



ACADEMIA ROMÂNĂ
Școala de Studii Avansate a Academiei Române
Institutul de Arheologie „Vasile Pârvan”, București

DOCTORAL THESIS ABSTRACT

TITLE:
TOBACCO USE IN 16TH-18TH-CENTURY TRANSYLVANIA

Thesis Supervisor:
Cs. I Dr. Daniela Veronica Istrate

Candidate:
Sebastian Ovidiu Dobrotă

Tobacco Use in 16th-18th-century Transylvania

Tobacco has a complex history – used for millennia in the Americas, in Eurasia it is a newcomer, part of the great transatlantic exchange of the mid-2nd millennium. To an even greater extent than all the other plants that have crossed this path, it has been embraced and demonized by different groups and cultures, the contradictory discussions about its benefits and dangers beginning almost immediately and continuing, in various forms, to the present day.

In what forms has this dichotomy materialized historically? And what material traces has it left behind because, hated or loved, over the last centuries tobacco has become, globally, an integral part of society. This thesis attempts to provide a series of new answers to these questions, reconstructing the historical trajectory of tobacco consumption in the Transylvanian area starting from the 16th century, when it spread east to the Atlantic, and until the 18th century, when, at the beginning of the industrial age, its presence was already established. At the end of this period, the year 1792 also marks the appearance of the first volume on the history of tobacco in Transylvania, a work by botanist and historian Joseph Benkő¹. However, it will take almost two centuries for this research subject to become relevant again.

The last decades have marked the emergence of several new works on the topic of the history of tobacco in Transylvania, a subject already explored for other regions from several angles and perspectives. However, the picture remains fragmentary and the accumulation of new information has not been accompanied by a comprehensive synthesis. The present thesis aims to be such a synthesis, approaching the subject from a double perspective – a historical-documentary one and an archaeological one. The two approaches are traditionally used in parallel to examine the history of tobacco use, but, most of the time, the emphasis falls on one aspect or the other. I wanted to see if the story told by the documentary evidence is reflected in the archaeological heritage and vice versa, and during the research I was able to follow this train of thought. The political history, legislation, and trade ties of Transylvania are distinct throughout these three centuries, and the material culture associated with tobacco use is similarly specific – thus, in the 17th century, if in Oradea or Timișoara, part of the Ottoman Empire, we have vivid evidence of oriental-style smoking, in the territories under the control of the principality these gradually draw ever scarcer.

¹ Benko 1792.

This is where the archaeological factor and the difficulties inherent in methodology come into play. The material culture associated with smoking, consisting mainly of clay pipes, has been published either as part of the total corpus of finds from a site, thus lost among data and various other discoveries, or in the form of typologically organized lots, which have taken too little account of the context of discovery – when it known, and they are not simple collections with uncertain origins. Such a method of publication has obvious drawbacks, and I wanted to demonstrate that these discoveries must be studied as a separate category of artefacts, with their own typology, but without disconnecting them from their context – the association between typologies, their contemporaneity or the changes that occurred over time, are equally important elements. If these are not taken into account, the information that the smoking pipes provide is greatly diminished. With proper publication, with established series, however, smoking pipes can become dating elements almost as relevant and accurate as coins, and the circulation of different types, some common, others purely local, others unexpected appearances in the local landscape, can provide crucial clues about the circulation of goods and people.

Pursuing these objectives, I structured the work so that, starting from the most general historical context, I could engage into discussions and build typologies specific to archaeology, yet integrated into the concreteness of the era, with its events and society.

Chapter 1 – *Transylvania in the 16th-18th centuries.*

What does “Transylvania” actually mean in the context of the 16th-18th centuries? The eastern extremity of the Carpathian Basin, isolated from the plains further west by the Apuseni Mountains, at the beginning of the period appears as a distinct geopolitical entity within the general framework of the Kingdom of Hungary. Organized into a voivodeship, its ethnic and administrative composition was varied – noble counties, Saxon seats and districts, Szekler seats.

The year 1492, which marks the discovery of America, and the following year, which marks the introduction of plants of the genus *Nicotiana* to Europe², preceded by only a few decades the 1526 collapse of the Medieval Kingdom of Hungary, on the battlefield of Mohács. János Szapolyai, the voivode of Transylvania, would become the leader of the national faction in the fight for the crown of Hungary. After decades of intermittent struggles between House Szapolyai, the Habsburgs, and the Sublime Porte, further complicated by the

² Burns 2007, p. 19.

spread of the Reformation, in 1570, through the Treaty of Speyer, the Principality of Transylvania came into being. Thus began the second phase of the region's historical evolution through these centuries, a phase in which Transylvania oscillated between East and West, with a progressively more pronounced orientation towards the Sublime Porte. The events of the late 17th century – the Ottoman defeat at Vienna, the Habsburg counter-offensive and, in 1691, the Leopoldine Diploma – put an end to this second stage. For the long duration of the 18th century, Transylvania would remain firmly integrated into the Habsburg domains, its orientation now being towards Vienna and the West.

From one stage to another, the definition of "Transylvania" changed. In 1526 János Szapolyai was voivode of Transylvania, but later acted as king of Hungary (Eastern). The territories under the control of the Szapolyai gradually shrank, however – in 1541 central Hungary, then in 1552 Timișoara were integrated into the Ottoman Empire. But, when it came into being in 1570, the new principality of Transylvania was not limited to the old voivodeship – the princes' control also extended over the counties of Bihor, Mid-Szolnoc, Crasna and Maramureș, over the banate of Lugoj, Caransebeș, portions of Arad and Zarand. These would remain broadly the boundaries of "Transylvania" during the period of the "independent" principality. Occasionally the authority of the princes expanded greatly, as during the reign of Gábor Bethlen (1613–1629), but these were transient episodes. The most important territorial change would occur in 1658–1660, when Oradea and other regions in the west of the principality were annexed to the Ottoman Empire, becoming for the following decades a direct part of the Islamic world.

