Abstract
The examination of pubs and inns in Vas County was made possible by the first cadastral survey in 1857. The present paper attempts to examine this important building type. The architectural design, functions, layout, the location within settlements and the owners are part of the research. Based on the architectural analysis and value assessment of the buildings, the decision as to whether they should be put on the national or local lists of historic monuments and thus be protected can be made.
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Introduction
Public houses and inns (hereinafter: pubs) occupy an important position in the society, economy and architecture of a given age. As communal spaces, they provide a meeting place, a forum where people can discuss their concerns, travellers from faraway areas can access local information, guests can enjoy themselves, and in addition, they may host social and cultural events. The pub is the communal centre of a settlement, one that is frequented by many people, where a variety of information can be exchanged and connections built that may be important in everyday life. As a building type, it is typically a characteristic and notable part of the townscape, often as an outstanding component.

The present paper attempts to examine this historic building type based on its registration in a limited territorial unit, Vas County. Based on the architectural analysis and value assessment of the buildings, it can be decided whether they should be put on the national or local lists of historic monuments and thus to be protected.

Bases of research
The examination of the particular building stock was made possible by the first cadastral survey in the mid-19th century.\(^1\) The registration and documentation of property relations and the survey maps produced in 1857 were the basis for the social and economic registration (levying of taxes). In the cadastral maps, pubs were marked by a flag in the shape of a double triangle attached to the corner of the building\(^2\), while in the land register sometimes a textual remark (“wursthaus”) was added.(Figure 1)

In Vas County, such buildings or groups of buildings were of a large enough number (331)\(^3\) to allow for statistical analysis.

---

\(^1\) In Vas County, the first cadastral surveys were carried out between 1856 and 1861, typically in 1857, so this is used as the reference date.

\(^2\) Only the buildings marked with a flag were included in the analysed sample.

\(^3\) NB. this number is presumably incomplete even for the studied period, as some settlement monographs refer to pubs not included in the list. – E.g. at Csörötnék, the community owned a “small pub” in addition to that of the Cistercian abbey and it is not marked by the symbol on the map. [3] pp. 121-122.
Research method

After the thorough scrutiny of the 1857 cadastral maps and the pertinent land registers, the pubs were identified, their data recorded and their locations identified on present-day maps and block plans.

Cadastral maps are preserved at two places in the country. One is the Hungarian National Archives (HNA); the other is the given county’s archives. The copies in the National Archives are kept as a central source; the original more detailed maps that remained with the given county were in use up until around 1910. With their help, it is possible to retrace changes or plot modifications.

After the preliminary study of the research literature and special collections (old postcards, architectural depictions and surveys, etc.), the locations were inspected on site to update the information and situation of the buildings with more accurate data. Finally, the buildings were photographed and the condition described in words.

Data sheets

The database was compiled by completing a data sheet of each site included in the sample of selected pubs. Conciseness and transparency were the main requirements to be met by the sheets. (Figure 2)

The heading contains today’s name of the settlement and its earlier name(s). Roman numerals are used to differentiate several pubs in a settlement. This is followed by the name of the county in brackets. At the end of the line, the research aim, date at the beginning of the research and name of the researcher are given.

Data identifying the present-day site include: name of settlement again, with other incidental indicators (number, relation to the cardinal points, settlement location identifier); name of public space (street, square), street number and property number in the cadastre.

Data from the 1857 survey: the name at the time (including foreign, typically Croatian or German names) and the status of the settlement (or part of settlement) (village, market town, city); indication of house number; topographic numbers of plots belonging to the house number, together with branch of agricultural use and/or building(s) named, with size of plot in brackets (in Viennese square fathoms); the last item is the owner’s name in the cadastre.

Fig. 1. Sárvár-Rábasömény, Rábasöményi street 56. Pub. Cadastral map, 1857. By permission of MNL Vas Megyei Levéltár, Szombathely; (ARCANUM Adatbázis: Vas megye kataszteri térképe 1856-1860, DVD.)

Fig. 3. Rábapaty, Alsópatyi utca street 47. Topographical Number: 1. Inn and outhouses. Cadastral map, 1857. By permission of MNL Vas Megyei Levéltár, Szombathely; (ARCANUM Adatbázis: Vas megye kataszteri térképe 1856-1860, DVD.)

4 Owing to the present-day county borders, the “county” maps of the settlements in Csepreg district belonging to Sopron County until 1950 can only partly be found in the Sopron Archives. For this reason, they have been excluded and only those in the Hungarian National Archives studied.

5 The data of the given plot in the Parzellen Protokoll (a) (parcel records) has also been examined and appended to the maps.

