

BABEŞ–BOLYAI UNIVERSITY

FACULTY OF PHILOLOGY

DOCTORAL SCHOOL OF HUNGAROLOGY STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF HUNGARIAN ETHNOGRAPHY AND ANTHROPOLOGY

Doctoral Thesis

Furu Árpád:

ZONES OF TRANSYLVANIAN RURAL ARCHITECTURE

Scientific coordinator:

prof. dr. acad. Pozsony Ferenc

SUMMARY IN ENGLISH

Key words: rural architecture, vernacular architecture, Transylvania, settlement layout, plot arrangement, dwelling house, layout, baking oven, fire place, tiled oven, tiles, structure, walls, slabs, roof structure, roof coverings, verandah, portico, façade ornaments, ancillary buildings, baking houses, granary, barns, barns with cruck frames, barns with stables, entrance gates, timber gates, tall entrance gates, Seckler-gates, stone gates, rural architectural zones

ZONES OF TRANSYLVANIAN RURAL ARCHITECTURE – ENGLISH SUMMARY

Transylvanian Rural Architecture is very diverse and complex. The functional, structural and formal diversity of the buildings; plot and settlement structures; and the rich ornamentation of different buildings, are a direct consequence of the geographical, socio-economical and ethno-cultural complexity of the area.

The main objective of this thesis is to analyze the rural architectural zones of Transylvania, a region that historically was populated by several ethnic, social and religious groups. I wished to identify the nature of architectural differences, the way these differences can be evaluated, the process of fragmentation in macro and micro-zones of rural architecture. However, I was interested most in the main factors that determined these changes, and in the relationship between change and the general socio-cultural factors and influences.

The area covered by this analysis is Transylvania, a territory surrounded by the Eastern, Southern and Western Carpathians. This comprises the north-western part of Romania only and therefore excludes the Banat, Crisana and Maramureş regions. This study investigates the changes in rural architecture between the mid-18th century and the mid-20th century.

The subject of this analysis is the architecture created by people that lived in rural villages and were mainly employed in agrarian based industries. A common characteristic of these buildings is that they were built without the involvement of an architect but were the result of the direct work of their owner and/or the local community. Later, some of this work would have been coordinated by a master craftsmen. The rural architecture can be interpreted as the accumulation throughout long periods of time of certain well elaborated and crystallized architectural solutions. The rural dwelling-houses and their ancillary buildings are very well and logically positioned, a characteristic that has been influenced by multiple socio-economical factors. It has therefore also been necessary, as part of this study, to analyze the arrangement of courtyard and settlement structures.

During this study I very rarely focused on ecclesiastical, urban or high status architecture. I consider these groups of buildings to be outside the domain of rural architecture, but I am aware that certain solutions in ecclesiastical, urban and high status architecture can be factors that influence rural architecture.

I consider that the analysis of rural architecture from an ethnic point of view cannot lead to scientifically well based results. I therefore analyzed the elements of rural architecture with scientific rigor observing that they are influenced by geographical, socio-cultural factors that are connected to the lifestyle of certain communities and I tried to avoid the traps of false ethnic labelling and stereo-typing. I have presented the architecture of the mixed regions from a holistic view, so in the case of mixed regions, such as the Târnava Area or the Transylvanian Hill area, the material provided is characteristic of both Romanian and Hungarian communities. Of course, in fairly ethnically homogenous areas like the Seckler Area or the Mărginimea Sibiului Area the conclusions presented characterize the majority group, if not, it will be mentioned.

One of the most important challenges of the research was the linguistic and territorial disproportionality of the existing specialized literature. Some ethnographic areas are very well known and documented, whilst others are less so. Furthermore, my personal field of research was completed with different detailing and depths due to material and financial reasons. In some regions it was possible to make an inventory of every traditional building but in others I could only investigate representative structures. From 1996, I had the opportunity to carry out

thorough and detailed research in Rimetea, Călata, Odorhei Region, Covasna Region, Arieș Region, Niraj Valley and Gheorgheni. However, I could only investigate representative buildings in Ciuc, Ghimeș, Săcele, Târnava Valley Area and in the Transylvanian Hill Area., Borșa Valley, Ghiurghiu Area, Țara Făgărașului Region, Mărginimea Sibiului Region. Fully aware of the detailed results of certain studies and field research completed by other specialists, In a few places, I only confirmed previous research. These included the Saxon Area, in some villages near Rupea, Sibiu, Sighisoara, Medias, in Țara Bârsei Region and in the Bistrița area. In the case of the Pădureni Region and the Western Carpathians Region, I based most of my analysis on the very valuable and diverse studies that have been published. This enabled me to complete some smaller scale field research as in the case of the Pădureni Region and the Western Carpathians Region.

Although the larger amount of data available for some of the regions influenced the structure of this thesis, I am convinced that I was able to use sufficient data for all areas of the regions studied. I consider that the results are scientifically well based and sufficiently demonstrated but I cannot exclude the possibility that new field research would contribute to the fine tuning and further modulation of the conclusions.

