

BOGLÁRKA WEISZ

Markets and Staples in the Medieval Hungarian Kingdom



BOGLÁRKA WEISZ ■

**Markets and Staples in the Medieval
Hungarian Kingdom**

ARPADIANA I.

Series editors:

PÁL FODOR AND ATTILA ZSOLDOS



Research Centre for the Humanities
Budapest, 2020

BOGLÁRKA WEISZ ■

Markets and Staples in the Medieval Hungarian Kingdom



Research Centre for the Humanities
Budapest, 2020

This book has been published with the support of The House of Árpád Programme.



Revised and expanded edition of the book originally published in Hungarian
(Weisz Boglárka, Vásárok és lerakatok a középkori Magyar Királyságban,
[Magyar Történelmi Emlékek, Értekezések], Budapest: MTA Bölcsészettudományi
Kutatóközpont Történettudományi Intézet, 2012)

Translated by Alan Campbell

© Research Centre for the Humanities, 2020

© Boglárka Weisz, 2020

ISBN 978-963-416-199-8, ISBN 978-963-416-328-2 (PDF)
ISSN 2677-0881

Research Centre for the Humanities,
Budapest, Hungary
Prepress preparation: Institute of History, RCH
Research Assistance Team
Leader: Éva Kovács
Cover design and page layout: Ildikó Balázs
Maps: Béla Nagy
Printed in Hungary by Séd Nyomda, Szekszárd

■ CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	7
I. MARKETS IN THE MEDIEVAL KINGDOM OF HUNGARY	11
1. The emergence of markets	11
2. Market terminology	14
3. Forum liberum	19
4. Market day	25
5. The ban-mile right (Bannmeilenrecht)	38
6. Market revenues	41
7. Market proclamations	44
II. TRADE DEPOTS IN THE MEDIEVAL KINGDOM OF HUNGARY	51
1. The staple right in Hungarian historiography	51
2. The concept of the staple right in the Kingdom of Hungary	53
3. The acquisition of the staple right	56
4. The widening and narrowing of the staple right	78
5. Wrangling among towns with depots	86
6. Merchants' antagonism towards depots	95
7. Royal review of the depots	105
8. Rights and obligations in the depot	107
9. The concept of the staple rights, and its variants	111
III. RIGHTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE STAPLE RIGHT	115
1. Mandatory routes	115
2. Prohibition on sale in small quantities	131
3. The transshipment right	135
4. The use of municipal weights and measures	136
5. Ban on merchant companies	137

IV. SUMMARY	139
V. APPENDIX	141
1. Data inventory	141
2. Sources and Bibliography	217
Primary sources and abbreviations	217
Secondary literature	228
3. Index	242

■ INTRODUCTION

Markets – the organized, official places for exchange of goods – were familiar to the Hungarians even before they came to the Carpathian Basin.¹ This is apparent from a Hungarian word of Iranian origin, *vásár* (market), which appears in the earliest surviving sources of the written language, the foundation deeds of the abbeys of Tihany (1055) and Garamszentbenedek (1075).² The king guaranteed peace and honest dealings at markets, in exchange for which – starting with Stephen I (1000–1038) – he had tolls collected there.³ Markets were initially held on the first day of the week (*feria prima, dies dominica*), a fact preserved in the Hungarian word *vasárnap* (Sunday). Since King Stephen I ordered strict control of attendance at church,⁴ a market held on Sunday was more easily controlled. Only the market could assure merchants or the public that they were not buying stolen goods, and it was for this reason that Ladislaus I (1077–1095) banned sale outside markets, even of a person's own goods.⁵ Consequently, by the end of the eleventh century, markets were the only places where goods could be exchanged.

Until the thirteenth century, only the king had the right to hold markets on the lands of the Kingdom of Hungary, but clerical and secular landowners gradually acquired market rights in later times. The only prerogative retained by the king was the power to grant a franchise for a market. Kings may have created the institutional

1 Cf. Minorsky, *Sharaf al-Zamān Tāhir Marvazī on China, the Turks and India*, p. 35.

2 1055: “Mortis uasara kuta rea”, *DHA*, vol. I, p. 150; 1075: “...quod vocatur Hungarica Zobuzlou wasar...”, *DHA*, vol. I, p. 218.

3 “Si quis de propriis et domesticis rebus quid in foro vendiderit, lege sancti Stephani tributum reddat...”, *DRMH 1000–1301*, p. 27 (34§).

4 “Si qui ad ecclesiam venientes ad audiendum officium et ibidem hora sollempnitatis missarum inter se murmurant et ceteros inquietant, exponentes fabulas ociosas, et non intendentes divinas lecciones, cum ecclesiastico nutrimento, si maiores sunt, increpati cum dedecore expellantur de ecclesia, si vero minores et vulgares, in atrio ecclesie pro tanta temeritate coram omnibus ligentur et corripiantur flagellis ac cesura capillorum...”, *ibid.*, p. 5 (19§) Cf. *ibid.*, p. 3 (8§).

5 “Nemo emat vel vendat preter mercatum, si qui vero contra hoc emerint de furtiva re, pereant omnes, et emptor et venditor et testes. Si vero propriam rem contraxerint, perdant rem et pretium et testes tantundem. Si vero in mercato tractus sit, contractus fiat coram iudice et theloneario et testibus, et si res empta esse furtiva apparuerit, emptor quidem testimonio iudicis et thelonearii evadat, testes autem reddant venditorem...”, *DRMH 1000–1301*, p. 14 (7§).

basis for trade, but markets followed their own course of development in the way they operated. The system went through many changes as new demands arose over the centuries, but permanence and adherence to old ways was always a characteristic feature. In the fourteenth century, and even more so in the fifteenth, a typical demand in a large town was to complement the existing weekly market, which usually concentrated on food, with a market on another day of the week, where local artisans could sell their products.

The expanding range of merchandise led to differentiation among markets, and in the second half of the thirteenth century, weekly markets were joined by annual and daily markets. The former was largely for goods from broader market regions, and the latter for everyday food supplies. In the fourteenth century, more and more towns were granted rights to hold annual markets, and many tried to establish more than one. Large towns usually had at least two, and some had three, four or even more annual markets.

By the end of the fifteenth century, a major distinction had arisen between weekly and annual markets. Since foreign merchants were confined to trading at annual markets, the weekly markets were where domestic products were bought and sold. This does not mean that only imported goods appeared at the annual markets, and indeed there were some that seem to have had only local significance. Naturally, within its the region, the significance of an annual market for the people buying and selling there was undiminished if it did not attract merchants from foreign lands. There were cases a where a town had two or more annual markets, one attended only by regional traders, and the other also involving foreign merchants.

There was another trading institution that caused a divergence between weekly and annual markets. In the second half of the thirteenth century, kings started to control trade through the staple right. Towns granted this right could require foreign merchants to sell their wares there instead of taking them into the interior of the country, and by the end of the medieval period, there was a network of staple-right towns in the border regions of the country. Nonetheless, Buda, having been among the first to acquire the staple right, remained the predominant trading centre throughout the Middle Ages.⁶ The new institution enabled domestic merchants to buy up imported goods and sell them in the interior, thus taking much of the profit on sale. This system required foreign merchants to be banned from weekly markets and restricted to the staple-right towns and the annual markets.

By complementing the long-established markets, the staple right engendered an organized structure of interior and foreign trade.⁷ This book tells the story of these two institutions and their many interactions, and how they developed and

6 “Buda, metropolis Pannoniae inferioris, sede regia et externarum mercium emporio insignis...”, *Taurinus*, p. 88.

7 The term “institutions” covers the rules devised by people who decided what could and could not be done. Cf. North, “Institutions”, pp. 97–102.

changed over time. It offers a coherent terminology for historians, expressing the composition of these institutions more precisely than has hitherto been the case. It does not, however, cover the medieval history of commerce in Hungary in general, the types of goods sold, or their quantities and qualitative features, and it only partly covers the persons who engaged in trade either as a profession or on occasion.

