In any case, this area is out of the focus of this chapter. Besides that, none of the villages of the castle warriors had developed in this territory, as it was given to the sons of Andrew and Miroslav in the division of the borders between them and Vukota and his kindred in 1256.⁷⁶⁶

Comes Peter bought four other lands from: Nicholas and Dobča and their relatives (*cognati*), Scorosa, Duško, Stephan and their kinsmen (*eorum progenie*), Vratislav, Nadesco and Dominik sons of Trebenin and Trebeša and their relatives (*cognati*) and Cuplen and his relatives (*cognati*). These four lands were situated in the area around two swamps called *Suinna Mlaka* and *Sredna malaca*. In Hungarian *malaca* means pig. The word *suinna* could be svinja,

⁷⁶⁵ MHNC 1, doc. 2., pp. 3-5.


⁷⁶⁶ MHNC 1, doc. 9, pp. 11-13. It can be added here, as these data that could be useful for some future research about the estates of the sons of Andrew or the development of the settlement system of this part of Turopolje, that *terra Wlk* could have been a property of Vuk, a father of Kračun. In 1257, Kračun, son of Vuk together with Yandrag and his son Martin and their whole kindred (*tota generacio eorum*) had to return the land Lonka (*terra Lonka*), that was also situated in this area, to the sons of Andrew. MHNC 1, doc. 10. Besides that, in 1262, the sons of Andrew also had some disagreements about a land in this area with Vukša and Roduk, sons of Vratislav from whom comes Peter bought the land in 1228, CD 5, doc. 773., pp. 229-230.

which is pig in Croatian. Thus, both places could have been swampy areas where pigs were kept. Some of the other mentioned borders are: a road that leads to St. Martin (*strata que ducit ad St. Martinum*), a road that leads to Gorica (*strata ad Goricam*), lands of Scorosa and Nicholas and a land of Peter as well as some road next to a village (*per eandem viam iuxta villam*).⁷⁶⁷ Unfortunately, the name of the village is not mentioned. I did not find toponyms *Suinna Mlaka* and *Sredna malaca* on the Military surveys or modern maps. However, analysing later extant sources, I have concluded these lands were situated in the area north of the present-day villages Pleso (which would be the area of the present-day village Mikčevac). These sources will be shown in the further text. The road that leads to St. Martin was leading east of this area as the church of St. Martin was (and still is) situated in the village Ščitarjevo. A road that leads to Gorica went to the southeast of this area as that is where Velika and Mala Gorica are situated. It could have been an old Roman road that is shown on Klemenc's map passing through this area. As mentioned, the name of the village, *villa*, was not written but there was obviously some settlement in this area.

Finally, Peter bought one land from Milovan and his relatives (*cognati*). This land was situated next to the Kosnica River, but it is not clear from the text where exactly it was situated. The border started from *Rybnich qui est in fluuio Costnycza*. *Ribnich* could be the Ribnica stream or some of its tributaries that was pouring into the Kosnica River, not visible on the Military surveys or modern maps. From the Kosnica the border went in the *fluuius Merceceg*⁷⁶⁸ ascending by it towards the west. I did not find the river or stream of such name. In any case, this land could have been situated somewhere around the northern part of the Kosnica River where is today the village Kosnica, and close to the area of Mičevac, where the other lands described above were placed. It could have also been situated around the southern flow of the Kosnica. That is the area around villages Podotočje or Kuče, in which *comes* Peter and his descendants also owned the land.

⁷⁶⁷ MHNC 1, doc. 2, p. 4.

⁷⁶⁸ Cege, that is, *szegye* in Hungarian means an artificial structure built in a river or in a watercourse to block the fishes; at the end of the structure they can be collected from the structure. This is well-known from medieval Hungary. There is also plenty of ethnographic evidence. The word often appears in place names, either connected to the character of the place or to the name of the person who has created the structure. For ethnography see: <http://mek.oszk.hu/02100/02115/html/1-1089.html>



Map 52-Suinna Mlaka and Sredna Malaca

Thus, three people from whom *comes* Peter bought lands in 1228 can be identified with people whom Bela supposedly elevated into the rank of the *servientes regis*. These are Milovan whose lands were situated around the Kosnica River and Nicholas and Dobča whose lands were situated in the area north of Pleso. Therefore, it can be concluded that the kindred of Levča and Budina were owning lands in the area north of Pleso and in the area around the Kosnica. They sold these lands to *comes* Peter in 1228. By this, it becomes clear why there were no villages of the castle warriors in the area north of Pleso in 1560. As was the case with the other estates of descendants of Peter in the southwestern part of Turopolje, their estates in the northwestern part had developed into the separate units. In this way, the northern border of the area of the castle warriors in the northwestern part of Turopolje has been defined.

It is not, however, clear from the charter if the kindred of Budina and Levča was the only kindred that owned lands in this area. As written, the four lands were bought from Nicholas and Dobča and their relatives (*cognati*), Scorosa, Dusco, Stephan and their kinsmen (*eorum progenie*), Vratislav, Nadesco and Dominik sons of Trebenin and Trebeša and their relatives (*cognati*) and Cuplen and his relatives (*cognati*). So, three lands were bought from “families”, the relatives (*cognati*) and the fourth was bought from Scorosa, Dusco, Stephan and their kinsmen (*eorum progenie*). It is unclear if the last were of some separate kindred or the representatives of the kindred of Budina and Levča. Since this area did not become the property of the noble community, this data is not so important for the topic of this chapter. Nevertheless,

it shows the complexity of the situation in the first half of the thirteenth century or perhaps, to put it more accurately, it is hard to make any certain conclusions from these earliest sources as data written in them are not so easily interpreted from the present-day point of view. In addition to that, the sources are scarce.

From the perambulations of the lands around *Suinna Malaca* and *Sredna malaca*, it can be seen (by looking names of the bordering lands) that some of them were still held by Scorosa and Nicholas. Therefore, even after the 1228 purchase, the kindred or the kindreds still owned some parts of this territory. It will be shown later what happened with that. Likewise, one of the bordering lands was of Peter, so perhaps *comes* Peter already had owned some land in this area prior to the purchase in 1228 (or it was some other Peter).

Apart from the first charter, Levča appears in two other extant sources. He was *pristaludus* who did the perambulation of the borders between Vukota and his kindred and the sons of Andrew and Miroslav in 1256. One can be certain that this man was Levča who was mentioned in the first (1225) charter because the man from 1256 was denominated as *Leucha frater Budyna*.⁷⁶⁹ Also, Levča was *pristaldus* of the *comes terrestris* when *comes* Alexander of Pogdora adjudicated the land *Boblachmezew* to Stanišk and his kindred in 1258.⁷⁷⁰ In this case, it is written just Levča, so it can only be supposed that it is the same person. The land *Boblachmezew* was the hereditary land of Stanišk and his kindred but it was occupied by Čegul and his kindred. It was returned to the first after the testimonies of twelve witnesses. Among them was Toll son of Hotenow, who could be Tole mentioned in 1225.⁷⁷¹

5.2.2.1.2. *The second generation and the other kindred?*

Apart from the two charters mentioned above (from 1225 and 1228), there are no other extant sources about this area from the first half of the thirteenth century. The next extant charters date from the 1260s. In them, descendants of Nicholas and Dobča can be recognized.

Sometime in early 1265 (prior to the 25th of February) Nicholas' son Mikula sold twenty-five veretens of his land (*terra*) to Miroslav, son of Stephan *de genere Andre*, a cousin of the sons of Andrew. The bought land was located in *Herchen*, next to *Schynamlaca*.⁷⁷² The

⁷⁶⁹ MHNC 1, doc. 9, p. 12.

⁷⁷⁰ MHNC 1, doc. 12, pp. 15-16.

⁷⁷¹ MHNC 1, doc. 1, p. 1.

⁷⁷² MHNC 1, doc. 15, p. 18.

In 1346, Hrečin was owned by Stephan son of Lukač.⁷⁷⁴ Stephan's father Lukač was a son of *comes* Andrew. The sons of Andrew were listed among the neighbours who approved the purchase in front of Ban Roland in Želin in 1265. Obviously, the estate Hrečin stayed in their family in the next hundred years (and later).

Mikula, who sold the land in Hrečin to Miroslav in 1265, and his brothers Mikuš and Stephan were the sons of Nicholas mentioned in the first (1225) as well as in the second (1228) charter. When *comes* Peter bought the land in this area from Nicholas and Dobča in 1228, one of the bordering lands of the sold estate was the land of Nicholas. This could be the same land that his son sold to Miroslav in 1265. In 1228, Nicholas sold his land together with Dobča; in 1265 Phillip son of Dobča is mentioned as relative of Nicholas' sons. Perhaps Levča *capitosus*, who was also their relative, was a son of Levča, but that is just an assumption. This man is mentioned in few other sources but never in combination with the name of his father. In any case, these people are the second generation of the kindred of Levča and Budina.

As said, along with the sons of Andrew the other neighbours of the sold estate were present in Želin in 1265. These were: Goryna, Ladislav son of Gemzina, Stepko, Preda, Raduš son of George, Bork and Zlavina, the castle warriors of Zagreb castle. They represented their relatives and kindred (*proximis et generacione*). It should be added here that Bork and Zlavina were already mentioned in the chapter about the Hospitallers' estates in Turopolje. These were Borch and Zloyna who were, together with their brothers, renting the Hospitallers' estates Mala Peščenica and Lekenik prior to 1275 (that year, the order rented the same estates to *comes* Perčin and his brother Anthony from Grič).⁷⁷⁵ Still, it is important to emphasize that it is not clear from the text of the 1265 charter if the people mentioned above were of the same kindred as Mikula, Mikuš, Stephan, Phillip and Levča Capitosus, the descendants of Levča and Budina.

In 1266, the year after Miroslav purchased the land in Hrečin, Lukač and Peter, sons of Andrew, bought a part of some land near the Kosnica (*portio terrae iuxta aqua Coztnicha*) from the castle-warrior Mark son of Gurda. At the sale were present: brothers (*fratres*) of the seller called Petk and Zlopk, his relatives (*consanguinei*) Dahota, Vukodrug, Gorena, Vukoj, the neighbour (*commetaneus*) Phillip son of Dobča as well as Endrich, *comes terrestris* (who protested against this sale). The neighbouring parcels of this land next to the Kosnica were: a land of Vukodrug on the east, a land that Lukač was holding in pledge on the west, lands of

⁷⁷⁴ MHNC 1, doc. 58, p. 59.

⁷⁷⁵ CD 6, doc. 123., pp. 137-138.

Levča *capitosus* and Andrew on the southern part and a land of Phillip on the northern part.⁷⁷⁶ The only landmark that can be recognized in the modern environment is the Kosnica River (all the other landmarks are lands of individuals). I suppose that this land was situated somewhere in the northern flow of the Kosnica as, by shown so far, the people mentioned in the perambulation owned lands in this area. Still, theoretically, it could have also been also situated around the southern flow of the Kosnica. This is not so crucial for this topic, as this area did not become the property of the noble community. It is important that, again, in this charter the members of the kindred present in Želin in 1265 (when Ban Roland ratified the sale of the land in Hrečin) were mentioned. Petk could be Stepko, while the person who was certainly present at both sales was Gorina. And again, it is not completely clear if Phillip son of Dobča was related to these people. The text of the 1266 charter was the following: *Asisterunt etiam fratres venditoris: Petk and Zlopk, et consanguinei eiusdem scilicet: Dahota, Vukodrug, Gorena, Vukoy et Phillipus filius Dopcha commetanueus, Endrich comes terrestris (...)*. So, Phillip son of Dobča could have been a relative of the sellers and also a neighbour of the sold land (which he was, as can be seen in perambulation) or he could have been just a neighbour of the sold land, not blood related to the sellers. Actually, perhaps the second solution is more likely because Vukodrug who, as can be seen in the perambulation, also owned a neighbouring parcel, was listed as a relative of the seller, without the fact that he was a neighbour of the sold land being emphasized.

From all the data written so far, it can be concluded that the extant sources are not sufficient to make a firm conclusion about a number of kindreds that lived in the northwestern part of Turopolje nor which was their territory. It can be stated the members of the kindred of Levča and Budina had the estates in this area. Along with them, the kindred I will call in the further text the kindred of Borč and Zlojna also had estates in this area. It cannot, however, be said with certainty if these were two separate kindreds or if this was one kindred. The extant purchase contracts are the results of the activities of the sons of Andrew and their cousin Miroslav in the second half of the 1260s. After these purchases, in this northern part of Turopolje villages of the castle warriors did not develop. In that way, the northern border of the territory that will be analysed in the further text is defined. The southern border is, however, still unclear. And, as will be seen, the first data about the settlements that can be found in the


⁷⁷⁶ MHNC 1, doc. 19, p. 21.

extant sources also do not help much in clarifying the issue. Perhaps, in some future research new data that could help with better understanding of these processes, will be found.

5.2.2.2. The villages

5.2.2.2.1. Gorica, Rakarje, Pleso, Kobilic and Ilovnjak

The villages Velika and Mala Gorica, Rakarje, Pleso and Ilovnjak are put in the same group as the data that concern inhabitants of these villages are closely connected. As will be shown, the same families lived or had the estates in them. The earliest extant data give information of the territory and inhabitants of the village Rakarje, so that will be the starting point of this analysis.



Map 54-Velika Gorica, Mala Gorica, Pleso, Rakarje, Ilovnjak and Kobilic

5.2.2.2.1.1. Rakarje

Today, Rakarje is not the separate village; in the twentieth century it has been integrated into Velika Gorica. Its position can be seen on the Military surveys and it is also still well-known today (the Rakarska Street in Velika Gorica). In medieval times, the village Rakarje was situated north of Velika Gorica.

The first known owners of land placed in the territory of this village were Andrew and Ivan sons of Zloyna and Ivan son of Woyha. In 1278, they sold parts of their land called Rakarje (*particulas terre ipsorum Rakarya vocate*) to *comes* Ivan son of Minizlay. The neighbours of these lands who assisted the sale were: Bogdan son of Borch, Vratislav son of Iunossa and Iwazlo son of Pribinegh. The boundaries of the bought parcels were described but they were mostly swamps, trees and roads that cannot be recognized in the present-day environment. The boundaries that can be approximately placed are Želin (*terra domini N. bani Selyn nuncupatam*) and the land of *comes* Ivan on the eastern side as well as the *fluuius Rakarya* on the northern side. The border with Želin is the already-mentioned border of Novo Čiče where, today, is the toponym Želinski or Čički gaj (Map 55). The Rakarja River does not exist anymore, but on the First military survey the stream flowing through Rakarje is depicted (this stream was also called Ilovnjak and Babča on some other maps). Thus, the lands sold in 1278 were certainly placed in the territory where the village of Rakarje has developed.



Map 55-Rakarje and toponym Čički gaj

Comes Ivan son of Menezlay, who bought the lands, was mentioned in one other charter from 1273 as a castle warriors (*iobagio castri Zagradiensis*).⁷⁷⁷ His father Menezlaus or Minizlaus was also a castle warrior.⁷⁷⁸ Obviously, the title *comes* indicates a person of higher rank but how exactly Ivan gained this rank and what that meant in practice (how or if his status differed from one of the other castle warriors) cannot be said as he is not mentioned in the other extant sources. Likewise, it cannot be said to which kindred he belonged. What can be concluded from the data shown above is that people of the kindred of Borch and Zloyna owned the land in the area of Rakarje even after the parts of it had been sold to Ivan son of Menezlay. The sellers Andrew and Ivan sons of Zloyna and Ivan son of Woyha sold only parts of their land Rakarje and not the whole land. Besides that, one of the neighbours of the sold land was Bogdan son of Borch.

As the next extant charter that contains data about Rakarje was issued 115 years after the 1273 purchase contract, the process of forming of the village in the period in between is unclear. Nevertheless, some things can be supposed as that next charter is actually a transcript of the purchase contract from 1278, issued by the Chapter of Zagreb on the order of King Sigismund. In 1393, the king had sent a letter to the Chapter instructing them to examine and transcript the charter that Blasius and John sons of Vuk son of Branch *de Rakarya*, will show to them. The charter they brought, that is, the purchase contract from 1278, had been damaged due to its old age. The Chapter did what the king asked them to do. Thus, it can be concluded that Blasius and John were the descendants of *comes* Ivan son of Minizlay.⁷⁷⁹ It can also be concluded that by the end of the fourteenth century Rakarje was a formed settlement.

Except for Blasius and John, Vuk son of Branch had three more sons. These were Phillip, Fabian and Vučilo. They are all mentioned in 1410 when a group of people came in Zagreb to *comes terrestis* Matthias son of Mikec. They declared to him they had settled their disagreements about the borders of their estate Rakarje and its territory (*possessio Rakarya et eiusdem territorio*). These people were grouped into two groups. In the first were the sons of Vuk and their descendants, all *nobiles iobagiones castri de Rakarya*. They represented their other relatives, some of whom were listed by their names, while the others were mentioned as *alii proximi universi fratresque et consanguinei ipsorum de eadem Rakarya*. The other group were the sons of Ielk as well as the sons of George and their descendants. Likewise, they were

⁷⁷⁷ MHNC 1, doc. 26, p. 29.

⁷⁷⁸ MHNC 1, doc. 20, p. 22.

⁷⁷⁹ MHNC 1, doc.131, pp. 131-132; Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 380.

all *nobiles iobagiones castri de Rakarya* and represented their other relatives, some of whom were again listed by their names, while the others were mentioned as *alii proximi universi fratresque et consanguinei ipsorum de eadem Rakarya*.⁷⁸⁰

People who belonged to two extended families lived in the territory of Rakarje at the end of the fourteenth century. Members of one of them were most likely descendants of *comes* Ivan son of Minizlay, that is, descendants of Vuk son of Branch. The others could have been descendants of Borch and Zloyna whose sons also owned the land in this area in 1278. These were descendants of Ielk and George. The last is, however, just an assumption; these people cannot be genealogically connected (or not connected) with Borch and Zloyna as there are no extant sources from the period between 1278 and 1393. It should be noticed here that, while these two groups of people obviously differed themselves by their family origin, they were not listed as members of two different kindreds. So, perhaps it can also be supposed that Ivan son of Minizlay was of the same kindred as Borch and Zloyna. But, again, it can be just an assumption as kindreds from which certain families or individuals originated are, in general, rarely mentioned in the extant charters (only where there were reasons to emphasize it).

The borders recorded in 1393 are, up to a point, similar to the borders of the parts of the land called Rakarje (*particulas terre ipsorum Rakarya vocate*) that *comes* Ivan had bought from Andrew and Ivan sons of Zloyna and Ivan son of Woyha in 1278. As was the case with the 1278 perambulation, the perambulation from 1410 also cannot be completely reconstructed on a modern map as it contains some microtoponyms that do not exist in the present-day environment. It is, however, clear from the description that this border was also stretching from the stream Rakarje (*flumen Rakarya*) to the borders of Čiče (*meta Chychan*), where toponym Čički gaj can be found on contemporary maps (Map 58).⁷⁸¹ I suppose that the land on the left side of this border was owned by the family of Vuk son of Branch as that was the land that *comes* Ivan bought in 1278.

In any case, according to the extant sources, by the fourteenth century, Rakarje was the formed village inhabited by members of two extended families. In the next centuries, other families also settled here, but that is the topic for further research. As said at the beginning of this chapter, Rakarje remained a separate village until the twentieth century when it has been integrated into Velika Gorica and now it is one of its parts.

⁷⁸⁰ MHNC 1, doc. 172, p. 162.

⁷⁸¹ MHNC 1, doc. 172, p. 163.

5.2.2.2.1.2. Gorica

Although Velika Gorica, today the main town of the Turopolje region, was one of the important villages of the castle warriors of Turopolje in the medieval period (and the only village in the Plain in which territory the church was placed), the thirteenth- and the fourteenth-century data about it are scarce. The first charter in which Gorica is recorded is a purchase contract from 1228 by which was confirmed that *comes* Peter had bought, among others, lands around *Suinna Malaca* and *Sredna malaca*. As shown, these were situated in the area north of Pleso, where in the medieval period the descendants of Peter had their estate Hrečin. One of the borders of the sold lands was *strata ad Goricam*. Clearly, this data does not reveal anything about owners of land in Gorica. Laszowski thought that, in this case, Gorica most likely refers to Velika Gorica.⁷⁸² Still, in the list of the parish churches from 1334 the church in Velika Gorica was listed as *ecclesia Beate virginis in Campo*.⁷⁸³ This can mean that there was no settlement of some specific name near the church, thus, it was “located” simply *in the field*. So, it could be that the settlement around it was most probably was forming in that period.

As was the case with Gornji and Donji Lukavec and Donja and Gornja Lomnica, it is questionable if in the thirteenth century there were (or were in the process of forming) two settlements, Velika and Mala Gorica, or one settlement Gorica that later divided into two settlements. In this particular case, the church could be the solution. The church built between two villages, halfway, was not uncommon in the middle ages. Perhaps there were two settlements and the church between them. There are no extant charters that could clarify this issue. The fourteenth-century charters always use the name Gorica without any adjective. It can only be said with certainty that by the beginning of the fifteenth century this division existed; in 1407 Ivko son Jakov is mentioned as being *de Goricha beate virginis*⁷⁸⁴ (which is Velika Gorica) and in 1411 nobles of Mala Gorica (*nobilies iobagiones castri de Parua Goricza*) together nobles of Vrbanec (*nobiles dicti castri de Vrbancz*) determined the borders between their estates (*vniversis possessionibus et porcionibus possessionariis*).⁷⁸⁵

In general, there are only a few extant fourteenth-century charters that give some information about Gorica. The first known inhabitant was Alexandar, son of Ivan *de Goricza*.

⁷⁸² Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 392.

⁷⁸³ MHNC 1, doc. 51, doc. 93, pp. 51, 98.; Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 392.

⁷⁸⁴ MHNC 1, doc. 168., p. 159.

⁷⁸⁵ MHNC 1, doc. 35., pp. 39-40. The same year nobles from Mala Gorica determined the borders between them and the nobles of Kurilovec. Laszowski recorded that this charter existed but he did not have the original that he could transcribe. MHNC 1, doc. 174., p. 164.

He was one of the witnesses when the nobles of Mraclin redeemed their hereditary land in Rakitovec from Cordozlaus and his sons in 1346.⁷⁸⁶ Alexandar also owned some land in Rakitovec.⁷⁸⁷ The name Ivan (John) is a common name, so it cannot be said if Alexandar's father was some Ivan mentioned in the thirteenth-century sources.⁷⁸⁸

From 1389, the number of extant charters that contain names of nobles of Gorica started to grow.⁷⁸⁹ However, there is over 100 years difference between these sources and the thirteenth-century sources in which data about kindreds living in the area of the northwestern part of Turopolje are recorded. During this period at least two or three generations lived and died. Consequently, it is not possible to establish genealogical connections between castle warriors of the thirteenth century and the noble castle warriors (*nobiles iobagiones castri*) of Gorica from the late fourteenth and the fifteenth century.

Despite that, the example of the families that will be shown in the following lines, give some indication that the same people owners of lands in Rakarje and Velika Gorica as well as Pleso and Kobilić in the thirteenth century. These were the families who determined the borders of Rakarje in 1410, the sons of George and the sons of Ielk and their descendants as well as the sons of Vuk and their descendants. All of them owned land in Gorica. In addition to that, in the charters that concern their estates in Gorica they were named as nobles of Gorica. For example, in 1431, Michael son of George son of Kuša and his uncle Andrew, castle warriors of Gorica sold two of their agricultural lands to Thomas son of Ivan of Gorica. Thomas' father Ivan is a grandson of Vuk. The name of the village in which these lands were placed was not explicitly stated. I think it can be understood it was in the territory of Gorica as otherwise some different village would probably be mentioned. The perambulations of the lands contained names of people between whose lands and estates the sold lands were placed. As far as the first land is concerned, these were Jacob son of Peter son of George who was once *comes terrestris*, Thomas son of Ivan (the above-mentioned buyer), Ilija son of John, Paul and Stephan, sons of Benedict son of Ielk, Anthony and Lucas son of the other John [son of George]. The other land was

⁷⁸⁶ MNHC 1, doc. 60., p. 61.; Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 348.

⁷⁸⁷ MNHC 1, doc. 58., p. 59.

⁷⁸⁸ According to Ćuk, this Ivan was the son of *comes* Miroslav, the cousin of the sons of Andrew. Ćuk, *Zagrebačka županija*, p. 35. Ćuk probably concluded this because Ivan son of Minizlay who bought the land in Rakarje in 1278 was also called *comes* and the name Minizlay is similar to Miroslav. But, I think that this is not the same person, because, as written, Minizlay is mentioned in some other charters by this name as a castle warrior. However, it could be that Alexandar actually was the son of *comes* Ivan son of Minizlay who bought the land in Rakarje because, as will be shown, the same families owned the land in Rakarje and in Gorica. But, again, without the sources that could confirm it, this is just an assumption.

