

FORESTRY LEGISLATION AND ITS CONSEQUENCES IN TRANSYLVANIA BETWEEN 1753 AND 1867

Dorin-Ioan RUS*

Abstract. *In the pre-industrial era, wood (timber) was the most important energy source and building material. In the eighteenth century, various parts of Europe, including the Habsburg province of Transylvania, witnessed a wood crisis. It prompted the authorities to introduce measures against the abuse of forests, and to regulate access to them. In Transylvania, the measures introduced by governor Seeberg, followed by the 1781 Forestry Ordinance, caused conflicts between peasants, nobles, townsfolk, soldiers and the mining administration. Some of the bitterest conflicts over wood, such as those in the mining area of Rodna, occurred in the militarised zone of the province.*

Keywords: *forestry, Transylvania, wood, resources, environment.*

This study deals with the consequences of the forestry legislation on the population and industry in Transylvania, in the context of the measures introduced by the central and local authorities in order to put an end to the wood crisis and the devastation of forested areas in the eighteenth century. Forests played a central role in the economy as wood was the main energy source in the mining sector and in small industries, while timber was extensively used for building purposes. In addition, non-timber forest products met many household needs as they represented a welcome source of food not only for people, but also for their livestock, especially during years of economic downturn caused by climate change. The agricultural activities carried out in and around forests, such as livestock grazing, were also a source of revenue for the textile and food industries. Their expansion occurred at the expense of forests, which prompted the regulation of cattle and goat grazing activities due to the deterioration of new plantations, which in turn generated conflicts between peasants and the nobles, who were intent on preserving wooded areas due to hunting interests. Furthermore, the forest and its valuable resources were also at the heart of conflicts between the soldiers of border-guard regiments and the nobility due to the aforementioned motives, but also between these groups and the central Habsburg authorities, who were interested in exploiting forests for mining purposes.

Therefore, the forestry legislation had to balance the interests of the various social and government actors in order to prevent conflicts. In addition, it aimed to restrict access to wood and to sheep and goat grazing

* University of Graz, Austria; e-mail: dorin-ioan.rus@gmx.at.

on the new plantations, and to clearly outline what categories of wood were allowed to be used. Thus, like elsewhere in Europe, oak timber had a special status, being heavily used in public utility constructions (bridges, roofs, etc.), in the building of vessels for salt transportation, and in the mining sector. However, it was also abusively used by the population as firewood. On the other hand, softwoods such as fir and spruce were used as firewood in households (their primary role), tool manufacturing and in various construction works. After 1783, however, in the context of the timber crisis, they started to be used in the building of vessels for salt transportation on the River Mureş.

State of the art

This aspect of economic history was quite underrepresented in the Romanian historiography. In 1975, the historian Constantin Giurescu published the book *Istoria pădurilor româneşti din cele mai vechi timpuri până astăzi*¹ [The History of Romanian Forests from the Oldest Times until the Present] which provides a general view of how the exploitation of forests evolved mainly in the extra-Carpathian areas. It also includes useful information on Transylvania, together with methodological suggestions for future research.

Another relevant study is Rudolf Rösler's *Zur Forstgeschichte Rumäniens. Ein zusammenfassender Überblick*, published in *News of Forest History*.² It provides a historical overview of the forests in Transylvania and Romania as well as a description of the forestry legislation in eighteenth-century Transylvania. In addition, mention should be made of István Csucsujá's book, *Istoria pădurilor din Transilvania (1848–1918)* [The History of Forests in Transylvania, 1848–1918].³ The introductory study provides valuable information on forests in eighteenth-century Transylvania. Other less important books, such as Eduard Zamminer's *Geschichte des Waldwesens der königlichen Stadt Kronstadt*⁴ and Johann Binder's *Geschichte des Waldwesens der Stadt Hermannsstadt*,⁵ only superficially touch on the history of forests in the eighteenth century because of either insufficient archival research or emphasis on agrarian history. This is also the case with Georg Adolf Schuller's book, *Aus der Vergangenheit der siebenbürgisch-sächsischen Landwirtschaft*.⁶

¹ Giurescu 1976.

² Rösler 1999.

³ Csucsujá 1998.

⁴ Zamminer 1891.

⁵ Binder 1909.

⁶ Schuller 1895.

The topic of the research: conflicts over the forest as a natural raw material

Natural raw materials can carry different cultural, social, economic, and environmental meanings which are sometimes in conflict with each other. In general, these conflicts emerge because of opposing interests regarding the access to and use of raw materials. They are open and sometimes even violent, mainly in times of upheaval. They are especially interesting from the perspective of environmental history, but at the same time they represent key points in the research of the evolution of the relationship between man and the ecosystem.⁷

A focal point in the history of forests is their manifold use. In the period under analysis, wood was the source of many conflicts.

Forests and their ecosystems in the eighteenth century

Hardwoods were used in mining (iron ore and salt extraction), while both hardwoods and softwoods were used in charcoal burning. Certain types of hardwood were used in glass works, iron works and salt pits. Mention should also be made of the most important secondary uses of forests: *pastures, brushwood, complementary agriculture, and the use of forest products.*

Background of the conflicts: the eighteenth-century wood (timber) crisis

In the eighteenth century, Central Europe's resources were overused, which led to a change in attitude towards forests, and to better management of wood as a raw material and for industrial purposes. Therefore, the forest was rediscovered as new important attributes were assigned to it. In this context, most forestry regulations, surveys and travel reports in Central and Western Europe mention not only the devastation of woodlands but also the extant and prognosticated decline of forest resources.⁸ Literary works and non-forestry documents from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries describe the same situation regarding forests and the populations depending on them from an interesting non-forestry perspective.

At the time, Transylvania included the Szekler Land (*Terra Siculorum*) which was very rich in forests, as well as the mostly Saxon-inhabited Royal Domain (*Fundus Regius*). They were not subject to any master.⁹ In 1773, Baron Martin von Seeberg issued an ordinance pertaining to the territory of the Saxon *natio*, which included provisions on timber harvesting,

⁷ Bellow, Breit 1998, p. 31–57.

⁸ See the report of Reichenstein von Müller (Müller 1789, p. 68–69).

⁹ Köpeczi, Barta 1990, p. 227–228.

forestation, forest preservation, etc.¹⁰

For Transylvania, the transition from the seventeenth to the eighteenth century meant its transition from one epoch to another: externally, the end of the Ottoman influence and the beginning of the Habsburg influence, and internally, the transition from the feudal state to the modern form of absolutism.

Technical progress in the mining sector also prompted a strong current of opinion in favour of forest conservation. The introduction of blast furnaces for smelting ores led to a reduction in wood consumption. As a result, more forested areas were conserved as less wood was harvested to meet the needs of melting plants. This factor, together with the officials' continuous efforts to ensure that the necessary wood was available to the industry, led to the creation of a specialist corps tasked with forest preservation and conservation. Thus, on 13 September 1748, Empress Maria Theresa issued an ordinance that created the position of chief forester for the mining domains in Zlatna.¹¹

Maria Theresa's instructions clearly outlined the position of the forestry service within the administration of mines. However, the forestry service was subordinated to the local mines and the main task of the forestry services was limited only to ensuring the supply of wood to the plants and warehouse in Zlatna, which indicates that these measures essentially targeted the satisfaction of the mines' needs. Therefore, the issue of forest conservation was subordinated to industrial imperatives.

