

RURAL COMMERCIALIZATION IN  
SOUTHERN GERMANY, C. 1200–C. 1500:  
SOURCES, PROBLEMS, AND POTENTIAL \*

*Shami Ghosh*

FOR nearly three decades it has been recognized that English society had experienced a high degree of commercialization from the late twelfth century onwards, and by the second half of the thirteenth century, between a third and half of even the rural population was in many regions

\* The present paper is the result of a two-year Insight Development Grant (430-2015-01215) for the years 2015–17 funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of the Government of Canada, with some further work conducted as part of my current project, entitled “Rural Commercialisation in Southern Germany, c. 1200–c. 1440,” funded by the same Council by means of an Insight Grant (435-2018-0283) for the years 2018 to 2023. It is based on research conducted in 2016 and 2017 at the Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv in Munich, the Staatsarchiv Augsburg, the Staatsarchiv Nürnberg, and the Germanisches Nationalmuseum Nürnberg; I am extremely grateful to the staff at all of these institutions, in particular to Frau Meier in Munich, for their assistance. I thank also the Interlibrary Loan staff at the Robarts Library in the University of Toronto for their efforts on my behalf. I am also deeply indebted to Claudia Sutter for her careful editing, corrections, and many useful criticisms; her thoroughness saved me from many errors.

The following abbreviations are used for archival sources:

AA	Amtsbücher und Akten
GL	Gerichtsliterale
HL	Hochstiftliterale
KL	Klosterliterale
KÄA	Kurbayern Äußeres Archiv (often KBÄA in the older scholarship)
NKB	Neuburger Kopialbücher
StV	Staatsverwaltung.

Unless explicitly otherwise indicated, all shelf marks bearing these abbreviations are for the Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv in Munich (which is thus not repeated in each instance). In addition, the Bischöfliches Zentralarchiv in Regensburg is abbreviated as BZAR.

arguably in some way market-dependent, with a majority of the rural population in most parts of England more or less involved in the market by this point.<sup>1</sup> The evidence for this is manifold: records of foundations of markets and mints, and activities at markets and mints not just in major towns but also in small towns and villages; a high incidence and frequency of local fairs; the commutation of natural rents and labour services into money; accounts recording the sale of produce for cash; records of taxes and other dues assessed in coin. While the extent of commercialization is not amenable to precise measurement even in England, there is no doubt both that widespread commercialization was a phenomenon of late-medieval English rural society and that it had been so even before the collapse of feudal social-property relations in the fifteenth century. Coupled with increasing commercialization was a concomitant social stratification, which arguably both enabled and in turn fuelled commercialization.<sup>2</sup>

The fact of commercialization in medieval English society, and specifically rural society, has in turn had implications for modern ways of understanding socio-economic change. The most influential theory regarding the origins of capitalism of the past half-century, that of Robert Brenner, was based on a notion of a feudal society of self-sufficient peasants who did not need to be dependent on the market for their subsistence, which changed into a tripartite structure of landowners, tenant farmers, and an agrarian proletariat over the course of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries: agrarian capitalism.<sup>3</sup> Such an autarkic peasant society can now definitively be said not to have predominated already by the later thirteenth century in much of England, and Brenner's theory is em-

<sup>1</sup> Richard H. Britnell, *The Commercialisation of English Society 1000–1500*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, 1996); Shami Ghosh, "Rural Economies and Transitions to Capitalism: Germany and England Compared (c. 1200–c. 1800)," *Journal of Agrarian Change* 16 (2016): 255–90, here 259–60 (with extensive reference to the older literature not repeated here).

<sup>2</sup> Richard H. Britnell, *Britain and Ireland 1050–1530: Economy and Society* (Oxford, 2004), 172–73; Bruce M. S. Campbell, "The Agrarian Problem in the Early Fourteenth Century," *Past and Present* 188 (2005): 3–70, here 48–49; Christopher Dyer, *An Age of Transition? Economy and Society in England in the Later Middle Ages* (Oxford, 2005), 72–76; Ghosh, "Rural Economies," 259–61, 279.

<sup>3</sup> T. H. Aston and C. H. E. Philpin, eds., *The Brenner Debate: Agrarian Class Structure and Economic Development in Pre-Industrial Europe* (Cambridge, 1985).

pirically no longer tenable not least because of the more recent findings regarding the extent of market dependence even under feudal socio-economic structures.<sup>4</sup> More recently, English commercialization has been viewed as a part of a precocious process of “Smithian growth,” a socio-economic transformation that included early rises in total factor productivity and occupational diversity coupled with increasing market activity, anchored by increasing centralization of public order institutions, allowing some scholars to see a more or less direct road from the later thirteenth or the fourteenth century to the Industrial Revolution.<sup>5</sup>

What is common to both these theories is England’s postulated uniqueness and precocity in economic development.<sup>6</sup> But other regions of Europe also industrialized over the course of the nineteenth century, for which process they also required highly commercialized societies with high levels of productivity and occupational diversity. It seems therefore fallacious to assume that all other regions simply imitated England, an argument that is in any case not amenable to proof, and I have suggested elsewhere that they experienced a long trajectory of growth similar to that of England. My hypothesis also, however, requires proof; one place to start is by examining the extent and nature of commercialization in the precise period in which it has been found in England to see if the beginnings of a path towards modern industrialized economies—and by any account, Germany and Switzerland must count as such from the later

<sup>4</sup> Ghosh, “Rural Economies,” with reference to further literature; cf., however, Spencer Dimmock, *The Origin of Capitalism in England, 1400–1600* (Leiden, 2014).

<sup>5</sup> Stephen Broadberry, Bruce M. S. Campbell, Alexander Klein, Mark Overton, and Bas van Leeuwen, *British Economic Growth, 1270–1870* (Cambridge, 2015); Stephen Broadberry, Bruce M. S. Campbell, and Bas van Leeuwen, “When Did Britain Industrialise? The Sectoral Distribution of the Labour Force and Labour Productivity in Britain, 1381–1851,” *Explorations in Economic History* 50 (2013): 16–27.

<sup>6</sup> I have presented the arguments of the present and following paragraphs in much greater detail elsewhere (Ghosh, “Rural Economies”), and for reasons of space I refer the reader to that publication for the details and supporting literature, as well as for further discussion of and caveats regarding the term “feudalism” and its cognates. It should be noted that now even some English historians have become willing to concede the similarity of the Dutch case.

nineteenth century onwards as much as England—might indeed be similar.<sup>7</sup>

It is worth noting that although in many ways developments in Germany appear to have been similar, or at least comparable, to those in England between *c.*1300 and *c.*1800, England was indeed largely unique in some respects. Direct management of manors, with (at least formally) a significant labour service requirement, survived concomitant with the commercialization of rural society; and both, as well as the other legal apparatus of feudal social-property relations, more or less vanished over the course of the fifteenth century.<sup>8</sup> In most of the German-speaking regions of Europe, as elsewhere on the continent, direct management of estates had largely been given up (at least by the larger ecclesiastical landowners for whom we have the most evidence) by *c.*1300; but legal subordination and various other trappings of feudalism remained in place, in many instances until the eighteenth century. Despite these differences, other aspects of social and economic transformation—commercialization, social stratification, productivity growth, occupational diversity—were comparable between at least some regions of Germany and England over the course of this period.<sup>9</sup> Thus legal status and conditions of land tenure need to be examined as distinct from these processes, rather than as causal factors explaining them; this has often not been the case in earlier scholarship. Another way in which England was different from Germany (and most of continental Europe) has to do with the early centralization of institutions and laws, the integration of jurisdictions and removal of tolls and so on for internal trade, and the standardization of currency, weights, and measures; but again, in spite of

<sup>7</sup> I am of course aware of the anachronism of using terms such as “Germany” and “Switzerland,” but I do so to avoid awkward circumlocutions in every instance.

<sup>8</sup> Mark Bailey, *The Decline of Serfdom in Late Medieval England: From Bondage to Freedom* (Woodbridge, 2014).

<sup>9</sup> Shami Ghosh, “The Imperial Abbey of Ellwangen and Its Tenants: A Study of the Polyptych of 1337” [“Ellwangen”], *Agricultural History Review* 62 (2014): 187–209, “Rural Commercialisation in Fourteenth-Century Southern Germany: The Evidence from Scheyern Abbey” [“Scheyern”], *Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte* 104 (2017): 52–77 (in which the involvement of Scheyern’s dependents in the market is in fact rather underestimated because I erroneously did not distinguish between the regular shilling and the Bavarian “long” shilling), and “Rural Economies,” with reference to the older scholarship.

these supposed institutional disadvantages, the German lands appear to have experienced comparable socio-economic transformations between c. 1200 and c. 1850.

This hypothesis regarding the similarity of developments in Germany to those in England, along with the argument that the supposed uniqueness of English commercialization must be re-examined, can only be upheld on the basis of much more thorough empirical, statistically grounded analysis of the extant sources on a far larger scale than has hitherto been the case. While there have been many recent such studies of German agrarian history particularly for the centuries after 1450, the subject has been less well served for the earlier period; even the first volume of the recent handbook on German agrarian history only begins its synthesis in 1350, and in fact devotes most of its discussion to the years following 1450.<sup>10</sup> Such studies as exist for the period before 1450 have mostly not been much concerned with the questions posed here and are thus generally, whatever their other virtues, lacking in a solid statistical foundation; even though they provide sufficient impressionistic information to allow reasonable confidence that there was a marked increase in commercialization, what is needed is real statistical data. Furthermore, while it has been suggested that there is some link between commercialization and urbanization, the collapse of the manorial system, and population growth,<sup>11</sup> what that link is remains completely unclear: it is certainly likely that all of these developments were related, but for any real understanding of the processes of historical change involved, and for any proper comparison with other regions to be possible, greater precision is required.

This article is a preliminary effort towards the beginnings of such precision. The first step is to determine whether there are any sources that could allow for the comparative work that I suggest is needed, and to devise a method by which the problems that the sources inevitably pose might be overcome to address the questions at hand. The article presents

<sup>10</sup> Rolf Kießling, Frank Konersmann, Werner Troßbach, *Grundzüge der Agrargeschichte*, vol. 1: *Vom Spätmittelalter bis zum Dreißigjährigen Krieg (1350–1650)* (Cologne, Weimar, and Vienna, 2016).

<sup>11</sup> Werner Rösener, *Grundherrschaft im Wandel: Untersuchungen zur Entwicklung geistlicher Grundherrschaften im südwestdeutschen Raum vom 9. bis 14. Jahrhundert* (Sigmaringen, 1991), 561.

an overview of hundreds of individual unpublished sources as well as a number of edited texts collectively comprising over 50,000 pages of relevant materials; it also provides a discussion of the nature of the sources and the ways in which they might be approached with a view to the problem of rural commercialization. The southern German regions, now primarily in the states of Bavaria and Baden-Württemberg, might seem paradoxical choices for a study of rural commercialization: the highly commercialized regions of the Middle and Lower Rhine might appear more obvious candidates. But these regions are chosen precisely because they are in some respects more similar to, and thus more easily comparable with, southern and Midland England, the regions of England where commercialization of rural society is supposed to have been the most dense. They are not highly specialized regions of market-oriented production close to a dense network of towns; rather, they are characterized by a diversity of landscape, including large swathes of primarily arable land, mixed farming regions, hilly pastoral areas, and some towns of varied sizes, but no exceptional urban density. Their source base is also exceptionally rich, both printed and in manuscript, and unlike some other regions, their sources go far back into the early Middle Ages, making it possible in theory to provide a long-term study of the growth of rural commercialization from *c.* 800 to *c.* 1800 and beyond. Bavaria is exceptional also in that there is a very dense series of estate surveys of the Duchy of Bavaria for the whole period in question; in Germany as elsewhere, such sources for secular landlords are relatively rare, so this presents an unusual and excellent opportunity to compare practices of secular and ecclesiastical landlords. Apart from similarities, a key difference also makes these regions useful comparanda with England: the absence of a centrifugal force exerted by a great city like London. They are also characterized by a relative lack of urban density compared to the Low Countries, another part of Europe seen as exceptional in terms of precocious economic development, where the absence of an equivalent to London is thought to be compensated by high levels of urban density, thus allowing for a trajectory very similar to that of (southern) England. Despite these differences, however, these southern German regions are nevertheless part of the so-called “blue banana,” the belt of manufacturing regions stretching across Europe from the Low Countries through to northern Italy, as is evidenced not least by the take-off of various rural

industries already in the later Middle Ages in a symbiotic relationship with agriculture.<sup>12</sup> The mix of similarities and the key difference, as well as the massive but as yet untapped source base, thus makes the German regions in question an attractive comparandum.

While there are many ways of studying of both commercialization and broader economic change, I suggest that monetization of renders and services in agrarian society is a basic and good indicator of rural commercialization, and the latter is itself a prerequisite for further economic change—which is not to say that it is some sort of prime mover, for it might itself be a consequence of urbanization or other factors, or, more likely, acts in concert with numerous other factors to cause a structural transformation of the socio-economic system as a whole. Genuine monetization (as opposed to the use of money as an accounting method) must indicate commercialization for a very simple reason: no one grew money, and insofar as natural renders or labour services were commuted for coin, there had to be ways of converting labour or produce into cash. In other words: monetization of renders implies the existence of markets of some sort and the demand for labour or produce sold in those markets; this in turn implies the existence both of a population that needs or wants to buy rather than produce subsistence commodities, and of a surplus produced to meet that demand. Given the fact that both output growth in manufacturing and urban growth are only possible if there is a rural surplus (of production and population), and given the predominantly rural populations of all pre-industrial societies, economic change in the countryside is both a prerequisite for, and barometer of, larger processes of economic (and social) transformation.

The following three sections provide a brief discussion of different categories of sources, dealing in turn with estate surveys, accounts, and serial lists; this is followed in each section by an overview of the archival and printed sources in each category, with information regarding the approximate extent and chronological range of the sources, and any particular idiosyncrasies worthy of note.<sup>13</sup> In the final section I discuss some

<sup>12</sup> Ghosh, “Rural Economies,” 258, 262.

<sup>13</sup> The extent of the sources is usually listed with an approximate number of pages. In many instances, it is impossible to be precise about the extent without in effect either measuring manually the extent of relevant content on each page or

of the methodological problems posed by the sources and how they might be overcome. No overview of the majority of the material presented below has been published in any language, and information concerning most of these sources is generally available only in the archive and normally even more sparse than what I provide here. While I have myself commenced a study of this subject using some (but not all) of the sources discussed below for a large part of the period in question, I hope the arguments and data provided here will be convincing enough and will provide sufficient information for other scholars to take up the challenge posed by the masses of extant material to come to a deeper and more empirically based, statistically founded analysis of rural economies in south German regions in the later Middle Ages.

The archival and printed material I have inspected, albeit for the most part as yet only cursorily, comprises deposits of landlords and holdings

providing an edition, as the texts are frequently interrupted by blank lines, parts of a page, or whole pages, or by unrelated materials; and the sources are recorded in volumes and scripts of widely varying sizes. A page range, therefore, can only have any sort of precise meaning when all of these issues are taken into account, and must otherwise be only an approximate guide. When these texts are edited, these problems are elided along with any blank spaces or pages or extraneous materials, and the extent can be indicated by the number of entries (though these also often differ in length even within the same source); but within the manuscript context, greater precision is rarely achievable outside the context of a detailed analysis of a single source or set of sources that encompasses a purely physical examination. Another reason for approximation is that, as discussed below, for sources from after *c.* 1440, I have been unable to examine the materials myself, and I provide details based on archival catalogues, which vary greatly in how much information they provide; in many cases, they give no indication as to the extent of the relevant volumes, and I am also therefore unable to do so. It should also be noted that the extent of the sources and their format and content have for the most part no discernible relationship. The source may be incomplete; record-keeping practices differ from landowner to landowner and sometimes from source to source even when compiled by the same landowner; some codices contain several years' worth of lists or accounts, whereas others contain one or two lists or surveys mixed up with all kinds of other sources. Even when comparing two sources of the same type from the same landlord and compiled in reasonable temporal proximity to each other, and even when assessing only the number of entries rather than number of pages or folios, there might be a significant difference in extent. The reasons for this difference cannot be determined without a thorough study of just those sources and everything else related to the landlord's land-management and record-keeping practices.



mainly in (modern) Bavaria, of which the manuscript materials are principally in the Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv in Munich, as well as archives in Augsburg, Regensburg, and Nuremberg. The archival deposits are all, with the exception of the Duchy of Bavaria, of ecclesiastical institutions, mostly themselves located in the modern state of Bavaria, but in some cases also within—and in almost every case with holdings in—the regions of Franconia, Swabia, and Tyrol, not all of which are encompassed by modern Bavaria. For reasons of time and scope, it has not been possible for me to conduct detailed surveys of materials from neighbouring regions, though in the final section I do give some indication of published materials available from them. There is a great increase in the source base from c. 1440 onwards that corresponds with what Dorothee Rippmann has noted for northern Switzerland,<sup>14</sup> and because of limited time in the archives in 2016 and 2017, I have been unable to examine the later sources in any detail; my discussion of them remains more superficial than of the earlier material and is frequently based only on archive catalogues or other scholarship rather than my own inspection of the sources. (All references to archive catalogues below are to post-medieval finding aids, though in some cases these date back to the eighteenth century; and in almost all cases, the catalogues are only available *in situ* at the relevant archive.) The bulk of the relevant sources are in the Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv in Munich, mostly catalogued as “Klosterliteralien” (and occasionally as “Amtsbücher und Akten”; a recataloguing of many records under the former heading to the latter has been underway for some years).<sup>15</sup> My focus has been on landholders for whom

<sup>14</sup> Dorothee Rippmann, “Leben, Arbeit und materielle Kultur im Lichte pragmatischer Schriftlichkeit in der Schweiz,” in *Wirtschafts- und Rechnungsbücher des Mittelalters und der Frühen Neuzeit: Formen und Methoden der Rechnungslegung: Städte, Klöster und Kaufleute*, ed. Gudrun Gleba and Niels Petersen (Göttingen, 2015), 209–53, here 214.

<sup>15</sup> The records of the Duchy or Bavaria are, naturally enough, held in the principal Bavarian state archive. Records of ecclesiastical institutions were for the most part absorbed by the Bavarian state after the secularization of these institutions in the wake of the Napoleonic Wars of the early nineteenth century, and thus entered the holdings of what became the Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, where they were mostly catalogued either as “Urkunden” (charters) or “Literalien,” the latter term incorporating pretty much everything other than charters and clearly literary material that had been bound in a manner indicating a clear separation from documen-

multiple sources across a lengthy time period are extant, and I have therefore generally avoided cases of very patchy or fragmentary survival of sources. I have also not been able to identify any further secular landlords with sufficiently dense deposits of extant surveys or serial sources (which is not to say that such deposits are not waiting to be found). Nevertheless, since the aim of the present work is to provide an easily accessible overview of the relevant archival holdings that is as close to comprehensible as possible, with the exception of the one surviving survey for Wessobrunn from 1397 (Wessobrunn, AA 157, c.40 pp.) that I was unable to inspect *in situ*, I provide brief descriptions of all estate surveys, manorial accounts, and rent lists preserved under the catalogue headings of “Klosterliteralien” or “Amtsbücher und Akten” that have not been either edited or described elsewhere.<sup>16</sup> As will be seen, what I present is a very large sample, and although it is far from all the extant material, I am confident that no significant deposits of further sources of the kinds discussed here are to be found in the Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv or the state archives at Augsburg or Nuremberg, and I would be surprised if any such deposits are in any other state archives in Bavaria. I have not, however, investigated smaller archives, and doubtless further searching would reveal further sources of interest for rural economic history in this period. It is almost certain, however, that with regard to ecclesiastical institutions located within the current boundaries of Bavaria, whatever few other sources might be found would not require any significant revisions to the results of any studies based on the sources encompassed by the present article.

tary records; the latter were generally absorbed by what became the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek. These transfers of sources did not, however, encompass everything, in particular materials from episcopal archives; and more recent reorganizations of the archival system in Bavaria has sent some records to regional archives also under the Generaldirektion der Staatlichen Archive Bayerns, normally with the rationale that the records in question pertain to institutions within a region otherwise falling under the purview of that regional archive.

