TRANSYLVANIAN REVIEW

History, Philosophy and Politics
(10th–21st Centuries)

Edited by

DANIELA MÂRZA • LIANA LĂPĂDATU

On the cover:
Densuş (Hunedoara county),
Orthodox church, 13th century, general view,
photo by Ştefan Socaciu

cst@acad-cluj.ro
www.centruldestudiitransilvane.ro

Contents

Matrimonial Behaviours
of the Transylvanian Romanian Rural Elite
(Second Half of the 19th Century)*

Daniela Deteşan

Romanian historiography paid special interest in the last decades to the marital strategies in the second half of the 19th century in Transylvania[1]. The parish registres and matrimonial documents made possible investigations about the way in which partners were chosen, how the moment of the marriage was chosen, the circumstances and the determinants in taking "the big decision." The most difficult to explain was the motivation, the individual choice of each of the two partners. In other words, *who marries whom*? This is the simplified form of the main question that this study intends to answer. Would "a rich person marry a rich person," and would "a poor person marry a poor person," thus complying with an unwritten law of marriage? How important is the social background in choosing a partner? What about age, place of origin, residence or geographic proximity of the bride and groom? Was marriage an honest act of expressing love or was it a financial affair, a way of transferring land and wealth? What was the role of the father in the decision of the son or daughter to marry?

The theoretical basis is the classical demarcation established in 1965 by John Hajnal,[2] from St. Petersburg to Trieste, dividing Europe into two regions with different levels of nuptiality, the West and the East. Hajnal's pattern of European marriages differentiated between two matrimonial regimes, two demographic structures, and two family systems. The Western European marriage pattern implied older ages upon first marriage both for women and men and many single individuals, both men and women, while in the East, the practice of marriage was universal and the age for marriage was very young.

Many studies already proved that partners were not chosen at random. A network of social relations underlied marriage. Couples were mainly based on the simi-

larity of the social statuses of the spouses. Marriage had social determinants and it was subordinated to the general family interests.[3] The indicators taken into account are: homogamy, endogamy, seasonality of marriage, age upon the first marriage, difference between the ages of the bride and groom as well as their economic status, parental control and the freedom of choice.

A wide range of variables: the process of courtship, the engagement or the "agreement upon marriage," the arrangements for the religious wedding, the establishing of the dowry, the three public notifications in church done on holidays or on Sundays, the confessions of the bride and groom, the parents' acceptance of the marriage, the exemptions for cases where impediments prevented marriage, and cases of re-marriage reveal the specifics of the Transylvanian area. Two regions in the "historic Transylvania," Alba and Năsăud, highly individualized through specific features, will be analyzed further on. Alba is the area of the Apuseni mountains, it is rich in gold mines, and a part of the Alba de Jos county, and of the Turda-Arieş county after 1876. A significant social category here was represented by the full mine owners or partial mine owners, the so-called "cuhe" (ROM.), in Abrud-Roşia, Zlatna, Brad, Bucium-Saşa.[4] Their rich status gave them a privileged position of the elite. Năsăud is the border area where the militaries imposed themselves due to their special status and they owned plots of land and big households. Due to the *Statutul grănicerec* ["Border regulations"] of 12 November 1766, issued during Mary Theresa's reign for all 44 military locations along Valea Rodnei, the area, mainly Greek-Catholic, with an Orthodox enclave along Valea Bârgaielor, developed rapidly due to privileges and fiscal exemptions granted to the military by the Austrian state. The descendants of the border military enjoyed social prestige and they had a specific mentality and a consciousness based on discipline, order, rigour, dilligence and a hard-working attitude. "The border military family" or the "household-based community" were phrases designating the ownership system in the border military regiments. In Banat, Transylvania, Croatia, Slavonia, Hungary, it meant that several generations, even from different families, whether related or not, would live together in the same household. All border military belonged to a household and they were registered as such in the registries of the military authority. They would work and use their fixed and non-fixed assets jointly. Each community was headed by the host (*pater familias*), helped by *mater familias*, who was not necessarily his wife but any old, hard-working women in the household[5]. This state of non-division provided, together with fragments of plots from outside the military jurisdiction, a mosaique of specific realities. All of them, with their unique morphology, ensure the continuity of the land.

This article searches for explanations about the way in which practices, customs, arrangements and rules of marital alliances in Transylvania evolved in the second half of the 19th century. We intend to decipher, analyze and compare matrimonial decisions, legislative laic and ecclesiastic norms as well as moral values and attitudes. All are reflected into the "sets of choices" taken at the moment of marriage.

