

---

## *A Mercantilist Initiative to Compete with Venice: Kaschau's<sup>1</sup> Fustian Monopoly (1411)*

Ondrej R. Halaga

Slovakian Academy of Sciences (Czechoslovakia)

Kaschau's monopoly over fustian production and the purchase of raw materials, which covered the whole of former Hungary, had begun to attract attention from an early date. The nine authorizing documents from the years 1411-1429 were already being kept in the secret archive of the town itself during the XVth century rather than in the gild chest of the fustian makers.<sup>2</sup> This fact alone demonstrated that the whole town government was interested in the monopoly. On the eighth of January 1611, the town notary prepared copies of the stored documents for the Weavers' gild.<sup>3</sup> The interest shown by the Weavers' gild in the fustian and bleaching monopoly reveals that it was acting in the capacity of successors to the monopoly and was also recognised as its successor by the town government. This means that at the beginning of the XVIIth century the Kaschau fustian makers were once again organised within the framework of the weavers' gild and possibly formed an autonomous group there.

Kaschau's textile monopoly (fustian and bleaching) did not escape the notice of either the chroniclers or the regional writers or Budapest writers in later

---

<sup>1</sup> Košice, the East Slovakian capital, Czechoslovakia, in Latin Cassovia, in Magyar Kassa, in German (in the Middle Ages) Cashc, Casscha, Kaschow. Throughout both the German Kaschau and the Czech Košice are used.

<sup>2</sup> *Archivum civitatis Cassoviensis* (further ACC), *Elenchus jurium et privilegiorum civ. Cassoviensis*, inventory from 1505 lists "Litterae barchanistarum" from 1411-1429 with the code I.

<sup>3</sup> ACC, C-Textores; Schv 18056, 18066. All original documents. Schv 18052-18071, were not transferred to the weavers' gild until 1768.

centuries. Admittedly, it was mostly first a case of a brief rendering of the concession which caught their eye.<sup>4</sup> The earlier writers in particular, who were dependent on the town annals<sup>5</sup> for their source, rendered the text without being really clear about what sort of production the Kaschau monopoly was actually concerned with. Their varying interpretations even went quite beyond the sphere of textile production (e.g. parchment monopoly<sup>6</sup>), and the Magyar term 'parket' which I. Hajnik and G. Wenzel used<sup>7</sup> led later generations astray.

Before we discovered that there were systematic details of Kaschau's textile production,<sup>8</sup> the fustian monopoly lacked a real basis. This misled many into taking the a priori view that Kaschau's fustian production was just some "artificial planting" of King Sigismund's.<sup>9</sup> Because of this Kaschau's fustian production itself has hardly attracted the interest of economic historians and no one has so far undertaken exhaustive research on the topic, while the much less important production in Bardejov,<sup>10</sup> on the other hand, thanks to the well-known edition of the account books,<sup>11</sup> has proved to be a much more attractive field of research.<sup>11a</sup> It has become traditional to transfer from one book to another the idea that it was "failed attempt on the part of King Sigis-

---

<sup>4</sup> HAJNIK, I.: *Adalékok a magyar kereskedelem történetéhez I. Kassa*. In: Századok 1868, p. 160 f. - KEMÉNY, L. in: *Magyarország varmegyéi es városai I, Abauj-Torna varmegye es Kassa*, Budapest 1896, p. 42 f.; in: Révai Nagy Lexikóna XI. Budapest 1914, p. 318 - SZÁZDEKZY, L.: *Iparfejlődés és a czéhek története Magyarországon I.*, Budapest 1913, p. 37 - WICK, B.: *Kassa története és műemlékei*, Kassa 1941, pp. 38-41.

<sup>5</sup> *Annales Cassovienses, Kassai szadok, Kaschauer Chronik*. Edited from the older chronicles and notes in 1631 (missing at the present time).

<sup>6</sup> TUTKO, J.: *Kassa Szabad Királyi városának évkönyve*. Kassán 1861, p. 30. TOTH, L.: *Adalékok az ipar s kereskedelem történetéhez Kassan*. Kassa 1886, p. 2, 107/pp. 4-5, following Hajnik he also talks of the fustian monopoly.

<sup>7</sup> HAJNIK, I.: *op. cit.*; WENZEL, G.: *Kassa város parketkészítése a V. század kezdetén*. Pest 1871.

<sup>8</sup> HALAGA, O.R.: *Textílie v polsko-pruskom obchode vsl. miest*. In: *Historický časopis XII*, 1974, pp. 1-23 - HALAGA, O.R.: *Košice - Balt. Výroba a obchod v styvek vsl. miest s Pruskom I.*, Košice 1975, pp. 254-261.

<sup>9</sup> WENZEL, G.: *op. cit.*, p. 14. This was repeated by many after him.

<sup>10</sup> North of Košice on the Polish border. Magyar Bártfa, German (Modern) Bartfeld.

<sup>11</sup> FEJÉRPATAKY, L.: *Magyarorð szági városok régi számadásk onyvei*. Budapest 1885, pp. 163-617 (years 1418-1444). The document index was also helpful. IVÁNYI B.: *Bartfa sz. k. város levéltára 1319-1526*. Budapest 1910.

<sup>11a</sup> LEDERER, E.: *Bártfa város vászonszövő üzeme a 15. sz-ban*. Budapest 1934. Szűcs, J.: *Városok és kézművesség a XV századi Magyarországon*. Budapest 1955, pp. 220-243. JERŠOVÁ, M.: *Z dejín platenictva*. In: *Príspevky K dejinám východného Slovenska*. Bratislava 1964, p. 143 ff.

mund".<sup>12</sup> The first person to speak out against such disparaging references in the works of the Magyar and Slovakian authors was W. von Stromer.<sup>13</sup>

G. Wenzel had grasped correctly that Hungary's export possibilities and the central location of Kaschau in the north which was the then major route for Hungary's foreign trade had led to King Sigismund's supporting the Kaschau monopoly.<sup>14</sup> Wenzel also gave proper emphasis to the question of the standard of textile production, including the production of fustian: Kaschau had raised the King's hopes for the future because he was dissatisfied with the quality of fustian in the other towns.<sup>15</sup> G. Wenzel also correctly judged the 1411 document to be a local statute and not a law that was binding for the whole of Hungary.<sup>16</sup> Nevertheless, the privileges were supposed to be effective throughout the Kingdom and other trades were not recognised. Less accurate was Wenzel's equation: fustian makers + mining industry = sovereign rights.<sup>17</sup> The King never had any direct rights over the Kaschau fustian makers in the same way as he had sovereign rights in the mining industry. The view that the royal privileges freed the fustian industry in Kaschau from the bonds of the guild regulations by the setting up of a factory or manufacturing system does not take into account conditions in Upper Hungary, (or rather East Slovakia) at the beginning of the XVth Century. The claim that Sigismund had ideas for introducing manufacturing on a grand scale with free competition and free enterprise, which he ostensibly subordinated to the local interests and submitted to an inappropriate organisation, would make more sense in a highly advanced form of capitalism than the Middle Ages.<sup>18</sup>

It contributes little to our understanding to show that the points of departure were then shifting, because in this period everything was becoming centralised in the capitals (Budapest, Bratislava), whereas a reverse centralisation process was taking place with all the fustian makers moving from Buda, Bratislava etc. to Košice/Kaschau. It also escaped Wenzel's notice that the fustian production originated from the weaving trade and that Kaschau once held a central position

---

<sup>12</sup> MÁLYUSZ, E.: *History of the Middle Classes in Hungary*. In: Quarterly Journal for Social and Economic History XX, 1928, p. 362 f. - FÜGEDI, E.: *Kaschau, an East European trading town at the end of the XVth Century*. In: *Studia Slavica Ac. Sc. Hung.* II, 1956, p. 185 - MARSINA, R.: in: *Slovensko I., Dejiny* (2nd Ed.). Bratislava 1978, p. 283.

<sup>13</sup> STROMER, W. VOIL.: *Economic Policy in the Late Middle Ages: The founding of the cotton industry in Upper Hungary in 1411*. In: *Studi in memoria di F. Melis, Vol. III*, Naples 1978, p. 248.

<sup>14</sup> WENZEL, G.: *op. cit.*, (=7), pp. 7-8.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 3; cf. pp. 7, 8, 10, 14-15.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 9-11, cf. STROMER, W.: *op. cit.*, p. 249 f. 1411 promulgated... a law; the document of the acts of law.

<sup>17</sup> WENZEL, G.: *op. cit.*, p. 13, 11.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 13, 14-15.

in Hungary's handicrafts and foreign trade. Thus the references to the fustian monopoly emphasised increasingly the ephemeral and contrived nature of "Sigismund's venture" in Kaschau.<sup>19</sup> In the same way it was incumbent upon the editor of the earliest municipal register<sup>20</sup> to document 'the regional metropolis' leading position in textile production' and to attribute Kaschau's fustian monopoly to its 'position, skills and ambitions in the textile production and trade of the time.'<sup>21</sup> Without taking into consideration the documentation on the East Slovakian textile production in the XIVth and XVth centuries, W. von Stromer went beyond his predecessors and arrived at a stage of making King Sigismund's foundation step absolute.<sup>22</sup>

Von Stromer based his case on the document which King Sigismund had drawn up on the first of September 1411 in Vyssegrad,<sup>23</sup> and he argued that this led to the foundation of the fustian trade in Kaschau where there had ostensibly been none in existence up to this point. Hence the King was the founder and his ministers Ulrich and Marcus von Nürnberg were the inspiring minds behind the project for a cotton industry in Kaschau. The document was ostensibly made charter in the German imperial Chancery. The German ratification of the privilege is interpreted to mean that the articles were supposed to attract the craftsmen from throughout the realm. That they should then be integrated into the ranks of the patriciate, so W. Stromer suggests, was allegedly 'granted' by the emperor, who was thus encroaching on the autonomy of the town. Kaschau's area of administration was part of the Carpathian market for the Upper German fustian. The King's Councillors, Ulrich and Marcus von Nürnberg according to W. Stromer, took advantage of their official positions in Hungary to carry out reforms which adversely affected the local traders and Polish traders who were in competition with Upper German enterprises. This makes some

---

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Scücs, J.: *op. cit.*, pp. 215, 217, 219, 220 etc., the attempt to make the fustian weaving in Kaschau a secret: only a decade: Marcus von Nürnberg's grandiose attempt ended in fiasco; collapsed in ruins etc.

<sup>20</sup> *Acta judicialia civitatis cassoviensis 1393-1405*. The handwritten editor's copy ready for the press in the publishing house of the Slovakian Academy of Sciences (co-editor: Southeast German Historical Commission, Munich).

