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Instead of introduction

Events that took place long time ago vanish from people’s memories. Sometimes they remain in stories but sometimes they are doomed to oblivion. In 1378 Kurzeme diocese Dome Cathedral Chapter admitted that humane memory is temporary and doomed to death, thus events have to be preserved in written testimony\(^1\). And indeed, if actions of that time were not written down, we probably would not know about the place where now is seen a park but in the past stood defensive walls inside of which along the narrow streets stone constructions were formed and in walls of which people engaged in trade and crafts. It is a place which formerly was known as "Kukonoys" and later began to be called "Kokenhusen" and which we now call the Koknese. Koknese medieval city developed at a stone castle around the half of 13\(^{th}\) century and was there until the second half of 17\(^{th}\) century when part of its territory was created in the castle defence structures (Appendix No.1). Later, when the castle was abandoned, the urban area overgrew and the only evidence of it was found in the documents in archives or under the ground. This will be a story about the city of Koknese in medieval times. In order to tell it, let us keep in mind Konkese castle, look at city’s governing bodies, its buildings and occupations of population as well as attempt to evaluate its importance in Livonia and wider region.

A place near two rivers

We can only guess why at the promontory already in the 1 millennium BC between the river Daugava and Perse formed an urban area, which in 11\(^{th}\) – 13\(^{th}\) century was built as distinctly strengthened fortification\(^2\). Presumably, vital role in the development of it was the river Daugava located at the foot of a rocky hill connecting the East to the Baltic Sea. The road system was of enormous importance in trade\(^3\), especially such as the Daugava waterway. Perhaps that is why the position of the place was evaluated and such an unenviable advantageous place for the construction of the fortification was selected. On one side the hill was shielded by Perse River, on the other by Daugava River and on the third side ditch, which later separated the stone castle and the suburb areas. Thus, the first wood, later fortified stone structures were built in the form of a peculiar triangle, adapting them to the hill terrain.

In the 13\(^{th}\) century, during the Crusades war it was included in the territory of Riga Diocese and in 1269 given as a fee to Hans for Tyzenhauzen\(^5\). At the earlier wooden castle in the 11\(^{th}\) – 13\(^{th}\) century population developed\(^6\), but after burning down the wooden castle the population left the place\(^7\). Shortly after the stone castle was built Koknese location in the new
administrative system as a fortification near the Daugava had a huge role to play, because the site was acquired for development as the necessary safety features. If we assume that at that time castles were the most secure settlements, then benefits of the place saw those for whom security guarantee to do what must be done was the most important. And those were people who could make things and people who could take them from one place to another. We know them as craftsmen and traders.

**Constructing the locality**

In mid-summer of 1277, on the 13th July, The Archbishop of Riga Johann von Lune (Johannes I von Lune, 1273 – 1284) led for some unknown reasons handed in Koknese town foundation documents (Appendix 2.). However, this step was not artificial creation of a new locality, but legal processing of existing locality or as it was written in the Middle Ages it is necessary ‘to create space for city’\(^9\). Changes in space and time have left us only a small part of the city's founding document. Remained a part of it, which is determined by a different legal status of the fixed boundaries of the site. The beginning of the document included accepted manuscript formulas, most of which were repeated. Founding document fragment provides guidance on a number of essential things. First, city-owned meadows which were in the area from the River Daugava till some hill which was named after Helen were mentioned. Second, next to meadows, there are mentioned gardens which were in the area until the previously mentioned Helen hill. Third, city stone wall was mentioned. We do not know where exactly it was located, as well as it is not possible to affirm that it girthed whole city, but it is known that the stone wall or part of it at that time already existed. Fourth, somewhere not far from the inhabited place was Johan fon Tyzenhauzen fields, who taking into consideration 1269 fee letter, was fee owner of Koknese castle at that time. Fifth, there are mentioned house properties, for which as written in the document, were attached gardens mentioned above. Furthermore, house owners had relatively wide rights because they could freely sell the existing properties in the city. What was Koknese place in 13th century’s 70s? It is seen that population near the castle already existed; furthermore it was very specific, and naturally inseparable settlement which was partly or completely surrounded by stone constructions. There were houses at the locality for which the gardens outside the place were attached. Outside the city there were meadows that belonged to the city. Thus, as mentioned, the Archbishop of Riga legally strengthened the already existing locality providing additional opportunities for the communities living near the castle and owning these homes gardens and meadows.
City Status

