

CHANGING ETHNIC PATTERNS IN TRANSYLVANIA SINCE 1989

KÁROLY KOCSIS

Geographical Research Institute, HAS, Budapest
Hungary

The aim of this paper is to provide an overview of changing ethnic patterns in Transylvania since the fall of Communism in Romania in 1989. The ethnic structure of this multicultural province was dominated by Hungarians, Romanians and Germans from the early 13th century until the middle of 20th century and by Romanians, Hungarians and Roma since 1989. The natural decrease and the increasing (e)migration of the population associated with the economic, social and political changes of the epoch has led to considerable changes in the ethnic structure of Transylvania. The most striking ethnic changes are the accelerated decrease of the population of the national minorities (mostly of Germans and Hungarians) and the dynamic demographic growth of the Roma population. Nearly half of the Hungarians live in municipalities where they represent an absolute majority of the local population (e.g., the Székely land and parts of Bihor-Satu Mare-Sălaj counties). As a result of their dynamic increase (25% between 1992 and 2002), the Roma community might outnumber the Hungarians in the decade to come, becoming the second largest ethnic group (to the Romanians) of Transylvania (according to estimates and not census data).

Keywords: Transylvania, Romania, ethnic structure, ethnic geography

Introduction

The term “Transylvania”¹ is often used in contemporary Hungary to refer to the areas of the Carpatho-Pannonian region which today are part of Romania (but until 1920 had formed part of Hungary). Historic Transylvania (about 57,000 km²) is located between the Eastern-Southern Carpathians and the Apușeni mountains (Bihor Massif). This historic east Hungarian province possessed a certain autonomy in the medieval Hungarian Kingdom due to its remoteness from the capital (Buda) and its special geographic location, encircled by high mountains. Between 1541 and 1690 it existed as an autonomous principality of the Ottoman Empire (as the maintainer of lost Hungarian statehood). During the periods of 1690–1704 and 1711–1867 it constituted a province of the Habsburg Empire (constitutionally be-

longing to the Hungarian Crown). From 1867 until 1918 Transylvania was part of Hungary within the framework of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Since 1919 (de jure since 1920) it is part of Romania, apart from the period between 1940–1944, when the northern part of Transylvania (43,101 km²)² was temporarily incorporated into Hungary as a result of the Second Vienna Award (August 30, 1940).

Over the course of its history Transylvania has always been an ethnically and religiously mixed region of a strong multicultural character. Migrations, the events of wars, the distinct habitats of the particular ethnic groups and their different political status have resulted in considerable shifts in the ethnic structure over the past millennium. The sequence of the major ethnic groups of the province changed as follows: 10th–12th century: Hungarians, Slavs; 13th century–1650's: Hungarians, Romanians, Germans; 1650's–1980's: Romanians, Hungarians, Germans; since 1980's Romanians, Hungarians, Roma (Gypsies).

Direct Ethnic Antecedents: The Socialist Period

Following the communist take-over in the 1950's, during the “heroic age” of Romanian socialist industrialization, population concentration and the increase in industrial jobs and urban population was a primary target. Between 1948 and 1956 the urban population of Transylvania increased by over one million, parallel with the increase of the ratio of Romanians in the urban population (1948: 49.9%, 1956: 58.1%). In addition to fulfilling the socio-political aims of early East European socialist urbanization, Romanian ethno-political targets (turning cities and towns with Hungarian majorities into cities and towns with Romanian majorities) played a very important role, too. Because of the massive migrations and losses during the war, the rural ethnic territory of Germans (whose number diminished by 200,000 since 1941) had vanished completely. The ethnic vacuum that emerged in 1944–1945 in the German villages was almost completely filled by Romanians by 1956.

In spite of an average 7.8% annual natural increase over the period between the 1956 and 1992 censuses, the population of Transylvania only grew by ca 1.5 million, i.e., 24.2%.³ Because of the high discrepancies among different ethnic groups regarding their natural and mechanical demographic trends and the changes in ethnic identity (assimilation-dissimilation), the number of Roma (Gypsies) increased by 159%, of Ukrainians–Ruthenians by 59.7%, of Romanians by 40.7%, and of Hungarians by 2.9%, while there was a decrease in the number of Jews by 93.9% and of Germans by 70.4% over the course of the thirty-six years under examination (*Table 1*). Large shifts in proportions were due to emigration from and immigration to Transylvania affecting more than one million people, and a migration balance that was negative for ethnic minorities and

positive for Romanians. According to the statistics concerning place of birth and demographic trends, estimates on the number of Romanians resettled from the regions beyond the Carpathians put their number at about 630,000 between 1945 and 1977 (Varga 1998). An overwhelming proportion of immigrants from Moldavia and Wallachia were directed to southern Transylvania into the heavy industrial triangle of the counties of Braşov–Arad–Reşiţa, where an increased demand on the workforce could not be met owing to a traditionally low natural birth-rate (which subsequently became a negative rate of population growth) and, later, because of the growing rate of emigration of Germans. Furthermore, masses coming from Moldavia and Wallachia were used to accelerate Romanianization of certain municipalities in northern Transylvania (Cluj-Napoca, Oradea).

Beside the massive influx of Romanians, the rapid process of the decline in the number of ethnic minorities in Transylvania was the result of their increasing emigration. While there was an annual emigration of 2,000 to 3,000 Germans and maximum 1,000 Hungarians in the framework of family unification between 1956 and 1975, 389,000 people (215,000 Germans, 64,000 Hungarians, 6,000 Jews and 5,000 others) left Transylvania between 1975 and the 1992 census.⁴ The annual number of German emigrants, in accordance with the agreement concluded in 1978 between German chancellor H. Schmidt and Romanian president N. Ceauşescu, had stabilized at 10,000 to 14,000 annually (Schreiber 1993). In the same period the number of Hungarians leaving the region rose from 1,058 in 1979 to 4,144 in 1986 and to 11,728 in 1989, in close relationship with the gradual deterioration of the economic and political situation.

Massive migrations in different directions taking place over the past four decades, especially within the framework of socialist urbanization, resulted in population growth in Transylvanian cities and towns from 2.1 to 4.4 million, while population of villages dropped from 4.1 to 3.3 million between 1956 and 1992. In rural areas, due to the exodus of Germans, all of the three present-day dominant ethnic groups (Romanians, Hungarians, Roma) grew, but in the cities, as loci of Romanianization, the number and proportion of Romanians rose considerably (1956: 1.2 million, i.e., 58.1%; 1992: 3.3 million, 75.6% in urban settlements). In this period eight towns formerly of Hungarian ethnic majority turned into settlements with a preponderance of Romanians (e.g., Cluj-Kolozsvár in 1957, Zalău-Zilah in 1959, Oradea-Nagyvárad in 1971, Satu Mare-Szatzmárnémeti in 1973). The relatively rapid and profound change of social patterns in urban settlements of Transylvania that took place when groups of different social structure and behavior, as well as ethnic and religious affiliation, were mixed increased the danger of emerging ethnic conflicts in the largest centers, as did the later total “ruralization” of towns.

Table 1. Ethnic Structure of the Population of the Territory of Transylvania (1941–2002)

| Year | Total population | Romanians | Hungarians | Germans | Roma (Gypsies) | Ruthenians, Ukrainians | Serbs | Slovaks | Croats | Bulgarians | Czechs | Others |
|------|------------------|-----------|------------|---------|----------------|------------------------|--------|---------|--------|------------|--------|--------|
| 1941 | 5,882,600 | 3,288,400 | 1,735,700 | 533,600 | 81,400 | 25,100 | 43,000 | 35,600 | | 11,000 | 12,000 | 116800 |
| 1948 | 5,761,127 | 3,752,269 | 1,481,903 | 332,066 | | | | | | | | |
| 1956 | 6,218,427 | 4,041,156 | 1,558,254 | 367,857 | 78,278 | 31,532 | 43,689 | 23,093 | | 9,749 | 9,645 | 55,174 |
| 1966 | 6,719,555 | 4,559,432 | 1,597,438 | 371,881 | 49,105 | 36,888 | 41,972 | 21,839 | | 9,707 | 8,446 | 22,847 |
| 1966 | 6,719,555 | 4,569,546 | 1,625,702 | 373,933 | 32,022 | 36,208 | 39,816 | 19,558 | | 9,268 | 5,086 | 8,416 |
| 1977 | 7,500,229 | 5,203,846 | 1,691,048 | 347,896 | 123,028 | 42,760 | 32,140 | 21,133 | 7,433 | 9,067 | 6,305 | 15,573 |
| 1992 | 7,723,313 | 5,684,142 | 1,603,923 | 109,014 | 202,665 | 50,372 | 27,163 | 19,446 | 6,751 | 7,885 | 4,569 | 7,383 |
| 1992 | 7,723,313 | 5,815,425 | 1,619,735 | 91,386 | 84,718 | 47,873 | 31,684 | 18,195 | | 7,302 | 3,934 | 3,061 |
| 2002 | 7,221,733 | 5,393,552 | 1,415,718 | 49,229 | 244,475 | 49,299 | 20,816 | 17,070 | 6,691 | 6,607 | 3,041 | 15,235 |
| 2002 | 7,221,733 | 5,541,286 | 1,429,473 | 40,653 | 106,212 | 46,473 | 18,854 | 15,952 | 6,309 | 6,087 | 2,625 | 7,809 |

Table 1 (cont.)

