Hungarian Studies
DOI: 10.1556/044.2023.00227

AKADÉMIAI KIADÓ

Patterns of guild migration in the early modern period: Lessons from a comparative study of young artisans' migration and university peregrination

Katalin Mária Kincses[1,2*]

[1] Károli Gáspár University of the Reformed Church, Hungary

[2] VERITAS Research Institute for History and Archives, Hungary

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Received: January 4, 2023 • Accepted: March 22, 2023

ABSTRACT

Guild migration in Hungary in the 16th to 18th centuries can be best captured by exploring the migration of young artisans. Peregrination and the migration of young artisans were a process of learning and making contacts in a foreign environment over several years. We will be looking at the life, tasks, objectives and, not least, knowledge acquisition and career strategy of one age group, young men roughly between the ages of 16–20, who in the early modern period were the main depositories of local economic and political power in Europe, including the territories of the former Kingdom of Hungary – especially in the towns – and who were entering local economic and political power after half a decade or so of studying.

This highly mobile way of acquiring knowledge abroad through university and guild migration provided an experience of leaving the familiar home base. What these young men had in common was that their learning process took place in a foreign territory, far away from their home, in the unfamiliar environment of another country, using a different language. In the case of both groups of learners, the existence of a network of family ties, which can be traversed in several directions, proved to be a key organising factor. This link between the – mainly German-speaking – urban and rural citizens in Western Europe and the Hungarian (and Transylvanian) citizens in the early modern period was always evident in the guild organisation, both economically and culturally.

* Corresponding author. E-mail: kincsesbene@gmail.com

KEYWORDS

guilds, peregrination, migration, young artisans, mobility

THEORY, HISTORIOGRAPHY, METHODOLOGY

There is a whole library of literature on the theory and research of migration, and the concept also has many definitions. Several of these approaches agree on the central idea of the felt need to change one's location: to leave one's place of residence, to find a new place of settlement, to move or to migrate. Historical research in recent decades has interpreted migration as a positive event, a displacement of populations for their survival, and as a necessity to know more, a human desire to explore and to avoid disasters.[1] The study of migration is a very popular theme nowadays, and theoretical approaches also try to analyse the types of migration. The common feature of all these studies is that they are all approached from a judicial standpoint.[2]

In the discipline of historiography, migration on the European continent becomes the subject of historical research primarily in the context of the great migration of peoples in the fourth–sixth centuries on the one hand and in the modern era on the other, because these are periods when massive displacements took place. The research and interpretation of migration in historical research in Hungary has recently enlarged this framework. The approach, following the German model,[3] is clearly social-historical rather than legal, and on the other hand, it has "filled in" the missing centuries: it has also reviewed the overall phenomena of migration in the Middle and Early Modern period, both in Europe and in the Carpathian Basin, from a thematic perspective. As a result, the latest studies, which provide a comprehensive overview of the most recent research in Hungary, distinguish between political and religiously motivated population movements (the activities of missionaries, the migration of pilgrims, the mobility of religious groups and ethnic groups during the Crusades or the migration of religious refugees) and economic, occupational and educational migrations (for example, peasant settler movements, peregrination, guild migration, emigration to Europe, emigration and immigration in Hungary in the 19th and 20th centuries, etc.) or the resurgence of Muslim radicalism on the European continent in the 20th and 21st centuries.[4]

Peregrination and emigration – on first impression, placing the two concepts in parallel may be unusual, since they represent two completely different historical phenomena. It is, however, possible to see how concepts such as university visits, migration and guild migration can be connected without entering unscientific and superficial discussions.[5] We can do so, because we

[1]For the most recent summary of the Hungarian literature, see: Tóth (2001), 19; Halász (2011), 5.

[2]For a summary of the Hungarian literature see: Hautzinger–Hegedüs–Klenner (2014).

[3]For contemporary studies of social history, especially in German, see: Reith (1998), 11–54; Reith (2002), 39–71; Winzen (2002).

[4]Pósán–Veszprémy–Isaszegi, 2018.

[5]The paper is based on the presentation given at the 11th Symposium on the History of Craftsmanship (Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Academic Committee of Veszprém, Working Committee on the History of Craftsmanship, Budapest, 10–11 November 2022). The background to the present study was provided by: Kincses (2018).

are talking about the fate, tasks, objectives and not least the knowledge acquisition and career strategies of the same age group. These 16 to 20-year-olds were in the early modern period the cadre of the local economic and political power in Europe, including the territories of the former Kingdom of Hungary – mainly in the cities – who entered the arena of local economic and political power after half a decade or so of their studies. They were the future leaders of the communities; in city magistracies and in internal and external councils were made up of partly of former Peregrines, partly of guild masters who had formerly been student artisans. The key concept that links them is social mobility.[6]

However, to talk about the common features of emigration and peregrination, we need to move away from the hierarchy of education and training that had developed by the 19th century.[7] Peregrination led to higher education in some theoretical field, while the emigration of artisans crowned the learning process of a practical craftsmanship. The end of both was the practice of a profession: a position in the bureaucracy, in an ecclesiastical or secular administration or, after passing a masters' examination, opening a guild workshop. Once the training was completed, the task was to start a career immediately afterwards, regardless of the training received. In modern times, our definitions have changed – higher education degrees have become valorised, expressing higher knowledge, and contributing greatly to social mobility, while craft skills have been established at the level of secondary education and have become a means of social belonging.

However, this was not necessarily the case in the previous centuries, particularly in the 16th and 18th centuries, especially for the latter group. After all, how can one separate skills and knowledge when looking at the acquisition of the position of town mayor, for example, in the case of Kristóf Lackner, a goldsmith from Sopron, and Kristóf Lackner, a doctor of law and mayor of Sopron?[8] And what is the reason why, for example, among the city councillors of Cluj (in Hungarian: Kolozsvár) we find a mixture of university educated councillors with legal knowledge and guild masters who had not participated in this form of education, in the same positions and in the same councillor's duties in the early modern period?[9] The answer may be that they obviously had something in common in their education which provided the foundation for them to be able to do their jobs, whether they were former university students or former guild travellers. This paper thus goes on to highlight some common elements that developed similar competencies in the two types of training structures. Then, drawing on theoretical lessons, it tries to review through some examples the most important migration patterns associated with early modern Hungarian artisans.

Research on European guild migration began in the 1970's, and the results of this research have been published over the last one and a half to two decades as part of a comparative

[6]The topic of early modern social mobility in Hungary is very extensive, and has recently focused mainly on the 18th century, the nobility, their career opportunities, and how to get into the non-middle classes. This is exemplified by the recent literature on the subject, see e.g.: Nagy (2019); Khavanova (2019); Gőzsy (2019); Szijártó (2019); Mátyás-Rausch (2020); Borbély (2020); Szabó-Turákné Póka (2021). On serfdom, see most recently: Tompa (2022). On the links between education and mobility, see: Federmayer (2018). Finally, on cities, see: H. Németh (2018), especially: 177–188, where the author also focuses on the nobility.

[7]For an overview, see: Pukánszky–Nóbik (2019). See mainly Chapter VI.

[8]Tóth (2008); Kovács (2014), 178–192.

