

Limits of Comparison: A Case study of Early Modern Urban Migration

Jaroslav Miller

Introduction

Most surveys of urban growth in the long sixteenth century stress the comparatively high level of early modern population mobility encouraged by the emergence of qualitatively new phenomena in the spheres of the economy, culture and religion. There is also a prevailing consensus among historians referring to “natural decrease theory”. Historical demographers have suggested that because of the high mortality rates caused by epidemics, wars, natural catastrophes, and continual problems with hygiene the natural increase of the urban population was either moderate or nonexistent. Therefore, it was primarily immigration that either produced the rise or compensated for population losses.¹

In this study I will restrict myself to some aspects of early modern population mobility in East-Central Europe, a region largely neglected so far by comparative historians. To be more specific, my attention will be drawn to Poland-Lithuania and two provinces of the Habsburg monarchy, namely the Bohemian Lands and Royal Hungary. By discussing geographical horizons of urban immigration I will also explore the dimensions of population movements in relation to urbanization and political, economic and religious pressures. For methodological reasons, explained later in the text, the article is concerned exclusively with the full-right citizens who usually formed between 10 – 25 per cent of the city’ total population. First, however, problems of sources and the impact of variables on the nature and structure of immigration will be considered.

Limits of research and limits of immigration

Attempts to investigate the mobility of the population in the pre-statistical period are limited by several factors. First of all, the insufficiency and fragmentary character of the available data does much to impede any comprehensive survey of the structure and dynamics of urban migration. Most sources do not cover the whole social spectrum of the urban population and they refer just to one particular stratum. This is why the calculation of overall migration flows in early modern age is virtually an unachievable objective. Moreover, one has to take into consideration the existence of variables; local specifics with a considerable impact on the nature and intensity of migratory patterns. Among them, the geographical location of the city, its functional typology, the immigration policy of the urban authorities, military conflicts in the close surroundings of the town, or the character of the urban economy rank among the most significant. There can be no doubt that the flow of incomers had a beneficial effect on the urban economy, as new inhabitants were usually less reluctant to engage themselves in poorly-paid menial work that was shunned by local townspeople. At the same time, the increasing size of the population stimulated demand for urban craft products. Yet still in-migration was a double-edged phenomenon and it remained one of the most destabilizing factors by making the nature of the urban society economically, socially, and religiously heterogeneous. Not only did the growing population concentration increase the pressure on the urban infrastructure but also the influx of people with different social status, lifestyles, and cultural and religious backgrounds contributed much to the existence of frontiers within urban society. Unable to effectively regulate the flow of propertyless and unqualified people entering the city, urban leaders had to pay increasing attention to the living conditions of the city's population. Therefore, in many cities measures meeting the minimum social needs of the poorest, such as a better water supply, had to be adopted. As a result, private donations, as well as a considerable percentage of municipal expenditures, were channelled into better infrastructure and the upkeep or foundation of hospitals. Under normal circumstances, however, immigration was restricted in a natural way, by the absorption

potential of the city. In this respect, a whole spectrum of factors mattered, namely the state of the urban infrastructure, the city's accommodation capacity, or the food supply. Among them, integration into urban economic structures proved of vital importance as the demand for new artisans was also derived from the endeavour of guilds to keep competition on the urban market under strict control. The regional density of the urban network has to be taken into account as well, since the relationship between immigrants from the countryside and towns was heavily dependent on the quantity of towns around the urban centre under discussion. The effects of the functional typology of towns and their geographical location on the nature of urban immigration have also been largely neglected by historians. Let us consider the case of Danzig. As we shall see, its key role in the Polish maritime trade, in combination with its location on the periphery of the *Rzeczpospolita*, caused the influx of a massive number of foreign immigrants when compared to inland centres such as Kraków, Prague, or Wrocław.

In general, one may identify three major types of urban migration. Firstly, there were organized, temporary, and more or less periodical population flows into and out of urban settlements with certain administrative or political functions. While it has been suggested that on the eve of war with Sweden in the mid-17th century Warsaw hosted about 30,000 inhabitants, during sessions of the General Diet (*Sejm*), that often lasted several months, the number of people in the city rapidly rose to 40,000–50,000 or even more.² The presence of such temporary inhabitants had a more permanent character in cities that accumulated central functions. In Olomouc, the capital of Moravia, the Diet as well as the Law Court of the Land (*zemský soud, Landrecht*) were summoned twice a year and each session attracted at least several hundred people. Moreover, in the first half of the 16th century, the richest Moravian landlord, the bishop of Olomouc, still used to call his numerous vassals to the city in order to discuss economic, administrative, and legal issues.³ Thus, for a considerable part of the year the population of Olomouc was definitely higher than estimated by historians. Secondly, cities often faced mass but irregular population movements that were mostly provoked by

natural catastrophes, epidemics or, alternatively, by religious and political persecution. The last and the most common type, however, was natural everyday migration between the town and its hinterlands or the mutual exchange of urban populations.

The existence of cyclical as well as fitful migration waves proves that regardless of long-term demographic trends, any town was a pulsing, expanding and contracting organism with enormous population fluctuation. This is why the historian faces major difficulties in writing about population movements. There is no doubt that the early modern age, compared to the preceding period, produced quite rich material to be examined by students of urban migration. Though originally used for different purposes, parish registers, books of wedding contracts, guild records, or judicial documents inform us about the motives, nature, and intensity of immigration into cities. In the case of Pest, for example, parish records, combined with other sources, made it possible to reconstruct some parameters of immigration after the Christian reconquest of the city in 1686. More recently, having explored marriage agreements, P. Vorel managed to outline the contours of immigration into the small and rather agricultural town of Přelouč in Bohemia. Still another source, a list of inhabitants from 1585-1586, shows the geographical structure of newcomers to the New Town, one of Prague's autonomous municipalities.⁴ While such sources may serve well in case studies, it still remains questionable if their quantity is sufficient enough for a systematic and more comprehensive investigation.

As a large-scale comparison requires a survey of typologically similar records, registers of new burghers (*Bürgerrechtsbuch*, *Matricula civium*), fiscal books, or city council records (*Ratsprotokolle*) that are preserved in many municipal archives seem arguably to be the most suitable source for the study of migratory patterns. Yet their narrative value is limited as well, as they usually covered only the *haut monde* of urban society, namely town dwellers possessing full rights. On the other hand, these sources registered a socially stable and, for the demography of the town, the most important segment of urban society.

Undoubtedly, the existence of social and economic ties with the city had a considerable impact on the lower mobility of burghers *vis-à-vis* other classes of the city's population. In Polish Międzychód (Birnbaum), for example, almost one quarter of new full-right town dwellers between 1668–1695 contracted a marriage shortly before or after getting their burghership.⁵ Apparently, the higher level of social anchorage, as well as better living standards, created good preconditions for bringing up children. Moreover, the ratio between the number of births and deaths was arguably more favourable in the group of full-right town dwellers than in the unprivileged strata of urban society. Such assumption, however, still awaits verification or revision on the basis of a comprehensive sociological and demographic survey of early modern urban populations. Considering the comparative goal of this study I will explore the mobility of full-right burghers that was elsewhere best recorded by municipal authorities.

Though registers of new burghers have always been extensively studied by historians, until now many of them have escaped attention. In Bohemia, for instance, this refers to Vodňany, Česká Lípa, or Rakovník. More surprisingly, however, no systematic survey of immigration has been conducted for major Hungarian urban centres, namely Lőcse, Kassa, or Pozsony. In addition, major outcomes of investigations have been mostly presented in case studies with no or minimal attention to the social, religious, or economic setting of migration. This fragmentation of research greatly impedes the reconstruction of early modern population movements. Yet, to some extent, a similar judgment may be passed on German and Austrian historical scholarship, as they have traditionally preferred monographic works to a comparative approach.⁶

With reference to historical scholarship on burgher migration, one should also be aware of some methodological inadequacies of previous research. In the past the narrative value of available sources was often overinterpreted by urban historians. By ignoring a highly selective nature of registers of new burghers they used to generalize outcomes of their

research.⁷ Moreover, in 1930s and early 1940s lists of new citizens were often studied not as historical documents but rather as ideological instruments that testified to the Germanity of many East-Central European cities and towns.⁸

Before discussing the main parameters of early modern burgher immigration its institutional limits shall be reviewed. Elsewhere, city councils applied a whole range of regulatory mechanisms aiming to support or restrain the influx of migrants, secure public peace, and maintain the social or confessional uniformity of the urban population. Such measures did not always reflect the real immediate needs of the city, as the structure of immigration was often influenced by the private interests of the feudal lord, either the king or noble and ecclesiastical owners. Consequently, in the long run the immigration policy of cities was marked by considerable discontinuity caused by changeable economic, confessional, or political conditions within or outside the urban society. In years after plague epidemics or natural catastrophes city fathers, aiming to compensate for the population loss, tended to adopt a pro-immigration strategy. This support mostly took the form of lower criteria for admission to *Bürgerrecht* or a more flexible procedure leading to citizenship. Arguably, the most conspicuous examples of pro-immigration factors, namely a low market competition and high demand for labour, emerged in Hungarian towns shortly after their liberation from the Ottomans. Thus, in the first years following 1686 the number of new town dwellers in Buda and Pest saw a steep ascent and within a decade the average number of new burghers reached about 50–60 per annum. The impressive level of immigration into both cities, briefly cut down by the Rákóczi uprising in 1703–1711, continued in the first half of the 18th century.⁹

At the same time, urban authorities elsewhere made an effort to maintain social and economic stability by eliminating certain groups of the population from burghership. Most cities applied criteria that influenced the social, confessional, or ethnic composition of the upper class of urban society. Since the social elevation to full-right citizenship usually

involved relatively high costs, such as the purchase of a house or administrative fees, this privileged status was accessible rather to strata with at least average financial revenues. Requirements, however, were far from being uniform. For example in Česká Lípa, as in many other towns, candidates for burghership were asked to contribute to public security by providing a bucket to be used in case of fire.¹⁰ Legitimate birth always had to be proven by the applicant and restrictions were placed on certain confessions as well. Protestants were often excluded *de iure* from citizenship in Catholic towns and *vice versa*. In the early modern age, Pilsen was arguably the most typical example of systematic support for Catholic immigration. Formally, only Catholics were eligible to apply for burghership in Kraków, Poznań or Biecz, but in practice the attitude of the city fathers proved more lenient or pragmatic, especially when the candidate had considerable financial means.¹¹ On the other hand, the mostly Protestant milieu of Royal Prussian cities incited the influx of non-Catholic settlers, especially Lutherans and Calvinists. However, the selection of new town dwellers on a confessional basis had only a limited impact on the religious structure of the whole urban society, which was, in many towns, persistently heterogeneous. In this respect, a promising opportunity to unify the creed of the urban population emerged in Buda and Pest after the Christian reconquest. A marked depopulation of both cities, caused by the exodus of Moslem and Jewish inhabitants, created favourable preconditions for mass immigration as well as more effective regulation of the religious profile of the newly formed urban society. Unfortunately, the insufficient data for the decades after 1686 do not permit us to identify to what degree the upper strata in Buda and Pest acquired a strictly Catholic character.¹² Conversely, it seems that the confessional criterion proved less significant in traditional meeting places of different religions, for instance, the southeastern territories of the Polish Crown. The religious plurality of burghership is particularly apparent in Przemyśl and, above all, in Lwów.¹³ In the latter, between 1405 and 1604 about 7 per cent of new citizens were

the Orthodox Ruthenians and 2 per cent belonged to the Armenian Church, while most new burghers were the Catholics.¹⁴

