

Networks of Economic Relations between Rural and Urban Areas

The Economic Modernization of Transylvania in the Second Half of the 19th Century

IOSIF MARIN BALOG

From an economic point of view, very important for the general process of urbanization was the creation of the so-called “economically appealing areas” of towns and boroughs.

Iosif Marin Balog

Researcher at the Romanian Academy's George Bariț Institute of History of Cluj-Napoca, a specialist in economic and social history. Author of the book **Dilemele modernizării: Economie și societate în Transilvania 1850–1875** (The dilemmas of modernization: Economy and society in Transylvania, 1850–1875) (2007).

IF WE look at the latest trends in economic history, where states are seen as political and national entities while industrialization and modernization are analyzed as trans-regional phenomena, we notice that regional differences come to characterize and are the effect of economic processes. The historians of economics, Eastern or Western, have demonstrated the fact that the industrialization was first and foremost a regional process, and only then a “national” one. Therefore, any historical analysis must take into account the circumstances and the factors that favored the industrialization and urbanization of some regions, leaving others barely or even not at all affected by these processes. Even if the economic integration of regions into larger units has been accepted and even seen as a main component of economic growth, essential to the success of the political-national designs of the 19th century, historians only rarely started from the role played

by such regional models. The expansion of those “enclaves of modernization” and the damage caused in other areas by the process of integration and homogenization are but two of the many reasons that could inspire contemporary historians to adopt precisely such an approach.¹ The main aspects to be discussed in this context regard the factors that mediate the interactions between various historical regions and provinces, the type of regional division existing between various centers and, more interestingly, the types of relations and interactions that appear between the urban and the rural components of a region.²

Economic modernization, the emergence of the modern market economy and of the dynamic modern relations based on individual value and on a person’s economic potential and power have underpinned the major transformations occurred in the Austrian Empire during the second half of the 19th century. The process was a long and tortuous one, affecting both the rural and the urban environment. Change, sometimes seen as synonymous to economic progress, and sometimes not, became the fundamental law of society. It compelled the rural world to open up and abandon its previous autarchy and isolation as pre-requisites of economic development, placing it in confrontation with the urban environment and setting in motion the whole process of modernization. While Marx argued that the greatest division of material and spiritual labor is the separation between city and village, and that the opposition between city and village has been a constant presence in the history of civilization, the reality appears to be infinitely more complex than this eternal opposition, as demonstrated by historians, demographers, and sociologists.³ They also indicated that the economic modernization of a society cannot be accurately assessed unless one also takes into account the nature of the relations established between cities and villages in the context of the development of a modern industrial society. Urban expansion is seen as deriving from the urban phenomenon itself, with the urban attributes spreading across the rural area.⁴ According to others, the phenomenon includes both the intrusion of the urban into the rural, as well as the penetration of rural features into the urban space. Cities are joined together via thoroughfares, but they are also connected to the adjoining area that supplies them with raw materials and agricultural produce. The new means of transport, especially the railways, massively changed the situation: the railways brought with them modernity and the modern mentality. The city began to supply rural producers with more and more manufactured and industrial goods and services: commercial, medical, judicial and sometimes administrative, although the latter were not always welcome and sometimes imposed upon the rural inhabitants against their will. Gradually, the village became a source of political (electoral) support for the city.

The opening of the village towards the city was a complex process that proceeded at various speeds in the different stages of modernization and economic development. From this point of view, the period between 1850 and 1875 saw

the emergence in Transylvania of the conditions necessary to modern economic growth, a process that unfolded in keeping with the local situation and circumstances. Consequently, it developed a number of unique features, which have to do with the specific historical and political situation in the province and with its ethnic, linguistic, and cultural diversity. In the Habsburg Empire, and implicitly in Transylvania, the economic modernization which began in the mid-19th century brought to the forefront the urban environment, likely to set the pace required by economic development. The new developments experienced during this period by the urban environment are rather unprecedented, if we compare them to the previous period or even with the events occurring in the rural area. This, however, does not mean that the village remained a place of paralysis and isolation.

