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ABSTRACT

CENTRALITY AND PARISH CHURCHES IN THE MIDDLE AGES IN THE TOWNLESS REGIONS OF HUNGARY

The region analyzed comprised two areas, namely North-Eastern Hungary and Southern Transdanubia, which are considered regions without towns in the medieval town network. Due to the lack of ‘real’ towns, other settlements had to fulfil the urban functions and these settlements might have been market towns. The paper discusses the connection between the parish churches and market towns, examining the number of altars and chapels, the existence of hospitals, the existence of two or more churches, and the differences in area as an important indicator of their centrality. It can be concluded that the churches belonging to Group 1. surpass the rest in all respects; particular settlements that belong to Group 2. might partly be classified in this category. The churches of Group 3. constitute a transitional category between the city and village churches, whilst those of Group 4. share the features of village churches.
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INTRODUCTION

Based on the central place theory applied to medieval Hungary by András Kubinyi the study of the third and last phase of medieval Hungarian town development – the period of market town development – has shifted its focus in the last 20 years. The core of the theory is examining the functions of settlements and based on this data placing them in a criteria scheme and settlement hierarchy.1 Kubinyi examined

Map 1. The analyzed market towns and central places on the recent map of Hungary
a number of criteria which were not included in the final theory, principally because of the lack of source material. These possible criteria are introduced in his other works.

The present study examined market town parish churches following Kubinyi’s ideas mentioned above. The aim of this study is to analyse the role of market town parish churches in the groups of the criteria scheme by Kubinyi and to compare the examined groups with the examined country regions. The urban functions of market towns have been widely debated in Hungarian scholarly circles. My analyses aim to find out what role parish churches played in the process of market town development and thus to what extent do market towns, especially a certain group of them, fulfil urban functions.

EXAMINED REGIONS

In the medieval town network the northeastern part of Hungary and the Southern Transdanubia (especially its southwestern part) are considered to be regions without towns. Regions without towns are regions where there were no or very few ‘real’ towns (towns under royal authority, episcopal seats). Given the lack of ‘real’ towns, other – smaller – settlements had to fulfil the urban functions and these settlements might have been the market towns. As Kubinyi’s scheme divides characteristics of urbanism into groups thus enabling classification among market towns as well, it is of great importance for the present study.

THE CONNECTION BETWEEN SETTLEMENT NETWORK AND GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATION

The geographical characteristics of the two regions examined in this study are rather different. Northeastern Hungary is mainly dominated by the North Hungarian Range – the southern part of the Carpathians – and is the meeting point of highlands and lowlands. The most influential central settlements, the market towns were either built along international trade routes or along smaller, local trade routes running at the foot of mountains, in the river valleys. Southern Transdanubia is characteristically different from a geographical point of view. The Transdanubian Hills entwine the southern and western side of Lake Balaton and is highly dissected by hills, alluvial cones, river valleys, and flat washlands. In connection with the analysis of the
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central settlements of the Southern Transdanubia András Kubinyi pointed out that the rate of village market places and villages is 32% in the region, compared with the ratio of 22% of the region of the Great Hungarian Plain. The difference might have been caused—knowing the geographical characteristics—by the dissected geographical landscape. Maybe this more even distribution is behind the higher rate of village market places in the Southern Transdanubia, one of the region under my examination.3

THE GROUPS EXAMINED WITHIN THE CRITERIA SCHEME

I took Kubinyi’s criteria and point system as a starting point in choosing the central places to be analysed, however I did not include all his seven groups. I left out his first, second and seventh groups, namely the first-rate (greater) towns, the second rate towns, and the villages fulfilling central functions.4 The reason behind my ignoring them was that they included the so-called real towns or villages where markets sometimes did take place.5

