

Swine for Pearls?

Animals in the Thirteenth-Century Cistercian Houses of Henryków and Mogiła

Grzegorz Żabiński (Katowice)

The Cistercian houses of Henryków (Lower Silesia) and Mogiła (Little Poland) showed striking differences in the development of their economies in the thirteenth century. Around 1300, Henryków's economy was mainly based on incomes from neighbourhood demesne (courts), while Mogiła's incomes predominantly included peasant tithes and rents, with demesne income being of secondary importance.¹ This suggests that the role animals played in the economies of both houses differed considerably as well.

Husbandry as part of monastic economies

Mogiła

Mogiła (c. 8 km east of Cracow) was founded in the 1220s by two members of the nobility's clan of Odrowąż: Wisław and his cousin Iwo Bishop of Cracow.² Foundation benefices were concentrated in two core areas: in a complex around Prandocin (c. 25 km north-east of Cracow) and in Mogiła (where the house was relocated from an initial site in Kacice on the Prandocin estate). In order to assist the building works, Iwo gave a grant to be paid out over the

¹ The structures of monastic economies were analysed by Grzegorz Żabiński, "Mogiła and Henryków: A Comparative Economic History of Cistercian Monasteries within their Social Context (up to the End of the Thirteenth Century)," unpublished PhD thesis (Budapest: Central European University, 2005).

² For basic data about the monastery see Tomasz Kawka and Hugo Leszczyński, "Kacice-Mogiła," in *Monasticon Cisterciense Poloniae* [henceforth as: *MCP*] 2, eds. Andrzej Marek Wyrwa, Jerzy Strzelczyk and Krzysztof Kaczmarek (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, 1999), 98-112; Maciej Zdanek, "W sprawie procesu fundacyjnego opactwa w Mogile" (On the foundation process of the abbey in Mogiła), *Nasza Przyszłość* 94 (2000): 85-118; id., "Proces implantacji opactwa cystersów w Mogile" (The process of implantation of the Cistercian abbey in Mogiła), *Nasza Przyszłość* 96 (2001): 515-549.

first three years: apart from money, salt, honey, grain and iron, it also included 40 oxen, 40 cows and 300 sheep with 300 lambs.³

As can be seen, animals were significant part of the monastic foundation benefices. This was not uncommon at Cistercian foundations. A similar grant was made in 1194 by a Hungarian nobleman Dominic Bors to his Cistercian foundation in Borsmonostor (apart from villages, money and men, 100 oxen, 50 cows and 1000 sheep were donated).⁴ The monastery of Sardaigne, founded in 1205, was granted 200 horses, 50 cattle, 2000 swine, 300 sheep and 1000 goats.⁵ The monastery of Santa-Maria della Paludi in Sardinia, founded in the same year, received 10,000 sheep, 2000 swine, 1000 goats and 5000 cattle.⁶ Concerning the provenance of animals, husbandry was an important component of the Odrowąż clan estates, as can be seen at the estate of Końskie (the local name comes from *koń*–“a horse”), which was in all probability one such husbandry centre.⁷ Although an intention to support monastic building works was stated by the donor, the grant in all probability was also meant to launch a permanent monastic husbandry economy. Since it may have required a specialised centre with qualified labour force, it was in all probability located in a monastic court. The presence of a demesne economy was testified to in Kacice in the Prandocin estate and in Mogiła.⁸ From the point of view of the surrounding environments,

³ See the charter by Bishop Iwo from 1222, Eugeniusz Janota, ed. *Diplomata monasterii Clarae Tumbae prope Cracoviam* [henceforth as: *DMCT*] (Cracow: Nakładem C.K. Towarzystwa Naukowego Krakowskiego, Drukarnia C.K. Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 1865), No. 2: 2-3; the transfer of patronage was confirmed in 1223, *DMCT*, No. 3: 3-4; Zdanek, “W sprawie procesu,” 96; about the relocation of the house from Kacice to Mogiła see also a forged charter from 1225, *DMCT*, No. 4: 4-5. This charter was based on the charter of Duke Bolesław the Shy of Kraków from 1273, see *ibid.*, No. 32: 25-26; the relations by Jan Długosz, *Liber Beneficiorum Dioecesis Cracoviensis* [henceforth as: *LibBen*] 3, in *Joanni Długosz Opera Omnia* 9, ed. Aleksander Przeździecki (Cracoviae: ex Typographia Kirchmaieriana, 1864), 420-421, and *id.*, *Annales seu cronicae incliti Regni Poloniae*, 5-6 (Warsaw: PWN, 1973), 245-246; Karol Górski, “Ród Odrowążów w wiekach średnich” (The clan of Odrowąż in the Middle Ages), *Rocznik Towarzystwa Heraldycznego* 8 (1926/27): 84-85; Zdanek, “W sprawie procesu,” 93-106; *Słownik historyczno-geograficzny województwa krakowskiego w średniowieczu* (The Historical-Geographical Dictionary of the Voivodship of Kraków in the Middle Ages) [henceforth as: *SHG*], eds. Janusz Kurtyka, Jacek Laberschek, Zofia Leszczyńska-Skrętowa, Franciszek Sikora (Polska Akademia Nauk. Instytut Historii) (Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1989), 2.2, 349-352.

⁴ Louis J. Lékai, “Medieval Cistercians and Their Social Environment. The Case of Hungary,” *Analecta Cisterciensia* 32.1-2 (1976): 256.

⁵ Josef Hermann Roth, “Die Wirtschaftsgeschichte der Cistercienser,” in *Die Cistercienser. Geschichte-Geist-Kunst*, ed. Ambrosius Schneider (Cologne: Wienand Verlag, 1977), 564.

⁶ David H. Williams, *The Cistercians in the Early Middle Ages* (Trowbridge: Cromwell Press, 1998), 346.

⁷ *DMCT*, No. 2: 2-3; Stanisław Trawkowski, “Prędota Stary” (Prędota the Old) in *Polski Słownik Biograficzny* (Polish Biographical Dictionary) 28: 445-447 (Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1984-1985) and Górski, “Ród Odrowążów,” 11-15, 20-23.

⁸ Apart from the afore-mentioned charters, see a German law grant to the Prandocin estate from 1278, *DMCT*, No. 34: 27-28; in 1283, two hides (ca. 50 ha) of demesne cultivated by

both monastic courts may have provided good conditions for husbandry as situated in the stream valleys of rivers, possessing an abundance of meadows and pastures.⁹

Different features may be noted in the grant by Duke Henryk the Bearded of Silesia and Cracow from 1238. The Duke granted Mogiła part of the village of Czyrzyny (c. 5 km north-west of Mogiła) and rights to trap beavers in the Dłubnia river within the borders of monastic estates there.¹⁰ Beavers were considered as especially precious and the right to trap them belonged to Ducal *regalia*. Therefore, the grant fits well into the special favour enjoyed by Mogiła from this ruler and his son, Henryk the Pious.¹¹

Another issue is the general economic importance of husbandry for Mogiła. This monastery was situated close to the important market of the capital town of Cracow. The house ran two butcher stalls there. The one might have been acquired in the foundation process¹² and the other was obtained between 1244 and 1273.¹³ Moreover, as the Prandocin estate was relocated on the German law in the 1280s, the locators were later to establish two butcher stalls

monastic *familia* in the complex and monastic meadows in Kacice were mentioned, *ibid.*, No. 35: 28-29; in 1286, monastic demesne in Mogiła was mentioned, *ibid.*, No. 61: 48-50; Zdanek, "Proces implantacji," 523-527, 534-535.