<sup>16</sup> In the latter category belong the surveys of Au, Isen, Hochstift Regensburg, and Weltenburg. The first three are discussed by Johannes Wetzel, “Die Urbare der bayerischen Klöster und Hochstifte vom Anfang des 11. Jahrhunderts bis 1350,” unpublished PhD dissertation (Munich, 1995), 16–20, 52–53, 83–85; and the survey of Weltenburg is discussed by its editor, Matthias Thiel, ed., *Die Traditionen, Urkunden und Urbare des Klosters Weltenburg* (Munich, 1958), 64\*, 251–302.



Although estate surveys, income lists of various kinds, and manorial accounts are the principal source types that can be used for present purposes, other kinds of sources are also, of course, of use for assessing the history of the rural economy and indeed of rural commercialization. Customals (“Weistümer”) and land transfer documents, for example, as well as chronicles, can often provide a great deal of contextual information. Nevertheless, estate surveys, accounts, and serial lists of incomes are the main sufficiently data-rich sources extant over a long period, to which other materials can for the most part only be a supplement for a large-scale diachronic study. (It is also the case with regard to customals and chronicles containing relevant information that they are extant mostly only from quite late in the fifteenth century.)

I should also note that each source type as discussed here is in fact a rather flexible category; the genre definitions are modern, there is a wide range of variation, and attempts at precision sometimes essayed by earlier scholarship (and to be found frequently in archive catalogues) are, in my view, at best unhelpful and at worst misleading with regard to the actual state of the extant source material. In my attempt at a typology I therefore remain deliberately somewhat vague, and in general I avoid the descriptive terms used of manuscript sources in archive catalogues and scholarship. I believe there is nevertheless some benefit in setting out some of the differences between different kinds of sources, with all appropriate caveats duly expressed, since it is useful for scholars to have some sense of what kind of material to expect when entering an archive; in this spirit, I offer my flexible typologies of estate surveys, manorial accounts, and lists in the following pages.

#### ESTATE SURVEYS AND RELATED LISTS (“URBARIELLE QUELLEN”)

Estate surveys—in German known mainly by the term “Urbar,” but also “Salbuch,” “Gültbuch,” or sometimes “Zinsbuch,” and in English and French normally called polyptych/*polyptique* or extent or rental/*censier*—are by far the most commonly used source for agrarian economic history in this period, and outnumber accounts by some measure, though the boundary between estate surveys and lists of various kinds can be

rather more porous than that between them and accounts.<sup>17</sup> After an initial flourishing in the Carolingian period, of which famous examples from Germany are the polyptychs of Prüm and Weißenburg,<sup>18</sup> there was a hiatus in the production of such texts until late in the twelfth century; almost all the earliest south German examples are from the second half of the thirteenth century, from which point there is a fairly prolific production of such surveys. The history of estate surveys in Germany and the manifold problems they pose have been discussed at great length elsewhere, and I do not reproduce the details here.<sup>19</sup> Various kinds of

<sup>17</sup> Mark Bailey, *The English Manor, c.1200–c.1500* (Manchester, 2002), 21–43; Robert Fossier, *Polyptiques et censiers* (Turnhout, 1978); P. D. A. Harvey, *Manorial Records of Cuxham, Oxfordshire circa 1200–1359* (London, 1976), 72–78, and *Manorial Records* (London, 1984), 15–24.

<sup>18</sup> Christoph Dette, ed., *Liber possessionum Wizenburgensis* (Mainz, 1987); Ingo Schwab, ed., *Das Prümer Urbar* (Düsseldorf, 1983).

<sup>19</sup> Matthias Bader, “Die Urbare Herzog Ludwigs des Gebarteten von Bayern-Ingolstadt: Eine hilfswissenschaftliche Untersuchung zu Ausbau und Modernisierung einer Landesherrschaft am Anfang des 15. Jahrhunderts,” *Archiv für Diplomatik* 54 (2008): 147–203, here 194–97; idem, “Urbare,” in *Historisches Lexikon Bayerns*, <http://www.historisches-lexikon-bayerns.de/Lexikon/Urbare> (accessed 26 May 2018); Christa Bertelsmeier-Kierst, *Kommunikation und Herrschaft: Zum volkssprachlichen Verschriftlichungsprozeß des Rechts im 13. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart, 2008), 23–60, 182–88; Enno Bünz, “Probleme der hochmittelalterlichen Urbarüberlieferung,” in *Grundherrschaft und bäuerliche Gesellschaft im Hochmittelalter*, ed. Werner Rösener (Göttingen, 1995), 31–75; idem, “Urbare und verwandte Quellen zur Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte,” in *Aufriß der historischen Wissenschaften*, ed. Michael Maurer, vol. 4 (Stuttgart, 2002), 168–89; Enno Bünz, Dieter Rödel, Peter Rückert, Ekhard Schöffler, eds., *Fränkische Urbare: Verzeichnis der mittelalterlichen urbariellen Quellen im Bereich des Hochstifts Würzburg* (Neustadt an der Aisch, 1998), 11–22; Gregor Egloff, “Das Urbar als Werkzeug historischer Erinnerung und Legitimation: Güterverzeichnisse des Kollegiatstifts St. Michael in Beromünster vom 14. bis ins 17. Jahrhundert,” in *Wirtschaft und Herrschaft: Beiträge zur ländlichen Gesellschaft in der östlichen Schweiz (1200–1800)*, ed. Thomas Meier and Roger Sablonier (Zurich, 1999), 371–96; Fossier, *Polyptiques*; Hugo Ott, “Probleme und Stand der Urbarinterpretation,” *Zeitschrift für Agrargeschichte und Agrarsoziologie* 18 (1970): 159–84; Roger Sablonier, “Verschriftlichung und Herrschaftspraxis: Urbarielles Schriftgut im spätmittelalterlichen Gebrauch,” in *Pragmatische Dimensionen mittelalterlicher Schriftkultur*, ed. Christel Meier, Volker Honemann, Hagen Keller, Rudolf Suntrup (Munich, 2002), 91–120; Stefan Sonderegger, “Landwirtschaft auf dem Papier und

typologies have been attempted, though the more recent scholarship has—correctly—abandoned any effort at a strict typology; in any case, for comparative purposes, flexibility is preferable, as the technical terminology and typologies of English scholarship invariably differ from their German counterparts.<sup>20</sup>

An estate survey may be defined as a list of the holdings of a landlord (normally but not always encompassing many estates and holdings of various sizes in many individual settlements), the regular renders and services due from them, and often also tithes and extraordinary renders of services or rents sometimes owed or required (for example, recognition fees, death duties, fines for marrying into another jurisdiction, etc.). Estate surveys may also list other dependents who may not hold property from the landlord but owe dues resulting from personal bondage, in surveys of institutions with other pertinences beyond land and personal dependents, tolls, fees, fines, and other kinds of dues and rights of the institution in question may also be recorded. In some cases, the surveys list the inventory provided by the landlord to be retained on the property in the case of a tenant's departure, mainly seed and livestock (called *geriht* and similar terms in Middle High German, which are often also used even in Latin surveys, though the latter sometimes use the term *instrumenta*).<sup>21</sup> Many exemplars also designate holdings with inexact size markers such as *curia*, *huba*, *mansus*, or vernacular equivalents, but this is not always the case; in most of the extant examples I have seen from this period, no measure of actual size of the holdings is given. In some cases, we also find brief descriptions of customs, names of landholders, and sometimes details regarding inheritance; occasionally there is scattered information about the length of leases; and even less frequently, records of disputes between landlord and tenants. The boundary between surveys and customals (“Weistum,” pl. “Weistümer”) can be

in der Praxis,” in *Adel und Bauern in der Gesellschaft des Mittelalters: Internationales Kolloquium zum 65. Geburtstag von Werner Rösener*, ed. Carola Fey and Steffen Krieb (Korb, 2012), 249–72, here 255–58.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. the works cited at n. 17.

<sup>21</sup> Josef Hopfenitz, “Hubgericht – Hofgericht – Hubrecht: Eine Untersuchung zum mittelalterlichen bäuerlichen Besitzrecht in Oberdeutschland,” *Zeitschrift für Agrargeschichte und Agrarsoziologie* 24 (1976): 8–53; Michael Toch, “Lords and Peasants: A Reappraisal of Medieval Economic Relationships,” *Journal of European Economic History* 15 (1986): 163–82, here 167–69.

blurred, though the latter may record various other customs including those pertaining to interactions between tenants rather than between tenants and the landlord, and frequently do not provide any information on renders. Estate surveys are often static sources, recording neither change over time, nor even disputes and actual incomes collected; but many estate surveys do also contain a vast range of additions, corrections, and modifications, attesting to actual use and an effort to keep them current.<sup>22</sup>

The manuscripts themselves typically have no genre designator, frequently beginning *medias in res*; many simply state what is to be found in the following pages. So, for example, one of the oldest surveys of Benediktbeuern from the late thirteenth century commences with the words *Hii sunt redditus cellarii . . .*,<sup>23</sup> which formula begins each set of renders listed by each office (“Amt,” pl. “Ämter” in modern German, identical to the Middle High German allowing for orthographical variations).<sup>24</sup> There is naturally a great deal of variation between individual surveys—and often even within a single survey. In general, however, they follow a formulaic pattern, with each entry listing a place, a holding or tenant, and the renders and services owed. Insofar as an estate survey is, in essence, a long list of renders and services, it is hard to differentiate them from simpler lists; modern scholarly editions and archive catalogues tend to use the latter term (for example, “Zinsliste,” “Zinsregister,” “Zehntliste”) where only one form of render is recorded. Thus, the oldest tithing list of Neustift begins with the words *Hee sunt decimationes ecclesie Sancti Petri*, followed by place names with the number of hold-

<sup>22</sup> Alfred Zangger, *Grundherrschaft und Bauern: Eine wirtschafts- und sozialgeschichtliche Untersuchung der Grundherrschaft der Prämonstratenserabtei Rüti (ZH) im Spätmittelalter* (Zurich, 1991), 72.

<sup>23</sup> Benediktbeuern, KL 32: 1r.

<sup>24</sup> Most larger ecclesiastical landlords, as well as the Duchy of Bavaria, divided their records of rents according to various officers of the landlord. In the case of ecclesiastical landlords, these would have been monastic officials, for example, the cellarer or the procurator; in the case of the Duchy of Bavaria, the offices were in every case defined by the region from which they collected rents. Without further thorough analysis, it is impossible to determine whether there is any consistency regarding what kinds of properties (or how many) were assigned to which offices of ecclesiastical landlords; and, similarly, further research would be required to determine precisely how the collection of rents functioned within the ducal administration and its offices.

ings (and in some cases holding types) owing tithes.<sup>25</sup> The difference between this and an estate survey is that in the latter, all forms of renders for each holding tend to be listed together (though tithes are often listed in a separate section, but within the same manuscript), whereas lists may simply be records of just tithes, or money rents, or cheese renders, and so on; and surveys are more likely to provide additional information on the nature of the holding, its tenants, and its inventory, though they do not by any means invariably do so.

Particularly from the second half of the fifteenth century, there is an increase in the frequency of lists kept as serial sources (in volumes designated in the catalogues—and sometimes in the books themselves—with terms such as “Gültbuch,” “Zinsbuch,” “Stiftbuch,” or “Gültregister” or “Zinsregister”), with renders recorded every year in the same codex, albeit with far less detail than in a full estate survey. Entries in such lists are typically a single line giving a name and a sum. These annually recorded lists are probably—more than estate surveys—to be understood as actual and current records of collections.<sup>26</sup> Although often classified along with estate surveys and other lists, because these are proper serial sources, I term such annually kept lists as “serial lists,” and discuss them separately below (there is no consistent generic term used

<sup>25</sup> Hermann-Joseph Busley, ed., *Die Traditionen, Urkunden und Urbare des Klosters Neustift bei Freising* (Munich, 1961), 113–211. Here and in the following, I provide references to modern editions (but not those printed in the *Monumenta Boica*) and studies or descriptions where appropriate. Where editions are cited, unless expressly indicated (by the use of “pp.” or by an asterisk) I provide not the page numbers but the entry numbers as given in the editions. Note that the introductory matter in most editions bears a page number together with an asterisk, and in such cases, “pp.” is not given below since it will be clear that these numbers refer not to entry numbers but rather to the pages of the introduction. In the case of manuscript material, where an extent of pages is given (e.g., “40 pp.”), unless explicitly stated otherwise, this refers to pages rather than folios; where a range is given (e.g., “262–315”), this refers to folios rather than pages, unless “pp.” precedes the numbers. Page ranges of volumes listed as containing material other than the source here described are to be understood as pertaining only to that source and not the whole volume unless otherwise indicated; if no other sources are said to be in the relevant volume, the page range refers to the whole volume. Like the page ranges, dates are to be understood as approximate and provisional; in most cases much more close analysis than has yet been possible will be necessary for a firm date.

<sup>26</sup> Sonderegger, “Landwirtschaft,” 258; Zangger, *Grundherrschaft*, 72–73.



in German or English, and in English both serial lists and proper surveys are sometimes called “rentals”). The discussion in this section pertains only to those lists that are more piecemeal and can be—and indeed often have been—viewed as similar to estate surveys (“urbarielle Quellen”). It must be stressed, however, that the lack of a clear generic boundary between these two kinds of lists is exacerbated by the vagaries of transmission: what appears to be a survey-like list might be only one surviving year of a serially kept set of lists. In most instances, however, it is clear when a serial list is intended to be precisely that, since these tend to be recorded with a series of several years in one volume, which is almost never the case for estate surveys, for which different years typically receive their own codices. It is, however, sometimes the case that several discrete surveys are later bound together in one volume, which could potentially give the appearance of a serially kept set of lists. At the present state of research, therefore, these genre distinctions are necessarily provisional.

Surveys and similar sources are often recorded in volumes containing other kinds of material (this is much less frequently the case with genuinely serial sources, whether serial lists or accounts), and it can sometimes be uncertain whether they should indeed be viewed discretely as texts of a genre distinct from the rest of the manuscript content. Estate surveys are frequently found not only with other “urbarielle Quellen”—lists of some kind—but also in codices that encompass cartularies or copies of land transfer documents (“Traditionsbücher”) and/or customals (“Weistümer”) as well, and often enough other more or less random material. Thus, for example, the volume containing one of the earliest estate surveys of Tegernsee is entitled *Liber traditionum seu oblationum piarum ad monasterium Tegernsee*, and folios one to seventeen indeed comprise a collection of charters and records of donations.<sup>27</sup> Even these folios, however, also contain a calendar, and some musical notation. The estate survey proper commences at fol. 18r with the words *Redditus domini abbatis*, but this is interrupted towards the end of the manuscript with a *Lectio de beata virgine Maria* and a narrative of the abbey’s recent history. Similarly, the late fourteenth-century manuscript of Obermünster in Regensburg bears a heading of *Redditus* on almost every page, but in fact many pages contain customs (often in German), and in some

<sup>27</sup> Tegernsee, KL 4.

cases headings are given indicating this; the manuscript switches back and forth between renders and customs making any sort of genre differentiation both impossible and undesirable.<sup>28</sup> The combination of various texts and various types of texts within one manuscript is hardly unusual for all kinds of medieval manuscripts, not just those containing estate surveys; and while it is certainly the case that editors need to be sensitive to the questions arising from the manuscript context, it may nevertheless be possible—as in the case of the Tegernsee manuscript cited above—to distinguish between the survey and the other matter in the manuscript with reasonable clarity and certainty. The nature of the volumes containing these sources varies considerably, from what appear to be some sort of presentation manuscripts such as many of the volumes of the estate surveys of the Duchy of Bavaria, to rather scrappy codices that might well have had a more day-to-day use in monitoring and recording incomes. In some cases, volumes that appear to have started out as the former kind were clearly over time converted to more pragmatic uses. Needless to say, while for a more holistic rural history all these elements of the manuscript context would arguably require equal consideration, this is not possible within the scope of the present paper, though where possible I refer the reader to other relevant studies.

A detailed overview of the estate surveys from this region up to c. 1350 is provided in Johannes Wetzel's doctoral dissertation, which remains difficult to access within Anglophone academia.<sup>29</sup> Although I draw on Wetzel to a certain extent, my comments are in almost every instance based on my own inspection of the materials (for sources before c. 1440) or archive catalogues and finding aids (for later sources), and I operate with slightly different categories of sources than does Wetzel. I do not consistently note the language of the source; before 1300 almost all are in Latin, and after 1400 almost all are in the vernacular.

*Duchy of Bavaria (Herzogtum Bayern).* The Duchy of Bavaria has left us a number of estate surveys from the thirteenth century, many of which are described in some detail elsewhere.<sup>30</sup> The source base is unusually

<sup>28</sup> Obermünster, KL 3.

<sup>29</sup> Wetzel, "Die Urbare."

<sup>30</sup> Bertelsmeier-Kierst, *Kommunikation*, 34–43; Ingrid Heeg-Engelhart, ed., *Das älteste bayerische Herzogsurbar: Analyse und Edition* (Munich, 1990), 51\*–

rich in that the series of estate surveys continues uninterrupted and expands considerably over the course of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Like the thirteenth-century surveys, those of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries list dues not solely from rural tenant holdings (for example, from markets, granaries, and elsewhere); but they nevertheless remain overwhelmingly concerned with the rural economy and are an invaluable resource, which, once their relationships to each other and their reliability have been more closely examined, should be able to shed considerable light on the nature of the rural economy in the period. The series is unusual both in the quantity produced so early by a secular landlord and in respect of the language of the earliest (thirteenth-century) and many of the fourteenth-century surveys, as the vernacular is used earlier than in most such sources. Given that the documentary and legal production of the Bavarian chancery was almost exclusively in Latin until the early fourteenth century, it has been plausibly suggested that the oldest survey (KÄA 4734, c. 1230) is in the vernacular because it was based on an oral questioning of the relevant local officers (and possibly tenants),<sup>31</sup> and there are a few indications in the text that this was indeed the case.<sup>32</sup> This also suggests that the text was still relatively close to the oral survey and is perhaps also relatively trustworthy in its content. According to Matthias Bader's analysis, this practice of questioning tenants is evidenced in all of the later texts he examined as well.<sup>33</sup> As is the case with most estate surveys, the renders owed are listed in the oldest survey according to office, of which it records thirty-six, a number shared by a few of the following surveys as well. With 1937 entries, the survey is—particularly given the likelihood that it was in fact based on an oral questioning of local informants rather than a documentary record—certainly a source worth closer examination with regard to rural commercialization, and in fact money rents are extremely common in it.

