

Framework of Modernization: Government Legislation and Regulations on Schooling in Transylvania 1780–1914

In the middle of the nineteenth century, schooling became the focus of the emerging nationality conflict in Transylvania. Up to the present day, this perspective largely dominates research on the history of schooling in Transylvanian schools. The manifold Romanian literature on this subject reveals a picture of Romanian schools which were barely capable to provide an impoverished nation with at least elementary education, since they had to struggle against government control and the repressive Magyarization policies of the Hungarian government.¹ The literature on German schools of the Transylvanian Saxons shows only a slightly different picture, being somewhat more imbued with pride in a traditional system of elementary and secondary

- 1 I. Lazăr, *Învățămintul românesc din sud-vestul Transilvaniei (1848-1883)* [The Romanian education in south-western Transylvania, 1848-1883] (Cluj-Napoca: Argonaut, 2002); S. Retegan, "Politică și educație la românii din Transilvania în epoca liberalismului austriac (1860-1867)" [Politics and education of the Transylvanian Romanians in the epoch of Austrian liberalism] *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie Cluj-Napoca* 30 (1990/91): 73-88; D. Suci, "Date privind situația politică și confesional-scolară a românilor din Transilvania în prima decadă a dualismului" [Data concerning the political and confessional-educational situation of the Romanians in Transilvania during the first decade of Dualism] *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie Cluj-Napoca* 30 (1990/91): 89-122; L. Maior, "Politica școlară a guvernelor maghiare față de români (1900-1914)" [The school politics of the Hungarian government with regard to the Romanians, 1900-1914] *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie Cluj-Napoca* 30 (1990/91): 123-138; J. M. Bogdan, "Eintritt in die Modernität. Die Rumänen und ihr Schulwesen (Banat, Siebenbürgen, Bukowina, Moldau und Walachei)", in *Revolution des Wissens? Europa und seine Schulen im Zeitalter der Aufklärung (1750-1825). Ein Handbuch zur europäischen Schulgeschichte*, ed. W. Schmale and N. L. Dodge (Bochum: Winkler, 1991), 389-431; S. Mîndruț, "Învățămintul comunal elementar din Transilvania între anii 1867-1918" [Communal elementary education in Transilvania during the years 1867-1918] *Crisia* 19 (1989): 265-187; D. Suci, "Aspecte ale politicii de asuprire națională și de maghiarizare forțată a românilor din Transilvania în timpul dualismului" [Aspects of the politics of national oppression and forced Magyarization of the Romanians of Transilvania in the era of Dualism] *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie și Arheologie Cluj-Napoca* 28 (1987/1988): 289-310; V. Popeangă, *Școala românească din Transilvania în perioada 1867-1918 și lupta sa pentru unire* [The Romanian schools of Transilvania during the period 1867-1918 and their struggle for unification] (București: Editura didactică și pedagogică, 1974). See also M. Păcurariu, *La politique de l'état hongrois à l'égard de l'église roumaine de Transylvanie à l'époque du dualisme austro-hongrois 1867-1918* (București: Editura institutului biblic și de Misiune al bisericii ortodoxe române, 1986); A. Plămădeală, *Lupta împotriva deznaționalizării românilor din Transilvania în timpul dualismului austro-ungar în vremea lui Miron Romanul (1874-1898)* [The struggle of Transylvanian Romanians against denationalization during the Austro-Hungarian Dualism in the times of Miron Roman, 1874-1898] (Sibiu: Tipografia Eparchială, 1986).

schools that dated back to the Middle Ages and the Protestant Reformation and then came under the attack of an increasingly repressive state.² Numerous articles on school and nationality legislation during the Dualist period are highly critical of the way the Hungarian government infringed upon nationality rights and discouraged education in the mother tongue.³ Hungarian nationalism thus seems to have caused a clear breach of policy. It contrasts sharply with the previous approach of the Austrian government, which had established a modern system of state control over a quickly expanding network of elementary and secondary schools and had shown the necessary respect towards various mother languages.⁴

The amount of literature on the other ethnic groups falls behind the bulk of research on government legislation of Romanian and Saxon schools. Studies on the Jewish schools in nineteenth-century Transylvania are scarce.⁵ Information on the Hungarian Catholic, Calvinist, Unitarian, and Armenian schools has to be extracted largely from the histories of the respective confessions.⁶ Finally, astonishingly few attempts have been made at a

- 2 Carl Göllner et al eds. *Die Siebenbürger Sachsen in den Jahren 1848-1918* (Wien, Köln, Weimar: Böhlau, 1988); W. König, "Die Entwicklung des Schulwesens der Siebenbürger Sachsen zwischen 1867 und 1914" *Forschungen zur Volks- und Landeskunde* 27, 1 (1984), 45-55; Otto Folberth, "Die Auswirkungen des Ausgleichs auf Siebenbürgen" *Südostdeutsches Archiv* 11 (1968), 48-70; and most recently: Walter König, *Schola seminarium rei publicae. Aufsätze zu Geschichte und Gegenwart des Schulwesens in Siebenbürgen und Rumänien* (Wien, Köln, Weimar: Böhlau, 2005).
- 3 István Dolmányos, "Kritik der Lex Apponyi (Die Schulgesetze vom Jahre 1907)", in *Die nationale Frage in der österreichisch-ungarischen Monarchie 1900-1918*, ed. Péter Hanák (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1966), 233-304; Zoltán Szász, "Die Ziele und Möglichkeiten der ungarischen Regierungen in der Nationalitätenpolitik im 19. Jahrhundert", in *Gesellschaft, Politik und Verwaltung in der Habsburgermonarchie 1830-1918*, ed. Ferenc Glatz and R. Melville (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1987), 327-341; Béla Bellér, "Die ungarische Nationalitäten-Schulpolitik von der Ratio Educationis bis heute", in *Ethnicity and Society in Hungary. Études Historiques Hongroises 1990*, ed. Glatz, vol. 2 (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1990), 433-454.
- 4 Helmut Engelbrecht, *Geschichte des österreichischen Bildungswesens. Erziehung und Unterricht auf dem Boden Österreichs*, vol. 3 (Vienna: Österreichischer Bundesverlag, 1984); Márton Horváth and Sándor Kőte, eds., *A magyar nevelés története*, vol. 1 (Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó, 1988); Klaus Frommelt, *Die Sprachenfrage im österreichischen Unterrichtswesen 1848-1859* (Graz and Cologne: Böhlau, 1963); Ágnes Deák, "Nemzeti egyenjogúsítás" 1849-1860 [Creating "national equality", 1849-1860] (Budapest: Osiris, 2000), 225-287.
- 5 E. Glück, "Jewish Elementary Education in Transylvania 1848-1918" *Studia Judaica* 2 (1993), 103-113. For the general framework see A. Moskovits, *Jewish Education in Hungary (1848-1948)* (Philadelphia: Bloch Publishing Company, 1964).
- 6 Adam Wandruszka and Peter Urbanitsch eds. *Die Habsburgermonarchie 1848-1918. Band IV: Die Konfessionen*, second edition (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1995); M. Bucsay, *Der Protestantismus in Ungarn 1521-1978. Ungarns Reformationskirchen in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 2 vols. (Wien, Köln, Graz: Böhlau: 1977 and 1979); Kálmán Sebestyén, *Erdély református népoktatása* [Transylvania's Reformed elementary schooling], (Budapest: Püski, 1995); Cf. also György Beke, *Régi erdélyi iskolák. Barangolás térben és időben* [Old Transylvanian schools. Promenade in space and time], (Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó, 1989).

comparative synopsis or at the study of cultural interferences among the different school systems.⁷

Therefore the dominant picture of the history of Transylvanian schooling seems rather blurred, if not somewhat distorted. The main problem lies in the fact that the nationally inspired criticism of government policies takes the dominantly confessional structure of the schooling system in Transylvania more or less for granted and has therefore focused mainly on the language issue. The present paper investigates the development of this structure, which was deeply rooted in traditions of church autonomy and constituted the specific fabric of the Transylvanian school system. This research, based on an editorial project on the legal framework of schooling in nineteenth-century Transylvania, looks at the interplay between government regulation and confessional schooling.⁸ It conceives the relation between government legislation and church regulations as a system of challenge and response. On this basis, I shall argue that by the middle of the nineteenth century different reactions on government regulation had developed into a well-balanced legal framework which was well adapted to the specific conditions of multiethnic Transylvania. It set the necessary incentives for a broad participation of the laity in school affairs and gave an impetus towards the dynamic development of all schools under the specific conditions of the confessionally structured multiethnic fabric of Transylvanian society. Under these conditions, national conflict over the nationalist coloring of government regulation did not hamper efficient schooling, but rather turned into a powerful incentive for the internal development of schooling in Transylvania, which by the beginning of the twentieth century was unparalleled in the region.

