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RURAL SMALL TOWNS AND MARKET-TOWNS OF SACHSEN, CENTRAL GERMANY, AT THE BEGINNING OF THE MODERN AGE

MAKOTO TERRAO
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I. Preface

Karl Bücher defined in his famous book, *Die Entstehung der Volkswirtschaft* (The Rise of National Economy), the medieval German town as a regionally exclusive market area. Such an area usually comprised the rural villages about it, and generally extended over a distance which a local farmer could cover in a day's trip from his home to the market and back. Bücher states this regionally exclusive town area was quite common in Germany. By the end of Medieval Age, there existed about three thousands towns throughout the country; one in each two or two and half square miles in Southwest Germany, one in each three or four square miles in Central and Northwest Germany and one in each five or eight square miles in East Germany.

Generally, these market areas were not very large as was mentioned before, but in number and size they differed widely as they were in the East and the West. The former had less as compared with the latter, but in size, the ones in the East were generally about twice as large as those in the West. Disregarding the fact that these differences came from the qualitative difference in the structure of market between the East and the West, Bücher just disposed his discussion with the general theory on “Town Economy” (*Stadtwirtschaft*).  

2 Ibid., S. 121.
The person who systematically treated this question of qualitative difference in market structure between the East and the West is Max Weber. In the lecture *Capitalism and Rural Society in Germany* given by him in the United States in 1904, he referred to this. He thinks this difference is due to the degree of development in the local money economy. By the local money economy, otherwise called the local communication or local trade, is meant the "exchange of goods within and among the smallest local communities (die kleinsten Ortschaften)". This local money economy developed far more in the West than in the East, as the farmers there enjoyed a greater opportunity and inducement to sell their products as compared with the East. In contrast to the intensive local trade carried on in the West, very little inter-community trade and exchange of goods were executed among the farmers in the East, and thus they sought to market their goods at distant places rather than in the near-by regional villages.

Max Weber explains this difference in market structure between the two parts of Germany as derived from the following facts: First, the difference between the East and the West in their rural social structure. In the West there existed a powerful tradition of the village community, symbolic of the mutual helpfulness handed down from the ancient times, while the landed lords there were rather weak, so weak that several of them often controlled one village jointly. These conditions worked favorably for the farmers and enabled them to secure a fairly well-established stand in their cause against the feudal lords.

The reverse, however, was the case with the East not only because the tradition of the village community was broken up through the settlement of the colonists, but because of the complete seizure by one master of the patrimonial rights over a whole village, effected through the combination of some lordships, thus carrying the so-called Bauernlegen, the enlargement of the cultivated area of lord’s estate to the disadvantage of the farmers. This difference in the structure of the rural village in the East and the West brought about the discrepancy in its productive capacity and the possible chance to exchange the goods among local communities.

---

7 Ibid., S. 444, op. cit., pp. 376-377.
In the second place, Weber referred to the different degree of social division of labor developed in the East and the West. In the West and South, bottoms, river valleys and plateaux were intermingled in the narrowly circumscribed regions. The variety of climatic and other natural conditions in these districts, combined with the above mentioned agricultural condition, brought about a highly differentiated division of labor.8

On the contrary, the East, having a vast plain of open fields and carrying production under uniform geographical conditions, farmers engaged in producing the same things, letting the local markets for rural products dwindle and caused them to raise the cereals desired by distant places.9

This valuable insight by Weber into the production and the marketing conditions of Germany was further expounded upon by Robert Gradmann.10 He made a comprehensive and practical analysis of the structure of the market in the West and South Germany. As did Weber, he noticed the high distribution rate of towns in the West and South, and attributed it to the greater development of regional and local markets.11 The regional market was useful for the exchange of goods between a town and its neighboring villages, more practically put, it is the periodic market held weekly (Wochenmarkt),12 and the local market facilitated the exchange of goods among the towns within a district, for example, the periodic fair held annually (Jahrmarkt).13 Then there was the market developed by the hawker regardless of the constituted markets in town or village. Hawking was the marketing activity by a producer himself or his sales agent; a free exchange of goods was conducted by him beyond the marketing limits set by the medieval township.14

Gradmann considers those markets to have been large elements in

---

8 Ibid., SS. 446-446, op. cit., pp. 378-379.
the high market distribution rate of the West, and also points out the importance of rural industry along with the heightened productivity of farmers as a necessary condition for the development of the social division of labor in and among rural villages, if the regional or the local market is to flourish.

Besides the structural aspect of market described above, Gradmann’s analysis reveals another aspect of the problem, the trend of town growth in relation to the shifting of time. He gathered the statistics of Württemberg in this connection as shown in Table I.

**TABLE I. WÜRTTEMBERG**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Birth</th>
<th>Big Town Population above 100,000</th>
<th>Middle Town Population 100,000-20,000</th>
<th>Small Town Population 20,000-5,000</th>
<th>Smaller Town Population 5,000-2,000</th>
<th>Smallest Town Population below 2,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 C</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table I shows the two peaks, one in the 13th and the other in the 14th century, the former referring to the big town, the middle town, the small town and the smaller town (the largest record of all the births), and the latter to the smallest town. In other words, the high distribution rate of towns in this district was due to the large number of the smaller and smallest towns born respectively in the 13th and the 14th century. Gradmann explains the large increase of these small scale towns in these periods as due to the competition among the feudal landlords to build towns besides the then extant economic conditions mentioned before. As the emergence of these kinds of towns in large numbers was the result of the conscious efforts of feudal landlords, then were often established in the neighborhood of a lord’s castle, a monastery, a manor-house or on a river. In addition to the above, there existed the towns which were established artificially along side of an old village by landlords and those which spontaneously

developed from a village,\textsuperscript{19} but it was the former which accounted for an overwhelmingly large number of the towns built up in the latter half of the Medieval Age. (In Table I, the former is 27 as against 5 of the latter.)\textsuperscript{20}

Looking over the figures presented by Gradmann, however, we find that many of them are of the middle and the small town class, however with reference to the smaller and the smallest towns, figures are not given in a great number of cases. So, the presented ratio between the artificially developed towns and the naturally developed towns can not be accepted as reliable material.

It is also to be noted that the birth of naturally developed towns came somewhat later than artificially developed towns, although not

\begin{table}
\centering
\caption{Sachsen}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Kind of Town} & \textbf{Type of Development} & \textbf{Date of Birth} & \textbf{ND} & \textbf{AD} & \textbf{ND} & \textbf{AD} & \textbf{Market-town} \\
\hline
\hline
\textbf{ND} & \textbf{AD} & \textbf{ND} & \textbf{AD} & \textbf{ND} & \textbf{AD} & \\
\hline
\hline
10 C & 1 & \\
11 C & 2 & \\
12 C & 5 & 1 & \\
13 C & 2 & 19 & 10 & 14 & 1 & \\
14 C & 1 & 12 & 12 & 18 & 4 & \\
15 C & 6 & 12 & 9 & 7 & \\
16 C & 1 & 17 & 7 & 8 & 7 & \\
17 C & 2 & 1 & 2 & 5 & 2 & \\
18 C & \\
19 C & 1 & \\
20 C & 16 & 2 & \\
\hline
\textbf{Total} & 20 & 50 & 43 & 51 & 51 & 3 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}


\textsuperscript{20} R. Gradmann: \textit{Die städtischen Siedlungen....}, SS. 159-163. The calculation was made referring to the items mentioned in the page cited and the attached chart of the book.
### TABLE III. HESSEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presettlement of Town</th>
<th>Kind of Town</th>
<th>Date of Birth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 C</td>
<td>13 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market-Town</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle and Village</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>18 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market-Town</td>
<td>4 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle and Valley-community</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>4 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market-Town</td>
<td>3 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manor-house and Village</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market-Town</td>
<td>3 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market-Town</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manor-house</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market-Town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monastery and Church</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market-Town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Made-up Town</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market-Town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Keyser: <i>Hessisches Städtbuch, 1957</i>; <i>Handbuch der Historischen Stätten Deutschlands</i>, Bd. 4, Hessen, edited by Dr. G. W. Sante, 1960. Numbers in bracket are those of naturally developed towns.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-settlement of Town</th>
<th>Kind of Town</th>
<th>Date of Birth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>1  (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market-Town</td>
<td>1  (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle and Village</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>3  (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market-Town</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manor-house and Village</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market-Town</td>
<td>2  (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manor-house</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market-Town</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monastery and Church</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market-Town</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market-Town</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Keyser: Rheinisches Städtbuch, 1956; Handbuch der Historischen Stätten Deutschlands, Bd. 3, Nordrhein-Westfalen, edited by Dr. H. Borger und Dr. J. Bauermann, 1963. Numbers in bracket are those of naturally developed towns.
much in actual point of time. Almost all the towns which came into existence in the 17th and the 18th century were naturally developed towns.