In %

| Year | Total population | Romanians | Hungarians | Germans | Roma (Gypsies) | Ruthenians, Ukrainians | Serbs | Slovaks | Croats | Bulgarians | Czechs | Others |
|------|------------------|-----------|------------|---------|----------------|------------------------|-------|---------|--------|------------|--------|--------|
| 1941 | 100.0 | 55.9 | 29.5 | 9.1 | 1.4 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 0.6 | | 0.2 | 0.2 | 2.0 |
| 1948 | 100.0 | 65.1 | 25.7 | 5.8 | | | | | | | | |
| 1956 | 100.0 | 65.0 | 25.0 | 5.9 | 1.3 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.4 | | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.9 |
| 1966 | 100.0 | 67.9 | 23.8 | 5.5 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.3 | | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.3 |
| 1966 | 100.0 | 68.0 | 24.2 | 5.6 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.3 | | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| 1977 | 100.0 | 69.4 | 22.6 | 4.6 | 1.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| 1992 | 100.0 | 73.6 | 20.8 | 1.4 | 2.6 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| 1992 | 100.0 | 75.3 | 21.0 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.2 | | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| 2002 | 100.0 | 74.7 | 19.6 | 0.7 | 3.4 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| 2002 | 100.0 | 76.7 | 19.8 | 0.6 | 1.5 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 |

Change (1992=100%)

| Year | Total population | Romanians | Hungarians | Germans | Roma (Gypsies) | Ruthenians, Ukrainians | Serbs | Slovaks | Croats | Bulgarians | Czechs | Others |
|------|------------------|-----------|------------|---------|----------------|------------------------|-------|---------|--------|------------|--------|--------|
| 1992 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 2002 | 93.5 | 94.9 | 88.3 | 45.2 | 120.6 | 97.9 | 76.6 | 87.8 | 99.1 | 83.8 | 66.6 | 150.8 |
| 2002 | 93.5 | 94.8 | 88.3 | 44.5 | 125.4 | 97.1 | 82.2 | 87.7 | | 83.4 | 66.7 | 255.1 |

Remarks: In 1941, 1956, 1966, 1977 and 1992 Croatian mother tongue data are included in the category of Serbs.

Italic figures: mother tongue (native language) data of censuses.

Source: Census data (based partly on Varga 1998).

Early Post-Communist Years and the Census of 1992

As a result of the exodus that began with the collapse of the Ceaușescu regime, 60,072 Germans, 23,888 Romanians and 11,040 Hungarians left Romania in 1990. Of the 96,929 people who left, 83,512 (86.2%) were from Transylvania. The factors prompting their departure were higher living standards abroad, the hope for a better future for their children, their shattered confidence in Romania, and an open burst of nationalism. This wave of emigration has subsided recently and stabilized at a national rate of 20,000 annually.⁵

At the time of the Romanian census of January 7, 1992 7,723,313 inhabitants were counted in the territory of Transylvania (310,000 less than in the middle of 1989). Of them nearly 5.7 million (73.6%) declared themselves to be of Romanian nationality, while 1.6 million (20.8%) declared themselves Hungarian, nearly 203,000 (2.6%) Roma, 109,000 (1.4%) German, and 50,000 Ukrainian. The Romanians formed the absolute majority in 14 counties. Romanians represented over 90% of the population in Hunedoara, Bistrița–Năsăud and Alba and between 80–90% in Sibiu, Brașov, Caraș-Severin, Timiș, Arad and Maramureș (*Appendix 1*). Romanians were the dominant ethnic group in 22 of the 26 Transylvanian city-municipalities, 77 of the 92 towns, and 4,222 of the 5,203 villages. The almost homogeneous Romanian rural areas could be found first of all in southern Maramureș, the historic Năsăud and Chioar regions, the Someș Hills, Bihor Masif and the Transylvanian Alps. As a result of enforced and ethnically controlled urban growth Romanians made up 75.6% of the urban population. In the previous centuries the Romanians of Transylvania were considered rural people, but by 1992 most of them (58.9%) had become urban dwellers. Some 50 to 70 years earlier the most populous cities of the region, including Timișoara, Cluj-Napoca, and Brașov, had had a Hungarian–German majority, but the populations of these cities became 75–90% Romanian. In 1992 95% of the Romanians of Transylvania lived in a city, town, or settlement in which they formed an absolute majority, and 67.1% were found in settlements with a Romanian population over 80% (*Appendix 2*).

The following cities were home to major Romanian communities: Brașov (287,000), Timișoara (275,000), Cluj-Napoca (249,000), Sibiu (159,000), Arad (151,000), Oradea (144,000) and Baia Mare (120,000).

The Transylvanian Hungarians (numbering 1,604,000 according to ethnicity and 1,620,000 according to mother tongue) constituted an ethnic majority at that time in two counties (Harghita and Covasna), four cities (Târgu Mureș, Miercurea Ciuc, Odorheiu Secuiesc, Sfântu Gheorghe), 14 towns (9 in the Székely land), and 795 villages. 56% of Hungarians were urban dwellers. Thanks to Hungarians dwelling in rural communities and especially in the Székely land, Bihor and Sălaj,

51.6% of Hungarians lived in a town or community with an absolute Hungarian majority. 30.5% were residents of communities in which they represented 80% or more of the population, but 22.2% of them lived in communities with less than a 20% Hungarian population. The most populous Hungarian communities (with the exception of Târgu Mureș) were to be found in cities, in which over the past decades Hungarians became a minority constituting between 23% and 41% of the population (Cluj-Napoca, Oradea, Satu Mare).

45.1% of Hungarians lived in the counties of the Székely land, 27.5% in Crișana/Partium, 10.4% in northern Transylvania, 8.8% in southern Transylvania, and 8.2% in Banat. They could only preserve the relative ethnic homogeneity of their settlements in Székely land and in northern Bihor. They lived in Satu Mare and in Sălaj counties alongside Romanians, Germans and Roma, while in the other regions they only formed ethnic pockets, islands and diasporas.

At the time of this census 202,665 persons declared themselves to be Roma (84,718 Roma mother tongue). The difference is that, due to the situation, the majority (54.3%) of the Roma living in the country declared Romanian their native tongue, 4.7% of them were native speakers of Hungarian, and a mere 40.9% declared Roma as their mother tongue. Provided that Roma population assumes its ethnicity to a similar extent in Hungary and in Transylvanian Romania, the Roma population of the region could be estimated at 700 thousand, or 9% of the total.⁶ The settlement pattern of Roma that emerged in the 18th century did not change considerably over the past centuries within the ethnic territories of mixed (Romanian, Hungarian, German) character. Accordingly, 42.2% of the Roma lived in the inner areas of Transylvania (Mureș, Sibiu, Cluj, Brașov counties), and 34.1% of them inhabited the western areas of the region (Timiș, Arad, Bihor, Sălaj, Satu Mare counties). 34% of Roma were urban dwellers, with the largest communities to be found in gravity centers of their settlement areas: in the Transylvanian Basin Târgu Mureș (3,300), Cluj-Napoca (3,200), Târnaveni, Turda (2,400–2,400); in the western areas Timișoara (2,700), Arad and Oradea (2,100–2,100). At the time of the census of 1992 there were 24 settlements (predominantly those abandoned by Germans and one community named Ungra) in which the majority declared Roma ethnic affiliation.