However, despite all this, progress was made toward imposing a more evolved forestry regime by envisioning a series of measures regarding forest preservation and conservation and by establishing forms of forest management able to meet the mining industry's constant demands for wood and timber.

The 1748 instruction forbade timber harvesting in mountain forests, and clear-cutting undertaken in order to turn forested areas into plots for houses, gardens or agriculture. Large forested areas were targeted by this piece of legislation, thus generally limiting the use of wood. Furthermore, firewood was to be allotted, but from distant places with bad-quality wood. Timber for construction, trade or the crafts could be obtained only based on an authorisation, and by paying taxes. The cutting of twigs for fences or enclosures was forbidden, and punishments for forest-related infractions were introduced.

Given the growth and expansion of the population, restrictions targeting deforestation and the use of wood seriously harmed the interests

¹⁰ Rösler 1999, p. 15–16.

¹¹ Wollmann 1999, p. 45.

of peasants in the fiscal domains, thus increasing the possibility of social unrest. This generated disputes between the Transylvania *Gubernium* and the Viennese Aulic Chancellery over the implementation of the forestry ordinance. The *Gubernium* was in favour of stronger restrictive measures, while the Chancellery considered that clear-cutting should be banned completely, especially in cases where a forest was populated. It also deemed wood harvesting allowable in areas where it led to the increase of the domain's revenues. However, wood harvesting had to be subordinated to the interests of mines and foundries. At the same time, it proposed that wood harvesting should be conducted exclusively with permission from the domain and in specially designated areas.¹²

The first forestry ordinance

Transylvanian and Hungarian forestry found an important ally in the military administration and the War Council in Vienna. In 1754, the Hungarian government issued a forestry ordinance for the entirety of Hungary.

One should mention that the measurement and mapping of forested areas was ordered as early as the reign of Maria Theresa (1740–1780). The implementation of these measures is known to us only from the documents pertaining to the forests owned by the city of Braşov because, unfortunately, the rest of the documents, together with the maps, were lost at the beginning of the nineteenth century.¹³

Until the mid-nineteenth century we do not have data on the extent of Transylvania's forest patrimony, and we have even less data on wood types and the general state of the forests. We only encounter the often-repeated general remark that a significant area of Transylvania is covered in uninterrupted forests.¹⁴

Ownership relations played a significant role in the evolution of the forest economy. In Transylvania, the public ownership of forests was very viable.¹⁵ The awareness of the right to use forests freely was very strong among the inhabitants of the Apuseni Mountains (Western Carpathians), being rooted in a centuries-old practice. The free use of pastures and forests ensured that wood was provided for handicraft, household firewood, and nourishment for the inhabitants of this mountainous region and their livestock. As for certain staple foods, they procured them from the surrounding agricultural regions, especially through the trade of woodcraft

¹² Giurescu 1976, p. 89–90.

¹³ Zaminer 1891, p. 89–115.

¹⁴ Müller 1961, p. 32–33.

¹⁵ Rieser 1989, p. 64–70.

products. On the other hand, forests were an obstacle to the expansion of settlements situated in the foothills of mountains. Moreover, the creation of new agricultural lands could be achieved only at the expense of forests, through massive and intense deforestation.

The forest economy in fiscal domains was tightly connected to local mining and furnaces. This regime was instituted in the first decades of the eighteenth century during the domination of mercantile policies, and remained in force until 1858 when the Austrian law of 1852 was extended over Transylvania. Here, mercantilism manifested itself in the form typical of cameralism. According to this economic policy, the main source of riches and income is the exploitation of precious metals, and their maintenance in internal circulation. In their preoccupation with the capitalisation of mining resources, which required vast quantities of fuel and timber especially for shaft timbering, the authorities were compelled to pay greater attention to forestry.¹⁶

Forests located around mines, called “mountain mines” in the documents of the time, were exploited regardless of the nature of their property, almost exclusively with the aim to meet the needs of this sector, and peasants living in the environs of these mines were required to harvest and transport the timber needed at the furnaces.

The repeated destruction of forests prompted the authorities to become more cautious and regulate the exploitation of forests around mines by issuing an ordinance on the appointment of forest guards. The number and importance of the functions fulfilled by these guards increased over time to such an extent that they were given complete independence within the hierarchy of the mine administrations.

Forestry and mercantilism

For eighteenth-century mercantilism, agriculture and forestry were at the basis of industry and crafts. In 1762, the Hungarian government put forward a program that was well suited in this respect: the improvement of agriculture, the regulation of forestry and so forth.¹⁷

In the second half of the eighteenth century, Transylvanian forestry reached a satisfactory level. The notes of Emperor Joseph II (1780–1790) from the time of his visit to Transylvania describe the state of neglect which characterised forests in the Grand Principality.¹⁸ Almost all mountains were covered in forests, but were unexploited due to the poor state of the roads.

¹⁶ Wollmann 1999, p. 46.

¹⁷ Schmidt 1835, p. 586–593.

¹⁸ ANAV, Acts of the State Council, Baron Auersperg, *Anmerkungen*, 1773/1806, fasc. I, fol. 224, 486.

Therefore, there were places, such as Sibiu, which were affected by a wood crisis. For the transportation of wood to Hungary, the Rivers Mureş [Muresch] and Someş [Somesch] could be used. Governor Count Auersperg (1771–1774) proposed the appointment of Baron von Hohenegg from Niederösterreich as director of forests in Transylvania.¹⁹

An instruction issued by Maria Theresa in 1769 limited the rights of serfs to only dry wood, and wood (hardwoods and softwoods) torn down by the wind. All the wood the peasant harvested, except that for personal needs (firewood and timber for the household), could be obtained only with permission from the owner and was subject to taxation.²⁰ Acorn gathering and any exploitation of the so-called “reserve” forests was also subject to taxation.

An instruction from 1775, issued by Francisc Kibling von Löwenfeld, stipulated the recruitment of forest guards whose task was to confiscate goats that destroyed the forest. The same piece of legislation prohibited the cutting of trees for trading or home use, except for the gathering of branches blown down by the wind. It also prohibited the cutting of logs at sawmills or mills.²¹

The Josephine Forestry Act of 1781

An important place in the development of forestry in Transylvania is held by the Josephine Forestry Act of 30 May 1781, whose provisions on the exploitation, preservation and maintenance of forests were very progressive for the age. Moreover, this act served as basis for the development of forestry. In 1784, based on this major piece of legislation, the city of Braşov issued a forest ordinance elaborated by the Senator Petrus Traugott Clompe (1751–1798). It divided forests into those where access was “denied” [*verboten*] and those where it was “allowed” [*erlaubt*], regulated their use (cleanings, fallen wood, etc.), timber harvesting periods and night transport, prohibited the arbitrary creation of forest roads, etc.²² Later pieces of legislation, such as Law XXX/1791 and Law XXIV/1811, include other important provisions to limit the devastation of forests, to conserve them,

¹⁹ He drew up a plan to improve forestry in Transylvania, which divided forests into three types: (1) cameral forests necessary for mining; (2) forests belonging to border guards and placed under the administration of the War Council in Vienna; (3) private forests. The first two categories had to be reorganised again; The Treasury [Schatzamt] was tasked with recruiting specialised forestry and mining personnel for the division of forests, selecting forested areas for timber harvesting, and introducing the Hungarian legislation in Transylvania. Unfortunately, these plans were not implemented (Müller 1961, p. 32).