In many cities, however, the religious policy towards new town dwellers was marked by discontinuity caused by changeable political and social circumstances. Thus the mostly Protestant nature of the population of Olomouc was heavily affected by the re-Catholicization efforts after the collapse of the anti-Habsburg uprising in 1620. As early as 1625 Cardinal Dietrichstein, on behalf of Ferdinand II, issued a decree excluding Protestants from burghership.¹⁵ Henceforth, non-Catholic applicants for citizenship were obliged to convert to Catholicism.¹⁶

In terms of burghership most cities pursued a discriminatory policy towards the Jewish population. Major works on early modern urban societies tend to argue that Jewish incomers had no right to acquire full-right citizenship until they converted to Christianity.¹⁷ Apparently, however, this norm was not strictly pursued everywhere and some exceptions might have occurred. In Bochnia, for example, no less than 7 Jews were granted city rights between 1531–1656.¹⁸ Several Jews appeared in the lists of new citizens also in Lwów.¹⁹ Generally, more favourable legal protection was enjoyed by Jewish communities in towns located in the southern and eastern peripheries of Poland-Lithuania. As Jews played an important role in the urbanization plans of Polish, Ruthenian, and Lithuanian magnates, the prospect of life under the aegis of a mighty feudal lord ranked among the factors that caused the gradual movement of the Jewish population to the border provinces of the *Rzeczpospolita*.²⁰ Similarly, the register of new burghers in Velké Meziříčí (Moravia) reveals that in the 17th century Jews were repeatedly admitted as active citizens in this private town. It appears that during the first wave of Jewish immigration between 1636 and 1668 no less than 19 Jews acquired the citizenship.²¹ Yet, in the Bohemian Lands such a complete integration of Jews into Christian society arguably was a genuine anomaly.

A specific regulatory mechanism applied by many Bohemian towns was the criterion of language, as candidates for citizenship were supposed to be proficient in Czech. In the atmosphere of post-Hussite Bohemia, this was mainly directed against German-speaking incomers. In Pilsen such a requirement was introduced in 1500, when the city council excluded German colonists from burghership unless they learned the Czech language.²² In 1514 a similar norm was adopted in Litoměřice.²³ Similarly, in Prague and some other Bohemian and Moravian cities at least a basic command of Czech was a formal but apparently not strictly enforced criterion to be met by applicants for urban citizenship.²⁴

For different reasons some Polish and Royal Prussian cities pursued a policy of quasi-national discrimination against Scottish immigrants. It was the unauthorized economic activity of many Scots competing with local trade and guild production that proved the principal motive behind such a policy.²⁵

All the examples mentioned above demonstrate that elsewhere the city fathers or feudal lords made an effort to regulate the intensity and the religious or social structure of immigration. Similar criteria were often applied by urban guilds, touching on, for example, the language skills of newcomers candidates for membership. Administrative checks on immigration, however, might have secured a certain level of uniformity only within the economically or politically organized segments of urban society, but far less control was exercised over the massive and colourful body of the vagrant *proletariat* and lower social strata, which were often the fountainheads of internal conflicts and urban radicalism.

A cursory review of the administrative tools aiming to handle immigration has suggested that an in-depth macroanalysis must take into account the nature of the available sources and the policy of urban governments, as well as a plethora of other factors shaping the size and structure of migratory flows. No doubt, considering variables cannot be avoided by a historian focusing on the long-term trends in migration and its social structure and geographical scope.

Parameters of early modern burgher immigration

Long-term archival research, combined with the analysis of published sources, makes it possible to sketch at least some parameters of early modern immigration into East-Central European cities. **Table 1** covers the average annual numbers of new burghers in approximately four dozen towns. Most unfortunately, not all the cities for which sources were studied could be attached to the list as they are either fragmentary with significant time gaps (Leszno in Greater Poland) or, as was the case of Uherské Hradiště in Moravia, the records cover only a short period of time.²⁶

*New burghers in East-Central European cities*²⁷

Table 1

<i>Large cities (more than 10 000 inhabitants)</i>	<i>Total number of new burghers</i>	<i>Annual average</i>
Danzig (1558–1709)	19026	Cca 125 per annum
Prague (1618–1770)	14335 (from 1671 no data for Hradčany)	Cca 93.7 per annum 70.5–82 per annum
Kraków (1502–1601)	6544	Cca 65.4 per annum
Buda and Pest (1686/7–1720)	1815 (1119 and 696)	Cca 52.7 per annum (cca 32 and 20.5 per annum)
Toruń (1631–1650)	684	Cca 34.2 per annum
Lublin (1605 – 1626)	750	Cca 34.1 per annum
Poznań (1576–1650)	2542	Cca 33 per annum
Lwów (1496–1604)	2289	Cca 21 per annum
Old Warsaw (1506–1655)	3091	Cca 20.6 per annum
<i>Medium-sized cities (5000 – 10 000 inhabitants)</i>	<i>Total number of new burghers</i>	<i>Annual average</i>
Pozsony (1630–1650)	939	Cca 44.7 per annum
Görlitz (1500–1676)	5605	Cca 31.7 per annum
Kassa (1600–1632)	1013	Cca 30.6 per annum
Bautzen (1634–1699)	1877	Cca 28.4 per annum
Olomouc (1668–1696)	748	Cca 25.8 per annum
Brno (1561–1650)	2160	Cca 24 per annum
Jihlava (1537–1560 and 1586–1649)	475 and 1041	Cca 19.7 and 16.3 per annum
Cheb (1501–1650)	2306	Cca 15.4 per annum
Przemysł (1541–1664)	1510 ²⁸	Cca 12.2 per annum
Pilsen (1600–1618)	161	Cca 8.5 per annum
<i>Cities with less than 5000 inhabitants</i>	<i>Total number of new burghers</i>	<i>Annual average</i>
Eperjes (1584–1650)	1529	Cca 23 per annum
Lőcse (1550–1650)	2177	Cca 21.5 per annum
Broumov (1563–1674)	2141	Cca 19.1 per annum

Ivančice (1585–1644)	1109	Cca 16.8 per annum
Malbork (1500–1603 and 1617–1700)	1396 and 1244	Cca 13.4–15.5 and 14.8–15.6 per annum
Kamenz (1570–1744)	1764	Cca 13.5 per annum
Bochnia (1531–1656)	1686	Cca 13.4 per annum
Bártfa (1597–1648)	641	Cca 12.3 per annum
Žatec (1584–1660)	875	Cca 11.4 per annum
Biecz (1538–1687)	1508	Cca 10 per annum
Chojnice (1551–1700)	1451	Cca 9.7 per annum
Międzychód (1668–1695)	250	Cca 8.9 per annum
Most (1578–1680)	893	Cca 8.7 per annum
Löbau (1648–1700)	457	Cca 8.6 per annum
Kadaň (1595–1660)	548	Cca 8.3 per annum
Sopron (1535–1581)	359	Cca 7.8 per annum
Česká Lípa (1461–1470 and 1491–1670)	112 and 1012	Cca 6.2 and 5.6 per annum
Rakovník (1542–1660)	654	Cca 5.5 per annum
Domažlice (1584–1669)	423 ²⁹	Cca 5.2 per annum
Velké Meziříčí (1636 – 1700)	314	Cca 4,8 per annum
Vodňany (1572–1629)	165	Cca 2.8 per annum

The dimensions of burgher immigration illustrate the natural orientation to large residential and commercial centres with a high market potential. Among them, Danzig proved the most attractive destination of migration streams, followed by the Prague agglomeration. However, one has to put the annual numbers of newly accepted citizens in Danzig and Prague into historical context. In the case of the Prussian city the sources covered the period of its greatest prosperity, during which the influx of people culminated. It also seems that general trends of immigration were not damaged by the relatively short-lived conflicts with Sweden in 1626–1629 and in the mid-17th century. This by no means applied to Prague, whose apogee of glory was already over after 1618, when the havoc of the Thirty Years' War heavily affected the scope of immigration. Before this period the city, being the imperial residence and the political centre of the Holy Roman Empire, saw imposing waves of immigration. For instance, by 1600 about 50–60 applicants every year were granted citizenship in the Old Town and the total number of new town dwellers in all the parts of Prague's agglomeration ranged from 120 to 140.³⁰

Compared to Danzig and Prague, Kraków saw markedly lower immigration rates during the 16th century. Apart from economic stagnation this was also due to the gradual diminution of the city's central functions after the Lublin Union (1569) in favour of Warsaw. The long-term regressive character of immigration may be verified with the help of available data for both the preceding and subsequent periods. While in 1392–1506 the average number of new Kraków citizens still attained a figure of 80–82, in the 16th century this figure sank to 65. The loss of residential character and the shift to the geographical periphery of Poland-Lithuania caused the descending trend to persist in the 17th century, when only 47 candidates per year were granted burghership.³¹ The situation in the case of some rising urban centres was quite the reverse. The interdependence of the increasingly multi-functional nature of the city and intensity of immigration was perhaps most clearly manifested by Warsaw, the new political centre of the country from the first half of the 17th century. If between 1506 and 1655 only 21 burghers per annum won city rights, in the next period (1679–1701) their number rose to 35 and shortly before the political division of the country immigration came to its climax, with almost 52 new full-right town dwellers a year.³² For similar reasons a conjunctural rise of immigration took place in Pozsony, the provisional capital of Hungary, and also in the agglomeration of Buda, Pest and Óbuda after the Christian reconquest.³³ For Pest, steadily upward trends in immigration between 1687–1770 have also been confirmed by the analysis of complementary source, namely parish registers.