The number of Germans, the third dominant ethnic group of historical Transylvania, dropped from 372,000 in 1966 to 109,000 in 1992 (91,000 by mother tongue). As a consequence of massive emigration of the younger generations they are primarily elderly people, most of them pensioners. 38% live in historical Transylvania (Saxons), 44.1% in the Banat ("Swabians"), 17.9% in the Crișana/Partium. In this area (Satu Mare) there lived a community of roughly 10,000 that, having gradually assumed Hungarian as its mother tongue over the past two centuries, declared German ethnicity out of political-economic consider-

ations. Only four villages in Banat and in southern Transylvania respectively have been able to retain their – mainly relative – German majority. Now the survival of German communities is maintained by residents of Timișoara (13,200), Sibiu (5,600), Reșița (5,300) and Arad (4,100).

Ethnic Developments between the Censuses 1992 and 2002

In the period between the censuses of 1992 and 2002 the population of Romania decreased by more than 1.1 million and that of Transylvania by 502,000 (6.5%). The main triggers were the revolution of 1989 and the opening of the state borders after the change of political regime. The ensuing economic collapse hit the younger generations particularly hard and provoked large-scale emigration. Birth rates dropped and natural population decrease became a prevailing demographic trend. Natural decrease was responsible for 25.8% (129,555) of the population loss in Transylvania, the other 74.2% (372,025) being a consequence of emigration. Between the two censuses all the counties experienced population loss, but to a highly varied extent for different demographic reasons of natural and mechanical change. Whereas population decrease in Timiș (–3.2%), Cluj, Bistrița–Nasăud, Covasna (–4.6%), and Mureș (–4.8%) counties remained below the average of Transylvania, Caraș-Severin (–11.5%) and Hunedoara (–11.4%) counties lost more than a tenth of their population. The actual loss was somewhat curbed by a positive natural change of the dominantly Romanian Bistrița–Nasăud (+2.4%) and Maramureș (+1.2%) counties and Sibiu (+0.1%), with a sizeable Roma population, and a balanced proportion of birth and death rates in Harghita (–0.6%) and Covasna (–0.3%) counties (which have a Hungarian majority). There was a sweeping natural loss in Arad (–5.1%), Caraș-Severin (–3.5%), Bihor, Cluj (–3%), Timiș (–2.6%) and Sălaj (–2.5%) counties. The demographic picture is further distorted by a population loss in crisis counties formerly dominated by Romanian heavy industry and lately struck by emigration. At the same time the latter development has been successfully counterbalanced in Arad (–0.2%), Timiș (–0.6%) and Cluj (–1.6%) counties by migration from the regions beyond the Carpathians.

The spatial pattern of demographic components outlined above can further be analysed at the level of individual communities. In spite of the fact that it was the Romanians who suffered the least losses (–5.1%), the mountainous and hilly areas inhabited by them (–5.1%) were the most affected (e.g., Banat mountains, Poiana Ruscă mountains, the Transylvanian Alps, Bihor Massif, Someș Hills, Codru Hills, and the Țibleș mountains). This was a result of natural decreases in centers of heavy industry (which were sunk deep in crisis), villages in a disadvantageous

situation with regards to transportation, and alpine farmsteads with aging populations. It was also a result of an accelerated move of the younger generations into urban centers of Transylvania, which offer better living conditions. This migration from village to town, mountain to valley, and periphery to center runs counter to a recently prevailing national and international trend of moving from the cities and towns (mainly from housing developments) to villages of urban agglomerations with favourable situations for commuting and better habitability. As a result of this process of suburbanization the number of residents of communities in the surroundings of some cities of Transylvania (e.g., Timișoara, Arad, Oradea, Cluj-Napoca, Târgu Mureș, Sibiu, Brașov) grew considerably between 1992 and 2002.

The demographic move to the periphery of urban centers, the lower birth rate of urban dwellers, and the willingness to emigrate have all contributed to a more intense population loss (−7.9%) in cities and towns than in villages (−3.6%). This occurred in spite of the fact that the cities having undergone economic recovery due to foreign investment. Areas close to the western state border and demographic vacuum areas created by the outflow of Hungarians and Germans (e.g., Cluj-Napoca, Oradea, Târgu Mureș, Timișoara, Arad) have absorbed huge masses of Transcarpathian (mainly Moldovan) Romanians. Thanks to this trend the number of ethnic Romanians grew by 1.6% in Cluj-Napoca and by 0.7% in Oradea, whereas Târgu Mureș suffered a loss of a mere 0.4% and Timișoara of 1%. Proximity of the western border (as an incentive to undertake work abroad or to engage in cross-border commercial activities), migration of most of the Germans, and the presence of Romanian relatives and acquaintances who settled some decades before in the formerly Schwabian communities also stimulated a heavy influx, and this in turn resulted in considerable growth in the lowland areas of Banat, Arad and Bihor. Apart from the settlements of the Transylvanian Basin affected by suburban inflow, a similar massive increase could be observed in communities with a sizeable Roma population with a high birth rate.

Between 1992 and 2002 the number of Romanians dropped by 290,000 (and by roughly one million in the whole country) in Transylvania and that of Hungarians by 188,000. This meant a 5.1% loss of the former ethnic group and 11.7% loss of the latter. A dramatic decrease in birth rates (coupled with inaccuracy in the registration of the ethnic affiliation of newborn children, statements of the parents corresponding to ethnic assimilation) resulted in a sharp difference between birth and death rates. Between 1992 and 2001 the number of deaths exceeded the number of births by 49,370 among the Romanians and 97,108 among the Hungarians (Kiss 2004). In 86% emigration to the “West” accounted for the drop in the number among Romanians. The 188,000 drop in the number of Hungarians was associated with natural loss (56%), migration loss (34%) (Horváth 2004) and assimilation, overwhelmingly Romanianization (roughly 10%). Concerning Hungarians this decline affected the contiguous blocs of their ethnic area, which were hardly

hit by natural loss (e.g., Székely land), the least (6–7%), whereas in cities (e.g., Oradea, Cluj-Napoca, Târgu Mureş, Satu Mare, Braşov, Arad, Timișoara, and Baia Mare) the proportion of Hungarians has dropped by 16% to 26% since 1992. Over the same period Roma, the third most populous ethnic group, increased their number by 41,810 in Transylvania (and by 134,000 in the other provinces of Romania), 75.7% (31,651) (Kiss 2004) of which was due to natural increase, the rest resulting from a growing self-awareness and migration balance. A considerable mass of Roma emigrated from Transylvania, which curbed their growth by 20.7%, a figure much smaller than that in Romania Proper (46.5%). Germans of Transylvania, numbering nearly 540,000 during the Second World War, have been decimated as a result of their accelerating emigration to Germany from the 1970s, which turned into flight after 1990. Between 1992 and 2002 their numbers dropped by 54.8% because of emigration and natural loss among the aging population.

