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By the 18\textsuperscript{th} century many ideas were born in Europe how to revive the economy of a country. The mercantilists of the 17\textsuperscript{th} century thought that the only method to make a country rich is the development of trade and industry. The problem „guild” was inevitable in the industrial development.

The appearance of the guilds is a common phenomenon in Europe: such corporations were founded in the middle-age in every country because of the same causes and they functioned in similar frames. At the turn of the 17\textsuperscript{th} and 18\textsuperscript{th} century the handicraft shows thank to the historical development different effects in each country. In the more developed industrial countries like England the frames of the handicraft were not as inflexible and closed anymore as in the other European regions where industry was less advanced. Until the industrial more developed countries overran the craft-production, the guilds flourished in the 18\textsuperscript{th} century in the Eastern regions; there were here no or rarely manufactures or companies.

Nevertheless, apart from the development of the handicraft the 18\textsuperscript{th} century is the periode when the state consciously aimed to give forth to the economy, to broaden the guild framework, to control the function and the privileges of the guilds and to open opportunities to the free industrial development.

The intention of the dissertation is to show the process beginning in Hungary in the 1720’s which resulted the disbanding of the frames of the guilds and which gave free way to the industrial development beyond handicraft. In Western Europe this process ran its course spontaneously or with little aerarian intervention thus far in Middle Europe a stronger aerarian interposition was necessary.

This procedure took place in Hungary differently than in the other parts of Europe and the cause was not mainly the for Western Europe underdeveloped industry. The main role played in it the historical inheritance of the long dismembering of the country, the depopulation because of the Turkish wars and the different economical level of the certain regions in this very large country.

The dissertation presents how and why the aerarian initiation began in Vienna that intended the development of the Hungarian industry, why King Charles III (1711-1740) and Queen Maria Theresia (1740-1780) deecided not to abolish the guilds but to broaden their opportunities, that meant: to give free way to the industry beyond handicraft. We analyse the aerarian resolutions related to the industrial development beyond crafts and we examine also their grounds and effects. We study the circumstances how the guilds could to set off their interests, how they could adapt or wanted to adapt in the middle of the 18\textsuperscript{th}
century to the aerarian industry-development. We analyse point for point the complains sent to the Locotenential Council but we should note that we do not intend to list the negative aspects of the guilds: the examination of these problems helped the Locotenential Council to set out a project for unification and improvement of the crafts.

In the mid-course of the government of King Charles III, in 1732 a sweeping reform was introduced about the guilds in the German-Roman Empire that finished a more than hundred year old process. The German guild-reforms had appreciable effects in Hungary, too. The counsellor of the Locotenential Council, Ferenc Sauska worked out a reformproject for the Hungarian guilds based on the German reforms; we present this project and we analyse its main points and its perceptible impacts in the 1730’s.

The aerarian guild-regulation culminated in 1761 with a general guild-resolution: the privileges of the guilds were unified, the monopolies were abolished and some points of the resolution protected the industry beyond handicraft. We examine the resolution in all details, we demonstrate the antecedents of it and the guild-politics in the 1740’s and the 1750’s in comparison with the guild-politics in the 1720’s and the 1730’s. The dissertation examines the changes as a consequence of the resolutions of King Charles III and the achievements during the rule of King Charles III and Queen Maria Theresia as in the life of the guilds as in the relationship between the guilds and the Locotenential Council. The dissertation proves that the guild-regulation of Queen Maria Theresia was in fact a longer process between 1761 and 1764 and it means more than one aerarian orders relating to the guilds.

The dissertation observes that Hungary was in this period not an independent country with a separated economy but it was a part of an empire and the economic resolutions of the rulers were determined by the economic interests of the Habsburg-Monarchy on imperial level. That is why we feature the main points of the economic policy of Vienna based on the essential works of Johann Joachim Becher, Wilhelm Schröder and Philipp Wilhelm Hörnigk.

