

Methodological Issues Concerning the Study of Armigerous Burghers: The Example of Brno in the Network of the Lands of the Crown of Bohemia in the Late Middle Ages and Early Modern Period

Ludmila Sulitková 

ABSTRACT

Using the example of Brno, one of the leading royal cities in Moravia (as one of the lands of the Czech Crown), the author outlines methodological issues related to the study of the so-called heraldic burghers. In towns located on the territory of Bohemia, Moravia and Bohemian Silesia, they constituted a kind of transitional group between the townspeople and nobility, based on a royal privilege granting them a coat of arms, occasionally supplemented with an actual ennoblement. However, admission to lower nobility was conditioned by acceptance from the relevant noble community. Most of the privileged burghers thus preferred to live in the city, making their living by practicing occupations typical of the urban environment. For her study, the author uses sources of Brno provenance for the early modern period, when this class of burghers was created in connection with the so-called closing of the noble estates, as well as sources of provincial provenance previously processed in thorough editions and monographs. The urban sources include not only written materials, but also preserved burgher epitaphs and possibly also burgher seals. The author pays particular attention to the social and professional composition of the armorial burghers, their share in the city administration and, last but not least, to the creation and inheritance of their coats of arms.

KEYWORDS: Brno, burghers, cities, privileges, administration

Declaration on Possible Conflicts of Interest

The author has declared that no conflicts of interest exist.

Funding Statement

The author received no specific funding for this work.

Doc. PhDr. Ludmila Sulitková, CSc., Jan Evangelista Purkyně University in Ústí nad Labem, ludmila.sulitkova@seznam.cz, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7887-7457>

Methodological Issues Concerning the Study of Armigerous Burghers: The Example of Brno in the Network of the Lands of the Crown of Bohemia in the Late Middle Ages and Early Modern Period – ZfO / JECES 72/2023/4

(received 2023-01-13, accepted 2023-03-30)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.25627/202372411425> – eISSN 2701-0449, ISSN 0948-8294



In order to understand the scope of this study, it is first of all necessary to take into account the extremely dense network of towns on the territory of the Czech lands (Bohemia, Moravia and today's so-called Czech Silesia), which has been forming since the early decades of the thirteenth century.¹ The relative size of the urban population is understandably related to this, however, the royal cities were only recognized as the "fourth" estate as a result of the democratizing tendencies of the Hussite revolution before the middle of the fifteenth century. The notion of the so-called heraldic burghers as a "transitional" group within the fully privileged population of municipalities (both royal and seignorial) developed in the Czech lands in the early modern period under basically the same conditions as in the western part of the Habsburg monarchy (later the so-called Cisleithania)—i.e., also in countries on the territory of today's Austria—and in the broader context of limiting the access to the knighthood (*Ritterstand*).² For all these countries, we not only have access to records of royal privileges granted to individuals,³ but also official books of the provincial authorities containing records of their landed property, or, in the case of the Czech lands, the official *Salbücher* (Czech: *salbuchy*),⁴ books kept by the central Bohemian Royal Chancellery

¹ This is an updated version of the essay: LUDMILA SULITKOVÁ: K metodologickým otázkám studia erbovních měšťanů [Methodological Issues Concerning the Study of Armigerous Families], in: VLADIMÍR RÁBIK (ed.): *Litteris ac moribus imbutus*, Trnava 2014, pp. 319–333.

² In difference to Austria, in the Czech Lands there isn't such type of royal privilege (*Wappenbrief*), which ensured the right of the recipient to hereditary use of the coat of arms, but did not indicate its "ennoblement." Instead, the privilege of coats of arms always indicated belonging to the "nobility," although not in the narrow sense of the specific estate affiliation. See TOMÁŠ STERNECK, ROBERT ŠIMŮNEK: Der böhmische und mährische Niederadel im Spätmittelalter und in der Frühen Neuzeit: Seine sozialen, politischen und kulturellen Hintergründe, in: LEONHARD HELTEN, ANKE NEUGEBAUER et al. (eds.): *Niederadlige Herrschaftskulturen: Legitimationen—Repräsentationen—Strategien*, Halle (Saale) 2021, pp. 39–72, here pp. 52–54, with appeals to JÜRGEN ARNDT: Die Entwicklung der Wappenbriefe von 1350 bis 1806 unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Palatinatswappenbriefe, in: *Der Herold*, Neue Folge 7 (1969/1971), pp. 161–193.

³ JAN ŽUPANIČ, MICHAL FIALA, PAVEL KOBLASA: *Šlechtický archiv c. k. ministerstva vnitra: Erbovní listiny* [Nobility Archives of the Imperial and Royal Ministry of Interior: Heraldic Deeds], Praha 2014; TOMÁŠ KREJČÍK: *Diplomatika erbovních listin vydaných českou panovnickou kanceláří 14–18. století* [Diplomatics of Heraldic Deeds Issued by the Bohemian Royal Office in the Fourteenth–Eighteenth Centuries], in: MILAN ŠÍŠMIŠ (ed.): *Zborník príspevkov z medzinárodnej konferencie, ktorá sa v dňoch 19.–20. októbra 2005 uskutočnila v priestoroch Slovenskej národnej knižnice v Martine*, Martin 2006, pp. 132–144; TOMÁŠ KREJČÍK: K diplomacie nobilitačních a erbovních listin v novověku [Diplomatics of Ennobling and Heraldic Deeds in the Modern Period], in: JIŘÍ BRNOVIÁK et al. (eds.): *Nobilitace ve světle písemných pramenů*, Ostrava 2009, pp. 13–35.

⁴ MICHAL FIALA: *Tři studie k české renesanční heraldice (Znaky měšťanů Starého Města pražského v letech 1526–1618 ve světle salbuchů)* [Three Essays on Bohemian Renaissance Heraldry (Arms of the Old Town of Prague Burghers between 1526 and 1618 in the Light of the *salbuchy*)], in: *Heraldická ročenka* 20 (1993), pp. 3–32; To the meaning

(Böhmische Hofkanzlei), which registered the coat of arms privileges. In addition, the royal privileges differ in their quality—sometimes only a coat of arms and a predicate were awarded, while at other times the individual was also ennobled, but such cases are not very common. If the burghers endowed in this way by the sovereign did not aspire to a higher status, but continued to live in the city and pursue urban occupations, they formed an intermediate stage between the burghers and the lower nobility (and this study is focused on examining how even the mere granting of a coat of arms and a predicate served to endow them with greater prestige in the urban community). Thus, more individuals continued to live in the cities than chose to take up life as knights to be accepted by the provincial noble community.

Only relatively few historical studies on the fringes have focused on this issue in the eastern part of the Habsburg Monarchy, including present-day Hungary and Slovakia, (only one researcher, Frederic Federmayer, whose studies mainly focus on Bratislava (Pozsony, Preßburg) and the Slovak mining towns, has devoted himself to it in recent years).⁵ However, there were only relatively few “burghers with coats of arms” (that is, those with a predicate and a coat of arms who continued to practice city professions) in these mining towns and in Bratislava. If they used a coat of arms, it meant that they had already acquired noble status, because in Hungary, unlike in the Imperial lands, there was no mid-position between the burgher and the nobleman.

The situation in Hungary was fundamentally different from the Czech lands in the sense that the sovereign granted both the coat of arms and the ennoblement simultaneously. There are no preserved sources that could prove the subsequent acceptance of persons endowed with the coat of arms by the provincial noble community (apparently it was not necessary). According to the findings of Federmayer, they were actually nobles settled in the city, still practicing city professions.⁶ Their coats of arms and *eo ipso* social status were hereditary. The peculiarity here is that some Hungarian burghers, namely those of German ethnicity (individuals from the mining cities, to which a number of mining specialists and other residents from German countries, but also some from Bra-

and processing of *salbuchy* as registers of ennoblement documents see DAGMAR CULKOVÁ: *Salbuchy*, in: *Genealogické a heraldické listy* 28 (2008), 1, pp. 25–35; JIŘÍ HANÁČEK: *Kniha pánů rytířů [Book of Knights of the Margraviate of Moravia]*, Brno 1986; JIŘÍ DAVID: *Kniha moravského rytířského stavu (1628–1690): Stavovský rozměr nobilitačního procesu [Book of the Moravian Knighthood (1628–1690): Estate Dimension of the Ennoblement Process]*, in: BRŇOVJÁK, *Nobilitace ve světle písemných pramenů*, pp. 141–159, here pp. 141–143; ZBYNĚK ŽOUŽELKA: *Moravská šlechtická matrika: Pramen k dějinám moravské šlechty doby pobělohorské [Moravian Nobility Register: Source on the History of Post-White Mountain Moravian Nobility]*, *ibid.*, pp. 174–181 (here also about the importance of the *salbuchy* for Moravia).

⁵ FREDERIK FEDERMAYER: *Burghers and Heraldry: On the Usage of Heraldic Signs by Burghers in Early Modern Hungarian Kingdom*, in: *The City and History* 10 (2021), pp. 48–74 (with an overview of his previous studies on this issue). *Ibid.*, p. 49, the author speaks of a completely marginal interest in this issue in contemporary Hungary.

⁶ FEDERMAYER, pp. 51–54.

tislava, had migrated), petitioned not for Hungarian, but Imperial nobility. It is worth remembering that in 1536 Bratislava became the coronation city of the Hungarian kings for more than two centuries. Other Hungarian burghers who had immigrated from the Roman Empire brought their nobility status from their homeland.

Among the other key countries of Central Europe, it is necessary to mention Poland, which had its own specific type of state organization in the early modern era (the Polish-Lithuanian union, in which “noble parliamentarism” took over and in which the burghers did not have comparable status as in the above-mentioned countries). In addition, Polish heraldry is characterized by one feature that was unique in Europe—one coat of arms could be used by several families. In this description, we do not mean the territories of the Silesian principalities, which belonged to the lands of the Czech Crown until 1742 – with the exception of the so-called Austrian or also Czech Silesia.

If we go back to the Czech Lands, the armorial, or ennobled burghers’ category, could of course emerge in Bohemian and Moravian towns only as a consequence of stricter detachment of the aristocracy and most importantly the knighthood since the first decades of the 16th century.⁷ According to the prac-

⁷ ZIKMUND WINTER: Kulturní obraz českých měst I: Život veřejný v XV. a XVI. věku [The Cultural Image of Bohemian Towns: Public Life in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries], Praha 1890, pp. 129–135. More recently: JAKUB HRDLÍČKA: Pražská heraldika: Znaky pražských měst, cechů a měšťanů [Prague Heraldry: Arms of the Towns of Prague, Guilds and Burghers], Praha 1993, pp. 151–171; MAREK STARÝ: Udělování erbu a stavu v českém zemském právu před a po Bílé hoře [Granting Coats of Arms and Estates in the Bohemian Land Law before and after the White Mountain], in: ŠÍŠMIŠ, pp. 121–131; MICHAELA HRUBÁ: Erbovní měšťané—“urozená” vrstva předbělohorských českých měst? (Životní styl erbovních rodin na příkladu Mrázů z Milešovky v Litoměřicích) [Armigerous Burghers—“Noble” Class of Pre-White Mountain Bohemian Towns? (Lifestyle of Armigerous Families on an Example of the Mráz of Milešovka Family in Litoměřice)], in: KATEŘINA JÍŠOVÁ, OLGA FEJTOVÁ et al. (eds.). V komnatách paláců, v ulicích měst, Praha 2007, pp. 245–248. IGOR ČINOVEC: Obraz vývoje stavů v 16. století podle titulářů [Image of the Estates’ Development in the Sixteenth Century according to the Titularies], in: Genealogické a heraldické listy 31 (2011), 3, pp. 26–39; JIŘÍ L. BÍLÝ: Metodika a analýza právně archeologických objektů na příkladu erbu [Methodology and Analysis of Legal-Archaeological Features on the Example of a Coat of Arms], in: KAREL SCHELLE (ed): Právní archeologie, Ostrava 2011, pp. 5–40; JIŘÍ BRŇOVJÁK: “Aus böheimischer königlicher Macht und Vollkommenheit”: Wandlungen der Adelstitulatur in den böhmischen Standeserhöhungen und bei der Aufnahme in die Stände in der Zeit der Herrschaft der Habsburgerdynastie, in: Bohemia 55 (2015), 1, pp. 96–137; JIŘÍ BRŇOVJÁK: “Adelsrecht” aneb možnosti nabývání šlechtictví v českých zemích v kontextu habsburské monarchie a Svaté říše Římské v 17.–19. století [“Adelsrecht” or Feasibility of Acquiring Noble Rights in the Czech Lands within the Habsburg Monarchy and the Holy Roman Empire in the Seventeenth–Nineteenth Centuries], in: Genealogické a heraldické informace 37 (2017), pp. 7–28. The basic works for Moravia include: FRANTIŠEK KAMENÍČEK: Zemské sněmy a sjezdy moravské [Moravian Diets and Conventions], vols. 1–3, Brno 1900–1905, in particular vol. 3, Brno 1905, pp. 48–55, 107; JOSEF PILNÁČEK: Staromoravští rodové [Old Moravian Families], Viedeň 1930, pp. 6–8; ANTONÍN MARKUS, JOSEF PILNÁČEK: Znamení a znaky nešlechticů [Symbols

tice in Bohemia and Moravia since the 1530s, a candidate endowed with a coat of arms and a predicate could only become a member of the knighthood after the noble community had accepted him (first through a word of honor, later transformed into an oath; in the first generation, the admitted candidates carried the title of “reputable esquire”).⁸ If an armiger remained bound to an urban trade or craft, his potential acceptance by the noble community could not be considered. Although this category gradually gained considerable numbers and formed a significant element of the urban population,⁹ the existing historical production is unfortunately still unsatisfactory in clarifying the role that the ennobled burghers occupied within their communities. Yet, research into this population group, which oscillated between bourgeoisie and aristocracy, can be traced back to the 1860s when Antonín Rybička started his pioneering work, first for the towns of Čáslav and Nymburk.¹⁰ He and the other contemporary historians get a credit for mapping the armigerous (and potentially also the *vladyka* families (i.e. families of a lower nobility) over the following decades in Hradec Králové, Chrudim, Plzeň, Nový Bydžov, Mladá Boleslav and Turnov.¹¹ At the same time, Josef K. Hraše presented (together with general char-

and Emblems of Non-Noblemen], Praha 2004 [1933], pp. 28–29; JOSEF PILNÁČEK: Občanské znaky [Personal Arms], Brno 2009, pp. 3–4; JOSEF PILNÁČEK, MOJMÍR ŠVÁBENSKÝ: Neznámé rody a znaky staré Moravy [Unknown Families and Arms of Old Moravia], Brno 1983, in particular pp. 250–252.

