Urban Territories in Late Medieval Brussels. Imagined Frontiers and Responsible Institutions

Bram Vannieuwenhuyze
University of Ghent

Abstract

This chapter[1] focuses on the spatial analysis of intra-urban territories which existed in late medieval and early modern Brussels (Belgium). By studying their morphological characteristics and origins, I seek to understand their functions within urban society. These intra-urban territories did not have clear or stable frontiers, unless they were demarcated by town walls. The territories were defined by a chain of loose spatial elements. The town council used them to organise urban defence and to apply fiscal and commercial rules. Therefore, they were created *ex nihilo*, revealing the *divide et impera* policy of the town council.

In deze bijdrage wordt een ruimtelijke analyse van een aantal specifieke binnenstedelijke territoria in het laatmiddeleeuwse Brussel uitgevoerd. Hierbij gaat de aandacht vooral uit naar de morfologische eigenschappen van deze territoria, hun ontstaanscontext, hun ruimtelijke begrenzing en hun maatschappelijke rol. Uit het onderzoek blijkt dat deze territoria geen duidelijke en vaste grenzen bezaten. Enkel de beide stadsomwallingen fungeerden als dusdanig. Voor het overige werden ze beschreven door middel van een keten van losse ruimtelijke elementen. De verschillende territoria werden vermoedelijk gecreëerd in het kader van een divide et impera-*beleid vanwege de Brusselse stadsoverheid. Ze werden gebruikt om de stedelijke defensie te organiseren en om fiscale en commerciële reglementen op te leggen.*

Introduction

Throughout history, cities have been described in many ways. Some authors enumerate the most striking properties and qualities of the city. Other writers conceive of cities as conglomerations of significant buildings and structures (e.g. city halls, churches, town

walls, palaces, important roads and markets). In both approaches the city is reduced to its most characteristic elements. Other aspects of the urban experience remained unstudied although they were certainly characterized by specific particularities.

During the 18th century, some guides and chronicles of Brussels tried to fill this gap by describing the different parts of the city one by one[2]. The 'advertisement' for the readers of such an edition clearly indicated that the inhabitants of large cities often ignored the things that made their city famous[3]. Because of improvements in statistical methods and administrative practice, the entire urban surface could more easily be grasped in one single approach. Yet, this kind of description and analysis often risks being static and colourless.

Nowadays, historians also need to elaborate appropriate ways of describing and – more importantly – understanding historic urban space. This chapter focuses on a specific method for describing and understanding the space of late medieval and early modern Brussels, examining the intra-urban territories that existed in the 15th and 16th centuries using a particular approach.

Intra-urban territories

From the 15th century, Brussels town council edicts mentioned specific territories. Some territories were demarcated outside of the town walls and enclosed city and hinterland, e.g. the so-called *Ammanie*, *Vrijheid* (Liberty) and *Kwartier* (Quarter) of Brussels. They have already been studied thoroughly and will not be dealt with here[4].

However other small territories existed within the city walls and are therefore defined as strictly intra-urban and have not been studied by historians. Generally they were mentioned in the records that were issued by the Brussels town council, indicating that there was a close relationship between these territories and the town council[5]. They can be classified typologically by using the terminology of the day (*wijcken*, circles and quarters). The *wijcken* are the best supported with evidence from the records and seem the most important and developed intra-urban territories in late medieval times. These territories will be treated in detail, the others will be discussed more briefly.

Beside their morphological properties and date of creation or first mention in the records, special attention is paid to the delimiting of each type of territory as well as to its social and political functions within society. Since they were created artificially, studying these territories is bound to reveal the policy of the creators and users. The conclusions will consider whether the configuration of these territories has evoked a corresponding identity.

