

IOAN BOLOVAN
SORINA PAULA
BOLOVAN

Transylvania until World War I

Demographic Opportunities and Vulnerabilities (I)

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).

Introduction

NO ONE disputes today the fact that, for centuries, the diversity of traditions and cultures has been one of the major assets of both Europe and Romania, and that during the past decades the principle of tolerance has become the guarantee of a European open society aware of the importance of its cultural diversity. Transylvania is one of the major provinces of today's Romania and, starting with the dawn of the Middle Ages a thousand years ago, the Romanians were joined here by several other peoples which would later influence to varying degrees the history of this land. Among the peoples in question we find the Hungarians, the Germans, the Jews, the Armenians, the Serbs, the Slovaks, etc. Of course, their presence among the Romanians was not uniform, either from a chronological point of view (as they arrived here in different periods), or from a demographic one, as some came in larger numbers than others. Since the Middle Ages, Transylvania has had a

TABLE 1. THE POPULATION OF ROMANIA BY NATIONALITY, ACCORDING TO THE 2002 CENSUS

Unit	Total population	Romanians	Hungarians	Roma	Germans	Ukrainians	Serbs	Slovaks
ROMANIA	21,680,974	19,399,597 89.5%	1,431,807 6.6%	535,140 2.5%	59,764 0.3%	61,098 0.3%	22,561 0.1%	17,226 0.08%
TRANSYLVANIA	7,221,733	5,393,552 74.7%	1,415,718 19.6%	244,475 3.4%	53,077 0.7%	49,229 0.7%	20,816 0.3%	17,070 0.2%
WESTERN REGION								
Arad	461,791	379,451	49,291	17,664	4,852	1,741	1,217	5,695
Caras-Severin	333,219	294,051	5,824	7,914	6,149	3,526	6,082	340
Hunedoara	485,712	450,302	25,388	6,823	1,937	218	52	100
Timiș	677,926	565,639	50,556	16,084	14,174	7,321	13,273	1,908
NORTHWESTERN REGION								
Bihor	600,246	404,468	155,829	30,089	1,163	198	35	7,370
Bistrița-Năsăud	311,657	281,273	18,349	11,155	661	84	12	5
Cluj	702,755	557,891	122,301	19,834	944	203	24	40
Maramureș	510,110	418,405	46,300	8,913	2,012	34,027	14	15
Satu Mare	367,281	216,085	129,258	13,478	6,417	1,556	20	186
Sălaj	248,015	176,671	57,167	12,544	102	35	6	1,366
CENTRAL REGION								
Alba	382,747	346,059	20,684	14,306	1,311	39	8	14
Brașov	589,028	514,161	50,956	18,313	4,418	99	19	7
Covasna	222,449	51,790	164,158	5,973	198	24	4	4
Harghita	326,222	45,870	276,038	3,835	140	29	4	6
Mureș	580,851	309,375	228,275	40,425	2,045	72	23	8
Sibiu	421,724	382,061	15,344	17,125	6,554	57	23	6

Unit	Total population	Bulgarians	Czechs	Croats	Jews	Greeks	Other (Poles, Turks, Tartars, Chinese, etc.
ROMANIA	21,680,974	8.025 0,04%	3.941 0,02%	6.807 0,03%	5.785 0,03%	6.472 0,03%	122.751 0,5%
TRANSYLVANIA	7,221,733	6.607 0,09%	3.041 0,05	6.691 0,09%	1.804 0,02%	733 0,01%	8.920 0,1%
WESTERN REGION							
Arad	461,791	819	152	17	178	25	689
Caraș-Severin	333,219	52	2.479	6.273	49	14	466
Hunedoara	485,712	35	57	4	104	97	595
Timiș	677,926	5.562	283	371	441	209	2.105
NORTHWESTERN REGION							
Bihor	600,246	31	15	4	224	74	746
Bistrița-Năsăud	311,657	4	1	2	15	1	95
Cluj	702,755	20	9	3	250	152	1.084
Maramureș	510,110	2	6	-	94	11	311
Satu Mare	367,281	5	1	-	36	2	237
Sălaj	248,015	5	1	-	12	8	98
CENTRAL REGION							
Alba	382,747	21	4	4	27	8	262
Brașov	589,028	21	19	8	138	77	792
Covasna	222,449	1	-	1	19	5	272
Harghita	326,222	5	1	-	13	3	278
Mureș	580,851	14	4	3	150	17	440
Sibiu	421,724	10	9	1	54	30	45

Source: www.insse.ro

population structure dominated by three main nations (Romanians, Hungarians, and Germans) and six major denominations (Orthodox, Roman-Catholic, Greek-Catholic, Calvinist or Evangelical Reformed, Lutheran or Evangelical CA – *Confessio Augustana*, and Unitarian), accompanied by other nations and denominations which, taken together, never accounted for more than 2 or 3% of the population. Specialists normally reserve the name *Transylvania* for the area surrounded by the Carpathians, but most people use the name for that part of Romania consisting of several regions that had a more or less similar destiny across the centuries: historical Transylvania (which, between the middle of the 16th century and 1867, when it was annexed by Hungary, remained an autonomous principality under Turkish and, after 1699, under Habsburg suzerainty), Banat, Crișana, and Maramureș. These territories grouped under the umbrella name of Transylvania were gradually conquered by the Kingdom of Hungary starting with the 11th and the 12th centuries, partially came under Turkish control after 1541, and ended up under Austrian rule after 1699. Until the First World War, Transylvania's central and regional authorities remained almost exclusively in Hungarian, Saxon, and Szekler hands. This because, beginning with the 14th century, the Romanian majority was gradually denied any participation in the political, economic, or cultural life of their native province.

The information in Table 1 provides us with a synthetic overview of the ethnic composition of Romania and of Transylvania. In the case of the latter, the data is presented by development region and, further on, by county (the data is taken from the last official census, carried out in the spring of 2002). While in the country as a whole the Romanians are the absolute majority, in Transylvania as well the Romanian population is clearly dominant, accounting for nearly three quarters of the total population (74.7%), followed by Hungarians (approx. 20%), Roma (or Gypsies, as they appeared in documents and statistics for centuries on end), who represented 3.4%, Ukrainians 0.7%, Serbs 0.3%, Slovaks 0.2%, etc.

Over more than a thousand years of living together, this ethnic and denominational diversity most likely shaped certain types of demographic behavior typical for these peoples and denominations and led to mutual contacts and influences. 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. And this was most certainly the case in other European countries, where the majority population lived alongside significant ethnic or religious minorities. Despite the occasional conflicts, the local Romanians, Hungarians, Germans, and others also shared moments of cooperation and mutual struggle, of kinship and of unity of purpose.¹ If we look in retrospect at the previous centuries in the history of Europe (including Romania and, implicitly, Transylvania), we might ask a seemingly exaggerated question: was there a sin-

gle state or nation that was not affected by violence, that did not experience the drama of an interethnic or religious war, of an ethno-confessional conflict? It would seem that the correct answer is a negative one. More serious, even, is the fact that these wars were not confined to trenches and battlefields, engulfing instead homes, streets, markets, shops, churches or synagogues, and even cultural institutions. Furthermore, their victims were not only soldiers and combatants, but also common people, women, children, and elderly people.

