Transylvania until World War I
Demographic Opportunities and Vulnerabilities

Ioan Bolovan
Sorina Paula Bolovan

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 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, Crişana, and Maramureş. These territories grouped under the umbrella name of Transylvania were gradu-

ally 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 form 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 single 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 mea-

sures 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 cit-

ies). 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) generally 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 identify 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.[5]

Table 1. The population of Romania by nationality, according to the 2002 census

Unit	Total population	Romanians	Hungarians	Roma	Germans	Ukrainians	Serbs	Slovaks
	21,680,974	19,399,597	1,431,807	535,140	59,764	61,098	22,561	17,226
Romania		89.5%	6.6%	2.5%	0.3%	0.3%	0.1%	0.08%
	7,221,733	5,393,552	1,415,718	244,475	53,077	49,229	20,816	17,070
Transylvania		74.7%	19.6%	3.4%	0.7%	0.7%	0.3%	0.2%
Western Region								
Arad	461,791	379,451	49,291	17,664	4,852	1,741	1,217	5,695
Caraş-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
Timiş	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
Bistriţa-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
Maramureş	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
Braşov	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
Mureş	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

Table 1. The population of Romania by nationality, according to the 2002 census

Unit	Total population	Bulgarians	Czechs	Croats	Jews	Greeks	Other (Poles, Turks, Tartars, Chinese, etc.)
	21,680,974	8,025	3,941	6,807	5,785	6,472	122,751
Romania		0.04%	0.02%	0.03%	0.03%	0.03%	0.5%
	7,221,733	6,607	3,041	6,691	1,804	733	8,920
Transylvania		0.09%	0.05	0.09%	0.02%	0.01%	0.1%
Western Region							
Arad	461,791	819	152	17	178	25	689
Carş-Severin	333,219	52	2,479	6,273	49	14	466
Hunedoara	485,712	35	57	4	104	97	595
Timiş	677,926	5,562	283	371	441	209	2,105
Northwestern Region							
Bihor	600,246	31	15	4	224	74	746
Bistriţa-Năsăud	311,657	4	1	2	15	1	95
Cluj	702,755	20	9	3	250	152	1,084
Maramureş	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
Braşov	589,028	21	19	8	138	77	792
Covasna	222,449	1	-	1	19	5	272
Harghita	326,222	5	1	-	13	3	278
Mureş	580,851	14	4	3	150	17	440
Sibiu	421,724	10	9	1	54	30	45

Source: www.insse.ro

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.[6] 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 southeastern part of Transylvania during the second half of the 12th century. The second 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

Orăştie (Hunedoara County) to the west and Drăuşeni (Braşov 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 Bistriţa 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.[7]

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, occasionally embraced one of the new Reformed denominations (in the Land of Haţeg, in Maramureş, 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.[8] 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.[9]

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."[10] 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.[11] Nevertheless, even at that time nobody thought of questioning what mush 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."[12] 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.[13] 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*."[14] Thus, no Romanians were included in the conscription 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.[15] 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."[16] 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 though 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.[17]

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 political-military to 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.[18] 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.[19]

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.[20] 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 campaigns, 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.[21]

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.[22]

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 Timişoara 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 Timişoara, 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 colonist. 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.[23]

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 Maramureş, the so-called Saxons of Zips (Spiš), Slovakia. During the 18th century, the Austrian state encouraged the settlement of other Germans at Vişeul de Sus, Borşa, Frasin, etc. They were miners, but also lumberjacks, carpenters, rafters, etc. Most of them became locally known as *Ţipţeri*, 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 Ciumeşti. 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.[24] 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 civic national guards. Until late March, some Romanians 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 were the Romanian community leaders were present, the main objectives of the Romanian revolutionary program began to emerge, demanding serious reforms but remaining largely legalistic.[25] 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 cooperate 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."[26] 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 bought 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 Bărnuţiu, 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*.[27]

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, Crişana, and Maramureş, 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 Mihalţ, 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.[28] The intransigence of the Hungarian nobles and the repres-

sion 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."[29] 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 Dragoş, 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."[30] This tentative cooperation between the Romanian and the Hungarian revolutionists came too late, as on 13 August 1849 the Hungarian army capitulated at Şiria (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, 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.[31] 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.[32] 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.[33] 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.

The Population of Transylvania in the Statistical Era: Ethno-Confessional Realities between 1850 and 1910

Specialists consider that after the middle of the 19th 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 changes. 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.[34] This significant increase in the percentage of Hungarians was caused by three factors:

1) the natural increase of the population, with Hungarian birthrates 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 19th century and at the beginning of the 20th century: the Hungarization 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.[35]

The information in Table 2 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

Table 2. The ethnic composition of Transylvania between 1850 and 1910[a]

	1850[b]		1880	
Nationality	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

	1900		1910	
Nationality	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. 1 (Budapest, 1893); *A Magyar Korona országaiban az 1881. év elején végrehajtott népszámlálás eredményei, némely hasznos házi állatok kimutatásával együtt*, vol. 2 (Budapest, 1882); *Magyar Statisztikai Közlemények, new ser.*, vol. 1 (Budapest, 1893); I. I. Adam and I. Puşcaş, *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, Crişana and Maramureş.

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 birth-rates and their limited interest in emigration that led to a positive score, but also the assimilation of other nationalities.[36]

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 19th 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."[37] 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 Mureş–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[38]; 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%[39]; 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 Hungarization 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.[40] 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 19th century and at the beginning of the 20th 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 20th 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."[41] 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."[42] 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 3 confirms the observations of the older historiography which argued that, until the middle of the 19th 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

Table 3. Changes in the number of Romanians, Hungarians, and Germans in the cities of Transylvania[a] between 1850 and 1910[b]

	1850		1910	
Nationality	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, Crişana and Maramureş.

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

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 Hungarization of the cities was also speeded up by the settlement and the Hungarization 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.[43]

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."[44] 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 (see Table 4.) reveals some interesting demographic developments and even the 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

Table 4. The religious structure of Transylvania between 1850 and 1910[a]

	1850[b]		1880		1910	
Religion	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.

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 19th Century

The 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 19th century. The period saw massive changes in the strategy and in the ideology of the national liberation movement of the Transyl-

vanian 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.[45]

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 poliçies 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.*[46]

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."[47] 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."[48]

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, Timiş, Sătmar, Maramureş and Caraş-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 Maramureş, that is, on the eastern borders of the Monarchy, on the left bank of the Tisza River, in the triangle between the Tisza, the Mureş, 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,"*[49] *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 Memo-

randum 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.