The examined groups are: Group 1. smaller towns and market towns holding key functions (21–30 points); Group 2. market towns holding medium urban functions (16–20 points); Group 3. market towns holding partly urban functions (11–15 points); Group 4. average market towns and villages of a market town nature (6–10 points).6 After working out his system and analysing a significant section of Hungary, Kubinyi concluded, that the dividing line between oppida and towns is to be found around 15–16 points. Thus, central settlements—irrespective of their legal status—with a score above 16 must be considered part of the town network system. The group with the score between 11 and 15 points may be considered a transitional group. On the one hand they are transitional because of the lack of source material which prevents them from gaining more points and thus being classified in a group with higher scores. On the other hand they are called transitional as both the urban and rural characteristics are to be found in their case.7

ALTARS AND CHAPELS IN PARISH CHURCHES

Formation of altars and chapels in town parish churches in the 15th and the 16th century followed one another and soon became an important part of church life and

3 A. Kubinyi, Városok, mezővárosok, pp. 27, 36, 39.
5 Ibidem, pp. 15–38.
6 Hereafter I will allude as Group 1., 2., 3. and 4. to the examined categories.
7 A. Kubinyi, Városok, mezővárosok, p. 16.
also an indicator of the financial growth of the citizens. Their formation meant that these parish churches rose above other churches in hierarchy, and thus also indicated the position of towns in settlement hierarchy.

The increase in the number of chapels in the greater settlements in medieval Hungary began in the first half of the 15th century and became especially rapid in the period after 1470. This was also the period of the flourishing height of market town development when market town parish churches were changing as well. Thus, formation of altars and chapels further emphasized the urban features of oppida.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of settlement</th>
<th>Date of sources and the name of altar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debrecen</td>
<td>15th–16th century St. Stephen protomartyr, St. Peter, St. Catherine, St. Ladislaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gönc</td>
<td>1524 2 altarists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gyöngyös</td>
<td>around 1500 St. Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miskolc</td>
<td>1483 St. Catherine, 1495 St. Mary, 1502 St. Benedict, 1522 St. John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sárospatak</td>
<td>1435 and 1438 St. Nicholas, St. Mary, St. Lucas, St. Simon and Jude, Body of Christ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szikszó</td>
<td>1429 2 altarists, 1483 St. Mary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

11 MNL, DF 218205.
13 MNL, DL 105615.
14 MNL, DL 57141.
15 MNL, DL 84018.
19 *Oklevélútár a gróf Csáky család történetéhez I/1, Oklevelek 1229–1499-ig*, ed. L. Bártfai Szabó, Budapest 1919, p. 462.
### Group 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kisvárda</td>
<td>1423 St. Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagykálló</td>
<td>1351 Holy Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagykanizsa</td>
<td>1430 St. Salvator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozora</td>
<td>1531 St. Andrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pásztó</td>
<td>1459 altarist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segesd</td>
<td>1475 Holy Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolnavár</td>
<td>1478 altar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Group 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Babócsa</td>
<td>1501 St. Giles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bátaszék</td>
<td>1428 altar portabile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunaszekcső</td>
<td>1429 St. Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kőröshegy</td>
<td>1493 altarista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sátoraljaújhely</td>
<td>between 1420–1444 altarista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somogyvár</td>
<td>1455 St. Stephen protomartyr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szerencs</td>
<td>1524 altarista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamási</td>
<td>1433 altar portabile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Group 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Babarc</td>
<td>1429 St. Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bélavár</td>
<td>1496 St. Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodrogkeresztúr</td>
<td>first half of 16th century St. Catherine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fehérgyarmat</td>
<td>1448 Michael archangel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forró</td>
<td>1430 altar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hejőcsaba</td>
<td>1502 altarista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hetes</td>
<td>1496 St. Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lábod</td>
<td>1492 All Saints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcali</td>
<td>1456 St. Ladislaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pellérd</td>
<td>1542 2 altarists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somogyszil</td>
<td>1524 altar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somogytúr</td>
<td>1500 All Saints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zalaegerszeg</td>
<td>1540 altarista</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The formation of altars and chapels financed by market town citizens shows their claim to the contribution of church finances in proportion with their wealth. In return they used the inner areas of churches, e.g. in order to pray for salvation. Besides forming chapels and altars they also laid a claim to be buried inside the church as a crucial part of their advowson.