■ I. MARKETS IN THE MEDIEVAL KINGDOM OF HUNGARY

1. The emergence of markets

Markets divide into two groups by origin: those that formed under the effect of natural factors and those created artificially. The first group, in which the later grant of a market privilege was merely confirmation of something that already existed, further divides into two subgroups. Some markets became established in centres of clerical and secular administration, such as Kéménd and Pécs in the county of Baranya. Kéménd was the centre of the Baranya domain of the Óváris of the Győr kindred, and Pécs was an episcopal seat connected, if only indirectly, to the major trade routes. Markets in the seats of ispáns¹ who ruled the counties include those of Bodrog, which appears in sources as early as the eleventh century, and Nógrád. In the county of Nyitra, the suitability of Újhely (today Nové Mesto nad Váhom, Slovakia) as the location for a market derived from it being the centre of a minor royal domain. The connection between administrative centres and markets has prompted a hypothesis that weekly markets were held in every county seat in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.² The effect also worked in reverse, because in the late thirteenth century, new secular centres grew up in towns with markets. There is clear evidence that a large proportion of the county law courts (*sedes iudicaria*, or just *sedria*)³ that emerged at the end of that century sat on the same day as the weekly market.⁴

Other markets of ‘natural origin’ emerged under the effects of economic geography, through their location at transport intersections, river crossings and the meeting points of areas favouring different forms of production. Szombathely (Arad county, today Sîmbăteni, Romania), for example, lay along the River Maros, the major salt-carrying water route, and Eszék (Baranya county, today Osijek, Croatia) formed at the most important Dráva crossing point, on one of the busiest military

1 On this term, see Zsoldos, *The Árpáds and Their Wives*, pp. 207–208.

2 Cf. Szende, “Von der Gespanschaftsburg zur Stadt”, pp. 389–292.

3 Cf. Považan, “To Question the Existence of Authorities to Prosecute Crimes”, p. 11; Rady, *Customary Law in Hungary*, pp. 61–62.

4 Csukovits, “Sedriahelyek – megyeszékhelyek a középkorban”, pp. 377–378.

roads, a route also used by pilgrims to Jerusalem. Pásztó (Heves county) lay where the plain met the hills, and Hídvég (Hont county, Ipelské Predmostie, Slovakia) grew up beside a bridge across the River Ipoly. There are many other examples.⁵ The administrative function and economic geographical factors often combined to influence the formation of a market, such as in the two early seats of the Árpáadian kings, Esztergom and Székesfehérvár. Until the middle of the thirteenth century, Esztergom was a royal seat, and continued to be a county town and an archiepiscopal seat throughout the Middle Ages,⁶ but it was also located at a point that favoured its development as a centre of long-distance trade,⁷ the confluence of the rivers Danube and Garam.⁸ Its Castle Hill, rising above the natural crossing point, provided control of both the river and land routes.⁹ One of the factors favouring the emergence of a market in the royal centre of Székesfehérvár, besides its significant church institutions, was its location on a road intersection where the Bakony hills meet the plain of Mezőföld. A third royal city, Buda, was added in the second half of the thirteenth century. With a good location beside the Danube and at the centre of the road network, its market took primacy from that time onwards. Győr was equally well-appointed, a county and episcopal seat located at the confluence of three rivers, the Moson-Danube, the Rába and the Rábca, and with crossing points for those travelling by road. The same is true for Nagyvárad (today Oradea, Romania), an episcopal seat on the River Sebes-Körös and on the road to Transylvania; Bács (today Bač, Serbia), a county centre and archiepiscopal seat on a major land route; Veszprém, a county centre and episcopal seat traversed by main land routes; Nyitra (today Nitra, Slovakia), a county centre and later an episcopal seat at an intersection of major trade routes; and some lesser towns, such as Keve (today Kovin, Serbia),

5 For network of roads in the Árpáadian Ages see Diószegi, *A Magyarországon keresztülvezető kereskedelmi utak*; Glaser, “Dunántúl középkori úthálózata”, pp. 138–167, 257–285; Tóth, “Via imperatoris, 1217”, pp. 575–580; Szilágyi, “Mobility, Roads and Bridges in Medieval Hungary”, pp. 64–78.

6 Szende, “Stadt und Naturlandschaft im ungarischen Donaauraum des Mittelalters”, pp. 375–376; Szende, “Towns along the way”, pp. 171–175.

7 In the second half of the thirteenth century, Esztergom and its market started to decline in status, the result of several interacting factors, as had been true for the rise of the city. Firstly, church influence started to inhibit its urban development at the turn of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Secondly, the rise of Buda following the Mongol Invasion had a detrimental effect on the city and its market. The holder of the market toll, the Esztergom chapter, made attempts to make up for decreasing toll income, a sign that merchants were passing the market by. They obtained the right to collect tolls in other towns (Győr and Tát) under the heading of “Esztergom market tolls”. *BTOE*, vol. I, pp. 233–236; *MES*, vol. II, pp. 236–241. Cf. Draskóczy, “Commercial Contacts”, pp. 278–299.

8 Cf. 1147: “...Danubio qui hanc satis in directum praeterfluit, et multarum regionum divitias nobili civitati Estrigim navigio invehit...”, *MGH SS*, vol. XXVI, p. 62.

9 The city is known in German as Gran, derived from the name of the River Garam. Cf. Györffy, “Esztergom árpádkori kezdetei”, pp. 7–11; Molnár, “Dunai átkelőhelyek Esztergomnál”, pp. 143–151. Most traffic along the Danube in the thirteenth century had Pest as its destination, although there are records that the river was also a transport route further to the south. *MES*, vol. II, pp. 236–241. For more on the history of shipping on the Danube, see Kováts, “Adalékok a dunai hajózás történetéhez”, pp. 433–470; Domanovszky, “Duna-Fekete-tengeri kereskedelmi hajózásunk múltjáról”, pp. 161–183.

county centre and busy Danube ferry; Csongrád, a county centre at the confluence of two important water routes, the Körös and the Tisza; and Liptó (today Liptovský Hrádok, Slovakia), centre of a royal domain on the River Vág along the road to Polish lands. Other examples include Pozsony (today Bratislava, Slovakia), Vasvár, Sopron, Jászó (today Jasov, Slovakia), Galgóc (today Hlohovec, Slovakia) and Szatmár (today part of Satu Mare, Romania).

Artificially-created markets owed their foundation to the granting of a right, the prerogative of the king in the Middle Ages, as was the granting of consent for moving the place or time of an existing market. The market may have started up before royal permission was obtained, but could not have run permanently without it. Having been created through the royal franchise, however, a market was assured a long life only if the factors discussed above provided the conditions for its survival. In Gerla in the county of Bars, for example, Andrew II (1205–1235) granted a market franchise to a church belonging to John, Archbishop of Esztergom in 1206, even providing it with the privilege that neither toll collectors (*tributarii*) nor the *curialis comes*, nor the ispán's agent (*billogos*), nor any other tax collector (*alii exactores*) was permitted to visit or collect any tax.¹⁰ Despite this considerable privilege, both the village and the market disappear from later sources, probably owing to Gerla's weak geographical location and lack of administrative functions.

When a town was granted the right to hold a market, the issue of the charter was followed by a public announcement to enable any aggrieved party to raise an objection. According to the *Tripartitum*, the market had to be held within a year after the grant of privilege, otherwise the right was forfeited.¹¹ Internal regulation of the market was the power of the owner of the market. The regulations covered where in the market the various traders could sell their wares, and these places gradually became permanent. This emerges from a document providing for the division of Csütörtökhely (today Štvrtok na Ostrove, Slovakia), in Pozsony county, between the sons of Ábrahám Szentgyörgyi in 1333. The west half of the village went to Sebes and the east half to Péter. The market held in the village was also divided. Péter got the part where livestock (cattle and horses), fur, leather, linen, broadcloth, sundry goods and groceries were sold, while Sebes' part accommodated sellers of their own produce, local and external butchers, bakers, cloth merchants, shoemakers, and was also where grain, firewood, building timber, cartwheels, carts, crates, cupboards and pulses was sold.¹² In Buda, the German butchers could trade at places other than their shops or shambles on two days of the week, Wednesday and Saturday, meaning that they could sell at the appropriate places on the Wednesday and Saturday

10 *CDES*, vol. I, p. 112.