In the third phase, the notion of Transylvania was again restricted to what it had meant at the beginning of the 16th century. Its very identity was threatened, and its reorganization as a Grand Principality in 1765 did not change the fact that it was gradually becoming more and more integrated into the power structures of Vienna ³.

But what can we understand by Transylvania in the context of these eras? The old medieval voivodeship? The voivodeship plus the "Hungarian parts" integrated into the principality? The principality plus the counties of Royal Hungary temporarily under its control? And do we include or not Timișoara or Oradea, which ended up being part of the Ottoman Empire?

The hard core, corresponding to the old voivodeship and the great principality of the 18th century – and currently overlapping roughly with the counties of Alba, Bistrița-Năsăud,

³ In general for the history of the period: Pop I. A. & Bolovan 2013.

Braşov, Cluj, Covasna, Harghita, Hunedoara, Mureş and Sibiu – remains a constant. We cannot ignore, however, those portions of the Kingdom of Hungary that were under the direct control of the principality, and which were represented even within the diet by a nation of their own, distinct from that of the Transylvanian counties. Nor can we look at Transylvania as an entity torn from its context, without taking into account the constant political presence and cultural pressure of its neighbors – be they great powers such as the Sublime Porte and the House of Habsburg, or local centers such as Wallachia and Moldavia.

Chapter 2 - *The global socio-economic context of the emergence and spread of tobacco use.*

Used for millennia in the Americas, tobacco reached Europe in 1493, through Rodrigo de Jerez. The following decades are punctuated by occasional mentions of its existence and use. After the mid-16th century, however, the genus *Nicotiana* gained accelerated notoriety. In the West, this was due to Jean Nicot, appointed French ambassador to Lisbon in 1559, who promoted it for its medicinal benefits. Soon, tobacco became known in the medicine of the time as a universal panacea. Then, from the 1580s, its recreational use also gained popularity, a phenomenon linked to the name of Sir Walter Raleigh.

The way in which tobacco – and the practice of smoking – spread eastward is less well documented. In Transylvania, tobacco is mentioned early on, in connection with Lodovico Gritti (†1534) and Pál Bornemissza (†1579), probably still for medicinal purposes. One mention states that smoking entered Transylvania in 1576, with the smokers who accompanied Aga Mohamed during his visit to Alba Iulia⁴. In general, the period documents refer to the penetration of tobacco into Transylvania space via the Ottoman, or at least Levantine, channel.

In the following period, documentary mentions multiply and processes taking place on a global scale can be detected. The popularization of recreational tobacco use provoked violent counter-reactions both in the West and in the East. If up to this point we have been talking about (2.1.) *The beginnings of tobacco consumption in Europe*, (2.2.) *The emergence of tobacco in Transylvania* and (2.3.) *The spread of tobacco in the East*, what follows is a new stage marked by the (2.4.) *Tobacco detractors and anti-smoking policies of the 17th century*.

Faced with the advance of new customs, Quranic exegetes were quick to classify tobacco as a disgusting substance (*khaba'ith*) and an innovation (*bid'a*). The combination of fire

⁴ Codrea 2022, p.18. Haider, Orgona & Ridovics 2000, p.18-20.

danger and religious arguments led to the first prohibitions, already present in Istanbul in 1610. Over the next decades, active persecutions were carried out, and under Murad IV (1623–1640) the death penalty for smoking was introduced. However, many consumers evaded the edict by switching to snuff or found ways to ignore it. In 1646, economic arguments led Sultan Ibrahim (1640–1648) to lift the draconian punishments imposed by his predecessors.

At the same time, the West was going through a similar, if less brutal, anti-smoking reaction. In (2.5.) *Anti-smoking Transylvania and the rooting of tobacco* we can follow how this process affected the region, from the first anti-smoking measures taken by Prince Mihály Apafi I (1661-1690), to the decisions taken by the Diet over the following decades. But, in both the East and the West, in the second half of the 17th century there was a gradual transition from anti-smoking policies to (2.6.) *Monetization of tobacco*. Russia, the country with the longest prohibition, also bowed to the inevitable. In 1696, Peter the Great allowed the sale of tobacco in Moscow for a year. Four years later, tobacco use had effectively become legal. The 18th century, with Transylvania now firmly part of the Habsburg domains, would be dominated by a succession of monopolies and companies attempting to monetize tobacco and related instruments.

If we are to talk about (2.7.) *Tobacco production and consumption in the 16th-18th centuries*, in addition to these processes, reactions and counter-reactions summarized above, two other phenomena are to be observed. The first is related to production – if until the second half of the 18th century tobacco came mainly from the New World, now the Ottoman and the one produced in the Pannonian Plain were spreading. The second phenomenon is related to intake – snuff was gaining ground in front of the emblematic smoking pipe. In the following century, the ways of recreational tobacco use would become even more diversified⁵.

Chapter 3 – *Tobacco in Transylvania – legislation, trade, production.*

How did these realities materialize in Transylvania? The subject aroused interest early on and, as we mentioned, the first history of tobacco in Transylvania appeared already in 1792. In this chapter, we gradually approach the problem, dividing it into three broad themes. First, we resume the subject of the spread of tobacco in Transylvania but now (3.1.) *From emergence to legislation*. Objectively, we do not have detailed information about the early

⁵ For the history of tobacco in general: Burns 2007. Goodman 1993. For the Carpathian Basin: Haider, Orgona & Ridovics 2000.

emergence of tobacco and related products – they remain at the level of simple mentions until they begin to be directly present in legislation. After the first measures taken by Mihály Apafi I, this legislation becomes increasingly denser. The Diet of December 19, 1670, through Article XIII, constitutionally prohibited the consumption of tobacco, its marketing and transit. The following year, however, the legislation was eased, allowing transit through the principality.

