

## ***Interactive comment on “Mid-19<sup>th</sup>-century building structure locations in Galicia and Austrian Silesia under the Habsburg Monarchy” by Dominik Kaim et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #3**

Received and published: 24 January 2021

The article "Mid-19th-century building structure locations in Galicia and Austrian Silesia under the Habsburg Monarchy" tries to reconstruct buildings locations in Galicia and Austrian Silesia in the period stated in the title. It brings a lot of new information based on the archival research of censuses data and analysis of cadastral and military maps. Although the manuscript in its present form is very interesting and informative, I recommend some changes. First of all, it should be explained in the introduction why exactly those two Habsburg provinces were chosen for analysis. I suppose the obvious reason is that part of both are today part of Poland. Perhaps it would be much better if authors concentrated only on Galicia, or if they compared (if there are) differences between those two provinces of the Habsburg/Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. Second,

C1

it is not clear is your analysis covering only rural areas? If yes, it should be stated in the title. Third, it should be clearly explained what types of buildings are included. This is the biggest problem of this article, according to my opinion. The authors divide the buildings into two categories – "residential" and "outbuildings". However, what kind of buildings are those called "residential" is not clear, because, at the page 4 of the article it is stated that this category includes also "some churches, monasteries, town halls or railway stations". According to my opinion, it is not appropriate, because those are public and religious, and not residential buildings. It is also very weird that only party of them ("some") and not all of them are analyzed. If I did not understand properly, and if the authors did include all of religious and public buildings into their research then it should be clearly stated in the article. If not, they should change the title of the article so to emphasize that they analyze only residential and farm buildings. Are all of those buildings really called just Wohngebäude in archival sources? If yes, it seems rather unusual to me, considering that Austrian surveys were mostly very precise. To conclude – if not all of those buildings were residential, then you cannot call them residential. Furthermore, although public and sacral buildings comprise only 1% of the buildings marked with "red" on maps, they were, almost always, the biggest buildings in places, so they should be included into your research. This way your article would be much useful for historians of architecture too. Regarding the second type of buildings that authors are analyzing, the term that they use - outbuildings – is very unusual, at least in architectural history. If I understood properly, it is the translation of the German word Wirtschaftsgebäude, and the authors also use for this type of buildings term "farm buildings". This German word, however, has broader meaning – Wirtschaftsgebäude are not only farm buildings, as can be clearly seen from dictionaries. Fourth and the last thing: on the page 6 it is stated "The censuses closest in time to the publication of the maps were organized in 1857 for Austrian Silesia (n=23) and in 1869 for Galicia (n=76)". According to my knowledge, both censuses (in 1857 and 1869) were organized in the whole Habsburg Monarchy, therefore also in Silesia and Galicia on both occasions.

C2