Mixed Marriages in Transylvania in the Modern Era: Between Identity and Otherness

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. Talking to her daughter Persida about her love for Ignatius (Naţl) Huber, Mara (the famous female character in the homonymous novel written by Ioan Slavici) confessed: "God knows how much I thought about you, how much I toiled for you, how devotedly I took care of you, and He cannot possibly punish me so harshly. If I were to see you dead all the joy in my life would be lost, but I would tell to myself that this happened to other mothers as well, and I would eventually find my peace. But no one in our family has ever tainted their blood!"[50] How much is fiction and how much is reality in this fragment written by Ioan Slavici in 1894? His later memoirs, written beginning with 1924, also include an interesting passage: "The Romanians did not live together with, but alongside the others; they got along well, but did not live together. I was different, even if my mother always remained determined that one must not eat from a plate used by a foreigner."[51] Undoubtedly, these texts—fiction or memoirs—had in them a significant amount of reality, but ascribing general validity to their content cannot help us piece together an extremely complex phenomenon (mixed marriages), with implications that were demographic as well as ethno-confessional, sociological, cultural, etc., and defined modernity in Transylvania.[52]

Human identity is defined by one's membership to a religious community, to an ethnic group or a nation, something which comes at birth or can be gained later in life through socialization. To put it simply, the ethnic diversity of humankind found an expression in the competitive ethnological image of WE and THEY, in which national awareness was also grounded. It was on this foundation that nearly all nations built their image of themselves, contemplating their own identity but at the same time comparing themselves to OTHERS. Throughout history, until World War I, most of the peoples in Central and Southeastern Europe lived in a state of constant insecurity when it came to their borders and to their ethnic and religious survival. Of course, this kind of geopolitical heritage left a

deep imprint upon the collective mentality, and each generation produced and assimilated stereotypes, "ethnic mentalities and images, both of the self and of the OTHERS, which in time turned into natural norms of their daily life. Mistrust of the neighbors and the fear of foreigners came to define, consciously or not, one's ethnic behavior. With these nations we see an exaggerated concern for the affirmation of their national identity. Ethnicity became one and the same with survival."[53] In such a context, it would be interesting to see how the people of Central Europe looked at mixed marriages, basically a way in which, alongside other social and political mechanisms, one could gradually change his or her ethnic and confessional identity.

At least until the modern era, marriage was the essential way to establish a family, to socially legitimize a basic institution of humankind. By marriage, the spouses and their offspring entered the cosmic cycle of life and death. Marriage was ascribed such a significance precisely in order to protect family life from human weaknesses, from pagan influences, so that the family could fulfill its economic, social, and cultural role.[54] How did the inhabitants of Transylvania look at mixed marriages at the end of the modern era? How relevant are for a historian the aforementioned texts by Slavici? Of course, such fictions and memoirs also describe true instances of demographic behavior, stereotypes and prejudices that decisively influenced the conclusion of marriages in Transylvania during the last decades of the 19th century. Slavici's texts also present us with a world in motion, showing both the conservative attitude of Mara with regard to ethnically mixed marriages or to the adoption of other religious and social practices, and the psychological openness to interculturality illustrated by Persida and by Naţl, or by the writer himself, in his memoirs or in the actual mixed marriage he himself concluded.

After 1865, we find statistical data for the counties, the seats, and the districts of Transylvania, making it possible to assess the magnitude of the phenomenon of mixed marriages in this region. Before examining the quantitative features of this phenomenon, we must explain the term "mixed marriage." The statistics produced by the Hungarian authorities in our period of interest recorded denominational differences, indicating all of the marriages concluded by people belonging to two different denominations. This means that what the documents listed as a mixed marriage (*vegyes házasság*) did not necessarily involve spouses from different ethnic groups, as the ethno-confessional diversity of Transylvania made it so that people from the same ethnic group embraced different denominations: the Romanians were Orthodox and Greek-Catholic, the Hungarians were Roman-Catholic, Evangelical, or Unitarian, the Germans were Roman-Catholic and Lutheran (also known and Evangelical CA – Confessio Augustana), or members of different ethnic groups embraced the same religion. Of course, these

Table 5. Interdenominational marriages in Transylvania between 1866 and 1875 (%)

Administrative Unit	1866	1867	1868	1869	1870	1871	1872	1873	1874	1875
Alba de Jos County	13.2	11.9	11.7	11.6	11.7	11.6	12.1	12.5	13.4	13.8
Arieş Seat	10.9	10	14.4	17.2	13.4	20.7	19.4	20.3	17.1	11.8
Solnocul Interior County	5.1	6.9	6.7	8.9	9	7.3	7.3	8.7	8.8	7.3
Bistriţa District	11	4.8	11.3	10.8	5.8	9.4	6.3	8.8	4.7	7.1
Braşov District	8.2	7.3	9.9	9.1	8.9	7.6	10	9.6	9.6	10.2
Ciuc Seat	1.8	0.8	1.2	1.3	2.1	1.7	2	1.7	1.7	2.8
Dăbâca County	6.7	7.4	7.1	7.4	6.3	7.6	8.1	7.3	9.2	9.1
Alba de Sus County	5.1	6.5	6.8	6.4	7	8.3	5.7	7.5	10.7	11.4
Făgăraş District	12.2	13.6	12.8	12.7	17.2	10	12.2	11.6	12.7	11.2
Trei Scaune Seat	13	13.8	15.5	12	14.6	10.5	13.6	13.4	14.5	14.5
Hunedoara County	6.9	5.4	6.7	7	7	7.4	7	8.6	10.4	8.2
Cojocna County	7.4	7.6	8.3	9.8	7.2	12.1	12.3	11.1	11.9	11.4
Rupea Seat	4.1	7	7.6	7.8	3.8	11	7	7.3	3.4	7.7
Chioar District	6.9	7	4.8	4.7	5	4.8	3.9	5.4	4.8	3.9
Solnocul de Mijloc County	2	2.3	1.9	3.3	2.7	2	3.1	3.2	2.2	2.1
Crasna County	2.3	2.5	2.6	3.4	3.5	3.9	3.3	3.1	4	1.8
Târnava County	12.5	13.2	16.3	15.2	14	15	13.9	17.7	16.8	13.5
Mediaş Seat	5.3	10.9	8.3	9.3	11	14	15.5	16.6	12.2	11.7
Cincul Mare Seat	3	0.8	0.9	1.3	3.7	2.9	4.3	3	2.7	3.2
Năsăud District	4.5	3.6	4	4.4	4.8	5.5	5.4	6.1	4.9	5.9
Sighişoara Seat	6.5	2.5	7	3.3	3.6	3.2	8.3	4.6	2.5	3.5
Mureş Seat	11.4	13	13.3	13.3	14	16.1	15.1	15.8	15.2	15.2
Sebeş Seat	3.8	12	7.6	7	9	6.5	6.2	7	6.7	9.4
Orăştie Seat	16.9	18	16.6	19.4	17	8.5	4	6.8	11.6	19.5
Sibiu Seat	11.2	9.2	9	9.5	9.8	12.3	10.2	12.8	13.4	12.4
Miercurea Seat	4.1	1.6	6.7	6.4	1.5	3	3.5	3.4	4.5	6.1
Turda County	12.3	12	12.5	11.2	10.7	5.7	6.3	4.5	15.5	14.5
Odorhei Seat	9.3	10.1	11.7	10.3	10.7	10.1	12.4	11.4	11.5	10.8
Nocrich Seat	10.8	9.7	12.4	11.4	7.9	10.9	10.7	14.4	12.8	14.1
Zarand County	0.7	1.3	1.3	0.8	1	0.8	1.1	1.5	1.5	2.3
Caraş County	3.4	3.8	3.3	3.5	4.2	4.3	3.7	4	5.1	4.8
Timiş County	3.2	3.3	3	3.9	3	3	2.9	3.8	3.1	4.2
Arad County	4.3	3.9	4.5	5.6	5.4	6	5.6	5.9	6.1	5.5
Bihor County	7.3	7	8.5	8.7	8.8	7.1	7	6.8	7.2	7.3
Maramureş County	2	1.8	1.4	1.3	1.5	1.8	3	1.9	2.1	2.1
Sătmar County	8.5	6	5.4	5.7	5.6	6.8	6.5	6.4	6.3	6.4

