

HISTORICKÝ ČASOPIS

Historical Journal

An academic journal on the history of Slovakia and Central Europe
ISSN 0018-2575

Volume 65 * 2017 * Number 5



HISTORICKÝ ÚSTAV
SLOVENSKEJ AKADEMIE VIED

CONTENTS

Articles

Vörös, László: The social function of historical knowledge and scholarly history writing in the 21 st century	785
Šuch, Juraj: The constructivist understanding of history and its ethical dimension	799
Hudáček, Pavol: <i>Silva Bereg</i> . A Royal Forest in Medieval Hungary	809
Kušniráková, Ingrid: Social and health care in the Kingdom of Hungary in the first half of the 19 th century	849
Boissérie, Étienne: «La situation n'est pas encore critique... » Les problèmes de contrôle de la Slovaquie dans la correspondance Markovič – Beneš – Šrobár (février – mai 1919)	879
Michálek, Slavomír: The Tripartite Commission and the Czechoslovak monetary gold	895

Reviews

Hlaváčková, Miriam (ed.): From symbol to word. Forms of medieval communication (Marek Druga)	931
Duchoňová, Diana – Lengyelová, Tünde: Castle Kitchens and the Eating Habits of Aristocrats in early modern Times. The Joy of Festivals, The Sorrows of Everyday Lives (Michal Bada)	935
Kováč, Dušan – Kowalská, Eva – Šoltés, Peter et al.: Society in Slovakia in the long 19 th century (László Vörös)	939
Londák, Miroslav – Michálek, Slavomír – Weiss, Peter et al.: Slovakia: A European Story (Jakub Drábik)	947

ARTICLES

THE SOCIAL FUNCTION OF HISTORICAL KNOWLEDGE AND SCHOLARLY HISTORY WRITING IN THE 21ST CENTURY

LÁSZLÓ VÖRÖS

VÖRÖS, László. The social function of historical knowledge and scholarly history writing in the 21st century. *Historický časopis*, 2017, 65, 5, pp. 785-797, Bratislava. In the 21st century historiography remains epistemologically diverse like no other discipline in the social sciences and humanities. Theoretically uninformed, often nationalist, and objectivist (reconstructionist) narrative historians coexist with constructionist and deconstructionist historians who work with social theories and conduct critical analyses within the same institutional frames of regional or national historiographies. In spite of decades of intense plausible criticism – at least in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe – the national/nationalist history writing based on rather naïve objectivist epistemology remains influential and forms an important, if not dominant, part of respective national historiographies. The present paper suggests that there are several factors of the lasting reproduction and even thriving of the obsolete epistemological positions that traditional, narrative national/nationalist historiographies are based on. These might be categorized as cognitive, social, and institutional in their nature. The paper analyses particularly the social purpose of the knowledge about the past and the social functions of institutionalized professional history writing. National histories play an important part in the politics of memory and identity; they provide a historical dimension to the ideal (imagined) national community, they also serve as legitimizing or delegitimizing narratives – these functionalities require a strongly objectivist (naïve) epistemology. In fact, the epistemological points of departure of the traditional narrative national/nationalist historians are very similar to the intuitive “pre-cognitive” theories of the past shared by most ordinary people. Both are based on the idea that the past can be narrated in the form of one true story. The paper comes to the conclusion that historiographies – at least in the Central and Eastern European countries – are formatively influenced by social determinants coming from outside the discipline to a much larger extent that most historians are ready to admit. Key words: Social function of history. Historiography. Abuse of history. Legitimization through history. Epistemology of historiography.

The study of the social function of history and historiography is not new and neither is it simple.¹ It is not simple since it poses some serious theoretical and methodological

1 This article is a slightly developed version of the presentation that was given at the 15th congress of the Slovak Historical Society held on May 11-13 2016 in Skalica, Slovakia. Footnotes and references were

challenges. In particular, it is important to distinguish between the declared ideal aims, intentions and conceptions of historians and the actual practice of history writing and its social impact. It is also necessary to distinguish whether we are speaking of universal cognitive or psychological modality, meaning a subjective need for temporal anchoring of the individual's self-image, or about an institutionalized activity, which is part of the processes of secondary socialization of the individual. In my presentation I will briefly outline some of the reasons why professional history writing is epistemologically torn apart to such an unparalleled degree. There are widely divergent views within our discipline about theoretical and methodological issues concerning the very foundations of historiography as a field of scholarship. There is no general consensus on such elementary questions as *how* and *for what reasons* the past should be studied. What is most surprising, within the mainstream of national historiographies worldwide, an obsolete way of researching and representing history prevails, in spite of the fact that it has been widely criticised and plausibly falsified on many grounds for at least half a century now. I will argue that one of the reasons of this peculiar state of matters is that those obsolete forms of research and history writing fulfil important social functions. At this point, however, I would like to state that what I will present on the next few pages merely touches upon a few particular aspects of an otherwise much larger phenomenon.

During the period of the professionalization of historiography in the last 150–200 years, there have been developments not only in the epistemic points of departure and declared ideals and aims of historical research, but also the audience for which historians wrote their works changed dramatically. In the 19th century, and depending on the specific period and regime also in part of the 20th century, historians wrote primarily for the educated middle class people, who were interested in public affairs and were regarded as the “core” of the “nation”. The institutionalized mainstream national historiographies most often addressed their readers through the language of the educated middle class. The form of representation was almost exclusively narrative, the logic of the explanation the historians applied was the logic of the nationalizing and nationalist middle class and the value judgements proposed by historians were based mostly on the values of that same middle class.

In the second half of the 20th century and increasingly to the present times, historians began to write primarily for historians; and many historians started to research problems and ask questions that are too complex, or seemingly too trivial and uninteresting to the lay public. The historiographic practice dramatically diversified so that various orientations and schools have existed and functioned side by side, a situation that continues today. Some currents are consistently critical and analytic, conforming to the highest standards of scholarship, while other are openly naive with approaches to research that do not meet the currently prevailing scholarly standards. Between these two extreme positions, both of which have a definitely minority place in the discipline today, a multitude of intermediate approaches occur.

However, despite these developments the social purpose of knowledge of the past has not changed in its basic function. Philosophers of history and historians of historiography only recently began to study in greater detail the dialectic nature of the communication

added only to a limited extent.

of professional historians with the public. Historians participate in public commemoration events, are often called by the media as experts at the anniversaries of historical events, great deeds of great men, or the birth/death of historical actors important to a national community, social movement or political party. In such situations historians often “just” play the game orchestrated by the moderator (a publicist, journalist, presenter etc.). Events like these often follow a script, and different kinds of occasion (birth or death anniversary of a person, anniversary of a founding act, anniversary of beginning or ending date of an event and so on) have their different canons of commemoration, that to a certain extent regulate what questions may be asked from historians and what kind of answers should be given by historians. In such situations historians serve a particular social purpose. I will return to this point later. Now it is important to ask how does this purpose, or more particularly, this kind of situation, influence the impartiality, sense of proportion and tendency not to generalize of the historian, and the quality of communicated knowledge? We know that social and political (ideological) influence on historiography exists. A multitude of critical studies of cases, where the public, political or cultural discourse has a strongly formative influence on historical discourse, are already available, and I am not speaking only of outrightly ideological historiographies in non-democratic regimes.

This is not only a trivial theme of research for philosophers, but an important epistemological and ethical problem, and especially concerning historiography out of all disciplines of the humanities and science in general. Physicists, chemists or biologists too communicate with the lay public, but in their case there is no risk that their scientific practice, conceptual apparatus, and methods will be contaminated by naive concepts and thought constructions. For example, it is very unlikely that the theory of evolution would be replaced by some sort of creationism. Perhaps it is not the best comparison, since if such a radical and non-scientific turn occurred in the theoretical foundations of biology, we would have to speak about a significant regression. However, in the case of historiography, despite the long term gradual and progressive sophistication the influence of the non-scholarly sphere remains large.

Naturally, there are various views on the public or social engagement of historians. There are also different views on the purpose of historical knowledge and so on the mission of historians. Views vary between two absolute positions, namely that if historiography should remain a scholarly discipline it must be directed exclusively by the logic of its research practice and guided by an uncorrupted desire to learn about the human nature through studying the past human related phenomena. On the opposite pole is the view that historiography should be a socially engaged discipline, which should actively react to “public demands”. Its activity should be primarily determined by the “needs of society” – whatever that should mean. Between these two poles we find a wide range of intermediate positions, differing in various ways, but most frequently emphasizing one or the other aspect of this complex question. Apparently the majority of historians do not consider this to be an important issue and relegate it to the realm of philosophy or at best the theory of history, which, however, is usually considered as having little practical relevance for the practice of scholarly research and history writing. Understandably there is no single normative answer to the question of whether historians have to publicly engage

and react to themes or questions, which can be described as “questions of public interest” from one or other ideological position, and if they should, then how and to what degree?

Historiography developed in the 19th century as a nationalist discipline, which had the primary aim of providing knowledge about the past of the “nation” as the primary referential group of human societies. A vast amount of literature already exists that analyses how historiographies served various societal purposes in the last two centuries. Historians often helped to legitimize regimes or world views; they functioned as ideological producers of knowledge about the past. Narratives about national history took over the function of myths of ancestry and heroism, with the primary aim of creating group solidarity remaining unchanged. In other words, historiography created stories that provided a framework for identification with an ideal community: a nation or ethnic group, religion, denomination or other referential social entity. This is clearly far from being the only function fulfilled by knowledge about the past. As we will soon see, history also functions as a source of self-identification, legitimization, inspiration, tradition and also can serve as a source of critical knowledge about humans as social beings. In other words, history was and is written for various social purposes. It remains an open question what should be regarded as scholarly history and, what social purpose can historiography fulfil without ceasing to be a scholarly discipline?

The criticisms of traditional narrative national historiography² from the last half century are relevant to such a degree that they can be resisted only by ignorance. As long

-
- 2 WHITE, Hayden. *Metahistory. The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Baltimore; London : The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973, ISBN 0801814693; PAUL, Herman. *The Historical Imagination*. Cambridge : Polity Press, 2011, ISBN 9780745650135; ANKERSMIT, Frank. *History and Tropology : The Rise and Fall of Metaphor*. Berkeley : University of California Press, 1994, ISBN 0520080459; ANKERSMIT, Frank. *Meaning, Truth, and Reference in Historical Representation*. Ithaca : Cornell University Press, 2012, ISBN 0801450713; ANKERSMIT, Frank. *Language and Historical Experience*. Bielefeld : ZfF, 1995; JENKINS, Keith. *Re-thinking History*. London; New York : Routledge, 1991, ISBN 0415304431; JENKINS, Keith. *On “What is History?”: From Carr and Elton to Rorty and White*. London; New York : Routledge, 1995, ISBN 0415097258; JENKINS, Keith. *Why History? Ethics and Postmodernity*. London; New York : Routledge, 1999, ISBN 0415164168; MUNSLOW, Alun. *Deconstructing History*. 2nd Ed. London; New York : Routledge, 2006, ISBN 9780415391443; MUNSLOW, Alun. *The Routledge Companion to Historical Studies*. Second Edition. London; New York : Routledge, 2006, ISBN 9780415385770; MUNSLOW, Alun. *The New History*. London : Pearson Longman, 2003, ISBN 0582472822; JENKINS, Keith – MUNSLOW, Alun (Eds.). *The Nature of History Reader*. London; New York : Routledge, 2004, ISBN 0415240549; ZELENÁK, Eugen. *Konštruktivizmus a pluralita v histórii*. (Constructivism and plurality in history.). Ružomberok : Verbum, 2011, p. 35-51, ISBN 9788080847746; ZELENÁK, Eugen. *Úvod do kritickej filozofie histórie I. Vybraní autori od druhej polovice 20. storočia po súčasnosť*. (Introduction to the critical philosophy of history I. Selected authors from the second half of the 20th century to the present.). Ružomberok : Verbum, 2015, ISBN 9788056103104 (the work is accessible on-line: <http://www.forumhistoriae.sk/web/guest/-/uvod-do-kritickej-filozofie-historie-i-vybrani-autori-od-druhej-polovice-20-storocia-po-sucasnost>); KOŽIAK, Rastislav – ŠUCH, Juraj – ZELENÁK, Eugen (Eds.). *Kapitoly zo súčasnej filozofie dejín*. (Chapters from the recent philosophy of history.). Bratislava : Chronos, 2009, p. 64-228, ISBN 9788089027286; HORSKÝ, Jan. *Dějepisectví mezi vědou a vyprávěním. Úvahy o povaze, postupech a mezích historické vědy*. (Historiography between science and narrative.). Praha : Argo, 2009, ISBN 9788025701249; ŠUCH, Juraj. *Naratívny konštruktivizmus Haydena Whitea a Franka Ankersmita*. (The narrative constructivism of Hayden White and Frank Ankersmit.). Ostrava : Universitas Ostraviensis, 2010, ISBN 9788073689353; JANČOVIČ, Ivan. *Fikcia a historický naratív*. (Fiction and historical narrative.). In ŠUCH, Juraj (Ed.). *K otázkam metodológie vied (spoločenských a prírodných)*. Banská Bystrica : Matej Bel University in Banská Bys-

as historical knowledge of the past is constructed and communicated exclusively in the form of a narrative, as long as historians uncritically apply the categories and naïve theories of everyday social practice in their explanations, the resulting histories will not meet the basic standards of scholarly knowledge as they are understood today. The narrative as the form and ordinary language as the means of communication represent constituents with meaning-forming effects over which the historians cannot have sufficient control. According to Hayden White, one of the most widely read philosophers of history of the last half century, the construction of a narrative, method of argumentation and value anchoring of the story depends on tropological prefiguration, which is a result of a pre-critical, unconscious act of the historian's mind. A story, whether fictional or based on facts about real events, always has the same characteristics and is subject to the same rules of construction. According to White every history regardless of how consistently it is based on primary sources, will have the character of a romance, tragedy, comedy or satire if it has the form of a narrative. The argumentation contained in every historical narrative will have either a formist, mechanistic, organicist or contextualist character, and every history account will explicitly or implicitly depart from a specific ideology of anarchist, conservative, radical or liberal type.³ A historian or an author of any narrative has all these "parameters" under control only to a limited extent. Tropological prefiguration can be metaphorical, metonymic, synecdochic or ironic. According to these, four different (ideal) kinds of figurative language can be identified. These structure and convey meaning at a deeper level and according to White determine all the other above mentioned parameters of the narratives written by historians.⁴ Therefore, it is not surprising that, for example, the story of the dissolution of the Kingdom of Hungary and founding of Czechoslovakia in 1918/1919 as written by Slovak narrative historians most frequently has the form of a romance or less frequently of a comedy, while narratives by Hungarian historians on the break up of the Kingdom of Hungary (in 1918/1919) and its consequences have the character of tragedy, or rather exceptionally of satire.

The ordinary language used by people in everyday social interactions and by the traditional narrative historians to construct their accounts of history is a source of further difficulties. To put it more precisely, the problem is not language as a whole, but some naïve concepts and categories, especially those concerning the social world and life. When they do so to say "contaminate" the scholarly discourse they represent an epistemological problem. The social categories and concepts of the everyday discourses are often reifying, essentialist, stereotyping, generalizing and prone to group entitativism, to name only some of the problematic aspects. In other words, some concepts of the ordinary language are often erroneous from an epistemological point of view because they assign an incorrect ontic status to the social entities they represent.⁵ Such epistemologically in-

trica, 2011, p. 59-76, ISBN 9788055703114; JANČOVIČ, Ivan. K problematike narativy a referencie historiografii a v umeleckej literatúre. (On the problem of narration and reference in historiography and art literature.). In *Historický časopis*, 2010, vol. 58, no. 4, p. 621-632, ISSN 0018-2575.

3 WHITE ref. 2, p. 7-29; ZELENÁK 2011, ref. 2, p. 40-42; ŠUCH ref. 2.

4 WHITE ref. 2, p. 31-38; ZELENÁK 2011, ref. 2, p. 43-46; ŠUCH ref. 2.

5 For a more detailed account of these issues see VÖRÖS, László. *Analytická historiografia versus národné dejiny. „Národ“ ako sociálna reprezentácia*. (Analytical historiography versus national history. The "nation" as social representation.). Pisa : Edizioni Plus, Pisa University Press, 2010, ISBN 9788884927415;

correct concepts with a significant presence in everyday discourses include, for example: *nation*, *nationality*, *race*, (social) *group* or in the period of the last three or four decades also *identity*.⁶

The means and form of historical representation, namely language and narrative, represent only two of the several epistemological/ontological questions to which a historian must pay proper attention and take adequate methodological measures to remain on scholarly grounds of constructing non-fallacious knowledge about the past. This is not just a matter of theoretical speculation, but of significant epistemological problems, that are considered in other disciplines of the humanities and social sciences very seriously. Within the research practice of sociology, social and cultural anthropology, social psychology, and literary science to mention just a few branches of scholarship devoted to the study of human phenomena, conscious critical reflection of the researcher's subjectivity, identifying of bias stemming from naïve preconceptions, deconstruction of fallacious "common sense" concepts and construction of a clear analytical conceptual apparatus, belong to the basic methodological-theoretical corpus. If historians adopt these methodological measures it is usually due to the personal determination of individual researchers and not the result of systematic training. The theoretical-methodological corpus of historiography, as it is lectured at the majority of universities, at least in the region of Central-Eastern Europe is still very one-sidedly oriented towards the traditional research practices, such as heuristics and source criticism, that pays little or no attention to the very persona of the historian, the language and the form through which and in which the history is represented.

When I speak of scholarly historiography, I have in mind a research attitude that is consciously reflective on the above mentioned epistemic issues. Scholarly history writing takes into consideration findings in the fields of the philosophy of knowledge and history, theoretical and methodological studies in related disciplines of the social sciences and humanities. From this point of view, the traditional narrative history cannot be regarded as genuine scholarly knowledge anymore. In spite of this, narrative history remains the mainstream form of professional history writing not only in Central and Eastern Europe, but, I dare to say, globally, wherever the institutionalized traditional European model of historiography exists and functions. It is an interesting phenomenon, not found to such a degree in other disciplines of the humanities and social sciences, that historiographical

VÖRÖS, László. Ako existujú sociálne entity? Metodologické poznámky k žánru národných dejín (19. a 20. storočie). (How do social entities exist? Methodological notes on the genre of national history (19th and 20th centuries).). In KOVÁČ, Dušan et al. *Sondy do slovenských dejín v dlhom 19. storočí*. Bratislava : Historický ústav SAV, 2013, p. 12-29, ISBN 9788097154011 (the work is accessible on the internet: <http://www.forumhistoriae.sk/web/guest/-/sondy-do-slovenskych-dejin-v-dlhom-19-storoci>); VÖRÖS, László. Vlastenectvo aj šovinizmus, alebo len nacionalizmus? Terminologické a definičné problémy skúmania nacionalizmov a historická komparácia. (Patriotism and also chauvinism, or only nationalism? Problems of terminology and definition in research on nationalism and historical comparison.). In KOVÁČ, Dušan et al. *Slovenské dejiny v dejinách Európy. Vybrané kapitoly*. Bratislava : VEDA, 2015, p. 336-371, ISBN 9788022414487; see references to further literature in these works.

6 BRUBAKER, Rogers – COOPER, Frederic. Beyond "Identity". In BRUBAKER, Rogers. *Ethnicity without Groups*. Cambridge; London : Harvard University Press, 2004, p. 28-63. ISBN 0-674-01539-8; GLEASON, Philip. Identifying Identity: A Semantic History. In *The Journal of American History*, 1983, vol. 69, no. 4, p. 910-931. ISSN 0021-8723.

schools and movements that strive for scholarly rigour in the above defined terms constantly remain minority genres within the general framework of the discipline.

It is general rule in the world of science and scholarship that new approaches, methods or theories that prove themselves valid, gradually become part of the methodological and empirical corpus of the given discipline as long as they are not falsified. In other words, the new methods and theories validated by empirical research after a certain time advance from an avant-garde position to become integrated into the mainstream methodological corpus of the discipline. It is an on-going progressive process, dynamics of which may depend on several factors. However, in the case of historiography it seems that this progress is extremely slow. Within historiographies globally, such recognized and much cited schools and approaches as the *Begriffsgeschichte*, the Cambridge School of intellectual history and the history of political thought, the *Annales*, the *Gesellschaftsgeschichte*, varieties of historical anthropology and the history of culture, Microhistory and *Alltagsgeschichte* and so on, have remained with their approaches, methods and theories in the position of permanent avant-garde. Some of these schools have 40, 60 or 80 years of progressive development behind them, nevertheless they continue to occupy the position of expert elite fields with little appeal to the mainstream historiography. Why have their methods, theories and knowledge not yet become part of mainstream history writing?

It is an interesting phenomenon accompanied by several paradoxes. The schools and approaches mentioned above partly owe their origin and development to the dissatisfaction of their founders and proponents with the traditional narrative historiography. However, with the exception of a few exceptional leading personalities, they are little known or entirely unknown to the general public. The traditional public image of historiography as a field of scholarship created on the basis of the traditional narrative national (nationalist) historiographies from the 19th and 20th centuries mostly persists to this day. In the view of the public the historian is the scholar who tells a true story about “how it really was”, what really happened with “our” ancestors, “our” national heroes, “our” battles and striving for freedom, independence, and better tomorrows – whatever that may mean.

An interesting feature of this state of affairs arises when we look at the ideal image of a “scientist” from other disciplines. Probably not many people still see biologists as men running around fields with butterfly nets or crossbreeding peas in a laboratory that is actually a garden. The public is well aware of the high degree of sophistication of biology and the existence of specializations and sub-divisions such as microbiology, molecular biology, and genetics. Understandably, the conceptual apparatus of the biologists and the manner of explaining “biology” to the lay public have also changed throughout the past century. I think that it is not necessary to mention further examples from the fields of physics or chemistry. However, a similar argument also applies for instance to sociology. The general perception of sociology and sociologists today no longer departs from the picture of Comtean or Spencerian sociologists from the end of the 19th century.

When researching the causes of this situation, it is possible to come to various different explanations depending on which factors and determinants one wishes to emphasize. However, in principle, the explanation may be of a cognitive, institutional and functional

character. The situation when the leading historical schools and their approaches continually remain within the discipline in a position of an elite avant-garde, and are almost entirely unknown to the public – while traditional narrative (national) historiography not only survives but reproduces itself and morphs into more “scholarly-looking” yet still pseudo-scholarly forms in spite of decades of very relevant criticism – is undoubtedly partly the consequence of the outdated system of history schooling, the training of professional historians, the personnel policies of research institutions, evaluation of the quality of scientific activity, inadequate financing, political pressures and so on. Institutional factors are the simplest to identify and study. But behind them there are the underlying cognitive, psychological and socio-psychological factors. With this I return to the introductory section and the main theme of this presentation, namely the social purpose of *history* (that is, the knowledge of certain aspects of past events), and *historiography* (that is the organized, systematic construction of *history*).

As I mentioned in the introduction, when researching the social function of collective memory and remembering, it is necessary to distinguish between individual cognitive capacity and the need of human beings to create a temporal perspective of their own physical existence in the social and natural environment, meaning the perception of the self as a continually existing integral being “I”, and the institutionalized level of the creation and manipulation of the content of memory. Although I think it is impossible to consistently research one without examining the other; it is important to avoid confusing these levels or inadequately mixing them into one phenomenal whole. There is a large quantity of literature concerned with the social function of historiography.⁷ Various authors have worked out different classifications, which I have condensed into three points. The following typology will not be primarily concerned with the function of expert history works written by expert historians exclusively for expert historians. The following typology will deal with the function of historical knowledge in social contexts – beginning with the role of history in the processes of primary and secondary socialization, through ritualized collective acts and ending with the individual “consumption” of history.⁸

-
- 7 HOBSBAWM, Eric J. The Social Function of the Past: Some Questions. In *Past and Present*, 1972, no. 55, p. 3-17, ISSN 0031-2746; MOMMSEN, Wolfgang J. Social Conditioning and Social Relevance of Historical Judgments. In *History and Theory*, 1978, vol. 17, no. 4, p. 19-35, ISSN 1468-2303; SCHIEDER, Theodor. The Role of Historical Consciousness in Political Action. In *History and Theory*, 1978, vol. 17, no. 4, p. 1-18, ISSN 1468-2303; FABER, Karl-Georg. The Use of History in Political Debate. In *History and Theory*, 1978, vol. 17, no. 4, p. 36-67, ISSN 1468-2303; FINLEY, Moses I. *The Use and Abuse of History. From the Myths of the Greeks to Lévi-Strauss, the Past Alive and the Present Illumined*. New York : Penguin Books, 1990, ISBN 0140134433; FLORESCANO, Enrique. The Social Function of History. In *Diogenes*, 1994, vol. 42, no. 168, p. 41-49, ISSN 1467-7695; TOSH, John. The Uses of History. In TOSH, John. *The Pursuit of History. Aims, Methods and New Directions in the Study of Modern History*. 5th ed. New York : Longman/Pearson, 2010, p. 29-57, ISBN 9780582894129; MOSES, A. Dirk. Hayden White, Traumatic Nationalism, and the Public Role of History. In *History and Theory*, 2005, vol. 44, no. 3, p. 311-332, ISSN 1468-2303; LLOYD, G. E. R. History. In LLOYD, G. E. R. *Disciplines in the Making. Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Elites, Learning, and Innovation*. Oxford; New York : Oxford University Press, 2009, p. 58-75, ISBN 9780199567874.
- 8 The following typology does not claim to be complete. Other functions could be defined, such as history as a form of entertainment or the phenomenon described in expert literature as “public history”, but I omit these for reasons of limited space available and because it is not necessary to introduce here an exhaustive classification to support the main ideas of this presentation.

The classical phrase: *Historia magistra vitae est*, excellently designates the first point of the general typology of the social function of history. Under this function historical knowledge serves primarily as a source of learning concerning social, political, power, economic, cultural and other phenomena for the needs of the present. Machiavelli's *The Prince* can be mentioned as a prototypical example. Niccolò Machiavelli analysed past events and the actions of monarchs, generals or politicians to provide examples to support his ideas on the functioning of power and government. Historical examples served him first of all as a source of practical lessons and as illustrations to support the techniques and methods he proposed for the seizing, retaining and increasing of power over land and people. Understandably, any pragmatic approach to researching phenomena and the actions of people in the past fall under this function. Some branches of military, economic, legal, social, demographic and other fields of historical research are explicitly directed towards obtaining specific information for the purpose of understanding a particular phenomenon in the present or to achieve better results in the tasks of the present. For example, detailed research on various aspects of military campaigns, battles and strategies is an important part of the preparation of officer cadres for armed forces. Future commanders of military operations are expected to learn literally from the mistakes of their forerunners or be inspired by their successful strategies and campaigns.⁹ Similarly, some, if not most of the studies of great economic crises in the past are at least partially motivated by the aim of learning more about current and future crises.¹⁰ Similarly, many studies devoted to the undemocratic regimes of the 20th (and 21st) centuries, wars, genocides, discrimination policies, nationalism, racism and so on are partly motivated by the desire to understand those phenomena in order to prevent their repetition.

The *legitimizing function of history* is clearly the most researched aspect of the action of historiography in various countries and regimes of the 19th and 20th centuries.¹¹ When this function of knowledge of the past is mentioned, the majority of historians and lay people think mainly of the historiographies of undemocratic regimes. However, the works of H. White and other philosophers of history cited above encouraged research on ideological influences on historiography, and, at the same time, on the ideological effect of history on the interpretations and argumentations in political and public discourses. Apart from the explicit legitimization of a political regime, economic system, discrimination against or even elimination of ethnic or other categorically defined groups, political,

9 MURRAY, Williamson – SINNREICH, Richard Hart. *The Past as Prologue. The Importance of History to the Military Profession*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2006, ISBN 9780511219924.

10 The bursting of the great mortgage bubble in the USA (2008) and the subsequent global economic crisis led to a greatly increased number of historical texts or texts using historical data devoted to the given phenomenon in various periods of the 19th and 20th centuries. Perhaps the most attention was attracted by the work of the French author Thomas PIKETTY. *Capital in the 21st Century*. Cambridge Massachusetts : The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2014, ISBN 9788055142487. Piketty is an economist, but he has done extensive work on historical series data and the works of economic historians.

11 For the Slovak context see for instance HUDEK, Adam. *Najpolitickejšia veda. Slovenská historiografia v rokoch 1948 – 1968*. (The most political science. Slovak historiography in the period 1948–1968.). Bratislava : Historický ústav SAV, 2010, ISBN 9788097030230 (the work is accessible online: <http://www.forumhistoriae.sk/web/guest/-/najpolitickejsia-veda-slovenska-historiografia-v-rokoch-1948-1968>), where references to further literature can be found.

social and economic reforms, traditions and so on, it is also possible to investigate the implicit legitimization of stereotypic constructions, social categories and naive theories about the phenomena of social life, or the meaning and significance of history for the national or other collective social entity. The actual legitimizing happens in various forms: for example, referring to social categories as if they were denoting “God-given” natural kinds and entities, justification of phenomena, events, decisions and their consequences as “lesser evils”, “historical inevitabilities” or “natural developments”. Every argumentation of this type inevitably has to start from particular ideological premises that provide a normative framework of what is good and what is evil, what is correct and what erroneous, what is natural and what artificial, what is justifiable and what unacceptable.

The *anchoring* or “identity-shaping” function of historical knowledge is closely connected with the legitimizing function. The majority of people, including historians identify with history narratives about their essential reference groups, be that a nation, social class, religious or other social group or category. Under anchoring and identification, I have in mind the acceptance of great history narratives from an *in-group* point of view, namely appropriation, for example, of the story of the “nation” as a personal story. This is just one of the many mechanisms of social identification. At the same time, some social-psychological research indicates that the quantity and detail of the information known to the individual is not important. The key factor is awareness of the existence of the history of the reference group, mastery of the detail is not essential for the successful functioning of self-identification with the group.¹²

It is clear that the second and third functions of knowledge of the past are much more present in social practice and have a relatively greater social impact than the first function, designated *Historia magistra vitae est*. The belief that history represents one of the basic foundations for the existence of social and institutional forms of human organization is one of the almost universally shared dogmas of modernity. The existence of “nations” and similar social entities that, as is generally believed bring about elementary social cohesion, is allegedly unthinkable without something usually called “shared history” or perhaps more exactly historical tradition. And in turn, the long-term existence of social institutions and organizations is unthinkable without social cohesion. It is worth remembering that these beliefs are probably as old as the myths; nevertheless they re-emerged in much sophisticated forms during the period of the Enlightenment and underwent further theoretical development in the course of the 19th century. These conceptions of the need for a historical dimension still have a strong influence today. They unambiguously condition at least the institutionalized processes of secondary socialization, especially the teaching of history, politics of memory and commemoration rituals.

It is also clear that the *legitimizing* and *anchoring* functions are fulfilled especially effectively by the traditional narrative national history writing. In the course of the 19th century, historiography was established and organized as a scholarly discipline precisely

12 See CONDOR, Susan. “Having History“: A Social Psychological Exploration of Anglo-British Autostereotypes. In BARFOOT, C. C. (Ed.). *Beyond Pug's Tour: National and Ethnic Stereotyping in Theory and Literary Practice*. Amsterdam; Atlanta, GA : Rodopi, 1997, p. 213-253, ISBN 9789042001688; CONDOR, Susan. Pride and Prejudice: Identity Management in English People's Talk about 'This Country'. In *Discourse & Society*, 2000, vol. 11, no. 2, p. 175-205, ISSN 1460-3624.

according to the principles described above. The explicitly formulated goal of the emerging national historiographies of the 19th and 20th centuries was to provide the “nation” with a historical dimension, that is, to construct a narrative history of the “nation” and of “its” state, its institutions and organizations, to write biographies of important men of the nation, to construct historical traditions, which have to appear ancient. In this way, national historiographies contributed and still contribute to confirming and reproducing the reified concept of the nation as an objective historical entity.

The scholarly historiography as defined above cannot really fulfil these particular functions. The schools of critical history writing I have mentioned earlier distance themselves exactly from those properties of the traditional national historiographies, which endow them with the ability to serve the legitimizing and anchoring functions. That is, the narrative form of representation, national (nationalist) frames of interpretation, reifying and essentialist conceptions of social identities and social organization, a myth-like representation of historical actors as hero-like ideal figures, representation of eras, periods or particular events as good times or dark times in the life of a “nation” and so on. Indeed some of the schools mentioned above investigate precisely the origin, development and spread of these fallacious concepts and their functioning as sources of “identity”, legitimacy and self-identification, and thus significantly contribute to their deconstruction.

It is not my aim here to evaluate whether the above mentioned social functions of historical knowledge are inevitable or only the product of certain social constellations, whether they are beneficial or harmful in their effects. It is a complex question that needs to be considered from various viewpoints. My aim is to point to the paradoxical situation in which the public perception of historiography is based on a long outdated form of history writing, and historians are still expected to produce the sort of narratives about the past that are not in congruence with up to date scholarly standards for the humanities and social sciences.

This situation also has an influence on the practice of scholarly history writing, and for this reason, it is a problem that requires attention. Many historians think that these questions do not concern historiography and leave them to the philosophers of history. This usually leads to complete ignorance of the problem, because few historians regard philosophy of history as a partner discipline that has a relevant say in the theory and research practice of their discipline. This is also why historiography is still one of the most epistemologically fragmented disciplines of the humanities and social sciences. When various methodological and theoretical canons exist in the framework of one discipline for some time, it may be part of a process of progressive “fermentation”. However, when opposing and even mutually excluding epistemologies exist alongside each other in the framework of one discipline for a long time, it is usually an expression of crisis. To overcome the crisis, it is necessary to investigate its causes, to understand the factors leading to its long-term persistence. However, such investigation must inevitably be inter-disciplinary.

Historiography in Central and Eastern Europe, but apparently in other parts of the world as well, will probably continue to exist and reproduce itself also in its outdated traditional narrative, nationally and ideologically informed form, because it fulfils

particular social functions. However, at the same time, the clear understanding of this phenomenon is essential for the preservation of historiography as a scholarly discipline.

* The research for this article was supported by the project VEGA 2/0139/13 *Historical memory and the history of Slovakia – processes of instrumentalization and manipulation in the 19th and 20th centuries*. The completion of this article was done within the framework of the project *Methods of historical research on the phenomenon of nationalism (inter-disciplinary inspirations)* supported by the Institute of History of the Slovak Academy of Sciences.

DIE SOZIALE FUNKTION DES GESCHICHTSKENNTNISSES UND WISSENSCHAFTLICHES SCHREIBEN DER GESCHICHTE IM 21. JAHRHUNDERT

LÁSZLÓ VÖRÖS

Keiner der Bereiche der Sozial- und Geisteswissenschaften ist derzeit so epistemologisch gesplittert wie die Historiographie. Im Rahmen einzelner Historiographien – zumindest in den Ländern von Mittel- und Osteuropa – wirken nebeneinander auf einer Seite narrative Historiker, die aus der Rankekonzeption der Geschichte ausgehen, auf der anderen Seite konstruktivistische Historiker, die mit gesellschaftswissenschaftlichen Theorien arbeiten und sich mit den methodologischen Vorgängen aus anderen Disziplinen der Sozial- und Geisteswissenschaften inspirieren. Für Historiker die zur ersten genannten Gruppe gehören bildet den Hauptgegenstand ihres Interesses „die Nation“, welche sie als historische Entität verstehen, die gleichzeitig das Objekt sowie handelndes Subjekt der Geschichte ist. Diese Historiker schreiben die nationale Geschichte und oft kommen in ihren Arbeiten auch nationalistische Argumentationen vor. Die zur zweiten Gruppe gehörenden Historiker betrachten als Hauptgegenstand ihrer wissenschaftlichen Untersuchung soziale Phänomene, und sie fangen ihre Arbeiten oft mit der Kritik nationaler/nationalistischer Interpretationen der Vergangenheit an. Verständlicherweise stellen die so definierten „Typen“ von Historikern nur zwei Randpolen dar, zwischen denen eine Menge übergängiger Varianten des Zugangs zur Vergangenheitsforschung ist. Wie ist es möglich, dass innerhalb einer wissenschaftlichen Disziplin langfristig nebeneinander zwei sich gegenseitig vollkommen ausschließende Untersuchungszugänge existieren können? Wie ist es möglich, dass nationale/nationalistische Geschichtsschreibungen nicht nur überleben, sondern sich auch erfolgreich reproduzieren, obwohl mindestens ein halbes Jahrhundert lang die unerbittliche und begründete Kritik ihrer epistemologischer Zufluchten sowie methodologischer Vorgänge dauert? Es gibt mehrere relevante Antworten auf diese Fragen in Abhängigkeit vom Bereich, wo wir uns entscheiden sie zu suchen. Untersuchen kann man kognitive, sozial-psychologische und soziale sowie institutionelle Faktoren. In diesem Artikel konzentriert sich der Autor nur auf einen konkreten sozial-psychologischen und sozialen Faktor, welcher bedeutend zu der Reproduktion des „Paradigmas“ der nationalen Geschichte beiträgt. Dieser Faktor ist: der soziale Zweck des Wissens über die Vergangenheit (also der Geschichte), womit eng auch die soziale Funktion der Historiographie als institutionalisierter wissenschaftlicher Disziplin zusammenhängt. Die nationale Geschichte, also Narrative, über die Vergangenheit des Volks sowie die nationalen/nationalistischen narrativen Historiker spielen eine wichtige Rolle in der Gedächtnispolitik und der Identitätspolitik.

Die nationale Geschichte bietet eine historische Dimension der „Nation“ als der vorgestellten Gemeinschaft – „die Nation“ wird auch dank dem wirklich und tastbar, dass sie „eine Geschichte hat“. Die nationalen Historiographien können diese ihre „Mission“ auch aus dem Grund erfüllen, dass sie aus der objektivistischen Epistemologie ausgehen, die auf intuitiver Ebene einer Mehrheit der Menschen eigen ist. Die Vorstellungen traditioneller narrativer nationaler/nationalistischer Historiker und einfacher Menschen über die Vergangenheit und Kennbarkeit der Vergangenheit sind sehr ähnlich. So die nationalen Historiker als auch die meisten ihrer Leser denken über die Vergangenheit als über ein vergangenes Geschehen nach, das in Form eines Narrativs repräsentiert werden kann, das ein treues Bild dessen ist, wie die Dinge tatsächlich geschehen sind. Der Autor untersucht im Artikel auch weitere soziale Funktionen, die die Historiographie die historische Wissenschaft in den modernen Gesellschaften erfüllt und er kommt zum Schluss, dass die nationalen Historiographien dank der sozialen Anfrage – obwohl sie laut gegenwärtiger Kriterien des wissenschaftlichen Kennenlernens nicht als wissenschaftlich betrachtet werden können – überleben und sich reproduzieren. Die Historiographie stellt aus dieser Sicht eine Disziplin dar, auf deren Regeln und Funktionieren ihre sozialen Funktionen einen solchen bedeutenden Einfluss haben, dass sie die kompletten Grundsteine ihrer wissenschaftlichen Tätigkeit beeinflussen.

Mgr. László Vörös, Phd.
Institute of History of the SAS
P. O. BOX 198, 814 99 Bratislava, Klemensova 19
e-mail: histvoro@savba.sk

INGRID KUŠNIRÁKOVÁ a kolektív

*„Pre blaho nášho ľudu,
všetkých našich kráľovstiev
a provincií“*

Reformná politika Márie Terézie
a jej pokus o modernizáciu Uhorska



THE CONSTRUCTIVIST UNDERSTANDING OF HISTORY AND ITS ETHICAL DIMENSION

JURAJ ŠUCH

ŠUCH, Juraj. The constructivist understanding of history and its ethical dimension. *Historický časopis*, 2017, 65, 5, pp. 799-808, Bratislava.

The author of the article introduces Hayden White's, Frank Ankersmit's, and Jouni-Matti Kuukkanen's constructivist understanding of history. He contrasts their understandings of history with the traditional understanding, which supposes direct correspondence of historical work to the past. In his presentations of constructivist thought, he points out their emphasis on legitimate possibilities of different methods of construction and ways of presentation, which result in different historical representations of historical events. Differences among historical representations of the past can also be related to the historian's choice of different constructive methods and also the involvement of his/her preferred moral and political values. These constructivist understandings of history, with the deeper analysis of process writing, incite the historian to deeper ethical self awareness of his/her work.

Key words: Constructivism. Plurality. Values. Historical work. Past.

We also encounter polemics and discussions of the character of historical work and historical knowledge after the process of formation of history as a scientific discipline in the 19th century. The source of these polemics is the contrast between the continual creation of different historical ideas of the past and the one unrepeatable and "inaccessible" past. The search for a satisfying explanation of the constant plurality of depictions of the past is one of the main stimuli for deeper consideration of the nature of the work of the historian and its results. In connection with the views on the plurality of historical approaches to the past and the various reflections on the nature of history, we should distinguish two view currents: the *realistic* or traditional and the *constructivist*. In our paper, we mainly use the example of selected constructivist conceptions from writers using English (Hayden White, Frank Ankersmit and Jouni-Matti Kuukkanen), and point to the ways they considered the ethical aspects of the creative work of historians.

The traditional understanding of history

The constructivist understanding of history developed from criticism of the realistic or traditional understanding of history. The *traditional understanding of history* starts from Ranke's well known statement that historians should write history "as it really was". Conceptions representing the traditional understanding of history are dominated by the conviction of the exclusive importance of a particular transforming principle or selected principles, which should be used by the historian to achieve knowledge and to transform the structures of the past into their "true", objective historical form. This transforming principle, methodological approach or recommendation is expected to solve the

problem of the historian's selection and evaluation of the significance of individual pieces of information. It is assumed that application of the "correct" transforming principle or principles will lead to the narrative approaches to the past supplementing each other and crystallizing one "true" objective picture of the past.

Geoffrey Elton is one of the most important representatives of the traditional understanding of history from the English speaking countries. In his book, *The Practice of History* (1967), he critically reacted to the views of Edward H. Carr in the book *What is History?* (1961), and justified the idea of uncovering a true picture of the past based on autonomous and professional research into the sources.¹ In his view, achievement of this aim was enabled by the historian using the so-called historical method, which "is not anything more than a recognized and verified way of extracting what remains of the past, namely the true facts and events of the past, and if possible their significance and connections, with all of this directed by the first principle of historical understanding, namely that the past must be studied from its own perspective, its own aims, its own connections".² Elton's definition of the so-called historical method can be regarded only as a very general recommendation, which does not provide the historians any concrete instructions or guarantees that they will uncover the true perspective of the historic figures. His rejection of the historian using theories, which could be a source of a distorted interpretation of the sources, is similarly unconvincing and arguable.³

According to Elton, autonomous and professional uncovering of the truth hidden in the sources is accompanied by discussions between historians. From this point of view, these discussions lead to the constant growth of correct historical knowledge and certain confirmation of "the existence of the real truth and not the predominance of individual and arbitrary views".⁴ Elton's assumption about the convergence or harmonization of different historical approaches to the past start only from his conviction of the unconflicting nature of unambiguously determined facts supplementing each other from the accessible sources. On this basis, the historians only have to fill in the missing pieces in the "mosaic picture" of the past. Deepening of the plurality of historical ideas about the past has cast doubt on this assumption about the direction of discussion among historians. This plurality demonstrates the predominance of "individual positions", rather than clearly identifying the "real truth".

The assumption of the professional and autonomous approach of the historian to research and presentation of the past emphasized by the traditional understanding of history marginalized the relevance of consideration of the ethical dimensions of the work of the historian. From the point of view of the traditional understanding of history, the his-

1 The trustworthiness of his view on the autonomous and independent research of the historian is made problematic by his tendency to give priority to conservative views. In ELTON, Geoffrey R. *The Practice of History*. Sydney : University Press, 1967, p. 103. We also encounter the recommendation to adopt a conservative position in his work *Return to Essentials*. ELTON, Geoffrey R. *Return to Essentials*. Cambridge : Gambridge University Press, 1991, p. 24, ISBN 9780521524377.

2 ELTON, *The Practice of History*, ref. 1, p. 65.

3 ELTON, *The Practice of History*, ref. 1, p. 29-38. In connection with the constantly emphasized need for historians to be autonomous when researching the sources, Elton also expressed fear of historians applying theory in the work *Return to Essentials*, ref. 1, p. 15, 28-29.

4 ELTON, *The Practice of History*, ref. 1, p. 61.

torian's work was supposed to be only an "invisible" mediator of historical reality. With such an understanding of history, he did not have to concern himself with ethical questions when doing research or presenting his results. There was an exception when critics thought that a historian had consciously or unconsciously given up his autonomous position, which inevitably led to claims of a "distorted" picture of the past. Undistorted pictures of the past had to provide unambiguous definition of the actions of historic figures. This information could be a firm basis for the process of their moral assessment. The gradually deepening plurality of historical depictions of the past, which reduced the clarity of ideas about the course of events in the past, could also increase the problems of assessing the actions of historic figures. In contrast to the traditional understanding of history, the conception of the representatives of the constructivist understanding of history had a different view of the development of historiography in the last decades of the 20th century.

Hayden White's constructivist understanding of history

Conceptions representing *historical constructivism* cast doubt on the privileged nature of certain transforming rules, although they recognize the use of various transforming rules by means of which the creation of differing ideas or pictures of the past are justified. From the point of view of the supporters of this current, the possibility of using various transforming rules leads historians to different meanings of facts or events, so that various depictions of historical reality arise. The plurality of historical pictures makes unclear the idea of one firm and "obvious" structure of the past. By making problematic the possibility of "uncovering" the content or meaning of historical pictures of the past, the constructivist view of history emphasizes the problem of the relativity of historical knowledge.

Hayden White's tropological understanding of history is one of the most important constructivist conceptions. In the introduction to his most important book, *Metahistory* from 1973, he pointed to the historical construction and fictional dimension of the process of historical depiction of the past, which is associated with the distinguishing and shaping of events or facts into a story. From his point of view, historical narratives not only put known facts or descriptions of events into a single whole in some way, they also explained them. Using the example of the works of 19th century historians and philosophers, he tried to illustrate the use of a selection of explanatory types from the "quadruple tetrads" of superficial and deep types. According to White, it was possible to identify on the superficial level of historical narratives the application of one of the *subject* types: romance, comedy, tragedy and satire, *explanatory* types: formistic, organistic, mechanical and contextual, and types of *ideological implication*: anarchist, conservative, radical and liberal.⁵ The individual superficial types had to be coordinated with one of the deep tropes: metaphor, metonymy, synekdoche and irony, which had to connect with the historian's imagination.⁶

5 WHITE, Hayden. *Metahistory*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1973, p. 7-38. ISBN 0801817617.

6 WHITE, ref. 5, p. 52-54. For more details on critical reactions to *Metahistory* see ŠUCH, Juraj. *Narativny konstruktivizmus Haydena Whitea a Franka Ankersmita. (The narrative constructivism of Hayden White*

White's constructivist idea of the possibilities for historical application of various explanatory, superficial types, when depicting the past, explains different, even contradictory historical depictions of the same events. In his view, differentiation between narrative forms of the past is connected with different shaping of the meaning of individual events in the framework of narrative units. According to White, when creating a narrative unit, events are "*processed into a story by suppressing or subordinating some of them, while emphasizing others, by characterizing, repetition of motifs, variation of tone and perspective*".⁷ In the process of shaping a historical narrative, the meanings of individual events are harmonized by the historian into the narrative form he has chosen. White pointed to the role and significance of the narrative form as an important part of securing understanding of historians' ideas of past events. A precondition for attributing different meanings to events in historical narratives is White's idea of an amorphous past, in which "*historical events and situations are not inherently tragic, comic or romantic*".⁸ According to his point of view, historians have not discovered one fixed and value neutral model of reality, but a plurality of different depictions of a "plastic" past shapable by values.

White's identification of the inevitability of the historian applying figurative language when producing a narrative depiction of reality also contributed to increasing awareness of the unclear nature of the past. White compared the historical narrative to the metaphor as a symbolic structure, which "*does not reproduce the events it describes, but tells us how we should regard these events. [...] It evokes in our minds pictures of things in the same way as a metaphor does*".⁹ White's identification of the literary character of the attribution of meaning to individual events in narrative is associated with legitimization of the value content of the narrative picture of the past, and so also the relevance of the aesthetic and ethical evaluation of the starting points for choosing between competing ideas about the past.¹⁰ In relation to the identifiable value orientation of the historical narrative, as well as the process of endowing events with different meaning in historical narratives with the help of figurative elements or tropes, White regarded the narrative

and Frank Ankersmit.) Ostrava : Ostravská univerzita, 2010, p. 53-76, ISBN 9788073689353; ČORNEJ, Petr. White nezměnil dějiny, ale pohled na ně. (White did not change history, but our view of it.). In WHITE, Hayden. *Metahistórie*. Brno : Host, 2011, p. 575-600. ISBN 9788072943760. The results of helpful approaches to the application of White's tropological model to various historical narratives pointed to the emergence of various subject events in the narrative representations of the past. Among Slovak historians, Martin Vašš recently attempted this. VAŠŠ, Martin. Možné aplikácie naratívneho konštruktivizmu Haydena Whitea pri historiografickej analýze vybraných diel Milana Stanislava Ďuricu a Františka Vnuka. (Possible applications of the narrative constructivism of Hayden White to historiographic analysis of selected works by Milan Stanislav Ďurica and František Vnuk.). In *Historica Olomucensia*, 2015, vol. 48, no. 1, p. 193-206.

7 WHITE, Hayden. The Historical Text as a Literary Artefact. In *Tropics of Discourse : Essays in Cultural Criticism*. Baltimore : The John Hopkins University Press, 1978, p. 84. ISBN 0801827418.

8 WHITE, ref. 7, p. 85.

9 WHITE, ref. 7, p. 91.

10 For example, in the conclusion to *Metahistory*, White stated that stated that "*placed before the alternative visions that history's interpreters offer for our consideration, and without any apodictically provided theoretical grounds for preferring one over another; we are driven back to moral and aesthetic reasons for the choice of one vision over another*". (WHITE, ref. 5, 1973, p. 443).

account as a “figurative account, an allegory”.¹¹ At the same time, his conceptual emphasis on the application of various constructs or “literary” approaches and narrative forms, he emphasized not only the problem of definition of the real form of the past, but especially the problem of an appropriate narrative approach to historical events.¹²

In comparison with the traditional understanding of history, White’s idea of the creation of historical narratives uncovers in more detail the relevance of the historical construction processes, which emphasize the possibility of shaping different forms of the past. At the same time, White’s identification of the complexity of historians’ construction processes drew attention to the “indirect” correspondence of historical narratives to the past, while offering the recipients a figural truth about the past. On one side, White’s identification of the constructivist character of history writing leads to “fictional” constructive sujet’s elements, schemes or value aspects and to emphasis on the need for radical awareness of the relativity of historical narrative or interpretation. At the same time, White’s emphasis on the naturalness of different narrative approaches to the same events evoked not only questions about limitation of the trustworthiness of historical knowledge of the contours of the past, but also of the position and task of the historian. In his constructivist understanding, the historian is not the “passive mediator of historical knowledge” but an active creator, who should be aware of the moral and social meaning of his choice of a particular form of narrative depiction of the past.¹³

Frank Ankersmit’s constructivist understanding of history

Like Hayden White, Frank Ankersmit already rejected the traditional understanding of history with its pre-condition of the truthful correspondence of the historical narrative with historical reality in his first book *Narrative logic* (1983). Ankersmit admitted the correspondence and assessment of the truth of individual sentences, but not of narrative wholes, which could only be subjective or objective.¹⁴ In comparison with the traditional realist understanding of history, he was convinced of his view that “whatever concrete content we may give to the translation rules, they will never be more than arbitrary selection rules, acceptable to some historians but to be rejected by others. [...] Nor is the

11 WHITE, Narrative in Contemporary historical Theory In *The Content of the Form*. Baltimore : The John Hopkins University Press, 1987, p. 48.

12 While White’s conception offers an acceptable explanation for the origin of different historical narrative depictions of events such as the coming of the Magyars to the Carpathian Basin or the Slovak National Uprising, in the case of discovery of a similar interpretative spectrum serious fears were evoked. Although White did not assume the strict universal applicability of his model of the quadruple tetrads explaining the types and tropes presented in *Metahistory*, in the 1990s, he considered modernist events and their depiction by means of intransitive writing in connection with the Holocaust. For further details see ŠUCH, ref. 6, p. 112-118.

13 In his article *The historical subject and the problem of truth in historical representation*, White pointed to the example of the book by Andreas Hillgruber: *Two kinds of Ruin: the Fall of the German Reich and the End of European Jewry* (1986) on the complexity of the historian’s complicated search for an appropriate depiction or interpretation of a historic event, which should also consider its ethical dimension.

14 ANKERSMIT, Frank. *Narrative Logic. A semantic Analysis of the Historian’s Language*. The Hague : Martinus Nijhoff Philosophy Library, 1983, p. 77. ISBN 9789024727315

*past like a landscape that has to be projected onto the linguistic level with the help of projection or translation rules. For the "historical landscape" is not given to the historian; he has to construct it".*¹⁵

* * *

According to Ankersmit, the narrative substance, which in some way constituted individual statements in the historical text, had key importance for understanding the nature of historical narrative. In his view, narrative substance represents the "image" or unifying "concept" such as the Renaissance or the Cold War, which "*organize our knowledge of the past without reference to it or its description*".¹⁶ On the basis of selection of particular methods, historians have constructed narrative interpretations, which, like metaphors, indicate a particular view of the past to their recipients. In spite of the fact that the truthfulness of historical narratives as a whole cannot be determined, Ankersmit pointed to the possibility of assessing their objectivity. In relation to the impossibility of comparing the historical narrative to historical reality, Ankersmit admitted considerations of their relative objectivity on the basis of comparison of their originality and scope. The most objective historical narrative should be the most original, and "*its scope reaching beyond its descriptive content was maximized (other indicators being equal)*".¹⁷ Surprisingly, he supposed value neutrality of the assessors of historical narratives in the process of comparison.¹⁸

In Ankersmit's shift to an understanding of historical narrative as representation, we encounter his explanation of their special nature. In connection with the relationship of representation and description to reality, he stated "*that description and representation relate to reality. We say that description refers to reality with the help of the subject term, while we say that representation as a whole is about reality*", while the reference is "*intended objectively, that is to objects from reality, which is designated by the subject term description, but to be about is essentially unstable and indefinite, since descriptions contained in text offer representations or in this case a different definition*".¹⁹ In his view, the process of evaluating historical representations is associated with comparing them, as well as with a particular social and political reality.²⁰ According to him, precise distinction between fact and evaluation in historical narrative is not possible, because true statements can also be arranged so that "*they clearly propose a particular political course of action*".²¹ Ankersmit came to the conclusion that the historical narrative is a

15 ANKERSMIT, ref. 13, p. 86

16 ANKERSMIT, ref. 13, p. 97.

17 ANKERSMIT, ref. 13, p. 238.

18 S. Crowell looked critically at the problem of applying value neutrality when assessing historical narratives in connection with Ankersmit's conception. CROWELL, Steven G. The Heterogeneity of Historical Discourse. In *History and Theory*. 1998, year 37, no. 3, p. 234-236. ISSN 0018-2656.

19 ANKERSMIT, Frank. The Linguistic Turn : Literary Theory and Historical theory. In *Historical Representation*. Stanford : Stanford University Press, 2001, p. 41. ISBN 0804739803.

20 ANKERSMIT, Frank. *Historical Representation*. Stanford : Stanford University Press, 2001, p. 91-93. ISBN 9780804739801.

21 ANKERSMIT, ref. 19, p. 94.

representation of the past containing true statements, which embody its cognitive claims, as well as *ethical rules and values*.²² In relation to the fact that historical representation cannot be evaluated only on the basis of normative and cognitive discourse but of their comparison, he proposed to determine the representation success of particular historical representations on the basis of their fulfilment of aesthetic criteria.²³ Ankersmit advised historians only to experiment in the “*garden of writing about history*”, where they should gradually make visible the advantages and disadvantages of the ethical and political values of historians by means of fulfilling the aesthetic criteria for successful representation.

In contrast to White, Ankersmit did not give priority to any construction processes, and so the creative work of historians applying various translation rules naturally leads to a plurality of different narrative interpretations of the past. In his view, the influence of aesthetic and moral values can be connected with various arrangements of the individual statements in a historical narrative, which represents a particular view of historical reality. In relation to the assumption of a free space for the creative work of historians, in which they attempt to construct the “most relevant idea of the past” in various legitimate ways, it is possible to consider the priority of fulfilling the relevant aesthetic criteria rather than the moral or political criteria. This leads to the justified question of the degree to which the aesthetic criterion for the success of historical representation can really be divided from “external” value influences. Perhaps precisely the close connection of the aesthetic and ethical aspects could more convincingly explain the way historians continue to depict selected events in accordance with a prevailing and persisting value orientation.

The constructivist understanding of history of Jouni-Matti Kuukkanen

Jouni-Matti Kuukkanen has taken up a critical position on White and Ankersmit’s understanding of history. He has described their position as *representationalist* because in their view historians should in some way represent the past, and his own understanding of history as *non-representationalist*. In his view: “*historiography is about justifying a view and the main contribution of historical work should be to provide evidence for and against the view*”.²⁴ In connection with the construction of historical works, Kuukkanen pointed to the importance of formulating *colligatory concepts*, which connect or unite empirical data into a unified whole. Since in his view colligatory concepts are not directly and automatically derivable from the empirical data, their selection by historians should fulfil criteria in the form of supporting data, coherence, richness of content and originality.²⁵ Kuukkanen refused to accept the intuitive assumption of the correspondence

22 ANKERSMIT, ref. 19, p. 95.

23 In this context Ankersmit emphasizes that the representation success of historical narratives is not dependent on their comparison with the actual past, but on their comparison with each other, which is decided by their range, associated with the risk as well as their resistance to falsification in connection with existing historical knowledge. ANKERSMIT, ref. 19, p. 96-97.

24 KUUKKANEN, Jouni-Matti. *Postnarrativist Philosophy of Historiography*. London; New York : Palgrave Macmillan, 2015, p. 23. ISBN 9781137409867.

25 KUUKKANEN, ref. 24, p. 123-127.

of historical works and their views with the actual past because of the absence of an independently existing object that would confirm it. Therefore, he proposes in connection with historical works to consider “*the justification of historiographic views without the pre-condition of their truthfulness*”.²⁶ He gives as an example of a historiographic view the expression “*Khrushchev’s thaw*”, which could be appropriate in connection with a large amount of data and phenomena from the period of Khrushchev’s rule

When assessing these historiographic views and synthesizing historical knowledge, Kuukkanen distinguishes between epistemic, rhetorical and discursive dimensions.²⁷ These three dimensions “*together amount to the cognitive justification of historical works and specifically of the arguments that they contain*”.²⁸ Although Kuukkanen is aware of the political and social context of historiographic discourse, he is convinced of its rational starting points. He considers that rationality itself is a universal principle, but its specific application always depends on the situation. Precisely the situational character of the creative work of historians together with prejudice is one of the reasons for the construction of different interpretations of the same theme. He also states that if historians’ interpretation is more rational and acceptable, then it is more objective.²⁹ In this context, Kuukkanen states that the historian should direct his attention to the creation of an argument, which “*had to be rationally convincing as far as possible*”.³⁰ In relation to his definition of history understood as the rational activity of historians, who try to construct arguments with rationally justifiable conclusions, he places it between objectivism and subjectivism, or simultaneously both objective and subjective.³¹ In his view, the degree of subjectivity or objectivity depends on the evaluation of individual historical works.

In contrast to the traditional understanding of history, the constructivist conception of H. White, F. Ankersmit and J.-M. Kuukkanen rejects direct correspondence of the content of historical works with the past. Casting doubt on the direct correspondence between historical work and the past emphasizes the relevance of the construction processes when creating a more complete picture or narrative of the past on the basis of the accessible data. The qualitative difference between the more comprehensive depictions stimulated their considerations of the key importance of the determining roles of the

26 KUUKKANEN, ref. 24, p. 143.

27 While, in his view, the epistemic dimension connects with the epistemic values (coherence, content, richness of content and originality), the rhetorical is associated with the actual text, which addresses the readers. The discursive dimension is connected with the intellectual context in which the historical work appears. KUUKKANEN, ref. 24, p. 156-158.

28 KUUKKANEN, ref. 24, p. 166.

29 KUUKKANEN, ref. 24, p. 196.

30 KUUKKANEN, ref. 24, p. 197.

31 Although according to Kuukkanen there are various views on the objectivity of historical works as presented, he considers it most realistic to eliminate the subjective by means of inter-subjective criticism. He associates the source of the subjectivity of historical works (1) with the absence of reference of colligatory and metaphorical concepts, (2) postulating the nominal categorizing principle, (3) by constituting a narrative of connecting causal relationships, and (4) the meaning of history. KUUKKANEN, ref. 24, p. 170-175.

colligatory concepts, namely tropes, narrative substance, historiographic views, in determining the historical shape of the past. In connection with the process of the historian formulating colligatory concepts, narrative substance or historiographic views, they emphasize the constructive space in which he is placed not only before the unavoidability of choice between various known possibilities, but also the creation of his own alternative. By searching for appropriate alternatives to the well known narrative pictures of the past, historians not only widen but also “deepen” the space for construction. In relation to the social and so the value position of this space, it is clear that a particular value or ethical orientation is naturally associated with the historian’s choice of how to depict the past. In discussions between historians, more comprehensive representations of the past become the subject of criticism not only because of different ideas of the past, but also because of the value or ethical consequences recipients associate with them. The value aspects of historical work are made more clearly visible to the recipients in connection with the method of correlation of individual events in developmental processes.

The constructivist conceptions with more detailed research into the methods of constructing historical texts offer various explanations of the processes of creating different ideas of the past. Like the views of the supporters of the “traditional” understanding of history, the constructivist conceptions considered here also provoke responses, which will cast doubt on the relevance of their observations or conclusions for the everyday work of historians. On the other hand, the attempts of the constructivist conceptions to explain the origin and persistence of the confrontation of different historical ideas about the past can become one of the stimuli pushing historians not only towards deeper methodological reflection on their work, but also towards awareness of its ethical dimension.

* The paper originated in the framework of the project VEGA no. 1/0519/14: *The problem of interpretation – ontological, methodological and epistemological aspects.*

KONSTRUKTIVISTISCHES VERSTÄNDNIS DER GESCHICHTE UND IHRER ETHISCHEN DIMENSION

JURAJ ŠUCH

Der Autor des Artikels stellt ein konstruktivistisches Verständnis der Geschichte von Hayden White, Frank Ankersmit und Jouni-Matti Kuukkanen dar. Er stellt dem traditionalem Verständnis der Geschichte ein traditionelles Verständnis gegenüber, das eine direkte Korrespondenz der Arbeit des Historiker mit der Vergangenheit, voraussetzt.

In seiner Annäherung des konstruktivistischen Verständnisses weist er auf ihre Andeutung der Anwendung legitimer Möglichkeiten der unterschiedlichen Methoden und Vorstellungsarten hin, die in unterschiedlichen Representationen der historischen Ereignisse mündet.

Die Unterschiede zwischen historischen Representationen/ Abbildungen der Vergangenheit können auch mit der Auswahl der Historiker aus unterschiedlichen konstruktivistischen Methoden und der Aufnahme seiner moralischen und politischen Werte zusammenhängen.

Das konstruktivistische Verständnis der Geschichte mit einer tieferen Analyse des Schreibprozesses regt ein tieferes Selbstbewusstsein der ethischen Dimension ihrer Arbeit an.

Doc. PhDr. Juraj Šuch, PhD
Department of Philosophy, Faculty of Humanities
Matej Bel University
Tajovského 40, 974 01 Banská Bystrica
e-mail: juraj.such@umb.sk

PAVOL HUDÁČEK

HUDÁČEK, Pavol. *Silva Bereg*. A Royal Forest in Medieval Hungary. *Historický časopis*, 2017, 65, 5, pp. 809-848, Bratislava.

The author of this study is concerned with researching the Bereg royal estate, which formed part of the frontier regions of the medieval Kingdom of Hungary. In the 11th century Bereg belonged to the great frontier county of Boržava, but formed an independent territory within it. A separate county organization under noble control was established in it only later. Its centre was a royal manor, where the kings of Hungary settled people of German origin in the first half of the 13th century. Its importance mainly lay in the fact that it was a dynastic property of the House of Arpád at least from the 11th century. It was a part of the Carpathian mountains dominated by forests. Members of the Arpád dynasty often went there to hunt. In Western Europe such properties were known as *forestes* and the prerogatives of the monarch prevailed there. It is very probable that forest properties of the dynasty including Bereg were also protected by special rights of the monarch in the Kingdom of Hungary. According to all the evidence, Bereg was a royal forest where members of the Arpád dynasty hunted, and it had an internal organization similar to that known from Western Europe.

Key words: Kingdom of Hungary. House of Arpád. Frontier region. Bereg. Ugoča. Royal forest. Hunting. Dynastic property. *Comitatus* and *districtus*. *Comes* and *procurator*.

In the 11th and 12th centuries Hungary was an extensive kingdom with the Carpathians forming a natural frontier to the north-east. More continuous forest areas were found mainly in the marginal frontier regions.¹ Some medievalists consider that these regions were thinly settled and inhabited mainly by foresters, hunters, fishermen and falconers of Slavonic origin.² In contrast to the more densely settled *medium regni*, which already had

1 On the forests of the Carpathian Basin see: SZABÓ, Péter. Changes in woodland cover in the Carpathian Basin. In SZABÓ, Péter – HÉDL, Radim (eds.). *Human Nature : Studies in Historical Ecology and Environmental History*. Brno : Institute of Botany of the ASCR, 2008, s. 106-115. ISBN 9788086188287; RABB, Péter. Natural conditions in the Carpathian Basin of the middle ages. In *Architecture*, 2007, year 38, no. 2, p. 50-54. ISSN 17893437.