The reforms of Joseph II. were the starting-point. In 1781, his *Norma Regia* introduced the basic ideas of reforms, previously enacted in the hereditary lands and in Hungary, into Transylvania. From then on, schooling was defined as a public matter, as the basis of public welfare (*publicae felicitatis fundamentum*), and therefore belonged to the foremost rights and obligations

7 Walter König ed. *Beiträge zur Siebenbürgischen Schulgeschichte* (Cologne, Weimar, Vienna: Böhlau, 1996); Joachim Puttkamer, *Schulalltag und nationale Integration in Ungarn. Slowaken, Rumänen und Siebenbürger Sachsen in der Auseinandersetzung mit der ungarischen Staatsidee 1867-1914* (Munich: R. Oldenbourg, 2003); Michael Kroner, *Der rumänische Sprachunterricht in den siebenbürgisch-sächsischen Schulen vor 1918* (Stuttgart: Institut für Auslandsbeziehungen, 1972); Carl Göllner and A. Pankratz, "Der rumänische Sprachunterricht in den siebenbürgisch-sächsischen Schulen vor 1918", in: Paul Philippi ed. *Beiträge zur Siebenbürgischen Kulturgeschichte* (Cologne, Vienna: Böhlau: 1974), 1-48.

8 For source editions in this field see S. Köte and J. Ravasz eds. *Dokumentumok a magyar nevelés történetéből, 1849-1919*, [Documents from the history of Hungarian education, 1849-1919] (Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó, 1979); Friedrich Teutsch ed. *Die siebenbürgisch-sächsischen Schulordnungen*, 2 vols. (Berlin: Hofmann, 1888 and 1892) (*Monumenta Germaniae Paedagogica*, vols. VI und XIII); Simion Retegan ed. *Satul românesc din Transilvania ctitor de școală (1850-1867)* [The Romanian village in Transylvania, founder of schools, 1850-1867] (Cluj-Napoca: Echinox, 1994); idem ed., *Sate și școli românești din Transilvania la mijlocul secolului al XIX-lea (1867-1875)* [Romanian villages and schools in Transylvania in the middle of the 19th century] (Cluj-Napoca: Dacia, 1994).

of the monarch.⁹ Institutions of public government had a final say in educational matters. This reform was aimed mainly at secondary schools. Their curricula were unified, and they were obliged to put their finances on a solid bureaucratic footing. In addition, elementary schooling became obligatory, including religious education as well as reading, writing, and arithmetic. Every child was to be taught in his mother tongue and, where possible, should learn German. Instruction in Latin was to be confined to schools that prepared for secondary and higher education. All schooling was to be conducted in a spirit of religious tolerance, which had its limits only by the provision that Catholic pupils were forbidden to visit any other than Catholic secondary schools.¹⁰

The *Norma Regia* was modeled on the *Allgemeine Schulordnung* for the Austrian hereditary lands, which had been enacted by Maria Theresa in 1774, and the *Ratio Educationis* for Royal Hungary enacted in 1777. But whereas the *Ratio Educationis* applied only to Catholic schools and left Protestant autonomy untouched, the *Norma Regia* intended to submit Protestant schools to government control as well. It established a common school council to be staffed by members of the different confessions and obliged all schools to the principles of a common curriculum.¹¹ As might be expected, these provisions met with serious resistance by the Protestant churches, mainly the Calvinist and the Lutheran churches.¹² In the end, Protestant autonomy prevailed, and the *Norma Regia* became applicable only to Catholic schools. The Toleration Patent of 1781 had even extended autonomy to the Orthodox Church and their schools as well.¹³ Thus, by the beginning of the nineteenth century, there had developed a complementary system of state-governed Catholic schools on the one hand and various systems of autonomous non-Catholic schools on the other.

Even though the threat posed by the *Norma Regia* to confessional autonomy had been largely averted, its effects were to be felt throughout the first half of the nineteenth century. The reaction of many Hungarian schools towards compulsory German language education, which Joseph II. had introduced in 1784, is well known as well as its strong impact upon the development of Hungarian nationalism.¹⁴ Yet, the national aspects should not be overrated. Curiously enough, it was the German Transylvanian Saxons who were the first to express their fear that the politics of government intervention constituted a

9 *Norma Regia pro scholis Magni Principatus Transilvaniae Iosephi II. Caesar. Aug. Magni Principis Trans. iussu edita* (Sibiu: Martin Hochmeister, 1781), 9.

10 *I.d.*, 22.

11 *I.d.*, 11-12 and 43-73.

12 Kelemen Gál, *A kolozsvári unitárius kollégium története* [The history of the Unitarian college at Cluj] (Budapest: Minerva Irodalmi és Nyomdai Műintézet Rt. nyomása, 1935), vol. 1, 313-318; Heinz Brandsch, *Geschichte der siebenbürgisch-sächsischen Volksschule* (Schäßburg: Verlag der Markusdruckerei, 1926), 58-59.

13 Elemér Mályusz, *Iratok a türelmi rendelet történetéhez* [Documents on the history of the Toleration Patent], (Budapest: Magyar Protestáns Irodalmi Társaság, 1940), 285-290.

14 Moritz Csáky, *Von der Aufklärung zum Liberalismus. Studien zum Frühliberalismus in Ungarn* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1981).

threat to their group identity.¹⁵ Rather than language issues, it was the potential infringement on church autonomy which most worried the Protestant clergy and laity. The Saxon Lutheran Church reacted quickly by establishing elaborate regulations of their own for the Lutheran schools and thus laid the basis for the improvement of elementary education. A comprehensive plan for the far-reaching reorganization of the Transylvanian Saxon secondary schools formulated in 1823 remained a dead letter, but strongly influenced pedagogic thinking for the following decades.¹⁶

The Saxons were not the only ones to realize that a well-developed school system was in the best interest of their flock. But contrary to the Lutheran Church of the Transylvanian Saxons, the other confessions understood government activity in the field of education to be not so much a threat but an incentive to push for the establishment of extensive elementary and secondary schooling. Inspired by the enlightenment, public education now came to be seen as a major task. Throughout the first half of the nineteenth century, Unitarian and Calvinist and even more so the Orthodox and Uniate schools were similarly concerned with the wearing task to guarantee elementary schooling in every single village and to establish a system of more or less clear-cut responsibilities for regular schooling within their clerical hierarchies. The Calvinist Church already in 1786 introduced a school inspectorate for her elementary schools.¹⁷ Calvinist Church authorities regularly reminded all parents of their obligation to send their children to school, as well as the priests to care for regular elementary schooling.¹⁸ In 1817 and 1821, the Unitarian schools passed a similar set of regulations on elementary education.¹⁹

A resolution of the Uniate Synod of 1833 was typical in demanding that every parish without a regular teacher should engage a suitable person to teach the children in religious matters as well as reading and arithmetic, if necessary in his own house.²⁰ Under these circumstances, the Uniate and Orthodox churches strongly appreciated the financial and organizational support offered by the government to develop the Romanian schools. The upsurge of schooling activities also led to the foundation of numerous new gymnasia, among which the Armenian *Gymnasium Raphaelinum* in Erzsebetváros/Dumbrăveni, opened in 1843, the Catholic Gymnasium and the Orthodox Șaguna lyceum in Brassó/Brașov, opened in 1837 and 1850 respectively, the Calvinist gymnasium in

15 E. Josupeit-Neitzel, *Die Reformen Josephs II. in Siebenbürgen* (München: Trofenik, 1986); A. Schaser, *Josephinische Reformen und sozialer Wandel in Siebenbürgen. Die Bedeutung der Konzivilitätsreskripts für Hermannstadt*, (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1989).

