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This study investigates how the council of the Free City of Regensburg reacted to and tried to cope with the challenges posed by the so-called Town War (1387–1389) to everyday life in a late medieval city. One hundred and forty-one ordinances (Ratsverordnungen) issued by the Regensburg council between 1381 and 1389 are surveyed, investigating how the councillors sought to regulate human interaction in a city threatened by war, how they tried to implement their regulatory measures and which means they used to encourage the urban population to comply with their precepts. Furthermore, the study explores the Town War’s effects on the council’s standing and authority, and elucidates the delicate political negotiations necessary to legitimize the surveyed regulations. Overall, the paper sheds light on the Town War as a crisis during which governmental social control accelerated, thus contributing to long-term processes of late medieval Herrschaftsverdichtung.
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Introduction

Two years after Regensburg, the only Free City on Bavarian soil, had rejected an initial invitation to join the Swabian Town League in 1379, the councillors – faced with increasing pressure from the dukes of Bavaria, who threatened the city’s traditional independence from the House of Wittelsbach – decided to accept a renewed invitation and join the then rapidly growing League.1 With this act, Regensburg became part of an extensive system of alliances that, at the peak of its expansion, reached from the Rhine across Switzerland to Franconia and Bavaria, uniting more than 50 Imperial Cities, and – despite its name – a large number of South German nobles.2 After years of diplomatic manoeuvring, the disputes between the members of this alliance and their opponents from the high nobility eventually culminated in open hostilities, known as the “Town War” of 1387–1389.3 Unlike many of its allies, Regensburg was directly affected by the fighting: between September and November 1388, the Bavarian dukes’ armies laid

sieg to the city. On 13 November 1388 the defenders launched a successful attack on the enemy camp, gaining the League’s only significant open battle victory against the party of the princes and prompting the Wittelsbachs to lift the siege. However, the city had effectively been abandoned by its allies and had overexerted itself. On 4 May 1389 Regensburg officially withdrew from the Town League and concluded a peace agreement with the Wittelsbach dukes. With Nuremberg’s simultaneous withdrawal, this heralded the League’s ensuing political defeat in the so-called Cheb Landfrieden. Although Regensburg avoided any major destruction, the Town War scarred the city deeply, both politically and economically.

In this article I take the ordinances (Ratsverordnungen) enacted by the Regensburg council in the years before, during and immediately after the Town War to investigate how a late medieval German town council reacted to and tried to cope with a crisis by policing the everyday life of its subjects. I am not primarily interested here in the military dimension of the conflict, but rather in shedding light on one aspect of what has famously been called the late medieval Herrschaftsverdichtung, i.e. the tightening of the governmental grip on the population. As is well known, crises such as wars were essential in catalysing and accelerating these processes. Regensburg’s involvement in the Town War therefore offers a promising case study by which to shed light on one of the prominent drivers of Herrschaftsverdichtung – the gradual tightening of “social control” during the Late Middle Ages and the Early Modern Period. Here, this concept is understood as a complex, multidirectional process involving various actors from across urban society. However, the article’s main focus is on “governmental social control”, i.e. on the councillors’ ex officio attempts at controlling their subjects’ behaviour by issuing and implementing voluntaristic norms, which – from their point of view – aimed at preserving and improving the common weal. In what follows, I look at how exactly the Regensburg councillors sought to regulate human interaction in a city threatened by war, how they implemented these measures and which means they used to encourage the urban population to comply with their regulations. Furthermore, since control of this type naturally contributed to stabilizing the power of those exercising it, I also

4 ENGELKE, Regensburg, 125, based on BayHStA, Reichsstadt Regensburg Literalien, no. 371, fol. 92r–93r (edited in KURSCHEL, Stadtrechtsbuch, pp. 255–256, no. 249) and BayHStA, Reichsstadt Regensburg Literalien, no. 297, fol. 1r (edited in: ENGELKE, Stadtbuch, pp. 145–146, no. 6).
5 A portrayal of the battle in: GEMEINER, Chronik II, 252–253, based on BayHStA, Reichsstadt Regensburg Literalien, no. 371, fol. 92v–93r.
HARDY, Associative Culture, 194–196.
9 Cf. the seminal work by: MORAW, Von offener Verfassung.
10 The definition of “governmental social control” presented here is based on SCHWERHOFF, Zungen, 181. It differs from the somewhat narrower scholarly concept of “social disciplining”, insofar as I do not presume that the measures discussed in this article emanate from conscious long-term attempts by the Regensburg councillors at disciplining and educating their subjects. Instead, they are rather short-term reactions to the events of the war. On the various argumentative uses of the “common weal” as justification for urban politics cf., e.g., HARRY, Constructing, or several of the contributions in: LECUPPRE-DESJARDIN – VAN BRUAENE, De Bono Communi.
explore the Town War’s effects on the council’s standing and authority within the city and thereby elucidate who was able to exercise social control in late fourteenth-century Regensburg.

Regensburg’s administration at the end of the fourteenth century

Late medieval Regensburg, with its approximately 12,000 inhabitants, looked back on an urban tradition unbroken since antiquity that set the city apart from the rest of Bavaria in practically every aspect of ecclesiastical, economic, social and constitutional history. An independent city council is first documented in the middle of the thirteenth century. This council was formed of sixteen councillors, a peculiarity within the Austro-Bavarian urban landscape, which probably derived from the equally unusual division of the walled-in town into eight so-called Wachten (literally “guard districts”) instead of the customary quarters. The council’s rights and duties comprised the usual wide range of matters, from directing the city’s foreign policy to maintaining the peace, collecting taxes, regulating the local economy, exercising justice and conserving the public buildings, including the famous Stone Bridge across the Danube. Despite certain fluctuations – especially during the period we are interested in – the Regensburg council was dominated by the city’s traditional merchant elite, excluding artisans from power as much as social climbers from the ranks of the merchants, unless they managed to form bonds with the established families.

As in other German towns, a second representative body complemented the council. In Regensburg, this “outer council” was called the “Commune” (Gemeine) or – since it had 45 members – “the Forty-five” (Fünfundvierziger). The Forty-five emerged in the 1330s when, as a result of a civic revolt, the Regensburg council had to cede certain rights of control to the city’s artisans. From then, this governing body was responsible for electing, advising and, to a certain degree, supervising the council. The latter was supposed to consult with the Forty-five on all important matters of the city’s administration, and the top positions in municipal government were split between the two bodies. Despite this theoretical division of power, by the end of the fourteenth century the Forty-five no longer represented a second, independent political voice within the city; this is evident, for instance, from the fact that the Forty-

11 SCHMID, Regensburg, 122–123.
13 The composition of the council in the war years was studied in depth by: KEARNEY, Burgher Factions. ENGELKE, Stadtbuch, 521–524 and the annexed list of officials. FISCHER, Regensburger Hochfinanz, 75–77.
14 See: RITSCHER, Entwicklung, part 1, 123–126. SCHMID, Regensburg, 126–127. KROPAČ – BOTZEM, Verfassung, 101. RICHARD, Regensburger Stadtrat, 10. The terms “Commune” and “Forty-five” evolved over time and gradually changed their respective meanings, sometimes denoting the same, sometimes two different institutional bodies. During the period of investigation, both terms were synonymous and referred to the “outer council” and not, for example, to the Bürgergemeinde (community of free citizens), see: ENGELKE, Stadtbuch, 521; for an example of the synonymous use of “Commune” and “Forty-five” cf. ibid., pp. 245–246, no. 393. In what follows, I use the term “Forty-five” to prevent any confusion of this government body with the Bürgergemeinde as a whole.
15 On the election procedure see: RICHARD, Regensburger Stadtrat, 9–10.
16 ENGELKE, Stadtbuch, 522 made the important observation that at the end of the fourteenth century the post of Treasurer (Kämmerer) was always filled by a member of the council, whereas the post of Magistrate (Schultheiß) was a prerogative of the Forty-five.
five only met at the council’s behest.\textsuperscript{17} Even though there is evidence from the time of the Town War that indicates rifts among the councillors and the Forty-five,\textsuperscript{18} the interpretation of Milo Kearney, which saw the Forty-five as an oppositional outlet for “general opinion in the town”,\textsuperscript{19} seems to have been superseded now by the research of Thomas Engelke and Olivier Richard. As both have shown independently, the Forty-five were no actual political counterweight to the council at the time of the Town War, but rather an ancillary institution, due to the intertwining of personnel between the two bodies.\textsuperscript{20} If there were indeed frictions within the city’s ruling elite during the war, the fault lines seem to have run across, not between, the two governing bodies.

A third collective body that needs mentioning here is the so-called Hanse.\textsuperscript{21} Headed by a “count” (Hansgraf) from the ranks of the merchant elite, this institution oversaw trade and commerce within the city and administered major public buildings such as the Danube harbour. Income from houses owned by the Hanse, fines collected for infringements of the market regulations and rents generated by the lease of public facilities such as the weighing house provided it with an economic base that was independent from other sources of municipal income. Presumably, it was this economic power that re-strengthened the Hanse’s position within the city’s administration precisely at the time of the Town War, after it had been in decline for a century or two.\textsuperscript{22}

To study how Regensburg’s authorities exercised social control during the Town War, we must also consider the roles of the city’s most important municipal offices. As far as our topic is concerned, these were the mayor (Bürgermeister), the treasurer (Kämmerer) and the so-called Wachtmeister, or captains, of each of the city’s eight districts. The highest ranking of these officials was the mayor, who – unlike in other Bavarian and Austrian towns – was no burgher but a salaried nobleman from the region.\textsuperscript{23} The Regensburg mayor functioned primarily as a military captain, who also represented the city in its dealings with the surrounding lords and princes. The leading figure in internal city politics was the treasurer, whose authority rested on the administration of the city treasure.\textsuperscript{24} This was an annually rotating office filled by a burgher elected from the ranks of the then active councillors. Together with the council, the treasurer essentially ran the city, which made him the most powerful of the city’s officials in effect, though not in name. Finally, the eight Wachtmeister formed the backbone of the mid-level administration, serving as the council’s executives for each of the city districts.\textsuperscript{25} They usually came from respected families and sometimes simultaneously held a seat on the council or among the Forty-five. We do not know how they were selected, but it seems likely they were appointed by the council. Like the quarter-captains in other German towns, they were responsible for collecting taxes and arbitrating neighbourly

\textsuperscript{17} SCHMID, Regensburg, 127.
\textsuperscript{18} See below, note 92 and 97.
\textsuperscript{19} KEARNEY, Burgher factions, 282–283, quote at 283.
\textsuperscript{20} ENGELKE, Stadtbuch, 521–524. RICHARD, Regensburger Stadtrat, 10.
\textsuperscript{21} See: LÖSSL, Regensburger Hansgrafenamt. RITSCHER, Entwicklung, part 2, 8–21. SCHMID, Regensburg, 137–138. The latest extensive work on this topic, SCHOTTER, Regensburger Hansgrafenamt, provides nothing new.
\textsuperscript{22} Further detail below, note 99.
\textsuperscript{24} See: RITSCHER, Entwicklung, part 2, 41–51. KROPAČ – BOTZEM, Verfassung, 100.
\textsuperscript{25} See: RITSCHER, Entwicklung, part 2, 28–40. SCHMID, Regensburg, 144–145.
disputes, especially with regard to construction regulations. In addition, they fulfilled key public security and defence functions, which I discuss in more detail below.26

The Regensburg “Yellow Book” as a source for studying social control
The so-called “Regensburg Yellow Book” (Gelbes Stadtbuch) is an exceptional source for studying social control in a late medieval town.27 In 1993, Thomas Engelke published an exemplary critical edition of the manuscript, on which I draw for the following brief presentation.28 The extant volume – named after the colour of its late medieval leather cover – encompasses 137 folios, which contain 905 individual texts written between 1370 and 1419. The length of the entries ranges from single-line notes to copies of charters that are several pages long. The editor distinguishes three different phases of registration, which saw the manuscript change function, from a working-manual used by the town clerk for keeping brief minutes of the day-to-day business of the chancery to hand, to an official municipal register used for systematically documenting the verdicts, ordinances and laws enacted by the city council.29 Due to the manuscript’s gradual evolution and its original miscellaneous character the entries cover many different aspects of life both inside and outside the city walls: foreign and defence policy, crime and the administration of justice, the city’s institutions and officials, public finances, and the life of the Jewish community.30

On a structural level, a large proportion of the texts take the form of ordinances enacted by the Regensburg council. These decrees either dealt with individual cases (Engelke calls these Ratsentscheidungen) or established new, general and permanent laws for the entire urban population (Engelke calls these Ratsordnungen). Together, these two types of texts constitute the – numerically – fourth-largest body of texts preserved in the “Yellow Book”.31 Many of them aimed at policing and regulating the everyday life of the city’s population. For the purpose of analysing governmental social control, this corpus can be further augmented by other text types, such as minutes concerning offences against the aforementioned ordinances, verdicts pronounced by the councillors and records documenting their arbitration in inner-urban conflict. The “Yellow Book” also provides specific information on how the urban society functioned at a time of war: chronologically, most of its entries date from the years between 1385 and 1395, i.e. the time of the Town War and its immediate aftermath.32 It was during this period that the aforementioned structural transformation of the volume from a working tool into an official compendium assembling the city’s customs and laws took place. The military struggle and its side-effects thus thoroughly inform

26 See below, note 120.
27 The manuscript is preserved today at the Bavarian State Archives in Munich under the call number BayHStA, Reichsstadt Regensburg Literalien, no. 297. A digital representation of the manuscript is now available at: https://bavarikon.de/object/bav:GDA-OBJ-00000BAV80043803 [17 September 2022].
28 ENGELKE, Stadtbuch. For an in-depth description and analysis of the manuscript and its composition see ibid., 29–61.
29 ENGELKE, Stadtbuch, 63–98.
30 On the typologization of the material see: ENGELKE, Stadtbuch, 63–64 and the statistics ibid., 497.
31 See the statistics: ENGELKE, Stadtbuch, 497. However, see on the methodological pitfalls of such statistical evaluations: ibid., 64 and 497.
the manuscript, prompting Engelke to characterize it as a prime source “for studying how an urban society responds to a crisis such as the Town War”.33

**Social control in wartime: What was regulated?**

In the following analysis, I leave aside ordinances that focus predominantly on military matters and issues of urban defence, even though an argument could be made for their inclusion in a discussion of late medieval social control. Instead, I look closely at all entries from the years 1381 to 1389 that sought to police the life and behaviour of the Regensburg population during the (pending) war, or that inform us about problems the council confronted when attempting to do so. These “emergency decrees”34 can be roughly grouped into four subject matters, and I examine each of these in turn.

**Food supply**

The question of the city’s food supply is one of the most prominent topics in the “Yellow Book” as a whole. It comes as no surprise that this is also true for the time of the Town War. The sheer number of entries concerning this subject in one way or another makes them stand out in comparison to any other topic, with the exception of the city’s defence.35 The thematic range of the ordinances grouped here under the heading “food supply” is quite broad, though. First, we have export bans on foodstuffs such as grain, rye, seeds, bread, salt and wine, and rulings demanding that such goods be brought in from the hinterland to the walled town.36 These restrictions were clearly part of the council’s strategic preparations for the war: the councillors were already passing rulings controlling the movement of these goods well before the outbreak of open hostilities. In August 1386, for instance, they prohibited the sale of oats to anyone who did not keep horses, i.e. a strategically important resource for the pending war.37 The council also actively sought to avoid favouritism: the export bans on food and other merchandise and the stockpiling orders were valid for all unequivocally, “so that one is treated like the other”.38 This also included the city’s numerous religious institutions.39 In essence, this first group of ordinances therefore served two main objectives: first and foremost, they were an attempt to guarantee the provisioning of the city with basic foodstuffs, and secondly they aimed to prevent damage to civic property located outside the city walls.

33 **ENGELKE, Stadtbuch**, 104.
34 The evocative term “Notstandsgesetzgebung” is used by: **ENGELKE, Stadtbuch**, passim, e.g. at 108.
35 Of 394 entries dating from the period between 1381 and 1389, 66 concern military matters, 44 the city’s food supply. Only some of these texts are ordinances issued by the council, though. Among the 141 ordinances examined here in more detail, 33 predominantly deal with military matters, while 30 are primarily concerned with the city’s food supply.
36 **ENGELKE, Stadtbuch**, pp. 257–258, no. 431–432; p. 266, no. 454; pp. 422–423, no. 742–744; p. 445, no. 819–820. (For practical reasons, the notes here and hereinafter refer only to the page and number in Engelke’s source edition, not to the original manuscript.)
37 **ENGELKE, Stadtbuch**, p. 224, no. 306. On this particular ordinance cf. also below, note 114.
A second group of ordinances strove to ensure what would today be called food safety. These provisions regulated the quality of the food sold in the city and were not specific to the time of the Town War. However, a third group of ordinances is more relevant to the functioning of social control: ordinances stipulating maximum prices for basic foodstuffs, such as cereal, bread and lard, and beverages, especially wine. In the same vein, a specific ruling in 1389 banned the city’s gate guards from buying victuals directly from the peasants they inspected upon entering the city: the guards had instead to purchase their groceries in the marketplace like everybody else. Likewise, prices for board and lodging for allied soldiers quartering in the city were regulated sometime in 1388 to prevent shrewd businessmen from taking advantage of the situation and, in the process, raising consumer prices in general.

These market and price regulations were crucial in stabilizing the council’s power during the war. Naturally, the councillors derived a lot of their authority from their capability of ensuring the wellbeing of their subjects. Already in times of peace they were thus weary of civil unrest caused by food shortages or rising prices. In wartime, though, problems in this area could be even more detrimental and risk losing the city. The “Yellow Book” ordinances make it clear that the city fathers were very much aware of this danger; for instance, an ordinance enacted on 1 July 1388 explicitly decreed that an earlier maximum price regulation for wine was to remain in effect to prevent sedition among the city’s less well-to-do. Naturally, statements of this type require critical reading. We cannot be sure that this assertion did not actually serve to mask the fact that the wine-consuming elite of the city benefitted more from a price cap than the poor, who consumed less and cheaper wine. Nevertheless, I think that under the extraordinary circumstances of the war, regulations of this type aimed primarily at forestalling potential food riots. This interpretation is also supported by the fact that the only two other food price caps in the “Yellow Book” which explicitly claim relief of the poor as their motivation concern bread and cereal for pig feeding. The particular significance of affordable food for the inhabitants of a beleaguered town also explains why the Regensburg council occasionally had selected members of the Bürgergemeinde confirm ordinances concerned with the food supply – in particular decrees concerning wine-selling – by oath.

---

41 See in general: DIRLMEIER, Lebensmittel- und Vorsorgepolitik, 150–151.
43 ENGELKE, Stadtbuch, p. 266, no. 455.
44 ENGELKE, Stadtbuch, p. 248, no. 401. Similar regulations were enacted, for instance, on the occasion of royal sojourns in the city, cf.: BECKMANN, Deutsche Reichstagsakten, Vol. XI, p. 487, no. 255 (c. August 21, 1434).
46 ENGELKE, Stadtbuch, pp. 258–259, no. 434, here p. 259: “daz man di armen niht vmbtreib”.
47 Cf. the research on discourses of "common weal" quoted above, note 10.
49 See below, note 105.
If we finally look at the history of Regensburg in general, the numerous ordinances from the war years on who was allowed to sell wine and at what price take on additional significance. Many of the councillors were themselves personally engaged in wine growing and trading. Moreover, selling and serving wine had been a bone of contention between the burghers and the inhabitants of the city’s many religious institutions for decades. The latter claimed exemption from import taxes on wine grown on their own estates and from the Ungeld, an excise tax on wine consumption levied by the commune. The recurring bans on buying wine from clerics that were issued during the Town War therefore not only protected Regensburg’s wine-producing burghers from unwanted competition but also brought money into the city’s distressed coffers.

Individual mobility

Restricting – or at least controlling – people’s freedom of movement was another crucial aspect of medieval urban defence, as well as a means of policing people’s behaviour. Naturally, Regensburg’s authorities engaged heavily in such restrictions during the Town War. As was common practice in other towns threatened by war, we can surmise that, in general, strangers were only reluctantly admitted into the city. When the military threat peaked in 1388, the council furthermore implemented a rigid regime of access controls. Only messengers and suppliers delivering foodstuff were to be permitted inside the city gates. The latter had to procure themselves with so-called politen, which were to be shown to the guards upon entrance and departure. These passes were issued by a councillor, who had been entrusted with the newly created office of Politenmeister. To obtain them, the petitioner had to bring forth a witness from the city, who confirmed that they were going to sell to or buy from the petitioner, or had already done so. The inhabitants of Regensburg themselves were also subject to the same system: they were altogether forbidden from leaving the city without official permission under an ordinance that explicitly applied to both sexes and included “priests, monks, and nuns” and their servants.

These restrictions on traffic into and out of the city were complemented by decrees regulating people’s movement within the city. In November 1388, the whereabouts of a newly hired master gunner were noted in the “Yellow Book”. Earlier that same year, the councillors banned everyone from going to the Jewish cemetery. At the height

---

50 FISCHER, Regensburger Hochfinanz, 76–77.
52 See: ENGELKE, Stadtbuch, pp. 226–227, no. 312; p. 279, no. 488. Ibid., p. 214, no. 268 explicitly forbade the selling of new cider until the councillors had sold all wine from the publicly owned vineyards in nearby Donaustauf. Dirlmeier identifies such fiscal considerations as a primary factor for governmental intervention in the food sector in general, DIRLMEIER, Lebensmittel- und Vorsorgepolitik, 149.
53 ENGELKE, Stadtbuch, p. 444, no. 818; p. 447, no. 824.
54 In his glossary, Engelke translates “polite” as “Passierschein”. On similar systems in other towns cf., e.g., SCHUBERT, Der Stadt Nutz, 110, 112. ZEILINGER, Lebensformen, 122, 124. KAAR, Wirtschaft, 178–182. PLASSMANN, Stadt, 137. On the emergence of identity cards in the Late Middle Ages more generally GROEBNER, Schein der Person, 124–130.
55 On the establishment of new municipal offices during the war see below, note 107.
56 ENGELKE, Stadtbuch, p. 256, no. 430; p. 444, no. 818; p. 447, no. 824. Quote at p. 447.
57 ENGELKE, Stadtbuch, p. 154, no. 23.
58 ENGELKE, Stadtbuch, p. 440, no. 810.
of the military crisis the council also issued nocturnal curfews.\textsuperscript{59} These curfews most probably applied to the city’s population as a whole;\textsuperscript{60} however, special mention was made of strangers staying at one of the city’s inns and of musicians who wandered the streets at night with fiddles and pipes. This mistrust of travelling folk and strangers is a well-known characteristic of medieval – and later – urban societies distressed by war.\textsuperscript{61} Strangers, who were not tied to the Bürgergemeinde by oath, were perceived as undependable and a security risk. Furthermore, they threatened to complicate the city’s provisioning in the event of a siege. In Regensburg, this fear led to bans on beggars entering houses,\textsuperscript{62} calls for the denunciation of “idle folk”,\textsuperscript{63} and eventually the expulsion of minstrels, musicians and all foreign clerics and nuns under pain of expropriation and arrest.\textsuperscript{64}

Maintaining common decency

The ordinance banishing travelling folk and musicians could also be subsumed under a third category of rulings: those designed to police morals and common decency in the beleaguered city. Thomas Engelke demonstrated how criminal law tightened in Regensburg during and after the Town War, even though the councillors strategically showed mercy towards able-bodied men, whom they needed to defend the city.\textsuperscript{65} In addition, the town fathers fought against what they perceived as unchristian behaviour and moral misdemeanour.\textsuperscript{66} It is striking that verdicts concerning fornication and adultery were recorded in the “Yellow Book” exclusively during the war years, despite the fact that these offences were undoubtedly not specific to this period.\textsuperscript{67} These findings are especially remarkable if one takes into account that the distribution of justice by the city council was temporarily suspended during the war\textsuperscript{68} and that indecency offences generally seem to have been only rarely prosecuted in Regensburg before the year 1410.\textsuperscript{69} Gambling bans were also repeatedly renewed, and the abovementioned decree banning people from entering the Jewish cemetery was issued, as well as a further ordinance concerning Jewish moneylending to indebted artisans.\textsuperscript{70}

The councillors viewed such rulings on matters of common decency as an integral part of their preparations for the city’s defence. This is evident, for instance, from an ordinance from 1388, which explicitly links a nocturnal curfew aimed at travellers and other strangers with a ban on the excessive display of wealth in the form of luxurious

\textsuperscript{59} \textsc{Engelke}, Stadtbuch, p. 243, no. 385; p. 244, no. 390; pp. 442–444, no. 816.

\textsuperscript{60} \textsc{Engelke}, Stadtbuch, 244: “Item mein herren habent verpoten, daz des nahts nieman vf der strazze gen sol.”


\textsuperscript{62} \textsc{Engelke}, Stadtbuch, p. 247, no. 397.

\textsuperscript{63} \textsc{Engelke}, Stadtbuch, pp. 442–444, no. 816, here p. 443. On this particular ordinance cf. as well below, at note 126.

\textsuperscript{64} \textsc{Engelke}, Stadtbuch, p. 247, no. 397; p. 447, no. 825. The latter ordinance was evidently executed, see ibid., pp. 439–440, no. 806.

\textsuperscript{65} \textsc{Engelke}, Stadtbuch, 107–108, 110.

\textsuperscript{66} On the theological background cf., for instance: Schwerhoff, Zungen, 190–195.

\textsuperscript{67} \textsc{Engelke}, Stadtbuch, p. 239, no. 362; p. 252, no. 413; p. 255, no. 424.

\textsuperscript{68} \textsc{Engelke}, Stadtbuch, p. 256, no. 427.

\textsuperscript{69} Wernicke, Von Schlagen, Schmählen und Unendlichkeit, 390, 395.

\textsuperscript{70} See above, note 58 and \textsc{Engelke}, Stadtbuch, p. 241, no. 373. On gambling see further detail below, note 76.
clothing or jewellery (tânt) for both clerics and laymen. Another example comes from an ordinance detailing fire regulations: amidst the very practical procedures to be followed in the event of a fire, the councillors also prohibited women from gathering at the site of the blaze. Offenders were to lose their cloak and veil, which would be sold off for the benefit of those who had caught them. Implicitly, the councillors imputed here that women were susceptible to sensation-seeking at the expense of the common good – a morally questionable behaviour that entailed a very specific defamatory penalty not seen elsewhere in the “Yellow Book.”

Another numerous collection of war-related social restrictions aimed at policing morally reproachable behaviour: closing time regulations and the abovementioned gambling bans. On 24 May 1387, for instance, the council renewed an older ordinance, declaring that “nobody should allow people to gather [in their inn] after closing time, nor let them gamble there, nor sell or deliver wine to them”. The timing of this decree is significant: during the very same session the council appointed the first so-called “inquirer” (Frager), a newly created municipal office, which was supposed to replace the treasurer as the head of the city’s administration. This new office was probably established as a result of a protracted power struggle among the councillors. It is thus no coincidence that the elect’s first official act was to enact the said ordinance. Bans on nocturnal gatherings and gambling were predominantly intended to maintain peace and order within the city and to prevent violence among the urban population, as the threat of war loomed large. However, control of the city’s inns also helped to keep dissatisfaction with the council’s policy in check. Besides these political aspects, though, this type of regulation also had a clear moral quality, demonstrating how the Regensburg authorities’ grip on their subjects’ private lives tightened during the war. This grip further institutionalized in the wake of the military crisis, when the restrictions concerning closing time and gambling were not abandoned, but rather time and again renewed.

71 ENGELKE, Stadtbuch, p. 243, no. 385: “Jtem mein herren habent verpoten als tânt, daz nieman im tânt ge heimlich oder offentlich, weder pfaff noch lay, oder man wils fur schellt haben. Ez verbient auch mein herren, daz dhein wirt sein gest, ez seyn letzter oder aender gestt, nach pirlkolen, weder mit liecht noch an liecht, vf der strazz gen noch aus seinem haus gen lâß vntz des morgens als man daz erist laût, oder man wils vahen vnd fur schellht haben.”

72 For a detailed discussion of this ordinance see below, note 120.

73 ENGELKE, Stadtbuch, pp. 442–444, no. 816, at p. 443: “Jtem ez verpieten auch mein herren, daz dhein fraw zu dheinem feft. Wo man sy vint, do sol man yn mantel vnd sleir nemen vnd dy vertrinkhen.”

74 On similar regulations against bystanders from other towns see: FOUQUET, Bauen, 403–404. HEUSINGER, Zunft, 160.

75 For examples from Nuremberg see: ZEILINGER, Lebensformen, 78–79.

76 ENGELKE, Stadtbuch, p. 234, no. 330: “Jtem mein herren vnd daz XLV sind bi dem ersten frager […] des ernstlich vberein worden vnd verpieten als nahtsitzzen, daz nieman nach pirlgoken sitzen noch spiln lasz, noch daheinen wein nyman in daz haus geb, der sitzeht wein, bi LX dn.” An exception was made, however, for overnight guests. A similar ban from September 1381 is recorded ibid., pp. 206–207, no. 232.

77 KEARNEY, Burger Factions, 283–284. However, see as well the critical remarks in: ENGELKE, Stadtbuch, p. 106, note 414 and p. 110, note 451. On the establishment of new municipal offices during the war see also below, note 107.