<sup>21</sup> HALAGA, O.R.: *op. cit.* (Košice-Balt. I) p. 260 - Re the printing error 1400 instead of 1411: Set of handwritten and approved copies burned with printery. The book was produced using photographs of press proof copies.

<sup>22</sup> STROMER, W. v.: *op. cit.*, pp. 245-270.

<sup>23</sup> Original presently in Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum of Budapest, code ALW 3667. Photocopy in Magyar Országos Levéltár in Budapest, Code DI 272944. On the original is the old code (ACC, Schv) 18052. Simple transcript from XVIIth Century remained in ACC, also transcript of 1416 (Schv 18043). Published in WENZEL, *op. cit.*, p. 15 f. (from the transcript), in WICK: *op. cit.*, p. 39, Note 5 (from WENZEL) in STROMER, *op. cit.*, p. 264 f. (from the original).

Stromer's copy corrects some of Wenzel's incorrect readings. He himself destroys

sense of the action Marcus took with regard to Bardejov's textile equipment (milling, bleaching) in 1407, but it contradicts the view that the Nürnberg co-owners of other textile firms in the realm (Cologne etc.) were the originators of the project to found a competitive monopoly in Kaschau in 1411 which includes a complete ban on all fustian imports from abroad and exports of raw materials from Hungary.

W. von Stromer is known for his researches on the Upper German trading capital and the high politics of the Luxemburg era.<sup>24</sup> All of these are widely and richly documented and full of bold conceptions, and his research into the textile production has already been widely commended for its numerous insights.<sup>25</sup> Likewise his interest in German trade in the Carpathian region is by no means new.<sup>26</sup> To look at these economically backward and distant regions from the imperial angle can well lead to the discovery of constructive and completely new factors but it can also mislead one into being over-schematic. An example of this is the classification of Kaschau, Bartfeld, Bratislava and Buda in the table of the 'Herman' textile industry with the code 'F' (*fürstlich* = princely).<sup>27</sup> None of them belonged either to the empire or to the imperial princes. Nor did they belong to King Sigismund; his right of disposal only pertained to the title of King of Hungary not to that of German King or Roman Emperor.<sup>28</sup>

At the outset Von Stromer admits that his claim that a medieval ruler and state had implemented a systematic economic policy provoked great controversy in Germany, and that he is building up his almost mercantilist interpretation of Sigismund from fragments, of which some may be "no doubt often deficient" (p. 247), which is to his credit. It is also to his credit that he quotes Slavic and Magyar books, although he himself has not mastered these languages to an

---

the sense of the original in the case of: *czuhant, ander leynwat, schickten, do wider/* instead of: *czu hant (at hand), andre leynwat (other linen), schicken (send), dowider (against this) cf. further p. 8.*

<sup>24</sup> STROMER, W. VON.: *Upper German High Finance 1350-1450*. Vol. 1-11, Wiesbaden, 1970.

<sup>25</sup> STROMER, W. VON and ENDREI, W.: *Hydraulic and technical inventions for textiles in Central Europe in the XIVth and XVth Centuries*. In: *History of Technology* 41, 1974, pp. 89-117 - STROMER, W. VON.: *The founding of the cotton industry in the Middle Ages. Economic Policy in the Late Middle Ages*, Stuttgart 1978.

<sup>26</sup> STROMER, W. VON.: *Nürnberg entrepreneurs in the Carpathian era. An Upper German non-ferrous metal oligopoly 1396-1412*. In: *Kwartalnik Historii Kultury Materialnej* 16, 1968, pp. 641-662.

<sup>27</sup> = 13 (p. 269 f.).

<sup>28</sup> Corrections required on p. 255. Kaschau was not in the province "Sarosch" (Sariš) as was Bartfeld: Map p. 267: Levice is not a parallel to "Pressburg" (Bratislava): Dukla-pass still belonged to "stratis inconsuetis viisque per Duklam de novo adinventis" in 1484 (IVÁNYI, B.: *op. cit.*, p. 353, Nr. 2367) — whereas the following are omitted: the old "Russian Way" (Mukáčevo-Stryj), the old route Bardejov-Zmigrod-Lublin, the route Humenné-Sanok.

extent that enables him to identify all that is important in them. He failed to notice, for instance, that the town of Bardejov came under Kaschau's legal jurisdiction, that both towns remained loyal to each other in the league of five (the Pentapolis) and they together fought the usurping of their bleaching rights by Prešov and other places. The fustian workers of Bardejov existed at the will of Kaschau and only as long as the parent town agreed to their existence.<sup>29</sup> There was thus no contradiction when one privilege refers to the Kaschau monopoly and the other to the monopoly in Kaschau and Bardejov.<sup>30</sup> There is a question-mark over the "parallel" between Marcus action against the Bardejov bleachery in 1407 and that of the Kaschau fustian makers against the Prešov bleachery in 1429. Both were directed against competition but not the same competition. The Nürnberg man, Marcus, fought against Bartfeld's competition not in Kaschau's interest but because of "his people", i.e. in the interest of his own enterprise.<sup>31</sup>

The ideas that Sigismund was "a genius in forging commercial projects" and a dogged pursuer of these projects<sup>32</sup> may sound credible in relation to the Kaschau monopoly document of 1411 — if this privilege is considered in isolation. If, however, it is more closely related to the actual facts provided by modern research, then the actual power of King Sigismund vis-à-vis the town of Kaschau seems illusory. In the '90s Sigismund still struck a sovereign attitude when he issued documents which did not please the Kaschau town-hall. But immediately after 1398 there followed new documents in favour of Kaschau.<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup> ACC, *Schv 18055* (published WENZEL, G.: *op. cit.*, p. 29, Nr. XII): In 1424 Sigismund required of the 8 fustian makers of Bardejov "dummodo consensus fidelium civium et hospitem civitatis nostre Cassoviensis ad premissa accesserit et voluntas". Cf. HALAGA, O.R.: *Právny, územný a populacný vývoj m. Košíc*. Košice 1967, p. 19, 73. The same: *Košice-Báň I (= 8)*, p. 259 f. The same: *PENTAPOLIS - East Slovakian community of towns and their craftsworkers' unions*. In: "Městské právo 16.-18. stol. v Evropě". (*Municipal law in the XVI-XVIIIth Century in Europe*). Universita Karlova, Praha 1982, p. 41.

<sup>30</sup> STROMER, W.: *op. cit.* (= 13), pp. 253-256.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 258, cf. MÁLYUSZ, E.: *Zsigmondkori oklevéltár / Diplomatarium temporis Sigismundi*; further *Dipl. Sigismundi / 11/2* Budapest 1958 / p. 1 Nr. 5213: pro se ipsis usurpando.

<sup>32</sup> STROMER, W.: *op. cit.*, p. 247: p. 256: the King pursued the original idea for over 20 years, stubbornly and persistently.

<sup>33</sup> The document of 1393 in favour of the subsidiary centre of Leutschau (Levoča) was no longer authenticated by Sigismund with his seal as early as 1405/6. (*Dipl. Sigismundi I, Nr. 2792*), in 1404 he revised the preferential treatment afforded to the Polish merchants vis à vis the Kaschau staple (1392) by rigorous enforcement of the Kaschau staple right (ACC, D16; *Dipl. Sigismundi I, Nr. 2630*; 11/1 Nr. 3268 /: in 1390 he limited Kaschau in Transylvania in favour of Sibius (*Dipl. Sigismundi I, Nr. 1322, 1323*) and in 1399 he compensated for this "commisio propria domini regis" (ACC D 8; *Dipl. Sigismundi I Nr. 5643*) etc.

Kaschau was in fact a 'steadfast' creditor of Sigismund and financed his wars and campaigns etc. The indebted King, who was continually looking for further loans, <sup>34</sup> was never in a position stubbornly to impose any sort of scheme on his follower, the town of Kaschau. Conversely, Kaschau was in a position to impose conditions on its distinguished debtor to gain economic and legal privileges — including several donations of villages and an entire castle estate with all its villages.<sup>35</sup> The document of 1411 is one of those 'hundred' documents with which Sigismund richly showed (or had to show) his gratitude incurred many years before.<sup>36</sup> His frequent stays in the Kaschau palace was connected both with the loans and the dating of many documents in the interest of Kaschau. These were issued mainly "*commissio propria domini regis*" as was the article of 1411.<sup>37</sup> Earlier studies have already pointed to the connection between Sigismund's stack of documents in favour of Kaschau and his 'eternal' indebtedness.<sup>38</sup>

In the assessment of who formulated the document on Kaschau's fustian monopoly, it is not irrelevant that this did not impose any material obligations on the town, but only guaranteed advantages for the town. The privilege put only the King under material obligations: to complete the equipping of the bleachery, to give wood for their work, but the taxes for the King are maximized. The words and phrases used reveal that the originator of the draft was unsure whether the inconsequent King was going to respect the obligations consistently or whether he might evade them. In this instance he was required to make an unusual pledge: "and we the above-written Sigismund, King of Hungary etc. do solemnly promise for us, our heirs and descendants, always and steadfastly to keep the above-written articles and freedom and do nothing against it in any way".<sup>39</sup>

Words of solemn promise and obligations on the one hand and advantages without obligations on the other hand are sufficient in themselves to divine

---

<sup>34</sup> Compare repeated acknowledgements and pressure to make payment: *Dipl. Sigismundi I* Nr. 2469, 2470, 3235; 11/1 Nr. 3017, 3033, 3058, 3208, 3397 etc.

<sup>35</sup> The Sokot castle estate 1429 (ACC, L-Szakalya I) the villages Myslava, Vyšný, Tejkeš, Nižny Tejkeš 1397, 1399 (ACC, M4, L 3, 5) etc.

<sup>36</sup> Compare Sigismund's documents in the economic interests of Kaschau: Staple rights ACC, D8-16 (years 1389-1404) etc.: Tax Dreissigst) and customs exemption E1, 2/in 1404/, F 10-24 / from 1388-1406 etc. Thus Sigismund waived the obligations of the town to pay the tax towards the military etc. *Dipl. Sigismundi I* Nr. 409, 3220, 4183; 11/1 Nr. 680, 1949, 3308 (Staple); 1 Nr. 660, 661, 2886, 2948, 4183; 11/1 Nr. 3406, 3722, 3778, 3802 (Tricesima, Telonia) etc.

<sup>37</sup> Of Sigismund's 14 documents in the interest of Kaschau's fustian monopoly which G. Wenzel published (*op. cit.* Nr. I, III-V, VII-IX, XI-XIII, XVI-XIX), one half (7) is dated in Košice and the majority (9) made charter "*commissio propria domini regis*".

