

Regulations Related to Town Defenses in Guild Statutes of Cluj and Sighișoara (Fifteenth to Seventeenth Centuries)

IZSÁN CSABA

Preamble

WHEN WALKING through the still standing fortifications of historical towns, one cannot help but wonder about the difficulties in defending those structures many centuries ago. The role of guilds in town defense and in the maintenance of fortifications is a well-known topic among historians specialized in medieval and early modern urban history, and it is also widely-known by the general public. However, there are certain research questions which need to be asked. What did the defensive regulations exactly demand from the guilds? Do we have extant regulations from Transylvanian towns? Were the regulations modernized or updated with the constant development of firearms and defensive structures in the seventeenth century? I have dedicated a major chapter of my doctoral thesis to the role of guilds in the town defenses of sixteenth-seventeenth century Cluj/Kolozsvár, Sighișoara/Segesvár/Schässburg, Brașov/Kronstadt, and Sibiu/Hermannstadt.¹ The present study examines and discusses in detail the regulations of the guild statutes regarding the defensive obligations of the craftsmen from fifteenth-seventeenth century Cluj and Sighișoara, while complementing the source material with analogies from Sibiu and Brașov.

A considerable number of defensive regulations have survived in earlier guild statutes, dating to the fifteenth-sixteenth centuries, but only quite few from later periods. Annamária Jeney-Tóth has formulated a hypothesis regarding this situation, arguing that the texts of the regulations were so well-known in the period that they were written down only when significant changes took place.² One of the aims of the study is to confirm or amend Jeney-Tóth's hypothesis.

The Formation of Guilds and Their Numbers in the Middle Ages

THE PROCESS of guild formation in the medieval Kingdom of Hungary and implicitly in Transylvania can be traced back to the fourteenth century. In the case of certain German towns, the guilds were emerged from local establishments (called

Trinkstube), created with the purpose of defending their neighborhood.³ In the Kingdom of Hungary however, shared rules of craftsmanship and the promotion of commonly practiced crafts were the main factors behind the guilds.⁴ Earlier historiography suggested that the idea of guilds was brought to Hungary by German settlers (*hospes*).⁵ However, more recent research results seem to confirm that the guilds emerged either from religious fraternities/confraternities, or, as Renáta Skorka and other historians have considered, the formation of guilds was the result of economic competition between craftsmen practicing the same profession.⁶ Researching and analyzing the earliest guild statutes from Transylvania, Lidia Gross has warned that separating the guilds from the religious confraternities is a difficult task; a confraternity did not necessarily precede the formation of a guild.⁷ For the fourteenth-fifteenth centuries, Gross has considered that nearly all of the guilds had connections to confraternities, and certain guilds can be linked to more than one confraternity.⁸ Elek Csetri also suggested that there are considerable differences between the guilds and associations or confraternities, however some of the functions of the guilds coincided with the roles and functions of the cooperatives.⁹

The establishment of guilds in medieval Hungary was catalyzed by the discovery of new gold mines in the first half of the fourteenth century, which led to the rapid development of the mining industry. Thus, at the end of the Angevin period, Hungary provided eleven-twelfths of the annual output of European gold mining.¹⁰ However, certain documents attesting to the formation of the first guilds and dating from the early fourteenth century Hungary have been proven to be fake. The first official confirmation of Transylvanian guilds happened in 1376, when King Louis I of Hungary approved the decision of the Assembly of the Seven Saxon Seats, which confirmed the statutes of 19 guilds from Sibiu/Hermannstadt, Sighișoara/Schäßsburg, Sebeș/Mühlbach, and Orăștie/Broos.¹¹ In the same year, the butchers, shoemakers and bakers from Bratislava/Pozsony obtained guild privileges as well.¹²

Tracing the early stages in the formation of the first guilds of Cluj/Kolozsvár and Sighișoara is a difficult task and exceeds of the scope of our investigation. However, if we wish to quantify the number of guilds functioning in the towns of Cluj and Sighișoara in the medieval and early modern period, we can use the results of a relatively recent research project, titled *Erdélyi Céhes Adattár I and II*, of which I was a member (as junior research fellow) between 2018 and 2019.¹³ The project has delimited the medieval period at the year of the fall of Buda in 1541, and the early modern period with the treaty of Szatmár in 1711. Drawing on the results of the project, the existence and activity of 22 guilds of Cluj: the goldsmiths/jewelers, shoemakers, bootmakers, belt-makers, baize-trimmers, saddle-makers, tanners, tailors, German tailors, baize-makers, weavers, wool weavers, skinners/furriers, heel-makers, locksmiths, rope-makers, coopers, butchers, wheelwrights, carpenters, chariot-makers, stonemasons, and three from Sighișoara (smiths, belt makers, shoe- and bootmakers) can be attested for the medieval period. The leader of the research group, Enikő Rüszt-Fogarasi, has previously documented the activity of 20 guilds in Cluj for the time of the battle of Mohács.¹⁴ Beside the aforementioned medieval guilds of Cluj, the guilds of button-makers, German skinners/furriers, Hungarian butchers (*hentellérek* – an archaic form of the Hungarian word *hentes*), millers, barbers, soap-makers, book painters/ornament makers (*képirok*) were formed, plus the stonemasons (*kőfaragók*) separated from the guild of ordinary masons (*kőművesek*), forming their own guild. In early mod-

ern Sighisoara, the activity of the guilds of shoemakers, bootmakers, tailors, belt-makers, rope-makers, hat-makers, tanners, weavers, carpenters, and butchers can be attested. On the other hand, the crafts of barber, goldsmith/jeweler, skinner/furrier, miller, cooper, brazier, locksmiths, tanner, wheelwright and glove-maker were practiced outside the guild system. Thus, an increase to 30 guilds in Cluj and 10 in Sighișoara respectively (plus the existence of 11 other crafts, practiced by non-guild members) could be confirmed for the early modern period based on the results of the abovementioned project. For an adequate comparison (without naming the exact guilds) the same research project has confirmed the activity of 16 medieval guilds in both Brașov and Sibiu, and 30 and 32 guilds for the early modern period, respectively, as listed in the table below.