Source: *Magyar statisztikai évkönyv*, vols. 2–5 (budapest, 1874–1878).

Note: For the counties of Caraş, Timiş, Arad, Bihor, and Maramureş the data includes those areas that are currently not part of Romania.

Table 6. Mixed marriages in Transylvania between 1876 and 1889 (%)

Administative Unit	1876	1877	1878	1879	1880	1881	1882	1883	1884	1885	1886	1887	1888	1889
Alba de Jos County	14.6	15.8	16.9	17	16.3	19	16.9	17.4	17.2	17.8	18.3	16.8	18.6	16.9
Arad County	4.3	4.3	4.8	5.2	5.7	5.6	5.3	4.7	5.7	5.1	5.4	5.6	5.8	5.2
Arad City	20.8	18.3	23.4	22.6	23	19.5	24.2	24.8	28	26.6	25.9	24.1	21.5	22.3
Bistriţa-Năsăud County	7.2	8.6	7.5	8.2	7.6	9.5	6.9	8.9	8.2	8.7	9.4	10.2	10.4	10.8
Bihor County	6.5	7.8	6.9	7.3	7.8	8.9	8.8	8.1	8	8.8	9.3	8.6	9.5	9.3
Oradea City	29.3	23.2	29.9	28.5	22.8	28.9	26	26.8	27.7	33.6	33.5	34.7	29.3	29.9
Braşov County	10.4	13.6	13.3	12.1	9.7	11.3	14	13.1	11.9	11.2	11.7	11.4	10.4	12.5
Ciuc County	0.9	4.7	3.5	4.2	3.8	4.5	3.2	3.6	4.8	4.4	5.7	5.5	7.4	5.5
Făgăraş County	14.5	24.5	16.5	14.7	16.5	15.1	13.7	18.6	18.5	13.1	14.8	17.8	16.7	12.3
Trei Scaune County	15.3	15.5	16.8	14.5	15.9	15.3	18.4	16.9	16.9	16.1	17.9	17.5	19.3	19.1
Hunedoara County	8.3	9.3	9.5	8.3	9.4	7.7	9.6	8.7	10.9	9.8	8.9	9.5	10.3	11
Târnava Mică County	12.9	16.5	19.5	15.3	16.3	15.5	15.6	17.9	16.2	15.1	20.4	16.6	17.9	17.8
Cojocna (Cluj) County	9.2	9.8	9.4	9.4	11.3	11	11.1	9.3	10.1	9.3	10	10.6	10.2	11
Cluj City	34.9	39.7	39.8	44	37	36.9	45.8	38.4	37.6	44.1	40.6	39.4	47.9	46.9
Caraş (after 1880, Caraş-Severin) County	5.3	5.7	6.5	6.1	5.9	5.5	5.3	6	5.9	5.2	5.9	6.1	6.6	6.9
Maramureş County	1.9	4.6	4.1	4.7	3.7	4.3	4.2	3.2	4.1	3.9	4.4	3.8	3.9	4.5
Mureş–Turda County	14.1	13.2	16.7	14.2	15.6	15.4	15.1	14.8	16.6	17.9	17.5	17.6	15.8	19.9
Târgu-Mureş City	28.6	41.9	43.4	38.5	42.8	37.1	43.1	39.1	36.6	44.4	39	43.2	37.3	44.2
Târnava Mare County	7.1	9.4	9.1	8.6	8	8.8	9.8	9.7	11	9.7	9.8	9.6	10.6	10.2
Sătmar County	6.8	9.1	8.5	9.8	7.2	8.7	9.1	9.7	9.6	10.6	9.8	9.7	9.7	10.2
Satu Mare City	17.1	23.8	22.5	22.2	24.2	26.5	17.3	22.5	26.7	25.9	26.8	25.3	26.3	28.9
Sibiu County	8.1	11.5	9.8	10.7	10.4	13.3	11.5	10.9	11.8	10.9	11.5	10.7	12.9	12.2
Sălaj County	4.3	4.1	4.3	6.5	4.5	4.6	4.1	4.1	4.8	4.7	6	4.1	4.8	4.5
Solnoc–Dăbâca County	10.6	9.4	8.2	10.5	9.4	8.6	10.6	11.6	8.7	11.3	10.4	11.4	11.3	13.8
Severin County	2.5	2.6	2.9	2.2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Timiş County	3.4	4.3	4.4	4.9	3.6	4.8	4.4	4.6	3.9	4.6	4.1	4.9	4.4	4.3
Timişoara City	22.8	14.1	14.4	19.4	17.7	19.6	17.3	12.2	15.5	17.3	20.4	20.4	21.1	16.7
Turda–Arieş County	12.3	13.5	13.2	13.3	12.5	13.8	14	14.2	12.9	13.9	16.5	16.4	15	16.3
Odorhei County	13.6	13.9	13.2	13.5	10.5	13	13.5	13.3	12.8	15.4	13.2	14	13.4	14.7