The *wijcken*

The medieval Dutch word *wijck* is difficult to translate into English or French. French historians generally used the word *quartier* (quarter), but that would make it compli-

cated to distinguish between the *wijcken* and the *quartieren* (see below). The use of the Latin word *vicus* is not a solution either, since *vicus* was the common translation for 'street' in medieval Brussels (at least in Latin records). In other regions the word *vicus* referred to medieval settlements as a whole, some of which dated as far back as Antiquity or Carolingian times (Quentovic for instance). The English word *district* largely covers the meaning of *wijck*, but could also be used to translate *quartier* and *singel*. To eliminate any confusion, I prefer to use the medieval Dutch word *wijck*.

The medieval *wijcken* of Brussels appeared in the sources in the middle of the 15th century. An urban edict of 10 January 1453 enumerated and described 21 *wijcken* within the city. R. Laurent edited this edict, yet commented little on the term[6]. The *wijcken* were divided in two groups: 11 *wijcken* were located "outside of the old town walls", while the other 10 *wijcken* were placed "within the old town walls". These "old town walls" are now called the "first town wall of Brussels" and were constructed during the 13th century[7]. The construction of the "second town wall of Brussels" began a century later[8], and greatly increased the area of the city. All of the 11 *wijcken* "outside of the old town walls" were incorporated within the second town wall and were therefore present between both town walls. This clearly shows that the town walls functioned as frontiers, although only the first town wall was explicitly mentioned as such.

Both groups of *wijcken* are mentioned again in a list dating from 1496[9], although the number of *wijcken* listed is higher. In this year, the city of Brussels was divided into 41 *wijcken*: 19 were located between both town walls (though this is not explicitly mentioned) and 22 within the old town wall. Except for the different number of *wijcken*, the same conclusions can be drawn. The town walls functioned as frontiers and only the oldest walls were explicitly mentioned as such. Nevertheless, some parts of this wall fell into disrepair, while other parts were absorbed by the building plots, hollowing out its demarcating power[10].

The *wijcken* are presented in both records in a largely similar way. This is a translation of a representative text extract describing the tenth *wijck* of Brussels in 1453:

> The tenth wijck, outside of the Wolfsgate, along the ditch, with the Silverstreet, continuing through the Vegetable Marsh up to Orsendal and Cabbage Gate and behind Saint Laurens along the within of the ditches up to the church of the monastery[11].

As can be concluded from this extract, a description rather than a demarcation of the *wijck* is given. By reading these words, it is nearly possible to walk along the track through the city. Indeed, the people who were responsible for the descriptions of the *wijcken* simply communicated the tracks they followed. They did not measure the surface of the entire *wijck*, nor did they determine precise and visible boundaries by using border lines or stakes.

The crucial components of the description of the *wijck* are material orientation points such as well-known places, public buildings, streets and infrastructures. In other words, the *wijck* is defined by a chain of these elements. In the example given above, a pedestrian gate (*Wolfsgate*), the ditches of the first town wall, a street (*Silverstreet*), a gate of the second town wall (*Cabbage Gate*) and a monastery with a church (*Saint Laurens*) are the crucial components. To estimate the exact location and surface of the *wijcken* a good comprehension of the urban topography is absolutely required. Unfortunately, Brussels historiography has not reached that level yet.

Although the descriptions of the *wijcken* in 1453 and 1496 were very much alike, they were not compiled for the same purpose. The list with the 21 *wijcken* of 1453 is an appendix belonging to an urban edict stipulating specific rules and measures for fire prevention in the city. Every year the town council charged two 'good, honourable and peaceful' men in each *wijck* with the duty to assist their neighbours in preventing fire[12]. These masters of the *wijcken* (*wijckmeesters*) also had to report every kind of trouble or irregularity within their *wijck*. Apart from the recording of their oath in the 1470s, the masters of the *wijcken* did not appear in the sources again. Their duties were taken over by other public officers known as the centurions (*honderste mannen*). This change occured during the time the number of *wijcken* increased (between 1453 and 1496).

In the list dating from 1496, the names of the centurions responsible for the *wijck* are written above the description. However their role and functions within the city of Brussels remain unclear until now it is very likely that they were officially responsible for their *wijck*. Indeed, their duties belonged to the domain of public order: the mobilisation of fighting men, fire prevention, the proclamation of urban edicts and the collection of taxes[13].