78 On inns as focal points of civic unrest cf., e.g., KÜMIN, Wirtschaft, 84. RÜTHER, Predigtstuhl, 158, 163. HEUSINGER, Zunft, 99–102, 141–142.

Confederations of the citizenry

Finally, another interesting phenomenon of social control documented in the “Yellow Book” are what Engelke calls Schwurgemeinschaften, i.e. confederations of the Regensburg citizenry in the form of public oaths. The “Yellow Book” records three such oaths administered by the town fathers during the Town War (in July 1386, December 1387 and February 1389). The written documentation of these pledges gives a good impression of the councillors’ shifting priorities during the course of the war. In summer 1386, open hostilities had not yet begun, yet the councillors already made an oath “together with all of their honourable burgurers” promising mutual loyalty and obedience to a recently appointed commission, which was to assess what each burgurer would have to contribute to furnish the city’s military forces. The entry documenting this confederation is rather short and only gives the text of the oath and the composition of the commission. In late 1387, when open conflict was clearly imminent, the councillors and the Forty-five once again took a pledge of mutual assistance, expanded by an oath of secrecy on matters of strategic importance discussed in the council sessions. This time, the scribe meticulously reported the names of those who took the oath and of those absent at the time. The missing oaths were recovered later, as can be inferred from interlinear and marginal additions noting who had – or had not – later taken the pledge. In February 1389, when the city was obviously already struggling heavily with the effects of the war, the councillors compelled their fellow burgurers to take yet another oath of allegiance, this time obliging those swearing to share the public debt and to remain in the city for ten years after the war had ended.

It is no coincidence that this confederation is documented in even more detail than the previous one. Unlike in 1386, the scribe recorded the names of all individuals who took the oath, not only the councillors; this amounted to no fewer than 326 names, most probably representing all adult men who held full citizenship of Regensburg at the time. The names are grouped into paragraphs, which presumably represent urban neighbourhoods, providing a hint at how the oaths were likely obtained. In contrast to the list from 1387 there is no mention of subsequently recovered pledges. However, the scribe did add marginal notes on individuals who had failed – or perhaps refused – to make the pledge.

It is well known that the sworn confederation (“coniuratio”) of free burgurers was one of the constituting elements of the medieval European town. In many towns this confederation was regularly re-enacted in so-called Schwörtage, where officials and burgurers publicly swore to uphold the city’s constitution. The sections of the “Yellow Book” dating from the 1390s and the 1400s contain a number of such oaths of office. Research has shown that these pledges were not static and could be adapted to political needs. It is therefore no surprise that oaths of allegiance were imposed on urban communities during wartime; Gabriel Zeilinger has shown, for instance, how
the Nuremberg councillors requested pledges of obedience from specific sections of the population suspected of potential disloyalty, namely foreigners and the city’s Jews, during the so-called Second Town War. 88 The Regensburg confederations of 1386 and 1389, though, are special insofar as they show the councillors systematically asking the entirety of their fellow burghers to commit to their policy. The confederations were a way of building and publicly demonstrating consensus. At the same time, they also were a means of social control, publicly exposing anyone who refused to fully support the council’s policy and registering their names in the official records.

**Negotiating social control: Who had the authority to regulate?**

The confederations recorded in the “Yellow Book” draw attention to traces of possible dissent within the urban community: not all burghers swore the oaths of allegiance required of them by the council, and not everyone was enthusiastic about fulfilling guard duties or seeing their countryside estates ravaged. 89 Furthermore, some of the ordinances enacting unpopular measures, such as trade bans, rather conspicuously insist that the measures apply to all burghers regardless of their position and status, implying that there had been evasion attempts. 90 On at least one occasion the council even expelled persons from the city under pain of death due to “seditious speech”. 91 Milo Kearney and Thomas Engelke have also noted signs of possible rifts among the councillors and the Forty-five. 92 Kearney has even suggested that, during the war, the council temporarily lost part of its usually firm grip on the city’s population. 93 This raises questions about how the councillors attempted to legitimize the regulatory measures we have discussed and how they sought to bolster their authority against potential resistance.

Following Kearney’s pioneering study, Engelke already pointed out 30 years ago that the extraordinary burden imposed on the city by the Town War forced the council to seek help from outside the hitherto largely self-contained council-elite. 94 Faced with the dangers – and costs – of the war, the councillors were compelled to temporarily grant certain rights of control to representatives of the most affluent burghers outside the council in return for their financial contribution. The “Yellow Book” records a few phenomena fairly characteristic of such negotiation processes. For example, the council decreed the establishment of a municipal archive some time in 1388. At the same time, provisions were made for the safekeeping of the city’s seal. 95 In relation to the latter, an

88 ZEILINGER, Lebensformen, 78. Similar measures had already been taken in 1388, see: SCHUBERT, Der Stadt Nutz, 110–111.
89 ENGELKE, Stadtbuch, p. 249, no. 403; p. 256, no. 429; p. 444, no. 817.
90 See above, note 38. See also: ENGELKE, Stadtbuch, p. 242, no. 376, emphasizing an equal obligation upon all burghers to contribute financially to an upcoming campaign.
91 ENGELKE, Stadtbuch, p. 246, no. 396. This case is rather atypical, though, as the expelled were a pair of siblings from the noble Sattelboger family, who lived in religious institutions situated within the city walls that were technically outside the council’s jurisdiction. Agitators from the ranks of the burghers were usually sentenced to prison, see: WERNICKE, Von Schlagen, Schmähen und Unendlichkeit, 397–398.
93 KEARNEY, Burger Factions, 284–286.
94 ENGELKE, Stadtbuch, 111–112. KEARNEY, though, located the starting point of this process earlier and claimed that Regensburg’s accession to the Town League can already be attributed to a shift in the composition of the council’s personnel.
95 ENGELKE, Stadtbuch, p. 241, no. 374–375.
intervention was made against unilateral borrowing in the name of the city (presumably by the treasurer). The ordinance in question decrees that contracts about the sale of municipal annuities were invalid unless they had been publicly sealed during a session of the council.96 As I noted earlier, the office of treasurer was even – albeit briefly – abolished during the crisis and replaced by the newly established post of inquirer.97

Engelke also postulated that both the Forty-Five and, even more so, the Hanse gained political weight at the expense of the council during the fifteenth century due to the repercussions of the Town War.98 The beginnings of this development can already be observed in the period under investigation. The Hanse, for instance, was involved in reorganizing the city’s revenues immediately after Regensburg had retired from the hostilities.99 It ceded part of its revenues to the council for the “wellbeing of the city”, and it seems reasonable to assume that it demanded closer control of the council’s expenditures in return. It is therefore certainly no coincidence that the decree, which records the Hanse’s transfer of part of its income to the councillors, also orders that a book of expenditures be set up by the council and kept under special supervision.100 Meanwhile, the Forty-Five co-authored a number of the ordinances we have already discussed above, primarily those related to the city’s food supply.101 But is the fact that the Forty-five co-authored a number of the decrees dealing with the particularly sensitive problem of the city’s food supply indeed a sign of this body’s increased political weight? Not necessarily. In my view, it seems possible that the councillors merely preferred to call for the additional authority of the city’s second governing body when issuing potentially unpopular ordinances such as export bans and food price caps. Knowing that these decrees would threaten the economic interests of the city’s merchants and the even more vital food-producing trades, the councillors presumably sought extra legitimacy by demonstratively soliciting the backing of the Forty-five. This interpretation is supported by the fact that the council also consulted the Forty-five when making drastic – and certainly not too popular – military decisions, such as the strategic dismantling of houses.102

Interestingly, though, the Forty-five are not the only co-authors of the ordinances recorded in the “Yellow Book”: there are also occasional mentions of the Bürgergemeinde in this capacity, a body that is otherwise almost completely without mention in the “Yellow Book”. The burghers appear, for instance, in the abovementioned fire regulation of 1389. According to the scribe the councillors had agreed with “their

96 ENGELKE, Stadtbuch, 241: “Nota daz man daz grozz sigel besunder leg vnd furb[a]z vmb dhein leipting sigel, dann in offem rat.” More regulations concerning the particularly sensitive topic of annuities ibid., no. 372.
97 See above, note 77. Characteristically, this first inquirer was a particularly rich merchant, who had not held any municipal offices before, see: ENGELKE, Stadtbuch, p. 112, note 453.
98 ENGELKE, Stadtbuch, 112.
100 ENGELKE, Stadtbuch, 273.
101 ENGELKE, Stadtbuch, p. 221, no. 294–295; p. 224, no. 306–307; pp. 258–259, no. 432–434; p. 259, no. 436; p. 266, no. 456; pp. 278–279, no. 487; pp. 444–445, no. 819–820. Ibid., p. 234, no. 330; p. 419, no. 735 and pp. 422–423, no. 742–744 were issued in the name of the council, the Forty-five, and an additional authority such as the mayor or the inquirer. In contrast, ordinances restricting individual mobility and maintaining common decency tended to be issued by the council alone.
102 See, e.g., ENGELKE, Stadtbuch, pp. 259–260, no. 435 and no. 439.
honourableburghers”on the measures prescribed by this ordinance.\textsuperscript{103} Significantly, the Bürgergemeinde also appears twice in ordinances concerning the selling and serving of wine. In autumn 1386, the council allegedly came to an agreement with no less than 150 burghers “both poor and rich” to ban the serving of certain types of wine.\textsuperscript{104} Two years later, 82 burghers, who are mentioned by name, took an oath to observe another decree concerning an upper cap on the price of wine.\textsuperscript{105} This again poses the question of whether these occurrences are a sign of an increase in the political involvement of larger parts of the Bürgergemeinde, as Kearney and Engelke have suggested. Once more I am inclined to be rather cautious. In my view, the council sought the burghers’ backing for these ordinances for the same reasons as they sought the backing of the Forty-five for other ordinances: the more substantial a public backing they obtained from the urban community for a decree, the less room there was for dissenters. As we saw in the case of the confederations of the citizenry recorded in the “Yellow Book”, written documentation of burghers’ oaths also increased social pressure to comply with the sworn decrees and to defend them if necessary. Furthermore, frictions within the council could have resulted in an increased desire to have any controversial measures backed-up by the Forty-five or by representatives of the urban population. I am not suggesting here that the populace of Regensburg had no say at all in political decisions. There surely were groups such as the middle-class craftsmen who were able to set conditions for their public consent, to voice complaints and to influence the execution of the “emergency decrees” discussed here. Indeed, in the final section of this paper we will meet burghers who were involved in the implementation of governmental social control without holding municipal offices.\textsuperscript{106} Nonetheless, in light of what has been said above – notably with regard to the confederations of the citizenry – I think that the presence of common burghers in the said ordinances is probably less a sign of a particularly consensus-oriented wartime policy than simply an additional means by which the Regensburg council attempted to stabilize and enforce its authority.

**Implementing the ordinances: How to exercise social control on the ground**

In this final section of the paper, I examine what we can learn from the ordinances discussed above about the practical implementation of social control in a late medieval town in general. This approach is undoubtedly limited: ordinances are normative texts, and do not necessarily reflect actual practice. Nevertheless, these decrees provide a valuable insight, given that other more directly legal texts – namely the verdicts pronounced by the Regensburg council that are preserved in the “Yellow Book” – barely contain any information about the practical implementation of social control.

The ordinances show that the practical enforcement of the war-related “emergency decrees” rested mainly on the shoulders of ad-hoc appointed special commissions,
who complemented the city’s regular hierarchy during the war.\textsuperscript{107} Over the years, the Regensburg council experimented with various extraordinary offices, such as the abovementioned inquirer,\textsuperscript{108} the Politenmeister\textsuperscript{109} and a six – or subsequently four – member war council.\textsuperscript{110} Its aim in establishing these offices was probably to ensure rapid decision-making and an efficient chain of command. However, these newly established extraordinary offices and special commissions were conspicuously unstable. The council probably made a conscious effort to avoid overstraining the incumbents of these special offices, although it is also conceivable that the councillors were wary of giving too much military and financial power to a small circle of individuals and preferred therefore to uphold at least the illusion of collective leadership.\textsuperscript{111} At any rate, it is evident that over the years a small group of experts emerged, who rotated in the war-related extraordinary offices.\textsuperscript{112}

Apart from these specific war committees, the councillors also gave conspicuous attention to the oversight of the food supply. This resulted in further special commissions being established, including committees for meat inspection,\textsuperscript{113} for oat rationing\textsuperscript{114} and for overseeing the wine price cap.\textsuperscript{115} Meat inspection was entrusted to specialists from the butchers’ guild, a practice that remained in use after the war.\textsuperscript{116} The commissions responsible for supervising oat trade and wine prices each consisted of two councillors and two representatives of the Forty-five; this once again highlights the councillors’ efforts to balance power and responsibilities between the city’s two principal governing bodies.\textsuperscript{117}

To implement their disciplinary measures on the ground, the councillors also had recourse to attendants who were paid by the city and bound by the council’s instructions. During the Town War, however, these attendants are mentioned only sporadically in the “Yellow Book”, mostly as guarding the city’s walls and patrolling its streets after nightfall.\textsuperscript{118} Another municipal office seems to have been much more important in terms of disciplinary enforcement: the Wachtmeister.\textsuperscript{119} This is evident from the

\textsuperscript{107} On similar arrangements in other towns cf., e.g., SCHUBERT, Der Stadt Nutz, 107–109; ZEILINGER, Lebensformen, 53–55; PLASSMANN, Stadt, 55–57.
\textsuperscript{108} See above, note 77.
\textsuperscript{109} See above, note 54.
\textsuperscript{111} Cf. the observations of PLASSMANN, Stadt, 34 and 50–57 on war and political leadership in medieval Cologne.
\textsuperscript{112} Thomas Sitauer appears to have been one such military expert among the councillors. After administering various regular and special military offices during the Town War, he remained in charge of settling accounts with the city’s mercenaries after the war; see: ENGELKE, Stadtbuch, p. 302, no. 577.
\textsuperscript{113} ENGELKE, Stadtbuch, pp. 456–457, no. 855–857.
\textsuperscript{114} ENGELKE, Stadtbuch, p. 224, no. 306.
\textsuperscript{115} ENGELKE, Stadtbuch, pp. 278–279, no. 487.
\textsuperscript{116} ENGELKE, Stadtbuch, pp. 356–357, no. 661; p. 446, no. 823.
\textsuperscript{117} On these efforts see as well above, note 102.
\textsuperscript{118} See, for instance: ENGELKE, Stadtbuch, pp. 442–444, no. 816 at p. 443. For more detail see: Archive of the Historical Society of the Upper Palatinate and Regensburg (HVOR), R.RI 51 (Ausgabenverzeichnis der Turmwächter und Torhüter zu Regensburg).
\textsuperscript{119} See above, note 25.
lengthy fire regulation from 1389 mentioned earlier. Fire protection was one of the Wachtmeisters’ principal duties. However, the decree in question not only detailed the chain of command in case of fire and stipulated which guild was required to furnish which gear in the event; it also sheds light on various other functions the Wachtmeister performed during the war on behalf of the council: they published the councillors’ instructions at local assemblies (wachtting), mustered the burghers’ armament and fined those who were insufficiently prepared, manned the towers and walls in the sections of the city walls assigned to their respective districts, and organized night watches. Finally, they were explicitly required to supervise the comings and goings and the loyalty of their districts’ inhabitants.

I will return to this point shortly, since it deserves closer attention; in the meantime, it is interesting to note that it was not only officials – like the councillors, the municipal attendants and the Wachtmeister – who played a part in policing the urban population’s behaviour. As I said earlier, common burghers who did not hold municipal offices are also recorded as responsible for implementing the measures prescribed by the council. The decrees on closing-time regulations and gambling bans, for instance, indicate that it was the innkeepers’ task to implement these ordinances in their taverns and that they were accountable for their guests’ compliance with the rules. The fire regulation of 1389 went a step further: not only did it prescribe that every householder must furnish their house with a proper lock to ensure control over who entered and left their house. It also required “that every [householder] knows who rents or lives in their house, where the residents get their money from and what their profession is”. Should a head of household learn of people “who are useless to the city” he should report them immediately to the local Wachtmeister and to the council. This amounts to an obligation of disclosure and denunciation, and similar obligations are present in other ordinances as well. For instance, the 1388 decree on wine prices, discussed earlier, explicitly demanded that the 82 burghers who signed an oath on the said decree report any violation of it to the council. The implementation of social control in war-time Regensburg therefore did not rest exclusively on the shoulders of the city’s officials but involved – more or less voluntarily – much wider circles of the urban population.

120 ENGELKE, Stadtbuch, pp. 442–444, no. 816. See also above, note 72. Nuremberg issued a similar fire regulation during the Second Town War, see: ZEILINGER, Lebensformen, 80–81.
121 On fire fighting in late medieval German towns in general cf. the survey in FOUQUET, Bauen, 400–414.
122 See in more detail below, note 126.
124 ENGELKE, Stadtbuch, 443: “Jtem so sol ein yeder hawswirt sein haws versliessen mit einem guten slosse, daz er wisse, wer aus vnd ein gee.”
125 ENGELKE, Stadtbuch, 442–443: “daz ieder man wizz wen er halt oder wer er sey oder welherley zerüng er pfleg oder waz sein tźn sey’.
126 ENGELKE, Stadtbuch, 443: “Oder ob yeman erfůr laût, dy der stat nicht nůzte waren, daz sol er meinen herren vnd dem wachtmaister ze stůnd sagen.”
127 See above, note 104.
Conclusion

In this article I have examined texts from the “Regensburg Yellow Book” that inform us about the Town War of 1387–1389 as a crisis during which the Regensburg council intensified its grip on various aspects of its subjects’ behaviour. Within a broad understanding of “social control” I have discussed several different types of ordinances issued by the councillors during the war in their efforts to police human interaction in the beleaguered city. I have examined evidence of how these “emergency decrees” were practically implemented, both by the city’s officials and by members of the common burgher population. In addition, I have detailed the delicate political negotiations necessary to legitimize the surveyed regulations and to encourage the burghers’ compliance. One way of ensuring this compliance and forestalling possible dissent was to enact public oaths; the Regensburg council used this approach extensively, most notably in the large confederations of the citizenry. Some of the measures imposed, such as nocturnal curfews, gambling bans, the expulsion of strangers and the persecution of moral misdemeanour, had a substantial impact on the everyday life of the Regensburg population. However, it is clear from the texts examined that seemingly less drastic interventions by the council, such as price caps, also required extra backing by additional authorities, such as the Forty-five or representatives from the Bürgergemeinde. This shows that although the Regensburg council seems to have been quite successful in maintaining and even tightening control over its subjects during the Town War, this military crisis unsettled the established balance of power between the councillors, the Forty-five, the Hanse and the Bürgergemeinde.

Further studies should thus look beyond the war years to shed light on the medium-term effects of the Town War and to further test Engelke’s hypotheses on the development of the relationship between the various stakeholders of urban politics. For instance, several crafts codes issued by the council in the 1390s and 1400s – seemingly at least partly against the guilds’ wishes – could indicate a continued tightening of governmental social control in the wake of the Town War that was already noted with regard to closing time restrictions and gambling bans. This raises the question of whether the council’s attempts at further increasing social control contradict or rather support Engelke’s claim that the councillors lost part of their traditional authority over the fifteenth century to the advantage of the city’s other representative bodies. Furthermore, the wartime “emergency decrees” discussed in this article should also be contrasted with ordinances issued in connection with other extraordinary events, such as royal or princely sojourns in the city, or the two large chivalric tournaments held in Regensburg in 1393 and 1408. Such contributions will help to further clarify whether the regulations studied in this paper were really mere short-term reactions to the events of the war, or whether the Town War also – or even primarily – reinforced and accelerated pre-existing, long-term tendencies of late medieval Herrschaftsverdichtung through governmental social control.

129 See above, note 79.
130 See the example above, note 44.
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From the second half of the thirteenth century, economic privileges of cloth merchants became almost a norm in the cities of Central Europe, including Poland. The same entrepreneurs constituted at the same time a group that exercised power in their cities. From the fourteenth century, the aspirations of local textile manufacturers became apparent, they demanding the right to free retail sales of their products. The resulting conflict with merchants was permanent. However, it was not connected with the demands of gaining access to power in the town, although at the same time the weavers were involved in struggles of a political nature. This state of affairs is the starting point for an examination of the characteristics of the course of the aforementioned conflict in Polish cities and a consideration of its possible causes.

Keywords: Merchants. Weavers. Economic conflict. Central European cities.

Researchers considering the background of the various violent conflicts gripping the communities of medieval cities and their relations with the feudal environment will not avoid divergence in assessing the importance of various constituent factors – from accentuating systemic social inequalities and differences in economic interests, to noting vertical and horizontal divisions in the city’s social and political space, as well as testimonies to the culture of litigation. Of course, this also applies to conflicts involving textile craftsmen. Without even going as far as the most famous ones in the cities of Flanders, or the revolt in Florence, it is enough to recall from the territory of Silesia the analyses of the revolt of the weavers of the New Town in Wrocław in 1333, or their role in the revolt of the commoners in Wroclaw in 1418. The municipal authorities and territorial rulers of the time struggled with the same problem of properly assessing the potentially crisis situation in their – in the case of the former: relentless, in the case of the latter: forced – efforts to preserve peace in the city as the foundation of its existence. Thus in order to protect the interests of the common folk, thirty guilds of Wroclaw (Breslau) signed an agreement in 1389 which forced the
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monarch to get involved long-term in intra-urban politics. Its main purpose was to grant favours to particular groups that were seeking to reinforce or, alternatively, to try and maintain their position in the social hierarchy. As it quickly turned out, one such dispute acknowledged by a group of people who had influence on the king’s decisions was an argument between merchants and weavers, with the latter demanding the right of retail sale of their own products. Highlighting the extraordinariness of his concessions, as a special favour to the weavers, King Wenceslaus IV allowed them in 1391, 1395 and 1396 to trade their manufactured goods for up to three years. After the last period of the privilege expired, it was not prolonged, which coincided in time with a turn in the monarch’s politics, who stepped back from supporting the common folk of Wrocław in 1399.4

Camerae pannorum

According to the logic of the functioning of the privileged trading institutions such as benches and shambles, it can be safely assumed that in every place where a cloth hall was established in a form characteristic of areas east of the Elbe river, the owners of its compound chambers (i.e. particular shops) were equipped with a monopolistic privilege of cutting cloth and its retail sale per ell.5 Contrary to other owners of the oldest limited trading stalls, butchers and bakers, cloth merchants (German Gewandschneider) did not offer products manufactured on their own. Yet until the local market hypothetically only offered cloth imported from the outside, their activity did not collide with the interests of the manufacturers. However, if a specialized group of cloth producers, i.e., wool weavers, was present in town, then automatically a postulate could have appeared to enable fair access to retail clients. In theory, there was no reason for the weavers not to build or purchase chambers in cloth halls. In practice, those were entirely dominated by representatives of merchants who were in possession of larger financial resources, which was visible among others in investments in foreign goods and room for its storage. With a limited number of permanent trading posts, these were simply financially unavailable for the craftsmen. As a result, once the number of local producers in town reached a number and degree of organization that allowed them to express their discontent, a confrontation with the privileged group was inevitable, which led to the necessity of the ruler’s confirmation expressis verbis of the cloth hall merchants privileges or, alternatively, the finding of a compromise.

The first solution can be found in Frankfurt (Oder), where already in 1267 the margrave forbade the broadcloth-producing townfolk to sell it by ell,6 or in Silesian Świdnica (Schweidnitz), where in 1285 the duke forbade the town’s weavers and villagers to cut by the ell and sell fabrics, which was an activity limited to the merchant chambers’ owners.7 The duke put in place a similar solution in Oława (Ohlau) in 1282, and the very same was enforced in Pyzdry in the Greater Poland region in 1297.8 Its meaning in practice was explained clearly by the duke of Greater Poland, who in 1288 decided that the townsfolk of Śródka’s Old Town could not cut and sell the materials
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6 RIEDEL, Codex Diplomaticus Brandenburgensis [further: CDBr], vol. I/23, 5 no 4. RABELER, Konsumenten, 113.
7 IRGANG, Schlesisches Urkundenbuch [further: SUb], vol. 5, no 224. WYROZUMSKI, Tkactwo w Polsce, 518.
8 SUb, vol. 5, no 29. WYROZUMSKI, Tkactwo w Polsce, 517–518.
produced or imported by themselves but only as a whole. The aim was obviously to protect the monopoly of the cloth merchants from the newly charted city of Poznań. The fact that within the territory of Poznań the clothiers of Śródka could only sell whole pieces (pannos integros) was expressed by the duke in 1293. At the same time no weavers were mentioned by the record of the laws of the Cracow city council, known from a royal confirmation of 1342, which affirmed the monopoly of merchants (pannicidae) to sell cut cloth and excluded the nobility and peasantry (kmetones) from the privilege, at the same time allowing “guests”, i.e., travelling merchants, to sell six pieces of Flanders fabric on a market day. This in fact further diminished the interests of weavers, as it allowed allegedly cheaper goods from the country to enter the market.

The second, compromise solution was established in Wrocław no later than at the turn of the fourteenth century, to which period guild charters allowing the limited sale of cloth by weavers are dated. A whole piece of cloth could be sold to no more than three people, thus it could not be divided into more than three pieces – therefore the retail sale was not fully allowed. At the same time trading was supposed to take place in two city squares alternately (New and Old Market), which would preclude any requests to build permanent stalls. In the case of Market Square (the Old Market) trading happened in the passageway between rows of cloth hall stalls, which at that time could have already been covered with a roof. Some analogical spatial solution was used in Strzegom (Striegau), where in 1337 the duke confirmed the weavers’ old privilege of selling whole pieces of fabric sub lebys, i.e., under arcades of houses around Market Square.