16 Brandsch, *Geschichte der siebenbürgisch-sächsischen Volksschule*, 67-72, 77-87; Ulrich A. Wien and Karl W. Schwarz eds. *Die Kirchenordnungen der evangelischen Kirche A. B. in Siebenbürgen (1807-1997)* (Cologne, Weimar, Vienna: Böhlau, 2005), 61-70.

17 Kálmán Sebestyén, *Erdély református népoktatása*, 46-48.

18 I.d., 37.

19 Gál, *A kolozsvári unitárius kollégium története*, 554-555.

20 I. M. Moldovanu, *Acte sinodale ale biserecei romane de Alb'a Julia si Fagarasiu* [Synodal resolutions of the Romanian Church of Alba Iulia and Făgăraș], vol. 2, (Blaj: Tiparia arhidieceșana, 1872), 63-68.

Sepsiszentgyörgy/Sfântu Gheorghe, opened in 1859, the Lutheran gymnasium in Szászrégen/Reghin, opened in 1861, and the Romanian frontiersmen's Uniate lyceum at Naszód/Năsăud, opened in 1863, were the most prominent. Only then, the development of schools came to be seen not just as a means of offering education to their flock, but also as an essential way to preserve one's cultural identity in a changing world.

Thus, by the middle of the century, the Transylvanian churches had in various ways taken up the challenge of government regulation and had discovered the dynamic development of schooling as a means to conform to government expectations, make use of the help which was offered and to forestall further intervention which might endanger church autonomy. This pattern was to prevail until the end of the Monarchy.

The twofold system of Catholic schools governed by the state, and non-Catholic schools that were trying to keep up the pace, underwent fundamental changes. In the wake of the Revolution of 1848/49, the so-called *Organisationsentwurf* reorganized secondary schooling along lines which became obligatory to all institutions of higher education, regardless of their confessional denomination.²¹ It provided the Habsburg monarchy with the most advanced and modern system of secondary education in Europe at the time. Under neoabsolutism, comprehensive government regulation thus came to be appreciated even more strongly as a general framework and an incentive for the development of the educational system within a unified, binding, and peremptory structure. A considerable number of the newly established secondary schools mentioned above can be seen as a direct result of the *Organisationsentwurf*.

A further, even more far-reaching measure was taken by József Eötvös after the Austro-Hungarian compromise in 1867. Based on his theoretical reflections on the nationality problem in Hungary, Eötvös dismissed the notion of confessional education as being an involuntary, but necessary concession to the autonomy of the churches. He recognized rather that the system of church schools under government regulation, as it had emerged during the previous decades, could be productively developed into a legal framework, which was not only suitable to a multiconfessional and multiethnic society, but also guaranteed broad participation of the laity in local and regional school affairs. Local schools were to become not just a government issue, but a public responsibility. Consequently, in the Nationality Law (Art. 38) and the School Act (Art. 44) of 1868, Eötvös deliberately gave large weight to confessional schools. The law provided for communal and state schools only as supplementary forms in those regions where the churches proved unable to support sufficient institutions of elementary education. Following the general ideas of the *Organisationsentwurf*, elementary schools became subject to regulations which precisely spelled out the framework of modern elementary education. By assigning the main responsibility for the schooling to the different churches, Eötvös hoped to divert and confine nationality problem to

21 *Entwurf der Organisation der Gymnasien und Realschulen in Österreich* (Vienna: Ministerium für Kultus und Unterricht, 1849). See also Engelbrecht, *Geschichte des österreichischen Bildungswesens*, 147-152.

the sphere of culture and education and thus to find an outlet, if not a compensation, for the political restrictions following from the idea of the one and indivisible Hungarian political nation.²²

Even though Eötvös himself was a Catholic, his legislation was based on the premise of churches organized along the Protestant model. Therefore, it is not surprising that the Protestant churches did not have to go far in order to adapt to the new situation. The Transylvanian Calvinist Church had gradually reorganized lay participation along synodal lines between 1861 and 1872.²³ Its statutes partly served as model for the later comprehensive reorganization of the united Hungarian Calvinist Church in 1881.²⁴ The Unitarian Church could also leave its constitution of 1851 basically unchanged.²⁵ The Lutheran Church of the Transylvanian Saxons, which had just previously received a new constitution, in 1870 passed a new *Schulordnung* which in terms of compulsory school attendance and curricula not only conformed to government legislation, but even surpassed it in many fields.²⁶

The non-Protestant churches were faced with the necessity of undergoing more comprehensive reforms. Headed by the far-sighted Metropolitan Andreiu Şaguna, the Orthodox Church already in 1868 adopted a new constitution, the *Statutul Organic*, which incorporated many elements of the Protestant consistorial model into Orthodox Church law and provided for the participation of the laity as well as a well-structured system of school authorities.²⁷ The reorganization of Jewish schooling turned out to be more problematic. The whole idea of a hierarchically structured church being alien to Judaism, the idea of structured autonomy along protestant lines, as it was put forth at the

22 Paul Bödy, *Joseph Eötvös and the Modernization of Hungary, 1840-1870. A Study of Ideas of Individuality and Social Pluralism in Modern Politics*, 2nd ed. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985); Johann Weber, *Eötvös und die ungarische Nationalitätenfrage* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1966); Puttkamer, *Schulalltag und nationale Integration in Ungarn*, 75-99.

23 Mihály Zsilinszky, *A magyarhoni protestáns egyház története* [History of the Hungarian Protestant church] (Budapest: Athenaeum, 1907), 761.

24 S. Dárday, ed., *Közigazgatási törvénytár a fennálló törvények, rendeletek és döntvényekből rendszeresen összeállította Dárday Sándor* [Collection of administrative laws, compiled from laws, decrees and decisions by Sándor Dárday], vol. 3, 3rd ed. (Budapest: Athenaeum, 1903), 182-263.

25 Dárday ed. *Közigazgatási törvénytár*, 376-384.

26 "Schulordnung für den Volksunterricht im Umfange der evangelischen Landeskirche A. B. in Siebenbürgen" in *Verfassung der evangelischen Landeskirche Augsburger Bekenntnisses in Siebenbürgen* (Hermannstadt: Drotleff, 1871), 18-31.

27 *Protocolul congresului nationalu Bisericescu Romanu de Religiunea greco-resariteana, conchiamatu in Sabiu pe 16./28. Septembrie 1868, tiparitu din partea Presidiului* [Records of the National Congress of the Romanian Greek-Orthodox Church, convened at Sibiu 16./28. September 1868, printed on behalf of the President] (Sibiu: Tipografia archidiecesana, 1868), 234-284; Keith Hitchins, *Orthodoxy and Nationality. Andreiu Şaguna and the Rumanians of Transylvania, 1846-1873* (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1977); Johann Schneider, *Der Hermannstädter Metropolit Andrei von Şaguna. Reform und Erneuerung der orthodoxen Kirche in Siebenbürgen und Ungarn nach 1848* (Cologne, Weimar, Vienna: Böhlau 2005).