11 *Tripartitum*, pp. 240–241 (II/12, 3§).

12 *AO*, vol. III, pp. 33–35.

markets.¹³ The market owners could also specify the order in which purchases could be made. In Sopron in 1445, it was decided that the butchers could buy at the butchers' shambles first, and other citizens only afterwards.¹⁴ Similarly, the Pest and Buda butchers could buy livestock driven to Pest before anyone else.¹⁵ In Buda, however, it was city residents who took precedence over the butchers when buying livestock, because the German butchers of Buda were prohibited from buying sheep and goats driven to the market by people living near the city – at Easter or on any other day – if another local resident wished to buy them.¹⁶ For similar reasons, there were regulations preventing Buda fishmongers and butchers from buying salted or live fish – large or small – from merchants and fishermen until they had been offered for sale for three days.¹⁷

2. Market terminology

Latin sources most generally refer to markets – regardless of their type – by the words *forum* or *mercatus*: these may be regarded as synonyms.¹⁸ The equivalent in Hungarian was *vásár*,¹⁹ a word that often appears in toponyms.²⁰ In German sources,

13 1481: "...in foro plateali deputato...", *Budai mészárosok*, p. 358; 1494: "...auf den darzu ordinirten marckh...", *ibid.*, p. 371.

14 The butchers were obliged to sell everything in their shops, and could therefore sell to both outsiders and locals. An outsider could buy from an outsider until vespers but not for the rest of the day. "Item das auf dem wochenmarkt zum ersten die fleischaker kauffen sullen auf die pennkh vnd nichts mer vnd darnach sullen vnd mügen die andern mitpurger kauffen vnd kain fleischaker nicht mer vorbehalten, was er zu den pennkhen haben wil, darumb mag er ainem yeden gast vnd auch ainem hieigen wol in den kauft steen vnd die gest sind frey zu kauffen von den gesten vncz auff vesperzeit vnd nicht verrer am markttag." *Sopr. Tört.*, vol. II/2, p. 175. In Boroszló, local citizens could buy on the veal market first, and the butchers only after them. Cf. *Simplicissimus*, p. 39.

15 1426: "...carnifices Budenses et Pesthienses semper et omni tempore prescripta libertate et consuetudine, ut videlicet iidem huiusmodi pecora prius et ante memoratos carnifices Veterisbudenses ac etiam quoslibet alios per se emendi habuerint et haberent facultatem...", *Budai mészárosok*, p. 347.

16 1481: "Item cum oves alique, aut capriole tempore pascali, aut aliis temporibus per ipsos villanos circumquaque vive hue ad forum causa venditionis introducuntur, tune nullus earnificum easdem emere debet et potest, siquis aliorum hominum et incolarum civitatis non carnifex easdem emere pretendit...", *ibid.*, p. 359; 1494: "Wie auch, wan zu österlicher oder sonst anderen zeithen einige schäfflein oder geiß durch die manner oder schaffhalter anhero auf dem platz zu verkhaufen gebracht werden, solle keiner aus denen fleischhackhern solche kauffen, und nach dem wan einer diser statt inwohner, der kein fleischhackher ist solche zu kauffen in willens hatt...", *ibid.*, p. 372.

17 1424: "...piscis autem tam salitos, quam vivos, tam etiam parvos, quam magnos, qui per mercatores seu piscatores forenses adducti fuerint, non prius, nisi elapsis tribus diebus et dictis piscibus per eosdem venditioni expositis predicti piscium venditores aut carnifices nostri concives non debeant neque presumant ab eisdem mercatoribus seu piscatoribus forensibus...", *ibid.*, p. 344.

18 1255: "...tributum de foro seu mercato...", *BTOE*, vol. I, p. 54; 1290: "...tributum fori sive mercati...", *ibid.*, p. 256.

19 1055: "...Mortis uuasara kuta rea...", *DHA*, vol. I, p. 150

20 E.g. Asszonyvására (Bihar county, now Târgușor, Romania), Martonvásár (Fejér county).

we find some form of the word *markt*,²¹ which also appears in toponyms.²² In distinguishing different kinds of market, we are helped by source that tell us the times at which they were held. The term *forum cottidianum* was used for markets held every day.²³ Weekly markets (in latin sources: *forum ebdomadale seu septimanale*,²⁴ in German sources: *Wochenmarkt*)²⁵ were denoted in various ways: a source may mention the day of the market²⁶ and, separately, whether it was held every week.²⁷ Weekly markets also appear in toponyms: the generally-accepted view is that place names containing a day of the week refer to the day of the market held there.²⁸ Weekly markets were termed *forum sollempne*, *forum generale*, *forum commune* or *forum publicum*. The interpretation of *forum sollempne* as “weekly market” has mainly been inferred from a comment about the Záhgráb (Záhgráb county, today Zagreb, Croatia) market²⁹ that the *forum sollempne* was held twice a week, on Monday and Thursday.³⁰ The use of *forum generale* for weekly market first appeared in 1307, when it was held in Eger on Tuesdays.³¹ The sources also make clear that *forum commune* referred to a market held each week.³² András Kubinyi also ascribed the terms *forum comprovinciale* and *forum provinciale*, which mainly appear in three-market proclamations,³³ to weekly markets.³⁴ Evidence in support of his hypothesis is a charter of Charles I

21 “...von den marcktagen dyser stat...”, *OSz*, p. 137 (227§).

22 E.g. Késmárk (Szeps county, now Kešmarok, Slovakia), Reussmarkt (Saxon Lands, now Miercurea Sibiului, Romania).

23 E.g. 1239: “...cum foro quotidiano, ad quod forum omnes mercatores secure venient...”, *EFHU*, vol. III/2, p. 33.

24 1396: *MNL OL DF*, 271 895.

25 *OSz*, p. 105 (116§).

26 1261: “...item volumus et concedimus, quod in villa ipsorum secunda feria liberum forum celebretur...”, *EFHU*, vol. III/2, p. 53.

27 +1015: “...Forum eciam bis in ebdomada stare concessimus duobusque in locis, unum [...] die dominico [...] quarta feria aliud...”, *DHA*, vol. I, p. 76; 1262: “...forum ipsorum, quod in Syplak die lune in singulis septimanis consueverat congregari...”, *Sopron vm*, vol. I, p. 25.

28 Hétfő (Monday): Hetvehely (Vas county, today part of Deutsch Schützen, Austria), kedd (Tuesday): Keddhely (Sopron county, today Mannersdorf an der Rabnitz, Austria) or Csoltkedde (Komárom county), szerda (Wednesday): Szerdahely (Baranya county), csütörtök (Thursday): Csütörtökhely (Pozsony county, today Štrvrtok na Ostrove, Slovakia), péntek (Friday): Péntek (Beszterce district, today Slătinița, Romania), szombat (Saturday): Szombathely (Vas county). Cf. Major, “A magyar városok és városhálózat”, pp. 48–90; Szabó, “A hét napjai a helységnevekben”, pp. 51–55; Szabó, *A vásározás emlékei középkori helységneveinkben*.

29 Erik Fügedi interpreted this term to mean an annual market, but András Kubinyi took the view that it was a weekly market. Cf. Erik Fügedi, “Középkori magyar városprivilegiumok”, p. 91, footnote 118; Kubinyi, *Die Anfänge Ofens*, p. 49.