We use sources from church archives: marriage contracts, lists of un-married youth, matrimonial contracts based on mutual agreement, dowry documents of brides and grooms, mutual agreements between brides and grooms, parish certificates that confirm the blessing of the marriages, certificates proving the three public notifications, demands to be granted exemptions and marriage exemptions, schemes of affinity or consanguinity, agreements of parents to the marriage of the engaged couple, divorce files. The high quality of these sources allows reconstruction of demographic characteristics such as: gender, age, civil status, religion, occupation, locality of origin and locality of residence of the bride and groom, value and composition of the dowry received upon marriage.

In Transylvania, there had been no civil marriage before 1894; given the religious nature of the matrimony, the church registered the agreement of the bride and groom. The fact was established also by the Austrian Civil Code, in art. 75 stipulating that the engaged couple was supposed to give their solemn consent to marriage in front of the priest. The consent of the parties appeared as registered in the so-called "mutual agreements" signed by the groom, the bride, their parents, the priest and 2 witnesses. Orthodox priests had the obligation, according to art. 16–20 in the regulations of bishop Andrei Şaguna, *Cunoştinţe folositoare despre trebile căsătoriilor* ["Useful knowledge about marriage-related matters"] (1854) to fill in forms of the mutual agreements. With the Greek-Catholic religion, the mutual agreement contract is mentioned by the synod that decided the taking of the post by bishop Ioan Lemeni in 1833. The arch-diocesan synod in Blaj that took place on 20–22 October 1869 expressed the same view. This kind of historic sources is well preserved in archives and some of them have been published already[6]. Here are some examples: Mihăilă Cucui, 21, a peasant, and Cornelia Dascălu, 19, also a peasant, both of them Greek-Catholics from Cetatea de Baltă, declared on the 7 May 1898 that "out of their own will and without any constraints, out of genuine love, they wanted to concluded their holy marriage[7]. Gavrilă Manta, 23, from Ilişua, and Anastasia Ripan, "a virgin" from the same village, when they concluded their marriage on 31 January 1856, declared that "without being forced by anyone, they wanted to get married"[8]. It was not by accident that "contracts" became major evidence in divorce trials. The ecclesiastic fora were supposed to establish whether the respective marriage had been concluded in a legitimate manner by complying with all regulations in force. If free agreement had been sincere or not, that was to be established; however, it was one requirement to conclude the marriage. The church cooperated with the state in such matters, especially to implement final decisions in divorce trials, to punish those found guilty or to regulate issues related to wealth and successions.

The practice of concluding mutual agreements was a custom in Transylvania and not only for people who married for the first time. Nicolae Negru and Ana Lica, peasants from Cetatea de Baltă, widower and widow respectively, both Greek-Catholics, declared on 21 January 1899, in a mutual agreement, that they wanted to conclude their second marriage "in peace and best harmony"[9]. Tecla Palagia, 45, a

widow for the second time, concluded on 30 October 1889, a third "mutual agreement" with Nicolae Salvan, 43, a widower, and Greek-Catholic from Nepos[10]. The free consent of the bride and groom given at the parish office would be registered in a protocol entitled *Protocolul bunelor învoiri*[11] ["Protocol of mutual agreement"] or *Protocolul contractelor matrimoniale de bună învoire*[12] ["Protocol of matrimonial mutual agreements"].

The starting point in this analysis is the datum according to which the marriage contract in the Romania territories was not used in the same way as in other parts of Europe. Although marriage was a "contractual arrangement" stipulating rights and obligations of the couple, Romanians did not have marriage contracts[13]. An explanation may be the fact that the contracts were concluded after the marriage, or that the couple had a precarious material condition and did not possess assets, like in the case of Catalonia[14].

The patrimonial relations between spouses, for Năsăud area, have been clearly established in the marriage contract. Pragmatic spirit, rational and objective motivations superseded feelings. The proof is in the 97 marriage contracts identified for the Greek-Catholic community in Ragla, 1864-1871 and 111 contracts for the Greek-Catholic parish in Zagra, 1859-1929. Although not so many, like for the French in Vernon region, where the marriage contract was a quasi-systemic practice after the adoption of the French Civil Code, they include information regarding the dowry of the bride and groom. For the area of the former border military regiment, 109 marriage contracts referring to the town of Năsăud have been already exploited[15].