<sup>38</sup> HAJNIK, I.: *op. cit.*, p. 152, TÓTH, L.: *op. cit.* (= 6), p. 77 f.

<sup>39</sup> = 23.

which of the two sides, the King or the town, formulated the original text, and which of the two was compelled by circumstances to comply with this particular wording. The customary note at the beginning of the charter "*commissio propria domini regis*" is only indicative of the fact that the King personally commanded the Chancery to prepare the document. It was precisely the unusual form of the pledge, which was perhaps added in the margin of the draft, which moved the clerk making the fair copy to reassure himself by taking the unusual step of repeating "*commissio propria domini regis*" at the end of the document as well. Such a note emanating from the Chancery, which was commissioned to make a fair copy of the document, in no way shows who was the "intellectual originator of the draft" or "the inventor of the original idea".<sup>40</sup> The financial links between the King and Kaschau suffice to make it clear why neither of the parties was interested in asking an additional dignitary from the ranks of Hungary's magnates to be mediator in the affair. The discretion and haste with which the document was made charter is shown by the fact that the language was immediately put into municipal German rather than in the Latin translation which was the official language of the magnates and the hierarchy of the time.

Thanks to the fact that the original German draft — without first being translated into Latin — was carried over into the final form of the document we have further evidence of where we can find the initiator of the idea of creating a state-wide fustian monopoly and also who formulated the text. The use of German in a Hungarian legal deed does not by itself warrant the opinion that this document could "well originate from the German Court Chancery of Sigismund as the Roman King".<sup>41</sup> One must examine the special characteristics of the dialect and graphemes of the German that were used. W. von Stromer merely transferred the intellectual inspiration and authorship of the document from the King to his economic advisers (Marcus von Nürnberg) because of the technical terms in it.<sup>42</sup> In the original, of course, one finds nothing which may be connected with any other, non-Hungarian Chancery of Sigismund's. From the language of the document itself one can establish nothing that may not be explained by the peculiarities of the dialect and graphemes of the Kaschau town Chancery. These are very special characteristics.

The particularity of the Kaschau Chancery German has been clearly established due to the thorough research published on the earliest town register (1393-1405), and the tables of the variability of vowels and consonants offer an excellent opportunity for comparison.<sup>43</sup> It was precisely many of the typical

---

<sup>40</sup> STROMER, W.: *op. cit.*, p. 250.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 251.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 257 f.

<sup>43</sup> HALAGA, O.R.: *The oldest town register of Kaschau from the years 1393-1405*. In: Southeast German Archives XXII/XXIII Vol. 1979/80, pp. 153-163 (Tab. pp. 158-163) - HALAGA, O.R.: *Najstaršia košická mestská kniha 1393-1405*. Bratislava-Košice 1979.

features of Kaschau German which were standardised in Stromer's transcript. Thus there was for example the change *cht* — *t* *nit bezallin sulln*; transcript: *nicht bezallen sullen* (shall not pay) *w-b bawm bolleyn*; transcript: *bawm wolleyn* (cotton); *o-a sal man, dornoch*; transcript; *sol man, dornach* (shall one, thereafter); *e-i bezallin, artikil, anhangindem*; transcript the *e* which is omitted before *n, e, r* is written in: instead of *sulln* (shall), *brengn* (bring), *selbign* (same), *wurkn* (work), *willn* (will), *treibn* (drive); *andre leynwat* (other linen), *obgeschribner* (above-written) there is *sullen, brengen, etc., ander leynwat, obgeschribener*. Unnecessarily the transcript gives 'firczenhundert' instead of *firczenhundert* (1400) etc.<sup>44</sup>

Fifty years ago E. Mályusz had already rejected the view that Sigismund himself was the originator of the fustian monopoly, and he even attributed the initiative to the Kaschau citizens who were supposed to have induced the King to include in their privilege the imposition of a ban on production in the other towns of Hungary.<sup>45</sup> Our findings unequivocally justify such an interpretation. The language of the document of the first of September, 1411 makes it clear that the first draft of this was submitted to the King by persons from the circle of the Kaschau town Chancery. There are also further traditional peculiarities which point clearly to this particular Chancery.

Such a peculiarity is the formulation "and these selfsame fustian makers shall suffer good and ill in our town of Cassaw along with the other fellow citizens". This principle was currently being advanced in the gild articles in the Kaschau town Chancery.<sup>46</sup> It was also incorporated in the Statutes of 1461 and 1481 which the fustian makers received. Let us look at the variation in the formulation: <sup>47</sup>

1461: that they might carry the burden the more lightly by suffering it communally alongside others.

1481: so that in suffering good and ill with us some advantage and freedom shall be their lot ... and they might enjoy great advantage from their trade.

This expression which was customary in Kaschau was included in 1411 among the internal trade regulations, which were determined by the local practice of the time and, as in 1461 and 1481, not by a reaction to the arrival of any foreigners. The aim of this part of the sentence was to guarantee that the members of the fustian trade received the same rights as other inhabitants of the town and participated equally in the duties (taxes, defence etc.) and in

<sup>44</sup> STROMER, W.: *op. cit.*, p. 264 f.

<sup>45</sup> MÁLYUSZ, E.: *op. cit.* (= 12), p. 363.

<sup>46</sup> ACC, H 111/2 par 2. Cf. TÓTH, L.: *op. cit.* p. 5 (Weavers), II (Tailors), 63 (Potters). The expression disappears from use after the XVth Century.

<sup>47</sup> ACC, Gild articles in par 2, fol. 10v-12. WENZEL, G.: *op. cit.*, p. 39, 38, Nr. XXI, XX.

the privileges (market, customs duties etc.) G. Wenzel abbreviated this to too narrow a definition in his paper thus saying that "the masters were at the same time citizens".<sup>48</sup> W. von Stromer, without having any idea that the expression at issue was the customary expression of the Kaschau town Chancery, interpreted it as a promise to the future immigrants from the German realm that they would automatically become members of the "highly privileged small class" (patriciate) and that this "award" contradicted the will and wish of the patriciate.<sup>49</sup> Our rich documentary sources hardly permit imagination to take us as far as this.

The formulation of the guarantee as quoted was always given to the guilds by the town council together with the judge. Their inclusion in the document of 1411 makes it clear who participated in the preparation of the first draft. To put such wording "into the mouth" of the King was the prerogative of the representative of only a self-governing town; i.e. judge and councillors. The chief notary usually belonged to this group as well. Only from their point of view, not from the King's, could the immigrants become "fellow citizens".

The King alone — even if he knew of the protocols generally observed in Kaschau — was not authorised to include such a formula in the document without the council's knowledge, to "force" it to a town with ancient privileges which guaranteed it a maximum of town rights at the time in Hungary and also through trade in Poland and Russia. The indebted King was in the last resort in no position to take the liberty of wilfully interfering in the legal powers of his creditors.<sup>50</sup>

The first draft which reached the fair copy stage in the Vyssegrad Chancery with the help of the King may well have deletions and insertions. The clerk making the fair copy did not notice the faulty logic either because he was working hastily or because he misunderstood the words and their sequence. In the paragraph which deals with the question for whom the privileges are prescribed the logical sequence of the sentence is in fact broken by a missing noun; without this the relative pronoun together with the adjective (*iren iczlichen*) has no function in the sentence. The logical sequence of the sentence would only further require the repetition of the word "allen". In order to determine the range of possible candidates for the missing noun we must first understand the meaning of the adjective "iczlich". It often appears as "*yeczlich-jiczlich*". Nevertheless we do not take as our starting-point the New High German word "*jetztlich*" (current) because the word was used in Kaschau correspondence of

---

<sup>48</sup> WENZEL, G.: *op. cit.*, p. 10.

<sup>49</sup> STROMER, W.: *op. cit.*, p. 251 f.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 252: "interfered in the autonomy of the town in the prerogative of the civic community". It is wrong to regard Kaschau as having first got onto "the best path" to that far-reaching autonomy under Sigismund. The written formulation of the common law of 1405 can hardly be magnified into a "constitutional reform".

the time in the sense of "each", "each one" (of a whole).<sup>51</sup> The second point which supports this argument is found in the relationship of the pronoun "ihr" (their). The stylistic whole of the first sentence is delimited by the relationship "of all... jointly and their each and every [...] especially". The missing noun thus specified the important representatives of the previously mentioned totality. The important representatives were called in practice "virmeister" in Kaschau and "eldeste" or "czechmeister" in the rest of Hungary.<sup>52</sup> Many authors who were ignorant of this fact deduced from the term "virmeister" that the relevant guilds in Kaschau only consisted of four Masters.<sup>53</sup> It was presumably this sort of misunderstanding which led the clerk in the Vyssegrad Royal Chancery to omit a limitation to "vier Meister" — four masters.

If the text of the document is corrected to make each word follow in logical sequence in the sentence structure it appears as follows:<sup>54</sup>

"... to all the fustian makers jointly and to each of their [master representatives] especially [and to all] who came to our country to Cassaw and settle here and are placed here and to the Master Bleacher and Master Mangler and [to all] who are members with these we have given further freedom in writing and give with the power of this custom ..."

Even without the supplementary words the paragraph should not have given rise to any doubt as to whom the special privilege was addressed.<sup>55</sup> To an historian with no a priori assumptions the text says clearly enough that the chief addressees are "all the fustian makers jointly". This cannot be a fictitious

---

<sup>51</sup> ACC, Schv 43 (Regest: *Dipl. Sigismundi 11/1 Nr 3900*): Debt 2410 Fl. auri for "300 stregeian cloth, each at 6 gulden 1 ort" and 20 "lengths of Thyn, each at 27 gulden 1 ort". The fustian makers articles 1461 (WENZEL, *op. cit.*, p. 43, Nr. XXI): "so shall each of the masters: so shall each one be forfeited half a pound of wax; so shall each one take part: the journeymen also with their wives, each with a quarter pound of wax".

<sup>52</sup> ACC C. — Pelliones 1 (in 1307 and 1448): "Virmayster of the gild (Czeche) for this year" (publ. SÁZDECZKY, L.: *op. cit.*, 11, p. 14, Nr. 3) — Fustian Makers Article 1461: publ. WENZEL, G.: *op. cit.*, p. 43 "one of the virmayster or the eldest... in the gild (Czeche)" — SÁZDECZKY, L.: *op. cit.*, 1, p. 191, established that the term 'virmayster' was used in the sense of the 'eldest in the gild' (Czeche) by the Kaschau furriers, bag makers, belt makers, cartwrights, turners, carpenters, tailors, tanners and butchers.

