Discourses on Urban Order

Conference of the International Commission
for the History of Towns (ICHT)

Matera, 23-25 September 2024

Campus Università della Basilicata, Via Lanera 20

International Commission for History of Towns
Commission Internationale pour l'Histoire des Villes
Internationale Kommission für Städtegeschichte

ICHT CIHV IKSG

REGIONE BASILICATA

Progetto MeDiLuc - "Potenza e Matera nel
Medioevo: edizione digitale e studio dei
documenti (secc. XII-XVI" - Fondo per lo
Sviluppo e la Coesione - Regione Basilicata -
Dipartimento di Scienze Umane

COMUNE DI MATERA

Abstracts

Organisers: International Commission for the History of Towns with University of Basilicata

Sunday, 22 September 2024
Arrival of the participants
Board meeting of the ICHT

Monday, 23 September 2024

10:30-13:00 Atlas Working Group session and business meeting

13:00-14:30 Lunch break

14:30-15:00 Conference registration

15:30-16:00 Official opening of the Conference

Roman Czaja (president of ICHT), **Irena Benyovsky Latin** (general secretary of ICHT), **Domenico Bennardi** (Mayor of Matera), **Ignazio M. Mancini** (Rector of UniBas) *Greetings*

16:00-17:30 Session 1 chaired by **Laurentiu Rădvan**, University of Iași

Francesco Panarelli, Francesca Sogliani (University of Basilicata), The medieval origins of the city of Matera

Irena Benyovsky Latin (Croatian Institute of History, Zagreb), Discourses of urban order in transformation of Dubrovnik's suburbs into the centre of the city during the Venetian rule

17:10-17:30 Q&A Discussion

17.30-19.30 General assembly of the ICHT

20:00 Conference dinner

Tuesday, 24 September 2024

9:30-10:50 Session 2 chaired by **Ferdinand Opll**, University of Vienna

Rosa Smurra (University of Bologna), Medieval university and urban order in Bologna (12th-15th centuries)

Roman Czaja (University of Toruń), The political order of the cities of Königsberg - a contribution to the discourse on the specificity of the urban political order in Eastern Central Europe at the turn of the Middle Ages and in the Early Modern Period

10:30-10:50 Q&A Discussion

10:50-11:10 Break

11:10-13:10 Session 3 chaired by **Roey Sweet**, University of Leicester

Jana Vojtíšková (University of Hradec Králové), Town law of the Kingdom of Bohemia from 1579 as a significant stabilizing element of the town order in early modern Bohemia

Olga Kozubska (Institute for Comparative Urban History, Muenster), Ordering the diversity: establishing order in multi-religious urban milieu of Kamianetsk Podilsky (17th-18th centuries)

Liudas Glemža (Vytautas Magnus University, Kaunas), Municipal reforms in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, 1764-1794: from the unification of rights to the extension of self-government

12:40-13:10 Q&A Discussion

13:10-15:00 Break

15:00-17:00 Session 4 chaired **by Martin Scheut**z, University of Vienna

Remigijus Civinskas (Vytautas Magnus University, Lithuania), The interests of urban elites in minimising the negative impacts of imperial government reforms: a discourse analysis of the appeals of Lithuanian townsmen and Jews (1795–1863)

Miriam Tveit, Steinar Aas (Nord University, Bodø), Urban order and the origins of the Nordic welfare state

Marjaana Niemi (University of Tampere), Managing the city, making modern citizens: Debates about urban infrastructure in Helsinki in the late 19th and early 20th centuries

17:00-17:20 Break

17:20-19:20 Session 5 chaired by **Michel Pauly**, University of Luxembourg

Gilles Genot (Lëtzebuerg City Museum), Multilingualism and urban order: a historical perspective on the city of Luxembourg (19th-21st centuries)

Mariavaleria Mininni (University of Basilicata), Matera, an urban story still to be told

Martina Stercken, (University of Zurich), Urban order Closing remarks
19:20-19:40 Q&A Discussion

20:00 Dinner

Wednesday, 25 September 2024

09:00-11:30: Guided walking tour of Matera
Discussion
Conference ends

The medieval origins of the city of Matera

Matera is one of the few Italian cities that originated in the Middle Ages; written sources relating to the first centuries of its existence are really thin and only begin to provide us with more abundant information from the 13th century onwards. To reconstruct order in the design of the city, we must work by induction and start from the decisions concretely made by the urban community (*Universitas*) and the Monarchy. By the mid-13th century, the city had acquired a well-defined profile, with a castle (attested since the 11th century), a cathedral (built between 1203 and 1270, even in the absence of a bishop) and the division into three clearly distinct districts. This subdivision is also a peculiarity of the new town, as it is the only case within the division of burdens in the *Statutum de reparacione castrorum* (ordered by Frederick II) that provides for a clear division between the *Civita* and the two Sassi. This division was maintained even in the following centuries, when shared choices between the *Universitas* of Matera and the monarchy led to the dismantling of the old castle to make room for urban construction. Choices on the organisation of urban space can be read above all in the privileges agreed upon with the Angevin and Aragonese monarchy. (Panarelli)

The lack of written documentation for an interpretation of the 'forma urbis' of Matera for the early Middle Ages is, in the current state of research, at least partly made up for by the archaeological data, which confirms the post-antique origin of the urban core, and the absence of a topographical genesis from the Roman period and the usual orthogonal grid. The discoveries made in the early 20th century in the *Civita* district relating to Byzantine coins and the identification of churches and rocky monastic complexes with liturgical and decorative spaces of oriental influence have directed more recent research that, by recomposing already known information and new data cross-referenced with scarce historical-documentary sources, is reinterpreting the urban physiognomy of Matera in the Middle Ages. Matera's fully urban and strategic role was consolidated in the early Middle Ages, in the years when the Byzantine component had to manage both administrative and fiscal aspects and military control, also through forms of integration, revealed by the sources, with representatives of the previous Lombard government and the local component. Consequently, the urban topography, thanks also to the material data, seems to reflect the initial hierarchies of the social fabric to which the representatives of secular and religious power, who probably occupied the area of the *Civita*, belonged; the inhabitants distributed themselves in the rocky city around it. (Sogliani)

Francesco Panarelli (University of Basilicata)
Francesca Sogliani (University of Basilicata)

Discourses of urban order in transformation of Dubrovnik's suburbs into the centre of the city during the Venetian rule

Based on my recent research of medieval Dubrovnik/Ragusa, I will discuss discourses of urban order (introduced and maintained via spatial planning and administration of space) that aimed to build a sense of security and belonging to a wider community but also to reinforce the existing hierarchy, social stratification and communal control.

In the period of Venetian rule (1205-1358) the city experienced significant political and social changes and it transformed into an important port and economic centre of South Adriatic, as its trade market expanded into the hinterland. The rapid population growth resulted in an increased demand for housing space and the expansion of the old town boundaries. During this time the city tripled its size, and the process included projects such as filling up the marshy land that divided the old town on the peninsula from the coast (where there was a settlement later known as St. Nicholas suburb); (re)organising the (new) suburban land accordingly (in several phases) – changing the number and sizes of plots, introducing new communications and redirecting the old ones, constructing new lines of the walls etc. At the turn of the 14th century this gradual „work-in progress" culminated with unification of different suburbs and their final connection with the old city.

This long and dynamic process, reconstructed with combined approaches of social topography and spatial syntax, resulted in residential mobility and changed relation between centre and periphery. The transformation of Dubrovnik's suburbs into the centre of the city is analysed with regard to the terrain, local heritage, the position of local urban elite, but also through the influence of Venice and its representatives in the city - the (permanent) counts that carried out the policy from the central authority, bringing the knowledge and experience from different parts of Venetian territory and beyond. (In Dubrovnik, their lodgings were located in the walled area separated from the city, positioned between the old town and the suburbs, what may be compared with some other Eastern Adriatic cities under Venetian rule.)

According to the recent archaeological data, as well as to the documentary and spatial analysis, we can trace the phases in planned organisation of Dubrovnik's suburbia form the beginning of the Duecento. The organisation of suburban land was changing according to multiple factors: the function of this space, the character and the number of the tenants, the construction of the new public buildings extra muros, development of the city port, the external and internal crisis and threats etc. Already by the middle of the 13th century, the suburbs had become an attractive residential location for some of the wealthiest (new and local) families. They provided the necessary space and economic opportunities due to the proximity to the new political, economic, and administrative centre.