The Diet of Sighișoara in 1683 resumed the previous provisions – with the mention that despite them no change had been observed. In 1686, at the Diet of Alba, the import, cultivation and possession of tobacco was prohibited, citing the previous decisions as an argument. The Diet of Iernut in 1688, reinforced these decisions. The following year, the Diet of Sighișoara insisted even more on the prohibition of smoking and planting tobacco, and increased the penalties. Thus, a new and complex system of fines was established, in an attempt to stop abuses. However, the battle was already lost, the Diet's decision specifying that even those who collected fines from smokers did so "with a pipe in their mouth" and, according to some contemporary accounts, the participants in the Diet discussed how to combat smoking while smoking their own pipes. The Alba Iulia Diet of 1698 took up the subject again. After Transylvania came under the authority of the Habsburgs, the situation changed rapidly, and the 1702 patent of Emperor Leopold liberalized tobacco⁶. Various anti-smoking laws would remain in effect, however, due to the omnipresent fire danger that smoking implied. Other anti-smoking laws that remained in force had more abstract considerations, such as maintaining student morals.

In the new context of the 18th century, smoking would become widespread, with the pipe and tobacco pouch becoming practically an indispensable element of the period costume, as can be seen as we approach the themes related to (3.2.) *Production and processing*, and (3.3.) *Marketing and custom*. But Transylvania did not experienced the refined Ottoman customs, nor the expansion of tobacco cultivation experienced by neighboring regions. Even at the beginning of the 20th century, Transylvania's tobacco production represented only a fraction of that of Banat and not even 150th of that of Crișana. We could attribute this to the relief and climate, but historical Maramureș produced almost 20 times more tobacco. As will be seen, this regional disproportion did not remain at the level of tobacco production, but extended even further, in the field of production of utensils necessary for its consumption – while in Debrecen at the beginning of the 19th century 10,000,000 pipes and 200,000

⁶ In general see Codrea 2022 and Gruia 2013.

mouthpieces were produced annually, in Transylvania we are limited to occasional mentions of workshops and/or craftsmen who produced pipes. Much more frequently, documentary mentions are made of imported tobacco and pipes, brought by Armenian merchants, but also by Jews or other ethnic groups.

Chapter 4 – *Instruments.*

We thus arrive at the concrete aspects of the material culture implicit in tobacco consumption. (4.1) *Pipes* are the most emblematic instruments, and the main archaeological *marker* of this practice. In Transylvania they appear in oriental, composed of the actual smoking pipe, a stem and a mouthpiece. Of these, only the (4.1.1) *Smoking pipes* – and especially the ceramic ones – appear in significant numbers in archaeological contexts. Throughout the paper we will opt for classifying them into three major periods – the “Ottoman” (16th(?)-17th centuries), the “Baroque” (late 17th century – late 18th century) and the “industrial” (late 18th century – 20th century). Regarding the (4.1.2.) *Stems and mouthpieces*, most of the preserved artefacts are either recent or luxury pieces – or both – of little relevance to everyday instruments and to the general picture of the era. The one-piece (4.1.3.) *Western ceramic pipe* is notably absent from the repertoire of discoveries, Transylvania being firmly within the sphere of the Eastern pipe. However, we have (4.1.4.) *Porcelain pipes and other smoking instruments*, especially wooden pipes of the Western tradition and meerschaum or porcelain pipes, with origins in the Eastern composite tradition. Then there are (4.2.) *Containers for transporting and storing tobacco*, from simple bags to luxury snuffboxes, (4.3.) *Accessory tools – fire strikers, flints, pliers, cleaners* and (4.4.) *Other elements of material culture associated with tobacco* such as molds, chisels, etc. respectively – (4.4.1.) *Tools associated with the production of smoking pipes*. With this we enter into the concrete to discuss (4.4.2.) *Archaeological traces associated with tobacco production*.

Chapter 5 – *The state of archaeological research* .

In Romania, the publication of the first artefacts of this genre is due to Karl Romstorfer – in 1913 his volume *Cetatea Sucevii descrisă pe temeiul propriilor cercetări făcute între 1895 și 1904*⁷, published in Bucharest, included a plate with 18 archaeological smoking pipes, some observations about where they were found and a short commentary on one of them.

⁷Romstorfer 1913.

Even before that, in 1883, Flóris Rómer had begun to pay attention to the pipes found during the excavations at the cathedral in Oradea.

However, Transylvanian smoking pipes began to draw attention only at the end of the 20th century, through the gradual publication of pieces from Sibiu, Oradea and Vințu de Jos, followed in 2002 by an attempt at typology based on finds from Oradea⁸. The first section of the chapter, entitled (5.1) *Transylvania proper*, focuses on the historical core of the region and is intended to be not just a simple presentation of the bibliography, but a repertoire of discoveries known and disseminated, a working tool necessary to obtain an overall picture. The published discoveries fall into three large categories: sets of smoking pipes published from the typological perspective of tobacco archaeology/ethnography (Deva, Gheorghieni – Prișca, Reghin, Rupea, Sebeș, Sibiu), discoveries of pipes published as part of more complex inventories (Alba Iulia, Cluj-Napoca etc.) and simple non-detailed mentions, the latter being the most numerous.

