

IZA DP No. 6829

iPEHD: The ifo Prussian Economic History Database

Sascha O. Becker
Francesco Cinnirella
Erik Hornung
Ludger Woessmann

August 2012

iPEHD: The ifo Prussian Economic History Database

Sascha O. Becker

*CAGE, University of Warwick,
Ifo, CEPR, CESifo, and IZA*

Francesco Cinnirella

Ifo, CESifo and CEPR

Erik Hornung

Ifo

Ludger Woessmann

*University of Munich,
Ifo, CESifo, IZA and CAGE*

Discussion Paper No. 6829
August 2012

IZA

P.O. Box 7240
53072 Bonn
Germany

Phone: +49-228-3894-0
Fax: +49-228-3894-180
E-mail: iza@iza.org

Any opinions expressed here are those of the author(s) and not those of IZA. Research published in this series may include views on policy, but the institute itself takes no institutional policy positions.

The Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA) in Bonn is a local and virtual international research center and a place of communication between science, politics and business. IZA is an independent nonprofit organization supported by Deutsche Post Foundation. The center is associated with the University of Bonn and offers a stimulating research environment through its international network, workshops and conferences, data service, project support, research visits and doctoral program. IZA engages in (i) original and internationally competitive research in all fields of labor economics, (ii) development of policy concepts, and (iii) dissemination of research results and concepts to the interested public.

IZA Discussion Papers often represent preliminary work and are circulated to encourage discussion. Citation of such a paper should account for its provisional character. A revised version may be available directly from the author.

ABSTRACT

iPEHD: The ifo Prussian Economic History Database^{*}

This paper provides a documentation of the ifo Prussian Economic History Database (iPEHD), a county-level database covering a rich collection of variables for 19th-century Prussia. The Royal Prussian Statistical Office collected these data in several censuses over the years 1816-1901, with much county-level information surviving in archives. These data provide a unique source for micro-regional empirical research in economic history, enabling analyses of the importance of such factors as education, religion, fertility, and many others for Prussian economic development in the 19th century. The service of iPEHD is to provide the data in a digitized and structured way.

JEL Classification: N13, N33

Keywords: economic history, Prussia, 19th century, database, county

Corresponding author:

Ludger Woessmann
Ifo Institute for Economic Research
at the University of Munich
Poschingerstr. 5
81679 Munich
Germany
E-mail: woessmann@ifo.de

^{*} Over the years, a large number of research assistants have contributed to the digitization work underlying iPEHD. We are grateful for their contributions, especially to Christian Steibl, as well as to Rajesh Bhateja. Financial support by the Pact for Research and Innovation of the Leibniz Association is gratefully acknowledged.

1. Introduction

Prussian economic history during the 19th century proves a fascinating setting to study many of the most fundamental questions in economic history. A country of such high diversity, but with a rather uniform institutional setting, allows answering many important research questions by analyzing the micro-regional variation existing within one country. For example, the Prussian setting allows analyzing the importance of such factors as education, religion, fertility, and many others for industrialization and historical economic development.

What is more, starting with the first full-scale population census in 1816, the Royal Prussian Statistical Office collected a huge amount of data in a number of censuses over the 19th century. Many interesting county-level data have survived in archives. Thanks to the Prussian proverbial orderliness and thoroughness, we have high-quality data for the Prussian counties (*Kreise*) covering nearly the whole range of the 19th century. These data provide a unique source for empirical research in economic history, with the particular potential to study historical micro-regional data with modern microeconomic methods.

The service of the ifo Prussian Economic History Database (iPEHD) is to provide many of these data in a digitized and structured way. Thus, iPEHD is a county-level database covering a rich collection of variables for all counties of Prussia over the period 1816-1901. iPEHD is freely available to any interested researcher at www.cesifo-group.de/ipehd. The iPEHD website does not only provide the raw data, but also background information, definitions, and sources of variables. It also makes suggestions on how to merge data from different census waves with varying administrative boundaries into panel datasets. Finally, it provides a collection of thematic maps visualizing the data, ready-made datasets and codes to replicate tables from published research, and additional material.

Throughout, iPEHD covers all Prussian counties, whose number increased over the 19th century from 308 in 1816 to 574 in 1901. Drawing from a total of 15 original sources – many of which contain several volumes – iPEHD comprises more than 1,500 variables. The available data cover a wide range of topics including a host of indicators of economic development, education, demographics, and more. iPEHD organizes these data into eight content areas: education, occupation, wages and income tax, industry, agriculture, population, religion, and miscellaneous. In total, iPEHD contains more than half a million data points at the county level. While nowhere near being a complete collection of all available data, we think that iPEHD provides a comprehensive micro-regional database on 19th-century economic history in Prussia.

This paper documents iPEHD and provides guidance on how to use the data contained in it. The next section starts with some brief background on how iPEHD emerged. Section 3 provides an overview of the data contained in iPEHD. Section 4 describes the data structure and suggests a procedure to combine data from different census years. Section 5 lists the original sources, published by the Royal Prussian Statistical Bureau or its employees, from which the iPEHD data stem. Section 6 gives a brief overview of research that has been conducted using iPEHD data so far. Section 7 presents a few additional features of the iPEHD website, and Section 8 concludes.

2. A Brief History of the Birth of iPEHD

In 2006, when looking for data to analyze the relationship of religion and literacy with economic outcomes in German history, we stumbled upon the rich county-level data available from the Prussian census of 1871. After thorough studies of the data, we were fascinated by the depth and breadth of the historical information that the Royal Prussian Statistical Office had collected and documented. Prussian thoroughness had produced high-quality data at the county level in the 19th century documenting everything from education over religion and demographics to economic development (see Figure 1 for an example).


