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Typologising Cities. Critical Reflections

Instead of referring to the general term ‘city’ – notoriously difficult to define – historians often speak of certain types of cities, highlighting either a key functional aspect or a visible feature of these more or less dense settlements: ‘agrotown’, ‘merchant city’, ‘port city’, ‘court city’, ‘working-class city’, ‘mining city’, ‘consumer/producer city’, to name but a few. To emphasise certain religious functions, the terms ‘bishop town’, ‘cathedral town’, ‘monastic town’, or, in the Indian context, ‘sacred city’ or ‘temple town’ have been introduced to the literature. Historians and historical enquiries, of course, are not the only source of typologies of cities. Over the last century, city planners, bureaucrats, and social scientists have contributed to the expansion and differentiation of city taxonomies. Some of the most popular categories also used outside academia – like ‘smart city’ or ‘garden city’ – are not historical coinages.

The workshop seeks to reconstruct where typologisation in urban history came from and what it was intended to achieve, either in a historiographical manner or in terms of the history of scholarship. One starting point is certainly Max Weber’s 1921 essay on the city and his (sociological) method of forming ideal types. In European urban historiography, Weber’s approach (including a first attempt at urban typification) was widely received and further developed, especially in the Institut für vergleichende Städtgeschichte in Münster and in the European project of historic town atlases (HTA).

During the workshop we want to trace these stages and to follow the question what we gain and what we lose when we assign certain cities to a category based on a supposed main characteristic or function. Also, are city types applicable only in their respective regional context? What would be the European equivalent of an Indian ‘temple town’? Which alternative terms can we use for engaging comparatively with cities?