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ARTICLES
Topography of Power: Venice and the Eastern Adriatic Cities in the Century Following the Fourth Crusade

Irena Benyovsky Latin

In the thirteenth century, in the aftermath of the Fourth Crusade, Venice became an important power in the Mediterranean, which caused profound change in its political, territorial and economic ambitions. The main strategy of Venice was to maintain the sea route from the northernmost point in the Adriatic to the Levant, and therefore it was crucial to dominate politically over the Eastern Adriatic: the cities there could serve as points of departure or safe harbours in which Venetian vessels could be sheltered and supplied with merchandise, food, water, and manpower. One of the ways to incorporate the Eastern Adriatic cities into a common area of governance was to construct recognizable public buildings, and to introduce and standardize a legal and administrative order that was mainly adapted to the central political entity, but also served the local urban communities. This paper follows the changes that were directly or indirectly mirrored in the urban structure of the cities during the thirteenth century: primarily the design of urban spaces (especially public ones) and the construction of public buildings linked to governance, defence, trade or administration. During the thirteenth century, one can follow the development of Venetian ambitions and their focus on particular areas or activities (economic, military) in the state, as well as the activities of Venetian patricians holding the governor’s office. Naturally, the local circumstances and the local population had a crucial impact on the formation of urban space, but this paper focuses primarily on the role of the Venetian administration in this respect.

Keywords: Eastern Adriatic. Croatian Middle Ages. Venice. Urban History. Public Buildings.

Introduction

The term “topography of power” in this paper refers to determining the area of central authority (Venice) over the cities (Eastern Adriatic), and identifying the ways and channels that consolidated and enforced that authority. Implementation, maintenance and enforcement of central power were carried out in different ways and through different channels – institutions, personal relations, rituals, diplomacy, legal and administrative models, public works, and the design and construction of some kind of “compendia” of power symbols. Namely, the power was consolidated through the control and (re)construction of (new) public buildings and facilities – primarily government buildings for the government representatives, commercial and/or administrative buildings – which will be the focus of this paper.

This study was financed by the Croatian Science Foundation, project nr. 2055 (Topography of power. Eastern Adriatic cities in medieval spheres of power (TOPOS); http://topos.s11.novenaweb.info/en/home/)

Prof. dr. sc. Irena Benyovsky Latin, Croatian Institute of History, Zagreb, Croatia; ibenyovsky@isp.hr; ORCID iD: 0000-0002-6325-7415

Medieval notions of power, authority, dominion, or jurisdiction are not easy to interpret. The medieval state and the character of power and administration differed from the territorial state of the Early Modern Period, and especially from the nation state of our times, so that their participants and processes should not be evaluated outside of their chronological context. CHITTOLINI – MOLHO – SCHIERA, Origini dello Stato. BRUNNER, Land and Lordship. HORODOWICH, Language and Statecraft. HUMMER, Visions of kinship. BENYOVSKY LATIN, Introductory study, 13–35.
Today, the Eastern Adriatic is geographically perceived as a recognizable segment of the Mediterranean, as part of the coastal area of various countries (mostly Croatia, but also others – Italy and Slovenia in the north, Montenegro and Albania in the south). Many processes in the Eastern Adriatic had been transforming the area since the times before the Middle Ages. The cities had very complex layers of different heritage and it was their interaction that made the urbanization of the Eastern Adriatic coast so specific. Also, cities in this area differed as to the time and circumstances of their foundation, since some inherited an ancient urban core (Split, Dubrovnik), and some were built ex novo (Šibenik, Korčula). The focus of this paper will be on the Croatian part of the Eastern Adriatic. The cities in this area had a common heritage in terms of ethnicity, religion and language, which were more important criteria of identity than the political divisions or changing borders. However, this area was a heterogeneous geographical entity and it was often politically fragmented during the medieval period. Thus, a number of urban communities had specific relations with the local, central or regional authorities.

Figure 1: Map of the Eastern Adriatic (made by Ivana Haničar Buljan).

---

2 Cf. JANEKOVIĆ RÖMER, Mnoga lica i značenja srednjovjekovlja, 501–508. BERTOŠA, Istra, Jadran, Sredozemlje.
3 Cf. KREKIĆ, Dubrovnik.
Eastern Adriatic cities are mostly located along the easily navigable, indented coast, which was one of the reasons for the great interest in this area throughout history. The area was strategically important in the Middle Ages, since it was located on the route from Western Europe (via Venice) to the Levant, and from the Mediterranean to the continental areas (Central Europe) – and so the cities were crossroads of encounter and exchange in this part of medieval Europe. The Venetians aspired to bring the Eastern Adriatic – especially its cities – under their control because of its excellent position as well as its existing heritage and “infrastructure” – solidly built harbours that could be enlarged if needed, the existing customs and laws that could be easily adjusted, and the population that they could communicate with as plurilingualism was a specific feature of the Eastern Adriatic. For the Venetians, merchants from the coastal cities were of great help as intermediaries in the trade with the states in the hinterland, since they spoke a language similar to that of this area and had better knowledge of the political and social situation. Also, the local population practiced the same (Roman Catholic) religion as the Venetians.

Venice showed strong aspirations to dominate the Eastern Adriatic from the early eleventh century, because the area was a natural maritime route for its targeted expansion to the Levant – the Adriatic Sea interconnected various parts of its territory, cities, islands and coasts. The founding element of Venetian expansion out of the lagoon was a naval expedition in the year 1000, commanded by Doge Pietro II Orseolo. He first took control over the Adriatic as the “Gulf of Venice” and titled himself as dux Veneticorum et Dalmaticorum. Thus the Venetians were recognized as an Adriatic power and no longer a regional state. But in this early period, it primarily meant the Byzantine recognition of Venetian authority over the Quarner islands, particularly Rab, Krk, and Osor, and until the Fourth Crusade (or for some cities even later), Venice was not in the position to establish continuous authority in the Eastern Adriatic for prolonged periods of time. For Venice, the urban communes in the Eastern Adriatic

---

5 Although Roman or Latin languages in the Adriatic often imply the import from Venice or other Italian centres, not all of the Latin culture was imported in this period. Since the early Middle Ages, Roman and Slavic heritage and culture were not just confronted but were elements of a new and unique culture. The influx of people from the hinterland to the coastal towns was a lengthy process and their assimilation with the local populations finally resulted in the creation of distinctly Croatian-Latin bilingual communities in all strata of society and even in the patriciate. Certainly, this process was not the same in all parts of the Eastern Adriatic. RAUKAR, Hrvatsko srednjovjekovlje, 136. JANEKOVIĆ RÖMER, Slavensko i romansko, 207–226.
6 Thus, Dubrovnik continued its relations with the hinterland: in 1215, the king of Serbia granted free trade to merchants from Dubrovnik, while in 1230, the Bulgarian tsar allowed the people of Dubrovnik to trade throughout the country. In the thirteenth century, Serbia became very powerful under the rule of Uroš I and that is the time when mines of noble metals are first mentioned. The king tried to conquer Dubrovnik several times. Dubrovnik had a very complex relationship with the hinterland – the populations spoke similar languages, but were of different confessions (Dubrovnik being Roman Catholic).
7 DOUMERC, L’Adriatique du XIIe au XVIIe siecle, 201–312. For instance, although Venice supported mendicant orders in the Eastern Adriatic cities, many of the friaries in the Eastern Adriatic were built in the cities before Venetian rule, and all were widely accepted by the local population (unlike the cities of present-day Greece, where the role of the mendicants was a part of “latinization”).
8 See also: OSTALLI – SCHMITT, Balcani occidentali. ROBBERT, Venice and the Crusades, 379–451.
9 ORTALLI, Pietro II Orseolo, 13–27.
10 Venice only dominated the entire Eastern Adriatic in the 1320s, but this was not enough to establish its sovereignty, such as that achieved in the fifteenth century. From the first decades of the fourteenth century, the Hungarian rulers of the new Anjou dynasty had the ambition to create a powerful continental-naval state, to
were significant primarily for strategic reasons, but symbolic reasons were equally important for expansion – it was necessary that the entire Adriatic enhance the fame of the Serenissima. Dominance over the Adriatic Gulf was rooted in the political culture of Venice and was central to Venetian mythology (including the Ascension Day ceremony of the doge wedding the sea).\textsuperscript{11}

However, various regional and central powers aspired to control the Eastern Adriatic as well: Byzantium (in this early period, though briefly), the Hungarian-Croatian kings and the Croatian magnates from the hinterland, and the Patriarch of Aquileia, but also Bosnian and Serbian rulers and magnates. The Genoese were also fighting for the same economic area in the Adriatic Sea.\textsuperscript{12} In the period that followed, the maritime policy changed and the balance of power with Genoa and the Hungarian king was challenging. The central government over the cities had different continuity, dynamics and reach, which depended on the area and the time period. The Hungarian-Croatian rulers from the Arpad dynasty had considered themselves to be the natural heirs of Dalmatian cities ever since King Koloman’s crowning in the city of Biograd in 1102. However, not all Hungarian kings had the same level of power and interest as Koloman to engage in active governance over the Adriatic. This weakening grip on the coastal area resulted in the cities’ attempts at securing their independence, but also an increase in the aspiration of other powers, primarily Venice. Before the Fourth Crusade, Dalmatian cities alternately recognized the rule of Venice and the Hungarian rulers, and Venice exerted continuous control over the upper Adriatic before the thirteenth century, in the Quarner islands (Rab/Arbe, Cres/Cherso, and Krk/Veglia). The area of the northern Adriatic was obviously the primary interest of Venice – the cities there were closer to Venice and easier to control. Hungarian rulers invested in “reconquering” Dalmatian cities (like Zadar/Zara, Šibenik/Sebenico, Trogir/Traù and Split/Spalato) with armed force and by making liaisons with the Croatian magnates from the hinterland.\textsuperscript{13}

Before the second half of the thirteenth century, the impact of Venice on the coastal cities is more difficult to assess because of the scarcity of preserved sources. Our information therefore comes only from the narrative sources as well as some sporadic which purpose it was crucial to dominate the Eastern Adriatic. To achieve this aim, they used their connections with the Croatian magnates from the hinterland. In this “campaign” of the Anjou kings in the fourteenth century, Louis I of Anjou was the most successful in this respect. When Dalmatian cities were subjected to the sovereignty of the Hungarian Crown in 1358, this resulted in institutional changes and a partial transformation of the fortifications, public spaces and administrative palaces. However, early in the fifteenth century, the territorial-political relations changed considerably as to the role of Venice, as well as the new circumstances caused by the Ottoman incursions and their important consequences for the Hungarian kingdom. Since then, as part of the Stato da mar, most of the Eastern Adriatic cities shared the fate of Venetian political, social and military plans (except the territory of the Republic of Dubrovnik). BENYOVSKY, Interventi sul piano, 981–1016.

\textsuperscript{11} To legitimize the traditional ceremony of the doge’s marriage with the Adriatic Sea. See: LANE, Venice. Maritime Republic, 200, 224–237. MUELLER, Aspects of Venetian Sovereignty, 30. TENENTI, The Sense of Space and Time, 17–46.

\textsuperscript{12} DOTSON, Venice, Genoa and Control, 135.

\textsuperscript{13} It is known that after the death of the Hungarian-Croatian king Béla IV and the ensuing dynastic struggles, there was a sudden rise of the Croatian magnates who exercised their power from the fortified cities in the hinterland of Dalmatia (Modruš, Ostrovica, Bribir, Knin, Klis), with territorial pretensions concerning the Dalmatian cities, which all affected the status of urban autonomy. The Šubić of Bribir played a major role in the political events of Eastern Adriatic cities at the turn of the fourteenth century, replacing the weak royal power of the last Arpad kings in Croatia and Dalmatia. The relations between the Counts of Bribir and Venice were complex – despite their joint campaigns against the family Kačić of Omiš as well as many personal connections, in regard to the Adriatic cities they were rivals. See: KARBIC, Odnosi gradskoga plemstva, 43–58.
documents. In the second half of the century, the sources became more systematic, both those linked to private legal affairs (notarial records) and those of public nature (decisions of councils, statutes). It is known that from the twelfth century, patricians (Venetian but also local) were often given territories in hereditary lease (leased countship) on the Quarner islands, in exchange for consolidating the Venetian rule and offering military and trade support (often the doges’ sons were granted countships there). This principle was applied in Osor/Osera – an important strategic point on the island of Cres (the Venetian patrician families of Michaeli and then Morosini). On the island of Rab/Arbe, the twelfth-century Venetian counts were often sons of doges. They obtained their office for life from Venice, although it was not hereditary owing to the previously gained autonomy (the municipality of Rab was subjected to Venice, not to the count). On the island of Krk/Veglia, the local Counts Bartol I and Vid I were given the office to administer in the twelfth century and their family retained their hereditary power throughout the thirteenth century, although not continuously. The island of Korčula/Curzola was given into hereditary lease to the Zorzi family in the twelfth century by Doge Domenico Michiel (Popone Zorzi obtained the leased countship in the period from around 1125 to 1180) and then it was referred to Marslio Zorzi, who obtained the leased countship of Korčula in the mid-thirteenth century. The Istrian cities were ruled by the Patriarchs of Aquileia until the end of the thirteenth century, yet gradually gained a certain degree of autonomy. However, the city podestàs there were often members of Venetian nobility (but also Friulian, or local Istrian). Also, Venice signed special trade agreements with some Istrian cities (Kopar/Capodistria, Rovinj/Rovigno, Poreč/Parentino, Novigrad/Cittanova and Umag/Umago, as with the Italian cities of Rimini, Cremona, Treviso, Aquileia, Ravena and Verona). Among the most attractive Eastern Adriatic cities for Venice were two cities in central and southern Dalmatia – Zadar/Zara and Dubrovnik/Ragusa – which had extensive trade networks infra and extra culfum. Dubrovnik did not recognize the Venetian rule before the thirteenth century (except briefly in 1171–1172) and Zadar repeatedly rebelled against the Serenissima, relying on the Hungarian king in the twelfth century. Venice had strategic but also economic interest in Zadar because of the salt pans on

14 LONZA, Mletačka vlast nad Dubrovnikom, passim.
15 Beginning with Doge Pietro Polani in the twelfth century and continuing with the doges Domenico Morosini and Vitale II Michiel: MILLER, Venice in the East Adriatic, 64.
16 BEUC, Osorska komuna, 1–160.
17 MLACOVIC, The Nobility and the Island, 166.
18 KOSANOVIĆ, Družine i potknežini knezova, 234.
19 FORETIĆ, Otok Korčula u srednjem vijeku, 38. BELAMARIC, Osnutak grada Korčule.
20 MINOTTO, Documenta ad Foriumilli, 3–47. PRELOG, Poreč, grad i spomenici, 35.
21 For instance, the doge signed a treaty in 1182 with Kopar where he established the “salt stage”. Kopar was a major commercial hub in Istria and beyond. MILLER, Venice in the East Adriatic, 52. Cf. HOCQUET, Venise et le monopole.
23 Dubrovnik maintained active economic ties with cities on both sides of the Adriatic in the twelfth century. Just like Zadar, it had numerous trade contracts with Italian cities: with Pisa (1169), Ravena (1188), Fano, Ancona (1199), Molfetta in Apulia (1148), the nearest dominion across the Adriatic, Bari, Monopoli (1201), and Termoli (1203): Cf. LUCIC, Dubrovačke teme, 518. ASHTOR, Il commercio levantino di Ancona. KREKIĆ, Le port de Dubrovnik, 653–673.
the island of Pag (mostly owned by the nobles of Zadar and partly Rab). 24 Also, Zadar was surrounded by a large agricultural hinterland, and had trade networks with the Croatian and Hungarian continental lands. 25 The city was a potential supplier of food to Venice. 26 Owing to its geopolitical position, Dubrovnik functioned as a link between Italy, the Slavic hinterland and the Levant. 27 The Balkan hinterland was important for Venice because of the growing exploitation of precious metals and other raw materials in the area of present-day Serbia and Bosnia.

**Gaining control after 1204**

In the thirteenth century, Venice became an important factor in the Mediterranean. 28 As the Venetian economic empire largely depended on the sea, it was crucial to ensure a safe path to the Mediterranean and the Levant. 29 The cities there could serve as points of departure, return or maritime relay for Venetian military and merchant ships or those destined for the Holy Land. 30 In their harbours, vessels could be sheltered and supplied with merchandise, food, water and manpower.

Thus, in the first half of the thirteenth century, the Venetian rule was established or consolidated in northern Dalmatian cities (Osor, Krk, Rab) as well as the ones in central and southern Dalmatia (Zadar, Dubrovnik and briefly Dyrrachium). The sea route towards the Levant continued through the Ionian Sea with its newly conquered cities of Corfu, Coron and Modon in south-western Peloponnese, all the way to Crete (Candia) in the Aegean. Venice was also connected to Constantinople via Negroponte, and another route led to Syria (the newly conquered cities of Akkon and Tyr). 31 Parts of the acquired territory along the Mediterranean route were soon lost (Dyrrachium and Corfu were now in the hands of the Despot of Epirus), 32 which made the above-mentioned Eastern Adriatic cities all the more important. 33 Certainly, the conquest of Zadar and Dubrovnik was a great success, but the situation was far from stable in the first half of

---

24 ČOLAK, Proizvodnja paške soli i pomorska, 486–485. PERIČIĆ, Proizvodnja i prodaja paške soli, 45–83. RAUKAR, Zadarska trgovina solju, 41–48, 72. Salt from Pag (as well as from Kopar and Piran) was similar in quality to that of Chioggia. HOQUET, Le Sel au cœur de la puissance maritime, 150.

25 In 1216, the Hungarian-Croatian king concluded a treaty with Venice on free trade. According to this treaty, Venice was obliged to allow the Croatian merchants from the hinterland to pursue free trade in Zadar, and the people of Zadar to trade in the hinterland. Cf. LJUBIĆ, Listine o odnošajih izmedju I (hereinafter Listine I), pp. 29–31.

26 MLACOVIĆ, Gradani plemići, 163–164.

27 Dubrovnik developed strong trade contacts with Byzantium and through it with the distant overseas: Cf. KREKIĆ, Dubrovnik in the 14th and 15th Centuries, 16. FEJIĆ, Dubrovnik (Raguse) au Moyen Âge, 35–36.


30 For instance, pilgrims who came by land embarked in Venice and then travelled between three to eight days to Zadar, where they visited the relics of Saint Simeon. Cf. FABIJANEC, La vie maritime, 184–191, here 190.


32 NICOL, Byzantium and Venice, 401.

the century. In the second half of the thirteenth century, Venice conquered Korčula, and in its final decades, Hvar and the Istrian cities of Poreč, Umag, Rovinj, Piran, Kopar and Sv. Lovreč. However, some of the important coastal ports in central Dalmatia (Split, Trogir, Šibenik) accepted its rule only in the first half of the fourteenth century.

In the beginning of the thirteenth century, Venice signed contracts with some of the Eastern Adriatic cities (e.g. Zadar, Dubrovnik), in which it negotiated their rights and obligations. The conquered cities lost much of their autonomy: external authorities tried to exercise jurisdiction over cities by using constitutional means. Depending on the local circumstances, Venice tried to exert control over the cities by appointing its men to the highest administrative posts – judges and members of the Great Council – and occasionally to the episcopal office. But the degree of autonomy in the Eastern Adriatic cities was a result of political history, geopolitical position and the development of urban elite, and was expressed in the form of institutions, municipal bodies and statutes. Venice introduced a polycentric structure of administration in its new territories, and personal ties, i.e. mediators between the authorities and the cities, were very important. The cities strove for a maximum of both autonomy and protection, so many of the specificities of the Eastern Adriatic cities emerged precisely because of the fact that they were building their autonomy between the aspirations of great powers. During the Venetian domination of the fourteenth century (which is not within the focus of this paper), the revision of most of the city statutes followed (and the older ones have mostly been lost).

The Venetian administration was not organized in the same way in all the conquered areas. The differences primarily depended on the importance of the area in question, its geographic position with regard to Venice, and the given local circumstances (especially the inherited degree of autonomy). In the Eastern Adriatic, Venice maintained close and continuous relations with some cities (e.g. Rab or Osor), while others were occasionally rebellious (e.g. Zadar). In the thirteenth century, Venice introduced a system of public governance – podestal-style countship – in which the count’s post was not hereditary. Thus, Zadar and Dubrovnik were directly governed by Venice, who appointed city counts

34 The entire thirteenth century was marked by wars between the patriarch and Venice over the Istrian patrimony, which was eventually ended by the margrave (patriarch) renouncing it in exchange for annual remuneration (the peace treaties of 1291 and 1307). Cf. BENUSSI, L’Istria nei suoi, 262–263. DAROVEC, Pregled istarske povijesti, 41–43.
35 ORLANDO, Gli accordi con Curzola. KREKIĆ, Unequal rivals.
36 CVITANIĆ, Pravno uređenje splitske.
38 It should be emphasized that different national (especially older) historiographies often have their specific approaches to the exploration of the Eastern Adriatic, in which medieval urban history has often been perceived (partly because of language barriers) only through particular national narratives – Italian, “Yugoslav, Austrian, Hungarian, Croatian”. BERTOŠA, Model ‘pobijedjenih’ ili historiografija, 35–81. PALADINI, Storia di Venezia, 253–298.
39 NOVAK, Comes, potestas, prior, consul, 227–273. MATIJEVIĆ SOKOL, Item iurabunt ipse potestas, 268–278. JANEKOVIĆ RÖMER, Grad i gradani između kraljeva, 207–228.
40 RADIĆ, Neki aspekti kontrole upravitelja, 185–203. The first mention of the Rab Statute dates from 1244, but it was changed and finally established between 1325 and 1327 by the notary Giovanni Antonio Cernotta. It seems that some kind of legal manual existed in Trogir as early as the end of the thirteenth century, but it has not been preserved. Before the statute of 1322 (the year when Trogir accepted Venetian rule), there was also the (unsaved) statute of 1303. The Dubrovnik Statute was codified in 1272, but in 1325 and 1328 regulations were also changed, as they were in 1343.
with a temporary mandate (the regimen of 2–3 years), but the policy of introducing a new model of public administration began to prevail only during the dogeship of Giacomo Tiepolo. Some of the counts’ families played a significant role in introducing the legal system, others in designing urban space. The political affiliation of some Venetian patrician families and their liaisons with the current doge may have influenced their choice to govern a particular city. For example, in the thirteenth century, the families of Querini and Badoer were associated with the dogal family of Tiepolo (i.e. Doges Giacomo and his son Lorenzo, leaders of the new merchant aristocracy in Venice). On the other hand, there were members of old patrician families – Dandolo, Morosini, Gradinigo, Giustiniani and others. Venice occasionally changed the system of governance if it was in the best interest of consolidating its rule.

Consolidation of the Venetian rule

In all Eastern Adriatic cities ruled by Venice, the governor’s safety and the prevention of rebellions were the foremost priority, as were the safe harbours for the Venetian vessels. Thus, the bulwarks were under the jurisdiction of the central authority from the beginnings of the Venetian rule. Doge Pietro Ziani (1205–1229), formerly the Count of Rab, dedicated the first decade of his office, from the treaty with Zadar in 1204, to securing the sea route from Venice to the Levant by conquering a series of cities and fortresses and investing in a chain of fortifications in Eastern Adriatic cities (unlike Venice’s rival Geona). It was necessary to ensure safe navigation in this part of the Adriatic, so as to prevent the plundering of merchant ships by pirates or enemies.

41 The practice was established only in the second or third decade of the thirteenth century, and the first counts in Zadar and Split were also appointed for life.
42 Some counts used their office for the private, commercial benefit of their family in a specific area.
43 The political division and mutual rivalry of Venetian patrician families in some areas affected the positions of individual counts in the cities, but not all branches of the family necessarily acted the same, or their members sided with the same group. Although there were tensions in Venice between the old and the new aristocracy, between rich and poor, there were still many overlapping circles, connections between different families that were created by mutual marriages, individual interests and the like. CROZET PAVAN, *Venise et le monde communal*, 277–315. BENYOVSKY LATIN, *Mobilnost i umreženost mletačkih kneževa*.
45 KEDAR, *Merchants in Crisis*. 
Zadar was also to supply military aid to Venice when needed – when Venice was at war in the Adriatic. One in thirty Venetian galleys had to be provided by Zadar, which may have defined the city as organized around the harbour and the arsenal. The existing fortifications (especially those located at the city margins) were reused and restructured to accommodate the count and his entourage. Zadar’s bulwark is known to have been derelict at the time, but it was to be repaired only with the permission of the doge, the count, or the council. Zadar is situated on a peninsula between protective islands in the centre of the Eastern Adriatic: in 1202, before the crusaders devastated the city, it had a strong harbour with an iron chain.

In Dubrovnik, the locality chosen for the count’s lodgings was an area surrounded by a wall and separated from the city, which included the fortress (castrum) and the

---

46 In Zadar, a castrum is mentioned that the Venetians allegedly conquered when trying to subjugate the city in the 12th century. Cf. ANTOLJAK, Vladarski dvor (palača) i kraljevske kuće, 55–76, esp. 62.

47 Listine I, pp. 20–21, doc. 31; p. 61, doc. 88. KLAČ – PETRICIOLI, Zadar u srednjem vijeku, 284. PETRICIOLI, Lik Zadra, 170–171.

48 Cf. FABIJANEK, La vie maritime de Split, 185. KEDAR, Prolegomena to a World History, 10.
This building complex was close to the city harbour and, later, the arsenal. In Zadar and Dubrovnik, the (arch)episcopal palace near the cathedral was the most majestic building in the city before the construction of the Count’s Palace, and could serve, for example, to accommodate the doge during his visit. At that time, fortresses were obviously not suitable for public purposes or the count’s lodgings, and the commune was expected to pay the rent for a house that was worthy of a residence for the count and his family. On the contrary, during the twelfth century, Zadar’s count Domenico Morosini and his son Ruggerio (later the Count of Osor) owned their own house with a tower rather than renting one, but when the Venetians left the city, it passed into the hands of a local nobleman.

Real estate in the cities was preferably owned by inhabitants who were loyal to the new ruler. When Zadar was conquered (after the famous sack during the Fourth Crusade), the population loyal to the Venetians, previously exiled, returned to the city in 1205. Rivalries among the local nobility were used by Venice to consolidate the sovereign rule. According to the treaty of 1204, those who had been exiled from the city for having supported Venice could now return. Moreover, thirty hostages from the most distinguished (and rebellious) families were to be sent to Venice. Dubrovnik was also asked to send hostages after the rebellion of 1226: twenty members of the families from the “rebellious clan”, who had to stay in Venice on a permanent basis.

The weakness of Doge Ziani during the second part of his rule was used by Zadar in 1226 to attempt surrendering to Koloman, brother of the Hungarian-Croatian king Béla, but eventually Venice re-conquered the city. If there were riots in the cities, Venice imposed its authority by means of trade embargos. Thus, in 1226 the Venetians were forbidden to buy goods from Zadar or Dubrovnik. Also, Venice tried to limit the commercial benefits and trade activities of the Eastern Adriatic cities in the Gulf.

---

49 The (arch)bishop was to be appointed from Venice according to the new agreements, same as the count.
50 BENYOVSKY LATIN, Governmental Palaces, 111–161.
51 In Zadar, this was decreed as early as 1204, and in Dubrovnik in 1252 (the contract of 1205 has not been preserved, but the one from 1232 has). Listine I, pp. 20–21, doc. 29 and 30; p. 46, doc. 75. In Dubrovnik, the archiepiscopal palace was likewise the most representative building of all and remained so until the late 1270s. A contract from 1253 (after the last ribellione) established that the doge, should he come to the city, was to be accommodated “in domo archiepiscopali”. As late as 1272, the time of the Statute of Dubrovnik, the archiepiscopal palace was the place where the municipal administration assembled for the rector’s investiture. Obviously, there was still no other suitable locality in the city or the castrum, although the latter started to be called castellum at that time (1272).
52 In Zadar, this was decreed as early as 1204, and it may be presumed that the situation was similar elsewhere.
53 ŠIŠIĆ, Zadar i Venecija od god, 257–259.
54 Listine I, pp. 21–22, doc. 30.
55 Listine I, p. 40, doc. 57. CESSI, Deliberazioni del Maggior Consiglio, doc. 43.
56 Listine I, p. 37, doc. 52; p. 41, doc. 60; p. 37, doc. 52. In 1228, the Venetian government forbade the Venetians to travel to Zadar until the following year without permission from the doge and his council. Listine I, p. 45.
57 In 1228, the doge concluded treaties with some Italian cities (Osimo, Recanti, Castelfodardo) in order to weaken the monopoly of Ancona, which remained the largest trading competitor in the Adriatic after the conquest of Zadar and Dubrovnik. In a new treaty with Dubrovnik, the navigation activities of the Ragusans were even more limited: it was declared that when Dubrovnik merchants brought goods from Byzantium, they had to pay 5% of the customs duty, and if they exceeded the norm, they had to pay 20%. For goods from Egypt, Tunisia and Barbaria, the duty was as high as 20%. This order was repeated in 1236 and later (which means that the people of Dubrovnik still traded in these areas). On the other hand, the Venetians in Dubrovnik had no such limits and were privileged there. As for the goods imported from “Sclavoniae” (Serbia and Bosnia), the Ragusans had a freer initiative. Listine I, pp. 84–85. FEJIĆ, Dubrovnik et la mer, 192–202.
Ziani, a member of the ancient Venetian aristocracy (like his predecessor, Dandolo) finally retired in 1229 as an old man. The new (narrowly elected) doge was a member of the new trading patrician circles: the famous Giacomo Tiepolo (1229–1249). Nevertheless, during the first part of his rule, Tiepolo had to focus on problems with Emperor Frederick II\textsuperscript{58} and some Eastern Adriatic cities used this period of instability to enhance their autonomy and get rid of Venetian sovereignty.

![Map of Dubrovnik](image)

Figure 3: Dubrovnik. 1. Castrum; 2. Rented house for the count; 3. Town Hall; 4. Cathedral; 5. Arsenal; 6. St. Blaise’s Church (and the new Loggia); 7. The Old Town; 8. The western city gate; 9. The old eastern city gate; 10. The new eastern city gate; 11. Main (Placa) Street (the border between the old and the new burgus, later in the centre of the town). Map by Ivana Haničar Buljan.

Venice tried to bind the commune of Dubrovnik more tightly to its authority with the treaty of 1232.\textsuperscript{59} (This was also the period when Dubrovnik secured its trade monopoly in the wider Balkan hinterland and signed trade contracts in the Adriatic.\textsuperscript{60}) The lower Adriatic was not subject to the Venetian commercial regulations and the trade was

\textsuperscript{58} Ferrara and the surrounding cities with which Dubrovnik had concluded treaties at the time recognized the rule of Frederick II and were in competition with Venice. Nevertheless, having joined the Lombard League in 1239, Doge Tiepolo managed to consolidate the Venetian rule in his immediate hinterland. Cf. ORTALLI – CRACCO – COZZI – KNAPTON, \textit{Povijest Venecije I}, 174.


\textsuperscript{60} LUČIĆ, \textit{Dubrovačke teme}, 60.
still relatively unlimited. After 1236, the doge appointed his son, Giovanni Tiepolo, as the Count of Dubrovnik (he was the first one to serve in the city for two years and not for life, and the first who swore an oath to serve the commune of Dubrovnik besides the doge, and to protect the city’s customs). Doge Giacomo Tiepolo placed members of close and reliable families (e.g., Michieli, Querini) in strategically important and/or unstable posts (he was known for nepotism of this kind). As for Zadar, Doge Tiepolo appointed his confidant Giovanni Michiel as the count in 1236. However, Zadar rebelled in 1239 and expelled Count Michiel, who was then restored in his office with the help of doge’s son, Giovanni Tiepolo. Zadar rebelled again in 1242 (quinta rebellione), trying to use the presence of Béla IV (the expelled Count Giovanni Michiel would be appointed the Count of Dubrovnik in 1243 and return to Zadar in 1250). After the rebellion of Zadar in 1242, Venice began to build a fortress to house the Venetian army and countship was converted from lifelong to two-year, which allowed Venice to change the officials without the citizens’ consent. Doge Tiepolo supposedly decided to consolidate his authority by installing more patrician and commoner families from Venice in Eastern Adriatic cities.

DUBROVNIK’s merchants traded freely extra culfum, but in the immediate vicinity, and in the Ionian Sea with Crete. There were many trade connections with the area of Byzantium (Romania) and the Levant. For Dubrovnik, the Levant started from Corfu and the coast of Epirus and extended to the Black Sea, descending the coasts of Syria and through Egypt to Tunisia. In 1237, the Despot of Epirus gave the merchants of Dubrovnik the privilege of free trade, and from 1238 to 1240 they settled their relations with Corfu by contract. In the mid-thirteenth century, Dubrovnik still maintained lively trade connections with Durazzo and Corfu, when the cities were under the rule of the Despotate. According to Andrea Dandolo’s chronicle, in 1242, at the time of Count Mihael Mauroceno (Morosini), a number of Venetians were to divide the real estate in the city among themselves. Having defeated Zadar after the rebellion, Doge Tiepolo decided in 1243 to have the fortress of Zadar (castellum Jadere) repaired and reinforced, and Leonardo Querini, appointed to the count’s office in 1243, had to divide the land of Zadar to that purpose into seven hundred equal plots.

---

61 Dubrovnik’s merchants traded freely extra culfum, but in the immediate vicinity, and in the Ionian Sea with Crete. There were many trade connections with the area of Byzantium (Romania) and the Levant. For Dubrovnik, the Levant started from Corfu and the coast of Epirus and extended to the Black Sea, descending the coasts of Syria and through Egypt to Tunisia. In 1237, the Despot of Epirus gave the merchants of Dubrovnik the privilege of free trade, and from 1238 to 1240 they settled their relations with Corfu by contract. In the mid-thirteenth century, Dubrovnik still maintained lively trade connections with Durazzo and Corfu, when the cities were under the rule of the Despotate. KREKIĆ, Dva dokumenta o Krfu, 50–51. Outside these borders, Dubrovnik could trade only with the permission of the doge.

62 The first major legal unit in the Statute of Dubrovnik, which was added to the redaction of 1272, was probably formulated during his mandate. Count Ivan’s father, Doge Giacomo Tiepolo, is famous for his legislation (in Venice, he codified the Statutum Novum in 1242 and its impact was felt in all parts of the state).

63 CD IV, p. 32.

64 The doge’s son Pietro was appointed governor of the then rebellious cities of Padua and Treviso (CROUZET PAVAN, Venise et le monde communal, 285) and was also count of Osor in 1236; however, he soon died in the fight against Friedrich II.

65 He would participate in the compilation of the new Statute of Venice in 1242, together with two other Venetian patricians.

66 Listine I, p. 80, doc. 104. In the meantime, in 1242, he was the Count of Chioggia, where he codified the city statute.

67 Giacomo Tiepolo was the Count of Candia when mass colonization was conducted there.

68 Quod cum Duci nuntiatum foret, gaudio repletus, Michaelem Mauroceno comitem fecit et multis nobilibus et popularibus venetis, divisis inter illos civium bonis, Jadram custodiendum tradidit. PASTORELLO et al, Andreae Danduli Ducis Venetiarum, 354.

69 In 1243, the new count, Michael Morosini, came from Venice accompanied by ten armed men. Listine I, p. 61, doc. 88; p. 68, doc. 96. In 1247, the construction of this fortress is mentioned; supposedly it is the one at the north-western corner. Cf. PETRICIOLI, Lik Zadra, 161–165. HILJE, Mletački kaštel u Zadru, 109–116. However, a castrum in this locality is positively mentioned only in 1289, when it is referred to as castrum novum.

70 His brother Giacomo was probably the count of Zadar in 1265. Archivio di Stato di Venezia: Miscellanea codici I, Storia veneta 17. M. Barbaro – A.M. Tasca, Arbori de’ patritii veneti, Genealogie, 319). The naval expedition of 1243 was conducted by the future doge Rainero Zeno. CROUZET PAVAN, Venise et le monde communal, 298.
and distribute them among those who were granted these estates by the Venetian council. But since Zadar rebelled again in the following year (1244), the planned land division probably never took place, and neither did the construction of the fortress.

The year 1243 was marked by intense Venetian presence in the entire Eastern Adriatic: according to the narrative sources, in Krk and Osor the hereditary counts were temporarily substituted through direct governance. Instead of Bartol Krčki, Lorenzo Tiepolo was appointed to the count’s office in 1243. He was another son of Doge Tiepolo and a future doge himself. That same year, Giovanni Tiepolo, formerly the Count of Dubrovnik, was appointed the Count of Osor (and in 1236, the same office was occupied by the doge’s third son, Pietro Tiepolo). As explained by the Venetian chronicler Dandolo, the doge took this course because of the rebellious inclinations of the counts of Osor and Krk (who were allegedly helping King Béla IV and Zadar). A treaty with Osor and Krk was signed in Rab at the doge’s orders in 1243, stating that the city would defend the new population of Zadar with its ships for a period of three years. That same year, Pula (which was under the rule of the local Castropola family, relatively independent of the patriarch, until the early fourteenth century) was briefly subjected to Venetian rule (owing to its reliance on the pro-Venetian fraction among the local nobility). The city promised to accept a Venetian for its governor and not to rebuild the bulwark without permission from Venice. But the Venetian rule in Pula was short-lived, and Zadar rebelled again in 1244 (after which king Béla IV nevertheless renounced the city).