[9]Jeney-Tóth (2001); Kincses (2016).

perspective within local research. The phenomenon of migration has also been a core research topic in Western European historiography for five decades, from the 15th century to the present day. Nor is it new that a significant proportion of European migration from the 1500's onwards was made up of migration movements related to reasons of nationality, which essentially drew the map of European migration in each period.[10] Among relevant Hungarian researchers we may mention the name of Ottó Domonkos whose results have become incorporated into the international literature of the subject and who created the basis for the research of artisans' migration. He identified the main migration routes of Hungarian artisans and pointed out the impact of artisans' immigration on technological development.[11] Franz Lerner also studied Hungarian artisans in Frankfurt,[12] whilst Hedvig Szabolcsi's work focussed on carpenters in Veszprém.[13] In Vienna, Harald Grundner explored the migration of Hungarians, showing that in the 18th and 19th centuries painters, potters, masons and hatters came to Salzburg from Buda, Pest, Bratislava (in Hungarian: Pozsony), Timisoara (in Hungarian: Temesvár) and Sopron.[14]

While the history of early modern guild migration is one of the most continuously and intensively researched topics in the West, research in Hungary, which started in the mid-1980's, stopped at the end of the 1990's and only started again in 2012/2013, partly by using the results of the Hungarian Guild Database (HGD).[15] We ourselves, on the basis of the sources we have been researching for about a decade in the framework of the HGD programme, have been – and still are – interested primarily in the motivations for acquiring knowledge, the environment supporting the student, their family relationships and other relationships, the conditions, possibilities and pathways of studying, as well as topics such as their mother tongue and linguistic background. The idea for an overview of similar motives for peregrination and emigration was provided by an excellent study by Zoltán Csepregi, which examined what kind of network of contacts and capital of contacts that university candidates arriving in Wittenberg brought with them from home helped them to succeed.[16] According to Zoltán Csepregi, if we want to compare the dependency and contact relations of the Peregrinas to a network, the following are the most important points of contact: 1. education (including, in his opinion, long-term secondary education rather than shorter-term university studies); 2. mother tongue and

[10]For a summary, with literature, see: Crossik (1997). Hungarian research was also represented in this volume: Bácskai (1997), 200–217. For a new perspective on Hungarian research, see: Bácskai (2002); King–Winter (2016), 285–308. The main point of the research on guild migration in Hungary was the international symposium on handicrafts in 1986, where the issue was given special attention. The literature of this (together with that of earlier occasions) was summarised in: Szulovszky (2002), 184–187. The latest summary of the history of research, with a mention of guild bibliographies: Kincses–Tuza (2015).

[11]Domonkos (1979); Id., 1989; Id., 2002.

[12]Lerner (1989), 31–42; Otruba (1979).

[13]Szabolcsi (1982).

[14]Grundner (2014).

[15]Faragó (2003). The culmination of domestic research on guild migration was the International Crafts Symposium in 1986, where the issue was given special attention. The literature of this (together with that of the earlier ones) was summarised: Szulovszky (2002), 184–187. The MCA programme was implemented in the framework of an OTKA research project (2012–2015): the Hungarian Guild Database 1526–1761 (Call ID: 101 669.) For a revival of research, see: Kincses–Tuza (2014c); Ead., 2014a; Ead., 2014b.

[16]Csepregi (2015).

ethnolinguistic relations; 3. family and kinship relations. Zoltán Csepregi interprets all this as a very complex multi-factorial system that was ultimately able to function effectively. In a word, the same points of reference that emerged in the context of peregrination are also highlighted here. As such, we may fairly ask whether these points could not also mark out the methodology of research when examining mappable patterns of migration that can be detected and mapped based on the emigration of artisans.

PEREGRINATION AND ARTISANS' MIGRATION – ANALOGIES

The first analogy is that migration, the mobile way of acquiring knowledge abroad, as represented by university-related and artisans' migration, was an alternative to sticking to the familiar. What these travellers had in common was that they were studying in a distant land, a foreign country far away from home, in an unfamiliar environment and a different language, as there were no universities in Hungary and for artisans, too, travelling usually meant a journey abroad. Those who had been educated abroad – either in a guild or at a university – were later able to function in any community, economically and politically, both within and outside their original community, because of the experience they had acquired, their professional and linguistic skills, their network of contacts, their ability to see the larger picture and their ability to assert themselves. Indeed, this was their main motivation: to acquire knowledge for their own well-being and that of the community.

Another analogy may be that the phenomenon of guild migration patterns in Hungary may at first sight remind us of the traditional model of the centre and the periphery, with the developed guilds of Western Europe – including Vienna due to its geographical proximity – at the centre, and the cities of the 15th–18th century Kingdom of Hungary and Transylvania at the periphery.[17] This is also mentioned in the context of peregrination, with researchers highlighting the central role of Vienna and possibly Krakow in the early modern period. In the age of Reformation this central–peripheral orientation became modified, with new centres emerging which became the nodes of an extensive network.[18] Such a model can also be applied to guild life: the guild-related migration pattern, which is mostly related to economic and occupational reasons, is basically aligned with this centre-periphery pattern. However, to nuance the picture, sources also show that the place named as the centre does not play an exclusive role in the network. It is therefore more accurate and useful, in our opinion, to understand guild relations as a very extensive network in space, extending practically from the French, German and Swiss territories to the eastern border of the Polish territories, with a few prominent nodes, depending on the craft, and with 'branches' extending from London to St Petersburg. The best illustration of this is the classic example of the early modern guilds of Debrecen, whose sphere of influence was not only directly outside the city limits, but sometimes hundreds of kilometres away.[19]

[17]Naturally, the study of the question does not only include the migration impact of the free royal municipal guilds, but also the rural and countryside guilds, as well as those belonging to secular and ecclesiastical estates. In the absence of systematic, comprehensive research on the guilds of the latter, our study focuses primarily on the guilds of the free royal towns. For the guilds of the rural towns and villages, see: Eperjessy (1963); Id., 1967.

[18]Szabó–Szögi (1998); Kiss (2000); Szögi (2003); Kissné Bognár (2004); Fata–Kurucz–Schindling (2006); Tüskés (2008); Szabó–Kelényi–Szögi (2016).

[19]Domonkos (2002), 51.