²⁰ Rösler 1988, p. 19.

²¹ Ibid., p. 21.

²² Ibid., p. 61–71.

to ensure their durable exploitation, and so forth.

In 1781, Emperor Joseph II issued a law that limited the serfs' access to the forest to two days a week. In those days, peasants had the right to harvest and transport timber under the supervision of foresters or forest guards. The Aulic Chancellery of the Transylvanian *Gubernium* as well as the *Comes Saxorum* and the *Universitas Saxorum* strove to supervise the application of the 1781 Forestry Act.²³ An instruction issued in 1783 established posts for 24 guards, who were tasked with monitoring forest exploitation in the fiscal domains in the Apuseni Mountains. They had to supervise the activity of all the inhabitants and gather information about the local population's character, customs, and work methods.

In addition to the Forest Ordinance [*Waldordnung*], a Hunting Ordinance [*Jagdordnung*] was issued by the Viennese authorities on 21 August 1786. It included twenty-nine points and established the hunting season for the period 1 March – 1 July each year. Moreover, the *De conservazione sylvarum* Act of 1791 stipulated that the right of forest ownership belonged exclusively to the landowner, with the serfs having no rights in this regard.²⁴ Therefore, compared to the previous state of affairs, this new forestry regime pertaining to the mining area of the Apuseni Mountains promoted and regulated a more rational and sustainable use of forests, a forestry culture, and the conservation of forested areas.

The exclusion of peasants from the free use of forests was explained by the need to “protect forests.” This exclusion would have a decisive impact on the peasant lifestyle.²⁵ Nationalist historiography views this measure as an attempt to erase the ancestral rights of peasant communities and to alienate the land. The domains owned by the Bánffy family are a typical example of the way in which forest exploitation in the noble domains in the Apuseni Mountains evolved over time. The family archive on the forest domain at Unghiul Călatei provides sources that allow researchers to assess the situation of the Apuseni Mountains with regard to forest exploitation and lifestyle in the forested areas.²⁶

The domain at Unghiul Călatei, comprising mostly beech and fir forests as well as a few oak forests, extended over approximately 3,300,000 acres. In late eighteenth century, the Bánffy family introduced a system that could be considered rational regarding forest economy. The system acted in two directions: (1) it sought to end the traditional advantages that peasants enjoyed by abolishing their right to the free use of forests; (2) it aimed to

²³ Binder 1909, p. 54.

²⁴ Ziegler 1805, p. 14–21.

²⁵ Csucsujá 1998, p. 28.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 34.

divide the domain among the family members. On 17 February 1796, the family met and decided to divide the forests. Because such a division implied cadastral measures, which was time-consuming, they reached an agreement to place the forests at Unghiul Călatei under joint family administration. Thus, the domain received a unique administration, and measures were taken jointly. Furthermore, they created a premise for the introduction of measures and methods for the exploitation of forests. The same year, they prohibited serfs from using the forests on the domain, which were declared “off limits.” One of the first prohibitions stated that peasants were no longer allowed to “cut logs, planks, beams, and perches for financial gain.” They also ordered the confiscation of wheels and parts of peasant saw mills, and prohibited the cutting of “planks or any other wooden material at the saw mills that peasants used in common.”²⁷

Joseph II’s Hunting Ordinance of 1786 set the rules for hunting in Transylvania, which remained in force until the nineteenth century. It intended to put an end to abuses in this domain and to protect wild animals from poachers, who used to shoot even gestating animals. At the same time, the ordinance also set conduct rules for hunters in order to protect forests and agricultural lands.²⁸ It complemented two older hunting ordinances issued in 1751²⁹ and 1759, respectively,³⁰ which had banned hunting during the close season, established which animals could be hunted, and set certain rules concerning hunting methods.

Whenever a food crisis hit the province, violations of the hunting rules became more frequent and conflicts ensued. Such a conflict erupted in the area of Toplița in 1785.³¹ The conflicts of 1763–1764 in Sighișoara were partially triggered by the damage done by hunters and the wild animals they chased to riverside plots.³²

The “regulatory prescriptions” issued between 1795 and 1805 for the Saxon *natio* in Transylvania stipulate in Point 6 of Chapter III (“On the common economy”) that forests are very important from two perspectives: (1) the population’s basic needs; (2) the industry’s needs. In this respect, the Emperor ordered:

- (a) For the Forestry Law to be applied, engineers in every town and Seat had to measure forests and record the measurements with precision. Then, forest engineers had to divide forests into parcels.

²⁷ Maior 1914, p. 333–338.

²⁸ Rus 2017, p. 201–204.

²⁹ Witting 1936, p. 75–76.

³⁰ Rus 2017, p. 164–166.

³¹ Marc 2011, p. 139.

³² Siegmund n.yr., no. 111, A VIII 189, vol. II. fol. 29.

- (b) On the parcels, private persons were also allowed to harvest wood (timber) after paying a tax to the allodial tax collector and after receiving instructions from the forest engineer.
- (c) Paupers were allowed to pick twigs.
- (d) In those Seats where the situation of the allodial estate did not allow for the employment of an engineer, the use of a forest engineer from the neighbouring Seat was allowed.
- (e) In towns, wood management could be organized through the construction of a warehouse where the population could buy wood (timber) for a price.³³

Introduction of the Austrian forestry legislation

In 1858 the Habsburg forestry legislation of 1852 was also introduced in Transylvania and remained in force until the establishment of Austria-Hungary in 1867. All the problems pertaining to forest economy were legally regulated; the legal provisions touched on a wide range of issues: from the division of forests into the aforementioned groups to timber harvesting, forestation, clear-cutting, economic plans, pasturing, the hiring of foresters for the great forested areas, and the supervision of forest exploitation with the help of civil servants.

The forest legislation on the cities

As early as the sixteenth century, towns and communes in Transylvania attempted to halt forest cuttings by means of restrictive and protective measures. Seventeenth-century decrees of the town of Sighișoara [Schessburg] stipulate: “[...] those who harvest more wood than they can load or take to a field [...] those who find it can load it unhindered”; this measure does not refer to a limitation of free exploitation, but merely to an interdiction of pointless devastation.

In 1743, the *Gubernium* drafted a complaint stating that besides noblemen, citizens and craftsmen, “ordinary people” also owned muskets and hounds and went hunting, thus missing Sunday Mass, which would serve as a bad example to respectable people. In 1751, the *Gubernium* decreed that hunting was allowed for “lords and members of the *Magistrat*,” but not peasants. On this occasion, close seasons were also established.