6 There are only a small number of pubs indicated differently from the rest; the deviating signs are noted on the datasheets.

7 The datasheets and background materials as the basis of the research, as well as the complete study, can be found in the Plan Collection of the Foster Gyula Nemzeti Örökséggazdálkodási és Szolgáltatási Központ, Budapest.

8 Lack of data is marked by dots.
and the buildings, present-day function, mass size and a typical photo. (Figure 5)

In the further tasks rubric, the tasks still to be carried out to complete the architectural-conservational investigations are listed (e.g. surveying), together with the recommended status to be assigned to the surveyed building as a protected monument.  

As background material to the datasheets, the settlement maps from the county atlas have been copied, and added to the collected old picture postcards and architectural surveys. (Figure 6) (Figure 7)

**Pubs and inns**

To get a better insight into the 19th century variants of this building type, it is worth looking at the glossary of terms used with it. The most unambiguous name is csárda [wayside inn], meaning an inn removed from inhabited areas, located in the

---

9 Referencing of special literature and old depictions can only be carried out in a later phase of the research.
10 See later: national historic value, local value.
11 [7]
12 [1] pp. 91-112.
The most important economic background to the catering function was the retailing of drinks, which were legally regulated by important provisions, decrees and even a statute, exactly because it was a lucrative business. The right of licensing belonged to the “minor royal usufructs” of landlords, giving the landlord the exclusive right to serve small amounts of any kind of alcoholic drinks to standing or sitting guests and to open pubs and inns for this purpose. In commonages, this right was due to the joint tenants who were to exercise this right collectively (Act 12/1836, §21). In free royal and free regional towns, as well as in some free market towns, licensing rights were vested on the community of the town. The right to sell drinks (commonly known as regale) to which landlords were entitled, did not prevent socagers from wholesaling the wine they produced, and moreover, under the socagers’ licence, every community of serfs who had vineyards belonging to the village had the right to sell wine.— from St Michael’s Day to St George’s Day, or from St Michael’s to Christmas. —This right was not exercised by individual serfs but by those to whom this right was rented out, whether it was grown there or elsewhere. Vine-growers living scattered around the vineyards were also allowed to serve wine to their labourers during the vine tending periods outside the period of the socagers’ licence (Act 6/1836, § 2)...”13

Kinds of designations of the studied buildings in the maps and cadastral registers include:

1. Nemessi Kocsma [Noblemen’s Pub] – named after the community of noblemen as owners14
2. Ágilis Kocsma – named after a noble owner or one with some right of the nobility15
3. Új vendégsfogadó [new inn] – a new inn built shortly before the studied period (before 1857)16
4. Vida Csárda – named after the owner17
5. Hegyallai Korcsma [hillfoot pub] – named with reference to the location18
6. Hatlábussi fogadó [six-legged inn] – referring to the form of the building19
7. Gasthaus – German designation of a lodging house20
8. Csárda – allusion to the character of the building21

Architectural design

The majority of pubs were characterized by a dual function: catering and the innkeeper’s residence. The simplest plans adopted the tripartite dwelling house: the front room was the salon for the guests, then came the kitchen with the third room being the innkeeper’s dwelling place. There was no sharp dividing line between the private and public spaces, which often overlapped. This type can be referred to as the cottage–pub. Not only the layout, but also the size and shape was identical with that of a traditional peasant cottage. The building would be set perpendicularly to the street, with its gabled or half-hipped front perfectly fitting into the streetscape of similar buildings arranged in “comb” pattern.

The other shape is that of the inn, which also contained guest rooms to provide accommodation. Those with more than two to four rooms were only found in towns. When sited on a corner plot, the specific location allowed for an L-shaped structure or a building set longitudinally with the street to be built22.

Location of pubs within settlements

A pub provided services to two target clientele. It served the wine of the landlord to the local community and provided

---

13 [5] pp. 689-690.
14 Bejegyértékonos-I. Rábahidvég-I.
15 Bejegyértékonos-II.
16 Hegyalfu-II.
17 Magyarszeicsőd-III.
18 Nádasd-III.
19 Szombathely-XX. The building is still called the six-legged inn; the six legs can be seen in the six pillars of the shed.
20 Ikervár
21 Rábahidvég-III.
22 This is a typical sight in the traditional building layout, constructed perpendicularly to the street line.
board and lodgings to travellers. The local community was best supplied when the pub was located in the centre, particularly at the intersection of roads, which was also an expedient location for transit guests.