In the second part of the chapter we extend the repertoire to (5.2.) *The connected parts of the principality of Transylvania*, where we include, for the sake of an overall picture, the western parts of present-day Romania (with the large lots put into circulation from Oradea and Timișoara) but also the great production center in Debrecen.

The third part of the chapter focuses on (5.3.) *The extra-Carpathian neighbors*, namely (5.3.1.) *Wallachia*, (5.3.2) *Moldavia*, and (5.3.3) *Dobruja*, without attempting this time to compile an exhaustive repertoire. A simple comparison between the discoveries inside the Carpathian arc and those outside it is sufficient to show two profoundly different material cultures. For the period of the 18th century and later, this is not surprising, Transylvania evolving along the lines of Central Europe, while the territories over the mountains followed the trajectory of the Ottoman Empire. But even in the early period, when only “Turkish” pipes circulated throughout the entire space, there are clear differences between the artefacts in use in Transylvania and those in use over the mountains.

Chapter 6 – *Three case studies*

Having thus obtained an overview in the previous chapter, based on published material and occasional unpublished information, we further clarify and detail the subject through *three case studies* based on substantial quantities of unpublished material. In these case studies we address not only issues related to the spread and typology of the material culture

⁸Russian 2002.

associated with tobacco but also procedural aspects, emphasizing the disadvantages presented by museum collections compared to discoveries with a known context.

Each of the three studies addresses a different social environment, namely that of large centers (exemplified by the case of Sibiu), that of secondary centers (exemplified by the case of Turda) and that of military contexts (exemplified by the case of the Báthory Fortress in Șimleu Silvaniei). The analysis and inventory of the unpublished materials that underpin these case studies are a noticeable progress in advancing the level of knowledge of the archaeology of tobacco consumption. An equally important contribution, however, is the fact that these lots are not analyzed solely by themselves, through simple typological analogies, but are put into context and compared with lots from similar contexts, allowing us to observe *patterns* of historical spread and shortcomings in modern publication.

6.1. A large center – Sibiu

The case of Sibiu is that of a vast urban context from which various discoveries, from different points, were published at different times, without being synthesized and gathered into a coherent whole, so that the picture remains fragmentary. But among the great centers of Transylvania proper, only about Sibiu can we say that it benefits from enough information to at least glimpse the panorama of the types of smoking pipes historically used. The case study, published in a first version during the doctorate⁹, was based on a group of 30 clay pipes, a wooden pipe and a pipe cleaner discovered in 2018-2020 during archaeological research carried out inside the Evangelical Cathedral of Sibiu.

We thus first present (6.1.1.) *The context of the archaeological research at the Evangelical Cathedral of Sibiu*, most of the pieces discussed originating from a level related to the restoration works carried out in the years 1853-1855, a specific deposit, rich in material. Regarding the smoking pipes, it immediately stands out that the most numerous are the artefacts of Central European type, generally in industrial forms easily attributable to the 19th century, as expected considering the chronology of the deposit from which they originated. Stamps of the workshops <A.RESS>, <AMSTÄTT[ER]> and <BODNAR / SCHEMNITZ> confirm the chronology. The forms are either Central European or late Ottoman, and the absence of smoking pipes of “Hungarian” type is notable, but the other published excavations in the city were not much richer in such type of discovery. The

⁹ Dobrota 2023.

difference from the material culture usual in other parts of Transylvania may be due to a cultural dichotomy between Saxons and Hungarians that extended to their smoking habits.

6.2. Secondary centers – Turda

Also from the urban environment, but from a completely different type of urban environment, come the pieces preserved in the archaeology and ethnography collections of the History Museum in Turda. While elaborating this thesis, 25 pieces from the museum's archaeology collection, 16 pieces from the ethnography collection and five specimens discovered during archaeological excavations at the Reformed church in Turda Veche were processed.

As we are talking about museum collections and artefacts with frequently uncertain provenances, the nature of the studied material was much more varied and the lot could be divided into (6.2.1.) *Materials of Ottoman tradition* and (6.2.2.) *Pipes from the Austro-Hungarian mass production era*. We were also able to make some initial statistical comparisons with two other nearby centers, Aiud and Reghin, which offer very different images, although, in the first case, the material with which we can work consists of a series of punctual discoveries, and in the second, it is a museum collection, as at Turda. A comparison between the lots from Turda, Aiud and Reghin is suggestive of the poverty of the early discoveries, both for the Ottoman ones proper and for those produced in the Ottoman tradition in the following era. On the other hand, mass-produced smoking pipes are very well represented, both in the case of the production of the large Hungarian workshops of the 18th century and of the Central European ones of the 19th(-20th) century.

6.3. Military contexts – Báthory Fortress in Șimleu Silvaniei

With the exception of workshops, military contexts have provided the most valuable – and most numerous – information on the evolution of smoking pipes, as they were intensively used in the military environment and the transformations undergone by the fortifications ensured the existence of clearly datable situations. A well-known case is Jeni Palanka, destroyed in 1686¹⁰, which provided a very rich material, successfully used for dating the types of smoking pipes widespread in the Ottoman period and for the time

¹⁰ Gaal 2010.

of their appearance. In Transylvania, a valuable lots of this kind were found at the Prișca quarantine, near Gheorghieni, in use between 1732 and 1808¹¹, and at Deva fortress¹².