Change in the population of Romanians was basically controlled by objective demographic factors and not by those of a subjective character (shifts between Romanians, Hungarians and Roma resulting from assimilation and dissimilation). Natural loss was responsible for a drop of 0.9%, while negative migration caused a decrease of 4.4%. A northeast-southwest opposition in demographic behavior shaped in the 20th century has long survived and could be recognized even 20 years ago. In 1981 natural increase exceeded an annual value of 11% in Bistrița–Nasăud and Maramureş counties, whereas in Banat and in the southern parts of Crișana it did not reach 5% and there was even a 2.5% natural loss in Arad county. In the southwestern counties this trend could be attributed to economic considerations, *i.e.*, to an attempt to raise living standards through reduced birth rates, and limited reproduction led to similar demographic trends in the neighbouring areas of Hungary and Serbia (Voivodina) as early as the first half of the 20th century.⁷

Following the change of political regime these spatial disparities vanished when on the one hand a large mass of Romanians with a high natural birth rate settled in the Banat, mainly in Timiș county, and on the other the unfavorable demographic processes became typical of the northern Romanian ethnic areas. Mortality has outweighed natality in Cluj and Bihor counties since 1991 and in Sălaj, Satu Mare and Mureş counties since 1992. Natural increase was recorded only in Bistrița–Nasăud (+1.2‰) and Maramureş (+0.2‰) counties neighbouring the regions of Bukovina and northern Moldva, which traditionally have high birth rates and are inhabited almost exclusively by Romanians. An extreme drop (over 10%) in the Romanian population was typical of the mountainous areas mentioned because of a natural loss among the prevailing elderly people and the migration of their younger cohorts. These circumstances led to a 7–10% loss among the Romanians in the period of 1992–2002 in Caraș-Severin, Hunedoara, Alba, Sălaj,

and Satu Mare counties, which offered very modest living conditions. Counties along the western borders in fairly good economic and geographical positions and large urban centers with the best living conditions were by far the most attractive areas for Romanians from the remote regions of the country. This is why the migration balance proved to be positive in Timiș (+2.1%) and Arad (+1.9%) counties and there was a minor migration loss in Cluj (−0.4%), Bihor (−2.1%), and Mureș (−2.8%) counties. This is reflected by the figures: of the 23 urban centers with the highest population loss (10–20%) in Transylvania, 18 are found in the southern areas of this region.⁸ At the same time a positive migration balance is represented by the influx of the Romanians in Nădlac along the western border (8.5%), Sănnicolau Mare (3.2%), and Jimbolia (2.1%), as well as in Cluj-Napoca (1.6%) and Oradea (0.7%), both located along the European transport corridor traversing Central Transylvania. The “Székely capital”, Târgu Mureș, had a Hungarian ethnic majority (51.4%) in 1992 and turned into a city with a Romanian Majority (50.3%) by 2002 as a result of an intense Romanian influx and Hungarian emigration. A vigorous internal migration typical in Romania has affected not only the western regions and important municipalities. There was an en mass migration of Romanian urban dwellers into suburban settlements in search of better living conditions. This process of suburbanization was especially striking in the vicinities of Timișoara, Arad, Oradea, Satu Mare, Baia Mare, Cluj-Napoca, Târgu Mureș, Sibiu, Medişa and Braşov. The overspill phenomenon of Romanians into suburban villages not only reduced the ratio of Hungarians, but in some cases these communities became homes to Romanian majorities (e.g., Dumbrăvița near Timișoara or Botiz near Satu Mare).

The number of people declaring Romanian ethnicity grew not merely for demographic reasons, but through the assimilation of minorities as they changed nationality. There was an above average lingual and ethnic Romanianization of the Hungarians living sporadically and in large centers in southern Transylvania, while the assimilation of Roma could be traced primarily in southern Transylvania and sporadically in Banat. An inverse process, i.e., dissimilation among the Romanians, came about due to an increasing self-awareness among Roma, mainly in Satu Mare, Sălaj, and Bihor counties and to a lesser extent in the Transylvanian Basin. In Crişana/Partium (e.g., near Satu Mare and the river Barcău) there were examples of re-Magyarization at the expense of the Romanian population. On the whole as a result of demographic trends anticipating the formation of Romanian ethnic blocs and unfavorable to ethnic minorities, the number of Transylvanian urban settlements in which the ratio of Romanians was above 80% has risen from 658 to 687 between 1992 and 2002 and the share of Romanians within the aggregate living here increased from 67.1 to 73.2% over the same period.

In contrast to the population increase among Romanians, there was a 11.7% population decrease among Hungarians of Transylvania caused by migration (–4.5%) and a 6% natural decrease. According to the aggregate Transylvanian data (similar to the pattern in Hungary), among those declaring Hungarian ethnic affiliation death rates have exceeded birth rates since 1982, a shift that occurred among the Székelys a bit later, since 1992–1993 (Veres 2004). Moreover, in case of Hungarians of Covasna county there has been a trend towards equilibrium between these opposite demographic parameters measured in a fluctuation between –1.5 and +1.5%, which in the Carpathian Basin, regrettably, must be considered a “demographic success”. Spatial differences of natural demographic processes show a close interrelationship between the ethnic geographical pattern and historical features of the settlement area of the Hungarians living here. The most favorable demographic figures are seen among Hungarians living in blocs or those forming an overwhelming majority, in contrast with Hungarians of southern Transylvania and Banat (especially the urban dwellers). These assumptions are corroborated by birth rate data of Hungarian females of reproductive age, which represented 40–44% in the Székely land, 35–39% in Satu Mare–Sălaj, and 20–29% among the southern diaspora-Hungarians in 2002 (Veres 2004). Migration losses of Hungarians reflected a similar picture. Emigration potential and factual data on emigration of Hungarians living in blocs (predominantly the Szeklers) are lagging far behind the similar values of Hungarian minorities of Central Transylvania (Gödri 2004).⁹ In shaping the spatial pattern of the Hungarians in Transylvania, however, emigration plays a much more important part than internal migration. In the framework of the latter – similar to the behaviour of Romanians – the resettlement of the urban dwellers (mainly from housing developments) to the suburban belt is highly typical. Due to this migration to the suburbs (in spite of an aggregate loss of 11.7% across Transylvania) the number of Hungarians in settlements in the vicinity of urban centers with a sizeable Hungarian population grew (e.g., Sfântu Gheorghe, Târgu Mureș, Cluj-Napoca, Satu Mare, Oradea). Along with the objective demographic components, change of nationality and processes of assimilation-dissimilation represent one tenth of the drop in the number of Hungarians over the period under study (Veres 2004).

Besides the aforementioned trends of natural population change and migration it was the change of native language and then of nationality that caused a 20.6% drop in the number of those declaring Hungarian ethnic affiliation in southern Transylvania and a 19.8% decrease in Banat, where Hungarians living primarily in urban centers but also in sporadic rural settlements were under extreme pressure from the Romanians to assimilate. At the same time the Székelys, who strive to preserve their ethnic self-awareness in better ethnic geographical circumstances, dropped by a “mere” 7.6%.¹⁰ In the above mentioned areas of southern Transylvania and Banat, in which the vanishing diaspora Hungarians have been

trying to preserve ethnic and linguistic identity, their loss due to assimilation can be estimated at 51–61% of the actual decline (Szilágyi 2004). It should also be mentioned that Hungarians did not suffer serious losses everywhere. There are areas in which their number has risen and there are settlements of converts (people who declared Romanian, Roma and German ethnic affiliation in 1992 declaring Hungarian ethnic affiliation in 2002). As a result of internal (chiefly suburban) migration and processes of assimilation in favor of the Hungarians, the latter has expanded in the triangle of Satu Mare–Zalău–Oradea,¹¹ in marginal places of the Transylvanian Basin, in the innermost parts of the Székely Land, and in some of its towns (e.g., Sfântu Gheorghe, Bălan, Sovata). The number of communities and urban settlements with a sizeable Hungarian majority (above 80%) rose from 102 to 103 and the ratio of Hungarians increased from 30.5% to 32.6%. With the transformation of Târgu Mureș into an urban center with a Romanian ethnic majority the percentage of the Hungarian population has been reduced from 51.6% to 48.5%. The decrease of the ratio of Hungarians below 20% in Cluj-Napoca, Alesd, and Curtici contributed to the creation of a situation in which every fourth Transylvanian Hungarian lives in a towns or communities in which his/her language is not an official language (22.2% in 1992).

Of the populous ethnic groups of Transylvania only those of Roma ethnic affiliation managed to increase their number, if to a lesser extent (20.6%) than the Roma living in Hungary (which increased by 33.2%). An overwhelming part of this growth was prompted by their extremely high (15.6%) natural increase, while the other 5% was added by the shift from Romanian to Roma (dissimilation), when Roma having earlier declared Romanian affiliation acquired Roma self-consciousness. Between 1992 and 2002 the population size and local proportions of Roma tended to grow at a rate above the average within their traditional settlement areas in the lowland and hilly regions of Crișana/Partium and the Transylvanian Basin. “Magyarization”, a tendency opposite to that of “Romanianization” (but one that apparently did not last too long), hit the Roma communities mainly in southern Transylvania and to a smaller extent in Banat, Mureș and the Székely land. As a result of a steady demographic expansion of Roma, the number of urban settlements and communities in which they numbered more than 20% of the population rose from 30 to 49. In spite of trends of re-stratification which were favorable to Roma, in 2002 34.9% lived in settlements in which they accounted for less than 5% of the total population, in comparison with 43.5% in 1992.