30 1242: “Item statuimus, quod in eadem civitate forum sollempne duobus diebus in ebdomada, videlicet die Lune et die Iovis celebretur et preterea forum cottidianum cottidie habeatur...”, *CDCr*, vol. IV, p. 174.

31 1307: “...forum generale, quod feria tertia celebrator...”, *Reg. Slov*, vol. I, p. 240.

32 1330: “...villa ecclesie prefate Errad vocata feria tertia singulis ebdomadis imperpetuum forum commune et provinciale possit celebrari...”, *MNL OL DF*, 200 402.

33 See *Market proclamations* chapter.

34 Kubinyi, “Professional Merchants”, p. 438.

dated 12 June 1330 by which the Bishop of Veszprém granted his people in Nyirád the right to hold a market (*forum commune seu provinciale*) on Tuesdays,³⁵ and a 1396 charter by which King Sigismund (1387–1437) granted Hibbe (today Hybe, Slovakia) in the county of Liptó the franchise for a market each Monday *ad modum et instar ceterorum comprovincialium fororum*.³⁶ Annual fairs were commonly referred to as *forum annuum*, but also as *forum annuale*, *nundinae*, *congregatio*³⁷ and *feria* (feast) in Latin sources and as *Jahrmarkt* in German documents.³⁸ Fifteenth-century Hungarian-language sources used the word *sokadolom* for annual fairs (*magnaessent nondinae vulgo sokadalom, hogi zentpeter sokadalmaban pesten mynden ember vammal tartozyk*).³⁹ In the charter by which he granted the town of Dés a franchise to hold a Saturday weekly market (*forum ebdomadale liberum*), issued on 20 November 1517, Louis II (1516–1526) stipulated that the franchise was granted only if it did not injure the rights of other towns (*absque tamen preiudicio nundinarum liberarum civitatum, oppidorum seu villarum aliarum*).⁴⁰ Here, the word *nundinae* was used instead of the usual term (*absque tamen preiudicio fororum liberorum aliorum*), even though the market was granted with the same privileges as applied to other towns' weekly markets (*sub iisdem libertatibus et prerogativis, quibus fora ebdomadalia aliarum civitatum seu oppidorum et villarum celebrantur*).⁴¹ This might be considered a clerical error were it not for a fifteenth-century entry on the back of King Sigismund's charter of 25 May 1427 granting a Thursday weekly market to Földvár (today Feldiora, Romania), stating that the document concerned the town's *nundinae*.⁴² These two instances do not permit far-reaching conclusions, but warn us to caution in interpreting the term *nundinae* in sources written at the turn of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

35 *MNL OL DF*, 200 402.

36 *MNL OL DF*, 271 895.

37 1353: "...ita videlicet, quod predictae nundine, congregatio generalis seu forum annual debet inchoari in festo beati Bartholomei apostoli usque quindenae eiusdem festi in singulis annis duraturum...", *UGDS*, vol. II, p. 98; 1377: "...in nundinis seu congregacione...", *Mon. Zagr*, vol. V, p. 76.

38 "...wir yeczund von Wardein jarmarkch czw phingsten darnach gen Ofen chemen sein...", *MNL OL DF*, 241 550.

39 *MNL OL DL*, 8056; 1538: "Nundine: sokadalom: der marckt"; 1585: "Nundinae: Sokadalom"; 1595: "Nundinae: Iarmarckt: Sokadalom", *RMG*, p. 616. Kubinyi also urged the use of common terminology for markets. He regarded the Hungarian expressions *évi vásár* and *sokadolom* appropriate for annual markets instead of the widespread *országos vásár* (countrywide market). See Kubinyi, "A belkereskedelem a késő középkori Magyarországon", p. 235. Some foreign authors distinguish the *Jahrmarkt* from the *Messe*, even though the sources use the term *nundinae* for both. The former was of local or regional interest, with trade between traders and retail customers, while the latter was where wholesalers from further afield offered their goods for sale. There is no generally-accepted definition of the term *Messe*. Cf. Jarnut, "Die Anfänge des europäischen Messewesens", pp. 1–12; Opl, "Jahrmarkt oder Messe?", p. 189; Irsigler, "Jahrmärkte und Messesysteme", pp. 11–12; Rothman, *Die Frankfurter Messen im Mittelalter*, pp. 31–32.

40 *MNL OL DF*, 253 401.

41 *Ibid.*

42 "Literae super nundinas oppida", *UGDS*, vol. IV, p. 295.

The medieval sources thus differentiate three types of market in terms of frequency: daily, weekly and annual. Daily markets for sale of goods are usually referred to by the word *piac*, but the sources describe many of the markets where trade was, or could be, carried on daily, not as those serving everyday needs, as is usually implied by *piac*, but much more substantial trade. Béla IV's charter of privilege issued to the Pest *hospites* in 1244 ordered that ships and ferry boats travelling up or down the river must bring in their goods and wagons and, as before, hold a market every day.⁴³ This certainly did not concern the retail trade of the *piac*, but rather the provision of a more serious market. When a large section of the burghers of Pest, at the news of a renewed Mongol incursion, settled on Buda Castle Hill and took their privileges with them,⁴⁴ the town of Buda started to exercise the right granted in the Pest charter.⁴⁵ Certain days were assigned for the weekly markets in Buda: Saturday and Tuesday in 1320⁴⁶ and Wednesday, Friday and Saturday in the late medieval period.⁴⁷ The municipal authorities managed the wholesale trade that it directed to Buda not through the weekly markets but by an arrangement in which trade could be conducted on any day of the week, as provided by an article in the 1244 charter article concerning markets. In 1271, Stephen V (1270–1272) granted the Győr *hospites* a franchise for a *forum liberum* to be held every day – rather than on a specified day – both within and outside the castle. The ispán of Győr and his officers had no jurisdiction over this market, but were still due the tolls from Saturday market in the town of Győr.⁴⁸ Since the royal franchise was for a *forum liberum*, the meaning of which will be discussed later, it could not have been a daily *piac*, but was expressly a *vásár*. The need for this derived from the right provided by Stephen V in the same document to require merchants going to or from Austria to lay out their goods and offer them for sale,⁴⁹ which was only possible if the merchants had the chance to sell their goods whatever day they happened to arrive in the town. This state of affairs did not persist in the subsequent period, and the *forum liberum* was assigned to Friday, Saturday and Tuesday.⁵⁰ In the first half of the fourteenth century, the weekly markets in Kassa (today Košice, Slovakia) were held on Thursday and Sunday.⁵¹ When Louis I (1342–

43 “Item naves et carine descendentes et ascendentes cum mercibus et curribus apud eos descendant et forum sicut prius habeant cottidianum...”, *EFHU*, vol. III/2, p. 40.

44 Kubinyi, *Anfänge Ofens*, p. 20; Rady, *Medieval Buda*, pp. 3–6.

45 In 1502, the citizens of Pest probably cited this document in their attempt to establish that the staple right applied to them, too. *OSz*, pp. 203–204 (444§). Cf. Skorka, “A budai jogkönyv lerakatra vonatkozó artikulusai”, pp. 371–372.

46 *MNL OL DL*, 40 389.

47 *OSz*, p. 137 (227§).

48 “...concessimus eisdem liberum forum tam in castro, quam exterius quotidie celebrandum...”, *EFHU*, vol. III/2, p. 62.

49 *EFHU*, vol. III/2, p. 63.

50 Saturday, 1360: *Pannonhalmi oklt.*, vol. I, p. 115; Friday, 1361: *PRT*, vol. II, p. 474; Tuesday, 1480: *Hédekváros*, vol. I, p. 425.

51 1327: *MNL OL DL*, 16 095; 1342: *MNL OL DL*, 103 170.

