

Mateusz Goliński
University of Wrocław

ON THE PROBLEM OF THE SIZE OF TRADING COMPLEXES IN MEDIEVAL TOWNS AND CITIES OF CENTRAL EUROPE

Abstract

Wherever the town owners did not literally grant the settlement official, i.e. founder (Pol. *zasadźca*), or the commune itself, full rights to privileged trading facilities, they reserved the competences to shape the size, location and appearance of their complexes. Decisions in this regard formed an element of economic and fiscal policy towards the town, albeit not always – they could also be part of a planned vision of the town or city (the way space was divided could decide about the town's economy), or flexibly adapted to needs formulated by the interested groups of townspeople. The size of cloth halls and rich stall complexes was supposed to reflect the economic potential of the town, and the size of the complexes of butcher stalls and chambers – the consumption needs of the population. However, in the latter case there were significant deviations, which manifested themselves in strict adherence to artificially established models and traditions rather than in flexibility. The data concerning the number of trade stalls, although still undervalued in historiography, are an important source for research into the history of individual towns and cities, even though they may be less useful for comparative approaches.

Keywords: city, town, cloth halls, stalls, butcher stalls, thirteenth–fifteenth centuries

The typical privileges of the German town law as well as privileges for aldermen (*vogts*) issued in medieval Poland included a description of the property granted to hereditary judges and their successors, including the trading facilities in the town or village, or their specific section that was to belong to the alderman (*vogt*).¹ These facilities are

¹ Cf. Stanisław Kuraś, *Przywileje prawa niemieckiego miast i wsi małopolskich XIV-XV wieku* (Wrocław, 1971), 117; Josef Joachim Menzel, *Die schlesischen Lokationsurkunden des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Würzburg, 1978), 221, 265 (in Silesian charters from the second half of the thirteenth century butcher stalls appear 67 times); Anna Berdecka, 'Lokacje

also listed in later municipal charters issued by owners bequeathing special privileges to the local townspeople or granting rights to build them. Similarly, in individual cases the lord of the town transferred the ownership of a few selected trading stalls to the monasteries he funded. From the content of all these documents emerges a fixed set of facilities with which a city was to be equipped: butcher, baker and shoemaker stalls, as well as cloth stalls and chambers, holding monopolies on their products. This privilege determined the need to limit the number of trading stalls in the town. However, there were conflicting forces at play, as it was in the economic interest of the stall users – butchers, bakers, shoemakers, merchants and stall keepers – to retain a relatively low and steady number of trading points. On the other hand, it was in the interest of the recipient of the rent from stall users (the town's owner or the alderman) to have their number increased in order to increase the revenue. If town authorities or a private entrepreneur were entrusted with the task of constructing a complex of facilities to sell them on to all interested parties, they would make similar calculations. At the same time, town authorities had the responsibility to ensure that the community had an adequate supply of basic foodstuffs; this was helped by a relatively large number of butcher and baker stalls and by lower prices (note the importance of the stalls with footwear, which at the time wore out quickly and therefore was also a basic product). Their opinion could affect the decisions of territorial authorities, who took into consideration the changes of attitude on the part of the populace. The view expressed here is not far from the opinion that the number of butcher stalls was more often than not left to the alderman, who was supposed to have the town's best interests at heart.²

However, an objective assessment of the situation was hindered by the ruling group of the town and its makeup, where merchants, stall keepers and butchers held an extremely strong position, and they were reluctant to widen the access to their own ranks. Another hindrance was the pressure from guild organisations, keen proponents of all

i zagospodarowanie miast królewskich w Małopolsce za Kazimierza Wielkiego (1333–1370)', *Studia i Materiały z Historii Kultury Materialnej*, lv (1982), 120–1.

² Irena Rabęcka-Brykczyńska, 'Jatki rzeźnicze w Polsce w XIII–XIV wieku', in *eadem* and Tadeusz Sobczak, 'Z problematyki badań nad produkcją i konsumpcją żywności w Polsce', *Studia i Materiały z Historii Kultury Materialnej*, lviii (1984), 33.

sorts of regulation. The example of the Silesian town of Brzeg (Ger. Brieg) shows that such activities were indeed effective. In 1315, in exchange for 80 Marks paid by owners of butcher stalls, the local duke promised, on his own behalf as well as on behalf of his successors, not to arrange for new butcher stalls.³ The same situation occurred in Strzegom (Striegau). In 1317, after receiving 20 Marks from the townspeople, the duke announced that he would uphold the privilege, in force since the time of his father, not to create new butcher, baker, or shoemaker stalls.⁴ In 1377, bakers in Brzeg received a new privilege – in connection with the difficulties experienced by their profession, the duke lowered the number of baker stalls in the town from 65 to 42, a privilege that was to last in perpetuity.⁵