Majority and National Minorities Today: The Case of Romania

MANY DECADES ago states and trans-national political bodies sought to protect national minorities and reduce interethnic and inter-denominational conflicts to a minimum. Right after the First World War, the League of Nations militated for a minority protection system that included things such as cultural rights, the right to petition, to education, to their own language, etc. After 1945, minority rights were relocated from the political to the human level, the stress being laid on the fundamental human rights. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948 made no reference to minorities, stating in its Article 2 that everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status. In the EU legislation, individual rights have been given considerable attention, and this applies to sexual, religious, or ethno-linguistic minorities alike: the absence of discrimination on grounds of gender, the equal treatment of men and women in terms of employment, promotion, professional training, social security, etc., all come to perfectly circumscribe this concern. The Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities adopted in Strasbourg on 1 February 1995 by the European Council and ratified by Romania through Law 33/1995 promotes non-discrimination, equality between the national minorities and the majority, as well as individual freedoms: the right to associate, freedom of expression, thought, conscience. Furthermore, linguistic freedom, the openness towards the other, and the preservation of cultural identities are a constant concern of European institutions. The European convention requires member states to create a framework within which national minorities could maintain and develop their culture, and preserve the essential elements of their identity, such as their religion, language, traditions, and cultural heritage.

At the same time, the members of a national minority are granted a number of specific rights, such as the right to use names in the minority language, the right to freely use and learn the language in question, and the right to signs, inscriptions, and information in the language in question. It must be said in this context that, in keeping with the principle of full and effective equality between the members of national minorities and the majority population, according to the provisions of the same Framework Convention, the special measures taken in regard to national minorities must abide by the principle of proportionality, avoiding any discrimination or infringement of other people's rights. Besides, the Framework Convention of the European Council requires that special measures concerning the minorities not be extended beyond what is necessary towards achieving the objective of full and effective equality between the members of the minorities and those of the majority. Thus, the Framework Convention that Romania is party to lays down a number of rules of European relevance, assimilating the basic principles that govern the issue of minority protection. Most essential among these rules are the following: 1. equal rights for the members of a national minority and of the majority; 2. non-discrimination of the majority in regard to the minority, or between the various national minorities within a state; 3. the rights of the individuals belonging to a national minority should be limited to the essential elements required for the preservation of their identity: culture, language, education, religion, traditions; 4. no collective rights whatsoever for the national minorities; 5. respect of the constitutional order and of the values of the states in which such national minorities live.

In what concerns Romania, during the EU accession negotiations, the respect of minority rights emerged as a major point of interest for the European institutions.² In the 2003–2005 reports concerning the progress made towards EU accession, the European Commission considered that Romania met the political criteria for accession set in Copenhagen in 1993, as it respected the fundamental human rights and liberties. In what concerns the rights of national minorities and their protection, the European Commission highlighted the progress made by Romania during the reporting period, stressing the fact that the 2003 revision of the Constitution included the right for those national minorities which account for a significant part of the population of any given administrative unit to use their own language in the relation with the local authorities, and that the Romanian citizens who are members of a national minority were also given the right to use their mother tongue during judicial proceedings (Title III, chapter VI, article 128). Another constitutional amendment that did not go unnoticed granted citizens the right to use their mother tongue in civil trials, with the Hungarian language used to a significant extent in certain regions.

Also, the Law regarding the status of police officers provides for the recruitment of officers familiar with minority languages, although their number is still fairly low.

Positively appreciated were the implementation of the existing regulations concerning the presence of bilingual signs in the places where the national minorities account for more than 20% of the population and the elimination of that constitutional provision requiring that education take place only in Romanian or in widely-spoken languages. This made possible the creation of universities using only the languages of the national minorities, examples in this respect being the two officially-recognized Hungarian private universities (Partium in Oradea and Sapientia in Cluj-Napoca, with branches in several Transylvanian cities). Furthermore, a state-run university, Babeş-Bolyai of Cluj-Napoca, has been praised by European officials because of the fact that the educational process here is organized along three complete lines of studies at undergraduate level (in Romanian, Hungarian, and German), and also for its postgraduate programs in all of the three languages, completed by a studies program in Hebrew.³

Obviously, the current situation—with all the minorities in Romania and implicitly in Transylvania enjoying the same rights as the majority population and possessing all the legal, judicial, and institutional instruments needed for the preservation and development of their own identity—was not constantly present throughout history, and it is equally true that for centuries the Romanian majority in Transylvania did not enjoy rights equal to those of the minorities that controlled the province following the numerous changes in the political and judicial status of this territory occurred during the previous millennium. On many occasions and until the contemporary era, this situation generated tension and conflicts among the various ethnic and religious groups present in Transylvania, often accompanied by violent outbursts resulting in the destruction of property and in loss of life for both parties involved in the conflict. Despite all that, the people of today are not responsible for the actions of their ancestors and should not be made to bear such a burden. The demographic data of the last census (see Table 1) by and large reflects the historical developments of the previous centuries, except for the fact that until roughly the middle of the 20th century, the German and the Jewish presence was far more significant than that of 2002. The tragic events of the Second World War and the developments that followed the introduction of the communist regime influenced the dynamics of Romania's population in general, but they particularly affected the German and the Jewish communities.⁴ This is why the present paper focuses on some essential components of the demographic structure of Transylvania during the medieval, the modern, and the contemporary periods, the evolution in number and as a percentage of this main ethnic and religious groups, seeking to identi-

fy the common features but also the differences in behavior that were always present in such a multi-cultural space, the manner in which interethnic relations unfolded, the political response to this ethnic and religious context, the degree of tolerance/intolerance showed by the inhabitants and by the state towards this ethno-cultural diversity.

Demographic Structures and Interethnic Relations in Transylvania in Historical Perspective

Antecedents: Transylvania before the Prestatistical Era

DEMOGRAPHIC REALITIES AND EVIDENCE

THE FIRST interesting aspect pertaining to the demographic (ethno-confessional) structure of Transylvania during the period investigated in this sub-chapter concerns the age and the percentage of the three main ethnic groups that inhabited Transylvania during the second Christian millennium. The matter is a complex one indeed, and for more than two centuries it has been the object of heated debates within the Romanian, Hungarian, and German historiographies. Consequently, we shall present here only briefly the main relevant events and discuss some relatively recent information and data uncovered by the specialists in historical demography. Romanian historians, but also some German ones, consider that in Transylvania and in the rest of Romania the native population is the Romanian one, the Romanians being a Neo-Latin people that emerged over several centuries in the area between the Black Sea, the Carpathians, and the Danube, within an ethno-linguistic process that began with the Roman conquest of Dacia in the second century A.D. and reached completion at the end of the first Christian millennium.⁵ Historical sources speak about the presence in Transylvania, around the turn of the first millennium of the Christian era of polities created by Romanians and occasionally by Slavs. This was also the time of the Hungarian arrival in Europe: originating from Central Asia and settled in the Pannonian Plain, after becoming sedentary and embracing Christianity, this people proceeded to conquer the neighboring territories, Transylvania included.