1382) granted Kassa the same privileges as Buda in 1347, however, he also granted a franchise for a trade to be held every day.⁵² As in Győr and Buda, then, the “daily market” in Kassa may be identified as a wholesale operation. We can be almost certain that this trade, which primarily involved large lots, did not take place on market places but in market halls or other suitable buildings. It is also conceivable that in the initial period, before such buildings were built, trade was conducted on the market places or in the merchants’ lodgings.⁵³ Kassa, holding the right to hold a daily trade, protested in 1482 that despite its privileges, nobles living in the surroundings and county of Kassa (*in illa provincia*), meaning Abaúj county, had set up places for depositing merchandise on their own estates and in their own village, and that they were bringing in wine from outside and selling it there.⁵⁴ These documents seem to give credence to the suspicion that wholesale trade may have been behind Béla IV’s granting to Esztergom in 1239 a franchise for a weekly market lasting from midday on Friday until Saturday evening *cum foro quotidiano*.⁵⁵ We may presume the same in the case of Zággráb, where Béla IV (1235–1270) granted a franchise to the *hospites* of the town in 1242 for a weekly market on Monday and Thursday, and also permitted them to hold a market every day.⁵⁶

This does not, of course, deny the emergence of markets of lesser significance, mainly for food, in large towns, but it shows that we should not assume that such markets necessarily correspond to the term *forum cottidianum*. There is a record of such a *piac* in Árpáadian-era Esztergom. On 22 September 1290, Andrew III (1290–1301) granted the servant people of the archbishop and chapter, living outside the Esztergom ramparts, in the suburb and the villages of Petye, Libár, Hévíz, Örmény, Kovácsi and Szentpál, the right to freely take their own goods, and goods they purchased locally, to the Esztergom market at any time of any day.⁵⁷ This cannot mean anything other than a daily market (*piac*). In the early fifteenth century, we hear of a daily market in Igló (today Spišská Nová Ves, Slovakia), from which the income due to the town was disbursed by the Igló judge.⁵⁸ In 1307, Bishop Martin of Eger promised to restore to the chapter the daily market (*forum cottidianum, quod ab antiquo fuit ipsius capituli*) – distinct from the Tuesday *forum generale* – that it had

52 “...item currus descendentes et ascendentes cum mercimoniis apud eos descendant et forum, sicut prius, habeant cotidianum...”, *VMMS*, vol. I, p. 148.

53 There is a reference to the latter in a passage of the Buda toll register that mentions valuation and imposition of tolls in merchants’ lodgings. See *EFHU*, vol. III/2, 45.

54 “...in villis et possessionibus ipsorum quedam loca depositionis instituissent et ad huiusmodi loca vina externa congererent et exinde [...] venditioni exponerent...”, *MNL OL DF*, 271 438.

55 *EFHU*, vol. III/2, p. 33.

56 “Item statuimus, quod in eadem civitate forum sollempne duobus diebus in ebdomada, videlicet die Lune et die Iovis celebretur et preterea forum cottidianum cottidie habeatur...”, *CDCr*, vol. IV, p. 174.

57 *MES*, vol. II, pp. 271–272.

58 (1422): “...von dem gelde der taegmesse...”, Weinelt, *Das Stadtbuch von Zipser Neudorf*, no. 130.

long held but had been withdrawn by his successor Bishop Andrew.⁵⁹ The church of Nagyvárád held a market every day in the Hétközshely area of the town even before the fifteenth century, although we do not know of a charter granting it.⁶⁰ We find a reference to daily selling in the *Ofner Stadtrecht*. This was done by the costermonger (*fragnerin*). The statutes strictly prescribed the number and origin of these costermongers, their places in the market and what they could sell. Distinctions were made among sellers of fruit, dry vegetables, cheese, poultry, game, fresh vegetables and salt. Sellers of various produce were permitted to sell in different districts of Buda, but all those offering the same produce had to set their stalls in a row, side by side. The Statute Book also regulated the number of costermongers, and being a city of two ethnic groups, it fixed the proportions of Hungarians and Germans among them. It also stipulated that on market days, until the flag of the free market was lowered, which meant about midday, the costermongers could not sell food.⁶¹ We also find market costermongers (*fragner*) in Sopron. They were confined to the *fragnermarkt*,⁶² although there must have been retail grocers in every large town.

3. Forum liberum

In Hungarian legal Latin, the term *forum liberum* can be interpreted in two ways: either as a toll-exempt market⁶³ or a market of a kind that emerged in the twelfth century, where the king assigned the toll from the market, and jurisdiction over it, to the market holder.⁶⁴ According to András Kubinyi, however, *forum liberum* was a complex term, and in the late medieval period it chiefly implied free trade open to anyone and the protection of merchants and customers.⁶⁵ István Tringli also highlighted the royal guarantee of protection afforded to persons on their way to and from markets, both weekly and annual. This meant that people on the road in either direction could not be stopped to or their wares arrested. For weekly markets, the protection presumably applied for two days, and for annual markets, for the time stated in the charter of privilege.⁶⁶

59 *Reg. Slov.*, vol. I, p. 240.

60 1411: "...in civitate pretitulata capitulari Waradiensi in loco Hethkezshel nominato omnibus et singulis diebus forum celebratum cottidianum extitisset et celebrari esset consuetum libertate et consuetudine ecclesie predicte Waradiensis antiqua requirente...", *MNL OL DF*, 245 026.

61 *OSz*, pp. 113–115 (153–154§).

62 Mollay, "A soproniak harmincadvámja", p. 139; Mollay, *Erstes Grundbuch*, p. xiv, 32; Mollay, *Das Geschäftsbuch des Krämers Paul Moritz*, p. 14.

63 Gáspár, *A vásárok történeti fejlődése*, p. 48.

64 Fügedi, "Középkori magyar városprivilegiumok", pp. 30–32; Major, "A magyar városok és városhálózat", p. 50; Szűcs, *Az utolsó Árpádok*, p. 53.

65 Kubinyi, "Professional Merchants", pp. 438–439.

66 Tringli, "Vásártér és vásári jog", pp. 1324–1330.

Since every document granting markets from the fourteenth century onwards mentions the *forum liberum*, so that it this was the sole expression denoting “market”,⁶⁷ we must seek the basic definition of the *forum liberum* in Árpadian-era sources. That was when *forum liberum* started to appear in addition to the established term *forum*.

The available information suggests that the institution emerged in the late twelfth century. An 1192 charter of Béla III (1172–1196) permitted Makariás to hold a *forum liberum* in Monoszló (Körös county, today Moslavina Podravska, Croatia) on the far side of the Dráva, and neither the bán of Slavonia nor his deputy, nor the toll collectors nor the salt officials had any jurisdiction there, even in court cases arising in the market, which were to be judged not by the bán or his judges but by Makariás.⁶⁸ We next encounter the *forum liberum* in sources from the reign of Andrew II.⁶⁹ The institution of *forum liberum* may be linked to markets for which the franchise granted by Andrew II incorporated some kind of freedom or exemption. An example is the market franchise granted to Archbishop John of Esztergom in 1206 for his church in the village of Gerla, which we mentioned earlier. The king granted the market with the privilege that neither toll collectors nor the *curialis comes*, nor the ispán’s agent (*billogos*), nor any other tax collector was permitted to visit or collect any tax or toll. The king removed the village from the ispán’s jurisdiction at the same time.⁷⁰ In 1209 Sebes *comes* of the Hontpázmány kindred received a royal franchise for a market in the predium of Szentgyörgy (Pozsony county, today Svätý Jur, Slovakia), where nobody could collect tolls (*forum ab omni exactione tributi liberum*) and toll collectors could not harass those on their way to the market.⁷¹ In 1230, the king conferred on his subjects Beucha, Hauch and Polko the right to hold a market free of tolls and *exactio* (*forum [...] ab omni tributo et exactione liberum*).⁷²

Several sources mentioning the grant *forum liberum* give no explanation of what freedoms were associated with the franchise.⁷³ Others mention various privileges along with the *forum liberum*. These include protection of those visiting the market in the form of royal prohibition to obstruct persons going to or coming

67 Other forms of sale, such as everyday sale by costermongers, were not regarded as markets. By the end of the medieval period, however, there was a change in this respect, because the Tavernicus law provided for daily free markets (*forum quotidianum liberum*), where officers could not make seizures either on the market place, on streets or squares, or in houses. *Statutum civitatis Ilok*, I/9§, Mertanová, *Ius tavernicale*, I/9§.

