

---

# TRANSSILVANICA

## Transylvania until World War I

IOAN BOLOVAN  
SORINA PAULA  
BOLOVAN

### Demographic Opportunities and Vulnerabilities (II)

---

*Along the centuries, relations between the native Romanians and the other peoples that inhabited the Transylvanian space were neither pure or immaculate, nor horrible and disastrous.*

---

#### **Ioan Bolovan**

Professor at Babeş-Bolyai University, head researcher of the Center for Transylvanian Studies. Author, among others, of the volume **Transilvania între Revoluția de la 1848 și Unirea din 1918** (Transylvania between the 1848 Revolution and the 1918 Union) (2000).

#### **Sorina Paula Bolovan**

Lecturer at Babeş-Bolyai University, author, among others, of the volume **Familia în satul românesc din Transilvania** (The family in the Romanian village of Transylvania) (1999).

#### The Population of Transylvania in the Statistical Era

ETHNO-CONFESSIONAL REALITIES  
BETWEEN 1850 AND 1910

**S**PECIALISTS CONSIDER that after the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century we can talk about a statistical period in what concerns the Habsburg (Austro-Hungarian after 1867) monarchy. Periodic censuses were taken after 1850 (every ten years after 1870), the content of the collected data increased, the precision of data collection improved, the staff involved in this kind of operations was increasingly qualified, etc. The history of Transylvania between the Revolution of 1848–1849 and World War I saw significant economic, social, and cultural mutations which influenced the demography of the province. The dynamics and the structure of the Transylvanian population during the aforementioned period faithfully reflects the process of

renewal manifest at all levels, as well as the internal and external circumstances that caused more or less significant fluctuations in demographic behavior or in terms of the ethno-confessional structure. If in the prestatistical era the ethno-confessional structures in Transylvania were influenced in the direction desired by the Court in Vienna by way of colonization (mostly with Catholics) or by the union of the Orthodox Romanians with the Church of Rome, between 1850 and 1918 things were completely different. Thus, we can anticipate a bit on the content of this paper by saying that after 1867 the Hungarian governments in Budapest implemented demographic policies in keeping with their state interests, affecting the ethno-confessional structure of Transylvania.

We know that until World War I Hungary, just like the other half of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, was one of the most heterogeneous countries in Europe in terms of both nations and denominations. Specialists are nearly unanimous in saying that between 1850 and 1910 the empire saw sizable ethnic and linguistic developments. Amid all these mutations occurred within the provinces, we also witness a contrasting tendency with regard to the dominant nations: while in Cisleithania the percentage of Germans dropped from 36.2 to 35.6, the percentage of Hungarians in Transleithania increased from 36.5 to 48.1.<sup>1</sup> This significant increase in the percentage of Hungarians was caused by three factors: 1) the natural increase of the population, with Hungarian birth-rates higher than the country average; 2) the less significant Hungarian emigration, as compared to other ethnic groups; 3) the process of assimilation, which gained momentum in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century: the Hungarianization of a part of the non-Hungarian population and of most of the immigrants.

Under these circumstances, in the ethnic composition of Transylvania during the period in question we see more or less spectacular ethno-linguistic developments, varying in magnitude according to population dynamics, emigration, the educational and cultural policy of the authorities, etc. We must begin by saying that not all of the seven censuses taken between 1850 and 1910 explicitly indicated the ethnicity of the inhabitants. Other differences, manifest between the first part of the interval and the period of dualism, concerned the criteria used by the census takers in order to define ethnicity. Thus, in 1850–1851, the Austrian census takers used the criterion of “nationality,” as freely stated by each citizen. During the dualist period (after 1867), the censuses organized by the Hungarian authorities no longer recorded the nationality of the inhabitants, but only the mother tongue, understood as “the language spoken best and with the greatest pleasure by the person interviewed.” This criterion explains why in the documents of the censuses taken between 1880 and 1910 we find no Jews, Armenians, Gypsies, etc., as they were almost entirely

listed as Hungarians. According to such a classification, in Transleithania the percentage of the Hungarian population increased between 1880 and 1910 from 41.2 to 48.1, with the percentage of non-Hungarian decreasing, naturally, from 58.8 in 1880, to 51.9 in 1910.<sup>2</sup>

TABLE 1. THE ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF TRANSYLVANIA BETWEEN 1850 AND 1910<sup>a</sup>