In the 16th and 17th century there was not in Hungary any aerarian regulated guild-politics or any orders related to the handicraft. The foundation of guilds was allowed by the cities or the landlord and the guild-charters were affirmed by the King only in special cases. The economic policy of these centuries was determined by the Turkish wars, the accomodations of the army, the correct collection of the aerarian incomes. Under the circumstances we cannot speak about a modern, directed, aerarian guild-regulation or industry-development, there was no possibilities for it.
The handicraft appeared at the first time in the parliament in 1659 as a country-wide „problem”. The artificers did not sell their products for the same prices in the different counties and it made the obtaining of goods inequal and difficult. The state ruled the conditions of the marketing of the goods of artisians first by the law in 1659 in the whole country, however, the tariffs and the punishments of the rebelliouses fell within the county’s cognizance.

After the Ottoman period the number of the new-founded guilds increased rapidly. It is understandable because the new settlers in the depopulated regions needed craftmen. But we can find new guild-foundations in the whole country, the causes are simple: many guilds wanted to renew their old charters either because it was too old and does not contain the new privileges or it was not affirmed by the king. If we examine the guild-foundations at the beginning of the 18th century, it turns out that these guilds are mostly such old-new corporations. Another important factor was the migration of the cobblers toward the desolated territories where they could found new guilds. But these guilds satisfied firstly the local needs and the everyday-life.

Although the Hungarian craftmen could not compete with the handicraft of the Western-European countries either in the number of their members or in the quantity of the production, they did not lag behind that time in their technology and in the quality of their goods. The apprentices studied during the peregrination not only languages but they learnt modern technique, fine master-strokes and they got to know the local traditions and conventions.

The committee led by Leopold Kollonich bishop in Győr that aimed the reorganisation of the Hungarian Kingdom worked out the so called Einrichtungswerk that mentioned in the development of the industry firstly the rollback of the guild-privileges, the easement of the assumption into guilds and the initiation of free industry. At the same time the Hungarian noblemen presented their ideas of the reviving of the country but the field industry appeared only on the periphery. Palatine Paul Eszterházy focused in his preoject on the military and the administration but not at all on economy.

During the examination of the foundation, function and role of the Hungarian guilds we discover that they are hardly different than the guilds in Western Europe. The religion dominates stronger in Hungarian crafts than in Western Europe where the guilds had defensive tasks, too and we can see some tiny differences caused by the other cultural background. The Hungarian guilds lagged behind only in the quantity but in no wise in technology and quality that time.
The Habsburger Kings understood in the 17th century, after the Thirty Year’s War that an economic recovery cannot come to pass in their countries without an aerarian economy policy. King Ferdinand III (1637-1657) and King Leopold I (1657-1705) tried to broaden the frames of the handicraft and the opportunities of the craftmen. They intended to involve the cobbler into the industrial production with the establishment of manufactures and companies.

The first mercantilist of the Habsburg Empire, Johann Joachim Becher (1635-1682) intended to ground aerarian manufactures in order to educate new technologies and to create new workplaces. In 1668 was published his essay *Politischer Discurs* in which he brought out his ideas. After his opinion the base for the economy is the resettlement of the country because the whole population can be fed only by enough labour. Becher’s brother in law, Philipp Wilhelm von Hönnigk (1640-1714) improved his ideas. His essay *Österreich über alles* was published in 1684 in which came out Hönnigk’s imperial thinking: he saw the Monarchy in one unit and not divided in provinces. He is convinced about the richment of Austria by its diversity: Austria has everything necessary to the life, it can be autharchical. The possibilities of the country are not used to the full. He says, the import of finished products makes rich only the merchantmen but the benefit comes out of the country, so the homeland becomes poor. It is highly dangerous to bring the raw material abroad because it is worked up there very cheap and the homeland buys back the finished products made by the own materials much more expensive. Hönnigk planned for Hungary a special role and place in this imperial economy.

The third thinker was Wilhelm von Schröder (1640-1688). His main opus “*Fürstliche Schatz- und Rentkammer*” was published first in 1686 and after the opus of Hönnigk counted the most widely-red and the most popular economic work in the 18th century. Counter to Becher and Hönnigk Schröder does not work up the complex economy but he concentrated on the industry as the first source of the richment of a country. The object of his examinations is not Hungary and the Hungarian guilds but his comments about the German guilds apply to the Hungarian relations, too. Schröder appointed that the biggest barriers of the development of the German industry are the guilds with their privileges, misuses, authoritarianism.