⁹ On topographical conditions of both sites see Adam Gorczyński, "Pogląd na położenie Mogiły" (A view on Mogiła's location), in *Monografia opactwa cystersów we wsi Mogiła* (A monograph on the Cistercian abbey in the village of Mogiła) (Cracow: Towarzystwo Naukowe Krakowskie, Drukarnia Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 1867), 1-4; Iwo Kołodziejczyk, *Mogiła. Opactwo cystersów* (Mogiła: the Cistercian Abbey) (Cracow, 1992), 3; Władysław Łuszczkiewicz, *Wieś Mogiła przy Krakowie, jej klasztor cysterski, kościółek farny i kopiec Wandy* (The village of Mogiła at Kraków, its Cistercian monastery, the parish church and the hill of Wanda) (Cracow: W Drukarni "Czasu", 1899), 6-8, 12; Jacek Poleski, "Besiedlungshinterland des frühmittelalterlichen Krakau", in *Centrum i zaplecze we wczesnośredniowiecznej Europie Środkowej* (Centre and hinterland in early medieval Central Europe), ed. Sławomir Moździoch (Wrocław: Werk, 1999), 185-186; Długosz, *LibBen* 3: 422-423; Zbigniew Pęckowski, *Ziemia miechowska. Zarys dziejów osadnictwa do końca XVIII wieku* (Land of Miechów. A sketch of settlement to the end of the eighteenth century) (Cracow: "Secesja," 1992), 11-12; Zdanek, "Proces implantacji," 527, states that the court in Kacice was oriented toward animal husbandry.

¹⁰ *DMCT*, No. 15: 12; Zdanek, "Proces implantacji," 519, 526.

¹¹ This was in all probability related to a political support by the monastery to political plans of those Dukes in Little Poland. For other charters of Silesian Henryks to Mogiła see *DMCT*, No. 13: 11, No. 17: 13. For the context see Benedykt Zientara, *Heinrich der Bärtige und seine Zeit. Politik und Gesellschaft im mittelalterlichen Schlesien* (Schriften des Instituts für Kultur und Geschichte der Deutschen im östlichen Europa. Bd. 17) (Munich: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 2002), 257-258, 286-287, 300-303, 308-309; Górski, "Ród Odrowążów," 21-23, 34, 45, 74, 85; Zdanek, "Proces implantacji," 518-519, 525, 530.

¹² *DMCT*, No. 4: 4-5; Zdanek, "W sprawie procesu," 101.

¹³ *DMCT*, No. 20: 15-16, the charter by Bishop Prędota of Kraków stating a monastic possession of one stall and *ibid.*, No. 32: 25-26, the charter of Duke Bolesław the Shy of Kraków, mentioning two stalls; compare the point of view of Zdanek, "W sprawie procesu," 101-102; *id.*, "Proces implantacji," 521-522, 524, 532.

there. However, this task was probably not completed. The same concerns the attempted organisation of two fishponds on the estate.¹⁴ Furthermore, in 1291, the monastery received market rights for their estates, which was especially relevant for the Prandocin complex.¹⁵ Finally, in 1299, Mogiła possessed a court in Cracow.¹⁶ Therefore, the monastery disposed over many facilities to put its husbandry production into the market, with special reference to the capital town. There is no reason to assume that this was not done at all; however, based on the scarcity of mentions in the sources it can be said that husbandry was not of any special prominence in the monastic economy.

The reasons for this seem to have been various. First, the monastery received rich foundation benefices, which chiefly comprised well-organised villages and incomes. Those estates were located in well-populated areas.¹⁷ In the entire period in question Mogiła was favoured by the rulers in Cracow, bishops of Cracow and people of their entourage. Thanks to this, it enjoyed new grants, mainly consisting of populated estates, tithes and exemptions. Starting from the 1270s, the monastery commenced to re-organise its estates based on the German law. The role of demesne economy and colonisation of wasteland was secondary. Around 1300 monastic estates consisted of 12 villages, 2 courts (demesne), 7 pieces of land, tithes from 27 estates, 1 right of patronage, 1 parish, 3 urban enterprises (butcher stalls and a court in Cracow), 1 mayor's office and 1 market-place in Prandocin. Out of a gross income of about 500 Marks, roughly 80 Marks only was yielded by demesne while c. 355 Marks came from tithes and ca. 65 Marks came from peasant rents.¹⁸ Therefore, as the monastic foundation

¹⁴ *DMCT*, No. 35: 28-29 and *ibid.*, No. 59: 46-47; Zdanek, "Proces implantacji," 547.

¹⁵ *DMCT*, No. 4: 4-5; Zdanek, "Proces implantacji," 537, 539.

¹⁶ Stanisław Estreicher, ed., *Antiquum registrum privilegiorum et statutorum civitatis Cracoviensis*, Wydawnictwa Komisji Historycznej PAU 82 (Cracow: PAU, 1936), No. 1: 1; Zdanek, "Proces implantacji," 540.

¹⁷ For early settlement of areas where the most important part of monastic estates were located see Poleski, "Besiedlungshinterland," 185-193; Andrzej Źaki, *Archeologia Małopolski wczesnośredniowiecznej* (Archaeology of early medieval Little Poland) (Polska Akademia Nauk Oddział w Krakowie. Prace Komisji Archeologicznej 13) (Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1974), 274, fig. 225 ab, 284, 286, fig. 238, 289, fig. 241 ab, 293-299; Elżbieta Dąbrowska, "Osadnictwo wczesnośredniowieczne na terenie powiatu krakowskiego" (Early medieval settlement in the district of Cracow), *Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Prace Archeologiczne UJ* 4 (Cracow: Nakładem Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 1962), 47-48, 91-96, 107-108, 117; *id.*, *Studia nad wczesnośredniowiecznym osadnictwem ziemi wiślickiej* (Studies on early Medieval settlement of the territory of Wiślica) (Instytut Historii Kultury Materialnej Polskiej Akademii Nauk) (Wrocław-Warsaw-Cracow: Ossolineum, PAN, 1965), *passim*; Renée Hachulska-Ledwos, "Wczesnośredniowieczna osada w Nowej Hucie-Mogile" (An early medieval settlement in Nowa Huta-Mogiła), *Materiały Archeologiczne Nowej Huty* 3 (1971): 7-210; Pećkowski, *Ziemia miechowska*, *passim*.

¹⁸ For foundation benefices, property development and the relations between the house and its entourage see *DMCT*, Nos. 2-30, 32-37, 39, 40, 42, 44, 61: 2-35, 48-50; Estreicher, ed., *Antiquum registrum*, No. 1: 1; Długosz, *LibBen* 3: 420 ff; Wojciech Kętrzyński, ed., *Chronicon monasterii Claratumbensis Ordinis Cisterciensis auctore fratre Nicolao de*

benefices were rich and the house was constantly supported with new grants, there was probably no need for Mogiła to develop a broad scale market-oriented husbandry. Moreover, as demesne economy was of secondary importance, husbandry in order to secure draught beasts for monastic estates, was not necessary, either.

Henryków

Henryków (c. 55 km south-east from Wrocław) was founded on the initiative of Mikołaj, a notary of Duke Henryk the Bearded of Silesia.¹⁹ Although Mikołaj transferred patronage rights to the Dukes and his son Henryk the Pious, foundation benefices for the house were scarce. Their core, concentrated on various small estates by Mikołaj, was located in the neighbourhood of Henryków. It constituted a sparsely populated estate (c. 690 ha) with a sort of demesne, the village of Nikłowice, and a forest (the Bukowina, c. 50 great hides or 1250 ha) with a meadow along the Morzyna stream. Thanks to the initial concentration of activity by Mikołaj, German law re-organisation, organisation of efficient demesne and implementation of a regular three-field system were made possible. The estate offered an abundance of pastures and meadows for draught beasts, indispensable for intensive cultivation with better agricultural tools. However, all these features needed to be complimented by investments and people who could cultivate the land. Other benefices included forest areas and four villages in more distant parts of Silesia, in Great Poland and Little Poland.²⁰

Cracovia (Monumenta Poloniae Historica 6) (Cracow: Nakładem Akademii Umiejętności, 1893), 435-442; Zdanek, "W sprawie procesu," passim; id., "Proces implantacji," passim; Kawka and Leszczyński, "Kacice-Mogiła," 98-102; a summary of Mogiła's estates and a tentative calculation of income (based on the afore-mentioned sources) quoted after Żabiński, *Mogiła and Henryków*, 155-158.

