

## **Hungarians in Transylvania between 1870 and 1995**

Original title: „Erdély magyar népessége 1870–1995 között”

Published in Magyar Kisebbség 3–4, 1998 (New series IV), pp. 331–407.

Translation by Tamás Sályi  
Linguistic editing by Rachel Orbell

Published by Teleki László Foundation  
Budapest, March 1999

Occasional Papers 12  
Editors: Nándor Bárdi, László Diószegi, András Gyertyánfy

The aim of this study is to contribute to the elaboration of the demographic history of present-day Transylvania by publishing sources partly or completely unexplored until now. The study therefore provides information about the demographic history of ethnic Hungarians in Transylvania focusing on three major aspects, the first of these aspects being dealt with more comprehensively than the other two. Firstly (after an outline of the official statistics available), changes in the number of ethnic Hungarians in Transylvania over the last one and a quarter centuries are examined with regard to the natural and real increase in the total population. Next, urbanisation, as a major modifier of the ethnic picture, is analysed statistically, with a focus on migrations which follow urbanisation, especially the influx of Romanians from the Transcarpathian region.\* Since a new approach to the sources has been used, it was considered appropriate to include detailed technical and methodological explanations and several figures. Owing to the limited scope of the present study there is no detailed analysis of the development of the population in terms of location (areas, settlements, density): nor does the study discuss changes in social structure and other demographic features – partly due to the shortage, or absence, of information. These are outlined in the final chapter (an expanded and modified version of an article published in *Hitel* 3, 1996) and are based on the 1992 census, which reflects recent conditions.

### **Main demographic sources**

In order to examine ethno-demographic tendencies in the territory of present-day Transylvania, major „officially authentic” data sources can be obtained partly from the Hungarian censuses carried out between 1869 and 1910 and in the year 1941 (in the northern part of divided Transylvania), and partly from the Romanian censuses conducted after Romania took over the territory. Before modern censuses, only that taken by the Austrians for military purposes in 1850/51 provides direct, fully authentic information about ethnic relations, since it included questions relating to nationality. However, these detailed figures only refer to historical Transylvania. The politically cautious 1869 census did not yet include questions about nationality but did take account of religion. If we look at the religious distribution of the population and bear in mind contemporary estimates, we can attempt to give approximate figures for ethnic proportions at the time of the census. From 1880, the Hungarian censuses obtained information about nationality by means of questions concerning native language – that is, the language spoken most readily and most fluently. In addition, these surveys also revealed how many people in different ethnic and religious groups spoke languages other than their mother tongue. The range of languages involved in the process therefore became wider and wider at each new survey. In 1941, Hungarian experts even included a direct

---

\*These chapters rely on the following studies: Varga E. 1994b; 1994a, 1997.

nationality criterion in the questionnaire. Summaries of the census results always presented detailed figures regarding the distribution of native languages (or nationalities) and religions even in villages, and the living conditions of the different nationalities were outlined in tables.

In the enlarged Romania, the first nationality survey was carried out during the 1930 census. Previously, in 1919, the temporary Transylvanian Governing Council had organised data collection in the Hungarian territory occupied by the Romanian army. One and a half years later in Transylvania, which by that time had been adjudged to Romania by the Great Powers, the local under-secretary of state for the Ministry of the Interior carried out a census for public administration purposes. Of the 1919 census, which was based on reports made by parish councils, only provisional county data have been preserved. Nevertheless, these data covered population distribution in terms of both nationality and religion. The 1920 census, which also covered nationality, was published in a collection of data on settlements. In these censuses a rather vague, politically motivated criterion, that of „descent according to people”, was used to determine nationality. The procedure was often simply based on an analysis of names, or alternatively ethnic status was identified with religion. The same criterion, which was not completely free of racist connotations, was applied by the Romanian Ministry of the Interior in 1927 in its attempt to conduct „a general survey of the population” on a national basis. The statistical office’s refusal to co-operate meant that the hastily carried out registration was doomed to failure, and detailed figures were never published.

The census conducted in 1930 met international statistical requirements in every respect. In order to establish nationality, the compilers devised a complex criterion system, unique at the time, which covered citizenship, nationality, native language (i.e. the language spoken in the family) and religion. While no information was requested regarding knowledge of other languages questions were deliberately posed regarding the possession of an „understanding” of Romanian. The publication of the census results was somewhat delayed, but the data were abundant and included figures for ethnic and religious distribution in each village. The two volumes containing details of occupational groups at local (village, town) level according to nationality, as well as an analysis of schooling at local levels, represent an important source of information. The 1941 census, prepared with the same accuracy, included a survey of multilingualism for the first time in the history of Romanian censuses. However, due to the war these results, like many others, remained unprocessed. Only major local data concerning the „ethnic origin” of the population were issued.

The first census in Romania after World War II was conducted in 1948, together with an agricultural survey which was intended to prepare the way for land collectivisation. Some of the demographic results from this census, which was similar to previous censuses in terms of its study criteria, were processed later, but only major preliminary data regarding the size and native-language distribution of the population in counties and towns were published. Afterwards, a census based on a Soviet model was conducted in 1956, followed by others using more modern methods and more substantial study programmes in 1966, 1977, and 1992. Information was requested on nationality and mother tongue on each occasion, and in 1992 even religion was once again included after an absence of forty-five years. Of these data, however, local- (village-) level figures were only published for 1966, and for decades the volumes were unavailable to the public. Thus, until recently, the 1956 ethnic and native-language data, broken down according to medium-sized administrative units and towns, and still relatively detailed, formed the basis of post-war Romanian nationality statistics. It is generally agreed that these statistics provide a more accurate picture of the real conditions than do the data of a decade later. Both the 1956 and the 1966 census reports (comparing the urban and rural population at county level, and, in 1966, at rajon and town level, too) reveal a correlation between nationality and native language. In 1956, data concerning social structure and education among the different nationalities were elaborated at county level according to settlement type. In 1966, the social distribution of different ethnic groups was given only in a national breakdown, whereas education related figures were also published in a county breakdown. The 1966 census was unique in that it contained questions on both place of residence and place of birth, since data were grouped according to date of arrival in the place of residence. A knowledge of the date of change of residence provides a rough idea of how periods of internal migration, which significantly modify the ethnic map, can be differentiated in time. In addition, a comparison of county figures provides an illustration of the territorial distribution of migrations in certain periods.

The real ethnic data of the 1977 census were only revealed one and a half decades later. Until that time, only the extremely distorted county-level figures were available, which were unsuitable for in-

depth analysis. The delayed publication of the real figures and the absence of any village breakdown or other details are regrettable, since the ethnic picture provided by the 1977 census in Transylvania is relatively authentic and can be compared most easily to the 1956 data. However, place of birth statistics in the 1977 census, which were obtained at the halfway point of the peak of migration fever, still provide important information about the direction and extent of internal migrations over the previous decade.

The 1992 census was carried out at a time when the turbulence following the collapse of the previous political system – a collapse which had been accompanied by enormous external and internal population movements – had already abated. An analogy with the surveys conducted after the war would seem obvious. The ethnic consequences of this „tabula rasa” are summarised in a special volume which gives details of population distribution according to nationality, native language and religion. In addition, the overlapping of nationality and native language, as well as of nationality and religion, is illustrated numerically in a county breakdown according to settlement type. (Correlations are also included between nationality and native language in a breakdown for towns.) It also provides, although in a national breakdown only, a comprehensive picture of the demographic conditions of the different ethnic groups, a unique occurrence in the history of Romanian ethnic statistics. Although the 1992 village-level ethnic and religious data have not yet been published, they are available to researchers.

In the Hungarian censuses, data for military personnel were not processed at village level before 1900. The retrospective tables given here therefore show the number of civilians present in 1880 and 1890; the number of both civilians and military personnel in 1910; and, in 1900, both the number of civilians and the total population. Given that the military population was relatively small (only 0.6 to 0.7 per cent in the territory in question), this does not greatly affect the comparability of these periods. The Romanian censuses give a figure for the resident population, from which those who have been „temporarily” present, and to which those who have been „temporarily” absent, over an extended period of time, are subtracted and added respectively. This fine adjustment means that the quantitative difference between the resident population and the population actually present is insignificant. In 1956, the total resident population registered was 8,620 persons fewer than the number of inhabitants present (in towns, 11,781); and in 1966, the resident population was 2,184 persons fewer (208 more in towns). A comparison of the 1977 census figures and the population returns published in statistical yearbooks reveals that, as a result of an increase in internal population mobility, in 1977 nearly 130 thousand more inhabitants (in towns, 300 thousand) were registered in Transylvania than had been estimated previously, based on the resident population recorded in 1966. The difference was particularly striking in the so-called „closed” towns, in which settling was subject to the obtaining of a permit. Subsequently, in official statements the criteria were adjusted to the real situation and, in addition to the resident population defined above, the number of inhabitants with a registered permanent address was taken rather than the number of persons present. The population actually present has, in practice, been referred to as the „resident population” in statistical returns since 1977. In 1981, the number of persons actually present was 96,313 higher (in towns, 246,903) than the number of persons with a permanent residence in the same place; and in 1992, the figure was 45,107 persons (in towns, 130,708) higher.

The Hungarian Statistical Office provided demographic data with reference to religion (from 1890 to 1893), and later (in 1897, and from 1900 to 1918) to native language also. (An analysis of mixed marriages was included from the beginning of this century.) The figures were given at local administrative level until 1912 (or until 1915 for natural population changes with respect to native Hungarians), and at regional level between 1913 and 1918. Local-administration-level data on emigration and remigration were published between 1899 and 1915. Emigrants were registered from the beginning of this period, and remigrants from 1905, on the basis of native language, homeland and destination. Every year between 1920 and 1937, with some minor interruptions, the Romanian statistics service published the main results of population changes with respect to denomination according to region and type of settlement. The ethnic data regarding natural population changes are available for the period between 1920 and 1923, and between 1933 and 1942. (From 1934 the data are also available at county level and include monthly figures.) Figures showing the natural growth of the different nationalities were also published between 1931 and 1939 at county level, and in both parts of Transylvania after its division according to the Vienna Award. International migration statistics (emigration, immigration and remigration with respect to nationality, citizenship and country) were

first published annually between 1926 and 1942, and this practice was resumed after the 1989 changes (emigration data according to nationality have been recorded since 1975; data with respect to destination from 1980; and remigration figures according to nationality or provenance from 1990). The key figures for population changes with respect to nationality have not been published in Romania for two generations, although some minor information has been leaked occasionally.

### Population development in Transylvania between 1869 and 1995

Population development in present-day Transylvania from 1869 to the present is illustrated in Table 1. (The table contains basic data published in census reports and statistical yearbooks as well as figures relating to different areas and periods which are required for the calculation of population changes.)

**Table 1. Population development in Transylvania 1869–1995**

31 Dec. 1869 <sup>a</sup>	4,224,436	25 Jan. 1948 <sup>g</sup>	5,748,546
31 Dec. 1880 <sup>a</sup>	4,032,851	1 Jan. 1956	6,219,600
31 Dec. 1890 <sup>a</sup>	4,429,564	21 Feb. 1956	6,232,312
31 Dec. 1900 <sup>a</sup>	4,840,722	1 Jan. 1966	6,727,900
31 Dec. 1900	4,874,772	15 March 1966	6,736,046
31 Dec. 1910 <sup>b</sup>	5,262,495	1 Jan. 1966 <sup>h</sup>	6,711,456
31 Dec. 1910	5,259,918	15 March 1966 <sup>h</sup>	6,719,555
1919	5,208,345	5 Jan. 1977	7,500,229
Dec. 1920 <sup>c</sup>	5,114,214	1 July 1977 <sup>i</sup>	7,531,130
Dec. 1920 <sup>d</sup>	5,133,677	1 July 1985 <sup>i</sup>	7,915,841
29 Dec. 1930	5,548,363	1 July 1989 <sup>i</sup>	8,033,633
31 Jan., 6 April 1941 <sup>e</sup>	5,912,265	7 Jan. 1992	7,723,313
31 Jan., 6 April 1941 <sup>e,f</sup>	5,910,974	1 July 1992	7,709,627
25 Jan. 1948	5,761,127	1 July 1995	7,646,926

*Italics: calculated values*

<sup>a</sup> Civilian population.

<sup>b</sup> Taking an undivided number of inhabitants in border settlements.

<sup>c</sup> Data for Battyánháza (Óbéb), Cenei/Csene, Soca/Karátsonyiliget, Comloşu Mic/Kiskómlós, Checea/Kócse, Lăţunaş/Lacunás, Jamu Mare/Nagyzsám, Beba Veche/Óbéb, Pustiniş/Öregfalu, Cherestur/Pusztakeresztúr, Uivar/Ujvár, Jombolia/Zsombolya occupied by Serbia, and those of Iam/Jám are missing. Busenje/Káptalanfalva, Jaša Tomić/Módos, Medja/Párdány, belonging to Yugoslavia at present, are included.

<sup>d</sup> Figure relating to final borders and based on the 1910 settlement data listed above, according to the 1930 administrative situation (without the 1,151 inhabitants of Coşna/Kosna and Cârlibaba Nouă/Radnalajosfalva).

<sup>e</sup> Data for the Romanian parts of Tiszaalónka/Lunca la Tisa/Luh and Técső/Tyacsiv in Máramaros/Maramureş county are not known, so the two parts are included with the 1930 figures.

<sup>f</sup> According to the 1930 and 1948 administrative situation.

<sup>g</sup> 1956 administrative situation.

<sup>h</sup> Present administrative situation.

<sup>i</sup> Official data based on the 1977 census without illegal emigration.

Sources:

Magyarország népessége községenként (...) az 1869. évi népszámlálás alapján, táblázat. A magyar korona országaiban az 1881. év elején végrehajtott népszámlálás főbb eredményei (...) 1882: pp. 9–331. A magyar korona országainak helységnévtára 1892: pp. 18–656. Magyar Statisztikai Közlemények 1902: pp. 280–455, 1912: pp. 280–457, 581–629. Popa – Istrati 1921: p. 156. Martinovici – Istrati 1921: pp. 7–52. Recensământul general al României din 29 decembrie 1930 1938: pp. XXXII–XXXIII. Recensământul general al populaţiei României din 1941 6 aprilie (...) 1944: p. XI. Az 1941. évi népszámlálás (...) 1947: pp. 498–690. Golopenţia – Georgescu 1948: pp. 39–41. Biji – Nichita 1957: p. 11. Recensământul populaţiei din 21 februarie 1956. Rezultatele generale 1959: p. 4. Recensământul

populației și locuințelor din 15 martie 1966 1968: Volumes relating to counties in Transylvania. Recensământul populației și locuințelor din 15 martie 1966 1969: p. 2. Measnicov – Trebici 1978: p. 31. Recensământul populației și locuințelor din 5 ianuarie 1977 1980: p. 6. Anuarul statistic al Republicii Socialiste România 1986: p. 13. Recensământul populației și locuințelor din 7 ianuarie 1992 1994: p. 1. Anuarul statistic al României 1990: p. 52, 1993: p. 686, 1995: p. 748.

Because of the geopolitical situation in the region, it is worth studying the comprehensive figures for population growth in conjunction with the figures for the historically connected neighbouring territories (Table 2). In those territories which were taken from Hungary and attached to Romania population growth between 1870 and 1992 can be regarded as average for Europe. Over the last century or more the number of inhabitants in these territories has almost doubled, as has the population of present-day Hungary. During the same period, the number of Romanian citizens living in the Transcarpathian region has more than tripled. Population growth in the three regions was also different before World War I. In the Transcarpathian region, for instance, real population growth was three times higher than in Transylvania. (This was partly due to the demographic crisis in the 1870s, when the population decreased by 5 per cent in present-day Transylvania.) The population of Transylvania increased slightly over the subsequent four decades, and the 1948 figure indicates a stagnation compared with the figures for Hungary and Transcarpathia. The slower growth was caused by wars: population growth in the period including World War I was more modest, and during the Second World War, the decrease was significantly higher than in Hungary or in the Transcarpathian region. In the subsequent three and a half decades, however, there was a significant increase in the Transylvanian population, with the average annual growth rate exceeding the comparable Hungarian rate, and, between 1970 and 1980, even the figure for Transcarpathia. This upward trend changed to a negative trend at the end of the 1980s. The Transylvanian population was somewhat smaller in 1992 than at the beginning of the previous decade. Meanwhile, Hungary's population also started to decrease, and the growth rate of the Transcarpathian population was also one-third of the figure of a decade earlier.

**Table 2. Population development in Transylvania, Hungary, and the Transcarpathian region 1870–1992<sup>a</sup>**

Year	Population (x thousand persons) <sup>b</sup>			Index (1870 = 100)			Average annual growth or decrease (%) <sup>c</sup>		
	Trans-sylvania	Hungary	Trans-carpathia	Trans-sylvania	Hungary	Trans-carpath.	Trans-sylvania	Hungary	Trans-carpath.
1870	4,224.4	5,011.3	<i>4,500.0</i>	100.0	100.0	100.0	–	–	–
1880	4,032.9	5,329.2	<i>4,750.0</i>	95.5	106.3	105.6	–0.42	0.56	0.54
1910/12	5,260.0	7,612.1	7,507.0	124.5	151.9	166.8	0.88	1.18	1.41
1930	5,548.4	8,685.1	8,732.4	131.3	173.3	194.0	0.27	0.66	0.84
1941	5,912.3	9,316.1	10,202.9	140.0	185.9	226.7	0.63	0.70	1.51
1948/49	5,761.1	9,204.8	10,111.5	136.4	183.7	224.7	–0.37	–0.15	–0.13
1956	6,232.3	9,861.0	11,257.1	147.5	196.8	250.2	0.97	1.15	1.33
1970	7,032.6	10,322.1	13,220.0	166.5	206.0	293.8	0.84	0.30	1.12
1980	7,725.0	10,709.5	14,476.4	182.9	213.7	321.7	0.94	0.37	0.91
1990/92	7,723.3	10,374.8	15,060.3	182.8	207.0	334.7	0.00	–0.32	0.34

*Italics: estimated values*

<sup>a</sup> According to present borders. Transylvania and the Transcarpathian region are separated according to administrative borders at the time of the censuses.

<sup>b</sup> Population as of the date of the censuses which were usually carried out at about the same time. Exceptions are 1970 and 1980 for Transylvania and the Transcarpathian region where mid-year figures are given, and 1956 for Hungary, where the value calculated refers to conditions at the beginning of the year. The initial figures for Transylvania and also for present-day Hungary are from the beginning of the year in which the censuses were carried out. The same figure for the old Romanian kingdom was calculated at the end of the year.

<sup>c</sup> Growth or decrease since the previous date. Figures are taken from the middle of the period.

The population development outlined above can be shown in greater detail in a breakdown reflecting the sources of real population growth (that is, natural growth and migration). These factors are given in Table 3 for Transylvania and in Table 4 for Transcarpathia, a region which has also had strong demographic links with Transylvania.

**Table 3. Real and natural population growth and the difference between the two values in Transylvania between 1869 and 1995**

Period	Real	Natural <sup>a</sup>	Difference	Real	Natural	Difference
	growth or decrease(-)		between real and natural growth	growth or decrease(-)		between real and natural growth
	Number of persons			Annual average per thousand		
1870–1880 <sup>b,c</sup>	-191,585	-55,280 <sup>d</sup>	-136,305	-4.2	-1.2	-3.0
1881–1890 <sup>b,e</sup>	396,713	432,479 <sup>d</sup>	-35,766	9.4	10.2	-0.8
1891–1900 <sup>b</sup>	411,158	403,026 <sup>d</sup>	8,132	8.9	8.7	0.2
1901–1910	387,723 <sup>f</sup>	477,437	-89,714	7.6	9.4	-1.8
1911–1920	-125,090 <sup>g</sup>	140,800 <sup>h</sup>	-265,890 <sup>h</sup>	-2.4	2.7	-5.1
1921–1930 <sup>i</sup>	414,700	482,508	-67,800	7.7	9.0	-1.3
1931–1941 <sup>i,j</sup>	362,611	386,865	-24,254	6.3	6.7	-0.4
1941–1948 <sup>i,j</sup>	-149,847	125,000 <sup>k</sup>	-274,900 <sup>l</sup>	-3.7	3.1	-6.7
1948–1955 <sup>m</sup>	471,050 <sup>n</sup>	...	...	10.0	...	...
1956–1965	508,300 <sup>o</sup>	481,487	26,800	7.8	7.4	0.4
1966–1976 <sup>p</sup>	788,773 <sup>r</sup>	715,423	73,350	10.1	9.2	0.9
1977–1985 <sup>s</sup>	415,612 <sup>t</sup>	374,422	41,190 <sup>t</sup>	6.3	5.7	0.6
1985–1989 <sup>s</sup>	117,792 <sup>t</sup>	140,782	-22,990 <sup>t</sup>	3.7	4.4	-0.7
1989–1991 <sup>s</sup>	-310,320	41,030	-351,350	-15.7	2.1	-17.8
1992–1995 <sup>s</sup>	-76,387	-34,355	-42,032	-2.8	-1.3	-1.5

*Italics: calculated values*

<sup>a</sup> Calendar years.

<sup>b</sup> Civilian population.

<sup>c</sup> Real decrease allowing for probable lack of data in the 1880 census: approx. 162 thousand. Natural decrease without unregistered victims of the cholera epidemic: approx. 90–100 thousand. Accordingly, migration loss: approx. 60–70 thousand.

<sup>d</sup> In the case of counties divided by the border: calculated values.

<sup>e</sup> Allowing for probable lack of data in the 1880 census, real growth: approx. 367 thousand. Accordingly, migration loss: approx. 65 thousand.

<sup>f</sup> Real growth was calculated using the undivided population in settlements divided by the border.

<sup>g</sup> Real growth was calculated by taking the 1920 population between confirmed borders.

<sup>h</sup> Without war victims. If war victims are included, real growth changes to a decrease of 29.7 thousand persons, and migration loss amounts to 95.4 thousand.

<sup>i</sup> Within the 1930 administrative borders.

<sup>j</sup> Between censuses.

<sup>k</sup> Estimated value in North Transylvania (in related areas in Ugocsa/Ugocea and Máramaros/Maramureş counties and, in 1944, in the whole of North Transylvania).

<sup>l</sup> Difference between immigration and emigration + war loss.

<sup>m</sup> According to 1956 administrative borders.

<sup>n</sup> Between 25 January 1948 and 1 January 1956.

<sup>o</sup> Between 1 January 1956 and 1 January 1966.

<sup>p</sup> According to present administrative borders.

<sup>r</sup> Between 1 January 1966 and 5 January 1977.

<sup>s</sup> Based on the population between two censuses with mid-year figures and taking half of the natural growth in the year in question.

<sup>t</sup> Using officially calculated data based on the 1977 census, without illegal emigration.

Sources:

Magyar Statisztikai Közlemények 1893b: pp. 70–73\*. Magyar statisztikai évkönyv 1874–1875, 1877–1880, 1893–1916/1918. A népmozgalom főbb adatai középsőként 1828–1900 1980: pp. 28–35, 44–51, 90–99, 110–119, 1984: pp. 30–51, 78–99. Magyar Statisztikai Közlemények 1913: pp. 280–459. A népmozgalom főbb eredményei 1911–1920. Manuilă 1938: p. 796, 1929: pp. VIII, XI, XV. Anuarul statistic al României 1928–1939/1940. Magyar

statisztikai évkönyv 1941–1942. Statisztikai negyedévi közlemények 1942–1944: 1–2. Thirring 1943: p. 358. A népmozgalom főbb adatai községenként 1901–1968 1969: pp. 62–67, 124–129, 184–199, 314–319, 376–381, 436–451. Buletinul demografic al României May 1940-January/February 1948. Comunicări statistice 1947: p. 5–6. Anuarul demografic al Republicii Socialiste România 1967: pp. 22, 82, 1974: pp. 144, 238. Anuarul statistic al Republicii Socialiste România 1975–1986. România. Date demografice 1994: pp. 124, 188. Anuarul statistic al României 1990–1996.

**Table 4. Real and natural population growth and the difference between the two values in the Transcarpathian region between 1930 and 1995**

Period	Real	Natural <sup>a</sup>	Difference between real and natural growth	Real	Natural	Difference between real and natural growth
	growth or decrease(-)			growth or decrease(-)		
	Number of persons			Annual average per thousand		
1931–1941 <sup>b</sup>	1,471,784	1,312,912	158,872	15.1	13.5	1.6
1941–1948 <sup>b</sup>	-92,653	258,350	-351,000 <sup>c</sup>	-1.3	3.7	-5.0
1948–1955 <sup>d</sup>	1,109,300 <sup>e</sup>	...	...	13.1	...	...
1956–1965	1,117,000 <sup>f</sup>	1,283,490	-166,500	9.5	10.9	-1.4
1966–1976 <sup>g</sup>	1,692,807 <sup>h</sup>	1,835,255	-142,448	11.6	12.6	-1.0
1977–1985 <sup>i</sup>	749,314 <sup>j</sup>	943,151	-193,837 <sup>j</sup>	6.1	7.7	-1.6
1985–1989 <sup>i</sup>	308,936 <sup>j</sup>	366,553	-57,617 <sup>j</sup>	5.1	6.1	-1.0
1989–1991 <sup>i</sup>	-31,209	111,264	-142,473	-0.8	2.9	-3.8
1992–1995 <sup>i</sup>	-52,697	-19,317	-33,380	-1.0	-0.4	-0.6

*Italics: calculated values*

<sup>a</sup> Calendar years.

<sup>b</sup> Between censuses.

<sup>c</sup> Difference between immigration and emigration + war loss.

<sup>d</sup> According to 1956 administrative units.

<sup>e</sup> Between 25 January 1948 and 1 January 1956.

<sup>f</sup> Between 1 January 1956 and 1 January 1966.

<sup>g</sup> According to present administrative borders.

<sup>h</sup> Between 1 January 1966 and 5 January 1977.

<sup>i</sup> Based on the population between two censuses with mid-year figures and taking half of the natural growth in the year in question.

<sup>j</sup> Using officially calculated data based on the 1977 census, without illegal emigration.

Sources:

Between 1931–1940: Anuarul demografic al Republicii Socialiste România 1974: pp. 142, 236. From 1941 on the same as in Table 3.

The first column of Tables 3 and 4 gives real population growth or decrease in different periods within changing administrative borders. The second column gives the values for natural growth and decrease as a result of the difference between the number of live births and deaths. If we substitute the missing data with an estimated value reflecting between 26 and 28 per cent of the national natural growth rate in Transylvania, we find that natural growth in Transylvania between 1948 and 1955 may have coincided with real population growth. The third column gives the difference between real and natural growth in different periods. This figure provides information regarding fluctuations resulting from internal and external migration, and, from 1911 to 1920 and from 1941 to 1947, includes both military and civilian losses (since demographic figures did not include victims of war). A certain distortion of the migration figures in the 1970s and 1980s, due to shortcomings in data processing, should be taken into consideration (THIRRING 1963, p. 229; KATUS 1980, p. 271). Thus the real migration difference during these periods is smaller than that indicated in the table.

The data illustrate that, until recently, natural population growth was a determining factor in Transylvania's real population growth, apart from the period affected by the epidemic in the early 1870s and some war years. The different factors causing natural population changes in both regions are shown in Tables 5 and 6.

**Table 5. Live births, deaths and natural population growth  
in Transylvania from 1866 to 1995**

Period	Live births	Deaths	Natural growth or decrease	Live births	Deaths	Natural growth or decrease
	Number of persons			Annual average per thousand		
1866–1869 <sup>a,b</sup>	608,218	484,171	124,047	37.6	29.9	7.7
1870–1880 <sup>a</sup>	1,729,344	1,784,624	–55,280	38.1	39.3	–1.2
1881–1890 <sup>a</sup>	1,775,238	1,342,759	432,479	42.0	31.8	10.2
1891–1900 <sup>a</sup>	1,785,674	1,382,648	403,026	38.5	29.8	8.7
1901–1910	1,799,824	1,322,387	477,437	35.5	26.1	9.4
1911–1914	748,450	531,923	216,527	34.9	24.8	10.1
1915–1918	355,792	511,319	–155,527	16.5	23.7	–7.2
1919–1920	310,734	230,934	79,800	30.1	22.4	7.7
1921–1930	1,623,808	1,141,300	482,508	30.4	21.4	9.0
1931–1940	1,442,417	1,054,722	387,695	25.2	18.4	6.8
1941–1943 <sup>c</sup>	360,770	306,430	54,340	20.3	17.2	3.1
1945–1947	364,722	310,337	54,385	21.0	17.9	3.1
1956–1965	1,134,174	652,687	481,487	17.5	10.1	7.4
1966–1976	1,515,087	799,664	715,423	19.4	10.2	9.1
1977–1985	1,131,893	741,720	390,173	16.3	10.7	5.6
1986–1988	371,179	262,575	108,604	15.5	11.0	4.5
1989–1991	321,025	263,568	57,457	13.4	11.0	2.4
1992–1995	328,305	370,449	–42,144	10.7	12.1	–1.4

*Italics: calculated values*

<sup>a</sup> Based on calculated values in counties divided by the border.