Based on these assumptions, determining the number of privileged trading units must have been subject to a complex process of adjusting various tendencies and needs in the urban environment. The cases of solutions enforced by higher authorities (even though it must be noted that these are only few) are therefore even more worthy of attention, as they reveal conscious planning on the level of the territorial authorities. An impressive, although relatively late example of such activities is Prague at a time when the commercial infrastructure of the town should have long become established, along with the professional corporations based on it. Issued in 1377, the privileges of Wenceslaus IV and his father Charles IV provided for the setting up of as many as one hundred cloth chambers in the New Market – undoubtedly many more than the Main Square had previously – each burdened with an annual fee of sixty *groschen* paid to the monarch and held in hereditary succession by the so-called cloth cutters. If the plan had been implemented, the new cloth hall would have been significantly larger in size than similar objects in other towns and cities. This has prompted historians to conclude that it was therefore an element of the monarch's concept for transforming Prague into a European centre for economic exchange. However, it only reached two-thirds of the intended shape, with sixty-six standardised chambers built within

³ Colmar Grünhagen (ed.), 'Urkunden der Stadt Brieg', *Codex Diplomaticus Silesiae* (hereinafter: CDS), ix, no. XIII (Breslau, 1870).

⁴ Colmar Grünhagen and Konrad Wutke (eds.), 'Regesten zur schlesischen Geschichte 1316–1326', CDS, xviii, no. 3711 (Breslau, 1898).

⁵ *Urkunden der Stadt Brieg*, no. xxxv a.

the cloth hall. Interestingly, Wenceslaus' privilege had been addressed to exactly sixty-six named cloth cutters.⁶ The made-up number of one hundred stalls was not, however, unlikely in the reality of Prague, and may have reflected the state of affairs in butcher stalls. Their complex in the Old Town at some unknown point became divided into two groups – Czech and German stalls, in accordance with the division among the butchers – with fifty stalls in two rows each. This number was then copied in Prague's New Town, founded by Charles IV and carried out in accordance with the monarch's concept – the imperial privilege of 1359 mentions one hundred butcher stalls in this location. The idea of the same number of butcher stalls in both communes was presented by Charles in 1349, therefore at the time when the construction of the New Town began. At that time, he exempted the Slavic Benedictine monastery for ten years from taxes on wine in compensation for the income granted to the monks in the amount of one Mark from each New Town butcher stall, which could not be collected because of the tax relief period for new settlements enjoyed by the townspeople of the New Town.⁷

The later fourteenth-century top-down concepts of determining the size of cloth halls manifested themselves in concessions for the construction of twelve chambers, as opposed to the 100 or 66. In the Silesian town of Ząbkowice (Frankenstein), only after the 1342 privilege was granted to open the same number of cloth chambers did the council build the respective object, and the twelve merchants to whom the stalls were given included all town councillors. A similar princely privilege was granted in 1362 to Strzelin (Strehlen),⁸ where

⁶ Archiv hlavního města Prahy, Sbirka rukopisů, ref. no. 556 (Kniha kvitancí, měšťanských práv, erbovních privilegií, cechovních artikulí a dalších cechovních písemností), 225v–228v; Milada Vilímková and František Kašička, 'Minulost pražských kotců a předpoklady pro jejich regeneraci', *Památková Péče*, xxvi, 5 (1966), 135–8.

⁷ Jiří Spěváček, Blažena Ryněšová, and Jana Zachová (eds.), *Regesta diplomatica nec non epistolaria Bohemiae et Moraviae*, v: 1346–55, no. 575 (Pragae, 1958–2005); *ibid.*, Bedřich Mendl and Milena Linhartová (eds.), vii: 1358–63, no. 259 (Pragae, 1954–64); Wacław Wladiwoj Tomek, *Dějepis města Prahy*, ii (Praha, 1871), 44–5, 147; Vilém Lorenc, *Nové Město pražské* (Praha, 1973), 134.

⁸ Konrad Wutke and Erich Randt (eds.), 'Regesten 1338–1342', CDS, xxx, nos. 6885, 6886 (Breslau, 1930); Franz Xaver Görlich, *Geschichte der Stadt Strehlen in Preußisch-Schlesien* (Breslau, 1853), 72–3; Mateusz Goliński, 'Die Anfänge der Kaufhäuser und Reichkrane in den schlesischen Städten', *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung*, xlii, 1 (1993), 11.

the Pomeranian idea of co-creating a common cloth hall by the smallest towns was not implemented. This was the case in 1296, when the margraves of Brandenburg documented an agreement made between the Templars who owned the town of Banie (Bahn), the town itself, and the town of Trzcińskie (Schönfließ) regarding the aid given to Banie in the amount of six pounds for the expansion of its merchant house (*theatrum*). In return, the townspeople of Trzcińskie received the right to use six stalls (*stationes in theatro*), charged with a fee of eleven *solidi* each.⁹