During the analysis of the resolutions of King Charles III and Queen Maria Teresia to the regulation of the guilds we detect several times the opinion and concepts of Schröder. The Austrian economic experts saw already by the end of the 17th century that the manufactures and other companies cannot exist without a serious aerarian support –
even not among beneficial conditions. The big funds to the ground of manufactures, the export of finished products, the eventual import of raw materials and the education of workforce could be provided only by the state.

In Hungary the development of the industry, the investigation of the circumstances of the guilds and their regulation was the task of the Locotenential Council. In the 1720’s the Council was not thinking about abolishing the guilds and grounding manufactures. On the 13th December 1725 the Locotenential Council asked the counties and the cities for writing a memorandum about the number of their craftmen, the further need for artisans and their opportunities of grounding manufactures. The counties and cities sent their responses at the beginning of 1726.

From the relations of the counties emerges that the local craftmen work only for the local market and they can satisfy the need of the people in the seducement-district, as well. The craftmen do not have enough fund, the guilds inhibit the reception of new masters, they do not manumit the apprentices and they do not accept new prentices, either. The guilds do not permit selling cobblers or other guilds on the markets and the high taxes make impossible the assumption into the guild. There is nowhere an industrial production that would be able to become manufacture. On the most place they found defaults on raw materials or workforce, exactlier the raw materials and the workforce are not used to the full.

The Locotenential Council evaluated the relations and pointed out that the guilds with their old privileges should be abolished and new craftmen should be settled in. But it was obviously, too, that the abolition of the guilds is difficult because the vacancy should be filled in with educated workers, with fund and new technology that does not exist in Hungary. That is why the Council proposed instead of abolishing the guilds to regulate and to supervise them strongly.

The Locotenential Council examined up front the guild-charters in order to discard the old, updated privileges, the groundless, high taxes, the obstructive items. The examination of the charters got on very slowly. The presented charters were reviewed by the Locotenential Council, some items were annulled, some modified. The modified, resp. annulled items can divided in 4 fields:

1. Items related to the markets and market-privileges (confiscation of the products of the cobblers and/or of other guilds inside 2 miles, getting in of visit-tax and all).

2. Reduction of different taxes (assumption into the guild, assumption into the apprenticeship, banquet-tax an all).
3. Abolishment of privileges related to the religion or instructions connecting with Protestants.


The Locotenential Council discussed after 1724 several guild-abuses and it remedied them and all these things prepared the situation for the transplantation of the German guild-reforms in Hungary. The German guild-reforms could not be transplanted fully because of the different economic conditions but the Locotenential Council tried to set up as many reforms as possible. Ferenc Sauska counsellor got the task to work out a guild-reform in Hungary similar to the German reforms.

In order to be able to plan a really useful and effective guild-regulation, the counsellors had to know the problems masterfully. The Locotenential Council dealt in the 1730’s with several problems in field handicraft and guilds that were always examined the most carefully and with the support of the responsible local municipality. About the regulations in the 1720’s and 1730’s we can ascertain that the Council tried to solve the similar problems in the similar way, it served the unification. It happened sometimes that the solution of a special case became a royal order related to the whole country.

Altough the Locotenential Council was concerned with the problems of the guilds, it does not mean that the guilds caused only problems and troubles. If something operates well, nobody cares about it, it is only necessary, to secure the conditions. That is why only the problems and the unsolved discusses came to the Locotenential Council but the Council did not handle these as negative phenomena; they served as a guide, they showed where, in which field, with what kind of solutions the guilds can be made capable.

The most commun problem was that the guilds intended to inhibit the assumption of new members. It is typical already in the 1720’s, in some cities earlier, too, but after the regulation in 1733 it appeared more and more often. The guilds guarded strongly their privileges, they close and were afraid of any reforms. They limited the members of the masters and they prefered candidates who were sons of masters or who married the daughter or widow of a master. The guilds often adduced at the rejection of the candidates that they have enough masters to serve the local market and they do not need more craftsmen.