The same cloth weavers (textores et operarii pannorum) of Strzegom approached the duke with a complaint aimed at indefinite townsfolk of their town (probably municipal authorities) who wanted to disregard their privilege. The duke supported the craftsmen’s cause and in 1297 ordered the local Vogt to protect their rights, which had been granted back when the city was first located (a prima locatone civitatis). The 55-year distance in time from the original event may give credibility to the clothiers’ tradition that was mentioned by the duke. A striking thing here may be the fact that the circumstances, number and details of cloth halls in Strzegom do not appear in the content of medieval privileges. In contrast, knowledge about the functioning of other types of trading venues, as well as about the situation in similar Silesian cities, comes from this type of source. This may hypothetically mean that initially the weavers of Strzegom were not subject to the typical trading limitations resulting from the existence of the privileged cloth hall chambers. An attempt to change such a state of matters was prevented in 1297. On the other hand, in cities such as Racibórz (Ratibor),

9 ZAKRZEWSKI, Kodeks Dyplomatyczny Wielkopolski [further: KDW], vol. 2, no 625. WYROZUMSKI, Tkactwo w Polsce, 518.
11 PIEKOSIŃSKI, Kodeks Dyplomatyczny miasta Krakowa, part 1, no 25; part 2, no 260. WYROZUMSKI, Tkactwo małopolskie, 121–122, 125.
12 KORN, Breslauer Urkundenbuch [further: BU], no 68, art. 7/1, 3, 4, art. 26/ 2. GOLIŃSKI, Podstawy gospodarcze mieszczaństwa, 79–80.
13 WUTKE – RANDT – BELLÉE, Regesten zur schlesischen Geschichte, no 5955.
14 SUb, vol. 6, no 310.
15 MŁYNARSKA-KALETYNOWA, Strzegom wczesnośredniowieczny i lokacyjny, 9.
16 Cf. GOLIŃSKI, On the problem of the size of trading complexes, 113, 114.
where in 1293 the duke confirmed the privileges granted earlier (i.e., before 1282, by Duke Vladislaus) to the owners of “cloth hall chambers”, reversing the situation was not possible – provided, that is, such attempt of attack was meant by the duke when describing an old dispute between the municipality and the tradesmen (antiquam etiam querellam intra universitatem civium Ratiboriensium ex una parte et mercatorum eiusdem civitatis ex altera parte), though this could also be regarding something different, e.g., the size of fees. (The reason of the dispute being the right to cut cloth was advocated by Marek Słoń. It may also be proven by the fact of simultaneously granting the merchants of the cloth hall a monopoly for their activity within a mile radius). 17

Incisio pannorum

In 1344 the councillors of Poznań and guild masters ended the war (guerra) between the cloth merchants and weavers, and ruled that the weavers could sell one piece of their fabric to no more than three people. At the same time, although the weavers were allowed to trade in the markets, they were forbidden to cut cloth at fairs, similarly to how it was forbidden for weavers in other cities. 18 In such case fairs could be understood as venues excluded from the allowed selling limitation to three customers. At the same time in Kalisz as a result of a royal privilege from 1343 weavers were allowed to sell their fabric to no more than five customers. 19 Or rather: as many as five. What is unusual is the limitation of the number of customers and division of a piece of fabric into three not being addressed directly to the weavers who appeared in Wrocław in 1305 in the duke’s privilege of 1305, where he confirmed to the “townsfolk in chambers under cloth halls” the continuation of rights granted by the former rulers. Its main aim was to remind of the prohibition of cutting cloth outside the chambers. Additionally, along with fabrics imported from Ghent and Ieper, locally produced textiles were explicitly mentioned. The latter was not a coincidence since cutting cloth was forbidden not only “between stalls and stands” but also in the New Town of Wrocław, which was known to be a cluster-point of weavers, as well as for nuns. 20 A clearly defined restriction on the possibility to sell cloth only in whole pieces appeared in 1310 in a duke’s privilege allowing the Beguines in Wrocław to produce white and grey broadcloth. 21

Unfortunately, the above picture is structured by the trade provisions of Wrocław from 1360 only in theory. It stated precisely the types of fabrics whose retail sale was limited to the merchants of cloth halls. Therefore, those who did not “stand in chambers” were not allowed to cut the “long fabrics” from Ghent, Brussels or Leuven, nor the “beautiful fabrics”, broadcloth from Bruges, Mechelen, Ieper and Korterich, or any other “long fabric” – whether they were weavers, nuns, clergy or secular folk. 22 We do not know, however, if this means that the monopoly did not involve the 33-ell “short broadcloth”, which was mentioned in documents along with the “long” (40-ell) one as produced by local weavers. Such selectivity is acceptable on the condition of combining the criterion of length with the quality of the fabrics. Let us mention here the record of laws of the Cracow city council of 1530, which, based on an old custom, resolved

17 SUb, vol. 6, no 129. SŁOŃ, Miasta podwójne i wielokrotnie, 176.
18 KDW, vol. 2, no 1233. WYROZUMSKI, Tkactwo małopolskie, 125. GĄSIOROWSKI, Rzemioślo i handel, 273.
19 WYROZUMSKI, Tkactwo małopolskie, 125.
20 BU, no 76. GOLIŃSKI, Podstawy gospodarcze mieszczarstwa, 80.
21 BU, no 90.
22 KORN, Schlesische Urkunden zur Geschichte des Gewerberechts [further: CDS 8], no XXXIV.
that only dyed broadcloths would be subject to the exclusivity of being sold by the ell by cloth hall merchants.\textsuperscript{23} The regulations from Wrocław of 1360 discussed above do not clarify the aforementioned doubt regarding the addressee of the limitations in the retail sale of broadcloth. They also mention cases of cloth purchased “under chambers” (\textit{under den kamern}) being divided between three buyers. One may only risk an interpretation that this describes a transaction made outside the merchants’ chambers, thus by weavers – based on similar decisions repeated regarding cutting into three pieces “under chambers” a piece of broadcloth purchased from a merchant who did not “stand in a chamber” but offered “beautiful fabric for clothes”\textsuperscript{24}. Otherwise, it would not be possible to explain the logic of the very generally formulated terms of the aforementioned temporary privileges granted by Wenceslaus IV to weavers in Wrocław. In 1395 it was only mentioned that the weavers could cut the fabrics of their own production for general use for only three years.\textsuperscript{25} Similarly in 1396, in order to avoid a “war” from the weavers’ side, the king confirmed the fact that he agreed for them to cut and sell by the ell the fabrics of their own production for no more than three years. Additionally, he introduced a fee to be paid by the seller to the councillor for every piece of cloth that was cut.\textsuperscript{26} In such form it was not perceived as compensation, which was the case later in Kalisz where in the mid-fifteenth century the weavers were allowed to sell their fabrics by the ell with the compensation of 2 groschen per tradesman.\textsuperscript{27}

The councillor of the duchy attempted to stop a dispute (\textit{dissensio}) that took place near Wrocław, in Środa Śląska (Neumarkt), between the cloth hall merchants (\textit{pannicidae}) and weavers in 1347, when he agreed to the division of a weaver’s fabric between as many as six buyers, though it had to be cut by a sworn tailor. Additionally, each weaver could produce one piece of fabric for personal use, both in winter and in summer, which implies it could have been cut depending on the need, while the unused excess of the material could be sold under appropriate supervision. In this context we fail to consider the third part of the sentence, which orders the weavers produce 30-ell–long pieces of fabric and sell them as a whole. We may again assume that such differentiation of laws was dependent on the type of fabric produced.\textsuperscript{28} Less than a year later the same councillor announced the details of an agreement between the merchants (\textit{mercatores seu pannicidas}) and the weavers, which clarified further aspects of the aforementioned dispute (\textit{dissensio et controversia}).\textsuperscript{29} It is supplemented by statutes granted to the weavers of Środa Śląska by the monarch in 1351. It turns out that on every market day the craftsmen offered their fabrics for sale in the cloth hall, except for one fair where they could stand wherever they wished. The fabrics offered for sale, long and short ones, were subject to control measurements by the councillor’s servants, according to the Wrocław custom. In addition, the maximum number of six buyers for a piece of fabric was repeated and the fact that it had to be
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\textsuperscript{27} WYROZUMSKI, \textit{Tkactwo małopolskie}, 125.
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brought to a tailor for cutting, as well as the right to sell the excess of the two pieces of fabric that were allowed for personal use.\textsuperscript{30} The enforced compromise was not stable – in the last decade of the fourteenth century it was violated by the news of a concession towards the producers from the capital of the duchy. In 1394 King Wenceslaus IV felt obliged to grant the weavers in Środa Śląska a privilege of the unrestrained retail sale of fabrics, just as he had done earlier in Wrocław (in 1391).\textsuperscript{31}

In 1367, the weavers (\textit{wewer}) of Reichenbach (nowadays Dzierżoniów), despite the protests of the cloth hall merchants (\textit{gewandsnyder vnd cammerherren}), were given the right to cut fabric by the Duke of Świdnica. After the duke’s death, the cloth merchants complained to the widow-duchess, pointing out that the already mentioned privilege belonged to them from the moment the city was located. In order to appease the “war” (\textit{krieg}), duchess Agnes returned the monopoly on cloth cutting to the merchants.\textsuperscript{32} This concession from the widow-duchess’ side cannot be a surprise, bearing in mind she was fighting on many fronts to maintain her position and was subject to pressure from the merchants’ elite in the duchy (most certainly in other cities people feared having changes similar to the ones from Dzierżoniów introduced there as well). What remains a surprise are the earlier motifs of Duke Bolko II towards the weavers, with an interesting fact being that the weavers appealed to a tradition of being privileged \textit{ab urbe condita} without any written proof. Their new legal situation after being granted the diploma from the duchess did not exclude the necessity of finding a compromise with the craftsmen, which is visible already a month and a half later in resolving further disputes announced by the council of Dzierżoniów. According to it the weavers could sell their fabrics by the ell in neighbouring Niemcza (Nimptsch) without objection from the cloth merchants of Dzierżoniów,\textsuperscript{33} while the unsold fabrics could be taken home, yet without the possibility of selling them around or in their home town. The cloth merchants were forbidden to search the houses of weavers, tailors and clippers for cut fabrics. The number of buyers for one piece of broadcloth was limited to five and although it was not clearly stated that this restriction applied to fabrics sold by weavers, it remains clear that this must have been the case, especially that the cutting was to be done by the council surveyor. Last but not least, similarly to in Środa Śląska, in summer and in winter the weavers were allowed to produce a piece of fabric for clothes for the family and their journeymen, with the right to give the clothes to friends or workers.\textsuperscript{34} None of that prevented another argument (\textit{czwetreehtekeit}) between the cloth merchants and wool weavers in Dzierżoniów two decades later, in the resolution of which the council and guild’s elders were involved. The main point of the decision made by them, with the duchess’ knowledge, in 1387 was the imposition of a rent of five marks per year for the councillors. It was also mentioned that should they be forbidden to cut fabric, the rent would be deducted. As a result of this solution, we learn about a new prey of the producers, due to which they had a new financial extortion forced upon them which
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\textsuperscript{33} What is characteristic is that it is not mentioned what the inhabitants of Niemcza themselves thought about the situation. There was no \textit{discordia} between the groups, like there was in 1291 between the inhabitants of Halberstadt and Quedlinburg, where the latter wanted to cut their fabrics in the city of the former. See HOLBACH, \textit{Cloth Production and Cloth Trade}, 168.
\textsuperscript{34} CDS 8, no XLII.
was later disclosed in Wrocław. The cutting limit only applied to personally produced fabrics, while those purchased by the weavers were excluded from the scope of the decision. Contrary to in the largest city in the region, the legal gains obtained by the inhabitants of Dzierżoniów were of more permanent character, which is proven by statutes issued by the councillor in 1399 and developed by the deputy councillor and city council members of Świdnica as arbitration judges in the dispute between the weavers and the cloth merchants. Both groups were granted the right to cut fabrics within the city of Dzierżoniów, highlighting additionally that the monopoly forbade such activity in the country and in front of churches in the municipal area. This did not exclude production outside guilds because a limitation of two purchasers was set for “broadcloth of the landowner’s production”, which could be cut in a cropping house. When it came to the weavers, it was clearly expressed that they were not allowed to cut any other fabric than that personally made. Both groups were obliged to comply with this regulation also outside the town, for example at fairs. Finally, the weavers’ rent was lowered to four marks per year.

An agreement announced by the Margrave of Brandenburg between the cloth merchants (pannicidae) and wool weavers (pannifices siue lanifices) in Perlenberg in 1345 does not contain any details, yet in an act of approval of the cloth merchants’ guild connected to it there is a monopoly defined for those cutting and selling fabrics by the ell. A hundred years later the margrave was not so consistent anymore. In 1447 in a verdict to a conflict between local cloth merchants (wantsnider) and weavers (wulen wefern and wantmackern) about cutting fabrics, he gave the right to the latter to cut by the ell and sell their own products. In the mid-fifteenth century in Wieluń a dispute between weavers and clothiers was brought to an end by a king’s decree that forbade the merchants to sell broadcloth cheaper than 13 quartae (a type of silver coin, equal to half a groshen) as these were limited to the weavers. However, all of the above does not mean that the concessions towards the producers were permanent, and the protests of the cloth merchants losing their monopoly were unsuccessful. Let us have a look at the example of Havelberg where, in 1310, the margrave first forbade both the visiting and the local weavers to sell broadcloth by the ell, allowing its trade only in full pieces. This was confirmed further in 1365 and 1441. Yet in 1442 the margrave allowed the wool weavers (wullenweber vnd gewantmacher) to cut broadcloth of their own production. However, already in 1448, when resolving a dispute “growing each day” between the cloth merchants (gewantsneider) and the weavers about cutting cloth, the margrave decided that the craftsmen were not to cut and sell by the ell.

---
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the fabrics they produced. A similar failure was noted in Frankfurt (Oder). In 1301 the agreement between the quarrelling (discordantes) cloth merchants and clothiers ruled that the weavers would not cut and sell by the ell any broadcloth besides that intended for their personal use and for their families, which is similar to what we know from Środa Śląska.

Chronology and economic lagging

Half a century ago Jerzy Wyrozumski argued that before locally produced fabrics became a matter of larger scale transactions, imported materials were of significance. This, according to the researcher, explained why a function of professional intermediary in cloth trading (pannicidae) was developed in the cities earlier than the activity of weaving was distinguished from household duties. Also, as a consequence, this was why cloth hall merchants gained the monopoly in trade already in the thirteenth century – unlikely for other branches of production – for both imported and locally produced fabrics, thus eliminating the craftsmen from business (for some time at least). It would not be difficult to agree with such reasoning, especially since we know that in the exemplary city of Magdeburg a guild of cloth merchants was established already in 1183. However, in this case the chronology of events did not match with the scheme. In the old March town of Stendal in 1231 the margraves organized cloth merchants into guilds (fraternitas) according to the Magdeburg example (gilde et incisores panni). Only two years later, in 1233, the local council forced the guild organization on weavers. A similar example of a delay that overthrows the argument about the gaining of advantage by the right of metrics can only be found in Pyrzyce (Pyritz). In 1320 the duke of Pomerania overturned an earlier unification of the crafts of cloth merchants and wool weavers (opus pannicidarum et lanificum) and forbade the latter to sell broadcloth by the ell. In the Czech city of Žatec in 1360 the king’s representatives together with the municipality forbade the clothiers (pannifices) to cut and sell broadcloth by the ell, as being harmful for the citizens. However, from the local Law Book one can learn that the cloth hall (mercatorium) in Žatec was built only two years later at the expense of the cloth merchants. In connection with research on material culture about the production breakthrough, and the subsequent market breakthrough, caused by the introduction of the horizontal foot-treadle floor loom and the connected excavated artifacts, it is nowadays believed that professional weavers functioned in the cities in our part of Europe from at least the twelfth century. Similar metrics are assigned to the appearance of fulled fabric, so broadcloth in the present-day meaning of the word. Thus, the privileged position of cloth hall merchants, which began only with the
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construction of cloth halls, i.e., in the thirteenth century, happened in the circumstances of already developed native woven production. Large-scale international cloth trade in the thirteenth century forced a lowering of production costs through the simplification of technology, which is visible in features of fabric artifacts dated to the fourteenth–fifteenth centuries. The wave of disputes from the fifteenth century caused by the postulates of producers wanting to gain direct contact with the customers should be viewed in the context of increasing competition.

The above-mentioned J. Wyrozumski researched numerous fascinating cases of smaller cities in Lesser Poland where producers successfully defended themselves from the cloth hall merchants. This phenomenon was a feature of a harmful economic underdevelopment of these local centres. Of course, such a situation could also be found west of the Polish territories. For example, in Neuruppin in 1323, the local council, with permission from the city owners, granted the townsfolk *de opere textorum* the right to sell broadcloth in pieces. On market days this could take place in cloth halls (*theatrum*), while on weekdays in their own houses. This does not mean that such an order of matters was widely accepted by the society from the beginning. It also happened to be a result of the same dispute, which, as we have tried to demonstrate, was at the basis of the economic organization of the late medieval city with borough rights.

---


54 Weavers from Lełow in 1362 obtained a royal privilege, confirmed in 1512, which stated that according to an old custom during Thursday market no visiting merchant could carry on retail trade of fabric of lower value than sixty groschen per piece. Thus, the interests of local producers were protected as those offering cheaper cloth, while the interests of local merchants were neglected. The prohibition of the import and sale of fabric of lower or equal value to local products outside the market which was issued in the interest of weavers, the cited researcher indicated also in Tarnów (1456), Częstochowa (1464), Plzeň (1502), Biec (1531) and Ciężkowice (1580). In Krzyżanowice, which was an unsuccessful settlement anyway, the location privilege from 1367 anticipated that, following the example of other towns and cities in the kingdom, the weavers would be allowed to sell the fabric in pieces and as a whole, within the city and outside of it, as well as bring it from the outside. In the sixteenth century weavers had the monopoly to trade broadcloth in Rzeszów. WYROZUMSKI, *Tkactwo małopolskie*, 122–125.
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57 Compare examples from Lesser Poland from the second half of the sixteenth century where tailors were forced to purchase fabric from weavers, as described in WYROZUMSKI, *Tkactwo małopolskie*, 124.

58 In Szydłów the cloth weavers, who were in dispute (*controversia*) with merchants and other townsfolk, in 1522 were given a royal privilege that dismissed the old right of the tradesmen to bring and cut cloth from the Kingdom of Poland and from Mazovia. They obtained or kept the right to sell and cut cloth of their own production. The limitations did not apply to the fair. The merchants were also allowed to sell imported fabrics if weavers did not supply enough of their own products. WYROZUMSKI, *Tkactwo małopolskie*, 122–123, where the source is edited.
A researcher characterizing the participation of Marseilles craftsmen in the trade found the connection of the weavers-dressmakers with it rather obvious. Nonetheless, this relationship may have stemmed primarily from the local craftsmen’s reliance on processing and re-exporting imported textiles, as dramatically demonstrated by the dyers in Montpellier. In such arrangement, there was an exchange of raw goods for processed goods between local merchants and craftsmen, mutually in need of each other. In this mechanism, as in the organization of the local production of linen cloth, possibly a network of economic dependence can be discerned, but certainly not a system based on legal favouritism or discrimination. A well-known example of the centralization of cloth production remains the hierarchical relations occurring between the economy of Cologne and the cities that made up its hinterland. The formation of a network of small centres specializing in cloth manufacturing, whose products were exported outside the region through a central market in the dominant metropolis, must have entailed (or resulted from) dependence and economic dictate. This was partly unavoidable, including in those cases where weaving production was based on high-quality raw material imported from abroad with the efforts and money of merchants. This led in the shortest way to the emergence of the putting-out system
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62 HOLBACH, “Also wer Tuch macht im Gericht zu Boppard”, 267. Examples from other regions, however, warn against overemphasizing the role of raw material imports, and thus the position of importers. Cf. VERHULST, De inlandse wol in de textielnijverheid, 18.
whose starting point was the possession of capital and not the socio-professional status of its organizers. It means that such organizers in the cities of the western part of the Reich originated both among merchants and craftsmen.63 A less well-known fact is the shift of Flanders cities from cheap and mass production to the manufacture of costly, high-quality cloth, in order to achieve a monopolistic position in European markets in this regard, as is known from the fourteenth century onward. The process leading to this shift remained painful for the manufacturers, as was revealed both in the reduction of wages for wage earners employed in the crafts and in the great social unrest of 1280.64 However, this did not mean an automatic antagonism between craftsmen and all merchants.65 And this despite the fact that the weavers’ guilds in Flanders cities, growing in political strength over time, retained their exclusively artisanal character while not restricting their members from doing trade.66

The above examples of the inadequacy of the situation noted on the symbolic east and west of the river Elbe can be further multiplied. They seem to perfectly reflect the balancing act to maintain the equilibrium of power between merchants and craftsmen in the cities. In places where exporting one’s own products played a secondary role for the economy, there was a glaring advantage for merchants, who could dictate their terms.67 When the economic situation evolved in favour of the producers, the tensions just described in this article emerged, difficult to eliminate under conditions of maintaining a monopoly of power by the merchant patriciate.
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This study follows the life of the merchant Reinhard of Reims, who moved to Prague in the 1390s and amassed significant property and a fair amount of political power due to his business activities. When the Hussite Revolution began, however, he had to leave Prague, and all his assets remaining in Bohemia were confiscated due to his political and religious beliefs. Like many other Prague merchants, he found a new home in Wroclaw, Silesia, a major hub for international trade. Reinhard continued to conduct his trade from exile in Wroclaw, taking part in the retrieval of valuables from abandoned Czech monasteries and other activities of exiles from Bohemia. After a peace was reached and Emperor Sigismund took the Czech throne, Reinhard achieved the restitution of some of his confiscated property.

Keywords: Late Middle Ages. Hussite Revolution. Exile. Commerce. Prague. Wroclaw.

As the chronicler writes, anno Domini M o CCCXCII o fuit diluvium Prage in vigilia sancti Nicolai. A number of other events both remarkable and unremarkable certainly also took place in the Czech capital that year, of course. Written records on the vast majority of those events, if they ever existed, have long since disappeared into the mists of time. Preserved city records do tell us, however, that in the second half of July in that same year borough rights to the Old City of Prague were extended to the protagonist of this story. His name was Reinhard and he was a merchant from Reims in the Champagne region of France. He had probably come to Prague somewhat (or perhaps much) earlier, perhaps as the agent for some trading company (possibly a family business), and settled down. If not for the Hussite Revolution, he may well have spent the rest of his life there. This study traces his life story, as he is the best attested exiled burgher from Hussite Bohemia.

Reinhard was not a typical Catholic emigrant from Bohemia, however, as his impressive fortune (although we can only roughly estimate its worth today) far exceeded the burgher property usual for the time. If the exiles had been an organized group and elected a representative, it is quite probable that Reinhard’s candidacy would have found broad support among the other exiles. Most of the other exiles belonged more to the middle class, lost (almost) all of their possessions when they left their...
homes and had to build their living from scratch in exile (which is also why there are very few records of them). For this reason, most exiles moved only to Catholic towns inside Bohemia and Moravia, most often to Jihlava. Reinhard, on the other hand, was one of the few lucky ones who took into exile or owned considerable wealth abroad and therefore headed for important business centres outside Bohemia. His fate is therefore quite unique and it is not possible to create a deeper characterization of the phenomenon of the Catholic exile from Hussite cities on the basis of this knowledge. This text is therefore a material study, expanding the hitherto quite sketchy source base for future research into this phenomenon of the Hussite wars.3

Due to the close connections with the family from Mühlhausen (am Neckar), older literature sometimes identified Reinhard with Reinhard of Mühlhausen. It was not entirely unusual for one person to use more than one name at that time (although the city councils tried to prevent it), but as Martin Musílek definitively showed using primary sources, this identification is not justified.4 Reinhard probably had good contacts in Prague even before 1392, perhaps in relation to his commercial activities. When he received borough rights, his sponsor was Rudolf of Mühlhausen, a wealthy Prague merchant who owned house number 549/I on Old Town Square as well as a number of annuities in the greater Prague area.5 Later, Reinhard became Rudolf’s son-in-law after marrying his daughter Markéta.6

What could have brought Reinhard to Prague? As we will see below, his motives appear to have been driven by business opportunities. Holy Roman Emperor Charles IV helped build systematic long-distance trade in Prague in 1354 when he confirmed the privilege granted to Prague by his grandfather Henry VII. This exempted Prague merchants from customs fees throughout the empire. Other privileges and prerogatives granted during his reign made it easier for them to gain business contacts in Poland and Hungary as well as passage through Hungary to Venice, the centre for distributing luxury goods from the East. Venetian merchants also wanted to buy gold and silver exported from Bohemia, as Prague was a major Central European hub for trade in

3 A deeper analysis of the phenomenon of Catholic exile in the form of a monograph will be the main output of the above-mentioned project (see the first footnote) and is tentatively planned for 2024. The work on the project is currently in the phase of collecting material and its partial evaluation. In the past, this topic has been treated only superficially or fragmentarily in historiography and there is no dedicated monograph, because collecting the source material scattered in many foreign archives is much easier today than in the past thanks to digital technologies. Selected from the literature: TOMEK, Dějepis města Prahy IV. KLIER, Nürnberg und Kuttenberg. HOFFMANN, Jihlava v husitské revoluci. MEZNÍK, Venkovské statky. MEZNÍK, Praha před husitskou revolucí. MUSÍLEK, Formy komunikace. CAPSKÝ, K postavení Vratislavi. KRZENCK, Mähren als Exilland. I have already outlined the preliminary results of a study of the diaspora of exiles from Hussite cities in VODIČKA, “Und ap es geschege”. However, the results of this study will have to be corrected or completely rewritten in many respects in the planned monograph.

4 Reinhard of Mühlhausen was a Prague burgher by 1380, cf. MUSÍLEK, Patroni, klienti, příbuzní, 235. Prague had more than one burgher at that time using the surname of Mühlhausen (Reinhard, Rudolf and Konrad), although Musílek states they were not related, ibid., 239.


6 An entry in the Wroclaw administrative records for 1429 indicates that he was married to one of Rudolf’s daughters, cf. Archiwum Państwowe we Wrocławiu (hereinafter APW), Akta miasta Wrocławia (hereinafter AMW), sign. 665 (Libri excessum et signaturarum 1428–1429), fol. 487v–488v, pag. 64–66, here fol. 487v, pag. 64: “am teile des Reynhards von Rems von seiner elichen husfrauen und irer geswisterde wegen, nemelichen Maternus und Nicolaus gebrudern, Agnes, Katherina und Hedwiga, alle geswisterde und etwenn Rudolphi von Molhausen, dem Got gnade, alle eliche kynder, der grossen stat von Prage.” A supplication from 1418 states that his wife was named Markéta, cf. ERŠIL, Acta Martini V., pp. 74–75, no. 165.
precious metals at that time. At least, that is the conclusion reached by some authors based on the three to four city officials overseeing adherence to trade regulations for gold and silver in Prague.\(^7\)

As to Reinhard’s occupation, we only know generally that he was a merchant and to some extent a financier (as was common for merchants). It is not entirely clear, however, which aspect of his business (if any) took greater precedence. He appears to have done trade in all the usual goods, especially cloth, wine and precious metals. Indirect evidence from 1407 indicates that Reinhard was part of a trading company with other Prague merchants (Hanuš Ottlinger, Petr of Meziříčí, Mikuláš Puschwiczer, Mikuláš Hochhut and Mikuláš of Aachen): Hanuš Sachs paid them almost 230 threescores of groschen.\(^8\)

Reinhard also did business on his own, as evidenced by the deed of privilege and safe conduct granted by the Austrian Duke Arnost when visiting Prague in the fall of 1412. This deed guaranteed Reinhard and his servants protection, freedom of movement, accommodation and trade in goods (only wine is mentioned specifically) throughout the Duchy of Austria.\(^9\) Another surviving record from 1418 shows that Reinhard was working with Prague merchants Antonín of Munheim and Matyáš of Aachen to recover a debt they all had against a certain Mikuláš *Generischgern* of Olomouc. According to the Old Town Council, they were all to split any payments made in proportion to the debt owed them.\(^10\)

Reinhard used the profits from trading to buy property and annuities in and around Prague. The first record of ownership of a house dates from 1400, when Reinhard and Mikuláš of Žatec confiscated house number 702 on Masná street from Petr Royn in payment of debt. They appear to have sold it immediately, however.\(^11\) In 1407 Reinhard received an annuity of five threescores from Uršula Mikulášova from Prague on a house on Celetná street.\(^12\) He also held house number 930c on Old Town Square for some time – certainly in the years 1405–1413, but probably for even longer, possibly until the revolution began.\(^13\) In 1413 he bought a vineyard called Plesenstein at Bruska (now part of Hradčany) for 130 threescores of groschen from Reinhard the younger (III) of Mühlhausen.\(^14\) In January of 1416 he purchased an annuity of 25 threescores of groschen from Sluštice in Sluštice for a purchase price of 200 threescores.\(^15\) His most significant acquisition, and probably also his primary residence, was the house called U Šlona (*Ad elephantem*, today U Zlatého slona, number 609, 610/I) where the street Dlouhá třída meets Old Town Square. Previous owners of this prestigious home include Prague burgher František Rokycanský. Sometime between 1403 and 1405 this house passed from Pertold of Mühlhausen to Reinhard

---

\(^7\) DVOŘÁK, *Císař Karel IV. a pražský zahraniční obchod 1*, 7–15, 22. DVOŘÁK, *Císař Karel IV. a pražský zahraniční obchod 2*, 38. On the attempt to entice Venetian merchants to trade with Bruges through Prague cf. ibid., 34.

\(^8\) TEIGE, *Základy starého místopisu*, p. 344, no. 930c. Comp. DVOŘÁK, *Císař Karel IV. a pražský zahraniční obchod 1*, 61.


\(^10\) TEIGE, *Základy starého místopisu*, p. 345, no. 930c.


\(^12\) MENDL, *Z hospodářských dějin*, 282.

\(^13\) TOMEK, *Základy starého místopisu I*, p. 19, no. 930c.


\(^15\) EMLER, *Reliquiae tabularum*, 125. Miloš Dvořák is of the opinion that Reinhard of Reims held a lien over the entire Sluštice property, cf. DVOŘÁK, *Císař Karel IV. a pražský zahraniční obchod 1*, 75.
of Reims by some unknown means. Since no record of the sale exists, it is possible that Reinhard may have acquired it in some other manner. Given his family connections to the Mühlhausen family, it seems quite likely that he acquired it through his previously mentioned marriage to Markéta of Mühlhausen. Reinhard is recorded as the owner of this house in 1405, 1406 and 1413, but he most likely held it until the Hussite Revolution began. Like other wealthy Prague burghers, Reinhard also had a country estate. Sometime in the early fifteenth century, apparently between 1409 and 1416, he received the village and fortress of Roztoky from Reinhard II of Mühlhausen. The *terminus ante quem* relates to a ruling by the Old Town Council in a dispute led (and later won) by Reinhard of Reims in the spring of 1416 against the Břevnov Monastery, former owner of Roztoky, over the meadow between the fortress and the Vltava River.

Reinhard built on his financial success with a rise in political influence as well. In the early fifteenth century he was a member of the city council in 1402, 1405, 1407 and 1413. Reinhard’s first engagement on the city council is of particular note. The council was appointed under the influence of Sigismund of Luxembourg, administrator of the Kingdom of Bohemia while Wenceslas IV was imprisoned in Vienna. Reinhard took advantage of the peculiar political situation, which worked in his favour and allowed *hominis novi* to rise to power due to their wealth and connections. It should also be noted that Reinhard retained at least part of his influence, as he was appointed to the council again even after 1408; that year is generally considered a turning point in city council appointments after which preference was given to Czech candidates. His political engagement helped Reinhard integrate more deeply into the highest levels of Prague society as well as draw the attention of the nobility and court circles. This social capital later played a critical role for Reinhard during the turbulent times of the Hussite Revolution, when the court of Sigismund of Luxembourg became a source of information and a certain amount of institutional protection for Catholic exiles leaving cities controlled by the Hussites, travelling around the border regions, and settling down in trading hubs outside the Bohemian borders, as seen below.

Other evidence of Reinhard’s good connections with the nobility includes his participation in the supplication of Vilém Zajíc the younger of Házmburk, dated 13 January 1418. Vilém was the brother of Archbishop Zbyněk Zajíc of Hazmburk, who died in exile in Hungary in 1411. He was also a royal advisor to Wenceslas IV and maintained contact with his brother Sigismund of Luxembourg as well. Later he acted as a leading member of the Catholic and royalist faction in Hussite Bohemia.
had lain under the lasting stigma of interdict since it was first imposed in 1412, so Vilém and several influential Prague burghers petitioned Pope Martin V for an exception so they and their families could hear Mass even in places under interdict. Reinhard and his wife were also the only applicants to receive permission to choose a confessor to give them the last rites as well as to use a portable altar for their own needs.  