As was indicated by Weber and Gradmann, we have seen that the distribution rate of towns in a district is high in proportion to the increase of rural productive power under a special agricultural system and the sound development of the division of labor among rural communities, as was seen in West Germany. In places where these conditions were successfully met, the naturally developed towns came into being spontaneously from among rural villages besides the artificially developed towns which feudal landlords built, thereby developing the market relation which goes far more freely than the medieval towns have prescribed.\(^21\) This is what Weber terms “the exchange of goods within and among the smallest local communities”, giving rise to the practice of an intense local money economy. As far, however, as Gradmann’s study of Württemberg reveals, the market relations of the rural naturally developed towns were completely overruled by the market relations of the medieval type of towns. Now, we will see how the situation was in other parts of West Germany.

Table II, III and IV present the statistics on the historical development of towns respectively in Sachsen, Hessen and Rheinland. Varied as they are in degree, the ratios of the towns which spontaneously developed from rural villages are all greater as compared with those shown in Gradmann’s table.\(^22\) Sachsen had 95 artificially developed towns as against 64 naturally developed towns up to the 16th century, indicating the lowest ratio of naturally developed towns among the three districts. On the other hand, Rheinland and Hessen had 45 against 33, and 79 against 60 respectively, both showing a higher

\(^21\) Hisao Otsuka: Economic History of Europe, pp. 149-150.


Werner Spieß: Das Marktrecht, Die Entwicklung von Marktprivileg und Marktrecht insbesondere auf Grund der Kaiserurkunden, 1916, SS. 43-48, 54-56, 83-86, 89-101, 122-125, depicts the way rural markets spontaneously came into being from among rural villages in and after the 14th century, and developed into market-towns or towns; for example, Straußberg of the estate of Schwerin which turned into a market-town in 1356.

The original “Kaiserurkunden”: Deshalb wir ihm und seinen Erben....erteuert(haben), ....das dieselben....aus ihrem Dorfe zur Straßburg einen Markt machen mügen und altselbst einen wochentlich Market sezen...., do die Nachbarn und Umbesessenen zu fahren, zu keuffen und verkeuffen.

\(^22\) Table II. Sachsen derived from Karlheinz Blaschke: Historisches Ortsverzeichnis von Sachsen, 1957; Table III. Hessen from Erich Keyser: Hessisches Städtetbuch, 1957 and Table IV. Rheinland from Erich Keyser: Rheinisches Städtetbuch, 1956.
ratio of naturally developed towns as compared with Sachsen. This large increase in the birth of naturally developed towns in those places occurred following the classical town building enterprise in the 13th century, and reached its peak in the latter half of the Medieval Age and the early period of the Modern Age, that is, the time from the 14th to the 16th century. Thus we recognize two periods or stages in the town building of West Germany: (1). The classical medieval town building (artificially established towns) which was started in the 11th and the 12th century, reached its peak in the 13th century and lasted into the 14th century, (2). The building of modern rural towns (naturally developed towns) which was started in the 13th century, reached its peak in the 14th, 15th and 16th centuries and lasted into the 17th and the 18th century.

However, the fact that town building in the early years of the second stage mentioned above often bears the characteristics of the medieval town construction, obscures the distinction between the two stages. This has induced some scholars like Karl Bücher to take such a stand as to explain the origin of town in West Germany in the period from the Medieval to the Modern Age summarily with the same theory which they use in the elucidation of the medieval or the East German town construction.  

In the Section which follows, we will discuss on the conditions for the birth of naturally developed towns in Sachsen, Central Germany, up to the beginning of the Modern Age, and look into the causes for their reversion to the medieval type of town.

II. THE CONDITIONS FOR THE SETTLEMENT OF RURAL SMALL TOWNS AND MARKET-TOWNS. (1)

In the preceding Section were presented the statistics on the settlement of towns in Sachsen, Central Germany. They have been derived from Historisches Ortsverzeichnis von Sachsen, a brief detailed

---

23 Heinz Stoob: "Minderstädtische, Formen der Stadtentstehung im Spätmittelalter", Vierteljahresschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, Bd. 46, 1959, SS. 1-28, is a fine scholarly work, looking primarily from the stand-point of legal history into the way how people originally came to settle into a town. In analyzing the situation, however, he makes no distinction between the East and the West Germany. Generally he denies the natural growth of rural village into a town and thinks that it rather came to develop as such through the conscious efforts of feudal lords concerned with town building, the process being practically the same as with the case of town in the Medieval Age.

24 Karlheinz Blaschke: Historisches Ortsverzeichnis von Sachsen, 1957. In the preface to this book, Blaschke presents an outline history of how the comprehensive historical materials of Sachsen were compiled. This work was started in the
history of all the autonomous bodies in Sachsen such as town, small town, market-town and village. The book also gives us such information as whether a town was originally a naturally developed or artificially developed, as well as the historical change of its administration. Obtained from this historical source, Table II shows the shifting in the town settlement process.  

In considering the "towns," that is, the classical medieval towns, we find that the majority of them were the artificially developed towns, and their settlement was concentrated especially in the 13th century. As to the "small towns," however, we find that a large number of the artificially developed among them were settled in the 13th and the 14th century, and the naturally developed small towns came somewhat later in the 14th, 15th and 16th centuries. The frequency of the two compared 51 to 43, in other words, the artificially developed small towns stood somewhat above the naturally developed small towns numerically. Concerning the matter of "town settlement", we find the "market-towns", as generally distinguished from "towns", were largely the expansions of rural villages. Their settlement is concentrated in the 15th, 16th and again in the 18th, 19th centuries.

As is seen above, the town settlement of Sachsen in the Medieval and in the early Modern Age took fourfold steps: the birth of "town" mainly in the 13th century, that of "artificially developed small town" in the 13th and the 14th century, that of "naturally developed small town" in the 14th and the 15th century and that of "market-town" in the 15th and the 16th century. Throughout these four steps, there is perceived a competitive relationship between the classical medieval towns and the spontaneously developed towns. However, since a part of the naturally developed towns together with the artificially developed towns are classified together into the "small towns" category, this competitive relationship is somewhat obscured.

19th century. Coming into the 20th century, it was succeeded by Hans Beschorner, Alfred Meiche and Otto Mörtzsch at the request of Saxonian Historical Commission (Sächsische Kommission für Geschichte). On the basis of this original work, a new comprehensive research of the matter was taken up by Prof. Dr. L. E. Schmitt and Historische Kommission des Landes Sachsen (Historical Commission of State Saxony). Further, this work was continued as a subject for study of Staatssekretariat für Hochschulwesen (The Secretariate of the Academy of Local State) under the supervision of Dr. K. Blaschke. The result thereof was published in book form as cited here.