The second list of the *wijcken* was intended for the collection of taxes. The descriptions of the *wijcken* are part of a so-called hearth counting (*herttellinghe*)[14] in the duchy of Brabant which was set up to collect new taxes from the population[15]. This list includes the number of inhabited, uninhabited and poor hearths for each Brussels *wijck*. Therefore, tax purposes stimulated the description of the *wijcken* in this way. In 1526 a new hearth counting took place in the city of Brussels and the *wijcken* were described again in a similar list[16]. The number of wijcken in 1526 was the same as in 1496.

In addition to the lists of the *wijcken* dating from 1453, 1496 and 1526, the Brussels archives contain another interesting text with a partition scheme of the different *wijcken*. It is included in a partly conserved register containing defensive and preventive measures to protect the city in the year 1542 ("done and passed on the 2nd of August 1542 to know the number of fighting men within the city")[17]. This document consisted in a division of the city in three quarters (see below), each of them subdivided in a certain number of *wijcken*, all together resulting in 41 *wijcken* (as before). The *wijcken* are listed

without a description of their content, but rather with the inclusion of the number of fighting men, divided under several banners (*vaenkens*).

In 1453 the *wijcken* of Brussels did not have specific names. They were listed numerically 1 to 11 (outside of the old walls) or from 1 to 10 (within the old walls). This changed over time: in the lists of 1496, 1526 and 1542, each *wijck* was designated by its own name. By evaluating these names, it is possible to understand the structure and meaning of these territories. The list below shows the typology of the identifying elements in the nomenclature of the *wijcken* in 1542[18]:

    streets (including vaulted streams): 16
    buildings: 10
    public spaces or markets: 7
    place names: 5
    fountains: 3

Although a *wijck* was a territory – which means that it covered several urban elements – it was always named after a single morphological or spatial element. Not one single name referred to a person or to a social group, which sharply distinguished *wijck* names from medieval street names. Neither a "Butchers' *wijck*", an "*Ophem wijck*" or a "Monks' *wijck*" existed, whereas the "Butchers' street" (*Vleeschouwerstrate*), the *Ophemstrate* (named after the well-known Brussels family *van Ophem*) and the "Monks' ditch" (*Papenvest*) are examples of personified street names.

Hence, all *wijcken* were named after one of their morphological elements, public spaces (streets and markets) in particular. These spaces structured the territory of the corresponding *wijck*, either as important arteries or as central market squares. Yet, ten *wijcken* bore a name referring to a public building, and three to a fountain. Most of these buildings were (semi-)ecclesiastical, except for the court of the duke of Brabant, the Corn Hall and a city gate (*Sint Jacops poorte*). Both these buildings and fountains were commonly used as orientation points within the late medieval city.

The names reveal a high degree of centrality inside the *wijcken*. Most of them included a central space – artery, market or building – around which the *wijck* was structured. Only a few *wijcken* bore a name referring to a wider zone – called "place names" in the list above – but this resulted from the lack of a central space inside these *wijcken*. The central spaces played a very important political and social role. They were undoubtedly the areas where the fighting men gathered and the places designated for organising a response to such problems as fire, crime or street fights. The centurions (and previously the masters of the *wijcken*) assumed their public tasks within these spaces.

In conclusion, during the 15th and first part of the 16th century the *wijcken* were administrative concepts rather than spatial realities. Their names, their undefined boundaries, their functions and associated public servants point to that conclusion. Instead

of the *wijcken*, the central spaces figured as the most important spatial structures, while the *wijcken* themselves were artificially created around them.