The stages of the marriage, well established by the church precepts, had to be followed dutifully: the bride and groom would confess and be baptized, they would be taught about their Christian duties, their parents agreed upon their marriage[16], and upon the religious wedding, the bride and the groom would express their agreement by replying "I like it" to the question of the priest, the marriage was announced three times in the church in order to make it public so that whoever knew a reason for which the marriage should not have been concluded to find about the marriage and to inform. After the announcements, the priest issued a "certification of the announcements," the so-called "announcements booklet" or "announcements certification," confirmed in writing that there were no canonical, political or military impediments to the marriage and then issued a parish certification of blessing of the marriage[17].

It is difficult to establish which of the obligations of the bride and groomis is part of the myth and which is real, as they appear in the documents of those times. Theoretically, the list of their duties was long[18]. Since the time of vicar Ioan Marian (1835-1846), the groom was supposed to have a good moral behaviour, to prove he went to school and he could read and write, that he knew the prayers[19], that he planted and grafted 12 apple trees and 12 pear trees[20], that he was vaccinated against smallpox[21]. The priest in Măgura asked the Vicar's office in Rodna to give approval for the marriage of a young man, aged 32, to a young lady who was no longer vir-

gin, from Ilva Mare, a man who had made the three announcements, had made his confessions and he got baptised, and he knew the duties of a good Christian and the duties of married men, he went to the communal school and he had the required trees[22]. Who did not know the prayers, would pay 2 florins for the school and married only after[23]. In a rural poor world, this tax, together with other taxes (for the priest and proto-priest upon the religious wedding, and for exemptions) increased the number of couples who chose to live together outside marriage because of financial reasons. The costs incurred by marriage were rather high, if we take into account the money paid for the religious wedding (about 4 florins), for exemptions (about 5 florins), for the dowry and especially for the party organized for the wedding[24].

The consent of the parents, and in some areas, of the grandparents as well (in some Swiss cantons[25]), was needed. When there was no such consent, an exemption was given. The father of the young Teodor Strungariu did not want his son to marry his fiancee, Iona Galeşiu from Ilva Mare because they had had love relations for a long time and they already had a child born out of the wedlock. The priest asked for approval for this wedding against the will of the father who would make him unhappy, as he would be forced to marry another woman. Hence, a life in scandals would follow, and the groom, a man with a good behaviour, hard-working, with blonde hair, did not deserve that[26].

Provisions about the dowry of the bride and groom were expresssed by Andrei Şaguna, a metropolitan priest, in *Compendiul de drept canonic* ["Canonic law regulations"] (1868), the main regulations for the Orthodox church in Transylvania until the end of the 19th century. Rings were supposed to be exchanged and the dowry agreed upon by concluding dowry books, in order to validate the engagement. In case of annulling the marriage, the women would take back her dowry. The request was based on art. 89 in the law XXXI/1894 on the matrimonial law.

In the traditional Transylvanian society, marriage was the main way to transfer family assets from one generation to another. Possession of land was the main reason of marriages, whether forced or out of one's own will. Land was the main sign of wealth and power and the most precious asset of peasants. Peasants would work land day and night, would take care of it and "loved it as they loved their mother and father"[27]. A characteristic feature of Năsăud area was that the area of the land appeared expressed in "number of days of ploughing," in "carts full of hay or full of maize flour." In order to identify the plots of land, apart from their topographic number and their usual names *Între Văi* ["Between the Valleys"], *La Părul lui Drăgan* ["At Dragan's Pear Tree"], *În Vârful Runcului* ["On Runcu's Top"], *La Hotar* "(On the Borderline"], *În Vărtoape* ["In the Ravines"], *În Coasta Ursului* ["Near the Bear's Premises"], *În Vârful Măgurei* ["On Magura's Top"], *După Deal* ["Behind the Hill"], *În Dosul Sasului* ["Behind the Sasz's Hill"], *Pe Dealul Ursului* ["On the Bear's Hill"], *La Măgura Lupului* ["At the Wolf's Hill"], etc. the neighbours of the plot were indicated. The cartographic location of the plots in French notary documents specifies, like in Transylvania, the names of the neighbours[28].