25 The systematized items are as follows: Geographic Positions, History of System, Kinds of Settlement and Kinds and Scales of Arable Land, Development of Population, Authorities over Administrative Areas, Authorized Feudal Landlords, Ecclesiastical Organization and Historical Titles of Communities.
TABLE V

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Town</th>
<th>Type of Development</th>
<th>Date of Birth</th>
<th>10C</th>
<th>11C</th>
<th>12C</th>
<th>13C</th>
<th>14C</th>
<th>15C</th>
<th>16C</th>
<th>17C</th>
<th>18C</th>
<th>19C</th>
<th>20C</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Town</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market-Town</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oberlausitz</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordensachsen</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mittelsachsen</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erzgebirge und Vogtland</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Town</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market-Town</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ND = Naturally developed

AD = Artificially developed

Now, taking up our subject, the clarification of the conditions for the settlement of naturally developed towns which happened largely in the wake of the birth of artificially developed towns, we find a very interesting fact in Table V. Table V presents the detailed figures for the district of Sachsen given as a composite in Table II. They are divided into four areas: Oberlausitz (South Lausitz), Mittelsachsen (Middle Saxony), Nordwestsachsen (Northwest Saxony) and Erzgebirge (Erz Mountain or Highland). We notice a marked difference in the town settlement trend of these four areas. See the chart (p. 89). It is especially distinct in comparing Oberlausitz on one hand, and Mittelsachsen and Erzgebirge on the other. In these two places, the previously mentioned four steps in the settlement process of the towns are definitely followed, though deviating somewhat from their regular course, while in Oberlausitz, confining our observation to the time up to the beginning of the Modern Age, the fourfold steps of town growth were only very imperfectly followed. While the establishment of artificially developed town in the 13th century and that of artificially developed small town in the 13th and the 14th century occurred rather frequently, the birth of the naturally developed small town and market-town was very rare over there, only sporadically happening from the 13th to the 17th century. No naturally developed market-town appeared in the 16th century, its settlement being concentrated rather in the 18th and the 19th century. Thus we come to see that the classical

26 We can also confirm this difference by consulting the chart “Town Settlement in East Germany” in Geschichte der ostdeutschen Kolonisation by Rudolf Kötzschke und Wolfgang Ebert, SS. 238-239. Roughly speaking, with the Elbe as the dividing line, the East and the West exhibit a marked difference in town distribution rate. Also, it is clear that the high town distribution rates in the West of the Elbe were obtained from the situation in the 14th, 15th and 16th centuries. See my own chart (p. 89). For a further study of the distributions of towns, small towns and market-towns about 1780, refer to K. Blaschke: “Zur Siedlungs- und Bevölkerungsgeschichte der Oberlausitz”, in Oberlausitzer Forschungen, SS. 75-76, and the attached Chart 8. As to the other three districts of Sachsen, refer to K. Blaschke: “Zur Statistik der sächsischen Städte im 16 Jahrhundert”, in Vom Mittelalter zur Neuzeit, Festschrift zum 65 Geburtstag von H. Sproemberg, SS. 133-143 and its attached chart.

27 The increase of market-towns in the 18th and 19th century in this area was partly due to the general growth of rural industries in rural villages, but on the other hand, their growth was largely restricted by the existing Gutsherrschaft of the district. Ten out of the 14 rural market-towns which appeared after the 17th century had been knight’s estate before their settlement.

medieval town overwhelmed the modern rural town in Oberlausitz at the beginning of the Modern Age.

Looking, however, at Mittelsachsen and Erzgebirge, we find the reverse was the case; the small towns and market-towns which naturally developed from rural villages exhibit larger ratios. Erzgebirge was somewhat different. There, because of a concentrated settlement of artificially developed towns and small towns—prosperous mining towns—in the 15th and the 16th century, their ratio to the naturally developed small towns was high.28

In between these three contrasting areas, Nordwestsachsen takes a middle stand. Here the three stages of town growth are followed: the town, the artificially developed small town and the naturally developed small town; but the settlement of the naturally developed market-town, the last event in the process of town growth, was very rare as compared with Mittelsachsen and Erzgebirge. As though trying to make up for this tardiness, the area had a large number of naturally developed small towns as compared with other areas, and the ratio of the naturally developed against the artificially developed as a whole was rather high. In view, however, of the peculiar character of this place the majority of the naturally developed market-towns here grew into small towns, and as practically few market-towns were developed since the beginning of the Modern Age, it seems correct to say that Nordwestsachsen lies midway between Oberlausitz and Mittelsachsen as well as Erzgebirge.

Here we harbor the doubt as to where these regional variations, especially those between Oberlausitz and Mittelsachsen or Erzgebirge come from. To clarify this point, we shall naturally be led into a search of those conditions which will produce the naturally developed small towns and market-towns from rural villages. In the last Section, reference was made to Weber's attempt to explain the difference in the market structure between the East and the West of Germany by the structural difference of their rural communities.29

Oberlausitz, which embraces only a small number of the small towns and market-towns which naturally developed from rural villages, is situated in an area characterized by the farm system which Weber designates Gutsherrschaft (the special demesne system). Friedrich


In this area, 16 mining towns and small towns were settled during the 60 years after the construction of Schneeberg in 1470.

Lütge, an excellent scholar on the farm system of Central Germany, believes Oberlausitz with the Gutsherrschaft to be an exception in Central Germany where the peasantry is independent and self-sufficient (das selbständiges Bauern­tum).30 R. Kötzschke, a scholar on the history of rural Sachsen, also points to Oberlausitz as the only place in Sachsen where Gutsherrschaft flourished.31 Supported by the previously mentioned historical material of K. Blaschke, it seems we are quite established in our argument. Consult Table VI.

### TABLE VI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Bautzen</th>
<th>Oschatz</th>
<th>Chemnitz and Floha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period in which Knight's Estate Developed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 C</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 C</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 C</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 C</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>134</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In Table VI the three districts are compared with regard to whether or not there existed knight’s estates (das Rittergut): Bautzen, the central area of Oberlausitz; Oschatz in Nordwetsachsen, where the Gutsherrschaft was rather prevalent; and Chemnitz and Floha, the centre of Erzgebirge in the west of Sachsen.32 The percentage of the villages with knight’s estates in Bautzen is 51.3%, higher than

---

32 K. Blaschke: *Historisches Ortsverzeichnis von Sachsen*, Bd. II, III, IV. The knight’s estate (das Rittergut) is the complex of Lord’s dwelling house and his big Farm. Besides he is not only landlord, but also has the right of jurisdiction over a whole village.
any of the other two. It is 24.4% in Oschatz, and 19.3% in Chemnitz, showing the villages without knight's estates are overwhelmingly in the majority in these places. The percentage of these villages without any Lord's Demesne or Lord's House is 31.8% in Bautzen, 48.7% in Oschatz, and 70.7% in Chemnitz.

The birth of the knight's estate in Oberlausitz is concentrated in the 16th and the 17th century, especially in the former. It coincided with the period when only very few small towns or market-towns developed from rural village there. We naturally conclude, therefore, that this numerical meagerness of the naturally developed small towns and market-towns in this place be attributed to the structure of that rural society. In other words, this area, as was observed by M. Weber, is a colonial district which the Germans obtained from the Slavs and is severed from the tradition of a village community which was fostered by the Germans in their homeland. In addition the controlling influence of the feudal landlords was very strong there. There the Gerichtsherrschaft (jurisdiction) and the Grundherrschaft (landlordship) are perfectly merged under the patriarchal rule of the feudal landlord, and the entire village is completely subjugated to a single lordship. These historical conditions, combined with the exploitation of the distant grain market, naturally induced landlords to launch out eagerly on the enlargement of his demesne. Varied as the ways they adopted to meet their object, they thought the oppression of the independent peasant economy the best. However, extremly reactionary methods like this considerably restrained the productive power of the peasants and cut down the surplus product which was essential for the development of the division of labor in and among rural communities.