Nationality	1850 <sup>b</sup>		1880	
	Number	%	Number	%
Romanians	1,226,901	59.5	2,231,165	54.9
Hungarians	536,843	26	1,024,742	25.2
Germans	192,270	9.3	487,145	12
Serbs and Croats	–	–	52,105	1.3
Roma (Gypsies)	78,902	3.8	–	–
Slovaks	–	–	25,305	0.6
Armenians	7,600	0.4	–	–
Ruthenians	–	–	14,514	0.4
Jews	15,570	0.8	–	–
Others	4,612	0.2	224,431	5.6

  

Nationality	1900		1910	
	Number	%	Number	%
Romanians	2,682,435	55	2,827,419	53.7
Hungarians	1,436,896	29.5	1,662,180	31.6
Germans	582,027	11.9	564,359	10.7
Serbs and Croats	51,160	1.1	53,455	1
Roma (Gypsies)	–	–	–	–
Slovaks	29,904	0.5	31,655	0.6
Armenians	–	–	–	–
Ruthenians	20,587	0.4	25,620	0.5
Jews	–	–	–	–
Others	69,012	1.5	95,814	1.9

- a. Figures based on data taken from: Traian Rotariu, ed., *Recensământul din 1850: Transilvania* (Bucharest, 1996); *Magyar Statisztikai Közlemények*, new ser., vol. I (Budapest, 1893); *A Magyar Korona országában az 1881. év elején végrehajtott népszámlálás eredményei, némely hasznos házi állatok kimutatásával együtt*, vol. 2 (Budapest, 1882); *Magyar Statisztikai Közlemények*, new ser., vol. I (Budapest, 1893); I. I. Adam and I. Pușcaș, *Izvoare de demografie istorică*, vol. 2, *Secolul al XIX-lea–1914: Transilvania* (Bucharest, 1987).
- b. The data of this census regard only the former Principality of Transylvania (Ardeal) without Banat, Crișana and Maramureș.

The information in Table 1 indicates the changes in the number and in the percentage of the various ethnic groups that inhabited Transylvania during the six decades that separate the Revolution of 1848–1849 from the First World War. The first post-revolutionary census, taken in 1850–1851, showed the undeniable Romanian dominance in historical Transylvania (Ardeal) (59.5%). The

same table indicates the changes in the percentage of the three main ethnic groups during the dualist period: the Romanians decreased from 54.9% in 1880 to 53.7% in 1910, the Germans also decreased from 12% in 1880 to 10.7% in 1910, but the Hungarians increased from 25.2% to 31.6%. The causes behind this rapid increase in the percentage of Hungarians are several in number, often mentioned being the higher natural increase of the Hungarians, the smaller number of emigrants given by this ethnic group, and only “to a small extent” the ethno-linguistic assimilation of the Jews, the Armenians, and of the several thousand Czechs, Poles, and Italians brought here by the industrialization. If this is perfectly true when it comes to the more limited Hungarian emigration, we have reservations when it comes to the much higher natural increase of the Hungarian population. Most likely, it was not only the high Hungarian birthrates and their limited interest in emigration that led to a positive score, but also the assimilation of other nationalities.<sup>3</sup>

In what follows we shall discuss a few aspects concerning the changes in the ethnic structure of Transylvania during the period in question, with special reference to the Romanians, the majority population in Transylvania. A much debated subject, now and at that time, was the number of Romanians in the dominantly Szekler regions located in the eastern part of the province. A foreign traveler who visited Transylvania at the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century (Augustin de Gérando) noticed the “Szeklerization” of the Romanians in that region: “Today there are many Szeklers of the Greek faith. They are all de-nationalized Wallachians.”<sup>4</sup> Thus, one of the ways in which the number of Hungarians increased in Transylvania until World War I was the assimilation of the Romanians living in the Szekler counties (Ciuc, Odorhei, Trei Scaune and partially Mureș–Turda). In the localities currently belonging to Covasna County, the Romanians represented 14.1% of the population in 1850, but only 11.5% in 1910; during the same period, the Hungarians increased from 82.8% to 87.5%. In 1850, the Orthodox and the Greek-Catholics amounted to 15.4%, reaching 17.3% in 1910<sup>5</sup>; under these circumstances, we see that the difference between the percentage of Romanians and of the members of the two denominations increased from 1.3% in 1850 to 5.8% in 1910. Considering that in the former Great Principality of Transylvania the Orthodox and the Greek-Catholic groups coincide almost entirely with the Romanian population, we tend to believe that between 1850 and 1910 there was a substantial increase in the number of Orthodox and Greek-Catholic believers who declared themselves (or were listed as) native speakers of Hungarian. In the marital records in the region hundreds and thousands of “Szekler” family names seem actually Romanian (Bokor, Dancs, Niczuj, Koszta, etc.) or are translated (Virág—Florea, Kedves—Dragu,