Jewish congress in 1868, was almost bound to fail.²⁸ Only liberal Jewish schools were governed along the lines of the regulations that had been passed by the Congress of 1868, whereas orthodox Jewish schools became subject to a special government decree passed in 1871.²⁹ The reorganization of Catholic schooling turned out to be even more troublesome. The idea of Catholic autonomy, as it was put forth by Eötvös, which would provide for responsible participation of the laity in church and school affairs, smacked too much of Protestantism. Whereas several approaches to Catholic autonomy failed in Hungary proper, Transylvanian Catholics could build on a specific tradition of lay participation dating back to the time of the principality during the seventeenth century.³⁰ By reviving the so-called *Status Catholicus*, the Catholic Church implemented a structure which secured comprehensive participation of the laity in administering the finances and the schools of the Catholic Church.³¹ In the long run, only the Uniates remained aloof from the system as Eötvös had conceived it and consigned lay participation in church and school affairs to the local parishes.³²

Thus, in contrast to developments in Hungary, the situation in Transylvania came very close to what József Eötvös had conceived. This result was due not just to the deeply ingrained traditions of confessional autonomy in Transylvania, in which Catholics also took part. One further reason is of course that religious and ethnic affiliation coincided much more closely in Transylvania than in the rest of Hungary. Even though not all Uniates were Romanian and not all Lutherans were German, it is rather easy to designate national Romanian, Hungarian, and Saxon churches in Transylvania. As a result, there was a tendency in Transylvania during the Dualist era towards the development of separate Hungarian, Romanian and Saxon ethnic school systems, which were fairly consolidated. Almost all public efforts to develop the schools in Transylvania, local initiatives even more so than government activity, were directed towards the consolidation of this ethnic structure. Whereas the government established state schools in the towns with the declared intent to secure support for the Hungarian idea of the nation, government activity in the countryside as well as the activity of the *EMKE* (Transylvanian Association for the Popularization of Hungarian Culture) by necessity concentrated on securing the ethnic identity of the Magyar and Szekler peasant population

28 Nathaniel Katzburg, "The Jewish Congress of Hungary 1868-1869", in *Hungarian-Jewish Studies*, ed. Randolph L. Braham, vol. 2 (New York: World Federation of Hungarian Jews, 1969), 1-33; Thomas Domján, "Der Kongreß der ungarischen Israeliten 1868-1869", *Ungarn-Jahrbuch* 1 (1969), 139-162.

29 *Közigazgatási törvénytár*, 385-397; *Magyarországi Rendeletek Tára* [Archive of Hungarian decrees] (1871), 436-446.

30 Joachim Bahlcke, "Status catholicus und Kirchenpolitik in Siebenbürgen. Entwicklungsphasen des römisch-katholischen Klerus zwischen Reformation und Josephinismus", in Wien eds. *Siebenbürgen in der Habsburgermonarchie. Vom Leopoldinum bis zum Ausgleich (1690-1867)* ed. Zsolt K. Lengyel and Ulrich A. Wien (Cologne, Weimar, Vienna: Böhlau, 1999), 151-180.

31 Edit Szegedi, "Die Katholische Autonomie in Siebenbürgen", *Zeitschrift für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde* 27 (2004), 130-142.

32 *Archiv für katholisches Kirchenrecht mit besonderer Rücksicht auf Deutschland, Oesterreich und die Schweiz*, 56 (New Series 50) (1886), 31-38.

which was thought to be threatened by assimilation via the Romanian majority.³³ In addition, there was a high amount of competition among schools of different types which forced the government to comply with the demand for schooling in the native language.³⁴ This tendency towards ethnically consolidated schools markedly distinguishes Transylvania from the development in other ethnically mixed regions of Hungary proper where the tendency to merge the different schools into a comprehensive system of Hungarian schooling in Hungarian was predominant.

The nationality conflict and growing involvement of the state in school affairs came to threaten this balanced system in Transylvania. Driven by national considerations, Calvinist and Unitarian parishes tended to hand over their schools to the state or the local community. Between 1867 and 1918, more than two thirds of the Calvinist elementary schools and a considerable number of Unitarian schools thus changed their character.³⁵ As the nationality conflict intensified, government circles came to see the failures of Romanian village schools to provide proper Hungarian language education more and more as a political disobedience, protected by the autonomy of the Orthodox Church. Subsidies to teacher salaries thus turned into an instrument, by means of which the government tried to find a lever to discipline teachers and churches which were considered to be politically unreliable. This logic which was also underlying the disputed Lex Apponyi of 1907, was countered by both Romanian churches as well as by the Lutheran Church of the Transylvanian Saxons by intensified financial investments in order to safeguard their organizational autonomy in school affairs. Yet, by 1914 the well-balanced system of confessional schools acting freely within the framework of government standards had come to sway.

33 Puttkamer, *Schulalltag und nationale Integration in Ungarn*, 207-209.

34 I.d., 222-229, 240-251; Joachim Puttkamer, "Mehrsprachigkeit und Sprachenzwang in Oberungarn und Siebenbürgen 1867-1914. Eine statistische Untersuchung", *Zeitschrift für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde* 26 (2003), 7-40.

35 Sándor Bíró, Mihály Bucsay, Endre Tóth, and Zoltán Varga, *A magyar református egyház története* [History of the Hungarian Reformed Church] (Budapest: Kossuth Könyvkiadó, 1949), 375-376.

The Lutheran Clergy in Transylvania during the *Vormärz*: A New Saxon Intellectual Elite

In March 1819 the notorious playwright August von Kotzebue was murdered in Mannheim by a theology student advocating German nationalism.¹ Austrian officials regarded the assassination as an outcome of the intellectual turbulence characteristic of German revolutionary youth. This historical moment resulted in a strict ban imposed on the access of students also from Transylvania to all German universities until 1830, which, in turn, complicated the severe surveillance measures undertaken by Klemens von Metternich within the borders of the Monarchy. Unhindered attendance of Transylvanians at German universities was only reestablished after 1848. In 1821, the Habsburg authorities decided to build a Protestant theological training institution (*Lehranstalt*) in Vienna in order to compensate for this interdiction.² Its main aim was to “undercut the study at foreign universities.”³ The outstanding implications of this political evolution cannot be ignored for the Saxons in Transylvania. On the one hand, the age-long link between Transylvanian students and the German Protestant academic world underwent a process of decadence. On the other hand, it gave rise to the first generation of Transylvanian Lutheran clergy with university degrees in theology at a Viennese institution. As to the strength of specific curricular characteristics, this generation may be divided into three distinct historical clusters, namely: 1821–1830, 1830–1840, and 1840–1848. I will call these theologians collectively the “*Vormärz* generation.” Their curriculum was shaped by higher standards of education as a condition of access to clerical office according to a specific “Habsburg pattern”, albeit culturally it continued to be oriented towards the German model, as it will be further argued.

Thus, my paper addresses the formation of the Saxon Lutheran clergy in Transylvania during the *Vormärz* or the Reform Era (1830–1848) – as it is customarily referred to in Central European historiography. The era represented a period of major reforms and changes encompassing a large sector of the

1 For a further investigation on this issue, see George S. Williamson, “What killed August von Kotzebue? The temptations of virtue and the political theology of German nationalism”, *The Journal of Modern History* 72 (December 2000): 890–943.

2 Regarding the state policy towards the Protestant University and the idea of its foundation on a historical perspective, see Gáspár Klein, *Az állami protestáns egyetem eszméje a Habsburgok alatt a XVIII–XIX. században. Művelődéstörténeti forrástanulmány*. [The idea of the protestant state university under the Habsburgs in the eighteenth-nineteenth centuries] (Debrecen: az Országos Református Lelkész-Egyesület, 1930).

3 Herbert Rampler, *Evangelische Pfarrer und Pfarrerrinnen der Steiermark seit dem Toleranzpatent* (Graz: Historische Landeskommision für Steiermark, 1998), 342.

public sphere, politics, economy, society, and culture. My aim here is to display the dynamics of change which the curriculum of Saxon theologians underwent during this period. To this end, I first discuss how important university attendance remained for Lutheran ministers in Transylvania. In this sense, I mainly refer to the prevailing spirit of reform in this era and stress the distinction between academic and non-academic candidates to the ministry. My assumption in this respect is that due to the ecclesiastic authority's endeavors, the ministry was meant to represent the privilege reserved for highly trained theologians. Starting in 1837, theologians were expected to fulfill a new norm consisting of a fixed period of university attendance. Thus, theoretically, academic performance became the main criterion of eligibility for obtaining a parish. Nevertheless the clerical office did not constitute a wholly independent profession, and in Transylvania it was closely related to a teaching position.