Soon, we recognized the sheer amount of data that were just sitting around in the statistical annals at German state libraries. The quality of this impressive collection of information, remarkable for the 19th century, has generally been regarded as excellent by historians and demographers (cf., e.g., Galloway, Hammel, and Lee (1994)).¹ And compared to the selective samples which a lot of historical research is restricted to, the full censuses covering the whole population provide a much more reliable picture of the historical setting.

After the original “Was Weber Wrong?” paper (eventually published as Becker and Woessmann (2009)) which relied mainly on the 1871 census and subsequent data, we explored annals covering rather unknown census data from 1816 to 1821.² Although lots of effort had to be undertaken to make these data ready for research and to ensure their comparability, we soon found it to be very promising and equally reliable. A third large data digitization project involved the census of 1849. The sheer amount of information provided in the sources was overwhelming.

¹ After we had digitized the data used in Becker and Woessmann (2009), data from that project became available online at www.patrickgalloway.com.

² We are grateful to Davide Cantoni for pointing us to these data sources at the time.

Figure 1: Protestantism in 19th-Century Prussia



Note: County-level depiction based on the 1871 Prussian Population Census. For details, see Becker and Woessmann (2009).

The censuses of 1816, 1849, and 1871 became the foundation of iPEHD. But, as time went by, we also digitized data from different other censuses to fill in the gaps. Although far from complete, we find the data to provide a rather comprehensive overview of 19th-century economic history in Prussia. Thus, we are happy to be able to make the digitized data available to the scientific community and the interested public. iPEHD went online in the summer of 2012 to be freely used by anyone interested at www.cesifo-group.de/ipehd.

The collection of these data and their provision to the scientific community is part of the project “Establishment of a leading international center for empirical research on the importance of education for long-term economic development,” generously funded by the Leibniz Association under the Pact for Research and Innovation. The project was carried out at the Human Capital and Innovation department at the Ifo Institute – Leibniz Institute for Economic Research at the University of Munich.

3. An Overview of the Data contained in iPEHD

This section provides an overview of iPEHD, discussing its scope, the structure of its data files, the areas of content covered, and the information contained in the codebooks.

3.1 *The Scope and Data Files of iPEHD*

iPEHD starts with the population census in 1816, the first full-scale census released by the Royal Prussian Statistical Office, which had been founded in 1805. The 1816 census covers the 308 Prussian counties at the time. Further extensive census data are available in 1849, 1864, 1871, and 1882, but – as indicated in Table 1 – many more detailed data were collected in additional years. As the number of counties grew over time, by 1901 the data cover 574 Prussian counties. In total, iPEHD contains more than 1,500 variables and more than half a million data points, all at the county level.

Table 1: The Scope of iPEHD

Year	No. of variables	No. of county observations	No. of data points
1816	58	308	17,864
1819	5	344	1,720
1821	22	344	7,568
1816-1821	24	456	10,944
1829	6	59	354
1849	712	335	238,520
1858	6	342	2,052
1862	4	346	1,384
1864	53	347	18,391
1866a	1	342	342
1866b	11	334	3,674
1871a	25	453	11,325
1871b	14	458	6,412
1878	5	426	2,130
1882a	269	464	124,816
1882b	14	465	6,510
1886a	156	544	84,864
1886b	97	518	50,246
1892	8	550	4,400
1896	15	552	8,280
1901	8	574	4,592
Sum	1,513		606,388

Note: Some of the data points may contain missing information.

iPEHD consists of county-level information gathered from these different censuses. The data are currently presented in 76 separate data files, organized by content area, specific topic, and census year. Each data file in iPEHD contains a unique county (*Kreis*) identifier (discussed in Section 4.2 below), the county name, the abbreviated district (*Regierungsbezirk*) name (rb), and a set of variables of census data. iPEHD stores its data in comma-separated values (csv) format, which is easily accessible from any statistical software. For example, to open the csv data files in Stata, one just has to type:

```
insheet using "xxxxxx.csv"
```

To give an example of a data file, Table 2 shows a brief extract of a few variables for the first few counties (by alphabet) from the data file “ipehd_1819_indu_fac.csv”, which contains data on the number of factories in a county in 1819. E.g., the variable “fac1819_brick” documents the total number of brick manufactories in a county in 1819, and the variable “mill1819_water” the total number of water mills.

Table 2: Extract from an Example Data File

kreiskey1800	County	rb	fac1819_brick	fac1819_lime	fac1819_glass	mill1819_water
277	Achen	AAC	5	10	2	26
33	Adelnau	POS	11	6	0	26
254	Adenau	KOB	0	1	0	71
196	Ahaus	MUN	11	15	0	20
255	Ahrweiler	KOB	0	0	0	51
2	Allenstein	KON	5	0	1	31
219	Altena	ARN	3	13	0	41
257	Altenkirchen	KOB	1	0	0	41
10	Angerburg	GUM	4	26	0	5
53	Angermünde	POT	13	2	0	28
32	Anklam	STE	3	0	0	2
209	Arnsberg	ARN	12	4	0	26
67	Arnswalde	FRA	7	3	3	29
160	Aschersleben	MAG	8	5	0	57
55	(Nieder-)Barnim	POT	8	0	1	30
54	(Ober-)Barnim	POT	18	0	0	36
190	Beckum	MUN	8	3	0	22

Note: Extract from iPEHD data file “ipehd_1819_indu_fac.csv”.