TABLE 1. NUMBER OF GUILDS ACTIVE IN MEDIEVAL AND EARLY MODERN BRAȘOV, SIBIU, SIGHIȘOARA, AND CLUJ

Town	Number of guilds	
	Middle Ages	Early modern period
Brașov	16	30
Sibiu	16	32
Sighișoara	3	10 + 11 crafts practiced by non-guild member citizens
Cluj	22	30

The Towers Maintained by the Guilds

AS WE have already mentioned, it is common knowledge that the towers and bastions of medieval towns were maintained by guilds, which in turn gave their names to the fortifications. In certain cases however, the guild responsible for the maintenance of a tower changed on several occasions during the centuries. Consequently, the names of those towers also changed to reflect the profession of their new keepers. This practice explains the multiple names of the still standing towers preserved in the vernacular languages. The process can be traced back to different economic aspects. Certain (once important) craft associations *lost their tower* as the relevance of their products declined, and they were required by the town to provide the upkeep of another segment of the fortifications, together with the members of another guild. We wish to illustrate this process with two case studies, reflecting considerably distinct examples. The once important bowyer craftsmen of Sibiu gradually lost their relevance, as with the rapid spread of firearms in the late fifteenth-early sixteenth century the demand for their products declined continuously. Finally, the bowyers lost their status as an independent guild in 1545, forming a new guild alongside the arrowsmiths, fletchers, comb makers, and armorers.¹⁵ The barbers of Sighișoara were faced with a completely different situation, as their tower was demolished in 1631. Thus, the town council ordered the barbers to help maintain the tower of the tanners.¹⁶

Listing the towers of Cluj for the period between the great fires of 1629 and 1655 (the later destroying all but 6 towers of the town), starting from the south-western corner of the city walls, the guilds were as follows: the shoemakers, goldsmiths/jewelers,

weavers, wool weavers (*Wollenweber* in German, *szűrtakácsok* or *gyapjúszövőők* in Hungarian), butchers, coopers, potters, tailors, locksmiths, stonemasons, beltmakers, grinders/copers (*csiszárok*), carpenters, smiths and furriers/skinners (*szűcsök*).¹⁷ The tower of the wool weavers guild is an interesting case. The archaic Hungarian expression *szűrtakács* can be translated into English as the craftsmen who were responsible for making the typical Hungarian baize coats called *szűr*. The craft can be considered similar to the German *Wollenweber* (wool weavers), however earlier historiography suggested that the *szűrtakács* craftsmen were members of the tailors' guild.¹⁸ From archival sources we can only confirm the maintenance of a tower by the *szűrtakács* craftsmen for the 1640s, and we were unable to find documents belonging to a separate guild of the wool weavers. For example, the 1643 gunpowder accountings of Cluj contain an inventory of towers where gunpowder was stored, and the tower maintained by the *szűrtakács* craftsmen appears to sit between the tower of the weavers (transformed in the nineteenth century into the still standing fire-fighters tower) and the tower of Hungarian butchers (*hentellérek*), most probably alongside the Malomárok (mill canal).¹⁹

In seventeenth century Sighișoara, starting from the Várhegy/Dealul Cetății and going along the western side of town walls, the guilds in charge of towers were: goldsmiths/jewelers, rope makers, butchers (they maintained a tower and a separate bastion), furriers/skinners, weavers, tailors, shoe and bootmakers, locksmiths, coopers, barbers (until their tower was demolished in 1631), smiths, stonemasons and pewterers (*önöntők/Zinngiesser*).²⁰

Defensive Obligations for the Guilds of Cluj

THE CASE of Cluj can be considered a fortunate one, as a quite high number of defensive regulations have survived. We have to differentiate the regulations issued by the local authorities from the inner guild rules regarding the town defenses, found in the statutes. An appropriate example for the first category can be considered the 1558 privileges gained by Cluj from Queen Isabella Jagiellon. The majority of the privileges entailed economic benefits, however a regulation related to town defenses was also included in the document. The members of the guilds had to guard the gates and towers of the city, had to provide ammunition for the *ballistae* (bolt throwers) and cannons at their own expense and finally, during wartime, they had to guard the walls continuously.²¹ The magistrate of Cluj further issued certain resolutions regarding the defensive role of the guilds. In March 1563, after the defeat of the Transylvanian armies at Hodod/Hadad, the guilds had to provide guards for the town at all times and had to equip their towers with firearms and to supply those with gunpowder. The guilds were also warned that those supplying insufficient gunpowder to their tower would suffer serious consequences.²² Seven years later, on 25 March 1570, the Cluj magistrate issued a resolution regarding those guilds which could not construct their own towers. It was decided that they should benefit from the help of another guild, and if that was not enough, they should ask for help from a third guild.²³ The regulation can be interpreted as ordering a helping hand in the construction of towers, but also as support for the reconstruction and renovation works. In the

case of damaged fortifications, in September 1606 the magistrate ordered an inspection of the towers of the smiths, stonemasons and other guilds. If the craftsmen needed financial support for the renovation works, it had to be provided from the income of the salt mine at Cojocna/Kolozs.²⁴ A few months earlier, in May 1606, the guild of tailors had already received 400 salt blocks in support of the renovation work on their tower.²⁵