On the contrary, in the western side of the Elbe, where such a reactionary feudalism was not the pattern, the independent peasants prospered and a fairly large amount of surplus product was obtained, as is indicated

---

36 R. Kötzschke: a.a.O., SS. 125-126. Kötzschke holds the view that the peasants of Oberlausitz in Sachsen were put in an exceptionally disadvantageous position concerning landholding by which a landlord could terminate his lease with them any time he wished. Further, they were bound to the land through the compulsory service of their children to their lord (Gesindezwangsdienst), which was stricter than in any other areas. Even their own personal freedom was restricted.
by K. Blaschke and F. Lütge. As is seen in Table VI, the establishment of the knight’s estate was not without instance in Oschatz and Chemnitz either. Especially in Oschatz, it came to exist to a fairly large extent. According to Blaschke, the attempt to enlarge the lord’s estate was made also in Central and West Saxony, but the establishment of knight’s estate at the expense of the village field was practiced mainly around Borna, Leipzig, Oschatz, and Großenhain. However, most of the village fields thus transformed into the lord’s estate were waste lands, so the harmful effect upon the peasants of the lord’s efforts to enlarge his demesne should not be overstated. Still, there is no denying that it was prejudicial to the interests of the peasants living around a lord’s estate. Though the percentage of the village with knight’s estate itself is not so high as in Bautzen, the percentage of these with other kind of demesne or manor house is most high among the three areas. In fact, it was this very factor which turned the naturally developed market-towns into “small towns” or even “towns” and brought about the scanty existence of market-town in Nordwestsachsen.

In contrast to this areas, a large number of small town and market-town spontaneously emerged from rural villages in the mountain or forestry regions of Mittelsachsen and Erzgebirge where reactionary feudalism was least prevalent. The peasants especially in the forestry zone, living as they did in a collective mode of life called Waldhufen-dorf (the forest colony with holdings in single parallel strips of land running down to a valley, each group having a house at the base of its strip), possessing a security of individual rights, developed a strong sense of independence. It is remarkable to note that the naturally developed market-villages in these regions developed into regular small towns and market-towns.

From what we have surveyed, we may conclude that the regional differences in the mode of town settling, or the birth of naturally developed small towns and market-towns in Sachsen should be explained by the structural differences in the variety of regional rural living, more specifically, through feudalistic influence on the tradition of village community, the basis of rural life.

---

89 R. Kötzschke: a.a.0., S. 227. In a “forest colony”, the house of each peasant is situated right on the land he owns. Consequently there developed a strong sense
III. THE CONDITIONS FOR THE SETTLEMENT OF RURAL SMALL TOWNS AND MARKET-TOWNS. (2)

The second condition for an intensive development of naturally developed small towns and market-towns within a rural region is the manifold social division of labor, indicated by M. Weber and R. Gradmann. The development of a social division of labor within a rural region, according to Weber, "should be one which makes possible the exchange of goods within the smallest as well as among the smallest local communities".40

The smallest community in this case includes the village community. More important than anything else for the development of the rural small town and market-town is the division of labor realized among the smallest units of a group, that is, among the village communities.

Needless to say, this kind of division of labor owes a great deal of its development to the existence of many independent peasants in the preceding feudal village and their relatively high standard of living.

However the specialization of labor among different villages is a more essential factor for the growth of a specific village to a regular small town or a market-town. The marketing relations among the classical medieval towns were not necessarily confined within the limits of the exclusive relationship between a town and its neighboring villages, as was considered by K. Bücher. As was clearly brought out by G. v. Below, R. Hápke and G. Vollmer who were critical of Bücher's view, the marketing relationship, which the classical medieval town had, was of the local dimension centering around a powerful local town, which might be termed the metropolitan market area.41 This type of market relationship is well exemplified in the annual fairs held in middle or small towns centering around the Messe (annual fair) of a powerful town. These local annual fairs also stand in a mutual complementary relationship with the weekly market, an exclusive marketing area of independence among the resident peasants. According to Kötzschke's Chart 23 and K. Blaschke, Burgstädt, a naturally developed small town, was settled in the forest colony of Burkersdorf as early as in the 14th century.

around a town. The main support for this local market was the social division of labor developed within a district, especially among different medieval towns.

The settlement of rural small towns and market-towns in the latter half of the Middle Age is contrast to the above described local market of the classical medieval town. It is a new departure in the formation of the market area on the narrower district basis than the latter. This new district market is characterized more than anything else by the social division of labor among rural villages and its resultant exchange of goods. Needless to say, this district market area in practice overlapps the local market area of old medieval towns and is very difficult to distinguish from the latter. But we should be aware that it was engaged in the exchange of goods among rural villages in contrast to the market area of medieval town mainly devoted to the exchange of goods among towns.

The fact that rural villages finally established district-wide marketing areas in spite of feudalistic pressure was due to their success in the maintenance of a relatively independent position and the acquisition of an economic surplus which made it possible for them to transact a mutual exchange of goods. In considering the way in which they accomplished an enlargement of the market (their steady effort toward a division of labor and the mutually useful exchange of goods), we can assume they were supported by the demand of the general masses.

In order to develop this kind of division of labor, it is important that rural communities under feudalistic pressure should not only have a high standard of living, but be provided with a variety of natural


The studies by these two scholars reveal that the visitors to weekly markets are not necessarily confined to the peasants and manual workers from the surrounding rural villages. They embraced outsiders too, proving that the latter are also an integrated part of the weekly market.


Gradmann points out the three best conditions for the market of a town: (1). Unrestricted by marketing competition from near-by towns, (2) Favored by economic affluence due to the high fertility of the land and the prosperity of rural industries and (3) Communication well developed.

K. H. Schröder considers that the blessed vine-culture of Württemberg after the 14th century was derived from the prosperity of the towns, the heightened agricultural productivity and the talented large population.
conditions which may be utilized for its survival. This is the point which Weber mentioned with reference to West Germany. There, within the narrow stretch of the district was given a diversity of natural conditions such as field, basin, valley, plateau, forestry and mountain. Intermingled with each other and supported by the peculiar local conditions, these natural conditions proved to be stimulus for the growth of the social division of labor and the effective exchange of goods among the rural villages.

The above mentioned hypothesis can be well documented by the historical facts of Sachsen. Looking over Table V we are impressed by the different settlement rates of the small towns and the market-towns in various districts of Sachsen. These differences point to the existing states of feudalism or the degrees of social division of labor attained in these places. As to the latter, we must consider about the natural conditions of these places. Mittelsachsen and Erzgebirge, for example are favored with a diversity of natural conditions, occupying the forestry plateaux and mountain regions between the plains in the north and the mountains of the south. This physical diversity actually gave rise to the division of labor, which brought about the settlement of a large number of rural small towns and market-towns.

We now proceed to look into the relationship between the newly acquired social division of labor and the growth of the naturally developed small towns and market-towns more specifically with reference to Erzgebirge. The main division of labor acquired in this district were two: linen-weaving and metal-working. Having developed as rural industries, catering to the masses, their products were rather cheap and crude. The linen-weaving in this region originally centered round the monopolistic Bleaching Field of the noted classical medieval town Chemnitz which received its supply of materials and half-finished goods from neighboring rural villages. In about the 15th century, these rural villages, became discontented to remain a mere suppliers of raw materials and half finished goods to Chemnitz, developed a complete manufacturing process. Consequently the Chemnitz Bleaching Ground,
that had prospered under the patronage of the territorial prince, the Duke of Saxony, lost its monopolistic privilege.48 A number of unlicensed bleaching grounds was established in the region where the linen-weavers of the rural small towns or market-towns soon developed to the irritation of the Chemnitz linen-weavers.49 Really, the enterprising spirit of these unlicensed linen-weavers was a significant factor in the urbanization of Erzgebirge. This development of weaving industry was due to the big demand for soft goods not only by villager but also by the miners whose numbers had greatly increased about this time in the district.50