Second, I present what characterized the *Vormärz* generation in terms of university trends and examine to what extent it underwent a process of change. An empirical study of study stracks of theology students allows the reassessment of the theory of pro-German orientation, which Transylvanian Saxons allegedly demonstrated during the *Vormärz* era. In this sense, I briefly consider the Transylvanian (Saxon) tradition of attending German universities after the Reformation. This highlights the identity dimension of this phenomenon during the entire (early) modern era. Subsequently, I analyze the individual and collective response of the Transylvanian Saxons to the Viennese policy. To this end, I briefly refer to the attitude of the Lutheran Consistory, and I focus on the attendance at the Faculties of Protestant Theology at Vienna and other German universities. In this respect, I argue that the Lutheran Church had a moderate position, however, it succeeded in obtaining some freedom for attending the German universities. By contrast, individual cases show the dynamics of development as connected to the characteristics of their education. The testimony of Georg Daniel Teutsch, the future Lutheran Bishop in Transylvania, is very expressive in this sense. I am inclined to believe that his remarks concerning the University of Vienna, represented the general attitude shared by most Saxons. Finally, resorting to statistical evidence, I underline the level of education among theologians and the extent to which they complied with the Consistory norms. Thus, I hope to sketch out the manner in which the transformation of the new clergy occurred.

A New Clergy between Tradition and Innovation: The Legislative Frame and the Selection of Aspirants

During the early period of the Reformation and even subsequently, the academic requirements for aspiring clergy in the Transylvanian Lutheran Church were only vaguely defined. According to the Synod held in 1563 in Mediasch/Mediaș, in order to be eligible for the clerical office – concerning the academic requirements – it was enough to be *mediocriter eruditi* (von

hinreichender Bildung).⁴ During the early modern era, although *peregrinatio academica* was wide spread among theologians, there were no strict norms concerning the attendance of universities and the duration of studies. In most cases, after a short university attendance, the students returned to Transylvania and practiced as teachers. Only later were they expected to become ministers. For this reason, the clerical office was to a large degree tied up with the teaching profession, and therefore, the academic expectations for (gymnasium) teachers were in fact valid for priests as well.

The intellectual quality of the teachers and respectively, preachers and ministers, represented an outstanding issue during the Reform Era in Transylvania. Friedrich Teutsch (son of the previously mentioned Georg Daniel Teutsch) pointed out that insufficiently mature students were sent to universities from some gymnasiums, although most of the active urban clerics and preachers attended a university by that time.⁵ Concerning the lower clergy, Christian Heyser mentioned the inadequate education of many preachers in the countryside: "Doch sind leider viele von ihnen zu ihrem Stande nicht gehörig vorbereitet [...] Dagegen gibt es auch manche, die sich durch ihr Wissen und Betragen kaum von den bessern Bauern unterscheiden."⁶ Certainly, these problems raised the attention of church authorities, who during the *Vormärz* developed a program meant to reform education and to implement higher academic standards for the entire clergy. The Upper Consistory even considered building a central institution over the gymnasiums, whose target was to prepare students for university. Due to "political, intellectual, moral and economic reasons", the project was rejected.⁷ The innovation consisted in the gymnasia reform, carried out during 1823 and 1835. Nonetheless, concerning its implementation, Friedrich Teutsch refers to the lack of unity and uniformity when comparing different institutions.⁸ Ultimately, in 1837 an improved norm was released for aspiring ministers. The new school plan aimed at creating a gymnasium which would also serve both for the training of incumbents of the lower positions in the church and for the formation of learned ecclesiastics. Seminary classes had been established since 1788. They functioned in the frame of the gymnasium, and besides normal curricula, students were trained for teaching professions (four hours per week).⁹ According to the new school plan, the education of the lower clergy had to be accomplished in the framework of a seminary for schoolteachers (*Schullehrer-Seminarium*). Initially, it was planned as part of the gymnasium, but after the 1834 protocol it was decided that it would be separated from the gymnasium.

4 Georg Daniel Teutsch, *Zur Geschichte der Pfarrerswahlen in der evangelischen Landeskirche in Siebenbürgen*, (Hermannstadt: Druck und Verlag vn Theodor Steinhaußen), 7.

5 Friedrich Teutsch, *Geschichte der Siebenbürger Sachsen für das sächsische Volk*, Band III (Hermannstadt: Krafft, 1910), 164.

6 Christian Heyser, *Die Kirchen-Verfassung der A.C. Verwandten in Großfürstertum Siebenbürgen* (Wien: Gedruckt bei Leopold Grund, 1836), 108.

7 Friedrich Teutsch, *Geschichte der Siebenbürger Sachsen*, 164.

8 I.d., 163.

9 Ernest Wagner, *Pfarrer und Lehrer der evangelischen Kirche A.B. in Siebenbürgen*, Band I (Köln; Weimar; Wien: Böhlau Verlag, 1998), 11.

According to the school plan, only those who did not pursue the “formation to highest learning” could study at this seminary.¹⁰ Its aim was to train students in pedagogy and rhetoric (science of preaching) for their future profession. Praxis was part of the program as well.¹¹ The duration of study at the seminary was eventually fixed to four years. Moreover, it was stipulated that no candidate for the position of a village preacher or teacher in *Trivialschulen* should be permitted to leave the gymnasium without having completed his studies. For employment, only the most capable were to be considered (*geschicktern*) in accordance with the consistorial norm.¹² Nevertheless, a seminary completely separated from the gymnasium only began in 1878, and centralization was completed only in 1895/96.¹³

The academic expectations were different concerning the higher positions in the church, such as parish ministers. Thus, the selection of the aspirants for the ministry during the *Vormärz* was accomplished in accordance with the 1803 *Regulation Reskript*, which was reinforced and significantly modified in 1837 with regard to the training requirements. According to the *Reskript*, all candidates had a “rank” which not only constituted a decisive factor in obtaining a ministry, but, in practice, also established the scale of preferences following the importance of the parish. Advantage was given to members of the capital city, ranked first, followed by the academic candidates teaching in a gymnasium or in the service of the town churches, and, lastly, by those academic and non-academic men who taught in “grammar schools.” In 1843, one proposed to modify this criterion by situating the first two categories on the same value scale. This was approved through government decision in December of the same year.¹⁴

The rank of the academic candidates for theology who entered in the service of the gymnasiums was established by the Consistory after graduation from gymnasium, in accordance with the “rigorous consistorial examination.” In its course, a proposal of the school board had to be presented, which the Consistory examined *pro danda informatione*, assisted by the rector. On this account, candidates received their respective rank, which would allow them to take up a first position in a town school and a preacher’s office. After university attendance, the Domestic Consistory had the right to change the rank in accordance with developments observed during their studies. A new norm of high significance was the stipulation that candidates were to be reviewed for graduation after three years of study completed in Vienna (or two years at another foreign, in this case, German, university).¹⁵ Moreover, the

10 Friedrich Teutsch, *Die siebenbürgisch-sächsische Schulordnungen* II, 287, 288

11 I.d., 270.

12 I.d., 288.

13 Ernest Wagner, *Pfarrer und Lehrer*, 13.

14 “Bei Candidationen soll Rücksicht genommen werden auf die Capitularen sowohl, als auf die bei den Gymnasien und städtischen Kirchen angestellten Candidaten.” *Handbuch*, 179.