The large-scale comparison of migratory flows, then, verifies the hypothesis that either major hubs of commerce (Danzig, Lublin) or residential and administrative centres (Prague, Kraków, Pozsony) sucked in the population most greedily. Nonetheless, comparatively high numbers of new burghers have been discovered in towns of a much smaller size too. Here, the most conspicuous examples are Ivančice and Broumov, though in each city the principal motives for immigration were different. It was the religiously tolerant climate of the former, hosting around the mid-16th century the central institutions of the *Unitas Fratrum*, that had

the greatest influence on the population influx.³⁴ On the other hand, the affluence of newcomers into Broumov responded to the boom in the cloth industry that made the city one of the major foci of textile production in East-Central Europe. At the same time, the significant immigration into Ivančice and Broumov also raises a question relating to the causal nexus between the legal status of the town and the average annual number of new burghers. Some historians, aiming to explain dynamic population rise in many private towns, have suggested that the generally more liberal immigration criteria in such centres were responsible for the relatively massive population influx.³⁵ No matter how true this may be, no systematic survey comparing immigration into royal and private cities has yet been made to verify this presumption.³⁶

In comparison with more populous Polish and Bohemian urban centres, one would find the dimensions of immigration into medium-sized Royal Hungarian towns (Kassa, Éperjes, Lőcse) rather surprising. It is the generally accepted view that the Ottoman conquest sparked the exodus of large segments of the population. Naturally, many refugees marched to Upper Hungary, hoping to find shelter and a new social existence in inland cities. Though the parameters of Hungarian exile and its social composition are still subject to discussion, the analysis of the geographical origins of urban immigrants, where available, supports the theory that some migratory flows were directed to Upper Hungarian cities. Unfortunately, in most cities registers of new burghers mention the origins of applicants only occasionally. This means that our conclusions do not rest upon a representative sample of immigration. Considering only those burghers with a listed origin, applicants for Eperjes citizenship, coming from all parts of Hungary, formed almost 70% of immigrants in 1537–1696. Similarly, between 1597-1648 Hungarian immigration into Bártfa accounted for about 63%.³⁷

The sufficiently long stretch of time covered by the sources helps to identify inherent trends in burgher immigration as well. Here, one may wonder to what extent key factors, such as war or economic cycles, were responsible for qualitative and quantitative changes in the

nature of migratory flows. Again, the juxtaposition of major urban centres proves instructive (**Appendix, Diagram A**). First consider the strikingly divergent trends in immigration into Prague and Danzig. In the case of the former, the abrupt end of the Rudolphine boom and the desolation caused by the subsequent war suffocated immigration, which dropped in the mid-17th century to some 60 new burghers per year. Compared to the situation before the Thirty Years' War, the average number of newly accepted town dwellers almost halved. The consolidation of social conditions in the second half of the 17th century sparked off a moderate growth in immigration, but the pre-war intensity was not reached before 1700.³⁸ A very similar trend, a short-term decline in immigration, may be observed in Buda and Pest during the Rákóczi uprising at the start of the 18th century. As for Pest, the pernicious effect of war on immigration is confirmed by other sources, mainly parish registers, which refer also to unprivileged segments of the urban population (**Table 2**).³⁹

Numbers of new burghers in Buda and Pest, 1686/1687-1730

(data for Pest compared to a study by Z. Fallenbüchl based on a broader spectrum of sources)

Table 2

Buda, 1686–1730		Pest, 1687–1730 (Fallenbüchl)		
1686–1691	132	1687–1690	66	138 (1687–1700)
1691–1700	253	1691–1700	297	
1701–1710	181	1701–1710	148	112
1711–1720	533	1711–1720	185	513
1720–1730	403	1720–1730	221	749

While the Thirty Years' War was responsible for the demographic crisis in the Prague agglomeration, Danzig faced a steadily increasing number of newcomers that culminated shortly before the Swedish invasion. This coincided with the apex of Danzig's economic prosperity in the first half of the 17th century.⁴⁰ Yet another situation is offered by Kraków. If immigration into Prague and Danzig fluctuated markedly, then migratory flows to Kraków

saw neither considerable increase nor dramatic decline and in the 16th century the average number of new burghers oscillated around 60 per year. Such long-term stability may be interpreted as a sign of stagnation caused by growing economic problems and, towards 1600, by the gradual loss of central residential and political functions in favour of Warsaw.⁴¹

Looking at patterns of immigration into middle-sized towns (2000–10,000 inhabitants), it seems apparent that their nature was affected in the same way. This is most conspicuously illustrated by a survey of migratory flows into Bohemian and Moravian towns (**Appendix, Diagrams B, C**). While in most cities the numbers of new burghers climaxed around 1600, the period of the Thirty Years' War, regardless of the different functional typologies of the settlements compared, brought a marked recession.⁴² With the exception of Jihlava, in the first half of the 17th century practically all towns experienced a dramatic fall in the numbers of new town dwellers for several consecutive decades, while a moderate rise started after 1650. In Brno, for instance, the average number of newly-accepted burghers almost halved during the restless years of the Thirty Years' War, while in Cheb the flow of full-right inhabitants practically dried out in the '30s–'40s of the 17th century. Parallel migratory trends in most cities suggest a fundamental shift in the nature of population movements during the war. The essence of this discontinuity, I believe, was twofold. First of all, perpetual military campaigns generated a significant structural change as the imminent danger of warfare, frequent epidemics, the overall decline of commerce, and the precariousness of long-term planning provoked spasmodic, provisional, and unintentional movements rather than periodic and planned migration. This phenomenon found its reflection in the growing proportion of newcomers who did not apply for burghership and, consequently, were not registered in city books. On the contrary, the unstable social conditions during the Thirty Years' War may have been responsible for a marked fall in the numbers of new citizens, though in reality the intensity of immigration might have soared significantly. Apart from this qualitative change in population movements, there was another factor lying behind the low number of burghers

accepted during the war, namely the shift in migratory flows to safer or religiously more tolerant Hungarian, Saxon, or Polish towns. Considering cities in Hungary, it seems that exile from Bohemia and Moravia had a positive effect on the number of new burghers in the '20s–'40s of the 17th century (**Appendix, Diagram D**).⁴³ Newcomers from the Czech lands may be traced most easily in Lócse, where the town registers listed the origins of immigrants more consistently than in other Hungarian cities.

Better evidence in terms of religious migration is offered by burgher registers in the Saxon and Upper Lusatian towns situated along the Bohemian border. Here the combined impact of re-Catholicization and military campaigns in Bohemia caused profound shifts in standard migratory patterns. If the first emigration wave from the Bohemian Lands culminating in the late 1620s was mainly channelled to Saxon urban settlements, such as Pirna or Freiberg, than in the early 1650s it was the former Upper Lusatian *Sechsstädte* that served as the main target of the massive religious exodus.⁴⁴ The graphic illustration of immigration trends into Görlitz seems to suggest that population transfers from Bohemia climaxed twice during the period under discussion (**Appendix, Diagram E**). While the first wave of religious immigration in the late 1620s caused a dynamic rise in the numbers of new burghers, its size was much overshadowed, after two consecutive decades of recession, by the huge Bohemian exodus in the period 1648–1670.⁴⁵

Compared to similar patterns of immigration into Bohemian, Hungarian and Upper Lusatian towns in years of crisis, one observes more heterogeneous trends in Poland (**Appendix, Diagram F**). This may be explained by the merely regional dimensions of armed conflicts that left other parts of the *rzeczpospolita* untouched. In Chojnice, for instance, the sudden drop in immigration in the late 1620s coincided with the short-term war over the mouth of the Vistula river. In all probability, the uprising of Bohdan Chmielnicki in the late 1640s had a similar effect on immigration into Przemyśl. Though there is a consensus among Polish historians that perpetual warfare after the mid-17th century greatly affected the level of

urbanization in the country, our sources do not verify such general inferences as the data available for this period are simply not sufficient.⁴⁶ Nonetheless, the markedly low numbers of new burghers in Biecz, Poznań, or Chojnice seem to support the theory of the depopulation of Polish cities after the Swedish deluge. In Poznań, for instance, only 484 people acquired city rights between 1651–1675, while in the preceding periods of 1601–1625 and 1626–1650 the number of new burghers reached 777 and 700 respectively.⁴⁷

Having seen how crucial factors such as economic prosperity, war, or urban functions influenced the intensity of migratory flows, let us investigate how the same aspects affected the geographical scope of immigration. Here, three spatial dimensions should be distinguished, namely regional immigration, then immigration within a state and, finally, immigration from abroad. Again variables, such as the location of the city, the density of the population, or the nature of the urban economy, mattered. The concurrent effect of these factors was, no doubt, responsible for the highly specific proportion of foreign to domestic immigration into Danzig (**Table 3**). Equally important was a transformation of inherent urban functions, as the case of Warsaw eloquently suggests. As one of the Mazovian regional centres, Old Warsaw saw, till 1500, only a minimal influx of foreign newcomers, who formed between 3–5% of all immigrants. The relocation of the royal residence from Kraków and the elevation of the city to the administrative and political metropolis of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth resulted in significant shifts in the geographical structure of migratory flows.⁴⁸ Thus, the first half of the 17th century was a period of a dynamic rise in foreign immigration, which reached almost 20% between 1651–1655. Regional immigration, however, experienced the opposite trend. While still dominant around 1500, by the mid-17th century its share was similar to that of long-distance immigration.⁴⁹ Something which proves very surprising, in comparison with other large cities, is the particularly high proportion of foreign immigration to Pest after 1686. Given enormous depopulation of the country and considering that some parts of historical Hungary still remained under Ottoman sovereignty,

the large influx of Christians from abroad seems only natural. The investigation of the social background of the migrants, however, also suggests other explanations for this phenomenon. In the first decades after the Christian reconquest long-distance migration was stimulated by comparatively low economic competition in the urban market and by the high demand for specialized crafts. Our sources indicate a particularly strong immigration wave of stoneworkers and building experts, who mainly came from abroad.⁵⁰ The third factor greatly hindering immigration from the adjacent Hungarian provinces was perhaps a religious one. Having lived for a long time on Ottoman-dominated territory, much of the Christian population from the re-conquered Hungarian regions had either lapsed from the orthodox Catholic faith or was Islamicized, which would, no doubt, have hampered social integration in Pest.

Regional, countrywide and foreign immigration, selected large cities⁵¹

(Only records including the origin of migrant considered)

Table 3

CITY	Regional immigration (%)	Countrywide immigration (%)	Foreign immigration (%)
Danzig (1558–1709)	Cca 29% (Royal Prussia)	Cca 2% (other provinces of the Polish Crown, Lithuania)	Cca 69%
Lwów (1496–1604)	Cca 36% (Red Ruthenia)	Cca 58% (other provinces of the Polish Crown, Lithuania)	Cca 6%
Prague (1618–1770)	Cca 62% (Bohemia)	Cca 10% (other provinces of the Bohemian Crown)	Cca 28%
Pest (1687–1720)	Cca 52% (Hungary)	Cca 4% (other provinces of the Hungarian Crown)	Cca 44%
Olomouc (1668–1696)	Cca 49.7% (Moravia)	Cca 21.2% (other provinces of the Bohemian Crown)	Cca 29.1 %
Lublin (1605–1626)	Cca 50% (Lesser Poland)	Cca 32% (other provinces of the Polish Crown, Lithuania)	Cca 10%
Old Warsaw (1506–1655)	Cca 63% (Mazovia)	Cca 27% (other provinces of the Polish Crown)	Cca 10%

Due to the immediate impact of many variables, however, one should not overestimate the data presented in **Table 3**. On the other hand, a statistical survey may be utilized as a tool displaying the attractiveness of the city for foreign migrants, as well as the geographical structure of migratory flows. This naturally raises the question as to which regions supplied large East-Central European cities with newcomers and what stimuli led to the long-distance population transfers. As might be expected, **Table 4** confirms the quantitative prevalence of burghers coming from the Holy Roman Empire (excluding the Lands of the Bohemian Crown). It is only logical that the share of immigrants from this territory proved higher in cities lying on the western periphery of East-Central Europe (Prague, Danzig), while in the case of urban centres in its central and eastern parts (Lublin, Lwów) the geographical scope of immigration was distributed more evenly.

