

Machine translation

Excerpt from the history of the von Kleist family

Second part

General history

IV. Section:

Genealogy and History of the Kleist Family from 1289 to 1477

by L. Quandt

1. The task to be addressed in this section is the genealogy and history of the Kleist family, along with simultaneous documentation of land ownership from 1289 to 1477, i.e., for the period identified above as the second epoch of family history. From what Kratz has most thoroughly and comprehensively presented in the previous section regarding the origins of the Kleist lineage, I must recap some points because I need them as arguments, and others because I aim to justify a differing interpretation.

At the forefront must be placed the content of Document 75: Pribislav of Wenden [of the Mecklenburg princely house], lord of the land of Daber and the land of Belgard in Cassubia, granted in 1289 the Abbey of Bukow 200 hides of land in his territory of Belgard, Cassubia, which are adjacent to the boundary of the 100 hides that Knight Johann Kule had previously given to the Abbey near the village of Persantike; [this occurred in 1268, and these hides extended generously measured from the village's boundaries upwards towards Poland. Duke Barnim then added the lake Ceresseke (Streizig); around 1280, Lord Kasemer also donated the village of Persanzig with its 120 hides and parish.] Witnesses to this grant were his ministeriales Nicolaus hakenbeke, Johannes frater suus, Cristoforus cnueth, priscebur, clest fratres, Gerardus monachus, Johannes cnetechowe, Reinholt bolte, Hinricus hekethusen. Around 1287, Priscebur appeared as the head of the councilmen of Arnhausen [Doc. 74], thereby serving as castellan there.

2. This Clest, settled in the land of Belgard and obligated to the castle of Belgard as a ministerialis, undoubtedly and universally acknowledged, owned the seal that was discovered in 1834. Based on the form of the shield, the engraving, and the script, it was crafted around 1300. It features the Kleist coat of arms and the inscription: S(igillum) Klest de Densin. The name "Klest" for the lineage is found until the 16th century, pronounced with a long "e" (as Cleest, see Docs. 85, 88–90, 96, 102, 106). Later, in the 14th and 15th centuries, it appears more outwardly as "Kliest," although it continued to be used in Pomerania and in Dubberow in handwritten signatures until the early 17th century. The name "Kleist" appears in original documents for the first time around 1480. From Denzin near Belgard, where Kleist had his seat (though not necessarily the entire village), a portion of the estate remained in the family until 1596 and was still considered a fief in 1663. From the adjacent Roggow, the family owned property until 1487, and from the neighboring Boissin, property remains in family possession to this day. Along the road connecting these three locations to Muttrin—which around 1320 was a seat of a branch of the family—namely along a forest path between Ristow and Wutzow, the seal ring of Kleist was discovered. If what I have explained elsewhere, with the agreement of Klempin and Kratz, is correct—that witnesses, especially in cases of land grants and boundary determinations, were somehow involved, even as neighbors—then Kleist already owned the later extensive estate near Lake Raddatz by 1289. This estate included the land granted to Bukow, which extended from Persanzig upwards toward Poland, i.e., southward—Pomerelia only later came under Polish rule—and was bordered by Lake

Streizig to the west. Thus, Klest is the definite progenitor of the lineage by name, coat of arms, residence, and estate.

3. In "Klest de Densin," the first name can only be a baptismal name, as it appears again in 1407 with a member of the Raddatz branch of the family [Doc. 100]. It should be understood as "a resident of Denzin of the Kleist lineage," similar to how "v. Kleist-Denzin" would be a completely modern designation retroactively applied to the 13th century. Therefore, the name in the document of 1289 is also a baptismal name. "Prissebur, Clest fratres" identifies both as brothers, perhaps also including Cristoforus Knuth as a half-brother.

The rules of punctuation have been brought into question here, meaning that modern conventions have been anachronistically imposed on the Middle Ages, where they do not apply. Some documents contain almost no punctuation marks, while others use far more than we do today, but only where separation was deemed necessary. Here, a mark would have been required between the names to designate them as two persons, but after "Clest," such a mark was unnecessary.

The interpretation adopted by those holding the opposing view—"Prissebur [and] the brothers Clest"—is inadmissible, as it would have been expressed as "fratres Clest" or more analogously as "fratres dicti Clest." If the name "Clest" is a baptismal name, then it was passed on to descendants, as were so many others. It should properly be understood in the genitive form as "Klesten" or "Klestes," much like the descendants of Bork are called "Borken" or, in Latin, "Borconis." In Polish, this is equivalent to "Borkowicz" (son of Bork). Similarly, a Mitzlaff was still referred to in 1389 as "filius Meslaf" (Doc. 92).

The family is of Slavic origin, as evidenced by its baptismal names. In the Middle Ages, Pomeranian noble families of clearly German origin predominantly bore German names, less commonly general Christian names (derived from saints), and rarely, and only later, Slavic names. Among families of unmistakable Slavic descent, Christian names among men became more frequent over time than Slavic names, but the latter continued to dominate over German names until after 1500. Thus, among the Kleist family members known to have been born before 1500, 42 had general Christian names, excluding the two Clests. Of the remaining 30, or actually 33 (as Bartes and Bartus are the Wendish abbreviations of Bartolomaeus, like Bartel and Mewes in German), Slavic names predominated, with only 15 German baptismal names recorded. It cannot be argued that the Wendish language was suppressed only late in the Belgard region, as evidenced by the nickname "Brata" of Dubislaw from 1477 and various names of localities. The predominance of Wendish names cannot be explained in this way, as the neighboring families of the Kleists in this region rarely or never show such names. These neighboring families include the Loden (Lode = unfurled cloth, the first Sifrid recorded in 1232 at Loitz, the name remained prevalent until around 1500), the Glasenapps (Glasnapf, as their earliest seal shows, the first Lutbert, his sons Peter and Berthold, with Peter later dominating), the von Hechthausens (from the parish village in the Bremen region, Heinrich 1289 [see above 1], two Heinrichs in 1389, and several "Heine" later), and their relatives, the Versens. The von Mönchows (to whom I attribute the Gerardus monachus mentioned in the 1289 document, see Doc. 84) frequently appear, as do the van dem Woldes, whose origins trace to Thuringia. In contrast, families like the von Kamekes, the von Bonins, and the Bartuswizes of Bulgrin, which are undoubtedly Slavic, exhibit a pattern similar to that of the Kleists.

5. The genealogical charts of the high nobility in the Middle Ages teach us that families at that time limited themselves to a few recurring names, that some names were exclusively associated with specific families as predominant, and that several families (as still seen with the Reuß family today) used only a single name (e.g., all members of the Swabian Hohenzollern family from 1200 to 1460 were named Friedrich). Furthermore, a man's name often passed to his eldest grandson and a nephew. These principles, used as tools by genealogists, are also applicable to the noble families of Pomerania. Based on them, Kratz established the ancestors of the brothers Prissebur and Klest, with inferred elements

placed in square brackets: “Jarislaw, 1175 chamberlain of Duke Kasemar I, [father of] Prizno-, Prisni-, Priza-bor, Priscebur, who is encountered between 1219 and 1240, always in Stettin, and in 1219 and 1236 as chamberlain of Stettin and thus as a castle steward there. With him, his son Jaroslaw, Jeroslaw, appears from 1224 to 1235, [who is identical to] Jarislaw, Jereslaw, encountered between 1239 and 1257 as a knight and castle steward in Röbel, southern Mecklenburg, and is the father of Prison- (Price-, Pricze-) bur and Johannes ‘called von Röbel,’ who appear between 1270 and 1285. Their sons are Hinrich Priscebur, knight in 1299, Priscebur von Kelle, knight and marshal between 1300 and 1307, and the brothers Johannes and Vicke ‘called Pritzbur,’ squires. In the following generation, Priscebur von Kelle, squire in 1347; Johann Priscebur von Poppentin; Priscebur and Hinrich Priscebur, Vicke’s sons from Grabenitz (1345–1347), became the progenitors of the Mecklenburg family von Pritzbur. Furthermore, the sons of [the aforementioned chamberlain] Prisnibor [from another marriage, as they appear much later than the first son], the knights Pribeslaw and Dubeslaw, also appear in Stettin in 1267. The former, Pribeslaw, served as Barnim’s marshal in 1265 and 1266 and his chamberlain in 1270. The latter, Dubeslaw, son of Prisnibor, is recorded as R. Dobislaw or Dubeslaw von Woty, Wotuch, Wotich, Wothec, or Wotice, from 1276 to 1286. As this latter figure is undoubtedly the progenitor of the von Woticke, Wotke, or Woedtke families, so too must the former be regarded as the father of the brothers Priscebur and Klest of 1289. I fully agree with this. The coat of arms borne by Klest and his descendants is also carried by the Wotickes, and in 1576 both families considered themselves cousins for this reason. Pribislaw and Dubeslaw are the most common Slavic names among the Kleists, with 18 and 16 occurrences, respectively, including five sets of brothers. Before 1270, no other Prisnibor, Prizabor, or Priscebur appears besides the aforementioned chamberlain. The name does not repeat in any other Pomeranian family besides the Kleists, as Priszbur, Priscebur, Priczbor, or shortened to Prisse in a spurious record from 1580, and among the Wotickes as Priscebur and Pritz. Among the Wotickes, this name occurs only twice out of 13 men recorded before 1524 and is their only Slavic name. The sons of Johannes von Röbel are also ‘called Pritzbur,’ so their father, Jaroslaw, must be identified in Mecklenburg as Prisnibor, even though he does not appear there by that name. The identification with the similarly named son Prisnibor from Pomerania is entirely plausible, especially considering the timeframes. By analogy, this points to a Jarislaw—six Kleists also bear this name—as the father of Prisnibor. Prisnibor is described as a “vir nobilis” (Doc. 11), a designation rare at the time. He appears as the first lay witness in 1220 (Doc. 3) and is listed among witnesses from the noble estate, the Zupanen, in Doc. 5. His father must therefore have held a prominent position. This is reflected in the chamberlain Jaroslaw of 1175, and Prisnibor, as his eldest son, who first appears as a witness in 1224, cannot have been born much later than 1175. Chamberlain (Camerarius) was not a court office (chamberlain in the sense of a personal servant) but an administrative role, comparable to the later chamber director. It was the second-ranking position among officials (the first being the castellan), through which the large administrative districts (castellaniae) in Pomerania were governed, and the office was undoubtedly filled from among the most distinguished men of the castellany.

6. Jarislaw is the only chamberlain of Kasemar I mentioned, so he must have held the office either in the castellany of Demmin or that of Cammin. In the latter, specifically in the district of Treptow, was located in 1224 the village of Otoc, which is Dubislaw’s titular seat, Wothec 2c [otok, wotek = at or near a spring]. By 1523 it was written as Wotke, in 1614 as Woetke, and today as Woedtke. This area included Zirkwitz and Zapplin, later possessions of the Woedtke family. Within the castellany was the castle and territory of Plate, which Dubislaw owned in 1277—likely as a new fief, since he did not take his name from it but rather from Wotuch. However, he had lost it before 1284 (see Doc. 70). The Treptow district also included the inherited estate that his brother Pribislaw sold in 1270 (Docs. 49, 50).

This sale concluded a lengthy legal dispute that Pribislaw had waged against the Abbot of Belbuk before Duke Barnim (who had been the ruler of the area since June 1264). The case concerned “dominion, ownership, and possession of the villages and boundaries from the middle of the Nifloza River

[Lievelese] in the west and the middle of the Nifloza [Eyersberger] Lake, the villages on both sides of the Rega River, and the village at the mouth of the Rega into the Salt Sea, including the lake and river Rega and extending to the location of Dwirin, the boundary point of the Kolberg municipal area [= Kolberger Deep, according to another document]." The abbot argued and demonstrated ("allegante et docente") that the mentioned possessions, villages, and properties had long ago been donated to his monastery by Barnim's ancestors ("proavi et progenitores principes"). Pribislaw countered that the goods and possessions fell to him as an inheritance from his fathers, and that the inheritance due to him under local law ("patrio jure") could not in any way be taken from him. Through the favor of the duke and upon the advice of his nobles, a settlement was reached: the abbot paid either 500 marks for the mentioned lands, including the river Rega and the associated fisheries, lakes, and all appurtenances, while retaining the ferry (as per Doc. 49), or 300 marks, allowing the chapter to keep the tavern, the princely Cammin chamber to maintain its levy on herring fishing and beer sales to foreigners, and the bishop to collect a tithe from the herring ships, while a vicariate in Cammin retained the ninth penny (as per Doc. 50). Pribislaw fully renounced his claim. Pribislaw did not claim the land as something he already possessed but rather as an inheritance from his father's side that had fallen to him, land that had been held by a paternal uncle or great-uncle and his descendants. He was their nearest heir, and this was acknowledged when the abbot agreed to the payment, buying out Pribislaw's rights, as advised by the duke's councilors. This establishes that Pribislaw's paternal lineage originated in the Cammin castellany, in the vicinity of Woticke and Regemünde, even though he and his father only appear in records as officials in Stettin. It is worth noting that when the castle of Stettin was recaptured by Boguslaw II from the margraves in 1212, it was garrisoned with castellans from various regions. Cammin also remained under his control, as it was only divided with his brother Kasemar II, who later controlled it, in 1214 or 1216.

The legal dispute seems to reveal further details. The "village on the Rega" (thus the disputed "village at the mouth of the Rega," later called Regemünde near Deep) and the Rega itself, along with the adjacent lake, were given to Belbuk by Wartislaw III on his deathbed in 1264. Barnim confirmed this donation in 1269, including the Rega with all its usages on both sides and the fisheries in Reszko. Fishing rights in the lake had been granted by Wartislaw in 1242 and confirmed in 1240; these fisheries in Lake Reszko (later called "Camper" in German) derive their name from "Recha" or "Rega." The Rega in this context refers to the Old Rega, which flows into the Regesche Lake and stretches to Dwirin. The disputed villages on both sides of the river were Robe, Camp, and Wustrow, all with Wendish names. The abbot did not base his claim on Wartislaw's donations, as these were clearly contested by Pribislaw, given that the legal dispute had been ongoing since long before 1270. Instead, the abbot relied on a document from Barnim's ancestors—not the one issued by his father in 1208, but the only earlier one, the foundation charter of the great-uncle from 1177, which Anastasia also referenced in 1235. This document granted half a share in a fishery on the Rega and half of Niflose Lake with an adjacent fishing village [Eyersberg], which were confirmed in 1208 and not disputed. However, the document also stated: "Moreover, we grant the monks 'super hominem Brattonem nomine tertiam dimidiam marcam' [evidently, the 2 ½ marks that a certain Bratto had annually paid to the prince] 'et totam insulam in qua manent'" (and the entire island on which they reside). The addition in the transcript by Rango reads "excepta villa Tribuse, Tribus," which was not gifted until 1224 by Anastasia. This "entire island," undoubtedly significant in size, can only be the land surrounded by the Rega, the Old Rega, the Zarbensch Brook, and the drainage ditches stretching northward from Treptow to the Rega. Barnim's confirmation of 1269 also includes the ancient Wendish villages of Zarben and Zamow as part of the original donation of 1177. This area's connection to the first donation of 1177 is evident, regardless of whether the additional restriction in the sole surviving matricular transcript is omitted due to Anastasia's donation lifting it—which I prefer—or whether Rango merely used a copy that included the addition. Either way, it shows how "totam insulam" was understood. Barnim did not confirm the entire "insula"

in 1269, only specific locations within it, excluding those along the Old Rega that had already been claimed by Pribislaw. For this "totam insulam," the abbot relied on a foundation, but for the area north of the Old Rega, he could only substantiate his claim through the tribute paid by Bratto. This Bratto may well have been the owner of the land strip contested by Pribislaw. The closely connected words "et totam insulam" should be understood as "and indeed the entire island"—or, more precisely, "the rest of the island." Bratto might have been the father of Jarislaw, who, as previously mentioned, was likely around 30 years old in 1175 (see Section 5). Bratto could have been a younger son or the great-uncle of Pribislaw, inheriting this property, or perhaps, more likely, Bratto himself was the great-uncle. His descendants may have died out by May 1264, when Wartislaw granted the land strip. Perhaps they were the founders of the vicariate in Cammin. In any case, Jarislaw's father would have been born during pagan times.

7. The Kleist family already considered themselves, by 1576 and "according to old accounts," as cousins of the Wotike, Bulgrin, Buzke, and Kranksparn families, basing this on the similarity of their coats of arms and, in the case of the Bulgrin family, on their possession of the village of Kleist (near Köslin). The latter claim is unfounded, as the Wendish name of the village, likely signifying "low shrubbery" (supported by its location), has nothing to do with the family's name, which first appears as a baptismal name [see above, Section 3]. The matter of the coats of arms has been discussed extensively. In summary: From around the beginning of the 16th century, the families Kleist, von Woedtke, von Bulgrin, von Butzke, Kranksparn, and von Meseritz used two running foxes divided by a horizontal bar, which in very small seals was occasionally omitted. However, in the oldest seals of the Kleist family from 1289 onward, the animals were leaping wolves. Moreover, as I add, the LR von Kleist (*1844), who was unfamiliar with these old seals, claimed that they depicted wolves, a memory that persisted. The same wolves, oriented in the same way but without the horizontal bar, are also used by the Borken family from 1282, the von Bulgrin family from 1287, the von Woedtke family from 1460, and the von Butzke family from 1510. However, from 1337, the Borken wolves are crowned, as are the Bulgrin wolves from 1309, and by 1620, the Bulgrin foxes were also crowned, according to Micraelius. When the aforementioned families adopted their coats of arms around 1500, modeled after those of the Kleist family, they began to view themselves as relatives of the Kleists.

Kratz has demonstrated that identical coats of arms do not necessarily prove identical lineage. This is evident from the above-mentioned heraldic grouping. The Borken family traces its origins to Prince Mistislaw of Gützkow in 1127 (as already suggested by A.G. Schwartz), who in turn descended from the kings of the Wilzi, ultimately tracing back to Dragowit in 789. The Kling=, Klangsporen, and Kranksparn families, unlike the others, are of undoubtedly German origin, not Wendish. They adopted their coat of arms from the von Bulgrin family, from whom they acquired the estate of Bulgrin. The Kranksparns first appear as owners there in 1456, although Pavel may have already owned it in 1389 (according to Doc. 92). This acquisition likely occurred through marriage, as the name Paul seems to dominate among them, as it does among the Bulgrins. Henning, who sold the castle of Nassow with its appurtenances (Bitzicker, Cratzke, Nienveld, and Schetterow) to the bishop in 1372, also bore a name prevalent among the Bulgrins. Barthus Bulgrin, in 1287, donated a forest near Nassow that bordered the Bulgrin territory. Kratz also assumed that the progenitors of the Bulgrin and Kleist families married daughters from the Borken family, thereby acquiring property and adopting their coat of arms. The Kleist family modified it immediately by adding the horizontal bar, while the others made changes later. Knight Dubislaw von Wotuch, who used "a star with a leaping wolf" as his coat of arms in the city privilege of Plate in 1277 (Doc. 63), may have modified the Borken coat of arms by omitting one wolf. However, since Henning Bork's 1335 seal featured a star between two wolves, it is likely that Plate was acquired from the Borken family. The star appears only once among the Borkens and at a later date. It is certain that Dubislaw, who only recently owned Plate [see above, Section 6], used the coat of arms of its former owner as the lord of the land. However, the identity of the previous owner is unclear.

Knight Barthus (-tus, -tis), the Black, known as von Bulgrin, in 1286, together with his wife Ermegardis and his sons Andreas, Paulus, Bartholomeus, Pribislaw, and Matheus, donated several hides and the church tithe in Bulgrin to the Abbey of Bukow. In 1287, with the seal featuring two wolves, he donated land to the Köslin nunnery of Moker and a heath near Nassow along with meadows at the Radüe River. He last appeared in records in 1288. His sons, grandsons, and great-grandsons were sometimes called Bartuswitz, sometimes referred to as von Bulgrin in later records. Of his sons, Andreas, Paulus (noted as lord in his seal), and Matheus, were in 1309 owners of Repkow and Wusseken [neighboring Bukow], and witnesses in Köslin in 1313. Lord Paul appears again in 1335 with his sons Johannes or Henning and Bartus, as well as the grandsons of the first Paul, Ulrich, and Vicko. Of these, Paul and Vicko were granted 500 hides of uninhabited land in the Bublitz region by 1342, extending from the town to beyond what would later become Baldenburg. All three—along with Bartus and Henning, sons of the first, and Andreas, son of the second—sold their share of the Nest River and the Jamund Lake to Köslin in 1353. The same Bartus and Henning relinquished further rights in 1356, with Henning recorded as residing in Claushagen [= Hagen near Nest]. In 1359, Bartus of Wusseken appeared with his sons Andreas, Paul, and Ruleke. Ruleke was Vogt in Zanow in 1387, and Drews, Henning, and Junge Paul [the younger Paul, presumably the son of the elder Paul] appeared in 1389. Of later members of the family, Pawel of Wusseken, who killed his brother Bartus and, according to the well-known story, in 1415 made a pilgrimage "400 miles" to Santiago de Compostela for atonement, should be mentioned. He was directed by his confessor to the chapel on Gollenberg. Pawel of Wusseken appears again in 1446, and the brothers Henning and Hans in 1450 (see Docs. 109, 111, 116). Pawel of Repkow and Henning of Wusseken are noted in 1522 (Docs. 411, 413). Henning of Tunow is recorded in 1494, and Henning, who dictated his family's genealogy to Bolduan in 1619, is also notable. All these members belonged to the ecclesiastical line. Only the three younger sons of Barthus the Black donated hides in Bulgrin in 1300 and 1303. One of their descendants may have been Henning, who lived around 1500 in Bulgrin alongside the Kranksparn family. As a grandson of one of these three, possibly Matheus (also known as Mathias), I consider Mathias Buzeke, the first documented member of this family. In addition to the similarity of their coats of arms, Mathias was a witness in 1353 during the aforementioned sale by the Bartuswitzes. Butzke is located near Bulgrin, and both places, though situated in the Belgard region, were not obligated to the Belgard castle, indicating that Knight Barthus in 1286 was either not subject to, or only loosely affiliated with, Lord Pribislaw of Belgard.