<sup>53</sup> Thus, for example, TÓTH, L.: *op. cit.*, p. 23.

<sup>54</sup> = 23.

<sup>55</sup> STROMER, W.: *op. cit.*, p. 251 f.: a Kaschau trade cannot be the instigator and recipient of the document since this trade did not yet exist as a corporate entity. It could not be constituted by the statute until such time as... the fustian makers were recruited from abroad... Not even the town of Kaschau itself or the community of citizens was the recipient and immediate addressee of the document.

group still living scattered around the world or in foreign realms, but was rather a living reality, a totality which already had an objective existence in the town which *via facti* received this document and four years later had it officially transcribed.<sup>56</sup> The document was submitted to make the transumpt "*in loco credibili*" on 29th. April 1416 in Jasov. This was carried out by "Ladislaus Kukulbrecht *iudex* and Johannes Hebenstreit and mag. Franciscus *notarius, iurati cives civitatis Cassoviensis*" in their own name and in the name of the whole community.<sup>57</sup> In fact just such representatives as drew up the gild documents and whom we presumed to be the originators of the first draft of the document in 1411.

In addition, the first part of the address with its appendices and references documents quite plainly, in the light of the gild analogies already known to us, that the Kaschau weavers and others who processed the cotton into fustian were already an organisation at the time when the document was made charter and they had an elected committee. It is immaterial whether the organisation was only called "trade", "brotherhood" or rather "*Czeche*".

Likewise, the text of the document even without the corrections does not give the historian the right to deny the existence before 1411 of those indispensable specialist facilities for processing the cotton, woollen and linen cloths. The document is, after all, also addressed *verbis expressis* to the "Master Bleacher and Master Mangler". The use of the present tense in the clause which refers to both of these together with all the other staff in the workshops of all the named categories ("who are members here with these") excludes the interpretation which suggests that they would all have to be recruited first or that the bleachery and mangling facilities were supposed first to be set up.<sup>58</sup> Thus the document of the 1st. September, 1411 makes such exhaustive citation of the addressees that the document itself demonstrates the existence of the scarcely less significant number of masters; further it shows that the fustian trade had its own governing body and this had at its disposal the bleaching and mangling facilities as well as all the specialists in Kaschau/Košice; finally it shows that apart from the masters there were also journeymen, apprentices, servants and day labourers working in the workshops of the fustian makers. From the latter part of the address it emerges that the "further freedom in writing" had supplemented the inherited custom and previously enjoyed freedom which was "given" by Sigismund.

---

<sup>56</sup> This shown already by G. WENZEL: see above, p. 2.

<sup>57</sup> ACC, Schv 18053: publ. WENZEL, G.: *op. cit.*, p. 17. Nr 11 — W. VON STROMER (*op. cit.*, pp. 250, 255, 265) reads the dating incorrectly: 27.4. "Feria 4" (= Wednesday) according to Georg this fell on 29. April in 1416.

<sup>58</sup> STROMER, W.: *op. cit.*, p. 254. It was in keeping with the aim of founding the trade that... the preparation process should also be established there... in other words, the bleachery.

Part of the traditional peculiarity of the Kaschau craft guilds was that two master craftsmen inspected all the products which were destined for the market. This obligation was laid down in the gild statutes.<sup>59</sup> We also come across it in the statutes of the fustian makers in 1461. The inspection was supposed to be paid for by the manufacturers. Fustian which was sold without inspection or trademark was liable to confiscation.<sup>60</sup> It was clearly a very old practice because there is documentary evidence of such a practice at the beginning of the century in the textile production in Bardejov (pursuant to Kaschau's title and monopoly).<sup>61</sup> The authors of the first draft of the 1411 document thus included the Kaschau practice. There is a difference compared with the practice of other craftsmen in the number of checks: 2 -- inspection of bleached and unbleached, and the inspector -- 4. That can be explained by the unique opportunity for inspecting the quality of the fustian after the weaving and the bleaching.<sup>62</sup> The interest in bleaching and mangling shared by all fustian makers was shown in the statutes of 1461: every new member gave their dues to the gild and likewise a gulden for mangling. Each journeyman was obliged to help with the mangling of his master's products.<sup>63</sup> The interest the fustian makers had in the bleaching and mangling as well as the connection between the inspection fees and the investment in both facilities also emerges from the association of these ideas in the corresponding paragraph in the 1411 document.<sup>64</sup>

The points made in the 1411 document, which are based on experience of current practice, indicate a similar reaction to the competition between local workshops and not just to competition from other towns. The regulations are for example a reaction to the rising cost of many work processes, to the coaxing of the journeymen and servants from one workshop to another to inferior products and the dishonest work. The aim of them all is to limit the possibilities of entrepreneurs who had not learned the trade, and whose workshop only functioned with the aid of journeymen and apprentices, from becoming parasites on the trade. From the point of view of the suppliers (i.e. merchants) the regulation is formulated which permits the tools and workshops of negligent

---

<sup>59</sup> SZÁDECZKY, L.: *op. cit.*, p. 194.

<sup>60</sup> ACC, H. pur 2, fol. 10v (WENZEL, G.: *op. cit.*, p. 40): 'likewise one shall be liable permit the inspection; and whoever sells a piece of fustian in advance which has not been inspected and stamped... he shall forfeit it; two parts going to the council and one third to the gild (Czeche).

<sup>61</sup> HALAGA, O.R.: *Košice-Balt.*, *op. cit.*, 1, pp. 127, 259.

<sup>62</sup> 1411 document (= 23): likewise we shall and will always call upon the same fustian makers for the inspectors who shall inspect this... of this they shall give us to hand... for the inspection of bleached and unbleached.

<sup>63</sup> = 47.

<sup>64</sup> 1411 document (= 23): 'So we shall bring the bleachery and all that belongs to it into line and fit it out with our own money, in advance, for the same fustian makers'.

fustian makers who do not carry out honest work to be removed from them and entrusted to someone else. To avoid abuse of this regulation the King gives anyone affected by it the opportunity of appealing to him. That could well have been the King's personal idea.<sup>65</sup> All the evils which the regulations of 1411 attempted to control were precisely the corollaries of economic prosperity.

The phenomena to which the regulations of fustian makers' guild were reacting make it clear that there was already a big demand for fustian before 1411 within the radius of Kaschau's commercial interests, and that the profits and prosperity enticed the suppliers, merchants and manufacturers in Kaschau to expand their production. The need to increase radically the number of workshops and expand production inevitably ran up against a shortage of master craftsmen and journeymen even in Košice. This shortage also undermined Kaschau's thirty-year span of privileges in the trade with Russia and on the "Tartar Way",<sup>66</sup> along which cotton and other raw materials were imported from the harbours of the Black Sea (Kaffa, Moncastro etc.) for the weavers. The import of cotton from Venice, to which Kaschau and Pentapolis sent some of their exports, was not exactly the most advantageous part of their trade and not without difficulties.<sup>67</sup> It is completely understandable that Kaschau wanted to maintain its pre-eminent position in the import and processing of cotton. If Kaschau had not had the prerequisites, if it had not yet had anything to preserve, what would have been the point of realistic and calculating merchants making an investment in order to secure for themselves the monopoly over the whole of Hungary? Only a position of advantage would enable them to concentrate all the specialists from the whole of Hungary in the Kaschau Guild, and through the privilege of 1411 they procured the legal status for achieving this objective.<sup>68</sup> At the same time,

---

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*: 'likewise one shall fix a named and equal wage which shall be given for weaving, spinning, carding and woolcombing so that no one shall give more than any other for the same job. We also do not want any master to alienate or persuade in any way any youth to leave the service of any other master; and that no one should pursue this craft or proceed in it unless he can work at it with his own hands. If any of these same fustian makers become neglectful and slack in their work and refuse to pursue their craft honestly then another may take over and run it; nevertheless this may only happen with our knowledge and determination, not in any other way.

<sup>66</sup> Documents in HALAGA: *Košice-Balt. I. op. cit.*, p. 147 — cf. HEERS, J.: *Gènes au XVe siècle*. Paris 1961, pp. 382-402. Document Register of the History of the Germans in Transylvania IV, ed. GÜNDSCH, G., București-Cologne-Vienna, 1973, p. 426, Nr. 2106.

<sup>67</sup> HALAGA, *op. cit.*, p. 154. STROMER, W.: *op. cit.*, p. 260 f. SASSI, S.: *Lettere di commercio di A. Barbarigo, mercante veneziano del 400*. Naples, 1951, p. 7 f.: Prices for Levantine cotton in Venice rose and sank according to whether the merchants from Hungary could get there or not.

<sup>68</sup> 1411 document: 'thus we will that thereafter there shall be no bleaching or fustian made anywhere else in the above-written Kingdom of Hungary than in Cassow

the legal status might also have been an enticement for the specialists from the kingdom and from abroad, since the monopoly rights of the Kaschau Gild affected them all. In aiming to achieve such a concentration of specialists, Kaschau's monopoly was also directed at excluding all competition outside Hungary not only in the fustian trade, but also in the buying of raw materials necessary for the fustian throughout the Kingdom.

The fact is that it was this commercial and economic motive which led the authors of the first draft to put special emphasis right at the very beginning of the document (in the *narratio*) on the shortage of craftsmen in the country,<sup>69</sup> and further to stress the importance of the hoped-for immigrants from abroad by naming these in the address section of the document immediately after the local group of fustian makers and their local leaders: in other words, before the master bleacher and the master mangler and before the remaining staff of the trade. It is hardly logical simply to accept the expected immigrants on the list of addressees in the document and to claim that all the rest were not yet in existence. This is illogical not only from the point of view of the document itself, but also because the actual existence of fustian makers in other towns and villages in the country and throughout the Kingdom can be demonstrated.

Why would the King uproot and resettle all the fustian makers and "found" everything "from scratch" in a town where nothing at all existed previously? Yet only a few years after the proclamation of the Kaschau monopoly we discover that the monopoly was being harmed by the competing fustian makers from other towns -- indeed, from a number of villages too.<sup>70</sup> There were fustian makers everywhere who were not supported by the King and despite all the royal bans, threats and discriminatory acts these did not disappear. Where for example did Bardejov,<sup>71</sup> Bratislava, Buda, Székesfehérvár,<sup>72</sup> Sibiu<sup>73</sup> get their

---

alone, and that no thread, whether it be cotton or yarn, be taken from the country, and no fustian shall be brought from other countries into our above-written country, Hungary'.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*: 'now we have noticed that our above-written Kingdom of Hungary undoubtedly needs some craft workers and special fustian makers or those who can make fustian'.