Geographical structure of foreign immigration, selected cities ⁵²

(Only records including the origin of migrant considered)

Table 4

CITY	Geographical structure of immigration (%)
Danzig (1558–1709)	Holy Roman Empire (Bohemian Crown excluded) cca 75%, Bohemian Crown cca 10%, the Low Countries cca 6%, Baltic area cca 3%, British Isles cca 1.7%
Prague (1618–1770)	Holy Roman Empire (Bohemian Crown excluded) cca 84%, Italian peninsula cca 6%, Hungary cca 2%, France cca 1.5 %, the Low Countries cca 1.2%
Lwów (1496–1604)	Bohemian Crown cca 48%, Holy Roman Empire cca 17%, Italian peninsula cca 12.7%, Hungary cca 9%, British Isles cca 2%
Lublin (1605–1626)	Holy Roman Empire (Bohemian Crown excluded) cca 49.5%, Italian peninsula cca 23%, Muscovite Russia cca 8.6%, Armenia and Middle East cca 6.7%, Scotland cca 3.8%
Pest (1687–1720)	Holy Roman Empire (Bohemian Crown excluded) cca 75.5%, Bohemian Crown cca 9.8%, other 14.7%.

Though colonists from the German territories, taking advantage of geographical proximity, represented the most numerous body of all foreign immigrants, in the course of the 16th-17th centuries one may observe a dynamic rise in immigration from the Italian peninsula, the Low Countries, and the British Isles. While Italian communities were more or less evenly dispensed throughout the region, the locus of Anglo-Scottish and Dutch settlement remained on the Baltic coast and the provinces of Poland's heartland. Nonetheless, the vestigial presence of Dutch immigrants has also been discovered in Bohemian and Moravian towns.⁵³

The rather stationary character of immigration from the British Isles and the Low Countries was, no doubt, caused by the close ties with the sea trade between Poland and Western Europe. In consequence, Prussian cities, namely Danzig, Elbląg, and Toruń, but also Königsberg, served as foci of immigration from these countries. Apart from economic stimuli, the affinity of confessional and cultural milieu mattered as well. This became evident during the Dutch-Spanish war, which provoked a mass exodus from the Netherlands. It has been estimated by Heinz Schilling that in 1585 Dutch settlements formed about 5 % of London population (cca 10 000 persons) and even higher was their proportion in German cities like Frankfurt (cca 20 %), Emden (cca 30 %) or Aachen (cca 20%).⁵⁴ Apart from London and some urban centers in Germany, it was the Prussian Baltic coast that offered asylum to sizeable Dutch diaspora. Moreover, in the Royal Prussian urban milieu one can identify another integrative factor that was either absent or weak in other East-Central European cities. This is the strong urban republicanism and self-identification with civic values, a tradition that was also deeply embedded in the rising Dutch bourgeois society. The temporal concurrence of commercial, political, and religious factors caused Dutch immigration into Royal Prussian cities to climax around 1600. According to Danzig registers 384 newcomers from the Low Countries (the Spanish Netherlands included) acquired citizenship between 1558-1619, but only 179 in the following period until 1709.⁵⁵ There is no doubt, however,

that the Dutch enclave in Danzig was much more numerous, as many poor immigrants from the Low Countries were employed by their fellow countrymen as labourers or servants. The reciprocity of migratory flows between the Baltic area and the Low Countries is shown by an Amsterdam register recording 22 newcomers from Danzig, 7 from Königsberg, and 7 from Stettin between 1580 and 1649.⁵⁶

The extensive commercial and social bonds between Prussia and the Low Countries were perhaps best embodied by the personality and life story of Amsterdam merchant Cornelis Loufsz. Born in Danzig, he moved to the Low Countries and ran a prosperous company that was mainly engaged in the sea trade between the Baltic and Amsterdam. In 1567 he found himself at the zenith of his career. Apart from commercial exchange with Danzig, in which his father played a key role, Loufsz successfully expanded his trade activities into Lisbon. His address in the élite Amsterdam quarter, *Warmoesstraat*, reveals that he ranked among the wealthiest merchants. The ongoing war of independence, however, brought a fundamental change into the lives of the inhabitants of Amsterdam, including Cornelis Loufsz. As a Protestant, perhaps of Lutheran confession, he joined the anti-Catholic opposition in the city and his house even served as the temporary residence of the leader of the Protestant nobility, Hendrik van Brederode. When attempts to seize political power in the city collapsed and Catholic families resumed their position Loufsz was sentenced in 1568 to the confiscation of his property and life-long exile. Like many emigrants from the Low Countries who settled in Prussian cities, Loufsz took advantage of his family background and commercial contacts, as well as the favourable religious climate, and returned to Danzig, his native city. Loufsz's family ties and the fact that he was probably still seen as a burgher of Danzig perhaps caused the Hanseatic League to protest against his persecution by the Amsterdam authorities. Having moved his company to Danzig, Loufsz revitalized his trade, now channelled to Emden, Rotterdam, and Middelburg rather than to Amsterdam. A radical change of policy in Amsterdam in 1578 made possible the return from exile of many Protestants and their

rehabilitation. Unlike the Hooft merchant family and other Amsterdam emigrants who considered Prussia as a place of temporary asylum, Cornelis Loufsz, however, decided to stay in Danzig. The story of the rich Amsterdam merchant who opted for Danzig as his residence and the headquarters of his company illustrates the cultural, religious, and commercial attractiveness of the Prussian milieu for Dutch immigrants. In addition, Loufsz's decision to remain in Danzig shows that the affluent Baltic city offered economic potential and commercial opportunities, though geographically more confined, comparable to Amsterdam. His belief that in the matter of European trade Danzig was an acceptable alternative to Amsterdam might be one of the major reasons explaining Loufsz's behaviour.⁵⁷

The motives for immigration from England were very similar to those for that from the Low Countries. While Danzig retained its crucial role in Dutch commerce with the Baltic, the English trade, however, switched from the late 1570s to the rival port of Elbląg, which guaranteed broader commercial concessions as well as favourable legal and religious conditions. Thus around 1600 the city hosted a sizable enclave of English merchant families mostly affiliated with *the Eastland Company*. According to rough estimates, in the first half of the 17th century (1600-1640) no less than 97 English families settled in Elbląg and 34 newcomers had already become full-right burghers before 1600, while Danzig citizenship was acquired from 1580 to 1639 by only 9 immigrants of English origin. The persistent hostility of the Danzig merchants and brokers, who found themselves jeopardized by Elbląg's economic competition, as well as the more convenient location of Danzig's port and the broader spectrum of commodities on its market, however, resulted in the gradual decline of the company's activities in Elbląg and the departure of many English colonists.⁵⁸

Compared to English immigrants, the Scottish diaspora formed in many ways a highly specific entity. Though small groups of Scots appeared in Polish towns towards the end of the 15th century, their immigration remained on a low level until the 1560s-70s, when population transfers from Scotland intensified greatly. Yet the actual size of the Scottish diaspora is not

easy to estimate, for at least two reasons. Trying to escape dismal social conditions in their home country, many young Scots sought better living prospects in the Baltic, but often they earned their living as vagrant petty tradesmen or servants in burgher households or they joined the homeless urban proletariat. Moreover, numerous Scottish merchants rivalled the local trade and production, pursuing their commercial activities without applying for burghership and without affiliation with urban guilds. As both groups were covered rather haphazardly by urban administrations our knowledge of Scottish settlement still remains rather fragmentary. Both the substantial immigration of Scots to Poland, as well as their rather modest living standard, did not escape the attention of Fynes Moryson, according to whom “[The Scots] *flocke in great numbers into Poland...rather for the poverty of their owne Kingdome, then for any great trafficke they exercised there, dealing rather for small fardels, then for great quantities of rich wares*”.⁵⁹ No wonder that municipal magistrates in some cities, mainly in Royal Prussia, applied a discriminatory policy towards Scottish incomers unless they agreed to share all communal burdens. The issue was raised several times by the Polish *Sejm* and the state authorities promulgated a series of decrees aiming to eliminate unauthorized commercial activities carried out by itinerant Scots.⁶⁰ That pauper immigration from Scotland evolved into a grave social problem is illustrated by a petition to James I in 1624, in which the well-to-do Scottish colony in Danzig informed their ruler that many young and poor Scots coming to the city often remained jobless and homeless.⁶¹

The precarious social status of many Scots perhaps resulted in the fact that in the long period from 1558 to 1709 only 135 newcomers from Scotland gained Danzig burghership, while that of Kraków acquired 33 Scots between 1573-1602 and only one Scottish immigrant (Aberdeen) obtained Lwów citizenship from 1537 to 1604, though the influx of Scots into all three cities was more substantial.⁶² In general, in the 17th century Scots have been traced in about 420 Polish settlements. Despite the fact that the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was not the single European destination of Scottish migrants, the available data suggest that the

main influx was channelled to the *rzeczpospolita*. It has been argued that in the first half of the 17th century Scottish immigration into Poland oscillated between 30,000-40,000 persons, while the dimensions of migration to Ireland, Scandinavia, and the Low Countries did not reach that level.⁶³

While immigrants from the European northwest mainly settled in northern and central parts of Poland, the Italian diaspora, not being economically tied to the sea trade as were many Dutch and British newcomers, rapidly expanded throughout the whole region of East-Central Europe. Despite the persistent absence of a comprehensive investigation of population transfers from Southern Europe, a marked spatial diffusion of Italian migration is suggested by sources of urban provenance recording Italian burghers in practically all types of cities of different size. Thus Vodňany in southern Bohemia, Uherské Hradiště in Moravia, or Hungarian Eperjes, to name but three out of many local urban centres, also served as termini of early modern Italian migration. Nonetheless, as harbingers of Renaissance culture in East-Central Europe, Italian migrants headed particularly to affluent areas and residential towns. In fact, it was long-term social demand that stimulated population transfers from the Italian peninsula to Hungary, the Czech lands, and Poland – Lithuania. Referring to the occupational structure of Italian immigration, stoneworkers and bricklayers, but also merchants and financiers, prevailed, finding in East-Central Europe enormous market potential to be realized. The dominant position of building crafts in the Italian diaspora has been confirmed by abundant surveys. In Lwów, between 1571-1604, almost half of the new burghers engaged in building activities came from the Italian peninsula.⁶⁴ The predominance of stoneworkers among the Italians in Brno has also been suggested by L. Sulitková.⁶⁵ Naturally, Italian bricklayers and experts in building techniques were also concentrated in residential centres. In Bytča, the residential town of Hungarian palatine György Thurzó, no less than 9 families of Italian stoneworkers were identified around 1600.⁶⁶ It appears that the occupational structure of Italian immigration into other types of cities followed a similar pattern. Though between

1538–1688 only two *Włosi*, as they were called, acquired citizenship in Biecz (Lesser Poland), one of them, Anthoni Conti from Milano, was referred to in municipal registers as *murarz* (bricklayer).⁶⁷ Similarly, one of the three new burghers of Italian origin in Domažlice (1584–1669) was engaged in building activities.⁶⁸

Despite the fact that Kraków and Prague hosted arguably the most numerous Italian enclaves, it was Buda that was first targeted by more sizeable Italian immigration as early as the second half of the 15th century. András Kubinyi's investigation helped to clarify that the appearance of an Italian settlement comprising several dozen incomers was motivated by the commercial potential of the Hungarian capital during the reign of Matthias Corvinus and the Jagellonian kings. He showed us that Italian factors in Buda not only supplied the royal court with goods but they also served as a source of financial credit to the king and Hungarian magnates.⁶⁹ After the liberation of Buda and Pest by the Habsburgs, however, the number of immigrants from Italian territories was rather spasmodic.⁷⁰ In Kraków, the close affiliation of the Italian enclave with the royal court was even more manifest. Under the patronage of Bona Sforza, the royal wife of Sigismund the Old, the first wave of the Italian settlement in Kraków culminated in the first half of the 16th century. Professionally, many Italians were engaged in the service of the Court as diplomats, politicians, or artists, while merchants and craftsmen represented a less numerous segment of the Italian colony in Kraków. However, the flow of immigrants in the second half of the 16th century changed the social and occupational structure of the Italian settlement in favour of the latter, with more than 50-60% of the newcomers involved in trade or craft production. A still different pattern was followed by Italian settlement in Prague. As the city did not serve as a permanent royal residence the first Italian incomers were craftsmen, particularly stoneworkers and bricklayers. Unlike Kraków, Prague saw only sporadic and rather haphazard Italian immigration in the early 16th century, but the influx steadily increased in the '60s–'80s and it reached its apex in the Rudolphine

era. Again, economically active classes prevailed, but the percentage of Italians affiliated with the Imperial Court was remarkable as well.⁷¹

Apart from the building trade, many Italians were engaged in both small- and large-scale trade and financial transactions. The highly profitable import of lucrative commodities (wine, luxury cloth, oriental spices) in combination with financial loans offered to the nobility and well-to-do burghers elevated some Italian colonists to the apex of urban society. In Kraków 6 Italian merchants belonged to the tiny class of the richest burghers in 1643.⁷² Similarly, in Prague the trade activities of Italians considerably undermined the long-term monopoly of the Nuremberg merchants and some, such as the branch of Werdeman's banking house, supplied the imperial troops with weaponry or channelled their investments into silver mining in Kuttenberg.