The first lease contract for hunting dates back to 1757 (it was closed for a period of five years with an annual payment of ten guldens). It pertained to the forested area of Sighișoara and to the “open field.” Later ordinances prohibited soldiers from hunting and fishing (1765) and limited the export of rabbit skins through the imposition of taxes (1785). The 1786 Josephine hunting ordinance regulated close seasons and the legal

³³ Zaminer 1891, p. 218–220.

relationship between forest owners and hunting license holders, and established taxes on the damage produced by hunting.

The local authorities in Sibiu [Hermannstadt] showed constant interest in the conservation of the Dumbrava Forest due to its ecological, economic and recreational importance. Thus, in 1754, Martin von Seeberg suggested to the local *Magistrat* that

every forest be divided in ten equal parcels and each parcel be annually cut down and sawed into equal pieces, and wherever there are trees missing or there is an empty space, each peasant's son who turned ten must plant two oak seedlings the following spring, enclose them with a small protective fence, and take care of them until they marry.

The “Forest Directive” issued by the municipality on 30 May 1781 regulated the maintenance, conservation and use of the forest, and stipulated sanctions against offenders. In 1787, Joseph II visited the Dumbrava Forest, and a few years later the “Regulatory Directives” on the management of all forests were issued at his behest. The first measurements and maps, as well as the recruitment of guards and administrative measures, date back to this period. In order to spare forests, it was recommended that in winter rooms be heated by using as little wood as possible, and inhabitants were encouraged to build firewood-saving stoves to replace those they owned at the time.³⁴

The military border and its forests

After the re-conquest of Hungary in 1699, the anti-Ottoman military border was extended into what is present-day Slovenia, the Banat (1742), and Transylvania (1762–64). The Austrian administration in Transylvania recruited border guards from among the Wallachians who represented the majority population. Many forests were cut in order to create agricultural lands and expand or build new settlements. In the long run, these newly created joint-ownership forests were to play a major role in the emergence of the new forestry.³⁵

General Buccow's project, sanctioned by Empress Maria Theresa on 16 April 1762, declared the border-guard area free and exempted the peasants from performing services (except for capitation).³⁶ Border guards had the right to own real estate and other immovable property in the border-guard areas, were granted access to forests and pastures, and received a certain amount of remuneration.³⁷

³⁴ Binder 1909, p. 67–68.

³⁵ Rösler 1999, p. 25.

³⁶ Schaser 1989, p. 25–41.

³⁷ Göllner 1974, p. 9–15.

A report by the War Council in Vienna, sent to Maria Theresa on 2 April 1770, stated: “Transylvanian border guards are lacking the necessary land for ensuring their food” and that revolts had started, particularly because “several border-guard villages had to give up the lands they had owned before the militarisation.”³⁸ Furthermore, the villages neighbouring border-guard communities were also landless and overpopulated.³⁹ The expansion of agricultural lands in border-guard villages was achieved through deforestation. These newly-created lands were exempt from taxation for a period of six years.⁴⁰

Conflicts over pastures in forested areas broke out between border guards and noblemen; the latter refused to lease their pastures to the former who had been cattle farmers before the militarisation, which led to reprisal actions and trials.⁴¹

The wood crisis also affected border-guard villages, in that officers were demanding firewood from peasants, and when the latter were unable to provide it, they had to pay the officers a sum of money representing its value.⁴² Many border-guard villages only had a few forests; some only had brush, while others had nothing, according to a report issued by General Hadnik in 1767. Border guards had to buy the firewood themselves, sometimes being compelled to travel long distances to procure it. Moreover, in cases of bad weather, the firewood could get wet.⁴³

Conflicts between the authorities and the subjects

In Transylvania, the number of conflicts over forests started to grow during the delineation of the military borders. The borders formed a militarised zone across part of the strategic strip of land stretching from Voivodina in the south to Năsăud in northern Transylvania.⁴⁴ A more specific conflict

³⁸ Ibid., p. 189.

³⁹ Ibid., p. 226–227.

⁴⁰ ANAV, House, Court and State Archives, file 2385/1767, fol. 8.

⁴¹ Archives contain numerous documents referring to conflicts over forests and pastures (Rus 2017, p. 294–302).

⁴² At Point 4, Hadnik refers to a complaint lodged by villagers from Háromszék County where the Szekler Cavalry Regiment was stationed (Göllner 1974, p. 191).

⁴³ Rus 2017, p. 298–299.

⁴⁴ After disbanding the organisation of border guards and riflemen, the Viennese Court decreed the militarisation of Transylvania’s border areas with Moldavia and Walachia through the creation of border guard regiments made up of men recruited from among the local population. There were seven border guard regiments in Transylvania: five infantry regiments (two Romanian and three Szekler), a Wallachian Dragoon Cavalry Regiment and a Szekler Hussar Cavalry Regiment (ANAV, House, Court and State Archives, Family Archives, Hofreisen, box 7/1773, fol. 756–773. *Stand und Umstände, die Lage deren 5*

occurred during the militarisation of the Rodna Valley close to the free Saxon town of Bistrița [Bistritz].⁴⁵ A timber shortage prompted the Austrian military authorities to institute forceful measures in Saxon-majority areas. For instance, the timber used in the building of the officer quarters in the villages of Johannisdorf and Großdorf was harvested abusively and without compensation from the forest owned by the Saxon commune of Weißkirch; according to reports from 1762, entire wooded areas were devastated as a result of firewood and timber thefts. Furthermore, in the villages of Schönbrück and Heidendorf, the “off limits” oak forests were devastated and the timber was sold.⁴⁶

The wood harvested from forests located in the Rodna Valley played the role of energy source for the Rodna mine that was owned by the town of Bistrița since 1475 – that is, since the reign of King Matthias Corvinus.⁴⁷ However, Romanian peasants, in a letter sent to the Viennese Court on 13 April 1758, claimed: “they were not serfs, but people born free [...] and owned the forests, mountains, pastures and fields since time immemorial.”⁴⁸ Thus, they sought release from serfdom, and the conflict over forests between the Romanian peasants and the town of Bistrița received a social dimension. Nonetheless, on 24 May 1762, upon reading several reports dispatched by General Buccow, Empress Maria Theresa decreed that the twenty-one Romanian villages in the Rodna Valley, together with their properties, should be incorporated into the military district of Năsăud.⁴⁹

Conclusions

In everyday practice, both peasants and noblemen sought to bypass the various pieces of legislation related to forests that were issued by the central and local authorities. Noblemen were especially interested in building saw mills, which meant that the law would be broken. Despite all the legal restrictions, peasants continued to harvest wood in the forests – both firewood and timber – especially given the increasing demand for it in plain settlements. Timber, in particular, was in high demand. The figures relating

sogenannten Grenzregimenten, ihre jetzige und künftige sowohl im Krieg als Frieden vorzusehende Nutzbarkeit ihrer Bekostung und Gedenkungsart, samt meinen Gedanken vor die Zukunft).