Returning to Silesia, we need to note that the prototypical solutions for local centres could be characterised by greater flexibility in predicting further developments. In 1282 the townspeople of Oława (Ohlau) received a privilege from the duke which allowed them to construct twelve merchant stalls where they could cut cloth by ell, but it was noted that they would be able to build more if necessary.¹⁰ Nevertheless, such a precise number as this one, or the one from 1327 in Opava where merchants 'standing in chambers' were granted a 26-stall 'merchant house' privilege by the duke, were rare.¹¹ Earlier, in 1299, the bishop of Wrocław (Breslau), as the owner of the town of Nysa (Neisse) allowed its townspeople to erect twenty-four stone 'lower chambers' in the middle of the main square, intended for cutting cloth. 'Upper chambers' were to be used for the storage of cloth and by stall keepers. The privilege was confirmed after the 1302 fire of the town.¹² Extensive detail of the document, covering the location of the object, the type of material used and, above all, its internal layout (with two levels) in a situation where its recipient and not the exhibitor, as we can guess, would shoulder the costs of the investment may prompt questions about its reasons. Without a doubt, it was the desire to emphasise the bishop's full, albeit recently

⁹ Rodgero Prümers (ed.), *Pommersches Urkundenbuch*, iii, Part 2: 1296–1300 (Stettin, 1891), no. 1769; Jan M. Piskorski, *Miasta księstwa szczecińskiego do połowy XIV wieku* (Poznań and Szczecin, 2005²), 184.

¹⁰ Winfried Irgang (ed.), *Schlesisches Urkundenbuch* (hereinafter: SUB), v: 1282–1290 (Köln and Wien, 1994), no. 29; Goliński, 'Die Anfänge', 4.

¹¹ Grünhagen and Wutke (eds.), 'Regesten 1327–1333', CDS, xx, no. 4604 (Breslau, 1903); Goliński, 'Die Anfänge', 10–11.

¹² Winfried Irgang (ed.), SUB, vi: 1291–1300. no. 376 (Köln and Wien, 1998); Grünhagen and Wutke (eds.), 'Regesten 1301–1315', CDS, xvi, no. 2724 (Breslau, 1892); Goliński, 'Die Anfänge', 8–9.

challenged, authority over the said town. However, we may never know whether this power manifested itself in the imposition of a plan conceived within the bishop's circle, or in benevolent acceptance of the townspeople's concept.

Limiting the size of trading facilities due to the scope of privileges – the monopoly of stall owners in terms of their retail cloth trade – is easily justified, but it did not translate to all similar cases, when it was enough just to name the right type of licensed stalls. In such situations, we do not know whether the parchment was accompanied by agreements made by spoken communication. Their lack was only occasionally revealed, as was the case in 1297, when after the fire of the town of Głogów (Glogau) the duke allowed its townspeople to build “merchant stalls” in the market square in any number, passing on the profits to the town.¹³ Had he kept them for himself, perhaps he would not have been as impertinent. A rare case of precision, as opposed to the tendency to sweeping generalisations, was Świdnica (Schweidnitz), where in the last of the thirteenth-century stages of erecting brick structure in the centre of the main square the duke granted the town a privilege (in 1291) to install thirty-two “pharmacies for merchants”, located on whichever side of the local *theatrum*, i.e. the cloth hall. Incidentally, the original complex of rich stalls was reduced in the second half of the fourteenth century at the cost of the town hall, and determining the actual number of stalls in operation from that moment on remains highly disputable.¹⁴ In 1309 the dukes granted a privilege to the Brzeg townspeople who had been stricken by fire – they were allowed to build twelve fee-free stalls in the same location where shoes had previously been sold.¹⁵ (As a result, the layout of the town was interfered with in this case as well.) In 1310 the bishop allowed the Nysa townspeople to rebuild twenty-four “stalls, or merchant chambers” of stone in the main square.¹⁶ Strzegom was given the privilege to build sixteen stalls in 1338, Środa

¹³ SUB, vi, no. 309; Goliński, ‘Die Anfänge’, 14.

¹⁴ SUB, vol. 6, no. 6; Goliński, ‘Die Anfänge’, 16; *id.*, *Wokół socjotopografii późnośredniowiecznej Świdnicy*, part 1 (Wrocław, 2000), 43–45; Rafał Czerner and Czesław Lasota, *Blok ratuszowy w Świdnicy do połowy XVI w.* (Wrocław, 1997), 54–60.

¹⁵ *Urkunden der Stadt Brieg*, no. ix.

¹⁶ Gustav Adolf Tzschoppe, Gustav Adolf Stenzel, *Urkundensammlung zur Geschichte des Ursprungs der Städte und der Einführung und Verbreitung Deutscher Kolonisten und Rechte in Schlesien und der Ober-Lausitz* (Hamburg, 1832), no. cxi; Goliński, ‘Die Anfänge’, 16.