As the dazzling careers of several merchant families in Prague and Kraków illustrate, social admission to the urban *haut monde* was usually secured through a combination of patronage, close social bonds with the local élite, and personal wealth. Among the Italian entrepreneurs in Rudolphine Prague Ercole da Nova should perhaps be mentioned before others. The way he managed the commercial and financial activities of numerous magnate and noble families in Bohemia, the Rosenbergs, Wallensteins, and Žerotíns among them, remained unrivalled for a long period of time. Granted city rights in 1589 and ennobled in 1604, he ran a prosperous banking house until his death in 1606. Ercole da Nova's life story offers a portrait of a successful immigrant who generously supported his Italian relatives, bestowed rich donations on both the Catholic and Protestant Churches, did not avoid assimilation with Prague's social milieu, and who twice married daughters of local patricians.⁷³ Kraków offers a similar life story in the case of Hieronymus Pinocci, who settled in the city in 1640. His successful involvement in the wine trade and affinity with a leading Kraków patrician family via marriage not only secured Pinocci's elevation into the urban élite but also opened the door to a meteoric political career in the urban administration as a councillor and *Bürgermeister* and

then in the state service as the royal secretary and diplomat at the Viennese imperial court, London, and the Low Countries.⁷⁴ Brief profiles of Ercole da Nova's and Hieronymus Pinocci's careers demonstrate a model pattern of full economic and social integration based on close commercial and personal bonds with the urban patriciate, profitable financial activities, and finally marriage as the strongest integrative mechanism. However, successful social assimilation did not automatically open the door to public office and urban government. The reasons why the local community excluded "foreigners" from direct access to political power were usually religious or cultural. Here again a juxtaposition of Prague and Kraków may be instructive. In predominantly Catholic Kraków the chances of Italian burghers to make a political career in urban government proved high. While in the first half of the 16th century Kraków city council was controlled by German and Polish patricians and the first Italian surname among the councillors appeared in the '40s, a century later no less than 10 Italians won nomination to the city government. By 1600 the number of representatives of Italian origin in the Kraków city council exceeded that of councillors from the German cultural milieu. The strong position of Italians in the city administration is further illustrated by the fact that out of 139 Italians who were granted Kraków citizenship in the 17th century, 21 (15%) acted at least once as municipal councillors.⁷⁵ The situation in Prague, where the Italian enclave, due to its Catholic faith and frequent language problems, was for a long period disqualified from participation in political life, was very different. According to lists of municipal councillors only three Italians were identified in the Old Town government between 1547–1650 and just one in the New Town council between 1600–1650. In all cases, however, their tenure coincided with the period of strong re-Catholization after the collapse of the Protestant anti-Habsburg uprising in 1618-1620.⁷⁶ Thus the only exception was Pietro della Pasquina, who became a member of the city council in the Little Town as early as 1616.⁷⁷

Immigration from urban and rural environments

Considering the geographical structure of population movements, one should expect a high number of newcomers from rural areas. Supposedly, a large-scale study of migratory flows between the city and countryside *vis-à-vis* inter-city migration may help to enlighten the nature of early modern urbanization. Was the growth of large cities provoked by the influx from the countryside or it was rather a symptom of an extensive population redistribution between small and sizeable urban centres? A comparative survey based on registers of new burghers basically suggests that immigration from the countryside generally retained its local or regional character. Usually new town dwellers moved to the city from adjacent feudal domains or from the rural hinterland of the city. Conversely, long-distance migrants usually originated in an urban milieu. Let us investigate the changeable proportion between countryside and urban immigrants into Old Warsaw. As stated above, while still dominant in the 16th century, regional immigration into the city dropped considerably in the later period in comparison with long-distance population movements. Shifts in urban functions had basically the same effect on the relationship between rural and urban immigration. Until the 1570s burghers coming from the countryside still formed about 50% of all applicants for citizenship, but in subsequent decades their share steadily decreased. While in the first quarter of the 17th century this group covered roughly one third of all new burghers, by 1700 its proportion was oscillating around 7%.⁷⁸ Similar trends have been detected by A. Kubinyi for the agglomeration of Buda (Buda, Pest, Óbuda) before 1526. Compared to rather parochial Óbuda, the residential and economic gravity of Buda was mirrored in the overtly different social background of its citizens. While the majority of the new burghers of Buda and Pest came from towns, Óbuda, due to markedly lower living costs, sucked in population rather from the countryside or from urban settlements of local significance. Correspondingly, Óbuda witnessed much stronger regional immigration than Buda and Pest.⁷⁹

Percentage of new burghers coming from towns and the countryside, selected Polish cities

(Only records including the origin of the migrant considered)

Table 5

CITY	new burghers coming from the countryside (%)	new burghers coming from cities (%)
Kraków (1601-1700)	cca 12	cca 88
Lublin (1605–1626)	cca 15	cca 85
Lwów (1496–1570)	cca 19.6	cca 80.4
Danzig (1558–1709)	cca 28.5	cca 71.5
Przemyśl (1541-1664)	cca 29.6	cca 70.4
Poznań (1576–1600)	cca 32.4	cca 67.6
Biecz (1538 -1688)	cca 41.2	cca 58.8
Bochnia	cca 66	cca 34

The data shown in **Table 5** imply the higher significance of rural immigration to small and medium-sized urban settlements rather than to Polish hubs of commerce and large residential centres. This schema certainly did not apply in all cases, as the relationship between rural and urban immigration depended greatly on the regional density of the urban network or the attitudes of feudal lords towards the mobility of their subjects. The importance of variables becomes most overt when Lwów, the commercial hub of Red Ruthenia, and the small, largely agricultural town of Vodňany in southern Bohemia are compared, as the proportion between two social groups of new burghers proved very similar in both cities.⁸⁰ Yet in general one may assume that the more intimate economic ties between small towns and the countryside, as well as comparable rhythms of life, channeled rural immigration rather to local urban settlements. Another factor, that of living costs, mattered as well, since the inexpensive milieu of the small town was more favourable for usually less affluent countryside migrants aiming to acquire citizenship. This presupposition, which remains to be verified or rebutted by more comprehensive investigation, seems to be supported by the small-scale analysis of regional urban migration in Red Ruthenia and Lesser Poland.

*Regional urban migration: migratory flows between Lwów (Red Ruthenia) and three
medium-sized towns in Lesser Poland*

Table 6

MIGRATION FROM:	to Lwów	to Przemyśl	to Bochnia	to Biecz
Lwów		30 (1540-1629)	7 (1531-1656)	10 (1538-1688)
Przemyśl	48 (1496-1604)		2 (1531-1656)	5 (1538-1688)
Bochnia	less than 16 (1496-1604)	6 (1541-1664)		X
Biecz	28 (1496-1604)	X	11 (1531-1656)	

By covering the social mobility between the Ruthenian metropolis (Lwów) and three medium-sized towns **Table 6** suggests that it was Lwów sucking the population from Przemyśl, Bochnia, and Biecz, while reverse migratory flows, from Lwów to Lesser Polish urban settlements, proved much less intensive. Given that in all three local centres newcomers from the countryside formed a remarkably strong segment of the burghership (**Table 5**), dominant population movements on the axis countryside - local or regional urban centre - large city appear much likely. Though the narrative value of this scrutiny is limited by its geographical scope and by the nature of its sources, it raises a question about the rhythms and dimensions of urbanization in the 16th-17th centuries. If only one aspect is considered, namely social mobility between countryside and towns, then a systematic survey of migratory flows will test our hypothesis, which is that the main targets of early modern urbanization were local urban settlements, while the dynamic growth of large centres was rather based on inter-city population transfers.

Conclusion

This study, by focusing on the full-right stratum of city populations, was concerned with a macroanalysis of 16th-17th century urban in-migration in East-Central Europe. To sum up, let us briefly discuss its major outcomes and suggest some directions of future research.

1) As a quantitative survey of early modern migration requires a great number of typologically uniform sources, registers of new burghers are of vital importance. Moreover, they also cover socially the most stable and, from the demographic point of view, the most important segment of the urban population. The one-sided focus on full-right town dwellers, however, raises a following question: Would long-term models of burgher in-migration, manifested by the attached diagrams, also apply to unprivileged urban strata not speaking on poor migrants? Until now there has been no large-scale investigation of abundant alternative sources (books of wedding contracts, parish registers, guild records). Given that immigration of burghers was subject to a whole range of variables that might have caused serious fluctuations in the number of admitted citizens, the data presented in this study may or may not reflect general trends and models of urban immigration. A survey based on alternative sources would, therefore, resolve to what degree one may actually speak on the universality of migratory patterns across the social spectrum of urban inhabitants.

2) With reference to foreign immigration, besides the Holy Roman Empire it was three regions that supplied East-Central Europe with newcomers, namely the Low Countries, British Isles and Italian speaking territories. In this context, the study has briefly examined the integration of foreigners with different cultural and religious backgrounds into „domestic“ urban milieu and it raised a set of issues that were, until now, studied rather unsystematically by urban historians. Among them migration stimuli or career chances of immigrants are of significance. The opposite perspective, namely changes within domestic urban societies that were generated by foreign immigration, also deserves particular attention. Because of the substantial numbers of new burghers coming from remote European territories, one can make a tentative conclusion that the inner integrity of urban society, still medieval in its nature, was challenged by the influx of inhabitants with different cultural and sometimes also religious background. True, when accepting the burghership, new citizens obliged themselves to act in the common interest by sharing both imposed duties and ample corporate privileges. The

oath of citizenship, therefore, served as the important unifying factor, whose principal goal was to stress the republican and egalitarian nature of urban community. Despite this, foreign immigrants contributed substantially to the rise of ethnical, cultural or confessional frontiers within urban societies. In fact, early modern urban space was far from being a perfect melting pot in which nationalities and social groups would be fully amalgamated. There is an abundant evidence that elsewhere foreigners, if in sufficient numbers, tended to create enclaves with semi-autonomous status. Apart from the exceptional case of Jewish burghers, it was the Armenians in Polish and Lithuanian towns that enjoyed a high degree of self-governance. Mostly, however, the collective endeavour of foreign minorities focused just on the creation of basic organizational platforms, namely churches, religious fraternities and schools without further aspirations to far-reaching political and administrative self-governing rights. Yet still, these institutions were embodiments of centrifugal rather than centripetal forces and under specific circumstances they might have been responsible for confessional and cultural fragmentation of urban population as was, for example, the case of Prague's Rudolphine society by 1600. Given the size of expatriate Italian, Dutch, English or Scottish burgher communities one should investigate to what extent the rising religious, cultural and ethnical diversity of the urban societies might have undermined their capacity to reach a fundamental consensus on matters of gravity and to act as the legal entity.