Source: *Magyar Statisztikai Évkönyv*, vols. 6–19 (Budapest, 1876–1891).
Note: For the counties of Caraş, Severin, Timiş, Arad, Bihor, Sătmar, and Maramureş the data includes those areas that are currently not part of Romania.

interdenominational marriages (among members of the same ethnic group) are relevant for the chosen topic, but much more interesting are the marriages that were both interdenominational and ethnically mixed. It must be said that mixed marriages have been a significant factor in the numerical increase or decrease of certain communities, with long-term demographic consequences. Of course, this type of marriage represented a smaller percentage of the overall marital exchanges between social units.[55]

The statistical evidence available at this point allows us to piece together the dynamics of interdenominational marriages in Transylvania over nearly a quarter of a century, that is, for the period between 1866 and 1889 (see Tables 5 and 6). A first observation concerns the regional variations in the intensity of the studied phenomenon. Thus, we have units with a reduced or extremely low rate of mixed marriages, such as: the seat of Ciuc (dominantly Roman-Catholic), where between 1866 and 1875 the rate of interdenominational marriages varied annually between 0.8% and 2.8%; Zarand County (dominantly Orthodox), with values for the same period between 0.7% and 2.3%; the seat of Cincul Mare, with a minimum of 0.8% and a maximum of 4.3%; Maramureş County, with values between 1.3% and 3%; Solnocul de Mijloc County, with a variation between 1.9% and 3.3%. At the other end of the spectrum we find units with much higher rates: Alba de Jos County, with a minimum of 11.6% in 1871 and a maximum of 13.8% in 1875; Făgăraş District, with a minimum of 10% and a maximum of 17.2%, the seat of Odorhei, with values between 9.3% and 12.4%; the seat of Mureş, with 11.4% and 16.1%, etc.

A tentative association between the variation in the rate of mixed marriages and a certain ethnic or religious group might not withstand a thorough analysis. For instance, in the Szekler seats we find contrasting attitudes towards this phenomenon, the seat of Ciuc being typical for religious endogamy, while the seats of Odorhei and Trei Scaune exceeded the Ciuc rate by more than 10%. Similarly, in the Saxon seats we find some with lower rates (Cincul Mare, Miercurea), and others with high rates (Orăştie, Nocrich, etc.). When it comes to the Romanians, absolutely dominant in the counties of Zarand or Hunedoara, the attitudes towards mixed marriages also varied considerably: Zarand shows very low rates, exceeded by those of Hunedoara by more than 5%; Făgăraş District featured even higher rates than that. Under these circumstances, we believe that only case studies that would take into account the local realities, matrimonial traditions and practices, ethno-confessional structures, geography, etc. could offer a pertinent explanation regarding the regional variations in mixed marriages. Only interdisciplinary perspectives can shed new light on the circumstances that, in time, led to an expansion in the marriage selection pool, beyond the confines

of one's community, religion, or ethnic group. This selection of spouses from outside the community also involves cultural connotations which are "related to the axiological systems of the social groups, to the degree of religious tolerance, to customs and to the prestige value attached to some ethnic or religious groups."[56]

After the administrative reorganization of 1876, which abolished the seats, the districts, and all the local forms of administrative autonomy, replacing them with a uniform organization into counties at the level of the whole Hungary, statistical sources offer us information about mixed marriages in the counties and in the main cities of Transylvania. Thus, for the period 1876–1889 (see Table 6), we notice first and foremost a great regional diversity in what concerns the phenomenon of mixed marriages. There were areas of increased confessional and ethnic endogamy, such as Maramureş County, where the minimum rate of interdenominational marriages was 1.9% and the maximum one of 4.7%; in Severin County the rate varied between 2.2% and 2.9%; in Timiş County, the annual rate of mixed marriages varied between a minimum of 3.4% and a maximum of 4.9%; in Sălaj County the extreme values were of 4.1% and 6.5%, and in Arad County of 4.3% and 5.8%. While the majority of counties displayed average rates, there were some with a high incidence of mixed marriages. Thus, in Alba de Jos County the rate varied between 14.6% and 19%; in Mureş–Turda County, between 13.2% and 19.9%; in Târnava Mică County, between 12.9% and 20.4%, and in Turda–Arieş County between 12.3% and 16.5%. While no spectacular increase was recorded in the period for which we have synthetic data for the counties, we do see an increase in the percentage of mixed marriages. In nearly all counties, the annual rates for the mixed marriages in the 1880s are generally higher than those of the previous decade.

The data in Table 6 shows a surprisingly high rate of mixed marriages in the urban environment as compared to the rural hinterland. In the big cities for which we have statistical data (Timişoara, Arad, Oradea, Satu Mare, Cluj, Târgu-Mureş), we notice that interdenominational marriages were 4 or 5 times more common then in the rest of the county. For instance, in the city of Arad, the rates for the investigated phenomenon stood at 18.3%–28%, while in the rest of the county they were merely 4.3%–5.8%. In Timişoara, mixed marriages varied between 12.2% and 22.8%, but in the rest of the county only between 3.4% and 4.9%; in the city of Cluj, the rate varied between 34.9% and 47.9%, and in the rest of Cojocna County it stood between 9.2% and 11.3%. Of course, in the urban environment, the ethno-confessional diversity was much greater than in the rural environment. Hence the increased possibility for urban dwellers to choose their partner from a much richer ethnic and religious selection pool.