After the regulations issued by local authorities, we have to take a closer look to the defensive regulations found in the guild statutes, the earliest ones surviving from the later decades of the fifteenth century. In the second oldest surviving statute (1481) of the Cluj shoemakers we read: “*Magistri artis sutoriae turrim atialem in antiquo castro versus portam et turrim Rapularum sitam (...) cum armis bellicis, defendiculis, balistis, bombardis (...) decorarunt.*”²⁶ The formula can be translated as: the masters of the shoemaking crafts, whose tower is situated in the Old Fortress and sits opposite the gate tower of Mănăstur/Monostor Street, had to outfit their tower with war weapons, *ballistae* and *bombards*.²⁷ The formula is similar to the regulation found in the 1479 statute of the furriers guild, who were maintaining the abovementioned gate tower on Mănăstur Street: “...*magistri turrim in platea rapulorum sitam per eorum sollicitudines cum armis bellicis, defendiculis, balistis, bombardis, necnon aliorum armorum ingeniis diligentius appositis partim eorum expensis et laboribus muniendo et fulciendo decorarunt.*”²⁸ We have to underline the last segment of the obligation, which highlights the fact that the guild had to defend, provide with weapons, and also to maintain the gate tower with their work and on their own expenses. The 1475 statute of the tailors and clothmakers (*posztócsinálók*) guild ordered the artisans to guard the city walls in cases of emergency and to help in its defense with firearms: “...*cum armis et pixidibus pulueribus.*”²⁹

Continuing the chronological review of the defense-related guild regulations from Cluj for the sixteenth century, we should take a closer look to the renewed statute of the tailors' guild. In the renewed statute from 1561, a detailed description regarding the defenses was written down. The article highlights the fact that tailor masters had been responsible for the maintenance of their tower (found on the southern corner of the town walls) for generations. For provisioning the tower with bullets, gunpowder and all the necessary equipment, those who wanted to become guild master had to pay six Hungarian florins for the upkeep of the tower and also had to organize a feast with an appropriate meal.³⁰ On the other hand, if an accomplished craftsman came to Cluj and wanted to join the guild but would only be offered the position of journeyman, which he would be ashamed or unwilling to take, he had to make an agreement with the masters of the guild regarding the price of the service, and the sum of money was spent on the upkeep of the tower.³¹

The guild of the butchers also renewed their statute in 1561. One of the articles of the new statute highlights that boys who wanted to learn butchery had to pay six florins to join the guild, because the guild had to maintain their tower located “on Middle-street,” and to supply it with weapons. On the other hand, the slaughterhouse also had high expenses.³² Similar regulations can be found in the 1525 and 1589 statutes of the stonemasons and also in the statutes of goldsmiths/jewelers.³³ As an interesting analogy, the smiths guild from Sibiu ordered in 1514 that the new members had to donate a firearm to the guild upon admission, and also if they married into the master's family.³⁴ On the other hand, the fines paid by the craftsmen were kept for the maintenance of their tower, like in the case of other guilds. Regarding the fines for not respecting the defensive regulations,

we should take a look at the 1477 statute of the smiths' guild of Cluj. The guild threatens those craftsmen who did not defend the tower with their own weapons during sieges or during revolts with losing their guild membership: *Item siquis magistrorum tempore disturbiorum et obsidionis ciuitatis huius cum ipsorum armis bellicosis, causa defensionis, ad ipsorum Turrim necessitate*.³⁵

Defensive Regulations in the Guild Statutes of Sighișoara

THE EARLIEST surviving defensive regulations from Sighișoara date back to 1484, and are found in the statute of the skinners/furriers guild. The nineteenth article of the statute orders the craftsmen who were not members of the guild to help transporting the munition for the firearms to the tower.³⁶ The text is considered by Gernot Nussbächer and Paul Niedermaier as being the earliest known mention of the walls and towers of Sighișoara and, on the other hand, the earliest known defensive regulation from Transylvania which mentions not only the guild members, but also the craftsmen outside the association.³⁷

Unfortunately, little is known about the regulations dating before 1676, a year when a great fire broke out in the town and caused massive destruction of buildings and archived documents.³⁸ The inventories of weapons stored in the towers of Sighișoara (written down by the town clerk, Johann Krempes in 1680–1681) after the finished reconstruction works after the great fire constitute an important source for our research. Krempes himself had personal ties to the guilds through his son, also called Johann Krempes, who was the apprentice of barber master Christian. The younger Krempes joined the guild in 1684 and the decorated preface to his apprentice book was written by his father.³⁹ In the inventories of Krempes we find important details regarding the town defenses. As an example, the inventory of the tower of tanners and barbers suggests that the members of the two guilds kept their weapons separately in the tower.⁴⁰