These rural industrial towns which developed around Chemnitz included both the towns naturally developed from villages and the artificially developed towns of medieval origin.51 The ratio of these different types of towns was: the naturally developed 8; the artificially developed 5; and the half naturally developed 7. Among these, the most active were the naturally developed and the half naturally developed.52 Another point to be noted is that these small towns are situated a certain distance from Chemnitz. This shows the existence of the regulated market area (Bannmeile) enjoyed by the chartered town of this period, Chemnitz, and at the same time it opened the possibility for new towns to be established outside of such an area.53 (See my own chart of p. 89). We may designate this phenomenon of Chemnitz as the centripetal tendency of the market as over against the centrifugal tendency of rural towns.54

Now, we take up the metal-working industry, the other primary rural industry developed in Erzgebirge. Settled in the timbered areas of the mountain, it was called “blacksmith in forestry” (Waldsch-
RURAL SMALL TOWNS AND MARKET-TOWNS

mied). In the regions where this industry developed, there had been the silver or other kinds of mining industry in 15th and the 16th century, centering about a number of mining towns. Many of these mines were operated by international merchants with an object of securing the funds for their foreign trade. Other minerals such as iron and tin were mined. Regardless what of the exploited, mining is an expensive business. Naturally mines and mining towns came under the control of distant privileged merchants or the territorial princes through their financial or political involvement.

On the other hand, the manufacturing industries for these ores were operated as petty rural enterprises making primarily such items as wrought iron, bar-iron or cast iron, and such finished goods as tin-plate, nails or wire. In the second place such farming tools as sickle, hatchet, plough or shovel were made, as well as such producers’ instruments for weaving or mining industries. Among the goods mentioned above, those of the first category were important objects of sales related to transportation or building trades, while those of the second category were widely transacted as important producers’ goods in Erzgebirge about the period from the 16th to the 17th century. Really, metal-working, hand in hand with the previously discussed linen-weaving, played an important role in stimulating a division of labor among the rural villages in the district.

These metal-working industries were well established in the area from Schwarzenberg to Zwickau. See my chart (p. 89). They are especially common in the region around Schwarzenberg and its adjacent

To see how influential the market of the mining town was as a privileged enterprise under the control of a distant merchant class, consult E. Gothen: a.a.o., S. 665f. Ludwig Scheuermann: Die Fugger als Montanindustrielle in Tirol und Kärnten, 1929, S. 25f., SS. 96-99, 390-397.
In any of the above historical materials, iron as raw material is mentioned as the common object of daily transaction.
60 L. C. Lünig: Codex Augusteus, Bd. I, Sp. 244.
areas with the two market-towns *Aue* and *Eibenstock* as their centres.  

*Schwarzenberg* is an industrial, artificially developed town of medieval style around which there were 9 satellite industrial villages and 6 hamlets.  

None of these villages and hamlets has grown into a town by as late as the 19th century. This means that the market relation here took the same course of development as *Chemnitz* of the linen-weaving industry, that is, it tended to be centripetal.

On the contrary, *Aue* and *Eibenstock*, letting market-towns spontaneously emanate from within, tended to be centrifugal in their growth. To be more specific, *Aue* region had 7 industrial villages, out of which *Neustädte* in the 16th century, *Aue* in the 17th century and *Zschorlau* in the 18th century developed into a small town or a market-town respectively.  

*Eibenstock* region, consisting of 5 industrial villages and 7 industrial hamlets, also saw *Eibenstock* grow into a small town from a market-town in the 16th century, and *Hundshübel* and *Schönhäide* grow into a market-town from a village respectively in the 18th and the 19th century. This centrifugal trend of market-town growth bespeaks the prevalence of good exchange among the rural villages within the district, as was the case in the linen-weaving industrial zone mentioned before. *Aue*, in fact, is a concrete example of this trend of town growth as it developed in the 19th century into a regular machine industry town well surpassing *Schwarzenberg* in scale.  

It is to be remembered here that this smooth growth of town from village was attained because of the demand for metal works largely coming from within the district instead of its being disturbed by demands from distant places as was the case in the linen-weaving industry.

---

61 In this connection, consult the attached chart in R. Förberger: *Die Manufaktur in Sachsen* and J. Müller: a.a.o., S. 34, SS. 37-41, 52-53.


This village was invested for the first time with the right to an open market in 1627, but its development in and after the 19th century was remarkable as a machine manufacturing town even far surpassing *Schwarzenberg*. The fact can be perceived through the movements of population in both towns about that time. *Aue* had the population of 1,600 in 1849 and 15,200 in 1900, while *Schwarzenberg* had 2,400 and 4,100 respectively in those years.


It is to be noted that in the metal-working industry also it was possible to have the medieval town as *Schwarzenberg*. For instance, there was formed the iron-working craftsmen's *Zunft* (craftsgild) in *Loßnitz*, a medieval town in *Erzge-
As was briefly surveyed above, *Erzgebirge* was a typical case where linen-weaving as consumers' goods industry, and metal-working as producers' goods industry, flourished as rural industries. It is also significant that not only the linen-weaving and the metal-working industries were carried on among rural villages, but also those villages were located in close proximity to each other. Further, it is important to note that around those rural villages with industries there existed many farming villages which engaged in raising cereals, and that there developed an intensive social division of labor with pure agriculture, linen-weaving and metal-working as its major component parts. Really, this existence of the well-defined social division of *birge* as early as 1396. (J. Müller: Ibid., S. 38) A similar example existed also in *Oberursel*, a grown-up town in South *Hessen*. (H. Schubert: Ibid., S. 125) Gothein points out that an association (*Verband*) for blacksmiths was formed under the patronage of the territorial prince in *Schwarzwald*. (E. Gothein: a.a.0., S. 653f.)

In addition, paper-making, lumbering and woodworking were carried on extensively within the villages in *Erzgebirge*. Also besides these producers' goods, some metal goods such as spoon for home use were made. (J. Müller: Ibid., SS. 39-40, 44-46).

To state more concretely, this refers to the contiguity of the upland region centering around *Chemnitz* with linen-weaving industry to *Erzgebirge* with metal-working industry. Especially, in the border region between the two, linen-weaving, metal-working and woodwork industries flourished together. (J. Müller: a.a.0., S. 48, 50). Kunze observes that the textile industry centering around the rural towns in the mountains was able to maintain its stand strong enough even to compete with *Chemnitz*. This fact should be explained in terms of the mutual contiguity of rural villages there and the locally managed exchange of goods among them. (A. Kunze: a.a.0., SS. 99-100).

Since the metal-working industries prospered in the mountain forests with a small number of pure-agricultural villages around, there is no question that they had to depend on the exchange of their products with other regions for the supply of their cereals. The number of households, derived from the historical materials gathered by Blaschke and Heitz and classified according to industrial villages or pure agricultural villages, shows: 5,598 to 5,498 in the textile industrial region, and 640 to 267 in the metal-working industrial region. G. Heitz: a.a.0., SS. 34-35. K. Blaschke: *Historisches Ortsverzeichnis von Sachsen*, Bd. II, III.

The exchange of goods among the rural villages of *Erzgebirge* was not confined to its own region, but reached out to the specialized industrial regions of *Sachsen* at large. For example, *Nordwestsachsen* and the North of *Mittelsachsen* provided agricultural products to supply the regions of industrialized *Erzgebirge* and southern *Mittelsachsen*. The exchange of village goods beyond their regional bounds often came to overlap the scope of the local market of medieval towns, with the result that most of the market-villages of *Nordwestsachsen* grew into small towns of medieval type.

labor and its resultant exchange of goods among the rural villages within district were effective factors in the dispersing, centrifugal settlement of the naturally developed small towns and market-towns around rural villages.