¹⁹ For basic data on the monastery see Stanisław Kozak, Agata Tarnas-Tomczyk, Marek L. Wójcik, "Henryków," in *MCP 2*: 64-78; Heinrich Gröger, *Heinrichau. Geschichte eines schlesischen Zisterzienserklosters 1227-1977* (Cologne and Vienna: Böhlau, 1978); Stanisław Trawkowski, *Gospodarka wielkiej własności cysterskiej na Dolnym Śląsku w XIII wieku* (The economy of the great Cistercian property in Lower Silesia in the thirteenth century) (Instytut Historii Polskiej Akademii Nauk) (Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1959).

²⁰ On the foundation process and benefices see *DMCT*, No. 1: 1; Józef Pater, ed., *Liber foundationis claustris Sancte Marie Virginis in Heinrichow czyli Księga Henrykowska* (... or the Book of Henryków) [henceforth as: Pater, *LF*], 2nd ed. (Wrocław: Muzeum Archidiecezjalne, 1991), Book I.1: 109-117, 120-121; Book I. 2: 118-121, Book I. 3: 123, Book I. 5: 126-127, Book I. 6: 129-130, Book I. 8: 133-137, Book I. 9: 138-141, Book I. 10: 148-149, Book II. 4: 169, Book II. 5: 175, Book II. 7: 189-196; *Ordinatio Wratislaviensis ecclesiae episcoporum*, in: Pater, *LF*, 194-199; the foundation charter from 1228, *Schlesisches Urkundenbuch* [henceforth as: *SU*] 1.2, ed. Heinrich Appelt (Graz, Vienna and Cologne: Böhlau 1968), No. 290: 213-214; *SU* 1.2, No. 210: 153-154, No. 252: 184-185, No. 253: 185; *SU* 1.3, ed. Heinrich Appelt (Vienna, Cologne and Graz: Böhlau, 1971), No. 371: 295-296; *SU* 2, ed. Winfried Irgang (Cologne, Vienna and Graz: Böhlau, 1977), No. 138:

The monastic site lay in a highland area between the Bystrzyca and the Oława rivers, c. 20 km north from the main ridge of the Sudety mountains. It was situated in the loess valley of the Oława river (crossed by several small tributaries of that river), covered with small “islands” of deciduous forest. The region of Henryków was settled relatively late, that is, in the second half of the twelfth and the first half of the thirteenth centuries. Therefore, it was not densely populated, and the extensive agriculture run by local petty nobles with their few dependants and free Ducal peasants was still on the level of single household farms or small hamlets. Extensive agriculture together with inheritance divisions often led to “chessboard” fields, standing in the way of more efficient land cultivation. Well-organised great land property was rare in this area. Concerning husbandry, some landholders undertook deforestation work (e. g., in the Bukowina forest or at Brukalice) in order to secure fodder for draught beasts.²¹ A

90, No. 196: 124; *SU* 3, ed. Winfried Irgang (Cologne and Vienna: Böhlau, 1984), No. 448: 294-295, No. 452: 298-299; Grüger, *Heinrichau*, 2-5, 8-11, 16-19, 122-123; Kozak, Tarnas-Tomczyk, and Wójcik, “Henryków,” 65-66; Trawkowski, *Gospodarka*, 34, 37-39, 49; Dariusz Karczewski, “Nieznany dokument książęcej krakowskiej Grzymisławcy z roku 1228. Przyczynek do najwcześniejszego uposażenia klasztoru cystersów w Henrykowie (An unknown charter of Grzymisława, Duchess of Kraków from 1228. A contribution to the oldest benefices of the Cistercian monastery in Henryków),” in *Venerabiles, nobiles et honesti. Studia z dziejów społeczeństwa Polski średniowiecznej. Prace ofiarowane Profesorowi Januszowi Bieniakowi w siedemdziesiątą rocznicę urodzin i czterdziestopięciolecie pracy naukowej* (Venerabiles, nobiles et honesti. Studies on the society of medieval Poland. Articles presented to Professor Janusz Bieniak on the occasion of his seventieth birthday and the forty-fifth anniversary of his scholarly work), eds. Andrzej Radziński, Jan Wroneński and Anna Supruniuk (Toruń: Uniwersytet Mikołaja Kopernika, 1997), 91-99.

²¹ On topographic conditions and early settlement see Pater, *LF*, Book I. 2, I. 3, I. 4: 118-124, Book I. 5: 126, Book I. 7, I. 8: 132-135, Book I. 9: 140, Book I. 10: 147-148, 150-152, Book II. 1: 156-157, Book II. 2, II. 3, II. 4: 162-169; *Ordinatio*, in: Pater, *LF*, 195-196; *SU* 2, No. 138: 90; *Regesten zur schlesischen Geschichte* [henceforth as: *SR*] 1316-1326, eds. Colmar Grünhagen and Conrad Wutke, in *Codex Diplomaticus Silesiae* [henceforth as: *CDS*] 18 (Breslau: Max, 1898), No. 3766: 73, No. 3848: 102, No. 4152: 189; Trawkowski, *Gospodarka*, 34-38, 68, 71, 80; Grüger, *Heinrichau*, 4, 26, 34, 114, 143; id., “Die slawische Besiedlung und der Beginn der deutschen Kolonisation im Weichbilde Münsterberg,” *Archiv für Schlesische Kirchengeschichte* 21 (1963): 1-37; Kozak, Tarnas-Tomczyk, and Wójcik, “Henryków,” 64; Lech Tyszkiewicz, “Ze studiów nad osadnictwem wczesnofeudalnym na Śląsku” (Studies on early feudal settlement in Silesia), *Sobótka* 12.1 (1957): 2-3, 6-7, 9, 11-12, 18, 22-26, 29, 32-40, Appendix, 41-50, No. 26, 36, 37, 242; Jerzy Lodowski, “Osadnictwo a zalesienie Dolnego Śląska we wczesnym średniowieczu” (Settlement and forest areas of Lower Silesia in the early Middle Ages), in *Ziemia i ludzie dawnej Polski* (Land and people of the Old Poland), eds. Adam Galos and Julian Janczak (Prace Wrocławskiego Towarzystwa Naukowego Seria A, No. 179. Wrocław, Ossolineum, 1976), 68-72, 78; Lech A. Tyszkiewicz, “Śląsk przed lokacją i kolonizacją na prawie niemieckim” (Silesia before location and colonisation on German law), in *Księga Jadwiżyńska. Międzynarodowe Sympozjum Naukowe “Święta Jadwiga w dziejach i kulturze Śląska”. Wrocław-Trzebnica 21-23 września 1993 roku* (A Book of Jadwiga. An international scholarly colloquium “St Jadwiga in the history and culture of Silesia”) (Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 1995), 19-20, 24.

similar early stage of settlement may be seen in another area where the monastic estates were later concentrated, that is, in the Góry Sowie mountain region, c. 20 km south-west of Henryków.²²