After the splitting of the Duchy into Upper and Lower Bavaria (Oberbayern and Niederbayern) in 1255, the earliest surviving survey (KÄA

62\*, 74\*–92\* (an edition of KÄA 4734); Wilhelm Volkert, "Die älteren bayerischen Herzogsurbare," *Blätter für oberdeutsche Namenforschung* 7 (1966): 1–32.

<sup>31</sup> Bertelsmeier-Kierst, *Kommunikation*, 36–37; Volkert, "Die älteren bayerischen Herzogsurbare," 15.

<sup>32</sup> Heeg-Engelhart, *Das älteste bayerische Herzogsurbar*, 1313, 1556–57.

<sup>33</sup> Bader, "Die Urbare Herzog Ludwigs des Gebarteten," 187.

4755/1, 23 pp.) is a partial one of two offices only. It was compiled between 1255 and 1261 and is, like the oldest survey (KÄA 4734), in the vernacular. The next surveys are from Upper Bavaria, with two volumes from *c.* 1280 recording holdings north and south of the Danube, of which there is also a partial copy (KÄA 4735, *c.* 260 pp.; KÄA 4755, *c.* 140pp.; StV 1065a); these are in Latin, though they make frequent use of German vocabulary; they refer to an old book as a source, but it is not clear whether this is KÄA 4734 or something else altogether that is now lost, and the relationships between these texts awaits further examination. For Lower Bavaria, the earliest surveys, for the offices An der Rott and Straubing, are dated to around 1300, and are both in German (KÄA 4740, *c.* 300 pp.; KÄA 4745, *c.* 160 pp.).<sup>34</sup> There follow a number of further estate surveys for individual offices and in some cases counties, most of which are from Lower Bavaria (KÄA 4744/1, *c.* 90 pp.; KÄA 4744/2, *c.* 240 pp.; KÄA 4744/3, *c.* 85 pp.; KÄA 4744/4, *c.* 80 pp.; KÄA 4744/5, *c.* 90 pp.; KÄA 4744/6, *c.* 25 pp.; KÄA 4744/8, *c.* 15 pp.; KÄA 4744/9, *c.* 115 pp.; KÄA 4747, *c.* 85 pp.; KÄA 4764, *c.* 210 pp.; StV 1070a, *c.* 16 pp.; StV 1082, *c.* 30 pp.; StV 1083, *c.* 300 pp.); the relationship of these to earlier surveys and the precise dating are yet to be determined.<sup>35</sup> From the period 1400–1440, there is one large codex containing a complete survey of all estates of Bavaria-Landshut arranged by office (StV 1096, *c.* 750 pp.). According to Elisabeth Noichl this is likely to have been compiled around 1435.<sup>36</sup> The remaining surveys are once again of particular

<sup>34</sup> Volkert, “Die älteren bayerischen Herzogsurbare,” 25–27, 31. Note that KÄA 4740 is dated *c.* 1330 in the archive catalogue; Volkert’s dating, given here, is adopted also by Heeg-Engelhart and Bertelsmeier-Kierst.

<sup>35</sup> StV 1083 is now at the Staatsarchiv Amberg but may be consulted on microfilm at the Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv. A few idiosyncrasies of the sources and of the archival practices are worth noting here. Many of the codices currently extant contain a number of discrete surveys, and were bound at a date later than what modern scholars have suggested for the earliest of the surveys they contain. The modern archive shelf marks in some cases indicate this fact, and thus, for example, KÄA 4744 is one volume with many surveys, a fact reflected by the individual shelf marks for those surveys (e.g., 4744/1, 4744/2, etc.). It is, however, equally the case that many shelf marks do not indicate that the relevant volume contains several different sources from different dates; this is true, for example, of the volumes with shelf marks beginning NKB.

<sup>36</sup> Elisabeth Noichl, “Das Urbar über das Kastenamt Rosenheim: Zur Ge-

offices, the most numerous of which are those undertaken by Louis the Bearded (Ludwig der Gebartete) of Bavaria-Ingolstadt, which have been the subject of a recent diplomatic study by Matthias Bader.<sup>37</sup> Of particular interest is the set of instructions on what a survey should contain that is bound into one of these volumes that allows us to get a sense of the nature of administrative practice and how it corresponds to the theory of what should have been done; these are the earliest such instructions extant from Germany.<sup>38</sup> Bader lists thirty-one surveys, complete or partial, including copies, from the period 1415–40, which in most cases are extant as several surveys bound together in one volume; in the following, I present these briefly along with my own findings, in roughly chronological order.<sup>39</sup>

From 1415–21/22 there are two surveys of Hilpoltstein (NKB 70: 10–88; GL, Obere und Junge Pfalz, Hilpoltstein 1a) of which NKB 70 served as the basis for Hilpoltstein 1a. There is one survey each from Donauwörth (NKB 77: 271–93), Floss and Vohenstrauß (NKB 75: 229–308), Hohenburg (NKB 76: 353–414), Holnstein (NKB 76: 415–76), and Rain (NKB 77: 237–70), as well as one from Monheim (NKB 5: 262–315) of which an extract exists in a contemporary copy as well (GL, Obere und Junge Pfalz, Monheim 6: 350–71), and a survey from Reichertshofen and Wolznach in two copies plus a copy of the Reichertshofen portion from the second half of the fifteenth century (NKB 69: 98–154, 270–304, 201–41). From 1416 there are a survey of Parkstein-Weiden that is the source for a further undated survey (NKB 75: 1–224; Staatsarchiv Amberg, Landrichteramt Parkstein, 175), two essentially identical surveys of Swabia (GL, Schwaben 19; GL, Schwaben 20), and surveys of Kitzbühel and Rattenberg (Innsbruck, Tiroler Landesarchiv, Urbare 91/1; Urbare

schichte des Niederbayerischen Landesurbars Herzog Heinrichs des Reichen von 1435,” *Das bayerische Inn-Oberland* 46 (1986): 126–41, here 126–27.

<sup>37</sup> Bader, “Die Urbare Herzog Ludwigs des Gebarteten.”

<sup>38</sup> GL, Obere und Junge Pfalz, Hilpoltstein 1a: 0; Bader, “Die Urbare Herzog Ludwigs des Gebarteten,” 184–86.

<sup>39</sup> Bader, “Die Urbare Herzog Ludwigs des Gebarteten,” 199–203. I have inspected the volumes or (in the case of volumes from after *c.* 1440) the archive catalogues for deposits pertaining to the Duchy of Bavaria with shelf marks KÄA and StV; shelf marks and folio ranges from other fonds are taken from Bader, and from Noichl, “Das Urbar über das Kastenamt Rosenheim.”

89/1).<sup>40</sup> From 1416–19 there are three more or less identical surveys for the offices of Ingolstadt, Kösching, Gaimersheim, and Gerolfing (GL, Ingolstadt 109; Stadtarchiv Ingolstadt, B 5; NKB 69: 9–93, 158–62). From 1417 there are three closely related surveys of Graisbach bound in one codex (NKB 5: 99–142, 148–204, 205–58), and a survey of the office and jurisdictions of Kling and Wildenwart (KÄA 4749/1, c.460 pp.), as well as a survey of Neuburg (NKB 66: 159–250) that Bader dates to 1417–20, excerpts from which were copied possibly around 1420 and bound in the same codex (NKB 66: 94–145, 304–11), and which also served as the basis for two copies from after 1453, also bound in the same codex (NKB 66: 7–87, 253–94). From 1418/19 there is another survey of Kling and Wildenwart (KÄA 4749/2, c.470 pp.). From 1420 there is a survey of Aichach (NKB 76: 199–352) that Bader identifies as the basis of a version from after 1436 that forms the first third (fols. 9–84) of a codex with around 300 folios, the remainder of which I have not yet been able to date precisely (KÄA 4773). From the same date there is a survey of Friedberg (NKB 76: 1–48), which is, according to Bader, identical in its basis with another survey of Friedberg and Igling from the same year (Pfalz-Neuburger-Akten, 3240: 2–44; GL, Landsberg 11: 121a–c), and was also used as the basis for later surveys from after 1464 (NKB 76: 51–104, 107–69). From 1431 there is another large survey of the county of Swabia (KÄA 4757, c.230 pp.), from 1435 surveys of the offices of Marquartstein (GL, Marquartstein 10), Teisbach (GL, Teisbach 4), and Burghausen (GL, Burghausen 11) and recently discovered fragments discussed by Noichl;<sup>41</sup> and from 1438 a survey of all the holdings of Lower Bavaria (StV 1078, c.180 pp.), the relationship of which to an earlier and less extensive survey from 1427 is still to be determined (KÄA 4742, c.170 pp.). There are also brief surveys of Kranzberg from 1435 and 1472 (KÄA 4741, c.40 pp.). From the later fifteenth century, there are also surveys from Friedberg from after c.1469 (Pfalz-Neuburger-Akten, 3240: 45–89) and after c.1470 (KÄA 4748, c.280 pp.); two further surveys from the fifteenth century that I have not yet been able to date more precisely (StV 1076, c.100 pp.; StV 1087, c.16 pp.); three surveys of Monheim that Bader dates to the second half of the

<sup>40</sup> Hanns Bachmann, ed., *Das Rattenberger Salbuch von 1416* (Innsbruck, 1970).

<sup>41</sup> Noichl, “Das Urbar über das Kastenamt Rosenheim.”

fifteenth century and are more or less identical with each other (GL, Obere und Junge Pfalz, Monheim, 6: 335–49, 372–87, 388–405); a survey of Höchstädt, Lauingen, and Gundelfingen also from the second half of the fifteenth century (NKB 67); and an extensive survey for Friedberg that sits unclearly on the boundary between the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries (KÄA 4751, c.700 pp.). There are, further, two large surveys of the Bavarian Oberland from c.1450, and I have not yet determined how they relate to each other (KÄA 4738, c.1000 pp.; KÄA 4739, c.960 pp.); a survey of Abensberg from the same date (KÄA 4743, c.200 pp.); and from towards the end of the fifteenth century surveys of Vohburg (KÄA 4752, c.380 pp.), and Ingolstadt and neighbouring offices (KÄA 4753, c.370 pp.).

As noted above, it is the case with most landlords that the extant source base expands considerably after c.1440; however, it is not clear that this is the case for the Duchy of Bavaria, and in fact there is something of a decrease in numbers of codices after this date—though the surviving volumes are almost all more extensive than their earlier counterparts. It is not possible here to discuss another source produced by the Duchy that is also potentially useful for present purposes, namely, the tax registers that began to be kept from the late fourteenth century, on which see the recent studies of Georg Vogeler.<sup>42</sup>

Needless to say, all of this material represents a very extensive source base that has, rather surprisingly, remained relatively unutilized for the kind of questions posed here. It should be stressed that the fifteenth-century sources in particular can be—and to an extremely limited extent have been—used for statistical analysis encompassing data such as household size, holding size, relative proportion of pasture and arable, heads of livestock, and so on; such details are relatively rare from most German sources of this period, making these texts invaluable resources.<sup>43</sup> Much preliminary work still needs to be done—on dating

<sup>42</sup> Georg Vogeler, “Spätmittelalterliche Steuerbücher deutscher Territorien: Teil 1: Überlieferung und formale Analyse,” *Archiv für Diplomatik* 49 (2003): 165–295, and “Spätmittelalterliche Steuerbücher deutscher Territorien: Teil 2: Funktion und Typologie,” *Archiv für Diplomatik* 50 (2004): 57–204. On the possible impact of increased taxation on the monetization of the rural economy, see Ghosh, “Scheyern” (n. 9 above), 69.

<sup>43</sup> Hanns Bachmann, “Das Salbuch des bayerisch-herzoglichen Amtes Ratten-

the sources and determining their relationships to each other, critically examining their veracity, and also the legal and diplomatic background to why, when, and where they were produced, and why the record-keeping in this form appears to recede in the later fifteenth century. It is also important to differentiate between the presentation copies that appear not to have had much pragmatic use, and surveys that were regularly updated. Nevertheless, it should be apparent that these are sources of a relatively rare nature and invaluable for the examination of rural society living on the lands of a secular landlord—all the more so since most of the other secular landlords from southern Germany have left relatively fewer sources from this period.<sup>44</sup> This set of sources is comparable for this period, to my knowledge, only to the extensive series of estate surveys from Austria published in the series *Österreichische Urbare*. While it must be conceded that a landlord such as this is obviously an exceptional case and we cannot extrapolate from it to the practices of the far more numerous smaller secular landlords (for whom sources are extant mostly only from late in the fifteenth century),<sup>45</sup> that is no reason to ignore the insights into the rural economy that these sources could bring.

*Aldersbach*. The Cistercian abbey of Aldersbach is particularly notable for its early and long series of accounts, recently edited by Bernhard Lübbers, and introduced below.<sup>46</sup> The earliest surveys are incomplete, bound into a volume containing charters and a list of properties purchased in the early fourteenth century, and themselves date from be-

berg von 1416: Zur wirtschaftlichen Organisation eines Landgerichtes im Mittelalter,” *Tiroler Heimat* 19 (1955): 7–76; Klaus Brandstätter, “Die Salbücher für die Gerichte Kitzbühel und Rattenberg (1415/16) als agrargeschichtliche Quelle,” *Montfort* 51 (1999): 31–47; Eduard Widmoser, “Das Kitzbüheler Salbuch von 1416,” *Stadtbuch Kitzbühel* 1 (1967): 109–93.

<sup>44</sup> For lands further west, see Werner Rösener, “Grundherrschaften des Hochadels in Südwestdeutschland im Spätmittelalter,” in *Die Grundherrschaft im späten Mittelalter*, ed. Hans Patze, vol. 2 (Sigmaringen, 1983), 87–176.

<sup>45</sup> Kurt Andermann, “Grundherrschaften des spätmittelalterlichen Niederadels in Südwestdeutschland: Zur Frage der Gewichtung von Geld- und Natural-einkünften,” *Blätter für deutsche Landesgeschichte* 127 (1991): 145–190.

<sup>46</sup> Bernhard Lübbers, ed., *Die ältesten Rechnungen des Klosters Aldersbach (1291–1373/1409): Analyse und Edition* (Munich, 2009). In what follows, I use the term “abbey” for male and “convent” for female monastic communities.



tween 1296 and 1328, comprising only a few pages each (Aldersbach, KL 1: 46–62).<sup>47</sup> In addition, there are extant two surveys of the abbey's properties in Austria of which one is from 1322 (KL 59½, c. 15 pp.), and the other is undated but also possibly from the same period (KL 59, c. 30 pp.). From the fifteenth century there is one undated survey probably from early in the century (KL 59 ⅓, c. 10 pp.), and two further surveys, one from 1469 (KL 60), and the other from late in the century or possibly the early sixteenth (KL 61). Beyond this, along with the accounts there is extant a series of serial lists from the fifteenth century. Aldersbach's deposits are thus excellent sources for a study over the *longue durée* of the economy of one monastery.

*Altomünster.* The Benedictine convent Altomünster has produced some of the earliest surviving estate surveys of this period, although the amount of total extant material is rather meagre. The first survey dates to around the middle of the thirteenth century (Altomünster, AA 47, c. 15 pp.) and is in a volume titled *Liber reddituum* that also contains a number of charters (some in the vernacular) and some local customs as well.<sup>48</sup> The text was edited in the nineteenth century, but the edition is slightly problematic, printing only the main text but not any of the annotations and corrections in the manuscript.<sup>49</sup> The charters are printed elsewhere,<sup>50</sup> and the customals are printed along with other customals from later (early fourteenth-century) manuscripts that also contain surveys which are clearly related to and in some way dependent on the oldest survey (AA 48, c. 30 pp.; AA 49, c. 30 pp.). The precise relationships are yet to be determined, and the other material in these two manuscripts is not identical with that in the manuscript containing the oldest survey. There

<sup>47</sup> Wetzel, "Die Urbare," 10–11. For reasons of space, here and in the following, after the first shelf mark, I omit the name of the landlord (here Aldersbach) or the place where the landlord is located (for instance, Passau, St. Nikola) for all documents from the same fonds.

<sup>48</sup> This was formerly Altomünster, KL 1, and is so described by Wetzel, "Die Urbare," 12.

<sup>49</sup> Friedrich Hektor Graf Hundt, "Kloster Altomünster im Besitz des Benediktiner-Ordens," *Oberbayerisches Archiv* 21 (1859–61): 194–230.

<sup>50</sup> Friedrich Hektor Graf Hundt, "Regesten ungedruckter Urkunden zur bayerischen Orts-, Familien und Landesgeschichte: 17. Reihe: Urkunden des Klosters Altomünster in Oberbayern aus der Zeit des Besitzes des Ordens vom heiligen Benedikt," *Oberbayerisches Archiv* 20 (1859–61): 3–52

is another fourteenth-century manuscript that is completely in the vernacular (AA 50, c. 30 pp.), and finally, there are two fragmentary surveys from 1427 (AA 51, c. 10 pp.) and 1447 (AA 52, c. 12 pp.).

*Asbach.* The evidence for the Benedictine abbey of Asbach begins relatively early, though it is also relatively thin and lacking in detail for the most part; the thirteenth- and fourteenth-century materials are from two manuscripts (Asbach, KL 1; KL 2) and are available in a modern edition.<sup>51</sup> The earliest relevant material is from c. 1200, and comprises two lists of renders from a total of fifty-five properties, all of which are in coin.<sup>52</sup> Also from the early thirteenth century is another income list from a different office, with forty-one tenants, once again all recorded as paying renders in money.<sup>53</sup> The rather brief estate survey proper dates to c. 1320 and unlike the previous lists records mainly renders in kind.<sup>54</sup> From roughly the same date are two further income lists recording renders in the Regensburg and Passau currencies, and a list of renders from the church in Közlberg.<sup>55</sup> From the latter half of the fourteenth century there are two further income lists, all recording money renders.<sup>56</sup> None of these lists, even taken together, provides an overview of all the abbey's properties.<sup>57</sup> After a gap of about a century, there are two further, more extensive surveys, from 1472 (KL 3, c. 200 pp.) and 1486 (KL 4, c. 120 pp.), both in codices that also contain a good deal of other documentary material, as well as one further volume of rents and tithes dated in the catalogue to sometime in the fifteenth century (KL 4/1).

*Augsburg: SS Ulrich und Afra.* The Benedictine imperial abbey SS Ulrich and Afra, one of the richest and best endowed in Bavaria/Swabia, has left a vast amount of documentation, which because of time constraints I was unable to examine *in situ*. The sources have been catalogued in detail by Wilhelm Liebhart, and the two oldest surveys have been edited by Robert Müntefering, whose descriptions I summarize

<sup>51</sup> Johann Geier, ed., *Die Traditionen, Urkunden und Urbare des Klosters Asbach* (Munich, 1969).

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, 2–36.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, 37–72.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, 73–111.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, 112–89, 190–98.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, 199–247.

<sup>57</sup> Wetzell, “Die Urbare,” 15.

briefly here.<sup>58</sup> The earliest source is a fragment from c. 1100 (Archiv des Bistums Augsburg, Hs. K 13: 102r);<sup>59</sup> this is followed by a full survey dated by Müntefering to 1175 and by Liebhart to 1160/65 (St. Ulrich und Afra, KL 5: 30r–37v).<sup>60</sup> This is in many of its entries extraordinarily detailed with regard not just to renders but also the dates they are due. There is also a register of renders for Tyrol from the fourteenth century (KL 236). Beyond this we have a series of income registers that also record expenses.