<sup>70</sup> Szücs, J.: *op. cit.*, p. 215, correctly observed that there were also fustian makers among the cottage craftsmen in the villages and according to the monopoly documents these were also supposed to move to Košice.

<sup>71</sup> ACC, Schv 18055, publ. WENZEL, G.: *op. cit.*, p. 20 f., Nr. V: Sigismund directed on the 9.VI.1419 that outside Kaschau "nullibi alias intra regni nostri ambitum fustanum seu barhannum preparetur, texcatur et ordinetur", and that all fustian makers "tam in possessionibus nobilium et aliorum quorumvis possessionatorum hominum, quam in civitatibus et liberis villis et specialiter in civitate nostra Bardfa vocata existentes et commorantes cum omnibus eorum clenodiis et pertinenciis ad ipsam artem barhanicam necessariis et spectantibus ad dictam civitatem nostram Cassoviensem veniant, venireque compellantur et astringantur moraturi... Et si aliqui ex eis ad Cassoviam

fustian makers and bleachers from if these towns, just like the royal, episcopal and aristocratic villages and markets, were only able to offer burdens of discrimination after 1411 and no advantages at all as an enticement to master craftsmen from abroad? Four months after it became possible to move to Kaschau with all goods, relatives and friends, and without paying duty, Buda actually had "a great many" fustian makers.<sup>74</sup> Why would the migrants from abroad avoid the prospering town of Kaschau with its attractive advantages of the state-wide monopoly and expose themselves to the King's disfavour and discrimination by settling somewhere else? Only one explanation suggests itself: the fustian makers outside Kaschau developed their trade from the local weaving trade before 1411, and so were already long-standing residents of their town, as they also were in Kaschau. This accounts for why they were able to resist the instructions to move to Kaschau.

The claims that the fustian trade of Košice and in Hungary as a whole suddenly came into being as a revolutionary act, that it was "founded" in 1411 by the will of the ruler, that all the weavers and other fustian workers were specifically brought in are mistaken on our estimation, and there is much additional evidence to prove this. According to the 1411 document the raw material required by the fustian makers included not only oriental cotton but also traditional raw materials indigenous to the country, such as sheep's wool and flax. Weaving was likewise preceded by traditional spinning, carding and scutching and the fustian makers end products included not only fustian

---

antedictam omnino venire contempserint, tales nullus in regno nostro fovere, tenere et conservare audeat vel presummat sub pena nostre regie indignationis.

<sup>72</sup> ACC, Sch 18056; publ. WENZEL, G.: *op. cit.*, p. 22, Nr. VII: Sigismund's regulation of the 14. August 1419, that the towns and villages belonging to the King, the church and the nobility, especially Buda, Székesfehérvár and Bratislava should publicly proclaim "ut textura barchani seu fustani in regno nostro nullibi, nisi dumtaxat in predicta civitate Cassoviensi fieri debeat et exerceri, nullusque barchanista seu artifex eiusdem texture eandem artem exercere volens, allibi quam in eadem civitate Cassoviensi debeat residere". At the same time the import of foreign fustian and the export of cotton and yarn is banned. The ban is reinforced from Košice on 14. September, 1419 and again on 20. September, 1419 (*ibid.*, pp. 23-27, Nr. XIII-IX).

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*: p. 28, Nr. XI: Sigismund from Kolín (Bohemia) on 9. August 1420 commanded the town of Sibiu on the basis of earlier regulations from the Kaschau monopoly "firmiter et districte, ut omnes barchanistas, vestri in medio residentes, cum ipsorum instrumentis versus dictam Cassoviam transmittere et nulla tenus eandem artem vestri in medio exercere permittere debeatis". He threatened any renewed failure to obey with "displicentiamque nostram non modicam".

<sup>74</sup> Sigismund guaranteed from Košice on the 17. August 1419 a tax-free departure from Buda. On 14. September, 1419, again from Kaschau, he reproached the town of Buda thus: certos et quam plures barchanistas et eiusdem artificii textores et laboratores vestri in medio foveretis, conservaretis eosdemque ipsorum artis praxim exercere... permetteretis. WENZEL, G.: *op. cit.*, p. 18, 24, Nr. III, VIII.

but also bocasin and "other linen". The weavers put out all the products for inspection after the weaving and again after the bleaching. This great variety of products is indicated in the 1411 document and in the articles of the fustian makers a century later. Each master could work on three looms simultaneously. On the one he may have been weaving table cloths and on the other two either fustian or twill, or just fustian or whatever he could do besides.<sup>75</sup> From the diversity of the raw materials, weaving techniques and end products one can only conclude that the weaving trade was the cradle of the fustian specialisation. The weaving guild no doubt offered refuge to all the fustian makers who were supposed to move from the other towns to Košice but refused to do so.<sup>76</sup> A joint guild with the weavers was formed for example by the Viennese fustian makers<sup>77</sup> whose standards for weaving the fustian had been adopted by the Kaschau masters.<sup>78</sup>

The weavers of Kaschau were the first apart from the furriers to have written regulations from the council.<sup>79</sup> The extent to which this craft grew and developed a tradition is evidenced by the fact that apart from the general guild committee, which was dominated by the masters, the journeymen also elected their own authoritative body and had special articles. We may deduce from those regulations which made it difficult for the masters to leave<sup>80</sup> that the Kaschau weavers were experiencing a boom in the XIVth and XVth centuries. Before the end of the XIVth Century they were already differentiated according to their main specialisation, although every one of them produced several different fabrics. Among those appearing in the town court were not only numerous "male weavers" and "female weavers" (*textor-textrix*),<sup>81</sup> but also specifically the flax weaver — *linifex*,<sup>82</sup> the wool weavers — *lanifex*,<sup>83</sup> the fancy cloth weavers,<sup>84</sup> the twill makers<sup>85</sup> and the coarse woollen cloth workers (*lottinwirker*).<sup>86</sup> The twill makers and the wool weavers were among those specialisations which attracted the greatest number: both of these processed not only sheep's wool

---

<sup>75</sup> = 47, cf. HALAGA, O.R.: *Košice-Balt*, I, *op. cit.*, p. 258 f.

<sup>76</sup> = 68, 71-74.

<sup>77</sup> NÜBLING, E.: *Ulm's cotton weaving mill in the Middle Ages.*, Leipzig 1890, p. 50wf.  
— SZÜCS, J.: *op. cit.*, p. 214.

<sup>78</sup> - 109.

<sup>79</sup> HALAGA, O.R.: *Evolution of Right... op. cit.* (= 29), pp. 69-71 (Table of the craft specialisations and guilds).

<sup>80</sup> SZÁDECZKY, L.: *op. cit.*, I, p. 40.

<sup>81</sup> *Acta Iudiciaria civitatis Cassoviensis* (= 20), Nr. (in Halaga's edition), 534, 2421, 2703, 2935, 3001, 3032 etc.; 3003, 3633 etc.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*, Nr. 968, 2128, 2233 etc.

<sup>83</sup> *Ibid.*, Nr. 1076, 1091 etc.: 1749, 2291 etc.

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid.*, Nr. 328, 893, 905, 1156, 1161, 1753 etc.

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.*, Nr. 55, 226, 368, 403, 405, 546 etc.

<sup>86</sup> *Ibid.*, Nr. 3216.

but also cotton. There was even silk production as well — the “silk scutchers” are documented.<sup>87</sup> The numerous “scutchers”<sup>88</sup> are probably also connected with the preparation of the flax and wool, as well as the cotton for spinning. The Kaschau silk production was linked with the braid workers (*borten wirker, portar*).<sup>89</sup> Our documents thus refer to ‘silk’ and ‘silk braid’<sup>90</sup> and emphasise the good fustian (*barchanum bonum*)<sup>91</sup> which presupposes the manufacture of cheaper types of fustian as well. Even at the beginning of the legal register in 1395 a manufacturer of fustian (*parcat*) is mentioned in the document.<sup>92</sup>

The discovery of the advanced state of textile production in Kaschau is something new, and this discovery was not possible until the source material was prepared for publication. The weavers who were scattered across the country produced cloths which were called ‘*panni Cassenses*’, ‘*stamen Cassense*’, ‘*loden Cassenses*’, ‘*golez*’, ‘*sindones*’, ‘*zwillich*’ (twill), ‘*stamen griseum*’, ‘*strick*’ (cord), ‘*Cascher leymet*’ (Kaschau linen) etc. The products were sold long-distance merchants. The textiles sold so well that the buyers were forced to purchase future products well in advance. The system of supply and distribution heralds the beginnings of a capitalistic organisation of the scattered manufactures of the weaving trade in Košice.<sup>93</sup>

We therefore take the view that all the specialised branches of the weaving trade in Kaschau expanded progressively within the framework of the weaving trade and formed groups within it, and that the weaving trade functioned for a time as a federation of several specialist groups which gradually asserted their independence (fustian makers, twill makers, cloth makers, etc.) or rather formed a new mixed guild. In this way the specialisation of the Kaschau fustian makers developed into an autonomous trade. Thus according to the circumstances first outlined it was still closer to the truth of the situation in 1411 to explain that by ‘fustian makers’ what was meant was ‘those who can make fustian’.

All the specialised branches of the weaving trade in Košice and in the whole country had been able to use the Kaschau bleachery long before 1400. Several ‘bleachers’ (1394) worked there under the direction of a ‘master bleacher’.<sup>94</sup> The bleaching process probably also included the technique of washing the fabric

---

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*, Nr. 1404, 2398.

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.*, Nr. 2457, 4313, 4453, 4634, 4938, 4946 etc.

<sup>89</sup> *Ibid.*, Nr. 1720, 3216, 3788, 4029, 4068, 4799 etc. Compare Der Grosse Brochhaus 15 edition., III Vol., Leipzig 1929, p. 183; STERLINGER, J.V.: *Encyclopaedic German-Bohemian Dictionary I*, Praha 1916, pp. 996, 1000; IV (Praha 1935), p. 455.

<sup>90</sup> *Acta iudiciaria civ. Cass.*, Nr. 1778, 3062.

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid.*, Nr. 2008 (from 1397).

<sup>92</sup> *Ibid.*, Nr. 246.

<sup>93</sup> = 8.