There are numerous references to husbandry in the history of economic development of Henryków up to c. 1300. In 1236, Paweł Bishop of Poznań granted the house the village of Dębica in Great Poland (c. 9 km north-west of Gniezno) together with a horse herd of 38 mares. Apart from the pious intention, the donor aimed to support the poor monastery founded by his relative Notary Mikołaj.²³ A sort of parallel to foundation grants to Mogiła may be noted here. Bishop Paweł was deeply engaged in the foundation process of Henryków. Thus, it is no wonder that bearing in mind the reluctance of the Silesian Dukes to help the foundation, he intended to support the *opus vitae* of his relative.²⁴ The number of mares suggests the existence of a horse-breeding centre there, in all probability organised as demesne based on the necessity of employing a specialised labour force.²⁵

The importance of pastures for monastic husbandry is notable at the estate of Jaworowice at Henryków. Granted to the monks in 1243 by Duke Bolesław II Rogatka, it was then confiscated by Duke Henryk III. As the monks feared that the house would be deprived of building sand reservoirs and pastures for cattle, they decided to re-purchase it, even bearing in mind that they had to indebt the house for this purpose and offer “gifts” to the Duke and his officials. In this estate, with an area of 16 small hides (c. 240 ha), the demesne was organised later, but part of it may have remained within the peasant economy.²⁶

From 1254, there are data on the monastic demesne in Nikłowice, exchanged with a local nobleman for a piece of land in the valley of the Oława river. Its size may be estimated at c. 70 ha. Cultivation within it took the form of the three-field system; c. 46.6 ha was available annually. There were 20 cattle

²² Pater, *LF*, Book I. 9: 138-147; Trawkowski, *Gospodarka*, 40; Lodowski, “Osadnictwo,” 75; Tyszkiewicz, “Ze studiów,” 8-10, 13, Appendix, 48, No. 210; Zientara, *Heinrich*, 176-179, 196, the map, 364-365; Josef Joachim Menzel, “Schlesien zur Zeit der Heiligen Hedwig,” in *Księga Jadwiżyńska*, 32-41.

²³ *SU* 2, No. 124: 81-82; Grüger, *Heinrichau*, 20, 116. In the same year the bishop made another grant upon the monks’ request in order to alleviate their poverty, *ibid.*, No. 123: 80-81; Grüger, *Heinrichau*, 20, 116.

²⁴ Pater, *LF*, Book I. 1: 112-114, 116, 117, 120, Book I.10: 150-151; *SU* 1.2, No. 252: 184-185, No. 290: 213-214; Karczewski, “Nieznany dokument,” 91-99; *SU* 3, No. 179: 123; Kozak, Tarnas-Tomczyk, and Wójcik, “Henryków,” 65-66; Grüger, *Heinrichau*, 9-18; Trawkowski, *Gospodarka*, 49;

²⁵ A court is mentioned in 1318, see *SR 1316-1326*, No. 3802: 83-84 and Lambert Schulte, “Heinrichau und Münsterberg,” in *id.*, *Kleine Schriften* (Darstellungen und Quellen zur schlesischen Geschichte 23) (Breslau: Hirt, 1918), Appendix 6: 144-149; Grüger, *Heinrichau*, 24-26, 116.

²⁶ Pater, *LF*, Book I. 6: 129-131, Book II. 6: 185-186; *SU* 2, No. 241: 145; *SU* 3, No. 150-151: 106-107; Wilhelm Wattenbach, ed., *Das Formelbuch des Domherrn Arnold von Protzan*, in *CDS* 5 (Breslau: Max, 1862), 166-168; *SR 1316-1326*, No. 3552: 4-5; Grüger, *Heinrichau*, 3, 85, 108-109, map 2; Trawkowski, *Gospodarka*, 116-118, 141-142.

and 30 swine within the demesne. Combined with mentions of plows kept at the court, this means that 5 teams with 4 oxen in each were needed to cultivate the total demesne area. In other words, one team was able to work c. 14 ha of land (including 2/3 or c. 9.3 ha available annually and 1/3 or c. 4.6 ha being left fallow).²⁷ This monastic deal may have also signalled an intention to secure additional pasture land, which (as can be seen in the afore-mentioned story of Jaworowice) was a crucial issue for the house at that time.

Monastic interest in husbandry resulted in the establishment and acquisition of trading posts. In 1276, the monastery was granted the right to establish a free tavern and settle two smiths, two shoemakers, two bakers and two butchers in Rychnów (Lower Silesia). They were permitted to freely sell their products in the village.²⁸ In 1291, the monastic possession of a tax-free butcher stall in the town of Reichenbach (c. 45 km north-west of Henryków and c. 22 km north of the monastic village of Schönwald, where the stall may have been supplied from) was confirmed.²⁹ Before 1291, the monastery owned a butcher stall in the neighbouring town of Münsterberg, and in that year the house was granted another butcher stall and a rent from another stall there.³⁰ Another butcher stall in that town was acquired in 1297.³¹ In the same year, the monastery received confirmation of its possession in the town of Strzelin (20 km north of Henryków), which comprised a tax-free butcher stall and a tax-free shoe stall.³² Strzelin, Reichenbach and Münsterberg formed a triangle encompassing the monastery as well. Thus, the house acquired access to the most important markets in the neighbourhood.

Another important branch of the monastic animal husbandry was fish. The exchange of Nikłowice for land along the Oława river opened the way for monastic expansion there. In order to secure water for monastic needs (including mills), the monks undertook irrigation and dug a new river-bed for the Oława river. The original river-bed was then called *antiquus meatus Ołauie*.³³ A

²⁷ Pater, *LF*, Book I. 7: 132-133, *SU* 3, No. 124-125: 89-91; ca. 70 ha seems to be quite typical for Cistercian demesne in Silesia, see Trawkowski, *Gospodarka*, 63-80; Grüger, *Heinrichau*, 90, 107; Henryk Dąbrowski, *Rozwój gospodarki rolnej w Polsce od XII do połowy XIV w.* (The development of agriculture in Poland from the twelfth to the mid-fourteenth century) (Polska Akademia Nauk, Instytut Historii Kultury Materialnej, *Studia i Materiały z Historii Kultury Materialnej* 11, *Studia do Dziejów Gospodarstwa Wiejskiego* 5.1) (Warsaw: PWN, 1962), 52-59, 106, 114.

²⁸ *SU* 4, ed. Winfried Irgang (Cologne and Vienna: Böhlau, 1988), No. 301: 203-204; Rychnów and the neighbouring village of Quolsdorf were exchanged by the house in 1293 for the village of Wiesenthal in the monastic vicinity, see Pater, *LF*, Book II. 4: 169-173, *SU* 6, ed. Winfried Irgang (Cologne, Weimar and Vienna: Böhlau, 1998), No. 91: 77-79.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, No. 39: 33.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, No. 24: 20-21.

³¹ *Ibid.*, No. 299: 239-240; Trawkowski, *Gospodarka*, 166.

³² *SU* 6, No. 308: 246-247; Trawkowski, *Gospodarka*, 165-166.