The twin village of Gardis [Garz], where Sabic and Rozsuar lived, along with Karsibor [Caseburg] and its appurtenances [later the Caseburg estate on Usedom], was granted by Duke Barnim to the Abbey of Dargun in 1242 and reaffirmed in 1246 and 1256. Sabic sold the territory to the abbey [so Rozsuar was likely his brother] without the consent of his sons (who must have been at least 20 years old at the time). Thus, in 1282, Barthus and Johannes, brothers and sons of Sabic, received compensation and fully relinquished their rights with the consent of their sons Johannes and Paulus, Barthus and Bartolomeus, Johannes and Zawist. None of them used a seal. Three of these names, including the two that appear twice, are prevalent among the Bartuswitz family. The fourth, Bartholomeus, appears in 1286 alongside Barthus among these individuals. The Sabekewiz and their sons are contemporaries of Barthus von Bulgrin and his sons. The epithet "the Black," which this Barthus bore on his seal and in documents concerning his sons, differentiates him from another Barthus, who was no less prominent and resided nearby. The Sabekewiz family provided as guarantors Lord Bork, who, according to his seal, resided in Fritzow [near Kolberg] at the time, and Lord Vidant [of Regenwalde, whose son resided in Pribislaw, near Schivelbein]. Witnesses included their sons, Count Otto of Everstein [then already lord of Naugard but also still active near Köslin on what later became the Schmeling estates], and Conrad of Nymer = Nehmer, indicating that the Sabekewiz family had acquired property near the Bulgrin holdings, possibly Nassow. As they sold land to Dargun, Paulus, the son of Barthus the Black, appears as a witness in Köslin in 1289 regarding the acquisition of the Bast estate by Dargun. The Abbey of Bukow, endowed

by the father and sons, was a filial monastery of Dargun.

At the very time Sabic must have sold Caseburg and other properties—since the princely grant is dated June 20, 1242, which must have followed the sale—Bartus, a nobleman (*nobilis*) of Cammin, appears on March 29, 1242, as a witness in nearby Lebbin in matters concerning the monastery of Usedom. Bartos is also mentioned in 1240 as a castellan there, identified with Bartolomeus (1228, 1241), and alongside him appears a Paulus (1228, 1235, 1240) and a Zawist (1244), all of whom were contemporaries of the younger years of Barthus the Black. Adding to this, the area sold by Sabic includes the village of Caminke, i.e., Klein-Cammin, located near Garz, thus being one of the two Gardis villages that received its later differentiating name after the main castle. Decisively, the name Zawist, apart from this castellan and the grandson of Sabic, appears elsewhere only once more, also in Cammin, where Zawist (once spelled Zawiz) is the first mentioned castellan. He is recorded in 1175 and 1176, succeeded by Unima in 1181, and referred to in 1176 alongside Wartislaw (II) of Stettin (from a ducal sideline) as "*principes viri*." Thus, Paul, Bartos, and Zawist can be considered his grandsons. The intermediate generation is unclear, but Paul can be regarded as the father of Barthus the Black, who in 1264 likely held the title of "nobleman of Cammin" and, from 1286 to 1288, appears as the owner of Bulgrin and the ecclesiastical territory near Köslin. He may have exchanged the latter property with the bishop for Fritzow c.p. (near Cammin) or Pribbernow c.p., whose acquisition by the bishop is undocumented. Bulgrin c.p. could have been acquired from the duke when, in 1274, he elevated Cammin to the status of a German town and endowed it with the hides of local Slavic noblemen, who must therefore have been compensated. The derivation of the Bulgrin family from Zawist would also explain the crowning of the wolves in their coat of arms. The names Sabic and Roszuar do not otherwise appear within the family but are found elsewhere; this suggests a marital connection, with Sabic possibly having married a sister of Zawist's three grandsons.

At the top of the established genealogical chart of the Borken family is Knight Borke, the last burggrave (castellan) of Kolberg, recorded from 1251 to 1282. By 1282, his seal identifies him as being "of Fritzow"—it is likely that the nearby Borkenhagen, east of Kolberg, also derived its name from him. By this time, he had probably already passed the Labes territory, part of the Cammin castellany, to his grown sons. They described it as their inheritance from their ancestors, indicating that Borke's father had owned it. While the name of Borke's father is not recorded, it is reasonable to consider Borke a grandson of Lord Bork, who, according to the Reppow Chronicle, fell in the war of Margrave Otto against Lord Boguslaw in September or October 1219, during which Duke Kasemar II also perished, likely near the Oder River. Lord Bork, titled in the same manner as the dukes, was of princely origin, and his father is likely Pribe, who appeared as castellan (burggrave, *zupan*) of Gützkow from 1175 to 1187. Pribe was an envoy to the emperor in 1184, identified by Saxo with the full name Pribislaw, as in one charter. Pribe is listed as the son of Borco, and this Borco is likely the son of Mistislaw, who resided at Gützkow in 1127, was described as "*dux et princeps*," and was in the prime of his life at the time. Mistislaw's documented son, Panten Mistizlawi, who appeared from 1153 to 1182, held lands south of the lower Peene River, including Ukermünde, with his closest descendants. One of Pribo's sons was Tessimer, who in 1212 donated Clebow to Colbatz and was described by the duke as "*dilectissimus noster*" and as participating in the grant, which was typically reserved for *zupans*. The charter was issued in Cammin, and Pribislaw appears last among the witnesses, all of whom were demonstrably involved in some capacity. Pribislaw, identified as "*de Kamin*" in 1215, was ranked among the most distinguished individuals and titled "*nobilis*" in 1220. He appears in Cammin in 1228, 1235, and 1240 alongside and among the grandsons of Zawist. Pribislaw, bearing the same name as his father, can thus be considered his son and also Tessimer's nephew, involved in the events of 1212. Pribislaw is the father of Borke, recorded from 1251 onward.

The Gützkow burgward (including Meziretsch) was lost to the Princes of Rügen around 1190 and, when it returned to the control of the dukes in 1212, it was exchanged with the Colbatz ducal line. This

required compensation for the former lords, who evidently first established themselves in Clebow and Cammin and later received the Labes territory from the duke, initially as castellans of Cammin, to whose castellany it belonged. Knight Sanda, recorded in Cammin in 1242 and 1244 (alongside Zawist in the latter), appears as a castellan there in 1254, but in 1249, 1251, and 1255, he is documented in Kolberg. He owned the village of Carow "on the Rega in the Cammin district" and relinquished it in 1255 to the Abbey of Belbuk, likely upon his death, as he is not mentioned thereafter. It is more likely, however, that he was an older brother of Borke (recorded from 1251 onward), given that they are mentioned together, sometimes with Sanda preceding and sometimes following Borke. Sanda appears in Cammin just as Pribislaw disappears and owned Carow, with its 100 hides and seven lakes, encompassing the territories of Carnitz, Schowanz, and Stramehl. These territories bordered the Labes region and likely belonged to it, later becoming Bork family holdings, with Stramehl noted as a seat in 1288.

Thus, in 1175, Cammin was home to Jarislaw, the chamberlain well-established as the progenitor of the Kleist and von Woedtke families, alongside Zawist, the castellan more strongly established as the progenitor of the von Bulgrin and von Butzke families, as well as the first members of the Borken family to settle in Pomerania proper, having migrated from the then-Pomeranian portion of Liutizia. All these were ancestors of the heraldic group bearing the two wolves. The oldest heraldic seal of any noble family in Pomerania also originates from Cammin. Attached to a document from around 1240 concerning the transfer of the local St. Giles Church to the Dominicans by the Zetrslawitz family, specifically the castellan Stoislav, is his relatively well-preserved seal depicting an Agnus Dei. Stoislav served as castellan of Cammin from 1234 to 1244, as tribunus in 1228, and first appeared in 1220 with his father Zetzlaw in 1227. Zetzlaw, identified as Zetislav Unimiz, served as castellan of Cammin from 1181 to 1208, alongside Cetzlaw, the first recorded nobleman of Cammin (1176–1194), who was likely his brother. The family, referred to as Sarnoslawitz, is thus of very noble origin. I have claimed them as a branch of the princely sideline of Stargard that relocated to Cammin through an exchange with Kasemar I. Equally noble, however, are the Borken family, as shown by our derivation. Therefore, it can be confidently assumed that they also bore their coat of arms around 1240. This coat of arms is not to be interpreted as a common insignia of the Cammin castellans, as the ancestors of the Kleists ceased being part of that group after 1212, and the castellan Stoislav bore a different seal. Thus, it must have been a family coat of arms. This requires a marital connection between the Borken family and the descendants of Zawist—the Lord Bork who fell in 1219 may have married Zawist's daughter—so that both families regarded themselves as one and adopted the same coat of arms. Kleist's coat of arms incorporates the horizontal bar, marked as an addition by its occasional omission and later inclusion in the Bulgrin coat of arms. The bar indicates a branch of the family, as was common in house marks, which later evolved into coats of arms, where a son branching off added a distinguishing element to his paternal insignia. There is no evidence of marital connections with the Borken family or the descendants of Zawist, nor of inheritance succession. Thus, the only conclusion is that Kleist's ancestors—Pribislaw already bore a coat of arms as a knight—were related by blood to the Bartus family. While prominent researchers like von Ledebur consider coat-of-arms similarity as proof of shared ancestry, it should be seen as supportive but not definitive evidence. In our case, this is reinforced by the shared status as castellans in Cammin before 1200 and the belief in kinship, traceable to at least 1500 in both families. Finally, if the kinship is as close as possible, then Chamberlain Jarislaw would be a nephew or cousin of Castellan Zawist. The offices would not preclude this, as demonstrated by the two Nankowitz noblemen of Cammin: Jacob, who served as Drost (dapifer) of Cammin and count from 1223 to 1242, and Johann or Janik, who was Drost of Demmin from 1214 to 1239. Similarly, the brothers Andreas and Unislaw served as castellan and chamberlain of Danzig.

8. If the Kleist family adopted the name of Kleist from 1289 in the sense of "Klestenson," then his

brother Prissebur was either childless or his descendants assumed a different name. This brings into consideration the remaining family that shares the Kleist coat of arms: the von Meseritz. They owned the villages of Meseritz, Semerow, Barkenow, and Rützenhagen, i.e., the western edge of the northern part of the Schivelbein district, cut off by the Rega River. Additionally, they held the nearby village of Nazmersdorf in Pomerania as vassals of the Borken family from around 1450 to 1650. That northern section remained under episcopal ownership in 1320 and 1356 but came into the possession of the Teutonic Order before 1410, likely in 1387, and was incorporated into Schivelbein. Likewise, Arnhausen, where Prissebur served as castellan around 1287, remained under the bishop's control until 1436. This provides a plausible path by which he or his lineage could have acquired the Meseritz estates. The western neighbors of these estates, the von Zozenow family, and the eastern neighbors, the von Wopersnow family, also owned lands in the Arnhausen region—specifically, Zwirnitz for the former and Standemin for the latter.

9. Returning to the Kleist family and their progenitor, Klest. The Slavic first names among the Kleist family during the Middle Ages are names that either appear among princes or could be understood based on their meanings. Jaroslaw, found in both the Rügen and Russian princely houses, means "glorious fame" (comparable to the German names Bertmar and Hruodperaht = Ruprecht, Robert). Prisnibor translates to "fierce fighter" (= Hartwig). Pribeslaw, also a name among Mecklenburg princes, means "growing fame" (possibly akin to Oghard or Oger; compare with the name Wasmod = Wachsmuth). Du-, Dobeslaw derives from dobialles (to strike down) and slawa (fame). Schir is a shortened form of Siroslaw, as seen in both forms in the name of a Polish voivode and governor around 1150 and as the father-in-law of Pomeranian Prince Skambor of Danzig. The name means "far-reaching fame." Bispro, attested as Bezprawe in 1250, means "without law, unrestricted by law," reflecting the Slavic concept of freedom. Tessen is a shortened form of Tesislaw or Tetzlaff (the name of the oldest prince of Rügen, common among his descendants in Putbus) or Tessimir or Tesmar. The former means "joyful fame," the latter "peaceful joy." Bratto, if part of the family, derives from Old Slavonic brati sia (to fight).

The name Klest, however, stands apart. It has not appeared in my research as a Slavic name. A Clits is mentioned in Rügen in 1233, but any transpositional connection is speculative. The name (Bohemian kljc, pronounced "klitsch") may be an abbreviation of klitschar (keeper, warden), as evidenced in Rügen by clerics such as Janik (clisceruiz, 1207) and Martinus (cliceruiz or clisaryuicz), whose seal shows klitsarevius. This could denote an office, possibly steward or chamberlain. Even among the multitude of free farmers listed in the Gnesen charter of 1136, no comparable name appears. The closest, Chelsta, might derive from chelst- (to rattle) or the Bohemian chlsta (freedman). Etymology offers no definitive solution. Thus, Kratz's hypothesis remains plausible and is likely correct: Klest's mother was a daughter of the brothers Berthold and Conrad Clest, who gave their younger son the family name of his maternal lineage as a first name. Kratz supports this with numerous examples, the most recent being Otto Rudolf Reder von Kleist, who fell in the Seven Years' War and received his third name from his mother, a von Reder—a practice still common in England today.

Berthold and Conrad Clest, brothers, appear in 1249 as witnesses in Colbatz when Barnim took the Damm estate as a fief from the abbey (Doc. 27). Conrad, as the younger of the two, first appears in 1248 during the donation of the Salwey mills near Garz (Doc. 26) and is documented from November 2, 1248, to 1254 as Barnim's marshal. In 1248 and 1249, he is listed after the knights, indicating his status as a squire at the time, but from 1249 onward, he is consistently referred to as a knight. In 1254, the brothers relinquished the village of Lucowe Zedeliz (= Kerkow near Soldin; this later name means "church place") to the duke, who granted it to Colbatz Abbey (Doc. 32). The property was likely sold rather than gifted, as no donation is mentioned in the document. Conrad is listed first, indicating that he was the owner, while his brother was a co-grantee. Knight Berthold Clest is last mentioned in 1255 in Pyritz (Doc. 36) and had passed away by 1269 (Doc. 48). The estate in the valley north of the castle in Stettin (near the Marienkirchplatz), which Knight Conrad Cleist had previously held—likely in his capacity as

marshal—was retained by Barnim when he consecrated the castle as the Marian chapter and donated it to the chapter. In 1264, Conrad Clest was one of the arbitrators in the dispute between the duke and the bishop over tithe rights in the Fiddichow territory. On April 7, 1269, in Schellin (a village belonging to the bishop), and in the bishop's presence, he renounced any claims to the village of Belitz, the settlement of Brode (Paßmühle), 4 hides in Groß Schönhof, and 4 hides in Sabes. These properties, which he held from Colbatz for life with all rights but not hereditarily, were to pass to the monastery upon his death. His heirs were not to have any claim to these lands, which had been granted to the monastery around 1180 and confirmed by Prince Swantibor in 1235. Knight Conrad Cleist appears as a witness in 1261 near Greifenberg (in the Uckermark, Doc. 41), in 1265 defining the boundaries of the village of Liepen near Oderberg (Doc. 45), in 1273 at Dragebrück with the Margraves (Doc. 55), and in 1284 among the knights of Margraves Otto and Conrad, who were provided as guarantors to the Pomeranian duke (Doc. 70). By this time, he was a subject of the margraves.

The brothers Berthold and Conrad Clest undoubtedly belong, based on their first names, to the group of German immigrants. While I have come across an essay claiming they were native Wendish Pomeranians and members of the later Kleist lineage, the argument states they received German first names because Heinrich Plochimeris (1173), Heinrich Ranniwez (1194) of noble Liutizian descent, and Heinrich, castellan of Usedom (1208), whose son was Pribislaw, were similarly named. It also argues that Polish princes of the time were named Conrad, and Conrad I, bishop of Cammin (†1186), was the brother of Jaczo or Johannes, a Wendish noble. However, these three Heinrichs lived in Liutizia, where they were baptized during the rule of Heinrich the Lion, who oversaw deeper Christianization. This mirrors the situation of the first Mecklenburg princes with the name Conrad, who were not Pomeranians. Moreover, the essay ignores the fact that two brothers bore German names, one of which—Berthold—was not even common among German immigrants. No proof is provided. In contrast, based on Conrad's documented appearances, he could not have been born after 1218, meaning his brother was born no later than 1216. By this time, laypersons with German first names had not yet appeared in the original Pomerania where the brothers are documented. The only exceptions are Beringer of Stettin in 1187, who is explicitly described as having been born in Bamberg, and Berner, a Lübeck merchant present at a land assembly.

The regions where the two Clest brothers appear were still largely deserted after the Margraves' devastations in 1211 and 1212, according to records from 1240. German court officials began appearing in Barnim's service in 1234, German noble landowners in the Randow district in 1238, around Pyritz in 1240, and in the Bahn territory in 1234. Therefore, the Clest brothers' immigration cannot be placed earlier than 1240. Certainly, they did not arrive with wives and children but rather as unmarried men seeking court and military service and pursuing "adventure." Thus, Conrad, who appears as a Margravian vassal and knight from 1261 to 1284, cannot be anyone other than the Conrad documented in Pomerania. The Luowe Zedeliz estate, which he received as a fief, was likely deserted or nearly so. After selling it and relinquishing the marshal's office, he appears only as a vassal of the Margraves and the Abbey of Colbatz (which had fully aligned with the Margraves in his later years), and perhaps also of the bishop. Conrad had heirs in 1269, while his brother did not—this would have been mentioned in the 1269 document. Thus, the mother of Klest of 1289 was likely a daughter of Conrad.

Both brothers resided near Pyritz, with Berthold possibly in Megow. The farmer Klyst, recorded among Germans in Megow in 1372 (Doc. 84), is likely an illegitimate descendant.

10. If Klest of 1289 bears as his first name the family name of Conrad, documented from 1248 to 1284, then this name cannot have been derived from a location, as Kratz prefers and from which he deduces Conrad's origin from the Altmark. At that time, family names were too young for such a derivation; by

analogy, the name Clest as a surname must have been first adopted by Conrad's father or, at most, his grandfather and only became a family name with their respective sons. Furthermore, in Pomerania, families not named after locations only began using "von" after 1650, while those named after locations initially used it consistently, later omitting it increasingly in the 15th and 16th centuries, and reintroducing it in more recent times. In Rügen and Pomerania (within its boundaries as of 1215), between 1216 and 1269, approximately 550 individuals of noble status (excluding townspeople, mayors, millers, and farmers) are documented with names derived from locations in the printed and available charters. Of these, only 19 instances lack the "de," and in no case is it entirely absent from other instances of the same name, which are typically much more numerous. Of these 19 cases, 13 are from later copies, where the "de" may have been omitted due to contemporary usage, and in the six remaining originals, one is written in Wismar regarding Joh. Apeldorn, and another concerns Joh. Treptow, who was simultaneously a townsman, and four instances include the "de." Thus, it is impossible to consider the 21 instances where Berthold and Conrad Clest appear, always without "de," as instances where the "de" was simply omitted. Rather, their name belongs to the class of appellative names, which were strongly represented during that time and often quite peculiar, e.g., Dowat (do what), Halup (pick up). Compare similar examples outside Pomerania, such as Schalk zu Berge (near Minden), Schelme von Bergen (near Frankfurt a. M.), Hundsbiß in Swabia, Nothast and Rindsmaul in East Franconia, and Schack (originally in Holstein and Lauenburg) = robber, synonymous with Schacher. Among the possible meanings for the name Klest, Klist, or Kleist as an appellative—none of which are found in Middle High German dictionaries—the only fitting one is "Lanzenschaft" (lance shaft) from Frisch's dictionary. This would characterize the original bearer as a tall, slender man and parallels noble family names such as Stange (1234) and Speet (Doc. 85) = spear. The term appears to be a Meissen provincialism. Therefore, the brothers Klest likely originated from Meissen, as evidenced by the knight Bartold Misner, who appears only once, in 1253, during the donation of the Burgacker in Pyritz. He is likely identical to Knight Bartold Klist, who resided there at the same time. Thus, as with the Lettow family (Lettow = Lithuanians), whose family tradition identifies them as originally von Vorbeck, and the ecclesiastical Zart family of Sassenburg, who are likely descendants of Ulrich Sasse (Saxo), residing in the bishopric around 1280, the Kleist family name likely reflects a similar origin.