<sup>b</sup> Omitting data referring to the Banat military border territory.

<sup>c</sup> Based on values calculated in the parts of Ugocsa/Ugocea and Máramaros/Maramureş belonging to Transylvania.

Sources: as for Table 3.

**Table 6. Live births, deaths and natural population growth in the Transcarpathian region  
from 1871 to 1995**

Period	Live births	Deaths	Natural growth or decrease	Live births	Deaths	Natural growth or decrease
	Number of persons			Annual average per thousand		
1871–1880 <sup>a</sup>	...	...	...	35.6	31.3	4.3
1881–1890 <sup>a</sup>	...	...	...	42.4	28.3	14.1
1891–1900 <sup>a</sup>	...	...	...	41.1	29.2	12.0
1901–1910 <sup>b</sup>	2,604,194	1,683,621	920,573	40.2	26.0	14.2
1911–1915 <sup>b</sup>	1,570,474	912,904	657,570	42.3	24.6	17.7
1921–1930 <sup>b</sup>	3,199,045	1,804,654	1,394,391	39.5	22.3	17.2
1931–1940	3,193,793	1,888,998	1,304,795	32.8	19.4	13.4
1941–1947	1,681,040	1,414,570	266,470	23.6	19.9	3.7
1956–1965	2,297,572	1,014,082	1,283,490	19.5	8.6	10.9
1966–1976	3,136,509	1,301,254	1,835,255	21.5	8.9	12.6
1977–1985	2,274,676	1,291,212	983,464	17.5	9.9	7.6
1986–1988	768,959	487,411	281,548	17.1	10.8	6.3
1989–1991	638,540	482,584	155,956	14.0	10.6	3.4
1992–1995	665,458	694,502	–29,044	11.0	11.5	–0.5



*Italics: calculated values*

<sup>a</sup> Estimated value.

<sup>b</sup> In the territory of the Old Kingdom (Oltenia, Muntenia, Moldavia and Dobrudia between 1921 and 1930).

Sources:

Between 1871 and 1900: Ghetau 1997a: p. 29.

Between 1901 and 1930: Anuarul statistic al României 1922–1933. From 1931: as in Tables 3 and 4.

During the last quarter of the nineteenth century, Hungary entered the second phase of the so-called calculated demographic transition. This model implies that in the first phase, where traditional demographic conditions prevail, high birth and death rates result in a relatively low rate of natural growth of between 5 and 10 per thousand. The mortality rate then decreases while the birth rate remains unchanged or decreases slightly, so the population growth rises to between 10 and 15 per thousand. In the third phase, the birth rate decreases continually and therefore, with an unchanged mortality rate, population growth also decreases. In Hungary the demographic acceleration developed later than in Western Europe. Another difference was that, almost parallel with the decrease in the mortality rate, the birth rate also decreased. This near coincidence meant that there was scarcely any second-phase provisional population increase. The second phase was also delayed due to the devastating cholera epidemic in the 1870s and a famine which decimated the population at the same time, both of which struck the east of Hungary as it was then, particularly Transylvania. Natural population changes in present-day Transylvania as it entered the second phase of the demographic transition (in the last two decades of the nineteenth century) show that the fall in the birth rate, which was somewhat more marked than the similar national (Hungarian) figure, was larger than the fall in the mortality rate. This trend changed for the better only in the decade preceding World War I, and then again for a short time in the early 1920s, the latter reflecting normal post-war population changes. The low number of births during World War I had a significant negative impact on demographic changes. This appeared not only as a direct loss (in Transylvania between 350 and 400 thousand fewer children were born than would normally have been expected), but also as a later deficit resulting from the lower number of potential parents. By the time those generations affected by the war-related birth deficit reached child-bearing age between 1931 and 1940, the live birth rate had decreased considerably, which, accompanied by the new war-related birth deficit (although much smaller than the earlier one), contributed to a fall in the number of babies born between 1956 and 1965. (Previously, between 1948 and 1955, taking the natural population growth estimated above and calculating a somewhat lower mortality rate in Transylvania than the national average, the live birth rate must have been higher by 3 to 4 per thousand, that is, over 20 per thousand.) At the same time the mortality rate gradually decreased, stagnating at around 10 per thousand before slowly increasing again. Altogether, natural population development in present-day Transylvania has been marked by a high degree of instability in terms of birth rate, influenced by several factors. Accordingly, the relatively progressive values of between 9 and 10 per thousand for the population growth rate at the beginning of the century were only reached after the wars and, following radical measures introduced by the state to increase birth rates, at the turn of the 1960s. Apart from the negative records reached during the war years, natural population growth reached its lowest levels in the 1930s and 1980s, and in recent years the national trend has become a fall in the population level resulting from a falling live birth rate and a rising mortality rate. The demographic transition described above occurred in the Transcarpathian region after a delay of three decades. Live birth rates were higher and mortality rates were usually lower here than in Transylvania. During the demographic depression in the 1930s, for example, the average natural population growth in the Transcarpathian region was twice as high as in Transylvania, and even after 1948 it was, for three decades, between 3 and 3.5 per thousand higher than the respective Transylvanian figure. The negative balance of migration after 1956 (resulting in a positive balance in Transylvania), indicates that after World War II significant numbers out of the high population in the Transcarpathian region had moved westwards through the Carpathians to establish new homes.

## Population development with respect to nationalities and the number of Hungarians between 1869 and 1992

The demographic metamorphosis in Transylvania is closely connected with changes in the number of its major components, that is, the various nationalities. An outline of this metamorphosis is given below, focusing on the population development among Hungarians and Romanians in different periods. Changes in relations between nationalities and religions can be seen in Tables 7 and 8.

**Table 7. The number of different ethnic groups according to native language and nationality in  
Transylvania between 1869 and 1992\***  
**Index number (starting population = 100)**

Year	Total	Hungar.	Roman.	German	Jewish, Yiddish	Other	Gypsy	Ukrain.	Serbian	Croatian	Slovakian
1869 <sup>a</sup>	<b>100.0</b>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i> <sup>b</sup>	...	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i> <sup>c</sup>	<i>100.0</i>
1880 <sup>a,d</sup>	<b>95.3</b>	<i>9.2</i>	<i>92.0</i>	<i>100.0</i> <sup>b</sup>	...	<i>105.6</i>	<i>107.3</i>	<i>86.3</i>	<i>115.0</i> <sup>c</sup>	...	<i>115.8</i>
1890 <sup>a</sup>	<b>104.7</b>	<i>113.9</i>	<i>99.3</i>	<i>109.8</i> <sup>b</sup>	...	<i>111.3</i>	<i>116.4</i> <sup>f</sup>	<i>89.0</i>	<i>102.0</i>	<i>81.4</i> <sup>c</sup>	<i>124.6</i>
1900 <sup>a</sup>	<b>114.3</b>	<i>134.9</i>	<i>107.1</i>	<i>114.3</i> <sup>b</sup>	...	<i>94.2</i>	<i>54.5</i>	<i>107.8</i>	<i>100.5</i>	<i>38.1</i>	<i>131.1</i>
1900	<b>115.2</b>	<i>136.2</i>	<i>107.6</i>	<i>115.5</i> <sup>b</sup>	...	<i>95.3</i>	<i>54.5</i>	<i>109.0</i>	<i>102.4</i>	<i>38.8</i>	<i>132.2</i>
1910	<b>124.2</b>	<i>157.2</i>	<i>113.3</i>	<i>112.0</i> <sup>b</sup>	...	<i>115.5</i>	<i>110.5</i>	<i>137.0</i>	<i>110.2</i>	<i>23.4</i>	<i>137.3</i>
1919	123.7	131.0	119.8	102.4	100.0	98.2	...	...	...	...	...
1920	121.3	124.1	117.5	109.2	105.9	89.6	...	...	...	...	...
1930	<b>131.1</b>	<i>140.3</i>	<i>129.5</i>	<i>107.4</i>	<b>65.0</b>	<b>103.3</b>	<b>79.4</b>	<b>144.6</b>	<b>89.3</b> <sup>g</sup>	...	<b>174.4</b> <sup>h</sup>
1930	131.1	128.2	128.5	108.0	104.3	150.1	198.5	179.5	91.5 <sup>g</sup>	...	201.5 <sup>h</sup>
1941	139.7	164.9	132.4	106.3	48.3	139.6	...	...	...	...	...
1948	<b>136.2</b>	<i>140.4</i>	<i>150.5</i>	<i>65.8</i>	<i>17.5</i>	<i>93.2</i>	...	...	...	...	...
1956	<b>147.7</b>	<i>153.5</i>	<i>163.9</i>	<i>74.2</i>	<i>5.7</i>	<i>86.6</i>	<i>69.4</i>	<i>175.6</i>	<i>92.1</i> <sup>i</sup>	...	<i>83.6</i>
1956	147.7	148.1	162.8	73.3	25.6	119.5	142.5	191.1	95.6 <sup>i</sup>	...	102.2
1966	<b>159.6</b>	<i>154.5</i>	<i>184.0</i>	<i>74.5</i>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>86.0</b>	<b>58.3</b>	<b>219.4</b>	<b>87.1</b> <sup>i</sup>	...	<b>86.5</b>
1966	159.6	151.8	183.6	74.1	7.9	102.1	89.4	223.6	91.8 <sup>i</sup>	...	96.6
1977	178.1	160.7	209.6	69.3	4.6	143.8	223.7	259.2	70.3 <sup>i</sup>	90.6 <sup>c</sup>	93.5
1992	<b>183.4</b>	<i>153.9</i>	<i>234.2</i>	<b>18.2</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>113.2</b>	<b>154.0</b>	<b>290.1</b>	<b>69.3</b> <sup>c</sup>	...	<b>80.5</b>
1992	183.4	1524	228.9	21.7	1.6	186.4	368.5	305.3	59.4	49.1	86.0

\*Within present administrative borders

**Bold type: native language**

Normal type: nationality

*Italics: calculated values*

<sup>a</sup> Civilian population.

<sup>b</sup> Including Yiddish native speakers.

<sup>c</sup> Croatians, Crassovanians.

Those unable to speak are divided proportionally among the nationalities.

<sup>e</sup> Serbians, Croatians, Crassovanians.

<sup>f</sup> According to the 1893 census of Gypsies the figure is 273.3.

<sup>g</sup> Serbians, Croatians, Slovenians.

<sup>h</sup> Czechs, Slovaks.

<sup>i</sup> Serbians, Croatians, Slovenians, Crassovanians.

According to the estimation made by Elek Fényes, the renowned Hungarian descriptive statistician (FÉNYES 1839–1840; 1842, p. 52<sup>b</sup>), it can be stated that in the 1830s and 40s a total of 62.3 per cent of the population of present-day Transylvania were Romanian, and only 23.3 per cent were native Hungarian speakers. At the time of the 1869 census it is estimated that the proportion of Hungarians and Romanians was 24.9 per cent and 59 per cent respectively (VARGA E. 1997, p. 61). (Of the 3.3 per cent decrease in the proportion of Romanians, 1 per cent occurred among native Gypsy speakers who were regarded as Romanians by Fényes.) The change in ethnic proportions was most

striking in the Tisza/Tisa-Maros/Mureş region, where the ratio of Romanians decreased by nearly 12 per cent in four decades, while the ratio of Hungarians and Germans increased by almost the same percentage due to resettlement in Banat.

**Table 8. The number of different denominations in Transylvania between 1869 and 1992\***  
**Index number (Starting population = 100)**

Year	Total	Orthodox	Greek Catholic	Roman Catholic	Calvinist	Lutheran	Unitarian	Jewish	Other
1869 <sup>a</sup>	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
1880 <sup>a</sup>	95.3	92.7	93.5	99.8	96.4	95.8	102.6	116.5	82.6
1890 <sup>a</sup>	104.7	98.5	104.1	113.0	108.2	101.2	110.6	143.3	66.5
1900 <sup>a</sup>	114.3	104.9	113.6	126.9	120.8	107.7	119.4	173.7	47.2
1900	115.2	105.4	114.1	128.3	122.0	108.8	120.3	174.9	48.3
1910	124.2	111.7	124.2	138.8	134.2	113.4	127.2	200.9	94.7
1919	123.7	112.9	128.1	128.3	133.3	115.2	124.8	189.1	258.6
1930	131.1	119.5	138.1	132.6	134.6	118.7	126.6	212.9	1,033.7
1992	183.4	333.3 <sup>b</sup>	20.8 <sup>b</sup>	120.5	154.0	24.4	140.7	3.1	7,480.0

\*Within present administrative borders

<sup>a</sup> Civilian population.

<sup>b</sup> Combined figure for Orthodox and Greek Catholics: 213.8.

As shown in Table 7, changes in the proportion of Romanians were greatly influenced by the demographic catastrophe of the 1870s. The number of Romanians fell by 200 thousand between 1869 and 1880, and two-thirds of this decrease was caused by the demographic crisis of the decade (the remaining third being due to migration and assimilation). Thus, in one decade the proportion of Romanians fell by a further 2 per cent, almost as much as during the previous three to three and a half decades (excluding the decrease caused by the separation of the Gypsies). During the same period the proportion of Hungarians within the total population increased by 1 per cent, despite a slight fall in their actual number, to reach 25.9 per cent.

According to official native-language statistics between 1880 and 1910 the proportion of Hungarian native speakers continued to increase the most rapidly, in Transylvania as in all other parts of the country. The growth rate here was not only twice as high as that of the population as a whole, but it was also 3.7 per cent higher than the national average for their rate of increase (calculated without Croatia-Slavonia). As a consequence, the proportion of Hungarians increased from the 25.9 per cent of 1880, to 31.6 per cent by 1910, while the proportion of Romanians decreased from 57 to 53.8 per cent.

The significant changes in the ethnic spectrum in Hungary at the turn of the century can be explained by three factors: 1. The natural population growth of Hungarians was higher than that of non-Hungarian nationalities; 2. The proportion of Hungarians emigrating was lower than the proportion of non-Hungarians; and 3. Some non-Hungarians and most immigrants were assimilated to the Hungarians (KATUS 1982, p. 18). These statements are true with respect to the territory of present-day Transylvania. There was yet another phenomenon which contributed to the fact that the proportion of Hungarians in Transylvania increased more rapidly than the national average: a positive balance of internal nationality exchange in certain administrative units. The factors outlined above are illustrated with demographic data from the last decade before World War I, which is more or less relevant to the present territory as well.

As Table 9 shows, between 1901 and 1910 the number of Hungarian native speakers increased far more rapidly than the total population (a higher figure was only recorded in contemporary statistics for Ruthenians and Slovaks, both very small in number). Half of the total natural growth occurred among Romanians and 36.3 per cent among Hungarians. The high natural increase with respect to Hungarians was partly due to their relatively lower mortality rate, and partly due to the slightly higher than average birth rate, although this was still proportionally lower than the Romanian birth rate. The mortality rate among Romanians was highest of all the nationalities (apart from a few fragments of ethnic groups not specified here). It is for this reason that the number of Romanians increased

considerably more slowly than the number of Hungarians, despite the fact that the Romanian birth rate was higher at the time.

**Table 9. Live birth rates, deaths and natural population growth in Transylvania according to native languages between 1901 and 1910**

Native language	Live births	Deaths	Natural growth or decrease	Live births	Deaths	Natural growth or decrease
	Number of persons			Annual average per thousand		
Total	1,799,824	1,322,387	477,437	35.5	26.1	9.4
Hungarian	559,552	386,109	173,443	36.1	24.9	11.2
Romanian	<i>1,009,140</i>	<i>770,325</i>	<i>238,815</i>	<i>36.6</i>	<i>27.9</i>	<i>8.7</i>
German	<i>177,498</i>	<i>125,849</i>	<i>51,649</i>	<i>30.9</i>	<i>21.9</i>	<i>9.0</i>
Other	<i>53,634</i>	<i>40,104</i>	<i>13,530</i>	<i>28.8</i>	<i>21.5</i>	<i>7.3</i>

*Italics: calculated values*

Sources:

Magyar Statisztikai Közlemények 1905: pp. 178–183, 340–345, 1907b: pp. 184–193, 346–355, 1910: pp. 184–193, 346–355, 1916a: pp. 244–249, 460–465. A népmozgalom főbb eredményei 1901–1910.

A comparison of the data for natural and real population growth highlights further phenomena affecting the unequal proportions in terms of population increase among the different nationalities. The difference between the two numbers indicates the balance between external and internal migration in the territory at the time as well as the negative or positive effects of assimilation for the nationalities in question.

**Table 10. Real and natural population growth and the difference between the two values in Transylvania between 1901 and 1910**

Native language	Real	Natural	Difference between real and natural growth	Real	Natural	Difference between real and natural growth
	growth or decrease			growth or decrease		
	Number of persons			Annual average per thousand		
Total	387,723	477,437	-89,714	7.6	9.4	-1.8
Hungarian	224,787	173,443	51,344	14.5	11.2	3.3
Romanian	144,854	238,815	-93,961	5.3	8.7	-3.4
German	-17,438	5,649	-69,087	-3.0	9.0	-12.0
Other	35,520	13,530	21,990	19.1	7.3	11.8

*Italics: calculated values*

As shown in Table 10, only real growth among Hungarians and other native speakers is higher than their natural growth. (The positive balance among other native speakers indicates the increase in the Gypsy population on the territory of historical Transylvania compared with the 1900 figures. The increase is due to the appearance of nomadic Gypsies, and to different self-identification among Gypsies in 1910 at the expense of other nationalities, mainly Romanians.) The negative Romanian and German balance is the result of massive emigration. Statistics suggest that in the period examined above emigration among the Romanian population was in proportion to their numerical ratio; while the Hungarians were under-represented, and the Germans over-represented, in terms of emigration in the present-day territory of Transylvania. The emigration deficit with respect to Romanians in the period, taking unregistered immigration into account, was 80 thousand (KOVÁCS 1912, p. 798) or, allowing for some hidden population changes (e.g. Gypsies becoming statistically independent), somewhat less, but below 60 thousand (VARGA E. 1977, p. 77).

In terms of Hungarian native speakers, between 1880 and 1910 the population gain above their natural growth in the region was between 180 and 200 thousand, while Romanian losses were between

130 and 150 thousand, depending on whether we take the birth rate figures of the last decade as retrospectively relevant, or calculate with the more balanced earlier figures for nationality growth. The Romanian losses were mostly due to emigration, which increased dramatically in the 1980s, especially in southern counties of historical Transylvania and became a mass movement at the beginning of the twentieth century. Hungarian population gains, on the other hand, included a migration surplus. However, the exact value of this cannot be determined, since we are unable to give a balance of internal population exchanges between administrative units with respect to the present borders. Nevertheless, the attraction of certain central points giving rise to migration among regions is well known. In Krassó-Szörény/Caraş-Severin and Hunyad/Hunedoara counties, where natural population growth was originally low, mining areas and rapidly developing industrial centres attracted Hungarians from a distance. Thus, in three decades their number multiplied between 4.7 and 4.2 times. The proportion of Hungarians therefore increased from 1.9 per cent to 7.2 per cent, and from 5.1 to 15.5 per cent for the two areas respectively. A massive increase can be seen in certain areas of Temes/Timiş and Torontál counties (the number of Hungarians increased 2.5 times, their proportion growing from 8 per cent to 16.6 per cent). In Arad county, where the increase in proportions was average, the number of Hungarians also grew rapidly (the figure in 1910 is 1.8 times higher than in 1880, with their proportion rising from 22.3 per cent to 29 per cent). Similar data are available in Kolozs/Cluj county (1.7 times higher with the proportion increasing from 33.2 to 38.9 per cent); in Szatmár/Satu Mare and Ugocsa/Ugocea (where the proportion increased from 44.4 to 55.1 per cent); and in the Bihar (Bihor) area, where the proportion of Hungarians rose from 39.8 to 44.4 per cent in spite of the high birth rate among local Romanians. The rise in the number of Hungarian native speakers in Máramaros/Maramureş also deserves attention: the number of Hungarian native speakers here increased 2.1 times over thirty years, and the proportion grew by 5 per cent to reach 19.4 per cent in 1910. At the same time, the serious local economic and social crisis in Szeklerland is well demonstrated by the fact that here, in the smaller language area of the eastern periphery of the country, in Csík, Háromszék and Udvarhely counties, the population increase among Hungarians fell far behind even the Transylvanian average because of losses resulting from migration.

The population growth and the changes in ethnic proportions outlined above were also influenced by the fact that assimilation enlarged the Hungarian population. The main areas in which this process occurred were the rapidly developing towns, with those assimilated being individuals who had become estranged from their original, homogenous ethnic blocks, and who had drifted far away from their place of birth and were rising into the middle class. Hungarian expansion due to assimilation is illustrated by the process during which the denominations became more Hungarian.

**Table 11. The number of Hungarian native speakers per denomination between 1880 and 1910 (x 1,000 persons)**

Period	Total	Orthodox	Greek catholic	Roman catholic	Calvinist	Lutheran.	Unitarian	Jewish	Other
1880 <sup>a</sup>	1,009.4	11.2	31.6	366.8	468.2	23.6	52.4	54.4	1.2
1880 <sup>a,b</sup>	1,046.1	11.6	32.7	380.6	485.0	24.5	54.3	56.2	1.2
1890 <sup>a</sup>	1,201.2	13.0	42.3	434.6	547.2	26.0	58.8	77.5	1.8
1900	1,438.5	20.9	63.3	530.9	622.6	30.7	64.5	104.3	1.3
1910 <sup>c</sup>	1,663.2	25.2	82.3	632.2	685.8	35.8	68.0	132.0	1.9

Index number (Starting population = 100)

Period	Total	Orthodox	Greek catholic	Roman catholic	Calvinist	Lutheran.	Unitarian	Jewish	Other
1880 <sup>a,b</sup>	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
1890 <sup>a</sup>	114.8	111.4	129.5	114.2	112.8	106.1	108.2	137.9	145.9
1900	137.5	179.7	193.7	139.5	128.4	125.3	118.6	185.8	101.6
1910 <sup>c</sup>	159.0	217.4	251.9	166.1	141.4	146.0	125.1	235.0	154.5

<sup>a</sup> Civilian population.

<sup>b</sup> Those unable to speak are divided proportionally among the nationalities.

<sup>c</sup> Value calculated with regard to the undivided population in settlements divided by the border.

Sources:

A magyar korona országában az 1881. év elején végrehajtott népszámlálás főbb eredményei, némely hasznos házi állatok (...) 1882: pp. 508–623. Magyar Statisztikai Közlemények 1893a: pp. 256–307, 1907a: pp. 354–387, 1916b: pp. 248–281.

The growth index in Table 11 vividly illustrates that the number of Hungarian native speakers belonging to „non-Hungarian” churches increased much more rapidly than the number of Hungarian native speakers in general, whereas the population growth among those who belonged to typically Hungarian churches (Calvinists, Unitarians) was below the average. Among Hungarian native speakers the highest increase was among Greek Catholics, followed by Hungarian Jews and members of the Orthodox Church. According to data for specific local areas, the Hungarian language gained ground in the Câmpia Ierului/Érmellék area, in Szatmár/Satu Mare and Ugocsa/Ugocea counties; to a smaller extent in Szeklerland among Greek Catholics; in Bihar/Bihor among Orthodox believers; around Nagyvárad/Großkarol/Carei and Szatmárnémeti/Sathmar/Satu Mare; in Banat among Roman Catholic Germans; and among the Jewish population in general. The expansion of the Hungarian language did not make any real changes to the language borders, except in the Szatmár/Sathmar/Satu Mare – Ugocsa/Ugocea area, where the 1910 census revealed that the outlines of the Hungarian language area were more clearly defined, as Greek Catholic Romanians and Ruthenians and Roman Catholic Germans had exchanged their native languages for Hungarian. The adoption of Hungarian was most intensive among the Yiddish speaking Jews who arrived in a steady stream from Galitia and Bukovina from the middle of the century and among whom the growth rate was very high. The number of Hungarian native speakers belonging to the Jewish community in Transylvania increased two and a half times by 76 thousand persons between 1880 and 1910. Among native Hungarian speakers, during the three decades about 40 per cent of the population gain above the natural increase (80 thousand persons) was a result of assimilation. Two-fifths of those assimilated were originally Orthodox and Greek Catholics, another two-fifths were Jewish, and the rest were made up of Germans in Szatmár/Sathmar/Satu Mare and Banat, as well as some smaller nationalities.

The ethno-demographic tendencies around the time of the 1910 census were dramatically reversed after World War I as a consequence of the change in political supremacy. Intensive emigration up to the beginning of the war and war losses (see MIKE 1927, p. 627; WINKLER 1919, pp. 31–34) virtually counterbalanced the demographic gain among Hungarians in the second decade of the century. At the end of 1918, as the Romanian occupation resulted in a flow of refugees, the number of Hungarians in Transylvania started to fall. Up to December 1920, a total of 154.3 thousand persons arrived in Hungary from the occupied territory (THIRRING 1938, p. 390). At the time of the Romanian census in 1920, the number of those remaining who had been registered as Hungarian native speakers in the 1910 census could not have been much higher than 1.5 million. However, the census recorded 200 thousand fewer ethnic Hungarians than could be expected. The deficit was found mainly in border counties and major centres of migration, but the census modified the ethnic proportions in all those areas in which high numbers of Hungarian native speakers belonging to „other religions” were living. In order to achieve politically motivated „statistical justice”, the organisers took back the whole of the assimilation gain in the number of those speaking Hungarian that had been recorded earlier by the Hungarian censuses, something which had undoubtedly reflected their delayed ambitions to create the nation state. The first official Romanian census reproduced the conditions of the decades prior to the 1910 census, while being forward looking at the same time. This is proved by the fact that the basic nationality proportions registered then did not change essentially in the subsequent decade.

According to official statistics, in the first four years of the new regime 25.1 per cent of the total natural population growth occurred among Hungarians, and 57.2 per cent among Romanians (Table 12). A significant fall in the mortality rate and a rise in the birth rate after the war meant that the total population increased at the same rate as between 1911 and 1914 (although the live birth rate did not reach the level of ten years earlier). However, the decreasing natural growth rate, and especially the birth rate among Hungarians (compared with earlier periods and other nationalities) predict an unfavourable demographic change in this respect.

**Table 12. Live births, deaths and the natural population growth in major ethnic groups in Transylvania between 1920 and 1923**

Native language	Live births	Deaths	Natural growth	Live births	Deaths	Natural growth
	Number of persons			Annual average per thousand*		
Total	676,413	465,784	210,629	32.6	22.4	10.2
Hungarian	161,336	108,438	52,898	30.1	20.2	9.9
Romanian	413,050	292,635	120,415	34.9	24.7	10.2
German	65,456	43,544	21,912	30.0	20.0	10.0
Jewish	19,501	10,530	8,971	26.5	14.3	12.2
Other	17,070	10,637	6,433	26.8	16.7	10.1

\*Mid-period population based on the nationality results of the census conducted in December 1920 with natural population growth added to and deducted from the census respectively, according to missing refugees (the 1920 natural growth is divided proportionally among nationalities).

Source:  
Istrate 1925: p. 115.

Population development according to ethnic groups between 1921 and 1930 can only be given indirectly, by means of the demographic data with respect to denominations.

**Table 13. Live births, deaths and natural population growth in Transylvania according to denominations between 1921 and 1930**

Denominat.	Live births	Deaths	Natural growth		Live births	Deaths	Natural growth	
	1921–1928		1921–1928	1921–1930	1921–1928		1921–28	1921–30
	Number of persons				Annual average per thousand			
Total	1,308,612	926,202	382,410	483,846	31.1	22.0	9.1	9.1*
Orthodox	444,729	343,443	101,286	131,027	30.0	23.2	6.8	7.0
Greek Cath.	375,807	242,929	132,878	171,100	36.7	23.7	13.0	13.2
Roman Cath.	210,141	153,740	56,401	68,896	29.0	21.2	7.8	7.6
Protestant	237,251	162,574	74,677	90,843	30.1	20.6	9.5	9.3
Jewish	37,288	20,310	16,978	19,958	25.7	14.0	11.7	10.9
Other	3,396	3,206	190	654	8.4	7.9	0.5	1.3

\*This value is based on an average figure re-calculated from the 1930 census, thus it differs from the comparable figures in Table 5.

Sources:  
Anuarul statistic al României 1923–1931/1932. Istrate 1929: pp. 681–683. Kovács 1929: pp. 1210–1211.

