

**The more transformations, the more chances to come across doubtful transformations.**

If we were not talking about historical facts, or about the way they are reported and ultimately reach us, this could be a sound assertion.

But when aligning vertically several *multi-hypothesis chronology diagrams* the assertion is soon denied (compare for instance *a* - Grand Scales - to *b*) - fish stalls - far more transformations in the former, far more doubts in the latter).

This is primarily due to the heterogeneity of historical records, in terms of quantity, of exhaustiveness, of precision, of trustworthiness.

But the way we, today, analyse and interpret historical evidence also plays a significant role in the emergence of doubts, when we for instance consider if a fire reported on edifice *A* could have spread to its neighbour edifice *B* (illustrated in *c* - baker's stalls - the 1445 fire reported in *c* is confirmed on the neighbouring salt stalls, but its actual impact on the bakers' stalls is not confirmed by sources), or when we investigate on parentage relations between edifices (illustrated in *d*, Rich stalls).

**Fig. 16** A comparison of four *multi-hypothesis chronology diagrams*. The grey rectangle corresponds to a duration of one century.

- a) Grand Scales,
- b) fish stalls,
- c) bakers' stalls with the bread benches considered as the possible first element of bakers' stalls' evolution,
- d) Rich Stalls with several artefacts that can be considered as the possible first element of Rich Stall's evolution.

