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Unidentified Medieval Settlements in Southeastern Hungary:

*Bozvár, Castellum Cikovásárhely, Castrum Cseri, and Sugya*

One of the questions yet to be solved in connection with medieval Southeastern Hungary is the delineation of the administrative boundaries in that area at that time. Thus, for instance, the exact borders of Keve, Krassó, Temes, and Torontál counties are yet to be drawn. In the Middle Ages these counties were arranged along what one may call a horizontal line: Krassó and Keve on the Danube, with Temes and Torontál bordering them from the N, and Arad and Csanád separating them from the Maros River. Of the latter, Csanád County extended in an almost equally proportioned triangle over territories N and S of the Maros River and E of the Theiss. In later times, Keve was incorporated into the neighboring Temes and Torontál counties. As a result, in the Modern Period only three counties were in existence in the general area: Krassó-Szörény, Temes, and Torontál. Furthermore, having absorbed all territories S of the Maros River previously belonging to Arad and to Csanád counties, the three counties now were arranged along a more vertical line.

Though the how and why of this rather important change has by now been established in its broader outlines, many of the questions of detail, such as the exact borders of the medieval counties, the territory they once covered, the distribution of the then existing settlements among the then existing counties, etc., are still awaiting answers, answers which can be given in a more or less conclusive form with the help of Ottoman sources. As I have pointed out repeatedly, and most recently in my "Unidentified Medieval Settlements in Southeastern Hungary: *Alba Ecclesia, Castrum Ér-Somlyó, Castrum Somlyó, and Maxond*" (Hungaro-Turcica, *Studies in Honour of Julius Németh* (Budapest, 1975), 28 pp.), the Ottoman domesday books
form an especially valuable link between the Middle Ages and the Modern Period, providing information vital to a better understanding of both Medieval and Habsburg-era Hungary. Their testimony is of the greatest importance, for instance, in the establishing of administrative boundaries.

Administrative boundaries, in the Ottoman Empire as elsewhere, vary depending on the nature and function of the unit they limit. The most important administrative units in the Ottoman Empire were the eyalets / beylerbeyliks, the sancaks / livas, and the nahiyes / kazas. Though a comprehensive study of Ottoman administrative units and structures is yet to be written and, with time, relevant terminology has changed in its semantic content, sometimes even to the extent of a full reversion, it can safely be stated that, at the height of its supremacy, the Ottoman Empire consisted of about thirty–forty eyalets and, solely by deduction, of about six to eight-hundred sancaks and six to eight-thousand nahiyes. It is obvious that for the study of administrative boundaries in Southeastern Hungary in Ottoman times Ottoman eyalet (province) boundaries are of little or no relevance and, thus, no attention will be given to them here. The situation is somewhat different with respect to the sancaks, the Ottoman administrative units next in size. The sancaks having been units of a military nature, their boundaries, in most cases, were not stable enough to make a good base for comparison since they were subject to frequent territorial changes, especially when they were located in the vicinity of enemy territory. It follows from the same military considerations that inside of the Empire proper the sancaks were of bigger extension, diminishing in size, and often considerably, in border territories. Nevertheless, there were instances where the Ottoman sancak coincided with or was a continuation of a pre-Conquest administrative unit of the area. Examples for the latter are given by B. Cvetkova in her “Early Ottoman Tahir Defters as a Source for Balkan History”, (“Archivum Ottomanicum” 8 (1976), p. 83 (manuscript), E.g. the Vidin czardom of Ivan Stratsimir = Sancak of Vidin; the domain of Konstantin Dragash = Sancak of Kostandili; the land of Brankovich = = Sancak of Vilk-İli; the territory of Bulgaria at the time of Shishman = Sancak of Nikopol; etc. Further to the north, in the area along the Danube, the question seems to be far more complicated. E.g., while the Sancak of Sirem was the exact continuation of medieval Szerém County, the medieval Bánát of Macsó constituted only one part, the northern one, of the Sancak of Simendere, and the boundaries of the Sancak of Segedin included the whole of Búcs, Bodrog, and Csongrád counties and part of Fejér County.