In 1425 Revel town council instructions to their envoys to the meeting in the city Parnu noted that ‘it is necessary to talk about the fact that Riga and Tērbata gentlemen received help for their spending from small towns’. Riga trade system was attracted to Koknese town, which town’s council had to pay these spending. What are town meetings as well as which other cities were attracted to Riga trade system will be viewed later together with specific examples, however from the mentioned it is seen that in Livonia there was developed understanding about which were big and which were small cities. And Koknese belonged to the second city group. Thereby Koknese, as well as Valmiera and Limbaži are to be called small towns. Koknese locality designations used when mentioning the locality can be seen below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.07.1277.</td>
<td>stadt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1323.</td>
<td>civitate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.05.1350.</td>
<td>stadt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07.11.1378.</td>
<td>stat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.10.1382.</td>
<td>stadt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.06.1389.</td>
<td>stadt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1389.</td>
<td>stadt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.08.1391.</td>
<td>oppido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.07.1408.</td>
<td>stadt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.10.1422.</td>
<td>stat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.12.1434.</td>
<td>stad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.09.1442.</td>
<td>stadt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.08.1444.</td>
<td>stadt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.10.1473.</td>
<td>stadt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.05.1492.</td>
<td>stedekenn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.07.1513.</td>
<td>stadt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The examples above imply to the specifics of small town where the locality was called a city, but it was also marked by the reduced form of ‘town’ (stedekenn). As for the 1277 document granting the city status, as well as the 1555 list of Livonian castles and cities, then both of the compilers of documents used the Latin word ‘civita’, thus denoting legally secure city. Often such designated towns in real life were very different form in the same way designated big cities but they all shared exactly legal validity factor.

**Town government**

As we saw, the town was founded and thereby for its senior became the Archbishop of Riga. The Archbishop called Koknese ‘our church town’ or simply ‘our town’, in that way verifying his power over it. Town’s direct administration was in the hands of town’s council, where there was at least one burgomaster and one alderman (Appendix No.3). Although usually there were more people in town council, at present there is a lack of strong evidence of its numerical structure. Neither the principles, according to which the town council functioned, nor the frequency of how often they met is known, but people in the town council in the specific period of time had related link which lets assume that from town council members burgomaster was selected. The released documents burgomaster approved with his seal, which was also Koknese town council seal (Appendix No. 4). The functions of the members of the town council were administrative and representative, for example, approve buying and selling documents or represent the town in regional meetings, which in Livonia were city days. In Koknese castle or town stayed also Riga Archbishopric vogt. Likewise, it is thought that in the castle stayed Koknese vogt, in whose oversight was Koknese vogtey. It is possible, taking into consideration the example of Limbazi town, that vogt took part in the town administration and without his knowledge town’s council could not make decisions. On that alludes also Jakob fon Tyzenhauzen 1546 testament, in which approval took part the vogt of Koknese as well as two more people, possibly, citizens of Koknese, who were the relatives of the dead. Vogt approved his decision with his seal (Appendix No. 5). In Koknese castle stayed also the judge of Koknese, whose functions were
to collect fees. Taking into account that Archbishop was the senior of the town, he had the rights to take part in town administration. But how often did the Archbishop stayed in Koknese? It is often assumed in literature, that the Archbishop of Riga had three main staying places – Rauna, Limbaži and Koknese. It is mentioned by Bartolomej Grefental in his ‘Chronicle of Livonia’. He writes that in the castle of Rauna the Archbishop stayed form Mikeli until Candle day. Then Archbishop went to Limbaži, where he stayed from the Candle day till summer solstice. While from the summer solstice till Miķelji the Archbishop stayed in Koknese. Let us not hurry to agree with this allegation because, for example, itinerary or the list of staying places of Archbishop of Riga Wilhelm from Brandenburg shows that Wilhelm stayed in Koknese in the second half of August in 1539, in the beginning of February 1540, in the beginning of November 1541, in the end of October 1542, but in 1547 he stayed there in the end of February, middle of the April and in the beginning and the end of September. As it can be seen there are times that overall confirm the ones mentioned in Grefental chronicles, but there are times in which the Archbishop in Koknese has given out documents; although according to the chronicle he had to be somewhere else. Of course it is essential to understand that the documents have remained fragmentary and it is not possible to gain chronologically precise data of the residence time in any of places; however these documents show the main tendencies that are facts to take into consideration.