A 1704 regulation regarding the defenses of Sighișoara has survived. The town, fearing a potential attack by Kuruc troops, issued detailed defensive regulations for certain parts of the fortifications. From earlier inventories we can conclude that the butchers guild had the financial possibilities to maintain both a tower and bastion, the later one built in front of their tower in the sixteenth century.⁴¹ The bastion had to be defended by 17 craftsmen according to the regulations from 1704, which was the same number of defenders as in the case of the tower of skinners, standing near the butchers tower.⁴² In the butchers' tower were stored 5 arquebuses, a double barrelled arquebus in better condition, a musket, bullets for firearms, and a quintal of gunpowder.⁴³ Fortunately, the tower of the skinners is also listed in the inventory from 1680, when 2 great arquebuses, another 15 arquebuses in average condition, a small cannon/piece of ordnance (*ein erzenes Stückel*), 8 big spears or pikes, 1 halberd, 5 tons (barrels) of gunpowder, a full barrel of lead bullets, 5 cannonballs, 5/4 lead, several other, middle sized cannonballs and a big mortar/howitzer-ball were stored in the tower.⁴⁴ The resolution from 1704 ordered that the tower of the coopers had to be defended by 19 craftsmen, under the command of old

master Martin Schenker and young master H. Danielis, plus 8 other craftsmen who were under the command of Hannes Kreischer.⁴⁵ The coopers also had to provide men for the defense of gates, being the guild with the highest number of requested defenders by the magistrate.⁴⁶ Another interesting detail from the document is that the carpenters and belt makers kept their weapons in the tower of the goldsmiths/jewelers guild.⁴⁷ The number of guild members requested by the 1704 regulation exceeds the numbers appearing in earlier documents of the same type. For an earlier analogy we can use a list from Brașov, from the middle of the sixteenth century. As indicated by the table (2) below, none of the guilds of Brașov had to provide more than 8 firearm-bearing men for the defense of the town.⁴⁸

TABLE 2. NUMBER OF FIREARM BEARERS (*Pyxe Schyczen*) SUPPLIED BY THE GUILDS OF BRAȘOV IN 1542

Guild	Number of required mobilized members
Tailors (Schnayder)	4
Skinners/Furriers (Kyrchner)	4
Tanners (Ledderer)	8
Shoemakers (Schuester)	8
Weavers (Weweer Czech)	6
Wool Weavers (Wellewewer)	3
Rope-makers (Zoeler)	4
Smiths (Schmit)	2
Goldsmiths/jewellers (Goltschmit)	2
Belt-maker (Remner)	5
Locksmiths (Schlosser)	2
Butchers (Flescher)	4
Braziers (Kesler)	2

Practicing with Firearms

EVEN IF the towers were equipped with defensive weapons, the members of the guilds had to learn the use of firearms. The earliest source mentioning the practice with ranged weapons in Sibiu dates back to 1469, when the magistrate ordered the practice of shooting arrows for the citizens (or for the members of the magistracy, depending on the interpretation of the primary source).⁴⁹ From the fifteenth century city accounts of Sibiu, 13 occasions can be attested when ranged weapons were used inside the city, and on 6 later occasions, firearms were used.⁵⁰ Not all of these occasions can be regarded as shooting practice, but those which clearly were entailed either shooting at fixed targets (*ad/pro tharschen/tarczan*) or at birds (*pro ave/ad avem*).⁵¹ The same practice is also referenced in the 1522 account books of Sighișoara.⁵² The specialist literature considers that on

those occasions more accurate weapons were used.⁵³ The *czil armbst* donated by Mathes Engel to the Saint Sebastian fraternity of Bratislava can provide evidence for this theory.⁵⁴ A firearm analogue of the mentioned *czil armbst* could be the *czyl puchsen* mentioned in the inventory of the bowyers guild of Sibiu.⁵⁵ Elek Benkő considered that the “*czehis sagittariis cum pixidibus*” mentioned in the 1507 account book of Sibiu cannot be considered as a shooters guild, more likely it was shooting practice organized inside the guild system, for which the magistrate offered 1 florin, and the practice was repeated the following year.⁵⁶

The firearm practice of the guilds of Cluj is also attested by the sources. The existence and location of a shooting range after 1519 can be proved. As mentioned by Gyöngy Kovács-Kiss, the shooting range was situated opposite the Bridge Street gate tower, over the Saint Elisabeth Almshouse and its mill, in the vicinity of the vineyards below the *Klmal*.⁵⁷ The accounts of the goldsmiths/jewelers from 1563–1567 prove that the guild spent two florins during each Easter time on shooting practice.⁵⁸ A different source from 1574 also confirms the use of bows and arrows during shooting practice in Cluj.⁵⁹ The practice can also be confirmed for later centuries. During Pentecost in 1639, the members of the tailors guild spent two days doing shooting practice: “...*ad locum sagitantem vulgo czylsthat*.”⁶⁰ Learning the use of firearms was not only for the craftsmen, but also for common soldiers. The sixteenth century military treatise *Consillium rationis bellicae* written by the Polish military theoretician and commander Jan Tarnowski states: “Infantry captains are expected to train soldiers in shooting and to teach them how to use guns during a battle, because it is very necessary, since we in Poland have few veterans, and every unit has many inexperienced novices; therefore they should be taught how to shoot.”⁶¹

Conclusions

DRAWING FIRM conclusions on such a complex topic is a daunting task. As we have already mentioned, the texts of the few surviving defense regulations are quite similar, and we have to accept Annamária Jeney-Tóth’s hypothesis, with a few additions. We can suppose that the texts of the regulations were so well known that these matters were written down only in the earliest statutes, or in cases when significant changes were applied to them. In cases of emergency, the guilds had to guard the town walls, prepare and supply with gunpowder their weapons stored in the towers. The guilds with the highest economic potential had to contribute 8–18 members to the defenses of the town. These numbers decreased proportionally to the capacity and membership of the guilds. The craftsmen were also obliged by the local authorities to learn the use of firearms. The study was not meant to determine the decline in importance of certain guilds, however those processes can also be observed from researching the primary sources related to town defenses in early modern Transylvania.