The rebellious citizens of Zadar allegedly moved to the nearby Nin, and when Zadar signed a new treaty with Venice in 1247, they had to plead with the doge to let them return home. According to the sources, they were allowed to do so, but had to repair the bulwark and their own houses, as well as maintain guards at their own cost in the newly built castrum. Its construction is specifically mentioned that very year, perhaps referring to the fortress planned back in 1243. It was also decreed in 1247 that Count Angelo Mauroceno (Morosini) should be accommodated at the house of one of Zadar’s citizens, Damijan Varikaša.

---

71 … debeas diligenter in septingentis partibus dividere et partire vel dividi et partiri facere, et equaliores partes, quas poteris inde facere et determinare vel fieri facere et determinari, ipsasque partes dabis et con-signabis illis personis, quibus easduxerimus concedendas. Facies quoque et procurabis, quod ipsas partes eisdem designatas debeant regere et procurare, ac ea omnia attendere et observare bona fide, que in concessione nostra plenius continebuntur... Listine I, pp. 61–63, doc. 88.
72 Marco Contareno was the Count of Krk from 1248 until 1253. Chronicon Venetum Andreae Danduli, p. 354, c. 5, 37.
73 Ibidem
74 DE VERGOTTINI. Lineamenti storici della costituzione politica.
75 KANDLER, Cenni al forestiero che visita Pola, 21.
76 Listine I, p. 68, doc. 96.
77 In 1258, the sources mention the Count as having a small military entourage of six soldiers in the fortress of Zadar (castri Jadre) and only one assistant.
78 Count Angelo Morosini, from the branch of the doge Domenico Morosini, was the brother of future doge Marino Morosini (later the count of Rab), and his son Marino was from 1280 the hereditary count of Osor. MILLER, Venice in the East Adriatic, 282.
79 Listine I, doc. XCIV, p. 68. The Count was granted two councillors as assistants. In order to stabilize the situation in 1248, Venice allowed Zadar to freely export all goods from Tunisia, Sicily, Romania and the barbarian countries to Venice, paying only the tax paid by the Venetians themselves. Later on, Venice also allowed Zadar to keep all trade agreements signed with foreign countries.
The same house had already been mentioned in the first treaty (1205) – apparently, it was luxurious and well-positioned, since it was also sublet to the subsequent counts until as late as 1278. From 1279, Damijan’s descendants lived in a house next to the bulwark and St Stephen’s, which allows for the conclusion that this was the location of the rental house for the counts, with the commune paying the rent. It is known from a document that in 1237 Count Giovanni Michiel likewise lived in a house next to the bulwark and St Stephen’s church. Unlike these rental houses, in twelfth-century Zadar, Count Domenico Morosini (son of Doge Domenico) and his son Rogerio (who would later become the Count of Osor) owned their own house with a tower, which passed into the hands of a local nobleman when the Venetians left the city. It is possible that in those cities that Venice had given to certain families in inheritance, counts lived in their own houses prior to the construction of Counts’ Palaces (in Rab, for example, a palatio comitisae is mentioned as being owned by the mother of the Morosini brothers).

In Dubrovnik, the Venetian governors may have lived in rented houses from the mid-thirteenth century. In the present-day Držićeva Poljana, there was a set of two buildings (owned by the nobility) in which the Venetian governor and the judges lived until 1283. In this period, Venetian fortresses were not suitable either for public events or for the count’s lodgings, and thus the communes were expected to pay the rent for houses that were fit to accommodate the count and his family. In Dubrovnik, this house must have been located next to the bulwark, same as in Zadar. Before the construction of permanent residences for the counts, the (archi)episcopal palaces in Dubrovnik and Zadar were the most luxurious houses in the city (and the doge was to be accommodated there in case of a visit). In Zadar, this was decreed as early as 1204.

Under the newly appointed Doge Marino Morosini (1249–1252), Venice pursued a policy of stabilizing the conquered territories and signing peace treaties. After recurring instabilities in Dubrovnik, a new peace treaty with Venice was signed in 1252. Doge Rainero Zeno (1253–1268), however, focused particularly on maritime trade (codifying the famous Maritime Statute in 1255) and on establishing safe

81 During the first decades, the Counts of both Dubrovnik and Zadar stemmed from the two branches of the Dandolo family.
82 MITIS, Storia dell’isola, 75–200, 77.
83 Biblioteca Marciana Venezia, Manoscritti, Girolamo Alessandro Capellari Vivaro, Campidoglio Veneto, in cui si hanno l’Armi, l’origine, la serie de’luomini illustri et gli Albori della Maggior parte delle Famiglie, così estinte, come viventi, tanto cittadine quanto forastiere, che hanno goduto e che godono della Nobiltà Patrizia di Venetia; Caphtm3/Ca3v126r.
84 CD II, pp. 261–262, doc. 246.
85 KUKULJEVIĆ SAKCINSKI, Regesta documentorum regni, p. 8, doc. 24.
87 Listine I, pp. 20–21, doc. 29, p. 30; p. 46, doc. 75.
88 CESSI, Venezia nel Duecento, 171.
89 Listine I, p. 82, doc. 106. Venice again imposed a customs tax that limited Dubrovnik’s trade, while the Venetian merchants were again exempted from these limitations. Merchants from Dubrovnik were allowed to travel to Venice with only four small ships per year, and there was a prohibition of trade between them and other foreign merchants in the Venetian territory. Venice also prescribed that if Venice was banned from trading in the Kingdom of Sicily, this was also to apply to the people of Dubrovnik.
strategic harbours on the way to the Levant. The Venetian (trade and maritime) law and institutions were gradually introduced in the cities under control, but it was a long process and Venice had to adapt to the local circumstances and customs. Doge Rainero Zeno was the last doge who had authority over Romania. At that time, Venice still primarily controlled trade in the northern Gulf. But after the fall of Constantinople, in 1261, Venice intensified its control over the whole Adriatic, as it had lost the coastal holdings around the Dardanelles and the Sea of Marmara.

Figure 4: Korčula: 1. Count’s Palace. Map by Ivana Haničar Buljan.

---

90 The Statuta navium were promulgated in 1255 by Doge Raniero Zeno: Cf. PREDELLI – SACREDOTI, Gli statuti marittimi veneziani. LANE, Maritime Law and Administration, 21–50. The Zadar Statute from 1305 contains a book entitled Liber quartus de navibus et navigiis, which in some aspects coincides with regulations in the Venetian maritime statutes from 1255. BEUC, Statut zadarske komune, 491–781, here 679. Codification of the Statute of Zadar was completed in 1305, but it had probably started in the 1260s.

91 He particularly focused on maritime trade, codifying the famous Statuta navium et navigantium in 1255. At that time, Venice still primarily controlled trade in the northern Gulf: for instance, Ferrara’s Adriatic economic activities were limited by 1240 (the city was a large trading hub through which the trade of the Po Valley ran). HODGSON, Venice in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries, 83.

92 See also: JACOBY, Byzantium, Latin Romania.

93 In 1258, Zadar’s and Ancona’s merchants agreed to abolish datiam et debitum, omnem iniuriam et rubbariam. KLAIC – PETRICIOLI, Zadar u srednjem vijeku, 424.

94 In 1264, Ancona was forced to recognize the Venetian system of staple in the northern Adriatic, while its trade with Palestine, as well as with Bologna and Ferrara, was limited. Eastern Adriatic cities were transit centres in trade with the continent, and thus, for example, there were warehouses of goods in Rab in 1267 that served a Venetian merchant for trade between Hungary and Venice. MLACOVIĆ, Rapsko plemstvo, 154.
In Dubrovnik, one may observe the restructuring of the suburbs in the form of regular blocks from the mid-thirteenth century. The Statute of 1272 mentions the existence of terrena prope civitatem with access lanes. A document mentions that the boundaries of a noble estate were defined in 1255, perhaps in the context of new land division. This new urban arrangement may have been initiated by the new Count of Dubrovnik, Marsilio Zorzi, in a similar way that he would influence the urban planning of Korčula later on. According to the chroniclers, in 1254 Zorzi managed to defend Korčula, while in 1262 he participated in the conquest of Mljet. As an important Venetian official under Doge Zeno, Zorzi received the conquered Korčula as a hereditary fief in 1255–1256, also referring to his inherited family rights.


96 BENYOVSKY LATIN – LEDIĆ, The Estate of the Volcassio Family, 18–19. In 1256, the Venetian Council decided that the Count of Dubrovnik could have two assistants rather than one; Listine I, p. 86, doc. 112.
97 He probably also confirmed the property and possession rights of the local nobility of Dubrovnik. He came there as an experienced army leader and governor after the rebellion of the nobility in 1252 as well as to negotiate a peace treaty with Uroš. It was a Venetian practice to send governors with strong military experience from Syria to rebellious cities, and occasionally those who had marital ties with rulers from the hinterland. As a Venetian bailo, Zorzi was also involved in urban planning elsewhere: thus, in 1244 he revised the memoriale possessionum in Syria, which listed the Venetian properties: the governor’s (bailo’s) palace, the loggia, the fondaco, the cistern and the seafront tower. Cf. MASÉ, Modèles de colonisation vénitienne, 133–142, esp. 141.
98 FORETIĆ, Korčula, 62.
At the site of the existing settlement, Marsilio Zorzi founded a city *ex novo*, designed according to the latest principles of urban planning. Starting from the main street, access lanes descended towards land plots in private ownership and the newly built bulwark. Their size was comparable to the length of the blocks in Dubrovnik’s suburb in the mid-thirteenth century. However, in a Statute supplement from 1265, Marsilio Zorzi proclaimed that all land in Korčula that was not private should henceforth belong to the Zorzi family (rather than the commune as in Dubrovnik). 99 The new city of Korčula was gradually surrounded by a bulwark (around 750m long), which integrated the private towers, with the Count’s Palace situated next to the mainland gate. The Count’s Palace was defended by two towers, and the third, called *turris comitis*, was directly incorporated into the Palace. 100 According to the (rather unreliable) narrative sources from 1252, the mandate of Marsilio Zorzi in Dubrovnik was also the time when a bulwark was built around the suburbs, due to the threat from the hinterland. 101 Nevertheless, parts of the old bulwark were sold to private persons, which implies that the old wall was no longer functional and that a new one had been built. 102

Doge Zeno relied on individual Venetian patricians along the Adriatic route, whom he gave leased countship; the foundation of Korčula should also be viewed in this context. He also returned Krk to the Counts of Krčki in 1260 as hereditary counts, with precisely defined conditions for both family lineages (Vid’s and Škinela’s). 103 On the island of Rab, Counts Marco Badoer (1262–1268) and Giovanni Badoer (1269–1279) acquired a large estate that served as a base for their permanent settlement on the island. 104

The era of public works and the construction of Counts’ Palaces

Doge Lorenzo Tiepolo (1268–1275), 105 son of the famous Giacomo, again abolished the practice of leased countship and proclaimed that the Count of Osor should only stay in the office for two years. 106 Before becoming a doge, Lorenzo Tiepolo was a representative of the Venetian government in the Adriatic cities – for example in Krk – but he was also a podestà outside Venetian territory, for instance twice in Fermo (where in 1267 a pentagonal citadel called Rocca Tiepolo was built). His sons were also counts in the area – Pietro, the Count of Dubrovnik, and Giacomo, the Count of Zadar (and also the podestà of Chioggia and Fermo as many as three times.) 107 The Genoese support of the Byzantine restoration of 1260 worsened the relations with Venice, and during the war with Genoa (1257–1270) Venice established its supremacy in the Adriatic. During Lorenzo’s dogeship, Venetian sovereignty was acknowledged by the Istrian cities of Poreč (1267), Umag (1269), Novigrad (1269–1270), Sveti Lovreč,
and briefly Pula (1271) (but Pula would be subjected to the Venetian rule only in the fourteenth century).  

In the newly conquered cities, it was decreed at once that a house should be provided to accommodate the count (probably a rental one). Thus, in Umag it was stated as early as 1269 that the count should receive a *domum pro sua habitacione sine fictu* with his salary. Similar decrees were made in Sv. Lovreč in 1271 and in Novigrad in 1270. In Poreč, which was conquered in 1267, Count Marco Michiel, probably son of Zadar’s Count Giovanni Michiel, ordered the construction of a Count’s Palace as early as 1270. This count, like his father, was deeply involved in the politics of cities in the Quarnet Gulf and the northern Adriatic. According to descriptions in the narrative sources, Poreč had a loggia in the square, in front of the Count’s Palace. Such an early construction of a permanent palace may have been related to the conflicts between the Count of Poreč and the bishop. (Another reason why the palace in Poreč was built significantly before those in the other cities – although there is no documentary or material evidence for it – may have been the fact that a communal palace had stood in the same locality before. Marco Michiel was also the Count of Zadar in 1278, when it was decided that counts should no longer live in a rental house. It may be presumed that the construction of a permanent Count’s Palace was planned at the time. However, there are no data on the Count’s Palace in Zadar before the early 1280s.

---

109 CESSI, *Deliberazioni del Maggior Consiglio di Venezia II* (hereinafter DMC II), p. 58, doc. 56. BENEDETTI, *Umago d’Istria nei secoli*, 101. BOLŠEC FERRI – MILOŠEVIĆ, *Baština Umaga i okolice*. The loggia was located next to the west façade of the communal palace, on the ground floor, overlooking the main square.  
111 DMC II, p. 59, doc. 58.  
112 He was a son of Giovanni, the Count of Zadar and a confidant of Doge Giacomo Tiepolo.  
113 This is known from a transcript of the plaque at the palace, published in: CAPRIN, *L’Istria nobilissima*, 201. The situation of that palace, which is no longer extant, can be inferred (by its rear side) from Valla’s drawing of the city from 1755, and eighteenth-century narrative sources mention it next to the tower and the city gate, its front façade overlooking the square and the loggia. Cf. KANDLER, *Codice diplomatico istriano*, pp. 282–285, doc. 353 and 354.  
114 MLACOVIĆ, *The Nobility and the Island*, 143.  
115 The patriarch was also supported by his suffragans, the local bishops (of Pula, Poreč, Kopar, and Novigrad), with whom the communes were often in conflict.  
116 There was, namely, a similar case in Kopar, where the oldest communal palace in the Eastern Adriatic was built in 1269, and which became the Count’s seat in 1278, with the Venetian rule. Cf. CAPRIN, *L’Istria nobilissima*, 199. BELLO, *Capodistria, la Piazza*, 245–247, 256–264. Even though Kopar acknowledged the authority of the margrave (the Patriarch of Aquileia) in the thirteenth century (before the Venetian rule), they did manage to achieve a degree of autonomy. In such circumstances, the first communal palaces were built, which were later transformed into seats of the Venetian counts. Unlike the Counts’ Palaces, communal palaces (both in Istria and in Dalmatia) were built in the city centre, mostly in the main square. BENYOVSKY LATIN, *Governmental palaces*, passim.  
118 That same year, in 1278, the decision on building the *castellum Jadre* was made – possibly the *Babarum* tower was also transformed into a *castrum*, since in 1281 a *castrum novum* is mentioned (next to St Silvester’s Church). This was also the time when the first official notary came to Zadar: it was Henrik, who was active until 1296.

During the dogeship of Jacopo Contarini (1275–1280), Venetian sovereignty was acknowledged by the Istrian cities of Motovun (1276) and Kopar (1278), and by the Central Dalmatian islands of Hvar and Brač. In 1276, the commune of Osor requested the introduction of leased countship again, but that was achieved only later, during the reign of Doge Giovanni Dandolo. Under Doge Contarini, it was decreed in 1278 that Dalmatian governors should be appointed by the Great Council and a year afterwards that the election of some city governors in the Venetian territories should be double.

119 DMC II, p. 66, doc. 88.
120 Listine I, p. 115, doc. 161.
121 Listine I, p. 112, doc. 160.
122 Listine I, pp. 118–119, doc. 167.
This period is known for numerous public works – new planned suburbs, bulwarks, arsenals, and Counts’ Palaces – which are easier to track down owing to a greater number of systematic documents. Intensified control over public space and its planning was linked to the demographic surge and the development of a legal and administrative system. The suburbs of Dubrovnik (south of Placa), an area of private estates with access lanes, were now turned into an organized communal urban area with transversal public streets (as confirmed in the statutory regulation of 1272). The Count of Dubrovnik who ordered the codification of the Statute in 1272 was Marco Giustiniani, who was succeeded by Pietro Tiepolo, son of the former Doge Lorenzo Tiepolo (who was permitted by the Major Council to take foreigners as his assistants.
as well as notaries). In 1277, a count of the same name, Marco Giustiniani, was again holding the count’s office, and at that time the first official notary, Tomasino de Savera, came to Dubrovnik. From 1278, rental land plots owned by the commune are mentioned north of the (private) suburb regulated by the Statute of 1272. At the time of Count Nicola Morosini (1279–1281), this communal land was systematically divided into land plots and given in lease to those who offered the most. One should also take into account the impact of the notary and other assistants of the count on urban planning, including the administering and perhaps partly structuring public areas.

Figure 8: Pentagonal tower in Poreč.

---

124 Even though Dubrovnik’s notarial records are preserved from 1277, there may have been an older book of debenture bonds from 1275.

125 It is not certain that it was the same person: According to E. Crouzet Pavan Dubrovnik there were two counts under the name Marco Giustiniani in thirteenth century Dubrovnik, one son of the late Giacomo, and the other son of the late Pietro. CROUZEZ PAVAN, Venise et le monde communal, 294. Thus Marco Giustiniani who was prince in 1272 possibly wasn’t the same as the one who was appointed prince in 1278. According to Barbaro genealogy there is also Marco, son of Pietro (grandson of Ferigo). There is also a third Marco Giustinian, who had a son, Ugoitino. Archivio di Stato Venezia (hereinafter ASV), Barbaro, VII, 459, 465.

126 It was from this point that the notarial records were systematically kept, and Tomasino also compiled the Book of Customs Regulations, the first source to mention administering public space.

127 It may have been the campus mentioned in the regulation on streets from 1272. Cf. Dubrovnik Statute, L. V, c. 41.
In 1277, the Count of Zadar was Giacomo Tiepolo, another son of the former Doge Lorenzo Tiepolo. Supposedly the pentagonal tower next to the city gate and St Stephen’s Church (as well as the house where the counts lodged) was built at that time. Tiepolo was responsible for extensive public works in the city and the pentagonal tower is probably a part of his project. Next to it, integrated in the bulwark, there was a smaller tower, no longer extant, rounded in the south: the so-called turris Babarum (mentioned in 1270). The bulwark was running between them (parts of its indented crest are preserved, identical to those of the pentagonal tower). This type of pentagonal tower – also next to the mainland gate – can be seen in Poreč as well, and south of it (and to the north), linked through the bulwark, there was the so-called round tower. These elements indicate a similar way of designing the city.

By building the bulwark at the southeastern edge of Zadar, its mainland front was shifted towards the southeast. The sources sporadically mention communal land plots there, allowing us to presume that this newly designed area was intended for rent. It was organized in regular blocks, perhaps divided into rental plots. Giacomo Tiepolo was succeeded by the aforementioned Marco Michiel, who came to Zadar in 1278. He decided that the count should no longer live in the rented residence near St Stephen’s and also initiated the construction of the castellum Jadre (this term may have referred the former Babarum tower, since in 1281 this fortress next to St Silvester’s Church was called castrum novum).

---

128 As for the so-called pentagonal tower in Zadar, Smiljanić has suggested that it was built at the time of Zadar’s Count Giacomo Tiepolo, since it preserved the coat-of-arms of the Tiepolo family. Cf. SMILJANIĆ, Iz urbane topologije srednjovjekovnog, 379–384. It should be added, however, that Giacomo Tiepolo was the Count of Zadar on two occasions, in 1276/77 and 1289/90, with other Venetian patricians holding this office in between.

129 JOVIĆ, Jugoistočni potez zadarskih zidina, 79–119.

130 The tower was enlarged in the fifteenth century. Cf. PRELOG, Poreč, grad i spomenici, 206.
In the last decades of the thirteenth century, local harbours were becoming increasingly important for military and economic purposes, for sheltering and supplying ships: according to the documents, in 1272 Venice leased a galley to the island of Cres and sold one each to Dubrovnik and Korčula. One galley was sold to each of the communes of Rab and Krk in 1273, per patronos arsane. We find the same declaration in 1273 for Krk, which created the need of building and restructuring the arsenals. These ships had multiple functions: from merchant ships they could become military if needed, and vice versa. To strengthen its position in the Adriatic, Venice implemented the custodia Culphi from 1280, meaning that the gulf squadron controlled navigation in the Gulf. To ensure a safe journey through the Adriatic, Venice had to confront its enemies with the help of its subjects and allies (particularly problematic were the Genoese). Moreover, merchants were often attacked by pirates from the city of

---

131 Listine I, p. 105, doc. CXXVIII; p. 106, doc. CXLI, doc. CXLIV.
Omiš (south of Split). Venice forbade the coastal cities to trade with the pirates (like in 1226, when Dubrovnik, for instance, established trade contacts with the Omiš pirates) and supported them with the necessary vessels for fighting them: for instance, in 1280 Venice sent a galley (with this sole purpose) to Dubrovnik. The City Statute’s regulations assigned an important role to navigation. An entire book (VII) of the Statute of Dubrovnik (1272), containing 64 chapters, is dedicated to the regulation of seafaring and shipping, as well as piracy, smuggling and shipwrecks. In 1277, the Liber statutorum doane Ragusii was codified, with regulations on customs taxes and excise duties in the commune of Dubrovnik. One chapter of the Zadar Statute drafted at the end of the thirteenth century was also entirely devoted to seafaring (Chapter IV). The legislation covered the employment contracts of seafarers, the construction and sale of ships, cargoes and ballasts, insurance and liability for goods on board, shipwrecks etc. Venetian law was incorporated in the local statutes and as such could be an instrument of both political control and coordination, but some aspects were useful for the local communities (like development of institutions and maritime law).

Under Doge Giovanni Dandolo (1280–1289), a representative of the traditional aristocratic families, Venice extended its sovereignty to the Istrian towns of Piran and Rovinj (1283). The first Venetian podestà in Piran was Andrea Dandolo, the doge’s son known as il Calvo, and before that he was also the first Venetian podestà of Motovun. Pietro Gradonigo, the future doge, was at the time of Dandolo the podestà of Koper (in 1280, and he held the same position again in 1289). In 1280, Dandolo again assigned the Osor County to patrician Marino Mauroceno, with hereditary rights. It seems he was also the count of Dubrovnik in 1292 (during an epidemic) and the podestà of Koper in 1298. LJUBIĆ, Ob odnosajh dubrovačke, 107–109. MORTEANI, Notizie storiche della città, 326. PUSTERLA, I rettori di Egida ‘Giustinopoli, 9.

For instance, in 1224 there is a mention of pirates attacking merchants in the Adriatic, when a capitaneum galeatum was sent from Venice because in front of Ancona “the people of Split and people who call themselves Kačići” robbed a barcam that belonged to a Venetian merchant. Listine I, p. 33, doc. XLIII. In the mid-thirteenth century, Venice even allied with the Dalmatian cities that were under the Hungarian-Croatian crown for combating the Omiš pirates. SMČIKLAS, Codex diplomaticus Regni Croatiae 5, 236–237, 420, 456, 583. Miller, Venice in the East Adriatic, 84.

In 1293, the galley was again given to the city count to fight the pirates if they approached the city from the sea; Listine I, p. 151, doc. 249. In 1288 a galley was given to the city of Rab. In 1301, it was given to Zadar’s count to launch a military campaign against the pirates. Listine I, p. 194, doc. 291.

The citizens of Dubrovnik were forbidden to rent foreign ships (with the exception of Venetian ones) and they were also forbidden to sell, sublet or donate their ships to the Slavs, for fear of competition; on the other hand, the Dubrovnik Statute stipulates that the citizens of Dubrovnik who sailed to Corfu would receive money.

Dubrovnik Statute, II, 24. In Dubrovnik’s statute of 1272, one finds three types of limited liability contracts – entega, collegantia and ragantia – which enabled merchants with insufficient capital to engage in long-distance trade: these new forms of business and institutions had developed in Venice as a result of risky long-distance trade in the thirteenth century. The Statute of Dubrovnik likewise contains elements of the Venetian law, the European ius commune and various customs from a wider Eastern Adriatic area. In 1277, the Venetian count Marco Giustiniano codified the Liber statutorum doane Ragusii, which defined the regulations on customs taxes and excise duties in the commune of Dubrovnik.

A customs tariff was set for the import of cotton bags from Romania or Calabria and wool bags from Tunisia. Statuta Iadertina, L 4, doc. 24, pp. 414 and 416.

134 For instance, in 1224 there is a mention of pirates attacking merchants in the Adriatic, when a capitaneum galeatum was sent from Venice because in front of Ancona “the people of Split and people who call themselves Kačići” robbed a barcam that belonged to a Venetian merchant. Listine I, p. 33, doc. XLIII. In the mid-thirteenth century, Venice even allied with the Dalmatian cities that were under the Hungarian-Croatian crown for combating the Omiš pirates. SMČIKLAS, Codex diplomaticus Regni Croatiae 5, 236–237, 420, 456, 583. Miller, Venice in the East Adriatic, 84.

135 In 1293, the galley was again given to the city count to fight the pirates if they approached the city from the sea; Listine I, p. 151, doc. 249. In 1288 a galley was given to the city of Rab. In 1301, it was given to Zadar’s count to launch a military campaign against the pirates. Listine I, p. 194, doc. 291.

136 The citizens of Dubrovnik were forbidden to rent foreign ships (with the exception of Venetian ones) and they were also forbidden to sell, sublet or donate their ships to the Slavs, for fear of competition; on the other hand, the Dubrovnik Statute stipulates that the citizens of Dubrovnik who sailed to Corfu would receive money. Dubrovnik Statute, II, 24. In Dubrovnik’s statute of 1272, one finds three types of limited liability contracts – entega, collegantia and ragantia – which enabled merchants with insufficient capital to engage in long-distance trade: these new forms of business and institutions had developed in Venice as a result of risky long-distance trade in the thirteenth century. The Statute of Dubrovnik likewise contains elements of the Venetian law, the European ius commune and various customs from a wider Eastern Adriatic area. In 1277, the Venetian count Marco Giustiniano codified the Liber statutorum doane Ragusii, which defined the regulations on customs taxes and excise duties in the commune of Dubrovnik.

137 A customs tariff was set for the import of cotton bags from Romania or Calabria and wool bags from Tunisia. Statuta Iadertina, L 4, doc. 24, pp. 414 and 416.

138 ORLANDO, Beyond the Statutes, 131–147, here 132. KREKIĆ, Venetians in Dubrovnik, 27–35.

139 It seems he was also the count of Dubrovnik in 1292 (during an epidemic) and the podestà of Koper in 1298. LJUBIĆ, Ob odnosajh dubrovačke, 107–109. MORTEANI, Notizie storiche della città, 326. PUSTERLA, I rettori di Egida ‘Giustinopoli, 9.

140 The doge Dandolo’s daughter Maria married Marino Gradenigo, the brother of the future doge Pietro, and the ties between these patrician families were strengthened. Da MOSTO, I dogi di Venezia, 94.

141 Listine I, pp. 124–125, doc. 172.
life. During Dandolo’s dogeship, Venetian counts and the territories they controlled were placed under stricter control. The tax and customs system, as well as the use of the same currency across the territory, was an important means of maintaining the Venetian presence in the Adriatic. In Dandolo’s time, the Venetian gold coin (ducat) was introduced in Venice. In 1280, the office of the Contraband was founded in order to coordinate different administrative offices, but also to suppress smuggling. The office dealt with maritime trade in the upper Adriatic and the counts received its orders on trade regulation. Venice tried to hinder the Istrian cities in imposing their own duties and tariffs on exports and imports, and in creating a commercial network with the Istrian communes. However, Venice also systematically suppressed salt production in Piran and Pula. In 1281, the import of salt became compulsory: the Major Council ordered merchants to return to Venice with a load of salt (ordo salis).

Doge Dandolo wanted to emphasize the role of Venice in the cities, and it was under his rule that the first separate Counts’ Palaces were built in the Eastern Adriatic (with similar public works observable in other Venetian territories). In Hvar, it was decreed in 1278, following the Venetian conquest, that a house should be built to accommodate Count Andrea de Molino, but it was built only in 1282–1283, a castrum “that they had previously lacked”. In 1283, it was decreed that Piran should build for the Count a domum pro habitatione sua et sue familie. Marco Michiel, the count of Rab (and formerly of Poreč and Zadar) invested from 1283 onwards in the construction of the Count’s Palace and the arsenal. That same year, a house for the count’s assistants is mentioned in Zadar. In 1283, the practice of renting houses as residences for the Venetian governors (in today’s Držićevo Poljana) was also discontinued in Dubrovnik.

The houses – both of them cum volta – were sold to real-estate traders, Venetians Filipo

142 BMV, Il Campidoglio, Cap3v78v.
143 The doge had the Venetian statute revised, adding to it the provisions issued by the Great Council after Tiepolo’s statute in 1242. RÖSCH, The Serrata of the Great Council, 68–69. KOHL, The Serrata of the Greater Council, 3–34.
145 MILLER, Venice in the East Adriatic, 175. CESSI, Deliberazioni del Maggior Consiglio di Venezia II, 220.
146 The Cattaveri were the auditors of public accounts, and they controlled the receipts and expenditure of Venice.
147 ASV, Ufficiali al Cattaver, reg. 1, f. 8v.
148 From the turn of the fourteenth century, the office of Contraband-Cattaver controlled illegal trade and smuggling: In 1281, the Venetian Maggior Consiglio ordered the Istrian cities to provide official inventories for the ships, in order to control maritime traffic in the upper Adriatic: DMC II, pp. 219-220, 330, 328. Cf. MILLER, Venice in the East Adriatic, 181–182.
150 Salt transport and export trade became closely linked. HOCQUET, Au coeur de la puissance maritime, 152.
154 MLACOVIĆ, The Nobility and the Island, 150.
Veroci and Furlano Bazili). In 1283, there is a mention of a *locia domini comitis*,\textsuperscript{156} possibly built in front of the fortress,\textsuperscript{157} which began to be transformed into a Count’s Palace.\textsuperscript{158} The former orientation of the fortress to the south (the old town) was altered: the new structures were turned westwards, where the communal square\textsuperscript{159} and a new suburb were starting to take shape. In 1283, houses for the Venetian count in Dubrovnik were no longer rented in what is now Držićeva Poljana.\textsuperscript{160} It is possible that the *castrum/castellum* was transformed into a Count’s Palace at the time and the archiepiscopal palace lost its status as the most lavish building in the city.\textsuperscript{161}

In Zadar, a *logia domus nostri comitatus* is mentioned in 1289.\textsuperscript{162} However, another communal or “great” loggia is mentioned from the late thirteenth century in the main square, in the city centre (at the site of the present-day one, built in 1565).\textsuperscript{163} Opposite it was the church of St Peter the New (demolished in the fifteenth century), where the citizens’ assembly met.\textsuperscript{164} The loggia of Rab was also separate from the Count’s Palace and positioned in the city centre (it is mentioned from the fourteenth century, but may have been there from an earlier period), at the site of the present-day one, built in 1509. The position of loggias in the main square is perfectly logical, since that was the centre of socio-economic life in the commune.\textsuperscript{165} Those loggias that were built near or within the Counts’ Palaces, namely in Dubrovnik and Poreč,\textsuperscript{166} were situated next

\textsuperscript{156} There are no preserved data on its construction, but it is known that the new loggia was built at the new church of St Blaise in 1356 (opposite the Rector’s Palace), although the old loggia is mentioned as late as 1362. The sources tell of an old loggia, demolished in the fifteenth century, which was situated in front of the western façade of the Rector’s Palace: it was an annexed structure with four columns, vaults and a terrace. GRUJIĆ, *Knežev dvor u Dubrovniku*, 149–170.

\textsuperscript{157} The new loggia is known to have been built next to the new church of St Blaise in 1356 (opposite the palace), but the old loggia is still mentioned in 1362.

\textsuperscript{158} At the time of the Statute of 1272, the *castrum* seems not to have been a majestic place, since it was the archiepiscopal palace (*archiepiscopatum*) where the city government met for the Count’s investiture. Cf. BENYOVSKY LATIN, *Notes on Urban Elite*, 38–39. In Dubrovnik, it was only in the fourteenth century that the *castellum* started to be called a “communal palace” – *palatium* or *pallazzo magior*. GELCICH, *Monumenta Ragusina* (hereinafter MR) I, 239.

\textsuperscript{159} In 1281 and 1282, the *camerlengaria* is mentioned in the square, and the *fonticus* was located nearby.

\textsuperscript{160} Both were *cum volta* and sold to real-estate retailers Filipo Veroci and Furlano Basilio from Venice. Cf. MHR II, p. 282, doc. 1142; p. 322, doc. 1278; p. 323, doc. 1279.

\textsuperscript{161} At the time of the Statute, in 1272, the *castrum* was not luxurious enough: for the Count’s investiture, the Archiepiscopal Palace (*archiepiscopatum*) was where the municipal administration met. In 1282, the archbishop sold a house owned by the archdiocese and located in front of the cathedral entrance, and in 1283 he sublet another one to a merchant from Venice (afterwards the bishop and his canons mostly met in the Archiepiscopal Palace). Cf. BENYOVSKY LATIN, *Notes on Urban Elite*, 38–39. The original defence fortress was oriented towards the cathedral and the old town, but the new façade was opened up towards the west, where a new part of the city (*burgus*) was developing. It was only in the fourteenth century that the *castellum* started to be called the Communal Palace: *palatium*, i.e. *pallazzo magior*. MR I, p. 239.

\textsuperscript{162} PETRICIOLI, *Umjetnička baština Zadra*, 194.

\textsuperscript{163} It is not known how the older loggia may have looked, but in the late fourteenth century the chronicler Paulus de Paulo mentioned it as having columns. Cf. PETRICIOLI, *Lik Zadra*, 162.

\textsuperscript{164} GEORGOPOULOU, *Venice’s Mediterranean Colonies*, 102.


\textsuperscript{166} In Poreč, the palace was not built in the former forum (the later *Piazza di Marafor*), but in the newly formed communal square (next to the bulwark, the tower and the harbour gate). Cf. PRELOG, *Poreč, grad i spomenici*, 40. CAPRIN, *L’Istria nobilissima*, 199. On the urban development of Rab, see: DOMIJAN, *Rab, grad umjetnosti*. DOMIJAN, *Rab u srednjem vijeku*. 
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to the (newly formed) main square.\textsuperscript{167} (Some documents from Dubrovnik refer to the thirteenth-century loggia as the \textit{logia comunis}.\textsuperscript{168}) In the cities under Venetian rule, loggias could also function as seats of the city council before the construction of town halls.\textsuperscript{169} Even though the late thirteenth century was marked by the construction of Counts’ Palaces as seats of the representatives of the Venetian administration, it was also the time when the communal institutions developed and the local nobility became more powerful.\textsuperscript{170} In Dubrovnik, north of the Count’s Palace, there was a \textit{fonticus} in the late thirteenth century, with rooms for the council meetings on the first floor.\textsuperscript{171}

![Figure 10: Rab. 1. Governmental palace; 2. Loggia; 3. Bishop’s palace; 4. Arsenal. Map by Ivana Haničar Buljan.](image)

\textsuperscript{167} In Dubrovnik, the new loggia, built in the fourteenth century and likewise a separate structure, was not far from the Count’s Palace.

\textsuperscript{168} GRUJIĆ, \textit{Knežev dvor u Dubrovniku}, 149–170.


The Counts’ Palaces built during the Venetian rule in the thirteenth century were always located at the city margins, next to the bulwark and usually the tower, probably to ensure the safety of the count and his retinue. In Dubrovnik, the palace was built near the eastern city gate and the harbour, and in Zadar next to the mainland gate and the pentagonal tower (later the “Captain’s Tower”). In Rab and Poreč, the palace was located next to the harbour gate (in Rab, it was towards the present-day Donja Street, with the tower to the east). In Korčula, the Count’s Palace was built at the very entrance to the city,172 and in Hvar at the city margins, next to the fortifications. The marginal position of Counts’ Palaces often meant the vicinity of suburbs (that is, the new part of the city). The position of Rab’s palace between the old town and the burgus173 may be compared to some extent to the situation in Dubrovnik or Piran. The burgus of Rab is believed to have been created in the twelfth or thirteenth century,174 apparently as a planned area (perhaps with rental plots). In Piran, the same as in other cities, the Count’s Palace was situated at the margins of the old town, next to the city gate and the new suburb that was gradually encircled by the new bulwark.175

In Dubrovnik too, the suburbs became a new zone of economic activity, and the administrative and political centre of the commune gradually moved to the north. During the office of Count Nicola Morosini (1279–1281),176 the land division of large private estates in the suburbs was completed. Also, the new communal suburbs were systematically divided into land plots at the same time as the new city square was created and the Counts’s Palace restructured.177 The communal land was retained with the purpose of lease, which served as an “open call” to the best bidders – not only those who paid the highest rent, but also with regard to the needs of the city. The population that settled there and was involved in real-estate transactions often consisted of newcomers (from the surrounding areas as well as Venice).178 Communal land plots rented in 1282 were listed in the Book of Communal Property,179 started in 1286 by Aço de Titulo, personal secretary to Count Michele Morosini, son of Albertino (he took care of the income from communal property after the first notary Tomasino de Savere). According to recent research, the daughter of Count Michele Morosini was married to Vladislav, son of the Serbian ruler Stefan Dragutin. It was the time when the Serbian
ruler Stefan Uroš II Milutin (1282–1321) renewed his territorial ambitions towards Dubrovnik, and the connection between the Morosinis and the Serbian royal family could certainly be used in Venetian diplomatic activities. Dubrovnik’s documents from the mid-1280s mention the construction of a new bulwark around this suburb, finished only after the fire of 1296 and the new regulation of the area north of Placa. In 1286, the count of Dubrovnik was, for the second time, Venetian patrician Niccolò Querini. Querini had also been a podestà in cities outside Venetian territory, such as Treviso (1279) and Bergamo (1282) (regions with so-called planned cities, which may have had an impact on the formation and administration of the then Dubrovnik burgus). Although he was associated with the Tiepolos, his family in Dubrovnik (especially before the conspiracy of 1310) still had strong business ties and a network of contacts. The Querini were owners of various real estates and speculated with them: in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, 11 members of this family are mentioned in Dubrovnik, as well as 13 from the Contarini family.