After an initial boom, the average natural population growth fell steadily and rapidly each year, except for the years 1928 and 1930. The decrease in birth rate was uninterrupted among Roman Catholics and Protestants, whereas some occasional improvement could be found with the other denominations. Since the mortality rate of the different denominations decreased at almost the same rate, the natural population growth differences were determined by birth rates. Accordingly, decrease in natural growth is most marked among Protestants, Roman Catholics and Jews, somewhat weaker among the Orthodox community, while the relatively smallest decrease can be found among Greek Catholics. The figures are especially unfavourable with respect to Hungarians, since the situation was at its most serious among Hungarian denominations. Taking the values in column 4 of Table 13, we can attempt to establish what proportion of the population growth over the ten years occurred in the major ethnic groups. The calculation is based on the proportion of Hungarian and Romanian native speakers in each denomination in 1910. These figures can then be used to calculate what proportion of the natural growth between 1921 and 1930 occurred in the two major ethnic groups within each denomination (see KOVÁCS 1929). The result shows that out of the total natural population growth of

483.8 thousand persons, an increase of 141.4 thousand persons (29.2 per cent) occurred among Hungarians, and double this figure, that is, 277.6 thousand persons (57.4 per cent), among Romanians. (If we adjust this result, which is optimal from a Hungarian point of view, to Romanian data collection practices based on the concept of „descent according to people”, and accordingly subtract Jewish persons and include Orthodox Hungarian native speakers among Romanians, the Hungarian share in the natural population increase is reduced to approximately 115 thousand persons, while the Romanian share increases to 290 thousand persons.) In order to calculate (even conditionally) the population balance with respect to Hungarians, migration losses also have to be taken into consideration. Between 1921 and 1924 there was an increase of 42.8 thousand in the number of Transylvanian refugees registered in Hungary. According to the official Romanian emigration statistics, the emigration, immigration and remigration balance with respect to ethnic Hungarians or Hungarian citizens was –8.7 thousand persons between 1926 and 1930. The real number of Hungarian emigrants was increased by those who were regarded as non-Hungarian – for example, Jews and Germans. Emigration was particularly intensive in the first half of the decade, but we have only incomplete information from this period (STATISTICA EMIGRĂRILOR DIN ROMÂNIA 1923, DIE SIEBENBÜRGISCHE FRAGE 1940, p. 223). With this in mind, however, it is no exaggeration to estimate that the deficit in the number of Hungarians emigrating from Transylvania over ten years amounts to at least 60 thousand persons. This number is nearly as high as the negative balance of the real and natural population growth of the region illustrated in Table 3. The census in late December 1930 found a maximum of 80 thousand, or, allowing for the „descent according to people” criterion 55 thousand, more Hungarians in Transylvania than could be estimated for 1920, or than the figure recorded in the census. The nationality returns in the census, which stated that the number of Hungarians had increased to 1,353.3 thousand, just fulfil these low expectations. The figure of 1,480.7 thousand for native speakers is closer to the estimation based on the 1910 data, although this is still 100 thousand fewer than 1.6 million, the figure generally accepted by moderate Hungarian statisticians (RÓNAI 1938, p. 97, 1939, p. 351; SCHNELLER 1940, p. 492). Interestingly enough, in 1910 the total number of those whose identity was subject to controversy (Hungarian native speakers belonging to the Jewish, Greek Catholic, and Orthodox denominations, and Germans who became Hungarian in Szatmár) amounted to 264.1 thousand. This figure was roughly the same as the difference between the estimated 1.6 million mentioned above and the number of Hungarians registered by the 1930 census. Of these, 127.2 thousand spoke only Hungarian, while 114.5 thousand had Hungarian as their native language but also knew another language which, because of their denomination, was taken to be their „original” language. The number in this latter group is approximately equivalent to the shortfall from the figure for native language.

The data for population changes with respect to denominations in Transylvania between 1931 and 1935 are shown in Table 14.

**Table 14. Live births, deaths and natural population growth according to denominations in Transylvania between 1931 and 1935**

Denominat.	Live births	Deaths	Natural growth	Live births	Deaths	Natural growth
	Number of persons			Annual average per thousand		
Total	732,462	531,567	200,895	25.9	18.8	7.1
Orthodox	247,770	195,649	52,121	25.3	20.0	5.3
Greek Catholic	228,324	144,255	84,069	32.0	20.2	11.8
Roman Catholic	108,858	84,460	24,398	22.7	17.6	5.1
Calvinist	82,904	60,992	21,912	23.4	17.2	6.2
Lutheran	30,033	21,744	8,289	21.6	15.6	6.0
Unitarian	8,304	5,777	2,527	23.9	16.6	7.3
Jewish	17,594	12,492	5,102	18.0	12.8	5.2
Baptist, Adventist	6,245	3,190	2,335	28.7	18.0	10.7
Other	2,430	2,288	142	*	*	3.1

Source:

Anuarul statistic al României 1933–1937/1938.



The regional breakdown reveals that the most favourable figures for natural population growth for all the denominations, with the exception of Jews and Greek Catholics, were recorded in the territory of historical Transylvania. Even the positive birth rate among the Orthodox community reaches 8.2 per thousand here. The same figure for Roman Catholics and Calvinists is 8.4 per thousand and 7.2 per thousand respectively. The birth rate among Greek Catholics is highest in the Crişana/Körös and Maramureş/Máramaros areas (12.2 per thousand). In Banat, a further fall in the originally low birth rate meant that not only the Jewish community and the Unitarian and Greek Catholic segments, but also the dominant Orthodox denomination began to experience a natural decrease (an annual average of -0.9 per thousand). The Banatians, too (and the Germans in particular), among whom the birth rate was traditionally low, reduced the average natural population growth among Roman Catholics with an annual figure of 0.6 per thousand. It is once again instructive to look at denominational data in order to demonstrate ethnic differences in population changes, as well as to check demographic statistics with respect to nationality. Using the method applied above, the natural population growth among Hungarians over half a decade can be established as 51.7 thousand persons (or 41.7 thousand if the „descent according to people” criterion is used), while the same figure for Romanians is 128.6 thousand or 134.8 thousand. As Table 15 indicates, according to this method the number of Romanians actually increased during this time. The population growth among those officially regarded as ethnic Hungarians is higher than expected, since the calculation based on denominations produces a lower value than the real one due to the low birth rate among the Germans.

**Table 15. Live births, deaths and natural population growth according to nationality in Transylvania between 1931 and 1939**

Nationality	Live births	Deaths	Natural growth			Live births	Deaths	Natural growth		
	1934–1939		1934–1939	1931–1935	1931–1939	1934–1939		1934–1939	1931–1935	1931–1939
	Number of persons					Annual average per thousand				
Total	858,531	627,061	231,470	200,922	365,151	24.7	18.0	6.7	7.1	7.1
Romanian	548,515	392,899	155,616	130,903	241,661	27.1	19.4	7.7	8.0	8.1
Hungarian	180,160	133,299	46,861	44,813	77,592	21.3	15.8	5.5	6.5	6.2
German	66,013	55,429	10,584	8,891	16,925	19.8	16.6	3.2	3.2	3.4
Jewish	20,305	14,957	5,348	5,695	9,113	18.3	13.5	4.8	6.3	5.5
Russ., Ukr.	8,271	4,983	3,288	2,752	5,014	34.2	20.6	13.6	14.4	14.1
Other	35,267	25,494	9,773	7,868	14,846	24.7	17.9	6.8	6.8	6.8

Sources:

Anuarul statistic al României 1935/1936–1939/1940. Buletinul demografic al României May 1939–April 1940.

Manuilă 1940: pp. 95–103.

The annual natural population growth rate among ethnic Hungarians between 1931 and 1933 was still 7.5 per thousand, but over the next six years it fell by 2 per thousand, thus increasing the shortfall compared with Romanians from 1.3 per thousand to 2.2 per thousand. Thus the tendency of the 1920s towards the equalisation of the growth rate in the two ethnically dominant Transylvanian nationalities seems to have gained strength up until the early 1930s when it turned into a new inequality, this time to the advantage of the Romanians. The growth rate among Hungarians fell from 11.2 per thousand (the rate between 1901 and 1910), to less than half that figure, that is, 5.5 per thousand. At the same time, the fall in the Romanian growth rate was only 1 per thousand, and the natural growth rate among the Romanian population still reached an annual figure of 7.7 per thousand. (However, this value was extraordinary only by Transylvanian standards, since the Romanian growth rate amounted to 12.6 per thousand over the whole of Great Romania.) Although the ethno-demographic statistical records were distorted to some extent due to the lack of a clearly standardised criterion system, they basically followed major tendencies. They demonstrate that the demographic turn-around with respect to the two nationalities described above was due to the disproportionately large difference between the fall in birth rates, since the decrease in mortality rates was more or less equal (compared with the first decade of the century the Hungarian rate fell by 9.1 per thousand, and the Romanian rate by 8.5 per thousand).

The annual birth rate among Hungarians was 14.8 per thousand lower than it had been three decades earlier. The same Romanian value was only 9.5 per thousand lower. This phenomenon was probably also brought about by the accumulated population losses among Hungarians, since the wave of refugees fleeing to Hungary after the war compounded the decreasing birth rate caused by the low number of those of child-bearing age (although this factor should not, of course, be exaggerated). The annual average for Hungarian natural growth is only higher than the Romanian figure in Banat (4.1 per thousand) where the number of Romanians was falling at the time (-1.2 per thousand). On the other hand, it is remarkable that the natural population growth rate among Romanians (10.3 per thousand) was 1.5 times higher than that among Hungarians (6.7 per thousand) even in the territory of historical Transylvania, whereas in the Crişana/Körös and Maramureş/Máramaros areas the rate was 2.5 times higher (8.6 and 3.2 per thousand respectively). This suggests that we should be cautious when interpreting these data. Such a great difference can only be explained by the fact that the architects of the demographic statistics followed the practice of the 1930 census and based their figures on the obscure „descent according to people” criterion. With this in mind, and correcting the data with regard to denominations, it can be seen that from the natural growth of the total Transylvanian population between 1931 and 1940, which amounted to 386.8 thousand persons, some 250 thousand persons (64.6 per cent) may have been Romanian and another 100 thousand (25.8 per cent) Hungarians. According to the official nationality registration, the number of Hungarians increased to 1,430.9 thousand, during a period in which demographic tendencies were officially regarded as undisturbed (MANUIŢĂ 1940, p. 97). However, allowing for the data of the 1910 Hungarian census concerning native speakers, and following the argument outlined above, we obtain a figure of 1.7 million.

The period between 1931 and 1941 was concluded by a further change in political supremacy. Since the Second Vienna Award resulted in mutual population movements in the region, it seems advisable to draw the ethnic picture of divided Transylvania allowing for the new border. Figures for natural population changes detailed in this way also demonstrate that this border, running from the western edge of present-day Romania to the southern curve of the Carpathians, lies along a demographic break-line dividing the fertile north and north-west of Transylvania from the southern and south-western parts where population growth was decreasing (see Table 16).

**Table 16. Live births, deaths and natural population growth in Transylvania between 1931 and 1941\***

Territory	Live births	Deaths	Natural growth	Live births	Deaths	Natural growth
	Number of persons			Annual average per thousand		
North	702,149	467,930	234,219	28.0	18.7	9.3
South	759,398	606,752	152,646	22.8	18.2	4.6

\*Between 1 January 1931 and 31 January 1941 in North Transylvania, and 1 January 1931 and 31 March 1941 in South Transylvania

Sources:

Thirring 1943: p. 358. Anuarul demografic al Republicii Socialiste România 1974: pp. 142, 236. Buletinul demografic al României May-July 1941.

Table 17, illustrating real and natural population growth according to major ethnic groups, reveals that the Hungarian census in North Transylvania in late January 1941 practically reconstructed the ethnic and native language situation as it had been before Trianon. The reasons behind this phenomenon are almost impenetrably complex. According to the registration made by the Central Office for the Control of Foreigners 100 thousand Hungarian refugees had arrived in Hungary from South Transylvania by the date mentioned (A ROMÁNIAI MENEKÜLTEK FŐBB ADATAI 1944, p. 410), which is also indicated by the real and natural population balance. Most of them sought refuge in the north, and almost as many persons arrived in the reannexed territory as moved to the Trianon territory from South Transylvania (STARK 1989, pp. 72, 74). As a result of these migrations, North Transylvanian Hungarians increased by almost 100 thousand. In order to „compensate” for this, a great number of Romanians were obliged to leave North Transylvania. Of them, some 100 thousand had left by February 1941 according to the incomplete registration of North Transylvanian refugees carried out by the Romanian government (TEROAREA HORTHYSTO-FASCISTĂ 1985, p. 143).

Besides this, a fall in the total population suggests that a further 40 to 50 thousand Romanians moved from North to South Transylvania (including refugees who were omitted from the official registration for various reasons). If the difference between real and natural population growth in the two main ethnic groups is adjusted according to migration gain and loss respectively, the population balance among Hungarian native speakers becomes +160 thousand, while the Romanian figure is -90 thousand. These values reflect returns which differ from the previous census, that is, a reassimilation gain among Hungarians, and a disassimilation among Romanians. The Hungarian assimilation gain is made up of losses on the part of other groups of native speakers, as shown in the last column of Table 17. The figures reveal that more than half of the persons recorded as Yiddish native speakers in 1930 returned to the community of Hungarian native speakers. This tallies with the corresponding figures of the 1910 census. Yiddish, then recognised as a special German dialect, was spoken by 40.2 thousand Jewish persons who had German as their native language in the counties in question in 1910 (with respect to present-day Transylvania), whereas there were 48.5 thousand Yiddish speakers in North Transylvania in 1941. The changing of language was most typical among Romanians, nearly 90 thousand of whom were added to the total number of Hungarian speakers. As for nationality, the Hungarian gain is much higher than gain based on native language: that is, over 300 thousand.

**Table 17. Real and natural population growth and the difference between the two values according to native language and nationality in North and South Transylvania between 1930 and 1941 (x 1,000 persons)**

a. In North Transylvania according to native language

Major ethnic groups	Number of persons		Real	Natural <sup>b</sup>	Difference between real and natural growth
	In 1930	in 1941 <sup>a</sup>	growth or decrease(-)		
Total	2,393.3	2,578.1	184.8	234.2	-49.4
Hungarian	1,007.2	1,344.0	336.8	80.0	256.8
Romanian	1,165.8	1,068.7	-97.1	138.0	-235.1
German	59.7	47.3	-12.4	1.5	-13.9
Yiddish	99.6	48.5	-51.1	3.5	-54.6
Other	61.0	69.6	8.6	11.2	-2.6

b. In North Transylvania according to nationality

Major ethnic groups	Number of persons		Real	Natural <sup>b</sup>	Difference between real and natural growth
	in 1930	in 1941 <sup>a</sup>	growth or decrease(-)		
Total	2,393.3	2,578.1	184.8	234.2	-49.4
Hungarian	912.5	1,380.5	468.0	62.0	406.0
Romanian	1,176.9	1,029.0	-147.9	146.0	-293.9
German	68.3	44.6	-23.7	4.2	-27.9
Jewish	138.8	47.4	-91.4	10.0	-101.4
Other	96.8	76.6	-20.2	12.0	-32.2

c. In South Transylvania according to nationality

Major ethnic groups	Number of persons		Real	Natural <sup>b</sup>	Difference between real and natural growth
	in 1930	in 1941 <sup>a</sup>	growth or decrease(-)		
Total	3,155.0	3,332.9	177.9	152.7	25.2
Hungarian	440.7	363.2	-77.5	21.1	-98.6
Romanian	2,031.0	2,274.6	243.6	110.2	133.4
German	475.6	490.6	15.0	13.3	1.7
Other	207.7	204.5	-3.2	8.1c	-11.3

*Italics: calculated values*

<sup>a</sup> In North Transylvania on 31 January 1941, in South Transylvania on 6 April 1941.

<sup>b</sup> Values based on nationality figures until 1939. When native language is recorded, it is corrected by estimation.

<sup>c</sup> Of this Jewish: – 1 thousand.

Sources:

Thirring 1943: p. 358. Anuarul demografic al Republicii Socialiste România 1974: pp. 142, 236. Manuilă 1992: p. 145. Buletinul demografic al României May 1940-July 1941.

On the other hand, behind this figure were instances, many of them in Máramaros/Maramureş and Szatmár/Satu Mare counties, where in dozens of settlements many of those who had declared themselves as Romanian now identified themselves as Hungarian, even though they did not speak Hungarian at all (not did they in 1910). The 1941 Romanian census data with respect to Hungarians in South Transylvania are quite correct, since most ethnic groups whose identity was debated were found north of the border and were thus recorded by the Hungarian census. Their number was between 160 and 300 thousand, the range being somewhat wider than ten years earlier.

The population balance during World War II can be calculated by comparing the 1941 and 1948 census returns with natural population growth in the period. The result shows a real deficit of 275.6 thousand persons in terms of the total population. This is the balance of the total losses and gains among the different ethnic groups. The number of North Transylvanian Jews, three-quarters of them Hungarian, is established at between 90 and 100 thousand (SEMLYÉN 1982, Part 6 p. 9; ERDÉLY TÖRTÉNETE 1986, p. 1757). Another 100 thousand may represent the number of Germans who fled to the West with the withdrawing Hitlerist troops. Some 90 to 100 thousand Germans were sent as workers to the Soviet Union by the Romanian government to repair war damage. Most of them did not later return to their homeland, but settled in Germany or Austria (ILLYÉS 1981, pp. 28–29). The number of Hungarians leaving Transylvania for good in subsequent waves is also estimated at between 100 and 125 thousand by different sources (STARK 1989, p. 73). The sum of these losses is higher than the figure based on the population balance mentioned above. Consequently, another segment of the population experienced a significant migration gain, for which no precise figures can be given without knowing details of military losses. This gain obviously enlarged the Romanian population and contributed to an estimated real increase of 400 thousand persons (as regards native language), because of which the proportion of Romanians, which had been almost stagnant until then, rose by 9 per cent to reach two-thirds of the population at the time of the 1948 census. The number of Hungarians in Transylvania fell from 1,743.8 thousand to 1,481.9 thousand during this period according to the census. The difference of over 260 thousand persons and their natural population growth between the two censuses went to produce the total population deficit of Transylvanian Hungarians, which includes those who were killed on the fronts or as prisoners of war, the civilian victims of deportations, military actions and reprisals, as well as those leaving the country for good. All that can be deduced from this deficit, relying on different sources, is the number of refugees, expatriates and deportees, that is, a total of 200 thousand. Not having any (even approximate) data, about the other Hungarian victims of war, we can only presume that these losses did not exceed the Hungarian natural population increase in the seven years. Theoretically, these losses must have been the remaining 60 thousand missing from the officially established number of Hungarian native speakers. Owing to the destruction of Hungarian Jews, this deficit is much smaller than could be ascertained from previous Romanian censuses. The difference still indicates uncertainties in the estimation due to incomplete data about human losses. On the other hand, it also witnesses to the survival of earlier reflexes such as repeated attempts to separate members of certain population groups with dual ethnic identity (mostly denominations using Greek rites, as local data show) from Transylvanian Hungarians.

Over the next eight years, as shown in the 1956 census, native language proportions did not change in practice in Transylvania. Within the same administrative borders the number of Hungarian native speakers increased by 137 thousand, and the number of Romanian native speakers by 339.8 thousand between 1948 and 1956. The Hungarian real annual population growth was 11 per thousand, that is, 1 per thousand higher than the total population increase, even slightly exceeding the 10.8 per thousand Romanian annual population growth. Part of the Hungarian population growth seen in the 1956 census derives from a verifiable positive change in declarations of nationality compared with the 1930 and 1948 censuses. It is obvious from regionally analysed data that the Hungarian population growth rate in Transylvania is above the average primarily in the north-west border region, except in

present-day Hunedoara county where a higher rate occurred due to remigration into the mining area. In the north-west, once the territory of Szatmár/Satu Mare) and Szilágy/Sălaj counties, the number of Hungarian native speakers increased by an annual 16.1 per thousand, while the same figure for local Romanians, well-known for their high birth rate, was only 7.5 per thousand.\* A closer study reveals that this unique outcome in the history of Romanian censuses was due to the fact that ethnic groups that had earlier broken away from the Hungarian native-speaking community now returned to it – although, as shown in later censuses, only temporarily. Because of this temporary assimilation gain for the Hungarians, their natural population growth was lower than the real increase, although we do not know how much the birth rate differed from the average in the region, since there are no figures for the period.

Ethnic relations were challenged, but, with respect to the Hungarian and Romanian positions at least, were only slightly modified along earlier break-lines, by the repeated changes in political supremacy. A real rearrangement of the ethnic spectrum has occurred since the 1956 census. As shown in Supplementary Table 1, in 1956 the Hungarian population had once again reached, for the first time since the beginning of Romanian censuses, approximately the same levels as registered in 1910. Their proportion of the total population had even increased (compared with 1930) with respect to the nationality breakdown, nor did it fall below the lowest value recorded until that time (in 1869) with respect to native speakers. Moreover, their position in North Transylvania remained unchanged, even in the towns, compared with 1930; there was even improvement in certain areas, whereas the proportion of Romanians barely retained its two-thirds share. At that time the increase in the proportion of Romanians was mostly due to their intensive expansion, which meant their replacing those masses of Hungarians who, although not forming compact groups, had left or had been forced to leave Transylvania. This expansion was primarily experienced in southern counties along the traditional „industrial axis”, and in German settlements already in the process of being deserted (especially in Banat and North Transylvania, around Bistrița/Bistritz/Beszterce – Reghin/Säschesch-Regen/Szászrégen, so it did not, in fact, occur at the cost of Hungarians.

In the three and a half decades since that time, however, the proportion of Romanians in terms of native speakers has increased by another 9.8 per cent and by 8.6 per cent with respect to nationality. Thus, at the time of the 1992 census, about three-quarters of the Transylvanian population was made up of Romanians. The ratio of Hungarian native speakers (which is not far above that of ethnic Hungarians) has decreased by a further 5 per cent, and consequently in 1992 only one-fifth of the population was Hungarian. These changes, however, cannot be followed in detail, as the demographic data do not contain a nationality breakdown. An ethno-demographic approach can only rely on regional demographic publications to some extent, although it is clear from earlier corresponding data that it can be misleading to relate population growth rates in the different counties directly to their nationality ratios and then to project these values onto a national level. Information leaked sporadically suggests that the population increase among ethnic Hungarians in the last decades has been checked, unlike in earlier periods, by a higher than average mortality rate. (Between 1934 and 1939, when the birth rate among ethnic Hungarians was 3.4 per thousand lower than that in Transylvania as a whole and 5.8 per thousand lower than the same Romanian figure, a relatively satisfactory level of growth among Hungarians was ensured by a mortality rate 2.2 per thousand lower than the Transylvanian average and 3.6 per thousand below the Romanian figure.) In 1965, when the national birth rate fell to an extremely low 14.6 per thousand in Romania, and to 14.2 per thousand in Transylvania, the live birth rate among Hungarians in Transylvania was 12.8 per thousand, while the Romanian figure was 14.5 per thousand (ANUARUL DEMOGRAFIC 1967, p. 53). Thus the Hungarian birth rate was only 1.4 per thousand lower than the Transylvanian rate and 1.7 per thousand lower than the Romanian average. In that year (using calculations based on the mother's nationality), out of the 20,812 Hungarian new-born babies, 20,675, that is, 99.3 per cent, were born in Transylvania. Over the next eleven years the number of babies born to Hungarian families was approximately 336 thousand (SEMLYÉN 1980a, p. 49), 333.5 thousand of whom must have been born in Transylvania if we accept the ratio mentioned above. Taking a mean proportion of the values of the

---

\*The source of the 1956 data adjusted to previous administrative units is László Sebők's Transylvanian historical-statistical gazetteer. Computerised database, L. Teleki Foundation Library and Documentary Service, Budapest.

two censuses we obtain a birth rate of 18.8 per thousand, which roughly corresponds with the Transylvanian average. During this period the Hungarian population increased by 93.6 thousand persons in Transylvania, an annual growth rate of 5.3 per thousand. From the figures for live births and the 5.3 per thousand average real population growth between 1966 and 1977, we obtain, by a simple calculation, a mortality rate of 13.5 per thousand, that is, 3.3 per thousand higher than the Transylvanian average. However, there is no reason why we should accept this speculative result as probable. Relying on demographic data between 1966 and 1985 in counties where Hungarians formed a majority or lived in great numbers, we can only suppose that as Hungarian birth rates in Transylvania slowly sank below the average, mortality rates approached, or sometimes exceeded the average (VARGA E. 1994c, pp. 80–81). Official information concerning the natural population changes among Hungarians was only provided quarter of a century later, when the national demographic situation had become critical: the official version is that Hungarian mortality rates over the whole country increased to 14.8 per thousand in 1992, while the birth rate reached only 9 per thousand (GHETĂU 1993). Although this alarming fact effectively documents the dramatic outcome of nationality inequalities in the process of demographic transition, it does not enable us to draw definite conclusions about conditions a few decades earlier.

Owing to the forty-five year blockade on information on the natural population growth of particular nationalities and its structure, we can only rely on the real population development figures recorded in the censuses when reviewing the dramatic changes that occurred in ethnic relations between 1956 and 1992. It is clear from Table 18 that the number of ethnic Hungarians between 1956 and 1977 increased by only 132.7 thousand, thus Transylvanian Hungarians did not increase more in these two decades than during the previous eight years. It is also worth mentioning that the 1977 census documentation flagrantly distorts the original records (NYÁRÁDY 1983, VARGA E. 1996b) and takes only 1,651.3 thousand „ethnic Hungarians and native speakers” into account. Thus it acknowledges the existence of just 93 thousand (only 35 thousand as native speakers) more Hungarians in Transylvania than recorded twenty-one years earlier by the 1956 census. Bearing in mind the chaotic, contradictory nature of the publications, earlier doubts about the ethnic data supplied by the Romanian statistical service would seem to be justified. It is not therefore surprising that this period saw the highest number of different estimations regarding the number of Transylvanian and Romanian Hungarians. Using general population trends and church registrations, Hungarian specialists usually put this figure at between 2 and 2.2 million in the 1980s, immediately before the beginning of mass emigration, flight and natural population decrease (DÁVID 1982; NYÁRÁDI 1983; SÜLE 1988; ANTAL 1989; KOCSIS-KOCSISNÉ 1991; KLINGER 1991; SEBŐK 1992).

Members of the general public who were keen to know the facts were faced with a „fait accompli” in the 1992 census, which, contrary to even moderate expectations, registered a serious fall in the number of ethnic Hungarians compared with the previous census. The decrease of 87.1 thousand (or 89 thousand nation-wide) can only partly be explained by emigration. According to data from the Ministry of the Interior, 63,427 ethnic Hungarians had left Romania legally since the previous census (ANUARUL STATISTIC 1993, p. 143). Taking the results of the two censuses, natural population growth and official emigration statistics, we find that the real migration loss for Romania was at least twice as high as officially registered (VARGA E. 1994a, pp. 196–197). (This was partly due to the omission of many Romanian citizens who were abroad at the time the census was carried out.) Thus the number of Hungarians who had either left the country for good or who were merely away from the country must have been higher than mentioned before. Taking the multiplier referred to above, it probably reached 100 thousand. However, not even this can explain the population deficit among Hungarians recorded in the census, since their natural increase must have compensated to a great extent for the losses caused by permanent or temporary emigration. Allowing for natural population growth and migration, the Bucharest Statistical Service registered 1,753.2 thousand Hungarians in Romania on 1 January 1988 (FEHÉR KÖNYV 1991, p. 2). (These records suppose a natural population growth of 63.5 thousand relying on the 1977 census which recorded 1,712.8 thousand ethnic Hungarians, and they take the number of persons emigrating between 1977 and 1987 as 23.1 thousand. In this case, the annual rate of population increase among Hungarians would be 3.4 per thousand compared with the 5.5 per thousand average for the total Transylvanian population.) If we reduce this officially established value by 40.3 thousand, that is, the number of emigrants between 1988 and 1991, and by a further 35 thousand, being the probable number of unregistered illegal emigrants, we still obtain a total of 1,680 thousand Hungarians – a figure that should have been found

in Romania by the 1992 census. In fact, the census only registered 1,625 thousand Romanian citizens as belonging to the ethnic Hungarians. Although natural population growth has turned into a decrease in Romania as well, and although this change must have occurred somewhat earlier among Hungarians, it is not likely that the population gain among Hungarians in Romania, which had accumulated up to the end of the 1980s, vanished in a few years. All this considered, the number of Hungarians in Romania recorded at the time of the census is at least 50 thousand fewer than can be calculated taking the 1977 census as a basis and allowing for natural and mechanical population changes. The deficit can be attributed to different declarations of nationality from those given in the previous census, that is, assimilation (or reassimilation) shifts: one-third of the deficit seems to have gone to enlarge the German and Gypsy communities, and two-thirds were probably included among Romanians.