The look of the town

The same as the castle, Koknese town position was defined by the naturally existing relief. If we look at Koknese location plan of 1630 (Appendix No. 6), seems that Koknese town was nothing more than extended castle forepart. Such impression occurs because the town’s stone walls were broadened withholding castle fortification line direction. But the castle structures were separated from the town with stone wall. Furthermore, each structure had its own administration institution. The town wall, as clarified, was mentioned already in 1277 in town rights allocation document. From the description included in the document, it is not possible to localize the stone wall, as well as it is not definable whether it grasped whole territory of the town. The existence of the stone wall is shown in 17th century Koknese location plans (Apendix No. 7). There were several gates in the stone wall. One was called Water gate and they were located on the city side that was pointed to the River Daugava. The other, in the beginning of the 17th century was called the Old gate, which means that at some point they functioned as town gate. While the third gate was simply called the Town gate,
without special name. In the end of 15th century one of the previously mentioned or other gate were denoted with a name ‘Lubberdesschenn’. It is possible that this name denotes the personal name which would be ‘Lubert gate’. It is not known why gate were called like that. This gate was located in front of the priest land and house.

Koknese town occupied about 3.6 hectares in which different types of buildings were placed. There was St. Paul church in the town. Taking into consideration that in Koknese Mayor seal (Appendix No. 4) was St. Paul, it is possible that he was once chosen for saint patron or protector of Koknese town. St. Paul attribute, as it can be seen in the seal, was a book. Thus it is understandable that the town church was devoted to this saint. In 1392 testament which was compiled by some Bertold from Koknese, 2 marks were bequeathed to St Paul church reconstruction. When the church was built is not known, but it happened possibly in the 13th century as in the beginning of the 14th century the church had both Rector and Plebani, who was one and the same person and his name was Arnold Stove from Koknese. In 15th century document another person is mentioned, who was connected with church because in his use was the land of the priest. In priests use was also the land in front of the town. It is possible that exactly near this church made burials were investigated in 1962 archaeological works, where it was concluded that the dead were buried in wooden arks and burials were carried out in several layers. Regularly mentioned in documents is chapel near Koknese town, which was called the Town Chapel. There was also other chapel which in the 15th century was called the Old Chapel. In one of these chapels was St. Virgen Mary vicaria founded by some Heinrich Bremere, which rent the son of Engelbrecht von Tyzenhauzen – Hans, sold for 83 Riga marks to its guardians – Koknese town council. It means that defunct Heinrih Bremer in his life had been connected with Koknese town council why the town council was his vicaria guardians, while the vicaria landing money incoming rent payments had been bequeathed to Tyzenhauzen family. It is possible that Kersten fon Rozen was in debt for already mentioned vicaria as in the distribution of property between him and his cousins he mentioned 300 mark big debt to some vicaria in Koknese. Besides churches in Koknese town also functioned Franciscan Order sub branch Bernardins monastery. No evidence of found of its functioning before 16th century. Monastery brothers were called Basque, grey brothers or minority, all of which were synonymous to Franciscan monks. In 1515 Franciscan monk monasteries functioned in Riga, Viljandi, Limbaži and Koknese, where they were bequeathed half lasts malt. In 1522 10 marks were bequeathed to Franciscan monastery in Koknese. The donations to mental organisations in medieval times were popular thus normal thing. Taking into consideration that reformation to monastery operation in biggest Livonian cities left disruptive effects then in 1532 the
Archbishop of Riga handed out defence letter to Franciscan order brother of Koknese. We should think that reformation did not influence the monastery operation in Koknese and in 1556 50 marks were bequeathed to it.