The traffic of travellers was related to the roads, so the county road network, which more or less coincides with today’s network, was studied when analysing the locations of the inns. The intersections of national highways and river crossings became typical sites for this function. Concerning those on a long journey, lodgings and roadside inns a day’s or half-day’s walk apart also had to be taken into account. These were also located as close to the settlement or manors as possible. Most of these buildings were at the edge of the settlement, on a separated plot, somewhat withdrawn so that the distance might separate these buildings of noisy functions from the quiet dwelling houses.

In the sample (a total of 331 pubs), there are 15 (4.5%) situated on the outskirts; inside the village, there are 121 (36.5%) cottage–pubs set in “comb” pattern streets; 148 (44.7%) on corner plots or at bifurcations and 47 pubs situated as isolated buildings (14.2%). When the siting of the pub within the plot is examined, one finds that most small pubs – like the dwelling cottages – were at right angles to the street, in the “comb” pattern. As for the larger establishments, typically the alignment was parallel with the street, either flush with the street line, or projecting beyond it. By contrast, a building set deeply back from the street line was very rare.

The development of a plot is the function of the pub’s size: a small dwelling house and pub is built in the traditional linear manner: first comes the residential building, followed by the stable and an open-sided “legged” barn and other smaller outhouses in the middle of the yard. For larger inns, behind the main building parallel with the street, there was the “legged” cart-shed in the middle of the yard, with the stables further to the rear. There were occasionally other buildings on the plot, such as a butcher’s room, storerooms and cellars.

As regards the form of the buildings, three main groups can be differentiated in the sample of 331 (100%): buildings on an oblong plan (191, 57.7%), L-shaped, bent ground-plans (116, 35.0%) and U-shaped, framed buildings (24, 7.3%).

In this phase, it was not possible to carry out architectural surveys on the main buildings; therefore, the inclusive measurements were analysed (degree of precision: metre); this was taken from the georeferenced cadastral maps and also used the accurate data of the few (10) architectural surveys. The main buildings typically measured 6-9 m in width, sporadically 10-12 m, with considerably varying building lengths at 20-28 and even 35-45 m. The building plan usually has one wing with or without a lateral corridor, sometimes one and a half or two wings with a lateral corridor.

Resorting to the theoretical device of building reconstruction, one can find (in a 4-5 m wide building) the salon (5-6 m) at the street end of the longitudinal arrangement, next to it the kitchen (4 m) and larder (3-4 m), followed by smaller (3 m) or larger (5-6 m) guest rooms. The toilet was at the tail end of the building with the other storerooms.

In a street of a closed row of buildings, the suite of rooms could be interrupted by a covered driveway. The majority of buildings are single-storied; the construction of a storied building or the addition of a level to an existing building was not common.

---

23 In this county of tiny villages, this investigation did not produce relevant results in determining the distance between the pubs.

24 Rábapaty-I.

25 Sitke

26 I ranged buildings with a slight inclination among the oblong-plan buildings, T- and Z-shaped buildings among the L-shaped ones, and the E- and F-shaped plans, as well as the completely closed buildings enclosing a yard among the U-shaped plans.

27 [2] With two DVDs, one (A) of the maps in the Hungarian National Archives, the other (B) of these in the county archives.

28 Reliable analyses can only be based on detailed architectural surveys.

29 Sótóny
building only occurred in towns (Kőszeg, Szombathely) and some (then) market towns (Kőrmend, Szent-Gotthárd, Jánosháza, Cellódömöl-Kiscell, Ikervár, Sárvár-Vármellék, Vasvár), depending on the wealth of the landowner or the bus-
tling trade. An important section of the main building was the
cellar where the wine was stored. The amount of wine to be
kept there was between 80 and 400 akó (cc. 1000-5000 gallons),
requiring a cellar under part or the whole of the main building.
It was accessed from the yard30, the kitchen or a lateral corridor.

With regard to manner of transportation the most important
auxiliary buildings were the cart shed standing on piers and
the stable with stalls. The former was a shed on four or six
brick piers with a hipped saddle roof used for the storing of
coaches, and the latter was where the horses and oxen were tied
up. It was necessary, almost compulsory to supply guests with
meat dishes, which required the running of a butcher’s shop31.

This was in a separate outhouse, or sometimes an open shed
at the end of the building32. Other storage facilities and sties
and pens for the animals of a farming household were grouped
beyond the well in the yard33. The self-subsistence aspect of a
catering function was complemented by small animal breeding,
the vegetable garden and orchard. Occasionally, a pasture and
hayfield, and a piece of plough-land also belonged to such a
farmstead34.

The construction materials of the buildings are character-
ised by the region and the financial standing of the clients
who ordered the buildings. Most main buildings (279, 84%)
are marked red in the cadastral maps, meaning solid materi-
als35, with a small number (2, 16%) coloured yellow, meaning
temporary materials36. The latter is more frequent in poorer or
woodland areas. The building material of the auxiliary build-
ings is evenly divided between the two main groups.