Zadar’s suburb next to the Babarum fortress was probably controlled by the commune (as it would be in the fifteenth century) and the notarial records mention several rental land plots owned by the commune from the 1290s onwards. In Poreč, the palace was situated in the centre of the (ancient) city, but according to some researchers, the eastern part of the city was ruralized in the early Middle Ages and possibly functioned as a suburb (this is supported by documents from the mid-thirteenth century, which refer to this area as burgus, and it is only then that the new medieval bulwark, towers and city gates were built around it).

The thirteenth century was marked by urban demographic growth and expansion of the cities. The construction of new suburbs (and their inclusion within the city walls) was also an invitation to the newcomers who could contribute to the progress of urban economy and administration. The former suburbs were integrated in the city by enclosing them within the walls, which altered the relationship between centre and periphery. Thus, the seats of counts in some cities, originally situated marginally next to the city gates, were now in the city centre owing to the expansion of urban space.

After the death of Doge Giovanni Dandolo, there were again tensions between the two factions of patrician families for the dogal position: the Tiepolos tried to impose their candidate Giacomo, son of the former Doge Lorenzo (and the former count of Zadar). Nevertheless, the office came into the hands of Pietro (Pierazzo) Gradenigo (1289–1311), son of Marco Bartholomeo, a true representative of the old aristocratic families. Doge Gradenigo was familiar, like Giacomo Tiepolo, with the Eastern Adriatic area, having served as the podestà of some cities. In 1278, he was also in charge (along with Tommaso Gritti) of building Castel Leone in Koper, a fortification in the middle of the bridge that connected the city with the coast. Public works in the cities continued during his dogeship as well.
During Gradenigo’s dogeship, Venice was again at war with its rival Genoa (1293–1299) and the subjected cities were giving military support.\(^\text{186}\) Thus, in 1297 the count of Rab was ordered to prepare armed ships against Genoa. Besides military support from the cities under its rule, Venice also expected their services to work within a network. This was especially important after the failed Querini-Tiepolo conspiracy, as Baiamonte Tiepolo fled to the Eastern Adriatic and to Paul I of Bribir, a Croatian magnate from the hinterland, to whom he was related (members of Paul’s family were counts in Šibenik, Trogir and Split at the time). The beginning of the fourteenth century was very dynamic and variable in the political sense – at first marked by the dominance of Croatian magnates - the Counts of Bribir, and ultimately by the instability and dynastic struggles within the Hungarian-Croatian Kingdom. Venice was defeated by the Genoese near Korčula in a new war, but the treaty of Milan from 1299 banned Genoa from the Adriatic (and Venice was forbidden to enter the territories under Genoese control).

Gradenigo’s rival Giacomo Tiepolo became the count of Zadar (for the second time in 1289).\(^\text{187}\) He was married to a noblewoman of Croatian descent: Šubić, sister of Paul Bribirski Šubić,\(^\text{188}\) and one of their sons was Baiamonte Tiepolo. In 1289, Count Jacopo Tiepolo ordered the paving of the foundations of the Zadar’s harbour next to the bulwark, from the arsenal to the new castrum (the north-western corner).\(^\text{189}\) In 1289, Zadar had a logia domus nostri comitatus, and in 1290 a turris comunis.\(^\text{190}\) At the time of the Serrata,\(^\text{191}\) Doge Gradenigo appointed his brother-in-law Fiofio (Teofilo) Giovanni Morosini,\(^\text{192}\) brother to his wife Tommasina (granddaughter of a Hungarian queen),\(^\text{193}\) as the count of Zadar.

In other cities, the construction activity flourished as well. Thus, in Hvar it was decreed in 1292 that an arsenal should be built, but it is not known whether it was completed, since the documents still mention the building plans in 1317. Before that, in 1288, the governor or Hvar was allowed to spend 500 librae for repairing the palace and the fortifications, and a year afterwards the bulwark was repaired as well.\(^\text{194}\)

\(^{186}\) From 1291 the captain of Istria (capitaneus Istrie or capitaneus generalis Istriei) had the seat in Kopar. RADOSSI, Stemmi di S. Lorenzo del Pasenatico, 187–240. DE VERGOTTINI, L’Impero e la ‘fidelitas’, 380.

\(^{187}\) BENYOVSKY LATIN, Governmental Palaces, 111–161.

\(^{188}\) In the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, doges or members of their families married, or remarried, girls from ruling houses outside Venetian territory. HURLBURT, The Dogeressa of Venice, 27–28. Doge Giacomo Tiepolo married a foreigner in the thirteenth century, and the next generations of this family embraced the tradition of creating strong political alliances through marriage strategies, as seen in the choice of wife of Giacomo’s grandson of the same name, who married the daughter of a Croatian nobleman from the Šubić family. In 1275, such marriages were forbidden because the interference of foreign policies with the Venetian one was called into question. Women did not have access to political influence, but the marriage of Venetian patricians to foreign nobles or rulers could influence foreign policy. For instance, the Morosini family had family ties with the Hungarian and Serbian royal houses.

\(^{189}\) ZJAČIĆ, Spisi zadarskih bilježnika, 98, 121, 129.

\(^{190}\) PETRICIOLI, Umjetnička, 194. Next to the Count’s Palace, located at the mainland gate, a whole urban district emerged in the fourteenth century, linked to the city government and administration. Listine III, p. 113, doc. 176. PETRICIOLI, Lik Zadra, 168.

\(^{191}\) In 1297 the council was reformed and expanded (Serrata del Maggior Consiglio. LANE, The Enlargement of the great council, 255. CROUZET-PAVAN, Venise: une invention, 207. TODESCO, Andamento demografico della nobiltà, 119–164.

\(^{192}\) ÓNB, Barbaro, II, 290–291. ASV, Barbaro, V, 323.


\(^{194}\) Listine I, p. 147, doc. 239.
palaces that served as the Counts’ residences, there was an increasing need for buildings that would accommodate the city administration and the city councils (which were established at the time). The Count’s Palace complex in Rab shows that it grew out of several palaces built at different times. The oldest palace (the south wing) was the thirteenth-century Count’s Palace, next to which various other buildings were constructed for the city administration and the city council, established at the time.

In 1320, Andrea Michiel, the count of Rab, continued the project of restructuring the palace built by his father, Marco Michiel.

Figure 11: As yet unpublished depiction of Dubrovnik with its famous port. It is held in Austrian National Library, dated 1700 (after the great earthquake of 1667); Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Kartensammlung – Albertina-Vues, Sign. ALB Vues 08646 KAR MAG.

195 VEKARIĆ, Udio plemstva u stanovništvu Dubrovnika, 31–46.
198 The presentation of the city is inaccurate in details and some important buildings and churches are missing. See more in: BENYOFSKY LATIN, Mobilnost i umreženost mletačkih knežev.
The town hall of Dubrovnik is mentioned only in 1301 (*in sala comunis Ragusii*),\textsuperscript{199} when the hall of the Major Council bridged the passage through the *fonticus*\textsuperscript{200} (which was annexed) at the level of its first floor. However, a town hall may have existed earlier, before the fire.\textsuperscript{201} It was only in the Angevin period that the Count’s Palace was transformed into a building complex organized around an inner courtyard. The fire of 1296, which destroyed much of the *burgus*, made room for new, modern planning of this area (especially on communal land), with the so-called double rows, according to the latest model of urban planning.\textsuperscript{202} It may have been conducted under Venetian influence (e.g. the area of San Lio) or that of other Italian cities where this model can be identified (Aquila, Manfredonia, Alcamo, Chioggia;\textsuperscript{203} cities with which Dubrovnik had trade contacts) – through the counts, notaries or merchants.

**Conclusion**

At the time when communes were emerging in the Eastern Adriatic, there were serious attempts to conquer the area by the central and regional authorities, to achieve a temporary or long-term consolidation of power by means of negotiations and appointments of officials, which later influenced the level of urban autonomy and institutions, as well as the spatial layout of the cities.\textsuperscript{204} In the century after the Fourth Crusade, the pretensions of Venice over the Eastern Adriatic cities intensified, and concrete measures were taken to retain control over them more permanently. Venetian power was established in medieval cities by means of military ventures and/or diplomacy and agreements, and it was consolidated through certain hierarchically organized structures – institutions and personal contacts.\textsuperscript{205}

The processes of implementing power were dynamic and variable, depending on the different external and local circumstances to be scrutinized. Geographical position was very important in this respect.\textsuperscript{206} Some cities were in frontier zones and they were subject to overlapping influences. Others relied on their own heritage and the fact that the political power was far away, both geographically and at the political or institutional level. The Adriatic cities had different relations with Venice: some of them had continuous and strong links – as had cities of the Quarner Bay, partly due to their geographical proximity – while others oscillated and had strong

---

\textsuperscript{199} GRUJIĆ, Knežev dvor u Dubrovniku, 28. MR V, p. 61.

\textsuperscript{200} GRUJIĆ, Knežev dvor u Dubrovniku, 158–160. It was at that time that the wall, the doors and the pillars were commissioned.

\textsuperscript{201} North of the Count’s Palace, a *domus comunis* is mentioned in 1291. Cf. BENYOVSKY LATIN – ZELIĆ, *Libri domorum et terraeorum*, 133. In 1344, the documents mention a new hall built for the Major Council, with a painted interior. Cf. FISKOVIĆ, *Dubrovačko slikarstvo*, 84–85. FISKOVIĆ, Prvi poznati dubrovački graditelji, 103.


\textsuperscript{203} PLANIĆ-LONČARIĆ. *Planirana izgradnja na području*.

\textsuperscript{204} The central authorities often limited their jurisdiction to the areas of their immediate interest, such as taxes, accommodation for themselves or other dignitaries, and the construction of public buildings. BENYOVSKY LATIN, *Introduction: Towns and Cities*, 13–35.

\textsuperscript{205} Only a few studies have paid sufficient attention to the Eastern Adriatic as an area of contact for the interregional networks of people, knowledge and cultures. Although recent literature has been increasingly focusing on the channels of political communication between various European cities and the central authorities. ARNADE, *City, state, and public ritual*, 300–318. HATTORI, *Political Order and Forms*.

\textsuperscript{206} Thus, the Hungarian kings acted as the protectors of various Dalmatian cities during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, but their political power in the Eastern Adriatic was very different from that in medieval Slavonia.
links with the Hungarian kings (e.g. Zadar), in which cases Venice had to use different strategies, and sometimes resort to compromise. In some periods, Venetian power over the cities weakened, which had the effect of strengthening the cities’ autonomy. The occasional increase of urban autonomy was also linked to the strengthened local economic circumstances, alliances with other political entities, or an insufficient focus or power of the central authorities to exercise actual power in cities.

The central authorities mostly relied on the existing local elites in the Eastern Adriatic, so they were deeply involved in the local social relations, creating personal and institutional ties and new loyalties. The representatives of the central government and administration played a key role not only in the relationship between the authorities and the cities, but also that between different cities, because their service was temporary and mobile within the area and in terms of power. They were transmitting influences and knowledge. The counts and their assistants brought new knowledge, which would then be applied in planning, organizing and administering the urban area, especially the communal parts. These counts certainly implemented ideas crafted in Venice, but at the same time had diverse contacts and connections with the local elites, which could directly influence their relations with the central authorities and with other cities.

The numerous connections – especially in legal culture, the circulating individuals, common measurements and trade, institutions and symbols – resulted in new customs, community circles, and new overlapping identities. Communication at this level was primarily about the transmission and exchange of information (knowledge, ideas, social values, beliefs, values and norms) and was largely conducted through personal presence and contacts, symbols and rituals, but also increasingly in writing and by means of laws. The Venetian authority was sometimes an integrative element in a particular area – one that connected the cities and standardized their systems, created interrelated networks, and brought stability. Sometimes, it was an element of dissent between the cities – if cities of the same cultural heritage were within different political entities, or if they were dissatisfied with their position within a sphere of power.

Various measures that Venice applied in the Eastern Adriatic cities during the thirteenth century had an impact on urban change: ordering the construction (or reconstruction) of the castrum to accommodate the count, the bulwark and the arsenal for military and merchant ships. Some of the urban changes – institutional or spatial – resulted from decisions made due to extra-regional circumstances, namely the Venetian government in the thirteenth century, and not merely from those made by the local governments. On the other hand, although Venice often tried to introduce unified systems and order throughout their domain of power, their implementation was always subject to the specific circumstances. So, comparison is important for establishing similarities as well as differences in the design of cities under the same sovereign in the Adriatic and beyond – within a particular political formation.

Based on the selected examples, it may be concluded that the Venetian rule had had a considerable impact on urban change already in the thirteenth century: nevertheless,
this paper is a still a preliminary study in long-term research that aims to explore the complex relationship between urban planning, the cities, the government and the local circumstances in each individual city.\textsuperscript{210} Thereby it is particularly important to take a comparative approach, which will make it possible to evaluate this relationship: not only in the context of Eastern Adriatic cities, but also in other cities that were part of the Venetian territory.
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Heraldry today belongs undoubtedly to one of the most dynamically developing branches of auxiliary history, as far as Slovak historiography is concerned. Only relatively recently, fundamental works were published that describe in detail the development of this discipline in Slovakia, as well as offering a modern perspective on Slovak heraldic terminology. Scholarly research has been particularly impressive regarding state symbolism, and communal, county-level and especially noble heraldry. The past two decades have seen a relatively high number of heraldic and genealogical lexicons relating to noble family heraldry. These are interesting to the academic community but also to a wider reading public, which is beneficial because until now this type of publication was absent in Slovak heraldry scholarship. Other publications tracked the development of noble arms in Slovakia, as well as works on the links between heraldry and phaleristics. It is equally encouraging that heraldic source books are beginning to be published, including the soon to be published, much anticipated collection of grants of arms from Slovakia.

The study presents the state of research into burgher heraldry in Slovakia. It notes the perspectives and possibilities of further research, as well as the importance of the sigillographic study of burgher seals. On the basis of its findings, it demonstrates discoveries on the uses of coats of arms, or more precisely, personal heraldic marks, by burghers in early modern towns of the Hungarian Kingdom (and includes, for instance, the issues of heritability of burgher marks and the ennoblement of burghers from a heraldic point of view).

Keywords: Heraldry. Sigillography. Burghers. Hungarian Kingdom. Arms/Crest of Arms.

Heraldry today belongs undoubtedly to one of the most dynamically developing branches of auxiliary history, as far as Slovak historiography is concerned. Only relatively recently, fundamental works were published that describe in detail the development of this discipline in Slovakia, as well as offering a modern perspective on Slovak heraldic terminology. Scholarly research has been particularly impressive regarding state symbolism, and communal, county-level and especially noble heraldry. The past two decades have seen a relatively high number of heraldic and genealogical lexicons relating to noble family heraldry. These are interesting to the academic community but also to a wider reading public, which is beneficial because until now this type of publication was absent in Slovak heraldry scholarship. Other publications tracked the development of noble arms in Slovakia, as well as works on the links between heraldry and phaleristics. It is equally encouraging that heraldic source books are beginning to be published, including the soon to be published, much anticipated collection of grants of arms from Slovakia.
Studies into burgher (non-noble) heraldry are more complicated, and this area has stood in the shadows for a long time for Slovak heraldic scholars. In the 1985 academic symposium in Námestovo on the state of research by auxiliary history departments, for instance, burgher heraldry was not even mentioned; or at least, it is absent from the published symposium proceedings. The subsequent decades have seen the first scholarly studies and articles which mapped, on the basis of case studies, the situation in certain chosen localities. Despite previous assumptions which tended to marginalize burgher heraldry in Hungary, quite the opposite has been revealed. The wide use and richness of burgher heraldic symbolism was particularly surprising. The published studies therefore gave us a preliminary, basic overview of the breadth and development of heraldic use in our towns. It has become evident that burgher heraldry in Hungary developed along similar lines to that of neighbouring Central European countries. A wealth of typological similarities and choices of burgher symbolism, as well as the manner of using burgher heraldic marks, are particularly comparable to those of Austrian, southern German and Czech urban environments. This is without doubt a phenomenon deriving from the intensive German colonization of medieval Hungarian (today Slovak) towns not only during the Middle Ages, but also during the Early Modern Era. Nevertheless, we also notice some Hungarian deviations which we focus on below. It is clear, therefore, that we shall require further and deeper studies to understand the complexities of this area, including studies of an interdisciplinary heraldic, sigillographic, prosopographic and genealogical nature.

Hungarian historiography and heraldic research, both current and historical, does not focus sufficiently on this topic. This is odd, since family heraldry has a rich tradition with our southern neighbours. What research there is focuses mainly on noble families, and heraldic studies related to burghers and their marks are published only sporadically. Older works by E. Tompos and Cs. Csorba are nevertheless still relevant, and they present similar findings to those by Slovak authors. Hungarian historiography also feels the absence of a complex synthesis relating to burgher heraldry.

The author of this text has a long-term focus on the use of heraldic marks in Hungarian towns. In 2002 he presented a study on the development of burgher heraldry, including the classification of symbolism and use of personal marks, i.e., arms of burghers and non-nobles. He also published several studies on burgher heraldry in the Hungarian capital Prešporok (Pressburg, today’s Bratislava), the vineyard towns of the Little Carpathians and Central Slovakian mining towns. He has begun to define the basic direction of further research and pointed to the need of heraldic research of citizenry

---

6 The most recent Slovak textbook on heraldry describes burgher heraldry as one of the least explored areas of heraldry in our country. GLEJTEK, Heraldika, 201–205.
7 VRTEĽ, Pomocné vedy historické, 62–70.
not only of royal towns, but also in smaller feudal towns and townships. In terms of basic research, we still do not have satisfactory data on the use of burgher heraldic seals in the context of diplomatic production in towns. We are aware of only minimal sources on trade symbolism used chiefly by master artisans of lesser-known crafts, and similarly we know little about the links between burgher and guild heraldry. Similarly, there is yet to be systematic primary research into the heraldry of town intelligentsia (preachers, organist, schoolmasters, artists, scribes, lawyers and public notaries). It is necessary to connect the heritability issue of burgher marks with the genealogical research of their families. Certainly, the most fascinating area of study is burgher ennoblement and the subsequent transformation of their arms, which also requires focused genealogical and prosopographic work. Here we must admit an important advantage enjoyed by Slovak research into burgher heraldry, and that is the wealth of surviving archival material. This makes a successful study into this subject eminently possible.

The period of probably the greatest use of burgher heraldry in Hungarian towns was during the Early Modern Era, between 1500 and 1750. As such, this study focuses on this time and includes a number of thematic areas that revealed themselves during sigillographic research.

**Ennoblement of burghers and changes in their heraldic marks**

One of the most interesting phenomena of social development in post-Mohacs Hungary was the significant growth in ennoblements. As a rule, the Habsburg monarchs ennobled soldiers, royal officials and the familiars of magnates and dignitaries of the realm. However, another particular social group granted nobility in the Early Modern period consisted of the inhabitants of royal and mining towns – particularly members of the patriciate and town elites. It appears that even the royal court supported this trend. For instance, a successful career in town administration became an accomplishment worthy of ennoblement. However, this process of ennobling town elites occurred in different timeframes across different Hungarian free royal towns. In the capital we can roughly define it to 1570–1600. Whilst in the first half of the sixteenth century only some individuals of the senate were nobles, by 1600 almost every senator of Bratislava was either newly ennobled or, indeed, a noble by birth. If a non-noble was voted into the senate, soon after he successfully petitioned for noble status for himself and his family. Senators from Hungarian (Magyar) and Croatian artisan classes, who were pushed into the senate as supporters of the Catholics, also soon became noblemen. The master blacksmith Michael Bán was raised to this status in 1618, the haberdasher Caspar Bella alias Gömbköthő in 1612, another haberdasher, Martin Galgóczy in 1629, the barber and wound healer Caspar Várady in 1635, locksmith Peter Szilvassy and butcher John Otth in 1651, to be followed by others. Of course, families outside of the town administration were also ennobled. The right to arms and noble privileges were also obtained by members of the urban intelligentsia, town officials and wealthy merchants, as well as successful artisans. They all continued to pay taxes from their

urban properties and they bought themselves out of military duty, and were therefore precisely documented in towns. The 1597 rollcall of Bratislava burghers included 79 such individuals (“armalists”). The majority of the recently ennobled Bratislava patriciate continued their urban way of life. They continued to make their living principally by trade or craft; but with some families we see an intention to blend into the Hungarian nobility. They sought positions in royal service and offices and tried to become related to noble families. Such marriages were, counter-intuitively, particularly interesting to impoverished gentry and descendants of noble exiles from the south, as well as to educated young nobles working in royal offices of the capital. A contributory part to this intermingling with the Hungarian nobility were attempts by the richest members of the city elite to purchase the free noble country possessions outside of town. Importantly, this kind of ownership transformed their legal status, and from mere possessionless “armalists”, they became county nobles with the right to engage with the county administration and apply for royal posts. And so, for instance, the Bratislava Hoffingers became owners of a noble estate in Deutsch Jahrndorf in Moson county; the Heindls and Schrembsers bought estates in Rajka; the Pecks and Karners owned estates in the Rye Island (Žitný ostrov, Csalloköz); and the Schmuggers, estates in Veľké Leváre. Some secured their ownership even further with royal donations.

Modern heraldic study should also be concerned with the issues surrounding burgher ennoblement; since with the gaining of noble status a burgher, or his family branch, was also granted a hereditary coat of arms. Often the appearance of the latter was suggested or co-produced by the petitioner himself, who sent it to the royal chancellery drawn into the ennoblement application. It is important to note a Hungarian particularity in respect to this. In the Kingdom of Hungary, contrary to in Imperial lands, there was no legal mid-position between burgher and noble status. In Austrian and Bohemian lands, for example, the monarch could grant hereditary arms to burghers and other individuals by way of a document, without also granting nobility. These gained a coat of arms, sometimes even the right to feudal possession (Wappen und Lehenartikel), but not nobility. A similar jurisdiction to issue grants of arms for burghers was exercised by Imperial palatine counts (Hofpfalzgraf). This produced a numerous group of armigerous burghers whose families thus had hereditary arms. Yet, it remained a burgher coat of arms, however complete (with helm, mantling and crest). The closed or tilting helmet was used as a rule. It lacked the coronet and was replaced by the torse. These armigerous burgher families could subsequently petition for ennoblement, but did not always do so.

It was not possible for Hungarian burghers to petition for this kind of hereditary coat of arms. Then again, an advantage for them was that with a grant of arms they also gained noble status and noble arms. Since the burghers themselves were directly involved in co-creating their noble arms, it is evidently very interesting to explore the

14 Archív mesta Bratislavy [Municipal Archive of Bratislava], mesto Bratislava [City Council of Bratislava] (hereinafter AMB, MB), Spisy, box 56, lad. 34, no. 6.
15 FEDERMAYER, Leopold Peck, 168, 175. Slovenský národný archív [Slovak National Archives], Hodnoverné miesto Bratislavskej kapituly [Collegiate Chapter of Bratislava – place of authentification] (hereinafter SNA, HMBK), protokol no. 18, p. 57; no. 27, p. 804; no. 28, p. 411.
16 GLEJTEK, Heraldika, 20–24.
extent to which they carried through their original personal marks or symbols. We studied this phenomenon with a number of elite urban Bratislava (Pressburg) families of the Early Modern period. It became clear that only rarely have their original burgher arms, and individual figures from them, been incorporated into newly granted noble arms. Those that were used were mostly so-called canting arms. This is seen with the mayoral families of Klee, Aichinger or Kögl, who were among the first in the Hungarian capital to be ennobled during the sixteenth century. These findings are published in an earlier study. 18 By contrast, families whose members used trade symbolism or personal trade marks (including the Laussers and Schrembers) preferred noble coats of arms depicting entirely different symbols. Their noble heraldic achievement was principally evidence of their newly acquired privileged social standing. But there remained families who did not cease to use their burgher signs, particularly merchants with their personal marks, even after ennoblement – since they fulfilled a function. This can be seen with the Burgstaller family of Bratislava mayors. 19

Transformations of the heraldic arms of the Feyrtag and Welligrand families

It was possible to use the sources to successfully map and document the heraldic changes subsequent to ennoblement of further burgher families living in the Hungarian capital. We have chosen two families – Feyrtag and Welligrand – which until now have not been the subjects of any heraldic or genealogical work. In the Early Modern period the Feyrtags (Feyrtag, Fayrtagh, Freytag) were among the most eminent burgher families of Bratislava. We may consider them as a typical example of a family which gradually ascended from the craftsman class to the city elite. So far, it is possible to trace the family genealogy from the master furriers, brothers Thomas Feyrtag (†before 1590) and Andrew Feyrtag (†after 1590). Thomas was more significant for the family; he sat in the greater city council and owned a house on the main square. His widow married the nobleman and royal official Salamon Streitberger. 20 This relation probably ushered the furrier family into the city’s noble community. Thomas’s descendants became familiar with the social environment of their father-in-law and they themselves, later, gained noble titles. 21 We do not know exactly when this was, since the date of the ennoblement is unknown and neither is it mentioned in older genealogical literature. However, the earliest Feyrtags appear in the lists of Bratislava nobility in the years 1640, 1643 and 1650. 22 A more significant ascent of the Feyrtags in the capital city was probably limited by their Protestant faith, to which they were loyal after ennoblement. This made it impossible for them to apply for the higher royal posts then resident in Bratislava. The family became extinct in the second half of the seventeenth century.

We can also trace the Feyrtag ennoblement through heraldic sources. We are familiar with the seals of Thomas Feyrtag’s son, Joachim (†before 1624) pressed in 1603 and 1623, and of his grandson Lawrence from 1633. 23 They depict differing heraldic charges.

---

18 FEDEMAYER, Richtár Michal Klee, 68–79.
19 FEDEMAYER, Heraldický svet richtára, 168–179. NOVÁK, Rodové erby na Slovensku I, 205.
20 AMB, MB, Magistrátny protokol 2a. 4, p. 254; 2a. 5, pp. 57, 186, 317, 516, 584; 2a. 6, pp. 89, 257.
21 AMB, MB, Magistrátny protokol 2a. 9, p. 285.
23 Štátny archív v Trnave [State Archives in Trnava], Magistrát mesta Trnava [City Council of Trnava], Missiles, school year 1623. AMB, MB, Spisy, box 50, no. 2; box 51, lad. 33.
In 1603, Joachim still used his personal mark on the seal, inserted into the escutcheon within a cartouche. This mark was a combination of his initials and an upward pointing arrow (fig. 1). We know that he worked in the services of the Bratislava town chamber, and later as a Bratislava merchant. His eponymous elder son, Joachim, entered the Imperial service in Vienna, where he became a member and subsequently a corporal of the city guard. Around this time the family was raised to the nobility, and it appears that this was Imperial, not Hungarian nobility. When Joachim Feyrtag the younger married in 1611, documents already identified him as a noble.24 Joachim’s younger son Lawrence Feyrtag (†1653) entered the services of the Imperial protestant nobleman Melchior Beringer von Königshofen, who was a courtier of Emperor Ferdinand II and worked as a military official in Hungary. Lawrence himself became an Imperial courtier later on, but was not given a more important office.25

The earlier seals of Joachim (1623) and Lawrence from 1633 already depict the noble arms of the Bratislava Feyrtags. The escutcheon was divided by a wedge (heraldic chapé) into three fields. The wedge was charged by a bird facing to the right (a cockerel?). Both upper fields contained rosettes. The shield was surmounted by a closed, barred helmet with a coronet and mantling. The crest was the aforementioned bird between a pair of oliphants. Three roses issued from each oliphant (fig. 2). We do not yet know the tinctures (colours) of the coat of arms, but we hope to find the Feyrtag grant of arms. Arms of this kind and content were typical for the Renaissance period, or the period between the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Joachim Feyrtag kept nothing of his personal mark in his new noble arms. This was not unusual and, as we have mentioned, it is consistent with other ennobled Bratislava families who used merchants’ marks in the past.

Other families managed to enter noble ranks in the Early Modern Period, some even from the densely populated suburbs of the Hungarian capital. We have chosen the Welligrands (Beligrond) as an example where we can also trace a change in heraldry. The earliest known ancestor of this burgher family was George Welligrand (†1594), who lived, together with his sons Matthew and Michael, on Danube Street (Thonaugasse) in the suburbs.26 This street was inhabited by numerous burghers who made their living on the river – boatmen, millers or fishermen. The Welligrands were also originally a fishing family. The Danube branches, richly stocked with fish, enabled the local fishermen to prosper within the Bratislava burgher community, both materially and socially. The guild of fishermen and fish merchants was one of the oldest in the city, with its statutes published by the city in 1511 and 1543.27

The wealthiest master fishermen used their own personal marks, probably also depicted in the billboards hanging outside their shops, and certainly in their personal seals. Their heraldic signs depicted the symbolism of their craft – most commonly fish in various configurations.28 The Welligrands were no exception. We know of three seals

25 SNA, HMBK, Spisy, caps. 4, fasc. 9. SNA, HMBK, Protokol no. 40, p. 293; no. 41, pp. 320, 404.
26 AMB, MB, Magistrátny protokol 2a. 6, p. 344; AMB, MB, Protokol testamentov 4n. 5, p. 236. FEDERMAYER, Rody starého Prešporka, 209, 224–225.
27 ŠPIESZ, Štatúty bratislavských cechov, 32, 395.
28 FEDERMAYER, Meštianska heraldika, 34.
pressed by George’s son Matthew, from 1601 (fig. 3) and 1610. All show the same image: a shield charged with two crossed fish, accompanied by four rosettes. Above the shield, at the top of the seal field, are the initials M. W. Since two or three crossed fish was a common charge of fishing guilds, it is probable that Matthew was influenced in his arms by guild heraldry.

In the first third of the seventeenth century, the Welligrand family rapidly achieved social prominence. They moved into the city centre where they owned two houses, and Matthew’s brother Michael Welligrand (†1644) was chosen as Bratislava’s town winery mountain master (Pergmeister). By then Michael’s two sons, Andrew and Paul, had adjusted themselves to their higher social status and they abandoned their traditional work. Both became linen merchants and city dignitaries, and finally gained Hungarian nobility. The highest position in the city was achieved by Paul’s eponymous son Paul Welligrand the younger (†before 1684) who was a member of the senate in 1670–1672. Noble status enabled the family to gradually distance themselves from town life. In the eighteenth century, the Welligrands were prominent principally in Moson, Győr and Trenčín counties. They even reached royal service, including Andrew Welligrand (†1751) who headed the royal toll station in Trenčín. His seal from 1745 depicts the noble family arms.

This family coat of arms was granted to the Welligrands when they were raised to noble status by a grant of nobility, published by Ferdinand II on 6 January 1633. The shield was charged by a dove, issuing from a coronet on a trimount, and holding a branch in its beak. The crest depicted a griffon issuing from a coronet, grasping a branch in its claw. It is interesting to see that there is no trace of the original burgher symbolism of the family (fish, rosettes). It appears that the Welligrands were loath to return to the artisan (fishing) past of their ancestors and, indeed, by adopting completely new charges in their noble coats of arms they projected a future as part of the noble community.

Using a hereditary family burgher coat of arms

An as yet little-studied phenomenon of Hungarian burgher heraldry is that of armigerous urban families, in other words non-noble but hereditary arms in towns. Older research suggested that these kinds of families were rare, particularly in large towns, both during the Middle Ages and in the Early Modern period. Clarification of this issue is complicated by two factors. One of these is the relatively widespread ennoblement of town elites; particularly from the final third of the sixteenth century, many prominent urban inhabitants enjoyed nobility and noble arms, even if their way of life remained dependent on their civic status (as merchants, scholars or artisans). We usually know the precise date on which the grant of arms and ennoblement was published by the Hungarian monarch. We must consider these kinds of grants as unquestionably noble arms of ennobled burghers and not as part of urban, burgher heraldry. The problem

29 AMB, MB, Spisy, box 51, lad. 33, fasc. 11; AMB, MB, Listy a listiny, inv. no. 9129.
30 NAGYBÁKAY, Zunftwappen mit Helmzierden, 147, 154. MAJERECH-MRZÚCH, Remeselnícke cechové organizácie, 84–85. NOVÁK, Češové znaky, heslo Rybář.
31 NAGYBÁKAY, Zunftwappen mit Helmzierden, 147, 154. MAJERECH-MRZÚCH, Remeselnícke cechové organizácie, 84–85. NOVÁK, Češové znaky, heslo Rybář.
32 In the text of the document, the surname of the family is written as “Belligront”. REXA, Czímeres levelek Fejérvármegye leveltárában, 124.
33 FEDERMAYER, Meštianska heraldika, 15–17.
cases are those where it is uncertain whether the family was in fact ennobled, as many families died off relatively early and we miss genealogical data. Often the royal grants for these burghers are missing or lost. The second factor undermining a clear understanding of the issue is the fact that some Hungarian burghers, namely those of German ethnicity, petitioned not for Hungarian, but Imperial nobility, which they gained as burghers of Hungarian towns. We have several examples, including the Schifferers of Krupina (ennobled 1583), Liechtenpergers of Banská Bystrica (1604) and Partingers of Bratislava (1583).\textsuperscript{34} Other Hungarian burghers of Imperial extraction brought their nobility from their homeland. Even if they lived civic lives in Hungary, not as noblemen, they quite legitimately continued to use the hereditary noble coats of arms of their ancestors. A useful differentiating tool in the study of heraldic charges of ennobled burghers is the formal appearance of their arms. These are almost always complete achievements – with shield, helm, crest and mantling. Important, however, is that the helms are surmounted as a rule by the coronet, as a sign of noble status.

But apart from the arms of ennobled burghers with coronets we have also found hereditary arms of burghers that lack this kind of helm coronet. They are known to have existed since the Middle Ages, namely the fourteenth century. While the Bratislava mayoral Jakub family still represented a specific status as burghers – and patricians holding noble property – the younger Gallsms of Bratislava and Jungs of Banská Bystrica were definitely burghers. Both these families not only used complete coats of arms, but with the Jungs we also have sigillographic proof that their heraldic blazon of three shells was hereditary.\textsuperscript{35} Similarly, but later, in the sixteenth century, heraldic charges (three postal trumpets and half an arrow) were also hereditary in the well-known Banská Štiavnica burgher and mining family, the Schalls.\textsuperscript{36} Again, we know this through discovering their heraldic seals – that of Conrad Schall from 1542 for instance, or of Elias Schall in 1570.\textsuperscript{37} Both these patricians of Štiavnica bore arms without the noble coronet. Since the family moved to Banská Štiavnica from Swabian Stuttgart, their hereditary coat of arms was clearly an Imperial import. We have found similar types of arms borne by other families from the mining town regions, including the Lindacher and Riedmüller families.

The Lindachers are documented since the sixteenth century and they worked in mining towns as miners and mining officials. The first significant member was Christopher Lindacher, who began as a mining master in Boca in Liptov county (1564–1569); he is then mentioned in 1571 as a successful chief steward of the private Brenner mining venture in Banská Štiavnica. His 1569 seal depicts an unusual coat of arms (fig. 4).\textsuperscript{38} Its formal appearance suggests a hereditary coat, but its charges point to

\textsuperscript{34} Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, Allgemeines Verwaltungsarchiv, Adelsarchiv, Reichsadelakten, Allgemeine Reihe, no. 248. 43; no. 313. 15, no. 369. 56.
\textsuperscript{35} HALKO – KOMORNÝ, Dóm, 42–45. RÁBIK, Erb stredovekej banskobystrickej meštianskej rodiny Jungovcov, 49–58.
\textsuperscript{36} Recent work on this family: ČELKO, K lokalizácii knižníc, 239–247.
\textsuperscript{37} Slovenský banský archív [Slovak Mining Archives], Hlavný komorskogréfelskú úrad v Banskej Štiavnici [Office of the Main mining chamber count in Banská Štiavnica] (hereinafter SBA, HKG BŠ), Spisy, Spoločná agenda, box 93. Štátny archív v Banskej Bystrici, pracovisko Archív Banská Štiavnica [State Archives in Banská Bystrica, Banská Štiavnica branch], Magistrát mesta Banská Štiavnica [City Council of Banská Štiavnica] (hereinafter ŠA BB, ABŠ, MG-BŠ), Missiles, school year 1542.
\textsuperscript{38} ŠA BB, ABŠ, MG-BŠ, Missiles, school years 1564/2, 1569/2. BALÁŽOVÁ, Medzi Prahou a Norimbergom, 75. HERČKO, Osobnosti Banskej Štiavnice, 145.
personal burgher marks. The shield is divided vertically. The right field contains a cut branch from whose right side grows a living shoot with leaves. The left field depicts two melter’s pincers side by side. The escutcheon is surmounted by a tilting helmet with mantling, but lacking a coronet. Two outspread eagle’s wings form the crest. The hereditary quality of this coat of arms is confirmed by an earlier seal (1586) of a different family member – Elias Lindacher of Banská Štiavnica. It depicts a very similar blazon, again without a coronet. The only difference is represented in the right-hand field of the shield, where the branch and shoot are replaced with an entire tree. It is doubtless a canting charge – the linden tree (die Linde in German). The left field is once more filled by the melter’s pincers, which we may assume to represent the bearer’s profession. Pincers were used to drain ore and melt precious metals. We do not have any evidence that the Lindachers enjoyed Hungarian nobility. Since both heraldic achievements lack a coronet, we can assume that they were true burgher arms.