⁸ MARKUS/PILNÁČEK, p. 115, indicate that badges bestowed on noblemen and burghers ennobled by means of a Grant of Arms were considered hereditary. JIŘÍ L. BÍLÝ: Soukromoprávní dispozice ke znaku v měšťanském prostředí [Private-Law Directives on Coats of Arms in the Burghers' Milieu], in: Heraldická ročenka (1983), pp. 58–67; BÍLÝ, Metodika a analýza, pp. 5–40; STARÝ, Udělování erbu a znaku, pp. 121–131. For the coat of arms and badge relation, see LADISLAV VRTEJ: Pokus o definiciu erbu [Attempt to Define a Coat of Arms], in: LADISLAV VRTEJ (ed.): Heraldická terminológia I, Martin 2003, pp. 7–40. The fact that the actual coat of arms was not the subject of the inheritance law is indicated in: MAREK STARÝ: Rodový erb, jeho přejímání a dědické právo v 17. století [The Family Coat of Arms, Its Acceptance and the Inheritance Law in the Seventeenth Century], in: KARIN BRZOBHATÁ, TOMÁŠ TYL (eds.): Symbol a symbolika v právu, Praha 2006, pp. 63–84; BRŇOVJÁK, “Adelsrecht” aneb možnosti, p. 8.

⁹ WINTER, pp. 129–135.

¹⁰ ANTONÍN RYBIČKA: O nymburských rodinách erbovních [Armigerous Families of Nymburk], in: Památky archaeologické 4 (1860), pp. 92–93; ANTONÍN RYBIČKA: O šlechtických a erbovních rodinách rodinách čáslavských [Noble and Armigerous Families of Čáslav], in: Památky archaeologické 5 (1863), pp. 353–360.

¹¹ VAVŘINEC STEMBERG: O rodinách rytířských a erbovních v Novém Bydžově v 16. a 17. století [Knightly and Armigerous Families of Nový Bydžov in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries], in: Památky archaeologické 9 (1872), pp. 309–320. At the same time, findings on armigers in Hradec Králové were summarized in a large monograph on the town in: JERONÝM JAN SOLAŘ: Dějepis Hradce Králové nad Labem a biskupství hradeckého [History of Hradec Králové nad Labem and Hradec Bishopric], Praha 1870, in particular pp. 440–450; ANTONÍN RYBIČKA: Rodiny šlechtické v XV–XVII. století v Chrudimi [Noble Families of Chrudim in the Fifteenth–Seventeenth Centuries], in: Památky archaeologické 10 (1874), pp. 27–42 (addendum *ibid.*, pp. 826–827); ANTONÍN

acteristics of the armigerous burghers) twelve most important post-White Mountain ennobled families from Náchod.¹² The contemporary research into the matter culminated by a summary of findings in the work of Zikmund Winter on the cultural image of Bohemian towns in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.¹³ However, the summary of the existing knowledge of Czech Crown towns' cultural history in a broader sense only regarded Bohemia because for understandable reasons. Winter included Moravia into his research on the urban issues only marginally. There was no similar research in Moravia even in the following decades while in Bohemia, the issue was extended with other towns: Pardubice,¹⁴ Klatovy,¹⁵ Soběslav,¹⁶ Domažlice,¹⁷ Pelhřimov,¹⁸ and marginally Prague.¹⁹

-
- RYBIČKA: Erbovní rodiny Plzeňské [Armigerous Families in Pilsen], in: *Památky archaeologické* 10 (1875), pp. 262–274 (addendum *ibid.* 10 (1877), pp. 827); ANTONÍN RYBIČKA: Královéhradecké rodiny erbovní [Armigerous Families of Hradec Králové], Praha 1873; BEDŘICH VILÉM SPIESS: Sousedé plnoprávní, předměstští a erbovní v 16. a 17. století v Hradci Králové [Full-Right, Suburban and Armigerous Neighbours in Hradec Králové in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries], in: *Ratibor* (1891), 27–29, not pag.; BEDŘICH VILÉM SPIESS: Královéhradečtí erbovníci na počátku XVII. století [Armigerous Citizens of Hradec Králové in the Early 17th Century], in: *Ratibor* (1898), 37–41, not pag.; BEDŘICH VILÉM SPIESS: Erbovníci a šlechtici v Hradci Králové na počátku XVII. století usedlí [Armigerous and Noble Citizens Settled in Hradec Králové in the Early Seventeenth Century], in: *Památky archaeologické* 20 (1902), pp. 319–324; FRANTIŠEK BAREŠ: Šlechtické a erbovní rodiny v městě Boleslava Mladého 1471–1620 [Noble and Armigerous Families in the Town of Boleslav Mladý between 1741 and 1620], *Mladá Boleslav* 1893; JOSEF VÍTĚZSLAV ŠIMÁK: Erbovní a šlechtické rodiny turnovské [Armigerous and Noble Families of Turnov], in: *Časopis Společnosti přátel starožitností* 10 (1902), pp. 86–92, 116–142.
- ¹² JAN KAREL HRAŠE: Dějiny Náchoda: Díl první od nejstarších dob až do bitvy na Bílé hoře [The History of Náchod. Part One from the Oldest Times to the Battle of White Mountain], Náchod 1895, pp. 585–609.
- ¹³ WINTER, pp. 129–135.
- ¹⁴ JOSEF SAKAŘ: Dějiny Pardubic nad Labem II, 2 [History of Pardubice nad Labem II, 2], Pardubice 1925, pp. 162–201. For more reflections on other towns, see JOSEF P. PILNÁČEK-RADOSTICKÝ: Královéhradecké, chrudimské, pražské aj. rodiny erbovní a měšťanské [Armigerous and Burgher Families of Hradec Králové, Chrudim and Prague], Videň 1919.
- ¹⁵ JINDŘICH VANČURA: Dějiny někdejšího královského města Klatov I, 2 [History of the Former Royal Town of Klatovy I, 2], Klatovy 1928–1929, pp. 702–719.
- ¹⁶ JAN LINTNER: Z historie soběslavských rodin [From the History of Soběslav Families], in: *Časopis rodopisné společnosti české* 3 (1931), pp. 17–21, 84–86.
- ¹⁷ BOHUMIL STRÉR: Erbovní rodiny v Domažlicích [Armigerous Families of Domažlice], ed. by V. MIŠKOVSKÝ, in: *Ročenka Městského musea v Domažlicích* (1937), pp. 5–35.
- ¹⁸ JOSEF DOBIÁŠ: Dějiny královského města Pelhřimova a jeho okolí. Díl 3.1, část 2: Doba reformatční [History of the Royal Town of Pelhřimov and Its Surroundings. Vol. 3.1, pt. 2: Reformation Period], Pelhřimov 1950, pp. 234–256.
- ¹⁹ PILNÁČEK-RADOSTICKÝ, pp. 35–38. There is also a description of the life stories of leading burgher families, but not armigers, from Nové Město na Moravě and Křižanov in the sixteenth century: JOSEF FIALA: Primátorský rod Štrafů v Novém Městě na Moravě [The Mayor Štraf Family in Nové Město na Moravě], in: *Rodokmen* 2 (1947), pp. 10–14.

Renewed interest in this peculiar category of population can be seen, initially with a bit of hesitation, in the 1970s when Hradec Králové caught attention again.²⁰ Older works on Hradec Králové, Turnov and Klatovy (in case of Klatovy, the above-mentioned collective monograph on the history of the town) were then used by Hana Rechcíglová in her dissertation in the late 1970s where she compares the development trends.²¹ This issue received justified attention again in the following decades when research turned to the members of individual families, again mostly from Bohemian towns (Beroun,²² Český Krumlov,²³ Kutná Hora,²⁴ Litoměřice²⁵ and again Chrudim²⁶ and Prague).²⁷ A metho-

²⁰ IVAN ŠTEFL: Pražákové z Petřína (k erbům rodin královéhradeckých) [The Pražák of Petřín Family (Coats of Arms of the Hradec Králové Families)], in: *Listy genealogicko-heraldické společnosti* (1974), 2, pp. 10–12; BÍLÝ, Soukromoprávní dispozice ke znaku, pp. 58–67.

²¹ HANA REHCÍGLOVÁ: Erbovníci a jejich přijímání do rytířského stavu před vydáním Obnoveného zřízení zemského [Armigerous Citizens and their Knighting before the Issue of the Renewed Land Ordinance], PhD Diss., Charles University Prague, 1977.

²² MARIE TOŠNEROVÁ: Jindřich Čížek z Jenštejna [Jindřich Čížek of Jenštejn], in: *Minulostí Berounska* 5 (2002), pp. 305–311; MARIE TOŠNEROVÁ: Maxmilián Albín z Jenčova: Portrét renesančního měšťana [Maxmilián Albín of Jenčov: Portrait of a Renaissance Burgher], in: *Minulostí Berounska* 6 (2003), pp. 279–288.

²³ ANNA KUBÍKOVÁ: Českokrumlovský měšťan Matyáš Fuch z Fuchýřova [Burgher Matyáš Fuch of Fuchýřov in Český Krumlov], in: *Časopis Národního muzea v Praze, řada historická* 166 (1977), 1–2, pp. 1–5 (in this case, the armiger is probably a pretender).

²⁴ ROLAND NOHEL: Kutnohorské erbovní rody [Armigerous Families of Kutná Hora], Kutná Hora 1998; HELENA ŠTROBLOVÁ: Kutnohorský podnikatelský patriciát a erbovní páni z Vrchoviště [Entrepreneurial Patriciate of Kutná Hora and Armigerous Lords of Vrchoviště], in: *Časopis Národního muzea v Praze, řada historická* 161 (1992), 1–2, pp. 8–13; EVA MATĚJKOVÁ: Kutnohorský patricijský rod “z Vrchoviště” v jagellonské době [A Patrician “of Vrchoviště” Family in Jagiellonian Kutná Hora], in: *Východočeský sborník historický* 21 (2012), pp. 117–149; KAREL VOŠTA: Schafferové z Jeleče a Schaffendorfu [Schaffer of Jeleč and Schaffendorf Family], in: *Kutnohorsko: Vlastivědný sborník* 19 (2017), pp. 1–15.

²⁵ JITKA JAROŠOVÁ: Mrázové z Milešovky v Litoměřicích v předbělohorské době [Mráz of Milešovka Family in Post-White Mountain Litoměřice], in: MICHAELA HRUBÁ, PETR RAK (eds.): *Města severozápadních Čech v raném novověku, Ústí nad Labem* 2000, pp. 223–237.

²⁶ DAVID RICHTER: Francové z Liblic v Chrudimi: Sonda do majetkového a sociálního postavení elitní rodiny v prostředí královského města v 16. století [Franc of Libice Family in Chrudim: Probe into the Property and Social Status of an Elite Family in the Milieu of a Sixteenth-Century Royal Town], in: *Východočeský sborník historický* 29 (2015), pp. 35–78.

²⁷ JAROSLAV JÁSEK: Karel Mělnický z Karlsperka, měšťan a stavitel [Karel Mělnický of Karlsperk, Burgher and Builder], in: OLGA FEJTOVÁ, VÁCLAV LEDVINKA et al. (eds.): *Pražské měšťské elity středověku a raného novověku—jejich proměny, zázemí a kulturní profil*, Praha 2004 (Documenta Pragensia, 22), pp. 125–130; JAN KILÁN: Kropáčové z Krymlova: Z bohatých měšťanů pauperizovanými rytíři [Kropáč of Krymlov Family: From Wealthy Burghers to Pauperized Knights], in: *Pražský sborník historický* 35 (2007), pp. 79–114; JIŘÍ PEŠEK: Mistr Jan Kaňka z Veleslavína—obyčejný život pražského

dically exemplary essay primarily focused on genealogy and heraldry concerns Prague,²⁸ otherwise the papers are shorter contributions concerning the royal town of Rakovník,²⁹ the dowry town of Vysoké Mýto,³⁰ and the wider Tábor area.³¹ Works with broader theoretical and methodological aspirations again deal with Prague, respectively the Old Town of Prague,³² royal towns in north-west Bohemia,³³ especially Žatec,³⁴ and then with České Budějovice in the

profesora a měšťana doby rudolfínské [Master Jan Kaňka of Veleslavín—the Ordinary Life of a Prague Professor and Burgher in the Rudolphine Era], in: *Acta Universitatis Carolinae: Historia Universitatis Carolinae Pragensis* 47 (2007), 1–2, pp. 161–170.