Notes

1. Dissertation titled “A kora újkori erdélyi városvédelem újabb szempontjai. Védművek, céhes városvédelem és a darabontok szerepköre/Aspecte noi ale apărării urbane în Transilvania premodernă. Sistemele de apărare, breslele și rolul trabanților orașenești” (New Aspects of Town Defenses in Early Modern Transylvania. Defensive Structures, Guilds and the Duties of Town Guards). Babeș-Bolyai University, Faculty of History and Philosophy, Graduate School “History. Civilization. Culture,” date of public defense: 29.04.2024, coordinator: Dr. Enikő Rüszt-Fogarasi.
2. Annamária Jeney-Tóth, *Műves emberek a kincses Kolozsvárott. Iparostársadalom a 17. századi Kolozsváron* (Craftsmen in Cluj. Artisanal Society in 17th Century Cluj) (Cluj-Napoca: Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyesület, 2004), 108–110.
3. Endre Veress, *Az erdélyi ipari céhek élete* (The Life of Transylvanian Industrial Guilds), (Kolozsvár: Lengyel és Mayer Könyvnyomda, 1929), 13; Géza Kovách and Pál Binder, *A céhes élet Erdélyben* (Guild Life in Transylvania), (Bucharest: Kriterion Könyvkiadó, 1981), 7–8.
4. Veress, *Az erdélyi ipari céhek élete*, 13; Kovách and Binder, *A céhes élet Erdélyben*, 7–8. Elek Csetri, “A szövetkezeti gondolat régmúltjából Erdélyben” (The History of the Idea of Cooperatives in Transylvania), *Közgazdász Fórum* 6, no. 6 (2003): 13–14.
5. Lajos Szádeczky, *Iparfejlesztés és a céhek története Magyarországon I.* (Industrial Development and the History of Guilds in Hungary, vol. I), (Budapest: Ranschburg Gusztáv Könyvkereskedése–Az Országos Iparegyesület Kiadása, 1913), 12–13.
6. Renáta Skorka, “A céhrendszer kibontakozása” (The Development of the Guild System), in *A magyar kézművesipar története* (The History of the Hungarian Craft Industry), ed. János Szulovszky (Budapest: Magyar Kereskedelmi és Iparkamara, 2005), 117; András Kubinyi, “A középkori budai mészároscéh” (The Medieval Butchers Guild of Buda), in *A budai mészárosok középkori céhkönyve és kiváltságlevelei* (The Medieval Guild Book and Privileges of the Butchers of Buda), ed. István Kenyeres (Budapest Fővárosi Levéltára–Budapesti Történeti Múzeum, 2008), 15.
7. Lidia Gross, *Bresle și Confrerii sau despre pietatea urbană în Transilvania medievală (secolele XIV-XVI)* (Guilds and Confraternities or Urban Piety in medieval Transylvania [14th–16th centuries]), (Cluj-Napoca: Argonaut, 2014), 119–121.
8. Lidia Gross, *Confreriile medievale în Transilvania (secolele XIV-XVI)* (Medieval Confraternities in Transylvania [14th–16th centuries]), (Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitară Clujeană, 2004), 261.
9. Csetri, “A szövetkezeti gondolat régmúltjából Erdélyben,” 14.
10. Skorka, “A céhrendszer kibontakozása,” 119.
11. Kovách and Binder, *A céhes élet Erdélyben*, 8; Csetri, “A szövetkezeti gondolat régmúltjából Erdélyben,” 14; *Comerț și meșteșuguri în Sibiu și în cele șapte scaune 1224-1579/Handel und Gewerbe in Hermannstadt und in den Sieben Stühlen 1224-1579*, eds. Monica Vlaicu et. alii (Heidelberg–Sibiu: Societatea de Studii Transilvane–Editura Hora, 2003), 67–70; *Codex diplomaticus Transsylvaniae. Diplomata, epistolae et alia instrumenta litteraria res Transylvanas illustrantia. Erdélyi okmánytár: Oklevelek, levelek és más írásos emlékek Erdély történetéhez*, vol. V ed. Zsigmond Jakó, Géza Hegyi, and András Kovács W. (Budapest: A Magyar Országos Levéltár, 2021), 111–113.
12. Skorka, “A céhrendszer kibontakozása,” 119.