In the second half of the 19th century, ownership of land was extremely fragmented not only in the district, but in the entire Transylvanian province. The Land Book documents reflected the number of plots of land owned, their denominations, the type of land (agricultural, pasture and garden, vignard, pasture, forest, covered with reed) and the taxable income. These realities are also reflected by matrimonial contracts and wills. The young Iosif Luca Dan, 25, from Zagra, took in possession from his parents 9 plots of land to use them[29]; the young Ion Dumitru Sima, 23, from the same village, took in possession 7 plots of land for ploughing and scything, with ownership rights and usufruct rights[30]; on 24 April 1887, the groom Gavril Zinveliu, a Greek-Catholic, 24, received as a dowry 14 plots of land while his bride received 6 plots of land[31].

The young Nastasia Florea Lupu, 23, from Zagra, apart from real estates: the house and the garden, and animals: a cow and a young bull (still not used to pull the plough) aged 2, and 2 piglets, received agricultural products as well, "10 *carfe* of maize, 5 *mierțe* of rice [122.5 kilos of rice], 10 *cupe* of hemp seeds [over 100 kilos of hemp seeds], a haystock of two carts, 1 *mierță* of corn straws [22.5 kilos of corn straws]"[32]. The peasant's transportation vehicles: "a cart, fully equipped," "a cart with harness," beehives and sometimes, money, completed the list of assets received upon marriage ["Trifilina brought into marriage, from Sângeorgiu, 67 florins, 2 cows, 1 young cow, 10 sheep and goats"[33]; Andrei Pavel Olaru from Mocod received from his parents, in addition to 4 plots of land, the amount of 49.80 florins.][34]

While in the provinces of Moldova and Muntenia, dowries were exorbitant and ruined families[35], in Transylvania dowries had average values. In the sample studied, the minimal value of the dowry was about 54 fl., while the maximal dowry was 695 fl., which results into an average of 486 fl. There were cases where certain provisions in a will completed the dowry. For instance, Ioan Pop, 53, a widower from Poieni, attached to his marriage contract concluded on 17 June 1886 with Senia Sârdea Drăgan, 52, a widow, an annex in which he stipulated that he would leave his wealth to his wife after his death and to his wife's relatives after the death of his wife[36].

To note the huge number of cases of re-marriage (19.5%) due to the death of a partner, not to divorce. The same pattern appears in the case of the village of Cuzdrioara (21.1%)[37]. The explanations of re- marriage are simple, they are caused by economic reasons to complete or to increase wealth. Nicolae Salvan, 43, a widower from Nepos, thought of marrying Tecla Palagia, 45, a widow, to complete his wealth because he had spent his assets to look after his first wife, deceased 2 years before because of a long disease[38]. Children rearing and children's education was also a justification, as peasants' families had many children. The agreement concluded between Nechifor Mititean, a widower, and Safta Strutean, a widow, who had 2 minor children and an older daughter, aged 12, stipulated that the man would undertake, in front of God and of the witnesses to the wedding, to look after all children of the family, his and the woman's, and "to make them good citizens"[39].

The pattern of the marriage arranged by parents can be found in all divorce files registered with the Matrimonial Court. Phrases like: "I concluded this marriage because I was afraid of my parents and I was forced into, and not out of true love," "my life after marriage was like in a prison," are often found, as a theme of the files. It was the same case in Norway, where, until the end of the 19th century, parents had a significant control over their children's marital choices[40]. On 12 June 1857, Maria Macu, a Greek Catholic from Gherdeal, requested divorce from her husband, George Pascu, because: "my mother made me marry him, using force and beating me with a stick, for his wealth and assets"[41].

The decision to choose one's partner was sustained in some cases by objective motivations related to the actual life conditions. Ioan Buburuzanu from Ilva Mare was living with his mother and two sisters, sick and unable to work, one of which lacked a leg. Under these circumstances, he had to marry since he needed a woman to do the housework and look after him and after the other women in the household[42].

In some other cases, marriage was based on an agreement resulted from a compromise of both parties. Women with stained reputation or very poor men would accept a convenience marriage that would inevitably end with a divorce. Iustina Demian, a peasant from Corneşti, requested, on 9 March 1893, to the Matrimonial Greek-Catholic Forum of First Trial in Târnăveni to be divorced from her husband after 7 years of marriage for the reason of "moral and physical averssion." The preliminary investigation to gather evidence for the trial revealed that the woman had not married Mihăilă Demian for love and out of her own will. "I never liked him, I do not like him and I shall never like him, even if I or he shall live 100 years more; when I see him, I become dizzy and feel I am going to faint. My father, Simion Opriţa, made me marry him, saying he was good-looking, blonde-haired, and his parents were good people, they were not bad or dangerous, and he said it was not a problem they were poor since we had enough wealth, and that the most important was to have harmonious marriage. When he made me go to the priest and change my religion into Greek-Catholic, he gave me and my Mum a good beating! Four weeks after the wedding I went to my parents to give birth to the child I had with another man. My husband came to see me and my father asked him not to leave me because he would receive some assets if he didn't. My husband said he would forgive me and he would never mention or reproach with my mistake and my sin, and he told me I could go back home after I get well. However, even after my child died, I didn't want to return to my husband's house but my father, after I recovered, sent me back to my husband. I did not have a nice life with my husband, it was very painful and difficult!"[43].