In order to measure the extent of urbanization in Transylvania, we have to take into account the fact that, according to the 1850 census, of the 2,796 fixed settlements, 25 were towns, 22 were suburbs (*Vorstädte*), 65 were boroughs (*Märkte*),⁵ while Hungary had 61 towns and 657 boroughs.⁶ In Transylvania, the regional peculiarities in terms of economic development and the constraints represented by the geographic location, soil, climate and resources, by the access to transport routes set a distinct pace to the process of modernization which, having started prior to 1848,⁷ continued in a new context after 1850.

From an economic point of view, very important for the general process of urbanization was the creation of the so-called “economically appealing areas” of towns and boroughs. These were precisely delineated areas which hosted the exchange of products between the various regions. These areas of appeal took shape starting with the Middle Ages, but gained more importance in the second half of the 19th century, following the modernization and the improvements in transport and communications, of the changes in the socio-professional structure and of industrialization. Thus, those analyzing the urbanization of 19th century Transylvania claim that at the beginning of that century for the boroughs the “area of appeal” was of approximately 20 km, reaching 50–60 km for the larger towns.⁸

Hungarian researcher Emma Lederer, drawing on the data of the census of 1869, which also included elements concerning the social structure of towns, identified three types of urban centers:⁹ industrial, semi-industrial, and mining centers. On the basis of these criteria, we see that in the 1870s the first category most certainly included Timișoara, where industrial workers represented 25% of the population; the second category included Arad and Oradea, with 11% industrial workers, while in Cluj 9% of the inhabitants worked in the industry. The trend is quite manifest if we look at the data of the 1910 census, when Timișoara had 7,155 industrial workers of an active population of 11,755, Arad 4,647 of 8,380, Cluj 3,295 of 7,230, Oradea 2,727 of 7,485.¹⁰

In what concerns the cities located outside the area enclosed by the Carpathians—Timișoara, Arad, Oradea—one essential element marked their development until the beginning of World War I: apart from the favorable geographic location, the railway connections (Timișoara in 1857; Arad and Oradea in 1858) ensured their access to the favorable markets of the 1860s and the 1870s, favoring the development of an active commerce, of a manufacturing industry, initially for food products (steam-powered mills, alcohol distilleries), and then in other sectors (agricultural machinery, industrial equipment). The development of these regional centers around the aforementioned cities was also discussed by the Hungarian researcher Pál Beluszky, who also operated with other, administrative-cultural indicators. According to these criteria, he identified in the Kingdom of Hungary a number of ten regional centers: Bratislava, Zagreb, Cluj, Szeged, Košice, Debrecen, Timișoara, Pécs, Arad, Oradea.¹¹

If we increase the number of criteria and indicators used to assess the importance of a city as a regional center, the list of the latter becomes longer. In this respect, we contend that one must take into account several indicators at the same time: the demographic weight, the economic function at industrial and commercial level, the relevant administrative and cultural functions, the ratio of non-agrarian population, coming to expand the initial socio-economic criterion limited to the industrial workers with the inclusion of the other typically urban socio-professional categories, such as merchants, craftsmen, etc. We come thus to a more complex definition, fitting the nature of the Transylvanian towns of this period.¹²

Thus, if we seek to map Transylvania from the vantage point of the area of economic appeal of the urban areas, we notice their interesting distribution and, at the same time, a number of other peculiarities, most notable among them the absence of an economically dominant area. Also, the areas identified by us cannot be seen as “pure,” given the large number of regional interferences dictated by the economic and geographic features of each area.