*Baumburg.* The Augustinian canons of Baumburg have left us with two exceptionally early surveys, of which the earliest (Baumburg, KL 2) is from between 1204 and 1210 and is quite brief; it has been edited, albeit not entirely satisfactorily, along with the much more extensive second-oldest survey of c. 1245 (KL 17).<sup>61</sup> From the fourteenth century, there is unfortunately only a brief grain tithe list (KL 1: 66–78). From c. 1440, there is a sudden resurgence of record-keeping, beginning with three partial surveys from 1440, each recording renders from two offices (KL 19, c. 90 pp.; KL 20, c. 70 pp.; KL 21, c. 35 pp.). The remaining sources are serial lists and are described below.

*Benediktbeuern.* The Benedictine abbey of Benediktbeuern, famous for its literary and musical manuscripts, has an early, complex, and dense but interrupted tradition of estate surveys and lists. Contained within a thirteenth-century “Traditionsbuch” is a brief rent list that has been partially edited and dates to c. 1250 (Benediktbeuern, KL 9: 2r, 2v, 3r, a1r, a1v, a2r).<sup>62</sup> The two oldest full surveys and their relationship to each other is debated. Benediktbeuern, KL 32 (c. 85 pp.) bears a date (albeit

<sup>58</sup> Wilhelm Liebhart, *Die Reichsabtei Sankt Ulrich und Afra zu Augsburg: Studien zu Besitz und Herrschaft (1006–1803)* (Munich, 1982), XII–XXII; 291–92; Robert Müntefering, ed., *Die Traditionen und das älteste Urbar des Klosters St. Ulrich und Afra in Augsburg* (Munich, 1986), 1–253.

<sup>59</sup> Müntefering, *Die Traditionen*, 1–9.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, 10–253. For the date, see Liebhart, *Die Reichsabtei*, 291; and Müntefering, *Die Traditionen*, 47\*.

<sup>61</sup> Philippe Dollinger, *Les transformations du régime domanial en Bavière au XIIIe siècle d’après deux censiers de l’abbaye de Baumburg* (Strasbourg, 1949), 51–67, 68–112; Wetzel, “Die Urbare,” 21.

<sup>62</sup> Franz Ludwig von Baumann, “Das Benediktbeurer Traditionsbuch,” *Archiv-alische Zeitschrift* NF 20 (1914): 1–82; Wetzel, “Die Urbare,” 26.

in a hand different from the main hand) of 1279, but the dating of the text is complicated by the fact that it has been written by many different hands, and a number of other dates are given, with the latest being 1306.<sup>63</sup> Dollinger accepts 1279 as the date, whereas Wetzel believes the survey was made between 1285 and 1291.<sup>64</sup> The manuscript contains almost exclusively the estate survey, but it also includes a medical text and a land grant dated to 1289.<sup>65</sup> There are also a number of annotations and additions in a variety of hands. The other complete survey dates from after 1285 (KL 34, c. 30 pp.), but the relationship to KL 32 remains unclear; the marginal notes and other additions of the latter suggest that it was begun as a copy of KL 34.<sup>66</sup> Finally, there is one further undated survey (produced between 1291 and 1318), with an unclear relationship to KL 32 and KL 34 (KL 32a, c. 95 pp.).<sup>67</sup> There follows a lengthy hiatus, resolved once again at the crucial date of 1440 with a number of volumes which I have not inspected personally; they are, however, almost certainly serial lists rather than estate surveys, and they are briefly listed below in the section on serial lists. The series, it should be noted, continues more or less uninterrupted through to the eighteenth century, and thus, like Aldersbach, Benediktbeuern presents an excellent set of sources for a study of long-term rural economic change.

*Beuerberg and Beyharting.* The Augustinian abbeys Beuerberg and Beyharting are of less interest for the earlier period, with one relatively brief survey from the middle of the fourteenth century each (Beuerberg, KL 36, c. 60 pp., including, however, charter copies and customals; Beyharting, KL 4, c. 50 pp.), of which the survey of Beyharting survives only in a late fifteenth-century copy, the value of which is dubious for the fourteenth century.<sup>68</sup> Both, however, have very good records from 1500 onwards in the form of serial lists, and Beyharting also has an extensive set of income lists beginning in 1460 (Beyharting, KL 5, c. 1200 pp.).

<sup>63</sup> Benediktbeuern, KL 32: 1r, 39r.

<sup>64</sup> Philippe Dollinger, *Der bayerische Bauernstand vom 9. bis zum 13. Jahrhundert* (Munich, 1982), 443; Wetzel, "Die Urbare," 26–27.

<sup>65</sup> Benediktbeuern, KL 32, 17v–20v (medical text, in German); 27v (land grant).

<sup>66</sup> Wetzel, "Die Urbare," 26.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, 27.

<sup>68</sup> On Beuerberg, see also Wetzel, "Die Urbare," 28–29.

*Biburg.* The estate survey of the Benedictine double-monastery Biburg, from 1272, is notable because of its relatively early date (Biburg, KL ½, c.45 pp.).<sup>69</sup>

*Dießen.* The Augustinian canons of Dießen on the Ammersee once again leave a rather mixed set of records, with an early income list from 1240/47 (Bayerische Staatsbibliothek clm 1018: 29v–30r) and an extensive estate survey from 1362/63 (Dießen, KL 37), both of which are available in a good recent edition with extensive descriptions of the manuscripts and are thus not described further here.<sup>70</sup> We should note, however, that there are a number of additions in the manuscript from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries that might suggest that the survey was kept current, and thus might be taken to represent actual expectations of renders at various points in time.<sup>71</sup> There follows a hiatus of a century before the record resumes with accounts and other serial sources.

*Ettal.* The early sources from the Benedictine abbey of Ettal cannot be securely dated; Wetzel dates what he believes is the earliest survey (Ettal, KL 31, c.36 pp.) to 1346/47 (not long after the abbey's foundation in 1330) on the basis of internal evidence, though he does not discuss the other surviving sources and their relationship and relative dating to KL 31.<sup>72</sup> This mainly Latin manuscript is a simple list of renders (in which coin is ubiquitous), and is useful also because—unusually—the type of holding is frequently given. Two further manuscripts, almost exclusively in the vernacular, also provide simple lists of renders and are in my view probably to be dated to the second half of the fourteenth century (KL 22, c.25 pp.; KL 23, c.20 pp.).<sup>73</sup> After a hiatus, there is, once again from c.1440, an uptake in record-keeping; I have been unable to examine the sources from this period carefully, but I would tentatively categorize them as serial lists, and they are briefly described below.

<sup>69</sup> Ibid., 30–31.

<sup>70</sup> Waldemar Schlögl, ed., *Die älteste Besitzliste und das Urbar des Stiftes Dießen von 1362–63 und die Register zu Traditionen, Urkunden und Urbar* (Munich, 1970), 1–66; 67–418; for discussion and description, see idem, ed., *Die Traditionen und Urkunden des Stiftes Dießen 1114–1362* (Munich, 1967), 75\*–89\*.

<sup>71</sup> Schlögl, *Die Traditionen*, 88\*–89\*.

<sup>72</sup> Wetzel, “Die Urbare,” 36.

<sup>73</sup> Note that KL 23 is dated to the fifteenth century in the archive catalogue.

*Formbach.* Although there is no significant continuous record from the Benedictine abbey of Formbach, its estate survey from 1338 is nevertheless worth noting because of its extent and relative generosity of detail; the manuscript also includes a tithe list, and at the end of the manuscript there are a number of charter copies (KL 8, c.85 pp.).<sup>74</sup> Wetzel also notes a further survey from 1343 of c.300 pages that is in a private archive in Austria.<sup>75</sup> Apart from this, however, there is only a fragmentary tithe and income list contained in a cartulary of the mid-thirteenth century (KL 1: 124–25), and a rent roll from sometime in the fifteenth century (KL 9, 4.17 metres).

*Frauenchiemsee.* The Benedictine convent Frauenchiemsee leaves us with a fairly rich tradition of serial sources from after 1440; before that date, there is one survey of rents, probably from 1410 (Frauenchiemsee, AA 40, c.50 pp.; the date occurs at fols. 16v and 17r). The dating is perhaps controversial, since it occurs at a point in the manuscript where the hand changes, and the language also switches from Latin to German; only a more detailed examination will reveal whether the date can hold for the Latin sections too. The relationship of the source to the actual rents current when it was written might be complex, as the Latin portion has frequent headings saying *redditus antiqui*, and I have not as yet determined whether these are intended also to be the current renders. There are many entries, as well as corrections and notes, in later hands, suggesting at least an effort to keep the manuscript current. It closes with what appears to be a brief custumal.

*Freising St. Veit.* Although from the canons of St. Veit in Freising I have identified only one manuscript of any significance for present purposes (Freising, St. Veit, KL 1, c.90 pp.; dated in the manuscript to 1418), it is worth noting for its relative extent and detail; it is also of interest because even though it is mainly an estate survey, there are a few records of *distributiones*, though these are too brief and inconsistent for the text to be counted as a true account book.

*Freising: Hochstift Freising.* The Prince-Bishopric of Freising has left us with a rather more generous record of its economic activities, begin-

<sup>74</sup> Wetzel, "Die Urbare," 38–40.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*, 38.

ning relatively early with a fragmentary survey from c.1160 (Freising, HL 4: 53r–56v) and another from c.1180 (HL 4: 49r–52v, 57r–58v).<sup>76</sup> Two complete surveys are extant from c.1300; HL 541 (c.200 pp.) was compiled between 1291 and 1308, with entries for different offices in the Austrian regions being added in different years; HL 7 (c.160 pp.), with entries on the Bavarian holdings, was compiled in 1305. Wetzel also provides details of three manuscripts (Munich, Erzbischöfliches Ordinariatsarchiv 251; Freising, HL 8; Munich, Erzbischöfliches Ordinariatsarchiv, 250) that are essentially copies of parts of HL 7 from the early fourteenth century, the last of which is a complete survey from c.1320.<sup>77</sup> There are two more surveys from the fifteenth century that require further analysis for a more precise dating, but are quite possibly from the first half of that century (HL 10, c.55 pp.; HL 12, c.40 pp.); another volume entitled *descriptio prediorum* is probably from around 1430, and, unusually, contains extensive descriptions of holdings, but not always the rents owing (HL 183, c.140 pp.). A further fifteenth-century volume labelled “Gült- und Stiftbuch” (HL 182) and dated to the fifteenth century in the catalogue has, I was informed by archive staff, been missing for some time.<sup>78</sup>

*Fürstenfeld.* The Cistercian abbey of Fürstenfeld has an extensive survey compiled between 1347 and 1350 (Fürstenfeld, KL 582, c.80 pp.); on the basis of frequent notices stating that now the dues are different (e.g., fol. 32v: *modo dat pro tot ova cxxx* just after renders including grain, geese, and chickens are listed along with eggs), it is reasonably to be understood as having been kept current and might thus be an accurate approximation of real renders at the time.<sup>79</sup> There is nothing else from the fourteenth century; from the fifteenth, apart from “Stiftbücher” with serial lists of renders (beginning in 1451), there is one codex (KL 51, c.40 pp.) with some lists of renders, but also records of property transactions and records of who cultivates certain properties without, how-

<sup>76</sup> Wetzel, “Die Urbare,” 40–41.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, 43.

<sup>78</sup> E-mail from Dr. Genoveva Rausch of the Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv dated 23 May 2017.

<sup>79</sup> Wetzel, “Die Urbare,” 44; see further the detailed study of this source by Christopher Landon, which is expected to appear in 2021.

ever, describing their renders. The entries in this volume date mainly from the first half of the fifteenth century.

*Gars.* The various lists and surveys of the Augustinian canons of Gars are contained in one manuscript (Gars, KL 1) and are available in a good recent edition and are thus described in less detail here.<sup>80</sup> Apart from a number of lists of incomes, tithes, and simply names of dependents dating from the early thirteenth to the late fifteenth century, there are two estate surveys from *c.* 1250 in which money is already ubiquitous, and a fuller survey from the second half of the fourteenth century.<sup>81</sup> These are followed by very brief lists of various incomes from the fifteenth century.

*Geisenfeld.* There are a number of thirteenth-century surveys from the Benedictine convent of Geisenfeld, though with one exception they cannot be securely dated. The earliest relevant record is a partial survey in Latin along with a vernacular version of this survey, which Wetzel dates to the middle and second half of the thirteenth century (Geisenfeld, KL 3: 16r–28r);<sup>82</sup> the rest of the codex contains customals of various dates, in Latin and German. The next (and reasonably securely dated) survey is partial, in German, from 1281 (KL 1: 18r–31v).<sup>83</sup> Three further manuscripts contain surveys from *c.* 1300, with later additions and corrections, in each case beginning with the words ...*redditus prediorum et iurium*, and also containing material in German, as well as customals (KL 22; *c.* 75 pp.; KL 23; *c.* 200 pp., including customals; KL 24; *c.* 150 pp.).<sup>84</sup> The precise relationship of these manuscripts to each other is controversial.<sup>85</sup> Following this, there is another manuscript with a mixed content of survey, lists of tolls and renders, customal, and charters, dated in the catalogue to the fourteenth or fifteenth centuries (KL 25). From the fifteenth century, with a date of 1450 inscribed in the codex, there is an extensive “Gruntbuch” containing vernacular lists of properties leased

<sup>80</sup> Heiner Hofmann, ed., *Die Traditionen, Urkunden und Urbare des Stiftes Gars* (Munich, 1983).

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, 59–146; 148–391.

<sup>82</sup> Wetzel, “Die Urbare,” 48.

<sup>83</sup> *Ibid.*, 49.

<sup>84</sup> Wetzel believes that KL 23 must be from after 1350 purely on the basis of script (*ibid.*, 48 n. 234).

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.*, 50.



out and the renders they owe (KL 26; c.400 pp.). There are, further, a volume dated to the fifteenth century in the catalogue and there named a “Salbüchlein,” a survey of tithes and renders from one specific office of Sanspach (KL 27; c.70 pp.; KL 196; c.50 pp.), and serial lists (described below). Once again, the series continues over several centuries, presenting good evidence for a study of extended temporal scope.

*Herrenchiemsee and Iimmünster.* The Augustinian canons of Herrenchiemsee and the collegiate canons of Iimmünster both provide very few sources, and in the case of Herrenchiemsee, the dates are too uncertain to be of much use. Iimmünster has only two brief surveys from 1478 (Iimmünster, KL 133, c.50 pp.; KL 134, c.60 pp.). From Herrenchiemsee we have a codex containing an estate survey and customals dated 1280–1315 in the catalogue, but the script and the use of the vernacular, as well as the fact that there is in the manuscript a copy of a charter dated 1409, make the early date suspect to me (Herrenchiemsee, KL 10, c.100 pp., of which about half contain the survey). The codex is nevertheless of interest for its customals and particularly because it contains, at fol. 38r, what appears to be a questionnaire to be used in compiling a customal. A further codex has a mixed content of records of donations and rents and is from the late fourteenth century (KL 12, c.30 pp.).

*Indersdorf.* The Augustinian canons of Indersdorf have left us with one extensive estate survey from 1330 (Indersdorf, KL 35, c.130 pp.), followed by a reasonably rich transmission from the fifteenth century.<sup>86</sup> The survey of 1330 is based on an earlier survey which it apparently updates, and consistently lists the inventory as well as the renders from each holding.<sup>87</sup> The next source is from 1429 and is particularly of interest because—unusually—in most cases the extent of the holdings is recorded (KL 36, c.130 pp; the date occurs at fol. 6r, along with the title of *annotatio prediorum*). The latter part of the codex contains a customal in German and some charter copies. From the later fifteenth century there are two further extensive surveys, from 1470 (KL 38, c.320 pp.) and 1493 (KL 41, c.300 pp.).

<sup>86</sup> Note that Wetzel, “Die Urbare,” 51, gives an incorrect shelf mark of KL 36 for this manuscript.

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*, 51–52.

*Kaisheim.* The Cistercian abbey Kaisheim has left a rich source base of estate surveys from the fourteenth century, an account book, and serial lists from the fifteenth century, all of which have been described in some detail in the editions of the earliest surveys and accounts and in the recent archive catalogue; my description in this section largely follows the information given by Hermann Hoffmann and Claudia Kalesse.<sup>88</sup> Hoffmann's edition is a composite of the two earliest surveys: from between 1319 and 1326, with some additions up to 1349 (**A**: A 4, c. 140 pp.), and another roughly contemporary survey with additions up to 1357 (**B**: A 5, c. 150 pp.).<sup>89</sup> There follow surveys from c. 1353 with additions from 1368 and 1369 (**C**: A 6, c. 150 pp.); from 1375 (according to Hoffmann's dating based on watermarks) with additions from 1376–95 (**D**: A 8, c. 205 pp.); and finally the last more or less complete survey from the fourteenth century, dated in the manuscript to 1379 (**E**: A 9, c. 245 pp.). The first three of these codices survey the four offices of the monastery, but **D** and **E** omit the office of Kaisheim. There follow three further surveys of one office each from the fourteenth century, for Bavaria (**F**, which Hoffmann dates to 1380/83: A 10, c. 130 pp.), Ries (**G**, which Hoffmann dates to 1384/85: A 11, c. 105 pp.), and Swabia (**H**, which Hoffmann dates to 1386/90: A 12, c. 130 pp.). Each of these also contains numerous additions reaching to the middle of the fifteenth century, suggesting that an effort was made to keep the surveys current. Also from the fourteenth century there is extant a vernacular partial translation of

<sup>88</sup> Hermann Hoffmann, ed., *Die ältesten Urbare des Reichsstiftes Kaisheim, 1319–1352* (Augsburg, 1959); Julia Bruch, *Die Zisterze Kaisheim und ihre Tochterklöster: Studien zur Organisation und zum Wirtschaften spätmittelalterlicher Klöster, mit einer Edition des "Kaisheimer Rechnungsbuches"* (Berlin, 2013); Claudia Kalesse, *Staatsarchiv Augsburg: Reichsstift Kaisheim: Zentrale und unterbehördliche Überlieferung, Amtsbücher und Akten* (Munich, 2007). The shelfmarks are all Staatsarchiv Augsburg, Reichsstift Kaisheim, Bursamt, Amtsbücher, followed by the catalogue number; in the text above I cite this simply as A = Amtsbücher, followed by the catalogue number.

<sup>89</sup> I give Hoffmann's sigla in the text above in bold letters, along with the new shelf marks from Augsburg in my footnotes; note that at the time of his edition the texts were still held in the Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv in Munich and his shelfmarks are thus now inaccurate. The concordance of old (Munich) and new (Augsburg) shelf marks in Kalesse's catalogue is unreliable, and the shelf marks given here are based on my own personal inspection of the deposits at the Staatsarchiv Augsburg assisted by the local finding aids there.