3.2 Areas of Content covered by iPEHD

The iPEHD data are categorized into the following eight content areas:

Education: This area contains, among others, such data as the number of students, teachers, and schools by school type, literacy, and school finance.

Occupation: This area contains, among others, data on the labor force in agriculture, in factories, in manufacturing, in crafts, and in services.

Wages and Income Tax: This area contains data on daily wages of day laborers, on teacher income, and on income taxes.

Industry: This area contains data on a huge number of different factories, technologies, and transportation.

Agriculture: This area contains, among others, such data as livestock, crop yields, soil composition, and the distribution of land.

Population: This area contains data on population by age, by gender, and by marital status, on births and deaths, and on population with disabilities.

Religion: This area contains denomination-specific data on population, literacy, education, occupation, and number of churches.

Miscellaneous: This area contains such data as surface area, buildings, municipalities, and residential areas for each county.

Apart from the data gathered in these eight content areas, the **merger file** provides information on merger variables necessary to combine data from different census years (see Section 4.3 below).

3.3 Codebooks

A large number of codebooks provide additional information for each variable contained in iPEHD. There is one codebook for each year, so that explanations for each variable can be found in the codebook for the corresponding year. A summary codebook that combines all years is also provided; this summary codebook allows a content search of the whole iPEHD.

The codebooks list the variable name (“variable name”), the name of the data file where it can be found (“ipehd datasets”), an English label (“label”), and the original label in German language (“original label”). The German language label is similar to the table headings found in the original sources. The English label leads with the year and is a shortened (direct) translation

of the German label; in cases where a translation is not feasible, the original German term was adopted. In addition, the codebooks indicate the source of each set of variables (“source”).

4. Merging Data from Different Censuses

One of the biggest challenges when analyzing historical data is to ensure comparability over time. A key service of iPEHD is to facilitate the analysis of data from different census years at the county level, holding the administrative boundaries fixed. This section presents the structure in which the data are presented in iPEHD and the suggested procedure of combining different census years.

4.1 County-level Structure of the Data

Starting after the Congress of Vienna in 1815, Prussia reformed its administrative structure and introduced the county level. At the time, the dimension of a county was meant to follow borders of previously existing administrative units. The maximum distance to the administrative center was meant to be two to three Prussian Miles (roughly 15 to 23 km or 9 to 14 miles), such that every inhabitant could travel forth and back within a day. The population size was meant to range between 20,000 in sparsely populated areas and 36,000 in densely populated areas.

Throughout the 19th century, various administrative reforms reshaped the county structure of Prussia. As the population grew over time, it became necessary to divide existing administrative units in order to reduce administrative efforts. Most of these changes were partitions of one county into two or more counties.

Thus, it is usually possible to reconstruct earlier administrative units by aggregating data from later years to the former structure. A drawback of this procedure is that the researcher loses part of the variation provided by having more observations. Still, the procedure appears necessary in order to have intertemporal comparability of the units of observation. The alternative would be to assign the same early data to two or more subsequently parted units, introducing measurement error if observed data were not uniformly distributed in the original area.

A peculiarity of the Prussian county system is the city county. Starting with the introduction of the county level in 1815, the so-called *Immediatstädte* (immediate towns) became a county themselves. As urbanization advanced, an increasing number of cities were detached from their

original county and became a county of their own. Thus, the database often contains a *Landkreis* (rural county) and a *Stadtkreis* (city county) with similar names. For example, there are six pairs of *Landkreis/Stadtkreis* information among the 335 county observations in the 1849 classification and 20 pairs among the 458 county observations in the 1874 classification.

4.2 County Identifiers

All data in iPEHD reflect the administrative conditions in place at the date of publication of the census. Since censuses often ordered the counties in different ways, identifiers were assigned reflecting the order of each census. Thus, each county in each census has been assigned a continuous number which is *unique within a census but not across censuses*. The identifiers are named kreiskeyYYYY, where YYYY represents the four-digit year (see Section 4.5 below for additional peculiarities of the 1816-21 data).

The year in the identifier denotes the administrative structure of Prussia, which is not necessarily the same as the census year. In some cases, different identifiers (e.g., kreiskey1871 and kreiskey1874) even had to be assigned to data from the same census year (1871) because the Royal Prussian Statistical Office used different aggregations in different publications of data from the same census.

4.3 Intertemporal Comparisons

Researchers may be interested in intertemporal comparisons and in the construction of panel datasets using iPEHD. The iPEHD county identifiers, together with the merge-county file also provided on the iPEHD website, provide a service that facilitates such linkage of comparable units of observation over time. Our suggestion is that, *in order to obtain a comparable set of observations, researchers should collapse the data to the earliest set of counties in the data*. However, it is important to point out that at the end of the day, the best way to structure and use the data will be specific to every single research project.

To conduct intertemporal comparisons, our suggestion is to take the following nine-step procedure. To construct cross-sections, the procedure should be followed only until step 3.

1. Choose datasets from the same census year.
2. Merge all datasets from the same census year using the identifier (e.g., kreiskey1882).
3. Save the cross-section.

4. Use the merge-county file provided on the iPEHD website.
5. Drop all duplicate and missing observations from the merge-county file according to the identifier in the cross-section (e.g., kreiskey1882): see section 4.4 for an example.
6. Merge the merge-county file with the cross-section using the identifier (e.g., kreiskey1882).
7. Aggregate (sum/mean) all variables in the cross-section to the aggregation level of the earliest census in the analysis using the identifier of the earliest census in the analysis (crucial step!).
8. Repeat steps 1 to 7 for datasets from other census years.
9. Merge the resulting cross-sections using the identifier of the earliest census in the analysis.