IN HISTORICAL Transylvania, the Cluj area was dominated by its major urban center, the city of Cluj, with a population of 19,612 inhabitants in 1850 and with a sustained demographic growth, so that by 1910 the city had 60,808 inhabitants.¹³ From an economic and geographic point of view, the area combined the agricultural potential of the plateaus located in the counties of Cluj, Dăbâca and Solnocul Interior with the potential of the mountain areas of the Western Carpathians, a source of animal produce, wood, and other raw materials. For this area, Cluj was the main manufacturing and then industrial center supplying industrial products to the rural area over considerable distances, a role it shared with other smaller towns like Turda, Dej, Gherla, and Zalău. In their turn, these towns had their own micro-areas of appeal, whose borders over-

lapped in the fringe areas.¹⁴ With the progress of industrialization and of the transport infrastructure, the competition between these centers increased, and so did the involvement of the rural areas in the new circuits, as indicated by the significant population increase of towns like Turda, Gherla and Dej.

At the beginning of the dualist period, Cluj was mainly an administrative and handicrafts center, lacking a major industry. In the early decades of the dualist period, most specialists agreed that one had to support the small industrial and trading activities, in order to turn the city into an area with a complex function for the wider possible area.¹⁵ In this respect, we have to mention first and foremost the actions and the efforts of the Budapest government: the creation of the University in 1872, the preservation and the extended role of certain regional institutions, such as the Regional Fiscal Directorate, the Regional Court, the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, the university clinics. The city also became a major financial center, second only to Sibiu in terms of capital, following the creation here of a branch of the Austro-Hungarian Bank and of branches of the commercial banks in Budapest. Quite natural in this context was the emergence of industrial units turning to good account the available raw material: the tobacco factory, the smelter of Solymossy et Co., Péter Rajka's agricultural machinery factory, the repair shops of the railway company, etc. Some were state-run or state-subsidized factories, others appeared amid the economic revival from the end of the 19th century and following the constructions boom, as in the case of the brick factory.¹⁶

In what concerns the area of appeal, Cluj undoubtedly had the largest one in the whole of Transylvania. The historians who investigated the origin of the industrial workers of Cluj according to their birthplace for the period between 1880 and 1910 identified two main areas of influence: an internal one, located in Cluj county, and an external one, consisting of the counties of Solnoc-Dăbâca, a part of Turda-Arieș and Alba de Jos, a part of Mureș-Turda, all in all, an area 200–300 km in diameter.¹⁷

The second largest area was the Târgu-Mureș area, which included the villages in the seat of Mureș and in the counties of Târnava, Turda, the seat of Sighișoara, and the county of Alba de Jos. This area of appeal gained contour especially in the second half of the 19th century, as the city developed from a demographic and urban point of view and emerged as a cultural and administrative center. The completion of the Războieni-Târgu-Mureș railway line in 1871 accelerated the development of the city. Alongside its alcohol distilleries and brewery, a sugar refinery began to operate here in 1893, with state funding and employing more than 400 people.

The smaller towns had their own areas of appeal: Reghin, Odorheiul Secuiesc, Mediaș, Dumbrăveni, Gheorgheni, Sighișoara. In the seat of Odorhei, the town of Odorheiul Secuiesc had an area of appeal covering most of the seat of Odorhei

and the affiliate seat of Caşin, on a radius of 20–25 km.¹⁸ Reghin had created its own area in the Mureş Valley, over a mixed and economically complementary region: the Mureş depression, specializing in wood and livestock trade, and the villages around Reghin, specializing in grain and vegetables. In its turn, the town of Gheorgheni created an area of appeal for the villages located in the Giurgeu depression and in the upper Ciuc area, which specialized in animal husbandry. Gheorgheni became the most important cattle market in eastern Transylvania.¹⁹ In the area of Trei Scaune (Háromszék), the zones of appeal were divided among Târgu Secuiesc and Sfântu Gheorghe, not forgetting the influence exerted by the major urban center of Braşov. Even Sighişoara created its own area, but the poor economic development of the city after 1867 diminished its influence in the area, given the competition represented by Târgu-Mureş and Sibiu.