11. The brothers Prissebur and Klest appear in 1289 as ministeriales of the then-lord of Belgard. The main seat of the Kleist family has always been within the territory of Belgard as it was defined at the time. It is necessary to explore the conditions there because Kratz interprets ministeriales simply as knights, a definition I do not agree with. Belgard (i.e., Weißenburg) was, around 1100, a fortified, wealthy, and populous capital and residence of the Pomeranian duke, according to the testimony of the oldest Pomeranian chronicler. The Icelandic sagas also depict it as such, referring to the Pomeranian coastal land as Bialagard-Sida (Belgard side). Bishop Otto, the Christianizer of Pomerania, visited the city twice, in 1124 and early 1125, and built a church there. During the division of the land between the first Christian dukes, Wartislaw I and Ratibor I, Ratibor received Belgard, Schlawe, and Stolp. When Ratibor died around 1155, his eldest son, Boleslaw, inherited Schlawe and Stolp, while the younger son, Swantipolk, received Belgard. Swantipolk died childless in 1185—his daughter Damroka was married to Prince Subislaw II of Danzig—so Duke Boguslaw I became the lord of Belgard and ceded it in 1186 to Wartislaw, the son of Boleslaw of Schlawe. Wartislaw's son was likely Ratibor II, who last appears in 1262 and died in 1265 without heirs. Consequently, Duke Barnim I became the lord of Belgard. Barnim's son, Boguslaw IV, granted Belgard as a fief to Pribislaw or Pribeko from the Mecklenburg princely house, with the rights of nobiles barones. Pribislaw first appears as lord on April 12, 1280, but by the first half of 1291, Belgard had been reclaimed. After the division of the land in 1295, Belgard passed to the Wolgast line and, in 1372, to the eastern Swine branch.

In 1321, the dukes found it necessary to inspect and establish the borders between their domain and the episcopal lands for future reference. The delineations were as follows: a) between the lands of Belgard

and Cussalin from the mouth of the Radduje River into the Persante, following the Radduje upstream to the Cotle River (Kautel), continuing upstream to its source, then to the Wendish graves [near Gräberhof east of Schmenzin], to the source of the Lubank stream [a tributary of the Tribgust, likely near Lubenhof, now Grünhof], then directly to the Lositze Lake, which was under episcopal ownership [Lotzen Lake]. From there, along the border between the ducal Wochow Lake (Wurchow) and the episcopal Virchow Lake, then through the same path between the ducal lakes Schmoltzigk and Sparse and the episcopal lakes Plottiz and Kitan [modern Schmaunsch, Sparsen, Plötschen, Küter]. The boundary continued along the middle of the Dolgen River, then to the village of Sadick, and further to the Sarne River [Zahn River], and finally descending along the Kuddow River. b) between Belgard and Tarnhusen: from the confluence of the Tepele River into the Persante [modern Krumme Wasser and then Teipel], following the Persante to its origin in Rorbrugk, between the villages of Ganskow and Navin. From there, the boundary ascended through the wetlands to the Mughellize River (Müglitz) and across it, continuing through Ballenberg and east of Zwirnitz and Retzin to the Lype Lake [likely the lake southeast of Retzin]. From there, the border passed to the Diesberg (Dewsberg) and through the middle of the Loine Forest to Cemine [Zemmin], then across to the point where a river emerged, leading to a stone mound. From there, it ran between the two villages of Wrow [Alt- and Neu-Wurow] to Repekow [Reppow] and finally to the Drawe River. At the Drawe River, it intersected the Polish, later Margravial, Commandery, which became the Dragheim and Tempelburg Starostei under Polish rule in 1368. From there to the Kuddow River, the boundary was left indeterminate, crossing through vast wilderness, which was only settled and defined by cultivation on both sides toward the end of the 16th century, establishing the modern boundary.

Around 1333, Neustettin was established. The Vogtei (bailiwick) existed in 1364 and at that time was the paragon of Duke Wartislaw V. The border with Belgard was likely the same as in the 16th and 17th centuries: Naseband and Vilnow belonged to Belgard, while the rest remained as it is today.

Within the Vogtei Belgard, as it had existed since 1364, the villages Reddelin, Silesen, Pummelow, the mill at Butzke, Darkow, Klempin, Vorwerk, Lentzen, Schintzcke [likely a diminutive for the small area east of the boundary river Teipel, as the western area, called Schinz, belonged to Arnhausen], Laatzke, Grüssow, Zarnefanz, Naffin, Denzin, Roggow, Boissin, Ristow, Barga, Schlennin, Groß- and Klein-Dubberow [both until 1487, Doc. 194], Wussow, Vitzow, Zatkow, Muttrin, Döbel, Kikow, [Klein] Crosszine, Burßlaff, and [Groß] Tichow were obligated to pay to the castle (later the Amt) Belgard a levy known as "Ripengeld" (a monetary tribute) and "Ripenkorn" (grain, specifically rye and oats). This was a form of tax, called *bede* or *precaria*, as described by Achatius Kleist in 1624, and Ripenkorn was also referred to elsewhere as *Bedekorn*. In Western Pomerania, it was often called "Hundekorn" (dog grain), as it was used to feed the dogs guarding the castles. This levy was introduced in Pomerania around 1250 and likely in Belgard around 1264 when the area came under the control of Barnim. It can be assumed that the obligated villages existed at that time. The list, due to the form "Wussow" (instead of the newer "Wutzow"), predates 1700 and, based on the forms "Crosszine" and "Burßlaff," likely dates to around 1500, though it was clearly derived from older records. In addition to the tax obligation, the villages were generally required to provide wagon service, i.e., *Burgdienst* (castle service) for the construction and repair of Belgard Castle, which they were also obliged to defend in emergencies. I consider the noble-born individuals obligated to these duties to be the *ministeriales* mentioned in the 1289 document (see above, Section 1). They were thus distinguished from other vassals of Lord Pribeko, and the term *ministeriales* still retained much of its older meaning. Among those mentioned in the document, Kleist had Denzin, and likely already Dubberow and Muttrin; the Knuth family held Laatzke and other locations until around 1580; the Hekethusen family held Naffin, Zarnefanz, and Grüssow until more recent times; and Gerhard Monachus, if he was an ancestor of the Mönnichow family, likely had Schlennin as his descendants did. For the Hakenbeke, Cnetechowe, and Bolte families, I have no further information, though there are enough locations among the above for

them.

The bede and wagon service were soon after their introduction granted to noble-born individuals, particularly those residing at castles, as they were intended to support the defense of the castles and the maintenance of their garrisons. Consequently, the above list excludes villages belonging to Polzin Castle, which was first mentioned as "Poncyn" in 1331. In 1337, Henning von Wedel placed it under the protection of Margrave Ludwig, who in 1341 granted 1/4 of the land to the sons of Hasso (who had been lord there in 1340). This quarter likely included Poppelow and Bruzen, which became part of the Tempelburg territory and, with it, passed to Poland until 1772, joining Pomerania and the Belgard district only in 1816. Even Heinrich resided there in 1375, but by 1389, Michel Manduvel and Zciczik [von Zozenow] were in residence, alongside whose descendants a Glasenapp also appears in 1524, all as castle residents. Furthermore, all villages of the von Wolde family are missing from the list, as well as Sietkow, which is surrounded by obligated villages. Their main seat, Wusterbart, had a castle hill and a castle estate. At Bolkow and Bukow, the Teutonic Knights destroyed their "crow's nest, which they call a castle" in 1389. This likely included Damen, whereas Vilnow and Naseband, along with Drenow and Zarnekow (which belonged to them until around 1380), were probably exempted from obligations. Mandelatz, unless it was a later settlement, originally belonged to castrum Bukow, as it also did to the parish. The situation differs for the remaining villages missing from the list above. Rostin, Lüllfitz, and the part of Camissow east of the boundary river Teipel were transferred to the town of Belgard and have been listed in its privilege confirmations since 1454. Groß- and Klein-Pankenin, Kösternitz, and Pustchow were certainly only established after 1299 and on the Schetterow land. The latter (of which part belonged to Nassow) is listed in 1299 as the Belgard boundary between Lüllfitz and Pumlow, not the villages. The first village belonged to a prebend of the Colberg chapter until 1541, while the second was endowed by the von Zabow family as a vicariate in the Belgard church, whose patronage passed to the town council before 1540. The last two appear only as domains belonging to the castle. Pustchow is equivalent to Pustkowie, meaning "settlement in a wasteland." The tithe from Lüllfitz (together with that of the adjacent Zimines) and from Bulgrin (Balgurino) was assigned to the Colberg chapter at the beginning of the 13th century, which otherwise collected tithes only from the Colberg region, where the first village was incorporated around 1318. Furthermore, Bulgrin and its owner, Knight Bartus, were not subject to Pribeko but directly to Duke Boguslaw, who confirmed his donations in 1288. Thus, an expansion of the land is evident here. In the border description of 1321, Dukes Otto, Wartislaw IV, and Barnim III acknowledged that they held the land of Belgard as a fief from the bishop, just as their progenitores (thus already Barnim I) had. This was reaffirmed by Wartislaw's sons in 1356. Therefore, it can be concluded that the bishop ceded the land expansion as a fief and, in return, also gained nominal overlordship over the original Belgard land, which was solely granted to Pribeko. The added territory includes Nassow, which reverted to the bishop in 1372, as well as the non-obligated villages Bulgrin and Butzke, Rottow (belonging to the castrum and parish of Bukow of the von Mönichow family), Tiezow, both Voldekows (Peter von Voldekow was a witness for the Bartuswitz family in 1353), Warnin, Kowalk, and Schmenzin. All these villages had previously belonged to the collegiate church in Schwellin, and their owners, at least since the late 15th century, also held estates on the ecclesiastical side of the boundary determined in 1321.

12. Transitioning to the determination of the genealogy of Klest's descendants, I first present the data:

a) In 1289, Klest and his brother are listed among the ministeriales of the Lord of Belgard, with Klest of Denzin mentioned (see above, Section 1).

b) Voltze Kliestes is mentioned in a letter dated to Belgard in 1316 (Family Genealogy of 1576, reference "i").

c) In 1364, Duke Wartislaw (V.) of Neustettin enfeoffed several named Wends with the surrounding area of Ratzebuhr, including a share of 25 hides in "the Glyne," where Prißebur holds the other half in

joint possession. This Prißebur "who is called Klest of Muttrin" appears among the witnesses as Priszbur Klest (Doc. 83). His holdings include half of Glinike, which belonged to the Raddatz family in 1493. This became the Kleist village of Nassen Glieneke, while the other half, Trocken Glieneke, went to the Vangerow family and other descendants of those enfeoffed in 1364. The joint possession was claimed by the Kleist family into the 16th and 17th centuries. The Family Genealogy of 1558 places this Prißebur around 1320.

d) "An old letter confirms that Jarßlaff and Hennig were the sons of Prißebur, as Prißebur obtained a letter in 1325 [or 1315] for Glineke in his own name and in the name of his two sons, Jarßlaff and Hennig" (Family Genealogy of 1576, reference "i"). This letter likely records the event when Prißebur acquired joint possession of the other half of Glineke, which had previously belonged to the Glaseknapp family, presumably at the same time as his own half. The date is likely incorrect, as Prißebur, who was alive in 1364, could not have had sons who were legally competent and eligible for fiefs 40 [or 50] years earlier. Furthermore, the 1364 enfeoffment (c) notes that the enfeoffed lands, stretching northward to include Trabehn, were only being prepared for settlement. The neighboring Lottin estates were only settled around 1500, the Wulflatzker estates around 1550, and the area south of Persanzig and Raddatz was not cultivated or populated until 1570. It was essential for Neustettin to exist as a protective fortress before villages along the Kuddow near Ratzebuhr could be established. Neustettin first appears as extant in 1356, is not mentioned in the papal enfeoffment of Barnim III. in 1331 (which lists all Pomeranian fortresses, including the new Polzin), and was likely founded when the Stettin dukes Otto and Barnim III. served as regents of the Wolgast division, which included all lands east of the Ihna, i.e., before 1336. It is clear that the date xxv (or xv) was misread instead of lxv, and 1365 fits perfectly.

e) Dubbeslaus Clist, squire, appears as a witness in Köslin in 1368 (Doc. 84). In 1377, Dubbeslaff Cleest, squire, and Cunrad Scheeraf, a citizen of Köslin, sell a rent from properties acquired from Squire Hintze Speet in Oustyn [Augustin] to the local nunnery (Doc. 85). In 1379, Dubbeslaff Clist of Bonnin sells the Bruchmühle (marsh mill) at a hereditary lease, stipulating that the village of Bonnin must continue to mill there, even if it is sold or reclaimed (Doc. 86). In 1383, Dubslaus Cleest, a vassal of the bishop, is a witness in Köslin (Doc. 87). On October 15, 1385, Dubslaf Cleest acts in Körlin on his own behalf and that of his brothers regarding the sale price of 800 marks VO. for the village of Bonyn, which their late father Dubslaf Cleest had purchased from Hintze Heydebreck and sold to the Köslin nunnery (Doc. 88). In 1386, the nunnery pays 150 marks to Kurd Kameke, who had won a lawsuit against Dubbeslaff Cleest over Bonyn (Docs. 89, 90).

f) In 1387, the Cammin cathedral chapter, with the approval of the cathedral estates and the dukes, elects Duke Boguslaw (VIII.) as provost of the chapter. Among the witnesses (from ducal and episcopal territories) are, listed as the sixth and seventh witnesses, Pribbeslaff and Bisprow, called the Cleste cousins (Doc. 91).

g) In 1388, Tessin Cleest appears in Dubberow (Docs. 91a, b, p. 5).

h) In 1389, the Pomesanian bishop, acting as a judge delegated by the pope, summons several Pomeranian nobles who had captured Duke Wilhelm of Geldern during his pilgrimage to Prussia. Among them are Briczmar Kleste, a half-priest from Sattikow [Zatkow], and Bisbra Kleste, son of Vulzen of Belgard (Doc. 92).

i) Among the 14 vassals, along with three cities, who serve as arbitrators in 1402 to divide the ducal territories of Stolpe, Rügenwalde, Schlawe, Belgard, and Neustettin among the three dukes, the fifth and thirteenth listed are Olde Bispraw Klest and Junge Bispraw Klest (Docs. 93, 94). The latter also serves as a witness in the simultaneous confirmation of the territorial privileges (Doc. 95).

k) [In 1403] Conrad Cleest and Czybille committed acts of feudal robbery against Heinrich Güntersberg of Waltersdorf and Balster, and against the von Wedel family of [Neu-]Wedel. Similarly, Heinrich Cleest, residing in Radacz, intercepted two farmers from the first party. The Teutonic Order master [as

lord of the Neumark since 1402] demanded reparations on February 5, 1404 (Doc. 96, indicating that the feud occurred in 1403). On Mid-Lent Sunday [1404], the Neumark governor reported to the Teutonic master that the Güntersbergs had retaliated by invading the duchy, killing Hennyng Clest, capturing his son, and burning down his house and the village of Radatz (Doc. 97). [On May 5, 1404], Hannos Klist and other Clyste plundered Groß- and Klein-Sabin, belonging to Hans von Güntersberg (Docs. 98, 99). According to Doc. 99, this occurred before May 8, 1405, but based on Doc. 98, it happened three days before Ascension Day, meaning 1404, as Ascension fell on May 28 in 1405. Thus, Doc. 98 belongs to 1404.

l) On February 2, 1407, Olde Bispraw Clest, Hennyng Clest of Bruskow, Hennyng Clest of Raddatz, Hennyng Clest of Mutteryn, Kurt Klest of Damen, Pribbeslaf Clest of Kresyn, Pribbeslaf Clest, Henningh Clest's son of Raddatz, pledge themselves to Duke Bogislaw and the council of Neustettin for their kinsman [= family member] Clest, Henningh Clest's son of Raddatz, who was imprisoned in Neustettin. They guarantee that Clest, Henningh Clest's son of Raddatz, will cause no harm in the duke's lands and will not reside in Stettin without the permission of the duke, the council, and the inhabitants (Doc. 100). The guarantors of this declaration of fealty are listed in alphabetical order.

m) In 1411, during the peace [i.e., after the Treaty of Thorn on February 2, 1411, in which Duke Bogislaw participated as an ally of Poland], damages were inflicted in the Neumark from the duke's duchy by the Kleists and others. They plundered Dolgenow and Clötzin [north of Schivelbein], took 16 horses from the Born family of Grasse, and made three raids into Falkenburg. Heinrich Klest's peasants from Zanow stole cattle from Schivelbein citizens; the Kleists of Kresyn looted in Wurow and Clebow in the Falkenburg region and even in front of Falkenburg Castle itself (Doc. 101).

n) In a document from 1430, Thilo found George Kleist listed as a witness (von der Osten).

o) During the peace, "Polans" and "Kashubians" invaded the Schlochow district. Claus Kameke and Pribbeslaf Cleste, with their company, plundered the villages of Domslaw, Lasen, Hensfelde, and Falkenwalde [all southeast of Hammerstein] on the day before Michaelmas, nearly a year prior. On St. Martin's Day, the [Poles] from [Polish] Crone plundered Christfelde (Doc. 103). Kratz dates this to 1435, rightly so, as Voigt reports similar plundering in Schlochow by Pomeranians and from Crone in 1435. The peace in question is the supplemental peace of Brzesc concluded in November 1433. To the same period—and not around 1414–1416 as Kratz assumes—also belongs the following: "After the peace, from the Duchy of Stolp, damages were inflicted by two Zastrow, Adam Podewils, etc., as well as Przybeslaff Cleest and the Kameke's retainers, Jurge Cleest and Wolf Gumptow, etc., and others from Cuprvin and elsewhere" (Doc. 102). The association of Przybeslaff (Przyb. is a Polish diminutive) with the Kamekes is unlikely to be twofold. Adam Podewils and Jurge Kleist also appear in 1439, and the latter also in 1430 and 1445 (see n., q., r.). The Duchy of Stolp encompasses all lands governed by the duke, who primarily resided in Stolp and was titled as ruler of the Teutonic Order lands from Stolp—essentially all of Hinterpommern. Kashubians here still (as in a.) refer to the Belgard and Neustettin region.

p) Duke Bogislaw complained to the Grand Master Paul von Rußdorf [who reigned 1420–1440] that the peace between the Order on one side and the King of Poland and himself on the other was not being upheld. The Danzig Komtur had imposed taxes on the duke's men from Polzin and others. The Vogt of the Neumark, within the same peace, had also taxed "our man, Henningh Klyste's son of Mutteryn," as well as "our citizens of Stargard, Arnswalde, and Belgard," despite Bogislaw having written repeatedly

to the Vogt about these matters (Doc. 104). "This also seems to belong to around 1435," Kratz suggests. The time is determined by the expedition of the Danzig Komtur with a mercenary force from Dramburg through Polzin and Polnow in the summer of 1433, as well as Pomerania's possession of the Neumark town of Arnswalde. Bogislaw took Arnswalde as an ally of Poland in June 1433 and retained it in the supplemental peace of Brzesc in November 1433 until it was ceded in the perpetual peace on December 31, 1435, and handed over in 1436. Thus, the taxation occurred in 1433, and the letter, preceded by several others, dates to 1435.

q) In a dispute between Adam Podewils and the Ramel family over Altschlage, the Neumark forest master, along with Hermen and Jurjen Kleist, supported the Ramel family. On August 18, 1439, a settlement was reached (Doc. 105).

r) For the meeting scheduled by the Grand Master for the Feast of St. James in 1445 with the duke at the border near Bütow, the Neumark representatives were instructed to register their claims against Pomeranian subjects. Among those summoned (cited) were olde Marquart Sanitze calling Jurge Cleiste of Damen and Hans Zosenow of Polzin, a citizen of Arnswalde calling Lüdeke Cleyste residing in Vitzow, and Reymer Podewelsch (Doc. 105b in the second supplement).

s) Gertrud served as prioress from 1454 to 1456, and Gese (=Gertrud) as abbess of the Köslin nunnery from 1458 to 1465 (Docs. 106–110).

t) Ewald of Belgard acted as guarantor for Reimer Versen of Voldekow in 1472 (Doc. 117).

u) According to the 1474 land register, Pribschlaff, along with his brothers Bispro, Dubschlaff, and Jacob, received enfeoffment. He also sought and obtained joint possession of their Damen estates alongside Bispro (Family Genealogy of 1576, reference "r."). Voltze, their brother, is likely mentioned in the register as Henning's fifth son (ibid., reference "i.") since he is otherwise counted as the seventh.

v) Knight Jacob or Jakusch [a Polish diminutive of Jacob] was around 1450 a landowner in the Dirschau region of Pomerelia.

w) Finally, the contents of the letter of enfeoffment of April 13, 1477, are to be reiterated: all Kleist enfeoffed at that time testified that they descended from a common ancestor who had three sons. One son's lineage includes Bispro of Muttrin with his sons Henning, Peter, and Hans; Dubbeschlaff of Damen with his sons Drewes, Curd, Bispro, Peter, and Pribbeslaw; and Pribbeslaw of Muttrin with his sons. Another lineage includes the brothers Reymer and Bartes of Tichow, Jurgen and Peter, brothers of Dubberow. The third son's descendants include Voltze of Vilnow and Curt and his brothers of Raddatz (Doc. 125).