The first Catholic refugees apparently left Hussite Prague immediately after the death of King Wenceslas in August 1419. The dowager queen Sophia’s attempts at peacemaking in November and Sigismund’s negotiations with Prague burghers in Brno in December apparently had little to no success in allowing exiles to return. As soon as a crusade was launched against the Hussites in March of the next year, the Prague municipal authorities began to actively hunt down and drive out enemies of the chalice. It is a near certainty that Reinhard left Prague no later than at this time. City councils were seizing the property of those who fled, selling them in later years or even giving them to adherents. The city council sold Reinhard’s house (no. 930c) on Old Town Square in 1424 for 63 threescores to Jan Carda, who kept it until at least 1433. Smil of Prackovice bought the Bruska vineyard from the city at some point before 1427 for 19 threescores. Jan Rozvoda of Stakory acquired the house U Slona (no. 609, 610/I) from the city and later sold it to Jan Krupa for 70 threescores. The city council also confiscated Roztoky and handed it over to Jan of Pořešín, protonotary for the city council, in 1421.

The first steps taken by Catholic exiles after leaving Prague have long since disappeared due to a lack of source material, and Reinhard is no exception. Generally speaking, those going into exile first hid in fortresses near Prague controlled by royalists, hoping they would soon be able to return to the city once it was conquered. Two potential strategies come into play after the crusade failed in late July 1420. Since Reinhard had property in the countryside, he may have attempted to defend it. This may seem like a relatively reckless move from today’s standpoint, but at the time hope of a successful crusade had not yet died. As Roztoky was not far from Hussite Prague

---


22 ERŠIL, *Acta Martini V.*, pp. 74–75, no. 165. Other applicants listed alongside Vilém and Reinhard are Jan of Bamberg (1405–1419 head clerk for Wenceslas IV, also known as “Master Hána”) and an unidentified Jan of Prague.

23 The first group of migrants from Prague in connection with the Hussite movement were the scholars of Prague University who left in 1409 following the issue of the Decree of Kutná Hora. This charter fundamentally changed the power relations at the university. See NODL, *Dekret kutnohorský*.


28 The fortress at Makotřasy, for instance, belonging to Petr of Meziříčí, was unsuccessfully besieged in May of 1420 by an army from Prague and conquered in March of 1421 with the help of encampments. Comp. MEZNÍK, *Venkovské statky*, 18. TOMEK, *Dějepis města Prahy IV*, 58–59, 133.
(about 10 km), however, this does not seem particularly likely. Alternatively, he may have made use of his many social connections to secure the hospitality of friendly merchants or members of the nobility based in border regions. He could theoretically have gone in any direction. The most important (and perhaps those less important as well) received safe conduct from King Sigismund for themselves and members of their households, guaranteeing them freedom of movement and residence throughout the empire.²⁹ It is highly likely that Reinhard received such a safe conduct as well, although no record of it has been preserved. Documents such as these could have served in lieu of the letter of recommendation (Abzugs-, Geburts-, Freibrief) newcomers were usually required to provide in order to be granted borough rights.³⁰

As far as we can tell from indirect references, Reinhard appears to have followed other wealthy merchants from Prague tracing the steps of the office of the vicars general of the Prague diocese, travelling through Litoměřice north to the six towns of the Lusatian League. We can deduce as much from an undated draft of a letter from the bailiff of the Ebrach monastery property in Nürnberg to the exiled abbot of the Cistercian monastery at Nepomuk, living at the time in Austria at a monastery estate near Krems.³¹ The document refers to valuables from Nepomuk held by Eufemie, the widow of Adam of Zaříčí, a clerk from Prague’s Ungelt, also in exile from Hussite Prague. Eufemie remained in Zittau for some time, where Reinhard met with her periodically on his travels. On his last visit, around 24 June (apparently in 1421), however, he did not find her there. Thus it seems clear that Reinhard spent the first years of the Hussite Wars more or less on the move, perhaps travelling between Nürnberg, Zittau and Wrocław.

Since the above-mentioned 1412 safe conduct from the Duke of Austria is to be found in the Nürnberg archive today, previously the hypothesis was that Reinhard spent the time of the Hussite Revolution there.³² Based on many records from the Wrocław city archive, however, it is certain that Reinhard was part of the wave of wealthy Prague Catholics who settled down there before the mid-1420s. Wrocław was an attractive location for merchants due to its location and significance in long-distance trade. It sat on a trade route called the Via regia, or Hohe Straße, by which goods travelled from Russia and Poland to Central and Western Europe. In 1359, Charles IV exempted Wrocław merchants from customs duties within the empire, and the following year Wrocław was granted the right to mint its own gold coins, connecting it with the Prague gold market.³³ Although safe conducts from King Sigismund allowed Prague exiles to set out in any direction to find a temporary safe haven, Wrocław was certainly the most popular destination, for the reasons set forth above. However, it was certainly not without significance that the Silesian metropolis was within the borders of the Lands of the Bohemian crown and was therefore not really a foreign destination. We can find a large number

²⁹ Only two of these documents survive. The first is a safe conduct for Petr the older and Petr the younger of Meziříčí, dated 14 February 1421, cf. VODIČKA, “Und ap es geschege”, 36–37. The second is a safe conduct for Václav Ottlinger dated 19 December 1433, recorded in ALTMANN, Regesta Imperii (hereinafter RI) XI/2, p. 262, no. 9901. For more on letters of safe conduct in general, cf. KINTZINGER, Cum salvo conductu.

³⁰ SCHWINGES, Neubürger und Bürgerbücher, 39.


³² HLAVÁČEK, Drobné příspěvky, 73.

³³ DVOŘÁK, Císař Karel IV. a pražský zahraniční obchod 1, 24. DVOŘÁK, Císař Karel IV. a pražský zahraniční obchod 2, 40.
of exiles from Prague later living in Wroclaw (among the most important we might mention the merchants Albert Camerer, Chval Lorberer, Petr of Žatec and Václav Stupen; goldsmiths Hanuš Neumeister and Václav of Prague; and whole extended families such as Čotr, Ottinger/Paierehl, of Meziříčí, of Mühlhausen, and the orphaned children of František Rokycanský). We can find other exiles in smaller numbers in Vienna (Antonín of Munheim, the brothers Jindřich and Heřman Sachsenfeld, and Leotold Zwirner) and other less important locations (Czech cities, especially Jihlava and Pilsen, and other cities like Klodzko and Zittau). 34

We do not know exactly when Reinhard arrived in Wroclaw. The first mention of his name cannot be placed on the timeline until shortly before 13 February 1425. It consists of an undated insert of the will of Zikmund Albík of Uničov in a notarial deed of that date in a letter from the papal legate Jan Carvajal dated 15 May 1448. 35 At the time the testament was made, Reinhard already owned a house in the city (in presencia ... domini Reynhardi in domo eiusdem Reynhardi in stuba) in which Zikmund Albík entrusted 500 Hungarian guilders (about 175 three scores of groschen) to goldsmith Hanuš Neumeister of Prague, executor of his estate. 36 The reason the testament itself is put at a date shortly before the notarial instrument is that Zikmund Albík declares in both documents that he is drawing up his will because he intends to leave Wroclaw for Hungary (to join King Sigismund’s court, where he died in 1427). Another, reliably dated reference to Reinhard in Wroclaw comes from 22 September 1425. This record represents the beginning of his lengthy dispute with Heinrich “Langeheincze” Reuter of Coburg, discussed in more detail below. His possession of a house once again sets Reinhard apart from the other exiles, as few could afford to own a house in exile, and those who did mostly did so only in the late 1420s or early 1430s, when the hope of a military defeat of the Hussite Revolution and complete restoration to the old system was quite low.

Most traces of Reinhard’s activities in exile relate to older debts. For some we have no further information, just the name of the debtor and amount of the debt. That is the case for Prague exile Vavřinec the swordsmith, based in Zittau in 1426, who owed Reinhard 42 marks and nine groschen. 37 The same applies to Vincent Procot, who did not know the exact amount of his debt and visited Reinhard for that reason in the same year, accompanied by Mikuláš Paschewicz of Grossendorf (today Dłużyce in Poland). After checking his accounts, Reinhard calculated Procot’s debt at 22 marks of groschen, seven of which he forgave on the spot. 38 Somewhat more information is available on the debt owed Reinhard by Salzburg burgher Hanuš Greymel. Salzburg benefited from its prime location on the trade route between Venice and Prague; meagre source documents trace this contact from the time of Holy Roman Emperor Charles IV. 39 We can thus

34 I have outlined the preliminary results of a study of the diaspora of exiles from Hussite cities in VODIČKA, “Und ap es geschege”.
35 Národní archiv (hereinafter NA), Archiv kolegiátní kapituly vyšehradské, charter no. 355.
36 On Zikmund Albík of Uničov and especially his testament, cf. ŘÍHOVÁ, Dvorní lékař, 38. For new sources on his stay in Wroclaw, cf. VODIČKA, Exil českého a moravského duchovenstva, p. 203, no. 114.
37 APW AMW, sign. 662 (Libri excessum et signaturarum 1426–1427), fol. 334r, pag. 65. Vavřinec acknowledged the debt before the Wroclaw city council and agreed with Reinhard on a payment schedule for one year. Polish mark means 48 pieces/coins.
38 Ibid., fol. 338r, pag. 73.
39 In the 1380s, for instance, Salzburg merchant Jörg Aigl supplied wine from Venice to Prague and arsenic to Venice. During the same period, Petr Weilhamer and partners exported arsenic to Venice and fustian to Prague. About 1391 the Salzburg factor for the Runtinger family was trading with Bohemia. The Rosenberg book of
presume that Hanuš incurred his debt of 500 Hungarian guilders (about 175 threescore of groschen) from unknown business activities between himself and Reinhard prior to 1420. The first letter from the Salzburg magistrate to Hanuš about failure to meet payment deadlines bears the date 18 March 1422 and summons him to appear before the court on 24 April. Hanuš, however, ignored this summons and several others that followed, and apparently could not be found in Salzburg. In 1423 he was living in the town (Markt) of Schladming and did not appear troubled about his debts. Reinhard did not handle these matters in person. He sent servants to represent him, first Heinrich Cholrär (1422, 1423) and later Conrad Eysenreich (1430). Half of Hanuš Greymel’s house in Tragasse (now Getreidegasse), Salzburg, was used as collateral for the debt, and in 1430 the city court ruled that the tenants should pay rent to Reinhard as interest on the principal. Early the next year the magistrate decided that said half of the house would go to Conrad Eysenreich, Reinhard’s servant, for 400 (sic) Hungarian guilders, and sent word to Schladming. Hanuš Greymel had one last opportunity to redeem the house at this price within six weeks. Conrad Eysenreich did not want to wait that long, however, so he entrusted the exercise of Reinhard’s rights to his landlord Hanuš Rawchenperger. After the grace period had passed, Hanuš Rawchenperger informed the magistrate on Wednesday 28 February 1431 that Hanuš Greymel had not redeemed the property, and it was then transferred to Reinhard. It was decided that the tenants should continue to pay rent to Reinhard and that he could treat the house as his own as well as enjoying the advantages of burgher rights, which in many cities were contingent upon owning property. The last report of a debt owed to Reinhard dates to 1433. Nickel Reyman of Krakow acknowledged a debt of nearly 26 marks of groschen before the Wroclaw city council and agreed to payment in instalments. Once again we have no indication of how the debt was incurred. All we know is that failure to keep up with the instalment schedule would mean any amount paid went to the creditor and the debt itself (the bill of debt) would not expire. Reinhard was an atypical exile with regard to debt as well. In most cases emigrants from Bohemia were the ones drowning in debt they were unable to pay, sometimes granting their creditors theoretical rights to their confiscated property in Bohemia.

In the late 1420s and early 1430s Reinhard played an important role in the exile community in Wroclaw in negotiating a dispute that was essentially fairly simple, yet under the circumstances difficult to resolve. In 1429 the Wroclaw city council discussed debt as part of settling the estate of Reinhard’s father-in-law, Rudolf of Mühlhausen, formerly based in Prague. The parties to the dispute were Rudolf’s heirs (sons Materna and Mikuláš and daughters Anežka, Kateřina and Hedvika) and Bernard Falkenauer, to


41 APW AMW, sign. 665 (Libri excessum et signaturarum 1432–1433), pag. 114. The debt consisted of two parts; the source document specifically states “five and a half marks and 20 and 18 groschen”. Most likely the word “marks” was left out here (20 marks and 18 groschen), since the instalment plan was set up for multiple years of nine hrivna each, which would not make sense for six marks and 14 groschen.
whom Rudolf owed the above-mentioned debt. On 17 September the arbiters made a ruling that did not actually address the dispute, but merely put it off indefinitely. The bills of debt from Rudolf’s estate attesting to his receivables in Bohemia, temporarily in the keeping of Reinhard of Reims, were to remain with him. If a return to Bohemia did become possible in the future, then the ruling would be made on who would be entitled to the receivables.42 This ruling did not satisfy Bernard, however, and the matter was discussed again on 11 October of the same year. This time the arbiters stipulated that Bernard should receive two bills of debt from Reinhard for debts from Čáslav burghers (and, coincidentally, exiles in Jihlava) worth 279 threescore of groschen, in addition to several smaller matters. Only if they were able to recover this money from debtors in the future would the heirs of Rudolf of Mühlhausen have the right to claim their receivables according to Prague burgher rights, provided that they could prove and defend said claim. The ruling also stated that the parties to the dispute would have a chest made with two locks that could only be opened with both keys at once, and each party would hold one key. The chest was to be filled with all the bills of debt the arbiters had seen (with the apparent exception of those awarded to Bernard) and then entrusted to Reinhard of Reims.43 As far as Reinhard’s own will is concerned, none has survived until the present. Generally speaking, the wills of emigrants tend to leave two different types of legacies. The first concerned chattels (usually fairly negligible in size) in the place of exile, while the second involved confiscated property and difficult-to-recover debts in Bohemia. In most cases the second type of legacy was never enforced.44

Further evidence that Reinhard had a secure, well-located and spacious stone house in Wroclaw includes the fact that other exiles stored their valuables with him. In addition to the above-mentioned money left behind by Zikmund Albík of Uničov and the chest with the bills of debt from Rudolf of Mühlhausen, the Augustinians from the canon house at Karlov in Prague also stored a chest of vestments with Reinhard. After Reinhard – ab antiquo amicus, fautor et benefactor of the Karlov canon house – returned them in 1430 with reference to his advanced age, the vestments were relocated to the Wroclaw canon house Na Písku (Piask, In arena).45 This kind of relationship between a wealthy exiled burgher and an exiled cloister was relatively common at the time, but typically it involved pawning valuables the impoverished church institutions were later unable to redeem. The cloister’s treasures and libraries were then sold off piecemeal. This house was not the only property Reinhard owned in the city, however. The Wroclaw Schöffenbuch (liber scabinorum) contains a record dated 20 March 1430, according to which Reinhard purchased three additional houses from Eufemie Walrabynne: one

42 APW AMW, sign. 665 (Libri excessum et signaturarum 1432–1433), sign. 663, fol. 486v, pag. 62.
43 Ibid., fol. 487v–488v, pag. 64–66. The Čáslav receivables pertained to burghers Ondřej Rychtář and Václav Finder, to whom King Sigismund pledged three villages (belonging to Sedlec Abbey and worth 400 threescore of groschen) on 4 December 1420 in Kutná Hora due to his own debts and the protection of property. See NA, České gubernium – listiny, no. 186. Comp. BARTA, Zástavní listiny, p. 161, no. 68.
44 I am preparing a separate study of the wills of Bohemian exiles during this time period, which should be published in 2022 or 2023.
45 The document was issued by DOLEŽALOVÁ – DRAGOUN, Střípky k exilovým pobytům, pp. 309–310, no. 2. Cf. also KADLEC, Katoličtí exulanti, 47.
called Vorderhowt next to the parish yard of the Church of Mary Magdalene and two smaller houses on the same courtyard. 46

Reinhard’s most significant, or rather best documented, legal case was his dispute with Jindřich Reuter, also called Langeheincze or occasionally Langehans. Originally from Coburg in Upper Franconia, his parents were Herman Reuter and Tyle Reuteryn (previously Tyle Arnolt). 47 His first wife was named Alžběta, and he married a second time to Kunhuta sometime between 1435 and 1441. 48 His trade network stretched at least between Nürnberg, Prague, Leipzig, Wroclaw and the six towns of the Lusatian League. He enjoyed burgher rights in Görlitz between 1421 and 1424. 49 He often did trade in this city even after that time, supplying military equipment (armour, horses, banners) and providing loans. 50

Unfortunately, we have no information on the actual substance of the dispute between these two influential, wealthy merchants. We can only assume that the business contacts between them had a pre-Hussite past. Perhaps the dispute involved some debts from a business agreement thwarted by the Hussite Revolution. One party may have considered the agreement void for objective reasons, while the other may have insisted that the agreed conditions be met, come what may. It may just as well have concerned discrepancies in the settlement of someone’s will or similar. From later phases of the dispute we only know that Reinhard claimed a debt of 26 threescore of groschen from Jindřich and had him imprisoned in Wroclaw over that debt. On Saturday 22 September 1425 Jindřich stood before the Wroclaw city council – apparently under duress and facing the threat of further imprisonment – and acknowledged the debt and his intention to repay it by placing a document on pledge. 51 Three days later, on Tuesday 25 September four arbiters (at least two of whom were exiles from Prague) appeared before the council – Zikmund Weilburg Janův of Prague 52 and Zikmund Taschner on behalf of Reinhard, and Chval Lorberer of Prague 53 and Jindřich of Meissen on behalf of Jindřich. They described for the council additional details of the settlement: Jindřich

---

46 APW AMW, sign. 623 (Libri scabinorum 1426–1433), fol. 194v. For the sale of other property from her extensive widow’s estate cf. ibid., fol. 201v, 218v, 241v, 266r, 284r.

47 In 1394 his father bought the house at Ketschengasse No. 22, cf. ANDRIAN-WERBURG, Das älteste Coburger Stadtbuch, p. 2, no. 11; p. 29, no. 182. For the first mention of Jindřich and list of his extended family members dated 17 May 1409, cf. ibid., p. 330, no. 1849. Another mention dated 1419 ibid., p. 113, no. 678. The name lang Heincz first attested in 1423, ibid., p. 160, no. 945.

48 Alžběta is attested in 1435, cf. ibid., p. 243, no. 1410. Kunhuta is attested in 1441, see footnote 80 below.

49 For burgher rights, cf. WENTSCHER, Codex diplomaticus Lusatiae superioris V (hereinafter CDLS V), p. 22, p. 24, footnote no. 5. In 1423 he supplied Görlitz with horses from Leipzig, cf. JECHT, Codex diplomaticus Lusatiae superioris II/1 (hereinafter CDLS II/1), 146.

50 CDLS II/1, 279, 293 (five suits of armour from Nürnberg for 19 threescore of groschen), 325 (a loan of 11 threescore of groschen), 333 (a loan of 5 threescore of groschen), 334 (a banner for an army marching on Ústí nad Labem for 20 groschen), 420 (armour for 51 threescore of groschen), 441 (armour for 9 marks), 494 (a horse for 10 threescore).

51 APW AMW, sign. 661 (Libri excessum et signaturarum 1424–1425), fol. 287r, pag. 69.

52 Bachelor of medicine and master of the free arts, head scribe at the Prague Old City Hall in 1412–1419. For this reason also known as Zikmund de pretorio. He fled during the Hussite Revolution to Zittau and from there to Wroclaw, where he entered the services of another wealthy Prague exile, Václav Stupen. Later (before 1435) he came to hold a parish prebend in the village of Jakubowice near Namysłów (Jacobsdorff im Namslichen gebiete gelegen). Cf. VODIČKA, Exil českého a moravského duchovenstva, p. 203, no. 116.

53 Chval also fled to Wroclaw, acquiring a house on the market square on the corner across from the Church of St Elizabeth in 1432, which he appears to have kept until his death in 1446. Cf. GOLIŃSKI, Przy wroclawskim rynku 2, 13–14. He traded in copper for the production and maintenance of firearms. Records of his business
acknowledged his debt and temporarily placed on pledge with Reinhard a document concerning the property of the Cistercian monastery at Plasy (brief ... der obir die monche zum Plass lautet). He also promised to abstain from all unfriendly actions against Reinhard, his heirs, servants and goods, as well as against the city of Wroclaw as a whole.\(^5^4\) Jindřich repeated this pledge before the Wroclaw city council in August 1426 – it was recorded in the city books again on Friday 2 August, and the council issued a written confirmation on Friday 30 August.\(^5^5\) On 28 June 1427, both merchants appeared a final time before the Wroclaw city council and a note was added to the extensive record from September 1425 stating that the debt had been paid and the document held in pledge had been returned.\(^5^6\)

The story of this ordinary dispute could have ended here. Debts had been paid, wrongs righted and property returned. As it transpired, however, the story was only just picking up pace. It appears that Jindřich placed a high value on his document regarding the property at Plasy, and so he held up his end of the agreement faithfully – until he got his pledge back. Then he could finally show that he did not consider the matter fairly settled at all and that he had made his promises only under duress. Less than a month after he had last stood before the Wroclaw city council, Jindřich was already dreaming up plans to take his revenge on Reinhard and the city of Wroclaw. As the capital city of Silesia, Wroclaw’s power was not insignificant, and so he knew he would need allies to bring his plans to fruition. Searching for said allies, of course, ran the risk that anyone he approached would not share his views and would use the information to their own advantage. That is exactly what appears to have happened, in fact, since a letter arrived in Wroclaw dated 26 August 1427.\(^5^7\) The letter’s author, Kašpar Lelau, was a prominent member of the Görlitz city council class and was mayor in 1423. He wrote to the Wroclaw city council to inform them of progress in the negotiations at the Dresden assembly on 22 August, where Friedrich I der Streitbare (1370–1428, Duke of Saxony 1423–1428) had tried in vain to induce the cities and nobility of Upper Lusatia to join the conquest of Most.\(^5^8\) He also devoted a large part of his letter, however, to Jindřich, with whom Kašpar had met on the way back while staying overnight at the bishop’s castle Stolpen.

Jindřich had allegedly been heard to say that he had warned Nürnberg merchants not to load their goods on wagons with goods belonging to merchants from Wroclaw. From this Kašpar deduced that Jindřich was planning to attack Wroclaw merchants, and he spread the news everywhere he could. He reported that he informed the Bishop of Meissen, Hanuš of Polensko (the magistrate – German Vogt – of Lower Lusatia) and representatives of the other towns of Upper Lusatia. They all attempted to convince Jindřich not to do anything against Wroclaw until the other side could be heard and to wait at least until Michaelmas (September 29). After Jindřich denied all

\(^{54}\) APW AMW, sign. 661 (Libri excessum et signaturarum 1424–1425), fol. 288v–289r, pag. 72–73.
\(^{55}\) APW AMW, sign. 662 (Libri excessum et signaturarum 1426–1427), fol. 332v, pag. 62; a fragment of a document dated 8 August 1426 cf. ibid., Dokumenty miasta Wroclawia, no. 1705.
\(^{56}\) APW AMW, sign. 661 (Libri excessum et signaturarum 1424–1425), fol. 289r, pag. 73.
\(^{57}\) CDLS II/1, 457–458.
\(^{58}\) King Sigismund had pledged Most to the Dukes of Saxony, cf. RI XI/1, p. 388, no. 5494, no. 5503, p. 389, no. 5504.
the accusations, he received a warning that any unfriendly action towards Wroclaw would result in his being prosecuted throughout Lusatia. Jindřich did not remain on his own, however. He arrived at Stolpen in the company of Jindřich Berka of Dubá and Honštejn, whose protection he intended to enjoy while staying at his castle, according to Kašpar’s information. The Lord of Dubá and Honštejn was not a reliable long-term ally against the six towns of the Lusatian League, however, as he often cooperated with them, nor against the Duke of Saxony, to whom he had offered assistance in the war against the Wartenbergs and Hussites as early as June 1427. The deadlock thus resulted in nothing more than another attempt to reach an amicable settlement to the dispute. The agreement was made on an unknown date before the Gőrlitz city council and recorded in the city books there. Witnesses standing on the side of Jindřich included Janko Knobelauch, the Honštejn hetman, and Mikusch, the Tolštejn hetman, indicating the continued (although we do not know how committed) support of the lords of Dubá, Jindřich Berka of Honštejn and Hynek Berka the younger of Tolštejn.

It is almost certain that Jindřich had no intention of upholding this agreement either, yet he also could not engage in overt sabotage against Wroclaw merchants with his current allies. A much more appropriate accomplice for Jindřich against the broad Saxony/Lusatia/Wroclaw alliance would be someone who shared his enmity for most of the subjects involved. Jindřich found just such an ally on the other side of the barricade in the burgeoning Wartenberg wars in Zikmund Děčínský of Wartenberg. Zikmund was the embodiment of aristocratic pragmatism, manoeuvring deftly through the Hussite Revolution between the two opposing religious camps. He presented himself in public as a Catholic during the war over religion, maintaining contact with the Zittau consistory and placing Catholic priests in churches throughout the period, but he brought his political schemes to fruition using all available resources, from diplomatic to military, and he did not hesitate to make common cause temporarily with Utraquist subjects if the Hussites had the upper hand in the region. Zikmund had shown his ruthless side before the Hussite Revolution began, taking part in several armed attacks on his northern neighbours. His relationship with the Lusatian League appears to have taken a turn for the worse in 1425, when he was allegedly planning a raid into Upper Lusatia. The year after that he probably reached a truce with the Hussites and did not take part in the battle at Ústí nad Labem. As mentioned above, in June 1427 Hynek Berka of Dubá and Honštejn allied with the Duke of Saxony against

---


60 For his contacts with the six towns of the Lusatian League, cf. CDLS II/1, 165, 208. For the alliance against the Wartenbergs, cf. CDLS II/1, 435. He took part in negotiating the ceasefire after the “Wartenberg War” in June 1436, cf. CDLS II/2, 637.

61 CDLS II/1, 615–616.

62 I provided a detailed biography in the study VODIČKA, Zikmund Děčínský.

63 In 1417, for instance, he attacked barges carrying goods for the Altzelle monastery from Lovosice to Saxony on the Elbe, cf. ibid., 7–8. Around the middle of the 1420s he took part in a raid on merchants near Bautzen, cf. CDLS II/1, 32–33.

64 Ibid., 237.

65 The literature traditionally states that he defected to the Hussites before the battle and supported them in the battle. No credible evidence to support this has been found, however, and the events that followed make
Zikmund Děčínský and the Hussite armies.\textsuperscript{66} The next year Zikmund joined forces with Jan Smiřický and they sacked the Prague Union’s property in the Elbe River lowlands.\textsuperscript{67}

In July 1428, when the Wartenberg War had perhaps cooled for a time, the Görlitz council sent Zikmund Děčínský a letter that tells us what Jindřich Reuter did next. It briefly summarizes the events in the case to that point and apparently had an enclosure with a description of the Görlitz agreement from the previous year. It also states clearly that Jindřich based his claim on the (in his view) unjust imprisonment in Wroclaw, for which he was unable to seek justice in any other way. Based on the request from Wroclaw, the Görlitz council asked Zikmund, who had Jindřich under his protection at that time, to talk him out of carrying out his intentions.\textsuperscript{68} After that no primary sources are available on the case, so we cannot know whether any robberies of Wroclaw merchants actually took place. Zikmund Děčínský would certainly not have hesitated to do so if he had seen in it some profit to himself (which is practically certain) and it suited his plans at the moment (which is quite probable). The 1433 report that Zikmund sent armed men to rob merchants near Zittau may relate to this case as well.\textsuperscript{69} We know that he continued in his pragmatic manoeuvring and deceptions for the rest of his life, which ended in 1438 in prison after he was accused of conspiracy against the king, Albrecht of Austria, during the siege of Tábor.\textsuperscript{70} We could also speculate that Jindřich Reuter may have been under arrest in Bautzen in late 1430 and early 1431.

In April 1431 a statement of reconciliation was issued in Nürnberg by the lords of Bohemia in the conflict between Bautzen and Jaroslav Berka of Dubá and Milštejn.\textsuperscript{71} Besides the general phrases about putting an end to enmity and releasing prisoners, the document also states that a certain unnamed person was detained in Bautzen and certain goods were confiscated ("von des wegen, der in der stat Budischin gescheczt ist ... von des wegen, dem sein khisten odir truhen auffgeprachen ist warden"), and that if that person wished to take revenge on Bautzen, Jaroslav should not be held accountable for it. The unknown robbery victim was to take the matter to the city court, where he

\textsuperscript{66} CDLS II/1, 435: “wieder die keczer zu Behemen, ern Sigmunden von Wartenberg und ouch allen den, dy des kryges zuschicken haben.” This in itself does not permit the conclusion that Zikmund was a Hussite at this time, as asserted by older literature.

\textsuperscript{67} ŠMAHEL, \textit{Husitská revoluce} 3, 205–207. While plundering Prague property in the Mělník area, Zikmund Děčínský and Jan Smiřický allegedly took the fortress of Kamýk. Cf. ibid., p. 384, footnote no. 397.

\textsuperscript{68} CDLS II/1, 615–616.

\textsuperscript{69} CDLS II/2, 501.