The third area is that of southwestern Transylvania, with the counties of Hunedoara, Alba de Jos and Alba de Sus, and the seat of Arieş. The area saw little urbanization, as no town exceeded 10,000 inhabitants. The only urban center was Alba Iulia, with modest economic and demographic dynamics within the process of urbanization. Some “centers of appeal” did nonetheless appear in the region: the town of Aiud, with a small surrounding area limited to modest commercial activities, basically exchanges of products between the urban and the rural centers in the form of regular fairs; Abrud, a mining center, began to lose in importance, as indicated by the decreasing population (3,636 inhabitants in 1850; 4,129 in 1870, 2,869 in 1880).

Other areas of appeal were the smaller centers such as Baia de Criş and Câmpeni. The situation of the latter is quite interesting, as it emerged as a market town after 1850, mediating between the villages of the Western Carpathians and the adjoining areas. The poor economic development of this area persisted until the late 19th century, when the situation changed somewhat following the development of mining and metallurgy in the county of Hunedoara and in the Jiu Valley.

In the southeastern part of Transylvania, the presence of a great urban center with a long historical and economic tradition, the city of Braşov, led to the emergence of a dominant area of appeal which included the Land of Bârsa, Făgăraş and a few other fringe areas. From an economic and commercial point of view, at the middle of the 19th century Braşov was the main such center in Transylvania, the hub of Transylvanian commerce with the Danube Principalities and later with Romania, at least until the customs war of 1886–1891. It was also home to the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, established in 1851, which monitored and supervised economic activities throughout southern and eastern Transylvania until 1891, when it began to share this attribute with the city of Târgu-Mureş. Braşov also hosted the headquarters of the largest Transylvanian trading company, the Levantine (Romanian) Trade Gremium (Conglomerate) of Braşov, which controlled 90% of the wholesale trade on the Braşov market and, in 1854,

included 93 companies and had 168 members.²⁰ Located at the intersection of the main trade routes towards the Danube Principalities and the Black Sea, through five passes across the Carpathians, Braşov also favored the spread of economic activities towards the rural areas of the Land of Bârsa and Făgăraş, until the great restructuring that occurred after the outbreak of the customs war against Romania. The thriving economy of the Braşov area had a lot to do with its economic relations with the markets of the Danube Principalities, both in terms of exports and when it came to the import of raw materials.²¹

A relatively large number of small and medium industrial companies operated in the area: glass factories at Bicsad, Cârţa, Arpaşul de Sus, Porumbacul de Sus, with an annual turnover somewhere between 1,000 and 4,000 florins.²² At the middle of the 19th century, the textile mills were the largest industrial units in the area. The Zărneşti textile mill owned by Constantin Ioanovici produced in 10,574 kg of thread in 1851. Also important was the paper mill, which in 1856 operated with a subscribed capital of 155,000 florins and employed 150–200 workers.²³

Trade (in grain and raw materials, metal parts and tools, manufactured goods, cattle) increased steadily at least between 1850 and 1859, accounting for most of the overall trade of Transylvania and even surpassing in this respect the city of Sibiu. The phenomena that changed the economic configuration of the city and of its area of appeal in the second half of the 19th century included the railway connection established in 1873 and further extended as far as Romania in 1879. This opened new avenues for commerce, also favored by the ten years during which the customs agreement with Romania remained in force. The years of the customs agreement manifestly contributed to the development of the region, as imports and exports increased, and so did local trade. The weekly fair at Braşov remained a point of attraction throughout the whole 19th century. It took place every Friday between 8 in the morning and late in the afternoon, and it occupied the whole central square and nearly all of the nearby side streets. Pretty much everything could be bought and sold, from fruit and vegetables to grain and to household items, handmade or factory-made clothes, food, beverages, various groceries sold by the producers or by the chambers of commerce, which also operated some 200–250 shops. The annual fairs took place on 15–17 June and 19–21 October and were the largest in Transylvania, known as the *Wöllmärkte*. Apart from the usual goods sold at such annual fairs, the main products traded here were the grain and cattle imported from Romania to be processed in the factories of Transylvania or sold further into the Austrian Empire. Apart from the great specialized merchants, these annual fairs gathered participants on a 50–60 km radius.