Market towns ranking higher in the hierarchy were, in many respects, rather similar to free royal towns, and tried to imitate them with their buildings or donations. However, there has always been a dividing line which they could not or did not want to cross, so they were always ranked lower than free towns. The example of

---

20 MNL, DL 87971.
22 P. Lukcsics, op. cit., I, Nr. 1361.
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Miskolc in 1508 – in connection with gilds and altar formation – shows this role of market towns, when the gild functioned as an organisation in the formation of the altar. Interestingly they did not form a new altar but chose from the existing ones.\textsuperscript{50} Furthermore, this is the only example in the case of the examined settlements when the gild functioned as an organisation in the formation of an altar. Also in the case of chapel formations belonging to the church we do know about one example when the tailor gild of Gyöngyös have had a chapel (the St. Anna chapel) built next to the parish church.\textsuperscript{51} This few examples suggest that it was probably these settlements which fulfilled the urban functions in areas without towns.

Chapels can be divided into 2 groups: chapels inside the church and chapels outside the church. Chapels inside the church are indicators of the economic power of citizens of late medieval towns. Religious disposition and the desire to redeem salvation coincided with the desire to represent and with the opportunity to execute it.

\textbf{Chart 2: Chapels inside the church}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of settlement</th>
<th>Date of sources and name of chapel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 1.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gyöngyös</td>
<td>15\textsuperscript{th} century St. Anna\textsuperscript{52}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miskolc</td>
<td>1489 St. Mary and St. Michael archangel\textsuperscript{53}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 2.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pécsvárad</td>
<td>1428 St. Mary\textsuperscript{54}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 3.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babócsa</td>
<td>1455 St. Mary\textsuperscript{55}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kálmáncsa</td>
<td>1455 St. Mary\textsuperscript{56}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 4.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gyöngyöspata</td>
<td>13\textsuperscript{th} century St. Andrew\textsuperscript{57}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mátraverbély</td>
<td>1400 Trinity and St. Mary Magdalene\textsuperscript{58}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szepetnek</td>
<td>1492 chapel\textsuperscript{59}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{50} MNL, DL 39386.  
\textsuperscript{52} Ibidem.  
\textsuperscript{53} MNL, DL 83949, Miskolcz város története és egyetemes helyirata III, ed. J. Szendrei, Miskolc 1890, pp. 120–122.  
\textsuperscript{54} P. Lukcsics, op. cit., I, Nr. 994.  
\textsuperscript{55} MNI, DL 14915.  
\textsuperscript{56} Ibidem.  
\textsuperscript{57} F. Levárdy, Gyöngyöspata, plébániatemplom, Budapest 1984, p. 2.  
\textsuperscript{58} Monumenta Vaticana historiam regni Hungariae illustrantia I/4 Bullae Bonifacii IX. p. m., Budapest 1888, Nr. 311.  
\textsuperscript{59} Monumenta romana episcopatus Vesprimiensis III, Nr. 480.
Chapels outside the church were first mentioned in 14th century sources and their formation was probably triggered by the growth in the number of inhabitants and the geographical expansion of these settlements. Two types of chapels should not be included in the aforementioned group. One is the subcategory of cemetery chapels which did not serve the everyday religious life of the community. Another subgroup is the castle chapel which were formed by the advowee himself – sometimes to the honour of his patron saint, as in the case of Ozora – for its own and his family salvation, and to the fulfilment of the religious needs of his court. To this last subcategory belongs the question of boundaries of the parson which was examined – in connection with free boroughs – by Marie-Madeleine de Cevins; however, because of the lack of accurate data her results are questionable.