**A** and **B** dated to *c.* 1360 (**L**: **A** 7, *c.* 130 pp.). Three further surveys of individual offices date from between 1412 and 1420: **I**, **J**, **K** (**A** 13, *c.* 180 pp., after 1412; **A** 14, *c.* 150 pp., 1412–19; **A** 15, *c.* 140 pp., 1419). There are no later estate surveys, but the latter three surveys contain additions and corrections from well into the sixteenth century. Finally, there are two surveys of vineyards at Heilbronn, from 1461 (in a copy from 1521: **A** 79, *c.* 40 pp.) and 1491 (**A** 78, *c.* 14 pp.), and a fragment of a survey with details on a fishery from 1464 (**A** 30, *c.* 2pp).

*Münchsmünster.* The Benedictine abbey of Münchsmünster's oldest estate survey (Münchsmünster, KL 24), dating from 1403, has a modern edition with a detailed description and is thus passed over here.<sup>90</sup> There is a second survey from 1476 on the first 45 folios of a larger codex (Münchsmünster, KL 25), of which only a few entries are edited by Thiel and Engels, according to whom the text is largely based on the same source that was the base for the 1403 survey.<sup>91</sup> Finally, there is a volume listed in the catalogue as a copy of these two surveys that I have as yet been unable to inspect (KL 26); it is possible that it is not just a simple copy and might contain modifications of relevance for historical purposes.

*Neustift.* The surveys and lists of the Premonstratensian abbey Neustift are available in a modern edition.<sup>92</sup> The texts Busley prints are from two manuscripts, one containing a series of partial lists of renders and properties (in many instances just listing properties with no record of rents) from *c.* 1180 to *c.* 1295 and one entry from the fourteenth century (Neustift, KL 1), and the other providing an extensive survey from 1403 (KL 3).<sup>93</sup>

*Niederaltaich.* There is a good recent edition of the extensive estate surveys of the Benedictine abbey of Niederaltaich compiled in the third quarter of the thirteenth century (Niederaltaich KL 39; KL 41), which I do not, therefore, describe any further here, especially as the edition and

<sup>90</sup> Matthias Thiel and Odilo Engels, eds., *Die Traditionen, Urkunden und Urbare des Klosters Münchsmünster* (Munich, 1961), pp. 47\*–58\*, 1–522.

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid.*, 523–94.

<sup>92</sup> Busley, *Die Traditionen, Urkunden und Urbare des Klosters Neustift bei Freising* (n. 25 above).

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid.*, 179–252, 268–749.

two earlier studies also discuss the rest of the extant source base and the economy of the abbey (the focus, however, is very much on the abbey's economy rather than that of its dependents).<sup>94</sup> It should be noted, though, that here we do frequently have indications of holding size and many are quite small; there seems to have been an effort to keep the surveys current and representative of the real situation; and money renders are already common at this relatively early date. In addition to these early surveys, there is a further manuscript with partial estate surveys from the late thirteenth through to the end of the fourteenth century (Niederaltaich, KL 9a, c. 160 pp.).<sup>95</sup> From the last third of the fifteenth century are two further extensive surveys (KL 42, c. 500 pp.; KL 43, c. 500 pp.). From 1472 and 1478/79 we have two partial surveys for the properties at Tundorf and Rinchnach (KL 60, c. 16 pp.; KL 66).

*Oberaltaich.* The earliest estate survey of the Benedictine abbey Oberaltaich is a fragment contained in a "Traditionsbuch" from c. 1100 (Oberaltaich, KL 1) that has been described extensively by the editor of Oberaltaich's charters and by Wetzel.<sup>96</sup> The same manuscript also contains a tithe register and brief lists of other incomes and properties. There follow three fragmentary surveys not precisely dated but from sometime in the fourteenth century, one not bound with other materials (KL 11, c. 35 pp.), and the other two contained in separate quires of a volume otherwise containing charters (KL 10: 1r–8r, 57r–58v). There is also one volume from c. 1480 listed in the catalogue as a "Salbuch" for dependent parish churches that might be an estate survey, or simply the sole surviving volume of a set of serial lists (KL 52, c. 160 pp.). From the fifteenth century there are series of volumes described as "Salbuch" in the catalogue, and in many cases in a contemporary hand in the source itself. I have not as yet determined the relationship of these volumes to each

<sup>94</sup> Josef Klose, ed., *Die Urbare Abt Hermanns von Niederaltaich* (Munich, 2003); Siegmund Herzberg-Fränkell, "Die wirtschaftsgeschichtlichen Quellen des Stiftes Niederaltaich," *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung, Ergänzungsband* 8 (1911): 1–130; idem, "Wirtschaftsgeschichte des Stiftes Niederaltaich," *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung, Ergänzungsband* 10 (1928): 81–235.

<sup>95</sup> Wetzel, "Die Urbare," 56.

<sup>96</sup> Cornelia Mohr, ed., *Die Traditionen des Klosters Oberaltaich* (Munich, 1979), 22\*–26\*; Wetzel, "Die Urbare," 62–63.

other, but since they occur almost annually, I discuss them under the category of serial lists below.

*Osterhofen.* The estate survey of the Premonstratensian abbey Osterhofen (Osterhofen, KL 1) dates from 1349–53 and is, with over 1800 entries, one of the most extensive such sources extant from this period, with a good modern edition.<sup>97</sup> It is unusual in that all holdings are recorded twice, first in geographical order, and then according to office, in which portion the entries are arranged according to the type of render. The only other relevant source for Osterhofen is from 1440, a large composite manuscript with varied content, including about 80 pages of records of holdings and rents and tithes (KL 2: 1–42, 49–54, 66–77, 81–110, 169–73), as well as a list of paid wages (KL 2: 57–59).

*Passau: St. Nikola.* As a result of recent recataloguing of the deposits of the Augustinian canons of St. Nikola in Passau during my visits to the Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, I have been unable to examine any of the sources myself, but because of the extent of the source base I nevertheless provide here a brief overview on the basis of the modern catalogue, which is—unusually—available online.<sup>98</sup> The bulk of the sources are very extensive serial lists of incomes and tithes that will be described later. From the fourteenth century there are two surveys from 1316 (Passau, St. Nikola, AA 174, c.50 pp.) and between 1319 and 1327, both of which were regularly updated over the course of the century (AA 415, c.140 pp.).<sup>99</sup> There is a further list of incomes for one office from after 1350 (AA 34, c.30 pp.).<sup>100</sup> From the second half of the fourteenth century there are, from 1471 (AA 186, c.400 pp.) and 1482 (AA 187, c.250 pp.), two further estate surveys, of which the former was updated until the end of the sixteenth century. There is also one fragment of a survey dated in the catalogue to the fifteenth century (AA 368, 1 fol.).

<sup>97</sup> Johann Gruber, ed., *Die Urkunden und das älteste Urbar des Stiftes Osterhofen* (Munich, 1985).

<sup>98</sup> <http://www.gda.bayern.de/findmitteldb/Findbuch/4279/> (accessed 25 May 2018) with sections 1.2.3, 1.2.4, 1.2.5, 1.2.6, and 1.5 being most pertinent for present purposes.

<sup>99</sup> I have given Wetzel's dating, but note that the new catalogues dates differ from his; see Wetzel, "Die Urbare," 60.

<sup>100</sup> The catalogue dates this to the first half of the fourteenth century; Wetzel, "Die Urbare," 59, dates it to after 1350.

*Passau: Hochstift and Domkapitel.* The estate surveys of the Prince-Bishopric (“Hochstift”) of Passau and the Passau cathedral chapter (“Domkapitel”) are available in an excellent edition that includes very extensive descriptions of the manuscripts on which Wetzel bases his few pages on the earlier texts; in addition, these sources have also been the subject of a recent and accessible dissertation.<sup>101</sup> I thus do not provide much detail here. Both institutions have a source base beginning relatively early, with two partial surveys from the Hochstift (Passau, HL 2: 2v–14r; HL 3: 8r–37v)<sup>102</sup> and four partial surveys from the cathedral chapter from the later twelfth century, c. 1220, 1221/30, and 1222/40 (HL 5: 72r–74v, 101r–104v; HL 2: 79r–88v; HL 5: 114v.), as well as a large number of scattered lists of incomes, possessions, and sales of lands from between 1250 and 1270 (HL 4: 1r–46v). From the fourteenth century there are two near-contemporary copies of a lost survey of 1324, from 1333 (HL 10, c. 120 pp.) and some point after 1331 (Bayerische Staatsbibliothek clm 11006, c. 110 pp.), a roll with a partial survey from 1342 (Hochstift Passau, Urkunden, Faszikel 439), an income list of one office from 1340 (HL 1568: 27r–32v), and a full survey from 1367 (HL 11: 7r–74v).<sup>103</sup>

*Prüfening.* The evidence for the Benedictine abbey of Prüfening begins with two documents dated by Wetzel to the first half of the fourteenth century: an estate survey that also records some customs (Prüfening, KL 19, c. 80 pp.), and a single sheet inscribed on both sides that is a partial survey of properties and their renders (KL 17).<sup>104</sup> There

<sup>101</sup> Adam Maidhof, ed., *Die Passauer Urbare*, 3 vols. (Passau, 1933–39); Wetzel, “Die Urbare,” 69–75; Martin Hofbauer, “Ausbildung und Struktur der Herrschafts- und Besitzverhältnisse des Hochstifts Passau im 13. und 14. Jahrhundert (in geographischer, wirtschaftlicher und sozialer Hinsicht), dargestellt an den Passauer Urbaren,” unpublished PhD dissertation (Hamburg, 2005), available online at <http://edoc.sub.uni-hamburg.de/hstu/volltexte/2005/493/> (accessed 26 June 2016).

<sup>102</sup> A copy of HL 3 from the fourteenth century, itself copied from a 1265 copy and with few modifications, is in Passau, HL 11: 76r–97v; Maidhof, *Die Passauer Urbare*, vol. 1, XIX–XXIV.

<sup>103</sup> I have not seen the later, more or less exact copy of this described by Maidhof, *Die Passauer Urbare*, vol. 1, LIII–LV.

<sup>104</sup> Wetzel dates KL 19 to between 1337 and 1347, and KL 17 to 1320/30; Wet-

follow two rent-lists from 1372 (KL 18, c.28 pp.) and 1377 (KL 18a, c.56 pp.), which treat of one office each. From the fifteenth century there is a survey from 1407, which has particular value since, apart from renders, it also provides the extent of the holdings (KL 14, c.10 pp.); there are also two undated volumes that include several charters, along with lists of renders and tithes, from various dates in the late-fourteenth and fifteenth century (KL 10, c.220 pp, including charters; KL 8, c.80 pp.; including charters).<sup>105</sup> Also worth mentioning is a list of expenses from c.1300 (KL 33, c.26 pp.).

*Raitenhaslach.* The earliest relevant records from the Cistercian abbey Raitenhaslach are fragmentary surveys and tithe and rent lists from 1180–1210 contained in a “Traditionsbuch” that was initially put together in 1180 (KL 6: pp. 21, 36–38, 43, 53–54, 59–60); and a further volume that contains the same tithe list and part of the same survey as KL 6 (KL 3: pp. 97–98, 111–14).<sup>106</sup> There follow several surveys from the fourteenth century, of which the oldest, in Wetzel’s dating, is from 1327/32; this is bound in a codex with a further survey from 1334, and two fragments from 1357 and 1366 (KL 8: pp. 1–46, 47–48, 49–52, 53–100).<sup>107</sup> The middle of the fourteenth century yields two further surveys (KL 7a, c.35 pp.; KL 7, c.130 pp.),<sup>108</sup> and there is one undated survey (not recorded by Wetzel) that could also be from the same period, and is almost certainly from before 1400 (KL 7b, c.60 pp.). These fourteenth-century surveys appear to be dependent on each other in chronological order, but the extent to which alterations were made to reflect changing practice needs closer examination. There is one further survey from 1409 (KL 8¼, c.130 pp.), as well as one from 1438 that I have not been able to inspect (Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, cgm 1517, c.300 pp.). From later in the fifteenth century we have two “Stiftbücher,” one from 1481 (KL 8½, c.260 pp.) and the other not securely dated (KL 14 c.70 pp.); these,

zel, “Die Urbare,” 78, 77. Andreas Otto Weber, *Studien zum Weinbau der alt-bayerischen Klöster im Mittelalter: Altbayern – österreichischer Donauraum – Südtirol* (Stuttgart, 1999), 202, dates KL 19 to c.1347.

<sup>105</sup> Weber, *Studien zum Weinbau*, 197, dates KL 10 to 1347/80.

<sup>106</sup> Wetzel, “Die Urbare,” 80–81.

<sup>107</sup> *Ibid.*, 81.

<sup>108</sup> Wetzel (*ibid.*, 82) dates KL 7 to 1343 and the later fourteenth century, but the sixteenth-century first quire bears a date of 1332.

however, are more likely to be the extant remains of an annual series of income lists than estate surveys.

*Regensburg: Niedermünster.* From the canonesses of Niedermünster in Regensburg there is one partial survey from the middle of the thirteenth century (Regensburg, Stadtarchiv Regensburg, Historischer Verein von Oberpfalz und Regensburg, R III 81, c. 16 pp.), followed by two income lists from the fourteenth century, one undated and written in two different hands, possibly of different dates (Regensburg, Stift Niedermünster, KL 17, c. 30 pp.), and the other from 1356 that also contains entries in later hands and a custumal, and records the (mainly urban) rents received by the leprosarium St. Nicholas (KL 18, c. 10 pp.).<sup>109</sup> From the second half of the fourteenth century there are two further surveys of holdings, neither of which consistently records rents paid by the leaseholders (KL 22, c. 200 pp.; KL 23, c. 50 pp.). There are four similar volumes extant from the fifteenth century, with inconsistent recording of rents (KL 24, from 1410, c. 210 pp.; KL 25, from 1444, c. 90 pp.; KL 26, from 1448, c. 160 pp.; KL 27, from 1472, c. 170 pp.). Finally, there is an undated rent list from the fifteenth century (KL 19, c. 110 pp.), and two parchment leaves of a further volume of rent lists (KL 19). A copy made in 1803 of a survey of 1444 survives in the Bischöfliches Zentralarchiv in Regensburg (BZAR, Standortrepertorium 12) that I have not seen but is likely to be a copy of KL 25, though Johann Gruber does not mention this possibility.<sup>110</sup>

*Regensburg: Obermünster.* The oldest survey of the canonesses of Obermünster is in a manuscript at the Bischöfliches Zentralarchiv in Regensburg that has been described in detail by Hardo-Paul Mai, who dates it to between 1290 and 1308 (BZAR, Obermünster, KL 1); the

<sup>109</sup> Ibid., 57.

<sup>110</sup> Johann Gruber, "Spätmittelalterliche Rechnungen, Register und Urbare im Bischöflichen Zentralarchiv Regensburg," in *Regensburg im Spätmittelalter*, ed. Peter Schmid (Regensburg, 2007), 75–83, here 80. It should be noted that because of renovations underway at the BZAR and the consequent temporary relocation of many of its deposits, I was unable to see any sources located there myself, and my descriptions of materials in this archive—here and in the following—are based solely on the work of other scholars. A recent overview of is provided by Gruber, according to whom the archival material was still, in 2007, in need of proper cataloguing.



fairly detailed estate survey occupies fols. 7–21 (interrupted by a charter copy at fols. 18v–19r), with the rest of the manuscript also containing income lists pertaining to various offices, and charters from various dates.<sup>111</sup> Obermünster has also left us with a number of partial or full estate surveys and lists from the fourteenth century now in the Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, of which Wetzels discusses those contained in two manuscripts, one containing two surveys, in Latin and German, from *c.*1300 and *c.*1350 (Regensburg, Stift Obermünster, KL 7, *c.*30 pp.), and the other with four fragments, all from the early fourteenth century (KL 10, *c.*80 pp.).<sup>112</sup> There follow a more extensive survey in a manuscript also including records of customs from 1374 (KL 3, *c.*120 pp. including customs), an undated volume probably from the late fourteenth century with many additions in different hands also containing surveys and customals (KL 4, *c.*130 pp. including customals), a further survey possibly from the 1390s (KL 6, *c.*170 pp.), and finally a brief list of renders to one office, also undated but from the fourteenth century (KL 9, *c.*14 pp.). I have been unable to identify any relevant fifteenth-century sources (which is not to say that they do not exist).

*Regensburg: St. Emmeram.* The first estate survey from the very rich deposits of the Benedictine abbey of St. Emmeram dates to 1031 and has unfortunately not survived, being known from two early twelfth-century copies (now also lost) and a further copy from the later twelfth century (Regensburg, St. Emmeram, KL 5 ⅓). The latter is printed in Philippe Dollinger's study of the Bavarian peasantry along with the twelfth-century additions.<sup>113</sup> After a partial survey from *c.*1280 (KL 15, 12r–15v), the next survey is a roll from *c.*1300 (KL 11a, 250cm, inscribed on both sides), followed by three further surveys that Wetzels dates to the 1330s (KL 29, 6v–8v, 10r–16v, with additions in later hands, and also a customal, elsewhere in the manuscript; KL 14, *c.*400 pp. including customals; KL 12 *c.*520 pp. including land transfer documents). All three contain later additions as well; KL 29 and KL 14 include customals, and

<sup>111</sup> Paul Mai, "Studien zum hochmittelalterlichen Kanzleiwesen des reichsunmittelbaren adeligen Damenstifts Obermünster in Regensburg," in *Grundwissenschaften und Geschichte: Festschrift für Peter Acht*, ed. Waldemar Schlögl and Peter Herde (Kallmünz, 1976), 141–56.

<sup>112</sup> Wetzels, "Die Urbare," 63–68.

<sup>113</sup> Dollinger, *Bauernstand*, 455–63; Wetzels, "Die Urbare," 31–32.

KL 12 (according to Wetzel in large part a copy of KL 14) also has some records of sale of lands.<sup>114</sup> Of these only KL 14 appears to have been consistently kept current over the course of much of the fourteenth century, though the precise relationships between these various sources still need further work to determine. From the later fourteenth century there is a manuscript with lists of rents, recognition fees, and tithes following a custumal (KL 25, pp. 23–41). There are two further surveys, both undated, that I would tentatively place in the first half of the fifteenth century (KL 30, c. 60 pp.; KL 32, c. 100 pp.). Beyond these documents, the abbey has left us with a number of accounts and serial lists, described below.

*Regensburg: St. Johann.* The canons of St. Johann have left a number of income and tithe lists from the fourteenth century compiled together in one codex, of which the longest is a partial survey containing the incomes of one office from 1363 (BZAR, 3202, pp. 23–46).<sup>115</sup> All of the “urbarielle Quellen” have been recently edited and do not need further detailed description here, beyond noting that almost all the surveys and lists of incomes are clustered around the middle of the fourteenth century, and that most of the surveys are records of incomes of the same office (the *oblagium*, responsible for donations and endowments), which allows for comparison over the course of some 60 years. The extensive tithe lists are mainly from the late fourteenth century or around 1400.<sup>116</sup>

*Regensburg: St. Paul.* Only fragmentary surveys survive from the Benedictine convent of St. Paul from before c. 1400 (Regensburg, St. Paul, KL 18; KL 135a; KL 270), from which period there is a proper survey (KL 464); all these documents are printed in a modern edition, and thus not described further here.<sup>117</sup>

*Rohr.* The earliest survey of the Augustinian canons of Rohr is fragmentary, running to 150 entries in the modern edition, and dates to 1330/32 (Landshut, Staatsarchiv Landshut, Historischer Verein von

<sup>114</sup> For the dates, see Wetzel, “Die Urbare,” 33–35.