The author is lecturer in early modern history, Palacký University, Olomouc, the Czech Republic

¹ This theory, to be found in numerous historical studies, has been subject to vehement criticism by some scholars. Allan Sharlin, for instance, has tried to demonstrate that immigrants were mostly responsible for the excessive number of deaths. As many of them belonged to the pauper segments of urban society, they often remained childless and unmarried. In consequence, they received no credit for births in the city and their names appeared only in the death registers. See Allan Sharlin, "Natural Decrease in Early Modern Cities: A Reconsideration", *Past and Present* 79 (1978), 126–138. Some theoretical aspects of early modern urban migration have been discussed by Jan de Vries, *European Urbanization 1500–1800* (London, 1984), 179–200; Paul M. Hohenberg – Lynn Hollen Lees, *The Making of Urban Europe 1000–1994* (Cambridge / Massachusetts – London, 1995), 85–98; Etienne Francois, ed., *Immigration et société urbaine en Europe occidentale, XVIe–XXe siècle* (Paris, 1985); Gerhard Jaritz and Albert Müller, eds., *Migration in der Feudalgesellschaft* (Frankfurt am Main – New York, 1988). See also some case studies by Steve Hochstadt, "Migration in Preindustrial Germany", *Central European History* 16/3 (1983), 195–224; Christopher R. Friedrichs, *Urban Society in an Age*

of War: Nördlingen, 1580 – 1720 (New Jersey, 1979), 45–64. Idem., *The Early Modern City 1450–1750* (London – New York, 1995), 114–135. Heinz Schilling, „Niederländische Exulanten im 16. Jahrhundert“, *Schriften des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte* 187 (1972), 1 – 200.

² Maria Bogucka, „Warszawa w latach 1526–1720” (Warsaw in years 1526 – 1720) in *Warszawa w latach 1526–1795* (Warsaw in years 1526 – 1795), ed. A. Zahorski (Warsaw, 1984), 187.

³ Zemský archiv Opava – pobočka Olomouc (Land Archive Opava, branch Olomouc), *Lenní dvůr Kroměříž* (Feudal Court Kroměříž), *Knihy* (Books), shelfmarks 23, 24, 38.

⁴ Zoltán Fallenbüchl, „Pest város népességének származáshelyei a statisztika és a kartográfia tükrében (1687–1770)”, *Tanulmányok Budapest múltjából* 15 (1963), 239–287. Petr Vorel, *Dějiny města Přelouče* (History of Přelouč) I, (Přelouč, 1999), 81–85. Jaroslava Mendelová, „Obyvatelé Nového města pražského na přelomu let 1585 a 1586” (Inhabitants of Prague’s New Town between 1585 and 1586), *Documenta pragensia* (Prague Documents) XIX (2001), 81–84.

⁵ Hans Jockisch (ed.), *Das Bürgerbuch von Birnbaum 1668–1853* (Marburg/Lahn, 1982), 1–21.

⁶ A comparative approach has been applied, for instance, by Hanno Vasarhelyi, "Einwanderung nach Nördlingen, Esslingen und Schwäbisch Hall zwischen 1450 und 1550", in *Stadt und Umland*, ed. Erich Maschke and Jürgen Sydow (Stuttgart, 1974), 129-165. Franz Mathis, *Zur Bevölkerungsstruktur österreichischer Städte im 17. Jahrhundert* (Vienna, 1977). More recently see Hochstadt, "Migration in Preindustrial Germany", 195-224.

⁷ This is arguably the case of otherwise excellent study by Stanislaw Gierszewski, *Obywatele miast Polski przedbiorowej* (Urban population in pre-partitioned Poland) (Warszawa, 1973). In some of his conclusions the author clearly tends to identify the „burgher“ immigration with „urban“ immigration.

⁸ Among many examples perhaps the most instructive was the case of Václav Nešpor, who studied the burgher immigration into Olomouc. Accused by the Protectorate magistrates of the misinterpretation of the source with the aim to dispute the German nature of the city, he was obliged to leave the study unfinished. After several decades Nešpor’s research was accomplished by Vladimír Spáčil. Václav Nešpor, „Matriky měšťanů olomouckých od r. 1668 do r. 1915“ (Olomouc burgher registers, 1668 to 1915), *Časopis vlasteneckého spolku musejního v Olomouci* 50 (1937), appendix 1 – 8, (1938), 99 – 106, (1939), 109 – 116, (1940), 119 – 126, (1941), 163 – 170;

⁹ Budapest Főváros levéltára (hereafter FövL) (Budapest City Archive), Pest Levéltára, Buda Levéltára (hereafter PL, BL) (Pest Archive, Buda Archive), *Matricula civium*.

¹⁰ Státní okresní archiv Česká Lípa, (State District Archive Česká Lípa), *MěÚ Česká Lípa*, no. 41, shelfmark reg. 89/1 K1.

¹¹ Gierszewski, *Obywatele miast Polski przedbiorowej*, 77.

¹² Denominations of immigrants were recorded more systematically from the mid-18th century. As a whole, between 1687 and 1848 Catholics in Pest represented 86% and in Buda (1686–1848) even 89% of all immigrants whose confession is known. Protestants or Greek Catholics formed an insignificant minority; FövL, PL, BL, *Matricula Civium*.

¹³ Archiwum Państwowe Przemyśl (State Archive Przemyśl), *Cathalogus civium civitatis Praemisiensis ius civile acceptantium* (**Register of burghers granted citizenship of the city of Przemyśl**), no. 429. Also Kazimierz Arłamowski, „Przyjęcia do prawa miejskiego w Przemyślu w latach 1541–1664” (Admittance to burghership in Przemyśl 1541 – 1664), *Sprawozdanie dyrekcji państwowego gimnazjum II*, (Przemyśl, 1931), 10. Aleksy Gilewicz, *Przyjęcia do prawa miejskiego we Lwowie w latach 1405–1604*, (Admittance to burghership in Lwów 1405 – 1604) (Lwów, 1931), 411–412.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 411.

¹⁵ Státní okresní archiv Olomouc (State District Archive Olomouc), *AMO, Listiny* (Charters), no. 1355.

¹⁶ Václav Nešpor, „Matriky měšťanů olomouckých od r. 1668 do r. 1915”, appendix, 7.

¹⁷ Maria Bogucka and Henryk Samsonowicz, *Dzieje miast i mieszczaństwa w Polsce przedbiorowej* (History of cities and urban society in pre-partitioned Poland) (Wrocław – Warszawa – Kraków – Gdańsk – Łódź, 1986), 474 – 475.

¹⁸ Archiwum państwowe Kraków, oddział Bochnia (State Archive Kraków in Bochnia), *Akta miasta Bochni*, ASB 71. Feliks Kiryk, ed., *Księga przyjęć do prawa miejskiego w Bochni 1531–1656* (Register of admittance to burghership in Bochnia 1531 - 1656) (Wrocław – Warszawa – Kraków – Gdańsk, 1979), 13–15.

¹⁹ Gilewicz, *Przyjęcia do prawa miejskiego we Lwowie w latach 1405–1604*, 412.

²⁰ See Jerzy Topolski, “On the Role of the Jews in the Urbanization of Poland in the Early Modern Period”, in *The Jews in Poland*, ed. Andrzej K. Paluch, I, (Kraków, 1992), 45–50.

²¹ Státní okresní archiv Žďár nad Sázavou (State District Archive Žďár nad Sázavou), Archiv města Velké Meziříčí, no. 8, fol. 3b – 11b.

²² Josef Strnad, ed., *M. Šimona Plachého z Třebnice Paměti Plzeňské* (Pilsen memoirs by Master Šimon Plachý of Třebnice) (Plzeň, 1888), 93–94.

²³ Josef Kliment, “Státní občanství a národnost v českém právu do Bílé Hory” (Citizenship and nationality in Bohemian law until the White Mountain), in *Sborník prací z dějin práva československého*, ed. Jan Kapras, I (Prague, 1930), 55. Also Josef Macek, *Jagellonský věk v českých zemích* (Jagellonian age in the Bohemian Lands), 4, (Prague, 1999), 178.

²⁴ Zikmund Winter, *Řemeslnictvo a živnosti XVI. věku v Čechách (1526–1620)* (Craftsmen and crafts in the 16th century Bohemia 1526 - 1620) (Prague, 1909), 21–25. Most recently Olga Fejtová, “Das Verhältnis zwischen Nationalitäten in den Prager Städten an der Wende vom 16. zum 17. Jahrhundert”, *Berichte und Beiträge des GWZO* (1999), 52.

²⁵ Anna Biegańska, “A Note on the Scots in Poland, 1550–1800”, in *Scotland and Europe 1200–1850*, ed. T. C. Smout (Edinburgh, 1986), 157–165.

²⁶ The Uherské Hradiště city books cover just the period 1684–1691. After this date records continue from 1706. Státní okresní archiv Uherské Hradiště (State District Archive Uherské Hradiště), AM UH no. 410.