<sup>94</sup> *Acta iudiciaria civ. Cass.* Nr. 1812, 56, 1467, 1518, 1921, 2308, 2463, 3929, 4524, 4735, 5832.

using a water hammer (so-called beater).<sup>95</sup> The 'beater-washers' are also mentioned on the first page of the legal register in 1394.<sup>96</sup> From 1393-1405 the bleachery in Kaschau was leased by the master bleacher, Hannus, because he collected personally through the court the debts from the weavers. He also took legal proceedings against the 'young masters' and other staff in a dispute over wages. He engaged in further litigation on the issue of bricks and wood for building. Because of the large amounts of money involved he tried the cases together with citizens from the neighbouring districts (Zips, Jelšava in Gemer). From this one may deduce the weavers throughout the whole province were obliged to use the Kaschau bleachery in the 90s. All these details record the Kaschau bleachery as being a smoothly running organisation where expansion and renovation were currently in progress.<sup>97</sup>

The fact that the Kaschau bleaching masters had established themselves in this way, for which we have furnished documentary evidence from the latter end of the XIVth Century to the beginning of the XVth Century, is also assumed by the authors of the draft of the 1411 document. The King agrees that logs from the royal forests should be supplied to the bleachery as required. But wood cutting and transportation from the woods to the bleachery continue to be administered by the master bleacher, the present lease holder. The last words serve to emphasise once more what we have deduced from the details about the master bleacher in the town register and namely that he was a leaseholder for a fixed period.<sup>98</sup>

The authors of the 1411 draft were most concerned with improving the quality of the products and keeping in check dishonest and inferior production. They used the King's authority and interest to discriminate against poor quality products. The workshops whose fustian quality was deteriorating had to pay higher fees to the King for the inspection (2 - 6 - 9 pence) but the highest rate was payable for 'cutting' (*snyt*) i.e. for cutting up faulty cloth.<sup>99</sup> Before the workshops had to begin to pay off their dues the King was also supposed to contribute to improving the quality of the bleaching procedure. The Kaschau representatives writing the draft put "into the mouth" of the King the solemn promise that he would arrange for the full provision of the special facilities for

---

<sup>95</sup> STERZINGER, J.: *op. cit.*, IV, pp. 192, 196, 197, 207.

<sup>96</sup> *Acta iudiciaria civ. Cass.*, Nr. 455, 481, 1007, etc., cf. Nr. 139; slagtuch - stamen 9. 1/2 fl.

<sup>97</sup> ... 94.

<sup>98</sup> 1411 Document (= 23): 'it is up to the master bleacher always to send for logs and give as much to the bleachery as is required and as often as is needed by the leaseholder in future times, but that also the same (wood) shall be cut by the same master bleacher, the present leaseholder, and be brought in with his own hauling and effort.

<sup>99</sup> *Ibid.*, 'from the best fustian 3 pence, from the average 6; from the worst 9 also from the cut cloth 12 pence and from the bleaching 7 pence.'

fustian with his own money.<sup>100</sup> The relevant words do not indicate the founding of a new bleachery but rather that the King should fully equip the existing bleachery so that it meets the requirements of modern fustian manufacture. This is the correct interpretation of the words "bring into linen" (*ausrichten*) and "fit out" (*fertigen*): to ascribe to these words the suggestion of "setting up from scratch"<sup>101</sup> shows a misapprehension of the current language usage,<sup>102</sup> and the discovery that a bleachery actually existed there from a quarter of a century before makes such an interpretation quite inadmissible.

Since the details of the Kaschau bleachery (*albatorium*) were not published and for a long time were quite unknown, von Stromer is not the only one to hold the view that it was a case of King Sigismund "setting it up". The Hungarian historian of the post-war period, J. Szücs, likewise based his calculations on a single ten-year period in the life of the Kaschau bleachery: everything had ostensibly collapsed with the other facilities of the fustian makers at the end of the 20s;<sup>103</sup> as a result he is then amazed to find that the bleachery reappears "as cool as you please" in Kaschau in 1529 and employs ten day-labourers with municipal funds.<sup>104</sup> This amazement is hardly justified as G. Wenzel had already published documents showing the continuing production of different sorts of fustian, twill, drill cloth and linen in the years 1461 and 1481.<sup>105</sup> Quite correctly W. von Stromer emphasised the continuation of the fustian trade for "over a full two centuries".<sup>106</sup> A little earlier O. R. Halaga documented the existence of the textile production in the XVth and the beginning of the XVIth Century with the reference to "*cascher leymet*" (Kaschau linen) in the years 1424, 1475, 1493, the purchase of raw materials though the twill makers' guild in Cracow in 1489, and the import of yarn from Prussia, Galicia and Poland.<sup>107</sup> Furthermore, the well-known disputes between Kaschau (together with Bartfeld) and the other towns and feudal lords on the subject of the bleach monopoly leave no doubt that business carried on in the Kaschau bleachery.<sup>108</sup>

In the documents which G. Wenzel published (particularly those for 1461), the production process of the more complicated varieties of cloth is described in detail. Because of the great variety of techniques and the width of the warp

---

<sup>100</sup> = 64.

<sup>101</sup> = 58.

<sup>102</sup> SACHS-VILLATTE, *Encyclopaedic French-German and German-French dictionary*, Vol. II, 30th edition, Berlin 1954, p. 93: *ausrichten* (bring into line, streamline) = redresser doter, faire la dépense; p. 283 f.: *fertigen* (fit out) = finir, ajuster.

<sup>103</sup> SZÜCS, J.: *op. cit.*, pp. 218, 220.

<sup>104</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 243.

<sup>105</sup> = 47.

<sup>106</sup> STROMER, W.: *op. cit.*, p. 261.

<sup>107</sup> HALAGA, O.R.: *Košice-Balt. I, op. cit.*, pp. 259-261.

<sup>108</sup> *Ibid.*, documents p. 260, note 61, cf. ACC, Schv 779 (year 1498) Schr 19170 (year 1429); IVÁNYI, B.: *op. cit.*, p. 131, Nr. 572 (year 1480) etc.

each weaver possessed a number of looms, and the fustian gild maximised the number of these by putting one master weaver with three weavers. Each type of fabric had a prescribed warp width. This width was the same for Kaschau fustian as it was for Viennese fustian and it had the same number of threads. The Viennese warp length, width and number of threads in the warp was prescribed for the Kaschau fustian in the statutes of 1411 and 1461.<sup>109</sup> The Kaschau twill had two different warp widths: one loom was set to a warp width of  $5/4$  yards and the other to a width of one yard. The twill as well as the fustian belonged to that group of Kaschau cloths which not only required hand weaving but working the treadle as well. This is why both were called "footwork".<sup>110</sup> It was even more demanding to sit at a loom which was set for "bird-patterned" (*gevogeltes*) weaving. In 1461 it was not yet obligatory for the journeymen to master this technique: the statutes gave the master weavers a free hand to choose whichever of the journeymen and apprentices he wanted to instruct in this technique.<sup>111</sup> Evidently this technique was a local innovation which was still being kept secret from strangers. W. von Stromer says it was to produce the "bird's eye" pattern which was first introduced into the fustian production in Basle on the Rhine in 1463 and was then called "*Vogel-Schürlitz*" (bird fabric).<sup>112</sup> The table cloths, in particular, were produced on 8 or 6 shafts respectively in the Kaschau workshops. The largest measured  $2\frac{1}{2} \times 2\frac{1}{2}$  yards and had 50 threads "warped with 16".<sup>113</sup> The tablecloths provided for the market were smaller:  $2\frac{1}{4} \times 2\frac{1}{4}$  yards. These had 40 threads "warped with 16".<sup>114</sup> The smallest tablecloths measured  $2 \times 2$  yards and had 40 threads "warped with 16".<sup>115</sup>

---

<sup>109</sup> 1411 document (= 62) '(4 inspectors) also shall check that the same fustian is produced to the Viennese standards of length, width and number. Article 1461 (= 47). Likewise one shall also make fustian according to the same length and width as in Vienna and according to the number of threads'.

<sup>110</sup> *Ibid.* (yr 1461) '(twill) this shall be five quarters wide on the first loom and one yard wide on the others... Likewise a journeyman who has travelled and can operate with the foot, he shall be given work on the twill or other footwork, or fustian, or whatever he can do.

<sup>111</sup> *Ibid.*: 'Or if he (travelling journeyman) wants to sit at the bird-patterned (loom) then he shall be permitted to work there. If the master wants to take trouble with him that he in a different way...

<sup>112</sup> STROMER, W.: *op. cit.*, p. 201.

<sup>113</sup> Article 1461: 'likewise if someone wants to work on or make 8-shafted or 6-shafted tablecloths those shall be three-and-a-half yards long and wide; ...the largest tablecloths shall have 50 threads warped with 16'.

<sup>114</sup> *Ibid.*: 'and if he wants to make tablecloths for the market these shall be two yards and a quarter long and wide... the market tablecloths shall have 40 threads warped with 16'.

<sup>115</sup> *Ibid.*: 'If he wants to work on tablecloths on the third loom these shall be two

Any master weaver who produced fabric for the market with different types of yarn was liable to have his fabric confiscated. One of the yarn varieties was called "Greek", the other was called "wartgarn — wetgarn".<sup>116</sup> In the documents from the year 1419 the imported cotton is called "apetum seu bombasum".<sup>117</sup> The "wetgarn" variety seem to have been of an inferior quality since the fustian and twill gild instructed the members of its monopoly in 1481 to weave with Greek yarn but allowed as an exception the linen weavers to weave the handkerchiefs with "wetgarn".<sup>118</sup> Cotton was used in the weaving of bocasin, the colourful fine cloth with oriental patterns. The Kaschau weavers perhaps learned this from the Armenians — either on the "Tartar Way" or in the Kaschau market.<sup>119</sup> The bocasin manufacture in Kaschau is even mentioned in the 1411 document.<sup>120</sup> The dyeing of the fustian using leaves from certain types of trees in Košice is documented in King Sigismund's decree of the 11 November, 1430. The bishops and chapters of Eger were only allowed to sell these leaves from their village woods to the people of Kaschau, not to any stranger.<sup>121</sup>

The technical equipment for the individual procedures of the fustian manufacture must have been very scarce and very expensive in the first quarter of

---

yards long and wide... and the small circular tablecloths shall have 36 threads warped with 16'.

<sup>116</sup> *Ibid.*: 'Likewise all work which is made for the market shall be woven with one sort of yarn, either nothing but Greek or nothing but 'wetgarn'.'

<sup>117</sup> WENZEL, G.: *op. cit.*, pp. 5, 19, 20, Nr. IV, V.

<sup>118</sup> 1481 document (= 47): 'Likewise no linen weaver here in the town shall make drill cloth outside of his gild and use no Greek or 'wetgarn' in his work — except for handkerchiefs for which the linen weaver may work with 'wetgarn'.'