4.4 Example from the Merger File

In the example shown in Table 3, the eight illustrative counties observed in 1901 were established from six counties in 1874 and five counties in 1849. Between 1849 and 1874, the ‘Elbing Landkreis’ had been divided into ‘Elbing Stadtkreis’ and ‘Elbing Landkreis’. Between 1874 and 1901, the ‘Danzig Landkreis’ had been divided into ‘Danzig Niederung’, ‘Danzig Höhe’, and ‘Dirschau’.

Table 3: Example from the Merge File

Kreiskey 1901	County1901	Kreiskey 1874	County1874	Kreiskey 1849	County1849
38	ELBING STADTKREIS	38	ELBING STADTKREIS	37	ELBING LANDKREIS
39	ELBING LANDKREIS	39	ELBING LANDKREIS	37	ELBING LANDKREIS
40	MARIENBURG IN PREUSSEN	40	MARIENBURG IN PREUSSEN	38	MARIENBURG IN PREUSSEN
41	DANZIG STADTKREIS	41	DANZIG STADTKREIS	39	DANZIG STADTKREIS
42	DANZIG NIEDERUNG	42	DANZIG LANDKREIS	40	DANZIG LANDKREIS
43	DANZIG HOHE	42	DANZIG LANDKREIS	40	DANZIG LANDKREIS
44	DIRSCHAU	42	DANZIG LANDKREIS	40	DANZIG LANDKREIS
45	PREUSSISCH STARGARD	43	PREUSSISCH STARGARD	41	PREUSSISCH STARGARD

Note: Extract from the iPEHD merge file “ipehd_merge_county.csv”.

In order to have a comparable set of observations when performing intertemporal comparisons between 1901 and 1849, one has to aggregate the observations of ‘Danzig Niederung’, ‘Danzig Höhe’, and ‘Dirschau’ to match ‘Danzig Landkreis’. Thus, one should always aggregate the data to the aggregation level of the earliest census year in the specific analysis (step 7).

However, to perform intertemporal comparisons between, e.g., 1874 and 1849, one needs to drop the duplicate entries of ‘Danzig Landkreis’ from the merger file first (step 5). In addition, one needs to drop entries from the merger file that have missing observations on the county identifier in the respective year. Such missing observations exist because some territories were annexed by Prussia only after the respective census year.

As one example of how to merge datasets from 1874 and 1849, the following Stata code exemplifies the nine steps of the suggested procedure:

```
insheet using "ipehd_1871_edu_literacy_part2.csv", clear /* Step 1 */
save "ipehd_1871_edu_literacy_part2.dta"

insheet using "ipehd_1871_pop_demo_part2.csv", clear
save "ipehd_1871_pop_demo_part2.dta"

merge 1:1 kreiskey1874 using "ipehd_1871_edu_literacy_part2.dta" /* Step 2 */
drop _merge

save "ipehd_1871_part2.dta" /* Step 3 */

insheet using "ipehd_merge_county.csv", clear /* Step 4 */

duplicates drop kreiskey1874, force /* Step 5 */
drop if kreiskey1874==.

merge 1:1 kreiskey1874 using "ipehd_1871_part2.dta" /* Step 6 */

collapse (sum) pop* lit* edu*, by (kreiskey1849) /* Step 7 */
drop if kreiskey1849==.
save "ipehd_1871_part2_2.dta"

insheet using "ipehd_1849_rel_deno.csv", clear /* Step 8 */
save "ipehd_1849_rel_deno.dta"

insheet using "ipehd_merge_county.csv", clear
duplicates drop kreiskey1849, force
drop if kreiskey1849==.
merge 1:1 kreiskey1849 using "ipehd_1849_rel_deno.dta"
collapse (sum) rel*, by (kreiskey1849)
save "ipehd_1849.dta"

merge 1:1 kreiskey1849 using "ipehd_1871_part2_2.dta" /* Step 9 */
drop _merge
save "ipehd_1849_1871.dta"
```

4.5 Peculiarity of the Data from 1816 to 1821

By 1816, Prussia had just started her administrative reform that established the county level. In some parts of the country, the reforms had not been finalized even in 1821. Thus, the data from the censuses in 1816 until after 1821 sometimes reflect old administrative units.

Unfortunately, due to the reform, these old units were subsequently aggregated and then newly divided in order to establish the new counties. This makes it impossible to accurately match the data of (some of) the administrative units from the early censuses to (some) counties in subsequent censuses. The *kreiskey1800* is thus coded so as to aggregate the data to a higher level. The *kreiskey1800* can be used to link the 1816-1821 data to later periods.

However, iPEHD also provides a unique identifier that allows merging data from the same census for these cross-sections. These identifiers are named 'id1816' and 'id1819'. In order to merge data from 1816 to other data from 1816, one should use id1816. In order to merge data from 1819 or 1821 to other data from 1819 or 1821, one should use id1819.

In order to merge data from 1816, 1819, or 1821 to data from subsequent censuses, one should take the following steps:

1. Choose datasets from 1816, 1819, or 1821.
2. Merge all datasets from the same census using the identifier (idYYYY).
3. Aggregate (sum/mean) all cross-sections using the identifier 'kreiskey1800'.
4. Merge the cross-section with aggregated data from subsequent censuses using the identifier 'kreiskey1800'.

5. Original Sources underlying the iPEHD Data

The iPEHD data have been digitized from different sources originally published by the Royal Prussian Statistical Bureau or its employees. These original historical volumes should be consulted for detailed information regarding the exact attributes of the data. Figure 2 shows two example pages from such source volumes.

The following list documents all the volumes used as sources for iPEHD. There are a total of 15 original sources, many of which consist of several volumes.