²⁷ In all cities under review approximately one third of new burghers were native town dwellers. Data on burgher immigration are based on primary sources from following archives: Főváros Levéltára, Budapest [Budapest City Archive], Pl, Bl, *Matricula Civium*, 1686/7 – 1848; Archiv města Bratislavy [Bratislava City Archive], *Bürger Buch der Stadt Preßburg ab Anno 1630 bis 1683*, 2 el; Archiv města Košic [Košice City Archive], *Liber Neo-Concivium*, H III/2 civ 1; Stadtarchiv Bautzen, *Rats-Protocolle*, shelfmark 1-31. The listed data may not be fully complete as no city book recording new burghers was preserved in Bautzen. See also unpublished *Bürgerrechtserwerb 1599-1700* provisionally elaborated by city archivist Willi Mendel who relied on *Rats-protocolle* and *Kammer-Register*; Štátny oblastný archiv Prešov [State Regional Archive Prešov], *Magistrát mesta Prešova – Knihy*, 2118; Štátny oblastný archiv Levoča [State Regional Archive Levoča], *Bürgerrechtsbuch*, MML XXI, no. 49; Státní okresní archiv Náchod [State District Archive Náchod], AM Broumov, *Bürgerrechtbuch*, shelfmark 347, no. 261/C1; Archiwum państwowe Kraków, oddział Bochnia [Kraków State Archive in Bochnia], *Akta miasta Bochni*, ASB 71; Archiwum państwowe Przemysł, [State Archive Przemysł] *Catalogus civium civitatis Praemisliensis ius civile acceptantium*, no. 429; Státní okresní archiv Česká Lípa [State District Archive Česká Lípa], MěÚ Česká Lípa, sign. reg. 89/1 K1, inv. no. 41; Státní okresní archiv Rakovník [State District Archive Rakovník], Archiv města Rakovníka, *Matrika civitatis Raconae*, no. 27, fol. 1a – 42a and no. 8; Státní okresní archiv Strakonice [State District Archive Strakonice], Archiv města Vodňan, *Kniha smluv svadebních*, sign. AM VOD 76; Státní okresní archiv Žďár nad Sázavou [State District Archive Žďár nad Sázavou], Archiv města Velké Meziříčí, no. 8, fol. 3b – 11b. As for the edited sources see Gierszewski, *Obywatele miast Polski przedrozbiorowej*, 18 – 60; Hedwig Penners – Ellwart, ed., *Die Danziger Bürgerschaft nach Beruf, Herkunft und Volkszugehörigkeit 1539 – 1709* (Marburg/Lahn, 1954); Václav Líva, “Kolik obyvatelů měla Praha před třicetiletou válkou a po ní” (How many inhabitants had Prague before and after Thirty Year’s War) *Český časopis historický* 42 (1936), 332–347; also the recent study by Eva Semotanová, “Knihy měšťanských práv – významný pramen předstátnického období (Příspěvek ke studiu přistěhovalectví do měst pražských v letech 1618–1770)” (Burgher registers – an important source of pre-statistical period: Contribution to study of immigration into Prague 1618 – 1770) *Historická demografie* 10 (1986), 73–115; Jan Małecki, *Studia nad rynkiem regionalnym Krakowa w XVI wieku* (Study on the Kraków regional market in the 16th century) (Warsaw, 1963), 21; Bogucka and Samsonowicz, *Dzieje miast i mieszczaństwa w Polsce przedrozbiorowej*, 387 – 392; *Codex diplomaticus Lusatiae superioris*, V (Görlitz, 1928); Albert Eberhard Stange, ed., „Görlitzer Bürgerrechte von 1601 – 1676“ *Oberlausitzer Sippenkundliche Beiträge* 1, (1937), 34 – 83; Václav Nešpor, „Matriky měšťanů olomouckých od r. 1668 do r. 1915“ (1937), appendix 1 – 8, (1938), 99 – 106, (1939), 109 – 116, (1940), 119 – 126, (1941), 163 – 170; Vladimír Spáčil, „Matriky olomouckých měšťanů od r. 1668 do r. 1915“ (Registers of Olomouc burghers, 1668 – 1915), *Okresní archiv v Olomouci*, (1973), 51 – 58, (1974), 66 – 72, (1975), 79 – 84, (1976), 79 – 88, (1977), 129 – 132, (1978), 133 – 140, (1979), 116 – 119; Jaroslav Marek, “O studiu městského přistěhovalectví” (On study of urban immigration), *Sborník Matice moravské* 79 (1960), 86–111; Aleksy Gilewicz, “Przyjęcia do prawa miejskiego we Lwowie w latach 1405–1604”, 375–414; Tadeusz Slawski, „Studia nad ludnością Biecz w wiekach XIV. – XVII.“ (Study of the population of Biecz in the XIV – XVII centuries), *Malopolskie studia historyczne* 3 – 4 (1958), 21 – 66; Jerzy Sadownik, *Przyjęcia do prawa miejskiego w Lublinie w XVII wieku* (Admittance to burghership in Lublin in the XVII century) (Lublin: 1938), 51 – 53; *Historia Polski w liczbach* (Główny urząd statystyczny, Warsaw, 1993), 47; Anton Altrichter – Helmut Altrichter, “Die Iglauer Neubürger 1360–1649 nach Beruf, Herkunft und Volkszugehörigkeit” *Zeitschrift für Sudetendeutsche Geschichte* 2 (1938), 91–112; R. Toepen, “Das Bürgerbuch der Stadt Marienburg”, *Altpreuussische Monatsschrift* 38 (1901), 192–220; Stephan Gerhard, ed., “Kamenzer Bürgerbuch 1570–1744”, *Flugschriften für Familiengeschichte* 14 (1929), 1–96; Otto Staudinger, ed., *Löbauer Bürgerbuch von 1648 bis 1847*, (Görlitz, 1939); Feliks Kiryk, ed., *Księga przyjęć do prawa miejskiego w Bochni, 1531 – 1656*, Marie Marečková, “Řemeslná výroba Bardějova a Prešova v prvé polovině 17. století” (Craft production in Bardejov and Prešov) *Československý časopis historický* 1 (1976), 91–121; Kazimierz Arłamowski, *Przyjęcia do prawa miejskiego w Przemysłu w latach 1541–1664*, 1–31; Rudolf Wenisch, “Saazer Neubürger (1571–1726)”, in: *Sudetendeutsche Familienforschung* 8–9 (1936–1937), 15–18, 53–57, 97–100, 131–134; 17–20, 56–58, 93–95; Hans Jockisch, ed., *Das Bürgerbuch von Birnbaum*

1668–1853, (Marburg/Lahn, 1982), 1–21; Joseph Blumer, “Die Bürgerrechtsverleihungen in Brüx von 1578 bis 1680”, *Mitteilungen des Vereines für Geschichte der Deutschen in Böhmen* 69 (1931) 273–312; Miloslav Bělohávek, “Plzeň – obraz města předbělohorské doby” (Pilsen – the picture of the city in the pre-White Mountain period), *Folia Historica Bohemica* 15 (1991), 101–135; Josef Hofmann, “Hundert Jahre Bürgerzuwachs durch Einwanderung in Kaaden (1595–1694)”, *Sudetendeutsche Familienforschung* 3 (1930–1931), 23–26, 68–70, 156–159; Granasztói György, “Bécsles Sopron XVI - XVII. Századi lelekszámara”, *Történelmi Szemle* 3 (1970), 316 and 323; Jenő Házi, *Soproni polgárcsaládok 1535 -1848* (Sopron burgher families) (Budapest, 1982), 7-8; Petr Mužík, ed., “Knihy domážlických měšťanů” (Domažlice burgher register), *Okresní archiv Domažlice – Výroční zpráva IX* (1986), 73 – 109.

²⁸ No records for the years 1571, 1574, 1594, 1595, 1634 – 1639, 1643, 1647.

²⁹ No records for the years 1625, 1632, 1640, 1658, 1666.

³⁰ See slightly different numbers suggested by Josef Janáček, *Dějiny obchodu v předbělohorské Praze* (History of commerce in pre-White Mountain Prague) (Prague, 1955), 345; Marek, “O studiu městského přistěhovalectví”, 92–93; also see Semotanová, “Knihy měšťanských práv – významný pramen předstatického období (Příspěvek ke studiu přistěhovalectví do měst pražských v letech 1618–1770)”, 99.

³¹ Małecki, *Studia nad rynkiem regionalnym Krakowa w XVI wieku*, 21; Gierszewski, *Obywatele miast Polski przedbiorowej*, 118. For Kraków economic stagnation see Janina Bieniarzówna – Jan M. Małecki, *Dzieje Krakowa* (A history of Cracow) 2, (Kraków, 1994), 9–38; Bogucka – Samsonowicz, *Dzieje miast i mieszczaństwa w Polsce przedbiorowej*, 392.

³² *Ibid.*, 392; Gierszewski, *Obywatele miast Polski przedbiorowej*, 18; *Historia Polski w liczbach* (History of Poland in numbers) (Warsaw, 1993), 47.

³³ Domokos Kosáry – Lajos Nagy, eds., *Budapest története* (History of Budapest) III, (Budapest, 1975), 130–135.

³⁴ Marek, “O studiu městského přistěhovalectví”, 86–111.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 94 – 95.

³⁶ This hypothesis has been raised, for instance by Jaroslav Marek, *Ibid.*, 94–95. The issue has recently been touched on by Petr Vorel, *Rezidenční vrchnostenská města v Čechách a na Moravě v 15.–17. století* (Residential private towns in Bohemia and Moravia in 15th – 17th centuries) (Pardubice, 2001), 178.

³⁷ Marečková, “Řemeslná výroba Bardějova a Prešova v první polovině 17. století”, 94–98.

³⁸ Gierszewski, *Obywatele miast Polski przedbiorowej*, 55; Semotanová, “Knihy měšťanských práv – významný pramen předstatického období (Příspěvek ke studiu přistěhovalectví do měst pražských v letech 1618–1770)”, 99.

³⁹ Fövl, PL, BL, *Matricula Civium*; Fallenbüchl, “Pest város népességének származáshelyei a statisztika és a kartográfia tükrében (1687–1770)”, 243–267.

⁴⁰ For the economic and demographic upsurge of Danzig see Baszanowski, *Przemiany demograficzne w Gdańsku w latach 1601–1846*, 132–134; Edmund Cieślak – Czesław Biernat, *History of Gdańsk* (Gdańsk, 1995), 109–129.

⁴¹ Małecki, *Studia nad rynkiem regionalnym Krakowa w XVI wieku*, 20–29.

⁴² Immigration into Vodňany or Kadaň followed similar trends as in other cities.

⁴³ For Bohemian and Moravian exile see most recently Ivan Mrva, “Uhorsko, azylová krajina v období novoveku” (Hungary, the asylum country in modern period), *Česko-slovenská historická ročenka* 1999, 17–26; Marie Marečková, “K náboženským exulantům z českých zemí ve východoslovenských městech raného novověku” (On religious refugees from Bohemian lands in early modern eastern Slovakian towns), *Ibid.*, 49–50; Josef Macůrek, *České země a Slovensko (1620 – 1750)* (Czech lands and Slovakia 1620 – 1750) (Brno, 1969), 39 – 68.

⁴⁴ According to official records kept by Saxon magistrates, the city of Pirna, with about 4000 inhabitants, hosted in 1629 more than 2100 emigrants from Bohemia, in 1631 almost 2000, and still five years later about 1600. See Lenka Bobková, *Exulanti z Prahy a severozápadních Čech v Pirně v letech 1621–1639* (Religious refugees from Prague and northwestern Bohemia in Pirna, 1621 – 1639) (Prague, 1999), xxiv, xxxix.

⁴⁵ Stange, ed., „Görlitzer Bürgerrechte von 1601 – 1676“, 34 – 83.

⁴⁶ For more on the depopulation of Polish cities after the mid-17th century see Bogucka–Samsonowicz, *Dzieje miast i mieszczaństwa w Polsce przedbiorowej*, 340–345.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 387.