### Chart 3.: Chapels outside the church

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of settlement</th>
<th>Date of sources and name of chapel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debrecen</td>
<td>end of 14th century All Saints’ and St. Elizabeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>first part of 15th century St. Nichola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gyöngyös</td>
<td>15th century St. Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miskolc</td>
<td>1376 St. George</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Group 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Chapel/Altar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nyírbátor</td>
<td>1433 Body of Christ(^{69})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozora</td>
<td>1420 St. Anna(^{70})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segesd</td>
<td>1455 St. John the Baptist(^{71})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolnaúr</td>
<td>1553 St. Bartholomew(^{72})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Group 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Chapel/Altar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bátaszék</td>
<td>1470 St. Thomas and St. Sophia(^{73})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keszthely</td>
<td>1247 St. Martin and St. Lawrence(^{74})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poroszló</td>
<td>1420 St. Jacob(^{75})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamási</td>
<td>1432 All Saints(^{76})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telkibánya</td>
<td>before 1367 chapel(^{77})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Group 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Chapel/Altar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iregszemcse</td>
<td>1531 chapel(^{78})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keszthöléc</td>
<td>1437 St. Michael(^{79})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Independent chapels outside the church are mentioned in the 14th century or earlier, while the spread of chapels within the church – together with altar formations – was in the 15th century, especially in the last decades of the century. In the first half of the century primarily the greater settlements and centres were mentioned, while records from the 16th century usually refer to churches of settlements lowest at the hierarchy. The period of the increase in the number of chapel and altar formations in market town parish churches coincided with the period of market town urbanization, which could primarily be traced in the case of churches classified into higher categories. Consequently there is a connection between the formation of altars and the place of central settlements and town markets in the settlement hierarchy.
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\(^{69}\) Középkori oklevelék a Szabolcs-Szatmár-Bereg Megyei Levéltárban (1300–1525), ed. G. Érsze-gi, Nyíregyháza 2000, Nr. 50.

\(^{70}\) P. Lukcsics, op. cit., I, Nr. 284..

\(^{71}\) MNL, DL 14915.

\(^{72}\) A.K. Németh, op. cit., p. 166.

\(^{73}\) Ibidem, p. 40.

\(^{74}\) Hazai okmánytár VI, ed. A. Ipolyi, Győr 1876, Nr. 33.


\(^{76}\) P. Lukcsics, op. cit., II, Nr. 72.

\(^{77}\) MNL, DL 5783.

\(^{78}\) A Héderváry-család.

\(^{79}\) P. Lukcsics, op.cit., II, Nr. 443, Nr. 444.
Hospitals functioned since early medieval times in Hungary and their number began to increase at the turn of the 13th and 14th century. Marie-Madeleine de Cevins placed the multiplication of hospitals into the last phase of urbanization, after the mid-15th century. She also pointed to the fact, that certain towns were unable to finance such institutions even at the end of the 15th century, and there were barely any such institutions in small market towns and villages at all.

According to sources, hospitals only functioned in market towns and towns. However, there has not been any thorough study in Hungary about the connection between hospitals and towns yet. In the 1940s, Lajos Pásztor and Zoltán Somogyi were the first to try to collect data about medieval hospitals. Their work was continued by András Kubinyi, and the latest general work was published by Judit Majorossy and Katalin Szende. While summoning the available sources of the topic they pointed out to their contingency, eventuality, and disproportionateness. They also called attention to the fact that the vast majority of hospitals were established in either the second half of the 14th century or in the first half of the 15th century thus following the rhythm of intense urbanisation which also took place in this period. At the end of the 15th century almost each hospitals were municipal institutions, although supervision was divided with the parson of the settlement or other churches. However, this was less characteristic of bishop towns and oppida as in these cases advowsons remained vested in the local landowner or the parson. Consequently, hospitals played an important role in the townscape and the hierarchy of church buildings and their relationship with the local parish church and its priests was equally important.