From the very beginning, the Hungarian kings sought to consolidate their domination over the recently conquered province in the east, sending there colonists loyal to the Crown and favoring the Roman-Catholic faith. Thus, the Szeklers—a people whose ethnic origin is uncertain and still the object of debate (Hunnish, Pecheneg, Hungarian, Avar, Gepidic, Cumanian, etc.)—were settled in the south-eastern part of Transylvania during the second half of the 12th century. The sec-

ond colonization operated by the Hungarian Crown involved German settlers. In what concerns the name of these colonists, it must be said that despite the initial Franconian majority and the more reduced Saxon presence, the German settlers eventually called themselves and were recognized as *Sachsen* (Saxons). The first major area of Transylvania to be colonized by Saxons was the one around today's city of Sibiu, in the second half of the 12th century. Later on, other groups of colonists settled on lands given to them by the king—between Orăștie (Hunedoara County) to the west and Drăușeni (Brașov County) to the east, and between the Târnava Rivers to the north and the Olt Valley to the south, in an area that included southern Transylvania, the Land of Bârsa, and the Bistrița region. The Szekler and Saxon colonists enjoyed administrative, judicial, and ecclesiastical autonomy, were governed by their own laws and elected their administrative leaders and their clergymen, but they had to fulfill precise financial obligations and offer military assistance to the king of Hungary.⁶

Within the Kingdom of Hungary, Transylvania enjoyed a certain degree of autonomy by virtue of its local institutions, the “gatherings of the Estates,” and also because of the presence here of an Orthodox (Romanian majority). A somewhat particular Transylvanian institution was the General Assembly of the Nobility, first mentioned in a 1288 document, at the time of Voivode Roland Borsa. These gatherings were attended by the Hungarian nobles and by the Szekler, Saxon, and Romanian elites. After the middle of the 14th century, the measures taken by King Louis I in 1366 increasingly turned Catholicism into a pre-condition for ennoblement, and therefore the Romanians no longer participated in the gatherings of the Estates and found themselves increasingly marginalized from a political and social point of view. In 1437, this state of affairs was completed with the introduction of the *fraterna unio* followed, in the 16th century, by the *unio trium nationum*. After the religious Reformation occurred at the middle of the 16th century, a policy of religious tolerance was introduced in Transylvania, which became the first European state to grant simultaneous official recognition to Roman-Catholics, to Calvinists, to Lutherans, and to Unitarians, communities consisting almost exclusively of Hungarians, Szeklers, and Saxons. Unfortunately, given their Orthodox faith, the Romanians remained outside the system of the three privileged nations (political Estates) and four official denominations. In Transylvania, their status was one of political, economic, and cultural inferiority. It was not by accident that some members of the Romanian elite, and sometime even common people, decided to emigrate south and east of the Carpathians to the Romanian states of Wallachia and Moldavia, where their freedom was not restricted. It is also true that a small fraction of the Romanian nobility, such as it still existed after the Catholic conversion policy implemented by the Hungarian Crown in the previous centuries, occasion-

ally embraced one of the new Reformed denominations (in the Land of Hațeg, in Maramureș, Chioar, etc.).

Throughout the Middle Ages, the native character and the numerical dominance of the Romanians in Transylvania was seen as a natural thing, repeatedly stated by high officials in the Kingdom of Hungary, by foreign travelers, and others. Until the modern era, it never occurred to anybody to deny the fact that the Romanians had emerged as a people in Transylvania and had not arrived there from anywhere else, and that they were the largest community in the province. These things were explicitly stated by many scholars and representatives of the establishment. In 1536–1537, in his text entitled *Hungaria*, Nicolaus Olahus presented his native Transylvania as follows: “It is inhabited by four different nations: Hungarians, Szeklers, Saxons, Romanians . . . According to tradition, the Romanians are former Roman colonists. Evidence in this respect are the many words they share with the language of the Romans.” Antonius Verantius, another humanist and a contemporary of Olahus, also wrote that Transylvania was inhabited by “Szeklers, Hungarians, and Saxons; I also have to mention here the Romanians who, while easily equal in number to the others, have no freedoms, no nobility of their own, no rights.” Also, Verantius repeatedly mentioned the Roman origin of the Romanians, and when it came to numbers, he stated that the Romanians were at least equal in number to the other inhabitants, namely, that they accounted for more than 50% of Transylvania’s population.⁷ The socio-economic investigation of several *urbaria* (registers) of some large estates in 16th century Transylvania has also demonstrated that the Romanian villages were the most numerous, the sum total of the subjects (heads of family in the registers) indicating that the Romanians were the absolute majority of the population in the Principality of Transylvania.⁸

The Habsburg conquest of Transylvania, occurred at the end of the 17th century, also brought with it an efficient administration meant to organize and take stock of the human and material potential in the territories integrated within the empire. Among other things, this led to the gradual introduction of conscriptions and to the periodical surveying of the various socio-professional categories or even of the entire population. In other words, we can speak of a prestatistical era between the arrival of the Austrians and the middle of the 19th century. Of course, during this period we continue to find general empirical statements regarding the demographic structure of Transylvania. Thus, in 1702, the Jesuit Andreas Freyberger, the author of the first historical piece on the union between the Orthodox Romanians in Transylvania and the Roman-Catholic Church, contended that the Romanians were the largest population in the province, as “they are present all over Transylvania and in the Szekler region, and even on the lands and in the seats of the Saxons. There is not a single village, town,

or suburb without its Romanians.⁹ Still, from the beginning of the 18th century, apart from the old narrative or economic-demographic sources (geographies, travelogues, *urbaria* and parish registers), we begin to have other types of sources: fiscal, military, religious conscriptions, parish records, etc. In other words, the sources of statistical and demographic data grew in number and their content became increasingly diverse. Also, their authors were increasingly skilled at the task, and so we begin to have a more accurate panorama of the demographic potential and of the material resources available in Transylvania. The available data concerning historical Transylvania indicate for 1690–1847 an average percentage of Romanians of 52.7%, with the Hungarians (including the Szeklers) amounting to 27.3%, with the Germans (Saxons, imperial officials and military personnel) at 16.7%, and with the other ethnic groups (Armenians, Jews, Gypsies, Slavs, etc.) accounting for 3.3% of the population. During the period in question, there was a slight but constant increase in the percentage of the German population, with the Hungarians and the Romanians losing a few percentage points.¹⁰ Nevertheless, even at that time nobody thought of questioning what must have been natural and obvious to all contemporaries, namely, the native character of the Romanians and their demographic dominance in the province.

Relatively late, at the end of the 18th century, when the Romanian elite in Transylvania demanded equal rights with the Hungarian, Szekler, and Saxon elites and resorted, among other things, to historical, philosophical, and judicial arguments in order to demonstrate that the Romanians were the oldest and most numerous inhabitants of the province, some Hungarian and Saxon historians (in keeping with the interests of the ruling political circles in Transylvania) began to challenge the native character and the Romanian numerical dominance since the Middle Ages. Then, in the 19th and the 20th centuries, more and more Hungarian and German historians elaborated upon this idea, seeking to demonstrate that the Romanians had emerged as a people in the Balkan Peninsula and came to Transylvania only in the 13th and the 14th centuries, at a time what the area had already been settled by Hungarians, Saxons, and Szeklers. Furthermore, according to some of these historians, the Romanians became the majority in Transylvania only in the 18th century, after a migratory influx from Moldavia and Wallachia caused by the oppressive Phanariot regimes there.