Furthermore, the rural restrictions or reluctance in matrimonial matters were less present in the urban areas, more liberal when it came to marrying outside one's own social group. Interestingly enough, the cities in Banat and Partium fare less better than many Transylvanian towns in what concerns the percentage of mixed marriages (thus, even the upper limit of the mixed marriage rate in the western cities was below the lower limit recorded in Cluj or Târgu-Mureş!). The relatively similar ethnic and denominational structures of these two categories of cities cannot provide an explanation for this. Instead, we have to take into account historical tradition and the pattern of tolerance-intolerance in the course of time.[57]

Table 7 illustrates the dynamics of mixed marriages in the whole of Hungary (urban as well as rural) over the last two decades of the 19th century. The first observation we could make has to do with the yearly increase in the percentage of mixed marriages. If between 1881 and 1885 there was an average of 11,643 mixed marriages a year, in the last 5 years of the 19th century the number increased to approximately 15,300. The percentage of mixed marriages increased proportionally from 8.1% between 1881 and 1885, to 8.8% between 1886 and 1890, to 9.1 between 1891 and 1895, and to 11.1% between 1896 and 1900. This confirms the observations based on the data in Table 6, which shows a similar development in nearly all cities and counties in Transylvania. Surprising in

Table 7. Interdenominational marriages in Hungary between 1881 and 1900

Year	Number	%
Average no. between 1881 and 1885	11,643	8.1
Average no. between 1886 and 1890	11,688	8.8
1891	11,383	8.6
1892	12,610	8.9
1893	12,871	8.9
1894	13,170	9.1
1895	13,136	9.7
Average no. between 1891 and 1895	12,634	9.1
1896	14,362	11.3
1897	14,461	11
1898	14,709	10.9
1899	16,269	11
1900	16,616	11.2
Average no. between 1896 and 1900	15,283	11.1

Source: *Magyar Statisztikai Évkönyv*, new ser., vol. 8 (Budapest, 1901), 29.

Table 8. Mixed marriages in Hungary in 1892

Religion of the bride	Religion of the groom								Of which mixed marriages	
	RC	GC	O	EA	ER	U	M	TOTAL	No.	%
RC	62,231	1,002	267	1,216	2,105	65	–	66,886	4,655	6.9
GC	1,053	14,921	775	79	269	10	–	17,107	2,186	12.8
O	154	813	18,294	33	49	4	–	19,347	1,053	5.4
EA	1,128	63	37	9,018	464	14	–	10,724	1,706	15.9
ER	1,848	334	78	404	17,750	114	–	20,528	2,778	13.5
U	67	15	9	13	120	454	–	678	224	33
M	–	–	–	–	–	–	5,789	5,789–		–
TOTAL	66,481	17,148	19,460	10,763	20,757	661	5,789	141,059	12,602	8.9
Of which mixed marriages	4,250	2,227	1,166	1,745	3,007	207	–	12,602–		–
%	6.4	13	6	16.2	14.5	31.3	–	8.9–	–	

Legend: Roman-Catholic (RC); Greek-Catholic (GC); Orthodox (O); Evangelical Augustan (EA); Evangelical Reformed (ER); Unitarian (U); Mosaic (M).
Source: *Magyar Statisztikai Évkönyv*, new ser., vol. 2 (Budapest, 1895), 47.

the case of Table 7 is the rather abrupt increase in the average annual percentage of interdenominational marriages from 9.1% between 1891 and 1895 to 11.1% in the last 5 years of the 19th century. The additional two percentage points reflect the consequences of the legislative amendments introduced by the Hungarian state in 1895, when marital records were transferred to the lay authorities. This law, which replaced the Church with the state in terms of the control over the essential moments in one's life (birth marriage, death), also led to this "liberalization" of interdenominational marriages.[58] After 1895, the Church had to become more flexible on interdenominational marriages, lest it should lose those members unhappy with the intransigence of their spiritual leaders. Furthermore, slight changes also occurred in the mentality of the various ethnic groups that lived in Hungary at that time, as they became more open to the idea of a mixed marriage (interdenominational first and foremost, but also from an ethnic point of view).

Tables 8 and 9 can lead to interesting conclusions regarding the situation of interdenominational marriages in the whole of Hungary in two separate years of the last decade of the 19th century (1892 and 1900). Thus, we see that those of the Mosaic faith (Jews) were less willing to enter mixed marriages, displaying the lowest conjugal mobility (exogamy) outside their ethnic group. At the opposite end we find the Unitarians, relatively few in number (approximately 65,000 people in the whole of Transylvania in 1900),[59] who were most willing to conclude exogamous marriages: of the Unitarians, 33% in 1892 and circa 43% in 1900 married members of other denominations, chiefly favoring the Reformed Evangelicals and the Roman-Catholics.

The two tables above show no striking differences in behavior between the men and the women of the investigated denominations when it comes to mixed marriages, despite the presence of certain variations. Thus, Roman-Catholic grooms are between 0.5 and 1% below the percentage of women of the same denomination who concluded mixed marriages, and the Greek-Catholic grooms are 0.2% more in 1892 and 0.5% fewer in 1900 than the Greek-Catholic women who married outside their denomination. The situation within the Orthodox denomination is the precise opposite of the latter, with the men more willing to take a spouse from among the members of another denomination: in 1892, 6% as opposed to 5.4% Orthodox brides, and in 1900 the difference increased to 8.6% as compared to 6.7%. The same situation appears with the Evangelical Augustan and with the Evangelical Reformed denominations, where men surpassed women by as few percentage points when it came to marrying outside their denomination.

Based on the data in Table 10, we can assess the matrimonial behavior of the inhabitants of 5 counties and of 5 major Transylvanian cities in what concerns the

Table 9. Mixed marriages in Hungary in 1900

Religion of the bride	Religion of the groom										Of which mixed marriages	
	RC	GC	O	EA	ER	U	M	OR	RW	TOTAL	No.	%
RC	67,107	1,189	423	1,538	2,956	67	150	5	9	73,444	6,337	8.6
GC	1,179	13,406	1,019	60	400	7	3	2	–	16,706	2,670	16.6
O	183	935	17,512	29	112	5	4	–	–	18,780	1,268	6.7
EA	1,366	44	39	9,505	566	11	14	–	2	11,547	2,042	17.6
ER	2,618	382	143	538	17,668	141	24	–	2	21,516	3,848	17.8
U	64	11	9	4	138	300	–	–	–	526	226	42.9
M	140	5	11	20	30	–	6,492	–	4	6,702	210	3.1
OR	–	–	–	–	1	–	–	2	–	3	1	33.3
RW	4	–	–	–	4	–	6	–	21	35	14	40
TOTAL	72,661	15,972	19,156	11,691	21,875	531	6,693	9	38	148,629	16,616	11.2
Of which mixed marriages	5,554	2,566	1,644	2,189	4,207	231	201	7	17	16,616	–	–
%	7.6	16.1	8.6	18.7	19.2	43.5	3	77.8	44.7	11.2	–	–

Legend: Roman-Catholic (RC); Greek-Catholic (GC); Orthodox (O); Evangelical Augustan (EA); Evangelical Reformed (ER); Unitarian (U); Mosaic (M); Other religions (OR); Religion withheld (RW).