THE QUARTERS

In the document dating from 1542 all the *wijcken* are classified in one of the three large quarters (*quartieren*): the Cattle Market (*Veedemerct*), the Grand-Place (*Grooten Merct*) and the Horse Market (*Peerdemerckt aenden Savel*)[19]. Unfortunately, this is the only contemporary record using this classification. Similar to the nomenclature of the *wijcken*, the names of the quarters neither covered nor described the whole territory, but referred to a public space – a market place – within the quarter. The three quarters were more or less equal in size and number of *wijcken*. They respectively contained 14, 13 and 14 *wijcken*. The document also indicated that each quarter counted approximately 1650 fighting men.

In contrast to the *wijcken*, the three central market places of the quarters did not have a central location. The Grand-Place, for instance, was situated on the right bank of the Zenne river, while its quarter scarcely covered the left bank. However, the names were not chosen by accident. Within the dense street network of late medieval Brussels, the three market places were the sole wide public spaces. Therefore, these spaces served as perfectly gathering places for the fighting men in times of trouble.

It appears that the division of the city in three quarters was not based on topographical or geographical imperatives. Demographical, military and administrative parameters determined the extension of these territories and explain why each quarter contained an equal amount of *wijcken* and fighting men, in addition to one of the three wide market places where they could be gathered.

THE CIRCLES

Besides the *wijcken* and *quarters*, the urban edicts reveal another type of intra-urban territories. They are indicated by using the medieval Dutch word *cingule*, which can be translated as "circle". This word suggests the idea of a territory with a round perimeter. The records however do not confirm this hypothesis. The descriptions of the circles are an enumeration of loose spatial elements (just as in the case of the *wijcken* and quarters). Clear boundaries are not mentioned, which contrast with the idea of a round perimeter.

The oldest known circle, which appeared in the records in 1409, did not bear a specific name[20]. It can be called the "wine circle". This circle was located between two houses in the city, probably two taverns. Unfortunately, their exact location is unknown. The circle led upwards from the house known as "the Bellows" (*den Blaesbalge*), located on the so-called *Steenwech*, one of the most important arteries which led through the heart

of the medieval city of Brussels. Similarly for the second house: the circle led upwards starting from the house called "the Golden Spike" (*den Guldenen Aer*). At the end of the record, reference is made to older rights, implying that the wine circle already existed before 1409.

A later mention of the wine circle, dating from 1430, specifies a third house that functioned as frontier: the house known as "the Mirror" (*den Spiegel*), located in Mountainstreet (*Bergstrate*)[21]. Despite the quite precise localisation of this building, it remains difficult to reconstruct the area of the wine circle.

The same localisation problems occur in reconstructing the territory of the second circle, of which only one mention is known (1449)[22]. The circle extended from the lowest forge in the Vegetable Marsh (the forge of Janne Robbijns, called the *Hootstal*), located opposite the Sandstreet, up to the town wall and also alongside this same Sandstreet in the direction of the previously mentioned wall up to the Orsendalpool (*Orssendalpoele*) and from there to the Cabbage Gate. In fact, this territory was situated in the same neighbourhood of the tenth *wijck* in 1453 (see above). It can be called the "thatched roofs circle".

The third circle was called the "circle (or freedom) of the Corn Hall" and appeared several times in the sources around 1460[23], when the town council temporarily received this Corn Hall from the duke of Brabant. The circle was located between the Hall itself, the Stone Gate, the church of the Saint-John's hospital and the fountain near the monastery of the Carmelites. Although these frontier markers are easier to locate, the area of this circle cannot be identified exactly.

The functions of the three circles were different from those of the *wijcken* and quarters. The "wine circle" and the "circle of the Corn Hall" demarcated fiscal zones. The urban edicts stipulated taxes on wines that entered into the "wine circle". These taxes were lower than the taxes paid for wines that did not enter the circle. Furthermore, the "circle of the Corn Hall" was the only place in which the wholesale trade of grain was allowed. The ducal taxes also had to be paid within this circle.

The "thatched roofs circle" demarcated a zone of exemption within the late medieval city. The inhabitants of this territory were not officially ordered to cover the roofs of their houses and farms with hard materials (especially roofing tiles). This part of the city was a marked agricultural zone with many farms, vegetable gardens, granges and stables where thatched roofs remained.