The Bathory Fortress in Șimleu Silvaniei, which fell into disuse during the 18th century, is another very good example, and from here I had the opportunity to analyze a batch of 233 archaeological clay pipes. (6.3.1.) *The material of Ottoman tradition* is relatively well represented in the form of (6.3.1.1.) *Kaolin pieces*, (6.3.1.2.) *Common pieces*, (6.3.1.3.) *Glazed pieces*, but also (6.3.1.4.) *Regional variants*. Very early pieces appear, with Arabic inscriptions, which are missing further east. The general analogies are towards the area of present-day Hungary and the exact analogies suggest close links with Oradea and Deva. However, the majority of the material is represented by (6.3.2.) *Pipes from the Austro-Hungarian mass production era* or their derivative forms. The best represented is the Hungarian mass production of the late 17th-18th centuries, with the standard types M1, M2 and M3, as defined by Kondorosy¹³, being categorically predominant. The large amount of material has led to the analysis being divided into (6.3.2.1.) *Hungarian smoking pipes of type M1*, whose production ceased around 1720, (6.3.2.2.) *of type M2*, which continued until the middle of the century, (6.3.2.2.) *of type M3* and (6.3.2.4.) *Other types from the era of mass and industrial production* , a category underrepresented in Șimleu Silvaniei as a result of the gradual abandonment of the fortress.

At Báthory Fortress I had at my disposal a large, internally coherent set of smoking pipes from well-documented contexts and from a site with close dating. This allowed me to establish clear typologies and identify forms that circulated simultaneously in (6.3.3.) *The Smoking Pipes from Báthory Fortress in Their Archaeological Context*.

Chapter 7 – Transylvanian ceramic pipe – the main forms

Based on the information gathered during the elaboration of the case studies, correlated with the information already put into circulation and with the typologies previously advanced in the specialized bibliography, we have followed the distribution and typology of clay pipes. The great variety of shapes and decorations that the smoking pipe takes does not allow for the establishment of a fixed typology at this time. However, a series of striking shapes, clear chronological and stylistic landmarks can be discerned, some spread over vast territories, others local manifestations, but well defined. In this chapter we focused on these *marker*

¹¹ Demjen 2018.

¹² Codrea 2022.

¹³ Kondorosy 2010, with bibliography.

pieces, trying to define the period and space of their circulation – and in doing so, larger *patterns* took shape.

We structured the typology based on the three major periods already established in the previous chapters, thus resulting in three major segments: (7.1.) *The Ottoman period (late 16th century – early 18th century) and its legacy*, (7.2.) *The Baroque period (late 17th century – early 18th century)* and (7.3.) *The Industrial period (19th century – early 20th century)*.

In the Ottoman period we can differentiate between (7.1.1.) *Unarticulated smoking pipes* – within which we can recognize (7.1.1.1.) *Unarticulated pipes with articulated ring (Varna II)*, (7.1.1.2.) *Faceted and polished unarticulated pipes* and (7.1.1.3.) *Unarticulated pipes, light in color, with star decoration*. We then have (7.1.2.) *Semi-articulated pipes* from which the mass-produced ones will derive and among which we can discern (7.1.2.1.) *Semi-articulated Ottoman pipes with simple bowl*. Next are (7.1.3.) *Glazed pipes*, a category specific to the North Balkan and Pannonian space, which can be broadly divided between (7.1.3.1.) *Rosette pipes*, (7.1.3.2.) *Other unarticulated glazed pipes*, (7.1.3.3.) *Glazed pipes with lobed bowls* and (7.1.3.4.) *Articulated glazed pipes*. (7.1.4.) *Unglazed articulated pipes*, common in the Ottoman cultural sphere, are rarely encountered, their presence being largely limited to very early kaolin pieces, either with a long shank, a bowl and the inscription "*Liqā al mahbub liqā al qulub*", or with a short shank and bulgy.

The typology of the Baroque period is less varied, the era being dominated by (7.2.1.) *The "Hungarian" semi-articulated pipes* that evolve through the succession of three semi-standardized models – M1, M2 and M3 – before strongly diversifying. (7.2.2.) *The unarticulated pipes* continue to exist in the 18th century, characteristic for the period being the pieces with a tulip-shaped bowl. But we also have local forms – in Deva and Șimleu Silvaniei we can identify a type of unarticulated pipe, datable based on the context to the beginning of the 18th century, with a bag-shaped bowl and a shank that narrows strongly only to flare out again towards the end, an outline that is well reminiscent of the faceted red Ottoman pieces. A declining category are the (7.2.3.) *Glazed pipes and their descendants*, although variants of the usually unglazed categories are occasionally produced in glazed forms, a practice that will continue into the 19th century. In the category (7.2.4.) *Articulated pipes and the transition to industrial types* we include a number of local types, widespread over time.

The third period in the history of the evolution of the clay pipe is marked by the emergence of new large production centers, whose wares spread from one end of the Austrian empire to

the other. The dimensions of the pieces increase, the chimneys of the pipes (cylindrical, polygonal or flared cylindrical) become high, the proper bowls largely disappear, the rings become thinner and simpler, and the stamps become common. Two fashions predominate – the Central European (or typically industrial) one, and the evolved forms of the Hungarian pipes of the previous century. (7.3.1.) *Central European (Austrian) pipes* from the large production centers of present-day Slovakia, especially Schemnitz (Banská Štiavnica, Selmec(bánya)), but also Podreč (Podrečany) or Nitra or from Austria (Wiener Neustadt, Theresenfeld, Pernitz), dominate the landscape of Transylvanian archaeological discoveries. Although they bear famous stamps, other pieces were actually produced in Körmend, Vasvár, Bonyhád or Pápa in western Hungary. The factory at Batiz was also active, and production by local craftsmen also continued. Thus (7.3.2.) *Hungarian pipes* continue to exist, in forms influenced by Central European ones, and, later in the century (7.3.3.) *Café pipes* also appear.