The critical spirit, irony and humour regarding matrimonial strategies were present in the Trasylvanian society. The satirical magazine "Gura satului" ["The gossiping village"] reflected marital faithfulness in the poem *Soţia fidelă* ["Faithfull wife"]:

Pe Ion tirana moarte / Din petreceri l-a eschis / Şi curănd, trăgând la moarte / Nevestei sale i-a zis: / De vrei ca eu după moarte / Să am odihnă în pământ / Te rog, mai întâi de toate / Să-mi depui un jurământ: / Că lui Tănase nu-i vei da măna / Căci cu el am trăit ău, / Şi prin asta mă năzbună, / Nu-l primi de soţ al tău! / Jur, că n-oi da a mea mănă / Lui Tănase cel lenios, / Căci mai mult de-o săptămână / I-am promis altui frumos![44].

[The cruel death John was drawing / From his parties and revelling / So he wanted a thing to clarify / With his wife, before he died: / If you want me to rest in peace / In the tomb after I leave / Above all, please / Fulfil my following wish: / Tănase never ever marry / Because he has been mean to me, / And I will thus take my revenge, / Please, make this pledge! / For sure I shall not grant / To the lazybones Tănase my hand/ As for more than a week if not more/ I have promised it to another suitor!].

Although the minimal age for marriage in Transylvania was 18 for girls and 22 for boys, they could marry at 15[45] or 16 with exemptions (the case of the bride Raveca Petre Vlaicu from Gledin, who wanted to marry a young man aged 23, Dumitru Onigaşu from Gledin[46]). The oldest bride found in documents was a widow aged 67 from Ilva Mare.

In terms of distribution by seasons, higher frequency has been found in winter, especially in February (25.6%) and November (22.4%). This pattern is typical not only for the sample chosen but for Transylvania in general.

The principle "the poor will marry the poor and the rich will marry the rich" operated. George Pop, a young man, single, aged 22, married Todoria Pop, a virgin, aged 25, both from Nepos, because neither the groom, since he was poor, could not marry a better woman, nor the bride could hope for the better[47].

In the area we have studied, we came across families that were more or less related. For instance, in Ilva Mare, most inhabitants were in relations of consanguinity or affinity[48]. Consequently, the marital market was limited; they were forced to marry among themselves which explains the huge number of exemptions requested for consanguinity of 3rd degree, of 6th degree (2nd degree cousins), of 7th degree. To note that the inhabitants of Ilva Mare did not learn to marry people from other villages[49]. Neither did the gipsies from Ilva Mare[50].

The spiritual relations created through godfather-godmother relations were present and covered areas larger than those stipulated by church canons. On 31 September 1863, the proto-priest Ioan Anderco-Homorodanu gave exemption for the 2nd degree spiritual or soul relations[51]. In many communities, the so-called "collective godfather" existed and he baptized almost the entire village, being a symbol of property, prestige and social function[52].

Other reasons for which exemptions were given: during the mourning period for the bride, requested to the Arch-bishop's Office by the priest from Monor, Petru Tanco[53], an exemption from the 2nd and 3rd announcement because the time of the

fast was approaching; for the 2nd degree afinity: the brother of the bride had a child born out of the wedlock with the sister of the groom, and because the bride and the groom (Luca Boca, 22, and Anghilina Borza, 23, both Greek-Catholic) were not responsible for their brothers' sin, they requested to be granted exemption for their marriage; also, since they were poor, they requested exemption from the 2 florins tax; the reply of the vicar Grigore Moisil of 25 July 1884 was that they had to submit a special request to the Diocesian bishop to ask for exemption from the Apostolic chair so that the matrimony be legitimate; although the impediment was caused by third parties (relatives of the bride and groom) it was an obstacle for them which could be removed only by legal means[54]. Marin Rusu, a widower, annulled his engagement with Ana Burduhasu from Rebrişoara out of personal reasons and he received an exemption for marriage and got engaged with Firona Galeşiu, a widow from Ilva Mare. In this case, there was still an impediment of a 3rd degree affinity because the first husband of the bride ws a brother of the late wife of the groom, and a 2 florins tax had to be paid for the exemption[55]. The young Ion Urechea wanted to marry Elena Cantaroie, a virgin, both from Ilva Mare, but the groom had a child "born out of the wedlock" with Palagia Condale, a servant from Maieru, who prevented him from getting married before he would pay one-and-a-half-year allowance for the child[56].