**Table 18. The real population growth and decrease among Hungarians, Romanians and the population in Transylvania between 1948 and 1992\***

Period	Total	Romanian	Hungarian	Total	Romanian	Hungarian
	Number of persons			Annual average per thousand		
1948–1956	483,766	339,785	137,008	10.00	10.8	11.0
1956–1966	503,734	520,951	39,136	7.7	12.0	2.5
1966–1977	780,674	644,414	93,610	10.2	12.2	5.3
1977–1992	223,084	480,296	-87,125	1.9	5.9	-3.5

\*Between two censuses, according to the territorial system valid at the end of the decade. Native language test 1948–1956, nationality test 1956–1992.

### Major data for city development and for the flow of Transcarpathian Romanians into Transylvania

Supplementary Table 2, tracing the development of ethnic relations in Transylvanian towns, illustrates that ethnic structures, weakened by repeated changes in political supremacy, were modified fundamentally only by the city explosion during the „second urbanisation” based on massive industrialisation. An outline of the process is given here, with a focus on the nation-wide migration which brought great masses of Romanian people into towns, as well as on the large-scale population exchange between the two great regions of the country.

The sources of twentieth-century urban population growth in Transylvania are illustrated in Table 19.

**Table 19. The sources of urban population growth in Transylvania between 1900 and 1944<sup>a</sup>**

Period	Real	Natural (-)	Migration difference	Administration changes <sup>b</sup>	Annual average growth <sup>c</sup>
	growth or decrease				
1901–1910	124,650	21,714	79,895	23,041	20.1
1911–1920	38,985	-12,483 <sup>d</sup>	55,606 <sup>e</sup>	-4,138	5.5
1921–1930	241,872	18,960	132,228	90,684	28.7
1931–1941	190,226	5,951 <sup>f</sup>	169,321	14,954	18.0
1941–1948	-34,740	...	...	-1,839	-3.1
1948–1956	634,940	...	...	243,070	27.4
1956–1966	625,525	136,770	351,260	137,494	30.1
1966–1972 <sup>g</sup>	623,325	...	...	240,556	36.8
1972–1976 <sup>g</sup>	555,957	150,000	405,960	-	37.7
1977–1981 <sup>g</sup>	424,293	165,040	259,250	-	25.0
1981–1985 <sup>g</sup>	316,007	115,395	200,612	-	19.1
1985–1989 <sup>g</sup>	269,598	...	...	59,184 <sup>h</sup>	15.2
1989–1991 <sup>g</sup>	-138,852	48,536	-187,388	-	-12.4
1992–1994 <sup>g</sup>	3,112	10,177	-7,065	-	0.3

*Italics: calculated values*

<sup>a</sup> Real growth between censuses; natural growth broken down into calendar years.

<sup>b</sup> Number of persons in settlements that were declared towns, or were attached to or separated from towns at the beginning of the period.

<sup>c</sup> Real population growth compared with mid-period figures per thousand

<sup>d</sup> Between 1911 and 1918, and in 1920.

<sup>e</sup> Difference between immigration and remigration minus war losses.

<sup>f</sup> Between 1 January 1931 and 1 April 1941 (in North Transylvania between 1 January 1931 and 1 August 1940).

<sup>g</sup> Taking the mid-year population for the years between the two censuses and half of the population growth in the year in question.

<sup>h</sup> Newly established towns with end-period numbers.

Sources:

Magyar Statisztikai Közlemények 1902: pp. 280–455, 1912: pp. 280–457, 1913: pp. 280–459. A népmozgalom főbb eredményei 1911–1920. Martinovici – Istrati 1921: Dicționarul comunelor. Manuilă 1929: pp. VIII, XI, XV. Anuarul statistic al României 1922–1939/1940. Ionescu 1927: pp. 57–62. Recensământul general al populației României din 29 decembrie 1930 1938: pp. XLII, 116, 224, 234, 276, 416, 440. Buletinul demografic al României May–November 1940, Mai–July 1941. Recensământul general al României din 1941 6 aprilie 1944: pp. 1–270. Az 1941. évi népszámlálás 1947: pp. 498–690. Recensământul populației din 21 februarie 1956 1960: pp. 17–158. Recensământul populației și locuințelor din 15 martie 1966 1968: Volumes relating to Transylvania. Cucu – Urcu 1967: Supplementary Table. Anuarul statistic al Republicii Socialiste România 1973–1986. Recensământul populației și locuințelor din 5 ianuarie 1977 1980: p. 616. Recensământul populației și locuințelor din 7 ianuarie 1992 1994: p. 1. Anuarul statistic al României 1990–1995.

Urbanisation was dynamic in the first decade of the century as well, although the rate of increase was more modest than later because of the lower number of newly established towns. Nearly two-thirds of the growth was a result of immigration. The ratio of migration increase to natural population growth was 4:1. A total of 100.8 thousand Hungarians (81 per cent), or 88 thousand (86.6 per cent) not counting newly established towns, contributed to the growth in urban population during the decade, and their natural population growth reached 22.6 thousand persons. The difference between the two figures is due to migration and assimilation gains among Hungarians. The shift in ethnic proportions following the change of supremacy can partly be attributed to forced reassimilation. (In the 1920 census, for example, 91.1 thousand urban Jews, whose mother tongue was Hungarian, were registered as ethnic Jews.) However, it was also caused by flight and by the changeover in terms of state administration, officials and the liberal professions, as well as by an influx of Romanians coming from rural areas into the towns. Those settlements which became towns were mostly made up of Romanians or were mixed even at that time. Some of the migration gain experienced in the 1930s was temporary, since it included refugees who had been forced to leave their homes and who were lodged in towns on both sides. However, the fact that 53.5 per cent of migration gain was concentrated in the narrow strip of the South Transylvanian industrial area, in the towns of Brașov/Brassó, Sibiu, Hunedoara, Caraș-Severin, Timiș/Temes-Torontal and Arad counties, was a sign of permanent change.

Obvious parallels can be found between urbanisation trends during the peaceful years before World War I and after World War II as far as proportions are concerned. In both cases, the proportion within urbanisation of those belonging to the dominant nation was much higher than their proportion in the existing urban population. The Hungarian share in urban population growth between 1901 and 1910, calculated within the same administrative system, was 86.6 per cent, while the same figure for Romanians was 88.5 per cent between 1956 and 1966, and 87.3 per cent between 1966 and 1977. Between 1977 and 1992, the population growth among Romanians exceeded that of the whole country in towns as well. As Hungarian historians clearly show, towns at the turn of the century were „furnaces of assimilation to the Hungarians”. This demographically true statement about the dominance of the official language is true for later periods as well, in so far as an overwhelming majority of Transylvanian towns are now furnaces of assimilation to the Romanians. The only difference – a difference which cannot be ignored – is the intensity of these trends. Urban population growth in the first decade of the century was a mere 101.6 per thousand (apart from in newly established towns), while the same figure increased to 488 thousand after 1956. Over the next eleven years it rose to 938.7 thousand, and in mid-1989 it reached 950.7 thousand. Two-thirds of this tremendous growth was the consequence of migration into towns, at least until the mid-1980s.



As an after-effect of the massive migration, the growth capacity of towns also increased. The impact of the environment in pushing down birth rates was delayed: in small- and medium-sized towns open to migration, and even in relatively „closed” big cities with a large proportion of autochthonous population, the higher birth rate among the newcomers remained dominant for some time (SEMLYÉN 1980b, p. 194). From the 1970s on, as shown by a comparison of Tables 5 and 20, in towns (and city-like settlements) live birth rates approached the national average. As a result of relatively high birth rates and mortality rates far above the average, the source of natural population growth gradually shifted to urban areas. Between 1956 and 1966, between 70 and 75 per cent of natural population growth occurred villages (including settlements regarded as urban at the time but which were, in fact, rural). This ratio fell to between 55 and 60 per cent between 1966 and 1977, and dropped to between 20 and 25 per cent between 1977 and 1992. In this latter period rural areas entered the phase of natural decrease from the original 40 to 45 per cent level.

**Table 20. Live births, deaths and natural population growth in Transylvanian towns between 1900 and 1994<sup>a</sup>**

Period	Live births	Deaths	Natural growth	Live births	Deaths	Natural growth
	Number of persons			Annual average per thousand		
1901–1910	176,806	155,092	21,714	28.0	24.6	3.4
1911–1914	78,169	65,690	12,479	28.1	23.6	4.5
1915–1918	45,600	71,893	-26,293	16.1	25.3	-9.3
1920	17,923	16,592	1,331	24.8	23.0	1.8
1921–1925	87,843	76,131	11,712	23.2	20.1	3.1
1926–1930	88,524	81,276	7,248	19.1	17.5	1.6
1931–1939	153,414	145,808	7,606	17.6	16.7	0.9
1956–1965 <sup>b</sup>	366,705	199,124	167,581	14.0	7.6	6.4
1972–1976 <sup>b</sup>	309,084	140,654	168,430	17.7	8.1	9.6
1977–1985 <sup>b</sup>	605,686	304,568	301,118	16.2	8.1	8.1
1989–1991	174,785	112,302	62,483	12.8	8.2	4.6
1992–1994	132,927	121,720	11,207	10.0	9.2	0.8

<sup>a</sup> According to administrative units at the end of the period.

<sup>b</sup> Including city-like settlements and together with fringe settlements.

Sources:

Magyar Statisztikai Közlemények 1913: pp. 280–459. A népmozgalom főbb eredményei 1911–1920. Manuilă 1929: pp. VIII, XI, XV. Anuarul statistic al României 1922–1939/1940. Ionescu 1927: pp. 57–62. Anuarul demografic al Republicii Socialiste România 1967: pp. 22–24, 82–84. Anuarul statistic al Republicii Socialiste România 1973–1986. Anuarul statistic al României 1990–1995.

The demographic „ruralisation” of the urban population was caused by the growing number of incoming Romanians, many of them from the Transcarpathian region. The only exception to this rule was Szeklerland. The returns with respect to migration deficits in a regional breakdown suggest a massive influx of people from the Transcarpathian region. (A summary of the related data from Tables 3 and 4 can be found in Table 21.)

Official records reveal a continual migration deficit in the country since the end of World War II. Between 1956 and 1989, migration loss in the Transcarpathian region exceeded the national value, while Transylvania had a migration gain despite the fact that a large proportion of emigrants (especially Jews, Germans and Hungarians) had left Transylvania. The deficit caused by these emigrations was apparently compensated by people coming from the former Old Kingdom. Including these, the immigration gain from the Transcarpathian region from 1948 to 1955 can be estimated at between 35 and 40 thousand; from 1965 to 1976 at between 120 and 125 thousand; and from 1977 to 1989 at 250 thousand, thus totalling nearly half a million over the whole period. The number obtained in this way can be further increased by several tens of thousands with regard to officially unregistered legal emigration, as well as ethnic Romanians leaving Transylvania before 1976. The real number of those arriving in Transylvania is even higher than this, since it also includes people coming from the Transcarpathians who moved into places previously inhabited by those moving to the Transcarpathian

region. The real weight, that is, the direct and indirect demographic importance of Transylvanian inhabitants originating from the Transcarpathian region, can be outlined using census data with respect to place of birth (Table 22).

**Table 21. The migration balance in the present territory of Romania according to the two main regions (x 1,000 persons)**

Period <sup>a</sup>	Romania	Transcarpathia	Transylvania
1901–1910	...	...	-89.7
1911–1920 <sup>b</sup>	...	...	-265.9
1921–1930	...	...	-67.8
1931–1941	134.6	158.9	-24.3
1941–1948 <sup>b</sup>	-625.9	-351.0	-274.9
1948–1955	-130.2	...	...
1956–1965	-139.7	-166.5	26.8
1966–1976	-69.2	-142.5	73.3
1977–1989 <sup>c</sup>	-233.2	-251.4	18.2
1989–1991	-493.8	-142.5	-351.3
1992–1995	-75.4	-33.4	-42.0

<sup>a</sup> Migration balance based on the population on 1 January (registered by census in 1941, 1948, 1977 and 1992; in 1989 and 1995, mid-year figures).

<sup>b</sup> Difference between immigration and emigration + war losses.

<sup>c</sup> Based on official data following the 1977 census, excluding illegal emigration.

**Table 22. The population of Transylvania according to place of birth and habitation: 1930, 1966, 1977, 1992 (Number and percentage)<sup>a</sup>**

Total											
Year	Total population	Born in present place of habitation		Born elsewhere in the country						Other <sup>b</sup>	
				In the same county		Elsewhere in Transylvania		In Trans carpathia			
1930	5,548,363	4,105,376	74.0	788,695	14.2	414,855	7.5	68,650	1.2	170,787	3.1
1966	6,719,555	4,333,885	64.5	1,078,816	16.1	791,427	11.8	397,373	5.9	118,054	1.7
1977	7,500,229	4,640,685	61.9	1,329,210	17.7	916,289	12.2	532,905	7.1	81,140	1.1
1992	7,678,206	6,174,802	80.4			876,752	11.4	573,986	7.5	52,666	0.7

Of these, number of persons living in towns

Year	Total population	Born in present place of habitation		Born elsewhere in the country						Other <sup>b</sup>	
				In the same county		Elsewhere in Transylvania		In Trans carpathia			
1930	963,418	400,124	41.5	215.552	22.4	214,576	22.4	44,466	4.6	88,700	9.2
1966 <sup>c</sup>	2,619,925	1,075,900	41.1	617.226	23.5	542,450	20.7	304,247	11.6	80,102	3.1
1977	3,558,651	1,499,878	42.1	891.960	25.1	672,488	18.9	435,254	12.2	59,071	1.7
1992	4,344.939	3,167,464	72.9			657,633	15.1	482,318	11.1	37,524	0.9

<sup>a</sup> 1930, 1966, 1977: population actually present; 1992: those with a registered permanent address.

<sup>b</sup> Born abroad or did not respond.

<sup>c</sup> According to the administrative units introduced in 1968.

Sources:

Recensământul general al populației României din 29 decembrie 1930 1940: pp. XXXIV-XXXVII, XLII-XLIX. Recensământul populației și locuințelor din 15 martie 1966 1970: pp. 2–9, 18–25. Recensământul populației și locuințelor din 5 ianuarie 1977 1980: pp. 696–701, 720–725. Recensământul populației și locuințelor din 7 ianuarie 1992 1994: pp. 112–123, 130–141.

It can be seen that in 1930 only 68,650 persons born in the Transcarpathian region were living in Transylvania. Four and a half decades later this number rose to 532,905. On the other hand, in 1930 some 176,381 persons, (289,791 in 1977) born in Transylvania were registered in the Transcarpathian region. Thus the migration balance for Transylvania was still negative in 1930, but later it became positive. The outstandingly detailed publication containing 1966 data, which sets out domestic population changes up until that date with reference to period as well, also helps clarify the picture (see Table 23).

**Table 23 Dates of residence changes in Transylvania in the 1966 census according to place of birth**

Persons changing their place of habitation  
Total number

Date of changing place of residence	Before 1945	1945– 1949	1950– 1954	1955– 1959	1960– 1966	No response
Living in Transylv., born in Transc.	33,425	39,073	51,721	72,161	181,847	19,146
Living in Transc., born in Transylv.	77,069	17,170	25,932	27,358	77,962	15,314
Domestic migration balance	-43,644	21,903	25,789	44,803	103,885	3,832
Living in Transylv., born abroad	54,432	20,202	10,596	9,827	12,819	6,062

Of these, persons living in towns

Date of changing place of residence	Before 1945	1945– 1949	1950– 1954	1955– 1959	1960– 1966	No response
Living in Transylv., born in Transc.	26,038	27,979	45,118	59,950	134,302	10,860
Living in Transc., born in Transylv.	70,532	15,101	22,823	22,070	59,775	10,034
Domestic migration balance	-44,494	12,878	22,295	37,880	74,527	826
Living in Transylv., born abroad	36,555	13,775	8,411	7,284	8,690	3,403

Source:

Recensământul populației și locuințelor din 15 martie 1966 1970: pp. 70–260.

Detailed records confirm that the domestic migration balance for Transylvania became positive after World War II. Before that, a greater number of people had moved to the Transcarpathian region from Transylvania than vice versa. The year 1945 can be regarded as a watershed: earlier, Transylvanian inhabitants born abroad included those who had come from Hungary. After 1945, this number refers rather to immigrants from territory which had belonged to Romania before 1945. Between 1 January 1945 and 15 March 1966, some 345,000 persons settled in Transylvania (within the present borders of the country) from the Transcarpathian region. If we take into account the 50,000 persons coming from abroad (mostly from Transprut and South Dobrudia), those who did not submit information about their place of habitation and those who arrived after 1945 but were no longer alive and consequently unregistered, we can state that the total number of persons flowing into Transylvania from the Transcarpathian region amounted to 450,000 persons between 1945 and 1966.

Between the 1966 and the 1977 censuses the number of people living in Transylvania and born in the Transcarpathian region increased by 135,532 persons. In order to establish the number of immigrants, it is not sufficient to calculate the difference between the two censuses. We also have to consider the number of deaths in the intervening period. Taking a figure of 10.2 deaths per thousand inhabitants, we find that it is one-tenth of the total number of immigrants. By carrying out the necessary calculations, it can be concluded that between 1966 and 1977 approximately 183 thousand persons arrived in Transylvania from the Transcarpathian region. With this in mind, the number of persons moving from the Transcarpathian region into Transylvania from the end of World War II until 1972 can be estimated at 630 thousand. Using similar calculations we find only 74 thousand Transylvanians moving to the Transcarpathian region between 1966 and 1977, and taking the whole period from the end of World War II, this figure rises to a mere 250 thousand. Moreover, many of

these immigrants must have belonged to ethnic minorities (even if we presume that their proportion within the migration total was much lower than their proportion in the existing population) without there being a compensatory counter tendency from the Transcarpathian region, since the proportion of non-Romanians in the Transcarpathian region was only 1.5 per cent in 1966, the comparable figure being 32 per cent in Transylvania. As shown above, the population exchange in terms of Transylvanian Romanians is remarkable, especially if ethnic disproportions within domestic population changes are considered. Their migration gains can be estimated at at least 400 thousand persons between 1945 and 1977, including counter migration as well as the Romanian gain compensating the losses among ethnic minorities caused by their migration to the Transcarpathian region.

The 1992 census recorded some 600 thousand persons living in Transylvania and born in the Transcarpathian region, although no special details are provided. Among them, 573,986 had a permanent dwelling. If we increase the difference in their numbers between the two censuses by 95 thousand, a figure based on the annual mortality rate of 11 per thousand, we reach an immigration figure of a further 165 thousand persons over fifteen years. Thus the number of persons moving into Transylvania from the Transcarpathian region in the last half a century can be put at between 800 and 900 thousand, allowing for domestic and external migration data, place of birth statistics and deaths in the period. With this important figure in mind, we can venture to state that in the past few decades Romanians coming from the Transcarpathian region (and their descendants) have been able to compensate the population decrease of over one million persons which was caused by war losses, repeated waves of flight and the continual emigration of non-Romanians. Strictly according to the rules of calculation, this statement may be questioned since without the inhabitants emigrating to the Transcarpathian region the net migration gain for Transylvania is scarcely above half a million. However, the conclusion above can be regarded as true if we take into consideration the very intensive physical presence of Transcarpathians (and their dominant mentality).

This presence is mostly to be experienced in towns, as shown in the 1977 place of birth records. Geographical mobility is not simply a process of mobility between different areas or territories, but also between different kinds of settlement, especially a movement from villages to towns. Consequently, the population exchange between identical settlement types must have been relatively modest in terms of inter-regional relations. Unfortunately the data available do not allow us to make any in-depth investigation. Relying on national statistical averages, however, we can rightly suppose that centrifugal population changes mostly brought villagers to the Transcarpathian region, while centripetal forces mainly caused those people arriving in Transylvania to move into towns. Because of these shifts the net migration gain in Transylvanian towns temporarily reached, and sometimes even exceeded, the domestic migration gain in the total Transylvanian population. Approximately one-fifth of the migration gain in Transylvanian towns between 1956 and 1977, and nearly one-third of that between 1977 and 1985, was derived from the Transcarpathian region. This gain, which may appear insignificant compared with the whole value, can be seen as a moderate, or in some places even a considerable gain, where examined locally. In 1977, for example, 33.2 per cent of urban dwellers in Braşov/Brassó county, 23.4 per cent in Hunedoara county, and 16.2 per cent in Timiş/Temes county, were of Transcarpathian origin (i.e. had been born there). It also indicates that migration from the Transcarpathian region was primarily focused on the „migration buffer zone” in South Transylvania. More than 80 per cent of those who moved here from the Transcarpathian region were recorded in the three counties mentioned above as well as in Caraş-Severin, Sibiu and Arad counties. Although domestic migration lines ran, by and large, from one end of the country to the other, from those Transcarpathian regions which experienced natural growth, people tended to move to neighbouring Transylvanian counties (recently Cluj/Kolozs) and the industrial centres referred to above. Until 1977, migration from the Transcarpathian region only exercised an indirect influence on the ethnic structure of towns traditionally regarded as Hungarian by the general public (except in Harghita/Hargita and Covasna/Kovászna counties). (A mere 4 per cent of city dwellers in North Transylvania were born in the Transcarpathian region and no more than 7 per cent of Romanians here were of the same origin.) Certain indications, however, clearly demonstrate that forced urbanisation, delayed after 1977, was accompanied by an aggressive settlement policy, no longer motivated economically, aimed at North Transylvanian towns. The contribution of (domestic) migration to urban population growth was very high, between 65 and 70 per cent in Bihor/Bihar and Cluj/Kolozs at the time (comparable only to the southern counties mentioned earlier), and from 1981 also in Satu Mare/Szatmár and Mureş/Maros

counties. One of the main sources of migration here is still the chain of Romanian villages surrounding these towns, but in Cluj/Kolozs and Mureş/Maros counties urban population growth is being increased to a greater degree than earlier by settlers coming from outside Transylvania. In Szeklerland, of the new settlers coming from other counties those from the Transcarpathian region formed a majority in this period. Although they withdrew from Harghita/Hargita county, in the towns of Covasna/Kovászna county their number doubled over one and a half decades.

Using place of birth statistics and relying on estimates, we can form a picture of the role played by migration in the development of ethnic structures in towns. The effect of migration into and from towns can be inferred from the ethno-demographic conditions of counties with a population outflow. Our starting point is the hypothesis that the ethnic structure of settlers in towns corresponds with ethnic relations in their place of birth. Of course, this is only a theoretical assumption, since we have no opportunity to locate the (perhaps ethnically different) migration centres, within those counties experiencing natural growth, from which people migrate. Likewise, we have to ignore the ethnic aspects of those factors (economic, social, political) which influence changes in place of habitation, especially considering the fact that these movements were partly controlled and, particularly in the „closed” towns, ethnically discriminative. We have tried to compensate for the resulting distortions by establishing a fictitious ethnic structure for inhabitants born elsewhere over the last half a century on the basis of the 1977 nationality data (which reflected the increasing dominance of the leading nationality). In 1977, out of 3,558.6 thousand city dwellers 2,058.8 thousand had their place of habitation elsewhere in Transylvania. Among them, 892 thousand were born in another settlement in the same county, 672.5 thousand in another county in Transylvania, and 435.2 thousand in the Transcarpathian region. Calculations suggest that two-thirds of those who came from another Transylvanian county were made up of Romanians, and somewhat more than a quarter of them were Hungarian. The number of Romanians is in line with their proportions in Transylvania as a whole, while Hungarians are over-represented compared with their proportion in the region. This is related to the fact that Hungarian migration is greatest from Covasna/Kovászna, Harghita/Hargita and Mureş/Maros counties (as well as from Sălaj/Szilágy, Bistriţa-Năsăud/Beszterce-Naszód and Alba/Fehér counties where Romanians form a majority). (These Szekler counties, which had 15 per cent of the total Transylvanian population in 1977, share 20 per cent of the total population exchange among Transylvanian counties.) Transylvanian Romanians, unlike Hungarians, have a significant migration hinterland outside Transylvania as well, which essentially modifies the overall picture. The 435.2 thousand persons born in the Transcarpathian region practically doubled the number of Romanians who arrived in Transylvanian towns from outside the county. At the same time, tens of thousands of Hungarians left Transylvania for the Transcarpathian region and, as ethnic data records, were lost to the Hungarian community. Romanians born in other Transylvanian counties and in the Transcarpathian region together total up to 80 per cent of the urban population born outside their county of residence. (If we add persons coming from the Transcarpathian region to those born in other counties, the Hungarian share of newcomers drops to only 15 per cent.) The presence of Transcarpathians increased the proportion of Romanians among settlers in towns primarily along the borderline of the two regions, especially in Braşov/Brassó, Hunedoara, and Caraş-Severin, as well as in Harghita/Hargita and Covasna/Kovászna counties. Studying the migration balance of individual counties we can see that in Covasna/Kovászna and Harghita/Hargita counties, where the total balance was negative, there was a growth among the Romanians. In Bihor/Bihar, Satu Mare/Szatmár and Mureş/Maros counties the Romanian balance was also negative, although their presumed migration loss was smaller than the corresponding Hungarian figure. Besides the areas mentioned, considerable Hungarian migration was experienced from Sălaj/Szilágy county. Hungarians swarming away from these areas found new homes in the towns of Arad, Caraş-Severin, Cluj/Kolozs, Maramureş/Máramaros, Timiş/Temes, Sibiu, Hunedoara and Braşov/Brassó counties in Transylvania. The inter-county migration growth among urban Hungarians reached its highest values in the last four counties mentioned above, with Hunedoara, and in particular Braşov/Brassó, ahead, the latter having an intensive population exchange with Covasna/Kovászna. Hungarian migrants settling in South Transylvania arrived in their new homes along with hundreds of thousands of people coming from the Transcarpathian region. It is not surprising that these masses, estimated at several tens of thousands, disappeared in the Romanian melting pot here as well as in the Transcarpathian region. In this area in 1977 only the towns of Timiş/Temes and Braşov/Brassó counties presented tangible Hungarian population growth.

## Main demographic characteristics for Hungarians based on the 1992 census<sup>\*</sup>

The official number of ethnic Hungarians living in Romania was 1,625 thousand at the time of the 7 January 1992 census. Demographic returns have reported a fall of 53 thousand since then. Only one-fifth of this figure can be accounted for by the difference between emigration and remigration, the majority of the decrease resulting from a high mortality rate. Accordingly, the number was established as 1,572 thousand on 1 January 1996 (GHEȚĂU 1997b, p. 3).

A total of 98.7 per cent of Hungarians in Romania live in Transylvania, where they form slightly more than one-fifth of the total population. Some 45.1 per cent of Transylvanian Hungarians (723.2 thousand) live in Szeklerland (Mureș/Maros, Harghita/Hargita, Covasna/Kovászna counties); 24 per cent (385.3 thousand persons) are concentrated on the ethnically mixed border area of the central Hungarian settlement territory which extends over the Hungarian-Romanian frontier (Satu Mare/Szatmár, Bihor/Bihar, Sălaj/Szilágy counties); and 30.9 per cent (495.4 thousand persons) live in language islands or blocks loosely connecting the larger Hungarian language area with the smaller one, or are scattered north and south of these language islands. The greatest population decrease over the last fifteen years has taken place in the latter, intermediate area (77.3 thousand persons). Fewer Hungarians now live along the north-west border as well (-31.1 thousand persons), and their number has only increased in Szeklerland by 21.3 thousand (in Mureș/Maros county, however, it has decreased by 15.6 thousand persons compared with 1977). The regional distribution of emigration partly explains the fall in the Hungarian population in certain counties. Approximately three-quarters of the officially registered 483.5 thousand emigrants from the country (two-thirds of them non-Romanians) between 1977 and 1991 left Transylvania, most of them from Timiș/Temes, Sibiu, Arad and Brașov/Brassó counties, as a result of German emigration, but a considerable number (tens of thousands) left Cluj/Kolozs, Bihor/Bihar and Mureș/Maros counties as well (ROMÂNIA. DATE DEMOGRAFICE 1994, pp. 456–457; GHEORGHIU 1995.)

A total of 56.1 per cent of Transylvanian Hungarians live in towns. As clearly shown in Table 24, these are the places where the natural growth among Transylvanian (and, generally, Romanian) Hungarians, actually disappears. While the rates of population decrease in villages between 1977 and 1992 were roughly the same among Hungarians and Romanians, in towns the Romanian population growth rate was eight(!) times higher than the corresponding Hungarian figure. The real population growth among Hungarians in Transylvanian towns is equal to their natural population growth (mostly occurring in Szeklerland). The gains resulting from migration from villages have evaporated due to external and internal losses (emigration, natural decrease in major towns and assimilation).

**Table. 24. Population levels in Transylvania in 1992, growth and decrease between 1977 and 1992 according to settlement type and the two main nationalities\***  
(Number and percentage)

Number of persons in 1992						
Nationality	Total		Romanians		Hungarians	
Total	7,723,313	100.0	5,684,142	73.6	1,603,923	20.8
Towns	4,429,697	100.0	3,351,001	75.6	898,387	20.3
Villages	3,293,616	100.0	2,333,141	70.8	705,536	21.4
Change in number of persons between 1977 and 1992						
Nationality	Total		Romanians		Hungarians	
Total	223,084	3.0	480,296	9.2	-87,125	-5.1
Towns	814,941	22.5	847,714	33.9	36,358	4.2
Villages	-591,857	-15.2	-367,418	-13.6	-123,483	-14.9

<sup>\*</sup>The sources for the tables in this chapter are as follows: Recensământul populației și locuințelor din 7 ianuarie 1992 1994, 1995. Data not published in these volumes are from working papers made for the internal use of the Statistical Office of Bucharest.