With the progress of industrialization, fairs became increasingly specialized. Those that survived were mainly in the urban areas, and they converted to daily

commerce in response to increased consumption and to the expansion of the pre-urban hinterland. The last decades of the 19th century saw the massive restructuring of handicrafts and manufacturing units, with winners as well as losers. Some entrepreneurs adapted to industrial activities: F. Czell and his alcohol distilleries, Georg Dück and his leather processing plant and steam-powered mill, Georg Türk and his mill and lumber mill, as well as Julius Gmeiner, the owner of an oil refinery, or Scherg, who had a textile mill. This period also saw the inauguration of the sugar refinery at Bod. Following the development of economic activities, in 1910 Braşov had 46 industrial companies (as compared to 42 in Cluj).²⁴

It must be said, however, that Braşov also had a long-standing tradition of transit commerce, chiefly towards the areas south and east of the Carpathians, and from this point of view the “area of appeal” of this center extended far beyond the mountains, as demonstrated by the many businesses owned by Braşov entrepreneurs in cities like Bucharest, Brăila, Galaţi, Târgovişte, etc. Given the slow but steady decrease in transit commerce, capitals shifted in direction of production activities, indicating a clear process of modernization and a development of competitive market relations in regions previously limited to transit commerce.

The social life of Braşov also benefited from the prosperity of the local merchants. The first commercial school in Transylvania was founded here in 1869, nearly at the same time as the Association for the support of Romanian apprentices and novices led by archpriest Bartolomeu Baiulescu.²⁵

Another dynamic area, ethnically dominated by the Saxons, was the region known until 1876 as the Royal Land (*Fundus Regius*). Its main city was Sibiu, third largest in Transylvania after Braşov and Cluj, with 15,315 inhabitants in 1850 and 21,435 in 1857.²⁶ The city had industrial units that processed agricultural produce, such as the largest milk processing plant in Transylvania, several meat-packing plants, as well as the metallurgic and agricultural machinery factory of Andreas Rieger, etc.²⁷ The area of appeal for this city largely included the villages in the Mărginime region: Sălişte (4,422 inhabitants in 1857), Răşinari with 5,695 inhabitants, Tilişca with 2,406 inhabitants, Poiana Sibiului with 3,823 inhabitants, Orlat with 1,649 inhabitants, Sadu with 1,626 inhabitants.²⁸ These were important centers specializing mainly in animal husbandry and in the cattle trade with Romania, which peaked for the last time during the customs agreement with Romania (1875–1885).²⁹ These villages had roads connecting them to Sibiu, and many of them sought to become towns. However, the economic changes of 1850–1900 changed this evolution under the influence of a complex set of factors, such as the absence of a rail network and the marginalization of the area by government decision-makers.

The sixth area was that of northeastern Transylvania, where Bistriţa was the main urban center. Its area of appeal included the villages in the Bârgău Valley and the region of Năsăud, with the former border guards' villages along the

Ilva Valley and Sălăuța, as far as the border with Bukovina. Another important part of it was the region of Maramureș. The area had significantly moved towards modernity during the existence of the border regiments (until 1851), but the new trends in the direction of modernization and industrialization manifested themselves at a somewhat slower pace, leading to a more modest rate of urbanization. The very population of Bistrița increased at a slower pace than that of the great cities: 5,214 inhabitants in 1850; 6,690 in 1857; 7,212 in 1869.³⁰

OF COURSE, the aforementioned classification of regional centers and of the main cities as centers of appeal is essentially an analytical model, sufficiently rooted, though, in the economic realities of that time. Detailed investigations in this direction are needed, taking into account and analyzing a number of indicators to the quantitative extent allowed by the existing sources. In 1850–1875, when Transylvania met the pre-conditions for industrialization and self-sustained growth, this system continued to operate without any major differences as compared to the previous decades, until the end of the century; later on, as the economy and the society changed, this system of relations at the level of economic micro-regions was itself restructured. New articulations appeared in the relation between city and village, some general, some specific to the local realities created by the new economic context.