13. The following observations must be prefaced for the further investigation: after 1477, marriages of Kleist men before the age of thirty are exceedingly rare and should therefore not be presumed; in contrast, women often married at a very young age. The average duration of a generation (from death to death, and thus also from birth to birth) among the descendants of Bispro of Muttrin—specifically, the lineage of his firstborn son Henning, where all successors are firstborns—is 37 years. Among the descendants of Peter (the Borntiner line) and Curt of Damen, it is 38 and 39 years; among those of Curt's brother Bispro, 43 and 44 years; for his brother Peter, 40 to 43 years; and among the Raddatz line, from the death of Schir (1541) to their extinction, it is 36 years. Some individual cases show even longer durations, such as the line of Bispro of Damen, whose youngest son from his second marriage, Jürgen, was followed by Carsten (Jürgen's third-youngest son) and Joachim (Carsten's second-youngest son), with generational spans of 35, 44, 60, and 59 years, respectively (averaging 49.5 years). Paul of Damen approved a parish appointment in 1493 and received enfeoffment in 1501, but his sons were minors in 1556, meaning the eldest could not have been born before Paul was at least 55 years old. Similar conditions often apply to sons from second and third marriages. An average generational span of 30 years, as Kratz applied, is therefore inadmissible. - Another remark is that, until 1600, sons

received their father's name only five times: four times it was given to the youngest son (in the respective fifth, sixth, seventh, and sixth positions) and once to the fourth son, who was not the youngest. Only later does this practice appear sporadically for sole sons, although sons with different names may have died young.

14. Looking solely at the 1289 document concerning Klest, one could ascribe him any age.

However, if Prisnibor and Conrad Clest are accepted as his grandfathers, he could not have been born before 1260–1262. Conrad was active from 1248 to 1284, and Pribislaw, Klest's father, from Prisnibor's second marriage, first appears in 1265 and is mentioned as a knight on June 13, 1267, but not on February 12, 1266 (Docs. 43, 46). Thus, Klest would not have been older than 55 in 1316 when Voltze appears as a witness [see 12b], making Voltze his son, recently of age, as young men of this sort were often chosen as witnesses for their vigor. This would be confirmed if the 1316 document explicitly referred to "Voltze Kliestes." Voltze, if applicable, would have been the Vulcze referred to as the father of Bispraw [b]. Bispraw was involved in a major state event in 1387 [see f], implying he was of full legal age. By 1402 and 1407, he is distinguished as "the elder" [see i, l]. In 1402, among the 14 vassals who served as arbitrators between the dukes, he is listed as the fifth and the third among the knights, Bispraw is listed as the 13th (or 11th) arbitrator. However, the younger Bispraw must have reached manhood by 1389, as it was necessary to distinguish the elder explicitly as "Vulcze's son." Therefore, the elder Bispraw could not have been born after 1347 and may have been born as early as 1340, at which time Voltze, as Klest's son, must have been between 42 and 50 years old. Thus, Voltze is the Vulcze referred to, and there is no need to assume a second marriage for him. Of the two lines of the third branch, as outlined in [w], the Vilnowers are always listed before the Raddatzers, even in the Family Genealogy, where they are derived from the elder brother. The location of the two estates also suggests that Vilnow was the seat of the common ancestor. The Raddatz line consisted of multiple members in 1403 and 1407 [see k, l], so the Vilnower line must have been similarly established. Among the guarantors for the Raddatz Clest in 1407 [see l], one would expect the then-current Vilnower, as the closest relative and neighbor, to be included; however, he is notably absent. Instead, only Olde Bispraw is listed without a specified residence, making him the Vilnower. The Family Genealogy of 1576, which speculated and later confirmed that Voltze was the ancestor of the Vilnow-Raddatz branch, is thus correct. The reasoning they provided—namely, the recurrence of the name within this branch (Volz of Vilnow in 1477, Volz of Raddatz, †1469, his grandson Volz in 1541 and onward, and his great-grandson Völz Joachim, all heads of their respective lines)—completes the proof. This also identifies Klest as the Oldervater referred to in the 1477 letter of enfeoffment [see w] and as Bolduan's Kleistius.

The Henning of Raddatz who acted as guarantor in 1407 is clearly the same Henning later named as the father of Pribbeslaf and Clest of Raddatz [see l]. His sons were already of age, as one served as guarantor while the other was able to choose his residence, having previously lived in Neustettin but conducted himself in a manner that led to his imprisonment and expulsion from the city. This Henning must therefore be the father of the Henning who was still combat-ready in 1404 [see k]. He is described as "geslagen" (struck down), meaning wounded and left lying, rather than killed outright; his son was captured, indicating he was also capable of combat. The age of the sons places Henning as a contemporary of Bispraw, making him the ancestor of the Raddatz line, just as Bispraw is the ancestor of the Vilnower line, and thus Henning is Bispraw's younger brother. Consequently, the Heinrich who was already living in Raddatz and engaged in feuds in 1403 [see k] must be Henning's eldest son. There is no need to assume Heinrich was a scribal error for Henning, as this is unsupported and unnecessary. It is notable, however, that the Heinrich who held Zanow in 1411 [see m] was likely the duke's pledge-holder (Pfandvogt) for this estate. Zanow, originally an episcopal castle since around 1345, was acquired by the duke in 1387 and hosted Vogts there in 1387, 1457, and 1480. Pribbeslaf, a young man in 1407, is the only candidate to be the Pribbeslaff plundering near Hammerstein in 1435 [see o]. The location of the estates suggests he belonged to the nearest Kleist family, the feud-loving border keepers

at Raddatz and Dallentin. The Kamekes, to whom his companion belonged, still owned the area around Carzenburg and Wesenborg at the time.

15. The Family Genealogy (FG) of 1558 and 1576 places a Pribschlaff at the head of the confirmed genealogy of the Raddatz line as the father of Voltze, who fell as a leader in the Schivelbein War [1469]. Voltze's eldest son, Curt, who was enfeoffed in 1477 [w.], was a minor in 1480 and reclaimed property in 1486 that had been sold during his minority. The second son, Pribbeslaw, became a notary of the principal officialate in Stettin in 1488 [indicating he was of age by then] and died only in 1541 as cathedral dean, having accepted a coadjutor in 1537 due to old age. These facts suggest they were born around 1460 and 1462, respectively, meaning their father must have been born before 1430. According to documents and the FG of 1700, Pribschlaff's elder brother was Bisprow, who spelled his name "Bisprau" and was considered over 80 years old in 1496. Their sister was married in 1458, suggesting she was born between 1433 and 1442. Bisprow's stepmother had died a few years earlier in 1486 [but before 1477]. Thus, Pribschlaff married his first wife no later than 1415 and was still alive in 1435, making him the same Pribbeslaf, son of Henning, who appeared in 1407 and 1435. This securely connects the genealogical line of the Raddatz family to Klest.

The eldest son of Voltze of Vilnow [1477, w.], Schir, stated that he was born in 1464 or 1465 to a Smelingk (Doc. 421), placing his father's birth before 1435. According to the FG, his brother was Prissebur, who must have died before 1477. The FG of 1558 and 1576 identifies their father as Dubschlaff, whom it also describes as a brother of Pribschlaff of Raddatz because both are placed at the heads of two lines that supposedly descend from two brothers. However, Dubschlaff was more likely a descendant of the elder Bisprow, specifically his grandson, as suggested by the inclusion of an additional intermediate generation, Voltze. The Voltze of 1477 is younger than the Voltze of Raddatz, who was the third son of a younger son of Henning, Bisprow's younger brother. In contrast, the Vilnow line consists exclusively of firstborns, implying an additional generation in their lineage. Dubschlaff would have been roughly contemporary with Dubschlaff of Damen, who is distinguished as "Brata" (brother), with no third individual of the same name appearing at that time. - If Dubschlaff of Vilnow and Pribschlaff of Raddatz were not brothers, the FG's reference to their brother Jarislaff, mentioned as childless and last in line, must belong to one of them. Given the known brothers of Pribschlaff of Raddatz (through k. and l.), Jarislaff should be assigned to the Vilnow line.

16. In the Muttrin-Damen branch, Bisprow, Dubslaw (Brata), and Pribslaw were enfeoffed in 1477, in that order of age according to the sequence in [w.] and the relationship of their sons. The FG, however, places Pribslaw first and second, grouping the two Muttrin lines together. They are identified as brothers according to [u.] and the FG of 1558. Their younger brothers were Jacob, Schir, David, and Voltze, all of whom were alive in 1477; the latter two were deceased by 1474, as Voltze is listed as the fifth son [u.]. Their father was Henning, according to the FG, presumably mentioned in the 1474 letter of enfeoffment [u.].

Bisprow is not mentioned after 1477. His eldest son Henning appears until 1498, and the second son Peter died in 1501. Dubslaw lived until December 11, 1479, but was already deceased by December 28, 1485, as his sons were then enfeoffed with what they inherited and purchased. His two eldest sons, Drewes and Curt, were already deceased by 1493; Drewes' son Bartes was of age, and Curt's second son, Paul, was of military age. Drewes must therefore have been born by 1438, placing Dubslaw's birth around 1408. Dubslaw's father was the Henning of Muttrin who, in 1407, was the last (youngest) of the three Hennings acting as guarantors [l.] and was still alive in 1435 [p.]. His son, Bisprow, was taxed in 1433 and already managing the estate. Thus, Henning could not be the Henning who was enfeoffed with half of Glienicke in 1365, alongside his father Prissebur and elder brother Jarßlaff [d.], as suggested by the FG. Moreover, the FG's connection—where Jarßlaff, who first acquired Damen, is said to have sons named Herman and Georg, with the former dying unmarried by accident and the latter slain childless during a dispute—cannot be correct. These are instead the Hermen and Jurjen who appear together in

1439 [q.]; Jurjen is the Jurge mentioned in 1430, 1435, and 1445 as residing in Damen [n., o., r.]. This aligns with the FG's assertion that Dubslaw partially inherited Damen through pledges. Therefore, the Conrad or Curt residing in Damen in 1403 and 1407 [k., l.] must have been Jarßlaff's son, who originally acquired Damen, and the father of those two brothers. Their unusual deaths and Jarßlaff's acquisition of Damen are the only memories preserved by later owners. Consequently, the Henning residing in Muttrin in 1407 and 1435, who must have been born before 1376 based on the ages of his two eldest sons, must be distinguished from, but linked as a son to, Henning, the younger brother of Jarßlaff who remained in Muttrin. The FG's mention of Henning's marriage to a von Wedelstett likely refers to the younger Henning. She was a descendant, not a daughter, of the individual who owned one-third of Gülzow, as its sale to the bishop by the Schmeling and von Wedelstett families occurred in 1303, with final payment confirmed in 1331. The second Henning must be the younger son of the first due to their shared name [13]. The elder is likely the younger Bispraw, who was an arbitrator between the dukes in 1402. Based on the above [14], he was notably younger than the elder Bispraw but was of age by 1389 and still alive in 1407, when the elder was still differentiated. If this younger Bispraw was the son of Voltze, who was the youngest son of the Oldervater based on his children's ages, then the younger Bispraw was the grandson of one of the two older sons, specifically the Muttriner, as the name recurs only among his descendants. Born before 1365, he could only have been the son of the first Henning, as Jarßlaff had other sons [16, para. 2 and 17]. His father, Prissebur, as stated by the FG, was old by 1364 and an independent owner of Muttrin by 1320, making him the son of Klest.

Bispraw's brother resided in Muttrin, while Bispraw likely lived elsewhere. Bispraw's son is probably Lüdeke, who resided in Vitzow in 1445 [r.]. Lüdeke's son is likely Ewald, who lived in Belgard in 1472 [t.], as the estate later became the exclusive possession and primary seat of the Muttrin branch, specifically the descendants of Peter, enfeoffed in 1477. They are first documented in Vitzow in 1486 (Doc. 184), and the name Ewald was most popular among them, later spreading to other lines. Since this line alone acquired the estate, it can be assumed that Bispraw initially acquired it, and Ewald transferred it to Peter before 1477 (as Ewald is absent from the 1477 register). Joint ownership of new acquisitions was only granted after 1477. Similarly, Dubslaw's descendants exclusively owned Damen, which he inherited from Jarßlaff's grandchildren, the original acquirer's descendants.

17. Zatkow was also a possession of the Muttrin lineage and, in 1477, belonged to the two Muttrin branches and the Damener branch [p. 273]. Thus, the Briczmar in Sattikow mentioned in 1389 (in h.) must be part of this lineage. He was a "Halvpape," i.e., undoubtedly a cleric who had received the lowest ordination that leads to the subdiaconate. He presumably remained in clerical status in his younger years and left no heirs. The name is indisputably (also according to Kratz) a misinterpretation of "Pritzbor," the old alternative form of "Priszbur," since the relevant document was issued in East Prussia and written by a High German scribe (it features forms such as "v. Walde," "Mantufel," "Heydebrechen," "Buchow," "Claushayn," and "Czulchhain" for Zülkenhagen). This scribe also wrote "Bolczin" for Polzin and "Bisbra" or "Wisbra" for Bispraw. The suffix "-mar" (from "-mir") could have easily been substituted for the much rarer "-bor" in Pomerania and Poland, which were both regions influenced by the Teutonic Order at the time. Elzow provides the lineage: Voltze from 1316 [b.] as the progenitor of the second branch, with his sons Conrad, Henning, and Prissebur. The first was the father of Jacob (the father of Tessen at Dubberow) and Hans at Gr. Tichow, while the FG of 1576 directly lists Hans and the father of Tessen of Dubberow as sons of the unnamed progenitor of this branch. Elzow did not derive the three brothers from family tradition, which knew nothing of them, nor did he invent them—such an act is uncharacteristic of him—especially since two died without heirs and were therefore irrelevant to the family tree. Instead, he likely transferred them from notes he encountered in another family record and placed them where the FG left a gap. These men existed and were contemporaries: Conrad as the Conrad (Kurt) of Damen in 1403 and 1407, Prissebur as the Pritzbor from 1389, who belonged to the family, and the third as the co-guarantor Henning of Brückow from

1407, the first of three Hennings there [l.]. Gr. and Kl. Brückow belonged to the castle of Stolp in 1485 [Urk. 177] and thereafter. When these estates came under its control is unknown to me, possibly under Boguslaw X., who acquired domains for the castles wherever possible. The castle at Stolp emerged from the princely mill estate and was expanded into a residential house by him in 1480. When the land came under Pomeranian control in 1317, the old Wendish castle had been destroyed, and the associated estates had been transferred to the Putkamer family.

18. The brothers Reimer and Bartes, who were seated and enfeoffed at Gr. Tichow in 1477, do not appear in later records. Of Reimer's grandsons, Michel was enfeoffed in 1527, and Tessen served as a witness in 1518 [Urk. 431, 395]. Among his sons, Tessen is recorded from 1490 to 1527 as a Johanniter commander in Zachow (and not after 1529). It is certain that he must have been at least 30 years old when he achieved this position, suggesting that Reimer could not have been born after 1425. According to the FG of 1558 and 1576, Reimer's father was Hans of Tichow, and his cousin was Tessen of Dubberow, the father of Jurgen and Peter, who were enfeoffed in 1477. Since, apart from the aforementioned Tichow Tessen, another Tessen appears among Reimer's descendants and two more among Bartes', Hans' father and Tessen's grandfather must have been the Tessin of Dubberow mentioned in 1388 (g.).

19. Pribbeslaf and [Olde] Bispraw were involved in the significant state matter of 1387 and described as cousins [s.]. Just as Bispraw was the son of the youngest of the three original brothers, Pribbeslaf, who was listed first and thus as the elder, must have been the son of one of the two older brothers. Since the sons of Prissebur, who was still alive in 1365, are known, Pribbeslaf must have been the son of the other, unnamed brother. He can be identified as Pribbeslaf of Kresyn, who acted as a co-guarantor in 1407 [l.]. This is plausible because, in 1411, several Klyste from Kresyn appear [m.], presumably his sons.

Dubbeslaw, who first appeared as a witness in Köslin in 1368 and later in 1383, acquired and sold the nearby village of Bonin and died in 1385 (as his son issued a receipt for payment on October 15, 1385), lived well past the time of Prissebur, who was already advanced in age, and nearly into the time of his sons. His connection to Clest extends too far to consider him another original brother. Instead, he must have been the son of Pribbeslaf's elder brother, making him the only plausible position left in the family tree. His property acquisitions in the church lands did not preclude his residence in the Belgard region. His son Dubslav, likely the youngest due to sharing the same name, issued a receipt in 1385 on behalf of his brothers, just as his father had done in 1379 with his heirs [e.]. The sons were evidently of age by 1385. If they belonged to the Dubberow branch, then Tessin of Dubberow in 1388 was the eldest, and the second might have been Hannos, of the same name as his descendant, who led other Klyste in raids in 1404 [k.].

Based on our understanding, Dubbeslaw's sons were of age by 1385, and Reimer of Tichow was about 20 years younger than Bispraw of Muttrin. There were three generations between Clest and Bispraw and four between Clest and Reimer. Therefore, the progenitor of the Dubberow branch must have been Clest's eldest son. This alignment is also consistent with the FG of 1607 and 1700, likely not based on memory but on symmetry in the genealogical trees. - As for the name of this ancestor, it was unknown in 1576; Elzow erroneously assumed it to be Voltze, while the Lehnbrief of 1608 and likely the FG of 1607 name him Jacob, and Bolduan in 1614 along with all subsequent records name him Georg. Just as Prissebur shares his name with his uncle and great-grandfather, Clest's eldest son might have been named after his paternal grandfather Pribislaw (and Voltze possibly after his maternal grandfather). This eldest son would have passed on his name to his younger son, like Dubbeslaw. - The FG of 1576 does not identify the older brother of Hans of Tichow, the link between the two Tessens of Dubberow, but Bolduan and later sources call him Peter, which is quite plausible. Only Elzow names him Jacob. Perhaps Jacob was Peter's brother and the knight Jakusch (a Polish diminutive of Jacob) who resided near Dirschau around 1450 [v.]. The Kresyn branch, mentioned in 1411, likely died out without heirs.

Their property seems to have been fragmented. By the 16th century, the Versen family owned half of Kresyn, while the Kleist families of Gr. Tichow and the Damen line (the latter already in 1485) each owned a quarter.

20. Perhaps the von Krummensee family in the Schlochau district near Landeck was a side branch of the Kleist family. Currently, only Hannos von Krommenzehe is known. In 1429, he was granted 40 Hufen at Remmen [now part of the royal forest near Krummensee] under Kulm law in exchange for knight service by the Grand Master (Document 599). In 1612, Philipp Kleist [of the Viezower line] from Batrow (Flatow District) appealed to Duke Philipp: he had purchased his estates nearly 20 years ago, but they were now being reclaimed by other Poles, alleging that he lacked Polish indigeneity. Philipp argued that several Pomeranian Kleists had held such status for ages, especially in the village of Krummensee, which had been owned by the Kleist family for over 300 years. He requested certification of his contested kinship with the Krummensee family, and this was granted. The certification must have sufficed since Philipp and his sons, who later died childless, retained the estates. Krummensee first appeared as Kleist property in the land registry of 1575. Hans von Muttrin, listed as residing there in 1546, was the grandson of the Hans who was granted estates in 1477. This Hans's brother Peter is the ancestor of Philipp. The shared ancestor is likely Bisprow of Muttrin, who was active between 1433 and 1477. According to von der Osten, Bisprow "acquired and was granted Polish indigeneity," a note possibly derived from the now-lost Viezower genealogical record of 1607. Bisprow could have been the closest heir of Hannos of 1429, securing inheritance rights that he or his son exercised. Hannos might have been his paternal uncle or the son of young Bisprow. Alternatively, the note could pertain to this younger Bisprow, whom the family genealogy does not mention but was mistakenly attributed to his similarly named nephew. On the other hand, Elzow adds under the section "This family also appears in Poland": "One member of this family married the last of the Borntine family of the Polish line, Margaret von Borntin, and acquired Borntin estates as there were no remaining male heirs." Only one such marriage is recorded: Hans, grandfather of the first Kleist identified in Krummensee, married Paul von Bornentin's heiress around 1480 and acquired part of the village of Bornentin with her (Genealogy of 1558). If Margaret were descended from Hannos of Krummensee by affinity, this would unify both accounts. However, as Königsberg archivist Dr. Meckelburg informed me, the Schlochau documents were taken to Lithuania by the widow of Schlochau's starost Radziwill in 1721 and have yet to be recovered. Future research might clarify this matter.

21. Let us now turn to the family's estates and their distribution among the branches before 1477. The following are the primary sources for this analysis:

a) The letter of enfeoffment for the five Damen brothers, sons of Dubbeslaff Brata, from 1485 (Document 192). b) The 1541 letter of enfeoffment for Pribslaw of Borrentin detailing what he and his brother inherited from their father Hans (†1516, granted estates in 1477) (Document 460), reflecting their holdings from 1517. c) The 1575 letter of enfeoffment for the Vietzower branch (Document 503), which includes estates acquired from the Raddatz branch in 1480, shares obtained before 1501 in Borrentin, portions ceded in 1517, and other acquisitions from 1490 to 1517. This likely reproduces a letter of enfeoffment issued around 1502 after the death of Peter (granted estates in 1477, died in 1501). d) Property exchanges between the sons of Pribslaw of Muttrin and Peter of Damen in 1522 (Document 414) and with the Dubberow family in 1524 (Document 418), in which they gave up their holdings in ducal lands. e) The ownership status of certain villages in Belgard in 1577 (Document 518). f) Further records from 1628 (Document 607). Below, references to these documents are cited by their corresponding letters. The first estates to be considered are those owned by the Kleists in 1477:

Denzin: Around 1300, this village served as the seat of Kleist, referred to at the time as Densin, a name that persisted in Lubin's records. It appears in the 1621 letter of enfeoffment as Kleist property (Document 594), with Carsten von Kleist of Cöslin identified as its resident. In 1591, his uncles Lorenz

and Venz von Podewils lodged a formal complaint that the Belgard captain had appropriated a meadow their peasants had used for over 100 years. Likewise, in 1609, the Kleist and Podewils families reported that prime farmland had been seized and incorporated into the Belgard Vorwerk (manorial estate) around 1595, despite their continued payment of 92 bushels of Reipenkorn (a grain tax). By 1628, the village, encompassing 17.5 Hufen (a medieval land measurement) and 2.5 cottagers, was integrated into the Belgard estate. The share of the von Podewils in Denzin was owned in 1478 by the Gantzel family (who provided three feudal horses in 1523) and was inherited at that time by Adam von Podewils as the Angefäll (hereditary entitlement) (Document 131).