---

2 Communication by A. Z. H e r t z from his Deftar-i mufassal-i Semendire, 517 (1571; in preparation).
3 T. H a l a s i - K u n, Sixteenth-century Turkish Settlements in Southern Hungary, “Belleten”, 28, pp. 1—72, 10 plates. See esp. map on pp. 16/17.
In contrast to the sancaks, the nahiyes, which are the next in size among the Ottoman administrative units, show, at least in the northern parts of Danubian Europe, a remarkable stability in their boundaries. And, since in most cases not only their territories remained unchanged for long periods of time but even their strong ties to their medieval predecessors, they lend themselves extremely well to comparative studies.

The nahiye boundaries of the Sancak of Segedin are a good example for the above⁴. E.g., Titel and Baç nahiyes = medieval Băcș County; Bodrog and Baya nahiyes = Bodrog County; Sobotka nahiyesi = a territory which, in the Middle Ages, belonged sometimes to Bodrog, sometimes to Csongrád County; Vașarhel nahiyesi = a territory which, in the Middle Ages, belonged sometimes to Csongrád, sometimes to Csanád County; Segedin nahiyesi = Csongrád County minus the territories attached to Sobotka and Vașarhel nahiyes, as mentioned above. It is interesting to see how, for instance, the medieval administrative setup of Fejér County is reflected in the Ottoman administrative setup. One part of the medieval Fejér County extended over the left bank of the Danube. It consisted of three sedes, special administrative units: the Sedes of Solt, the Sedes of Kalocsa, and the Sedes of Hontoka⁵. There were close ties between the Sedes of Kalocsa and the Sedes of Hontoka, the first one having been the winter, and the second the summer residence of the archbishop of Kalocsa. In the Ottoman arrangement the Sedes of Solt = Șot nahiye, and the Sedes of Kalocsa together with the Sedes of Hontoka = Kalaça nahiye.

What we have seen above in the case of the Sancak of Segedin is also valid for the medieval and Ottoman administrative arrangement in Southeastern Hungary (= Bánát of the Modern Period). Here too, the Ottoman nahiye boundaries offer valuable criteria with the help of which one can establish, in retrospect, the boundaries of earlier administrative units. Thus, for instance, the description of the eighteen nahiyes of the Timișyar and Modova sancaks in the Mufassal 579 (1579 A.D.) and of the southern nahiyes in the registers of Čanat is an invaluable help in the clear and detailed definition of the boundaries of the medieval Keve, Krassó, Temes, and Torontál counties.

Deeper investigation into Ottoman defter material enables us to go even further with such comparative studies. Indeed, if followed through carefully, with the aid of it one can also establish more minute details such as the boundaries of administrative sub-units of a county, e.g., boundaries of districts and royal or private domains. The eastern part of medieval Temes County is, for instance, especially interesting from this point of view. This county, in the Middle Ages, consisted of small units

---

⁴ Halasi-Kun, "Belleten", 28, pp. 16/17 (map).
centered usually either around a *castrum* or around an *oppidum*. Some of these units were regular royal or private domains, while others — be they royal or private — were special, so to say military units. The latter were called in Hungarian historiography *districti volahales*. Many of these units in *Temes* County were once in the hands of no less a person than John Hunyadi. As interesting as they may be, the border descriptions of these sub-units are, in most cases, vague and inconclusive, if known at all, and even specialists like D. Csánki⁶ and B. Milleker⁷ are often faced with insurmountable difficulties when trying to define their outline or to locate or identify the center to which they once belonged.

A detailed listing of the Hunyadi domains is given by B. Hóman⁸. If we select from this list only the domains which were in the eastern part of medieval *Temes* County, our special interest at this point, the following table can be set up:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Stronghold</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Borzlyuk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bozor</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ikus</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monostor</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggya</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zsupán</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turd</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A second list of domains in eastern *Temes* County, domains not in Hunyadi hands, can be obtained from data given by Milleker (op. cit., pp. 149, 153, and 178) and can be set up in a table as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Settlements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cseri</td>
<td>1387</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1459</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1473</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1501</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doboz</td>
<td>1462</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodos</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czikó-Vásárhely</td>
<td>1488</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though in both cases the borders of the domains or districts are generally little known or vague and, as can be seen from the above tabulation, the number of settlements in a given unit can fluctuate, increase and decrease considerably, the greatest difficulty still lies in the fact that not too infrequently even the focal points, the

---

⁷ B. Milleker, *Délmagyarország középhori földrajza*, Temesvár 1915.
⁹ Csánki, op. cit., pp. 33—34.
centers of these units are not clearly established. Such unidentified centers are, for instance, Cseri, Cikóvdsárhel and Sugya.