Source: *Magyar Statisztikai Évkönyv*, new ser., 8: 29.

Table 10. Percentage of interdenominational marriages in the studied sample in 1877, 1880, and 1885

Religion of the groom	Religion of the bride	Type of administrative unit: County (Cojocna, Mureş–Turda, Bihor, Arad, Timiş)		City (Cluj, Târgu-Mureş, Oradea, Arad, Timişoara)		TOTAL	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	GC, O	198	32	76	20.5	274	27.7
	EA, ER, U	421	68	294	79.5	715	72.3
RC	TOTAL	619	100	370	100	989	100
	O	612	76.1	13	14.1	625	69.8
	RC, EA, ER, U	192	23.9	79	85.9	271	30.2
GC	TOTAL	804	100	92	100	896	100
	GC	649	80.6	25	18.2	674	71.5
	RC, EA, ER, U	156	19.4	112	81.8	268	28.5
O	TOTAL	805	100	137	100	942	100
	O, GC	43	29.9	5	3.8	48	17.4
	RC, ER, U	101	70.1	126	96.2	227	82.6
EA	TOTAL	144	100	131	100	275	100
	O, GC	111	19.8	38	11.6	149	16.8
	RC, EA, U	448	80.2	290	88.4	738	83.2
ER	TOTAL	559	100	328	100	887	100
	O, GC	9	10.5	1	2.6	10	8.1
	RC, EA, ER	77	89.5	37	97.4	114	91.9
U	TOTAL	86	100	38	100	124	100

Legend: Roman-Catholic (RC); Greek-Catholic (GC); Orthodox (O); Evangelical Augustan (EA); Evangelical Reformed (ER); Unitarian (U).

Source: *Magyar Statisztikai Évkönyv*, vols. 7, 10, 15 (Budapest, 1879, 1882, 1889).

attitudes towards mixed marriages. Beyond the interdenominational aspect, we shall also try to estimate the approximate number of ethnically mixed marriages.

We have grouped the denominations so as to indicate the manner in which the Romanians were or were not willing to take Hungarian or German spouses, as well as the extent to which the latter were willing to marry a Romanian. Thus, we considered that the Orthodox and the Greek-Catholics roughly represented the Romanian population (with a small margin or error), and that the Roman-Catholics, the Reformed and Augustan Evangelicals, as well as the Unitarians were Hungarians and Germans. Thus, we notice that the 27.7% of the Roman-Catholic Hungarian and German men took Romanian (Orthodox or Greek-Catholic) brides, as opposed to only 17.4% and 16.8% of the Reformed and Evangelical men (with the Unitarians, the percentage is even smaller, given the fact that this denomination was present chiefly in the Szekler area, which had a smaller Romanian presence). When it comes to Romanian men, however, they showed more openness in this respect, and 30.2% of the Greek-Catholic men and 28.5% of the Orthodox men married outside their ethnic group. This investigated sample confirms the conclusions of Gheorghe Şişeştean regarding mixed marriages in another geographic area of Transylvania. More precisely, he argued that in the second part of the 19th century the ethnic criterion "surpassed the religious one and became dominant in the definition of marital behavior."[60]

Of course, an analysis of mixed marriages, of denominational and especially of ethnic exogamy, we must consider, beyond the existing prejudice, the magnitude of the ethnic mix in the respective places, the local matrimonial market, etc., as well as the dispositions of canon law and the religious practices of the main Transylvanian denominations in regard to marriage. At any rate, the evidence suggests that towards the end of the 19th century, as states turned secular and the Church began to lose its influence, mutations occurred in the attitude shown by the various denominations in Transylvania on the matter of mixed marriages, and people became more willing to marry outside their ethnic or religious group. The modernization of society, the industrialization and the urbanization that accompanied the development of the province in the last decades prior to World War I increased the mobility within the population, mostly in the case of men, who were presently more willing to seek employment outside the traditional community. More often than not, this meant completely moving to another place and marrying a woman from another religious or ethnic group.[61] The manifest regional variations require a further horizontal investigation of the dynamics of mixed marriages in Transylvania, as well as comprehensive case studies applied to urban and rural samples, this being the only method likely to accurately piece together a such a comprehensive social and cultural phenomenon.

Conclusions

At the end of this study concerning some of the more important aspects pertaining to the population of Transylvania over nearly a millennium of history, we could easily conclude, as brilliantly indicated by an expert in the history of the province, that

> *along the centuries Transylvania was not a purely Dacian-Roman or Romanian country, and it could not be that, given its wealth and its location on the route of various armies. It always saw the sometimes peaceful, sometimes violent settlement of various peoples—Scythians, Celts, Sarmatians, Romans, Goths, Huns, Gepidae, Avars, Slavs, Bulgarians, Hungarians, Pechenegs, Udae, Cumans, Szeklers, Saxons, Teutonic Knights, other Germanic peoples, Jews, Gypsies, Serbs, Croats, Ruthenians, Armenians, etc.—but over nearly two thousand years the Roman legacy and the Romanian population defined its distinct personality and fundamentally shaped its destiny.*[62]

Until the 1918 union between Transylvania and Romania, the Hungarian kings, the Habsburg emperors, and the various governments in Budapest tried to alter its dominantly Orthodox and Romanian character. They partially succeeded, as in the Middle Ages a sizable part of the Romanian noble elites embraced first the Roman-Catholic and then the Reformed Calvinist faiths; after 1700, when some of the Romanian Orthodox united with the Church of Rome, the denominational composition of Transylvania became even more complex. The settlement of colonists, from the Middle Ages to the Modern Era, failed to eliminate the Romanian ethnic majority, but managed to decrease the percentage of Romanians in the province—never, however, under 53%. Indeed, what occurred on 1 December 1918 in Alba Iulia, namely, the democratic implementation of the right to national self-determination by the majority population in Transylvania, rendered this union stable and legitimate. The decision of the Paris Peace Conference to officially and internationally recognize the union between Transylvania and the Romanian state involved first and foremost the acceptance of a geopolitical reality based on the clear demographic majority of the Romanians in the territories that had decided their fate by way of a plebiscite.