\*According to present administrative units

The decrease in Hungarian demographic weight in Transylvanian towns is particularly striking. The number of inhabitants in the eight towns in Table 25 has almost doubled since 1966: from 992.5 thousand to 1,845 thousand. Of this growth, some 800 thousand persons were Romanians and only 60 thousand Hungarians. In the decade preceding the 1977 census the number of Hungarians living in these towns increased by 79 thousand persons (three-quarters of them new settlers, which was only 15 per cent of all settlers even then), but this gain was partly lost over the subsequent fifteen years. Between 1977 and 1992, the number of Romanian inhabitants increased by 66.2 per cent in /Târgu Mureş/Marosvásárhely; by 62 per cent in Baia Mare/Nagybánya; and by 56.9 per cent in Oradea/Nagyvárad, while the number of Hungarians did not actually increase. In other places, significant Romanian population growth was accompanied by a similarly remarkable decrease in the Hungarian population which, in Cluj-Napoca/Kolozsvár for example, resulted in a complete change in ethnic proportions which had still been balanced twenty-five to thirty years earlier. Considerable Hungarian population gain in the last fifteen years has only appeared in small and medium-sized towns in Szeklerland and in Satu Mare/Szatmár, Sălaj/Szilágy and Bistriţa-Năşăud/Beszterce-Naszód counties, although nearly three-quarters of this 77.5 thousand gain was restricted to just two counties (Harghita/Hargita, Covasna/Kovászna).

**Table 25. Changes in the total population, and in the number and proportion of Romanians and Hungarians in eight Transylvanian towns between 1966 and 1992<sup>a</sup>**  
(Percentage)

Town	Nationality proportions						Change in number of persons <sup>b</sup>					
	Romanians			Hungarians			Total		Romanians		Hungarians	
	1966	1977	1992	1966	1977	1992	1966–1977	1977–1992	1966–1977	1977–1992	1966–1977	1977–1992
Arad	63.8	71.1	79.7	24.9	20.9	15.7	35.9	11.0	51.6	24.3	10.8	-14.1
Braşov/Brassó	75.8	81.9	88.8	17.0	13.6	9.7	57.0	26.2	69.6	36.9	25.3	-9.6
Cluj-Napoca/Kolozsvár	56.5	65.8	75.6	41.4	32.8	22.8	41.6	25.0	64.9	43.7	12.1	-13.2
Târgu-Mureş/Marosvásárhely	28.5	35.1	46.1	69.6	63.2	51.4	50.4	26.4	85.2	66.2	36.5	2.8
Baia Mare/Nagybánya	66.7	73.2	80.2	31.9	25.3	17.4	56.5	47.7	71.6	62.0	24.5	1.4
Oradea/Nagyvárad	46.1	53.9	64.8	51.4	44.0	33.3	39.2	30.6	62.9	56.9	19.3	-1.2
Satu Mare/Szatmárnémeti	47.6	51.0	55.1	49.5	47.2	41.0	48.4	27.5	59.2	37.6	41.6	10.5
Timişoara/Temesvár	62.6	71.2	82.2	17.8	13.6	9.5	54.6	24.0	75.7	43.2	18.4	-34.5
Total	58.0	65.6	74.5	34.8	29.0	22.0	47.6	25.9	66.9	43.0	22.9	-4.1

<sup>a</sup> According to present administrative units.

<sup>b</sup> The proportion of increase or decrease as a percentage compared with the original number of persons.

Movement from villages to towns can be traced in the change of the population structure with regard to the size of settlements (Tables 26 and 27). Due to migration and natural population decrease which began in the villages in the second half of the 1980s, the number of small villages increased. The proportion of villages with fewer than 500 inhabitants out of the total of 5,285 Transylvanian settlements rose from 45.5 per cent to 54.8 per cent, while the proportion of those living in villages with below 500 inhabitants rose from 7.7 per cent to 8.1 per cent. At the same time, the proportion of all settlement types with between 0.5 and 10 thousand inhabitants fell, the most significantly in the case of settlements with between 1 thousand and 5 thousand inhabitants. In 1992, some 51.6 per cent of the total Transylvanian population was concentrated in towns with over 10 thousand inhabitants, in contrast to 41.1 per cent in 1977. The increase was the highest among Romanians (11.6 per cent) and took place almost exclusively in towns with over 50 thousand inhabitants. Within the Romanian population especially, the proportion of inhabitants living in towns with a population of between 2 thousand and 5 thousand (-4.8 per cent) and towns of between 0.5 and 1 thousand inhabitants (-3.8 per cent) decreased. In absolute figures, the greatest losses were suffered by the former group, while in

proportion to their nationality ratio, losses were greater among the latter. Hungarian statistics mainly improved in medium-sized towns with between 20 thousand and 100 thousand inhabitants, primarily at the cost of small towns with between 10 thousand and 20 thousand inhabitants and settlements of between 1 thousand and 5 thousand inhabitants. The proportion of Hungarians fell drastically in towns with over 100 thousand inhabitants and in those with between 10 thousand and 20 thousand inhabitants.

**Table 26. The number of settlements in 1977 and 1992. The number of Romanians, Hungarians and the total population in 1992, and changes in their numbers in settlement groups arranged according to number of inhabitants**

Settlement groups according to number of inhabitants	Number of settlements		Number of persons in 1992			Change in population between 1997 and 1992		
	1977	1992	Total	Roman.	Hung.	Total	Roman.	Hung.
—499	2,404	2,895	626,899	507,602	89,167	53,222	33,357	9,710
500–999	1,438	1,217	856,475	644,140	154,254	-172,898	-142,535	-19,258
1,000–1,999	936	744	1,013,476	701,444	229,867	-269,520	-189,840	-53,611
2,000–4,999	369	292	867,555	579,291	213,130	-219,590	-94,468	-66,380
5,000–9,999	69	56	372,302	235,135	108,843	-73,762	-32,528	-11,603
10,000–19,999	30	35	442,741	340,089	68,322	31,634	70,774	-32,443
20,000–49,999	25	27	829,024	576,662	221,725	100,088	78,317	29,782
50,000–99,999	6	10	705,760	569,683	109,103	275,887	230,830	50,024
100,000–	8	9	2,009,081	1,530,096	409,512	498,023	526,389	6,654
Total	5,285	5,285	7,723,313	5,684,142	1,603,923	223,084	480,296	-87,125

**Table 27. Total population. The distribution of Romanians and Hungarians in settlement groups arranged according to number of inhabitants in Transylvania in 1977 and 1992**

Settlement groups according to number of inhabitants	Proportion of population according to settlement group						Proportion of population within the settlement group			
	Total		Romanian		Hungarian		Romanian		Hungarian	
	1977	1992	1977	1992	1977	1992	1977	1992	1977	1992
—499	7.7	8.1	9.1	8.9	4.7	5.6	82.7	81.0	13.8	14.2
500–999	13.7	11.1	15.1	11.3	10.3	9.6	76.4	75.2	16.9	18.0
1,000–1,999	17.1	13.2	17.1	12.3	16.8	14.3	69.5	69.2	22.1	22.7
2,000–4,999	14.5	11.2	13.0	10.2	16.5	13.3	62.0	57.2	25.7	21.0
5,000–9,999	5.9	4.8	5.1	4.2	7.1	6.8	60.0	63.2	27.0	29.2
10,000–19,999	5.5	5.7	5.2	6.0	6.0	4.3	65.5	76.8	24.5	15.4
20,000–49,999	9.7	10.7	9.6	10.2	11.3	13.8	68.4	69.6	26.3	26.7
50,000–99,999	5.7	9.2	6.5	10.0	3.5	6.8	78.8	80.7	13.7	15.5
100,000–	20.2	26.0	19.3	26.9	23.8	25.5	66.4	76.2	26.7	20.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	69.4	73.6	22.5	20.8

Transylvanian Hungarians formed an absolute majority in 828 settlements in 1977 and in 786 settlements in 1992 (a quarter of all Transylvanian settlements inhabited by Hungarians, Table 28). In another 25 settlements their proportion did not reach 50 per cent, but they were the largest ethnic group numbering 21,942 persons. The number of Hungarians forming an absolute majority in their settlements decreased from 955.1 thousand to 912 thousand between 1972 and 1992. However, their proportion in the total Transylvanian population hardly changed (going from 56.6 to 56.9 per cent). Characteristic proportion shifts among settlement groups demonstrate the tendency for certain Hungarian urban communities to lose ground demographically (clearly illustrated in Table 25). As a consequence, the number of Hungarians forming less than 25 per cent of the population in settlements



rose from 316.6 thousand to 425 thousand, and their proportion within the total Hungarian population in Transylvania rose from 18.7 to 26.5 per cent. The ethnic homogeneity of settlements outside city administration is stronger and relatively more stable. Four-fifths of ethnic Hungarians registered in Transylvanian villages formed an absolute majority in the settlements in which they were living at the time of both censuses. However, nearly one-sixth of those Hungarians living in settlements with a Hungarian majority, that is, some 91 thousand persons, lived in smaller administrative units with a Romanian majority. The number of those living in villages where the majority of the administrative staff were Romanians was highest in Mureş/Maros (17.9 thousand), Cluj/Kolozs (14.8 thousand), Satu Mare/Szatmár (15.2 thousand) and Bihor/Bihar (11 thousand) counties, while their proportion was greatest in Hunedoara (100 per cent), Timiş/Temes (79.1 per cent), Bistriţa-Năşăud/Beszterce-Naszód (67.4 per cent), Maramureş/Máramaros (65.5 per cent) and Arad (57.6 per cent) counties. At the same time, in villages with a Hungarian majority a considerable number of people belonging to other ethnic groups could be found. These numbered a total of 110 thousand and formed nearly one-fifth of the population in these villages, being present mainly in Mureş/Maros (29.4 thousand), Satu Mare/Szatmár (18.4 thousand), Bihor/Bihar (16.2 thousand) and Sălaj/Szilágy (14.3 thousand) counties (see Table 29). Taking these three aspects into account, the homogeneity of rural Hungarians within their settlements is most complete in Covasna/Kovászna and Harghita/Hargita counties, and relatively strong in Mureş/Maros, and Bihor/Bihar, and also in Sălaj/Szilágy counties, although Hungarian settlements in Szilágyság form disconnected islands surrounded by Romanian villages. Due to the tendency of the Hungarian language area along the border in Satu Mare/Szatmár county to become ethnically mixed, settlement relations among Hungarian villages constitute a specific transition from ethnic blocks to ethnic islands and sporadic patches, tending rather towards the latter type.

**Table 28. The distribution of Transylvanian Hungarians according to their proportion in settlements in a breakdown per settlement group**

Hungar. proport. (%)	Number of settlements inhabited by Hungarians				Hungarian population							
	Total		In villages*		Total				In Villages*			
	1977	1992	1977	1992	1977		1992		1977		1992	
	Number				Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
–9.9	1,814	1,902	1,636	1,691	70,059	4.1	148,096	9.2	31,044	3.7	25,727	3.7
10–24.9	240	245	193	202	246,569	14.6	276,878	17.3	36,333	4.4	36,605	5.2
25–49.9	232	225	190	190	419,241	24.8	266,847	16.6	96,410	11.6	80,692	11.4
50–74.9	180	163	165	148	260,619	15.4	277,097	17.3	146,490	17.7	102,302	14.5
75–89.9	150	139	138	129	206,006	12.2	185,381	11.6	112,093	13.5	106,691	15.1
90–99.9	416	375	388	349	467,838	27.7	426,341	26.6	386,151	46.6	330,271	46.8
100	82	109	80	106	20,716	1.2	23,283	1.4	20,498	2.5	23,247	3.3
Total	3,114	3,158	2,790	2,815	1,691,048	100.0	1,603,923	100.0	829,019	100.0	705,535	100.0

\*According to present administrative units

The number of Hungarian native speakers was 1,639.1 thousand in 1992, that is, 81.6 thousand less than in 1977. Some 97.87 per cent of them (97.53 per cent in 1977) were ethnic Hungarians. Among those ethnic Hungarians with a different native language the most numerous are Romanians: 32.9 thousand persons, that is, 2.03 per cent (2.25 per cent in 1977). The proportion of ethnic Hungarians with a different native language is highest among the Hungarian diaspora in the Transcarpathian region, who are exposed to the most intensive language erosion (18.4 per cent; 15.8 per cent in 1977). The Transylvanian average is only 1.9 per cent (2.3 per cent in 1977), but the corresponding proportions (usually referring to ethnic Hungarians with Romanian as their native language) are high in areas where Hungarians have settled sporadically such as Caraş-Severin (14 per cent), Hunedoara (10.3 per cent), Sibiu (8.3 per cent), Bistriţa-Năşăud/Beszterce-Naszód (7.6 per cent), Alba/Fehér (6.7 per cent) and Timiş/Temes (6.6 per cent) counties. The lowest proportions can be found in Bihor/Bihar (1.1 per cent), Mureş/Maros, Satu Mare/Szatmár, Sălaj/Szilágy (0.8 per cent

each), Covasna/Kovászna (0.3 per cent) and Harghita/Hargita (0.2 per cent) counties. When ethnic Hungarians have a different native language, it usually indicates a step towards assimilation to the dominant nationality (nation state). On the other hand, if the proportion of other nationalities increases among Hungarian native speakers, it also weakens the numerical potential of Hungarians. With the strengthening of the Gypsy and, in Satu Mare/Szatmár/Sathmar, „new-German” identity, the number of Gypsies and ethnic Germans among native Hungarian speakers has doubled since 1977, while the number of Hungarians has decreased accordingly (as a result of the disassimilation of the former and reassimilation of the latter group).

**Table 29. The number of Hungarians in Transylvanian villages, the number of Hungarians who form an absolute or a simple majority in their villages, and their proportion in a county breakdown in 1992**

County	Hungar. inhabit. total	Forming a majority in their place of habitation		Of these, living in villages with a Hungarian majority		Villages with a Hungarian majority			
						Number	Total population	Of this Hungarian	
Alba/Fehér	11,253	5,144	45.7	2,890	56.2	2	4,822	3,011	62.4
Arad	23,725	9,512	40.1	4,034	42.4	3	6,374	4,080	64.0
Bihor/Bihar	72,991	60,818	83.3	49,809	81.9	16	66,306	50,143	75.6
Bist.-Nas./Beszt.-Nasz.	12,450	7,437	59.7	2,428	32.6	1	3,722	2,437	65.5
Braşov/Brassó	17,602	7,040	40.0	3,202	45.5	2	5,741	3,208	55.9
Caraş-Severin	929	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cluj/Kolozs	46,166	28,468	61.7	13,649	48.0	7	21,269	13,865	65.2
Covasna/Kovászna	84,803	84,033	99.1	83,227	99.0	28	93,077	83,281	89.5
Harghita/Hargita	168,662	164,861	97.7	164,458	99.8	42	169,459	164,467	97.0
Hunedoara	1,494	170	11.4	—	—	—	—	—	—
Maramureş/Máramaros	10,976	5,931	54.0	2,047	34.5	1	2,498	2,047	81.9
Mureş/Maros	125,159	104,129	83.2	86,199	82.8	31	120,449	91,007	75.6
Satu Mare/Szatmár	67,601	44,226	65.4	29,011	65.6	12	51,229	32,836	64.1
Sălaj/Szilágy	38,311	34,615	90.3	29,345	84.8	12	44,292	29,971	67.7
Sibiu	2,927	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Timiş/Temes	20,486	6,127	29.9	1,285	21.0	1	2,400	1,285	53.5
Total	705,535	562,511	79.7	471,584	83.8	158	591,638	481,638	81.4

The data for religious distribution (Supplementary Tables 8 and 9) indicate that cultural identity was also manifested according to denomination, in other words, the coincidence of religion and nationality is invariably a strong and relevant tendency, although not as obvious as it used to be, while in the case of traditional diversities certain changes can be observed. One reason for this is the consolidation of Free Churches and the appearance of new religious communities in the many-coloured religious spectrum. The national proportion of believers outside the historical Christian churches, that is, in the Jewish and Muslim denominations, rose from 0.5 per cent in 1930 to 2.7 per cent by 1992. New denominations among the established churches in Romania are the Pentecostal Church (the fifth largest in terms of number of followers), the Evangelical Free Christian Church and the Orthodox Church which follows the traditional ritual. (These are all detailed in the census as well.) The Synod-Presbyterian Evangelical-Lutheran Church, the congregation of which is mostly made up of Hungarian native speakers, was also listed in the census as independent. This church separated from the Lutheran Church of the Augustan Confession after the change of political supremacy and was definitely recognised in 1948. (The two churches were often confused in censuses.) In addition, in ethnically mixed regions such as Transylvania, we can observe certain „rare exceptions” (MARTSA 1930), which were taken into consideration in Hungarian demography as early as the late nineteenth century. Changes in ethnic and denominational overlappings in Transylvania since 1910 can be followed in Table 30.

**Table 30. Correlations between ethnic groups and denominations in Transylvania with respect to major ethnic groups in 1910 and 1992<sup>a</sup>**

*The increase or decrease in the number of persons belonging to different denominations between 1910 and 1992<sup>b</sup> (x 1,000 persons)*

Denomination	Total	Romanian	Hungarian	German
Total	2,495.2	2,872.4	-50.0	-453.0
Orthodox	3,563.7	3,418.2	-0.3	4.5
Greek Catholic	-1,028.8	-929.2	-58.4	0.8
Roman Catholic	-130.2	72.2	32.1	-231.9
Calvinist	102.7	13.6	76.3	0.4
Unitarian	7.3	0.7	5.7	0.1
Lutheran	-205.6	1.7	-16.0	-182.7
Jewish	-178.8	-0.4	-131.6	-48.5
Other	364.9	295.6	42.2	4.3

*Denominational proportions among nationalities (%)*

Denomination	1992			1910		
	Roman.	Hungar.	German	Roman.	Hungar.	German
Total	73.60	20.77	1.41	53.78	31.61	10.74
Orthodox	95.33	0.47	0.11	94.10	1.40	0.08
Greek Catholic	85.71	11.01	0.77	89.54	6.61	0.07
Roman Catholic	9.28	76.91	7.66	0.73	63.52	30.10
Calvinist	1.87	95.53	0.32	0.19	98.68	0.31
Unitarian	1.53	96.94	0.22	0.68	98.87	0.14
Lutheran	5.74	34.98	51.09	0.58	13.61	80.52
Jewish	13.62	6.18	1.05	0.40	72.33	26.93
Other	80.63	11.89	1.19	49.87	40.41	2.19

*Nationality proportions among denominations (%)*

Denomination	1992			1910		
	Roman.	Hungar.	German	Roman.	Hungar.	German
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Orthodox	89.90	1.56	5.41	60.11	1.52	0.25
Greek Catholic	3.12	1.42	1.46	39.40	4.95	0.15
Roman Catholic	1.40	41.00	60.10	0.26	38.01	53.01
Calvinist	0.26	47.45	2.35	0.05	41.23	0.38
Unitarian	0.02	4.59	0.15	0.02	4.09	0.02
Lutheran	0.06	1.23	26.46	0.05	2.15	37.47
Jewish	*	0.01	0.03	0.03	7.93	8.70
Other	5.24	2.74	4.04	0.08	0.12	0.02

<sup>a</sup> In 1992, according to nationality; in 1910, according to native language (in the case of counties divided by the border, based on calculated values).

<sup>b</sup> With respect to present administrative units.

The decrease in the number of persons belonging to the Roman Catholic Church, the Lutheran and the Jewish denominations is equal to the decrease among the German and Jewish population, and, as the 1910 native-language statistics show, among the Hungarian population also. The proportion of Germans among the Roman Catholics in Transylvania fell from 30.1 per cent to 7.7 per cent; the proportion of German Lutherans fell from four-fifths to 50 per cent. In 1910, persons belonging to the

Jewish community made up a large proportion of the Hungarian population (nearly three-quarters of them declared Hungarian as their native language and they totalled 7.9 per cent of Hungarian native speakers), but this ethnic group has now practically disappeared. The low number of Greek Catholics can be explained by the abolition of their church in 1948. The persecuted unification movement was forced underground and, when the church was reorganised, it was unable to regain those believers lost forty years earlier. The ratio of Greek Catholics among Romanians thus fell to 3.1 per cent from the total of 39.4 per cent of 1910. Although within this denomination the proportion of Hungarians rose in absolute terms, the group also weakened (the number of Greek Catholic Hungarians is only one-quarter of the total of eight decades earlier), so their proportion among the Hungarians is a mere 1.4 per cent in contrast to levels of 4.9 per cent in the past. In order for the Orthodox Church to triumph as the „national” church, a lasting population gain has been required: this has been achieved via forced conversions, as shown by the fact that its growth is higher than its demographic increase. At present, nine-tenths of Transylvanian Romanians are Orthodox. Some Hungarian Greek Catholics were incorporated into the Orthodox Church, the importance of which is unchanged in the life of Transylvanian Hungarians. The number of Orthodox Hungarians hardly decreased, while their proportion (among ethnic Hungarians) increased to some extent compared with 1910. At the same time, Christianity according to the eastern rite has lost some ground among Romanians: only 93 per cent of Romanians are Orthodox or Greek Catholic now compared with 99.5 per cent in 1910. This is partly due to the fact that Orthodox Gypsies have declared their nationality more freely than before. Another, more important reason is the fact that neo-Protestant communities, whose congregations are pressing ahead to fill the gaps left by Byzantine religious traditions, are winning over a growing number of Romanian believers. Nearly two-thirds of the Romanian followers of Christian Free Churches, and among them three-quarters of those belonging to the most popular Pentecostal and Baptist (and other non-specified denominations), live in Transylvania, where Romanians attending these two churches form 81.9 and 84.6 per cent respectively. Thus the Free Churches are primarily a „reservoir” of Romanian ethnic potential even if they represent a rival to Orthodoxy. On the other hand, the proportion of Roman Catholics and Calvinists has tangibly increased among the Romanian population: it is exactly ten times higher than in 1910. This tendency indicates that the dominant nation is gaining ground among people belonging to „other religions”, a similar, but inverse, trend to that which took place at the beginning of the century in favour of Hungarians. By studying the proportions of the different denominations among Hungarians, we find that the dominance of historical Hungarian churches became stronger due to the losses suffered when the Greek Catholic and Jewish communities were abolished. At the same time, the census also indicates that the national character of these churches was weakened; Hungarians lost 1.9 per cent with respect to Unitarians and 3.2 per cent with respect to Calvinists. Where Hungarians could make headway, usually at the cost of Germans, Romanians were also able to gain ground: they multiplied tenfold in the two Lutheran churches, and almost one in every ten Roman Catholics in Transylvania is now Romanian. (Many of them arrived from the Transcarpathian region where the number of registered Romanian Catholics was 282 thousand, most of them living in Moldovian counties, from where the highest numbers came). A great number of ethnic Romanians and Gypsies can be found among Calvinists, and the proportion of German Calvinists is the same as it was eight decades ago. Their number has slightly increased, while the total number of Transylvanian Germans has fallen to one-fifth of previous levels.

The distribution of Transylvanian Hungarians according to sex is marked by the proportion of women being somewhat higher than the national average: 51.6 per cent to 50.8 per cent. Although the proportion of male live births among Hungarians is higher than the equivalent Romanian figure, between the ages of 40 and 44 the male-female ratio changes in favour of women because of the higher premature mortality rate among men, and perhaps also due to migration among the male population. The proportion of women slowly increases from 50.3 to 53.7 per cent for the 60- to 64-year-old age group; for those between 65 and 69 it reaches 57.6 per cent, to end at 64.1 per cent for those over 75.

The national average age is 34.6 years. The average age among Hungarians is 37 years, and among Romanians, 34.5 years. Among Hungarians, the proportion of children (between 0 and 14 years old) is below the national average, while the ratio of elderly people (over 60) is above the average. The proportions for these age groups have decreased and increased at the same rate as among Romanians (Table 32).

**Table 31. Ethnic Hungarians in age groups according to sex in Romania in 1992 compared with the national and the Transylvanian averages and the corresponding figures for Romanians**

Age group	Breakdown by age of ethnic Hungarians						National average	Transyl. average	Nation. aver. for Rom.-s
	Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women			
	(Number or persons)			(%)					
Total	1,624,959	786,971	837,988	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
0–4	93,208	47,512	45,696	5.7	6.0	5.4	7.1	...	7.0
5–9	96,791	49,729	47,062	6.0	6.3	5.6	7.3	...	7.3
10–14	121,119	61,834	59,285	7.4	7.9	7.1	8.4	22.7 <sup>a</sup>	8.4
15–19	129,898	66,625	63,273	8.0	8.5	7.6	8.4	8.5	8.4
20–24	136,601	69,299	67,302	8.4	8.8	8.0	8.9	8.8	9.0
25–29	84,082	43,306	40,776	5.2	5.5	4.9	5.5	5.9	5.5
30–34	100,218	50,816	49,402	6.2	6.5	5.9	6.8	7.0	6.8
35–39	121,300	60,784	60,516	7.4	7.7	7.2	7.5	7.7	7.6
40–44	109,944	54,691	55,253	6.8	7.0	6.6	6.7	6.8	6.7
45–49	106,636	52,199	54,437	6.6	6.6	6.5	5.2	5.3	5.1
50–54	105,592	50,623	54,969	6.5	6.4	6.6	5.9	5.8	5.9
55–59	100,234	47,389	52,845	6.2	6.0	6.3	6.0	5.6	6.0
60–64	97,707	45,220	52,487	6.0	5.8	6.3	5.4	5.2	5.4
65–69	83,559	35,416	48,143	5.1	4.5	5.7	4.5	4.4	4.5
70–74	54,203	21,424	32,779	3.3	2.7	3.9	2.4	2.6	2.4
75- <sup>b</sup>	83,867	30,104	53,763	5.2	3.8	6.4	4.0	3.7	4.0

<sup>a</sup> 0-14 year olds together

<sup>b</sup> Including persons not disclosing their age

**Table 32. Distribution among the total population, Romanians and Hungarians, according to major age groups in Romania in 1977 and 1992 (%)**

	0-14	15-59	over 60	0-14	15-59	over 60
	years old	years old		years old	years old	
	1992			1977		
Total	22,7	60,9	16,4	25,4	60,2	14,4
Romanians	22,7	61,0	16,3	25,6	60,3	14,1
Hungarians	19,1	61,2	19,7	22,2	60,5	17,3

The proportion of adult Hungarians is relatively high and has risen since 1977. The total proportion of the population which is mainly inactive in economic terms is 642 to every one thousand economically productive adults, that is, there are 373 children and 269 old people to every thousand adults. This figure is 638 for the Romanians, where a large majority are children (372), while among the Hungarians, the corresponding figure is 634 with a relative majority of old persons (321). The proportion of elderly people also increased within the economically non-active population. While in 1977 there were 76 elderly persons to every 100 Hungarian children (the figures is 53 among Romanians), in 1992 this number was 103 (72 for the Romanians). The age structure of the population in villages shows a rising population of elderly people as a natural result of the migration of young people: here there were twice as many elderly persons to children under 14 as there were in the towns. Among ethnic Hungarians the ageing index is quite high in towns as well (87) (see Table 33). It is worth noting that while this figure is 123 among Hungarian villagers on a national basis, in those Transylvanian villages in which Hungarians form an absolute majority (81.4 per cent of the population in these settlements) there were only 103 elderly persons to every 100 children. Although this may partly have been caused by the age structure of other nationalities living here (one-fifth Gypsy), we can still conclude that it is not the above-mentioned group that is mostly affected by the ageing process, but rather the sporadic Hungarian village communities.

**Table 33. Number of elderly persons per 100 children in Romania and Transylvania, and among Romanians and Hungarians in 1992 according to settlement type**

	Total	Towns	Villages
Romania	72.2	48.0	105.7
Transylvania	70.1	48.4	103.0
Romanians	71.6	45.3	109.2
Hungarians	102.6	86.9	123.1

At the time of the 1992 census, 64.3 per cent of women over 15 were married. The same figure among Hungarian women was only 61.1 per cent. The proportion of unmarried women (16.8 per cent) and divorced women (4 per cent) were basically the same as the national average, that is, 17 per cent and 3.7 per cent respectively, but the proportion of widows among Hungarian women (17.8 per cent) is far higher than the national average (14.7 per cent).