In the case of the military, apart from enforcing the canonic regulations, the approval of military top officers was needed. The marriage contract, under the form of a protocol, was written according to the Order of the Regiment of 29 October 1844 no 1692. A certificate from the priest, the Mayor or the elderly of the village certifying that the respective person had a good moral behaviour and was able to support his family and also showing what his/her wealth was.

The marriage of orphans was concluded with the approval of the parent still alive and with the approval of the co-tutor, and then the marriage licence was issued by the Pretorial Court[57]. Ioana Turbatu, an orphan, received from the Pretorial Court in Şieu her marriage licence to marry Nicolae Euthim from Monor[58]. According to paragraph 147 point 2 in art. XX in 1877, the marriage of the orphan Varvara Simion Ruscu with the young man Avacom from Ilva Mare was allowed and the wedding booklet was issued by the Court for Orphans' issues[59].

A surprising, dynamic, permanently adapting universe reveals itself within the family cell. The Transylvanian family in the modern times, based on logics and basic principles that were much different from the current ones, had a wide ranges of variables: indissoluble attachment to the land, excessive fragmentation of the property, the dowry, the practice of transfer between generations from ascendents and descendents, similarity between social statuses, a pattern of precocious marriages, distribution of marriages according to seasons with higher numbers in winter, huge number of re-marriages due to the death of a partner, not to divorce. All this shows once again the well defined mechanisms operating at social level, family level and psychic level. ❑

Notes

1. Sorina Paula Bolovan, *Familia în satul românesc din Transilvania*, Cluj-Napoca, 1999; Simion Retegan, "Strategies of marriage in the Romanian rural society from Transylvania in the middle of the 19-th century," in *Transylvanian Review*, XVIII, 1, 2009, p. 185-194; Claudia Septimia Peteanu, "Protocolul căsătoriţilor din comunitatea Năsăud în a doua jumătate a secolului al XIX-lea," în *Arhiva Someşană*, IV, 2005, p. 211-245; Ioan Bolovan, Sorina Bolovan, "From tradition to modernisation. The Romanian family in Transylvania in the modern era (1850-1918)," in *Transylvanian Review*, XVIII, no 1/2009, p. 147-159; Claudia Septimia Peteanu, "Setting the dowry in the land of Năsăud in the second half of the 19-th century," in *Romanian Journal of Population Studies*, II, no 2/2008, p. 61-71.

2. John Hajnal, "European marriage pattern in historical perspective," in D. V. Glass, D. E. C. Eversley, (eds.) *Population in History*, Arnold, Londres, 1965; *Ibidem*, "Two kinds of preindustrial household formation system," in *Population and Development Review*, London, 1982, VIII, 3, p. 449-494.

3. Göran Therborn, *Between sex and power. Family in the world, 1900–2000*, London and New York, 2004; Jean-Pierre Pélissier, Daniele Rébaudo, Marco van Leeuwen, Inke Maas, "Migration and endogamy according to social class: France, 1803–1986," in *International Review of Social History*, 2005, 50, p. 219–246; Jan Kok, Kees Mandemakers, "Free choise from a limited supply. The marriage market in two Dutch provinces, 1840–1940, in *Romanian Journal of Population Studies*, 2008, 1, p. 82–104; Marco Breschi, Matteo Manfredini, Alesio Fornasin, "Remarriage in a pre-transitional Italian community," in *Continuity and change*, 2007, 22, 3, pp. 407–428; Christer Lundh, "Remarriage, gender and social class: a longitudinal study of remarriage in southern Sweden, 1766–1894," in *Continuity and Change*, 2007, 22, 3, p. 373–406.

4. For instance, the mine "Concordia-Rodenpoch" consisted of 25 parts of mine out of which a part was the property of the Greek-Catholic church of Bucium-Şaşa, while the others belonged to an owner from Abrud, Boer Béla, and to the "Fortuna" company inc. See the National Archives, Alba county directorate (herein abbreviated as ANDJAB) *Parohia greco-catolică Bucium-Şaşa*, 2/1897, f. 3.