2 KARÁCSONYI, János. Halvány vonások hazánk Szent István korabeli határaitól. (The unclear outline of our frontiers in the time of St. Stephen.). In *Századok* (hereinafter Sz), 1901, year 35, no. 3, p. 1051-1052; SZÚCS, Jenő. *Az utolsó Árpádok*. (The last Arpád dynasty kings.). Budapest : MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1993, p. 39. ISBN 9789633892718; BAKAY, Kornél. Hungary. In REUTER, Timothy (ed.). *The New Cambridge Medieval History III, 900–1024*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1999, p. 540. ISBN 9781139055727; SZÉKELY, Gusztáv. Ugocea vármegye kialakulása az új kutatások tükrében

a large number of churches and monasteries in a varied cultural landscape, these forested regions were thought to be occupied only by vast wild forests. This view is only partly true. It is necessary to recognize that the royal power reached into these outlying parts of the country, although clearly not so strongly as in the western part of the kingdom. The frontier zones were often specified territories both in the political and the socio-cultural senses. They belonged to the ruling dynasty and the royal power had to be militarily and culturally represented precisely there.³ Therefore not only the natural character of the country, but also extensive territories where various cultural, military and commercial contacts soon appeared, formed the natural frontiers of the country (*finēs, confines, termini*). Medieval rulers had a strong interest in the defence and in using their power to support these marginal territories.⁴ They were part of the great frontier counties (*marchia, confinium*)⁵ of the Kingdom of Hungary, and almost all belonged to the dynastic or “private” properties of the Arpád dynasty. The royal power was represented by the manor houses as power centres, chapels, dynastic monasteries⁶, and in the military field by the network of royal defensive castles, defensive measures and frontier guards (*indagines regni, clausura, obstaculum, porta, euri, speculatores* alebo *sagittarii*).⁷ Members of the Arpád dynasty often hunted in these frontier regions, and so they often came under regal law. In Western Europe they were called *forestis/forestum/foresta, silva regis* and the regal or forest law inevitably associated with them was most frequently called *wildbann*.⁸

-
- I. (The creation of the County of Ugocsa as reflected in new research I.). In *Acta Beregsasensis*, 2009, year 8, no. 2, p. 85. ISSN 23101954. On this see: RAJMAN, Jerzy. „In confinio terrae“ : Definicje i metodologiczne aspekty badań nad średniowiecznym pograniczem. (“In confinio terrae”: Definition and methodological aspects of research on medieval frontiers.). In *Kwartalnik Historyczny*, 2002, year 109, no. 1, p. 84-88, 91-92. ISSN 00235903.
- 3 On this see e.g.: BEREND, Nora. Medievalists and the Notion of the Frontier. In *The Medieval History Journal* (hereinafter *MHJ*), 1999, year 2, no. 1, p. 55-72. ISSN 09719458; RODRÍGUEZ-PICAVEA, Enrique. The Frontier and Royal Power in Medieval Spain : A Development Hypothesis. In *MHJ*, 2005, year 8, no. 2, p. 273-293; CASTELLANOS, Santiago – VISO, Inaki Martin. The local articulation of central power in the north of the Iberian Peninsula (500–1000). In *Early Medieval Europe*, 2005, year 13, no. 1, p. 1-42. ISSN 14680254.
- 4 BEREND, Nora. *At the Gate of Christendom : Jews, Muslims and 'Pagans' in Medieval Hungary, c. 1000 – c. 1300*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2001, p. 6-17. ISBN 100521651859; RAJMAN, ref. 2, p. 79, 81-82, 84, 86-87, 94. On this see: POHL, Walter. Soziale Grenzen und Spielräume der Macht. In POHL, Walter – REIMITZ, Helmut (eds.). *Grenze und Differenz im frühen Mittelalter*. Wien : Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2000, p. 11-18. ISBN 3700128967; GOETZ, Hans-Werner. Concepts of realm and frontiers from late antiquity to the early Middle Ages : Some preliminary remarks. In POHL, Walter et al. (eds.). *The Transformation of Frontiers : From Late Antiquity to the Carolingians*. Leiden; Boston : Brill, 2001, p. 73-74, 82. ISBN 9004111148.
- 5 HÓMAN, Bálint. *Geschichte des ungarischen Mittelalters I. : Von dem ältesten Zeiten bis zum Ende des XII. Jahrhunderts*. Berlin : Verlag Walter de Gruyter & Co, 1940, p. 211-212. On the frontiers of Hungary see: BAKAY, ref. 1, p. 540.
- 6 MEZEY, Ladislaus. Ungarn und Europa im 12. Jahrhundert : Kirche und Kultur zwischen Ost und West. In MAYER, Theodor (ed.). *Probleme des 12. Jahrhunderts : Vorträge und Forschungen 12*. Stuttgart ; Konstanz : Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 1968, p. 259-260, 262. ISSN 0452490X.
- 7 GÖCKENJAN, Hansgerd. *Hilfsvölker und Grenzwächter im mittelalterlichen Ungarn*. Wiesbaden : Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH, 1972, p. 12-22. ISBN 351500775X; BEREND, ref. 4, p. 20-22, 24-30.
- 8 HUDÁČEK, Pavol. Kráľovské lesy a dynastické majetky Arpádovcov v 11. – 12. storočí : Porovnanie so západnou Európou. (Royal forests and the dynastic properties of the Arpád dynasty in the 11th and

Hungarian historiography used the term *erdőuraldom* (Ger. *Forstdomäne*). Only later, thanks to more perfect organization did *erdőispánságok* (Ger. *Forstgespanschaften*) develop.⁹ Bereg and neighbouring Ugoča (Ukr. Угоча/Hun. Ugocsa) were also such royal forests, or to be more exact, dynastic forest properties of the ruling dynasty.

Some of the forests of medieval Hungary, namely Igfon, Zvolen, Spiš and Csepe, are mentioned by Anonymous in his well-known work *Gesta Hungarorum* (hereinafter GH). He describes events that occurred in the 9th – 10th centuries, but they are adapted in the period from the end of the 12th and beginning of the 13th centuries, when this source was written. Therefore the majority of the information it gives needs to be taken with some reservations. However, this does not concern the nature of the country at the time. The author aimed to convince the reader of the trustworthiness of the events he described, and so the real country of his time forms part of the story.¹⁰ For this reason, we can consider that the information about the forests is authentic. In the 12th century, the royal forests were not only small wooded areas, but in some cases also larger forested regions.¹¹ For example, the GH contains various mentions of the Havaš Wood (*silva Hovos, Howos*) in the north-eastern Carpathians,¹² through which the Magyar nomads came to Pannonia – the Carpathian Basin. An extensive region in this mountain range (*ad partes Hung descenderunt*) belonged to the castle of Uh/Užhorod (*castrum Hung*).¹³ The *Gesta*

12th centuries.). In KOVÁČ, Dušan et al. (eds.). *Slovenské dejiny v dejinách Európy : Vybrané kapitoly*. Bratislava : VEDA, 2015, p. 35, 50, 66-67. ISBN 9788022414487.

- 9 KRISTÓ, Gyula. *A vármegyék kialakulása Magyarországon*. (The formation of counties in Hungary.). Budapest : Magvető Könyvkiadó, 1988, p. 377-383, 391-392, 399, 407-408, 413. ISBN 9631411893; SZŰCS, Jenő. Sárospatak kezdetei és a pataki erdőuraldom. (The beginnings of Sárospatak and Patak forest hunting territory.). In *Történelmi Szemle*, 1993, year 35, no. 1/2, p. 1-57, p. 12-13, 15, 23-24. ISSN 00409634; *Korai magyar történelmi lexikon (9. – 14. század)*. (A dictionary of early Hungarian history (9th – 14th centuries).). (hereinafter *KMTL*). KRISTÓ, Gyula – ENGEL, Pál – MAKK, Ferenc (eds.). Budapest, 1994, p. 194-195, 353-354, 533, 594-595, 680-681, 747. ISBN 9630567229; KÖRMENDY, Adrienne. *Melioratio terrae : Vergleichende Untersuchungen über die Siedlungsbewegung im östlichen Mitteleuropa im 13. – 14. Jahrhundert*. Poznań : Wydawnictwo Poznańskiego Towarzystwa Przyjaciół Nauk, 1995, p. 10-13. ISBN 8370631002; SZABÓ, Péter. *Woodland and Forests in Medieval Hungary*. Oxford : Archaeopress, 2005, p. 26, 87-88, 89-90. ISBN 1841716944; TRINGLI, István. *Megyék a középkori Magyarországon*. (Counties in medieval Hungary.). In NEUMANN, Tibor – RÁCZ, György (eds.). *Honoris causa : Tanulmányok Engel Pál tiszteletére*. Budapest : MTA Történettudományi Intézete; Piliscsaba : Pázmány Péter Katolikus Egyetem Bölcsészettudományi Kara, 2009, p. 494-495, 500-501. ISBN 9789639627253.
- 10 RATKOŠ, Peter. Anonymus *Gesta Hungarorum* a ich pramenná hodnota. (The anonymous *Gesta Hungarorum* and its value as a source.). In *Historický časopis* (hereinafter *HČ*), 1983, year 31, no. 6, p. 851-856. ISSN 00182575; MÚCSKA, Vincent (ed.). *Kronika anonymného notára kráľa Bela : Gesta Hungarorum*. (The chronicle of the anonymous notary of King Bela : *Gesta Hungarorum*.) Budmerice : Vydavateľstvo Rak, 2000, p. 23, 25-26, 27. ISBN 8085501171; MUSIL, František. *Gesta Hungarorum a historicko-zemepisný obraz Slovenska*. (The *Gesta Hungarorum* and the historical – geographical picture of Slovakia.). In *HČ*, 2004, year 52, no. 3, p. 435, 442; VESZPRÉMY, László. The Invented 11th Century of Hungary. In URBAŇCZYK, Przemysław (ed.). *The Neighbours of Poland in the 11th Century*. Warsaw : Wydawnictwo DiG, 2002, p. 141, 144. ISBN 837181271X.
- 11 MUSIL, ref. 10, p. 434, 436.
- 12 NÉMETH, Péter. Borsova határvármegye természeti földrajza. (The geography of the natural boundaries of the County of Boršov.). In *A Nyíregyházi Jónás András múzeum évkönyve, 1969–1971*, 1972, year 12-14, p. 48. ISSN 05470196; *KMTL*, p. 258-259; MUSIL, ref. 10, p. 445.
- 13 P. MAGISTRI, qui Anonymus dicitur, *Gesta Hungarorum*, Cap. 9, 11, 12, 13. BAK, János M. – RADY,

Hungarorum also states that Prince Arpád sent his warriors to take the land between the Tisza and Bodrog as far as Ugoč (*usque ad Vgosam*). At the same time, they surrounded and captured Boržava Castle and sent the prisoners to Uh/Užhorod Castle.¹⁴ The castles of Uh/Užhorod (County of Ung and Boržava (County of Boržava-Bereg) already existed in this part of the Hungarian frontier region around the year 1200, and we know that the castle of Sásvár (County of Boržava-Szatmár-Ugoča) also existed at the time.¹⁵ We do not learn much from the terms used to designate places and territories such as *silva Hovos* – Carpathians, frontier or county castles such as *Castrum Hung*, *castrum Borsoa*, in the case of Ugoča (*Vgosa*),¹⁶ what the locality was like or what type of property. According to the documents from the first half of the 13th century, we know that it was not a castle. However, it had its name, and apparently a separate territory was known by this name. It could have been a royal dynastic property or a royal forest (*silva Vgosa?*) like the forests (*silvae*) of Igfon, Zvolen, Spiš and Csepel. If Anonymous had mentioned the royal property of Bereg in his work and if he had described it in more detail, he might have spoken of the *silva Bereg*, because this is how it is designated in the first half of the 13th century.¹⁷

In 1085, when the deposed King Solomon of Hungary (1063–1081) was released from captivity, he fled to the Pechenegs. He obtained military assistance from their khan and invaded Hungary with Pecheneg warriors. They penetrated into the territory of the *provinciae* of the castles of Uh/Užhorod and Boržava.¹⁸ This is one of the earliest mentions of the frontier County of Boržava. According to mentions from the 13th century we know that the royal forest properties of Bereg and Ugoča were situated in its northern

Martyn Rady – VESZPRÉMY, László (eds.). *Anonymous and Master Roger, Anonymous, Notary of King Béla The Deeds of the Hungarians, Master Roger's Epistle to the Sorrowful Lament upon the Destruction of the Kingdom of Hungary by the Tartars*. Budapest; New York : Central European University Press, 2010, p. XXI-XXIII, 27, 31, 35. ISBN 9789639776561; STEINHÜBEL, Ján. *Nitrianske kniežatstvo : Počiatky stredovekého Slovenska*. (The Principality of Nitra: The beginnings of medieval Slovakia). Bratislava : Rak, 2004, p. 187-188. ISBN 8022408123.

- 14 „*Arpad dux missis exercitibus suis totam terram, que est inter Thisciam et Budrug usque ad Vgosam sibi cum omnibus habitatoribus suis preoccupavit ad castrum Borsoa obsedit et tercio die pugnando apprehendit, muros eius destruxit et milites Salani ducis, quos ibi invenit cathenis ligatos in castrum Hung duci precepit.*“ P. MAGISTRI, qui Anonymus dicitur, *Gesta Hungarorum*, Cap. 14, p. 39; STEINHÜBEL, ref. 13, p. 187-188; KRISTÓ, Gyula. *Hungarian History in the Ninth Century*. Szeged : Szegedi Középkorász Műhely, 1996, p. 191-203. ISBN 9634821138.
- 15 KRISTÓ, ref. 9, p. 493; NÉMETH, Péter. *A középkori szatmár megye települései a XV. század elejéig*. (Medieval settlement of the County of Szatmár up to the beginning of the 15th century.). Nyíregyháza : NKA, 2008, p. XXIX, XXXII. ISBN 9789637220630.
- 16 *KMTL*, p. 696.
- 17 GYÖRFFY, György. *Az Árpád-kori Magyarország történelmi földrajza I. (Historical Geography of Hungary in the Árpád Period.)* (hereinafter ÁMTF I). Budapest : Akadémiai Kiadó, 1963, p. 530-531. ISBN 9630575043.
- 18 „*Dux autem Kutesk inani spe seductus, cum magna multitudine Cunorum invadens Hungariam devenit usque in provinciam castrorum Vng et Borsua.*“ *Chronici Hungarici compositio saeculi XIV*, Cap. 134. (hereinafter Chron. Hung. comp. saec. XIV) In *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum I* (hereinafter SRH). DOMANOVSKY, Alexander (ed.). Budapestini : Academia Litter. Hungarica atque Societate Histor. Hungarica, 1938, p. 408; KÁLTI, Márkus – DERCSÉNYI, Desző (eds.). *The Hungarian illuminated chronicle : Chronica de gestis Hungarorum*. Budapest : Corvina Press, 1969, s. 128. ISBN 0800840151; KRISTÓ, ref. 9, s. 421-422; STEINHÜBEL, ref. 13, p. 188.

and eastern parts.¹⁹ It is impossible to unambiguously prove whether this was already the case at the end of the 11th century. According to the historian Frigyes Pesty, Bereg and Ugoča were originally part of an extensive forest where royal manor houses were found, and so he regards them as an old hunting territory of the Arpád dynasty.²⁰ György Györffy makes this statement more specific saying that already in the 11th century Bereg was a royal hunting territory and belonged to the frontier county (*marchia*) of Boržava. However, these statements are not based on any documents and represent only the guesses of these historians.²¹ The medievalists could not exactly determine when the individual counties of this frontier region of Hungary originated,²² but it is generally accepted that up to the 12th century Bereg, Ugoča, Máramaros and the north-eastern part of Szatmár were part of the great County of Boržava. These territories were gradually separated in the course of the 12th and 13th centuries.²³ This was not an exceptional situation in the context of the territorial administrative division of Hungary. We know of a number of other examples, for example, the counties of Zvolen and *Novum Castrum*.²⁴ It is important to realize that the territories of the great counties contained a varied property structure with county castles, frontier castles, properties of the king, royal and religious institutions, which were reflected in their internal divisions and territorial arrangements.²⁵

Thus Bereg was situated in a frontier region of Hungary (*confinium, marchia*), it was part of a large royal county, it served the kings of Hungary as a hunting area, it had a royal manor house and villages of specialized royal servants connected with hunting. However, we have no information from the 11th – 12th centuries to directly prove that Bereg and Ugoča or the nearby Erdőd in the County of Szatmár,²⁶ were royal forests. The only written evidence that the king was accustomed to hunt in this frontier region of Hungary is found in a document from 1199. Emeric I (1174–1204) granted part of the land

19 KRISTÓ, ref. 9, p. 421-426, 492-497; NÉMETH, ref. 12, p. 46-48.

20 PESTY, Frigyes. *Az eltűnt régi vármegyék I.* (Vanished old castle counties.). Budapest : Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1880, p. 192, 195-196.

21 ÁMTF I, p. 519, 520-522; KRISTÓ, ref. 9, p. 421, 492. On this see: BOTKA, Tivadar. A vármegyék első alakulásáról és őskori szervezetéről III. (On the initial development of counties and their early organization III.). In *Sz.*, 1871, year 5, no. 5, p. 393, 396.

22 VESZPRÉMY, ref. 10, p. 144-145. On the assignment of Ugoča in the 11th century see: KRISTÓ, Gyula. Nehány vármegye kialakulásának kérdéséhez. (On the question of the creation of some castle counties.). In *Sz.*, 2002, year 136, no. 2, p. 473-475. ISSN 00398098.

23 PESTY, ref. 20, p. 192, 195; ÁMTF I, p. 520-522; KRISTÓ, ref. 9, p. 421-426, 490-492, 492-497; NÉMETH, ref. 15, p. XXVIII-XXIX; SZÉKELY, ref. 2, p. 74-89.

24 BOTKA, Tivadar. A vármegyék első alakulásáról és őskori szervezetéről IV. (On the initial development of counties and their early organization IV.). In *Sz.*, 1872, year 6, no. 1, p. 23; KRISTÓ, ref. 9, p. 398-410, 377-383.

25 ÁMTF I, p. 39-49 (an example from Abov); ZSOLDOS, Attila. The First Centuries of Hungarian Military Organization. In VESZPRÉMY, László - KIRÁLY, Béla K. (eds.). *A Millennium of Hungarian Military History*. New York : Social Science Monographs, 2002, p. 7. ISBN 088033519X; BEREND, Nora. Hungary in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries. In LUSCOMBE, David – RILEY-SMITH, Jonathan (eds.). *The New Cambridge Medieval History, Vol. IV/2, 1024–1198*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2004, p. 307-308. ISBN 9781107460638.

26 BOTKA, ref. 21, p. 396; NÉMETH, ref. 15, p. XXIX-XXX, XXXII; PESTY, ref. 20, p. 137-138; KRISTÓ, ref. 9, p. 489-490.

of royal servants in **Pakhe*, a vanished village in the County of Sopron, to his jobagio, the *comes* Laurence for saving his life in an accident during a hunt in Máramaros (*cum in Maramorisio tempore venationis venatum ivissemus*) and other merits.²⁷ In 1272 one of the boundaries of Ugoča went *ad indagines silve Maramorisii*, which was surely the forest where King Emeric had hunted at the end of the 12th century.²⁸ When the King of Hungary hunted in Máramaros, he surely also hunted in nearby Bereg and Ugoča. They were wooded areas of the Carpathian foothills and marginal parts of the frontier County of Boržava.²⁹ Medievalists still state, in agreement with the above mentioned older views, that Bereg and Ugoča were originally hunting territories (*erdőuradalomok*) of the Árpád dynasty, similar to Turňa, Šariš and Patak. In the course of the 12th century, they were organized as *erdőispánságok* – meaning forest lordships or royal forest properties.³⁰

In the second half of the 13th century, Bereg and Ugoča in contrast to all the other *erdőispánságok* were designated by the term *forestae*.³¹ This word was normally used in Western Europe for royal forests protected by forest or regal law. This mention is found in a document of Bela IV (1235–1270) from 1261 concerning the properties and rights of the Bishopric of Eger. The document mentions that the wooded lands of the later counties of Ugoča and Bereg were originally organized as royal forests (*forestae nostrae*). The document was issued to confirm the properties and rights of the Bishopric of Eger, gained from St. Stephen (1000/1001–1038)³² when the bishopric was founded,

-
- 27 WAGNER, Hans et al. (eds.). *Urkundenbuch des Burgenlandes und der angrenzenden Gebiete der Komitate Wieselburg, Ödenburg und Eisenburg I. : Die Urkunden von 808 bis 1270* (hereinafter *UB I*). Graz; Köln : Verlag Hermann Böhlhaus Nachf., 1955, no. 64, p. 36. ISBN 103901517189; BÉLAY, Vilmos. *Máramaros megye társadalma és nemzetiségei : A megye betelepülésétől XVIII. század elejéig*. (Society and nationality in the County of Máramaros: From the settlement of the county to the beginning of the 18th century.). Budapest : Sylvester Nyomda Rt., 1943, p. 6, 10; ZSOLT, Sebestyén. *Máramaros megye helységneveinek etimológiai szótára*. (An etymological dictionary of the place-names in the County of Máramaros.). Nyiregyháza : Bessenyei Könyvkiadó, 2012, p. 5. ISBN 9786155097539; KMTL, s. 442; ZOLNAY, László. *Vadászatok a régi Magyarországon*. (Hunting in the early Kingdom of Hungary.). Budapest : Natura, 1971, p. 93-94. ISBN 0669000252453.
- 28 Magyar nemzeti levéltár Budapest, Diplomatikai levéltára. (National Archives of Hungary, Archival documents.). (ďalej MNL DL), sign. 70 588 (year 1272); FEJÉR, Georgius (ed.). *Codex diplomaticus Hungariae ecclesiasticus ac civilis V/1* (hereinafter *CDH*). Buda : n. p., 1829–1844, p. 177; SZENTPÉTERY, Imre – BORSA, Iván (eds.). *Regesta regum striptis Arpadianae critico-diplomatica II* (hereinafter *RA*). Budapest : Kiadja a Magyar tudományos Akadémia, 1923–1987, no. 2117, p. 116; *ÁMTF IV*, p. 112-113, 124; BOTKA, ref. 21, p. 392; KRISTÓ, ref. 9, p. 426; PESTY, ref. 20., p. 192.
- 29 BOTKA, ref. 21, p. 392-396; *ÁMTF IV*, p. 112.
- 30 KRISTÓ, ref. 9, p. 424, 492; SZÜCS, ref. 2, p. 46; BOGLÁRKA, Weisz. A Felső-Tisza-vidék vámszedése az Árpád-korban II. (Collection of tolls in the upper Tisa basin in the Árpád period II.). In *Szabolcs-Szatmár-Beregi szemle : Társadalom, tudomány, művészet*, 2005, year 3, no. 1, p. 95-97. ISSN 1219092X.
- 31 It is exceptional because in Hungary this term is not regularly used. However, we know of another two cases. When defining the property of Hurbuchan in the County of Zala in 1263 (*vadit per forestas*). *UB I*, no. 430, p. 294; *Codex diplomaticus Arpadianus continuatus VIII* (hereinafter *CDAC*). WENZEL, Gusztáv (ed.). Pest ; Budapest : Kiadja Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1860–1874, no. 34, p. 52-54. When dividing the village of Tarcsa (now Tarcea) in Bihar in 1338 (*vinee in forestam redacte existentem*). DEDEK, Ludovicus Crescens (ed.). *Monumenta Ecclesiae Strigoniensis III*. (hereinafter *MES*). Strigonii : Typis Descriptis Gustavus Buzárovits, 1924, no. 457, p. 317.
- 32 GYÖRFFY, Georgius (ed.). *Diplomata Hungariae antiquissima accedunt epistolae et acta ad historiam Hungariae pertinentia I. (1000–1131)* (hereinafter *DHA*). Budapest : Akadémiai Kiadó, 1992, no. 10, p.

as well as further grants of property by St. Ladislav (1077–1095). The documents from these kings granting privileges were destroyed during the Tartar invasion, so the properties and rights derived from donations and liberties granted by these saintly kings (*per sanctos reges donatas et concessas*) had to be confirmed.³³ Specifically it was about land ownership, tolls, tithes, liberties and rights. The document spoke of *diversis possessi-onibus et piscinas ac multiformis libertatibus* with properties of the bishopric located *in pluribus districtibus et comitatibus*.³⁴ The properties and rights are clearly arranged into three groups. The first is concerned with definition of the land and villages belonging to the bishopric. This is followed by places for catching fish (*piscinas*) belonging to these villages, and then by the various liberties granted by the saintly kings (*libertas enim per predictos sanctos reges...donata hec est*). The most interesting section is the part concerned with rights, liberties, church tithes and revenue (*decimam partem*) from royal tolls. The document ends with a specific statement that Belo III (1173–1196) and Andrew II (1205–1235) granted the Bishopric of Eger a tenth (*decimas*) of the revenue from all the royal forests (*omnium forestarum nostrarum*), from newly formed or cleared and future royal estates – *praedia (novalium prediorum nostrorum fundatorum et fundandorum)*, from the villages of noblemen (!) and royal servants (*servitori nostri*),³⁵ located in the districts of Ugoča and Bereg (*in districtibus de Wgacha et de Beregh*).³⁶ In 1271 Stephen V (1262/1270–1272) confirmed this document at the request of Bishop Lampert of Eger.³⁷ A second variant survives of the 1271 document with different content

60-61 (year 1009). ISBN 9630549522.

- 33 On this see: TRINGLI, István. The Liberty of the Holy Kings : Saint Stephen and the Holy Kings in the Hungarian Legal Heritage. In ZSOLDOS, Attila (ed.). *Saint Stephen and His Country : A Newborn Kingdom in Central Europe: Hungary (Essays on Saint Stephen and his Age)*. Budapest : Lucidus Kiadó, 2001, p. 142-143. ISBN 9638616393; MÚCSKA, Vincent. K otázke vzťahu uhorského kráľa k cirkvi v 11. storočí. (On the question of the relationship of the King of Hungary to the Church in the 11th century.). In ŠIMONČIČ, Jozef (ed.). *Studia historica Tyrnaviensia III*. Trnava : Katedra História Trnavskej Univerzity v Trnave, 2003, p. 338, 340. ISBN 8089074634.
- 34 KONDORNÉ LÁTKÓCZKI, Erzsébet (ed.). *Árpád-kori oklevelek a Heves megyei levéltárban : Diplomata aetatis Arpadiana in archivo comitatus Hevesiensis conservata* (Árpád period documents in the archives of the County of Heves.). (hereinafter *HÁO*). Eger : Heves Megyei Levéltár, 1997, no. 9, p. 23. ISBN 9637242112; *RA II/1*, no. 2123, p. 118-119.
- 35 The Latin terms *servitor* is also interesting. It was also not normally used in 13th century Hungary. SZEKFŰ, Julius. Die Servienten und Familiaren im ungarischen Mittelalter. In *Ungarische Rundschau für historische und soziale Wissenschaften*, 1913, year 2, p. 527-531.
- 36 1261/1271: “*Item Bela proavus noster et Endere pater noster karissimus, felicitum recordationum reges, decimas omnium forestarum nostrarum et novalium prediorum nostrorum fundatorum et fundandorum ac villarum nobilium et nostrorum servitorum universaliter in districtibus de Wgacha et de Beregh existentium ecclesie Agriensi applicarunt et condonarunt, demum et nos applicavimus et condonavimus, perpetuo et irrevocabiliter exigendas.*“ *HÁO*, č. 9, p. 23-29; *RA II/1*, no. 2123, p. 124; *RA I/3*, no. 1267, p. 386; *ÁMTF I*, p. 530; PESTY, ref. 20, p. 196-197; SZÉKELY, György. Településtörténet és nyelvtörténet : A XII. századi magyar nyelvhatár kérdéséhez. (History of settlement and language : On the question of the Hungarian language boundaries in the 12th century.). In BALÁZS, Éva H. – FÜGEDI, Erik – MAKSAI, Ferenc (eds.). *Mályusz Elemér emlékkönyv : Társadalom- és művelődéstörténeti tanulmányok*. Budapest : Akadémiai Kiadó, 1984, p. 321. ISBN 9630532727; SZÜCS, ref. 9, p. 12-13; CSÓRE, Pál. *A magyar erdőgazdálkodás története : Középkor*. (A history of the economic exploitation of Hungarian forests: the Middle Ages.). Budapest : Akadémiai Kiadó, 1980, p. 79. ISBN 9630519143; ZOLNAY, ref. 27, p. 95-97.
- 37 *RA II/1*, no. 2123, p. 118-124; SUGÁR, István. *Az egri püspökök története*. (A history of the bishops

to the first. The part about revenue from tolls in the Diocese of Eger states which counties were involved. This also concerns the counties (*comitati*) of Ugoča and Bereg, and the document specifically states that these were formerly forests of the saintly kings (*qui duo ultimi comitatus, scilicet Wgacha et Bereg fuerunt foreste sanctorum regum*).³⁸ On the basis of this text, F. Pesty states that Ugoča and Bereg were not originally royal counties, but became ones only much later. Since they are still mentioned in the 1271 document as royal forests (hunting grounds of the saintly kings), there appears to have been a wish to indicate a change concerning these territories, which were already organizationally equal to other counties of the Kingdom of Hungary in the second half of the 13th century.³⁹ This is one of the direct pieces of evidence that they had earlier not been royal counties, and before the 13th century they had a specific position in the framework of the royal properties as hunting grounds or royal forests.⁴⁰ However, we cannot satisfactorily explain the use of the term *foresta* in these documents, since it was not normally used in medieval Hungary. Apart from the term *foresta*, the document uses the expression *vasali nobiles*, another term unknown in Hungary.⁴¹ This could have been connected with the writer of the document. It was conceived by the royal vice chancellor Magister Paul, then Provost of Alba Iulia. However, he came from Hungary, so the possibility that he was a foreigner does not come into account. However, he could have been educated abroad. These terms are usual in documents from Western Europe.⁴² In 1271 the Provost of Oradea and royal vice chancellor Magister Benedict wrote a copy based on a document from 1261 and preserving the terms used in the original.⁴³ When Paul used the term *foresta* in the case of Bereg and Ugoča, he certainly did not do it by accident. Everything suggests he knew

of Eger.). Budapest : Szent István Társulat az Apostoli Szentszék Könyvkiadója, 1984, p. 77-78. ISBN 9633603927.

- 38 „Item decimam partem omnium tributorum, per quemcunque exhibi consuetorum, in comitatibus videlicet Borsad, Abauywar, Zemplen, Wng, Zabolch, Zarand, Kyuzonuk, Heueswyuar, Bereg et in Wgocha, qui duo ultimi comitatus, scilicet Wgacha et Bereg fuerunt foreste sanctorum regum tradite et donate per predecessores nostros ecclesie Agriensi supradictae in decimis dicandis et persolvendis, prout ceteri comitatus.“ *HÁO*, no. 14, p. 34-38; *HÁO*, no. 38, p. 63 (1284); *CDH V/1*, p. 157; *RA II/1*, no. 2124, p. 124-125; *BOTKA*, ref. 21, p. 393; *PESTY*, ref. 20, p. 192, 195-197; *SZŰCS*, ref. 2, p. 39, 151.
- 39 *PESTY*, ref. 20, p. 196-198.
- 40 *SZŰCS*, ref. 2, p. 23, 39, 46.
- 41 *HÁO*, no. 9, p. 24; *RA II/1*, no. 2123, p. 120. This unusual term was also used in a document from 1284 concerned with the rights, tithes and liberties of the Bishopric of Eger. The context of the record shows that they were noblemen serving the Bishopric of Eger, very probably as soldiers (*nobilium vasallorum suorum*). Therefore they could have been noble vassals of the Church, so-called predialisti. *HÁO*, no. 37, p. 62 (1284).
- 42 For direct use of *vassalli nobiles* see: *The Cartulary of Flavigny : 717–1113*. BOUCHARD, Brittain Constance (ed.). Cambridge ; Massachusetts : The Medieval Academy of America, 1991, p. 91, 98, 112-113. ISBN 100915651181. For *vassallus*, *vasalus* see: *The Cartulary and Charters of Notre-Dame of Homblieres*. EVERGATES, Theodore – CONSTABLE, Giles – NEWMAN, William Mendel (eds.). Cambridge; Massachusetts : The Medieval Academy of America, 1990, p. 40, 58, 63, 69. ISBN 091095688X; KOCH, Walter (ed.). *Die Urkunden Friedrichs II. 1198–1212 : Die Urkunden der deutschen Könige und Kaiser 14/1. : MGH*. (hereinafter *F III/1*). Hannover : Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 2002, p. 7, 316. ISBN 3775220011; *F III/2*, p. 100-101, 114, 416.
- 43 ZSOLDOS, Attila. *Magyarország világi archontológiája 1000–1301*. (Secular archontology of Hungary. 1000–1301.). (hereinafter *MVA*). Budapest : MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 2011, p. 111, 341.

the Latin term normally used abroad to designate this type of royal property or territory, and he used it to designate specific properties of the kings of Hungary intended for hunting. Since only the term *silva* appears in written sources from Hungary,⁴⁴ the word *foresta* probably had the same meaning in these documents as it had in Western Europe, for example in France or the Holy Roman Empire.

Another interesting term in this document is *decima*.⁴⁵ It probably concerned revenue or income of the royal chamber (*fiscus regius*) as part of the royal prerogative (*ius regale*).⁴⁶ They were certainly not church tithes. In the 1261 document, a tenth of the revenues from the royal tolls (*decima pars omnium tributorum*) and a tenth of the income (*decimae*) from the royal forests are mentioned separately in a special part.⁴⁷ There is good evidence for the term *decima* in connection with the revenues of the royal chamber of Hungary. For example, in 1198 King Emeric confirmed that the Archbishopric of Esztergom had the right to all the royal revenues (*de omnibus proventibus regalibus...decimam ad plenum recipere debeat*) already granted by St. Stephen and St. Ladislav (*sicut per sanctos reges erant donate*), and the revenue from royal tolls, which were also designated by the term *decima*.⁴⁸ In 1203 Pope Innocent III, referring to the

44 HUDÁČEK, ref. 8, p. 50-51.

45 *Lexicon latinitatis medii aevi Hungariae : A Magyarországi középkori latinság szótára III.* (Lexicon of Mediaeval Latin of Hungary III.). Budapest : Akadémiai kiadó, 1987–1993, p. 21-22.

46 On the revenues of the Arpád dynasty and royal chamber in medieval Hungary see: BARTA, Gábor – BARTA, János. Royal Finance in Medieval Hungary : The Revenues of King Béla III. In ORMROD, W. M et al. (eds.). *Crises, Revolutions and Self-sustained Growth : Essays in European Fiscal History, 1130–1830*. Stamford : Shuan Tyas, 1999, p. 22-37. ISBN 1871615933.

47 On interpretations of *decima*, *decimacio* as princely revenues see: BALÁSSY, Ferencz. *A megye és a várispánság, vagyis a két intézmény közötti különbség.* (Counties and castle lordships, the difference between two organizational units.). Budapest : Kiadja a Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1893, p. 27; CZIZMADIA, Andor. Die rechtliche des Zehnten (Decima) in Ungarn. In *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte*, 1975, year 61, p. 230. ISSN 03234142; MODZELEWSKI, Karol. *Organizacja gospodarcza państwa piastowskiego X – XIII wiek.* (Economic organization of Piast lordship in the 10th–12th centuries.). Poznań : WPTPN, 1975 (reprint 2000), p. 92-94. ISBN 8370632734; ŽEMLIČKA, Josef. „Decimas trium provinciarum“ pro klášter v Břevnově (K hmotnému zajištění nejstarších klášterních fundací v Čechách). (“Decimas trium provinciarum” for the monastery at Břevnov (On the material securing of the oldest monastic foundations in Bohemia).). In IWAŃCZAK, Wojciech – KUCZYŃSKI, Stefan K. (eds.). *Ludzie, Kościół, wierzenia : Studia z dziejów kultury i społeczeństwa Europy Środkowej (średniowiecze – wczesna epoka nowożytna)*. Warszawa : Wydawnictwo DiG, 2001, p. 126, 128-129, 130-132. ISBN 83 7181 223X; PAUK, Marcin Rafał. Plenariae decimationes św. Wojciecha. O ideowych funkcjach dziesięciny monarszej w Polsce i na Węgrzech w XI – XII wieku. (The Plenariae decimations of St. Wojtech. On the conceptual functions of the royal tithe in Poland and Hungary in the 11th – 12th centuries.). In DOBOSZ, Józef et al. (eds.). *Gnieźnienskie koronacje królewskie i ich środkowoeuropejskie konteksty*. Gniezno : Urząd Miejski w Gnieźnie, 2011, s. 196-199. ISBN 9788393423408; JØRGENSEN, Dolly. The Roots of the English Royal Forest. In LEWIS, C. P. (ed.). *Anglo-Norman studies XXXII : Proceedings of the Battle Conference*. Woodbridge : The Boydell Press, 2010, s. 118-119. However, Péter Németh thinks that church tithes were involved. In the second half of the 13th century, the Bishopric of Eger had a dispute with the Bishop of Transylvania about tithes in Ugoča. NÉMETH, ref. 15, p. XXXI. On church tithes see also: MÚCSKA, ref. 33, p. 336-337, 339.

48 MARSINA, Richard (ed.). *Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Slovaciae I* (hereinafter *CDSI*). Bratislava : VEDA, 1971, no. 99, p. 110; MARSINA, Richard (ed.). *V kráľovstve svätého Štefana : Prameny k dejinám Slovenska a Slovákov III* (In the Kingdom of St. Stephen: Sources for the history of Slovakia and the Slovaks.), (hereinafter *PDSS*). Bratislava : Literárne informačné centrum, 2003, no. 25, p. 80.

documents of his predecessors confirmed to Jób Archbishop of Esztergom the privilege with regard to church needs of the kings of Hungary and their court. He also mentions the right to a tenth of the revenues of the royal chamber (*decimas...de camera regis*).⁴⁹ The archbishoprics of Esztergom and Kalocsa reached agreement in 1212 after a long dispute. One of the points settled was the right of the Archbishopric of Esztergom to a tenth (*decima*) of the revenue from the royal mints in the whole of Hungary.⁵⁰ It is clear from these cases that a *decima* was a tenth of the revenue of the royal chamber. Therefore in the document from 1261, it was a tenth (*decimae*) of the revenue from the royal tolls, royal forests and *prediorum nostrorum* (economic income and payments from the royal estates).⁵¹ Interpretation of the revenue from the villages of noblemen (!) and royal servants is problematic. It may have meant specific payments, for example, in marten skins (*marturinae*), which came from the royal servants in the royal lands of Ugoča and Bereg during the reigns of Bela III and Andrew III. A document from 1212 provides help with interpretation of this tenth (*decima*) of the revenue from the royal forests. Sometime at the beginning of the 13th century, Bank Sheriff of Bihar and administrator of the queen's court (*curiali comitis regine*) bought the *terra Szurch* in the County of Szabolcs from the Comes Ypoch. In 1212 Andrew II confirmed the ownership of this property and designated its boundaries. The last part of the document states that the property contains a further 15 villages, which were not under his judicial authority. However, the monarch gave him the right to the royal tax (*tributum*). Every household in these villages had to annually pay him the so-called forest tax (*pro tributo silve*) in the form of one oko (about 54 litres) of grain, two hens and five pieces of cloth. This was a specific payment collected from the royal property in the furthest part of the County of Szabolcs near the river Tisza.⁵²

This north-eastern part – with the villages mentioned in the document from 1212 – was, like Bereg, originally part of the frontier county of Boržava.⁵³ Therefore, it is very probable that the *decima omnium forestarum nostrorum* could also have been such a forest tax (*tributum silve*), which was paid not only in Szabolcs-Boržava, but also in the royal properties in Bereg-Boržava and Ugoča-Boržava. However, we cannot say whether

ISBN 808878829.

- 49 “...*decimas insuper, primitias et incensum, quae de camera regis ecclesiae memoratae debentur...*“ *CDH II*, p. 416-417.
- 50 “*De prouentu monete decima pertineat ad ecclesiam Strigoniensem, ubicunque in regno Hungarie cudatur...*“ ENDLICHER, Stephan Ladislaus (ed.). *Rerum Hungaricarum monumenta Arpadiana* (hereinafter *RHMA*). St. Gallen : Scheitlin & Zollikofer, 1849, p. 407; PAUK, ref. 47, p. 199-201.
- 51 SZABÓ, István. The Praedium : Studies on the Economic History and the History of Settlement of Early Hungary. In *Agrártörténeti szemle* (hereinafter *Asz*), *Supplementum*, 1963, year 5, p. 1-24. ISSN 00021105.
- 52 „*Preterea sciendum est, quod sunt alie ville circumiacentes his predictis metis..., que tamen omnes sint libere a iurisdictione et iudicio premissi Banconis comitis, sibi et suis heredibus pro tributo silve annuatim tenentur persolvere de singulis domibus unum aconem annone, duas gallinas et quinque ligaturas lini.*“ NAGY, Emericus – IPOLYI, Arnoldus – VÉGHELY, Desiderius. (eds.). *Codex diplomaticus patrius VIII*. (hereinafter *CDP*) : *Hazai okmánytár VIII*. Budapest : Typis societatis Franklinianae, 1865 – 1880, p. 7, p. 12-15; *RA I/I*, no. 214, p. 68, no. 269, p. 86; BOGLÁRKA, Weisz. A Felső-Tisza-vidék vámszedése az Árpád-korban I. (Collection of tolls in the upper Tisza basin in the Árpád period I). In *Szabolcs-Szatmár-Beregi szemle : Társadalom, tudomány, művészet*, 2004, year 2, no. 3, p. 252-253. ISSN 1216092X.
- 53 *ÁMTF I*, p. 520-522; KRISTÓ, ref. 9, p. 418-421, 421-424.

this type of tax could also relate to the *decimas* from the royal *predia*, villages of the nobles and royal servants. It is interesting that when Ladislav I founded the Benedictine monastery at Szentjobb (now Sinjob) in Bihar in 1084–1095, and gave it royal estates (*predia*), people – even royal foresters (*custodes nemorum*) – revenues (*cum certis tributis*) from tolls in Szalacs (Bihar) and Szatmár, other revenues (*alii proventibus*), probably also from these territories, are mentioned.⁵⁴ *Proventus* could also mean payments from forests (the Igfon Wood (?) in Bihar)⁵⁵ or from the royal properties as in the case of the above mentioned *tributum silve* from 1212. Thus, in Hungary, the terms *decima*, *tributum* and *proventus* meant revenue from royal estates or forests, apparently of a tenth of the royal income also in the cases of *tributum* and *proventus*. The record in a document from 1261 about *decimas* from Bereg and Ugoča is also made more meaningful thanks to a financial inventory from 1264 compiled in Venice and concerning debts for luxury goods (cloth, clothes and jewellery) for the needs of the court of the Junior King Stephen. It ends with several records of the payment of debts for the Venetian merchant *Wilamus*, who secured the delivery of these goods to Hungary. In the name of Prince Stephen, the Provost Benedict paid 90 marks, which he obtained from the revenue or profit (*collecta*) of the royal chamber in Sriem, 75 marks from the income of the salt chamber at Szalacs (Bihar, Rumanian Sălacea), and in Buda he was paid 100 marks from the royal income from the silver of Banská Štiavnica. To these payments were added a further 40 marks from Magister Vladimír, *Vicercancellarius* to Stephen. These were revenues from the *silvis de Lompert*,⁵⁶ which were royal forests in Bereg near the village of Luprechzaza/Lampertszász (Hung. Beregszász, Ukr. Бєрєгово) about which we will learn more later. Since in these cases, it was a matter of profits or revenue of the royal prerogative, we can suppose that special forest payments (*tributum silve*, *decima*) collected in money, flowed regularly into the royal chamber from the Forest of Bereg.

The mention of the village of *Perek, a vanished village situated east of Beregújfalú, Бєрєгѹѹфалѹ is also important in the document from 1261.⁵⁷ The record of the properties of the Bisopric of Eger state who gave them to the bishopric. It was either St. Stephen or St. Ladislav. Only *Perek was granted by Andrew II, the monarch whose grant was appealed to in the above mentioned part about revenue from the royal forests. The important thing is mainly that he granted it together with forest and swineherds (*cum porcorum*

54 „...cui eciam predia et cetera necessaria atque populum ad officium ecclesie pertinentem ordinavit cum certis tributis de Zolochy et de Zathmar ac aliis proventibus“. *DHA I*, no. 101, p. 302-303; *ÁMTF I*, p. 668-669. On markets and tolls in this part of Hungary see: BOGLÁRKA, ref. 52, p. 251-257; BOGLÁRKA, ref. 30, p. 92-97.

55 *KMTL*, p. 280-281.

56 „Item LX marcas quas dedit magister Lodomerius eidem syr Wilamo in silvis de Lompert.“ ZOLNAY, László. István ifjabb király számadása 1264-ből. (The accounts of the Junior King Stephen from 1264.). In *Budapest régiségei*, 1964, year 21, p. 82, 88, 106. ISSN 01331892; FEJÉRPATAKY, László. *A királyi kancellária az Árpádok korában*. (The royal chancellery in the Árpád period.). Budapest : Kiadja A. M. T. Akadémia, 1885, p. 119; *ÁMTF I*, p. 532-533; ENGEL, Pál. *The Realm of St. Stephen : A History of Medieval Hungary 895–1526*. London, New York : I. B. Tauris, 2001, p. 250. ISBN 101860640613.

57 MIZSER, Lajos. Bereg megye korai helynevei. (Early place names in the County of Bereg.). In LAKATOS, Ilona P. – SEBESTYÉN, Zsolt (eds.). *Emlékkönyv Mező András tiszteletére*. Nyíregyháza : Bessenyei Könyvkiadó, 2010, p. 88. ISBN 9786155097072; *ÁMTF I*, s. 547. *Perek is still mentioned in 1299 as a property of the Bishopric of Eger. *RA II/4*, č. 4220, s. 215.

pastoribus collata).⁵⁸ It was a village of royal swineherds, and part of the forest divided from the territory of the royal property in Bereg belonged to it. In Western Europe pasturing of pigs in forests was part of the royal prerogative, and it could have been the same in Hungary. It happened in oak or beech forests, especially in royal properties. Fees had to be paid for the possibility to pasture pigs in royal forests.⁵⁹ For example, a falsified document supposed to be from 1015 for the monastery of St. Benedict at Pécsvárad states that Stephen I granted the abbot the right to the revenues from all the forests belonging to the monastery. Specifically this meant fees for the pasturing of pigs (*in tributis porcorum*).⁶⁰ In another falsified foundation charter, that of the monastery of St. Maurice at Bél from 1037/1086, established in the royal forest of Bakon, the monarch granted the abbot the right to freely pasture pigs in this forest (*porci quoque abbatis in eadem libere pascantur*).⁶¹ When Ladislav I confirmed the properties of the monastery of St. Martin at Pannonhalma at the end of the 11th century, he also mentioned villages together with forests. They were granted to the monastery for the salvation of the king's soul. The possession of one of the monastery's properties, located in the forest of *Selez*, was also confirmed. It had 30 settlements of swineherds with 300 pigs and was intended for the pasturing of pigs (*ad pasturam porcorum*).⁶² Finally, one of the points of the *Golden Bull* of 1222 is a rule that the king's pigs cannot be pastured in the forests or meadows of the king's servants (*serviens regis*) without their permission.⁶³ Since one of the points of the bull was also control of forest pastures, it testifies to the importance of rearing pigs in royal properties. The revenues (*decimae*) from the royal forests mentioned in 1261 also include the fees for pasturing pigs in the Bereg forest. The evidence includes the

-
- 58 „*Item villa Perek cum silva et aliis suis utilitatibus in comitatu de Bereg, sita per karum patrem nostrum Endere regem felicis memorie cum porcorum pastoribus collata et per nos ex certa scientia confirmata.*“ *HÁO*, no. 9, p. 26; *RA II/1*, no. 2123, p. 123; *PESTY*, ref. 20, p. 192, 195-196; *ÁMTF I*, p. 547.
- 59 HUDÁČEK, Pavol. *Silva ad pasturam porcorum* : Lesné pasenie sviň na kráľovských majetkoch v ranostredovekej Európe. (*Silva ad pasturam porcorum*: Forest pasturing of pigs in royal properties in early medieval Europe.). In *Historické štúdie : Ročenka Historického ústavu Slovenskej akadémie vied*, 2014, year 48, p. 71-102. ISBN 9788022413954. On the pasturing of pigs in Hungary see: CSÖRE, ref. 36, p. 43-47, 190-194; MAKKAI, László. Östliches Erbe und westliche Leihe in der ungarischen Landwirtschaft der frühfeudalen Zeit (10. – 13. Jahrhundert). In *Asz, Supplementum*, 1974, year 16, p. 4-9, 21-22; KUČERA, Matúš. *Slovensko po páde Veľkej Moravy : Štúdie o hospodárskom a sociálnom vývine v 9. – 13. storočí*. (Slovakia after the fall of Great Moravia: Studies of economic and social development, 9th – 13th centuries.). Bratislava : VEDA, 1974, p. 110-115. ISBN 9788374902557.
- 60 „*Silvarum quoque proventum ubique ecclesie pertinencium, ut in tributis porcorum seu arundinetorum, nulli omnino liceat possidere, nisi abbati.*“ *DHA I*, no. 12, p. 76.
- 61 *DHA I*, no. 26, p. 119 (falsified). On this see: SZABÓ, ref. 9, p. 139-142; CANTOR, Leonard. Forests, Chases, Parks and Warrens. In CANTOR, M. Leonard (ed.). *The English Medieval Landscape*. Bristol : Typeset by Leaper & Garrd Ltd, 1982, p. 60-63. ISBN 0709907079.
- 62 „*Quindecim predium est infra silvam Selez, quod dedit rex L. ad pasturam porcorum cum XXX mansionibus subulcorum et trecentis porcis.*“ *DHA I*, no. 100, p. 300 (1093 – 1095).
- 63 „*Porci nostri in silvis vel pratis servantur non pascantur contra voluntatem eorum.*“ *CDSI I*, no. 270, p. 200; 1222: Cap. XXII. BAK, M. János – BÓNIS, György – SWEENEY, James Ross (eds.). *The Laws of the Medieval Kingdom of Hungary I. 1000 – 1301 : Decreta regni medievalis Hungariae I. 1000–1301* (hereinafter *DRMH I/1*). Idyllwild : Charles Schlacks, Jr. Publisher, 1999, p. 22. ISBN 88445292; BÉSENYEI, Lajos et al (eds.). *De Bulla Aurea : Andreae II. Regis Hungariae MCCXXII*. Verona : Edizioni Valdonega, 1999, p. 23-26, 171-180. ISBN 108885033350.

privilege of Andrew II from 1206 for royal guests in Transylvania. He freed them from paying fees (*tributum vel decima*) for pasturing pigs in the royal forest.⁶⁴ When Belo IV confirmed older properties and rights of the Hospitellers from Székesfehérvár, he also granted them further privileges. They gained freedom from paying *tributum vel decimae porcorum*, which concerned the pasturing of pigs in forests.⁶⁵ It is interesting that in the cases mentioned above, the designation of the royal fees agrees with our statements in the part about the revenues of the royal chamber. In Western Europe, the revenue of the royal prerogative also included fees for construction timber, collection of fallen wood, scything of meadows, founding of new villages and so on.⁶⁶

It is questionable whether similar fees were considered under the term *decimae* from Bereg and Ugoča in 1261. We cannot exclude it because we have evidence from medieval Hungary of similar royal fees relating to royal forests. For example, in 1275, not the king but the Hungarian Hospitellers allowed the *Comes* Perchin to freely pasture pigs in woods belonging to the order's house at Čič, now in Croatia, which also concerned the right to construction timber⁶⁷ Thanks to the privileges granted by Ladislav IV (1272–1290), the guests from Vasvár could obtain wood for their needs such as building and heating, cut grass, collect herbs (?) and use the rivers – for fishing (?) in the royal *silva Raba*.⁶⁸ Ladislav IV in 1283 and 1286 and Andrew III (1290–1301) in 1291 and 1298 granted similar rights, which were part of the royal forest prerogative in this forest.⁶⁹ We learn much more about what is hidden behind permission to use royal forests from a document of Queen Constance of Bohemia, daughter of Bela III of Hungary. In 1228 (!) she granted privileges to German guests in Hodonín. They could collect brushwood, dry

64 MNL DL 30 354; *CDH III/1*, p. 34; JAKÓ, Sigismundus (ed.). *Codex diplomaticus Transsylvaniae : Diplomata, epistolae et alia instrumenta litteraria res Transsylvanas illustrantia I. (1023–1300)*. Budapest : Akadémiai Kiadó, 1997, no. 32, p. 132. ISBN 9636311579.

65 MNL DL 106 180 (1232/1377); *CDH IV/1*, p. 105-106; *RA I/2*, no. 637, p. 194-195; HUNYADI, Zsolt. *The Hospitellers in the Medieval Kingdom of Hungary c. 1150–1387*. Budapest : METEM ; CEU, 2010, p. 34, 37. ISBN 9789639662445.

66 YOUNG, R. Charles. English Royal Forests under the Angevin Kings. In *The Journal of British Studies*, 1972, year 12, no. 1, p. 10-11. ISSN 00219371; NICHOLLS, H. Philip. On the Evolution of a Forest Landscape. In *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 1972, year 56, p. 57-58. ISSN 14755661; CANTOR, ref. 61, p. 58-59; BIRRELL, Jean. Common Rights in the Medieval Forest : Disputes and Conflicts in the Thirteenth Century. In *Past and Present*, 1987, year 117, p. 36-38. ISSN 1477464X.

67 „*Preterea in silvis ad domum de Chychan spectantibus, excepta silva Owas vocata, tam porci dicti comitis Perchini...sine aliqua exactione tributi pascantur et ligna tam pro hedeфициis domorum, quam usu recipient...*“ MNL DL 924; *CDAC IX*, no. 84, p. 129; *RA II/2-3*, no. 2632, p. 135; On this see: HUNYADI, ref. 65, p. 73-74.

68 „*Concessimus etiam, ut in silva Raba ligna recipiendi pro usibus suis necessaria, falcandi fenum et herbas et utendi usu aque sine exactione et impedimento aliquo liberam habeant facultatem.*“ POZZA-LINDECK, Irmtraut et al (eds.). *Urkundenbuch des Burgenlandes und der angrenzenden Gebiete der Komitate Wieselburg, Ödenburg und Eisenburg II. : Die Urkunden von 1271 bis 1301 (hereinafter UB II)*. Graz; Köln : Verlag Hermann Böhlau Nachf., 1965, no. 185, p. 131-133; KUBINYI, András (ed.). *Elenchus fontium historiae urbanae, III/2*. Budapest : Balassi Kiadó, 1997, no. 59, p. 71-72. ISBN 9635061692.

69 *UB II*, no. 240, p. 175; no. 281, p. 200; no. 283, p. 201; no. 320, p. 224; no. 369, p. 255; no. 456, p. 317.

wood and herbs (?), pasture their pigs and cattle, but they could not cut the green shoots of oaks after trimming.⁷⁰

According to the document from 1261, the properties of the Bishopric of Eger were located *in pluribus districtibus et comitatibus*.⁷¹ It is interesting that different terms are used to designate these lands, and they are certainly not seen as synonyms. The counties of Heves, Borsod, Szolnok, Csanád, Békés, Zaránd, Zemplin, Abov and Szabolcs are all called by the term *comitatus*. Only Ugoča and Bereg are designated as *districti*. Therefore, it is very probable that the author of the document distinguished “normal counties” from dynastic properties. This is also indicated by the second variant of the document from 1271, which clearly states that Bereg and Ugoča were originally royal forests (*fuerunt foreste sanctorum regum*). Only the village of *Perek was located *in comitatu de Bereg*. The explanation of this exception could be the fact that although the older tradition (!) of designating these lands from the reigns of Bela III and Andrew designated these former royal forests as *districti*, according to the document from 1261 this village was no longer situated *in districtu*, but *in comitatu*. This may indicate a change in the territorial organization of Bereg in the second half of the 13th century, which was also expressed in a different designation of this former royal property, which was already organized in a similar way to older counties.

In the first half of the 13th century the kings of Hungary sometimes stayed in or near Bereg. We know this thanks to documents which state that the king was *in silva que nominatur Bereg* (1233), *apud silvam Berech* (1233), *apud silvam Bereyg* (1233).⁷² The donation of the document of **Chepanfulde*, a vanished village not far from Kisdobrony, Мала Добронь, on the edge of the Bereg area, in 1248 already states that it lay *in comitatu Beregh*.⁷³ Between 1257 and 1261, the land of **Paznan*, a vanished village in the territory of Beregsurány, south-west of Beregszász, is mentioned *in provincia Bereg*.⁷⁴ The 1261 document designates this territory as the *districtus de Beregh*.⁷⁵ In 1263 the

70 „Item kletska, sicca ligna, libere herbasque habeant, excepta viridi quercu. Pastor cum grege vadat libere in eadem sylva.“ *RHMA*, p. 425-426; *CDH VII/5*, no. 124, p. 240.

71 *HÁO*, no. 9, p. 23; *RA II/1*, no. 2123, p. 118-119.

72 In 1233 the king's location was said to be near the Bereg Wood, but the document was issued only in Esztergom: „Actum apud silvam Bereyg...Datum Strigonii...“ THEINER, Augustibus (ed.). *Vetera monumenta historica Hungariam sacram illustrantia I* (hereinafter *VMH*). Roma : Typis Vaticanis, 1859, no. CXCVIII, p. 119; no. CCVIII, p. 124; *ÁMTF I*, p. 522, 530-531; KRISTÓ, ref. 9, p. 424. On the king's meeting with the papal legate in Bereg see: FONT, Márta. Ungarn und Osteuropa zur Zeit des Königs Andreas II. (1205–1235). In GÜNDISCH, Konrad (ed.). *Generalprobe Burzenland : Neue Forschungen zur Geschichte des Deutschen Ordens in Siebenbürgen und im Banat*. Köln; Weimar, Wien : Böhlau Verlag, 2013, p. 53-54. ISBN 9783412210946.

73 NAGY, Imre – NAGY, Iván – VÉGHÉLY, Dezső (eds.). *Codex diplomaticus domus senioris comitum Zichy de Zich et Vasonkeo I. : A zichi és vasonkeői gróf Zichy-család idősb ágának okmánytára* (hereinafter *Zichy Ok.*). Pest : Editio Societatis Histor. Hung, 1871, no. 244, p. 284 (1248/1402); *RA I/2*, no. 887, p. 267; *ÁMTF I*, p. 537; ZSOLT, ref. 27, p. 33-34. Also see the year 1282: „de comitatu Bereg“ *Zichy Ok. I*, no. 53, p. 50; *RA II/2-3*, no. 3190, p. 302 (1282).

74 MNL DL 83 038; *Zichy Ok. I*, no. 8, p. 5-6; SZENTPÉTERY, Imre – ZSOLDOS, Attila (eds.). *Regesta ducum, ducissarum stirpis Arpadianae necnon reginarum Hungariae critico-diplomatica* (hereinafter *RD*). Budapest : MOL, 2008, no. 82, p. 61; *ÁMTF I*, p. 547; ZSOLT, ref. 27, p. 112.

75 *HÁO*, no. 9, p. 23-29.

villages of Szentmiklós (Чинадієво), Szolyva (Свалява), Alsóverecke (Нижні Ворота) up to Mukačevo and the frontier were *in comitatu de Bereg*.⁷⁶ In 1263 the outlying village of *Borod near Mukačevo also lay *in comitatu de Bereg*.⁷⁷ In 1279 the village of Beregsurány was *in comitatu de Bereg*,⁷⁸ and in 1280 the village of Nagymuzsaly (Мужієво) was *in comitatu de Beregh*.⁷⁹ Do all these labels: 1233 *silva*, 1248/1402 *comitatus*, 1257–1261 *provincia*, 1261 *districtus* and from 1263 usually only *comitatus*, represent organizational or administrative changes that happened in the course of the 13th century, or are they synonymous in this period? It is entirely possible that the terms *districtus* or *provincia* could have originally been used to designate a royal property (*predium*) or forest (*silva*) composed of a large continuous territory. On the basis of this, Gy. Györffy supposes that Bereg as a royal forest property (*predium*) with a manorhouse (*curia*) and foresters (*custodes silvarum*) was destroyed during the Tartar invasion, and later the greater part of its population was composed only of the castle *jobagiones* and *castrenses* of Boržava. Therefore this originally royal property was gradually transformed into an independent county and its territory was divided from Boržava. For this reason the designation of Bereg in the second half of the 13th century was still not fixed with *provincia*, *comitatus*, *predium* and *districtus* all appearing.⁸⁰ Evidence that in the first half of the 13th century, *districtus* and *provincia* could really be terms that designated royal lands, can be found in the record of the property of the Arpád dynasty in Šariš, part of the frontier county of *Novum Castrum*. In 1261 the Junior King Stephen granted land with a church dedicated to St. Ladislav King of Hungary to the *Comes Echy*. The land was situated in the territory of the royal property of Solivar (*quamdam terram in districtu predii nostri de Souuar existentem*).⁸¹ Solivar, as a royal *predium*, had its *districtus* or defined territory. Liptov, as part of the great royal domain with its centre at Zvolen, was a royal *predium* mentioned in 1233, 1279 and 1293.⁸² In 1230 Andrew II granted land *in territorio de*

76 MNL DL 552; MNL DL 553; *CDAC VIII*, no. 45, p. 68; *RA II/1*, no. 1809, p. 16; *RA I/3*, no. 1379, p. 422-423; ZSOLT, ref. 27, p. 15, 125, 131; *ÁMTF I*, p. 548, 549, 550.

77 MNL DL 105 776; *CDP VIII*, p. 98, no. 77; *RD*, no. 81, p. 61; ZSOLT, ref. 27, p. 29; *ÁMTF I*, p. 535-536.

78 *RA II/2-3*, no. 2954, p. 234; ZSOLT, ref. 27, p. 126.

79 *RA II/2-3*, no. 3069, p. 266, 1280; TASNÁDI NAGY, Gyula (ed.). *Codex diplomaticus Hungariae Andegavensis VII. : Anjoukori okmánytár VII* (hereinafter *AO*). Budapest : Kiadja a Magyar Történelmi Társulat, 1920, no. 322, p. 602, 1280/1359; ZSOLT, ref. 27, p. 104; *ÁMTF I*, p. 546. See also in 1285: *RA II/2-3*, no. 3397, p. 365.

80 *ÁMTF I*, p. 522-523.

81 Ministry of the Interior of the Slovak Republic, State Archives Prešov, Prešov city authorities collection, sign. 1; *CDAC III*, no. 3, p. 4-5; *CDAC VIII*, no. 7, p. 11-12; ŠMILAUER, Vladimír. *Vodopis starého Slovenska*. (Hydrography of old Slovakia.). Prague; Bratislava : Učená spoločnosť Šafaříková, 1932, p. 218; ULÍČNÝ, Ferdinand. *Dejiny osídlenia Šariša*. (History of the Settlement of Šariš.). Košice : Východoslovenské vydavateľstvo, 1990, p. 369. ISBN 8085174030.

82 The granting of Ifanovo in Liptov: „...sitam et iacentem in Lyptou, que ad predium nostrum pertinebat...“ *CDSI I*, no. 416, p. 304; 1279: „...quod universi populi nostri de predio nostro de Lyptou“. Magyar nemzeti levéltár Budapest, Diplomatikai Fényképgyűjtemény (Photos of archival material held elsewhere) (hereinafter MNL DF), sign. 283 623; *CDAC XII*, no. 216, p. 255; *RA II/2-3*, no. 2978, p. 240. The village of Palúdzka: „...quamdam terram seu villam nostram Kyssew Polugha vocatam in Lypto existentem et ad ipsum predium nostrum de Lypto pertinentem...“ MNL DL 40 218; *CDP VIII*, no. 273, p. 329-340; *RA II/4*, no. 3952, p. 125, 1293. On this see: *ÁMTF IV*, p. 39-52; MALINIÁK, Pavol. *Človek a krajina*

Lyptou.⁸³ In 1263, even the village of Slovenská Ľupča – a considerable distance from the centre of Liptov and on the river Hron south of the Nízke Tatry, is said to be *in provincia Liptouiensi*.⁸⁴ In a dispute from 1289 on the ownership of part of the land of *Sokolče in Liptov witnesses are said to be *de districtu Lypto*.⁸⁵ In 1295 forest above the village of Liptovská Sielnica is said to be *in provincia Lythouiensi*.⁸⁶ In a property exchange in the same year, Demeter son of Paul, a king's man in judicial matters (*homo regius?*), is described as a *homo provincie de Lyptov*.⁸⁷ The territory of the royal property in Liptov in the 13th century is never called a *comitatus*. This was probably because only Zvolen was a *comitatus*. Liptov, Turiec, Šušolie and Orava, lands that were an integral part of it, were already designated differently in the sources, namely as *districtus* or *provincia*. Apart from Zvolen and Liptov, there was also a royal *predium* in Turiec.⁸⁸ We have a record from 1293 concerning the village of Nedožery-Brezany, which belonged to the royal property (*terrae nostra prediales*) located in *provincia de Turuch*.⁸⁹ We have a mention from the same year of the village of Slovenské Pravno, which *ad praedium nostrum de Turucz pertinentem*, and for more precision it is said to be *in fine districtus de Turuch*.⁹⁰ Even at the end of the 13th century, Andrew III strove to solve the unclear property situation after the preceding extensive grants, by revision and control of the territories of his properties (*predia*) in Zvolen, Turiec and Liptov.⁹¹ Finally also in neighbouring Spiš, which was also a “private” royal property,⁹² the grant of the land of *Miloj in 1255 is said to be *in districto Scepusiensi*. This document states that the king's man Magister Aba carried out a revision of the royal properties with regard to the *terras comitatus Scepusiensis*.⁹³ We also know from a document from 1293 that the king's dog handlers from the village

Zvolenskej kotliny v stredoveku. (Man and the landscape. The Zvolenská Kotlina Basin in the Middle Ages.). Banská Bystrica : Fakulta humanitných vied UMB, 2009, p. 43-48, 54. ISBN 9788080839147.