15 “[...] so wie nach den von jedem Candidaten nach seiner Rückkehr über den richtig vollendeten dreijährigen Studien- Curs an der Wiener-Fakultät, oder aber den fleißigen zweijährigen Besuch einer auswärtigen Hochschule, vorzulegende Zeugnisse.” *Handbuch*, 159.

candidates were examined by the Upper Consistory, but according to the 1818 imperial decree, poor academic candidates were allowed to take the second consistory exam in front of the Domestic Consistory. Another mention of the same norm stated that longer stays at universities for advanced scholarly training must not diminish the rank of candidates when entering office.¹⁶

With regard to grammar schools, in cases when an academic candidate was competing with a non-academic one “under the same circumstances”, the rule was to place academics in an advantageous position. In the districts, with fewer gymnasiums or grammar schools, the candidates had to be selected from the capital city and from adjacent districts. Only “competent candidates” were to be considered. For the best parishes, besides the competent capitulars, one had to promote academic men of merit. By contrast, in minor parishes, in the absence of competent academic candidates, village preachers also could be accepted. Nonetheless, they were expected to have graduated from the seminary for teachers. After graduation they had to pass the *Maturitätsprüfung* for village teachers and only the most talented of them would be taken into consideration. However, the prerequisite for their entrance consisted obviously in competence, office diligence, and good moral record. Students from gymnasiums could be considered for clerical office only if as teachers in lower classes they had obtained the recommendation of their superiors.¹⁷

These norms were meant to bring about higher academic standards. Nonetheless, due to a specific professional curriculum, the candidates did not study theology alone, but were required to study other disciplines as well, as they were first expected to become teachers, and only later ministers. For this reason, university attendance represented for most of them a training pursuit for a teaching chair, and less for a clerical office. This practice encountered severe difficulties when candidates were no longer allowed to attend German universities.

New Faculty, New Identities

German universities developed a special function as regards the formation of collective identity for Saxon Lutherans in Transylvania after the Reformation. Friedrich Teutsch briefly described them as the “source of the new spirit and new life.”¹⁸ Indeed, during the entire modern era, the cultural and spiritual role played by German Protestant universities for generations of Saxon pastors was enormous. Ernst Wagner estimated that out of all Lutheran pastors, during the 16th century alone, 98.9 % of Saxons were registered at a Lutheran gymnasium or a German Protestant university.¹⁹ Moreover, during the 16th and 17th centuries, half of the Transylvanian students stemmed from the five most

¹⁶ *Handbuch*, 159.

¹⁷ *Handbuch*, 159.

¹⁸ Friedrich Teutsch, “Die Sachsen und die deutschen Universitäten”, in *Bilder aus der Kulturgeschichte der Siebenbürger Sachsen*, vol. I, (Hermannstadt, 1928), 246.

¹⁹ Ernest Wagner, *Pfarrer und Lehrer*, 38. Concerning the later period see also the data published by Miklós Szabó and László Szógi, *Erdélyi peregrinusok* [Transylvanian peregrini] (Marosvásárhely: Mentor Kiadó, 1998).

important Saxon towns. These quantities should not represent any surprise since the German Lutherans (in comparison with the other Transylvanian ethnic groups) were wealthier, and very often the family of wandering students could support the costs of the studies. Furthermore, they could receive stipends at German universities, and during the 18th and 19th centuries, universities such as Tübingen, Heidelberg, Jena, Halle, and Göttingen offered a “free table arrangement for needy students.”²⁰

At the beginning, the most often frequented universities were Wittenberg, Königsberg, Thorn, Danzig, and Elbing. Afterwards, during the 18th century, Halle, the center of Pietism, played a fundamental role. Other German universities preferentially attended by Saxon Transylvanians during the 18th century were Wittenberg, Jena, and Tübingen. By the beginning of the 19th century and until 1819, Transylvanian students were also present in high numbers at universities such as Nürnberg, Frankfurt an der Oder, Göttingen, Heidelberg, and Tübingen. Stephan Ludwig Roth, the symbol of the Saxon revolution in Transylvania, also studied at the latter university. In fact, he belonged to the “traditional” Transylvanian Saxon students’ generation, formed in a totally different context from the subsequent one, the *Vormärz* generation.

The university formation of the *Vormärz* generation is analyzed here on the basis of the assumption that Lutheranism secured the main cultural and confessional liaison between the Transylvanian Saxons and the German universities. Robert Evans considers that the Lutheran confession contributed further to the sense of distance established between Saxons and Austria.²¹ This confirms the statement by the interwar historian Gyula Szekfű, who maintained that the Saxon leading elite detached itself from Hungary and Austria in order to join the German intellectual realm: “L’unique exception fut les Saxons de la Transylvanie. Leurs couches dirigeantes se joignirent aux intellectuels allemands. Ils se sont détachés de l’esprit hongrois et viennois pour rejoindre l’Allemagne.”²² Resorting to Robert Evans’ and Gyula Szekfű’s statements, I argue that the *Vormärz* generation, despite their studies in Vienna, continued to be of pro-German orientation. I mainly sustain my thesis on two arguments. First, the Lutheran authorities, although acting moderately, strove to obtain free attendance in German universities. Second, following the permission to attend German universities, the number of students at the faculty of Vienna constantly decreased and some of the students concerned actually succeeded in circumventing the Habsburg capital to study at German universities. It is also noticeable that many students stayed at the Vienna theological faculty (*Lehranstalt*) only a few months or even less.

20 Miklós Szabó and László Szögi, “Az erdélyiek külföldi egyetemjárása a XVIII. században és a XIX. század első felében” [The academic peregrination of Transylvanians in the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth century] in: *Emlékönyv Jakó Zsigmond születésének nyolcvanadik évfordulójára* [Festschrift for the eightieth anniversary of the birth of Zsigmond Jakó] (Kolozsvár: Az Erdély Múzeum Egyesület, 1996), 472.

21 Robert J. W. Evans, “Religion und Nation in Ungarn 1790–1849”, in *Siebenbürgen in der Habsburgermonarchie, von Leopoldinum bis zum Ausgleich*, ed. Ulrich A. Wien and Zsolt Lengyel (Köln; Weimar; Wien: Böhlau Verlag, 1999), 13–45, 25.

22 Gyula Szekfű, *État et nation* (Paris, 1945), 295.

Undoubtedly, the assassination of Kotzebue brought about a new course in the formation of the Lutheran clergy in Transylvania. The Viennese policy concerning the total ban of German universities scored a notable success. Between 1819 and 1830, no Saxon man was allowed to pursue his studies at German Protestant universities. Thus the Protestant Theology in Vienna of 1821 remained the only alternative. The high number of theology students in Vienna during its first decade may suggest that the state policy succeeded in dismantling the traditional linkage between German universities and Transylvanian Saxons. Nevertheless, it raises the question to what extent did Saxon theologians comply with the new situation. What was the reaction of both the ecclesiastic authorities and the students? The post-1830 evolution demonstrates that although Vienna represented a favorable training environment for many Saxons, it did not have the same importance as German Protestant universities.

Certainly, the Viennese policy affected to a great extent all Protestants in Transylvania. The Calvinist Consistory manifested in a submission to the Gubernium in 1837 its indignation against the university ban: "Es ist eine Sünde, wen immer in seinem heiligen Streben nach Ausbildung zu hindern."²³ The Lutheran Consistory pointed to the old 17th century approbates concerning study abroad. According to these, free allowance to study abroad was guaranteed by law: "All free commerce [...] including studies, service, dwelling, undertaking peregrination are not interdicted [...] nevertheless, they ought to show *salvus conductus*."²⁴ As a consequence of these undertakings, in 1841 the universities of Greisswald, Leipzig, Halle, Göttingen, Erlangen,

Marburg, Frankfurt, Memmingen, as well as the Dutch universities (frequented the most by Hungarian Calvinists) opened up to Protestants for study. In addition, after the request of the Transylvanian Estates in 1842, the University of Tübingen joined the list of open universities in 1844.²⁵

Vienna did not actually exert much attraction for Saxon students of theology, but on the contrary, it was rejected. Besides traditional Protestant reservations, a plausible reason for the "ideological rejection" might have been the "quality" or the "prestige" of Viennese theology, which, in turn, also had repercussions on the formation of Saxon theologians. Contemporaries perceived it as an inadequate match to German imperial universities and there was much criticism addressed both to the teaching staff and the educational plan. The poet Tobias Gottfried Schröer, in a letter to Count Széchenyi, expressed his reservations about the teaching staff: "Es seien Männer, die wohl als fleißige Lehrer für Lateinische Schulen in Ungarn paßten, aber einer neu errichteten Anstalt, die die Hochschulen Deutschlands ersetzen sollte, Leben und Schwung zu geben, reichen ihre beschränckten Kräfte nicht zu."²⁶

23 Richard Schuller, *Der siebenbürgisch-sächsische Pfarrer. Eine Kulturgeschichte* (Schäßburg, 1930), 40.

24 *Handbuch*, 201.