⁷⁸⁹ For the first extant sources that appear in this period see: MNHC 1. doc. 119, doc. 122 and doc. 153., pp. 124, 126 and 145.

situated between lands of Ivan *faber* son of Nicholas son of Petrus and his nephew Clemens son of Briccius (son of Peter) and Ilija son of John son of Ielk as well as some tenant peasants of Čiče (*homines de Chichan*).⁷⁹⁰ Some of these people (Jacob son of Peter son of George, Thomas son of Ivan, Ilija son of John, Paul and Stephan, sons of Benedict son of Ielk, Anthony and Lucas son of the other John) were the descendants of Vuk, Ielk and George, so *nobiles iobagiones de Rakarya* from 1410.⁷⁹¹ Anthony son of John son of George was in one charter from 1428 named as *Anthonius filius Iohannis de Gorycza*.⁷⁹²

There is one earlier charter that contains the same example and is also important for understanding the process of development of the village Kobilic. In 1424, Phillip son of Vuk and his nephews Thomas son of John [son of Vuk], Valentin son of Fabian [son of Vuk], and Thomas son of Blasius [son of Vuk], *nobiles iobagiones castri de Goricha sancte Marie*, had some disagreements with Blasius son of Briccius, Nicholas son of Andrew and Phillip son of Clemens, also the castle warriors of Velika Gorica about a filial quarter of some estate in Mala Gorica (*Parwa Goricza*). Finally, the estate was given to the last and, in return, they gave to the descendants of Vuk some agricultural land situated in Mala Gorica. Blasius, Nicholas and Phillip, son of Clemens inherited these estates from their maternal aunts (*materterae*) Rose and Lucia, daughters of Ivan. Lucia was, on the other hand, an aunt of the grandsons of Vuk as she was married to Vuk's son Blasius.⁷⁹³ Along with showing the complexity of the land inheritance rules in the territory of the noble community, this charter testifies about the process of parcelling of land placed within the villages of the nobles of Turopolje.⁷⁹⁴ The sons and grandsons of Vuk, in this case, declared themselves as *nobiles iobagiones castri de Goricha sancte Marie*. Besides that, in this charter they were also called *Wklouichi*, *alio nomine Kobilichi* and *fili Vuk alias Kobylichi*.⁷⁹⁵

Before I proceed with the analysis of the village Kobilic, I would like to emphasize that the sons of Vuk, the sons of George and the sons of Ielk were not the only families who lived or had the estates in Velika and Mala Gorica. There are many other people mentioned in the extant fifteenth-century sources who were not of these families. Among them were the above-mentioned Blasius son of Briccius, Nicholas son of Andrew and Phillip son of Clemens from

⁷⁹⁰ MNHC 1. doc. 226., p. 296.

⁷⁹¹ MNHC 1. doc. 172., pp. 162-163.

⁷⁹² MNHC 1, doc. 222., pp. 266-268.

⁷⁹³ MNHC 1, doc. 197., pp. 189-191.

⁷⁹⁴ About filial quarter and the hereditary rights of females in general in the period of King Sigismund, see: Miljan, *Plemićko društvo zagrebačke županije*, pp. 96-125, and scholarship listed there.

⁷⁹⁵ MNHC 1, doc. 197., pp. 189-191.

Velika Gorica who got the filial quarter in Mala Gorica in 1424. Their fathers, Briccius, Nicholas and Andrew were listed among the castle warriors of Gorica who, in 1397, sued the castellans of Želin for the occupation of their estates.⁷⁹⁶ There were no members of the families of Vuk, George or Ielk mentioned among these castle warriors. However, there are no data that could connect these people with some people mentioned in the thirteenth-century charters. Still, it is important to emphasize that many families lived in Velika and Mala Gorica in the fifteenth and the sixteenth century. More detailed analysis of both published and unpublished fifteenth- and sixteenth-century charters could certainly be a good basis for a detailed study about this settlement and reasons why it became the most important settlement in the Turopolje region in the modern period.

5.2.2.2.1.3. Kobilic

The present-day village Kobilic is situated approximately 3.2 kilometres northeast of Velika Gorica and 1.5 kilometres northeast of Rakarje. The above-mentioned charter from 1424 is the first extant charter that I have found so far in which the word Kobilici is recorded. It was a nickname or a last name of descendants of Vuk (*Vukouichi, alio nomine Kobilichi; filiis Vuk alias Kobylichi*).⁷⁹⁷ It can be said with certainty that by 1462 the village Kobilic was formed, as more people *de Kobilyth* are recorded.⁷⁹⁸ In the extant charter from 1487 Kobilic is explicitly called a village (*villa Kobilicz*).⁷⁹⁹

In Laszowski's opinion, the name of the village was derived from the name of the family Vukovic or Kobilic from Velika Gorica that had estates in the area at the beginning of the fifteenth century and "probably, at that period, had moved there".⁸⁰⁰ I think that it is up to the point correct, that is, the Vukovic family had the estates in Kobilic. But, as shown so far, this family also had the estates in Rakarje. Therefore, it can be discussed if they had moved in the area of Kobilic in the first half of the fifteenth century or they had lived in the area prior to it. I think that the estate in Kobilic was connected with the estates of the same family, descendants of Vuk, in Rakarje and that it was so from the thirteenth century. According to the perambulation of the parts of the lands called Rakarje that *comes* Ivan son of Minizlay bought in 1278, the border of the bought lands started on the eastern side next to Želin and next to

⁷⁹⁶ MHNC 1, doc. 153.

⁷⁹⁷ MHNC 1. doc. 197., pp. 189-191.

⁷⁹⁸ MHNC 1. doc. 338., pp. 416-417.

⁷⁹⁹ MHNC 2, doc. 40., pp. 49-50.; Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 338.

⁸⁰⁰ Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 338.

Ivan's land (*terra eiusdem Ivani comitis*), it went for a longer while towards the west and then entered the Rakarja River (*fluuius Rakarya*), by this river it went towards north and came to the land of Ivan (*ad terram Ivan supradicti*).⁸⁰¹ On Map 56 can be seen that the stream passing through Rakarje was flowing towards the north, exactly in the area of the present-day Kobilić, where, in the thirteenth century, was the land of *comes* Ivan. Also, as written, most likely the descendants of Vuk had their estates on the eastern part of Rakarje in 1410.⁸⁰²



Map 56-Kobilić and Rakarje on the 1st Military survey

Thus, according to these data, it seems that Kobilić was the estate of *comes* Ivan in the thirteenth century and his descendants in the fourteenth and fifteenth century. In the fifteenth century, the separate village developed in this area. Interestingly, the form of the village on the Military survey shows two different parts on the branches of a road as well as a separate also manor (Majerhof). This could be a noble residence which emerged separately, and later people settled there, forming the village.

So, in my opinion, it is not that the family Vuković moved to the area of Kobilić in the fifteenth century. They lived, or had some estates in that area, prior to it. It is more likely that in the fifteenth century a separate village developed over estates of one branch of the family Vuković who, at the same time, also had estates in Rakarje, Gorica and, as will be seen, in Pleso. It should be mentioned here that rescue archaeological excavations conducted on the track of the by-pass Velika Gorica, on the western side of the present-day village Kobilić in 2010, revealed the remains of the thirteenth-century settlement features.⁸⁰³ The number of the

⁸⁰¹ MHNC 1. doc. 29., pp. 32-22.

⁸⁰² MHNC 1. doc. 172., pp. 162-163.

⁸⁰³ About the results of the excavations see: AntoniĆ – Ákos Racz, Selected medieval finds, pp. 255-279.

uncovered features was too small to permit a conclusion if this was a smaller private estate or an edge of a bigger village. Nevertheless, this proves that the area was inhabited in the thirteenth century. Except for one pit dated to the fourteenth century, that was situated further from the thirteenth-century features, there were no traces of habitation in the excavated area in the fourteenth or fifteenth century. As all the features were covered with the layer that was interpreted as most likely the flood layer, it could be that after one bigger flood people moved to some other place further from the stream while the abandoned part was used as an agricultural surface. In any case, the development of the settlement system can be, to some extent, seen through the analysis of the historical sources. Yet, only systematic archaeological excavations could explain its real dynamics and answer the question when the nucleation process of the villages in Turopolje region began.

5.2.2.2.1.4. Pleso

The present-day village Pleso is situated approximately 1.5 kilometres northwest of the centre of Velika Gorica and some two kilometres west of Rakarje (the part of Velika Gorica). According to Laszowski, the first extant charter in which the estate named Pleso (*possessio Pleza*) is recorded dates from 1377.⁸⁰⁴ However, location of toponyms from the perambulation of the estate recorded in 1377 shows this estate was not in the area of the present-day Pleso. Besides that, it can be discussed if *Pleza* and Pleso are the same words (I cannot answer to that as I do not have sufficient linguistic knowledge).

The 1377 charter is a record of a court procedure held in front of Nicholas from Virtus, *comes* of Zagreb and castellan of Medvedgrad, John, son of George, *comes terrestris* and a jury which included two noble judges of Zagreb County, for higher nobles (*nobilium regni*) and five castle warriors (four of them from Kurilovec and Vid son of Endre whose domestic village was not specified). This court procedure took place because Ladislav, son of Thomas, a castle-warrior and, at that moment, a fellow-citizen (*concivis*) of Gradec and his son Anthony sued Martin and Peter, sons of John, son of Vrban, also castle warriors, for the occupation of their estate called Pleso (*totalis possessio Pleza vocata*). The verdict was that Martin and Peter have to give the estate back to Ladislav and John, but also that Ladislav and his son have to give Martin and Peter one part of this estate (*vnam particulam seu possessionariam porcionem de*

⁸⁰⁴ Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1., p. 376.


eadem possessione).⁸⁰⁵ It is known out of some other extant documents that Martin and Peter were castle warriors of Vrbanec, a village situated on the eastern side of Kurilovec (see the subchapter *Vrbanec*, pages 356-357). Ladislav, son of Thomas, on the other hand, originated from Kurilovec.⁸⁰⁶

The borders of the part of *Pleza* given to Martin and Peter were recorded. They were mostly roads and trees that cannot be located in the present-day environment. Except that, the borders were a land of Ladislav (*terra dicti Ladislai*) and a land of the king (*terra domini regis*) as well as a small valley called Vudoll on the south and land of Ivan and Peter, son of Raden on the west.⁸⁰⁷ On Map 60 is clearly visible that on the southern side of the present-day Pleso is Velika Gorica. Judging from data from the later sources, there was no “royal” land in this area. The nearest estate that was under direct jurisdiction of the king in 1377 was Želin. But, the borders of Želin, defined in the previous chapter, were on the eastern side of Gorica and not south of Pleso (Staro and Novo Čiče on Map 57).

⁸⁰⁵ MHNC 1, doc. 93., pp. 97-99.

⁸⁰⁶ MHNC 1, doc. 98., p. 104. For further explanation see the subchapter The borders of Donja Lomnica and the location of Nowgar, p. 350 etc.

⁸⁰⁷ MHNC 1, doc. 93., pp. 98-99.



Map 57-Village Pleso and possessio Pleza form 1377

Thus, according to this data, either there were some parcels of royal land in the area south of Pleso or the part of the estate Pleso that Martin and Peter got in 1377 was not in the area of the present-day Pleso. I think that the second solution is correct. One of the neighbouring lands was a land of Ivan and Peter, son of Raden. Peter Radinović, that is, his estate was mentioned in the perambulation of one land situated in Kurilovec in 1445 and 1455 (*terra condam Petri filii Radynowych*).⁸⁰⁸ Also, as will be seen in the later text, a place called Vudoll (*locus Vudoll*) and the watercourse Vudoll (*meatus Vudoll*) were the borders of the estate Vrbaneć in 1411. That estate, owned by Thomas and Jacob, sons of Martin and their cousin Valentin, son of Peter was situated on the eastern side of Kurilovec. Finally, four of the castle warriors present on the trail in 1377 were from Kurilovec. Therefore, it can be concluded that the part of the estate Pleso given to the grandsons of Vrbaneć in 1377 was not in the area of the present-day Pleso, but some 3 kilometres southeast of it, in the area north of Kurilovec and

⁸⁰⁸ MHNC 1, doc. 255, doc. 298.

Vrbanec. This estate did not develop into a separate village. In 1410, when nobles of Vrbanec were determining their borders with nobles of Mala Gorica, there was no village called Pleso between them. Some parts of the estate from 1377 were probably integrated into Vrbanec or Mala Gorica or Kurilovec (from where the first known owners originated).

The whole estate Pleso was, in the charter from 1377, defined *circa ecclesiam beate virginis de Goricha in dicto Campo Zagradiensi habitis et existentis*.⁸⁰⁹ Based on this, Laszowszki concluded that Pleso was an estate of the church of the Blessed Virgin Mary in Gorica.⁸¹⁰ As far as ownership over land in the area is concerned, this is an important question. The above-mentioned sentence could also mean that the estate Pleso was near/next to (*circa*) the church in Gorica. However, if the church, in medieval times, was in the same area as the present-day church of Blessed Virgin in Velika Gorica, the estate must have been at least one kilometre distant from it. In order to clarify this issue, the data from the other extant charters about Pleso should be looked at.

The first extant data I have found so far, for which it can be stated with certainty that they refer to the area of the present-day Pleso, are from the 1420s. In 1428 one of the northern borders of the estate called Trebeš was *terra seu possessio Hrechyn filiorum Lucasii* and one of the southern borders was *meta possessionum wlgo Pleskameya* [meya is means the border, so this means the border of Pleso] *vocata*.⁸¹¹ Hrečin was situated in the area of the present-day village Mičevce. Toponym Trebež is visible in the area south of Mikčevce on modern maps. South of it is Pleso. According to this perambulation, the border of Trebež, after passing the *Pleskameya*, proceeded through some bushes to the southeast and came to *terra Anthonii filii Iohannis de Gorycza*.⁸¹² So, the land of Anthony was surely situated in the area of the present-day Pleso or southeast of it, along with the northwestern borders of Velika Gorica. The same Anthony, son of John was mentioned in 1410, together with his brothers Peter, Adrian and Lucas, sons of John, son of George as *nobilis iobagio castri de Rakarya*.⁸¹³ In a charter from 1427, so the charter issued one year earlier than the charter with perambulation of Trebež, he is mentioned as *Anthonius filius Iohannis de Plezo*.⁸¹⁴ Again, it is visible that people of the same family, this time descendants of George of Rakarje, had the estates in Gorica, Rakarje and Pleso

⁸⁰⁹ MHNC 1, doc. 222., p. 98.

⁸¹⁰ Laszowszki, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 376.

⁸¹¹ MHNC 1, doc. 222., p. 228.

⁸¹² MHNC 1, doc. 222., p. 228.

⁸¹³ MHNC 1, doc. 172., p. 162.

⁸¹⁴ MHNC 1, doc. 208., p. 204.

and were defined in a certain charter as being from an estate that was a purpose of an issuing of a certain charter.

The 1427 charter was a donation charter. By it was confirmed that Scolastica and Margareta, daughters of Andrew, son of Jelk from Rakarje gave their agricultural land (*terra arabilis*), bought by their late father Andrew, to Thomas, Peter, Anthony, Valentin and Mark, sons of Phillip, son of Vuk from Rakarje. This land was situated in the estate Pleso (*possessio Plezo*), between lands of Thomas, son of John and [the above-mentioned] Anthony, son of the other John from Pleso.⁸¹⁵ The same Thomas, son of John (grandson of Vuk) was in 1431 mentioned as being *de Goricza*.⁸¹⁶ Finally, along with the descendants of George and Vuk, it is certain that the family of Ielk also held some estates in Pleso. It can be seen on the example of Ilija, son of John and grandson of Ielk. In 1410 he was called *de Rakarya*,⁸¹⁷ in 1431 *de Goricza*,⁸¹⁸ and in 1445 *de Plezo*.⁸¹⁹

In the 1427 purchase contract is written that Thomas, son of John and Anthony, son of the other John were *de Pleso, ad ecclesiam beate Marie semper virginis de Gorica*.⁸²⁰ It was shown that the whole estate Pleso owned by Ladislav, son of Thomas and his son Anthony that Martin and Peter, sons of John, son of Vrbani occupied in 1377 was defined as *circa ecclesiam beate virginis de Goricha in dicto Campo Zagrabiensi habite et existentis*,⁸²¹ which lead Laszowski to the conclusion that this estate was property of the church in Gorica.⁸²² I think that it was not as, obviously, the castle warriors were free to sell these estates as they wanted. But, the formulations *ad ecclesiam beate Marie semper virginis de Gorica* and *circa ecclesiam beate virginis de Goricha in dicto Campo Zagrabiensi* are, up to the point, confusing. I think they both mean that the estates called Pleso (the one in the territory of the present-day Pleso and the one that was somewhere in the territory between Mala Gorica and Kurilovec) were actually parts of Gorica. So, both of the expressions written above simply signify *Gorica sancte Marie*, the name which appears in the extant sources prior to the name Velika (*Maior, Nagy*) Gorica. One of these estates, the one placed in the territory of the present-day Pleso, had

⁸¹⁵ MHNC 1, doc. 208., p. 204.

⁸¹⁶ MHNC 1, doc. 225., pp. 232-233.

⁸¹⁷ MHNC 1, doc. 172., p. 162.

⁸¹⁸ MHNC 1, doc. 225., p. 232.

⁸¹⁹ MHNC 1, doc. 253., p. 268.

⁸²⁰ MHNC 1, doc. 208., p. 204.

⁸²¹ MHNC 1, doc. 93., p. 98.

⁸²² Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 376.

developed during the late fourteenth or early fifteenth century into the separate village.⁸²³ The name Pleso, however, was obviously the name of more different estates situated in the different parts of the territory of Gorica.

Finally, one other charter from 1427 that confirms the above-mentioned will be shown. Elena, daughter of Iuren *de Plezo* was married to Cherkoni son of John from Kurilovec. After his death, Elena and her three daughters Vinka, Elena and Margaret gave some of his estates to their nephews Briccius and Blasius son of Matthew from Kravarsko. Among those was a quarter of one agricultural land in Gorica, called Pleso (*in terra arabili in Gorica habita, Plezo vocata*). I did not find any other data about Elena's father Iuren, but, most likely, he was not from the families of descendants of Vuk, George and Ielk. So, except that the land called Pleso was in Gorica, this charter shows some other families, apart from the two above-mentioned, lived in the settlement Pleso in the late fourteenth or the beginning of the fifteenth century. The situation is similar as for Gorica and Kobilic. But, since Pleso was a smaller village, I think that most of its territory was owned by descendants of Ielk, George and Vuk. Later, more different families could have settled in its area.

5.2.2.2.1.5. Ilovnjak

The last village in this group of villages (Gorica, Rakarje, Kobilic, Pleso) is Ilovnjak. It does not exist today but it is possible to place it in the present-day environment as the toponym Ilovnjak can be found on the 1861 cadastre map (Map 58). The village was situated on the left bank of the Babča stream, some 600 meters north of Kobilic and 900 meters north of Rakarje.

⁸²³ I think that archaeological excavations would result in finding traces of settlement features that could be dated earlier than the fourteenth/fifteenth century, as was the case with Kobilic. The situation is similar: although Pleso was not a separate village prior to the fifteenth century, it was a part of the estates of the noble families from Rakarje and Gorica. Although it is not strictly connected to the topic, it should be mentioned that the only excavations done so far in the area of Pleso were the rescue excavations in 2013, conducted prior to the reconstruction of the airport. Only seven features from the medieval period were discovered, but they are important as they were dated to the period between the late seventh and the eighth century. These are one of the earliest traces of Slavic population in the area. Maja Bunčić, "New Early Slavic finds from Zagreb surroundings. Rescue excavation on the Pleso - airport site", a poster, sources: Academia.edu.



Map 58-Toponym Ilovnjak on the 1861 cadastre map

Ilovnjak was first mentioned in 1470 when Elena (also called Jelka), a daughter of Ilija (once župan of the Field), son of Jelk, and a wife of Demeter son of Bojniković from Grič sold her estates in Pleso, Rakarje, Velika Gorica and Ilovnjak (*totales suas possessiones et porciones possessionarias in dicta Plesso, Goricza Maior, Rakarya et Ilouenak*). These estates were also owned by her son Martin from Pleso, and Elena sold it also in his name. The buyer was Klemens, son of Blasius Pogledić from Kurilovec.⁸²⁴ Elena inherited these estates from her father Ilija from Pleso.⁸²⁵ So, the family of Ielk who owned the estates in Pleso, Rakarje and Velika Gorica had also the estate in Ilovnjak.

There is one extant charter from 1388 that confirms the same family owned the estates in this area in the last quarter of the fourteenth century. That charter contains perambulation of the estate *Grdynazela* which was in the area of the village Gerdovščak. This village does not exist today but its borders are visible on the 1861 cadastre map. According to the perambulation from 1388 some of the southern borders were the boundaries of sons of Ielk (*metae filiorum Ielk*).⁸²⁶ Toponym Ilovnjak is placed south of Gerdovščak.


⁸²⁴ MHNC 2, doc. 10., pp. 11-12.

⁸²⁵ MHNC 1, doc. 253., pp. 268-270.

⁸²⁶ MHNC 1, doc. 116., pp. 119-120.

Ilovnjak was a very small village. In 1667, both Ilovnjak and Rakarje together had 6 houses. It was last mentioned in 1734, in a record of juristic district Rakarje - Pleso.⁸²⁷ It must have completely disappeared shortly after that because it does not appear on the First military survey. Laszowski wrote down that the traces of old houses are still visible and that there is a legend that the village fell into the soil together with the church, so sometimes it can be heard how the bells of that old church are ringing under the earth.⁸²⁸ This is a very common and standard vernacular story, connected always to a deserted village, where traces were still recognizable for local people.

5.2.2.2.2. Kurilovec, Trnovec, Kušanec, Zobačlaz, Zamlačje and Vrbaneč



Map 59-Kurilovec-Vrbaneč, Trnovec, Kušanec, Zamlačje and Zobačlaz

The territories of these six villages are situated next to each other and their developments are connected, so they are put into the separate group. Besides that, on the 1861 cadastre, the territories of all these villages are within the cadastre borders of Kurilovec. The origins of this territorial organization can be found in the medieval period. Although data about Trnovec and Kušanec have already been written in the chapter about Okuje, they will be briefly repeated here in a subchapter *Kurilovec* as they are necessary for understanding a development of the medieval settlement system of this area.

⁸²⁷ Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 334.

⁸²⁸ Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 334.

5.2.2.2.2.1. Kurilovec, Trnovec, Kušanec

Kurilovec does not exist today as the separate village. In 1971 it was merged with Velika Gorica. Today it is one of its parts, situated on the southern side of the city. Unlike the villages discussed so far in this chapter (Gorica etc.), which were named after natural features, Kurilovec was named after the personal name Korilo.⁸²⁹ The name of the village itself appears for the first time in the extant source from 1346; Peter called *Lapas de Corilowecz* was, together with Alexandar son of Ivan from Gorica, a witness when the nobles from Mraclin redeemed their hereditary land in Rakitovec from Cordozlaus and his sons.⁸³⁰ In the charter from 1377, Kurilovec is explicitly called a village (*villa Korilouch*).⁸³¹

There is, however, one earlier source that contains information about the territory of Kurilovec and the process of the development of this village. In 1249, Ban Stephan returned to the Wylkin, Mark and Miren, sons of Corala their hereditary land/estate Odra (*terra Odra*) that had been occupied by count Ivan son of Jaroslav in the anarchic period after the Mongol invasion.⁸³²

The borders of the estate Odra were the following: “The border started at the eastern side near the Odra River (*fluuius Odra*) at the earthen boundary, and through the successive boundaries it went towards the south for a long while and came to a road called *vttewen* (*via fundata, que vttewen dicitur*), and there bordered with the land/estate Mortun (*terra Mortun*), and from there went to the river Ramiščak (*fluuius Haranichnik*), after which it descended to the river Černec (*fluuius Chernech*), and then went to an holm oak tree and from there to the Mostičajna river (*fluuius Mozechine*), and there, under an holm oak tree, was the boundary, and from there went to the Lomnica River (*fluuius Lomnicha*), and from there from the western side through the Odra River it returned to the first boundary.”⁸³³

This estate was placed south of the Odra-Lomnica River. Its approximate position in the present-day environment is shown on Map 60. I think that, in this case, names Odra and Lomnica refer to the same river (unlike in the area around Hrašće, Mala Mlaka and Odra where

⁸²⁹ Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 375.

⁸³⁰ MHNC 1, doc. 60., pp. 60-61.

⁸³¹ MHNC 1, doc. 93., p. 98.

⁸³² MHNC 1, doc. 6., p. 9. This was also confirmed by King Bela IV in 1264; MNHC 1, doc. 14., p. 17.

⁸³³ MHNC 1, doc. 6, p. 9.


the watercourse Odra was flowing parallel with the Lomnica River but was not the same as the Lomnica River).

Milan Šenoa, a geographer and an associate of Laszowszki wrote (in the beginning of the twentieth century) that the Lomnica River flows through Donja Lomnica, Gradići, and Kurilovec, after Kurilovec it is called the Odrica, and after Vukovina is called Odra.⁸³⁴ As *terra Odra* was situated exactly south of the present-day Kurilovec, the two names for the same river mentioned in the perambulation correspond with the data Šenoa wrote. The road *vttewen* is the Roman state road Emona-Siscia used in the medieval period. The position of the stream Ramiščak, south of that road, can be easily seen on modern maps. As far as Črnc is concerned, the stream of such name does not exist today, but there are more watercourses in this area that could be medieval Črnc, for example, the stream Peščenjak or the watercourse that is parallel to the Lomnica River, today called Mostičajna (this watercourse is visible on the First military survey). The flow of Mostičajna stream was the border between Donja Lomnica and Lukavec, so the Mostičajna stream as the boundary of *terra Odra* could be in that position or it could refer to the above-mentioned watercourse that flows parallel with Lomnica. In any case, the estate Odra was, at least partly, placed in the territory of the present-day Gradići.