New organisation of the suburbs meant also the establishment of communal/state control over the land and the (new) urban population. It also went along with the introduction of statutory regulations and communal administration. In the late 13th century, a public street network began to be established as a sign of communal control of this area and the transformation of the large *territoria* to the smaller units - city lots. The sources that are crucial for investigating this process are notarial documents as well as the regulations in the Statute of Dubrovnik concerning streets – that of 1272 and that of 1296., after the fire that had destroyed most of the city. Whereas the former confirmed the existing situation

and introduced a new network of streets in the *burgus* of St Blasius, the latter planned new streets in the same *burgus* after the fire and regulated those in the 'communal' *burgus* of St Nicholas. The decision of 1272 resulted from a demographic increase, as well as the economic dynamics of the city, which required a new infrastructure and a re-evaluation of the existing territories. The area of the *burgus* was organized as an orthogonal network, and the tracts set aside for housing construction were defined. Although basic disposition from the previous period survives, large blocks gradually disappeared from the *burgus*. The owners of the plots were mostly members of local urban elite and religious institutions. Commoners mostly rented the plots on private estates and on communal land. In medieval Dubrovnik urban policies and urban land-use intersected, as housing and building codes and property regulations served putting in order physical and related social relations. The whole fifth book of the Statute of 1272 was entirely consecrated to the matters of building and public utilities: streets, water supplies, drainage, relations between neighbours, etc. The government's aim to administer communal property fund and control collecting of rent resulted in establishing the Books of Communal Properties and Rents (from 1286) - official registers that periodically revised complete inventories of communal land, providing evidence on their holders/tenants paying annual rent. This early appearance of Dubrovnik's real-estate fund, as well as the regulatory interventions in the *burgus*, were closely related to the city's coherent planning policy of the late 13th century, showing the tendency to ensure administrative and fiscal control over the (sub)urban space.

After the fire of 1296, which destroyed much of the suburbia (because of predominance of wooden houses), the new phase of the development was achieved. The destruction cleared the space for more contemporary urban regulation - a new layout of streets and street blocks. The main formative element became elongated block with two rows of houses – but it was a renewed version of the older blocks. The exact number and the width of a street as well as the dimension of the lots were fixed. The new plan was best introduced in the northern suburb of St Nicholas where land plots were owned by the commune, and they were intended for long term rent. At the turn of the 14th century, the former suburbs had become the city's residential and economic hub, encircled by the new northern city walls. Spatial planning and administration of space that were introduced in medieval Dubrovnik in the 13th and first half of the 14th centuries had their very practical function (residential, economic, administrative, safety), as well as an aesthetic and conceptual one, because they reflected a political system, social hierarchy and common good.

Regular grid was a practical way to organize a city, but also a visible symbol of order and control in a specific historical context. The organisation of urban space in medieval Dubrovnik may be compared with some other cities in Eastern Adriatic under Venetian rule: elements of specific 'urban model' can be identified as adapted to the complex terrain and existing local heritage and institutions. The introduction of recognizable elements in urban planning, recognizable public buildings and standardized legal and administrative system (often adjusted to the local customs) certainly helped incorporating the city into a wider area of governance, facilitating the formation of a common identity and a sense of belonging to a Venetian community.

Irena Benyovsky Latin (Croatian Institute of History, Zagreb, Croatia)

Medieval university and urban order in Bologna (12th-15th centuries)

This paper aims to explore the discourses on the urban order and its connection with the medieval university (*Studium*) starting from the imperial *constitutio* promulgated by Frederick Barbarossa (1155) providing for forms of protection for students and *magistri* who had moved away from their place of origin for the purposes of their studies, through various normative texts produced up to the last communal statutes of Bologna (1454).

The focus of the article is on town laws (statutes) as an instrument of order and an expression of municipal autonomy vis-à-vis other powers, such as the imperial one, from which an analysis of the relationship between urban order and the university cannot be separated.

In fact, the statutes can be seen as a mirror, albeit a distorted one at times, of the urban order that the Bolognese city government was developing in its various phases. Bologna, like other medieval cities, kept several drafts of its Statutes, and already in the first statutes, the Municipality promulgated rules expressing a strong interest in maintaining the presence of the University in the city, given the prestige and economic benefits derived from the flow of students.

It is perhaps not surprising to note that all the drafts of the Statutes contain provisions relating to the University, and this gives an idea of how important it was for the Bolognese urban order to clarify the pillars of this liaison. The relationship between the urban order created and modified by the *Commune* during this period and the various phases of development and transformation of the *Studium* highlights the fact that the presence of the community of professors and students in the city was an indispensable condition for the urban order. To this end, after a reference to the Imperial Constitution, the analysis is based on the legal documentation dating from the first half of the 13th century, through the numerous redactions of the following century, until the middle of the 15th century (1454). This is a considerable body of documentation, often influenced by the school of law, i.e. the professors of the *Studium*.

Given that the dynamics of the evolution of medieval Bologna were inextricably linked to those of the emergence and development of the University, I wish to examine the relationship between the two institutions in the light of the discourses emanating from legislative activity, that is to say, from the set of rules that were incorporated into the city's legal compilations and that shaped the coexistence of the members of the urban community. Within the latter, the diverse university community, whose members were largely foreigners and expatriates, played a prominent role.

The importance and prestige of the city was greatly influenced by the development of the *Studium*, as evidenced by the presence of thousands of students, the majority of whom were non-Bolognese. The *magistri* and *scolares* formed a large community which, as is well known, was of primary importance for the Bolognese economy. Aware of this role, the *magistri* and *scolares* never missed an opportunity to protest in order to assert their position and obtain privileges. The most common means used by the students was to threaten to leave the city along with their professors. By the beginning of the 13th century, both students and professors had gained power within the urban community and systematically threatened to leave the city in case of conflict with the municipality.

As is well known, some of these 'migrations' in the 13th century gave rise to *Studia* in other Italian cities, some long-lived, others ephemeral. Bologna had tried to curb this

phenomenon and, since the end of the 12th century, had bound professors to the city by oath. However, to stay in the first quarter of the century, there were at least three secessions: students and professors migrated to Vicenza in 1204, to Arezzo in 1215, and to Padua in 1222.

To sum up, during the three centuries under consideration, there was no shortage of tensions and hostilities between the *Commune* and *Studium*, but there were also convergences and collaborations, and on the whole the link created between the studio and the city was strong, so much so that one could speak of an indissoluble symbiosis. But what discourses were used to support this relationship or, on the contrary, to undermine it? How did the urban order interfere with the autonomy of the medieval university? What are the most striking themes that emerge from a study of the redactions of the statutes over three centuries?

On the basis of some of the provisions of the municipal statutes, an attempt will be made to analyse the tenor of the discourses that can be discerned behind the dictates of the norms, which were given ample prominence in the vast amount of legislation produced over the centuries.

Rosa Smurra (University of Bologna)

The political order of the cities of Könisgberg - a contribution to the discourse on the specificity of the urban political order in Eastern Central Europe at the turn of the Middle Ages and in the Early Modern Period

In the middle of the fifteenth century, the trend towards a change in the political and social order of the towns in the countries to the east of the Elbe became apparent. In place of the hitherto alliance between territorial rulers and urban ruling groups, which had enabled most towns to retain significant political and political autonomy, comes the effort of the princes to abolish the independence of the towns. The attack of the Elector Frederick II on Berlin in 1442 is considered to be one of the first instances of the territorial lord's abolition of the city's political independence.

This paper aims to examine, using the examples of the Altstadt Königsberg and Kneiphof Königsberg, the process of limiting the autonomy of the town and the discourses on the model of political organisation of towns during periods of particularly intense political conflict: the mid-15th century and the first two decades of the 16th century. The choice of these two cities as the subject of the case study is primarily due to the unique dynamics of their relationship with the territorial ruler. Both cities belonged to the group of so-called large cities that were actively involved in the political life of the Teutonic Order's state in Prussia from the middle of the 14th century, with long-distance Hanseatic trade as the basis for their economic development.

The large Prussian cities had enjoyed full independence in the mid-15th century through the election of town councils, court officials, and the legislating of statutes. The ruling groups of these cities demonstrated their aspirations for independent government over the cities and for participation in political decisions concerning the whole country. During the growing conflict with the ruler of the country (the Teutonic Order) from the 1430s onwards, the large Prussian cities began to use the formula "privileges, liberties and rights" as a legal and political basis to legitimise their political independence from the ruler of the country and their aspirations for sovereignty. The treatment of privileges as a certain legal entity referred to the legal and political formulas known in the cities of the Holy Roman Empire, which were based on the general idea of freedom (Libertas) of the city.