<sup>119</sup> = 66. *Acta iudiciaria* (= 20) Nr. 4021, 5192: *The Armenians before the court in Košice*. (year 1401, 1403) — ACC, Schv 125: Martinus Armenius brings 1200 florins in 1417 from Kaschau to the Florentine Onufrio (Count of the Buda Chamber).

<sup>120</sup> 1411 document: 'from the proceeds which bocasin and other linen would make, from this shall also be given to us (i.e. pay off the royal due) — Szücs, J.: *op. cit.*, p. 218 misconstrued the royal due for the bleaching of bocasin and other linen and thought that the King's approval was required for the manufacture of these.

<sup>121</sup> ACC, Schv 18069: publ. WENZEL, G.: *op. cit.*, p. 36, Nr. XIX: folia quarundam arborum vestrarum in territorio et pertinenciis eiusdem poss. Tarkany (today Trakany near Tisa)... barhanistas nostris seu factoribus barhanni in ipsa civ. nostra Cassoviensis ...pro tinctura huiusmodi barhanni necessaria, non ipsis barhanistas nostris, sed aliis extraneis et forensibus hominibus precio vendere consuevissent ...propter quod ipsi barchaniste in huiusmodi eorum opere et laboris exerci magnum defectum pate-rentur... a modo in postenum talismodi folia arborum dictis barhanistis pro tinctura barhani necessaria... per vestras officiates, populosque et iobagiones ubicumque com-morantes, ubi scilicet eadem folia seu arbores habentur... prelibatis barhanistis seu eorum hominibus et non quibuscumque forensibus dari vendi... permittatis.

the XVth century for it to be described as "*clenodia*".<sup>122</sup> The town council of Kaschau were extraordinarily concerned with concentrating all the fustian makers' equipment from other towns in Kaschau itself. The council insisted that Sigismund's documents relating to this should make a point of directing people to move with all their equipment, and already in 1411 the council was given the power to taking their hand tools away.<sup>123</sup> The deprivation of all tools was introduced by the council in the fustian makers statutes of 1461 as the greatest penalty.<sup>124</sup>

Investment in the expensive equipment of the fustian workshops was probably beyond the means of the assembly line weavers in Kaschau and in the country as a whole, who were dependant on selling their goods in advance at the end of the XIVth century; they worked with what the suppliers gave them in the way of raw materials and money and what these merchants ordered from them and often booked for in court.<sup>125</sup> An innovation in weaving equipment was almost of more interest to the enterprising suppliers than to the weavers who were dependant upon them. The merchants had means at their disposal and their investment in the weaving mill multiplied the profits which they made on the import of cotton, wool and yarn — but only when finished textiles were exported. The customs exemptions and privileges, which were directed against foreign competition and came into force with the 1411 document, point clearly to the initiative of the merchants who were investing in raw materials, production and sales; they did not serve the interests of the ordinary cotton weaver. The fact that those councillors who had an interest in the import of raw materials for the fustian also helped to draft the 1411 document furnishes positively brilliant documentary proof of the first point. "For ever more" the import of yarn and whatever else is required for the production of fustian shall be exempt from the '*Maut*' tolls and the '*Dreissigste*' taxes throughout the Kingdom.<sup>126</sup> If the advantages of tax-free imports accrue as a result of the competition being reduced then this is above all in the interests of the "*Reichkromer*" (merchant) — suppliers. This is the sort of background which gave rise to the wording of the Kaschau right of monopoly in "bleaching and fustian" and the ban on the export of raw materials from the country and the import of fustian from

---

<sup>122</sup> = 71.

<sup>122</sup> = 71.

<sup>123</sup> = 65, 71, 73. This is also in the mandate issued from Kaschau on the 14.IX. 1419 for Buda (= 74): *committatis eisdem, ut se cum universi's suis instrumentis... artificii exercendi versus... civitatem cassoviensem transferant moraturos.*

<sup>124</sup> = 60.

<sup>125</sup> = 8.

<sup>126</sup> 1411 document: 'in the first place they shall be exempted for ever more from tolls (*Maut*) and may no tolls (*Maut*) or tax (*Dreissigste*) on any of the yarn and on anything that pertains to the making of fustian in all the tax places in our country and wherever there are royal tolls.

abroad. Both these directives which appear in the 1411 document and in the subsequent monopoly documents come from the ranks of the Kaschau "Reichkroemer" (merchants). The stand they take here shows quite unambiguously that the Kaschau town council has the right to send its confidential agents to all the places where taxes (*Dreissigste*) and customs are collected, in fact even to the markets in other Hungarian towns in order to keep a check on imports, exports and the supply of goods. The collectors of taxes (*Dreissigste*) and customs duties throughout the Kingdom were obliged to assist the confidential agents from Kaschau in the confiscation of prohibited goods. Kaschau town council reserved the exclusive right to make any exceptions to the import of fustian and the export of cotton and yarn.<sup>127</sup>

We can provide a good illustration of the way in which the monopoly documents were drafted in favour of the long-distance merchants who formed the nucleus of the town council and the patriciate rather than in the interests of the King, by showing the proportions in which the impounded goods were distributed. Kaschau's internal procedure in these cases was such that the council claimed 2/3 of the forfeited goods for itself and allowed 1/3 to its subordinate legal authority. The town council also prescribed this ratio in the fustian makers statutes of 1461 and 1481.<sup>128</sup> In the case of confiscation for offences against the state-wide monopoly we should be inclined to expect the ratio to be to the King's advantage. Vladislav II, for example, appropriated half the fines levied on the guilds for disobedience for himself and half for the royal chamber.<sup>129</sup>

---

<sup>127</sup> ACC, Schv 18054 (WENZEL: *op. cit.*, p. 19, Nr. IV): Sigismund's mandate to the tax collectors (*Dreissiger*) that they should check and confiscate all prohibited goods "presente fidedigno homine civ. n. Cassoviensis..., quem iudex et iurati... ad id disposuerint" (4.VI.1419) — Schv 18055 WENZEL: *op. cit.*, p. 20, Nr. V: Sigismund proclaimed the Kaschau monopoly on 9.VI.1419 and banned the import of foreign fustians and the export of cotton "absque licencia et permissione iudicis et iuratorum predicti civ. n. Cassoviensis" — Schv 18057 (WENZEL: *op. cit.*, p. 25, Nr. VIII): Regulation of the town of Buda from 14.IX.1419 "ut quandocumque et quotiescumque per hominem iudicis et iuratorum eiusdem n. civ. (Cassoviensis), quem ipsi... ad id deputaverint... eidem vestris auxiliis et subsidiis firmiter assistatis, ut ipse predictas res prohibitas, sc. barchanos forenses... auferre valeat atque possit. — Schv. 18058 (WENZEL: *op. cit.*, p. 26, Nr. IX): King Sigismund to the Count of the Chamber and manager in Buda on the 20.IX.1419 "dum et quotiescumque per familiares et homines... civ. Cassoviensis ad premissa deputandos, ...consiliis, auxiliis et subsidiis adeo assistatis, ut ipsi predictos barchannos alienos et forenses inductos ac bombasium, quod extr aregnum educeretur, auferre et transgressores... detinere valeant atque possint. — Schv 18067 (WENZEL: *op. cit.*, p. 33, Nr. XVI): Mandate of the King in 1429 to all prelates, magnates, castles, noblemen, towns and villages, especially to the town of Oradea, to obstruct the sale of all fustian which was not manufactured in Košice and to detain the importers of such; to help the confidential agents of Košice in this task.

<sup>128</sup> WENZEL, G.: *op. cit.*, p. 40 (= 60) 41 (twice) 42; 38.

<sup>129</sup> ACC, Schv. 18071 (formerly Nr. 18062): Vladislav II directed that the master

But it was this internal practice of the Kaschau town council which was adopted by those who composed the draft of Sigismund's regulation for the Buda Counts of the Chamber, which was made Charter in Kaschau on 20 September 1419. 2/3 of the confiscated goods became the property of the Kaschau town council and only 1/3 went to the King.<sup>13</sup> At the same time this ratio probably shows that the King was more interested in hard cash, which his follower (i.e. the town) gave him on the spot, than in future benefits such as these which quite possibly seemed to him, too, to be somewhat illusory.

The fate of the fustian trade was determined by the two monopoly principles which cancelled each other out and in which King Sigismund had encouraged the long-distance merchants on the town council to take a material interest. King Sigismund had not only given the merchants the right to concentrate all the fustian production and the purchase of cotton as well as other raw materials in Košice but he had also given them the right to grant permission for exceptions both to the sale of fustian produced outside Kaschau and to the export of raw materials for fustian. Naturally, the over-riding concern of the 'Reichkromer' (merchants) was not the common interest of the manufacturers in their own town but their own profits. The 'Reichkromers' interest in investing in local fustian production rose or sank together with their expectations of higher profits either from the concentrated production at home or from imports. As soon as the imported fustian and the transit of cotton and yarn promised more readily accessible profits or greater profits they directed their trading interests into these areas. The 'Reichkromer' were safeguarding their own position: they organised themselves into a brotherhood (gild) at the beginning of the XVth century and, as further proof, they did not tie themselves down by giving any special consideration to the fustian monopoly. Their statutes, which were sealed by the town council in 1475, not only permitted the sale of imported fustian in Kaschau but even forbade foreigners to sell less than 4 pieces.<sup>131</sup> That was exactly the same situation as prevailed before 1411.<sup>132</sup>

The patricians of other Hungarian towns were even less prepared than Kaschau to observe the fustian monopoly; especially where they kept their own

---

craftsmen of the capitals of the Bohemian Crown these being Prague, Wrocław, Olomouc, Świdnica, Legnica, among others, should consider the members of the "linen weavers, drill makers and fustian makers" of Silesia to be efficient and should promote them. The fine for obstructing this: 50 marks of fine silver -- The Kaschau copy on parchment, probably for the weavers' and fustian makers' gild was notarised and sealed by Wrocław (Breslau) on 18.IX.1499. -- "an organisational connection" between the cotton weaving mill in Kaschau and that of Prague and Schweidnitz -- especially in relation to the early stages -- can in no way be inferred from the contents of this document. Cf. STROMER, W.: *op. cit.*, pp. 262/3.

<sup>130</sup> ACC, Schv 18058 (WENZEL: *op. cit.*, pp. 26/7).

<sup>131</sup> ACC, Schv 433; HALAGA, *Košice-Balt. I*, p. 252.