Śląska (Neumarkt in Schlesien) to build nine in 1356, and Strzelin at least six in 1362.¹⁷ None of these, however, nor other cited cases applied the prototypical solution used in 1266 in Wrocław. It was then that Duke Henry III sold certain two townsmen *gades mercium institorum*, a fenced commercial merchant area with “47.5 stall”.¹⁸ The link between the cited number with the area of *gades* is beyond any doubt – the predetermined area was divided by the standard surface of one stall (charged with rent in the amount of 5 *fertones*, which the duke also imposed on investors); otherwise, it is impossible to explain this uneven number. The duke also guaranteed the certainty of the investment by promising the buyers not to move stalls to another place in the future. Incidentally, its later state indicates that the entrepreneurs, or their successors, lost ownership rights to the plots under the rich stalls, forty-eight of which were fully owned by users who constructed their brick stores themselves.¹⁹

The case of Prague, where the number of butcher stalls was defined in writing only for the New Town, while for the Old Town it has to be reconstructed and in the Lesser Town and Hradčany can be only roughly estimated, and so there are inconsistencies in the source material relating to the same issue in a single centre, which is nothing exceptional. Suffice it to consider the case of Wrocław: in the same year of 1266, the same ruler, Henry III, sold twenty-four butcher stalls to three other local townsmen “in the New Market” (in fact, on a plot adjacent to the actual square), collecting 12.5 Marks for each stall. A strictly defined number of butcheries was at the heart of the transaction, as a result of which the duke passed onto the buyers the possibility of charging rent to the users of the stalls (1.5 Marks per year). In order to avoid any doubts in this regard, the document clearly stated that no more similar stalls would be erected.²⁰ Meanwhile, we do not have

¹⁷ *Regesten 1338–42*, no. 6089; Johann Heyne, *Urkundliche Geschichte der Königlichen Immediat-Stadt Neumarkt* (Glogau, 1845), 56; Görlich, *Geschichte der Stadt Strehlen*, 72–3; Goliński, ‘Die Anfänge’, 16–17.

¹⁸ Winfried Irgang (ed.) *SUB*, iii: 1251–66 (Köln-Wien, 1984), no. 541; Mateusz Goliński, *Podstawy gospodarcze mieszczaństwa wrocławskiego w XIII wieku* (Wrocław, 1991), 158–9.

¹⁹ Rafał Czerner, *Zabudowy rynków. Średniowieczne bloki śródrynkowe wybranych dużych miast Śląska* (Wrocław, 2002), 99, 101.

²⁰ *SUB*, iii, no. 537; Rabęcka-Brykczyńska, ‘Jatki rzeźnicze’, 54; Marta Młynarska-Kaletynowa, *Wrocław w XII–XIII wieku. Przemiany społeczne i osadnicze* (Wrocław, 1986), 130, 169; Goliński, *Podstawy*, 154–7.

similar information on the second, larger (probably 42-stall) complex of the so-called Old Butcheries in the same town, except for the fact that the ownership of both was in practice highly fragmented. It was only in 1350 that King Charles IV, clearly recognising the provisioning needs of the town, allowed its authorities to build twelve additional butcher stalls. It seems thus that both complexes received six.²¹ In 1271, the duke of Wrocław allowed the townspeople of his capital centre, understood as a commune, to build sixteen baker stalls, the rent from which was to be used for the construction of “bridges”. In 1273, he permitted the construction of thirty-two baker stalls. We do not know how the first type of stalls were related to the latter, and to the overall number of baker stalls trading on the two squares of the town before the trade was crammed into the brick hall of the so-called *Smatruz* hall in the main square in the fourteenth century.²² In the above cases, the limiting of the number of stalls was not an end in itself, but merely an indispensable element of the policy of regulating the revenues granted by the duke to the town authorities. In this context, the example of Strzelin seems to have been an exception: with the location of the town in 1292, when awarding the property to the alderman, the duke precisely listed not only how much the official was given, but also the entire number of planned trading facilities: thirty-four butcher stalls, thirty-two baker stalls, and thirty shoemaker stalls, with the reservation that their number could not be increased.²³ Other types of facilities, not mentioned here, were not part of the alderman’s remuneration, or were even owned by the dominium, but above all it was expected that they would be built at a later stage. As explicitly expressed in the foundation document of Sandomierz, only when *civitas ... ex integro in opere suo stecerit constructa et completa*, would cloth and merchant stalls be built.²⁴

The surprising extent of the town owner’s interference in the planning of trading facilities erected by the townspeople was only

²¹ Georg Korn (ed.) *Breslauer Urkundenbuch* (Breslau, 1870) no. 199; Goliński, *Podstawy*, 29.

²² Winfried Irgang (ed.) *SUB*, iv: 1267–81 (Köln and Wien, 1988), no. 153, 209; Czerner, *Zabudowy*, 131–3.

²³ *SUB*, vi, no. 78; Rabęcka-Brykczyńska, *Jatki rzeźnicze*, 32 and 131; Czerner, *Zabudowy*, 132–3.