- 28 The most importantly comprehensive essays are: HRDLÍČKA; FIALA, *Tři studie k české renesanční heraldice*; MIROSLAVA PŘIKRYLOVÁ: *Podíl nobilitovaných měšťanů na staroměstské samosprávě v letech 1547–1648* [Share of Ennobled Burghers in the Old Town of Prague Government in 1547–1648], in: *Documenta Pragensia* 9 (1991), 1, pp. 135–179; HELENA PEŘINOVÁ: *Teuflové z Zeilperka: A Paper on Understanding the Life of the Upper Class in the Old Town of Prague at the Turn of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, in: *Pražský sborník historický* 32 (2003), pp. 39–64; PETRA VEČEŘOVÁ: *Jiří Závěta ze Závětic (1575–1637?)* [Jiří Závěta of Závěťice (1575–1637?)], in: FEJTOVÁ/LEDVINKA, *Pražské městské elity středověku a raného novověku*, pp. 131–158.—In connection with the study of local elites, see also OLGA FEJTOVÁ: “Můj ortel zní, že mám z rathauzu býti oběšen ...” Kutnaurové ze Sonenštejna—životní osudy staroměstské bratrské měšťanské rodiny v neklidné době konfesijních zvratů [“My Death Warrant Says that I Am to be Hanged from the Town Hall ...” The Kutnauer of Sonenštejn Family—Life Stories of an Old-Town Brethren Burgher Family during the Turbulent Times of Confessional Upheavals], in: *Pražský sborník historický* 48 (2020), pp. 238–271.
- 29 ANTON F. MALINOVSKÝ: *Rakovnická panská lavice s erby* [Manorial Bench with Coats of Arms in Rakovník], in: *Heraldika a genealogie* 39 (2006), 1–2, pp. 109–116.
- 30 JIŘÍ HÁŠ: *Erbovní a šlechtické rody vysokomýtské* [Armigerous and Noble Families of Vysoké Mýto], in: *Heraldika a genealogie* 30 (1997), 3–4, pp. 143–160. The author briefly introduces about 30 families whose origins date back to the Middle Ages, the others to the pre- and post-White Mountain period.
- 31 ROMAN CIKHART: *Šlechtické a erbovní rody na Táborsku ve svých znacích* [Noble and Armigerous Families of Tábor on their Arms], in: *Heraldika a genealogie* 27 (1994), pp. 175–184.
- 32 PŘIKRYLOVÁ, pp. 135–179; PEŘINOVÁ, pp. 39–64; VEČEŘOVÁ, pp. 131–158.
- 33 HRUBÁ, *Erbovní měšťané*, pp. 245–257; MICHAELA HRUBÁ: *Měšťanské elity v královských městech severozápadních Čech v předbělohorské době* [Burgher Elites in North-West Bohemian Post-White Mountain Royal Towns], in: JIŘÍ JUROK (ed.): *Královská a poddanská města od své geneze k protoindustrializaci a industrializaci*, Ostrava—Nový Jičín 2001, pp. 125–143; MICHAELA HRUBÁ: *Možnosti výzkumu měšťanských elit v prostředí královských měst severozápadních Čech* [Feasibility of Research into Burgher Elites in the Milieu of North-West Bohemian Royal Towns], in: FEJTOVÁ/LEDVINKA, *Pražské městské elity středověku a raného novověku*, pp. 193–210.
- 34 BOHUMÍR ROEDL: *Žatecká rodina Hošťálků z Javořice* [Hošťálek of Javořice Family from Žatec], Louny 1997. A brilliantly written essay which, however, is provided only with a basic annotation apparatus because of its popular scientific focus: BOHUMÍR ROEDL: *Dodatky k Hošťálkům z Javořice a rodině Pavla Skály ze Zhoře* [Annotations on Hošťálek of Javořice and Pavel Skála of Zhoř Families], in: *Sborník Okresního archivu v Lounech* 10 (2001), pp. 101–122.

south Bohemian region³⁵ and Pelhřimov in Vysočina,³⁶ Moravia is represented by more recent methodologically inspiring research into Brno,³⁷ Jihlava,³⁸ and Olomouc³⁹, while Silesia is represented by Opava.⁴⁰

³⁵ TOMÁŠ STERNECK: *Consul Budvicensis a jeho vlastnoruční genealogické záznamy* [Consul Budvicensis and his Personal Genealogical Records], in: *Výběr* 47 (2007), pp. 40–67; TOMÁŠ STERNECK: *Mezi měšťany a šlechtou: Dějiny rodu Doudlebských ze Sternecku* [Between Burghers and Noblemen: History of Doudlebský of Sterneck Family], Brno 2009, monitors in his unique monograph the raising of one of the originally armigerous České Budějovice families to the noble rank in its individual branches over a long period until now.

³⁶ KAREL KRATOCHVÍL: *Pelhřimovský primas Matěj Mauricius Klokotský a radní vrstva: K roli příbuzenských vztahů v samosprávě královských měst v 17. století* [Pelhřimov Primas Mauricius Klokotský and the Councillor Class. Kinship Relations in the Seventeenth-Century Royal Town Governments], in: *Opera historica* 12 (2007), pp. 221–254.

³⁷ TOMÁŠ STERNECK: *Měšťanské elity v berních úřadech a královská města jako daňoví poplatníci—střet zájmů? Případ předbělohorského Brna* [Burgher Elites in Revenue Offices and Royal Towns as Taxpayers—Conflict of Interests? A Case from Pre-White Mountain Brno], in: FEJTOVÁ/LEDVINKA, *Pražské městské elity středověku a raného novověku*, pp. 225–242; TOMÁŠ STERNECK: *Jakub Kunek z Rosenthalu a jeho analistické záznamy* [Jakub Kunek of Rosenthal and his Annalistic Records], in: *Brno v minulosti a dnes* 19 (2006), pp. 351–390; LUDMILA SULITKOVÁ: *Patriciát nebo vrchní vrstva? Zamyšlení nad charakterem horní vrstvy městského obyvatelstva v Brně v předbělohorském období* [Patriciate or Upper Class? Reflections on the Nature of the Leading Class of Urban Population in Pre-White Mountain Brno], in: *Studia Historica Tyrnaviensia* 3 (2003), pp. 255–270; LUDMILA SULITKOVÁ: *Městské elity ve středověku a raném novověku (na příkladu moravského královského města Brna)* [Urban Elites in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Times (on the Example of the Royal City of Brno)], in: JIŘÍ HANZAL, ONDŘEJ ŠEFCÍK (eds.): *Sršatý Praž: Erich Šefčík (1945–2004)*, Praha 2010, pp. 29–50; HANA JORDÁNKOVÁ, LUDMILA SULITKOVÁ: *Příběh jednoho brněnského nobilitovaného měšťana (aneb není malíř jako malíř)* [The Story of an Ennobled Brno Burgher (or, There are no Two Painters Alike)], in: HANA AMBROŽOVÁ, TOMÁŠ DVOŘÁK et al. (eds.): *Historik na Moravě*, Brno 2009, pp. 833–852; HANA JORDÁNKOVÁ, LUDMILA SULITKOVÁ: *Nobilitace—předpoklad pro úřední kariéru brněnského rychtáře předbělohorské doby?* [Ennoblement—A Prerequisite for Brno Reeve's Career in the Pre-White Mountain Period?], in: JANA ČERMÁKOVÁ, RADANA ČERVENÁ et al. (eds.): *A vůbec ...: Utajený sborník Mileně Flodrové k 75. narozeninám*, Brno 2010, pp. 92–111.

³⁸ For a comprehensive account of the burgher family badges, see ZDENĚK JAROŠ: *Jihlavská měšťanská heraldika I.–IV.* [Burgher Heraldry in Jihlava 1–4], in: *Vlastivědný sborník Vysočiny—Vědy společenské* 6–9 (1988–1994), pp. 83–132, 81–128, 67–118, 61–107.

³⁹ KAREL MÜLLER: *Olomoucký erbovní měšťan Valentin Parsch z Prschendorfu* [Olomouc Armigerous Burgher Valentin Parsch of Prschendorf], in: *Ročenka Státního okresního archivu v Olomouci* 9 (28) (2000), pp. 138–142. The number of ennobled families in contemporary Olomouc is summed up in: MILOSLAV ČERMÁK: *Lidé renesanční Olomouce* [People of the Olomouc Renaissance Period], in: *Střední Morava* 14 (2008), 26, pp. 39–68; JIŘÍ L. BÍLÝ, ZDENĚK KAŠPAR: *Novomoravští rodové. I: Olomoučtí protestanté ve zmocňovací listině z roku 1610. Právní archeologie, biografie, genealogie, sfragistika a heraldika olomouckých obyvatelů a měšťanů uvedených ve zmocňovací listině olomouckých protestantů císaři Rudolfo II. z roku 1610* [New-Moravian Families. I:

The provided outline therefore indicates that specialized research into the urban armigerous families had concentrated on Bohemia since the very beginning, while Moravia attracted attention as late as the 1990s and Silesia in the present century. The focus of these specifically oriented studies varies—from issues concerning social position of “ennobled” families in the contemporary urban society as a whole, through the individual armigerous families to the studies following auxiliary historical disciplines, that is genealogy and heraldry. The condition of sources available in the individual towns greatly differs. In general, the existing knowledge is not very satisfactory because from the several dozen contemporary royal towns in Bohemia and Moravia, the existing research (with main accent to the pre-White Mountain period) concentrated only on seventeen (Beroun, Brno, Čáslav, České Budějovice, Domažlice, Hradec Králové, Bohemian queens’ dowry town of Chrudim, Jihlava, Klatovy, Kutná Hora, Litoměřice, Nymburk, Olomouc, Plzeň, Praha, Tábor⁴¹ and Žatec) while from the far more numerous manorial towns, only seven are included—Český Krumlov, Náchod, Nový Bydžov, Mladá Boleslav (raised to the royal town in 1600), Pelhřimov (raised to the royal town in 1596), Soběslav and Turnov.

Although each partial finding on the life stories of individual early modern armigerous families deepens general historical knowledge, it would be convenient to characterize the entire class of armigers in a given town over a selected period together with other complementary approaches including statistical, demographic, sociological, anthropological and culturally historical. This would be the only way of arriving at a more objective assessment of this prestigious group of urban population in the overall image of the town. The results of such comprehensive research into one town could then be reliably compared with similarly focused research into other towns. However, we understand the limits of such knowledge caused in many cases by fragmentary and thus mutually incomparable sources. Moreover, varied social statuses of

Olomouc Protestants in an Enabling Deed of 1610. Legal Archaeology, Biography, Genealogy, Sphragistics and Heraldry of Olomouc Citizens and Burghers Listed in the Olomouc Protestants’ Enabling Deed of 1610 to Emperor Rudolf II], part 1, Ostrava 2013. A unique perspective in Czech literature that still remains is the processing of the burghers’ coat of arms: KAREL ŽUREK: *Merky olomouckých měšťanů ve XIV–XVIII století* [Personal Symbols of Olomouc Burghers in the Fourteenth–Eighteenth Centuries], Olomouc 1992.

⁴⁰ IRENA KORBELÁŘOVÁ, RUDOLF ŽÁČEK: *Opavští erbovní měšťané předbělohorské doby: Prolegomena k výzkumu* [Armigerous Families of Pre-White Mountain Opava: Prolegomena on the Research], in: *Slezský sborník* 113 (2015), 1, pp. 5–21; IRENA KORBELÁŘOVÁ: *Erbovní a nobilitovaní měšťané slezských měst před- a pobělohorského období: kultivované osobnosti, nebo bezskrupulózní hráči?* [Armigerous and Ennobled Burghers in Pre-White Mountain Silesian Towns: Cultivated Persons or Unscrupulous Players?], in: JIŘÍ BRŇOVJÁK, JAN ŽUPANIČ (eds.): *Changes of the Noble Society: Aristocracy and New Mobility in the Habsburg Monarchy and Central Europe from the Sixteenth to the Twentieth Century*, Ostrava–Praha 2018, pp. 115–134.

⁴¹ On a broader Tábor area: CIKHART, pp. 175–184.

the individual towns as regards the legal (royal towns versus manorial towns) and social economical aspects pose another challenge. Medieval and early modern towns were very peculiar organisms. Therefore, we cannot realistically expect that comprehensive research in locations of comparable parameters should necessarily produce analogous results with regard to the representation and role of armigerous burghers.

Nonetheless, we want to indicate an orientation of the respective research to achieve the above-mentioned objectives. As a great example, we can use the royal city of Brno, which offers a sufficient source of official information (mainly municipal books),⁴² as well as the needed complementary sources (mainly contemporary chronicles as documents of the other side of the spectrum) for the early modern times.⁴³ Regarding the actual ennoblements, we will use documents from the royal office level,⁴⁴ or diets and courts in case of the armigers' admission to the actual noble community.⁴⁵

The fundamental research focus therefore concerns:

- 1) The absolute and relative numbers of burgher armigers in the respective town (i.e. not only in aggregate numbers but also in relation to the overall urban population of the legitimate burghers)
- 2) Possibilities of the armigers' rise (admission) to the knighthood
- 3) The armigers' property circumstances
- 4) Family relations (including godparents' commitments), marriage strategies

⁴² For an overview, see LUDMILA SULITKOVÁ: Městské úřední knihy z Archivu města Brna 1343–1619: Katalog. Úvodní svazek [Municipal Books from Brno City Archives 1343–1619: Catalogue. Initial volume], Brno 1998; LUDMILA SULITKOVÁ: Vývoj městských knih v Brně ve středověku (v kontextu vývoje městských knih v českých zemích) [Development of Municipal Books in Medieval Brno (within the Development of Municipal Books in the Czech Lands)], Praha—Brno 2004.

⁴³ PETER RITTER VON CHLUMECKY: Des Rathsherrn und Apothekers Georg Ludwig Chronik von Brünn (1555–1604), Brünn 1859. Contemporary memoirs of the municipal scribes and older literature on them are discussed in the essay by HANA JORDÁNKOVÁ, LUDMILA SULITKOVÁ: Městští písaři a vrcholná politika čtvrtého stavu (na příkladu královského města Brna) [Municipal Scribes and High Policy of the Fourth Estate (on the Example of the Royal City of Brno)], in: Časopis Matice moravské 125 (2006), 2, pp. 367–396; HANA JORDÁNKOVÁ, LUDMILA SULITKOVÁ: Kroniky a pamětní knihy začátku novověku z královského města Brna [Chronicles and Commemorative Books in the Royal City of Brno at the Beginning of the Modern Period], in: OLGA FEJTOVÁ, VÁCLAV LEDVINKA et al. (eds.): Historiografie s městem spojená: Historiografie o městech a historiografie ve městech, Praha 2018 (Documenta Pragensia, 37), pp. 333–350.

⁴⁴ Here, *salbuchy* are decisive also for the Moravian milieu. Although they were established in the late eighteenth century, they contain records from the first third of the sixteenth century. FIALA, Tři studie k české renesanční heraldice, pp. 6–7; ŽOUŽELKA, pp. 174–175; DAVID, pp. 141–148.

⁴⁵ KAMENÍČEK, vol. 3, pp. 48–55, 107, 250–252; PILNÁČEK, Staromoravští rodové; PILNÁČEK/ŠVÁBENSKÝ, in particular pp. 250–252. Of course, Pilnáček also had to base his research on the *salbuchy*.

- 5) Education levels and carrier advancement opportunities also outside the urban community
- 6) Share in the town administration, i.e. formal (institutionalized) and informal relations within the community
- 7) Participation in the municipal defence corps
- 8) Artistic aspects of coats of arms and their locations as the means of self-presentation

In issues 3–7, the selected questions need to be examined in correlations with facts found on other members of the contemporary burgher community.

In the following presentation, we will thus concentrate on the selected town to outline a summary of answers that application of the mentioned approaches to materials related to the Moravian royal city of Brno has provided.