There were several properties in town where residential home of workshop was located. There were several properties that belonged to the Archbishop. Also a big part of estate belonged to the inhabitants and citizens of Koknese. In the town and outside it there was a property that belonged to the vassals of the Archbishop of Riga, for example Johanam Shurman, who was landknecht from Laudona or biggest vassal family representatives, for example Heinrich van Ungernam. The property in the town was inherited, sold and bought. It varied in size. The property known for us was built from stone and was 8x11 m big. Fully archeologically investigated is only one home (Appendix No.8). It had also 3 m deep basement for which there was stairs from the street. This most probably was house. Next to it there was another, which taking into consideration the big amount of bones as well as blanks and their processing tools was bone processing workshop. Buildings with the narrowest building part were pointed to the street and arranged in lines. This kind of building was traditional to medieval towns in Germany. While the street was paved, furthermore 2,5 m wide and with kennels at the sides. Probably the streets had names that are not known to us. The location of Koknese Town council cannot be clarified as well as nothing is known of its layout. There are only directions that the Town council was stone building, that it was not far from Water gate and that another estate was attached to it the functions of which are not mentioned.

**Inhabitants of Koknese**

At the town both to the side of the River Perse, in front of the town and most probably in other parts of the town, town’s administrator’s property was located, which was Tyzenhauzen, citizen and other Archbishop Vassal property. Furthermore, in 1350 Archbishop granted additional land area for town’s citizen use calling it a ‘good investment’. These properties were agricultural fields and meadows that were attached to some property in the town. It means that the citizen of Koknese had land in the town where the house or workshop was located as well as agricultural land outside the town that was field or meadow.

Very essential were the roads that led to Riga, Bērzaune and Cesvaine. Also there was a ferry over Daugava near Koknese and such ferries were also near Ikšķile and Lielvārde. One of the roads near Koknese was used to get to Lithuania. It was probably
used by the Mayors of Tērbata Bishopric who in the winter of 1424 were sent on secret mission to Lithuania\textsuperscript{77}. Roads and structures connected to them were vitally essential elements in medieval times, and they very often determined the development of a place and its inhabitants.

The road system also played essential role in what occupations inhabitants had. In the 80s of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century many tradespeople who stayed in Koknese were involved in trade in Riga\textsuperscript{78}. Among them we should specially highlight tradespeople Zeimes (Seyme) family representatives or sales partners\textsuperscript{79}. They in trade deals with Riga town councillors, their own family representatives or other traders were involved at least 16 times\textsuperscript{80}. Zeimes family activities show that at that time Koknese was already attracted to Hanseatic trade system and was not the only town, because family trade connections reached till Valmiera and Cēsis. Also in the town of Koknese functioned craftsman, for example, bone processing master or potter\textsuperscript{81}. The existing property of the own archbishop rented to the inhabitants of the town, whom had to do the so called citizen service\textsuperscript{82}. What this service included is not known precisely but one craftsman who apparently had knowledge in bricklaying, had to do the service in the castle\textsuperscript{83}. It means that the citizen service in one way or another was connected with the duties for towns senior and his property – castle.