Territories demarcated by the town walls

The last type of territories did not have a name either. As stated above, late medieval Brussels was characterized by at least two town walls, which the historians call the first and the second town wall. The so-called "old wall" dated from the 13th century, the

"new wall" from the second half of the 14th century. The territories that were demarcated by both or one of both town walls were simply indicated by the words "within/outside of the old walls" (*bynnen der ouder mueren*, *buten der ouder mueren*), "in between both walls" (*tusschen beide de mueren van Bruessele*) or "within the new walls" (*binnen den nuwen mueren vander stad van Bruessel*).

These kinds of territories appeared many times in the late medieval urban records, which can undoubtedly be explained by the strongly demarcating role of the walls. The oldest trace of this type of territory dated back to 1306, when it was forbidden to the weavers and fullers to stay the night within the walls of Brussels[24].

Generally, the town council used these territories for the application of rules derived from urban law. Examples are plentiful: certain city officials were allowed to acquire a domicile within the new walls; it was forbidden to play dice within the old walls; it was forbidden to keep geese within these walls; people bearing weapons within the walls received penalties, *et cetera*. As a final example, I refer to the repartition of the *wijcken* according to the position of the town walls: no *wijck* extended over both town walls.

Conclusions

The medieval intra-urban territories of Brussels did not have precise and fixed frontiers, except from those demarcated by the town walls. Although the contemporaries disposed of some embryonic instruments of surveying, they did not use them for setting down the frontiers of the *wijcken*, quarters or circles. Only a few examples report on the use of such instruments, for instance placing stakes to measure small parcels. The position and location of nearly all intra-urban territories – from little, individual parcels to greater surfaces as the *wijcken* – was described instead of precisely measured.

The descriptions located the territory with respect to loose spatial elements. These elements were either located outside or inside the territory. Natural elements and structures were sometimes used (for instance streams, mountains, valleys, marches, etc.), but most of the times artificial elements like streets, public spaces and buildings were used.

Only one kind of spatial element functioned as a true frontier (meaning a continuous, stable and visual borderline): the town walls. Especially the first town wall of Brussels was explicitly mentioned as such, even in the period after the construction of the second town wall (emptying the old one of its former military functions). All the other topographical and spatial elements that were used in the descriptions did not function as true frontiers, although some of them did indicate the limits of certain territories (for instance the buildings that limited the circles). To estimate the territorial surface, it is necessary to draw an imaginary line between several spatial elements. Due to the lack of clear and stable frontiers, these can be considered as porous territories which existed especially (if not only) in the mind of their creator, the town council (at least, during the late medieval period).

The creation of all these territories was a result of a kind of *divide et impera* policy of the Brussels town council. The intra-urban territories were used for many purposes. Some served for the military organisation of the city, while others for the application of fiscal and commercial measures. The circles and the town walls demarcated zones of exemption and interdiction, while the creation of the *wijcken* and quarters was due to demographic, defensive and fiscal imperatives. In this latter case the town council assigned public servants (the masters of the *wijcken*, later on the centurions) who accomplished the civil tasks within their territory.

It is difficult to correlate the intra-urban territories with the existence of specific social identities. First of all, the porous character and the unclear visibility of their frontiers caused an identification problem. Passing from one to another territory did not matter or cause trouble. This was not the case with the parishes: moving from one parish to another could lead to intensive discussions between the ecclesiastical authorities (because it implied loss or gain of revenues from processions, baptisms, weddings, funerals, *et cetera*).

Secondly, the creation of the intra-urban territories took place 'from above'. The town council tried to control and order urban society by creating a kind of superstructure which consisted in dividing the territory into pieces. The repartition, form and structures of the intra-urban territories thus only reflected the purposes and desires of the governors, not of their inhabitants. However, it is probable that in case of emergencies – war, street riots, fire – the inhabitants of a given *wijck* collaborated very closely and acted more or less as a group. Unfortunately, to prove this with reference to late medieval records is virtually impossible.