We can find several items in the guild-charters that guarantee to the guild advantages, even monopolos on the markets, as the markets were the most important places of buying raw materials and selling finished products. People from the surroundings and further villages came to the market to buy artisan products for a longer time that is why it
was essential that the guilds can use the opportunities of the markets. One of the most important privileges was the right to revise of the merchandises of other guilds and masters. If the examined products were not high-quality, the local guild confiscated them. Moreover, the examined artisans and guilds had to pay for the examination, it was called visit-tax. The local guilds had the right to buy raw materials firstly, they went before the extraneous guilds that could buy only the left-over products. Among the abuses of the guilds the atrocities in the markets stood on the first place.

The problems about the visit-tax the local municipalities wanted to solve, as well, so they supported the Locotenental Council in it. It was connected with questions of competence and with financial causes. The guilds went namely against the competency of the municipalities when they confiscated the products of extraneous merchantmen and guilds but the municipalities were helpless in these cases because of the guild-privileges. In spite of that the Locotenental Council inhibited several times the visit-tax and ordered to give back the collected money, the guilds tried and tried again.

Beside the visit-tax another commun problem was the obstruction of the sale on the markets for extraneous guilds and cobblers. Some guild-charters allowed the sale for cobblers and extraneous guilds only the day before the market-day, other charters prohibited it. The local guilds struggled not only with the cobblers and the other guilds. The foreign merchantmen caused them big damages because they did not pay visit-taxes and the guilds could not confiscate their goods. These merchantmen often sold products brought from abroad or their goods were unusual, special in comparision with the local goods, so they could sell out them earlier and more beneficial than the local guilds. The Locotenental Council did not prohibit selling foreign goods to the foreign merchantmen as the dominating economic idea, the merkantilism supported firstly the free commerce; that is why such complains of the guilds were not supported.

The problems with the apprentices became acute since the 1720’s. The guilds locked up, limited the number of the guild-members, resp. they favored the sons and relatives of the masters at the assumption, so more and more apprentices could not get into the guild. To be a prentice was aggravatated by the high assumption-tax and the adopted prentices complained more often about the masters who did not teach the craft. Since the 1730’s the guild-charters limited the number of the apprentices who could serve at one master at the same time. The biggest problem was the negligency of the certificates: the masters forgot or they did not want to give it to the emancipated apprentices. For this reason the Hungarian apprentices could not begin to wander. The Locotenental Council tried several
times to reduce the different taxes and to maximize the price of the masterpiece. Generally we can say, if the Locotenental Council had to decide in the trouble between the cobblers and the guilds, it spoke well for the cobblers.

The fact, that the guilds locked in, they were unable and not ready to change, furthermore the increase of the number of the cobblers implied that the guilds soon had to fight against each other for the customers and the markets. The most common method of this competition was when the older, local guilds inhibited the foundation of new guilds. The Locotenential Council always aimed to turn aside all problems that counterwork the free industrial development and the free competition.

In the Holy Roman Empire surveys were initialized since the middle of the 17th century with the purpose to unify and to regulate the German guilds. When the Locotenential Council began to supervise the guilds in 1724, the process for the guild-regulation in Germany came near to its end. The guild-regulation came into effect in Germany in 1732 but in Hungary the guilds had a totally different function in the commodity production, so the Locotenential Council could not set up it without any changes. Councillor Sauska proposed firstly that the Council should abolish every guild that has no royal charter. The project of Sauska ruled over the apprentices point for point. In the project he regulated the assumption, the duties, the rights of the apprentices and he recommended the abolition of the assumption-tax. The oversight was entrusted to the local municipality.

The most common problem with the apprentices was that the masters did not want to manumit them and did not give certificates to them. It was a serious problem because the apprentices had to go for wandering abroad and after 1732 they could wander neither in Austria nor in Germany without any certificates. The emancipated and migrant apprentices went from Hungary firstly toward Austria and Germany. The project of Sauska protected the apprentices against the masters: they had to be emancipated in right time, they had to get certificates about their apprenticeship and their skills. The period and the method of wandering was regulated and it was cleared which municipality takes responsibility about the wandering apprentices. According to the project the apprentices had to work at a master for a certain while before his assumption into the guild and they had to justify it.

We find many complaints about the abusus between the motherguild and its affiliated guilds. The original motherguild wanted to influence the network of its affiliated guild, as well. Some affiliated guilds became royal concession to ground own affiliated guilds; so
the situation became more complicated. The project of Sauska proposed for this reason the
abolishment of the authority of motherguilds over the affiliated guilds.