The thesis has the following structure: after the introduction, the results of the scientific research on the rural architecture of Transylvania completed by Hungarian, Romanian and German authors, from the mid-19th century through to the present day, are presented. After the presentation of the hypothesis, there is a chapter dedicated to the methodology of the research. From this point the content can be divided in two major parts, dedicated to the analysis and the synthesis. The main constitutive elements and factors of rural architecture are discussed in several chapters. The analysis of settlement structures is followed by a presentation on courtyard arrangements. Three chapters are dedicated to the dwelling-house, one each on the layout and heating systems, one on the structural components and one on formal characteristics: proportion and decoration. A chapter focuses on the ancillary buildings that served the different agricultural-related purposes within the plot, followed by a large chapter on traditional gates and features with multiple, even symbolic, significance. The analysis of the constituting elements of rural architecture provided, forms the framework for their contribution to the differences between the various architectural zones. These chapters introduce the most important part of the work. This is the synthesis dedicated to the different rural architectural macro and micro zones. Here, I have discussed the relatively standard village architecture of the 18th century and how this changed. Later, this resulted in the fragmentation of various rural

architectural zones. This phenomenon culminated at the end of the 19th century and the first decades of the 20th century. The thesis ends with the presentation of the conclusions.

During my research I was supported both scientifically and financially by a series of institutions. These included the Transylvania Trust Foundation, The Ethnographic Museum of Transylvania in Cluj, the National Seckler Museum in Sfântu Gheorghe, The Molnar István Museum from Cristuru Secuiesc, the Haáz Rezső Museum from Odorheiu Secuiesc, the Kriza János Ethnographic Society. These institutions allowed me access to their photographic archives to assist my research. I also thank my professors and colleagues, Dr. Balassa M. Iván, Dr. Pozsony Ferenc, Szőcsné Gazda Enikő, Fodor Attila, Vajda András, Tötszegi Tekla, Miklós Zoltán, Domokos Levente, Salló Szilárd, Adriana Stroe, and to the sponsors of the research: The National Cultural Fund from Hungary, Balassi Institute, Communitas Foundation and to Dr. Andrea H. Schuler.

The results of the research are multiple. However, the most important aspect is, that for the first time a general synthesis based on uniform criteria has been completed for the whole of Transylvania. Previous studies either concentrated on smaller areas or focused partially on the ethnography or architecture of certain ethnic groups. This study concentrated primarily on the architecture in general, so it considered all the main groups that lived in Transylvania.

As mentioned previously, I could not always base my research on the territorially homogenous data that did not uniformly characterize the evolution, over time, of the architectural phenomena, I am still convinced that I was able to determine successfully the macro and micro zones of rural architecture of the studied area, as well as the development over time of these zones, the extent and character of certain changes, and the interference and influences between these special zones. I also established, with sufficient precision, most factors that influenced the development of rural architecture.

The identification of various factors of certain architectural micro and macro zones that were previously unknown is also an important achievement. Before the start of our field studies there were no studies published about the late 19th and early 20th century architecture of Rimetea, Călata region. The architectural value of the Arieș Region, Odorhei Area, Niraj Valley Area or the Gheorgheni Area had also not been systematically scrutinized and published.

CONCLUSIONS ON THE EVOLUTION OF RURAL ARCHITECTURE AND THEIR FACTORS OF INFLUENCE

1. The most important factor that influences the evolution and character of rural architecture is the lifestyle of those communities that create the houses, buildings and settlements. The lifestyle determines the type of economic or agricultural production which in turn determines the form of the settlement, the street pattern, the functional arrangement of the courtyard, the ancillary buildings but also the layout of the main house. Communities with different lifestyles created different rural architecture, for example a village formed by shepherds differs from a village established by miners, or from a village of a community that has a balanced agricultural production.
2. The natural environment determines the architectural heritage in a direct and indirect way. Firstly, the geographical and climatic factors determine the nature and form of the economic and agricultural activities. In this way they influence the lifestyle and as a consequence they influence the built environment. Geographic, geologic and climatic factors also determine the materials available for construction. Thirdly, the buildings have to protect the population from the various climatic effects (wind, precipitation, temperature) that vary with geographic position.
3. Another very important factor is the social status of the particular communities. The architecture of historically privileged or free communities differs essentially from the architecture of communities with feudal ties. The social status influences directly the material situation, the right to use certain material resources, but also generates certain needs for higher quality and representation that will be reflected in the quality of the architecture.
4. The ethnic and linguistic aspect influences to a much lesser extent and only indirectly to the evolution of architecture. If the ethnic differences overlap with a special and different social status then the architecture will also differ, but the architecture of different ethnic and religious groups that live under similar social conditions is identical. Religion has a relatively minor influence, with symbolic features, for example crosses or stars in different forms, displayed on buildings.
5. In a certain place at a certain time the factors that influence rural architecture are mostly constant, so families with approximately similar material and social

conditions have lived in fairly similar built environments, the layout and structure of their houses and ancillary buildings were also very similar.

6. In a certain place at a certain time families with different social and material conditions used buildings that differed less or more from each other. The buildings of families with poorer material conditions were equivalent to buildings used by the wealthier families of previous generations.
7. Development in rural architecture occurred by adopting evaluated solutions, that were not very dissimilar to the previous ones. Small scale mansion houses and the ore buildings on the outskirts of towns and cities provided the models for these evaluated solutions.

THE LEVELS OF ARCHITECTURAL ZONES

1. **The four different layouts** that are typical of Transylvanian dwelling-houses of the 18th century, provide the basis for the macro-zones of rural architecture. These are as follows:

a. **The zone of the house with storage room**

This is characteristic of the Romanian population in the mountain areas of the Apuseni Mountains and the Pădureni Area. This form is also associated with the architecture of Gorj and the Vâlcea region.

b. **The zone of the house with weathering**

This house type has a room heated by a tiled stove and is typical of dwelling-houses in the eastern strip of the Seckler Area. This form is the result of an intern evolution based on the small mansion house model.

c. **The zone of the house with baking oven in the kitchen**

This type is evident in central Transylvania where architectural development was influenced by mansion houses and urban architecture.

d. **The zone of the house with baking oven in the main room**

This type can be found in from Northern Transylvania and is also a form used in large areas including the northern territories of Hungary.