etc.), indicating that a sizable part of the Szekler population is of Romanian origin.

In the localities situated in what is today Harghita County, the ethno-confessional situation was as follows: in 1850, the Romanians accounted for 8.5% of the population, and the combined Orthodox and Greek-Catholic believers reached 8.8%, a negligible difference. On the other hand, in 1910, the situation changed: the Romanians were only 6.1%, and the two denominations amounted to 8.9%<sup>6</sup>; thus, nearly 2.8% of the inhabitants declared themselves Hungarians while belonging to the two typically Romanian denominations. In light of the aforementioned data, we can estimate that the assimilation of the Romanians by the Szeklers was slower, and therefore in 1850 we have a relatively small difference between the national group and the total for the two denominations. After 1867, the Hungarianization process accelerated, and the Szekler region was ideal for the purposes of the central authorities. Clearly we can find here a segment of Hungarian speakers who had a typically Romanian “faith,” a situation explained only by the fact that the inhabitants in question were from the first or the second generation of Szeklerized Romanians. The flawless demonstration of I. I. Russu, after a minute investigation of the local habitat, of the existing bibliography, and of the manuscripts dealing with this issue brings valuable clarifications to the issue of the Romanians’ “Szeklerization” in the medieval and the modern eras.<sup>7</sup> The assimilation of the local Romanians was, until a certain point, spontaneous, natural, by way of mixed marriages, but after 1867 the process was clearly directed in keeping with the demographic policy of the Hungarian authorities.

Another way in which the authorities in Budapest sought to influence the ethnic composition of Transylvania in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century was the colonization of Hungarian peasants or of foreigners in various parts of the province. Indeed, this colonization also had an undeniable economic purpose, but there was certainly a political agenda behind it, one devised to serve the general interests of the ruling circles in Hungary. One of the most systematic theorists of the colonization policies of dualist Hungarian, Gusztáv Beksics, the author of several texts dealing with the political, economic, and demographic problems at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, argued that the number of Hungarians had to increase and also that they had to be more judiciously “spread” over the territory, mainly by means of colonization. After 1894, colonization policies became the province of the Agriculture Ministry, which received significant amounts of money on a yearly basis. The central support for the colonists clearly indicates the political character of this action. Symptomatic in this respect was the increased attention given

to colonization in the meadows of the Mureş and Someş Rivers, in order to increase the Hungarian presence in the Transylvanian Plain and establish a solid bond between the Szeklers and the Hungarians in the Tisza Plain by expanding the scattered Hungarian “pockets” in the region. In fact, Agriculture Minister Ignác Darányi clearly stated in the year 1900 that the purpose of colonization in Transylvania could only be a political one: “The governing idea behind the colonization must be that the Hungarian population should be strengthened where it represents a minority, for this is of great state and national interest . . . Under these circumstances, the instinct of self-preservation demands—and this is only self-defense—that the Hungarian population be strengthened in Transylvania by way of colonization organized by the state. If we set this colonization agenda for the near future and if we seek to completely and minutely follow it through, then the millions thus invested will bring serious benefits to the consolidated Hungarian state.”<sup>8</sup> The tens of thousands of Hungarians, Csangos, Slovaks, Germans, etc. settled in Transylvania did not radically alter the ethnic structure of the population, but statistically they increased the percentage of Hungarian speakers.