68 *MNL OL DF*, 262 045.

69 1211: *UGDS*, vol. I, pp. 11–12; +1214: *CDES*, vol. I, pp. 144–150.

70 *CDES*, vol. I, p. 112.

71 *CDES*, vol. I, pp. 121–122.

72 *CDES*, vol. I, p. 257.

73 E.g. 1243: *CDES*, vol. II, pp. 97–98. (Jászó, Abaúj county); 1251: *CDES*, vol. II, pp. 256–258 (Késmárk, Szepes county); 1264: *RHMA*, pp. 505–506 (Szatmár, Szatmár county); 1291: *RHMA*, pp. 627–629 (Torockó, Torda county, today Rimetea, Romania).

from the *forum liberum*,⁷⁴ and in some cases, an exemption from tolls.⁷⁵ There were also cases where the king withdrew the market from the ispán's jurisdiction,⁷⁶ making the market exempt from tolls at the same time,⁷⁷ and there is an example where the guarantee of the safety of those arriving at, and departing from, the market appears together with market toll exemption.⁷⁸ The grant of a *forum liberum* was sometimes included in the charter that granted the collection of tolls, but the tolls were not always linked to the market: in one case, this may be inferred;⁷⁹ in another, the right granted concerned a transport toll rather than a market toll,⁸⁰ and in yet another, the king expressly granted the collection of a market toll.⁸¹ There is also a case where we cannot tell what kind of toll was involved.⁸² Finally, *forum liberum* also makes an appearance to denote a toll-exempt market.⁸³

We also know of market franchises that conferred privileges typical of the *forum liberum* without mentioning the term. For example, people travelling to or from the Szikszó market (Heves county) could not be waylaid,⁸⁴ and those on their way to or from the market in Bátor (Szatmár county) could do so freely and without paying tolls.⁸⁵ There are also several sources concerning markets exempt from tolls that do not use the term *forum liberum*.⁸⁶

All this points to two basic elements in the Árpadian-age *forum liberum*. The first was the royal guarantee of unimpeded travel to and from the market, an essential

74 1277: "Unde volumus publice proclamari, quod quicumque ad ipsum forum venire voluerint causa mercationis faciende, libere veniant et secure nullusque ad ipsum forum venientes audeat impedire vel aliquatenus presumat molestare...", *BTOE*, vol. I, p. 253.

75 "...in ipso castro Nitriensis dedimus forum liberum, quod die martis perpetuo celebratur, ita, ut in illuc venientes et recedentes de eodem, sine aliquo debito tributi cum suis mercimoniis libere veniant et secure recedant...", *CDES*, vol. II, p. 209.

76 "...quandam villam castris nostri Supruniensis Dobrun vocatam sitam in Bokonol, cum foro libero sibi in eadem villa per nos celebrare die martis concessio, exceptam a iurisdictione eiusdem castris penitus et exemptam...", *UB*, vol. II, p. 52.

77 "...feria tertia forum liberum concessimus celebrari ita et tali libertate, ut in ipso foro nullum tributum per quempiam exigere possit et debeat [...] Item statuimus etiam, quod comes parrochialis aut curialis comes eiusdem in ipso die fori nullum ius nullamque iurisdictionem habere potest in eadem possessione. Unde volumus, quod quicumque ad ipsum forum modo prehabito per nostram gratiam eidem comiti Johanni concessum causa mercandi convenire voluerint, libere veniant et secure.", *MNL OL DL*, 91 145.

78 "Item volumus et concedimus, quod in villa ipsorum secunda feria forum celebretur et absque tribute. Si qui etiam ad eandem villam venire voluerint causa commorandi, libere veniant salvis ac sanis rebus suis...", *EFHU*, vol. III/2, p. 53.

79 1271: *EFHU*, vol. III/2, p. 62.

80 1276: *CD*, vol. VII/2, p. 48.

81 1211: *UGDS*, vol. I, pp. 11–12.

82 *MNL OL DL*, 89 378.

83 "Item volumus, quod forum habeant liberum et absque tributo secunda feria celebrandum...", *ÁÚO*, vol. VIII, p. 32.

84 *MNL OL DF*, 210 759.

85 *ÁÚO*, vol. IV, p. 379.

86 E.g. 1279: *EFHU*, vol. III/2, p. 72 (Vasvár, Vas county); 1291: *VMMMS*, vol. I, pp. 75–76 (Pozsony, Pozsony county).

provision, because merchants on their way to “free” markets would otherwise have to pay tolls for royal protection on the road. In waiving the market toll, the king wished to make the market more attractive to persons wanting to sell their wares, but this also required that the merchants should not be harassed on their way there. As the markets rose in standing, however, the holders of the market right considered the renunciation of toll income as unnecessary, and their right to collect tolls was later built into the concept of the *forum liberum*. The good illustration of this change is the case of Belszond (today Sonta, Serbia), where the market had been free of tolls under ispán Makariás,⁸⁷ but had tolls imposed by his son Tamás.⁸⁸ Although toll exemption also appears in later sources, it was conditional: in 1397, Miklós Kanizsai granted a franchise to hold a *forum liberum* each Wednesday in Pinkafő (today Pinkafeld, Austria) to belong to Borostyán Castle (today Bernstein, Austria). Locals were to be exempt from paying tolls, but anybody who came to the market from outside was obliged to pay toll to the castellan of Kanizsai, amounting to two denars for a four-wheeled cart and one for a two-wheeled cart (*biga*).⁸⁹ Another important aspect of the *forum liberum* was exemption from the ispán’s jurisdiction in favour of the holder of the market. What really distinguished the *forum liberum* from the pre-existing *forum* was that it was completely independent of the king, and was thus truly “free”. This naturally implied the two privileges we have discussed – exemption from ispán’s jurisdiction and crown tolls. If a new market owner wanted the right to collect tolls on his *forum liberum*, he required a specific privilege granted in a new – or the original – franchise, otherwise he had to leave the market free of tolls.

In the fourteenth century, the concept broadened but changed: the market could only be held without injuring the rights of “other markets” (*absque tamen preiudicio fororum liberorum aliorum*),⁹⁰ which meant neighbouring markets (*sine preiudicio fori conuicini*)⁹¹ or others in the same county (*sine preiudicio fororum comprovincialium*),⁹² and merchants were assured freedom of movement under special royal protection (*sub nostra protectione et tutela speciali*).⁹³ Everybody at a

87 1192: *MNL OL DF*, 262 045.

88 (1230): *ÁÚO*, vol. XI, pp. 218–230.

89 “Alii vero homines extranei ad ipsum forum causa venditionis et emptionis rerum venientes de singulis curribus eorum duos denarius, de bigis vero vnum denarium et non plus dare tenebuntur pro tributo fori prelibati castellano castris nostri preinserti...”, *CD*, vol. X/3, p. 200.

90 E.g. 1329: *MNL OL DL*, 60 964 (Jobbágy, Heves county); 1348: *MNL OL DF*, 262 928 (Krompach, Szepes county, today Krompachi, Slovakia); *MNL OL DL*, 42 283 (Vacs, Pest county). The principle that newly-established markets could not be to the detriment of those already in existence was also present in Western Europe. The “statutum in favorem principum” was adopted by King Henry of the Germans in 1231 and confirmed by Holy Roman Emperor Frederick II in 1232. This provided that new markets could not obstruct old markets: *Item nova fora non possint antiqua aliquatenus impedire*, *EFHU*, vol. I, p. 148.