**Towns significance in Livonia and attraction to Hansaetic system**

Koknese town had experienced a series of changes towards the beginning of the 14\textsuperscript{th} century. The gaining of town status promoted people economic activity. Likewise towards the end of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century Koknese was already attracted to Hanseatic system and distant tradespeople partners already operated in it. Similarly as the fact that Koknese belonged to the diocese of Riga as religiously territorial division\textsuperscript{84}, it similarly was attraction to Riga trade county of the so called third. Limbaži, Cēsis and Valmiera also belonged to it\textsuperscript{85}. The division in economical and religious space was not related to the spatial distribution of political power and operated independently from it, but decisions made in Livonian political space, of course, influenced it. On the 2\textsuperscript{nd} February 1369 issued recess or the city gatherings, which at that time took place in Pernava, show several essential things\textsuperscript{86}. Very clearly is shown Livonian small town attraction to big cities or more precisely – their trade regions or thirds. Also Livonian small town attraction to Hanseatic system and its space is evident, which was united by tradespeople, common deals as well as common attitude in topical issues. In 1369 one such an issue for the community of Hansea was the prolonged war against the Kingdom of Denmark and its king Valdemars IV\textsuperscript{87}. This common attitude manifested itself as payments for the sake
of common interests. In face of Hanseatic community power the kingdom of Denmark conceded and as a result of Stralzunde piece contract tradespeople of Hansea gained monopoly rights for trade in the Baltic Sea. Among the biggest German speaking towns, the contract was sealed also in Riga, Tērbata and Rēvele. Taking into consideration that Livonian small town interests in the meetings and outside them officially represented already mentioned big cities, it will not be correct to say that Livonian small towns including Koknese indirectly took part in decision making for whole Hanseatic system and thus were fully-fledged Hanseatic cities. Koknese town payment for this common attitude was 7.5 marks of Riga. For comparison purposes, below are payment amounts that other Livonian cities had paid for tax.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Payment sum (in marks of Riga)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rīga</td>
<td>304,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koknese</td>
<td>7,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limbaži</td>
<td>8,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valmiera</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cēsis</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tērbata</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vīlande</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pērava</td>
<td>73,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rēvele</td>
<td>265,125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The amount of diversity of the tax might surprise. It is necessary to keep in mind that tradespeople, their partners and all the parties interested played a big role in Hansea. It means that these figures, probably are connected with the interests of tradespeople involved at that time, which were exposed to common good. However then Koknese payment against, for example, Vīlande payment seems illogically small. Maybe the amount of money was connected with the economical asset, but then Rēvele and Riga tax amount against payments of Tērbata surprise. Likewise it is not possible to link these figures with the significance of a town. If we assume that this was not the only payment towns paid for Hanseatic community question solving then there is a possibility that the payments differed each time and the
algorithm for calculating it was not linked to objective town size, but with the specific situation. Thus the question of the dissimilar amount of payment has not been solved for now.

Since the 15th century representatives of Koknese town began to attend town meetings taking place in Livonia. Very often in these meetings decisions connected with Hanseatic community events were made. Town representatives discussed these questions connected with roads or political attitude in some event, formulated common Livonian view which then in the meeting of Hanseatic community big city meeting had to be represented by big Livonian cities. It was arabesque cooperation model in which small towns delegated their opinion to be represented by big cities. Town cooperation principle defined that small Livonian towns have to pay expenditure of big city envoys that occurred when visiting Hanseatic community meetings outside Livonia. In order to formulate common view, before town meeting days, big cities invited for the conversation those small Livonian towns which were in the third. One such a meeting took place in the summer of 1425 where in Riga gathered small, attracted to the third town envoys, in order to discuss the question of travel expenses. Most probably in these meetings other questions that were not discussed in town meetings were discussed.

Previously we saw that in Koknese had active commercial life starting from the 13th century. Tradespeople who attracted Koknese town to Riga trade system and thus to the wide Hanseatic community trade system worked there. Different kind of money was spent and cashed in in Koknese, which means that tradespeople form different countries operated there. The specifics of Koknese trade system was the focus on trade with Polocka and Pleskava, furthermore, this connection with the Eastern territories existed already before the 13th century. Likewise Koknese was attracted to the trade network with the territory of Lithuania. From this trade network Koknese, starting from the 15th century gained payments, which were connected with customs. For example, in 1446 Lithuanian Gran Duke Envoys complained to German Order master that the judge from Koknese cashed in payment for 20 ships that were located half a mile form Koknese. The reason of the complaint was the fact that such a payment had not been asked before. Hence, the trade in Lithuanian territory also took place along the Daugava trading route and Koknese castle and town had convenient location in order to raise objections to the control system. Presumably Koknese controlled other types of traffic along the Daugava and thus gained a certain income. Although we do not know anything more about the trade in Koknese, it was a field, that was the main source of livelihood for most town’s people.

As we can see Koknese town incorporated in Hanseatic trading room. Especially actively it happened in the end of the 13th century, when Hanseatic level tradespeople
operated in the town. Later, the attraction of the town became more and more formal, as their representation internationally undertook the big cities of Livonia.