The whole territory of *terra Odra*, however, although it had been returned to Korilo's sons, did not remain the estate of their descendants in the following centuries. It has been shown in the previous chapter (about Lomnica) that in 1279 in the area of the present-day Gradići was Topolovec, an estate of the sons of Opor, a part of which they sold to the sons of Vukota, the castle warriors of Lomnica.⁸³⁵ How the sons of Opor got this estate, that is, if they had bought a part of the estate from sons of Corala or in some other way cannot be said due to the lack of sources.

⁸³⁴ Milan Šenoa, "Zemljopis i narodopis [Geography and Ethnography]," in Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine Turopolje* 1, p. 6.

⁸³⁵ MHNC 1, 31., pp. 35-36.



Map 60-Terra Odra

By 1356, the territory of present-day Gradići became the area of Petrovina, an estate of the Želin castle. On the eastern side of Petrovina was Trnovec, the estate whose borders were stretching from the Odra River on the north to the borders of Kravarsko on the south.⁸³⁶ Different owners owned the lands in this estate (*magister* Ivan, grandson of the Jaroslav, the castle warriors of Kurilovec and other villages etc.). By the middle of the fifteenth century, on the northern part of Trnovec a separate village named Kušanec had developed. It was first mentioned in 1455; one of the borders of some lands situated in Kurilovec was *terra nobilium de Kusanecz*.⁸³⁷ The same year, the first known inhabitant of Kušanec is mentioned. This was *Andreus filius Luce Kusanych dicti de Kusa(necz vill)a*.⁸³⁸ Lucas, son of Kuša and his brother John were one of the six castle warriors of Kurilovec who, in 1397, redeemed their estate Trnovec (*possessio Ternouech*) from John, Thomas and Jakob, sons of Martin Vrbanić.⁸³⁹ Martin and Peter, sons of John, son of Vrbanić were, on the other hand, castle warriors *de Vrbanch*. More about this estate will be said in the following text. All these villages, so Trnovec,

⁸³⁶ CD 12, doc. 357., pp. 463-464.

⁸³⁷ MHNC 1, doc. 290., p. 329.; Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine*, p. 353.

⁸³⁸ MHNC 1, doc. 294., p. 337.

⁸³⁹ CD 18, doc. 120., p. 170.

Kušanec and Vrbanec became parts of Kurilovec; this area was obviously closely connected from the thirteenth century.

It is important to emphasize that, in the medieval period, the name Kurilovec referred to the village situated north of the Odra-Lomnica River and not on the area of the estate Odra given back to the sons of Korilo by Ban Strephan in 1249. The sons of Korilo could have also had their estates in the area north of the Lomnica-Odra river, that is, in the area of the present-day Kurilovec. Over these estates, the village could have developed sometime in the second half of the thirteenth or the first half of the fourteenth century, when the first nobles of Kurilovec appear in the extant sources (1346). However, although from the second half of the fourteenth century the names of these nobles start to appear in a great number (for example, the charters issued in 1377 contain many names of these nobles),⁸⁴⁰ I could not connect them with Wylkin, Mark and Miren, sons of Corala or with people of some kindred, either the kindred of Vukota or the kindreds of Budina and Levča or Borč and Zlojna. As far as the last is concerned, it should be added here that the families of Ielk and Vuk and George whom, as shown, had the estates in Gorica, Pleso, Rakarje and Ilovnjak did not have estates in Kurilovec. As far as the sons of Corala are concerned, the time gap between the middle of the thirteenth century when they appear in the extant sources⁸⁴¹ and the period when the first nobles of Kurilovec appear in the extant sources is too big that these people could be connected. There must have been at least one or two generations in between, but there are no extant sources from this period.

There is also a possibility that Korilo was a head of his kindred that had lived in the area of Kurilovec and south of it, where the estates of sons of Kurilo were situated in 1249 (*terra Odra*). The village that had developed in the territory of this kindred could have been called by Korilo – Kurilovec. Same later data show that nobles of Kurilovec considered themselves as a separate kindred. In 1377, they settled long-lasting disagreements they had with Martin and Peter, sons of John, son of Vrban from Vrbanec over some part of land (*particula seu porctio*) and some mill-place (*locus molendini*⁸⁴²). According to the perambulation, this part of land was

⁸⁴⁰ MHNC 1, docs. 93 and 94., pp. 98 and 100.

⁸⁴¹ MHNC 1, doc. 6, p. 9.

⁸⁴² MHNC 1, doc. 94., pp. 100-101. The meaning of the term *locus molendini* was not straightforward. It could mean the place where mill was once built and could be rebuilt or where completely new mill is supposed to be built. The term has changed its meaning in the period from the fourteenth to the sixteenth century. According to the latest research of András Vadas for the territory of medieval Hungary "*locus molendini* meant much more than the site of a formerly existing mill. In many cases, this term referred to places suitable for building a mill or permission to build a mill in a particular or at a chosen location", András Vadas, "Some Remarks on the Legal Regulations and Practice of Mill Construction in Medieval Hungary," in: *Wasser in der mittelalterlichen Kultur. Water in Medieval Culture* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2017), pp. 290-314. In the mentioned case from 1377 I think the

situated south of the Odra River, which would actually be the territory of Trnovec.⁸⁴³ The present castle warriors, *nobiles iobagiones castri de Korilouch*, made the agreement in their name as well as the name of *vniversorum filiorum, fratrum et proximorum suorum generacionis hominum de eadem Korilouch*. On the other hand, Martin's and Peter's sons, brothers and relatives (*fili, fratres et proximi*) are mentioned but not the kindred.⁸⁴⁴

In 1496, when Ban John Corvin was staying in Vukovina, Paul Pogledić from Kurilovec came to see him. He complained to the ban that castellans of Lukavec occupied some parts of estates (*possessiones possessionarias*), namely three dwelling units (*sessiones*) in Vrbanec and one in Kurilovec, that were the property of Paul and of *fratrum suorum generacionalium, generacionis videlicet condam Korlyo*.⁸⁴⁵ Thus, at the end of the fifteenth century, the inhabitants of Kurilovec considered themselves to be descendants of Korilo, a man who lived in the first half of the thirteenth century. More about this will be written in the closing part of this chapter (see Remarks).

5.2.2.2.2. Vrbanec

The village Vrbanec does not exist today. Actually, in 1560, it was not considered a separate village but a part of Kurilovec. In King Ferdinand's charter issued that year, Kurilovec was named *Korylowcz alias Wrbancz*.⁸⁴⁶

Vrbanec was first mentioned in a charter issued in 1377 that notified about the agreement of Martin and Peter, sons of John, son of Vrban *de Vrbanch* and the castle warriors of Kurilovec about some land particle and the mill place.⁸⁴⁷ Obviously, the name of the village was derived from the personal name-Vrban, who was a grandfather of Martin and Peter. Thus, the village had developed in the territory of an individual estate sometime in the fourteenth century.

I did not find any toponym Vrbanec in the area of the present-day Kurilovec. However, the estate can be approximately located in the present-day environment as its borders were

term referred to an actual mill as the beginning of the perambulation it is written that the border started: *iuxta fluium Odra in fine cuiusdam parve clausure ipsius molendini*.

⁸⁴³ One of the borders was also the Roman state road Emona-Siscia, *vtewwen* from 1247. MHNC 1, doc. 6., p. 9.; in this charter from 1377 it is called *magna via que itur de Odra versus Schersech*. I suppose that Schersech is Sisak.

⁸⁴⁴ MHNC 1, doc. 94., p. 100.

⁸⁴⁵ MHNC 2, doc. 119., pp. 167-168.

⁸⁴⁶ MHNC 3, docs. 282 and 283., pp. 448-542.

⁸⁴⁷ MHNC 1, doc. 94., p. 100.

recorded in 1411 when grandsons of Vrban, John, Thomas and Jacob sons of Martin and their cousin Valentin son of Peter determined the borders between their estates and the estates of the castle warriors of Mala Gorica. The perambulation was the following: “The first boundary of the estates or parts of the estates (*possessionum seu porcionum possessionariarum*) begins on the south in Odra, the river that flows through the village Kurilovec (*villa Kurilowecz*), and from this Odra it crosses one ditch (*fossatum*) and goes towards the southern bank and comes to a place called Vudoll (*ad locum Vudoll*), and in this place called Vudoll, in the time of rain, runs some mediocre water, and through this course Vudoll (*per ipsum meatum Vudoll*), it turns towards the east, and going for a while reaches one new earthen boundary that was recently erected, and from this new earthen boundary passes through a new ditch (*fossatum*) towards the south and comes to some new earthen boundary, and from there goes towards the south and comes to the already-mentioned Odra River and there finishes.” The estates and parts of the estates within these borders were of the sons of Martin and of Valentin, that is, the castle warriors of Vrbanec. Outside of the borders were the estates of the castle warriors of Mala Gorica.⁸⁴⁸ So, this estate was situated between the Odra River on the south and the watercourse Vudoll. The place Vudoll has already been mentioned as one of the southern borders of the *possessio Pleza* that sons of Vrban occupied in 1377 and gained a part of it.⁸⁴⁹ It was concluded then that this estate was situated somewhere between Kurilovec, Mala Gorica and Vrbanec. According to these data, as well as the proximity of Mala Gorica, it can be concluded that Vrbanec was situated on the eastern side of Kurilovec.

Vrban is a common name and grandfather of Martin and Peter cannot be connected with any particular person known from the earlier sources. It was shown that in 1377, when making the agreement about the part of the land and the mill place, the nobles of Kurilovec were defined as being of one kindred, while Martin and Peter were not; only their *fili, fratres et proximi* were mentioned.⁸⁵⁰ Perhaps this could indicate that they were of the same kindred as the nobles of Kurilovec, but that is just an assumption. In any case, during the fifteenth and sixteenth century, besides the Vrbanić family, some other families had their estates in Vrbanec (among them was Paul Pogledić from Kurilovec).⁸⁵¹ By 1560, Vrbanec was merged with Kurilovec and remained a part of this village.

⁸⁴⁸ Since in the fifteenth and documents the family Pogledić from Vrbanec is often mentioned, Laszowski suggested that Vrbanec was in the part of Kurilovec where the old curia of the Pogledić family was placed.

⁸⁴⁹ MHNC 1, doc. 93, pp. 97-99.

⁸⁵⁰ MHNC 1, doc. 94., p. 100.


⁸⁵¹ MHNC 2, doc. 119; Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, pp. 402-403.

5.2.2.2.2.3. Zobačlaz and Zamlačje

Zobačlaz and Zamlačje were situated in the area of Kurilovec in the medieval period. None of them exists today, but, as will be shown in the further text, toponyms reveal locations of these medieval hamlets.

In the charter issued by King Ferdinand in 1560, one of the 36 estates (villages) listed as the property of the nobles of Turopolje was called *Zobachlaz*. Along with that, the king confirmed to the nobles their ownership of two agricultural lands called Delnice and Zamlače, situated within the boundaries of the estate Kurilovec (*Delnycze et Zamlathye vocatis, intra metas dictae possessionis Korylowcz*).⁸⁵²

Toponyms Delnice and Zamlače are visible on the 1861 cadastre map. According to these toponyms, the land Delnice was place between the Lomnica River on the north and the stream Mostičajna on the south. The lands called Zubačka and Zamlačka were placed on the southeastern side of Delnice. Zamlačka is obviously a form of the name Zamlačje. I think Zubačka is a variation of Zobač (laz). Toponyms Zubači and Zamlačje can also be seen on modern maps (Map 61). It seems, therefore, there were two small settlements, or better to say hamlets, situated in this area in the medieval period.



Map 61-Toponyms Zubači and Zamlače

⁸⁵² MHNC 3, docs. 282 and 283., pp. 448-452.

In the 1488 tithe list, Zamlačje was marked as a village (*villa Zamlache*), next to the village Kušanec.⁸⁵³ This is the only mentioning of the village of such name (found so far). For that reason, I suppose Zamlačje was a small hamlet, abandoned by the middle of the sixteenth century as in 1560 this area was *terra arabilis Zamlathye*.⁸⁵⁴ Zobačlaz was also mentioned in the tithe list, in 1503, next to Kurilovec and Trnovec.⁸⁵⁵ In the tax lists from 1554 and 1555, both Trnovec and Zobačlaz are recorded as a property of the nobles of Kurilovec (*Thernowcz et Zobachlaz nobilium de Korylowcz*).⁸⁵⁶ According to the toponym (Map 64), the village was placed within the southeastern borders of Kurilovec.⁸⁵⁷ There are no nobles from Zobačlaz mentioned in the extant sources. I think Zobačlaz was a smaller hamlet inhabited by tenant peasants (as was Zamlačje).⁸⁵⁸ After 1560, the village called Zamlačje is not mentioned. Either it had been abandoned sometime in the late sixteenth century or it remained a small hamlet, a part of Kurilovec, and as such was not mentioned anymore in the extant sources. By the time of the First military survey, there were no houses in this area.

5.2.2.2.3. Velika Mlaka

The last village in the group of villages mentioned in 1560 as the property of the nobles of Turopolje situated in the northwestern part of the region that will be analysed in this chapter is Velika Mlaka. Today are two villages named Mlaka – Velika and Mala Mlaka. Both of them existed in the medieval period. Mala Mlaka has already been mentioned in the previous chapter. It was not an estate of the castle warriors in 1560. When the borders between Vukota and his kindred and the sons of Andrew and Miroslav were divided in 1256, the territory of Mala Mlaka belonged to the last.⁸⁵⁹ Velika Mlaka, on the other hand, was a village of the castle warriors of Turopolje.

As was the case with Gorica, Lomnica and Lukavec, the earliest (fourteenth-century) charters do not make a distinction between Mala and Velika Mlaka. They named certain people

⁸⁵³ MHNC 2, doc. 48, pp. 64-65.; Laszowszki, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 406.

⁸⁵⁴ MHNC 3, docs. 282 and 283., pp. 448-452.

⁸⁵⁵ MHNC 2, doc. 147., pp. 221-222.

⁸⁵⁶ MHNC 2, docs. 211 and 230.

⁸⁵⁷ Laszowski thought that Zobačlaz was most likely placed “somewhere on the slopes of Vukomeričke gorice, perhaps between Mraclin and Lukavec. Laszowszki, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 407. But, I think it is clear from the toponyms and the charters (it was owned by the nobles of Kurilovec) that it was placed on the southeaster side of Kurilovec.

⁸⁵⁸ For example, *providus* George Kozel (*in possessione Zobachlaz commorantis*) mentioned in 1557. MHNC 3, doc. 245.

⁸⁵⁹ MHNC 1, doc. 9, pp. 11-13.

simply *de Mlaka*. Mala Mlaka was first time mentioned as *Minori Mlaka* in 1374,⁸⁶⁰ and Velika Mlaka as *Maiori Mlaka* in 1465.⁸⁶¹ According to Laszowski, Velika Mlaka must have been an older village than Mala Mlaka.⁸⁶² If that is correct, the first mentioning of this settlement would be in 1326 when Nicholas, son of Nicholas from Mlaka, his brother George and his cousins Bartholomeus and Valentin sons of John gave their estate in Petrovec to the priest Denis. After that, numerous people from Velika Mlaka are mentioned in the charters as *nobiles castrenses de Mlaka*.⁸⁶³ I suppose that the ones who were mentioned as the castle warriors were from Velika Mlaka while the ones who were not mentioned as the castle warriors were from Mala Mlaka.⁸⁶⁴

Some of the families that lived in Velika Mlaka in the fifteenth and sixteenth century were Krupići, Bedovlići, Kuvenčići, Lackovići, Mudići etc.⁸⁶⁵ For some of them, like Bedovlići and Krupići, is clear that they had settled in Turopolje in the late medieval period.⁸⁶⁶ In 1516, Lackovići and Mudići, claimed they had originated from Roduš, one of twelve proclaimed *servientes regis* by young King Bela in 1225.⁸⁶⁷ This will be discussed in more detail in the closing chapter. There are no extant thirteenth- and fourteenth-century sources that could prove or disapprove such connection. Actually, there is only case when a genealogical connection of a person mentioned in the extant thirteenth-century sources and the fifteenth-century nobles of Velika Mlaka can be established.

One of the lands that *comes* Peter bought in 1228 had belonged, prior to this purchase, to Vratislav, Nadesco and Dominik sons of Trebenin and Trebeša and their relatives (*cognati*). This was one of the lands situated around *Suinna Malaca* and *Sredna malaca*, in the area of medieval Hrečin, the present-day Mikčevac. It has already been mentioned in the subchapter

⁸⁶⁰ MHNC 1, doc. 90., p. 93.

⁸⁶¹ MHNC 1, doc. 351., p. 431.

⁸⁶² Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 400.

⁸⁶³ MHNC 1, doc.40, p. 43.; Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 400.

⁸⁶⁴ For example, Peter and George, sons of Nicholas *de Mlaka* whose estate Mlaka (*possessio Mlaka*) was occupied by Nicholas, Stephan and Ladislaus, sons of Benedict and Gregory son of Michael from Odra were not labelled in any way as were not Nicholas, Stephan, Ladislaus and Benedict. The last ones were the great grandsons of Lucacius, son of Andrew, so the descendants of *comes* Gurk. Nicholas and Stephan were from Mala Mlaka, they were already mentioned as owners of Mali Kostanjevec or Novaki. In that charter from 1373 they were called *egregii*. So, none of these people was the castle-warrior of Turopolje. MHNC 1, docs. 99, 138, 139 and 140., pp. 105, 136-138.

⁸⁶⁵ See: Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 400.

⁸⁶⁶ Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 400.

⁸⁶⁷ MHNC 1, doc. 228., p. 236.

Pleso that, in the medieval period, an estate called Trebež was situated in the area between Mikčevac and Pleso. Today there is a toponym Trebež south of Mikčevac.

The estate Trebež (*possessio Trebesyn*) is first time mentioned in 1343; someone accused castle warriors Lucas son of Vučjak and Vid son of Vraislaj that they had occupied some estate (*possessio*) in *Trebesyn* that was a land of the castle of Zagreb (*ad castrum pertinentem*). Lucas and Vid proved that this was actually their hereditary estate, inherited from their grandfather Rodik son of Trebeša. *Magister* John, *comes* of Zagreb issued a charter that confirmed it.⁸⁶⁸

It can be mentioned here that the toponym Trebež can have several meanings. It can be derived either from the personal name Trebeša, so the name of the owner of the estate, or from the verb *trijebiti* or *trebiti*, to extinct. In the case of the last, it indicated a clearing of land, cutting down woods and preparing land for cultivation.⁸⁶⁹ There is also a theory that the word is connected with the Slavic pagan mythology; the old Slavic word *trebište* means sacrifice place, so the places called Trebište could be connected with ritual sacrifice places.⁸⁷⁰ As Lucas and Vid clearly inherited the estate from their great grandfather Trebeša, it can be concluded that the estate was most likely named after the owner. Still, it should be taken into consideration that theoretically it was also possible that the owner Trebeša was named after the estate Trebašin that was the property of his ancestors.

In 1427, Peter son of George and his cousin Matthey son of Marc, *nobiles castrenses de Mlaka* asked John *literatus*, a *comes* of Zagreb, and an official of Bishop John of Zagreb as well as a *comes terrestris* Stephan Pedk to issue them a transcript of the above-mentioned charter from 1343. They needed a conformation of their ownership over a half of their hereditary estate Trebež (*possessio eorum hereditaria Trebesyn vocata*) that they owned together with their other cousins.⁸⁷¹ Next year, Peter and Matthew's son Blasius were installed into a half of the estates that they owned together (*communiter tangencium*) with their cousins whose names were now mentioned. These were John son of Lucas and his son John, also castle warriors of Mlaka. The estates that were supposed to be divided were called Trebež and were situated in Mlaka, Rakitovec and some other places (*possessiones et porciones possessionarie*


⁸⁶⁸ MHNC 1, doc.54., p. 54.

⁸⁶⁹ Kiss, "Földrajzi nevek," pp. 656-657.

⁸⁷⁰ Vitomir Belaj – Juraj Belaj, *Sveti trokuti – Topografija hrvatske mitologije* [Holy triangles – Topography of Croatian mythology] (Zagreb: Ibis grafika, Institut za arheologiju u Zagrebu, Matica hrvatska, 2014), p. 71.

⁸⁷¹ MHNC 1, doc. 211., p. 210.

Trebesyn vocate, in predicta Mlaka ac in Rakythowech et alias ubvis habite et existente).⁸⁷² Although the perambulations of two estates recorded in this charter do not refer to any land in Rakitovec, Lukač son of Vučjak certainly owned a land in Rakitovec as his estate is mention in the perambulation of one estate in Rakitovec in 1388 (*possessio Luchasii filii Wlchyak*).⁸⁷³ But, as Rakitovec was in the area of Veliki turopoljski lug, nobles of different kindreds and villages owned the land there.



Map 62-Present-day toponym Trebež

The 1428 charter contains perambulations of two lands, parts of the estates Trebašin in which Peter and Matthew's son Blasius were installed. Some of the borders of the first land (estate) were Hrečin, the estate of the sons of Lukač, a boundary of some estates (*possessiones*) called *Pleskameya*, a land of Anthony son of John from Gorica, the "water" Velika Mlaka (*aqua*

⁸⁷² MHNC 1, doc. 222., p. 227.

⁸⁷³ MHNC 1, doc. 117., p. 121.

Mlaka magna) on the western side. I suppose there was some waterflow of this name as the charter stated that the border went through this Mlaka to the first boundary. The other part that they inherited was an agricultural land (*terra arabilis*), situated along the borders of nobles of Donja Lominca (*penes metam nobilem de Lompnycza Inferiori*).⁸⁷⁴ So, this agricultural land was situated around the borders of Donja Lomnica. There is a toponym Trebež in this area. Today a land called Trebaž is situated within borders of Velika Gorica, but on the 1861 cadastre map it was situated around the northern borders of Donja Lomnica (Map 62). I think that somewhere in this area was the land of Peter and Blasius, descendants of Trebeša mentioned in 1228. That would mean that the estate Trebež was covering the whole area between the present-day Velika Mlaka, Velika Gorica, Donja Lomnica, Pleso and Kurilovec. Obviously, this whole area did not belong to the kindred of Vukota or descendants of Vuk, George and Ielk who owned the estates in Gorica, Pleso, Rakarje and Ilovnjak. Trebeša, from whom one noble family of Velika Mlaka originated, was the person mentioned in 1228 but it remains unclear if he was of the same kindred as Budina and Levča or Borč and Zlojna or some other kindred.

5.2.2.3. Remarks

In this chapter the development of the villages situated in the northwestern part of Turopolje has been analysed. The analysis showed these villages can be divided into two groups. In the first group are Rakarje, Gorica, Pleso, Kobilić, and Ilovnjak. In the second group are Kurilovec, Kušanec, Vrbanec, Trnovec, Zamlačje, and Zobačlaz. Apart from that, the village of Velika Mlaka existed as the separate unit. Scarce thirteenth-century extant sources do not allow the conclusion whether the territory in which the villages had developed can be connected with one specific kindred or kindreds whose territory can be precisely defined as could have been done for the kindred of Vukota. Nevertheless, certain kindreds are mentioned in the thirteenth-century sources owning land in the northwestern part of the region. Besides that, the existence of extended families, as the sons of George and Ielk and the sons of Vuk, that can be traced in the sources from the late fourteenth century indicates that a considerable number of nobles who lived in Rakarje, Gorica, Pleso, Kobilić and Ilovnjak originated from the same ancestors. The facts that these families did not have their estates in the area of the villages of the other group and that nobles of Kurilovec considered themselves as being of the kindred

⁸⁷⁴ MHNC 1, doc. 222., p. 229.

of Kurilo in the late fifteenth century indicate that in the earlier centuries people who inhabited the area of Rakarje, Gorica, Pleso, Kobilić and Ilovnjak could have had considered themselves as being of separate kindred. However, the general conclusion of the analysis is that there is not enough extant data on the basis of which could be specified how many kindreds lived in the area of the northwestern part of Turopolje.

Likewise, the scarce data are not sufficient for any detailed analysis of the initial process of forming of the villages in the northwestern part of Turopolje. Still, again, some general trends can be noticed. Bigger portions of land over time split into smaller portions on which separate villages had developed. For example, the territory of Gorica, first mentioned in 1228, was, by the beginning of the fifteenth century, divided into the areas of Velika Gorica, Mala Gorica, and Pleso. The estates of the Vuk family initially existed both in the territory of Rakarje and Kobilić. *Comes* Ivan, son of Minizlay from whom this family originated bought *terra Rakaria* in 1278. One of the bordering lands of the purchased estate was Ivan's land. Thus, he had already owned some land in the area prior to the purchase in 1278. As shown, this land was situated in the territory of Kobilić. By the middle of the fifteenth century, a separate village called Kobilić had developed. This was probably connected with both the growth of population and the fact that joint territories of extended families started to be split into territories owned by smaller family units, in which new villages had been formed in the central areas of the estates.

Kobilić, Pleso and Kušanec (a village formed in the territory of Trnovec) developed into separate villages in the fifteenth century, which corresponds to the development of the villages formed over the family estates in Vukomeričke gorice. That process also took place in the fifteenth century. Kurilovec and Vrbanec were formed in the first half or the middle of the fourteenth century. Kurilovec is mentioned for the first time in the extant sources in 1346 and Vrbanec in 1377.⁸⁷⁵ Thus, judging by the time of appearance of villages named after some person in the extant sources, it seems the process of forming of villages over individual estates was happening earlier in this part of Turopolje. For Vrbanec is clear that this was so as the first people mentioned were Martin and Peter, sons of John, son of Vrban *de Vrbanch*. Kurilovec, on the other hand, could have developed over an estate of one family, Wylkin, Mark and Miren, sons of Corala to whom Ban Stephan returned their hereditary land/estate Odra (*terra Odra*), occupied by *comes* Ivan son of Jaroslav.⁸⁷⁶ As shown, *terra Odra* was situated south of the

⁸⁷⁵ MHNC 1, docs. 60 and 93., pp. 61 and 98.