The understanding of the urban community as a sovereign entity emerges very clearly in the dispute over the oath of new citizens and senior guilds, which broke out in the Altstadt Königsberg in 1449. The city council, which belonged to a party opposed to the Teutonic Order, removed the pledge of allegiance to the ruler of the country from the oath and left only the provision on obedience to the city council and action for the good of the city. The Archbishop of Riga, who took part in the resolution of the conflict, accurately read the intentions of the city council, which in his opinion was seeking a position comparable to the free cities of the Holy Roman Empire. The participants in the conflict formed themselves according to the classic model: the ruling group - and on the other side the commoners and the ruler of the country.

A different model of the relationship between the city and the territorial ruler was expressed by the officials of the Teutonic Order. The opinion drawn up by the Commander (Komtur) of Thorn on overcoming the political crisis in Prussia contains a vision of cities fully subordinated to the authority of the Teutonic Order. Among other things, the

Commander recommended: the abolition of municipal law and the subordination of cities to the general law of the country, full control by the ruler over the election of city officials, and annual homage of newly elected officials. The conception of the relationship between the ruler of the country and the cities expressed in the letter of the Commander of Thorn was certainly not an isolated voice of an official of the Teutonic Order. It certainly reflected the position of the majority of the brother knights, who were well familiar with the process of subordinating cities and towns to the authority of princes from their home countries in the Holy Roman Empire. However, the opinion of the Commander cannot be regarded as a strategic program; rather, we should speak of the gradual implementation of the proposals depending on the current political situation.

For the first time, the conditions for the limitation of the legal and political independence of the cities of Königsberg appeared in the middle of the 15th century. In 1454 the large cities, including the Altstadt Königsberg and Kneiphof, as well as the Prussian knights supported by the Polish king, took up arms against the Teutonic Order. The troops of the Teutonic Order with the support of the commoners managed to suppress the revolt of both cities in 1456. The position of the territorial ruler was strengthened by the transfer of the Grand Master's residence from Marienburg to Königsberg in 1457. The Teutonic Order removed the previous ruling group in the Alstadt Königsberg and in Kneiphof from power and gained influence in shaping the composition of the municipal councils and in establishing the municipal statutes.

The second part of the paper will present a discourse on the communal political order in the cities of Königsberg during the period of the reign of the last two grand masters, Frederick Duke of Saxony (1498-1510) and Albrecht von Hohenzollern (1511-1525). Their reign was determined by two objectives; the centralization and strengthening of the grand master's power and an active and costly policy towards the Kingdom of Poland. From the beginning of the 16th century, there is a visible tendency to remove the legal autonomy of cities, visible in legal acts and ceremonial: the obligation of the council to swear an oath to the Grand Master every year and the handing over of the keys to the city gates to the new council by the castle Commander, the establishment of a sovereign court in the castle which served as an instance of appeal against the judgments of the city court and the abolition of the right of court appeals to Magdeburg, the establishment in the Grand Master's office of a special book in which information on the tributes paid by city councils and lists of new citizens were recorded.

At the beginning of the 16th century, a new element was introduced into the discourse on the city model, namely the direct power of the territorial ruler over the burghers. Laws passed on the initiative of the grand master (the country statute of 1503) strengthened his position towards all burghers, thus undermining the role of the council as a representative of the municipality to the territorial authority. The statutes issued by the ruler of the country did not question the authority of the town council over the municipality; on the contrary, they expressed the concept of a hierarchical order of power: just as the town councilors are subordinate to the grand master, the town council rules over the town. This oligarchic conception of political order was based on the link between the municipal ruling group and the territorial ruler.

The idea of the hierarchical and oligarchic political order in the cities of Königsberg, however, did not correspond to the dynamic social reality in which the municipal commune emerged as an important actor. It should be emphasised, however, that the

political activity of the commoners did not result solely from bottom-up aspirations to participate in municipal political life, but was to a large extent a consequence of the interaction between the ruling group and the territorial ruler. In the first quarter of the 16th century, the councils of the two cities of Königsberg, faced with increasing tax demands from the grand master, sought to avoid the full responsibility of agreeing to new taxes for fear of public discontent. For this reason, the city councils sought to involve the burghers in the political decision-making process. The ruling group of Königsberg seeking to distribute responsibility for the new taxes was even prepared to challenge its position as an intermediary between the municipal community and the city lord. In 1501, during a discussion on the introduction of a new beer tax, the town council requested from the grand master that officials of the Teutonic Order present the draft tax and its justification to the townspeople.

The municipal law did not specify procedures for the participation of the common people in the political life of the city. It contained only general formulations for the inclusion of the commoners or their elders in the discourse on the most important matters concerning the community. The inclusion of the commoners in the decision-making process therefore required the development of a basic organisational framework, above all the places of discourse and community leadership. During the first two decades of the 16th century, a spatial expansion of political discourse is marked. Debate over decision-making took place not only in the castle and town halls, but also in town squares, guild houses and burgher gardens. Connected with the places where people gathered was the problem of communal leadership, to which the court benches, guild elders and spontaneously elected leaders, the so-called elders of the people, aspired. Very characteristic of the debate on the new city model is the idea of a dichotomous structure of municipal communes: a council-led commune consisting of merchants and brewers and a commune of craftsmen, represented by elders drawn from the various craft guilds.

The political divide in the two towns of Königsberg worked to the advantage of the Grand Master, who was in urgent need of financial support during the period of war with Poland between 1519 and 1525. Albrecht von Hohenzollern, according to the principle of divide et impera, sought to win over divergent interests and aspirations within the townspeople of Königsberg. He was also instrumental in the discourse on the political model of the urban community. In 1521, in order to obtain the consent of the ruling group to establish new taxes, he advocated an oligarchic model of the municipality in a country statute. Among other things, this statute introduced, for the first time in the history of the Teutonic Order state, a distinction in terms of dress between councilors, benches, and merchants on the one hand and craftsmen on the other. In the following year, the country's ruler, faced with the threat of revolt and the resistance of the town councils to the new taxes, supported the commoners' aspirations to participate in municipal power. The grand master issued a separate privilege for the commoners of all the towns of Königsberg, in which he canceled the dress restrictions introduced in 1521 and, in addition, ordered that guild representatives be included in the town council meetings.

The general reason for the end of the intense debate on the political model of the cities of Königsberg in 1525 was the strengthening of the political position of the territorial ruler. The Grand Master made peace with Poland and secularised the Teutonic Order state in Prussia, and then, as a secular prince, assumed power over Prussia. The Reformation strengthened his authority as the country's church leader. On the occasion of the fight in

1525 against the peasant uprising in Sambia, burghers opposed to the oligarchic rule of the council were expelled under the pretext of cooperating with the rebellion.

After 1525, the Altstadt Königsberg and Kneiphof, like Berlin in 1442, were subordinated to the ducal authority. The alliance of the ruling group with the ruler of the country became the foundation of the political model of the cities on the Pregel. It is clear from the considerations presented that this was not the only way in which the relationship between the municipal community and the city lord developed in east-central Europe.

Roman Czaja (Faculty of History, Nicolaus Copernicus University
Toruń, Poland)

Town Law of the Kingdom of Bohemia from 1579 as a significant stabilizing element of the town order in early modern Bohemia

"I. Právo pak nic jiného není nežli umění a rozeznání dobrého od zlého, spravedlivého od nespravedlivého, pravého od křivého, mírného od nemírného, kteréž jednoho každého k tomu vede a učí, čeho se má přidržeti a čeho se zase vystříhati.
II. A tak známost a umění práv záleží na tomto trém: totiž ctně a šlechetně živu býti; bližnímu v ničemž neubližovati; a čím komu, kdo spravedlivě jest, povinovat, toho jemu sám od sebe udělovati. Což kdyby vůbec ode všech zachováno bylo, nebylo by potřebí práv psaných ani zřízení, ustanovení aneb snešení obecních a lepší mnohém by řád mezi lidmi byl."

The urban network, made up of royal and serf towns, began to crystallize intensively in the Kingdom of Bohemia, from a geographical point of view in Bohemia, influenced by a number of factors in the 13th century. The earliest town-type settlements include Litoměřice and the Old Town of Prague (Prague), which, especially due to favourable historical-geographical factors and the proximity of the royal seat, permanently acquired the role of the main and most important city of the kingdom. The adoption of town law, the knowledge of which was brought by incoming German-speaking colonists or transiting merchants in the first wave of town foundations, was essential for these legal towns being formed and the basis of their municipal regulations (and thus their urban order). Thus, two main legal areas were gradually formed within Bohemia – the area of the so-called South German law (with the main authority of the Old Town of Prague) and the so-called Saxon-Magdeburg law (with the main authority of Litoměřice). Even within these groupings, however, there were smaller or larger differences between individual towns. As early as the 15th century, a number of towns in the so-called Litoměřice legal district began to gradually switch to the so-called Prague law, taking into account the certain conservatism of the Saxon-Magdeburg law, e.g. in the area of testamentary practice. The body of Prague law, enriched in the 15th century with elements of the law of the Moravian towns of Brno and Jihlava, was better suited to the developing late medieval society. This trend supporting economic development continued in the 16th century, which already falls into the early modern period.