83 CDS I, no. 361, p. 257.

84 CDH IV/3, p. 182-183.

85 RA II/2-3, no. 3540, p. 408-409.

86 RA II/4, no. 4021, p. 149, 1295; CDP VII, no. 195, p. 240-241.

87 MNL DF 248 802; CDAC X, no. 88, p. 140; RA II/4, no. 4067, p. 165.

88 MÁLYUSZ, Elemér. Die Entstehung des Komitates Turóc. In *Ungarische Jahrbücher*, 1921, year 1, no. 4, p. 298-312.

89 MNL DL 40 215; RA II/4, no. 3919, p. 113.

90 MNL DL 57 153; CDH VI/1, p. 242-245; RA II/4, no. 3908, p. 109.

91 In 1293: „*Quod cum nos, more maiestatis nostri imperii ad videnda seu habitanda seu predia nostra, Zou-lum scilicet, Turuch, et Lyptou accessissemus et in eisdem ea, qua rite acta non fuerant in alienationibus terrarum ad ipsa predia nostra pertinentium, voluissemus emendare et in melius reformare ibique moram traxissemus in manendo propter premissa reformanda, statuimus, ut omnes terre, que a dictis prediis nostris quocumque modo vel quibuscumque per praedecessores nostros collate et donate extitissent, re-ambulantur et statuerentur et restituerunt...*“ MNL DL 65 255; RA II/4, no. 3910, p. 109-110; MNL DL 57 153; CDH VI/1, p. 242-245; RA II/4, no. 3908, p. 109.

92 ZSOLDOS Attila. Vznik Spišského komitátu. (The origin of the County of Spiš.). In ŠTEVÍK, Miroslav (ed.). *K stredovekým dejinám Spiša*. Stará Ľubovňa : Ľubovnianske múzeum, 2003, p. 21, 25-26. ISBN 8096889028.

93 MARSINA, Richard (ed.). *Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Slovaciae II* (hereinafter CDSI II). Bratislava : VEDA, 1987, no. 493, p. 343; FEKETE NAGY, Antal. *A Szepesség területi és társadalmi kialakulása*. (The creation of the territory and community of Spiš.). Budapest: MTA, 1934, p. 112, 114-115.

of Smižany came *de districtu de Scepus*.⁹⁴ Therefore, we can conclude that all the great royal properties (*predia*) with a central manor house (*curia, curtis, villa regis*) had their own territories called *districtus, provincia* or *comitatus*. They included villages subject to the royal manor and together formed an integrated territory. The village of **Csernyec* (somewhere near Berzence, County of Somogy) is a good example of the internal organization of a royal property. It is mentioned in the first half of the 13th century in a dispute between Pannonhalma Abbey and the Chapter of Veszprém about tithes in the County of Somogy. However, it was originally a royal manor to which 10 villages belonged (*de villa Chernech, que curia regalis fuit, sed modo donata est nobilibus et decem villarum pertinentium ad eandem curiam et circumadiacentium*).⁹⁵

Bereg also contained a royal *predium*, which is already mentioned in 1232.⁹⁶ The designation of the Bereg territory as a *districtus* or *provincia* is probably connected with the royal property, which could have had this designation at least since the reign of Bela III. However, we cannot say with certainty whether the terms *districtus* or *provincia* were regularly used for all dynastic lands or forests of the Arpád dynasty already in the 12th century. We know a multitude of cases from the 13th century, when the lands of the king or queen were most frequently designated as *comitatus*. For example, the well known royal forest of Bakon is mentioned in the sources as *silva, comitatus* and *districtus*. The frontier royal forests of Erdőd and Szilágy not far from Bereg and Ugoča, are mentioned only as *silvae* in the first half of the 13th century. Ugoča, where there was also a royal *predium*, is mentioned with Bereg as a *districtus* in 1261. By the end of the 13th century, it is also designated as a *comitatus seu districtus* or *provincia*. However, Patak-Sárospatak was always only a *comitatus*. Šariš is mentioned in the 13th century as a *predium* and *comitatus*, and by the beginning of the 14th century regularly as a *districtus*. Turňa was designated in the Middle Ages as a *predium, comitatus* and *districtus* (!). The properties

94 MNL DL 71 627; *RA II/4*, no. 3923, p. 114-115; *CDH VI/1*, p. 245; FEKETE NAGY, ref. 93, p. 94-96.

95 ERDÉLYI, László (ed.). *A pannonhalmi főapátság története I. : A pannonhalmi Szent-Benedek-rend története*. (The history of Pannonhalma Abbey I.: History of the Pannonhalma Benedictines.). Budapest : Stephaneum, A Szent-István-Társulat Nyomdája, 1902, no. 104, p. 691; BOLLA, Ilona. A jobbágytelek kialakulásának kérdéséhez (A „curia“ és „mansio“ terminusok jelentésváltozása az Árpád-korban). (On the question of the development of the serf-plot (the change in meaning of the terms curia and mansio in the Arpád era.). In *Annales Universitatis Scientiarum Budapestinensis de Rolando Eötvös nominatae : Sectio Historica*, 1961, year 3, p. 101. ISSN 05248981; KIS, Péter. *A királyi szolgálónépi szervezet a 13. – 14. században*. (The organization of royal service in the 13th – 14th centuries.). Szeged : Szegedi Középkorász Műhely, 2010, p. 42. ISBN 9789633060803. On the theory of central places see: MOŹDZIOCH, Sławomir. Mjesca centralne Polski wczesnopiastowskiej. Organizacja przestrzeni we wczesnym średniowieczu jako źródło poznania systemu społeczno-gospodarczego. (Central places in early Piast Poland. Spatial organization in the Early Middle Ages as a source of knowledge of the socio-economic system.). In MOŹDZIOCH, Sławomir (ed.). *Centrum i zaplecze we wczesnośredniowiecznej Europie Środkowej*. Wrocław : Werk, 1999, p. 22-24, 26. ISBN 8391113019.

96 MNL DF 253 657 (1232/1360); DOMAHIDI-SIPOS, Zsigmond. A „Keresztyén Urak adománya“. (“The donation of Christian lords.”). In *Magyar nyelv*, 1956, year 52, no. 3, p. 384; SZABÓ, Károly. *Az Erdélyi muzeum eredeti okleveleinek kivonata (1232–1540)*. (A catalogue of the original documents in the Transylvanian Museum (1232–1540).). Budapest : Az Athenaeum R. Társulat Könyvnyomdája, 1889, no. 1, p. 5; *RA I/1*, no. 497, p. 158; *ÁMTF I*, p. 530-531; SZÉKELY, ref. 36, p. 322; HECKENAST, Gusztáv. *Fejedelmi (királyi) szolgálónépek a korai Árpád-korban*. Budapest : Akadémiai Kiadó, 1970, p. 98-99. ISBN 7069137.

of the queen at Segesd (County of Somogy), Verőce (County of Somogy) and Vižol' (County of Abov) are always mentioned in the sources as *comitatus*. It is interesting that in 1276 Segesd is mentioned as *comitatus seu clytium nostrum Segusdiense*. The term *clytium* is used here with the meaning *mensa regia* – a property intended to supply the court of the queen.⁹⁷ This brief selection makes it clear that the word *comitatus* was also used to designate dynastic properties and it appears that in the course of the 13th century it entirely replaced the older terms *districtus* or *provincia*.

In the first half of the 13th century, the royal property of Bereg is mentioned as *silva, provincia, districtus* and *comitatus*.⁹⁸ We think that on the basis of the examples given above, these terms expressed its specific position in the framework of the territorial administrative division of the Kingdom of Hungary. The designation of this territory in royal documents gradually began to change, and in spite of some irregularities, the term *comitatus* became usual in the 13th century. All the dynastic properties found in the territories of royal counties were organized independently. In some cases we can also speak of royal forests, which resembled the organization of forests in France or the Holy Roman Empire (*foresta*). This was probably also the case with Bereg, Ugoča, Erdőd and others.⁹⁹ Since they were not “normal counties”, each with a central castle (*civitas, castrum*), they were not originally designated *comitatus*. However, it is necessary to say that also in the earliest period, various terms such as *pagus, parochia* or *comitatus*, were used for royal counties (*megye-provincia*) and castle lordships (*várispánság-comitatus*), but it is not possible to see in this any rule because they were considered synonymous.¹⁰⁰ In the first half of the 13th century, the designation of these territories was already much more consistent than in the 11th and 12th centuries. It is questionable whether they always distinguished royal counties from the dynastic properties of the Arpád dynasty. They were not always clearly distinguished by the terms used in practice. Therefore, the word *comitatus* did not have to designate only a royal county, it could also be a dynastic property or royal estate (*predium, districtus, provincia, comitatus*), in spite of the fact that it lay within the territory of a royal county.¹⁰¹ In this context, it is necessary to comment that a *comitatus* did not have to be a territory with exact boundaries, but often concerned the exercise of power over a group of people in individual localities or smaller administrative territories. This legal authority of a person appointed by the king related to an

97 KRISTÓ, ref. 9, p. 252-254, 255-259, 261-262, 319-320, 389-393, 407-408 410-411, 413, 488-490, 492-497; SZÚCS, ref. 9, p. 23.

98 KRISTÓ, ref. 9, p. 421-426; *KMTL*, p. 97-98; NÉMETH, Péter. Szatmár vármegye : Történeti áttekintés. (The County of Szatmár. A historical summary.). In *Szabolcs-Szatmár-Beregi szemle : Társadalom, tudomány, művészet*, 2011, year 46, no. 1, p. 8-9. ISSN 1219092X.

99 HUDÁČEK, ref. 8, p. 42-43, 48, 54.

100 On this see: BALÁSSY, ref. 47, p. 11, 13-16; HÓMAN, ref. 5, p. 208-211; BEREND, Nora – URBAŇCZYK, Przemysław – WISZEWSKI, Przemysław. *Central Europe in the High Middle Ages : Bohemia, Hungary and Poland, c. 900 – c. 1300*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2013, p. 152-154. ISBN 9780521786959.

101 GYÖRFFY, György. *Civitas, castrum, castellum*. In *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 1975, year 23, no. 3-4, p. 331-334. ISSN 15882543; ZSOLDOS, Attila. Szent István vármegyéi. (St. Stephen's county.). In KRISTÓ, Gyula (ed.). *Államalapítás, társadalom, művelődés*. Budapest : MTA Történettudományi Intézate, 2001, p. 44, 49. ISBN 9638312734.

individual community – people of the king, queen, church institution or other – in the framework of a larger region, and it is very probable that this also applied in Hungary. It meant an independent jurisdiction, not subject to the central administrative officials such as the sheriff of a county. In Western Europe this also especially concerned royal forests (*forestae*).¹⁰²

These independent territories of the monarch were overseen by special royal administrators, who, for example, in France and the Holy Roman Empire, were called *iudices*, *villici*, *actores*, *praefecti*, *advocati* or *procuratores*.¹⁰³ It is supposed that dynastic properties in Hungary (*predium*, *districtus*, *comitatus*) had administrators appointed by the king. However, they did not fall under the authority of the sheriffs of the counties in which these dynastic properties were situated. It is probable that in the 11th century they were royal *villici*, who administered royal manors (*curia*, *curtis*, *villa*) and the lands surrounding them. They are already mentioned in the oldest Hungarian laws. In the first half of the 13th century, royal *procuratores* appear. They were administrators of royal properties (*predia*) and they appear to have replaced *villici*.¹⁰⁴ Gallus Anonymus in the *Gesta principum Polonorum* from the 12th century mentions princely administrators of castles and royal properties (fortified manor houses (?) – *civitas*) as *villici* and *vicedominii*.¹⁰⁵ Polish medievalists suppose that royal administrators were called *villici* at first and later *procuratores* as in Hungary.¹⁰⁶ It is probable that in the course of the 13th century *procuratores* were replaced by *comites* in Hungary. This could have been connected with the more frequent designation of royal properties as *comitatus*, which was then reflected in the designation of their chief representatives as *comites*. It is questionable whether in the 11th – 13th centuries *villici* and *procuratores* were only administrators of the royal manor house, while administration and justice in its territory was the responsibility of the *comes*, so that there were two “officials” active at the same time in a royal estate. The term *ministerialis* is also interesting in connection with the administration of royal property. For example, Buna son of Narad had this designation. In 1231, on orders from the king, he demarcated a grant of land at Bobrovec in Liptov.¹⁰⁷ He could have been the administrator royal property in Liptov (*ministerialis noster de Lipto*) as there was also a

102 BENJAMIN, Arnold. *Princes and territories in medieval Germany*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1991, p. 114-116. ISBN 52139085.

103 BRÜHL, Carl Richard. *Fodrum, gistum, servitium regis : Studien zu den wirtschaftlichen Grundlagen des Königtums im Frankenreich und in den fränkischen Nachfolgestaaten Deutschland, Frankreich und Italien vom 6. bis zur Mitte des 14. Jahrhunderts I*. Köln, Graz : Böhlau-Verlag, 1968, p. 77-79, 100, 180-183, 381-387, 434, 520. ISBN 5550002840357.

104 HUDÁČEK, ref. 8, p. 37, 44-46, 48.

105 *Gesta principum Polonorum*, Liber I, Cap. XII, XV. KNOLL, W. Paul – SCHAER, Frank (eds.). *Gesta principum Polonorum : The Deeds of the Princes of the Poles*. Budapest; New York : Central European University Press, 2003, p. 64-65. ISBN 9639241407; GÓRECKI, Piotr. *Economy, Society and Lordship in Medieval Poland, 1100–1250*. New York; London : Holmes & Meier, 1992, p. 124-127. ISBN 0841913188.

106 WASILEWSKI, Tadeusz. Poland's Administrative Structure in Early Piast Times : Castra Ruled by Comites as Centres of Provinces and Territorial Administration. In *Acta Poloniae Historica*, 1981, year 44, p. 14. ISSN 00016829.

107 *CDS I*, no. 378, p. 270.

royal *predium* there. However, we cannot convincingly prove whether he was equivalent to a *procurator* or *comes*.

Thomas *comes de Lypto* is mentioned in 1249.¹⁰⁸ He was apparently also an administrator of royal property like Buna had been earlier (*ministerialis – comes*). Historians also consider the *comites* of Liptov, Turiec and Devičie, described as *officiales* in the sources, were subordinate to the *comes* of Zvolen. This is often interpreted that they were *comites curialis*, meaning deputy sheriffs. However, they are never referred to as *comites curiales*, but only as *Comites* and as the sheriff's *officialies*.¹⁰⁹ Therefore we think that it is not appropriate to think of them as “deputy sheriffs” of Zvolen, but more as independent administrators of individual royal properties in the framework of the great royal domain of Zvolen. However, they were subordinate to the chief administrator of this royal property, namely the *comes/procurator de Zolum*.

Mescu *comes de Bereg* is already mentioned in 1214 as the chief representative of the royal property in Bereg. At Oradea Mescu acting as judge (*iudex*) and the *pristaldus* Andrew solved a dispute between Vadu and Vulcanus, royal foresters from the *silva Beregu*.¹¹⁰ Therefore he must have held lower judicial authority as the king's administrator of the royal property. In 1232 this post was held by Legyr *procurator predii de Beregh*, who was also *comes*.¹¹¹ Is it possible that when Andrew II sometime before (*olym*) 1232 granted him the village of *Pátroh, separated from the *predium de Beregh*, he was only a *procurator*, but in 1232 he was already the *comes de Beregh*? Or was the *comes* Legyr simply serving as the *procurator predii*? A mention survives from 1263 of Michael son of Mika, former *comes de Bereg*, who received from the king three villages on the frontier in Bereg. Since he died without heirs, the Junior King Stephen granted them for proven services to Aladár, chief treasurer to the queen. Like Legyr and Michael he gained property from the king. However, we cannot say whether this resulted from the function of *comes* of Bereg, or was not connected at all. Some historians regard the oldest known *comites* of Bereg also as sheriffs of Boržava and the sheriffs of Boržava also as sheriffs of Bereg.¹¹² They were led to this by the fact that Bereg was originally part of Boržava.

108 CDSI II, no. 323, p. 225.

109 KUBÍNYI, Ferencz (ed.). *Oklevelek hontvármegyei magán-levéltárakból, Első rész 1256–1399 : Diplomatarium Hontense, Pars prima*. (Documents from private archives from the County of Hont. Part one, 1256–1399.). Budapest : n. p., 1888, no. 7, p. 11-12 (1272); *RA II/2-3*, no. 2670, p. 151 (1275); *MVA*, p. 236-238. On this see: MALINIÁK, ref. 82, p. 52.

110 „*Vadu de custodibus silvae Beregu impetiit convillanum suum, Vulcanum, pro occisione filiae suae per potionem, iudice Mescu comite de Beregu, pristaldo Andrea. Vulcanus iustificatus est.*“ KARÁCSONYI, Joannis – BOROVSZKY, Samuelis (eds.). *Regestrum Varadinense examinum ferri candentis ordine chronologico digestum, descripta effigie editionis A. 1550 illustratum* (hereinafter *RV*). Budapest : Typis Victoris Hornyánszky, 1903, no. 88 (314), p. 184.

111 „...*Andreas rex, terram Legyr, procuratoris predii sui de Beregh nomine Patroh olim ab eodem predio suo sibi collatam, ad idem predium assumpsisset...deinde procederet et convicinaretur metis terre hereditate eiusdem Legyr comitis, ibique terminaretur.*“ MNL DF 253 657; DOMAHIDI-SIPOS, ref. 96, p. 384; SZABÓ, ref. 96, no. 1, p. 5; *RA I/1*, no. 497, p. 158.

112 LEHÓCZKY, Tivadar. Beregvármegyei főispánok. (Sheriffs of the County of Bereg.). In *Sz.*, 1871, year 5, no. 9, p. 649; NAGY, Imre. Észrevételek a Bereg vármegyei főispánok névsorára. (Observations on the list of sheriffs of the County of Bereg.). In *Sz.*, 1871, year 5, no. 10, p. 719-720.

The most recent of them Atila Zsoldos already makes the distinction, but he definitely sees all the three above mentioned *comites* as chief sheriffs of Bereg.¹¹³ We think that the terms *procurator* or *comes* designated only one royal administrator, and that the *comes de Bereg* cannot be seen as the sheriff of a county. The older medievalists Tivadar Botka and Frigyes Pesty regarded the *comites de Bereg* only as the administrators of royal forest properties, just as in the well-known case of the *comes de Bakon* in the royal forest of Bakon, and in their view they were certainly not the sheriffs of counties.¹¹⁴ This view was also held by Jenő Szűcs, who also mentions other examples from the royal properties in Liptov, Turiec, Zvolen and Patak.¹¹⁵

Therefore, the *procurator* or *comes* of Bereg was the chief administrator of a royal property (*predium*), based at the main manor house located at Nagy Beregh (Великі Береги), or more probably at Beregszász (Берегове), which was the central place of this frontier territory of the Arpád dynasty. He probably oversaw the whole property and had responsibility for the villages belonging to it and the surrounding lands (*districtus, comitatus*), similarly to the sheriff (*comes*) of a royal county or castle lordship.¹¹⁶ A case from the royal forest of Zvolen, also a royal property (*predium*) of the Arpád dynasty gives clear evidence that the *procurator* and *comes* of a royal property or forest was the same person and not two people.¹¹⁷ In 1222 Detrik *comes de Zvolen* is mentioned,¹¹⁸ while a document of Andrew II from 1229 mentions that he was *procurator noster de Zoulum*.¹¹⁹ In 1230 he is again designated as *comes de Zolum*.¹²⁰ Thus, during his time as royal *comes* of Zvolen (1222–1242),¹²¹ he is also designated as *procurator*. People who held this “office” could also be *comites* without being responsible for the administration of a county. It was a common designation of a high ranking person close to the king and his court. In the Early Middle Ages this title expressed a rank or service and it did not matter whether he was active at the royal court, in a county or in a royal property. All bearers of this title were always closely connected with the royal power.¹²² Documents from Hungary also most frequently used the term *comes*. Apart from meaning the sheriff of a county, this title also designated various functionaries at the royal court such as the *comes palatinus* and the chief representatives of the king’s servants, for example, the

113 *MVA*, p. 136.

114 BOTKA, ref. 21, p. 393; PESTY, Frigyes. A bakonyi erdő-ispanság. (The county of Bakony Forest.) In *Sz*, 1876, year 10, no. 2, p. 296-297; PESTY, ref. 20, p. 196-197.

115 SZÚCS, ref. 9, p. 22-23.

116 BEREND, ref. 25, p. 307-308.

117 In 1232: „...*predium nostrum de Zoulum*...” *CDSI I*, no. 392, p. 280.

118 *CDSI I*, no. 277, p. 105 (1222).

119 MNL DL 65 686; *CDH III/2*, p. 133; *CDAC I*, no. 157, p. 163; *RA I/I*, no. 457, p. 147 (1229).

120 *RA I/I*, no. 460, p. 148-149.

121 *CDSI II*, no. 115, p. 76; *MVA*, p. 235.

122 BEREND, ref. 25, p. 307-308; WOLFRAM, Herwig (ed.). *Intitulatio II : Lateinische Herrscher- und Fürstentitel im neunten und zehnten Jahrhundert*. Wien; Köln; Graz : Hermann Böhlau Nachf., 1973, p. 192-207, 235-241. ISBN 9783205084112; ZOTZ, Thomas. In Amt und Würden : Zur Eigenart „offizieller“ Positionen im früheren Mittelalter. In *Tel Aviver Jahrbuch für deutsche Geschichte : Zur Sozial- und Begriffsgeschichte des Mittelalters*, 1993, year 22, p. 1-4, 9-10, 12-14, 18. ISSN 09328408; BENJAMIN, ref. 102, p. 112-114.

comes falconarium regis and *comes venatorum*. In general it was the normal designation for any “royal official” entrusted by the monarch with administration of a territory or with securing the needs of the court of the Arpád dynasty.¹²³ In the Kingdom of Hungary *procuratores* or *comites* were the chief administrators of dynastic lands, namely *predium*, *silva*, *districtus* or *comitatus*. They also oversaw the functioning of the royal manor houses in these properties.¹²⁴ Therefore, if he was the administrator of a royal property or forest, then it is not appropriate to translate the term *comes* as sheriff (in Slovak: župan), because he was not the sheriff of a county (*comes comitatus*), but the king’s chief administrator of a royal property. Historians sometimes call them forest sheriffs (Hungarian: *erdőispánok*, German: *Waldcomites*), which is connected with the designation of the land they administered (*erdőispánság*).¹²⁵

Finally, evidence from the neighbouring *comitatus* or *predium* of Ugoča points to the view that although sources from the first half of the 13th century already mention only the *comes de Hugosa/Ugosi/Ogocha/Vgacha*,¹²⁶ he was not sheriff of a county, but the administrator of a royal property. In 1216, when royal guests of Flemish origin (*Flan-drenses*), who were settled in the village of Batár (now Bratove, Барап) had a dispute with Paul from the village of Nyírbéltek (County of Szatmár) directly according to the royal decree, Ezau *comes* of Ugoča represented them in the case involving trial by ordeal at Oradea.¹²⁷ In 1217 he acted as a judge (*iudex*), like Mescu *comes de Bereg* in 1214, in a dispute between the inhabitants of Halmi (which originally belonged to Ugoča, now Halmeu, County of Szatmár).¹²⁸ In 1220 Paul *comes* of Ugoča also acted as the judge in a dispute between inhabitants of Péterfalva (Пийтерфолво).¹²⁹ The confirmation of the grant of part of the land of the village of Tiszabökény (Тисобикень) to the royal *serviens* Farkaš from 1230 states that it belonged *ad comitatum de Vgacha*, which must be understood as the territory of the royal property. Farkaš legally owned part of the land

123 PROCHÁZKA, Vladimír. Župa a župan. (County and sheriff.). In *Slavia Antiqua*, 1968, year 15, p. 24-25, 31-32, 34-35. ISSN 0080993; BOGUČKI, Ambroży. *Komes w polskich źródłach średniowiecznych*. (The comes in medieval Polish sources.). Waszawa; Poznań : Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1972, p. 17, 33-34, 36. ISBN 8388500198; FODOR, István. Neue Bemerkungen zum Verhältnis von slawisch und ungarisch župan – špan – ispán. In *Ungarn Jahrbuch* (hereinafter *UJ*), 1993/94, year 21, p. 138-139. ISSN 0082755X; MAKK, Ferenc. Megjegyzések a Szent István-i államalapítás történetéhez. (Notes on the foundation of the state by St. Stephen.). In *Aetas*, year 26, 2011, no. 1, p. 125-127. ISSN 15871258.

124 SZÉKELY, ref. 36, p. 320-322; BOLLA, Ilona. Das Dienstvolk der königlichen und kirchlichen Güter zur Zeit des frühen Feudalismus. In *Annales Universitatis Scientiarum Budapestinensis de Rolando Eötvös nominatae : Sectio Historica*, 1976, year 17, p. 15-43. ISSN 05248981.

125 HÓMAN, ref. 5, p. 207-208; *KMTL*, p. 194.

126 *MVA*, p. 215.

127 *RV*, no. 163 (243), p. 212; KOMÁROMY, András. *Ugocsa vármegye keletkezése*. (The origin of the County of Ugocsa.). Budapest : Kiadja a Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1896, p. 16; SZABÓ, István. *Ugocsa megye*. (The County of Ugocsa.). Budapest : Kiadja a Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1937, p. 286-287; NÉMETH, ref. 15, no. 46, p. 26-27.

128 „*Iudex autem huius casuse...*“ *RV*, no. 171 (31), p. 216; KOMÁROMY, ref. 127, p. 16; SZABÓ, ref. 127, p. 363-364.

129 „...*iudice Paulo, comite de Ogocha...*“ *RV*, no. 246 (3), p. 246; SZABÓ, ref. 127, p. 448-449. It is interesting that in all three cases, people from the royal estate in Ugoča were represented by a *comes*, as administrator of the royal property. In all three cases, *pristaldi* were also present and all came from the County of Szabolcs.

on the basis of the grant – in contrast to the king’s servants (*populi regis*) settled in the royal property of Ugoča. Therefore, it seems to be especially emphasized that the *comes de Vgacha* could not disturb him in connection with possession of this land.¹³⁰ Since the villages of Batár, Halmi, Péterfalva were situated near the village of Tiszabökény, which belonged *ad comitatem de Vgacha*, they were also part of the royal property of Ugoča. All of them lay in a marginal part of this territory on the right bank of the Tisza. The centre of the royal property lay to the north of them with the main royal manor house at Királyháza (Королево).

The most important argument in favour of the statement that the *comes* of Ugoča was the administrator of a royal property or royal forest is a document of the Junior King Stephen from 1264 in which he granted various privileges to guests from Szatmár (Satu Mare). On the basis of older complaints of the guests with regard to a dispute about use of the forests, Stephen entrusted *Roch comiti de Vgacha et de Erdeud* (Erdőd) with restoring their use of the Erdőd forest as had previously applied.¹³¹ Only the administrator of the royal property could renew the old right of the guests to part of the forest, which was originally divided from the territory of the royal forest. Roch was *comes* of Ugoča and his legal authority also covered the royal property of Erdőd, which was already included in the County of Szatmár.¹³² Since Ugoča and Erdőd were royal forests (*erdőispánságok*) their *comes* was not the sheriff of a county, but the chief administrator (*comes*) of these two dynastic properties. He was concerned only with the “private property of the dynasty”, and this was why the king entrusted him with solving the request of the guests from Szatmár for use of part of the forest that originally belonged to the Erdőd territory. Álmos, also *comes de Wgacha et de Erdeud*, is mentioned in 1272. For his faithful service, the king granted him some abandoned land in the County of Szatmár, where the king’s beaver hunters (*castorinarii*) had previously lived.¹³³ Further evidence that Ugoča was a royal property¹³⁴ – although in the 13th century it is almost always called a *comitatus* and its chief official is a *comes* – is found in two documents of Andrew III. In Ugoča, as in the cases of Zvolen, Liptov and Turiec, this monarch strove to audit the royal properties. The audit was carried out by Stephen *comes de Wgacha*, and in 1296 it concerned the village of Tiszakeresztúr (Перехрестя), which belonged *ad predium nostrum de Wgacha*.¹³⁵ In this way he got back (*nostris regis manibus reddiderunt, et*

130 *CDP VII*, no. 16, p. 19; *RA I/1*, no. 590, p. 181; SZABÓ, ref. 127, p. 297; SZÉKELY, Gusztáv. Ugočsa vármegye kialakulása az új kutatások tükrében II. (The creation of the County of Ugočsa as reflected in new research II). In *Acta Beregsasiensis*, 2010, year 9, no. 3, p. 133, 137-138. ISSN 23101954.

131 „*Ad hec cum iidem silvis indignissent, sicut nobis sua conquestione demonstrarunt, precepimus Roch comiti de Vgacha et de Erdeud, ut eisdem silvam de Erdeud statueret usui eorumdem sufficientem, qui sicut nobis per suas litteras demandavit silvam ipsis statuisset de Erdeud ad priorem (?) silvam ipsorum...*“ *MNL DL 90 750* (1264/1291); *RA II/4*, no. 3768, p. 62-63; *CDH IV/3*, p. 206-207; *RA II/1*, no. 2133, p. 127-128; NÉMETH, ref. 15, no. 447, p. 281-282.

132 NÉMETH, ref. 15, no. 123-124, p. 78-79.

133 *CDP VIII*, no. 360, p. 438; *RA II/1*, no. 2224, p. 161.

134 SZABÓ, ref. 127, p. 32, 37-38, 45-46, 114, 321-322, 382, 410-411; SZÉKELY, ref. 2, p. 83, 85; SZÉKELY, ref. 130, p. 133, 137-138.

135 „*...terras ad predium nostrum de Wgacha pertinentes...reambulari fecissemus...*“ *CDP VIII*, no. 369, p. 447; *RA II/4*, no. 4048, p. 171; SZABÓ, ref. 127, p. 499-500.

restituerunt pleno iure) the property of Visk, now Вишково, originally part of Ugoča, but later part of Máramaros with a village, castle and toll, which the Huntpoznam family had obtained from Stephen V and Ladislav IV. The document directly states that this property was *in comitatu de Vgacha* and belonged *ad predium suum de Vgacha*.¹³⁶ As a replacement, the Huntpoznam family received from the king the villages of Rakasz (Рокосово), Feketeardó (Чорногісів) and *Nyrteluk (near Tiszaújhely, Нове Село and Tiszaújlak, Вилко and Karácsfalva, Карачин),¹³⁷ which also *ad predium nostrum de Wgacha pertinentes, in eodem comitatu sitas*.¹³⁸ We can interpret this as meaning either that in the framework of a county (*comitatus*) of Ugoča under aristocratic control there was still also a royal property belonging to the *predium Wgacha*, or that the *comitatus* was only a word designating the land belonging to the *predium Wgachu*. On the basis of the above mentioned documents, we can only be certain that the territory (*comitatus, districtus*) of Ugoča extended on both sides of the Tisza¹³⁹ and all these villages belonged to the royal property (*predium*) with its centre at Királyháza, where there was a royal manor house (*domus regalis*).¹⁴⁰

Where further mentions of *comites* of Bereg from the second half of the 13th century (1269, 1273) are concerned, it is interesting that they were men who also served as *comites* of Zvolen, Spiš and Patak.¹⁴¹ The same king's man or representative of his power administered various dynastic properties. It is possible to suppose that in these cases it could have been an honorary function,¹⁴² because he could not really have been active in all these territories at the same time. They must have had deputies in individual properties, who really worked there, as in the case of the deputy sheriffs *comites curiales*) of royal counties. However, we cannot say whether they were designated in royal properties as *comites curiales, ministeriales* or *officiales*. No case is known of a *comes* of royal properties, who was also the sheriff of a royal county (*comes comitatus*). This is further evidence of the specific position and administration of these royal domains. It is interesting that in 1273 Bereg was headed by a man who was also chief representative of the royal teamsters and cup bearers, functions closely connected with the royal court.

136 MNL DL 38 138; *CDH VI/2*, p. 253-254 (1300); *RA II/4*, no. 4319, p. 248.

137 SZABÓ, ref. 127, p. 443-444, 452-453.

138 „...in concambium prefate possessionis Wysk cum castro suo et villa sub eodem existente, quasdam possessiones nostras seu villas, nunc ad predium nostrum de Wgacha pertinentes, in eodem comitatu sitas, Rokoz, et Feketheardow, que sunt minime populose, et Nyrteluk...“ MNL DL 38 138; *CDH VI/2*, p. 253-254 (1300).

139 On the right bank of the Tisza: Batár, Halmi, Peturfalva, Tiszabökény, Feketeardó, Visk. On the left bank of the Tisza: *Nyrteluk, Tiszakeresztúr a Rakasz.

140 SZABÓ, ref. 127, p. 382-383; SZÉKELY, ref. 130, p. 135-137.

141 MNL DL 40 160 (1269/1281); *RA II/2-3*, no. 3082, p. 269-270; MNL DL 834 (1273/1383); *RA II/2-3*, no. 2415, p. 58-59; *CDP VI*, no. 205, p. 284 (1282). On this see also: *MVA*, p. 136, 149, 167-168, 179, 188-189, 205-206, 215-216, 235-238; NÓGRÁDY, Árpád. „Magistratus et comitatus tenentibus“ : II. András kormányzati rendszerének kérdéséhez. In *Sz*, 1995, year 129, no. 1, p. 168-170; ZSOLDOS, ref. 92, p. 23-24.

142 ENGEL, Pál. Honor, castrum, comitatus : Studies in the Government System of the Angevin Kingdom. In *Quaestiones mediaevi novae*, 1996, year 1, p. 91-100. ISSN 14274418. On this see: BENJAMIN, ref. 102, p. 116.

We could find many more similar cases in medieval Hungary. We often encounter such combinations of functions in the case of the sheriffs of royal counties, so we cannot see anything specific in this.¹⁴³ In this context, let us comment that the second variant of the 1261 document, that from 1271, mentions important witnesses, who were selected from the Diocese of Eger, to ascertain the old rights of the Bishopric of Eger. They were all of noble origin (*seniores nobilium*), and came from important families such as *de genere Acus, Aba, Bartyan, Guthkeled, Chaak*. Some of them were *comites*. They included the above mentioned Bartholomew and Felician *comitibus de Beregh et Vgocsa*, but they are the only ones without predicates or indications of their families. This could be explained by them working on royal properties only as administrators so that their social position depended on the administration of these territories, which belonged to the Arpád dynasty. The witnesses did not include a sheriff of a royal county, but only local aristocrats, so the *comites* of Bereg and Ugoča could also have had aristocratic origins. As the representatives of royal power and administrators of dynastic properties they confirmed the old rights of the Bishopric of Eger, which, as we know, also concerned these royal properties. Apart from this, precisely in agreement with the document from 1261, in which tithes from Ugoča and Bereg (*in districtibus de Wgachu et de Beregh*) are mentioned together, the *comites* of the two territories appear together.¹⁴⁴

The oldest information about Bereg from the beginning of the 13th century provides the best evidence that the terms *foresta* or *districtus* correspond to a similar type of royal property known from Western Europe.¹⁴⁵ With its help, we can better interpret the data from the 1261 document and roughly outline the organization of this royal property (*predium regalis, proprium nostrum, regale allodium, predia regalia, terra regia, possessio regalis*).¹⁴⁶ Bereg¹⁴⁷ is mentioned in 1232 as a royal *predium* headed by the king's *procurator predii de Beregh*.¹⁴⁸ In the 12th – 13th centuries it was part of the frontier county of Boržava as an independent *districtus* or *comitatus*, which gradually got smaller as a result of royal grants, mainly in the second half of the 13th century. This was associated with its gradual change into a county controlled by the aristocracy, a process completed in the late 13th and 14th centuries. An important transformation process occurred in Hungary in this period connected with important social changes, which included the break up of the great royal properties.¹⁴⁹

143 „...magistrum Stephanum maiorem plaustrorum suorum regalium comitem de Beregh et de Patak...“ MNL DL 834 (1273/1383). „...magister pincernarum nostrorum comes de Beregh...“ *RA II/2-3*, no. 2415, p. 58-59; *RA II/2-3*, no. 2447, p. 68, no. 2531, p. 104; NÓGRÁDY, ref. 141, p. 179-180.

144 „...item Bartholomaeo et Feliciano comitibus de Beregh et Vgocsa...“ *CDH V/1*, p. 157; *RA II/1*, no. 2124, p. 124-125.

145 On this see: HUDÁČEK, ref. 8, p. 33-38.

146 RUGONFALVI KISS, István. *Az egységes magyar nemesi rend kifejlődése*. (The development of a unified Hungarian noble estate.). Debrecen : Debreceni M. Kir. Tisza István-Tudományegyetemi Nyomda, 1932, p. 25-33; LEDERER, Emma. *Feudalizmus kialakulása Magyarországon*. (The development of feudalism in Hungary.). Budapest : Akadémiai Kiadó, 1959, p. 93-174; HUDÁČEK, ref. 8, p. 41-42.

147 *ÁMTF I*, p. 530-532; ZSOLT, ref. 27, p. 24-25.

148 SZABÓ, ref. 96, no. 1, p. 5; *ÁMTF I*, p. 530-531; SZÉKELY, ref. 36, p. 322; HECKENAST, ref. 96, p. 98-99.

149 SZÜCS, ref. 9, p. 24; BEREND, ref. 25, p. 313.

On the basis of the two documents from 1232 and 1270 we will attempt to reconstruct the original size of this royal property. When Andrew II granted Legyr *procurator* of Bereg part of the land of Muzsaj (?) in 1232, Legyr had to return the royal land of *Pátröh, which originally belonged to the *predium de Beregh*.¹⁵⁰ *Pátröh was situated somewhere near Muzsaj (Nagymuzsaly, Мужієво, or the vanished *Kismuzsaly), which was not far from Beregszász.¹⁵¹ Both lay in immediate proximity to the centre of the royal property in Bereg. In exchange for *Pátröh, Legyr received the five hides (requiring 5 ploughs) of land of Muzsaj (*quandam terram nomine Muse*), which was detached from the property of Boržava Castle. From the definition of the granted area of land done by the royal *pristaldus* Čák son of Dionýz, we know that it bordered on the village of the sons of the jobagiones from Mezőgecse (Геча), the village of Nagybakta (Велика Бакта) formerly inhabited by the sons of the jobagiones of St. Stephen, the property of Peter from Tornaj (?), a village of the royal servants (*populi regis*) from *Bátor, situated in the south-eastern part of the territory of Beregszász bordering on *Kismuzsaly, and another village of royal servants from *Kismuzsaly (*villa Muse*). Finally, it also bordered on Legyr's inherited property.¹⁵² Since the boundaries are indicated only roughly, according to the surrounding villages and not more thoroughly on the basis of boundary features, rivers and other geographical points, it is not possible to determine the precise location of this land. Some of the mentioned villages later disappeared, and this also prevents more complete localization. In spite of this, we can state the boundary of this part of the land, that originally belonged to Boržava Castle, was probably the river Vérke (Bepke), which flows into the river Boržava near the castle. The Boržava then flows into the Tisza. The land of *Pátröh, which is said to have been part of the royal property, and the royal village of *Bátor located near the royal village of Muzsaj, were properties of the Arpád dynasty and lay on the other side of the river Vérke. Therefore this river must for a long time have divided the territory of the castle lordship or county of Boržava from the royal property of Bereg, although Boržava Castle lay only on the other side of this river. The villages originally belonged to Boržava Castle and later became part of the County of Bereg. According to Gy. Györffy they were Nagybakta, *Cibik, Gecse, Halábor and Muzsaj. However, in contrast to him we think that Muzsaj (Nagymuzsaly and *Kismuzsaly) always belonged to Bereg and the information from 1232 does not relate to this village, but only to the land of the same name and the extent of 5 hides. It could not have been a part divided from the village of Muzsaj. This is not mentioned in

150 „...quod cum idem dominus, Andreas rex, terram Legyr, procuratoris predii sui de Beregh nomine Patroh olym ab eodem predio suo sibi collatam, ad idem predium assumpsisset, in concambium ipsius terre quandam terram nomine Muse, usui quinque aratrorum competentem ac a castro de Borsua exceptam, sibi et per eum heredibus suis iure perpetuo contulisset possidendam [et in dominium] ipsius terre per fidelem pristaldum suum Chak, filium Dionisii auctoritate regis ipsum fecisset introduci...” MNL DF 253 657; DOMAHIDI-SIPOS, ref. 96, p. 384.

151 ZSOLT, ref. 27, p. 79, 104; *ÁMTF I*, p. 546.

152 „Cuius prima meta esset cum terra filiorum jobagionum de villa Gwerche, inde teneret metam cum villa Bagotha, que esset filiorum jobagionum Sancti Regis, inde teneret metam cum Petro de genere Thomay, inde teneret metam cum populis regis de villa Batur, inde teneret metas cum populis regis de villa Muse, deinde procederet et convicineretur metis terre hereditate eiusdem Legyr comitis, ibique terminaretur...” MNL DF 253 657; ZSOLT, ref. 27, p. 19, 22, 52; *ÁMTF I*, p. 529, 530, 539.

the document because according to the description of the boundaries it is clear that this concerned only the territory before the river Verke. If the land had extended beyond the river, it would have been an unusually large property by the standards of the time. Apart from this, there were already villages on the other side of the river (*Pátroh, *Bátor, *Kismuzsaly), so that it would have significantly disturbed the property situation in this part of the royal property. A further possibility is that part of the village of *Kismuzsaly belonged to the king and another part on the other side of the river to Boržava Castle. In 1280 the *comes* Kunch son of Eberhard received the village of Nagymuzsaly *in comitatu de Beregh* from Ladislav IV. On the basis of a later property dispute from 1337, we learn that *comes* Kunch was *iudex* (mayor) *de Luprechzaza* (now Beregszasz), that the village of Nagymuzsaly had boundaries with the royal town of Luprechzaza, the village of *Kismuzsaly, which already belonged to John known as Nylas and finally with Bene (Бене),¹⁵³ property of a certain Aegidius.¹⁵⁴ This was the property situation of part of the former territory of the royal *predium Bereg* close to Boržava Castle. All these villages were located near the river Vérke and their territories did not cross the river. In 1232, when Andrew II took away from Legyr *procurator* of Bereg the territory of *Pátroh, originally part of the *predium Beregh*, he granted as compensation land belonging to Boržava Castle. Apparently he was striving to maintain the integrity of this royal property, so Legyr did not receive another property in Bereg but land belonging to Boržava Castle and situated on the other side of the river Vérke. Apart from this, the five hides had a boundary to the east with Legyr's inherited property already located in the territory of Boržava. The fact that properties belonging to Boržava Castle lay on one side of the river Vérke is also shown by the vanished village of *Cibik, situated south of Gecse (Геча).¹⁵⁵ The royal guests from Luprechzaza claimed this land, which *castro nostro* (Boržava) *continebatur*,¹⁵⁶ in a false document from 1261. A source from 1299 still mentions *quandam terram castrenium Cybek vocatum*, but is already *in comitatu de Bereg*.¹⁵⁷ The village of *Cibik, as well as other villages inhabited by royal jobagiones according to the document from 1232 was located close to Boržava Castle and on its side of the river Vérke. The royal property of Bereg was on the other side of the river.

We can reconstruct another part of the extensive territory called the *predium Beregh* on the basis of Stephen V's document from 1270. The king granted the properties of the traitor Simon, husband of the daughter of the important nobleman Bán Banko,¹⁵⁸ to the *comes* Michael son of Andrew. This property comprised the villages of Lónya (Nagy-lónya, Bereg), Bótrágy (Баградь, Bereg), Bátuý (Батъово, Bereg), Szalóka (County of

153 ZSOLT, ref. 27, p. 23; *ÁMTF I*, p. 530.

154 1280: „...comitis Kunch, filii Eberhardi...quandam villam Mwsey vocatam, in comitatu de Beregh existentem, eidem Konch dedisset...“; 1377: „...quandam possessionem ipsorum aquisitiitiam Mwsay vocatam, in comitatu de Beregh...cui civitas Luprechzaza reginalis et possessio Johannis dicti Nylas Kysmusay, nec non possessio Egidii Bene vocate iure commutaneitatis vicinarentur...“ *AO VII*, no. 322, p. 602 (1280/1337/1359); *RA II/2-3*, no. 3069, p. 266.

155 *ÁMTF I*, p. 536; ZSOLT, ref. 27, p. 31-32, 52.

156 MNL DL 24 664 (1261/1365/1603); *RA I/3*, no. 1681, p. 508.

157 MNL DL 50 641; *RA II/4*, no. 4278, p. 233.

158 *MVA*, p. 286.

Szabolcs), Lónya (?), Szentmiklós (Чинадієво, Bereg) and Szolyva (Свалява, Bereg).¹⁵⁹ The description of this property also mentions a boundary with the *terra domini regis*. The village of Lónya had a boundary with the royal village of Shom (Шом), north-west of Beregszász, Bótrágy with the royal village of Szernye (Серне), south-west of Mukačevo and Bányu with the royal village of Nagydobrony (Велика Добронь), west of Mukačevo.¹⁶⁰ These villages form an imaginary line along the north-eastern boundary of the royal property of Bereg in the second half of the 13th century. Since there was no clear natural boundary such as a river, mountain range or marsh, the territory could have reached as far as the river Tisza in the 12th century. As a result of grants of marginal parts of the royal property, its boundary changed, gradually shifting towards the centre of Bereg near the present villages of Beregszász and Nagy Beregh.

In the case of the villages of Szentmiklós and Szolyva, there is a specific statement that Simon received them from Andrew II and their boundaries are specified in the document. Perhaps this is because, in contrast to the preceding villages, they were located on the northern margin of Bereg. Clear evidence of the extent of this *districtus* or *comitatus* is found in the definition of the village of Szentmiklós, the territory of which bordered on the royal property (*a terra domini regis Bereg vocata*), which must be understood as the boundary of the *predium de Bereg*. It is probable that the boundary in this part of Bereg was the river Latorica. The village of Szolyva was also a neighbour of the royal property (*adiungitur terre domini regis*) and the river Svalyavka (Свалявка) was the boundary of the *predium de Bereg*, because it is directly mentioned that *remanendo in dextra parte ipsius aque domino regis*.¹⁶¹

Precisely in this part of Bereg between the villages of Duszina and Strojna (Дусино and Стройне), both located south-east of the village of Szolyva, the vanished locality of *Kýralzallafa* (Királyszállása) is mentioned in 1548.¹⁶² In Hungarian király means king and szállás means lodgings, so Királyszállás was originally the site of a hunting lodge of the Arpád dynasty, where the kings of Hungary stayed when they went hunting in the surrounding forests. Similar place names are also found in the royal forests of Patak and Šariš (*locus Keralzalasa, Kyrzallassa*) and they had exactly this meaning.¹⁶³ All these records show that in the 12th – 13th centuries the royal *predium Bereg* or *districtus Bereg* was roughly defined by the rivers Vérke, Tisza, Latorica, Svalyavka, the Carpathian

159 MNL DL 30 577 (1270/1272/1476); *RA II/1*, no. 1907, p. 50-51; *CDAC VIII*, no. 176, p. 260-262; ZSOLDOS, Attila. *Családi ügy : IV. Béla és István ifjabb király viszálya az 1260-as években*. (A family matter: the quarrel between Béla IV and Junior King Stephen in the 1260s.). Budapest : MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 2007, p. 52, 59. ISBN 9789639627154.

160 *ÁMTF I*, p. 538-539, 543-544, 549; ZSOLT, ref. 27, p. 22, 24, 77, 102, 103, 125, 127-128, 131.

161 MNL DL 30 577; *ÁMTF I*, p. 548-549; ZSOLT, ref. 27, p. 127, 131.

162 ZSOLT, ref. 27, p. 44, 71, 133.

163 SZŰCS, ref. 9, p. 15. On the Hungarian term *szállás* see: SZAMOTA, István – ZOLNAI, Gyula. *Magyar oklevél-szótár*. (Hungarian diplomatic dictionary.). Budapest : Kiadja Hornyánszky Viktor Könyvkereskedése, 1902-1906, p. 879; KRISTÓ, Gyula. Szempontok korai helyneveink történeti tipológiájához. (Observations on the historical typology of early place names.). In *Acta Historica*, 1976, year 55, p. 89-90, 94. ISSN 03246965; HUDÁČEK, Pavol. Dynastické majetky Arpádovcov a kráľovské lesy v strednom Šariši. (The dynastic properties of the Arpád family and royal forests in central Šariš.). In *Mesto a Dejiny*, 2015, year 4, no. 2 (in press). ISSN 13390163.

range and the river Boržava. In the second half of the 13th century it was still an extensive territory.

Mentions of royal residences, manor houses or villages (*curia regis, curia regalis, curtis regali, villa regis, curia nostra, villa nostra*).¹⁶⁴ In the first half of the 13th century we do not find a castle in the territory of Bereg, as was usual in counties and castle lordships.¹⁶⁵ The administrative centres of the surrounding counties were the older royal castles of Boržava, Uh/Užhorod and the frontier castle of Sásvár, but the centre of the royal property of Bereg was the main royal manor house (*curia, curtis, villa regis*).¹⁶⁶ It is thought that Bereg Castle was built on the initiative of the king only after the Tartar invasion, to replace the older Boržava Castle, destroyed during the invasion. We first learn of it in 1264, when Princess Anna, daughter of Bela IV and already a widow, complained to the Pope that the castles of Bereg (*castrum Berez*) and Füzér, as well as the villages of Salamon and Boržava had been unjustly taken from her by her brother the Junior King Stephen. The castle may have been built in the territory of Nagy Beregh or Beregszász. Baranka (now Szuhabaranka, Бронька) another royal defensive castle was built deep in the Carpathian foothills sometime before 1263. Nyaláb (Нялаб) Castle¹⁶⁷ was also built on royal initiative in neighbouring Ugoča near the older royal manor house of *Királyház-domus regalis* (1262) in the village of Félzász (today's Királyháza),¹⁶⁸ sometime in the second half of the 13th century. New castles were also built in this period in other royal hunting properties, for example, Patak Castle in Patak and Szádvár Castle in Turňa. In all cases, it is important that none of these properties was previously a county or a castle lordship.¹⁶⁹ Therefore, the castles built in these royal properties from the second half of the 13th century were the first castles built there under the Arpád dynasty.

The first mention of a royal manor house in Bereg is found in a document from 1264. The Junior King Stephen spent Christmas there with his court and the Bishop

164 HÓMAN, ref. 5, p. 206-207, 221-222, 309-310, 319-325; PESTY, ref. 20, p. 195-197; BAKAY, Kornél. *A magyar államalapítás*. (The foundation of the Hungarian state.). Budapest : Gondolat Kiado, 1978, p. 104-105. ISBN 9632806743. On this see: IVERSEN, Frode. Royal villas in Northern Europe. In CAS-TILLO, Juan Antonio Quirós (ed.). *The archaeology of early medieval villages in Europe*. Bilbao : Universidad del País Vasco, 2009, p. 99, 101-102, 106, 107, 108-109. ISBN 9788498603033.

165 BEREND, ref. 25, p. 307-308.

166 For comparison see: HUDÁČEK, Pavol. Kráľovský majetok a počiatky mesta Veľký Šariš v 13. storočí. (The royal property and beginnings of the town of Veľký Šariš in the 13th century.). In BODNÁROVÁ, Miloslava (ed.). *Príspevky k starším dejinám slovenských miest a mestečiek*. Prešov : Filozofická fakulta Prešovskej univerzity, 2013, p. 87-119. ISBN 9788055508887.

167 FÜGEDI, Erik. *Vár és társadalom a 13. – 14. századi magyarországon*. (Castle and society in 13th–14th century Hungary.). Budapest : Akadémiai kiado, 1977, p. 171. ISBN 9630511525; SZÉKELY, ref. 2, p. 86; SZÉKELY, ref. 130, p. 133, 137-138.

168 *CDH XIII/3*, no. 40, p. 44; *RA III/1*, p. 10, no. 1788; KOMÁROMY, ref. 127, p. 13-15, 23, 25; NÉMETH, ref. 15, p. XXIX.

169 „...quod tu eos de Berez et Fizer castris ac Solomon et de Borsna villis...que dicti ducissa et orphani se diu iuste et pacifice asserunt possedissee, contra iustitiam spoliasti...eis restituere indebite contradicis...“ *VMH I*, no. 506, p. 276; *ÁMTF I*, p. 534-5, 530-532, 529-530; FÜGEDI, ref. 168, p. 104; FÜGEDI, Erik. *Castle and society in medieval Hungary (1000–1437)*. Budapest : Akadémiai Kiadó, 1986, p. 55, 59. ISBN 9630538024; ZSOLDOS, ref. 159, p. 31, 85; MÓR, Wertner. *Az Árpádok családi története*. (A history of the Arpád dynasty.). Nagy-Becskerekén : Pleitz Fer. Póal Könyvnyomdájá, 1892, p. 463-475.

of Oradea Zozimas also came there, (*in curia domini regis Stephani...de Bereg*).¹⁷⁰ It is most probable that the manor house was situated at Beregszász and not Nagy Beregh. It was the main royal manor house in the renowned Bereg Forest (*silva Bereg* = Bereg manor house) and the central place of the royal *predium*. In spite of the fact that only one mention of this manor house exists, it was certainly an important place, where the kings of Hungary often stayed, when they moved through their properties in this part of the frontier region. Queen Elizabeth wife of Stephen V probably spent Christmas in this royal manor house in 1271. She issued a document *in Beregh* on 24 December 1271.¹⁷¹ Since members of the Arpád dynasty and their courts stayed in this manor house on important Christian festivals, there must have been a royal chapel (*capella regis*) there.¹⁷² We know that at important royal manor houses monarchs always established chapels for their religious needs. In Western Europe and in Hungary the chapel was an essential part of a royal manor house (*curtis nostra cum aedificio*) in addition to the royal residence (*palatium, domus*) and economic buildings.¹⁷³ The royal chapel as an institution meant mainly the chaplains of the Arpád family, who worked at the various royal residences in the dynastic properties, and were subordinate to the Archbishop of Esztergom. For this reason, all the royal monasteries, parishes and chapels were exempt from the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the bishop in whose diocese they were situated.¹⁷⁴ This can be seen in nearby Ugoča, where royal guests from Félzász were settled immediately around the royal manor house (*hospites nostri de villa Felzaz, apud Domum nostram, videlicet in Vgocha constituti*). When Stephen V granted them privileges in 1272 he stated that the Church of St. Peter as a royal chapel (*capella nostra*) was exempt from the jurisdiction of all priests and archdeacons.¹⁷⁵

A provision in a grant of privileges from 1247 to royal guests in Luprechzaza (Beregszász) in the territory of Bereg has a similar meaning. It states that the local church

170 MNL DL 76 144; *Zichy Ok. I*, no. 15, p. 12; *Zichy Ok. I*, no. 16, p. 13; SZŰCS, ref. 9, p. 17. When Zosimas went back to Oradea at the beginning of 1264, he stopped in the property of the *comes* Privard at Gacsály in the County of Szatmár, where he recorded the last will of Privard's wife. NÉMETH, ref. 15, no. 142, p. 89-90.

171 *RD*, no. 92, p. 66.

172 SZŰCS, ref. 9, p. 17.

173 GYÖRFFY, György. *Święty Stefan I : Król Węgier i jego dzieło*. (St. Stephen I: The King of Hungary and his work.). Warszawa : Oficyna Wydawnicza RYTM, 2003, p. 296-297. ISBN 8373990984; GEREVICH, László. The Royal Court (Curia), the Provost's Residence and the Village at Dömös. In *Acta Archaeologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 1983, year 35, no. 3-4, p. 387-389, 409. ISSN 15882551; KÓCKA-KRENZ, Hanna. Palatia wczesnopiastowskie. (Early Piast palaces.). In SKUPIEŃSKI, Krzysztof (ed.). *Średniowiecze w rozjaśnieniu*. Warszawa : Wydawnictwo DiG, 2010, p. 119-120, 126-130. ISBN 9788371816130; ZOTZ, Thomas. Die Goslarer Pfalz im Umfeld der königlichen Herrschaftssitze in Sachsen : Topographie, Architektur und historische Bedeutung. In FENSKE, Lutz (ed.). *Deutsche Königspfalzen : Beiträge zu ihrer historischen und archäologischen Erforschung, Band IV. : Pfalzen – Reichsgut – Königshöfe*. Göttingen : Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996, p. 248-287. ISBN 9783525354360.

174 GYÖRFFY, ref. 173, p. 296-297.

175 „*Praeterea restituimus eisdem, vt ecclesia beati Petri, capella nostra, a iurisdictione omnium plebanorum et archidiaconorum penitus libera habeatur, et exempta.*“ *CDH V/1*, p. 176-177; *RA II/1*, no. 2117, p. 116; BÉLAY, ref. 27, p. 6, 10; ZOLNAY, ref. 27, p. 133-138, 157; SZABÓ, ref. 127, p. 38, 44-45, 382-383.

belongs to the Archbishopric of Esztergom, and the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Eger and of local priests or archdeacons do not apply to it, in spite of the Boržava – Bereg region being part of the diocese of Eger.¹⁷⁶ Therefore this church was originally a royal chapel (*capella regis*) and was also an exempt parish (*exempta parochia, plebania exempta*). The members of the Arpád dynasty founded special ecclesiastical institutions in their properties in the form of royal chapels. These became exempt parishes headed by royal chaplains (*capellanus regis*), and so they did not fall under the jurisdiction of the local bishop.¹⁷⁷ A document from 1284 gives entirely convincing evidence that Luprechzaza and Beregszász as two independent royal chapels,¹⁷⁸ originally also two separate villages in the framework of the dynastic property of Bereg, were really two exempt parishes. Ladislav IV was solving a dispute about jurisdiction and tithes between the Archbishopric of Esztergom and the Bishopric of Eger. He informed the chapter of Esztergom that a copy would be prepared of the document from 1271 about the properties, rights and liberties of the Bishopric of Eger. This copy from 1284 has a part at the end, which directly mentions the parishes (*plebaniae*) in Luprechzaza and Beregszász, at Nagyszöllős (*Asszonyságyszöllős*)¹⁷⁹ in Ugoča, and *Novum Castrum* Sárospatak the centre of the royal forest of Patak¹⁸⁰ – all properties where royal guests were settled – and the Premonstratensian monastery of Jasov, a foundation of the Arpád dynasty. They were all located in the diocese of Eger, but had been placed under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Esztergom.¹⁸¹

As we already mentioned, medievalists suppose that in the 11th – 12th centuries, Bereg and Ugoča were hunting reserves of the Arpád kings.¹⁸² The fact that Bereg was a royal forest, or if we like, a forest lordship (*erdőispánság*), is proved by the following data: Already in 1181 in the furthest part of the County of Szatmár, not far from the

176 „*Ecclesia vero eorumdem ad archiepiscopatum Strigoniensem contineatur et sit sine iurisdictione magistratus.*“ MNL DL 314 (1247/1271/1507); *RHMA*, no. MCCXLVII, p. 471-472; *CDH IV/1*, p. 456-457; *RA I/2*, no. 867, p. 261; *MES I*. Ed. KNAUZ, Ferdinandus. Strigonii : Typis Descripsit Aegydius Horák, 1874, no. 474, p. 369; *ÁMTF I*, p. 532-533; KOVÁCS, Béla. *Az egri egyházmegye története 1596-ig.* (A history of the Diocese of Eger up to 1596.) Eger : Egyetemi Nyomda, 1987, p. 36-40, 55-56. ISBN 0519000784969.

177 SZÜCS, ref. 9, p. 9-11. On this see: KISS, Gergely. Királyi egyházak a középkori Magyarországon. A királyi kápolna mint lehetséges közös eredet. (Royal churches in medieval Hungary. The royal chapel as a possible common starting point.). In KISS, Attila P. et al. (eds.). *Középkortörténeti tanulmányok 7.* Szeged : Szegedi Középkorász Műhely, 2012, p. 77-82. ISBN 9633061601.

178 The Papal register from 1334 and 1335 still mentions them separately : „*Item plebanus de Luprechzaza, Item plebanus de Bereg, Item de Zeleus* (Nagyszöllős in Ugoča); *Item plebanus de Lempert Zaza, Item de Bereg, Item de Zeleus.*“ *Rationes collectorium pontificorum in Hungaria, Pápai tized-szedők számadásal 1281 – 1375 : Monumenta Vaticana historiam regni Hungariae illustrantia, Series prima, Tomus primus* (hereinafter *Mon. Vat. I/1*). VÁRSZEGI, Asztrik – ZOMBORI, István (eds.). Budapest : METEM, 2000, p. 356, 371. ISBN 9638472480; SZÜCS, ref. 9, p. 9-10; *ÁMTF I*, p. 532-533.

179 *CDAC VIII*, no. 23, p. 31; *RA II/1*, no. 1793, p. 11; SZABÓ, ref. 127, p. 321, 419.

180 SZÜCS, ref. 9, p. 5, 21.

181 „...videlicet plebaniis Beregzaza, Luprethzaza et Azunsagzeuleus, item Potook et una ecclesia collegiata Yazau nominatis, que in dyocesi Agriensi dinoscuntur esse situate et fundate, et in omnibus iurisdictionibus suis ad ecclesiam nostram pertinere...“ *HÁO*, no. 38, p. 63 (1284); SZÜCS, ref. 9, p. 9-10.

182 *ÁMTF I*, p. 519; SZÉKELY, ref. 36, p. 321; SZÜCS, ref. 9, p. 10-11, 12-13, 15, 22-23.

territories of Bereg and Ugoča, foresters are mentioned in the properties of Túrístvándi (*Tur*) and Szatmárcseke (*Cheke*) near the river Tisza, which belonged to the Benedictine monastery of the Virgin Mary at Cégénydányád.¹⁸³ They were probably originally royal foresters, who already oversaw the forests or forest properties of the Arpád dynasty in this part of Hungary in the 12th century. Foresters were certainly also active in the nearby royal forest of Bereg at least from this period. However, the first mention of them dates only from 1214 (*custodes silvae Beregu*).¹⁸⁴

Apparently like foresters (*forestarii*) in Western Europe, they oversaw the royal forests, administered the forest rights of the dynasty and supervised their application in this territory. They also provided various services for the king when he came to hunt. They were settled in a village with the characteristic name **Ardow* – Beregardó¹⁸⁵ mentioned in 1332–1335 and later joined to the important royal village of Beregszász.¹⁸⁶ Some medievalists suppose that the record of a village of royal falconers or keepers of birds of prey (falcons or hawks) from 1220 (*villa Dranci* – falconers) could concern the present village of Beregdaróc, which is located near Beregszász.¹⁸⁷ It is mentioned without any doubt in 1284 as *Drauch* (now Beregdaróc)¹⁸⁸ and its inhabitants kept birds of prey and hunted with them for the needs of the kings of Hungary in the Forest of Bereg.¹⁸⁹ A false document giving the date 1255 also deserves attention. According to it, King Stephen V (!) allegedly gave guests from Luprechzaza (Beregszász) the royal land of **Vrkurteleke*, a vanished village west of Beregszász. This was originally inhabited by indefinitely defined royal servants/serfs/slaves (*servi nostri*).¹⁹⁰ In spite of the fact that it is a falsified

183 „*In predio Tur sunt duo custodes silvarum...In predio Cheke...unus custos silvarum, cuius nomen Cheke.*“ *RA I/I*, p. 43-44, no. 133; MAKSAI, Ferenc. *A középkori Szatmár megye.* (The medieval County of Szatmár.) Budapest : Stephaneum Nyomda, 1940, p. 18-19, 120, 123, 126; NÉMETH, ref. 15, p. XXXII, p. 38-39; ROMHÁNYI, Beatrix F. *Kolostorok és társaskáptalanok a középkori Magyarországon.* (Monasteries and collegiate churches in medieval Hungary.) Budapest : Pytheas, 2000, p. 17. ISBN 9789636932398.

184 *RV*, no. 88 (314), p. 184; LEHOCZKY, Tivadar. *Bereg vármegye.* (The County of Bereg.) Budapest, Beregszász : Hatodik Síp Alapítvány, Mandátum Kiadó, 1996, p. 376. ISBN 9638294191 (reprint of a work from 1881–1882); *ÁMTF I*, p. 530; KRISTÓ, ref. 9, p. 424; FÁBIÁN, Ilona K. *A Váradi regestrum helynevei.* (Places in the Oradea register.) Szeged : Szegedi Középkorász Műhely, 1997, p. 42. ISBN 963482174X.

185 Villages originally inhabited by royal foresters are designated by Hungarian place names such *Ardó*, *Ordó* (Hung. Erdőóvó). ZOLNAY, ref. 27, p. 135-137, 175-178, 245-246; GYÖRFFY, György. *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft der Ungarn um die Jahrtausendwende.* Budapest : Akadémiai Kiadó, 1983, p. 71-72, 76-77. ISBN 963053200X.

186 *ÁMTF I*, p. 528; MIZSER, ref. 57, p. 88-89.

187 *RV*, no. 243 (124), p. 244; FÁBIÁN, ref. 184, p. 58.

188 *ÁMTF I*, p. 538; MIZSER, ref. 57, p. 89.

189 *Zichy Ok. I*, no. 70, p. 66; *ÁMTF I*, p. 538; LEHOCZKY, ref. 184, p. 376, 497, 691, 693. On this see: KRISTÓ, Gyula. Settlement Name Giving in the Age of the Árpáds. In MATICSÁK, Sándor (ed.). *Settlement names in the Uralian languages.* Debrecen; Helsinki : Onomastica Uralica, 2005, p. 129-130. ISBN 9634729053.