91 E.g. 1330: *MNL OL DF*, 200 402 (Nyrád, Zala county).

92 E.g. 1348: *MNL OL DF*, 262 928 (Krompach, Szepes county).

93 E.g. 1322: *AO*, vol. II, p. 22 (Szalók, Sáros county); 1363: *MNL OL DL*, 73 695 (Egregy, Outer-Szolnok county, today Românași, Romania); 1410: *MNL OL DL*, 64 149 (Kapi, Sáros county, today

forum liberum was “free”, which meant that nobody could be arrested except somebody who had committed a malfeasance at the market itself.⁹⁴ This also freedom applied to people heading for, or departing from, the market place. Thus, when Mihály Szomor of Pókatelek waylaid László Farkas of Csoltabony on the road (*in itinere*) to Szerdahely (today Dunasjká Streda, Slovakia) on a Wednesday, he was found to have breached the freedom of the market (*libertatem fori violasset*).⁹⁵

Annual markets (*forum annual liberum*) may be regarded as a special type of *forum liberum*. On 21 March 1256, Béla IV granted to the citizens of Záhgráb a toll-exempt annual fair that lasted from the eighth day before the feast of St Mark the Evangelist (25 April) until eight days after the feast.⁹⁶ When (on 23 June 1287) Ladislaus IV (1272–1290) granted the holding of an annual market in Buda, he assigned jurisdiction over the market to the Buda judge and exempted those arriving for the market from payment of tolls anywhere in the town.⁹⁷ This means that in addition to granting the citizens of Buda the right to hold a market free of tolls, he assigned jurisdiction over the market to the city authorities. We encounter a phenomenon similar to what happened in the case of the *forum liberum*: the *nundinae* first appeared only as a toll-exempt market, but later it also involved the placing of jurisdiction in the hands of the market holder. In Buda, however, exemption from tolls was injurious to the owners of the Buda market tolls, the nuns of Margaret Island. They successfully petitioned for the right to collect tolls even from those visiting the city during the annual market.⁹⁸ In several cases, there is specific mention of the annual market being exempt from tolls⁹⁹ or of a royal guarantee to merchants that they were exempt from tolls within the boundaries of the town¹⁰⁰ or in the area within two miles of the market.¹⁰¹

In later times, we repeatedly find that franchises for an annual market conferred similar rights to those associated with the *forum liberum*: the king assured freedom of movement, under royal protection, for merchants visiting the market (*sub nostra*

Kapušany, Slovakia); 1517: *MNL OL DF*, 253 401 (Dés, Internal-Szolnok county, today Dej, Romania).

94 E.g. 1410: *MNL OL DL*, 64 149 (Kapi, Sáros county). Everyone was also free at an annual fair, even someone who had already been found guilty of an offence (*OSz*, pp. 160–161 [306§]), but there, too, the exemption did not extend to offences committed at the fair. Cf. 1410: *MNL OL DL*, 64 149; *OSz*, p. 161 (307§).

95 *MNL OL DL*, 61 926.

96 *Mon. Zagr*, vol. I, p. 26.

97 *BTOE*, vol. I, pp. 229–230.

98 1290: *BTOE*, vol. I, p. 261.

99 E.g. 1357: *CD*, XI, p. 514 (Zsolna, Trencsén county, today Žilina, Slovakia); 1407: *MNL OL DF*, 278 788 (Debrecen, Bihar county); 1515: *MNL OL DL*, 101 482 (Hodász, Vas county, today Markt Neuhodis-Althodis, Austria).

100 E.g. 1347: *VMMS*, vol. I, p. 150 (Kassa, Abauj county).

101 E.g. 1390: *MNL OL DF*, 268 911; 1412: *MNL OL DF*, 268 920 (Zólyom, Zólyom county, today Zvolen, Slovakia).

protectione et tutela speciali),¹⁰² and annual fairs could be held only without breaching the rights of other annual fairs (*absque tamen preiudicio nundinarum seu fororum annualium liberorum aliorum*).¹⁰³ The franchise charter sometimes stated no more than that the king conferred the freedoms and privileges of the Buda market,¹⁰⁴ or the annual fairs of Buda and Székesfehérvár,¹⁰⁵ or of Buda, Székesfehérvár and Sopron,¹⁰⁶ or the town of Kassa¹⁰⁷ or the *oppidium* of Szakolca (today Skalica, Slovakia),¹⁰⁸ or Pozsony¹⁰⁹ or the royal free towns (*sub eisdem libertatum et gratiarum prerogativis, quibus nundine libere nostrarum civitatum regalium sunt insignite*),¹¹⁰ or other towns or *oppidia* (*sub hiisdem libertatibus et prerogativis, quibus nundine seu fora annualia aliarum civitatum seu oppidorum et villarum quorumcunque celebrantur seu celebrari solent*)¹¹¹ or the Transylvania towns.¹¹² A town could be granted a franchise through the transcription of the charter for the town referred to in the grant of market right, although this was probably not done in every case. On 10 June 1364, Louis I granted Brassó (today Braşov, Romania) an annual fair with the freedoms the Buda fair, to be held on 1 November.¹¹³ On 18 October 1364, Louis I addressed a charter to the judge and jurymen of Buda stating that he had granted an annual fair in Brassó accordance with that of Buda, and at the request of Brassó citizens Hermann and Jakab, they could transcribe their own annual fair charter under their own seal.¹¹⁴ After Hermann and Jakab appeared in Buda, on 20 December 1364, the

102 E.g. 1390: *MNL OL DL*, 42 439 (Montaj, Borsod county); 1427: *MNL OL DL*, 67 772 (Kovácsi, Vas county); 1456: *MNL OL DL*, 24 830 (Szepesváralja, Szepes county, today Spišské Podhradie, Slovakia); 1481: *MNL OL DL*, 30 475 (Bolcs, Bihar county).

103 E.g. 1424: *MNL OL DF*, 274 556 (Szentmiklós, Liptó county, today Liptovský Mikuláš, Slovakia); 1452: *MNL OL DL*, 44 614 (Marcelháza, Komárom county, today Marcelová, Slovakia); 1518: *MNL OL DL*, 47 241 (Šamson, Central-Szolnok county, today Šamšud, Romania).

104 E.g. 1353: *UGDS*, vol. II, p. 98 (Beszterce, Beszterce district, today Bistriţa, Romania); 1362: *MNL OL DL*, 5133 (Galgóc, Nyitra county); 1377: *MNL OL DL*, 6413 (Simontornya, Tolna county); 1384: *MNL OL DL*, 105 457 (Kusaly, Central-Szolnok county, today Coşeu, Romania); 1412: *MNL OL DF*, 268 920 (Zólyom, Zólyom county).

105 E.g. 1387: *Károlyi okli*, vol. I, p. 425 (Károly, Szatmár county, today Carei, Romania).

106 E.g. 1344: *VMMS*, vol. I, p. 138 (Pozsony, Pozsony county).

107 E.g. 1347: *CD*, vol. IX/1, p. 502 (Nagybánya, Szatmár county, today Baia Mare, Romania).

108 E.g. 1419: *CD*, vol. X/6, p. 216 (Szenic, Nyitra county, today Senica, Slovakia).

109 E.g. 1411: *MNL OL DF*, 274 861 (Somorja, Pozsony county, today Šamorín, Slovakia).

110 E.g. 1390: *MNL OL DL*, 42 439 (Montaj, Borsod county); 1398: *MNL OL DL*, 8316 (Vereb, Nógrád county); 1408: *MNL OL DL*, 58 825 (Komjáti, Nyitra county, today Komjatice, Slovakia); 1417: *MNL OL DF*, 258 963 (Dobšina, Gömör county, today Dobšiná, Slovakia); 1440: *MNL OL DL*, 24 731 (Külsökimle, Moson county); 1462: *MNL OL DL*, 15 759 (Igal, Somogy county) – There are sometimes slight differences in the wording.