The tendency to unify town law in Bohemia also began to manifest itself more significantly in the 16th century – after the accession of the Habsburgs, when the sovereign power intervened in the process. Ferdinand I (1526–1564), who had to deal with post-Hussite and new religious currents after ascending to the throne of Bohemia and with the strong position of the estates (in Bohemia lords – higher nobility, knights – lower nobility, royal towns), thus targeted the tactics of gradual limitation of power at first mainly to the royal towns, which showed significant autonomy and actively intervened in the political situation at the time, including several uprisings against Ferdinand. In the spirit of centralizing tendencies, the monarch had Briccius Gurimensis (Brikci z Licka) write down Town Law (1536), which, however, were not accepted as official codification by the royal towns – with regard to the formulated strengthening of the monarch's power over them. As evidenced by the preserved sources, some towns followed this work in practice, despite their official disapproval. Only the monarch's second attempt, beginning in 1559, was successful, when, after protracted disputes between Prague and Litoměřice, a code was

made binding, which was prepared by the university-educated old town chancellor and lawyer Pavel Kristian of Koldin with a number of assistants. The Town Law of the Kingdom of Bohemia (1579), as Koldín called this set of legal regulations, were only issued under Rudolf II (1576–1611). The code essentially regulated the entire life of the town's inhabitants as well as its administration and judiciary, thus establishing the basis of the town code. Town Law was adopted by the vast majority of towns in Bohemia, both royal and serf. Only the towns around Litoměřice resisted, which were forced to adopt the code by a decision of the land diet in 1610. The unification and spread of town law was also helped by the adoption of Town Law by the Court of Appeal, an institution established by the monarch in the spirit of centralism in 1548 after the anti-Habsburg uprising (1547) and intended for towns as their appellate authority. The Town Law became binding for Moravian towns only in 1697, when the centralizing tendencies of the sovereign's power were already more evident.

With regard to the theme of the ICHT 2024 – Discourses on the peculiarities of urban order – the main focus of the proposed paper is focused not only on the circumstances under which the code was created, but also on its content. The code, written in excellent Czech and supplemented in the spirit of humanistic education with learned Latin sentences, contained elements of Prague, Brno, Jihlava and Roman laws, but at the same time reflected the basic principles of land law. To form an idea of how the code was prepared, it should first be stated that its authors drew on proven legal principles of the past and modified or added legal provisions in those cases where it was useful or necessary. This can be very well demonstrated by the example of the books of testaments, marriage contract books and market books, which I systematically examine in the context of researching medieval and early modern municipal chancelleries in Bohemia. That in the case of Town Law it was a functional period set of legal provisions is evidenced by the fact that in the edition from 1618, i.e., before the fateful battle on Bílá Hora (White Mountain, 1620), there is not a single change compared to the edition from 1579.

This so-called Koldin's Town Law is a truly unique work for its time, which, with regard to its precision and timelessness, survived the radical measures implemented after the estates' army lost the battle with the imperial army, when the Bohemian state entered a new era of early absolutism. Prudently, the text from 1579 did not contain articles or even allusions to the religious situation, which was very complicated in Bohemia before 1620. Therefore, the code was acceptable to the Habsburgs even after 1620, when society in Bohemia was undergoing a radical re-Catholicization. Town Law, regulated in the period of the 17th and 18th centuries by partial measures of the sovereign and the land authorities (an example is the regulation of criminal law), functioned in its relics until the publication of the General Civil Code (1811). It was thus a significant stabilizing element of the urban order in Bohemia for more than 200 years.

Koldin's Town Law became a necessary part not only of municipal chancelleries, but also of all estate and later sovereign offices. Officials on estates and ecclesiastical institutions also owned copies. In order to increase the impact of the work, Koldin published its summary in 1581 – the so-called Summa, which was freed from Latin sentences and focused on a basic and functional interpretation of the issue. A convenient pocket format of this version of Town Law made it an indispensable aid for a number of official and court proceedings. The fact that it was issued fourteen times proves the necessity of Town Law in period early modern society. In addition, at the beginning of the 17th century, the code

was translated into German by a private initiative to make it more usable in German-speaking towns. This version was later copied.

In the proposed paper, special attention will also be paid to the council scribes (clerks), who for centuries ensured legal continuity in the urban milieu, so important for the preservation of the urban order. As an example, the destabilization of the order during the Thirty Years' War will be mentioned, when in a number of towns, due to departures into exile or a lack of population, the position of council scribe was not properly filled for a certain period, which led to a decrease in the knowledge of town law and the abuse of powers by some representatives of the municipal administration, especially royal magistrates. The situation usually stabilized only after the end of the war. It was only in the middle of the 18th century that state power began to require proper education within the municipal administration: first from council scribes (syndics), from the 1880s in larger cities also from some officials of reformed municipal authorities (magistrates). What a far-sighted and timeless decision, when Koldin, aware of the need for a universal code with which even scribes without a university education will be able to work, quickly prepared an extract from Town Law - the so-called Summa. In the preserved copies of the Summa and Law (in the order of several dozen) we find numerous annotations by scribes who variously added explanations or recorded changes ordered by superior authorities.

The Town Law of the Kingdom of Bohemia represent an important work of Czech legal history that reflects the erudition of its creators, especially Pavel Kristian of Koldin. The code unified the town law in Bohemia and created the basic framework of urban order, which remained in relics in municipal society until the beginning of the 19th century. Since the set of legal provisions significantly covered individual areas of urban life, quality research on early modern urban society in Bohemia is essentially unthinkable without a good knowledge of the code. Therefore, the application of the normative-comparative method appears to be optimal, when we are able to follow the theory of Town Law and its implementation in practice through research of the preserved sources. It is one of the currently implemented methodological trends in Czech urban history.

Jana Vojtíšková (Institute of History, Philosophical Faculty,
University of Hradec Králové Czech Republic)

Ordering the Diversity: Establishing Order in Multi-Religious Urban Milieu of Kamianetsk Podilsky (17th-18th centuries)

The presentation is focused on the urban order in the town of Kamianest Podilsky (Podolian Palatinate of Poland-Lithuania, present-day Ukraine) during the Early Modern Times. It existed as a castle already in the 13th century; received ist urban privilege in 1374 and became a capital of Podolian Palatinate and a bishop seat in 1378. What makes this example special is the fact that the town population consisted of three religious communities: Latin, Orthodox and Armenian. Each of these communities developed institutions of self-government, though the town council of the „Latins" had priority and officially represented the town on the outside. Moreover, this tripartite composition could be seen in the town topography with three town quarters and three separate buildings of magistrates. One text from the 17th century idealistically described Kamianets as „the town of three nations" (Poles, Ruthenians and Armenians) implying harmonious co-existence of the three Christian communities until the Ottoman occupation (1672-99). Jewish presence was restricted in the town and local burghers sometimes complained that Jews encroached on their (i.e. of Christians) commercial privileges, but all such restrictions were lifted during the Ottoman occupation. Ottomans, on their part, re-organized the town according to their understanding of the proper order, some traces of which are still visible in the architecture of the town: many of the churches were turned into mosques during the occupation. Furthermore, after the second Partition of Poland in 1793, the town became a part of the Russian empire and, again, the order could possibly be re-defined according to the new political necessities. Thus, various actors were forming and transforming the urban order in Kamianets within a relatively short period of time (17th-18th centuries), and equally various were political contexts in which an order was defined and negotiated (in a chronological order these were Poland-Lithuania – Ottoman Porte – Poland-Lithuania – Russian empire).

In contrast to narratives, legal sources presented a different picture of the urban order (or the lack of it) in Kamianets, and this type of sources are much more numerous, that narrative texts. Therefore, documents issued by local/communal and central/royal authorities during the 17th and 18th centuries will be my main textual data to look for the types of topics related to the order (or how the order was understood in these legal texts), for discursive statements and for manner in which they were made. Most of the sources could generally be divided into two main groups: those issued by the communal authorities (i.e. any of the magistrates or courts in the town), and those issued by a central (royal/imperial) power.