190 „...*quandam terram Vrkurteleke vocatam, qua servorum nostrorum dignoscebatur exitisse...*“ MNL DL 90 809; NAGY, Imre – DEÁK, Farkas – NAGY, Gyula (eds.). *Hazai oklevéltár 1234–1536.* (Charters of the Homeland 1234–1536.) Budapest : Kiadja A. M. Történelmi Társulat, 1879, no. 26, p.33-34; *RA III/I*, no. 1751, p. 1; ZSOLT, ref. 27, p. 155; *ÁMTF I*, p. 550; SZÚCS, ref. 9, p. 21.

document, the information about the royal servants could be genuine. They may have fulfilled duties connected with the needs of the kings of Hungary when they came to hunt in this part of Hungary's frontier regions, or they provided various services for the nearby royal manor house. Such properties certainly include the above mentioned village of **Perek* (1261), which was originally inhabited by royal swineherds. The document from 1232 also mentions that not far from Beregszász were two villages of royal servants (*populi regis*) **Bator* and *Muzsaj* (**Kismuzsaly*). We can only guess what duties they fulfilled for the king. It is entirely possible that like earlier servants, the inhabitants of these villages carried on economic activities in the royal property of Bereg and probably also fulfilled hunting duties for the king. All these villages are situated near the most important royal properties, namely Beregszász and Nagy Beregh. This was the central part of the great *predium Bereg* and in the earliest period it was the most densely populated.

In the course of the 12th – 13th centuries the kings of Hungary settled large groups of guests (*hospites regni, hospites nostri*) almost always in their royal properties.¹⁹¹ They often settled close to the main royal manor houses, which were the centres of individual territories belonging to the “private property” of the Arpád dynasty. Sometime before 1247 Saxon guests came to Bereg on the basis of royal initiative, and Belo IV granted them extensive privileges. He settled them in the village of Luprechzaza – Beregszász (*hospites nostri de Lwprechzaza*). This village also appears as Beregzaza, Luprechzaza, Szász, Lampertszásza and Luprechtszásza. Originally they were two separate villages of Luprechzaza and Beregszász situated near the main royal manor house in Bereg. It is interesting that in the papal registers from 1334 and 1335, it is mentioned not only as *Luprechtzaza*, but in one case also directly as *Lempert Zaza*.¹⁹² This village is thought to have got its name from Lampert, younger brother of Gejza I and Ladislav I.¹⁹³ From 1050 to 1095 Lampert was Prince of Bihar, which placed him not far from the frontier region of Hungary where Bereg was situated. Gy. Györffy states that it was Lampert who brought the Saxons to this village, and he regards Lampert as its founder.¹⁹⁴

191 FÜGEDI, Erik. Das mittelalterliche Königreich Ungarn als Gastland. In SCHLESINGER, Walter (ed.). *Die deutsche Ostsiedlung des Mittelalters als Problem der europäischen Geschichte*. Sigmaringen : J. Thorbecke, 1975, p. 481-488. ISBN 379956618X; KUBINYI, András. Zur Frage der deutschen Siedlungen im mittleren Teil des Königreichs Ungarn (1200–1541). In SCHLESINGER, Walter (ed.). *Die deutsche Ostsiedlung*, p. 529-544; MARTINI, Friedrich. Der Deutsche Ritterorden und seine Kolonisten im Burzenland. In *UJ*, 1979, year 10, p. 42-56; ZSOLDOS, ref. 25, p. 11, 14-15; BEREND, ref. 25, p. 313. On this see: IVERSEN, ref. 164, p. 99, 101-102, 106, 107, 108-109.

192 MNL DL 314 (1247/1271/1507); *ÁMTF I*, p. 532-533; MIZSER, ref. 57, p. 88; SOLYMOSI, László. Hospeskváltság 1275-ből. (A hospes privilege from 1275.). In KREDICS, László (ed.). *Tanulmányok Veszprém megye múltjából*. Veszprém : Veszprém Megyei Levéltár, 1984, p. 56-57, 60. ISBN 9630145375; *Mon. Vat. I/Is*. 356, 371.

193 *ÁMTF I*, p. 532-533; GYÖRFFY, ref. 173, p. 616; ENGEL, ref. 56, p. 61; KRISTÓ, Gyula. *A XI. századi hercegség története Magyarországon*. (The History of the 11th Century Duchy in Hungary.). Budapest : Akadémiai Kiadó, 1974, p. 62-63, 92-94. ISBN 9630503980; *KMTL*, p. 393. On the names of villages derived from the kings and dynastic saints of the Arpád dynasty (Imrich, Koloman, Stephen, Ladislav) see: MEZŐ, András. *A templomcím a Magyar helységnevekben (11. – 15. század)*. (Church dedications in Hungarian place names (11th – 15th centuries).). Budapest : METEM, 1996, p. 90-91, 109-110, 125-131, 134-141. ISBN 9638472197.

194 On this see: KRISTÓ, ref. 188, p. 98.

We know little about Lampert, but there is information that he and Ladislav I founded and endowed the later important provostry of Titel in the County of Bács.¹⁹⁵ He may really have “founded” or enlarged the village of Luprechzaza. However, it appears to us much more probable that while Lampert was Prince of Bihar he could have built a manor house (*curia regis*) in the Forest of Bereg.¹⁹⁶ Therefore the place was named after him in later tradition. When he hunted or stayed in this part of the frontier region of Hungary, he stayed precisely there. Since the name of the village preserved his name, it could have been his main residence in the dynastic property of Bereg, which was part of the frontier County of Boržava. We already mentioned that the kings of Hungary always settled guests in their dynastic properties, often near their manor houses. We do not think that guests from Saxony were already invited there by Lampert. They came only much later on the initiative of later kings of Hungary, perhaps at the end of the 12th or beginning of the 13th century. However, we cannot entirely exclude the possibility shown by a record from 1216 about German guests (Szatmár) Németi, who settled near Szatmár Castle in the neighbouring County of Szatmár.¹⁹⁷ Andrew II granted them privileges in 1230, but a much older tradition was recorded in this document that they had come already in the time of Queen Gizela (984–1060).¹⁹⁸

If we accept the assumption that as a member of the Arpád dynasty, Lampert also stayed in the royal manor house in Bereg (Luprechzaza), then we have evidence that the royal forest of Bereg was already part of the “private” property of the Arpád dynasty in the 11th century. Considerations of the name of the village of Luprechzaza, named after Prince Lampert, largely start from the record of the above mentioned inventory of goods for the court of the Junior King Stephen in 1264. The part about the payment of debts to the Venetian merchant Wulam mentions Lampert’s forests (*in silvis de Lompert*).¹⁹⁹ These were forests in Bereg, either around the village of Luprechzaza or elsewhere in the property. Since they were named after Prince Lampert and not mentioned as *silvae de Beregh*, it is a strong argument clearly testifying to the activity of Lampert in this part of the frontier region of Hungary. Not only the names of the village with the royal manor house but also the surrounding forests bear his name. This may originally have applied to the whole territory of Bereg. Lampert probably used this district as an area for hunting already in the 11th century. Since it was a dynastic property it could be similarly used by other regional princes and later also by kings of Hungary. Apparently for this reason, thanks to the dynastic memory of the Arpád family, this naming was preserved until the second half of the 13th century.

195 *ÁMTF I*, p. 240-242; *KMTL*, p. 677.

196 Gy. Györfly also later admitted that Lampert had to establish a princely manor house there. GYÖRFFY, György. *Az Árpád-kori Magyarország történelmi földrajza*. (Historical Geography of Hungary in the Arpád Period.). (hereinafter *ÁMTF IV*). Budapest : Akadémiai Kiadó, 1998, p. 115. ISBN 9630575043.

197 NÉMETH, ref. 15, no. 325, p. 199-201, no. 447, p. 281-282.

198 ZIMMERMANN, Harald. *Hospites Theutonici : Rechtsprobleme der deutschen Südostsiedlung*. In ZIMMERMANN, Harald (ed.). *Siebenbürgen und seine Hospites Theutonici : Vorträge und Forschungen zur südostdeutschen Geschichte*. Köln, Weimar, Wien : Böhlau Verlag, 1996, p. 57-58. ISBN 3412127957.

199 „Item LX marcas quas dedit magister Lodomerius eidem syr Wilamo in silvis de Lompert.“ ZOLNAY, ref. 56, p. 82, 88, 106; FEJÉRPATAKY, ref. 56, p. 119.

According to the document granting privileges from 1247, the king's guests from Luprechzaza could use the mountains, forests, valleys and waters in their surroundings.²⁰⁰ Apart from this, they also gained the right to pasture their pigs and cattle during certain periods in the Forest of Bereg. It was apparently a matter of feeding their animals during the pannage (autumn) period of pasturing with acorns and beech nuts, and obtaining the wood they needed for building.²⁰¹ Forest pasturing, a part of the royal prerogative, happened regularly in the Forest of Bereg as is shown by the mention of the village of *Perek and its swineherds. The falsified foundation document of the monastery of St. Maurice at Bél (1037/1086) in the royal forest of Bakon mentions the right of the serfs to cut wood for the needs of the monastery (*in silva Bocon ligna incideri*).²⁰² When Stephen II (1116–1131) confirmed in 1121 the foundation of the monastery of the Virgin Mary at Almad by Ogiuz and Misko sons of Band, he also mentioned the right of the monastery to take wood from the royal *silva Selcz*.²⁰³ In the period 1264–1270 Belo IV solved a dispute between the Bakon foresters and the Cistercian nuns from the monastery of the Virgin Mary in Vesprém. They demanded the right to take wood from the royal forests to repair their monastery buildings as Belo IV had already allowed them to do.²⁰⁴ We can see from these examples that to cut wood in a royal forest was a prerogative right of the monarch and the privileges granted to the guests at Luprechzaza concerned precisely this royal right.

A royal manor house or residence of the monarch – *Királyház-domus regalis*, now called Királyháza, in Ugoča, is also mentioned in 1262.²⁰⁵ We have a record from 1272 that royal guests were settled near this manor house *apud domum nostram...in Vgocha constituti*.²⁰⁶ It was the main hunting manor house of the Arpád dynasty in the royal property of Ugoča, where the king and his court stayed during hunting and their con-

200 On the similar privileges regarding the free use of the royal forests by German guests in Transylvania (Burzenland) from 1224 see: ZIMMERMANN, Franz – WERNER, Carl (eds.). *Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte der Deutschen in Siebenbürgen I*. (1191–1342). Hermannstadt : In Kommission bei Franz Michaelis, 1892, no. 43, p. 35.

201 *.....ac etiam quantum possunt uno die cum porcibus et pecoribus ad sylvam Beregh pervenire, percipiant sicuti volunt, et in eadem ligna ad edificia mactare.*“ MNL DL 314 (1247/1271/1507); *RHMA*, no. MCCXLVII, p. 472; *CDH IV/1*, p. 456-457; *RA I/2*, no. 867, p. 261; *AMTF I*, p. 532-533. On this see: SOLYMOSSI, László. *A földesúri járadékok új rendszere a 13. századi Magyarországon*. (The new income system of landlords in 13th-century Hungary.). Budapest : Argumentum Kiadó, 1998, p. 66, 102, 118, 183, 187. ISBN 9634460844.

202 *DHA I*, no. 26, p. 119 (falsified). On this see: SZABÓ, ref. 9, p. 139-142; CANTOR, ref. 61, p. 60-63.

203 *.....ad silvam Selcz in qua habet securitatem sive ad succidendum...libere et sine aliquibus terminis...*“ *DHA I*, no. 151, p. 413.

204 *.....conuentui monialium ecclesie sancte Marie de ordine cystericiens in valle Vessprimiensis existentium ligna in silva Bakon, que pro reparatione curie vel ad rehedificationem ecclesie necessaria fuerint libere et sine quolibet impedimento dari permittas...*“ MNL DL 5983; *CDH VII/1*, p. 362; *RA I/3*, no. 1675, p. 507; *CDH IX/4*, no. 6, p. 44-45. On this see: YOUNG, ref. 66, p. 10-12; CANTOR, ref. 61, p. 59; WILSON, Dolores. Multi-Use Management of the Medieval Anglo-Norman Forest. In *Journal of the Oxford University History Society*, 2004, no. 1, year 2., p. 3-5. ISSN 1742917X.

205 *CDH XII/3*, no. 40, p. 44; *RA III/1*, no. 1788, p. 10; NÉMETH, ref. 15, p. XXIX.

206 *RA III/1*, no. 2117, p. 116; *CDH V/1*, 176; SZABÓ, ref. 127, p. 45-46, 114, 321-322, 382, 410-411; KRISTÓ, ref. 9, p. 492-497; SZÜCS, ref. 9, p. 17; NÉMETH, ref. 96, p. 8-9.

tinual movement around the royal properties.²⁰⁷ This territory is mentioned as *predium nostrum de Wgacha* even at the end of the 13th century.²⁰⁸ The presence of communities of guests at the manor house (Félszász 1272) and in its surroundings shows the importance of this royal property. They are mentioned before 1262 at **Tornatelek*, a vanished village in the present territory of Gödényháza, Гудя and then in Szászfalu (now Sasovo, Сасово).²⁰⁹ Apart from these Saxon communities, the Arpád dynasty settled further guests in the village of Nagyszöllős (Виноградів). It is situated on the other side of the Tisza near the already mentioned royal manor house and village of Félszász, and in 1280 it is even mentioned as *villa nostra regalis*.²¹⁰ In 1262 the Junior King Stephen granted these guests (*hospitibus nostris de villa Zeleus*) privileges concerning the rights and internal organization of their community. They were given permission to hunt deer, wolves and foxes in the surrounding forests and to freely catch fish (*in silvis adiacentibus venari capriolos, lupos, wlpes et in aquis piscari libere possint et secure*). As a result of the larger number of guests they also received land of the royal falconers (keepers of birds of prey for hunting, *terra Droch*) and fishermen, located not far from this village.²¹¹ They were certainly among the older organizations of royal properties in this part of Hungary. Apart from this, it has a royal chapel or queen's chapel, since according to a mention from 1284 it was an exempt parish like Luprechzaza and Beregszász. This is clear evidence that it was a dynastic property of the Arpád family. Gy. Györffy also supposes thanks to a single record of its name as Asszonyságszöllős (*Zeleus*, Nagyszöllős) that this was a village of the queens of Hungary at least from the time of Queen Gizela.²¹² A further document of Stephen V from 1272 granted privileges to royal guests from Félszász, who were settled directly around the royal manor house (*hospites nostri de villa Felzaz, apud domum nostram, videlicet in Vgocha constituti*). They appear to have originally fulfilled various duties for the king. It testifies to the fact that they gained various privileges because of the constant burden from frequent visits by the monarch and the need to entertain him (*ius descensus*) at the nearby royal manor house. The king granted them a forest, the *sylva Stulba*, where they could obtain new soil and freely hunt wild animals of appropriate size such as bears, wild boar and deer. Nobody else had the right to use it in this way. They were also allowed to catch fish in the Tisza up to the boundary of the Máramaros forest.²¹³ Not far from the royal manor house in Ugoča there were also two

207 SZABÓ, ref. 127, p. 32, 37-38, 45, 382.

208 CDP VIII, no. 369, p. 447 (1296); CDH VI/2, p. 523-524 (1300); KRISTÓ, ref. 9, p. 496.

209 „...*terram Tornatelek vocatam in Comitatu Vgocha existentem, in qua antea hospites nostri residebant, nunc vacuum, et habitatoribus destitutam...convicinatur terrae hospitem nostrorum Király háziak vocatorum...versus terram hospitem nostrorum Nogzaz...*“ CDH XII/3, no. 40, p. 44-46; RA II/1, no. 1788, p. 10; SZABÓ, ref. 127, p. 355-356, 479, 521-522.

210 CDAC XII, no. 241, p. 292; RA II/2-3, no. 3080, p. 269; SZABÓ, ref. 127, p. 419.

211 „*Concessimus eciam, quod in silvis adiacentibus venari capriolos, lupos, wlpes et in aquis piscari libere possint et secure...Preterea, ut numerus hospitem nobis serviencium augeatur, dedimus terram Droch et terram piscatorum nostrorum adiacentem eiusdem...*“ CDAC VIII, no. 23, p. 31; RA II/1, no. 1793, p. 11; SZABÓ, ref. 127, p. 321, 419.

212 GYÖRFFY, ref. 173, p. 296-297; SZABÓ, ref. 127, p. 419.

213 „...*quod quia iidem per frequentes descensus nostros quam plurimis sint grauati... Item contulimus eisdem sylvam, Stulba vocatam...in qua araturas exercean, et feras mediocres, videlicet ursos, apros, cervos, et*

villages of royal foresters, who oversaw the forests of the Arpád dynasty in this part of the frontier region of Hungary. They were Szöllősvégardó (Підвиноградів) (*custodes silvarum nostrarum...in comitatu de Ugacha,...possessionum regalis Ordou vocate*)²¹⁴ on the left bank of the Tisza and Feketeardó (Чорнотисів) on the right bank.²¹⁵ These privileges for the royal guests at Nagyszöllős and Félészász are important evidence that Ugoča was a royal forest, where the possibility to hunt animals, catch fish or obtain soil for cultivation were part of the prerogative rights of the Arpád dynasty. Although no such extensive privileges are mentioned for the guests at Luprechzaza or Beregszász, we can suppose that the kings of Hungary had the same prerogative rights in the *predium Bereg* or *silva Bereg*, as those they granted to the guests in Ugoča.

The territory of Bereg was part of the frontier region *confinium* of the Kingdom of Hungary. It was originally a dynastic property of the Arpád family and it probably had been at least since the 11th century. It was a wooded territory in the Carpathians, where members of the Arpád dynasty often went to hunt. We do not have direct evidence of royal hunts, but we know that by the end of the 12th century, the king hunted in the neighbouring forest of Máramaros. We suppose that this also happened in Bereg, and that the surviving documents indirectly testify to it. It is mentioned in the first half of the 13th century as a royal forest (*silva regis*). An autonomous county controlled by the nobility arose there only later. Its territory contained villages of royal servants, who performed duties connected with royal hunts. There were villages of royal foresters (*custodes silvarum*), falconers (*falconarii, accipitres*), and we can suppose that there were other servants such as dog-handlers (*caniferi, leporariferi*) and hunters (*venatores*). Such royal properties were known in Western Europe as *forestes* and the prerogative rights of the monarch (*Wildbann, Forstbann, bannum bestiarum*) applied there. These rights covered hunting, fishing, pasturing of pigs, tolls, extraction of timber, mining of ores and so on. It is probable that these forest rights of the dynasty (in Hungarian: *erdőuraldom, erdőispánság*) also applied in Hungary and that the territory of Bereg was also protected by special rights of the monarch (*ius regis-venatio, piscatio*). In the 11th century Bereg was part of the great frontier County (*marchia*) of Boržava, and formed a distinct *districtus* or *comitatus* within it. Its main centre was the royal manor house (*curia, curtis, villa regis*), close to which the kings of Hungary settled guests of German origin in the villages of Luprechzaza and Beregszász during the first half of the 13th century. An important finding is that Bereg, specifically these two villages had royal or princely chapels (*capella regis*) established by the Arpád dynasty. We know from later documents that they were exempt parishes (*exempta parochia, plebania exempta*) subject directly to the

capellas occidenti (?) liberam habeant facultatem. Ceterum volumus, ut nullus extraneorum usum silvae ipsorum possit recipere violenter...Adhuc concessimus, quod usque ad indagines silvae Maramarosi de terminis terrae ipsorum incipiendo, piscaturam in Ticia omnimodam possint exercere. “MNL DL 70 588; CDH V/1, p. 176-177; RA II/1, no. 2117, p. 116; BÉLAY, ref. 27, p. 6, 10; ZOLNAY, ref. 27, p. 133-138, 157; SZABÓ, ref. 127, p. 38, 44-45, p. 382-383.

214 CDP VIII, no. 372, p. 453-454; CDAC V, no. 85, p. 136; SZABÓ, ref. 127, p. 489; HECKENAST, ref. 96, p. 92.

215 SZABÓ, ref. 127, p. 336-337.

Archbishop of Esztergom, so that the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Bishop of Eger did not apply to them. This fact also shows that the royal property of Bereg belonged to the “private property of the Arpád dynasty”. It is clear from the unusual naming of the village of Luprechzaza – Lampertszász that Prince Lampert, a member of the Arpád dynasty was involved. It is entirely possible that he had a princely manor house in Bereg. If he really did, it would be one of the few pieces of evidence that Bereg was already part of the dynastic property of the Arpád family in the 11th century. It is also interesting that Bereg and Ugoča were the only royal forests in Hungary to be designated by the term *forestae*, which was not used in Hungary. Apart from this, it is said that *fuertunt foreste sanctorum regum*, which means that members of the Arpád dynasty already used them at least in the 11th century. It is unique evidence that royal properties resembling the *forestis* organization of Western Europe also existed in Hungary. The use of this term in Hungary would confirm the view of older medievalists that when forming their kingdom, the Arpád dynasty significantly drew on the traditions of their neighbours. When organizing and building up their property domains they followed models from France and the Holy Roman Empire. Since Bereg was a separate territory of the dynasty, the legal authority of the county sheriff (*comes comitatus*) did not apply there, in spite of the fact that it was located within the territory of a county. It was designated as a *predium, districtus, provincia or comitatus* in medieval sources. The term *comitatus* prevailed in the course of the 13th century, but not in the sense of a royal county. It is necessary to understand it as a term also used in documents from Hungary to mean the “private property” of the Arpád dynasty. The administrators of these territories were not royal sheriffs that is state officials, but people entrusted by the king, who apparently operated at the royal court. They oversaw royal forest property, were the main representatives of the power of the monarch at the main royal manor houses and they provided special services in the organization of royal hunts. In sources from the first half of the 13th century, they are designated as *procuratores*, but we cannot exclude the possibility that during the 11th – 12th century they were known as *villici*, men who are known to have represented the king in his properties in this period. They probably also fulfilled functions connected with the administration of the forest properties of the dynasty. In the course of the 13th century, they began to be designated with the word *comes*, but not in the sense of sheriff of a county. Such a *comes* was the administrator of a royal forest property.²¹⁶ The term *ministerialis* is also interesting. It could designate a deputy or subordinate “official” of the chief administrator of the dynastic property. The royal *predium, districtus* or *comitatus* of Bereg was an extensive territory with boundaries that can be approximately reconstructed on the basis of documents from 1232 and 1270. In the second half of the 13th century they were roughly defined by the rivers Vérke, Tisza, Latorica, Svalyavka, the Carpathian range and the river Boržava. However, we cannot exclude that its extent was much greater in the 11th – 12th centuries.

* The study was produced in the framework of the grant APVV-0051-12 *Medieval castles in Slovakia: Life, culture and society* and the project VEGA 2/0079/14 *Social and demographic development of towns in Slovakia in the Middle Ages*.

216 HUDÁČEK, ref. 8, p. 38-41, 45-46, 48-49, 53-63, 66-76.

SILVA BEREG (KÖNIGSWALD IM MITTELALTERLICHEN UNGARN)

PAVOL HUDÁČEK

Bereg war im Mittelalter ein Teil des ungarischen Grenzgebiets (*confinium*) und ursprünglich handelte sich es um ein Dynastiebesitz von Árpáden. Es war ein bewaldetes Gebiet (Teil von Karpaten), wo die Mitglieder der Árpáden-Dynastie jagten. Über die königlichen Jagten gibt es zwar keine direkte Beweise, jedoch wir wissen, dass am Ende des 12. Jahrhunderts jagte der König im benachbarten Wald Maramuresch. Wir nehmen an, dass es auch in Bereg üblich war. In der ersten Hälfte des 13. Jahrhunderts wird er als Königswald erwähnt (*silva regis*) und erst später entstand dort ein selbstständiges Komitat oder adeliges Stuhlbezirk. Auf seinem Gebiet befanden sich die Dörfer der königlichen Diener, die die Pflichten rund um die Jagd des Herrschers erfüllten. Es waren die Dörfer der königlichen Forstwächter (*custodes silvarum*) und Züchter der Jagdvogel (*falconarii, accipitres*). Solche königliche Waldbesitze waren in Westeuropa als *forestis* bekannt und es galt dort hinsichtlich der Jagd, des Fischfangs, Schweineweidens, der Maut, Holz- und Erzförderung usw. das Regalrecht des Herrschers (Wildbann, Forstbann, *bannum bestiarum*). Sehr wahrscheinlich auch in Ungarn waren diese Waldbesitze der Dynastie (ung. *erdőuraldom, erdőispánság*), und somit auch das Gebiet Bereg, durch das Sonderrecht des Herrschers (*ius regis-venatio, piscatio*) geschützt. Bereg gehörte im 11. Jahrhundert in das große Grenzkomitat (*marchia*) Borschava, innerhalb dessen er ein selbstständiges Gebiet war (*districtus, comitatus*). Sein Zentrum war der Königshof (*curia, curtis, villa regis*), in dessen Nähe, irgendwann in der ersten Hälfte des 13. Jahrhunderts, die ungarischen Könige die deutschen Gäste in den Dörfern Luprechzaza und Beregszász ansiedelten. Von großer Bedeutung ist die Feststellung, dass in Bereg, konkret in den erwähnten Dörfern, die Árpáden königliche oder fürstliche Kapellen (*capellae regis*) hatten. Aus den späteren Belegen wissen wir, dass es sich um Exempt-Pfarreien (*exempta parochia, plebania exempta*) handelte, die direkt dem Graner Erzbischof unterlagen, und aus diesem Grund standen sie nicht in Rechtsgewalt des Jäger Bischofs. Nach dem außergewöhnlichen Namen des Dorfes Luprechzaza-Lampertszász zu urteilen, handelte sich es um den Fürst Lampert, einen Mitglied der Árpáden-Dynastie. Es ist durchaus möglich, dass er in Bereg seinen Fürstenhof hatte. Wenn es so wäre, würde sich es um einen der wenigen Belege dafür handeln, dass Bereg bereits im 11. Jahrhundert zum Dynastiebesitz der Árpáden gehörte. Es ist interessant, dass nur Bereg, zusammen mit Ugotsch, die einzigen königlichen Wälder in Ungarn waren, die mit dem *Terminus forestae* bezeichnet waren, der sonst in Ungarn nicht gebräuchlich war. Darüber hinaus nannte sie auch als *fuerunt foreste sanctorum regum*, was bedeutet, dass die Árpáden dort zumindest schon im 11. Jahrhundert jagten. Es handelt sich um einen einzigartigen Beleg dafür, dass es auch in Ungarn königliche Besitze gab, die offensichtlich der Organisation von *forestis* in Westeuropa ähnlich waren. Das könnte die Hypothese der älteren Mediävisten belegen, dass sie bei der Entstehung des Königreichs Vieles aus den Traditionen ihrer Nachbarn übernahmen. Bei der Organisation ihrer Besitzdomäne nahmen sie Beispiel vom Fränkischen oder Heiligen Römischen Reich. Weil Bereg ein selbstständiges Dynastiegebiet war, unterlag er nicht der Rechtsgewalt des Gespans vom Komitat (*comes comitatus*), obwohl er auf seinem Gebiet lag. In den mittelalterlichen Quellen wurde er deswegen als *predium, districtus, provincia* oder als *comitatus* bezeichnet. Im Laufe des 13. Jahrhunderts wurde hauptsächlich die Bezeichnung *comitatus* verwendet, jedoch nicht im Sinne des königlichen Komitats. Es muss als ein *Terminus* betrachtet, der in Ungarn auch für die „privaten Besitztümer“ der Árpáden verwendet wurde. Ihre Verwalter waren nicht die königlichen Gespane, sondern vom König beauftragte Diener. Sie verwalteten den königlichen Waldbesitz, waren Vertreter der königlichen Macht am Königshof und erfüllten auch die Sonderdienste bei der Organisation der Königsjagd. In der ersten Hälfte des 13. Jahrhunderts wurden sie als pro-

curatores bezeichnet. Es ist gar nicht ausgeschlossen, dass sie in 11. – 12. Jahrhunderten als villici bekannt waren, über die wir wissen, dass sie zu jener Zeit die Vertreter des Königs auf seinen Besitztümern waren. Höchstwahrscheinlich waren sie auch mit der Funktion der Verwaltung des Waldbesitzes der Dynastie betraut. Im Laufe des 13. Jahrhunderts begann man sie als comites zu bezeichnen, jedoch nicht im Sinne des Gespans vom Komitat, sondern als Verwalter des königlichen Waldbesitzes. Sehr interessant ist auch die Bezeichnung ministerialis, womit wahrscheinlich der Stellvertreter oder den Untergeordneten des Hauptverwalters des Dynastiebesitzes bezeichnet wurde. Der königliche Besitz Bereg (predium, districtus, comitatus) war ein ausgedehntes Gebiet, dessen Grenze sich anhand der Urkunden aus den Jahren 1232 und 1270 ungefähr rekonstruieren lässt. In der zweiten Hälfte des 13. Jahrhunderts stellten die Grenze die Flüsse Vérke, Theiß, Latorica, Svalyavka, Karpaten und der Fluss Borschava dar. Es ist überhaupt nicht ausgeschlossen, dass in 11. – 12. Jahrhunderten sein Gebiet noch weitreichender war.

Mgr. Pavol Hudáček, PhD.
Institute of History of the SAS
P. O. BOX 198, 814 99 Bratislava, Klemensova 19
e-mail: pavolhudacek81@gmail.com

SOCIAL AND HEALTH CARE IN THE KINGDOM OF HUNGARY IN THE FIRST HALF OF THE 19TH CENTURY

INGRID KUŠNIRÁKOVÁ

KUŠNIRÁKOVÁ, Ingrid. Social and health care in the Kingdom of Hungary in the first half of the 19th century. *Historický časopis*, 2017, 65, 5, pp. 849-878, Bratislava.

The study is concerned with the changes in social and health care in the Kingdom of Hungary in the first half of the 19th century. In this period social care became more systematic and was gradually separated from health care. Apart from town administrations and religious institutions, charitable societies began to significantly contribute to charitable activities. Under the influence of the central government, local authorities began to devote increased attention to such categories of dependent people as the mentally ill, single mothers and illegitimate children, who had previously been scorned or punished by society. Educational institutions for deaf-mute and blind children were a new element on the regional level.

Key words: Kingdom of Hungary. 19th century. Social care. Health care.

The system of social care created in the Kingdom of Hungary in the course of Early Modern times underwent extensive changes during the short reigns of Joseph II and Leopold II. Joseph II wanted to put philanthropy on a new basis, to end its confessional character and replace accidental distribution of charity with targeted support for really needy persons. As a result of his reforms, many charitable institutions changed their character and administration. Resources intended for charitable purposes were shifted from institution to institution, or they were brought under state control. Although Leopold II attempted to preserve at least part of his predecessor's reforms, his decisions enabled philanthropy in the country to quickly return to its form before 1780. The parish poor institutes (Ger. *Phararmeninstituten*, Lat. *Instituta pauperum*), which Joseph II had planned as pillars of the new system of social care, quickly lost their importance and they gradually disappeared. Charitable institutions mostly returned to their original administrators, and philanthropy regained its confessional character. Since town authorities did not have enough financial resources to look after the poor, the majority of them again allowed street begging in their territories. The establishment of specialized state welfare institutions such as institutes for the mentally ill, remained on the level of ideas.¹

Social care in towns in the first half of the 19th century

In the first half of the 19th century, philanthropic institutions still arose and operated mainly in the urban environment. In the countryside, dependent persons still obtained

1 For more details on social care in the reigns of Joseph II and Leopold II see: KUŠNIRÁKOVÁ, Ingrid. *Reforma sociálnej starostlivosti v Uhorsku v období panovania Jozefa II. a Leopolda II.* (Reform of social care in the Kingdom of Hungary during the reigns of Joseph II and Leopold II.). In KOVÁČ, Dušan – KOWALSKÁ, Eva – ŠOLTĚS, Peter. *Spoločnosť na Slovensku v dlhom 19. storočí*. Bratislava : Historický ústav SAV : VEDA, 2015, p. 128-148. ISBN 9788022414784.

help mainly in the framework of traditional social ties. In this period, social care remained exclusively a domain for local government, the churches and numerous individual benefactors. As in the previous century, the state authorities did not intervene in this part of the life of urban communities. They only supervised the economic activities of existing charitable institutions and when necessary solved disputes on the basis of existing legislation. The method of financing charitable institutions also remained unchanged. The main source of their income remained endowments, gifts, bequests and collections. Towns contributed to care for the poor from their own resources only in exceptional cases.

As Jozef Klobusiczký's list² shows the protective network at the beginning of the 1790s comprised mainly hospitals and parish poor institutes, with a smaller number of charitable foundations, especially for the poor ashamed to beg and widows with orphans. Hospitals and parish poor institutes were administered mainly by town authorities, foundations mainly by the churches.³

The Napoleonic Wars, state bankruptcy of 1811 and cholera epidemic of 1831 caused considerable financial losses for the charitable facilities, while also increasing the number of people dependent on help and support. The existing financial arrangements for charitable institutions based mostly on interest payments from deposited capital, became more unsustainable and had to be supplemented with financial resources from other sources. As a result of wars, economic crisis and cholera a larger number of people could not support themselves by their own work. This required a new changed approach to their categorization, as well as the establishment of new types of charitable institution.

During the first half of the 19th century, the Hungarian elite gradually retreated from its hitherto passive position in the field of philanthropy and decided on an active approach. Under the influence of social and economic changes in the country, they essentially abandoned support for the poor by means of charitable foundations. They replaced one-time giving of financial resources with continual collection of money for this purpose. However, in contrast to the past, they did not entrust the money to the administration of municipal authorities or church institutions, but supervised the use of the money themselves. The changed approach of the social elites to the question of supporting the poor can be traced already from the beginning of the 19th century during a time of various catastrophes and natural disasters. If an extensive fire or flood affected a place, the local nobility and leading burghers organized collections or charitable theatre or musical performances to raise money to be distributed to the victims. From the 1820s, charitable societies became the main space for carrying out charitable activities.

The confessionally conditioned approach to support for the poor, characteristic for the religiously divided society of Early Modern times, was partially overcome in the course of the first half of the 19th century. Charitable institutions founded before 1780 usually maintained their confessional character regardless of whether they were administered by local government or by churches. Legislative article 26/1791 according to which

2 Jozef Klobusiczký produced this list for the needs of the Parliamentary Commission on Ecclesiastical Affairs, which worked in the period 1791–1792. The list is deposited in the Országos Szechenyi Könyvtár (hereinafter only OSZK), Kézirattár, Fol. lat. 790.

3 Ref. 2.

a charitable institution had to give help and support only to members of the confession for which it was originally founded, also significantly contributed to preserving this situation. When the Protestants of some towns in Hungary demanded in the 1790s that town hospitals should accept persons without regard for confession, because they had originally been municipal institutions that acquired a Catholic character only in the 17th century, the monarch always decided against them on the basis of the above mentioned article.⁴ However, especially in the larger towns, the Protestant and Jewish religious communities were soon able to establish their own charitable institutions, so that Catholic, Protestant and Jewish hospitals and care institutes operated side by side in some towns in the first half of the 19th century.

The first really non-confessional charitable institutions in the towns of Hungary were the parish poor institutes established on orders from Joseph II. The confessional allegiance of poor people was no longer considered by the majority of charitable and support societies formed in the first half of the 19th century or by the municipal charitable institutions established in this period. The majority of charitable institutions intended for children also declared religious toleration. Orphanages and child care facilities had to accept both Catholic and Protestant children and give them religious education in accordance with their confession. In spite of the fact that in many of these institutions, religious up-bringing was secured only for Catholic children, Evangelical children had to attend lessons on religion in the elementary schools of their confession.

In spite of the fact that confessional barriers in social life and in the field of social care were gradually reduced, charity remained part of religious life and an obligation of the faithful, although individual churches interpreted its importance for the salvation of the soul in different ways. Material support for people in need was also associated with care for their souls and for their religious and moral life. Therefore the majority of charitable institutions and facilities, regardless of founder, demanded that beneficiaries regularly participate in the religious ceremonies of their church, while children were provided with or, at least, enabled to attend religious education according to their confession.

Institutional and non-institutional forms of charity in the towns of Hungary

The ambitious project of Joseph II to create parish poor institutes as pillars of a system of social care in the towns and later in the whole country was accompanied by many difficulties from the beginning and these further deepened after his death. Leopold II declared his support for these institutions, but various measures approved by him significantly reduced their income. In particular, he allowed charitable endowments given to the poorhouses in 1787–1790, to return to their original administrators. He also repealed the decree by which all gifts and bequests to the poor worth more than 500 gulden had to be deposited as capital of the local poorhouse. If the testator asked, the money could be distributed directly to the poor.⁵ Financial difficulties and the relaxation of state pressure

4 Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár – Országos Levéltár (hereinafter only MNL OL), fond C 80, 1793, fons (hereinafter only f.)16, positio (hereinafter only pos.)1-25; Ibid., f. 35, pos. 1-6.

5 LINZBAUER, Franciscus Xaver. *Codex sanitario-medicinalis Hungariae*. Tomus III., sectio I. Budae: Typis caesereo-regiae scientiarum universitatis, 1853, p. 600.

to keep them in existence led to one poorhouse after another closing relatively quickly after 1790.⁶

After the failure of the project of a parish poor institute system, hospitals and poorhouses remained the basis for social care in the towns. In the smaller towns, these institutions essentially retained their medieval character into the first half of the 19th century, with various categories of dependent people living in them. In the larger towns, however, social care was gradually separated from health care and the charitable institutions began to specialize. Apart from charitable institutions in which dependent persons received long-term care, modern hospitals arose providing medical treatment for a limited period. In some towns, hospitals of the old and new types still operated under one roof, but as separate departments with exactly defined numbers of places or beds for the two categories of people. In spite of providing health care services, hospitals still belong among the charitable institutions in the first half of the 19th century, because they were mainly intended for people from the lower social groups, who could not be treated at home for various reasons.

In spite of the fact that the health of the population and protection of public health already became part of the state agenda in the reign of Maria Theresa, the state authorities aimed only to create a state health care administration and adopt legal norms stating the requirements for the education of medical personnel and setting the extent of their responsibilities. The establishment and operation of hospitals as medical – charitable institutions was still left to the voluntary initiative of the town and county administrations, church communities, and sometimes also charitable and support societies. Hospitals varied in the status of their founders, number of beds and level of specialization in the care they provided.

The first true medical facilities in Hungary were the hospitals of the Brothers of Mercy and Order of St. Elizabeth. At the time of the accession of Joseph II there were eight of them in the kingdom.⁷ Another four were added in the 1790s, one belonging to the Order of St. Elizabeth and three to the Brothers of Mercy. The existence and operation of hospitals was still firmly connected with religious orders in this period. Hospitals administered and run by secular personnel began to appear in the towns of Hungary at the end of the 1790s. The majority of them were founded by towns, a smaller proportion by religious communities, especially Jewish groups and voluntary or support societies. Their operations were financed mainly from the profit from invested capital, from gifts, various collections, and in the case of society hospitals from membership fees. Poor patients received free treatment, while more solvent people had to pay. The cost depended on the level of food and accommodation provided.

As will be mentioned, a general hospital of the Josephine type was not successfully established in Hungary, but some of the larger towns had similar institutions financed from their own resources. In relation to the rapidly growing population and solvency

6 OSZK, Kézirattár, Fol. lat. 790.

7 The monasteries and hospitals of the Brothers of Mercy were situated in Bratislava, Spišské Podhradie, Eger, Pápa, Eisenstadt (now in Austria), Oradea (now in Rumania) and Vác. The Order of St. Elizabeth administered a hospital in Bratislava.

of donors, the institution with the largest capacity was built in 1796–1797 in Pest. It was reconstructed and enlarged several times in later years. The Hospital of St. Roch in Pest included a department for the old and disabled, separate surgical and internal departments for women and men, a maternity ward⁸ and several places for the mentally ill. According to a description from 1834 the hospital had a capacity of more than 200 beds. Since the population of the city was constantly increasing, the city authorities bought another house, where they created a branch hospital with a capacity of 50 beds. The institution's personnel were divided into medical, economic and religious. The chief physician directed the everyday running of the institution. He was also its director and the city physician. Economic and financial affairs were run by a commission, chaired by a commissioner appointed by the monarch on the basis of a proposal from the Council of Lieutenancy. The other members of the commission were selected economic and medical personnel from the institution and representatives of the city. The institution's income came mainly from interest on capital, payments from patients and support from the city. In an effort to increase the hospital's income, the local authorities granted it the profits from various municipal fees. The institution's income was supplemented to some extent by gifts, bequests, weekly collections and income from the sale of the clothing of deceased patients and inmates. The institution accepted old, sick and disabled people without regard for age or religion. The only exceptions were patients with fatal and chronic illnesses. The accepted patients paid for their stay with a tax approved by the state. If they could not pay it, they received free treatment. The payments for a stay in the hospital were graduated to 16 kreuzers, 36 kreuzers or 1 gulden per day depending on the standard of care and especially on the comfort of the accommodation and quality of the food.⁹

Since hospitals arose without coordination from the initiatives of the local elites, their distribution across the kingdom was very uneven. Some counties, for example Orava-Turiec did not even have one in this period. The need for hospitals was associated mainly with the urban environment, where they provided treatment for sick people who lacked a family support network in the town or if working family members could not look after them. On the other hand, hospitals could only be established and operate in towns with a sufficiently numerous and financially strong elite, which could secure continuing finance for them. In general, more hospitals operated in regions with a denser network of urban settlements. The majority of hospitals had a capacity of up to 30 beds. Higher numbers of beds could be found in hospitals only in Buda, Pest, Bratislava, Szeged and Košice.¹⁰

County hospitals intended for the rural population began to appear in Hungary in the second quarter of the 19th century. Their establishment was initiated by the county nobility on the basis of financial capital obtained from gifts and collections. The first to open was the hospital in Oradea with a capacity of 100 beds. It was followed in 1824 by the

8 The maternity ward was intended for single mothers, so that they could discretely give birth to their illegitimate children.

9 For more details on the institution SCHWARCZL, József. *Nosocomium civium Pestiensium ad sanctum Rochum* [...]. Pestini : Typis Trattner – Karolyianis, 1834.

10 For more details see *Statistik des medicinal-Standes der Kranken- und Humanitäts-Anstalten* [...]. Hrsg. von dem k. k. Ministerium des Intern. Wien : In Comiss bei Braumüller, 1859.

hospital in Trnava and then in other counties including Nitra and Trenčín. The majority of these hospitals had internal and surgical departments from the beginning, and sometimes also departments for the mentally ill. Their capacity varied from 16 to a 100 beds.¹¹

Like the hospitals, charitable institutions providing long-term care varied in the value of their property, founder, number of beds and the quality of the care they provided. It all depended on the size of the settlement, person of the founder and wealth of the local elite. The majority of these institutions had older origins. Some had operated continuously since the Middle Ages. In the past they had been founded mainly by towns and landlords, but in the mid 19th century, societies and religious communities also engaged in this field. The basis for financing these institutions was interest on capital, or in the case of landlords, natural produce from their estates. Gifts, bequests, collections and charitable undertakings formed supplementary sources. The larger towns had charitable facilities for burghers who found themselves in need and for old, sick and disabled people from the lower social classes.¹² The care for inmates also corresponded to their social status. The difference lay in the quality of accommodation, clothing and the level of the daily payments for care. The capacity of these institutions in towns was usually 20–30 beds, only exceptionally more. Care institutions in the countryside and in small towns had 6–10 beds and not infrequently only 2–4 beds. These institutions often gave their inmates only accommodation. They had to provide clothing and food themselves.

Charitable societies

In the first half of the 19th century, charitable societies began to significantly engage in the field of social care, in addition to town administrations and religious institutions. The membership base of societies was formed mainly by the social elites living in towns. Their mission was to collect financial resources for charitable institutions such as hospitals, which they usually established and administered themselves. The methods of obtaining finance were varied: membership fees, public collections, charitable balls, charitable theatre performances and concerts. A society and the charitable institutions it administered were run by a committee of people elected by the members. The chairman was always a person with significant social status, which gave the society prestige and trustworthiness. Membership of the committee was honorary and unpaid. In some cases only the treasurer and secretary responsible for the written agenda received pay. By activity in charitable societies, social elites progressed from passive support for charitable institutions by means of one-time financial gifts or endowments to active long-term participation in their running and financing. Especially in the larger towns, charitable societies gradually took over a large part of the activities associated with support for dependant persons. They significantly weakened the activity of municipal authorities and churches in this field.

After the dissolution of the parish poor institutes of the Josephine type, the open form of social care in many smaller towns again acquired the form of irregular distribution

11 Ref. 10.

12 Facilities for burghers were called *Bürgerspital* or *Bürger-Versorgungshaus*, while institutions for people without burgher status were named *Armenhaus*. Institutions of both types were found, for example in Buda, Bratislava, Trnava, Košice, Prešov and Skalica.

of alms. However, the country was afflicted by a series of unfortunate events, namely war, state bankruptcy, inflation, as a result of which the number of beggars in the streets of towns in Hungary rapidly increased. The question of eliminating street begging again became topical in the first decades of the 19th century. In some towns,¹³ charitable societies also took the initiative in this field. Essentially they took over the system of collecting financial resources and distributing support from the dissolved parish poor institutes. However, if societies were to be really effective in eliminating street begging, they had to cooperate effectively with the municipal repressive bodies, which secured the removal of outsider beggars from the town and the placing of local people capable of work in workhouses.

A women's charitable society in Pest¹⁴

The Society of Noble Ladies founded in 1810 in Vienna started the development of the tradition of charitable societies in the Habsburg Monarchy. A similar charitable society for women was established in Pest in 1817. In the first period of its existence, up to 1833, it succeeded in building up and financing a network of charitable institutions providing open or institutional forms of social care to all categories of dependent persons. In harmony with the view of charity at the time, the society set itself the aim from the beginning of only supporting the really needy and helping dependant persons, since untargeted provision of assistance was considered incorrect, expensive, harmful and un-Christian. The society's activity started from the philosophy that a person unavoidably needs housing, clothing and food for life, or in the event of illness, medical assistance and appropriate care. If somebody lacked at least one of these requirements, he could be considered poor or needy and charitable institutions had to deal with the situation. According to the categorization of the society, persons were considered really worthy of support if they were willing and able to work, but could not find work for objective reasons; if they could work only partially or not at all; sick people with the resources needed for life, and orphaned or abandoned children. The charitable institutions founded by the society in the city also followed this categorization.

In the framework of the non-institutional form of social care, the society could promptly offer a helping hand to poor people, who found themselves in need because of old age, disability or illness. Assistance could take the form of food, clothing, wood, health care or medicines. In the case of need, applicants could receive one-time financial assistance or weekly or monthly financial support. Help was always provided for two months, but it could also be obtained repeatedly. The society paid poor families to provide housing and food for people who could not provide for themselves because of age or illness and for orphaned children of pre-school age. In this way it sometimes helped both sides. The society paid for hospital stays for poor sick people, who were not getting the care they needed at home.

13 For example, Buda, Bratislava and Trnava.

14 For more details on the organizational structure and its forms of activity see: *Ausweis über die in der königl. Freistadt Pesth vom Frauen-Vereine begründeten wohlthätigen Anstalten, deren Einrichtung und Bestand vom März 1817 an bis zu Ende Septembers 1833*. Wien : gedruckt bei A. Strauss's sel. Witwe, 1834.

Care (*Siechenhaus*) and school (*Schulanstalt*) institutions provided the institutional form of social care. A convalescence home combined elements of social and health care. The care institution was intended for disabled, sick and old people, who lacked resources for subsistence and had no help. The inmates received the food, clothing and care they needed as well as accommodation. Later this institution merged with the convalescence home used for completing the treatment of patients discharged from the hospital but not sufficiently healthy to immediately start work and look after themselves.

The school institution was a sort of orphanage, which accepted orphaned, abandoned or neglected children. Its mission was to provide children with basic education and secure their future subsistence. Boys learnt crafts while girls learnt to do housework so that they would be able work as servants. Inmates spent whole days in the institution from early morning until evening. Two hours in the morning and two in the afternoon were assigned to teaching writing, reading, arithmetic, religion and the basics of natural science and hygiene. The rest of the time was assigned to work. The children not only worked in the framework of preparation for their future crafts, they also had to help with housework such as cooking, cleaning and baking bread. All the inmates received food and clothing from the institution, although they partly worked for it. The institution took full responsibility for entirely orphaned children, but only partial responsibility for children who still had one parent or received care from other relations. Children from the first group returned in the evening to foster parents, who were paid to look after them by the society. Other children went to their relations.

Another field of activity of the society was provision of help to people, who, for various reasons, could not find work. Compared to the Josephine period this represents a significant shift in perception of the question of enforced unemployment. People with an interest in working but without the necessary work skills or because of age or poor health were no longer able to work hard all day could be employed in voluntary workhouses. As the name already shows, poor people entered such facilities at their own request, remained there only during the work period and returned home after finishing work. They received weekly pay for their work. Another activity of the society in this field was providing work at home for women. Reducing the number of beggars in the streets of towns was part of the basic mission of the society, but from 1830, when the elimination of begging from the streets of towns in Hungary again became very topical as a result of cholera epidemics, its activity in this field acquired a new dimension. In particular, the society began to cooperate with the city authorities, since enforcement of a complete ban on begging also required the use of repressive measures. Members of the committee in cooperation with the city authorities first made a list of beggars according to individual districts and gave them badges. Then the entitlement to support of each listed person was assessed and they were classified as local or outsiders. The latter, meaning the beggars from outside the city, were forcibly expelled. The local beggars had a claim to support only if they were in real need according to the established criteria and really could not work because of their age or state of health. Assistance was also denied to persons who satisfied the condition, but had previously lived by collecting alms and had refused offers of other forms of care from the society. People who were accepted received support weekly at the seat of the director of the voluntary workhouse from a special commis-

sion composed of members of the society and representatives of the city. Guards, who ensured that expelled persons did not return to the city and two compulsory workhouses, one for men, one for women, represented the repressive component of the programme. The society paid for food and clothing for the inmates of the workhouses, as well as the wages of the guards. The city authorities paid other expenses.

The society operated for a long time under the patronage of Maria Dorothea, wife of the Palatine, who generously supported it together with her husband. Its activity was directed by a committee composed of a chairwoman, 15 members, two secretaries and a treasurer. Each of the 15 women in the committee was responsible for a district, where she cared for the needs of the poor and collected financial resources. A wide range of charitable institutions and large number of care and support workers required a large amount of finance. The society was very active and creative in obtaining money. In the financial year 1830/31 its income and expenditure exceeded 255 thousand gulden. Income came especially from membership fees, but also collections, profits from charitable balls, theatre performances and concerts, and to a lesser extent from interest on deposited capital. From 1831 the society organized a special annual collection for the elimination of street begging.¹⁵

Although the income of the society significantly declined in the period after the cholera epidemic, by more than 40 thousand gulden in two years, it succeeded in keeping its finances in balance. Therefore, it is not clear why the Palatine Joseph decided in 1833 that to secure the sustainability and further existence of its charitable institutions, most of them had to be taken away from the society and entrusted to the city authorities of Pest. Only a hospital for treating eye diseases and distribution of alms from collections remained to the society. However, the city did not succeed in preserving the institutions. The school institution was dissolved in 1842 and the children were transferred to a newly established Josephine orphanage. The voluntary workhouse suffered the same fate in 1848. Only the institution that cared for poor, old and disabled people remained. In 1848 it cared for 154 people.¹⁶

Women's charitable societies also gradually took the initiative in the field of charity in other towns in Hungary, although they did not develop such a wide range of activities as the women's society in Pest. Their domain came to be especially care for children, whether in the form of child care facilities, orphanages or children's hospitals.

Support societies

In the absence of a modern system of social insurance, a large part of the working population could find themselves in material need and dependant on help from the people around them or from charitable institutions as a result of old age or sickness. Only the state provided its employees with some protection against fate. It guaranteed miners,

15 For more details on the economic affairs of the society in the period 1817–1833 see *Ausweis über die in der königl. Freistadt Pesth vom Frauen-Vereine begründeten wohlthätigen Anstalten, deren Einrichtung und Bestand vom März 1817 an bis zu Ende Septembers 1833*. Wien : gedruckt bei A. Strauss's sel. Witwe, 1834.

16 ROZSAY, Joseph. *Das Pester städtische Versorgungshaus Elisabethneum [...]*. Pest : Druck Landerer - Heckenast, 1857, p. 9-10.

state officials and soldiers, who lost the ability to work, regular financial support in the form of pensions or provisions, if they satisfied the specific conditions.¹⁷ In the first half of the 19th century, pension funds and support societies associating people on the basis of their profession, became an effective way of gaining security against the possible loss of ability to work. They functioned in essentially the same way as modern insurance companies. Employees paid a proportion of their wages or a set fee into a fund, and if they could no longer work because of old age or poor health, they received the agreed pension. If they died, their widows and children received payments. The statutes of every newly established society had to be approved by the monarch.

The prototype for professional support societies was apparently the pension fund for royal and private officials in Hungary established on 1 January 1797 on the basis of a proposal from the official of the Hungarian Chamber Augustine Holtsche. The fund was intended for officials of all levels younger than 50 and not suffering from serious or life threatening illnesses. A person interested in membership had to submit a written application with a baptism certificate and confirmation of his state of health from a town or county physician. Members of the fund were divided into two categories according to their financial possibilities. The annual contribution of the first category was 100% higher than for the second, and the difference in size of the eventual pension corresponded to this. To rapidly stabilize the financial position of the fund, gaining membership was conditional on payment of an entry fee of 200 gulden (1st class) or 100 gulden (2nd class), which could also be paid in instalments, but not more than four and with 5% interest. If a new member was aged over 30, he had to make an additional payment of half the annual contribution for his category for each year over this age limit. The claim to a pension arose if the payer could no longer work because of old age or illness. This had to be confirmed by the town or county physician.

As a result of the high entry fees and regular annual contributions, the size of the pension was relatively high. At the time of origin of the fund it was 200 gulden for the first class and 100 gulden for the second class. If an official paid contributions for more than ten years, the pension increased by 50% to 300 or 150 gulden, and after another ten years by a further third to 400 or 200 gulden. Members of the fund and their widows had a claim to the full pension, while children received a quarter of its value. However, if the member had more than four children, they received only their father's full pension. Boys had a claim to support until the age of 20, girls until 18.¹⁸

Similar societies began to be formed at local level by other categories of employees. One of the first was the pension fund for officials of the Royal Borough of Pest, established in 1808.¹⁹ Outside the official environment, for example, a support society for art and music teachers was established in 1817 in Bratislava. It also took over some

17 KUŠNIRÁKOVÁ, Ingrid. *Piae fundationes. Zbožné fundácie a ich význam pre rozvoj uhorskej spoločnosti v ranom novoveku.* (Piae fundationes. Pious foundations and their significance for the development of society in Early Modern Hungary.). Bratislava : Pro Historia, 2009, p. 160-162. ISBN 9788097006051.

18 HOLTSCHKE, Augustin. *Generalia principia instituti pensionalis pro officialibus, ... in Regno Hungariae erigendi.* Ofen : Druck Univ., 1796.

19 SCHAMS, Franz. *Vollständige Beschreibung der königlichen Freystadt Pest in Ungern.* Pest : Hartleben, 1821, p. 300-302.

elements of the decaying guild system. A condition for membership of the society was residence in Bratislava. A person who left the city lost his claim to payment of the deposited money. The duties of a member of the society included participation in the funeral of a deceased member and the Mass for his soul held on the next day.²⁰

Care for children

The old traditional ways of caring for orphaned and abandoned children in Hungary began to be supplemented in the first half of the 18th century by institutions providing institutional care for children in need. The first orphanages in the country were established as part of the religious disputes between Catholics and Protestants. On one side of the notional confessional barrier, they were established by Evangelical pastors, who supported German Pietism, and on the other by members of the Catholic Society of Jesus. The state entered the field of care for children in need in 1763, when Maria Theresa with the support of the Chancellor of Hungary Francis Esterházy established a royal orphanage with 100 places at Tomášikovo (Tallós). The establishment of a royal orphanage and general support for institutional care for children from the side of the Vienna court did not remain without a response from society in Hungary. In the following period, smaller orphanages or generous foundations for child care were established in Bratislava, Sopron, Szombathely and Oradea. Their founders and benefactors were mainly Hungarian noblemen, who lived and worked in the given city. The reign of Joseph II was a turning point in the development of institutional child care. The monarch decreed the merging of the royal orphanage with other institutions in the country and that it should be located in Bratislava. Only a small proportion of the boys, who showed an ability to study, remained in institutional care. The other children were divided by age into three categories and placed with foster parents for upbringing.²¹

The institution created by Joseph II in 1786 in Bratislava by merging the royal orphanage and the local institutions in Bratislava, Oradea, Kőszeg, Sopron and Szombathely,²² was dissolved soon after the death of its founder. On the basis of a mandate from Leopold II from 20 April 1790, the authorities of towns other than Bratislava received back the original property of their orphanages in the course of 1790, together with the children for whom they had responsibility. Only children cared for from the resources of the royal foundation and Franz Török Foundation remained in the Bratislava institution.²³ The original capacity of the institution of 443 children in 1786 was reduced to 250. Since the institution had financial difficulties, only 50-57 of the 137 places under royal patronage were filled in the years 1790–1792. In this period the orphanage looked after about 160 children, although the number frequently changed as a result of death, flight or

20 *Plan des Freundschaftlichen Vereins der gesammten freyen Künstler und Sprachlerer der ... Stadt Pressburg, zur Unterstützung ihrer Wittwen und Waisen [...].* Pressburg : Snischek, 1817.

21 For more details on the beginnings of institutional care for children in Hungary and the history of the royal orphanage in the period 1763–1790 see KUŠNIRÁKOVÁ, *Piae fundationes*, ref. 17, p. 146-150, 153-155; KUŠNIRÁKOVÁ, *Reforma sociálnej starostlivosti v Uhorsku*, ref. 1, p. 141-147.

22 *Historische Beschreibung von der milden und merkwürdigen Szecsenisch-Kollonicsischen Stiftung Hungarns...*, 1789; LINZBAUER, *Codex sanitario-medicinalis III/1*, ref. 5, p. 209-210, 219-220.

23 LINZBAUER, *Codex sanitario-medicinalis Hungariae, III/1*, ref. 22, p. 601.

discharge from the institution. About 60 of them lived directly in the orphanage and the rest with foster parents or employers.²⁴

After the reorganization of 1790, the orphanage continued to function according to the principles set by Joseph II in 1786. The majority of the children did not live directly in the institution, but with foster parents for an agreed payment. Older boys were placed with employers for training. In some cases, the mother of a child could also gain the foster parent's payment. Only boys with the ability to continue their studies remained in the orphanage. As a result of the class organization of society mainly boys of noble or urban middle class origin were considered qualified for further study. Since the orphanage did not include a school in this period, the boys studied at the local normal school or at the royal grammar school. In contrast to the reign of Joseph and apparently for financial reasons, children younger than one year were not accepted into the institution. Foster parents had to be paid most for them. After the reduction of the capacity of the institution, it was possible to place all the children in Bratislava, so that an official visitor from the administration of the orphanage could visit them regularly and supervise the level of care they were receiving. In spite of this, the death rate of children in foster care was extraordinarily high. The state officials blamed the foster parents for negligence, but the latter argued that the care allowance did not enable them to provide better food, medicine or medical care for a sick child. In an attempt to reduce the death rate among the children, foster parents were instructed in December 1792 to bring sick children to the orphanage, where they were cared for in its infirmary.²⁵

After an extensive fire in Bratislava in July 1800, the orphanage was transferred to Győr.²⁶ Problems with appropriate buildings led to discussion of returning to Bratislava in 1808, but the fire in Bratislava Castle in 1811 put an end to the idea. The number of children cared for by the institution continually declined after the move to Győr as a result of the difficult economic and financial situation in the country. Only 16 children were in institutional care in 1813. There was no payment for children placed outside the orphanage from 1812. The problems with the location of the orphanage were still unsolved in 1814. Since a move and especially the adaptation of a new building in a period after the state bankruptcy would have caused further problems for an institution already in serious financial difficulties, it was practically dissolved. The income from its property would be given to poor orphans and abandoned children in the form of annual grants.²⁷

The institution officially still existed and remained active after 1815. Its administrator, who was also director of the Győr school district, supervised the children of the orphanage during the whole period of their study or training. The directors of schools from the whole country in which children of the orphanage studied sent him school reports twice a year. The Bratislava Chapter informed him about the progress of apprentices. The foundation finance office in Buda administered the property of the orphanage. It also granted money to parents and tutors. Grants for students had a value of 200 or 100 gul-

24 MNL OL, C 80, 1791, f. 21; 1792, f. 3.

25 MNL OL, C 80, 1792, f.3.

26 MNL OL, C 80, 1800, f.6.

27 MNL OL, C 80, 1815, f.1.

den, while apprentices received 20 gulden, an amount later increased to 40. In 1815 55 children received support,²⁸ and twenty years later 67.²⁹ Under the new system, mainly boys, either students or apprentices were supported from the resources of the orphanage. Girls could gain third class grants only in exceptional cases.

With the exception of some private endowments, the right of patronage over the foundation places in the orphanage belonged to the monarch acting through the Council of Lieutenancy and Bratislava city authorities.³⁰ Applications to gain a place in the foundation under royal patronage had to contain the name and age of the child, confirmation of his or her good state of health and information about the social status of the family. Not only complete orphans had a claim to support from the resources of the orphanage, but also children from families that found themselves in material need because of the death of the father – breadwinner. The orphanage especially accepted children from the lower nobility, officials of various levels, soldiers and burghers – contributors, namely descendants of the social groups considered to contribute to the “common good” according to the ideas of the time. As in the reigns of Maria Theresa or Joseph II, royal supported places in the orphanage were not intended for the children of serfs, beggars, servants and day labourers. Married parents and Catholic religion were still conditions for acceptance in the first half of the 19th century. The Bratislava city authorities accepted two categories of children for the foundation places under its control. The first group were orphans or half orphans of Bratislava burghers, while the second came from the Bratislava poorhouse and belonged to the lower social classes, often of unknown origin. After 1800 the city authorities under pressure from the state authorities stopped recommending children from the poorhouse for foundation places in the orphanage.

After the transformation of the orphanage in 1815, the Council of Lieutenancy considered the possible success of the child as well as the social status of the father and financial position of the family, when assessing applications for grants. However, unambiguous criteria for awarding grants or support for apprentices were not stated. The positive or negative decision on each application was a result of the individual assessment of the relevant official of the Council of Lieutenancy, and could be significantly influenced by an intervention from the monarch or other influential patron, especially from the ranks of the Hungarian aristocracy.

In the period 1770–1786, normal school with training of teachers for elementary schools operated at the royal orphanage in Tomášikovo and later at Senec. Its existence was also anchored in the *Ratio educationis* of 1777.³¹ After the institution moved from Senec to Bratislava, the school continued to function for some time, but it disappeared by the beginning of the 1790s and the orphanage lost its status as a model educational institution important for the whole country. As was already mentioned, the children in the

28 Ref. 27.

29 MNL OL, C 80, 1835, f. 1.

30 In the course of the first half of the 19th century, the Bratislava Chapter gained this right again as approved administrator of the Török Foundation.

31 For more details on the operation of the school at the orphanage see KOWALSKÁ, Eva. *Osvietenské školstvo (1771 – 1815): Nástroj vzdelania a disciplinizácie*. (Enlightenment education 1771–1815. An instrument of education and discipline.). Bratislava : Historický ústav SAV, 2014, p. 130-132.

orphanage in Bratislava attended the local normal school or the royal grammar school, and the state authorities still expected them to become especially teachers.³² However, it appears that this was abandoned in practice after 1786, because in 1791 the competent institutions were again concerned with the question of training orphans for the teaching profession. The official visitor of the orphanage reported to the Council of Lieutenancy on 31 December 1791 that from 27 boys receiving institutional care at the expense of the royal foundation, 10 were considered by the headmaster of the normal school suitable for future work as teachers in elementary schools. However, approval from the Council of Lieutenancy was needed for this, so that they could study music as well as Latin. On 2 December 1791, the Council of Lieutenancy ordered the director of the orphanage that the boys who showed an interest in teaching careers should receive special attention, and the Council of Lieutenancy should be regularly informed about their success and morals, because the orphanage “*should be something like a seminary*” for the training of elementary school teachers.³³ The education of the boys had to be similarly oriented after the orphanage moved to Győr.³⁴ After the transformation of the orphanage in 1815, grants from the resources of the institution were awarded to students in all levels of school in the whole kingdom.

The royal orphanage was a result of a new approach by the state to care for abandoned and orphaned children, but the successors of Maria Theresa did not continue it. Joseph II preserved the facility in a reduced form, but defined care for this category of dependant persons as a responsibility of local government and aristocratic estate authorities, so he did not prepare the establishment of any more royal orphanages. Above all, local jurisdictions had to protect the property of orphans and ensure that it was properly administered during the minority of heirs.

Care for children was secured in the framework of the family, involving tutors and foster parents. The cost of care was paid from the income from property or from the domestic or municipal budget. The orphanages and foundations intended to support children established in Hungary from the 1730s formed only a supplement to the traditional system of communal care and cared for only an insignificant proportion of the total number of orphaned or abandoned children. This was still the case in the first half of the 19th century.

The local orphanages separated from the Bratislava institution in 1790 returned to their original locations, namely Oradea, Sopron, Kőszeg and Szombathely, and continued to provide an institutional form of care for children. In the course of the first half of the 19th century, further institutions were gradually added in Vesprém (1809), Pécs (1825), Bratislava (1832), Žilina (1833), Košice (1842) and Pest (1843). However, in contrast to the royal orphanage, these institutions were not concerned with the whole country, only with their own district or region. They were founded and administered by municipal or Catholic Church institutions, or by women’s charitable societies.

32 *Historische Beschreibung von der milden und merkwürdigen Szecsenisch-Kollonicsischen Stiftung Hungarns...*, 1789.

33 MNL OL, C 80, 1791, f. 21.

34 MNL OL, C 80, 1800, f. 6.

Apart from material care, all the orphanages placed special emphasis on the moral and religious education of the children, as well as on education “appropriate” to their gender and social status. Apart from the basics of their faith, children were taught reading, writing and arithmetic, with instruction provided directly in the institution or in a local elementary school. Boys were also taught a craft and girls were taught to do housework so that they would be able to work as servants. Some institutions enabled gifted boys to continue with grammar school study. Apart from the institutions providing institutional care, foundations, that provided regular financial support to poor orphaned children during their studies or until they reached a certain age, were established in the country in this period.