In addition to the above described factors there is another factor which works for the growth of small towns or market-towns from rural villages with a specific division of labor. It is the concentration of finishing workshops in a particular rural village of rural industrial region. In case of linen-weaving, for example, this happen with the bleaching grounds. We have seen how a number of unlicensed bleaching grounds came into being, opposing the privileged Bleaching Ground of Chemnitz. This very collection of bleaching grounds became an important factor in transforming some particular rural villages among the many existing industrial villages into well-settled towns. Here a division of labor developed between the villages with bleaching grounds and their surrounding villages which participated in the same weaving process, thereby this division of labor established a roundabout production. The situation also made an opportunity for the related villager to exchange their semi-manufactured goods on the market of these naturally developed towns with the handicraftsmen in the town who finish the manufacturing process with these bleaching grounds.70

This exchange among the various manual workers results in the realization of a more intensive and better equated transaction.71 Table VII shows vividly the way a rural small town had a number of villages under its command, bespeaking the existence of the division of labor and the mutual exchange of goods among them.72


According to the study by Abel, against the price of cereals 100 in the advanced Lowland region of Northwestern Europe, West Germany registers 90, whereas East Germany about 50. This wide difference in cereal price, Weber explains, is the reflection of the difference in the progress of farmers as producers in these two districts with different farm system and market structure. Abel also indicates that the low cereal price of East Germany was caused by its large-scale production aiming at exploiting distant markets. For further study of this explanation, see M. Weber: a.a.o., SS. 446.

In the metal-working industry, however, we find no clear evidence of the division of labor developed between a rural town and its surrounding villages as a result of the concentrated process of production as happened with linen-weaving. In the south of Hessen, however, every small town or market-town, being engaged in metal-working, developed a large number of grinding mills.\textsuperscript{73}


In these works are mentioned three rural metal working towns, \textit{Eppstein}, König-
From what we have seen in the above paragraphs, we may conclude:
(1) It is possible for any work such as pure agriculture, linen-weaving or metal-working to develop as component of an integrated reproduction, each part of which is carried on by separate rural villages. (2) A specialized industry may establish a regionally-separated division of labor which will compose its whole process of production; and with the above conditions for the division of labor intermingled, there will spontaneously develop new towns and market-towns over a rural region.

These towns also engage in the production of manual goods besides specialized industry, which in turn act as connecting links of a manifold division of labor. These goods, mainly the daily necessities, not only make the basis for the exchange of goods among the town dwellers, but become the objects of exchange with the surrounding villages.

This intensive division of labor in a definite district, hand in hand with the exchange of its products, brings the district into a supplementary relationship with its neighboring districts, often causing an overlapping with the local market among the medieval towns. Such division of labor and exchange of goods are often supplemented through the activities of some inter-local or international markets too. It is to be remembered, however, that the smooth growth of a rural village into a naturally developed small town or market-town is dependent more than anything else on the degree of the division of labor and the exchange of its products realized within the confines narrower than the old local medieval market.

We call the market thus evolved the new district market, which is

---

stein and Oberursel respectively provided with 1, 2 and 5 grinding mills. Oberursel had 5 water-mills for hand-work use besides 5 grinding mills. Müller thinks these water-mills were very useful in utilizing water as the driving force for metal work in Schwarzenberg. Aue is of the confluence point of two mountain streams.


Duncker mentions in *Weisthümer* (Precedent Documents of Lower Courts in Villages and Towns) the tanned leather work, brickmaker, shoemaker, tailor, weaver, lime-burner in the order of the works necessitating the concentration of handicraftsmen into a town or a market-town. Stoy also refers to shoemaker, tailor, blacksmith, baker, carver, cartwright, butcher, carrying trade, miller, linen-weaver and potter of Schildau, a small town of North Saxony, in the numerical order of the workers required. Looking over the works above, we find that the division of labor in rural towns is centered around the consumers' goods industries that are indirectly related to the two main lines of work: clothing and building.
based on the new district reproduction within a rural district.  

IV. THE DUAL CHARACTER OF RURAL SMALL TOWN AND MARKET-TOWN

The social division of labor among rural villages which brings rural small towns and market-towns into being is very complex, and the resulting market relationships among them for the exchange of goods are also complicated. Roughly speaking, the market relationships as such can be considered in three terms.

1. The annual market or fair (der Jahrmarkt). The annual market is one which is held periodically several times a year on a church festival day or a court day. This is an important affair in a rural town. Looking over Table VIII, we find that even in the market-village (das Marktdorf), which is the predecessor of the rural town, this was an important event. With Table IX on Hessen, we further get confirmation that the annual market of rural town plays an ever weighty role in local marketing.

This annual market, on the other hand, becomes related to the local market among medieval towns centering around the Messe of certain powerful town in the district. The situation may be taken as a dawning sign of a new district market with the rural town as its developmental pivot. In fact, the marketing of linen thread and linen cloth at the annual markets of some rural towns are conducted aiming


77 E. Keyser: Hessisches Städtebuch.


Ammann thinks that the visitors to the Nördlinger Messe were from the local towns including Oberursel, the above mentioned naturally developed town in South Hessen. Hapke also holds the view that the Frankfurter Messe was supported by the prosperity of its surrounding textile industrial towns in South Hessen. In Sachsen, towns as well as markt-towns took part in the Leipziger Messe. R. Hapke: a.a.O., S. 103.


Gradmann points out the possible relation between the annual market of a powerful local town and small towns, as well as the direct dealing among small towns and market-towns.
TABLE VIII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>License for Selling Wine on Church Festival Day</th>
<th>Ban on Selling Wine on Church Festival Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Big or Middle Town</td>
<td>Small Town</td>
<td>Market-Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Market</td>
<td>Small Town</td>
<td>Market-Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Weekly Market

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transitional Market to Weekly Market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Big or Middle Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market-Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Baking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Brewing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Selling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranger also Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Selling and Buying at Village Tavern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


TABLE IX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presettlement of Town</th>
<th>Hessen</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Weekly Market</th>
<th>Fair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle and Village</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manor-house and Village</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle and Valley-community</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manor-house</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church and Monastery</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newly Settled</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


at the exploitation of the district demand as well as the distant demand.80

According to *Weisthümer* (Precedent Documents of Lower Courts in Villages and Towns), the goods sold at village markets or the annual markets of small towns or market-towns were such things seasonings including salt, pepper and other spices, special provisions such as dairy products and wine, as well as all kinds of domestic animals, woolen or

linen fabrics, iron and metal works. Not a small number of these goods would be the objects of transactions at district, local, national or even international markets; through the agency of the Messe of a powerful town, they go far beyond the limits of a local market. As revealed by the studies of R. Gradmann and H. Ammann, it is clear that the sudden increase of Messe at the end of Medieval Age was greatly due to the vigorous marketing activities of the annual markets of the rural towns and villages.

(2) The weekly market (der Wochenmarkt). The weekly market is one which is held periodically once or more times a week, offering the chance for the exchange of goods between a town and its neighboring villages. The exchange in this case is not only between the manufactured goods of a town and the farm products from its neighboring villages, but also between the unfinished goods used in the various stages of rural industries. Different from the weekly market of a classical medieval town, which was one-sidedly advantageous to town manufacturers, the dealings at this weekly market between a rural town and its neighboring villages, especially industrial villages, were better equated than those at the former, although both were similarly called weekly market. Thus it served not only as an actual resort for the exchange of goods but as an index for the intensity of new local money economy.

However, the weekly market so far discussed should be differentiated from the daily market (der tägliche Markt) or the constant store selling (der standige Verkauf auf Laden) inside a town, so the system of the weekly market in a rural small town enforced on the neighboring rural villages the same market regulations as the classical medieval town.