Some of the documents dealt with concrete matters regulating the inner life of a community (for instance, a decree of the Armenian magistrate on the election of its members from 1634), or with the commerce and crafts in the town, such as in a conflict between the [Christian] burghers and local Jews (an appeal to the King from 1647 accusing Jews of violating the established order). There are also documents of more general character, like an inspection of Kamianets after the Ottoman occupation: in 1700, a special royal commission was sent to the town to make a report regarding current problems and required means to restore the order ("Resolution of the commission sent to the town of Kamianets after returning this town back from Turkey"). Later, in 1706, the magistrates together agreed upon the "Rules regarding the urban order". In fact, the 18th century was

the time prolific in terms of reforms, renovations or reorganizations in fields like administration, economy, army, education and so on. In order to regenerate towns, to systematize their rights and privileges, optimize functions of the urban institutions and to better organize urban space, the General Assembly (Sejm) of the Polish kingdom ordered to establish special commissions of "good order" (*boni ordinis*) for towns of the kingdom in 1764 (the decree was published in Volumina Legum). Such a commission was founded for Kamianets in 1767, and a "Project for the improvement of urban order" had been developed in 1779. Public order in the town became an issue in 1785, when all urban institutions decided to put efforts into "amendment of finances, organization of proper urban economy and police, development of production as well as wellbeing and moral of citizens" for which a subsequent record was made in the town books. A new epoch started in 1793, when Kamianest became a part of Russian empire, together with other territories of Poland-Lithuania, and the first document related to order became a declaration of Katherine II "On the annexation of certain Polish Regions to Russia" from the same year. It would be interesting to see how soon the new administration turned its attention to the urban order, especially taking into account that Katherine II initiated a broad urban reform in her empire in 1763 by issuing a decree "On making special plans for all towns, their buildings and streets, individually for each province (gubernia)" and establishing a separate "Commission for the organization of towns".

Apart from topics and discursive statements, these documentary sources allow to identify the continuity and changes of discourses over the time and their dependence on the political context. What was preserved in the discourse regardless of time or political changes? What were the reasons for issuing documents related to urban order? What social attitudes and values were revealed by these documents? Was there a difference in understanding of what "proper order' is among the religious communities of Kamianets? How was the hierarchy among the communities established, preserved and/or changed and what discursive patterns were used to communicate this?

Olga Kozubska (Institute for Comparative Urban History, Muenster)

Municipal Reforms in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, 1764-1794: From the Unification of Rights to the Extension of Self-Government

From the Middle Ages, privileged European cities were like separate states within monarchies and duchies ruled by monarchs. Alongside financial and military obligations to their suzerains (ruler or owner), the internal life of the most important cities was regulated by city laws and self-government traditions that had been established over the centuries. From the end of the 16th century, as central government powers rapidly grew, ideas emerged to expand it to privileged areas that had acquired immunity and to level all legal differences. The strengthening of the state depended on the prosperity of free cities, which was conditioned by trade, production, financial operations, and taxes collected from them into the state treasury. Therefore, from the second half of the 17th century, more power was concentrated in the hands of the rulers of Western European states, who were the first to interfere in the internal affairs of cities. To take control of urban space, monarchs had to peacefully exceed the urban rights and freedoms defined in the Middle Ages. The possibility of supplementing the state treasury by taxing more businesses and modernizing the tax collection system attracted the attention of monarchs in cities. This required a gradual reform of the legal system in urban areas, creating a unified space for all classes and removing constraints on the activities of state institutions. It also involved taking over judicial and police functions from the municipalities to ensure public order. Additionally, it required the regulation of the influx of the poor through social welfare solutions, as well as the reform and regulation of the new rules of commerce and production. The central government's arrival introduced concepts of street cleanliness, lighting, hygiene, and urban planning. This was made possible by the creation of new state institutions that gradually replaced traditional municipal governments and unified urban laws under state laws. Due to a century of reforms, cities lost their autonomy and privileges. Municipal officials became civil servants in a hierarchy of public officials. The functions of public officials in cities were unified and specialized. The number of officials became dependent on the size of the city, rather than on old traditions and privileges.

These processes, although delayed, did not bypass the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. In the Commonwealth, the monarch was weak and had to coordinate urban reforms with the noble parliament, known as the Sejm. According to the historical traditions, which were not alien to other European countries, towns in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania were divided into four groups: state, monarch's economy, ecclesiastical and private. The state did not control the towns owned by the church and the nobility and gentry but could only do so with the permission of the owners. Only in state-owned and monarch's-economy towns could innovations be introduced on the basis of directives from the Sejm and the central government. These towns were also known as royal or lordly towns. Towns enjoying self-government rights until the great reforms of 1791-1792 and 1793-1794 were known as Magdeburgian. Change in the Commonwealth was more rapid and inconsistent, as it was influenced by pressure and military intervention from neighboring states. In addition, the reforms had very little impact on private and ecclesiastical towns, as this depended on the will of the owner and the Church.

The initial indications of change were not observed until 1764, when the Sejm introduced common laws for the cities of the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Prior to the reforms of the latter half of the 18th century, the ruler or the Sejm addressed

each city separately, or at least listed all the cities for which a particular law was intended. The law concentrated on the redevelopment of urban space, which was to be carried out by the magistrates who retained self-government. The legal process, which took almost 30 years to conclude, was marked by disputes. In the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, the implementation of other innovations provided for in the law was significantly delayed and only began after the First Partition of the Republic. The 1776 partisan law called for the establishment of Good Order Commissions, composed of the nobility, to accelerate change in major cities, as was done in the Kingdom of Poland. However, the law was only slowly enforced, mainly to resolve intra-urban disagreements. The most significant innovation in the late 18th century was the compilation of a comprehensive list of all the dutiful units in the city, regardless of their rank. This shift in perception meant that by 1775-1790, cities were no longer viewed as a society based on estates, but rather as a shared space for all inhabitants.

Representatives of the cities of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Kingdom of Poland began gathering in Warsaw in 1764 to expedite urban transformation. They maintained their unity, as declared in separate documents, until 1789. At the end of the same year, they crossed the spheres of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and began to coordinate their positions with the cities of the Kingdom of Poland. However, the principles of neighborliness between the cities remained important. Vilnius and Grodno, being the most significant cities, continued to lead the Lithuanian towns.

During the four-year period of the Sejm (1788-1792), the governance of the state underwent significant reforms. Three new general laws were introduced for the free cities of the entire Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, defining a unified structure of self-government institutions, subordination to the newly established central authorities, and reforming the legal system. The urban space became homogeneous and indivisible because of the changes, and self-government was transformed from a lumpen into a territorial one. The rites of passage for city officials reflected these changes, with solemn pledges to the cities being replaced by oaths to the state and the sovereign. City law gradually became part of state law. With the removal of legal immunity, cities gradually transitioned from being independent republics to being subject to the will of the central government. The traditional Magdeburg law was becoming less relevant. These changes resulted in city residents retaining some of their newly acquired rights and gaining additional ones as citizens of the state rather than solely of the city. Changes were occurring simultaneously in Western Europe, but in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, there was insufficient time to consolidate them due to occupation and annexation. The laws expanded the prerogatives of the townspeople. They were allowed to acquire the rank of an officer and occupy high positions in the hierarchy of the clergy and state administration. The laws also gave them the possibility of representation in the central state institutions, such as the police and treasury commissions, the supreme court of justice (the Highest Court of the GDL), and the local executive authorities (the Civil-Military Commissions). It guaranteed justice for the citizens (prohibiting punishment without a court ruling) and provided for a systematic procedure for the ennoblement of those who had distinguished themselves. These innovations partly brought the rights of the townspeople into line with those of the nobility. The innovations of the four-year Sejm did not restrict, but expanded, the self-government of towns. In Lithuania, the number of self-governing towns was expanded from around 20 to 141 in just over a year, with the help of new privileges and laws.

The Cities Law, adopted by the Grodno Sejm in 1793, was less liberal towards small towns and cities, but the rights and freedoms of the larger cities were largely preserved, as they had been in 1791-1792. The Grodno Sejm's Town Law (albeit with very minor adjustments) also retained the structure of self-government of large (or privileged) towns as established by the Four years' Sejm, as well as the division of large towns into districts, as introduced by the Four years' Sejm, the nobility living in the cities were ordered to pay taxes to the city treasury and to obey the magistrate, and the internal organization of the cities, the electoral and judicial procedures, the structure of the magistrates, etc. were unified, as was the case in Four year Sejm. However, it must be admitted that the laws adopted by the Grodno Sejm considerably weakened the position of the citizens in society. First, the possibilities of representation of urban affairs in the Sejm were reduced, allowing the cities of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Polish Kingdom to elect and have only one representative in the Seimas - an agent (out of the 8 representatives of the cities, only 1 remained). In addition, the laws adopted by the Grodno Sejm did not allow citizens to hold positions in state administration. The number of self-governing towns was drastically reduced: only cities of 1st Class, less than ten in number, could exercise the full self-government rights provided for in the law. This was due not only to the new law, but also to the reduction of Lithuania's territory after the Second partition of Commonwealth.