**The town after the collapse of Livonia**

The biggest conflict in the region of Baltics in the 16th century – Livonian war – essentially influenced both, the looks of the town and socioeconomic situation. The town was occupied by the Russian Tsar Ivan IV troops in 1577. The town wall suffered as in the place of which Russians had built dwelling form wood. When Russian Tsar troops left Koknese, it came under the Poland-Lithuanian state power. In 1582, Polish-Lithuanian king Stephen Batory approved the privileges of Koknese, however; Koknese town rights were not obeyed. In the end of the 16th century Koknese Town council and the rest of the town’s community complained to king about the fact that the town walls were collapsing, citizens have become poor because the pubs and shops made that took away income, existed conversely to what was stated in privilege. Although exact previous period urban population was not known, during the war, presumably, the social composition of this community had changed. A number of landowners towards the end of the 16th century did not live in the town as well as 12 landowners building sites were empty, thus destroyed. The population near the castle existed until the 60s of the 17th century (Appendix No. 9), however after several decades cartographic materials no longer show the population at the castle. This might be due to the creation of Koknese castle fortification, which was built in the territory of the former town. After leaving the town in the beginning of the 18th century, the territory of the town overgrew and former events, which took place in the homes and streets of the town were forgotten. Remained only what was written down, although the part of the materials due to different circumstances were last. Nothing showed that the ground kept cobbled streets, which used to hold and active city life.

**Summary**

Although the Middle ages are perceived as a time when no development took place, however in the history of Koknese town this might have been the richest time with different kind of events that each in its own way ensured town’s growth and attracted this place to European trading system.

In the second half of the 13th century, with the gaining of the town status, the Archbishop of Riga made Koknese a legally secure settlement. Koknses locality was typical
Livonian town. It took a very small area and was located next to the castle and defence system ‘merged’ with it. Koknese town council’s numerical structure was small, moreover its functions were limited. People of the town lived from non-agrarian occupations and engaged in trade, but the town did not have a significant impact on larger commercial and political events. Koknese similarly as other Livonian town specifics was that it assigned the defence of its interests to some big city, which in Koknese case was Riga. Koknese was attracted to Riga trading interest zone, which largely influenced the economical connections of Koknese. Thus as a whole Koknese town beginning with the 13th century was incorporated in Hansaetic trading room, however the membership became more formal with a time, because already in the 15th century a metropolitan dominance was developed in trading room. Thereby Koknese as a small town focused on other trading directions. It could not be called read Hansaetic town because the town’s operations were more passive and it exposed its representation to big cities. This form of organisation might have been like that due to the fact that Koknese as a small town could not ensure its representation financially. Thereby it cannot be denied that Koknese was attracted to Hansaetic system, but the fact that it was real Hansaetic town would not be true and would not correspond that times reality.

Post scriptum106

Small locations usually raise big questions. This is exactly Koknese case. The research of some small town is quite complex process due to several reasons. In order to find clues, one has to examine huge amount of written historical sources, moreover, they have preserved fragmentary. Thereby it is almost impossible to get common vision of the development of small towns. It can be explained with the fact that the biggest part of town archives were lost well in advance, mostly in the military conflicts of the 18th century or fires. However, the research of town is not impossible. First, one has to put together all the facts in order to understand what can be told about the city. Also it is necessary to arrange these facts in one’s imagination, to visualise it. If something lacks in the whole scene, it is possible to substitute the white spots with analogies from the story of other small town. If it is done, then the research can take place. But the main motivation is always about the opportunity to know – the more unknown, the stronger the will to find it out.
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Original:
Johannes des 2. Ertz-Bischoff etc. ---
Ferner ihre heuschläge belangend, nemlich das vom berglein Helen naufwärts bis zu des küsters land, alles was zwischen dem berge und der Düna eingeschlossen ist, und von der Perse herabwärts bis zum lande Sigfridi, alles was zwischen dem berge und der Düna gleichfals liegt, der stadt heuschläge seyn. Item alles was da ist zwischen der stadt- maur und den eckern hern Johann von Tiesenhausen, und ferner gerade bis zum Heelen, und von dannen hinaufwärts bis zur strassen Helenes, der gantze thaal. Item vom lande des priesters bis zum lande Rutzekin, und das land, welches zwischen gedachten strassen und der Düna begriffen, gleichfals ihnen zu freien heuschlägen verbleibe. Item das ist vom lande Sigfridi das hole und krumme bächlein hinabwärts bis zu der Perse zu sehen, und bis zu den eckern Rottolffii hinabwärts, gleichfals die Perse selbst, und ferner das land, welches ist zwischen den eckern Sigfridi und den eckern Rodolffii bis zu unsern eckern. Item von der Perse brücken bis zum bächlein Atrad und zu beyden seiten der strassen zur lincken, nemlich bis an das land Knip, zur rechten aber bis zum flusse Perse zu heuschläge der stadt zu ewigen zeiten haben und besitzen. So aber doch jemand was eigenthümliches hätte von allen obgedachten grenzen, deme soll sein recht dazu frei bleiben, wie billig, auch die plätze, der garten von der Perse bis zu der Helen, nach dem besitzunge der häuser sollen frei sein zu verkaufen. Datum in Riga, in anno Domini 1277, d.13.Julii, am tage der heil. Margarethen etc.