The ratio of women of child-bearing age (15 to 49 years old) out of the total population of women in the country was 47.7 per cent, a slight decrease compared with the 49.2 per cent of 1972. The proportion represented by this age group within the Romanian female population was 48 per cent, and 46.7 per cent among the Hungarian female population. Over one-third of Romanian women of child-bearing age (34.1 per cent; 33.9 per cent of Hungarian women in this age-group) had no children at all, while 18.7 per cent (20.6 per cent with respect to Hungarian women) had one child. Some 40.8 per cent (42.7 per cent of Hungarian women) had between two and four children, and only 6.4 per cent (2.8 per cent of Hungarian women) had five or more children.

The birth rate trend can be illustrated by the number of children born to women over 15 (Table 34). The average number of children per woman is still high among the Romanians (among those over 50, the figure is 2.35), although it has decreased considerably compared with the 1977 figure (2.9). In the case of Hungarian women the decrease is smaller, but among women over child-bearing age (that is, over 50), the average number of children (2.1 compared with 2.45 in 1977) fell below the critical value (2.2) necessary for the simple renewal of the population. With respect to denomination, the highest values can be found among Free Church members. The number of children per thousand women among Orthodox women over 50 is 2,328. In the case of Catholic women this number is higher (2,342), but it is much lower among typically Hungarian women belonging to the Calvinist (2,073), Unitarian (2,132), and Synod-Presbyterian Evangelical Churches (1,747).

**Table 34. The number of children per one thousand women over 15 in the whole country and among Romanians and Hungarians in major age groups in Romania in 1977 and 1992**

Number of live births per 1,000 women

Nationality	over 15		15-49 year old		over 50	
	1992	1977	1992	1977	1992	1977
Total	1,802	2,034	1,467	1,610	2,329	2,855
Romanian	1,798	2,048	1,452	1,609	2,350	2,891
Hungarian	1,709	1,880	1,418	1,510	2,093	2,445

The 1992 census registered 6,393.1 thousand families in Romania. Of these, complete families (a couple with or without children) numbered 5,702.8 thousand and there were 690.3 thousand incomplete families where the father or the mother lived alone with his or her children. The number of childless families was 2,065.2 thousand, while complete families with children totalled 3,637.5 thousand. The average number of children per family in complete families was 1.92, and in incomplete families 1.5. Based on the nationality of the head of the family, the number of Hungarian families was 468,237 (7.3 per cent). Of these, 407,509 (7.1 per cent) were complete families and 60,728 were incomplete families, the proportion of which was apparently high (8.8 per cent) in correlation with the high number of divorced Hungarian women or widows. The number of childless Hungarian families was 145,072 (7 per cent), while Hungarian families with children numbered 262,437 (7.2 per cent).

Ethnically mixed families numbered 166,277 in the country as a whole. In 30.5 per cent of these marriages the husband was Hungarian, and in 33.2 per cent, the woman (that is, 50,677 and 55,141 persons respectively). Consequently, 12.9 per cent of the 819,482 ethnic Hungarian spouses lived in mixed marriages, while mixed marriages formed 22.8 per cent of the 462,650 „Hungarian” marriages (including all homogeneous and mixed Hungarian marriages). More than half of mixed marriages (56.8 per cent) were Romanian-Hungarian. In 62 per cent of Romanian mixed marriages one spouse was Hungarian, while in 89.2 per cent of Hungarian mixed marriages one spouse was Romanian.

There were children from 109,204 mixed marriages, of which 65,032 were Romanian-Hungarian. In over two-thirds of these families, that is, in 45,104 cases, the children were registered as Romanian and in only a quarter of them, that is, in 16,778 families, were the children declared as Hungarian. (In 3,150 families, a fragment of the total, the nationality of the children was divided between the parents' nationalities or was completely different from their parents'.) As to the nationality of children born to Romanian-Hungarian parents, Romanians registered a gain of 28,326 families, half of which resulted from assimilation. This means approximately 25 thousand children, if we calculate on the basis of fewer than two children per family.

The number of denominationally mixed families was 272,526 (4.8 per cent) in the 1992 census. The largest group of persons living in denominationally mixed families was formed by Orthodox Church members (100,442 men and 78,906 women). Two other relatively numerous groups in this category were Catholics (64,631 men and 71,782 women) and Calvinists (52,534 men and 51,658 women). Two-thirds of denominationally mixed marriages were contracted between Greek Catholics and members of other churches such as Roman Catholics (23.9 per cent of all denominationally mixed marriages), Calvinist (12.2 per cent), Greek Catholics (8.8 per cent), Pentecostalists (5.5 per cent) and Baptist (3.4 per cent). The number of marriages between Roman Catholics and Calvinists (19.6 per cent) and between Roman Catholics and Greek Catholics (2.7 per cent) was also significant.

Children were born to 62.7 per cent of denominationally mixed marriages. In 112,669 of these 170,938 families, either the wife or the husband was Orthodox. In mixed marriages with children where one spouse was Orthodox the children were raised as followers of the state religion in 66,286 cases (58.8 per cent), and in only 35,854 families (31.9 per cent) did they follow the religion of the non-Orthodox parent. In 10,529 cases the children's religion was different from that of their parents. Accordingly, gains for the Orthodox Church include the children of 30,432 families. Orthodox expansion was at the expense of Calvinists in 7,237 families, Roman Catholics in 7,053 families, Greek Catholics in 5,864 families, and other denominations (mainly Pentecostalists and Baptists) in 10,278 families. Although generation related changes of denomination are mostly in correlation with changes in the nationality spectrum indicating the expansion of Romanian Orthodoxy, figures for the two trends do not coincide. While in the balance of Romanian-Hungarian marriages with respect to the nationality of the children, the net gain of the dominant nation (state nation) is 28,326 families, in mixed marriages between Orthodox believers and those following a „Hungarian” denomination (Roman Catholic, Calvinist, Unitarian, Synod-Presbyterian Evangelical) gains on the part of the state religion are just over half of the figure mentioned above. This phenomenon can be explained by overlappings among nationalities and denominations (a large number of ethnic Romanians can be found in historically Hungarian churches and there are also a lot of ethnic Hungarians in Romanian churches).

Indexes for education reveal that the proportion of persons with further education qualifications is very low among Hungarians in the twelve years and above age group (only 3.6 per cent compared with 5.1 per cent among the population as a whole and 5.3 per cent among Romanians) (Table 35). Apart from the fact that a quarter of persons with further education qualifications are concentrated in the capital (excluding Bucharest the proportion of professionals is a mere 4.2 per cent), the following factors should be borne in mind: a controlled policy to produce an artificially low number of Hungarian professionals and, more importantly, massive emigration among Hungarian graduates. Hungarians are represented more proportionally among secondary-school leavers. The proportion of Hungarians with basic qualifications (the equivalent of the senior level of a first school) is better, that is, higher than the national average and the Romanian average. The proportions of Hungarians with no school education and of illiterate Hungarians are also better, in this case much lower than the Romanian average and the national average.

**Table 35. The number of 12-year-old and above ethnic Hungarians according to school qualifications in Romania in 1992 and the corresponding national, Transylvanian and ethnic Romanian figures**

School qualifications	Hungarians		National average	Transyl. average	National aver. for Roman.-s
	Number	%	%		
Total	1,389,042	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Further education	49,592	3.6	5.1	4.8	5.3
Vocational sch. after secondary sch.	23,449	1.7	2.0	2.0	2.0
Secondary school	257,930	18.6	18.4	19.0	18.8
Vocational school	203,794	14.7	14.1	14.7	14.3
Senior sect.+1 grade of second. sch.	550,692	39.6	32.1	35.3	31.4
Primary school	275,436	19.8	23.6	20.4	23.7
Without school education and other	28,149	2.0	4.7	3.8	4.5
Of these, illiterate	14,422	1.0	3.1	2.3	3.0

Among full-time Hungarian students the proportion of those in further education was lower than the average at the time of the 1992 census (Table 36). Ethnic Hungarian students in further education are particularly poorly represented at faculties of Law, Economics, Transport and Communication, but their presence falls far short of their ethnic proportions in faculties of Gymnastics and Sport, Medicine, Agriculture and Architecture as well. There are also few Hungarian students in secondary schools specialising in Transport and Communication, and also a disproportionately small number of Hungarians in grammar schools specialising in Gymnastics, Forestry, Informatics and Economics. The proportion of ethnic Hungarians is satisfactory in vocational training related to branches of industry, and their proportion is definitely high in the humanities. This is mainly true for schools training teachers, theologians and art students, but, in terms of attendance levels, secondary schools with high academic standards can also be regarded as especially important in Hungarian education. These institutions are often chosen because, in the absence of adequate Hungarian vocational training, they represent nearly the only opportunity for Hungarian students to learn in their mother tongue at secondary-school level. On average, between the years 1991 and 1994, approximately three-quarters of Hungarian students in primary and secondary education pursued their studies in their native language. If we look at the different stages of education and school types, the higher the level, the smaller this proportion becomes. The proportion of Hungarian students studying in Hungarian schools was 85 per cent in junior sections of primary schools, 80 per cent in senior sections, but slightly over two-thirds in secondary schools and only between 35 and 40 per cent in vocational schools (where only a single class or a specialised part of the class studied in Hungarian). In further education the teaching language is nearly exclusively Romanian. The drop-out rate among native Hungarian students is highest in areas where Hungarians are settled sporadically. Here, half of Hungarian children (in Hunyad and Temes counties almost three-quarters) are enrolled in Romanian schools in the first class of primary school.

**Table 36. Students at different educational levels according to the two major nationalities in Romania in 1992**

Level of education	Hungarians		National average	Romanians
	Number	%	%	%
Total	254,890	100.0	100.0	100.0
Further education	12,842	5.0	6.1	6.2
Vocat. sch. after sec. sch.	2,416	0.9	0.8	0.8
General secondary sch.	22,197	8.7	6.6	6.5
Special secondary sch.	33,780	13.3	13.5	13.7
Vocational school	19,370	7.6	7.3	7.4
Senior section	90,106	35.4	35.1	35.0
Primary school	74,179	29.1	30.6	30.4



The number of Hungarians among the economically active population was 698.8 thousand (6.7 per cent). This represents 137.5 thousand fewer than in 1977. The decrease was higher than the national average partly because of ageing and emigration, partly because of a reduction in economic activity among the working-age population, particularly among women, and also because of earlier retirement ages. The reasons mentioned, as well as the fact that younger age groups migrated to towns, explains why the participation of rural Hungarians within the economy was particularly low (see Tables 37 and 38).

**Table 37. The economically active population in Romania nationally and among Romanians and Hungarians between the 1977 and 1992 censuses, and according to major age groups and the percentage of men at the time of the 1992 census**

Nationality	1977		1992		Of these			
	x 1,000 persons	%	x 1,000 persons	%	under 30	30–49 years old	over 50	Men
					%			
Total	10,793.6	100.0	10,465.5	100.0	33.1	50.1	16.8	55.3
Romanian	9,590.7	88.9	9,500.8	90.8	33.0	50.0	17.0	54.9
Hungarian	836.3	7.7	698.8	6.7	32.7	52.7	14.6	57.4

**Table 38. The proportion of the economically active population in Romania nationally and among Romanians and Hungarians according to settlement type and sex at the time of the 1992 census**

Nationality	Total			Towns			Villages		
	Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women
Total	45.9	51.6	40.4	47.2	51.8	42.7	44.3	51.3	37.5
Romanian	46.6	51.9	41.4	47.7	52.1	43.5	45.2	51.7	38.8
Hungarian	43.0	51.0	35.5	45.7	51.6	40.4	39.5	50.2	28.8

The structure of the active Hungarian population shows a very low proportion within the primary sector (agriculture) and the predominance of the secondary sector (branches of industry). The proportion of persons working in the tertiary sector (trade and services) in the active Hungarian population approximates to the national average. A relatively high proportion of persons seeking first-time employment (in practice, the young unemployed) can be found among Hungarians (Table 39).

**Table 39. The active population per sector of the economy in Romania between 1966 and 1992 according to the two main ethnic groups (%)**

Sectors of economy	Year	Total	Rom.-n	Hungar.
Primary sector	1966	58.6	59.8	50.0
	1977	38.5	38.8	30.5
	1992	23.1	23.5	16.2
Secondary sector	1966	23.3	22.3	31.1
	1977	38.0	37.7	46.5
	1992	44.7	44.3	52.7
Tertiary sector	1966	18.1	17.9	18.9
	1977	23.5	23.5	23.0
	1992	27.8	28.0	26.3
Persons seeking first-time employment	1992	4.4	4.2	4.8

Over half (52.7 per cent) of active ethnic Hungarians work in industry and in the construction industry. Their proportion is particularly high (two and three times higher than the average proportion of active ethnic Hungarians proportion within the active population of Romania) in certain processing branches of light industry (furniture, clothing, leather, fur and timber industries) and also significant (nearly one and a half times higher) in the iron, steel, metal, ceramics, and cement industries and in the production of other building materials. In the tertiary sectors the proportion of Hungarians is well above the national proportions of ethnic Hungarian employees in trade, health, education, culture, arts and in other services, as well as among the employees of social and church organisations. The reason why the number of Hungarians in this sector falls short of the national average can be found in their under-representation in transport, telecommunications, research, informatics and, in particular, in public administration (Table 40).

**Table 40. The active Hungarian population in major branches of the economy in Romania in 1992 compared with the distribution of the active Transylvanian population and active ethnic Romanians according to major branches of the economy**

Branch of economy	Hungarians		National average	Transylv. average	National aver. of Rom.-s
	Number	%	%		
Total	698,798	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Agriculture	106,068	15.2	22.3	18.2	22.7
Industry, mining	318,951	45.6	37.3	41.9	36.9
Construction industry	37,512	5.4	5.6	4.9	5.6
Trade, tourism, public supply	50,677	7.3	6.6	7.0	6.5
Transport, telecommunications	33,746	4.8	6.1	5.8	6.2
Research, development, informatics	10,143	1.5	2.3	1.7	2.4
Banking, finance, insurance	3,965	0.6	0.5	0.6	0.6
Public administration	11,996	1.7	3.1	2.7	3.2
Education	26,757	3.8	3.7	4.0	3.7
Health	24,398	3.5	3.1	3.4	3.1
Culture and arts	4,152	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.5

**Table 41. The active Hungarian population according to occupation groups in Romania in 1992 compared with the corresponding national, Transylvanian and ethnic Romanian figures**

Occupational groups	Hungarians		National average	Transylv. average	National aver. of Rom.-s
	Number	%	%		
Total	698,798	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Senior offic. of the state and econom. managers	9,126	1.3	1.6	1.6	1.6
Professionals and researches	30,901	4.4	5.9	5.6	6.0
Technicians	67,771	9.7	10.2	10.2	10.4
Office workers	32,435	4.6	4.7	5.1	4.8
Employees in trade and services	40,303	5.8	5.1	5.6	5.1
Agricultural workers	78,159	11.2	18.5	14.9	19.0
Skilled workers	351,177	50.2	42.4	44.8	42.0
Unskilled workers	50,639	7.3	6.3	7.2	6.0

In major occupation groups the proportion of ethnic Hungarians surpasses the national average among skilled workers, employees in trade and the service industry, and among unskilled workers.

Romanian Hungarians, in keeping with their education figures, usually appear as under-represented for their number in special fields requiring further education qualifications. In occupations which require intermediate qualifications and vocational qualifications their representation is generally proportional.

The proportion of the elected representatives of Hungarians in the leadership of state administration approximately followed political arithmetics. In other fields of administration, however, where officials are not elected but appointed, the proportion of Hungarians does not even reach half of their national proportion in terms of active workers. An analysis of the higher intellectual stratum reveals that their proportion is similarly low among researchers in the natural and applied sciences, and particularly among economists, lawyers and experts in the social sciences and humanities. Hungarians are represented more strongly than the average in occupations requiring high-level intermediate studies (expert technicians) in health, primary education, and economic and administration management, but more poorly in jobs closely related to production. It is interesting to note that an extremely low proportion of Hungarians (fewer than one-sixth of their proportion with respect to nationality) were found among experts in sea, river and air transport as well as among policemen and detectives. In service and trade the ratio of Hungarians exceeds their proportion with respect to nationality among the economically active population mainly among public servants, social workers and shop assistants. There are far fewer Hungarians among employees preserving and defending public order. Among skilled workers the ratio of Hungarians corresponds to their proportion in different branches of the economy and it only sinks below their nationality proportion among electrical engineering, electronic and precision-engineering mechanics. Agricultural workers form only one-tenth of the active Hungarian population. This also means that nearly one-third of ethnic Hungarians working in the primary sector do not work in agriculture (this ratio is 20 per cent nationally), but, taking the national proportion as a basis, most of them are supposed to be mechanics, skilled and unskilled workers.

The above represents a summary of the major available data regarding the demographic structure of Romanian Hungarians. We have deliberately avoided concentrating on the „how many?” question which so often leads to religious dispute. In fact, this question could hardly be answered accurately even in the case of the most trustworthy of surveys because of the oscillations in nationality, native language and denominational figures, and also due to extended inter-ethnic relations within families. There is a more serious issue to be considered: it is a sad fact that the Romanian population has also entered a phase of natural decrease. As we pointed out in the first part of the study, this demographic turn occurred first in Transylvania, and it began among the Hungarian population (almost simultaneously with the similar process in Hungary) preceding the Romanian ethnic community.

**Supplementary Table 1**  
**The ethnic distribution of the Transylvanian population according to native language and nationality 1869 – 1992\***

Year	Total	Hung.	Roman.	German	Jewish, Jiddish	Other Total	From this				
							Gypsy	Ukrain.	Serbian	Croat	Slovak
1869 <sup>a</sup>	<b>4,224,436</b>	<b>1,053,500</b>	<b>2,492,500</b>	<b>502,900<sup>b</sup></b>	...	<b>175,500</b>	<b>55,000</b>	<b>16,500</b>	<b>46,900</b>	<b>8,200<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>22,600</b>
1880 <sup>a,d</sup>	<b>4,032,851</b>	<b>1,046,094</b>	<b>2,297,251</b>	<b>503,777<sup>b</sup></b>	...	<b>185,729</b>	<b>59,000</b>	<b>14,248</b>	<b>53,833<sup>c</sup></b>	...	<b>26,226</b>
1890 <sup>a</sup>	<b>4,429,564</b>	<b>1,201,183</b>	<b>2,479,422</b>	<b>553,199<sup>b</sup></b>	...	<b>195,760</b>	<b>64,000<sup>f</sup></b>	<b>14,696</b>	<b>47,967</b>	<b>6,700<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>28,190</b>
1900 <sup>a</sup>	<b>4,840,722</b>	<b>1,424,237</b>	<b>2,673,325</b>	<b>576,460<sup>b</sup></b>	...	<b>166,700</b>	<b>30,000</b>	<b>17,821</b>	<b>47,472</b>	<b>3,164</b>	<b>29,692</b>
1900	<b>4,874,772</b>	<b>1,438,465</b>	<b>2,685,174</b>	<b>582,545<sup>b</sup></b>	...	<b>168,588</b>	<b>30,000</b>	<b>18,026</b>	<b>48,294</b>	<b>3,224</b>	<b>29,940</b>
1910 <sup>g</sup>	<b>5,262,495</b>	<b>1,663,252</b>	<b>2,830,028</b>	<b>565,107<sup>b</sup></b>	...	<b>204,108</b>	<b>60,800</b>	<b>22,540</b>	<b>52,084</b>	<b>1,971</b>	<b>31,657</b>
1910	<b>5,259,918</b>	<b>1,661,967</b>	<b>2,829,389</b>	<b>565,004<sup>b</sup></b>	...	<b>203,558</b>	<b>60,800</b>	<b>22,615</b>	<b>52,022</b>	<b>1,967</b>	<b>31,099</b>
1919	5,208,345	1,378,189	2,974,951	513,794	170,943	170,468	...	...	...	...	...
1920	5,114,214	1,305,753	2,930,120	539,427	181,340	157,484	...	...	...	...	...
1930	<b>5,548,363</b>	<b>1,480,712</b>	<b>3,233,216</b>	<b>540,793</b>	<b>111,275</b>	<b>182,367</b>	<b>43,653</b>	<b>24,217</b>	<b>42,359<sup>h</sup></b>	...	<b>40,630<sup>i</sup></b>
1930	5,548,363	1,353,276	3,207,880	543,852	178,699	264,656	109,156	29,620	43,342 <sup>h</sup>	...	46,786 <sup>i</sup>
1941	<i>5,912,300</i>	<i>1,743,900</i>	<i>3,304,400</i>	<i>535,400</i>	<i>82,500</i>	<i>246,100</i>	...	...	...	...	...
1948	<b>5,761,127</b>	<b>1,481,903</b>	<b>3,752,269</b>	<b>332,066</b>	<b>30,039</b>	<b>164,850</b>	...	...	...	...	...
1956	<b>6,232,312</b>	<b>1,616,199</b>	<b>4,081,080</b>	<b>372,806</b>	<b>9,744</b>	<b>152,483</b>	<b>38,188</b>	<b>30,462</b>	<b>42,078<sup>j</sup></b>	...	<b>18,804</b>
1956	6,232,312	1,558,631	4,051,603	368,255	43,814	210,009	78,362	31,538	45,209 <sup>j</sup>	...	23,102
1966	<b>6,736,046</b>	<b>1,626,066</b>	<b>4,582,628</b>	<b>374,488</b>	<b>1,120</b>	<b>151,744</b>	<b>32,073</b>	<b>36,210</b>	<b>41,292<sup>j</sup></b>	...	<b>19,559</b>
1966	6,736,046	1,597,767	4,572,554	372,335	13,558	179,832	49,173	36,891	43,455 <sup>j</sup>	...	21,843
1977	7,500,229	1,691,048	5,203,846	347,896	7,830	249,609	123,028	42,760	32,140	7,433 <sup>c</sup>	21,133
1992	<b>7,723,313</b>	<b>1,619,735</b>	<b>5,815,425</b>	<b>91,386</b>	<b>324</b>	<b>196,443</b>	<b>84,718</b>	<b>47,873</b>	<b>31,684<sup>c</sup></b>	...	<b>18,195</b>
1992	7,723,313	1,603,923	5,684,142	109,014	2,687	323,547	202,665	50,372	27,163	4,030	19,446

%

Year	Total	Hung.	Roman.	German	Jewish, Jiddish	Other Total	From this				
							Gypsy	Ukrain.	Serbian	Croat	Slovak
1869 <sup>a</sup>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>24.9</b>	<b>59.0</b>	<b>11.9<sup>b</sup></b>	...	<b>4.2</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>0.2<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>0.5</b>
1880 <sup>a,d</sup>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>25.9</b>	<b>57.0</b>	<b>12.5<sup>b</sup></b>	...	<b>4.6</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>1.3<sup>c</sup></b>	...	<b>0.6</b>
1890 <sup>a</sup>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>27.1</b>	<b>56.0</b>	<b>12.5<sup>b</sup></b>	...	<b>4.4</b>	<b>1.4<sup>f</sup></b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>0.1<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>0.6</b>
1900 <sup>a</sup>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>29.4</b>	<b>55.2</b>	<b>11.9<sup>b</sup></b>	...	<b>3.5</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>0.6</b>
1900	<b>100.0</b>	<b>29.5</b>	<b>55.1</b>	<b>11.9<sup>b</sup></b>	...	<b>3.5</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>0.6</b>
1910	<b>100.0</b>	<b>31.6</b>	<b>53.8</b>	<b>10.7<sup>b</sup></b>	...	<b>3.9</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>1.0</b>	*	<b>0.6</b>
1919	100.0	26.5	57.1	9.8	3.3	3.3	...	...	...	...	...
1920	100.0	25.5	57.3	10.6	3.5	3.1	...	...	...	...	...
1930	<b>100.0</b>	<b>26.7</b>	<b>58.3</b>	<b>9.7</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>0.8<sup>h</sup></b>	...	<b>0.7<sup>i</sup></b>
1930	100.0	24.4	57.8	9.8	3.2	4.8	2.0	0.5	0.8 <sup>h</sup>	...	0.8 <sup>i</sup>
1941	100.0	29.5	55.9	9.0	1.4	4.2	...	...	...	...	...
1948	<b>100.0</b>	<b>25.7</b>	<b>65.1</b>	<b>5.8</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>2.9</b>	...	...	...	...	...
1956	100.0	25.9	65.5	6.0	0.2	2.4	0.6	0.5	0.7 <sup>j</sup>	...	0.3
1956	100.0	25.0	65.0	5.9	0.7	3.4	1.3	0.5	0.7 <sup>j</sup>	...	0.4
1966	<b>100.0</b>	<b>24.2</b>	<b>68.0</b>	<b>5.6</b>	*	<b>2.2</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.6<sup>j</sup></b>	...	<b>0.3</b>
1966	100.0	23.8	67.9	5.5	0.2	2.6	0.7	0.6	0.6 <sup>j</sup>	...	0.3
1977	100.0	22.6	69.4	4.6	0.1	3.3	1.6	0.6	0.4	0.1 <sup>c</sup>	0.3
1992	<b>100.0</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>75.3</b>	<b>1.2</b>	*	<b>2.5</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>0.4<sup>c</sup></b>	...	<b>0.2</b>
1992	100.0	20.8	73.6	1.4	*	4.2	2.6	0.6	0.3	0.1	0.2

\*According to valid administrative borders at the time of the censuses

**Bold type: native language**

Normal type: nationality

*Italics: calculated values*

<sup>a</sup> Civilian population

<sup>b</sup> Including native Yiddish speakers

<sup>c</sup> Croatians, Crassovanians

<sup>d</sup> Persons unable to speak are divided proportionally among different nationalities

<sup>e</sup> Serbians, Croatians, Crassovanians

<sup>f</sup> According to the 1893 Gypsy census: 150,300 persons, i.e. 3.4%

<sup>g</sup> Value calculated with respect to the undivided population of settlements divided by the border

<sup>h</sup> Serbians, Croatians, Slovenians

<sup>i</sup> Czechs, Slovaks

<sup>j</sup> Serbians, Croatians, Slovenians, Crassovanians

**Supplementary Table 2**  
**The ethnic distribution of the Transylvanian urban population according to native language and nationality,**  
**1869–1992\***

Number

Year	Total	Hung.	Roman.	German	Jewish, Jiddish	Other Total	From this			
							Gypsy	Ukrain.	Serbian	Slovak
1869 <sup>a</sup>	360,683	<i>188,710</i>	<i>76,570</i>	<i>79,450</i> <sup>b</sup>	...	<i>15,950</i>	...	<i>750</i>	<i>3,650</i>	<i>1,410</i>
1880 <sup>a,c</sup>	<b>390,654</b>	<b>212,683</b>	<b>74,752</b>	<b>82,691</b> <sup>b</sup>	...	<b>20,528</b>	<b>4,010</b>	<b>924</b>	<b>3,694</b> <sup>d</sup>	<b>1,905</b>
1890 <sup>a</sup>	<b>441,795</b>	<b>250,894</b>	<b>83,692</b>	<b>88,156</b> <sup>b</sup>	...	<b>19,053</b>	... <sup>e</sup>	<b>860</b>	<b>3,533</b>	<b>1,830</b>
1900 <sup>a</sup>	<b>529,165</b>	<b>329,359</b>	<b>93,237</b>	<b>95,201</b> <sup>b</sup>	...	<b>11,368</b>	...	<b>744</b>	<b>3,122</b>	<b>1,527</b>
1900	<b>557,911</b>	<b>340,275</b>	<b>103,948</b>	<b>100,647</b> <sup>b</sup>	...	<b>13,041</b>	...	<b>943</b>	<b>3,834</b>	<b>1,708</b>
1910	<b>682,561</b>	<b>441,130</b>	<b>120,929</b>	<b>104,524</b> <sup>b</sup>	...	<b>15,978</b>	...	<b>751</b>	<b>5,890</b>	<b>1,841</b>
1920	721,546	330,397	181,678	105,664	91,113	12,694	...	...	...	...
1930	<b>963,418</b>	<b>431,641</b>	<b>331,131</b>	<b>130,074</b>	<b>48,207</b>	<b>22,365</b>	<b>4,405</b>	<b>1,739</b>	<b>3,641</b> <sup>f</sup>	<b>2,974</b> <sup>g</sup>
1930	963,418	365,008	336,756	126,936	100,413	34,305	10,869	3,388	4,341 <sup>f</sup>	4,730 <sup>g</sup>
1941	1,153,644	548,217	395,057	136,711	<i>45,000</i>	<i>28,650</i>	...	...	...	...
1948	<b>1,118,904</b>	<b>436,665</b>	<b>562,141</b>	<b>80,239</b>	<b>22,940</b>	<b>16,919</b>	...	...	...	...
1956	<b>1,753,844</b>	<b>591,970</b>	<b>988,427</b>	<b>146,384</b>	<b>7,564</b>	<b>18,499</b>	<b>5,026</b>	<b>2,095</b>	<b>4,601</b> <sup>h</sup>	<b>1,042</b>
1956	1,753,844	554,324	985,584	141,981	38,724	33,231	8,278	2,653	6,037 <sup>h</sup>	3,070
1966	<b>2,379,369</b>	<b>657,902</b>	<b>1,537,995</b>	<b>159,153</b>	<b>965</b>	<b>23,354</b>	<b>4,839</b>	<b>2,428</b>	<b>6,901</b> <sup>h</sup>	<b>1,328</b>
1966	2,379,369	639,470	1,536,477	156,700	12,842	33,880	7,403	2,988	8,081 <sup>h</sup>	2,678
1977	3,558,651	848,061	2,464,300	170,034	7,554	68,702	31,802	4,376	13,119	7,937
1992	<b>4,429,697</b>	<b>898,954</b>	<b>3,413,047</b>	<b>61,177</b>	<b>275</b>	<b>56,244</b>	<b>25,480</b>	<b>5,017</b>	<b>13,009</b> <sup>i</sup>	<b>7,367</b>
1992	4,429,697	898,387	3,351,001	71,187	2,568	106,554	69,145	6,708	14,533	8,158