The Locotenential Council discussed the project, it found the plan of Sauska fits with
the laws and traditions of Hungary. The Council furthermore expressed its hope that the
regulation puts an end to the disorder in the guilds, it makes them uniform and moral. It
emerged clearly that the Locotenential Council based the guild-regulation on the co-
operation of the local municipalities and the royal cities.

Before and after 1733 the Locotenential Council published several resolutions that
regulated the guilds country-wide. The guild-politics of the Council followed already in the
1720’s the regulation in the Empire but after 1733 the Locotenential Council went
markedly by the new guild-politics determined by Sauska’s reforms. On 20th July 1736 the
Locotenential Council repeated the circular of 1726. The new examination aimed to clear
up if the handicraft in Hungary has changed and in which direction. The situation changed
in comparison with the one of 1726 only a few. After the regulation of 1733 we can
observe that the guilds accept the regulation of the less important things (e.g. reduced
taxes, giving out certificates) but they strongly hang on the economically important
privileges like the market-taxes.

In 1736 the Locotenential Council had to diagnose that the Hungarian handicraft still
produced goods only for the everyday-use, firstly clothes, weapons, tools and manufactures
or companies do not exist anywhere.

To sum up, several branches of industry began to develop, however, the counties and
the cities stood on different industrial level, they claimed to more craftsmen. In the middle
of the 1730’s it was born a new need for more extraordinary handicraft-products, as well.
The Locotenential Council had therefore the experience that the new royal orders did not
succeed yet but there were also effective achievements. In the 1720’s and 1730’s royal
orders ruled already the markets, the keeping and the educating of the apprentices, the
giving out of certificates. The handicraft in Hungary in the 1730’s was not squarely
overgone because the development and the opportunities of the industry did not permit of
the drastic abolishment of the guilds.

In the 1730’s the territorial unity of the country, the economic consolidation brought
their fruits and the new or re-organizated authorities could operate with more efficience
and more success, even in the craft-regulation. Because the state got more and more
control over the municipalities and the cities, they became more and more cooperative. So
the orders of the guild-regulation reflect after 1733 more often in the guild-charters.
At the beginning of the rule of Queen Maria Theresia the handicraft was not the most important problem. That is why the Locotenential Council continued in the early 40’s the guild-politics of the previous years without any change. It continously controlled the guild-charters and handled the complains as much as in the 1730’s. By 1750 the counties mostly collected and revised the guild-charters and they sent the copies to the Locotenential Council.

Compared with the guild-problems in the 1720’s and in the 1730’s we can detect that the complains against the guilds changed in the 1740’s. The typical categories: obstruction of the assumption into the guild, the concurrence between the guilds and so on are constant but the cases are not unique anymore. In these cases the main point is that the guilds feared of the markets, the acquired privileges, the right of pre-emption of raw materials. The complains related to the markets, the visit-tax, the confiscation of the goods disappeared and new types of complain appeared: the regulation of several taxes and the corroboration of the guild-charters.

The examination of the guild-affairs did not mean that the Locotenantial Council worked as a judicial forum, rather it tried to diagnose and solve the typical problems with the examination of the complains against the guilds. In the 1740’s and 1750’s the Council used the incoming guild-affairs for some kind of survey and it did not prefer to solve them individually but it looked for a general solution of each typical problem.

There are more causes why the complains changed: the affairs of the 30’s (e. g. the ones about the visit-tax and markets) disappeared because the royal orders partly or totally solved them. The new sorts of the guild-complains (related e. g. to the apprentices or/and widows) came together with the change of the social and economic situation: the number of the apprentices sprang up, the guilds feared more and more for their privileges.

The „old” complains (the obstruction of the assumption into the guild, the partition of the relative branches, the competition between the guilds) got more intensive thanks to the economic development.