⁴⁵ The conflict was provoked by the Romanian peasants’ desire to get out from under the tutelage of the town of Bistrița and submit to the Austrian military authority (Kramer 1868, p. 1–34).

⁴⁶ RNACCD, collection *Bistrița Town Hall*, fol. 58-71/1762.

⁴⁷ “... ipsum oppidum et pertinentias ejusdem de comitato praefato de Doboca eximendo, sicut a certis temporibus ad civitatem nostram Bistriciensem ... adnectere decreveramus ...” (Gündisch et al. 1991, doc. no. 4042, p. 43–44).

⁴⁸ Kramer 1868, p. 17–18.

⁴⁹ RNACCD, collection *Bistrița Town Hall*, fol. 58-71/1762. Lecta in Sessione Incl. Magistratus Publ. Die 20 July A. 1762.

to timber rafting in the valley of the Rivers Mureș and Someș toward the settlements on the surrounding plain are telling in this respect. These figures generally reflect the amount of tax, but the timber quantities that peasants harvested in forests were usually far bigger. Therefore, one can conclude that some peasants managed to bypass the control system. Even forest inspectors were known to admit that peasants harvested wood without permission.

The attempts to restrict access to forests met with resistance from the peasants. This resistance was manifested in many forms, and they can be encountered in several documentary accounts and trial transcripts. On occasion, peasants wrote collective petitions asking for permission to exploit the forests in accordance with their ancestral customs. However, they would also bypass the control network, clandestinely harvesting wood and taking it to the market without paying taxes.

Bibliographical Abbreviations

- ANAV – Austrian National Archives. Vienna.
- Bellow, Breit 1998 – Stefan von Bellow, Stefan Breit, *Wald – von der Gottesgabe zum Privateigentum. Gerichtliche Konflikte zwischen Landesherren und Untertanen um den Wald in der frühen Neuzeit*, Stuttgart, 1998.
- Binder 1909 – Johann Binder, *Geschichte des Waldwesens der Stadt Hermannsstadt*, Hermannstadt, 1909.
- Csucusja 1998 – István Csucusja, *Istoria pădurilor din Transilvania (1848–1918)*, Cluj-Napoca, 1998.
- Giurescu 1976 – Constantin C. Giurescu, *Istoria pădurii românești din cele mai vechi timpuri până astăzi*, Bucharest, 1976.
- Göllner 1974 – Carl Göllner, *Die siebenbürgische Militärgrenze: Ein Beitrag zur Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte 1762–1851*, Munich, 1974.
- Gündisch et al. 1991 – Gustav Gündisch, Herta Gündisch, Konrad Gündisch, Gernot Nussbächer, *Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte der Deutschen in Siebenbürgen*, vol. VII, Cologne, 1991.
- Köpeczi, Barta 1990 – Béla Köpeczi, Gábor Barta (eds), *Kurze Geschichte Siebenbürgens*, Budapest, 1990.
- Kramer 1868 – Friedrich Kramer, *Aus der Gegenwart und Vergangenheit der königlichen Freistadt Bistritz*, Bistritz, 1868.
- Maior 1914 – George Maior, *Bunurile de mână moartă în Transilvania și Ungaria în special bunurile Episcopiei Greco-Catolice din Oradea*, in RP, XXVIII, 1914, p. 333–338.
- Marc 2011 – Dorel Marc, *Aspecte etnografice privind alimentația societății tradiționale din zona Mureșului Superior. Interferențe etnoculturale*, in Sultana Avram (coord.), *Istorie și tradiție în spațiul românesc. Hrana – între necesitate și artă, la români și minorități*, Sibiu, 2011, p. 133–164.
- Müller 1789 – Reichenstein von Müller, *Mineralgeschichte der Goldbergwerke in*

- dem *Vöröspataker Gebirge bey Abrudbanya im Grossfürstenthume Siebenbürgen nebst einer Chartre von Herrn von Müller, K.K. Gubernialrathe und Oberberg- und Salineninspector zu Salatna in Siebenbürgen*, in *Bergbaukunde*, 1, 1789, p. 37–91.
- Müller 1961 – Konrad Müller, *Siebenbürgische Wirtschaftspolitik unter Maria Theresia*, Munich, 1961.
- Rieser 1989 – Hans-Heinrich Rieser, *Die wirtschaftliche Entwicklung in Siebenbürgen und im Temescher Banat 1688–1848*, in *SS*, 3, 1989, 1, p. 64–70.
- RNACCD – Romanian National Archives: Cluj County Department.
- Rösler 1988 – Rudolf Rösler, *Zur Geschichte der Forstgesetzgebung in Siebenbürgen*, in *ZSL*, 1, 1988, p. 61–71.
- Rösler 1999 – Rudolf Rösler, *Zur Forstgeschichte Rumäniens. Ein zusammenfassender Überblick*, News of Forest History, Vienna, 1999.
- Rus 2017 – Dorin-Ioan Rus, *Wald- und Ressourcenpolitik im Siebenbürgen des 18. Jahrhunderts*, Frankfurt on Main, Bern, Brussels, New York, Oxford, Warsaw, Vienna, 2017.
- Schaser 1989 – Angelika Schaser, *Siebenbürgen unter der Habsburger Herrschaft im 18. Jahrhundert*, in *SS*, 3, 1989, 1, p. 25–40.
- Schmidt 1835 – Franz Anton Schmidt, *Chronologisch-systematische Sammlung der Berggesetze der Königreiche Ungarn, Kroatien, Dalmatien, Slavonien und des Großfürstenthumes Siebenbürgen*, vol. 5, Vienna, 1835.
- Schuller 1895 – Georg Adolf Schuller, *Aus der Vergangenheit der siebenbürgisch-sächsischen Landwirtschaft*, Hermannstadt, 1895.
- Siegmund n.yr. – Konrad Siegmund, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Stadtwaldes von Schäßburg*, manuscript, Transylvanian Archive in Gundelsheim, no year.
- Witting 1936 – Otto Witting, *Istoria dreptului de vânatoare în Transilvania*, Bucharest, 1936.
- Wollmann 1999 – Volker Wollmann, *Der siebenbürgische Bergbau im 18. Jahrhundert*, in Rainer Slotta, Volker Wollmann, Ion Dordea (eds), *Silber und Salz in Siebenbürgen. Katalog zur Ausstellung im Deutschen Bergbau-Museum vom 27. August bis zum 31. Dezember 2000*, vol. 1, Bochum, 1999, p. 41–58.
- Zaminer 1891 – Eduard Zaminer, *Geschichte des Waldwesens der königlichen Stadt Kronstadt*, Kronstadt, 1891.
- Ziegler 1805 – Johann Theodor Ziegler, *De res sylvestris*, Hermannstadt, 1805.