Although we can meet with burghers' signs—which, however, were the results of their own “artistic creativity,” rather than being granted by the respective authority, on the Brno burghers' seals ever since the fourteenth century⁴⁶—we will be concerned with them in connection with the above-mentioned clarification of the royal ennoblement from the 1530s until the 1620s, affected by changes in the ennoblement constitution in our lands. The first known family to receive a badge “in a regular way” was the Munka of Ivančice family from Brno. The prominent city scribe Jan Munka received the badge and also the so-called *vľadyka* (lower level) knighthood in 1523, and his brother Václav was knighted in 1535.⁴⁷ Morava of Meziříčí family was the next, ennobled in 1549,⁴⁸ followed by Sixt of Ottersdorf in 1550,⁴⁹ Kostlach of Krems in 1558,⁵⁰ Greifensteiner of Medlan in 1562⁵¹ and Grybler of Altendorf in 1568.⁵² The

⁴⁶ BÍLÝ, Soukromoprávní dispozice ke znaku, pp. 58–67 (badge of the leading Ház family from the fourteenth century); MARKUS/PILNÁČEK, p. 8 (the oldest badge in the Brno milieu was allegedly used by Jindřich Stubnar in 1319).

⁴⁷ Brothers Jan and Kryštof were knighted in 1558, Jiří Munka with children in 1571 and Vilém Munka was even admitted among the ancient families as the Margraviate of Moravia prosecutor in 1612. PILNÁČEK, Neznámé rody, pp. 250, 255, 257, 258, 262; HANA JORDÁNKOVÁ, LUDMILA SULITKOVÁ: Brněnská městská kancelář v předbělohorském období. (Diplomatická a prosopografická studie) [Pre-White Mountain Municipal Brno Office. (Diplomatic and Prosopographical Study)], in: Sborník archivních prací 45 (1995), 2, pp. 316–328, here pp. 305–306; HANA JORDÁNKOVÁ, LUDMILA SULITKOVÁ: Předbělohorské soudy na Moravě a královské město Brno [Pre-White Mountain Courts in Moravia and the Royal City of Brno], in: Časopis Matice moravské 113 (1994), pp. 235–260, here pp. 256–257; HANA JORDÁNKOVÁ: Brněnská předměstí Cejl a Radlas—stručné dějiny do poloviny 17. století [Brno Suburbs of Cejl and Radlas—A Brief History until the Mid-seventeenth Century], in: Brno v minulosti a dnes 16 (2002), pp. 316–328.

⁴⁸ PILNÁČEK, Staromoravští rodové, pp. 205–206.

⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 81; JORDÁNKOVÁ/SULITKOVÁ, Brněnská městská kancelář, p. 307.

⁵⁰ PILNÁČEK, Staromoravští rodové, p. 110.

⁵¹ Ibid., p. 119.

⁵² Ibid., pp. 89–90.

ennoblements become more frequent since the 1570s. By 1618, 33 other Brno families were endowed with a coat of arms and predicate, which accounts for 39 armigerous Brno families in total. Some of the members, as we will indicate later, may also have joined lower aristocracy over the time. A below overview of the armigerous burghers⁵³ indicates that granting coats of arms to the Brno citizens was far from balanced, even in the years of more frequent ennoblements, as the fewest coats of arms and predicates were granted in the 1580s. The estimated average number of this part of the upper urban class was eight people ennobled over ten years and 16 people within one generation of 20 years.⁵⁴ It is not a large number because in the given period, there were 480 legitimate burghers in the inner city (with low deflection) that paid the city taxes.⁵⁵ It means that the number of burgher families endowed with a coat of

⁵³ 1523/1535 Munka of Ivančice, 1549 Morava of Meziříč, 1550 Sixt of Ottersdorf, 1558 Kostlach z Krems, 1562 Greifensteiner of Medlánky, 1568 Grybler of Altendorf, 1570 Wunderle of Deblín, 1570[?]/1581[?] Ryšan of Rosenštejn, probably “pretender” (*Anwärter*) (cf. fn. 63, 73), 1571 Kleifeindt of Lobenstein, 1573 Schram of Deblín, 1578/1596[?] Mencl of Kolsdorf (1603 knighthood), 1578 Tomanykl of Kolsdorf (1584 knighthood), 1579 Haidinger of Haidenperg, 1580 Václav Roučka of Tišnov, 1581 Brewin (Briwin) of Holstein, before 1585 Migl of Vztuhy, before 1585 Neher z Nehertink, 1590 Schwanz of Retz, 1593 Černovský of Schwarzach, 1593 Krezl of Goldperk, before 1596 Frydecký z Frydek, 1596 Židlochovský of Altenperk, 1596 Šolc of Bohumín, 1597 Jakub of Hacht, 1598/99 Jordan of Uherčice, before 1600 Valentin Duch of Lübeck, 1600 Jiří and Pavel Hovorka of Vyškova, 1601 Voglman of Mohrbach, 1603 Buko of Bukovan, 1603 Hybl of Trutnov (simultaneously knighthood), 1603 Lilgenblatt of Lilgenblatt, 1607 Klošovský of Tura, before 1609 Vřava of Tišnov, 1609 Greiml of Königsfeld, 1613 Hager of Altenberg, before 1614 Kosařský of Solovice, 1614 Kolumbán of Hochdam, 1614 Galigarda of Schönfeld, before 1618 Švábenský of Červená Hora, 1618 Reich of Reichenau. On the Brno armigerous families: JORDÁNKOVÁ/SULITKOVÁ, Nobilitace—předpoklad pro úřední kariéru, pp. 101, 108. Here the authors comment on the same predicate of both Brno reeves from different families—Wunderle of Deblín and Schram of Deblín. It probably did not concern heraldic unclehood, i.e. admission to the same coat of arms by the Wunderle of Deblín family. More recently: JORDÁNKOVÁ/SULITKOVÁ, Erbovní měšťané v královském městě Brně, pp. 73–95; STERNÉCK, Měšťanské elity v berních úřadech, pp. 233–237, finds in 1584–1600 five ennobled Brno burghers among those who were charged by the diet with collection of the kind of land tax in the Brno region for the burgher estate: Matouš Židlochovský of Altenperk, Jiří Šolc of Bohumín, Toman Schram of Delbín, Toman Buko of Bukovany and Sebastian Haidinger of Heidenberg. Sterneck also discovers that they had all previously sat in the Town Council at least once or became successful in the town reeve’s office or as chamberlains, while the land function posed no obstacle for simultaneous performance of the town councillor.

⁵⁴ JITKA LANGHAMROVÁ: Demografie: Učební text pro Univerzitu třetího věku [Demography: Textbook for University of the Third Age], Praha 2007, pp. 11–12, 20, derives the length of one human generation from the average woman’s age at the birth, which had to be lower in the sixteenth century, but for our consideration it is suitable to calculate with five generations within 100 years.

⁵⁵ I stem from the overall number of houses recorded in the municipal tax books in: Archiv města Brna (AMB) [Brno City Archives], Collection of Manuscripts and Official Books

arms and predicate accounted to a mere nine per cent in the entire burgher community and only less than three per cent over the duration of one generation.⁵⁶ The fact that Brno did not exceed the normal situation in other royal towns arises from a comparison with approximately equally populous Hradec Králové,⁵⁷ which provides the largest amount of data suitable for comparison and where about 50 armigerous families were detected.⁵⁸ We will get a slightly different picture by comparing the number of ennobled Brno citizens over one generation with a circle of persons who potentially met the conditions for participation in the town administration (the so-called *Oberschicht*).⁵⁹ As documented in another place, this upper class consisted of intellectuals (pharmacists, doctors, teachers, lawyers or scribes) besides the actual administrative elites⁶⁰ and other honored burghers (i.e. notable persons whose properties were often founded on credit granting operations).⁶¹ Although the estimated number of persons forming the upper class cannot be determined accurately, it must have exceeded the number of people directly involved in the town administra-

(A 1/3), tax book established in 1541, inventory No. 11, and tax book established in 1583, inventory No. 12. However, some of the burghers owned more houses in the built-up areas, which would somewhat reduce the total number of owners. As, on the other hand, the number of houses in the tax books and the contemporary tax registers (for a list of preserved financial books see the introductory chapter of SULITKOVÁ, *Městské úřední knihy z Archivu města Brna*) is not constant over the individual periods, the mentioned average number of 480 burghers/heads of families throughout the entire pre-White Mountain period appears to be an objective intersection of the above facts.

⁵⁶ Brno including the suburb thus had the maximum of 5,000 inhabitants in the pre-White Mountain period. JAROSLAV MAREK: *Lidnatost Brna v 14. až 16. století* [Population Density of Brno between the Fourteenth and Sixteenth Centuries], in: *Brno v minulosti a dnes* 2 (1960), pp. 125–147, here pp. 144–145.

⁵⁷ The number of houses in the Bohemian royal towns are listed in: JOSEF JANÁČEK: *Pivovarnictví v českých královských městech v 16. století* [Beer Industry in Bohemian Royal Towns in the Sixteenth Century], Praha 1959, p. 27.

⁵⁸ REHCÍGLOVÁ, supplement no. 2, pp. 1–3.

⁵⁹ For the terms *Oberschicht*, *Führungsschicht* and *Führungsgruppe* see ERDMANN WEYRAUCH: *Die politische Führungsschicht Kitzingens vornehmlich im 16. Jahrhundert*, in: INGRID BÁTORI, ERDMANN WEYRAUCH (eds.): *Die bürgerliche Elite der Stadt Kitzingen*, Stuttgart 1982, pp. 205–275, here p. 210. As for the conditions in question here, similar stratification has been detected for Brno (SULITKOVÁ, *Městské elity ve středověku a raném novověku*, pp. 29, 47–48) and for Pelhřimov (KRATOCHVÍL, pp. 225–226).

⁶⁰ HANA JORDÁNKOVÁ, LUDMILA SULITKOVÁ: *Mobilita městské inteligence v raném novověku (na příkladu královského města Brna)* [Mobility of Urban Intelligentsia in the Early Modern Times (on the example of the Royal City of Brno)], in: OLGA FEJTOVÁ, VÁCLAV LEDVINKA (eds.): *Město a intelektuálové: Od středověku do roku 1848*, Praha 2008 (Documenta Pragensia, 27), pp. 395–417.

⁶¹ Members of the upper burgher class, whether administration elites, intellectuals or property elites, were of course mutually tied by numerous relations, especially marriages and godparents' commitments. SULITKOVÁ, *Patriciát nebo vrchní vrstva?*, pp. 255–270; SULITKOVÁ, *Zamyšlení nad charakterem vůdčí vrstvy městského obyvatelstva*, pp. 243–250.

tion. While the estimated number of the so-called *Führungsschicht* in Brno is 40 over one generation, the upper class is up to 70 (heads of families). Therefore, the actual armigerous burghers accounted for only one quarter, but they were undoubtedly part of this wider, leading urban class.

In an absolute majority of cases, it was possible to prove that the coats of arms and predicates were also awarded to the siblings or male descendants of the ennobled.⁶² Additionally, although it has been mentioned several times that ennoblement represented the vladychahood,⁶³ all of them, with four exceptions, remained in the urban community without seeking real admission to the aristocratic community. If they were eventually admitted into their ranks, it did not happen until after the end of their commitments to the town. The four mentioned cases include two municipal scribes (Ambrož of Ottersdorf and Jan Mencl of Kolsdorf) and two town councillors—Matouš Židlochovský of Altenperk and Florian Tomanykl of Kolsdorf.

Ambrož of Ottersdorf, who was admitted by the noble community in 1550 (the same year he received an ennoblement charter from the emperor), simultaneously ended his scribe duty in the municipal office, started a private legal practice that lasted for four years and then became a prosecutor of the Margraviate of Moravia in 1554 until his early death in 1559.⁶⁴ The city scribe, Jan Mencl, who moved to Prague after completing his professional commitments in Brno in 1600 to work as a secretary of the Bohemian court office, was integrated into the noble community as late as 1603. Although, he was allowed to use the coat of arms and predicate already in 1578 when he received it together with his brother Jakub and uncle Tomanykl. In 1596, Jan Mencl received the same coat of arms and predicate from the emperor again, this time to his own name.⁶⁵ The mentioned Florian Tomanykl came from Vyškov and became established in Brno in the 1570s. He first became a member of the local city council in the office year of 1577/78 and was last listed as the councillor in the office year of 1584/85.⁶⁶ In 1584, he was admitted into the ranks of Moravian

⁶² JORDÁNKOVÁ/SULITKOVÁ, Příběh jednoho brněnského nobilitovaného měšťana, p. 841.

⁶³ Mentioned for the families of Hovorka, Hybl, Grybler, Kostlach, Morava, Munka, Mencl, Sixt, Schwanz, Šolc, Tomanykl, Voglman and Židlochovský. Also, the “pretender” Ryšan of Rosenštejn referred to himself as *vladyka*.

⁶⁴ JORDÁNKOVÁ/SULITKOVÁ, Brněnská městská kancelář, p. 309. For him as a chamber prosecutor of the Margraviate of Moravia cf. JORDÁNKOVÁ/SULITKOVÁ, Předbělohorské soudy na Moravě, pp. 250–251.

⁶⁵ His predicate was confirmed by the imperial majesty already in 1596, but he was admitted by the Moravian knighthood in 1603 without being able to take the oath due to his early death. Therefore, his son of the same name was again re-admitted by the Moravian knighthood in 1614. PILNÁČEK, Staromoravští rodové, pp. 304–305, no. 1045; PILNÁČEK/ŠVÁBENSKÝ, p. 262, no. 153; MOJMÍR ŠVÁBENSKÝ: Stavovské rukopisy 1348–1964 [Estate Manuscripts 1348–1964] [1971], in: Moravský zemský archiv [Moravian Land Archives], Brno, collection A 3, inventory no. I 3, fol. 53; JORDÁNKOVÁ/SULITKOVÁ, Brněnská městská kancelář, pp. 316–317 (fn. 7–8), p. 318 (fn. 39), p. 319 (fn. 56).