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the Riedtmüller family belonged to the city elites of Kremnica and Banská Štiavnica. As their surname implies, as does their coat of arms, the family’s ancestors were artisans – millers. In the environment of mining towns, from the second half of the sixteenth century, the Riedtmüllers were miners (“Waldbürgers”) and officials of the mining chambers. But there is no evidence that they were granted Hungarian nobility. And yet the extant seals are proof that they used hereditary arms with a noteworthy charge – in two variants. It consisted of a heraldic eagle placed in the shield with a millstone on its chest; or an eagle issuant from a half millstone in the bottom part of the shield. This charge recurred in the crest. It is first seen on seals of John Riedtmüller from 1570 and 1576, who used a full achievement with helmet, mantling and crest. Subsequently, the coat of arms was used with variations by John’s descendants during the entire seventeenth century, including the family’s most important member – Matthew Riedtmüller (†after 1672), the mayor of Banská Štiavnica. But all the variants lack a helm coronet; this is sometimes replaced by a torse, and sometimes there is no helm covering at all. This is consistent with burgher arms. The arms used by Christopher Riedtmüller (†1611), treasurer of the Banská Štiavnica mining chamber, is somewhat curious. His seal from 1609 shows the family coat of arms that, in formal terms, is comparable to noble arms of the period. The employment of a tilted Gothic shield, a pagan helm coronet and a cloak instead of mantling was fashionable particularly with the aristocracy and noble scholars in the first third of the seventeenth century. But the careful viewer will notice that Riedtmüller’s coat of arms once more lacks the helm coronet (fig. 5). Since this is repeated with every member of this family, we suspect this is intentional. We are thus dealing with a hereditary burgher coat of arms. It is again probable that the arms are of Imperial origin and were brought to Hungary by the Riedtmüllers from their homeland.

39 ŠA BB, Magistrát mesta Banská Bystrica [City Council of Banská Bystrica] (hereinafter MG-BB), Spisy, box 13, fasc. 45.
40 ŠA BB, MG-BB, Spisy, box 55, fasc. 226; ŠA BB, ABŠ, MG-BŠ, Missiles, school year 1570/1.
41 ŠA BB, pracovisko Archív Kremnica [Kremnica branch], Magistrát mesta Kremnica [City Council of Kremnica] (hereinafter AK, MG-K), Spisy, Tom II., Fons 50, fasc. 1.
42 NOVÁK, Rodové erby na Slovensku I, 226, 262, 276. FEDERMAYER, Zbierka erbových pečatí, 32, 52.
The double cross in burgher heraldry

From a heraldic perspective, the burgher family of Khuen is similarly interesting. Several artists and scholars came from this family, and the earliest known ancestor is the master goldsmith John Khuen (Khien), a member of the Banská Bystrica town council, who in 1555 and 1574 sealed with a curious personal heraldic sign (fig. 6).\(^{43}\) It consisted of a personal mark inserted into an escutcheon. Its basis was a double cross of arms of equal width. The bottom part of its vertical arm, however, was split into a rounded crocket (a so-called *Sparrenfußschaft* in German). Since the goldsmith and engraver John Khuen was a native of Levoča in Spiš county, we can legitimately ask whether his personal mark’s conceptual source may have been the arms of his native town.\(^{44}\) Indeed, Levoča used a double cross in its arms in the fifteenth and at the beginning of the sixteenth century; singly, or later in the well-known canting variant supported by a pair of lions.\(^{45}\)

The fact that the double cross, derived from the Hungarian royal symbol, appears in noble heraldry as well as in the arms of many of the oldest and most important royal towns, is a well-known and thoroughly studied phenomenon.\(^{46}\) It has been less studied in connection with Hungarian burgher heraldry. We are aware of its existence in the Middle Ages as one of the several variants of the personal merchants’ marks. The first evidence of this type of mark is in Košice, on a heraldic tombstone from the fourteenth century.\(^{47}\) It is generally assumed that these burgher marks were derived from masons’ marks and so-called house signs (*Hausmarken*). They are widespread throughout Central Europe, together with similar other marks based on the arrow, cross, hooks, or number cipher.\(^{48}\) As a result, they should not be directly related to the Hungarian royal double cross, even those seen in Hungary itself.

However, the most recent sigillographic finds cast this theory in a new light. In the event that a burgher’s mark was influenced by the heraldic symbol of his home town, then it was indirectly derived from the royal arms. Indeed, Khuen the goldsmith is not an isolated case. His contemporary, the Zvolen burgher Stephen Sielnický, sealed in 1585 with a similarly created personal heraldic mark, inserted into a Renaissance-style shield. Its basis was the double (patriarchal) cross, very similar to the contemporary depiction of the royal double cross. But it was augmented with a new, transversely diagonal arm that connected the bottom of the cross with its lower right arm (fig. 7). Judging from his surname, this burgher came from Sielnica near Zvolen. The former town did not have a double cross in its arms, but the latter used it as a charge since the town’s inception—including during the life of Stephen Sielnický.\(^{49}\) It is therefore possible that this Zvolen burgher derived his personal mark from the very arms of his town. It is interesting that another contemporary of these two burghers from the Zvolen region used arms featuring a double cross: a certain S. Schlaher who pressed a seal in 1584 at Vígľaš castle near

---


\(^{44}\) TORANOVÁ, *Zlatníctvo na Slovensku*, 220.

\(^{45}\) NOVÁK, *Pečate miest a obcí*, 541–542.

\(^{46}\) VRTEĽ, *Osem storočí*, 57–63.


\(^{49}\) NOVÁK, *Pečate miest a obcí*, 536. ŠA BB, MG-BB, Spisy, box 51, fasc. 211.
Zvolen. We do not know much about this individual, but the millstone in his heraldic sign implies that he could have been a miller – a burgher or descendant of such a family. Schlaher’s arms, which depict a Hungarian royal double cross growing out of a millstone between two leaves, is heraldically very powerful (fig. 8). Again, it could relate to nearby Zvolen, or potentially the bearer of this seal was in royal service. We shall see what future genealogical research might show about the Schlaher family.

In relation to the hereditary quality of burgher arms, we must return to the goldsmith Khuen and his heraldic sign. Personal marks were not usually hereditary, but they could sometimes be transformed into hereditary coats of arms. John Khuen was the founder of an important artistic and scholarly dynasty of burghers, which during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries produced a number of exceptional artists – painters, sculptors and engravers. John’s son James Khuen (†after 1619) became a relatively well-known Renaissance painter who worked principally in central Slovakia. He also used heraldic seals with his own coat of arms, which was made in a curious way. Into the escutcheon field, between three smaller shields which always symbolised artists (painters and engravers), he inserted his father’s personal mark. The sign of the double cross thus became hereditary. The arms included a tilting helm with a coronet (!), mantling and crest. The latter consisted of a pair of deer antlers, surrounding a demi-female figure without arms and with a torse on her head. We have published this coat of arms depicted in James’s seal from 1615 (fig. 9). Even though it had the appearance of a noble coat of arms, it was once again burgher heraldry. The helm with coronet is a little confusing in this instance. The coronet does not denote noble status, but was borrowed from guild heraldry. In fact the painter James Khuen created his arms by assuming the complete arms of the painters’ guild and augmenting them with his father’s sign. A generation later the family really did gain Hungarian nobility. The monarch granted the Khuens (Khien) a noble coat of arms featuring griffins, again without any connection to the symbolism of burgher heraldry. It would certainly be very interesting to focus research on the heraldic development of further generations of the Khuen family. It remains to be seen whether the double cross mark was truly forgotten, since younger members of the family remained painters, making it possible that they used their personal painters’ marks alongside their noble coat of arms.

Curiosities of burgher heraldry – the executioner’s arms

The content and symbolism of burgher heraldic signs was often influenced by social standing within the urban community, as well as type of activity or profession. With masters of traditional crafts (such as butcher, miller, furrier, tailor or cobbler) we mainly encounter heraldic motifs that derive from an artisanal, professional symbolism. Thus, the products were depicted, or perhaps the tools pointing to the particular craft of the burgher. This symbolism was used in both guild and burgher heraldry, and both closely influenced and enriched each other. The above-mentioned symbolism was of a relatively unified and universal character, but it nevertheless managed to create

50 ŠA BB, MG-BB, Spisy, box 100, fasc. 326.
51 GARAS, Schlachtenbilder und fremde Maler, 342–345.
52 ŠA BB, MG-BB, Spisy, box 70, fasc. 269. RAGAČ, Mälar Jakub Khien, 247–256.
53 The following study discusses the blazon of the painters’ guilds’ coat of arms in several Imperial cities since the Middle Ages: NAGYBAKAY, Zunftwappen mit Helmzierden, 141, 154.
54 VRTEĽ, Osem storočí, 163–167, 195.
a large number of original variations and combinations. And so, each urban craftsman was able to choose a unique symbol for his personal sign. This has been noted by several older heraldic studies. We can confidently identify and describe a good number of these professional charges; others, especially of lesser-known professions, are yet to be properly discussed. 55

But urban communities were also home to relatively uncommon or specialized professions. Their members usually worked in towns as individuals and were therefore not organized into guilds. Sigillographic research of these persons’ seals reveals their heraldic signs, which often contained unusual and noteworthy symbolism. Though rare and unusual, they significantly contribute to our knowledge of Hungarian burgher heraldry and to a general understanding of the relationship between Hungarian burghers and their heraldic signs.

For this reason, we have decided to include an example of a heraldic curiosity – the arms of the town executioner. Executioners have not yet been examined closely in heraldic research. Sigillographic sources, however, confirm that they also used seals. This is particularly interesting in light of their ambiguous social standing. On the one hand, they were usually pushed to the edges of society due to their repulsive and morally suspect profession. On the other, their services were extremely valued. Without them, it would have been impossible to enact the most serious judgements (torture, physical punishments and execution itself), which were the bases of feudal legal power and justice. But executioners were also charged with important hygienic services, such as the removal of corpses or catching stray dogs. Urban or county representatives thus always made sure to pay an executioner well, and they were often accommodated and even fed on their account. 56 The chronic existence of executioners on the edges of society and the marriage relations between their families, as well as their relative wealth, made it possible for the growth of executioner dynasties. It is a phenomenon worthy of closer study by heraldists as well as genealogists.

The earliest personal sign of an executioner known so far is from Bratislava, the then Hungarian capital. It survived on the seal of the executioner Christopher Feuler from 1563. It has a beautiful heraldic form and unusually powerful symbolism. The shield contains a large sword wreathed by two snakes. 57 The snakes here symbolise sin, while the sword means just punishment. The sword traditionally represented justice. Together with a pair of scales it is present in depictions of the Roman goddess of justice – Justitia – as well as of the Archangel Michael. 58 It was simultaneously the executioner’s professional symbol and his working tool.

One of Feuler’s successors in the Hungarian metropolis was the executioner Nicholas Amon. We know that he was from Vienna. Some brief inscriptions show that he worked in Bratislava, but also had paid work in the nearby towns of Svätý Jur and Pezinok. His seal from 1635 is undoubtedly a curiosity (fig. 10), since we find not a personal burgher sign, but a complete heraldic achievement. 59 The shield shows an angel holding...
a (fiery?) sword in his right hand, and a pair of scales in his left. A tilting helm above the shield supports a torse with mantling. The crest represents a double-tailed lion, issuing and turned to the right. His right paw wields a sword and his left holds a human head. This executioner’s coat of arms also had clear symbolism – justice in the shield and punishment in the crest. The shield charge probably represents St Michael. This archangel’s role on the Day of Judgment was to weigh the good and bad deeds of human souls on a pair of scales, and banish the unworthy from heaven with his sword.60

But the attention of heraldic experts must focus on the manner of appearance of these arms, since it is identical to hereditary family arms. The use of a torse instead of a coronet rules out the possibility that the family is noble. If the Amons were a family of executioners, the coat of arms suggests that they also bore hereditary arms. The question remains whether these arms were merely assumed or whether they obtained a grant of arms for them. Its publication by the Imperial chamber is not likely, but it might have come from the office of one of the lesser-known Imperial palatines. A wealthy family of executioners, working for generations in the most important cities and doubtless also for royal justice, could have obtained such a palatine grant without too much publicity. It is, of course, only a hypothesis that will have to be confirmed by genealogical research.

Finally, we would like to return to the importance of further developing research into burgher heraldry and point to primary sources. As with noble heraldry, the nature of these varies. As we have already mentioned, in Slovak (Hungarian) research we clearly miss grants of arms, and we only have imports of Imperial privileges.61 This means that perhaps the most acute problem is determining the exact tinctures of burgher arms. An alternative primary source for these may be decorated heraldic diaries (germ. Stammbuch).62 Also significant are sources in museums or on monuments – seal rings, seal matrices, artisanal signs, guild chests and guild memorial cups, as well as house marks or sepulchral monuments (tombstones and epitaphs of burghers).63 These, however, are usually only sporadically extant, and most of these primary sources are not indexed in any meaningful heraldic way. It is therefore likely that the most important source material for burgher heraldry is sigillographic material – seals of burghers themselves. Many are to be found in our archives, and each seal can be precisely dated and attributed to an individual, which markedly facilitates genealogical identification.

We therefore believe that the publishing of more comprehensive collections of sigillographic material in the future will help hugely in researching the use of heraldic signs in urban contexts. A possible goal for the near future would be a comprehensive, scholarly monograph that would introduce burgher heraldry in Slovak (and Hungarian) towns in more depth.

Translated by Miroslav Pomichal

60 MYSLIVEČEK, Panoptikum symbolů, 160, 226. OSWALD, Lexikon der Heraldik, 270.
61 For instance, many burgher grants of arms of Imperial origin are stored in the Archives of the City of Bratislava or in Hungarian central archives and libraries: FAUST, I. Archiv mesta Bratislavy, see: inv. no. 2, 8, 9 etc. ÁLDÁSY, A Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum, 373–377.
62 BALÁZOVÁ, Medzi Prahou a Norimbergom.
63 ORŠULOVÁ, Erb, 91–101. PETROVIČOVÁ, Meštianske znaky, 86–90. FEDERMAYER, Lausser.
BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary sources
Archív mesta Bratislavy [Municipal Archive of Bratislava], Mesto Bratislava [City Council of Bratislava]
Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, Allgemeines Verwaltungsarchiv, Adelsarchiv
Slovenský banský archív [Slovak Mining Archives], Hlavný komorskogrofský úrad v Banskej Štiavnici [Office of the Main mining chamber count in Banská Štiavnica]
Slovenský národný archív [Slovak National Archives], Archív rodu Apóni z Jablonice [Family Apóni of Jablonica]
Slovenský národný archív [Slovak National Archives], Archív rodu Zay z Uhrovec [Family Zay of Uhrovec]
Slovenský národný archív [Slovak National Archives], Hodnoverné miesto Bratislavské kapituly [Collegiate Chapter of Bratislava – place of authentication]
Slovenský národný archív [Slovak National Archives], Súkromný archív Bratislavské kapituly [Collegiate Chapter of Bratislava – private archives]
Štátny archív v Banskej Bystrici [State Archives in Banská Bystrica], Magistrát mesta Banská Bystrica [City Council of Banská Bystrica]
Štátny archív v Banskej Štiavnici [State Archives in Banská Štiavnica], Banská Štiavnica branch, Magistrát mesta Banská Štiavnica [City Council of Banská Štiavnica]
Štátny archív v Banskej Bystrici, pracovisko Archív Kremnica [State Archives in Kremnica branch], Magistrát mesta Kremnica [City Council of Kremnica]
Štátny archív v Bratislave, pracovisko Archív Modre [State Archives in Bratislava, Modra branch], Magistrát mesta Pezinok [City Council of Pezinok]
Štátny archív v Trnave [State Archives in Trnava], Magistrát mesta Trnava [City Council of Trnava]

Secondary sources


Figures

Figure 1: Joachim Feyrtag, heraldic seal from 1603.
Figure 2: Vavrinec Feyrtag, heraldic seal from 1633.
Figure 3: Matej Welligrand, heraldic seal from 1601.
Figure 4: Krištof Lindacher, heraldic seal from 1569.
Figure 5: Krištof Riedtmüller, heraldic seal from 1609.
Figure 6: Ján Khuen, heraldic seal from 1555.
Figure 7: Štefan Sielnický, heraldic seal from 1585.
Figure 8: S. Schlaher, heraldic seal from 1584.
Figure 9: Jakub Khuen, heraldic seal from 1615.
Figure 10: Mikuláš Amon, heraldic seal from 1635.
Petitioners of Jewish Property in Košice: A Case Study on the Holocaust and Local Society in a Slovak-Hungarian Border Region*

László Csősz** – Veronika Szeghy-Gayer***

vol. 10, 2021, 1, pp. 75–101
DOI: https://doi.org/10.33542/CAH2021-1-03

This study aims to provide an insight into the microworld of a group of witnesses to and participants in the Holocaust in Košice, a town ceded from dismembered Czechoslovakia to Hungary in November 1938. We argue that Košice represents a suitable case study for the examination of Aryanization of Jewish property on the municipality and individual levels in the Slovak-Hungarian border region (Southern Slovakia), which is a hitherto understudied field in Holocaust studies. Our analysis is centred around 253 petitions submitted by local residents to obtain rental rights to apartments previously occupied by Jews and supporting documentation preserved in the Košice City Archives. Our primary research question is who these petitioners for Jewish apartments actually were and how and why they became involved in the process. We explore the petitioners’ social stratification, occupational structure, gender, ethnic origin and other social indicators. Furthermore, we present and interpret their arguments, excuses and motivations. This issue also involves the striking question of how much these ordinary men and women understood they benefited from mass murder.
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I. Introduction

“Then all of a sudden we stood in front of our own door, with our rucksacks. The police cadet sealed the door behind us. It was hard to believe we could have not stepped back to our apartment even if we had wanted. He escorted us towards the Jewish temple, as if we were prisoners. The three of us walked slowly and portly. Daddy greeted all his acquaintances, raising his hat, and they greeted us as if the policeman would have not been there. We would not cry, shout or try to escape. We went on, as if we would walk on the promenade on a Sunday morning. The difference was the weird rucksack on us. Mummy had a pair of worn-out summer shoes on. She wanted to put on her boots, but the officer’s wife, who had been moved to the section of our apartment which had a separate entry, took them off of her feet. She told the officers wearing gloomy, black uniforms that those were her boots, although even the blind could see they would have been too small for her feet. The men in the black uniforms did not argue, because they were also afraid of the officer’s wife. The officer and his wife stayed in the apartment. The rooms facing the staircase and the street with the separate entry were left to them. That part of the apartment was not sealed.”

---

* László Csősz’s contribution to this article is an outcome of a project at the Institute of Contemporary History, Czech Academy of Sciences, funded by the Grant Agency of the Czech Republic: EXPRO 19-26638X, “Genocide, Postwar Migration and Social Mobility: Entangled Experiences of Roma and Jews”.
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1 KÁLMÁN, Örökség, 243–244.
This study focuses on the residents of the city of Košice/Kassa (henceforth we will use the Slovak version) who petitioned for the apartments and other property of their Jewish neighbours, and thus became beneficiaries of the genocidal campaign, just like the Hungarian military officer and his wife appearing in the autobiographical novel quoted above. The author, Márta Kálmán, the youngest member of the Kannengiesser family in Košice, managed to escape from the Košice ghetto and ultimately survived World War II in Budapest.

The main purpose of this study is to look into who these petitioners for Jewish apartments were and how and why they became involved, as well as to provide an analysis on the petitioners' social stratification, occupational structure, gender, ethnic origin and other social indicators. Furthermore, we are interested in gaining a better understanding of the extent to which these ordinary men and women were aware of the final outcome. In other words, did they fully understand they benefited from mass murder? How much was the available information internalized and rationalized? Were questions of legitimacy and morality raised? We intend to shed light on the motivations, besides sheer greed, which fuelled the broad interest in the expropriation of Jewish wealth, as well as to investigate the expectations, social realities and ideological incentives behind the petitions.

We argue that the story of Košice, a city ceded to Hungary by the First Vienna Arbitration in November 1938, represents a suitable case study for the examination of Aryanization of Jewish property on the municipality and individual levels in the Slovak-Hungarian border region. Besides the specificities of the Holocaust in Košice, we also investigate the problem in the broader context of nationwide anti-Jewish policies, concepts and practices from 1938 onwards, focusing on the Hungarian state's policy to improve social conditions – and the housing situation in particular – that was inseparably linked to racist proposals and policies. Furthermore, we examine the way the state policies and communication influenced local decision-making and individual responses and vice versa: what was the impact of grassroots initiatives and reactions on the top levels of the power structure?

The cohort of archival records we explore covers the fateful months between the German occupation of Hungary on 19 March 1944 and the end of Hungarian administration in Košice on 19 January 1945. Our analysis is mostly based on petitions and supporting documentation preserved in the Košice City Archives. In these files we identified 253 petitions submitted by local residents to obtain rental rights to apartments occupied by Jews, and these materials are the primary focus of this study. However, it should be added that we explored an additional 222 archival documents concerning Jewish property, which we partly used in our analysis, but should be subject to further research. According to the data provided by the city administration, a total of 2,100 Jewish apartments were emptied before the end of April 1944. The petitions quite often mention more than one apartment (in some cases apartments that had been taken over by the military); as well as this, the same Jewish apartment could be mentioned in multiple petitions. That is, the 253 documents investigated represent an estimated 12% of all Jewish apartments that were transferred to non-Jews in Košice.

---

2 We identified 27 petitions submitted by organizations or political parties to gain Jewish apartments for their purposes, 81 documents on the appointment of guardians (zárgondnokok) to "vacant" Jewish apartments, as well as 110 cases of Jewish apartments allocated to German or Hungarian armed forces and officers. Furthermore, we identified 4 separate files in which Jewish apartments were requested by the German or the Hungarian army.
between May 1944 and January 1945. Besides the petitions, we examined a wide variety of other primary sources, including municipal, ministerial and post-war trial records and press reports, as well as memoirs and post-war testimonies.

II. Historiographical and theoretical remarks

“What happened during World War II in the Southern part of Slovakia, I call the forgotten Holocaust. In Slovakia, we pretend that it does not concern us, because the territory was ruled by Hungarians, while the Hungarians say: it’s the territory of present-day Slovakia” – Peter Salner, ethnologist and former head of the Jewish religious community in Bratislava argued. In fact, the social history of the territory of Southern Slovakia, including Košice after the Vienna Arbitration, is still an overlooked aspect of Slovak historiography. The main reason for this is that monographs or textbooks on the history of Slovakia are based on the national-territorial principle, so they focus only on the history of the Slovak nation and after 1918 on the history of the Slovak state or territory. However, in Hungarian historiography, this border region has been considered as part of the wartime Hungarian state and therefore it has been discussed in the framework of studies on the Holocaust in Hungary. Recently the American historian Leslie Waters contributed to the discussion on the Holocaust in this specific borderland by arguing that the territory re-annexed to Hungary in 1938 played a particular role in Hungary’s Holocaust and Košice became a key strategic point, being the final stop for trains headed to Auschwitz. Besides, the proximity and historical connections to the wartime Slovak territory provided both the perpetrators and the victims with extra information that influenced the local patterns of genocide.

In Hungary, very few scholars scrutinized the primary sources kept in the Slovak state and municipal archives, mostly due to the language barrier posed by the overwhelmingly Slovak research infrastructure (finding aids and working language). One notable exception was Ádám Gellért’s investigation of the case of a war criminal, police commissioner László Csatáry. The Holocaust history of Košice was represented for a long time by the propaganda publications from the period of World War II and the memoir literature. The Slovak Marxist historiography made contributions to the subject, mainly on the Košice Arrow Cross Party; however, they paid primary attention to the “crimes of Hungarian fascism” without addressing the complex problem of collaboration and the Holocaust at a local level. Then, Michal Potemra investigated the history of Košice between 1939 and 1945 in his bibliographies and in his works examining the everyday life of Slovaks. In the last three decades, few publications drew on local archival material, for example the papers of a commemoration conference.

4 VERES, Košice v období rokov, 148–152. See also in detail: SZEGHY-GAYER, Personálna kontinuita, 129–140. The work of Tomáš Lang and Sándor Strba is focused mainly on the Jewish community of Nové Zámky. See LANG – STRBA, Holokaust na južnom Slovensku.
5 BRAHAM, The Politics of Genocide.
6 WATERS, Borders on the Move, 146–147.
7 GELLÉRT, Csatári László.
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on the 40th anniversary of deportations.\textsuperscript{10} As for the case of Aryanization in Southern Slovakia, the most remarkable contribution is the study of Katarína Repásová, who dealt with the issue of Jewish property after the deportation of the Jews in her case study of Komárno.\textsuperscript{11}

In brief, neither the Holocaust nor the history of the local Jewish community – which was the second-largest Jewish community in the territory of Slovakia – has been sufficiently explored so far.\textsuperscript{12}

Table 1: Jewish population numbers by religion in Košice between 1910–1950\textsuperscript{13}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Jewish Population</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>6723 (15.2%)</td>
<td>44 211 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>7 797 (16.6%)</td>
<td>46 826 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>8 792 (16.6%)</td>
<td>52 898 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>11 195 (15.9%)</td>
<td>70 117 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>11 420 (19.6%)</td>
<td>58 090 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>10 079 (15%)</td>
<td>66 981 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>1 500 (2.4%)</td>
<td>62 465 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hungarian participation in World War II and the Holocaust are still among the topics that lack a social consensus and have provoked bitter public and professional disputes. Recent historical research on Hungarian collaboration has focused largely on the perpetrators, including the decision-making process and the activities of political movements and various state agencies. Significant efforts have been made, especially in the fields of sociology and social psychology, to give voice to the victims. However, the responses of the majority society have remained an understudied aspect and have not been the subject of a comprehensive study. Holocaust scholarship has widely used the ambiguous term “bystander” to describe the non-Jewish population of a “perpetrator country”. Some scholars, however, preferred a broader definition of “bystanders” that included the neutral and allied countries and even the Jewish world outside Hitler’s Europe.\textsuperscript{14}

As the quotation marks suggest, we propose abandoning the monolithic category of “bystanders”, and even the more specific subcategories of the general term introduced by Raoul Hilberg.\textsuperscript{15} In any case, in any micro-history even these categories would blur as one observes the kaleidoscope of individual experiences, behavioural patterns and responsibilities. Being a “bystander”, in fact, is an active choice: many chose to remain ignorant, passive or become participatory agents of the genocide. In fact, all terms describing the part of society involved in the economic annihilation of Jews (beneficiary, facilitator, profiteer, etc.) prove to be too static to describe complex social

\textsuperscript{10} ŠALAMON – JUROVÁ, Košice a deportácie.
\textsuperscript{11} RÉPÁSOVÁ, Arizácia židovského majetku.
\textsuperscript{12} One remarkable contribution to the topic is KOVÁCS, Felemás asszimiláció. For recent work, see: SZEGHY-GAYER, Jewish representatives.
\textsuperscript{14} See, for example: CESARANI – LEVINE, “Bystanders” to the Holocaust; BARNETT, Bystanders. Conscience and Complicity.
\textsuperscript{15} In the last edition of his ground-breaking monograph, Hilberg abandoned even the general term, replacing it with the much more neutral term “neighbours”. See: HILBERG, The Destruction.
dynamics and human behaviour, sometimes even on the individual level. Moreover, one can even argue that participants of the “gold rush” of 1944 took their share in the dispossession of their neighbours, hence became accomplices of mass murder and therefore could be termed Holocaust perpetrators. Hence, we chose the neutral and general term “petitioner” to describe those who were competing for “Jewish” apartments, irrespective of how much they acted under compulsion or were motivated purely by material interests.

III. Housing Question, Racist Solutions

Housing shortage was one of the most severe social problems in Hungary in the interwar years and during World War II. Closely intertwined with other pressing social issues, such as intellectual unemployment and the land problem, the “housing question” was a central element of social and political discourses, which had been almost exclusively monopolized by race protectionists by the end of the 1930s. Far-right spokesmen and publicists blamed the Jews for the housing shortage, high rents and all social problems connected to it, such as lower fertility rates, health and moral issues, and criminality. They offered increasingly radical solutions, including the registry of Jewish apartments, special taxes, confiscation of Jewish apartments larger than two rooms, and even ghettoization. The popular far-right Arrow Cross Party prepared a program for the segregation of Hungary’s Jews: they suggested re-settling all Jews in Budapest and the ten cities with more than 50,000 inhabitants, including Košice, and establishing ghettos in the neighbourhoods most densely populated by Jews. In the ghettos, Jewish families were to occupy a living space not exceeding one room.

The system of Hungarian public administration, inherited from the liberal Austro-Hungarian era, afforded a rather broad sphere of authority to local governments, which were significant political factors. Municipalities dominated by the extreme nationalist and racist “new generation” regularly submitted initiatives to the legislators and the central administration through which they wanted to influence anti-Jewish policies. Right-wing radicalism was also prevailing in the newly re-annexed territories, mostly due to the influx of politicians and civil servants arriving from Hungary proper (known as the “anyások”: “those from the motherland”), who were typically more radical than their local counterparts, and spearheaded those grassroots initiatives to “solve” the housing problem and other social issues. For example, in 1942, the municipal authorities in Užhorod urged the government to impose radical discriminatory

17 Memorandum of Count Miklós Serényi on the possibilities of the forced resettlement of the Jews from Hungary, July–August 1941. Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár (hereinafter MNL) Baranyai Megyei Levéltár X. 2. Records of the Youth Organization of the Arrow Cross Party in Baranya County and Péc, monthly reports.
18 It was due also to the fact that after the second anti-Jewish law in 1939, with the exception of few major cities, most Jewish representatives – who had provided a balance up until then – lost their membership, and 90% of Jewish citizens lost their right to vote.
19 Sándor Márai, the Hungarian writer who returned to his hometown Košice after the Vienna arbitration in 1938, has devoted an entire book to presenting the ideological and social differences that developed during the interwar period between the society in Hungary and the Hungarian community of Czechoslovakia. However, his book was only published in 2013. See: MÁRAI, Hallgatni akartam, 92.
20 However, one can cite examples of the radicalism of local agents as well. Andor Jaross, one of the political leaders of the Hungarian minority in Czechoslovakia, joined the Hungarian parliament and was appointed the Minister responsible for the re-annexed Czechoslovak lands in 1939. He was the co-founder of the Party of
measures, including a decree “to null the rental contracts of Jews, if these violate Christian national interests, and relocate them to a place segregated from the Christian society.”

Košice was no exception in this trend. In June 1939, the staunch antisemite Sándor Pohl was appointed the mayor of Košice. Since the 1920s, Pohl had served in the municipal administration of Pest county and became as one of the right-hand men of Chief Constable László Endre, the forerunner of bureaucratic antisemitism, who initiated implicitly discriminatory measures and practices in Hungarian administration long before the formal anti-Jewish legislation. Pohl’s administration in Košice also went beyond the framework of discriminatory state legislation out of antisemitic zeal. Jews were deprived of trade licenses and dismissed from state employment en masse. The Municipal Assembly in Košice also supported the abovementioned antisemitic legislative proposals. However, the conservative government firmly rejected such radical propositions. The traditional ruling class were motivated by their private networks and interests, economic and foreign policy considerations, and calculations about the outcome of the war, as well as a political culture which was averse to any Bolshevik-style solution.

In the housing system of cities in interwar and wartime Hungary, private rented accommodation was the dominant form of tenure. In Budapest, in 1941, only 7% of the apartments were owner-occupied. Antisemitic publications presented the problem of urban housing as the conflict of the non-Jewish tenant and the “exploiting” Jewish owner. They cited statistics on heavy Jewish “overrepresentation” in the real estate sector. Of course, racist narratives failed to present the other side of the coin. According to state statistics, around 1930, less than 10% of Hungarian Jews owned any real estate. Jews owned only 3.3% of all houses in the country. The overwhelming majority of Jews lived in a rental apartment or house.

The government issued several war decrees regulating housing issues between 1938 and 1944, which imposed increasing state control and surreptitious forms of anti-Jewish discrimination, including non-termination and fixed rent clauses and state appointment of tenants. In September 1941, even requisitioning became legalized. With the pretext of solving the housing problems of state employees, the government allowed the requisition of the vacated apartments, summer houses and apartments of those renting more than one house in the same city, as well as the parts of larger apartments suitable

Hungarian Renewal, a pro-Nazi splinter group of the government party. In 1944, he was appointed Minister of the Interior and became one of the main architects of the Holocaust.

21 Proposal by the Municipal Committee of the City of Užhorod, 30 April 1942. MNL OL, K 150 I-31/h-1942.

22 See also the personal file of Sándor Pohl in Állambiztonsági Szolgálatok Történeti Levéltára (hereinafter ÁBTL), Pohl Sándor – 3.1.9. V.13523.

23 László Endre (1895–1946) was a civil servant, administrative expert, and one of the most influential extreme right-wing public figures in Hungary. Between 1938 and 1944, he served as subprefect of Pest-Pilis-Solt-Kiskun county. After the Nazi invasion in 1944, he was appointed state secretary of the Ministry of the Interior. In close cooperation with Adolf Eichmann, Endre orchestrated the mass deportation of Hungarian Jews. After the war, he was convicted of war crimes, sentenced to death and executed. On the practice of bureaucratic antisemitism, see VÁGI – CSŐSZ – KÁDÁR, The Holocaust in Hungary, 24–32.
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for creating a private dwelling. In Košice, for example, Mrs. Áronné Glück, a 73-year-old widow, lost her rented apartment, because she got gravely ill and temporarily moved to her son’s apartment. The Kannengiesser family were forced to offer a part of their home to a military officer, as recalled by Márta Kálmán’s autobiography quoted in the introduction above, in line with the rules indicated in this decree, while none of the decrees mentioned Jews or referred to existing anti-Jewish laws or decrees. However, administrative records concerning the implementation demonstrate that local officials interpreted and enforced the decrees in a vigorously antisemitic context. Besides the strive for solving local problems exclusively at the expense of Jews, they proposed more radical and openly antisemitic proposals.

Many individuals, of course, followed this line and started “private investigations” to determine whether an apartment met the criteria, reported their Jewish neighbours to the authorities and filed petitions to obtain their homes. Reacting to the increasingly deteriorating public mood, the Pest Israelite Community started negotiations with the government at the end of 1942. In the framework of the so-called “public interest housing action”, the members of the community “voluntarily” offered 500 apartments within four months for “social purposes”. In practice, the rental apartments were occupied by ministerial employees and other civil servants. The programme apparently served as a mitigating gesture to prevent further state discrimination or antisemitic violence.

As a result of this political climate, many Hungarians interpreted the anti-Jewish persecution in 1944 as the continuation of previous policies, only with different means. “Aryanization” was often presented as a necessity, something serving social justice and even the rightful reclamation of jobs, positions and property that had been “taken”, as argued by several wartime articles and petitions. “I one hundred percent believe in the sanctity of private property and consider its violation a mortal sin. However, as my well-thought-out and well-reasoned conviction dictates that the Jewry in Hungary obtained its wealth from usury, fraud, and the exploitation of Christian society, which can be considered robbery, there is therefore a legal basis for legally taking it from them.” Petitioning the authorities to achieve these goals, including the revocation of trade licences and the rental rights of shops, taverns, pharmacies and landholdings, had become common social practice years before the German occupation.

IV. The Housing Question in Košice between 1918 and 1944

From 1918, Košice, as part of the first Czechoslovak Republic, experienced rapid economic and demographic growth during the interwar period. It became an important strategic centre connecting the Czech Lands and the territory of Subcarpathia. Between
1918 and 1938 its population roughly doubled, which was in great part due to the mass migration of civil servants within the new republic. In the interwar years about 12,000 Czechs and 7,000 Slovaks from the Western part of Slovakia moved to Košice. They were mostly employees of the newly formed Czechoslovak law enforcement agencies, the state railway, the post and the radio, and financial officials and teachers, but also included a significant number of soldiers. The arrival of newcomers caused a serious housing shortage in the 1920s. At the beginning, the city was forced to take measures to be able to control even the allocation of hotel rooms.