Notes

[1]   This chapter began as a communication in the session on 'Frontiers and Identities within Cities' at the EAUH Conference in Stockholm, 2006. I wish to thank participants at the session and the members of the CLIOHRES network for their remarks and encouragements to publish the study in its present form. I am also very grateful to Elisabeth Vercammen and Annelies Puype for the correction of my English.

[2]   *Description de la ville de Bruxelles d'après Bruxelles, G. Fricx, 1743*, Brussels 1996; *Description de la ville de Bruxelles [1782]*, Brussels, 1996; J. Rombaut, *Bruxelles illustrée. Tome Second*, Brussels 1996; T. Mann, *Description de Bruxelles*[1785], Brussels 1996.

[3]   *Il n'est pas rare que les habitans d'une grande ville ignorent une partie des choses qui rendent leur ville célèbre; moins rare encore de les voir considérer ces mêmes choses avec une forte indifférence* (*Description G. Fricx, 1743* cit., p. I).

[4]   P. Bonenfant, *Quelques cadres territoriaux de l'histoire de Bruxelles. (comté, ammannie, quartier, arrondissement)*, in "Annales de la Société Royale d'Archéologie de Bruxelles", 1934, 38, pp. 5-45; Ph. Godding, *Impérialisme urbain ou auto-défense : Le cas de Bruxelles (12e-18e siècles)*, in "Bijdragen tot de Geschiedenis. De Brabantse stad. Vierde Colloquium, Brussel 29-30 maart 1974", 1975, 58, 1-2, pp. 117-138; Ph. Godding, *Juridische betrekkingen tussen de stad en haar omgeving*, in A. Smolar-Meynart,

J. Stengers (eds.), *Het Gewest Brussel. Van de oude dorpen tot de stad van nu*, Brussels 1989, pp. 110-117.

[5] Other powers that were present within the city, such as the Church or the duke of Brabant (the local sovereign), can also be linked to specific intra- and extra-urban territories (for instance the parishes), but these will not be treated. See for instance R. Laurent, *Les limites des paroisses à Bruxelles aux XIVᵉ et XVᵉ siècles*, in "Cahiers bruxellois", 1963, 8, 3-4, pp. 161-234; P. Lefèvre, *Le problème de la paroisse primitive de Bruxelles*, in "Annales de la Société Royale d'Archéologie de Bruxelles", 1934, 38, pp. 106-116; J. Verbesselt, *Het ontstaan van de Sint-Michielsparochie*, in « Sint-Michielskathedraal – Kunst en Geschiedenis » *Tentoonstelling ingericht in de Sint-Michielskathedraal te Brussel*, Tielt 1975, pp. 19-30.

[6] R. Laurent, *L'acte de 1453 concernant les limites des quartiers à Bruxelles*, in *Hommage au professeur Paul Bonenfant (1899-1965). Etudes d'histoire médiévale dédiées à sa mémoire par les anciens élèves de son séminaire à l'Université Libre de Bruxelles*, Wetteren 1965, pp. 471-478.

[7] S. Demeter, *La première enceinte, un patrimoine majeur pour Bruxelles*, in P. Blanquart, S. Demeter, A. De Poorter, C. Maasart, S. Modrie, I. Nachtergael, M. Siebrand (eds.), *Autour de la première enceinte. Rond de eerste stadsomwalling*, Brussels 2001, pp. 18-20.

[8] C. Dickstein-Bernard, *La construction de l'enceinte bruxelloise de 1357, essai de chronologie des travaux*, in "Cahiers bruxellois", 1995-1996, 35, pp. 91-128.

[9] J. Cuvelier, *Les dénombrements de foyers en Brabant (XIVᵉ – XVIᵉ siècles)*, Brussels 1912, pp. 219-292.

[10] M. Martens, *De gebruiksrechten en renten op de eerste vestingmuur van Brussel onder het Ancien Régime*, in "Tijdschrift van het Gemeentekrediet van België", 1968, 22, 86, pp. 203-213; Demeter, *Première enceinte* cit., pp. 20-21.