Hospitals in the Northeastern Hungary were usually to be found in Group 1. Their presence obviously affects the values of the criteria scheme by Kubinyi as points are
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81 M.-M. de Cevins, A szegények és a betegek gondozása a középkor végi magyar városokban, “Korall” 2003, no. 11–12, p. 49.
82 L. Pásztor, A magyarság vallásos élete a Jagellók korában, Budapest 1940, pp. 50–65; Z. Somogyi, A középkori Magyarország szegényügye, Budapest 1941.
87 Ibidem, p. 437.
assigned to settlements with hospitals. Their ratio – even in this smaller area under examination – justifies their relevant role in examining central sites. However, in the case of the examined market towns of Group 2. in the Southern Transdanubia only Nagykanizsa had a hospital, which is in sharp contrast with the aforementioned region. Although Nagykanizsa was a significant oppidium and an important estate, it does not explain why only Nagykanizsa had a hospital in the Southern Transdanubian region. Furthermore, a nationwide study about the role of hospitals showed that hospitals were only to be found in settlements belonging to the high category. The main reason beyond this phenomenon might be that in this region, because of geographical characteristic, central sites were densely located, thus the vast majority of settlements belong to Group 3. and 4. These, however, cannot be considered as significant central sites as those in which landowners or the population was able to establish and maintain such institutions.

THE HISTORY OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF MARKET TOWN PARISH CHURCHES – PROCESS OF THE HISTORY OF BUILDING CONSTRUCTION

The most important period concerning our study of the history of the building construction of churches was the 14th and 15th century. In this period the reconstruction of market town parish churches began and ended. 15th century is usually considered to be the main period of market town urbanization as there is far too little information about the oppida in the 14th century. In the second half of the 14th century, from the northeastern region Miskolc, Sárospatak and Sárosaljájhely, and from the Southern Transdanubia Dunaföldvár, Ozora, Segesd, Simontornya, Kálmáncsa, and Kőröshegy are first mentioned as oppida. These settlements in Northeastern Hun-
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90 A. Kubinyi, Orvoslás, gyógyszerészek, fürdők és ispotályok a késő középkori Magyarországon, p. 265.
91 J. Majorossy, K. Szende, op. cit., p. 419.
ary are market towns of Group 1. while in the southern Transdanubia market towns of Group 2. and 3. This difference might be explained by the fact that the distribution between categories is different in the southern Transdanubia, as only one settlement belongs to the highest category. Thus, settlements belonging to the two categories under the highest might have fulfilled the functions of the highest category.

Considering the aforementioned, the data about the reconstruction of churches in the 14th and 15th century is highly important. In the categories of smaller towns and market towns holding key functions we do know about extensions, reconstructions in almost each church in the 14th century. Concerning the availability of data, there are only two exemptions: one is the church of Gönc which apse was investigated in 2014, and turned out that the reconstruction of the 18th century destroyed the medieval strata of it, and the other is the unknown medieval parish church of Kapornak. However, in the case of churches with available data, we also have information about reconstructions in the 15th century. In the case of market towns of Group 2. we have no data while in the case of market towns of Group 3. only the church of Babócsa seems similar to the aforementioned tendencies. The exception of the category is Szécsény, its late medieval parish church was being built in this period, but not because of extension plans but due to change in the structure of the settlement.

We know about a lot of reconstructions of churches in Group 4. in the 14th century, and these reconstructions were also usually the last medieval period of reconstructions. This feature shows similarity with village parish churches as we only know about 1–2 cases – churches of Gyöngyöspata and Tar – when these village parish churches were rebuilt in the 15th century.

Based on the above data we can conclude that in the greatest part of market towns of Group 1. reconstructions and extensions in the 14th and 15th century also enlarged the capacity of the church as well.

In the case of the churches of lower categories, especially in the case of Group 3. and 4. the two centuries meant two distinct phases. The 14th century was usually the period of ground space expansion, while the 15th century was the period of the reconstruction of the choir, and the redecoration of the whole interior (paintings, gothic

---

stellar vault). The last was probably supported – especially in the case of smaller settlements – by the patron and the landlord (e.g. in the case of Tar).

Chapels are indications of the need of the enlargement of capacity, the increase of population, and the expansion of the settlement. The appearance of second parish churches in the settlements in the 14th and 15th century was even more suggestive, especially that these second churches gained full parochial rights.