³³ *SU* 3, No. 587: 373-375; *SU* 4, No. 67: 58-59, No. 95-96: 75-76; Wattenbach, *Das Formelbuch*, in *CDS* 5, 166-168; *SR 1316-1326*, No. 3552: 4-5; on further monastic expansion

monastic *antiqua piscina* on the Morzyna stream in Stary Henryków at Czesławice (a neighbouring estate, acquired by the monks at the turn of the thirteenth and the fourteenth centuries) was mentioned at the beginning of the fourteenth century.³⁴ In 1300, another monastic fishpond (later known as *Altteich*) with a plot of 0.5 small hides within the estate of Zobkendorf (part of Skalice) was mentioned.³⁵ All this shows the growing monastic interest in securing their own fish resources.³⁶

The monastic animal-related economy also included sheep husbandry. In 1282, the house acquired the estate of Muszkowice (south-west of Henryków). It was probably around 500 ha and had been re-organised by the house as a demesne specialised in sheep husbandry. It must have been a considerable holding, based on the fact that in 1302 a single sheep-fold there with 313 selected sheep (that is, animals giving better quality wool) was burnt down by a heir of the previous owners. Other components of the estate included a meadow and a grove, subsequently turned into arable land, a small village of “gardeners” (*ortulani* – dependent peasants whose chief duty was labour on the demesne land) and a hop-garden.³⁷ As the monastic estates expanded further in this direction, the monks enlarged the demesne in Muszkowice by incorporating part of the neighbouring village of Czerńczyce (6.5 great hides or c. 162.5 ha). Although deforestation had been begun there by previous owners, the monks decided to let the forest grow again on part of this land (3 ha). The other 3.5 hides were cultivated and contained a field (*campus*) called “the Animals’ Garden” (*Ortus Ferarum*).³⁸ The new piece of forest was designed to provide additional pasture area within the demesne. The “*Ortus Ferarum*” was probably an enclosure for sheep within the arable land, when the land was left to fallow. Moreover, in 1300-1303, the house acquired the neighbouring estate of Nietowice (7.5 small hides or c. 112.5 ha). It was joined to Muszkowice: in all probability, the 2.5 non-settled hides were used to enlarge the size of pastures or demesne

there after 1300 see Pater, *LF*, Book II. 6: 185-189; Grüger, *Heinrichau*, 22, 25, 80, 109-111, 125-128, 133; Trawkowski, *Gospodarka*, 68-71, 101-102.

³⁴ Pater, *LF*, Book II. 7: 188-192, see also *SU* 6, No. 292: 233-234; Grüger, *Heinrichau*, 26, 113-114, 129.

³⁵ Pater, *LF*, Book II. 3: 165-168; *SU* 6, No. 437: 339; Grüger, *Heinrichau*, 25, 111-112.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 102-103, 111-112, 129-130.

³⁷ Pater, *LF*, Book II. 1: 157-162, *SU* 5, ed. Winfried Irgang (Cologne, Weimar and Vienna: Böhlau, 1993), No. 13: 12-13, No. 14: 14-15; Grüger, *Heinrichau*, 24, 112; the neighbouring town of Münsterberg also had interests in the estate, probably related to the fact that sheep husbandry had also been practiced earlier in the monastery. The burghers may have feared an intensification of monastic clothmaking to the detriment of craftspeople in the town; see Trawkowski, *Gospodarka*, 93-94; on the organisation of Muszkowice see *ibid.*, 80-81, 86-87, 91-92, 102, 107-108, 118. This author states that the price of a “selected” sheep in the mid-thirteenth century was usually around 6 gr, twice the amount as for a “usual” sheep.

³⁸ Pater, *LF*, Book II. 2: 162-165, *SU* 5, No. 370 and 371: 292-293, *SU* 6, No. 368: 290; Grüger, *Heinrichau*, 25, 80, 112, 122-123, 143; Trawkowski, *Gospodarka*, 81, 87-88; Dąbrowski, *Rozwój*, 101-102.

arable land, and 5 settled hides were connected to the “gardeners” village.³⁹

Sheep husbandry was in all probability related chiefly to monastic cloth-making. Its scope was no doubt considerable, as monastic weaving and selling cloth retail was mentioned as being especially onerous in a complaint by the burghers of Münsterberg from 1293. A compromise was arrived at in which the monks were permitted to carry out all handicrafts. The monks were permitted to run two looms. One loom was to work from Christmas to Easter, while the other could function continuously. The monks were only permitted to sell twenty rolls of cloth (white or grey) in retail. The surplus could be sold wholesale in the monastery or in the towns.⁴⁰ It is notable that handicrafts and especially clothmaking was directly related to market access: apart from towns, the monks also organised a sort of market-place at the monastery itself.

The market orientation of monastic animal-related economy may also be seen in a trade privilege from 1293, granting the monks a toll-free passage for salt, grain and other commodities for monastic needs, transported from Cracow to Silesia or back. This trade was carried out at least to a degree by the house itself.⁴¹ Salt is mentioned in first place, which may be related to monastic interest in butcher stalls and fisheries.

Market orientation can also be seen in the monastic German law estates. When Henryków acquired the neighbouring village of Wiesenthal in 1293, the benefices of the village’s mayor included a tavern, a butcher, a baker and a fish-pond. The village was of considerable size (more than 31.5 great hides or c. 787.5 ha), which also meant profits from market enterprises there. Thus, it is not surprising that the monks bought the office soon after 1300.⁴²

Based on the afore-mentioned, the importance of various branches of husbandry for Henryków is evident. The economic development of Henryków proceeded in very different ways compared to Mogiła. Foundation benefices were scarce and further property acquisitions were indispensable in order to se-

³⁹ Pater, *LF*, Book II. 3: 167-168; Trawkowski, *Gospodarka*, 81; Grüger, *Heinrichau*, 25, 112-114.

⁴⁰ *SU* 6, No. 117: 97-98, No. 123: 104-105; Trawkowski, *Gospodarka*, 93-94, 97-99, 121-122, says that sheep-shearing could take place once or twice a year (in spring and autumn), although the quality of autumn wool is inferior. Thus, the monastery, in order to assure quality, probably relied rather on the spring shearing. On the other hand, due to a shorter growing period on the Sudety Plateau (demanding intensification of agricultural work), the preparation of wool for weaving probably took place in autumn. Thus, in winter the monastery had the greatest wool resources, which explains why the other monastic workshop only operated in winter. As the cloth produced by the monks could only be either white or grey, the monastery probably did not have a dying workshop; Grüger, *Heinrichau*, 95, 132, also underlines the charity aspect of Henryków handicrafts.

⁴¹ *SU* 6, No. 113: 95; Trawkowski, *Gospodarka*, 128-129, 163-164; Grüger, *Heinrichau*, 114-115; in 1320 Duke Władysław of Bytom confirmed the monastic right of free trade for monastic needs throughout his land. The charter mentions horses, cattle, salt, lead as well as other commodities, *SR 1316-1326*, No. 4059: 162-163.

⁴² Pater, *LF*, Book II. 4: 169-175; *SU* 6, No. 91: 77-79, No. 257: 208, No. 265: 212-213; *SR 1316-1326*, No. 3120: 165; Grüger, *Heinrichau*, 4, 25-26, 114.