[11] *Den thiensten wijck, buten tsWolfs wyket langhs der grecht mitter Silverstrate vervolgende int Warmoesbroeck tot den Orsendal ende ter Coelscher poirten toe ende achter Sinte Laureys langs binnen vesten totter kerken van der cloestere* (Laurent, *Acte* cit., pp. 474-475).

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 471.

[13] B. Vannieuwenhuyze, *"Allen dengenen die in der stad dienste sijn." Een overzicht van de stedelijke openbare ambten en diensten in het laatmiddeleeuwse Brussel 1229-1477*, Ghent, 2002, pp. 138-139.

[14] A general overview of this kind of sources is given by M. Arnould, *Les relevés de feux*, Turnhout 1976.

[15] Cuvelier, *Dénombrements* cit., pp. CCXIX-CCXLV.

[16] *Ibid.*, pp. CCXLVIII-CCCII.

[17] *Monstren gedaen ende gepasseert opten 2ᵉ dach augusti 1542 om te weten wat volck van weeren hier inder stadt waeren* [...] (Archives of the City of Brussels, Archives anciennes, n° 1223, fᵒ 46 vᵒ).

[18] Streets : *Loevenen wech, Berchstrate, Schoenbeke, Cruepelstrate, Ridderstraete, Spiegelbeke, Putterie, Vleeschouwers strate, Ruijsbroeck, Stoofstraete, Smaelbeke, Guldestraete, Steenstraete, Verwers straete, Vleemschen steenwech* and *Sᵗᵉ Cathelijnen straten;* buildings : *wijck opt Hoff, Sinte Laureijs wijck, Sinte Marie Magdaleenen, Capellewijck, Sᵗᵉ Peeters ten Sieckelieden, Sᵗᵉ Juliaens, tCorenhuijs, Sint Jacops poorte, tHerico, dBegijnhoff;* public spaces/markets : *Veedemerckt, Houtmarckt, Savel, Waelsche plaetse, Coolmerckt, Verff, Melckmerckt;* place names : *dWermoesbroeck oft Orssendael, Bavendal, Blijckerie, Overmolen, Cruijskenen;* fountains : *Gelaeskens borre, Sinter Claes borreput* and *Sʳ Thoensborre.*

[19] Record already mentioned in note 16.

[20] Archives of the City of Brussels, Archives anciennes, IX, fᵒ 55.

[21] *Ibid.*, fᵒ 53 and vᵒ.

[22] Archives of the City of Brussels, Archives anciennes, IV, fᵒ 159 vᵒ.

23 For instance on 3 March 1460 (*Ibid.*, f° 217); on 17 May 1462 (Archives of the City of Brussels, Archives anciennes, IX, f° 203 v°); in an undated record dating from the 15th century (Archives of the City of Brussels, Archives anciennes, IV, f° 139).

24 *Voert es onse seggen dat en geen wevere noch volre binnen den mure van Brussel bliven en sal noch en mach over nacht, wat wevere ofte wat volre daer binnen bleven over nacht, si waren tonsen wille van live ende van goede.* (ducal privilege from 12 June 1306, edited in P. De Ridder, *De oorkonden verleend door hertog Jan II van Lotharingen, van Brabant en van Limburg (1294-1312) aan de stad Brussel (1303-1312),* in "Eigen Schoon en de Brabander", 1974, 57, 8-9-10, pp. 307-313. See also H. Vandecandelaere, Een opstand in 'zeven aktes': Brussel 1303-1306, in "Cahier bruxellois", 2008 (in press).

Bibliography

Arnould M.A., *Les relevés de feux*, Turnhout 1976. (=Typologie des Sources du Moyen Âge Occidental, 18)

Bonenfant P., *Quelques cadres territoriaux de l'histoire de Bruxelles. (comté, ammannie, quartier, arrondissement)*, in"Annales de la Société Royale d'Archéologie de Bruxelles", 1934, 38, pp. 5-45.

