



www.gi.sanu.ac.rs
www.doiserbia.nb.rs, www.scindeks.ceon.rs
J. Geogr. Inst. Cvijic. 64(3) (377–382)



Scientific review paper

UDC: 912(048.07)
DOI: 10.2298/IJGI1403377G

**COMMENT ON ARTICLE “KUZMANOVIĆ L. (2013).
CARTOGRAPHIC RECOGNITION WITH ELEMENTS OF
PLANOGRAPHY OF MEDIEVAL SQUARE MACHO” (J. GEOGR.
INST. CVIJIC. 63 (4) 111-123)**

Tivadar Gaudenyi^{*1}

* Geographical Institute “Jovan Cvijić” SASA, Belgrade, Serbia

Received 10 November 2014; reviewed 15 November 2014; accepted 17 November 2014

The confused and hardly understandable paper of Lepota Kuzmanović (hereinafter: the Author) who according to the title was trying to made a cartographic recognition of the “Medieval square Macho”.

Town/fortress and land of Macho

The title of papers should be concise and informative, however in the mentioned title and the article text are mentioned the Medieval square. In the Abstract is mentioned square and town of Macho, in the keywords “square Macho” and in the paper is pointed on square, town and district of Macho. The name district (*okrug*) used in modern administrative context in Serbia, in the Medieval times Macho were used as a name for a land / area (province/county and principality) and the town / fortress. According to the available literature only in one source was mentioned “Districtus Macho”. However, as in the literature it was lack of information about the “Medieval square Macho”.

The in the available published sources the Medieval name of Macho has been used for the name of Macho has been used in two contexts as town / forress (a) and as a land (b-c)(e.g. : Lemajić, 2007; Spremić 1976, Thallóczy & Áldásy, 1907; Pesty, 1875).-

a) As **town and/or fortress of Macho** (*Lat.: Macho / Machow / Machou / castrum Machokv, Hung.: Macsó / Macsókö, Serb.: Mačov / Mačva*),

¹ Correspondence to: t.gaudenyi@gi.sanu.ac.rs

b) As a province / county: the **Banat of Macho** (*Lat.: Banatus Machoviensis / Macho / Machow / Machyo, Hung.: Macsói Bánság / Macsó / Macsóság, Serb.: Mačvanska banovina / Mačva*).

c) **Principality of Bosnia-Macho** (Serb.: Kneževina Bosanska Mačva, *Hung.: Boszniai Macsó Hercegség*).

In the modern context **Mačva** is the name of the administrative district (*Mačvanski okrug*) or Mačva or Mačva Plain (*Mačvanska nizija*) in geomorphological sense one of the south segments of the Pannonian Plain (e.g. Čalić et al., 2012).

The place names in historical context cannot be used the modern name if the historical name is different, only as explanations (i.e. we use the name *Singidunum* if we speaking in the context of history concerned the Roman Empire not Belgrade).

The Banat of Macho exist between 1254 (first governor: Rostislav Mikhailovich “Dominus de Machou”) and 1490 (last governor: Lawrence of Ujlak – Ban of Macho), more details about its governors were written by Pesthy (1875), Wertner (1909) Engel (1994, 1996). Its area changed during the Medieval history (existence of the Banat of Macho).

The location of the town / fortress of Macho

The Author in the Abstract when is mentioned that Gradac a village in Slovenia (!) appears as the recognized counterpart of Macho, however in the rest of the paper was dealing with the area of NW parts of Central Serbia.

he studies of the identification the postion of the former town/fortress Macho as well a description of changes the area of the land of Macho was given in the paper of Ćirković (2008). This new studies did not deliver any new scientifically facts regarding the position of town / fortress Macho.

The Medieval town/fortress of Macho which was the capital of the Banat of Macho is very difficult to identified, the according the written documents its position is not clear. It exist several theories which was the thematic of different forums of historians in Hungarian language: Fortress explorers blog – Várkutató (http://varkutato.blogter.hu/183408/macso_vara) and the Fortress heritage historians blog (<http://dnaploja.wordpress.com/2013/10/05/macso-fekvese/>)

According to the statements they conclude the following:

The position of Macho is according to the written documents could be identified

- a) In the town in Valjevo and its vicinity (i.e. Rađevo selo or Gradac) (Thallóczy, 1875)
- b) Between Šabac and Debrce
- c) Between Šabac and the Drina (Engel, 1988)
- d) Most probably in the slopes of the Cer mountain (Trojanov grad) (Fejér, 1844)
- e) The Gradac fortress was mainly identified as another fortification (Kolubar fortification).

The general statement is that archaeological excavations should confirm these theories and without them cannot speak the clear position of the Medieval town/fortress of Macho, similar conclusions had in his paper Čirković (2008).

Other Remarks

The chapter "Material and Methods" was missed where should indicate why the Author choose the methodology (if even have them) and how he applied it, when trying to find the location of Medieval Macho.

The written monuments are quite rare it would be nice to put the references or images. Also if Macho existed as late antique and Slavic settlement why we do not have a reference in the paper? If it exists a reference of two different locations of town of Macho why the author did not mention at least one reference from each?

Why the author did not use the same principles for about the language when writing names of the Hungarian kings (some of them are written in English some and in Hungarian with mistakes)?

The Ottoman Empire (not Otoman empire as it is in the text) was the official name of the state between 1299-1923 which is the successor of the modern Republic of Turkey. In that case we can speak about Ottoman government (if

previously mentioned Ottoman Empire in that cases it is recommended to use Ottoman Empire).