The migration of artisans and university attendance was a self-evidently accepted task for both the guild artisans and the Peregrines, and for the guild artisans or universities that employed, trained, and employed them. The main question was where the craft in question could or should be learnt abroad, i.e., where the individual craft centres were located. Criteria to consider included where the most renowned and knowledgeable craftsmen to learn from were located, which were the guilds where it was worthwhile to acquire knowledge and contacts in order to learn the skills of the craft and to build up an effective network for the future, and to do this, to travel long distances over several years, which was serious undertaking in early modern Europe. It should be noted here that the statement that Hungary was represented as an important centre[20] of a particular craft among the territories now known as France, England, Germany, Denmark, Sweden, Lithuania, Russia, Poland, Austria, and Venice only in the 18th century and only by the butchers, coppersmiths and brass workers of Pozsony and Buda, is no longer correct, according to the data of the research programme of the HGD. The first data of systematic research already disprove this: for example, the same can be said of the jewellers' and goldsmiths' guilds in Kolozsvár and the carpenters' guilds in Kolozsvár, the former clearly having intensive contacts with Germany, the latter mostly with Switzerland in the 16th and 17th centuries.[21]

The advocacy capacity of the city can also be analysed. It was in the fundamental interest of the city and the local community, to ensure and to some extent finance the supply of professionals. This does not only mean university graduates in law, medicine, or theology. It was from the guildsmen that the future guild masters, who were later to be settled, emerged, on whom the city's economic strength, the internal political life, the independence, and the ability to assert interests would depend some one and a half decade later.[22] The guild was not only an economic community where people practising the same craft came together to assert their interests, but also a form of local organisation of contemporary society, where guild members – and their entire families – related to each other, to the politics of the city, to their trading partners etc., in line with the existing social, moral and religious principles, which were also laid down in (guild) rules.[23] Communities, ranging from towns to families, followed a conscious staffing strategy, sending their sons to distant countries with the aim of cultivating not only the guild's traditional business and professional but also commercial and personal contacts, making new ties, learning about the life, tastes, customs, religion and, not least, the political system of the people of the distant lands. No studies have yet been carried out into which cities made more intensive use of this opportunity or had the possibility of supporting their travelling guildsmen (directly from the "guild horde" and in the form of foundations). However, it is fair to assume that those free royal cities which were wealthier and politically more autonomous were more successful, where self-government was stronger, citizens and guilds were more affluent, traditions were more deeply rooted and, as a

[20] *Ibid.,* 17.

[21] ANCN Fond 544. Br. Timplarilor, Nr. 1. Protocul breaslei, 1630–1731; Nr. 3. Protocul, 1640–1690. and especially: Br. Timplarilor, Nr. 2., which bears the title "Protocol, privilege, instruction, 1630–1885", but in fact contains the family history records of the Regeni (formerly Löw) carpentry dynasty of Kolozsvár (Cluj Napoca).

[22] There is an enormous literature on urban development in Hungary in the 16th and 17th centuries. Among the monographs presenting a comprehensive economic, social, and political history, which are fundamentally new in terms of methodology, see (without claiming completeness): H. Németh (2004).

[23] Bräuer (1989); Reiningshaus (1984).

result, career opportunities were more likely to be secured for returnees. In any case, the economic development of the city (also) indirectly led to the valorisation of studies.

The next factor is the question of the mother tongue and ethnic language relations. In terms of the target area, it goes without saying that everyone probably preferred an environment close to their mother tongue. However, it was very fortunate for guild relations that both Hungary and Transylvania, as well as the other provinces of the Habsburg Empire such as Silesia, Moravia and the provinces and principalities of the Empire, as well as the cantons of neighbouring Switzerland, were for the most part ethnically heterogeneous areas. Whether we consider travellers from German, Hungarian or Slavic linguistic backgrounds, they all originated from multi-ethnic, multilingual regions and migrated in the same regions. Not only regions and provinces, but even cities were multilingual. It was therefore not a problem to find one's way around the complex linguistic landscape of guild migration, since not only the destination, but the starting point itself, i.e., the city from which the guild migration started, was already a diverse and multilingual community.

Finally, there is the issue of family and kinship relations, to which social, cultural and, not least, moral and lifestyle factors contributed significantly. On the one hand, this was based on the traditional kinship relations of the settled population of the Hungarian towns, mainly of German origin, and on the other hand, on the kinship, communal and godparent relations based on the ancestors,[24] i.e., the former guild relations, which were fundamentally decisive in the guild framework. These, in turn, were based on the same system of traditions and cultural norms; mostly the same religious structures and, not least, on social structures of roughly the same quality and standard.

MIGRATION AND MOBILITY

Parallel study is a useful method in the field of guild migration and social mobility. Guild economic mobility has been a two-way migration process in Europe and, within that, also in Hungary. It can be seen as a kind of exchange process which is not only started from Hungary but also targets Hungary. Until at least 30–40% of the written guild sources in Hungary become processed, we can only estimate the ratio of the two processes, using representative samples. Based on the results of the HGD programme so far, we believe that a conservative estimate suggests that guild migration in Hungary – i.e., migration for economic purposes beyond the national borders – involved at least 50–60% of future guild masters in Hungary. Most migrant guild artisans, around 75–80%, returned to the mainland after their apprenticeship. The rest married into foreign guild families, settled abroad, and created an own livelihood. In the guilds in Hungary, the ratio of men from foreign countries compared to those from domestic guilds was estimated to be 1:3–1:5. One in four to one in six of the men working in Hungarian guilds in the early modern period were from abroad. How many of the foreigners stayed here and what proportion of them settled in Hungary has not yet been estimated. This depended heavily on the area and the guild, and after the expulsion of the Turks, the number of settler craftsmen from foreign lands obviously increased due to the settlements. Based on research to date, an estimate is available from the 18th century (although this does not document emigration but only

[24]For a summary, see last review: Rácz (2020); Kincses–Tuza (2020); H. Németh–Soós (2020).

settlement), which shows that in the larger Hungarian towns the average proportion of foreign, mainly German, settlers was between 13 and 26%, while in smaller towns and, for example, in the eastern regions, the proportion of foreign settlers was around 5%.[25] However, the 18th century data should be treated with caution: they should not be projected back to earlier centuries, partly because of the deliberate, organised settlements created in the century after the expulsion of the Ottomans.[26]

The issue of guild mobility goes beyond the urban context. It is a regional and even national phenomenon, not least transnational, because cities did not function as autonomous, isolated economic and political entities. On the one hand, they usually formed associations of towns, such as the mining towns, "five-town" units, and the association of towns in Northern Hungary. The mother guilds and their daughter guilds also formed a system of economic and personal contacts that extended across national boundaries – a classic example in our period is the close economic ties and intermarriage between the merchant guilds of Kassa, Pest and Szeged, which controlled the wine exports of the Srem-district wine region, and which were not broken up by the Ottoman occupation.[27] The medieval system of contacts of the Cracow and Kassa merchant guilds is a fundamental example of a system of contacts across national borders, which is also essential for mobility.[28] These levels of relations thus also meant a two-way exchange of professionals not only between cities, but also between regions, between Hungary and the neighbouring Länder (Moravia, Silesia, Austria, Poland), as well as between the more distant Länder of Western Europe, mainly Germany.[29]

THE IMPACT OF MIGRATION ON GUILD LIFE

Since the Middle Ages, the guilds in both Europe and Hungary have always been fundamentally concerned with the strict protection of their interests. This included setting a fixed number of masters. This applies as much to the guilds of the 14th and 15th centuries as to the later, early modern guilds. Depending on the population and marketability of the towns, which numbered a few thousand, relatively small guilds were set up, employing 3 or 4, or at most 4 or 5 craftsmen, within the coordinates defined by the town and its surrounding area. The number of bachelors and footmen depended on the number of masters, and in most European guilds (except the giant guilds) a master could employ one to three bachelors and footmen (the number of which was also recorded in the guilds' charter of privileges). Let us not forget that artisans and children could not work independently, and guild work also functioned as a practical training and education system – something the guild master had to do himself in addition to his work. An urban guild in the medieval and early modern period would have been the equivalent of a small enterprise of around 25–50 people, which in the demographic context of the early

[25]So far, only a statistical survey has been made of the number of immigrants from the German-speaking area to the Kingdom of Hungary from the beginning of the 18th century, and of the number of craftsmen who settled there: Spiesz (1989). Analytical presentation: Domonkos (2002), 15–16.