We shall not insist here upon the Phanariot fiscal regime in the two other Romanian countries (with the mention that the Phanariots took over the two countries in 1711 and in 1716, with the fiscal consequences of the takeover truly manifest only towards the middle of the century), and we shall equally refrain from discussing the Austrian political and fiscal system. We know for a fact that the inhabitants of 18th century Transylvania used to say that, after the 1699

Peace of Karlowitz, when Transylvania traded Ottoman suzerainty for the Austrian one, “the wooden yoke of the Turks was replaced by the iron one of the Austrians.”¹¹ Apart from the political implications, this statement indicates that Austrian fiscal policies, much more thorough than the previous ones, allowed for no exception when it came to the payment of taxes, the administration and the imperial army being there to enforce these policies. Or, in Wallachia and in Moldavia, despite the increase in the tax burden throughout the 18th century, and especially in its second half, tax evasion was rampant and the authorities in the two countries lacked the organized administrative apparatus and army to regularly and thoroughly collect the taxes. Therefore, the migration of the people unhappy with the increased economic and taxation burden was rather from Transylvania towards Wallachia and Moldavia, and much less the other way round.

Recent demographic investigations of the 1750 fiscal conscription confirm the fact that in Transylvania, until the middle of the 18th century, there was no massive “invasion” of Romanians from Wallachia and Moldavia. The fiscal conscription in question is the most valuable statistical source on the Transylvanian society at the middle of the 18th century. It provides the most complete and complex image of the economic, social, and demographic situation in the Principality of Transylvania. One document from the tens of thousands that comprise this conscription, previously unknown to historians, is called, in translation from the original Latin, “Excerpted general register of the towns, counties, Szekler and Saxon seats, as well as of the fiscal estates, indicating how many towns and villages in the Principality are inhabited by Hungarians, Szeklers, Saxons, and Romanians.” The included chart features an estimate of the authors regarding the number of localities inhabited by a Hungarian, Saxon, and Romanian majority.¹² It indicates the clear dominance of the Romanian localities, amounting to 1,401 and accounting for 58% of the 2,430 Transylvanian towns and villages, the Hungarian ones (807 in number) accounting for 33% of the total and the Saxons ones (222) representing only 9%. In what concerns the procedure employed, for the time being we know that each locality was visited by a commission of representatives of the administrative authorities in the unit in question (county, district, seat, town), who interviewed the local judges (*judicis*) and jurors on the basis of a standard questionnaire and directly surveyed the existing situation. As it has been pertinently argued, “the structure of the conscription committees, which included nobles, urban patricians, members of the Saxon and Szekler elite, ruled out any bias in favor of the component proven to represent the majority in the ethnic structure of the Transylvanian habitat of that time. Essential to ascribing a settlement to one ethnic group or another was, of course, the stable nucleus of the local population, and definitely not the newcomers, listed as *Inquilini* or *Vagi*.”¹³ Thus, no Romanians were included in the conscrip-

tion commissions of 1750 (or in the later ones) that determined the ethnic nature of a locality according to its stable residents. Had the Romanians immigrated in large numbers after social and economic conditions worsened in Wallachia and Moldavia under the Phanariot regimes (only after 1730), then these immigrant Romanians would have been listed among the newcomers and could have not influenced the already Romanian character of one or another of the conscripted towns and villages.

On the other hand, the reports issued by the administrative authorities in Transylvania indicate a serious concern with the massive and systematic departure of the local workforce in the direction of the other two Romanian countries.¹⁴ Even Emperor Joseph II, during his first visit to Transylvania in 1773, noticed that “these poor Romanian subjects, who are undoubtedly the oldest and most numerous inhabitants of Transylvania, are tormented and oppressed by everybody, Hungarians or Saxons, to such an extent that their fate, when you get to know it, seems quite miserable indeed and it is a miracle that so many of them are still here and have not left yet.”¹⁵ Thus, according to one of the most knowledgeable Austrian emperors, a man extremely familiar with the situation in his vast empire after many documentation visits and reports, the Romanians were deemed to be the oldest and most numerous inhabitants of Transylvania. The emperor’s observations are quite significant, especially since they came shortly before the most important episode in the 18th century political and national struggle of the Romanians (the 1791 memorandum called *Supplex Libellus Valachorum*), which sent shockwaves through the privileged categories of Transylvania and created considerable concern among the Hungarian, Szekler, and Saxon elites, as its demands would have allowed the Romanians access to the political life of the principality. But these privileged categories had no intention of relinquishing control over the province, hence the virulent attacks against the arguments raised by the Romanians, and especially against those concerning their origin and demographic weight.¹⁶

DEMOGRAPHIC “POLICIES” AND ETHNO-CONFESSIONAL STRUCTURES IN TRANSYLVANIA BETWEEN 1700 AND 1848

THE POLITICAL claims of the Romanian elite made at the end of the 18th century were not accidental, but rather the outcome of a century of national struggle for the Transylvanian Romanians, a century that had begun with the arrival of the Habsburgs and with the inclusion of the province into the Austrian Empire. Officially taking over Transylvania after the 1699 Peace Treaty of Karlowitz, the Habsburgs politically and militarily confronted the privileged Estates in the province, namely, the Hungarian nobles and the Szekler and Saxon leaders, all belonging to the four accepted (official) religions: Roman-

Catholic, Calvinist, Lutheran, and Unitarian. In their attempt to annihilate all opposition in Transylvania, the Habsburgs used both the carrot and the stick, their methods ranging from the political-military to the religious ones. Seeking to diminish the power of the privileged estates, the Habsburgs endeavored to foster internal “opposition” to them, indirectly “encouraging” and supporting the Romanians.¹⁷ Thus, the creation, right after 1699, of the Uniate Greek-Catholic Church and the later reorganization of the Orthodox Church, the establishment of the Romanian border regiments of Năsăud and Orlat, etc., favored the emergence of a Romanian ecclesiastical, intellectual, and military elite eager for recognition. The Union with the Church of Rome of some Orthodox Romanians in Transylvania not only strengthened the Roman-Catholic denomination, the official religion of the Habsburgs, in front of the Protestant ones embraced since the second half of the 16th century by the local Hungarians, Szeklers, and Saxons, but it also gave Greek-Catholic Romanians the possibility to climb the social, intellectual, and political ladder. It must be said that after 1700 the Uniate Romanians put to good use this opportunity offered to them by the Habsburgs and by the Holy See. After initially operating strictly within a religious context, the leaders of the Uniate Church, starting with Bishop Inochentie Micu-Klein, gradually expanded their claims to the whole national corpus, expressing the desiderata of the entire Romanian nation in Transylvania.¹⁸

Undoubtedly, the establishment by the Austrians of the Transylvanian military border at the middle of the 17th century occurred for more than just military reasons, such as the need to defend the borders of the empire against the Ottoman threat. The political motivation behind this initiative was part of the centralist polity of the State Council introduced by Kaunitz, who sought to limit the centrifugal tendencies of the Transylvanian Estates and better concentrate the efforts of state authorities, make more efficient use of the existing fiscal resources, and ensure public order in the province.¹⁹ At the beginning, these Romanian border regiments only accepted Greek-Catholics, but later, under Joseph II, a few Orthodox villages were also included in the military region. The consequences of the creation of the Transylvanian border regiments and of their survival for nearly one century have been the object of many investigations, which highlighted both the immediate and the long-term impact of the border regiments upon Transylvanian society in general, and especially upon the Romanians. In exchange for the chance to improve their condition, the Habsburgs expected loyalty from the Romanians. The countless events occurred within the empire between 1700 and 1918 demonstrate that the Romanians appreciated the opportunity offered to them by the House of Habsburg, and Austrian officials repeatedly praised not only the prowess of the Romanian border units (skilled in the use of weapons, stalwart, strong in front of the deprivations of long military cam-

paigns, heroic and willing to sacrifice themselves, etc.), but also their profound loyalty to the Crown and to Austria. The loyalty proven by the Romanian soldiers in the imperial and royal army over nearly one century and a half, until the dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy at the end of World War I, fully demonstrates that the Transylvanian Romanians remained faithful to the emperor. For the peasants living in the Romanian villages in Transylvania and Banat that were included in the military region by the Austrians in the second half of the 18th century, the transition from the judicial and economic status of serfs to that of free men amounted to a true “revolution.” They knew that they owed their new status to the emperor and that they had to remain loyal to him until their death. In time, this loyalty to the emperor in Vienna and the oath of fidelity taken by all those conscripted in the emperor’s army left deep and lasting traces in the behavior of the Romanians.²⁰