Conclusions

During the 16th-18th centuries, Transylvania went through several phases, reflecting the transformations of the modern era, which can be summarized in a first phase, corresponding to the last years of medieval Hungary and the internal conflicts that followed, a second phase (1570-1691), corresponding to the technically independent principality, caught between East and West, and a third phase, corresponding to the Habsburg domination and the embrace of Central European values. The three phases overlap with the stages of tobacco dissemination in the Old World. The first corresponds to the introduction of *Nicotiana tabacum* and *Nicotiana rustica*, at the time still exotic plants, for which public interest is primarily medical, but which are already beginning to become forms of entertainment. The second corresponds to the rapid spread of tobacco as a means of entertainment and the counter-reaction embraced by traditional societies against this undesirable plant and the new customs it brings. The Principality of Transylvania follows here the broad guidelines of the era, after the mid-17th century the Diet issuing a whole series of anti-smoking edicts, both against smoking and against tobacco as such – edicts that prove to be too little effective in stopping its spread. The third period is marked by accepting coexistence with tobacco and by organized efforts to profit from it, through monopolies, encouragement of cultivation, mass production of smoking pipes, etc.

Historically, these stages are reflected in the documents of the era, first through brief, largely anecdotal mentions, then through increasingly voluminous legislation. By the end of the 18th century the already manuals for tobacco cultivation and the first book dedicated to

its history in Transylvania. Social reactions, from the fervent embrace of smoking to the horror of certain religious figures and the authorities' concern for the fire dangers it involved, can be traced through these documents, as well as the interactions implicit in tobacco production, trade and intake.

However, the documents speak too little about this necessary toolkit and only reflect some aspects of the life of the era. This is where the role of archaeology comes in to decipher the material culture implicit in tobacco use – mainly by tracing the evolution and spread of smoking pipes. The role of archaeology, however, is intertwined with that of ethnography, and the two disciplines need to collaborate to obtain a coherent overall picture.

Tobacco archaeology is, however, a relatively new field opened in Transylvanian. It was only in the 2010s that we saw the emergence of specialized studies dedicated to clay pipes based on materials from Gheorghieni – Prișca quarantine (A. Demjén), Reghin (A.M. Gruia) and Rupea (O. Toda), and, towards Banat and Partium, from Timișoara (B.A. Craiovan, R. Dincă, A. Gașpar, Zs. Kopeczny) and Oradea (Sz. Kondorossy). Previously, although pieces were occasionally published, only an attempt by D. Marta, to establish a typology of pipes based on the discoveries from Oradea, published in 2002 in the monograph coordinated by A.A. Rusu, can be considered a specialized paper. This situation contrasts sharply with that in Hungary, where specialists have long been focusing on this field of study.

Between the beginning of this work in 2018 and the present, there has been only one major contribution to the archaeological study of clay pipes in Transylvania, but a monumental one – the volume on the pieces from the Deva citadel, published in 2022 by I.C. Codrea. In the area of interest and for the period in question, the only group comparable in size and significance was the one gradually published by Sz. Kondorossy from the Szeged citadel. Our case studies add three more points on the map: Sibiu, Turda and the Báthory citadel in Șimleu Silvaniei. In terms of size and variety, among the lots currently analyzed and disseminated, the one from Șimleu Silvaniei is surpassed only by those from Deva and Szeged and has the advantage of the fact that the Báthory citadel fell out of use in the 18th century, so the material can be dated precisely. The case studies on Sibiu and Turda emphasize the incongruities inherent in publishing materials discovered in different parts of a city, originating from various contexts. The materials from the Evangelical Cathedral in Sibiu are relatively uniform, but the discoveries from other parts of the city reflect other typologies, other eras. In Turda, the museum's smoking pipe collection is varied and does not allow the establishment of a coherent profile of the material culture. At the Báthory fortress in Șimleu Silvaniei, on the other hand, we have materials associated with each other

that allow us to establish the contemporaneity of certain typologies and, overall, a sufficiently numerous and uniform lot to follow the evolution of clay pipes during the period of use of the fortress. Early materials, of Ottoman manufacture, appear correlated with each other, types of smoking pipes mass-produced at the beginning of the Habsburg era appear together with products of local manufacture, etc.

The correlation of these large lots with artefacts published from different points of Transylvania, discovery points that I have tried to catalogue in as much detail as possible, reveals a still fragmentary landscape, but in which we can observe certain clear trends of material culture. Ottoman kaolin pipes with long shanks, frequently inscribed in Arabic and dated to the beginning of the 17th century, possibly even around 1600, thus being the earliest clearly identifiable category, appear in Timișoara, Oradea and Șimleu Silvaniei, but not further east. The historical trajectory of the three points is different – Timișoara was already part of the Ottoman Empire since the 16th century, Oradea will become part in the mid-17th century, and Șimleu Silvaniei will remain outside the empire, which is reflected in the small number of early Ottoman finds here. In Deva we have Ottoman pipes from the 17th century, but not the earliest forms. Further east, any standard Ottoman material becomes rare – a pipe from Turda is the only clearly identifiable piece. Otherwise, we occasionally find artefacts that reflect Ottoman fashion, but in less typical forms, and difficult to date precisely.

In the four well-documented points on the western frontiers of the Transylvanian princes, different developments are observed. The material from Oradea and Șimleu Silvaniei suggests closer relations with the Hungarian space – i.e., the Budin Eyalet, as well as directly between the two sites. Some pieces also suggest direct relations between these sites and Deva, but at the Deva fortress other Ottoman forms dominate, unlike those in the north, indicating the preeminence of other connections. Timișoara has the most divergent development, here dominating a category of polished unarticulated red smoking pipes, which appear in such quantities that it seems logical to assume that they were produced locally. In smaller numbers, these also appear at Oradea, Șimleu Silvaniei, Deva and to the west, but are missing to the east, in Transylvania proper.