\textsuperscript{70} When the Fourth Crusade armies invaded Bohemia and the Hussites called on their allies to defend the country, Zikmund Děčínský pledged his assistance, but did not provide it, cf. PALACKÝ, \textit{Urkundliche Beiträge} 2, pp. 234–235, no. 757. On 25 March 1435, Zikmund made an alliance with the Dukes of Saxony for three years against Jakoubek of Vísevořic and Kostomlaty, cf. VODIČKA, \textit{Zikmund Děčínský}. 16. In March of the same year he helped to arrest a bandit operating in the borderlands, hejtman of the Orphan’s Union Mikuláš of Keuschberk and Grabštejn and Chrastava, cf. ibid., 17. For more negotiations with the Lusatian League, cf. CDLS II/2, 580–582.

\textsuperscript{71} The original survives in the Archivverbund Stadtdarchiv/Staatsfilialarchiv Bautzen, Urkunden, no. 172. Jaroslav and his brother Jindřich held the castles of Milštejn and Ronov, as well as Helfenburk near Úštěk temporarily (1427–1429), and the towns Cvikov and Jablonné v Podještědí. In 1420–1429 he regularly informed Görlitz of the movements of armies within the country, and the end of this activity could be related to the above-mentioned dispute. For the last documentary evidence of the movements of the Hussite armies, cf. CDLS II/2, 36. He was in contact with the Zittau consistory in 1423, 1425 and 1427, cf. LC VIII–X, 54, 101, 134. In 1431 he was physically present in Nürnberg, cf. PALACKÝ, \textit{Archiv český} I, pp. 533–534, no. 213.
would receive legal satisfaction, and if he did not agree with that solution, he should appeal directly to King Sigismund. The hint that this could refer to Jindřich Reuter, who could certainly have been under the temporary protection of Jaroslav of Dubá and Milštejn, lies in a detail mentioned at the end: "As regards the stolen horse, that matter should be judged as well and the dispute put to rest, whoever the suspect." Witness statements before the Görlitz city court from about the same time (ca. 1430) mention that someone named Strasin, his servant Stürczbech, Paul Schönfelt and old Gelfrid von Hauwicz stole a horse from Jindřich Reuter.72

If the above-mentioned document does indeed refer to Jindřich and his case, we can be bolder in our speculations. It seems Jindřich’s goods were not confiscated without reason. Considering his extensive contacts and especially his firm resolve to injure Wroclaw merchants and Reinhard of Reims in particular, it may be that the entire affair was a reaction to a successful diversion against Reinhard’s business activities. Sometime before mid-1430 Reinhard’s servant was detained in Bratislava and unminted gold confiscated from him.73 As soon as King Sigismund learned of the matter, he had all the confiscated assets placed in the hands of Petr Reychel of Machalovce, who was župan (ispán) of the royal mine chambers.74 A letter of complaint dated 21 June gives us detailed information on the matter, as the Wroclaw council asks its Bratislava counterparts to intercede with the king, reminding them that the Wroclaw merchants had the privilege granted by Emperor Charles IV permitting them to trade in unminted gold, which King Sigismund himself had confirmed, also granting them permission to renew trade contact with Venice.75 The outcome of this episode is once again obscured due to a lack of primary sources, and its connection to Reinhard’s dispute with Jindřich Reuter is therefore purely theoretical, no more and no less. One could easily imagine Jindřich making use of his network of informants in Wroclaw to “map” Reinhard’s business interests and send out warnings to the relevant places, including the Bratislava city hall, regarding the perceived illegal transport of raw gold to Venice. At the very least this matter shows that Reinhard was one of many merchants in Central Europe attracted by the Venetian encouragement to import raw precious metals. Now they were attempting to take advantage of the much weaker boycott of Venice imposed by King Sigismund after 1415 due to land disputes on the Adriatic.76

72 CDLS II/2, 722.

73 We learn of this matter via a letter from the Wroclaw council, see below. We know the names of two of Reinhard’s servants: Heinrich Cholrär (1422, 1423, 1432), see footnote 41 above; and Konrad Eysenreich (1431), see APW AMW, sign. 665 (Libri excessum et signaturarum 1432–1433), pag. 108. Wroclaw merchants had experience with the potential dangers of transporting gold through Bratislava already. For one example see the false accusation of trading with Venice from the early 1420s, cf. ibid., sign. 659 (Liber excessum et signaturarum 1420–1421), fol. 74v. An edition issued by STOBBE, Mittheilungen, 344–345. In 1427 the city council heard a case in which one Wroclaw merchant helped another secretly go from Bratislava to Silesia to export gold ingots sewn into sacks. Cf. APW AMW, sign. 662 (Libri excessum et signaturarum 1426–1427), fol. 375v–376r, pag. 46–47.


75 Archív mesta Bratislavy, Magistrát mesta Bratislavy, zbierka listín a listov, no. 1141. Also on this point see Sigismund’s privilege to the Wroclaw merchants regarding freedom of movement in Hungary, cf. APW, Dokumenty miasta Wroclawia, no. 1495. Permission to renew trade with Venice, cf. ibid., no. 1498. See also RI XI/1, p. 319, no. 4520. In a document dated 18 August 1373 Charles IV granted Wroclaw and Świdnica merchants permission to transport raw gold and silver over the lands he administered, cf. RI VIII, p. 434, no. 5226.

76 In the first third of the fifteenth century the Venetian empire was facing a cash shortage. Incentives in the form of lowering taxes for the import of precious metals therefore aimed to increase imports from the Balkans.
Jindřich Reuter of Coburg, also called Langeheincze, is also significant in Czech history for his deed of pledge for 26 threescore of groschen, as mentioned above, for Plasy Monastery property. This most likely pertained to part of the monastery library being held as collateral for a loan. We know from other sources that this library was broken up and used as collateral, and the convent borrowed 10 Rheinish guilders from the Waldsassen monastery in an attempt to redeem the page. We also know that prior to 1433 Jindřich had loaned the convent a certain sum, over which he appealed to the Council of Basel for the release of 26 books held at the Waldsassen monastery house in Cheb. For the duration of the dispute the books were held temporarily in Cheb with the Commander of the Crusaders of the Red Star and the Waldsassen monastery lent Jindřich 10 threescore. It was agreed that if Jindřich won the right to the books in the case, they would be released to him only after payment of the above-mentioned 10 threescore as well as the 10 Rheinish guilders the Waldsassen monastery had lent the Plasy monastery to redeem the books from some previous pledge. If the court awarded the books to the Plasy monastery, Jindřich would still owe the Waldsassen monastery 10 threescore of groschen and would have to pay that amount upon request. Jindřich apparently won the case and took possession of a total of 62 volumes worth 530 Rheinish guilders held at Cheb. Sometime between 1433 and 1441 he sold them to the Cistercian monastery Dobrnlugk Abbey in Lower Lusatia. From there the set was resold in 1441 to the Premonstratensians at St Mary’s on Harlunger Berg near Brandenburg. The purchase contract for this sale has survived, including an inventory of the entire set. The source states that the books were acquired from Prague burgher (!) Jindřich Reuter (Henczo Rewther civis Pragensis) and his wife Kunhuta. Today the Plasy monastery library is missing, with the exception of seven volumes in the Czech National Library.

Not much documentary evidence survives to tell us about the last years of Reinhard’s life, only brief, isolated mentions here and there. He last appears in the Wroclaw city books in April 1433, when he relinquished the post of executor for the will of Vít of Strupina and guardian of his daughter Dorota. He may have remained in the city for another year, because on 6 March 1434 he presented Petr Šostáč, cleric of the Wroclaw diocese, at the Zittau consistory for the inaccessible chaplain’s prebend at Roztoky. This act hints that Reinhard (like many other exiles) was placing his hopes

---

77 Staatsarchiv Amberg, Kloster Waldsassen, Akten, no. 402, fol. 439rv.
78 Ibid., Kloster Waldsassen, Urkunden, no. 633.
79 Edition printed by PRAŽÁK, Plaská knihovna, 167–171. Recorded in ABB – WENTZ, Das Bistum, 198. His conclusions are summarized in HLAVÁČEK, Středověké soupisy, no. 88, p. 63. This source is also mentioned in MACHILEK, Die Zisterzienser, 206. The inventory itself is quite brief and was probably made based on the books themselves, not a presumed Plasy library inventory that has not survived, since the list is not given in any order and individual volumes of the same work are not listed consecutively. The most frequent genre appearing in the list is homiletic works (about one third), followed by works of exegesis (probably 10 titles) and a smaller number of works of theology and hagiography. The inventory also contains a few volumes of an encyclopaedic, philosophical, grammatical and legal nature. There are no books of liturgy or bibles, probably because the monks only pledged the manuscripts they did not need for daily mass or other use. The surviving Plasy volumes are kept at the Národní knihovna České republiky, Oddělení rukopisů a starých tisků, sign. I E 11, I F 6, I G 28, VI E 17, XII G 11b, XIII A 5b, XIII G 23.
80 APW AMW, sign. 665 (Libri excessum et signaturarum 1432–1433), pag. 116.
81 LC VIII–X, 223.
in the negotiations at Basel and preparing for a possible return to Bohemia, including officially activating his previously neglected theoretical rights and claims.\textsuperscript{82} We cannot even venture a guess as to when Reinhard first returned to Bohemia.

A certain Prokop Reinhard (Reinhard’s son?) of Prague appears in Wroclaw in 1434–1439. In 1434 he had an unknown dispute with Anežka Grodissynne and promised to waive his claim to settlement before an ecclesiastical court and to have it settled according to city law.\textsuperscript{83} Two years later Prokop, along with his sister Markěta and other exiles, took part in the sale of the house of Prague goldsmith Hanuš Neumeister on the Wroclaw market square as the guardian of his orphaned children.\textsuperscript{84} In the late 1430s he apparently intended to leave Wroclaw and left behind some unfinished business, perhaps debts. A group of Wroclaw burghers undertook in his presence to convey him (“dead or alive”) before the city council if needed, under a penalty of one hundred marks of groschen. These burghers include at least two important Prague exiles, Baltazar Čotr and Bernard Falkenauer.\textsuperscript{85} Prokop’s wife Uršula and Kateřina Heinczmannynne soon made the same pledge.\textsuperscript{86} The possibility naturally arises that Prokop could have been the son of Reinhard of Reims, Markěta his daughter and Uršula his daughter-in-law. It is not impossible that the son of a wealthy merchant could become a goldsmith, especially if that merchant dealt in precious metals. We will have to wait, however, to confirm or reject that hypothesis.

We find the last information about Reinhard after the Hussite Wars in the royal court books (Czech \textit{dvorské desky}). One entry from 1454 concerned the ownership of the village Roztoky and mentions the fortress, two farms (Czech \textit{poplužní dvůr}), a tavern, annuities, three vineyards and other appurtenances.\textsuperscript{87} We can deduce from that entry that Reinhard had taken hold of his property after the Compacts of Basel and could theoretically have spent his final years here. He had died at some point before this date, but we cannot pinpoint his date of death with any more certainty than that. Settling the estate could have taken years, and Reinhard could also have spent his final years in other countries, handling the restitution of Roztoky from a distance. Considering that he apparently came to Prague as an adult, and by 1430 had reached an advanced age, he may have been born around 1370. It is improbable (yet not impossible) that he could have lived to over 80 years old. The record also implies that he died without issue. Prokop Reinhard (Reinhard’s son) of Prague, the goldsmith mentioned above, either was not related or was also deceased without issue at that time.

This marks the definitive end of the primary source material for the life of this important merchant, local politician, supporter of King Sigismund and exile. Many questions remain regarding the other details of his life, and may never be answered.

\textsuperscript{82} I describe the theoretical filling of inaccessible prebends in the Hussite sphere of influence by Catholic priests and how exiled burghers played a role in the process in the study \textit{Die Verwaltung der Prager Diözese während der Hussitenkriege und die Flüchtlinge aus den hussitischen Städten in den Akten des Prager Domkapitels im Zittauer Exil}, which should be published in 2022.

\textsuperscript{83} APW AMW, sign. 666 (Libri excessum et signaturarum 1434–1435), pag. 20. Mentioned (dated 1435) in ČAPSÝ, \textit{K postavení Vratislavi}, p. 354, footnote no. 20.

\textsuperscript{84} The other named guardians are Anna, the widow of Hanuš Neumeister, and Václav of Prague; the orphaned children are named as Míkuláš, Marek, Heincz and Affara; the buyer is Míkuláš Danyel. APW AMW, sign. 624 (Libri scabinorum 1433–1443), fol. 156v.

\textsuperscript{85} Ibid., sign. 668 (Libri excessum et signaturarum 1438–1439), pag. 137.

\textsuperscript{86} Ibid., pag. 138.

\textsuperscript{87} NA, Desky dvorské, sign. DD 23, pag. 142.
definitely: If and how he took part in Prague's cultural life, whether he engaged in arts patronage, how far east his business network stretched, how far he travelled in his lifetime, how his business changed during the Hussite Wars, in what manner he returned to Bohemia and whether he ever lived in Bohemia permanently again. We have no information about the fate of his foreign property. After Reinhard’s death without heirs, King Ladislav granted Roztoky to Bedřich of Donín. The house U Slona, still referred to in 1429 as *domus quondam Reinhardi de Rems*,88 became the final scene of an attempted coup in 1427 led by Hynek of Kolštejn and Jan Smiřický with the support of other gentlemen. After his armed men were defeated, Hynek retreated to the house U Slona to hide from the Old City defenders and lost his life there.89 Later the house passed from owner to owner and was even used by the city council: in 1440 legates sent by Pope Felix stayed in the house and were feted during a visit from the rector and masters of the university with "confections from an apothecary".90 In this regard Reinhard’s fate is representative of the wave of exiles as a whole. Research thus far indicates that exiles returning to their original homes were relatively rare. Many died in exile before the Battle of Lipany and the Basel Compacts, and their children mostly assimilated into the populations of the exile locations, breaking ties with their former homes. Some restitutions were made after the revolution was over, but the legal situation was complicated and the restitutions tended to drag on for decades.91
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Drawing on urban and church archival sources such as handbooks, legal texts and birth registers, this study deals with changes in transitional rituals in the multi-denominational town of Slaný in Bohemia in the years 1600–1640. It focuses on both religious and civil rituals and shows how they changed in the course of the Counter-Reformation.


Introduction

The study of ritualized behaviour in early modern towns has been coming to the fore in Czech historiography. Initially, due to a richer source base, Czech researchers tended to focus on the study of rituals in the milieu of the nobility.¹ In recent years, however, the younger generation of scholars inspired by the classic works of Arnold van Genepp, Edward Muir and Barbara Stollberg-Rilinger in particular has turned its attention to the hitherto neglected urban environment.² In the form of a microanalytical probe the following study deals with the transformation of ritualized behaviour in the Bohemian multi-denominational town of Slaný in the Early Modern Era.³ My work is primarily based on records of town registers, edicts and land registers, but also church registers, memoirs and aristocratic correspondence. This mix of sources is unique in the Czech environment, allowing me to demonstrate how the Counter-Reformation and the pressure of re-Catholicization influenced the development of transitional rituals in the urban environment. The text deals mainly with life-cycle rituals but considers political rituals as well. Due to the narrow source base, previous studies could only be limited to political rituals, especially the question of the renewal of town councils. Furthermore, the town of Slaný ranked among important commercial and political representatives of the seventeenth-century urban estates. I consider these three facts to be significant for the selection of the town of Slaný as the site for this micro-historic probe.

¹ HRDLIČKA – KRÁL – SMÍŠEK, Symbolické jednání.
² GENNEP, Přechodové rituály, 64–65. MUIR, Ritual in Early Modern Europe. STOLLBERG-RILLINGER, Symbolische Kommunikation, 492–496.
³ For the main sources see: Státní okresní archiv Kladno [State Municipal Archive Kladno] (hereafter SOKA Kladno), Archiv města Slaný [Municipal Archive Slaný] (hereafter AM Slaný), unprocessed, books No. 57, 58, 59, etc.
Ecclesiastical developments in Bohemia (fifteenth–seventeenth centuries)

During the fifteenth century the teaching of Jan Hus, Bohemian reform theologian and preacher, was transformed into a specific branch of Christianity, of which the main characteristic was the emphasis on communion in both kinds, i.e. bread and wine. The new confession significantly differed from Catholicism in the interpretation of transubstantiation as well. Adherents of this new confession were called Hussites, according to their connection with Jan Hus, Calixtins, according to the lay chalice, or Utraquists, according to the Latin term “sub utraque specie” meaning “communion under both kinds”.

It must be said the Utraquists did not remain unanimous and many sects appeared. Some of them were even labelled as heretical and their members were slaughtered.

The majority of the population of Bohemia gradually went over to the new confession while Catholicism remained present only in some minority areas and lands of the crown, especially in Moravia. The Utraquist movement was also politically and militarily successful and managed to stave off several crusades organized by the Papal Curia. The climax came in 1436, when the Pope acknowledged Utraquism as a legitimate counterweight to Catholicism.

Nearly fifty years later, in 1485, both faiths, Catholicism and Utraquism, were legalized in Bohemia. The entrance of other non-Catholic confessions in the later years was accepted more openly, nonetheless resulting in the combining of the individual confessional elements.

That process started at the beginning of the sixteenth century when newly formed non-Catholic groups (so called Protestant Churches) began to slowly penetrate into Bohemia. Lutheranism found deep resonance in the noble estates bordering on Saxony, and in the environment of the Unity of Brethren. The Utraquists, who were still dominant in Bohemia, took over some elements of Lutheranism, which caused its splitting into a small conservative wing of Old-Utraquists and a Lutheran majority of so-called New-Utraquists. On account of such complicated doctrinal developments only some intellectuals, from among the aristocracy and bourgeoisie in particular, were able to understand the main differences between the individual faiths. Admittedly, many residents were to a certain extent divided between Catholic and non-Catholic, focusing on some of the individually perceived external features of belonging to a particular form of religion. Except for the intellectuals, the majority of the population identified with the “faith of their ancestors”, which meant that they maintained the everyday doctrinal routine they had learnt by watching their parents. It was not uncommon that people
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calling themselves Utraquists unwittingly adopted Lutheran faith elements. Similarly some non-Catholic gravestones embraced images of the saints or the Virgin Mary.\textsuperscript{14}

The Catholic Church gradually began to take advantage of the fragmentation of non-Catholic faiths. It symbolized tradition, continuity and stability. Catholic officials additionally benefited from the help of the ruling Habsburgs, who had succeeded to the throne in Bohemia in 1526, and who were one of the pillars of the Catholic faith in Europe. In 1561, the Catholic side reached its first major success, when the archbishopric in Prague was restored after 140 years of a \textit{sede vacante} period.\textsuperscript{15} A few years later the arrival of the Society of Jesus in the capital was another turning point.\textsuperscript{16}

These steps were all the more important in that non-Catholics had no collective political or religious platform, which they had failed to create in 1575.\textsuperscript{17} In addition, many members of the high nobility also began to show their loyalty to the ruling Habsburgs on a confessional level and started to convert to Catholicism in order to achieve higher social status.\textsuperscript{18} This process culminated in 1599, when the highest provincial officers of the Bohemian Kingdom were replaced with Catholic noblemen who governed the non-Catholic majority.\textsuperscript{19}

After this year, confessional affiliation started to become considerably politicized. The Catholic minority de facto began to rule the non-Catholic majority. It was only the weakness of Emperor Rudolf II that enabled non-Catholics to obtain the Letter of Majesty through defiance in 1609. In it, the emperor virtually granted religious freedom of faith and confirmed the Bohemian Confession in exchange for relative political and financial protection from his brother Matthias.\textsuperscript{20} However, the charter was practically unenforceable, especially in the environment of noble and ecclesiastical (Catholic) estates, where the nobility had the main say. Increasing political tensions led to a final clash between Catholic and non-Catholic leaders, resulting in the Third Defenestration of Prague in 1618, in which the regents of the newly elected King Ferdinand were thrown out of the windows of Prague Castle by the non-Catholics. This event gave rise to the Bohemian Revolt, with the non-Catholic estates even electing their own “defiance king” – Friedrich. However, this revolt was later bloodily suppressed. The non-Catholics were initially defeated at the Battle of White Mountain in 1620 and subsequently, in 1621, their 27 leaders were demonstratively executed by the victorious Catholics. The road to the complete re-Catholicization of Bohemia was thus fully open.\textsuperscript{21}

\textbf{Slaný – a brief description of its confessional development}

These confessional developments are reflected in the local conditions of the royal town of Slaný, on which the following study focuses. In the fifteenth century the town became one of the most important Utraquist centres. The determinative point was the fact that Slaný had been considered by Utraquist preachers to be one of the three
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towns chosen by God which would be saved from a future apocalypse.\textsuperscript{22} The Catholics were therefore expelled from the town so that their presence would not impede the salvation of the town. Considering the fact that these were mainly Germans, the whole “cleansing” also had an obvious ethnic background.\textsuperscript{23} From at least the middle of the fifteenth century onwards, only Utraquists were thus living in Slaný.

Even at the beginning of the seventeenth century Slaný was still seen as a traditionally non-Catholic town. In general, it was still possible to speak about allegiance to Utraquism. The non-Catholics of Slaný turned to the Lower Consistory in their affairs even before 1609, when it was opened up to Lutherans and members of the Unity of the Brethren.\textsuperscript{24} The town received regular reports on the activities of the Consistory and the burghers took an active interest in its staffing.\textsuperscript{25} The local dean also frequently provided accommodation to the “priests under both kinds”, who chose Slaný as a hospitable town for their Consistory renewals, since its proximity to Prague and the certainty of the same confessional environment suited them best.\textsuperscript{26}

Other records also support the thesis of a majority Calixtine town society in Slaný. For example, Daniel Vepřek, a burgher of Slaný, thoroughly recorded commemorative entries ("relics") related to important dates associated with the Utraquist confession in his calendar. The accession of Slaný to the newly established town military union in 1420 and the commemoration of the day Jan Hus was burned at the stake were worth recording for him.\textsuperscript{27}

Besides the dominant Utraquists, who filled the highest town posts, a Catholic minority lived there as well, having settled in the town with special permits issued by the town council. Most of them were people who were important to the local community, such as Italian (Flemish) construction workers who were involved in the building of a new church. Otherwise, the settlement of Catholics was actively discouraged; they were not allowed to buy houses within the town walls. In the same way, the burghers also prevented Jews from settling there. The town was also most likely inhabited by burghers professing to Lutheranism, which can be claimed due to the presence of Lutheran preachers in the town.\textsuperscript{28}

In 1599, there were about 174 townhouses inside the walls of Slaný and 33 other houses in the suburbs. It can be estimated that more than 3,000 inhabitants were living there.\textsuperscript{29} Due to its economic advancement and the geographical proximity of Prague, the capital of the kingdom, Slaný belonged to the major economic and political entities that contributed to the countrywide events.\textsuperscript{30} The participation of leading representatives of Slaný in the non-Catholic uprising of 1618 (Bohemian Revolt), which responded to the
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political changes in 1599 and subsequent years, was quite understandable. Following the 1620 defeat of the non-Catholic estates’ rebellion on the White Mountain, the town was pledged to the Catholic gentry and Catholicism was restored. Newly populated by Catholics, the town replaced non-Catholics in its municipal offices with Catholics and the non-Catholic burghers were made to convert or go into exile. 31

The following study seeks to show how political and confessional changes affected the transformation of local society and transition rituals. First, I focus on the perception of differences in the transitional rituals during the period preceding the Battle of White Mountain. I argue that differences in transitional rituals of the life cycle were much more closely perceived than theological variances between the local confessional groups. 32 To demonstrate this, I investigate the social environment of the Bohemian royal town of Slaný from 1600 to 1640, focusing on the rituals of baptism, election of a town council and funerals.

Transitional rituals in the confessionally divided town of Slaný (1600–1620)
The baptismal practices of the Catholics and non-Catholics of Slaný differed in two elemental aspects. The first one was the period that was supposed to pass between the birth and the baptism. Catholics required children to be baptized as soon after the birth as possible, but within three days at the latest. 33 Unbaptized infants were in danger of not being absolved of original sin. In the event of their sudden death they would be doomed to stay in Limbo. There they would not be punished; however, they would not be allowed to behold God. 34 The non-Catholics of Slaný believed that a child would be redeemed even without being baptized, since humans are constantly placed before the face of God. They often postponed baptism, frequently to an older age, in order to make the child fully aware of it. The second difference concerned in the person holding the child during the baptism. While the main godfather held the child in his hands during the non-Catholic rituals, the Catholics of Slaný placed their children in the hands of the baptizing priest. 35

As far as the funeral was concerned, the main difference between a Catholic rite and a non-Catholic one consisted of the singing of songs during the non-Catholic funeral procession. 36 The songs’ content was seen by the Catholics of Slaný as an insult to their faith. 37 Discrepancies, however, concerned not only this subject; they involved such details as the duration of candles flickering at the bedside of the deceased. In some localities the mutual wrangle culminated in the smashing of gravestones of other faith members or even the digging out of the dead bodies and their scattering about carrion sites. 38

The reason for such behaviour was that it represented a validation of personal confessional self-identification on the one hand and a mutual defining of one’s own faith against other faiths on the other hand. At the same time it was an attack on core
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values of Early Modern burghers, such as honour, social status of the deceased or the family memory. Long after the Battle of White Mountain confessional conflicts were still present in funerals; e. g. Czech historian Olga Fejtvá found similar cases in the late seventies of the seventeenth century.

The development was no different in other towns of the Czech lands. There was a similar situation in Moravia. For example, at the beginning of the seventeenth century in the town of Brno, Catholics and non-Catholics were buried in one cemetery and confessionally different funeral processions took place there. The situation among burghers escalated after an order from Cardinal František of Ditrichštejn forbidding burials of non-Catholics at the St James Church. In the town of Jindřichův Hradec confessional disputes about burials intensified together with the establishment of a new burial ground at the Trinity Church. In that case, the Catholic nobility supported by the Jesuits were pitted against the local non-Catholic community.

The Slaný town council evidently made some efforts to prevent such excesses. To that effect the council members required written testimonials from the deans regarding the confessional affiliation of the deceased, particularly in the case of handling deceased who were not Slaný burghers. Unless the priest could convincingly substantiate that the deceased individuals were non-Catholic, the aldermen refused to provide them with extreme unction and a burial on the Slaný cemetery. The Catholics of Slaný were forced to ask the town council for permission to bury their deceased on the holy land.

The majority of disputes related to the funeral rite in Slaný concerned the duration and course of the death knell. The tolling of the bells was supposed to mediate a connection between heaven and earth, heralding the death of a good Christian and opening up the way to heaven via their sound. In addition to that, they were expected to drive away evil spirits from the deceased according to folk religion ideas. The situation between the Catholics and non-Catholics of Slaný came to a head in the case of the local Catholic Jan Malíř’s daughter’s demise. On the day of her funeral, when the families of Jan Malíř and the deceased child’s grandfather Ondřej Svícník accompanied her dead body towards the cemetery, the bell-ringers refused to toll the bells. Ondřej Svícník presented the matter to the town council. Its members considered the interruption of the funeral an inexcusable misconduct. What perhaps played a part as well was the fact that the bell-ringers defied the direct order of the town council calling upon them to perform the tolling duly during the funeral. As a result, the aldermen spoke out strongly against the bell-ringers. Jan Babička, who was supposed to be personally responsible for the revolt, having urged the other bell-ringers to be rebellious in the case of a Catholic funeral, was put in a log and later whipped out of the town.
It would be wrong to assert that the mutual intolerance confined itself to the relationship between Catholics and non-Catholics. Utraquist burghers of Slaný assumed a negative attitude towards other non-Catholic denominations as well. In 1619 the town was honoured with a royal. The future Bohemian king, Friedrich I, the Prince Elector of the Rhenish Palatinate, had chosen the town of Slaný for an overnight stay before his coronation in Prague. The initial enthusiasm of burghers, who were enjoying his visit, was spoilt during his inspection of St Gothard’s Church. The prince condemned the alleged splendour of the church and ordered that most of the decorations be removed immediately. The burghers did not show understanding for his opinions and the city council refused his wish speaking out against the future king (sic!). This was a clash between two denominations, both based on different social and above all confessional environments. While the Utraquist burghers understood decorations of the church as the praise of God, Calvinist Friedrich I understood them as idolatry distracting believers from the original doctrine of Jesus Christ and his teachings of the poverty of the church.

While baptisms and funerals primarily concerned individuals, or particular burgher families, other rituals that affected the entire community of burghers existed in the town of Slaný as well. These rituals related to the tradition of holding of power and privilege, to the cohesion of local society and to the continuity of local cultural and confessional memory. The restoration of a city council was a ritual which included all of those elements.

Every year the city council was renewed by a king’s representative, most often by a royal reeve (iudex curie civitatum regalium). A week before his arrival was announced the town councillors summoned the elders of the town to the town hall. There the councillors asked the elders whether they were satisfied with their work in the council and whether they wanted to complain to the king’s deputy about any activities. The expected response was the sentence: “We are with our honest masters in everything well satisfied; between us there are no issues remaining.” The formula was followed with thanksgiving to God. The councillors formally resigned from their posts and became regular burghers.

Then they awaited the arrival of a royal representative. This had its well-defined course as well. The young men from the most important families of the town were chosen to form a ceremonial cavalry. When the reeve was approaching the town the young men rode out of the gates with banners in their hands to welcome him. The head of their group grasped the bridle of the reeve’s horse and took him through the main gate. In this way the royal reeve was incorporated into the social world within the
town walls and became a guest of the town. The same day the council was renewed. The act of restoration took the form of a reading of the new councilmen’s names. This act was followed by a festive, non-Catholic Holy Mass and the departure of the reeve. As can be seen, the ritual was connected with all age groups of the town’s society and the non-Catholic church and was a manifestation of power. All those elements held together the town’s society and built local cultural memory.