In the 19th century, the zone of the house with baking oven in the kitchen spread towards the east and west, decreasing the zone of houses with storage and the houses with weathering.

Towards the north there is a larger zone of transition where both specific functional forms are present. From the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century, the house with a room-kitchen-room layout becomes the preferred plan form in all four zones.

The form and position of the heating system developed according to the characteristics of the four different macro zones, however, certain details help us to define certain micro zones. Particular types of baking ovens and tiled stoves developed in the central Transylvanian region, including in Rimetea, the Arieș Region, the Southern Saxon Areas and the Mureș Valley region, whereas local types are known in northern Transylvania, in the Bistrița Region and in Călata Region. In the Eastern Transylvanian Strip the stoves are characteristic of the northern Odorhei region and the Homorod Area. In the other areas, the different forms vary through the use of different clay tiles produced by various local manufacturers. The four macro zones represent the starting point of further fragmentation caused by the use of various building materials and locally distinctive decoration.

2. **The structural solutions** and the materials used in construction were influenced by the natural environment but also the social and material state of the population. The use of construction materials that are the result of manufacture or an industrial process, for example lime, brick or glass, is a clear consequence of an improved standard of life and a higher degree of economic development within certain communities.

The structural techniques and the building materials used played an important role in determining the extent of certain architectural micro zones. By the 18th century, the use of stone and brick for walling in conjunction with clay tile roof coverings, had become characteristic of the Southern Saxon areas. Such changes altered the overall architectural appearance of the Homorod area in the early 19th century and in Ținutul Împădurit area in the late 19th century. Stone walls become important in the delimitation of the Borșa Valley area in the first half of the 19th century and then after 1870 in Rimetea. The North West part of the Câmpia Transilvaniei area became distinct due to the use of earth (adobe) walls. The freely available good quality timber in the mountain region allowed for buildings to be constructed exclusively from timber. The use of timber for construction also extended to the hill areas adjacent to the high mountain areas. In the hilly regions of central Transylvania most houses built in the 18th century were constructed from timber-frames with wattle and daub infill panels. Due to slow economic development in this region, brick did not become the dominant walling material in the area until the middle of the 20th century.

Although walling materials are important in the fragmentation of micro zones, it did not influence, or had very little influence, on the development of the layout of buildings. Ceilings have not influenced the fragmentation of architectural zones. Timber boarded ceilings were universally used in the whole region, as well as the roof structures. The techniques and materials utilized for the roof coverings evolved similarly in most places of the study area. For example, thatched roofs were replaced by shingles and eventually clay tile roof coverings became universal. Reed thatch was only used in certain specific areas such as the Câmpia Transilvaniei Region. The height of a roof was determined not only by the type of roof covering, but also by the local climate. Thatch needs a steep roof pitch with an angle that sometimes exceeds 60 degrees. Meanwhile, shingles are normally laid on a roof pitch between 45-55 degrees but in high mountain areas shingle roofs were built with a 60 degree pitch. In all the areas studied, clay tiled roofs were built with a roof pitch of around 45 degrees. The development of porticos and verandas was similar throughout the study area but there are distinctive local characteristics. For instance, in Ținutul Arieșului the verandas have smaller arched ends, whilst in the Ținutul Împădurit region a variety of brick columns and arches can be found. The attached closed porch is typical of the Saxon area whilst the portico with weathering is characteristic of the Odorhei region.

3. **The finishes and decoration** are usually a direct consequence of the material welfare of certain communities, as well as the need for social representation. By the late 18th and early 19th centuries the decoration on facades had become a tool in social and community representation in the Saxon Areas, in the Homorod region and in Rimetea. Here, the external elevations of buildings are only part rendered and the window surrounds and frames are painted red. In the Saxon areas and partially in the southern Seckler areas decorative motifs were painted on wet plaster applied to external elevations. These motifs were influenced by ecclesiastical and urban decorative art,. In these same regions, Classicist and Baroque stucco and geometric plaster decoration become popular during the second half of the 19th century. These colorfully painted, facades, influenced by urban and church art, are visible evidence of the changes in thought and taste of villagers at the end of the 19th century. The spread of various types of decoration on timber elements in rural architecture is also the result of the important changes that occurred from the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th century. Naturally, these happened on a larger scale in areas where timber was more readily available. First, portico columns were carved and then joints were decorated. The balustrades were also richly decorated, but is very difficult to find patterns or groups of motifs that are representative of

certain smaller architectural zones. Finally, the last phase comprised rich decoration to the timber walls that formed the gable ends that face the street or courtyard elevations. These solutions have local significance in areas such as Călata, Valea Nirajului or the Arieș Region. In most regions, the development of doors and windows has been relatively similar, therefore their contribution to zonal fragmentation is minimal.

4. **The ancillary buildings** are directly influenced by the agricultural production of the area and the social status and welfare of the owner. Baking houses were built throughout the study area but originated from different periods. The privileged groups are at the forefront of these changes. Baking houses had been built in the Seckler and Saxon areas by the end of the 19th century. The last areas where baking houses started to be used were in Călata and the Câmpia Transilvaniei area.