²⁴ Tomisław Giergiel and Robert Jop (eds.), *Dokument lokacyjny Leszka Czarnego dla Sandomierza z 1286 roku* (Sandomierz, 2015), 50.

occasionally justified in writing. This was the case in 1295, when the son of Margrave Henry, Frederick, who reigned in Dresden, established together with the townspeople regulations concerning persons who had a room (*locum*), four-ell wide, in *venditorium panni quod kouifhuis vulgariter dicitur*, while the sale of individual cloth grades was divided over two floors of the cloth hall.²⁵ In other cases, relations between the top authorities with the municipal authorities in terms of making detailed decisions remain unknown. In 1259, the Prussian vice-master gave permission for the construction of a market house (*domus forensis*) in Toruń (Thorn), later called the “merchant house” and operating as a cloth hall. He stipulated that its location and size would be determined by the commander of the Chełmno land (Culm). In 1274, the Prussian vice-master, and at the same time the Grand Marshal of the order, allowed for the construction of market stalls (*apotecae*) and baker stalls in the town. The building was to be the same length as the merchant house, and the distance between them was to be four rods, which could not be managed without measurements of the construction site previously delivered from the town.²⁶ In 1327, the duke of Świdnica allowed the local merchants to put a vaulted ceiling over eight chambers in the merchant house (*venditorii seu mercatorii*), located in its lower right-hand quarter.²⁷ We can only imagine that decisions regarding the exchange of ceilings for vaults in the other twenty-four chambers also belonged to the ruler, who discussed it not even with the municipal authorities, as was the case with Toruń, but with a group of interested entrepreneurs. The parties were brought together by the mutual concern for fire safety. Also in the involvement of Świdnica’s master one can find evidence of social considerations. In 1330, the duke constructed a “basement” in the place where bread and footwear had been sold, with four additional stalls for “poor” bakers, and four for shoemakers. This involved moving the baker stalls and shoemaker

²⁵ Carl Friedrich von Posern-Klett (ed.), ‘Urkundenbuch der Städte Dresden und Pirna’ (Leipzig, 1875), *Codex Diplomaticus Saxoniae Regiae*, v, no. 11, 8–9; Mateusz Goliński, ‘Ze studiów nad początkami sukiennic w Polsce (XIII–XIV w.)’, in Kazimierz Bobowski (ed.) *Monastycyzm. Słowiańszczyzna i państwo polskie. Warsztat badawczy historyka* (Wrocław, 1994), 138.

²⁶ Tomasz Jasiński, ‘Toruń XIII–XIV wieku – lokacja miast toruńskich i początki ich rozwoju (1231–około 1350)’, in Marian Biskup (ed.), *Historia Torunia*, i (Toruń, 1999), 152.

²⁷ *Regesten 1327–1333*, no. 4657; Goliński, ‘Die Anfänge’, 7–8.

stalls to two brick halls, with their number raised from 56 to 60 and from 60 to 64 respectively.²⁸ If we were to take the above examples as a standard, the system of managing the privileged sales points would appear to have been extremely rigid on account of the involvement of external factors (even troublesome for the latter). When the cloth hall in Ziębice (Münsterberg) faced difficulties in functioning, in 1405 the local princely couple gifted the town council with empty and ownerless chambers, but chambers in the hands of glaziers and stall keepers were also mentioned.²⁹

It should be examined whether the size of the commercial complexes remained in realistic proportion to the needs of the town, or whether it was primarily a relic of the organizer's concept, strengthened by privileges. First, using the example of selected Silesian towns and cities let us examine the relations between the numbers of trading stalls associated with luxury goods, that is cloth halls and rich stalls. Restricting the listings to one region is recommended because of the differences in the forms used by the complexes, and even the stalls themselves.

The cloth hall chambers were fewer than the rich stalls in:

Wrocław (Breslau) – 40 chambers, 48 stalls.

The numbers of the rich stalls and the cloth hall chambers were equal in:

Świdnica (Schweidnitz) 32 each,
Legnica (Liegnitz) 28 each,
Nysa (Neisse) 24 each.

The rich stalls were fewer than the cloth hall chambers in:

Głogów (Glogau) 22 chambers, 20 stalls,
Brzeg (Brieg) 20 chambers, 12 stalls,
Lwówek (Löwenberg) 17(?) chambers, 5 stalls,
Dzierżoniów (Reichenbach) and Strzelin (Strehlen) 12 chambers and 6 stalls each.³⁰

²⁸ *Regesten 1327–1333*, no. 4922; Czerner, *Zabudowy*, 133.

²⁹ Franz Hartmann, *Geschichte der Stadt Münsterberg in Schlesien von ihrer Gründung bis zur Gegenwart* (Münsterberg, 1907), 45.

³⁰ Based on: Goliński, 'Die Anfänge', table II.