cure monastic existence. Due to the reluctant attitude of the Dukes of Wrocław towards the house (support lent by bishops of Wrocław could not compensate for it), Henryków could not count on many grants and had to acquire new estates chiefly by its own monastic means. Moreover, the lack of Ducal protection exposed the house to conflicts with local nobility. On the other hand, the progressive economic decline of numerous landowners in the monastic vicinity facilitated the property expansion of the house. The land acquired by the house in the neighbourhood of Henryków was not densely populated and those acquisitions consisted of relatively small and scattered pieces of land which needed to be concentrated into a coherent estate. Moreover, due to an initial scarcity of monastic financial resources, the house had to direct its settlement and colonisation investments to more distant forest estates in Lower Silesia in order to turn them into profitable villages. All this contributed to the fact that around 1300 the core of the monastic estates was concentrated in the vicinity of Henryków and was organised within the demesne economy. The house's property in the vicinity of Henryków included 6 to 8 courts (demesne): in Henryków, Stary Henryków, Cienkowice, Muszkowice (with pastures and sheep-folds; a total area of c. 700 ha with c. 75 ha of forest), Brukalice, Neuhof (with pastures) Reuenthal and Czesławice. There was also 1 village (Wiesenthal), 1 piece of peasant land (Skalice), a shoe mill (*Schimmelei*), 2 looms and other workshops in Henryków, 2 fishponds (*Altteich* in Skalice, *antiqua piscina* or *Alter Fischteich* in Stary Henryków), a market-place in Henryków, and the forest area of the Bukowina (c. 1500 ha) with a meadow. This was complemented with tithes from 9 estates. In Lower Silesia, c. 20 km from Henryków, the house also held a village. In more distant areas, the house held 8 villages (one in Upper Silesia, 3 in Little Poland, 4 in Great Poland), 2 courts (one in Little Poland and one in Dębica in Great Poland with a horse-herd), tithes from one estate (in Great Poland). Urban possessions included 6 stalls and one source of income in the vicinity towns (one butcher stall in Reichenbach, 3 butcher stalls and a rent from another stall in Münsterberg, one butcher stall and one shoe stall in Strzelin). Out of a total area of monastic demesne of c. 2300 ha (c. 2150 ha for the immediate vicinity), probably c. 580 ha (roughly 23 great hides; c. 370 ha or roughly 15 great hides in the monastic vicinity) only were plowed. The number of monks around 1300 was c. 40, laybrothers: c. 25 and *familiars* c. 29. Thus, as at least 92 men were needed to cultivate the court land (4 men per hide), the chief labour force in monastic courts, apart from laybrothers and *familiars*, were dependent peasants. Out of approximately 735 Marks gross income of the house around 1300, c. 425 Marks comprised demesne income, c. 56 Marks came from the vicinity non-demesne land, c. 131 Marks from non-German law villages, c. 70 Marks from German law villages, c. 35 Marks from tithes and c. 18 Marks from urban stalls.⁴³

⁴³ For monastic estate development, organisation, labour force and the context see Pater, *LF*, Book I. 2-10: 118-153, Book II. 1-7: 156-192; *Ordinatio*, in Pater, *LF*, 195-199; *SU* 1.2,

In order to develop an efficient demesne economy (which was practically the only way for monastic vicinity estates), the monastery had to secure sufficient resources of draught beasts. As a team of 4 oxen was needed to cultivate c. 14 ha (2/3 arable land and 1/3 fallow), c. 166 oxen (c. 42 teams) were needed for a monastic demesne of 580 ha. This feature definitely necessitated developments in monastic husbandry. Moreover, as the house could not have counted on external support, the monks had to make use of various opportunities to secure the

No. 210: 153-154, No. 252: 184-185, No. 290: 213-214; *SU* 1.3, No. 371: 295-296; *SU* 2, No. 123-124: 80-82, No. 138: 90, No. 167: 107-108, No. 172: 110-111, No. 196: 124, No. 241: 145, No. 270: 162, No. 323: 190-191, No. 392: 249, No. 429: 271-273, No. 431: 274-275; *SU* 3, No. 46: 41, No. 58: 48-49, No. 97: 71-72, No. 124-125: 89-91, No. 141: 99-100, No. 150-151: 106-107, No. 179: 123, No. 251: 166-167, No. 281: 186-187, No. 298: 197, No. 418: 277, No. 419: 278, No. 424: 280-281, No. 437: 288, No. 448: 294-295, No. 452: 298-299, No. 482: 311-312, No. 586-587: 372-375; *SU* 4, No. 48-49: 43-47, No. 67-68: 58-60, No. 78: 65-66, No. 84: 68-69, No. 95-96: 75-76, No. 190: 135, No. 301: 203-204, No. 320: 214, No. 348: 230-231, No. 350-351: 232-233, No. 364: 242, No. 398: 266, No. 409: 274; *SU* 5, No. 1: 1, No. 13-14: 12-15, No. 22: 19-20, No. 23: 20-21, No. 25: 22, No. 27: 22-23, No. 59-60: 49-50, No. 90-91: 70-72, No. 93: 72-74, No. 158: 127, No. 217: 174-175, No. 261: 206-207, No. 267: 210-211, No. 287: 223-227, No. 292: 230-232, No. 317: 250-251, No. 370-371: 292-293, No. 453-454: 348-350; *SU* 6, No. 14: 13-14, No. 65: 51-54, No. 91: 77-79, No. 109: 193, No. 113: 95, No. 117: 97-98, No. 123: 104-105, No. 173: 139-140, No. 248-250: 199-200, No. 257: 208, No. 260: 209-210, No. 265: 212-213, No. 282: 226-227, No. 292: 233-234, No. 299: 239-240, No. 308: 246-247, No. 368: 290, No. 418: 320-324, No. 437: 339, No. 444: 345-346; Wattenbach, ed., *Das Formelbuch*, 166-168; *DMCT*, No. 31: 24-25, No. 41: 33, No. 43: 34, No. 50: 39, No. 61: 48-50; Schulte, "Heinrichau und Münsterberg," Appendix 6: 144-149, Appendix 7: 149-153; *SR 1301-1315*, eds. Colmar Grünhagen and Conrad Wutke, in *CDS* 16 (Breslau: Max, 1892), No. 3477: 283; *SR 1316-1326*, No. 3552: 4-5, No. 3802: 83-84; *Liber Vite Sancte Marie Virginis in Heinrichow*, Biblioteka Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, Ms. IV F 219, 2 r-5 v, 6 v-10 v, 11 v-61 r; Kozak, Tarnas-Tomczyk, and Wójcik, "Henryków," 65-66; Grüger, *Heinrichau*, 3-5, 9-30, 79-80, 84-92, 94-95, 99-116, 122-130, 132-133, 138, 140-141, 143; id., "Der Nekrolog des Klosters Heinrichau (ca. 1280 - 1550) T. 1," *Archiv für Schlesische Kirchengeschichte* 31 (1973): 48-52, 54-59; Rościszewski, "Wspólnota zmarłych w świetle najstarszych wpisów do Nekrologu Henrykowskiego" (The "community of the dead" in light of the oldest records unto the Necrologue of Henryków), in *Klasztor w społeczeństwie średniowiecznym i nowożytnym* (A monastery in the medieval and modern society), ed. Marek Derwich and Anna Pobóg-Lenartowicz (Institutum Historicum Universitatis Opoliensis, Institutum Historicum Universitatis Wratislaviensis. Opera ad historiam monasticam spectantia, S. I, Coll. 2, ed. Marek Derwich) (Opole, Wrocław: LARHCOR, 1996), 199-210; Grzegorz Żabiński, "Die Einträge der "zweiten Hand" zum Heinrichauer Totenbuch." *Archiv für Schlesische Kirchengeschichte* 61 (2003): 257-265; Trawkowski, *Gospodarka*, 37, 49-59, 63-81, 86-88, 91-94, 102, 107-111, 116-126, 128-129, 141-142, 152-156, 158-159, 163-166; Dąbrowski, *Rozwój*, 18, 23-24, 33-41, 52-59, 68-86, 95, 100-102, 104-111, 113-114, 120, 124-125; Andrzej Wyczański, "Gospodarka wiejska w Polsce XIV wieku w ujęciu liczbowym (próba oceny)" (Rural economy in fourteenth-century Poland in a quantitative approach (an attempt at estimation), *Roczniki Dziejów Społecznych i Gospodarczych* 62 (2002): 169, 172; a summary of Henryków's estates and a tentative calculation of income (based on the afore-mentioned data) after Żabiński, *Mogiła and Henryków*, 225-235.

existence of the house. Husbandry represented one such possibility which was additionally facilitated by good topographic and settlement conditions, such as an abundance of pastures and meadows or a relatively low level of population. Furthermore, a well-developed husbandry opened up new economic opportunities, like clothmaking. On the other hand, to succeed it required a development of market access points: as it was shown above, Henryków secured trading posts in the neighbouring towns and organised a sort of market-place at the monastery itself.