The exodus of Germans continued after 1992 and caused a roughly 43% (nearly 60,000 people) population loss among the Saxon and Swabian minorities. Because of a considerable drop in the intensity of this exodus and the gradual establishment of networks promoting emigration among Romanians, the share of Germans among the emigrants declined perpetually (62% in 1990, 28.4% in 1992,

and 0.8% in 2002, www.insse.ro). Another factor in their disappearance is a high natural loss due to ageing. Their assimilation to Hungarians was only sizeable in Satu Mare county, mainly around Carei. The local Swabian population of Roman Catholic denomination, having been Magyarized by the early 20th century, also declared Hungarian ethnic affiliation since 1941. Their German ethnic self-awareness revived en masse in 1992 (perhaps for the last time). Nowadays they do not form the majority in any of the communities, and because of their emigration in the early 1990s, 86.3% of them live either in urban settlements or communities in which they do not constitute even 5% of the population.

For the time being there are more Ruthenians and Ukrainians in Transylvania than Germans. Their loss due to emigration was basically responsible for a 2.1% population decrease, despite significant natural increase. As a consequence of ongoing emigration from their overpopulated ethnic area neighbouring the border with Ukraine, which offers only modest living conditions, the number of Ruthenians in Transylvania everywhere suffered an above average loss (3–15%) in 1992–2002. As a rule regional and local centers (e.g., Baia Mare, Satu Mare, Timișoara, and Lugoj) constitute the destinations of their internal migration.

Serbs suffered a massive drop in their numbers (23.7%). It was moderate in the communities with Serb ethnic majorities located along the Danube (between 5.4 and 13.1%) in the border zone with Serbia owing to lower assimilation pressures from Romanians and less emigration due to the relatively acceptable living conditions. This is not valid, however, for the diaspora along Mureș River (which has a history going back some five hundred years), where their population loss was between 28% and 32%.

The number of Slovaks living mostly in the Șes mountains (in Bihor and Sălaj counties) dropped by a mere 5.4% thanks to their natural increase, in contrast with people of the same ethnicity of Banat and the vicinity of Arad living in language islets and diaspora, where their numbers shrank by 14–16%. In Nădlac their ratio dropped from 52.1% to 47.2% as a result of the influx of Romanians and the natural decrease in population among Lutheran Slovaks.

Recent Ethnic Map of Transylvania

According to the data of the latest Romanian census (March 18, 2002), of the 7.2 million persons living in 16 counties of Transylvania nearly three fourth declared themselves to be of Romanian ethnicity, one fifth of Hungarian, 3.4% of Roma, and 0.7–0.7% of Ukrainian or German. The breakdown by native language indicated 76.7% Romanian speakers, 19.8% Hungarian speakers, and 1.5% Roma speakers. The number of people of Romanian and Hungarian ethnic affiliation remained below the number of those of the respective native language primarily be-

cause of Roma and Germans who declared Romanian or Hungarian as their mother tongue. It was also the Romanians and Hungarians who resisted alien language influence the most successfully; 98–99% of them declared a lingual affiliation coinciding with their ethnic affiliation. This ratio is 91–92% with the Slovak and Ukrainian minorities and 88% with the Serbs. Of the Germans and Roma only 70.3% and 44% assumed their native language, respectively.

In the ethnic spatial pattern of Transylvania the presence of the following ethnic blocs is still clearly discernible: two Romanian blocs in southern Transylvania–Bihor and in northern Transylvania–Maramureș; and two Hungarian blocs in the Székely land and northern Bihor. There are zones of mixed ethnic composition stretching between these blocs. As a consequence of conscious Romanian nation building and ethnic homogeneization efforts, between 1900 and 2002 the percentage of the Romanian population in Transylvania grew from 55.1 to 74.7. In two counties of the region Hungarians still form an absolute majority of the population. The percentage of people declaring themselves to be Hungarian was 84.6% in Harghita and 73.8% in Covasna in 2002, while in Mureș and Satu Mare counties (which had a Hungarian majority up to 1948) it was 39.3 and 35.2%, respectively. The Hungarian population reaches the 20% threshold necessary for the official use of the language in Bihor (26%) and Sălaj (23%) counties. In central Transylvania the percentage of Hungarians, which was 39.9% in 1941, dropped to 17.4% by 2002.

Romanians, the nation forming the state, represent more than 80% of the population in nine of sixteen counties in Transylvania (according to ethnicity 5.4 million and to mother tongue 5.5 million). In five other counties they made up between 50% and 80% of the population in 2002. The dominantly Romanian urban settlements and communities (i.e., in which Romanians form more than 90% of the population) are concentrated in the Transylvanian Alps, Bihor Massif and in the common border areas of Maramureș and Bistrița–Nasăud counties. 73.2% of Romanians live in urban centers and communities in which they make up more than 80% of the population and 23.3% of them live in settlements in which they comprise between 50% and 80% of the population. Seven municipalities (Timișoara, Brașov, Cluj-Napoca, Sibiu, Oradea, Arad, and Baia Mare) are home to more than 100,000 Romanians. As a result of socialist urbanization and a massive resettlement of Hungarians from municipalities and towns the ratio of urban Romanians (58.7%) was higher than that of urban Hungarians (52.6%).¹²

47.2% of Transylvanian Hungarians (1,416,000 according to ethnicity and 1,429,000 according to mother tongue) lived in the counties of the Székely Land (Harghita, Covasna, Mureș) and 27.5% lived in the Crișana/Partium (Bihor, Satu Mare, Sălaj, Maramureș). The rest of the Hungarians continue to attempt to preserve ethnic self-awareness in larger and smaller lingual islets in Banat, Arad and

its environs, and the central part of Transylvania. According to the census of 2002 32.6% of them lived in predominantly Hungarian urban settlements and communities (in which Hungarians constituted over 80% of the population) and 15.8% lived in communities in which there was a Hungarian majority of 50% to 80%. One fourth of them, however, lived in an administrative entity in which they represented less than 20% of the population. Consequently Hungarian was not in official use. 156,000 (10.9% of the Hungarians) are in a real diasporic situation (in municipalities, towns and communities with a Hungarian population of less than 10%) and are struggling for ethnic survival. More than 30,000 Hungarians live in the Székely municipalities (Târgu Mureș, Sfântu Gheorghe, Odorheiu Secuiesc, Miercurea Ciuc), Cluj-Napoca, Oradea, and Satu Mare. Owing to a massive outflow of Hungarians from the cities and towns, the share of urban Hungarians has dropped from 55.3% in 1992 to 52.9% in 2002.

According to self-declaration there were 244,000 people of Roma ethnicity and 106,000 people of Roma mother tongue in Transylvania at the time of the 2002 census. The respective figures for the whole country were 238,000 and 53,000, while the Roma organizations reported 1.4 to 2.5 million people of Roma ethnicity (www.edrc.ro).¹³ According to the latter source Roma is the second most populous ethnic group in Romania, outnumbering Hungarians. The ratio of those with Roma ethnicity (3.4%) based on self-declaration is higher in Transylvania than in the rest of the historical provinces of the country (2.5% in Wallachia, 1.4% in Moldva and 0.9% in Dobruja). The regions with the highest number and share of Roma population are traditionally the Transylvanian Basin (mainly South Transylvania, the Mureș area) and the lowland hilly regions of the western border counties (Satu Mare, Bihor, Arad, Timiș). Given traditional lifestyles, the Roma population as a rule avoids the mountainous areas. According to the 2002 census data a mere 0.4% live in a community (Ungra) in which they represent an absolute majority of the population. Another 34.9% are inhabitants of settlements in which their percentage of the population does not reach 5%. Though 68.2% of them are rural dwellers, communities of Roma numbering more than 3,000 live in large urban centers such as Târgu Mureș, Timișoara, Cluj-Napoca and Arad. As a rule Roma command the language prevailing in their environment (Romanian or Hungarian) as a first language, but in the Transylvanian Basin, mainly north of the rivers Târnava, they have Roma as mother tongue.