SEVERAL CHURCHES IN A MARKET TOWN

In the late medieval period there were often more than one parish churches in free royal towns. Even in the case of some oppida, investigation into the sources identified the presence of more than one church holding the function of a vicarage in the same settlement. Based on sources available, these settlements can be grouped into two classes:

The first class is constituted by settlements which operated as centres of chief deaneries. These settlements – such as Heves, Tólnavár, Segesd, Somogyvár, Gyöngyöspata – had two churches holding the rights of vicarage. One church was the parish church from the Árpádian Age and the other the deanery church.99

The other class is constituted by settlements with two parish churches built in medieval times. The most prominent example of this was the case of the parish church of Miskolc-Újváros,100 and the formation might have been triggered by more settlements merging into one town, as the example of Debrecen has shown.101

In the 14th century Germans were settled into Szikszó which is also shown by the name of a mount, which was Hungarian mount in 1367,102 but already German mount (monte Teutunicali) in 1406. Thus, one of the parish churches might have belonged to them for a while.103 Similar examples were to be found in Buda104 proving that the formation of more parish churches might have been triggered by multinational settlements where each nationality built their own parish church.

We also know of seven settlements where the existence of two churches has been confirmed by either written or archaeological sources.105 The construction of two

100 1445: P. Lukcsics, op. cit., II, Nr. 827.
102 MNL, DL 5608.
103 MNL, DL 9159.
104 Budapest története a későbbi középkorban és a török hódoltság idején, eds. L. Gerevich, D. Kósáry, Budapest 1973, p. 15.
parish churches might have been triggered in the late Middle Age by demographical changes, population growth, and the increasing population of settlements\(^{106}\) which might have contributed to such an expansion of settlements which also lead to an increase in the number of churches.

**PARISH CHURCHES AND THE GOTHIC ART – THE SURVEY OF PLAN STRUCTURES AND GROUND SPACES OF PARISH CHURCHES**

**The Andrén methodology**

The dimension of parish churches and its changes is vital in the relationship between parish churches and urbanization which aspect may also be one of the controls of the criteria system.\(^{107}\) The methodology that might lead to assessable results and is applicable to this purpose was elaborated by Anders Andrén in connection with his study of medieval towns of Denmark. He intended to evaluate the level of urbanization of settlements so he set up a sequence based on the number and dimensions of the churches in the settlements.\(^{108}\) He examined 112 towns between 1000 and 1550 in his study.

While selecting the aspects of research I had to take into account the differences which were bound to come up in connection with the availability of sources (both written and archaeological) and their varying results. As a result, I chose two aspects to be examined-namely the examination and comparison of ground spaces and that of plan structures – in the case of fully or partly examined churches.

---


Northeastern Hungary

The average ground space of churches in Group 1. is 462 m². This value is circa 355 m² in Group 2., circa 277 m² in Group 3. and circa 180 m² in Group 4. As data show, there are measurable and substantial differences between ground spaces of parish churches in different categories. The most remarkable differences are to be found between the first and the second categories, and especially between the second and third categories. The average dimension diversity between the third and fourth categories is approximately half, one-third of the previous ones. Consequently, we can conclude that churches of the first category definitely rise above churches of other settlements, and the churches of the second category are replicas of the first category on a smaller area. I need to underline that this category is still to be ranked with towns according to Kubinyi.109 Probably this can be seen at the boundary of the second and third clusters as in their case the difference between the averages equals the average dimension of a village church.

However, differences are not only to be found in connection with ground spaces. In churches of the first category the most modern architectural solutions of the age were applied together with high quality design of the interior.110 Only the latter aspect was to be found in the churches of the next category, with the exception of Nyírbátor where the church shows the national role of the landowner Báthori family and the impact of the royal court.111 Exceptions are to be found in every category but these can usually be explained with the lack of source material. Therefore, the ground spaces of churches in each category have been averaged as a mean value is much more reliable and applicable for comparisons. Another sort of example was the case of Somogyvár which was an important religious center in the first phase of the medieval age but failed to become an equally important economic center in the later periods so it did not become a significant market town and its church remained without changes. As the above data shows the use of the Andrén methodology is applicable and relevant in this case.