<sup>132</sup> ACC, Depositorium 16 (year 1404): HALAGA: *op. cit.*, I, p. 251.

weavers in a similar position of dependancy as the Kaschau suppliers. If the fustian makers elsewhere were also dependant on their suppliers they were scarcely able to decide for themselves whether they should follow the royal mandate and move to Kaschau with all their tools. Was it their exclusive property? Did their debts allow them to move out? The thesis that the fustian makers from the other towns of Hungary did not want to move to Kaschau because they were afraid of losing their freedom in the "royal enterprise" is based on false assumptions.<sup>133</sup>

The analysis of the documents and other source materials relating to the fustian monopoly of Kaschau has provided no support for the view that King Sigismund in the year 1411 founded some sort of factory where cotton was washed and spun or fustian was woven, bleached and dyed under the King's direction. We could find no endorsement for the thesis that the King freed fustian production in Kaschau in 1411 from the ties of the gild system and put it under his immediate protection, thus creating a basis for an early capitalist industrial enterprise, or that the state assumed the initiative in the Kaschau fustian production.<sup>134</sup> On the other hand the system of disseminated textile production, which is closely associated with the merchants-suppliers, started in the XIVth century and continued even after 1411. The municipal bleachery and mangling facilities which started to operate in the XIVth Century likewise continued to operate. The relationship between the weavers and the bleachery was not changed in any way because of the King's interest in modernising them. The sort of control and regulation of production and interrelated manufacturing processes which was enforced by the guilds was by no means relaxed for the Kaschau fustian makers in 1411: in fact these regulations became stricter.

The historians who were more concerned with emphasising Sigismund's grand economic plans and relating his policies to the broad spectrum of politics simply overlooked the clues and connections in the small details. For example, no one noticed the fact that the monopoly document of 1411 was not made charter until 5 years after the fall of Marcus von Nürnberg. In the meantime he had been succeeded in the Hungarian administration of taxes and tolls (*Urbur* and *Dreissigste*) first by the Pole, Rudlo Reger, in 1407, then by Musticius in 1408 and subsequently by others.<sup>135</sup> The hostility towards Marcus in the towns forced Sigismund to cancel all the Nürnberger's '*notivitates et adinventiones*' in the customs places and staples during the Polish-Hungarian negotiations in Spišská Stará Ves (d. Altdorf, m. Ofalu) in June 1407.<sup>136</sup> In the same way,

---

<sup>133</sup> SZÜCS, J.: *op. cit.*, p. 219.

<sup>134</sup> WENZEL, G.: *op. cit.*, pp. 13-14, Szücs, J.: *op. cit.*, p. 216 f., 220.

<sup>135</sup> Dipl. Sigismundi (ed. MÁYUSZ) 11/2, Nr. 5361, 5972.

<sup>136</sup> Town archive of Bardejov, S. 61 (HALAGA, *Košice-Balt. I*, p. 153): "*amplius nondum exigi et recipi iuxta novas adinventiones, quas Marcus de Norberk adinvenit et statuerat*"; relations that existed in the time of Ludwig de Anjou are being re-

the Kaschau town council, even as early as 1399, only allowed Ulrich von Nürnberg's society to register for the last time in the town register (regarding the Italian Guidotis) with a disassociating proviso. The references to Marcus' business activities are numerous in the years 1393-1395 but in 1402 they come to an abrupt halt.<sup>137</sup> None of the monopoly documents from 1411-1429 indicate that the administrators of the 'Urbur' and 'Dreissigste' taxes and toll offices and the customs offices had played into the hands of the monopoly town. The relations that had existed with the former administrators, Ulrich and Marcus von Nürnberg, had long since grown cold and finally ceased. Nor did the relations with their successors show any improvement. Kaschau actually arrested one of these, Reger, as he was riding through the town and would not release him until the Polish Queen Anna intervened personally and approached King Sigismund and Hermann Cillei.<sup>138</sup> We already know that the later successors, Valent von St. Georg (Jur) and the Florentine Onofrio were more offenders against the Kaschau monopoly than its supporters. In 1419 the council of Kaschau had to get the King to issue severe rebukes as a show of support for the confidential agents in their task of detecting and fining all those who violated the monopoly rules.<sup>139</sup> Indeed it is precisely this attitude towards the Kaschau monopoly on the part of the 'Urbur' and 'Dreissigste' tax, toll and customs administrators (whether in respect of fustian production, bleaching or the cotton trade) which reveals that those who conceived of the monopoly had been mistaken in trying to set it up with the co-operation of strangers.

If one exaggerates the importance of the customs exemptions which the Kaschau fustian makers enjoyed and deduces from this that King Sigismund was thereby enforcing protectionist policies of a mercantile nature this leads to the conclusion that these exemptions were radical aberrations from the normal practice which Kaschau had been systematically following for a long time. Kaschau was the most highly developed trading metropolis in Hungary. As such it had gained customs exemptions in its own province as far as Tisa and Bereg in 1319, in Russia, Poland and Prussia before 1344, on the route to Wroclav and into the Bohemian countries in 1364, the same exemptions as Cracow in both Poland and Russia in 1371 and again in 1380 on the 'Tartar Way', in 1388 customs exemptions on the route to Vienna and Austria, in 1390 in Pomerania etc. From time to time Kaschau managed to get either partial or even complete exemption from the border tax, *Tricesima*. Even in the reign of the

---

established — W. v. STROMER quotes this part but instead of mentioning the case he talks of a "successful economic war against Poland 1405-6" (*op. cit.*, p. 257).

<sup>137</sup> *Acta iudiciaria civ.* Cass (= 20), Nr. 2931 / to Ulrich: Nr. 1168, 1170, 1395, 1833, 2342, 2843, 2931; Nr. 4513 / to Marcus: 42, 226, 277, 389, 753, 932.

<sup>138</sup> Dipl. Sigismundi 11/2, Nr. 8124-8126; *Monumenta medii aevi historica res gestas Poloniae illustranti*, t. XII, Nr. 37, 38.

<sup>139</sup> = 127, 130. Cf. STROMER, W., *op. cit.*, p. 257: had more of an admonishing and reproving tone because of Onofrius' omissions up until then.

Anjous, Kaschau had the right to send its own agents to all the markets, customs places and Hungarian routes to check whether its general staple right (1361) was being observed. It was in all probability in 1290 that the currency exchange duties and the deductions for the exchange were waived, and this exemption was then extended in 1324 to all strangers who moved to Košice because of the trade or because of their contracts.<sup>140</sup> In such a system of waived obligations which Kaschau had been enjoying since before 1411 the fustian makers were only exceptional in the fact that the sovereign confined himself to addressing them alone.

Quite probably, however, those privileges which were addressed generally to the 'cives et hospites' of Kaschau did not apply in practice to every single person in Kaschau. The councillors circumscribed their practical applicability through the statutes so that, in effect, all the documents safeguarded the monopoly position of the town's 'Reichskromer' (merchants) and cloth dealers. The "poor little retailers" and craftsmen came under the jurisdiction of both the monopoly guilds. Only by staging a rebellion, for instance, did the ordinary tailors succeed in pushing through certain concessions in 1461, which were made at the expense of the two monopolising, commercial guilds, in the sphere of purchase from foreigners.<sup>141</sup> The councillors' interest in the monopoly documents evidences without any doubt the fact that even the fustian makers' exemptions profited above all the long-distance traders.

"Quot mercatores tot proditores" did not only apply to politics and war but also to technical novelties. The profit motive made sure that the traders always kept their eyes open. The interest of the East Slovakian towns at that time for Prussia, Pomerania, Hamburg, Lübeck, England, Flanders, Livonia, Novgorod, for Vienna, Salzburg, Ulm, Nürnberg, for Venice and Florence and especially for the Balkans, Greece, Moldau, Russia, the Armenians and Saracens<sup>142</sup> does not merely represent the then radius of the exchange of goods but also represents the acquisition of experience and an international frame of reference. The competence of the 'Hungarian' commercial houses, i.e. in a given direction at that time, particularly those in Kaschau and Leutschau (Levoča) was known and exploited by the Prussian towns, for instance, who sent their young merchants there to learn the ropes.<sup>143</sup>

The plans to secure the prime position in the textile and raw materials trade by monopolising and concentrating everything which was related to the then fashionable fustian; to exploit the monopoly to effect a totally controlled net-

<sup>140</sup> HALAGA, O.R.: *Evolution of right...*, *op. cit.*, (= 29), p. 16, 40, 44, 58-59; *Košice-Balt.* I (= 8), pp. 85, 101, 137/8, 140, 145 f.

<sup>141</sup> *Ibid.*, I, pp. 251-253.

<sup>142</sup> The summary from the source editions *Košice-Balt.* II and *Acta iudiciaria*, cf. *Košice-Balt.* I, *passim*.

<sup>143</sup> *Ibid.*, I, pp. 159, 290; HIRSCH, T.: *History of Danzig's Trade and Craft.* Leipzig 1858, p. 188.

work of all trade throughout the kingdom and to overcome the unwillingness of the customs officials by giving themselves new powers of control — all this suited Kaschau's long-distance traders and councillors admirably, in fact, and the initiative came from them. Their specialist experience gained from the business of supply and distribution, from production and trade, was sufficient to convince the sovereign who depended on their money of the sort of prospects and gains which could be expected from having all the fustian production concentrated in Košice.<sup>144</sup> Sigismund's political plans may even have contributed to his co-operation. He was, in fact, concerned with blockading the Venetian Republic both militarily and economically and cutting it off from the European hinterland. He also wanted to put an end to its role as mediator in the trade with the Levant by building direct links with the Middle East and by supporting the production of substitute goods in his own lands. These general, political intentions of Sigismund's, which the representatives of the Upper German trade chapters demonstrably shared, could be readily directed by the Kaschau patriariate to create a fustian monopoly which resulted in their gaining exclusive rights. As far as excluding Venice was concerned, the Kaschau patriariate knew how to shut out all foreign competition from Hungary, including that from the Upper German, at least in legal terms. Thus it holds true: *Fecit cui profuit*.

---

<sup>144</sup> Compare the narratio in the documents: 1411 to the benefit of our land and people: 1419 sana et matura deliberacione prehabita... regnique et regnicolarum nostrorum honoris commoditatis et lucri augmentum (Schv 18054); cupientes bonum nostrum, regnique nostri commodum et presertim civitatis nostre Cassoviensis lucrum, profectum et utilitatem desiderantes augere... in augmentum et acrescenciam ac continuacionem dicte artis barhanice (Schv 18055); 1419 and 1429: sana et matura deliberacione prehabita pro nostre celsitudinis ac regni et regnicolarum nostrorum honore, commoditate et lucri augmento, signanter civitatis nostre Cassoviensis, quam racionalibus ex causis animum regium ad id moventibus (Schv 18056 and 18066).