Those Germans (who were considered the third most populous ethnic group in Transylvania until the 1980s) who remained in the region by 2002 (49,000 by ethnicity and 41,000 by mother tongue) inhabit historical Transylvania (Saxon, 37%) and Banat and Crișana/Partium (Swabian). Owing to a far advanced exodus over the past two decades 86.3% of them live in urban settlements and communities in which they represent less than 5% of the population. Sizeable communities of Germans (between 2,000 and 7,000) have survived only in Timișoara, Reșița and Sibiu.

Conclusion

As a consequence of migration and changes in ethnic patterns that took place over the course of the 20th century the ethnic make-up of Transylvania on the one hand became simpler and more homogeneous at the expense of the ethnic minorities and to the benefit of Romanians and on the other became more varied because of the vigorous expansion of the Roma communities. A conscious efforts towards nation building on the part of Romanians, coupled with ethnic homogeneization, the events of wars and migrations have resulted in an increase in the proportion of Romanians in Transylvania between 1900 and 2002 from 55.1% to 74.7% and a concomitant decrease in the proportion of Hungarians from 29.6% to 19.6%.

During the period between the censuses of 1992 and 2002 the population of Transylvania dropped by nearly 502,000. This was triggered by the revolution of 1989 and the opening of the borders after the change of power. Other reasons included a massive emigration as a consequence of the economic collapse (which has caused a particular drop in the population of reproductive age), the decline in natality, and an accelerated population loss. Three-fourths of the drop in population was caused by migration and one-fourth by natural decrease. Since 1992 the number of Romanians has fallen by 290,000, i.e., 5.1% (by 1,000,000 in Romania as a whole), and the number of Hungarians by 18,000, i.e., 11.7%. The drop in the population of Romanians was caused mainly by migration, whereas the decline in the Hungarian population was primarily the result of natural decrease and secondly of emigration. The ethnic pattern has also been modified by internal migration (e.g., a continuing influx of Transcarpathian Romanians into the developed, western lowland and border areas and suburbanization around the cities). As a result of their dynamic increase (an increase of 25% between 1992 and 2002), the Roma population may exceed the Hungarian population in the coming decade and could be, according to estimates, the second largest ethnic group of Transylvania after Romanians.

Appendix

Appendix 1. Ethnic Structure of the Population of Transylvanian Regions and Counties (1992–2002)

| REGION, county | Year | Total population | Romanians | Hungarians | Roma | Germans |
|------------------------------------|------|------------------|-----------|------------|--------|---------|
| CRIȘANA / PARTIUM | 1992 | 1,846,548 | 1,290,187 | 440,148 | 47,544 | 19,506 |
| | 2002 | 1,725,652 | 1,215,629 | 388,554 | 65,024 | 9,694 |
| Satu Mare / Szatmár | 1992 | 400,789 | 234,541 | 140,392 | 9,823 | 14,351 |
| | 2002 | 367,281 | 216,085 | 129,258 | 13,478 | 6,417 |
| Maramureș / Máramaros | 1992 | 540,099 | 437,997 | 54,902 | 6,701 | 3,416 |
| | 2002 | 510,110 | 418,405 | 46,300 | 8,913 | 2,012 |
| Sălaj / Szilágy | 1992 | 266,797 | 192,552 | 63,151 | 9,224 | 146 |
| | 2002 | 248,015 | 176,671 | 57,167 | 12,544 | 102 |
| Bihar / Bihar | 1992 | 638,863 | 425,097 | 181,703 | 21,796 | 1,593 |
| | 2002 | 600,246 | 404,468 | 155,829 | 30,089 | 1,163 |
| BANAT / BÁNSÁG | 1992 | 1,563,997 | 1,279,558 | 131,753 | 35,937 | 48,050 |
| | 2002 | 1,472,936 | 1,239,141 | 105,671 | 41,662 | 25,175 |
| Arad / Arad | 1992 | 487,617 | 392,600 | 61,011 | 13,325 | 9,392 |
| | 2002 | 461,791 | 379,451 | 49,291 | 17,664 | 4,852 |
| Timiș / Temes | 1992 | 700,033 | 561,200 | 62,866 | 14,836 | 26,722 |
| | 2002 | 677,926 | 565,639 | 50,556 | 16,084 | 14,174 |
| Caraș-Severin / Krassó-Szörény | 1992 | 376,347 | 325,758 | 7,876 | 7,776 | 11,936 |
| | 2002 | 333,219 | 294,051 | 5,824 | 7,914 | 6,149 |
| NORTH TRANSYLVANIA | 1992 | 1,063,121 | 866,824 | 167,284 | 25,338 | 2,361 |
| | 2002 | 1,014,412 | 839,164 | 140,650 | 30,989 | 1,605 |
| Cluj / Kolozs | 1992 | 736,301 | 571,275 | 146,186 | 16,334 | 1,407 |
| | 2002 | 702,755 | 557,891 | 122,301 | 19,834 | 944 |
| Bistrița-Nasăud / Beszterce-Naszód | 1992 | 326,820 | 295,549 | 21,098 | 9,004 | 954 |
| | 2002 | 311,657 | 281,273 | 18,349 | 11,155 | 661 |
| SOUTH TRANSYLVANIA | 1992 | 2,058,003 | 1,826,498 | 141,481 | 52,580 | 34,058 |
| | 2002 | 1,879,211 | 1,692,583 | 112,372 | 56,567 | 14,220 |
| Hunedoara / Hunyad | 1992 | 547,950 | 503,241 | 33,849 | 5,577 | 3,634 |
| | 2002 | 485,712 | 450,302 | 25,388 | 6,823 | 1,937 |
| Alba / Fehér | 1992 | 413,919 | 372,951 | 24,765 | 12,661 | 3,243 |
| | 2002 | 382,747 | 346,059 | 20,684 | 14,306 | 1,311 |
| Sibiu / Szeben | 1992 | 452,873 | 397,205 | 19,309 | 18,730 | 17,122 |
| | 2002 | 421,724 | 382,061 | 15,344 | 17,125 | 6,554 |
| Brașov / Brassó | 1992 | 643,261 | 553,101 | 63,558 | 15,612 | 10,059 |
| | 2002 | 589,028 | 514,161 | 50,956 | 18,313 | 4,418 |
| SZÉKELY LAND | 1992 | 1,191,644 | 421,075 | 723,257 | 41,266 | 5,039 |
| | 2002 | 1,129,522 | 407,035 | 668,471 | 50,233 | 2,383 |
| Mureș / Maros | 1992 | 610,053 | 317,541 | 252,651 | 34,798 | 4,588 |
| | 2002 | 580,851 | 309,375 | 228,275 | 40,425 | 2,045 |
| Harghita / Hargita | 1992 | 348,335 | 48,948 | 295,104 | 3,827 | 199 |
| | 2002 | 326,222 | 45,870 | 276,038 | 3,835 | 140 |
| Covasna / Kovászna | 1992 | 233,256 | 54,586 | 175,502 | 2,641 | 252 |
| | 2002 | 222,449 | 51,790 | 164,158 | 5,973 | 198 |