Also in the context of history “...it is not terminated the domination of Mačva guidance” the Banate of Macho does not exist when starts to be a part of the Ottoman Empire.

Also the main facts were written that in the Serbian state of Tsar Stephen Dushan (Serb.: Stefan Dušan) became Macho he renamed the to new name according the Serbian language to Gradac, however without any references it is questionable.

Another wrong fact is written that “that Hungary continues to use geographic toponym Macho, relying on centuries-old tradition of these areas” First of all Thallóczy's (1895) article was written in German and cannot realize from that article what is the “centuries-old tradition”. Second the first official language in Hungary was the Latin till 1834. Also it is not a tradition, it is a historical official name from that period and if we used the toponym in historical context it is recommended to use the official name from that period. Another thing according the use of toponyms of the Hungarian language rules the last Hungarian used name if it exist in the language has been still used in the Hungarian language (i.e. the Hungarian medieval name for Smedrevo is Szendrő still in the writing in Hungarian is used Szendrő, only on brackets putting the official / Serbian name Smederevo, however if it is in the context of the Medieval age used as international standards the official name Semendria or the Hungarian Szendrő).

What means “faithfully copied the maps”? Which maps from the Medieval period was copied and in the map the town Macho was indicated, it is not clear in the author's text? Also according the Hungarian sources the town Macho / Macsó is not in the same place (e.g. Figure 3, 5, 8) or it was used a different cartographical projections?

It is definitively that the Bulgarian cited map (the source which is cited holds more than 700 maps without the title of map cannot see the thematic and the elements of the map because as the other segment of the map are without or with wrong titles) however it is evident the Macho according the Hungarian maps (Figure 1 and Figure 8.) are in the different banks of the river than the Bulgarian segment of the map (Figure 7).

I read for the first time in scientific article that King Sigismund and King Charles used in their charters used the Serbian place names as Radjevina, Beljina, Ljig, Debrc, Bela stena, as "prince Lazar" used the English name Small Srem.

In the article I cannot understand why the authors cited Novaković (1912) and Dinić (1978) because the Banat of Macho was described in the official documents of governors (Bans) were more accurate where was described the area which they governed.

How we know that they were Slavic fortification? We know (Prlender, 1991) that fortifications mainly served to defend from the troops of the Ottoman Empire of King Sigismund and a part of the citizens of Macho were Serbs.

Also the evidence of the wrong translation witnessed in the citation of Veselinović (1997) "ad partes Sclauonie ad locum dictum Mačua" which was translated in the text as "in Serbian areas in a place called Mačva" however it should be "in parts of Slavonia in the place called Macho (Mačva should be used if the text is in Serbian)".

Which family names of the Bans of Macho is also have a new data because the literature first time found family names as Garaia and Ilok, which sources / references used the author ?

Figures

The used figures which are the reduced copies of some general (thematic?) maps without its title or content and / or legend. All maps has been produces after the Medieval times, however I expect at least to have some copies of them. There are also evident some mistakes The Fig 1. and Fig 2. are the segments which were made in the same and with same errors as Szávaszdemeter and Mitrovica have to be in the same place which is now Sremska Mitrovica, Szávaszdemeter is the Hungarian and Medieval name, Mitrovica is the transliteration of the German Mitrowitz or Serbian/Croatian Mitrovica from the period when it was a part of the Habsburg Empire. Some other maps are not readable however (Figure 3. and 11). Also the "areal recording of fortress Gradac" (in brackets mentioned "Brangović, Jerina City, Macho") without any further explanations: Gradac is a fortress (without explanation from which period), Jerina's town is an archaeological site (without explanation which period) in the village of Brangović, Macho is in the context of Mačva district or Medieval Macho is unclear.

References

Why the Author did not followed the authors guide for preparing the manuscript? In this case we have no idea where to find the references in the cited web sites (the link to the site is generally the collection of maps where are in some cases a hundreds of them, indeed we do not he in the article text the title of the map).

References:

- Ćirković, S. (2008) Zemlja Mačva i grad Mačva. Prilozi za književnost, istoriju, istoriju i folklor LXXIV (1–4), 3–20.
- Engel, P. (1994). Magyarország és a török veszély Zsigmond korában (1387-1437). Századok 128, 273–287.
- Engel P. (1996). Magyarország világi archontológiája, 1301-1457. História 17: MTA Törttud. Int. – Budapest.
- Fejér, G. (1844). Codex diplomaticus Hungariae ecclesiasticus ac civilis, X (VI), Buda.
- Lemajić, N. (2007). Ugovor u Tati između despota Stefana Lazarevića i Žigmunda Luksemburškog, Radovi Filozofskog fakulteta, 8, Istočno Sarajevo, 443–448.
- Magyar Katolikus Lexikon (<http://lexikon.katolikus.hu/> derived on 12.02.2014)
- Pesty F. (1876). A macsóí bánok. Századok 6, 361–381.
- Prlender, I. (1991). Sporazum u Tati 1426. godine i Zigmundovi obrambeni sustavi. Historijski zbornik, XLIV, 1. sz. 23–41.
- Spremić, M. (1976). Despot Djuradj Branković i Mačvanska banovina. Istorijski časopis, 23, 23–37.
- Thallóczy, L., Áldásy, A. (Eds.) (1907). A Magyarország és Szerbia közti összeköttetések oklevéltára, 1198–1526, Magyarország melléktartományainak oklevéltára - Codex diplomaticus partium regno Hungariae adnexarum, II, Budapest.
- Wertner, M. (1909). Az Árpádkori bánok; Második közlemény. Századok, 472–494.