As is apparent from the above comparison, there was no fixed ratio between the two types of constructions. The differences between the individual centres come as a surprise, although there is a certain consistent trend – the smaller the town, the faster the number of rich stalls decreased in comparison to the size of cloth halls. Therefore, while the cloth hall in a typical medium-sized town (Dzierżoniów, Strzelin) corresponded to almost a third of their counterpart in the largest city of the region (Wrocław), the complex of rich stalls reached only 1/8 of the size of the Wrocław one. Also noteworthy was the expected balance between the cloth merchants' stalls and rich stalls in large cities (Świdnica, Legnica, Nysa, Głogów).³¹ This does not seem to have been a coincidence, but rather suggests the copying of some ideal organisational model, in which the two most affluent groups of retailers were entrusted with the same amount of space in the most important square of the city. In accordance with the above comment, the number of sixty-six cloth chambers in Prague had no precedent in the neighbouring lands. In Vienna, merchants cutting cloth used 36 rooms (*Gewandkellern*).³² At the beginning of the fifteenth century, the Cracow cloth hall had 34 chambers, with 64 rich stalls erected next to it, although the previous state of the cloth hall does not seem to have been the same in the light of archaeological research. In the second half of the thirteenth century, there were to be first 12, and, after the division, 24 chambers, and in the second half of the fourteenth century – thirty-six.³³ Naturally, the number of rooms did not have to correspond to the number of stores that were actually operating – 42 chambers have been identified in Wrocław, although written sources suggest forty, while two functioned as cloth-cutting workshops, the same as in Cracow.³⁴ In early fifteenth-century Toruń,

³¹ Such a balance could also exist in Brzeg, as architectural research seems to indicate the existence of about 20 stalls (Czerner, *Zabudowy*, 99).

³² Klaus Lohrmann, 'Das Werden von Stadt und städtischer Gesellschaft', in Peter Csendes and Ferdinand Opll (eds.) *Vienna. Geschichte einer Stadt*, i (Wien, Köln and Weimar, 2001), 258.

³³ Waldemar Komorowski and Aldona Sudacka, *Rynek Główny w Krakowie* (Wrocław, 2008), 20–1, 25, 34, 36; Sławomir Dryja, Wojciech Głowa, Waldemar Niewalda, and Stanisław Sławiński, 'Sukiennice krakowskie – fazy budowy', *Krzysztofory* 28/1 (2010), 185; Sławomir Dryja, Wojciech Głowa, Waldemar Niewalda, and Stanisław Sławiński, 'Przemiany architektoniczne Kramów Bogatych i Kramów Bolesławowych', *Krzysztofory* 28/1 (2010), 155, 168, 171.

³⁴ Czerner, *Zabudowy*, 21.

there were about twenty chambers leased from the city, as well as 24 rich stalls.³⁵ At the same time, other cities within the State of the Teutonic Order saw a shift with regard to trading points, as they moved from cloth halls to private houses (hence the number of cloth cutters in the Elbląg (Elbing) *Gewandhaus* fell from sixteen in 1404 to seven in 1413).³⁶ In any case, there was no strict relationship between the size and importance of the city and the size of its cloth hall, otherwise the Wrocław cloth hall would not have had an advantage over the Viennese and Cracow ones (unless we add twenty-five cloth stalls conferred to Kazimierz near Cracow in a 1389 privilege),³⁷ and Świdnica over Legnica or Toruń. The founder's intentions had to be taken into consideration.

The above problem is illustrated in the table below, where the relative importance of a town is reflected in how much tax it paid. The amount of the tax, or *schoss*, was determined during the first half of the fourteenth century and, just like the number of cloth chambers, it was constant, reflecting the duke's decision taken once on the basis of assessment only he was privy to.

Table 1. Proportions between Silesian cities according to the number of cloth hall chambers, rich stalls, and the tax amount (in Mark)³⁸

City or Town	Chambers	Stalls	Tax
Wrocław (Breslau)	1 (40)	1 (48)	1 (400)
Świdnica (Schweidnitz)	0.8 (32)	0.67 (32)	0.75 (300)
Legnica (Liegnitz)	0.7 (28)	0.58 (28)	0.75 (300)
Opawa (Troppau)	0.65 (26)	?	?
Racibórz (Ratibor)	0.6–0.65 (24–26)	?	?
Nysa (Neisse)	0.6 (24)	0.5 (24)	?
Głogów (Glogau)	0.55 (22)	0.42 (20)	?
Brzeg (Brieg)	0.5 (20)	0.25 (12)	0.5 (200)
Lwówek (Löwenberg)	0.42 (17?)	0.1 (5)	0.2 (80)

³⁵ Jasiński, *Toruń XIII–XIV wieku*, 152.

³⁶ Arthur Semrau, 'Der Markt der Altstadt Elbing im 14. Jahrhundert', *Mitteilungen des Copernicus-Vereins für Wissenschaft und Kunst zu Thorn*, 30 (1922), 13.

³⁷ Berdecka, *Lokacje*, 123; Marcin Starzyński, *Średniowieczny Kazimierz, jego ustrój i kancelaria* (Kraków, 2015), 36.

³⁸ Based on: Goliński, 'Die Anfänge', table II; *id.*, *Wokół socjotopografii*, Part 1, 25–6.