[26]Rúzsás (1971), 221–234.

[27]Draskóczy (1999); Szakály (1999), 117.

[28]See: Kincses–Tuza (2015); Tuza (2018), 23.

[29]Ehmer (2002).

modern period was a much larger economic unit than today.[30] This system, and the number of staff, worked smoothly until the end of the 16th century. However, with the economic and commercial development of the 17th century, industrialisation and, not least, the growing population, this limited number of workers became an obstacle to competition between industries, the quest for quality and the expansion of their area of appeal. The aim was always to secure the income of the workers in the guilds. This practice, which could ensure maximum protection of interests, but which hindered industrial development, was only relaxed in Hungary towards the end of the 18th century, and even then, only because of external state intervention, and the phenomenon was finally ended only when the guilds were finally closed down in the 19th century.[31]

In this situation, there were two options. The first was, or would have been, to increase staff numbers. Although the guilds expanded, no giant guilds were formed in Hungary. Instead, branch guilds or daughter guilds were formed, as well as guild chains.[32] The expansion of the guilds could be delayed, but only temporarily, by the compulsory emigration of bachelors. It should be noted here that the emigration of artisans from the families of the craftsmen was usually one or two years shorter, but they, too, were obliged to emigrate.[33] The reason for this was very simple: someone who had grown up in a guild workshop from an early age could learn the craft much more intensively, over a longer period of time and therefore to a higher standard, in his father's workshop than someone who came from a different family and therefore joined a guild as a butler years later. This thorough training was necessary because, as a guild master, he had to take part in the political life of the city, in the magistrate's office and in the external council.[34]

Another way to develop the guilds in the 17th and 18th centuries was to take advantage of guild migration: young craftsmen and artisans who did not qualify for a guild master status used to emigrate. The earliest examples of collective emigration in Hungarian literature are those of the Sopron cadres in 1605 and the Győr strap makers, cutters, and saddlers in 1614.[35] The process was a two-way street. Foreigners also settled in Hungary in large numbers. After the expulsion of the Turks, the labour shortage was temporarily solved by the mass emigration of foreign artisans in a slowly expanding economic environment. Religious wars in the German provinces and overpopulation led to large-scale, wave-like expulsions in the 17th century, mainly to Poland, the Baltic states and even Russia and Ukraine. However, we cannot agree with the claim that Hungary and Transylvania benefited to a lesser extent from this because Turkish rule discouraged entrepreneurs, and those who came here on their migratory journeys only made it

[30]For an example of our research, see: Kincses (2016), 535–552.

[31]For a summary of the most recent literature on European guilds in the 17th and 18th centuries (including their background), see: Tuza (2018), 19–23.

[32]Kincses–Tuza (2015), 280.

[33]See for example the gingerbread guild in Lower Hungary: Archiv mesta Bratislavy, 31 CE 1. Statutum, 1681. július 17.; the potters of Jászó in 1712: Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár Országos Levéltára [National Archives of the Hungarian National Archives], A 72. No. 88. (with a Hungarian language registry of young artisans), or the cadres of Kolozsvár (Cluj): ANCN Fond 544. Br. Butnarilor Nr. 6. Alba Iulia, 07. 07. 1715. Completare la statutul breaslei butnarilor din Cluj.; Nr. 3. Cluj, 1581–1731. Registrul breaslei butnarilor; Nr. 4. 17. Registrul breaslei butnarilor, 1613–1763.

[34]On the role of guild masters in society, see for example: Ostrolucká (1998), and most recently: Hermann (2012).

[35]Domonkos (1964).

as far as the west and turned back from there.[36] It is enough to think of the masses of people arriving in Hungary from Bohemia, the Austrian provinces, or those fleeing the wars of reconquest in the second half of the 17th century. But before that, we can also refer, for example, to the settlement of Habanians in Western Transdanubia, Eastern Hungary and Transylvania.[37]

We should also be cautious about the topos-like horror of Turkish rule.[38] Those who wanted to settle during the period of the Turkish occupation certainly did not seek to settle in areas under Turkish rule, but it is not true that they avoided them. The situation changed after the expulsion of the Turks at the end of the 17th century. Migration to these areas became very significant. The state strongly encouraged the mass immigration of skilled craftsmen into the liberated areas.[39]

Guild-based economic migration in the early modern era was not a casual, self-serving venture to satisfy a youthful sense of adventure or to make a better living elsewhere. The aim was to gain wide-ranging experience which guildsmen were expected to document: the data were entered in the travellers' books.[40] Another concrete goal was to expand further the guild's network of contacts by exploring new sources of raw materials, discovering new markets, getting to know important European market centres and fairs and involving new partners.[41] The knowledge acquired during the migration was put to good use by the whole community: the returning members brought back new processes, patterns, tools and technologies.

The emigration of the artisans is not only important for learning a trade. At least as important is the fact that the employment of the young artisans in the guild has always been a means of providing the masters with sufficient labour. It was therefore necessary to regulate the work of young artisans and the conditions and framework for their employment.

The first guilds were established in the free royal towns of the former Royal Hungary (including Transylvania and Croatia) and in the Transylvanian Saxon Union in the 14th and 15th centuries. According to our present information, the earliest guilds were the guilds regulated by royal decree in 1376 in Sibiu, according to a royal charter regulating the operation of 19 such guilds.[42] A very early example is the regulation issued in 1411 for barchent makers to settle in Košice (in Hungarian: Kassa), although the city issued a separate guild statute for them in 1461, in which one of the guild statutes sets out the obligations of the men who join the guild.[43]

[36]Hausherr (1955).

[37]Barlay (1986), 183; and the following publication: Katona (2001).

[38]See for example, but not limited to: Szakály (1971), 235–272; Rúzsás (1971); Bácskai (2007), 105–135.

[39]Summarised with literature most recently: Tuza (2018), 18–19.

[40]See for example the cadres of Székesfehérvár from 1693: Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár, Fejér Megyei Levéltár [Hungarian National Archives, Archives of Fejér County], IX_19_c.; the blacksmiths and the bodhrans from 1694: ibid., X_25_a (with the 1752 Order of young Artisans), or in a subsequent document: Letter from a cordwainer in Olomouc (1809). Archivele Nationale Timis, Fond 1045, No. 71.

[41]Prak (2006); Denzel (2018) studies, in particular: Straube (2018); Rothmann (2018); Schöpfer (2018), 211, 214, 217; Rauscher (2018); Spannenberger (2018).

[42]Kovách–Binder (1981), 57–65.

[43]Wenzel (1871).