The Ottomans, according to the Mufassal 579, divided the eastern part of Temes County into ten nahiyes: Čerin, Iktar, Bojur, Ferdiya, Tîrgoviște, Şuveyda, Monostor, Façet, Marçına, and Bozovar. This is an unusually high number for such a small area (not even 100 kms long and hardly 20 kms in width), yet, as is evident from the available data, these miniature nahiyes are the reflections of medieval administrative formations: regular domains or special military units. The question of what considerations prompted the Ottomans to preserve these miniature medieval administrative units would call for investigations out of the scope of this study. Still, it is interesting to see that, while on the one side the Ottomans preserved these administrative units, on the other they eliminated the centers of these units if they were strongholds or castles. It was in the best of Ottoman traditions to tear down enemy strongholds considered unnecessary once the area had been conquered. Most of these strongholds tracelessly disappeared, but their memory in many instances lived on in the name of the nearby oppidum (Ottoman varos) or village (Ottoman kariye), or in the name of the pertinent administrative unit itself.

The general data furnished by the Mufassal 579 on the ten nahiyes can be tabulated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of nahiye</th>
<th>Origin of name of nahiye</th>
<th>Varos</th>
<th>Kariye</th>
<th>Mezraa</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Čerin</td>
<td>Kariye-i Čerin</td>
<td>1 Berin</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Iktar</td>
<td>Varoș-i Iktar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bojur</td>
<td>Varoș-i Bojur</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ferdiya</td>
<td>Kariye-i Ferdiya</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Tîrgoviște</td>
<td>Varoș-i Tîrgoviște</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Şuveyda</td>
<td>Kariye-i Şuveyda(^{11})</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Monostor</td>
<td>Varoș-i Monostor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Façet</td>
<td>Varoș-i Façet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Marçına</td>
<td>Varoș-i Marçına</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Bozovar</td>
<td>Kariye-i Bozovar</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^{11}\) On the border of Şuveyda and Monostor sub-counties. Though Şuveyda Sub-county undoubtedly was named after it, in the register it is mentioned in Monostor Sub-county as abandoned village.
With the exception of a small section of Iktar, the first four nahiyes were located S of the Béga River. The next three (5—7) were to the N, and nahiyes 8, 9 and 10 were around the headwaters of the same river. Comparing further the medieval material with information furnished by the Mufassal 579 we find that in some instances not only the names of the nahiyes (or nahiye centers) and their medieval predecessors are identical (e.g., Bojur = Bozsur, Ferdiya = Turd, Torgoviște = Cikóvásárhely (one is translation of the other)), but also their territories, and, occasionally, even the number of settlements they comprise. The register lists as many as 328 placenames in this very small area. The rich material offered by the Mufassal 579 will make, among others, a detailed description of the various administrative boundaries in the general area, a major undertaking beyond the scope of this article, possible. Here, as a first step in this direction, I want to locate and identify the centers of the ten nahiyes in the eastern Temes County-area. With the help of the tabulations given above six of the ten centers can readily be identified with their medieval and/or modern equivalents. As can be seen, three of the remaining four nahiye centers, e.g., Çerin, Targoviște, and Şuydya, appear as unidentified, while Bozovar is entirely missing from the medieval tabulations.

The methodology used in this article will be that employed in my previous articles dealing with similar problems. First, the available pertinent Hungarian medieval material, complemented in a few instances by modern relevant material, is given. Next the pertinent Ottoman data of the Muffasal 579 are quoted. Finally, the data of the two source groups are combined in annotated conclusions. A map and indices of the Hungarian and Ottoman placenames mentioned complete the material.12

As already mentioned, the four settlements of interest to us here are:

1. Bozvár

Csánki (op. cit., ii, p. 30) and Milleker (op. cit., p. 169) mention Bozvár in the medieval Temes County. They place the settlement on the Transylvanian border, but without identifying it in particular. Milleker (op. cit., p. 205) also mentions a Lukácstalca in medieval Temes County which occurs in connection with

---

12 For references and abbreviations used in this article, see T. Halasi-Kun, Unidentified Medieval Settlements in Southern Hungary, Ottoman: nam-i diğer, Studia Turcica, Budapest 1971, pp. 213—230.