LISTA ABREVIERILOR DE PERIODICE

- AAH** – Acta Archaeologica Hungarica (actualmente Acta Archaeologica). Budapesta.
- ABLR** – Archäologische Berichte des Landkreises Rotenburg. Wümme.
- ACMI** – Anuarul Comisiunii Monumentelor Istorice, secția pentru Transilvania. Cluj-Napoca.
- Acta** – Acta (Siculica). Muzeul Național Secuiesc. Sfântu Gheorghe.
- ActaArch** – Acta Archaeologica. Budapesta.
- ActaMN** – Acta Musei Napocensis. Muzeul de Istorie a Transilvaniei. Cluj-Napoca.
- ActaMP** – Acta Musei Porolissensis. Muzeul Județean de Istorie și Artă Zalău.
- Acta Theriologica** – Acta Theriologica. Mammal Research Institute PAS.
- AÉ** – Archaeologiai Értesítő a Magyar régészeti, művészettörténeti és éremtani társulat tudományos folyóirata. Budapesta.
- AIHAI/AIIX** – Anuarul Institutului de Istorie și Arheologie „A. D. Xenopol” Iași (din 1990 Anuarul Institutului de Istorie „A. D. Xenopol” Iași).
- AIICCMER** – Anuarul Institutului de Investigare a Crimelor Comunismului și Memoria Exilului Românesc. Institutul de Investigare a Crimelor Comunismului și Memoria Exilului Românesc. București.
- AIIGB** – Anuarul Institutului de Istorie „George Barițiu”. Series Historica. Institutul de Istorie „George Barițiu” din Cluj-Napoca.
- AIP** – Arheološki institut Posebna izdanja. Belgrad.
- AISC** – Anuarul Institutului de Studii Clasice. Cluj-Napoca.
- Altertum** – Das Altertum. Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin.
- Alt-Thüringen** – Alt-Thüringen. Museum of Prehistory and Early History of Thuringia.
- AM** – Arheologia Moldovei. Institutul de Istorie și Arheologie „A. D. Xenopol” Iași.
- AMET** – Anuarul Muzeului Etnografic al Transilvaniei. Muzeul Etnografic al Transilvaniei. Cluj-Napoca.
- AMM** – Acta Moldaviae Meridionalis. Muzeul Județean Vaslui.
- AnA** – Analele Aradului. Societatea Culturală „Asociația Națională Arădeană pentru cultura poporului român”. Arad.

- AnB** – Analele Banatului (serie nouă). Muzeul Național al Banatului. Timișoara.
- AnBr** – Analele Brăilei. Muzeul Brăilei „Carol I”. Brăila.
- AnD** – Analele Dobrogei. Revista Societății Culturale Dobrogene. Constanța (1920-1923). Cernăuți (1924-1938). Din 1995, seria nouă a publicației este editată de Muzeul de Istorie Națională și Arheologie Constanța.
- Angustia** – Angustia. Muzeul Carpaților Răsăriteni. Sfântu Gheorghe.
- Antiquity** – Antiquity. A Quartely Review of World Archaeology. York.
- AO** – Arhivele Olteniei (serie nouă). Institutul de Cercetări Socio-Umane. Craiova.
- Apulum** – Apulum. Acta Musei Apulensis. Muzeul Național al Unirii Alba Iulia.
- ArcheoSciences** – ArcheoSciences, revue d'archéométrie. Groupe des Méthodes Pluridisciplinaires Contribuant à l'Archéologie.
- ArchHist** – Archaeologia historica. Masarykova univerzita, Filozofická fakulta. Brno.
- Argesis** – Argesis. Studii și comunicări. Seria Istorie. Muzeul Județean Argeș. Pitești.
- ArhMed** – Arheologia Medievală. Reșița, Cluj-Napoca.
- ArhSom** – Arhiva Someșeană. Muzeul Nășăudean. Nășăud.
- ASC** – Archeologie ve středních Čechách. Praga.
- Astra Salvensis** – Astra Salvensis. Cercul Salva al ASTRA. Salva.
- ASUAIC** – Annales Scientifiques de l'Université „Al. I. Cuza”. Iași.
- ATS** – Acta Terrae Septemcastrensis. Sibiu.
- AUASH** – Annales Universitatis Apulensis. Series Historica. Universitatea „1 Decembrie 1918” din Alba Iulia.
- AUASJ** – Annales Universitatis Apulensis. Series Jurisprudentia. Universitatea „1 Decembrie 1918” din Alba Iulia.
- AUDJG** – Analele Universității „Dunărea de Jos” Galați. Seria Istorie. Universitatea „Dunărea de Jos” Galați.
- AVSL** – Archiv des Vereins für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde. Sibiu.
- BAM** – Bibliotheca Archaeologica Moldaviae. Iași.
- Banatica** – Banatica. Muzeul de Istorie al Județului Caraș-Severin. Reșița.
- BAR** – British Archaeological Reports (International Series). Oxford.
- BB** – Bibliotheca Brukenthal. Muzeul Național Brukenthal. Sibiu.
- BCȘS** – Buletinul Cercurilor Științifice Studentești. Universitatea „1 Decembrie 1918” din Alba Iulia.

Bergbaukunde	– Bergbaukunde. Leipzig.
BHAUT	– Bibliotheca Historica et Archaeologica Universitatis Timisiensis. Universitatea de Vest. Timișoara.
BMA	– Bibliotheca Musei Apulensis. Muzeul Național al Unirii. Alba Iulia.
BMB	– Berliner Münzblätter. Berlin.
BMJT	– Buletinul Muzeului Județean Teleorman – seria Arheologie. Alexandria.
BMN	– Bibliotheca Musei Napocensis. Muzeul de Istorie a Transilvaniei. Cluj-Napoca.
BMÖ	– Beiträge zur Mittelalterarchäologie in Österreich. Österreichische Gesellschaft für Mittelalterarchäologie. Viena.
BMP	– Bibliotheca Musei Porolissensis. Muzeul Județean de Istorie și Artă Zalău.
BMS	– Bibliotheca Musei Sabesiensis. Muzeul Municipal „Ioan Raica” Sebeș.
Brukenthal	– Brukenthal. Acta Musei. Muzeul Național Brukenthal. Sibiu.
BS	– Bibliotheca Septemcastrensis, Universitatea „Lucian Blaga” din Sibiu.
BSNR	– Buletinul Societății Numismatice Române. București.
BTh	– Bibliotheca Thracologica. Institutul Român de Tracologie. București.
BUA	– Bibliotheca Universitatis Apulensis. Universitatea „1 Decembrie 1918” din Alba Iulia.
BudRég	– Budapest Régiségei. Budapesti Történeti Múzeum. Budapesta.
Bulletin	– Bulletin de l’Association Pro Aventico. Lausanne.
Bylye Gody	– Bylye Gody. International Network Center for Fundamental and Applied Research. Washington.
CA	– Cercetări arheologice. Muzeul Național de Istorie a României. București.
Caietele ARA	– Caietele ARA: arhitectură, restaurare, arheologie. București.
Caietele CNSAS	– Caietele CNSAS. Consiliul Național pentru Studierea Arhivelor Securității. București.
CAH	– Communicationes Archaeologicae Hungariae. Budapesta.
Carpica	– Carpica. Complexul Muzeal „Iulian Antonescu” Bacău.
Carinthia I	– Carinthia I. Zeitschrift für geschichtliche Landeskunde von Kärnten. Verlag des Geschichtsvereines für Kärnten. Klagenfurt.
CCA	– Cronica cercetărilor arheologice. cIMeC. București.