1816-21: Mützell, Alexander A. (1821-25). *Neues Topographisch-statistisch-geographisches Wörterbuch des Preussischen Staats*, Vol. 1-6. Halle: Karl August Kümmel.

Figure 2: Example Pages from Source Volumes

Zusammenstellung der Kreise und ihrer Bevölkerung.

Ortswahlbezirk Bevölkerung am 1. December 1871

Kreis	Landkreis	Landkreis	evangelische		katholische		israelitische		andere		Gesamt	Männlich		Weiblich	
			männl.	weibl.	männl.	weibl.	männl.	weibl.	männl.	weibl.		männl.	weibl.		
M. Landkreise.															
1.	Kreis Hildesheim	76	37	5733	402	7343	16740	17475	34215	33460	67675	34199	33476	67675	
2.	Kreis Verden	128	6907	887	9487	21485	33216	44701	30973	48711	69684	34843	34841	69684	
3.	Kreis Lüneburg	79	123	9344	743	10087	19435	20465	39900	40465	80365	40182	40183	80365	
4.	Kreis Osterode a. D.	63	11	8272	451	10223	21798	23568	45366	46394	91760	45773	45987	91760	
5.	Kreis Göttingen	102	168	7269	443	9211	21192	22140	43332	43572	86904	43450	43454	86904	
6.	Kreis Eintracht	117	108	7237	402	9339	22544	23817	46361	46569	92930	46465	46465	92930	
7.	Kreis Zellerfeld	28	61	2136	357	3293	7163	7570	14733	15343	30076	15038	15038	30076	
N. Landkreise.															
1.	Kreis Hildesheim	6	6	6	45	88	278	242	520	412	932	466	466	932	
2.	Kreis Verden	14	14	14	39	39	316	325	641	123	764	382	382	764	
3.	Kreis Lüneburg	11	11	11	7	7	249	255	504	173	677	339	339	677	
4.	Kreis Osterode a. D.	7	7	7	7	7	136	133	269	236	505	253	252	505	
5.	Kreis Göttingen	12	12	12	12	12	143	143	286	143	429	215	214	429	
6.	Kreis Eintracht	12	12	12	12	12	146	146	292	146	438	219	219	438	
7.	Kreis Zellerfeld	2	2	2	2	2	36	36	72	36	108	54	54	108	
V. Name der Kreise.															
1.	Hildesheim	45	308	4473	1312	12486	30760	31409	61965	56562	118527	59283	59283	118527	
2.	Verden	128	1306	7603	800	10700	25342	37094	32446	34392	66838	33419	33419	66838	
3.	Lüneburg	79	146	4830	1493	11223	25744	26743	52487	52413	104899	52450	52450	104899	
4.	Osterode a. D.	63	131	18036	914	13350	29742	31892	61634	62363	123997	61996	61996	123997	
5.	Göttingen	102	190	9821	1870	12691	33617	34722	68339	68960	137300	68650	68650	137300	
6.	Eintracht	117	124	1487	784	13158	31662	32792	64454	64639	129093	64524	64524	129093	
7.	Zellerfeld	28	48	4862	802	8849	20818	22017	42835	43369	86204	43117	43117	86204	
8.	Communität	7	7	7	7	7	324	324	648	480	1128	564	564	1128	
C. Landkreis Lüneburg.															
I. Schuldist. Städt.															
1.	Kreis Celle	2	1	1903	304	3207	9840	9311	19151	18727	37878	18924	18924	37878	
2.	Kreis Verden	7	1	307	63	370	1415	1365	2780	1825	4605	2362	2362	4605	
3.	Kreis Lüneburg	1	1	530	136	1067	2823	2592	5415	5227	10642	5319	5319	10642	
4.	Kreis Osterode a. D.	2	2	342	103	1049	2769	2419	4188	3589	7777	3894	3894	7777	
5.	Kreis Göttingen	2	2	1456	409	3265	8390	7987	16377	15947	32324	16174	16174	32324	
6.	Kreis Eintracht	2	2	1448	215	2747	10240	9615	19855	19232	39087	19542	19542	39087	
7.	Kreis Zellerfeld	2	2	145	37	182	705	705	1410	1011	2421	1206	1206	2421	
II. Schuldist. Stadtkreise.															
1.	Kreis Verden	1	1	573	78	651	2111	2061	4172	4036	8208	4134	4134	8208	
2.	Kreis Lüneburg	1	1	174	33	207	746	707	1453	1385	2838	1417	1417	2838	
3.	Kreis Osterode a. D.	1	1	130	33	163	562	506	1068	933	1999	991	991	1999	
III. Landkreise.															
1.	Kreis Celle	239	344	7000	600	9306	29633	29548	45901	47304	93205	47304	47304	93205	
2.	Kreis Verden	146	236	6961	400	6561	23007	23007	46014	46014	92028	46014	46014	92028	
3.	Kreis Lüneburg	232	358	8247	774	9021	31757	31717	47974	47974	95948	47974	47974	95948	
4.	Kreis Osterode a. D.	239	387	5403	307	5710	22454	21949	44399	44399	88798	44399	44399	88798	
5.	Kreis Göttingen	237	383	7701	304	8005	31494	31439	42933	42933	85866	42933	42933	85866	
6.	Kreis Eintracht	232	358	8247	774	9021	31757	31717	47974	47974	95948	47974	47974	95948	
7.	Kreis Zellerfeld	232	358	8247	774	9021	31757	31717	47974	47974	95948	47974	47974	95948	
8.	Kreis Verden	232	358	8247	774	9021	31757	31717	47974	47974	95948	47974	47974	95948	
9.	Kreis Göttingen	232	358	8247	774	9021	31757	31717	47974	47974	95948	47974	47974	95948	
10.	Kreis Eintracht	232	358	8247	774	9021	31757	31717	47974	47974	95948	47974	47974	95948	
11.	Kreis Zellerfeld	232	358	8247	774	9021	31757	31717	47974	47974	95948	47974	47974	95948	
12.	Kreis Verden	232	358	8247	774	9021	31757	31717	47974	47974	95948	47974	47974	95948	
13.	Kreis Göttingen	232	358	8247	774	9021	31757	31717	47974	47974	95948	47974	47974	95948	
14.	Kreis Eintracht	232	358	8247	774	9021	31757	31717	47974	47974	95948	47974	47974	95948	
15.	Kreis Zellerfeld	232	358	8247	774	9021	31757	31717	47974	47974	95948	47974	47974	95948	
16.	Kreis Verden	232	358	8247	774	9021	31757	31717	47974	47974	95948	47974	47974	95948	
17.	Kreis Göttingen	232	358	8247	774	9021	31757	31717	47974	47974	95948	47974	47974	95948	
18.	Kreis Eintracht	232	358	8247	774	9021	31757	31717	47974	47974	95948	47974	47974	95948	
19.	Kreis Zellerfeld	232	358	8247	774	9021	31757	31717	47974	47974	95948	47974	47974	95948	
20.	Kreis Verden	232	358	8247	774	9021	31757	31717	47974	47974	95948	47974	47974	95948	
Summe I.		61162	87149	20981	28112	439	646	200	363	82782	116270	5669	8101	135407	134992