The Habsburgs skillfully set the Transylvanian Romanians against the Hungarians, the Szeklers, and the Saxons, as the former were demographically dominant but a “minority” from a political point of view. Of course, Vienna did not plan radical political changes for Transylvania, and never fully supported all Romanian claims, but it managed to “blackmail” the Hungarian, the Szekler, and the Saxon leaders into relative submission. Consequently, the Habsburg policy concerning the ethnic and religious structure of Transylvania had its first tangible results at the beginning of the 18th century, when the Uniate Church was established in the province. A century and a half after the Reformation occurred at the middle of the 16th century, the denominational structure of Transylvania changed again, as after 1700 the (Romanian) Greek-Catholic group appeared. Its size would increase progressively until around 1850 (with the direct involvement of the Austrian authorities), at the expense of the flock belonging to the Orthodox Church.

The settlement of foreign groups was another method used by the Habsburgs in order to alter the ethnic and religious structure in the territories annexed after the Reconquista occurred at the end of the 17th century and at the beginning of the 18th century. After the Transylvanian Saxons, the other major German-speaking community settled on the present-day territory of Romania were the Swabians. The Swabians reached this territory as part of the massive modern colonization process initiated by the Habsburgs once the Turks were driven out of Hungary and Banat, at the end of the 17th century and at the beginning of the 18th century. This colonization was different from the Saxon one, and led to different developments. Just like the Saxons before them, the Swabians reached Banat and the Partium region in the company of smaller groups of Frenchmen, Spaniards, Italians, Bulgarians, etc. Significant, however, is the fact that all of these colonists were part of the general Habsburg policy meant to consolidate

their political, economic, and religious hold over the territories annexed after the defeat of the Turks. After the Turkish war of 1716–1718, following the Peace of Passarowitz, Banat was also taken over by the Austrians, becoming a domain of the Habsburg Crown. Catholic colonists from the West were brought in Banat, because Vienna saw the settlement here of Catholic Germans as a way of increasing the number of loyal imperial subjects and of consolidating the Austrian rule over this fringe area of the empire.²¹

The first German colonists came from the army of Eugene of Savoy (the conqueror of Banat), veterans who were granted lands, houses, and other privileges. After 1719, the colonization continued at a steady pace, with a few moments of heightened intensity. Therefore, specialists talk about three main periods. 1) The first wave began in 1722 and lasted until the Austro-Turkish war of 1736–1739, with the establishment of 53 villages (most of them around Vršac and Biserica Albă); the number of colonists settled here during this period is estimated to have been somewhere around 35,000 people. During all this time, for the colonists Timișoara was a sort of “Klein-Wien,” given the presence there of an Austrian garrison, of German public servants, of administrative and cultural institutions. 2) The “Theresian” colonization initiated by Empress Maria Theresa after 1748, when German colonists were mostly settled in the marshlands northwest of Timișoara, in 30 new sizable villages; 17 older settlements also received an influx of population; it must be said that this stage in the colonization process was systematically planned and organized. A major recruitment center for the colonists was the city of Ulm, and from there they were shipped over to Banat by boat on the Danube or by road, via Hungary. The colonization patent (law) issued by Maria Theresa in 1763 (*Colonisierungspatent*) clearly stated the rights and the obligations of the colonists. Plans were also made for the establishment and systematization of their settlements, of the lands that were to be given to the colonists, and of the size of the fee (piece of land) held by each colonists. The settlers received financial assistance from the Austrian state for the construction of their houses, plus other benefits and/or tax exemptions for several years. It is estimated that the second major stage in the colonization process saw the arrival in Banat of approximately 10,000 families, amounting to about 40,000 people. Most of these colonists came from Lotharingia, Luxembourg, Trier, Upper Austria, etc. (of the Lotharingians, two thirds were German and one third were French). Thus, the Banat Swabians were not all *Suabi* in the true sense of the word, but rather Franconians from the Rhine and the Moselle regions, but the name Swabians came to be used in the 18th century for all the German colonists brought east by the Austrians. 3) The “Josephine” colonization, initiated by Emperor Joseph II after 1781, when 14 new villages were established and 13 older settlements received an influx of new inhabitants. The number of newly

arrived people is estimated to have been around 45,000 people. After 1787, the settlement of people in Banat was done on a strictly private basis, and colonists were brought in from Germany, Bohemia, Austria, etc., as skilled laborers for the mines, the industries, and for the cities.²²

In northwestern Romania, more precisely in the Satu Mare region, sources speak of the colonization of Germans as early as the 11th century, when a settlement was founded near the fortress of Sătmar (*Zoutmarkt, Satmarkt*). In 1230, Hungarian King Andrew II confirmed certain privileges for the Germans in this region. Also, in the 12th–14th centuries, German colonists were brought to work in the gold and silver mines of Baia Mare, Baia-Sprie, Cavnic, etc. German settlers were also attested in the same 14th century in Maramureș, the so-called Saxons of Zips (Spiš), Slovakia. During the 18th century, the Austrian state encouraged the settlement of other Germans at Vișeu de Sus, Borșa, Frasin, etc. They were miners, but also lumberjacks, carpenters, rafters, etc. Most of them became locally known as *Țipteri*, despite the fact that only some of the Germans in the region actually came from Zips, with the others coming from Bavaria, Tyrol, and Salzburg.

However, we can talk about a massive and systematic German colonization of the rural areas of northwestern Romania only beginning with the 18th century. The repopulation of these territories, after the lengthy and devastating wars between the Austrians and the Turks, as well as the economic potential of the region, were in the attention of the Austrian Court and also of some landlords. After the Peace of Satu Mare (1711), Count Alexander Károlyi received permission from Vienna to send emissaries to Oberschwaben (Upper Swabia) and find colonists for his lands in the Sătmar. Thus, the first 100 Swabian families arrived in Carei in the summer 1712, followed shortly afterwards by other groups who took up residence in Urziceni, Căpleni, and Ciumești. Not long after their settlement, Count Alexander Károlyi drew up a set of regulations laying down the rights and the obligations of the colonists. Most of them were serfs and paid a fee for the lands given to them, plus other obligations in produce and in labor. The colonization continued during the following years in the Sătmar and in northern Bihor and Sălaj, with Swabian colonists from Württemberg, Bavaria, Tyrol, etc. Not all of the approximately 9,000 Swabians settled here as part of this private initiative were farmers, some of them being craftsmen, extremely necessary to any feudal estates.²³ In the lowlands, animal husbandry, farming and viticulture were the main occupations of the Swabians in Banat and in northwestern Transylvania; in the hill regions and in the highlands they worked as lumberjacks, miners, or metal workers. The Swabians in Banat and in the Sătmar were deeply attached to the Roman-Catholic Church which, alongside their language and traditions, was a major component of their identity.