City or Town	Chambers	Stalls	Tax
Złotoryja (Goldberg)	0.4 (16)	?	0.2 (80)
Strzegom (Striegau)	?	0.33 (16)	0.25 (100)
Opole (Oppeln)	?	0.27 (13?)	?
Dzierżoniów (Reichenbach)	0.3 (12)	0.12 (6)	0.25 (100)
Strzelin (Strehlen)	0.3 (12)	0.12 (6)	0.1 (39)
Oława (Ohlau)	0.3 (12)	?	0.07 (30)
Ząbkowice (Frankenstein)	0.3 (12)	?	?
Środa (Neumarkt)	?	0.19 (9)	0.15 (60)
Ziębice (Münsterberg)	?	0.12 (6)	?

The discrepancy between the number of chambers and stalls is familiar from the previous table. However, there is an astonishing convergence in the proportions of the number of chambers and the tax paid by the town. This convergence breaks down only in the case of small cities with a clearly inflated size of cloth halls in relation to its importance (the above-mentioned lack of decrease below the threshold of twelve chambers). We do not know through what mechanisms this link had emerged. How the tax amount was determined was supposed to be influenced by the size of the cloth hall, but both the size and the *schoss* could have been established on the basis of another common criterion, e.g. the number of plots.

The links between the size of the town's population and the number of stalls selling the necessities – meat, bread and footwear – should be much clearer. In any case, the largest Central European agglomeration of Prague had more than 214 butcher stalls, and the great Nuremberg – 124 (73 Old Stalls, 19 New Stalls, 32 for butchers from out of town).³⁹ Unfortunately, the lack of adequate data about the medieval populations makes it impossible to verify the above assumption. What is more, a comparison of the size of trading complexes in individual categories (see the table below) suggests surprising discrepancies in defining these needs.

³⁹ <https://online-service2.nuernberg.de/stadtarchiv/hyper.FAU?sid=4C3DF5-F14&DM=4&ZEIG=1%20Fleischb%E4nke> (Accessed: 19 March 2019).

Table 2. Number of stalls in selected Silesian cities⁴⁰

City or Town	Meat	Bread	Footwear
Wrocław (Breslau)	78	63–65	78
Świdnica (Schweidnitz)	61	60	64
Głogów (Glogau)	40	40	60
Brzeg (Brieg)	?	65/42	?
Strzelin (Strehlen)	34	32	30
Dzierżonów (Reichenbach)	?	30	30
Strzegom (Striegau)	45	23	31

Therefore, while for instance the number of butcher stalls in Głogów in 1360 corresponded to 51 per cent of those in Wrocław, there were proportionally more baker stalls – 61 per cent, and as much as 77 per cent of shoemaker stalls in Wrocław. It seems possible to explain this to some extent by referring to the different chronology of when the size of each complex had stabilised. In Strzelin, as we have already pointed out, the raised numbers were imposed in advance based on an unknown criterion on the occasion of the town's location in 1292 and, being purely theoretical, they were subject to the pattern of reducing each complex by two stalls. Such a system threatened to overestimate the real needs and capabilities, which in an extreme way (by a third) can be seen on the example of the original number of baker stalls in Brzeg. On the other hand, the numbers for Wrocław seem to reflect an evolution that had been taking place until the middle of the fourteenth century. It could also be the cause of a surprisingly high number of butcher stalls in Strzegom, as the number above comes only from 1528.⁴¹ The common practice of baking bread at home curbed the demand for buying it, so it was a commonplace and well-recognised phenomenon in the literature that bakers in town were fewer than butchers, which had to translate into the number of their stands.⁴² The scale of home baking could vary, depending on

⁴⁰ Based on own findings and Czerner, *Zabudowy*, 133–4.

⁴¹ Dagmara Adamska and Mateusz Goliński (ed.), 'Strzegomska księga podatkowa z 1528 roku', in Mateusz Goliński (ed.), *Z kancelarii XVI-wiecznych miast śląskich. Edycje źródeł ze Strzegomia, Świdnicy i Wrocławia* (Łódź and Wrocław, 2016), 129, 150–1.

⁴² Josef Macek, *Jagellonský věk v českých zemích (1471–1526)*, iii: *Města* (Praha, 1998), 254.

the time, place, and consumer group, diversifying the demand for the offer of professional bakers. The literature on the subject also acknowledges the differences between the population per a statistical butcher. They are explained by the different levels of meat consumption, which could also change with time. However, we should not underestimate the degree of availability of goods outside the butcher stalls, at free markets, as well as the changing selling methods. For example, in accordance with a wider tendency in small Czech cities at the beginning of the sixteenth century, butchers were successfully convinced to consider selling small quantities of meat, in contrast to the medieval tradition requiring them to offer a minimum of whole quarters of animals.⁴³