(2) **Kreise bzw. grössere Städte.**

Im Jahre 1861 und früher Geborne, welche nicht lesen und schreiben können (Analphabeten):

Kreis	evangelische		katholische		israelitische		andere		Analphabeten überhaupt		Kinder, geboren in den Jahren 1871-1862				
	männl.	weibl.	männl.	weibl.	männl.	weibl.	männl.	weibl.	männl.	weibl.	männl.	weibl.			
	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13.	14.	
I. Regierungsbezirk Königsberg.															
1.	Memel	4 500	7 388	539	451	81	148	22	36	5 142	8 023	365	540	6 564	6 553
2.	Fischhausen	3 109	3 699	31	8	7	8	5	11	3 152	3 726	215	276	5 861	5 654
3.	Königsberg (Stadtkreis)	2 659	5 757	149	178	92	186	6	36	2 906	6 157	32	138	10 524	10 303
4.	Königsberg (Landkreis)	3 889	4 658	20	11	13	10	3	2	3 925	4 681	385	561	6 299	6 187
5.	Labiau	4 745	7 006	32	12	18	26	10	17	4 805	7 061	137	299	6 402	6 487
6.	Wehlau	3 473	4 761	26	12	13	14	1	3	3 513	4 790	333	497	5 764	5 790
7.	Gerdaun	2 348	3 368	6	4	13	10	—	—	2 367	3 382	365	414	4 935	4 897
8.	Rastenburg	2 499	4 012	177	214	9	4	2	3	2 687	4 233	101	322	5 181	5 317
9.	Friedland	2 390	3 495	13	14	8	5	9	20	2 420	3 534	686	832	5 405	5 484
10.	Preuss. Eylau	3 504	4 667	42	62	4	7	22	47	3 572	4 783	364	510	7 145	7 239
11.	Heiligenbeil	3 100	4 349	45	61	4	7	20	56	3 169	4 473	233	397	5 888	5 934
12.	Braunsberg	191	312	2 150	3 853	26	13	1	1	2 368	4 179	41	71	6 393	6 287
13.	Heilsberg	139	209	2 321	4 230	9	12	—	1	2 469	4 452	435	555	6 599	6 688
14.	Rössel	428	521	4 065	6 117	20	32	—	—	4 513	6 670	332	391	6 319	6 354
15.	Allenstein	370	234	6 641	8 794	12	18	3	—	7 026	9 046	419	550	7 499	7 442
16.	Ortelsburg	5 868	8 234	928	799	32	34	59	104	6 887	9 171	345	465	9 139	9 080
17.	Neidenburg	4 521	6 274	2 216	1 632	26	35	19	1	6 782	7 942	313	399	7 323	7 381
18.	Osterode a./Drewenz	7 843	10 093	1 229	1 276	30	37	8	15	9 110	11 421	197	315	8 875	8 955
19.	Mohrungen	3 974	5 827	230	240	17	30	7	8	4 228	6 105	233	410	7 370	7 359
20.	Preussisch Holland	1 612	2 285	121	144	5	10	3	2	1 741	2 441	135	159	5 922	5 651
Summe I.		61162	87149	20981	28112	439									

1829: Preussisches Statistisches Landesamt (1829). *Beiträge zur Statistik der Königlichen Preussischen Rheinlande, aus amtlichen Nachrichten zusammengestellt*. Aachen: J.A. Mayer.

1849: Statistisches Bureau zu Berlin (1851-55). *Tabellen und amtliche Nachrichten über den Preussischen Staat für das Jahr 1849*, Vol. 1-6b. Berlin: Statistisches Bureau zu Berlin.

1858: Meitzen, August (1868). *Der Boden und die landwirthschaftlichen Verhältnisse des Preussischen Staates*, Vol. 1-4. Berlin: Verlag von Paul Parey.