INTERETHNIC CLASHES IN TRANSYLVANIA IN 1848–1849

THE 19th century, the century of nationalities, brought with it the first violent ethnic clashes between the nations of Transylvania. Undoubtedly, the Revolution of 1848–1849 was one of the major episodes of modern history for both the Romanians and the other peoples of southeastern Europe. The revolution that broke out in mid-March in the Habsburg capital Vienna, and then in other main cities such as Prague, Bratislava, and Pest, also stirred turmoil in the former Great Principality of Transylvania. The Austrian and the Hungarian revolutionary plans were widely circulated and discussed here. In many Transylvanian town and villages, Hungarians, Saxons, and Szeklers proceeded to arm themselves and established the civic national guards. Until late March, some Romanian leaders sympathized with the revolution in Hungary, which promoted a number of liberal and progressive principles. But the increasingly exclusive attitude of the Transylvanian Hungarian nobles, their intolerance and their intention—shared by the provincial authorities, also largely Hungarian—of uniting Transylvania with Hungary triggered the first protest actions on the part of the Romanian elite. For the Romanians, who were the majority in the province, the promises of individual freedom and of progress generously offered by the Hungarian revolutionary program were not enough. The Romanians, who were not represented in the provincial executive or in its legislature, shared the Romantic national ideal and wanted recognition for their language and nationality, as well as equal rights with the other inhabitants. But this could not happen if Transylvania were to join a Hungary reborn on the territory of the old feudal kingdom of St. Stephen, the country of a single nation and of one official language: Hungarian.

In late March and throughout April the Romanian elites in Transylvania sought to define and clarify their ideology and their tactics. Gradually, by way of manifestos drawn up in the various centers where the Romanian community leaders were present, the main objectives of the Romanian revolutionary program began to emerge, demanding serious reforms but remaining largely legalistic.²⁴ The first major programmatic document was the manifesto drawn up on 25 March 1848 by Sibiu professor Simion Bărnuțiu and entitled *Provocațiune* (A challenge). The document rejected the idea of a union between Transylvania and Hungary for as long as the Romanians were not recognized as a nation and granted political rights. It also demanded national solidarity between all Romanian social classes and social or political forces. In early April, Blaj professor Aron Pumnul issued another manifesto, called *Proclamație* (Proclamation), which was sent to hundreds of Transylvanian towns and villages. The document also demanded recognition for the Romanian nation and stated principles such as equality, liberty, and fraternity, on the basis of which the Romanians were willing to coop-

erate with the Hungarians, the Saxons, and the Szeklers: “Romanians . . . tell the Hungarians, the Szeklers, and the Saxons that we love them like brothers, for we share the same country. Tell them and show them that we love them, but they should love us in return . . . tell them out loud that we do not wish to gain our rights by the sword, but with the help of sound laws, and therefore we are gathering together to understand what those rights are.”²⁵ The manifesto of Aron Pumnul, apart from the message of tolerance addressed to the “minorities” that were running Transylvania, deserves credit for having made the Romanian community aware of the need for a national gathering. In the absence of their own political institutions and since they were not represented in the Diet of the Principality, the planned Romanian national gathering was a truly democratic and representative one.

On 18/30 April 1848, despite the opposition of the authorities, the city of Blaj hosted a first representative gathering of the Romanians, attended by approximately 4,000 people: intellectuals, merchants, small nobles, priests, peasants. The gathering, known as the “Gathering of St. Thomas’s Sunday,” did not adopt a programmatic document, and the participants were invited to return in much larger numbers for the next national gathering. Still, this first meeting is important for having demonstrated the unity between the Romanian denominations in their struggle for national emancipation. It also brought the elite closer to the people, accelerating the merger between the top and the bottom layers of society, a process that had begun in the late 18th century after Horea’s Uprising of 1784 and the *Supplex Libellus Valachorum* of 1791, and which reached completion at the middle of the 19th century, during the democratic Revolution of 1848–1849. The national ideology, combined with the principles of liberalism and of social reform, provided the foundation on which the elites and the peasantry could take joint action during the Revolution of 1848–1849.

Throughout April, Transylvania witnessed the increasing defiance of the Romanian, Hungarian, and Szekler serfs, who were no longer willing to fulfill their feudal obligations to the nobles. At the request of the Hungarian nobles, the army units led by the Austrian military commander in the province and sometimes the civic guards themselves intervened against these social actions, some of which also had ethnic and national overtones, given the fact that most of the serfs were Romanian. On 2/14 May 1848, Simion Bărnuțiu, the main Romanian ideologist, delivered in front of the intellectuals gathered in the Blaj cathedral for the second national gathering a famous speech called “Romanians and Hungarians,” practically a theoretical and a programmatic prologue to the Great National Gathering of 3/15–5/17 May. This gathering was attended by approximately 40,000 people, mostly peasants from the various counties of Transylvania. The authorities once again sought to prevent or at least limit the magnitude of the

gathering, but were forced to admit that the event had taken place in perfect order and without the slightest incident, praising the maturity of the Romanian nation. The gathering took an oath of loyalty to the Romanian nation, to country and to the emperor in Vienna, adopting the 16 points of the program of the Romanian revolution called *The National Petition*.²⁶

The principles of the program adopted in Blaj reflect the Romantic idea of state and nation and are similar to what is found in the other programs of the democratic revolutions in Europe. Point 1 demanded national independence for the Romanian nation and equal rights with the other nations of Transylvania. Other demands included the abolition of serfdom without compensation from the peasants, economic and political freedom, the end of censorship, education in Romanian at all levels, etc. Point 16 demanded a constitutive assembly of the province, featuring representatives of all nations (the Romanians included), which would discuss the issue of the union between Transylvania and Hungary. In Banat, administratively a part of Hungary since the end of the 18th century, in the spring of 1848 the Romanians led by Eftimie Murgu drew up a programmatic document demanding autonomy for the region and direct subordination to the emperor, as well as democratic rights and liberties, etc. In Banat, Crișana, and Maramureș, some Romanian leaders gained seats in the Hungarian Diet and showed, if not sympathy, than at least neutrality towards the Hungarian revolution. The claims of the Romanians living in Banat and in Partium were largely similar to those of the Transylvanian Romanians, at least when it came to the social, cultural, and political ones.