%

Year	Total	Hung.	Roman.	German	Jewish, Jiddish	Other Total	From this			
							Gypsy	Ukrain.	Serbian	Slovak
1869 <sup>a</sup>	100.0	<i>52.4</i>	<i>21.2</i>	<i>22.0</i> <sup>b</sup>	...	<i>4.4</i>	...	<i>0.2</i>	<i>1.0</i>	<i>0.4</i>
1880 <sup>a,c</sup>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>54.4</b>	<b>19.1</b>	<b>21.2</b> <sup>b</sup>	...	<b>5.3</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>1.0</b> <sup>d</sup>	<b>0.5</b>
1890 <sup>a</sup>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>56.8</b>	<b>18.9</b>	<b>20.0</b> <sup>b</sup>	...	<b>4.3</b>	<i>1.3</i> <sup>e</sup>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>0.4</b>
1900 <sup>a</sup>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>62.2</b>	<b>17.6</b>	<b>18.0</b> <sup>b</sup>	...	<b>2.2</b>	...	<b>0.1</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>0.3</b>
1900	<b>100.0</b>	<b>61.0</b>	<b>18.6</b>	<b>18.0</b> <sup>b</sup>	...	<b>2.4</b>	...	<b>0.2</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>0.3</b>
1910	<b>100.0</b>	<b>64.6</b>	<b>17.7</b>	<b>15.3</b> <sup>b</sup>	...	<b>2.4</b>	...	<b>0.1</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>0.3</b>
1920	100.0	45.8	25.2	14.6	12.6	1.8	...	...	...	...
1930	<b>100.0</b>	<b>44.8</b>	<b>34.4</b>	<b>13.5</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>0.4</b> <sup>f</sup>	<b>0.3</b> <sup>g</sup>
1930	100.0	37.9	34.9	13.2	10.4	3.6	1.1	0.3	0.4 <sup>f</sup>	0.5 <sup>g</sup>
1941	100.0	47.5	34.2	11.9	3.9	2.5	...	...	...	...
1948	<b>100.0</b>	<b>39.0</b>	<b>50.2</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>1.6</b>	...	...	...	...
1956	<b>100.0</b>	<b>33.8</b>	<b>56.4</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>0.3</b> <sup>h</sup>	<b>0.1</b>
1956	100.0	31.6	56.2	8.1	2.2	1.9	0.5	0.1	0.3 <sup>h</sup>	0.2
1966	<b>100.0</b>	<b>27.6</b>	<b>64.6</b>	<b>6.7</b>	*	<b>1.0</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>0.3</b> <sup>h</sup>	<b>0.1</b>
1966	100.0	26.9	64.6	6.6	0.5	1.4	0.3	0.1	0.3 <sup>h</sup>	0.1
1977	100.0	23.8	69.3	4.8	0.2	1.9	0.9	0.1	0.4	0.2
1992	<b>100.0</b>	<b>20.3</b>	<b>77.0</b>	<b>1.4</b>	*	<b>1.3</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>0.3</b> <sup>d</sup>	<b>0.2</b>
1992	100.0	20.3	75.6	1.6	0.1	2.4	1.6	0.1	0.3	0.2

\*According to valid administrative borders at the time of the censuses

**Bold type: native language**

Normal type: nationality

*Italics: calculated values*

<sup>a</sup> Civilian population

<sup>b</sup> Including Yiddish native speakers

<sup>c</sup> Persons unable to speak are divided proportionally among different nationalities

<sup>d</sup> Serbians, Croatians, Crassovanians

<sup>e</sup> According to the 1893 Gypsy census: 9,954 persons, i.e. 2.3%

<sup>f</sup> Serbians, Croatians, Slovenians

<sup>g</sup> Czechs, Slovaks

<sup>h</sup> Serbians, Croatians, Slovenians, Crassovanians

**Supplementary Table 3**  
**The population of Transylvania according to denomination, 1869–1992\***

Number

Year	Total	Orthodox	Greek Catholic	Roman Catholic	Calvinist	Lutheran	Unitarian	Jewish	Other
1869 <sup>a</sup>	4,224,436	1,613,502	1,000,740	712,262	517,360	231,099	54,001	90,487	4,985
1880 <sup>a</sup>	4,032,851	1,498,181	936,335	712,921	498,723	221,528	55,389	105,675	4,099
1890 <sup>a</sup>	4,429,564	1,593,017	1,042,331	807,296	559,714	234,101	59,721	130,088	3,296
1900 <sup>a</sup>	4,840,722	1,696,034	1,137,698	908,182	625,346	249,029	64,476	157,622	2,335
1900	4,874,772	1,704,205	1,143,279	918,296	631,392	251,517	64,987	158,707	2,389
1910 <sup>b</sup>	5,262,495	1,807,917	1,245,318	995,390	694,930	263,016	68,759	182,471	4,694
1910	5,259,918	1,807,268	1,245,235	994,606	694,498	262,376	68,752	182,489	4,694
1919	5,208,345	1,815,854	1,274,935	910,601	689,669	266,191	67,374	170,943	12,778
1930	5,548,363	1,932,356	1,385,445	947,351	696,320	274,415	68,330	192,833	51,313
1992	7,723,313	5,360,102	206,833	854,935	796,682	36,264 <sup>c</sup> 20,184 <sup>d</sup>	75,978	2,768	369,567

%

Year	Total	Orthodox	Greek Catholic	Roman Catholic	Calvinist	Lutheran	Unitarian	Jewish	Other
1880 <sup>a</sup>	100.0	38.2	23.7	16.9	12.2	5.5	1.3	2.1	0.1
1880 <sup>a</sup>	100.0	37.1	23.2	17.7	12.4	5.5	1.4	2.6	0.1
1890 <sup>a</sup>	100.0	36.0	23.5	18.2	12.6	5.3	1.4	2.9	0.1
1900	100.0	35.0	23.5	18.8	12.9	5.2	1.3	3.2	0.1
1910	100.0	34.3	23.7	18.9	13.2	5.0	1.3	3.2	0.1
1919	100.0	34.9	24.5	17.5	13.2	5.1	1.3	3.3	0.2
1930	100.0	34.8	25.0	17.1	12.6	4.9	1.2	3.5	0.9
1992	100.0	69.4	2.7	11.0	10.3	0.5 <sup>c</sup> 0.3 <sup>d</sup>	1.0	0.0	4.8

\*According to valid administrative borders at the time of the censuses

<sup>a</sup> Civilian population

<sup>b</sup> Value calculated with respect to the undivided population of settlements divided by the border

<sup>c</sup> Lutheran of the Augustan Confession

<sup>d</sup> Synod-Presbyterian Evangelical



**Supplementary Table 4.**  
**The population of Romania according to nationality, 1930–1992\***

Nationality	1930	1956	1966	1977	1992
Total	14,280,729	17,489,450	19,103,163	21,559,910	22,810,035
Romanian	11,118,170	14,996,114	16,746,510	18,999,565 <sup>a</sup>	20,408,542 <sup>b</sup>
Hungarian	1,423,459	1,587,675	1,619,592	1,713,928 <sup>c</sup>	1,624,959 <sup>d</sup>
Gypsy	242,656	104,216	64,197	227,398	401,087
German	633,488	384,708	382,595	359,109 <sup>e</sup>	119,462 <sup>f</sup>
Ukrainian	45,875	60,479	54,705	55,510 <sup>g</sup>	65,764 <sup>h</sup>
Russian, Lipovan	50,725	38,731	39,483	32,696 <sup>i</sup>	38,606 <sup>j</sup>
Turkish	26,080	14,329	18,040	23,422	29,832
Serbian	50,310 <sup>k</sup>	46,517 <sup>k</sup>	44,236 <sup>k</sup>	34,429	29,408
Tartar	15,580	20,469	22,151	23,369	24,596
Slovak	50,7721	23,331	22,221	21,286	19,594
Bulgarian	66,348	12,040	11,193	10,372	9,851
Jewish	451,892	146,264	42,888	24,667	8,955
Croatian	...	...	...	7,500 <sup>m</sup>	4,085
Czech	...	11,821	9,978	7,683	5,797
Polish	15,804	7,627	5,860	4,641	4,232
Greek	23,161	11,166	9,088	6,262	3,940
Armenian	12,175	6,441	3,436	2,342	1,957
Other	49,182	13,357	4,681	5,279 <sup>n</sup>	8,602 <sup>o</sup>
No response	5,052	4,165	2,309	452	766

\*According to present borders

<sup>a</sup> Including 982 Aromanians and 1,176 Macedonians

<sup>b</sup> Including 21,736 Aromanians and 6,867 Macedonians

<sup>c</sup> Including 1,075 Szeklers

<sup>d</sup> Including 817 Szeklers

<sup>e</sup> Including 6,016 Saxons and 4,346 Swabians (Germans)

<sup>f</sup> Including 1,708 Saxons and 6,330 Swabians

<sup>g</sup> Including 1,057 Ruthenians

<sup>h</sup> Including 290 Ruthenians

<sup>i</sup> Of these: 21,206 Russians and 11,090 Lipovans

<sup>j</sup> Of these: 7,983 Russians and 30,623 Lipovans

<sup>k</sup> Including Croatians and Slovenians

<sup>l</sup> Including Czechs

<sup>m</sup> Including Crassovanians

<sup>n</sup> Including Csángós (Hungarians outside the Carpathians) and 1,251 Slovenians

<sup>o</sup> Of these: 2,723 Crassovanians, 2,062 Csángós, 1,356 Italians, 276 Slovenians and 55 Gagausians

**Supplementary Table 5**  
**The population of Romania according to native language, 1930–1992\***

Native language	1930	1948	1956	1966	1977	1992
Total	14,280,729	15,872,624	17,489,450	19,103,163	21,559,910	22,810,035
Romanian	11,360,137	13,597,613	15,080,686	16,770,628	19,184,405 <sup>a</sup>	20,683,406
Hungarian	1,552,563	1,499,851	1,653,700	1,651,873	1,720,680 <sup>b</sup>	1,639,135
Gypsy	89,989	53,425	66,882	49,086	77,373	166,635
German	636,144	343,913	395,374	387,547	353,027 <sup>c</sup>	98,530
Ukrainian	44,678	37,582	68,252	59,803	55,054 <sup>d</sup>	63,585
Russian, Lipovan	71,661	39,332	45,029	40,526	30,651 <sup>e</sup>	31,447
Turkish	...	...	14,228	17,453	21,909	27,587
Serbian-Croatian	47,196 <sup>f</sup>	45,447 <sup>f</sup>	43,057 <sup>f</sup>	41,897 <sup>f</sup>	39,639	33,664
Tartar	42,945 <sup>g</sup>	28,782 <sup>g</sup>	20,574	21,224	21,299	22,754
Slovak	42,425 <sup>h</sup>	35,143 <sup>h</sup>	18,935	19,797	20,034	18,283
Bulgarian	63,510	13,408	13,189	10,439	9,685	9,421
Jiddish	259,812	138,795	34,337	5,143	3,429	964
Czech	...	...	6,196	6,339	5,741	4,953
Polish	...	6,753	5,494	4,699	3,800	3,047
Greek	...	8,696	8,979	8,369	5,643	2,605
Armenian	...	6,987	4,716	2,617	1,517	918
Other	69,669	16,162	5,836	3,207	3,532 <sup>ii</sup>	2,335
No response	...	523	3,986	2,516	2,492	766

\*According to present borders

<sup>a</sup> Including 759 Aromanians and 790 Macedonian native speakers

<sup>b</sup> Including 50 Szekler native speakers

<sup>c</sup> Including 2,833 Sayon and 3,323 Swabian native speakers

<sup>d</sup> Including 715 Ruthenian native speakers

<sup>e</sup> Of these: 28,985 Russian and 1,666 Lipovanian native speakers

<sup>f</sup> Including Slovenian native speakers

<sup>g</sup> Including Turkish native speakers

<sup>h</sup> Including Czech native speakers

<sup>i</sup> Including 889 Slovenian native speakers

**Supplementary Table 6**  
**The population of Romania according to nationality compared with native language at the time of the 1992 census**

Nationality	Total	Native language								
		Romanian	Hungar.	Gypsy	German	Ukrain.	Russian	Turkish	Serbian -Croat.	Tartar
Total	22,810,035	20,683,406	1,639,135	166,635	98,530	63,585	31,447	27,587	33,664	22,754
Romanian	20,408,542	20,382,796	15,378	1966	2,470	2,928	599	79	546	37
Hungarian	1,624,959	32,949	1,590,290	656	806	56	45	4	50	–
Gypsy	401,087	217,844	18,860	163,897	101	8	10	305	25	11
German	119,462	13,330	11,642	63	94,266	26	8	4	53	–
Ukrainian	65,764	4,674	206	6	10	60,482	241	3	77	3
Russian, Lipovan	38,606	8,097	27	4	3	18	30,417	–	5	3
Turkish	29,832	2,710	13	24	6	2	2	27,037	–	20
Serbian	29,408	2,764	140	3	75	25	15	2	26,358	–
Tartar	24,596	1,768	3	–	–	6	5	127	–	22,677
Slovak	19,594	1,211	339	2	89	2	3	1	4	–
Bulgarian	9,851	1,281	94	4	10	1	24	2	8	–
Jewish	8,955	6,456	1,273	5	304	5	27	–	–	–
Croatian	4,085	198	42	1	23	3	1	–	3,804	–
Czech	5,797	660	103	1	155	1	2	6	6	2
Polish	4,232	1,122	95	–	53	18	14	–	2	–
Greek	3,940	1,481	25	2	3	–	4	3	1	–
Armenian	1,957	973	82	–	4	–	9	2	–	–
Other	8,602	3,092	523	1	152	4	21	12	2,725	1
No response	766	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

Nationality	Native language								
	Slovakian	Bulgar.	Jiddish	Czech	Polish	Greek	Armen.	Other	No response
Total	18,283	9,421	964	4,953	3,047	2,605	918	2,335	766
Romanian	178	926	79	56	87	171	36	210	–
Hungarian	47	26	3	5	5	3	1	13	–
Gypsy	7	5	4	–	1	2	1	6	–
German	14	11	5	7	15	3	–	15	–
Ukrainian	51	1	–	1	6	2	–	1	–
Russian, Lipovan	–	9	3	4	1	1	1	13	–
Turkish	–	1	3	12	1	–	–	1	–
Serbian	8	9	1	4	–	2	–	2	–
Tartar	5	1	–	3	–	–	–	1	–
Slovak	17,921	3	3	2	1	–	–	13	–
Bulgarian	–	8,420	–	5	1	–	–	1	–
Jewish	3	1	847	3	2	1	–	28	–
Croatian	1	–	4	2	–	2	1	3	–
Czech	11	3	3	4,839	2	2	–	1	–
Polish	1	–	–	1	2,923	1	–	2	–
Greek	2	1	–	–	1	2,410	–	7	–
Armenian	–	4	2	–	–	–	878	3	–
Other	34	–	7	9	1	5	–	2,015	–
No response	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	766

**Supplementary Table 7**  
**The population of Transylvania according to nationality compared with native language at the time of the 1992 census**

Nationality	Total	Native language								
		Roman.	Hungar.	Gypsy	German	Ukrain.	Russ.	Turkish	Serbian-Croat.	Tartar
Total	7,723,313	5,815,425	1,619,735	84,718	91,386	47,873	918	156	31,684	44
Romanian	5,684,142	5,666,382	13,755	773	1,974	325	96	7	402	4
Hungarian	1,603,923	29,134	1,573,126	649	773	55	37	3	50	–
Gypsy	202,665	100,556	18,735	83,223	98	7	3	1	22	1
German	109,014	9,334	11,562	56	87,941	19	6	2	49	–
Ukrainian	50,372	2,550	202	5	6	47,435	53	1	64	1
Russian, Lipovan	987	275	24	2	–	1	677	–	5	–
Turkish	223	70	9	1	3	1	–	138	–	–
Serbian	27,163	2,336	138	2	68	19	12	1	24,567	–
Tartar	57	11	3	–	–	–	–	1	–	38
Slovak	19,446	1,159	328	2	85	2	3	1	3	–
Bulgarian	7,885	609	91	2	10	–	16	–	7	–
Jewish	2,687	1,172	1,087	2	146	1	3	–	–	–
Croatian	4,030	166	41	–	21	3	–	–	3,793	–
Czech	4,569	431	88	1	137	1	2	–	6	–
Polish	749	273	91	–	36	2	7	–	1	–
Greek	529	119	23	–	1	–	–	–	1	–
Armenian	224	91	81	–	3	–	2	–	–	–
Other	4,490	757	351	–	84	2	1	1	2,714	–
No response	158	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

Nationality	Native language								
	Slovakian	Bulgar.	Jiddish	Czech	Polish	Greek	Armen.	Other	No response
Total	18,195	7,302	324	3,934	362	413	49	637	158
Romanian	173	97	41	33	14	24	1	41	–
Hungarian	47	24	3	4	4	2	1	11	–
Gypsy	7	4	4	–	–	2	–	2	–
German	14	11	5	3	2	2	–	8	–
Ukrainian	50	1	–	1	1	2	–	–	–
Russian, Lipovan	–	2	–	–	–	–	–	1	–
Turkish	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
Serbian	7	8	1	2	–	–	–	2	–
Tartar	3	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Slovak	17,844	3	2	2	1	–	–	11	–
Bulgarian	–	7,147	–	2	–	–	–	1	–
Jewish	3	–	261	2	–	–	–	10	–
Croatian	–	–	1	1	–	1	1	2	–
Czech	10	3	3	3,883	2	1	–	1	–
Polish	1	–	–	–	338	–	–	–	–
Greek	2	1	–	–	–	379	–	3	–
Armenian	–	–	–	–	–	–	46	1	–
Other	34	–	2	1	–	–	–	543	–
No response	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	158

**Supplementary Table 8**  
**The population of Romania according to nationality compared with denomination at the time of the 1992 census**

Denomination	Total	Nationality								
		Romanian	Hungar.	Gypsy	German	Ukrain.	Russ., Lipov.	Turkish	Serbian	Tartar
Total	22,810,035	20,408,542	1,624,959	401,087	119,462	65,764	38,606	29,832	29,408	24,596
Orthodox	19,802,389	19,322,047	27,828	342,130	8,126	52,839	12,285	461	26,219	149
Roman Catholic	1,161,942	361,324	669,420	19,275	70,983	620	94	24	920	4
Calvinist	802,454	16,140	765,370	17,598	2,792	69	8	8	22	—
Greek Catholic	223,327	191,453	23,393	3,569	1,900	1,693	32	7	84	3
Pentecostian	220,824	202,220	4,339	7,919	500	5,035	25	1	97	1
Baptist	109,462	94,358	12,845	932	438	218	56	2	186	-
Adventist	77,546	66,058	8,280	1,694	351	1,031	52	2	15	3
Unitarian	76,708	1,457	74,021	910	170	91	6	2	6	1
Muslim	55,928	952	35	583	14	9	2	29,034	15	24,319
Evan. Cris.	49,963	43,888	2,393	920	2,223	194	19	2	31	—
Augustan Luth.	39,119	3,660	7,201	229	27,313	9	10	4	103	—
Trad. Cristian	28,141	3,711	98	94	17	121	24,016	1	21	39
Trad. Orthodox	32,228	26,378	59	110	12	2,324	1,819	3	1,483	6
Syn-Presb. Ev.	21,221	1,694	12,842	41	2,858	5	1	55	1	1
Jewish	9,670	1,716	193	14	56	37	3	7	4	9
Other	56,329	39,768	11,924	896	1,334	1,288	59	146	134	38
Atheist	10,331	8,920	616	235	80	30	53	38	25	12
Non-denominat.	24,314	17,002	3,277	3,203	198	105	46	24	27	10
No response	8,139	5,796	825	735	97	46	20	11	15	1

Denomination	Nationality									
	Slovak	Bulgar.	Jewish	Croat.	Czech	Polish	Greek	Armen.	Other	No resp.
Total	19,594	9,851	8,955	4,085	5,797	4,232	3,940	1,957	8,602	766
Orthodox	850	2,112	317	62	307	312	3,735	1,411	1,079	120
Roman Catholic	12,974	7,351	97	3,954	4,812	3,729	57	94	6,145	65
Calvinist	121	12	28	2	180	17	9	8	60	10
Greek Catholic	587	132	21	20	93	114	70	16	132	8
Pentecostian	530	29	82	—	15	7	3	—	21	—
Baptist	92	20	9	1	285	4	2	1	13	—
Adventist	16	16	2	—	3	5	3	3	12	—
Unitarian	10	5	13	2	5	3	1	—	3	2
Muslim	—	3	81	—	14	—	5	1	839	22
Evangel. Cris.	133	87	14	1	16	7	5	12	18	—
Augustan Luth.	503	2	11	2	29	3	4	—	30	6
Tradit. Cristian	—	7	2	1	1	—	2	7	1	2
Tradit. Orthodox	1	2	5	—	—	2	5	17	2	—
Synod-Presb. Ev.	3,688	3	2	—	10	—	—	—	15	5
Jewish	2	—	7,566	28	1	—	5	3	25	1
Other	57	55	101	2	17	15	17	368	101	9
Atheist	7	5	255	6	3	7	6	2	30	1
Non-denominat.	16	6	310	3	6	6	9	13	46	7
No response	7	4	39	1	—	1	2	1	30	508

**Supplementary Table 9**  
**The population of Transylvania according to nationality compared with denomination at the time of 1992 census**

Denomination	Total	Nationality								
		Roman.	Hungar.	Gypsy	German	Ukrain.	Russ., Lipov.	Turkish	Serbian	Tartar
Total	7,723,313	5,684,142	1,603,923	202,665	109,014	50,372	987	223	27,163	57
Orthodox	5,360,102	5,109,835	24,952	150,082	5,900	40,768	764	48	25,245	7
Roman Catholic	854,935	79,337	657,559	18,960	65,520	358	43	15	877	2
Calvinist	796,682	14,917	761,109	17,582	2,556	67	8	5	21	–
Greek Catholic	206,833	177,274	22,781	3,374	1,596	738	22	1	72	1
Pentecostian	158,970	142,600	4,274	6,037	481	4,822	15	1	94	1
Baptist	94,630	79,860	12,805	799	411	158	9	1	184	–
Adventist	29,180	18,478	8,198	1,223	312	918	9	–	11	–
Unitarian	75,978	1,164	73,653	898	164	65	1	–	5	–
Muslim	534	131	30	6	7	1	–	121	5	36
Evangel. Cris.	12,372	7,709	2,277	237	1,893	73	2	–	7	–
Augustan Luth.	36,264	2,202	6,977	208	26,214	8	2	4	101	–
Tradit. Cristian	1,058	826	93	63	14	10	27	–	19	4
Tradit. Orthodox	3,891	2,276	55	66	12	1,074	58	–	343	–
Synod-Presb. Ev.	20,184	1,040	12,769	28	2,627	4	1	7	1	1
Jewish	2,768	377	171	8	29	34	–	2	4	1
Other	45,323	30,298	11,678	781	980	1,115	6	15	127	3
Atheist	3,649	2,802	550	98	55	23	9	1	15	1
Non-denominat.	15,365	9,881	3,219	1,831	165	91	8	1	19	–
No response	4,595	3,135	773	384	78	45	3	1	13	–

Denomination	Nationality									
	Slovak	Bulgar.	Jewish	Croat.	Czech	Polish	Greek	Armen.	Other	No resp.
Total	19,446	7,885	2,687	4,030	4,569	749	529	224	4,490	158
Orthodox	825	373	116	53	217	86	451	56	319	5
Roman Catholic	12,904	7,240	66	3,935	3,735	563	25	62	3,721	13
Calvinist	118	12	26	2	176	14	9	8	51	1
Greek Catholic	583	127	13	14	81	63	19	7	66	1
Pentecostian	530	26	53	–	13	4	3	–	16	–
Baptist	90	16	3	1	281	2	–	–	10	–
Adventist	15	8	1	–	–	2	1	–	4	–
Unitarian	10	5	3	2	5	1	–	–	2	–
Muslim	–	–	31	–	1	–	2	–	161	2
Evangel. Cris.	127	13	7	1	14	–	–	1	11	–
Augustan Luth.	484	2	9	2	22	1	4	–	24	–
Tradit. Cristian	–	1	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	–
Tradit. Orthodox	1	–	4	–	–	1	–	1	–	–
Synod-Presb. Ev.	3,680	3	2	–	9	–	–	–	11	1
Jewish	2	–	2,114	13	–	–	4	–	9	–
Other	52	50	66	2	8	7	4	88	39	4
Atheist	4	3	70	3	1	2	2	–	9	1
Non-denominat.	15	3	92	1	5	3	5	1	22	3
No response	6	3	11	1	–	–	–	–	15	127

### *Sources of Supplementary Tables*

In [ ]: serial numbers of Tables related to the subject.

Magyarország népessége községenként (...) az 1869. évi népszámlálás alapján [1–3]. A magyar korona országaiban az 1881. év elején végrehajtott népszámlálás eredményei, némely hasznos házi állatok (...) 1882: pp. 586–593 [1], pp. 812–819 [2]. A magyar korona országaiban az 1881. év elején végrehajtott népszámlálás főbb eredményei megyék és községek szerint (...) 1882: pp. 9–331 [1–3]. A magyar korona országainak helységnévtára 1892: pp. 18–656. [1–3]. Magyar statisztikai közlemények 1893a: p. 112. [1], 1895: pp. 14–16\*, 9–13 [1–2], 1902: pp. 38–43\*, 280–455 [1–3], 1907a: pp. 212–213 [1], 1916b: p. 118. [1], 1912: pp. 280–457, 581–629 [1–3]. Popa-Istrate 1921: pp. 156–157 [1], 158–156 [3]. Martinovici-Istrati 1921: pp. 7–52 [1]. Anuarul statistic al României 1922: pp. 30–31 [2]. Recensământul general al populației României din 29 decembrie 1930 1938: pp. XXXII–XXXIII, LVIII–LIX [1], pp. XXXVI–XXXVII, LXII–LXIII [2], pp. LXXXIV–LXXXV [3]. Recensământul general al României din 1941 6 aprilie 1944: p. XI [1–2]. Az 1941. évi népszámlálás 1947: pp. 498–690 [1–3]. Anuarul statistic al Republicii Socialiste România 1966: pp. 74–75 [5]. Golopenția–Georgescu 1948: p. 22 [5], 39–41 [1–2]. Recensământul populației din 21 februarie 1956, Rezultate generale 1959: pp. 558–561 [1–2, 4–5]. Recensământul populației și locuințelor din 15 martie 1966 1968 [1–2]. Recensământul populației și locuințelor din 15 martie 1966 1969: pp. 153, 155, 163, 165 [4–5]. Recensământul populației și locuințelor din 7 ianuarie 1992, Rezultate preliminare 1992: pp. 38–43 [1–2, 4]. Recensământul populației și locuințelor din 7 ianuarie 1992. 1994: pp. 708–709, 720–721 [1–2, 4–5]. Recensământul populației și locuințelor din 7 ianuarie 1992. 1995: pp. 2–3 [4], 38–121 [6–7], 296–379 [3, 8–9].

### **Bibliography – References**

#### *Az 1941. évi népszámlálás. Demografiai adatok községek szerint*

1947 [The Census of 1941. Demographic Data by Settlements.] Központi Statisztikai Hivatal [Hungarian Statistical Office], Stephaneum, Budapest. 4, 21, 697p.

ANTAL, G. László

1989 A magyarság helyzete Romániában. [The Situation of the Hungarians in Romania.] *Limes* 1, pp. 109–151. – The same in Romanian: *Situația minorității etnice maghiare în România*. Asociația Culturală Haáz Rezső [Haáz Rezső Cultural Association], Odorheiu Secuiesc, 1996. 55p. (*Caiete Muzeale* nr. 6.)

#### *Anuarul demografic al Republicii Socialiste România*

1967 [Annual Demographic Report of the Socialist Republic of Romania.] Direcția Centrală de Statistică [Central Statistical Office], București. 263, 42p, 11 tables.