The authorities knew very well that such an increase was not only the outcome of reduced Hungarian emigration and of higher birth rates as compared to the other nationalities. In fact, the Slovaks and the Ruthenians had a birth rate—and implicitly a natural growth—superior to the Hungarian one, but their percentage in the areas they occupied decreased between 1850 and 1918. In actual fact, the government in Budapest gave considerable attention to demographic policies at the turn of the century. Of course, first they demanded the support of the Royal Central Statistics Office, established in 1867 and led by the reputed demographer Károly Keleti. By order no. 4795/902 of 22 August 1903, Károly Khuen-Héderváry (the prime minister of Hungary) notified the Royal Central Statistics Office in Budapest to start preparing for the collection of data regarding the Hungarian-Slovak language border and also the Hungarian-Romanian one. Complex investigations regarding the mother tongue (in fact, the ethnic origin) were to be carried out in thousands of mixed villages situated in the areas inhabited by Hungarians, Slovaks, and Romanians, in order to corroborate the census data with the existing situation. On 14 December 1905, Gyula Vargha, the director of the Royal Central Statistics Office, assured the prime minister of Hungary that he “would endeavor to the best of his ability to see that the work concerning the linguistic borders, in keeping with the intentions of Your Excellency and for the success of the tremendously important action of national salvation, is carried out in the most thorough of fashions.”<sup>9</sup> This “linguistic border” project took several years to complete, and significant funds were allocated to it. The investigation was expanded to include

other aspects—social, economic, political, cultural, and religious—pertaining to the Slovaks and the Romanians. Practically, the authorities in Budapest wanted an in-depth analysis of the situation of the two nations in order to devise a political strategy suitable for the interests of the ruling classes in Transleithania. Without a doubt, the demographic data generated by the investigation coordinated by the Royal Central Statistics Office inspired many of the measures taken by the Hungarian government in the years prior to the war.

TABLE 2. CHANGES IN THE NUMBER OF ROMANIANS, HUNGARIANS, AND GERMANS IN THE CITIES OF TRANSYLVANIA<sup>a</sup> BETWEEN 1850 AND 1910<sup>b</sup>

Nationality	1850		1910	
	Number	%	Number	%
Romanians	40,394	30.1	83,227	23
Hungarians	48,809	36.4	219,235	60.8
Germans	39,973	29.8	56,386	15.6
Others	4,993	3.7	1,950	0.6
TOTAL	134,169	100.0	360,798	100.0

a. Data concerning only the former Principality of Transylvania (Ardeal) without Banat, Crișana and Maramureș.

b. Figures based on: *Recensământul din 1850*; *Magyar Statisztikai Közlemények*, new ser., vol. 42 (Budapest, 1912).

Table 2 confirms the observations of the older historiography which argued that, until the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the cities of Transylvania were inhabited mostly by Romanians and Germans (not so much the medieval core of the Transylvanian cities, usually known as the *intra muros*, but everything that fell within the modern urban territory). Indeed, in 1850 the two groups accounted for roughly 60% of the urban population. At the other end of our chronological interval, in 1910, the situation had changed radically: the Hungarians represented approximately 60% of the urban population of Transylvania, while the Romanians and the Germans combined reached only 39%. Of course, such a significant change in the population of Transylvanian cities in the space of only six decades was not the outcome of a natural increase in the Hungarian population, coming instead after a complex process aimed at the assimilation of the other nationalities and encouraged after 1867 by the ruling circles in Budapest. The Hungarianization of the cities was also speeded up by the settlement and the Hungarianization of Jews, alongside the assimilation of the native German bourgeoisie. This process, natural and spontaneous up to a certain point, was accelerated by the Hungarian government and by the nationalist circles. The higher the position in the social hierarchy, the higher the percentage of Hungarians and of newly-assimilated categories. Most of the industrial and commercial

bourgeoisie, but also an important part of the middle bourgeoisie (intellectuals included), consisted of assimilated people. The drastic decrease in the percentage of the German population in the urban environment, from 29.8% in 1850 to 15.6% in 1910, can only be explained by the ethno-linguistic assimilation of a part of the German bourgeoisie. Also, much of the German urban population suffered the serious economic consequences of the Revolution of 1848–1849. In early 1852, the governor of Transylvania issued a directive eliminating some abuses and the monopolies of some mostly German trade guilds. Furthermore, the law of 1860 regarding the freedom of professions dealt a hard blow to trade guilds, even though they continued to exist until 1872. Under these circumstances, with large factories gaining more and more ground, the traditional Saxon occupations decayed and many Germans emigrated from the urban areas either to Romania, or to America. We have already indicated that the percentage of German emigrants exceeded their average representation within the total population of the province, many German emigrants coming from the urban environment and being replaced mostly by Jewish immigrants from Galicia and Russia, who embraced the Hungarian language and culture. Significant in this respect is the fact that in 1910, of the 360,798 urban inhabitants, 26,429 (more than 7% of the total urban population) belonged to the Mosaic faith—meaning that they were Jews—, but were listed as speakers of Hungarian, artificially inflating the percentage of the Hungarian population.<sup>10</sup>