⁸⁷⁶ MHNC 1, doc. 6., p. 9. This was also confirmed by King Bela IV in 1264; MNHC 1, doc. 14. p. 17.

settlement Kurilovec, in the area called Trnovec in the middle of the fourteenth century. In this area, the village Kušanec and hamlets Zobačlaz and Zamlačje came to existence in the fifteenth century. There is also a possibility that Kurilo was head of his kindred and Kurilovec was named after him. The kindred of Kurilovec is mentioned in the extant charter from 1377, but the name of the kindred is not specified.⁸⁷⁷ The kindred of Kurilo (*generacio condam Korlyo*) was mentioned in 1496.⁸⁷⁸ It should be noticed that, by the period of late fifteenth century, a general trend among nobility was to try to prove their origins as far back as it was possible. Still, taking into consideration the name of the village Kurilovec, the memory of Kurilo, a person who lived in the first half of the thirteenth century must have been in some way preserved among the later generations. It is very likely that the story about nobles of Kurilovec being descendants of Kurilo was not simply made up in the late fifteenth century. On the other hand, as will be shown in the following text, the same cannot be said for the story about the kindred of Budina and Levča that was important both for the legitimacy and the origins of the noble community of Turopolje.

In 1516, the nobles of Turopolje raised a complaint to vice-Bans Balthasar Batthyany and Balthasar Alapić against Count George of Brandenburg because of violent acts of his people. Among other misdeeds, they broke into the church of St. Mary the Virgin in Velika Gorica, took five bacons, one sleigh, one vessel of vine, some clothes and fibres, money and many charters that belonged to the nobles, the kindreds of which, as the text of the charter states, originated from Budina, Ivan, Levča, George, Ivan son of Ladislav, Pribizlaus, Roduš, Nicolaus, Thol, Dobča, Milovan and Košut.⁸⁷⁹ These are names of people whom young King Bela supposedly freed from the servitude of Zagreb *castrum* and proclaimed as *servientes regis* in 1225. The debates about the authenticity of the 1225 charter were already mentioned in the chapter *The kindreds*. Now they will be discussed further. This 1225 charter is extant only as a transcript preserved in a charter issued by King Matthias in 1466, on a request of priest (*presbiter*) Fabian of Donji Lukavec, *literatus* Emeric of Donja Lomnica and John Jagnjić of Gornji Lukavec. They asked the king to confirm the 1225 charter and privileges given to them and their kinsmen, the nobles of Zagreb Field (*universi nobiles Campi Zagrabienensis, fratres sui generacionales*) by late King Bela. King Matthias granted them their wish.⁸⁸⁰

⁸⁷⁷ MHNC 1, doc. 94., pp. 100.

⁸⁷⁸ MHNC 2, doc. 119., p. 168.

⁸⁷⁹ MHNC 2, doc. 228., pp. 348-349.

⁸⁸⁰ MHNC 2, doc. 262., pp. 457-458.

One of the arguments that Laszowski wrote, claiming that the 1225 charter is genuine and not the fifteenth century forgery, was: “As can be seen, by 1466, finished the process the consequence of which was that all people [nobles] of Turopolje had started to consider themselves descendants of those mentioned in the charter from 1225, the charter by which they had gained nobility. And it could be so, because, without any doubt, by the marriages of Budina, John, Levča and their cousins, their kindred was mixed with all others kindreds of Turopolje and by that time [by 1466] any [noble] person from Turopolje could have called one of them their ancestor. The reason why the charter was shown to the king exactly at that time [in 1466, when King Matthias confirmed it] is that that period [middle of the fifteenth century], in general, was the time when people wanted to show that their noble origin is as old as much as it was possible.”⁸⁸¹

As far as the marriages by which all noble families of Turopolje are somehow connected with each other are concerned, it could be as Laszowski wrote. However, some of the nobles who raised a complaint to vice-Bans Balthasar Batthyany and Balthasar Alapić against Count George of Brandenburg in 1516 claimed to be direct descendants of some people mentioned in the 1225 charter and it can be stated with certainty that it was not so. For example, according to the 1516 charter, Kvirin Košković from Hrašće was a son of Peter Košković, who was a son of Anthony, who was a son of Petko, who was a son of Koško, who was a son of Vidimer, who was a son of Chadona, who was a son of late Košut (*olim Kwskwk*).⁸⁸² According to this data, Kvirin originated from Košut mentioned in the 1225 charter. The ancestors of Kvirin Košković can, indeed, be identified in the thirteenth century sources owning a land in the territory of Hrašće. In 1331, priest Denis sold a part of his land to castle warriors Petko, son of Vidomer, son of Chaduna and Stephan, son of Mark, son of Badoztech. The land was situated in length between the Odra and the Globoka and in width between lands of Želin castle and Petko and his kindred.⁸⁸³ Thus, the kindred of Petko also owned land in the territory of Hrašće and, as shown, land in Hrašće belonged to Vukota and his kindred. According to the genealogy recorded in 1516, the ancestor of Peter Košković who was called Petko was a son of Kosko, a son of Vidimer, a son of Chadona. According to the purchase contract from 1331, a son of the same Vidomer was Petko. Perhaps Kosko had a brother called Petko and they were both sons of Chadona. That part is not problematic. However, according to the 1516 charter, Chadona

⁸⁸¹ Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 242.

⁸⁸² MHNC 2, doc. 228., pp. 348-349.

⁸⁸³ MHNC 1, doc. 47., p. 48.

was a son of Košut. On the opposite, according to the charter from 1256, one of the representatives of the kindred who came with Vukota to testify the division of the borders between them and the sons of Andrew and *comes* Miroslav was Chaduna son of Raduan, not Košut. Even if one takes into consideration the possibility that there could have been two people named Chaduna and one was a son of Radovan and the other a son of Košut, the names of other people written down in 1256 contradict the possibility that the kindred that lived in the territory of Hrašće was the same as the one of Levča and Budina. Namely, the people who represented the kindred in 1256, together with Chaduna were: Vukota son of Iurgis, Dragoš son of Zdeslay and his brothers, the sons of Vratisha, Volčila, son of Volcumi, Dedomer son of Vukša and Raduhna son of Radomer. Among their names and the names of their fathers, there is not one name of the people proclaimed *servientes regis* in 1225. There was, however, one person of the kindred of Levča and Budina mentioned both in 1225 and 1256. That was Levča, brother of Budina (*Leucha frater Budyna*). Levča was a *pristaldus*, an envoy and a person of trust of Ban Stephan (*dilectus et fideles noster*) who had determined the borders between Vukota and his kindred and the sons of Andrew in 1256.⁸⁸⁴ A *pristaldus* must have been an impartial person in this matter. Levča would have hardly been perceived as such if a territory of him and his kinsmen would have been in question.

Furthermore, according to the 1516 charter, George son of Knezek from Mraclin was a direct descendant of Levča. His family origin was the following: his father George was a son of Blasius, who was a son of Peter, who was a son George, who was a son of Gregory, who was a son Martin, who was a son of late Levča (*olim Hewcha*).⁸⁸⁵ In general, there are not many extant charters from Mraclin and it is not possible to make detailed a genealogical analysis of the families from this village. Nevertheless, there are two thirteenth-century charters in which the names of people of Mraclin are listed. One of them was Stanišk son of Vrašnik. In 1258, he and his kinsmen raised a complaint to Alexandar, *comes* of Pogdorja against Čegul and his kindred who had occupied the land/estate (*terra*) *Doblechmezew*. Levča was also mentioned in this charter. He was one of two *pristaldi* who did perambulation of the borders of the estate. But, the name of his brother is not mentioned, so it can only be assumed that it was Levča brother of Budina.⁸⁸⁶ If so, it can again be assumed that he was not of the kindred of Mraclin. Stanišk and his kindred had been deposed by prince Bela to *castrenses* and Ban Joakim elevated

⁸⁸⁴ MHNC 1, doc. 9., p. 12.

⁸⁸⁵ MHNC 2, doc. 228., p. 348.

⁸⁸⁶ MHNC 1, doc. 12., pp. 15-16.

them again to castle warriors. Ban's charter, issued in 1271, lists the names of kinsmen of Stanišk. These were Stanišk, Voltuk, Bosk son of Varatišk, Benk son of Prek, Draguzlaus son of Gudyzlay, Moak son of Draguani, Gordina son of Dražilo, Poruos son of Stank, Zlobb, Vobkosa as well as the others of their kindred (*ac totam generacionem eorundem*).⁸⁸⁷ As was the case with Vukota and his kindred, there is not one person among the kinsmen of Stanišk who had the same name as people of the kindred of Levča and Budina from 1225. Hypothetically, it could be that George son of Knezek was a descendant of Levča and that his ancestors moved to Mraclin sometime in the fourteenth century, but the kindred that inhabited the territory of Mraclin in the thirteenth century cannot be connected with the kindred of Levča and Budina.

In any case, George son of Knezek was not the only one who claimed to be a descendant of Levča. The first extant charter in which *generatio Lewcha* is explicitly mentioned dates from 1412, so one hundred years earlier than when George of Mraclin lived. The people who claimed to be of the kindred of Levča were George son of Nicholas Mikšić, Vuk son of Ladislav and Gregory Stanilović to whom King Sigismund confirmed their right to the estate Donji Lukavec. This was confirmed by the charter issued by the title of a new donation. Charters of these types were issued only in cases when people to whom a certain estate was confirmed were already in possession of that estate but for some reason did not have charters that could prove their ownership. King Sigismund stated that he gave Donji Lukavec to George, Vuk and Gregory as a reward for the help they and their kinsmen (*iidem unacum fratribus eorum generacionalibus*) provided to him in the restless past time and also that their ancestors possessed this estate from antiquity.⁸⁸⁸ It must be noticed that it is not written in the charter that Levča, the supposed founder of the kindred, was Levča from the 1225 charter. That, however, can be supposed because one of three people who brought the 1225 charter to King Matthias in 1466 was (*presbiter*) Fabian of Donji Lukavec. Fabian was a son of Denis Mikšić and a grandson of the above-mentioned George Mikšić.⁸⁸⁹ Denis, son of George Mikšić was, together with his cousins Vit, son of Vuk and Gregory Stanilović, installed into their hereditary and ancestral estate Donji Lukavec in 1428. All of them claimed they were *de genere Leucha*.⁸⁹⁰ Thus, according to this data, it can be assumed that the nobles of Donji Lukavec somehow got hold on the 1225 charter. It had happened sometime before 1412 as then the kindred of Levča was first mentioned. As it

⁸⁸⁷ MHNC 1, doc. 23., p. 25.

⁸⁸⁸ MHNC 1, doc. 219., pp. 220-221.

⁸⁸⁹ MHNC 1, doc. 362., pp. 457-458.

⁸⁹⁰ MHNC 1, doc. 219., p. 221.

can be assumed that they got hold on it, it can also be assumed that it could have been in their family from 1225. They could have indeed been the descendants of Levča. Their family, first mentioned in Lukavec in 1363, could have moved from some other area in Donji Lukavec, but the territory of Donji Lukavec was placed in the territory that had belonged to the kindred of Vukota and, at least partly, to the kindred of Lomnica in 1373.

In 1516, both Thomas Mudić and John Lacković of Velika Mlaka claimed they originated from Roduš, a kinsman of Levča and Budina. Perhaps the area of Velika Mlaka could have been in the territory of the kindred of Levča and Budina, but the only person mentioned in the thirteenth-century charters whose offsprings can be found living in Velika Mlaka in the fifteenth century was Trebeša from whom *comes* Peter bought the land in 1228. If Trebeša was of the same kindred as Budina and Levča cannot be stated.

In my opinion, all the above written shows the statement that noble families of Turopolje originated from the kindred of Levča and Budina cannot be either approved or disproved in cases when there are no extant sources. On the other hand, it can be disproved in cases when there are extant sources, for example, Kvirin Košković from Hrašće as a direct descendant of Košut. The families that were living in the territory of Lomnica, Hrašće, Lukavec and Mraclin did not originate from the twelve. If some family living in this area in the fifteenth or sixteenth century or later did originate from them, they had probably moved from somewhere else. In that case, however, their ancestors did not possess estates in the territory of Lomnica, Hrašće, Lukavec or Mraclin from antiquity as George son of Nicholas Mikšić, Vuk son of Ladislav and Gregory Stanilović of the Levča kindred claimed in 1412.⁸⁹¹ In this respect, one other interesting aspect can be noticed. It was shown that the only territory that could have been connected with the kindred of Levča and Budina is the one north of Pleso, Hrečin, sold to the sons of Andrew in the 1260s. It can be supposed that the kindred of Levča also owned land in the wider area, in the territory of Pleso, Rakarje or Gorica. It is, therefore, more likely that the families of Ielk, George of Vuk could have had some connections with the people mentioned in the 1225 charter. Still, none of them claimed to have such a connection.

Perhaps the 1225 charter was not a forgery and young King Bela did proclaim one kindred of Turopolje to be *servientes regis*. Maybe, as Laszowski and Nada Klaić wrote, that

⁸⁹¹ Concerning the three above mentioned nobles from Donji Lukavec, this was also an opinion of Nada Klaić. She thought that these three nobles convinced the King Sigismund that they originated from Levča and that they used the real person that had lived in the thirteenth century for their private purposes. Klaić, *Povijest Zagreba*, p. 36.

they did not find the status useful enough to insist on it as they were surrounded by other castle warriors. Being *servientes regis*, they could have not enjoyed in the joint goods, for example pasturing their pigs in Veliki Turopoljski lug. Likewise, their descendants could have lost this status soon after their fathers had gained it. These kinds of depositions are recorded in the extant sources; the kindred of Stanišk deposited by Bela to *castrenses* is a good example. In this respect, it can be stated that it cannot be concluded with certainty if the “first charter” is a forgery or not. On the other hand, it can be concluded with certainty that the story about noble families of Turopolje who originated from the kindred mentioned in the “first charter” is a forgery. I think that the people who used it were also aware of that.

The topics of kindreds, what a kindred meant in the fifteenth and sixteenth century as well as forgeries of origins of families or kindreds are very interesting and require further studies. I hope that the analysis done in this thesis contributed to the question and showed how the mapping of data from charters can contribute to different aspects of historical analysis, including the kindred studies. At the end, I would like to emphasize that all the data about kindreds gained through the analysis of the historical development of the settlements that surround the area around the archaeological site of Šepkovčica are just fragmentary data of the process of the development of kindreds in Turopolje. Furthermore, this development did not stop in the fifteenth century nor later.

In 1560, the so-called “brotherhood of Turopolje” was renewed and the statute of the noble community has been written. One part of the statute was the following: “Moved by these and other considerations, they [the nobles of Turopolje] have made and ordained for all time among themselves a unanimous and single disposition and determination, which is as follows: that because many noble kinsmen, namely those of the same kindred and those who divide their land among themselves, as after they have multiplied and divided their goods between themselves, eject their tenant peasants, occupy their places and gather there to stay, and as by God’s will they have also been more fully fecund, some have gathered to stay on farmland and others in woodland assarts, and growing in population, beset by poverty, they cannot at all protect themselves against the magnates and powerful men, and their other violent oppressors, both outsiders and insiders, but on account of penury and poverty can scarcely take out summonses or have these executed; wishing to remedy such evil circumstances, they have agreed mutually to defend one another, sharing costs and expenses in the aforesaid hereditary goods that they have and which are on the said Field and in the County of Zagreb as also in all their suits and litigation, and so that this be made easier they shall accept and receive each other

mutually, reciprocally, in turn and anew as adopted kinsmen and as dividing their land among themselves, and if they are descended from a single womb or lineage and descent by way of a perpetual right, in such a way that if one or other of them by the verdict of divine disposition, by whose will everything is ruled, shall die without the solace of heirs, the goods of the dead man shall descend and proceed to his closest and nearest surviving kinsman or his heirs.”⁸⁹²

Many important issues regarding both the development of the medieval settlement system of the Turopolje region and the development of the noble community are well illustrated in this quotation. It is a valuable testimony written by people who were practically contemporaries of these processes. The natural growth of population had led to the cleaning of dense woods that were covering the area, in order that new dwelling zones could be made. As shown in the chapters of this thesis, this growth of population was reflected in the development of new settlements and fragmentation of the bigger areas into smaller portions of lands owned by individual families. At the same time, as the quote from the 1560 Statute informs, the growth of population also led to turning of agricultural lands into dwelling areas as well as the expulsion of tenet peasants, the productive working groups of the population of these areas. This, as well as fragmentation of the land that was happening due to specific inheritance laws of the noble community, had negative impacts. The result was the impoverishment of individual families and their incapability to protect themselves against pretensions of magnates. On this ground, the new brotherhood was formed. In some aspects, like mutual protection or the rule that a property of a person who died without direct heirs must be inherited by the nearest surviving kinsman or his heirs, the brotherhood very much resembled a medieval kindred. It must be emphasized that the last statement is up to the point simplification of historical processes; naturally, the kindreds of the thirteenth century were not identical institutions as the kindreds in the fifteenth or the sixteenth century. Each kindred should be a subject of specific research. In general, there are not enough study cases on kindreds, especially the ones of lesser nobility that some firm conclusions can be drawn. Still, I think the noble community did represent a sort of kindred organization practically up to the abolishment in the twentieth century, in a way that it had always consisted of a considerable number of people, majority of whom had blood connections and an awareness of it, who lived in rural area, shared communal lands and woods, protected each other because of the mutual economic and strategic interests, and also in some periods shared the stories of imaginary common ancestors. The changes it underwent through

⁸⁹² This quote is taken from English translation of the 1560 Statute of Nobles of Turopolje, translated by Martin Rady in scope of the project under supervision of Damir Karbić.

in these periods as well as why it was preserved for so long are important topics for the further research.

As was the case with the names of the villages in the southwestern part of Turopolje, the names of the villages of the northwestern part that first appear in the extant sources are derived from names of certain natural features and perhaps, of names of certain economic activities. The villages whose names are derived from personal names are mostly of later origin. The exceptions are Kurilovec and Vrbanec, mentioned in the extant sources around the middle or the third quarter of the fourteenth century, thus, formed earlier than the villages in Vukomeričke gorice. The names of the villages in the southwestern area, derived from the names of natural features, were all connected with two distinctive characteristics of Turopolje – woods and waters. The names of some villages in the northwestern part are also connected with woods and waters, but some others cannot be interpreted easily as their meanings are not straightforward. In those cases, all the possible solutions are listed. A proper meaning of each, however, can be determined only by fieldwork.

Mlaka is a toponym whose meaning is clear. It means a swamp, a smaller swamp or a pool or even liquids in general.⁸⁹³ All these meanings are compatible – if a standing water is small it is a puddle and if larger it is a swamp. Mlaka is often used for puddles or small streams, especially in northern Croatia.⁸⁹⁴ In Turopolje, there were (and still are) two settlements named Mlaka; Velika Mlaka was in the territory of the noble community, while Mala Mlaka was not. These two villages were not situated next to each other but at some five kilometres distance. The villages of Hrašće and Odra were located between them. Therefore, in this case, it cannot be stated that initially there was one compact territory called Mlaka that was later divided into Velika and Mala Mlaka, as was the case with Gorica, Lomnica and Lukavec. It could be that both villages were named after smaller and larger swamps, around which they had developed, but also that both villages had swamps in their territory but one settlement was bigger and the other smaller.

⁸⁹³ Tomislav Ladan, *Život riječi: etimologija i uporaba* [The life of words: etymology and usage], (Zagreb: Novela media, 2009), pp. 213-214; Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine*, pp. 399-400, Gluhak, *Hrvatski etimološki rječnik*, p. 416; Brozović-Rončević, *Nazivi za blatišta*, p. 39; *Rječnik hrvatskog ili srpskog jezika*, vol. 6, p. 831; Skok, *Etimologijski rječnik*, vol. 2, p. 440; Wippel, *Die geographischen Namen*, pp. 68-69.

⁸⁹⁴ *Hrvatski enciklopedijski rječnik*, p. 752.

The first place name that appears in the extant sources from Turopolje is Gorica (in 1228). The word is a diminutive of a word *gora* that can mean several things; it can signify a hill (the oldest meaning), a large wood or a vineyard⁸⁹⁵. I think, in the case of Velika and Mala Gorica, the word most likely indicates wood. They are not placed in a position higher than the surrounding area, that is, on a hill. Also, the plain of Turopolje was a swampy area and not really suitable for large vineyards before the water regulation projects. Still, there is also one additional meaning of this toponym, noticed by Vladimir Sokol in his research of medieval cemeteries in the territory of southern Croatia. It will be mentioned as it can be an important indicator of archaeological sites. The word *gorica* was used (especially in the Vinodol area) for a public space near a well, a spring or for some part of common land, often in an area around a church. Medieval graveyards were discovered in more than several such places. Thus, in southern Croatia this toponym is certainly connected with burial places.⁸⁹⁶ I did not find any such interpretation of the toponym in the context of medieval Slavonia. Yet, perhaps it also cannot be entirely excluded. At the beginning of the twentieth century, a part of the early 9th-century graveyard has been discovered in Velika Gorica, but, due to this early dating, it is not connected with Christian burials. Whether it continued to function as a burial place later or whether there was a church next to it at one point cannot be said as only a smaller part of the graveyard was excavated. It is the fact, however, that Velika Gorica (called Gorica in the first extant sources) was the only village of castle warriors in the plain in which the church was placed. When the church was built cannot be specified. Likewise, it is possible that the area of the church was first a cemetery ground in which, later, the church was built. The church in Gorica was first mentioned in the first list of parish churches from 1334.⁸⁹⁷ Anyway, since there are no other parallels of burial places and toponyms named *gorica* for the territory of medieval Slavonia, at this state of research, it is more likely that the word Gorica in the names of the settlements of Velika and Mala Gorica primarily meant wood. But, the possibility that the church in Gorica was built first and then the settlement was named after the burial place next to it should not, considering the parallels from the territory of southern Croatia, be completely excluded. Perhaps some further archaeological research that will take into consideration

⁸⁹⁵ Skok, *Etimologijski rječnik*, vol. 1, pp. 589-590; *Rječnik hrvatskog ili srpskog jezika*, vol. 3, pp. 270-272, 283; Wippel, *Die geographischen Namen*, p. 27; Kiss, *Földrajzinevek*, pp. 242, 245.

⁸⁹⁶ Vladimir Sokol, *Medieval Jewelry and Burial Assemblages in Croatia. A Study of Graves and Grave Goods, cca 800 to cca. 1450*, Turhout: Brill, 2016.

⁸⁹⁷ MHNC 1, doc. 51., p. 51.

toponyms of a surrounding area will show that the word *gorica* can also indicate a burial place in the area of northern Croatia, that is, medieval Slavonia.

The other settlement name that appears in the thirteenth-century sources is Rakarje. The root of the word Rakarje is rak, a crayfish or rakar, a person who catches crayfish.⁸⁹⁸ Laszowski proposed an interesting theory about the origin of this name: “the name of the settlement was derived from the name of the stream that must have had lots of crayfishes and, perhaps, people living in that village served to the town of Zagreb in a way that they were catching crayfishes for a *comes* of Zagreb *castrum*”.⁸⁹⁹ The last part of the theory sounds unlikely, if nothing else because this area belonged to castle warriors and a job like catching crayfishes would more likely be performed by groups of lower social ranks. However, if the name of the settlement indeed was derived from the occupation of its inhabitants (not perhaps castle warriors but their serves or tenet peasants, *iobagiones*, *populus*), it is interesting that such occupation stayed preserved in the settlement name while some other jobs that must have been happening on a much larger scale in Turopolje area in general, like pig farming, were not. I do not have any explanation for this. Perhaps the word rakarje also had some other meanings except “people who catch crayfishes”. Perhaps inhabitants of the area indeed did perform this job on a larger scale and the area that became the village Rakarje was known for this. It would be interesting to see results of archeozoological analysis of some animal bones deposits that could be found in some future excavations in this area.

The word Kobilíć was first mentioned as the nickname of the family Vuković (*Wklouichi, alio nomine Kobilichi*) in 1424. These people were descendants of *comes* Ivan, the first known owner of land in this area. The village could have been named after the family as Laszowski thought, but it could also be that a part of the Vuković family who owned lands in this area got the nickname after the name of their estates. The only explanation I have found for the root of the word Kobilíć is kobila, a mare.

Medieval village Pleso was located in the area of the present-day Pleso. It appears in the sources, starting from the fifteenth century, as *Plezo*. But, as shown, there was also an estate called *Pleza*, first mentioned in 1377, located north of Kurilovec.⁹⁰⁰ This estate had not developed into a separate village. In addition to that, agricultural land called Pleso, situated in Gorica (*in terra arabili in Gorica habita, Plezo vocata*) is mentioned in 1427. It was already

⁸⁹⁸ Wippel, *Die geographischen Namen*, p. 90; Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 380.

⁸⁹⁹ Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 380.