13. Details on the research project in *Erdélyi Céhes Adattár I.* (June 2018–March 2019) and *Erdélyi Céhes Adattár II.* (June 2019–December 2019) Domus Szülőföldi Csoportos Kutatási Pályázatok, 4039/16/2018/HTMT. Leader of the research group: Dr. Enikő Rüszt-Fogarasi.
14. Enikő Rüszt-Fogarasi, *Privilegiile și îndatoririle orașelor din Transilvania voievodală* (Privileges and duties of towns in voivodal Transylvania), (Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitară Clujeană, 2003), 193.
15. The town magistrate of Sibiu confirming the statute of the new guild in January 1545: *Comert și meșteșuguri*, 354–357.
16. Paul Niedermaier, *Contribuții privind istoria orașelor/Beiträge zur Städtegeschichte Vol/Band II. Atlas istoric al orașelor din România/Städtegeschichteatlas Rumäniens, Seria/Reihe C, Transilvania/Transylvanien, Fasc/Lieferung 1, Sighișoara/Schässburg.* (Bucharest–Sibiu: Editura Enciclopedică–Editura Honterus, 2000), 14–15; Gernot Nussbächer, *Aus Urkunden und Chroniken- Beiträge zur siebenbürgischen Heimatkunde. 9. Band Schassburg* (Braşov: Aldus, 2010), 150–151.
17. Csaba Izsán, “A zsoldos darabontok számadásai és a város védműveinek javítási költségei Kolozsvár 17. századi számadáskönyveiben” (The Accounts of the Guardsmen and the Costs of the Fortification Repair Works in the Seventeenth Century Accounting Books of Cluj), in *Ezerarcú Erdély. Politika, társadalom, kultúra*, ed. Áron Tötös (Cluj-Napoca: Erdélyi Múzeum Egyesület, 2019): 347; Radu Lupescu, “Kolozsvár második középkori erősítése az írott források tükrében” (The Second Medieval Fortification of Cluj in the Light of Sources), in *Album Amicorum. Tánulmányok Sipos Gábor születésének hetvenedik évfordulójára* (Studies on the Seventieth Birthday Anniversary of Gábor Sipos), ed. Zsolt Bogdándi, Veronka Dáné, Makó Mária Lupescu (Cluj-Napoca: Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyesület, 2021), 443–445.
18. Géza Rajka, *A kolozsvári szabó céh története a XV–XVII. században* (The History of the Tailors Guild of Cluj in the 15th–17th Centuries), (Cluj-Napoca: Stief Jenő és Társa Könyvsajtója, 1913), 41–42.
19. Storing 2 barrels (containing 322 Cluj pounds) of gunpowder at the time. Serviciul Județean al Arhivelor Naționale Cluj (National Archives of Romania, Cluj County Branch, hereinafter: SJAN CJ), F584- Primăria Municipiului Cluj (The Archives of Cluj), Colecția Socotelile Orașului Cluj (The Accountings of Cluj Collection), rola de microf. (microfilm roll) no. 56, 24/IV.
20. Niedermaier, *Contribuții privind istoria orașelor*, 14–15; Nussbächer, *Aus Urkunden und Chroniken*, 149–175.
21. Jeney-Tóth, *Míves emberek a kincses Kolozsvárott*, 108–110.
22. The original formula in Hungarian: “Egybegyűlvén 1563. márcz. 6-n a száz-férfiak, a király hadának Hadadvárnál leveretése s a vár megvétele szomorú hírétől megilletődve végezték: „Mind-en éjre a város nagyobb tornyába [közép kapu] az örök közül kettő rendeltessék, a kik szorgalmasan vigyázzanak s a kürtösnek az őrzésben segítségül legyenek. A czéhbelieknek a bíró és senatorok hagyják meg, hogy minden toronyban éjjel-nappal öröket tartsanak, a tornyokat és erődöket ágyukkal, tarackokkal s minden hadi eszközökkel készítsék fel, különösen porróll gondoskodjanak. A mely czéhnek nem lesz pora, a bíró keményen büntesse meg...” Elek Jakab, *Kolozsvár története. Második kötet oklevéltárral. Újabb Kor. Nemzeti fejedelmi korszak (1540–1690)* (The History of Cluj. Second Volume with Archives of Documents. Newer Period. National Principal Period, 1540–1690), (Budapest: Magyar Királyi Egyetemi Könyvnyomda, 1888), 119–120.