After 1748 Austria had to re-consider its economic policy because of the lost of Silesia. The industry-development in Austria and so the guild-politics was the task of the new authority, the Directorium in publicis et cameralibus. The new authority firstly worked out statues of activity for the manufactures and it secured the market and the raw materials for them. According to the Directorium the main tasks of the industrial politics are: 1. education of craftmen, 2. boost of the internal market, 3. inhibition of the export of the raw materials and the capital, 4. protection of the home-made products against the
external ones, 5. making the home-made products competitive abroad, 6. making the raw materials and the work-force cheaper. The Directorium ascertained that the biggest barriers of the free industrial development are the guilds. The competency of the Directorium did not reach to Hungary, anyway, in the guild-politics we can detect paralellism with the regulation of 1732.

In 1732/33 the Locotenential Council worked out the Hungarian guild-regulation based on the German guild-regulation. Although the Council had to frame the German orders to the Hungarian economic and social circumstances. In the 1750’s the Locotenential Council had to frame its guild-politics in the same way to the guideline of the new industry-development of the Directorium, namely the rollback of the crafts, the slacking off of the guilds, the protection of the industry beside the guilds dominated accomodate to the Hungarian conditions. In the 1740’s the Locotenential Council followed in the guild-politics the praxis of the 1730’s that is the observance of the royal orders, the abolishment of the guild-abuses. In the 1750’s this politics became harder and more decisive.

Councillor Georges Fabiankovics, who was encharged in the Council int he 1750’s with the guild-affairs, got the commission to examine the guilds, if they keep the resolutions, wether the situation changed since 1733, wherein the conditions of the Hungarian crafts are different from the German guilds. Fabiankovics discovered several cases that were discussed by the Locotenential Council after 1733 because of the ignorance of the resolutions. First of all Queen Maria Theresia wanted to get a line on guild-cases, so she asked also for the copy of the guild-regulation of 1733.

Councillor Georges Fabiankovics laid on the 17th September 1750 two documents in front of the Queen. The first one was the project of Sauska in 1733 for abolishment of the guild-abuses, resp. the copy of the resolution. Fabiankovics wrote aside several points „Stat” or „Non stat” depending on it wether the solutions of the resolution of 1733 can be retained or not according to the economic and social changes in the 1750’s.

The second document was an elaboratum written by Fabiankovics that summarized clearly, well reviewable several contracted points of the German guild-regulation and he observed aside each point what is the real praxis and situation in Hungary, which are the similar and the different charakteristica.

Fabiankovics firstly mentioned that every kind of guild-meeting in Germany must be allowed by the municipality but the guilds come together in Hungary ad-libitum and the
banquet on the occasion of the assumption into the guild cost a fortune and it can totally ruin the new master.

He reminded the Queen that many guilds live with a charter that is not affirmed by the king despite of the royal orders, so these chartres should be revised. In the Empire there are not anymore guilds with non-royal charters.

As in Hungary as in the Empire the apprentices can get a certificate free of charge but only after the finished apprenticeship.

In the affairs of the guilds or in affaires between the guild-members, if they can not agree, the local municipality is competent. In the Empire such cases fall under educated advocates. In the Empire the connection between motherguilds and affiliated guilds are regulated by royal orders, the affiliated guild is subordinated to the motherguild only, if the ruler allowed it. In the contrary, the connection between motherguilds and affiliated guilds is in Hungary anarchical.

Finally Fabiankovics proposed that every point of the resolution that do not conflict with the laws should be affirmed. The revision in 1750 underpinned the directives of the guild-politics and the Locotenential Council continued to set off the royal orders, to unify the guild-privileges, to give free way to the industry-development beyond the guilds.

By the 1750’s the Locotenential Council, the Chamber and the Chancellery affirmed the power of the ruler, so Queen Maria Theresia could get on against the guilds with more success as long as the authorities involved the cobbler into the economic production and set off the royal orders. At the end of the decade there were problems only mostly in Northern Hungary, in the mine-cities and in the Spis. Only few mine-cities collected and presented the guild-charters, the crafts in Késmárk countered constantly, the affiliated guilds of Kassa, Lőcse, Eperjes made continously a complain.