Objectively, with the exception of the Deva fortress, it is difficult, almost impossible, to find discoveries from this period in the other known Transylvanian sites. Even at Șimleu Silvaniei, in Crasna county, the early Ottoman material does not exceed 10%. This may be due to the fact that the assemblages are much less numerous and coherent (or too late), their absence reflecting only a stage of research, but it may also reflect the reality created by the legislation of the era. The appearance of artefacts of clear Ottoman inspiration, but not

belonging to fixed types, could in this case be explained by the attempts of local potters to imitate imported pieces after the liberalization of the market.

The establishment of Habsburg rule at the end of the 17th century is also reflected through changes in the typology of pipes, the Ottoman-made material being largely replaced by a mass production of the “Hungarian” type, mainly from the workshops in Debrecen. These types of pipes represent the majority of the discoveries from Șimleu Silvaniei, both in their classical forms and with different variations indicating other influences. In parallel with them, however, there is also at least one characteristic, local type of pipe circulating, richly decorated and descended from the unarticulated forms of the previous period. This type of pipe is also well attested in Deva, indicating the continued existence of some connection, but, except for an isolated exception in Szeged, it does not reappear in the region.

Further east, the discoveries, or at least the current stage of research and publication of the results, suggest a gradual spread of these mass-produced pipes. The "Hungarian" pieces mass-produced at the turn of the 17th-18th centuries are barely represented, those from the first half of the following century become more common, and in the second half of the century these mass-produced smoking pipes not only become widespread, but are also produced locally, with more or less success in imitating quality standards, a reflection of the liberalization of tobacco intake.

In parallel with them, better quality Central European-made merchandise, decorated with palmettes and other characteristic patterns, began to circulate, and new local types appeared. Some had a limited distribution, while others gained regional popularity, such as the black pipe with a "claw" bowl, one of the most characteristic types of pipe in the Transylvanian area, and one almost unheard of outside of it. Documented so far in Aiud, Alba Iulia, Andreeni, Baia Mare, Bran, Cluj-Napoca, Deva, Gheorghieni - Prișca, Reghin, Rupea, Saschiz, Sibiu, Șimleu Silvaniei, Târgu Secuiesc, Turda and further west in Szeged and possibly in Oradea, this type opens the series that ends the 18th century and dominates the 19th century, as demonstrated by its presence in Prișca, where the quarantine was in use between 1732 and 1808.

Easily recognizable due to the bowl shaped “in claws”, the result of the progressive stylization of the older petals, this type of pipe already shows the characteristics of the 19th century, especially through the black ware and the polished surface. However, regional subtypes can also be observed in the production of Hungarian pipes, characterized by orange ware, frequently with only a partially burnt core, and with a rough surface. In Turda and Gheorghieni – Prișca we have a “Hungarian” subtype that revalues the hemispherical bowl

of old-fashioned forms and combines it with a very short shank, ending in a ring that forms a flower. In Deva, Marghita, Oradea, Turda, Hatvan and (probably) Szeged a subtype closer to the classical form from the second half of the 18th century, but with the base of the bowl in the shape of a disk. Other subtypes of Hungarian pipes are documented by fewer specimens. In general, it is difficult to establish whether these were products of the large workshops in the Debrecen area or the results of local production, an activity well documented, such as in 1722 in Baia Mare. A number of atypical pieces, such as some from the Cristuru Secuiesc area, can be clearly attributed to local production, resembling more closely the old Ottoman models or what was produced over the mountains, but, since they generally lack clear contexts, an attempt to date them would be risky.

The majority of the discoveries in Transylvania proper, however, consist of merchandise attributable to the great 19th-century workshops in Slovakia, eastern Austria and western Hungary. However, the stamps (Batiz, Deva, Kronstadt) indicate the production of these smoking pipes continued locally and pipe makers continue to appear in documents. In the places where consistent lots have been published, these Central European materials either dominate the statistics or represent at least a significant proportion. The exceptions are the Báthory fortress in Șimleu Silvaniei and the Prișca quarantine in Gheorghieni, already out of use during this period. In Oradea, Hungarian pipe forms continue to predominate, probably due to the proximity to Debrecen. In Timișoara this type of merchandise is scarce, but almost all the material published from Timișoara is of early Ottoman manufacture.

To recapitulate these general lines, finds dating from the period of the principality proper (before 1690) are rare and those that do exist are concentrated in the west, in military contexts on the border with the Ottoman Empire. In contrast, finds from points under the direct control of the Sublime Porte (Timișoara, Oradea) are consistent. This reflects the anti-smoking legislation of the Diet and the (illegal) pipes mentioned in contemporary sources were probably of a more perishable nature. In the following period, when mass production begins in the Debrecen area, we observe a gradual spread of these mass-produced orange ware pieces, so that by the end of the 18th century this type of clay pipe had already taken root in Transylvania and was produced locally, in various shapes. The third period, characterized by pieces in the Central European style, generally of better quality than before, black or red ware, corresponds mainly to the 19th century, but these pieces already appear at the end of the previous one. The presence of stamps and better documentation of workshops now frequently allows for tracing origins, but counterfeiting of renowned products becomes a problem.

Each of these periods is marked by smoking pipes with characteristic features, but the great variety of types and workshops active in parallel makes it difficult to establish a fixed typology. If we were to classify the material not in a fixed typology, but in a series of categories, depending on its distinctive elements, a first categorical differentiation that we could try to make is between smoking pipes with a continuous profile – i.e. without a break between the shank and the bowl – and pipes with articulated profiles – in which the bowl and shank are distinct, more or less well-defined elements. The paste and finish are also distinctive elements. For the Ottoman period (pre-1690) we have distinctive unarticulated, glazed or kaolin paste forms, but forms of this type continue to appear in the following periods. Orange paste is characteristic for the “Hungarian” mass production and black and/or red quality paste for the Central European production, but there are always exceptions.