Child care facilities

In the first half of the 19th century, a new category of dependent persons began to be considered in the towns of Hungary, namely children aged two to seven coming from poor families in which both parents needed to work to earn their living. Such children were left unsupervised from an early age, which threatened not only their health and safety, but also their moral and intellectual development. In the cities of Western Europe, philanthropists already began to be concerned with the question of care for this group of children from around 1800. Child care facilities were established under various names to solve this problem in England, Holland, Belgium, France and Saxony.³⁵ It is possible to trace two basic tendencies in the foundation of these institutions during the following years. One of them was directed towards building up child care facilities as charitable and care institutions, while the other placed great emphasis on the fulfilment of educational as well as charitable aims.³⁶

Theresa of Brunswick became a pioneer of child care in Hungary. She learnt about this type of facility combining care and education for children of pre-school age during her travels abroad. She founded the first child care facility at Buda in 1828, and thanks to her initiative there were 12 of them by 1836.³⁷ Apart from Pest and Buda, they could be found in Banská Bystrica (1829), Bratislava (1830, 1831) and Trnava (1832). The main purpose of the child care facilities was to provide the children of poor working parents with all-day care and adequate education, which would prevent their moral decline. Society perceived the educational aspect of the child care facilities as prevention of child criminality, street begging and the creation of gangs of children.³⁸ Children received free

35 MIKLEŠ, Ján. Kapitoly o vzniku ústavnej predškolskej výchovy na Slovensku. (Chapters from the origin of institutional pre-school education in Slovakia.). In HOLÉCYOVÁ, Oľga (ed.). *Kapitoly z histórie materského školstva na Slovensku*. Bratislava : Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo, 1970, p. 23-24.

36 KASÁČOVÁ, Bronislava. Od detských opatrovní po predškolskú edukáciu. (From child care to pre-school education.). In GAŠPAROVÁ, Eva – MIŇOVÁ, Monika (eds.). *Od detskej opatrovne k materskej škole*. Banská Bystrica : Slovenský výbor Svetovej organizácie pre predškolskú výchovu, Spoločnosť pre predškolskú výchovu, 2009, p. 14. ISBN 9788097026608; Accessed at http://omep.sk/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/zbornik2009_bb.pdf, [8 Dec 2015].

37 TARJANOVÁ, Margita. O vzniku materských škôl. (On the origin of nursery schools.). In HOLÉCYOVÁ, Oľga (ed.). *Kapitoly z histórie materského školstva na Slovensku*, ref. 35, p. 79.

38 KEMÉNY, Ludwig. *Hundert Jahre der Wohltätigkeit gewidmet, 1830–1930. Rückblick auf die Vergangenheit des Pressburger wohltätigen Frauenvereines als Jubiläums-Festschrift*. Bratislava : C. F. Wigand,

care or paid a fee, which did not correspond to the real cost, according to the social position of their families. The majority of child care facilities were established and operated by women's charitable societies. The resources for their running came from gifts, membership fees, income from capital and various collections or charitable undertakings.

The care and educational programme of the first child care facilities in Hungary was significantly influenced by the work of the English theorist on pre-school care and education of children Samuel Wilderspin.³⁹ Wilderspin emphasized the educational dimension of the activity of these institutions. He saw them as children's schools forming a preliminary stage of elementary education or a substitute for it. Theresa of Brunswick also initially held the view that these institutions should be small schools, which would provide hitherto lacking educational opportunities for poor children. The children in them would gain knowledge to such an extent that they would not need to continue their school education after leaving. Under the influence of the ideas of other contemporary philanthropists and education experts, especially Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi and Joseph Wertheimer, but also Anthony Rehlinger and Stephen Rokos, the first teachers in the child care facilities at Trnava and Banská Bystrica changed their views. They began to prefer care rather than school learning, bringing play into the educational process, making more use of pictures and visual aids.⁴⁰

Efforts to create state charitable institutions

During the reign of Joseph II so-called general hospitals, which had to be established in the centres of the individual parts of the monarchy, became a new element in the system of social and health care. These institutions represented the application of the monarch's ideas about specialized and targeted care provided under state control. These hospitals combined under one administration medical treatment, maternity wards and sections for looking after the poor, foundlings and the mentally ill. Supervision of their activity was the responsibility of the administration of the land in which they were situated. The basis for their financing was the income from funds derived from the property of local charitable institutions and various endowments. Although the general hospitals were regarded as institutions belonging to their whole region, mainly people from the city in which they were located were accepted into their charitable and medical facilities. Patients and other recipients of care were divided into three or four classes. People, who could not pay because of poverty, belonged to the lowest class and received free care. Other patients were assigned to classes according to the amount they paid. The quality of the care they received depended on this.

1930, p. 5.

39 T. of Brunswick was most influenced by Wilderspin's work *Infant Education; or Remarks on the Importance of Educating the Infant Poor; from the Age of Eighteen Months to Seven Years*, London 1825, or to be more specific by the third edition of this work in German, published in 1826 in Vienna thanks to her adviser Joseph Wertheimer. KASÁČOVÁ, *Od detských opatrovní po predškolskú edukáciu*, (*From child care to pre-school education*), ref. 36, p. 16.

40 MICHALIČKA, Vladimír. Odkaz Terézie Brunšvikovej. (The message of Theresa of Brunswick.). In *Predškolská výchova*, 54, 1999/2000, p. 12.

The first, essentially model hospital was established in Vienna in 1784. Others were gradually added in Brno (1786), Olomouc (1787) and Prague (1790). As a result of long term problems with financing these institutions, the Emperor Francis I decided that the maternity ward and foundlings sections (1818) and the mental illness departments (1820) would be state facilities supported from public resources. The medical care and poor-house sections remained local charitable institutions financed from municipal and private resources.⁴¹ In many cases they became a basis for independent specialized facilities such as mental hospitals or maternity wards.

No general hospital was established in the Kingdom of Hungary and it seems the state authorities did not prepare to establish one. This may have been because Joseph II decided to change the capital of the country. At the beginning of the 1780s, the old capital Bratislava already had a wide range of charitable institutions by Hungarian standards, with property that could become the basis for the establishment of a general hospital, although with less capacity than in other cities of the monarchy. Buda regained the status of capital after almost 250 years, but up to 1784 it was only a smaller city of regional importance. The property of the charitable institutions active in its territory could not cover the cost of building and operating a general hospital. As was already mentioned, some form of these institutions actually arose in the larger cities of Hungary. However, they did not serve the whole state, only their own districts. They were subject to municipal authorities and had limited capacity. The state authorities planned to establish in Hungary at least some facilities, such as a mental hospital or maternity ward, which operated in the framework of general hospitals in other regions of the monarchy, but these ideas were not implemented. The only charitable institutions for the whole country established by the state authorities up to 1848 were institutes for the deaf and blind, but they had a more educational than charitable purpose.

Care for the mentally ill

In the absence of a general hospital, the need for a state institution for the mentally ill appeared to be the most acute. Leopold II took the first step towards establishing one with a mandate from 26 August 1791 to create a fund worth 300 thousand gulden derived from the property of dissolved religious brotherhoods, for the purpose of establishing such an institution.⁴² The idea was forgotten for some time because of the Napoleonic War, but in 1807 Francis I repeated the decision to create an institute for the mentally ill and disabled in Hungary. Since the fund from the property of the religious brotherhoods was not sufficient for its establishment and operation, the missing resources had to be found by launching a collection in the whole state. The monarch expected that it would be just as successful as in the case of the institute for the deaf,⁴³ but the money from the

41 HLAVAČKA, Milan et al. *Sociální myšlení a sociální praxe v českých zemích 1781–1939*. (Social thinking and social practice in the Czech Lands 1781–1939.). Prague : Historický ústav, 2015, p. 41.

42 LINZBAUER, III/I, ref. 5, p. 665.

43 LINZBAUER, Franciscus Xaver. *Codex sanitario-medicinalis Hungariae. Tomus III., sectio II*. Budae : Typis caesereo-regiae scientiarum universitatis, 1855, p. 240.

collection did not fulfil expectations, so appeals to collect money for this purpose were again published in 1826 and 1829.⁴⁴

The institutes for the mentally ill established in the Monarchy in the 1790s were directed more towards looking after patients and isolating them from the surroundings than actually treating them. However, in the course of the first half of the 19th century, psychiatry began to emerge as an independent branch of medicine, and institutes for the mentally ill began to employ specialist doctors, so that they gradually changed into real medical facilities. According to statistics from 1837, institutes for the mentally ill existed in the capital cities of all the provinces of the Monarchy with the exceptions of Dalmatia, Transylvania, the Military Frontier and Hungary. There were 38 institutes in the whole Monarchy, but 9 of them were in Lombardy and 16 in Venetia.⁴⁵ However, according to the literature of the time, they were still more policing and care than treatment facilities. The institutes in Prague and at Hall in Tyrol were the only exceptions in this area.⁴⁶ For several decades, the establishment of an institute for the mentally ill in Hungary remained on the level of considerations and plans, which did not acquire any reality until 1836, when Bishop Franz Nádasdy of Vác bought the building of the former Theresiana in Vác for the needs of the institute and Kazimír Gáspárik donated 1000 gulden for its establishment.⁴⁷ Adaptation of a building began later, but the institute still had not opened in 1848.⁴⁸

The absence of a state institute seriously complicated the possibility of local jurisdictions to fulfil the decree of Leopold II from 1790, which bound them to care for dependent persons with mental breakdowns. Town or county authorities could request the acceptance of mentally ill people by institutions outside the territory of the Kingdom of Hungary, but this solution was associated with many difficulties, especially the burden it placed on the domestic budget. Separate departments in the hospitals of the Brothers of Mercy and special rooms in town hospitals became a starting point for towns dealing

44 LINZBAUER, Franciscus Xaver. *Codex sanitario-medicinalis Hungariae. Tomus III., sectio III.* Budae : Typis caesereo-regiae scientiarum universitatis, 1860, p. 165, 355.

45 SPRINGER, Johann. *Statistik des österreichischen Kaiserstaates. Zweiter Band.* Wien : Fr. Beck's Universitäts-Buchhandlung, 1840, p. 65-66; Accessible at https://books.google.sk/books?id=a5tM5L-Gr_ZsC&printsec=frontcover&dq=SPRINGER,+Johann.+Statistik+des+%C3%B6sterreichischen+Kaiserstaates&hl=sk&sa=X&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false, [2 Dec 2015].

46 ISENSEE, Emil. *Geschichte der Medicin, Chirurgie, Geburtshülfe ..., Zweiter Theil, Sechtes Buch.* Berlin : Albert Nauck & Comp., 1845, p. 1306; Accessible at https://books.google.sk/books?id=331NAAAAcAAJ&pg=PA1306&dq=irrenanstalt+waitzen&hl=sk&sa=X&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=irrenanstalt%20waitzen&f=false, [14 Dec 2015].

47 LINZBAUER, Franciscus Xaver. *Codex sanitario-medicinalis Hungariae. Tomus III., sectio V.* Budae : Typis caesereo-regiae scientiarum universitatis, 1861, p. 133.

48 Information about the establishment of the institution for the mentally ill at Vác was presented by the *Allgemeine Zeitschrift für Psychiatrie* published in Berlin (1847, vol. 4, part 1); Accessible at https://books.google.sk/books?id=j3kFAAAAQAAJ&pg=PR6&dq=irrenanstalt+waitzen&hl=sk&sa=X&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=irrenanstalt%20waitzen&f=false, [16 Dec 2015]. At that time the building had still not been reconstructed and the capacity of the institute had not been determined. In 1851 Ferenc Schwartzer von Babarcz, pioneer of psychiatry in Hungary finally established the institute at Vác. However, it had a private character and in 1852 it moved to Buda. A state institute for the mentally ill was established according to the plans F. Schwartzer in Buda (Lipótmező) only in 1862.

with this situation,⁴⁹ while the counties solved this problem in the framework of the development of county hospitals.⁵⁰ Some of them established their own independent institutes with a smaller capacity.⁵¹

Some of the mentally ill patients from Hungary found treatment in the institutes of other parts of the Monarchy, especially in Vienna. There were two ways to get into an institution: either at the request of their families, or because they lived and worked in Vienna or Lower Austria at the time they became ill. Since people from Hungary were considered “foreign”, they did not have a claim to free treatment even in the event of material need. Payment for their treatment became a long term and insoluble problem, which concerned the government of Lower Austria as well as the Hungarian and Viennese officials. The cost of treatment for patients from Hungary had to be paid by their families or home municipalities. However, both sides endeavoured to avoid this obligation. Relations argued that they were too poor, while municipalities argued that the persons in question were not known to them, had not been long-term residents and did not own any immovable property. On the basis of a decision from the monarch, patients from Hungary, their relations or home municipalities could request payment of the cost of a stay in an institute from the funds of suppressed religious brotherhoods. Since the representatives of mentally ill persons from Hungary repeatedly asked for support only when a patient was already in an institute, or the debt for his treatment grew, the monarch decreed in 1807 that patients from Hungary could be accepted by the Vienna institute only if they pay for their stay. If they did not have resources to pay for treatment and wanted to apply for support from the fund, the monarch had to give approval before patients could be accepted.⁵²

In 1822, with reference to the royal mandate from 1790, the Council of Lieutenancy again reminded the local authorities of their obligation to care for their own poor, especially for the mentally ill without their own financial resources. Local authorities could pay for care for mentally ill persons in extreme cases from the resources of the domestic budget. In relation to the fact that the number of patients from Hungary in the Vienna institute, supported by resources from the dissolved brotherhoods was growing and the cost of their care exceeded the possibilities of these resources, the Council of Lieutenancy decided that patients from Hungary could not be accepted by the Vienna institute at the expense of the fund, and those who did not present a danger to their surroundings would be returned to domestic care. A list of the persons who had to leave the institute had to be sent to the local authorities in the near future.⁵³

49 The precise number of mentally ill people treated in hospitals of the Brothers of Mercy is given, for example, in an expert report to the Council of Lieutenancy from 31 March 1829. Linzbauer, III/III., ref. 44, p. 357-358.

50 The first county hospital for the mentally ill opened in 1824 at Trnava. The Nitra county hospital opened in 1833 also had such a department. Both hospitals had a capacity of 80 beds, 20 of them intended for patients with mental illnesses. *Statistik des medicinal-Standes*, ref. 10, p. 79, 87.

51 For example, the counties of Veszprém (1837) and Sátoraljaújhely (1840). *Statistik des medicinal-Standes*, ref. 10, p. 123, 211.

52 LINZBAUER, III/II, ref. 43, p. 234.

53 LINZBAUER, III/III, ref. 44, p. 35.

Since the enforcement of payment by the patients from Hungary in the Vienna institute was slow and usually ineffective, the monarch attempted to simplify the whole process by decreeing observance of reciprocity in 1814. In practice it meant that the charitable institutions in Lower Austria and Hungary cared for patients from the other part of the state without charge.⁵⁴ The mandate also ordered categorization of patients. The first category was patients with short-term illnesses, the second was people with mental breakdowns and third was crippled or deformed people called *monstrosi* in Latin. Reciprocity applied to patients in the first and second categories, while people in the third group had to be paid for by their families or home municipalities. Since Hungary had no state institution for mentally ill and disabled patients, the duty of reciprocity applied to charitable institutions administered mainly by town authorities. However, the towns of Hungary rejected such a solution. In their view it was no problem to provide free assistance for patients in the first category, but nobody in Hungary wanted to provide free care for mentally ill people, who were expected to require long-term or permanent hospitalization. They proposed payment of expenses from a public fund, but no such fund existed in Hungary.⁵⁵

Since they had failed to establish reciprocity between the Austrian and Hungarian parts of the Monarchy, the monarch decided that the Vienna institute did not have an obligation to accept patients from Hungary,⁵⁶ who could not pay their own expenses. Existing patients, who were not paid for by their families or municipalities, had to return to domestic care in Hungary.⁵⁷ Who had to secure and finance their transport remained an unanswered question. In spite of these measure, patients from Hungary, for whom no payment was received, remained in the institute, and the government of Lower Austria demanded payment from the Council of Lieutenancy of Hungary. However, it could not effectively solve this problem, so it again asked the government of Lower Austria not to accept patients from Hungary if they did not guarantee payment. Its report from 31 March 1829 presented the view that it was necessary to find out the real origin of mentally ill people. Among the 119 mentally ill people in institutions in Hungary at the time, there were surely some people from the Austrian part of the Monarchy to whom the principle of reciprocity applied. Where the deportation of non-paying people from the Vienna institute to Hungary was concerned, the Council of Lieutenancy warned against the possible difficulties, lack of experience with such a solution and lack of financial resources for providing transport. In addition, mentally ill people of foreign origin in Hungary were never deported back to their places of origin.⁵⁸ In spite of the efforts of all the interested parties, the deadlocked situation was not solved. The monarch and the Council of Lieutenancy issued repeated appeals that insolvent people not be admitted to the institute, but non-paying people from Hungary remained among its patients. The government of Lower Austria continued to send statements on the debts and demands for payments to

54 LINZBAUER, III/III, ref. 44, p. 445.

55 LINZBAUER, III/III, ref. 44, p. 357-358.

56 People who originated from Hungary but had lived in Vienna for at least 10 years without interruption were an exception.

57 LINZBAUER, III/II, ref. 43, p. 475, 542.

58 LINZBAUER, III/III, ref. 44, p. 357-358.

the Council of Lieutenancy which sent them to the local officials, who usually informed the Council of Lieutenancy that the patients' families could not pay the debts for various reasons. The state authorities considered the deportation of the non-paying people back to Hungary as the only way out of this vicious circle,⁵⁹ but they never actually progressed to this radical step.

Maternity wards and foundlings homes

The physiocratic and populationist theories that influenced the policies of Maria Theresa and Joseph II brought a new view of the value of population and of every individual as a potential soldier or worker. The approach of the state authorities to the question of children conceived or born outside marriage also began to change under their influence. This change was not only manifested in the reduction and later abolition of penalties for extra-marital pregnancy, but also in an effort to establish institutions where single pregnant women could find refuge, safely give birth to their babies and have the possibility to leave them in the care of the state.⁶⁰ The Mary Magdalene Maternity Ward and Foundlings Home founded in Prague in 1765 on the basis of a decree issued by Maria Theresa in 1762, was one of the first of such institutions in the Monarchy.⁶¹ The aim of Joseph II was to develop such institutions as part of the general hospital in each province of the Monarchy.

A maternity ward was established as a refuge for pregnant women, who wanted to give birth secretly and perhaps also permanently conceal from the world the "*fruit of their sin*". According to the literature of the time, they were intended especially to provide expectant single mothers with the necessary care, to protect them from shame and need, and to care for the innocent babies to which they gave life.⁶² The state authorities saw these institutions as ways of preventing abortion, infanticide, illegal abandonment of children and suicides of single mothers. The first Josephine maternity ward was opened in 1784 in Vienna. It was followed institutions at Brno and Olomouc in 1785 and Prague in 1789.⁶³ Maternity wards with foundlings homes were also founded by provincial governments after the death of Joseph II. By 1840 they existed in all parts of the Monarchy except Hungary and Transylvania.⁶⁴ Maternity wards and foundlings homes undoubtedly represented a progressive element in the system of social and health care, but it soon turned out that they did not entirely solve the difficult position of single mothers and their extra-marital children. The primary aim of these institutions was to protect the lives

59 LINZBAUER, Franciscus Xaver. *Codex sanitario-medicinalis Hungariae. Tomus III., sectio IV.* Budae : Typis caesereo-regiae scientiarum universitatis, 1861, p. 637.

60 TINKOVÁ, Daniela. *Tělo, věda, stát. Zrození porodnice v osvícenské Evropě.* (Body, science, state. The origin of maternity wards in Enlightenment Europe.). Praha : Argo, p. 46-47.

61 BAYER, Thaddäus. *Beschreibung der öffentlichen Armen-Versorgungsanstalten in der königl. böhmischen Hauptstadt Prag.* Prag, 1793, p. 22-23.

62 HAIDINGER, Andreas. *Das wohlthätige und gemeinnützige Wien.* Wien : Druck und Verlag A. Pichler's sel. Witwe, 1844, p. 327, accessible at <https://books.google.sk/books?id=z11iAAAAcAAJ&pg=PR1&dq=andreas+haidinger&hl=sk&sa=X&ved=0ahUKewjpsK7j6LKAhUF3g4KHa-RD-scQ6AEIOjAE#v=onepage&q=andreas%20haidinger&f=false>, (11 Dec 2015).

63 TINKOVÁ, ref. 60, p. 327, 329.

64 SPRINGER, ref. 45, p. 67.

of threatened children and their mothers, but a high death rate, both in the institutions themselves and in foster families, became a long-term and insoluble problem.

Since maternity wards with foundlings homes were built according to a unified model, they functioned according to more or less the same principles in the whole Monarchy. The majority of them had four divisions with graded fees for the care they provided. The first division with the highest fees enabled women to give birth secretly, while the last was free of charges for the poorest women, but they had to submit evidence of their poverty. In return for free treatment, the poorest women had to provide their bodies for the needs of instruction, and after giving birth, they had to serve as wet nurses in the foundlings home for some time. Mothers from the first three classes could leave their babies in the foundlings home for an established and graded fee. Women from the fourth category could do it free of charge. Maternity wards varied in the extent of their responsibilities. Some only accepted future mothers from the town and its surroundings, others from the whole country or province. The majority of maternity wards also served as training centres for midwives and obstetricians.⁶⁵

Children born in the maternity ward to mothers who could not or did not want to care for them were placed in the foundlings home, so both institutions usually operated under one administration. According to the directing rules⁶⁶ a foundlings home was originally intended only for new-born babies from a maternity ward, but later their activity was extended to include children from outside – real foundlings, orphans or children of living but poor parents. These children could be accepted into the foundlings home only with the approval of the appropriate provincial office, which also set the conditions for acceptance and the level of fees. Children fulfilling the established criteria were accepted without payment in the case of poverty and parents resident in the place of activity of the institution. Relations or the home municipality had to pay an entry fee for other children.⁶⁷

The institution had to place healthy children with foster parents as soon as possible, while sick or weak children were given the care they needed. However, interest in accepting children into foster care was low. At the request of the authorities, parish priests repeatedly appealed for people to show love for their neighbours in this way. Especially families from the lower social groups took an interest in children from foundlings homes. Such families regarded the payments for looking after such children as a way of increasing their income, and the low level of care they provided corresponded to this.⁶⁸ Financial compensation was graded according to the age of the child into three categories. The first and best paid was children up to one year receiving breast feeding, the second was

65 TINKOVÁ, ref. 60, p. 329-336.

66 Decree of Joseph II from 16 April 1781 with the title *Direktiv-regeln zur künftigen einrichtung der hiesigen spitäler und allgemeinen versorgungshäuser*, which set the basic guidelines for reform of charitable institutions in the country.

67 HALÍŘOVÁ, Martina. *Sociální patologie a ochrana dětství v Čechách od dob osvícenství do roku 1914 : disciplinace jako součást ochrany dětství*. (Social pathology and the protection of children in Bohemia from the Enlightenment to 1914: discipline as part of the protection of children.). Pardubice : Univerzita Pardubice, Fakulta filozofická, 2012, p. 120-121. zlý typ písma, nemá být podčiárknuté

68 HALÍŘOVÁ, ref. 67, p. 131-137.

children aged one to eight and the last was those aged ten to twelve. The institution did not pay for children aged over 12. They were expected to be able to support themselves from their work. However, the administrators of the foundlings home still had to make sure that a child learnt a craft. Children, who could not work because of their weak physical condition, had to be placed in an orphanage. To ensure better care and a lower death rate among young children, foster parents were promised an additional payment if a child reached the age of one and another at the age of five.⁶⁹

Telling evidence of the position of children in foster care can be found, for example, in the mandate of the Emperor Francis II from 1804, issued again two years later, to regulate the situation in the Vienna foundlings home. The institution had got into financial difficulties because of high prices caused by the long-lasting war, so the monarch decreed various benefits to motivate parents to take children into their care without payment. If foster parents took two children into their care without payment, looked after them until they were 12 and at least one of them was a boy, then one of their own sons would be freed from military service. If they took two boys, only one of them would have an obligation to serve in the army. Children for whom the institution offered no financial compensation were essentially offered to foster parents as cheap workers, since they had to stay until they were 22, and help with work in agriculture, craft or trade without payment.

After reaching the prescribed age, they could decide for themselves whether to remain with their foster parents or find other ways to make their living. To prevent bad treatment of children by foster parents, they were subject to supervision by the local authorities, parish priests and so-called fathers of the poor. If they were known, the parents did not lose a claim to their children. If they expressed an interest in their children, they had to repay the costs paid to the foster parents for their care, the bonus paid to the foster parents by the foundlings home when the children were one and five, and compensation for the profit expected from the children's work until they reached the age of 22.⁷⁰

One of the few mentions of a plan to establish a maternity ward in Hungary appears in a mandate of Francis II from 1799. As a result of the growing number of infanticides, the monarch ordered the quick establishment in the country of an institution in which single pregnant women would be able to give birth to their children secretly, and to create a fund to finance it. Apart from a plan to establish a maternity ward, he also asked for proposals on how to prevent killing of new-born babies and enable single mothers to safely give birth in places where a maternity ward could not be established. The Council of Lieutenancy proposed to solve this problem by creating small sections for mothers and new-born babies in municipal charitable institutions.

On the basis of this royal decree, local jurisdictions were asked whether they could provide several rooms in their charitable facilities for use as maternity wards. The representatives of towns with no such possibility had to state how they could fulfil the

69 LINZBAUER, III/II., ref. 43, p. 238. The categorization of children by age and the level of payments changed according to the level of economic development in the region. The payment was supposed to correspond to the real cost of looking after a child, but in reality it lagged behind the actual development of prices.

70 LINZBAUER, III/II., ref. 43, p. 237.

monarch's intension to help single mothers.⁷¹ As was already stated above, a state maternity ward was not established in Hungary. The plan to create small sections for mothers and their children in town hospitals and other charitable institutions was more successful. As in the case of the mentally ill, the state transferred responsibility for single mothers and their children to local authorities.

As in the case of other state charitable institutions, the situation around the foundlings home in Hungary developed differently to other parts of the Monarchy. According to the directive rules from 1781, a foundlings home for children aged up to six and an orphanage for children aged six to fifteen had to be established in every province. However, later Joseph II changed his decision. He ordered the merging of the existing orphanages in the individual provinces and their union under one administration with the newly established foundlings homes. In an effort to minimize costs and maximize the number of children receiving care, he ordered that all the children had to be placed with foster parents, and only a limited number of boys with the ability to study would remain in institutional care. The court decree from September 1788 also abolished the categorization of children into "foundlings" and "orphans", and introduced the term "orphan" for all age categories.⁷²

The Royal Orphanage of Hungary was reorganized in 1786 according to the directive rules from 1781, on the basis of which the institution was intended for children aged six to sixteen.⁷³ The decision to merge the orphanage with the foundlings home could not be implemented in the conditions of Hungary because there were not enough financial resources to establish a foundlings home. The solution was a new age categorization of the children in the orphanage, according to which the youngest age group was under one year, the next was 1–10 and the last was 10–18.⁷⁴ Thus, in Hungary the foundlings home was actually created in the framework of the orphanage. According to a list from 1791, the orphanage had 30 children younger than one year, for whom foster parents were paid 24 gulden a year, and clothing or other goods worth a further 8 gulden on receiving a child. After the death of Joseph II, the orphanage underwent a further transformation at the end of 1790, after which only children older than one year were accepted.⁷⁵ Care for children aged up to one year, whether they were true foundlings, extra-marital children or children of poor parents became exclusively the responsibility of local authorities.

Educational institutions for deaf and blind children

As was already mentioned, the only charitable institutions successfully established for the whole of Hungary in the first half of the 19th century were the educational institutions for blind and deaf-mute children. The successes of enthusiastic individuals in some European countries in educating children with impaired sight or hearing also convinced the Habsburg monarchs that with appropriate up-bringing and education such handicapped persons were not inevitably dependent on help from their families or from

71 LINZBAUER, III/II, ref. 5, p. 828.

72 HALÍŘOVÁ, ref. 67, p. 117.

73 LINZBAUER, III/I, ref. 5, p. 219-220.

74 *Historische Beschreibung von der milden und merkwürdigen Szecsenisch-Kollonicsischen Stiftung Hungarns ...*, 1789.

75 MNL OL, C 80, 1790, f. 30.

charitable institutions, and could do work that would contribute to the common good. Since the establishment and financing of institutions specializing in the up-bringing and education of handicapped children was beyond the possibilities of local government, they arose in the individual provinces of the Monarchy as state institutions with support from the Vienna court.

The institute for deaf-mute children

The first attempts to educate deaf-mute children were recorded in some European countries already in the 16th and 17th centuries. The foundations of their education were laid by the Frenchman Charles Michel de l'Épée (1712–1789) and the German Samuel Heinicke in the second half of the 18th century. L'Épée founded his institute in Paris in 1773, and Heinicke independently of him in 1778 at Leipzig. Their innovation lay in the fact that in contrast to their forerunners, they not only endeavoured to teach children to speak, but wanted to give them a real up-bringing and education. L'Épée and Heinicke taught in their schools according to methods they created themselves. Their combination and improvement led to the so-called Viennese method, used in institutions in the territory of the Habsburg Monarchy.⁷⁶

Maria Theresa opened the first school in the Monarchy for deaf children in 1779 at the city hospital in Vienna according to the example of the Paris institute, which Joseph II had visited in 1777 during his journey to France. The school had a capacity of 12 places, six for boys and the same number for girls. After the accession of Joseph II, the school became an independent institution with its own building and a gradually increasing number of places financed from public resources.⁷⁷

In Hungary Andrej Cházár initiated the establishment of an institution. He began to collect financial resources, but gained the support of Francis II for his private initiative. The Council of Lieutenancy announced in a decree from 7 October 1800 that the monarch had decreed the establishment of an institution at Vác, and for this purpose granted the building of the former bishop's palace to the foundation's fund. He justified his decision by the position of the town in the centre of the kingdom with a healthy climate and acceptable food prices.⁷⁸ The institution had to be established and operate under state administration. Resources to finance it had to be obtained from a public collection. To propagate the new institution and inform the public about its aims, the decree included a report written in German and Hungarian about the existence of a similar institution in Vienna.⁷⁹ In August 1801 the Council of Lieutenancy ordered local authorities to compile lists of children, who could satisfy the criteria for acceptance by the institution. The lists

76 On the beginnings of education of deaf-mute children see e.g. VENUS, Alexander. *Das kaiserl. königl. Taubstumm-Institut in Wien*. Wien : bei Wilhelm Braumüller, 1854, p. 1-19; Accessible at https://books.google.sk/books?id=SzBQAAAAcAAJ&printsec=frontcover&dq=VENUS,+Alexander.+Das+kaiserl.+k%C3%B6nigl.+Taubstumm&hl=sk&sa=X&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=VENUS%2C%20Alexander.%20Das%20kaiserl.%20k%C3%B6nigl.%20Taubstumm&f=false, [8 Dec 2015].

77 VENUS, ref. 76, p. 21.

78 Andrej Cházár originally intended to establish an institution in Rožňava and he gave his own house for this purpose.

79 LINZBAUER, III/I., ref. 5, s. 856-876.

had to give the names and ages of children with information about their physical and the social position of their parents or other relations.⁸⁰

The ceremonial opening of the institution happened on 19 March 1802.⁸¹ Since the collection did not bring the expected amount of money, the operating costs were paid from the resources of the foundation fund. However, such a solution was considered only temporary because the institute would not have enough of its own financial capital to provide income for its activities. In the decree announcing the opening of the institute, the Council of Lieutenancy again appealed to the local authorities and public of the kingdom to support its existence according to their possibilities. In an effort to motivate donors, the state authorities decided that if an individual or corporation (county or town) gave the institution 2 000 gulden, they would gain the permanent right to a place for their candidate.⁸² In an attempt to gain the support of benefactors, the leadership of the newly established institution also helped with propagation. Newspapers published extensive reports about the mission of the institution,⁸³ public tests of the pupils were organized in the presence of members of the secular and religious elites of Hungary, and the results were reported by the press.⁸⁴ The institution received financial support from the foundation fund until 1812, when the monarch definitively stopped it. In an effort to avoid financial decline of the institution, the Council of Lieutenancy again turned to the public of Hungary with an appeal for continued financial support.⁸⁵

Children with impaired hearing aged 7 to 14 were accepted into the institution. In relation to the six year period of study, pupils could not be aged more than 20. A good state of health and physical condition was a condition for acceptance. Education of those with handicaps in addition to impaired hearing was considered ineffective and in conflict with the mission of the institution, which was to bring up useful citizens of the state and not people dependent on help from others. Parents, who wanted to place their children in the school without paying fees, had to apply with the support of county or other authorities to the Council of Lieutenancy with evidence of poverty and the child's state of health. The institution could accept 30 non-fee-paying children. The number of fee-paying students was not limited. In 1804 the annual fee for one child was 100 gulden. A further payment of 100 gulden secured a higher standard of care. The children received accommodation, food, clothes, study materials and when necessary medical care.

During their six years of study, the children learnt reading, writing, arithmetic and the basics of the Christian religion. Parents could decide whether their children would be educated in German or Hungarian. School education was combined with practical

80 LINZBAUER, III/II., ref. 43, p. 13-14.

81 The Vác institute was the third to be established in the territory of the Habsburg Monarchy after Vienna (1779) and Prague (1786).

82 LINZBAUER, III/II, ref. 43, p. 19-20.

83 *Pressburger Zeitung*, no. 26, 5 April 1803; Kurze Beschreibung des königl. Ungrischen Taubstummen Instituts zu Waitzen. In SCHEDIUS, Ludwig. *Zeitschrift von und für Ungern, zur Beförderung der vaterländischen Geschichte, Erdkunde und Literatur*, 1804, p. 327-340.

84 *Pressburger Zeitung*, no. 47, 17 June 1803, *Pressburger Zeitung*, no. 1, 6 Jan 1804; SCHEDIUS, Ludwig. *Zeitschrift von und für Ungern, zur Beförderung der vaterländischen Geschichte, Erdkunde und Literatur*, 1803, p. 189-190.

85 LINZBAUER, III/II, ref. 43, p. 326-327.

training. Boys learnt a craft and left the institution as journeymen, while girls had to learn to do housework so that they would be able to work as servants. After completing their study, children returned to their parents or found their own way of making a living. If they had been orphaned or came from very poor families, boys received 20 gulden and girls 15 gulden for their journeys.⁸⁶

The institute for the blind in Pest

Education of visually handicapped children first began to receive attention in the second half of the 18th century from the Frenchman Valentin Hauy and the blind pianist Theresa von Paradies. The school for blind children he founded in his house in Paris in 1784 became a model that was soon followed in other European cities. In the territory of the Habsburg Monarchy, the first institutes were established in Vienna and Prague in 1808, followed by Linz in 1823 and Pest in 1826.⁸⁷

The director of the Vienna school J.W. Klein took the initiative in establishing an institute in Hungary. In 1825 he sent his associate Raphael Beitel to Bratislava to present his project to members of the Hungarian parliament. Beitel gained the support of the Palatine Joseph, and with his help, founded a small institute for four children in 1826. To present the importance of this to the Hungarian nobles and gain their support, he organized the first public test, a few months later. It was extraordinarily important for the further development of the institute, that the Palatine of Hungary became its patron. At the end of 1826 he decreed that it should move to Pest, he secured premises and appointed a supervisory board. The Palatine and his wife Maria Dorothea gave continual support to the institute. Their help included paying the expenses for two students. The costs of operating the institution were paid from the income from its fund, which was created from the financial resources collected at the 1825 parliament and the financial donations obtained from various individuals and institutions. In particular, the monarch Francis II, his wife, some Hungarian magnates and the city of Pest gave large contributions.⁸⁸

The Palatine's patronage of the institution and his generous support was considered binding and motivating not only for Hungarian magnates, but also for the central authorities of Hungary and local jurisdictions. Aristocrats established foundations for blind children from their estates or made long-term commitments to fund their study, state

86 Kurze Beschreibung des königl. Ungrischen Taubstummen Instituts zu Waitzen. In SCHEDIUS, Ludwig. *Zeitschrift von und für Ungern, zur Beförderung der vaterländischen Geschichte, Erdkunde und Literatur*, 1804, p. 327-340.

87 DOLEŽÁLEK, Anton Joseph. *Nachricht von der Verfassung des Blinden-Instituts in Pest*. Pesth : Gedruckt mit v. Trattner-Károlyischen Lettern, 1836, p. 7-8; Accessible at https://books.google.sk/books?id=02VU-AAAACAAJ&pg=PA8&dq=Nachricht+%C3%BCber+die+verfassung+des+Blinden&hl=sk&sa=X&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=Nachricht%20%C3%BCber%20die%20verfassung%20des%20Blinden&f=false, [17 Dec 2015].

88 DOLEŽÁLEK, Anton Joseph. *Ansichten über die Erziehung der Zöglinge einer Blinden-Anstalt*. Pest : In Commission bei Gustav Heckenast, 1840, s. 5-6. Accessible at <https://books.google.sk/books?id=Ef5XAAAACAAJ&pg=PA32&lpg=PA32&dq=dole%20%C5%BE%20%C3%A1lek+ansichten+%C3%BCber+die+beziehung&source=bl&ots=2dd09Aq661&sig=y9GaexPjGtw-eT313UZHT0e-Kup4&hl=sk&sa=X&ved=0ahUKUewjQ-9b4vqbKAhUGHg8KHV6GBdYQ6AEIMTAC#v=onepage&q=dole%20%C5%BE%20%C3%A1lek%20ansichten%20%C3%BCber%20die%20beziehung&f=false>, [17 Dec 2015].

offices made provisions for children of their employees and county or town authorities for children from their districts. Thanks to their foundations, the number of funded places at the institution continually grew.⁸⁹ In 1840 the foundation fund supported 12 children and there were a further 13 paying students. Foundations could have supported a further 14, but there were only 5 in that year because of lack of space in the building.⁹⁰ The institute for the blind had responsibility for the whole of Hungary, but it did not get the traditional state status administered by the Council of Lieutenancy under the supervision of the monarch. It operated as a private institution administered by an administrative board appointed by the Palatine, patron of the institute.⁹¹

In 1833 Raphael Beitel was replaced as director by Anton Doležalek, who worked intensively to improve and propagate the institute. He published several smaller works and occasional speeches about the institute, its mission and the need to educate blind children, with the aim of informing the public about the existence of such a charitable facility in Hungary and encouraging individuals and institutions to support it.⁹² In 1839, when the Hungarian Parliament was going to discuss the construction of a new building for the institute at state expense, he sent to Bratislava ten of the older students, to demonstrate their knowledge and abilities to the members of parliament, especially in the area of playing musical instruments, with the aim of convincing them of the importance of such an educational institution and the effectiveness of educating blind children. The students from the institute did tests in public and in St. Martin's Church they performed a choral Mass composed by their blind teacher Ladislav Füredy. They also performed with the Bratislava Church Music Society in a great concert in the city concert hall. The immediate result of this journey was enough capital to endow two new foundation places, but the decision on the construction of a new building was delayed until the next parliament.⁹³

Children aged 8–12 were accepted by the institute. Incurable blindness but an otherwise good physical and mental state was a condition for acceptance. It had to be proved with a confirmation from a doctor. Proof of being vaccinated against or surviving smallpox was also required. Non-paying students also had to provide evidence of poverty. The public was informed about free places in the institute by reports published in the press. Applications for places financed from the institute's fund were addressed to the administrative board, which sent them to the director of the institute. He assessed the applications and proposed the appropriate candidates for acceptance. Students financed by private foundations were selected by the bearers of the right of patronage, but the obligation to submit the necessary confirmation documents also applied to them.⁹⁴

89 DOLEŽÁLEK, ref. 88, p. 6-7, 10-11, 19.

90 DOLEŽÁLEK, ref. 88, p. 27.

91 DOLEŽÁLEK, ref. 88, p. 6; DOLEŽÁLEK, ref. 87, p. 20-21.

92 In 1836 he prepared and published in German and Hungarian a report on the institute and distributed it to secular (county and royal borough) and religious (dioceses, chapters, superintendencies) jurisdictions with the request that they establish foundation places for children from their places of activity. DOLEŽÁLEK, ref. 88, p. 8-10.

93 DOLEŽÁLEK, ref. 88, p. 21-22, 26.

94 DOLEŽÁLEK, ref. 87, p. 27-29.

During their 6–8 years of study all the students received the basics of religious education and learnt reading, writing and arithmetic in the German or Hungarian language. Children were divided according to their ability into three classes, in which they received classical school education, musical or practical training. Gifted pupils could study further. The extent of the education they received enabled former students to study further or become private teachers or tutors. Children with musical gifts prepared for careers as musicians or music teachers, while other boys learnt crafts and girls learnt to do housework.⁹⁵ The education of children in the institute was not study for its own sake. The school really prepared them to undertake their chosen profession.⁹⁶ The problem of this charitable educational institution, as in the case of the institute for deaf-mute children, was the limited capacity of the funded places, which meant that only a small proportion of blind children could gain an education.

Conclusion

In the first half of the 19th century, the majority of the reform measures in the field of social care, which Joseph II failed to implement under state direction during his short reign, were gradually achieved thanks to initiatives from below. Social care came to be addressed and directed exclusively to those who could not support themselves by work, which meant especially children and the old, sick and handicapped. In contrast to earlier periods, enforced unemployment also became a reason for help or support. In essence, the medieval type of charitable institution, in which all categories of dependent persons lived under one roof, usually disappeared. Health care was separated from social care. Various small hospitals administered by religious orders were gradually supplemented by hospitals with specialized departments, established and run by local government, religious communities or charitable societies. Charitable institutions also gradually became specialized in their activities. Under the influence of the state authorities, local government began to devote increased attention to such categories of dependent persons as the mentally ill, single mothers, children of unmarried parents, who had previously been scorned or punished by society. On the provincial level, educational institutes for deaf-mute and blind children became a new element. They educated children so that they would be able to support themselves from their work in spite of their handicaps. In spite of the undoubted qualitative and quantitative development, the level of social and health care in Hungary significantly lagged behind that in other parts of the Monarchy, and because of lack of financial resources and the limited capacity of existing institutions, they were accessible only to a narrow range of people.

* This work arose on the basis of support from the Agency for Support of Research and Development according to contract APVV-14-0644.

95 For more details on the content of education at the institute see DOLEŽÁLEK, ref. 87, p. 13-19.

96 In his report on the institute from 1836, Anton Doležálek stated their former students included two teachers, five musicians, two weavers and a carpenter. From the nine students who left the institute in 1839, one continued to study while also working as a tutor, another became an organist in a monastery, a third return to his place of origin and worked as a carpenter. One became a weaver and another a maker of musical instruments. Two girls became servants, a third returned to her family as an excellent harpist and singer. DOLEŽÁLEK, ref. 87, p. 14-15; DOLEŽÁLEK, ref. 88, p. 22-23.

SOZIALE UND MEDIZINISCHE FÜRSORGE IN UNGARN IN DER ERSTEN HÄLFTE
DES 19. JAHRHUNDERTS

INGRID KUŠNIRÁKOVÁ

In der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts wurden im sozialen Bereich dank der Initiative „von unten“ allmählich die meisten Reformmaßnahmen realisiert, die es Josef II. während seiner kurzen Regierungszeit nicht gelang, direktiv durchzusetzen. Soziale Fürsorge wurde gezielt und konzentrierte sich ausschließlich auf diejenigen, die nicht durch eigenen Arbeit für seinen Unterhalt sorgen konnten – nämlich Kinder und alte, kranke und behinderte Menschen. Im Unterschied zur Vergangenheit wurde ein Grund für die Hilfe und Unterstützung auch gezwungene Arbeitslosigkeit. Die meisten noch mittelalterlichen wohltätigen Institutionen, wo unter einem Dach bedürftige Menschen aller Kategorien lebten, hörten auf zu existieren. Die medizinische Fürsorge verselbständigte sich von der sozialen und einige kleine Krankenhäuser, die die Kirchenorden verwalteten, wurden allmählich um medizinische Einrichtungen mit Fachabteilungen ergänzt, die von Selbstverwaltungen, Kirchengemeinden oder Wohltätigkeitsvereine gegründet wurden. In ihrer Tätigkeit spezialisierten sie sich nach und nach auch die Wohltätigkeitsinstitutionen. Unter dem Einfluss der Staatsmacht begannen die Selbstverwaltungen sich mehr auch um solche Kategorien zu sorgen, wie geistlich Kranke, alleinerziehende Mütter und uneheliche Kinder die von der Gesellschaft bis dahin missachtet oder sogar bestraft wurden. Auf der Landesebene entstanden auch Bildungsinstitutionen für taubstumme und blinde Kinder, die sie trotz ihres Handicaps ausbilden sollten, damit sie mit eigener Arbeit für ihr Unterhalt sorgen könnten. Trotz der unbestrittenen qualitativen und quantitativen Entwicklung, blieb das Niveau der sozialen und medizinischen Fürsorge in Ungarn im Vergleich mit den restlichen Regionen der Monarchie deutlich nach und wegen der fehlenden finanziellen Quellen und eingeschränkten Kapazität der existierenden Institutionen, wurde sie nur für einen eingeschränkten Personenkreis zugänglich.

Mgr. Ingrid Kušniráková, PhD.
Institute of History of the SAS
P. O. BOX 198, 814 99 Bratislava, Klemensova 19
e-mail: kusnirakovai@gmail.com

«LA SITUATION N'EST PAS ENCORE CRITIQUE...»
LES PROBLÈMES DE CONTRÔLE DE LA SLOVAQUIE
DANS LA CORRESPONDANCE MARKOVIČ – BENEŠ – ŠROBÁR
(FÉVRIER – MAI 1919)

ÉTIENNE BOISSERIE

BOISSERIE, Étienne. «*The situation is not yet critical...* » The problems of controlling Slovakia in the correspondence of Markovič – Beneš – Šrobár (February–May 1919). *Historický časopis*, 2017, 65, 5, pp. 879-894, Bratislava.

The study analyses how the prevailing situation in Slovakia during the first months of 1919 was reported in part of the official or more informal correspondence between Ivan Markovič and Vavro Šrobár on the one hand and Edvard Beneš on the other.

Some specific material problems occurred and the Czechoslovak authorities faced the reluctance of part of the civilian population. They also had to cope with the Italian military mission that was widely considered unreliable and Hungarian-leaning. The core of the correspondence is made up of considerations on the material and political uncertainties arising from the lasting shortages, the weakness of the nascent Czechoslovak apparatus and the latter's difficulties stabilizing the situation in the whole region (and more specifically in some counties). As the weeks went by, the importance of a final decision regarding the borders with Hungary was firmly underlined, while the Slovak authorities were poorly informed on the overall diplomatic and political situation in Paris. Meanwhile, Slovak political Catholicism remained ambiguous and led agitation challenging and potentially weakening the Czechoslovak authorities. Markovič's correspondence expresses the instability of the Czechoslovak authorities' positions, shifting between partial improvements and lasting difficulties. At the end of April 1919, the overall situation remained precarious.

Keywords: Ivan Markovič. Vavro Šrobár. MPS. Italian military mission. Slovak political Catholicism.

Après deux mois de grandes difficultés à prendre le contrôle d'un territoire en Slovaquie, le gouvernement de Prague est parvenu à établir une forme d'autorité civile et militaire sur ce territoire. Lorsque la conférence de la paix s'ouvre à Paris, la détermination des frontières slovaques en constitue l'un des enjeux, et les difficultés restent importantes. Elles vont croissantes au cours du printemps, alors que les autorités slovaques sont confrontées à des résistances et à des insuffisances qu'elles ne peuvent surmonter dans un délai aussi court. La correspondance entretenue dans le triangle Paris – Prague – Bratislava, en l'occurrence entre Beneš, Markovič et Šrobár, témoigne de ces problèmes concomitants. Composée principalement de lettres de Markovič, elle a pour objet principal d'informer Beneš à Paris de l'évolution du contexte en Slovaquie, des difficultés d'implantation des autorités civiles, de la défiance entre autorités civiles slovaques et autorité militaire italienne, du poids des résistances d'une partie de la population et de la

Hongrie, de la faiblesse des ressources humaines dont dispose l'administration civile slovaque, ainsi que des multiples formes que prennent la contestation de son autorité dans un contexte de difficultés matérielles et d'approvisionnement croissantes. Certains de ces aspects des problèmes des autorités slovaques peuvent se lire comme un complément des correspondances entre Prague et Paris entretenues par Masaryk avec Beneš ou Kramář¹ ou des notes Šrobár publiées dans l'entre-deux-guerres et complétées récemment.² C'est une correspondance d'une nature différente des rapports de Fedor Houdek envoyés de Paris à Bratislava plutôt constituée de rapports d'information sur les travaux de la conférence de la paix³ que d'informations sur les mesures à prendre ou à anticiper selon les cas en vue d'une action aussi harmonieuse que possible entre la délégation parisienne et les autorités en Slovaquie. Cette correspondance de Markovič n'épuise pas la liaison et les différents flux d'informations entre les trois villes, y compris aux fins d'articuler positions et mesures à prendre, et présente – pour la période observée ici – une source d'informations de nature plus civiles que militaires.⁴ Elle n'a pas un caractère *stricto sensu* officiel, les trois hommes entretenant des liens de proximité et de confiance développés dans le cadre du travail de l'action extérieure ou, dans le cas de Šrobár et de Markovič, de plus longue date, depuis le renouveau de l'activité culturelle et politique à la périphérie du Parti national slovaque (SNS) dans les années précédant immédiatement la Grande Guerre. C'est de cette proximité et de cette confiance d'ailleurs que découlent leurs situations respectives au moment étudié. La familiarité de Markovič avec les hommes et le contexte slovaque permet un degré d'analyse précieux. Lorsqu'il informe Beneš, il le fait soit sur la base de ses propres séjours en Slovaquie, soit à partir des rapports venant de Slovaquie dont il dispose. Dans le cas de la correspondance de Prague vers Bratislava, il répercute des positions gouvernementales tchécoslovaques – dont nous ne parlerons pas ici – ou la substance des messages transmis de Paris sur la conduite à tenir en Slovaquie

-
- 1 ŠOLLE, Zdeněk (dir.). *Masaryk a Beneš ve svých dopisech z doby pařížských mírových jednání v roce 1919. II.* (Masaryk et Beneš dans leur correspondance de la période de la Conférence de la paix de Paris en 1919. Vol. 2.). Prague : AV ČR, 1993. ISSN 0323-1313; HÁJKOVÁ, Dagmar – QUAGLIATOVÁ, Vlasta – VAŠEK, Richard (dir.). *Korespondence T. G. Masaryk – Edvard Beneš 1918–1937.* (Correspondance T. G. Masaryk – Edvard Beneš 1918–1937.). Prague : Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 2013. ISBN 978-80-87782-06-4; BÍLEK, Jan et al. (dir.). *Korespondence T. G. Masaryk – Karel Kramář.* (Correspondance T. G. Masaryk – Karel Kramář.). Prague : Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 2005. ISBN 80-86495-33-7.
 - 2 ŠROBÁR, Vavro. *Osvobodené Slovensko. Pamäti z rokov 1918–1920, zv. 1.* (La Slovaquie libérée. Souvenirs des années 1918–1920. Vol. 1.). Prague : Čin, 1928; ŠROBÁR, Vavro. *Osvobodené Slovensko.* (La Slovaquie libérée.). Édité par Jan Rychlík. Bratislava : AEP, 2004. ISBN 80-88880-60-2.
 - 3 Správy delegáta Fedora Houdeka [Rapports du délégué Fedor Houdek] (28. 2. 1919 – 13. 5. 1919). Slovenský národný archív, Bratislava (ci-après SNA, BA), of. Vavro Šrobár, carton 10, inv. č. 623; Voir aussi HOUDEK, Fedor. *Vznik hraníc Slovenska.* (La Création des frontières de la Slovaquie.). Bratislava : Nákladom „Prúdov“, 1931, p. 285; JANŠÁK, Štefan. *Vstup Slovákov medzi slobodné národy.* (L'Entrée des Slovaques parmi les nations libres.). Bratislava : Vyd. Spolku Slovenských spisovateľov, 2006, p. 140. ISBN 80-8061-259-5.
 - 4 Elle contient 64 lettres et rapports rédigés entre début février 1919 et le 4 octobre suivant, dont 43 jusqu'à la fin du mois de juin. Une partie des lettres est rédigée de Prague, une autre de Bratislava où il séjourne à plusieurs reprises au cours de trajets Prague-Budapest après qu'il a été missionné début février pour participer aux travaux de la commission de liquidation (voir Ordre de service, Paris, 3 février 1919. SNA, BA of. I. Markovič, carton 1, inv. č. 1; voir également Markovič à Masaryk, Referát Markovič prezidentu Masarykovi, Prague, fin février 1919 [même fond, inv. č. 6]).

et les mesures à y prendre. C'est à cette dimension que nous accorderons plus d'attention. Dans ces messages adressés à Beneš, il s'efforce de rendre compte de la situation intérieure slovaque et de son évolution.

Les deux principaux protagonistes de cet échange, Vavro Šrobár et Ivan Markovič, ont chacun une part à l'activité politique et publique slovaque au cours des décennies précédentes. Šrobár est un homme de la première génération du renouveau de la mutualité tchéco-slovaque des années 1880. Il est de presque toutes les initiatives, qu'elles soient associatives ou politiques dès les années 1890. Il connaît le milieu pragois et Masaryk personnellement depuis cette époque. Au cours de la guerre, il joue un rôle important d'information en Slovaquie, il est l'homme de la Déclaration du 1^{er} mai 1918, première expression slovaque en Slovaquie du souhait de construction d'un État commun.⁵ Il a compté parmi ceux qui ont contraint le SNS à abandonner sa politique de passivité et à tenir la réunion du 24 mai qui valide l'option tchécoslovaque.⁶ Emprisonné au cours de l'été, il est libéré début octobre et il se trouve à Prague le 28 octobre. Il est l'un des cinq signataires de la proclamation d'indépendance publiée ce jour-là. Il est immédiatement désigné pour diriger le gouvernement provisoire, dit «de Skalica», début novembre, puis de nouveau envoyé en Slovaquie le 10 décembre⁷. Il dispose alors des pleins pouvoirs dans des conditions toujours difficiles. Son gouvernement reste à Žilina jusqu'en début février. Ivan Markovič, est né à Myjava en 1888 dans une famille active du mouvement patriotique.⁸ Il appartient à la génération de la diversification du mouvement national avec l'apparition d'un fort groupe dans le Záhorie, en Slovaquie occidentale, qui remet en cause la stratégie du parti national de Martin et cherche à s'appuyer fortement sur l'exemple tchèque pour sortir des impasses du mouvement slovaque. Après des études de droit à Pest puis à Leipzig, il s'est associé à Bohdan Pavlů, un juriste de cinq ans son aîné qui écrit alors dans le *Slovenský týždenník* et surtout dans le *Čas*, périodique proche de Masaryk et des réalistes, et à Vladimír Roy pour fonder en 1909 la revue *Prúdy* dans laquelle il est très impliqué.⁹ Il est également administrateur de la filiale de la Ludová

5 Pour le contexte et les détails du processus, voir HRONSKÝ, Marián. *Mikulášska rezolúcia 1. Mája 1918*. (La Résolution de Mikuláš du 1^{er} mai 1918.). Bratislava : Veda, 2008. ISBN 978-80-224-1005-2.

6 Voir notamment «Lettre ouverte» de Šrobár à Dula, 19 février 1918 (Literárny archív Slovenskej národnej knižnice, Martin (ci-après LA SNK), fonds SNR, sign. 94 K 10); Lettre de Šrobár à Dula, 5 mars 1918 (LA SNK, sign. 94 K 10). Sur la prise de position du SNS le 24 mai, voir Správa predsedníctva SNS, 24. Máj 1918 et Uzavretia pred. SNS (LA SNK, sign. 94 T 14).

7 Vymenovanie... (Nomination...) SNA, BA, of. V. Šrobár, carton 10, inv. č. 611.

8 PODRIMAVSKÝ, Milan. *Slovenská národná strana v druhej polovici 19. storočia*. (Le Parti national slovaque dans la seconde moitié du XIX^e siècle.). Bratislava : SAV, 1983, p. 138; Strana národná slovenská. 16. 2. 1896. Zápis z porady [Parti national slovaque, 16 février 1896. Procès-verbal du conseil] (LA SNK, sign. C 878). Voir également, MARKOVIČ, Július. *Nitrianský politický proces. Politická úvaha*. (Le Procès politique de Nitra. Réflexion politique.). Martin : T. S., 1903.

9 Sur le sujet, voir récemment ZEMKO, Milan. *Prúdisti v čase, ktorý trhol oponou*. (Les Prudistes au moment de déchirer le rideau.). In IVANIČKOVÁ, Edita (dir.). *Kapitoly z histórie stredoeurópskeho priestoru v 19. a 20. storočí*. Bratislava : Historický ústav SAV, 2011, p. 269-280. Sur l'importance de l'implication de Markovič dans les *Prúdy*, voir en particulier sa correspondance de 1909-1910 avec Pavol Neckar (LA SNK, sign. A 970); Voir aussi lettre de Markovič à Šrobár, Budapest, 23 février 1911. In RYCHLÍK, Jan (dir.). *Korespondence T. G. Masaryk – Slovenští veřejní činitelé [do r. 1918]*. Prague : Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 2007, příloha IV, p. 156-157. ISBN 978-80-86495-48-4.

banka de Nové Mesto nad Váhom en 1913.¹⁰ La même année, il participe au congrès slave de Sofia. Envoyé sur le front russe dès la mobilisation, il y est fait prisonnier et intègre le corps de volontaires en Russie, la *Česka družina*, dès 1915.¹¹ Il travaille dès décembre de la même année dans l'Union des associations tchécoslovaques [*Zváz československých spolkov*] de Petrograd. En mai 1917, il devient le secrétaire de la branche russe du Conseil national des Pays tchèques et rédige la revue *Čechoslovák* dans laquelle il propage le programme de l'action extérieure.¹² Au printemps 1918, il représente la légion tchécoslovaque dans les négociations avec le gouvernement soviétique. En juillet 1918, tout juste arrivé à Paris, il devient le secrétaire du Conseil national des Pays tchèques et, dès octobre, secrétaire du ministère des Affaires étrangères du gouvernement provisoire à peine constitué. Il est en même temps le rédacteur en chef des deux principales revues tchécoslovaques en France, *Československá samostatnost* et *La Nation tchèque*. Il est, avec Štefan Osuský, l'un des deux Slovaques présents à Genève fin octobre 1918 lors de la rencontre entre les principaux représentants de l'action extérieure et les politiciens tchèques restés au pays au cours de la guerre.¹³ Pendant quelques semaines, il joue un rôle d'information utile, de Paris en novembre, puis de Prague.¹⁴ Dès novembre, il s'est soucié de la circulation de l'information et de la répartition des quelques Slovaques fiables¹⁵ dans les trois principales villes où leur présence est utile : à Prague, à Bratislava et à Paris.

Lorsqu'il retourne en Tchécoslovaquie fin décembre 1918, il intègre le ministère plénipotentiaire pour l'administration de la Slovaquie (MPS) dirigé par Šrobár au sein duquel il est chargé des affaires juridiques. Le 14 janvier 1919, il est le premier des anciens légionnaires à être nommé à l'Assemblée nationale provisoire par Šrobár. C'est là qu'il travaille à l'organisation de la transition juridique pour la Slovaquie et entre au parti social-démocrate. Markovič est donc un homme absolument fiable, expérimenté, essentiel dans le processus politique de construction du projet tchécoslovaque.¹⁶

-
- 10 Sur la participation d'Ivan Markovič aux conseils d'administration et de surveillance des différentes banques slovaques, voir JESENSKÝ, Fedor (dir.). *Slovenský kompas 1911*. (Le Compas slovaque 1911.). Turčianský Svätý Martin : Slovenský peňažník, 1912.
 - 11 Sur la Družina et sa création, voir VÁVRA, Vlastimil. Formování České družiny. (La Formation de la Družina tchèque.). In *Historie a vojenství*, 1990, 39^e année, n° 1, p. 107-118.
 - 12 Voir *Jozef Gregor Tajovský v kritike a spomienkach*. (Jozef Gregor-Tajovský dans la critique et les souvenirs.). Bratislava : Slovenské vydavateľstvo krásnej literatúry, 1956, p. 199-200.
 - 13 FERENČUHOVÁ, Bohumila – ZEMKO, Milan (dir.). *V medzivojnovom Československu 1918 – 1939*. (Dans la Tchécoslovaquie de l'entre-deux-guerres. 1918–1939.). Bratislava : Veda, 2012, p. 24. Voir aussi KLIMEK, Antonín. Ženevská jednání čs. politiků na sklonku října 1918. (Les Négociations de Genève des politiciens tchécoslovaques à la fin du mois d'octobre 1918.). In *Historie a vojenství*, 1998, 39^e année, n° 1, p. 3-23.
 - 14 Voir notamment la lettre de Markovič à Šrobár du 29 novembre 1918. SNA, BA, of. V. Šrobár, carton 11, inv. č. 656.
 - 15 Sur les listes réduites sur lesquelles s'appuie Šrobár, voir SNA, BA, of. V. Šrobár, carton 10, inv. č. 611. Voir aussi JANŠÁK, ref. 3, p. 159-160.
 - 16 Au cours de la première République, il est élu député social-démocrate en 1920, quelques mois ministre de la Défense du deuxième gouvernement Tusar, ministre de l'Unification des lois et de l'organisation de l'administration du premier gouvernement Švehla (1922–1925). Il est de nouveau député en 1929, réélu en 1935 et vice-président de l'Assemblée nationale de 1935 à 1938. Après les accords de Munich, il par-

En janvier 1919 Markovič a été nommé membre de l'Assemblée nationale par Vavro Šrobár.¹⁷ En Slovaquie, après les difficultés de l'automne dans la détermination de la ligne de démarcation entre la Hongrie et la Tchécoslovaquie et les difficultés du contrôle politique et administratif du territoire,¹⁸ le respect de cette ligne et son occupation, la situation s'est provisoirement améliorée pour l'autorité tchécoslovaque, mais les problèmes sont multiples. Certains résultent directement de la faiblesse du contrôle exercé et d'autres, ponctuels sans pour autant être contingents, affectent quelques régions – orientales ou proches de la ligne de démarcation – ou sont liées aux dysfonctionnements de certains secteurs – transports et approvisionnement notamment – et affectent l'exercice réel de l'autorité civile au-delà de Bratislava et de la Slovaquie occidentale, d'une part, et l'articulation de cette autorité civile avec l'autorité militaire assurée par les Italiens depuis l'accord de décembre 1918, d'autre part.¹⁹ Pour la délégation tchécoslovaque à Paris comme pour le ministre plénipotentiaire à Bratislava, ces sujets sont essentiels et occupent une grande partie de la correspondance entre Markovič et Bratislava ou Paris.²⁰

Le problème italien

La relation avec l'Italie et avec le commandement italien est un des sujets les plus difficiles du printemps 1919. Il semble se poser dès février de manière aiguë, à partir du moment où les autorités civiles slovaques s'installent à Bratislava alors que, malgré les tensions, les Italiens n'ont pas encore de ligne claire sur leur attitude à l'égard de la Tchécoslovaquie.²¹ Depuis décembre 1918, le général Piccione commande l'armée tchécoslovaque qui opère en Slovaquie et qui se déploie le long de la ligne de démarcation. Le 27 décembre, le ministre de la Défense tchécoslovaque, Václav Klobučník, a donné des instructions pour que l'autorité militaire n'interfère pas dans l'autorité civile

ticipé aux discussions avec les représentants du HSES afin de limiter l'affaiblissement de l'État central. Il est à Prague au moment de déclaration slovaque d'indépendance et de l'invasion allemande des Pays tchèques. Il est arrêté au cours de l'été 1939, au cours de l'«Action Albrecht», déporté à Dachau puis à Buchenwald où il meurt le 16 février 1944.