**Efforts at the re-Catholicization of rituals (1620–1640)**

After the Catholic gentry took over the town in 1621 (1623), the baptismal ritual became the fundamental differentiating factor between the Catholics of Slaný and those who tried to defy the new masters and the re-Catholicization pressure. Through carrying out godparenthood, the non-Catholics attempted to create a closed community, trying to completely socially shut out the Catholics. They usually identified themselves by seeking out non-Catholic clergymen from out of the town or by refusing to put children in the priest’s hands during their baptism. Such a strategy was successful in the short-term; however it later failed due to some arrivistes seeking to advance their careers.

The most detailed depiction of defiance found in the sources is that of the burgher Jan Blejsa, who for a long time resisted having his child baptized by a Catholic priest. He was tried for his convictions by the gentry clerks, who insisted on baptism within the obligatory three-day period. The Slaný burgher opposed the regional estate governor Mikuláš Hanžburský, claiming that parents may freely decide when they have their child baptized. He shielded himself with the Bible against the governor’s insistence on a Catholic course of the baptism, considering the book the highest authority in compliance with the Utraquist tradition saying that “even in the Holy Scripture he could not learn that by reading”. Furthermore, he argued that God can save unbaptized children: “if [a child] has been formed by the Lord in the life of a mother, it shall stay under God’s guardianship, the Lord condescends to see it and thus it does not sin against the Lord”. However, his reasoning did not meet with success; he was eventually dispossessed and forced to emigrate with his whole family.

As far as funerals were concerned, all burghers had to submit to a unified ritual and the singing of non-Catholic songs was forbidden. Therefore, non-Catholics tried to express their confession in their last wills. They stated that they wanted to be buried in the cemetery of Trinity Church, which was perceived by the burghers as non-Catholic in contrast to St Gotthard Church, where Catholic rituals took place as well during the period preceding the Battle of White Mountain. However, the later war
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years often saw burials carried out without any rituals. The only effort the burghers made was to bury their loved ones in sacred ground rather than leaving their bodies outside the fortifications, as done by the new military commanders of the town. In this respect, all the confessional disputes and discrepancies entirely gave way in the face of wartime atrocities.

In the post-White Mountain period the ritual of the change of the city council completely transformed as well. The new Catholic regent of the town became a key person in it and town councillors were forced to swear loyalty to him instead of to the Bohemian king. The regent’s role was also supported by the presence of a Catholic priest. The oath wasn’t sworn to God only but equally to the Virgin Mary and to all the saints. The strongest attack on the religious faith of the local councillors was forced confession of sins associated with communion under one kind. In particular, this new element, which followed immediately after the oath, was a great shock for all non-Catholic townsmen. Many of them gave priority to their faith, sacrificed their status and voluntarily gave up their positions on the city council. Many went into exile. The original ritual, which had affirmed burgher rights and freedoms, was transformed into a clear demonstration of the subordination of non-Catholics to a Catholic gentry. With the departure of a greater part of its local elites the town lost its intellectual backbone and the most important bearers of its local cultural memory. The way to the overall re-Catholicization of the town was thus opened.

Conclusion

Until the 1620s Slaný was a multi-confessional town with a non-Catholic majority. Both religious and civil transitional rituals drew strict lines between Catholic and non-Catholic burghers. Following the 1620 defeat of the non-Catholic estates in the course of the rebellion on the White Mountain, the town was pledged to the Catholic gentry and Catholicism was restored. The new gentry focused on changing transitional rituals, trying to influence burghers’ everyday lives and to force them to convert. Many did not withstand the pressure and chose to go into exile. After their departure all rituals became strictly Catholic. Later, during the 1630s and 1640s, the confessional disputes gave way to wartime atrocities.
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The development of many settlements was not only determined by regional and economic factors, but could rely on a quite different motivation, when it was firmly tied to an important magnate family, for whom the town would become a residential and memorial environment. This was, of course, linked not only to the construction of a representative family residence, but also to the appertaining ecclesiastical centre, which usually functioned in the already existing, older local church. Therefore, in our study we will take a closer look not only at the settlement of Pezinok itself and its military guard, toll and market functions, but also at the formation of its ecclesiastical centre – the parish and the Parish Church of the Blessed Virgin Mary – because the factor of the magnate’s residence gave it a distinct position in the territory of the Bratislava Provostry. Pezinok was already of considerable importance in Great Moravian times, as it was a settlement situated in the immediate vicinity of a strategic pass through the Little Carpathians. It was this location that resulted in the fact that even after the establishment of the Kingdom of Hungary, its importance was preserved and by the eleventh century at the latest, a Hungarian guard garrison settled here, in the vicinity of an older Slavic settlement with a market and toll function. The settlement situation and archaeological findings make it possible to express the opinion that there must have been a sacral building here already at this time, which survived until the major rebuilding in the fourteenth century. From 1207 Pezinok became the property of the noble Hont-Poznan family, the ancestors of the local counts. After being settled by a German population, it developed towards urban agglomeration, as a result of which it has been called a town since the fifteenth century. Throughout the period, its parish church was an important centre of the settlement.

Keywords: The Middle Ages. History of the settlement. City. Town. The Kingdom of Hungary. Church. The right of patronage.

In the settlement structure of the Kingdom of Hungary, urban settlements of lower legal status played a particularly important role. They were consistently referred to in contemporary terminology (especially from the fifteenth century onwards) as oppida. These towns significantly shaped the economic character of the surrounding region, as they were the basic points of its market network. For the privileged and free royal towns, they thus provided the necessary economic base to which their own economy was linked. They were equally important for completing the population base of the area, across all levels of society. However, the development of many of them was also firmly linked to the important magnate families for whom they became residential and memorial environments.
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Such special importance of the towns in the country is evidenced by their relatively high number. According to research by Katalin Szende, there were 709 oppida\(^1\) in total in the Kingdom of Hungary at the end of the Middle Ages, which retained this legal status as a permanent state. However, their actual number had undoubtedly at times been much higher, but especially in the fifteenth century many of them were for various reasons relegated in their status as towns.\(^2\)

However, the development of many of them was not only determined by regional and economic factors, but relied on a completely different motivation, when firmly tied to an important magnate family for whom such a small town had become a residential and memorial environment.\(^3\) And this was linked not only to the construction of a representative family residence, but also to the appertaining ecclesiastical centre, which would usually become established in the already existing, older local church. This was done with the application of relevant rights of patronage, which would further shape its architectural expression and its economic and legal inclusion in the church administration. As a result of this new function, the church would gain in importance, which would also be reflected in its better economic security, and its administration would become an interesting and sought-after benefice and ecclesiastical title. Such was the case in Pezinok, which, thanks to the fact that it became the family seat of one of the most important branches of the noble Hont-Poznan family, the later counts of Pezinok, became ranked among the most important settlements in the territory of today’s southwestern Slovakia.\(^4\) In our work we will focus on the origin and formation of the relationship between this type of settlement and the formation of its ecclesiastical centre – the Parish Church of the Blessed Virgin Mary – the factor of a magnate’s residence giving it a distinct position in the territory of the Bratislava Provostry.

**Topography of the settlement**

The layout of the medieval town and its topography can be reconstructed mainly on the basis of two deeds on the division of the estates of the counts from 1412\(^5\) and 1425,\(^6\) and also from the wine tithe register from 1437. In the first deed, the Bratislava Chapter informed King Sigismund of Luxembourg about the valuation of the hereditary estates of the brothers Nicholas and George II, while the second already gives concrete testimony to their division. The following streets are mentioned in the deeds: Hradná or Trhová (Varucza sive Vasarucza; Marckgossen), Garbiarska (Platea cerdonum, Lederergossen) and Záhradná (Kertwtcza, Pamgorthen). In addition to these, in the wine tithe register are also mentioned the streets Hrnčiarska (Hoffnergossen), Uhorská (Vngergossen), Pekárska (Peckengossen), Bodenzeil (Podenczayl), Frauenberg (Wraberg) and Vorberg (Worbergergossen). The streets Pekárska, Záhradná, Hrnčiarska, Bodenzeil
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\(^1\) SZENDE, The birth of oppida, 7.
\(^2\) ŽUDEL, Osidlenie Slovenska, 99.
\(^3\) KUBINYI, Residenz- und Herrschaftsbildung, 421–462.
\(^4\) Pezinok is currently located 18 km northeast of the capital Bratislava. It covers two cadastral territories, Grinava and Pezinok, on an area of 7276 ha at the foot of the Little Carpathians, at an altitude of 156 m above sea level. It is a district town, part of the Bratislava Region. It is adjacent to the districts of Senec, Bratislava, Malacky and Trnava. „O meste“. Mesto Pezinok. Accessed 15 May 2021. https://www.pezinok.sk/?yggid=4.
\(^6\) Magyar Nemezeti Levéltár – Országos Levéltár Budapest, Diplomatikai Levéltár (hereinafter MNL-OL DL), 11727, 11718.
and Frauenberg are identical to those on the 1785 map of the town’s intramural area. Uhorská Street formed only the upper part of the street of the same name from 1785. Hradná (Trhová) Street overlapped Veľká Street (Platea magna).

On the upper corner of Garbiarska Street was the Perghaus (identical with the later Krusič house). The dominant feature of Pezinok was the towerless Gothic Church of Virgin Mary with a tomb and a cemetery. Also mentioned are the hospital with the Chapel of the Holy Spirit, where burials took place, the houses of the chaplains and the administrator of the aforementioned hospital, the bell-ringer’s house, the school and the spa located near the mills in the northern part of the town. The Holy Spirit Hospital was located on the corner of today’s streets Holuby and Moyzesova. There were four water mills in Pezinok, three of which had double wheels (duplices rotas) and all of them were located in the northern part of the town near the settlement of Cajla. One of the mills in the fourteenth century belonged to Master León.

Within the rural areas of the town, sources mention vineyard appellations – the oldest known name of a vineyard is Lyetin (1345). In addition to the vineyards, the sources mention fruit trees – pears – and the cabbage garden of Count Sebes II on the Sumberg estate, where another of the water mills was located. The largest amount of information about the natural environment of Pezinok in the Middle Ages comes from the boundary documents of Pezinok from the years 1216 and 1256. The two documents are almost identical, with the later one giving more details. Both documents mention five watercourses located in the territory of Pezinok.

In addition to watercourses, forests and groves are also mentioned in the deeds. One of them was a lime grove (nemus, quod dicitur Lipounuc), which was located north of the village currently named Viničné. The second grove was probably made up of common oaks (nemus, ubi est meta sub arbore ylicis) and was located around the area of Lake Grinava.

The road network in the Pezinok district is only briefly mentioned in the boundary documents. In the northern part of the territory of Pezinok there was a road heading northwest to Pernek (via Misle) and a road heading west to Jabloňové (via Jablan). Another road formed the boundary between Pezinok and the mining settlement of Myr/Nir. It is described in more detail in a deed concerning the division of the above-mentioned mining settlement from 1343. The road led from the Grinava stream through the forest towards Sumberg and the Blatina stream. According to the aforementioned document, it was very old and therefore overgrown in certain parts. Along the road there were several boundary markers made of earth and crosses cut into tree trunks. The road ended at the cabbage garden of Count Sebes II on the Sumberg estate. We learn partly about the roads from the charter on the delimitation of the royal estates, delineating the territories belonging to the counts from 1429. This charter focuses on the area between Pezinok, Veľký Biel and Viničné. The document states

7 MARSINA, Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Slovaciae. Tomus I (hereinafter CDSl I.), 160–161, no. 205.
8 MARSINA, Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Slovaciae. Tomus II (hereinafter CDSl II.), 366–367, no. 531.
9 These are the stream Zlošä (rivulus Zolose) – the unknown stream, the stream Hliník (fluvium Hylynuc) – Myslenický Stream, the stream Bystrica (fluvium Bistric/Nyrpataka) – Blatina Stream (bav. Saulák = a place where pigs wallow), the stream Lúčnica (fluvium Luchync) – Trniiansky Stream, and the stream Suchá (fluvium Succa) – part of the Viničniansky Canal. CDSl II., pp. 366–367, no. 531.
10 CDSl II., p. 367, no. 531.
that from Pezinok there was a road leading southwards to Veľký Biel, generally named the public road (*via publica*). Parallel to the previous route (more to the northeast) was the road heading to the village of Viničné, which went on through blackberry bushes (*via versus partem orientalem inter rubeta*). From where the bushes were located (south of Viničné) led a dirt road and another larger road led from Senec (*via publica de dicta Sempcz*). However, today it is very difficult to determine which roads or routes were involved.  

**Ownership and the settlement image**

Architecturally and functionally significant objects, among which the most prominent are the sacral buildings, completed the settlement image of most localities. The church dominated a settlement, completed its settlement and inhabitant identity and, through the church cult, integrated the settlement into wider regional and supra-regional links. The architectural supremacy of the sacral building over the surrounding buildings, multiplied by the cemetery as a place of ancestor worship and often with a public space function, only accentuated this importance, quite deliberately, to remind of its centrality in the mentality of the population.  

Using the example of medieval Pezinok, we will try to present the peculiarities of the church infrastructure in the functional and social transformations of the settlement.

Pezinok is mentioned in written documents as early as 1208. In that year, King Andrew II of Hungary issued a deed of gift, confirming the donation of the land of Pezinok to Thomas, the Count of Nitra. The aforementioned property had previously belonged to the administration of the Bratislava County Castle, and the monarch, when making the donation, ordered the then Bratislava County governor Poth to bring the county governor Thomas into his possession. The county governor of Bratislava then entrusted his companion and confidant Gregor (*suum contubernarium*) to draw the boundaries of the donated property. The result of his work was also included in the royal charter, and thus we learn about the total extent of the then property of Pezinok.  

As Ján Lukačka proved by his detailed research, the Nitra County governor Thomas was a member of the great Hont-Poznan family and became the founder of one of the most important branches of this family clan—the counts of Svätý Jur and Pezinok. However, the document from 1208 not only informs us about the change of ownership in Pezinok, but its content brings very important data about the oldest organizational and settlement classification of the entire settlement area of Pezinok. As the document explicitly states, Pezinok as an estate (predium) originally belonged to the administration of Bratislava Castle, which meant both the institutional-administrative as well as the ecclesiastical-administrative connection to the royal institution of the county castle, which in the eleventh century also fulfilled the special role of the administrative centre of the Hungarian border post.  

This gives the importance of the settlement of Pezinok itself, although it is not stated in what relation and servitude to the Bratislava castle the population of Pezinok was. However, this will emerge

---

15 CDS1 I., pp. 113–114, no. 143: **“terram quandam Bozen nomine qua ad castrum Posoniense pertinebat.”**
more clearly from a detailed analysis of the document. As to the circumstances of the issuance of the deed itself, however, it should be noted that its issuance in 1208 by King Andrew II was only an additional act of recording the donation itself, which was made slightly earlier. The text of the document clearly shows that the donation of Pezinok to the county governor Thomas took place when the county governor of Bratislava was Comes Poth, who by virtue of this function and on the special authorization of the ruler performed the official act of bringing Comes Thomas into the ownership of Pezinok (per Pothonem tunc comitem Posoniensem). However, we know that in 1208 Poth was already the county governor of Moson County and the county governor of Bratislava was then Comes Mog. In these posts both county governors appear in the list of witnesses of the above-mentioned charter of Andrew II from 1208. However, this is also confirmed by other documents. Poth’s position as a county governor of Moson in 1208 is also documented by another document, which was written on the occasion of Poth’s own endowment by King Andrew II with some estates directly in the territory of Moson County.18 The county governor of Bratislava, Mog, was also among the witnesses of this act of donation. Likewise, he was also a county governor of Moson in the years 1199, 1206, 1208–1212 and 1214–1215.19 Thus, the only time we find Comes Poth as county governor of Bratislava is in 1207 (as a witness at the endowment of the Religious Order of the Holy Sepulchre),20 which implies that the endowment of Pezinok to the Count of Nitra, Thomas, may have taken place that year, i.e. in 1207, which slightly advances our knowledge of the earliest written documents about Pezinok.

However, the possession of Pezinok in the hands of county governor Thomas and his descendants was not quite stable in the first half of the thirteenth century, and they had to make quite a lot of efforts to maintain it in the following period. This was mainly due to the special favour of King Andrew II, whom they served faithfully while he was prince, and Thomas’s sons Sebes and Alexander in 1204 freed Prince Andrew from prison in Esztergom, where he had been imprisoned by his brother King Imrich. Andrew never forgot this support and after his accession to the Hungarian throne, he donated several estates in the territory of Bratislava County to the county governor Thomas and his sons: Plavecký Štvrtok in 1206, Veľké Kostoľany in 1208–1209, the large territory of Svätý Jur with four other villages in 1209, part of Rozvadza, Mylá near Sládkovičovo and Galád in Temėš in 1212, and Dvorník near Vajnory and Kmetovo near Nové Zámky in 1214, and thus they became the most important property owners in the territory of Bratislava County.21 As for the ownership of Pezinok, the original deed of gift was lost by the county governor Thomas and his sons during events in which Queen Gertrude was murdered and during the subsequent riots (the queen was murdered in 1213 by disgruntled rebels during Andrew’s expedition to Halič /Galicia/).22

18 CDSI I., p. 114, no. 144.
19 ZSOLDOS, Magyarország világi, 168–169, 182–183. It should be noted that for the year 1208 the function of the Bratislava court Špán (the highest royal official in the Kingdom of Hungary, the head of the county) is also known, which was then Comes Nicholas. In that year, the king entrusted him with settling a dispute between buffalo breeders from the village of Ípp in Kraszna County in Transylvania. KARÁCSONYI – BOROSZKY, Regestum Varadinense, p. 166, no. 1: “Rex autem commisit causam coram Nicolao comiti, scilicet curiali et Posoniensi discutiendum.”
20 CDSI I., p. 113, no. 142.
21 On individual acquisitions see: LUKAČKA, Formovanie vyššej šľachty, 34–35.
22 MARSINA, dejiny Slovenska, 227.
so King Andrew II in 1216 reissued the deed to them with a literal wording. However, the younger King Belo confiscated Pezinok and other properties from Thomas’s sons Sebes and Alexander, so in 1231 King Andrew II returned Pezinok to their possession again and confirmed all previous acts of donation. In 1245, King Belo IV reaffirmed the possession of Pezinok for Kozma, the son of Alexander, for his combat operations against the Austrian Duke Frederick, during which he penetrated as far as Vienna. Finally, also in 1256, King Belo IV confirmed the possession of Pezinok to Alexander’s sons Kozma and Achiles, and on this occasion the boundaries of the property were redrawn. The data from this document are very important, because they significantly supplement the older boundary document from 1208 (or 1207) and complete the picture of the earliest history of Pezinok. Several previous researchers have already noticed that the toponymy in the description of the boundaries of Pezinok has a predominantly Slavic character, thus pointing to the old Slavic settlement background. If we put both boundary delimitations on a map and analyse them, we obtain a rather remarkable documentation of the antiquity of the local settlement area with its pre-Hungarian origin and its special functional classification even in the conditions of the Kingdom of Hungary in the eleventh–twelfth centuries.

First of all, it is necessary to note the Slavic origin of the name Pezinok, which comes from the personal Slavic name Boza with the suffix-in, which proves the ownership (possessive) relationship of a person to the settlement. Considering the existence of the Great Moravian fortified settlements in Svätý Jur and Modra, the linguist Rudolf Kraľovič places the origin of the name as early as the ninth century. He points to the fact that names of this type occur in the vicinity of Slavic fortified settlements, which, as we will see, can also apply directly to Pezinok. Such a chronological classification of the name of Pezinok (and thus of the whole settlement) is also proved by the fact that for settlements under castle administration, such as Pezinok after the establishment of the Kingdom of Hungary, names were very often applied according to the names of the castle inhabitants who administered or used the land, but this was always done without adding the appropriate suffix, only by designating the property in the simple form of a personal name. The case of Pezinok with the composite form of the name means that it was indeed a settlement with an older, pre-Hungarian origin. With the above-mentioned also correspond the (as yet modest) archaeological findings of a Slavic settlement in the eighth-century Mahulanka location, but especially from the town’s intramural area on Mladoboleslavská Street and in the area of the sanctuary of the Parish Church of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary, which document the local Great Moravian and post Great Moravian settlement. However, other settlements

24 CDS I., pp. 265–266, no. 373. The preserved document is a copy, but the data about Pezinok are reliable.
25 CDS II., p. 139, no. 204.
28 STANISLAV, Slovenský juh, 409.
29 DUBOVSKÝ – ŽUDEL, Dejiny Pezinka, 39.
30 KRAJČOVIČ, Počiatky feudalizmu, 34.
31 To compare the relevant argumentation see: SEDLÁK, Die älteste Besiedlung, 99–101.
32 FARKAŠ – VAVÁK – WITTGRÜBER, Dejiny Pezinka, 18–19.
in the immediate vicinity were also of Great Moravian origin. It is noteworthy that the oldest written reports record them all in a subordinate relationship to Bratislava Castle as the land of castle soldiers (jobagions), which shows the functional inclusion of these settlements in the county and administrative system under the conditions of the building of the Kingdom of Hungary, even with the indigenous inhabitants. As we will see, this was also related to the special designation of the Pezinok settlement itself and its strategically important location.

According to both of the above-mentioned boundary delimitations from the years 1208 and 1256, Pezinok was adjacent to the land and settlement complex Mir, whose name is also of Slavic origin, while in 1256 it is stated that it was the land of the inhabitants of Bratislava Castle. In this year it was already divided by property, while its western part, separated from the rest by a river with the Slavic name Bystrica, was held by the jobagion of Bratislava Castle, Comes Baca. According to the document of 1290, before this year another part of Mir had been owned for a long time by the nobles of Žitný ostrov Matej, Martin and Svorad, the sons of Hertel. The continuation of the settlement of this land is today's Myslenice. The archaeological discovery of a Slavic settlement in Šúrske with a general dating to the eighth century corresponds with the Slavic origin of the name. Myslenice is immediately adjacent to Svätý Jur on the south side, where an important Great Moravian fortified settlement has been archaeologically documented in the location of Neštich.

Remarkable was the settlement on the western side of the Pezinok border, where an ancient settlement complex under the Slavic name Žužol was (the name deriving from the appellative Žužol with the meaning of coal). Its origin also dates back to the ninth century and it was originally a settlement of a servant population with a focus on charcoal burning, ranging from Viničné through Senec (the name deriving from the Hungarian translation of the name for charcoal – szén) to Tureň in the south. It also included the settlement *Doľany in the northwestern part of the complex, which had disappeared in the Middle Ages. The latter is mentioned in 1340 as being adjacent to the borders of Pezinok and at the same time Veľké Tŕnie. This whole extensive complex still resonates in the complaint of the counts George and Nicholas of Pezinok of 1423, according to which the reeve of Senec, Nicus Laybathan, royal subjects and inhabitants of Senec violently damaged the boundary landmarks between the districts of Pezinok and “a kind of settlement *Doľany”. The document is also important because it shows quite reliably the original extent of the land of *Žužol. The settlement has been investigated archaeologically, namely in the local part of Senec in the location of Martin, where, in addition to the settlement itself, dating back to at least the tenth century (but probably dating back to the ninth century) with a termination horizon in the fourteenth century, a sacral building was uncovered – the church of St Martin,
whose origins are equally old. This church was thus the original ecclesiastical centre of the entire servant complex of the coal miners of Žužlany and later Senec.

Another original neighbouring property with Pezinok was Šenkvice, located northeast of Pezinok, which according to a deed from 1256 was held by a jobagon (castle soldier) of Bratislava Castle with the Slavic name Chanuk. It was also an old settlement and archaeology has uncovered militaria from as early as the eighth century, but surface collection has also found Slavic pottery with a wave-shaped pattern from as early as the fifth or sixth century.

From the north, Pezinok was adjacent to two important settlements – Modra and Veľké Tŕnie. In the case of Modra, the Great Moravian origin of the settlement and the numerous Great Moravian findings, including an important fortified settlement, are already known. According to a document from 1256, Modra was inhabited by a population that paid five units of silver for each to the administration of Bratislava Castle, so the settlement was organized in this way as well.

Guard, toll and market function of the settlement

The settlement of Veľké Tŕnie is particularly significant. In the boundary delimitation of 1208 it is mentioned only as the land of “Turdune”; only in 1256 it is stated that it is the village of the sons of Chukar, who was also the castle jobagon of Bratislava Castle. In 1292 it is also directly referred to as Chukar’s village (Chukarfolus). Archaeologists have uncovered a well from the ninth century in the settlement with the remains of Great Moravian pottery, and there is no doubt that it was connected to the local settlement. The name is also of Slavic origin with an etymologically clear origin – thorn (tŕnie in Slovak). However, the significance of this name lies not only in the local natural abundance of thorns, but especially in the fact that it had a specific purpose. The settlement was located in a strategically important area with a passage to the other side of the Little Carpathians, so it seems that its inhabitants cultivated the thorn intentionally to create barricades, abatisses (indagines), communication restrictions and regulations. The local population had a duty to cultivate the thorn plantation on purpose to secure the local crossing over the Little Carpathians, leading through the (Pezinská) Baba. From the other side of the mountains this function was provided by the settlement of Jablonové, whose name is also derived from the cultivation of wild trees for the purpose of creating abatisses in order to protect the pass. At the same time, a defensive system was also provided by the military garrison on the fortified settlement above Pernek (spot height 445). The fact that such a system of building...
defensive abatisses was a reality on the dominion of the owners of Pezinok, who also acquired other local estates, is evidenced by a document from 1209. By means of it, King Andrew II donated the extensive property of Svätý Jur to Comes Sebes of Pezinok and at the same time exempted the local subjects (as well as all others on Sebes’s estates) from the obligation to build defensive abatisses and ditches. 49 However, this report also testifies the decline of this ancient defensive system in the area of southwestern Slovakia.

The pass (road) itself is mentioned in a border delimitation from 1208, according to which the border of the property of Pezinok led along the road leading through Jablonové 50 to Pernek and from there it continued a little further along the road, but after a while the border line disappeared. 51 The road, however, continued to the other side of the Little Carpathians and led to Trnie. In the above-mentioned borderline, there is another interesting piece of information, because after the borderline left the crossing road, it joined the spring called Lučinc(i), 52 where the borders of Pezinok and Trnie met. The name of the spring is very important, because it seems to be related to the whole situation described around the local guarding of the Little Carpathian pass. The name of the spring, which according to the boundary delimitation stretches all the way to Trnie and the area of its source being the border point between Pezinok and Trnie, is probably linked to the medieval designation of archers, also called “lučinci” in the Middle Ages. They were probably the guard population in charge of the military security of the pass. In fact, a similar situation can be documented at another pass in the Little Carpathian region a little further north near Lošonc, where the name of the village—originally probably Lučince—could also be derived from the archers. 53 These archers probably formed a military garrison of the eastern ethnic group of Sikulov, which is mentioned in this settlement area in 1256 at the demarcation of Boleráz. 54 In the case of the Little Carpathian pass near Pezinok and Veľké Trnie it would not be an isolated phenomenon, rather the opposite. In this context, the archaeological discovery of arrowheads on the back of the ridge in the Cajlanska valley above the confluence of the streams Blatnica and Sedláčkov jarok is remarkable, pointing to the eastern ethnic provenance of their bearers. 55 They could have been the aforementioned archers. A fortified settlement was found in the above-mentioned location in the Cajlanska valley, which was destroyed in the second half of the thirteenth century, and which is probably related to the evidence of the existence of the Old Castle, known in sources from the seventeenth century onwards. 56 This fortified settlement probably provided a strategic passage through the Little Carpathians on the opposite side of the pass,

50 It is certainly important to note that the village of Jablonové was already in the possession of the county governor Thomas before 1206, CDSI I., p. 111, no. 139 (it being mentioned in the boundary document of Plavecký Štvrtok).
51 CDSI I., pp. 113–114, no. 142: “transiens per medium villam Jablan ad viam Mhysle et tendendo parum superius per eandem viam declinat ad sinistram, dimissa illa via.”
52 Vincent Sedlák interprets this spring under the name Lúčnik, but the context of the whole situation speaks of a different etymology, compare: SEDLÁK, Die älteste Besiedlung, 100.
53 MAREK, Cudzie etniká, 78–79.
54 CDSI II., pp. 392–393, no. 563.
56 On the location “Starý zámek” compare: DUBOVSKÝ – ŽUDEL, Dejiny Pezinka, 40–41 (the author of the relevant part is J. Žudel).
just as the fortified settlement above Pernek did on the eastern side. However, the question is where these archers were specifically deployed as a military guard garrison and what their ethnicity was. In the conditions of the Kingdom of Hungary, this role was performed by specialized troops of Old Hungarian and related tribes, whose traces remain in the topography as the names of their settlements. If we take into account the whole context (the Little Carpathian pass, its intercepting facilities on both sides of the mountains, traces of the guarding population—archers, the fortified settlement above the pass at Pernek and the parallel positional fortified settlement in the district of Pezinok), then the existence of the so-called Hungarian Street, which existed in medieval Pezinok, fits into the whole situation quite accurately. It is documented under this name in 1437 in the register of wine tithes from the wine-growers of Pezinok.57

It seems that this was the mentioned settlement of the Hungarian military garrison with a guarding function in relation to the above-mentioned Little Carpathian pass and which settled directly in Pezinok, where the ethnonymic name of one of the streets of Pezinok was preserved even in the fifteenth century. Looking at the topography of Pezinok, it is obvious that the Old Hungarian garrison was located directly in the vicinity of the Slavic settlement, on the right bank of the stream that ran through Pezinok. The original older settlement with its church and market centre was located on the opposite bank. However, the settlement of the Hungarian guards directly into Pezinok undoubtedly fulfilled another purpose, namely to strategically secure the nearby Great Moravian fortified settlements in Modra and Svätý Jur after they had been subordinated to the administrative system of the Kingdom of Hungary. Both of these fortified settlements fulfilled the role of providing the strategic security of this Little Carpathian pass already in Great Moravian times, but they were also important centres of regional administration. Their subordination to the Hungarian power and the new securing of the pass must have taken place in the second half of the tenth century, which is also a proof of the pre-Hungarian existence of the settlement of Pezinok and its special significance.