In what concerns the Romanian urban population, its number doubled between 1850 and 1910 (from 40,394 to 83,227), although as a percentage it decreased from 30.1% in 1850 to 23% in 1910. There are many reasons for this development, but we shall focus only on two of them. As we have already seen, in the cities the Romanian population had a lower birthrate than all other ethnic groups. Also, even at that time the Romanian rural population was reluctant to emigrate to the cities. The reason for this is psychological in nature, with Romanian peasants being highly conservative: “No other nation in the monarchy loves their family and home village more than the Romanian peasants. The bond uniting them to the family home and to the native village . . . brings with it many disadvantages and economic losses. Factories can wait for years in the vicinity, but the Romanians do not seek employment there. The economic losses are offset at national level: our villages have remained unspoiled.”<sup>11</sup> It is almost axiomatic to say that Romanian peasants would not allow their children to learn a trade in the city, fearing their moral and ethnic alienation.

Despite the absence of any major mutations between the Revolution of 1848–1849 and World War I, the denominational composition of Transylvania’s population reveals some interesting demographic developments and even the



TABLE 3. THE RELIGIOUS STRUCTURE OF TRANSYLVANIA BETWEEN 1850 AND 1910<sup>a</sup>

Religion	1850 <sup>b</sup>		1880		1910	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Orthodox	637,800	30.9	1,504,049	37	1,804,572	34.3
Greek-Catholic	648,239	31.5	941,474	23.2	1,247,105	23.7
Reformed	295,723	14.4	510,369	12.6	695,127	13.2
Roman-Catholic	219,533	10.6	716,267	17.6	992,726	18.9
Evangelical	198,774	9.6	220,779	5.5	263,120	5
Unitarian	46,008	2.2	55,492	1.4	68,759	1.3
Mosaic	15,668	0.8	107,124	2.6	183,556	3.5
Other religions	–	–	4,953	0.1	4,687	0.1

a. Figures based on: *A Magyar Korona*, 2; Hungarian National Archives, Budapest, coll. EOKL, F 551; Adam and Puşcaş, 2.

b. Data concerning only the former Principality of Transylvania (Ardeal) without Banat, Crişana and Maramureş.

trends manifest in the evolution of the ethnic structure of the province. In what follows, we shall speak not so much about the smaller denominations, amounting to less than 2% of the population and occasionally left out of some censuses (for instance, the Armenian-Catholic faith), but rather about the main religions of Transylvania: Orthodox, Greek-Catholic, Reformed, Roman-Catholic, and Evangelical. A first general observation is that the percentage represented by the Romanian religions (Orthodox and Greek-Catholic) either decreased or increased moderately between 1850 and 1910, while the typically Hungarian denominations (Reformed and Roman-Catholic) were on the increase. Thus, the percentage of Orthodox believers in Transylvania decreased from 37% in 1880, to 34.3% in 1910, while that of Greek-Catholics increased slightly, from 23.2% to 23.7%.

With the data for ethnic groups roughly matching that for the religious denominations, we see a parallelism between the dynamics of the Evangelical (Lutheran) faith, which decreased from 9.6% in 1850 to 5% in 1910, and of the German population, steadily declining throughout the entire period. With the Hungarians, however, the parallelism between religion and nationality is harder to follow, as they almost exclusively belonged to three denominations: Reformed, Roman-Catholic, and Unitarian. Between 1850 and 1910, all three denominations increased in number and as a percentage, particularly the Roman-Catholic one. A notable increase also occurred in the case of the Mosaic faith, especially between 1880 and 1910, when the data in Table 3 cover the whole of Transylvania: the percentage represented by this faith increased from 2.6% to 3.5%, indicating the massive settlement of Jews in the province under the dualist regime, following their political and civil emancipation.