⁹⁰⁰ MHNC 1, doc. 93., pp. 97-99.

mentioned that a linguist should confirm if *Plezo* and *Pleza* are the same words. There are two possible etymological explanations of the meaning, which actually again indicates that the meaning of the name of the estate *Pleza* does not necessarily have to be the same as the meaning of *Plezo*. Pleso can mean a deep or wide place in a river, a bend in a river or lake (the primary Proto Slavic meaning),⁹⁰¹ a water meadow or a flooded swampy area in a wood.⁹⁰² Laszowski, observing the environment in his time, when there were still some smaller swamps around the village of Pleso, concluded that the word, in this case, means a swamp.⁹⁰³ It could be so, but it could also be that this word was used as the opposite of *Mlaka* (a swamp), indicating thus a lake or more open water surface. Also, there is one other interpretation of this toponym; in kajkavski dialect it can mean a cleared land, *pleša* or *pliša* and *plešina* in čakavki dialect.⁹⁰⁴ Since the name was used for several different places, among which was the agricultural land, I think that this last option is also very likely.

The word *Ilovnjak* is a derivation of the words *ilovača* or *ilovina*, meaning a loam, a clay, a mud, a sludge.⁹⁰⁵ The settlement could have been named after the stream *Ilovnjak* that was flowing through it, as Laszowski thought. The stream is mentioned in 1486. The name of the stream meant “the stream that was turbid of a loam”.⁹⁰⁶

Zobačlaz is a compound of two words: *Zobač* and *laz*. The word *laz* can have several meanings. Two primary meanings were a narrow path (*semita*) and a place where one can pass through a fence (usually not through doors but in a place where a fence is broken). Out of those two, the third meaning has developed; *laz* meant a place where wood was cleaned or is still being cleaned in order to make agricultural surfaces. Besides that, *laz* can also signify a small agricultural land especially in an area covered with stone. *Laz* is a common toponym but it is often hard to determine its original meaning in a specific case (a narrow path, a fence or a cleared surface).⁹⁰⁷ In this case, as *Zobačlaz* was a hamlet that had developed by the end of the fifteenth century, I think that *laz* indicates a cleared land. There is also the village called *Lazi*, situated south of *Mraclin*, that appears only in 1540, inhabited by one family from *Mraclin*. As

⁹⁰¹ Brozović-Rončević, *Nazivi za blatišta*, pp. 30-31.

⁹⁰² Brozović-Rončević, *Nazivi za blatišta*, pp. 30-31; *Hrvatski enciklopedijski rječnik*, p. 390; Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 376; Lukenda, *Zemljopisna nomenkultura*, p. 58; Skok, *Etimologijski rječnik*, p. 682; Wippel, *Die geographischen Namen*, p. 104.

⁹⁰³ Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 376.

⁹⁰⁴ Brozović-Rončević, *Nazivi za blatišta*, p. 31.

⁹⁰⁵ Brozović-Rončević, *Nazivi za blatišta*, p. 16; Wippel, *Die geographischen Namen*, p. 35.

⁹⁰⁶ Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine*, p. 334.

⁹⁰⁷ *Rječnik hrvatskog ili srpskog jezika*, vol. 4, pp. 931-932; Skok, *Etimologijski rječnik*, vol. 1, p. 278; Magyar néprajzi lexikon, *laz*, <http://mek.oszk.hu/02100/02115/html/3-1212.html>.

this village is placed in the area of Veliki turopoljski lug, it can be supposed that it was formed in the place where the wood was cleaned by some inhabitants of Mraclin who later settled the place.⁹⁰⁸ It can also be significant that both settlements (Zobačlaz and Lazi) were hamlets or single farms. It can show individual woodland clearing. A person or a family who had cleared land became its owner (in such cases, the land was often named after him). In the areas where clearing was rather a community project, usually new villages emerged. In any case, the statute of the noble community from 1560 mentions the clearing of woods in order to make living areas for the grown population. While the meaning of laz is rather clear in both of the above-mentioned cases, the first part of the compound Zobačlaz is not clear. Perhaps Zobač was a personal name, but it should be noticed that a person of such name was not mentioned in the extant sources found so far. If Zobač was a personal name, it is unusual (although not impossible). Laszowski suggested, although with retention, that the word could be a derivate of the verb zobati, to peck, and that it could be a place with a vineyard where grapes were packed.⁹⁰⁹ The only word that I can think of as being associated with Zobač is zob, an oat. But, as said, the word is unclear.

Finally, two last toponyms are easier to interpret. The root of the word Trnovec is a thorn, trn, so it signifies place overgrown with thorns.⁹¹⁰ Zamlačje, on the other hand, is a compound of two words: za and mlaka.⁹¹¹ Za is shorted of *iza*, behind, and mlaka is a swamp or a pond.

The names of the villages in the northwestern part of Turopolje are more diverse than the names of the villages in the southwestern part. While some of them, like Mlaka, Zamlačje, Ilovnjak or Trnovec testify about the historical environment of the region in the early medieval period, the other testify about processes by which people interfered into the landscape, for example a clearing of woods (laz and perhaps Pleso). The meanings of Gorica and Rakarje are less clear. Does Gorica mean wood or it can be connected with a burial ground around the church? Was catching of crayfishes so important that the name of the village was derived from it? These questions can be answered only by fieldwork. Perhaps meanings of both words are the meanings recorded in most of the onomastic dictionaries; Gorica as a hill, a vineyard or a wood and Rakarje as a derivation of the word rakar. At this moment, in the absence of other

⁹⁰⁸ Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 354.

⁹⁰⁹ Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine* 1, p. 407.

⁹¹⁰ Laszowski, *Povijest plemenite općine*, pp. 387-388.

⁹¹¹ Wippel, *Die geographischen Namen*, p. 110; Petar Šimunović, *Ojkonimija općine Dvora na Uni*, *Rasprave zavoda za hrvatski jezik*, vol. 17, p. 276.

evidence, it seems so. At the same time, it should be noticed that onomastic research is often theoretical. Therefore, fieldwork and a historical context could add new meanings to certain toponyms. I think both the examples of Rakarje and Gorica illustrate that, while toponyms are very useful in historical, historical environmental and archaeological research it can also be vice versa.

5.3. The site of Šepkovčica

After the analysis of the development of the medieval settlement system in the territory of the castle warriors of Turopolje done in the previous chapters, in this chapter I will present the remains of the medieval settlement features excavated at the site of Šepkovčica. The purpose of the analysis that will be done in the following text is to discuss in what way data collected during the excavations of the archaeological site contribute to understanding of historical development of Turopolje that has been written so far on the basis of data gained through the analysis of the historical sources, toponyms and cartographic sources. Likewise, it will be discussed whether the historical sources can help with an interpretation of the archaeological remains found on Šepkovčica.

First, it will be shown to which medieval village the remains of the excavated settlement features belonged. I have already dealt with this issue in my MA thesis and concluded that, in the late medieval period, the area of the site was most likely part of Donja Lomnica.⁹¹² Now, I will shortly explain how I came to this conclusion and also add some new data that I have found meanwhile, that support the above-mentioned assumption. After that, the summary of the results of the archaeological excavations will be shown and inserted into the broader framework of the development of the villages of castle warriors.

5.3.1. Historical interpretation (charters, toponyms and maps)


5.3.1.1. Borders of Donja Lomnica and the location of Nowgar

The position of the archaeological site Šepkovčica in the present-day environment is shown on Map 63. The cadastre parcel Šepkovčica is situated within the cadastre borders of two present-day villages – Donja Lomnica and Gradići. Donja Lomnica is one of the oldest known villages of castle warriors of Turopolje (first time mentioned in the extant sources in 1279 as *Lomnicha*⁹¹³). Contrarily, the name Gradići does not appear in medieval charters; according to the sources I have found so far, it is first mentioned in 1734. Thus, the village called Gradići was most likely created sometime in the early modern period. In like manner, a toponym or a village named Šepkovčica cannot be found in medieval charters. The first mentioning of this time I found so far is recorded on the 1861 cadastre map, in the form *Šebkovščece*, as a name of agricultural land. On the First and Second military surveys, created

⁹¹² Antonić, “Late medieval village in Turopolje”, pp. 65-83; Antonić, “Combining documents, toponyms and archaeology,” pp. 217-228.

⁹¹³ MHNC 1, docs. 30 and 31, pp. 34-35.

prior to the 1861 cadastre, it is clearly visible that the area of Šepkovčica was an agricultural land or a meadow.



Map 63-Villages around Šepkovčica

Except for Gradići, all the present-day villages that surround the archaeological site have been analysed in the previous chapters of this dissertation as they were all villages inhabited by nobles of Turopolje and frequently mentioned in medieval charters. These villages are Hrašće, Velika Mlaka, Pleso, Velika Gorica, Mala Gorica and Kurilovec. The last two are today parts of Velika Gorica. Their position is, however, well known.

There are no thirteenth-charters that concern the area in between the above-listed villages, where the archaeological site was discovered. Consequently, it is not possible to connect this area with certainty with the territory of some of the kindreds known from the written sources. From the second half of the fourteenth century, however, the extant charters are more abundant. Even more, the number of these as well as the fifteenth- and the sixteenth-century charters is considerable and enable placing of the site in its medieval environment. No separate village in the territory of Šepkovčica had been mentioned in any of the charters. Therefore, I think it can be concluded with certainty that the remains excavated at the site were within the borders of one of the villages that surround the site today. The surface of the whole

area in between the villages is approximately four by four kilometres, so it is really not likely that a separate village would not be mentioned (again taking into consideration the big number of the extant charters).


My first assumption was that the area of Šepkovčica was a part of the village nearest to the site – Donja Lomnica. I still think this is correct. The detailed descriptions of the borders of Donja Lomnica in the medieval period have been recorded for the southwestern and southeastern borders of the village. The southeastern borders, that is, the borders between Donja Lomnica and Petrovina, are extant in the charters issued in 1395/1396 when the castle warriors of Lomnica were in conflict with the burghers of Gradec.⁹¹⁴ The southwestern borders, that is, the borders between Donja Lomnica and Lukavec were recorded in 1428, in the charter that confirmed Denis son of George Mikšić and his cousins Vit son of Vuk and Gregory Stanilović were installed into the estate Donji Lukavec.⁹¹⁵

Unfortunately, there are no extant charters that contain such a detailed description of the northern borders, where the site is situated. However, there is one charter that gives some information about this area. In 1428, Peter son of George and Paul son of Matthey, son of Marc, noble castle warriors of Mlaka were installed into half of their hereditary estate Trebež (*possessio Trebesyn*). The whole estate had been previously owned by Peter and Paul and their cousins. As shown (see pages 359-362, Map 62), the part of this estate was situated in the area between Velika Mlaka, Mičevac and Pleso, where toponym Trebež can be seen on modern maps. Along with that, Peter and Paul were installed into one agricultural land (*terra arabilis*). The perambulation of this land was the following: “The first boundary begins around the borders of nobles of Donja Lominca (*penes metam nobilum de Lompnycza Inferiori*), on the western side at some earthen boundary near *Zepy*, from there goes towards the east to the other earthen boundary, and from there proceeds to the south to some caltrop (*tribulus*) signed with a cross and a circled earthen boundary, from there goes to the other caltrop called *glog* and a circled earthen boundary, around the border of nobles of Lomnica, and through this thorny boundary proceeded towards the west and comes to *Zepy*, and through *Zepy*, through the road proceeds towards the north and comes to the first boundary where it finishes.”⁹¹⁶

⁹¹⁴ For example: MHCZ 1, docs. 378 and 385, pp. 357-358 and 366-369.

⁹¹⁵ MHNC 1, doc. 221, pp. 224-225.

⁹¹⁶ MHNC 1, doc. 222, pp. 228-229.



Map 64-Toponym Trebež and the site of Šepkovčica

This land was situated along the northern borders of Donja Lomnica. The toponym Trebež can be found on the 1861 cadastre map, situated along the northern border of Donja Lomnica, but within the borders of this village. It can also be found on present-day cadastre map (Map 64). I think that the agricultural land whose borders are described above was situated somewhere in this area, as this obviously was the bordering area of Donja Lomnica and Mlaka. Likewise, as can be seen in the text of the perambulation, the boundary called Zepy was also situated on the border between the two villages. Although the text of the perambulation is not completely precise in specifying what *Zepy* is,⁹¹⁷ I think that was actually a name of a road. Apart from the above-mentioned charter, the term *Zepy* is mentioned in two other charters from the Turopolje area, as the name of the road. In 1509, some nobles of Turopolje came in conflict with people of Baltazar Alapić near *via zep dicta, publica et communis*, near Lukavec castle.⁹¹⁸ The western border of a certain estate situated in Buševac, mentioned in 1559, was *via regia et communis Zeph vocata*.⁹¹⁹ The road Zepy mentioned in the perambulation of the agricultural

⁹¹⁷ Laszowski marked it as *locus metallicus*, MHNC 1, Index personarum, locorum et rerum momentosarum, p. 528.

⁹¹⁸ MHNC 2, doc. 174., p. 262.

⁹¹⁹ MHNC 3, doc. 261., p. 416.

land in 1428 was oriented north-south. This could be the same road that was placed somewhere around Lukavec castle, as Lukavec is south of Donja Lominca. Buševac, on the other hand, is placed some 15 kilometres southeast of Donja Lomnica. Because of that, I do not think *via regia et communis Zeph vocata* mentioned in 1559 is the same road as Zepy from 1428. The reason why different roads were called Zepy is, in my opinion, that the name Zepy means the same as *öttevény*.

In the medieval period, the term *öttevény* was used for Roman roads that were still in use in the Middle Ages. The equivalent of this term in Croatian is *sep* and *sap* (the origin of both is sipati-to pour).⁹²⁰ One variation of *sep* or *sap* is *zeph* or *zepy*. The road that went through Buševac is the well-known Roman state road Siscia-Poetovia (Sisak-Ptuj), mentioned in more medieval charters. For example, one charter from 1347 mentions it as *via magna and publica Scep dicta*.⁹²¹ The similarity with *via regia et communis Zeph vocata* mentioned in 1556 is obvious.⁹²² A Roman road used in the middle ages so far has not been discovered in the area between Velika Mlaka and Donja Lominca or around Lukavec. Judging by the Roman period finds from Šepkovčica (remains of settlement features, two necropolis), this area was densely populated in the Roman period, and the nearby contemporary road is to be expected. Actually, one Roman period road was discovered in the excavations. It was situated 260 meters northwest of the part of the site where late medieval features were discovered. It was 4 meters wide and had two side ditches (total width, including the ditches, was 6 meters).

The road was situated next to the Roman necropolis. It seemed it stopped being used already in the Roman period as on its western edge it was intersected with an animal burial, a well and a pit filled with slag. Also, this road was not constructed by pouring of gravel; geological layers of gravel close to the surface were used (at least, that was the situation on the excavated area of the road). There were no medieval finds in this area and it cannot be stated if this road was used in the medieval period. In my opinion, it is not impossible that it was used because Zepy is recorded as being on the border between Donja Lomnica and Velika Mlaka and in this area were agricultural lands. The absence of any finds of the medieval origin in the area of the Roman necropolis point that this was an agricultural surface, a pasture or a hay in the medieval period. Thus, the road discovered in the excavations can be taken as an option, but data about medieval roads from charters would need to be combined with a large-scale field

⁹²⁰ Laszlo Hadrovics, “*Mađarski elementi u srednjovjekovnom latinitetu Hrvatske* [Hungarian elements in the Medieval Latin in Croatia]”, *Starine* 54 (1969), p. 15.

⁹²¹ CD 11, doc. 268., pp. 352-353.

⁹²² MHNC 3, doc. 261., p. 416.

walking and an areal photographing that the medieval road system of the area could be established.⁹²³

In any case, I think it can be concluded that the northern borders of Donja Lomnica in the medieval period were situated somewhere in the area of the present-day toponym Trebež. It should be said that Trebež is a common toponym, found in different places in Turopolje. However, taking into consideration the position of the land Trebež along the very border of the present-day village, the name could have been preserved from the time the descendants of Trebeša, a person mentioned in the thirteenth-century sources, were holding it. Over time, the name could have started to refer to a wider area. Besides that, it can be assumed that the borders of the village did change slightly from the medieval period. As can be seen on Map 64, the site Šepkovčica was situated south of the area of Trebež, within the borders of Donja Lomnica and Gradići.

As Šepkovčica was placed in the bordering area between Donja Lomnica and Gradići, the southeastern border of medieval Donja Lomnica should be discussed. As will be shown, it is important both for location of the site within borders of a certain village as well as for an interpretation of the site.

The territory of the present-day Gradići is situated north of the Lomnica River. That territory, or at least part of it, was called Nowgar in the medieval period. It can be concluded on the basis of two perambulations from the middle of the sixteenth century. One of the lands that Thomas Oderianić from Kurilovec was selling in 1551 was situated *in loco Nowgar*. The land bordered with the Odra River on the south and a public road (*via publica*) that leads from Petrovina to the *Campum Polye* (to the Field, that is, to Turopolje) on the west and north.⁹²⁴ In 1556, nobles of Turopolje gave to Matthew Slatinski, among others, some agricultural lands and hays in *Nowgari*. These lands bordered with agricultural lands and hays of Peter Dijanković from Kurilovec and Martin Terczel from Rakarje on the east, the Odra River (*fluuius Odra*) on the south, a public road (*via publica*) on the west and hays of nobles of Donja Lomnica on the north.⁹²⁵ So, in both of these cases, the lands were situated north of the Odra River. Petrovina, on the other hand, was situated south of that River. A road that was going from Petrovina to

⁹²³ More about the archaeology and research of Roman roads, with the issue of the archaeological traces see: Borhy László, Czajlik Zoltán, Bődöcs András, "Neue Wege der Erforschung des Siedlungs- und Wegenetzes im römischen Pannonien", In: Szerk: *Günther Schörner Leben auf dem Lande. 'Il Monte' bei San Gimignano: Ein römischer Fundplatz und sein Kontext*. Wien: Phoibos, 2013. pp. 331-338.

⁹²⁴ MHNC 3, doc. 163., p. 273.

⁹²⁵ MHNC 3, doc. 236., p. 381.

“the Field” could have been going through Donja Lomnica or Kurilovec but, if so, these villages would probably be mentioned. If the road went straight to the north, it could only go through Gradići. One such road can be seen on the First military survey (Map 65).

Map 65-Approximate position of the site Šepkovčica and Nowgar on the 1st military survey

⁹²⁶ MHNC 1, doc. 98, pp. 103-104.

mentioned as bordering lands, were castle warriors from Kurilovec.⁹²⁷ So, again, all the data point to the conclusion that Nowgar was situated next to the territory of Kurilovec. On Map 68 can be seen that Kurilovec is placed east of Gradići. Tomas, son of George, a grandson of Ivčec later sold this land to Clement, also a castle warrior of Kurilovec. After Clement's death, his wife Elena sold the land to Benedict Krupić (in 1455).⁹²⁸ Benedict will be mentioned in the further text, but, first should be discussed what actually Nowgar was.

I did not find any extant charter in which Nowgar was called a village (*villa*). Also, I did not find any mentioning of people from Nowgar. Charters either mention it as a boundary (*metas Nouvarzkamesye dictas*,⁹²⁹ *metham wlgo Nowaarye dictam*⁹³⁰), a name of agricultural land (*terrae arabiles Nowgari vocatae*)⁹³¹ or mention that certain land was placed in Nowgar (*in Nowgari*).⁹³² In a charter from 1551, Nowgar is called *locus (in loco Nowgar)*.⁹³³ On the other hand, when Blasius, George, Ladislav and Michael from Lukavec gave in pledge their agricultural land (*terra arabilis*) to Phillip, Ambrosius and Valentin, sons of Blaž Majhenić from Donja Lomnica in 1455, it was stated that the land was situated *in possessionibus N[o]wgar vocato* [sic], between a land also held in loan by Matthew and George from Lušan and a thorny border (*meta spinose*).⁹³⁴ The term *possessio* is used in the fourteenth- and fifteenth-century charters as an equivalent for a village, but always in singular, for example, *in possessione Inferior Lompnicha*,⁹³⁵ *in possessione Kys Mlaka*.⁹³⁶ The term is used in plural when referring to more estates of a certain individual, for example, *in possessionibus et porcionibus possessionariis Benedicti filii condam Georgii dicti Ztanchych de Lokawecz*.⁹³⁷ It is clear, however, from all data shown so far, that different people from different villages had their estates in Nowgar, and that all these estates were agricultural lands, hays, meadows. The name of the place itself points at the agricultural activity. Nowgar means *na ugaru* which is a Croatian term for “land set aside”. It indicates a land left for a certain time period, in order to recover its fertility.⁹³⁸ The word *ugar* is also used in Hungarian and it is of Slavic origin. The

⁹²⁷ MHNC 1, docs. 155 and 298, pp. 147 and 343.

⁹²⁸ MHNC 1, doc. 298, pp. 342-344.

⁹²⁹ MHNC 1, doc. 98, p. 104.

⁹³⁰ MHNC 2, doc. 6, p. 7.

⁹³¹ MHNC 3, doc. 163, p. 273.

⁹³² MHNC 3, doc. 236, p. 377.

⁹³³ MHNC 3, doc. 163., p. 273.

⁹³⁴ MHNC 1, doc. 289, p. 327.

⁹³⁵ MHNC 1, doc. 231, p. 239.

⁹³⁶ MHNC 1, doc. 271, p. 301.

⁹³⁷ MHNC 1, doc. 284, p. 318.

⁹³⁸ See: Antonić, “GIS in historical research,” p. 227.


meaning is the same. Originally, it signified land that became again fertile by manuring it (by keeping animals on it) or by burning vegetation on it. Later ugar meant a fallow, so a land left aside for a while, for example in a two-course or a three-course rotation system. Hence, there was no settlement in the territory of Gradići, that is, along with the northeastern borders of Donja Lomnica, in the medieval period. It was a place where nobles from different villages owned land used either for agricultural purposes or (perhaps) for pasturing. This data, as will be shown in the further text, is important both for the location and the interpretation of the archaeological site. Here, it should be added that, sometime in the early modern period, a village Gradići developed in the area of Nowgar.

5.3.1.2. The area of Šepkovčica

With the toponym Trebež recorded on the 1861 cadastre map as well as on modern maps and the location of Nowgar in the present-day environment, the northern and the northeastern borders of medieval Donja Lomnica have been approximately defined. In the following text, some other toponyms mentioned in medieval charters that can be placed within the borders of Donja Lomnica and in the proximity of the site will be discussed.

In 1424, Damian, son of Fabian, sold his agricultural land (*terra arabilis*) called *Parua Crachicha* to Antony, a son of Peter and Vrban, son of Paul, son of Peter. The land was located in the territory of Donja Lomnica (*in territorio de Inferiori Lompnicha*), situated between lands of Kirin, son of Philipp, Simon, son of Gregory and Blaise, son of George, son of Nicolas, son of Novak, son of Mark. On the northern side, it bordered with Damian's land and on the southern side with the *terra Iarchenicha*, a land of Peter, son of Paul, called Vrdug.⁹³⁹ Toponym Jarčenica or Jarčevica can be found both on modern maps and on the 1861 cadastre map, in the area placed around 600 meters south of the site Šepkovčica, along the old river bed of the Lomnica River.

⁹³⁹ MHNC 1, doc. 202, p. 195.




Map 66-Toponyms of medieval origin around Šepkovčica

Few other charters confirm that land of the Vrdug or Wrag family (this is the same word – Devil, in Hungarian and Croatian version) was situated in the area around the Lomnica River. For example, in 1461, Elena, daughter of Venec, son of Peter, sold two of her lands to Valentin, son of George, son of Swatzh. The first land, which was a plot land (*terra sessionalis*), was situated between the Lomnica River on the south, a road (*via publica*) and a well on the east, another road (*via communa*) on the north and an estate (*possessio*) of Wrag – *Wragovazemla* (Wrag's land in Croatian) on the west.⁹⁴⁰ In this respect, one other toponym that can be found in the area of Jarčevica should be mentioned here. That is *Dvorno mjesto*. Traditionally *Dvorno mjesto* signified a land on which a noble house (*curia*) with a courtyard and economic buildings stood, so a nobleman's estate. It could be that this toponym signifies the place where the *curia* of Vrag family stood. Pieces of medieval pottery can be found in this area, indicating Jarčevica is a potential archaeological site. There are also some other land parcels called *Dvorno mjesto* in the area of Donja Lomnica, as shown on Map 67. Still, it also should be mentioned that in the modern language of Donja Lomnica, *Dvorno mjesto* signifies a building plot. Therefore, without a detailed field walking and excavations, it is not possible to claim with certainty that on all these places *curiae* of castle warriors were situated in the medieval period.⁹⁴¹

⁹⁴⁰ MHNC 1, doc. 336, p. 414.

⁹⁴¹ Antonić, "Late medieval village in Turopolje", 75-76.

As can also be seen on Map 67, there are no toponyms *Dvorno mjesto* in the area of Šepkovčica or its nearest proximity. The land *Parva Crachica* Damian, son of Fabian sold to Anthony and Vrban in 1425 was an agricultural land (*terra arabilis*) and, as written, situated north of Jarčenica. The other lands that were surrounding *Parva Crachica* were called simply *terre*.⁹⁴² I suppose that they were also agricultural lands; in the fifteenth century, the term *terra* implies an agricultural land or a land in the field (*terra campestris*) rather than a dwelling plot. These data indicate that agricultural lands were situated in the area north of Jarčenica. This is just an assumption, but one other charter that can be more closely connected with the area around the site also gives such an impression.