The earliest surviving charter of privilege is that of the Weavers of Kassa from 1419, which was supplemented in 1583 by a charter of young artisans.[44] Finally, the earliest known guild statute containing the regulations for the guild's airing of ironmongers dates from 1477 and it is preserved in the guild book of the blacksmiths of Kolozsvár.[45]

There was no state-regulated guild system in Hungary in the 16th and 17th centuries. The establishment of guilds was authorised by the town or the landowner (in some cases we know of guilds founded by bishops). The economic policy of the 16th and 17th centuries was primarily determined by the Turkish wars, the provisioning of the army and the need to collect and secure chamber revenues as accurately as possible. In this situation, there was no question of "industrial development" in the modern sense.[46] – This should be underlined to make it clear that guild migration did not take place within the framework of a centrally controlled system but was a completely spontaneous process. The institution of migration in Hungary, which had originated in the Middle Ages, was already established in the 15th century, as evidenced by the proliferation of young artisans' regulations and artisans' codes from the beginning of the 16th century. Whereas previously individual points of the letters of privilege dealt with the working hours, duties, and obligations of the leges, from the 16th century onwards, there were separate documents, divided into several points, which regulated the tasks, duties, pay, accommodation conditions and, finally, the conditions of their way of life and their customs (both on working days and holidays).[47]

However, this process was a two-way street. As mentioned earlier, it was not only Hungarians who went abroad, but foreigners also arrived in the Carpathian Basin. In the same period, the Pozsony goldsmiths-imposed requirements on the men who came to them during their migrations; the previous accommodation of those who arrived here included Augsburg and Altenburg in Saxony, Vienna, Hall in Württenberg, Hainburg in Lower Austria or Riegewall in Pomerania etc. The guild of glove-makers from Bratislava also included men from Brno, Brunswick, Neustadt, Laibach, etc.[48] A spectacular example of the dimensions of guild migration from Hungary in the early modern period is the migration of 17th century carpenters from Győr to Europe.[49] As regards migration to Győr, those who did not come from the close vicinity (from the Trans-Danubian cities or Vienna) or from the cities in the Highlands, were from the Austrian and German provinces and the Swiss cantons. Most of them came from the Danube headwaters, the area around the Black Forest (roughly the area bounded by Freiburg-Nuremberg-Mainz-Strasbourg) and its more distant surroundings, including a radius of some 200–250 km. This was a multicultural region, and a region where guild development flourished – the triangle where Switzerland, France and Germany meet today. This covered the area along the Rhine from Strasbourg and Cologne in the west; along the Elbe from Prague, Dresden, Leipzig, Magdeburg, and Hamburg; from Schleswig in the north and even Denmark (Copenhagen).

[44]Archiv mesta v Košiće, Cechy mesta Košic – Tkáci, 1419., 1481. Privileges of 1583 and the 1583. Code of Conduct. This is the first document in which guild offices are mentioned: Kincses–Tuza (2014b), 280.

[45]ANCN Fond 544. Br. Fierarilor Nr. 1. Registrul breaslei fierarilor… din Cluj. 17–18. Centuries.

[46]Tuza (2018), 17.

[47]See the Order of young tailors in Cluj from 1502: Szádeczky (1913), vol. II, 28–32; Domonkos (2002), 147–160.

[48]Domonkos (2002), 52.

[49]Batári (1967).

An area that stands out along the Oder is Wrocław, Poland along with its surroundings – similarly to the Alps, this was traditionally a region rich in wood, a crucial raw material for carpenters. As regards the Baltics, artisans would arrive in the carpenter's guild in Győr from the largest cities on the coast such as Lübeck and Rostock; as well as from Danzig in the east, from Königsberg even further north and even from today's Riga (which is more than 1100 km from Győr as the crow flies). From the east, migrant artisans mostly arrived from two Transylvanian towns: Aiud (in Hungarian: Nagyenyed) and Sighișoara (in Hungarian: Segesvár).

Establishing data is more difficult in the case of those who emigrated from Hungary because the relevant sources are not located in the country of origin, but in the collections of archives or museums in the country of destination. In the meantime, until international research in this field becomes co-ordinated and unified in order to provide us with a more detailed and nuanced picture,[50] we can rely on research by Ottó Domonkos who discovered earlier migration routes, as far back as the 18th century. Based on his research, it is already clear that a single bachelor used to travel considerable distances to dozens of guild centres. The itineraries in the travellers' books were well targeted and documented, covering hundreds of kilometres.[51] Returning to the large number of travellers arriving in Hungary, if we take the bookbinding guild of Sopron as an example – a guild with a small number of members – according to the accommodation books, a total of 254 men were employed over the more than half century between 1645 and 1700, usually meaning five or six men each year. Of these, no more than 8–10 were Hungarians, amounting to just over 5% of the total number, while foreign artisans outnumbered locals by an enormous margin of 94–95%.[52] The guild had enough manpower for 4 or 5 masters, most of whom came from foreign countries via migration. Sopron's guild largely owed its labour supply to migration. Another example is the carpenters' guild in Sopron, which employed a total of 440 young artisans between 1674 and 1700. Of these, 78 were of Hungarian origin and 372 of came from other countries, i.e., about 85% of the total number were of non-Hungarian origin. Here, too, a large proportion of the workforce came from abroad.[53]

Based on the data we know so far, we can say that in the early modern period the guilds in Western Hungary employed a very large number of bachelors, mainly from Western Europe. We may fairly assume that the same applies to the Highlands (today's Southern Slovakia),[54] and this was perhaps also a common practice in Transylvania, even if not to the same extent (Due to the Turkish conquest, figures are different for the cities of the lowlands and beyond the Tisza.) In other words, in more than one case the guild labour force was replaced by migration on a massive scale. The background to all of this is that in the cities of the German provinces, in the 17th century, and especially in the second half of the century, the crafts industry, which worked in a broad division of labour, had a considerable surplus of labour due to the emergence and growth of manufactories – a process which came to a head in the 17th century, after the period under study.[55]

[50] Kincses–Tuza (2014b), 282–284.

[51] Domonkos (2002). 99.

[52] The data on which I have based the calculation are presented in tabular form: *Ibid.,* 77.

[53] *Ibid.,* 76.

[54] *Ibid.,* 82.

[55] Klíma (1959); Domonkos (2002), 83, 87; Bräuer (1998), 7–18. – This trend is not unique to Hungary: Jaritz (1989), 50–61; Domonkos (2002), 94.

CONCLUSION

Based on the research conducted thus far, guild migration in Hungary in the 16th and 18th centuries can be best and most clearly captured through exploring the emigration of young artisans and shows a similar picture to peregrination patterns characteristic in Hungary at that time.[56]

In both cases, what proved to be a fundamental organising factor was the interpenetrating network of kinship relations between urban and rural, mostly German speaking citizens of Western Europe and Hungarian (as well as Transylvanian) citizens – a network which had been traced from the beginnings of guild organisation in the Middle Ages in both the economic and the cultural spheres, and which became even stronger from the Reformation onwards.[57] In terms of guild mobility, late medieval and early modern sources reveal a continuous pattern of behaviour, whether it be preacher-candidates seeking to study in Protestant intellectual centres, university students or itinerant guildsmen learning their trade, whatever their denomination. It was a generally accepted even required practice and condition for artisans, which accounted for a significant proportion of contemporary migration. This practice was essentially based on common cultural, religious, and intellectual values, and the kind of urban coexistence which tolerated linguistic diversity. It is not a case of forced migration (e.g., lack of livelihood, religious persecution, or flight from war), in other words not a type of cataclysmic economic and/or religious-political migration, but one motivated by economic factors and accompanied by positive social expectations, capable of sustaining the economic system of the time. Guild migration from Hungary and to Hungary both belong to this context.