Finally, on the matter of the guarding function of Pezinok, it should be noted that the settlements, which provided important communications at the inland and border crossings, also fulfilled an economic role as toll collection and regional market centres. At the same time, however, they were also a religious regional centre.58

The ancient toll function of the Pezinok settlement is evidenced by the mandate of King Charles I of Austria of 19 November 1339, which, at the request of the magistrate Sebes of Pezinok, forbids anyone to bypass the old toll in Pezinok. The toll had been donated to his ancestors on the basis of a royal donation and they had attached it to the belongings of their castle in Pezinok.59 However, there is another remarkable document about the toll of Pezinok, which informs us that one third of its revenues have always belonged to the Benedictine Pannonhalma Archabbey. Thus, in 1393, the counts Nicholas and George of Pezinok paid the abbey its annual share of the toll revenues, totalling six pounds of denarii.60 Similarly, in 1397, the Abbot of Pannonhalma,
Stephen, acknowledged the two counts for paying the same amount for the share of the toll of Pezinok on the feast of St Michael the Archangel (29 September), which belonged to him and his monastery.\textsuperscript{61} It should be pointed out that such a one-third share of the revenue by religious institutions dates back to very old times, certainly to the time when Pezinok was under the administration of Bratislava Castle. The latter, as is known from the organization of the county system in Hungary, also received one third of the toll collected and the last third was left to the monarch. This old property and administrative arrangement dates back to the time of the first Hungarian king Stephen I.\textsuperscript{62}

The toll institution in Pezinok is certainly of the same origin. However, the above-mentioned also means that in 1207 the Count of Nitra received Pezinok with only two thirds of the local toll (county/castle and royal).

Equally ancient is the market function of the settlement. However, the concrete evidence comes from the document of the regional judge James of Spiš from 1375, who at a meeting of his court in Bratislava judged a dispute between John, son of Sebes, on the one hand, and on the other hand Thomas, castellan of Holíč, and Peter of Svätý Jur, son of the deceased Peter, who was the brother of the aforementioned Sebes. The dispute concerned the mutual transfer of a number of subjects from their estates and the regulation of the movement and transfer of their subjects on the estates of the aforementioned nobles. Among other things, it was agreed that the subjects of the counts of Svätý Jur were allowed to come to the market in Pezinok without interference, but they were obliged to pay the usual market toll, as were all other market traders.\textsuperscript{63}

In 1376, at the request of the aforementioned John, son of Sebes, King Louis I renewed the privilege of the weekly market in Pezinok, as the original privilege had been lost. It is not known whether this loss was related to the aforementioned dispute between the relatives, but the newly granted charter allowed the weekly market in Pezinok on Wednesdays, as it had been before.\textsuperscript{64} Wednesday as a market day in Pezinok is probably also a very ancient institution, because we know from the Slavic environment that it was a traditional market day of the Slavs, which is indicated by several documents, especially from Poland and Croatia.\textsuperscript{65} Thus, this was also an economic organization, which probably dates back at least to the beginnings of the Kingdom of Hungary, but most likely to the times before that. The market function of Pezinok is also emphasized by its German name Pösing. It originated after Pezinok was settled by the Germans sometime shortly after the Tartar invasion, when the German population added the suffix -ing to the old Slavic name to signify market activity.\textsuperscript{66} The first record of such a name dates back to 1318 (Graf von Poesing).\textsuperscript{67}

\textsuperscript{61} MNL-OL DL, 8256: “nobis et dicto nostro monasterio (...) racione porcionis nostre tributarie in dicta Bozyn existentis in festo sancti Michaelis archangeli solvere tenentur.”

\textsuperscript{62} GYÖRFFY, István király, 268.

\textsuperscript{63} MNL-OL DF, 83 344: “causa fori cum mercibus aut sine mercibus in predictam venirent possessionem Bozyn nuncupatum (... tributum consuetum more alliorum foresiensium (...) solvere tenentur.”

\textsuperscript{64} Štátny archív Bratislava, pracovisko Archív Modra, fond Mesto Pezinok, documents: “forum liberum singulis feris quartis in omni ebdomada, in dicta possessione sua Bozyn vocata.”

\textsuperscript{65} SEDLÁK, Die älteste Besiedlung, 81–82. This issue is also specifically addressed in the study: RÁBIK, Vznik mestského zriadenia, 68.

\textsuperscript{66} Compare: RÁBIK, Nemecké osídlenie, 37–62.

\textsuperscript{67} SEDLÁK, Regesta diplomatica, p. 175, no. 358.
The development of Pezinok accelerated with the arrival of the Germans, especially economically but also socially, and from the fifteenth century onwards it was referred to as a town (oppidum).  

The earliest mentions of the parish church and parish

The military guard, toll and market functions of the Pezinok settlement, which ranked it among the localities of supra-regional importance, was accompanied by an important position in the church administration of the Bratislava Archdeaconate as the seat of the parish. The outlined settlement and functional situation of Pezinok gives room to consider that Pezinok was very early a cult ecclesiastical centre. The building of the medieval church itself was eccentrically situated in the settlement, namely in its peripheral northwestern intramural part on the left bank of the local watercourse – thus, in an area where an ancient settlement had been forming since Great Moravian times and which in the second half of the thirteenth century was also overlaid by German settlement. On the other side, from the end of the tenth and the beginning of the eleventh century, a settlement of Old Hungarian guards was formed, who took control of the entire local region and the strategic passage to the Little Carpathians from Záhorie. The medieval church itself was thus also located on the Great Moravian cultural layer and it should be considered particularly significant that it was in the area of its sanctuary that archaeologists managed to find a fragment of the upper rim of a ninth century pottery vessel decorated with a wave-shaped decoration. It is not known whether the discovery can be directly linked to the existence of a sacral building at this time. However, in view of the substantiated ancient institutions in Pezinok of pre-Hungarian origin as well as the developed neighbouring settlement and administrative Great Moravian structures in the immediate vicinity of Slavic Pezinok, this cannot be ruled out. On the contrary, all these circumstances play in favour of such an interpretation. Certainly, this Great Moravian find in the central part of the sacral building cannot be assessed as accidental. Also remarkable is the result of another piece of archaeological research, which documented that the foundation walls of the sanctuary in its entire later extent, even with the polygonal cap, are older than its superstructure, which was already part of the rebuilding of the church in the fourteenth century. Although the dating of these walls is still very cautious, at least Early Gothic architecture is noted. Indeed, it is inconceivable that a settlement of such importance would not have had a religious building with parish administration long before the thirteenth century. It can be rightly assumed that the church in Pezinok formed part of the basic parish infrastructure of the Bratislava Provostry from its beginnings.

However, the oldest known data dates back to the second decade of the fourteenth century. This was on the occasion of the papal nuncio Rufinus of Cibio, the archdeacon of Tolna in the diocese of Pécs, who arrived in the Kingdom of Hungary on 12 October, on the special commission of Pope John XXII. He was to remain in Hungary for three years (he left the country on 12 March 1320) and, by papal commission, was to collect for the Apostolic Camera an annual income from all unoccupied ecclesiastical benefices in the kingdom. These were often occupied by the seculars, the nobility and even the monarch,
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68 The oldest proof dates from 1410. FEJÉRPATAKY, Magyarországi városok, 50. Compare also: LAKATOS, Mezővárosi oklevélék, 239.
69 FARKAŠ – VAVÁK – WITTGRÚBER, Dejiny Pezinka, 19.
70 RÁBIK, Formovanie farskej siete, 30.
thus depriving the Roman Curia of a large income from the compulsory benefices which their clerical holders had to pay. In the Kingdom of Hungary, however, Rufinus met with disapproval, so the pope considerably reduced his original decree and sent Rufinus a new instruction. According to it, he was already to collect half of the annual pension from unoccupied benefices whose annual income exceeded six grzywnas of pure silver (one grzywna was counted as four chambered papal guilders). For this reason, Archdeacon Rufinus also dealt with the parish in Pezinok, but he did not learn of its vacancy until the end of his three-year stay, i.e. around the beginning of 1320, and did not have time to settle the parish accounts. However, it was the Archbishop of Esztergom, Thomas, who pointed out to him that the income of the parish of Pezinok exceeded the amount of six grzywnas, so Rufinus commissioned him to settle the accounts himself and send the money to the Roman Curia. It follows that sometime at the end of 1319 or at the beginning of 1320 the parish of Pezinok was emptied. It was also vacant between 1332 and 1337, when papal tithe collectors were in the country, and from their activities have survived detailed records of tithed parishes, but without any mention of Pezinok. Only very indirectly is the parish of Pezinok mentioned in the complaint of the vicar and sub-provost Thomas and the canons of Bratislava, magistrates Tybold, Pavel of Vienna, Ivanek and the Bratislava town parish priest Peter, to the Archbishop of Esztergom, Csanád, claiming a quarter of the archbishop’s tithes, which belonged to the castle districts of Stupava, Devin, Pezinok and Šváštý Jur, as well as from the villages of Rača, Vajnory, Ivanka pri Dunaji, Kostolná pri Dunaji, Most pri Dunaji, Jelka and Vlky on Žitný Ostrov, which had belonged to them under previous archbishops, and were now being denied to them by the archiepiscopal tithe collectors. They therefore demanded the archbishop intervene and protect their rights. But since the archbishop wanted the whole matter investigated first, he asked Bishop Nicholas of Eger, formerly Provost of Bratislava, to enlighten him as to how the tithes had been handled when he held the office of Provost of Bratislava. After his explanation of the whole matter, as well as after the testimony of the priests of the churches that belonged to the districts of the castles mentioned above, the archbishop learned that this was indeed the case and that the canons and the chapter had indeed been receiving the disputed tithes from a long time ago (“as far back as memory goes”), and therefore he reaffirmed their possession of the tithes for the future.

Finally, however, it was not until the foundation deed of the Count of Šváštý Jur, Magister Sebes, in 1345 that the patronage of the parish church in Pezinok was mentioned for the first time in concrete terms. On 11 November of that year, Count Sebes, out of reverence and devotion to Almighty God and the Virgin Mary and St Ladislaus the King, St John the Evangelist, St John the Baptist and St Andrew the Apostle, as well as to all the saints, and for the salvation of the souls of his ancestors, but also for the greater salvation of his own soul and the souls of his descendants, appointed Conrad, a priest of Buda, to be chaplain of his chapel, which was situated in Pezinok.


73 MES, pp. 208–209, no. 306.
and was dedicated to the veneration of St Ladislaus the King. For the maintenance of such a foundation he gave him one vineyard, colloquially called Lyetin, and the mill of the burgher of Pezinok, Lev Margirlin, but on condition that from this mill priest Conrad should obligatorily hand to the priest of the church of the Blessed Virgin Mary of Pezinok forty units of wheat. In addition, he granted him a pension of five pounds of Viennese denarii (three of which came from the importation of barrels and two from barrel fees, colloquially called Kusingobe).74

The importance of the parish church in the region was increased by the granting of a papal indulgence in 1369.75 In the document, Pope Urban V particularly emphasizes the veneration of the Virgin Mary, whom he piously refers to as the mother of mercy, grace, friend of love and comforter of mankind, the one who intercedes for the salvation of the faithfuls to “the King whom she bore”. All this, more out of reverence than out of duty, led the Pope to grant indulgences to churches dedicated to the Blessed Virgin Mary. Therefore, the Parish Church of the Virgin Mary in Pezinok, in the Archbishopric of Esztergom, was also to receive these graces, so that the greatest number of the faithful could gather there. Therefore, to all the faithful in Christ who had made a valid confession and repented, and on the feasts of the Nativity of Our Lord (25. 12.), the Circumcision (1. 1.), the Epiphany (6. 1.), the Resurrection (Easter Sunday), the Ascension (Thursday before the Exaudi Sunday) and Corpus Christi (Thursday after the Holy Trinity), as well as on the Marian feasts of the Nativity (8. 9.), the Annunciation (25. 3.), the Purification (2. 2.) and the Assumption (15. 8.), and also on the feasts of St John the Baptist (24. 6.), Saint apostles Peter and Paul (29. 6.) and All Saints (1. 11.), also during the octaves of the above-mentioned feasts and the six days of the Whitsun, he visited annually the mentioned church and granted 100-day indulgences. However, this privilege of the parish church of Pezinok was to last only for a period of ten years.

The parish of Pezinok, or its priest, is then mentioned only in the document of Doctor of Law Leonard of Pesaro, Archdeacon of Zagreb, Canon of Zagreb and Esztergom and Vicar “in spiritualibus” of the Archbishop of Esztergom, John of Kaniža, of 1390. In that year he wrote a protest, which was made at the last diocesan synod under the presidency of the archbishop himself, by the canon and sub-custodian Martin of Esztergom against the provost Vavrinec of Bratislava and eighty-six other parish priests with named parishes, who were under the provost’s jurisdiction. Among them, the parish priest of Pezinok is also specifically mentioned. Canon Martin accused the provost and his priests of violating the old rights of the Esztergom Chapter in the matter of the dispensing of sacred oils and chrism, which were illegally distributed by the Provost of Bratislava. The latter, however, argued that this was allegedly an ancient custom, which was also confirmed by the representative of the Bratislava Chapter, Canon Magister Vavrinec. The other side, however, denied this and stated that the mentioned priests used to go to Esztergom for oils. The mediated agreement at the synod stipulated that in the future only one of the canons of Bratislava was to bring the oils from Esztergom for all priests, and that these were to be distributed from the Bratislava Chapter to the other parish priests. For the oils, each of the parish

---

74 MES, p. 576, no. 768: “capelle mee, que est in castro meo in Bozingo in honore sancti Ladizlai (...) plebano sancte Marie in Bozinga.” On Marian and Ladislaus patronage compare: MEZŐ, Patrociniumok a középkori, 212, 403.

75 THEINER, Vetera monumenta, p. 94, no. 182: “parochialis ecclesia sancte Marie in Bozin, Strigoniensis diocesis” (the year 1370).
priests was to pay the Esztergom Chapter four denarii per year and hand over a candle the size of the length of a man’s arm. One half of it was to be used for the lighting needs of Esztergom Cathedral and the other half for Bratislava Cathedral. Apart from its remarkable content, the whole dispute is particularly important for introducing a significant part of the church topography in the territory of the Bratislava Provostry at the end of the fourteenth century.

The parish of Pezinok (Bazin) is also mentioned among the parishes of the Bratislava Provostry in 1397, when a visitation of the Archdiocese of Esztergom was allegedly carried out by Antonio da Ponte, Bishop of Sibin and Archbishop’s Vicar, on behalf of Archbishop John of Kaniža, in the presence of the notary of the Prague cleric John of Turnov. The visitation protocol included an inventory of all the parishes in the archdiocese, divided according to their organizational assignment to the various arch- and vice-archidiaconates. However, the situation with this list is problematic, because it is missing in the copies known today (two copies, the first from the second half of the fifteenth century and the second from the middle of the sixteenth century), where this list was in the form of a separately drawn up appendix. Today, the only known survival is a copy of it in the synodal proceedings of the Trnava bishops’ synod of 1629, where it was intended to serve as a record of the losses suffered by the Catholic Church in the process of the Reformation from the sixteenth century onwards, and at the same time as a basis for recatholicization activities. However, a list of parishes of a similar nature, i.e. from the Archbishopric of Esztergom, is also known from 1516. It was created on the occasion of the preparation of a diocesan synod, which, however, did not take place in the end. The inventory is also interesting in that the method of registering individual parishes and their organizational subdivisions, as well as the language of the toponymic entries, which bear a distinctly Germanic linguistic expression, are partly similar to the alleged register of parishes of 1397, as we know it in the preserved document of 1629. This means that both registers were based on some common source, which to a certain extent also defends the credibility of the register of 1397. The parish of Pezinok is listed in the register of parishes of 1516 in its proper organizational classification as part of the Bratislava Provostry (Bozyn).

However, the medieval sources also provide us with other data that more vividly present the functioning of the parish of Pezinok, its staffing, and other aspects of religious, ecclesiastical and administrative life in the town.

The central position here was of course represented by the parish church building itself with its Marian consecration. In addition to the already mentioned documents of 1345 and 1369, there are also data from the fifteenth century that describe the church in terms of some of its structural elements. Thus we learn that when in 1425 the
counts of Pezinok, brothers George and Nicholas, divided the estates of the Pezinok manor and some other estates on the Žitný ostrov, all the sacral buildings in Pezinok (even the chapel in the castle) and the church facilities belonging to them were left in joint possession and administration. The division itself was preceded by a dispute between the two counts, in which Count George accused his brother Nicholas of insufficient participation in the administration and income of the family estates. The whole dispute reached the monarch, who delegated the case to the regional judge Matthew of Pavlovce. Only then did the fraternal dispute end by conciliation and with an agreement on the equal division of estates. To this end, King Sigismund commissioned the Bratislava Chapter to carry out a revision of the estates in question, which it did in September 1425 (the report itself being written on 19 September). On the basis of the report, the division was carried out again by the representatives of the chapter and the royal commissioner in the days following the feast of St Michael (from 29 September) of that year. On the basis of both of these documents we thus learn that in Pezinok were not only the Castle Chapel of St Ladislaus and the Parish Church of St Mary, but also the hospital of the Holy Spirit, the rectory and the house of the hospital administrator (rector), the houses of the hospital and parish beneficiaries (chaplains, holders of benefices), of the bell-ringers, the local school and the spa, as well as all the vineyards, mills and ecclesiastical pensions, from whatever sources they came from. From the second document we again learn that the church was without a tower and had a cemetery, that the hospital was also without a tower, and that burials used to take place there as well. 80

In 1467 Helena, the widow of Count Imrich, and her brother-in-law Count Ladislaus supported with an unspecified amount of money unspecified construction works on the parish church. 81 The parish church also received a more significant financial investment for reconstruction in 1474. In this year, the noblewoman Catherine, widow of Marshal Adam of Rogów in Poland, placed herself under the protection and patronage of the counts of Pezinok Ladislaus and his nephew Simon, and gave them possession of all her estates and property shares, including their revenues, and especially the villages Lukáčovce and Neznawicz in Nitra County. After her death these estates could be bought from the counts of Pezinok by Catherine’s relatives. In addition, Catherine also gave all her dowry properties and several receivables she had towards several nobles, as well as towards family members, to the two counts. At the same time, she designated half of these dowry properties for the rebuilding of the Parish Church of the Virgin Mary in Pezinok. The counts of Pezinok undertook to protect Catherine and to provide her with shelter and sustenance until the end of her life. 82 Thus, the two reports above show that in the second half of the 1460s and the first half of the 1470s the church in Pezinok was undergoing significant structural changes. No more
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80 MNL-OL DL, 11727: “predictum siquidem opidum Bozyn demptis ecclesia parochiali in honore Beate Marie Virginis gloriose et hospitali in honore sancti Spiritus fundatis, domibusque plebanie et rectoratus, eiusdem hospitalis prebendaris, campanatoribus, et scola, item vineis, molendinis, et censibus seu redditis ab bbalneo (!) vel aliunde eidem ecclesie hospitali et plebanie seu alteri earundem deputatis et proveniendis, quas et que partes statu, libertate et condicionibus superioribus promississet”, MNL-OL DL, 11 718: “Item ecclesiam lapideam in honore beate virginis constructam absque pinnaculo habens sepulturem ac hospitale in nomine sancti Spiritus fundatis absque pinnaculo, ubi eciam defuncti solent quiescere.”

81 HÁZI, Pozsony vármegye, 77.

82 MNL-OL DL, 17 575: “totalem ac directam et equalem medietatem dotum et rerum parafernalia omnium porcionum et iurium possessionariorum suarum, in predictis possessionibus Neznawicz et Lakachy vocatis, habitarum, ad fabricam ecclesie parrochialis sancte Marie in oppido Bazin fundate.”
medieval documentary evidence survived, but further building activity is evidenced by the discovery of a dating of 1501 on the triumphal arch, as will be discussed below. The church also contains an epitaph of Count George from 1426 and a Renaissance baptismal font dating to 1523.83

However, the parish church also had several chapels and associated altar chapels with prebends, which were administered by special rectors – priests. Religious fraternities of Pezinok inhabitants were also attached to these altar chapels. From historical documents, only the Chapel of the Holy Trinity and the Confraternities of the Blessed Virgin Mary and Corpus Christi are known. On 23 September 1449, the rector of the Chapel of the Holy Trinity in Pezinok, Hans Talkner, informed the Bratislava magistrate that he was unable to come to Bratislava on the next feast of St Michael to receive the sum of seventeen and a half guilders.84 It was a sum equal to half a year’s liability of the Bratislava magistrate to this chapel. A similar sum was also accepted from the citizens of Bratislava in 1466 by the chaplain John, who at that time also acted as chaplain to Count Ladislaus.85 In 1478 the rector of the chapel of the Holy Trinity, John Märcher, castellan of the castle of Pezinok George Bechkez and the burgher of Pezinok George Reynisser, on the orders of the vicar of the Bratislava provost and canon of the Bratislava chapter Nicholas de Hyttendorff, witnessed the testamentary bequeath of the nobelwoman Catherine, widow of Peter of Blažov, by which she appointed her son Ladislaus as heir to all of her estates.86 The report of the Bratislava Chapter of 1494 shows that in 1446 the burghers of Bratislava had set up a special fund at this altar and had undertaken to pay it the sum of thirty-five guilders annually. However, the deceased administrator of the chapel, the priest Ján Marykharth, lost the foundation deed and the whole commitment was questioned by the citizens of Bratislava. In 1494, however, an agreement was reached between the Bratislava magistrate and Count Simon on the redemption, as a result of which the Bratislavians redeemed themselves from this obligation by paying the sum of three hundred and fifty guilders,87 which represented the amount of the ten-year census.

However, there was undoubtedly also a chapel of the Corpus Christi in Pezinok. It is only indirectly mentioned in the report of its fraternity. On the basis of an agreement of 1504 between the Duke of Transylvania, Count Peter of Pezinok and Svätý Jur, and the Archbishop of Esztergom, Thomas Bakócs, the rectors of the altars in the churches of Pezinok and Svätý Jur, during the lifetime of Duke Peter did not have to pay tithes from the vineyards which belonged to them (as had been the case before), and similarly the Confraternities of Corpus Christi and the Virgin Mary, which existed in these towns, were also exempt from paying tithes from the vineyards.88 The Confraternity and Altar Society of the Blessed Virgin Mary, however, did not exist in the parish church, but was

84 Magyar Nemezeti Levéltár – Országos Levéltár Budapest, Diplomatikai Fényképek (hereinafter MNL-OL DF), 242 275: “Herr Hanns Talkchner rector cappelle sancte Trinitatis in Posingo.”
85 MNL-OL DF, 242 780 “Ich Hans Graff Ladslau kapplann czw Posing.”
86 MNL-OL DL, 18 015: “...honorable et decietus vir dominus Johannes Märcher rector capelle sancte Trinitatis in Bozin.”
87 MNL-OL DF, 243 022: “...census (...) capelle sancte et individue Trinitatis in dicta ecclesias parochiales in Bozyn construcute, singulis annis (...) deberent solvere.”
88 MNL-OL DL, 20925: “...item decimas de vineis rectorum altarium in ecclesiis opidorum Zenthgherge et Bozyn predictorum fundatorum provenientes, que scilicet vinee per prius (!) decimales non fuissent, eisdem rectoribus altarium modo simili vita ipsius comitis Petri durante annuisset. Item de vineis ad confraternitatem sanctissimi
organized in the hospital church, where it also had its own altar of the Blessed Virgin Mary. From 10 to 12 November 1515, the chaplain of this altar, Nicholas, the son of a scribe, was successively ordained to all degrees of ordination by Bishop Matthew de San Leone in Rome. As for the hospital itself, in 1509, in his will, the Provost of Varadinum (now Oradea), Matej Ilesházi of Iliašovce, bequeathed two guilders to it, which is the last known medieval record of the hospital.

The parish church also included a school and a rectory building, which are first mentioned in the division of the Pezinok manor in 1425, as already mentioned. No other medieval documents about the school are known. However, the rectory is also mentioned in 1451, when four representatives of the Bratislava Chapter and George of Rozhanovce met there to make a legal declaration of the release of all his and his cousin’s (Sebastian of Rozhanovce) estates in Upper Hungary to Count Imrich of Pezinok. As the deed of the Bratislava Chapter states, Imrich was the son-in-law of George of Rozhanovce and the husband of his daughter Helena, and the whole matter concerned the estates of Šintava, Bernolákovo (Čeklís) and Šamorín, Rusovce and Vrakuňa. These estates and their revenues were to be held by Count Imrich until Sebastian of Rozhanovce returned to the country from captivity.

However, let us also take a look at the staffing of the parish office. The first known parish priest of Pezinok is only the parish priest John, who, together with the parish priest of Devin, Stephen, was entrusted by the Archdeacon of Nitra, Matej de Vicedominis, the appointed judge from the Archbishop of Esztergom, in 1417, to investigate the witnesses in the dispute over the rights and scope of jurisdiction between the Bratislava magistrate and the Provost of Bratislava, John Juban. Testimonies were given by the Bratislava burgurers Peter List, Ulrich Rawhenwarter, Egid Futrer, the noblemen Michael of Kaplnná and John of Rača, and finally by Simon Cayetus, the parish priest of St Martin’s in Bratislava, and by the rector of the Bratislava school, the keeper of the altar of St Andrew in St Martin’s Church, the cleric of the Raba diocese, the priest George. Sometime after this year, the Bratislava magistrate and the Provost of Bratislava concluded a partial agreement concerning the right of the chapter to sell wine, the formation of a joint committee to manage the rebuilding of St Martin’s Church, the right of asylum and also the jurisdiction of the court. In this case, the agreement was also assisted by the two aforementioned parish priests. In 1461, the parish priest of Pezinok was Sigismund, who at that time informed the Bratislava city council about the origin and reputation of the burgher of Svätý Jur, Bartholomew

Corporis Christi et Beatissime Virginis Marie in ecclesiis predictorum opidorum existentes spectantibus decimas provenientes eidem confraternitati consimiliter vita dicti comitis Petri durante relaxavit."

89 AAV, Cam. Ap., Libri format., Vol. 13, fol. 32r: "Matheus, episcopus sancti Leonis, in Romana curia residens, ex speciali commissione nostra, de manadato etc. et auctoritate etc. nec non vigore supplicacionis sub data Rome apud sanctum Petrum octavo idus Novembris anno quarto, dilectum nobis Nicolaum Scriptoris, scolarem (...) Strigoniensem, capellanum ad altare beate Marie virginis situm in hospitali sancti Spiritus oppidi Bosinconensis (!), eiusdem dioecesis, Rome die Lune, X novembris, ad primam tonsuram et quatuor minores et subdiaconatus insuper, die Martis, XI dixit mensis, ad diaconatus, postremo die Mercurii, XII dixit mensis, ad presbiteratus sacros ordinis infra missarum sollemnia iuxta ritum sanctorum Romane ecclesie in capella domus sue solite residentie promovit." Compare RÁBIK, Monumenta Vaticana, IV., 376.
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91 MNL-OL DL, 14 454: "Georgius de Rozgon in opido Bozyn prescripto, in curia plebani, ibidem personaliter constitutus."

92 MNL-OL DF, 243 022: "Stephanus de Thebna et Johannes de Posingo parochialium ecclesiarii rectores."

93 MNL-OL DF, 240 919: "Johannes in Posingo et Stephanus in Tebna parochialium ecclesiarii rectores."
of Holíč, who had moved to the town ten years earlier.\textsuperscript{94} In 1467, when donating funds for the rebuilding of the church, a certain Farkaš was mentioned as the parish priest of Pezinok.\textsuperscript{95} The priest Michael Aychler was also a parish priest of Pezinok before 1500. After his death in that year, Count Francis of Svätý Jur and Pezinok appointed a priest of the diocese of Passau, Stephan Ströbel, as the new parish priest and asked the Archbishop of Esztergom, Thomas Bakócz, to formally approve him. On this occasion, Count Francis particularly emphasized that he was doing so on the basis of the right of patronage which duly and lawfully belonged to him, which is important information.\textsuperscript{96} Undoubtedly, his ancestors obtained the right of patronage together with the donation of Pezinok as early as 1207, and it was exercised without any protests continuously throughout the entire period under review.