Map 67-Toponyms *Dvorno mjesto*

In 1467, Peter, son of Kirin called Čanković of Donja Lomnica sold three of his agricultural lands (*terrae arabiles seu campestris*) to Benedict Krupić.⁹⁴³ Benedikt was a nobleman from Velika Mlaka. Most of his estates were situated in Velika Mlaka and Kurilovec and he was trying to group them together.⁹⁴⁴ As mentioned, in 1455 he bought some land from

⁹⁴² MHNC 1, doc. 202, p. 195.

⁹⁴³ MHNC 2, doc. 6., pp. 6-7.

⁹⁴⁴ About the life of Benedikt and the Krupic family see: Miljan, "Plemićka obitelj Krupić," pp. 83-125.

Elena, wife of late Clement of Kurilovec. This land was situated in Kurilovec, somewhere around the area of Nowgar, which was one of its borders.⁹⁴⁵ The lands that Benedict bought from Peter in 1467 were in the territory of Donja Lomnica (*in territorio predictae Lompnice*⁹⁴⁶). All three lands were situated along the eastern side of a road (*via communa*) that was heading from Donja Lomnica to Velika Mlaka. The southern border of one of the lands was a road that was going straight from Čiče to Hrašće (*via communa de Chicza tendentem directe sursum ad Hrascha*). On Map 68 can be noticed that this road must have been passing through the area north of the Lomnica River, somewhere around Šepkovčica. One more road was mentioned as an eastern boundary in the perambulation of two lands; in the first case it is called *via communa* and in the second simply *via*, but also the boundary of Nowgar (*via vel metha wlgo Nowgary edictam*). Except for the roads, lands (*terre*) of some other people were also mentioned as borders.⁹⁴⁷ Hence, the lands Benedict bought were certainly situated north of the Lomnica River and west of Nowgar, that is, west of the present-day Gradići. I think it is clear from all these data that the lands in question were situated in the area around the site or perhaps even some of this land was the site itself.

These few extant sources analysed above combined with the toponyms and cartographic data point at the conclusion that, in the fifteenth century, the area of Šepkovčica was a place where *terre arabiles* or *terre campestris* of the nobles of Donja Lomnica and the others (for example, Benedict Krupić of Velika Mlaka) were placed. In the next chapter, it will be shown if this picture created on the basis of data from the written sources can be complemented with the archaeological finds.

5.3.2. Results of the archaeological excavations at the site of Šepkovčica

The archaeological site Šepkovčica was excavated during the rescue excavations on a track of Zagreb-Sisak highway, in the period 2006-2008. The length of the area on which archaeological features were discovered was one kilometre. The width was limited to 60 meters as that was the width of the highway right-of-way. The site had a multi-layered vertical stratigraphy (up to three meters in depth) and, in some areas, a complex horizontal stratigraphy (this was the case with the area where the remains of the medieval settlement were discovered).

⁹⁴⁵ MHNC 1, doc. 298, p. 343.

⁹⁴⁶ This is emphasized in the charter for the first of the sold lands. I think it also implies to the other lands, as no other specific villages was mentioned in connection with them and besides that these lands were next to each other.

⁹⁴⁷ MHNC 2, doc. 6., p. 7.

The excavations resulted in numerous and varied finds from different historical periods: settlement features of several prehistoric cultures, the Roman period settlement features and two necropolises as well as the remains of medieval settlement features have been investigated.⁹⁴⁸

The remains of the medieval features were spreading over an area approximately 350 meters long, that is, in the area of approximately 15,000 square meters. Altogether 823 different features were defined; 75% of them were postholes, while the rest were medium- and large-sized pits. Most of the features were found in the same geological layer – sandy Aeolian silt created in the period between the late antiquity and the early Middle Ages.⁹⁴⁹ The northwestern and the southeastern border of the site were defined during the excavations. Features extending under the northern and southern profiles of the site (meaning outside of the excavating zone) clearly showed that medieval settlement features were also situated in the broader area than the zone determined by the track of the highway. However, since these were rescue excavations it was not possible to extend the excavating zone. The field walking data also confirmed the spreading of the site in directions of both north and south, with a greater density of finds on the southern side. On the southern corner of the field walk area, it was not possible to determine where surface finds stop because the area cultivated by modern agriculture is limited by the first houses of Gradići.⁹⁵⁰

The time scope of usage of the area of the site in Middle Ages was determined on the basis of the radiocarbon dating and the preliminary analysis of the excavated objects. It stretched from the ninth to the fifteenth century.⁹⁵¹ A dating of each feature, done on the basis of data of the preliminary analysis of objects found in them, is shown on the plan of the site, Drawing 5.⁹⁵²


⁹⁴⁸ Bugar, "Preliminarno izvješće," pp. 4-7; Bugar, "Lokalitet: Šepkovčica," pp. 269-273.

⁹⁴⁹ Bugar, "Naselje ranog srednjeg vijeka," p. 180.

⁹⁵⁰ Antonić, "Medieval village," p. 6.

⁹⁵¹ Bugar, "Naselje ranog srednjeg vijeka," p. 180.

⁹⁵² I have done this preliminary analysis for when I was writing the MA thesis based on typology of the pottery material and metal objects from the pits and wells dated with the radiocarbon method. The finds are published and analysed in: Bugar, "Naselje ranog srednjeg vijeka," pp. 182-192; Bugar, "Dva srednjovjekovna bunara," pp. 165-178. I have also taken into consideration the pit dated with the coin of King Sigismund in the fifteenth century as well as the archaeological literature with published finds from Croatia and abroad. For further explanations see: Antonić, "Medieval village," pp. 11-16.



Drawing 5-The site of Šepkovčica



Photo 12-An areal photograph of the site (photo by Borko Rožanković)

As can be seen on the plan of the site (Drawing 5), the distribution of features on the northwestern part differs from the distribution of features on the southeastern part. The number of uncovered features at the southeastern part is significantly bigger as is the number of postholes. The dating of the features also differs; apart from two smaller pits excavated at the northern edge of this part of the site, all the features found at the southeastern part are dated to the period from the 9th/tenth to the first half of the thirteenth century. On the other hand, along with the few early medieval pits and ovens, the pits and the wells on the northwestern part are dated in the period from thirteenth/fourteenth to the fifteenth century. The area between these two parts (sectors 7 and 8 on Map 71), with no features uncovered in it, was an old stream/river bed, that consisted of two main channels – a larger one (25-40 meters wide) on the south and a smaller one (10-15 meters wide) on the north. These channels were filled with layers of alluvial origin. It is not likely that this stream/river permanently flowed in the medieval period. A geological analysis showed that some of the excavated layers found inside of it were deposits formed by sedimentation in wetlands and shallow lake environments while the others were flood layers. Therefore, this was a swampy area with standing water that flooded the surroundings, probably during the periods when the water table was high.⁹⁵³ Alluvial layers

⁹⁵³ Tomo Novosel, "Geološka i inženjersko-geološka obilježja na lokalitetu Šepkovčica [Geological and engineering-geological characteristics at the site of Šepkovčica]," Unpublished report stored in the archive of the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Croatia, Zagreb, 2008, p. 6.

were found both inside the channels as well as outside them, testifying of these occasional flooding. Two ovens uncovered in the southwestern part of the stream/river bed, covered with the flood layer, as well as several pits, first dug into alluvial layers and later covered with the other alluvial layers, give the impression how this environment looked like in the medieval period. I think it can be said that this part of the site is a physical remain of *mlaka*, *chert*, *lacus*, *palus* or *terra aquosa*, so swamps and standing waters. As can be seen in the texts of numerous perambulations analysed in the previous chapters, these terms were often used in the charters.

The earlier horizon of the site was broadly dated in a period between the 9th/tenth to the first half of the thirteenth century. Majority of the features of this horizon was situated on the southeastern side of the stream/river bed. On a surface of around 315 meters long, 732 features have been defined. 75% of them were postholes while the other 25% were pits of various shapes and sizes. Most of them were concentrated in the 145 meters-long area, spreading from the banks of the old stream bed. The pits, the postholes structures, as well as the ovens were remains of houses, working places, animal fences, waste pits, that is, the remains of settlement units. The finds found in their fillings were typical objects found in the medieval villages. The most represented were the remains of the pottery vessels; it was mostly common pottery of everyday use. A considerable amount of animal bones had also been found. The most represented remains of domestic animals were the ones of pigs. Except them, bones of cattle, sheep, goats, chickens and horses were collected. The bones of wild animals, deer, roe deer, rabbits, foxes and bears, reveal the importance of hunting. At the same time, they give information about the medieval natural environment. Dense woods were covering Turopolje both in the medieval and the modern period, practically until the industrialization at the twentieth century. Pieces of slag were found only sporadically. Found metal objects were mostly objects of everyday use (knives, nails, needles, two hoes, two axes etc.). Except that, six pieces of jewellery and dress accessories have also been found. While s-shaped hair rings are typical jewellery of the Bijelo brdo culture found in graveyards and settlements of the Carpathian basin, a Volyn-type earring is a typical find for the area between the Sava and the Drava, thus, connected with the southern influences. Similarly, parallels to one bronze pendant can be found among jewellery of the old Croatian culture, again pointing at the southern influences.⁹⁵⁴ As an atypical find, one strap end, shown on Photo 13, should be mentioned. It was found in the pit that, according to the pottery fragments, can be dated to the tenth century. It is a simple cast bronze object and looks like a product of mass production. It is important as no strap ends have been found in graveyards or

⁹⁵⁴ Bugar, "Naselje ranog srednjeg vijeka," pp. 187.

settlements of the Bijelo brdo culture in the territory of medieval Slavonia so far. Also, at this state of research, no parallels for such objects have been found. Therefore, it is possible that the strap end was produced locally. The possibility of local workshops should not be disregarded; the moulds and few poorly casted earrings found at Sisak testify about it.⁹⁵⁵ Hopefully, some new finds will help with clarifying the origin of the strap end.




Photo 13-Strap-end (photo by Borko Rožanković)

The settlement excavated at Šepkovčica is one of the biggest settlements of the Bijelo brdo culture uncovered so far in northern Croatia. The abundant excavated material and numerous uncovered features offer a good opportunity for studies of everyday life and economic activity in the period prior to the first half of the thirteenth century. This period is, however, out of the focus of this thesis. Nevertheless, as far as the settlement system of Turopolje is concerned, it is important to emphasize the existence of the fully developed and permanent settlement in the territory of Donja Lomnica and Gradići, at least from the 9th/tenth century (according to the data we have so far). It is also significant that the usage of the area of the settlement changed in the high and late middle ages. Since the fourteenth- and the fifteenth-century features were found on the northwestern side of the stream/river bed, one can conclude that, at some point, the area on the southeastern side was for some reason abandoned. Only two pits that, according to the pottery finds, could be dated later are found on this side, along with the northern edge of the site. In the central part of the early medieval settlement, however, there

⁹⁵⁵ Zdenko Vinski, "O postojanju radionica nakita starohrvatskog doba u Sisku" [About the existence of jewellery workshops of old-Croatian period in Sisak], *Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu*, Vol.4 No.1, 1971.

were no late medieval finds. If one looks at Map 64, one can see that this is the bordering area between Donja Lomnica and Gradići, where the medieval territorial unit called Nowgar was placed. Therefore, in this case, the archaeological finds correspond with the data from the written sources; in high and late Middle Ages, the area of the early medieval settlement was either a field, a meadow, an agricultural land or hay or perhaps at one point even a wood, with no permanent dwelling units. This could be the area of Nowgar or part of Donja Lomnica close to Nowgar.

On the other hand, some of the features discovered on the opposite side of the stream/river bed, shown on Drawing 6, were created in the fourteenth and fifteenth century. Some of them intersected the early medieval features. The surface of the part of the site in which these features were uncovered measured 85 x 55 meters. Altogether 91 features, dated from the eleventh to the fifteenth century, have been defined; two wells, two channels, three ovens with two waste pits, three fireplaces, thirteen postholes, and sixty-seven pits of different shapes and sizes, with depths varying from 10 to 30 cm. Most of these pits contained fragments of pottery, some contained animal bones and some metal objects. Eleven pits did not contain any finds, while in sixteen of them pottery finds were too few and fragmented to allow any dating.



Drawing 6-The northwestern part of the site

Five pits as well as remains of three semi-subterranean ovens were broadly dated into the eleventh-thirteenth century period (marked green on Drawing 6). They were contemporary with some of the features found on the opposite side of the stream/river bed. The dating of the

ovens is also confirmed with the stratigraphic situation; all three of them were intersected by the fourteenth/fifteenth-century ditch. Two of the ovens were situated next to each other and connected to the same garbage pit. They could either have been made at the same time or, after one oven collapsed, the other was made next to the same pit. The filling of the garbage pit, with layers of carbon and earth, shows multiple usages. Two other pits, discovered 85 centimetres south from the ovens, had similar fillings. One had red burnt earth and the other dark earth mixed with a great deal of carbon. This could have also been remains of an oven and a garbage pit next to it, but less preserved. These ovens usually served for baking bread or drying meat. In general, these kinds of ovens could have been situated either inside of a village or on the periphery.⁹⁵⁶ It seems that the last was the case with the ovens in question here (since no houses were found in the excavated area).

Except for the well dated to the thirteenth/fourteenth century (Well 7 on Drawing 6), the features broadly dated to the fourteenth century are all pits (marked blue on Drawing 6). The well was discovered near the southwestern edge of the site and it appeared to be isolated. For that reason, it cannot be said if it was situated on the edge of some household, whose remains could be lying in the area north of the excavated zone or if it was situated in a field or pasture land. In addition to that, there was no visible connection between the well and the excavated pits, although the well was most likely used in the period when at least some of the pits were created. In general, it is often very difficult to claim anything with certainty about an original function of pits, especially in a situation like this, when their position in relation to dwellings is unknown. They could have been garbage disposal places or pits initially made for extracting clay or storage pits for grain, later filled with garbage.⁹⁵⁷ Likewise, some of them could have been remains of the lowest parts of some standing features (houses, barns, some sorts of smaller warehouses). In this context, it is important to mention the postholes discovered in this part of the site. As visible on Drawing 5, the postholes on the southeastern side of the site were numerous. Lots of them formed more or less regular lines. On the northern side, however, only thirteen postholes were found and they did not form regular lines or circles. The primary function of few postholes found next to the wells will be explained in the further text. As far as

⁹⁵⁶ For the analysis of a usage of ovens in Slovakia and interpretation of functions of different types of smaller ovens in settlements: Matej Ruttkay, "Ovens in the Early Medieval Settlements of South-Western Slovakia", *Civilisations, Revue internationale d'anthropologie et sciences humaines* 42 (2002), pp. 271-283.

⁹⁵⁷ About the ethnographic and archaeological data about grain storage pits see: Mária Béres, "Adatok az Árpád-kori gabonátároláskérdéséhez" [Contributions to the question of grain storage in the Arpadian age], *A Móra Ferenc Múzeumévkönyve* 1 (1987), pp. 25-35; Endre Füzes, "Gabonásverem" [Pit for grain storage], in *Magyar Néprajzi Lexikon*, vol. 2, ed. by Gyula Ortutay (Budapest: Akadémiai kiadó, 1979), pp. 256-257.

the others are concerned, it is not possible to reconstruct particular structures they had possibly formed. Nevertheless, they still were the traces of wooden posts, that is, the remains of some standing wooden features or fences. Since on this part of the site preserved postholes are very shallow (5 to 10 centimetres deep), one should realize that only their very bottoms were preserved. Bottoms of other postholes could have easily been destroyed by the erosion produced by agricultural activity if they were just 5-10 cm shallower than these ones. Besides that, since no archaeological material was found in the fillings of the postholes, it is not possible to date them. They could have been of the medieval origin, but they could have also been created in the early modern or the modern period.

The last phase of the site was dated approximately in the fourteenth/fifteenth century. This was done on the basis of (the other) well dated to the fourteenth/fifteenth century (well 6 on Drawing 6)⁹⁵⁸ and one pit that contained the coin of King Sigismund, minted between 1390 and 1427.⁹⁵⁹ Except for these two features, one T-shaped ditch, two fireplaces and seven other pits filled with pottery of same type as the one found in the above-mentioned pit and well (pots with very profiled rims typical for the late medieval period) are dated to the last phase of the site (marked violet on Drawing 6). A hypothesis about the usage of the pit with the coin (SU 2176/2177 on Drawing 6) can be offered, although it also cannot be confirmed. The pit was 60 centimetres deep (the other pits were on average 15-30 cm deep) and 1.80 x 0.60 metres large. Next to its the eastern end was another smaller (1.60 x 1 m) and shallower (10 cm) pit, filled with reddish brown earth that contained smaller pieces of burned earth. The posthole (46x40 cm, 10 cm deep), found some 20 centimetres north of the large pit, indicates the pit could have been covered with some sort of upper construction, possibly for the protection from strong sun or the rain. Except for the coin, twelve metal objects were found in the large pit: three knives of which two were broken, one belt mount, two small pieces of broken nails, one long nail, one needle, one bent and broken iron ribbon, one broken piece of a square-shaped iron object, one small iron hoop (maybe part of a bridle), and one hoe. The fill of the pit also contained seven smaller broken pieces of iron and few pieces of slag as well as animal bones and fragmentary pottery pieces.⁹⁶⁰ These very fragmented pieces of pottery and the animal bones suggest the pit was filled with garbage in its final phase. It should be noted that the pit was dug into the flood

⁹⁵⁸ Bugar, "Dva srednjovjekovna bunara", p. 169.

⁹⁵⁹ Ana Pavlović, "Numizmatički nalazi s lokaliteta Šepkovčica" [Numismatic finds from the Šepkovčica site], *Opuscula archaeologica* 35 (2011), p. 280.

⁹⁶⁰ All together 134 small pieces of pottery were found. After merging of the broken pieces there was still 108 of them, which shows that these were the remains of different pots out of which only fragments ended in this pit.

layer, which contained a large number of bones, pottery, and metal objects from different time periods. Consequently, some of the finds could have “came” into the pit while it was being dug. On the other hand, the large amount of both broken and preserved metal objects and several pieces of slag indicate that, although at one point the pit was covered with trash, maybe even flooded, it could have had another primary function. Taking into consideration the amount of the metal objects found in the pit, the usage of fire and the upper construction, it can be suggested that the pit could have been a remnant of a small temporary workshop for some minor blacksmith work. It could have been made for a craftsman to sit or stand in it while working and later used as a waste pit.⁹⁶¹

As far the other pits are concerned, as already written, their original purpose is hard to define accurately considering there were no traces of dwelling units nearby. The few fireplaces did not show traces of multiple usages. Next to one of them, pieces of two, maybe three, pots were found, in a very shallow pit (approximately 5 cm). The pots were lying underneath a very thin layer of earth; perhaps they were not put in the pit, but left next to the fireplace and were broken afterwards. In the burnt earth of the fireplace, a broken belt buckle and a horse tooth were discovered. One metre east of this fireplace was another fireplace. This one was not visible on the surface. The pit in which it was found had multiple uses. Originally it was a fireplace, later covered with earth that contained pieces of pottery, slag, and animal bones, with broken pieces of a millstone and parts of a horse spine on top.

The pit found few meters northeast of Well 6, along with earth and broken pottery, contained a large number of pebbles in its filling; it might have been connected with the process of building of the well. Likewise, postholes found next to both wells can be connected with the lifting of water from the wells.⁹⁶² Two postholes were found next to the Well 7, and three next to Well 6. One posthole intersected the pebble ring of Well 7; it could have been from some later construction. The others could have been traces of a wooden structure composed of one vertical post that had a Y-shaped upper end and a horizontal post placed in the Y. If so, a horizontal beam had a bucket on one end and stone (for weight) on the other. These constructions usually had one standing post but there could also have been another post standing next to it, for binding the horizontal beam when the construction was not in use. In the case

⁹⁶¹ György Szabó, “A falusikovács a XV–XVI. Században” [The Village Blacksmith in the 15-sixteenth centuries], *Folia Archeologica* 6 (1954), pp. 123-145; for ethnographic data about travelling craftsman see: Csilla Siklódied, *Between East and West. Everyday Life in the Hungarian Conquest Period - Über die Grenzwischen Ost und West. Ungarn im 9-11. Jahrhundert* (Promptus: Budapest, 1996), pp. 77-99.

⁹⁶² About the wells and the process of building the wells, see: Bugar, “Dva srednjovjekovna bunara.”

here, this is not likely because the postholes were not oriented in a line towards wells that would confirm such an assumption. It is more likely that the construction broke once and was replaced with the other. The purpose of these structures was enable to pulling up a large amount of water in a relatively short time span.



Photo 14-The pits, the well 6 and the ditch (photo by Vjekoslav Iličić)



Photo 15-The wooden construction at the bottom of the well 6 (photo by Vjekoslav Iličić)

A T-shaped ditch was situated next to Well 6 (at 70 cm distance). Its longer branch was 60 meters long and 90 centimetres wide, in the area of the excavation zone. But, it extended under the northeastern profile of the site, so the real length remains unknown. The shorter branch was 24.10 meters long and around 70 centimetres wide on the northern and 50 centimetres on the southern end. The preserved depth was 15-20 centimetres. The bottom of the shorter part was 90 centimetres lower than the bottom of the longer part, which means the ditch could have had a flow. It could have served for drainage; by it, water could have been directed towards the stream/river bed which, as geological analysis showed, was a swampy area. The flood layers found on the banks of the stream/river bed confirmed that the area was often flooded, thus, some drainage system was probably needed. Except for that, the ditch could have also been a product of the process of building of some wooden structure. It is known from the ethnographic literature that, when building animal fences, people would first dig a ditch and on the earth thrown from it they would put a wooden fence.⁹⁶³




Photo 16-Ethnographic example of T-shaped fence (1)

⁹⁶³ Fences for animals were made in different forms depending on a type of animals that were kept in them. Sometimes different kinds of animals could have been kept at the same site in different sorts of fences, for example, the site at Kengyel, see Laszlovszky, “*Famasanctis* and the Emergence of St. Margaret’s cult in the Rural Countryside,” in *Promoting the Saints Cults and Their Contexts from Late Antiquity until the Early Modern Period*, ed. by Ottó Gecser, József Laszlovszky, Balázs Nagy, Marcell Sebők, Katalin Szende (Budapest: CEU Press, 2011), pp. 103-124.



Photo 17-Ethnographic example of T-shaped fence (2)



Picture 1-Ethnographic example of T-shaped fence (3)

The ditch was found next to the well (6). Both structures could have been used in extensive animal husbandry. Actually, this type of T-shaped “fences” is well known in the areas of the extensive type of animal husbandry (puszta, Hortobágy) in Hungary (according to the data collected by ethnographers). They were built in the following way: earth from a ditch was deposited on one side of the ditch and some kind of light structures were erected on the top of it (reed, straw, etc.). It was possible to build them without ditches as well. It protected animals

from wind and offered some shadow. The position of the ditch from the site is also typical; one part of the T runs towards the small stream/marshy area. Thus, two types or groups of animals separated by the fence could have been kept and they could have had access to the water. At the same time, depending on a part of a day or a direction of a wind, they could have been kept in the shadow and protected from the wind.

Finally, few words should be said about the objects found in the fourteenth- and fifteenth-century features. As was the case with the objects of the earlier horizon, the most represented finds were fragments of vessels. These were mostly pieces of pots, and, occasionally, of bowls, jugs and lids. Fine pottery was very rare. Metal finds were mostly objects of everyday use; knives, needles, nails, a hoe etc. Four plain belt buckles of oval and rectangular forms were also found. These are typical dress accessories of the High Middle ages, found in settlements and graveyards, and not connected with any specific social stratum. Only two objects that perhaps can be connected with castle warriors are two remains of spurs with a rowel (Photo 18). This type of spurs appear in Europe in the middle of the thirteenth century; the types as the one found at Šepkovčica were in use from the middle of the thirteenth to the middle of the fourteenth century.⁹⁶⁴ As spurs with rowels were parts of knight's equipment, it can be supposed that castle warriors as king's soldiers used them, as a part of their ware.



Photo 18-The spur with rowel (photo by Borko Rožanković)

⁹⁶⁴ Bugar, "Naselje ranog srednjeg vijeka," p. 192.

So, it can be concluded that the archaeological excavations at the site of Šepkovčica resulted in the discovery of numerous medieval features and finds created in the broad time span. The site could be broadly divided into two phases. The first phase, that is, the period from 9th/tenth to the thirteenth century is characterized by permanent settlement features densely placed next to each other (workshops, dwelling units etc.). On the other hand, the fourteenth- and fifteenth-century features do not clearly show the existence of permanent dwelling units for humans or animals. It is not clear if they were parts of some household situated on its edge, if they were placed on the edge of a settlement or further from a settlement.

Wells that had the above-described wooden structures next to them are called dip wells. As one of the most common types of wells in the Carpathian Basin and in Eastern Europe, they are well documented in the ethnological literature. They could have been placed both within individual housekeeping and in open fields, often as communal property. In the last case, they were used to draw water for cattle and other animals. Besides that, moving the upper end of the construction could have signalized when cattle arrived or for another purpose (for example, when the working day was over).⁹⁶⁵ The T-shaped ditch could have been a remnant of a drainage system or an animal fence. Perhaps the fireplaces found on the site were used by shepherds. Some pits could also have been used by them, as storage pits. Metal production connected with the workshop pit is usually performed on the outskirts of villages or of a single house. This pit could also have been used by an itinerant craftsman who performed some minor blacksmith work in an area where animals are kept. Therefore, the last phase of the site, with no traces of permanent buildings for animals or people, indicates that the place could have been used for extensive animal husbandry. This does not mean that some structures could not have been present in this phase of the site. As written, postholes indicate that some structures existed, but it is not possible to say in which time period.