REFERENCES

Bácskai, V. (1997). Artisans in Hungarian towns on the Eve of industrialization. In: Crossik, G. (Ed.), *The Artisan and the European Town, 1500–1900*. Aldershot: Scolar Press, pp. 200–217.

Bácskai, V. (2002). *Városok Magyarországon az iparosodás előtt*. Budapest: Osiris.

Bácskai, V. (2007). *Városok és polgárok Magyarországon*. Budapest: Budapest Főváros Levéltára.

Barlay, Ö.S. (1986). *Romon virág. Fejezetek a Mohács utáni reneszánszról*. Budapest: Gondolat.

Batári, F. (1967). Asztalos legények Győrött a XVII. században. Adatok Győr város asztalosművességének történetéhez. *Arrabona*, (9): 93–125.

Borbély, Z. (2020). Nemesi stratégiák és társadalmi mobilitás Felső-Magyarországon a 17. század első felében. *Századok*, 1(154): 25–52.

Bräuer, H. (1998). Verarmungsprozesse im mitteleuropäischen Handwerk während der frühen Neuzeit. In: Szende, K. and Kücsán, J. (Eds.), *„Isten áldja a tisztes ipart" Tanulmányok Domonkos Ottó tiszteletére*. Soproni Múzeum Alapítvány Sopron, pp. 7–18.

Bräuer, H. (1989). Innungasordningen als Quellen für die Erforschung der bürgerlichen Ideologie. In: Éri, I., et al. (Eds.), *Nemzetközi Kézművesipari Szimpózium. Veszprém, 1978. november 22–24*. Veszprém: MTA VEAB, pp. 324–335.

[56]For full details, see: Wagner (1998); Szögi (2011); Csepregi (2015).

[57]Jakubowski-Tiessen (2005); Csepregi (2013).

Crossik, G. (Ed.), (1997). *The Artisan and the European Town, 1500–1900*. Aldershot: Scolar Press.

Csepregi, Z. (2013). *A reformáció nyelve. Tanulmányok a magyarországi reformáció első negyedszázadának vizsgáltat alapján*. Budapest: Balassi.

Csepregi, Z. (2015). Hálózatosság Közép-Európa reformációjában 1540–1610: a wittenbergi ordinációs anyakönyvek vizsgálata alapján. In: Kónya, P. and Kónyová, A. (Eds.), *Od Reformácie po založenie cirkvi. K. 400. výročiu synody v spišskom podhradí./A reformációtól egyházalapításig. A szepesváraljai zsinat 400. évfordulójára*. Prešov: Vydavatel'stvo Prešovskej University, pp. 97–129.

Denzel, M.A. (Ed.), (2018). *Europäische Messegeschichte 9.–19. Jahrhundert*. Böhlau Verlag, Köln–Weimar–Wien.

Domonkos, O. (1964). A győri szijgyártó legények szabályzata a XVII. században. *Arrabona* (6): 93–98.

Domonkos, O. (1979). Reiserouten der wandernden Handwerksgesellen und die technisch-historische Bedeutung der Gesellenwanderschaften. In: Somkuti, É., Éri, I., and Nagybákay, P. (Eds.), *Internationales Handwerksgeschichtliches Symposium. Veszprém, 20–24. 11. 1979*. Veszprém: MTA, VEAB, pp. 13–30.

Domonkos, O. (2002). *A magyarországi mesterlegények közép-európai kapcsolatai és szokásai a XV–XIX. században*. Budapest: MTA VEAB.

Draskóczy, I. (1999). Borkereskedelem a 15–16. század fordulóján. Kassa kiváltságai és borkereskedelme. In: Benyák, Z. and Benyák, F. (Eds.), *Borok és korok. Bepillantás a bor kultúrtörténetébe*. Budapest: Hermész Kör, pp. 99–114.

Ehmer, J. (2002). Zünfte in Österreich in der frühen Neuzeit. In: Haupt, H.G. (Ed.), *Das Ende der Zünfte. Ein europäischer Vergleich*. Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, pp. 87–126.

Eperjessy, G. (1963). A mezővárosi és falusi céhek kialakulása és bomlása az Alföldön és a Dunántúlon (1686–1848.). *Századok*, 97(8), 951–981.

Faragó, T. (2003). Céhek és kézművesek Magyarországon a 17–19. században a számok tükrében. In: *A társadalomtörténetírás helyzete hazánkban. Ipar és társadalom a 18–20. században. A Hajnal István-kör és a Társadalomtörténeti Egyesület 10., jubileumi konferenciájának előadásai. (Salgótarján, 1996. augusztus 22–23.)*. Salgótarján–Budapest: Hajnal István Kör – Nógrád Megyei Levéltár – Budapest Főváros Levéltára, pp. 79–142.

Fata, M., Kurucz, G., and Schindling, A. (Eds.), (2006). *Peregrinatio Hungarica – Studenten aus Ungarn an deutschen und österreichischen Hochschulen vom 16. bis 20. Jahrhundert*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Federmayer, F. (2018). A jezsuita iskolákban végzett diákok és karrierlehetőségeik a Magyar Királyság 17. századi fővárosában. *Történelmi Szemle*, 60(2): 215–236.

Gőzsy, Z. (2019). A püspök-főispánokkal kapcsolatos elvárások és minták Mária Terézia idején. Klimo György püspök és főispán. *Századok*, 153(6): 1167–1188.

Grundner, H. (2014). Gesellenwanderungen zwischen Salzburg und Westungarn im 18. und frühen 19. Jahrhundert. In: Kropf, R. and Wagner, M. (Eds.), *Zünftiges Handwerk. Amt der Burgenländischen Landesregierung, Abteilung 7 – Landesmuseum*. Eisenstadt, pp. 89–126.

H. Németh, I. (2004). *Várospolitika és gazdaságpolitika a 16–17. századi Magyarországon (A felső-magyarországi városszövetség)*, Vol. 1–2. Budapest: MNL OL – Gondolat.

H. Németh, I. (2018). Pozsony centrális szerepköreinek hatásai és jellegzetességei a magyarországi városhálózatban. *Történelmi Szemle*, 60(2): 171–199.

H. Németh, I. and Soós, I. (2020). A magyarországi hungarus-tudat. In: Béni, L.B., et al. (Eds.), *Az együttélés történelme: nemzetiségi kérdés Magyarországon. Tanulmányok*. Budapest: Nemzeti Levéltár, pp. 59–71.

Halász, I. (2011). *Nemeztközi migráció és közigazgatás*. Budapest: Budapesti Corvinus Egyetem.

Hausherr, H. (1955). Zur Kritik des Herrn Dr. Gerhard Bondi an meiner „Wirtschaftsgeschichte der Neuzeit". *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Martin-Luther-Universität, Halle–Wittenberg*, 4(2): 285–292.

Hautzinger, Z., Hegedüs, J., and Klenner, Z. (2014). *A migráció elmélete*. Budapest: Nemzeti Közszolgálati Egyetem Rendészettudományi Kar.