⁶⁶ JORDÁNKOVÁ/SULITKOVÁ, Brněnská městská kancelář, p. 496.

knighthood together with sons Ondřej and Václav and started to hold the office of the lower land law scribe.⁶⁷ We no longer encounter him in the urban society after the mid-1580s.⁶⁸ The case of councillor Matouš Židlochovský is a similar situation. He also asserted himself in the lower land offices (most recently in the office year of 1602/03) only after the end of his engagement in the municipal administration body (as a beer tax collector and then as a land armoury administrator).⁶⁹

Although this is only a small sample, we can conclude that burghers endowed with a predicate and coat of arms by the emperor were adopted by the Moravian noble community immediately or within seven years at the latest. The case of the Tomanykl and Kolsdorf families presented the so-called armigerous unclehood⁷⁰ (uncle Florian adopted his nephew for his coat of arms). This peculiar status may have also been applied in case of the Židlochovský and Grybler families, but it is not clear. In this case, Matouš Židlochovský used not his uncle's but his father-in-law Šimon Grybler's coat of arms.⁷¹ Moreover, the coat of arms and the predicate were not identical—Grybler used the Altendorf predicate while Židlovský used Altenperk. The mentioned municipal scribe Jan Munka of Ivančice (he held the councillor scribe's office in 1520–1538), who received his armigerous chart from the emperor as the first of the Brno burghers in 1523, continued to be fully identified with the municipal community. The benefits of the knighthood were used only by his

⁶⁷ PILNÁČEK, *Staromoravští rodové*, p. 304, no. 1045; PILNÁČEK/ŠVÁBENSKÝ, p. 259, no. 105.

⁶⁸ In 1583, he represented the burghers when reporting the so-called twentieth groschen tax to the land commissioners: KAMENÍČEK, vol. 1, Brno 1900, pp. 260–261. Before being admitted to the noble rank, he owned only town properties; he bought a land-registered estate as late as 1592: VLADIMÍR NEKUDA: *Vlastivěda moravská: Vyškovsko* [Natural History of Moravia: The Vyškov Region], Brno—Vyškov 1965, p. 337; FRANTIŠEK MATĚJEK: *Moravské zemské desky 1567–1642. Sv. 3: Kraj Olomoucký* [Moravian Land Registers 1567–1642. Vol. 3: The Olomouc Region], Praha 1953, pp. 256–257, no. 115.

⁶⁹ The coat of arms was awarded to him by the emperor in 1596: PILNÁČEK. *Staromoravští rodové*, p. 91, no. 217; JORDÁNKOVÁ/SULITKOVÁ, *Brněnská městská kancelář*, p. 406; TOMÁŠ STERNECK: *Moravská zemská zbrojnice v Brně na přelomu 16. a 17. století* [Moravian Armoury in Brno at the Turn of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries], in: *Brno v minulosti a dnes 17* (2003), pp. 273–309, here pp. 283, 288–289; STERNECK, *Měšťánské elity v berních úřadech*, p. 233.

⁷⁰ After the White Mountain, the armigerous unclehood could no longer be applied without the emperor's consent: BRŇOVJÁK, "Adelsrecht" aneb možnosti, p. 8.

⁷¹ Šimon Grybler was an urban estate administrator in Kuřim and served simultaneously, together with Šebastián Haidinger of Haidenperk, as local governor in 1592–1594: JORDÁNKOVÁ/SULITKOVÁ, *Brněnská městská kancelář*, p. 406. Grybler traded in wine and had disputes with the municipal administration over unauthorized volumes of wine imported to the town: *ibid.*, pp. 406, 407 (fn. 21). For the emblem on Grybler's epitaph cf. JORDÁNKOVÁ/SULITKOVÁ, *Erbovní měšťané v královském městě Brně*, pp. 75, 85–86.

knighted relatives after 1535.⁷² With regards the judicial scribe, Václav Ryšan (he held this position in Brno between 1547 and 1564), who is several times mentioned with the predicate *Rosenštejn* in the municipal documents, there is no evidence of awarding the predicate. His biography allows us to conclude that he was so-called pretender (*Anwärter*),⁷³ or that he received the predicate after leaving the municipal services.⁷⁴

Concerning property backgrounds of the armigerous families, we can collectively conclude that they were based on premeditated marriage strategies (for example, one daughter of Jan Mencl of Kolsdorf married the brother of another city council scribe, the armigerous burgher Pavel Hovorka of Vyškov and the second daughter married the ennobled painter Jiří Šolc of Bohunín),⁷⁵ as well as the members' own entrepreneurial skills that were the source of their above-average wealth. The members of the urban intelligentsia apparently looked for equally well-to-do families to form tight non-blood relationships through marriages, while the godparents' commitments represented another widely used alternative.⁷⁶

As for the professions, the first generation of the ennobled burghers were usually successful tradesmen (Demetrius Reich of Reichenau, Oldřich Lilgenblatt of Lilgenblatt, Matouš Židlochovský of Altenperk, Šimon Schwanz of Retz), members of lucrative professions (maltsters Mates Schram of Deblín, Jan Greiml of Königsfeld, Jan Kleinfeldt of Lobenstein, goldsmiths Hanuš Kostlach of Křemže, Jošt Voglman of Mohrbach or cloth tailor Blažej Munka of Ivančice)⁷⁷ and, in a larger number, also members of the urban intelligentsia—the municipal scribes (we need to add Mikuláš Černovský of Švarcava and Jiří Hovorka of Vyškov to the three above-mentioned scribes who later entered the noble ranks, i.e. Jan Munka, Ambrož of Ottersdorf and Jan Men-

⁷² Cf. fn. 47.

⁷³ He was of non-marital origin (JORDÁNKOVÁ/SULITKOVÁ, Brněnská městská kancelář, pp. 357–361). However, he was extremely purposeful. In the city milieu, he acquired solid wealth and a general recognition through marriages with two female burghers. After 1564, he even entered the imperial services. He also had high educational ambitions and kept correspondence with the humanist Jakub Palaeolog where he expressed his admiration for Erasmus of Rotterdam (*ibid.*, p. 361). Ryšan's relations with the lower noble family of Ryšan of Modřice and the form of the predicate remain unclear. PILNÁČEK, *Neznámé rody*, p. 182, presents his badge seal from 1570; however, its iconography differs from his seal dated 1581: PILNÁČEK, *Staromoravští rodové*, p. 206. For more details cf. JORDÁNKOVÁ/SULITKOVÁ, *Erbovní měšťané v královském městě Brně*, p. 87.

⁷⁴ The predicate of *Rosenštejn* cannot be traced in the Brno sources prior to 1570.

⁷⁵ JORDÁNKOVÁ/SULITKOVÁ, Brněnská městská kancelář, p. 316; JORDÁNKOVÁ/SULITKOVÁ, *Příběh jednoho brněnského nobilitovaného měšťana*, p. 844.

⁷⁶ For the city council scribes active in the town office, this fact is sufficiently documented in: JORDÁNKOVÁ/SULITKOVÁ, Brněnská městská kancelář, pp. 305, 308, 316, 323, 328.

⁷⁷ The town reeve Blažej Munka was brother of the mentioned Jan Munka, but his admission to the *vľadyka* estate in 1535 only applied to his other brother Václav and his descendants. JORDÁNKOVÁ/SULITKOVÁ, *Nobilitace—předpoklad pro úřední kariéru*, p. 104; JORDÁNKOVÁ/SULITKOVÁ, *Předbřlohorské soudy na Moravě*, pp. 256–257.

cl).⁷⁸ Regarding the court scribes, only one sporadically used a predicate—the above-mentioned Václav Ryšan of Rosenštejn, but most likely not quite rightfully. The case of Jan Dětrich Lhotský of Ptení was exceptional among scribes who were not endowed with any closely specified “official title.” Although he was a *vладыка*, he held a long-term position in the municipal office (from 1606 until 1635).⁷⁹ As regards other members of the intelligentsia, town doctors—or more often land doctors settled in the royal city by the decision of the diet—were in several cases legitimate knights admitted to the knighthood. Conversely, we found no interest in a coat of arms or predicate among pharmacists who were wealthy.⁸⁰ Also, we did not find any members of the normal town professions among ennobled burghers. However, it would be advisable to examine whether all of the armigerous families fulfilled the social prestige by their lifestyles, i.e. by lucrative privileged professions (also in the further generations) or whether the offspring merely used the predicate as formal, outward pomp.

Compared with many “ordinary” townspeople, the wealth of ennobled burgher families represented primarily by the real estate was truly above-average, but comparable with properties of other, albeit non-ennobled urban upper class members. When houses whose purchase prices could be verified by the sources were owned by ennobled persons, they reached at least the average of 1,000 Moravian guildens in the Brno environment. For example, the purchase price of a town house owned by Mikuláš Černovský of Švarcava greatly exceeded the average. When sold in 1605, it amounted to 2,050 Moravian guildens.⁸¹ The price of a house owned by his widowed sister-in-law (widow of Mikuláš’s brother Ludvík) amounted in the same year to 1,800 Moravian guildens⁸² and the purchase price of a house owned by Kryštof Jordán of Uherčice

⁷⁸ JORDÁNKOVÁ/SULITKOVÁ, Brněnská městská kancelář, pp. 322–328 (Mikuláš Černovský), pp. 328–333 (Jiří Hovorka); JORDÁNKOVÁ/SULITKOVÁ, Městští písaři a vrcholná politika čtvrtého stavu, p. 403. Two of the municipal scribes (Jan Munka and Jiří Hovorka) built their own libraries, of which, however, we have no information on the Brno burghers’ last wills, and then enriched the councillor collegium’s library with testament bequests from their own libraries: JORDÁNKOVÁ/SULITKOVÁ, Brněnská městská kancelář, p. 423.

⁷⁹ His calligraphic hand is traceable in various municipal libraries and individual documents; JORDÁNKOVÁ/SULITKOVÁ, Brněnská městská kancelář, pp. 410–412. In fact, the town rejected his request to buy a house under the emphyteusis in 1615 because he was not a burgher; *ibid.*, p. 410.

⁸⁰ JORDÁNKOVÁ/SULITKOVÁ, Mobilita městské intelligence, pp. 399–401; HANA JORDÁNKOVÁ, LUDMILA SULITKOVÁ: Lékárníci v Brně v předbělohorském období [Pharmacists in Pre-White Mountain Brno], in: Brno v minulosti a dnes 17 (2003), pp. 245–271; HANA JORDÁNKOVÁ, LUDMILA SULITKOVÁ: Lékaři v Brně v předbělohorském období [Doctors in Pre-White Mountain Brno], in: Brno v minulosti a dnes 21 (2008), pp. 71–88.

⁸¹ AMB, A 1/3, book of testaments, inventory no. 51, fol. 164v–171r.

⁸² *Ibid.*, fol. 175r–179r.

amounted to 1,600 Moravian guldens in 1619.⁸³ Some of the armigers (much like other members of the elite) owned more houses in the built-up areas (e.g. Ludvík Černovský of Švarcava or Kryštof Schwanz of Retz). However, we can observe the same phenomenon in the ennobled burghers as in the other Brno burghers—only a few owned their town houses for long. “Change of the residence” was frequent, which is still not satisfactorily explained.⁸⁴ Yet, it was probably not greatly connected with speculative purchases, i.e. increasing the value of the obtained property and then selling it at a higher price.⁸⁵ Although the municipal scribe Jiří Hovorka of Vyškov bought his Brno house for only 1,000 Moravian guldens, its furnishing was all the more splendid, as vividly documented in his testament.⁸⁶ Other testaments from the same period are not nearly as eloquent testimony to the wealth of the deceased (moreover, the inheritance inventories from Brno have not survived).

The standard part of real properties of Brno burghers, and therefore also the armigers’ properties, were vineyards near Brno or at more distant locations.⁸⁷ They were purchased at considerable costs and represented a regular source of revenues. For example, Mikuláš Migl of Vzduhy bought his Brno house together with vineyards and wine-making equipment in Hustopeče, Starovice and Mikulčice for 2,500 Moravian guldens.⁸⁸ Similarly, Oldřich Lilgenblatt

⁸³ AMB, A 1/3, reeve book, inventory no. 1810, fol. 225r–233r.

⁸⁴ LUDMILA SULITKOVÁ: Ke kritice pramenů hromadné povahy k dějinám měst v 16. století (na příkladu Brna) [Criticism of Mass Sources on the History of Sixteenth-Century Towns (on the Example of Brno)], in: Časopis Matice moravské 105 (1986), pp. 290–291; HANA JORDÁNKOVÁ, LUDMILA SULITKOVÁ: Realita každodennosti a kritika faktů hromadné povahy [Reality of Everydayness and Criticism of Mass Facts], in: MICHAELA KOKOJANOVÁ (ed.): Měšťané, šlechta a duchovenstvo v rezidenčních městech raného novověku 16.–18. století, Prostějov 1997, pp. 58–72, here pp. 62, 70.

⁸⁵ Such speculative house purchases have been documented on Italian building masters, see HANA JORDÁNKOVÁ, LUDMILA SULITKOVÁ: Italové a Španělé v Brně v předbělohorském období [Italians and Spaniards in Pre-White Mountain Brno], in: TOMÁŠ BOROVSKÝ, LIBOR JAN et al. (eds.): Ad vitam et honorem profesoru Jaroslavu Mezníkovi: Příatelé a žáci k pětasedmdesátým narozeninám, Brno 2003, pp. 715–742.

⁸⁶ JORDÁNKOVÁ/SULITKOVÁ, Brněnská městská kancelář, p. 330; JORDÁNKOVÁ/SULITKOVÁ, Měští písaři a vrcholná politika čtvrtého stavu, pp. 373–384.

⁸⁷ For Brno burghers’ geographical vineyards distribution, see HANA JORDÁNKOVÁ, LUDMILA SULITKOVÁ: Záliba v trpkém moku—benefit pro městskou pokladnu (na příkladu Brna v raném novověku) [Indulgence in the Bitter Drink—A Benefit for the Town Treasury (on the Example of Early Modern Brno)], in: JAN KILIÁN (ed.): “Trpké býti zdá se?” Vín a vinařství v českých zemích ve středověku a raném novověku: Sborník příspěvků z konference konané v Mělníce 2.–4. dubna 2008, Mělník 2009, pp. 191–193; HANA JORDÁNKOVÁ, LUDMILA SULITKOVÁ: Vinice brněnských měšťanů od středověku do poloviny 17. století (s přednostním zřetelem na vinice na cizích gruntech) [Brno Burghers’ Vineyards from the Middle Ages to the Mid-Seventeenth Century (with Focus on Vineyards on Foreign Grounds)], in: Brno v minulosti a dnes 31 (2021), pp. 75–100, here p. 91.

⁸⁸ In Brno, however, vineyards did not constitute a permanent part of a particular house. See LUDMILA SULITKOVÁ: Domy s právem nálevu piva a vína ve středověkém a raném

of Lilgenblatt bought his town house, a suburban barn and vineyards with facilities in Lovčičky, for 2,300 Moravian guldens.⁸⁹ We should therefore mention the less common types of properties: The mentioned Ludvík Černovský owned a fish tank for some time in the Brno suburbs, and Matěj Schram of Deblín also bought a fish tank and operated other “business activities”—a brewery and a timber workshop in the suburbs.⁹⁰ Jiří Buko of Bukovany bought an old water pipeline with a timber workshop in a suburban street and Bernart Brevín of Holstein bought a farmstead in the suburb for more than 6,000 Moravian guldens.⁹¹ However, our deep analyses of the Brno municipal books also document that farmsteads with fields and other undoubtedly lucrative properties such as mills or hammer works were also owned by other burghers⁹² who belonged to the city elite.