Following the implementation of the Grodno Sejm resolutions in the cities, the 1794 uprising occurred. This briefly reinstated the laws of the Four Years' Sejm in the towns. However, the general administration of the cities differed from that of 1791-1792 due to changes in the central authorities and their functions in the context of the war against the Russian Empire. Following the annexation, townspeople who had previously obtained self-government privileges during the Four Years' Diet attempted to re-establish their autonomy. However, after the revolt was defeated, the internal administration of the towns was restored in the second half of 1794, based on the Grodno Sejm, with significant adjustments. This system remained in place until the beginning of 1795.

Liudas Glemža (Vytautas Magnus University, Kaunas, Lithuania)

The Interests of Urban Elites in Minimising the Negative Impacts of Imperial Government Reforms: A Discourse Analysis of the Appeals of Lithuanian Townsmen and Jews (1795–1863)

Conceptual approach and historical context: In the field of urban elite studies (primarily related to 18th–19th century studies), two dimensions are prominent, encompassing the topic of changes in social structures and interaction with the modern state (Charle, 2008; Hartmann, 1998; Smith, 2000; Beresnevičiūtė-Nosálová, 2017). These urban elitist studies are based on different theoretical approaches. The historians use different sociological, critical, network and other theories. It is true that the use and integration of these concepts into theoretical reasoning are highly variable.

Moving on to the research on urban elites, it can be noted that historians use the themes of elite change, power dynamics (mobilisation or loss), and bureaucratization in their research on urban high society. Researchers link the process of urban bureaucratization to the importance of chamberist ideas, the inclusion of bureaucratic elites in city councils, and state reforms (Németh, 2012). These changes have affected urban elites in a variety of ways, resulting in conflicts and displacing some groups from positions of municipal power (the concept of two ruling elites) (Maentel, 2000). It is important to note that scholars of urban elites have examined the expressions, rivalries and conflicts between traditional (merchant groups) and new (so-called functional elites, i.e., 'new' bureaucrats and academics) in individual German states and Russian cities (Bielefeld historians' project 'Städtische Selbstverwaltung und bürgerliche Eliten vor 1914, Rußland im Vergleich mit Deutschland') (Hausmann, 2002; Häfner, 2000).

On the basis of these studies, research approaches were conceptualised. There is an obvious gap in these research studies. Historians have only limitedly (only sporadic studies) examined the reactions of individual elite groups to change, especially when states or cities underwent changes in political orders. For example, only isolated studies have examined urban elites' reactions to reforms of the urban economy or local governance introduced in empires or monarchies. Historians have not looked at protest reactions to urban transformations in Poland and Lithuania (after the third division of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth State in 1795) or in Prussian cities (after the so-called Stein-Hardenberg local governance reform). The economic elites and the members of the town councils protested "quietly," with requests and proposals rather than with manifestations and other radical forms. As a result, the "inconspicuous" protests have remained outside of historical research and have not received sufficient scholarly attention.

Aim: Based on a case study, to analyse the communicative discourses of urban elites with state officials by examining their reactions to the state's reforms of urban governance and municipal management. The study would use Pierre Bourdieu's theory and ideas of political fields and capital to look into the effects of changing orders on discourse (Bourdieu, 1998; Gorski, 2013). These ideas describe the roles and powers of both collective and individual actors in the unique meta-field of interactions between the state and local government. A historical sociological approach that positions both collective and individual elite actors, along with discursive analysis, can help us understand how people think and what is going on around them.

Methods: The research is based on three methods: 1) a case study approach, examining the case of Lithuanian urban elites (representing groups of townspeople, merchants and Jews)

in their interactions with the authorities of the Russian Empire (the Emperor, the ruling Senate and the ministries in charge in St. Petersburg, governors in relevant gubernia). We chose this case for a number of reasons. Firstly, it illustrates the transformation of urban orders during the integration of the cities of the of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (part of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth State) into the Russian Empire. The social, managerial and communal arrangements of the cities changed as a result of the maximal reduction of self-government and the subordination to the tax system (fulfilment of Zemstvo obligations). Secondly, the Russian authorities implemented a series of reforms aimed at integrating Jews into the urban elite, city management, city finances, and so on. Previous research on elites (Civinskas, 2018; Civinskas & Glemza, 2018; Civinskas, 2001) influenced the study's selection, as did an analysis of the political and bureaucratic (power or meta) fields to identify elites and their interactions with the Russian imperial government (10 cities and about 25 towns). Thirdly, a discourse analysis will examine the collective appeals made by urban elites to the Russian authorities. This would include an in-depth analysis of collective appeals, messages and complaints (most of the documents found in archives, N = 75) addressed to the authorities, covering the period 1795–1861. Combining the three approaches would allow us to take into account the political process in terms of the balance of power and explore attitudes and interests towards the changing orders of state reform and transformation.

Results: The research revealed the development of the state bureaucratic field. The bureaucratization of governance in some Western cities was primarily a European-level process involving capitals, residential cities (for example, in German lands), and, in the end, all larger administrative centers. It was a consequence of the rise of the state with respect to larger or smaller independent cities and of organisational modernization. States in Europe aimed their physical power at the lower class. The empires needed to develop a unitarian, centralised government to implement statist reforms based on centralization and to develop a pro-state identity.

From 1800–1802, a bureaucratic field of the Russian empire "emerged," which started to build a state monopoly in "Lithuanian Gubernias" as well as in Lithuanian cities. By using the administrative governance system of the Governorate, the apparatus of the Empire had to ensure an effective performance of state (Zemsky) duties. For the performance of state functions, the urban elite served as an organisational resource and, partly, as a part of the bureaucratic system. By reducing the independence of the elite of Lithuanian cities Vilnius and Kaunas (e.g., willingness to act in accordance with privileges and city rights), the Russian Empire legitimised its dominance.

Several events symbolically represented the state's dominance. In 1808, a new Dumas (in Vilnius and Kaunas cities) was established with very limited autonomy, which was gradually reduced. The city's governance underwent a transformation in 1831–1836, drawing inspiration from the governance model of Russian cities. Only the functioning of the Court of the Magistrate in 1808–1840 testifies to the continuity of the old tradition of Lithuanian

towns for several years. In general, Lithuanian cities self-government institutions largely served as local government institutions directly subordinated to empire institutions. The local urban elite groups held peripheral positions in the bureaucratic field.

The Russian government, in cooperation with the nobility (mostly owners of surrounding estates), closed down about 70 town councils in small towns (1795–1840), which was not

up to the imperial "standard." It stipulated that local government could only operate in the centres of counties. It is true that the elites of small towns tried to defend their rights and petitioned for proof. In general, one can see a collective movement of urban elites fighting for the former state's urban traditions and urban self-government.

The analysis of the requests, complaints, and reports of the townspeople (N = 75) revealed several things. First, townspeople attempted to defend their rights by invoking privileges and other laws to prove their rights. In addition, the discourse analysis reveals the towns' loyalty to the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and urban tradition. For this purpose, urban elites have employed various subtle rhetorical elements. On the other hand, urban elites used legal arguments to support their claims, often hiring lawyers and other legal professionals. Secondly, the urban populace employed economic arguments to counter the financial demands placed on the municipality, such as postal reform, military enforcement, and trade reforms. They pointed out that the Empire didn't profit from the cities' economic downturn, which they attributed to the heavy burden of state functions on the population, because the urban elites, particularly Christian and Jewish merchants, imposed such arguments. Third, the townspeople adapted to imperial communication and used relevant rhetoric and arguments (references to imperial orders, the interests of the merchants of the 1st Guild, etc.). In fact, the discourse of urban elites became more effective and bureaucratized. Remarkably, the urban population began to use arguments for historical rights and violations less frequently. In general, the communication of urban elites with imperial officials to maintain their positions of power was not effective, even as the discourses themselves changed in content and form. This was due to a number of contextual factors.

Discussion: When examining the discourses of urban elites in relation to negative evaluations of state reforms (for urban communities, the economy, and directly for elites), it is important to take contextual factors into account. The context of the local (individual city, etc.) political process is relevant when examining urban elites' requests, complaints and reports to the city government.

A case study illustrates the integration of Lithuanian cities into imperial structures. Conversely, it's crucial to consider the dynamics and factors that contribute to the frequent reforms (the 64-year transformation analysis confronts us with several large-scale reforms and a series of administrative reorganizations). We must compare the contextual factors of a local city or a group of cities with the variables that reveal the dynamics and complexity of reforms. It can be debated that generalisations of the political process (interactions between elites and state institutions) and trend-level analysis can narrow the analysis.