For transcription and transliteration used in this article, see Halasi-Kun, "Belleten", 28 (1964), pp. 1—72.

Bozvár and Nemesest\(^1\) and is also known under the alias Kastély. He identifies this Kastély with modern Kostej/Felsőkastély\(^2\).

*In the Bozovar Sub-county (Bozovar nahiyesi) of the Mufassal 579 the following pertinent entries can be found:

a) At the beginning of the nahiye, before Selıște:\(^3\) “Kariye-i Kaștîl-i Bozovar. Tâbi-i mezbur... Mezraa-i Maço苇îste\(^4\), nezd-i kariye-i mezbur. Halkı ziraat edip tasarruf ederler... Hassa: Bağ-i Bozvari Yanoş, 200... Diğer hassa: Bağ-i Bojvari Andraș, 200’’ (p. 237).

b) After Roğosan\(^5\) and before Nemesest\(^6\): “Kariye-i Bozovar. Tâbi-i mezbur... Asiyab-i Mehmet ağa, hâlen der yed-i Oruç base, hâli, der hudud-i yar-i kaya” (pp. 238—239).

c) On pp. 237—239, under the heading “Nahiye-i Bozovar. Der liva-i Timuşvar” nine settlements (eight kariyes and one mezraa) are mentioned N of the Béga River, reaching from the headwaters of the Kostej River as far as Temeresty. In the south, Nahiye-i Bozovar bordered on Marçına Subcounty.

This would mean that Bozvár formed a cluster with Kastély and, consequently, the two settlements can be considered identical. To the Ottomans Bozvár was known as Kaștîl-i Bozovar while the other section (modern Kostej/Felsőkastély, medieval Lukicsfalva) they called simply Bozovar. An interesting example of Hungarian-Ottoman symbiosis is also offered by the above entries: on the one side, some of the vineyards of Kaștîl-i Bozovar were still in the possession of the Bozvári-family, on the other, the mill in Bozovar was in the hands of a Mehmet ağa.

Medieval Macsás was known as Maço苇îste to the Ottomans. It is listed in that time as a mezraa in the vicinity of Kaștîl-i Bozovar.

---

2. Castellum Cikóvásárhely

Csánki (op. cit., ii, pp. 12, and 17: s.v., Czikó-Vásárhely) and Milleker (op. cit., pp. 150: s.v., Pathkocz, and 153: s.v., Czikó-Vásárhely) mention an Oppidum Czykowasarhel cum castello, sometimes also known as Pathkolc, in the medieval Temes

---

\(^{1}\) Modern: Nemesest (Nemcse), NE of Marzsina (Facset 22 XXVI; Lugos 40° 46’); ancient: Nemesest (Milleker, op. cit., p. 214).

\(^{2}\) Modern: Kostey (Felsőkastély), N of Homosdia (Maros-Illye 22 XXVI; Lugos 40° 46’); ancient: Kostie (Kriegs-Charte des Temeswarer Banath, plate 73).

\(^{3}\) Ancient: Szeliște, in the Nemesest-area (Milleker, op. cit., p. 242).

\(^{4}\) Ancient: Maczsás, in the Kostey-Marzsina-area (Milleker, op. cit., p. 206).

\(^{5}\) Modern: Zorány, NE of Marzsina (Facset 22 XXVI); ancient: Rogosán (Sorani) (Milleker, op. cit., p. 232; Kriegs-Charte des Temeswarer Banath, plate 72).

\(^{6}\) See note 1.
County. Although, according to Milleker (op. cit., p. 153) the possessio of Cikóvásárhely consisted of the impressive number of twenty-eight settlements in 1488, Csánki did not even attempt to locate the castle and/or its oppidum, while Milleker himself mentions, but only vaguely, the possibility that it may be linked to a "watchhouse of Vásárhely" on the Remete-Poganest—Lugos highway, five kms N of Remete-Poganest3. In addition, Milleker (op. cit., pp. 156, and 256) mentions an Agvásárhely/O-Vásárhely/Vásárhely settlement as part of the Cikóvásárhely-domain.