5. Marlen Negrescu, "Desfiinţarea instituţiei comunionului pe teritoriul fostei graniţe militare bănăţene" in *Analele Banatului* XV, 2007, p. 177–185; Carmen Albert, "Family models in Banat (19th – 20th century)," in *Families in Europe between the 19st and 21st centuries. From the traditional model to the contemporary PACS*, eds. Antoinette Fauve-Chamoux, Ioan Bolovan. Cluj-Napoca, 2009, p. 211–228.

6. See doc. 11, 14, 15, 22 from the volume *Ciclul vieţii familiale la românii din Transilvania în a doua jumătate a secolului al XIX-lea*, eds. I. Bolovan, D. Covaci, D. Deteşan, M. Eppel, E. C. Holom, Cluj-Napoca, 2009.

7. ANDJAB, Fond *Parohia greco-catolică Cetatea de Baltă*, reference number 1/1898, f. 69.

8. National Archives, Bistriţa-Năsăud county directorate (herein abbreviated ANDJBN), *Oficiul parohial greco-catolic Ilişua, 1852-1894*, reference number 27, f. 5-6.

9. ANDJAB, Fond *Parohia greco-catolică Cetatea de Baltă*, reference number 1/1899, f. 94.

10. ANDJBN, Fond *Oficiul parohial greco-catolic Nepos, 1879-1910*, reference number 25, f. 5-6.

11. ANDJAB, *Protocolul bunelor învoiri din parohia Idicel*, reference number 65.

12. ANDJBN, *Protocolul contractelor matrimoniale de bună învoire* of Zagra Greek-Catholic parish (since 30 October 1884 until 24 May 1901), reference number 47.

13. Constanţa Vintilă-Ghiţulescu, "Marriage without contracts in Romanian society (18-th and 19-th centuries)" in *Romanian Journal of Population Studies*, 2008, vol. II, no. 1, p. 5.

14. Julie Marfany, "Choices and constraints: marriage and inheritance in eighteenth and early nineteenth century Catalonia" in *Continuity and Change*, 2006, 21, 1, p. 77.

15. For Năsăud area, 109 marriage contracts have been published, and they include also the dowry of the groom and bride. See Claudia Peteanu, "Protocolul căsătoriţilor," p. 211-245.

16. ANDJBN, *Oficiul parohial greco-catolic Gledin, 1857-1864*, reference number 33, f. 3, 20.

17. *Ibidem*, f. 169.

18. ANDJBN, *Colecţia Iulian Marţian*, reference number 32, f. 53-54. See also Ciprian Ghişa, "Problemele matrimoniale în practica bisericii greco-catolice din Transilvania, 1830-1850," in *Studia Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai, Theologia Catholica*, LIII, 2008, no. 1.

19. ANDJBN, Fond *Oficiul parohial greco-catolic Gledin*, f. 53.

20. ANDJBN, Fond *Colecţia Iulian …*, f. 53.

21. ANDJBN, Fond *Oficiul parohial greco-catolic Gledin*, f. 129.

22. ANDJBN, Fond *Oficiul parohial greco-catolic Ilva Mare, 1865-1884*, reference number 27, f. 153.

23. ANDJBN, Fond *Oficiul parohial greco-catolic Gledin*, f. 21.

24. D. Deteşan, S. Retegan, "Sub focul încrucişat al bisericii şi statului: Concubinajul la românii din Transilvania între 1850-1900," in vol. *În căutarea fericirii. Viaţa familială în spaţiul românesc în sec. XVIII-XX*, coord. I. Bolovan, D. Covaci, D. Deteşan, M. Eppel, E. C. Holom, Cluj-Napoca, 2010, p. 86.

25. Anne-Lise Head-König, "Forced marriages and forbidden marriages in Switzerland: state control of The formation of marriage in catholic and protestant cantons in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries," in *Continuity and Change*, 8, 3, 1993, p. 452.

26. ANDJBN, Fond *Oficiul parohial Ilva Mare*, f. 198.

27. George Bariţiu, "Românii transilvani, ca proprietari de pământ," in *Gazeta Transilvaniei*, XXIV, 1861, no. 95, p. 395.

28. Fabrice Boudjaba, *Des paysans attachés à la terre? Familles, marchés et patrimoines dans la région de Vernon (1750–1830)*, Paris, 2008, p. 297.