- Celticum** – Celticum. Supplément à OGAM-Tradition celtique. Rennes.
- CMA** – Concilium mediæ aevi. Zeitschrift für Geschichte, Kunst und Kultur des Mittelalters und der Frühen Neuzeit.
- CNRS** – Centre national de la recherche scientifique. Paris.
- CollMed** – Collegium Mediense. Comunicări științifice. Colegiul Tehnic „Mediense” Mediaș.
- Cumania** – Cumania. A Bács-Kiskun Megyei Önkormányzat Múzeumi Szervezetének Évkönyve. Kecskemét.
- Cumidava** – Cumidava. Muzeul Județean de Istorie Brașov.
- Dacia** – Dacia. Recherches et découvertes archéologiques en Roumanie. București, I, (1924) - XII (1948). Nouvelle série: Revue d'archéologie et d'histoire ancienne. București.
- Dacia Magazin** – Dacia magazin. Dacia Revival International Society. New York.
- DAMN.SRD** – Din activitatea muzeelor noastre. Studii, referate, documente. Sfatul Popular al Regiunii Ploiești. Muzeul Regional de Istorie Ploiești.
- Danubius** – Danubius. Muzeul de Istorie. Galați.
- DR** – Dacoromania. Institutul de Lingvistică și Istorie Literară „Sextil Pușcariu” din Cluj-Napoca al Academiei Române. Cluj-Napoca
- EJA** – European Journal of Archaeology. European Association of Archaeologists.
- EphNap** – Ephemeris Napocensis. Institutul de Arheologie și Istoria Artei Cluj-Napoca.
- FI** – Fiile de Istorie. Muzeul de Istorie Bistrița (continuată de *Revista Bistriței*).
- FolArch** – Folia Archaeologica. Magyar Történeti Múzeum. Budapesta.
- FVL** – Forschungen zur Volks- und Landeskunde. Sibiu.
- Gând românesc** – Gând românesc. Asociația culturală „Gând Românesc, Gând European”. Alba Iulia.
- Germania** – Germania, Römisch-Germanischen Kommission des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts. Frankfurt pe Main.
- Godišnjak** – Godišnjak grada Beograda. Beograd.
- Hierasus** – Hierasus. Muzeul Județean Botoșani.
- Hileya** – Hileya: naukovyy visnyk. Natsional'nyy pedahohichnyy universytet imeni M. P. Drahomanov. Kiev.
- HU** – Historia Urbana. Academia Română. Comisia de Istorie a Orașelor din România. București.

- IJMP** – International Journal of Modern Physics: Conference Series.
- Istros** – Istros. Muzeul Brăilei. Brăila.
- JAS** – Journal of Archaeological Science. Elsevier.
- JASREP** – Journal of Archaeological Science: Reports. Elsevier.
- JKK** – Jahrbuch der Kaiserlich-Königlichen Central-Commission zur Erforschung und Erhaltung der Baudenkmale. Viena.
- JRA** – Journal of Roman Archaeology. Editorial Committee of the Journal of Roman Archaeology.
- JRLS** – Journal of Romanian Literary Studies. ALPHA Institute for Multicultural Studies. Târgu Mureș.
- JSKV** – Jahrbuch des siebenbürgischen Karpathen-Vereins. Hermannstadt (Sibiu), I-XXX (1881-1922).
- JSRI** – Journal for the Study of Religions & Ideologies. The Academic Society for the Research of Religions and Ideologies. Cluj-Napoca.
- Közlemények** – Közlemények az Erdélyi Nemzeti Múzeum Érem - és Régiségtarából. Cluj-Napoca.
- Kühn-Archiv** – Kühn-Archiv. Berlin.
- LIUGC** – Lucrările Institutului de Geografie al Universității din Cluj. Institutul de Geografie al Universității din Cluj. Cluj-Napoca.
- Limba română** – Limba română. Institutul de Lingvistică al Academiei Române „Iorgu Iordan - Al. Rosetti”. București.
- LSCMIB** – Lucrările Stațiunii de Cercetări Marine „prof. Ioan Borcea” Agigea. Universitatea „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” Iași.
- Marisia** – Marisia. Muzeul Județean Târgu Mureș.
- MAQ** – Medium Aevum Quotidianum. Krems.
- MCA** – Materiale și cercetări arheologice. București.
- MI** – Magazin istoric. București.
- MKKCC** – Mittheilungen der K. K. Central-Commission zur Erforschung und Erhaltung der Baudenkmale. Viena.
- Mousaios** – Mousaios. Muzeul Județean Buzău.
- MN** – Muzeul Național. Muzeul Național de Istorie a României. București.
- Münzen Revue** – Münzen Revue. International Coin Trend Journal.
- NAC** – Numismatica e Antichità Classiche - Quaderni Ticinesi. Lugano.
- Naukovi zapysky** – Naukovi zapysky Ternopilskoho natsionalnoho pedahohichnoho universytetu im. V. Hnatiuka. Ser. Istoriia. Ternopil's'kyy natsional'nyy pedahohichnyy universytet imeni V. Hnatiuka. Ternopil'.

NIMPR	– Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section B: Beam Interactions with Materials and Atoms. Elsevier.
Notae Numismatacae	– Notae Numismatacae. Zapiski numizmatyczne. Cracovia.
NZ	– Numismatische Zeitung: Blätter für Münz-, Wappen- und Siegel-Kunde. Weissensee.
ONS	– Obshchestvennye nauki i sovremennost'. Rossiyskaya Akademiya Nauk. Moscova.
PA	– Patrimonium Apulense. Direcția Județeană pentru Cultură Alba. Alba Iulia.
PB	– Patrimonium Banaticum. Direcția Județeană pentru Cultură Timiș. Timișoara.
Pferdeheilkunde	– Pferdeheilkunde. Equine Medicine. Official Organ of the German Veterinary Association, Section – Equine Medicine. Baden-Baden.
PHN. Istoriia	– Problemy humanitarnykh nauk. Ser. Istoriia. Drohobych State Pedagogical University named after Ivan Franko. Drohobîci.
Plural	– Plural. Revista Departamentului de Istorie și Geografie a Universității Pedagogice de Stat „Ion Creangă” Chișinău.
PRA	– Proceedings of the Romanian Academy, Series A: Mathematics, Physics, Technical Sciences Information Science. Academia Română.
Prilozi	– Prilozi. Instituta za arheologiju u Zagrebu. Zagreb.
Problemy istorii	– Problemy istorii i istoriografii. Sbornik dokladov mezhvuzovskoy nauchnoy konferentsii. Federal'noye gosudarstvennoye avtonomnoye obrazovatel'noye uchrezhdeniye vysshego obrazovaniya Sankt-Peterburgskiy gosudarstvennyy elektrotekhnicheskiy universitet LETI imeni V. I. Ul'yanova (Lenina). Sankt Petersburg.
QFA	– Quaderni Friulani di Archeologia. Società Friulana di Archeologia onlus. Udine.
RA	– Revista arhivelor. Arhivele Naționale ale României. București.
RAE	– Revue Archéologique de l'Est. Société archéologique de l'Est. Dijon.
RAN	– Revue Archéologique de Narbonnaise. Paris.
RAP	– Revue Archéologique de Picardie. Societe des antiquaires de Picardie.
RB	– Revista Bistriței. Complexul Muzeal Bistrița-Năsăud. Bistrița.