<sup>115</sup> Matthias Thiel, ed., *Die Urbare des Kollegiatstifts St. Johann in Regensburg* (Munich, 1996), 222–328.

<sup>116</sup> *Ibid.*, 365–671.

<sup>117</sup> Johann Geier, ed., *Die Traditionen, Urkunden und Urbare des Klosters St. Paul in Regensburg* (Munich, 1986), 1–131 (fragments), 132–434 (full survey).

Niederbayern, MS XII 374b).<sup>118</sup> After a lengthy gap, there are two further surveys from 1456 and 1496/97 (Rohr, KL 16; KL 17) that I have not been able to inspect myself, and a fragmentary rent list from 1497 (KL 19).

*Schäftlarn.* Alois Weißthanner's edition of the estate surveys of the Premonstratensian abbey of Schäftlarn also provides—uniquely among the series of editions of surveys from Bavarian archives—a very full description of all the archival deposits relating to this monastery, of which I summarize very briefly the relevant portions here.<sup>119</sup> Weißthanner's edition is from four manuscripts, including a survey dating to 1313 and shortly after (this includes tithes and taxes) (Schäftlarn, KL 23);<sup>120</sup> an income list from c.1330 (KL 4);<sup>121</sup> lists of rents, tithes and tolls from Tyrol and Bolzano from after 1327 (KL 24);<sup>122</sup> and tithe lists from Bolzano from 1450/70 and 1481 (KL 28).<sup>123</sup> In addition, there is extant an extensive series of annual income lists ("Stiftbücher") from the second half of the fifteenth century and beyond, which are described in the relevant section below.

*Scheyern.* The Benedictine abbey of Scheyern is noteworthy in the present context particularly for its extensive series of accounts and serial lists, which are described below. The earliest surveys have been edited and described along with the later manuscripts by Michael Stephan, to which work I refer the reader for details.<sup>124</sup> Stephan edits the two partial surveys from c.1210 and c.1220 (Bayerische Staatsbibliothek clm 1052 and clm 17401), and the oldest full survey, from c.1310 (Scheyern, KL

<sup>118</sup> Hardo-Paul Mai, ed., *Die Traditionen, die Urkunden und das älteste Urbarfragment des Stiftes Rohr 1133–1332* (Munich, 1966), 1–150.

<sup>119</sup> Alois Weißthanner, ed., *Die Urkunden und Urbare des Klosters Schäftlarn* (Munich, 1957), 14\*–25\*.

<sup>120</sup> *Ibid.*, 1–303.

<sup>121</sup> *Ibid.*, 510–47.

<sup>122</sup> *Ibid.*, 304–427; 503–9.

<sup>123</sup> *Ibid.*, 428–501.

<sup>124</sup> Michael Stephan, ed., *Die Urkunden und das älteste Urbar des Klosters Scheyern* (Munich, 1988), 18–41; see further Bernhard Hanser, "Kloster Scheyern: Rechtsgeschichtliche Forschungen," unpublished PhD dissertation (Munich, 1920), 139–40; and Wetzel, "Die Urbare," 89–95.

54).<sup>125</sup> The next full survey is dated to 1347 by Stephan, and to between 1335 and 1340/43 by Wetzel (KL 55, c.125 pp.).<sup>126</sup> These two full surveys provide extremely detailed records of holdings organized by office, along with the inventory provided to each holding (*geriht*). The relationship of these surveys to each other and to the contemporary accounts from 1339 and 1347 remains to be determined. The next surveys are extant from 1404 (KL 56, c. 100 pp.) and 1497 (KL 57) and once again, the relationship to the very full series of accounts from the fifteenth century awaits analysis.

*Tegernsee*. The Benedictine abbey of Tegernsee has an extremely rich deposit of sources from the middle of the thirteenth century more or less continuously to the end of the fifteenth century and beyond. There are six estate surveys or lists most probably from the thirteenth century, though the precise dating and the relationship of these sources to each other remains to some extent uncertain. What is now generally agreed to be the oldest of them, Tegernsee KL 3 (c.65 pp.), is from the middle of the thirteenth century, and Wetzel dates it to between 1248 and 1256/61.<sup>127</sup> From roughly the same period is a fragment of seven folios from a manuscript that probably originally had about 110 folios, with a relationship to KL 3 that is unclear (KL 7a).<sup>128</sup> Probably dependent on KL 3 is a further estate survey from 1251/56 (according to Wetzel) or 1250/61 (according to Weber) within a manuscript that includes a fair amount of entirely unrelated material (KL 4: 18r–27r).<sup>129</sup> From about a generation later there is a further survey with over 1000 entries that has been edited, and because of its organization is clearly not dependent on the earlier texts (KL 1);<sup>130</sup> this is from after 1286, possibly 1289.<sup>131</sup> There is also a fragment of a survey from 1242 (KL 152: 1r–4r).<sup>132</sup> From

<sup>125</sup> Stephan, *Die Urkunden*, 1–90, 91–404 (partial surveys); 405–796 (oldest full survey). For the date, see 33\*–34\*; and Wetzel, “Die Urbare,” 90.

<sup>126</sup> Stephan, *Die Urkunden*, 40\*; Wetzel, “Die Urbare,” 91.

<sup>127</sup> Ludwig Holzfurtner, *Das Klostergericht Tegernsee* (Munich, 1985), 17; Wetzel, “Die Urbare,” 94.

<sup>128</sup> Wetzel, “Die Urbare,” 93.

<sup>129</sup> *Ibid.*, 94–95; Weber, *Studien zum Weinbau*, 260.

<sup>130</sup> Holzfurtner, *Das Klostergericht Tegernsee*, 1–1081.

<sup>131</sup> *Ibid.*, 17, 116; Wetzel, “Die Urbare,” 94–95.

<sup>132</sup> While acknowledging the date in the manuscript itself, Weber believes it is

the fourteenth century there is an as yet undated fragment (KL 152½; c.16 pp.), an undated full survey that the catalogue places in the thirteenth or fourteenth century, but for which Wetzel accepts (without making explicit why) a date of 1360/70 (KL 2, c.55 pp.), and a further full survey probably from 1346/50, with the relationship of these two surveys to each other remaining as yet undetermined (KL 5, c.140 pp.).<sup>133</sup> There is another survey begun in 1427 (KL 11; c.700 pp.) but with portions from various dates in the fifteenth century up to the 1490s in a manuscript also containing customals, followed by one from 1436 (KL 6; c.360 pp.), and finally one from 1480 (KL 10; c.860 pp.), with the remaining very rich source base comprising serial sources of one sort or another, described below.<sup>134</sup>

*Weihenstephan.* The source base for the Benedictine abbey Weihenstephan begins relatively early, with its first estate survey dating to 1260 (Weihenstephan, KL 10, c.70 pp.), and its second to 1291 (KL 11, c.90 pp.).<sup>135</sup> The former bears a number of additions that contain information included in the second survey, which is also fuller in other respects; both also record the inventory of the holdings in most cases, and both appear to have been kept current over the course of the fourteenth century.<sup>136</sup> The next survey comes after a gap of a century with a date of 1381 in the manuscript (KL 12, c.125 pp.). Despite the number of years separating them, the format is much the same as the older surveys. KL 12 also, however, has a brief section containing expenses. It and KL 11 are interesting in that the renders are arranged by office with a heading *Placitum* + place-name, which could be understood as making explicit the negotiated nature of the matter recorded. After a further long hiatus, Weihen-

from shortly after 1300 on structural grounds: Weber, *Studien zum Weinbau*, 347. Excerpts are printed on pp. 395–98.

<sup>133</sup> For the dates, see Wetzel, “Die Urbare,” 93; note that he cites Wolf Schöfel, *Studien zur oberbayerischen Siedlungsgeschichte und Namenkunde mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Tegernseeischen Urbaramtes Warngau* (Munich, 1976), as suggesting an earlier date.

<sup>134</sup> Excerpts from KL 10 and KL 11 are printed in Weber, *Studien zum Weinbau*, 387–95.

<sup>135</sup> Wetzel, “Die Urbare,” 96.

<sup>136</sup> *Ibid.*, 97.

stephan has a good series of serial lists beginning in 1448, described below.

*Windberg.* The oldest fragmentary surveys of the Premonstratensian abbey Windberg are contained in a manuscript of the *Pantheon* of Godfrey of Viterbo; Wetzel categorizes them as three separate texts from 1250/60, the end of the thirteenth century, and the last third of the thirteenth century (Bayerische Staatsbibliothek clm 22237: 3r–5v, 171r–173r).<sup>137</sup> The first full survey is from 1305 in a manuscript that also contains a fragmentary survey dated to 1270/80 by Wetzel (Windberg, AA 156: 7–59: survey of 1305; 1–6: fragment of 1270/80).<sup>138</sup> The more extensive of these two has a number of additions and annotations from later in the fourteenth century, attesting to an effort to keep it current. There are two further extensive surveys, from 1392 (AA 157, c. 100 pp.), and c. 1400 (AA 158, c. 120 pp.), after which we have a series of serial lists from 1400 onwards.

#### ACCOUNTS

English rural history has been fortunate in the vast number of manorial accounts preserved for England, but also in the relative standardization of this kind of source there.<sup>139</sup> Such standardization did not obtain in Germany, and there has been very little study of German manorial accounts.<sup>140</sup> While not as many such accounts are known from Germany

<sup>137</sup> *Ibid.*, 99.

<sup>138</sup> *Ibid.* Note that this was formerly in the Staatsarchiv Landshut, and Wetzel gives the old shelf mark

<sup>139</sup> Bailey, *English Manor*, 97–115; Bruce M. S. Campbell, *English Seigniorial Agriculture* (Cambridge, 2000), 26–37; P. D. A. Harvey, “Agricultural Treatises and Manorial Accounting in Medieval England,” *Agricultural History Review* 20 (1972): 170–182, *Manorial Records of Cuxham*, 12–71, and *Manorial Records*, 24–41.

<sup>140</sup> Bruch, *Die Zisterze Kaisheim*, 9–11, and “Die Kunst, Daten in Informationen umzuwandeln: Zur Auswertung eines zisterziensischen Rechnungsbuchs aus dem 13. und 14. Jahrhundert und den Herausforderungen in der Analyse serieller Wirtschaftsquellen,” in *Wirtschafts- und Rechnungsbücher*, ed. and Gleba and Peterson (n. 14 above), 13–44; Bernhard Lübbers, “Überlegungen zum Rechnungswesen der Zisterzienser im Mittelalter: Zugleich ein Versuch der Typologie

as from England, it must be said that far more survive than one would think from the general lack of scholarship on them: these sources remain a woefully underutilized resource. For the period in question, there are sets of accounts for a number of ecclesiastical institutions, as well as for the Duchy of Bavaria. I omit discussion of the latter here, since although they are naturally also useful for rural history, they include as a matter of course large amounts of data (more than is the case with regard to the surveys) of rather less relevance for the questions here posed, and unpicking the urban and territorial material from that relevant for the history of rural commercialization would far exceed the scope of the present article. Nevertheless, it must be acknowledged that these, along with the (only partially edited) extensive sets of accounts for Tyrol naturally merit further research even for rural economic history.<sup>141</sup>

Accounts can be differentiated from estate surveys and related sources primarily on the basis of two criteria: they are serial sources (normally kept annually, though not necessarily extant for every year); and they record both incomes and expenditures. Because they are serial sources and thus are thought to show actual incomes from year to year, it may be assumed that there is a greater chance of a relationship to what was actually paid; but the possibility must also be acknowledged that money

spätmittelalterlicher Klosterrechnungen, dargelegt am Beispiel der Aldersbacher, Heilsbronner sowie Kaisheimer Rechnungen,” *Archiv für Diplomatik* 53 (2007): 323–51; Lübbers, *Die ältesten Rechnungen des Klosters Aldersbach*, 14\*–21\*; Michael Toch, ed., *Die ältesten Rechnungsbücher des Klosters Scheyern 1339–1363* (Munich, 2000), 33\*–36\*.

<sup>141</sup> On the Bavarian and Tyrolian accounts, see Christoph Haidacher, ed., *Die älteren Tiroler Rechnungsbücher (IC.277, M.C.8): Analyse und Edition* (Innsbruck, 1993), and *Die älteren Tiroler Rechnungsbücher (IC.278, IC.279 und Belagerung von Weineck): Analyse und Edition* (Innsbruck, 1998); Lübbers, *Die ältesten Rechnungen des Klosters Aldersbach*, 15\*–17\*; Edmund Freiherr von Oefele, “Rechnungsbuch des oberen Vicedomantes Herzog Ludwigs des Strengen 1291–1294, mit Register,” *Oberbayerisches Archiv* 26 (1865–66): 272–345; Otto Stolz, *Der geschichtliche Inhalt der Rechnungsbücher der Tiroler Landesfürsten von 1288–1350* (Innsbruck, 1957); and Georg Vogeler, “Die Rechnung des Straubinger Viztums Peter von Eck (1335) und ihre Stellung im mittelalterlichen Rechnungswesen Bayerns,” *Archivalische Zeitschrift* 82 (1999): 149–224. On territorial accounts more generally, see Mark Mersiowsky, *Die Anfänge territorialer Rechnungslegung im deutschen Nordwesten. Spätmittelalterliche Rechnungen, Verwaltungspraxis, Hof und Territorium* (Stuttgart, 2000), 22–35, 43–134.

amounts were simply forms of accounting, and need not represent actual renders. Like estate surveys (and unlike their English counterparts), the manorial accounts in southern Germany can vary greatly in terms of what they record; apart from incomes in cash and kind, they may also list services, differentiate between rents and pertinences of feudal lordship (marriage fines, death duties, recognition fees), provide some information on lengths of leases, accumulation, and (indirectly) on inheritance as well. The extent to which they do so varies greatly, and there is often little consistency even within the same account for one year. Similarly, accounts may sometimes give some information on holding size or type, though this is relatively rare; more frequently but still inconsistently, they differentiate between renders actually paid and those owed, allowing for some estimation of levels of default, deferral of payment, or relaxation of dues.<sup>142</sup>

Beyond differences in the level of detail, the numbers of years covered, and the nature of incomes and expenses recorded, there is also one more fundamental distinction between two kinds of extant accounts from this region. Three Cistercian abbeys—Aldersbach, Heilsbronn, and Kaisheim—have left extraordinarily good series of accounts from relatively early dates; but these do not record the incomes from individual holdings. Rather, they list consolidated incomes from each office. Such accounts are, of course, of great use for various forms of economic history, and indirectly give us some information regarding commercialization in the countryside (not least through information on wages paid for agricultural and other labour); but they have less to tell us about the market involvement of individual tenants. In contrast, accounts like those of Scheyern list the incomes from each individual dependent of the abbey for every year, and in many cases list not only what was owed but also deferred payments, debts, defaults, and instances where money renders were paid in kind or vice versa.

Accounts are almost invariably in dedicated volumes, though, it is also the case that account books often contain other matter as well (which I ignore here); this is, however, rather less common for accounts than it is for surveys. Typically, the accounts list out the receipts from each office first, often with a *summa* at the end of the listings of one office, or in some cases at the end of the list of receipts from particular villages or

<sup>142</sup> See, e.g., Ghosh, “Scheyern” (n. 9 above), 72.



estates; this tends to be followed by the expenses from that same office. Accounts are not always trustworthy in their calculations: the sums given do not necessarily add up correctly, and the incomes and expenses frequently do not balance each other out. It is important to recall also that accounts, partly because they are often partial records of some offices only, need not provide a full overview of a landlord's incomes or expenses; and like estate surveys and lists of various kinds, they might give us only a partial glimpse of the local rural economy, since they might not include even all the tenants of any individual landlord, let alone of any single settlement. The accounts of the Cistercian abbeys of *Aldersbach* and *Kaisheim* have recently been edited and analyzed, and have also, along with the other Cistercian abbey of *Heilsbronn*, been the subject of a recent descriptive study with a preliminary typology of German Cistercian accounts; they are thus described only cursorily here.<sup>143</sup>

The accounts of *Aldersbach* are possibly the fullest and longest series of manorial accounts from the Middle Ages from anywhere in Europe. There are two sets of accounts in one manuscript (*Aldersbach*, KL 6) the main accounts of the abbey, and the accounts for the offices; the former are extant from 1291–1372/73, and the latter from 1294–1381, with one more year's entries for 1408/9; in both cases the series is more or less uninterrupted.<sup>144</sup> There are frequent mentions of money wages paid for various services, but dues from tenants are not listed individually.<sup>145</sup> The series continues more or less uninterrupted into the sixteenth century, with accounts for 1449–51 (KL 43), 1455–57 (KL 44), 1458–62 (KL 45), 1463–64 (KL 46), 1466–72 (KL 47), 1460–85 (KL 48), 1486–94 (KL 49), 1494–99 and 1504–5 (KL 50).

I have not myself been able to examine the archival deposits of *SS Ulrich and Afra* in Augsburg, and rely here on the brief descriptions of Liebhart.<sup>146</sup> The first account is from 1391 and provides a detailed description of renders, followed by a much briefer list of expenses (Augs-

<sup>143</sup> Bruch, *Die Zisterze Kaisheim*; Lübbers, *Die ältesten Rechnungen des Klosters Aldersbach*, and "Überlegungen," 331–51.

<sup>144</sup> Lübbers, *Die ältesten Rechnungen des Klosters Aldersbach*, 3–354, 357–515.

<sup>145</sup> I am grateful to my research assistant Julia Tomlinson for her notes on these accounts.

<sup>146</sup> Liebhart, *Die Reichsabtei*, 117–20.

burg, St. Ulrich und Afra, KL 7). This is the beginning of a largely continuous series of such registers that go on to the middle of the sixteenth century.

The accounts of *Dießen* start at the very end of our period, with extensive account books from the 1490s, followed by one that spans a quarter-century from 1496 to 1521 (Dießen, KL 32 for 1493–97, c.500 pp.; KL 33 for c.1498–1500, c.450 pp.; KL 35 for 1496–1521, c.470 pp.). These contain lists of incomes for each year (including services performed), and payments of various kinds of wages.

The Benedictine abbey *Ebersberg* provides only an account (KL 20, c.20 pp.) for 1446 and 1456; the rest of its extensive source base comprises serial lists, described below.

*Heilsbronn* has a largely continuous and extremely dense set of accounts numbering 314 volumes from 1338–1796; for our period, there are seven codices (Staatsarchiv Nürnberg, Fürstentum Ansbach, Klosterverwalteramt Heilsbronn, Rechnungen 1–7) with accounts for 1338–74 (c.445 pp.), 1374–1408 (c.450 pp.), 1408–42 (c.470 pp.), 1442–58, 1459–72, 1473–97, and 1498–1524, of which I have inspected briefly only the first three. Like the accounts of Aldersbach and Kaisheim, the renders of individual dependents are not listed, but only totals of incomes from various sources (rents, sale of produce, and so on).

The *Kaisheim* accounts are, unlike Kaisheim's estate surveys, accounts only of the daughter abbeys, not of the main abbey itself, and span the years 1288–1360 (with somewhat different dates within that range for each of the daughter houses) (Staatsarchiv Augsburg, Reichsstift Kaisheim, Archivium Spirituale, Amtsbücher 7).<sup>147</sup> Like those of Aldersbach, they do not list renders from individual holdings, but rather the sums for each office.