However, the lack of apartments and houses for the purpose of accommodating the new civil servants and their families boosted the building industry to a great extent. By 1927, about 150 million Czechoslovak crowns had been spent on the construction of such new apartment blocks, most of which was public investment. For the location of the new buildings the city leaders generally selected a state- or city-owned property. As a result, between the two world wars, approximately 1,500 new apartments were built for the Czechoslovak civil servants, some of them on a cooperative basis, such as the complex of two building blocks called “Little Prague” for the accommodation of the Czechoslovak railway officers in the northern part of the city centre. Among others, barracks were also built to accommodate Czechoslovak soldiers and their families. As a result, according to Hungarian official data, in December 1937 the percentage of vacant apartments in the city was only 0.3%.

Following the border changes caused by the first Vienna Arbitration, the Hungarian military administration, based on the directives of the KEOKH (National Central Authority Controlling Aliens), implemented a full-scale registration of foreigners (including those who moved in after 1918), “non-resident aliens”, and all Jews. By the end of 1938, approximately 16,000 Jews were listed in the reannexed territory on these grounds, and some 5,000 of them were expelled. Some of them had lived in the city of Košice since the early 1930s. Roma were not collectively discriminated against, and they did not comprise a category in the statistics; however, some administrative reports suggest that dozens of Roma families were also expelled from the region.

According to Hungarian data, a total of approximately 25,000 Czech and Slovak inhabitants fled Košice in this period. As a result, the total population of the city that exceeded 70,000 in 1930 and, according to some assumptions, reached 80,000 by 1937–1938, had shrunk to 58,000 by December 1938. Expulsion and forced migration
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resulted in a huge abundance of housing in the town. In January 1939, more than 5,000 apartments were vacant \(^{46}\) and a few months later in June 1939 their number was still 2,100. \(^{47}\) Later, at the end of 1940, Mayor Sándor Pohl reported that there were still 1,700 apartments without a new tenant. \(^{48}\)

Between 1939 and 1944, there were only few construction investments in the city. \(^{49}\) Initially, from a countrywide perspective, in Košice it was easy to get a modern apartment with central heating at a low price, \(^{50}\) which in that time was in line with the prices of the economically more backward Užhorod. \(^{51}\) In 1940, rental prices were 30–40% lower than before the reannexation. \(^{52}\) As a possible solution, the idea of Košice as the “Hungarian Graz” was raised: it was a programme that aimed to develop tourism in the city and take advantage of the empty apartments to accommodate Hungarian pensioners from all over the country. \(^{53}\)

However, with the flow of civil servants and military officers of the Hungarian administration from the heartland, the population had increased to 67,000 by 1941. By the summer of 1942, the housing of state employees in Košice once again became a pressing issue. Therefore, the Mayor’s Office asked for the requisition of Jewish apartments that had been vacated “without due reason” or were “unnecessarily large” for non-Jewish civil servants. They argued that Jewish owners who moved abroad (after the reannexation of Košice) would have rather left their apartments vacant than rent them to “Christian, Hungarian officials”. \(^{54}\) With the frontline approaching the Hungarian borders, the further increasing inflow of military personnel and refugees caused another housing crisis in 1944.

V. Besieging the Housing Bureau

The predominant reaction of Hungarian society to the anti-Jewish campaign unfolding after the Nazi invasion on 19 March 1944 was indifference and political passivity, as was the case in many occupied European countries. \(^{55}\) According to an SD (Kommandeur der Sicherheitspolizei und des SD) report from Hungary in May 1944, only the “simple folk” and some military officers supported the campaign wholeheartedly. Middle-class people, however, generally considered the anti-Jewish action too strict. They refused to cooperate unless direct material benefit was concerned. \(^{56}\) Indeed, opportunism was a mass phenomenon, even though it had various forms and could often
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be mixed with other motivations. At first, several non-Jews volunteered to “safeguard” the assets of their Jewish neighbours, who were frantically trying to hide or save their property from the plundering “hate state”. It is probable that only a few neighbours helped out of purely altruistic considerations. Then, having realized the unexpected opportunity for making a fortune, many others chose the “legal” ways of obtaining the apartments, businesses, furniture and other goods of the persecuted. Occasionally, these petitions were connected to transactions and agreements with the former owner. In any case, few of those assets were returned to the original owner after the war.

The German invasion came as a godsend for many who aspired to the positions and assets of their Jewish neighbours. It seemed as if the collaborationist government fulfilled all the wishes of antisemites at once through the full-scale nationalization of Jewish property, including apartments and shops. Government propaganda characterized ghettoization as being fundamentally about a fairer distribution of apartments, serving the double purpose of veiling the scale and brutality of expulsion and ensuring the mass support of the population. The Subprefect of Pest County, László Endre, acted immediately in the wake of the German invasion, and issued the decree (which apparently had already existed long before as a draft) on the confiscation of Jewish apartments, on 21 March, even before the formation of the new, pro-Nazi government. When the first major Allied air raids reached Hungary at the beginning of April 1944, it was “natural” that bombed-out families were offered new homes at the expense of Jews. However, this time there was no room for compromises, as was the case in 1942 with the “housing action” of the Jewish community discussed above. In April 1944, the Ministry of the Interior explicitly ordered the Jewish community to hand over 1,500 apartments.

By the end of May, some 100,000 apartments throughout Hungary became “vacant”, causing an unmanageable logistical problem for the authorities and inciting a huge wave of petitions requesting Jewish real estate. The greatest push was launched in Budapest where the “prey” included 28,000 apartments, and where tens of thousands had lost their homes due to the air raids. Despite calls by the press and authorities to wait, many petitions came in even before the process of setting up the yellow star houses began. City leaders in Budapest approached the cabinet, as the unfolding situation had become unsustainable: “under the double pressure of connections being deployed at higher levels and impatient petitioners, they could not provide a moral guarantee that matters would be resolved in a reassuring way.”

In order to avoid total chaos, a special commissioner’s office was created to take charge of apartment affairs in Budapest and its vicinity. This office received 5,000–
6,000 petitions daily. Even in smaller municipalities the number of petitions exceeded twice or three times the available apartments. In the county town of Szolnok, where allied bomb attacks destroyed or damaged more than 500 houses, this ratio was probably much higher. According to a financial directorate report in Szolnok, “every able person requested a Jewish apartment, if possible, a furnished one” and “of course, the claimants were all requesting that the inventoring take place as a matter of urgency. Lock-breaking has already been on the agenda for some time now.” The allocation and management of the apartments was the task of the municipal housing bureaus, and it far exceeded their capacities. Local residents exerted enormous pressure on town and county halls. The Subprefect of Komárom County, for example, urged the Ministry of the Interior to lift the ban on apartment allocation, saying that people are “besieging my office as well as the chief constable’s office on a daily basis”.

According to the deportation “master plan”, the Košice military district (no. VIII, including northeastern Hungary and Subcarpathia) was the first zone to make “Judenrein”. In the early morning hours on 16 April, gendarme and police detachments brutally woke up thousands of Jewish families. Forced relocation started in the villages, and was soon continued in the cities. In Košice, at first about 4,000 Jews from the vicinity (Abaúj-Torna County) were crammed into Jewish homes and the buildings of the synagogues. Then, all but a few of the Košice Jews were evacuated from their own or rented apartments, starting on 20 April. They were only allowed to take a package of 50 kilograms and a supply for 15 days with them. By 3 May a total of 10,601 Jews were forcibly moved to two collection camps set up in the territory of a brickyard in the outskirts of the city. Another 972 Jews were sent to a designated urban ghetto a few streets southwest from the old town. However, the ghetto was soon liquidated, and its inmates were also taken to the collection camps, apart from a few craftsmen toiling for the Germans. On 16 May, the mass deportations began. By 3 June, some 12,000 people were deported from Košice, in four trains, to Auschwitz.

Due to the deportations, about 2,100 Jewish apartments were vacated and 609 Jewish trade licenses (iparjogosítvány) were nulled in Košice. A few days before
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the German occupation, the Housing Bureau of the Department of the Administrative Affairs (közigazgatási ügyosztály lakáshivatala) of the city officially registered 130 petitions for apartments.\textsuperscript{73} By May, around 5,000 Košice residents applied for the former Jewish apartments,\textsuperscript{74} and in a month their number increased to 8,000.\textsuperscript{75} György Ruttkay, one of the main officials of the Housing Bureau, reported on 9 May 1944 that crowds of people were storming the office every day,\textsuperscript{76} so they decided to cancel the consultation hours and people could not apply for an apartment personally any more.\textsuperscript{77} Meanwhile, the non-Jewish owners of the houses from which Jewish tenants had been taken away contacted the Housing Bureau on the matter of the rent payments. These owners were told to wait about 1.5 months before the office would process all the applications. However, until then, homeowners could not demand rent from anyone for the apartments.\textsuperscript{78}

The inventory of the sealed Jewish homes was carried out by a four-member committee that included officials from the Housing Bureau and the Financial Directorate (Pénzügyigazgatóság), but usually one or two police officers too.\textsuperscript{79} Entering the apartment, the committee first looked for the keys to the locked cupboards, then took an inventory of the clothes and small utensils (porcelain, tableware, etc.). This was followed by the appreciation of high-value items (pictures, Persian rugs, furniture, etc.), among which the luxury items were delivered directly to the City Hall.\textsuperscript{80} Then, from June 1944, the Financial Directorate was entrusted with the inventory of Jewish property, from which they hoped to accelerate the processing of applications.\textsuperscript{81}

During the summer, however, there were personnel changes in the staff of the Housing Bureau. The Ministry of Interior received a complaint, based on which a proceeding was initiated against three members of the committee responsible for the Jewish apartments in Košice, with charges of misconduct.\textsuperscript{82} One of the accused officials was György Ruttkay, a city councillor, who moved to Košice in 1939 and was the key figure in judging the petitions in May and June 1944. At the end of June, he was replaced by László Váczy.\textsuperscript{83}

After World War II, Ruttkay fled to Hungary and became a renowned law expert, professor and avant-garde painter. Several books and articles
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\textsuperscript{77} Fölöslegesen senki se igényeljen zsidó lakást! In: Felvidéki Újság, 1944 (10. V.), no. 106, p. 4.
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were published on him, but none of them mentioned his controversial role in Košice.\textsuperscript{84} Similarly, another city official accused of corruption, István Gazsi (1910–1969) got away with his wartime activity. In November 1944 he was arrested by the Arrow Cross authorities,\textsuperscript{85} but later released. He survived the war, served in the new Czechoslovak city administration and lived in Košice until his death.\textsuperscript{86}

From August 1944 on, the city administration appointed guardians (\textit{zárgondnokok}) to the “abandoned” Jewish apartments and businesses. It incited a second wave of petitions: guardianship offered another route to benefit from the process. Following the Arrow Cross takeover in October 1944 there were still plenty of empty Jewish apartments without a permanent tenant. Several apartments were allocated to Arrow Cross party organizations and militias.\textsuperscript{87} The last petition preserved in the Košice City Archives was filed on 9 January 1945, ten days before the Red Army captured Košice.\textsuperscript{88}

\textbf{VI. Petitioners in Košice}

Hundreds of files have been preserved in the wartime records of the City of Košice pertaining to Jewish property. In this study, we turned our lenses to the applications of individuals specifically for the rental right of nationalized Jewish apartments. It was the largest cohort of petitions, due to the structure of tenures explained above, and also the category in which the local authorities could make substantive decisions. Public administration did not have the competence to hand over Aryanized private property to individuals. The same applied to Jewish shops and other enterprises. The authorities received quite a few petitions for these businesses as well, but they had to turn these applicants down, with specific exceptions. As stipulated by the decree of the Ministry of Commerce and Transport on the closure of all Jewish businesses, only the shops and other enterprises essential for “national defence or public supply” were allowed to operate under state-appointed company managers.\textsuperscript{89} Despite this, these kinds of petitions also reflect the attitudes and approaches of local citizens involved in the process.

We could identify 253 petitions and supporting documentation for apartments formerly rented by Jews (including those which were owned by Jews or non-Jews), which belong to 250 petitioners, as three petitions were actually the second attempts of the same individuals. That is, we could analyse a sample representing about 3\% of all supposed petitioners, since the number of petitions for Jewish apartments reached 8,000 by June 1944.

Some applicants simply filled out the request forms prepared by the authorities, which contained the following entries: name, occupation, number of dependent family members, reference to military care and/or military service, present address and number of rooms, date of moving to Košice, reasons for moving, the size of the

\textsuperscript{84} See, for example: TAKÁCS, \textit{Egy jogász-festőművész}.
\textsuperscript{85} See also: AMK, KE MMZ, box 189, file 30020/944.
\textsuperscript{87} AMK, KE MMZ, box 210, file 48921/944. Before the Arrow Cross era, these petitions were mostly rejected by the Housing Bureau of Košice, which typically argued that there was no decree regulating the requests of political organizations.
\textsuperscript{88} AMK, KE MMZ, box 210, file 47771/944.
\textsuperscript{89} Decree No. 50.500/1944 K.K.M. on the sealing of stocks and business equipment belonging to Jewish traders’ shops, 21 April 1944. ME Rendeletek Tára, 1944, Vol I., 603–604.
requested apartment, and the address of the actual apartment they applied for. Quite often the applicants also mentioned the name of the former resident (sometimes with an extension such as “the Jewish József S.”) and/or indicated more than one apartment. However, many people added a lengthy letter to support their case, handwritten or typed, which often reveals a lot about the social circumstances, living conditions and attitudes of the applicants, and sometimes even meticulous details about their everyday lives. After the Arrow Cross takeover on 15 October, petitions took a simple and concise form, which was probably due to the instructions of the authorities to formalize the process.

We could specify the occupation and/or social status of 240 applicants. The largest cohort of the petitioners belonged to the category of state-employed middle class, 59 applicants in total, which included active and retired civil servants (45) from all levels of the city and municipal administration as well as officers (military, police and gendarmerie, including one invalid, 14 in total). Another distinctive group is that of the self-employed middle class, ranging from top businessmen, manufacturers and well-off house owners to petty craftsmen and traders (44). They often also applied for the shops, workshops and offices as well as for the merchandise and equipment of their one-time Jewish competitors. A third branch of middle-class applicants constituted a similarly diverse group of intellectuals (24 petitioners), who belonged to liberal professions (medical doctors, pharmacists, lawyers, engineers), or to the state-employed educational and cultural elite (teachers, artists, a protestant pastor and the director of the Italian Cultural Institute). More than one fifth of the applicants were working class, including craftsmen’s and traders’ assistants, housemaids, day labourers, chauffeurs and other blue-collar employees (51 in total).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation/Social Status</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working class</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil servants, including the retired</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives (háztartásbeli)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisans and tradesmen, pub and restaurant owners</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectuals</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturer or house owner</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military officers, including invalids</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement officers</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled, sick, homeless</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No data available</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Occupation/social status of the petitioners of Jewish apartments in Košice

© L. Csősőz - V. Szeghy-Gayer
There are two specific “status groups” within the petitioners, in the case of which categorization by occupation or social stratification is problematic. One of them is the group of those who requested an apartment based on social grounds (refugees, disabled, sick, homeless, 21 petitioners in total). Quite a few petitioners were “housewives” (41). These women petitioned on behalf of their husbands or families, or they were widows, including war widows. The total proportion of female applicants was actually higher (78 persons, that is, 31% of all petitions). What is more, about 40% of these female applicants acted in their own capacity. This, aside from practical explanations (husbands and fathers serving in the army), is perhaps also an indicator of changing gender roles and relations in wartime.

In the case of the last three categories, most of the petitioners referred to (seemingly) well-grounded social needs, such as large families, severe health conditions, military service of breadwinners or unbearable living conditions such as overcrowded and unhealthy (dark, mouldy, humid) apartments. According to a public health officer’s report attached to a petition, the one-room apartment of the applicant was “damp, with bulging walls, the rain is constantly dripping in, the wall is completely mouldy, the floor is shabby and rotten, never exposed to the sun through its small windows, dark, musty air, and he is subsisting with two children and a sick wife who is becoming blind”.90

These “beneficiaries” of the process obviously had little room to manoeuvre. Neither did the refugees, who arrived in Košice in increasing numbers from late summer from other parts of Hungary threatened by the front, or those who lost their homes in air raids.91 They apparently applied for Jewish apartments because that seemed the only solution available. Those forced to move from the territory of the Košice downtown

90 AMK, KE MMZ, box 187. file 28808/944.
91 See, for example the cases of a group of refugees from Southern Transylvania (Romania) and the cases of air raid victims: AMK, KE MMZ, box 189, file 30694/1944. AMK, KE MMZ, box 201, file 41052/1944. AMK, KE MMZ, box 202, file 41805/1944.
ghetto joined the ranks of "non-voluntary" petitioners. As soon as the ghetto area was designated, authorities called upon the non-Jews living in the territory of the ghetto to show up at the city hall and pick up an apartment request form. Residents were urged to move, or otherwise "they would share the same treatment as the Jews". Later on, state authorities generally avoided such grave warnings. Instead, the government preferred to win over the locals for the campaign.

However, it is impossible to quantify the proportion of substandard apartments and the applicants in "real need", as certain petitioners supposedly exaggerated and dramatized the seriousness of their housing circumstances. In any case, a total of 54 petitioners mentioned substandard circumstances. Furthermore, there was a sizable group of applicants who clearly intended to improve their already favourable living conditions, and wanted to change apartments merely "out of passion", as a letter addressed to the mayor’s office put it. They used a variety of arguments, from more grounded ones to the nearly ridiculous. These included major life events such as a proposed marriage, pregnancy, sickness or changing jobs, but also such nuances as the tenant wishing to move to ground floor to avoid the steps, their apartment being "too far from the tram stop", having an unfavourable distribution of rooms, or the tenant badly needing a garden "to calm his nerves" and for his children "to move freely."

Members of the local intellectual elite took the lead in this way, trying to use their private connections and reputation. Adjunct Professor Béla Gy. was trying to make use of nepotism while condemning it at the same time. He stated that his wife had been "besieging the housing bureau" for more than a year, with no success, whereas recently 300 new applicants had received an apartment. "I can’t and I don’t want to believe that it is only connection that matters again, and there is no protector for those who wait modestly and without proper connections for a housing assignment" – he wrote in a letter addressed directly to city councillor Ruttkay. He even added bitter criticism: if it is the only factor what matters, he argued, then "what is better in this world [regime] than in the old?" The violinist and music teacher József L. listed no less than ten "Jewish apartments" he would prefer to take over. He argued he needed an extra room to practice for his "artistic development", and also complained about the neighbours, "a very poor and unclean family with five children, whose unclean air flows out of my apartment and so it is almost impossible to ventilate my apartment in the summer." Mrs. Andorné M., a teacher, could not find a proper apartment in the city and therefore entrusted her parents to take care for her children outside Košice, who, for her, handled them "too gently". “These times require very serious sacrifices from all Hungarian women, but not as severe as from me if I would not receive the requested

---

93 13 petitioners were moving from the ghetto area, while in 17 cases the petitions were submitted by refugees. Besides, 15 petitioners had to move from the "city shacks", a social housing area.
94 Anonymous letter of support attached to the petition of Mrs. István K., see: AMK, KE MMZ, box 187, file 28808/944.
95 AMK, KE MMZ, box 179. file 22298/944.
96 AMK, KE MMZ, box 176, file 19518/944.
97 AMK, KE MMZ, box 185, file 25820/944.
apartment” – she added. The retired civil servant Károly F. simply felt “bored” in the vicinity of Košice, where “everyone speaks Slovak and we have nobody to talk to”.

Corruption and nepotism flourished. Several political and intellectual leaders penned letters to support the requests of their protégés or attempted to obtain Jewish apartments and businesses. Certain church leaders and congregations could not abandon the temptation, either. Even Mayor Sándor Pohl acquired a luxurious six-room house and garden for himself. The move caused an administrative paradox: he petitioned his subordinates to allocate the house for him. A supervisor delegated by the Ministry of Interior gave the mayor a warning for misconduct, and instructed him to ask the permission of his superior authority. He did so, but the Subprefect of Košice replied that the decision should have been made by the mayor of the city. Other city officials, including the chief archivist, Rudolf K., who moved to Košice from Miskolc after 1938, followed Pohl’s example. The commander of the gendarmerie unit responsible for the round-up and deportation of the Jews in Košice, Colonel Jenő Sárvári, was also allocated a spacious downtown apartment, with extras such as a piano.

Employees and business associates of the former tenants also joined the ranks of petitioners. For example, the long-time executive manager of Izsák Weil’s textile factory immediately took over the business and also requested the apartment attached to it, which “has been closed down due to his deportation”, because it was “urgently and absolutely necessary for the continuation of the business”, as she argued. The neutral and uncaring tone is striking, as well as the usage of the term “deportation”, which appears in only two other petitions: others preferred to use euphemisms. Mass murder was considered a legal and administrative fact: “a resident who has left Košice permanently shall be deemed to be a person who does not claim to rent an apartment, as a sign of which he or she does not pay the rent” argued the lawyer of a house owner.

Petitioners often had widespread and detailed, even intimate knowledge of the homes and other property of their fellow citizens. Some of them could easily produce a “wish list” of several apartments with addresses, numbers of rooms and other figures. Applicants included neighbours, acquaintances and even family members. For example, a separated wife of a deported Jewish house owner petitioned for her former family home: “Now that my husband (a Jewish individual!) has been taken to an unknown place, the opportunity has opened for me to return to my own home.” There was even a Jewish applicant, who “enjoyed” exempted status, at least for the time being. Mrs. Jakabné Stern, the widow of a decorated Jewish World War I hero, was spared from ghettoization in the first round, but evicted from her apartment at Luther Street 9 and was forced to live in the yard, where “I and my furniture and kitchen equipment were exposed to the open air”. In her petition penned on 26 April,
which was supported by the Jewish Council of Košice, she asked the Housing Office to reopen the apartment, where she had lived for 15 years. Soon after, the request was rejected, because Mrs. Jakabné Stern “was removed from the country in May”, as the mayor’s office’s investigative department reported.107

As for the residency of the petitioners, in only 146 (58%) cases could we identify whether they were “natives” of Košice (born there or moved in during the Czechoslovak era) or were newcomers from the motherland (“anyás”) arriving in the city after November 1938. 63 applicants were from the latter category, while 83 were local residents, which implies that these two groups were represented in roughly equal proportions among both the petitioners and the recipients. The participation of “anyás” civil servants in the administration and public life of the reannexed (ceded) territories is an area that requires further research. For example, in specific sectors like the state police or public education the “anyás” civil servants were in absolute majority, while at the post or railway offices their number was lower. Attila Simon pointed out that the majority of the personalities appointed into the key administrative positions (prefects, mayors and chief constables) were from the ceded territory. However, he also argued that from the summer of 1939, there was a turnaround in this policy. Budapest was no more interested in strengthening the positions of the former regional minority elite.108

Therefore, quite a few of the local administrative leaders were replaced by civil servants arriving from Hungary. This was also the case in Košice: the conservative Mayor and local politician, László Tost, was replaced by the radical antisemite Sándor Pohl. From the perspective of our case study on the housing question it is more important to point out that in the Housing Bureau of Košice (see the cases of György Ruttkay and István Gazsi above), and also among the petitioners, one can find both newcomers from Hungary (“anyások”) and locals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Petitioners for Jewish apartment in Košice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>© L. Csősz - V. Szeghy-Gayer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 3

107 AMK, KE MMZ, box 174, file 17052/944.
108 SIMON, Magyar idők a Felvidéken.
Members of ethnic minorities were not explicitly excluded from the distribution of Jewish apartments, unlike in the case of land policy, which was often intertwined with Magyarization, especially in regions dominated by minorities, such as Subcarpathia. Ethnic Hungarians generally enjoyed an advantage, but it is actually impossible to measure the ethnic composition of the applicants, as of course ethnic Germans and Slovaks could hold Hungarian names and vice versa. Mixed identities and families were also not a rarity. The fifth of the relevant minority groups forming the multi-ethnic fabric of Košice, the Roma, were not legally excluded from the process, either. However, in their marginal social position it was nearly impossible for them to benefit from the process in this “legalized” way. There is only one Roma person among the identified applicants: Lajos L., a fiddler and father of six, who lived in a one-room apartment and applied for a larger one, but his request was turned down. According to certain post-war explanations, it was mainly the Arrow Cross “riff-raff” and “irresponsible elements”, including the Roma, that had scrambled to seize Jewish assets. However, it was clearly not the case and these narratives apparently served to whitewash the complicity of large segments of society in the expropriation of Jewish property, and the Holocaust in general.

Most of the petitioners emphasized their housing problems and/or their social status. The number of those who intended to take advantage of their military merits, “patriotic” achievements and tribulations was significantly smaller. This group included refugees from Southern Transylvania or Slovakia and those who suffered (real or alleged) discrimination under the “Czech occupation”, as one of the petitioners put it. “I have claims towards my homeland”, stated a retired teacher, who was forced to leave Czechoslovakia due to his “fervent patriotism” and live on the Hungarian side of the border.

It is a striking conclusion that extreme nationalistic and antisemitic tirades and argumentation are less frequent in the Košice petitions, if compared to the same kind of documents submitted to ministries and municipalities in Hungary proper (post-Trianon territory). Extreme right-wing phraseology appears in less than 10 percent of texts. Only five petitions (2%) emphasized “ancient Christian” (“Aryan”) origin as a justification of the claim. Only very few petitions sported the phrase “with patriotic respect” (hazafias tisztelettel), the wartime nationalistic variant of the commonly used “with (full/deep/humble/excellent) respect” ([teljes/mély/alázatos/kiváló] tisztelettel), and only a single one used the Arrow Cross Party greeting “Kitartás” (“Perseverance”). However, it should be taken into account that after the Arrow Cross takeover, petitioners used simple request forms, which did not include space for such closing greetings. Petitioners largely refrained from any political statement, or mentioning any party or movement, with very few exceptions. It is also remarkable, however, that there were both “true-born” residents of Košice and newcomers from Hungary proper among those who did use extremist language.

A possible explanation for this “moderate” tone is a kind of opportunism and careful manoeuvring because of the uncertain (or rather, increasingly clear) projected outcome of the war. According to a confidential gendarme investigative report dating from late

109 AMK, KE MMZ, box 176, file 19141/944.
110 MNL JNSzML, IV. 407. 684/1945.
111 AMK, KE MMZ, box 183, file 24843/944
112 AMK, KE MMZ, box 208, file 46615/944.
summer in 1944, many residents of Košice, a city the frontline was quickly approaching, calculated the return of the region to Czechoslovak rule as a realistic scenario and acted accordingly. What is noticeable, however, is the cold pragmatism and indifference of the population who apparently considered the process as a natural and normal one. The word choice is telling: petitioners write about “vacant”, “vacated”, “abandoned” or “released” (Jewish) apartments. In fact, “Jewish” gradually had become a synonym of “vacant” or “public” property, as a clear indication of the routinization of the process. People filed petitions for “Jewish apartments”, just like they had petitioned for “Jewish lands” one or two years before, and soon after the end of the deportations (and the death of most of the owners) they continued to petition for “Jewish furniture”, “Jewish baby clothes” and other “Jewish stuff”. Non-Jewish citizens simply carried on, trying to adapt to the deteriorating war conditions and paying little attention to the private tragedy of their neighbours.

Those Košice residents who applied for Jewish shops, businesses and moveable property were actually more inclined to use nationalistic or antisemitic phraseology, but it was still not common, whether this choice reflected conviction or opportunism. Besides precise legal argumentation (which proves the participation of local administration or lawyers in penning the petitions), the petitions often used “moral” arguments, trying to prove the real estate or position they requested was something they could not achieve or had lost because of the unfair economic or legal activity of their Jewish (or “Czech”) rivals. A timber trader claimed that “previously, all the proper facilities had been taken by concurrent Jewish firms”. A carrier, who was a member of the Hungarian Parties “during the Czech occupation”, and was allegedly not even given enough work to make ends meet, praised the “long-awaited solution of the Jewish question” that would ensure that “hitherto begging poor Christians will also find work and bread”. Self-victimization gave the submissions a “moral” tone: petitioners purported only to be seeking “their due”.

More commonly, petitioners acted as if the fulfilment of their request was actually of common interest and economically rational. An “ancient Christian” hatmaker requested the apartment and shop of her rival: “it is the primary interest of the community to reopen this Christian (!) business producing and selling public goods as soon as possible.” A local farmer petitioned for a house with an orchard, arguing that “without proper handling the fruits would be lost”. A non-Jewish housewife was anxious about some 50 rabbits her former Jewish neighbours “left behind”. “As [they have a] national and economic value, I took care of the poor animals myself.” Perhaps the most astonishing example is a petition in which no real financial interest was involved. On 19 May, when three Košice transports had already reached Birkenau, and the rest of the victims were awaiting deportation in the transit camp among indescribable circumstances, a prominent local intellectual petitioned the Mayor’s Office. Participating in the inventory of a Jewish pharmacy, he found an aquarium in a box. He expressed his

113 MNL OL, K 149 1944-6-sz.n.
114 Remarkably, none of the petitions mentioned “Slovaks” in this context.
115 AMK, KE MMZ, box 177, file 19978/944.
116 AMK, KE MMZ, box 174, file 17070/944.
117 AMK, KE MMZ, box 177, file 20580/944.
118 AMK, KE MMZ, box 184, file 25388/944.
119 AMK, KE MMZ, box 174, file 17118/944.
concern for the “little animals who should be fed and taken care of” and requested that the aquarium should have been allocated to him, so as he could have saved them.  

VII. Conclusion

Petitioners came from all layers of society, but the middle classes were overrepresented among them. They had far better prospects in the competition, due to their connections, sources of information, education and capital. The economic hardships suffered by the population and the scarcity of apartments due to bombings offer only a partial explanation for the fervent chase after Jewish property. Many of the petitioners actually wanted to switch from a comparatively good housing situation to an even better one; they were submitting petitions without any legal ground whatsoever, in some cases probably by deceiving the housing authorities.  

Summing up, 71% of the investigated applicants were successful (180 petitions), while 31 applications were rejected, mostly because the desired apartment was occupied by the German or Hungarian military, or due to unfounded arguments. In 42 cases, the outcome is not clear or the petition was withdrawn (for example, in the case of people ultimately moving back to the territory of the downtown ghetto).  

In fact, the government attempted to integrate various societal aspects, but simply lacked the time and capacity to organize the redistribution and satisfy all demands. Allocation of apartments was to serve as a way of rewarding servicemen, politically loyal public servants and local intelligentsia, and at the same time, as a means of social policy. High-ranking officials of the Ministry of the Interior suggested “allocating the vacated Jewish apartments to workers and clerks whose hearts are in the right place [i.e., who are politically loyal] and who are presently living in poor-quality apartments, and to Hungarian families, in order of their merits.” Furthermore, it was a key issue to accommodate the demands of the frontline soldiers, who also fervently followed the news coming from home on the new “opportunities” and petitioned directly or through their families. Government spokesmen did emphasize that “Jewish houses and lands are to be primarily given to frontline soldiers.”  

However, there were many other priorities and factors, and the authorities soon dispelled the illusions of many citizens who saw the scheme as an opportunity for upward social mobility. The mayor’s offices made sure that everyone got an apartment suitable for his/her social status. By exercising the tenant designation right, municipalities assumed an obligation to the landlord if the new tenant failed to pay the rent, and therefore they had to consider the tenant’s financial capacity. Thus, the distribution of apartments mirrored the social hierarchy and advantaged the more well-off applicants.

120 The author was Dr. Dezső R. (1905–1984), lawyer, public prosecutor, pianist and the chorus-master of the Košice Philharmonic Orchestra. AMK, KKE MMZ, box 178, file 21752/1944. He arrived in Košice from Hungary proper and returned there after 1945.  
121 In Nagyvárad, proceedings were initiated against several local officials who submitted apartment petitions with false data. Nagyvárad, 1944 (June 15), p. 2.  
122 MNL OL, K 557 fascicle 16, file IV/19.  
123 In these cases we can often find a recommendation from an officer of their military unit attached to the petition, like in the case of László T., whose superior asked for a priority treatment in allocating the requested four-room apartment for him. AMK, KE MMZ, box 179, file 21825/944.  
124 Nagyszalontai Az Újság, 1944 (7 July), p. 1.
From the spring of 1944 onward, the fate of the “Jewish wealth” was a topic dominating the public discourse. Government spokesmen and the press would relentlessly stress that the confiscated assets belonged to the state, they were to be carefully inventoried, and their utilization would be decided upon later. Minister of the Interior Jaross stated: “I emphasize that the wealth that Jews, with all their greed, managed to collect in property, treasures, and valuables in the liberal [Austro-Hungarian] era has ceased to belong to the Jews and now belongs to the Hungarian nation. But this wealth cannot simply be presented as gifts – it cannot be used to honour certain national achievements. It must enrich the nation in its entirety, it must be built into the circulatory system of the national economy, so that all honest working Hungarians can have their share of it.”

Actually, only fragments of the confiscated Jewish assets were successfully redistributed and the Hungarian state could not even get hold of a large portion of it. German and Hungarian authorities smoothly cooperated in their “blitzkrieg” against the Jews. However, the distribution of the booty caused serious conflicts from the very beginning. Besides the “legal” quartering of German military personnel, the Wehrmacht and the police and security forces (SS, Sipo, SD, Gestapo) also seized and robbed the homes of the wealthiest Jews all around the country. In Košice, German soldiers were accommodated in the empty school buildings, and later also in former Jewish houses. Károly Stirling, head of the pro-Nazi Eastern Frontline Companions’ Association (KABSZ) was one of the first Hungarian agents to apply for Jewish property. He requested the building of the Talmud Torah, the Jewish School at the Orthodox Synagogue on Kazinczy Street. However, the building had already been occupied by the local branch of Eichmann’s Sondereinsatzkommando, under SS-Hauptsturmführer Schmidtsiefen. German units systematically plundered Jewish shops and warehouses as well.

Therefore, a large number of apartments were simply out of the city hall’s sphere of authority. We lack exact figures, but we do have data from Szolnok, another important railway junction with a high presence of German troops, where by early June, 20% of the Jewish apartments were in German hands. We can presume that the figure was close to this in Košice. The failed “redistribution” of Jewish belongings disappointed many people, who had great expectations of honouring their alleged “patriotic” achievements, or solving all their existential problems at once. The secret police and SD commander in Košice reported on the general discontent of the middle class due to the unfavourable economic situation. Local residents condemned the
Hungarian authorities for the slow implementation of the “solution to the Jewish question”, as the report put it.\(^{133}\)

In the absence of uniform central regulations and with time running short, local decision makers had quite a lot of room to manoeuvre regarding the distribution of the apartments and other property under their control. Out of those taking part in the stock-taking of Jewish assets, few left with empty pockets. On 1 June 1944, for example, the Housing Bureau in Košice unexpectedly closed its doors to clients. Instead, the officials of the City Hall organized a closed auction of Jewish property among themselves.\(^{134}\) It was not uncommon that such invitation-only auctions were held the first time around for insiders, where people could obtain at the fraction of the regular price the bed sheets, clothes and other valuables of their neighbours (who had mostly been killed by then). These phenomena further escalated the moral erosion of society.

Finally, most of the people aspiring to gain “Jewish wealth” could obtain only fragments of the booty, in the form of lootings or social aid.\(^{135}\) The frustration occasionally led to protests and even “spontaneous” rallies in the last phase of Hungarian rule. In spite of the high risk (even the threat of capital punishment) involved, many people broke into the abandoned Jewish houses or joined the plundering Hungarian and German soldiers.

The mass activity of opportunists challenges the popular image of Hungarian society as passive and powerless onlookers, or even victims of the German occupation. Many non-Jewish citizens were in fact active players, who competed for Jewish wealth, and even contributed to shaping anti-Jewish policy. For example, the city officials planning the ghetto faced an agitated crowd of locals who demanded that their houses were omitted from the ghetto.\(^{136}\) Winning over the masses to the campaign was essential for the new regime, and therefore this kind of intervention was not neglected.

“What did they know, and when?” is one of the key questions when discussing the responsibility of the participants of the Holocaust. Statesmen and diplomats already knew full well by 1942 what the Nazi term “Endlösung der Judenfrage” meant in practice. Such accurate information did not reach the everyman, but many were informed about the mass murders from accounts of servicemen who had been to the front line, as well as from Allied radio announcements.\(^{137}\) Many “bystanders” (and victims) possibly rejected that kind of report as rumour. However, those who witnessed the campaign in 1944 and saw masses of people largely incapable of work (for men of active age had already been enlisted for labour service) being taken away ruthlessly and deprived of everything, could hardly do so. Tell-tale remarks in newspaper articles and petitions indicate that many people knew or suspected the real consequences of the operation. The high number of petitions for and widespread attitudes about “abandoned” property also implies that very few expected the deportees to return.

Mapping the post-war fate of the apartments and the former petitioners will also require further research. On the one hand, we cannot exclude the possibility that a certain number of petitioners were able to keep living in the apartments which


\(^{134}\) Complaint of Mrs. Imre Gréczi filed at the local Financial Directorate. 2 June 1944. MZsML, RG I, Reel 12. In: VÁGI – CSŐSZ – KÁDÁR. *The Holocaust in Hungary*, 204–205.

\(^{135}\) MNL JNSzML, IV. 407. 684/1945.