In the Tîrgoviște Sub-county (Tîrgoviște nahiyesi) of the Mufassal 579 we find the following pertinent entries:


b) On pp. 228—229, after Kursînca4 and before Fadîmag5: "Kariye-i Istarî-Tîrgoviște. Täbi-i m."

c) On pp. 224—232, under the heading "Nahiye-i Tîrgoviște. Der liva-i Timişvar" forty-two settlements (one varoş, thirty-seven kariyes, and four mezraas) are mentioned N of the Béga River, located in the area between the brook by Kutina and the Kîzdia River. In the south, Nahiye-i Tîrgoviște bordered on Iktar Sub-county.

This would mean that medieval Cikóvásárhely/Patokol, known as Tîrgoviște to the Ottomans, corresponds to modern Vásáros, NE of Bapsa (Temesrêkas 22 XXV) and, contrary to Milleker (op. cit., p. 150), N and not S of the Béga River. From the above entries it becomes evident that at the end of the sixteenth century Tîrgoviște was a live city, but there is no mention of its medieval castle anymore. There is, however, mention of a bridge which secured customs revenue income

---

1 Lugos 23 XXVI.
2 Unidentified.
3 Modern: Bapsa (Babsa), SW of Vásáros (Temesrêkas 22 XXV; Borovszky, Temes vármegye, Budapest, n.d., p. 24); ancient: Bapsa (Pabscha) (Csánki, op. cit., ii, pp. 25, and 12: s.v., Czikó-Vásárhely; Milleker, op. cit., p. 152; Kriegs-Charte des Temeswarer Banath, plate 70).
5 Modern: Fadimak, N of Bálinc (Facset 22 XXVI); ancient: Fagymag (Fatimak) (Csánki, op. cit., ii, pp. 36, and 12: s.v., Czikó-Vásárhely; Milleker, op. cit., pp. 181—182; Kriegs-Charte des Temeswarer Banath, plate 70).

---
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Ottoman Radulova corresponds to medieval Rádfalva. It was a meszra of Tírgovište in the Ottoman period and is to be sought in the vicinity of Tírgovište and Bapsa.

Medieval Agvásárhegy|Ó-Vásárhegy was called Istan-Tírgovište by the Ottomans and, judging from its position in the listing of the Mufassal 579, it also is to be sought in the Tírgovište-area.

3. Castrum Cseri

Csánki (op. cit., ii, pp. 11—12, and 17) and Milleker (op. cit., pp. 148—149) both mention a castrum and an oppidum Cseri in the medieval Temes County. It was the seat of the vast Cseri-domain which, in 1387 consisted of six, in 1459 of sixty-two, in 1473 of twenty-three, and in 1507 of thirty-one settlements (Milleker, op. cit., p. 149). There was even a monastery in oppidum Cseri; it belonged to the Order of Friars Minor (Csánki, op. cit., p. 17). Despite its evident importance, the exact location of Cseri, be it by Csánki or by Milleker, had not been established. Csánki merely indicates that it is to be sought somewhere in the area S–SW of Temesrékás. Milleker follows by and large the Csánki theory adding to it that Cseri had to be located on the shores of the Temes River since one of its headmen had milling rights on the river. He even refers to some fictitious homonyms on the north side of the Temes River, as further indications that Cseri is to be sought in that area.

* 

In the Çerin Sub-county (Çerin nahiyesi) of the Mufassal 579 the pertinent entries are as follows:

a) On pp. 204—205, after Petrilofşa and before Dolna- and Gorna-Oluk, as sub-entries under the main entry on the village Çerin:

---

7 Milleker, op. cit., pp. 156, and 256: s.v., Vásárhegy.
1 Temesrékás 22 XXV.
2 Modern: Petriștea, S of Ikloda (Buziás 23 XXV); ancient: Péterfalva (Milleker, op. cit., p. 224).
3 Modern: Ujlak (Temesyilak), NW of Ikloda (Buziás 23 XXV; Borovszky, op. cit., p. 117); ancient: Éliásfalva (Thothelelek and Magyaryllek) (Milleker, op. cit., p. 180; Csánki, op. cit., ii, p. 11: s.v., Cseri).
1. “Kariye-i Çerin. Tâbi-i mezbur”.
2. “Mezraa-i Şaraş⁴, nezd-i kariye-i mezburse. Kariye-i mezburse ve Berin⁵ ehali-
erleri ziraat edip, yerleri müşadır”.
3. “Mezraa-i Tatar-Selo⁶, nezd-i kariye-i mezburse, Çerin ve Berin⁵ halkı ziraat ederler, yerleri müşadır”.
4. “Mezraa-i Harga-Selo⁷, nezd-i kariye-i mezburse. Varoş-i Berin⁵ halkı ziraat ederler”.
5. “Mezraa-i Mitoliya-Sela⁸. Varoş-i Berin⁵ ehali personleri ziraat ederler”.