#### *Anuarul demografic al Republicii Socialiste România*

1974 [Annual Demographic Report of the Socialist Republic of Romania.] Direcția Centrală de Statistică [Central Statistical Office], București. XXV, 541p, 4 tables.

#### *Anuarul statistic al României*

1922–1939/1940 [Annual Statistical Report of Romania.] Institutul Central de Statistică [Central Statistical Institute], București.

#### *Anuarul statistic al Republicii Socialiste România*

1966–1986 [Annual statistical Report of the Socialist Republic of Romania.] Direcția Centrală de Statistică [Central Statistical Office], București.

#### *Anuarul statistic al României*

1990–1996 [Annual Statistical Report of Romania.] Comisia Națională pentru Statistică [National Statistical Committee], București.

BIJI, M.–NICHITA, A.

1956 Populația R. P. R. după naționalitate și limba maternă. (Rezultatele provizorii ale recensământului populației din 21 februarie 1956.) [The Population of RPR by Nationalities and Mother Tongue. Provisional Results of the Census.] *Revista de statistică* 4, 1956 (VI), pp. 3–16, 9 tables.

#### *Buletinul demografic al României*

1932–1948 [Demographic Bulletin of Romania.] Volumes I–XVI. Institutul Central de Statistică [Central Statistical Institute], București.

#### *Comunicări statistice*

1945–1947 [Statistical Communications.] 2 (31<sup>st</sup> January 1945), 6–7 (15<sup>th</sup> April 1945), 18 (15<sup>th</sup> August 1947). București, Institutul Central de Statistică.

- CUCU, V.–URUCU, V.  
 1967 Creșterea orașelor din R. S. România în ultimul deceniu. [Town Growth in SRR in the Last Decade.] *Revista de statistică* 5, 1967 (XVI), pp. 52–61, 2 tables.
- DÁVID, Zoltán  
 1982 Magyarok – határaink mentén. [Hungarians Along Our Borders.] *Mozgó Világ* 7, 1982 (VIII), pp. 38–51.
- Erdély története  
 1986 Erdély története 1830-tól napjainkig. [The History of Transylvania. 3 Volumes. The History of Transylvania from 1830 to the present.] Vol. 3. Ed. Zoltán Szász. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest. Pp. 1194–1945, 206 tables.
- Fehér könyv a romániai nemzeti, nyelvi vagy vallási kisebbséghez tartozó személyek jogairól  
 1991 [White Book on the Rights of the National, Linguistic, or Religious Minorities of Romania.] Part One: Statisztikai adatok Románia népességéről. [Statistical Data on the population of Romania.] *Romániai Magyar Szó* 4, p. 2.
- FÉNYES, Elek  
 1839–1840 *Magyar országnak, 's a' hozzá kapcsolt tartományok mostani állapota statistikai és geographiai tekintetben.* [The Contemporary State of Hungary and its Attached Territories from a Statistical and Demographic Point of View.] Trattner-Károlyi, Pest.  
 Vol 4. Békés, Bihar, Csanád, Csongrád, Máramaros, Szabolcs, Szathmár, Temes, Torontál, Krassó, Arad vármegyék. 1839. 479p.  
 Vol. 5. Verőcze, Szerém, Posega, Kraszna, Közép-Szolnok, Zaránd vármegyék, Kővár vidéke, Jász és Kun területek, Hajdu kerület, Magyar tengerpart, Zágráb, Varasd, Körös vármegyék. 1839. 261p.  
 Vol. 6. Katonai végvidék. Névmutató. 1840. VII, 420p.  
 1842 *Magyarország statistikája.* [The statistics of Hungary.] Vol. 1. Trattner-Károlyi, Pest. VII, 306p, 2 tables.
- GHEORGHIU, Dorel  
 1995 Migrația internațională în România 1980–1994. [ International Migration of Romania. 1980–1994.] *Revista Româna de statistică* 10, 1995 (XLIV), pp. 34–42.
- GHEȚĂU, Vasile  
 1993 De ce scade populația maghiară în România? [Why does the Hungarian Population of Romania Decrease?] *Adevărul* 22<sup>nd</sup> September.  
 1997a Evoluția fertilității în România. De la transversal la longitudinal. [The Fertility Evolution in Romania.] *Revista de cercetări sociale* 1, pp. 3–85.  
 1997b Prețul vesnicei tranziții: 7 ani de declin demografic. [The Price of the Eternal Transition: 7 Years of Demographic Decline.] *Adevărul* 25<sup>th</sup> March, p. 3.
- GOLOPENȚIA, A.–GEORGESCU, D. C.  
 1948 *Populația Republicii Populare Române la 25 ianuarie 1948. Rezultatele provizorii ale recensământului.* [The Population of PRR on 25 January 1948. Provisional Results of the Census.] Institutul Central de Statistică [Central Statistical Institute], București. p. 41. (*Extras din Probleme economice* 2. )
- ILLYÉS, Elemér  
 1981 *Nationale Minderheiten in Rumänien, Siebenbürgen im Wandel.* [Changes in Ethnic Minorities in Romania, Transylvania.] Wilhelm Braumüller, Wien. XIII, 322p. (Ethnos 23. )
- IONESCU, N. T.  
 1927 Mișcarea populațiunei României în anul 1925. [Population Movement in Romania from 1925.] *Buletinul statistic al României* 1, pp. 27–68.
- ISTRATE, N.  
 1925 Dare de seamă statistică asupra populației Ardealului în anul 1923, comparativ cu anul 1910, privind mai ales situația minorităților etnice. [Statistical Evidence Regarding the population of Transylvania from 1923, Compared to 1910, with Special Reference to the Situation of Ethnic Minorities.] *Buletinul statistic al României* 1, pp. 106–121.  
 1929 Ardealul și Banatul în lumina cifrelor. [Transylvania and Banat according to the Data.] In: *Transilvania, Banatul, Crisana, Maramureșul 1918–1928*. Vol. 1. Cultura Națională, București, pp. 677–689.



KATUS, László

- 1980 A demográfiai átmenet kérdései Magyarországon a 19. században. [Questions regarding Demographic Transition in Hungary in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century.] *Történelmi Szemle* 2, pp. 270–288.
- 1982 Magyarok, nemzetiségek a népszaporulat tükrében (1850–1918). [Hungarians, Nationalities in the Mirror of Demographic Growth.] *História* 4–5, 1982 (IV), pp. 18–21.

KLINGER, András

- 1991 Erdély népessége anyanyelvi összetételének alakulása. [The Evolution of the Linguistic Structure of Transylvania.] *Statisztikai Szemle* 10, 1991 (LXIX), pp. 813–835.

KOCSIS, Károly–Kocsisné Hodosi, Eszter

- 1991 *Magyarok a határainkon túl, a Kárpát-medencében*. [Hungarians outside our Borders, in the Carpathian Basin.] Tankönyvkiadó, Budapest. 179p.

KOVÁCS, Alajos

- 1912 Népesedésünk újabb jelenségei. [More recent Phenomena regarding our Population.] *Közgazdasági Szemle* 47, 1912 (XXXVI), pp. 783–806.
- 1929 Erdély népmozgalma vallásfelekezetek szerint az 1921–27. években. [Population Movement in Transylvania according to Denomination in the years 1921–1927.] *Magyar Statisztikai Szemle* 12, 1929 (VII), pp. 1207–1214.

*A magyar korona országaiban az 1881. év elején végrehajtott népszámlálás eredményei, némely hasznos házi állatok kimutatásával együtt*

- 1882 [Results of the Census in the Countries of the Hungarian Crown in 1881, together with Evidence of some Useful Domestic Animals.] Vol. 1. Országos M. Kir. Statistikai Hivatal [National Hungarian Royal Statistical Office], Budapest. XXX, 825p.

*A magyar korona országaiban az 1881. év elején végrehajtott népszámlálás főbb eredményei megyék és községek szerint részletezve*

- 1882 [Results of the Census in the Countries of the Hungarian Crown at the end of 1881, Detailed by Counties.] Vol. 2. Országos M. Kir. Statistikai Hivatal [National Hungarian Royal Statistical Office], Budapest. 415p.

*A magyar korona országainak helységnévtára*

- 1892 Thesaurus of Settlement Names of the Countries of the Hungarian Crown.] Ed. József Jekelfalussy. Országos M. Kir. Statistikai Hivatal [National Hungarian Royal Statistical Office], Budapest. X, 1895p.

*Magyar statisztikai évkönyv*

- 1874–1875, 1877–1880, 1893–1916/1918, 1941, 1942 [Hungarian Statistical Yearbook.] New Series, Vol. I–XXIV/XXVI, XLIX–L. M. Kir. Központi Statisztikai Hivatal [Hungarian Royal Central Statistical Office], Budapest.

*Magyar statisztikai közlemények*

- 1893a Hungarian Statistical Publications.] New series, Vol. 1. A magyar korona országaiban az 1891. év elején végrehajtott népszámlálás eredményei. [Results of the Census in the Countries of the Hungarian Crown at the beginning of 1891.] Part One: Általános népleírás. [General Demography.] Országos M. Kir. Statistikai Hivatal [National Hungarian Royal Statistical Office], Budapest. VI, 167\*, 418p.
- 1893b New Series, Vol. 5. A magyar korona országainak 1890. és 1891. évi népmozgalma. [The Population Movement in 1890–1891 in the Countries of the Hungarian Crown.] Országos M. Kir. Statistikai Hivatal [National Hungarian Royal Statistical Office], Budapest. 80\*, 103p.
- 1895 New series, Vol. 9. A Magyarországon 1893 január 1-én végrehajtott cigányösszeírás eredménye. [The Results of the Gypsy Census on 1 January 1893 in Hungary.] Országos M. Kir. Statistikai Hivatal [National Hungarian Royal Statistical Office], Budapest. IV, 59\*, 81p, 2 tables.
- 1902 New series, Vol. 1. A magyar korona országainak 1900. évi népszámlálása. Első rész. A népesség leírása községenként. [Results of the Census in the Countries of the Hungarian Crown in 1900. Part One. Data for the Population by Settlement]. M. Kir. Központi Statisztikai Hivatal [Hungarian Royal Central Statistical Office], Budapest. IV, 45\*, 612p.
- 1905 New series, Vol. 7. A magyar szent korona országainak 1900., 1901. és 1902. évi népmozgalma. [The Population Movement in 1900, 1901 and 1902 in the Countries of the Hungarian Crown.] M. Kir. Központi Statisztikai Hivatal [Hungarian Royal Central Statistical Office], Budapest. VIII, 106\*, 675p, 5 tables.
- 1907a New series, Vol. 5. A magyar szent korona országainak 1900. évi népszámlálása. Harmadik.

- rész. A népesség részletes leírása. [Results of the Census carried out in the Countries of the Hungarian Crown in 1900. Part Three. Extensive Description of the Population.] M. Kir. Központi Statisztikai Hivatal [Hungarian Royal Central Statistical Office], Budapest. VII, 746p.
- 1907b New series, Vol. 22. A magyar szent korona országainak 1903., 1904. és 1905. évi népmozgalma. [The Population Movement in 1903, 1904 and 1905 in the Countries of the Hungarian Crown.] M. Kir. Központi Statisztikai Hivatal [Hungarian Royal Central Statistical Office], Budapest. VII, 67\*, 748p.
- 1910 New series, Vol. 32. A magyar szent korona országainak 1906., 1907. és 1908. évi népmozgalma. [The Population Movement in 1906, 1907 and 1908 in the Countries of the Hungarian Crown.] M. Kir. Központi Statisztikai Hivatal [Hungarian Royal Central Statistical Office], Budapest. VIII, 85\*, 773p, 6 tables.
- 1912 New series, Vol. 42. A magyar szent korona országainak 1910. évi népszámlálása. Első. rész. A népesség főbb adatai községek és népesebb puszták, telepek szerint. [Results of the Census in the Countries of the Hungarian Crown in 1910. Part One: Main Data of the Population according to Settlements.] M. Kir. Központi Statisztikai Hivatal [Hungarian Royal Central Statistical Office], Budapest. VI, 50\*, 880p.
- 1913 New series, Vol. 46. A magyar szent korona országainak 1901–1910. évi népmozgalma községenként. [The Population Movement in 1910 in the Countries of the Hungarian Crown by Settlements. M. Kir. Központi Statisztikai Hivatal [Hungarian Royal Central Statistical Office], Budapest. IV, 727p.
- 1916a New series, Vol. 50. A magyar szent korona országainak 1909–1912. évi népmozgalma. [The Population Movement in 1909–1912 in the Countries of the Hungarian Crown.] M. Kir. Központi Statisztikai Hivatal [Hungarian Royal Central Statistical Office], Budapest. IX, 179\*, 947p, 6 tables.
- 1916b New series, Vol. 61. A magyar szent korona országainak 1910. évi népszámlálása. Ötödik. rész. Részletes demográfia. [Results of the Census in the Countries of the Hungarian Crown in 1910. Part Five. Detailed Demography.] M. Kir. Központi Statisztikai Hivatal [Hungarian Royal Central Statistical Office], Budapest. IV, 635p.
- Magyarország népessége községenként, a házak és családok száma, valamint a jelenlévő népesség neme és vallásfelekezete közigazgatási beosztás szerint az 1869. évi népszámlálás alapján. Táblázat*  
n. d. (188?) The Population of Hungary by Settlement, Number of Houses and Families, Gender and Denomination of the Present Population according to the 1869 Census. Table.] In the Manuscript Collection of the Library of the Central Statistical Office, Budapest.
- MANUILĂ, Sabin
- 1919 Tendințele mișcării populației în județele Transilvaniei în anii 1920–1927. [Tendencies of Population Movement in the Counties of Transylvania in 1920–1927.] In: *Transylvania, Banat, Crisana, Maramureș 1918–1928*. Cultura Națională, București., pp. 667–676, 13 tables.
- 1938 Aspects démographiques de la Transylvanie. [Demographic aspects of Transylvania.] In: *La Transylvanie*. Institut de l'Histoire Nationale de Cluj, Academie Roumaine, Bucarest, pp. 793–856.
- 1940 *Studiu etnografic asupra populației României*. [Ethnographic Study of the Romanian Population.] Editura Institutului Central de Statistică [Central Statistical Institute], București. 108p.
- 1992 *Studies on the Historical Demography of Romania. – Études sur la démographie historique de la Roumanie*. Ed. by Sorina and Ioan Bolovan. Center for Transylvanian Studies, The Romanian Cultural Foundation, Cluj-Napoca, 1992. 165p. (Bibliotheca Rerum Transsilvaniae 2).
- MARTINOVICI, C.–ISTRATI, N.
- 1921 *Dicționarul Transilvaniei, Banatului și celorlalte ținuturi alipite*. [The Dictionary of Transylvania, Banat and the other Attached Regions.] Ardealul, Cluj, 1921. 107, 290, 52p.
- MARTSA, Dénes
- 1930 Ritka kivételek a magyar demográfiában. [Rare Exceptions in Hungarian Demography.] *Magyar Statisztikai Szemle* 6, 1930 (VIII), pp. 477–495.
- MEASNICOV, Ioan–TREBICI, Vladimir
- 1978 Aspecte ale migrației interne și urbanizarea în lumina rezultatelor preliminare ale recensământului din 5 ianuarie 1977. [Aspects of Internal Migration and Urbanisation according to the Preliminary Results of the Census of 5 January 1977.] *Revista de statistică* 4, 1978 (XXVII), pp. 30–39.

MIKE, Gyula

- 1927 A Magyarbirodalom és a mai Magyarország vérvesztesége a világháborúban. [The Blood Waste of the Hungarian Empire and of Contemporary Hungary in World War I.] *Magyar Statisztikai Szemle* 7, 1927 (V), p. 623–633.

*A népmozgalom főbb eredményei 1901–1910, 1911–1920*

[Main Data for Population Movement 1901–1910, 1911–1920.] Megyesoros községenkénti összesítők. [Settlement data by counties.] Archives of the Central Statistical Office (Budapest), Népesedéssziszttikai iratok A–2.

*A népmozgalom főbb adatai községenként, 1828–1900*

- 1980 [Main Data regarding Population Movement by Settlement. 1828–1900.] Vol. 7. Békés megye, Csongrád megye és Szeged, Hajdú-Bihar megye és Debrecen. [Békés, Csongrád, Szeged, Hajdú-Bihar counties and Debrecen.] Központi Statisztikai Hivatal [Central Statistical Office], Budapest. 123p.
- 1984 Vol. 8. Szabolcs-Szatmár megye, Szolnok megye. [Szabolcs-Szatmár, Szolnok counties.] Központi Statisztikai Hivatal [Central Statistical Office], Budapest. 173p.

*A népmozgalom főbb adatai községenként, 1901–1968*

- 1969 Main Data regarding Population Movement by Settlement. 1901–1968.] Központi Statisztikai Hivatal [Central Statistical Office], Budapest. 529p.

NYÁRÁDY, R. Károly

- 1996 Az 1977. évi romániai népszámlálás eredményeinek kiértékelése, különös tekintettel a nemzetiségi és anyanyelvi viszonyokra. (A Külügyi Intézet számára készült kézirat, 1983. ) [Evaluation of the Census of 1977 in Romania, with Special Attention to Ethnic and Language Changes. (Manuscript for the Institute of Foreign Relations, 1983. )] In: *Erdély etnikai arculatának változása*. [The Change in Transylvania's Ethnic Set-up.] Teleki László Alapítvány Könyvtár és Dokumentációs Szolgálat [Library and Documentation Service of the Teleki László Foundation], Budapest, pp. 15–70. (*Kisebbségi adattár*. )

POPA, Valeriu–ISTRATE, N.

- 1921 Starea economică a Transilvaniei. Notițe statistice. [The Economic Situation in Transylvania. Statistical Notes.] *Buletinul statistic al României* 6–7, pp. 139–169.

*Recensământul general al populației României din 29 decembrie 1930*

- 1938 [The General Census of Romania from 29 December 1930.] Vol. 2. Neam, limba maternă, religie. [Nationality, Mother Tongue, Religion.] Institutul Central de Statistică [Central Statistical Institute], București. CLX, 780p, 4 tables.
- 1940 Vol. 4. Locul nașterii, situație în gospodărie, menaje colective, mărimea gospodăriilor, cunoașterea limbii române, cetățenia, vârsta. [Place of Birth, Households, Collective Households, Size of Households, Knowledge of Romanian Language, Citizenship, Age.] Institutul Central de Statistică [Central Statistical Institute], București. CCXCII, 428p.

*Recensământul general al României din 1941 6 aprilie. Date sumare provizorii*

- 1944 The General Census of Romania from 6 April 1941. Provisional Summary Data.] Institutul Central de Statistică [Central Statistical Institute], București. XXIV, 300p.

*Recensământul populației din 21 februarie 1956. Rezultatele generale*

- 1959 [The Census of 21 February 1956. General Results.] Direcția Centrală de Statistică [Central Statistical Office], București. XXX, 1081p.

*Recensământul populației din 21 februarie 1956*

- 1960 [The Census of 21 February 1956.] Vol. 1. Structura demografică a populației. Numărul și repartizarea teritorială a populației; starea civilă; naționalitate; limba maternă; nivel de instruire; familii. [The Demographic Structure of the Population. The Size and Territorial Distribution of the Population, Marital Status, Nationality, Level of Education, Family.] Direcția Centrală de Statistică [Central Statistical Office], București. LII, 689p.

*Recensământul populației și locuințelor din 15 martie 1966*

- 1968 [The Census of the Population and Settlements of 15 March 1956.] Volumes by Transylvanian regions: Regiunea Banat, Brașov, Cluj, Crișana, Hunedoara, Maramureș, Mureș Autonomă-Maghiară. Vol. 1. Populația [Population]. Direcția Centrală de Statistică [Central Statistical Office], București.
- 1969 Vol. 1. Rezultate generale. Partea întâi. Populația [Vol. 1. General Results. Part One. Population.] Direcția Centrală de Statistică [Central Statistical Office], București. LXXXVIII, 941p, 15

- tables.
- 1970 Vol. 4. Populația după locul nașterii. [The Population according to Place of Birth.] Direcția Centrală de Statistică [Central Statistical Office], București. VI, 776p.
- Recensământul populației și locuințelor din 5 ianuarie 1977*
- 1980 [The Census of the Population and Settlements of 5 January 1970.] Vol. 1. Populație – structura demografică. [The Population – Demographic Structure.] Direcția Centrală de Statistică [Central Statistical Office], București. VIII, 759p, 16 tables.
- Recensământul populației și locuințelor din 7 ianuarie 1992. Rezultate preliminare*
- 1992 [The Census of the Population and Settlements of 7 January 1992. Provisional data.] Comisia Națională pentru Statistică [National Statistical Committee], București. XXXV, 217p.
- Recensământul populației și locuințelor din 7 ianuarie 1992*
- 1994 [The Census of the Population and Settlements of 7 January 1992.] Vol. I. Populație – structura demografică. [The Population – Demographic Structure.] Comisia Națională pentru Statistică [National Statistical Committee], București. LVI, 991p.
- 1995 Structura etnică și confesională a populației. [The Ethnic and Denominational Structure of the Population.] Comisia Națională pentru Statistică [National Statistical Committee], București. LXXI, 635p.
- România. Date demografice*
- 1994 [România. Demographic Data.] Comisia Națională pentru Statistică [National Statistical Committee], București. 477p.
- A romániai menekültek főbb adatai az 1944. februári összeírás szerint
- 1944 [Main Data regarding Refugees from Romania according to the Registration of February 1944.] *Magyar Statisztikai Szemle* 9/12, pp. 394–410.
- RÓNAI, András
- 1938 Magyarok elterjedése a Földön. [The Spread of Hungarians World-wide.] *Földrajzi Közlemények* 4–5, 1938 (LXVI), pp. 83–104.
- 1939 Erdély népességi viszonyai. [Demographic Situation in Transylvania.] *Magyar Statisztikai Szemle* 4, 1939 (XVIII), pp. 350–360.
- SCHNELLER, Károly
- 1940 *Magyarok és románok erőviszonyai Erdélyben.* [Demographic Relations between Hungarians and Romanians in Transylvania.] Budapest. Pp. 484–500. (Special print of *Társadalomtudomány*).
- SEBŐK, László
- 1992 A romániai magyarok száma a népszámlálások és az egyéb statisztikák szerint. [The Number of Hungarians in Romania according to Censuses and Other Statistics] *Századok* 3–4, 1992 (CXXVI), pp. 382–401.
- SEMLYÉN, István
- 1980a Országos és nemzetiségi népességgyarapodás. [National and Ethnic Demographic Growth.] In: *Korunk évkönyv* [Korunk Yearbook.] Kolozsvár- Cluj-Napoca, pp. 41–55.
- 1980b Hazai valóság. [Internal Reality.] In: id: *Hétmilliárd lélek.* [Seven Thousand Million Souls.] Kriterion, Bukarest, pp. 183–226. (*Korunk könyvek.* )
- 1982 Demográfiai viselkedés – népesedési politika. [Demographic Behaviour – Demographic Policy.] Parts 1–6. *A Hét* 29–33, 36, 1982 (XIII).
- Die Siebenbürgische Frage. Studien aus der Vergangenheit und Gegenwart Siebenbürgens*
- 1940 [Studies on the Past and Present of Transylvania.] Ed. Emerich, Lukinich. Hornyánszky, Budapest. 398p.
- STARK, Tamás
- 1989 *Magyarország második világháborús embervesztesége.* [The Human Loss of Hungary in World War II.] MTA Történettudományi Intézet [Institute for History of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences], Budapest. 89p. (*Társadalom- és művelődéstörténeti tanulmányok* 3. )
- Statistica emigrărilor din România*
- 1923 [Emigration Statistics for Romania.] Ministerul de Interne, Direcțiunea administrației generale și statistici. [Ministry of Internal Affairs, Office for General Administration and Statistics.] *Monitorul oficial* 30, 10<sup>th</sup> May 1923.

*Statisztikai negyedévi közlemények*

1942–1944 [Statistical Quarterly.] 1–2/1942–1944 (XLV–XLVII). M. Kir. Központi Statisztikai Hivatal [Hungarian Royal Central Statistical Office], Budapest.

R. SÜLE, Andrea

1988 Tények és következtetések a II. világháború utáni román népszámlálások adatai alapján. [Facts and Consequences based on the Romanian Censuses after World War II.] In: *Magyarságkutatás. A Magyarságkutató Intézet évkönyve*. [Yearbook of the Institute for Hungarology.] Ed. Gyula Juhász. Magyarságkutató Intézet, Budapest, pp. 123–144.

*Teroarea Horthy-fascistă în Nord-vestul României septembrie 1940 – octombrie 1944*

1985 [The Horthy-Fascist Terror in the North-West of Romania in September 1940.] Ed. Mihai Fatu, Mircea Muşat. Editura Politică, Bucureşti. 325 p.

THIRRING, Lajos

1938 Magyarország Trianontól napjainkig. Néesség és népmozgalom. [Hungary from Trianon to the Present. Population and Population Movement.] *Magyar Statisztikai Szemle* 4, 1938 (XVI), pp. 375–390.

1943 Természetes és tényleges népszaporodás a két legutolsó népszámlálás közt a trianoni és a visszacsatolt területeken. [Natural and Actual Population Growth between the Last Two Censuses on Trianon Territory and the Reattached Areas.] *Magyar Statisztikai Szemle* 7, 1943 (XXI), pp. 352–359.

1963 Magyarország népessége 1869–1949 között. [The Demography of Hungary between 1869–1949.] In: *Magyarország történeti demográfiája*. [The Historical Demography of Hungary]. Ed. József Kovácsics. Közgazdasági és Jogi Könyvkiadó, Budapest, pp. 221–388.

VARGA E., Árpád

1994a Városodás, vándorlás, nemzetiség. Adatok és szempontok az erdélyi városi térségek etnikai arculatváltásának vizsgálatához. [Urbanisation, Migration and Ethnicity. Data and Perspectives on the Analysis of the Ethnic Changes in Transylvanian Urban Territories] *Erdélyi Szemle* 5–6, pp. 156–197. (Extended and modified version of the study published in *Regio* 4, 1991. )

1994b Erdély anyanyelvi, nemzeti és felekezeti statisztikája 1880–1992. [Statistics for Transylvania relating to Mother Tongue, Nationality and Denomination 1880–1992.] *Magyarság és Európa* 4, 1994 (II), pp. 20–52. (Extended and modified version : Limba materna, naționalitate, confesiune. Date privind Transilvania în perioada 1880–1992. [Mother Tongue, Nationality, Religion. Data from Transylvania 1880–1992.] In: *Fizionomia etnică și confesională fluctuantă a regiunii Carpato-balcanice și a Transilvaniei*. [Changes in the Ethnic and Denominational Physiognomy of the Balkan-Carpathian Region and Transylvania.] Asociația Culturală Haáz Rezső [Haáz Rezső Cultural Association], Odorheiu Secuiesc, pp. 83–133. (*Caiete Muzeale* 14. )

1994c Az erdélyi magyarság lélekszámáról. [On the Demography of the Transylvanian Hungarians.] *Tiszatáj* 8, 1994 (XLVIII), pp. 78–96. Extended and modified version: Despre numărul maghiarilor din Transilvania. In: *Fizionomia etnică și confesională fluctuantă a regiunii Carpato-balcanice și a Transilvaniei*. [Changes in the Ethnic and Denominational Physiognomy of the Balkan-Carpathian Region and Transylvania.] Asociația Culturală Haáz Rezső [Haáz Rezső Cultural Association], Odorheiu Secuiesc, pp. 45–81. (*Caiete Muzeale* 14. )

1996a A romániai magyarság főbb demográfiai jellemzői az 1992. évi népszámlálás eredményeinek tükrében. [Main Demographic Characteristics of the Hungarian Population of Transylvania, according to the Results of the 1992 Census.] *Hitel* 3, 1996 (IX), pp. 68–84.

1996b Az 1977. évi romániai népszámlálásról az újabb adatközlések tükrében. [On the Romanian Census of 1977 on the Basis of New Publication of Data.] In: *Erdély etnikai arculatának változása*. [Changes in the Ethnic Physiognomy of Transylvania.] Teleki László Alapítvány Könyvtár és Dokumentációs Szolgálat [Library and Documentation Service of the Teleki László Foundation], Budapest, pp. 71–107. (*Kisebbségi adattár*. )

1997 A népesség fejlődése, az etnikai és felekezeti viszonyok alakulása a jelenkori Erdély területén 1869–1920 között. [Population Development and the Dynamics of Ethnic and Denominational Relations in the Territory of Contemporary Transylvania in 1869–1920.] *Erdélyi Múzeum* 1–2, 1997 (LIX), pp. 40–87.

WINKLER, Wilhelm

1919 *Die Totenverluste der öst. -ung. Monarchie nach Nationalitäten*. [The War Losses of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy according to Nationality.] Seidl und Sohn, Wien. VI, 84p, 14 tables.