In disregard of the *National Petition*, the nobiliary Diet convened in Cluj on 29 May 1848 (which included no elected Romanian representative) decided in favor of the Union between Transylvania and Hungary. Amid the revolutionary events unfolding in Vienna, Emperor Ferdinand I sanctioned the decision of the Transylvanian Diet, and thus the Romanian nation was once again denied recognition. Throughout the summer, the acts of peasant disobedience against the nobles increased in number, and the social unrest increasingly gained a national character. The nobles responded with violence, ordering arrests and reprisals against the peasants, who were mostly Romanians. Such violent actions against the Romanians occurred in Mihălț, Luna, and in other places, the Hungarian authorities still cooperating with the Austrian army command in the actions taken against the peasants and the National Committee in Sibiu, some of whose leaders were arrested.²⁷ The intransigence of the Hungarian nobles and the repression against the Romanians led to the organization in Blaj, between 3/15 and 16/28 September 1848, of a new national assembly, attended by approximately 60,000 people. This time, however, many of them came armed. The gathering confirmed the revolutionary program adopted in May and outlined certain social

and political aspects: it rejected the union between Transylvania and Hungary and demanded a return to autonomy; it demanded the end of military executions and of the repression against those opposed to the Hungarian revolutionary government, etc. Refusing to recognize the Hungarian government, the Romanian elites considered a possible alliance with liberal and constitutional Austria. The memorandum adopted by the third national gathering and sent to the Austrian Parliament talked by a Romanian autonomous state within Austria, following the union between Transylvania, Moldavia, and Wallachia: “No other state has given nations more guarantees concerning their freedom and identity than Austria, through the just and liberal decisions of a high Parliament . . . We desire a free union of free peoples under the leadership of Austria, free inside, strong outside . . . And we speak not only for ourselves, but also for our brothers in the Danube Principalities.”²²⁸ The loyalty to the House of Habsburg—which, for a century and a half and practically pursuing its own interests, had indirectly supported the cause of the Transylvanian Romanians—led to a political alliance between the Romanian revolution and Austria, directed against the Hungarian revolution led by Kossuth.

The third Blaj gathering was another step forward in the Romanian revolution in Transylvania. The Romanians proceeded to implement the principle of national self-determination stated in Point 1 of the Blaj program of May 1848. Thus, the revolution set in motion the democratic administrative and military organization of Transylvania. The Standing National Committee in Sibiu coordinated the establishment of the prefectures and of the legions, political-administrative and military bodies that were to become the institutions of national self-government. In the regions with a mixed population, Hungarian and Saxon representatives were also included in the leadership of the local administrative institutions.

In early October 1848, the commander of the imperial army in Transylvania condemned the Hungarian revolutionary government and the annexation of Transylvania by Hungary, restoring the Austrian constitutional regime. Civil war thus broke out in Transylvania, involving the Romanians on the side of the Saxons and of the Austrian armies against the Hungarian revolutionary forces. Of course, the Romanian revolutionists never became fully subordinated, from a political and military point of view, to the imperial army. In the Western Carpathians, Avram Iancu set up a War Council that coordinated the administration in the area and the Romanian military resistance against the invading Hungarian army. Until March 1849, the Hungarian army led by Polish General Bem managed to occupy most of Transylvania, with the exception of the areas under Austrian (Alba Iulia fortress) and Romanian control (the Western Carpathians). In the occupied territories, the Hungarian nobles started a violent repression against the Romanian

and Saxon revolutionists and peasants who had opposed the authority of the Hungarian government. In the area of the Western Carpathians, the popular army of Avram Iancu scored one victory after another against the Hungarian troops anxious to take this last bastion of Romanian resistance. Wallachian revolutionists (Nicolae Bălcescu, Cezar Bolliac, Gheorghe Magheru a.o.), sought to reconcile the Transylvanian Romanian revolutionists led by Avram Iancu and the Hungarians led by Lajos Kossuth. Some of these negotiations saw the active involvement of Ioan Dragoș, a Romanian representative from Bihor (Partium) in the Hungarian parliament, but the results were most unfortunate for both Romanians and Hungarians.

In the meantime, the Austrians began their military counteroffensive, supported by the Russian troops present in the Danube Principalities since the summer of 1848. It was only in mid-July 1849, following the insistence of N. Bălcescu with A. Iancu and L. Kossuth, that a "Pacification Project" was signed, and on 16/28 July 1849 the Hungarian parliament passed a law of nationalities granting certain rights to the Romanian nation in Hungary: the use of their own language in the administration of the counties with a Romanian majority, the independence of the Orthodox Church, etc. Still, the union between Transylvania and Hungary (annexation) decided by the nobiliary Diet of Cluj remained valid. The letter sent by A. Iancu to L. Kossuth in early August pointed out that an alliance between the Transylvanian Romanians and the Hungarians was impossible, promising instead neutrality in the clashes between the Hungarians and the allied Russians and Austrians: "After seeing the peace terms brought by Mr. Bălcescu, the agent of the Romanian emigration, from the distinguished Hungarian government, I must express my regret that under the present circumstances it is impossible to discuss a peace with our Hungarian brethren . . . Still, in order to prove the brotherly feelings we have for the Hungarian nation, we have decided to remain neutral with regard to the Hungarian army, refraining from attacking it and responding only in case we are ourselves attacked."²⁹ This tentative cooperation between the Romanian and the Hungarian revolutionists came too late, as on 13 August 1849 the Hungarian army capitulated at Șiria (near Arad). Immediately after this, the commander of the Austrian army asked the Romanians to lay down their weapons, and the legions of A. Iancu, almost undefeated until then by the Hungarian revolutionary army, were forced to disarm. This was the end of the revolution in Transylvania, an event that unfortunately left a deep imprint upon the consciousness of the people of that time.

Of course, the clashes that opposed the Romanians and the Saxons to the Hungarian revolutionary army, the material and human losses caused by the Hungarian insurgents to towns and villages, the brutal treatment of the Romanian and Saxon civilians by the Hungarian occupation forces, the victory of

the Austrian and Russian armies over the Hungarian troops, the restoration of the imperial administration, etc. exacted a tremendous human and material price, which reveals only a small fraction of the tragedy experienced by the people of Transylvania in 1848–1849. This aspect has been widely discussed in the literature, in a more or less passionate fashion, starting with the second half of the 19th century. Thus, we shall not dwell here upon the tremendous suffering of those involved directly or indirectly in the events of 1848–1849. The villages of Transylvania suffered to varying degrees, according to their geographic location with regard to the Hungarian, Austrian, or Russian encampments and to their proximity to certain battlefields. At any rate, even in the places where the churches were not vandalized or destroyed, the households had to suffer and sometimes people's lives were in danger, the documents speaking about many civilians who were arrested, tortured, and assassinated. It is generally accepted that the revolutionary clashes, most of them involving the Romanians and the Hungarians, resulted in more than 40,000 deaths, approximately 200 burnt churches, several hundred villages destroyed, and other damages that are very hard to assess.³⁰ Although most Romanian historians claim that 40,000 Romanians were killed during the revolution, demographic estimates indicate that between the period prior to the revolution and the first truly modern census taken in the province in 1850–1851 we find a missing 40,000 people in the total population, the only explanation for this being their death during the bloody events of those years.³¹ This means that in the 40,000 we also have to include the Hungarians, Saxons, Armenians, Jews, Gypsies and the other inhabitants of Transylvania who bore to varying degrees the brunt of the revolution. Still, most testimonies (official ones or the statistics kept by the Orthodox or the Greek-Catholic) speak of the very large number of Romanians affected by the tough repression against them. Besides, the fact that at the time they were the majority in the province leads us to believe that most (but not all) of the approximately 40,000 victims of the revolution were Romanian. Equally serious in the long term were the interethnic consequences, the fact that the Romanians and the Hungarians abandoned all dialogue and turned to mutual accusations, relations between the two communities being long dominated by fear, suspicion and mistrust.³² This happened not only at the level of the elites, but sometimes even when it came to the common people, making life difficult within the mixed communities in the province. The experience of the conflicts and of the mutual violence seen at the time of the revolution remained in the collective memory, often altering marital choices in mixed communities, prolonging the sense of suspicion and mistrust and making intercultural communication difficult. □