Conceptual gaps complicate the combination of discourse and political process approaches in the study of urban elites' attitudes towards state reforms. First, in qualitative analysis, it is challenging to reconcile the interpretation of political process events with the implications of discourse. Second, the application of political sociology concepts (in this case, Bourdieu's concepts) does not relate to the analysis of discourse concepts. Therefore, a more comprehensive understanding of the concepts is necessary for their effective application.

Remigijus Civinskas (Vytautas Kavolis Interdisciplinary Research Institute,
Vytautas Magnus University, Lithuania)

Urban order and the origins of the Nordic welfare state

The Nordic countries have been seen as rather successful in terms of state formation, welfare, and societal order. The concept of a "Nordic model" appears to have become a general descriptor of the success of state formation in the north. While interpretations of the concept vary, there is a common view among historians and scholars in the social sciences that the post-World War II nation-state played a central role in implementing the Nordic model, particularly in its inception as a welfare state. One of the most important visions behind the Nordic model of welfare state is identified by Mary Hilson as "concentrated on the idea of social insurance schemes established to take care of those citizens who for different reasons were unable to support themselves through paid employment.

Even though historians dealing with contemporary history as well as among pollical scientists – Hilson included – there seems to be a common understanding and an inherent attitude that welfare is an invention of the post-war nation states, welfare has and will always be closely linked to the urban sphere. This also includes the establishment of urban order. In this regard, the origins of welfare and urban civilization can be traced back to at least the medieval towns of Europe. For example, in Guy Geltner's research on medieval Lucca, Italian cities initiated preventive measures for urban hygiene and health in the 14th century, challenging the notion of a lack of government interest in public health.

The legal corpus of Norwegian town regulations dates from the 12th to the 14th century and consists mostly of laws issued by the monarchy. These regulations can take the form of codified town laws, with amendments, or specific privileges granted to individual towns, in addition to a code of general urban regulations from 1276. From the late 13th century onwards, the Norwegian royal authorities displayed a keen interest in minutely regulating the towns within the kingdom, dedicating considerable legislation to their governance. These regulations primarily addressed peaceful interactions among burghers and the organization of urban life, encompassing collective duties, administration, taxes, trade, and shipping. Additionally, they covered criminal laws related to breaches of peace and violence, as well as fire prevention measures crucial for towns predominantly constructed with wooden-framed houses. Although direct regulations for health, hygiene, or disease prevention were absent in medieval urban law, various welfare-improving measures, including those securing hygiene, food supplies, and medical competence, is nevertheless evident from the source material.

While subject to royal regulations, the towns were generally granted autonomy in governance and law enforcement. In terms of administration, urban areas in medieval Scandinavia established their own town councils and administrations, a system introduced by the Norwegian king in 1276. Such privileges indicate a willingness to grant the towns some political jurisdiction to address urban societal issues. This contrasted with rural areas, where the yearly assembly was the sole meeting place for addressing societal problems. However, urban self-government is often overlooked in modern historiography, overshadowed by narratives of the young Norwegian nation state in the 19th century, where the rural assembly was portrayed as the origin of modern democratic culture. Additionally, medieval towns were governed by the mót – the town meeting – open to all urban citizens and convened as needed.

Medieval Swedish towns introduced town councils, yearly elections, town administration, and jurisdiction to enact their own bylaws. Additionally, all Swedish urban citizens had certain duties such as defending the town, acting as guards during nighttime, and cleaning the streets, with variations based on the town's size. Sofia Gustafsson emphasizes a contractual relationship between rulers and the ruled in Swedish, German, and English medieval towns, where rulers acted in the town's best interest. She also finds a more profound "relationship between the council and community in Swedish towns" – and a specific "equality between the town officials and the other citizens". Consequently, she finds a sort of "representation of the community" created in for instance Stockholm during the latter half of the 15th century.

Later, between the 15th and 19th centuries, a new set of welfare strategies aimed to establish what contemporary rulers viewed as "the good society," based on communal or collective order within society. In Denmark-Norway and Sweden, a more absolutist rule emerged, and in 17th-century Sweden, there appeared to be a tendency to perceive the "good society" as "an organic whole." Most institutions addressing welfare and order were established in towns, including significant legal and ecclesiastical bodies, as well as municipal and state administration. In addition, a certain political culture was in the making, a culture that seems to have the common good as a utopian aim.

During this period, new institutions emerged in towns, such as orphan homes, hospitals, poorhouses, and spinning houses, mostly in response to urban demands. Additionally, watchmen, police forces, and fire services were established, playing a significant role in shaping urban order. The "historical emergence of police practices in the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Europe (….) was a significant modulation within the two large diapositives of power – the one of sovereignty and the one of discipline", as sociologists and philosophers like Marinkovic and Ristic concludes. There is little debate about this, as both cases originate from urban areas.

The significant urbanization process in Norway during the 19th and 20th centuries highlighted the growing needs for welfare and urban order. This period saw the emergence of a new form of collectivism and communalism in urban societies, strengthening sovereignty and discipline in towns and cities. These urban areas became the strongholds for a burgeoning public sector, funded by the tax system and state funds, paving the way for future welfare systems. Pension schemes, working time arrangements, trade unionism, child protection, and health facilities were primarily funded and established by the towns, which also took on the responsibility of organizing and managing them due to the lack of a centralized welfare state. In the theories of political science, the welfare seems to be triggered off by WWII or the Cold War, and not by needs covered by towns and cities long before the outbreak of the war or the fall of the "iron curtain".

This paper aims to explore two main areas of discourse: the historiographical perspectives on the genesis of the Nordic model, and contemporary discussions surrounding welfare and urban initiatives spanning from the Middle Ages to the present day. Employing a long-term perspective, it delves into the possibility of tracing the origins of the Nordic welfare state to periods predating the post-war era. Specifically, it investigates whether concerns of welfare can be discerned in the medieval towns of the Nordic countries and the entities influencing urban order within these towns. Furthermore, the paper examines whether the evolution of the Nordic welfare state can be attributed to factors beyond post-war state formation, such as the development of Nordic towns and cities and the establishment of

legislation and institutions in early Norwegian towns. Additionally, it explores the role of the nation state in shaping historians' narratives concerning the emergence of the national welfare state.

Miriam Tveit (Nord University, Bodø, Norway)
Steinar Aas (Nord University, Bodø, Norway)

Managing the city, making modern citizens: Debates about urban infrastructure in Helsinki in the late 19th and early 20th centuries

During the late 19th and early 20th centuries, Nordic cities were instrumental in shaping modern citizenship by investing heavily in urban infrastructure and services. The availability of utility networks such as water, gas, and electricity, alongside transportation and welfare services, became essential to the lives of modern urban citizens. The implementation of these services, coupled with other changes, brought also about a remarkable metamorphosis of the urban landscape, setting new standards for sanitation and order in the central parts of the cities. However, the distribution of municipal services was uneven, and not all residents had equal access to them, despite increasing municipal involvement. While residents living in city centres had good access to different types of services, those in working-class areas, especially those located far from the urban core, had very limited access or not at all. Many of them lived in settlements which resembled semi-rural villages with few or no amenities.

Extending infrastructure services to the working-class areas was a costly undertaking, causing both municipal authorities and utility companies to hesitate. However, there were also significant reasons that justified the expansion of these networks. Urban reformers advocated for the extension of infrastructure networks, recognizing their potential to transform cities and promote modern ideals of organized and healthy urban areas. The provision of clean water, efficient waste disposal and improved lighting were seen as crucial in enforcing new standards of hygiene and behaviour, particularly in working-class areas. While not all expectations were met, civil engineering and infrastructure networks played a vital role in enabling municipal authorities to manage diverse urban areas and their populations. Furthermore, one significant advantage of this infrastructure-based approach was the ability to achieve important objectives through impersonal control. As Christopher Otter points out in reference to nineteenth-century London, 'tentacular networks of electric wires and water mains could subtly shape and normalize conduct, without any direct human inference, save for the occasional repairman or meter reader.'

The purpose of this study is to analyse the discussions surrounding urban infrastructure in Helsinki in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Specifically, the research aims to investigate the expectations placed on the new infrastructure networks in professional and public circles. How were these networks perceived as a means of managing the city, and how were they expected to change the city and its citizens? What was the role of engineers and civil engineering in producing and negotiating the everyday life of the city and what was the involvement of other stakeholders in the debate? Another related theme this study will address is the significant inequality among urban residents, in terms of access to infrastructure services. The research will analyse how Helsinki policymakers perceived the unequal situation and what measures they took to address it if any were deemed necessary. The analysis will also shed light on the reactions of the inhabitants of the fringe areas. How did they use their knowledge about unequal access as a tool for political assertion, advocating for inclusion and challenging the existing power structure?