⁴⁸ The rise of Warsaw was glorified in the description of Mazovia from 1634 by Jędrzej Swięcicki. See Stanisław Pazyra, *Najstarszy opis Mazowsza Jędrzeja Swięcickiego* (The oldest description of Mazovia by Jędrzej Swięcicki) (Warsaw, 1974), 147–148. More recently Maria Bogucka, “Między stolicą, miastem rezydencjonalnym i metropolią. Rozwój Warszawy w XVI–XVII w.” (Between capital, residential town and metropolis. Development of Warsaw in XVI – XVII centuries), *Rocznik Warszawski* 23 (1994), 173–186; Idem, “Krakau – Warschau – Danzig. Funktionen und Wandel von Metropolen 1450–1650”, in *Metropolen im Wandel*, eds. Evamaria Engel – Karen Lambrecht – Hanna Nogossek, (Berlin, 1995), 71–91. Mariusz

Karpowicz, "Das königliche Schloß in Warschau (1597–1619). Der erste Schritt zur Metropole", in *Ibid.*, 109–114; Maria Bogucka, "Between Capital, Residential Town and Metropolis: the Development of Warsaw in the Sixteenth to Eighteenth Centuries", in *Capital Cities and their Hinterlands in Early Modern Europe*, eds. Peter Clark - Bernard Lepetit (Aldershot, 1996), 198–216; Maria Bogucka – Maria I. Kwiatkowska, *Warszawa w latach 1526–1795* (Warsaw in years 1526 – 1795) (Warsaw, 1984).

⁴⁹ W. Szaniawska, „Mieszkańcy Warszawy w latach 1525 – 1655” (Inhabitants of Warsaw in 1525 – 1655), *Rocznik Warszawski* 7 (1968), 123. The author also covered burghers of unknown origin. On the other hand, Gierszewski excluded this group. This explains the differences between data given by both scholars. See also Gierszewski, *Obywatele miast Polski przedrozbiorowej*, 131.

⁵⁰ Z. Fallenbüchl, „Pest város népességének származáshelyei a statisztika és a kartográfia tükrében (1687–1770)”, 278–284. Fövl, Pl, *Matricula Civium*.

⁵¹ In Danzig the origin of new burghers was recorded in 98.7% of cases; Lublin – 91.7%; Pest – 47.1%; Lwow – 85.8%; Prague – 83.8%; Old Warsaw – 88%; Olomouc – 76.1%. Local town dwellers, who usually formed about 20 – 30 % of new citizens are not included in the table. In Danzig, for example, new burghers who originated in the city made 28 % of all records. See Penners – Ellwart, *Die Danziger Bürgerschaft nach Beruf, Herkunft und Volkszugehörigkeit 1539 – 1709*, Table 1 in appendix; Gilewicz, “Przyjęcia do prawa miejskiego we Lwowie w latach 1405–1604”, 384; Semotanová, “Knihy měšťanských práv – významný pramen předstáveckého období (Příspěvek ke studiu přistěhovalectví do měst pražských v letech 1618–1770)”, 94–95; Fövl, Pl, *Matricula Civium*; Sadownik, *Przyjęcia do prawa miejskiego w Lublinie w XVII wieku*, 46–47; Gierszewski, *Obywatele miast Polski przedrozbiorowej*, 131; Nešpor, „Matriky měšťanů olomouckých od r. 1668 do r. 1915“, 99–106, 109–116, 119–126, 163–170. Though Silesia was part of the Bohemian Crown for much of the early modern age, population transfers from this territory are usually understood by Polish historians as migration within the boundaries of the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth. This caused the minor difference between data shown in Table 9 and statistical surveys by Polish scholars.

⁵² Semotanová, “Knihy měšťanských práv – významný pramen předstáveckého období (Příspěvek ke studiu přistěhovalectví do měst pražských v letech 1618–1770)”, 73 – 115; Penners – Ellwart, ed., *Die Danziger Bürgerschaft nach Beruf, Herkunft und Volkszugehörigkeit 1539 – 1709*; Sadownik, *Przyjęcia do prawa miejskiego w Lublinie w XVII wieku*, 51 – 53; Gilewicz, “Przyjęcia do prawa miejskiego we Lwowie w latach 1405–1604”, 375–414; Fövl, PL, BL, *Matricula Civium*.

⁵³ See Hana Jordánková – Ludmila Sulitková, “Etnická příslušnost a jazyková komunikace obyvatel Brna ve středověku a raném novověku” (Ethnic structure and language communication of Brno inhabitants), *Documenta pragensia* 19 (2001), 50; Jaroslav Pánek, “Italové, Nizozemci a Němci v rudolfínské Praze - některé formy a problémy soužití” (Italians, Dutch and Germans in Rudolphine Prague – some forms and problems of coexistence), *Ibid.*, 67–74. Two burghers from the Low Countries in Moravian Ivančice were identified by Jaroslav Marek, “O studiu městského přistěhovalectví”, 105. In Kraków between 1573–1602 Leszek Belzyt found 28 citizens of Dutch origin. See Leszek Belzyt, “Sprachlich–kulturelle Pluralität in Krakau um 1600”, *Zeitschrift für Ostmitteleuropa – Forschung* 47/1 (1998), 55.

⁵⁴ Schilling, „Niederländische Exulanten im 16. Jahrhundert“, 1 – 200.

⁵⁵ Penners – Ellwart, ed., *Die Danziger Bürgerschaft nach Beruf, Herkunft und Volkszugehörigkeit 1539 – 1709* Appendix, Table I.

⁵⁶ *Amsterdam Poerterbooken, 1559–1651*, courtesy of Oscar Gelderblom, University of Utrecht.

⁵⁷ M. van Tielhof, “Handel en politiek in de 16e eeuw: een Amsterdamse Oostzeehandelaar tijdens de eerste jaren van de Opstand”, in *Holland, regionaal-historisch tijdschrift* 29 (1997), 37–52.

⁵⁸ J. K. Fedorowicz, *England's Baltic trade in the early 17th century: A study in Anglo-Polish commercial diplomacy* (Cambridge, 1980), 55. Andrzej Groth, ed., *Historia Elbląga* (History of Elbląg) II/1, (Gdańsk, 1996), 28–29. Stanisław Gierszewski, *Elbląg: Przeszłość i terażniejszość* (Elbląg: Past and presence) (Gdańsk, 1988), 80–84. Penners - Ellwart, ed., *Die Danziger Bürgerschaft nach Beruf, Herkunft und Volkszugehörigkeit 1539 – 1709*, Table I in Appendix.

⁵⁹ Fynes Moryson, *An Itinerary* (Amsterdam – New York, 1971), facsimile edition from 1617, part III, book 3, chap. 4, 155.

⁶⁰ See T. C. Smout - N. C. Landsman - T. M. Devine, "Scottish Emigration in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries", in *Europeans on the Move*, ed. Nicholas Canny (Oxford, 1994), 76–112. Also A. Biegańska, „A Note on the Scots in Poland“, 157 – 165.

⁶⁰ Gilewicz, “Przyjęcia do prawa miejskiego we Lwowie w latach 1405–1604”, 406.

⁶¹ Smout – Landsman – Devine, "Scottish Emigration in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries", 81 – 82.

⁶² Gilewicz, “Przyjęcia do prawa miejskiego we Lwowie w latach 1405–1604”, 384 – 390; Penners - Ellwart, ed., *Die Danziger Bürgerschaft nach Beruf, Herkunft und Volkszugehörigkeit 1539 – 1709*, Appendix, Table I; Belzyt, “Sprachlich–kulturelle Pluralität in Krakau um 1600”, 55.

⁶³ Smout - Landsman - Devine, "Scottish Emigration in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries", 76–112.

⁶⁴ Gilewicz, “Przyjęcia do prawa miejskiego we Lwowie w latach 1405–1604”, 406.

- ⁶⁵ Ludmila Sulitková, "Italové v Brně v předbělohorském období" (Italians in Brno in the pre-White Mountain period), in *Cramars – Furlánští a italští obchodníci v Českých zemích* (Cramars – Furlan and Italian merchants in the Czech Lands), ed. Giorgio Cadorini, 1 (Prague, 1999), 62.
- ⁶⁶ Jozef Kočiš – Slavko Churý, *Bytča 1378–1978* (Bytča 1378 – 1978) (Martin 1978), 63; Jozef Kočiš, *Bytčianský zámok* (Bytča palace) (Martin, 1974), 39–41.
- ⁶⁷ Slawski, „Studia nad ludnością Biecza w wiekach XIV. – XVII.“, 61–63.
- ⁶⁸ Mužik, ed., „Knihy domážlických měšťanů“, 81.
- ⁶⁹ András Kubinyi, "Die Stadte Ofen und Pest und der Fernhandel am Ende des 15. und am Anfang des 16. Jahrhunderts", in *Der Aussenhandel Ostmitteleuropas, 1450-1650*, ed. Ingomar Bog (Cologne/Vienna, 1971), 342-433. Also Idem., „Der königliche Hof als Integrationszentrum Ungarns von der Mitte des 15. bis zum ersten Drittel des 16. Jahrhunderts und sein Einfluß auf die städtische Entwicklung Budas“, in *Metropolen im Wandel*, eds., Evamaria Engel – Karen Lambrecht – Hanna Nogossek (Berlin, 1995), 154.
- ⁷⁰ FövL, PL, BL, *Matricula Civium*; Fallenbüchl, "Pest város népességének származáshelyei a statisztika és a kartográfia tükrében (1687–1770)", 278-284.
- ⁷¹ Danuta Quirini – Poplawska, "Die italienischen Einwanderer in Krakow und ihr Einfluss auf die polnischen Wirtschaftsbeziehungen zu österreichischen und deutschen Städten im 16. Jahrhundert", in *Europäische Stadtgeschichte in Mittelalter und früher Neuzeit*, ed. Werner Magdefrau (Weimar, 1979), 114–129. For Prague see Josef Janáček, "Italové v předbělohorské Praze (1526–1620)" (Italians in pre-White Mountain Prague), *Pražský sborník historický* XVI (1983), 77–118.
- ⁷² Bieniarzówna and Małecki, *Dzieje Krakowa 2, 73–74*. Janina Bieniarzówna, *Mieszczanstwo krakowskie XVII w.* (Kraków burghers in the 17th century) (Krakow, 1969), 32.
- ⁷³ For further information see Janáček, "Italové v předbělohorské Praze (1526–1620)", 77–118.
- ⁷⁴ Katarzyna Targosz, *Hieronym Pinocci. Studium z dziejów kultury naukowej w Polsce w XVII wieku* (Wrocław, 1967), 9–11.
- ⁷⁵ Lezsek Belzyt, "Grupy etniczne w Krakowie okolo roku 1600. Próba opisu topograficznego" (Ethnic groups in Kraków by 1600. An attempt of topographic description) *Studia historyczne* 40/4 (1997), 465–485. According to Janina Bieniarzówna, out of 139 Italians who were granted Krakow citizenship in the 17th century, 21 acted at least once as municipal councillors. See Bieniarzówna, *Mieszczanstwo krakowskie XVII w.*, 32.
- ⁷⁶ Jaroslav Douša, "Seznamy staroměstských konšelů z let 1547–1650", (Registers of Old Town concillors in 1547 – 1650) *Pražský sborník historický* 14 (1981), 65–119; Jaroslava Mendelová, "Rada Nového města pražského v letech 1600–1650", (Prague's New Town Council in 1600 / 1650) *Pražský sborník historický* 29 (1996), 84.
- ⁷⁷ Janáček, "Italové v předbělohorské Praze (1526–1620)", 110.
- ⁷⁸ Gierszewski, *Obywatele miast Polski przedrozbirowej*, 101-102.
- ⁷⁹ Kubinyi, *Budapest története* II, 135-137.
- ⁸⁰ SokA Strakonice, *AM Vod 76, no. 464, fol. 2r - 27r*. Burghers with recorded origin covered 73% of all applicants for Vodňany citizenship.