The method of storing cereals and other crops can vary from region to region. Granaries were used to store grain in a quite large area of Central Transylvania. This includes the area that covers the Arieș Area, Câmpia Transilvaniei Area, the Someș Valley area, the valleys of the Târnava and Mureș rivers, and even parts of the Seckler land. Granaries have a simple rectangular layout and a little portico is added in front of their entrance door. This probably evolved from polite architecture. In the other areas, cereals were mainly stored in different rooms of the house or other buildings. Up until the end of the 19th century, corn stores were made from woven panels. After this time, there was a slow transition to batten structures. This special building type can be found almost everywhere where corn is cultivated, therefore in most of the hill areas. Wheat stores are special tall timber-frame buildings covered by a roof. They are only characteristic of the Salt District and parts of the Valea Niraj region.

Barns are the largest ancillary buildings and there are many local and regional forms. This building type is therefore very useful when determining architectural micro zones. In the Saxon Areas and the South of Transylvania, the large timber-frame barn is dominant. Examples can also be found built partly from stone or even brick. These can be either just large halls used to store hay and to thresh, or they can contain stables for large animals. Sometimes, a middle portico with a horizontal roof enlarges the threshing area. In the Bistrița zone such barns were sometimes constructed under the same roof as the dwelling-house. Barns in the Seckler area are mostly built out of logs, with some containing stables. The storage area in these barns is called odor and is characteristic of this building type. In the Odorhei Region, a fourth bay is frequently added to the barn. These additional bays are open towards the courtyard and are mainly used to store carts. In the Odorhei region the large barn doors were often decorated with

carvings. In the Salt District and the Niraj Valley area a ventilation strip with a wooden frame was introduced below the eaves line of the roof. Occasionally, carved columns can be found decorating this detail. In the Niraj Valley area some of the timber barns have entrances within their gable ends. These gable ends are decorated like the gable walls of the houses.

Cruck-framed barns, exclusively used for threshing, were built in the central Transylvanian regions, including the Târnava Area, the Câmpia Transilvana Area, the Someș Valley area and the Arieș Area. Many other types of barns stand adjacent to these structures, some incorporating stalls or stables. The architectural forms and massing of the barns also contribute to the local character.

In the high mountain area, the Apuseni Mountains and Pădureni Region, the barns contain a stable and a storage room. Here, the most distinctive barn type is the polygonal barn.

The pens, sties and other small structures were built very similarly in most architectural areas. They are therefore not relevant as zoning criteria.

5. The various traditional **entrance gate types** contribute enormously to the definition of architectural micro and macro zones. From this point of view, we can divide Transylvania into three large parts. The Southern large area, dominated by the Saxon settlements, can be characterized by the use of high masonry walls and entrance arches built to connect the street fronts of houses. This became a very distinctive characteristic of this area. To the north of this region, there is a large strip starting at the western borders of the Seckler area and extending to the higher mountains in the west. This contains the Niraj Valley, Salt District, Târnava Valley, Mureș Valley, Arieș Valley and Călata region. Here, carved and covered small timber gates were built. These developed using churchyard doors as a model. In this vast area, a variety of local types were employed, differing by their carved decoration. The third area roughly overlaps the Seckler territories. Here, a large variety of forms, materials and decoration can be found. Influenced by high-status architecture, the large carved and covered timber gates were often enriched with dove-houses. The latter became very wide-spread. These gates, named Seckler gates by Hungarian ethnographers, were produced in several local variants. The gate with round windows of the Covasna region differs from the Ciuc gate and the three types of Odorhei gates. In parallel with the tall carved gates, is a small gate type with masonry piers that became popular in the Covasna area. This was also influenced by polite architecture. In addition, the Saxon large masonry gate type were often used next to local variants of the small or tall carved stone gates that had developed.

6. Most forms of **settlement layout and plot arrangements** are present in almost every architectural zone, although their percentage differs. In order to determine local characteristics both settlement structure and courtyard arrangements are used similarly in my analysis. In the Seckler Area of Covasna, Ciuc, Gheorgheni and partially in Mureş, the villages are mostly nucleated and courtyards have grouped or cross barn arrangement. The splitting up of existing plots within settlements also spread, generating dead end streets. Over time these nucleated villages became more uniform, the plots became narrower giving birth to a more rigid courtyard arrangement. In the Saxon areas villages have a more urban character, both the street structures and the courtyard arrangements are very uniform. Regular villages with branching multi-street structures are formed by narrow and long plots. Houses are usually built on the street front connected by tall entrance gates and the courtyards are either linear or have a cross barn. In the Bistriţa Area, as well as possessing the aforementioned characteristics, houses are often built parallel with the street. Roads become wider in the centre of these settlements, where the church is usually positioned. More archaic dwelling-houses are built under the same roof as the stables and the barn. Most houses also have a entrance door directly from the street.

In the Târnava Valley area and the Mureş Valley, between Reghin and Sebes, most settlements have a regular pattern, although irregular parts and plots can also be found. Settlement structures are branching multi-street ones, whilst plots are narrow and long as in the Saxon Areas. However, courtyards are less regular and rigid, the fences and gates are more transparent, and the positioning of the buildings is also more flexible.

In the Rimetea region the settlement structure and courtyard arrangements are just as ordered as in the Saxon areas. The multi-street settlements have long and narrow plots, both linear and transversal arrangement can be found. Most villages in the Arieş Region have a clustered core around which a regular narrow-plot structure has developed. The plot sizes vary, most are narrow but there are some wide ones with a double courtyard arrangement. The others have parallel or transversal arrangement.