1862: Königlich Preussisches Statistisches Bureau (1863). Die Eisen-, Stein- und Wasserstrassen des preussischen Staates im Jahre 1862, in *Zeitschrift des Königlich Preussischen Statistischen Bureaus*, Vol. 3, 206-214. Berlin: Verlag der Königlichen Geheimen Ober-Hofbuchdruckerei.

1864: Königliches Statistisches Bureau in Berlin (1867). *Die Ergebnisse der Volkszählung und Volksbeschreibung, der Gebäude und Viehzählung, nach den Aufnahmen vom 3. December 1864, resp. Anfang 1865 und die Statistik der Bewegung der Bevölkerung in den Jahren 1862, 1863 und 1864*. Preussische Statistik Vol. 10. Berlin: Verlag von Ernst Kuehn.

1866: Meitzen, August (1868). *Der Boden und die landwirthschaftlichen Verhältnisse des Preussischen Staates*, Vol. 1-4. Berlin: Verlag von Paul Parey.

1871: Königliches Statistisches Bureau (1873-74). *Die Gemeinden und Gutsbezirke des Preussischen Staates und ihre Bevölkerung: Nach den Urmaterialien der allgemeinen Volkszählung vom 1. December 1871*, Vol. 1-11. Berlin: Verlag des Königlichen Statistischen Bureaus.

Königliches Statistisches Bureau in Berlin (1875). *Die Ergebnisse der Volkszählung und Volksbeschreibung im Preussischen Staate vom 1. December 1871*. Preussische Statistik Vol. 30. Berlin: Verlag des Königlichen Statistischen Bureaus.

1878: Herrfurth, Ludwig and Conrad Studt (1880). *Finanzstatistik der Kreise des preussischen Staates für das Jahr 1877/78*. Zeitschrift des Preussischen Statistischen Landesamtes, Ergänzungshefte, Vol. 7. Berlin: Verlag des Königlichen Statistischen Bureaus

1882: Königliches Statistisches Bureau in Berlin (1884/85). *Die Ergebnisse der Berufsstatistik vom 5. Juni 1882 im preussischen Staat*. Preussische Statistik Vol. 76 a-c. Berlin: Verlag des Königlichen Statistischen Bureaus.

1886 (Education): Königliches Statistisches Bureau in Berlin (1889). *Das gesammte Volksschulwesen im preußischen Staate im Jahre 1886*. Preussische Statistik Vol. 101. Berlin: Verlag des Königlichen Statistischen Bureaus.

1886 (Agriculture): Königliches Statistisches Bureau in Berlin (1887). *Die Ergebnisse der Ermittlung des Ernteertrags im preussischen Staate für das Jahr 1886*. Preussische Statistik Vol. 92. Berlin: Verlag des Königlichen Statistischen Bureaus.

1892: Neuhaus, Georg (1904). Die ortsüblichen Tagelöhne gewöhnlicher Tagearbeiter in Preußen 1892 und 1901, in *Zeitschrift des Königlich Preussischen Statistischen Bureaus*, Vol. 44, 310-346. Berlin: Verlag des Königlichen Statistischen Bureaus.

1896: Königliches Statistisches Bureau in Berlin (1897). *Die Ergebnisse der Ermittlung des Ernteertrags im preussischen Staate für das Jahr 1896*. Preussische Statistik Vol. 147. Berlin: Verlag des Königlichen Statistischen Bureaus.

1901: Neuhaus, Georg (1904). Die ortsüblichen Tagelöhne gewöhnlicher Tagearbeiter in Preußen 1892 und 1901, in *Zeitschrift des Königlich Preussischen Statistischen Bureaus*, Vol. 44, 310-346. Berlin: Verlag des Königlichen Statistischen Bureaus.

6. Existing Research using the iPEHD Data

A lot of research in economic history has used data from the iPEHD by now. This research is briefly described in this section. For those papers already published in academic journals, the iPEHD website provides ready-made datasets and codes in Stata to replicate the tables published in the papers. In addition, many more projects are currently under way and will be added to the website as publications become available. There is also a non-technical survey that summarizes some of the research conducted using the iPEHD data: Becker and Woessmann (2011a), “The Effects of the Protestant Reformation on Human Capital.”

6.1 Protestant Economic History and Education

Becker and Woessmann (2009), “Was Weber Wrong? A Human Capital Theory of Protestant Economic History” (started in 2006, first working-paper version released in 2007): This paper uses data from several censuses (Population 1871, Occupation 1882, Education 1886) and additional sources (including the Income Tax Statistics 1877) to show that the higher economic prosperity of Protestant relative to Catholic counties can be accounted for by

Protestants' higher literacy (presumably spurred by instruction in reading the Bible), suggesting that explanations based purely on differential work ethics may have limited explanatory power.

Becker and Woessmann (2008), "Luther and the Girls: Religious Denomination and the Female Education Gap in 19th Century Prussia": Using data from the first Prussian census in 1816, among others, this paper shows that a larger share of Protestants in a county's population decreased the gender gap in basic education.

Becker and Woessmann (2010), "The Effect of Protestantism on Education before the Industrialization: Evidence from 1816 Prussia" (first working-paper version released in 2009): This paper shows that Protestantism led to more schooling already in 1816, before the Industrial Revolution, ruling out that Protestant education just resulted from industrialization.

Becker and Woessmann (2011b), "Knocking on Heaven's Door? Protestantism and Suicide": Using data from 1816-21 and 1869-71, this paper finds a substantial positive effect of Protestantism on suicide.

6.2 Education and the Industrial Revolution

Becker, Hornung, and Woessmann (2011), "Education and Catch-up in the Industrial Revolution" (first working-paper version released in 2009): This paper combines school-enrollment and factory-employment data from 1816, 1849, and 1882 to show that – in contrast to the state-of-the-art view based on British evidence – basic education was significantly associated with non-textile industrialization in both phases of the Industrial Revolution.