The analysis of the charters indicated that agricultural lands and “lands in the field” were placed in the area of Šepkovčica, in the fifteenth century. The question is: what the terms *terra arabilis* or *campestris* implied? Were these just empty agricultural surfaces or agricultural surfaces or hays with some features build on it? It can be supposed that, in most cases, the second solution is very likely. Agricultural production requires certain features. Pig- and cattle-keeping, done in woods, also requires at least some features where shepherds could come during

⁹⁶⁵ Endre Füzes, “Gémeskút” [Shadoof], in: *Magyar Néprajzi Lexikon*, vol. 2, ed. by Gyula Ortutay (Budapest: Akadémiai kiadó, 1979), pp. 276-277; Attila Paládi-Kovács, “Jeladáskútgémme” [Signalingshadoof], in *Magyar Néprajzi Lexikon* 2, p. 687.

rain etc. In this respect, one additional data about the family of Benedict Krupić, a man who bought the lands (*terre arabiles seu campestris*) situated on the western side of Nowgar in 1467, are interesting to look at. In 1555, his descendants had disputes about the inheritance. Female members were demanding to be paid off with moveable goods, especially animals which were living on their hereditary (paternal) estates when their fathers (sons of Benedict) were still alive. This included fifty pigs, eight oxen and seven cows.⁹⁶⁶ Thus, the written data also indicate that the activities connected with the extensive animal husbandry were performed in the area of Šepkovčica or around it.

However, one thing must be emphasized at the end. From the archaeological point of view, the importance of the highway rescue excavations is huge. Basically, these sorts of excavations enabled investigation of bigger surfaces of medieval rural settlements that was ever before possible. Still, as much as the excavated surfaces were big in comparison to the previous ones (before the highway excavations there were practically no excavations of medieval rural settlements), the data gathered from the historical sources, toponyms and maps showed that, in regard to the whole surface of the medieval village of Donja Lomnica, the area excavated at Šepkovčica is minor. For that reason, I think that until the bigger surfaces are excavated is pointless to make any certain conclusions about the features found at the site of Šepkovčica. While both the archaeological and historical data point that the area of the site was *terra campestris*, “the land in the field” in the last phase, only systematic excavations of the wider area of Donja Lomnica could confirm or rebut such an assumption.

Two important questions of the chapter about the functioning of the medieval settlement system of the area around the archaeological site Šepkovčica should be answered in this conclusion. The first is: do the archaeological finds contribute to the better understanding of the data gained through the analysis of the historical sources and, if so, in what way? The second is: do the historical sources contribute to the interpretation of the features and finds uncovered at the archaeological excavations at Šepkovčica?

The second question is, I think, answered through the analysis done so far. Due to the sources, as well as locating of data from the sources on maps, it became clear that the remains found at the excavations were not remains of some abandoned village. On the contrary, they

⁹⁶⁶ MHNC 3, *Protocolum iudiciourum et fassionum communitatis nobilium Campi Zagradiensis. Annor 1555-1558.*, p. 478.

were the remains of the medieval features situated, most likely, in the territory of medieval Donja Lomnica. Even if not so, they were situated in the territory of one the still-existing villages that were in the past inhabited by castle warriors of Turopolje. In addition to that, the abundant fifteenth-century sources indicate that, in the fifteenth century, the area of the site was on the edge of the village, where agricultural lands or lands “in the field” were placed. Thus, the remains of the fifteenth-century features could have been remnants of features connected with the extensive animal husbandry, with activities of shepherds or activities connected with metal reparation, that had usually been performed on the edge of a settlement. Still, as written, if one takes into consideration the whole surface of the medieval village of Donja Lomnica (that was similar to the surface of the present-day Donja Lomnica), the excavated area is insignificant. The numbers can illustrate this quite clearly: the surface of the present-day village is approximately 12 square kilometres and the surface of late medieval part of the site is approximately 25 square meters. Consequently, it can be stated that the excavated area is too small for forming any firmer conclusions about the usage of this surface in the fifteenth as well as in the fourteenth century.

At the same time, the data gained through the excavations are very important supplement to the history of the area. Even though just the segment of the early medieval settlement had been uncovered, this segment confirms that the area of the village of castle warriors was inhabited at least from the tenth century. It also confirms that, by the eleventh century, a fully developed settlement was formed in this territory. In regard to the process of forming of the villages of castle warriors and the process of forming of the counties in the first decades of the existence of the Kingdom of Hungary-Croatia these are valuable data.

The counties were formed on the castle system, the important part of which were castle warriors. According to some opinions, the first Arpadian kings were settling castle warriors in the strategically important places, among others, in Turopolje.⁹⁶⁷ In my opinion, based on the archaeological material, there are no concrete proofs that would indicate these people were settlers in the region and not indigenous people. There are no traces of some significant migrations in the material. Yet, it is fair to say, there was also not enough archaeological research that could completely disapprove the theory of the settling of the region in this period. Thus, according to the finds from Šepkovčica, the villages of castle warriors were formed in

⁹⁶⁷ Hrvoje Gračanin – Silvija Pisk, “Sjeverozapadna Hrvatska u ranome srednjem vijeku” [Northwestern Croatia in the Early Middle Ages], in: *Nova zraka u europskom svjetlu; Hrvatske zemlje u ranome srednjem vijeku* (o. 550. – o. 1150.), ed. by Zrinka Nikolić Jakus (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 2015), p. 362.

the already inhabited area. Likewise, names of nobles of Turopolje are common Slavic names and they also cannot indicate any bigger settling processes. At the same time, it is interesting that some of the place names show both the local Croatian (Slavic) and the Hungarian name forms. In this context is important to emphasize that people of different ethnic background did live in Turopolje in the medieval period. The village called Čehi, situated few kilometres west of Šepkovčica, probably got the name after the Czech settlers in the region. This area is mentioned as *terra Boyemorum* already in the earliest sources, starting from 1228⁹⁶⁸ and *terra populorum, qui dicuntur Chehy* in 1257.⁹⁶⁹ In addition to that, there is a village named Sasi. It is situated in the northeastern part of Turopolje, where the estates of the Chapter of Zagreb were situated. But, both of these villages were not the villages of the castle warriors. In any case, how the village system functioned in the period prior to the integration of Slavonia into the kingdom and did and how this major political change reflected on the organization of the settlements in Turopolje cannot be concluded only on the basis of data from Šepkovčica. Nevertheless, it is still an important segment that can be incorporated in the research that should be done on the larger scale for the wider area of Turopolje and Zagreb County.

⁹⁶⁸ MHNC 1, doc. 2, p. 5.

⁹⁶⁹ MHNC 1, doc. 10, p. 13.

6. Conclusion

The interest of historians in the Turopolje region began in the 19th century and have continued up to the present day. The research so far has been focused primarily on the noble community of Turopolje. This was rightfully so; this organization and its institutions deserve special attention since the nobles of Turopolje managed to preserve their special status until practically 1947, when the institution itself was abolished. Its traditions, however, remain alive in the Turopolje region; the noble community exists today as a cultural organization. Thus, its development and mechanisms of self-preservation are worth studying. The medieval history of the noble community represents the basis for understanding how this organization functioned in the early modern and the modern period. At the same time, as has been demonstrated in this work, the noble community was not the only important factor in the development of medieval settlements and land-use systems in Turopolje. Thus, any complex study dealing with the spatial aspects of the socio-economic changes in the region in the Middle Ages needs to consider these other factors, using a complex methodology to identify other influences.

The intention of this dissertation work was to contribute to previous studies using different methodological concepts. Originally, the thesis was based on the interpretation of the archaeological data derived from the highway rescue excavations conducted at the sites of Šepkovčica and Okuje. It became clear however, in an early stage of the work that the interpretation of the archaeological data had to be combined with an intensive study of written sources. Combining source materials leads to a holistic approach in the study of the settlement history, the natural environment and the landscape history of the area. Instead of a social analysis of one social group (the noble community), or one type of source material (the excavated archaeological features), the study focused on the spatial analysis of the Turopolje region, taking into consideration economic and social transformations, land-use patterns and particularly ownership issues in the context of settlement structure.

Clearly, the character of the analysed source materials significantly shaped possible research fields. In this respect, the particularly rich primary source material, as well as extremely useful earlier secondary literature connected (mostly) to the noble community, proved to be one of the decisive factors. Therefore, one of the foci of this work remained the social history of the area, with special regard to the emergence and development of this noble society.

At the same time, the same type of charter evidence, and more particularly the significant number of perambulations documented in them, was crucial for the identification of settlements, landscape features and for understanding the economic and social dynamics of the area. By translating these processes into more general concepts such as settlement continuity and discontinuity, nucleation processes versus dispersion of settlements etc., a more complex settlement history of the area emerged. This new interpretation was compared to the picture that emerged from a similar interpretation of the archaeological data. The two different types of source materials were analysed by themselves, using the relevant categories of interpretation in each case. This meant the analysis of contemporary terminology (*terra, villa, predium, etc.*) in the case of charter evidence and the use of standard categories employed in settlement studies in case of the archaeological sites. Following these conventional archaeological analyses, the two types of sources were compared with each other using terms and categories relevant for both source materials. Thus, the character of different source materials was respected throughout the whole work minimizing the problem of circular argumentation.

The natural environment and the particular landscape elements of the Turopolje region were studied at a different level of spatial analysis beyond transformations of the settlements themselves. Through these investigations, the general character of land-use patterns, the particular elements of local land-use forms (special forms of animal husbandry, exploitation of the flood-plain areas, etc.) have been identified. This also led to a better understanding of estate formation processes and to a more complex picture of how socially different structures intersected with the various landscape patterns of the region.

Some remarks are needed about how data from these two archaeological sites could be used since they were the starting points from which the whole idea of writing this thesis started. During the process of the research they moved somewhat out of the focus of this work with more emphasis put on data from the charters. This was not my original intention; simply, as the topic developed it became obvious that historical sources were more numerous than expected. For example, when I started my research, the only source that mentioned Okuje I knew of was King Sigismund's charter from 1435 by which he confirmed the ownership of Okuje and the other estates (Obrež, Demerje, Mišine, etc.) to George and Stephan Farkaš. As the other sources started to "appear", I focused more on them as it seemed to me that, at this point, they provide more information about the general history of the area.

The main results of this work were summarized at the end of each chapter, as the spatial analysis of data offered a new insight into various aspects of the estate and settlement system of the area and changes in them during the High and Late Middle Ages. On this basis, some other, more general, conclusions concerning various aspects of the social system of the region could be drawn. As far as the noble community is concerned, numerous new data about the kindreds from which the nobles of Turopolje originated emerged precisely as a result of the spatial analysis. It was shown that the territory of the noble community was primarily divided between kindreds but the sources that provide information about each kindred in particular are not equally extant.

The development of the kindred of Vukota, whose territory lay in the area south of the Lomnica River, in the southwestern part of Turopolje, proved to be most suitable for the analysis because it has the biggest number of extant sources. The first villages in this territory developed in the plain, probably because of the more favourable natural conditions (for agriculture and pig farming). All these villages are mentioned in the thirteenth-century sources (except Lukavec). The villages in Vukomeričke Gorice were established later; they only appear in the extant sources in the fifteenth century. It was possible to trace the process of the breakdown of the jointly owned land of the kindred as well as the breakdown of the kindreds into enlarged families that took place in the last quarter of the fourteenth century. The emergence of new kindreds can be explained by the splitting of the large kindred formation into extended family units through the spatial reorganization of the area and the fact that private estates became more important than the memory of a common ancestor. Likewise, this social transformation process is also connected to the more general trends of the development of kindreds (both in Croatian and in Hungarian social contexts). Still, the very existence of the noble community in Turopolje shaped this process in a slightly different way.

Through the spatial analysis of data recorded in the charters connected with the noble community, the presence of other nobles could be detected in the region (descendants of *comes* Jurk, the Ivanović family etc.). In my opinion, this is one of the most important results in this dissertation because new data about the history of Turopolje and the wider region emerged. Mapping of perambulations and analysing neighbouring estates proved to be useful for extracting new data from the written sources which again opens new possibilities into research on the thirteenth and fourteenth-century history of Zagreb county.

Therefore, although I think that it is completely understandable that the research interest of historians has been focused primarily on the noble community, this thesis showed that the history of Turopolje is not only a history of the noble community. Actually, as the borders of the territory of the noble community were identified, it became obvious that vast portions of the lands in the area were owned by the Hospitallers (until 1328), bans (kings), high nobility (the Toths, the Hennings, Baltazar Alapić) and mid-rank nobility (descendants of *comes* Jurk, the Ivanović family, the Farkaš family etc.). Likewise, although this was not included in my research, it should be mentioned that the land along the northern banks of the Sava River was owned by the Chapter of Zagreb. All these influences played important parts in the medieval history of the region.

This work focused primarily on the Turopolje region, but it was also my intention to use data gathered through this research within a broader context and use comparative material from other areas within the Kingdom of Hungary-Croatia. I am aware, however, that sometimes data had not been put properly even in the context of the history of the noble community. The primary sources (archaeological, historical, onomastic etc.) turned out to be so numerous and complex that dealing with all of them at the same time did not leave much room for other sorts of research. An additional problem was that the time scope of the work was also too extensive to allow data to be placed in broader contexts to be compared on every level. However, this relatively long chronological framework offered the possibility to understand major changes in the socio-economic system of the area, enhancing the analysis of the settlement network and its spatial structure. Thus, it seemed to me that at this state in the research it was more important to build a database of all these new primary data, not previously available to researchers in the area and to form my conclusions primarily based on them. The study of the archaeological material also helped me develop a complex methodology, not used before for the interpretation of this area. This research and the conclusions based on this new methodological approach should prove useful for further research on Turopolje within the broader context of the medieval history of Slavonia and surrounding regions.

Finally, I would like to point out that, as discussed above, the archaeological material of the area was examined in the context of written documents. Both source materials led to the conclusions concerning the spatial system of the Turopolje region, but more emphasis was put on historical sources. That, however, does not mean that in the future the archaeology cannot contribute just as much as the historical sources to this general history. As mentioned in the introductory chapters, in my opinion, all the sources are historical sources. For example, once

ovens discovered in Okuje are reconstructed they will provide data about the technological progressiveness or backwardness of the local potters. At this state in the research, however, the discussion of this problem does not fit within the main focus of the work, which is the reconstruction of the spatial system of the settlements. The analysis of selected knives from Šepkovčica and Okuje, now in progress, will also provide useful data. Similarly, animal remains are first-rate sources that testify both to the food consumption practices of a population as well as the economic basis of a certain area. This is especially important for the research of Turopolje where pig farming represented one of the most important sources of income for the local population as well as for the nobles of the noble community. If one takes into consideration the longevity of the noble community, it becomes clear that clarification of its economic basis should be one of the most important tasks for future research. Prior to the period when the written sources first appear, the archaeological data are the most important testimony to the animal husbandry and hunting practices in the area. Even in the period when the written sources appear, animals are only mentioned in them sporadically. The systematically collected and processed osteological data on the other hand, offers solid insight into this form of subsistence for the earlier populations in the region.

Thus, the archaeological data bear witness to the economic and social development of a certain area which is important for many aspects of historical research. However, in order to draw more general conclusions about social and economic trends in the area there is a need for more excavations and more analysis. I hope that the historical framework developed in this thesis and the complex methodology developed for the special research conditions of the area will also facilitate the understanding of the medieval environment of other sites, yet to be excavated. By increasing the number of these types of investigations and by offering a more detailed analysis of individual charters that can be connected to data from archaeological sites, more local elements can be identified. The combined study of charter evidence and archaeological data with a particular spatial focus is a successful way of interpreting such medieval settlement patterns and landscapes. This general methodology can, therefore, also be applied to other parts of Croatia, not only those with special social structures (such as the noble community of Turopolje) that shaped the history of the region. The character of the relevant source material may differ from region to region, but a spatial understanding of these medieval settlement processes are just as important for histories of other regions.

Bibliography

Archival material:

Archive of the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Zagreb

Archive of the Diocese and Chapter in Zagreb

Croatian State Archive, Zagreb

Hungarian State Archive, Budapest

Primary sources:

Kristó, Gyula, et al., *Anjou-kori oklevéltár. Documenta res Hungaricas temporis regum Andegavensium illustrantia 1301-1387*, vol. 1- (Budapest – Szeged, 1990-.).

Laszowski, Emilij, *Povijesni spomenici Plemenite općine Turopolja nekoć 'Zagrebačko Polje' zvane. Monumenta historica nobilis communitatis Turopolje olim 'Campus Zagrabiensis' dictae*, 4 vols. Zagreb: Plemenita općina Turopolje, 1904-1908.

Mályusz, Elemér, et al., *Zsigmondkori oklevéltár*, vol. 1- (Budapest 1951-.).

Nagy, Imre et al., *Hazai Okmánytár. Codex diplomaticus partius*, 8 vols. (Budapest 1865-1891).

Smičiklas, Tadija et al., *Diplomatički zbornik Kraljevine Hrvatske, Dalmacije i Slavonije. Codex diplomaticus Regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae*, 18 vols. (Zagreb: JAZU/HAZU 1904-1990).

Šamšalović, Miljen – Jakov Stipišić, "Isprave u Arhivu Jugoslavenske akademije," *Zbornik Historijskog instituta Jugoslavenske akademije* 2 (1959), pp. 289-379; vol. 3 (1960), pp. 563-643; 4 (1961), pp. 465-554; 5 (1963), pp. 533-578.

Tkalčić, Ivan Krstitelj, et al., *Povijesni spomenici slobodnog kraljevskog grada Zagreba. Monumenta historica liberae regiae civitatis Zagrabiae, vol. 1-19*, Zagreb: Slobodni kraljevski grad Zagreb, 1889.-1953.

Tkalčić, Ivan Krstitelj, et al., *Povijesni spomenici Zagrebačke biskupije. Monumenta historica episcopatus Zagrabiensis*, vol. 1-7 (Zagreb, 1873.-2005).

Secondary sources:

Adamček, Josip. *Agrarni odnosi u Hrvatskoj od sredine XV do kraja XVII stoljeća* [Agrarian relations in Croatia from the middle of the fifteenth to the end of the seventeenth century], Zagreb 1980.

Ančić, Mladen. *Putanja klatna. Ugarsko-Hrvatsko Kraljevstvo i Bosna u XIV. stoljeću* [Swing of the Pendulum. Hungarian-Croatian Kingdom and Bosnia in the fourteenth century],

- Zadar – Mostor: Zavod za povijesne znanosti Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti, 1997.
- Andrić, Stanko. Imenica Vas u staroj slavenskoj toponimiji, *CROATICA XXXVII* (2013), 73-129.
- Antonić, Nikolina. *Medieval village in northern Croatia through archaeological and historical sources*, MA thesis, Central European University, 2014.
- _____. "Combining documents, toponyms, and archaeology in Turopolje, Croatia. GIS in historical research", *Annual of Medieval Studies at CEU* 21, 211-228.
- _____. "Late medieval village in Turopolje", in: *Secular power and sacral authority. Collection of paper from the second medieval workshop in Rijeka*, Jovanović K., Milan S. (eds.), Amsterdam University Press, pp. 71-85.
- Antonić, Nikolina – Ákos Rácz, Tibor. "Selected Medieval Finds From Site Kobilić 1 in Turopolje", in: *Zbornik Instituta za arheologiju br. 6.: 2. međunarodni znanstveni skup srednjovjekovne arheologije "Srednjovjekovna naselja u svjetlu arheoloških izvora"*, eds. T. Sekelj Ivančan, T. Tkalčec, S. Krznar, J. Belaj, Zagreb 2017, pp. 255-279.
- Antonić, Nikolina – Los, Dženi. *Izveštaj o istraživanju starog grada Drežnika*, 2016. [The report about the investigation of the old town of Drženik, 2016], Zagreb 2017., an unpublished report stored at the Ministry of culture.
- Antonić, Nikolina – Lyublyanovics, Kyra. "Prilog proučavanju gospodarstva i prehrambenih navika u Turopolju u 13. stoljeću-životinjski ostaci s nalazišta Kobilić 1" [A contribution to the Research of the Economy and Dietary Habits in Turopolje in the Thirteenth Century.- Animal Remnants from the Archaeological Site of Kobilić 1]. *Zbornik Odsjeka za povijesne znanosti Zavoda za povijesne i društvene znanosti Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 34 (2016), pp. 21-37.
- Apostolova-Maršavelski, Magdalena. "Quarta puellaris po običajom pravu Turopolja (13.-16. st.)" [Quarta puellaris in the customary law of Turopolje, (thirteenth to sixteenth century)], *Zbornik pravnog fakulteta u Zagrebu* 42/2 (1992), pp. 141.-149.
- Barlé, Janko. "Povijest crkve u Turopolju" [History of the church in Turopolje], in: *Povijest plemenite općine Turopolja nekoć Zagrebačko polje zvane*, ed. by Emilij Laszowski, pp. 125-396.
- Belaj, Vitomir – Juraj Belaj, *Sveti trokuti – Topografija hrvatske mitologije* [Holy triangles – Topography of Croatian mythology], Zagreb: Ibis grafika, Institut za arheologiju u Zagrebu, Matica hrvatska, 2014.

- Bermanec, Vladimir – Ladislav Palinkaš – Marin Šouftek – Vladimir Zebec, “Zlato u Dravi i Muri – geološka geneza i mineraloška analiza” [Gold in the Drava and Mura rivers - geological genesis and mineralogical analysis], *Podravina* 13 (2014), pp. 7-18.
- Bojničić pl., Ivan. “Kraljevske darovnice, odnoseće se na Hrvatsku. Iz kraljevskih registraturnih kniga “libri regii”. Peti nastavak.”, *Vjesnik hrvatsko-slavonsko-damlatinskog zemaljskog arhiva* 11, 23-24.
- Borhy, László – Czajlik, Zoltán – Bődöcs, András, “Neue Wege der Erforschung des Siedlungs- und Wegenetzes im römischen Pannonien”, In: Szerk: *Günther Schörner Leben auf dem Lande. 'Il Monte' bei San Gimignano: Ein römischer Fundplatz und sein Kontext*. Wien: Phoibos, 2013. pp. 331-338.
- Bugar, Aleksandra. “Naselje ranog srednjeg vijeka Velika Gorica-Šepkovčica” [Early medieval settlement Velika Gorica – Šepkovčica]. In *Zbornik Srednji vek/Arheološke raziskave med Jadranskim morjem in Panonsko nižino*. Ed. Mitija Guštin, Ljubljana: Narodni muzej Slovenije Inštitut za dediščino Sredozemlja Znanstveno-raziskovalnega središča Univerze na Primorskem, 2008, pp. 179-193.
- _____. “Dva srednjovjekovna bunara s lokaliteta Šepkovčica” [Two medieval wells from the site of Šepkovčica]. *Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu* 44 (2011), pp. 161-178.
- _____. “Lokalitet: Šepkovčica” [Site: Šepkovčica]. *Hrvatski arheološki godišnjak* 5 (2008), pp. 269-273.
- _____. *Preliminarno izvješće- rezultati arheoloških zaštitnih istraživanja na lokalitetima Okuje (I, Ia, II, IIa, IIIb) i Mraclinska Dubrava. Muzej grada Zagreba. Autocesta Zagreb-Sisak/koridor A11, dionica Velika Gorica jug-Lekenik*, unpublished report.
- _____. Arheometrijske analize i njihova primjena u arheološkoj interpretaciji na primjeru lokaliteta Okuje, *Hrvatski arheološki godišnjak* 8/2011, in press
- Béres, Mária, “Adatok az Árpád-kori gabonatároláskérdéséhez” [Contributions to the question of grain storage in the Arpadian age], *A Móra Ferenc Múzeumévkönyve* 1 (1987), pp. 25-35
- Burmaz, J., Vujnović, N. 2010, *Preliminarno izvješće – Zaštitna arheološka istraživanja na lokalitetima Okuje III, IIIa i IIIc. Autocesta Zagreb-Sisak/koridor A11, dionica Velika Gorica jug-Lekenik*, unpublished report.
- Bresztyenszky, Aleksandar. *Pravno-povijesni podatci o Turopolju* [Legal-historical data about Turopolje], Zagreb 1892.
- Brozović Rončević, Dunja, *Apelativi u hrvatskoj hidronimiji* [Appellatives in Croatian hydronymy], doctoral dissertation, Zagreb, Filozofski fakultet, 1997.