Monastic animals as gifts and objects of exchange

In 1234, Henryków reimbursed a local nobleman 28 Marks for a battle charger, offered by the latter to the Duke, Henryk the Bearded. It was part of a compromise reached over the monastic part of the Bukowina forest, seized by the Duke and then granted to the nobleman. In order to get the forest back, the monks had to reimburse the nobleman for his gift.⁴⁴

Of interest is the high price of such a horse. In the afore-mentioned story of the monastic redemption of Jaworowice in 1255, the monks donated three horses worth 10 Marks each to the Duke and his officials.⁴⁵ Thus, the charger offered to Henryk the Bearded was no doubt a specially bred and trained animal.

The role of animals as objects of exchange is also notable in the monastic acquisition of Brukalice in the 1250s–1260s. This estate was held by a Polish petty noble family and its total size was 9 small hides (c. 135 ha). Due to inheritance divisions it was probably fairly difficult for the nobles to make it profitable. Thus, they exchanged their land with the monks for monastic estates in Great Poland and Upper Silesia. The land given by the monks was also accompanied with gifts in commodities, including livestock. In the first exchange deal from 1253, the two nobles, Bogusza and Paweł, exchanged their 3 small hides (c. 45 ha) in Brukalice for an equal quantity of land in Great Poland. They also received 2 horses worth 3 Marks, 4 oxen worth 2.5 Marks, 2 cows worth 1 Mark, 5 pigs worth 6 gr each, and 8 measures of rye worth 1 Mark. Apart from that, they received 1 Mark for their first trip to Great Poland and were leased 2 carts with 8 horses for 2 Marks for the other trip with their families.⁴⁶ In 1259, after Bogusza and Paweł sold their land in Great Poland back to the monks, the two nobles exchanged their newly inherited share in Brukalice (1.5 small hides or ca. 22.5 ha) for twice as much monastic land in Upper Silesia. Again, they

⁴⁴ Pater, *LF*, Book I. 8: 133-137; *SU* 1.3, No. 371: 295-296.

⁴⁵ Pater, *LF*, Book I. 6: 131; *SU* 3, No. 150: 106.

⁴⁶ Pater, *LF*, Book I. 10: 147-153; the charter from 1253 see also *SU* 3, No. 97: 71-72; the charter from 1256 *ibid.*, No. 179: 123; the charter from 1257 *ibid.*, No. 251: 166-167; Trawkowski, *Gospodarka*, 68, 71; Dąbrowski, *Rozwój*, 104-108; Gröger, *Heinrichau*, 11-15, 21, 111.

were also given a horse worth 1.5 Mark each, a cow with a calf, two oxen, five sheep, and five pigs.⁴⁷

Due to inheritance divisions among the heirs of Brukalice, the amount of available land diminished and efficient estate organisation impeded. Thus, it would have hardly been possible to implement a regular three-field system. Due to a lack of pastures and meadows, it was not possible to increase livestock numbers. An insufficient number of draught beasts rendered the use of better cultivation tools impossible.⁴⁸ When Bogusza and Paweł first traveled to Great Poland in 1253, they received 2 horses and 4 oxen. For their travel to Upper Silesia in 1259, they received 2 horses and 2 oxen. Counting 4 oxen or 2 horses for one plow-team for c. 14 ha, one gets to a plowing capacity of c. 28 ha for the livestock received in 1253 may be calculated. This would have been sufficient to plow c. 30 ha available annually out of c. 45 ha which they had received in both cases.⁴⁹ This suggests that both nobles possessed very little livestock in Brukalice. As they were offered both land and livestock (the other was probably a *conditio sine qua non*) in exchange for their share in Brukalice, they probably considered such a deal to be very beneficial. Furthermore, mentions of prices become interesting when compared to previous data concerning the Bukowina and the Jaworowice affairs. The variety of horse breeds is notable: a battle charger worth 28 Marks, a riding-horse worth 10 Marks and a draught horse for only 1.5 Marks.

Conclusions

The afore-mentioned features of monastic economies are part of a broader phenomenon. Husbandry was generally a very important part of Cistercian economies. This was followed by the particular interest of the monks in acquiring pastures.⁵⁰ In some cases, land was even re-forested by the Cistercians in order to secure additional pasture for livestock.⁵¹ Sheep husbandry and its natural outcome, that is, wool trade and textile production, were a core branch of the economies of several Cistercian monasteries. This was especially relevant for some Flemish, French and English houses, where the number of sheep could

⁴⁷ *SU* 3, No. 298: 197, for further deals concerning the estates see also *ibid.*, No. 418-419: 277-278, No. 424: 280-281; Gröger, *Heinrichau*, 14, 21, 111, 115;

⁴⁸ Dąbrowski, *Rozwój*, 41, 54-58, 68-78, 83.

⁴⁹ Pater, *LF*, Book I. 10: 148-149; *SU* 3, No. 97: 71-72, No. 298: 197; Dąbrowski, *Rozwój*, 100-101, 106, 114.

⁵⁰ Louis J. Lékai, *The Cistercians: Ideals and Reality* (Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1977), 319-320; Coburn V. Graves, "The Economic Activities of the Cistercians in Medieval England 1128 – 1307," *Analecta Sancti Ordinis Cisterciensis* 13 (1957): 14-15.

⁵¹ Wolfgang Ribbe, "Die Wirtschaftstätigkeit der Zisterzienser im Mittelalter: Agrarwirtschaft," in *Die Zisterzienser. Ordensleben zwischen Ideal und Wirklichkeit. Katalog zur Ausstellung des Landschaftsverbandes Rheinland*, ed. Kaspar Elm (Rheinisches Museumsamt, Brauweiler. Schriften des Rheinischen Museumsamtes 10) (Cologne: Rheinland Verlag, 1981), 210.

have even been as high as 2000-4000 animals, and wool-related incomes played a crucial role in monastic budgets.⁵² Another important component of Cistercian economies was fish. Apart from serving the houses' own needs, the market orientation of monastic fisheries is also notable in numerous cases.⁵³ All this was complemented by the involvement of Cistercian houses in trade, the acquisition of urban courts and trading posts as well as the organisation of monastic market-places.⁵⁴ Thus, the monastic animal-related economy was intertwined with other aspects of Cistercian economic activities.

⁵² Lékai, *The Cistercians*, 312-315; Graves, "The Economic Activities," 19-32; Roth, "Die Wirtschaftsgeschichte," 559; Williams, *The Cistercians*, 207-209, 346-351, 355-361; Constance H. Berman, *Medieval Agriculture, the Southern French Countryside, and the Early Cistercians. A Study of Forty-Three Monasteries* (Transactions of the American Philosophical Society 76.5) (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1986), 95-97; Ribbe, "Die Wirtschaftstätigkeit der Zisterzienser im Mittelalter: Agrarwirtschaft," 209-210; Werner Rösener, "Grangienwirtschaft und Grundbesitzorganisation südwestdeutscher Zisterzienserklöster vom 12. bis 14. Jahrhundert," in *Die Zisterzienser. Ordensleben zwischen Ideal und Wirklichkeit*, 150; Winfried Schich, "Die Wirtschaftstätigkeit der Zisterzienser im Mittelalter: Handel und Gewerbe," *ibid.*, 220-230; James Eugene Madden, "Business monks, banker monks, bankrupt monks: the English Cistercians in the 13th century," *Catholic Historical Review* 49.3 (1963): 342 ff.