\(^{136}\) ÁBTL, Pohl Sándor – 3.1.9. V.13523.

they had acquired after the deportation of Jews. We assume that they were mostly petitioners who lived in Košice long before the first Vienna Arbitration. On the other hand, the majority of those who arrived with the Hungarian administration in Košice after 1938 probably spent only a few months living in the acquired Jewish apartments. For example, Rudolf K., the city’s chief archivist who arrived in the city in 1940, was granted a Jewish apartment in the summer of 1944, but could not enjoy it for long. Arrested by the Arrow Cross in late 1944, he was imprisoned in the Dachau concentration camp. After World War II he did not return to Košice.138 Another petitioner for Jewish apartments, Béla G., who moved to Košice in 1942 as a secondary school teacher, escaped at the end of the Hungarian rule and lived in Budapest until his death.

Only a fragment of the Košice Jewish community survived the Holocaust. The few hundred survivors returning from camps, labour service or hiding struggled to get back their apartments and start new lives. However, few neighbours were inclined to give up former Jewish apartments and other valuables they had obtained in various ways during the war. In war-torn Central and Eastern Europe, the housing question was one of the gravest social problems, which fuelled frustrations and, in accordance with the old patterns, consequently became one of the major components of resurfacing antisemitism.139

Artúr Görög, member of the Jewish Council of Košice during the war, remembered the moment when he entered his house: “I stood paralysed in the stairwell. At the door of my apartment, a stranger’s brass plaque stared me in the face. Stunned, helpless, and without a thought, I sat down on a staircase. I was startled by a scream. – Jesus, Mary! But it is the landlord! Besides joy, a certain kind of fear also resonated in the cry. The enthusiastic neighbour who had found me was one of the more benevolent women. We took a mutual liking to each other, and as I discovered, she took the least of belongings from the abandoned apartment, and to her credit, she gave some of it back. This is how my life in my old home was restarted. But it also ushered in an era of disappointment and then resignation.”140

Legal rehabilitation of survivors was initiated, but fair and complete restitution was soon taken off the agenda both in Hungary and Czechoslovakia. Presidential Decree No. 5/1945 of 19 May 1945 annulled the property transactions between 1938 and 1945, but Jews had to reclaim their former property from the state according to the Act issued a year later (128/1946).141 However, this only applied to property rights, not to tenancy rights. What is more, persons who according to Decree No. 5/1945 were of German or Hungarian nationality were to be considered unreliable from the state’s point of view, and consequently were not able to regain their lost property. Among the Jewish apartments mentioned in the petitions, we could identify only one that after World War II returned to its Jewish owner. This was the villa of Aladár Zahler, a prominent Jewish lawyer, victim of the Holocaust, whose family, with the help of the lawyer Miklós Gaskó, was able to get back almost all of the real estate that the Zahlers owned before 1945.
However, this would probably not have been possible if Mrs. Zahler had not applied for reslovakization after returning home from deportation. 142

As the Soviet-style regimes gradually took over, several Holocaust survivors could not gain back their apartments and other assets or lost them again due to the nationalization process. Furthermore, the postwar years brought about another wave of violent state interventions and arbitrary practices in the housing sector, affecting many citizens, this time Jews and non-Jews alike.
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Horizons
Marian Plague Columns in Jaroměř and Polička: A Comparative Study on Baroque Sculptural Decorations of the Bohemian Urban Public Space in the First Half of the Eighteenth Century

Jana Vojtíšková∗ – Petr Polehla**

Based on fragmentally preserved sources as well as existing literature related to the topic (especially regional historiography, art history and historic preservation), the present study sets Marian plague columns into a broader context. Through the comparison of two minor East-Bohemian towns of a comparable population, it follows the factors playing a significant role in the creation of complex Baroque sculptural compositions. At the same time, it aims to identify the functions that the sculptures were to fulfil through their position in the public space. In this sense the study is inspired by the classic essay by Peter Burke called *Conspicuous consumption in seventeenth-century Italy*, which considers “the consumption” to be a specific form of communication. The composition of Marian plague columns can be perceived as an undeniable form of communication. From multiple perspectives, the article documents the key determinants, which are sometimes rather surprising, influencing the choice of partial components of the sculptural compositions as well as their overall impression – the communicative intention. Both Marian plague columns, to this day the most important monuments decorating the public space of the towns in question, are therefore approached in an interdisciplinary way especially in the context of the history of the towns, their manors and the East-Bohemian region. Therefore, the religious situation of both towns and their surroundings is not overlooked either. With regard to the fact that Jaroměř and Polička have been royal dowry towns, the Marian plague columns also reflect the relation to the Bohemian queen, which is expressed verbally as inscriptions on them. In particular, the artwork in Polička and the events related to its creation importantly signalize the “conspicuous consumption”.


Introduction
One of the significant parts of the religious life in Baroque Bohemia (and obviously, not only Bohemia) was the cult of saints,¹ which, in the Bohemian milieu, is characteristic of the Catholic tradition, whereas non-Catholic traditions tend to adopt a critical and negative stance on it.² Catholic believers were provided with an entire crowd of saints as

¹ MIKULEC, Náboženský život a barokní zbožnost, 31.
² This was the reality of the early modern times; for instance, the question of the cult of saints in Utraquism would be different. Nevertheless, the Lutheran tradition adopted a more benevolent stance than the later Reformation movements, e.g., influenced by Calvinism. Orthodox traditions, where the cult of saints is very strong, are not taken into consideration in the present article.
their models, advocates and assistants.³ The top of the imaginary pyramid of saints has always been occupied by the Mother of God, the Virgin Mary,⁴ whose statues very often decorated and sanctified the urban public space,⁵ especially on the plague columns⁶ erected in the early decades of the eighteenth century, i.e., on the plague columns built as a reaction to the end of plague epidemic, or as thanksgiving for the protection of the area from plague.⁷ These plague columns have rightly enjoyed continuous scientific attention⁸ as they have been considered as a significant and clearly visible expression of the Catholic faith and tradition.

The research was also focused on the Marian columns of Jaroměř and Polička in the past few years. Based on fragmentally preserved sources as well as existing literature related to the topic (especially regional historiography, art history and historic preservation),⁹ the present study sets Marian plague columns into a broader context. Through the comparison of two minor East-Bohemian towns of a comparable population it follows the factors playing a significant role in the creation of the complex Baroque sculptural compositions. At the same time, it aims to identify the functions that the sculptures were to fulfil through their position in the public space. In this sense the study is inspired by the classic essay by Peter Burke called Conspicuous consumption in seventeenth-century Italy, which considers “the consumption” to be a specific form of communication.¹⁰ The composition of Marian plague columns can be perceived as an undeniable form of communication. From multiple perspectives, the article documents the key determinants, which are sometimes rather surprising, influencing the choice of partial components of the sculptural compositions as well as their overall impression – the communicative intention. Both Marian plague columns, to this day the most important monuments decorating the public space of the towns in question, are therefore approached in an interdisciplinary way especially in the context of the history of the towns, their manors and the East-Bohemian region. Therefore, the religious situation of both towns and their surroundings is not overlooked either. With regard to the fact that Jaroměř and Polička have been royal dowry towns, the Marian plague columns also reflect the relation to the Bohemian queen, which is expressed verbally as inscriptions on the columns. In particular, the artwork in Polička and the events related

³ On the categories of the saints’ functions, see: ADAM, Liturgický rok, 195–196.
⁴ What is meant here is the figures of saints. Naturally, the top position in the hierarchical cult has been occupied by God in three divine persons, i.e., the Holy Trinity – God the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit.
⁵ The sanctification of the public space, when the sacred was brought out of the churches to the streets, was especially important in areas that were recatholized. Cf. HERSCHE, Muße und Verschwendung, 557.
⁶ This term is used in the general context; when describing concrete objects, a more specific term – obelisk or pillar – is used, based on the terminology of scientific literature.
⁷ The latest book on plague epidemics is JIRKOVÁ, ”Větší-li se, či menší mor”. The book presents a summary of Czech and foreign literature on the topic.
⁸ Basic literature on the topic includes e.g. ŠORM – KRAJČA, Mariánské sloupy v Čechách a na Moravě. SLOUKA, Mariánské a morové sloupy. A useful aid is the series of publications by MAXOVA – NEJEDLY – ZAHRADNIK, Mariánské, trojčinné a další světecké sloupy. Published for individual Bohemian regions and districts of Eastern Bohemia as a supplement of the journal Zprávy památkové péče.
¹⁰ BURKE, Peter. Conspicuous consumption in seventeenth-century Italy, 132–149.
to its creation importantly signalize the “conspicuous consumption”, the function of which was to differentiate Polička from other Bohemian towns.\textsuperscript{11}

The selected comparative method helps to highlight the unique constellation of the factors of the time within the towns chosen, and to capture the tendencies observed not only in Bohemian towns. As the earlier research carried out in some early modern European towns has proved, sumptuous monuments typically appear in the public space at the times of an evident multi-layered crisis. Without the knowledge of the local situation it might be interpreted as a proof of prosperity and well-being in the broadest sense of the word. However, as has been proved by the complex research by Amanda Wunder on the example of seventeenth-century Seville, at the times of an economic crisis, social conflicts and natural disasters, Baroque art was flourishing.\textsuperscript{12} A certain parallel can be seen to the situation within the Bohemian royal towns, which had been going through a similar crisis and decline since the Thirty Years’ War. Only some royal towns managed to overcome these problems as early as the beginning of the eighteenth century. In East Bohemia it was, in particular, Hradec Králové, traditionally the most significant town of the region, and the small town of Polička which surprisingly achieved stabilization. Despite Jaroměř ranking among the towns that were unmercifully affected by the decline, we find significant proof of Baroque art there.

The present study aims to illustrate that, by means of correct interpretation of sculptural decorations and understanding the historic space, it is possible to contribute to detailed knowledge not only of the early modern urban society but also the symbolism and functionality of Baroque sculptures and the presentation of Catholicity as such.\textsuperscript{13}

**The royal dowry town of Jaroměř and its pillar from 1723–1727**

The royal dowry town of Jaroměř, dating back to the reign of Přemysl Otakar II, ranked among minor, and in many respects rather inferior, royal towns of the Kingdom of Bohemia in the Middle Ages and early modern times.\textsuperscript{14} As the research has shown so far, the cause was the choice of a rocky hillock as a space for the foundation of a town surrounded by town walls. Although the town was situated on the Polish-Glatz route and both suburbs at the confluence of two rivers – Elbe and Úpa\textsuperscript{15} – were surrounded by fertile lowlands, these potentially beneficial factors did not prevail over the drawback of the low number of town houses, resulting in a square of the street type.\textsuperscript{16} The town with its suburbs is thought to have had 2,000 inhabitants in the first decades of the eighteenth century, which was below the average within the royal

\textsuperscript{11} In the case of Polička, a chronicle written a hundred years after the construction of the column states that the monument was erected to the honour of the town. NEJEDLÝ – GLÁSER, Mariánský sloup v Poličce, 33.

\textsuperscript{12} WUNDER, Baroque Seville.

\textsuperscript{13} With regard to the focus of the study, attention is not paid to detailed architectural description of the columns. References to publications quoted are included in the footnotes, especially in footnote 10.

\textsuperscript{14} A modern synthesis of the urban history of Jaroměř has been missing so far; therefore, the most notable source of knowledge is KNAPP, Paměti královského věnného města. A collective work of historians and historical geographers was published at the end of 2020: ŠIMŮNEK, Historický atlas měst České republiky, sv. 31.

\textsuperscript{15} The confluence of the rivers Metuje and Elbe is situated in the area of the former Ples manor. The area of Josefov, named after Emperor Joseph II and turned into a bastion fortress in the second half of the eighteenth century, is part of Jaroměř now, thus situating the town at the confluence of three rivers.

\textsuperscript{16} On the historical-geographical characteristics of the town see: VOJTIŠKOVÁ, Královské věnné město Jaroměř, 239–261.
towns of the Bohemian Kingdom of that time. In 1680 the inhabitants of Jaroměř probably had to face a kind of infection, whereas the town was probably spared from the plague epidemic of 1713–1715, as there is no record of it. Therefore, they still used the only cemetery at the Church of St James in St James’s suburb. Members of more affluent families were buried in the crypt of St James’s Church or St Nicolas’s Church, indisputably the town’s dominant buildings.

Figure 1: A section of Müller’s map of Bohemia from 1720 depicting the town of Jaroměř, the nearby city of Hradec Králové and the town of Dvůr Králové nad Labem

The town’s inferiority is also substantiated by lower administration. In 1719 a complaint is recorded about the municipal scribe being lazy and not keeping the town hall’s manual, a record of the agenda of the municipal council. The fact that there had usually been only a single scribe also supports the inferior position of the town. In 1725 governor’s clerks and regional officers also criticized that neither were regular

17 Based on the data of the Theresian Land Registry from 1757, the town belonged to a group of 45 towns with 200–300 houses liable for taxes. FIALOVÁ et al. Dějiny obyvatelstva českých zemí, 130.
18 ŠIMŮNEK, Historický atlas měst České republiky, sv. 31, 23.
Tuesday markets held nor the annual fair, starting on Saint Bartholomew’s feast day. Disrupted market activity is known of from other royal towns especially as a result of a plague epidemic or an imminent war. The lower economic level of the town is also supported by the size of the manor of Jaroměř. Although prior to the fatal confiscation of land property in 1547 the town had owned a middle-sized manor in comparison with other royal towns, in the latter half of the sixteenth century the town ranked among those possessing minimal land property: the town’s subjects, or the serfs of the Jaroměř hospital in legal terms, were the only inhabitants of several homesteads in the village of Kohoutov (the record of tax liability “berní rula” records 7 1/8 of the total number of tax units called “osedlý”)

Despite numerous arguments, a special position was held by Čáslavky, Hořenice and Dolany, villages bound to Jaroměř with a special tax liability, called “šos”. Surrounded by large noble domains, Jaroměř could not acquire a significant income from this property. With regard to a great deal of domestic problems, it is not surprising that Jaroměř was classified as a town whose economy was subject to sovereign supervision by establishing the economic office in the early eighteenth century.

An accompanying fact of the above-mentioned processes, however unfavourable in many respects, was, in accordance with other regions of the Bohemian lands, the spread of the Baroque style in architecture and art. In 1670, while recovering from the consequences of the Thirty Years’ War, Jaroměř saw a great fire: two thirds of the town houses burnt down as well as both Vartas, nearly all of St James’s suburb, and several houses along the town walls. Due to the wooden sheltered pedestrian bridge across the river Elbe, the fire also spread to the other riverbank. The result was that 124 houses and shelters were destroyed as well as the Renaissance town hall (which was to be rebuilt in the Baroque style), St Nicholas’s Church, St James’s Church, the deanery, the town school, the municipal mill with its water tower and the municipal malthouse. The renovation, influenced by Baroque trends reaching the town in later decades, is exemplified by, for example, the Baroque door of No. 64 with its relief decoration marked with the year 1672, nowadays displayed in the museum of Jaroměř.

Monitoring Baroque sculpture decorations, we have to mention a sandstone column from 1686, an early Baroque piece preserved in St James’s suburb after a series of

---

20 KNAPP, Paměti královského věnného města, 150–152.
21 On the anti-Habsburg resistance see: VOREL, Stavovský odboj roku 1547.
23 BÍLEK, Dějiny konfiskací v Čechách, 1096–1097.
25 On a detailed account of the problem, see: ČERNIKOVSKÝ, Lokální konflikt v byrokratickém soukolí, 57–96.
26 These were not liege villages subject to liege duties; their position was specific.
27 On economy in the context of Bohemia, see: JANÁK – HLEDÍKOVÁ – DOBEŠ, Dějiny správy v českých zemích, 220.
28 With regard to the limited area of the inner town, there were two minor enclosed areas of the street type connected to St James’s suburb, called Malá and Velká Varta; their aim was to increase the defensive capacity of the town. Both areas have survived without major changes. WOLF, Středověké opevnění města Jaroměře, 37.
29 SLAVÍK, Uměleckohistorické památky, 73.
mishaps. Who commissioned the sculpture, called Calvary, is not clear. Nevertheless, even the composition of this column is a certain form of communication by the artwork with its surroundings. In the upper part, i.e., the chapel, there are reliefs of the Virgin Mary, Jesus Christ (Ecce Homo), Saint Joseph and Saint Sebastian, the patron against plague; this column was also erected as a reaction to the recent plague epidemic, mentioned above. On the square plinth there are reliefs of Saint John the Baptist, Saint John of Nepomuk and Saint Florian, a protector against fires. Erected to commemorate the liberation of Buda from Turkish dominance, as tradition has it, the column was the place of prayer on the so-called cross days and on Saint Mark’s feast day when people walked to the fields to pray for a rich harvest. The column fulfilled its communicative function not only in its position but also through the processions held in due course. Depicting Saint John of Nepomuk attests to his spreading cult even before his official canonization in 1729. To describe the penetrating trends of the Baroque architecture in Jaroměř, an equestrian sculpture of Saint Wenceslas from 1707 has to be mentioned, which was commissioned to commemorate the former imperial reeve Václav Kosišťe by his daughter Anna Marie who was married to Knight Vilém Rudolf Cikán of Čermná; the statue was erected on the gate standing next to St Nicholas’s Church. This sculpture is clear evidence of the “conspicuous consumption” when there was a need of differentiating one’s family from others when the town saw a noticeable decline.

As has been said, the town was probably spared during the last plague epidemic. Let us consider how the aforementioned local circumstances of the early decades of the eighteenth century affected the composition of the Marian plague column, or more properly, the Marian pillar. Situated in a lesser square, the pillar attracts attention due to its richness, which contradicts the town’s characterization at first sight. Considering the surviving accounts, another contradiction arises: all that had been paid for the column was 1,321 fl. This fact may be explained by the personality of the sculptor. The statue from 1723–1727 is ascribed primarily to Matyáš Bernard Braun (1684–1738) and also to his disciple Řehoř Thény, who died in Jaroměř, probably having moved here after his workshop in Žďár nad Sázavou had declined. Braun’s bond to Jaroměř had developed thanks to commissions in the nearby hospital in Kuks: in 1719 he got married to Marie

30 Detailed information on the complicated fortunes of the monument is found in MAXOVÁ – NEJEDLÝ – ZAHRADNÍK, Mariánské, trojiční a další světěcké sloupy, 106–108.
31 SLAVÍK, Uměleckohistorické památky, 79.
32 On the development of the cult of John of Nepomuk, see: VLNAS, Jan Nepomucký, česká legenda, 74–127.
33 A decorative stone relief of the town emblem, situated on the entrance side of the church gate, dates to the same year. ŠIMŮNEK, Historický atlas měst České republiky, sv. 31, 25.
34 State Regional Archives (hereinafter SOA) Zámrsk, State District Archives (hereinafter SOkA) Náchod, Sbírka soudobé dokumentace, Počet aneb Pořádnost na příjem a vydání od P. P. dobrodincův na vystavení statuí ku poctění blahoslavené Panny Marie Početí. V královém věnném městě Jaroměři nad Labem léta Páně 1722. Vedený ode mě Jana Antonína Khüna, the fund has not been described, no foliation. The records have been printed twice; first published as journal installments, cf. PAUL, Počet aneb pořádnost na příjem a vydání, 71–79, and later published in a separate book, see: PAUL, Braunův Mariánský sloup. As it is a trustworthy, verified transcription, the present study refers to this edition.
36 The architect is not known, but some characteristics of the work point at František Maxmilián Kaňka (1674–1766), who cooperated with Braun on columns in Valeč and Cítoliby. KORÁN, Braunové, 87.
Alžběta, daughter of a prominent citizen and councillor of Jaroměř, Karel Miselius. As generally accepted, this may have been the reason Braun charged considerably less money than was usual; the commission for him and his assistants was merely 378 fl.

A very interesting question remains as to how the financial sum for the artwork, whose foundation stone was laid in 1721, was collected. We are well informed about it thanks to the records of incomes and expenses, kept by the mayor of Jaroměř and an apothecary, Jan Antonín Kühn, who documented the income of 1,315 fl. 25 kr. 4½ denarii for the years 1722–1729 and the expense of 1,321 fl. 30 kr. for the years 1723–1727. Obviously, the financial sum had been successfully assembled in a collection campaign.

Figure 2: Financial register of incomes and expenses related to the construction of the Jaroměř Marian column from 1723–1727

37 The prestigious position of the family is supported by the fact that according to the report in the dean’s register, Brauns’ wedding witnesses were a royal reeve, mayor, and another councillor. PAUL, Braunův Mariánský sloup, 4.
38 Ibidem, 5.
39 KNAPP, Paměti královského věnného města, 151.
40 On Kühn’s personality, see: ibidem, 171.
41 1 florin is a unit of currency (gulden); 1fl = 60 kr. (kreutzer).
42 PAUL, Braunův Mariánský sloup, 26, 35.
The collected sum consisted not only of the town’s finances but also of money gathered from individual contributors in 1722–1727. A donation was often motivated by the donator’s personal piety and reverence to their patron, or by their own prestige, as exemplified by the town’s financial officer and councillor Jakub Šmíd, who donated 26 fl. for the statue of Saint James. At that time, he had not owned a house in the square yet (he acquired the house No. 23 in 1729); nevertheless, the statue of his patron was “built in the busiest place by the road” for his donation. Štěpán Klepýtko donated 40 fl. “for the figure of Saint Stephen”, which was located opposite his house, No. 36. Václav Komínek bequeathed 40 fl. for a statue of Saint John the Baptist. A prayer to all the saints mentioned for the protection of the town is inscribed in the cartouche on a metal plate: “Vrbi nostrae semper svccutite Divi” (Saints, always help our town). The message was supported with money collected in a money box in the church or with money collected from donators without any specific focus of their donation. The greatest sum of money documented was 100 fl., contributed by “His Majesty Prelate from Broumov”. The donator is likely to have been the art lover and benefactor Otmar Daniel Zinke, who was the abbot of the Břevnov-Broumov abbey in 1700–1738. We do not know whether he was asked by the Jaroměř inhabitants, or whether he had been informed of the project and his donation was his own initiative. Money was also collected from minor, anonymous donators. Therefore, there are sums which were repeatedly “collected from contributors and benefactors” by Josef Šmíd (also spelt as Šmidt or Smidt). The accounts also provide evidence of collective contributions from guilds, e.g. the bakers’ or hatmakers’ guild, additionally the collection was supported by the special tax (“šos”), most often by 50 fl. It cannot be omitted that the creation of the Jaroměř pillar dedicated to the Immaculata, i.e., the aspect of the Virgin Mary’s life emphasizing her Immaculate Conception, was supported by the town treasury’s incomes from fines for moral misdemeanours and sexual delicts (rape, adultery, etc.). These ranged from 1 fl. to 40 fl. Earlier exacted debts were also used to support the erection of the pillar.

Considering the above-mentioned characterization of the town as well as the financial background, let us focus on the form of the Jaroměř pillar, as it is not accidental. Its height is 15.6 metres. The base of the pillar is a three-sided obelisk, symbolizing the Holy Trinity. On the balustrade there are statues of Saint Florian, the protector against fire, represented in the armour, with a guidon and a bucket of water being poured on a burning house; Saint John of Nepomuk, whose confession secrecy is symbolized by
a padlock without a key; and most probably a statue of Saint Ignatius. The presence of
the founder of the Society of Jesus or another Jesuit saint is sometimes interpreted as
a friendly gesture towards the Jesuits from the nearby residence of Žireč;\textsuperscript{54} the Jesuits,
however, are not on the list of the donators.\textsuperscript{55} In this context, it is worth noting that
the long-term conflict between the inhabitants of Jaroměř and this Jesuit residence
was documented in a report made in 1725; the Jaroměř representatives tended to
complain about the Jesuits to administrative and governing officers, as the Jesuits did
not pay the proper amount of tax (“šos”) for their possessions in the village of Hořenice,
which belonged to Jaroměř, or for levies, financial collections and other payments.\textsuperscript{56}
We are inclined to think that incorporating Jesuit saints may have resulted from the
fashionable popularity of certain cults of that time and the social significance of the
Jesuit order as such. It is also noteworthy that two of the then mayor Khün’s sons
became clergymen, one of them, Ludvík, entering the Jesuit order in 1735. Similarly,
two sons of the mayor František Bleiweis became Jesuit priests; Jan Bleiweis was the
deputy of the Bohemian Jesuit province at the imperial court. Josef Henzelius, a native
of Jaroměř, was a custodian of the Jesuit college in Opava.\textsuperscript{57}

Going back to the statue of the Jesuit saint, we can see a figure with a mystic look and
eyes fixed to the heaven, holding in his left hand a crucifix made of a log and decorated
with lilies, and in his right hand an oval with symbols of the eucharist – a chalice with
the host ornate with letters JHS. While the eucharist symbols and the inscription JHS
are frequent attributes of Saint Ignatius, the crucifix suggests this figure may be Saint
Francis Xavier. However, based on the representation of the saint’s face, Ivo Kořán
identifies the statue with this Jesuit missionary Francis Xavier.\textsuperscript{58}
The plinth of the pillar is decorated with statues of Saint John the Baptist, Saint Stephen and Saint James, as a pilgrim holding a staff, to whom the church in the suburb of Jaroměř has been dedicated since the fourteenth century.⁵⁹ We are not of the same opinion as Ivo Kořán that the statues of Saint James, Stephen and John the Baptist were selected “in the free judgement of the municipal council”.⁶⁰ The cult of Saint James had had a long tradition in the town and the church dedicated to the saint and the suburb named after him is a persuasive argument thereof (the other suburb has been called the Prague suburb since the end of the sixteenth century).⁶¹ What further justifies this theory about the cult of the patron saint of pilgrims is the fact that the town was

⁵⁹ Saint John the Baptist is depicted in a camel fur. At his feet there is a lamb – a symbol of Jesus Christ, who John the Baptist pointed at, while baptising in the river of Jordan, saying: "Behold! The Lamb of God". Saint Stephen, who is said to have seen the heavens opened and Jesus standing at the right hand of God (Acts 7, 56), is gazing up and holding a book in his left hand, indicating his wisdom (Acts 6, 10). There are three stones laid on the book – the instrument of his martyrdom and his frequent attribute. ROYT, Slovník biblické ikonografie, 278–279.

⁶⁰ KOŘÁN, Braunové, 88: “podle volného úsudku městské rady”.

⁶¹ KNAPP, Paměti královského věnného města, 85.
founded on a trade route. The choice of Saint Stephen may have been influenced by the financial donation from the owner of the Jezviny homestead, Jan Štěpán Klepýtko, whose contribution of 40 fl. ranked among the highest contributions from private persons. V. Paul states that “there are some among the donors who requested that statues of certain saints be built to their patron saints’ veneration”; and this applied to Klepýtko. However, it is also important to remark that the column from 1686 had already featured Saint Florian, John the Baptist and John of Nepomuk (leaving the Virgin Mary aside for now). This fact may have influenced the composition of the pillar of Jaroměř. The belief that the town had been protected against unfavourable events thanks to these saints may have been deeply rooted. What remains to be added is that there is another statue of Saint John of Nepomuk in St James’s suburb, made in the high-Baroque style, which is ascribed either to the aforementioned Řehoř Thény or to the Litomyšl workshop of Jiří František Pacák (probably 1670–1742). The statue is another example of the popularity of the Nepomuk cult, against the background of the minor town of Jaroměř.

The predominant topic of the pillar is the cult of the Virgin Mary; the central statue represents the Immaculata, the aspect of Mary’s life related to her Immaculate Conception. Noteworthy in this context is the conflicting data at the beginning and at the end of the accounts. The heading reads that the statue was built “to the veneration of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary”; nevertheless, at the end of the accounts it is declared that “the statue to the veneration of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary” was consecrated on 8 December 1727. The memorial book of the deanery, founded more than a hundred years later (in 1840), indicates that it was a “colossus Immaculatae Conceptionis Beatissimae Virginis Mariae”. This discrepancy reflects the inconsistency of the Mariological terminology and the differing opinions regarding the Marian cult. The dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, i.e., the future Mother of God having been protected from the original sin, was not declared by the Church until 1854. The Assumption of the Virgin Mary was dogmatically defined as late as 1950, but it was not accompanied by so many controversies in the period in question. The inscription on the metal plate on the front side of the pillar does not specify the devotion either. It says that the pillar was erected to express the town’s piety to the Mother of God (“pietas regiae urbis nostrae in Deiparam”). Above the Latin inscription there is another inscription on the metal plate, reading “Virgo et Mater Dei casta”, which indicates her virginity and motherhood, not the fact that she was protected from the original sin.

62 Ibidem, 228.
63 PAUL, Braunův Mariánský sloup, 5: “mezi dárci nalézají se někteří, kteří vyžádali sí ke cti svých patronů sochy určitých svatých”.
64 On the activity of Jiří František Pacák, cf. 13, 14, 17, 19.
65 PAUL, Braunův Mariánský sloup, 23, 35: “ku poctění blahoslavené Panny Marie Početí” and “statuí ku poctění blahoslavené Panny Marie Nanebevzetí”.
66 Quoted from MAXOVÁ – NEJEDLÝ – ZAHRADNÍK, Mariánské, trojiční a další světecké sloupy, 78: “kosos Immaculatae Conceptionis Beatissimae Virginis Mariae”.
67 Focusing only on the post-Tridentine era, the polemic on the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary was very lively not only between the Catholics and Protestants, but also within the Catholic Church. Nevertheless, Marian columns attest to the cult of the Immaculate Conception in Bohemia long before the dogma was officially declared. ROYT, Obraz a kult, 214–221. On both Marian dogmas, see: Maria in: SALAJKA, Orientační teologický slovník, 91–92.
There are three more events from the life of the Blessed Mary, depicted on the reliefs of the plinth: Visitation of the Virgin Mary, Presentation of Jesus at the Temple, and Assumption of the Virgin Mary. Above the third of these there is an elderly female figure, with a baby carrying a cross. Some authors identify it as an allegory of Faith, which is challenged by I. Kořán; he interprets it as Saint Anne, Mary’s mother. A Marian theme is also present on the relief representing the Holy Family. The Virgin Mary is relaxing under a tree and Saint Joseph is holding a staff, which suggest that this is probably the Holy Family on their flight into Egypt, although the obligatory donkey is missing, as well as the angels supporting the Holy Family.

Figure 4: The statue of an allegory of Faith or Saint Anne, Mary’s mother, on the Jaroměř pillar (photo by Petr Polehla)

68 The event referred to is the Virgin Mary’s visit to her relative Elizabeth, who was also pregnant, expecting the birth of John the Baptist (Luke 1, 39–45).
69 The event is named, for example, the Circumcision of Jesus or Presentation of Jesus at the Temple. All titles reflect the fact that Jesus was brought to the temple, a sacrifice was offered for him, and he was circumcised and presented to the local community of believers. Luke 2, 22–24.
70 PAUL, Braunův Mariánský sloup, 11.
71 KOŘÁN, Braunové, 88.
72 Ivo Kořán states that it is the Holy Family. Ibidem, 87. Other authors mention the flight into Egypt, cf. MAXOVÁ – NEJEDLÝ – ZAHRADNÍK, Mariánské, trojiční a další světecké sloupy, 78.
73 There are two angels; however, they rather complement the dove descending from the heavens, symbolizing the Holy Spirit.
74 ROYT, Slovník biblické ikonografie, 300–301.
Contrary to the Holy Family, the second relief on the plinth features an incomplete family where daughters are forced by their father (and by their misery) to earn money through prostitution. This is a relief representing Saint Nicholas. As has been noted, Saint Nicholas has a great significance in Jaroměř as the main church is dedicated to him. Nicholas is worshipped as an assistant who helps with many problems, which stems from the rich tradition of legends. His generosity, which is recalled in the tradition of giving presents on the eve of Saint Nicholas’s feast even today, proceeds from the story when Saint Nicholas secretly gave presents to three girls earning their living through prostitution. This story is presented on the pillar: there is a man dressed as a bishop, holding a book in one hand and handing apples to the girls sleeping. It is the apples that Saint Nicholas is often depicted with; the golden apples developed from three golden balls. The *Legenda aurea*, the most frequently read medieval hagiographical text, mentions three nuggets of gold (masa aurei) which Saint Nicholas threw as a present through the window of the house where the girls were living with their father. 75 According to the legend, the saint also resurrected three babies who had been murdered and brined in a barrel by a cruel innkeeper. Therefore, children (sometimes located in a barrel) are an attribute of Saint Nicholas, too. However, we suppose that it is significant for a town situated at that time on the confluence of two rivers (and with another river flowing nearby) that Saint Nicholas is also the patron saint of sailors (according to legends, he would help sailors in need) 76 and other professions connected with water – barges, raftsmen, fishermen and millers – and also of people travelling, especially on water. He is also worshipped as a protector against the danger of flooding. 77 Also noteworthy is the fact that in the dean’s church in Jaroměř the main altar is decorated with a painting of Saint Nicholas, which is ascribed to the Baroque painter Petr Brandl (1668–1735); if Brandl really was the author, the painting cannot be taken as an indicator of the town’s prosperity at that time. 78

---

75 In the representation of the saint, the golden balls or apples are sometimes replaced with bags of money. LCI, Bd. 8., 50.
76 VORAGINE, *Legenda aurea*, 70–76.
77 LCI, Bd. 8, 46–58.
The pillar of Jaroměř, decorated with an array of popular saints, literally became a place of cult very early in its existence. Again, the symbolic form of communication influencing the population in later decades may be highlighted. On feast days of the saints, prayers and services were held at the pillar, sometimes accompanied with music, e.g., on the feast days of Saints Florian, James and John of Nepomuk; there are also reports on Saturday worship and gathering before Marian feast days. The sculptural artefact and its close vicinity were used as a place of mutual prayer and religious gatherings, too, not exclusively serving private prayers. By no means were they just a medium of self-representation for the town and its representatives and donators from the milieu of inhabitants; we also suppose a family tradition was formed earlier, and spread orally and possibly by means of artefacts in burghers’ homes. Nor does

79 MAXOVÁ – NEJEDLÝ – ZAHRADNÍK, Mariánské, trojiční a další světecké sloupy, 79.
80 Here arise opportunities for research into the popularity of the saints in question in burghers’ families in Jaroměř, based on surviving artworks or written sources.
the celebration of the Empress, a worldly patron of the town, come to the foreground. Together with the inscription mentioning the town inhabitants’ piety as an incentive for building the pillar, on the metal plate on the front side there is a very brief note about the pillar having been built under Emperor Charles VI and Queen Elizabeth ("Carolo VI et regina Elisabetha regnante").

Let us add that the sculptures on the Jaroměř pillar have recently been replaced with copies and deposited in Josefov lapidarium (Bastion 1). A valuable Baroque tombstone of a Weeping Woman, made in 1730 by M. B. Braun for his deceased mother-in-law Anna Miselius, has also been replaced with a replica. In the period in question, it used to be located in the cemetery at St James’s Church. Setting such a valuable artefact in Jaroměř depended on the personality of the sculptor and his personal bond with a local family. This artwork, which was unique in the context of the town’s history, displays the need to differentiate the town from others.

In conclusion, a question can be formulated regarding whether the town of Jaroměř would have had a Marian pillar erected (and when it would have been built and what it would have looked like), if one of the burghers’ daughters had not married one of the main sculptors. In fact, Jaroměř was – together with the nearby town of Dvůr Králové, which also possessed a small manor – one of the smallest and least significant East-Bohemian dowry towns. The foundation stone to the Marian column in Dvůr was not laid until 1753.
The royal dowry town of Polička and its obelisk from 1727–1731

Like Jaroměř and Dvůr Králové, Polička also used to be one of the smallest and least significant East-Bohemian royal dowry towns. This characteristic held absolutely true until the end of the Thirty Years’ War. The town was built on a trade route near the border with Moravia, but the fact that the locality was not inhabited in the pre-urban era indicates unfavourable natural conditions, reflected in the poor agricultural production of the region over centuries. The reason was the relatively high altitude of 555m above sea level. Naturally, the adverse conditions affected the specialization of the local crafts and the possibility of trade.  

---

85 The most significant recent works on the history of Polička include RŮŽIČKA – KRUŠINA, Dějiny města Poličky I. JUNEK – KONEČNÝ, Dějiny města Poličky. ŠIMŮNEK, Historický atlas měst České republiky, sv. 30.
A particular period of almost a hundred years, traditionally labelled as the era preceding the battle at the White Mountain (1526–1620), was not an easy period for Polička and its inhabitants: due to the social changes caused by the development of the nearby aristocratic manor estates, the number of marketing places, especially where Polička beer was sold, diminished; besides, the town and its inhabitants, subjects of increasing taxation, were affected fatally by fires several times. The municipal treasury had to face financial problems repeatedly, which was intensified by the confiscation of land property as a result of the anti-Habsburg resistance in 1547. The town manor had been based on villages paying the tax called “šos”. In 1545 the villages were transformed into allodial villages. Luckily, the town managed to regain them. Some villages belonging to Jaroměř, which were situated in fertile lowlands, attracted the attention of aristocratic entrepreneurs, whereas the manor of Polička itself was left unnoticed. The town, with its two pertaining suburbs (the Upper and the Lower suburbs), later purchased other land property, despite the great indebtedness of the municipal treasury and the financial burden carried by the inhabitants. Gradually the town succeeded in building a middle-sized manor, as seen in the context of royal towns (incorporating the complete villages of Borová, Kamenec, Makov, Modřec, Nedvězí, Oldřiš, Radiměř, Sádek, Sedliště, Telecí, Trhonice and parts of Korouhev, (Pustá) Rybná, Široký Důl and Újezdec). The temporary boom connected with developing textile production did not prove able to revive the town, whose landmark remained the Gothic Church of St James. All of that was reflected in the cultural climate. As a consequence of the boom, another church was built in 1572–1576 – the filial Church of St Michael Archangel, with a Gothic exterior, but – already – a Renaissance interior. A new, larger cemetery was founded around the church, which may be considered to be a signal of the growing number of citizens; the old cemetery at St James’s Church ceased to exist after that.