From the convent of the Augustinian sisters of *Niederviehbach* we have four volumes of accounts for the years 1388–1433 (Niederviehbach, KL 15, c.380 pp.), 1434–68 (KL 16, c.370 pp.), 1469–1550 (KL 17, c.770 pp.), and 1477–1528 (KL 18, c.500 pp.).

<sup>147</sup> Bruch, *Die Zisterze Kaisheim*, 443–655.

*Oberaltaich* has, from the late fifteenth century, two volumes of grain income lists that also list expenses, for the years 1483–89 (*Oberaltaich*, KL 28, c.300 pp.), and 1489–97 (KL 29, c.400 pp.). There is one volume with receipts and expenses of money from 1466 (KL 26, c.140 pp.), and finally a codex with consolidated receipts and expenses in kind and cash from 1490–92 (KL 30, c.640 pp.).

As is the case with its surveys and lists, *St. Nikola* in Passau also has an exceptionally good deposit of accounts from most of the fifteenth century. There are two volumes of accounts for the *obligium* (the office responsible for pious bequests and endowments) for 1404–60 (Passau, *St. Nikola*, AA 35; c.550 pp.), and 1431, 1461–63, and 1468 (AA 36; c.230 pp.). The office of the procurator has left us with five volumes of accounts (AA 20 for 1471, 1479–85, c.170 pp.; AA 21 for 1477–79, c.250 pp.; AA 23 for 1487–90, c.315 pp.; AA 24 for 1487–91, c.575 pp.; AA 25 for 1490–91, c.145 pp.), as well an expense list (AA 22, for 1478–1501, c.260 pp.). There are two accounts for incomes for the kitchen along with related labour expenses (AA 26 for 1492–93, c.115 pp.; AA 27 for 1500, c.110 pp.). For the years 1440–49, there is a regional account book for Mautern, including expenses for the kitchen (AA 418, c.340 pp.). Finally, there are three further volumes of incomes and expenses for various offices that are most likely primarily urban and thus of less relevance for our purposes (AA 44–46 for 1404–70, 1494–97, 1499 and 1515–16).

*Obermünster* in Regensburg has accounts from 1368, 1385, 1390, and 1394, as well as fifteenth-century accounts extant for 1403 and from 1407 onwards for almost every year. The cataloguing of these volumes has not been completed, and they are to be located in the Bischöfliches Zentralarchiv in Regensburg in the fonds Obermünster, with no shelf mark. According to Gruber “countless” further accounts for Obermünster are “slumbering” in the archive, and proper description and study are clearly an important desideratum for future research.<sup>148</sup>

*St. Emmeram* in Regensburg provides us two very early fragments that are probably from accounts of some sort that Lübbers dates to 1305/6 (Regensburg, *St. Emmeram*, KL 35 $\frac{1}{3}$ ; one sheet of parchment with

<sup>148</sup> Gruber, “Spätmittelalterliche Rechnungen,” 80.

writing on both sides; KL 35¼; two small sheets of parchment).<sup>149</sup> These are followed by a discontinuous series of accounts from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries; it should be noted that these are not accounts solely for rural holdings. The earliest full account is probably from 1325–34, and only lists incomes from offices rather than individual holdings (KL 19½, c. 100 pp.).<sup>150</sup> There are two further fragmentary accounts from 1338 and 1345/46 (Nuremberg, Germanisches Nationalmuseum, Historisches Archiv, Geistliche Fürsten, Regensburg, St. Emmeram 1338: p. 9; *ibidem*, St. Emmeram 1345/46: p. 6) followed by full accounts from 1358, 1364, and 1381/82 (Nuremberg, Germanisches Nationalmuseum, Historisches Archiv, Geistliche Fürsten, Regensburg, St. Emmeram 1358: c. 75 pp.; Munich, Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Regensburg St. Emmeram, KL 20; c. 200 pp.; Regensburg, Stadtarchiv Regensburg, Rechnungen, Kloster St. Emmeram 1381/82; c. 275 pp.—formerly Cape Town, South African Library, Grey Manuscript 6 B 13).<sup>151</sup> These are each more forthcoming, providing incomes from individual holdings. For the years 1411–28 there is one further book of accounts, recording principally receipts in grain (but also in some cases cheese), and including many instances of as yet unpaid dues (Regensburg, St. Emmeram, KL 31, c. 105 pp.). This is not, however, a true account, since although expenses are occasionally recorded, it is mainly a serial list of renders.

*St. Johann* in Regensburg has left us an extensive series of accounts deposited in the diocesan archive in Regensburg that have been briefly described elsewhere.<sup>152</sup> Two volumes contain accounts for the years 1409–11 and 1421–25 (BZAR, St. Johann 3203–3204).<sup>153</sup> These are followed by thirty volumes of accounts for 1426–29, 1433, 1436, 1437,

<sup>149</sup> Lübbbers, *Die ältesten Rechnungen des Klosters Aldersbach*, 20\* n. 40.

<sup>150</sup> The dating requires further analysis for certainty; Lübbbers dates these accounts to 1325–28 and 1333–34: *ibid.*, 20\* n. 40.

<sup>151</sup> The accounts for 1381/82 have been digitized and are available in full (as a very large pdf file) at this link:

<http://www.uni-regensburg.de/bibliothek/medien/pdf/emmeram.pdf>

<sup>152</sup> Gruber, “Spätmittelalterliche Rechnungen,” 81.

<sup>153</sup> Thiel, *Die Urbare des Kollegiatstifts St. Johann in Regensburg*, 21\*–30\*.

1466, 1471, 1473, 1474, 1481–86, c.1493, 1494, c.1496, 1500, and beyond (BZAR, St. Johann 1–30).<sup>154</sup>

*Scheyern*'s accounts from the fourteenth century, for the years 1339, 1347, 1349, 1352–55, 1358, and 1363 (Scheyern, KL 77) are available in a good modern edition and have also recently been the subject of a study with respect to rural commercialization and are thus not described further here.<sup>155</sup> From the fifteenth century there are full accounts for 1413–20 (KL 78, c.630 pp.), 1436–48 (KL 79, c.800 pp.), 1450–66 (KL 80, c.800 pp.), 1467–83 (KL 81, c.800 pp.), and 1484–89 (KL 82, c.800 pp.).<sup>156</sup> There are also partial accounts for some offices for the years 1451–59 (KL 122, c.830 pp.).

From *Tegernsee* I have been able to identify only one volume of accounts in the catalogue, a register of incomes and expenses from holdings in Austria for the years 1461–91 (Tegernsee, KL 159); the extent of this volume is not stated, and I was unable to examine it myself *in situ*.

#### SERIAL LISTS

Unlike accounts, serial lists do not provide records of both incomes and expenditures and may list one or the other with no effort at a reckoning; and unlike proper estate surveys, they rarely provide much detail beyond the name of the rent-payer and/or the holding, the place, and the amount rendered. They are, however, like accounts in that they can be understood as actual records of incomes collected, since they are kept every year, and normally thus several years are recorded within one volume.<sup>157</sup> In this respect they may be distinguished from simple lists (“*urbarielle Quellen*”) that have been included above in the section on estate surveys, though as noted, it is not always possible to determine whether

<sup>154</sup> Note that according to Gruber, the cathedral chapter at Regensburg also has a set of accounts for 1412, 1413, 1446, 1447, 1456, 1458, 1478: Gruber, “Spätmittelalterliche Rechnungen,” 78. I have not inspected these myself, and it is not clear to me to what extent these are relevant for rural as opposed to urban history.

<sup>155</sup> Toch, *Die ältesten Rechnungsbücher*; Ghosh, “Scheyern.”

<sup>156</sup> Toch, *Die ältesten Rechnungsbücher*, 29\*–33\*. Scheyern, KL 83–90 take the series from 1497 to 1559.

<sup>157</sup> Sonderegger, “Landwirtschaft,” 258; Zangger, *Grundherrschaft*, 72–73.

the latter were genuinely non-serial lists or are simply all that is extant. It is reasonable to assume that what they record is not solely a postulated requirement of the landowner. While the information contained in these lists is normally lacking in the detail we find in other sources, this is to some extent compensated for by the serial nature of the sources and the sheer volume in which they are extant: in many instances we have such lists more or less continuously for decades, making it possible to track over time changes in the type and extent of renders. It should be said also that serial lists do in some instances provide more detail, such as the type or extent of the holding, or cases in which dues were unpaid for one reason or another, including for example the relaxation of rents by the landlord in times of distress.<sup>158</sup> As with the other types of sources discussed above, serial lists are also not always consistent in form, and after pages upon pages of simple lists, one might encounter entries with much more information; and there might be interpolations of other kinds of records. There are relatively few such lists extant from the earlier part of the period discussed here, but from the early fifteenth century, the production of these lists expands considerably. In many cases described here, I have not myself been able to inspect the sources (the sheer scope of the archival source base made this impossible) and am basing myself on the archival catalogues and finding aids, which provide the number of years covered in each volume; mostly these volumes are labelled “Stiftbuch” or “Zinsbuch” in the catalogues, and in many cases on the volume itself.

For *Aldersbach*, from the first half of the fifteenth century, four sets of serial lists (“Stiftbücher”) are recorded in the catalogue, but could not be located in the archive during either of my two visits (Aldersbach, KL 18, dated to 1406, 1408, 1424, and 1436).<sup>159</sup> The series continues through the fifteenth century and beyond, with sixteen further “Stiftbücher” up to the end of the fifteenth century, covering the years 1448–56, 1463–66, 1457–96 (KL 19–34; I reproduce here the information from the archive’s

<sup>158</sup> Stefan Sonderegger, “...*der Zins ist abgelon...* Aushandeln von Schadensteilungen zwischen Grundherren und Bauern in schwierigen Zeiten der Landwirtschaft,” in *Umweltgeschichte in der Region*, ed. Rolf Kießling and Wolfgang Scheffknecht (Constance, 2012), 139–57.

<sup>159</sup> I was informed that the items under this shelf mark have been missing for some time (e-mail from Dr. Genoveva Rausch of the Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv dated 23 May 2017).

finding aid). Unfortunately, I was not able to inspect them *in situ*, so it is not clear to me whether these are estate surveys or (far more likely), serial lists of incomes and renders.

The serial lists of *SS Ulrich and Afra* in Augsburg begin very late in the fifteenth century, but there is an exceptionally good series from the sixteenth century onwards (St. Ulrich und Afra, KL 226; KL 226½; Staatsarchiv Neuburg, St. Ulrich und Afra, KL 1–36, from 1493).

*Baumburg* has left us with two codices containing rent lists begun in c. 1440 and kept in one case to 1455 (Baumburg, KL 18½, c. 240 pp.), and in the other updated to 1512 (KL 18, c. 110 pp.). In addition the archive catalogue lists four further extensive volumes containing surveys and rent lists that I have not examined, dating from 1443 (KL 22, c. 400 pp.), 1467 (KL 23 c. 600 pp.), 1499 (KL 24, c. 300 pp.), and the later fifteenth century (KL 25, c. 160 pp.).

From *Benediktbeuern* we have a largely continuous set of serial lists from 1441 onwards, beginning with one volume for 1441–80 (Benediktbeuern, KL 35; c. 580 pp.), followed by a series of volumes encompassing between one and three years each for 1487–89 (KL 36, c. 568 pp.), 1490–91 (KL 37, c. 380 pp.), 1492–93 (KL 38, c. 440 pp.), 1494 (KL 39, c. 848 pp.), 1495–97 (KL 40, c. 480 pp.), 1497–99 (KL 41, c. 530 pp.). KL 42 and beyond continue the series up to the end of the eighteenth century. There are also two volumes with income lists and some expenses from 1491–1728 (KL 24/1 and KL 24/2).<sup>160</sup> In addition, there is one volume with a list of servile persons and their dues for the years 1492–1543 (KL 29; c. 190 pp.), a list of properties leased for the years 1484–1548 (KL 72; c. 170 pp.), and two lists of expenses (but not incomes) for the years 1494–1503 (KL 77–78). Expense lists continue through much of the sixteenth century.

For *Dießen* there is just one volume of serial lists for the years 1460–79 (Dießen, KL 38, c. 470 pp.), with the series continuing again only from 1583.

*Ebersberg* presents an unusual case in that all of its records (with one fragmentary exception) appear, on a cursory inspection at least, to be

<sup>160</sup> Weber, *Studien zum Weinbau*, 410–15.

serial lists, though given the nature of some of the codices it is hard to determine without further study whether they might not be better categorized as regularly updated—if rather sparse—estate surveys. The earliest volume is for the years 1303, 1311, 1314, 1330, and 1388 (Ebersberg, KL 11; c.250 pp.). Two further volumes are, on the face of it, possibly estate surveys, or at least survey-like sources, but I categorize them tentatively as serial lists because of their terseness and their temporal proximity that suggests that they might be part of a series (KL 8 from 1328, c.120 pp.; KL 10, probably beginning in 1313, c.120 pp.). The remaining volumes are unambiguously serial lists, with one for the years 1387 to 1413 (KL 9, c.90 pp; the dating of the entries is very uncertain and requires further study), and a series of seven volumes for the years 1406–41, for 1406–9 (KL 13, c.110 pp; note that the catalogue erroneously dates this to 1407), 1408/9 (KL 14, c.185 pp.), 1409 (KL 15, c.180 pp.), 1413 (KL 16, c.120 pp.), 1416–20 (KL 17, c.226 pp.), 1419–24 (KL 18, c.208 pp.), and 1420–21 (KL 19, c.295 pp.). The volumes continue, after a lengthy gap, from 1472 (KL 21, c.200 pp., with additions up to 1489), 1480–90 (KL 22, c.130 pp.), 1495–93 (KL 23, c.330 pp.), 1485 (KL 23½), 1488 (KL 24, c.100 pp.), 1494–95 (KL 25, c.250 pp.), 1497 (KL 26½, c.120 pp.), and 1497–99 (KL 26, c.295 pp.).

From *Ettal* we have two volumes of income lists for the abbey's alpine properties for 1477 and 1490 (Ettal, KL 85), and for 1494–97 (KL 86). There is also one volume of serial lists of grain rents ("Korngiltbüchel") for the years 1461–89 (KL 84), and two volumes that are probably both serial lists, although one contains records for only one year (KL 26 for 1441–49; KL 29 for 1441).

*Frauenchiemsee* has a number of volumes of serial lists from the fifteenth century, beginning with one volume listing renders from 1454 into the sixteenth century (Frauenchiemsee, AA 16, c.400 pp.), and continuing with lists of leases ("Lehenbücher") for 1469–76 (AA 85, c.420 pp.) and the 1490s (AA 64; AA 80; AA 81).

*Fürstenfeld*'s serial lists begin with a volume covering the years 1451–61 (Fürstenfeld, KL 52, c.820 pp.), which is followed by five volumes for 1471–77 (KL 53, c.1,080 pp.), 1478–85 (KL 54, c.1,370 pp.), 1486–95 (KL 55, c.1,740 pp.), and from 1497 onwards (KL 55½ c.668 pp.)



There is a very dense series of such lists for the sixteenth century continuing on to the early nineteenth.

The catalogue for *Geisenfeld* lists a series of extensive “Lehenbücher” from the second half of the fifteenth century, beginning with one volume from 1465 that is listed as a copy, possibly of an earlier volume (KL 72, c.800 pp.), followed by five volumes, from 1482 (Geisenfeld, KL 67, c.320 pp.), 1484 (KL 68, c.480 pp.; KL 69, c.600 pp.), 1495/1500 (KL 70, c.300 pp.), and some point as yet undetermined in the late fifteenth century (KL 71, c.200 pp.).

From *Indersdorf* there is only a single volume of serial income lists from 1468–71 (Indersdorf, KL 37, c.340 pp.).

From *Kaisheim* there is an annual list of tithes from 1347–90 (siglum **M** in Hoffmann’s edition of the earliest estate surveys; Staatsarchiv Augsburg, Reichsstift Kaisheim, Bursamt, Amtsbücher 22, c.245 pp.). There are also two lists of properties and their annual renders for Swabia from 1424–1553 (**N**; A 16, c.200 pp.), and for Bavaria from 1430–1560 (**O**; A 17, c.145 pp.). Finally, there is a serial list of tithes from 1433–51 (A 23, c.280 pp.).

For *Oberaltaich*, from the first half of the fifteenth century, there are five volumes listed in the catalogue as “Salbuch” that are in fact serial lists, one undated but probably from the early 1430s (Oberaltaich, KL 12: 1r–36v) that also usefully—and very unusually—provides the extents of most holdings, and then dated volumes from 1433/34 (KL 13, c.110 pp.), 1435/36 (KL 14, c.96 pp.), 1438 (KL 15, c.120 pp.), 1439 (KL 16, c.90 pp.), 1440 (KL 17, c.110 pp.), 1444/45 (KL 19, c.175 pp.), 1447 (KL 40, c.220 pp.), 1448 (KL 21, c.230 pp.), 1449 (KL 22, c.215 pp.), 1450–55 (KL 23, c.155 pp.). There follow further series of income lists recorded in the catalogue as “Registrum perceptae pecuniae” *vel sim.* for 1459/60 (KL 24, c.140 pp.), and 1465 (KL 25, c.140 pp.), the latter also recording receipts of wine.

*St. Nikola* in Passau is exceptional both because of the relatively early date when the serial sources commence and particularly because of the sheer numbers of volumes containing serial lists. The series begins already in the fourteenth century with two volumes of income lists for 1363, 1364, and 1381–84 (Passau, St. Nikola, AA 175, c.260 pp.), and

for the years 1393–1400 (AA 176, c.320 pp.). The series continues with forty-one volumes of income and tithe lists for various offices and regions from the fifteenth century and a more or less uninterrupted series through the sixteenth century and beyond (AA 37–38; AA 42; AA 177–80; AA 182–85; AA 188–89; AA 211–18; AA 240–42; AA 253–55; AA 362–66; AA 369; AA 373–76; AA 394; AA 417; AA 419).<sup>161</sup> There is a great variation in the number of years each volume covers, and correspondingly in the number of pages of each. There are also three registers of leased tithes, from 1401–9 and 1412–14 (AA 371, c.56 pp.), 1402 (AA 392, 2 fols.), and 1482–83 (AA 393, c.12 pp.).<sup>162</sup> Also of interest is a volume with lists of land transfers, sales, and fees accruing from these transactions, for the period 1429–80 (AA 181, c.190 pp.), and a further volume with records of various kinds, including fines for late payments of fees and information about leased tithes, from 1437 (AA 372).

*Prüfening* has a series of income lists from 1454 onwards, of which two are substantial from 1454–57 (KL 20, c.280 pp.), and 1462–64 (KL 21, c.200 pp.); these are followed by four quite brief lists (KL 22–25). KL 23 has 27 fols., and the other three have five or less.

*Schäftlarn* has four volumes of serial lists from the fifteenth century, two each for its properties in Bavaria, for 1457–66 (Schäftlarn, KL 26, c.200 pp.) and 1479–92 (KL 25, c.370 pp.); and Tyrol, for 1463/64 (KL 27, c.12 pp.) and 1459–92 (KL 28, c.280 pp.).

In addition to its estate surveys and accounts, *Scheyern* has also left us with some income lists, albeit from very late in the period, with fourteen volumes of such lists from 1493 to the middle of the sixteenth century (Scheyern, KL 136–49).