29. ANDJBN, Fond *Protocolul contractelor matrimoniale de bună învoire din parohia greco-catolică Zagra*, (în continuare Fond *Protocolul contractelor …*) reference number 47, f. 14.

30. *Ibidem*, f. 38.

31. *Ibidem*, f. 47-48.

32. *Ibidem*, f. 33.

33. ANDJBN, Fond *Sedria Generală a districtului Năsăud*, reference number XCI/84, f. 1.

34. ANDJBN, Fond *Protocolul contractelor …*, f. 31.

35. *Transilvania*, VI, 1873, no. 7, p. 77-78.

36. ANDJBN, Fond *Protocolul contractelor …*, f. 29.

37. Simion Retegan, *Drumul greu al modernizării. Un veac din istoria unui sat ardelean: Cuzdrioara, 1820-1920*, Cluj-Napoca, 2011.

38. ANDJBN, Fond *Oficiul parohial greco-catolic Nepos, 1879-1910*, reference number 25, f. 5-6.

39. ANDJBN, Fond *Oficiul parohial greco-catolic Luşca, 1857-1930*, reference number 15, f. 38.

40. Hans Henrik Bull, "Deciding whom to marry in a rural two-class society: Social homogamy and constraints in The marriage market in Rendalen, Norway, 1750-1900," in *International Review of Social History*, 50, 2005, p.46.

41. ANDJAB, Fond *Mitropolia Română Unită Blaj, Tribunalul de a II-a instanţă,* reference number 83/1860, f. 31.
42. ANDJBN, Fond *Oficiul parohial greco-catolic Ilva Mare,* f. 115.
43. ANDJAB, Fond *Parohia greco-catolică Cetatea de Baltă*, reference number 1/1893, f. 40-41.
44. *Gura satului*, Pesta, VII, 1869, no. 16, p. 63.
45. ANDJBN, Fond *Oficiul parohial greco-catolic Ilva Mare,* f. 42.
46. ANDJBN, Fond *Oficiul parohial greco-catolic Gledin*, f. 133.
47. ANDJBN, Fond *Oficiul parohial greco-catolic Nepos,* f. 1.
48. ANDJBN, Fond *Oficiul parohial greco-catolic Ilva Mare,* f. 122.
49. *Ibidem*, f. 19.
50. *Ibidem*, f. 82.
51. ANDJBN, Fond *Oficiul parohial greco-catolic Gledin,*f. 166.
52. Daniela Deteşan, "Reconstituirea evoluţiei demografice şi a sistemului de înrudire spiri-tuală în satul Filea de Sus (jud. Cluj) între 1848–1932," in *Populaţie şi societate. Studii de demografie istorică a Transilvaniei*, coords. I. Bolovan, C. Pădurean, Cluj-Napoca, 2003, p. 172–198; Crinela Holom, *Evoluţia demografică şi problema familiei în actualul judeţ Alba (1850–1910)*, doctoral thesis, Cluj-Napoca, 2009, p. 216.
53. ANDJBN, Fond *Oficiul parohial greco-catolic Gledin*, f. 88.
54 ANDJBN, Fond *Oficiul parohial Ilva Mare,* f. 206.
55. *Ibidem*, f. 217.
56. *Ibidem*, f. 227.
57. ANDJBN, Fond *Oficiul parohial greco-catolic Gledin*, f. 50.
58. *Ibidem*, f. 42.
59. ANDJBN, Fond *Oficiul parohial Ilva Mare,* f. 169.

Abstract
Matrimonial Behaviours of the Transylvanian Romanian Rural Elite
(Second Half of the 19th Century)

The article analyzes the matrimonial strategies of the Transylvanian Romanian rural elite in the second half of the 19th century. Based on unique historical sources, the analysis reveals various matrimonial behaviours and suggests explanatory models. The Transylvanian family of the modern epoch was based on logics and basic principles that were different from the current ones and operated on the following variables: indissoluble attachment to their land, excessive fragmentation of the property, the dowry, the transfer of assets from ascendants to descendants, similarity of social statuses, pattern of precocious marriages, a distribution of marriages according to the seasons, with more marriages concluded in winter, a high number of remarriage cases due to the death of one spouse, not to divorce. The variables used refer to a set of matters focused on the socio-economic statute, on age, religion, gender, civil status, occupation, locality of origin and locality of residence of the spouses, on the value and composition of the dowry received upon marriage.

Key words

matrimonial strategies, marriage contract, dowry, rural elite, Transylvania.