---

82 Eugen Nübling: Ulm's Handel im Mittelalter, 1900, SS. 448-460.
83 G. v. Below: a.a.o., SS. 216-221. Below points out that the annual market of small town often functions as an inter-district market through the Messe of a powerful town.
According to Heitz, in 1530 the linen-weavers' Zunft of Chemnitz complained of the rural linen-weavers making all kinds of linen, and selling them at the weekly markets of different towns.
86 F. Philippi: Zur Verfassungsgeschichte der Westfälischen Bischofständ., 1894,
In this connection, Weisthümer, the Precedent Documents of Lower Courts, reveal some interesting points. As is seen in Table VIII, the annual market, one of the typical market relationships arising among rural villages, is easy to be found, but the weekly market is rather obscure in its substance. It often takes place as the so-called “free baking” (frei backen), “free brewing” (frei brauen) or “free selling” (frei verkaufen). This substantial ambiguousness of the weekly market as a system comes from the indistinct differentiation of the exchange of goods within a market-village from that with the outside or neighboring villages.

These free markets range, in their characteristic indefiniteness of their substance, all the way from the ones that have some sort of rule which provides for the transaction of outsiders and thus come very close to the weekly market in essence, to the tavern which deals quite freely in all sorts of goods like the daily market. It is really surprising to know that there exist all stages of development in the settlement of market-villages.

It is significant, however, to note that in spite of such a state of market development, the daily market and the weekly market become distinctly differentiated as a market-village grows into a town. In other words, the weekly market thus evolved gets greatly restricted in its free relationship with its surrounding rural villages, especially industrial rural villages. This imposition of restriction by small town or market-town concerning the transactions of village industrial products and raw materials is certainly an evidence of the compelling market control. Such market control happened also in Sachsen in its linen-weaving industrial region.

Philippi holds the view that the medieval town was born out of the constant daily market of handicraftsmen, but the weekly market was rather an outcome of the development of town market.

Among these markets, the “free selling” at the tavern was most active at the market-villages in Bayern. With the territorial princes powerful control, the market-villages there had no chance to develop into towns. R. Gradmann: Süd­deutschland, Bd. I, S. 166, Bd. II, SS. 421-422.

F. Philippi: a.a.0., SS. 1-17.

H. Helbig: a.a.0., Teil IV, Nr. 293, S. 18. “The linenweavers working for the bleaching grounds, and the linen thread buyers, who live in towns, market-towns or villages of the district, ought to do their free purchase only on the market day of towns and market-towns in this district.”
(3) The Hawking (der Hausier Handel).

Different from the two systematized markets discussed in the preceding paragraphs, this denotes free goods exchange bound with no regulation. To explain it more concretely, this means that a village industry master or his sales agent may peddle along with the products from village to village, from town to town. R. Gradmann takes this activity by the producer as his direct sales effort in opposition to the medieval town merchant; it reaches out far beyond the set frames of the annual or the weekly market. The free exchange of goods of this sort has a tendency to penetrate into a place where an intensive division of labor within the narrow limits of an local area is prevalent. So, the hawking activity as such often serves as an index for the extent of a new district market. For example, since farm products, domestic animals, linen cloth, woolen goods and metal wares were widely sold by hawkers in Sachsen, we may surely conclude that the district market for these goods was well established there.

Complex as the market relationships are centering around the rural towns with annual market, weekly market and hawking, we may further analyze the situation. The first two of these three are the transplantations of the medieval town market system into rural towns, while the last one is a free and independent marketing from the former. In proportion as this type of free and independent trading develops, the rural small town and the market-town accomplish

Gradmann states that hawking is done by producers not only to sell their products themselves, but to purchase the necessary materials directly from the producers, with the result that hawkers make a large profit and help rural industries develop.

92 "Untersuchungen über die Lage des Hausiergewerbes in Deutschland," 4 Bde. Schriften des Vereins für Sozialpolitik, Bd. 77-80.


The historical materials show what difficulty the medieval towns had in managing hawkers.

In Eilenburg of Nordhessen, there were 7 hawkers among its inhabitants of about 200 houses.

a smooth growth, whereas if such is not the case, they are likely to remain retarded in their development and be set back to their medieval conditions. We find that in Sachsen, hawking became fairly well established in the region where the metal-working industry prospered. Where linen-weaving alone existed, the regular annual and weekly markets prospered rather than hawking. This is the reason why the rural towns and small towns in the linen-weaving region took the oppressive attitude toward surrounding village-weavers.

This antagonistic attitude against the rural industries was originally and persistently pursued by Chemnitz, a classical medieval town in the middle of the 15th century. It was primarily the protest against the appearance of unlicensed bleaching grounds around Chemnitz. In fact, most of the towns near Chemnitz including Rochlitz, Colditz, Penig, Frankenberg, Leisnig, Grimma set up bleaching grounds and as rural industrial centers stood against Chemnitz, menacing her monopolistic position in bleaching and marketing their products.

With the coming of the 16th century, however, we find the names of the small towns that had been antagonistic to Chemnitz, appear in the common complaints against the rural industries. They were Oederan (6 times from 1500 to 1540), Frankenberg (3 times), Zschopau (3 times), Hainichen (3 times), Mittweida (once) and Geithain (once). These were almost towns grown from rural villages.

This antagonism of rural town against the rural industries worked to strengthen the medieval characteristic of market system. The people

---


As is indicated by Kunze, in the linen-weaving industrial region some village dealers also were active in hawking, but it seems that they were more like brokers selling the linen works of their villages in towns.

This crisis is clearly seen in the Complaint of 1449 in which unlicensed bleaching grounds of Rochlitz, Colditz, Penig, Frankenberg und Krumbach were blamed. Among them Rochlitz was granted in 1451 the right to continue her business, though on a certain condition. In other words, the Bleaching Grounds of Chemnitz failed to hold their monopolistic right in the business.
who were most persistent were the linen-weavers of rural towns. They formed themselves into Zunft (craftsgild) since the middle of the 15th century after the pattern of one which existed in classical medieval town and used it as the main agency in reversing rural towns to their medieval forms.102

However, in and out of the rural towns that stood against rural industries, there were some people who had common interests with the latter and came in conflict with the Zunft of linen-weavers. But, as we shall see later, these people siding with rural industries were after all the masses of diverse elements in the light of the existing objective state of conditions. In spite, therefore, of their opposition, the Zunft could push its way through to realize the medieval type of market and its control over production.103

Compared, however, with the control exercised in Oberlausitz, discussed in Section III, the control here was not such a strict one as the classical medieval town wielded, admitting the autonomy of the rural industries to some extent.104 This leniency came from the fact that the economic prosperity of rural towns was originally brought about with the help of rural industry.

So, the rural industries in this region were taken into the framework of the putting-out system which was not too rigid there.105 Of course, the arrangement like this was not uniformly realized. Only the towns that had substantially assumed the characteristics of medieval town or those that were trying to do so in line of weaving industrial towns adopted it. In the towns that had just established their markets themselves, it was not fully realized. Oederan is a typical example of the former, Stollberg of the latter. The linen-weavers of Chemnitz criticized Stollberg for its free marketing without the system of Zunft-control.106 This, however, was probably


In the first of the book cited above, Heitz states that feudal aristocrats, supporting village industries, went so far as to fight against town linenweavers in Court. In the essay mentioned following the above, he cites the Complaint by the linen-weavers of Chemnitz which refers to the positive coalition of the town council and small dealers in Geithain and many other towns with village industries, supported by aristocrats. Some outsiders such as the Nürnberg dealers were also eager to avail themselves of the village industries.

106 G. Heitz: "Die Entwicklung....", S. 10f.
because the town had a metal-working industrial region as its neighbor, and stood as a marketing centre in a new district market area. It was not mere chance that a large number of peasants in this region rose in riot on the occasion of the Deutsche Bauernkrieg (German Peasant War) in 1525, although the majority of the farmers in Sachsen took no part in it.¹⁰⁷

Let me conclude briefly on the causes which retarded the natural growth of the rural towns so far discussed. The first one was the ever persistent control of feudal landlords. As was mentioned in Section II, the large part of Sachsen except Oberlausitz was not brought under the strong reactionary influence of feudalism as occurred on the east of the Elbe. In contrast to the eastern side of the Elbe where the peasants were reduced to serfdom under the Gutsherrschaft, the peasants in these regions were independent workers. However, the strengthened grip of reactionary influence as a result of the defeated Deutsche Bauernkrieg (German Peasant War) delayed the emancipation of the peasants in West Germany till the 18th and 19th century. The peasants in Sachsen were no exception to this.¹⁰⁸ Primarily the reactionary movement of feudalism was the lords’ effort to enlarge their demesne though on a small scale. This happened rather extensively in Nordwestsachsen. But the study by K. Blaschke clarifies also that there were similar cases in Erzgebirge and Mittelsachsen.¹⁰⁹ Table VI also shows a similar trend as seen in the increased settlement of knight’s estate in the surroundings of Chemnitz.