The same applies not only to other properties in the suburb and inside the city such as barns, wine presses, fish tanks, breweries, workshops, and various shops, but also to the movable property, especially the more accurately estimable cash amounts or debt claims from the testaments. While only some of the burghers owned larger amounts of available cash (Šimon Grybler of Alten-dorf, Demetrius Reich of Reichenau, Mikuláš Černovský of Švarcava), the last wills were more frequently concerned with records of debt claims, in many cases alongside their own debts, which were certainly very volatile amounts over the time (for example, at the time of his death, Kryštof Schwanz of Retz owed 3,000 Moravian guldens, but his claims amounted to 15,000 Moravian guldens).⁹³ Even such amounts were not unusual for other members of the urban upper class. However, except for Ambrož of Ottersdorf and Jan Mencl of Kolsdorf, who also acquired large properties in rural areas,⁹⁴ ownership of land-registered estates is surprisingly not documented even for the traders.

To perform their demanding professions, the so-called German or Czech schools were not sufficient for the armigers, although we have to understand that they gained many skills through their own practice or their fathers’ “initiation.” The most regular educational institutions were thus probably represented by the Brno particular school and the Jesuit Gymnasium for the Catholics since the 1570s.⁹⁵ However, university magister degree was very rare

novověkém Brně [Houses with the Right to Sell Beer and Wine in Medieval and Early Modern Brno], in: *Acta historica et museologica universitatis Silesianae Opaviensis*, řada C 2 (1995), pp. 59–71, in particular p. 65.

⁸⁹ AMB, A 1/3, reeve book, inventory no. 1782, fol. 119r.

⁹⁰ On his properties in detail cf. JORDÁNKOVÁ/SULITKOVÁ, *Nobilitace—předpoklad pro úřední kariéru*, p. 108.

⁹¹ AMB, A 1/3, reeve book, inventory no. 1773, fol. 125v–126r.

⁹² JORDÁNKOVÁ/SULITKOVÁ, *Realita každodennosti*, in particular, pp. 61–62.

⁹³ AMB, A 1/3, reeve book, inventory no. 1772, fol. 160r, 165r.

⁹⁴ JORDÁNKOVÁ/SULITKOVÁ, *Brněnská městská kancelář*, pp. 308, 215; JORDÁNKOVÁ/SULITKOVÁ, *Předbělhorské soudy na Moravě*, p. 251.

⁹⁵ HANA JORDÁNKOVÁ, LUDMILA SULITKOVÁ: *Možnosti vzdělání v předbělhorském Brně* [Possibilities of Education in Pre-White Mountain Brno], in: BRONISLAV CHOCHOLÁČ,

among the armigers and can only be documented for persons who worked as professional scribes in the municipal office; e.g. Jan Munka of Ivančice, who had studied in Vienna,⁹⁶ and Jiří Hovorka of Vyškov, who had studied at the Olomouc Jesuit Academy⁹⁷ where Miluláš Černovský of Švarcava, another municipal council scribe, also probably had received his education.⁹⁸ The municipal council scribe Ambrož of Ottersdorf had studied at Prague University.⁹⁹ Also Jan Mencl of Kolsdorf probably had university education,¹⁰⁰ but the sources provide only indirect support for this statement.¹⁰¹

If we focus our attention on verifying whether and to what extent the ennobled burghers were engaged in the “public affairs” administration, it is apparent that members of the municipal administration elite were only one of the parts of the above-defined upper class of burghers. However, what is rather surprising is the fact that not all of the ennobled sought to fortify their social prestige beyond the standard average¹⁰² by a position in the municipal administration. Of the above-mentioned 39 armigerous families, we have found some thirty members of these families throughout the entire pre-White Mountain period.¹⁰³ Thus, about three quarters of the ennobled families showed interest in membership in the town councillors’ college while one up to four persons from the ranks of the armigers appeared in the individual councils.¹⁰⁴ Considering that the council had only twelve members, the number was not negligible. In the late sixteenth century when ennoblements were more frequent, the share of the ennobled in the supreme administration body could account for one third while the number of families with a predicate represented less than a tenth in the overall number of the burghers. A similar proportion, about one third, will

LIBOR JAN et al. (eds.): *Nový Mars Moravicus aneb Sborník příspěvků, jež věnovali Prof. Dr. Josefu Válkovi jeho žáci a přátelé k sedmdesátinám*, Brno 1999, pp. 319–334, here p. 332.

⁹⁶ JORDÁNKOVÁ/SULITKOVÁ, Brněnská městská kancelář, p. 304.

⁹⁷ Ibid., p. 328.

⁹⁸ Ibid., p. 323.

⁹⁹ Ibid., p. 307.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., p. 314; JORDÁNKOVÁ/SULITKOVÁ, Mobilita městské inteligence, p. 408.

¹⁰¹ JORDÁNKOVÁ/SULITKOVÁ, Městští písaři, pp. 375–383, 394–395. The court scribe Václav Ryšan most probably had university education, but it is not known where he received his Rosenštejn predicate. Cf. fn. 65

¹⁰² In the Brno community, a burgher was alternatively referred to as a fellow citizen (*Bewohner*). Therefore, these terms do not express the qualitative distinction of the legal status. For the distinction of the legal status of the elites enjoying the brewing right and other burghers, see LUDMILA SULITKOVÁ: *Měšťané, jejich společenství a elity v Brně v předbělohorském období* [Burghers, Their Communities and Elites in Pre-White Mountain Period], in: JUROK, pp. 115–123, here pp. 117–118.

¹⁰³ As regards members of the town intelligentsia, the mentioned five councillors and possible one court scribe could become members of the Brno council only after their work in the municipal office, not simultaneously: SULITKOVÁ, *Patriciát nebo horní vrstva?*, pp. 260, 264.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., p. 264.

apply when we consider the so-called broader council, consisting of persons who had sat throughout their lives in the municipal council, thus being in Brno referred to as as *Rathsverwandte* or *Rathsfreunde* (and using the honorary title *Herr*).¹⁰⁵ As regards the reeve's office, which was not staffed every year (usually once every three years) from members of the so-called outer council, the proportion was different—of the total of 19 reeves, we have found a coat of arms and a predicate in 11, which accounts for 58 per cent against the non-ennobled persons in this position.¹⁰⁶

We have therefore indicated that although an overwhelming majority of armigerous burghers tried to affect the course of the public matters in some of the municipal official bodies, there were enough of those who undoubtedly based their social status on this exclusivity, but managed to defend it also in another way, e.g. by lucrative occupations or lending money. We could also assume that the leading burghers tried to serve as an example in the town's defence from outside enemy. This situation occurred in the pre-White Mountain period during the so-called long war with the Sublime Porte (1593–1606),¹⁰⁷ which also included Stephen Bocskai's uprising and thus potential direct threat to the city.¹⁰⁸ Brno prepared for this eventuality in any possible way and also became a billeting area for military units sent to the field, or an area of their military parades (*muštrůňk*) and soldiers' final pay settlements and release (*abdaňk*). The burghers were occasionally mobilized as commanders of the city battalions, guards accompanying vehicles with equipment to the battlefield and messengers-reporters. But it is apparent that members of the city elite, and especially the administrative elite, were not very keen to be directly involved in life-threatening situations. For example, exemption from the town guard duties for members of the town councillor elite was directly enshrined in the contemporary "legal regulation," a unique municipal guard code dated

¹⁰⁵ JORDÁNKOVÁ/SULITKOVÁ, Brněnská městská kancelář, in particular, pp. 453–457; HANA JORDÁNKOVÁ, LUDMILA SULITKOVÁ: Fungování nejvyššího městského správního orgánu ve světle pamětní zápisů městských písařů na příkladu raně novověkého Brna [Functioning of the Supreme Municipal Administrative Body in the Light of Municipal Scripts' Records on the Example of Early Modern Brno], in: ZDENĚK HOJDA, HANA PÁTKOVÁ (eds.): Pragmatické písemnosti v kontextu právním a správním, Praha 2008, pp. 139–150, here pp. 148–150.

¹⁰⁶ JORDÁNKOVÁ/SULITKOVÁ, Nobilitace—předpoklad pro úřední kariéru, p. 97.

¹⁰⁷ For this period, cf. the outstanding, carefully documented work TOMÁŠ STERNECK: Město, válka a daně: Brno v moravském berním systému za dlouhé války s Vysokou Portou (1593–1606) [Town, War and Taxes: Brno in the Moravian Revenue System during the Long War with Sublime Porte (1593–1606)], Praha 2006; STERNECK, Mnohem hůře nežli nepřítel, pp. 691–702.

¹⁰⁸ HANA JORDÁNKOVÁ, LUDMILA SULITKOVÁ: Odraz Bočkajova povstání v pramenech městské provenience (na příkladu Brna) [Reflections of the Bočkaj Uprising in Urban Sources (on the Example of Brno)], in: Turek Švéd a Prajz: Vojenský živel versus město a venkov českého raného novověku, Praha 2011 (Historie—Otázky—Problémy, 3), pp. 29–46. This paper contains references to all previous literature.

1605¹⁰⁹ and, in addition, people handicapped by age or illness were exempt from direct participation in a military battalion established by the town. Particular names in connection with active town defence appear only rarely, but one comment from 1597 deserves attention. Two important burghers, Matouš Židlochovský and Antonín Trusi, were sent to a military encampment at the Raab to provide a direct report.¹¹⁰ We encountered the former as an ennobled burgher in 1596, and in 1597, he was also a sitting councillor of the municipal council (he first sat there in 1590). Although the latter, an Italian tradesman, participated in the municipal administration body from as late as 1603,¹¹¹ these comments indicate that also indispensable persons were occasionally sent to dangerous missions. This is perhaps also because they were traders and thus able to deal with the dangers of travelling.

Now we need to comment on the artistic significance and composition of newly ennobled persons' coats of arms from the ranks of the Brno burghers. From the total number of recorded 39 armigerous families, we have an accurate description in 29 cases and black and white illustrations for 8 of them.¹¹² The colour descriptions are therefore based on original armorial charters (in two cases also on a confrontation on an epitaph picture),¹¹³ and in one case on a colour picture of a coat of arms on the regional courthouse wall (*Zemská soudnice*)¹¹⁴ or their copies in *salbuchy*¹¹⁵ discussed in older specialized pub-

¹⁰⁹ STERNECK, Město, válka a daně, pp. 116–118; JORDÁNKOVÁ/SULITKOVÁ, Odras Bočkajova povstání v pramenech městské provenience, pp. 40–42.

¹¹⁰ STERNECK, Město, válka a daně, p. 54; JORDÁNKOVÁ/SULITKOVÁ, Odras Bočkajova povstání v pramenech městské provenience, p. 37.

¹¹¹ JORDÁNKOVÁ/SULITKOVÁ, Italové a Španělé v Brně, p. 727.

¹¹² The burgher arms were accompanied with all other basic components such as helmets, crests and mantlings although research in general refers only to the escutcheon and crest, which, however, had to be placed on the helmet. The mantlings and the actual helmets are not very consistently mentioned, but they mostly have a bucket shape in the illustrations.

¹¹³ In case of Mikuláš Wunderle of Deblín and Šimon Grybler of Altendorf, the art of the arms field is unfortunately unclear. For more details cf. HANA JORDÁNKOVÁ, LUDMILA SULITKOVÁ: Erbovní měšťané v královském městě Brně (Jejich účastenství ve správních orgánech města v 16. a 17. století a snahy po sebeprezentaci) [Armigerous Burghers in the Royal City of Brno (Their Participation in the Municipal Administrative Bodies in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries and Self-presentation Efforts)], in: ZDENĚK HOJDA, JAN KAHUDA et al. (eds.): Z archivu ke studentům a zase zpět, Praha 2021, pp. 73–95, here pp. 75, 78, 85–86. This essay newly assesses all preserved tangible monuments including a set of about 400 pressed seals, which could be studied in documents deposited in the Collection of Decrees, Mandates and Letters of the Brno City Archives. However, only eight of them probably belonged to the armiger. Of the ten preserved Brno epitaph pictures from the pre-White Mountain period, the coat of arms was present in only two cases (and one of them is almost invisible).

¹¹⁴ It is a coat of arms of Jan of Kolsdorf Sr., cf. fn. 65. For more details cf. JORDÁNKOVÁ/SULITKOVÁ, Erbovní měšťané v královském městě Brně, p. 78.

¹¹⁵ Cf. fn. 44.

liccations¹¹⁶ that are based on a careful study of materials from the Imperial court office. As a result, we cannot expect too many new discoveries. Only some of the detected coats of arms have an illustration of a simple general figure in the shield field (e.g. a family from Ottersdorf that used two black wings on a golden escutcheon).¹¹⁷ Otherwise, the basic iconographic elements were heraldic figures (halved or exceptionally quartered escutcheons,¹¹⁸ or spikes¹¹⁹) supplemented with general figures. The resulting impression must have been somewhat “tasteless”¹²⁰ from our view because the crests, which in many cases repeated the symbol, were equally vivid. There were apparently no uniform templates from the Imperial office. The designs probably depended much more on potential motifs that came directly from the armigerous burghers.¹²¹ The artistic aspect of ennobled burghers’ coats of arms that we have examined does not much differ from the noblemen’s arms. For example, we do not find any reminiscence of the craft brands in the shield field, the escutcheons are not isolated but accompanied with helmets and crests.¹²²

Outcomes based on the mentioned methodological procedure and the Brno materials therefore serve as a prompt to apply these requirements, if the source base allows it, also in research on the given issue regarding other towns so that we can assess the role of the armigers in the particular urban communities as carefully as possible. We realize that the subsequent stage of research will have to monitor social and professional careers of the particular families over the following generation (or preferable at least two generations) to see whether these families maintained their positions in the urban community and used the same coat of arms in the social contacts.¹²³

If we briefly summarize outcomes of the study for the pre-White Mountain period in the selected location, the Moravian royal city of Brno, it is apparent that the first local representatives of the armigerous families were without reservation the city elites. They had large, but not necessarily the largest properties and were mutually interconnected by marriage policies and godparents’

¹¹⁶ Josef Pilnáček laid solid foundations to the study of Moravian noble families: PILNÁČEK, Staromoravští rodové; PILNÁČEK, Občanské znaky, pp. 3–4; PILNÁČEK/ŠVÁBENSKÝ; MARKUS/PILNÁČEK.