Hermann, I. (2012). A pápai iparosok részvétele a város irányításában. In: Hajnalka, M.V. (Ed.), *A céhládától az adatbázisig. Új utak és eredmények az ipartörténeti kutatásában*. Veszprém: Veszprém Megyei Levéltár, pp. 181–192.

Jakubowski-Tiessen, M. (Ed.), (2005). *Geistliche Lebenswelten: zur Sozial- und Mentalitätsgeschichte der Geistlichen in Spätmittelalter und Früher Neuzeit*. Wachholtz: Neumünster.

Jaritz, G. (1989). Gesellenwanderung in Niederösterreich um 15. und 16. Jahrhundert unter besonderer Berüchsichtigung der Tullner Schuhknechte. In: Éri, I., et al. (Eds.), *Nemzetközi Kézművesipari Szimpózium. Veszprém, 1978. november 22–24*. Veszprém: MTA VEAB, pp. 50–61.

Jeney-Tóth, A. (2001). Adalékok a céhek és iparosok szerepéhez a XVII. századi Kolozsváron. In: Dáné, T.K., et al. (Eds.), *Kolozsvár 1000 éve*. Kolozsvár: EME–MKE, pp. 100–114.

Katona, I. (2001). *A habánok Magyarországon*. Budapest: Gesta Könyvkiadó.

Khavanova, O. (2019). Madridtól Szentpétervárig. Gróf Esterházy Miklós, Mária Terézia első magyar karrierdiplomatája. *Századok*, 153(6): 1123–1139.

Kincses, K. and Tuza, C. (2014a). Handwerksquellen in öffentlichen Archiven. In: Müller, K., Kockel, T., and Bizer, K. (Eds.), *Geschichte des Handwerks – Handwerk im Geschichtsbild. Dokumentation des Workshops am 16. September 2013*. Göttingen: Mecke-Druck, pp. 70–71.

Kincses, K. and Tuza, C. (2014b). Céhtörténeti kutatások és számítógépes adatbázis. *Levéltári Közlemények*, 85: 263–287.

Kincses, K. and Tuza, C.. (2014c). Supraregional exchange and mobility of Hungarian craftsmen in Europe. In: *ESSHC 10th European Social Science History Conference 2014. Wien, Ausztria*, 2014.04.23–2014.04.26. Abstract. ESSHC, Wien, 2014.

Kincses, K. and Tuza, C. (2015). A céhtörténeti kutatások újabb lehetőségei hazai és külföldi gyűjteményekről készített adatbázisok alapján. *Levéltári Szemle*, 65(1): 57–70.

Kincses, K.M. and Tuza, C. (2020). Az etnikai arányok megváltozása a kora újkorban. In: Béni, L.B., et al. (Eds.), *Az együttélés történelme: nemzetiségi kérdés Magyarországon. Tanulmányok*. Budapest: Nemzeti Levéltár, pp. 41–57.

Kincses, K.M. (2016). A kolozsvári borbély-sebész céh a kora újkorban. In: Horn, I., et al. (Eds.), *Művészet és mesterség. Tisztelgő kötet R. Várkonyi Ágnes emlékére*. Budapest–Paris: L'Harmattan, pp. 535–555.

Kincses, K.M. (2018). Magyarországi kézművesek migrációja a kora újkorban. In: Pósán, L., Veszprémy, L., and Isaszegi, J. (Eds.), *Migráció a kora középkortól napjainkig*. Budapest: Zrínyi Kiadó, pp. 280–299.

King, S. and Winter, A. (Eds.), (2016). *Migration, Settlement and Beloning in Europe, 1500–1930s. Comparative perspectives*. New York–Oxford: Bergham Books.

Kiss, J.M. (2000). *Magyarországi diákok a Bécsi Egyetemen 1715–1789/Ungarländische Studenten an der Wiener Universität 1715–1789*. Budapest: ELTE Levéltára.

Kissné Bognár, K. (2004). *Magyarországi diákok a bécsi tanintézetekben 1526–1789 Ungarländische Studenten in Wiener Bildungsanstalten 1526–1789*. Budapest: ELTE Levéltára.

Klíma, A. (1959). *Über die größten Manufakturen des 18. Jahrhunderts in Böhmen*. Wien: Ferdinand Berger Horn N.-Ö., pp. 145–161.

Kovách, G. and Binder, P. (1981). *A céhes élet Erdélyben*. Bukarest: Kriterion Könyvkiadó.

Kovács, J.L. (2014). Die Confoederation der Edlen Gelehrten – Ödenburg und sein Studentenbund (1604–1674). In: Kropf, R. and Wagner, M. (Eds.), *Zünftiges Handwerk. Amt der Burgenländischen Landesregierung, Abteilung 7 – Landesmuseum*. Eisenstadt, pp. 178–192.

Lerner, F. (1989). Ungarische Handwerksgesellenwegen in Frankfurt am Main. In: Éri, I., et al. (Eds.), *Nemzetközi Kézművesipari Szimpózium. Veszprém, 1978. november 22–24*. Veszprém: MTA VEAB, pp. 31–42.

Mátyás-Rausch, P. (2020). Társadalmi mobilitás az erdélyi kincstári igazgatásban (1571–1629). *Századok*, 154(1): 5–24.

Nagy, J. (2019). Idősebb Brunszvik Antal közéleti karrierjének vázlata. *Századok*, 153(6): 1101–1122.

Ostrolucká, M. (1998). Kézművesmesterek Kassa város polgáraiként a 16. és 17. században. In: Szende, K. and Kücsán, J. (Eds.), *„Isten áldja a tisztes ipart" Tanulmányok Domonkos Ottó tiszteletére*. Soproni Múzeum Alapítvány Sopron, pp. 57–63.

Otruba, G. (1979). Wanderpflicht und Handwerksburschenwege im Spiegel Wiener und niederösterreichischer Zunftarchivalien. In: Somkuti, É., Éri, I., and Nagybákay, P. (Eds.), *Internationales Handwerksgeschichtliches Symposium. Veszprém, 20–24. 11. 1979*. Veszprém: MTA, VEAB, pp. 43–49.

Prak, M. (2006). Craft guilds in North-Western Europe (England, France, Low countries). In: *The return of the guilds. Conference of the global economic history network Utrecht, Utrecht university 5–7 October 2006*. Utrecht: University Press, pp. 1–18.

Pukánszky, B. and Nóbik, A. (2019). *A magyar iskoláztatás története a 19–20. században*. Szeged: SZTE BTK, https://eta.bibl.u-szeged.hu/1668/2/magyar_isk_tortenete/www.jgypk.hu/mentorhalo/tananyag/Magyar_isk_tortenete/index.html (04 01 2023).

Rácz, G. (2020). Magyarország nemzetiségei: az együttélés kezdetei. A középkori Magyar Királyság etnikai viszonyai. In: Béni, L.B., et al. (Eds.), *Az együttélés történelme: nemzetiségi kérdés Magyarországon. Tanulmányok*. Budapest: Nemzeti Levéltár, pp. 13–39.

Rauscher, P. (2018). Wege des Handels – Orte des Konsums. Die nieder- und österreichischen Jahrmärkte vom Mittelalter bis ins 19. Jahrhundert. In: Denzel Markus, A. (Ed.), *Europäische Messegeschichte 9.–19. Jahrhundert*. Böhlau Verlag, Köln–Weimar–Wien, pp. 221–266.