⁵³ Ribbe, "Die Wirtschaftstätigkeit der Zisterzienser im Mittelalter: Agrarwirtschaft," 210-211; Lékai, *The Cistercians*, 318-319; Graves, "The Economic Activities," 16; Roth, "Die Wirtschaftsgeschichte," 557-558, 566; Winfried Schich, "Die Gestaltung der Kulturlandschaft im engeren Umkreis der Zisterzienserklöster zwischen mittlerer Elbe und Oder," in *Zisterzienser. Norm. Kultur. Reform—900 Jahre Zisterzienser*, ed. Ulrich Kniefelkamp (Berlin and Heidelberg: Springer, 2001), 189; Williams, *The Cistercians*, 365-370; Richard C. Hoffman, "Medieval Cistercian Fisheries, Natural and Artificial," in *L'espace cistercien*, ed. Léon Pressouyre (Ministère de l'Enseignement supérieur et de la Recherche. Comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques. Mémoires de la section d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'art 5) (Paris: Editions du CTHS, 1994), 401-414.

⁵⁴ Winfried Schich, "Zum Problem des Einstiegs der Zisterzienser in den Handel im 12. Jahrhundert unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Ordensstatutes "De nundinis", in *Historia i kultura cystersów w Polsce i ich europejskie związki* (History and culture of the Cistercians in Poland and their European relations), ed. Jerzy Strzelczyk (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Adama Mickiewicza, 1987), 45-57; *id.*, "Die Wirtschaftstätigkeit der Zisterzienser im Mittelalter: Handel und Gewerbe," 220-228; *id.*, "Der Handel der rheinischen Zisterzienserklöster und die Einrichtung ihrer Stadthöfe im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert," in *Die niederrheinischen Zisterzienser im späten Mittelalter: Reformbemühungen, Wirtschaft und Kultur*, ed. Raymund Kottje (Zisterzienser im Rheinland 3. Cologne: Rheinland-Verlag, 1992), 49-73; *id.*, "Die Gestaltung der Kulturlandschaft," 190-192; Wolfgang Bender, *Zisterzienser und Städte. Studien zu den Beziehungen zwischen den Zisterzienserklöstern und den großen urbanen Zentren des mittleren Moselraumes (12.-14. Jahrhundert)* (Trierer Historische Forschungen 20) (Trier: Verlag Trierer Historische Forschungen, 1992), *passim*; Lékai, *The Cistercians*, 311, 320; Williams, *The Cistercians*, 385-395; Rösener, "Grangienwirtschaft und Grundbesitzorganisation," 151-152; Roth, "Die Wirtschaftsgeschichte," 558-559, 564; Reinhard Schneider, "Stadthöfe der Zisterzienser: Zu ihrer Funktion und Bedeutung," *Zisterzienser-Studien* 4 (1979): 11-28; Berman, *Medieval Agriculture*, 4, 82-83, 102, 120-125; Constance Brittain Bouchard, *Holy Entrepreneurs:*

From the point of view of the present paper, the most important point is the relationship between the general orientation of a house's economy (in this case, rent- or demesne-based one) and its animal-related activities. As has been demonstrated for Southern France, the importance of livestock and pastoralism was crucial for monasteries based on demesne economy (as for Henryków). Animal husbandry provided monasteries with financial resources especially in the initial phase of their existence. Moreover, as husbandry supplied the necessary draught beasts to monastic granges, it played an essential role in the monastic demesne economy keeping it superior to that of local small landholders.⁵⁵

Therefore, development of monastic husbandry and organisation of efficient demesne were features which doubtlessly mutually conditioned each other.

Cistercians, Knights, and Economic Exchange in Twelfth-Century Burgundy (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1991), 112-114; Graves, "The Economic Activities," 12-13;

⁵⁵ Berman, *Medieval Agriculture*, passim, with special reference to 75-117, 144-147 and appendix II; from one point of view, the Silesian house of Kamiemiec could be another interesting example. This house, originally an Austin Canon foundation taken over by the Cistercians in 1248-1249, was (like Henryków) situated in a sparsely populated highland borderland. The monastery held rich tithes (one of the most important source of monastic revenues), but foundation land estates were rather poor. Although the majority of land estates were peasant villages, the house developed a system of demesne in the monastic neighbourhood. Husbandry played an important role in the monastic economy as a source of draught beasts for demesne. Of special prominence was sheep husbandry, which gave rise to a development of monastic weaving. This was complemented with numerous monastic acquisitions of trading posts in vicinity towns and with organisation of a marketplace; see Heinrich Gröger, "Schlesisches Klosterbuch. Kamenz," *Jahrbuch der Schlesischen Friedrich-Wilhelm-Universität zu Breslau* 21 (1980): 84-87, 93-94, 97, 98-99; Stanisław Kozak, Agata Tarnas-Tomczyk, and Marek L. Wójcik, "Kamieniec," in *MCP* 2: 113-118; Franciszek Lenczowski, "Zarys działalności gospodarczej cystersów kamienieckich na Śląsku w wiekach średnich" (A sketch of the economic activity of the Kamieniec Cistercians in the Middle Ages), *Kwartalnik Opolski* 9.2 (1963): 25-37.

ANIMAL DIVERSITIES

Edited by

Gerhard Jaritz and Alice Choyke

MEDIUM AEVUM QUOTIDIANUM

HERAUSGEGEBEN VON GERHARD JARITZ

SONDERBAND XVI

ANIMAL DIVERSITIES

Edited by

Gerhard Jaritz and Alice Choyke

Krems 2005

GEDRUCKT MIT UNTERSTÜTZUNG DER ABTEILUNG
KULTUR UND WISSENSCHAFT DES AMTES
DER NIEDERÖSTERREICHISCHEN LANDESREGIERUNG

niederösterreich kultur

Cover illustration:
The Beaver,
Hortus Sanitatis (Strassburg: Johannes Prüm the Older, c. 1499),
Tractatus de Animalibus, capitulum xxxi: *Castor*.

Alle Rechte vorbehalten
– ISBN 3-90 1094 19 9

Herausgeber: Medium Aevum Quotidianum. Gesellschaft zur Erforschung der materiellen Kultur des Mittelalters, Körnermarkt 13, A-3500 Krems, Österreich. Für den Inhalt verantwortlich zeichnen die Autoren, ohne deren ausdrückliche Zustimmung jeglicher Nachdruck, auch in Auszügen, nicht gestattet ist. – Druck: Grafisches Zentrum an der Technischen Universität Wien, Wiedner Hauptstraße 8-10, 1040 Wien.

Table of Contents

Preface	7
Aleksander Pluskowski, Wolves and Sheep in Medieval Semiotics, Iconology and Ecology: a Case Study of Multi- and Inter-disciplinary Approaches to Human-Animal Relations in the Historical Past	9
Alice M. Choyke, Kyra Lyublyanovics, László Bartosiewicz, The Various Voices of Medieval Animal Bones	23
Grzegorz Żabiński, Swine for Pearls? Animals in the Thirteenth-Century Cistercian Houses of Henryków and Mogiła	50
Krisztina Fügedi, Bohemian Sheep, Hungarian Horses, and Polish Wild Boars: Animals in Twelfth-Century Central European Chronicles	66
Hilary Powell, Walking and Talking with the Animals: the Role of Fauna in Anglo-Latin Saints' Lives	89
Gerhard Jaritz, Oxen and Hogs, Monkeys and Parrots: Using "Familiar" and "Unfamiliar" Fauna in Late Medieval Visual Representation	107
Sarah Wells, A Database of Animals in Medieval Misericords	123
Zsófia Buda, Animals and Gazing at Women: Zoocephalic Figures in the Tripartite Mahzor	136
Taxiarchis G. Kolias, Man and Animals in the Byzantine World	165
Ingrid Matschinegg, (M)edieval (A)nimal (D)atabase: a Project in Progress	167