30 Bérbaltavár

31 The sale of meat – another royal usufruct – was the “prerogative” of the
innkeeper, for which he paid a separate rent to the landowner.

32 This building or building section could not be identified in the maps, nor
were the on-the-spot inspections thorough enough to detect them.

33 They are not indicated in the cadastral maps.

34 “… with the exception of towns, there was no pub or butcher’s shop in
the manorial estate, the tenure of which did not imply smaller or greater pieces
of land. This is understandable, for these parcels with buildings were part of
the village land system, which all had externalities as well…” [6] p.122.

35 Buildings of stone or baked bricks are indicated red in the cadastral maps.

36 Wattle and daub, adobe or wooden buildings are marked yellow in the
cadastral maps.
As the theoretical reconstruction of roofing suggests, most roofs were simple wooden roofs, with an occasional brick vault. The “extra” rooms were vaulted as were some lateral corridors and typically the kitchens. In the latter case, the danger implied by the fireplace required the use of non-combustible materials. In simple cases, kitchens had wooden chimneys and plastered walls.

Owners

Due to the right to sell alcoholic beverages, the owners of pubs and inns were in a privileged position. Having reviewed the entire sample (331, 100%), it is clear that the owners were mainly the landowners of the region or the joint tenants of the village. Sometimes the parish, a lesser landowner or a peasant could also own a pub. Inns were almost exclusively owned by large landowners. The major source of income – selling alcoholic drinks – was usually leased out, so it was the tenants who profited and carried the burden of running the pubs.

As for the studied pubs, the property relations were as follows:

- Aristocrats, large landowners (Batthyány, Erdődy, d’Este, Estéházy, Festetics, Sigray, Széchenyi families): 85 (25.7%)
- medium-sized estate owners: 70 (21.1%)
- smaller estate owners & others: 74 (22.4%)
- village, community: 62 (18.7%)
- church: 16 (4.8%)
- Royal Treasury: 3 (1.0%)
- no data: 21 (6.3%)

Total: 331 (100%)

Present-day state

The assessment of the current conditions of the pubs allows for the registration of changes over the past one and a half centuries. About half the buildings (146, 44.1%) have been demolished and no longer exist. In another large group, only the outbuildings are extant, or the original building is no longer recognizable as a result of later major reconstructions (51, 15.4%). Among the rest of the 124 cases (40.5%), the pub buildings have survived. Some are on the national list of historic monuments, (10, 3.0%) and some are recommended to be included in the local (61, 18.5%) or national (63, 19.0%) lists of protected buildings.

Further research will need to include the detailed examination and survey of the selected valuable buildings. The results will provide more accurate information on the formation, layout, use, running and role of this group of buildings in the society of the studied age. The clear aim of the study is to ensure the protection of the remaining stock of this building type and its conservation for posterity. It is therefore imperative to examine how to preserve it in the long run and give it adequate functions. On reflection, the survival of the selected cases effectively serves the fostering of cultural traditions and maintenance of historical, architectural relics. Not least, they ensure the continuity represented by the social and economic role of these buildings in occasionally renewed forms, featuring as a badge of identity in a settlement’s efforts aimed at development and tradition conservation.
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37 “The government’s proposal aimed to expropriate far more significant prerogatives from the landowners, viz. having pubs and mills, and the exclusive right of fishing, the latter two without compensation, and the sale of drinks with redemption. This was in polar opposition to the written orders of the Emperor, which left these privileges in the hand of the landlords. Its main consequence was to preserve the partial monopoly of liquor sales – notably that landlords were allowed to run pubs all year round, while the rest of the villagers were only allowed to do so for a quarter, or at most for half a year under the Socage Act. In this way, all noteworthy pubs and inns of villages and market towns remained the landlord’s property. Occasionally they were run by the owners and more frequently by “regale tenants”. The enormous profits produced not only by the older ones but also by the new establishments went to the landlords. The peasants and middle-class burglers declared equal before the law to the landlords were allowed to run temporary pubs at most because of the feudal prerogative of selling liquor; the latter being non-competitive, it did not pay to invest considerably in them…” [4] pp. 539-540.

38 Future research tasks: ● collecting the missing present-day block-plans to complete the identification in the remaining cases, ● locating the plans of both extant and extinct buildings (Plan Archive of ÁFÉSZ, Vásártőr, Agrober, Vasber companies, etc.) ● carrying out the architectural survey of outstanding items (as practical work for architecture students) ● value assessment, probing examinations, proposals for protection
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