- 17 Lettre d'Ivan Markovič à V. Šrobár, Prague, 15 janvier 1919. SNA, BA, of. V. Šrobár, carton 11, inv. č. 656.
- 18 HRONSKÝ, Marián. *Slovensko na rázcestí*. (La Slovaquie à la croisée des chemins.). Košice : Východoslovenské vydavateľstvo, 1976.
- 19 DEJMEK, Jindřich – KOLÁŘ, František (dir.). *Dokumenty československé zahraniční politiky. Československo na pařížské mírové konferenci 1918–1920. I* [Documents de politique étrangère tchécoslovaque. La Tchécoslovaquie à la Conférence de la paix de Paris, 1918–1920. I] (ci-après DČZP. PMK I), doc. 28, p. 98-101.
- 20 Markovič est à Bratislava dans la première moitié de mars. Il y fait des séries de conférences sur la politique étrangère tchécoslovaque et publie plusieurs articles dans le *Slovenský denník* (Voir notamment son éditorial in *Slovenský denník*, 22 février 1919). Šrobár de son côté voyage autant que possible dans le pays, dispose –même avec difficulté et irrégulièrement– d'informations de sources multiples, civiles par l'intermédiaire des préfets ou militaires par les deux Commandements régionaux de Bratislava et de Košice qui constituent une source essentielle de son information pour la partie orientale, moins facilement accessibles et contrôlables pour les autorités civiles.
- 21 KLÍPA, Bohumír. Italská vojenská mise v Československu. (La Mission militaire italienne en Tchécoslovaquie.). In *Historie a vojenství*, 1995, 44^e année, n° 3, p. 55. Sur les tensions italo-tchécoslovaques dans la seconde moitié de février, voir lettre de Masaryk à Beneš, Prague, 24 février 1919. In ŠOLLE, ref. 1, doc. 27, p. 184-186.

de Šrobár²² et, à partir de janvier, Bratislava est placée sous le commandement du général Barecca. Le conflit entre autorités militaires italiennes et Šrobár éclate rapidement; Il s'approfondit avec le déménagement du gouvernement de Žilina à Bratislava début février et les incidents graves qui marquent notamment la manifestation du 12 février.²³ Les Italiens en général sont réputés favorables aux Hongrois, et Barecca, dont l'attitude est plus particulièrement mise en cause, est d'ailleurs rapidement remplacé.²⁴ Ces tensions constituent une gêne pour la délégation tchécoslovaque à Paris. Par l'intermédiaire de Markovič, Masaryk fait savoir à Šrobár qu'il faut éviter de tendre cette situation : *«Esquiver le conflit avec les Italiens. Ils ne seront chez nous nous que quelques semaines. À Paris, les Italiens nous soutiennent. Ne faire part à Prague et à Paris que des véritables incorrections, mais, de nouveau, avec des pièces sur lesquelles il est possible d'intervenir énergiquement. Le simple "il s'est passé ceci" ne suffit pas. Le général P[iccione] sera chez le président qui le mettra en garde contre les véritables incorrections qui ne doivent pas se répéter.»*²⁵ Le mois de février est pourtant marqué par plusieurs incidents parfois sérieus qui continuent à tendre la situation. Markovič en fait part à Beneš, notamment dans la deuxième moitié de février. *«En Slovaquie, l'attitude des officiers italiens crée beaucoup de remous dont le Dr. Štěpánek vous a déjà informé et vous informe encore. Je ne veux pas entrer dans les détails parce que je ne Vous ferais part que de ce que j'ai entendu, sans preuve, et Vous ne pourriez pas en tirer grand-chose. En bref, les Italiens agissent comme s'ils n'avaient pas reconnu notre souveraineté, en particulier dans les villes magyarisées; ils affirment notamment qu'il n'est pas encore certain que ces villes (Prešporok, Lučenec, Komárno, Nitra) nous appartiendrons; cela se reflète dans l'administration (à Nitra, le colonel italien n'a pas permis de hisser nos drapeaux sur le bâtiment de l'administration du comitat afin de ne pas irriter la population hongroise).»*²⁶

Dans le même temps, au cours du mois de février, la loyauté des Italiens à l'égard de la Tchécoslovaquie est très ouvertement questionnée : Markovič s'en fait le relais dans sa lettre à Beneš du 23 février en termes explicites: *«Les Hongrois inondent la Slovaquie de tracts ; Ils ont des agitateurs et des propagateurs d'informations et de rumeurs les*

22 ŠROBÁR, ref. 2, 1928, p. 461-463.

23 ŠROBÁR, ref. 2, 2004, p. 29-31. Pour les mesures prises par le ministre de la Défense Klofáč, voir Opis č. 3641, 4 février 1919, Vojenský historický ústav, Bratislava [VHÚ, BA], fonds Zemské Vojenské Veliteľstvo (ci-après ZVV) Košice, Presidium 1919, carton 2, prez. č. 267/1919.

24 Sur le départ de Barecca le 4 mars et ses effets, voir Commandement de la place de Bratislava, Zpráva za týžden od 4. do 10. brezna 1919, 12 mars 1919, VHÚ, BA, fonds ZVV Košice, Presidium 1919, carton 3, prez. č. 757.

25 Lettre de Markovič à Šrobár, Prague, 9 février 1919 (SNA, BA, of. I. Markovič, carton 1, inv. č. 7); Sur l'entretien Masaryk-Piccione, voir KLÍPA, Bohumír. Italská vojenská mise v Československu. In *Historie a vojensví*, 1995, 44^e année, n^o 3. Au cours du mois de janvier, Masaryk a fait transmettre la même demande à propos de l'action des Polonais dans l'Est du pays (voir Lettre d'Ivan Markovič à Vavro Šrobár, Prague, 15 janvier 1919. SNA, BA, of. V. Šrobár, carton 11, inv. č. 656).

26 Lettre de Markovič à Beneš, Prague, [avant le 10] février 1919 (SNA, BA, of. I. Markovič, carton 1, inv. č. 8). Bědřich Štěpánek (1882–1943) est diplomate de carrière, consul austro-hongrois avant la Grande Guerre et jusqu'en 1916. Membre important de l'action intérieure à Prague à partir de cette date, il quitte illégalement le pays en juin 1918 pour rejoindre la France. En 1918–1919, il travaille au ministère des Affaires étrangères à Prague. En 1919, il est nommé ambassadeur aux États-Unis.

plus diverses. Les tracts sont acheminés à travers la ligne de démarcation qui, grâce à la “neutralité” des officiers italiens, n'est pas suffisamment étanche... »²⁷ Et Markovič de signaler que «l'irritation» à l'égard des officiers italiens augmente de jour en jour.²⁸ De son côté, fin février 1919, Masaryk a pris la décision de retirer son commandement à Piccione. Mais la mise en œuvre de la décision doit être reportée pour ne pas s'aliéner l'Italie à la conférence de la paix alors même que le chef de gouvernement, Kramář, inquiet de la situation en Slovaquie, pousse à la mise à l'écart rapide de Piccione.²⁹ Au-delà de la perception slovaque de l'attitude italienne, l'orientation pro-française de la Tchécoslovaquie à Paris complique la situation. Au cours du mois de janvier, une série d'accords a été signée entre Paris et Prague qui ont abouti à l'arrivée à Prague, le 13 février, de la mission militaire française commandée par le général Pellé.³⁰

Le 18 février, l'armée tchécoslovaque est placée sous le haut commandement des forces alliées du maréchal Foch. La Slovaquie est divisée en deux régions militaires – occidentale et orientale –, la seconde devant être commandée par le général français Hennocque dont l'arrivée est présentée dans la presse pro-gouvernementale avec un soulagement mal dissimulé.³¹ Les Italiens protestent immédiatement contre cette évolution et la situation se tend.³² De son côté, Šrobár a été informé par Markovič depuis fin février du départ de Piccione et des Italiens et Markovič lui a demandé une documentation précise.³³ Au cours des semaines suivantes, ces informations passent par de nombreux canaux – notamment par les rapports de situation des autorités locales,³⁴ municipales ou militaires³⁵ – et signalent tous une tension croissante entre armée tchécoslovaque et officiers italiens.

27 Lettre de Markovič à Beneš, 23 février 1919 (ref. 4, inv. č. 10, précitée). Sur les incidents frontaliers et les mesures prises pour mettre fin aux incursions aériennes hongroises, voir Kroměříž, 13 février 1919, VHÚ, BA, ZVV Košice, Presidium 1919, carton 2, č. 260/1919 et 233/1919.

28 Lettre de Markovič à Beneš, 23 février 1919 (ref. 4, inv. č. 10, précitée); Voir à ce sujet la note du ministère de la Défense nationale au Commandement militaire régional (ZVV) de Košice, 25 février 1919 (VHÚ, BA, fonds ZVV Košice, Presidium 1919, carton 2, č. 573).

29 Masaryk à Beneš, 24 février 1919. In ŠOLLE, ref. 1, VNK Masaryk-Beneš, II, doc. 27, p. 184-186 ; Lettre de Kramář à Masaryk, Paris, 28 février 1919. In BÍLEK et al., ref. 1, doc. 205, p. 331.

30 DEJMEK – Kolář, ref. 19, doc. 62, p. 145-150; MARÈS, Antoine. Mission militaire et relations internationales : l'exemple franco-tchécoslovaque, 1918-1925. In *Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine*, 1983, 30^e année, n° 4/, p. 563-567.

31 *Slovenský denník*, 4 avril 1919, p. 2.

32 FERENČUHOVÁ, Bohumila. Talianska a francúzska vojenská misia na Slovensku a československo-maďarský konflikt v rokoch 1918 – 1919. (Les missions militaires italienne et française en Slovaquie et le conflit hongaro-tchécoslovaque en 1918-1919.). In FERENČUHOVÁ, Bohumila. *Francúzsko a slovenská otázka 1789 – 1989*. Bratislava : Veda, 2008, p. 227-228. Voir aussi MARÈS, ref. 30, p. 569.

33 Lettre du 20 février 1919, inv. č. 8, précitée. Dans sa lettre à Beneš, Markovič écrit avoir demandé à Šrobár «de réunir des documents fiables sur toutes les incorrections hongroises, italiennes, hungaro-italiennes» et d'en informer Beneš régulièrement.

34 ŠUCHOVÁ, Xénia. Šrobárovi muži: Vymenovanie prvých československých županov ministrom s plnou mocou pre Slovensko Vavrom Šrobárom. (Les Hommes de Šrobár : La nomination des premiers préfets tchécoslovaques par le ministre plénipotentiaire pour la Slovaquie Vavro Šrobár.). In PEKŇÍK, Miroslav (dir.). *Dr. Vavro Šrobár politik, publicista a národnoosvetový pracovník*. Bratislava : Veda, 2012, p. 319-343. ISBN 978-80-224-1210-0.

35 Voir notamment VHÚ, BA, fond ZVV Košice, Presidium 1919, carton 2.

Même si à Prague, Masaryk reste favorable à des mesures d'apaisement qu'il recherche depuis février, le rapport avec les Italiens ne cesse de se dégrader, à Paris comme en Slovaquie.³⁶ Le sujet est toujours suivi attentivement par Markovič qui fait désormais ouvertement part à Beneš de son inquiétude quant à la qualité et à l'autorité des officiers italiens.³⁷

Informersur la situation intérieure

Les tensions avec les Italiens se déroulent dans un contexte intérieur fragile, marqué par des problèmes récurrents et importants avec une partie de la population civile. Alors que début février, plusieurs rapports de préfets signalent une situation très instable et dangereuse pour les autorités slovaques dans les régions proches de la ligne de démarcation,³⁸ Markovič qualifie la situation de «normale», alors même qu'il rend compte que *«le tri des anciens fonctionnaires hongrois menace toujours le cours normal de l'administration»* et que la faiblesse de la présence militaire tchécoslovaque a provoqué des incidents mortels dans certaines communes proches de la ligne de démarcation.³⁹ Deux semaines plus tard, il se fait plus insistant pour évoquer les difficultés persistantes de l'administration civile : *«En Slovaquie, la situation est plus difficile qu'elle ne l'a été. Les Hongrois n'ont de cesse de provoquer, surtout parmi les fonctionnaires, ce qui a eu pour conséquence une grève générale. Elle s'est manifestée surtout dans les chemins de fer et dans la poste où sont employés le plus grand nombre de Hongrois et de Magyars. Par chance, elle n'a pas éclaté partout simultanément, ce qui a permis de la paralyser progressivement et assez rapidement par l'apport de personnel tchèque. Aujourd'hui, les trains fonctionnent à peu près aussi régulièrement – ou plus précisément, aussi irrégulièrement – qu'auparavant.»*⁴⁰

L'information sur la situation des autorités civiles est une part importante de la correspondance destinée à Beneš. De ce point de vue, le principal sujet d'inquiétude est le flou qui règne sur la détermination des frontières et nuit à la détermination du périmètre de l'action du MPS et de ses préfets et donc à leur capacité à exercer effectivement leur autorité. Sans être alarmiste, Markovič met ainsi en garde Beneš à la fin du mois de

36 Voir Masaryk à Beneš, 31 mars 1919. In ŠOLLE, ref. 1, doc. 35, p. 202; Le 31 mars, Beneš avait télégraphié à Masaryk que *«les Italiens commencent à faire de grandes difficultés [à Paris, nda]»* (voir HÁJKOVÁ – QUAGLIATOVÁ – VAŠEK, ref. 1, doc. 46, p. 100). Voir surtout Beneš à Masaryk, 5 avril 1919, dans laquelle les affaires italiennes sont longuement développées et où, après avoir signalé que *«[les Italiens] sont déloyaux. Ici, à la conférence, ils sont contre nous sur presque tous les sujets»*, Beneš affirme *«Je considère comme indispensable de rapidement se débarrasser des Italiens, et de rapidement la [la mission militaire italienne, nda] renvoyer chez elle»* (in ŠOLLE, ref. 1, doc. 37, p. 206, 208).

37 Lettre de Markovič à Beneš, Prague, 3 avril 1919 (SNA, Bratislava, of. I. Markovič, carton 1, inv. č. 16). Voir également Piccione à Schöbl, Bratislava, 29 avril 1919 (č. 5825), le premier fait part au second des refus répétés des soldats tchécoslovaques – non légionnaires – de saluer les officiers de la 6^e DI, et demande que des mesures soient prises (VHÚ, BA, fond ZVV Košice, Presidium 1919, carton 4, inv. č. 1383).

38 Voir en particulier, pour le comitat de Novohrad, les rapports de Ludovít Bazovský à Šrobár des 3 et 5 février 1919, SNA, BA, of. V. Šrobár, carton 10, inv. č. 619.

39 Lettre de Markovič à Beneš, [avant le 10] février 1919 (inv. č. 8, précité).

40 Lettre de Markovič à Beneš, 23 février 1919 (inv. č. 10, précité). Dans plusieurs régions, les rapports des préfets soulignent la précarité des conditions sociales et politiques (voir SNA, BA, of. V. Šrobár, carton 10, inv. č. 619 pour les rapports de février 1919).

février : «[...] *Il est absolument nécessaire – et pour la Slovaquie en particulier – qu'il se passe quelque chose au plus vite, afin que cesse l'incertitude concernant les frontières minimales ou afin que celle-ci soit la plus réduite possible*⁴¹.» Dans cette même lettre Markovič demande à Beneš d'élargir les canaux d'information de Šrobár sur les progrès des travaux sur les frontières de la conférence de la paix par l'intermédiaire de Houdek qui commence à informer Šrobár directement à partir du 28 février.⁴² Markovič est tenu informé du contenu de cette correspondance Houdek-Šrobár – au moins par Šrobár.⁴³

L'autre difficulté immédiatement signalée par Markovič – et qui l'est d'ailleurs par plusieurs autres canaux entre février et mai – est le manque d'informations dont dispose Šrobár.⁴⁴ Et si les informations circulent, elles sont insuffisamment précises pour permettre de prendre des mesures en Slovaquie.⁴⁵ Ce problème récurrent de la circulation de l'information inquiète à mesure que la situation se dégrade en Slovaquie et que le caractère contradictoire de celles disponibles à Prague donne bientôt à Markovič un sentiment de chaos qu'il exprime à Beneš: «*Et si je me rappelle de ce que Vous m'avez confié à Paris, il me semble que le chaos n'y est pas moins grand* [qu'à Prague, nda] [...] *Cette situation est actuellement la plus inconfortable qui soit pour nous en ce qui concerne le règlement de la question hongroise. Šrobár et nous qui sommes autour de lui et intéressés à ce sujet en particulier, ne savons jusqu'ici pas comment il se présente à Paris, ni par conséquent quelle ligne nous devons tenir contre les Hongrois.*» Et il conclut sur ce point: «*Toute information sur cette affaire serait, pour le ministre Šrobár et pour nous autres, particulièrement précieuse.*»⁴⁶

Entre temps, Markovič s'est rendu à Bratislava où il est resté plusieurs jours avant de partir pour Budapest. En même temps qu'il participe à plusieurs conférences destinées à asseoir l'autorité tchécoslovaque,⁴⁷ il transmet alors à Beneš des rapports rien moins qu'optimistes sur la situation dans le pays. À peine arrivé, il conclut ainsi son rapport du

41 Voir en particulier, lettre du 23 février 1919 (inv. č. 10, précité).

42 Voir SNA, BA, of. V. Šrobár, carton 10, inv. č. 623, précité.

43 Voir lettre de Markovič à Beneš, Bratislava, 6 mars 1919, SNA, BA, of. I. Markovič, carton 1, inv. č. 12; lettre de Markovič à Beneš, Bratislava, 13 mars 1919, SNA, BA, of. I. Markovič, carton 1, inv. č. 14.

44 Lettres de Markovič à Beneš, Prague, 23 février 1919 et 7 avril 1919. SNA, BA, of. I. Markovič, carton 1, inv. č. 10, précitée et 18.

45 Lettre de Markovič à Beneš, 13 mars 1919 (inv. č. 14, précitée). Dans son rapport daté du 11 mars, Fedor Houdek est laconique sur la question des frontières : «*Nous ne pouvons toujours pas donner d'informations positives sur la fixation définitive des frontières. Les commissions ont déjà étudié le matériel que vous avez transmis et l'on dit que leur position et leur projet sera présenté au Conseil des Dix. Dans l'ensemble toutefois, il semble que la commission a accepté nos demandes et que les frontières seront déterminées avec de petits changements par rapports à ce que nous avons demandé.*» (Zpráva 7 Fedora Houdka Vavrovi Šrobárovi, Paris, 11 mars 1919, SNA, Bratislava, of. V. Šrobár, carton 10, inv. č. 623.)

46 Lettre de Markovič à Beneš, 7 avril 1919 (inv. č. 18, précitée). À ce moment, les quelques informations reçues de Houdek par Šrobár datent de début avril et sont peu encourageantes : Houdek informe Šrobár qu'il n'y a plus aucune information sur les frontières, que règne une atmosphère de secret, que la position wilsonienne «*d'humanisme optimiste... nuit plus qu'elle ne sert*». Sur la situation générale, appréciation : «*Pour nous, le danger n'a encore jamais été aussi grand que maintenant et il le sera encore dans un avenir proche.*» (Zpráva 11 Fedora Houdka Vavrovi Šrobárovi, Paris, 1er avril 1919. SNA, Bratislava, of. V. Šrobár, carton 10, inv. č. 623).

47 Voir par exemple in *Slovenský denník*, 25 février (p. 3), 4 mars (p. 2), 6 mars (p. 3) ou l'article hommage à Masaryk à l'occasion de l'anniversaire de ce dernier (SD, 8 mars, p. 2-3).

23 février: *«Je n'ai pas voulu que mon compte-rendu vous donne l'impression que les conditions ici sont intenables. Elles ne le sont pas. Le peuple fait globalement preuve de calme et de maturité, mais la situation se dégrade..., l'appareil fonctionne de façon très imparfaite parce qu'il n'y a pas de fonctionnaires en nombre suffisant. Pour résumer : la situation en Slovaquie n'est pas encore critique, mais elle est difficile et pourrait devenir critique si l'actuelle incertitude devait encore durer.»*⁴⁸

C'est donc de Bratislava qu'il informe Beneš dans la première moitié du mois de mars alors que la situation y est tendue et dégradée. Il en signale les aspects les plus importants : l'agitation des minorités – et notamment des Hongrois⁴⁹ – qui connaît un pic à l'occasion de la commémoration du 15 mars que redoute les autorités civiles et militaires, inquiètes des rumeurs de soulèvements armés à Bratislava et à Košice notamment, et qui prennent des mesures de sécurité exceptionnelles.⁵⁰ Comme en écho aux alertes de Houdek et du Premier ministre Kramář en effet, Markovič confirme l'importance de l'agitation hongroise en Slovaquie et le rôle qu'y joue une partie des organisations politiques catholiques: *«Il est certain qu'il existe une agitation anti-tchèque, mais elle provient des Hongrois, des Magyars et de leurs valets parmi lesquels surtout les cléricaux slovaques font également beaucoup de choses qui soutiennent indirectement la propagande magyarophile. Nous n'avons jusqu'à maintenant pas de preuve claire que cette coopération serait consciente, mais nous sommes méfiants en particulier à l'égard des partisans de Hlinka issus des cercles des anciens magyars.»*⁵¹ Quelques jours plus tard, toujours de Bratislava, le sujet est de nouveau abordé: *«Il est de plus en plus clair que l'on trouve derrière Hlinka tous les éléments magyars de l'église, tout ce qui, auparavant, appartenait au parti populaire hongrois. Nous n'avons provisoirement pas de document fiable sur le caractère direct et conscient du lien de Hlinka avec ces éléments.»*⁵² Dans cette même lettre, Markovič considère toutefois que si la propagande de Hlinka dispose d'un terrain favorable, elle est moins dangereuse que ce qui pourrait découler des problèmes de ravitaillement. Le souci d'approvisionnement semble en effet aigu. La réunion des députés et des préfets slovaques du 10 mars *«a montré que l'ensemble de l'appareil fonctionne dans des conditions relativement satisfaisantes, sauf pour*

48 Lettre de Markovič à Beneš, Bratislava, 23 février 1919, inv. č. 10, précitée.

49 Voir notamment les lettres des 6 et 13 mars 1919 (inv. č. 12 et 14, précitées). À ce sujet, voir également la résolution des députés du Club slovaque, 27 février 1919, *Slovenský denník*, 5 mars 1919, Za očistu nášho politického života (Pour le nettoyage de notre vie politique).

50 Sur les craintes et les rumeurs de soulèvement, voir lettre de Markovič à Beneš, 6 mars 1919 (inv. č. 12, précitée). Pour les mesures prises par Šrobár, voir Výnos MPS, 1131/1919 adm., 6 mars 1919 (VHÚ, BA, ZVV Košice, Presidium 1919, carton 3, inv. č. 613). Voir également le cas de Košice où le commandement de la 6^e DI demande au général Schöbl de faire en sorte d'éviter tout contact entre officiers et population civile dans les jours qui suivent l'interdiction des festivités (VHÚ, BA, ZVV Košice, Presidium 1919, carton 3, inv. č. 7854).

51 Lettre de Markovič à Beneš, 6 mars 1919 (inv. č. 12, précitée). Sur l'agitation provoquée par les catholiques à l'époque et l'attitude d'Andrej Hlinka au cours de cette période, voir notamment KRAMER, Juraj. *Slovenské autonomistické hnutie, 1918 – 1929*. (Le Mouvement autonomiste slovaque 1918–1929). Bratislava : SAV, 1962 et RYCHLÍK, Jan. *Češi a Slováci ve 20. století. Česko-slovenské vztahy 1914–1945*. (Les Tchèques et les Slovaques au XX^e siècle. Les relations tchéco-slovaques 1914–1945.). Prague : ÚTGM; Bratislava : AEP, 1997, p. 75-79. Voir également SNA, BA, of. V. Šrobár, carton 10, inv. č. 613.

52 Lettre de Markovič à Beneš, 13 mars 1919 (inv. č. 14, précitée).

*l'approvisionnement dont l'insuffisance rend par endroits la situation critique. Le terrain est donc propice à la propagande de Hlinka, mais le danger qui découle des manques de l'approvisionnement est plus grand que le cléricisme».*⁵³

Encore début avril, la situation telle qu'elle est rapportée à Beneš n'est pas encourageante. «*En Slovaquie, l'état des choses est satisfaisant. L'état d'esprit du peuple est certainement pire qu'il ne l'était au début de l'année, particulièrement pour ce qui concerne la relation avec les Tchèques, mais il n'y a pas pour le moment à avoir de craintes plus importantes. La dégradation de l'atmosphère est provoquée par l'agitation hongroise et cléricale qui a le champ libre parce que les éléments progressistes en Slovaquie sont submergés par le travail administratif et ne suffisent pas pour faire une propagande plus systématique et plus intensive auprès du peuple alors que les éléments subversifs ne cessent de provoquer des troubles. Par conséquent, dans beaucoup d'endroits, le peuple voit dans les Tchèques et dans l'armée tchèque la cause de la misère et des manques.*»⁵⁴

Dans la première moitié d'avril toutefois, Markovič fait part d'une légère amélioration de la situation dont les causes sont multiples:⁵⁵ d'une part, une crainte de la part de certaines populations jusqu'alors sourdement ou ouvertement hostiles à l'État à l'égard de la Hongrie des conseils, et qui a comme effet de limiter la déstabilisation des autorités tchécoslovaques à Bratislava;⁵⁶ d'autre part, une amélioration globale du ravitaillement qui était un sujet difficile au cours des semaines précédentes;⁵⁷ enfin, un renforcement progressif de l'administration grâce à l'afflux lent mais régulier de Tchèques ou au recrutement de Slovaques fiables. La principale satisfaction dont fait part Markovič concerne alors la place prise par les Tchèques volontaires pour servir dans différentes administrations –qui est un des motifs dominants et à double tranchant de la propagande des autorités civiles – et notamment dans le domaine scolaire. «*L'école commence à fonctionner, notamment l'école intermédiaire. On en compte déjà trente, et vingt écoles communales totalement slovaquisées. Les professeurs tchèques donnent satisfaction aux enfants comme aux parents. La communauté est même enthousiaste de nos écoles et de nos professeurs tchèques. Surtout, les Slovaques ne sont pas tchéquisés, mais au contraire les professeurs et fonctionnaires tchèques se slovaquisent. Pour nous, il a toujours été clair qu'il ne pouvait en être autrement.*»⁵⁸ L'appréciation positive dont il fait part à Beneš n'est pas la plus convaincante de cette correspondance et semble taire à dessein

53 Lettre du 13 mars 1919 (inv. č. 14, précitée). Sur cette réunion, voir également *Slovenský denník*, 5 mars 1919, Bratislavské porady (Les conseils de Bratislava) et in *ibid.*, 6 mars 1919, Politická situácia na Slovensku (La Situation politique en Slovaquie).

54 Lettre de Markovič à Beneš, Prague, 3 avril 1919 (inv. č. 16, précitée).

55 Lettre de Markovič à Beneš, Prague, 15 avril 1919 (SNA, BA, of. I. Markovič, carton 1, inv. č. 20).

56 Lettre de Markovič à Beneš, 7 avril 1919 (inv. č. 18, précitée).

57 Voir en particulier Vrchní velitelství čs-slov. vojsk na Slovensku (Le Commandement suprême des armées tchéco-slovaques en Slovaquie), 361/op, Materiální situace (Situation matérielle), Kroměříž, 8 mars 1919, annexe n° 6 (VHÚ, ZVV Bratislava, presidium 1919, carton 3, inv. č. 683).

58 Lettre de Markovič à Beneš, 15 avril 1919, inv. č. 20, précitée. Les chiffres ne sont pas identiques à ceux qui sont alors publiés dans la presse gouvernementale. Voir en particulier les chiffres publiés à l'occasion de l'inauguration de l'école normale de Modra et qui évoque des chiffres beaucoup plus élevés (ŠTEFÁNEK, Anton. Školy na Slovensku. (Les Écoles en Slovaquie.). In *Slovenský denník*, 10 avril 1919, p. 1).

les grandes difficultés auxquelles sont confrontés ces professeurs tchèques dans un environnement pas toujours spontanément accueillant, y compris dans les régions majoritairement slaves. La question scolaire reste, avec celle des institutions judiciaires, l'un des points difficiles à régler sur l'ensemble du territoire.⁵⁹

Sur le plan militaire, les rapports Markovič confirment à Beneš l'effet positif de l'arrivée de Hennocque malgré les problèmes d'articulation de l'autorité italienne avec celle des officiers français.⁶⁰ Dans sa lettre du 7 avril, Markovič rapporte à Beneš la conversation entre Šrobár et Piccione et sur les relations entre ce dernier et le général Pellé. *«Piccione a dit ouvertement à Šrobár que les officiers italiens savent qu'ils vont devoir partir et demandent seulement qu'il leur soit dit quand et qu'on ne les en informe pas au dernier moment. [...] Šrobár a négocié ici pour trouver une solution qui permette au général Piccione de rester commandant du territoire occupé en Slovaquie et que le général Hennocque devienne le commandant des troupes d'occupation des territoires qui, le cas échéant, nous seraient octroyés aux frontières orientales. [...] En échange, Šrobár aurait exigé du général Piccione la mise à l'écart ou le remplacement des officiers supérieurs italiens les moins fiables.»*⁶¹ Mais, conclut Markovič, cela ne réglerait pas le problème du commandement en chef des deux armées en Slovaquie.

La dégradation de la relation avec l'Italie n'est pas sans effet sur la cohésion des hommes de l'action extérieure, et la correspondance Markovič porte des traces du problème Štefánik,⁶² et notamment des tensions puis de la rupture entre Beneš et Štefánik dont Beneš a informé Masaryk le 5 avril⁶³ et dont il fait part à Markovič le 9 avril en termes simples et définitifs: *«J'ai eu un conflit avec Štefánik. Il est important que vous le sachiez, mais ce n'est que pour vous. Je crois que c'est totalement fini entre nous. Gardez l'affaire pour vous.»*⁶⁴ Moins d'une semaine plus tard, de manière incidente dans une longue lettre dans laquelle il fait le point sur une situation jugée provisoirement améliorée en Slovaquie, Markovič répond de manière lapidaire: *«Nous attendons toujours Štefánik. Vos informations m'ont affecté, mais pas surpris.»*⁶⁵ L'accord conclu le 18 avril

59 Sur les difficultés de mise en place d'un système d'instruction slovaque, voir SNA, BA, of. Anton Štefánek, carton 10, inv. č. III/2, Veselé a tragikomické príhody v prvých dňoch oslobodeného Slovenska. (Les événements heureux et tragicomiques dans les premiers jours de la libération de la Slovaquie.). Voir aussi MATULA, Pavol. *Českí stredoškolskí profesori na Slovensku 1918 – 1938*. (Les Professeurs tchèques des écoles intermédiaires en Slovaquie 1918–1938.). Prešov : Vyd. Michala Vaška, 2006, p. 22-39. ISBN 80-7165-582-1. Pour le cas très difficile de Košice, voir VHÚ, ZVV Bratislava, presidium 1919, carton 3, inv. č. 879 et 951.

60 Lettre de Markovič à Beneš, 3 avril 1919 (inv. č. 16, précitée).

61 Lettre de Markovič à Beneš, 7 avril 1919 (inv. č. 18, précitée). Au même moment, Masaryk fait part en termes clairs à Beneš de sa décision de maintenir Piccione provisoirement: *«Faire traîner : Tant que nous n'avons pas signé l'accord préliminaire, sous ne pouvons pas nous permettre une rupture. Piccione reste le maître en Slovaquie, Hennocque en Ruthénie.»* (ŠOLLE, ref. 1, doc. 39, p. 219).

62 Sur le rôle de Štefánik dans les discussions avec l'Italie en avril 1919, voir FERENČUHOVÁ, Bohumila. Francúzsko-talianská rivalita v Československu začiatkom roku 1919 a M. R. Štefánik. (La Rivalité franco-italienne en Tchécoslovaquie au début de 1919 et M. R. Štefánik.). In *Historie a vojenství*, 4/2000, p. 853-873.

63 HÁJKOVÁ – QUAGLIATOVÁ – VAŠEK, ref. 1, doc. 37, p. 207, 211.

64 Lettre de Beneš à Markovič, Paris, 9 avril 1919 (SNA, BA, of. I. Markovič, carton 1, inv. č. 19).

65 Lettre de Markovič à Beneš, 15 avril 1919 (inv. č. 20, précitée).

entre Štefánik et Diaz pour leurs gouvernements respectifs ne résout qu'imparfaitement les tensions ; il pose un problème immédiat de conflit d'autorité militaire en Slovaquie et fragilise la position de Hennocque en Ruthénie.⁶⁶

Au cours de cette période, la manière dont Markovič informe Beneš sur la situation en Slovaquie emprunte à plusieurs registres. Selon les sujets, il peut être tour à tour ou concomitamment optimiste, ou alarmiste. Optimiste lorsque les problèmes d'approvisionnement, souci constant qui reste sérieux en mars, notamment dans les régions orientales, commencent à se résoudre et, à lire Markovič, permettent de conforter les autorités tchécoslovaques dans la première moitié d'avril.⁶⁷ À le lire, certains segments de la population, «*ceux pour qui le patrimoine et la sécurité personnelle sont plus importants que l'intégrité du royaume de Hongrie*», jusqu'alors plutôt hostiles aux autorités tchécoslovaques, sont désormais inquiets de la révolution hongroise et le rapport de la population aux autorités tchécoslovaques globalement meilleur.⁶⁸ D'une manière générale, l'attitude de la population à l'égard des autorités civiles semble effectivement plus favorable aux autorités tchécoslovaques,⁶⁹ même si dans certaines régions, y compris occidentales comme à Nitra,⁷⁰ les tensions persistent et inquiètent.

Sur le plan politique, Markovič estime que les préventions du SNS, et plus précisément celles du «groupe de Martin», ont été levées courant février lorsque les grèves avaient montré l'importance du personnel tchèque pour administrer la Slovaquie.⁷¹

66 Sur l'accord du 18 avril conclu entre l'Italie et la Tchécoslovaquie pour un départ de la mission italienne le 24 mai, voir Miroslav Musil, Antonello Biagini (dir.), Milan Rastislav Štefánik vo svetle talianskych archívov, Bratislava, Nadácia pre záchranu kultúrneho dedičstva, 2011, doc.43a à 44d, p.78-85. Voir également Frédéric Guelton, Emmanuelle Braud, Michal Kšiňan (dir.), La Mémoire conservée du général Milan Rastislav Štefánik, Paris, SHD, 2008, doc. 141-144, p. 212-215.

67 Lettre de Markovič à Beneš, 15 avril 1919 (inv. č. 20, précitée).

68 Voir par exemple, Lettre de Markovič à Beneš, 7 avril 1919 (inv. č. 18, précitée). Masaryk fait part à Beneš de la même appréciation dans une lettre du 5 avril : «*Le bolchevisme hongrois nous a beaucoup aidé en Slovaquie : de nombreux Hongrois et Magyars nous voient en nous leur salut.*» (in ŠOLLE, ref. 1, doc. 36, p. 204). Voir également Markovič à Beneš, 15 avril 1919 (inv. č. 20, précitée) et l'analyse identique dans le *Slovenský denník*: JANŠÁK, Štefan. Verejné práce na Slovensku. (Les Travaux publics en Slovaquie.). In SD, 8 avril 1919 et surtout; Minister Šrobár precestuje... . (Le Ministre Šrobár se déplace...). In SD, 11 avril 1919.

69 Dans le même sens, au sujet de l'attitude de la population, voir le rapport hebdomadaire du commandement de la place de Bratislava pour la semaine du 7 au 13 avril 1919 (VHÚ, BA, ZVV Košice, presidium 1919, carton 4, inv. č. 1221); de même à Lučenec (Rapport de situation du commandement de la garnison pour la troisième semaine d'avril, même fond, inv. č. 1265) ou à Banská Bystrica (Rapport de situation daté du 27 avril, même fond, inv. č. 1363).

70 Pour le cas de Nitra, voir en particulier MNO à ZVV Košice, 18 avril 1919, 10743/11 (VHÚ, BA, ZVV Košice, presidium 1919, carton 4, inv.č.1252) et Rapport d'Igor Hrušovský, Žilina, 26 mars 1919 (SNA, BA, of. V. Šrobár, carton 10, inv. č. 619).

71 Lettre de Markovič à Beneš, 23 février 1919 (inv. č. 10 précitée). Quelques jours plus tard, Markovič développe ce sujet récurrent dans la correspondance : «*Je ferais encore remarquer que dans les rangs de l'intelligentsia slovaque patriotique, on ne peut pas parler de séparatistes; Seuls quelques individus sont furieux de ne pas avoir obtenus quelque poste "élevé" auquel ils aspiraient. Ceux-là tiennent des discours selon lesquels "les Tchèques nous mettent de côté", mais il n'y a pas de quoi se pendre [sic]. L'intelligentsia slovaque patriotique en général voit bien qu'il n'est possible de conduire et de tenir la Slovaquie que dans la plus étroite collaboration possible avec les Tchèques.*» (Lettre du 6 mars 1919, inv. č. 12, précitée.)

Malgré le problème récurrent posé par les catholiques, Markovič se félicite de l'attitude de la social-démocratie en des termes qui indiquent en creux la précarité de la situation: «*Nos socialistes sont bien. Ils comprennent la situation au point qu'eux-mêmes étaient d'accords pour que les manifestations du 1^{er} mai ne soient pas autorisées en Slovaquie.*»⁷²

Malgré ces progrès, Markovič exprime son inquiétude lorsqu'il s'agit d'évoquer les effets des problèmes matériels⁷³ ou la situation stratégique de la Slovaquie avant comme après l'arrivée au pouvoir de Béla Kun en Hongrie. Dans sa lettre du 13 mars, il soulignait déjà la perméabilité de la population à la propagande hongroise: «*Les Hongrois font toujours comme s'il n'y avait aucun doute sur le maintien de l'intégrité territoriale du royaume. Cela se voit dans plusieurs de leurs décisions et dans la petite musique que joue leur presse et leurs agitateurs. Et les masses sont totalement intoxiquées par ce haschisch.*»⁷⁴ Moins de deux semaines plus tard, tout en évoquant une situation plus calme, il signale que «*ce calme n'est pas de ceux qui ne peuvent pas, par endroits, se transformer en rébellion si nous montrions une main insuffisamment ferme et laissons le champ totalement libre à l'agitation. Il y a beaucoup d'éléments subversifs et peu de gens auraient le temps – et s'il l'avait, suffisamment de courage et de capacité – pour contrôler ces éléments. J'insiste sur le fait que la situation est telle qu'elle exige la plus grande attention et la plus grande prudence*»⁷⁵. Dans ce contexte, c'est la situation dans les régions orientales qui retient plus particulièrement son attention, et il fait état des multiples difficultés rencontrées. La situation matérielle y est constamment décrite comme plus défavorable encore que dans d'autres régions. Lorsqu'en mars, les difficultés d'approvisionnement y réapparaissent, alors que la question ruthène n'est pas encore totalement réglée à Paris,⁷⁶ les problèmes s'accumulent. À cette époque, le problème d'approvisionnement se pose plus que dans les premières semaines de l'année, mais il est «*particulièrement aigu dans les régions du Nord et du Nord-est il y a une grande misère. C'est encore plus vrai dans le territoire ruthène qui est, à tous égards, passif. C'est pourquoi Šrobár a demandé aux pays de l'Entente de s'occuper en particulier du ravitaillement du territoire ruthène car il existe un risque de bolchevisme dans la région*»⁷⁷. Après la révolution en Hongrie, et faute de pouvoir exercer un contrôle suffisant,

72 Markovič à Beneš, 15 avril 1919 (inv. č. 20, précitée).

73 «*Il y a pas mal d'insatisfaction dans le peuple. La raison en est le manque de produits alimentaires et d'autres produits de première nécessité, l'insuffisance de travail. Ce manque est décidément un bon moyen d'agitation contre les Tchèques et l'armée qui „affame“ la Slovaquie.*» (Lettre de Markovič à Beneš, 6 mars 1919, inv. č. 12, précitée.)

74 Markovič à Beneš, 13 mars 1919 (inv. č. 14, précitée).

75 Lettre de Markovič à Beneš, Bratislava, 26 mars 1919 (SNA, BA, of. I. Markovič, carton 1, inv. č. 15).

76 Sur la situation de la Ruthénie et des régions orientales de la Slovaquie, voir en particulier ŠVORC, Peter. *Krajinská hranica medzi Slovenskom a Podkarpatskou Rusou (1919 – 1939)*. [La Frontière entre la Slovaquie et la Ruthénie subcarpathique (1919–1939)]. Prešov : Universum, 2003, p. 131-148. ISBN 80-89046-16-9.

77 Markovič à Beneš, 13 mars 1919 (inv. č. 14, précitée). Markovič souligne d'ailleurs à cette occasion que la question administrative est plus complexe encore en Ruthénie qu'en Slovaquie car «*il faut considérer que les Ruthènes disposent d'encore moins de gens fiables et capables que nous*». Ce problème traverse la période, voir par exemple le rapport du préfet Moyš sur la situation dans le comitat d'Oujhorod début mai: «*Jusqu'à présent, nous sommes contraints de diriger l'administration, la justice, etc. avec des fonc-*

il devient plus aigu. Fin avril, dans un rapport sur la situation dans les régions orientales (25 avril), il est fait état d'une prise croissante de la propagande hongroise sur la population qui vit dans le plus grand dénuement dans la région d'Oujhorod et d'un risque de basculement vers le bolchevisme.⁷⁸

Alors que début mars, Markovič, sans doute habitué à des objectifs modestes, estimait que «*la machine fonctionne à peu près*»,⁷⁹ la stabilité de l'autorité tchécoslovaque restait précaire. Progressivement, la fiabilité de certains corps, notamment la police, longtemps douteuse,⁸⁰ s'est améliorée, l'agitation anti-tchèque persiste certes, mais sous des formes moins radicales et resurgira lors du conflit avec la Hongrie, et si le contrôle des chemins de fer et de la poste s'est amélioré depuis le reflux des grèves mi-mars,⁸¹ l'inquiétude que provoque le manque criant de cadres, en particulier dans le domaine judiciaire, pour se substituer à l'ancienne administration reste élevée.⁸² Toutefois, l'amélioration globale de la situation alimentaire dont fait état Markovič au cours du mois d'avril et dans la première partie de mai,⁸³ contribue à renforcer l'autorité des autorités civiles tchécoslovaques. C'est dans ce contexte –qui reste instable – que l'ordre de concentrer des forces en vue de l'occupation de la nouvelle ligne de démarcation et donné par le ministre Klofáč le 7 avril. Cette préparation rencontre des difficultés et n'est achevée que le 25 avril. Le 27, Hennocque est chargé d'occuper la Ruthénie. C'est le début de la seconde phase du conflit avec la Hongrie. Hennocque occupe la Ruthénie sans difficultés en utilisant le recul de l'armée hongroise et se trouve au contact de l'armée roumaine en quelques jours. Dans la zone de Miskolc, la 6e division du général Rossi occupe l'ensemble de la ligne de démarcation le 10 mai. Mais la contre-attaque hongroise met à jour la baisse sensible du moral et le manque de combativité de l'armée tchécoslovaque. Le 27 mai, les Tchécoslovaques sont revenus sur leurs positions de la fin du mois d'avril.⁸⁴ Cette phase du conflit a permis d'identifier les fragilités de l'armée tchécoslovaque. Elle manque de moyens de transport et de communications, elle est mal ravitaillée et mal équipée, affaiblie par une faible discipline⁸⁵ et la défiance qui s'exprime ouvertement à l'égard des

tionnaires de l'ancien régime dans la mesure où il est préférable d'avoir de mauvais fonctionnaires plutôt qu'aucun.» (VHÚ, BA, ZVV Košice, presidium 1919, carton 4, inv. č. 1496.) Pour les souvenirs du préfet Moyš, voir Ladislav A. Moyš: Jeho účinkovanie počas vojny, počas prevratu a po prevrate. (Ladislav A. Moyš: son activité au cours de la guerre, pendant et après la révolution.). SNA, BA, of. V. Šrobár, carton 26, inv. č. 1096).

78 Dans le même sens, voir le rapport du Commandement de la garnison d'Oujhorod pur la semaine du 7 au 13 avril, VHÚ, BA, ZVV Košice, presidium 1919, carton 4, inv. č. 1222.

79 Lettre de Markovič à Beneš, 6 mars 1919 (inv. č. 12, précitée).

80 Lettre de Markovič à Beneš, 23 février 1919 (inv. č. 10, précitée).

81 Voir pour la période de crise en particulier Markovič à Beneš, 13 mars 1919 (inv. č. 14, précitée) et, pour un satisfecit accordé à la situation dans les chemins de fer, Markovič à Beneš, 15 avril 1919 (inv. č. 20, précitée).

82 Markovič à Beneš, 15 avril 1919 (inv. č. 20, précitée).

83 Markovič à Beneš, Prague, 10 mai 1919 (SNA, BA, of. I. Markovič, carton 1, inv. č. 22).

84 HRONSKÝ, Marián. Priebeh vojenského konfliktu čsr. s Maďarskom v roku 1919. (Le Déroulement du conflit militaire de la Tchécoslovaquie avec la Hongrie en 1919.). In *Historický časopis*, 1993, 41^e année, n° 5-6, p. 607-614.

85 MEDVECKÝ, Karel Anton. *Slovenský prevrat, Sv. III.* (La Révolution slovaque. Vol. III.). Trnava : Spoloč Sv. Vojtech, 1930, p. 225-226.

officiers italiens. Le 27 mai, le général Mittelhauser prend le commandement de l'armée tchécoslovaque en Slovaquie. Trois jours plus tôt, au moment des combats les plus durs du secteur Miskolc-Salgotarjan, Klofáč a mis fin à la mission militaire italienne qui doit être effective au 1er juin.⁸⁶ L'armée tchécoslovaque se trouve alors en grande difficulté pendant plusieurs jours, le territoire dans une situation chaotique où réapparaissent les faiblesses structurelles des autorités civiles en Slovaquie.

„DIE SITUATION IST NOCH NICHT KRITISCH...“
DIE SCHWIERIGKEITEN BEI DER ÜBERNAHME DER KONTROLLE
IN DER SLOWAKEI BELEUCHTET ANHAND DER KORRESPONDENZ
MARKOVIČ – BENEŠ – ŠROBÁR (FEBRUAR–MAI 1919)

ÉTIENNE BOISSERIE

Diese Studie untersucht die Situation in der Slowakei im ersten Jahresdrittel 1919. Sie stützt sich dabei vor allem auf die Briefe, die Ivan Markovič an Edvard Beneš, den tschechoslowakischen Außenminister, der sich zur Friedenskonferenz in Paris aufhielt, und an Vavro Šrobár, den slowakischen Gesandten in Bratislava, adressierte.

Der Autor legt den Fokus unter Einbezug dreier zentraler Punkte auf jenen Teil, der dem slowakischen Kontext der Zeit gewidmet ist. Der erste dieser Punkte ist die tatsächliche Übernahme der zivilen Verwaltung und die damit verbundenen Schwierigkeiten, es folgen, zweitens, das Zusammenspiel von ziviler Macht in der Tschechoslowakei und der italienischen Militärführung in der Slowakei und schließlich, drittens, die politischen Probleme, die sowohl aufgrund der Vorbehalte bestimmter Teile der Bevölkerung gegenüber den neuen Autoritäten wie auch durch die, besonders durch katholische slowakische Organisationen geführte politische Unruhe, auftraten. Diese drei wichtigen Aspekte werden dabei in den Kontext der Unsicherheit im Bezug auf die schlussendlichen Grenzen zwischen der Tschechoslowakei und Ungarn, die dazu beiträgt, die strukturellen Schwächen der tschechoslowakischen Führung in der Slowakei zu verstärken, gestellt.

Die Korrespondenz Ivan Markovičs bezeugt einerseits eine Besserung in einigen Bereichen, besonders eine Veränderung in der Haltung eines Teils der Bevölkerung nachdem Béla Kun in Ungarn an die Macht kam, aber andererseits auch bleibende Schwierigkeiten. Gegen Ende des Monats April und zu Beginn des Monats Mai tritt die neue militärische Krise vor einem unverändert instabilen Hintergrund auf.

Étienne Boissérie, Maître de conférences HDR/Assistant Professor
Institut national des langues et civilisations orientales (Inalco), Paris
Centre de recherche Europe-Eurasie (CREE)
65, rue des Grands-Moulins, 75013 Paris (F)
etienne.boissérie@inalco.fr

86 VĚHŮ, Trnava, f. ZVV Bratislava, 1919, Presidium, carton 5, prez. No. 1980, S. 215-1/7.

THE TRIPARTITE COMMISSION AND THE CZECHOSLOVAK MONETARY GOLD

SLAVOMÍR MICHÁLEK

MICHÁLEK, Slavomír. The Tripartite Commission and the Czechoslovak monetary gold. *Historický časopis*, 2017, 65, 5, pp. 895-929, Bratislava.

The study considers questions related to the functioning of the Tripartite Commission for the Restitution of Gold Reserves created by France, the USA and Great Britain in 1946. Its role was to verify and distribute the gold reserves of 10 European countries stolen by Germany during the Second World War. One of the recipients was Czechoslovakia, which lost more than 45 tons of gold reserves in 1939–1940. The study is directed towards the marathon of talks between the commission and Czechoslovakia in the period 1947–1952, which finally led to recognition of the Czechoslovak claim to a share of the gold. However, this was blocked by pressure from the USA and it was eventually physically returned only in 1982. Key words: Tripartite Commission for the Restitution of Monetary Gold. Monetary Gold of Czechoslovakia. Illegal transfer to the Reichsbank. National Bank of Czechoslovakia. Slovak National Bank.

Gold. A phenomenon of world trade and a commodity people do not like to sell. They would much rather buy it. It was often a moving force in the history of states and nations. It was similar with Czechoslovakia's gold, the so-called golden treasure of the republic. Its troubled history began on the eve of the Second World War and continued for decades. It was stolen by the Nazis, found after the war and blocked by the Americans. It only returned to Prague via Switzerland in 1982.

To explain the whole situation on the level of international development and relations, let us turn to some findings, results or facts from the Paris Reparations Conference, which led to the signing of the *Agreement on German reparations, on establishing an Inter-Allied Reparations Office and returning gold reserves*. The third part of this agreement, signed on 21 December 1945, formulated the question of the return of gold in one article and seven points. The whole reparations agreement became effective on 24 January 1946. Czechoslovakia accepted it with the agreement of the provisional National Assembly on 30 January 1946 and it was signed in the name of Czechoslovakia by the Ambassador in Paris Jiří Nosek on 27 February 1946. President Edvard Beneš and foreign minister Jan Masaryk also approved it on 17 May 1946.

The *Tripartite Commission for the Restitution of Monetary Gold* was established on 27 September 1946 by the United States of America, Great Britain and France. The press reports from that day report that it was established to implement of the third part of the Paris agreement on German reparations, namely to secure the restitution of stolen or extorted gold reserves to the Allied nations attacked by Germany in the course of the war. They also reported that it was concerned with gold found in the salt mines at Merkers and gold "which could be proved to have been transferred to another country in the

course of the war in Germany. It is still not clear how much gold will be available for distribution, but it appears that its value could exceed several hundred million dollars."¹ Delegates from the Inter-Allied Reparations Office in Brussels: Russel H. Dorr for the USA, Desmond Morton K.C.B., C.M.G., M.C. for the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Jacques Rueff for France, were appointed as members of the commission. On the basis of the Paris Agreement on Reparations, gold had to be returned to robbed countries in a quantity proportionate to the loss of each country without regard for whether the returned gold could be identified as the gold that was taken. According to press reports, this deviation from the principles applied in the case of other types of property found in Germany was because the Germans had arbitrarily melted looted gold or otherwise destroyed its identifying marks, and because not all stolen gold had been found. Therefore, the commission considered it unjust that one state should have an advantage over others, because the Germans had accidentally or deliberately neglected to destroy the original identifying marks of the looted gold.

According to the above mentioned press report, the first task of the Tripartite Gold Commission (TGC) would be to collect details on the losses of the countries from which Germany had taken gold. On this basis, the TGC would determine the share states could claim. According to rough estimates, the total value of the stolen gold reserves was about 700 million USD.²

According to the statute of the TGC, its languages of discussion were English and French. Brussels was chosen as the seat of the commission and it was supposed to operate independently of the Inter Allied Reparation Agency (IARA). The commission was authorized to talk to delegates accredited to the IARA. The statute also formulated the basic tasks of the Tripartite Commission³

1. To request from governments applying the right to participate in the distribution of gold reserves found in Germany or returned from third countries to which the Germans sent it, claims for the restitution of gold stolen or illegally transferred to Germany, documented by detailed and trust-worthy data concerning these losses.
2. To study these claims in detail and determine the share to be received by each government from the gold reserves to be restituted on the basis of the third part of the Paris Agreement on reparations and all other relevant agreements.
3. To announce by an appropriate time the total value of the monetary gold available for distribution as restitution.
4. After receiving and deciding all the claims to restitution, to inform each state with a claim to a share of the gold, how much gold it would receive as restitution.
5. To apply all other methods set by the three governments forming the commission to assist in the distribution of the gold reserves assigned to be restituted.

1 Archív Ministerstva zahraničných vecí Českej republiky (Archive of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic) (AMZVČR), f. Medzinárodno-právny odbor (International Legal Department) (MPO), Dokumenty k otázke československého menového zlata, diel I., (Documents on the question of the Czechoslovak monetary gold, part I) 1946–1948, Tlačové prehlásenie o ustanovení Tripartitnej komisie pre reštitúciu menového zlata z 27. septembra 1946, (Press release on the establishment of the Tripartite Commission for the Restitution of Monetary Gold from 27 September 1946)..

2 AMZV ČR, ref. 1.

6. To carry out the administrative actions necessary for the implementation of the already mentioned tasks without limitation to the general nature of the above, as well as opening and maintaining bank accounts and concluding agreements on provision of necessary services. The expenses of the commission in connection with performing its tasks will be the first charge on the gold reserves that have to be distributed.³

The first official document, which the *Tripartite Commission for the Restitution of Monetary Gold* addressed to Czechoslovakia or to the Czechoslovak delegate to the IARA, dates from 13 March 1947. It not only clarified or explained the basic constants of the work of the commission, but also had the form of an invitation with instructions on how to proceed with a request for the return of gold reserves. Its informative part mapped the basic aims of the work of the commission in accordance with the official announcement from September 1946, namely why it had been established, what was its aim, where was it based, who formed it and so on. The document also explained the expression “*losses caused by theft from the side of Germany or illegal transfer to that country*”, to which the Tripartite Gold Commission appealed. This flowed in general from the *Declaration of the United Nations* from 5 January 1943 concerning the acts of expropriation of members of the Axis, and from *Declaration of the United Nations on gold* from 22 February 1944 and the *Resolution of the VI concluding protocol of the Monetary and Finance Conference of the United Nations* from 22 July 1944.

In connection with the submission of a request for the return of looted gold, the commission adopted the following definition: “*All gold that formed part of the currency reserves of the applicant state at the moment it was stolen or illegally transferred, whether it was in the accounts of the applicant state or the accounts of the applicant government or in the accounts of the central bank of the applicant state, or in another financial institution in its territory or abroad.*”⁴ As a result of this, the members of the Tripartite Gold Commission asked the Czechoslovak government to provide detailed and verifiable information about the losses of gold reserves as defined and as experienced by the Czechoslovak state after 12 March 1938. The application for gold had to be formulated by the Czechoslovak government, central bank or other financial institution of the Czechoslovak Republic. The commission also observed that it had no mandate to consider an application submitted by a government in the name of another government or for the account of a central bank or other financial institution of another country. In an effort to give the restitutions the necessary legal basis, the Tripartite Gold Commission required that this documentation was submitted in the form of an official declaration of the Czechoslovak government with signatures and confirmations from the appropriate offices. To facilitate and accelerate its activities, the commission proposed that the documentation produced by countries requesting the return of gold should be produced

3 AMZV ČR, f. MPO, Dokumenty k otázke.... Statute of the Tripartite Commission. Two supplementary concluding articles of the statute stated that the decisions of the commission would be taken by unanimous agreement of its members and that the text of the statutes would be published in the *London Gazette*, *Department of State Bulletin* and the *Journal Officiel de la Republique Francaise*.

4 AMZV ČR, f. MPO, Dokumenty k otázke..., diel I., 1946-1948, document from 13 March 1947, p. 26-27.

in a unified way. The commission had to study the documents and perhaps ask for new supplementary documents. The range of requested information included:

- Movements of gold as a result of theft by Germany or illegal transfers to that country;
- Return of gold that had been under the control of Germany or one of its allies;
- All other transfers of gold reserves during the period of hostilities.⁵

The Tripartite Gold Commission stated that the demand for such extensive documentation was necessary for the consistent reconstruction of the movement of gold from its theft to its later place of storage and its direct or indirect return. Governments, including that of Czechoslovakia, had to submit to the commission 12 copies of verified translations of the documents, 6 in English, 6 in French. The deadline was set as 30 April 1947.

After the first official request of the commission continual exchange of correspondence began between it and the authorized Czechoslovak representative – the delegate to the IARA, and between him and the Czechoslovak government.⁶ However, in this period none of the interested parties thought that the return of the Czechoslovak gold reserves would be a long-term process.

The marathon of talks and written dialogue between the Czechoslovak government and the *Tripartite Commission for the Restitution of Monetary Gold* with the aim of solving the return of gold began with the Czechoslovak delegate to the IARA Celestýn Šimr sending a letter on 30 April 1947. In this document the Czechoslovak Republic officially requested the return of the gold. In another letter from 28 May 1947, Šimr gave the commission some photocopies of records of the National Bank of Czechoslovakia in English and French. These proved the ownership of the gold. The American commissioner in the Tripartite Gold Commission Russel H. Dorr agreed that the Czechoslovak side could submit unsigned copies of documents and supplements with the promise that the signatures would soon be secured.⁷ The Czechoslovak side justified the delay in sending the signed documents by technical problems. However, the Czechoslovak documents were not only unsigned but also incomplete, as the general secretary of the Tripartite Gold Commission Michal Hirigoyen pointed out to Šimr on 10 July 1947, with the addition that in these conditions, it would not be possible to investigate the Czechoslovak request, or that the commission could not determine Czechoslovakia's percentage of the gold to be restituted.⁸ The commission reacted on two levels to the Czechoslovak reply of 5 August 1947, which actually filled in the commission's "gold" questionnaire. On 11 August 1947, the commission already asked the Czechoslovak government for assurances that it would not submit any further requests for gold. At the same time, the commission stated that it would not consider any claims submitted after 15 September 1947.

The second level of the response of the Tripartite Gold Commission was the request of its secretary M. Hirigoyen from 6 October 1947 for further relevant documents and

5 AMZV ČR, ref. 1, p. 28-29.

6 The Czechoslovak delegate to the IARA and authorized representative of the Czechoslovak Republic with the *Tripartite Commission for the Restitution of Monetary Gold* was Celestýn Šimr.

7 AMZV ČR, ref. 1, Dokumenty k..., p. 41, č.m. 936/47/IARA.

8 AMZV ČR, ref. 1, Dokumenty k..., p. 43, letter from M. Hirigoyen to C. Šimr from 10 July 1947.

evidence connected with various types of looted Czechoslovak gold. The commission asked for supplementary documents concerning the Czechoslovak claim to 6 375.8588 kg of pure gold in coins, which were in the possession of the National Bank and were taken by the Reichsbank on 12 June 1940. This meant the following documents and evidence:

1. Evidence of ownership and photocopies of the balances and books of the National Bank, which would indicate that these coins appeared in the bank's accounts as its property;
2. Evidence of illegitimate transfer – photographic copies of the protocol from 12 June 1940, which would indicate that the coins were taken by the Berlin Reichsbank.

At the same time, the Tripartite Gold Commission asked that if possible, photocopies of translations of testimony of representatives of the National Bank, who received an oral order that the coins had to be handed over to the Reichsbank, in addition photographs and translations of the report on the loan provided by the Reichsbank, when these gold coins were deposited in the “*Depositum Regulare*” account. The commission described submission of the photocopies and translations of the protocol from 12 June 1940 as the most important and urgent.⁹

The Czechoslovak side replied to the request of the Tripartite Gold Commission of 30 October 1947 with a detailed analysis of the situation, namely evidence of ownership and of forced transfer. This was supplemented with copies of relevant documents and their translations.

Among the evidence of ownership, the Czechoslovak side submitted a photocopy of the balance of the National Bank up to 31 December 1940. Cash in gold with a value of 1 446 990 103.85 crowns was mentioned as the first item in the balance. Details concerning this item were mentioned in the account “Purchase and sale of gold” recorded up to 31 December 1940. One of the items was “gold coins – Berlin depot” with a statement of the pure gold weight of the coins as 6 380.90170 kg. The difference of 1.338 kg resulted from the National Bank following accounting rules according to which a hidden reserve of one promile was always counted when making gold payments. Thus 6 380.90170 kg

9 AMZV ČR, ref. 1, Dokumenty k..., p. 49, letter from the commission from 6 October 1947, crom 113. In a letter from 29 October Šimr informed the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Prague that the commission was fully aware of the importance of returning gold to the afflicted countries in the current economic situation. It would not delay releasing the gold until all the applications were decided. At the same time, he informed the Prague centre that up to 15 September 1947 the commission had received applications for the return of gold from Albania, Austria, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Poland and Yugoslavia. On the basis of the completeness of the requested documents, the commission immediately decided to grant the following amounts of gold from the pool to the following countries: Belgium 90 649,8374 kg, Luxembourg 1 929,4999 kg and the Netherlands 35 890,5740 kg. It decreed further delay for Austria as a former ally of Germany 26 187,2639 kg of gold, for Italy, another former ally of Germany 3 805,3182 kg of gold. This preliminary division was supplemented by the assurance that when calculating the shares, the commission remembered to keep a reserve to satisfy still unconsidered applications. In: AMZV ČR, ref. 1, letter from C. Šimra from 29 October 1947, referring to the letter from the commission from 16 October 1947, addressed to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, no. m. 1819/47/IARA.

with the deduction of one promile of hidden reserve 6.38090 kg made 6 374.52080 kg, which was recorded in the balance up to 31 December 1940.

After officially receiving it, the Germans took the gold to Berlin on 12 June 1940. On this occasion it was necessary to consider the Czechoslovak hidden reserve. According to the attached records of the Reichsbank (RB), 6 375.8546 kg of pure gold was actually transferred.

When the National Bank received back its numismatic collection with a weight of 14.3719 kg of gold, and the National Bank had to replace it by sending other coins weighing 14.3761 kg to Berlin, the amount was increased by 0.0042 kg of pure gold. Thus the actual weight of the coins held by the RB in the “Depositum Regulare” account and reclaimed by the National Bank of Czecho-Slovakia (NBC-S) was 6 375.8588 kg of pure gold, and after the whole period of the occupation until after the liberation, this amount was held in cash in the gold of the NBC-S.

Photocopies and translations of the *Protocol* from 12 June 1940 were produced as evidence of the illegal transfer of these coins. Concerning the testimony of the representatives of the National Bank, who received the oral order to hand over the coins to the Reichsbank, the Czechoslovak side mentioned a document from 10 June 1940 issued by the Reichsprotector of Bohemia and Moravia no. II/1-12.500/40, which had the following content:

“The Reichsprotector of Bohemia and Moravia. II./1-12.500/40, Prague, 10 June 1940.

*To Mr. Prime Minister,
Prague.*

With regard to serious events with far-reaching consequences, which led to the arrest of department director Sadilek and one of the chief controllers at the National Bank for Bohemia and Moravia, it is essential to transfer the gold reserves deposited in the National Bank into the safe keeping of the German Reichsbank in Berlin.

I have asked the German Reichsbank to immediately carry out the transfer [of the gold], and I ask that the National Bank be informed of this.

Neurath.”¹⁰

The Czechoslovak side informed the commission that it could not find out when the National Bank was informed of the content of this order. The employees of the RB received the consignment of gold mentioned in this letter, on the basis of an oral order

10 The original document: “Der Reichsprotector in Böhmen und Mähren. II./1-12.500/40, Prag, den 10. juni 1940.

Au den Herrn Ministerpräsidenten
Prag.

Mit Rücksicht auf die schwerwiegenden Vorkommnisse, die zu der Verhaftung des Abteilungsdirectors Sadilek und eines Oberkontrollors bei die Nationalbank für Böhmen und Mähren geführt haben, ist die Verbringung des bei der Nationalbank liegenden Goldbestandes in den Gewahrsam der Deutschen Reichsbank in Berlin erforderlich.

Ich habe die Deutsche Reichsbank aufgefordert die Ueberführung alsbald vormmehmen, und bitte die Nationalbank entsprechend zu verständigen.

Neurath”.

AMZV ČR, f. MPO, Dokumenty k..., p. 57, letter from C. Šimr to the Tripartite Commission from 30 October 1947, no. m. 1654/47.

from the deceased Dr. Friedrich Müller, a high official of the Reichsbank and representative of the interests of the RB in relation to the National Bank. His official title was “Der Sonderbeauftragte der Deutschen Reichsbank bei der Nationalbank für Böhmen und Mähren“. The Czechoslovak side also added a photocopy record of the taking of this decision, prepared by the Reichsbank and addressed to its “Sonderbeauftragte”, as well as a photocopy of the letter by which this record was sent to the National Bank.¹¹

The marathon of requests from the Tripartite Gold Commission to the Czechoslovak government continued. On 12 November 1947, the secretary of the commission M. Hirigoyen informed Celestýn Šimr that the commission was actively studying the submitted Czechoslovak materials, and that there were some problems in the study of these documents, which would be the subject of further requests from the commission in the immediate future. He also informed Šimr that the commission would soon need documents and explanations about the gold administered by the Škoda enterprises and by Zbrojovka, as well as documents about the gold administered by the Bank of England (BOE) under the sub-account of the Swiss Bank for International Settlements (BIS). The commission requested the submission of photocopies and translations of:

- agreements concluded between the NBC-S and Škoda enterprises, entrusting the administration of this gold to the Škoda enterprises within the limits of the autonomy granted to them by the National Bank;
- records and balances of the NBC-S in which the gold administered by Škoda enterprises is recorded as the property of the National Bank before July 1940;
- credit notifications by which the National Bank notified Škoda enterprises of the payment of crown equivalents for transferred gold;
- records of the National Bank covering operations connected with the transfer of this gold to the Reichsbank;
- notifications sent from the National Bank to the Reichsbank for the purpose of notification of this transfer, as well as the confirmation from the RB that it had received this gold. The commission also requested testimony from important personalities of the National Bank, that they had received an explicit order to transfer the gold;
- all memoranda and reports written about this matter.

In connection with the gold administered by the BOE under the sub-account of the BIS, the Tripartite Commission requested testimony from the important persons at the NBC-S, who received the explicit order to transfer gold to the Reichsbank. It also requested photocopies and translations of all the memoranda and reports written on this matter, as well as photocopies and translations of letters sent:

- by the National Bank to the Bank for International Settlements from 18 March 1939 giving orders for transfers to the account of the Reichsbank;
- by the Bank for International Settlements to the National Bank from 24 March 1939 informing the NBC-S
- by the Reichsbank to the National Bank from 12 June 1939, informing the National Bank to transfer the corresponding amount of gold to the “Sonderlagerung” account.¹²

11 AMZV ČR, ref. 1, p. 58.

12 AMZV ČR, ref. 1, p. 62-63, letter from M. Hirigoyen to C. Šimr from 12 November 1947.

The *Tripartite Commission for the Restitution of Monetary Gold* sent further requests for documents concerning Czechoslovak gold on 8 and 11 December. The letter from 8 December asked for the quickest possible submission of documents and explanations concerning the gold requested by the Germans to cover the Czechoslovak paper money withdrawn from circulation in the Sudetenland. It again requested evidence that the NBC-S actually owned the gold, as well as facts about its illegal transfer. Therefore, the commission requested photocopies and translations of the balances and account books of the NBC-S. At the same time, it asked the Czechoslovak government for an official declaration that the records it had sent of gold ingots from the so-called Sudeten gold represented accurate information about the ingots deposited in the Bank for International Settlements and Swiss National Bank, but later transferred to the Reichsbank. The commission also requested photocopies and translations of documents that could prove that the National Bank was ordered to transfer gold to the RB under pressure from the German authorities. The commission also had an interest in the text and translations of telegrams by which the NBC-S gave the Bank for International Settlements and Swiss National Bank instructions on the transfer. The commission also asked for additional photocopies and translations of information about the implementation of these orders, sent to the National Bank of Czecho-Slovakia by the Swiss National Bank and the Bank for International Settlements, as well as photocopies and translations of the confirmations of receiving the gold from the Reichsbank.¹³

The second of these letters from the Tripartite Gold Commission, that from 11 December 1947, freely continued that from 8 December 1947. This time, however, the commission was concerned with Czechoslovak documents on Germany's acquisition of Czechoslovak gold during the occupation. According to the materials available to the commission, the acquisition of this gold could be divided into three categories. The first was the buying of part of the gold recorded by the Reichsbank for foreign currency – after the transfer of gold held by the BOE – to the “Sonderlagerung” account and transferred under pressure by the National Bank to the Reichsbank. This involved gold recorded by the Reichsbank in the “Separat Depot” account with a total weight of 9 636.06150 kg, from which 718.70210 kg was sold back to the Reichsbank, so that 8 917.35940 kg of gold remained in the account.