In the Câmpia Transilvaniei area most villages have a nucleated arrangement with many irregular plots. Here, the courtyard arrangement is very diverse. A large number of grouped courtyards and some double courtyards can be found next to parallel and transversal courtyards,. Some of the settlements developed in the 20th century have a rectangular street structure. During this same period many independent isolated farmsteads were established. In the Călata region villages are branching or Y-shaped, plots are usually narrow with linear or transversal arrangement. Rarely certain clustered village cores and irregular courtyards can be found. In the Apuseni Mountains and Pădureni Region many valley villages can be found next

to clustered villages. A large number of isolated farmsteads and shelters were established on the mountain slopes. This aspect provides a distinctive character to this mountain region. In contrast, the valley settlements of the Tara Făgăraşului region have a long, multi-street structure. Here, most courtyards have a linear form but there are also examples of cross barn arrangement. In Mărginimea Sibiului and Hunedoara Region nucleated villages have mainly transversal courtyards. In these regions a large number of isolated farmsteads have a strong contained arrangement. This form is also evident in some of the grouped settlements.

CONCLUSIONS REGARDING THE EVOLUTION OF CERTAIN ARCHITECTURAL ZONES

1. The main cause of the fragmentation in rural architectural zones is the different social and economic development of regions with different economical, social and cultural potential. Although the development of rural architecture mostly follows similar steps, the change is at a different rate and reaches certain stages at different times.
2. In the development of Transylvanian rural architecture, two privileged regions, the Saxon and secondly the Seckler areas, had a decisive role.
3. The basis for the fragmentation into architectural zones is the four macro zones presented earlier. one can already define zones with faster development In the first part of the 18th century, for example, Tara Bârsei Region, the seven Saxon Seats around Sibiu, Bistriţa Zone and the micro zone defined by the mining settlement of Rimetea.
4. The fast evolution in the Tara Bârsei and other Southern Saxon areas was realized by the adoption of modern technologies that needed a higher degree of technical knowledge, such as stone and brick masonry, and clay tile roof coverings.
5. The faster evolution in the Saxon Areas induced similar changes in all the neighboring territories but with a certain delay. Throughout the 19th century, the architecture of the Sacele region and Tara Făgăraşului region changed. Although timber was continuously used for construction in the Mărginimea Sibiului Area, the layout of the houses, the heating systems and the plot structure showed Saxon influence. In Hunedoara and Hateg the influences changed the layout but also the decoration and faade appearance. Changes in materials, mass and decoration can be noticed in the Târnavă Area, the southern regions of the Seckler Area, the Homorod Region, Ținutul Țmpădurit and Southern Covasna Region and in the west of the Odorhei Area.

6. The same evolution is witnessed in the Bistrița region but at a slower pace. However, here certain local architectural solutions were adapted. Later in the 19th century, strong urban influences redrew the architectural appearance of these villages.
7. The urban transformation of the Saxon architecture that took place from the beginning of the 19th century slowed down during the first decades of the 20th century. This way the continuous evolution of the surrounding areas reduced the differences between these and core of Saxon Territory.
8. The architectural evolution in the Seckler Areas was influenced greatly by the small mansion houses, and to a lesser extent by ecclesiastical architecture. However, there were also strong urban influences transferred from the Saxon Areas. The internal results of architectural development represented a source of inspiration for the architectural development in the Târnava area, the Câmpia Transilvana area and in the Mureș Valley area. The Arieș Region influenced development in the mountain areas of the Apuseni Mountains.
9. The Western Strip of the Seckler areas, that was more densely populated, had a better climate and benefited from its association with Saxon Areas, developed faster. Micro zones appeared due to local development and also because of urban and Saxon influences,. These micro zones are not very different, but there are some strong local architectural features like the complex porticos in the Valea Feernic, the perforated gable walls in the Salt District, or the lateral gable walls in the Niraj Valley region.
10. In the Eastern Strip of the Seckler Land the more archaic character of the architecture was maintained for a longer time. Factors that contributed to this slower evolution were the colder climate; poor agricultural potential and also the negative effects of the obligations imposed by Austrian border military police. A more substantial modernization only became possible at the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century. Some local architectural features provided identity to micro zones here and in the Valley of Rau Negru, in Ciuc and also in Gheorgheni.
11. The local character of the micro zones in the Seckler Area is strengthened by the presence of various local gate types, a phenomena described earlier.
12. The distinctive character of the local architecture in Rimetea was determined by the economical power of the mining and manufacturing community. Local solutions for decoration on buildings and roof forms was already spreading in the 18th century. A radical change in the local architecture took place at the end of the 19th century. Timber buildings were replaced by stone ones, more urban ornament types were adopted and locally made

iron details were also used. Saxon examples can also be identified. The architecture of Rimetea did not have a major impact on the neighboring villages.