Such an enlargement of demesne naturally called for the security of labor power by feudal territorial princes. There ensued the notorious compulsory service system, Gesindezwangsdienst, required of men and women by the landed lords.¹¹⁰ This compulsory service system was

¹¹⁰ K. Blaschke thinks that the method of enlarging the existing demesne by the requisition on farmers’ holdings was prevalent around Dresden in the south of Mittelsachsen, and the creation of a new knight’s estate was often made at the expense of farmers’ landed property around Chemnitz of Erzgebirge. In Nordwestsachsen, the creation or the enlargement of knight’s estate was executed by taking over the entire area of a deserted village.

This compulsory service system was started in the 14th century, formalized in the 15th century and was widely practiced in the 16th and the 17th century by feudal landlords with the object of securing necessary labor power. In its actual execution, it resorted to the threefold privileges: (1) The preferential right of the landlord to employ the children in his estate as against any third person, (2) The-
imposed not only on the landless inmates and lodgers, who had been gradually increasing, but even on the peasants in general. It was certainly a significant event to the persons who were ever intent on the enhancement of their prestige.\textsuperscript{111}

This was not all that the landed lords did to increase their reactionary influence. In addition to their efforts to expand their demesnes, the feudal lords, taking advantage of the dwindling \textit{kaiserliche Macht} (royal power), assumed the jurisdiction as the means to effect their patrimonial control over whole villages.\textsuperscript{112} Such being the situation, the independent peasants of \textit{Sachsen} were placed under the patrimonial village rule as far down as the 19th century, and the villages, remaining as stagnant as ever, grew in very slow tempo.

The second cause for the reversion of rural towns to their former state of feudalistic perversion is the competition among the feudal lords to build towns in order to strengthen their feudalistic influence. R. Gradmann observes that many small towns in Southwest Germany were born as a result of the competitive efforts of the feudal lords to build towns, while many market-villages in its adjacent \textit{Bayern}, where a strong territorial prince had ruled, never attained township.\textsuperscript{113}

This happened also in \textit{Sachsen}. Table X shows where-on the practical controlling power in various towns of \textit{Sachsen} in the 16th century lies.

---

\textsuperscript{111} F. Lütge: \textit{Ibid.}, SS. 217-221.

Lütge classifies the “menials” as follows: Ones who live in the residence of their lords, the “menials” in the strict sense of the word, and those who somehow live on their own accounts, practically the same as day laborers. He further differentiates those who work by compulsion from those who do so of their own accord; the former offer their labor for the legal wage to their lord for some years while in their childhood. Among the latter, some remain in their lord’s employ for a certain period of time after they finish their compulsory service, until they get married, while some others are obliged to remain “menials” throughout their lives. Some middle class or rich farmers keep “free menials” themselves in order to let those carry their obligation of service to their lord.


Quirin considers that the autonomy of the village community, that had been fairly well established before the \textit{Deutsche Bauernkrieg}, came to be merged into the lord’s jurisdiction and police authority after the 16th century. Thus with the jurisdiction of village community by peasantry being absorbed into the Lower Court (\textit{das Niedergerecht}), the lord’s control over the village community was strengthened.

In many small towns, it was in the hand of the city council as it should be, but we find the number of small towns controlled by territorial princes or knights (patrician feudal lords), far surpassing the autonomous ones in number. With market-towns, the knights were overwhelmingly in control as compared with territorial princes. \(^{114}\) There is one thing to be noted as Stoob states; the feudal aristocrats strengthened their rule over territory by granting small towns the right of autonomy. \(^{115}\) Here again, the petty territorial lords, that is, the knights were so powerful that they even exercised their authority over the Higher Court (das Hochgericht), although their territories often covered only few villages. \(^{116}\) They were eager in town-building competition. Getting ever more aggressive in this trend of self-aggrandizement, the aristocrats even tried to bring some naturally developed towns under

---

\(^{114}\) K. Blaschke: *Historisches Ortsverzeichnis von Sachsen*, Bd. I, II, III.


Stoob is critical of O. Kielmyer who takes the large number of intermediate towns settled in the last part of the Medieval Age as naturally developed towns, and thinks that they are rather the outcome of the conscious efforts by feudal lords to build towns as their reigning strongholds. See the followings for the further research on this point: Werner Spieß: *Das Marktprivileg*, SS. 43-48, 83-86, 89-101, 122-125. G. v. Below: *Territorium und Stadt*, 1923, SS. 95-97.


Even in the central part of Sachsen where territorial princes were powerful, the knight's estates with the Higher Court under their jurisdiction counted 33, while 21 knights exercised a similar right over the Lower Court only.
their influence. Such being the situation, the only way for the rural towns that were economically well off to sustain their independence was to acquire autonomy through the town council, practically the same tactics resorted to by the medieval town.\textsuperscript{117}

The last deterrent against the natural development of rural towns was the stagnant structural growth of markets. By the market structure here is meant the new district market area as mentioned before. It is based on the manifold social division of labor within a district narrower than the old local market of the classical medieval town; here the mutual exchange of goods is made among rural villages. As the smooth growth of this sort of market is effected, the regional, the local, the national or the international market of the medieval town would dissolve to be replaced by the new district, the new local, the new national or the new international market.\textsuperscript{118} But if the internal structure of feudalism should persist, the development of these new markets especially the new district or local market would remain stagnant, suffering from an excessive internal competition within a limited scope of activity, and adhering to the medieval type of restrictions on market and production.\textsuperscript{119} In such a condition of affairs, the outwardly spectacular introduction of commercial funds from South Germany strengthened only the reversal tendency of market structure in Saxony. Really, what happened in the linen weaving region of Sachsen

\textsuperscript{117} To look into the way by which territorial princes brought the naturally developed towns under their control, consult W. Spiieß: a.a.0., SS. 89-101.

Spiieß points out that territorial princes especially resorted to capturing the grown-up towns as a means for the expansion of their power. It is interesting to know how they developed rural villages into towns or market-towns with the object of making them the seats of the higher court which is placed under the jurisdiction of territorial prince.

This fact can be ascertained of Sachsen too, although indirectly. Concerning the rural industrial towns and the market-towns, we find 4 out of 8 naturally developed, 2 out of 2 half naturally developed and 3 out of 3 artificially developed controlled over by territorial prince. It is interesting to note, however, that out of these towns, one naturally developed and one half naturally developed were granted the autonomy of town council during the period from 1551 to 1590. For further knowledge on the acquisition of the medieval rights by naturally developed towns and market-towns, consult G. v. Below: a.a.0., pp. 96-97.


\textsuperscript{119} G. v. Below: a.a.0., SS. 96-97.

Below clearly brings out the dual trends of rural market-towns: one, the acquisition by market-towns of the medieval-like power of compulsion over surrounding villages, and two, the aspiration for freedom by the market-towns against the above.
was a typical example of this sort.\textsuperscript{120}

On the contrary, we see a steady development in industry, though not showy on the face, carried on in the metal-working industries around the rural regions of \textit{Erzgebirge}. Indeed, here we perceive the difference in the internal economic structure between the two contrasting cases of communities with feudalism as their background, and how it may bring about different modes of development in marketing facilities.\textsuperscript{121}


\textsuperscript{121} M. Weber: a.a.0., SS. 443-446.