THE ROMANIANS IN TRANSYLVANIA AT THE END OF THE 19<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY

**T**HE MEMORANDUM of 1892 submitted to Emperor Francis Joseph I by an impressive delegation of Romanian representatives (approximately 300 people) was undoubtedly the most important political action in Transylvania at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The period saw massive changes in the strategy and in the ideology of the national liberation movement of the Transylvanian Romanians, changes reflected by the very content of the Memorandum. According to some of the leading specialists in this matter, until a certain point the ideology of the Memorandum was that of the tribune movement (a social, political, and cultural trend which took its name from that of the first daily newspaper of the Transylvanian Romanians, *Tribuna* [The Tribune], published in Sibiu between 1884 and 1903), which sought to impose a new direction in the Transylvanian public spirit. In this vein, and starting from the premise that “numbers are the foundation of our worth,” the tribune movement demanded that the elites change their attitudes towards the common people and requested cultural initiatives likely to culturally, economically, and politically elevate the lower classes, turning their potential to good account.<sup>12</sup>

Romanian historiography has highlighted not only the innovative, but also the democratic character of the document of 1892. Drawn up by the leaders of the Romanian national emancipation movement, the Memorandum comprehensively and vehemently challenged the policies promoted by the Hungarian governments after 1867, the consequences of which had also negatively affected other nationalities:

*The situation of the Romanians is shared by our German countrymen, as well as by the Slavs living in the Hungarian state, and the same reasons of state demand that their legitimate interests be taken into account. As always, we remain convinced that only a sincere bond between nations can ensure the peaceful development of our country, and therefore the Romanians desire that, in a legal fashion and with the involvement of the competent factors, the system of government be reformed in our country, ensuring the rights once gained and taking into account the legitimate interests of all the nations living in the multilingual Hungarian state.*<sup>13</sup>

Consequently, the Memorandum was the natural outcome of the actions taken by the majority population, deprived of certain rights and liberties and subjected to a constant process of ethno-linguistic erosion. Free from the excessive historicism that might have made its reading difficult, the Memorandum turned

to other types of arguments and condemned official policies from other angles. One such approach, far from insignificant, was the demographic one. Thus, in the very text of the document presented in the spring of 1892 to Emperor Francis Joseph I, we clearly read the reason why excessive historical examples had been left out: “Even if the Romanians had no history of their own and no legitimate foundation for their claims in their millennia-long past, the simple fact that they exist, that they strongly demand, and can achieve a lot in certain circumstances is sufficient political reason to determine any government to take into account their legitimate interests.”<sup>14</sup> Or, as it has been accurately pointed out, this approach practically meant “the replacement of historical rights with the natural ones, a normal increase in the arguments provided by the majority principle.”<sup>15</sup>

Deliberate or not, but accurately presented on each and every occasion, the recourse to demography—or rather to the dominant number of Romanians in Transylvania—gave more weight to the Memorandum drawn up by the leaders of the national liberation movement. In its text, we have identified at least 15 fragments clearly alluding to the principle of demographic majority in support of the demands expressed therein. Here are a few excerpts:

*“The Union and its enactment in Art. 431868 meant the blatant disregard of every right of the Romanian nation, which represents the absolute majority in old Transylvania”; “We account for nearly three-fourths of the country’s population, we own lands to roughly the same extent, and we bear the common burden to the same extent; clearly we have the right to be proportionally represented in the Diet and to have a proportionate say in the country’s affairs”; “It is painfully true that more than 3 million of Your Majesty’s subjects are not and feel not represented in the Diet of their country”; “Everywhere in Transylvania, as well as in the counties located outside Transylvania, such as Bihor, Sălaj, Arad, Timiș, Sătmar, Maramureș and Caraș-Severin, 23 counties in all, the Romanians represent the overwhelming majority, sometimes even the only population”; “We the Romanians, a people of more than 3 million souls, have given our blood and our wealth to the support of the state, but there is not a single state-supported institution for our cultural advancement”; “Without including the autonomous Croatia, the Kingdom of Hungary has a population of approximately 13,200,000 people. Nearly one quarter of this population, roughly three million people, is represented by the Romanians living in compact masses in old Transylvania, in Banat, Arad, Bihor, Sălaj, Sătmar, and Maramureș, that is, on the eastern borders of the Monarchy, on the left bank of the Tisza River, in the triangle between the Tisza, the Mureș, and*

*the mountains on the Transylvanian border, on a territory of approximately 134,630.54 km sq, where they amount to 60–95% of the entire population,*<sup>16</sup> etc.