13. The change in building materials, the transfer from mixed timber-framed structures to stone walls produced the micro zonal character of the Borșa Valley region. However, this change was not strengthened by other architectural developments, such as façade decoration. As a consequence the development of this area slowed down and differences between the neighbors have been slowly reduced.
14. From the second half of the 19th century the local aspect of various regions was determined by the needs for local personal and community representation, that materialized mainly in the decoration on facades. At the same time, building layouts start to become standardized.
15. The last important developments in rural architecture were provided by the ornamental elements in Călata, Niraj Valley and Salt District regions. To a smaller extent, similar development took place in Arieș Area, and in Gheorgheni and Hateg region. In Călata region the strong architectural character of this late development exerted a significant influence on the neighboring territories. The carved entrance gates and the decorated gable ends were adopted also in the Apuseni Area, in Sălaj and in the western areas of the Câmpia Transilvana region.
16. The architecture in the Câmpia Transilvană region became special because of its long lasting archaic elements. Here, the urban influence had manifested in a very minimal form. Similarly, we could witness slow and not very significant development in the Apuseni Mountain Area, where modernization gradually occurred only in the 20th century. In the Apuseni Mountain Region and the Pădureni Region, the presence of scattered isolated farms and shelters play an important role in determining the local character of the architectural zone.
17. Over the first decades of the 20th century, there has been faster architectural development next to the most important trade routes. Houses in these areas were replaced every 30-40 years by new ones and therefore the local character of these areas vanished completely. Such strips can be identified next to the Mureș River between Reghin and Vintu de Jos, next to Arieș river between Turda and Hădăreni, and next to the Someșul Mic and Someșul Mare rivers between Cluj and Dej, and Beclean and Dej.
18. As a consequence one can identify three large areas where architectural development and the zonal fragmentation followed different patterns. These are the Southern Transylvanian areas, so the former Saxon Areas and their neighbouring areas, the territory North and East to the first one, mostly the territory of the Seckler Area, and the large central Transylvanian

territory between the Ciuc and Ghoergheni Mountains and the Apuseni Mountains, and a third northern strip, that contains the Bistrița Area, Năsăud and Someș Valley Area. Development was very slow in the Câmpia Transilvana region and the Apuseni region, where the last stage in architectural development and the use of ornamental elements for representation is almost completely missing.

19. The last important development in rural architecture, determined by the need for community and personal representation, materialized by local decorative art that took place in Călata, Niraj Valley and Salt District regions. This did not end in the 1950s, their effects could be identified with decreasing memento until the sixth and seventh decades of the 20th century.
20. We can therefore declare that unlike in the more western areas of the Carpathian Basin the fragmentation in rural architectural micro zones of Transylvania happened later. Similarly, the integration process of rural architecture in the West was completed at the end of the 19th century. In Transylvania this started later and partially overlapped with the continuous development of micro zonal architecture in certain areas. The phenomena of traditional architecture vanishes in Transylvania only with start of communist modernization and under the effect of present day globalization.

CONTENTS

THE ZONES OF TRANSYLVANIAN RURAL ARCHITECTURE

1.	INTRODUCTION	9
2.	OVERVIEW OF THE RESULTS OF THE RESEARCH ON TRANSYLVANIAN RURAL ARCHITECTURE	15
2.1	FROM THE BEGINNING UNTIL WORLD WAR ONE	15
2.2	BETWEEN THE TWO WORLD WARS	21
2.3	BETWEEN 1945-1989	25
2.4	POST-1989	34
2.5	CONCLUSIONS	43
3.	HYPOTHESIS	46
4.	THE METHODOLOGY OF IDENTIFYING OF THE RURAL ARCHITECTURAL ZONES	48
4.1	FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES	48
4.2	TIME AND SPATIAL ANALYSIS OF THE VARIABLES	50
4.3	THE ORGANIZATION OF THE RESULTS	55
5.	GEOGRAPHICAL UNITS OF THE ZONE ANALYSIS	57
5.1	THE GEOGRAPHICAL AREA OF THE RESEARCH	57
5.2	THE IDENTIFICATION OF THE GEOGRAPHICAL SUB-UNITS	57
5.2.1	The Seckler Area	58
5.2.2	The Saxon Area	59
5.2.3	The area of the counties	59
6.	SETTLEMENT LAYOUT AND PLOT ARRANGEMENT	61
6.1	SETTLEMENT LAYOUT	61
6.1.1	Nucleated villages	65
6.1.2	Regular villages	67
6.1.3	Rectangular villages	69
6.1.4	Dispersed villages and isolated farmsteads	70
6.1.5	Isolated farmsteads in the hill area	75
6.1.6	Settlement layout and their development	75
6.1.6.1	The Seckler area	79
6.1.6.2	The Saxon area	79
6.1.6.3	The area of the other counties	80

6.1.6.4	Mountain areas	80
6.2	PLOT ARRANGEMENT	81
6.2.1	Group plan	82
6.2.2	Double yard plan	83
6.2.3	Parallel plan	88
6.2.4	Linear and cross-barn plans	88
6.2.5	Plots in dispersed settlements	91
6.3	CONCLUSIONS	91
6.3.1	The Seckler Area	92
6.3.2	The Southern Saxon Area	93
6.3.3	The Northern Saxon Area	93
6.3.4	Târnava Area and Mureş Valley between Reghin and Orăştie	93
6.3.5	Arieş Area	94
6.3.6	Rimetea	94
6.3.7	Transylvanian Hill Area	94
6.3.8	Călata Area	94
6.3.9	Mountain Areas	94
7.	THE LAYOUT OF DWELLING-HOUSES AND HEATING SYSTEMS	96
7.1	THE LAYOUT OF DWELLING-HOUSES	96
7.1.1	CENTRAL TRANSYLVANIAN HOUSE TYPE – BAKING OVEN IN THE KITCHEN	98
7.1.1.1	The Southern Saxon areas	100
7.1.1.2	Rimetea	102
7.1.1.3	Arieş Area	104
7.1.1.4	Hill Area, Borşa Valley, Mureş Valley, Niraj Valley, Târnava Valley	108
7.1.1.5	Călata Area	110
7.1.2	EASTERN TRANSYLVANIAN HOUSE TYPE	114
7.1.2.1	House with weathering	114
7.1.2.2	Double house plan form	127
7.1.2.3	The role of cellars and verandas in the development of the house	128
7.1.3	NORTHERN TRANSYLVANIAN HOUSE TYPE – BAKING OVEN IN THE MAIN ROOM	130
7.1.3.1	Bistriţa region	131
7.1.3.2	Transition areas in the Someş Valley	132
7.1.4	WESTERN MOUNTAIN HOUSE TYPE - HOUSES WITH STORE-ROOM	133
7.2	TRADIIONAL HEATING SYSTEMS	134