Roggow: This village, taxed under Bede (see above 11), included a farm inherited by Jurgen Kleist of Dubberow from his ancestors. He exchanged it for Belgard castle property in 1487 (Document 194).

Boissin: This village paid taxes of 1 mark, 8 bushels of rye, and 8 bushels of oats (Bede). Thomas Kleist exchanged his peasants in Boissin for Dubberow in 1524 (d), which included two peasants with three Hufen in 1577 (e), and later in 1690, 1784, and 1862. The Kleists from Cöslin, listed as residing in Beußin or Boysin between 1575 and 1608 (Documents 502, 547, 564), owned nothing in the village by 1577. Instead, the Dubberow branch owned a sheep farm with shepherd and laborers (e). This estate was later absorbed into the Amt (administrative estate), which included these two peasants by 1628.

Dubberow: Dubberow was the seat of Tessin in 1388 (12 g). In 1487, Jurgen of Dubberow traded for Ripengeld (a tax in kind, typically grain), Ripenkorn, and all ducal revenues in Little Dubberow (lüttken Dobberowe) and Great Dubberow (groten Dubberowe) (Document 194). By 1577, the family owned Little Dubberow entirely, including the knightly seat, and held half of Great Dubberow (13 peasants, 12 Hufen, and a mill). The Damen line owned five peasants with seven Hufen, and the Cöslin branch owned four peasants with five Hufen (e). Likely, the Cöslin branch sold part of their share to the Damen line before selling the rest in 1613.

Mandelatz: First mentioned as Manlatz in 1608, the village appeared with variations such as Manlatzke (1577, 1609, 1641, 1645), Manlatz (1685, 1696), and Mannelatzke (1645). The name likely originated as a compound to distinguish it from other nearby villages with the suffix -latzke, meaning forested. The 1577 records show the village split between the Dubberow and Tichow branches (4 Bauernhöfe, 6 Hufen at Little Dubberow; 4 Bauernhöfe, 8 Hufen at Great Tichow, e), likely reflecting a division of ownership that had existed since 1477.

Tichow: First mentioned in 1425 and the seat of Hans and his sons in 1477, Tichow paid Bede taxes of 12 shillings, 6 bushels of rye, and 6 bushels of oats. Later known as Groten Tichow from 1540 onward, the estate remained in the family until the 18th century. The Versen family also held a seat in Tichow as of 1523 and maintained a portion of the village until 1773.

Croszine gave Bede 6 β., 3 bushels of rye, 3 bushels of oats (1387). In 1407, Pribbeslaff Kleist held Croszine as Kresyn. It was referred to as Kressyn and Kreszyn in 1411, Crossin in 1485, and from 1608 onwards as Lutken Cressin, Krossin, and Crössin. Since 1667, it has been called Kl. Crössin. Historically, it was merely a peasant village, with 16 hides (1/2) belonging to the Versen family of Burzlaff, 6 1/2 hides to the Kleist family of Gr. Tichow, and 9 1/2 hides to the Damen family (f). This portion was already held by Dubbeslaw in 1477 (a), as were likely the other shares. Since the Tichow family owned the village along with Gr. Tichow and Mandelatz with the Versen family, and since these two estates were equally divided among the descendants of Reimer and Bartes, yet the Tichow family held no shares in Kl. Crössin and only contributed 1 feudal horse in 1523 while the others provided 2 (document 415), and because Kl. Crössin is missing from the Damen estate register of 1501 (document 343), I conclude that Dubbeslaw acquired Reimer's share, presumably initially as a pledge.

Vitzow, written as Vietzow since 1590, provided 8 β. 4 bushels of rye and 4 bushels of oats as Bede. It

was the seat of Lüdeke in 1445 [12 r], Peter in 1486 (document 184), and his son Jacob (document 376 etc.). Jacob owned it in its entirety, along with the peasant village of Wussow (only mentioned once in 1665, and referred to as Wutzow from the 18th century onward) (5). The share of Wussow that the Glasenapp family held in the 16th and 17th centuries was likely sold to them by Jacob when he sold rents there in 1523 (document 416), Poberow, which he had purchased from his father, in 1516, half of Borntin in 1517, and half of Naseband in 1519 to raise funds for the acquisition of Bublitz.

Damen was first brought into the family by Jarshaw around 1365 [16], likely from Wusterbart, as it was exempt from Bede [11], and because its appurtenances, specifically from the field mark Nemrin, were intertwined with those of the Damen estate. Until around 1650, Damen (and its appurtenances, including Kaszekenhagen [Katschenhagen forest with manorial farms, likely named after the Kaszeke = Käseke family] and half of Nemrin [a]) belonged solely to the Damen family lines. A portion of the deserted field mark Nemrin was associated with Borntin (document 386 2c.), and another portion belonged to Wusterbart in 1560 [and earlier].

Muttrin (1407, 1480 Mutteryn, 1433 Mütteryn) provided 1 1/2 marks, 12 bushels of rye, and 12 bushels of oats as Bede. It was the seat of Prissebur in 1320 and 1364, his son Henning in 1365, Henning's son Henning in 1407, and the latter Henning's sons Bisprow (1433, 1477) and Pribbeslaw (1474, 1477), as well as Henning's sons Hans (1481, 1493, 1516 [b]) and Peter (1493, 1505, 1523). In 1524, Dubbeslaw and Jacob exchanged lands with the Dubberow family. These lands included the 4 peasant farms with 7 hides that they held in 1577 (e) and half of a farmstead occupied by Valentin in 1576. The other half was the knight's farm with 2 hides, which Peter from Damen exchanged in 1522 along with other appurtenances (e) for lands belonging to Bisprow's sons. Dubbeslaw already owned a share (a), and by 1577 his descendants held 8 peasant farms, 15 hides (including the exchanged lands), and Hans' descendants held 4 peasant farms, 5 hides, and 2 hides (e), along with a knight's seat.

Dobel (see Bede obligations above, 11) partially belonged to Dubbeslaw of Damen (a), Hans of Muttrin (b), and the descendants of Pribbeslaw of Muttrin, who exchanged lands there in 1522 and 1524 (d). By 1628, the Damen family owned 15 hides, while Hans' descendants owned 4 hides (f). Since the village historically consisted of only 19 hides, the portion of the current field mark west of the Persante River likely came from Borntin's holdings. This village, along with part of Nemrin, was acquired by Hans through marriage to the heiress of Paul of Borntin. Hans' sons purchased in 1517 the other half, which Peter of Vietzow (d. 1501) had received as a feudal privilege, from Peter's son. However, the Glasenapp family of Gramenz held a portion (around 1/4) in the 16th and 17th centuries.

Kikow paid 20 β., 10 bushels of rye, and 10 bushels of oats as Bede. It was a peasant village with 34 hides (e). Shares were held by Dubbeslaw of Damen (a, kykowe), Hans of Muttrin (b), who owned 6 hides in 1577 (e), Jacob of Vietzow (c), and the descendants of Pribbeslaw, who exchanged lands there in 1522 and 1524 (d). In 1524, this included 4 hides (according to e), while in 1522 it was more, as farms were exchanged for Peter's share, requiring an additional 100 florins for the increased holdings in Kikow. By 1577, the Damen family held the remaining 24 hides (e), including these farms and the Vietzow share.

Zatkow provided 1 1/2 marks, 12 bushels of rye, and 12 bushels of oats as Bede. In 1389, Sattikow was the seat of Pritzbor. It was spelled with an "S" until 1575 and 1584. The original form is undoubtedly Zartkow, as seen in a 1599 seal and a 1501 document (343), where the "a" is long (Zaatkow 1584, 1601; Zaetk. 1613, 1618; Zatichow 1656, 1670). Thomas exchanged 3 hides in 1524 with the Dubberow family (d), which amounted to 3 hides in 1577 (e). Dubbeslaw of Damen held 3 hides in 1477 (a) and 3 hides in 1577 (e). In 1556, Jürgen of Damen owned a portion, possibly the same share his son held in 1619. The remaining 12 hides (2/3), including the knight's seat existing before 1572, were held by the Vietzow family in 1577 (e). However, around 1502, they owned only a share that, when calculated among entire and half-villages (c), would have been less than half. This likely led to a land exchange

with Hans of Borntin. See Drenow for further details. The associated manor Lassentz was established in 1572.

Drenowe and Czernekowe were half-owned in 1485 by the Damen family (see below, 22) and half around 1502 by the Vietzow family (c). The same division existed at Zarnekow in 1628. Zarnekow had 22 hides, including 6 knightly hides, of which 5 taxable hides belonged to the Damen family and 11 taxable hides to the Vietzow family. Drenow had 20 knightly hides and 14 1/2 taxable hides. Of these, 8 knightly hides belonged to Vietzow, 2 knightly hides and 6 taxable hides to Pribschlaff of Muttrin, and 10 knightly hides and 8 1/2 taxable hides to the Damen family (f). Thus, half of the village belonged to the Damen family, while the other two families held a quarter each. Around 1500, the knightly hides were mostly occupied by peasants, making divisions focus more on equality of dues than on equal land areas. Hans inherited the Muttrin share from his sons in 1516 (b) and likely acquired it from Jacob of Vietzow through exchange between 1502 and 1516, as Jacob's descendants only owned a partial share in Zarnekow. Further records (Nasebänder reports) indicate that Tetzlaw von Bonin received lands west of the Chodel [Kautel River, within the Duchy] in a division with his brother in 1356, while his brother received the lands in the bishopric. Tetzlaw was enfeoffed by Duke Wartislaw [likely ruling 1374–1394, the father of King Eric] with Naseband, Drenow, Zarnekow, and Konow [Kramerwinkel]. Tetzlaw's son [more likely grandson, as Henning of Nasebande sat in 1389, a figure absent from the Bonin family tree], Ewald, who married a von Wedel-Falkenburg around 1400, pledged Drenow and Zarnekow to the Kleist family of Damen. Ewald planned to redeem the pledge through timber sales, but the wood was lost in flooding along the Persante River. His widow, supported by her von Wedel relatives, initiated a feud in which 5 Kleist villages were burned, and 10 knights died on both sides. However, the Kleist family retained the estates, which led to further conflict with the Kleist of Voldekow [likely Dubbeslaw's son Drewes, active 1477–1488; see below, 22]. Ewald's son Karze of Naseband died in 1486; his son Peter "was begged for half of Drenow and Zarnekow" and evidently reacquired half of Naseband from Jacob Kleist of Vietzow in 1519 after extended litigation (see soon). Peter likely reclaimed his share in both villages, as neither contributed Bede to Belgard Castle, confirming their original connection to Naseband Castle [see above, 11].

Vilnow—sometimes referred to as Vilmenow, likely its original form—was first mentioned in 1477 as the seat of Voltze, who was certainly the father with whom the FG begins. It appears as a Kleist estate in 1488, 1490, and 1493 (documents 203, 216, 269). Voltze's sons sold it before 1507, when they were established in the Mark (documents 339, 358 a.). Additionally, in 1490, Naseband was also a Kleist estate (document 216). Jacob of Vietzow was enfeoffed with half of Konave [field mark where the manor Krämerwinkel recently regained its name] and half of Nasebantt around 1502 (c) and sold it in 1519 to the Bonin brothers there for 440 florins (document 399). Subsequently, Voltze's son Schir sold his patrimony for approximately 1,000 florins (document 421, beginning), including Vilnow for 600 florins. Clearly, the share in Naseband constituted the other part of his father's inheritance, especially since no other Kleist appears to have resided there. The buyer was Peter of Vietzow, who likely sold it to his father, perhaps Jost von Bonin, uncle of the 1519 buyers, about whom the Nasebänder reports state that the estates belonging to him had been given to the Kleist as a fief.

Raddatz is first mentioned in 1403 as a seat (Radacz 12 k, Raddaß 1477), specifically of Henning, who divided it with his brother between 1360 and 1370 [14]. It had already been owned by the Kleist family in 1289 [2]. In 1526, Schir Kleist and the elders of the village demarcated the boundaries as his father [Voltze, d. 1469] had left them (document 422). These boundaries, verifiable in all respects, encompass the field marks Raddatz, Schneidemühl, Kucherow, Zamenz, Kl. Zemmin, Lanzen, Falkenhagen, Juchow, Gissolk, Bramstädt, Neudorf, Panikow, and Klingbeck. With the exception of the first and last, the others were established by the Kleist family in their "wilderness" after 1560. Certainly, the entire possession belonged to the deserted lands where in 1295 the Belgard region ended against Poland, and Kleist retained it in this manner, as others did neighboring lands. Raddatz, often recorded with the

article in documents, is evidently named after the lake and was likely established early. Klingebeke, due to its German name, probably existed before 1450.

Dallentin was owned, like Raddatz and Klingbeck, by the sons of Pribbeslaw from 1407. Divided in 1435, they had inherited it from their father, whose widow also retained 1/8 as a dower. He had acquired it since it was known around 1500 and 1533 by tradition that the Kleist family of Raddatz had received it from the Ubeske, who had obtained it as a dowry with two maidens from the Loden family, who had received it in exchange from the Glasenapp family (document 444 under 1). Half the village was pledged between 1458 and 1498 to the Loden family of Zuchen. The other half was transferred by Bisprow to Peter of Vietzow in 1480; of this half, 1/2 went to the Butenhave family, 1/4 to his stepmother, and 1/4 to Schir's widow.

Of the 25 hides in Glyne, Prissebur of Mutrin received half along with joint ownership of the other half from the Glasenapp family in 1364. He was likely enfeoffed with it around 1365 along with his two sons [12 b. c]. This is the half-Glineke that Bisprow of Raddatz pledged before 1493 to Claus vom Herzberge (documents 273, 274), and his nephew Schir inherited it from him. First called Nassen Glinke in 1659, he alone owned it, indicating it was neither divided among his brothers nor inherited from his father. How it passed from the Mutrin family to him is unclear. Since it does not appear in the 1477 register, it was either already pledged or not yet acquired.

22. On December 28, 1485 (document 192), the five brothers of the Damen family received their hereditary and feudal rights as their father had held them in the ducal lands and as they had purchased, namely, these properties in their entirety: Damen, Kaszekenhagen, Warnyn, Groten Hansselt, Groten and Lutken Voldekowe, half of Nemeryn, Drenowe, Czernekowe, Lutken Hansselt, Frigenstein, Lotzige (Lotzke), and what their father had possessed in Groten Dubberowe, Czathkowe, Muttryn, Dobeln, Kykowe, Kreszyn, Kowalk, Dymmekur, and Smenczin. Thus, the wholly owned estates are listed first, followed by those partially owned. Damen, along with Kaszekenhagen and half of Nemeryn, was acquired by Jarslaw around 1370. The properties not marked in print were also partially owned by other members of the Kleist family and were acquired before the relevant divisions. In contrast, the bolded properties remained exclusively owned by the Damen branch of the Kleist family until much later and can be seen as grouped under the Voldekowe estates, which in 1523 provided two feudal horses, compared to four provided by the four knightly seats in Damen along with shares in the older properties. Furthermore, the bolded properties were all part of the parish church in Schwellin (from which Kowalk was detached around 1570 and added to Naseband). These properties did not pay Bede to Belgard. The shares in Kowalk, Dimkuhlen, and Smenczin were already held by Dubbeslaw, as were Warnim and both Voldekowe. The field mark Groten Hansfelde, half of Lutken Hansfelde [both between Warnim and Kowalk], and Freienstein, along with the forest and lake Lotschen, were either purchased by the sons or partially owned by their father. This likely included the portion for which Peter Monnichow of Bukow was enfeoffed in 1479 as inheritance and fief: 1/8 of Frigenstein and shares in the forest Grabbama [possibly Grabuffa near Dimkuhlen, document 600], the forest Vir near Smenczin [where Vierhof is], the forest Karleue, and the lake Letzetzky (document 133), which is Lottschen. Later, the Münchow family no longer owned anything there. Furthermore, Ansam Versen of Pobanz was enfeoffed in 1517 with 1/3 of Smenczin, 1/3 of Kowalk, and a portion of L. Voldekow, which Pawel and Frederick Versen had held as a fief (document 387). The Versen family of Tiezow owned the first property until about 1700 (the woodland and a manorial farm until 1733), the second and third properties, except for a cottager, until after 1645 (document 623), and a sheep farm in Dimkuhlen until about 1620 (documents 517, 600). In contrast, Peter von Volcow is mentioned in 1353 as a witness in Köslin regarding the affairs of the von Bulgrin family, and Paul Versen the Younger is recorded in Volkow in 1389 (document 92), Curt V. in Voldekow in 1429, Reimer V. in Voldekow in 1472 (document 117), and by January 25, 1477. In 1490, Drewes Kleist is listed in Voldekow (documents 124, 216), and by 1501, the sons of his brother Curt had inherited their father's property in both

Voldekows (document 343). Originally, only the smaller Voldekow contained a knight's seat, while the larger Voldekow consisted solely of peasant holdings. Shortly before 1477, both were acquired from a branch of the Versen family by Dubbeslaw, likely using the funds he obtained from selling his share in Bublitz. This acquisition also included two-thirds of Schmenzin, Kowalk, and Dimkuhlen, as well as the entirety of the large Hansfelde and half of the smaller Hansfelde (which was subsequently associated with Kowalk), and probably also Warnin. The property acquired by Dubbeslaw's sons likely corresponds to the holdings that were still owned by the Münchow family in 1479.

23. In 1485, the Duke enfeoffed the brothers of the Damen family with their hereditary and feudal rights "in our lands." This likely contrasts with their holdings within the bishopric. The charter of Count Ludwig of Ewersteyn, the [1472] elected bishop, dated December 11, 1479 (document 135), provides further details. According to the document, Bishop Ziuwerd [Siegfried Bock] had, in 1444, as recorded by Brüggemann, sold Bublitz town and castle, along with the villages of Porse and Zassenborch, as hereditary property to Mickes Massow, Rudinger Massow, and subsequently to Dubbeslaw Kleist of Damen for one-half share, Peter Monnechow of Bukow for one-sixth share, and the brothers Peter and Henning Glasenapp of Manow for the remainder. Ludwig had purchased and redeemed the first two shares but was compelled to sell them to Jasper Loden of der Ghust. However, Peter Glasenapp and the sons of his deceased brother contested the sale, prompting Loden to cede his purchase to them. Ludwig then sold it to them and used the proceeds to release the citizens of Kolberg and Köslin from a surety they had undertaken against Dubbeslaw Kleist, who had only partially received his purchase money. Dubbeslaw had sold the property before January 25, 1477, as Ludwig had pledged the revenues ("Orbör") of Bublitz town to Drewes, Dubbeslaw's son, by that date (document 124), indicating the sale had likely occurred shortly before. Dubbeslaw may have purchased the property around 1467 or 1468.

Dargenhof is first recorded as a possession of the von Bonin family in 1491 (document 226a). Dubslaw Kleist, the son of Pribbeslaw of Muttrin, acquired part of it through marriage to Barbara von Bonin before 1513 (document 374). In 1522, he exchanged another portion of Dargen and the field mark Darso with Peter of Damen (document 414) and acquired further shares from Pribbeslaw, Jochim, and Jürgen, sons of Bisprow's brother. Additionally, the grandson of a third brother, Curt, inherited legal claims to both portions from his ancestors (document 511). The latter two portions were identified as ancestral hereditary fiefs. Evidently, their common ancestor Dubbeslaw had already owned them. However, Glineke and Schwellin were only acquired after 1477, with the former and half of the latter being lost again by 1536.

24. The state of ownership in 1477, based on the preceding details, would have been as follows: Bisprow of Muttrin owned shares in Muttrin, Döbel, Kikow, and Boissin; half of Denzin, Drenow, and Zarnekow; the majority of Zatkow (including Lassenz); one-quarter of Gr. Dubberow; and, additionally, his son Peter held all of Vietzow and Wutzow. Dubbeslaw of Damen owned all of Damen with its appurtenances, shares in Muttrin, Döbel, Kikow, Zatkow (about 3/9), half of Drenow and Zarnekow, one-quarter of Gr. Dubberow, and 2/9 of Kl. Crössin. Around 1475, he also acquired Warnin, Gr. and Kl. Voldekow, Gr. Hansfeld, two-thirds of Kowalk, Dimkur, and Schmenzin, half of Kl. Hansfeld and Freienstein, as well as a share in Dargen with Dasow. Pribbeslaw of Muttrin held shares in Muttrin, Döbel, Kikow, Zatkow (1/6), and Boissin (1/7). Jürgen and Peter of Dubberow owned all of Kl. Dubberow and half of Gr. Dubberow, nearly one-third of Manlatzke, and one peasant in Roggow. Reimer and Bartes of Tichow owned about three-quarters of Gr. Tichow, nearly half of Manlatzke, and one-fifth of Kl. Crössin. Voltze of Vilnow held this village and had recently acquired half of Naseband along with half of Konow. The Raddatz line owned Raddatz with its extensive wilderness, Klingebeck, and Dallentin, although half of it was pledged. Whether they or still the Muttrin line held Nassen Glineke at that time is unclear.