111 E.g. 1476: *MNL OL DL*, 200 544 (Peremarton, Tolna county); 1493: *MNL OL DL*, 39 014 (Szentkereszt, Sáros county, today Krížovany, Slovakia); 1498: *MNL OL DF*, 209 989 (Eger, Heves county); 1515: *MNL OL DL*, 101 482 (Hodász, Vas county) – There are sometimes slight differences in the wording.

112 E.g. 1412: *UGDS*, vol. III, p. 524 (Selyk, Saxon Lands, today Šeica Mare, Romania).

113 "...sub modis, libertatibus [...] quibus in civitate nostra Budensi nundinae sive congregationes annuales solent celebrari ac celebrantur atque conservantur..." *UGDS*, vol. II, pp. 212–213.

114 *UGDS*, vol. II, p. 219. Cf. Moldt, *Deutsche Stadtrechte*, pp. 24–25.

Buda judge, Stephanus Lorandi, and the jurymen transcribed for them Louis I's Buda fair charter of 18 October 1364, and Ladislaus IV's charter of 1287, according to which the king assigned jurisdiction at the fair to the judge of Buda and granted exemption from tolls within the town for persons coming to attend it.¹¹⁵

4. Market day

The Hungarian word for Sunday, *vasárnap*, is composed of the words *vásár* (market) and *nap* (day). That is how the Hungarian language refers to what in the Middle Ages was considered the first day of the week, on which every Christian was obliged to attend mass.¹¹⁶ In the early eleventh century, the market was held on Sundays, in front of the church. The forged diploma of Pécsvárad Abbey mentions the holding of the market on Sunday beside St Peter's Church.¹¹⁷ According to the *Chronicum Pictum*, Béla I (1060–1063) placed markets on Saturday,¹¹⁸ but historians usually attribute this decree to Géza I (1074–1077).¹¹⁹ Sunday markets also seem to have been a problem during the reign of Ladislaus I.¹²⁰ In addition to Saturdays, other days of the week were designated as market days, and in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, market day could be any day of the week from Monday to Saturday. Grants of markets on Sundays resumed in the second half of the fourteenth century,¹²¹ enabled by the consolidation of Christianity and the holding of annual markets on a Sunday.

The market, or the day of the weekly market, is sometimes reflected in a place name.¹²² Linguists and historians have long noticed the relations between geographical names and the holding of markets.¹²³ There have been detailed studies of this question among medieval place names by the historian Jenő Major and the

115 *UGDS*, vol. II, pp. 222–223. There is handwritten fifteenth-century entry on the back: “Libertas Budensis qualis etiam concessa est Brassouiensibus.” *MNL OL DF*, 246 809.

116 Stephen I himself ordered Sunday to be observed. *DRMH 1000–1301*, p. 3 (9§). Ladislaus I. relaxed Stephen's rule by allowing to be represented by a single person, if the villages far apart and the people are unable to come to church, but with the stipulation that he should put the others' offerings (bread and candle) at the altar. *DRMH 1000–1301*, p. 55 (11§). However, he extended Stephen's rule to the Jews on pain of similar punishment. *DRMH 1000–1301*, p. 57 (26§).

117 +1015: *DHA*, vol. I, p. 76.

118 *SRH*, vol. I, p. 358.

119 Györffy, *King Saint Stephen of Hungary*, p. 65; Jánosi, *Törvényalkotás Magyarországon a korai Árpád-korban*, p. 102.

120 *DRMH 1000–1301*, p. 56 (15–16§).

121 E.g. 1352: *MES*, vol. IV, p. 74 (Damás, Bars county); 1390: *MNL OL DL*, 63 114 (Lél, Komárom county, today part of Zlatná na Ostrove); 1464: *MNL OL DF*, 236 611 (Csurgó, Somogy county); 1519: *MNL OL DL*, 29 972 (Szombathely, Arad county).

122 Eperjessy, *Városaink múltja és jelene*, p. 170; Fügedi, “Mezővárosaink kialakulása”, pp. 325–326; Szabó, “A Vásáros jelző középkori helységneveinkben”, pp. 345–351; Hoffmann, Rác, Tóth, *History of Hungarian Toponyms*, pp. 218–221.

123 E.g. Bárczi, *A magyar szókincs eredete*, p. 161; Kálmán, *A nevek világa*, p. 170.

linguist G. Ferenc Szabó.¹²⁴ Each place name must be investigated individually, because the incorporation of a day of the week may refer to a personal name rather than the holding of a market.¹²⁵ Examples are Péntekfalva (“Friday-village”) in the county of Baranya,¹²⁶ a village called Péntek in the Beszterce district,¹²⁷ and two places called Vásárd¹²⁸ and a Vásárfalva in Nyitra county.¹²⁹ For a geographical name that is not the name of a town or village, a separate analysis is required to decide where the market mentioned in the name was held. For example, “Vásár hegy” (*ad montem mercati*, market hill) near the village of Árpás (Győr county) refers to a market being held in the vicinity, but it could have been Árpás or somewhere else. Indeed, a market was held in the neighbouring village of Mórchida.¹³⁰

Merchants probably arrived in the town on the day before the market and left the day after it, because royal charters of privilege usually provided traders and customers three days of free movement.¹³¹ In the grant of a Wednesday *forum liberum* to Pótharaszti in Pest county in 1350, Louis I prohibited the obstruction of persons going to and from the market from Tuesday to Thursday,¹³² and in the franchise for a Wednesday market to Kapi in Sáros county in 1410, King Sigismund guaranteed free movement for merchants from midday on Tuesday until midday on Thursday.¹³³ We find a similar provision for the Pinkafő Wednesday market, where no person or their goods could be obstructed between midday on Tuesday until midday on Thursday.¹³⁴ In 1455, Sopron Council decreed that goods brought to the weekly market had to be taken to the market place and could not be delivered to houses. A guard (*hweter*) at the market place would look after the merchandise at night.¹³⁵ Markets did not last all day: the sources mention that selling went on until about midday. The weekly market in Gara, for example, lasted until midday on Monday,¹³⁶ and in Buda, the flag of the free market had to be lowered around midday.¹³⁷

124 Major, „A magyar városok és városhálózat”, pp. 51–55; Szabó, “A hét napjai a helységnevekben”, Szabó, *A vásározás emlékei középkori helységneveinkben*.

125 Szabó, *A vásározás emlékei középkori helységneveinkben*, pp. 29–37.

126 1289: *CD*, vol. V/3, pp. 448–450. Cf. Szabó, *A vásározás emlékei középkori helységneveinkben*, p. 35.

127 1292: *ÁÚO*, vol. X, p. 83. Cf. Kniezsa, “Keletmagyarország helynevei”, p. 260.

128 1156: *CDES*, vol. I, pp. 78–79; 1214: *CDES*, vol. I, pp. 142–143. Cf. Szabó, *A vásározás emlékei középkori helységneveinkben*, pp. 33–35. It should be noted, however, that Péter Püspöki Nagy and György Györffy consider these to be places where markets were held. Püspöki Nagy, *Piacok és vásárok kezdetei Magyarországon*, p. 136; Györffy, *Az Árpád-kori Magyarország történeti földrajza*, vol. IV, p. 485.

129 1274: *CD*, vol. V/2, p. 217. Cf. Szabó, “A Vásáros jelző középkori helységneveinkben”, p. 345.

130 1251: *CD*, vol. IV/2, p. 87.

131 Cf. Mályusz, “A mezővárosi fejlődés”, p. 129.

132 *MNL OL DL*, 41 137.

133 *MNL OL DL*, 64 149.

134 1397: *CD*, vol. X/3, pp. 199–200.

135 *Sopr. Tört.*, vol. II/2, p. 181.

136 1366: *Zichy*, vol. III, p. 287.

137 *OSz*, p. 113 (153§).