b) On pp. 212—213, after Pozsporlaka⁹, as the last entry of that nahiye: “Kariye-i Istari-Çerin. Tâbi-i mezbur”.

c) On pp. 203—213, under the heading “Nahiye-i Çerin. Tâbi-i Timsâv” seventy-four settlements (one varos, twenty-six kariyes, and forty-seven mezraas) are mentioned S of the Temes and Béga rivers, between the settlements Boldur¹⁰ and Széphely¹¹.

This, in the first place, would mean that, contrary to Milleker’s conclusion, Cseri is to be placed S of the Temes River since all the settlements of the Çerin Sub-
county were located S and not N of the river. The main criterion upon which Mille-
k er based his assumption, i.e., the milling rights on the Temes River, does not only
not exclude a southern location of the village but does not even prove a river-bank
location. The given data merely show that a headman of Cseri had milling rights
on the Temes and the Arsus rivers between Bazos¹² and Liget¹³ (Milleker, op.
cit., p. 252, s.v., Tüő), which involves a distance of about thirty (!) kilometers.
The Mufassal 579 further indicates that Cseri was known as Çerin to the Otto-
mans. As it seems, the stronghold, at that time, no longer existed, but the village
can be considered a straight continuation of the medieval oppidum. According to
the register, it had four mezraas in Ottoman times: Şaraş, Tatar-Selo, Harga-Selo,

---

⁵ Modern: Berény (Temesberény), SE of Román-Sztamora (Buziás 23 XXV; Borovszky, op. cit., p. 99); ancient: Berény (Cszunki, op. cit., ii, pp. 15—16; Milleker, op. cit., p. 152).
⁶ Modern: Török-Szakos, NE of Ikloda (Buziás 23 XXV); ancient: Tatárfalva (Milleker, op. cit., p. 248; Cszunki, op. cit., pp. 66, and 11: s.v., Cseri).
⁷ Ancient: Herkefalva, in the Cseri domain (Milleker, op. cit., p. 192; Cszunki, op. cit., ii, pp. 41, and 11: s.v., Cseri).
⁸ Unidentified.
⁹ Modern: Purpur (Puzpür), NE of Szilas (Buziás 23 XXV; Milleker, op. cit., p. 227: s.v., Posporafalva); ancient: Poszpofalva (Milleker, ibid.; Cszunki, op. cit., ii, p. 58).
¹⁰ Buziás 23 XXV.
¹¹ Ötelek und Széphely 23 XXIV.
¹² Buziás 23 XXV.
¹³ Ötelek und Széphely 23 XXIV.
and Mitoliya-Sela. Šaraš, the first of these mezraas, is identical with Saris, S of Török-Szákos. The second mezraa, Tatar-Selo, could be identified with modern Török-Szákos, which does not have a direct correspondence in the register and, accordingly, seems to be a name of more recent origin. These two mezraas were cultivated jointly (müşa) by Cseri and Berény, which would indicate that they must have been in the vicinity of each other. Taking into consideration the information offered by the Mufassal 579 on the third and fourth mezraa, one has to conclude that Çerin could not have been located very far from Berin. Based on the above I feel that Cseri can safely be placed halfway between Berény and Török-Szákos, at the northern end of the Roman Vallum, where the same reaches the Poganis River. A conclusion compatible with all the available data, including the milling rights of the headman of Çerin, since it places the village at a distance of only nine kilometers from the Temes River.