In %

| REGION, county | Year | Total population | Romanians | Hungarians | Roma | Germans |
|------------------------------------|------|------------------|-----------|------------|------|---------|
| CRIȘANA / PARTIUM | 1992 | 100.0 | 69.9 | 23.8 | 2.6 | 1.1 |
| | 2002 | 100.0 | 70.4 | 22.5 | 3.8 | 0.6 |
| Satu Mare / Szatmár | 1992 | 100.0 | 58.5 | 35.0 | 2.5 | 3.6 |
| | 2002 | 100.0 | 58.8 | 35.2 | 3.7 | 1.7 |
| Maramureș / Máramaros | 1992 | 100.0 | 81.1 | 10.2 | 1.2 | 0.6 |
| | 2002 | 100.0 | 82.0 | 9.1 | 1.7 | 0.4 |
| Sălaj / Szilágy | 1992 | 100.0 | 72.2 | 23.7 | 3.5 | 0.1 |
| | 2002 | 100.0 | 71.2 | 23.0 | 5.1 | 0.0 |
| Bihar / Bihar | 1992 | 100.0 | 66.5 | 28.4 | 3.4 | 0.2 |
| | 2002 | 100.0 | 67.4 | 26.0 | 5.0 | 0.2 |
| BANAT / BÁNSÁG | 1992 | 100.0 | 81.8 | 8.4 | 2.3 | 3.1 |
| | 2002 | 100.0 | 84.1 | 7.2 | 2.8 | 1.7 |
| Arad / Arad | 1992 | 100.0 | 80.5 | 12.5 | 2.7 | 1.9 |
| | 2002 | 100.0 | 82.2 | 10.7 | 3.8 | 1.1 |
| Timiș / Temes | 1992 | 100.0 | 80.2 | 9.0 | 2.1 | 3.8 |
| | 2002 | 100.0 | 83.4 | 7.5 | 2.4 | 2.1 |
| Caraș-Severin / Krassó-Szörény | 1992 | 100.0 | 86.6 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 3.2 |
| | 2002 | 100.0 | 88.2 | 1.7 | 2.4 | 1.8 |
| NORTH TRANSYLVANIA | 1992 | 100.0 | 81.5 | 15.7 | 2.4 | 0.2 |
| | 2002 | 100.0 | 82.7 | 13.9 | 3.1 | 0.2 |
| Cluj / Kolozs | 1992 | 100.0 | 77.6 | 19.9 | 2.2 | 0.2 |
| | 2002 | 100.0 | 79.4 | 17.4 | 2.8 | 0.1 |
| Bistrița-Nasăud / Beszterce-Naszód | 1992 | 100.0 | 90.4 | 6.5 | 2.8 | 0.3 |
| | 2002 | 100.0 | 90.3 | 5.9 | 3.6 | 0.2 |
| SOUTH TRANSYLVANIA | 1992 | 100.0 | 88.8 | 6.9 | 2.6 | 1.7 |
| | 2002 | 100.0 | 90.1 | 6.0 | 3.0 | 0.8 |
| Hunedoara / Hunyad | 1992 | 100.0 | 91.8 | 6.2 | 1.0 | 0.7 |
| | 2002 | 100.0 | 92.7 | 5.2 | 1.4 | 0.4 |
| Alba / Fehér | 1992 | 100.0 | 90.1 | 6.0 | 3.1 | 0.8 |
| | 2002 | 100.0 | 90.4 | 5.4 | 3.7 | 0.3 |
| Sibiu / Szeben | 1992 | 100.0 | 87.7 | 4.3 | 4.1 | 3.8 |
| | 2002 | 100.0 | 90.6 | 3.6 | 4.1 | 1.6 |
| Brașov / Brassó | 1992 | 100.0 | 86.0 | 9.9 | 2.4 | 1.6 |
| | 2002 | 100.0 | 87.3 | 8.7 | 3.1 | 0.8 |
| SZÉKELY LAND | 1992 | 100.0 | 35.3 | 60.7 | 3.5 | 0.4 |
| | 2002 | 100.0 | 36.0 | 59.2 | 4.4 | 0.2 |
| Mureș / Maros | 1992 | 100.0 | 52.1 | 41.4 | 5.7 | 0.8 |
| | 2002 | 100.0 | 53.3 | 39.3 | 7.0 | 0.4 |
| Harghita / Hargita | 1992 | 100.0 | 14.1 | 84.7 | 1.1 | 0.1 |
| | 2002 | 100.0 | 14.1 | 84.6 | 1.2 | 0.0 |
| Covasna / Kovászna | 1992 | 100.0 | 23.4 | 75.2 | 1.1 | 0.1 |
| | 2002 | 100.0 | 23.3 | 73.8 | 2.7 | 0.1 |

Change (1992=100%)

| REGION, county | Year | Total population | Romanians | Hungarians | Roma | Germans |
|---------------------------------------|------|---------------------|-----------|------------|-------|---------|
| CRIȘANA / PARTIUM | 1992 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | 2002 | 93.5 | 94.2 | 88.3 | 136.8 | 49.7 |
| Satu Mare / Szatmár | 1992 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | 2002 | 91.6 | 92.1 | 92.1 | 137.2 | 44.7 |
| Maramureș / Máramaros | 1992 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | 2002 | 94.4 | 95.5 | 84.3 | 133.0 | 58.9 |
| Sălaj / Szilágy | 1992 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | 2002 | 93.0 | 91.8 | 90.5 | 136.0 | 69.9 |
| Bihar / Bihar | 1992 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | 2002 | 94.0 | 95.1 | 85.8 | 138.0 | 73.0 |
| BANAT / BÁNSÁG | 1992 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | 2002 | 94.2 | 96.8 | 80.2 | 115.9 | 52.4 |
| Arad / Arad | 1992 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | 2002 | 94.7 | 96.7 | 80.8 | 132.6 | 51.7 |
| Timiș / Temes | 1992 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | 2002 | 96.8 | 100.8 | 80.4 | 108.4 | 53.0 |
| Caraș-Severin / Krassó-Szörény | 1992 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | 2002 | 88.5 | 90.3 | 73.9 | 101.8 | 51.5 |
| NORTH TRANSYLVANIA | 1992 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | 2002 | 95.4 | 96.8 | 84.1 | 122.3 | 68.0 |
| Cluj / Kolozs | 1992 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | 2002 | 95.4 | 97.7 | 83.7 | 121.4 | 67.1 |
| Bistrița-Nasăud / Beszterce-Naszód | 1992 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | 2002 | 95.4 | 95.2 | 87.0 | 123.9 | 69.3 |
| SOUTH TRANSYLVANIA | 1992 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | 2002 | 91.3 | 92.7 | 79.4 | 107.6 | 41.8 |
| Hunedoara / Hunyad | 1992 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | 2002 | 88.6 | 89.5 | 75.0 | 122.3 | 53.3 |
| Alba / Fehér | 1992 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | 2002 | 92.5 | 92.8 | 83.5 | 113.0 | 40.4 |
| Sibiu / Szeben | 1992 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | 2002 | 93.1 | 96.2 | 79.5 | 91.4 | 38.3 |
| Brașov / Brassó | 1992 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | 2002 | 91.6 | 93.0 | 80.2 | 117.3 | 43.9 |
| SZÉKELY LAND | 1992 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | 2002 | 94.8 | 96.7 | 92.4 | 121.7 | 47.3 |
| Mureș / Maros | 1992 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | 2002 | 95.2 | 97.4 | 90.4 | 116.2 | 44.6 |
| Harghita / Hargita | 1992 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | 2002 | 93.7 | 93.7 | 93.5 | 100.2 | 70.4 |
| Covasna / Kovászna | 1992 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | 2002 | 95.4 | 94.9 | 93.5 | 226.2 | 78.6 |

Appendix 2. Major Ethnic Groups of Transylvania According to Their Proportion in the Communities of Their Residence (1992, 2002)

| Share categories (%) | Number of communities | | Number of Romanians | | Distribution of Romanians (%) | |
|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------|---------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|
| | 1992 | 2002 | 1992 | 2002 | 1992 | 2002 |
| 80–100 | 658 | 687 | 3,837,501 | 3,959,760 | 67.1 | 73.0 |
| 50–79.9 | 234 | 207 | 1,595,179 | 1,271,338 | 27.9 | 23.5 |
| 20–49.9 | 93 | 96 | 246,169 | 157,654 | 4.3 | 2.9 |
| 5–19.9 | 46 | 41 | 31,725 | 28,594 | 0.6 | 0.5 |
| 0–4.9 | 85 | 85 | 5,326 | 6,281 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Total | 1,116 | 1,116 | 5,715,900 | 5,423,627 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

| Share categories (%) | Number of communities | | Number of Romanians | | Distribution of Romanians (%) | |
|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------|---------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|
| | 1992 | 2002 | 1992 | 2002 | 1992 | 2002 |
| 80–100 | 102 | 103 | 489,750 | 461,791 | 30.5 | 32.5 |
| 50–79.9 | 74 | 65 | 338,774 | 223,786 | 21.1 | 15.8 |
| 20–49.9 | 141 | 136 | 420,604 | 376,840 | 26.2 | 26.6 |
| 5–19.9 | 179 | 179 | 317,011 | 317,898 | 19.7 | 22.4 |
| 0–4.9 | 620 | 633 | 40,918 | 38,240 | 2.5 | 2.7 |
| Total | 1,116 | 1,116 | 1,607,057 | 1,418,555 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