Let us now consider the conclusions that can be drawn from these data.

Among Bisproh's sons, Henning inherited the shares in Denzin, Boissin, and Gr. Dubberow. In 1493, he was also an heir at Muttrin (document 279), so his son likely sold the share to Hans. Hans owned shares in Muttrin (already in 1481), Döbel, and Kikow, and probably also in Zatkow. Peter owned half of Drenow, half of Zarnekow, over two-thirds or possibly almost half of Zatkow, a share in Kikow, and all of Vietzow and Wutzow. He could not have inherited these two villages from his father, as the division among the brothers would otherwise have been disproportionate. Since Lüdeke Kleist held Vietzow in 1445 and was, at most, a cousin (patruelis) of the seven Muttrin-Damen brothers at the time, and joint ownership of new acquisitions was only introduced in 1477, it has been inferred that Lüdeke's line acquired these two villages and transferred them to Peter.

What Prissebur owned as part of Muttrin in 1320 and 1364 corresponds to what the Muttrin and Damen families shared in 1477, namely Muttrin, Döbel, Kikow, and Zatkow. Damen and its appurtenances were only acquired by his son Jarislaw, while Zarnekow and Drenow were pledged by the Damen family according to the Nasebänder reports. Therefore, the properties divided equally between Jarislaw and his brother Henning were those attached to Muttrin and the halves of Gr. Dubberow and Denzin, along with a possibly significant share in Boissin held by Henning's descendants. Jarislaw held the knight's seat in Zatkow if the Pritzbor who resided there in 1389 was his son.

According to the FG, Henning had seven sons: Bisproh, Dubbeslaw, Pribbeslaw, Jakob, Schir, David, and Voltze. Of these, the last four died without heirs. The first, third, fifth, and seventh sons inherited Muttrin and its associated properties, while the second, fourth, and sixth inherited Damen. When the last two of these sons died, Dubbeslaw took over their shares in the Damen properties, and the children of his two eldest brothers allowed him to retain them to maintain unity. When Jürgen, Jarislaw's youngest son, was killed (after 1445), Dubbeslaw took possession of the Damen properties that Jarislaw had owned, claiming they had already been pledged to him during the lifetime of Herman, Jürgen's elder brother. Whether Dubbeslaw reached an agreement with his four brothers residing in Muttrin is unknown. In 1474, Bisproh and Pribbeslaw received joint ownership of Dubbeslaw and Jacob's Damen properties. This claim must be qualified, as all of Henning's sons were equally entitled to what Jarislaw had inherited from their father. Any differing arrangements could only concern acquisitions made by Jarislaw and his descendants, such as Damen (with Katschenhagen and half of Nemrin). However, two of Dubbeslaw's brothers also resided there, meaning he could not have held it alone. Instead, the inheritance from their father and cousins was pooled and divided into two parts, with the Muttrin share assigned to the first, third, fifth, and seventh brothers, and the Damen share to the second, fourth, and sixth. This alternating arrangement ensured that the brothers within each group inherited from one another first and only secondarily from the other group.

Drenow and Zarnekow were divided equally, likely because they were only held under pledge at the time. Similarly, half of Gr. Dubberow was split evenly, and Kikow was almost evenly divided, as were the peasant holdings in Muttrin and Döbel. The first group held the knight's seat in Muttrin. However, in Zatkow, the first group had the knight's seat and over two-thirds of the peasant holdings, indicating a division that deviated from earlier patterns. Additionally, the four brothers held shares in Denzin and Boissin, while the three brothers owned Damen, the most significant of all the estates. It can be assumed that the 12 1/2 Hakenhufen in Nassen Glineke were added to the four brothers' share. Since this still would not suffice, it must be accepted that Dubbeslaw held a pledge over Herman's share of Damen.

Among the surviving brothers from the first group, Pribbeslaw held significantly less than Bisproh. It is likely he who acquired Nassen Glineke and sold it to Bisproh of Raddatz, possibly using the proceeds to purchase property in Stolp, which his son Jacob and his descendants later owned.

Voltze, Kleist's third son, is mentioned as a witness in Belgard in 1316 [12 b.], and his son Bisproh was residing there in 1389 [12 b.] and, as of 1407, had not yet been titled "of Vilnow." The village of Vilnow is, by no means, equivalent to the holdings of the Raddatz brother. From this, I conclude that it

was acquired later—either from Naseband or more likely from the Triddemer, as it did not pay Bede to Belgard Castle and because it separated the estate of Crossin (Gr. Crössin) from its appurtenances Steinburg and Grünenwalde. Before acquiring Vilnow, the line likely owned estates that were connected to Belgard Castle and its knightly service. Potential candidates for these holdings include the other half of Kleist's seat, Denzin (the Gantzel family, whose minor sons of Laffrentz were also enfeoffed with shares in 1478 [document 131], are mentioned, as far as I can see, only in the Neumark in the 14th and early 15th centuries [document 98]), the remaining part of Roggow (where the Dubberow family held one peasant until 1487), and the village of Vorwerk, which, based on its name, was originally a dependency of the castle. This could explain why, around 1595, the fields and meadows of Denzin were annexed to Vorwerk. Presumably, the remainder of these holdings was sold around 1477, and in exchange, half of Naseband and Konow were acquired. Gr. Dubberow was divided equally between the first and second lines, indicating it was originally held by Kleist, as was Kl. Dubberow, since both villages were also considered a single settlement (document 518).

Both Dubberows and Denzin were certainly owned by Kleist, as were the intervening Roggow and Boissin. After the partition around 1320, the eldest son held all of Kl. Dubberow with the knight's seat, half of Gr. Dubberow, and the share of Roggow that his descendants inherited from their ancestors in 1487. Prissebur's descendants held half of Denzin (with the seat), half of Gr. Dubberow, and Boissin. According to the assumptions above, Voltze held the remainder of Roggow (later Vorwerk and peasant village), half of Denzin, and Raddatz. The division was approximately equal; even if Raddatz already existed as a new village, Klingbeck likely did not yet, and the share of the wilderness may have been granted later. The proposed ownership of Vorwerk may have been obtained by the elder Bispraw as a Burgmann of Belgard. Thus, Muttrin (with Döbel, Kikow, and Zatkow) was first acquired by Prissebur, which seems plausible since his share would otherwise have been disproportionately large. Additionally, shares in Gr. Tichow, Kl. Crössin, and Mandelatz were likely acquired later by the Dubberow family but before 1380.

<185>

Chapter 2.

The coat-of-arms von Kleist of the family
from George Adalbert von Mülverstedt.

A. Nature of heraldic animals.

All descriptions of the Kleist coat-of-arms in heraldic and genealogical works of Micrälius, the historiographer of Pomerania from the beginning of the 17th century, consistently indicate foxes as the heraldic animals of the shield, which the v. Kleist lead. The numerous petsham prints from the 18th and 19th centuries, which are available to us, should also confirm this by the Figuration, since the family currently maintains the view that this animal genus exists in its coat-of-arms. Paintings from the same period, too, no doubt show foxes at last up to the Kleist coat-of-arms, with only the most disappearing exceptions.

All the less, there have always been concerns about the correctness of this assumption, which has been further increased by the amount of material on Kleist heraldry in the illustrations of the oldest seals of the family and his ancestral families in Kratz's book of documents and finally led to the result that the Kleist heraldic animals are not to be addressed as foxes, but as wolves. Word We have therefore used this term throughout the following chapters and, in this preliminary remark, we shall set out briefly the reasons for this and the justification for our view.

It cannot escape the connoisseur of heraldry that the Middle Ages and his art of drawing gave the figures of the animals, which were chosen as coat-of-arms emblems, a very frequent and more or less inconsistent depiction with the figure and nature of the natural originals.

The peculiarity of the contouring and the taste, the clumsy, stiff and angular, the adherence to the once usual type, created from certain animal figures (to speak of these alone), although not misshapen or born out of the imagination, but still little corresponding to nature in individual parts bodies and it went over to reproduce and characterize those specialties and characteristics, which distinguish one genus from the other, one species in front of the other. Not only that in the "heraldic" animals the lions and eagles were, as is well known, transformed into creatures, less distorted images, as creatures, whose design deviates incredibly from reality and reveals equality only through the existence of certain parts of the body peculiar to those animals, but all these were lost in the representation of finer animal species, which had less distinguishing features in front of others that leapt into the eyes or were easier to reproduce through the drawing, and a general and common type emerged for certain animal species, which allowed the correct interpretation and naming of the heraldic animal only in other historical sources, from the sex name etc. In particular, we perceive this in the depiction of birds, and we are unable, looking back at drawings and paintings from the 13th to the 17th century, to distinguish whether the shape of a bird with a curved beak, spread wings, wide tail feathers and sharp catches applies to an eagle, vulture, falcon, a harrier or a goshawk. On the other hand, it is just as difficult to distinguish crows, pigeons and ravens, quails and sparrows, storks and herons etc. from each other. Very unknown and arbitrary form take at all the small bird genera, and the Bülow Pentecostal bird exists in numerous variants, to which only very few of the same in its natural form or even only agree among themselves.

But it is especially the Wolf and Fox belonging to the dog family, whose sometimes strongly prominent distinctions from each other, the heraldic drawing art and habit of the Middle Ages and also of the 16th and 17th centuries have greatly blurred, so that in some cases, depending on the greater or lesser artistry of the performer, a reliable recognition and distinction of both species is difficult, sometimes impossible. Only representations, often a few from a large number, can be

discarded in which the characteristic features of each animal genus are faithfully recorded and significantly reproduced, such as the pointed tip in the case of the fox, the blunt and wide muzzle in the case of the Wolf, the very wide and rearward-lying stiff ears in the case of the pointed one, the wide and strong, in the case of the fine barrels in the case of the Wolf, the shaggy tail hanging more downwards, at most just attached, in the case of the fox, the round and smooth-haired lobe-shaped raised and raised.

But if we look at the coat-of-arms of the German and Slavic nobility, we find only a very few families in conspicuous Weise, which foxes (always only in the singular), but exceptionally many, which wolves lead as emblems of arms. While I can only cite the noble families of the Voß in Mecklenburg, the fox in Franken, v. Leipziger in Saxony as such, whose coat of arms shows a fox, a Wolf (and certainly because of the seals one such) leads the v. d. Asseburg, v. Wulffen (in Jerichowschen), v. Bartensleben, v. Barleben, v. Einwinkel, Berwinkel, Wulfgrove, v. Ende, v. Kalitsch, v. Brandenstein, Winterfeld, Zicker, Wolffersdorff, Mochow, Myhlen, Flemming, Pogwisch, Prebentow, Wisch, Wolff (in Saxony and Anhalt), in Mecklenburg; two the v. Borck, Schenken v. Flechtingen, Bock, v. Wulfferstedt in the semi-urban, v. Busch Wartensleben Wulffen in the semi-urban Logbichen; three wolves the v. Graben. It is undecided whether the v. Vietzen in Mecklenburg and v. Leydekuhle in Rügen are up to a Wolf or a fox.

If we consider the oldest seals of those families which bear one of the two animals in the shield, which are decisive for the distinguishing presentation of the two animals alone, we find, however, that the distinguishing features of both animal species are expressed in little concise terms, but not always, by reason of the imperfect drawing and engraving. For example, the oldest seals of the v. Voß in Mecklenburg from 1284 (Mecklenb. Book of documents III. p. 120) the foxes jumping up, with no flapped-out tongue with rather thin barrels, with pointed ears pointing forward and the one with round club-shaped tails, while the opposite can be seen in almost all the pieces on the Voß seals of 1293 (ibid. p. 513). In particular, the tails are hanging down everywhere. The animals are all aligned (rampants), while the wolves present in the singular in heraldic shields have either this position (e.g. by Wulffen in Jerichowschen) or the jumping (Asseburg, end), or finally the louse. A very raw engraved seal of the Achim Voß on Vielbaum in the Altmark from 1496 (on a document in the Council Archive of Salzwedel) show over three Rosen a standing pointed-eared animal with a lowered tail, whose significance as a fox can only be guessed.

The view of the oldest seals of families with wolf coats of arms shows above all the claws of the feet in very concise formation and strongly prominent shagginess of the tail, so on the seals of Conrad v. Wulffen of 1405 and Otto v. W. of 1494. The same is the case on the oldest Asseburg seals, where the ears pay a visit sharply slightly backwards and the very shaggy rod hangs down limp.

In particular, however, we will have to look at those seals which, as with the Kleist coat-of-arms, show wolves in double numbers. Here we look in particular at the numerous seal antiques of the noble family of Schenken v. Flechtingen (Dönstedt), which show all the so-called peculiarities of Alferich S. from 1273, Heinrich from 1303 and Heinrich from 1386. In particular, the shaggy tails are stretched away, on the former two almost with the tip turned upwards, while an artlessly engraved seal of Henning from J. 1409 shows two animals standing like sluggish with their tails lowered. The ears of the animals on the seal of 1303 are strikingly pointed.

We also perceive all these varieties and differences in the presentation on the basis of time and artistic execution according to such different Kleist seals. On the oldest seal belonging to the late 13th century (addendum Table IX. No. 1), the animals show themselves as foxes are never shown, i.e. are depicted on seals, namely in a half-rising position, in which the rod then hangs slack down close to the hind legs. This is exactly how the heraldic animals appear on all seals of the v. Asseburg. And there is no doubt that they are running a Wolf, not a fox. Also the seal of the Knappen Dubislaw v.

Kleist (ibid. no. 2), which belongs to a very little later time, gives the heraldic animal exactly the same figuration. Even Peter's v. K. Siegel of 1493 (ibid. No. 7) reveals quite similar things. On the other hand, the majority of the remaining seals, in their sometimes very poor preservation, small scale and very raw design, represent the animals so imperfect that no heraldic eye should be able to identify certain characteristics by which they would be distinguished as foxes from wolves.

Therefore, the images of the later seals from the 17th and 18th centuries, some of which we could still claim for our view, will also be ignored, and will be to conclude that the degenerate or genus of the Kleist heraldic animals, the same as in other heraldic signs with the same presentation. Wenn Wir Nun

1. know not a single coat-of-arms outside Pommern, which unmistakably contained foxes in the double number,
2. the individual foxes appearing in different shields only in a half-crouching position directed towards the jump, but always jumping straight and never running,
3. finally, in the case of undoubted wolf coats of arms (Asseburg, Schenk, Ende, v. Borcke), the heraldic animals can be seen in exactly the same position and presentation as they show the oldest and older seals of the v. Kleist,

thus, it is concluded that the Kleist shield was originally intended to show not foxes, but wolves.

But the evidence for the quality of the Kleist heraldic animals becomes even stronger when we compare the formation of the v. Borckeschen coat-of-arms with the depiction which the oldest seals of the v. Kleist show with regard to the animals, the most complete agreement is evident and although it was not irrefutably established that they are wolves which lead the v. Borcke in the shield, so the only in the case of wolf depictions customary and very natural drawing of the Borckeschen animal figures as howling rising wolves and the comparison with the likewise doubtless wolves containing heraldic shields of the Asseburg, v. Ende, v. Bartensleben etc. would teach us that the v. Borckeschen coat-of-arms emblems and the Kleist emblems which are very similar to him represent the older seals as wolves and not as foxes. For this reason, and not because of the double number, the learned editor of the Kleist-Book of documents has considered the v. Borcke to be coats of arms of the v. Kleist.

At last, however, it is still mainly for our view to assert that the ancestors of the family of Bulgrin, who, according to very old assumptions, are not only among the coat-of-arms but also among the tribesmen of the v. Kleist, as it is also proven, have completely congruent heraldic animals in the Borckeschen, which, from the outset, are never to be addressed as foxes, but as wolves. Yes it is also found on several old seals of the same from 1335 (Table XIII. No. 6.7.8) the characteristic coronation of the heraldic animals, as in the case of the v. Borcke, and also the same communality with them, in that until 1521 the cross-bar separating the animals is missing, which, if not as a breadcrumb, should be regarded as a section separating originally different colored panels.

If it can be assumed, on the basis of the above, that we can see wolves in the Kleist heraldic animals, it will still be questionable whether the change of the heraldic animals in foxes should be given importance and whether the family tradition according to which the sex coat of arms contained foxes should be given justification. As regards the first point, it should be noted that the great similarity of the two species of animals, already emphasized above, together with the smallness and indistinctness, the form and artlessness on the family seals of the Middle Ages, must rightly be regarded as the reason for this shift from the Wolf to the fox. A long series of families could be cited, whose emblems have been obscured by the interaction of such causes and have been so altered that they have undergone a completely different interpretation. Pay a visit many examples here may only be the very striking of the Schenken von Flechtingen (Dönstedt), whose coat-of-arms has already been put on top, for evidence, the revealing wolves of the coat-of-arms, the same, which show their oldest and

older seals in agreement and without doubt, went over as a result of careless and artless depictions in animal designs, which were regarded as beavers for the sake of the lumpy hanging tail, so that on the seals of the family from the 17th and partly already from the 16th century, as well as in all printed images of the coat-of-arms from the early 17th century published Siebmacher's Arms Works, there are unmistakably depicted beavers pay a visit of the wolves. The family itself had thus fallen into error about the gender of their heraldic animals and their meaning, which some scholars reinforced when they tried to vindicate to the beavers a justification from the naming of the river of the Bevers at the Schenk ancestral home, in whose name the heraldic animals should have expressed an allusion. No less striking is the example of von Neindorff in Halberstädten, who defaced their ancient coat of arms, which they have in common with many families of the local area, the angularly drawn crossbar from their seals and painted in coat-of-arms into a comb (!) and so bleached it. But these examples may suffice here, pay a visit many. They show how a family itself could get into ignorance and error about the meaning of their heraldic figures, and the same was much easier possible, in terms of an animal shape that had the greatest similarity in the heraldic depiction with a related, also extremely often depicted in the same tincture.

Recognizing the legitimacy and importance of the "family tradition", it is easy to explain that it is less a tradition than a view formed by the perception of the image represented on seals only by drawing and painting. It may well have come only from looking at seals from the last three centuries. That these seals, if one can speak at all of a clear recognition of the animal figures in question on the seals, erroneously and incorrectly showed foxes paying a visit wolves, is however proven at the top; the oldest seals concealed and not hanging from documents, which were in family possession, of which the very oldest was only drawn to light a few years ago, had certainly not come to light for many generations.

In the above circumstances, however, we cannot recognize a so-called family tradition, as something very indeterminable, the beginnings of which are unknown, as a justification with regard to the explanation and interpretation of the coat of arms image, all the less so, however, as at the times when the first description of the coat of arms of the v. Kleist flowed out of learned pen, at the beginning of the 17th century, art and academia, especially in the dear Pomerania, was by no means on the point of view that a thorough and critical assessment and conception of the coat of arms emblems would be considered at all. Moreover, it is far from clear whether Micrälius received his description of the Kleist coat-of-arms in which he sees foxes from the family's own mouth or pen and that he did not, in his own view, have blasoned. However, there are also rallies within the family itself, which indicate doubts about the correctness of the interpretation of the Kleist heraldic animals. Thus, the painted pedigree of Field Marshal Henning Alexander v. Kleist, kept in the Secret State Archive on Berlin, apparently paid a visit by the foxes, has included the old wolves in the coat-of-arms Kleist-Retzow and, as we are told, the father of the Lord-President v. has also preferred the latter as the real images of the sex coat of arms and recognized them.¹

B. The coat-of-arms itself.

¹ In the genealogical tables that the order of St. John knights had to submit and which have been in the Geh since the beginning of the 18th century. In addition, there is a calm of depictions of heraldic animals as gray and yellow wolves with a hanging red tongue. The helmet ornaments are often chosen with regard to the coat of arms drawings, as weapons with which the heraldic animals were killed, so the toggle rods of the helmet jewelry of the family v. Kleist to wolves but not to foxes as heraldic animals fit. The later uncritical period could very easily come from the red coat of arms color of the wolves to the presumption that the animals were foxes, by forgetting that the coat of arms color does not mimic nature.

I. First we have the shield to deal with. As everybody knows The same shows a red cross bar in the white box, above and below which a red Wolf runs.

If we look at the coat-of-arms of the old Pomeranian nobility, we come across a not insignificant number of them, some of which are completely similar to the Kleist and show the same image, some of which have only a more or less great resemblance to it.

It is an incontrovertible principle of the aforementioned sciences, pronounced and proven centuries ago, further elaborated and substantiated in the presence of the best connoisseurs of genealogy and heraldry, that the equality of the coat-of-arms of two or more families also declares their tribal kinship, then also tribal unity. It must be avoided in this place, as in that of a special work, to explain this principle in general and by special examples; we only want to refer to the equally thorough treatise of the Baron of Ledebur on the groups of coats of arms of the Mark nobility contained in the second volume of the Mark research.