The analysis focuses on two specific geographical areas. The first is Kallio, a working-class area which was integrated into the infrastructure networks of the city in the late 19th century. Kallio illustrates the challenges faced by the municipal authorities in balancing the need to manage the city efficiently while keeping costs low. Kallio became popular with working-class families in the 1870s and 1880s due to its proximity to many factories and engineering shops. It soon emerged as the fastest-growing part of the city. In 1887, the city authorities planned the location and alignment of future streets and divided the land into plots to regulate the area's growth. However, the uneven terrain posed a significant problem, making it difficult and expensive to construct essential infrastructure such as streets, sewer and water pipes. To avoid the high costs associated with the construction of these services, the authorities tried to keep Kallio outside of the approved town plan area for as long as possible. However, in the 1890s, the city authorities changed their mind and decided to integrate Kallio into the central areas. The process involved providing essential municipal services such as water pipes, sewage systems, and tramlines to connect the area with the urban core. The study will analyze the discussion around this change in attitudes.

Second, I will look at the settlements of Toukola, Hermanni, and Fredriksberg, which were located outside the city limits in the late nineteenth century and were annexed to the city in the early twentieth century. Although the residents of these areas were active in demanding to be recognized as members of the urban community, these areas remained socially on the outskirts of the city. The settlements were seen as temporary arrangements well into the second half of the twentieth century and, therefore, were not entitled to the same level of services as the places in the town plan area. The expansion of municipal services, including water pipelines, electric lighting and gas distribution, was not significantly advanced in these areas until the 1920s and 1930s.

During the late 19th and early 20th centuries, the development of municipal infrastructure and services in Helsinki and other Nordic 'welfare cities' was deeply intertwined with broader urban and societal changes. During this period, there was a notable shift in the perception of what services were considered crucial for the daily lives and routines of modern urban citizens and, therefore, expected to be provided by the city administration. The provision of municipal services was also heavily influenced by changing notions of who was an urban citizen, a full-fledged member of the urban community entitled to essential services, and who could only expect partial access. Finally, in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, infrastructure networks and other services became an essential tool for the management of cities and their rapidly growing populations.

Marjaana Niemi (Faculty of Social Sciences / History,
Tampere University, Finland)

Multilingualism and Urban Order: A Historical Perspective on the City of Luxembourg (19th-21st centuries)

The city of Luxembourg, the capital of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, represents a fascinating case study of urban order through the lens of multilingualism. Since its origins in the Middle Ages, the city has been a linguistic and cultural crossroads. Over the centuries, it has experienced various French and German influences, each leaving distinct linguistic traces. More recent immigration, since the late 19th century, has added new languages to the city's linguistic landscape, making urban management more complex yet also richer. This complexity is particularly notable in a city hosting numerous European institutions, despite its national language not being an official language of the European Union.

Although the population has increased in recent years, the proportion between Luxembourgers and foreigners has remained unchanged. In Luxembourg City, out of a total population of around 135,000 inhabitants, 29.56% are Luxembourgish nationals, while 70.44% are foreigners, representing 167 different nationalities (data as of December 31, 2023). This demographic diversity is a fundamental characteristic of the city, often touted as a major asset. The city is presented as "cosmopolitan and polyglot" on its official website, emphasizing its unique linguistic situation "where over 160 nationalities coexist, making Luxembourg one of the most multicultural capitals in the world. Geographical and national boundaries no longer pose obstacles in daily life, with three official languages: German, French, and Luxembourgish, along with the languages of foreign residents, 15% of whom are of Portuguese origin. Publications and other means of communication are thus at least bilingual by principle." We start from the hypothesis that the linguistic question is an essential component of urban order in a multilingual city like Luxembourg City. This phenomenon, present for centuries with the dominance of (Latin,) German and French, profoundly affects the daily interactions of the city's inhabitants and visitors.

The author of this contribution is currently preparing an exhibition on the practice of translation within the City's History Museum, titled "Babel heureuse?". Facing the city's multilingual reality, the museum adapted its name in 2017, changing from "Musée d'histoire de la Ville de Luxembourg" to "Lëtzebuerg City Museum". The municipal administration has adopted this same strategy for a longer time, although in its official communication, it only uses the French denomination "Ville de Luxembourg". However, "city branding" is mainly done in English and Luxembourgish, with English becoming a new lingua franca and Luxembourgish serving as a promotional language for foreigners and an identity language for Luxembourgers. This transformation reflects a significant increase in English as a common language, at the expense of French, which is gradually losing its dominant position among the city's inhabitants and museum visitors.

This evolution raises questions about which languages to use in the museum, frequented mainly by residents, thus predominantly foreigners, as well as a significant proportion of tourists (about 40% in 2019, before Covid), to effectively communicate with each visitor. Founded in 1996, the museum initially displayed exhibition texts only in French and German, which sparked reactions, including frequent complaints in the museum's guest books about the lack of information in English. The museum took a pragmatic approach by adding English to the languages offered, notably due to the large number of tourist visitors.

Yet, even during discussions within the municipal council for the museum's creation, the question of adding the Portuguese language had been raised.

These observations constitute the starting point of our contribution to interrogate this question on the scale of the administration of the city of Luxembourg from a historical perspective since the 19th century: when and how did the city magistrate take specific measures to adapt to its particular linguistic landscape? Have these decisions contributed to ensuring urban order? Has the linguistic situation ever been an issue for urban order?

The origins of multilingualism in Luxembourg and the first Luxembourgish writings in the 19th century have garnered great interest among sociolinguistic researchers and historians. However, the specific question, viewed through the debates and decisions of the municipal and council councils of the capital, has not yet been addressed, despite its major importance in understanding the Luxembourgish modus vivendi facing inherent and evolving multilingualism. The municipal council reports, which date back to 1836, will be a privileged source for this study.

First, the use of languages by members of the Municipal council and the Council of Aldermen (Luxembourgish, German, French), as well as the linguistic dynamics and their impact on urban life will be presented: when did which languages appeared in the linguistic patchwork of the capital? Then, the analysis will focus on the possible anticipations or reactions of the Municipal council or Council of Aldermen. We start from the hypothesis that multilingualism has posed and still poses significant challenges to social cohesion, influencing the belonging and integration of inhabitants.

During the "pre-national" era, the question of linguistic integration hardly arose – the issue was "knowing how to communicate" in a time when immigration was proportionally very minor. Since the early 20th century, Luxembourg has been a country of immigration with successive waves of Germans, Italians, Portuguese. Today, the question of integration is naturally linked to that of language. In 2023, the ADR, a far-right political party, ran in municipal elections with the slogan: "Our language, at the heart of integration. Perfect!", praising Luxembourgish as the central pivot of foreigners' integration, with particular attention to young people. It is worth noting that for decades the municipal administration has offered Luxembourgish language courses in its "Citizens' Welcome Center" (Bierger-Center), and a consultative integration commission (formerly "Ausländerkommission", foreigners' commission) has long been established.

The communication and official documents will then be analysed. Have the languages used been adapted, and from which moments? After a long time favouring one language, authorities began at the end of the 18th century, when the country was integrated into the French "Départment des Forêts", to use two languages (French and German) in public communications (posters, public informations, etc.). In-depth research will identify the numerous adaptations from the 19th century to the present day regarding the use of languages in various domains. For instance, regarding the French language, around the year 2000, the mayor of the capital began presenting the budget in French, knowing that "an important part of our [Municipal Council] work is to report to our fellow citizens on how the city of Luxembourg is managed. It is also up to us to make non-Luxembourgish inhabitants of the city aware, and there are many, that the city is also their city, perhaps temporary, perhaps adopted, but nevertheless their city just like that of our Luxembourgish fellow citizens, and that the decisions we make within our Municipal Council concern them just as much."

As for the Portuguese and English languages, recent developments are to be observed and contextualized. Practical guides and coalition agreements (2012) are now frequently published in four languages: German, French, Portuguese, and English (the "Citizens' Welcome Center", 2002, on public primary education, 2012). The reflections that led to these decisions remain to be explored and studied.

Recently, the city has introduced "language cafes" – faced with an even more diverse array of languages in the city. In fact, many specific examples allow us to identify and discern possible strategies. The council's declaration in 1976 stipulated that "any new significant school construction will be equipped with a language laboratory." In what context does this decision fit?

In summary, the question arises as to whether, on the scale of the city of Luxembourg from a historical perspective dating from the early 19th century to the present day, to ensure urban order, key stages and moments in fields of action related to language diversity can be identified, and whether evolutions in political discourse can be observed.

Gilles Genot (Lëtzebuerg City Museum)