The second category was the use of assets of the clearing account “Warenkonto”, by which Czechoslovak gold was recorded by the Reichsbank in the “Depot Gratuit” account to a total of 4 102.5819 kg, from which 1 604.0050 kg was transferred to Switzerland, and a further part was transferred by the Reichsbank to the Slovak National Bank's account at the Swiss National Bank, to an amount of 3 397.77584 kg.

The third category of transfers of gold was represented by the transfer of 1 398.77576 kg by the Reichsbank to Switzerland from domestic extraction and sale by the Slovak National Bank to the Reichsbank.

In an effort to ensure the exact movement of gold in the Czechoslovak case, the Tripartite Gold Commission asked the Czechoslovak side to send copies of all financial operations recorded during the occupation involving the “Sonderlagwerung”, “Separat

13 AMZV ČR, ref. 1, p. 68-69, letter from M. Hirigoyen to C. Šimr from 8 December 1947.

Depot”, “Depot Gratuit” accounts, the “Warenkonto” clearing account and the Slovak National Bank’s account at the Swiss National Bank. At the same time, it asked for answers to seven questions:

1. What quantity of gold is recorded in the “Sonderlagerung” account, which had to be sold to the Reichsbank? What currency and in what amount did the Germans pay for this gold?
2. Why did the Germans allow the National Bank to leave in the “Sonderlagerung” account part of the gold that was transferred to this account, or what happened to the part of the gold that was not sold?
3. Why did the Germans allow the buying back of 9 636 kg, when they had previously demanded the sale of part of this gold?
4. Why was 718 kg of gold later again sold from this 9 636 kg of gold bought back by the National Bank?
5. What happened to the gold recorded in the Reichsbank in the “Separat Depot” account?
6. Has the National Bank again achieved free dealing with the deposits kept in the Swiss National Bank in the name of the former Slovak National Bank?
7. To what degree was German gold acquired in return for the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia or the Slovak Republic providing the government of the Reich with goods or services? According to the Tripartite Gold Commission, this point had to be explained in detail with regard to the operations carried out using the assets in the “Warenkonto” clearing account.¹⁴

The Czechoslovak side replied to the letter of 8 December 1947 from the Tripartite Gold Commission in two stages: the first on 12 January 1948 and the second on 13 February 1948. The reply summarized that the gold in question, that held in the BOE under an account and with the name of the BIS, belonged to the NBCS.

The reply of the Czechoslovak delegate to the IARA Celestýn Šimr to the *Tripartite Commission for the Restitution of Monetary Gold* from 12 January 1948 concentrated on two fields – the so-called autonomous and the so-called British Czechoslovak gold. Šimr’s letter explained that on the basis of government decree no. 46 from 1924 §15, the NBCS gained the right to all the foreign receivables gained from exports of goods or in other ways.¹⁵

To enable the great Czechoslovak consortium to more flexibly administer its foreign receivables, the National Bank granted the joint stock company of the former Škoda works a licence, which allowed it to maintain credit balances in foreign currency accounts opened in its name in foreign banks. This licence was originally issued individu-

14 AMZV ČR, ref. 1, p. 74-75, letter from M. Hirigoyen to C. Šimr from 11 December 1947.

15 Government decree no. 46 from 1924, § 15 stated: “*Payments gained in foreign currency from the exporting or sale of goods or securities, payments for work in Czechoslovakia or pay from abroad and so on (export foreign exchange) should be immediately, as soon as they are received, be submitted by the recipient to the National Bank of Czechoslovakia, either directly or with the mediation of another bank, under the conditions set by the National Bank. On receiving an official request, the creditor is obliged to prove that he did everything necessary to ensure that his foreign debtor paid the debt without delay.*”

ally for different foreign states or different foreign currency institutions. However, on 31 August 1932 this joint stock company received a general licence of which a copy with translations into English and French was sent to the Tripartite Gold Commission. On the basis of these licences, firms carried out arbitrage with foreign currencies or with these currencies and gold on the basis of prior authorization by telephone from the director of the foreign currency department of the NBCS. The firm was responsible for reporting to the National Bank of Czechoslovakia the state of its foreign receivables three times each month (every 10 days). The procedure or proof of the fact that the foreign currency administered by so-called autonomous firms was always considered the property of the National Bank clearly flowed from the letter sent on 15 October 1941 from the National Bank to the joint stock company of the former Škoda works. It contained details concerning the above mentioned practice, current since 1932. The Czechoslovak side sent photocopies and translations of this letter to the Tripartite Gold Commission.¹⁶ In a letter to the Tripartite Gold Commission, Šimr also stated that 81 gold ingots with a total weight of 1 020.76713 kg were then abroad stored for the joint stock company of the former Škoda works or for the Czechoslovak Zbrojovka in Brno, until these ingots had to be transferred or sent to Berlin according to an orally given order from a representative of the Reichsbank to the National Bank. Therefore, there was no record of these ingots in the books of the National Bank up to July 1940.

The above mentioned 81 gold ingots were recorded in the books of the National Bank of Czecho-Slovakia only when the National Bank became their owner on 31 August 1940. These photocopies formed a supplement to this letter. They include photocopies and translations of a letter from the National Bank from 20 August 1940 sent to the joint stock company of the former Škoda works, and photocopies of deduction records, which served as account documents. The books of the National Bank record this gold in an account named: "Transitional accounting of assets abroad".

The Czechoslovak "autonomous" gold was sent to the Reichsbank after its representative intervened at the National Bank. Other gold that was still in Prague in 1940 was sent at the same time. On this matter, the National Bank appealed to a letter, which the Reichs Protector sent to the prime minister on 10 June 1940. The Czechoslovak side sent a photocopy of this letter to the Tripartite Gold Commission on 30 October 1947. The gold was packed by the National Bank and delivered to the RB personally by Erich Šturn, a former German director of the National Bank, and Josef Jenček an employee of the bank. The written record of the consignment did not exist because E. Šturn informed the Reichsbank by telegram. However, the archives of the National Bank have a confirmation of receipt of the gold sent by the Reichsbank. A copy and translations of it were included as a supplement to this letter. The Czechoslovak side also added to the letter translations of the declaration of the employees of the National Bank, who carried out the manipulation of this consignment of gold.

The second part of the Czechoslovak letter to the Tripartite Commission was directed towards the gold held by the BOE under the sub-account BIS. On this matter, the

16 AMZV ČR, f. MPO, Dokumenty k ..., p. 80-81, letter from C. Šimr to M. Hirigoyen from 12 January 1948, no. 81/48.

Czechoslovak side added a copy and translations of the letter from the NBC-S from 18 March 1939 addressed to the Bank for International Settlements and containing a request for the transfer of gold held by this bank from the account of the NBC-S at the Bank of England in London to the Reichsbank. They also added translations of a letter from 24 March 1939 addressed to the National Bank containing notification about implementation of the order. The Reichsbank confirmed receiving this gold on 12 June 1939 by letter no. II.a14995. The order to transfer the Czechoslovak “British” gold was signed by the general director of the NBCS František Peroutka and the director of the foreign currency department of the NBCS Josef Malík. The content of a letter from Josef Malík sent to the president of the BIS in Basel on 13 October 1939 after Malík’s escape to Paris, confirmed that both acted under pressure. This letter and the reply from 29 October 1939 by the president of the BIS confirming its receipt formed part of the supplements.¹⁷

The letter from C. Šimr of 3 February 1948, actually a second part of the Czechoslovak reply to the letter from the Tripartite Gold Commission of 8 December 1947, concentrated on the provision of further evidence that the gold in question was the property of the NBCS and that its transfer was illegal. The submitted evidence included photocopies of extracts from the account books of the NBCS containing detailed information about the gold, which belonged to this bank and about its transfer to the Reichsbank. This concerned gold deposited in the BIS, namely 125 ingots with a total weight of 1 486.35684 of pure gold (marks and numbers DO 235-1A), located in Bern, and 47 gold ingots with 579.83230 kg of pure gold (marks and numbers 3678-6424), located in Brussels. There was also gold deposited in the Swiss National Bank, namely 921 ingots with a weight of 11 218.26636 kg of pure gold (marks and numbers 496-515-4204). The letter was supplemented by a photocopy and translation of a declaration from the minister of finance of the Czechoslovak Republic, stating that the information given was correct. On the subject of the illegality of the transfer of gold, C. Šimr stated that the transfer was one of the direct consequences of Munich. The Reichsbank requested the transfer of gold on the pretext that it was part of the gold backing the Czechoslovak banknotes circulating in the Sudetenland, which had been occupied by the German army on the basis of that agreement. According to the Czechoslovak side, this act by itself was sufficient proof that the transfer was done under pressure.

J. Malík and the representative of the general director of the National Bank V. Veněk represented the Czechoslovak side in talks on the transfer of gold in Berlin. Both were dead by 1948, so they could not give personal testimony to the Tripartite Commission. Therefore, the National Bank or the Czechoslovak side asked the Tripartite Commission to accept the above mentioned correspondence between Malík and the president of the BIS from 13 and 29 October 1939 as evidence of the illegal transfer of gold.¹⁸

The Czechoslovak delegate to the IARA submitted the second Czechoslovak reply to the requests and questions of the Tripartite Gold Commission from 11 December 1947 on 16 February 1948. This extensive document was composed of an analysis of Czecho-

17 AMZV ČR, f. MPO, Dokumenty k..., p. 83-84.

18 AMZV ČR, f. MPO, Dokumenty k..., p. 94-96, letter from C. Šimr to the Tripartite Commission from 3 February 1948, no. 265/48H/Št.

slovak “German” gold acquired during the occupation and its depositing in various accounts at the Reichsbank, and answers to the seven questions cited above.

The “Sonderlagerung” account was opened on 15 May 1939 with a record of 1 845 gold ingots with a total weight of 23 087.30400 kg of pure gold. The Czechoslovak side stated the details concerning the transfer of this gold to the Reichsbank in a letter to the commission from 12 January 1948. However, this letter included a supplement concerned with various “sales” of this gold to the Reichsbank. After the recording of the last of these “sales”, namely of 190.71920 kg of pure gold, the “Sonderlagerung” account still contained 10 318.33310 kg of pure gold.

The “Separat Depot” account was divided into two parts. The first contained unminted gold, the second comprised gold coins. The total quantity of gold bought by the National Bank from the Reichsbank and managed in this account was 9 636.06150 kg of pure gold. From this quantity, especially records of purchases of a total weight of pure gold reaching 9 607.84880 kg on 9 October 1941 are found in the part of the account concerned with unminted gold. To this quantity was connected a record of 22.80330 kg of pure gold, which the Reichsbank recorded on 7 June 1944 in favour of the National Bank to replace gold in Switzerland. This operation was done under pressure. The part of the account concerning gold coins includes a record of the purchase of 692.5 British sovereign gold coins with a total weight of 5.0471 kg of pure gold and the purchase of one exotic gold coin with a weight of 0.3623 kg of pure gold, making a total of 9 636.06150 kg of pure gold.¹⁹ When the National Bank later had to sell back to the Reichsbank 718.70210 kg of pure gold, the banking operation was done in this account, in the “unminted gold” part, so that the amount of pure gold remaining in the “Separat Depot” was exactly 8 917.35940 kg, from which 8 911.95000 kg was in the “unminted gold” part, while 5.40940 kg was in the “pure gold” part.

One of the essential requirements of the Tripartite Commission for the Restitution of Monetary Gold was that the Czechoslovak side had to explain the use of the assets in the RB “Warenkonto” clearing account. Since this problem concerned especially Slovakia – the Bratislava regional branch of the NBS offered an explanation to the commission. It mapped all the purchases and sales that happened during the occupation between the former Slovak National Bank (SNB) and the Reichsbank.²⁰ On 23 December 1940, the

19 Archive of the Czech National Bank (AČNB), Prague, f. NBČS, no. cart. 165, file of the NBČS no. 01238 for the Office of the Delegate to the IARA in Brussels from 3 February 1948.

20 The Slovak National Bank was created by a Slovak government decree no. 44 from 4 April 1939. Although the Slovak side endeavoured to gain a share of the foreign currency and gold reserves of the former NBS, the Germans refused to discuss this theme. The SNB was established as a joint stock company with share capital of 100 million Slovak crowns (Sk). 60% of the shares belonged to the state. The German side owned the rest of the shares through the Deutsche Golddiskont Bank of Berlin. The SNB was headed by a governor, the first of which was Imrich Karvaš. A problem of the bank was a shortage of foreign currency reserves, so the government declared a national collection for the so-called golden treasure. In the period 1941 – 1945 the republic obtained more than 7 tonnes of gold from exports, transactions abroad, mining in Slovakia and collections. It was deposited in Switzerland. The activity of the bank was ended by presidential decree no. 139 from 19 October 1945, according to which the SNB became part of the revived NBS from 26 November 1945. For further details on the question of the origin and functioning of the SNB and its relationship to the NBS and RB at the time of its origin see

Reichsbank made 724.8751 kg of pure gold available to the Slovak National Bank, with a further 1 151.2638 kg on 27 May 1941, 1 151.0669 kg on 15 June 1941, 1 075.3761 kg on 24 November 1941, and 1 793.77584 kg on 6 July 1944, making up a total of 5 896.35774 kg of pure gold. According to its records, the Reichsbank bought back 1 003.3721 kg of pure gold on 14 November 1941, 398.1184 kg of pure gold on 19 January 1942, and 1 097.0864 kg of pure gold on 20 January 1942. At the same time, the RB transferred to the account of the former NBC-S at the Swiss National Bank 1 604.0050 kg of pure gold on 16 July 1941, and 1 793.77584 kg of pure gold on 5 July 1944. None of the gold remained at the Reichsbank.²¹ It is necessary to mention here that the account designated by the Reichsbank as a “non-cash deposit” was not managed in the books of the former Slovak National Bank so the NBCS could not submit to the Tripartite Commission any record of this account. Some movements of gold were accounted by the former Slovak National Bank in a mass account “Purchase and sale of gold”, although other movements were recorded in various auxiliary accounts. The purpose of this procedure could have been an effort to hinder the monitoring of movement of gold by German officials, and disguise the real state of the gold reserves.

The Czechoslovak side provided the Tripartite Gold Commission with further supplementary data concerning the relations between the Swiss National Bank and Slovak National Bank in summary form. In general, the SNB’s account with the Swiss National Bank during the occupation showed the following movements: on 30 June 1941 the Reichsbank provided the SNB with the above mentioned 1 604.00837 kg of pure gold in return for Reichsmarks from the “Warenkonto” account. Another movement was gold bought by the Slovak National Bank at the Swiss National Bank in Bern, namely 303.45047 kg of pure gold, on 4 September 1941 – 1 006.77709 kg of pure gold and 17 June 1944 – 1 000.65419 kg of pure gold. A further already mentioned movement was provision by the Reichsbank to the Slovak National Bank of exactly 1 793.77584 kg of pure gold on 26 July 1944 in return for Reichsmarks from the “Warenkonto” account. In exchange for 1 399.7859 kg of pure gold, the Reichsbank made available to the former SNB at first 995.90528 kg and later 402.87048 kg of pure gold. It compensated the former SNB in Swiss francs for the remaining 1.01014 kg. The Slovak National Bank had a total of 7 102.44172 kg of pure gold in the Swiss National Bank in Bern.²² This information showed that only two purchases were carried out from the debt of the “Warenkonto” account, namely on 30 June 1941 and 26 July 1944. In the course of the occupation there was no sale of the gold held by the SNB in its account at the Swiss National Bank. The

SCHWARC, Michal. Vznik Slovenskej národnej banky a Nemecko (K niektorým otázkam nemeckého zasahovania do procesu konštituovania slovenského cedulového ústavu v roku 1939.) (The origin of the Slovak National Bank and Germany. (On some questions concerning German intervention in the process of constituting the Slovak National Bank in 1939.)). In *Centrálne bankovníctvo v stredoeurópskom priestore*. Bratislava : NBS a HÚ SAV, 2014, p. 130-137.

21 AMZV ČR, f. MPO, Dokumenty k..., p. 113, letter from C. Šimr to the Tripartite Commission from 16 February 1948, no. 295/48-M/5. It was a matter of gold coming from domestic extraction and delivered to the Reichsbank in exchange for gold, which it made available to the former SNB at the Swiss National Bank, and amounted in summary to 1 398.7776 kg of pure gold.

22 AMZV ČR, f. MPO, Dokumenty k..., p. 115.

total amount of 7 107.44172 kg of gold was given to the National Bank of Czechoslovakia in March 1947 for free use.²³ Where the “Warenkonto” clearing account is concerned, it is necessary to mention that it was maintained throughout the period of occupation not only for the needs of the SNB, but also for the needs of the National Bank of Bohemia and Moravia (NBBM). However, only the former SNB succeeded in buying gold with the debt of this account. Since the “Warenkonto” account existed from October 1939 to May 1945, the Czechoslovak side was not able to provide the Tripartite Commission with all the photocopies of operations. It was a matter of large account books containing records of the Slovak Republic’s economic relations with the Reich through the whole period of the war.

Seven Czechoslovak answers to the seven questions from the Tripartite Commission²⁴ from 11 December 1947 formed the final part of this Czechoslovak report:

23 The actual Czechoslovak – Swiss negotiations about the return of the Czechoslovak gold occurred from the beginning of 1946, and the question of the un-blocking of the so-called Slovak gold, which was still held in an account at the Swiss National Bank, was one of the main points of discussion. The Swiss side considered it obvious that after un-blocking the NBCS had the right to possession of the gold or that the revived Czechoslovak Republic after 1945 was a continuation of the pre-Munich republic, so the NBCS as the only main bank institution in Czechoslovakia was the legal successor to the National Bank for Bohemia and Moravia (NBBM) and the Slovak National Bank, and so had the right to possession of gold reserves deposited in Switzerland. These introductory talks resulted in concrete inter-state acts. Firstly, on 4 May 1946 Czechoslovakia and Switzerland signed a commercial political agreement, which was actually concerned only with the un-blocking of gold. After its approval by the Czechoslovak government on 7 June 1946, the NBCS turned to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which had to use diplomatic channels to apply to the Département Fédéral so that the Swiss government would tell the Swiss National Bank to transfer the gold into the account of the NBCS. The Département Fédéral agreed to the procedure in a reply on 6 November 1946. The NBCS asked the Swiss National Bank on 4 December 1946 to transfer the gold to its account and this was confirmed by a letter on 10 December 1946. The Swiss government made the SNB’s gold deposited in the Banque National Suisse in Zurich (7 107.441720 kg) and the Bank for International Settlements (200.568198 kg) freely available by a protocol on the transfer of income from Swiss capital invested in Czechoslovakia and a protocol on amendment of payments in the field of insurance between Czechoslovakia and Switzerland from 4 May 1946, approved by the Czechoslovak government on 7 June 1946. On 22 October 1946 a note from the Czechoslovak embassy in Bern asked the Swiss Federal Department for the Public Economy to issue an instruction that this Slovak gold was placed in the credit of the NBCS. This was done on 6 November 1946. In: AMZV ČR, f. MPO, Dokumenty k..., p. 107-108, Note of the Czechoslovak Embassy in Bern from 22 October 1946 and the reply of the Swiss Federal Department of the Public Economy from 6 November 1946.

24 The seven questions from the Tripartite Commission:

1. What is the exact quantity of gold in the “Sonderlagerung” account, which had to be sold to the Reichsbank? Which and in what quantity were the foreign currency resources that the Germans paid for this gold?
2. Why did the Germans allow the National Bank to leave part of the gold transferred to the “Sonderlagerung” account in that account, or what happened to the part of the gold that was not sold?
3. Why did the Germans allow the National Bank in Prague to buy back 9 636 kg, when they had previously demanded the sale of part of this gold? Was this buying back done with the help of foreign currency gained from the sale mentioned in the first question?
4. Why was 718 kg from the 9 636 kg of gold bought back by the National Bank, sold again later?
5. What happened to the gold recorded by the Reichsbank in the “Separat Depot” account?
6. Has the National Bank regained the right to free use of the deposits held by the Swiss National Bank in the name of the former Slovak National Bank?
7. To what degree was German gold acquired as payment for goods or services that the Protectorate of

1. The quantity of gold that was recorded in the “Sonderlagerung” account and which had to be sold to the Reichsbank comprised 1 034 gold ingots with a total weight of 12 768.9601 kg of pure gold. Their value was 35 338 829.38 Reichsmarks. Various sale operations related to this gold were recorded in favour of the account “RM – Konto II. – Devisen” during the period from 1 April 1939 to 16 May 1940. However, during this period the foreign currency needs of the NBC-S represented a value of 36 662 511 Reichsmarks. In spite of the fact that these obligations flowed from imports determined mainly to German companies and the German population, the NBC-S (or NBBM) had to cover them from its own resources, so that the account “RM – Konto II. – Devisen” showed a deficit of 1 123 681.62 Reichsmarks in this period. To cover this deficit, the National Bank was forced to make 461 277 dollars in the Chase National Bank of the City of New York available to the Reichsbank.²⁵ The difference between this deficit and the sum made available to the Reichsbank was recorded by the Reichsbank in favour of the free account of the NBCS named “Hauptkonto”, which had been used to account foreign currency transactions between the NBC-S and RB before the occupation. The total sum of foreign currency (free Reichsmarks) made available to the National Bank was 35 538 829.38 Reichsmarks.
2. The “Sonderlagerung” deposit was regarded as the property of the NBCS and as such it was recorded in books. However, the NBCS did not know what was really happening with this gold.
3. During the occupation foreign currency resources came to the Protectorate from exports of goods to third countries. In the framework of even fictitious economic autonomy the National Bank had the right to foreign currency coming from this source. In this way available assets were produced in free Swiss francs, Swedish crowns and Dutch gulden in accounts, which the National Bank maintained with correspondents in the appropriate countries. These assets were then transferred into exchange accounts, which the National Bank had to maintain at the Deutsche Golddiskontbank in Berlin. In the course of 1941, imports from abroad to serve the needs of the German occupation administration of the Protectorate critically increased. Although most of the imports were intended for German firms and German inhabitants, the National Bank was forced to pay with its own foreign currency resources. To make these foreign currency resources less immediately available to the German authorities, the National Bank attempted to convert them into gold, appealing to the need to strengthen gold coverage. When carrying out this operation, the National Bank transferred to the Reichsbank the available resources, namely 20 million Swiss francs, 10 million Swedish crowns, 2 415.000 Dutch gulden as well as 5 977 653.92 Reichsmarks from its credit balance in the “Hauptkonto” account, in which payments were recorded from third states for Czechoslovak goods, if these payments were made in free Reichsmarks. As payment for this transfer, the Reichsbank remitted 9 636.0615 kg

Bohemia and Moravia or the Slovak Republic provided for the government of the Reich? According to the Tripartite Commission, this point had to be considered especially carefully because of operations done with the help of assets in the “Warenkonto” clearing account.

25 AČNB, f. NBČS, c.165, sign. NB-PXVII-103.

of pure gold to the “Separat Depot” account created for this purpose in favour of the National Bank.²⁶

4. The sale of 718.7021 kg of pure gold was necessary because the National Bank needed a substantial sum in free Swiss francs by 12 August 1942. The need for them sharply increased at that time as a result of the ever larger imports dictated by the German occupation authorities. This need could be covered only by selling gold.
5. The National Bank’s books contained a record of gold kept in the “Separat Depot” as gold reserves. However, it was not known what had really happened to this gold in the Reichsbank.
6. The gold held by the Swiss National Bank in the former SNB’s account, namely a total sum of 7 107.44172 kg of pure gold had been returned in March 1947 and was freely available to the National Bank of Czechoslovakia.
7. Where the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia was concerned, the gold the NBC-S obtained from the Reichsbank had no connection with the goods supplied to the Reich or with the services provided to its government. Payments between the Czechoslovak Republic and the Reich derived from exchanges of goods or services, and from 1933 they were settled by means of clearing. From 1 October 1940, the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia was integrated into the economy of the Reich.

Where Slovakia was concerned, the situation was as follows: During the occupation, the active balance of the “Warenkonto” account of the former SNB at the Reichsbank was used for five purchases of gold amounting to a total of 5 896.35574 of pure gold worth 16 450 538.77 Reichsmarks. One of these purchases, according to a letter from the Deutsche Verrechnungskasse from 29 December 1941, involving an amount of 1 075.3761 kg or 3 million Reichsmarks, was done first from the “Warenkonto” account to the “Gironkonto der Reichshauptbank” account and on the same day, the “Gironkonto” account was burdened with a sum of 3 000 299.32 Reichsmarks, representing the value of the gold made available to the former National Bank. The submitted copies of these documents as well as the photocopies of the letter from the Reichsbank from 29 December 1941 concerned with the giro from the “Warenkonto” to the “Gironkonto” showed that the gold bought by the former SNB from the Reichsbank was paid for by burdening the “Warenkonto” account, namely by goods or services provided to the Reich by the Slovak Republic.²⁷

This detailed reply from the Czechoslovak side still did not represent the final source of information for the Tripartite Gold Commission, on the basis of which it could definitively conclude the problem of the Czechoslovak gold reserves. It soon turned out that the correspondence between the Tripartite Commission and Cestestýn Šimr, by this time already the empowered minister on the Czechoslovak side, would continue to fully occupy both sides. This written expert dialogue on the “question – answer” level was not

26 AČNB, ref. 25, p. 2.

27 AMZV ČR, f. MPO, Dokumenty k..., p. 116-120, letter from C. Šimr to the Tripartite Commission from 16 February 1948.

interrupted even by the Prague communist coup and the associated social change – the coming of communism in the Czechoslovak Republic.

However, we must state that the Tripartite Gold Commission's tracing of the gold reserves in this period underwent only a partial shift in favour of Czechoslovakia in this period. On 16 February 1948, the *Tripartite Commission for the Restitution of Monetary Gold* informed the Czechoslovak representative C. Šimr that it was able to grant a further partial award to several countries, including Czechoslovakia, to the extent that it had verified the justification for their claims. It had decided to grant 6 074.1564 kg of gold to Czechoslovakia. Apart from Czechoslovakia there were still Austria and Albania.²⁸ In the framework of this notification, the Tripartite Gold Commission asked the Czechoslovak government to provide the name of its authorized and empowered representative with documents confirming his empowerment. The Tripartite Gold Commission would then hand over the 6 074.1564 kg (195 288.635 ounces) of pure gold with the mediation of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, in which the so-called gold account of the Tripartite Gold Commission was deposited. At the same time, the Czechoslovak government through its empowered representative had to commit itself, that by accepting the 6 074.1564 kg of gold, namely the share of the Czechoslovak government in the preliminary distribution of the total quantity of gold reserves, it agreed *“that from the receipt of its complete and final share of the total gold reserves as determined by the commission with final validity”* it would completely renounce any claims directed towards gaining restitution of gold reserves stolen by the Germans or illegally transferred to Germany, as well as compensation in any other way against Germany or against other countries that obtained the relevant gold from Germany. The Czechoslovak government also bound itself that it would give up any claims directed towards achieving restitution of gold reserves or compensation, which could be raised against the Tripartite Gold Commission or its members – the USA, Great Britain and France – in relation to implementation of the mandate entrusted to them by the articles of the Paris Reparations Conference of 9 November – 21 December 1945. The government also bound itself in its declaration that *“it is willing on notification from the Tripartite Commission for the Restitution of Monetary Gold, to provide a quantity of gold proportionate to the amount awarded to the Czechoslovak government, which could be required to satisfy all the claims submitted to the commission by other countries up to 15 September 1947, in the event that these claims have been rejected by the commission, but are later accepted by a competent court, if one exists, but the amount of gold remaining in the stock of gold reserves available for distribution is no longer sufficient to satisfy the claim”*.²⁹ Otherwise or to put it simply, the Czechoslovak side had to confirm again its original commitment not to claim any more gold.

The physical transfer of six tonnes of Czechoslovak gold was done on 3 May 1948. Before this, however, the Czechoslovak side attempted to change the conditions of the

28 The commission granted 1 104.2606 kg to Albania and 7 596.1363 kg of gold to Austria. In: AMZV ČR, f. MPO, Dokumenty k..., s. 98, no. m . CC/Cz 231.

29 AMZV ČR, f. MPO, Dokumenty k..., p. 130-131.

first Czechoslovak share of the gold or to change the attitude of the Tripartite Gold Commission to the question of Czechoslovak gold coins, which had a high numismatic and historic value. A letter from 19 April 1948 started by thanking the commission for its decision to award 6 074,1564 kg of pure gold, but then it observed that the claims of the Czechoslovak government included one concerning 6 375.8588 kg of pure gold in gold coins with numismatic and historical values higher than the value of the metal. It was generally recognized that this value, for example, of the St. Wenceslaus ducats was about 20% higher. The definitive loss of these coins would be irreparable for the NBCS. The Czechoslovak government appealed to the Paris Reparation Agreement part III section A, where an article about the restitution of gold reserves stated that gold coins of numismatic and historic value would be excluded from the rest of the gold intended for distribution with the condition that they were identifiable. This Czechoslovak attempt mapped the steps of the Czechoslovak side from the end of the war – the identification of coins in Frankfurt am Main by the Czechoslovak officials Josef Jenček and Rudolf Kroc, in cooperation with the American officials in Germany Bernard Bernstein and Colonel Cragon. According to the view of the Czechoslovak side, these coins should be excluded from the general mass of gold intended for distribution and be returned to Czechoslovakia. The Czechoslovak side also appealed to its letter from 30 October 1947, in which it sent the commission proof of ownership and of the illegal transfer of these coins. At the same time, it asked that these coins be part of the first delivery.³⁰ The Tripartite Gold Commission did not react to this Czechoslovak request for the immediate return of these Czechoslovak gold coins.

To trace this problem further it is necessary to return to the technical discussions – the “questions and answers”, which continued without interruption. On 18 February 1948, the Tripartite Gold Commission already submitted to Prague a new request for explanation of some facts about gold and related developments within the Czechoslovak banking system during the war. It referred to the Czechoslovak reply from 12 January 1948 and asked for further information concerning the request for restitution of the 1 008.9145 kg of gold administered by the Škoda works and Zbrojovka.

The commission researched this part of the Czechoslovak claim and entrusted its secretary with arranging the sending of further necessary and exact information about the compensation provided by the Germans in connection with the illegal transfer of this gold. The Czechoslovak side originally stated in a questionnaire from the commission about gold (no. I.-A-I/II.) that the Reichsbank recorded the value of this gold as a credit to the account of the NBCS, which then paid the value in crowns to the Škoda works and Zbrojovka. Apart from this, a letter from the Reichsbank of 6 September 1940, attached as a supplement to the Czechoslovak letter to the commission of 12 January 1948, stated that the credits transferred by the Reichsbank to the cheque account of the National Bank comprised free Reichsmarks. Therefore the Tripartite Gold Commission asked the Czechoslovak side to clarify what happened:

1. Whether and to what degree these free Reichsmarks were used by the National Bank to acquire gold and foreign currency during the German occupation;

30 AMZV ČR, f. MPO, Dokumenty k..., p. 156-157, letter from C. Šimr to the Tripartite Commission from 19 April 1948.

2. Whether and to what extent the provisions of article 2, § “D” of the Paris Agreement on Reparations were applied after the end of the war. How far was there a possibility to provide the Czechoslovak government with resources from the giro accounts of the National Bank? The Czechoslovak replies to these points had to be verified with documents in the form of photocopies and translations, concerning any wartime and post-war use of credits transferred to the giro account of the National Bank at the Reichsbank;
3. Where changes to this account during the war were concerned, the commission wanted to know the conditions in which the National Bank of Bohemia and Moravia and the Slovak National Bank could take over the assets and liabilities of the NBC-S and could use the resources from the accounts of this bank in the Reichsbank;
4. In what conditions did the NBCS take over the assets and liabilities of the National Bank of Bohemia and Moravia and the SNB after the liberation?³¹

The reply of the Czechoslovak side to these four questions was submitted to the commission on 9 April 1948, in the form of a detailed description of the facts and connections of the time. Concerning the first question from the commission, namely whether and to what extent the free Reichsmarks could be used by the National Bank to acquire gold or foreign currency during the German occupation, the Czechoslovak side stated that during the occupation decisions about all operations of the National Bank concerned with gold and foreign currency as well as all other matters, were concentrated in the hands of the special representative of the Reichsbank (*Sonderbeauftragte der deutschen Reichsbank bei der Nationalbank für Böhmen und Mähren in Prag*, Reichsbankdirektor Dr. Müller) and the representative of the Reich Ministry of the Economy (*Regierungsrat*, Dr. Winkler). These two had offices directly in the building of the National Bank and decided all operations of the National Bank with complete and final authority. Gold and foreign currency represented a valuable resource for financing the Reich's purchases abroad, and so these two representatives of the Reich monitored their use in harmony with the interests of Berlin. No payment to a foreign country, whether to buy imports or for any other reason, could be made without their prior approval. In these circumstances it was clear that the possibility of converting free Reichsmarks into gold was of purely theoretical value. In the whole period of occupation, it was possible to use free Reichsmarks to buy gold or foreign currency only once. It was a transaction that the Czechoslovak side explained in detail to the commission in a letter from 16 February 1948, as I mentioned above. It concerned the so-called *Hauptkonto* and the sale in 1941 of Swiss francs, Swedish crowns, Dutch gulden and Reichsmarks, which came as payments by a third state for Czechoslovak goods.

In reply to the second question from the commission, the Czechoslovak side stated that since the end of the war, the Czechoslovak authorities had not drawn on the giro account of the NBC-S at the Reichsbank because the RB had ceased to exist as a debtor.

The further explanation of Prague on the commission's third question, on the internal relations between the NBCS, NBBM and NBS, was also detailed and understandable.³²

31 AMZV ČR, f. MPO, Dokumenty k..., p. 136-137, no. m. CC/Cz 242.

32 AČNB, f. NBČS, no. cart. 165, File no. 5849 from 26 March 1948 for the office of the delegate to the

After the occupation of Czechoslovakia and the creation of the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia in the framework of the Reich and the Slovak state, the currency or banking system was arranged as follows: The responsibilities of the NBC-S with its headquarters in Prague were set by a special decree from 31 March 1939 no. 96 in the collection of acts and decrees, which acquired validity on 7 April 1939. Paragraph 1 of this decree stated that:

1. The responsibilities of the NBC-S (§ 54 of the act from 14 April 1920 no. 347 Co. on the currency issuing joint stock company bank) in territories outside the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia are abolished from 13 March 1939. All rights and duties of staff of the bank with places of residence outside the territory of the Protectorate end on that day.
2. The bank shall bear the name “National Bank for Bohemia and Moravia in Prague”.

This text shows that the NBCS still existed after 15 March 1939 under the firm NBBM in Prague and with its responsibilities limited to the territory of the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia. All the accounts held in the name of the NBC-S in Prague and its correspondent banks abroad, including the accounts at the Reichsbank, remained also after 15 March 1939 the property of the NBC-S in Prague or after 7 April 1939 the NBBM.

In the territory of the Slovak state, as the Czechoslovak side explained to the commission, the Slovak National Bank with its headquarters in Bratislava was created according to the Slovak Government decree no. 44 Col. from 4 April 1939 as a joint stock company. The SNB took possession of the assets and liabilities of all the loans of the Prague NBC-S arranged in the territory of Slovakia and of all the banknotes issued by the NBC-S and circulating in Slovakia. The branches of the NBC-S had no receivables or debts in relation to foreign countries. After the withdrawal of the banknotes issued by the National Bank of Czecho-Slovakia from circulation in Slovakia and then as was determined the size of the compensation deriving from this title for the NBC-S or National Bank for Bohemia and Moravia in Prague, the SNB produced a balance of the receivables and debts of the NBBM towards the Slovak National Bank. The question of liquidation of the asset balance of this balance in favour of the SNB was settled by a special agreement.

In its reply to the Tripartite Gold Commission, the Czechoslovak side also explained that the SNB did not take over any account held by the NBC-S or its correspondents abroad. All these accounts were the property of the Prague National Bank for Bohemia and Moravia, which still recorded them in its account books.

Concerning the extent to which the Prague NBC-S or NBBM could use the resources recorded in the accounts at the Reichsbank, it is necessary to state that formally and theoretically it could use these accounts without any special limitations. However, in relation to the fact that direction of the National Bank was the hands of a special representative of the RB and a representative of the Reich Ministry of the Economy, the officials of the NBBM did not decide in practice about what would be done with these accounts.

IARA in Brussels.

The Czechoslovak side explained the situation after the liberation to the Tripartite Gold Commission in its answer to question number 4: The National Bank again changed its name and again became the National Bank of Czecho-Slovakia, but the Slovak National Bank continued to operate in the territory of Slovakia. Decree of the President of the Republic no. 139 Col. of Acts and Decrees from 19 October 1945 merged the SNB with the NBCS, and its Bratislava headquarters became the Regional Branch of the NBCS. Thus, the NBCS again became responsible for the whole of Czechoslovakia. Paragraph no. 5 of Act no. 139 Col. of acts was amended by the Czechoslovak government to bring about the merging of the property of the two parts of the currency issuing institution. On 11 March 1948, two weeks after the Communist coup in Prague, the National Assembly of the Czechoslovak Republic passed a new act on the NBCS, according to which it lost the character of a joint stock company and became a state institution. Paragraph no. 39 of this act stated that from the day it became valid all rights and duties passed to the new NBCS on the basis of legal succession without any liquidation.³³

A request from the Tripartite Gold Commission for more information was submitted immediately the next day after the previous Czechoslovak reply, namely on 10 April 1948. Understandably it did not react to the last Czechoslovak reply. That was not possible for time and technical reasons. It referred to a letter from 12 January 1948 in which the Czechoslovak side provided information about 1 008.9147 kg of Czechoslovak gold administered by the Škoda works and Zbrojovka, as well as to the request from 18 February 1948 asking for further details about compensation provided by the Germans in connection with an illegal transfer. In its letter of 10 April 1948, the commission stated the documents submitted so far made it possible to state that the delivery of gold by the Škoda works and Zbrojovka to the National Bank for Bohemia and Moravia, the further storage of this gold in the bank and its subsequent handing over to the Reichsbank led to the carrying out of certain formalities of an accounting character by the National Bank for Bohemia and Moravia. The commission wanted as much detail as possible about the NBBM's accounting actions. Several methods could be used to achieve this:

- Was the gold was placed in accounts managed as assets in the bank's balance, in this case what were these accounts and what was the counter-sum in the balance of liabilities;
- Was the gold placed in accounts not recorded in the balance, but this accounting was done doubly;
- There was no record in the accounts in the true sense of the word or to burdening, but only entries in one or more books usually serving the tracing of temporary assets;
- A mixture of these methods was used.

The Tripartite Gold Commission asked for an exact description of the method, and more exact dates of when records were put in accounts or books. The commission also stated that the Czechoslovak documents submitted so far showed payment of the value in gold (transferred in crowns by the National Bank for Bohemia and Moravia in favour of the Škoda works and Zbrojovka, and in Reichsmarks by the Reichsbank in favour of the

33 AMZV ČR, f. MPO, Dokumenty k..., p. 143-148, no. m. 679/48 H/Št.

NBBM) recorded in the accounts of the NBBM. Also in this case the commission asked for exact information on all the records produced in this matter, as well as the use of debt and credit accounts and the dates of debts and credits.³⁴

If the Czechoslovak side hoped that the Tripartite Gold Commission could soon complete its requests for information on the Czechoslovak gold and was convinced that all the relevant information had already been submitted to a sufficient degree, then the immediate future proved the opposite. On 5 May 1948, J.A. Watson already addressed a new request to C. Šimr. The introduction stated that the Czechoslovak side had provided additional documents concerning the sale of 12 768.9601 kg of pure gold to the Berlin Reichsbank, withdrawn from the “Sonderlagerung” account in the which the RB deposited in the name of the National Bank for Bohemia and Moravia 23 087.3040 kg of pure gold, which corresponded to the weight of the Czechoslovak gold held in the BOE in London and transferred under the name of the Reichsbank in the Bank of England. According to the Tripartite Gold Commission, the documents already submitted proved that the Reichsbank paid for these 12 768.9601 kg of pure gold 35 538 829.38 Reichsmarks into the “RM Konto II. Divisen” good account of the National Bank for Bohemia and Moravia. This enabled the National Bank to finance foreign currency obligations resulting from the importing of goods mostly intended for the needs of German firms and the German population from its own resources. The commission again studied all the documents it had received on this matter, and so that it could responsibly decide on the subject, it asked for more information from the Czechoslovak side, namely:

- Detailed and verifiable documents able to prove that the foreign currency (dollars, pounds and others) bought at the expense of the “RM Konto II. Division” account was actually entirely spent on imports of goods (or exactly what goods they were);
- Detailed and verifiable documents able to prove that these imported goods were made available to German factories and German inhabitants;
- An estimate of the number of free Reichsmarks taken from the “RM Konto II. Divisen” to pay for imports for the needs of German factories and German inhabitants;
- Exact data on identification of imports financed by free Reichsmarks not included in this estimate.

On the basis of the previous declarations of the Czechoslovak government, the Tripartite Gold Commission stated that this estimate corresponded to the greater part, but not the whole of the free Reichsmarks coming from the sale of the 12 768.9601 kg of gold.³⁵

After this request, the Czechoslovak side chose a different approach. It did not reply in writing but asked for personal talks. Therefore, on 10 May 1948, Ing. Jaromír Hollmann a member of the Czechoslovak delegation to the IARA visited the technical adviser to the commission M. Hirigoyen. Hollmann patiently explained that during the

34 AMZV ČR, f. MPO, Dokumenty k..., p. 151-152, Letter from the general secretary of the Tripartite Commission J. A. Watson to the empowered minister C. Šimr from 10 April 1948, no. CC/Cz 362.

35 AMZV ČR, f. MPO, Dokumenty k..., p. 177-178, Letter from the general secretary of the Tripartite Commission J. A. Watson to the empowered minister C. Šimr from 5 May 1948, no. CC/Cz 399.

occupation the National Bank was in the hands of the Germans, that import permits were issued by an office headed by a German, and that a large part of the imported goods paid for with foreign currency did not even enter the territory of the Protectorate. If such goods or raw materials came, their distribution was decided by the German occupation authorities without regard for the needs of the domestic economy. Hollmann also stated that the gold mentioned in the letter to the commission of 5 May 1948, was deposited in the BOE by the National Bank of Czecho-Slovakia. It was endeavouring to prevent transfer of the gold to the Reichsbank, when it quietly informed the British embassy in Prague about the forced order. In his view, this fact also proved that Czechoslovakia had no interest in the sale of its gold. Hollmann also sharply attacked the expressions used by the commission, that the foreign currency bought with gold allowed the National Bank to finance its obligations with its own resources. It was the word “allowed” that evoked the view that the Czechoslovak side had voluntarily initiated the sale of the gold. Hollmann maintained that they were forced to do it or they had to finance imports from their own resources.³⁶ The Tripartite Gold Commission did not take the Czechoslovak argumentation into account and still insisted on the submission of detailed and verifiable documents. In addition, on 13 May 1948 it went even further. On the basis of a previous Czechoslovak declaration that: “*The National Bank of Czechoslovakia could not after long talks with the Reichsbank gain acceptance of its objections to German demands concerning either the general obligation of the National Bank in relation to banknotes or the payment for these banknotes in gold*”, it asked for precise information about the talks with the Reichsbank and the objections raised by the National Bank. It also asked for explanation of the conditions and monetary consequences of rejoining the Sudetenland to Czechoslovakia after the war and the monetary consequences of the expulsion of former Czechoslovak citizens from the Sudetenland to Germany after the end of hostilities. The Tripartite Gold Commission asked for photocopies and translations of official texts, acts and decrees, supplemented by numerical data.³⁷ The Czechoslovak side again attempted to explain its position at talks in Brussels at the premises of the commission on 19 May 1948. The discussions occurred between the “troika” of Hollmann, Watson and Hirigoyen. Hollmann asked for justification of these questions, since the Czechoslovak side had already proved ownership of the requested gold, as well as of its illegal transfer as a direct result of the Munich Agreement, which had never been recognized by the government of the USA and which had been declared “null and void” by all the governments forming the commission. He also explained the Czechoslovak position on the question of the monetary problems of the Sudetenland, the question of the circulation of Reichsmarks in this territory, questions connected with the incorporation of the Protectorate into the economy of the Reich and so on. However, Watson insisted on written answers with the relevant documents.³⁸

36 AMZV ČR, f. MPO, Dokumenty k..., p. 179-180, Record of the discussion between J. Hollmann and M. Hirigoyen on 10 May 1948.

37 AMZV ČR, f. MPO, Dokumenty k..., p. 185, Letter from the general secretary of the Tripartite Commission J. A. Watson to the empowered minister C. Šimr from 13 May 1948, no. CC/Cz 401.

38 AMZV ČR, f. MPO, Dokumenty k..., p. 186-190, Record of the discussion of Ing. Jaromír Hollmann with

The Czechoslovak government's reply to the commission's questions was worked out by the representative of the Czechoslovak delegate to the IARA M. Novák on 14 July 1948. It was another detailed report supplemented by copies of documents connected with the given problem. It can also be regarded as one of the last materials by which the Czechoslovak side finalized the marathon of answering questions and requests from the Tripartite Gold Commission. To the first point – the question of the transfer of 14 563.2010 kg of pure gold to Germany, specifically to the Reichsbank in March 1939 as payment for the Czechoslovak banknotes withdrawn from circulation by German officials in the Czechoslovak territories occupied by German forces in autumn 1938 after Munich – the Czechoslovak side emphasized the fact that these banking talks were a direct result of the Munich Agreement concluded by Great Britain, France, Italy and Germany. At that time, the Czechoslovak side had no alternative to giving in to German pressure under the threat of isolation and accepting the conditions imposed by the Reich. The Czechoslovak side submitted this document as evidence. It also attached a letter from the National Bank of Czecho-Slovakia sent to the Reichsbank on 31 October 1938. It showed that the receivables in relation to foreign countries that existed up to 1 October 1938 in favour of persons living in the territories occupied by German forces according to the provisions of the Munich Agreement, were demanded by the Reichsbank at the same meeting as the transfer of the above mentioned gold. Although the NBCS financed the purchase of raw materials intended for processing by industry, leading to exports in return for foreign currency, the foreign currency profit on the exports fell to the Reichsbank. The foreign currency losses suffered by the National Bank reached a sum of 1.5 billion crowns.

In reply to the question about the currency conditions and results of the “joining of the Sudetenland to Czechoslovakia after the war”, the Czechoslovak side explained that no such “joining” happened. The reality was as follows: Germany occupied territory they called Sudetenland after Munich. The Munich Agreement was never recognized and the Allies designated it as invalid. On 15 March 1939 German forces occupied the rest of Czechoslovak territory, namely the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia, and recognized the independence of Slovakia. After the liberation, the government in exile returned, took power over the whole territory of pre-Munich Czechoslovakia and did not need any act of joining. There was a complex currency situation in the revived republic after the war. The Czechoslovak economy, stable before the war, was destroyed and several different currencies circulated in Czechoslovak territory. In the “Sudetenland” from autumn 1938, occupation marks or Reichsmarks circulated. The Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia, occupied after 15 March 1939, the Reichsmark and Protectorate crown were used, and for some time also the occupation mark, Russian army coupons and old pre-war Czechoslovak banknotes. Slovak crowns, Russian army coupons and the pengő in the region occupied by Hungary since 1938 – 1939 circulated in Slovakia. Therefore, after the war it was necessary to unify the currency. The Reichsmark was withdrawn from circulation in the whole territory from 31 July 1945, and a united currency in the whole territory of Czechoslovakia was achieved in November 1945.

representatives of the Tripartite Commission on 19 May 1948.

On the third question of the Tripartite Gold Commission, namely currency conditions and the results of the emigration of former Czechoslovak citizens from the Sudeten territories to Germany after the end of hostilities, the Czechoslovak side reacted with the statement that the currency situation or legal measures related to the whole territory of Czechoslovakia, so it did not take into account this emigration. The Reichsmarks withdrawn from circulation were used during the emigration of former Czechoslovak citizens to Germany. The emigrants were paid sums in Reichsmarks as determined by agreements concluded with the Allied authorities of the occupation zones to which they were going. According to the records of the NBC-S, 1.2 billion Reichsmarks were paid to these people at an exchange rate of 1 : 10, which meant 12 billion Czechoslovak crowns. The conclusion stated that the liberation of the Sudetenland did not bring any gain to the NBCS either in foreign currency or gold. On the contrary, the Reichsbank took foreign currency without compensation, 1.2 billion Reichsmarks were paid to the emigrants and the Czechoslovak gold was still in Germany.³⁹

After the sending of this Czechoslovak document, the Tripartite Gold Commission was silent. Further discussions and correspondence occurred only sporadically. New determining factors undoubtedly entered the game about the gold. The discussion of the Czechoslovak representative at the IARA O. Kulhánek with the general secretary of the Tripartite Gold Commission J.A. Watson in Brussels on 14 February 1950 confirmed this view. Kulhánek's record of the talks first maps the correspondence between the commission and the Czechoslovak side since December 1949. The commission had asked for further documents, so that it could continue to study the request of the Czechoslovak government for proportionate restitution of the gold the NBCS had lost in the course of the war. The National Bank answered the questions of the Tripartite Gold Commission in a letter from 12 December 1949. Meanwhile, the Czechoslovak delegate to the IARA asked the National Bank in Prague on the basis of a suggestion from Wingate a member of the commission, to send an expert to Brussels to provide the commission with the necessary explanations. The talks of the Czechoslovak expert Dr. Ing. H. Hajtl at the premises of the commission happened on 14 February 1950 with the participation of O. Kulhánek. The commission stated that the basic problem was the question of the receipt, use and accounting of 10 million British pounds, which the British government had made available to the Czechoslovak government in autumn 1938. The Czechoslovak side explained in the talks that this question had no direct or indirect connection with the Czechoslovak claims to restitution of gold reserves in accordance with the provision of the third part of the Paris Reparations Conference. Kulhánek commented in his record of the talks that he had got the impression from his talks with general secretary Watson that the commission was endeavouring "*to delay a decision on the request of the Czechoslovak government on the pretext of direct investigation of the facts*".⁴⁰ Watson refused to express a view on other questions, and asked for more time to consider the Czechoslovak request.

39 AMZV ČR, f. MPO, Dokumenty k..., p. 191 etc., 14 July 1948, no. m. 1272/48 IARA H/Št.

40 AČNB, f. NBČS, sign. NB-PXVII-332/5, Report on O. Kulhánek's talks with the general secretary of the Tripartite Commission J. A. Watson in Brussels on 14 February 1950.

Further talks by Czechoslovak representatives in Brussels in autumn 1951 confirmed the delaying tactics of the commission. On 21 November 1951, the chairman of the commission initiated talks with Czechoslovak experts from the State Bank of Czechoslovakia (SBCS)⁴¹ Ing. Julius Hájek and Dr. Karel Popel. The new questions from the commission confirmed that it was delaying matters. They had actually been answered and documented by the Czechoslovak side in 1947 – 1948. The chairman of the commission Ronald Wingate essentially only confirmed the view of the commission with regard to the relationship between the three banking entities: the NBC-S, NBBM and SNB, namely that these banks performed their activities under direct German control. He also confirmed the view of the commission that the SNB did not take over any gold or foreign currency reserves from the NBC-S, while the NBBM did.

A further question from the Tripartite Gold Commission concerned the transfer of 1 008 kg of gold from the Škoda works and Zbrojovka to Berlin, so that all the gold of the National Bank, whether held at home or abroad, was transferred to Germany with the exception of a few gold coins. The Czechoslovak experts, appealing to the submitted documents, stated that it was not so. Some of the gold of the National Bank remained both at home and abroad. They again explained to the commission the steps of the Czechoslovak government in the framework of the Czechoslovak – Swiss talks of spring 1946, and how seven tonnes of “Slovak” gold were released to the NBCS on the basis of state laws, namely the above mentioned Act no. 139/45 Col. on the transitional amendment of the legal position of the NBCS, regulating the question of succession to the SNB and NBBM.

The change of depositor on the Czechoslovak side also became a problem for the commission, although it was a problem the Czechoslovaks had already explained. The commission took into account that the transfer of 14 536 kg of gold was a transfer from the NBCS and that it was a transfer that concerned exclusively the NBC-S, but agreements connected with it, made by the Reichsbank in connection with this gold, were already made in the name of the NBBM, while two later transfers of 6 375 kg of coins and 1 008 kg of ingots of “autonomous” gold were already done entirely in the name of the National Bank for Bohemia and Moravia. The Tripartite Gold Commission asked for an explanation of how the name of the depositor of the above mentioned 23 087 kg of gold happened. The NBCS experts Hájek and Popel again explained to the commission that the transfers of 14 536 kg and 23 087 kg of gold were still formally done by the National Bank of Czecho-Slovakia because at the time the NBBM still did not legally exist. However, there was no real difference between these transfers because they resulted from unilateral forcible acts by the Germans.⁴² After answering all the questions from

41 After the establishment of the communist regime in Czechoslovakia extensive centralization of state banking began. Act no. 31 from 9 March 1950 established the State Bank of Czechoslovakia. From 1 July 1950 it took over all the rights and obligations of the NBCS, Živnostenská (Business) Bank, Post Office Savings Bank and Slovak Tatra Bank. It became the only banking institution in Czechoslovakia, active in issuing the currency, granting loans and managing accounts.

42 AMZV ČR, f. MPO, Dokumenty k..., part II, 1949-1957, p. 58-63, Report on the working visit by Ing. Julius Hájek and Dr. Karel Popel from the State Bank of Czechoslovakia to Brussels from 17–26 November 1951.

the commission, the Czechoslovak experts also began to ask questions. They strove to find out whether the circumstances of the Czechoslovak claims were already sufficiently clear and understandable for the commission – apparently yes, whether the Czechoslovak claims were considered justified and undeniable – the commission refused to answer, whether the Czechoslovak side would be informed about the end of the investigations, how the Czechoslovak claims were seen – also without a concrete reply from the commission, when they would definitively decide about the Czechoslovak claims – the commission answered: mid 1952, whether the Czechoslovak side could expect the return of gold in summer 1952 – this was not a matter for the commission but for the three governments, and what percentage would the government receive – the figures from the advance payments to individual countries could not be taken into account for the calculation.⁴³ These general and unbinding replies from R. Wingate to the Czechoslovak delegation in Brussels clearly showed that it was not important when the commission completed its “investigations”. What mattered was the political decisions of the governments of the three great powers – the USA, Great Britain and France.

Up to the end of 1952, the Tripartite Gold Commission for the Restitution of Monetary Gold made six preliminary awards from the total amount of gold to be restituted, the amount of which was never announced. Czechoslovakia received 15% of its claims. According to the data the commission gave to the office of the Czechoslovak delegate to the IARA in Brussels, the commission awarded preliminary return of gold amounting to 208 008.27845 kg. From this total, the following countries received shares: Czechoslovakia 6 074.1564 kg, Albania 1 121.4517 kg, Belgium 90 649.8374 kg, the Netherlands 66 536.7797 kg, Luxembourg 1 929.4999 kg, Italy 27 862.2013 kg, Yugoslavia 266.6766 kg, Austria 13 530.2064 kg and Greece 37.8319 kg.⁴⁴ A total of nine European states were involved. The commission did not officially publish information on whether other states had applied for restitution of gold reserves, but unofficial sources showed that, for example, Poland had applied but so far received nothing.⁴⁵ There was also unofficial information that France had been awarded 92 500 kg in October 1947 and a further 25 000 kg of gold in March 1952. France received these 117.5 tonnes of gold as partial compensation for the 203 tonnes of gold returned to Belgium after the war as its pre-war deposit. This deposit was stolen by the Germans during transport to Africa and so fell into the category of gold stolen by the Germans. However, the Tripartite Gold Commission did not report these French reserves to the office of the Czechoslovak delegate to

43 AMZV ČR, f. MPO, ref. 1.

44 The officially determined awards of the commission represented: 16 October 1947 – Belgium 90 649.8374 kg, the Netherlands 35 890.5740 kg and Luxembourg 1 929.4999 kg; 16 February 1948 – Albania 1 104.2606 kg, Czechoslovakia 6 074.1564 kg and Austria 7 596.1363 kg; 27 May 1948 – Italy 27 862.2013 kg; 30 June 1948 – Albania 17.1911 kg, Austria 5 934.0701 kg, the Netherlands 30 646.2057 kg and Greece 37.8319 kg; 17 July 1948 – Yugoslavia 215.2303 kg; 18 February 1949 – Yugoslavia 51.4463 kg. Národní archiv České republiky (National Archives of the Czech Republic – NA ČR), Prague, f. Political Secretariat of the ÚV KSČ (Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia) 1951-1954 (02/5), vol. 49, and j. 134, point 15, Report by V. Šíroky on the restitution of gold reserves from 11 December 1952.

45 Poland accepted Part III of the Paris Reparation Agreement only by a protocol signed on 6 July 1949 in London.

the IARA like other reserves. This evoked the suspicion that these French awards were not discussed by the commission or that they were not part of the common pool that had to be shared out on the basis of percentages. Taking into account the fact that the French award was not part of the common pool, and that Czechoslovakia received an award of gold of less than 15% of its recognized claims although the commission had informed it that all the countries would get back about 50% of the gold they claimed, it is not surprising that the Czechoslovak side perceived the situation at the end of 1952 as an expression of unjustified discrimination against them. It wanted to defend itself against this discrimination with protest notes addressed to the commission before it decided on the total amount of the “tripartite” gold, and by the diplomatic route in relation to the government of the USA, Great Britain and France after the decision of the commission on the amount of the “tripartite” gold.⁴⁶ However, such steps could have only a political and not a practical effect. A further Czechoslovak step should also be seen as mainly political: The Czechoslovak government proposed to involve the USSR in the problem by requesting its help or asking the government of the USSR to consider how it could help Czechoslovakia. This line – through the Soviet Union – proved to be problematic because it raised the question of how the restitution of gold reserves solved by the Paris Reparations Agreement fitted into the overall complex of international legal reparations and restitution agreements, and especially, what was the relationship of the Tripartite Gold Commission to the Yalta and Potsdam agreements and to the Allied Control Council in Berlin.

No direct relationship existed between the Potsdam Agreement and the Tripartite Gold Commission. The commission was a special international body established by the three authorized Western powers for the restitution of gold reserves according to part of the reparations agreement. The actual Reparations Agreement was a concretization of the principles of the Potsdam Agreement of 1 August 1945, namely its part concerned with German reparations. The USSR, as a signatory of the Potsdam Agreement and a participant in Yalta, also had an interest in the fulfilment of these international obligations. It did not give up this interest when, in article 10 of the Potsdam Agreement, it did not express an interest in the restitution of gold reserves found in Germany.⁴⁷ The fact that

46 The outline of the note addressed to the commission was worked out by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on 11 December 1952. Viliam Široký submitted it to the Political Secretariat of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia for approval. It appealed to the talks by the experts from the State Bank of Czechoslovakia at the Brussels premises of the commission in November 1951, as well as to the Czechoslovak appeal from 25 September 1952 asking the commission to grant further awards of gold. It asked the chairman of the commission Roland Wingate to inform the commission of the wish of the Czechoslovak government “*that all the governments with a claim to restitution should finally be informed of the total amount of gold reserves to be divided, and that they should be equally informed of the size of the claims of individual states sharing in the total mass. This should be done before the commission announces its decisions on the size of the awards it considers justified*”. NA ČR, f. Politický sekretariát ÚV KSČ 1951-1954 (02/5), vol. 49, a. j. 134, point 15, supplement to no. 5655.

47 The Potsdam Agreement contained the following provisions concerning German reparations:

1. The reparation demands of the USSR have to be satisfied by removal from the Soviet occupation zone in Germany and from appropriate German property abroad.
2. The USSR commits itself to satisfying Polish reparation claims from its own share of reparations.
3. The reparation claims of the USA, Great Britain and other states with a claim to reparations will be satisfied from the Western occupation zones and from appropriate German properties abroad.

the USSR gave up its own right to claim gold reserves does not mean that it could not take an interest in the fulfilment of all the principles of Yalta and Potsdam, including the just distribution of gold reserves without discrimination.

There was no direct relationship between the Tripartite Commission and the Allied Control Council (ACC) in Berlin. However, the ACC, which included the USSR, issued directives concerned with the restitution agenda in Germany, as is confirmed by the directives from January and March 1946 concerning the implementation and interpretation of restitution. The circumstance that the implementation of restitution from Germany was entrusted to the three authorized powers in the Tripartite Gold Commission did not mean that this question could not be discussed in the ACC forum, if it was proved that the commission or the three powers were not following a just approach to the distribution of gold reserves as stated in the preamble to the agreement on reparations, since by nature the ACC had the right to concern itself with restitution as such. This was not changed by the British position stated by Sir David Walley at the reparations conference in Paris, that the Potsdam Conference left gold to the Western powers, since the USSR gave up claims to gold found in Germany and that the ACC had nothing to do with the matter. The Allied Control Council did not need to consider the agenda of the Tripartite Gold Commission as long as solution of the questions of restitution of gold by the three powers and the Tripartite Gold Commission gave no reason for complaints about discrimination. However, if such complaints appeared, then the ACC was a higher forum where they could be discussed. However, it depended on how the government of the USSR judged the matter and whether it would be willing to help Czechoslovakia in international legal or political terms.

It is not clear whether the USSR actively intervened in the question of discrimination in the distribution of gold, or whether it supported the Czechoslovak position or not. We cannot tell from the accessible archive materials whether the Czechoslovaks really asked for such support. It is possible to suppose that they did not, since it would have further complicated some open problems in Czechoslovak – American relations. However, the fact remains that it reached the level of a protest note to the Tripartite Gold Commission and diplomatic steps in relation to Great Britain and the USA. A note to the chairman of the commission R. Wingate from 15 October 1954 requested the return of a larger amount of gold. The request was accompanied by a memorandum, which appealed to the statement of the commission that the documentation and verbal clarification were

-
8. The Soviet government gives up all reparation claims on shares of German companies located in the Western zones of Germany and to German property in all states apart from those named in point no. 9.
 9. The governments of Great Britain and the USA give up reparation claims on shares of German companies located in the Eastern occupation zone of Germany and to German property in Bulgaria, Finland, Hungary, Rumania and eastern Austria.
 10. The Soviet government will not claim gold taken by the Allied armies in Germany.

The text shows that the German reparation resources were divided into two territorial regions and two groups of recipients of German reparations. A territorial region was assigned to each group of recipients: the Soviet occupation zone of Germany for the reparation claims of the USSR and Poland, the Western occupation zones for the reparation claims of the USA, Great Britain, France and other countries with claims to reparations. Therefore, Czechoslovakia got into the second group of recipients of reparations, as did Albania among the other countries from the Soviet Bloc.

considered sufficient for the needs of the commission. The reply of the general secretary of the commission J.A. Watson addressed on 16 December 1954 to the Czechoslovak delegate to the IARA Jan Obhlídál was general and evasive: The work of the commission was taking longer than originally expected as a result of unforeseen circumstances not dependent on the will of the commission, and delays caused by the complexity of the questions the commission had to consider. The most complex of these concerned the requests submitted by the Czechoslovak government. The 6 074.1564 kg of gold that the commission handed over to the Czechoslovak government as a preliminary award was allegedly an amount proportionate to those given to other applicants in the conditions existing at that time. The note assured that as soon as the commission had the possibility to make a further declaration on the matter, it would do so immediately.⁴⁸ The position of the commission expressed in this note, spoke clearly: the decision about the award would not be taken by the Tripartite Gold Commission, but by the governments of the USA, Great Britain and France. This was essentially a repeat of what had been known for years, namely that the commission was only a technical organ of the great powers with zero decision making powers.

On 2 November 1954, the Czechoslovak government informed the British, French and American governments about their steps in connection with their restitution claims, which they had undertaken in relation to the Tripartite Gold Commission. In identical notes, the minister of foreign affairs Václav David asked the governments of the three powers to give their representatives in the commission the appropriate instructions, so that the restitution would not be further delayed.⁴⁹ The Czechoslovak government decided on this step after more than seven years of talks with the commission. The French government agreed to hand over the gold, but the USA and Great Britain presented a different view.

The British government did not react to the Czechoslovak note from 2 November 1954. However, the embassy replied to another Czechoslovak document, an *aide memoire* from 29 November 1954, on 11 January 1955 with a brief negative declaration that the question of gold reserves was a subject for “special negotiations”. A further Czechoslovak *aide memoire* to the British embassy in Prague from 28 June 1955 essentially repeated the general and evasive position of the Tripartite Gold Commission from December 1954 about unforeseen circumstances or the most complicated questions of the Czechoslovak claims concerning the work of the commission. The Czechoslovak side informed the British Embassy that its request for the return of gold was justified and arose as a result of the flagrant and notorious indirect theft of the Czechoslovak gold reserves by the Germans after the occupation of Czechoslovakia. Moreover, the commission had stated that Czechoslovakia had provided enough information and had not asked for further documents. This Czechoslovak *aide memoire* used tougher diplomatic language in that it directly accused Great Britain of losing the gold. It recalled that a

48 AMZV ČR, f. MPO, Dokumenty k..., part II, 1949-1957, p. 146, Note from the Tripartite Commission to the Czechoslovak delegate to the IARA from 16 December 1954, no. CC/Cz-2648.