Beyond the testimony of the mezraas, the testimony of the Roman Vallum, circumstantial as it may be, also offers some weighty evidence pointing in the same direction. The Ottoman Haram-Ér-Somlyó (Versek)—Temesvár–Arad military road followed the same course as did the great Roman Vallum in traversing Southern Hungary from the Danube to Arad. Moreover, it seems hardly coincidental that Mira, the important Ottoman tollgate, was located in the area where the Vallum is cut by the Temes River. The more one learns about the beginnings of medieval Hungary the more one realizes the longlasting importance Roman constructions have had in the Carpathian Basin. The Ottomans, with their tradition-oriented approach, often preserved that which was already in existence, and their documents contain much information leading back to the Middle Ages. The use of the Haram–Arad Roman Vallum is a good example of this and so is Cseri, granted the above location on the second Roman Vallum which runs parallel to the great Vallum already mentioned, but at some distance to the east of it. This second Vallum ends at Övesfalu and starts again at Török-Szákos, with the Poganis River flowing through the gap thus formed. It is my contention that the medieval Castrum Cseri and the Ottoman Çerin village (or medieval oppidum Cseri) is to be placed in the area of that crossing.

But there is even a third criterion which seems to lend considerable support to the above contention. The criterion is connected with and derives from the identity of the nearby Román-Sztamora/Felsőstamora. According to Milleker (op. cit., p. 246) Román-Sztamora is a medieval settlement, while Német-Sztamora/Alsó-

---

14 See, e.g., Borovszky, op. cit., p. 119. Also, Milleker (op. cit., p. 242: s.v., Székes) separates Török-Szákos from medieval Székes/Magyar-Szákos.
16 Used e.g. by Ahmed serdar in the 1552 campaign when marching against Temesvár (Hónam—Székfő, Magyar történet, iii, pp. 160/161 (map)).
17 Buziás 23 XXV.
sztamora\(^{18}\) is of more recent origin, a view shared by Borovszky (op. cit., pp. 23: s.v., Alsóstamora, and 41–42: s.v., Felsősztamora). Information furnished by the Mufassal 579 does not seem to bear out these assumptions. Though an I stam ur is mentioned after Petrel\(^{19}\) and before Tofay\(^{20}\) in the Čakova Sub-county (pp. 88—89) which can readily be identified with Alsóstamora, there is no name listed in the Čerin Sub-county which could be, at first sight, linked to Felsősztamora, yet the register does list the high number of seventy-four settlements in this relatively small area. From the above one may conclude first of all that Alsóstamora is to be considered not a recent but a medieval settlement. As to Felsősztamora, the lack of an I stam ur in the given area in the register seems to weigh rather heavily. However, there is an I stari-Čerin in the area which may be connected with the name Sztamora and, if so, could serve as additional proof for the location of Castrum Cseri in the break of the second Roman Vallum at the Poganis River.

4. Sugya

A settlement of the medieval Temes County, Csánki (op. cit., ii, p. 61) gives its name as Suggya, and Milleker (op. cit., p. 247) as Szugya. It was the seat of a districtus volahalis which, in 1454, consisted of fifteen settlements (Csánki, ibid.). Csánki holds that it might have been located in the Leukusest-area\(^{4}\), N of the Béga River, whereas Milleker identifies it with Szuszany\(^{2}\), S of the same river. In support of his identification Milleker mentions that in 1453 several kenézs from Szugya together with some kenézs from Boszur\(^{3}\) appeared in Zsupány\(^{4}\) as witnesses. Boszur, Zsupány, and Szuszány are undoubtedly neighbors and are undoubtedly located S of the Béga River, still, Milleker’s identification of Szugya (in his reading) with Szuszany is based solely on the similarity of the two names.

*  
In the Timișoara County (Timișoara livasti) of the Mufassal 579, with its various sub-counties, one finds several entries pertinent to the question:

\(^{18}\) Detta 24 XXIV.

\(^{19}\) Modern: Petromány, NW of Csák (Ótelek und Széphely 23 XXIV; Borovszky, op. cit., p. 89); ancient: Petre (Petri) (Borovszky, ibid.; Csánki, op. cit., ii, p. 57; Milleker, op. cit., p. 224).

\(^{20}\) Modern: Tofaj, SE of Széphely (Ótelek und Széphely 23 XXIV); ancient: Antalfája (Milleker, op. cit., p. 156; Csánki, op. cit., ii, p. 24).

\(^{1}\) Facet 22 XXVI.