The theory about the changing number of butcher stalls as the number of butchers evolved can be found in literature on Toruń. In the early fourteenth century, the Old Town was to have 40–57 butcher stalls, in the early fifteenth century 56 members of the guild were recorded, and at the turn of the sixteenth century there were 26 butcher stalls. In mid-fifteenth century Toruń New Town had thirty butchers, while at the turn of the sixteenth century there were 18 butcher stalls.⁴⁴ The number of bakers both around 1402 and in 1515 was to reach 39–40 in the Old Town, although at the turn of the fifteenth century there were 45 baker stalls, as well as further New Town ones.⁴⁵ The proportions were opposite in Brno in Moravia. In 1365, for 51 butcher stalls there were 28 baker stalls.⁴⁶ Similarly in Elbląg, where in the Old Town along with 34 butcher stalls (a number guaranteed to butchers by the council in 1384) there were only 13 shoemaker stalls and probably 24 baker stalls, while in the New Town there were 26 butcher stalls and only twelve baker stalls.⁴⁷ In 1312, the Szczecin council gave the

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 255–6; Hans-Peter Baum, 'Fleisch, Fleischer', in *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, CD-ROM Ausgabe (2000).

⁴⁴ Krzysztof Mikulski, *Przestrzeń i społeczeństwo Torunia od końca XIV do początku XVIII wieku* (Toruń, 1999), 88.

⁴⁵ Jasiński, *Toruń XIII–XIV wieku*, 152; Mikulski, *Przestrzeń*, 85.

⁴⁶ Jaroslav Dřimal, 'Rozvoj a stagnace města v období vrcholného feudalismu (1243–1411)', in Jaroslav Dřimal, Václav Peša (eds.), *Dějiny města Brna*, i (Brno, 1969), 51; Mojmír Švábenský, 'K hospodářským dějinám Brna v období 1243–1411', in *Brno v minulosti a dnes*, xii (Brno, 1994), 179.

⁴⁷ Semrau, *Der Markt*, 16–17; Roman Czaja, *Socjotopografia miasta Elbląga w średniowieczu* (Toruń, 1992), 20, 21–2, 169.

butchers 56 stalls in two locations: 34 at the Fish Market and 22 at the New Market.⁴⁸ It is surprising that in the populous Gdańsk (Danzig), in the Main City only 32 butcher stalls were recorded in the land book from the third quarter of the fourteenth century.⁴⁹ It seems that from the very beginning Sandomierz had the same number of stalls, while in Kazimierz near Cracow there were as many as 60 in the sixteenth century, the smaller Sieradz had 20 stalls in the early sixteenth century, and in the middle of the fifteenth century the town of Busko had 17 and Zawichost – 14.⁵⁰ It is impossible to use a uniform criterion when determining the number of stalls. This is confirmed by the symptomatic example of Poznań, where as many as five out of six trading complexes in the main square were to be equally planned. Therefore, the number of “plots” owned by cloth cutters, stall keepers, butchers, bakers and shoemakers was to be equal, with 32 each (only so-called stall keepers had 19 stands). However, the number of bread and perhaps footwear stalls in this perfect distribution of the market space was overestimated, as there were more of them than bakers and shoemakers in the city. The needs of the butchers were in turn underestimated, and so new butcher stalls had to be built outside of the main square in the early sixteenth century, increasing their total to 36.⁵¹

trans. Damian Jasiński

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Czerner Rafał, *Zabudowy rynków. Średniowieczne bloki śródrzynek wybranych dużych miast Śląska* (Wrocław, 2002).
- Goliński Mateusz, ‘Die Anfänge der Kaufhäuser und Reichkrame in den schlesischen Städten’, *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung*, xlii, 1 (1993), 1–20.

⁴⁸ Otto Heinemann (ed.), *Pommersches Urkundenbuch*, v: 1311–1320 (Stettin, 1905), no. 2762; Piskorski, *Miasta księstwa*, 131.

⁴⁹ Zofia Maciakowska, *Kształtowanie przestrzeni miejskiej Głównego Miasta w Gdańsku do początku XV wieku* (Gdańsk, 2011), 61 and 262.

⁵⁰ Berdecka, *Lokacje*, 124; Urszula Sowina, *Sieradz. Układ przestrzenny i społeczeństwo miasta w XV–XVI w.* (Warszawa and Sieradz, 1991), 28; Feliks Kiryk, *Miasta małopolskie w średniowieczu i czasach nowożytnych* (Kraków, 2013), 356, 411, 494, 514.

⁵¹ Jacek Wiesiołowski, *Socjotopografia późnośredniowiecznego Poznania* (Warszawa and Poznań, 1982), 141–3; Rabęcka-Brykczyńska, ‘Jatki rzeźnicze’, 28.

Rabęcka-Brykczyńska Irena, 'Jatki rzeźnicze w Polsce w XIII–XIV wieku', in *eadem* and Tadeusz Sobczak, 'Z problematyki badań nad produkcją i konsumpcją żywności w Polsce', *Studia i Materiały z Historii Kultury Materialnej*, lvii (1984), 7–130.

Mateusz Goliński – medieval history, urban and military history; professor at the Institute of History, University of Wrocław; e-mail: matgol@poczta.onet.pl