7.2.1	BAKING OVENS	135
7.2.2	FIREPLACES AND TILED STOVES	143
7.2.2.1	SECKLER FIREPLACE	144
7.2.2.2	CENTRAL TRANSYLVANIAN FIREPLACE	149
7.2.3	BAKING OVEN WITH A STOVE IN NORTHERN TRANSYLVANIA	152
7.2.3.1	Bistrița region	153
7.2.3.2	Țara Lăpușului region, Zona Chioarului region, Podișul Someșului region, East of Sălaj	154
7.2.3.3	Călata region	155
7.3	CONCLUSIONS ABOUT THE INFLUENCE OF THE LAYOUT AND HEATING SYSTEMS WHEN IDENTIFYING THE RURAL ARCHITECTURAL ZONES	160
8.	MATERIAL AND CONSTRUCTION	162
8.1	FOUNDATIONS	162
8.2	WALLS	165
8.2.1	Timber houses	166
8.2.1.1	Log houses	166
8.2.1.2	Horizontal timber plank construction	171
8.2.2	Timber frame buildings	173
8.2.3	Clay walls	179
8.2.4	Stone walls	181
8.2.5	Brick walls	186
8.3	PLASTER AND RENDER	187
8.4	CEILINGS	189
8.4.1	Plain ceilings	189
8.4.2	Vaults	193
8.5	FLOORS	195
8.6	ROOFS	196
8.6.1	ROOF STRUCTURES	196
8.6.2	Roof coverings	197
8.6.2.1	Straw	197
8.6.2.2	Thatch	200
8.6.2.3	Shingles and timber planks	202
8.6.2.4	Clay tiles	206
8.6.3	Roof forms	207
8.7	VERANDAS	210
8.8	CONCLUSIONS	221

9.	FORM, PROPORTION AND DECORATION	224
9.1	PROPORTION	225
9.2	EXTERIOR CLADDING	228
9.3	EXTERIOR DECORATION	230
9.3.1	WALL DECORATION	230
9.3.1.1	Painted decoration	230
9.3.1.2	Stucco	233
9.3.1.3	Ornamentation on render	241
9.3.1.4	Decoration on timber features	245
9.4	FACADES - CONCLUSIONS	252
9.5	TRADITIONAL WINDOWS AND DOORS	254
9.5.1	Windows	254
9.5.2	Doors	259
9.6	CONCLUSIONS	262
10.	BUILDINGS IN THE COURTYARD	263
10.1	BAKING HOUSES AND BAKING OVENS	264
10.2	OUTHOUSES	267
10.3	STORAGE BUILDINGS	269
10.3.1	Granary	269
10.3.2	Corn storehouse	273
10.3.3	Wheat shed	274
10.3.4	Cellars	275
10.4	BUILDINGS FOR ANIMALS	276
10.4.1	Stalls, stables and sties	276
10.5	MULTI-FUNCTIONAL ANCILLARY BUILDINGS	279
10.6	BARNS	281
10.6.1	Barns with cruck-frames – Ținutul Arieșului, Câmpia Transilvaniei, Podișul Târnavelor	283
10.6.2	Barns with other timber-frame types – Ținutul Arieșului	286
10.6.3	Barns with cruck-frames - Podișul Târnavelor	286
10.6.4	Barns with stables	286
10.7	CONCLUSIONS	297
11.	FENCES AND ENTRANCE GATES	300
11.1	FENCES	300
11.2	ENTRANCE GATES	305

11.2.1	Timber gates	307
11.2.1.1	Small timber gates	307
11.2.1.1.1	Gates in Valea Nirajului	311
11.2.1.1.2	Gates in Podișul Târnavelor și Valea Mureșului	317
11.2.1.1.3	Gates în Ținutul Arieșului	318
11.2.1.1.4	Gates in Călata	321
11.2.1.1.5	Small gates in the Seckler Area	326
11.2.1.1.5.1	Gates in Odorhei	327
11.2.1.1.5.2	Gates in the Salt District	327
11.2.1.1.5.3	Gates in Casin	328
11.2.1.1.5.4	Gates in Săcele	329
11.2.1.2	Tall gates seckler gates	329
11.2.1.2.1	Gates with windows – Covasna Area	333
11.2.1.2.2	Tall gates in Ciuc and Casin	335
11.2.1.2.3	Tall gates in Odorhei	337
11.2.1.2.4	Tall gates in Gheorgheni	340
11.2.1.2.5	Tall gates outside the Seckler Area	342
11.2.2	Carved stone gates	345
11.2.2.1	Small gates	345
11.2.2.1.1	Gates in Covasna Region	345
11.2.2.1.2	Gates in Valea Nirajului	346
11.2.2.1.3	Gates in Odorhei	347
11.2.2.2	Tall carved stone gates	347
11.2.3	Masonry gates	348
11.2.3.1	Small masonry gates	349
11.2.3.1.1	Covasna and other Seckler regions	349
11.2.3.2	Tall masonry gates with roofs	350
11.2.3.2.1	The Saxon area and its neighboring territories	350
11.2.3.2.2	Tall masonry gates in the Seckler land	351
11.2.3.3	Unrendered masonry gates	354
11.2.3.3.1	Gates in Casin	354
11.2.4	CONCLUSIONS - GATES	355
12.	ZONES OF RURAL ARCHITECTURE IN TRANSILVANIA BETWEEN 1750–1950	360
12.1	THE ZONE OF THE CENTRAL TRANSYLVANIAN HOUSE - BAKING OVEN IN THE KITCHEN	360