The demographic aspects are constantly invoked throughout the Memorandum in order to highlight once again the injustice of the Romanian subservient position on the land they occupied as the oldest and most numerous ethnic group. The use of demographic arguments also had a significant democratic ideological component, in keeping with the modern doctrines also manifest with the other national liberation movements in Central and Southeastern Europe. The Memorandum was undoubtedly a warning disregarded by the authorities in Budapest, foreshadowing the separation of Transylvania from Hungary at the end of World War I after the implementation of the principle of self-determination for the majority population in those territories.



## Notes

BCU Cluj / Central University Library Cluj

1. Adam Wandruszka and Peter Urbanitsch, eds., *Die Habsburgermonarchie 1848–1918*, vol. 3/2, *Die Völker des Reiches* (Vienna, 1980), 414.
2. L. Katus, “Multinational Hungary in the Light of Statistics,” in *Ethnicity and Society in Hungary*, ed. Ferenc Glatz (Budapest, 1990), 120, Table no. 5.
3. Ioan Bolovan and Sorina Paula Bolovan, *Transylvania in the Modern Era: Demographic Aspects* (Cluj-Napoca, 2003), 180.
4. Apud Sabin Opreanu, *Terra Siculorum: Contribuțiuni privitoare la românii din ținutul săcuilor* (Cluj, 1925), 34. The same author diachronically analyzed the phenomenon, confirming the observations made by A. de Gérando; cf. Sabin Opreanu, *Săcuizarea românilor prin religie* (Cluj, 1927).
5. Varga E. Árpád, *Erdélyi etnikai és felekezeti statisztikája. I. Kovászna, Hargita és Maros megye népszámlálási adatok 1850–1992 között* (Budapest–Csíkszereda, 1998), 6–7.
6. Ibid.
7. I. I. Russu, *România și secuii* (Bucharest, 1990), 19 sqq.
8. Apud Ștefan Manciușea, *Câmpia Transilvaniei* (Bucharest, 1944), 126 sqq.
9. Hungarian National Archives, Budapest, coll. *Miniszterelnökség*, K 26–1909–XXV – 181, f. 51.
10. Ioan Bolovan, *Transylvania între Revoluția de la 1848 și Unirea din 1918: Contribuții demografice* (Cluj-Napoca, 2000), 210.
11. Ioan Russu-Șirianu, *România din statul ungar (Statistică, etnografie)* (n.p. [Arad], 1904), 253 sq.
12. Nicolae Bocușan, “Ideologia politică a Memorandului,” in *Memorandul 1892–1894: Ideologie și acțiune politică românească* (Bucharest, 1992), 262; Liviu Maior, *Mișcarea*

*națională românească din Transilvania 1900–1914* (Cluj-Napoca, 1986), 16; Gelu Neamțu, “Precursorii Memorandului,” in *Istoria României: Transilvania*, ed. Anton Drăgoescu, vol. 2 (1867–1947) (Cluj-Napoca, 1999), 425 sq.; more recently in Vlad Popovici, “Tribunismul (1884–1905): Ideologie și acțiune politică, direcții culturale și angajament social,” doctoral thesis, Cluj-Napoca, 2008.

13. I. P. P.[app], *Procesul Memorandului românilor din Transilvania: Acte și date*, vol. 1 (Cluj, 1933), 43.
14. *Ibid.*, 42.
15. Liviu Maior, *Memorandul: Filosofia politico-istorică a petiționismului românesc* (Cluj-Napoca, 1992), 176.
16. P.[app], 15–42.

### Abstract

#### Transylvania until World War I: Demographic Opportunities and Vulnerabilities (II)

For centuries, the diversity of traditions and cultures has been one of the major assets of both Europe and Romania. The study examines, in a broad historical perspective, the demographic situation of Transylvania, a multiethnic and multilingual territory. Attention is given to population structure and to the status of the various ethnic groups in the statistical era, between 1850 and 1910. An interesting insight into the demographic and psychological behavior in Transylvania in the decades prior to World War I is offered by the matter of religiously and ethnically mixed marriages. We believe that this historical-demographic study, as well as other similar analyses, should offer both politicians and regular citizens of this country information and solutions for the present day.

### Keywords

historical demography, Transylvania, ethnic minorities, ethno-confessional structure, the Memorandum of 1892