Notes

1. Lily Rain, *Familia etnic mixtă: Județul Covasna* (Sfântu Gheorghe: Arcuș, 2001), 5.
2. Vasile Pușcaș, *European Negotiations. A Case Study: Romanian Accession to the European Union* (Gorizia: IUIES – ISIG, 2006), 32.
3. Nicolae Păun and Gabriel Troc, eds., *Cultură, multiculturalitate, interculturalitate la Universitatea "Babeș-Bolyai"* (Cluj-Napoca, 2006), 3.
4. Dumitru Șandru, *Mișcări de populație în România (1940–1948)* (Bucharest, 2003), passim; Anneli Ute Gabanyi, "Exodul germanilor din România: cauze, fapte, consecințe," *Xenopoliana* (Jassy) 5, 1–4 (1997); Hannelore Baier, ed., *Deportarea etnicilor germani din România în Uniunea Sovietică* (Sibiu, 1994), etc.
5. Thomas Năgler, "Transilvania între 900 și 1300," in *Istoria Transilvaniei*, vol. 1, eds. Ioan-Aurel Pop and Thomas Năgler (Cluj-Napoca, 2003), 200; Adolf Armbruster, *Romanitatea românilor: Istoria unei idei*, 2nd edition (Bucharest, 1993), 17; see also Ioan-Aurel Pop, *Românii și maghiarii în secolele IX–XIV: Geneza statului medieval în Transilvania* (Cluj-Napoca, 1996), 19 sqq.
6. Thomas Năgler, *Așezarea sașilor în Transilvania*, 2nd edition (Bucharest, 1992), 204 sqq.
7. Ioan-Aurel Pop, "Observații privitoare la structura etnică și confesională a Ungariei și Transilvaniei medievale (secolele IX–XIV)," in *Istoria României: Pagini transilvane*, ed. Dan Berindei (Cluj-Napoca, 1994), 10–11.
8. Nicolae Edroiu, "Românii în urbariile transilvănene din secolul al XVI-lea," in *Sabin Manuilă, istorie și demografie: Studii privind societatea românească între sec. XVI–XX*, eds. Ioan Bolovan and Sorina Bolovan (Cluj-Napoca, 1995), 68.
9. Apud *Istoria românilor*, vol. 6, *Românii între Europa clasică și Europa Luminilor (1711–1821)*, eds. Paul Cernovodeanu and Nicolae Edroiu (Bucharest, 2002), 93.
10. Ladislau Gyémánt, "Evoluția demografică a Transilvaniei între 1690–1847," in *Populația României: Trecut, prezent, viitor*, eds. Sorina Paula Bolovan, Ioan Bolovan, and Traian Rotariu (Cluj-Napoca, 2006), 42 sq.
11. Liviu Maior, *Habsburgii și români: De la loialitatea dinastică la identitate națională* (Bucharest, 2006), 15.
12. Ladislau Gyémánt, "Etnic și social în habitatul transilvănean în lumina a două tabele centralizatoare inedite ale conscripției fiscale din anul 1750," in *Om și societate: Studii de istoria populației României (sec. XVII–XXI)*, eds. Ioan Bolovan, Sorina Paula Bolovan, and Corneliu Pădurean (Cluj-Napoca, 2007), 17 sq.
13. *Ibid.*, 19 sqq.
14. Livia Ardelean, "Aspecte ale migrației din comitatul Târnava în anii 1764–1774," in *Sabin Manuilă: Istorie și demografie: Studii privind societatea românească între secolele XVI–XX*, eds. Ioan Bolovan and Sorina Bolovan (Cluj-Napoca, 1995), 91 sqq. David Prodan demonstrated, after consulting thousands of documents in Hungarian and Austrian archives, that in the 18th century, just like in the earlier period, the mobility of the population and the main direction of its movement was clearly from Transylvania towards the areas located beyond the Carpathians. This does not rule

- out the fact that some people did come to Transylvania from Moldavia or Wallachia, but they were far fewer than those who left Transylvania. See David Prodan, *Teoria imigrației românilor din Principatele Române în Transilvania în veacul al XVIII-lea: Studiu critic* (Sibiu, 1944), passim.
15. Ileana Bozac and Teodor Pavel, *Călătoria împăratului Iosif al II-lea în Transilvania la 1773*, vol. 1 (Cluj-Napoca, 2006), 26.
 16. David Prodan, *Supplex Libellus Valachorum: Din istoria formării națiunii române* (Bucharest, 1984), 86.
 17. Maior, *Habsburgii și români*, 16.
 18. Nicolae Bocșan, Ioan Lumperdean, and Ioan-Aurel Pop, *Etnie și confesiune în Transilvania (secolele XIII–XIX)* (Oradea, 1994), 69.
 19. Mathias Bernath, *Habsburgii și începuturile formării națiunii române*, trans. (Cluj-Napoca, 1994), 170 sq; Carl Göllner, *Regimentele grănicerești din Transilvania, 1764–1851* (Bucharest, 1973), 25 sqq.; Mathias Bernath, “Die Errichtung der siebenbürgische Militärgrenze und die Wiener Rumänenpolitik in der frühjosephinischen Zeit,” *Südost-Forschungen* 19 (1960): 164 sqq.
 20. Liviu Maior, Nicolae Bocșan, and Ioan Bolovan, eds., *The Austrian Military Border: Its Political and Cultural Impact* (Jassy, 1994), 7 sq; Liviu Maior, *Românii în armata habsburgică: Soldați și ofițeri uitați* (Bucharest, 2004), passim.
 21. Sorina Paula Bolovan and Ioan Bolovan, *Germanii din România: Perspective istorice și demografice* (Cluj-Napoca, 2000), 39.
 22. Otto Greffner, *Populația șvăbească (germană) din Banat* (Arad, 1994), passim.
 23. Ernst Hauler, *Istoria nemților din regiunea Sătmăruului* (Satu Mare, 1998), 3 sqq.
 24. Liviu Maior, *1848–1849: Români și unguri în revoluție* (Bucharest, 1998), 49; Nicolae Bocșan and Valeriu Leu, *Revoluția de la 1848 din Transilvania în memorialistică* (Cluj-Napoca, 2000), 8.
 25. Ștefan Pascu and Victor Chereșteșiu, eds., *Revoluția de la 1848–1849 din Transilvania*, vol. 1, *2 martie–12 aprilie 1848* (Bucharest, 1977), 451–452.
 26. Maior, *1848–1849*, 111 sqq.
 27. Gelu Neamțu, *Revoluția românilor din Transilvania 1848–1849* (Cluj-Napoca, 1996), passim.
 28. Cornelia Bodea, *1848 la români: O istorie în date și mărturii*, vol. 2 (Bucharest, 1982), 911.
 29. *Ibid.*, 2: 1101–1102.
 30. Maior, *1848–1849*, 408.
 31. Ioan Bolovan, “The Demographic Impact of the 1848–1849 Revolution in Transylvania,” *Transylvanian Review* 5, 4 (1996): 128–135.
 32. Maior, *1848–1849*, 408.

Abstract

Transylvania until World War I: Demographic Opportunities and Vulnerabilities

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 prestatistical era, between 1700 and 1848, and during the Revolution of 1848-1849, highlighting the discrepancy between the numerical presence of the Romanians and their social, political, economic, and cultural status in the province.

Keywords

historical demography, Transylvania, ethnic minorities, 1848 Revolution, colonization