Alone, like any rule, also suffers the above exceptions. Indeed, we can see that two noble families, who are known to be of the same origin, have used different emblems in their coats of arms, and indeed that brothers are totally dissenting in their coat-of-arms.

<190> Not only are these examples in a miniscule number opposed to those on the contrary, but it would be a violation of the essence of any reasoning if one were to base a pay a visit of evidence to be taken on their exception.

A second exception to the intended rule, however, deals more closely with the subject under discussion. This assumption is in turn rooted in the profound differences between the German and Slavic heraldry, between the German and Wendish noble coats of arms in their totality.

It cannot escape the general view of the mass of noble coats of arms in German and Wendish (Germanized) countries and regions that in the former there is a relatively small number of coat-of-arms of one and the same type, i.e. those which are congruent and identical with respect to shield emblems (coats of arms) section and formation, while the countries with originally Wendish or Slavic population supply everywhere an extremely large number of noble coats of arms, which are partly completely identical, partly similar in the main pieces.

This fact reaches the culmination point with the Polish nobility and anyone who is not unfamiliar with Polish heraldry, or who only examined Okolski's coat of arms, knows that Polen counts 20, 30, 40 and more noble families of different names, who use exactly the same coat-of-arms. And so there are just as many groups of equal arms (*sic venia verbo*) families there as individuals make up such a group. What would be the conclusion if the above rule of German heraldry were applied? Nothing more than that the ancestors of the families with respectively equal coat-of-arms are also descendants of an ancestor and all branches of a tribe. Only a closer and more detailed examination and specific research, do not reveal the correctness of that sentence, which is so sure for the German heraldry and rarely deceptive, and there is often a lack of all evidence to reduce the tribal unit of two or even more families of the same coat-of-arms. Nevertheless, the principle of equality of arms has its full application in individual cases also in Wendland and Slavic countries and, among the large number of noble families who use the same coat-of-arms, it can be shown in two or three of the same category that tribal and arms equality correspond to each other and completely coincide. However, answering the question of the reasons for the large number of noble families that occur in the designated countries, with equal coat-of-arms, without certain facts and occurrences giving the reason for this - cannot be found both by the reference to an undeniable poverty in the heraldry of two countries, and by the fact that, to a greater extent than in German countries, certain and certain coat-of-arms killed in action emblems were preferably and generally loved and honored, the object of general taste, not to say fashion, were and remained, that, to put it another way, the one-standing, related, following the

same occupations and inclinations, and indulging in a way of life, nobility also found very particularly attached to certain images for shield and helmet or to special inscriptions of its shields.

On this Weise we have to explain the many same coat-of-arms that we see in Wende countries in more or less large numbers of noble families used and this circumstance does not rule out the assumption of a tribal unity, but it lets them in the background and strips them of all justification, which they had in the German noble coats of arms of the same images from the beginning.

Just like that type of coat of arms, which show an animal growing out of a chess or also plants, crescent and star, half animals, tendrils, fish-tailed grabs etc., there is a not short series of such noble families of Pomerania, which use exactly the same coat-of-arms, which lead the v. Kleist.

In addition, other families show a shield that is similar to Kleist at least in terms of the division and arrangement of the characters.

With regard to the first case, the question will have to be asked: "Are all the families of a tribe with them that are equivalent to the v. Kleist - and is this a priori to be suspected or assumed for this reason - or are they just some (and which) of these families of the same type, or at last the above relation is paid a visit in all of them, namely that there is no family and tribal kinship among them, which would give the reason for the equality of arms, which is simply based on a popularity of the Kleist-shield emblems in Pomerania and can be derived?"

And in fact it cannot be proved that the family von Kleist occurring in Pommern, who lead with that of the same coat-of-arms, one only the v. Bulgrin, are with him from the same tribe, that is, their tribesmen or tribesmen, therefore also the seals of such families are by no means represented by the founder and most industrious researcher of the Kleist gender history, the immortalized Kratz, under the rubric: tribesmen-related families, but only referred to as those of arms-related families.

Von Kleist An identical sign with those lead in Pommern and generally the following noble families:

- 1) Meseritz's,
- 2) that of Wodtke (Woticke), both also with the same colors,
- 3) those of Butzke with yellow crossbars,
- 4) those of Bulgrin with black wolves,
- 5) that of Krankspar.

Von Kleist All these families, with the exception of the former and perhaps also the latter, whose helmet ornaments are not quite fixed, also carry the same helmet ornaments, as the à.

What is to be inferred from this? That if it is not proved that all these family von Kleist are related to the tribe, but only one of them, the rest will have come from the same land, as the v. Kleist, or vice versa.

Whether this home country is a German or a Wendish one will have to be examined and answered below.

Quite apart from all other evidence, we claim a agile (Slavic) country and according to the principle that a family is at home where it first and exclusively appears, Pommern von Kleist itself, as the country of origin and origin of the à in. The reasons for this are as follows:

- 1) If in none of the other noble families of Pommern, which are in agreement with the v. Kleist of the coat-of-arms and demonstrably do not belong to their clan, has so far made the assertion, or let alone made the evidence, that they have to derive their origin from a country other than Pommern, the country in which the first of their name and coat-of-arms appeared in a document: thus, the assumption and assertion that the comrades of arms of these families, the v. Kleist, are derived from a country other than Pommern itself will not be

allowed to take place.

2) If we find the ancestors of the v. Kleist and the first bearers of this name exclusively named in Pommern and living and nourished there, the sentence will assert itself that the cradle of the family stood where the first also lived. This sentence is so unmistakable and correct that it allows almost no objections and only the objection of the change of name in the new country can be asserted against him.

3) It is very important to note and to reinforce the evidence of the Wendish descent of the Kleist family when we find a number of families in Pommern, which are partly counted from time immemorial to the indigenous noble families of the same, partly by no means accompanied by those, in which one would have made an attempt to prove a German descent, which, although not identical to the Kleist-, but nevertheless a similarly formed or respectively the same heraldic animals in the same number, position etc. lead coat-of-arms. The editor of the Kleist Book of documents has already pointed out this himself by including the seals of such families in the coat of arms.

We have to distinguish two categories of such noble families of Pommern according to the last remark and turn first to those who have the Kleist-like shaped coat of arms, i.e. a beam dividing the shield transversely, accompanied by two figures, one at the top and one at the bottom, or a transversely divided shield, in the two halves of which an animal walks or jumps up. These are the kinds of families we see:

- 1) living from Damitz, near the Kleist, above and below the cross beam of the shield, leading a boar's head,
- 2) that of Falck, in both sections of the transversely divided shield with one grip each, also a Pomeranian family,
- 3) those of Brockhusen in Hinterpommern, below the crossbar a running Wolf, above the former three stars in the shield.

None of these families has been or can be said to be of German origin. We will therefore rightly have to think about the same origin of families with similar coat-of-arms.

Taking the second category of Kleist-like coat-of-arms as its subject, the editor has claimed a number of undoubtedly indigenous noble families of Pommern as such and described them in more detail on the seal boards.

According to the evidence of the long series of older seals of the Kleist family, several of them did not carry the shield in its present form and drawing, which was customary during the two previous centuries, but, with the omission of the crossbar, the two wolves alone among themselves, just as they still carry today the first family of Pomerania, the v. Borcke, against whose indigenous nature and undoubted descent from the most noble Slavic nobles has not yet raised their voices.

Those lords of Kleist whose seals show only the two wolves and not the crossbar are as follows:

- 1) Bispraus v. Kleist the Elder (olde), 1402, see addendum Table IX. No 3,
- 2) Bispraus v. Kleist, 1500, see *ibid.* No 2, and
- 3) Ewald Joachim v. Kleist, 1699, see *ibid.* Table XV. No. 12.

Even more family members use a mere dividing line pay a visit of the crossbar (see *ibid.* Table IX. X. XI. XV.), so that, if this is true, the coat-of-arms is conceivable only in such a way that the tinctures of the two areas separated by a simple line differ and the animals in them were of the opposite color, i.e. a red Wolf on top of Weiß and a white Wolf on bottom of red.

On the other hand, we perceive the designated coat-of-arms variant, namely the mere wolves without

the crossbar on the older seals of those families, which in later formation consistently lead a coat-of-arms identical to the Kleist and of which the v. Bulgrin certainly, the v. Woedtke at least afterwards view several genealogists and historians, to whom v. Kleist are ancestral (i.e. have to lead the same coat-of-arms with them), much more frequently.

I refer to the seals

- 1) of Henning v. Bulgrin, 1409, see addendum Table XIII. No 9,
- 2) Henning v. Bulgrin at Tunow, 1494, see *ibid.* op. cit. no. 10,
- 3) of Christoph v. Bulgrin at Wusszeken, 1521, see *ibid.* op. cit. no. 11.
- 4) of Hanß v. Butzke on Butzke, 1510, see *ibid.* Table XIV. No. 11.
- 5) of Alexius v. Woedtke, 1536, see *ibid.* Table XV. No. 17.

There are no old seals of those of the v. Meseritz, and the well-known seals of the v. Kranksparr from the beginning of the 16th century both show the crossbar.

It should also be noted that in the case of the above-mentioned noble families not only the crossbar is later found in the shield between the wolves, but that also almost all of them have the same variation as in those of Kleist: dividing line pay a visit of the crossbar etc.; so that we are decidedly dealing with a single special coat of arms, which is common to several families.

If, however, we consider the oldest seals of the Kleist family, i.e. those of circa 1290 and of Dubislaw v. Kleist of 1377 and 1385, the vast majority of Kleist seals from later times will see the crossbar contained, then it is probably to be rejected that the two wolves alone had constituted the initial coat-of-arms and that the crossbar was only a later ingredient, although in some of the other families and in the family Bulgrin of the v. Kleist de Densin of the crossbar, which is indisputably related to the v. Kleist, is only found later. However, the seal of this and the other families from the oldest and older period under consideration here are only a few or none at all preserved, so that conclusions are certainly not possible and it also seems possible and acceptable that arbitrariness, lack of care, negligence and the like should bear the blame for the variant of the coat of arms of those of Kleist and their comrades of arms, namely in omission of the crossbar or transformation thereof into a mere stroke. The rawness and imperfection of the drawing and the engraving of the Kleist and Pomeranian seals of nobility in the 14th and 15th centuries in general speaks the word of this declaration.

Therefore, if the shield with the crossbar separating the two wolves is the genuine coat-of-arms, we are able to enter the coat-of-arms of the v. Borcke and other Old Pomeranian nobles, as their ancient seals, all showing two soon uncrowned soon crowned wolves in the shield, bring the panels XII and XIII in the addendum numerous, the v. Kleist-like coat-of-arms or the emblems of coats of arms of related families not to see, even less we can see the v. Böhn with the three dogs or even the v. Glasenapp, v. Rekow and v. Kamecke, as it is the scratch view (see panel XII. 11 and XIV. No. 17-20), because they have a similar helmet decoration, count in this category. But we will soon come back to the Kleist Helmzier and its significance.

However, the similar formation of the coat-of-arms of the v. Borcke and other Pomeranian families with the Kleist, consisting in the leadership of two wolves in the same position, must be taken into account and is evidence for our purpose. And it is precisely characteristic that wolves, foxes, dogs are not just so mean in the coat-of-arms of the Pomeranian nobility, but that they only appear here most in such, so to speak, clusters and connections with each other or other heraldic figures.

For this reason, the similarity of the Kleist, Bulgrin, etc. coat-of-arms (yes, as far as individual older seals are concerned, the correspondence) with the Borckian is of no small importance for the investigation of the homeland and the homeland of those of Kleist. For, admittedly, if no other family of Pommern, but the v. Borcke have their cradle here, it will be necessary to conclude that also the

families related to the coat of arms, the noble families with similarly designated coat of arms shields in the same country as the v. Borcke must have originated.

In view of the striking similarity (albeit not a relationship, as stated in the book of documents p. 746²) of the Borckeschen coat-of-arms with the Kleist and its significance for an investigation into the same, it is necessary to approve a presentation of the seals in question on Tables XII and XIII (addendum), without it being necessary to go into a more detailed description and enumeration of those seals. And it is also noteworthy that other families of Pommern, for whom a German descent has not yet been proven, have in their coat of arms two animals running among themselves, the v. Borske dogs³, who have set v. Falck Greife, the latter even more similar to the Kleistsche wolves are separated by a dividing line.

II. A second consideration is to be devoted in the following to the helmet ornaments or the helmet ornaments of the Kleist coat-of-arms.

It will also prove or reinforce that we are dealing with a true Pomeranian coat-of-arms, with the coat-of-arms of a native family of Pommern.

The helmet decoration of the Kleist coat-of-arms consists of three hunting or gag skewers, which are turned downwards with the tips of three Rosen - we leave out the designation of the respective paints as temporarily irrelevant with intent.

This helmet jewelry is a highly characteristic and peculiar. It is found exclusively in Pomerania and is not found in any family of German descent in Deutschland.

The helmet decorations, which heraldists and genealogists have so far paid even less attention to than the emblems and figurations of the shields, deserve in fact a thorough consideration and often provide surprising information in a variety of directions, but most of all for the cultural history of the countries to which the respective noble families belong.

Who wouldn't have noticed, who regards a heraldic book differently from a colorful work of images, which color specialty characterizes the noble coats of arms of Westphalen - yellow and red? And what repetitive uniformity in the formation of the helmet decorations, the winging of the helmets and the repetition of the shield figures on the individual wings or the repetition of the tapered coat of arms shield between them? And so it can be said that every German country inhabited by a certain tribe of nations has not only declared the Stempel of peculiarity to the coat of arms of its nobility, but also that such peculiarity characterizes the helmet ornaments to no lesser extent. The coat-of-arms of the indigenous low nobility in Prussia, the Margraviate Brandenburg, in Schlesien, on the Harz, in Lower Saxony, Franken and Rhein have several categories of such peculiar degenerates helmet ornament rates.

<195> Let's take a look at what Pommern is doing in this regard. As in no other country, we find very specific degenerates of helmet jewelry in Pommern. We may at least highlight some of the many things that can be said in this respect.

Especially the most ordinary and most natural seeming in modern times with new noble and citizen coats of arms, especially since ingenious countless occurring helmet ornaments, namely the padding of the helmet and specifically with ostrich feathers shows, although not exclusively, but nowhere more than in Pommern. We abstain from the examples of this, which would only be impressive and proven by their mass, and refer to the Bagmihl coat of arms of Pommern or, which is already

² See addendum See

³ Dogs are also found elsewhere in the Pomeranian heraldry, also in the two-digit, but in a different position, namely jumping against each other, in the coat-of-arms of the von Koß and von Boehn.

completely sufficient, to the Pomeranian noble coats of arms in the third volume of the Siebmacher coat of arms.

A second helmet jewelry peculiar to Pomerania are natural Lilien, which also decorate many of the Pomeranian noble helmets in the triple number. This degenerate of the helmet ornament is also found in Pommern, while the coat-of-arms of German families rarely have it. We mention here, for example, the coat-of-arms of v. Wittken, v. Tesmar, v. Tauenzin, v. Dargusch, v. Versen, v. Janitz, (v. Tribbesees heraldische Lilien), v. Wobeser, v. Paris, v. Chmelentz, v. Zarbske (Sarbski), v. Lodes and others.

A side piece to the Lilien are Rosen, also in the triple on the helmet of old Pomeranian families, and this species of Helmzier belongs to the extreme rarity in the coat-of-arms of old German noble families. We only mention - apart from the v. Vangerow with one, v. Saenz and v. Schinburen with two, v. Rotermund with six and v. Meseritz with six or seven Rosen - the v. Powalski, v. Paris, v. Born, v. Ketel, v. Kowalck, v. Zozenow and others.

Again, a peculiarity of the Pomeranian heraldry we perceive in the occupation of the helmet with a weapon (whose use was also especially widespread in the Slavic countries) also in the triple number, namely with arrows and gag or hunting skewers. In the Slavic marrow of Brandenburg we also encounter these two types of helmet jewelry in indigenous Wendengescheuchen, namely the arrows, such as those of Retzow and Brietz or Brietzke. In Pommern we see three upright arrows, also sometimes turned downwards (very often arrows occur individually and twice on the helmets of the Pomeranian nobility) in the coat-of-arms of the v. Lissow, v. Herzberg, v. Wittken, v. Thadden, v. Velstow, v. Zarnow and others exactly in the same figuration as the hunting skewers on the helmets of those of Kleist. This fact will also help in its part to support the arguments that bear witness to the indignation of the Kleist family in Pommern.

Of those families who are part of a shield with the v. Kleist, all, except for the v. Meseritz, whose helmet ornaments vary greatly according to the imprint given in the seal board, also as it was carried in the Middle Ages could not be ascertained, also carry the same helmet ornaments as the v. Kleist, namely the three supported hunting skewers. The fact that this degenerate of helmet jewelry is also a favorite in Pommern, among its old native nobility (completely unknown in Deutschland), is shown by an overview of the Pomeranian coat-of-arms. In addition to the v. Kleist, v. Butzke, v. Bulgrin, v. Woedtke and v. Kranksparn, the v. Tesmar (one of the two families of this name), v. Reckow, v. Peselin and v. Kamecke, all four, if any, still lead him to the native body of knights and to the descendants of noble Wenden, and also the v. Lodes, as from the seal of the Richard v. Lodes of 1600 (see addendum Table XV. No. 15).

Kratz wrongly names the last two families - the first he passes over - families related to the coat of arms of the v. Kleist; the circumstance of the same helmet ornaments does not in the least justify that designation. It should be noted that all the families mentioned so far, which lead hunting spikes to the helmet ornament, have as a coat of arms emblem - only in the case of the v. Bonin it could be doubtful - hunttable, by hunting spikes to be killed and in Pommern at the time wildly occurring as a shield emblem.

In this, too, Kratz is wrong to place the v. Glasenapp in the same category of the families related to the v. Kleist coat of arms because it bears the seal of a single Mr. v. Glasenapp, Peter v. Glasenapp v. J. 1505 (see addendum Table XIV. No. 17), i.e. from a relatively late period, and shows, in addition, a helmet ornament only similar to the Kleist, not even the same, namely five bundles of upwardly

directed Lanzen or skewers⁴. In general, by the way, the v. Glasenapp have always and still now led a completely different helmet decoration. However, there are seals of the v. Kleist and some of their coats of arms, whose helmet ornaments resemble the aforementioned Glasenappschen, which is also inherent in the matter (see the seals of Andreas v. Kleist 1536 Table IX. No. 10). The helmet decoration in the Glasenappschen- and her coats of arms Siegel, which is usually attached to the shield just like on the Kleist Siegel without helmet, shows the hunting skewers with iron turned downwards.

Another specialty of the Kleist coat-of-arms, which is also evident in a number of other Pomeranian families, but only such, is the casting of the helmet with (heraldic) Rosen, on which the tips of the hunting or gag skewers rest. The first depiction of this is shown on the seal of Martin v. Kleist on Dargen from 1579 (addendum Table X No. 7), if not already the crossbar occupied by three Rosen in the coat of arms of the Camminer dean Pribislaf v. Kleist on its seal of 1538 (addendum Tab. IX No 12) contains an indication of this. Since then, we have found the Rosen soon to be appropriate, soon to be left out, but the latter is less common, and for 150 years they have consistently been found to be part of the Kleist coat-of-arms. Of the families of the v. Kleist who are related to the arms or tribes, only the coat-of-arms of the v. Butzke and v. Meseritz appear in later times, but they often lead a number of highly prized Rosen on their helmets, without the helmet roses; the v. Bulgrin and v. Woedtke lead them; of the v. Krankspar only a single older seal is known, on which they are missing.

In order to vindicate the character and type of a true Pomeranian in this piece as well to the Kleist coat-of-arms, we emphasize that we find, as noted, in a whole series of coat-of-arms of Old Pomeranian and as we believe indigenous families the same herald piece, the helmet roses or in their pay a visit other but similar characters, such as diamonds, clovers and the like. Thus, the helmet feathers of the Rügische v. Plates rest on Rosen, respectively they are wrapped with a rosary at the bottom, similar to the peacock tail on the helmet of the v. Varchmin. One of the two v. Steinwehr families has each of the three ostrich feathers stuck on its helmet on a Rose; likewise the v. Knuth with the trophy, while the v. Schwerin shows shamrocks or a shamrock wreath, the v. Billerbeck three (heraldic) diamonds and the v. Borsky stars instead of the Rosen. - -

After we have subjected all the plays of the v. Kleist coat-of-arms in the preceding sections to a detailed discussion, heraldic critique and comparative consideration, the coat-of-arms is continuously and in all plays as such, which does not bear a German, but a Wende or Slavic type and character. We have the evidence, on the one hand, of the formation of the shield and its images and the helmet ornaments, on the other hand, of the quality of the images themselves. We have found the same heraldic figure, the same formation and composition, the same degenerate of the Helmzier among a sometimes considerable number of noble families, which are native to the Pomeranian region from their first appearance and of which no one has been able to make the claim of a foreign in specifically German origin.

It is obvious that in such circumstances the coat-of-arms of the v. Kleist and its nature constitute a significant point in the chain of evidence in favor of the family's indigenous nature. For if the non-German type of coat-of-arms is admitted, those who wanted to adhere to the view of the German provenance of the family and the immigration of their ancestor in Pommern would only be able to counter that fact by doing so and could only attempt to explain it by

- 1) a filing of the German (ancestor) coat-of-arms,
- 2) the acceptance of a turning or

⁴ Otherwise, Kratz would also have had to count the v. Gousch, whose helmet shows a bundle of skewers, among the arms-related families of the v. Kleist.