12.1.1	BETWEEN THE 18 th CENTURY AND THE MIDDLE OF THE 19 th CENTURY	360
12.1.1.1	SOUTHERN SAXON AREAS	362
12.1.1.2	RIMETEA AREA	363
12.1.2	BETWEEN THE MID - 19 th CENTURY AND THE MID - 20 th CENTURY	366
12.1.2.1	SOUTHERN SAXON AREAS	367
12.1.2.2	MUREȘ VALLEY AND HAȚEG AREA	369
12.1.2.3	BRAN AREA, ȚARA FĂGĂRAȘULUI AREA AND MĂRGINIMEA SIBIUUI AREA	372
12.1.2.4	SĂCELE AREA	376
12.1.2.5	PODIȘUL TÂRNAVELOR AND MUREȘ VALLEY, BETWEEN LUDUȘ AND SEBEȘ	376
12.1.2.6	ARIEȘULUI REGION	378
12.1.2.7	RIMETEA	383
12.1.2.8	TRANSYLVANIAN HILL AREA	387
12.1.2.9	MUREȘ VALLEI BETWEEN LUDUȘ AND TOPLIȚA	390
12.1.2.10	BORȘA VALLEY	391
12.1.2.11	CĂLATA REGION	393
12.2	HOUSE WITH WEATHERING –EASTERN TRANSYLVANIA	396
12.2.1	BETWEEN THE 18 th CENTURY AND THE MID-19 th CENTURY	396
12.2.2	BETWEEN THE MID-19 th CENTURY AND THE MID-20 th CENTURY	399
12.2.2.1	HOMOROD REGION	402
12.2.2.2	ȚINUTUL ÎMPĂDURIT REGION	404
12.2.2.3	ZONE SFANTU GHOERGHE	406
12.2.2.4	ZONE ODORHEI	409
12.2.2.5	SALT DISTRICT	413
12.2.2.6	NIRAJ VALLEY REGION	414
12.2.2.7	SECKLER PARTIUM	417
12.2.2.8	NORTHERN COVASNA REGION	418
12.2.2.9	CASIN REGION	421
12.2.2.10	CIUC REGION	424
12.2.2.11	GHIMEȘ REGION	426
12.2.2.12	GHEORGHENI REGION	427
12.3	THE ZONE OF THE NORTHERN TRANSYLVANIAN HOUSE – HOUSE WITH BAKING OVEN IN THE MAIN ROOM	430
12.3.1	BETWEEN THE 18 th CENTURY AND THE MID-19 th CENTURY	430
12.3.1.1	BISTRIȚA REGION	431
12.3.1.2	EAST OF SĂLAJ AND SOMEȘ VALLEY AREA	432

12.3.2	BETWEEN THE MID-19 th CENTURY AND THE MID-20 th CENTURY	433
12.3.2.1	BISTRIȚA REGION	433
12.3.2.2	NĂȘĂUD REGION, ȚARA LĂPUȘULUI REGION, SOMEȘ VALLEY AREA	436
12.3.2.3	EAST OF SĂLAJ	437
12.4	THE ZONE OF THE WESTERN MOUNTAIN TYPE HOUSE WITH STORAGE	438
12.4.1	BETWEEN THE 18 th CENTURY AND THE MID-19 th CENTURY	438
12.4.2	BETWEEN THE MID-19 th CENTURY AND THE MID- 20 th CENTURY	440
13.	CONCLUSIONS ABOUT THE GENERAL STAGES OF EVOLUTION IN RURAL ARCHITECTURE IN TRANSYLVANIA AND THE DIVISION OF THE ARCHITECTURAL ZONES	443
13.1	THE GENERAL PROCESS OF DEVELOPEMENT IN THE EVOLUTION OF RURAL ARCHITECTURE	444
13.2	DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE ARCHITECTURAL MICROZONES	446
13.3	BRIEF PRESENTATION ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE MICROZONES	449
13.3.1	THE SECKLER AREA	449
13.3.2	THE SAXON AREA	451
13.3.3	THE AREA OF THE COUNTIES	451
14.	CONCLUSIONS	455
14.1	THE DEVELOPEMENT OF RURAL ARCHITECTURE AND FACTORS THAT HAVE INFLUENCED THIS ARCHITECTURAL TYPE	456
14.2	THE LEVELS OF ARCHITECTURAL ZONES	458
14.3	CONCLUSIONS ABOUT THE DEVELOPEMENT OF ARCHITECTURAL ZONES	466
15.	LITERATURE REVIEW	471