Cuvelier J., *Les dénombrements de foyers en Brabant (XIVᵉ – XVIᵉ siècles)*, Brussels 1912.

Demeter S., *La première enceinte, un patrimoine majeur pour Bruxelles*, in Blanquart P., Demeter S., De Poorter A., Maasart C., Modrie S., Nachtergael I., Siebrand M. (eds.), *Autour de la première enceinte*, Brussels, 2001, pp. 12-28. (=Archéologie à Bruxelles, 4)

Dickstein-Bernard C., *La construction de l'enceinte bruxelloise de 1357, essai de chronologie des travaux*, in "Cahiers bruxellois", 1995-1996, 35, pp. 91-128.

De Ridder P., *De oorkonden verleend door hertog Jan II van Lotharingen, van Brabant en van Limburg (1294-1312) aan de stad Brussel (1303-1312)*, in "Eigen Schoon en de Brabander", 1974, 57, 8-9-10, pp. 289-321.

Description de la ville de Bruxelles [1782], Brussels 1996. (=Algemeen Rijksarchief en Rijksarchief in de Provinciën. Reprints, 60)

Description de la ville de Bruxelles d'après Bruxelles, G. Fricx, 1743, Brussels 1996. (=Algemeen Rijksarchief en Rijksarchief in de Provinciën. Reprints, 59)

Godding Ph., *Impérialisme urbain ou auto-défense: Le cas de Bruxelles (12ᵉ-18ᵉ siècles)*, in "Bijdragen tot de Geschiedenis. De Brabantse stad. Vierde Colloquium, Brussel 29-30 maart 1974", 1975, 58, 1-2, pp. 117-138.

Id., *Juridische betrekkingen tussen de stad en haar omgeving*, in Smolar-Meynart A., Stengers J. (eds.), *Het Gewest Brussel. Van de oude dorpen tot de stad van nu*, Brussels 1989, pp. 110-117.

Laurent R., *Les limites des paroisses à Bruxelles aux XIVᵉ et XVᵉ siècles*, in "Cahiers bruxellois", 1963, 8, 3-4, pp. 161-234.

Id., *L'acte de 1453 concernant les limites des quartiers à Bruxelles*, in *Hommage au professeur Paul Bonenfant (1899-1965). Etudes d'histoire médiévale dédiées à sa mémoire par les anciens élèves de son séminaire à l'Université Libre de Bruxelles*, Wetteren 1965, pp. 467-478.

Lefèvre P., *Le problème de la paroisse primitive de Bruxelles*, in "Annales de la Société Royale d'Archéologie de Bruxelles", 1934, 38, pp. 106-116.

Mann T., *Description de Bruxelles*, Brussels 1996. (=Algemeen Rijksarchief en Rijksarchief in de Provinciën. Reprints, 62)

Martens M., *De gebruiksrechten en renten op de eerste vestingmuur van Brussel onder het Ancien Régime*, in "Tijdschrift van het Gemeentekrediet van België", 1968, 22, 86, pp. 203-213.

Rombaut J., *Bruxelles illustrée. Tome Second*, Brussels 1996. (=Algemeen Rijksarchief en Rijksarchief in de Provinciën. Reprints, 65)

Vandecandelaere H., *Een opstand in 'zeven aktes': Brussel 1303-1306*, in "Cahier bruxellois", 2008 (in press).

Vannieuwenhuyze B., *"Allen dengenen die in der stad dienste sijn." Een overzicht van de stedelijke openbare ambten en diensten in het laatmiddeleeuwse Brussel 1229-1477*, Ghent (unpublished master dissertation) 2002.

Verbesselt J., *Het ontstaan van de Sint-Michielsparochie*, in "Sint-Michielskathedraal – Kunst en Geschiedenis "Tentoonstelling ingericht in de Sint-Michielskathedraal te Brussel", Tielt 1975, pp. 19-30.