25 Richard Schuller, *Der siebenbürgisch-sächsische Pfarrer*, 40.

26 Karl Schwarz, "Eine Fakultät für den Südosten"; "Die Evangelisch-theologische Fakultät in Wien und der 'außendeutsche Protestantismus.'" *Südostdeutsches Archiv*, XXXVI–XXXVII, (1993–1994), 84–120, 85, 86.

In fact, due to the specific professional curriculum, the Viennese faculty was perceived as not offering appropriate training for the teachers. Christian Heyser, in his book describing the constitution of the Lutheran Church in Transylvania, acknowledged that the Viennese theological institute formed “brave and competent” people. However, the tendency among students to study in Germany was justified by Heyser through the specific Saxon professional curriculum; Vienna could not prepare them as future gymnasium teachers.²⁷ This was in fact the main argument of Georg Daniel Teutsch as well.

Thus Teutsch was among those expressing discontent with the Viennese theology. As a student at the Protestant faculty in Vienna, he considered that except for Professor Wenrich (a Saxon stemming from his native town, Schässburg, and a reputed Orientalist) there was nothing proper in that faculty. He believed that the educational plan was not suitable for his future formation as a gymnasium teacher. He manifested his sentiments of regret for being in Vienna quite explicitly, describing his sojourn there as a total waste of time and money:

*Was unsere Vorlesungen betrifft, so sind dieselben unter aller Kritik und gar nicht geeignet, uns für unseren künftigen Stand, d. h. zu Gymnasiallehrer, zu bilden. Hätte ich diesen Stand der Dinge drunten so gewußt, wie ich jetzt weiß, ich wäre nie nach Wien gekommen, da man hier nur Zeit und Geld verschwendet. [...] Wenn ich zurück denke auf die unaussprechliche Armseligkeit unserer Anstalt, wenn ich erwäge, daß ich die schönsten Jahre meines Lebens fast nutzlos zubringen soll, da dünkt mir kein Opfer zu groß, da bin ich fest entschlossen, Wien zu verlassen.*²⁸

In contrast to Vienna, when Georg Daniel Teutsch later arrived in Berlin, he labeled it as the “*Musenstadt*”, a target of his “hopes and wishes.”²⁹ Undoubtedly, if we consider only his particular case, and by comparing the academic facilities of the two universities, differences in the “educational curriculum” are likely the main reason for the rejection of the Viennese study track. In Vienna, the staff was recruited mainly among Lutherans and a few Calvinists of the Habsburg or German lands, but almost all had previously studied at German universities. Most of the professors had accomplished past services as gymnasium teachers or ministers. The admission requirement for the students was the *Maturitätsprüfung* certificate. The duration of studies was fixed to three years. Students were obliged to attend theology classes, but there was a certain freedom concerning the attendance of other disciplines from other faculties as well, especially philosophy. Nevertheless, state control was much extended and therefore the courses were placed under strict surveillance. By contrast to Vienna, the University of Berlin could boast of prestigious

27 Christian Heyser, *Die Kirchen-Verfassung*, 105.

28 Friedrich Teutsch, *Georg Daniel Teutsch, Geschichte seines Lebens* (Hermannstadt: Druck und Verlag vom W. Krafft, 1909), 15–17.

29 I.d., 19.

professors. Georg Daniel Teutsch had the opportunity to study with reputed scholars such as Leopold von Ranke (history) and Carl Ritter (Geography of ancient Greece). Students could, indeed, cross the borders of the theology faculty to study history and philosophy as well. Thus in Berlin, Georg Daniel Teutsch also attended the philosophy lectures of Benecke and the Old German Mythology course taught by Hagen.³⁰

The numbers concerning university (theology) attendance during the selected time frame suggests to us that Teutsch's attitude towards Vienna was not unique, but rather very common among contemporary Saxon theologians. Statistics on the attendance of the Protestant Theologies between 1830 and 1848 position Berlin, on average, as the top university, followed by Vienna. Nevertheless, it may be noticed that the number of students who attended the University of Vienna gradually decreased between 1821 and 1848. Of the three distinct stages I have mentioned, the first (1821–1830) was the one when the newly established faculty still recorded a high number of Transylvanian students. This period marked the emergence of the Viennese generation. In early 1821, there were twelve Transylvanians already enrolled in Vienna and by September an additional nine. Together with these, until 1829 inclusively, approximately one hundred Transylvanians studied in Vienna.³¹ The number is not surprising considering that during this decade they were only allowed to study theology there. However, this number, as compared to the subsequent stages, clearly shows that this group of theologians accepted Vienna as a solution.

For the second *Vormärz* stage (1830–1840) I used the same two lists of students from the University of Vienna, mentioned in the case of the first stage. For the other German universities, and particularly Berlin, I used only the data published by Miklós Szabó and László Szögi. This period featured new characteristics: conditionally and not without difficulties, the Saxons were given the opportunity to go and study in Berlin. The ease with which they could accomplish this was pointed out by Georg Daniel Teutsch, who had obtained the permission to attend Berlin in 1838 but only after an audience with Chancellor Metternich.³² Nonetheless, the data presented by Miklós Szabó and László Szögi suggests that in addition to Vienna and Berlin, other imperial universities were also attended, perhaps illegally, such as Halle, Jena, and Tübingen. Thus, at the University of Halle, two students from Kronstadt/Braşov/Brassó were registered in 1830 after having previously studied at Vienna. In Jena and Tübingen there were also two (Saxon) Transylvanians at each respectively. The explanation may consist in the fact that they were allowed to go to Germany, most probably to Berlin, and subsequently they decided to change their initial destination, occasionally even against the law. However, considering the circumstances, the attendance at the Vienna

30 Friedrich Teutsch, *Georg Daniel Teutsch*, 21.

31 The numbers have been approximately established according to the data presented by Michael Taufraht and I verified it with the one furnished by Miklós Szabó and László Szögi. A few theologians were Hungarian Calvinists and they were included in the statistics carried out by me.

32 Richard Schuller, *Der siebenbürgisch-sächsische Pfarrer*, 38.

University remained still fairly high. 69 Transylvanians were registered between 1830 and 1839 in Vienna. This signifies that the future Lutheran clergy, acting during the 1848 Revolution, was to a large extent the product of the newly established Protestant faculty. Nevertheless, the competition of Berlin began to have an impact on the attendance of Vienna University. Later on, it exceeded attendance at Vienna. Between 1830 and 1839 there were 73 Transylvanians enrolled at the University of Berlin. If we take into account how many of them went directly to Berlin, thus eluding Vienna, we find surprisingly that only 17 of them had previously attended the University of Vienna. On average, they studied one year in Vienna, and then moved to Berlin. Considering this, I believe that despite the lower travel and study costs in Vienna, Berlin University was more attractive for Transylvanian Saxons. Furthermore, this assumption is ascertained by the following phase, when due to the openness towards other German universities, the number of students in Vienna showed a sudden and sharp decrease. In this new context, traditional universities became again the main formation network for future generations of Saxon theologians. This was a sign that the Metternich' policy began to decline.