¹¹⁷ PILNÁČEK, Staromoravští rodové, p. 31.

¹¹⁸ The family Columban of Hochdam: PILNÁČEK, Staromoravští rodové, p. 256.

¹¹⁹ The families Schram of Deblín and Voglman of Mohrbach: *ibid.*, pp. 171, 148.

¹²⁰ For example, a halved yellow escutcheon (*štíť*) of Buk of Bukovina contained white hillocks in its right half from which a green tree was growing, and the left half contained three black poles. The Schram family had in the crest (unfortunately the escutcheon and crest colours are not provided) a “small man standing on a green hillock holding a mace in his hand.” *Ibid.*, pp. 123, 171.

¹²¹ KREJČÍK, Diplomatika erbovních listin, p. 132; KREJČÍK, K diplomacie nobilitačních a erbovních listin v novověku, pp. 13–19.

¹²² MARKUS/PILNÁČEK, pp. 10–12; JORDÁNKOVÁ/SULITKOVÁ, Erbovní měšťané v královském městě Brně, p. 79.

¹²³ See the observations of the legal historian STARÝ, Udělování erbu a stavu, pp. 121–131, that the actual coat of arms was not the subject of inheritance law.

commitments. The level of their involvement for the benefit of the town depended, much like the other co-burghers, on individual prerequisites and willingness. At the same time, however, we can unequivocally state that, at least in Brno, the social involvement of this “class” was more significant in relation to other fellow citizens in the period under review. Although not many of armorial burgers graduated from universities, their personal experience and probably very substantial initial family positions allowed them a better view and orientation in the contemporary socio-political circumstances and the needs of the town. While in the total burgher population (men as heads of families) heraldic town families in Brno in the pre-White Mountain period accounted for less than a tenth of their representatives, in the municipal administrative bodies they participated in about a third of their representatives, in the municipal reeve’s office in more than half of the cases. The armigerous families thus had a greater potential to influence the “general well-being” (*Allgemeinwohl*).

Bibliography

Unpublished Sources

Archiv města Brna

Collection of Manuscripts and Official Books (A 1/3).

ŠVÁBENSKÝ, MOJMÍR: Stavovské rukopisy 1348–1964 [1971], in: Moravský zemský archiv, Brno, collection A 3, inventory no. I 3, fol. 53.

Literature

BAREŠ, FRANTIŠEK: Šlechtické a erbovní rodiny v městě Boleslava Mladého 1471–1620, Mladá Boleslav 1893.

BÍLÝ, JIŘÍ L.: Soukromoprávní dispozice ke znaku v měšťanském prostředí, in: Heraldická ročenka (1983), pp. 58–67.

BÍLÝ, JIŘÍ L.: Metodika a analýza právně archeologických objektů na příkladu erbu, in: KAREL SCHELLE (ed.): Právní archeologie, Ostrava 2011, pp. 5–40.

BÍLÝ, JIŘÍ L.—KAŠPAR, ZDENĚK: Novomoravští rodové. I: Olomoučtí protestanté ve zmocňovací listině z roku 1610: Právní archeologie, biografie, genealogie, sfragistika a heraldika olomouckých obyvatelů a měšťanů uvedených ve zmocňovací listině olomouckých protestantů císaři Rudolfovi II. z roku 1610, Ostrava 2013.

BRŇOVJÁK, JIŘÍ et al. (eds.): Nobilitace ve světle písemných pramenů, Ostrava 2009.

BRŇOVJÁK, JIŘÍ: “Aus böheimischer königlicher Macht und Vollkommenheit”: Wandlungen der Adelstitulatur in den böhmischen Standeserhöhungen und bei der Aufnahme in die Stände in der Zeit der Herrschaft der Habsburgerdynastie, in: Bohemia 55 (2015), 1, pp. 96–137.

BRŇOVJÁK, JIŘÍ: “Adelsrecht” aneb možnosti nabývání šlechtictví v českých zemích v kontextu habsburské monarchie a Svaté říše Římské v 17.–19. století, in: Genealogické a heraldické informace 37 (2017), pp. 7–28.

BRŇOVJÁK, JIŘÍ—ŽUPANIČ, JAN (eds.): Changes of the Noble Society: Aristocracy and New Mobility in the Habsburg Monarchy and Central Europe from the Sixteenth to the Twentieth Century, Ostrava—Praha 2018.

ČERMÁK, MILOSLAV: Lidé renesanční Olomouce, in: Střední Morava 14 (2008), 26, pp. 39–68.

CIKHART, ROMAN: Šlechtické a erbovní rody na Tábořsku ve svých znacích, in: Heraldika a genealogie 27 (1994), pp. 175–184.

ČINOVEC, IGOR: Obraz vývoje stavů v 16. století podle titulářů, in: Genealogické a heraldické listy 31 (2011), 3, pp. 26–39.

CULKOVÁ, DAGMAR: Salbuchy, in: Genealogické a heraldické listy 28 (2008), 1, pp. 25–35.

DAVID, JIŘÍ: Kniha moravského rytířského stavu (1628–1690): Stavovský rozměr nobilitačního procesu, in: BRŇOVJÁK, Nobilitace ve světle písemných pramenů, pp. 141–159.

DOBIÁŠ, JOSEF: Dějiny královského města Pelhřimova a jeho okolí. Díl 3.1, část 2: Doba reformační, Pelhřimov 1950.

FEDERMAYER, FREDERIK: Burghers and Heraldry: On the Usage of Heraldic Signs by Burghers in Early Modern Hungarian Kingdom, in: The City and History 10 (2021), pp. 48–74.

FEJTOVÁ, OLGA: “Můj ortel zní, že mám z rathauzu býti oběšen ...” Kutnaurové ze Sonnenštejna—životní osudy staroměstské bratrské měšťanské rodiny v neklidné době konfesijních zvratů, in: Pražský sborník historický 48 (2020), pp. 238–271.

FEJTOVÁ, OLGA—LEDVINKA, VÁCLAV et al. (eds.): Pražské městské elity středověku a raného novověku—jejich proměny, zázemí a kulturní profil, Praha 2004 (Documenta Pragensia, 22).

- FIALA, JOSEF: Primátorský rod Štrafů v Novém Městě na Moravě, in: Rodokmen 2 (1947), pp. 10–14.
- FIALA, MICHAL: Tři studie k české renesanční heraldice (Znaky měšťanů Starého Města pražského v letech 1526–1618 ve světle salbuchů), in: Heraldická ročenka 20 (1993), pp. 3–32.
- HANÁČEK, JIŘÍ: Kniha pánů rytířů, Brno 1986.
- HÁS, JIŘÍ: Erbovní a šlechtické rody vysokomyšské, in: Heraldika a genealogie 30 (1997), 3–4, pp. 143–160.
- HRAŠE, JAN KAREL: Dějiny Náchoda: Díl první od nejstarších dob až do bitvy na Bílé hoře, Náchod 1895.
- HRDLÍČKA, JAKUB: Pražská heraldika: Znaky pražských měst, cechů a měšťanů, Praha 1993.
- HRUBÁ, MICHAELA: Měšťanské elity v královských městech severozápadních Čech v předbělohorské době, in: JUROK, pp. 125–143.
- HRUBÁ, MICHAELA: Možnosti výzkumu měšťanských elit v prostředí královských měst severozápadních Čech, in: FEJTOVÁ/LEDVINKA, Pražské městské elity středověku a raného novověku, pp. 193–210.
- HRUBÁ, MICHAELA: Erbovní měšťané—“urozená” vrstva předbělohorských českých měst? (Životní styl erbovních rodin na příkladu Mrázů z Milešovy v Litoměřicích), in: KATEŘINA JIŠOVÁ, OLGA FEJTOVÁ et al. (eds.): V komnatách paláců, v ulicích měst, Praha 2007, pp. 245–248.
- JANÁČEK, JOSEF: Pivovarnictví v českých královských městech v 16. století, Praha 1959.
- JAROŠ, ZDENĚK: Jihlavská měšťanská heraldika I.–IV, in: Vlastivědný sborník Vysočiny—Vědy společenské 6–9 (1988–1994), pp. 83–132, 81–128, 67–118, 61–107.
- JÁSEK, JAROSLAV: Karel Mělnický z Karlsperka, měšťan a stavitel, in: FEJTOVÁ/LEDVINKA, Pražské městské elity středověku a raného novověku, pp. 125–130.
- JAROŠOVÁ, JITKA: Mrázové z Milešovy v Litoměřicích v předbělohorské době, in: MICHAELA HRUBÁ, PETR RAK (eds.): Města severozápadních Čech v raném novověku, Ústí nad Labem 2000, pp. 223–237.
- JORDÁNKOVÁ, HANA: Brněnská předměstí Cejl a Radlas—stručné dějiny do poloviny 17. století, in: Brno v minulosti a dnes 16 (2002), pp. 316–328.
- JORDÁNKOVÁ, HANA—SULITKOVÁ, LUDMILA: Předbělohorské soudy na Moravě a královské město Brno, in: Časopis Matice moravské 113 (1994), pp. 235–260.
- JORDÁNKOVÁ, HANA—SULITKOVÁ, LUDMILA: Brněnská městská kancelář v předbělohorském období. (Diplomatická a prosopografická studie), in: Sborník archivních prací 45 (1995), 2, pp. 316–328.
- JORDÁNKOVÁ, HANA—SULITKOVÁ, LUDMILA: Realita každodennosti a kritika faktů hromadné povahy, in: MICHAELA KOKOJANOVÁ (ed.): Měšťané, šlechta a duchovenstvo v rezidenčních městech raného novověku 16.–18. století, Prostějov 1997, pp. 58–72.
- JORDÁNKOVÁ, HANA—SULITKOVÁ, LUDMILA: Možnosti vzdělání v předbělohorském Brně, in: BRONISLAV CHOCHOLÁČ, LIBOR JAN et al. (eds.): Nový Mars Moravicus aneb Sborník příspěvků, jež věnovali Prof. Dr. Josefu Válkovi jeho žáci a přátelé k sedmdesátinám, Brno 1999, pp. 319–334.
- JORDÁNKOVÁ, HANA—SULITKOVÁ, LUDMILA: Italové a Španělé v Brně v předbělohorském období, in: TOMÁŠ BOROVSÝ, LIBOR JAN et al. (eds.): Ad vitam et honorem profesoru Jaroslavu Mezníkovi: Přátelé a žáci k pětasedmdesátým narozeninám, Brno 2003, pp. 715–742.
- JORDÁNKOVÁ, HANA—SULITKOVÁ, LUDMILA: Měšťtí písaři a vrcholná politika čtvrtého stavu (na příkladu královského města Brna), in: Časopis Matice moravské 125 (2006), 2, pp. 367–396.
- JORDÁNKOVÁ, HANA—SULITKOVÁ, LUDMILA: Fungování nejvyššího městského správního orgánu ve světle pamětní zápisů městských písařů na příkladu raného novověkého Brna, in: ZDENĚK HOJDA, HANA PÁTKOVÁ (eds.): Pragmatické písemnosti v kontextu právním a správním, Praha 2008, pp. 139–150.

- JORDÁNKOVÁ, HANA—SULITKOVÁ, LUDMILA: Mobilita městské inteligence v raném novověku (na příkladu královského města Brna), in: OLGA FEJTOVÁ, VÁCLAV LEDVINKA (eds.): *Město a intelektuálové: Od středověku do roku 1848*, Praha 2008 (Documenta Pragensia, 27), pp. 395–417.
- JORDÁNKOVÁ, HANA—SULITKOVÁ, LUDMILA: Příběh jednoho brněnského nobilitovaného měšťana (aneb není malíř jako malíř), in: HANA AMBROŽOVÁ, TOMÁŠ DVOŘÁK et al. (eds.): *Historik na Moravě*, Brno 2009, pp. 833–852.
- JORDÁNKOVÁ, HANA—SULITKOVÁ, LUDMILA: Záliba v trpkém moku—benefit pro městskou pokladnu (na příkladu Brna v raném novověku), in: JAN KILIÁN (ed.): “Trpké býtí zdá se?” Víno a vinařství v českých zemích ve středověku a raném novověku: Sborník příspěvků z konference konané v Mělníce 2.–4. dubna 2008, Mělník 2009, pp. 191–193.
- JORDÁNKOVÁ, HANA—SULITKOVÁ, LUDMILA: Nobilitace—předpoklad pro úřední kariéru brněnského rychtáře předbělohorské doby?, in: JANA ČERMÁKOVÁ, RADANA ČERVENÁ et al. (eds.): *A vůbec ...: Utajený sborník Mileně Flodrové k 75. narozeninám*, Brno 2010, pp. 92–111.
- JORDÁNKOVÁ, HANA—SULITKOVÁ, LUDMILA: Odraz Bočkajova povstání v pramenech městské proveniencie (na příkladu Brna), in: Turek Švéd a Prajz: Vojenský živel versus město a venkov českého raného novověku, Praha 2011 (Historie—Otázky—Problémy, 3), pp. 29–46.
- JORDÁNKOVÁ, HANA—SULITKOVÁ, LUDMILA: Kroniky a pamětní knihy začátku novověku z královského města Brna, in: OLGA FEJTOVÁ, VÁCLAV LEDVINKA et al. (eds.): *Historiografie s městem spojená: Historiografie o městech a historiografie ve městech*, Praha 2018 (Documenta Pragensia, 37), pp. 333–350.
- JORDÁNKOVÁ, HANA—SULITKOVÁ, LUDMILA: Erbovní měšťané v královském městě Brně (Jejich účastenství ve správních orgánech města v 16. a 17. století a snahy po sebe prezentaci), in: ZDENĚK HOJDA, JAN KAHUDA et al. (eds.): *Z archivu ke studentům a zase zpět*, Praha 2021, pp. 73–95.
- JORDÁNKOVÁ, HANA—SULITKOVÁ, LUDMILA: Vinice brněnských měšťanů od středověku do poloviny 17. století (s přednostním zřetelem na vinice na cizích gruntech), in: *Brno v minulosti a dnes* 31 (2021), pp. 75–100.
- JUROK, JIŘÍ (ed.): *Královská a poddanská města od své geneze k protoindustrializaci a industrializaci*, Ostrava—Nový Jičín 2001.
- KAMENÍČEK, FRANTIŠEK: *Zemské sněmy a sjezdy moravské*, vols. 1–3, Brno 1900–1905.
- KILIÁN, JAN: Kropáčové z Krymlova: Z bohatých měšťanů pauperizovanými rytíři, in: *Pražský sborník historický* 35 (2007), pp. 79–114.
- KORBELÁŘOVÁ, IRENA: Erbovní a nobilitovaní měšťané slezských měst před- a pobělohorského období: kultivované osobnosti, nebo bezskrupulózní hráči?, in: JIŘÍ BRŇOVJÁK, JAN ŽUPANIČ (eds.): *Changes of the Noble Society: Aristocracy and New Mobility in the Habsburg Monarchy and Central Europe from the Sixteenth to the Twentieth Century*, Ostrava—Praha 2018, pp. 115–134.
- KORBELÁŘOVÁ, IRENA—ŽÁČEK, RUDOLF: Opavští erbovní měšťané předbělohorské doby: Prolegomena k výzkumu, in: *Slezský sborník* 113 (2015), 1, pp. 5–21.
- KRATOCHVÍL, KAREL: Pelhřimovský primas Matěj Mauricius Klokotský a radní vrstva: K roli příbuzenských vztahů v samosprávě královských měst v 17. století, in: *Opera historica* 12 (2007), pp. 221–254.
- KREJČÍK, TOMÁŠ: Diplomatika erbovních listin vydaných českou panovnickou kanceláří 14–18. století, in: ŠÍŠMIŠ, pp. 132–144.
- KREJČÍK, TOMÁŠ: K diplomacie nobilitačních a erbovních listin v novověku, in: BRŇOVJÁK, *Nobilitace ve světle písemných pramenů*, pp. 13–35.
- KUBÍKOVÁ, ANNA: Českokrumlovský měšťan Matyáš Fuch z Fuchýřova, in: *Časopis Národního muzea v Praze, řada historická* 166 (1977), 1–2, pp. 1–5.
- LANGHAMROVÁ, JITKA: *Demografie: Učební text pro Univerzitu třetího věku*, Praha 2007, pp. 11–12, 20.