Translation:
Second Archbishop Johan and so on.---
Further their meadows respectively, namely those not far from Helen hill until desert land, everything between the hill and the River Daugava is included, and from the River Pērse until Sigfrid land, everything that is between the hill andt River Daugava, town’s meadows are. Likewise everything that is there between the town wall and fields of Johan fon Tyzenhausen and further past until Helen hill and from it up till Helen road, everything is included. Likewise from the priest’s land until Rutzekin land and land which is understood between the mentioned road and Daugava, own them free meadows remain. Likewise it is From Sigfrid land’s caves and tortuous rill down until visible Pērse and until Rottolffii fields down, until Pērse and further the land that is between Sigfrid fields and Rodolffii fields until our fields. Likewise fromPērse bridge until Atrad rill and both sides of the road on the left, namely until Knip land and on the right until Pērse reiver town meadows, that have forever been and owned. So if any of all these borders were distinctive they should stay free the same as meadows and grdens from Pērse until Helen, and together with the house property should be free for selling. Published in Riga, the Lord 1277, on the 13th July, St Margaret day
# Appendix 3

The list of members of Koknese town council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name, surname (original writing)</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Time when mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hans Eggelun</td>
<td>burgomaster</td>
<td>August 31, 1444 (is burgomaster also in 1442)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurens Roper</td>
<td>alderman</td>
<td>March 29, 1405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everd Stenhusz</td>
<td>alderman</td>
<td>January 4, 1434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinrich Eggelun</td>
<td>alderman</td>
<td>September 21, 1435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johann Wallandt</td>
<td>alderman</td>
<td>June 9, 1437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinrich Eggelon</td>
<td>burgomaster</td>
<td>September 21, 1442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johan van der Winde</td>
<td>alderman</td>
<td>January 22, 1441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hans Frolik</td>
<td>alderman</td>
<td>February 16-17, 1444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johan Punder</td>
<td>alderman</td>
<td>February 12-17, 1445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johan Punder</td>
<td>alderman</td>
<td>May 4, 1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyderick Schroder</td>
<td>alderman</td>
<td>February 5-6, 1458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johann van Essen</td>
<td>alderman</td>
<td>February 21, 1464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johann Schurmann</td>
<td>burgomaster</td>
<td>March 28, 1541</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Seal of Koknese town burgomaster and alderman, year 1385

Koknese seal. Taking into consideration the symbol represented, this might be the seal of the vogt of Koknese, year 1486

The plan of Koknese castle. Year 1620. Stockholm War archive, No. Nr. 0406H:28:021:001
The plan of Koknese castle, year 1630. Stockholm War archive, No. 0406H:28:021:002 b
The building plan uncovered during 1961 archaeological research
Koknese castle and town in 1661. Picture by artist Johan Rudolf Shturm.

From: Аделунг, Ф. (компилятор) Рисунки к путешествию по России Римско-Императорского посланника барона Мейерберга в 1661 и 1662 годах, представляющие виды, народные обычаи, одеяния, портреты и т.п. Санкт-Петербург, 1827. С. 19.
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