However, the Castle Chapel of St Ladislaus also had its chaplains, who were funded there by the counts of Pezinok in 1345, as already mentioned. One such chaplain was the priest Simon, who in 1433 issued a receipt for payment of one hundred guilders to the town magistrate in Bratislava.\textsuperscript{97} The same was also a chaplain in 1441, when he again issued to the Bratislava townspeople a receipt for the payment of twenty-five guilders.\textsuperscript{98} In 1460 and 1462, this position was held by the parish priest John (Hans), who is perhaps identical with the administrator of the Holy Trinity Chapel in the parish church, where he was chaplain in 1466.\textsuperscript{99}

Part of the ecclesiastical-administrative organization of the parish of Pezinok was also the obligation to pay church tithes from specified crops, but in the case of Pezinok it was especially from wine, which absolutely dominated the tithe obligation of the inhabitants of Pezinok. However, we can find evidence of it in historical sources only from the first third of the fifteenth century. In the records of the Bratislava Chapter’s revenues from 1430, there is also a mention of tithes from the settlements on Žitný ostrov, which belonged to the Pezinok manor. They are not specifically mentioned, but the chapter’s accountants recorded that one quarter of them remained for the local parish priests.\textsuperscript{100} In fact, it was a quarter of a quarter, i.e. one sixteenth (called sedecima). We are informed about the collection of tithes from wine in Pezinok and the surrounding villages by the summary tithe register of the so-called Bratislava tithe circle.\textsuperscript{101} The wine tithe register of Pezinok dates from 1437 and is remarkable
for its information on the oldest settlement topography of the town. As for the tithe yield in that year, it amounted to 450 urns of wine for the whole of Pezinok, while the Bratislava Chapter accounted for 45 urns. In financial terms, each urn was worth 170 Viennese denarii. The tithe records from 1439 are of a general nature. An important account of tithes collected in Pezinok dates from 1462. It was a quarter share of the Bratislava chapter in all tithes, but it was leased by the counts of Pezinok for the sum of 800 denarii. The parish priest of Pezinok received 200 denarii of the tithes collected for his share (one sixteenth – *sedecima*). From this it can be determined that the total amount of tithes in Pezinok in this period was 3600 denarii (i.e. thirty-two guilders). However, the payment of tithe collectors by the counts of Pezinok for rented tithes was not always smooth. In 1483, for example, Count Simon of Pezinok and Svätý Jur owed the tithe collector, the nobleman Nicholas Baky, the sum of 100 denarii, and therefore he undertook at the Bratislava Chapter to settle his debt by 1 January 1484. If he failed to do so, he had to pledge his village Nové Košariská to Nicholas Baky until he paid the debt. In 1493 Archbishop Hypolit of Esztergom leased the tithes of Voderady, Pusté Úľany and Pezinok to Bertrand of Ferrara. However, the counts of Svätý Jur and Pezinok constantly tried to keep the tithes of their estates under their own control and lease, thus increasing their feudal income. However, disputes often arose over the extent of the harvest subject to tithes, with the ecclesiastical authorities resorting to ecclesiastical punishments to enforce their claims. In 1504, the Duke of Transylvania and Count Peter of Pezinok concluded an agreement with the Archbishop of Esztergom, Thomas Bakóc, in which it was specified to what extent tithes could be collected not only in the territory of Pezinok but also in the territory of the Svätý Jur manor.

The overall picture of the church conditions in Pezinok is also complemented by information about the piety of the patronage of the count’s family and the resulting church graces. In 1442, Count George of Pezinok was granted by the papal legate Cardinal-Presbyter Julián the right to possess a portable altar, at which any priest he chose could celebrate mass anywhere in worthy canonical places. George’s wife, Jitka of Opava, in turn, in 1443 donated fourteen pounds of pfennigs to the Augustinian monastery in Vienna, to be paid from the vineyard in Medling. This money was to be used to maintain the inextinguishable lamp in the chapel, which her first husband Wolfurt of Červený Kameň had built in the monastery. It was also to be used to celebrate requiem masses there for the deceased, as well as masses for all the descendants of Priestess Jitka. The indulgence charter for themselves, their wives and 20 selected familiars was obtained in 1451 by the counts George, John and Sigismund. They were allowed to arbitrarily choose a priest, who was given the power to absolve them of all their sins and the resulting punishments. The condition was that they had to observe a Friday fast for one year (or they could choose another day of the week). If this was
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beyond their means, the chosen priest was allowed to designate an alternative method of penance. In 1458 a similar grace was granted to the counts Thomas and Sigismund by the papal legate, Cardinal-Deacon John, with the proviso that the elected confessor, with full power to absolve all sins, was also allowed to absolve the two counts of the vow to make a pilgrimage to the Holy Land and to the tombs of Saints Peter and Paul in Rome and St James in Compostela, which they had previously made publicly. Instead of this vow the priest should have appointed them another penance. In this year also the Superior General of the Order of St Paul, Brother Andrew, received the counts John and Sigismund and their wives as tertiaries of that Order and included them in his devotions and prayers. The right to a freely chosen confessor, who was allowed to forgive all sins, was granted by Pope Pius II in 1462 to Count Sigismund and his wife Barbora. This grace, too, was conditional on the observance of penance on a chosen day of the week for one year, or another specified penance. In the same year, the counts Sigismund and George were finally accepted as members of the spiritual brotherhood of the Viennese Dominicans by the prior of the monastery, which meant that the members of the convent included them in their devotions and prayers from then on, even after their deaths.

The parish church in the light of archaeological research

The results of archaeological and architectural-historical research also provide significant information on the history of the church of Pezinok and the adjacent parish, thus completing the knowledge about this central medieval settlement building. In our work, we cannot bypass the findings of these investigations, because they can confirm the findings presented by us, or provide other perspectives and raise new questions on the issue under study.

In the recent past, archaeological, architectural-historical and restoration research has been carried out in the parish church, offering historians a unique opportunity to confront and supplement the acquired knowledge. At present, it is the oldest known sacral building in the town. The parish church is located in the historic centre of the town of Pezinok and is situated in the northeastern part of the built-up area. The church is architecturally composed as a three-aisled pseudobasilica, with an elevated central nave and lower side aisles, with facades vertically rhythmized by supporting pillars. On the west side it has a pre-built tower and on the east side a wider presbytery with a polygonal end continues the axis of the main nave. The north wall of the presbytery is flanked by a two-space sacristy, and the south wall by the side chapel of St Anne. A small chapel on an oval plan is attached to the north side aisle. The church has a triforium in the western part of the interior, under the presbytery, and under the chapel of St Anne there is a crypt. According to the latest interpretations, the parish church was built on the site of an older
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114 The area, in which the church is built as a solitaire, is bordered on the south side by a lattice fence from Farská Street, on the east side by a lattice fence from M. R. Štefánika Street, on the west side by the building of the Parish Office and on the north side by a full fence wall. The area of the premises has a plan of the shape of an uneven trapezoid. The main entrance to the premises is located on the south side – from Farská Street, with a side gate on the east side, from the side of M. R. Štefánika Street.
chapel as a pseudobasilica with flat ceilings and no tower. The current architectural expression of the church is dominated by late Gothic architecture from around 1500, combined with extensive Neo-Gothic alterations.115

In the exterior of the temple, rescue archaeological research was carried out at the turn of September and October 2002 in cooperation with the Municipal Museum in Pezinok. This was basically the first archaeological research on this building, which, however, was carried out basically only in the exterior of the parish church and did not in any fundamental way answer questions related to its origin.

More extensive archaeological research of the parish church was carried out in 2004–2005. It was carried out in connection with the complex reconstruction of the interior of the church and was carried out by the Slovak National Museum – Archaeological Museum in Bratislava in cooperation with the Municipal Museum in Pezinok. The research refuted one of the hypotheses of Ł. Šášky about the existence of an older sacral building from the thirteenth century in the eastern bay of the southeastern side aisle, where he classified the built-in object to the first half of the fifteenth century.116 Research of the interior of the church has shed more light on the issue of an older sacral building on the site of the present parish church.117 From the gained knowledge it is possible to consider an older sacral building in the area of the present sanctuary and the Gothic sacristy.118

The fourteenth-century temple existed in its present proportions, but the interior of the triple nave and the brick walls of the main nave and the brick late Gothic net and star vault were built only in the second half of the fifteenth century, which was proved by additional research in the summer of 2006, when the whole temple was excavated to a depth of 40–50 cm for the purpose of installing the under-floor tempered heating system. This excavation also revealed the bases for the original fourteenth-century triple nave. The earliest fourteenth-century entrance to the church was identified next to the burial chapel. Research has only sporadically been able to capture older objects from before the construction of the church, mainly due to extensive Baroque building activity. The most significant find was a rectangular-shaped object dating back to the thirteenth century.119 Thus, it can be concluded that the archaeological research of the parish church did not confirm the discovery of an older sacral building in the assumed location. However, it did reveal probable remains of an older sacral building in the sanctuary, dated to approximately the thirteenth to fourteenth century.120

116 ŽUDEL – DUBOVSKÝ, Dejiny Pezinka, 227.
117 However, archaeological research has indicated that an older sacral building (of the early Gothic type) can be considered in the area of the present sanctuary. This building was captured in its foundations and exactly follows the recent plan of the sanctuary in width and in polygonal closure. FARKAŠ – KRAMPL, Výskumná správa, 17–21.
118 The perimeter walls of the sanctuary and the nave of the church date back to the fourteenth century. The monumental Gothic double-pane window on the southwestern façade can also be dated to this period. The original triple nave has not survived. In 1501, the rebuilding of the church into its present form was completed, as indicated by the inscription above the triumphal arch. Of the original Gothic furnishings, only the polygonal red marble baptismal font and the epitaph of Count George of Svätý Jur from 1426 have been preserved. KRAMPL, Kostol Nanebovzatia, 189–190.
119 KRAMPL, Kostol Nanebovzatia, 195.
120 Further clarification of this situation and obtaining more answers are complicated and sometimes prevented by the interventions associated with the construction of the Baroque crypt in the eighteenth century.
The most recent rescue archaeological research of the parish church was carried out by the Slovak National Museum – Archaeological Museum in Bratislava. The research took place in 2007 and focused on the investigation of a specific object – the crypt, which is located in the interior of the parish church. This research again did not provide a clear answer as to whether the crypt, or at least a part of it, was built in the Middle Ages.

Architectural-historical and art-historical research of the interior of the parish church was carried out at the end of 2005. One of the main objectives of the research was to identify and evaluate the paintings and details, elements or components of the architecture of the church and to establish an analysis of the development of this monument. As far as our issue is concerned, the results of the research basically corresponded with the results of the archaeological research carried out so far and did not bring any further answers or knowledge regarding the existence of an older sacral building on the site of the present parish church.

It follows from the above that archaeological, architectural-historical and art-historical research has not brought unambiguous answers to the questions concerning the older sacral building on the site of the present parish church. The fact remains, however, that the research reports from the archaeological investigations already carried out indicate that the existence of an older sacral building on the site of the parish church or in its immediate vicinity is not ruled out. The historical research of the parish church and its inclusion in the overall settlement pattern of Pezinok and its surroundings highlights the possibility of considering the old origin of the religious cult in the town and the related sacral facilities. It is also unthinkable that a settlement of such importance and geographical position would not have an older sacral building. It is even highly probable that the church in Pezinok itself formed part of the basic parish infrastructure of the Bratislava Provostry from its beginnings.

121 These were the remains of four individuals. According to a preliminary estimate, there were supposed to be three men and one woman. A folded silk embroidered cloth was placed over the bones. Between the bones was a fragment of a necklace consisting of larger beads, probably from bone, and smaller metal beads, strung on a cord. CHOMA, Výskumná správa, 3–6.

122 SABADOŠOVÁ, Správa z Architektonicko-historického, 2–10.

123 Archaeologists have advised that all ground interventions, whether on the interior or exterior of the church, should be closely monitored as there is a high likelihood of disturbance to potential archaeological features and findspots.
Figure 1: Pezinok on the map. Source: www.un.org/geospatial/content/slovakia
Figure 2: The location of the parish church in the historic centre of the city. Source: www.Pezinok.sk
Figure 3: Location of the parish church on a map from 1785.
Figure 4: Plan of the church. Source: www.g-atelier.sk
Figure 5: Source: www.ttstudio.sk
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Reviews

Aleksander Łupienko’s book (originally published in Polish), combines multiple domains of historical research (urban history, cultural history, public history) in a complex picture of how Warsaw transformed into a monumental capital during the first half of the nineteenth century. The author, who worked as a researcher at the Institute of History, Polish Academy of Sciences in Warsaw, achieved this by looking for particular examples of the functioning of public spaces in the nineteenth-century city and by analysing various sources, from the preserved manuscripts of official institutions which took part in this transformation through the press and maps to fascinating contemporary guides and memoirs. What should be specifically highlighted is the author’s ability to frame the actual development of the city in the symbolic and mental mapping of governmental elites. Thanks to this, a reader can easily see all the different dimensions that projects such as the building, reconstruction or modification of public gardens or road surfaces fulfilled. Urban history, even though the book itself oversteps this category, is probably one of the most progressive kinds of historical research nowadays. It allows complex multi-disciplinarity and leads historians to projects that looked unimaginable a few decades ago. However, for various reasons, most of these works are related to the twentieth century, making Łupienko’s book quite a vital contribution (especially in the Central European context).

For the benefit of the reader, Łupienko does not start his work in medias res, but provides introductory chapters to all three crucial parts of the research. Therefore, he begins with the theoretical approach, the methodology he decides to apply and how he understands its essential points. Then he continues with a short overview of the history of public space and concludes this entree with an explanation of the most important political upheavals and events which occurred in the territories which once were the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth with Warsaw as its capital. The last-mentioned part is valuable not only because of the historical context but mainly because it also points to the variability of the external and internal factors that played a crucial role during the later development of the city. The second part of the book consists of the principal analysis, therefore looking for the answers about how public spaces functioned in nineteenth century Warsaw and what role they played (or if any) in the city’s transformation. The author demonstrates that during the studied period, Warsaw transformed into a metropole like its counterparts in Western Europe. Toll houses, representative city squares, theatres, banks and monumental buildings of the central state institutions, but also new pavements changed the face of the city and improved the lives of its inhabitants. It is fascinating and, thanks to the reader-friendly style of writing, also relatively easy to see in front of one’s eyes, metaphorically speaking, how Warsaw as a city changed during the studied period.

Most probably, the analysis of the factual transformation of Warsaw would be enough. Yet, as was mentioned, for Łupienko, this is only a starting point from which to study how all this was used on different levels of social reality. And this is not only interesting as a research problem but also looking at Łupienko’s conclusions. Even though Warsaw developed during the studied period, the functioning of these modifications of Warsaw’s new public spaces was improper – at least according to the goals public spaces should serve as presented in the book’s first part. The author states that the city was functioning: “it was developing demographically, and life revolved around day-to-day matters, holidays and Imperial visits” (p. 222). However, at the same time, a degree of cultural stagnation was induced from the fact that the actual improvement of society–administration relationships in Warsaw, ruled by the Russian tsar, proved impossible. “The history of Warsaw’s public space after 1831 is a story of improperly-functioning public space”, concludes Łupienko (p. 221).

The proper methodological background, the vast number of studied sources and the realization of analytical work do not leave many spaces for criticism. One could think
about what might be included in the book that is not (e.g., the question of the availability of drinking water or water in general), but what one would like to see is not something which ought to serve as a valid point of criticism.

In conclusion, Łupienko's book is a pretty valuable contribution to all the above-mentioned fields of historical research. On the one hand, it offers readers an exciting story about how Warsaw was modified during the first half of the nineteenth century. Still, at the same time, it also shows the inspiring nature of historians' work, when all this empirical knowledge about city planning and city building is used to produce relevant knowledge about human society.

Mgr. Oliver Zajac, PhD. German Historical Institute, Warsaw, Poland ORCID iD: 0000-0002-1519-7796


This monograph, authored by Michal Ďurčo, a researcher at the Institute of History of the Slovak Academy of Sciences in Bratislava, offers the reader a hitherto unprocessed part of the economic history of Slovakia, which can contextually complement the history of not only the region generally, but also the city specifically. The author has embarked on the difficult task of mapping the construction of the road network, which, although temporally defined by the interwar period, does not avoid earlier or later periods thanks to the effort to capture the continuity of development. The rather difficult task of understanding the basic features of the road transformation in Slovakia, also taking into account the state, nature and diversity of primary and secondary sources, has been translated by the author into a dense publication consisting of five separate, logically arranged chapters on the background of the political and economic changes of the interwar period.

Readers who may be distant from Czechoslovak realities but interested in the determinant processes of the genesis and transformation of road infrastructure will be inspired by the chapter devoted to the theoretical and methodological concepts underlying the work. Considering the state of economic history research in Slovakia, this partly interdisciplinary passage of the thesis can be considered as extremely successful and innovative. The chosen concept is based on the LTH (Large Technical Systems) theory of the American historian of technology Thomas Hughes, and the author has skilfully, considering the primary period in which the issue is set, used the fact that this theory is also about the structure of relationships and systems with specific meanings, overcoming different types of barriers that decide whether or not cities and other places will be connected, but also covering the approach of so-called system creators on the ideological level.1 From a historian's perspective, however, I found the section on the geographical location, relief and elevation of the different parts of Slovakia rather lengthy in this chapter, although the author's intention to portray the bedrock with which Slovakia was, and still is, actually struggling cannot be denied.

For researchers dealing with the urban or regional history, the very first part of the opening chapter, devoted to the connection of the Slovak and Moravian borderlands, is interesting. The author has managed to portray the development of the interconnection of the territory both in space and in a relatively broad time frame dating from the eighteenth century to the interwar period. All the aspects of the development of the road network taken into account are also supported by clear maps. At the same time, it is also possible to follow the ideological dimension of infrastructure construction traced by the author in this example, the borderlands after 1918 also representing a symbolic plane in the form of a permanent link in the newly established Czechoslovak nation. The defined theoretical

concept is followed by an extremely beneficial subchapter mapping the construction of the so-called Masaryk Road. The road connecting Pohronská Polhora and Tisovec, which served as a case study for the author, at the same time documents not only the problematic and economic disproportion between Slovakia and the Czech lands, but also reflects the economic, administrative and legal changes in the country on the hitherto little-explored phenomenon of the implementation of the new road vision of connecting the individual republics in reality.

In addition to a general analysis of the economic situation in Slovakia, the period of the so-called crisis 30s is supported by several extremely successful subchapters, the linking element of which is a description of the activities of the regionalist movement in Slovakia, which brought together experts at the time with the aim of strengthening and economically uplifting the individual regions of Slovakia. According to the author, one of the priorities of the movement was the effort to develop tourism (including individual car tourism) in Slovakia, especially in the still popular tourist locations around Central Slovakia or the Low and High Tatras. A necessary step in this area was, above all, the building of transport infrastructure and the interconnection of the individual (car) tourist centres of Slovakia. At the same time, in this chapter the author works with a rather unusual and interesting source in the form of a travelogue, which he partly uses as a contrast and filter against the official institutional positions, and with the help of which it is possible to demonstrate, through the subjective prism of the author of the travelogue, the constant difficulties associated with travelling at the turn of the 1920s and 1930s. Ďurčo goes on to give several other examples or unrealised plans for the development of tourism (including, for example, through bus transport), mainly focused on the area of Central and Eastern Slovakia. Nevertheless, according to the author, the opening up of initially inaccessible places such as Demänovská dolina, Štrbské Pleso and Donovaly to motor vehicles was a catalyst for the launch of tourism as we know it today.

The last chapter of the publication focuses on the issue of the plans for the construction of the Czechoslovak motorway between 1935 and 1939. It forms a fitting conclusion to the whole thesis, at the end of which the author opens up possible scope for further research. In the context of the complexity of the international political tensions at the end of the 1930s, it completes the overall picture of the complexity of the period in question, but also of the still persistent economic underdevelopment of the Slovak territory; unlike the Czech countries, Slovakia was still waiting almost three decades later for the first sections of motorway to be built. The genesis of the development of motorways in the world, the international transfer of theoretical concepts of their construction or their abuse by totalitarian regimes to consolidate power are quite interesting refreshments to the whole chapter.

However, Michal Ďurčo’s monograph offers much more. In addition to a wealth of supporting materials, illustrative examples and detailed characterization and pitfalls in the economic and legal spheres, it looks at the construction of transport infrastructure in a truly colourful, original way. The author has thus managed to handle the multifaceted issue sensitively, such that the reader does not get lost in the multitude of political, economic, social, administrative and legal problems. The work thus represents a hitherto missing piece in the economic history of Slovakia in the twentieth century. At the same time, it has the potential, especially on the theoretical level, to offer something to foreign researchers as well. For this reason, it will be a great plus if the author continues the trend and publishes his partial results of the work in English.
This book by Josef Grulich is possible to read in two ways: as an individual piece of work dealing with an interesting phenomenon of migrations in rural and urban environments but also as a methodological disputation that needs to be put into a greater context of studies about early modern-period rural areas. The following text tries to take both views into consideration.

Primarily, on the basis of research of more than a thousand so-called release letters, the book introduces the manner of the migration of subjects that took place in the microregion of the České Budějovice estate. Thanks to the description of the differing migration strategies of subjects in which Grulich accents fittingly also a gender aspect of migration strategies (in the research period, women mostly migrated for marriage, men for work or providing for life tenants, or more precisely for farmland; with men we can also then identify a specific gender component of migration connected to military service), he disproves a long-repeated statement about the firm ties of subjects to their noble lords’ estates. Besides the release letters, the author does not omit the role of letters that guaranteed subjects short-term movement without releasing them from servitude to specific noble lords (so-called “fedrovní listy”) – although release letters applied with the moving of subjects to a new estate. Grulich also pays attention to a very common reciprocity of such acts (“exchange of subjects”). Particular cases then tend to overlap into other fields of research and open new avenues of exploration both for “disability studies”, often ignored by Czech historiography of the early modern period – migration strategies of physically and mentally disabled – and for military history – the aforementioned migration related to military service, either in efforts to get enlisted or, on the contrary, to avoid military service. The research based on release letters is then properly complemented by a supporting file agenda (transfer letters, requests for release), church registers and town books. The author also does not omit the influence of suburbs on the settlement of subjects near České Budějovice and he states that migration was always going on both from the country to the town and from the town to the country.

If we look at Grulich’s book as a polemical work we will notice two main goals of his: Primarily, to defend the position of quantitative methods in confrontation to “the latest” historiographic movements; Secondly, to show that a micro-historical method is also possible to apply, with an appropriate result, to an individual that does not exceed the common perception of individuals of the era. In both cases, Grulich stands against a heavyweight, the most significant present Czech representative of microhistory. It is a credit to Grulich that during the defence of his own methodological procedures he does not veer towards the personal level, his discussion remaining factual, based on sources, and he refers to opponents’ works only twice in the whole text.

In the first part is visible his orientation in present trends of qualitative research, including reference to major world demographic databases. He supports his research with his database of the parish of České Budějovice. By that he shows that without the proper founding on a quantitative basis, the information contained in other researched sources would disintegrate into particular descriptions of personal story fragments. Even though this procedure is interesting and readable it has already been held against Čeněk Zíbrt. Nevertheless, Grulich does not reject a qualitative procedure, complementing his “hard” data properly by that. In my opinion, it’s the fusion of qualitative and quantitative methods where he justly sees a desirable trend of other research. In the second case he shows, by using the case of Alžběta Greisshuber, that it is possible to create an amazing micro-historic sondage by combining sources of municipal and noble lords’ provenance (market books, 1 Jaroslav Čechura, Accessed 14 February 2022, jaroslav-cechura.cz
release letters, orphan lists etc) also for a person that was not criminalized and did not stand outside the society in any way attracting great attention, e.g. in a court agenda.

PhDr. Josef Kadeřábek, Ph.D.
Institute of the History and Archive of Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic
ORCID iD: 0000-0002-6408-2223
Chronicle
On 17 May 2022, a scientific conference was held at the State Scientific Library in Košice on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Michal and Mária Potemras. At the conference, entitled “A Couple in the Circle of Science: Michal Potemra and Mária Potemrová”, the active participants, as well as the professional and lay public, recalled the scientific contribution, but also the personal life of these two well-known Košice residents. Michal Potemra (1922–2002) entered the history of historiography as the founder of Slovak retrospective bibliography, and he and his wife Mária, a music teacher and historian, became the authors of numerous (bibliographical) publications on the history of Košice and the wider area. Viera Nagyová, head of the Borrowing Services Department of the State Scientific Library in Košice, took the opening words on the importance of bibliography and its significance for history research, complemented by Angelika Kurucová, one of the organizers of the event. She stated that the Potemras have left a significant trace in the history of science in Slovakia, and their popularity is also evidenced by the large number of speakers and audience present.

The first two blocks of the conference were dedicated to the personality of Michal Potemra. Radoslav Žgrada (Slovak Matica) opened them with his contribution, which, apart from a brief excursion into the life of both spouses, emphasized above all the definition of bibliography as an independent discipline in Slovak conditions. He also gave data on the bibliographical works of the couple, and stressed that the life of M. Potemra has so far been little reflected in Slovak historiography. The next lecturer – Nikola Vályiová (State Archive in Košice) – continued on the issue of bibliography in M. Potemra’s works. She presented the approach to work of Potemra, which paid attention to entering into problems with the understanding of the facts, as well as to criticism and to being demanding towards creative work. At the same time, the author demonstrated this historiographical knowledge through selected historical studies and contributions, especially on the history of law, political parties and education in Košice. Ondrej Ficeri (Centre of Social and Psychological Sciences, Slovak Academy of Sciences, Košice) continued his analysis of the contribution of the bibliographical works of the Potemras. Considering the specific development of Slovak historiography evolving under the conditions of the Marxist approach to history research, he evaluated their work as a Marxist variant of post-structural urban history, which offers a unique and, from the bibliographical point of view, the most comprehensive picture of Košice so far. From the point of view of world Marxist historiography, cities were perceived primarily as sites of revolutionary events, although in Slovakia the predominant orientation was towards the industrialization, Hungarianization and proletarianization of cities, in which local patriotic expressions were not acceptable. For this reason Ficeri considers the works of the Potemras on the history of Košice, together with the works of another important Košice bibliographer, Mária Mihóková, to be a unique, hitherto unsurpassed body. Miriama Filčáková and Katarína Lukáčová (Department of History, Faculty of Arts, UPJŠ in Košice) looked at the works of M. Potemra from a completely different, didactic perspective. In addition to presenting current trends in history teaching and the importance of researching historical sources, which stem from the essence of the research approach, they identified the potential of bibliographical works in teaching regional history. At the same time, the paper was supplemented with a concrete example of a history-teaching figure concerning the view of the First Vienna Award and Košice in 1938 from a multi-perspectival approach. The session devoted primarily to the view of M. Potemra was concluded by Marek Rímsky’s (Department of History, Faculty of Arts, Pavol Jozef Šafárik University in Košice) paper. Rímsky, also against the background of the mutual correspondence between Michal Potemra and the Greek-Catholic priest Michal Fedor, pointed not only to the work with egodocuments as an important historical source, but especially to the fickleness of personal relationships in the turbulent period of the turn of the 1960s and 1970s in building power and leadership positions in Slovak institutions.

The afternoon section was in the spirit of contributions dedicated to the personality of Mária Potemrová, musicologist, publicist and pedagogue. The first speaker was Jana Lengová
(Institute of Musicology, Slovak Academy of Sciences), who in her contribution evaluated the contribution and legacy of M. Potemrová’s work and emphasized its significant place in Slovak musicology. The contribution to the history of the musical life of Prešov was presented by Renáta Kočíšová (Institute of Music and Arts, Faculty of Arts, University of Prešov), who pointed to M. Potemrová as the first ever personality of Košice who was devoted to musical regional studies. The session was closed by Dita Marečinková (Conservatory of Jozef Adamovič in Košice) with her contribution to the history of operetta in Slovakia. In the next block, the authors presented the potential of the life and work of the Potemras for future generations. Silvia Fečková (Musical Archive of the Church of St Egidius in Bardejov) presented in her paper how her encounters and contact with the Potemras influenced her professional life as a music scholar, critic and teacher. The contribution of Lýdia Urbančíková (retired at that time) offered a detailed analysis of M. Potemrová’s hitherto unsurpassed bibliographical work *Musical Life in Košice 1848–1919*. The author drew attention to the main features of M. Potemrová’s approach to the history of music, pointed out the potential of the work in Slovak historiography and its place in international databases. In the last contribution, Kristína Mihóková, daughter of another important bibliographer, Mária Mihóková, very sensitively retold her own memories of the Potemras as close family friends with whom she had the opportunity to grow up. The final session was devoted to the memoirs of the couple František and Melanie Balun, who recounted impressions, memories and encounters with the Potemras both in and out of the workplace. The conference concluded with a short film in memory of M. Potemrová – *Mária Potemrová: Heavenly Actress* – and the opening of an exhibition of the same name dedicated to the life and work of Michal and Mária Potemrová, which is available at the Cultural and Educational Centre of the State Scientific Library in Košice. The papers from the conference will also be published in the forthcoming proceedings.

Mgr. Miriama Filčáková
Pavol Jozef Šafárik University in Košice, Slovak Republic
ORCID iD: 0000-0002-0696-5669

Mgr. Katarína Lukáčová, PhD.
Pavol Jozef Šafárik University in Košice, Slovak Republic
ORCID iD: 0000-0003-3973-2463