On the 21st January 1760 Queen Maria Theresia encharged Councillor Stephen Gosztonyi to summerize the problems of the guilds, to analyse these affairs and to make a proposal for the solution. At he same time she ordered to the Chamber-Administration in Sips to revise the guilds belonging to its competence. Gosztonyi laid in January and February 1761 two elaboratum. In his first referatum, on 8th January he analysed the complains about the high taxes. The worst concerned municipalities were the counties Abaúj, Sáros, Zemplén, Borsod, Ung, Bereg, Szatmár, Szabolcs, Bihar, Gömör and Szepes, the Haiduck-cities, furthermore the cities Kassa, Lőcse, Szeben, Eperjes, Késmárk, Bártfa, Debrecen and Szatmárnémeti. The revision of Gosztonyi trended to these points: 1. if the
guild-charters are confirmed by the ruler, 2. if the charter handles the circumstances of the assumption into the guild, 3. if the guild-charters agree with the royal orders.

He did not find a way to convince the guilds to follow the orders. So he proposed to the Locotenental Council to split up with the present praxis, namely with the examination of single, special cases, instead it should work out a general guild-regulation. In other words the Locotenental Council should not suit the resolutions to the guilds, but the guilds have to accomodate to a general regulation. If the guilds are not ready to accept the general regulation, they immediately have to be abolished.

Queen Maria Theresia answered the elaboratum of Gosztonyi on the 16th February 1761. 1. Every guild without a royal-charter had to be abolished and in the fututre only the ruler can ground guilds. 2. If the officers in the municipalities contradict this resolution, they do not get their payment. 3. The membres of the disobedient guilds are not allowed to use their handicraft. 4. The guilds with a royal charter should be revised, too, and their dissonant privileges should be abolished.

In his second elaboratum Gosztonyi examined not only the guilds in Northern Hungary but other regions, as well, and he collected the articuli related generally to every guild. He expressed his opinion about the traditions and habits and he proponed changes where necessary. In the opinion of Gosztonyi and the Chamber of Sips, until the guild-privileges in the counties and the cities are not generally regulated, the guilds cannot be handled effectively as isolated problems. Gosztonyi proposed also a solution.

1. The royal guild-charters were ratified, so, if the guilds do not accept the legal rules, the state should take action against them.

2. The very high taxes immediately should be abolished.

3. The grounding of affiliated guilds should be not allowed, the existent affiliated guilds should be abolished.

4. Gosztonyi proposed 15 Ft as an assumption-tax and 10 Ft as banquet-tax.

5. The articuli related to the religion should be abolished because the religion is not important for the industry.

6. The propitiation of the wanderyears with money should be prohibited but the time of wandering should be ascertained.

The circular that was published in February in the region of the Sips was broadened on the 16th March 1761 in every county in Hungary and the guilds got a new, unified charter in the whole country. The assumption-tax was limited in 30 Ft. Maria Theresia let abolish the baptism-tax, the privileges of the masters-sons and of the apprentices married
with masters-daughters or widows. She prohibited the propitiation of the wandering and the masterpiece with money, she limited the time of wandering in 3 years. The right for jurisdiction of the guilds was broadened in punishments for 4 Ft. In the future the municipalities and the landlords were inhibited to give out guild-charters. The affiliated guilds became independent, the grounding of new guilds was reserved for the ruler.

In September 1761 Gosztonyi reported to the Queen that the regulation processed well, the guilds were obedient. All this took for a longer time but by 1764 the process seemed to finish. On the 6th July 1764 Gosztonyi submitted his project „Projectum regulandorum Articulorum cehalium” about the unified guild-charters. Queen Maria Theresia accepted it with some unimportant changes and on the 1st August 1764 she ratified it as a royal order.

Queen Maria Theresia arranged the guild between 1761-1764 with more resolutions. The old charters were called in and instead of them the guilds got new, standardized charters that contained general privileges. Chancellor Francis Eszterházy reported on the 16th August 1764 to Queen Maria Theresia about the finishing of the guild-regulation. We can so declare that the industry slowly began to develop after 1761 beyond the guilds thanks the economic orders of the ruler. The guild-orders and the regulation in and after 1761 finished a process that lasted for decades. During this period the frames of the guilds broke up and according to Klára Dóka’s opinion in an interval between 1761-1813 the development of the manufactures and the companies could start rapidly. Nevertheless we should accentuate that the guilds and the handicraft did not set back the industrial development in the 18th century, they were not an overgone remainder. For the population, the opportunities and economic conditions of Hungary guilds were institutes that had right for existence.