| Share categories (%) | Number of communities | | Number of Romanians | | Distribution of Romanians (%) | |
|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------|---------------------|----------------|-------------------------------|--------------|
| | 1992 | 2002 | 1992 | 2002 | 1992 | 2002 |
| 80–100 | 0 | 0 | . | . | . | . |
| 50–79.9 | 1 | 1 | 1,148 | 1,080 | 0.6 | 0.4 |
| 20–49.9 | 29 | 48 | 19,503 | 36,164 | 9.6 | 14.8 |
| 5–19.9 | 251 | 308 | 94,505 | 122,321 | 46.3 | 49.9 |
| 0–4.9 | 835 | 759 | 88,776 | 85,476 | 43.5 | 34.9 |
| Total | 1,116 | 1,116 | 203,932 | 245,041 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

| Share categories (%) | Number of communities | | Number of Romanians | | Distribution of Romanians (%) | |
|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------|---------------------|---------------|-------------------------------|--------------|
| | 1992 | 2002 | 1992 | 2002 | 1992 | 2002 |
| 80–100 | 1 | 0 | 119 | . | 0.1 | . |
| 50–79.9 | 2 | 0 | 2,126 | . | 2.0 | . |
| 20–49.9 | 6 | 4 | 4,287 | 1,686 | 3.9 | 3.2 |
| 5–19.9 | 77 | 15 | 34,683 | 5,602 | 31.7 | 10.5 |
| 0–4.9 | 1030 | 1097 | 68,077 | 45,943 | 62.3 | 86.3 |
| Total | 1,116 | 1,116 | 109,292 | 53,231 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Notes

I would like to thank the Hungarian National Research Fund (OTKA, T 49567) for their support of this article.

- ¹ In this paper the territory of Transylvania is interpreted in a broader sense. In addition to historical Transylvania, it includes Banat within present-day Romania and Crişana and Maramureş (Partium), i.e., the whole area ceded by Hungary to Romania. In accordance with the Trianon Peace Treaty 102,724 km² was ceded by Hungary to Romania (Löökkös 2000). Later the area of historical Transylvania (895–1919) grew to 103,093 km² as a consequence of state boundary modifications and territorial changes in compliance with the agreements between Czechoslovakia and Romania (June 1921) and Yugoslavia and Romania (April 1924).
- ² The population of the reannexed territories was 2,577,260 (52.1% Hungarian native speakers and 41.5% Romanian native speakers, Varga 1992).
- ³ Hungary's population grew by 5.2% and the population of Romania proper (i.e., not including Transylvania) grew by 11.2% between 1956–1992. In this period the mean annual natural increase was 2.3% in Hungary and 11.2% in Romania proper.
- ⁴ Between 1975–1992 503,553 people emigrated from Romania. Of them 235,744 were German, 171,770 were Romanian, 64,887 were Hungarian, 21,006 were Jewish and 10,146 were people of other nationality (*Anuarul Statistic al României* 1993, 143).
- ⁵ Number of emigrants from Romania: Germans: 1991: 15,567; 1992: 8,852; 1995: 2,906; Hungarians 1991: 7,494; 1992: 3,523; 1995: 3,608. (*Anuarul Statistic al României* 1996, 133). The proportion of Transylvanians among Romanian emigrants dropped between 1992–1994 from 76% to 64.4%.
- ⁶ In September and October 1993 the Central Statistical Office found 480,083 Roma and persons of “transitional” lifestyle in Hungary. Of them 143,000 declared themselves of Roma ethnicity in the census of 1990.
- ⁷ Between 1931 and 1933 an annual natural decrease of 0–3% was recorded in Timiş-Torontal and Caraş counties and a change of 0–3% in Arad and Severin counties, whereas there was a 9–15% natural increase in the northeastern areas (Ciuc, Mureş, Cluj, Someş, Sălaj, Satu Mare, Bistriţa–Nasăud, Maramureş counties), inhabited predominantly by Greek Catholic Romanians and Roman Catholic Hungarians. Already in the 1930s the combined territory of present-day Romanian Banat, Hunedoara and Arad counties, the Serbian Vojvodina, and southern Hungary represented the area of the Carpathian Basin with the lowest natural increase, below 6% annually (Rónai 1945).
- ⁸ Decrease in the number of Romanians in selected southern Transylvanian towns between 1992 and 2002: Uricani –19.4%, Cugir, Făgăraş –17.9%, Oraviţa –15%, Anina –14.8%, Hunedoara –11.7%, Petrosani –11%, Resiţa –10.5%.
- ⁹ Among the people obtaining immigrant status in Hungary in 2001 there were many more from Cluj, Bihor and Mureş counties than one would have expected from the spatial distribution of Transylvanian Hungarians (Gödri 2004). This can be attributed to the high mobility, emigration potential and background of the Hungarians of the large urban centers (Cluj-Napoca, Oradea, Târgu Mureş). According to the migration data between 1992 and 2002 the Hungarians of the Székely Land are underrepresented among the emigrants from Transylvania because of their strong adherence to the homeland.
- ¹⁰ During this period the number of ethnic Hungarians decreased by 8.3% in Hungary and 8.2% in Slovakia.

- ¹¹ It was because of these developments that the communities of Micula, Urziceni, Culciu Mare, Viile Satu Mare and Coșeu in the county Satu Mare and Sălaj regained Hungarian majorities by 2002.
- ¹² It was not until the 1980s that the Romanian party and state leadership was able first to balance and then reverse the profound difference between the extent of “urbanization” of Romanians and Hungarians, i.e., the proportion of urban dwellers in the population (Nyárády 2003).
- ¹³ www.edrc.ro (Ethnocultural Diversity Resource Center, Cluj-Napoca, Romania). Provided that the willingness of the Roma living in Romania and Hungary to declare their ethnicity is similar, their number in Romania might be estimated at 1.8 million. The same assumption concerning the Roma of Slovakia yields an estimated 2.2 million Roma based on the last Slovak and Romanian censuses.

References

- Gödri, Irén: 2004. Ki, mikor és miért lesz bevándorló? In: Kiss, Tamás (Ed.) *Népesedési folyamatok az ezredfordulón Erdélyben* (Kolozsvár, Kriterion, 2004), 126–146.
- Horváth, István: Az erdélyi magyarság vándormozgalmi vesztesége 1987–2001 között. In: Kiss, Tamás. (Ed.) *Népesedési folyamatok az ezredfordulón Erdélyben* (Kolozsvár, Kriterion, 2004), 61–90.
- Kiss, Tamás: Az erdélyi magyar népességet érintő természetes népmozgalmi folyamatok: 1992–2002. In: Kiss Tamás. (Ed.) *Népesedési folyamatok az ezredfordulón Erdélyben* (Kolozsvár, Kriterion, 2004) 9–27.
- Lökkös, János: *Trianon számokban* (Budapest, Püski, 2000), 383.
- Nyárády, R. Károly: *Erdély népesedéstörténete* (Budapest, KSH, 2003), 672.
- Rónai, András: *Atlas of Central Europe* (Budapest–Balatonfüred, Államtudományi Intézet, 1945), 401.
- Schreiber, Wilfried: Demographische Entwicklungen bei den Rumäniendeutschen, *Südosteuropa Mitteilungen* 33/3 (1993), 205.
- Szilágyi, N. Sándor: Az asszimiláció hatása a népesedési folyamatokra. In: Kiss, Tamás (Ed.) *Népesedési folyamatok az ezredfordulón Erdélyben* (Kolozsvár, Kriterion, 2004), 157–234.
- Varga, E. Árpád: *Népszámlálások a jelenkori Erdély területén* (Budapest, Regio – MTA Történettudományi Intézet, 1992), 208.
- Varga, E. Árpád: *Fejezetek a jelenkori Erdély népesedéstörténetéből* (Budapest, Püski, 1998), 388.
- Veres, Valér: A romániai magyarság természetes népmozgalma európai kontextusban, 1992–2002 között. In: Kiss, Tamás. (Ed.) *Népesedési folyamatok az ezredfordulón Erdélyben* (Kolozsvár, Kriterion, 2004), 29–60.