We draw attention to this due to the fact that the smoking pipes are usually discovered in a fragmentary state. If the bowl has survived, more or less intact, the classification of the artefact into one category or another is possible, as well as a more or less fitted dating. In many cases, however, we only have the shanks. Here too, distinctions can be made – in the Ottoman period, the unarticulated pieces had the shank finished in particular shapes, and the articulated ones preferred a large circular ring, with ante-ring protruding outwards; in the period of “Hungarian” mass production, the M1 type favored a terminal ring convex only towards the outside, notched linearly or with a toothed wheel, M2 had a richly geometrically decorated shank and a geometricized ring, twisted in a “turban” style, and M3 abandoned the decoration on the shank and used a carelessly notched terminal ring in a simplified “turban” style. In the following period, the Central European merchandise tends to reduce the ring to a simple terminal band or pair of bands, a fashion now taken up by the “Hungarian” production. These general trends are not without exceptions, however, as a bowl specific to a certain type can be combined with a shank more characteristic of another type.

Based on the inventory of known and published points of discovery, a working tool for a better understanding of the general situation, and the analysis of the smoking pipes from Sibiu, Turda and Șimleu Silvaniei, we were able to obtain analogies and synchronisms for these elements of material culture. In addition, each of the three case studies presented a different facet of the archaeology of tobacco intake. In the case of Sibiu, a large urban center, from where we have a consistent lot of pipes discovered in an archaeological context clearly dated before the mid-19th century and which can be compared with discoveries from other points of the city. In the case of Turda, a museum collection, varied and inhomogeneous,

which cannot be analyzed based on clear contexts, but only through analogies. At Șimleu Silvaniei, a homogeneous group of over 200 pieces, originating from a well-dated military context, a fortress that fell into disuse in the 18th century, and which, additionally, offers the opportunity for synchronisms due to the situations in which smoking pipes of different types emerged in large numbers.

Thus, based on these case studies, and pre-existing information, we were able to identify the main types of smoking pipes that can serve as temporal markers and establish a general typology, in which the artefacts can be placed. In the process, distribution patterns were also revealed, revealing relationships between different centers, or, due to the lack of analogies, the absence of such connection, which concretely reflects historical information about anti-smoking legislation in the Principality of Transylvania and the success of tobacco use in the following periods.

I would like to thank Ms. Daniela Veronica Istrate, my doctoral supervisor, for the intellectual and moral support she has offered me over the years and for the patience she has shown during the development of this thesis. I also thank her for the access she has provided to unpublished materials from the Báthory Fortress in Șimleu Silvaniei, the Black Church in Brașov, the Reformed Church in Turda Veche and Bonțida. I also thank her for the opportunity to participate during this doctoral research in the archaeological investigations carried out at the Evangelical Cathedral in Sibiu, the Reformed Church in the Citadel of Aiud and the refuge fortress in Saschiz, all sites that have provided valuable unpublished materials for the subject of this work.

I also thank Horațiu Dorin Groza, Vasile Paul Scrobota, Adrian Ioniță and Aurel Dragne for the information provided and for access to the materials. I thank the staff of the Institute of Archaeology "Vasile Pârvan", Bucharest, and the School of Advanced Studies of the Romanian Academy (SCOSAAR) for the opportunity they offered me to pursue this doctorate.

Bibliography

- Benkó 1792 Benkó, Joseph, *Közep-ajtai dohány, melyet Nemes Erdély ország gyűlése alkalmatosságával Kolosvárra el-adni küld Benkó Joseph*. Szebenben, és Kolo'sváratt: Hochmeister Márton, 1792.

- Burns 2007 Burns, E., *The Smoke of the Gods. A Social History of Tobacco*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2007.
- Codrea 2022 Codrea, Ionuț-Cosmin, *Obiceiul fumatului în Transilvania (secolele XVII-XIX). Pipe descoperite în cetatea Deva*. Cluj-Napoca: Mega, 2022.
- Demjén 2018 Demjén, Andrea, *The Tobacco Pipes Discovered at the Quarantine in Pricske (Harghita County)*. Ziridava. *Studia Archaeologica* 32, p. 221-252.
- Dobrotă 2023 Dobrotă, Sebastian Ovidiu, *Smoking pipes and paraphernalia from the recent archaeological investigations in the Evangelical parish church in Sibiu*. *Studii și Cercetări de Istorie Veche și Arheologie* 73-74, 2022-2023, p.89-120.
- Gaál 2010 Gaál, Attila, *Pipes from the time of the Turkish occupation in the collection of Wosinsky Mór Museum*. *Journal of the Académie Internationale de la Pipe* 3, 2010, p.33-52.
- Goodman 1993 Goodman, Jordan, *Tobacco in History. The Cultures of Dependence*. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Gruia 2013 Gruia, Ana-Maria, *The Gift of Vice. Pipes and the habit of smoking in early modern Transylvania*. Cluj-Napoca: Mega, 2013
- Kondorosy 2010 Kondorosy Szabolcs, *Clay pipes in eighteenth-century Hungary*. *Journal of the Académie Internationale de la Pipe* 3, 2010, p.13-19.
- Pop I.A. & Bolovan 2013 Pop, I. A., Bolovan, I., *Istoria Transilvaniei*. Cluj-Napoca : Eikon, 2013.
- Rusu A.A. 2002 Rusu, Adrian Andrei (red.), *Cetatea Oradea. Monografie arheologică. Vol. I. Zona Palatului Episcopal*. Oradea: Editura Muzeului „Țării Crișurilor”, 2002.