23. The original formula in Hungarian: “*a mely czéh tornyát megépíteni nem képes, adjanak mellé más czéhet, ha az sem elég, harmadikot*” Jakab, *Kolozsvár története. Második kötet oklevéltárral*, 118; Lupescu, “Kolozsvár második középkori erősítése,” 444.
24. Jakab, *Kolozsvár története. Második kötet oklevéltárral*, 437; Jeney-Tóth, *Míves emberek a kincses Kolozsvárott*, 109.
25. Jakab, *Kolozsvár története. Második kötet oklevéltárral*, 437; Jeney-Tóth, *Míves emberek a kincses Kolozsvárott*, 109.
26. *Urkundenbuch zur Gesschichte der Deutschen in Siebenbürgen*. vol. VII, ed. Franz Zimmermann, Gustav Gündisch, et al. (Berlin-Bucharest: Akademie Verlag, 1991), 261–262; Lupescu, “Kolozsvár második középkori erősítése,” 441–442.
27. For the exact location of the tower see: Lupescu Radu, “Kolozsvár történetének buktatói” (Pitfalls in the History of Cluj), *Erdélyi Múzeum* LXVII, 3–4 (2005): 66.
28. Elek Jakab, *Oklevéltár Kolozsvár története első kötetéhez* (Archives of Documents on the History of Cluj, first volume) (Buda: Magyar Királyi Egyetemi Könyvnyomda, 1870), 263; Szabolcs László Kozák-Kígyóssy, “Céhes városvédelem Nagyszebenben a XV–XVI. Században” (The Defensive Role of the Guilds in 16–17th Century Sibiu), *Hadtörténelmi Közlemények* 131/4 (2018): 840; Lupescu, “Kolozsvár második középkori erősítése,” 441.
29. SJAN CJ, F54: Colecția Bresle (Guilds Collection), 164, doc. no. 54–55.
30. The original formula in Hungarian: “*Es myert hogy az zabo mestereknek az cehbelielieknek en-nem kelcségekkel es munkaiokkal az regi megy holt iambor eleyneknek uegezesebol es rendelesebol Porral golyobissal mynden fele oltalmazó zerzamokkal es ugygasokkal [igy] haborusagnak ideien egy tornyot kel tartanyok Melly delfeol az uaras keritesenek egy zegelethyn uagyon fel epitue. Az okert mynden az ky mesterre akar lenny tartozzek az cebbe hat forintot fizetny. Annak felette mykoron annak ydeye uagyon tartozek zolgalni az egez cebbeli mester tarsasagnak egy ebedetis tisztessages etkekkel kezytettet adnya.*” Elek Jakab, *Oklevéltár Kolozsvár története második és harmadik kötetéhez* (Archives of Documents on the History of Cluj, second and third volumes), (Budapest: Magyar Királyi Egyetemi Könyvnyomda, 1888), 61–62; Lupescu, “Kolozsvár második középkori erősítése,” 440.
31. The original formula in Hungarian: “*Hogy ha ualamelly effele Mester erre az uarasra masu-natt kerített auuagy penig mezew uarasbol ualamy okokbol indultatuan ide az uarasra ione az cebbe akarna allani ha az elewt is cebbeli mester uolt es polgarsagot uagy ualamy egyeb tisztet uiselt uolna mel dology mya az yffiw mestersegbe illendo zolgalatot nem akarna auuagy zegellene fel uenny es eluiselny. Tehat effele mester effele zolgalatert penzbe megy zerezwdlhessek az celmesterekkel Effele penzis penyg az Thoroni segitsegere ualo legyen...*” Jakab, *Oklevéltár Kolozsvár története második és harmadik kötetéhez*, 61–62.
32. The original formula in Hungarian: “*mely ifjú a mészáros mesterséget meg akarja tanulni, 6 forintot fizet, azért, mert a Középutcza felett levő bástyatornyot a czéhnek kell hadilag felszerelni s jó állapotban tartani, e felett a mészárszékre is sok a költség.*” Jakab, *Kolozsvár története. Második kötet oklevéltárral*, 144; Lupescu, “Kolozsvár második középkori erősítése,” 442.
33. Jeney-Tóth: *Míves emberek a kincses Kolozsvárott*, 108.
34. Serviciul Județean al Arhivelor Naționale Sibiu (National Archives of Romania, Sibiu County Branch, hereinafter: SJAN SB), F32: Documente de breaslă Z.U. (Guild Documents), I. pack, doc. no. 33. Partially published in: Kozák-Kígyóssy, “Céhes városvédelem Nagyszebenben,” 835.
35. Jakab, *Oklevéltár Kolozsvár története első kötetéhez*, 257; Csaba Miklósi-Sikes, “Kolozsvár bástyái és városfalai. Adatok a középkori Kolozsvár katonai jellegű építkezéseihez” (The

- Bastions and Towers of Cluj. Data Related to the Medieval Military Type Constructions of Cluj), *Művészettörténeti Értesítő* 50, 3-4 (2001): 283.
36. “Die auswendig der Zach sind, die sollen Schoss und Los tragen am Gewehr zu dem Turm.” Nussbächer, *Aus Urkunden und Chroniken*, 173.
 37. Nussbächer, *Aus Urkunden und Chroniken*, 172–173; Niedermaier, *Contribuții privind istoria orașelor*, 3–4.
 38. The fire broke out on April 30, and the reconstruction works of the fortifications lasted almost four years, as we can read in the inventories of Johann Krempes. Nussbächer, *Aus Urkunden und Chroniken*, 173.
 39. Nussbächer, *Aus Urkunden und Chroniken*, 177.
 40. The original text in German: “Barlbier haben einen schönen Toppelhacken, einen mittelmässigen vndt einen kleinen Hacken, 75 Pfundt Pulwer; ein wenig Bley (lead) vndt, ein wenig Kuglen. Eben daselb haben die Ldrer einen schönen Toppel-vndt einen anderen guten Hacken, ein Muschquet, einen halben Centner (quintal) Pulwer vndt ein wenig Kuglen.” Nussbächer, *Aus Urkunden und Chroniken*, 177. In the inventory a clear separation can be observed between the weapons of the tanners and the ones of the barbers.
 41. Niedermaier, *Contribuții privind istoria orașelor*, 7, 14–15; Nussbächer, *Aus Urkunden und Chroniken*, 166–174.
 42. Nussbächer, *Aus Urkunden und Chroniken*, 166, 174.
 43. “5 Haacken, vndtner welchen ein schöner Toppel-Haacken (mit zwei Läufen) ist, ein Muschquet, etwas Kuglen, ein Zentner Pulwer.” Nussbächer, *Aus Urkunden und Chroniken*, 166.
 44. The original text in German: “Auf dem Kürschner-Turm sind 2 Doppel-Hacken, 15 gemeine Hacken ein erzenes Stückel, 8 große Spieße, eine Hellebarde. 5 Tönnen Pulver; eine ganze Tonne voll bleierne Kugeln, 5 Stückkugeln, 5 Viertel Blei, etliche andere Stüeckkugeln mitelmäßige, eine große Mörserkugel.” Nussbächer, *Aus Urkunden und Chroniken*, 174.
 45. Nussbächer, *Aus Urkunden und Chroniken*, 150.
 46. Nussbächer, *Aus Urkunden und Chroniken*, 150.
 47. Nussbächer, *Aus Urkunden und Chroniken*, 154.
 48. Serviciul Județean al Arhivelor Naționale Brașov (National Archives of Romania, Brașov County Branch), F1: Primăria Brașov (Archives of the City of Brașov), Colecția de documente Stenner (Stenner collection), seria slavă (Slavic series), doc. no. 315. Published in Gernot Nussbächer and Elisabeta Marin ed., *Documente de breaslă 1420-1580. Documente privind istoria orașului Brașov*. Vol. IX (Guild Documents 1420–1580. Documents Relating to the History of the City of Brașov, vol. IX), (Brașov: Editura Aldus, 1999), 190–191.
 49. The original formula: “Item dem bogenschwéczen von der herren geheys. flor. auri. 1.” The citizens or members of the magistrate depending on the interpretation of the word Herren. Kozák-Kígyóssy, “Céhes városvédelem Nagyszebenben,” 845.
 50. *Rechnungen aus dem Archiv der Stadt Hermannstadt in der Sächsischen Nation. Quellen zur Geschichte Siebenbürgens aus Sächsischen Archiven I. 1380–1516* (Sibiu: Ausschuss des Vereins für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde, in Commission bei Franz Michaelis, 1890), 148, 179, 197, 224, 253, 351; Kozák-Kígyóssy, “Céhes városvédelem Nagyszebenben,” 845.
 51. Kozák-Kígyóssy, “Céhes városvédelem Nagyszebenben,” 845.
 52. “Sagittaribus balistarum pro ave sagitantibus iussu dominorum consulum. flor. 1. et asp. 30.” Zsolt Simon, “Die Schässburger Rechnung von 1522,” *Zeitschrift für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde*, no. 35 (2011): 177.