In what concerns interethnic relations in Transylvania after 1918, their tortuous fate was also affected by the presence in the previous century of authoritarian and totalitarian regimes and by the Second World War, which meant a step backwards in Romanian-Hungarian relations. The violence and the destruction of those years negatively affected the collective memory, and it took decades and

a return to democracy before the two nations recovered their mutual trust and went back to peacefully living together. Today, things are moving in a positive direction, as indicated by the gradual increase in the number of mixed marriages in Transylvania.[63] 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. In this 21st century, in Romania and elsewhere, we need to shift the focus of tolerance from the social and political realm towards the field of human relations, because in the 21st century the concept of tolerance seems to be insufficient and limited. Thus, we need to move from a tolerant co-existence to an active collaboration (the most significant mutation should involve the replacement of "I tolerate" by "I respect"). First and foremost, this requires good knowledge of the past, and only then concrete practical and pragmatic actions. Of course, under these circumstances the education of both young people and adults plays a crucial role, as the majority must truly understand the problems of the minorities and accept and support the manifestation of their ethnic identity, by protecting their culture, religion, education, and languages. Therefore, both the authorities and the civil society must become involved in fighting discrimination and in the elimination of any form of extremism, chauvinism, anti-Semitism or territorial separatism, in supporting cultural diversity and in encouraging interethnic dialogue, in the development of civic multiculturalism as a part of the European identity.[64] It is just as true, however, that the members of the minority groups must be willing to accept and strengthen multicultural diversity, respect the majority population alongside which they live, and be loyal to the state whose citizens they are.

❑

Notes

1. Lily Rain, *Familia etnic mixtă: Județul Covasna* (Sfântu Gheorghe: Arcuş, 2001), 5.
2. Vasile Puşcaş, *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 "Babeş–Bolyai"* (Cluj-Napoca, 2006), 3.
4. Dumitru Şandru, *Mişcări de populaţie în România (1940–1948)* (Bucharest, 2003), passim; Anneli Ute Gabanyi, "Exodul germanilor din România: cauze, fapte, consecinţe," Xenopoliana (Jassy) 5, 1–4 (1997); Hannelore Baier, ed., *Deportarea etnicilor germani din România în Uniunea Sovietică* (Sibiu, 1994), etc.
5. See also Petru Bejan, "About Hospitality and Tolerance in South-Eastern Europe", in *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies*, 9, 26 (Summer 2010), p. 44.
6. Thomas Nägler, "Transilvania între 900 şi 1300," in *Istoria Transilvaniei*, vol. 1, eds. Ioan-Aurel Pop and Thomas Nägler (Cluj-Napoca, 2003), 200; Adolf Armbruster,

Romanitatea românilor: Istoria unei idei, 2nd edition (Bucharest, 1993), 17; see also Ioan-Aurel Pop, *Românii şi maghiarii în secolele IX–XIV: Geneza statului medieval în Transilvania* (Cluj-Napoca, 1996), 19 sqq.

7. Thomas Nägler, *Aşezarea saşilor în Transilvania*, 2nd edition (Bucharest, 1992), 204 sqq.
8. Ioan-Aurel Pop, "Observaţii privitoare la structura etnică şi confesională a Ungariei şi Transilvaniei medievale (secolele IX–XIV)," in *Istoria României: Pagini transilvane*, ed. Dan Berindei (Cluj-Napoca, 1994), 10–11.
9. Nicolae Edroiu, "Românii în urbariile transilvănene din secolul al XVI-lea," in *Sabin Manuilă, istorie şi demografie: Studii privind societatea românească între sec. XVI–XX*, eds. Ioan Bolovan and Sorina Bolovan (Cluj-Napoca, 1995), 68.
10. Apud *Istoria românilor*, vol. 6, *Românii între Europa clasică şi Europa Luminilor (1711–1821)*, eds. Paul Cernovodeanu and Nicolae Edroiu (Bucharest, 2002), 93.
11. Ladislau Gyémánt, "Evoluţia demografică a Transilvaniei între 1690-1847," in *Populaţia României: Trecut, prezent, viitor*, eds. Sorina Paula Bolovan, Ioan Bolovan, and Traian Rotariu (Cluj-Napoca, 2006), 42 sq.
12. Liviu Maior, *Habsburgi şi români: De la loialitatea dinastică la identitate naţională* (Bucharest, 2006), 15.
13. Ladislau Gyémánt, "Etnic şi social în habitatul transilvănean în lumina a două tabele centralizatoare inedite ale conscripţiei fiscale din anul 1750," in *Om şi societate: Studii de istoria populaţiei României (sec. XVII–XXI)*, eds. Ioan Bolovan, Sorina Paula Bolovan, and Corneliu Pădurean (Cluj-Napoca, 2007), 17 sq.
14. Ibid., 19 sqq.
15. Livia Ardelean, "Aspecte ale migraţiei din comitatul Târnava în anii 1764–1774," in Sabin Manuilă, *Istorie şi 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 imigraţiei românilor din Principatele Române în Transilvania în veacul al XVIII-lea: Studiu critic* (Sibiu, 1944), passim.
16. Ileana Bozac and Teodor Pavel, *Călătoria împăratului Iosif al II-lea în Transilvania la 1773*, vol. 1 (Cluj-Napoca, 2006), 26.
17. David Prodan, *Supplex Libellus Valachorum: Din istoria formării naţiunii române* (Bucharest, 1984), 86.
18. Maior, *Habsburgi şi români*, 16.
19. Nicolae Bocşan, Ioan Lumperdean, and Ioan-Aurel Pop, *Etnie şi confesiune în Transilvania (secolele XIII–XIX)* (Oradea, 1994), 69.
20. Mathias Bernath, *Habsburgii şi începuturile formării naţiunii române*, trans. (Cluj-Napoca, 1994), 170 sq; Carl Göllner, *Regimentele grănicereşti din Transilvania, 1764–1851* (Bucharest, 1973), 25 sqq.; Mathias Bernath, "Die Errichtung der sieben-

bürgische Militärgrenze und die Wiener Rumänenpolitik in der frühjosephinischen Zeit," *Südost-Forschungen* 19 (1960): 164 sqq.