88 JUNEK – KONEČNÝ, Dějiny města Poličky, 93–98.
In 1613, the town, especially the part surrounded by town walls, was substantially affected by a huge fire. One of the rebelling non-Catholic towns, Polička entered the Thirty Years’ War with a great number of problems, which resulted in a further deepening of the financial crisis of the town and its inhabitants and the destruction of town buildings. The records of the period describe an almost depopulated town looking like a rubbish heap, where even soldiers passing through did not want to stay. The war, during which the town manor was temporarily confiscated, affected other royal towns as well, but Polička’s inhabitants fell into misery much faster.

The town remained a building site for decades after the war. However, anyone who expected the town burghers to be so disconsolate due to their miserable fate that they could not regain an ordinary life in a peripheral, below-average royal town would be mistaken. The square, not covering a large area before this time, and reflecting the significance of the locality in the Middle Ages and early modern times, attests to an unusual boom which was sophistically reflected in the first half of the eighteenth century in an impressive Baroque composition decorating the public space. Whereas most of the Baroque town buildings were severely damaged and some of them completely destroyed by the great fire of 1845, the unique Baroque composition survived, albeit

with minor damage. And it is these Baroque artefacts especially, with the Marian column dominating, that are significant examples of “conspicuous consumption” – the attempt to differentiate Polička from other Bohemian royal towns of the first half of the eighteenth century. Their communicative intention is highly noticeable.

Following the building activity chronologically, two Baroque statues should be mentioned: made in 1727 by Jiří František Pacák’s stonemason’s workshop in Litomyšl, they were created to decorate two fountains that served as sources of drinking water in front of the medieval town hall. The statue of Saint George, which cost 100 fl., paid by the town, was more expensive; the statue of Saint Michael Archangel cost 62 fl. The latter was located on a gate pillar of the suburban cemetery in 1739–1940. Financially supported by a councillor’s son, Václav Tichý, a statue of Saint John of Nepomuk was built by the same stonemason’s workshop in 1727, two years ahead of the canonicalization of the saint; its location will be mentioned later. In 1727–1731 Pacák’s workshop created a Marian obelisk for the town of Polička, as a thanksgiving for the protection of the town from the plague epidemic of 1713–1715. The expenses recorded are 6,289 fl. 37 kr. and they significantly exceed other towns’ expenses for similar works of art. For a more precise idea, this sum would correspond to 10-year levies from the subjects of Polička. The sum was even comparable to the costs of the reconstruction of the town hall in 1733–1740 (adaptations of the interior took three more years), which resulted in the imposing, two-storey building of a Baroque palace town hall with a gambrel roof and a tower, situated in the middle of the rather small square. As the construction plans have not been found, it remains unanswered who the designer was: authors of recent literature speculate especially about F. Benedikt Klíčník, a master builder from Brno, supervising the construction in 1739–1740, or Carlo Antonio Canevalle (1680–1740) with regards to the mention of "the Canivalle debt" in the town accounts of 1737; some authors, however, ascribe the project of the town hall as well as the whole Baroque composition to the imperial architect František Maxmilián Kaňka (1674–1766). Finally, the above-mentioned statue of Saint John of Nepomuk was situated at the southern side of the town hall.

The facts mentioned adumbrate that the burghers of Polička, unlike those of Jaroměř, did not only overcome their problems but they also managed to gather considerable wealth, which was reflected in the Baroque composition of a public space of great artistic value. For example, in an extant request for a financial support

---

91 Ibidem, 247–251. The fire damaged part of the Baroque town hall. For more about the town hall, see below.
92 Today it is impossible to find in the archival inventory the sources on which the historiography of Polička based the information on the expenses. (We would like to thank Michal Severa and Stanislav Konečný from the State District Archives in Svitavy, based in Litomyšl, for the verification.)
94 WIRTH, Soupis památek historických, 90. JUNEK – KONEČNÝ, Dějiny města Poličky, 171.
96 JUNEK, Polička. Mariánský obelisk, 6.
98 JUNEK, Polička. Mariánský obelisk, 8.
for the construction of the town hall, which was addressed to Queen Elizabeth Kristine (1691–1750), the citizens of Polička represent their town as a poor one, referring to “the Swedish war” when the town hall was ruined, mentioning high levies supporting the army, and demanding sustenance of the clergy and other costs. However, obviously, this rhetoric was chosen in an attempt to gain money from the patron of the town. It is not clear whether she satisfied the requirements. In fact, the burghers, especially the owners of 113 houses with the brewing right, and to a lesser extent also the owners of houses built later and lacking the brewing right, lived their “golden age”, as this period of Polička’s history, covering the span of years 1700–1775, was called by a Polička native and the first local historian Antonín Hájek (1791–1863).

What was the ground-breaking event that caused a town of a minor size and lesser importance, seriously affected by war hardships, to make such extraordinary economic progress that this became evident in the public space by means of Baroque art? The answer should be sought in the first post-war generations, who were able to find a source of cheap labour and secure profit thanks to their tenacity. The inhabitants of Polička managed to utilize the work potential of their liege villages and transformed the manor into a corvée manor (“robotní panství”), following the example of the nobility.

As early as 1654 there was just one desolate homestead out of the total number of 362. According to the manorial lords’ regulations, the husbandmen were obliged to cultivate the fields deserted by runaway non-Catholic farmers. Besides the usual statute labour and financial obligations and the duties of harvest contributions, all of which were gradually increasing, the serfs had to process flax yarn for the town nobility; however, they were not allowed to trade it freely. They were also banned from producing woven fabric. One of the statute labour duties was transporting salt from Austrian salt mines to the storehouse in Polička. The town’s economy was based on the brewery, town farmsteads and forests, whose benefits were rather high despite the backward machinery, as most of the work was done by the subjects. Heavy duties and the plague epidemic led to long-term dissatisfaction that broke out in the Polička manor in 1680. The number of the newly settled families of serfs rose to 530 at the end of the century; several new settlements were founded in the surroundings, e.g., Landráty near the village of Telecí. With new inhabitants coming, the number of less wealthy, or even poor families, especially cotters’ (“chalupník”) or husbandmen’s lodgers’ (“podruh”) families, was growing. According to surviving reports, the burghers behaved disdainfully towards their subjects. This is another reason that the Polička town hall resembles a mansion, as it was the seat of the aristocratic administration. It presents another example of communication mediated through the Baroque building. However, another important fact regarding the Polička subjects should be mentioned. Although the town presented itself as a Catholic one, surrounding villages continued to be also inhabited by non-Catholics. Therefore, it may be agreed that the rich sculpture decoration presented in the Polička square was to demonstrate an

---

100 Ibidem, 154.
101 HÁJEK, Královské město Polička, 45.
102 The first to discuss the topic in detail is RŮŽIČKA – KRUŠINA, Dějiny města Poličky I., 68 nn.
103 JUNEK – KONEČNÝ, Dějiny města Poličky, 151–152.
104 Ibidem, 158–140.
adherence to Catholicism in an area with a strong non-Catholic tradition.\textsuperscript{106} Let us focus closely on the works of the Baroque sculpture which also show off the wealth of the town and its inhabitants endowed with the brewing right. The central point of the whole composition of the Baroque sculpture artefacts is the Marian monument, the base of which is a three-sided obelisk, symbolizing the Holy Trinity. It is richly segmented and decorated with sculptures of saints and angels along all the height of 20 metres. On the upper storeys, it is veiled by clouds. On the corner pillars are the parents of the Virgin Mary – Saints Joachim and Ann – and Mary’s fiancé, Saint Joseph. The iconographical programme starts with the Virgin Mary’s family, referring to her impeccability: the Immaculate Conception in Saint Ann’s womb, but also the Immaculate Conception of Jesus Christ, represented by the statue of Saint Joseph, holding a lily, an attribute of chastity, in the right hand; unfortunately, the lily has not survived.\textsuperscript{107}

Figure 8: Polička obelisk from 1727–1731 and the town hall as a part of the Baroque-composed public space (photo by Miroslav Beneš)

\textsuperscript{106} JUNEK, Polička. Mariánský obelisk, 4. In Bohemia plague columns are sometimes labelled monuments of anti-reformation. HERSCHE, Müße und Verschwendung, 564.
\textsuperscript{107} Ibidem, 7, 13.
In the niches of the first storey, there are statues of Saints Wenceslas, Vitus and Florian. The statue of the most significant patron saint of the country and the heir of Bohemia, Saint Wenceslas, is situated symbolically opposite the entrance to the town hall. The saint is depicted in armour, with a prince’s cap and a guidon. The palladium of Stará Boleslav is hung on his chest, a symbol of Marian protection of Bohemia. The inscription referring to the ruling authority, the secular patron, heiress and the lady of the town, Bohemian Queen and Empress Elizabeth Kristine, is located symbolically under his statue. Polička as a royal dowry town is presented on a cartouche under the statue of Saint Vitus, with a brief inscription “Me ex voto errigi ivssit Policzka Vrbs dotalis”. The largest cartouche celebrates the greatest female ruler, the Queen of Heaven and Earth, the Blessed Virgin Mary. Another patron saint of the country, Saint Vitus, with the attribute of a rooster, has enjoyed a great reverence since the early Middle Ages, and one of the important centres of the cult of this native of Sicily has been Prague. He is venerated as a protector against epilepsy, and also against lightning.108 A general’s staff in his hand was probably added later.109 Saint Florian’s statue, an integral part of many smaller or larger sculptures in town and village squares is represented traditionally as an armoured saint pouring water from a bucket onto a burning house.110 It is noteworthy that Polička had suffered several large fires; that is why the protector against fire is given a place of honour on the column on the same storey as the patron saints of the country.

The second storey was reserved for anti-plague patrons – Saints Sebastian,111 Roch112 and Charles Borromeo.113 All of them are represented in accordance with the iconographical canon; Saint Sebastian’s body is stabbed with arrows, Saint Roch is depicted as a pilgrim with a dog and Saint Charles Borromeo is wearing a cardinal hat. All of the three saints were also incorporated in the later decoration of the church in the 1730s; this decoration, however, was destroyed together with most of the other church decoration by the fire of 1845. On an art print from 1847, picturing the presbytery before the fire, we can see the statue of Saint Sebastian tied to a stake and the statue of Saint Roch with a dog licking a wound on his leg. The statues were situated on the sides of the altar of Saint Charles. On the opposite side of the presbytery there is an altar of Saint John of Nepomuk, who is also featured on the obelisk. With regards to the above-mentioned solitary statue of the saint from 1727, it is evident that Saint John of Nepomuk was a very popular saint among the Catholics living in Polička; he was, however, a thorn in the side of non-Catholics, who disseminated pamphlets against

108 LCI, Bd. 8, 579–583.
110 LCI. Bd. 6, 259–254.
111 Saint Sebastian was martyred with the arrows of Numid archers at Emperor Diocletian’s direct command. That is why he is usually depicted with arrows stuck in his body. LCI. Bd. 8, 318–324.
112 Saint Roch is a medieval plague patron saint. According to a legend, he healed a lot of people from plague, he himself being infected. The suffering Roch, living in isolation, was brought food by a dog, which often accompanies him on statues or paintings. He is also depicted as a pilgrim with a hat and a staff or as a man showing plague ulcers on his body. Ibidem, 276–278.
113 Archbishop of Milan and also a cardinal, Charles Borromeo became renowned in many respects. The reason he is worshipped as a patron saint against plague is that he risked his life fighting against the plague epidemic in Milan in 1576–1578 and helping the ill. He introduced very effective measures and proved to be a skilled organizer. He pushed through a strict hygienic regime, including using available disinfectants and isolation of the infected; he also built hospitals and organized general charitable support. GIORGI, Bildlexikon der Kunst, 195–197.
him. Moreover, in the church he is surrounded by Bohemian Saints Procopius and Vojtěch (Adalbert), who are not present on the obelisk. Saint James, the patron of the church and town, is also missing. The main altar of the church dedicated to the saint was completed in 1752, being a work of František Pacák, the son of Jiří František Pacák, and a Polička joiner, František Weinlich. The artistic heritage of the local master attests to the rising level of local culture.

Marian topics are expanded on the cartouches on the second storey of the obelisk. The reliefs are equipped with inscriptions, which make it easier to identify and interpret the saints. It is also the Trinity topic that is repeated as the relation of the Virgin Mary to the three Divine persons. The first relief represents the Virgin Mary as the Daughter of God the Father (Filia Dei Patris); the second one depicts her as the Mother of God’s Son (Mater Dei Filii) – she is holding Baby Jesus in her hands; and the third relief features her as a Fiancée of the Holy Spirit (Sponsa Spiritus Sancti). This cartouche depicts the Annunciation of the Virgin Mary: Mary is praying over a book or meditating on the Word of God; there is also an angel with a lily and the Holy Spirit descending from the Heaven as a dove.

The obelisk culminates with the statue of the Virgin Mary, represented as the Immaculata; in terms of iconography, it contains all the necessary attributes – the moon under her feet, twelve stars around her head and the globe twined by a serpent, the head of which is pressed on by one foot of the Immaculata, who is being elevated by angels. There is also an apple in the serpent’s (i.e. the devil’s) mouth, referring to the original sin. Mary, the new Eve, was prevented from committing the sin. It is noteworthy in this context that a local dean reported in the correspondence to the archbishop’s consistory in Prague that the aim of the artwork was to display the statue for public worship, so that the cult of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, or Immaculata, might increase. This report, presented in the historiography of Polička, proves the communicative intention, which was, from the point of view of the dean, embodied in the artefacts.

The town council considered the obelisk as something extraordinary and as a medium of the town’s self-representation, and this is evident from the fact that they had a copper engraving, depicting the monument, made by Michael Rentz (1698–1758), an engraver of Count Špork. They approached him in 1732. This act testifies to the high ambition of the Polička town representation, as Rentz was one of the most prominent engravers of his time.
masters of the art and obviously, he was not a cheap one. What is more, it was not easy to persuade the busy artist to accept the commission. In the end, Rentz did not undertake to make the engraving until June 1738. In his letter, he spoke highly of the Polička obelisk: “I cannot tell where a more splendid monument – apart from the Trinity statue in Teplice – could be seen all over the Bohemian Kingdom; I will not spare my diligence to complete it and I will make any effort to pay tribute with God’s help by means of another art form.” The sum of 200 fl. for engraving and expected 20 fl. for buying the copper plate was enormous, but Rentz defended it, saying: “By no means is the price of 200 fl., which I fixed earlier, too high or excessive”.

Nevertheless, the town councillors were willing to pay the sum, exceeding the costs of the statues for the fountains, in order to spread word of the town’s glory – and its token of loyalty to the imperial court and the Church – far and wide. They needed it to be finished on time so that a print could be made as a birthday present for Empress Elizabeth Kristine. However, it was not until 1742 that the artefact was delivered to Polička, and the size was extraordinary: the plate measured 111 x 52 cm and the size of the print was 109 x 49.5 cm. Due to the excessive size of the prints, the town had another plate engraved – a smaller one measuring 70 x 45.5 cm. It cost 122 fl. and it was not just a reduced copy of the original plate.

121 ROYT, Obraz a kult, 294. ŠERÝCH, Michael Rentz, 267.
122 SOA Zámrsk, SOkA Svitavy, Archiv města Polička II, box. 254, inv. no. 609.
123 The plate is part of the exposition of the Town Museum and Gallery of Polička nowadays.
As has been stated, both fountains are also decorated with statues of saints. Motifs from classical mythology that are used on fountains in some other towns cannot be seen here. In fact, it is Saint George and Archangel Michael that are represented on the fountains in Polička. Both of them are perceived in the Christian tradition as fighters against evil and its initiator – the devil. Both statues express the same wish – the victory over the evil in its broadest sense. Saint George is killing a dragon; he is kneeling on its body and stabbing a golden lance into its throat. Archangel Michael, the leader or prince of the heavenly army will be the main agent of the final victory over Satan according to the Revelation of Saint John or the Apocalypse. In the period in question, Archangel Michael also had a different function – he became the symbol of the anti-reformation fight. He is depicted on the Polička fountain, pressing the devil’s head.

125 SOA Zámrsk, SOkA Svitavy, Archiv města Polička II, box. 254, inv. no. 609.
126 ROYT, Slovník biblické ikonografie, 23. NEJEDLÝ – GLÄSER, Mariánský sloup v Poličce, 51.
with his left foot and holding a gilded fiery sword in his right hand raised above. In his left hand, he is clutching an oval shield with the monogram of Jesus Christ – IHS (Iesus Hominum Salvator). Accompanying the letters that have often been used as a symbol of the Jesuit order in the modern era, there are also three nails from Jesus’s cross. As has been claimed, the cult of Archangel Michael had been present in the town’s background earlier – there is St Michael’s Church with a cemetery. This consecration took another function of Saint Michael into consideration – that of the person who weighs souls on Doomsday;\(^\text{127}\) nevertheless, the newly built church altar depicted the fall of proud angels.\(^\text{128}\) After the statue of Archangel Michael was transported to the area of the cemetery, this last function prevailed.

Figure 10: The statue of Saint Michael Archangel on the Polička fountain (photo by Miroslav Beneš)

The above-mentioned Jesuits were not established in this royal dowry town; but the town representation tended to incline to this influential order, as testified by other artefacts. In particular, the town hall chapel, consecrated in 1751, is dedicated

---

127 Ibidem.
128 JUNEK – KONEČNÝ, Dějiny města Poličky, 181.
to the prominent Jesuit saint – Saint Francis Xavier. The altar painting represents this Jesuit missionary baptizing pagans. Alongside the altar painting there are statues of other significant Jesuits – the order’s founder Saint Ignatius, and Francis Borgia. All the statues were created by Řehoř Thény, who is commemorated in connection to Jaroměř, or Pacák’s stonemason’s workshop. The apotheosis of the best-known Jesuit missionary, Saint Francis Xavier, spreading Christianity to four continents, is depicted on the ceiling fresco. It was painted by Ondřej Andršt who settled in the culturally stimulating town of Polička in 1743. It may also have been by means of the chapel’s composition that the town representatives expressed their determination to support Jesuit missions in their manor, which was inhabited by non-Catholic inhabitants as well.

Conclusion

The towns of Jaroměř and Polička were among the smallest and least significant royal dowry towns of the Bohemian Kingdom in the Middle Ages and the early modern era. Whereas in the case of Jaroměř, situated on a trade route and neighbouring the confluence of two rivers, the cause of its long-term inferiority was its location on a relatively small rocky promontory, providing the burghers with just enough space for a square of the street type, Polička was founded in an area of adverse natural conditions, which is supported by the absence of agricultural settlement in the pre-urban era. These unfavourable factors were reflected in the economic situation of the town as well as at its cultural and demographical levels. The impacts of the Thirty Years’ War were disastrous; the war intensified the crisis in both the towns, and it was especially Polička as a depopulated town that is reported to have resembled a rubbish heap.

Nevertheless, the post-war development was entirely different. On the one hand, Jaroměř could not significantly utilize its manor, comprised of just a minor number of subjects and three villages liable to the tax called “šos”. On the other hand, Polička involved all its serfs and inhabitants of the villages in statute labour duties, and, thanks to its manor farm, managed to pay off all debts by the end of the seventeenth century. The burghers endowed with a brewing right found themselves economically stronger and the town municipality became affluent at the beginning of the eighteenth century. Whereas the Jaroměř municipal representatives had lost a significant number of liege villages after the confiscation of 1547 as they were situated in areas convenient for agriculture, surrounded by large aristocratic manors, the citizens of Polička made use of the fact that no noble entrepreneurs in the sixteenth century had been interested in the villages belonging to the town, which was an advantage obvious from a distance of one century. The perseverance of the first post-war generations directed the town to its “golden era”, as the first three quarters of the eighteenth century were called by the Polička historian Antonín Hájek (1791–1863).

An accompanying feature of the historical processes described above was the spreading of Baroque architecture and art in the context of both towns in question. The present contribution has focused on the decoration of the public space with Marian plague columns and the functions of these in the first half of the eighteenth century. Besides the protection and help epitomized by the Virgin Mary, saints associated with her, anti-plague patron saints accompanied by Saint Florian, Jesuit saints, and the very popular Saint John of Nepomuk, these compositions played also other roles within the towns’ society: they offered an opportunity for self-representation of the
town and the town representatives. They indicated the wealth of the town and its inhabitants, namely burghers with the brewing right, and they also provided means of separating the town milieu from its surroundings and its own past. It was especially through the example of the Polička Baroque composition that the communicative functions could be understood. These functions were ascribed to Baroque artworks in the spirit of the mentality of the time, too: to differentiate the so far insignificant Polička from other Bohemian royal towns, and to emphasize the difference between the town representatives and their subjects, and between the Catholics and secret non-Catholics.

Whereas the town of Jaroměř afforded the sumptuous pillar originating in 1723–1727 thanks to the marriage of one of the main artists, Matyáš Bernard Braun, to a daughter of a prominent burgher of Jaroměř, the citizens of Polička paid the same amount of money for their obelisk, made by the Litomyšl workshop of Jiří František Pacák, as they spent on the radical reconstruction of the town hall. What considerable “conspicuous consumption” at the time of decline of most of the royal towns of the Bohemian Kingdom! As an epilogue, let us add that a few years later the Polička urban society started to go through a serious inner crisis, reflected in the growing number of alcoholics and poor education of the younger generation. The superior offices had to look into numerous offences. After his visitation of the town, Emperor Joseph II even declared that he had not seen such misbehaved children anywhere in Bohemia.¹³⁰ The prosperity turned into decline and corruption for the Polička inhabitants. Since the last quarter of the eighteenth century a slow decline can be seen, when the town gradually became relatively insignificant again.¹³¹ It became a town which makes us amazed by the impressive artworks decorating the town’s public space: the square, which proves, through its size, the town’s inferior position in the Middle Ages, was decorated with a unique Baroque composition of sculptures and a two-storey town hall of a palace type, which has rightly enjoyed the status of a national cultural monument since 2008. Polička presents a rare example of a royal town that managed to overcome the disadvantages of its natural conditions in the pre-industrial era and to become substantially affluent. The inhabitants of Jaroměř have never had such potential, and due to the very limited space within the town walls and the small manor, could not have had either. Yet Jaroměř also features Baroque artworks by means of which the municipal representation or individual people communicated with their vicinity and differentiated themselves from it.

Abreviations
LCI – Lexikon der christlichen Ikonographie
SOA – State Regional Archives
SOkA – State District Archives

¹³⁰ ŠIMŮNEK, Historický atlas měst České republiky, sv. 30, 19.
¹³¹ JUNEK – KONEČNÝ, Dějiny města Poličky, 213 and following.
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Reviews
In the Canadian-born American historian Despina Stratigakos’s new book, the publisher claims that it is about an “untold story”. It is mainly about Hitler’s envisioned northern utopia for the occupied territory of Norway between 1940 and 1945. For international readers it is refreshingly new. Norwegian historians have not often published in foreign languages, so foreign readers and scholars do not have the same insight as Norwegians into Norwegian relations during World War II. Consequently, the Norwegian perspective pays more attention to specific national discourses, marked by more internal questions of national significance, than Stratigakos does.

So, her angle is different. Her starting point is the Nazi German regime and its visions for Norway. She presents an interesting view of the architects and engineers of Organisation Todt (OT). OT’s importance was so great that the institution was named “the second army” by the Allies. OT was first led by the wilful construction engineer Fritz Todt (1891–1942). After his death in 1942, the legendary right hand of Adolf Hitler, Albert Speer (1905–1981), took over the powerful paramilitary organization, responsible for the building and construction of the Nazi German–controlled areas during the war (1939–1945).

Stratigakos gives us a detailed insight into OT and its strategists. As one can imagine, it is not a book dealing with the Norwegian reactions to the strategies. Rather, she makes the reader aware of Norway’s rather different role compared to those of other occupied territories through the occupation. Because Norwegians were considered as racial and cultural opposites to the subhuman – or in German “Untermensch” – Norway rises as a contrast to areas of Eastern Europe. The ideas about the Nordic race and the brotherhood of Teutonic, Aryan people started to develop during the interwar period during an international conference on art. Then and there, the visions of some architects within the Nazi establishment became the basis for further and broader perspectives, put into action during the Nazi German occupation. Hitler did not visit Norway during the occupation – only in 1934. However, one can feel his considerations, visions and presence when it comes to the concerns and plans for Norway during World War II. He considered Norway as a “Zone of Destiny” – a “Schicksalsbereich” – binding up huge military resources in Norway during the occupation.

The first chapter addresses the main topic with a focus on how the German press was “Romanticizing the North”. The connection with an imminent need for information back home is clear. The attack on Norway probably came as a surprise in Germany as well. Why did Nazi Germany invade Norway? What was the reason for sending as many as 400,000 soldiers to the region, when the initial plan was to create a “lebensraum” for the German people in Eastern Europe? We know how instrumental the German propaganda was during World War II, so it comes as no surprise that the propaganda units of the Nazi regime directed their output towards target groups back home, partly based on ulterior, rather pragmatic motives. Because of the subsequent occupation, the regime had to construct a narrative fitting Norway into a concept of ideological aims. Norway was an underdeveloped void, an open space where visionary Nazis could cooperate with Nordic people in the development of a model nation.

Because the main perspective is German, there is not that much space given to the local actors – the inhabitants of Norway. They are more or less passive, observing extras. One important exception is the architect and professor in town planning, Sverre Pedersen, who was in charge of the Norwegian organization responsible for the reconstruction of the war-torn cities. His resistance to the great Nazi visions irritated the foreign architects. However, there is no proper overview on the development in relations between the occupied and the occupant regarding resistance, or reluctance to enact the plans and visions. The occupation changed from reluctant cooperation to a more articulated resistance, especially during the last three years under foreign rule. However, Stratigakos conclusively ends the chapter by focusing on the gap between visions and reality. All was not at all well between
the rulers and the ruled people. Despite being two peoples who were brothers of the same Aryan race, the occupation laid open a world of division and hierarchization. The introduction of a “New Order” in the North was far from easy to accomplish, mostly because of the lack of communication between the regime and the occupied people.

The second chapter deals with the way the Nazi German occupants tried to recreate Norwegian society in their ideological image, and how they implemented the “New Order”. This is implicitly describing how a colonial power tends to create a rule over a foreign country by the promotion of their fundamental ideologies. Stratigakos uses the term “Nazification” but does not define the concept properly, which she should have, since the book focuses so strongly on the history of ideologies. How did the regime implement the ideology? What was its essential concept? Road construction? Town planning? The development of infrastructure? For the conqueror it seems to be a rather technical issue. First and foremost, fortifications were to be built, to bolster Norway’s buffer towards the North Sea and the menacing Great Britain in the west. Norway was to be part of the Atlantic Wall, a coastal fortification line from the Barents Sea to the Bay of Biscay. Another vision concerned road construction, which was not different from the existing visions for the country before the occupation. The German occupiers wanted to link distant regions by Autobahns, especially in the parts closest to the Soviet Union. The vision was to connect distant regions, as well as connecting Norway with Germany. The roads were to build a new “Volksgemeinschaft” – a community between Norwegians and Germans. However, the Nazi regime needed the roads for military purposes as well, especially connected to “Operation Barbarossa” in June 1941, when the region of Finnmark was used as a frontline in the invasion of the Soviet Union.

Because of this obsession with defence, systems and military logistics, and the need for an extra workforce, more than 100,000 prisoners of war and foreign forced labourers were deported to work in Norway. They were tortured, plagued and tormented by the Nazi regime under the harsh climate and poor living conditions. For the Norwegian population, especially in the county of Nordland, the Nazi German race policy was brought to light in all its horror. As many as 17,000 did not leave Norway alive, with Soviets, Yugoslavs and Poles being the peoples worst affected. Stratigakos also makes a visit to another Nazi invention affecting Norway, namely the “Lebensborn” programme. It “sought to direct the production and flow of babies born to Norwegian women and German soldiers”, she underlines, and adds that the whole concept was about securing the “Aryanness” of the German population. The programme created a lot of traumas in the post-war period, not only directly for the women involved, their children and their relatives, but also in the Norwegian handling of the case as a national trauma in the Norwegian World War II memory process. The Lebensborn children and their mothers became part of the “Nazification process”, and hence pariahs.

The third chapter deals with the colonizers’ whereabouts in the North, seen through the realization of the welfare system for soldiers – the Soldiers’ Homes. These “Isles of Germanness” were constructed to take care of the young male German population in this remote and rural foreign atmosphere. Hitler himself led by example, when he donated one million Reichsmarks to the Soldiers’ Homes in Norway. The rationale was that Norway was, as Goebbels claimed, “of vast distances and of hard winter”. Far away from family and friends, the German soldiers needed a German nest in which to cultivate their own culture, through architecture, art and music. To illustrate this, Stratigakos takes us into some of the homes and shows us the ideas behind the architecture and interiors and their connection with German history, culture and geography. The Soldiers’ Homes paradoxically became secluded areas where the Germans isolated themselves from their “Norwegian brothers”. In some of the most war-torn cities they became grim examples of the Nazi German ostentation. While the Germans cultivated culture and Germanness in newly erected stately palaces of togetherness, civilian Norwegians who had lost their homes through German air raids in 1940 had no materials for the reconstruction of their homes. The hierarchies of importance and priority and the division between the people and their rulers became even more evident, symbolized by the Nazi German utopians.
The fourth chapter deals with town planning, especially the reconstruction of the towns demolished by the Luftwaffe in the acts of war during the spring of 1940. The Nazi German attackers failed in their strategy to get the Norwegian government and Royal family to cooperate on the occupation. The Norwegian Royal family decided to organize military resistance in the northern Norwegian regions with help from French, British and Polish troops from April to June 1940. But by the time of the capitulation in June, they had fled to London and continued the resistance there, so the power vacuum led to new changes of strategy for the occupation. However, the result was a German occupation and control of the state administration, beginning when Denmark, the Netherlands, Belgium and France were under the Nazi German control. From then on, some of Hitler’s most trusted men were travelling around in war-torn Norwegian towns to tell the municipal authorities about the utopian plans for a future ideal society. Stratigakos calls this project a “Nazification” process and devotes the subsequent chapter to a case study of the model city, “New Trondheim”, which was to be the urban beacon of the visions for a Nazi German city in Norway. Stratigakos’ perspective is not directed towards the tensions which occurred between the ruling elites and the inhabitants of the occupied land, but rather towards the mindset of the rulers.

At the end, the author concludes with a rather short chapter on all the consequences of the Nazi German ideology and visions for Norway, namely “Ghosts in the Landscape”. Here one can see the presence, or rather the lack of cultural heritage, of the Nazi German strategies. Even though there were utopians envisioning a new Trondheim in the vicinity of today’s Trondheim, there is hardly any trace left in the landscape reminding us about the visions of Hitler’s men. Consequently, a follow-up to this book could expect to deal with the responses to these visions from the reluctant Norwegians.

So, what is gained with Stratigakos’ book? First, it gives new and necessary insights into the German ambitions for Norway. Through it, one finds ways into the mindset and ideology of the Nazi regime, and it is possible to compare the role of the occupation in the Norwegian territory with other parts of the world controlled by Nazi Germany. Then some other aspects of the Nazi regime become clear. The contributions Germany made to Norway were, for instance, higher than the exports from Norway to Germany. This aspect shows the extent to which the regime was patient with Norway, at least in the first period of the occupation. Although there were plans for autostradas in Norway, the road system was not at all modern after five years of occupation. However, the traces of an ambitious strategy for infrastructure building are still visible. The modernization of Norway started during the Nazi German regime and was to be increased further in the post-war period by other political strategists. In this aspect, Stratigakos shows us that some of the visions of the Nazi regime were indeed common goals connected with nation state–building and economic modernization. So what, then, is “Nazification”, and what is “modernization”? After some years in Norway the Nazi regime realized that the war was about to be lost, and the visions for a Nazi showcase in Norway were to be forsaken. Hence Stratigakos’ book is a solid reminder of what could have been but was not. The reason was that all resources were put into the project of losing “a Total War”.

Prof. Steinar Aas, Dr. Artium
Nord university, Bodø, Norway
ORCID iD: 0000-0002-4359-9098


Urban morphology is a relatively new field of science. Traditionally it is traced back to the “British” school of M.R.G. Conzen and J.W.R. Whitehand; and to the “Italian” school of Gianfranco Caniggia and Gian Luigi Maffei. The former is rooted more in geography, the latter in architecture. In particular, three relatively recent (hand)books mark the emergence of urban morphology as a “self-standing” science: the book Urban Morphology: An Introduction to the Study of the Physical Form of Cities by Vítor Oliveira (Springer, 2016), The Handbook of Urban Morphology by Karl Kropf (Wiley, 2017),
and, in a special Central European context, 
the book *Towns in Austria-Hungary: Urban 
Tissue Typology and Urban Typology 1867– 
1918* by Éva Lovra (Terc, 2019).

As the book *The Mathematics of 
Urban Morphology* also testifies, urban 
morphology is currently a flourishing field 
at the cross-section of several disciplines: 
geography, architecture and urban planning, 
mathematics, engineering, statistics, and 
sociology. The leading idea of this book 
containing around 30 studies from different 
fields is what Michael Batty of the University 
College of London (the author of the foreword 
of the volume) refers to as “The New Science 
of Cities” in his 2013 book with the same title.

Although cities admittedly have physical 
form (the much-discussed “urban form”), it is 
ot easy to grasp, scrutinize, and discuss it 
in an objective, formalized, empirically tested 
and comparable (reproducible) way. Another 
aspect is the connection between the physical 
form of the cities and the social aspects, 
including the “quality” of urban space (the 
“image of a city”) that is hard to either 
quantify or describe. Nowadays significantly 
more data are available than any time before 
in history: this is what is often referred to 
as Big Data, which means a big opportunity 
if we know how to mine it. Meanwhile, it is 
important to avoid an excess of formalization 
and at the same time to be consistent with 
the conceptual rigour of mathematics, to 
paraphrase Bellomo and Terna from the book.

The studies in the volume are grouped 
into six main chapters: Fractals, Cellular 
Automata, Spatial Networks and Space 
Syntax, Complexity, Other Forms of 
Quantification, and Humanistic and 
Multidisciplinary Commentaries. These main 
chapters describe, more or less, the different 
approaches to the topics discussed above. 
Besides the above, the studies can be grouped 
in another way too, like this: introductions 
and discussions of an already established field 
and method (e.g., space syntax), discussions 
of new methods and case studies regarding 
their application, self-standing case studies, 
essay-like theoretical remarks, and (edited) 
republishing of earlier important writings.

The book can be read in several ways. It 
can be seen as a summary of the recent results 
and aspirations in this interdisciplinary field. 
It can foster new thoughts, considerations 
and research projects. And last, but not 
least, it can be used as a handbook. Several 
methods of study are rigorously described, so 
they can be repeated on other cities as well. 
Reproducibility and comparability are key 
factors in almost every study, as they are 
key concepts of the so-called hard sciences 
too. Several authors (alone or as members of 
research groups) developed custom software 
for their methods, and these pieces of 
software are freely available for the scientific 
community.

Although the authors refer to their studies 
as “chapters”, and the grouping of the studies 
also suggests that the book is a coherence 
handbook, it is in fact a collection of loosely 
connected studies. This is not a problem at 
all; actually, it underlines the fact that this 
field is extremely vivid and there is a place 
for multiple ideas and methods. Together 
with all this, a short editorial would have 
been advisable, discussing the circumstances 
of birth, the purpose, and the editorial 
principles/decisions of the volume. A short 
introduction describing the background of 
the authors would also have been advisable. 
The book informs the reader only about 
their affiliations, and nothing about their 
professions, expertise, ages, etc. In a new 
and interdisciplinary field, these data are of 
particular interest, and not only for the less 
informed readers.

The last chapter – written by Michael 
P. Conzen – can be seen as some kind 
of summary. The renowned professor of 
geography has a very promising proposal. 
He issues “a challenge for a grand test of all 
major conceptual and analytic approaches in 
urban morphology to be applied in a flexibly 
designed project focused on a single city”. 
I have no information on whether this grand 
test has started or not, but I am sure that 
my lab colleagues and I would take great 
pleasure in joining it.

Quoting the editor Luca D’Acci from the 
introductory study of the book, “quantification 
and mathematical modelling are means 
enabling us to discover partially predictable 
macro paths of our behaviours otherwise 
unreadable. Even if not deterministic, some 
trajectories are more probable than others. The 
mathematical language helps both in seeing 
these trajectories and in quantifying these 
probabilities.” This is a clearly formulated
and welcome goal of the new science of cities, discussed in this book too.

Dr. Zoltán Bereczki
University of Debrecen, Hungary
City Science Research Lab
ORCID iD: 0000-0003-0707-1621


Urban history is one of the fields of historical science that is currently developing very rapidly. Behind this development is the effort to understand the development of the city again. It is also an attempt to take urban development back into one’s own hands. This must be preceded by an understanding of the current development of urban areas, because otherwise their further development would be only random and would not be based on scientific knowledge. Due to this, the interest not only of the lay community, but especially the scientific community in the historical development of cities and metropolises has recently been growing rapidly. Urban history is thus experiencing a boom, and therefore blank points in the history of our cities are gradually being filled.