- _____. "Nazivi za blatišta i njihovi toponimij skiodrazi u hrvatskome jeziku [Names for muddy places and their toponymic reflections in the Croatian language]", *Folia onomastica Croatica* 8 (1999), 1-44.
- Bunčić, Maja. "New Early Slavic finds from Zagreb surroundings. Rescue excavation on the Pleso - airport site", a poster, sources: Academia.edu.
- Butorac, Josip. *Popis župa Zagrebačke biskupije 1334. i 1501. godine* [List of parishes of Zagreb bishopry in 1334 and 1501], Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti 1984.
- Cvetnić, Slavko, *Mraclin: kak je negda bilo: mjestopisne i povijesne crtice* [Mraclin: the way it once was: local and historical notes], Zagreb: vlastita naklada, 2009.
- Cvitanović, Đurđica, "Drvene seoske crkve na području Hrvatske" [Wooden village churches on the territory of Croatia], *Radovi Instituta za povijest umjetnosti* 15 (1991), pp. 286-293.
- Ćuk, Juraj. *Zagrebačka županija oko XIII. stoljeća : na godišnjicu uzpostave Nezavisne Države Hrvatske*, Velika župa Prigorje, 1942.
- Dickenmann, Ernest. *Studien zur Hydronymie des Save systems II*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1966.
- Dobronić, Lelja. *Templari i Ivanovci u Hrvatskoj* [Templars and Hospitallers in Croatia]. Zagreb: Dom i svijet, 2002.
- _____. *Topografija zemljišnih posjeda zagrebačkih biskupa prema ispravi kralja Emerika iz god. 1201.* [Topography of estates of bishops of Zagreb according to King Emerik's charter from 1201], Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1951.,
- Dujmović, Danko, "Otok svetog Jakova: prilog poznavanju srednjovjekovnoga kulturnog krajolika Zagreba" [The island of St. James: a contribution to our knowledge about medieval cultural landscape of Zagreb], *CCP* 78, pp. 39-48.
- Engel, Pál. *The Realm of St Stephen. A History of Medieval Hungary 895–1526*. London, 2001.
- Feletar, Dragutin, "Zlatari i splavari na Dravi," *Podravski zbornik* 2 (1976), pp. 116-131.
- Freudenreich, Aleksandar, *Kako narod gradi na području Hrvatske: zapažanja, snimci i crteži arhitekta* [How the folk build in the territory of Croatia: observations, recordings and drawings by architects], Zagreb: Republički zavod za zaštitu spomenika kulture, 1972.
- Fuerst-Bjeliš, Borna, *Historijsko-geografska analiza prostornog pojma tradicionalne regije Turopolje* [Historical-geographical analysis of the area traditionally considered Turopolje], PhD dissertation, University of Zagreb, 1996.

- Fügedi, Erik. *Castle and society in medieval Hungary (1000-1437)*. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest 1986.
- Füzes, Endre, "Gabonásverem" [Pit for grain storage], in *Magyar Néprajzi Lexikon*, vol. 2, ed. by Gyula Ortutay (Budapest: Akadémiaiadó, 1979), pp. 256-257.
- _____. "Gémeskút" [Shadoof], in: *Magyar Néprajzi Lexikon*, vol. 2, ed. by Gyula Ortutay (Budapest: Akadémiaiadó, 1979), pp. 276-277
- Gajer, Radovan. "Posjedi zagrebačkog kaptola oko Zagreba u prvoj polovici 14. st", *Radovi* 11, 5-102.
- Geoarheo d.o.o. *Izješće o arheološkom istraživanju na trasi izgradnje priključne prometnice istočne obilaznice Velike Gorice- Zračna luka Zagreb AN 1 I AN 2*, unpublished report, 2016.
- Gluhak, Alemko. *Hrvatski etimološki rječnik* [Croatian etymological dictionary], Zagreb: August Cesarec, 1993.
- Gračanin, Hrvoje – Silvija Pisk, "Sjeverozapadna Hrvatska u ranome srednjem vijeku" [Northwestern Croatia in the Early Middle Ages], in: *Nova zrak u europskom svjetlu; Hrvatske zemlje u ranome srednjem vijeku* (o. 550. – o. 1150.), ed. by Zrinka Nikolić Jakus, Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 2015.
- Gregl, Zoran, "Pokušaj rekonstrukcije antičke cestovne mreže na području Zagreba", *Iz starog i novog Zagreba* 6, pp. 7-14.
- Halász, Éva B. *Iobagio castri – nobilis castri – nobilis regni*. Castle warriors – castle nobles – noblemen. The development of a social stratum in County of Križevci, *Banatica* 26 (2016), 119-134.
- Hadrovics, Laszlo. "Mađarski elementi u srednjovjekovnom latinitetu Hrvatske [Hungarian elements in the Medieval Latin in Croatia]", *Starine* 54 (1969), 5-15.
- Heller, Georg. *Comitatus Zagrabiensis A-L*. (Veröffentlichungen des Finnisch-Ugrischen Seminars an der Universität München Series A, Bd. 11/1.) München, 1980.
- Hrg, Metod. "Ubdikacija nekih župa zagrebačke biskupije iz XIV. stoljeća", *Croatica Christiana Periodica*, Vol. 1 No. 1, 1977, 47-61.
- Hunyadi, Zsolt. *The Hospitallers in the Medieval Kingdom of Hungary, c. 1150–1387*. (METEM Books, 70; CEU Medievalia, 13.) Budapest: Magyar Egyháztörténeti Enciklopédia Munkaközösség, Department of Medieval Studies, Central European University, 2010.
- Hutyrová, Tatiana – Budak, Neven. "A comparison of the privileged communities Campus Zagrabiensis and Parvus comitatus, in: *Slovakia and Croatia Vol. I – Slovakia and*

- Croatia Historical Parallels and Connections (until 1780)*, eds. Martin Homza, Ján Lukačka, Neven Budak, Department of Slovak History of the Faculty of Philosophy of Comenius: Bratislava 2013, pp. 227-231.
- Ivančan, Ljudevit, "Vratislav i pleme Aka", *Vjesnik zemaljskog arhiva* 6 (1904), pp. 10-163;
- _____. "Potomci plemena Aka", *Vjesnik zemaljskog arhiva* 7 (1905), pp. 6-83.
- Jerković, Marko, "Lekenik u svjetlu najstarijih izvora: Jedna mikropovijesna studija" [Lekenik in the light of the oldest sources: A micro history study], in: *Lekenik 1217-2017*, ed. by Božidar Antolec, Stipica Grgić.
- Jurković, Ivan. "Raseljena plemićka obitelj za osmanske ugroze: primjer Berislavića de Werhreka de Mala Mlaka (Dio prvi – Stjepan Berislavić Vrhrički i Malomlački)" [A displaced noble family during the Ottoman threat: The example of the Berislavići de Werhreka de Mala Mlaka. First Part - Stephen Berislavic of Vrhrika and Mala Mlaka]. *Zbornik Odsjeka za povijesne znanosti Zavoda za povijesne i društvene znanosti Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 20 (2002), pp. 125-164.
- _____. "Raseljena plemićka obitelj za osmanske ugroze: primjer Berislavića de Werhreka de Mala Mlaka (Dio drugi – Nasljednici Stjepana Berislavića tijekom 16. st.)" [A displaced noble family during the Ottoman threat: The example of the Berislavići de Werhreka de Mala Mlaka, Second part –Stephan Berislavić's heirs during the sixteenth century]. *Zbornik Odsjeka za povijesne znanosti Zavoda za povijesne i društvene znanosti Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 21 (2003), pp. 119-181.
- Karbić, Damir, "Familiares of the Šubići. Neapolitan Influence on the Origin of the Institution of Familiaritas in the Medieval Hungary," in: *La noblesse dans les territoires Angevins à la fin du Moyen Âge*, ed. by Noël Coulet – Jean-Michel Matz (Rome 2000), pp. 134-139.
- _____. *The Šubići of Bribir: A Case study of Croatian Medieval Kindred*, PhD thesis, Central European University, Budapest, 2000.
- _____. "Hrvatski plemićki rod i običajno parvo. Pokušaj analize" [Croatian noble kindred and customary law. An attempt of analysis], *Zbornik Odsjeka za povijesne znanosti Zavoda za povijesne i društvene znanosti Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 19 (1999), pp. 73-116.
- Karbić, Damir - Suzana Miljan, *Diplomatarij knezova Zrinskih* [Collection of charters of the counts Zrinski], manuscript.

- Karbić, Marija. "Property and family in the nobilis comunitatis Zagradiensis", manuscript submitted for the project and edition Nobility in East and Central Europe (head researcher Janos M. Bak.)
- _____. "Heiratsstrategien des Kleinadels von Turopolje (Slawonien) im späten Mittelalter". *East Central Europe. L'Europe du Centre-Est* 29/1-2 (2002), pp.167-176.
- _____. "Plemićka obitelj Mikšić iz roda Levča do početka 16. Stoljeća [The Noble Mikšić Family of the Levča Kindred to the Beginning of the Sixteenth Century]", *Zbornik Odsjela za povijesne znanosti Zavoda za povijesne i društvene znanosti Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 32 (2014), pp. 67-78.
- Kekez, Hrvoje. *Plemićki rod Babonića do kraja 14. Stoljeća* [The Noble Babonići Kindred until the End of the Fourteenth Century], Phd dissertation, University of Zagreb 2012.
- _____. "Između dva kralja: plemićki rod Babonića u vrijeme promjene na ugarsko-hrvatskom prijestolju od 1290. do 1309. godine" [Between two kings: the Babonić family in the period of dynastic succession on the Croatian and Hungarian throne, 1290–1310], *Povijesni prilozi* 35, pp. 61-89.
- Kiss, Lajos, *Földrajzi nevek etimológiai szótára* [Etymological dictionary of placenames], Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest 1980.
- Klaić, Nada. *Medvedgrad i njegovi gospodari* [Medvedgrad and its masters], Zagreb 1987.
- _____. *Povijest Zagreba I* [The history of Zagreb I], Zagreb 1982.
- _____. *Povijest Hrvata u razvijenom srednjem vijeku*, Školska knjiga, Zagreb 1982.
- Klaić, Vjekoslav. *Krčki knezovi Frankopani. Knjiga prva. Od najstarijih vremena do gubitka otoka Krka (od god. 1118 do god. 1480.)* [Counts Frankopani of Krk. Book one. From the oldest times until the loss of the island of Krk (from 1118 until 1480)], Matica Hrvatska, Zagreb 1901.
- Klemenc, Josip, *Archaeologische karte von Jugoslawien. Blatt Zagreb, F. Pelikan, Beograd*, 1938.
- Knezović, Ivan. *Arheologija* [Archaeology], Velika Gorica: Muzej Turopolja, 2007.
- Kristó, Gyula, *Tájszemlélet és térszervezés a középkori Magyarországon* [Concept of landscape and spatial organization in medieval Hungary] (Szeged: Szegedi Középkorász Műhely, 2003).
- _____. "Sírhelyek korai okleveleinkben" [Graves in early charters], *Acta Historica* LXXI. (1981), pp. 21-27.
- Koppány, Tibor. "A castellumtól a kastélyig. A magyarországi kastélyépítés kezdetei." *Művészettörténeti Értesítő* 23. (1974) 4., 285-299.

- _____. *A castellumtól a kastélyig (Tanulmányok a magyar kastélyépítés történetéből)* [From Castellum to Castle. Studies from the History of Hungarian Castle Construction], HistóriaAntik Könyvesház, Budapest 2006.
- Ladan, Tomislav. *Život riječi: etimologija i uporaba* [The life of words: etymology and usage], (Zagreb: Novela media, 2009)
- Ladić, Zoran – Goran Budeč. “Glagoljska bilježnica šćitarjevskog župnika od 1524.do 1526. godine. Prilog proučavanju crkvenog i seoskog života u zagrebačkoj okolini u ranom novom vijeku” [The Glagolithic notebook of the parish priest of Šćitajevo from 1524 to 1526. A contribution to the research of the ecclesiastical and rural life in the surroundings of Zagreb in the early modern age], *Zbornik Odsjeka za povijesne znanosti Zavoda za povijesne i društvene znanosti Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 29 (2011), pp. 149-189.
- Laszlovszky, József. “*Dedi eciam terram, que adiacet circa aquam, que vocatur Tiza,*” in: *Adatokaz 1075-ös garamszentbenedeki oklevél helyneveinek lokalizálásához. ZOUNUK - A JÁSZ-NAGYKUN-SZOLNOK MEGYEI LEVÉLTÁR ÉVKÖNYVE* 1 (1986), pp. 17-20.
- _____. “*Fama sanctis* and the Emergence of St. Margaret’s cult in the Rural Countryside,” in *Promoting the Saints Cults and Their Contexts from Late Antiquity until the Early Modern Period*, ed. by Ottó Gecser, József Laszlovszky, Balázs Nagy, Marcell Sebők, Katalin Szende (Budapest: CEU Press, 2011), pp. 103-124.
- _____. “Space and place: Text and object. Human-nature interaction and topographical studies”, in: *People and Nature in Historical Perspective*, ed. by József Laszlovszky and Peter Szabó (Budapest 2003), pp. 81-101.
- Laszlovszky, József. – Rasson, Judith. “Post-medieval or historical archaeology: Terminology and Discourses in the Archaeology of the Ottoman Period”, in: *Archaeology of the Ottoman period in Hungary: papers of the conference held at the Hungarian National Museum*, Budapest, 24-26 May 2000., ed. by Ibolya Gerelyes and Gyöngyi Kovács (Budapest: Hungarian National Museum, 2003), pp. 377-382.
- Laszowski, Emilij et al., *Povijest plemenite općine Turopolja nekoć Zagrebačko polje zvane* [A history of the noble community of Turopolje once called Zagreb Field.], 2 vols. (Zagreb: Tiskom Antuna Scholza, 1910).
- Laszowski, Emilij. “Želin-Čiče,” *Prosvjeta* (Zagreb), 5 (1897) 14, pp. 435-438; 15, pp. 454-456.
- _____. “Brezovica,” *Prosvjeta* (Zagreb), 5 (1897), 20, pp. 628-631; 21, pp. 660-663.

- _____. “Šest bilježaka iz listina XIII. vijeka [Six notes from the thirteenth century charters]”, *Vjesnik arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 207-208
- Lukenda, Marko. “Zemljopisna nomenklatura u srednjovjekovnoj toponimiji Turopolja” [Geographical nomenclature in the medieval toponymy of Turopolje], *Kaj* 3 (1984), str. 55-63.
- Majnarić, Ivan. “The title of new donation and its role in structuring the society and family in the Kingdom of Croatia in the fourteenth century,” (in press)
- Maretić, Tomislav ed. *Rječnik hrvatskog ili srpskog jezika*, vol 7, (Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1911).
- Margetić, Lujo. *Hrvatsko srednjovjekovno običajno i nasljedno pravo* [Croatian medieval customary and inheritance law] (Zagreb: Narodne novine, 1992).
- Marković, Ksenija, “Majstori tesari – graditelji tradicijske arhitekture u Turopolju” [Master carpenters –builders of traditional architecture in Turopolje], *Radovi Instituta za povijest umjetnosti* 12-13 (1988-1989), pp. 286-293.
- Miklaušić, Vojko, *Plemeniti puti* [The noble ways], Donja Lomnica: Matica hrvatska, ogranak Velika Gorica, 1994.
- Miljan, Suzana. “Quarta puellaris prema slučaju Skolastike Jurjeve iz Mlake” [Quarta puellaris according to the case of Skolastika Jurjeva from Velika Mlaka]. *Lucius: zbornik radova Društva studenata povijesti "Ivan Lučić-Lucius* 8-9 (2006), pp. 141-148.
- _____. “Plemićka obitelj Krupić iz Velike Mlake u 15. i 16. stoljeću” [The noble family Krupić from Velika Mlaka in the fifteenth and sixteenth century]. *Zbornik Odsjeka za povijesne znanosti Zavoda za povijesne i društvene znanosti Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 29 (2011), pp. 83-125.
- _____. “Nijemci u Turopolju u kasnom srednjem vijeku” [Germans in Turopolje in the late Middle Ages]. *DG Jarhbuch* 18 (2011), pp. 29-50.
- _____. *Plemićko društvo zagrebačke županije za vladavine Žigmunda Luksemburškog (1387.-1437.)*, [Noble society of the County of Zagreb during the reign of Sigismund of Luxemburg (1387-1437)], PhD dissertation, University of Zagreb, 2015.
- _____. “Familiaritas i klijentelski sustav unutar plemićkog društva zagrebačke županije za vrijeme vladavine Žigmunda Luksemburškog (1387.-1437.)” [Familiaritas and the client system within the noble society of the county of Zagreb during the reign of Sigismund of Luxemburg (1387-1437)], *Zbornik Odsjeka za povijesne znanosti Zavoda za povijesne i društvene znanosti Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 33 (2015), pp. 103-132.

- Mirnik, Ivan. "Two Recent Finds of Medieval Lead Seals", *Folia archaeologica Balkanica* I, 479-484.
- _____. "Emilij pl. Laszowski Szilega. Bibliografija [Bibliography]", source: Academia.edu.
- Nekić, Antun, "Oligarchs and King in Medieval Slavonia, 1301-1342," *Südost-Forschungen* 74 (2015), pp. 1-25.
- Nemeth-Ehrlich, Dorica - Kušan Špalj, Dora. *2000 godina Andautonije – Od rimskog grada do arheološkog parka* [2000 years of Andautonia – from the Roman town to the archaeological park], Zagreb: Arheološki muzej u Zagrebu, 2007.
- Nikolić, Zrinka, "Obitelj Čupor Moslavački" [The Čupor Moslavači family], *Radovi Zavoda za znanstveno istraživački i umjetnički rad u Bjelovaru* 4, pp. 269-300.
- Novosel, Tomo, *Geološka i inženjersko-geološka obilježja na lokalitetu Šepkovčica* [Geological and engineering-geological characteristics at the site of Šepkovčica], Unpublished report stored in the archive of the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Croatia, Zagreb, 2008.
- Paládi-Kovács, Attila. "Jeladáskútgémme!" [Signalingshadow], in: *Magyar Néprajzi Lexikon*, vol. 2, ed. by Gyula Ortutay, Budapest: Akadémiaiadó, 1979.
- Pálosfalvi, Tamás, "Vitézek és Garázdák. A szlavóniai humanisták származásának kérdéséhez," *Turul* 86/1, 1-16.
- _____. *The Noble Elite in the County of Körös (Križevci) 1400–1526*, Monumenta Hungariae. Magyar Történelmi Emlékek, Dissertationes. Értekezések, Budapest: MTA Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóközpont Történettudományi Intézet, 2014.
- Pavlović, Ana, "Numizmatički nalazi s lokaliteta Šepkovčica" [Numismatic finds from the Šepkovčica site], *Opuscula archaeologica* 35, pp. 263-296.
- Pusztai, Tamás. "The pottery of the Turkish palisade at Báticasék", in: *Archaeology of the Ottoman period in Hungary: papers of the conference held at the Hungarian National Museum*, Budapest, 24-26 May 2000., ed. by Ibolya Gerelyes and Gyöngyi Kovács (Budapest: Hungarian National Museum, 2003), pp. 303-306.
- Radman-Livaja, Ivan et al., "Istraživanje arheološkog lokaliteta Buzin" [Research on the archaeological site Buzin], *Vjesnik arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu* 44 (2011), pp. 261–273.
- Rady, Martin. *Nobility, Land and Service in Medieval Hungary*, Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2000.
- Rendić-Miočević, Ante ed. *Zagreb prije Zagreba: arheološka baština Zagreba od pretpovijesti do osnutka biskupije 1094. godine* [Zagreb before Zagreb: The archaeological heritage

- of Zagreb from prehistory to the foundation of the bishopric in 1094], exhibition catalogue, Puljko: Zagreb, Puljko 1995.
- Rogalić, Josip, *Fizičko geografska obilježja Zagreba i okolice* [Physical geographical features of Zagreb and its surroundings], Split: Geografsko društvo, 2007.
- Ruttikay, Matej, "Ovens in the Early Medieval Settlements of South-Western Slovakia", *Civilisations, Revue internationale d'anthropologie et sciences humaines* 42 (2002), pp. 271-283.
- Siklódied, Csilla, *Between East and West. Everyday Life in the Hungarian Conquest Period - Über die Grenzwischen Ost und West. Ungarn im 9-11. Jahrhundert*, Promptus: Budapest, 1996, pp. 77-99.
- Skok, Petar, *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika* [Etymological dictionary of Croatian or Serbian language], vol. 1-3, Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1971-1973.
- Sokol, Vladimir, *Medieval Jewelry and Burial Assemblages in Croatia. A Study of Graves and Grave Goods, cca 800 to cca. 1450*, Turhout: Brill, 2016.
- Stepanić, Slavko. *Lomnički riječnik* [Lomnica dictionary], <https://sites.google.com/site/turopole/Home/turlomnicki-recnik-1>, 2012.
- Stipančević, Mario – Pleše, Tajana ed. *Stoljeće nakon Laszowskog, Znanstveno stručni skup i izložba. Knjiga Sažetaka* [A century after Laszowski. Scientific expert conference. Book of summaries], Prinera grupa d.o.o., Zagreb 2014.
- Szabó, György, "A falusikovács a XV–XVI. Században" [The Village Blacksmith in the 15-16th centuries], *Folia Archeologica* 6 (1954), 123-145.
- Szamota. István – Zolnai. Gyula. *Magyar oklevélszótár* [Hungarian charter dictionary], Hornyánszky, Budapest: 1902-1906.
- Szebereny, Gabor. "Noble Communities in Spiš and Turopolje in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries", u: *Slovakia and Croatia Vol. I – Slovakia and Croatia Historical Parallels and Connections (until 1780)*, eds. Martin Homza, Ján Lukačka, Neven Budak, Department of Slovak History of the Faculty of Philosophy of Comenius, Bratislava, 2013, pp. 222-227.
- _____. "Plemići, predijalci i iobagiones castri Rovišća u 13. i 14. stoljeću", *Zbornik Odsjeka za povijesne znanosti Zavoda za povijesne i društvene znanosti Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 30 (2012): 31-55.
- Szilágyi, Magdolna. *On the road: The history and archaeology of medieval communication networks in east-central Europe*, Budapest: Archeolingua. Series Minor, 2014.

- Takács, Lajos. *Határjelek, határjárás a feudális kor végén Magyarországon* [Border signs, perambulations at the end of the feudal period in Hungary], Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1987.
- Vadas, András. "Some Remarks on the Legal Regulations and Practice of Mill Construction in Medieval Hungary," in: *Wasser in der mittelalterlichen Kultur. Water in Medieval Culture, Gebrauch – Wahrnehmung – Symbolik / Uses, Perceptions, and Symbolism*. Eds. Gerlinde Huber-Rebenich, Christian Rohr, Michael Stolz, Berlin: De Gruyter, 2017, pp. 290-314.
- Virágos, Gábor. *The Social Archaeology of Residential Sites: Hungarian noble residences and their social context from the thirteenth through to the sixteenth century*, British Archaeological Reports, International Series, Band 1583. 2006.
- Vinski, Zdenko, "O postojanju radionica nakita starohrvatskog doba u Sisku" [About the existence of jewellery workshops of old-Croatian period in Sisak], *Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu*, Vol.4 No.1, pp. 45-92.
- Vujasinović, Branko, "Uloga rijeke Save u povijesnom razvoju grada Zagreba" [The role of the Sava River in the historical development of the city of Zagreb], *Ekonomskaiako historija: časopis za gospodarsku povijest i povijest okoliša* 3, pp. 142-153.
- Wippel, Johanna. *Die geographischen Namen des Turopolje (eine sprachwissenschaftliche Untersuchung)*, Druck: Ernst-Reuter-Gesellschaft, 1963.
- Zatykó, Csilla, "Medieval villages and their landscape", in: *People and Nature in Historical Perspective*, ed. by József Laszlovszky and Peter Szabó (Budapest 2003), pp. 343-375.

APPENDIX

Eleventh century



Photo 1



Photo 2

Thirteenth century



Photo 3



Photo 4

Fourteenth century



Photo 5



Photo 6



Photo 7



Photo 8



Photo 9



Photo 10



Photo 11

Curriculum vitae

Nikolina Antonić was born in Zagreb in 1980. She finished primary school and high school in Zagreb. In 2008 she graduated archaeology and history at the Faculty of humanities and social sciences in Zagreb. In 2014 she finished the one-year master program at the Department of medieval studies at Central European University in Budapest. She participated in numerous archaeological excavations in different areas of Croatia and abroad. From 2006 -2009 she worked as the part-time associate of Zagreb City Museum at the projects of highway rescue excavations in the Turopolje area. In the period from 2009-2011 she was employed as the archaeologist in the archaeological firm Kaducej.d.o.o. From 2014 she has been working as the part-time associate in Slovenian genealogical firm Zlatno dervo.

Published articles:

-Combining documents, toponyms, and archaeology in Turopolje, Croatia. GIS in historical research, *Annual of Medieval Studies at CEU* 21, Budapest 2015., pp. 211-228.

-Late medieval village in Turopolje, in: *Secular power and sacral authority in East-Central Europe. Collection of paper from the second medieval workshop in Rijeka*, eds. Kosana Jovanović – Suzana Miljan, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2016., pp. 71-85.

-Prilog proučavanju gospodarstva i prehrambenih navika u Turopolju u 13. stoljeću – životinjski ostaci sa nalazišta Kobilić 1. [A contribution to the Research of the Economy and Dietary Habits in Turopolje in the Thirteenth Century.- Animal Remnants from the Archaeological Site of Kobilić 1] , *Zbornik Odsjeka za povijesne znanosti Zavoda za povijesne i društvene znanosti Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 34, Zagreb 2016. (co-author: Kyra Lyublyanovics), pp. 71-85.

-Selected medieval finds from the site Kobilić 1 in Turopolje, in: *Zbornik Instituta za arheologiju br. 6, 2. međunarodni znanstveni skup srednjovjekovne arheologije "Srednjovjekovna naselja u svjetlu arheoloških izvora"*, eds. T. Sekelj Ivančan, T. Tkalčec, S. Krznar, J. Belaj, Zagreb 2017., (co-author: Tibor Ákos Rácz), pp. 255-279.

-Metallographic examination of two medieval knives from Kobilic (Republic of Croatia), *Materials and Manufacturing Processes*, special issue on "Aspects of Ancient Metallurgy", 2016, (co-authors: Adam Thiele, Jiří Hošek, Tibor Ákos Rác), <http://www.tandfonline.com/eprint/gjIGP3p5t2HTuSc6pnYp/full>