21. Liviu Maior, Nicolae Bocşan, and Ioan Bolovan, eds., *The Austrian Military Border: Its Political and Cultural Impact* (Jassy, 1994), 7 sq; Liviu Maior, *Românii în armata habsburgică: Soldaţi şi ofiţeri uitaţi* (Bucharest, 2004), passim.
22. Sorina Paula Bolovan and Ioan Bolovan, *Germanii din România: Perspective istorice şi demografice* (Cluj-Napoca, 2000), 39.
23. Otto Greffner, *Populaţia şvăbească (germană) din Banat* (Arad, 1994), passim.
24. Ernst Hauler, *Istoria nemţilor din regiunea Sătmarului* (Satu Mare, 1998), 3 sqq.
25. Liviu Maior, *1848–1849: Români şi unguri în revoluţie* (Bucharest, 1998), 49; Nicolae Bocşan and Valeriu Leu, *Revoluţia de la 1848 din Transilvania în memorialistică* (Cluj-Napoca, 2000), 8.
26. Ştefan Pascu and Victor Cheresteşiu, eds., *Revoluţia de la 1848–1849 din Transilvania*, vol. 1, 2 martie–12 aprilie 1848 (Bucharest, 1977), 451–452.
27. Maior, *1848-1849*, 111 sqq.
28. Gelu Neamţu, *Revoluţia românilor din Transilvania 1848–1849* (Cluj-Napoca, 1996), passim.
29. Cornelia Bodea, *1848 la români: O istorie în date şi mărturii*, vol. 2 (Bucharest, 1982), 911.
30. Ibid., 2: *1101–1102*.
31. Maior, *1848–1849*, 408.
32. Ioan Bolovan, "The Demographic Impact of the 1848–1849 Revolution in Transylvania," *Transylvanian Review* 5, 4 (1996): 128–135.
33. Maior, *1848–1849*, 408.
34. Adam Wandruszka and Peter Urbanitsch, eds., *Die Habsburgermonarchie 1848–1918*, vol. 3/2, Die Völker des Reiches (Vienna, 1980), 414.
35. L. Katus, "Multinational Hungary in the Light of Statistics," in *Ethnicity and Society in Hungary, ed. Ferenc Glatz* (Budapest, 1990), 120, Table no. 5.
36. Ioan Bolovan and Sorina Paula Bolovan, *Transylvania in the Modern Era: Demographic Aspects* (Cluj-Napoca, 2003), 180.
37. Apud Sabin Opreanu, *Terra Siculorum: Contribuţiuni privitoare la românii din ţinutul 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).
38. Varga E. Árpád, *Erdély etnikai és felekezeti statisztikája. I. Kovászna, Hargita és Maros megye népszámlálási adatok 1850–1992 között* (Budapest–Csíkszereda, 1998), 6–7.
39. Ibid.
40. I. I. Russu, *Românii şi secuii* (Bucharest, 1990), 19 sqq.
41. Apud Ştefan Manciulea, *Câmpia Transilvaniei* (Bucharest, 1944), 126 sqq.
42. *Hungarian National Archives*, Budapest, coll. Miniszterelnökség, K 26–1909–XXV –181, f. 51.
43. Ioan Bolovan, *Transilvania între Revoluţia de la 1848 şi Unirea din 1918: Contribuţii demografice* (Cluj-Napoca, 2000), 210.

44. Ioan Russu-Şirianu, *Românii din statul ungar (Statistică, etnografie)* (n.p. [Arad], 1904), 253 sq.
45. Nicolae Bocşan, "Ideologia politică a Memorandului," in *Memorandul 1892–1894: Ideologie şi acţiune politică românească* (Bucharest, 1992), 262; Liviu Maior, *Mişcarea naţională românească din Transilvania 1900–1914* (Cluj-Napoca, 1986), 16; Gelu Neamţu, "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 şi acţiune politică, direcţii culturale şi angajament social," doctoral thesis, Cluj-Napoca, 2008.
46. I. P. P.[app], *Procesul Memorandului românilor din Transilvania: Acte şi date*, vol. 1 (Cluj, 1933), 43.
47. Ibid., 42.
48. Liviu Maior, *Memorandul: Filosofia politico-istorică a petiţionalismului românesc* (Cluj-Napoca, 1992), 176.
49. P.[app], 15–42.
50. Ioan Slavici, *Proză: Poveşti. Nuvele. Mara*, ed. D. Vatamaniuc, vol. 2 (Bucharest, 1979), 345.
51. Ioan Slavici, *Lumea prin care am trecut: Memorialistică. Publicistică*, ed. Constantin Mohanu (Bucharest, 2004), 112.
52. Florica Ştefănescu, "Demographic Evolutions Between Religion and Politics," in *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies*, 8, 24 (Winter 2009), p. 284
53. Lily Rain, *Familia etnică mixtă: Judeţul Covasna* (Sfântu Gheorghe, 2001), 16–17.
54. Sorina Paula Bolovan, *Familia în satul românesc din Transilvania: A doua jumătate a secolului al XIX-lea şi începutul secolului XX* (Cluj-Napoca, 1999), 151.
55. Gheorghe Şişeştean, *Etnie, confesiune şi căsătorie în nord-vestul Transilvaniei* (Zalău, 2002), 68.
56. Ibid.
57. For an interesting interdisciplinary perspective on these cities which could be the starting point for such an explanatory approach see Sorina Voiculescu, *Oraşele din Câmpia de Vest: Structuri şi funcţionalităţi urbane* (Timişoara, 2004).
58. Ioan Bolovan and Sorina Paula Bolovan, "From Tradition to Modernization: Church and the Transylvanian Romanian Family in the Modern Era," *Journal for the Study of Religions & Ideologies* 7, 20 (Summer 2008): 113.
59. S. P. Bolovan, 57.
60. Şişeştean, 84.
61. Ibid., 89.
62. Ioan-Aurel Pop, *Românii şi maghiarii în secolele IX–XIV. Geneza statului medieval în Transilvania*, 2nd edition (Cluj-Napoca, 2003), 16.
63. Horváth István, "Căsătorii mixte româno-maghiare în Transilvania în perioada 1992–2002," in *Căsătorii mixte în Transilvania, secolul al XIX-lea şi începutul secolului XX*, eds. Corneliu Pădurean and Ioan Bolovan (Arad, 2005), 285 sqq. .
64. Mihaela Frunză, Sandu Frunză, "Etică, superstiţie şi laicizarea spaţiului public," in *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies*, 8, 23 (Summer 2009), p. 14

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 groups, highlighting the discrepancy between the numerical presence of the Romanians and their social, political, economic and cultural status in the province. 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. 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.

Keywords
Transylvania, ethno-confessional composition, status of the various groups, mixed marriages