- 3) the conversion of the German to Wendish type,
- 4) or at last would have to claim acceptance of the name of a German family without simultaneous acceptance of his coat-of-arms of pages of a family of Wends.

If, according to the exposition given in this chapter, the Kleist coat-of-arms presents Wendisches entirely alone as bearing the type of the Wenden coat-of-arms and thus as evidence for the origin of the family from Pommern itself, then a few words are still devoted here to some objections which could be raised against this view.

They will be able to rely on the fact that in other German countries outside Pommern there are coat-of-arms whose shields - because no one shows the same helmet jewelry - show a similar figuration with the Kleist, so that the evidence of the non-German origin of the family from the coat-of-arms at least loses its footing.

If we go back to the Kratzsche view, according to which it seems from the lack of the cross bar on some - extremely few - older Kleist seals to the occurrence of the cross bar on the oldest sex seals that the bar is a later ingredient and the two wolves alone represented the actual coat of arms, which is why also on the coat-of-arms of those v. Borcke and some old Pomeranian nobles is recurrent, we find, however, but in surprisingly small numbers, coat-of-arms of German families, which lead two crossing animals in the shield, namely, apart from the illustrious Hohenlohe family, the Schenken v. Dönstedt (Flechtingen), Bock v. Wülffingen, v. Ilten and v. Auerswald. More than these four I have not been able to discover under the whole nobility of the Upper and Lower Saxon district, which counts many thousands of families. This circumstance alone, which is explained by the infinite possibility of combinations of different heraldic figures, is already because of the extremely small number of cases in question, but even more so because of no significance or our evidence shocking, because it is clear that the v. Borcke Wenden blooms are and often such a heraldic image could also occur in such families and was brought here. It is therefore not worth the trouble to recall the likelihood that the v. Auerswald will only have to derive their origin from the native inhabitants of a turning country (Meißen) from time immemorial and originally appearing.

Almost with the same ease, the second objection will be overcome, which refers to the figuration of the Kleist coat of arms shield, which we also address as specifically Pomeranian and which rejects that also outside Pommern several noble families can be detected, whose coat of arms shield shows a crossbar accompanied at the top and bottom by certain emblems. Thus, the Hopkorf v. lead over and under the crossbar two and one star, as do the Scheplitz v., the Keyn v. two and a buckle or the like, the Barsewisch v. two and one leaf, the Kahlenberg v. two and one Rose, the Bronsart v. and Kassau v. four and three diamonds. All of these families occur exclusively only in Wends and Slave countries, the Jerichowschen, the Margraviate of Brandenburg and Prussia, and are, as can be shown, all of Wendish origin, but then these examples are less suitable for the reason that they all show not two but three figures as companions of the crossbar and not animals, but lifeless objects.

Much more apt is therefore the example of v. Rülcke, a native Neumärker, who later settled in Meißen, and two dogs, running on top of each other, lead in the transversely divided shield in mixed tinctures. However, if we also quite apart from the differences in the shield section, this can only be on our page, as the v. Rülcke also occur exclusively in a Wenden country and, as their name already shows, are undoubtedly native to the country.

Only the only coat-of-arms of the Schenken v. Stauffenberg (see Siebmacher I. p. 115), which belongs to the Swabian body of knights, is the one of which a similarity in the formation of the shield emblem can be claimed. It shows above a crossbar a lion walking along. In its isolation, it alone has no significance for answering the question of whether the Kleistsche coat-of-arms is of German or Wendish type, apart from the fact that it is not wolves but lions that we see in the South German

coat-of-arms. The wolves of the Kleist above and below the beam we find just nowhere again and in Deutschland shows and shines the Kleist shield only in the country, from which the ancestor of the whole family has sprouted.

C. Description of the family coat of arms and the individual branches of the family attached coat-of-arms.

1. The original coat of arms of the family v.. Kleist, which has been known and certified by seals for almost 600 years, presents itself in the unthinkable time as regards the position and combination of the coat of arms images and the colors and in the correct and normative form today for the sexual limbs entitled to the sole leadership of the simple coat-of-arms, as shown in the illustration next to the title page of the Book of documents, namely:

A white (silver) shield, in which a red crossbar, above and below which a red Wolf with a flared red tongue shows itself running.

The helmet has three red, yellow (gold)-studded (yellow-studded) Rosen next to it, each with a yellow (brownish) hunting or gag skewer (with natural-colored iron) standing down on it.

Helmets: red and white (silver).

There must be no debate in this place as to why we pay a visit the fashion pay a visit, which has been introduced in heraldic blasons for several hundred years, and perhaps here and there for some time now, to name the two colors white and yellow the corresponding metals that used and restored the old and proper way of designating them. We consider the other degenerate to be an expression of heraldic braid style and a pedantry, but above all a mistake, since no painter, especially in prehistoric times, completely tinges yellow and white heraldic shields and figurines with gold or silver colors (metal), but only in places where the "lights" had to be attached, along with individual protruding points that reflect the light.

Nor is it the place to spread the word about why the position of wolves has not been specified. It is a completely indifferent matter. The coat-of-arms remains the Kleist coat-of-arms and everyone will see it for the same, even if the wolves are shown paying a visit to the left (heraldic right, because one should think of the hand of the one holding the coat-of-arms in front of him) page to the right (heraldic left). This is confirmed not only by the seals of the Kleist, but also by the seals and older coat of arms of all noble families. The position of the heraldic figure, whether right or left, was a matter of pure arbitrariness and nothing would be more ridiculous than to talk of a false coat-of-arms if the wolves were constantly pointing to the right.

However, an important voice in crest representations and paintings has the aesthetic feeling or aesthetic taste. This has decided, especially from the point of view of convenience for the draftsman (not engraver) for the (natural) leftist page, according to which crest figures, especially since animals are to be turned, and indeed with full right, but only in the subject of individual coat-of-arms to be represented. In fact, the opposite is paid a visit - and with even more right and according to unquestionable aesthetic principles - both in the alliance of complete coat-of-arms (as a result of the alliance (marriage) of their wearers) and in the ecarterization and unification of heraldic figures in general, in which the former case all heraldic figures turned to the left have to turn in the opposite page - to the right - so that the whole coat-of-arms in the first place (that of the husband), as far as possible, also turns with the helmet to the second coat-of-arms next to it (that of the wife). In the other case, a squared shield containing four lions would therefore contain the right-hand side in boxes 1 and 3, which have to be turned left in boxes 2 and 4, so that the animals are not only facing each other in boxes 1 and 2, but also in boxes 1 and 4 and in boxes 2 and 3. A countless number of examples from all ages confirm this practice, which is based on a commendable sense of beauty.

In the present case, therefore, the Kleist heraldic animals, in the case of the union of the coat-of-arms with another, so that it is first (as the coat-of-arms of the husband) to turn to the right (heraldic left) page, as we also know a number of seals of the previous century, in which this is the case, as with

countless other coat-of-arms.

The lack of sound heraldic knowledge and aesthetics in the first half of this century and during most of the last century, in the design of the increased Kleist coat-of-arms, has made violations of such principles everywhere, since if the original coat of arms in the squared shield had been repeated, the heraldic animals should have turned towards each other.

In such cases, however, the diploma and its specification must be strictly adhered to and an amendment is not permitted.

As far as the helmet decoration of the Kleist coat-of-arms is concerned, it is only to be remembered in the case of the adjoining, taken from the Book of documents, normal depiction that the depiction in the beautiful taste and style from the middle of the 15th century caused the right-hand turn of the helmet and thus also the change of the position of the skewers, which are otherwise fan-like, the middle perpendicular, the others at an acute angle directed downwards towards it. Again, this was based on heraldic aesthetics and will have to be maintained when the helmet is turned forward. Other positions of the skewers, incidentally, show several seals.

<200> Finally, it is also noticeable, in consideration of the colors of individual parts of the coat-of-arms, that old paintings in pedigrees and family records depict the wolves in natural colors, i.e. dirty yellow or pale yellow and gray yellow, without altering the tincture of the helmet ceilings corresponding to the colors of the shield figures. But it is also the completely red color of the animals (vermilion) quite right, since it is the principle to depict the tincture of heraldic figures usually in certain colors, which often do not conform with the natural ones, which is why the heraldry has blue and black lions, black deer, blue Rosen, etc.

The Courland branch soon carries the original coat of arms after conventional manner with a crowned, soon with an uncrowned helmet.



2. Kleist v. Bornstedt. By means of the Most High Cabinet command of the Berlin of 11 April 1803 (see book of documents p. 652, 653), the Premier Lieutenant Franz Otto of Kleist and the future holders of the Fideikommissbesitzer of the manor of Hohen-Nauen received permission to combine the names of Kleist and Bornstedt and to call themselves Kleist v Bornstedt.

The coat-of-arms painted in the above Cabinets command and therefore still managed by this industry today is squared. Boxes 1 and 4 show the above-described original coat of arms, 2 and 3 that of those of Bornstedt (namely the Neumärkisch-Pomeranian family of this name), a red and Weiß-nested wall with three red battlements, above which on blue a brown, somewhat obliquely inclined floating tree trunk, at the top with two below occupied with a brown acorn.

Of the two helmets, the first (left) is the Kleist stem helmet, the second crowned one of the Bornstadt coat-of-arms, wears three ostrich feathers, one red between two blue ones.

The helmet covers are white and red on both sides.

(Illustration from the Book of documents Tafel II to p. 653).

As for the v. Bornstedtic coat-of-arms, it is here, at least in part, decidedly inaccurate. Coming into a detailed critique is not the place here, especially since the presentation is an unchangeable fait accompli. The slotted wall, which is said to have three red battlements, is absurd. As with many of the Neumark and Pomeranian families, the Bornstedt Shield (e.g. also with the v. Rüchel) consisted of half a chess, but it is not a wall and must have no battlements. If, however, a wall emerged from chess in completely erroneous Weise and through negligence and already after a few seals in the 17th century, it could only be depicted in one color, at most with joints marked red. There are also various concerns about the correctness of the calibration load. The v. Bornstedtic coat-of-arms shows itself on old seals and almost more on new ones in countless variations, the branch above the chess soon shows leaves of various shapes, soon fruits, soon gnards pay a visit of leaves, often it passes into a wall breaker (Sturmbock). Two main lines of the family differ by the helmet decoration, as the other industry led a growing image of women. Most often, the coat of arms also vary in color and the helmet is usually not crowned. See Bagmihl, Pomeranian Coat of Arms.

Region of Magdeburg A completely different tribe and different home than the above is the original family of Bornstedt, which keeps a hat in the coat-of-arms and also still blooms.



Rüchel-Kleist 3. v. or actually and originally v. Rüchel, otherwise v. Kleist. In 1809 at the latest (not 1810), the major, later Major General Jacob Friedrich v. Kleist, received the Highest Authorization to accept the name and coat-of-arms of those v. Rüchel for himself and his descendants, following his adoption by the then Lieutenant General Ernst Wilh. Ferdinand Friedrich Philipp v. Rüchel, the last of his family, who had always been affluent in the district of Dramburg-Schievelbein. See the details in the deed. 656 and 657. The coat-of-arms, which is only conducted according to the practice, not the diploma or cabinet order, which can no longer be found, consists of a squared shield, the 1st and 4th. Field the Kleist's original coat of arms, the 2nd and 3rd that shows the v. Rüchel, namely a blue (heraldic) lily in Weiß over a chess of blue and Weiß. Of the two helmets, the first (left) is the Kleist stem helmet, the second crowned is that of the Rüchel coat-of-arms and is covered with three green cloverleaves stuck on long green stems. The helmet covers are red and white on the left, blue and white on the right.

(Illustration from the Book of documents-Tafel III to p. 656.)

About the v. Rüchel, also belonging to the indigenous nobility of the Pomeranian country, especially on Semerow for centuries, compare Bagmihl a. o.



4. Count Kleist of Nollendorff. The coat-of-arms attached to the middle diploma of Paris 3 June 1814 under the name of Count Kleist v. Nollendorff raised to the Prussian county rank General of Infantry (later General Field Marshal) Friedrich Ferdinand Emil Heinrich v. Kleist - we would follow the words of the diploma here, if the same could not be printed in the deed book pp. 658 - 661 - in a squared shield with a middle shield containing the Kleist original coat of arms. Boxes 1 and 4 show on Weiß the Prussian golden eagle with a crown and clover angels (but without the name on the breast and without scepter and sword), boxes 2 and 3 yellow with an upright sword with a golden handle, surrounded by a laurel wreath consisting of two green laurel branches tied together in red below.

Three helmets also covered with count's crown rest on the count's crown covering the shield, the middle of which bears the Kleist trunk helmet, three from as much Rosen, one red between two yellow, toppled yellow (tournament) Lanzen; the second helmet (the first left) shows the eagle of the 1st and 4th, the third the figure of the 2nd and 3rd. field. The helmet covers are left: black, white and red, right: red and yellow, in the middle: red and white.

(Illustration from the Book of documents-Tafel IV to p. 660.)

The helmet decoration of the main coat of arms has been incorrectly stated with the above coat of arms propagation both with regard to the tincture of the Rosen, as well as the depiction of Lanzen (and indeed in the drawing as complete tournament lances) pay a visit of the short pressed hunting or gag skewers, whose figuration shows the drawing of the main coat of arms.

All generals of the Prussian army, who had been awarded an increase in their rank, received similar increases in their coats of arms from the war of 1813-14.



5. Count Kleist of Loß. The most medial diploma of that Berlin, 21 January 1823 in the Prussian county under the name of Count Kleist of Loß raised Prussian Major Wilhelm Bogislav v. Kleist received the following coat-of-arms, whose diplomatic description in the in the document b. 669 - 671 printed count's diploma is located: A twice split and once transversely divided shield, in the upper second field of which the Kleist'sche, the lower fourth field the Loß'sche original coat of arms, namely on red a green frog in the middle of a green leaf wreath. The 1st and 6th white field shows the black Prussian crowned, gold-reinforced eagle, but without clover angel, name, sword and scepter. Box 3 and 4 a white lion on blue.

The count's crown, which covers the shield, wears four helmets, which are also decorated with count's crown, the first of which shows the eagle described above growing, the second the Kleist helmet decoration in the usual representation, the third the Loß helmet, repeating the shield figure, the fourth the white lion growing.

The helmet covers are white and red in the middle, black, white and red on the left, blue, white and red on the right.⁵ - Illustration from the Book of documents Tafel V. at page 670.

The coat-of-arms of the ancient Meissen niches by several high-ranking men distinguished family v. Loß see at Sinapius, Schlesien Curiosite. 611 ff., Siebmacher I. p. 152.



⁵ A seal of the Earl of Kleist (Loß) in 1860, on the other hand, shows the shield, covered with a crown of counts, on which the simple helmet decoration: two wolves, see certificates. Tab. XI No. 20.

6. Barons von Kleist. The K. Prussian Premier Leutnant Heinrich Werner Eduard v. Kleist zu Tippielsgrün in retired obtained by diploma d. d. Böhmen 6 May 1831 the elevation to the Prussian baronial rank for himself and his Berlin Nachkommen.

The coat-of-arms given to him, which is described in detail in the diploma printed in the deed book pp. 671 - 673, has retained the master shield unchanged, but which is covered with a baron's crown in French pattern (!), which wears a crowned helmet with the helmet decoration of the master coat of arms; however, of the three Rosen only the middle red, the other two white, all yellow-seeded.

The helmet blankets are red and white.

(Illustration from the Book of documents Tablet VI to page 672.)



7. Kleist-Retzow. District councillor The K. Johann George v. Kleist in Kieckow received by Berlin on 13 February 1839 the highest diploma, which allowed to carry the name and coat-of-arms of the extinct Mark family v. Retzow Kleist-Retzow and to call itself v.

The diploma can be found in the Book of documents p. 673-675 printed.

According to the diploma, the coat-of-arms consists of a squared shield, the 1st and 4th. Field the Kleist original coat of arms, which contains 2nd and 3rd the v. Retzow coat-of-arms; namely on red two blue half-moons, which face each other with their spines, above and below which there is a blue star. The two helmets are on the left of the Kleist'sche with ordinary representation, on the right of the Retzow'sche, three blue upward sweeping arrows next to each other.

The helmet covers are blue, white and red on the left, blue, white and red on the right.⁶

(Illustration from Book of documents on Table VII at page 674.)



⁶ Kleist-Retzow Count v., Prussian Graf linked to the ownership of Fideikomisse Möthlow (817 ha), Kr. Groß-Tychow Westhavelland and à (3335 ha), with Alt-Bukow (1281 ha), Kr. Bublitz, Pommern., and hereditary to the male descendants of the male tribe who will be owned by the two estates in trust, i.e. Berlin June 16, 1913. Gotha, belongin to an earl houses, 1914 (2007)

8. Counts von Kleist. Under October 20, 1840, the retired major and majorate owner of Kleist was raised to the Prussian county on Zützen in the Niederlausitz under the restriction of the transfer of the earldom only to the first-born son or the eldest-living son. The diploma in question is not in the deed book, but only the relevant cabinet command on page 675. According to the figure given below (Table VIII from the Book of documents p. 676), the belongin to an earl coat-of-arms consists of the unchanged original coat of arms, only that the helmet rests on a count's crown.⁷



⁷ Heinrich Erdmann Bogislav Ewald von Kleist Wendisch-Tychow, Prussian Chamberlain, was s. d. 27. August 1869 by Sr. Maj. König Wilhelm I. was elevated to the status of Count by Prussia after the right of the primogeniture Wendisch-Tychow (the title of Count is linked to the sole possession of à). The coat-of-arms contains the following special feature: Shield holders: the Pomeranian handles, which are on an arabesque decoration. (These shield holders were lent to the old Kleist coat-of-arms at the elevation to the rank, as a reminder that the same occurred when Sr. Maj. of the König of Prussia was present in Pommern.) Gotha, belongin to an earl houses, 1874 (2007)

The count's diploma for the second Counts of Zützen and Gersdorf Heinrich Leopold, dated 1 June 1863, has been in the family archives in von Kleist since 2004 as an inheritance of his great-nephew, the last Fideikommissherrn of Zützen and Gersdorf, Count Hans Joachim Hamm. Therefore, the coat-of-arms belonging to the count's diploma can be shown here.



On 17 August 1869 Heinrich Erdmann Bogislav Ewald von Kleist became Wendisch Tychow, royal Prussian chamberlain, by Sr. Maj. König Wilhelm I was elevated to the rank of Count by Prussia under the law of primogeniture. The title of Count was associated with the sole ownership of Wendisch Tychow.

Coat-of-arms: in silver, a red crossbar, accompanied at the top and bottom by a fox of natural color running to the right. Count's crown. The crowned helmet with red-silver Decken wears three Rosen next to each other, one silver, one red and one silver, each with a toppled golden gag skewer. Shield holder: the Pomeranian red handles, which stand on a golden arabesque ornament. These shield holders were awarded to the ancient Cleist coat-of-arms at the elevation to the county, as a reminder that the same occurred when Sr. Maj. of König was present in the Pommern area.⁸



⁸ *Genealogisches Taschenbuch der gräflichen Häuser*, 1874, pp. 435

The coat-of-arms comes from: Wappenalbum der gräflichen Familien Deutschland und Österreich-Ungarns, Maximilian Gritzner; Adolf Matthias Hildebrandt [ed.], Part 2, 1887. The black and white copy was colored for the second edition of this book. (2007)

9. According to one on Table XV. No. 19 in the addendum is the seal depicted on 8 October 1860 in the Prussian Adelstand raised Mr. v. Kleist the original coat of arms was permitted to carry, but with a, in any case according to the remark above, very meaningless brooch, namely a mere right (heraldic left) turn of the heraldic animals. Instead of the skewers, the seal print shows upwardly turned swords, which also, especially on subtly stung seals completely resemble hunting skewers and are to be confused with them.

D. Shield holder.

A glance at the large amount of Kleist seals from 6 centuries, as the best source for the trueness of the coat of arms, reveals the coat-of-arms as described and depicted on page 164, in the most correct and original form, at least in the form that has been used for centuries and generally recognized by the family.

As far as the helmet is concerned, it is uncrowned to lead, a coronation occurs only very rarely (only abusive in recent times), e.g. on the seal of Richard Christian v. Kleist on Raddatz 1714, which also first adopted the Rosen on the beam, shows (Table XI. No. 9).

Shield holders, which are quite uncommon in Pommern, with low nobility in the Middle Ages with vanishing exceptions, hardly ever appear on seals, but now and since the last century have become a fashion thing, we find on the Kleist seals extremely rarely. The first to lead such is Peter Christian v. Kleist on Gross Tychow, 1740 (Table XI, 11). Next the shield holders appear on the seal of Christian Ewald v. Kleist on Kerklingen 1805 (Table XI, 13), namely Hirsch and Leo; then on the seal of the wife Marie Charlotte v. Kleist, born v. Retzow, 1769 (Table XI. 16) two wolves, perhaps as the most suitable figures, if one wants to step at all to such a coat of arms. The shield holders awarded by diploma to Count Kleist v. Loß can be passed over here, namely Wolf and Leo. Nowadays, all kinds of sign holders are also attached to seals of the family members here and there.