- LINTNER, JAN: Z historie soběslavských rodin, in: *Časopis rodopisné společnosti české* 3 (1931), pp. 17–21, 84–86.
- MALINOVSKÝ, ANTON F.: Rakovnická panská lavice s erby, in: *Heraldika a genealogie* 39 (2006), 1–2, pp. 109–116.
- MAREK, JAROSLAV: Lidnatost Brna v 14. až 16. století, in: *Brno v minulosti a dnes* 2 (1960), pp. 125–147.
- MARKUS, ANTONÍN—PILNÁČEK, JOSEF: *Znamení a znaky nešlechticů*, Praha 2004 [1933].
- MATĚJEK, FRANTIŠEK: *Moravské zemské desky 1567–1642. Sv. 3: Kraj Olomoucký*, Praha 1953.
- MATĚJKOVÁ, EVA: Kutnohorský patricijský rod “z Vrchovišť” v jagellonské době, in: *Východočeský sborník historický* 21 (2012), pp. 117–149.
- MÜLLER, KAREL: Olomoucký erbovní měšťan Valentin Parsch z Prschendorfu, in: *Ročenka Státního okresního archivu v Olomouci* 9 (28) (2000), pp. 138–142.
- NEKUDA, VLADIMÍR: *Vlastivěda moravská: Vyškovsko*, Brno—Vyškov 1965.
- NOHEL, ROLAND: *Kutnohorské erbovní rody*, Kutná Hora 1998.
- PEŘINOVÁ, HELENA: Teuflové z Zeilperka: A Paper on Understanding the Life of the Upper Class in the Old Town of Prague at the Turn of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries, in: *Pražský sborník historický* 32 (2003), pp. 39–64.
- PEŠEK, JIŘÍ: Mistr Jan Kaňka z Veleslavína—obyčejný život pražského profesora a měšťana doby rudolfínské, in: *Acta Universitatis Carolinae: Historia Universitatis Carolinae Pragensis* 47 (2007), 1–2, pp. 161–170.
- PILNÁČEK, JOSEF: *Staromoravští rodové*, Videň 1930.
- PILNÁČEK, JOSEF: *Občanské znaky*, Brno 2009.
- PILNÁČEK-RADOSTICKÝ, JOSEF P.: *Královéhradecké, chrudimské, pražské aj. rodiny erbovní a měšťanské*, Videň 1919.
- PILNÁČEK, JOSEF—ŠVÁBENSKÝ, MOJMÍR: *Neznámé rody a znaky staré Moravy*, Brno 1983.
- PŘIKRYLOVÁ, MIROSLAVA: Podíl nobilitovaných měšťanů na staroměstské samosprávě v letech 1547–1648, in: *Documenta Pragensia* 9 (1991), 1, pp. 135–179.
- RECHČIGLOVÁ, HANA: *Erbovníci a jejich přijímání do rytířského stavu před vydáním Obnoveného zřízení zemského*, PhD Diss., Charles University Prague, 1977.
- RICHTER, DAVID: Francové z Liblic v Chrudimi: Sonda do majetkového a sociálního postavení elitní rodiny v prostředí královského města v 16. století, in: *Východočeský sborník historický* 29 (2015), pp. 35–78.
- RITTER VON CHLUMECKY, PETER: *Des Rathsherrn und Apothekers Georg Ludwig Chronik von Brünn (1555–1604)*, Brünn 1859.
- ROEDL, BOHUMÍR: *Žatecká rodina Hošťálků z Javořice*, Louny 1997.
- ROEDL, BOHUMÍR: *Dodatky k Hošťálkům z Javořice a rodině Pavla Skály ze Zhoře*, in: *Sborník Okresního archivu v Lounech* 10 (2001), pp. 101–122.
- RYBIČKA, ANTONÍN: O nymburských rodinách erbovních, in: *Památky archaeologické* 4 (1860), pp. 92–93.
- RYBIČKA, ANTONÍN: O šlechtických a erbovních rodinách rodinách čáslavských, in: *Památky archaeologické* 5 (1863), pp. 353–360.
- RYBIČKA, ANTONÍN: *Královéhradecké rodiny erbovní*, Praha 1873.
- RYBIČKA, ANTONÍN: *Rodiny šlechtické v XV–XVII. století v Chrudimi*, in: *Památky archaeologické* 10 (1874), pp. 27–42.
- RYBIČKA, ANTONÍN: *Erbovní rodiny Plzeňské*, in: *Památky archaeologické* 10 (1875), pp. 262–274.
- SAKAŘ, JOSEF: *Dějiny Pardubic nad Labem II, 2*, Pardubice 1925.
- ŠIMÁK, JOSEF VÍTĚZSLAV: Erbovní a šlechtické rodiny turnovské, in: *Časopis Společnosti přátel starožitností* 10 (1902), pp. 86–92, 116–142.
- ŠIŠMIŠ, MILAN (ed.): *Zborník príspevkov z medzinárodnej konferencie, ktorá sa v dňoch 19.–20. októbra 2005 uskutočnila v priestoroch Slovenskej národnej knižnice v Martine*, Martin 2006.

- SOLAŘ, JERONÝM JAN: Dějepis Hradce Králové nad Labem a biskupství hradeckého, Praha 1870.
- SPIESS, BEDŘICH VILÉM: Sousedé plnoprávní, předměstští a erbovní v 16. a 17. století v Hradci Králové, in: Ratibor (1891), 27–29, not pag.
- SPIESS, BEDŘICH VILÉM: Královéhradečtí erbovníci na počátku XVII. století, in: Ratibor (1898), 37–41, not pag.
- SPIESS, BEDŘICH VILÉM: Erbovníci a šlechtici v Hradci Králové na počátku XVII. století usedlí, in: Památky archaeologické 20 (1902), pp. 319–324.
- STARÝ, MAREK: Rodový erb, jeho přejímání a dědické právo v 17. století, in: KARIN BRZOBOHATÁ, TOMÁŠ TYL (eds.): Symbol a symbolika v právu, Praha 2006, pp. 63–84.
- STARÝ, MAREK: Udělování erbu a stavu v českém zemském právu před a po Bílé hoře, in: ŠÍSMÍŠ, pp. 121–131.
- ŠTEFL, IVAN: Pražákové z Petřína (k erbům rodin královéhradeckých), in: Listy genealogicko-heraldické společnosti (1974), 2, pp. 10–12.
- STEMBERG, VAVŘINEC: O rodinách rytířských a erbovních v Novém Bydžově v 16. a 17. století, in: Památky archaeologické 9 (1872), pp. 309–320.
- STERNECK, TOMÁŠ: Moravská zemská zbrojnice v Brně na přelomu 16. a 17. století, in: Brno v minulosti a dnes 17 (2003), pp. 273–309.
- STERNECK, TOMÁŠ: Měšťanské elity v berních úřadech a královská města jako daňoví poplatníci—střet zájmů? Případ předbělohorského Brna, in: FEJTOVÁ/LEDVINKA, Pražské městské elity středověku a raného novověku, pp. 225–242.
- STERNECK, TOMÁŠ: Jakub Kunek z Rosenthalu a jeho analistické záznamy, in: Brno v minulosti a dnes 19 (2006), pp. 351–390.
- STERNECK, TOMÁŠ: Město, válka a daně: Brno v moravském berním systému za dlouhé války s Vysokou Portou (1593–1606), Praha 2006.
- STERNECK, TOMÁŠ: Consul Budvicensis a jeho vlastnoruční genealogické záznamy, in: Výběr 47 (2007), pp. 40–67.
- STERNECK, TOMÁŠ: Mezi měšťany a šlechtou: Dějiny rodu Doudlebských ze Sternecku, Brno 2009.
- STERNECK, TOMÁŠ—ŠIMŮNEK, ROBERT: Der böhmische und mährische Niederadel im Spätmittelalter und in der Frühen Neuzeit: Seine sozialen, politischen und kulturellen Hintergründe, in: LEONHARD HELTEN, ANKE NEUGEBAUER et al. (eds.): Niederadlige Herrschaftskulturen: Legitimationen—Repräsentationen—Strategien, Halle (Saale) 2021, pp. 39–72.
- STRÉR, BOHUMIL: Erbovní rodiny v Domažlicích, ed. by V. MIŠKOVSKÝ, in: Ročenka Městského musea v Domažlicích (1937), pp. 5–35.
- ŠTROBLOVÁ, HELENA: Kutnohorský podnikatelský patriciát a erbovní páni z Vrchovišť, in: Časopis Národního muzea v Praze, řada historická 161 (1992), 1–2, pp. 8–13.
- SULITKOVÁ, LUDMILA: Ke kritice pramenů hromadné povahy k dějinám měst v 16. století (na příkladu Brna), in: Časopis Matice moravské 105 (1986), pp. 290–291.
- SULITKOVÁ, LUDMILA: Domy s právem nálevu piva a vína ve středověkém a raně novověkém Brně, in: Acta historica et museologica universitatis Silesianae Opaviensis, řada C 2 (1995), pp. 59–71.
- SULITKOVÁ, LUDMILA: Městské úřední knihy z Archivu města Brna 1343–1619: Katalog. Úvodní svazek, Brno 1998.
- SULITKOVÁ, LUDMILA: Měšťané, jejich společenství a elity v Brně v předbělohorském období, in: JUROK, pp. 115–123.
- SULITKOVÁ, LUDMILA: Patriciát nebo vrchní vrstva? Zamyšlení nad charakterem horní vrstvy městského obyvatelstva v Brně v předbělohorském období, in: Studia Historica Tyrnaviensia 3 (2003), pp. 255–270.
- SULITKOVÁ, LUDMILA: Vývoj městských knih v Brně ve středověku (v kontextu vývoje městských knih v českých zemích), Praha—Brno 2004.

- SULITKOVÁ, LUDMILA: Městské elity ve středověku a raném novověku (na příkladu moravského královského města Brna), in: JIŘÍ HANZAL, ONDŘEJ ŠEFČÍK (eds.): *Sršatý Prajz: Erich Šefčík (1945–2004)*, Praha 2010, pp. 29–50.
- SULITKOVÁ, LUDMILA: K metodologickým otázkám studia erbovních měšťanů, in: VLADIMÍR RÁBIK (ed.): *Litteris ac moribus imbutus*, Trnava 2014, pp. 319–333.
- TOŠNEROVÁ, MARIE: Jindřich Čížek z Jenštejna, in: *Minulostí Berounska 5* (2002), pp. 305–311.
- TOŠNEROVÁ, MARIE: Maxmilián Albín z Jenčova: Portrét renesančního měšťana, in: *Minulostí Berounska 6* (2003), pp. 279–288.
- VANČURA, JINDŘICH: Dějiny někdejšího královského města Klatov I, 2, Klatovy 1928–1929.
- VEČEŘOVÁ, PETRA: Jiří Závěta ze Závětic (1575–1637?), in: FEJTOVÁ/LEDVINKA, *Pražské městské elity středověku a raného novověku*, pp. 131–158.
- VOŠTA, KAREL: Schafferové z Jelče a Schaffendorfu, in: *Kutnohorsko: Vlastivědný sborník 19* (2017), pp. 1–15.
- VRTEL, LADISLAV: Pokus o definiciu erbu, in: LADISLAV VRTEL (ed.): *Heraldická terminológia I*, Martin 2003, pp. 7–40.
- WEYRAUCH, ERDMANN: Die politische Führungsschicht Kitzingens vornehmlich im 16. Jahrhundert, in: INGRID BÁTORI, ERDMANN WEYRAUCH (eds.): *Die bürgerliche Elite der Stadt Kitzingen*, Stuttgart 1982, pp. 205–275.
- WINTER, ZIKMUND: Kulturní obraz českých měst I: Život veřejný v XV. a XVI. věku, Praha 1890.
- ŽOUŽELKA, ZBYNĚK: Moravská šlechtická matrica: Pramen k dějinám moravské šlechty doby pobělohorské, in: BRŇOVJÁK, *Nobilitace ve světle písemných pramenů*, pp. 174–181.
- ŽUPANIČ, JAN—FIALA, MICHAL—KOBASA, PAVEL: *Šlechtický archiv c. k. ministerstva vnitra: Erbovní listiny*, Praha 2014.
- ŽUREK, KAREL: *Merky olomouckých měšťanů ve XIV–XVIII století*, Olomouc 1992.