53. Kozák-Kígyóssy, "Céhes városvédelem Nagyszebenben," 846.
54. Katalin Szende, *Otthon a városban. Társadalom és anyagi kultúra a középkori Sopronban, Pozsonyban és Eperjesen* (At Home in the Town. Society and Material Culture in Medieval Sopron, Pozsony/Bratislava and Eperjes/Presov), (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete: 2004), 209; Kozák-Kígyóssy, "Céhes városvédelem Nagyszebenben," 846.
55. *Comerț și meșteșuguri*, 245–246; Kozák-Kígyóssy, "Céhes városvédelem Nagyszebenben," 846.
56. "czehis, quae cum pixidibus iussae sunt sagittare flor. 1"; "Eisdem chehis (...) sagittarunt flor. 1." *Rechnungen aus dem Archiv der Stadt Hermannstadt*, 487, 543; Elek Benkő, *Erdély középkori haragjai és bronz keresztelõmedencéi* (Budapest: Polis Könyvkiadó, 2002), 127; Kozák-Kígyóssy, "Céhes városvédelem Nagyszebenben," 846.
57. "...a Hídkapuval átellenben, a Szamoson túli Szent Erzsébet ispótály – és annak malma – felett, a Kőmál alatti szőlőskertek szomszédságában feküdt, és itt állították fel a lövőfát is." Gyöngy Kovács-Kiss, "A játékos város. A társadalmi érintkezés, a gondúzás és a játékok néhány színhelye a 16. századi Kolozsváron," (The Playful Town. The Scenes of Social Intercourse, Carousing and Games in 16th Century Cluj) *Korunk* 3. X/12 (1999): 47.
58. Kovács-Kiss, "A játékos város," 47; Szabolcs László Kozák-Kígyóssy, "Fegyverkészítés és céhes önvédelem a 15–16. századi Kolozsváron" (Weapon Production and Guild Participation in the Self-Defense of Kolozsvár (Klausenburg/Cluj) in the 15th–16th Centuries), in *Micae Mediaevales IX. Fiatal történészek dolgozatai a középkori Magyarországról és Európáról* (Papers by Young Historians about Medieval Hungary and Europe), ed. Enikő Kovács et alii (Budapest: ELTE BTK Történelemtudományi Doktori Iskola, 2020), 140.
59. Kovács-Kiss, "A játékos város," 48; Jeney-Tóth, *Míves emberek a kincses Kolozsvárott*, 111.
60. Kovács-Kiss, "A játékos város," 48; Jeney-Tóth, *Míves emberek a kincses Kolozsvárott*, 111.
61. Aleksander Boldyrev and Karol Łopatecki, "Volley Fire in Europe in the Mid-16th Century," *Studia Slavica et Balcanica Petropolitana*, 30, no. 2 (2021): 7.

Abstract

Regulations Related to Town Defenses in Guild Statutes of Cluj and Sighișoara (Fifteenth to Seventeenth Centuries)

The role of the guilds in town defense and in the maintenance of fortifications is a well known topic among historians specialized in medieval and early modern urban history. On the other hand, there are certain research questions which need to be asked. What did the defensive regulations exactly demand from the guilds? How many of those regulations from Transylvania have survived? Were the regulations modernized or updated with the constant development of firearms and defensive structures in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries? The study focuses on presenting and discussing in detail the regulations of the guild statutes regarding the defensive obligations of craftsmen in fifteenth to seventeenth century Cluj and Sighișoara, completing the analysis with the use of primary source analogies from Sibiu and Brașov.

Keywords

Guilds, guild statutes, town defenses, early modern period, Transylvania, Cluj, Sighișoara