\(^{2}\) Facet 22 XXVI.

\(^{3}\) Facet 22 XXVI.

\(^{4}\) Facet 22 XXVI.
a) In the Şuydiya Sub-county (Şuydiya nahiyesi):
1. On p. 268, as sub-county heading: “Nahiye-i Şuydiya. Der liva-i Timişvar”.
3. On pp. 268—271, under the heading “Nahiye-i Şuydiya. Der liva-i Timişvar” fifteen settlements (fourteen kariyes and one mezraa) are mentioned N of the Béga River, along the valleys of the Seliştea and the Kutina Brook.

b) In the Monoştor Sub-county (Monoştor nahiyesi), after Buna and before Zerneşti: “Kariye-i Şuydiya. Háli ez raiyye. Tábi-i mezbur” [i.e., Monoştor] (p. 218).

c) In the Iktar Sub-county (Iktar nahiyesi), after Klşova and before Şışamova: “Kariye-i Susam. Tábi-i m.” [i.e., Iktar] (p. 218).

Thus, the pertinent entries of the Mufassal 579 clearly refute Milleker’s identification of Szugya with Szuszany, S of the Béga River. First of all, according to the register, all settlements of the Şuydiya Sub-county were located N and not S of the river. It also is evident that Szugya cannot be identified with Szuszany, the Ottoman equivalent of which is Susam listed in the register in the easternmost section of the Iktar Sub-county, S of the Béga River.

Also, it is evident from the Mufassal 579 that Suggya was known as Şuydaya to the Ottomans and, accordingly, Csánki’s reading is to be considered the correct one. The only name in the Şuydiya Sub-county similar to Milleker’s Szugya reading would be Ober-Slu’d’a. Ober-Slu’d’a, however, never was the seat of any district. Furthermore, Şuydiya the settlement, which was once the seat of a districtus volahalis but even then small enough to be referred to only as village, by the time

---

5 Ancient: Ulicza (Milleker, op. cit., p. 254); according to the Mufassal 579 (pp. 270, and 271) its lands were a joint possession (müsa) with İkladağa (= modern: Kladova).
6 Modern: Kladova, S. of Ohaba-lunkha (Facet 22 XXVI); ancient: Kladova (Csánki, op. cit., ii, pp. 46, and 61: s.v., Suggya).
7 Unidentified.
8 Facet 22 XXVI.
9 Facet 22 XXVI.
10 N of Timişelu, consisting of the Bunya and Dubeşti valleys (Facet 22 XXVI).
11 Modern: Róman [sic] Bunya, S of Szegszárd Bunya (Facet 22 XXVI).
12 Modern: Cariste, NE of Monostor (Facet 22 XXVI).
13 Extending mostly S of the Béga River, covering the area from Szuszány to Hittyiás, with its western part reaching N of the river, covering the area between Sziklás and Sustra (Facet 22 XXVI; Lugos 23 XXVI; Temesrékas 22 XXV; Buziás 23 XXV).
14 Modern: Klcsóva (Klcsóva, Klcsó), W of Szuszány (Facet 22 XXVI; Csánki, op. cit., ii, p. 46; Milleker, op. cit., p. 200); ancient: Klcsóva (Csánki, ibid.; Milleker, ibid.).
15 Modern: Sziklás (Susanovecz), N of Kiszétő (Temesrékas 22 XXV; Borovszky, op. cit., p. 97); ancient: Sasánfalva (Seschenovac, Susanovec, Szászinfalva) (Csánki, op. cit., ii, pp. 60, and 88: s.v., Rádi; Borovszky, op. cit., p. 97; Milleker, op. cit., p. 240).
of the Ottomans must already have been a ghost-town. Consequently, in the Mufassal 579 it is mentioned only furtively as a deserted village, and even then not in the Šuyodya but in the Monoštor Sub-county neighboring it from the east. Though the listing in this case does not furnish fully conclusive evidence for it, it is my contention that Šuyodya = Sugya must have been located between Monoštor and Leuküsest, close to the border of the two nahiyes (Šuyodya and Monoštor).
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Temetberény, 147; see also Berény
Temesréd, 146
Temesujlak, 146; see also Éliásfalva, Magyaryllek,
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Tırgovişte, 143, 145—146
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