*Tegernsee* has an extensive series of income and tithe lists beginning relatively early, with two “Stiftbücher,” for the years 1357–78 for the Tegernsee district (Tegernsee, KL 94, c.85 pp.), and 1361–99 for other Bavarian properties (KL 34, c.575 pp.). There follows a dense series

<sup>161</sup> Since the finding aid is easily accessible online (see above, n. 98), for reasons of space, I do not provide further details about this exceptionally extensive series of lists.

<sup>162</sup> A further volume of varied content also includes some lists of leased tithes: AA 372.

from the fifteenth century uninterrupted through the sixteenth. These are in a series of six volumes for the Tegernsee district for 1427 (KL 96, c. 140 pp.) and then from 1441–99 (KL 97–101), with the series continuing on into the sixteenth century; in two volumes for properties in Tyrol for 1436–75 (KL 153) and 1445–93 (KL 156); two volumes for Austrian holdings for 1449–90 (KL 157) and 1491–1511 (KL 161); and four volumes for Bavarian properties for the years 1400–24 (KL 35, c. 670 pp.), 1426–60 (KL 38, c. 1200 pp.), 1461–80 (KL 47), and 1481–91 (KL 49). There is also one volume recording specifically grain rents for 1435–40 (KL 39, c. 105 pp.), and one recording the proceeds of grain sold between 1461 and 1480 (KL 42). We also have an extensive series of tithe lists from 1454 onwards, for 1461–80 (KL 40), 1454–79 (KL 41), 1461–80 (KL 43), 1467 (KL 46), 1464–1585 (KL 50), c. 1500 (KL 52). In addition, there are three registers of fees due from personal bondage (“Leibzinsbücher”) (KL 21 and KL 22 for 1498, KL 162 for 1496–1528), with the series continuing into the sixteenth century. Finally, there is an expense list from 1447 that has also been printed by Weber (albeit not in a proper critical edition) (KL 155).<sup>163</sup>

*Weihenstephan*’s serial lists of incomes begin in 1436 (Weihenstephan, KL 63) and continue again from 1448 uninterrupted in six volumes, for 1448–60 (KL 22), 1461–66/67 (KL 23), 1468–74 (KL 23a), 1475–86 (KL 24), 1487–91 (KL 25), and 1491–96 (KL 26); the series continues on into the sixteenth century. There is also one register specifically for properties in Tyrol for 1480–95 (KL 62), and another for other offices dated to 1436 in the catalogue (KL 63).

The Benedictine abbey *Wessobrunn* has left an extremely rich deposit of serial income and tithe lists, contained in registers beginning in 1363 with a volume that also contains tithe lists (Wessobrunn, AA 185, c. 300 pp.), and continuing from 1443 with one volume for almost every year until 1494, each volume containing 150–200 pages (AA 186–234).

From *Windberg* there are three registers for 1400–48, with the series only continuing after 1500 (Windberg, AA 164–66).

<sup>163</sup> Weber, *Studien zum Weinbau*, 404–16.

## PROBLEMS AND POTENTIAL

These, then, are the bulk of the published and unpublished sources, principally from the Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv in Munich. My estimate is that there are extant roughly 50,000 pages of relevant source material for the period *c.* 1200–*c.* 1500 from the archives and deposits I have described above, of which roughly a third are from before *c.* 1440, after which point the source base expands exponentially. These provide us with data, over any *c.* 50-year period, for anywhere between five and ten thousand individual peasant and sub-peasant holdings.<sup>164</sup> Doubtless there is more to be found in other state, municipal, and diocesan archives in Bavaria, and possibly even in the archives I have visited. Space and time do not permit discussion of sources from elsewhere even in southern Germany, but brief mention should be made of the extensive set of surveys printed in the series “Österreichische Urbare” with over twenty volumes published so far, the *c.* 470 surveys from Franconia catalogued in a recent publication,<sup>165</sup> and the nine volumes of estate surveys from Baden-Württemberg published by the Kommission für Geschichtliche Landeskunde of that state.<sup>166</sup> Also from Baden-Württemberg, it should be noted that the Benedictine abbeys of Ellwangen and Comburg in particular have exceptionally rich and continuous sets of unpublished records, and the deposits for the many commanderies of the Teutonic Order commence relatively early and have yet to be examined in detail from the perspective of rural economic history. An additional resource to be mentioned here is the extensive inventories of materials pertaining to economic history prepared by the Historisches Seminar of the University of Zurich for five Swiss archives, listing thousands of relevant sources particularly for the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.<sup>167</sup> There is thus a massive source base that is as yet untapped by the scholarship and deserves our attention. My survey of the material has been, for reasons of time and space, necessarily extremely cursory, and even my current five-

<sup>164</sup> For my use of the term “sub-peasant,” see Ghosh, “Rural Economies.”

<sup>165</sup> Bünz et al, *Fränkische Urbare*.

<sup>166</sup> See further the older list of printed sources published by Friedrich Pietsch, “Der Weg und Stand der Urbareditionen in Baden-Württemberg,” *Zeitschrift für Württembergische Landesgeschichte* 18 (1959): 317–54, here 345–54.

<sup>167</sup> I am grateful to Stefan Sonderegger and Claudia Sutter for making these inventories available to me.

year project will only be able to examine a relatively small selection of these sources from a relatively constrained perspective. But an initial overview suggests that a far more thorough rural economic history of this region can indeed be written than has so far been the case: the sources are there, and in great number, only awaiting systematic study.

But are the large numbers an illusion in terms of the reliability of their data? Can these sources really lead us to some sort of understanding of the nature and extent of commercialization, given that they present us solely with the landlord's perspective? In addition to the issues of reliability presented by estate surveys and related lists, serial sources are also problematic in other ways, not least because accounting methods differed widely and extracting meaningful statistics from any of these sources can pose severe—but not, I believe, insuperable—difficulties.<sup>168</sup> Obviously, we must accept that all sources have their own problems of credibility, and those described here may raise doubts, from the perspective of the research questions here posed—the questions concerning commercialization—on a number of counts. The most fundamental problem is that if commercialization is to be measured by using monetization of renders and services as an index, the fact that money is mentioned in the sources need not mean that money was actually rendered: it could simply be an accounting mechanism, converting renders in kind and labour services into a simpler form of record-keeping. There is, however, no *a priori* reason to assume that this was the case, and we need to have adequate indicators equally of unreliability and reliability with regard to the information provided by these sources.

It has been argued that estate surveys are more a projection of the power and wishes of the landlord than a genuine record of economic relationships, and might thus bear little relation to the actual rents collected, services rendered, or even the number and nature of the holdings.<sup>169</sup> There is certainly good reason to be cautious with estate surveys: in some instances extant charters appear to provide contradictory evidence; and where, unusually, a serial source recording renders exists, as is the case for Scheyern, with both an account for 1347 and a survey for the same year, it is possible to discern significant discrepancies. The Scheyern account for 1347 records 602 dependents owing dues of some

<sup>168</sup> See further Bruch, "Die Kunst, Daten in Informationen umzuwandeln."

<sup>169</sup> Sablonier, "Verschriftlichung."

sort, whereas the survey of the same year—which, unlike the account, designates around a third of the holdings recorded as “curia,” “mansus,” or “huba”—only records 483 holdings.<sup>170</sup> If, as has been suggested, the survey is to be dated earlier, that might explain some of the discrepancy, though not necessarily all of it; and given the uncertainty about the date, there is certainly cause for caution. In such a case we might assume that the survey is a record of an ideal situation, whereas the account gives us something closer to what in fact obtained, in this case among other things probably a significant level of fragmentation of holdings.<sup>171</sup> Such fragmentation, one might assume, could be of less interest to the landlord compiling a survey of properties as long as the rents were still collected, the record of which would be kept in annually running accounts.

Unfortunately, at least for the period and regions considered here, there is often a lack of parallel sources with which such suspicion regarding their veracity could either be justified or laid to rest; and the fact is that all extant sources either simply project the intentions of the landlords rather than of their tenants, or are (more likely, and just like the estate surveys) the result of a process of negotiation, but nevertheless certainly leaning towards the views of the landlords. Peasant and sub-peasant voices are mostly silent, certainly before the later fifteenth century, with respect to renders actually rendered and services actually performed. Clearly, therefore, it is necessary to use these sources with some caution; but equally, I would argue, a blanket lack of trust in any value they might have for scholarship is misplaced. We must also be cautious of over-emphasizing what one might call the political aspects of these sources and forgetting that they at least also had more immediate pragmatic functions of recording and administering manorial economies.<sup>172</sup>

Particularly in cases where we have more than one survey and changes over time can be detected, it seems legitimate to assume that they had some relationship to reality, even if initially unclear, which is why changes were made over time. Moreover, in many instances noted above—and also, to give an edited example, in the 1337 survey of Ellwangen—the estate surveys were regularly updated, with revised ren-

<sup>170</sup> Toch, *Die ältesten Rechnungsbücher*; Scheyern, KL 55; on the date, see the discussion above.

<sup>171</sup> See further Ghosh, “Scheyern,” 64–5.

<sup>172</sup> Sonderegger, “Landwirtschaft,” 256–57.

ders and in some cases also with records of disputes.<sup>173</sup> In other words: there was frequently a recognition on the part of the landlord that an estate survey was in fact not—*pace* Egloff—an eternal truth, even in terms of what ought to be paid; and it was updated on the basis of the reality of what could be negotiated.<sup>174</sup> Even an estate survey with no modifications, but certainly one that has been regularly updated, therefore, should be seen as a source through which the voices of the dependents may sometimes faintly be heard. This certainly does not mean that the agreed rents recorded in updated versions are actually what were collected; but I would argue that we have no reason to believe that there is no relationship to the reality of the situation—and it is also likely that the updating was done on the basis of what estate officers had actually been able to collect that year. We must of course also try and ascertain the purpose of the survey itself.<sup>175</sup> When it exists in a more or less clean, presentation copy with no modifications, it is quite likely to have a more tenuous relationship to reality than a more everyday manuscript with lots of corrections from different dates—or even a heavily corrected presentation copy. In sum: caution is certainly required, but it is equally inadvisable to be over-hasty with our scepticism.<sup>176</sup>

Serial sources like accounts and lists might appear more trustworthy because they are taken to record actual incomes year upon year; but as noted, it is not entirely clear whether they are always to be trusted as indices of monetization. I propose, however, that with some caution these sources can indeed be used, proceeding from the (admittedly probably quite few) examples that, on the basis of internal evidence, appear to be relatively credible. As I have discussed elsewhere, the Scheyern accounts, with the frequent instances of corrections, and more importantly, of statements that a render may be paid in kind or in cash, and of statements that cash was paid instead of a particular natural rent, are reliable indicators of monetization precisely because it is clear from the

<sup>173</sup> Ghosh, “Ellwangen”; Hubert Häfele, ed., *Das älteste Urbar der Abtei des gotzhuses zu Ellwangen von 1337* (Stuttgart, 2008).

<sup>174</sup> Egloff, “Urbar,” 388.

<sup>175</sup> Sonderegger, “Landwirtschaft,” 257.

<sup>176</sup> I should reiterate that my comments here are limited to the research questions I seek to address: it is quite possible that the surveys are less trustworthy with respect to the legal status of a landlord’s dependents, for example, than with respect to monetization of renders and services.

source that the compiler distinguished between money and other forms of renders, and there were changes over time and even within the same year.<sup>177</sup> This sort of evidence, however, must be supplemented by other indicators not in these sources. The fact that most holdings at Scheyern were within a day's reach of a market known from other sources; that the abbey itself spent a fair amount of money on various purchases, including products that would have been grown locally like hay and hemp, as well as on wages; that in some cases tenants owed rents that had to have been cash-derived (pepper, for example)—these are all further indicators of the existence of money as a medium of exchange in the local economy, which makes it more likely that money renders in these accounts really do mean that money was rendered.

Scheyern is, of course, but one example, and not all other sources are internally so consistent and credible. But the example of Scheyern can nevertheless be instructive with regard to method. A number of other landowners' sources also record renders from precisely the same settlements and regions from which Scheyern drew its money rents (for example, Freising St. Veit, Fürstenfeld, Indersdorf). These sources are more straightforward estate surveys, with less in terms of internal checks of the sort contained in the Scheyern accounts that lend credibility to the latter's records of money renders. If, however, we can accept that Scheyern's dependents in those same settlements and regions did in fact render coin, it is at the very least plausible that dependents of other landholders in the same places would also have been able to render coin; if a similar or greater proportion of money renders is found in the records of the other landholders (and this is certainly the case for Fürstenfeld), it seems plausible to take the view that here too we have to do with a genuine monetization of renders.<sup>178</sup> Similar procedures would have to be applied for each region and each set of sources, and of course it may not be possible to reach equal levels of credibility in each place; but at least this method allows for some level of plausibility in measuring monetization.

I suggest therefore that there are two principal means of applying checks to these kinds of sources, both of which must be employed, which in conjunction could lead to some sort of plausible approach to the reality of the situation. The surveys and accounts (and less often lists) some-

<sup>177</sup> Ghosh, "Scheyern."

<sup>178</sup> For the comparison with Fürstenfeld, see Ghosh, "Scheyern," 67.



times have internal indicators—for example, revisions, marginal notes, indications of refused payments or conflicts about dues, mentions that one or both of natural or cash renders were or could be replaced by the other—that suggest that the difference between coin on the one hand, and services or natural renders on the other, was recognized and recorded within the source; this is an invaluable indication that there is more to the source than an exercise of power—that it does have some relation to the realities of the exchanges in which that power dynamic manifested itself and was negotiated. In addition, there are external checks of various kinds. Charters recording land transactions, for example, sometimes record rents due from the land transferred (though there is no reason to believe these kinds of documents are any more reliable than the evidence of estate surveys!). It can be even more helpful to use the various sources as checks against each other (as I suggest above for Scheyern), triangulating their evidence against charters regarding rents, but equally against other evidence for social stratification, markets, mints, and money use.

A further, even simpler point is that changes over time must mean something: if, over the course of two centuries, the same landlords move from recording overwhelmingly natural renders and labour services to recording cash rents, this means at the very least that as an accounting practice, money becomes more common. This need not have very much to do with the actual practice of payment, but, coupled with the other indicators mentioned above, it seems to make real monetization a more plausible fact. I have not noted this in each case above, but it is a fact that cannot be escaped that money renders are ubiquitous in all the sources from the middle of the fourteenth century at the latest, and in most cases already from around 1300; however, while there are such renders in the early thirteenth-century sources, those of the ecclesiastical landlords record far less coin in this period than later. All of these data do of course also have to be contextualized against, for example, evidence of the existence of and production from mints, the foundation of and actual activities at markets, incidences of taxation and other kinds of monetary dues, and so on. For the purpose of providing a broader context that can enable us to judge whether or not the money renders are plausible, land transfer documents indicating rents owed from the transferred land can also be useful controls, though these are generally not extant in sufficient numbers to provide a check on most of the data in the surveys,

accounts, and lists. Customals or chronicles can also sometimes provide useful information, though before the later fifteenth century especially, they have generally little to say about rents. In any case, the same caveats must apply to all of these other sources as well: they are, without exception, recorded by the landowner, and thus must be suspected of presenting some distortion of reality from the landowners' perspective. Why should we believe a charter—as formulaic a document as an estate survey if not more so—that records transfer of a holding to a landlord and the annual rent in coin any more than a survey or an account? In both cases, the documents could reflect actual practice; but equally, the charter could also simply give a unit of value—and charters are also, after all, simply static documents that were, moreover, left thus, unlike even many surveys that were frequently updated.<sup>179</sup>

As stated above, most of these sources have relatively little evidence for actual holding size, but in many instances, they do say something about holding type, from which we can sometimes at least arrive at a rough estimate of the number of smallholdings, which could be taken as an indicator of some sort of exchange being necessary for the subsistence of the smallholders. Again, caution is required here since tenants could hold land from more than one landlord; but nevertheless, with some care, and where possible with the use of auxiliary evidence like charters or the records of other landlords, it may be possible to estimate the proportion of tenants that are smallholders. Some surveys and even accounts occasionally give information on the lengths of leases, and on accumulation of holdings over time, which can also help us in understanding the nature of tenure and the land market.<sup>180</sup> Until the fifteenth century (when serial lists begin to dominate and typically just record a single money payment), there is often differentiation between rents and recognition fees or other renders pertaining to some sort of feudal socio-legal relationship; and of course, many of these sources record labour services and their commutation. They can also thus be used to understand the changes in the nature of “feudal” society over time and how these changes com-

<sup>179</sup> For further discussion of the problems posed by charters, see Stefan Sonderegger, *Landwirtschaftliche Entwicklung in der spätmittelalterlichen Nordostschweiz: Eine Untersuchung ausgehend von den wirtschaftlichen Aktivitäten des Heiliggeist-Spitals St. Gallen* (St. Gall, 1994), 40–43.

<sup>180</sup> Ghosh, “Ellwangen,” 196–97, and “Scheyern,” 66, 75.

pare with what happened in England.<sup>181</sup> The sources described above can also be used, with all the cautions and caveats conceded, to examine not just changes in practices over time, but also variations in practice between different kinds of ecclesiastical institutions (cathedral chapters vs monasteries; Cistercians vs other orders; women's monasteries vs men's monasteries); between ecclesiastical landlords and the Duchy of Bavaria; and between different landscapes. They can also contribute to a more detailed legal history of practice rather than just of legal norm, which has been the focus of much of the scholarship in the past.

The brief typology given above is necessarily insufficient, and much further work needs to be done if we wish to arrive at a better understanding of the different forms of landlords' record-keeping in this period. And of course, with the usual caveats, these sources can be extremely helpful for studies of other topics as well, such as social structures of rural society, gender differences in landholding, inheritance patterns, production and productivity and the balance of different kinds of rural production over time, and the landlords' own economies. These subjects, while exceeding the scope of my current research and thus of this discussion, nevertheless await much more detailed study, and I hope that the presentation of the source base will stimulate such work as well.

Furthermore, while I have not systematically indicated the instances, it will be obvious from the material presented above that for a large proportion of the landholders it would be possible to undertake a study over several centuries beginning at least around 1450, and in many cases from the early fourteenth century or even earlier. Such studies would break the somewhat artificial medieval/early modern divide in an entirely salutary fashion, and, in the aggregate, would allow for far more sophisticated understandings of long-term socio-economic change. (I have kept myself within the boundaries of this periodization largely for pragmatic reasons, though I have tried to indicate the many cases where a dense source base extends beyond 1500.)

Of course, it is crucial that a sufficient volume of data be assembled before we can arrive at some sort of synthesis of late medieval rural economy and society in southern Germany; this is why it is of pressing importance that these sources receive much more attention than has hitherto been the case. I hope that the presentation here of the material evidence

<sup>181</sup> Ghosh, "Ellwangen," 197–98, 200, and "Scheyern," 66, 73–77.

for a rural economic history of these regions will prove an inspiration to examine this untapped mine of historical data. A comparative rural history of medieval Europe still needs to be written, and the sources, at least for these regions, are clearly present; only the concerted efforts of a number of scholars to make sense of the massive source base in the archives will make such a history possible. And it is only then that we can really begin to ask bigger questions regarding the long-term trajectories of economic change that led to the eventual transformations of arising through industrialization and capitalism.

*University of Toronto.*