Notes

1. On the debates on these issues in international historiography, see, among others, P. K. O'Brien, "Do We Have a Typology for the Study of European Industrialization in the 19th Century?" *The Journal of European Economic History* 15, 2 (Fall 1986): 291–334; J. D. Marshall, "Why Study Regions? Some Historical Considerations," *The Journal of Regional and Local Studies* 6, 1 (Spring 1986): 1–12; J. G. Williamson, "Regional Inequality and the Process of National Development," *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, July 1965; R. Knunke, "Trade and Politics of the Zollverein Era," *Journal of Economic History*, Spring 1978: 307 sqq.
2. See in this respect the methodological suggestions proposed, among others, by Lajos Timár, "Regional Economic and Social History or Historical Geography?" *The Journal of European Economic History* 21, 2 (Fall 1992): p. 393 sqq.
3. See, in this respect, Edward A. Tiryakian, "The Changing Centers of Modernity," in *Comparative Social Dynamics*, eds. Erik Cohen and Moshe Lissiak (Boulder, 1985), 131–147.
4. Ilie Bădescu, *De la comunitatea rurală la comunitatea urbană* (Bucharest, 1980), 48 sqq.
5. Ioan Bolovan, *Transilvania între Revoluția de la 1848 și Unirea din 1918: Contribuții demografice* (Cluj-Napoca, 2000), 38. See also Ioan Bolovan and Sorina Paula Bolovan,

- “Transylvania until World War I: Demographic Opportunities and Vulnerabilities” (I & II), *Transylvanian Review* 17, 4 (Winter 2008): 15–40, and 18, 2 (Summer 2009): 133–145.
6. Ibid.
 7. Alexa Csetri and Ștefan Imreh, “Aspecte ale situației și dezvoltării orașelor din Transilvania (1786–1814),” *Studia Universitatis Babeș-Bolyai* (Cluj), ser. Historia, fasc. 2 (1966): 63 sqq.
 8. Judit Pál, *Procesul de urbanizare în scaunele secuiești în secolul al XIX-lea* (Cluj-Napoca, 1999), 225.
 9. Emma Lederer, *Az ipari kapitalizmus kezdetei Magyarországon* (Budapest, 1952), 133.
 10. For details, see Robert Nagy, “Centru și periferie în economia Ungariei în perioada dualismului: Cazul Transilvaniei, Banatului și Crișanei,” in *Centru și periferie*, eds. Corneliu Gaiu and Horațiu Bodale (Cluj-Napoca, 2004), 231–248. See also Iván Berend and György Ránki, *Magyarország gyáripara 1900–1914* (Budapest, 1955), 301–302. For the case of Cluj see also Robert Nagy, “The Demographic Changes and the Industrial Workers of Cluj between 1890–1948,” *Transylvanian Review* 18, Supplement No. 1 (2009): 51–55.
 11. Gábor Gyáni and György Kövér, *Magyarország társadalomtörténete: A reformkortól a második világháborúig* (Budapest, 1998), 50.
 12. See, in this respect, the model proposed by Gábor Sonkoly, “Was ist ‘urban’?—Die transsylvanischen Kleinstädte im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert: Eine statistisch-quantitative Studie in definitorischer Absicht,” in *Kleine Städte im neuzeitlichen Europa*, ed. Holger Th. Gräf (Berlin, 1997), 25–58. See also Holger Th. Gräf, “Problemen, Aufgaben und Methoden historischer Kleinstadtforschung,” in *ibid.*, 11–24.
 13. See also Ioan Bolovan, “Aspecte privind populația Transilvaniei între 1850 și 1910,” in *Schimbare și devenire în istoria României*, eds. Ioan Bolovan and Sorina Paula Bolovan (Cluj-Napoca, 2008), 610 sqq.
 14. Lelia Papp, “Evolution of Economic Activities and Their Impact upon the Population of Turda and Its Surrounding Rural Area: Second Half of the 18th Century–Beginning of the 20th Century,” *Transylvanian Review* 18, Supplement No. 1 (2009): 62–65.
 15. For these debates, see Nagy, “Centru și periferie.”
 16. Maria Roșca Rosen, “Dezvoltarea industrială a orașului Cluj în perioada 1867–1900,” *Studia Universitatis Babeș-Bolyai*, ser. Historia 17, 2 (1972): 55–70.
 17. Egyed Ákos, *A korszerűsödő és hagyományörző Erdély*, vol. 2 (Csíkszereda, 1997), 86–87. See also Nagy, “Centru și periferie,” 241.
 18. Pál, 227.
 19. Ibid., 231.
 20. National Archives, Brașov County Division, Coll. no. 180, *Gremiul de comerț românesc (levantin)*, doc. no. 20, 3 June 1850, pages 1–2, “Tablou cu membrii gremiului român de comerț levantin.”
 21. For the many quantitative economic data, see: *Bericht der Handels- und Gewerbekammer in Kronstadt an das hohe K.K. Ministerium für Handel Gewerbe und öffentliche bauten über den Zustand der Gewerbe, des Handels und Verkehrserhältnisse im Jahre 1851* (Kronstadt, 1853), 27; Apostol Stan, “Relații economice între Țara Românească