Until now, Bratislava, the capital of the Slovak Republic, has been one such place with huge gaps in its known history. Although the historiography of Slovakia is recorded by a respectable number of historical works, the history of its capital has been processed little in terms of scientific approach. Research dealing with the development of the whole city and attempting to cover its entirety, considering the historical development and especially the planned regulation as a connecting element of the whole development, has been significantly missing so far.

The authors reference the so-called hybrid research method in the introduction to the book. They tried to connect the methods of architectonic, urbanistic and historical qualitative research and confront them with the visualization of individual planned interventions, based on previous investigation.

The mentioned methodological approach to the research could be compared mainly with the general attitude to urban history. It is often either purely chronological or local research, either in a topographical or temporal sense. The link between historical development with architectural and administrative development in the sense of their mutual connection is often not to be found.

Based on an extensively described historical development, a large number of case studies are prepared. They describe the development of either local parts of the city or urban ideas about modernization. The book is similarly structured according to this scheme. Leaving aside the obligatory introduction and the final technical part with appendices, the book is divided into three primary parts – the timeline, the historical development of the city and the typology of urban situations.

The first, shortest, part is a keyword-based list of historical developments to help the reader to orientate themselves on the topic. The timeline is multidimensional; in addition to “classic” historical events, there are also “specific” data that can be easily compared with other aspects – in this case, urban planning, the city and society, and industrial development.

The second part is a historiographical description of the chronological development of the city. It consists of a brief presentation of a large number of unrealized plans for modernization and reconstruction of the city. After an introductory summary of the development of the city in pre-modern times, the chapter focuses mainly on the modern period and the analysis of the plans that were created for Bratislava. In addition to the chronological categorization of the plans, proposals are also categorized locally and thematically, i.e., according to areas, or whether they were created for a specifically focused area or period. According to the conclusions of this research, Bratislava
developed organically, without much use of urban planning.

The third part is the most comprehensive one. It is basically a series of thematic probes that discuss the individual examples in depth. The probed examples are chosen to cover the development of the city either in specific cases or from a general point of view. In addition to the specific area of the Castle, main street or City Centre, it is the idea of an inner ring road, or an effort to develop affordable housing. In the previous chapter, the development of the city was outlined rather in general and without a more detailed insight. Here, a closer debate between the city and the actors influencing the development planning is compared. At the same time, current urban theses are applied. It is interesting to compare the past to the present state, as it is presented here. It is thus possible to parallel the continuous development of the place with regard to the current situation.

The authors used a wide source base for their publication. When describing the methodology, the authors mentioned one main obstacle. It is the impossibility of using the entire preserved archival material as it is in an uncatalogued state and thus inaccessible. Unfortunately, this kind of obstruction generally hampers any historical research. Nevertheless, this shortcoming is not to be remarked upon in the presented work. It was possible due to the broad usage of the contemporary professional discussion, published in the original architectural periodicals. It is important to mention this, because this kind of resource allows us to fill the gaps created by the impossibility of using the entire source base. Contemporary methodology, whether historiographical or urban, often omits this source. Indeed, it is an invaluable source of information for the analysis of modern urban development, sadly not used enough.

However, it is possible to make several criticisms of the publication. The first is its strong grounding in paradigms expressed by the architect and urban planner Ignasi de Solá-Morales. The team of authors admits their approaches for those paradigms in the introduction to the work. Nevertheless, it is unclear whether the authors wanted a wider comparative approach to the topic or to base the whole research on the paradigms that de Solá-Morales had formulated.

The second is that there is no wider comparison with cities that are close to Bratislava in terms of development and geography. For example, research by Klára Brůhová focused on the same topic in the case of the city of Prague, published as Praha nepostavená. Vltavské břehy jako urbanistické téma moderní metropole (Prague, 2017) or Pražské vize. Fantastické stavby, které nikdy nevznikly (Prague, 2018). Other research focusing on the city of Vienna, conducted by a team of authors, was published as Wasser Stadt Wien-Eine Umweltgeschichte (Vienna, 2019). The topic is distinctive in this case, but the methodology is remarkably similar. The history of the progression of the city was described according to the evolution of its specific parts and a conclusion was projected as to why the metropolis developed into its current shape.

The third complaint points more to the technical processing of the whole book. Although the visual form of the work is interesting and unique in the production of historical literature, it is not completely ideal for work with the text and illustrations especially. Some visualizations are hard to put into context and their descriptions are confusing. Some topographical plans were published in a much smaller view than would be needed for good clarity. This could be understood if the plans were taken from newspapers, where the quality of the illustrations is not high, but not in the case of newly scanned archival plans or in the newly created visualizations of modern regulations.

Despite these remarks, it is appropriate to highlight the presented publication for its innovative approach to a multidisciplinary research approach, the width of archival research and the effort to present the development of the city in its entirety. The published book must be marked as excellent research and an essential historical work. Bratislava has finally become one of the metropolises whose modern urban development has been successfully processed.

PhDr. Kryštof Drnek, PhD.
Archiv pražských vodovodů a kanalizací,
Praha, Czech Republic
ORCID iD: 0000-0003-2691-5180
In the last few years, several works related to the history of the Jewish community in a local perspective have been published. These publications aim to provide the professional and lay public with information explaining the importance and influence of the Jewish communities in Slovak towns. In addition, they do not bypass the fates of particular people. The monographs that map the history of the Jewish community in the local context include Eduard Nižňanský’s books *The History of the Jewish Community in Zvolen* and *The History of the Jewish Community in Banská Bystrica*. The co-author of the latter is Michala Lônčiková. The author’s long-term research interest is the Jewish communities in Slovakia.

The book *A History of The Jewish Community in Zvolen* is richly structured. In nine chapters, Eduard Nižňanský maps the fate of Jews in the town from the Middle Ages until the present. The core of the work covers the events related to the policy of the authoritative regime of the Slovak Republic in 1939–1945. The author’s attention is focused on the antisemitism and the state anti-Jewish policy. The fate of Jews is described chronologically. First, the author recounts persecutions, victimization and Aryanization. He also maps the revocation of Jewish business licences and last but not least, the deportation of Jews to the concentration camps. He monitors the given phenomena against the background of the adoption of anti-Jewish legislation, which limited the living conditions of Jews throughout Slovakia in the period 1939–1945. At the same time, the author doesn’t forget to demonstrate the local specifics, the initiative “from below” and the servility of local officers. He also points out the specific destinies of Jewish citizens, gives specific names and thus helps the readers to break away from the vague destinies and numbers, and abstract figures. But several topics remain open. For example, in the case of the parts concerning the administration of Jewish house property or interventions in land ownership, a more detailed analysis at the city level is lacking. On the other hand, since the work has a synthetic rather than an analytical character, this is acceptable. It is a pity that the work does not contain a conclusion with the author’s summarization of the findings. However, in the last chapter (which can be considered a kind of epilogue), the author sympathetically deals with the current Jewish community in the city, which was not fully restored until after 1989. There is no doubt about the author’s erudition; the work uses a rich collection of archival material, including newspapers, as well as extensive secondary literature. The contribution of the publication lies mainly in a summary of the most important facts and events in the life of the community, which was an integral part of the city’s colour before World War II.

The Monograph *A History of The Jewish Community in Banská Bystrica* by Eduard Nižňanský and Michala Lônčiková has a very similar structure to the previous publication devoted to Zvolen. In twelve chapters, the authors follow the life of the Jewish community in the town, also starting from the Middle Ages. The core of the work is dedicated to the period of the war years: 1939–1945. In chronological order, they describe the first anti-Jewish measures, the exclusion of Jews from public life, persecution, Aryanization and finally the deportations themselves in the town. In comparison with the book dedicated to Zvolen, this work is more extensive and deals with several phenomena in more detail. This is probably due to the richer archival material that has been preserved in the case of Banská Bystrica. The part on Aryanization can be highlighted in particular. For example, the authors pay attention to the aspect of the insufficient expertise of the arizators, and they also mention Aryanization by prominent residents of the city. Several topics, such as the administration of Jewish movable
and immovable property, are elaborated more rigorously than in the case of the city of Zvolen. The preparation of transports to concentration camps and their course is also described in detail. I also appreciate the fact that the fates of individual people are presented, as this helps to better understand the horrors of anti-Jewish policy. In the last chapter, one can find a summary of the life of the Jews in the city after World War II, especially after 1989. Also in this case, it acts as an epilogue. The work is followed by rich pictorial material, and there are also appendices devoted to the list of Aryanized businesses and list of Jewish household property. Unfortunately, the authors omitted a conclusion summarizing their findings based on the rich archival research. The list of sources used is documented at the end of the publication. Like the previous book, one can speak of a compact whole – a text that is mainly synthesizing.

Mgr. Patrícia Fogelová, PhD.
Slovak Academy of Sciences, Košice,
Slovak Republic
ORCID iD: 0000-0001-8348-3105
Reports
The founding of the University of Košice in 1657 represents a significant event in the history of university education in Hungary and in the history of the city of Košice. Although this university operated in Košice for a little over a century and, after the abolition of the Jesuit order that administered the university, was replaced by other academic institutions, the university tradition in Košice did not disappear and its manifestations can be traced back to the present Pavol Jozef Šafárik University. A lot of archival material comes from the activities of individual university and academic institutions in Košice, which does not form one unified collection, but is scattered throughout a number of archives in Slovakia and abroad. The effect of recent interest in a scholarly completion of university history and its sources on the activity of individual academic work sites led to the submission and subsequent implementation of a grant project at the Department of History of the UPJŠ Faculty of Arts within the internal university grant scheme of goal-oriented research (VVGS – PCOV) with the onset of solutions from 1 July 2019. The main goal of the project was to plan and implement a comprehensive archival survey of all available sources on the history of university education in Košice from the years 1657 to 1922 in archives in the territory of Slovakia and abroad. After reviewing the archives, the creation of an information database of sources with information on their storage and availability would lead to a subsequent digitalization and the creation of a digital archive. Some of the goals of the project included establishing cooperation with foreign work sites engaged in research into university history, methods of digitalizing sources and submitting another project on the topic of university education in an external grant scheme. The implementation of these goals has been significantly complicated by the COVID-19 pandemic, which has made it impossible to carry out archival research in foreign archives and postponed the project completion date to the end of October 2020.

During the project, an archival survey was implemented in the following institutions: Slovenský národný archív v Bratislave [Slovak National Archive in Bratislava], Štátny archív v Košiciach [State Archive in Košice], Archív mesta Košice [Košice City Archives], Arcidiecézny archív v Košiciach [Archdiocesan Archive in Košice] and in Východoslovenské múzeum v Košiciach [East Slovak Museum in Košice]. Research on sources stored in the Hungarian National Archives [Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár], in particular, those regarding the Jesuit period in university history, failed to be implemented; however, we drew on previous research by members of the Department of History of the Faculty of Arts, UPJŠ (Peter Fedorčák). Based on the archives, we verified that the state of the sources’ preservation is good and that they are available for the implementation of further research and preparation for digitalization. The disadvantage in further processing these sources is the fact that only one of the archival collections mentioned has an inventory.

Within the framework of our archival research, we also focused our attention on individual types of sources on the history of university education. Among those most researched are those belonging to university registries. They provide information about students and teachers working at the university and data from them appear in a number of works devoted to the

2 The University of Košice (Universitas Cassoviensis), founded by the Bishop of Eger B. Kisdy in 1657 and administered by the Jesuits, operated until 1773, at which time the Jesuit order was abolished. After this milestone, it was transformed into the Episcopal University (Universitas Cassoviensis Episcopalis), which lasted until 1777 and subsequently became the Royal Academy (Regia Academia). After the reform of education in 1850, the Academy of Law, which ceased to exist in 1922, was established.
3 Slovenský národný archív [Slovak National Archive] (hereinafter SNA), Kráľovská právnická akadémia v Košiciach (1777–1922) [Royal Academy of Law in Košice (1777–1922)].
4 Archív mesta Košice [City Archive of Košice] (hereinafter AMK), Košická univerzita (1693–1862) [University of Košice (1693–1862)], Catalogus studiosorum almae ac episcopalis academiae Cassoviensis I., II.
history of university education in Košice.\textsuperscript{5} In addition to university registries, the individual collections also contain record sheets for students and teachers, including classification sheets for individual semesters of teaching.\textsuperscript{6} A specific type of record book is the member book of the Marian Congregation at the University of Košice and the Royal Academy.\textsuperscript{7} Besides their informational value, they also attract attention with their graphics and the depictions of the coats of arms of members and supporters of the congregation, testifying to the representative purpose of this source.

The group of diplomatic sources is relatively large; deeds, mandates, intimates and programmes occur in practically all the collections examined during the period under research. Within the framework of this group, the foundation documents of the university hold a special status within the Hungarian National Archive, relative to those of other academic institutions that are also held there.\textsuperscript{8} As the University of Košice was founded by the Eger bishop and was administered by the Jesuit order, the collections examined include extensive official correspondence between church officials (bishop and chapter) and university dignitaries.\textsuperscript{9} Other types of preserved sources include documents related to the organization and internal affairs of the academy: minutes of faculty meetings, school regulations, final reports, certificates and scholarship documents.\textsuperscript{10} A quantitatively extensive agenda is represented by accounts and account ledgers.\textsuperscript{11} Some of the documents of the university library – protocols, catalogues and accounts – have also been preserved in the State archive in Košice.\textsuperscript{12} Books belonging to the university library are currently stored in Štátna vedecká knižnica v Košiciach [the State Scientific Library in Košice].

Narrative sources have an indispensable place in the research of university history. There are several sources of narrative character in the archives examined; perhaps the most famous are the Annales Universitatis Superioris Hungariae Regiae nunc Academiae Cassoviensis, whose author was J. Plath.\textsuperscript{13}

A variety of methods and procedures were used during the implementation of the project. As part of the application of historical method, heuristics of sources and scientific literature on the history of university education were undertaken. Subsequently, an archival survey was carried out, which critically evaluated the condition of the sources, their preservation and the possibilities of their use in the creation of the Historical Digital Archive (HiDA) and the research into university history. At the same time, an inventory of sources that were in the individual archives was prepared. Based on the archival survey, a proposal for the structure of HiDA was prepared, which respects the principle of provenance and the current storage of documents in archives.


\textsuperscript{6} For example: Arcidiecézny archív v Košiciach [Archdiocesan Archive in Košice] (hereinafter AAK), Košické biskupstvo [The Bishopric of Košice], records of professors and students from 1775–1776 or classification sheets from 1825–1829.


\textsuperscript{8} For example, the founding charter of the university issued by B. Kisdy can be found in the Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár, Országos Levéltára (MNL OL), fasc. 1, fol. 15, microfilm 14406.

\textsuperscript{9} AMK, Jágerská kapitula v Košiciach [The Eger Chapter in Košice (1664–1700)] [The Eger Chapter in Košice (1664–1700)].

\textsuperscript{10} SNA, Kráľovská právnická akadémia v Košiciach [The Royal Academy of Law (1783–1913)].

\textsuperscript{11} Štátny archív v Košiciach [State Archive in Košice] (hereinafter ŠÁ KE), Kráľovská právnická akadémia v Košiciach [The Royal Academy of Law (1783–1913)].

\textsuperscript{12} ŠÁ KE, Kráľovská právnická akadémia v Košiciach (1783–1913).
Although, due to the pandemic, it was not possible to meet all the objectives of the project as expected, we can state that a substantial part of the planned output has been achieved. We consider the most important result of the project solution to be the archival research carried out in the archives in Slovakia, which represents the initial phase of research into university history and at the same time enables the preparation of the digitalization of sources intended for HiDA. Another output of the project is the design of the basic structure of the digital archive. Its main objective is to create a digital repository of sources on the history of UPJŠ and university and academic institutions, which we can consider as its historical predecessors. Sources for the history of these institutions can be divided into written (archival documents), material and pictorial. The goal of HiDA is to create digitalizations of all relevant sources on university history with metadata that will enable their use in historical research. The bulk of sources for the history of the university are the written sources that have been the subject of the current project and will be digitalized in the first instance.

![HiDA – Basic Chart](image)

**Table 1: HiDA – archives and archival collections in the Slovak Republic**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HiDA SR</th>
<th>Archives</th>
<th>Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slovenský národný archív</td>
<td>Královská právnická akadémia v Košiciach (1777–1922)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Štátny archív v Košiciach</td>
<td>Královská právnická akadémia v Košiciach (1783–1913)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archív mesta Košice</td>
<td>Jágerská kapitula v Košiciach (1664–1700), Košická univerzita (1693–1862)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arcidiecézny archív v Košiciach</td>
<td>Košické biskupstvo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archív Univerzity Komenského</td>
<td>Maďarská právnická akadémia v Košiciach (1923–1933)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archív Prešovskéj univerzity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Registratúrne stredisko UPJŠ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Besides archives in the Slovak Republic, documents on the history of the university in Košice can be found mainly in Hungarian archives. The older period, covering the activity of the University of Košice (from 1657 to 1773/1777) is recorded by sources stored in the Magyar Nemzeti
Levétár [Hungarian National Archives], in the collections of the Districtum Cassoviensis, Acta Jesuitica Collegii Cassoviensis and Szepesi Kamarai Levétár – some thousand individual items. Prospectively, after an improvement in the epidemiological situation, we assume the implementation of an archive survey in Egri Főegyházmegyei Levétár [the Archives of the Diocese of Eger].

Table 2: Archives and archive collections in Hungary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HiDA HU</th>
<th>Archives</th>
<th>Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Magyar Nemzeti Levétár</td>
<td>Districtum Cassoviensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Szepesi Kamarai Levétár</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Egri Főegyházmegyei Levétár</td>
<td>Archivum vetus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research into sources on university history in Košice in other foreign archives has yet to be undertaken. We assume that valuable sources could be found in Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, Haus-, Hof und Staatsarchiv [the Austrian State Archives], in Archivum Provinciae Austriae SJ [the Archives of the Austrian province of the Society of Jesus], in the Vatican archives and in Archivum Romanum Societatis Jesu [Roman archives of the Society of Jesus]. Since archival research in these archives could not be undertaken at this time, we can only count on the digitalization of these sources at a later stage in the creation of HiDA.

Besides gaining evidence from archival sources, we have recorded the existence of written sources on university history held in libraries. These are the library collections of Budapesti Egyetemi Könyvtár [ELTE University Library], Országos Széchényi Könyvtár [National Széchényi Library] and Österreichische Nationalbibliothek [the Austrian National Library]. With regard to this type of source, we are counting on the digitalization of those documents that are of particular importance for research into university history.

Besides written sources, we have recorded other types of sources that are part of museum collections, archival collections or located in the field. These are pictorial sources (photographs, plans and maps), material sources (insignia and objects associated with university education), epigraphic sources (inscriptions and tombstones), sapphirest and heraldic sources (respectively seals and coats of arms). The inclusion of these sources in HiDA will enable research into university history by interdisciplinary methods. Research into them is planned within the project VVGS-2020-1661, which seamlessly follows up on the goals and outputs of our recently completed project.

Digitalization of sources and metadata creation is the main phase of HiDA creation. It will be preceded by a proposal for the technical solution of the digital archive, which will take place in cooperation with the UPJŠ Centre for Information and Communication Technologies. At the same time, legislative conditions will be defined and contracts with individual institutions will be concluded in accordance with applicable laws. In this area, the methodological instruction of the Department of Archives of the Public Administration Section of the Ministry of the Interior from 2011 on the procedure of state archives in digitalization, and the European Commission’s recommendations concerning the digitalization of cultural material, its online availability and digital preservation, are crucial. From the point of view of the time schedule

and the sequence of digitalization, we assume that sources from institutions in the territory of the Slovak Republic will be digitized first; secondly, after agreement of conditions, sources from Hungarian archives and memorial institutions. In the later stages of HiDA’s creation, we assume the inclusion of sources from other foreign institutions.

Besides the defined goals and outputs of the project, its researchers participated in a media presentation of university history research during the European Cultural Heritage Day event (21 September 2020). It was a series of professional lectures devoted to various topics, including the founding of the University of Košice, sources for university history, university education in the second half of the twentieth century, university buildings, and the division of UPJŠ in 1997. The lively discussion that followed the series of lectures testifies to the fact that these topics also resonated among the listeners and memorials of recent events from the history of UPJŠ. The event included an exhibition of historical photographs of university buildings from the collections of the East Slovak Museum. A further media output concerning the results of the project was the presentation of the finding of the seal of the Royal Academy from 1791. Although it is still a unique finding without the context of the sphragistic development of the seal symbols of individual university (academic) institutions, it expresses the current intention of the UPJŠ leadership to actively learn about the history, traditions and symbols of university education in Košice. Part of this plan is the currently completed project, as well as its continuation focused on other types of sources on the history of UPJŠ and its historical predecessors.

Translated by James S. Smith

Mgr. Mária Fedorčáková, PhD.
Pavol Jozef Šafárik University in Košice, Slovak Republic
Chronicle
On 18 and 19 November 2020, the tenth year of the Meeting of Young Historians conference was organized by the Department of History of the Faculty of Arts of UPJŠ in Košice in cooperation with the Slovak Historical Society. The theme of this jubilee conference was “Borders in Space and Time”, not only because the issue of borders is still more than current, but in 2020 we also commemorated the 100th anniversary of the signing of the Treaty of Trianon, the content of which, among other things, declared the borders of the newly formed Czechoslovak Republic. The interdisciplinary nature of the issue of borders was also reflected in the composition of the event participants – in addition to doctoral students in the field of history, doctoral students from the Faculty of Political Science and International Relations of MBU in Banská Bystrica and the Department of Ethnology and Non-European Studies of the Faculty of Arts of UCM in Trnava also applied. As the borders are also closely connected with geography, RNDr. Stela Csachová, PhD from the Institute of Geography of the Faculty of Science of UPJŠ in Košice took care of the expert commentary for one section of the event.

The conference has a firm place in the annual program of the Department of History, but due to ongoing anti-pandemic measures, it was necessary to move it to an online space this year. The conference was held through a web conference system and was also streamed through the Facebook page of the Department of History.

The opening of the conference took place on Wednesday, 18 November, with a speech by the main organizers, Mgr. Dana Kušnírová and Mgr. Peter Pavonič, who welcomed all active and passive participants of the event. The introductory word was provided by prof. PaedDr. Štefan Šutaj, DrSc., who was present at the inaugural Meeting of Young Historians, and in this tenth year he provided an expert commentary on the contributions from the first section of the conference.

Mgr. Michal Petríček (Institute of History, Trnava University in Trnava) made the first contribution – entitled Monetary Reform in Czechoslovakia in the International Context – in which he compared the monetary reform in Czechoslovakia in 1919 with the monetary reforms of other successor states, such as Hungary and Romania. He came to the conclusion that Czechoslovakia was able to cope best with this situation. The second speaker was Mgr. Adam Bielesz (Institute of History, Trnava University in Trnava) with a paper Establishment of the Protection Zone in Slovakia. In it, he focused on several areas that were affected by the establishment of the Protection Zone during the existence of the Slovak state – the army, police forces of the state, but also the daily life of the civilian population. The third was the presentation Historical Development of the Borders of the Republic of Poland by Mgr. Marianna Kmeťová (Faculty of Political Science and International Relations, MBU in Banská Bystrica). In her contribution, she presented the changes in Poland’s borders during its three partitions in the eighteenth century and the later fourth partition of Poland during World War II.

The first section was closed by the contribution of Mgr. Dana Kušnírová (Department of History, Faculty of Arts, UPJŠ in Košice) entitled Changes in the Borders of the City of Košice in the years 1945–1989. As the name suggests, in her presentation the author mapped the development of the borders of the city of Košice after 1945. During the reign of the Communist Party, the city grew several times, which was the result of industrialization in three phases – first to the west, later to the adjacent villages and finally to the east. In her presentation, the author also reflected the changes in the structure of the city that occurred as a result of the aforementioned industrialization in Košice. At the end of the first part, we listened to the expert commentary of prof. PaedDr. Štefan Šutaj, DrSc. of the Department of History of the Faculty of Arts of UPJŠ in Košice and guests’ questions were also taken.

After a short break, the second section of the conference followed, consisting of two presentations. Mgr. Jan Hrčan (Department of History, Faculty of Arts, MBU in Banská Bystrica) was the first to speak, with his contribution, Idea, Title, Concept and Borders of Vojvodina. The territory of Vojvodina in the north of Serbia is characterized by its diverse
national character, which was of course reflected in the presented article. The author introduced us to the historical development of the borders of Vojvodina from the middle of the nineteenth century until the establishment of the current form of Vojvodina in 1945. Mgr. Denisa Augustinová (Faculty of Political Science and International Relations, MBU in Banská Bystrica) made a presentation entitled *Argentina and its Borders*, in which she briefly introduced us to the geography of Argentina, and then she moved on to the historical milestones that affected its borders. The professional guarantor of the section that focused mainly on the geographical appearance of the borders was RNDr. Stela Csachová, Ph.D. from the Institute of Geography of the Faculty of Science of UPJŠ in Košice. After her comments, there was a space for discussion, questions for the speakers and also constructive criticism.

The final section of the first day of the conference was devoted to a paper focused on social and thinking boundaries. One of the most anticipated contributions of the conference was clearly the contribution *Sexual Renunciation as a Boundary between the Spiritual and the Secular in the Christian Tradition* by Mgr. Martin Vincurský (Department of History, Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University in Brno), which opened this section. In the presentation, the author addressed the issue of sexuality and related celibacy – as it was understood not only in the times of the creation of the New Testament, but also in the recent past, which is related to the fact that in the early days of Christianity, its ideology was interpreted differently. The second article was entitled *Borders and Imagination: Reflections on the Penetration of New Thought Concepts into Social Thought at the Turn of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries on the Example of Slovak Nationalist Discourse*, by Mgr. Blažena Krížová (Department of Slovak History, Faculty of Arts, Comenius University in Bratislava). The article dealt with the so-called bordering, and analysed the process of mental demarcation in the Slovak national emancipation movement. The author relied mainly on research conducted on the periodical press, on the basis of which she presented the conflict between the intellectuals grouped around the magazine Hlas and the conservative intellectual elite at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

The third contribution of this section – and the second contribution devoted to the city of Košice – was taken care of by Mgr. Katarína Hromuľáková (Department of History, Faculty of Arts, UPJŠ in Košice). The aspect of borders in her presentation *On the Border of Poverty: Unemployment in Košice in the years 1930–1938* is the concept of centre–periphery, which plays an important role in the paper. The author introduced us to what the care for the poor and unemployed looked like in Košice, and analyses the shortcomings of this assistance in the 1930s, which is paradoxically perceived as the golden age of the Czechoslovak Republic. Apart from the fact that Košice in the 1930s became the intellectual, cultural and tourist centre of the eastern part of the republic, the city had to take care of a large number of unemployed and poor people, who were concentrated mainly in the peripheral areas of the city.

The last contribution of the third section was *Communism between Political Ideology and Religion* by Mgr. Peter Pavonič (Department of History, Faculty of Arts, UPJŠ in Košice), who focused on the perception of communism throughout history – while in the nineteenth century it was not understood to be other than (political) ideology, today communism can be defined as an alternative religion. The professional commentator of this section was Mgr. Mikuláš Jančura, PhD, from the Department of History of the Faculty of Arts of UPJŠ in Košice. After his comments on the presented papers, there was a space for discussion, which closed the first day of the conference Meeting of Young Historians X.

On Thursday morning, the conference continued with the fourth section, which was dedicated to education. The first to speak was Mgr. Miriama Filčáková (Department of History, Faculty of Arts, UPJŠ in Košice) with her presentation *The Development of Higher Education in the Context of World Bipolarity*. In her presentation, she focused on the development of higher education during the Cold War, emphasizing the models adopted by Eastern and Western European universities, and analysing the similarities and differences in the adopted reforms. The second presenter was Mgr. Anna Lomen (Department of General History, Faculty of Arts, Comenius University in Bratislava) with the contribution *Borders as a Social Construct – the Case of Yugoslav and Serbian National Identity in History Textbooks against*
the Background of State Disintegration. The presentation focused on how the current political situation has affected the terms “we” and “the others” in Serbian history textbooks for the eighth grade. The professional guarantor of the section was doc. PhDr. Slávka Otčenášová, PhD from the Department of History of the Faculty of Arts of UPJŠ in Košice.

The last section of the conference was opened with the presentation of Mgr. Ludmila Luňáková (Department of History, Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University in Brno/The Institute of History, Czech Academy of Sciences), which was one of the few to deal with older history. Thanks to the article Meetings at the Borders. Negotiations between Czech princes and the Piasts and Arpads the participants at the conference learned that these medieval rulers chose border territories as their meeting places, preferably “no man’s lands”. The author also focused on finding an answer to the question of where “campus Lucsko”, a place where the Czech prince and the king of Hungary signed an armistice, is located. The second speaker in this section was Mgr. Michal Celnar (Department of Archiving and Auxiliary Sciences in History, Faculty of Arts, Comenius University in Bratislava) with his presentation Borders and Borderlands in the Context of the Ottoman-Hungarian Wars of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. In the presentation, he focused on an extremely interesting period of Ottoman expansion and tried to analyse the border area, which was the site of frequent military clashes, as well as peace negotiations, and emphasized the impact of this situation on the local population.

The third presenter was Mgr. Pavol Krajčovič (Department of Ethnology and Non-European Studies, Faculty of Arts, UCM in Trnava), who in his contribution, Malé Karpaty and Považský Inovec as a living space of German-speaking woodcutters – Huncokars, introduced an interesting and non-traditional topic dedicated to German mountain woodcutters who lived in the Malé Karpaty and Považský Inovec from the eighteenth century until the middle of the twentieth century. The author described their settlements, customs and traditions, but also the daily life of the Huncokars and their isolation from the rest of the population, which led to a mutual lack of knowledge, with each side associating the other with various stereotypes. The fifth section and at the same time the whole conference was closed by Mgr. Oliver Zajac (Historical Institute of the Slovak Academy of Sciences in Bratislava) with a paper entitled Natural Borders, Historical Borders, Political Borders: A Discourse on the Future Form and Nature of Independent Poland in the Conditions of the Great Emigration until 1861. The author focused on the analysis of the concepts of the future Poland, as presented by the representatives of Polish exile during the nineteenth century. An expert commentary on this section was given by Mgr. Patrik Kunec, PhD from the Department of History of the Faculty of Arts of MBU in Banská Bystrica, and this was followed by a final discussion.

Despite the lack of direct contact between active and passive participants of the event due to the virtual form of the conference, the jubilee tenth year of the Meeting of Young Historians conference received positive responses. It was attended by 16 participants from Slovakia and the Czech Republic. Several guests highlighted the qualitative level of contributions; a characteristic feature of the conference is traditionally high-quality professional commentary by scientists from various institutions. A collection of papers from the tenth year of the conference has been published and the eleventh year of the Meeting of Young Historians, which will take place in October 2021, is currently being prepared.

Mgr. Peter Pavonič
Pavel Jozef Šafárik University in Košice, Slovak Republic
On 21 April 2021, an online meeting of the Czech-Slovak Commission of Historians took place, this time under the organization of the Department of History of the Faculty of Arts, UPJŠ and the State Archive in Košice. The event, entitled History in the Digital Era, was intended primarily for the addressed experts, members of the Czech-Slovak Commission of Historians and employees of organizing institutions. All participants in this workshop presented their research with an emphasis on the objectives and methodology with regard to the central theme of the meeting. The meeting was opened by Martin Pekár (Faculty of Arts, Pavol Jozef Šafárik University of Košice), who justified the symbolic form of the conference on the MS Teams application due to the still persistent pandemic situation. Historians Ján Rychlík (Institute of Czech History, Faculty of Arts, Charles University in Prague) and Roman Holec (Faculty of Arts, Comenius University in Bratislava/Institute of History of the Slovak Academy of Sciences) also opened the meeting with their speeches. While Ján Rychlík stated that the ongoing pandemic, which many did not expect in the twenty-first century, has made us operate even more within the online world, from which the humanities can certainly benefit, Holec emphasized the still burning and current issue of the slow progress of digitization in Slovakia. However, both have expressed ambivalence over the role that traditional archival research will play in the future.

The first professional entry into the topic, certainly interesting for researchers in the field of urban history, was the contribution of Juraj Šedivý (Faculty of Arts, Comenius University in Bratislava): Comprehensive Memory Portal PamMap.sk. Šedivý presented the online meta-archive project, which combines elements of e-archives, e-galleries, e-museums and e-libraries. At the same time as archival digitization, its goal is to make the history of Slovakia accessible through historical sources originating mainly from the territory of Slovakia. The portal, which is currently still a trial version, makes digitized historical sources on the history of cities available to both the professional and lay public. At present, the applicant can filter the sources to those regarding the cities Bratislava, Košice, Banská Bystrica and Turzovka, and the village of Lozorno. Šedivý also outlined the direction of the current research technique, which is increasingly moving into the online space, and which is also becoming a kind of common European standard. Nevertheless, in Slovakia it still finds its limits mainly in material and technical support and equipment, as well as in limited human resources.

A similar project is the Czech Historical Atlas portal, presented by Jiří Cajthaml, Tomáš Janata, Jiří Krejčí and Petra Jílková (Czech Technical University in Prague). It is an electronic map portal dedicated to Czech and Czechoslovak history in an international context based on modern cartography. The freely accessible portal consists of map files supplemented by text comments and images. Those interested have the opportunity to clearly filter the maps not only chronologically from the Middle Ages to the present, but also according to borders, regions, military conflicts, historical milestones or population structure. It is also possible to compare the maps on the portal.

Adam Górka (Faculty of Arts, Pavol Jozef Šafárik University in Košice) also gave an interdisciplinary presentation devoted to Historical Geography Information Systems (HGIS). This contribution was devoted to the understanding of morphological changes in post-socialist cities using digital spatial tools (using a case study of the city of Košice).

---

1 The presented portal is available at the web address www.pammap.sk.
In his presentation on the example of the city of Košice, Górka distinguished three levels of analysis consisting of the background context, the context of the whole city and the in-depth analysis of selected areas. In his research, the author used a wide range of researched sources, which included, for example, archival and digital maps, cadastral charts, archival planning documents, pictography, written documents and also fieldwork. The author’s greatest contribution is the digital maps of the city made by GIS, presenting the urban structure of the city before 1952, between 1952 and 1989 and after 1989. Górka also indicated that the greatest benefit of HGIS lies in a new perspective on historical research and interdisciplinary approaches. On the other hand, he mentioned that HGIS has limitations based on the characteristics of the tool and the sources.

Katarína Hromuľáková and Miriama Filčáková (FF UPJŠ) made a contribution in the field of history education in the digital era. The presentation focused on the current challenge in the form of digitization of education in Slovakia. The authors also pointed out the biggest problems and difficulties associated with the digital transformation of schools in Slovakia. One of the projects that is currently trying to relativize the problems caused by the low rate of digitization of Slovak schools is the IT Academy project – Education for the twenty-first century. The aim of the project is to create a model for the education and training of young people for the current and future needs of the knowledge society and the labour market, with a focus on informatics and ICT. The authors responded to this current didactic challenge by creating their own web portal, in preparation for the IT Academy project, in which they focused on the effort to develop research teaching in history. It is one of the constructivist-tuned teaching applications that focuses on the historical transformations of the city of Košice in time and space. The learning application City in the Changes of Time and Space is intended for the education of fifth grade elementary school students based on the thematic unit Humanity in the Changes of Time and Space (according to the Slovak curriculum). Through the analysis of historical sources (postcards), students gain an idea of the transformations of their city and personalities of regional as well as national history in time and space. Pupils learn to work with historical time and space, with historical facts, events and phenomena in the search for relevant information by verifying historical facts, all through interactive tasks.

In addition to the above-mentioned contributions, which dealt with the history of cities, there were also other stimulating presentations. Ján Hlavinka (Holocaust Documentation Center) gave a detailed presentation on the European Holocaust Research Infrastructure (EHRI) project, aimed primarily at connecting and creating a community of researchers and experts in the field of Holocaust research across different countries of the world. At the same time, EHRI offers access to a variety of Holocaust-related resources through the EHRI web domain. The final two contributions offered an insight into the digitization of archival documents in the Czech Republic and Slovakia. Eva Ptáčníková (Security Services Archive, Prague) introduced the E-research room application, which enables and facilitates access to archival documents of the Security Services Archive, which processes funds and collections from the security services of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and National Front organizations. Lucia Tokárová (State Archive in Košice) presented the Electronic Archive Information System, which is a central repository of electronic archival documents digitized for the needs of electronic research. Users of the Electronic Archive have the opportunity to search in individual collections and archival aids, as well as submit requests for access to archival documents.

---

3 More information about the project is available at www.itakademia.sk.
4 The learning figure is free available at www.dejinoviny.sk/mesto-v-premenach-casu/.
5 Visit portal at: https://portal.ehri-project.eu/.
6 E-research room is also available in English version at www.ebadatelna.cz
The addressed experts, as well as the invited guests and moderators of the meeting sections, led a constructive discussion on the future of history in the online space. All the mentioned articles will be subsequently published in the upcoming new format of the Czech-Slovak Historical Yearbook.
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