Cinnirella and Hornung (2011), "Landownership Concentration and the Expansion of Education": Combining data from several censuses that effectively span the entire 19th century (1816, 1849, 1864, 1886, and 1896), as well as data from a 1866 classification of soil composition, this paper finds that landownership concentration, a proxy for the institution of serf labor, had a negative effect on school enrollment which diminished in the second half of the century.

6.3 Fertility and Education

Becker, Cinnirella, and Woessmann (2010), "The Trade-off between Fertility and Education: Evidence from before the Demographic Transition" (first working-paper version released in 2009): This paper uses data from the 1849 census and other sources to show that a

trade-off between child quantity and quality existed already in the 19th century and that causation between fertility and education runs both ways.

Becker, Cinnirella, and Woessmann (2012b), “The Effect of Investment in Children’s Education on Fertility in 1816 Prussia” (first working-paper version released in 2010): Using data from the 1816 census, this paper finds a significant negative causal effect of education on fertility – evidence for a child quantity-quality trade-off – already several decades before the demographic transition and shows that it is robust to accounting for spatial autocorrelation.

Becker, Cinnirella, and Woessmann (2012a), “Does Parental Education Affect Fertility? Evidence from Pre-Demographic Transition Prussia” (first working-paper version released in 2011): Combining data from three censuses – 1816, 1849, and 1867 – this paper finds a negative residual effect of women’s education on fertility, despite controlling for several demand and supply factors.

7. Additional Features of the iPEHD Website

The iPEHD website contains a number of additional features. For example, it provides a collection of thematic maps, produced using ArcGIS, that visualize the geographical distribution of several interesting variables across the Prussian territory. One such example is shown in Figure 1 above.

Furthermore, iPEHD is certainly not the only project dealing with historical Prussian data at the county level. Other projects provide such services as maps, information on territorial changes, additional data, and other material on Prussian counties. Links to websites of several of these projects, whose work is highly appreciated and can be viewed as complementary to iPEHD, are provided on the iPEHD website.

Finally, the iPEHD website contains a section on frequently asked questions, providing answers to standard problems encountered by iPEHD users.

8. Conclusions

The data contained in iPEHD, originally collected by the Royal Prussian Statistical Office, is an impressive collection of information whose quality, already in the 19th century, is generally regarded as excellent. Now digitized from censuses located in archives, these county-level data provide information on education, occupation, income and tax measures, industry, agriculture,

demographics, religion, and more. This database should facilitate future quantitative research on the economic history of 19th-century Prussia.

However, while iPEHD provides the service of supplying the historical data in a digitized and structured way and suggests ways on how to merge the data from different sources, researchers need to think carefully how to use the data in the context of their specific research projects. For instance, building panel datasets from the different census waves with varying administrative boundaries is a complex task that requires particular thought, meticulous care, and acquaintance with the structure of the original data. More generally, anybody planning to use the raw data contained in iPEHD should make sure to be well acquainted with the data structure and specifics as described in this documentation.

We hope that iPEHD provides a major service to researchers interested in Prussian economic history. Anybody who uses data from iPEHD is kindly requested to cite this paper as a source. Please also send one electronic copy of any work that uses data from iPEHD to iPEHD@ifo.de.

References

- Becker, Sascha O., Francesco Cinnirella, and Ludger Woessmann. 2010. "The trade-off between fertility and education: Evidence from before the demographic transition." *Journal of Economic Growth* 15, no. 3: 177-204.
- Becker, Sascha O., Francesco Cinnirella, and Ludger Woessmann. 2012a. "Does parental education affect fertility? Evidence from pre-demographic transition Prussia." *European Review of Economic History*: forthcoming.
- Becker, Sascha O., Francesco Cinnirella, and Ludger Woessmann. 2012b. "The effect of investment in children's education on fertility in 1816 Prussia." *Cliometrica* 6, no. 1: 29-44.
- Becker, Sascha O., Erik Hornung, and Ludger Woessmann. 2011. "Education and catch-up in the Industrial Revolution." *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics* 3, no. 3: 92-126.
- Becker, Sascha O., and Ludger Woessmann. 2008. "Luther and the girls: Religious denomination and the female education gap in nineteenth-century Prussia." *Scandinavian Journal of Economics* 110, no. 4: 777-805.
- Becker, Sascha O., and Ludger Woessmann. 2009. "Was Weber wrong? A human capital theory of Protestant economic history." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 124, no. 2: 531-596.
- Becker, Sascha O., and Ludger Woessmann. 2010. "The effect of Protestantism on education before the industrialization: Evidence from 1816 Prussia." *Economics Letters* 107, no. 2: 224-228.
- Becker, Sascha O., and Ludger Woessmann. 2011a. "The effects of the Protestant Reformation on human capital." In *The Oxford Handbook of the Economics of Religion*, edited by Rachel M. McCleary. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 93-110.
- Becker, Sascha O., and Ludger Woessmann. 2011b. "Knocking on heaven's door? Protestantism and suicide." CESifo Working Paper 3499. Munich: CESifo.
- Cinnirella, Francesco, and Erik Hornung. 2011. "Landownership concentration and the expansion of education." CESifo Working Paper 3603. Munich: CESifo.
- Galloway, Patrick R., Eugene A. Hammel, and Ronald D. Lee. 1994. "Fertility decline in Prussia, 1875-1910: A pooled cross-section time series analysis." *Population Studies* 48, no. 1: 135-158.