The comparison highlighted further differences as well. The comparison suggested that reconstruction and ground space expansions of the 15th century were influenced by the appearance of high quality Gothic solutions concerning new space structures, new vault types and other interior decoration elements. Based on this, an even more specific borderline can be drawn between the two categories. The first one is clearly separated while the second one can only be partly connected to it. The other two categories falling behind show a more homogeneous picture where although exceptions occur, regarding quality, their average is not even close to these churches.

However, there are outstanding artistic solutions and replicas of greater churches in this area as well. The portal of the churches in Gyöngyöspata and Abaújszántó resemble the portal of the cathedral of Kassa\(^{112}\) and thus distinguishing them from simple, village-like churches. The presence of such high-quality solution is usually connected to the role of the landowners. This can be seen by inscriptions and coat of arms placed in the churches: in the church of Nyírbátor there was an inscription\(^{113}\) placed above the southern portal; in the church of Pásztó the crest of Rátói family inscription\(^{114}\) in the side chapel; in the church of Gyöngyös the unified coat of arms of Tamás Szécsényi and his wife\(^{115}\) from the 14th century. Sometimes the builder of the church was also depicted on wall paintings, as in the case of the painting in the presbytery of Tar where the kneeling knight might be Lőrinc Tar himself, according to researchers. This assumption is supported by the inscription above the southern portal as well.\(^{116}\) The power of the landowner was well beyond the building of the church, questions might come up in connection with the residence church and advowson.

Referring to the Andrén methodology two important conclusions can be drawn. The first being that in the case of Hungarian oppida, specifically in the categories of Kubinyi examined in this study, the examination of ground spaces and that of their changes does show differences between the categories. The higher a settlement was in the settlement hierarchy the greater was the ground space of its parish church. However, concerning the character of towns, Hungary is characterised by single polarity. The case of duality was more sporadic and was rather characteristic in late medieval times, and was triggered by the expansion of towns, industrial growth, and market town urbanization, as in the case of Miskolc and Paks.

**Southern Transdanubia**

Although I took more settlements under examination in the Southern Transdanubia the data I managed to collect is less than in the case of the other region. As a result of the destruction of historical events we have very little information about the physical properties of churches in the area. Thus, it is hardly difficult to draw any conclusion, so I rather tried to support or refute consequences drawn from the northeastern region.

In this area we have no information of any church in Group 1. In the category of Group 2. we have information only about the ground spaces of 2 churches. Their average would be 124 m² which seems to be a rather distorted value,\(^{117}\) as the average
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113 Sz. Papp, op. cit., p. 71.
114 I. Valter, Pásztó, p. 278.
115 Idem, A gyöngyösi Szent Bertalan-templom, p. 94.
in the northeastern region was 355 m². The situation is similar in the case of Group 3., as we have only information about the ground plans and ground spaces of 2 churches. The values of the churches of Babócsa and Alsóbáta seem to correspond with the values of the north eastern region. The whole ground space of the church of Babócsa was 250 m² in its gothic period, and 290 m² of the church of Alsóbáta in its second period. We have the most information available in the case of Group 4. Even this amount of data is less than in the north eastern region; however, it is sufficient for calculating a relevant, reliable average, which is 125 m². The majority of these churches can be placed with – on the basis of their ground space – the greater village churches. Two exceptions are the chapel of Mecseknádasd-Schlossberg – because of its grand space and the parish church of Éte – because of its building style.

The special space structural solution when the nave and the presbytery of the church have the same width was common in this region. These churches of this region are hall churches which were built in smaller dimensions than in the northeastern region. Two examples of these church halls are: the parish church of Segesd with its straight closure of presbytery and the parish church of Babócsa with a polygonal closure of presbytery. Hall churches are to be found in Group 4. as well, e.g. in the settlements of: Éte, Csurgó, Valkó, Dalmad, Báta, and Zalaszántó.

The three nave gothic church equipped with a polygonal closure of apse is to be found only in a very low number, while it was rather frequent in the northeastern region. The most characteristic example of this type of church is the gothic church of Mecseknádasd-Schlossberg from the 14th century. It rather resembled the church of Szikszó from the end of the 14th and the beginning of the 15th century because of its great ground space, apse and articulated three nave structure.