- și Transilvania 1848–1859,” *Studii și materiale de istorie modernă* (Bucharest) 4 (1973): 110–173; Eugen Pavlescu, *Meșteșug și comerț la românii din sudul Transilvaniei* (Bucharest, 1970).
22. N. G. V. Gologan, *Cercetări asupra trecutului comerțului românesc din Brașov* (Brașov, 1928), 32.
 23. Al. Bărbat, “Fabrica de hârtie de la Zărnești 1852–1872,” *Studii și materiale: Istorie* 4 (1962): 204, 217.
 24. Data on the number and importance of these companies in *Raportul Camerei de comerț și industrie din Brașov pe anul 1912* (Brașov, 1912), 49 sqq.
 25. C. Lacea, “Brașovul între anii 1871–1878,” *Țara Bârsei* (Brașov) 2 (1930): 145–156.
 26. *Recensământul din 1850: Transilvania*, ed. Traian Rotariu (Cluj, 1996); *Recensământul din 1857: Transilvania*, 2nd edition, ed. Traian Rotariu (Cluj, 1997); *A Magyar korona országában az 1870. év elején végrehajtott népszámlálás eredményei a hasznos házi állatok kimutatásával együtt* (Pest, 1870).
 27. See *Adressenbuch der Handel- und Gewerbe-Treibenden Hermannstadts* (Hermannstadt, 1878).
 28. *Recensământul 1857*.
 29. I. Hațeganu, *Mărginenii în viața economică a Transilvaniei și Vechiului Regat* (Brașov, 1941).
 30. See supra, note 26; Ioan Bolovan and Sorina Paula Bolovan, “Transylvania until World War I: Demographic Opportunities and Vulnerabilities (III),” *Transylvanian Review* 18, 3 (Autumn 2009): 67–81.

Abstract

Networks of Economic Relations between Rural and Urban Areas:

The Economic Modernization of Transylvania in the Second Half of the 19th Century

As the historians of economics have demonstrated the fact that industrialization was first and foremost a regional process, and only then a “national” one, any historical analysis must take into account the circumstances and the factors that favored the industrialization and urbanization of some regions, leaving others barely or not at all affected. One of the main aspects to be discussed in this context regards the types of relations and interactions that appear between the urban and the rural components of a region. Thus, from an economic point of view, very important for the general process of urbanization was the creation of the so-called “economically appealing areas” of towns and boroughs. These were precisely delineated areas which hosted the exchange of products between the various regions. The present study examines six such areas of Transylvania: the Cluj area, the Târgu-Mureș area, southwestern Transylvania (the counties of Hunedoara, Alba de Jos, Alba de Sus, the seat of Arieș), Brașov, the Royal Land (*Fundus Regius*), and northeastern Transylvania.

Keywords

Transylvania, economic relations, urbanization, village, city, 19th century