Lista abrevierilor de periodice

- REF** – Revista de Etnografie și Folclor. Institutul de Etnografie și Folclor „Constantin Brăiloiu”. Academia Română. București.
- RevArh** – Revista Arheologică. Centrul de Arheologie al Institutului Patrimoniului Cultural al Academiei de Științe a Moldovei. Chișinău.
- RHSEE/RESEE** – Revue historique du sud-est européen. Academia Română. București, Paris (din 1963 Revue des études sud-est européennes).
- RI** – Revista de Istorie (din 1990 Revista istorică). Academia Română. București.
- RITL** – Revista de Istorie și Teorie Literară. Academia Română. Institutul de Istorie și Teorie Literară „G. Călinescu”. București.
- RJP** – Romanian Journal of Physics. București.
- RMNK** – Rocznik Muzeum Narodowego w Kielcach. Kielce.
- RMV** – Rad Muzeja Vojvodine. Novi Sad.
- RN** – Revue Numismatique. Société française de numismatique. Paris.
- ROB** – ROB. Berichten van de Rijksdienst voor het Oudheidkundig Bodemonderzoek. Amersfoort.
- RP** – Revista pădurilor. Societatea „Progresul silvic”.
- RRH** – Revue Roumaine d’Histoire. Academia Română. București.
- RRS** – Revista Română de Sociologie. Institutul de Sociologie al Academiei Române. București.
- Rusin** – Rusin. Ob’yednannyya “rus”. Toms’kyy derzhavnyy universytet. Kyshyniv. Tomsk.
- SAI** – Studii și articole de istorie. Societatea de Științe Istorice și Filologice a RPR. București.
- Sargetia** – Sargetia. Acta Musei Devensis. Muzeul Civilizației Dacice și Romane Deva.
- SCA** – Studii și Cercetări de Antropologie. Institutul de Antropologie „Francisc I. Rainer”. Academia Română. București.
- SCIV(A)** – Studii și cercetări de istoria veche (din 1974, Studii și cercetări de istorie veche și arheologie). București.
- SCN** – Studii și Cercetări de Numismatică. Institutul de Arheologie „Vasile Pârvan” București.
- Skhid** – Skhid. Ukrainian Cultural Centre. Institute of Industrial Economics of National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. Institute of Philosophy named after G. S. Skovoroda of National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. Zaporizhzhya National University.
- SlovArch** – Slovenská Archeológia. Nitra.

- SP** – Studii de Preistorie. Asociația Română de Arheologie. București.
- SprArch** – Sprawozdania Archeologiczne. Instytut Archeologii i Etnologii PAN, Ośrodek Archeologii Gór i Wyzyn w Krakowie. Cracovia.
- SS** – Siebenbürgische Semesterblätter. Arbeitskreis für siebenbürgische Landeskunde. München.
- Studii Clasice** – Studii Clasice. Societatea de Studii Clasice din R.S.R. București.
- ST** – Studii teologice. Revista Facultăților de Teologie din Patriarhia Română. București.
- StComCaransebeș** – Studii și Cercetări de Etnografie și Istorie Caransebeș. Muzeul Județean de Etnografie și al Regimentului de Graniță Caransebeș.
- StComSibiu** – Studii și comunicări. Arheologie-istorie. Muzeul Brukenthal. Sibiu.
- StComSM** – Studii și comunicări. Muzeul Județean Satu Mare.
- SUCSH** – Studia Universitatis Cibiniensis. Series Historica. Universitatea „Lucian Blaga” Sibiu.
- SympThrac** – Symposia Thracologica. Institutul Român de Tracologie. București.
- Terra Sebus** – Terra Sebus. Acta Musei Sabesiensis. Muzeul Municipal „Ioan Raica” Sebeș.
- TMNHN** – Travaux du Muséum National d’Histoire Naturelle. Muzeul Național de Istorie Naturală Grigore Antipa. București.
- Transilvania** – Transilvania. Complexul Național Muzeal ASTRA. Sibiu.
- Universul Juridic** – Universul Juridic. Revistă lunară de doctrină și jurisprudență. București.
- VAH** – Varia Archaeologica Hungarica. Budapesta.
- Vestnik Nizhegorodskoy** – Vestnik Nizhegorodskoy akademii Ministerstva vnutrennikh del Rossii. Nizhegorodskaya akademiya Ministerstva vnutrennikh del Rossiyskoy Federatsii. Nizhniy Novgorod.
- Vestnik Voronezhskogo** – Vestnik Voronezhskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya Gumanitarnye nauki. Voronezhskiy gosudarstvennyy universitet. Voronej.
- Vestnik Tomskogo** – Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya Istoriya. Tomskiy gosudarstvennyy universitet. Tomsk.
- Vestnik Tverskogo** – Vestnik Tverskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya Istoriya. Tver.
- Veterinarski glasnik Br** – Veterinarski Glasnik Br. University of Belgrade. Belgrad.

Lista abrevierilor de periodice

- Visnyk** – Visnyk Kyyivs'koho natsional'noho linhvistychnoho universytetu. Seriya: Istoriya, ekonomika, filosofiya. Kyyivs'kyy natsional'nyy movnyy universytet. Kiev.
- Vjesnik** – Vjesnik za arheologiju i povijest dalmatinsku. Arheološki muzej Split.
- VTT** – Veszprémi Történelmi Tá. Veszprém.
- WA** – Wiadomości Archeologiczne. Państwowe Muzeum Archeologiczne w Warszawie. Varşovia.
- ZfAM** – Zeitschrift für Archäologie des Mittelalters. Bonn.
- ZfTZ** – Zeitschrift für Tierzüchtung und Züchtungsbiologie: Organ der Reichsarbeitsgemeinschaft Tierzucht im Forschungsdienst (continuă: Zeitschrift für Züchtung. Reihe B, Tierzüchtung und Züchtungsbiologie). Berlin, Hamburg.
- Ziridava** – Ziridava. Muzeul Judeţean Arad.
- ZISP** – Zhurnal issledovaniy sotsial'noy politiki. Natsional'nyy issledovatel'skiy universitet "Vysshaya shkola ekonomiki". Moscova.
- ZSL** – Zeitschrift für siebenbürgische Landeskunde. (Arbeitskreis für siebenbürgische Landeskunde). Heidelberg.
- ZVHGL** – Zeitschrift des Vereins für hessische Geschichte und Landeskunde, Neue Folge. Kassel.