Regarding the expansion of Southern Transdanubian churches, it was observable that naves were not only expanded in western direction, but also southward, as in the case of the Mindenszentek (All Saints’) church in Pécsvárad (in the expansion in
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the 14th and 15th centuries) and in the case of the Szent István (St. Stephan) church in Mecseknádasd126 (in the reconstruction in the 14th century).

The ground space of churches were not expanded to such an extent as in the case of churches in the northeastern Hungary, but this was probably explained by the fact that the network of central settlements was more dense and evenly located in this area. Thus, settlements had less centrality and probably the number of population was also lower, which together resulted in the lack of greater expansions. To sum up, we can conclude that the examination off the plans, ground spaces, and particular structural elements of churches confirmed that differences between the examined categories of the criteria scheme is connected to the properties of churches thus they can be used as a control cluster.

We can also conclude that churches of settlements belonging to the highest category can be compared to towns, as they show similarities with their churches. Churches of settlements belonging to the lowest category are rather similar to village churches supporting the place of settlements in the settlement hierarchy. Categories between the two are transitory groups with unique examples.

The use of the inner spaces of churches

The most important changes regarding the inner use of space in churches were: the altars, chapels located inside the church, and burials within the church. In settlements where the landowner had advowson rights or/and a strong power the influence of the population on the representative reconstructions cannot be proved unambiguously. Often, we only guess the role of citizens in the late medieval reconstructions, but cannot prove it with sources. We also do not know surely who and from where invited the experts, skilled builders needed for the erection of hall churches resembling town churches. We again can only guess that, as these hall churches originate from the southern German area, these skilled workers might have been skilled workers from the Northern Hungary, where the number of German citizens was high.127

The differences in the use of elements in the inner space of churches can support the understanding of the role of a settlement in the settlement hierarchy. The central element of ceremonies was the high altar in the apse of the church thus it was usually this element which was reconstructed, ornamented in the smaller settlements. As the population did not grow considerably there was no need for the expansion of naves. We have barely any data concerning the formations of side-altars, e.g. neither the butcher gild of Miskolc did found their own altar directorate in 1508.128 This is also a borderline between categories, as it distinguishes market towns of Group 1. from

128 MNL, DL 39386.
‘real’ towns. Settlements belonging to lower categories can be distinguished by the presence and the number of side altars.

There is much more data available about chapels inside the church which help to distinguish the advowson role of the population and the landowner family. The role of the landowner Rátót family in the erection of the chapel to the southern side of the church of Pásztó is clear. Similarly, in the case of Miskolc, which got advowson rights at the beginning of the 15th century, István Kovács Csabai (Miskolci) erected the Assumption of the Virgin Mary Chapel at the northern side of the church, in 1489. The representation of a family in a church, which had both landowner and advowson rights, shows to what extent settlements were subordinated to and dependent on these landowners, e.g. Nyírbátor. The situation was rather different in free royal towns.

The last form of the use of the inner spaces in churches was the burial inside the church, as part of the advowson rights. Only two examples of cession or conferment of the advowson rights is known, namely in the case of Sárospatak (in 1392) and in the case of Miskolc (in 1411). These two settlements belonged to the Group 1., and both conferment took place under the reign of King Sigismund. Consequently, we have the most information about burials inside the church from these two settlements: in the case of Miskolc from the second part of the 16th century and from the end of the 15th century in the case of Sárospatak.

Based on the results of this study we can conclude that churches of Group 1. – and some of the settlements of Group 2. – rise above the other in every aspect. This finding is in full harmony with András Kubinyi’s categorization, in which central settlements with more than 16 points were considered towns in medieval Hungary. It can be proved, that churches of settlements of Group 3. with 11–15 points constitute a transitory category between villages and towns. Churches of Group 4. are similar to village churches.

Thus, we can conclude, that churches of the highest category in my study, both regarding their ground space and their inner design can be compared to parish churches of average free royal towns. Beside their church, these settlements can be grouped with free royal boroughs also on the basis of elements of church topography, or can fulfil their role in areas without towns.

---
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