Reiningshaus, W. (1984). Gesellenvereinigungen als Problem der Kontinuität in der deutschen sozielgeschichte. In: Fülep, Z., Nagybákay, P., and Somkuti, É. (Eds.), *II. Internationales Handwerksgeschichtliches Symposium. Veszprém, 21–26. 8. 1982. Bd. 1*. Veszprém: MTA VEAB, pp. 265–272.

Reith, R. (1998). Praxis der Arbeit. Probleme und Perspektive der handwerksgeschichtlichen Forschung. In: Reith, R. (Ed.), *Praxis der Arbeit. Überlegungen zur Rekonstruktion von Arbeitsprozessen in der handwerklichen Produktion. Campus*. Frankfurt–New York, pp. 11–54.

Reith, R. (2002). Zünfte im Süden des Alten Reiches: politische, wirtschaftliche und historische Aspekte. In: Haupt, H.G. (Ed.), *Das Ende der Zünfte. Ein europäischer Vergleich*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, pp. 39–71.

Rothmann, M. (2018). Marktkonzepte im mittelalterlichen Europa unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Heiligen römischen Reiches. In: Denzel, M.A. (Ed.), *Europäische Messegeschichte 9.–19. Jahrhundert*. Böhlau Verlag, Köln–Weimar–Wien, pp. 181–202.

Rúzsás, L. (1971). Die Entwicklung der Marktflecken Transdanubiens unter der Türkenherrschaft im 17. Jahrhundert. In: Pickl, O. (Ed.), *Die wirtschaftlichen Auswirkungen der Türkenkriege. Selbstverl. d. Lehrkanzel f. Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte d.* Univ. Graz, pp. 221–234.

Schöpfer, M.-C. (2018). Jahrmärkte und Messen auf dem Gebiet der heutigen Schweiz vom Mittelalter bis zum 19./20. Jahrhundert. In: Denzel, M.A. (Ed.), *Europäische Messegeschichte 9.–19. Jahrhundert*. Böhlau Verlag, Köln–Weimar–Wien, pp. 203–218.

Spannenberger, N. (2018). Märkte im Königreich Ungarn, Kroatien und in Siebenbürgen. In: Denzel, M.A. (Ed.), *Europäische Messegeschichte 9.–19. Jahrhundert*. Böhlau Verlag, Köln–Weimar–Wien, pp. 267–283.

Spiesz, A. (1989). A céhrendszer a Magyar Királyságban és helye az összeurópai céhrendszerben. In: Éri, I., et al. (Eds.), *Nemzetközi Kézművesipari Szimpózium. Veszprém, 1978. november 22–24*. Veszprém: MTA VEAB, pp. 236–243.

Straube, M. (2018). Aktuelle Fragen der deutschen internationalen Messegeschichte. In: Denzel, M.A. (Ed.), *Europäische Messegeschichte 9.–19. Jahrhundert*. Böhlau Verlag, Köln–Weimar–Wien, pp. 15–42.

Szabó, M. and Szögi, L. (1998). *Erdélyi peregrinusok. Erdélyi diákok európai egyetemeken 1701–1849*. Marosvásárhely: Mentor Kiadó.

Szabó, P., Kelényi, B., and Szögi, L. (2016). *Magyarországi diákok a prágai és krakkói egyetemeken 1348–1525. Students from Hungary at the Universities of Prague and Krakow 1348–1525*. Budapest: ELTE Levéltár.

Szabolcsi, H. (1982). A „remek" mint a stílus- és típusváltás kutatásának forrása a század fordulójának bútorművességében. *Ars Hungarica*, 10(2): 179–190.

Szabó-Turákné Póka, Á. (2021). A Magyar Kamara tisztviselőinek hivatali mobilitása 1527–1567 között. *Történelmi Szemle*, 63(2): 193–206, 259–288.

Szádeczky, L. (1913). *Iparfejlődés és czéhek története Magyarországon*, Vol. II. Budapest: Országos Iparegyesület.

Szakály, F. (1971). Zur Kontinuitätsfrage der Wirtschaftsstruktur in den ungarischen Marktflecken unter der Türkenherrschaft. In: Pickl, O. (Ed.), *Die wirtschaftlichen Auswirkungen der Türkenkriege. Selbstverl. d. Lehrkanzel f. Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte d.* Univ. Graz, pp. 235–272.

Szakály, F. (1999). A Közép-Duna menti bortermelés fénykora. In: Benyák, Z. and Benyák, F. (Eds.), *Borok és korok. Bepillantás a bor kultúrtörténetébe*. Budapest: Hermész Kör, pp. 115–131.

Szijártó, M.I. (2019). A „professzionális" hivatalnokok tereziánus nemzedéke és a „bürokraták" hatalomátvétele. *Századok*, 153(6): 1189–1206.

Szögi, L. (2003). *Magyarországi diákok lengyelországi és baltikumi egyetemeken és akadémiákon (1526–1788)/Studenci z Węgier na Uniwersytetach i Akademiach w Polsce i krajach Bałtyckich (1526–1788) [Hungarian students at Polish and Baltic universities and academies (1526–1788)]*. Budapest: ELTE Levéltára.

Szögi, L. (2011). *Magyarországi diákok németországi egyetemeken és akadémiákon, 1526–1700./Ungarländische Studenten an Deutschen Universitäten und Akademien, 1526–1700*. Budapest: ELTE Levéltára.

Szulovszky, J. (Ed.), (2002). *X. kézművesipari Szimpózium (Budapest, 2001. október 29–30.)*. Budapest: Harminc év számvetése. NSZI.

Tompa, L. (2022). Törpebirtokostól az óriás uradalomig. A szerződéses jobbágyság Veszprém, Sopron, Borsod és Bihar vármegyékben. *Történelmi Szemle*, 64(2): 269–294.

Tóth, G. (2008). *Lackner Kristófnak, mindkét jog doktorának rövid önéletrajza/Vitae Christophori Lackhner I. U. D. Hominis, brevis consignation*. Sopron: Soproni Levéltár.

Tóth, P.P. (2001). Népességmozgások a XIX. és a XX. században. In: Lukács, É. and Király, M. (Eds.), *Migráció és az európai unió*. Budapest: Szociális és családügyi minisztérium.

Tuza, C. (2018). *Állami céhszabályozás Magyarországon III. Károly és Mária Terézia uralkodása alatt/Zunftregulierung in Ungarn während der Regierunszeit von Karl III. und Maria Theresia*. Budapest: Line Design.

Tüskés, A. (2008). *Magyarországi diákok a Bécsi Egyetemen 1365–1526/Students from Hungary at the University of Vienna 1365–1526*. Budapest: ELTE Levéltár.

Wagner, E. (1998). *Die Pfarrer und Lehrer der Evangelischen Kirche A. B. in Siebenbürgen. I: Von der Reformation bis zum Jahre 1700*. Böhlau, Köln–Weimar–Wien.

Wenzel, G. (1871). Kassa város parket készítése a XV. század kezdetén. *Értekezések a Társadalomtudomány Köréből*, 2(2): 1–43.

Winzen, K. (2002). *Handwerk – Städte – Reich*. Stuttgart: Steiner Verlag.