49 AMZV ČR, f. USA Teritorial department – secret (TOT) 1945 – 1955, no. cart. 11, no. m. 421.374/54 ABO.

substantial part of the Czechoslovak claims concerned the indirect theft of Czechoslovak gold reserves, which were deposited in London with the mediation of the BIS of Basel. The Bank of England in agreement with the British government of the time had transferred them to the Reichsbank after the German occupation began in 1939. Therefore, it would be right for the British representative to put an end to any doubts the Tripartite Gold Commission still had in connection with this claim. According to the Czechoslovak document, it would be against not only the provisions of the Paris Reparations Agreement, but also the basic demands of decency and justice, to deny restitution of gold reserves precisely to Czechoslovakia – one of the first victims of Hitler's aggression and occupation, which had undoubtedly and provably suffered damage. If Czechoslovakia continued to be denied restitution of its fair share of the gold reserves, the Czechoslovak government would take into account in talks with the government of Great Britain, the fact that the British government and the Bank for International Settlements bore responsibility for the illegal transfer of 23 087 kg of Czechoslovak gold reserves to the German Reichsbank. Czechoslovakia had not been compensated for this loss. The British government gave priority to the payment of a loan from 1939 connected with the Munich Agreement, and the payment of credits it had granted to the Czechoslovak government in exile in London during the war, but which would not have been necessary, at least not to such an extent, if the Czechoslovak gold reserves deposited in the Bank of England in 1939 had not been lost.⁵⁰

The Czechoslovak Ministry of Foreign Affairs delivered to the embassy of the USA in Prague on the same day a document with an almost identical text to that for Great Britain. The American diplomatic office replied to the Czechoslovak request regarding the claim to restitution of gold reserves in note no. 304 from 7 February 1955. It dryly stated that the letter from the general secretary of the Tripartite Gold Commission addressed to the Czechoslovak delegate to the IARA on 16 December 1954, adequately explained the situation.

The Czechoslovak side described the reply as unsatisfactory, and in a note from 28 June 1955 appealed to the comments of the general secretary of the commission on certain circumstances not depending on the wishes of the commission, which allegedly hindered the restitution of the Czechoslovak share of the gold reserves. According to the Czechoslovak Ministry of Foreign Affairs, this gave the impression of some degree of external intervention, as if some governments, in the name of which the commission was negotiating, were connecting the restitution of the Czechoslovak share of the gold with open bilateral questions.

In the view of Prague, this also flowed from the American note no. 407 from 3 May 1955. Therefore the Czechoslovak government declared in this note that “*denial of restitution of gold reserves to Czechoslovakia for these motives would be in harsh conflict with the demands of the objective and disinterested discussion of the Czechoslovak claim*”

50 For more details on the question of British credits and loans to Czechoslovakia during the war see: Kuklík, Jan: *Do poslední pence. Československo-britská jednání o majetkoprávních a finančních otázkách 1938–1982. (To the last penny. Czechoslovak – British negotiations on property and financial questions 1938–1982).* Praha : Karolinum 2007, p. 13-133.

in accordance with the provisions of the Paris Reparations Agreement from 1946”, but on the other hand, a positive position from the USA could be favourably reflected in the solution of open bilateral economic questions.⁵¹ On the one hand, Czechoslovakia blamed the USA for linking the question of the gold with bilateral relations, but on the other it made a similar offer itself, namely that American agreement to restitute the gold would motivate Czechoslovakia to make concessions on other bilateral issues between the USA and Czechoslovakia. Thus, linking the problem of the gold with open bilateral problems was also already accepted by the Czechoslovak side, although it had long rejected this idea. The change of course could have been a reaction to an earlier American initiative in this area.

The new line of the Czechoslovak communist government in its effort to gain an improved share of the gold, directed towards the Tripartite Commission and the US government, was also aimed at a third level representing a possible attack against the Bank for International Settlements in Basel and against Great Britain. The Czechoslovak Communist Party leadership pursued this activity. A resolution from the 10 January 1955 session of the Political Secretariat of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia brought a decision that the Minister of Finance Júlíus Ďuriš should submit a report on the origin and development of the affair of the so-called Basel gold, as well as a legal assessment of the possibilities for applying Czechoslovak claims against the BIS in Basel and especially against Great Britain.

J. Ďuriš submitted the requested material to Prime Minister V. Široký on 15 February 1955.⁵² The brief account of the so-called Basel gold stated that at the time of the German occupation of the remaining parts of the republic in March 1939 the NBC-S had a total of 55 045 kg of its gold reserves deposited with the Bank of England. From this, 26 736 kg was in its own name and 28 309 was a so-called indirect deposit in the name of the BIS. Under German pressure, the NBCS issued two transfer orders on 18 March 1939. One asked the BOE to transfer its direct deposit to the BIS. The BOE did not implement the order because the British government had frozen Czechoslovak bank assets in Great Britain. Later the Czechoslovak government in exile in London gave control of this deposit of gold to the British government. After the war Great Britain paid Czechoslovakia about £ 8 million sterling for this gold and the Czechoslovak government spent this money on purchases in Great Britain. The case was legally settled in this way and it was not possible to do anything about it because post-war Czechoslovakia had decided to accept British currency instead of gold.

In the second order of 18 March 1939, the NBCS asked the BIS to transfer 23 087 kg of gold (the so-called Basel gold) from the indirect deposit to the Reichsbank of Berlin. Although the BIS had doubts about whether the NBC-S was acting freely, it instructed London to implement the order. Meanwhile, Prague used confidential diplomatic con-

51 AMZV ČR, f. MPO, Dokumenty k..., part II., 1949–1957, p. 163-165, Note from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs addressed to the embassy of the USA in Prague on 28 June 1955.

52 Národní archiv ČR (National Archives of the Czech Republic – NAČR), f. Úřad předsednictva vlády – tajné (Prime Minister’s Office collection – secret – ÚPV-T) 1945–1959, no. cart. 1686, sign. 13.36.17, no. j. 203/350/55 PT.

tacts to ask the BOE and the British government not to implement the forced order. In spite of this, the BOE placed 23 087 kg of gold under German control. British government figures defended their approach and the action of the BOE with the argument that the BOE had to fulfil the order from the BIS because with regard to the indirect deposit it had a legal relationship only with the BIS and not with the NBCS. Therefore, the British government could do nothing for Czechoslovak interests.

The brief account by the Ministry of Finance on the state of the Czechoslovak gold also mapped the size of the losses of Czechoslovak gold, including the Basel gold, coverage of banknotes in the frontier regions, gold coins and the autonomous gold of Škoda and Zbrojovka, which amounted to a total of 45 483 kg. After the war, only 6 074 kg was returned. The Tripartite Commission had not decided about the rest. The legal assessment of the Ministry of Finance, which was really general information about actually and legally complex and often unclear matters, considered the possibility of civil legal proceedings. It was concerned with the question of whether the NBCS could successfully bring a case against the BIS from the point of view of the deposit contract or from the point of view of compensation for losses. According to the assessment, the BIS was undoubtedly responsible, but there was minimal hope for success in the dispute. The authors relied on the following facts.

1. It is probable that the time limit for a dispute on compensation for losses was already passed in 1946 and the deadline for a dispute on the deposit was passed on 9 May 1955, that is ten years after the end of the war, as far as this right persists;
2. It is impossible to exclude that it would complicate the still unfinished proceedings of the Tripartite Commission;
3. It is improbable that a Swiss court would convict a Swiss bank for violating a deposit contract in such a serious case, because that would shake the domestic banking system, which is based on deposits of assets from many countries;
4. In relation to the practice of the Swiss courts, the legitimacy of the NBCS in the dispute could be doubted. There is a risk of a succession dispute. The NBCS that deposited the gold abroad before the war had the form of a joint stock company. That was abolished in 1948 and replaced by a public state institution. The legitimacy of the State Bank of Czechoslovakia before a Swiss court is not entirely secure;
5. The dispute could be very expensive and have far reaching international political consequences.

In relation to these arguments, the assessment from the Ministry of Finance recommended prompt investigation and supplementing of the factual and legal material. However, the doubts about the possibility of a successful legal dispute persisted. The assessment recommended that the Bank for International Settlements should be reminded in writing of its responsibility and asked how it intended to settle the matter. The minister of finance committed himself to submit a proposal to the Political Secretariat of the CC of the CPC on 10 April 1955 after obtaining further supplementary material and after further legal consultations.

In connection with the possibility of applying Czechoslovak claims against Great Britain, the assessment proposed to abandon the legal responsibility of the British govern-

ment and to pursue the Czechoslovak claim to compensation for losses in the framework of then interrupted interstate negotiations with Great Britain. This would facilitate the Czechoslovak position in commercial and financial discussions, and could lead to British pressure on the Tripartite Commission in favour of Czechoslovakia. According to the legal assessment, if there were pre-conditions for a civil legal case against the BIS, a similar method could be used to put pressure on Great Britain.⁵³

Although the Ministry of Finance's documents made it clear that Czechoslovakia's manoeuvring space was limited, the Political Secretariat of the CC of the CPC decided that Czechoslovakia should undertake an offensive. According to the proposed resolution, J. Ďuriš's report had to be taken into account, and he should be told to send a representative to the BIS by 1 March 1955, to remind it of its obligation towards Czechoslovakia and formally declare the Czechoslovak claim in a letter from the State Bank of Czechoslovakia. By 25 March he should supplement the domestic and foreign evidence, and in cooperation with the Minister of Foreign Affairs Václav David and Minister of Foreign Trade Richard Dvořák appoint a Czechoslovak representative for the talks about the "Basel gold" in the framework of future interstate talks with Great Britain concerning the financial settlement. By 30 April 1955 a definitive proposal had to be submitted to the Political Secretariat of the CC of the CPC concerning the possibilities of a legal case against the BIS. The proposed party resolution bound the Foreign Minister V. David to find out by 3 April 1955 what the Polish government was doing about the Polish assets deposited with the BIS in 1939, and in cooperation with Prime Minister V. Široký to agree to what extent the public should be informed about the case of the Czechoslovak gold. Interior Minister Rudolf Barák received the task of investigating by 25 March 1955 the documents of Edvard Beneš and the Czechoslovak government in exile in London to find out whether they contained any promises on the question of the gold or any declarations to the British government. Barák also had to investigate by 1 June 1955 whether any Czechoslovak citizens bore any responsibility for the loss of gold or for inadequate and delayed measures concerned with claiming compensation.⁵⁴

The surviving archive material does not tell us whether the leadership of the Czechoslovak Communist Party approved this document or not. The fact remains that the proposed Czechoslovak offensive to gain the "Basel gold" did not happen. The above mentioned legal analysis pointed out that steps against the BIS were unrealistic, and would only fully reveal that the Czechoslovak tripartite gold could only realistically be solved bilaterally and in connection with other questions. The outlined approach of the Czechoslovak communist leadership was an unrealistic illusion.

The Tripartite Commission for the Restitution of Gold Reserves completed its investigations of state claims for the return of gold in 1958. However, actual return of the Czechoslovak gold remained unforeseeable mainly because of the position of the USA, which conditioned completion of restitution on the solution of other open economic or

53 NAČR, f. ÚPV-T 1945-1959, ref. 52.

54 NAČR, f. ÚPV-T 1945-1959, ref. 52, Proposed resolution of the Political Secretariate of the ÚV KSČ (CC CPO) to no. j. 203/350/55 PT.

financial problems in bilateral Czechoslovak – American relations. The connection of the problem of the return of the tripartite gold with the open bilateral problems was not objective or just, but the Czechoslovak gold became a lever or factor in the hands of the USA, with which they mainly wanted to force a solution to the problem of compensation for nationalized American property in Czechoslovakia. Although the Czechoslovak side publicly rejected the connection of these two diametrically different problems, there was no real alternative to accepting the American position.

* This study is a partial result of project APVV-14-0644 *Continuity and discontinuity of political and social elites in Slovakia in the 19th and 20th Centuries*, at the Institute of History of the Slovak Academy of Sciences.

TRIPARTITE KOMMISSION UND TSCHECHOSLOWAKISCHES WÄHRUNGSGOLD

SLAVOMÍR MICHÁLEK

Die vorgelegte Studie greift die, mit dem Funktionieren der, im Jahre 1946 von Frankreich, USA und Großbritannien gebildeten Tripartiten Kommission für die Restitution des Währungsgolds, verbundenen Fragen auf. Ihre Aufgabe war, das, während des zweiten Weltkriegs vom Deutschland erbeutete und nach dem Kriegsende gefundene Währungsgold von 10 europäischen Ländern, zu verifizieren und zu verteilen. Ein der Rezipienten war auch die Tschechoslowakei, die in den Jahren 1939–1940 mehr als 45 Tonnen ihres Währungsgold unrechtmäßig verlor. Die Studie befasst sich mit dem Marathon der Verhandlungen zwischen der Kommission und der Tschechoslowakei in den Jahren 1947–1952, deren Ergebnis die Anerkennung des tschechoslowakischen Anspruchs auf den aliquoten Teil des Währungsgolds war, das jedoch auf Druck von USA blockiert wurde und tatsächlich erst 1982 zurückgegeben wurde.

PhDr. Slavomír Michálek, DrSc.
Institute of History of the SAS
P. O. BOX 198, 814 99 Bratislava, Klemensova 19
e-mail: hismich@savba.sk

MIRIAM HLAVAČKOVÁ (ed.)

OD SYMBOLU K SLOVU

Podoby stredovekej komunikácie



REVIEWS

HLAVAČKOVÁ, Miriam (ed.). *OD SYMBOLU K SLOVU. PODOBY STREDOVEKEJ KOMUNIKÁCIE. (FROM SYMBOL TO WORD. FORMS OF MEDIEVAL COMMUNICATION.)*. Bratislava : Institute of History of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, VEDA, publisher of the SAS, 2016, 456 pages. ISBN 978-80-224-1537-8.

The world of symbols, images, rituals and words as specific resources for communication reaches back to the oldest periods of human existence. A long road leads from the ancient forms of spreading of information to those of today. It also leads to understanding of such a conceptually and temporally distant problem as the passing on and reception of information in medieval society. Precisely the themes that join the effort to grasp various aspects of oral, non-verbal or written communication in the Middle Ages became the central feature of the monograph with the title *Od symbolu k slovu. Podoby stredovekej komunikácie (From symbol to word. Forms of medieval communication.)* reviewed here. The central theme became the connective tissue of the monograph, but the differentiated approaches of the authors of this collective work are also emphasized by its division into five thematic circles. The first two are directed towards the diplomatic messages or exchanges of information between different social groups, the third deal with their interaction on the symbolic level and the last traces the evidence value of the communication symbols in narrative sources, medieval wall paintings, seals and documents.

Miroslav Lysý presents the first contribution to the history of medieval diplomacy. The author is concerned with the Early Middle Ages, but his interest is directed especially to the 9th century and the written sources from the Great Moravian period. Emphasis is placed on the questions connected with the methods of sending messages, directly by the monarch or by social elites organized in an assembly, the connection between sending of gifts and the possible subordination of the Prince of Great Moravia to the Eastern Frankish monarch and the possible existence of messages for these purposes also in the Slavonic environment. In his conclusions, the author emphasizes that in spite of the absence of a single mechanism for the sending and receiving of messages, there was a shift in the diplomatic practice of the Slavonic environment of Great Moravian diplomacy. However, the contributions of Tomáš Homofa and Eva Frimmová bring testimony about the advances in diplomatic communication captured in detail by the sources. Both authors rely on detailed reports about the flourishing diplomatic practices of the courts of important royal dynasties. The contributions connect with each other in time, but the two authors emphasize different aspects of diplomatic negotiations. Tomáš Homofa has studied their course and wider context in the reign of Matthias Corvinus. On the basis of accounts in chronicles, he devotes attention to the accompanying rituals, symbolic communication and background of the diplomatic moves of political actors. Eva Frimmová has directed her attention to the diplomatic activities of the Jagiello dynasty and especially the Habsburgs at the beginning of the 16th century, especially in the political context. In the context of talks about dynastic unions she points to the active role of Papal diplomacy, the financial background of diplomatic successes or the military conflicts stirred up by the Emperor with the aim of strengthening the power political plans of the Habsburgs in Central Europe.

Daniela Dvořáková's account of the communication between the court of Queen Barbara of Cilly and King Sigismund from the Luxembourg dynasty opens a second theme in the monograph directed towards verbal and written communication. The author presents the composition of the queen's court in the form of graphs, on the basis of which she points to a gradual change in its

composition. Her conclusions cast doubt on the possible existence of a centre competing with the court of the King of Hungary, in spite of the exceptional position of Queen Barbara in the power structure of the Kingdom of Hungary. Different forms of medieval communication, directed towards the Catholics in Husite Bohemia and kinship relations in aristocratic families are covered in the contributions of Jan Hrdina and Monika Tihányiová. The first uncovers the problems of the lower Catholic clergy in the period 1420–1467 using official and private letters and documents. The second is mainly a sounding into the family and marital relationships of selected members of the aristocracy. Miriam Hlavačková turns her attention to the medical profession in the Middle Ages. Against the background of a broadly outlined problem, including a general description of medieval medicine, the methods of treatment and the ideas of the period about the causes of illness, the author presents recommended, sometimes rather curious forms of communication between doctor and patient. However, apart from dealing with the problem considered here, they testify to the distance of the medieval thought system from ours. Peter Labanc has undertaken a statistical analysis of the legal actions at the trustworthy place of Spišská Kapitula from 1260 to 1387. He notes a growth in the frequency of legal acts in some periods of the existence of the trustworthy place, the position of the official asking for testimony, the number of witnesses of the legal act and their time. The author concludes that written testimony had growing importance in the legal system, there was a tendency towards institutional securing of the state power and there are possibilities for further research. However, these statements apply to all the contributions to this thematic field.

The third and partially also the fourth and last part of the monograph turn to the symbolic aspects of medieval communication. Tomáš Borovský has significantly contributed to understanding the symbolism and functions of bells in the Middle Ages. The author does not direct his attention only to the position of bells in the liturgy, but also to the associated town celebrations. The contribution is interwoven with interesting examples from the Czech and Moravian environment, which point to the importance of the function of bells as a means of commemoration in the Middle Ages, specifically in relation to marking the anniversary of a death, or as an important part of town administration law, by summoning citizens to assemblies. Žofia Lysá informs us about the social stratification of urban society or about the financial investments of the propertied classes, for example, in Bratislava. The author considers the motives of the participants. In the framework of this problem, she also devotes attention to the growing number of donations to religious institutions, which very clearly have religious motives. Martin Nodl has concerned himself with the sources about the symbolic level of the activity of the Lithuanian Prince Žigmund Korybutovič in Husite Bohemia and the historical memory of his attempt to gain the Czech throne. The author has skilfully succeeded in depicting the contemporary response to the initial successes and eventual fall of the prince in the symbolic actions of actors as well as the later mediators of these events. The circle of themes in the chapter is closed by the contribution of Juraj Hric on the roots of Christianity and the cult of saints honoured in the towns of Pannonia. The author also devotes attention to the translation of their relics and transmission of their cult into the Early Middle Ages.

The contributions to the fourth part of the work are directed towards the literary language of the narrative sources. Peter Bystrický writes of the sagas and songs of Germanic origin, spread orally and written down only after centuries. The author does not draw information only from Germanic mythology, but also from history. His contribution includes poetry and prose works transmitted orally for generations. Early records of the Carpathians up to the 13th century are the subject of the contribution by Pavol Hudáček. The author considers mentions of forests, especially in chronicles, the symbolic meaning assigned to forests by medieval story tellers, and the existence of frontier forests, seen as a particular kind of barrier. Marek Oravec finds mentions of luxury objects on the pages of legends and chronicles. He traces their symbolic functions and perception in medieval society using examples from the oldest narrative sources.

The last chapter of the work is directed towards visual and musical communication. Dušan Buran presents especially Gothic monumental wall paintings as a means of visual communication. He points especially to the reasons for imitation of artistic depictions, emphasizing the function and aim of the imitation of luxury materials or popular motifs. Eva Veselovská has researched medieval notation or sources of musical culture from the 11th to the 16th centuries in the territory of Slovakia. Notation systems developed in connection with ecclesiastical centres. Her contribution also includes a pictorial supplement. The collection of works by different authors ends with a contribution from Miroslav Glejtek, devoted to the symbolic, informative and communication value of the seal. The author also uses a rich pictorial supplement to present especially royal, municipal and ecclesiastical seals. He tries to identify the motives often leading to more complex images on seals. He concludes that their complex symbolism was not necessarily accessible only to the intellectual elites of society.

The monograph is the collective work of authors, who have succeeded in combining various aspects of medieval communication into a content rich, but surprisingly integrated publication, considering its rather broad central theme. Precisely the theme of exchange of information in the Middle Ages combines a relatively wide and heterogeneous field of research by the authors into a homogeneous looking book title. The specialized studies are not directed only to description of the functioning of the channels of communication in medieval society, but also to the symbols or the functions they fulfilled in individual fields of social interaction. Tracing of the same phenomena in different periods, as in the case of diplomacy in the Early and Late Middle Ages, or of heterogeneous social groups, as with correspondence between members of royal courts, aristocratic families and the lower clergy, enables authors to change their perspective or identify shifts in the development of the institutions by means of which information was spread. The publication also includes a pictorial supplement, which could be enriched with illustrations concerning the inspirational contributions on Germanic sagas or luxury objects in the possession of the Hungarian nobility. The division of the monograph into chapters offers a clear division of the work, but the assignment of some contributions to thematic circles although they are actually somewhere at their intersection, is not entirely unambiguous. However, the contributions form qualitatively balanced wholes, which supplement each other. The inter-disciplinary connections also reach beyond the traditional understanding of the problem, enriching it with new views. Therefore, the monograph *From symbol to word. Forms of medieval communication* is an important contribution not only to its actual theme, but also to knowledge of the social connections in medieval society. Thanks to its attractive content, the monograph is not only a work serving scientific aims, but also a book attractive to readers.

Marek Druga

DIANA DUCHOŇOVÁ ~ TÜNDE LENGYELOVÁ

Hradné kuchyne a šľachtické stravovanie v ranom novoveku

Radosti slávností, strasti každodennosti



DUCHOŇOVÁ, Diana – LENGYELOVÁ, Tünde. *HRADNÉ KUCHYNE A ŠLACHTICKÉ STRAVOVANIE V RANOM NOVOVEKU. Radosti slávností, strasti každodennosti (CASTLE KITCHENS AND THE EATING HABITS OF ARISTOCRATS IN EARLY MODERN TIMES. The Joy of Festivals, The Sorrows of Everyday Life)*. Editors: Peter Kónya, Viliam Čičaj. Bratislava : Institute of History of the Slovak Academy of Sciences in the publisher VEDA, 2016. 320 p. ISBN 978-80-224-1538-5

The two authors from the Institute of History of the Slovak Academy of Sciences have presented the lay and expert public with a real break through. It is the first comprehensive work in Slovak historiography devoted to the theme of food in the aristocratic environment. The authors have researched court culture for a long time and obtained valuable material from long-term archive research and study of expert literature, which is mostly in Hungarian where the Kingdom of Hungary is concerned. They have recast it into excellent scientific monographs, fully able to compete with the books produced by renowned European publishers. The book is a deeply penetrating structuralist sounding into the “everyday” themes of food, dining, etiquette, economic organization and the hierarchy of servants in Early Modern times with regard to the court and aristocratic environment. The authors understood this theme exhaustively and on many levels.

The monograph is divided into four main chapters, each with various sub-chapters. In the first chapter under the title: *The Kitchen*, the authors broadly approach the importance and role of royal and aristocratic courts, which were spreaders of new cultural impulses. Naturally, aristocratic courts could not compete with royal courts, but by the end of the 16th and during the first half of the 17th centuries, aristocratic courts experienced great changes. They became centres for the culture of Hungary on the boundary between Eastern and Western Europe. Precisely food, the ways it was prepared and consumed – everything connected with it, was an integral part of the specific culture of the Kingdom of Hungary. Therefore, the chapter naturally begins with a description of the development of the royal court of Hungary after the Battle of Mohács, with the origin of three new court centres at Vienna, Bratislava and Alba Iulia, and an account of the basic features of an aristocratic residence. It further maps the development of the most important space connected with the preparation of food – the kitchen. In this case it is naturally about the late medieval castle kitchen. This was inevitably connected with a water supply in the form of a well, cistern or system for catching rain water. Castle kitchens were originally wooden and situated close to the banqueting halls. There was also an effort to build them so that fires would not threaten other buildings. In the case of late medieval royal residences, it is notable that there were two specialized kitchens: a larger one for the personnel, and a smaller one for the needs of the monarch. The residential castle of an early modern aristocrat also had two kitchens, the so-called big kitchen for the lord, his family and household, and the little kitchen for the *fraucimer* – the women’s part of the court, small children and their wet nurses. The authors also direct attention to the equipment of kitchens with detailed descriptions of the various types of vessel and tool. The reader is surprised by the level of technical maturity of some of the aristocratic kitchens, documented, for example, by a mechanical spit for cooking meat working according to the principle of a clock. It is also notable that the kitchen was very carefully guarded. This is documented in contemporary court regulations. It was motivated by an effort to ensure the quality of production, protect food from poison and especially to prevent theft. Activities closely connected to those of the kitchen, for example, baking of bread, production of vinegar and beer, as well as the cellars or storerooms, are not neglected. Estates and castle gardens were undoubtedly important sources of supplies for aristocratic kitchens. In this period it was already usual to divide them according to the plants cultivated into vegetables, herbs for medicine

and cooking, flowers, fruit and vines. Cultivation of exotic fruit such as citrus and pomegranate, and improvement or grafting of fruit trees became popular among the elites of Hungary in the 16th and 17th centuries. The practice of the so-called courtesy gift, common among aristocrats, is also connected. It often involved unique fruits, either cultivated or collected in forests. The establishment of luxury, decorative gardens as part of aristocratic residences such as those of the Pálffy and Lipai families in Bratislava, is a separate but closely related theme. A nobleman had to secure an appropriate quantity of food for the personnel of his castles and estates. Around 200–350 people could be found at an aristocratic court, and their hierarchy was considered when providing food. The kitchen was supplied both from the serfs' payments and from the output of the estate. Fish ponds, pastures, mills, vineyards, game reserves, gardens, fields, orchards and so on were the most important. Estates and fishponds had increasing roles and importance from the 16th century. Castle and manor house kitchens were supplied with meat from their own butchers and those at nearby estates.

The second chapter with the title: *The Kitchen Staff* takes the reader into the world of complex social structures typical of the court environment. The starting point is the late medieval organization of the kitchen staff at the royal court of Hungary. Functions and their roles are successively presented: court-master, cup-bearer, steward, stableman, manager, cooks and so on. This account continues into the post-Mohács period with regard to the Habsburg court. The personnel of castles and the organization of aristocratic courts were originally derived from the royal court of Hungary, but changes also came here in Early Modern times, especially in the two important functions of senechal and castelan. The key-bearer, court captain, chamberlain, stableman and the court-master, whose duties included supervising the apprentices, stewards, kitchen staff and kitchen master, can also be mentioned. The kitchen at an aristocratic court had its own apparatus, its own staff responsible for preparing food. The kitchen master from the ranks of the retinue stood at the head of the kitchen. He was responsible for the quality, preparation and serving of the food. He decided the menu, and directed the work of the chief, specialized and assistant cooks and kitchen servants. He also supervised the servants responsible for serving meals: stewards, servers of drinks, carriers of dishes, carvers and so on.

The third chapter with the title *Dining* gives an extraordinarily interesting view of its cultural and social importance. It was one of the criteria of social differentiation and for the aristocrat or monarch, it served as a manifestation of court glamour and wealth. Dining fulfilled various functions in the aristocratic environment. They included social communication: creating, extending and strengthening social contacts; representation: the form of dining, composition of the diners, eating habits, number and content of courses, serving. Dining also pointed to the property, life style and cultural maturity of an aristocrat, increased his social prestige and confirmed his status. This applied especially to wedding and funeral feasts. It was a direct mirror of the hierarchy and discipline of the court society and relations at the court. Dining customs in early modern Hungary also changed in various ways. In contrast to the Middle Ages, monarchs increasingly distanced themselves from their courtiers when dining. From the end of the 17th century, aristocrats at their own courts dined ever more frequently only with their immediate families. The authors describe a multitude of details connected with dining on the basis of the archive materials they have studied. Arrangement of tables with the help of carpets, serving, use of table furniture such as candelabra and saltcellars, the use of cutlery with the introduction of forks at 17th century banquets, and vessels for drinks. Since we lack domestic literature on behaviour and guides to the cultivation of good manners and self-control (N. Elias) from Hungary, the surviving court regulations represent a valuable source of information on table etiquette at aristocratic courts. We learn from them about the exact rules and instructions for dining, the order of seating at individual tables, namely those for the lord, the familiares, women and servants, the number of courses. From the mid 17th century,

the first course was soup and was followed by boiled and roast food, pâté, fruit and dessert. The number of meals offered during the day increased with the new phenomenon of breakfast appearing around 1700. Finally, it is necessary to mention the new drinks that appeared on the table in this period with coffee from the end of the 16th century, chocolate from the first half of the 17th century and tea from the beginning of the 18th century.

The following, fourth chapter: *On plate and in cup*, documents the close connection between culture and food. It presents the changes in the field of food in Hungary connected with Ottoman expansion, and with the spread of humanism and the Renaissance. These developments meant new foods, crops and technologies for preparing food and drink. These changes appeared most rapidly in the urban middle class and aristocratic environments, in connection with the trading journeys of businessmen from the towns, the study visits of noblemen and the presence of foreign armies in the country. To illustrate the eating habits of the period and evaluations of “national cuisines”, the authors have used their usual methods of contemporary texts placed in “us – them” opposition. They present authentic views on cuisine in Hungary through the eyes of outsiders: Poles, Germans and Turks. The views of people from Hungary on foreign food and ways of dining are also presented. The authors point to hospitality and the importance of bread and meat – mostly beef, but also from wild animals, sheep, lambs, fish and crayfish, with freshness not always the primary criterion of quality – and wine or beer in the catering arrangements at aristocratic courts. The reader learns about vegetable supplements, the introduction of potatoes, spread of pasta, use of puree, flavouring, spices, dairy products such as butter or tvaroh and bryndza cheeses, and the consumption of luxury goods such as citrus, olives, capers, artichokes and parmesan at aristocratic courts.

The conclusion of the work is extraordinarily interesting and valuable. It gives examples of various surviving menus from the aristocratic environment for individual days or longer periods, including ordinary, fasting and festive times. An unusual and revealing feature of the conclusion is a collection of authentic Early Modern recipes for food, including dishes with and without meat as well as desserts and drinks, which readers can produce for themselves.

It is also necessary to praise the rich pictorial supplement, which makes the work attractive for the ordinary reader.

Michal Bada

DUŠAN KOVÁČ – EVA KOWALSKÁ – PETER ŠOLTÉS
A KOLEKTÍV

SPOLOČNOSŤ
NA SLOVENSKEJ
V DLHOM 19. STOROČÍ



VYDAVATEĽSTVO SLOVENSKEJ AKADEMIE VIED

KOVÁČ, Dušan – KOWALSKÁ, Eva – ŠOLTÉS, Peter et al. *SPOLOČNOSŤ NA SLOVENSKU V DLHOM 19. STOROČÍ. (SOCIETY IN SLOVAKIA IN THE LONG 19TH CENTURY)*. Bratislava : VEDA, 2015, 511 pages. ISBN978-80-224-1478-4.

The collective monograph consists of of seventeen studies divided into five chapters. *The country and the towns* is the title of the first chapter composed of two studies. The following two chapters, composed of five and four studies respectively, are named: *The individual and society* and *A nation emerges*. The remaining six studies are divided between the fourth and fifth chapters under the titles: *Military and political battlefields* and *Man does not live by bread alone*. These titles of the chapters already suggest that in spite of its general title: *Society in Slovakia in the long 19th century*, the book only covers some specific aspects of the social history of the territory of Slovakia, which formed an integral part of the Kingdom of Hungary and Habsburg Monarchy in this period. A closer look at the individual studies shows that some of the chapters are rather heterogeneous in their content, which could be perceived as a shortcoming. However, in the case of the reviewed work, the relative thematic heterogeneity is a natural result of the purpose this book was intended to serve. This collective monograph is an outcome of the project financed by the Agency to Support Research and Development (contract no. APVV-0119-11). However, the main result of this project, is supposed to be a three volume synthesis of Slovak history in the 19th century published in the years coming. The seventeen studies forming the work reviewed here represent the initial results of the research team, giving an idea about the state of the research and the broad conception of the synthesis to be published.

The work opens with an *Introduction* authored by the three editors of the work: Dušan Kováč, Eva Kowalská, and Peter Šoltés. They give a rather selective outline of some aspects of the existence of the Slovaks in the Kingdom of Hungary in the 19th century. They concentrate on the following themes: the appearance of nationalism and later of political nationalism in the course of the 19th century, the “incorrect interpretation” of the Kingdom of Hungary by the “Magyars” as their own nation state, the absence of a Slovak national territory defined by a historical boundary, the problem of the patriotism of a large part of the Slovak elites and ordinary people towards the historic Kingdom of Hungary, and forced Magyarization. In the second part of the introduction, the authors devote attention to the theoretical points of departure they propose to use when researching the history of Slovakia in the 19th century. They consider the “paradigm of social history” to be optimal and they consider particularly useful the model proposed by Jürgen Osterhammel, which they briefly introduce (OSTERHAMMEL, Jürgen. *Die Verwandlung der Welt. Eine Geschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts*. München: C.H. Beck, 2009). In the closing section of the Introduction the editors briefly outline the areas in which the research is still in its initial stages. They suggest that the Slovak historiography should devote more attention to the development of aristocratic estates in the early modern period, processes of bureaucratization in the course of the 19th century, the adoption and development of modern forms of economy in the period before March 1848, the functioning of county and municipal structures especially in the part of the territory of the Kingdom of Hungary inhabited by Slovaks. At the same time, the editors self-critically admit that the aforementioned subjects will receive little or no attention on the following pages of the book. Finally, the Introduction concludes with a suggestion for abandonment of the narrowly national perspectives on Slovak history, for avoidance of a strong orientation towards political history, and for a more comparative approach to the research on the history of the Slovaks, paying attention also to the wider European context.

The introductory text of the book under review is revelatory. It is evident that the volume is meant to address particularly the Slovak readership. Since there is little attention paid to the introduction of the research questions that the authors actually attempt to answer in the volume, and some other issues are not mentioned at all – which particularly, I will specify below – this *Introduction* appears to be a wasted opportunity.

In the opening article to the first chapter, Dušan Škvarna analyses the ideas of the Slovak patriots about the national territory of the Slovaks in the first half of the 19th century. He outlines the pre-modern conceptions of the Slovak ethnic territory, but devotes more attention to the works of the leading representatives of the Slovak national movement in the 1830s and 1840s. Škvarna also studies cartographic sources, the works of early statisticians and ethnologists, and school geography textbooks. The second article by Jana Pochaničová is devoted to tradition and innovation in architecture in the period from the beginning of the rule of Joseph II in 1780 to the Austro-Hungarian Compromise of 1867. The changes of architectural style as a result of the dialectical relationship between the continuity of tradition and the discontinuous elements of innovation are documented using the example of the sacred architecture of the Jewish religious communities in Prešporok (the author uses the post-1918 designation of the city: Bratislava), and in the counties of Prešporok (Pressburg/Pozsony), Trenčín (Trencsén), Liptov (Liptó), Spiš (Szepes), Šariš (Sáros) and Zemplín (Zemplén). The second half of the article consists of a case study of the Feigler family, who belonged to the most prominent city architects, builders and developers in 19th century Prešporok.. Pochaničová traces architectural development and the various influences that determined it through the activities of three generations of the family.

The second chapter begins with a demographic study by Branislav Šprocha and Pavol Tišliar. Under the title: *Population development in the long 19th century. An outline of demographic trends*, they offer an analysis of the accessible demographic data, which they rigorously reduced to the present territory of the Slovak Republic, although, as they admit, this cannot be done with equal consistence in every case. The study traces the basic demographic parameters: growth of the population of the delineated territory (the authors usually speak of Slovakia, less often using the description: “territory of Slovakia”), the conditions and factors of change in the reproductive behaviour and death rate, marriage patterns and the structure of the population by age and gender. On the basis of these and other parameters and factors, they conceptualized the quantitative and qualitative transformation of the so-called old demographic regime and the coming of the demographic revolution to “Slovakia” in the course of the long 19th century. In the next study Tomáš Janura offers a partial prosopographic study of the county official apparatus using the example of the County of Zvolen (Zólyom) in the period 1790–1848. In the first part of the study, he informs the reader about the individual functions of the county administration and the responsibilities of officials. He also devotes attention to the process of selecting and appointing officials, the renewal of mandates or restructuring, although he concentrates mainly on the periodicity of elections summoned by the chief sheriff of the county. In the second part of the study, he analyses the so-called official dynasties of the County of Zvolen, that is the degree of presence of representatives of individual noble families (Radvanszky, Beniczky, Rakovszky, Czerva and others) in official positions during the relevant period. Janura looks at the building up of official dynasties from the point of view of the corrupt practices of clientelism (cronyism) and nepotism. In this way, he outlines an important theme for further research also concerning periods before the end of the 18th century and for the second half of the 19th and 20th centuries. The next three texts of the second chapter form one of the best integrated parts of the collective monograph. These three studies by Ingrid Kušnieráková, Katarína Pekařová and Gabriela Dudeková are devoted to social and health care. I. Kušnieráková studies the reforms of care for the urban poor, unsupported children and orphans in the Kingdom of Hungary during the reigns of Joseph II and Leopold II. The reforms mainly of the

first of these monarchs had the aim of rationalizing, bringing under state control and centralizing the hitherto unorganized and decentralized charitable activity. The author analyses not only the reforms, but also their practical implementation. In spite of its progressive character, the new system of social care finally resulted in a decline of the resources that individual charitable institutions could obtain, which reduced the number of people they could support. The Josephine reforms were implemented in Hungary only to a limited degree, and in the end they were either completely repealed or changed to such an extent that in various ways there was a return to the state before the reforms. K. Pekařová's extensive study examines the organization of public health in the territory of Slovakia in the period 1780–1918. The introduction briefly defines the issue of systematic health care in the framework of political and expert scientific discourse in the period. Pekařová mentions general data about the illnesses of the population of the counties situated in regions now belonging to Slovakia, and analyses various aspects of the legislative and institutional organization and professionalization of health care in chronological order with the years 1848 and 1867 identified as milestones. In the second part of the study, K. Pekařová considers the personnel providing health care, beginning with the professional training of doctors and midwives, and ending with the education of nursing staff. The last part of the study briefly covers the hospital institutions, their development in the 19th century and the activity of medical societies in the field of public health. The author devotes greater attention to the struggle and medical interventions against epidemics that afflicted especially the territory of Slovakia in this period, namely smallpox, diphtheria, cholera, typhus and tuberculosis. The author of the last of the three texts, Gabriela Dudeková has investigated the organization of health and social care in the period of Neo-Absolutism. Apart from tracing the legislative and organizational aspect, she attempts to see the reform of health and social care of the “Bach regime” also in relation to a question that has again attracted increased interest from Habsburgologists: To what degree was the repressive and centralizing system of the so-called Neo-Absolutist period modernizing or progressive, specifically in the field of state social policy?

The third collective chapter *A nation emerges* opens with Miloslav Szabó's study: *Nation and family. A contribution to analysis of the discourse of the Slovak national movement*, in which he analyses gender aspects of the narratives created by specific representatives of the Slovak national movement. He concentrates mainly on the texts of Ľudovít Štúr and Svetozár Hurban Vajanský, observing that gender and specifically sexual motifs are far from being limited in Slovak nationalist discourse only to the relations between “man” and “woman”. They also appear in the form of naturalist codes to define the Slovak national community, especially in connection with the anti-Jewish and xenophobic ideology of Slovak nationalists. In the following study, Peter Šoltés devotes attention to the hitherto unstudied theme of Slovak and Slavic “national names” in the Slovak national movement. He analyses the factors leading to a substantial difference in strategies of choosing Christian names between the Roman Catholic and Evangelical confessions in the course of the 19th century. It was much more difficult to establish non-traditional or non-biblical names in the Catholic environment than among Protestants. This is shown by quantitative soundings in church registers as well as by analysis of the Christian names in the families of active Slovak patriots from the Evangelical and Catholic confessions. For two generations, from the 1840s to 1880s, the giving of Slovak or Slavic national names remained a phenomenon confined mostly to the Evangelical patriotic elite. In the non-elite environment of the ordinary “Slovak people”, Slovak and Slavic names began to spread slowly only in the 1880s. The third study in the chapter on the “emergence of the nation” is a text by Daniela Kodajová devoted to the funerals and commemorations of notable Slovak patriots. Kodajová looks at these events as places for an “emotional form of staging of national identity”. As a result of the persecuting and restrictive activity of the Hungarian county and state officials, the funerals of leading “men of the Slovak nation” and commemorative events were among the few public scenes at which the active Slovak patriots could use gestures and

ritualized acts to address not only the small educated, reading public, but also the semi-literate or illiterate population, since these public events were not subject to notification obligations. National celebrations functioned as public theatrical performances and speeches at funerals enabled the construction and spreading of a cultural image of noble self-sacrifice for the nation, an ideal image of the national hero and leader of the nation or of the struggle for the nation. D. Kodajová analyses in more detail the funeral celebrations for Ján Kollár and Ján Hollý, the speeches at the funerals of Eudovít Štúr, Jozef Miloslav Hurban, Viliam Pauliny-Tóth and the superintendent Karol Kuzmány, Bishop Stephen Moyses and others. The third chapter closes with a study by Peter Macho on Bishop Fridrich Baltík and the attitude of the Slovak patriotic activists to him in connection with ecclesiastical legislation and the struggle of the Slovak Evangelical elites to preserve the integrity of the Cis-Danubian denominational district (the north-western part of the Kingdom of Hungary) in the last decade of the 19th century. The structures of the Evangelical Church of the Augsburg Confession, especially the Cis-Danubian district, represented a unique institutional platform in which they had some degree of autonomy and could relatively freely use the Slovak language not only as an instrument of communication, but also as an official administrative language. According to P. Macho, the governments of Hungary saw the Slovak Evangelical patriotic activists mainly as spreaders of pan-Slavism and so as anti-state elements threatening the territorial integrity of Hungary, so starting in the 1890s they increased their effort to Magyarize church life. A second source of tension and fear was the ecclesiastical policy laws, which introduced civil marriage and transferred registration to state offices. In the given situation, the Slovak Evangelical patriotic activists placed great hope in Fridrich Baltík, who was elected Bishop of the Cis-Danubian district in May 1890. However, Baltík did not fulfil their expectations, precisely the reverse. According to his critics, he followed a conformist and servile attitude towards the government, which led to Evangelical patriotic discourse viewing him as a turncoat, national renegade, “Magyarone” and traitor to the Lutheran Church and confession. However, P. Macho comes to the conclusion that such a designation is not correct, and an objective evaluation of Baltík by historians is still needed.

The fourth chapter with the title *Military and political battlefields* opens with a text by Roman Holec, which takes the reader back to the period of Neo-Absolutism. The study *Bach's hussars – symbol of the regime or one its myths* is an attempt to refute several interpretative schemes, which were and to some extent still are firmly rooted in the narratives of Central European historiography, especially in Hungary. R. Holec describes them as myths, which mostly originated during the period of neo-absolutism or soon after it. According to Holec, the Hungarian historiography uncritically accepted them into its national historical argumentation and repeats them until today. There are three specific “Hungarian myths”: (1.) Collaboration with the neo-absolutist regime also meant collaboration with Vienna during the revolution; (2.) The myth of the passive resistance of the Hungarian political elites to the neo-absolutist regime; (3.) The myth of the inability of the Slovaks to understand “Bach’s hussars”. The fourth myth that Holec seeks to deconstruct is not “Hungarian”, but rather “Czech” or “Czecho-Slovak”: (4.) The myth of the good and helpful Czech officials working in Upper Hungary in the period of neo-absolutism. R. Holec refutes these “myths” by giving concrete examples as well as statistical data. However, his study is mainly devoted to researching the strategies of self-preservation and trans-regime migration of professional cadres of Hungarian/Magyar officials, especially Bach’s so-called hussars. The next study in the fourth chapter is also concerned with the 1850s and specifically with the last year of that decade. Vojtech Dangel offers a detailed analysis of the presence of the armed forces of the Habsburg Monarchy in Lombardy–Venetia and the course of the Battle of Solferino in 1859. The final text in the chapter *Military and political battlefields* is the longest study in the reviewed work: *Slovak politics in the period of provisional arrangements and preparation for the Austro-Hungarian Compromise, 1859 – 1867* by Dušan Kováč. The study offers an analysis of dynastic politics and

the positions of the Hungarian political elites with an emphasis on the “nationality question” and specifically on the Slovak national movement. D. Kováč points critically to the hitherto prevailing one-sided and superficial evaluation of the loyalty to the Kingdom of Hungary and pro-government position of the Slovak political elite, namely the so-called Pest/Budapest group or Young School. However, he also evaluates the political conception of the Budapest group as naive and he regards the division over basic questions of the Slovak national programme as one of the most serious problems of the Slovak movement as a whole.

The last chapter, regarding its content not quite appropriately titled *Man does not live by bread alone*, is composed of excellent studies by three historians. Eva Kowalská, Elena Mannová and Ivona Kollárová devote their attention to selected aspects of institutional, social and political factors of the organization of modern society. In her study *Education as politics. The Enlightenment, elementary education and the Habsburg state around 1800*, E. Kowalská examines the establishment of state supervision over the process of organizing mass education and the pushing of the churches out of their previously dominant position not only in the field of education. State reform meant complex change not only in the field of applying the conception of reformed Catholicism and confessional tolerance, but also disruption of church school organization and securing of material and financial support for schools. The reforms also concerned teacher training and monitoring of the quality of education. New educational methods were derived, at least according to the theoretical conceptions of the reformers, from the principles of mercantilism, physiocracy and philanthropism. E. Kowalská analyses the inter-connected conceptual elements derived from Enlightenment conceptions of a good and just organization of society and the pragmatic needs of the dynasty and state. The concluding part of the study considers especially the impact of the Toleration Patent of 1781 on the organization of non-Catholic elementary education or on the so-called (denominationally) mixed schools. In the next study, Elena Mannová examines the phenomenon of civil societies and relations between the state and the citizens in the period 1848–1867. She traces the establishment and functioning of societies during the revolutionary years, the period of neo-absolutism and the 1860s. She analyses the legislative framework and the attitude of the government to society activities in this period. She devotes special attention to Slovak societies, but does not limit her consideration to them. The basic research question that E. Mannová tries to answer concerns the modernization potential of the non-governmental civil sector in the 1850s and 1860s. To what degree were civic societies in the Kingdom of Hungary and especially in Upper Hungary the bearers of social and political modernization changes in comparison with the Cis-Leithanian part of the Habsburg Monarchy and the German states? The state was the main initiator of modernization changes, but in spite of this, we cannot undervalue the importance of societal activity, because many civil societies were the bearers not only of nationalist agitation, but also of civil virtues and the ethos of civil equality. The final chapter ends with a study by Ivona Kollárová on the institutionalization and disciplining of the reading public in the period of more than half a century from the 1770s to 1840s. She investigates organizational and institutional conditions such as the establishment of reading rooms and reading societies, as well as conceptual and ideological changes, which led to the spread of reading as a new social phenomenon. The traditional institutions or organizations, which claimed to supervise the moral and ethical imperatives of social life and to be the arbiters of “truth” with regard to questions concerning the “correctness”, “success” and “necessity” of the existing political and social order of society, namely the church and state institutions, very soon began to notice the growth of reading and publishing activity as a lively phenomenon, which represented a serious threat if it was not controlled and regulated.

The collective monograph ends with a summary in English and index of names. There is no final synthesizing chapter, summarizing and evaluating the main findings of the authors, assessing the state of research and proposing further directions for investigation.

Let us first consider the formal aspect of the collective monograph. As I said in the introduction, the volume is rather heterogeneous in various ways. Apart from the relative thematic fragmentation, which is a natural result of the publication of “work in progress” research papers and so can be accepted without criticism, the lack of unity in the chapters and studies also appears in the internal division of the texts. Some studies have no conclusions and appear to end in the middle of the account (Pohaničová, Janura, Kodajová, Kováč). The use of names of people and places is not unified. Various authors use anachronistic names of cities and geo-political units (Bratislava, Italy, Germany). For example, the historically correct name Prešporok (Pressburg/Pozsony) is used consistently by only three authors (Pekařová, Dudeková, Mannová), with some authors at least mentioning the historic name in brackets. The writing of names of historic actors is even more variable, beginning with the systematic use of originally Hungarian (Magyar) Christian names and surnames in transcribed forms according to Slovak orthography (Pohaničová), continuing with the transcription of Hungarian names only of persons born or active for a long time in the territory now belonging to Slovakia (Pekařová) and with provision of the original form in brackets or with Christian names in the Slovak form and the surnames in the original form (Holec, Kowalská, Mannová). The question of using or not using anachronistic “Slovakized” names of Hungarian/Magyar people and places is still an open and sensitive question in Slovak historiography. However, from the scholarly point of view, the “retrospective Slovakizing” of historic Hungarian personal names and the anachronistic naming of geopolitical units is difficult to defend.

To what degree does the collective work fulfil the appeal formulated by the editors in the *Introduction* for an abandonment of the narrow national perspective on Slovak history, and for introduction of a more comparative approach? Only partially and superficially, rather than directly and systematically.

The majority of studies entirely lack any comparative dimension and some authors directly apply a Slovak ethnocentric national historicizing approach (Šprocha, Tišliar). On the other hand, some of the authors do not limit their attention exclusively to the territory now belonging to the Slovak Republic and consider to some degree the context of the whole Kingdom of Hungary and/or the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy (e.g. Kušniráková, Dudeková, Holec, Mannová). Nevertheless, it is impossible to avoid critically mentioning the excessive anachronistic use of the geo-political name “Slovakia”, already found in the actual title of the work, as an inevitable result of the ethnocentric or national conception of history. Before 1918 Slovakia did not exist as a geo-political entity, its territory formed an integral part of the Kingdom of Hungary. Only E. Mannová (p. 438, note 6) states an explicit position on this. She defends the regionalist approach and the use of the term “Upper Hungary” or “Upper Hungarian region”. It is only possible to agree with her that when researching the region of the north-western, northern and partly also north-eastern counties of the Kingdom of Hungary, inhabited mainly by Slovak speaking people, it is not historically accurate to use the geopolitical name “Slovakia”. The justification for the consistent retrospective construction of “Slovakia”, when researching the demography of the territory now forming the Slovak Republic, is questionable from the scientific point of view (Šprocha, Tišliar). The effects of social, political, economic, cultural and other factors in the 19th century in the framework of Hungary and the Habsburg Monarchy were not limited to the territory defined by the present frontiers of the Slovak Republic. It is impossible to avoid and ignore the fact that especially, but not only, the demographic factors resulting from legislative norms and governmental policies affected the territory of the whole kingdom and not only an anachronistically delineated part of its territory. The existence of confessional, cultural and social determinants specific to some regions inhabited by Slovak speaking people does not justify the retrospective designation of “Slovakia” in the period of the 19th century. Is it not more justified and more accurate in such cases to use the above mentioned regionalist approach with regard for historical realities?

In this context, the absence of critical reflection on the above mentioned problems, whether in the form of a separate study or a treatise in the *Introduction*, can be evaluated as a deficiency of the reviewed work. The correctness or incorrectness of ethnocentric interpretative frameworks and approaches to historical research has been discussed for several decades in the theoretical and methodological literature. Traditional national narrative history was rejected as a form of critical historical knowledge even earlier. It is unfortunate that the authors or at least the editors did not use this opportunity – the publication of working materials for a future large synthesis – to initiate discussion on the genre of syntheses of national history.

Some of the studies contain a further fallacy characteristic more of the traditional methodologically inadequate narrative approaches to the writing of history, namely uncritical, generalizing use of ethnic categories such as “Hungarians” (“Magyars”) and Slovaks. The studies of several authors contain the inadequate simplification of attributing an ideological position or political agenda to entire categories of the population, most often to the “Magyars” in general. I will mention only one example from the *Introduction*: “*On the basis of a historically incorrect interpretation that the Kingdom of Hungary, the Lands of the Crown of St. Stephen, had been a nation state since the Early Middle Ages, the Magyars demanded a Magyar nation state.*” Immediately in the next sentence a relatively more exact designation of the actors is given: “*However, Czech, German, Polish and other national agitators also used similarly incorrect historical interpretations in the same period. They also included historiography in their national agitation.*” (p. 11). Ethno-categorical generalizations are not problematic only because they obscure or fail to precisely designate concrete initiators and actors. Regardless of the historians’ good intention, such generalizations can potentially act as legitimizations of naive ideas about “collective responsibility” and as confirmations of social stereotypical constructions.

In connection with this problematic aspect of some studies, it is impossible to avoid criticism of the absence of a theoretical anchoring of the majority of texts in the collective monograph. This absence is surprising in relation to the fact that in the *Introduction* the editors describe the 19th century as the century of nationalism and propose to depart from the “paradigm of social history”. The almost total absence of theories of nationalism and of social theories is notable. In studies such as those of Škvarna, Kodajová, and Kováč, this absence is noticeable. M. Szabó is the only author who uses “nationalism” as an analytical category not tied to the ethnic background of the historical actors. In most of the other studies, “nationalism” is implicitly represented as a feature or phenomenon primarily related to the Hungarian (“Magyar”) political elite or Hungarians (“Magyars”) in general.

However, in spite of the above mentioned shortcomings, most of the 17 individual studies represent relevant scholarly examinations of particular Slovak related 19th century social history issues. However, deeper theoretical reflection and more consistent methodological consideration would certainly add to its explanatory value.

László Vörös

MIROSLAV LONDÁK
SLAVOMÍR MICHÁLEK
PETER WEISS et al.

SLOVAKIA

A EUROPEAN STORY

1989
1993
2004
2010



LONDÁK, Miroslav – MICHÁLEK, Slavomír – WEISS, Peter et al. *SLOVAKIA: A EUROPEAN STORY*. Bratislava : VEDA, 2016. 350 p., ISBN 978-80-224-1522-4.

During four decades of soviet rule, Slovakia and her history were locked away behind the iron curtain and only a very limited number of scholarly works about the country appeared in the English-speaking world. And despite the recent publication in English of a number of pioneering works on the subject, the history of Slovakia remains, in Western and Anglophone historiography at least, seriously under researched. Very much aware of this lack, Miroslav Londák, Slavomír Michálek and Peter Weiss decided, on the occasion of the first ever Slovak presidency of the Council of the European Union, to attempt to fill this gap, at least partially, by providing the broadest possible readership with a comprehensive survey of Slovakia's journey towards European integration. Thus appeared this very fine multi-authored monograph, of which they are the editors.

In their introduction, Miroslav Londák and Slavomír Michálek set out the purpose of the book, which is to illustrate the unique and progressive changes that Slovak people have experienced over the past century and “to show the reader the specific nature of the politics, history and economy of the Central European region” (p. 11). The book is divided into four main sections, which explore, in turn, the history of the formation of the independent Slovak state, Czechoslovak foreign policy in the years leading up to the break-up of Czechoslovakia, the development of Slovak society since the revolution of 1989, and the integration of Slovakia into the European Union.

Part I, *The Historical Context of the Formation of Independent Slovak Statehood*, consists of three chapters. In the first of these, Milan Zemko, Tomáš Gábriš and Valerián Bystrický manage in ten short pages to provide a whistle-stop tour of Slovak history from the origins of the formation of Slovak identity in the ninth century to the creation of the Slovak Republic in 1993. In the next chapter, which focuses on the years 1945 to 1989, Miroslav Londák and Elena Londáková offer a fresh look at this most complicated period of Slovak history, dealing especially with the events of 1968, the revolution of 1989 and the collapse of communist rule. Their analysis is not merely political but also economic and cultural and provides one of the most comprehensive contributions to the entire work. The final chapter of this section, by Jozef Žatkuliak and Peter Weiss, provides a more detailed investigation of the years 1990 to 1992 and the problems Slovakia faced on its troubled journey towards independence.

Part II, *The Foreign Policy Context of the Break-Up of Czechoslovakia*, comprises a single chapter in which Slavomír Michálek and Peter Weiss re-assess the significance and consequences of Czechoslovak foreign policy during the process of dis-unification, from 1989 to the end of 1992, with a particular focus on relations between Prague and Bratislava and the Washington administration – a much overlooked topic in the historiography to date.

The focus in Part III, *Slovak Society after 1989*, is Slovak society in the years following the Velvet revolution. The three chapters deal, in turn, with various aspects of living in post-November Slovakia. First, Ján Bunčák, Roman Džambazovič and Ján Sopóci highlight the great changes that have taken place with respect to the relationships between the various social classes in Slovakia. Branislav Šprocha then addresses Slovakia's demographic development, particularly noting the substantial growth of the Slovak population. Finally, Milena Sokolová deals with the churches' contribution to social development in the country and discusses fundamental changes in the general perception of religion during the two decades of Slovak independence.

Part IV, *Slovakia in the New Europe*, addresses the integration of Slovakia into the political structures of the European Union. In the first chapter, Juraj Marušiak details the internal political developments in Slovakia from 1993 onwards, and concludes that the general consensus from

around 1998 was that Slovakia's national interests would be best served by joining NATO and the EU. Milan Šikula then explores economic developments in Slovakia after 1989, especially the difficult transition from a centrally planned economy to a market economy, the problems relating to privatisation during the 1990s, the socio-economic development of Slovakia and its integration into the EU (particularly from an economic perspective), and the global economic crisis of 2008. The chapter by Darina Malová and Peter Weiss discusses Slovakia's accession to the EU in 2004, and the public discourse surrounding it, from the very beginnings of the integration process and the "return" to Europe, right up to attitudes towards the threat of "Grexit" in 2015. Finally, Ľudovít Hallon and Miroslav Sabol, both senior researchers at the Institute of History of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, round off Part IV with an exploration of globalization and the economic transformation of Slovakia in the years since it became an independent state on 1 January 1993.

Slovakia: A European Story offers a unique look at Slovakia's political history from the very beginnings of the foundation of the nation to the present day, and narrates an engaging account of Slovakia's economic and social development with a special focus on the years immediately following the Velvet Revolution of 1989. It brings together not only historians but also political scientists, sociologists, economists and experts in cultural studies, who combine to offer a properly comprehensive insight into Slovakia's journey towards membership of the European Union. This unprecedented gathering of arguably the most influential and experienced researchers that the Slovak humanities and social sciences have produced in recent decades brings a fresh perspective on Slovakia's history and in so doing offers a truly cutting-edge piece of research.

However, the book is not only the fruit of a highly professional piece of academic research; it is also interesting, engaging, and suitable for a wide audience: such a combination of readability and academic rigour is both rare and very welcome. Via its extensive reference apparatus, the book provides a rich source of data for scholars who wish to go deeper into the subject or follow up on their particular area of interest. One relatively minor drawback is that page numbers are not always included in the citations, making them difficult, on occasion, to follow up.

Slovakia: A European Story provides the English-speaking reader with more detail and a greater variety of sources on Slovak history, society and economics than any other work to date. It is a must-read, therefore, for anyone interested in Slovak history, especially the history of the country's integration into the European Union.

Jakub Drábik



RIVALI A PARTNER STUDENEJ VÉRY

SLAVOMÍR
MICHÁLEK



CONTENTS

Volume 65 * 2017 * No 1

Articles

- Herucová, Angelika: The war over the Babenberg Heritage and Stephen V. 3
- Hronček, Pavel – Budaj, Martin: The techniques of extraction and
the beginnings of production of gold and silver in the Štiavnička valley
of the Nízke Tatry Mountains 25
- Županič, Jan: A forgotten elite. The ennoblement of Jews in the Austrian Empire 47
- Magocsi, Paul Robert: The Heritage of Autonomy in Carpathian Rus' 79
- Fiamová, Martina: Changes in land ownership in Slovakia in the period 1939–1945 99

Horizons

- Šedivý, Juraj: From historical atlases to comprehensive memory portals.
Digitalization as a change of discourse in urban historiography 119

Discussion

- Tajták, Ladislav: Notes on the work: Peter Kónya et al. *A History of the Kingdom
of Hungary (1000–1918)* 133

REVIEW–ANNOTATIONS–BIBLIOGRAPHY–CHRONICLE

Volume 65 * 2017 * No 2

Articles

- Štefánik, Martin: “Rame di Pollana”. Spiš-Gemer copper in Flanders and
Venice in the first third of the 14th century 193
- Chvojká, Michal: Baron Miklós Wesselényi at the Frývaldov and Gräfenberg spas
in 1839–1843 217
- Machó, Peter: The visit of Štúr's group to Ján Hollý at Dobrá Voda 239
- Petrůf, Pavol: Developments in Czechoslovakia in the first half of 1968
on the pages of published French diplomatic documents against the background
of the development of Czechoslovak – French relations from the origin
of Czechoslovakia to the beginning of 1968 265

Horizons

- Lukáč, Eduard: The contribution of František Karšai to the development of Comeniology
and the history of education in Slovakia 295

Materials

- Vozár, Jozef: The beginnings of cultivation of legal science in Slovakia:
The centenary of the establishment of the *Právny obzor* and the first personalities
in Slovak legal science 321
- Pehr, Michal: The Slovak diplomat Ilja Rath in the Czechoslovak service
with the Holy See 335

REVIEW–ANNOTATIONS–BIBLIOGRAPHY–CHRONICLE

CONTENTS

Volume 65 * 2017 * No 3

Methodology and Historiography

- Hruboň, Anton: "A History of the Historians". Career Ups and Downs of Historians from the Faculty of Education in Banská Bystrica in the Context of the Liberalization and Normalization after the Warsaw Pact Invasion of Czechoslovakia 385

Articles

- Sedláček, Peter: The economic activity of the City Chamber in Bratislava on the basis of analysis of the chamber books of the city of Bratislava from the period 1434–1528 411
- Kollárová, Ivona: The secret book trade after the outbreak of the Great French Revolution. Symptoms of the latent history of communication 445
- Letková, Alexandra: Jan Antonín Baťa – The Fate of a Businessman in postwar Czechoslovakia 471
- Borza, Peter: The Greek Catholic Church and the Jews in Slovakia in 1939–1945 493
- Berlanský, Matej: The conceptual content of the celebrations of the 20th anniversary of the Uprising 515

REVIEW–ANNOTATIONS–BIBLIOGRAPHY–CHRONICLE

Volume 65 * 2017 * No 4

Methodology and Historiography

- Lužný, Dušan – Váně, Jan: The concept of collective memory – basic starting points and conclusions 577

Articles

- Magdoško, Drahošlav: The origin and administration of the suburbs of medieval Košice 591
- Szórádová, Eva: Franz Paul Rögler: *Anleitung zum Gesange, und dem Klaviere, oder die Orgel zu spielen* – the history of a music textbook 617
- Arpáš, Róbert: The Pribina anniversary as a celebration of the religious and national tradition of Great Moravia 655
- Szabó, Miloslav: "Clerical Fascism"? Catholicism and the Far-Right in Central European Context (1918–1945) 675
- Baka, Igor: The Slovak army and anti-Jewish pogroms in the occupied part of the USSR in 1941 689

Materials

- Đurková, Mária: Historiography in the History Institute of the Slovak Academy of Sciences in the period 2015–2016 709

Discussion

- Alberty, Július: A review of the new edition of the monograph on the *County of Gömör-Kishont* by the publisher Patrióta 727
- Kohútová, Mária: A reaction to part of Professor Roman Holec's study 733
- Holec, Roman: Reply to Prof. M. Kohútová 735

REVIEW–ANNOTATIONS–BIBLIOGRAPHY–CHRONICLE

HISTORICKÝ ČASOPIS / HISTORICAL JOURNAL

of the Institute of History of the Slovak Academy of Sciences

P. O. BOX 198, 814 99 Bratislava, Klemensova 19

Tel.: +421-2-529 25 753

Fax: +421-2-529 61 645

E-mail: histcaso@gmail.com

<http://www.historickycasopis.sk>

Chief Editor: Dušan Kováč

Editorial Board: Jozef Baďurík, Miloslav Čaplovič, Viliam Čičaj, Vojtech Dajgl, Katarína Hradská, Ivan Kamenec, Eva Kowalská, Jozef Leikert, Tünde Lengyelová, Ján Lukačka, Slavomír Michálek, Jan Pešek, Pavol Petruf, Ján Steinhübel and Dušan Škvarna.

International Editorial Board:

Peter Bugge (Aarhus), Stanislaw Bylina (Warsaw), Moritz Csáky (Vienna/Graz), Robert J. Evans (Oxford), Frank Hadler (Leipzig), Horst Haselsteiner (Vienna), Peter Haslinger (Marburg), Catherine Horel (Paris), George J. Kovtun (Washington), Francesco Leoncini (Venice), Jiří Malíř (Brno), Antoine Marès (Paris), Jaroslav Pánek (Prague), Jan Rychlík (Prague), Mark Stolarik (Ottawa), Martin Schulze Wessel (Munich), Arnold Suppan (Vienna), László Szarka (Budapest), Ela Zadorožňuk (Moscow).

Managing Editor: Miroslava Fabriciusová

Translator: Martin Clifford Styan

Orders: In writing, by telephone, fax, E-mail or the electronic order form on the web page of the journal.

Registration No. EV 3084/09

IČO: 00 166 944

© Historický ústav SAV, December 2017