The third *Vormärz* stage featured the recovery of traditional trends of theological training, entailing simultaneously the collapse of the Vienna connection. Thus, between 1840 and 1848, only 24 Transylvanians studied Protestant theology in Vienna. Furthermore, in a few cases, the students even transferred to another German university within a matter of months. As compared to the previous stage, the normal amount of difference may be noticed between Vienna and Berlin, the latter representing the main place of learning for the academic vanguard of Transylvanian Saxon theologians. There were 53 Transylvanian students registered at Berlin University in the years 1840 to 1848. The German university ranked second was Leipzig, where 46 Transylvanian students were enrolled between 1840 and 1848. Halle was another traditionally frequented university for Saxons during this period, with 26 Transylvanians. Despite the permission, universities such as Giessen, Göttingen, and Tübingen were much less attended. These numbers have a great significance. They clearly prove the importance of university attendance for Saxons during the Reform Era. Moreover, they manifest the persistent pro-German orientation of training.

Concerning the duration of studies, Michael Taufrath supplies no data on this issue because the students are mentioned only with the registration year. This can be found out only in the data collection by Szögi and Szabó who mention in many cases the period of studies or the date of return from the university concerned. Undoubtedly after the implementation of the new consistory norm (1837), most of the Saxon theologians complied with the office requirements, so that the average period of studies was indeed two years. This was the case for the majority of Saxon theology students registered at Berlin University during the post-1837 period, and it was rather exceptional when the period of studies began to last even longer. Often, students combined studies at various universities. Thus, among those who spent only one year in Berlin, one can find several ones who had previously studied in Vienna, Leipzig, or Halle. Concerning other German universities, the situation was similar to Berlin. For instance, at Halle, the majority of the students stayed for

only one year, but they had previously studied at another university, or would do so subsequently. The situation was similar in Leipzig where the majority of the students went on to Berlin.

The duration of studies can serve as an indication of how well trained the theologians were. The biographies of the *Vormärz* generation are quite conclusive in this sense. They establish to what extent we can label them as clerical elite, and more importantly, the proportion of academically trained ministers at the local level. Thus, out of all theology students during the selected time frame (including Hungarian Calvinists), over 60% became pastors, whereas many others remained in church service as teachers and preachers. The transitional period between the return from the university and employment in a parish office varied from individual to individual, but it could last even several decades. According to the statistics presented by Ernst Wagner, in 1865, out of all the ministers, 82% had academic training while 17% were only *Seminaristen*.³³ However, during the following period, the number of seminary trained ministers increased.

If we consider a particular case, such as the district of Bistritz, we may have a clear picture of the conditions of the academic formation of the clergy and, more specifically, on the changes ensuing after the introduction of the new norm. For this, I used the list of local ministers published by Gustav Arz in the *Siebenbürgische Familienforschung*³⁴ and completed it with the above-mentioned data on students abroad. Bistritz, similarly to the other large Saxon towns in Transylvania, represented the top choice for outstanding intellectuals having accomplished university studies and occupying important positions within the local school and church organization. If we consider every single parish, it is noticeable that only a few names do not appear on the lists of students abroad. For my report, I considered all ministers active during the post-1837 period. It is important to mention that out of all theology students during the *Vormärz*, only about 10% came from this region. Nonetheless, the parishes occupied by academic ministers appear to have amounted to over 80% in the whole district. Concerning the universities, which they attended, naturally after 1830, out of 21 students stemming from this district, 8 studied in Vienna and the other pastors at German universities.

Final Remarks

The *Vormärz* generation represented an intellectual elite. The legislation concerning entrance requirements to clerical office favored academic aspirants in their competition with the other non-academic candidates. Furthermore, for “good parishes”, where the pastors were to a significant extent recruited from gymnasium teachers and town preachers, a certain period of university attendance was required, such as three years in Vienna or two years at another foreign (German) university. On average, students complied with the newly established norms. Thus, the ecclesiastical authorities succeeded in

³³ Ernest Wagner, *Pfarrer und Lehrer*, 14.

³⁴ Gustav Arz, “Series Pastorum”, *Siebenbürgische Familienforschung* 7, no. 2 (1990), and 12, no. 2 (1995),

establishing an efficient system, which provided better training to the clergy and a higher educational profile.

The norms had to be fulfilled during a period of restrictions and censorship, when studies abroad became severely limited and controlled. The geopolitical circumstances favored the foundation of a new faculty of theology in Vienna, controlled by the imperial authorities. Despite its enormous significance for the formation of many Transylvanian Saxons, this faculty represented only a necessary compromise. This was illustrated by decreased attendance after 1830. In competition with Berlin and other German universities, in spite of restrictions, the University of Vienna lost a great part of its Saxon students. This course may be explained by the ideological rejection of Vienna, but possibly also by the higher prestige and educational quality of German universities. After 1840 this discrepancy became even more apparent. Saxon theologians reoriented themselves again towards the German Protestant world.

The policy of Vienna eventually failed to dismantle the traditional lineage between Transylvanian Saxons and Germany. Nevertheless, it determined the emergence of a new generation, characterized by both Viennese and German influence. This represented the *Vormärz* generation of Saxon-Lutheran theologians and was a group of students having undergone a process of significant cultural transformation and upgrading.

Ethnoconfessional Patterns of the Choice of Study Paths among Transylvanian Students of Law and Medicine (1900–1919)

Introductory Remarks

This is an assessment of the ethnoconfessional composition of the Transylvanian student body and university graduates in the first two decades of the twentieth century. More specifically, the comparison follows two lines. One is along the alternative offered for diploma pursuers in terms of the choice of the location of study: the smaller, less famous, but closer Transylvanian university in Kolozsvár/Cluj, and the much more sizeable Budapest University. This second option was more attractive in terms of the prestige of the qualifications it offered, but also presenting the would-be Transylvanian learned elite with extra hardships reflected in expenses and geographical distance (hardships nevertheless compensated by a cosmopolitan background that diminished parochial antagonisms, ethnic or other). The other line of this comparison is on the ethnically based student contingents in the Law and Medical Faculties of the University of Kolozsvár/Cluj, more precisely on differences between Western Christian majority Hungarians, Eastern Christian minority Romanians, with Jews and Germans as a third paradigm functioning as a control element in terms of minority contingents in this case. To be sure, such a comparison implies social dimensions as well, either in the sense of intra-group differentials following social variables, or that of determinant social criteria associated with certain ethnic groups within Transylvanian student generations in the targeted twenty years. Finally, a proper presentation of this student contingent would bear but restricted meanings without a sketch of the larger academic market conditions typical for the period under scrutiny.

Under the circumstances of a relatively belated modernization, higher studies were generally thought of as not simply a path of upward social mobility, but of a means of integration into the ruling Magyar elite. Associating social elevation to ethnic assimilation in this sense led to a prolonged controversy which is not only characteristic for the later Dualist period, but leaves its biasing marks on many later nation-state based perspectives regarding the liberalism of the higher educational assets of the Monarchy. While it is the largely Transylvanian-based Magyar-Romanian antagonism that this paper focuses on, the intention behind presenting abundant statistical data is to reveal the relative gains and losses of various ethnic groups participating in higher learning. Beyond the amount of figures, it is the above-mentioned combination of factors and variables that prevail over sheer ethnic belonging.

This should ultimately redirect the edgy debate on minority and majority issues towards a more complex sociohistorical approach of students and professional clusters in Transylvania at the beginning of the 20th century. Official or perceived Hungarian formulations on ethnic assimilation had different meanings for each minority, depending on their self-perception and socio-political perspectives. Resorting to statistical data on the topic aims at the partial deconstruction of the age-old Hungarian-Romanian antagonism witnessed in higher educational affairs by referring it to not properly ethnic components and to the often contrasting behavior of the local German and Jewish brackets within the academic market.

1. Approximating the Ethnic Dimension

No statistical source of the period in focus refers directly to ethnic background proper.¹ At best, there is data on the native tongue and everyday language use of students. This data may nevertheless bear a manipulative edge in the sense that such evidence tended to conceal rather than reveal ethnic belonging in a number of borderline cases (notably for bilingual students), owing to the official expectation of the assimilation of non-Magyar clusters ('minorities' or 'nationalities' in contemporary political discourse). Nevertheless, the mixed ethnic composition of the elite groups concerned can well be read from widely available confessional data. Indeed, confessional identities fall almost always in line with ethnic divisions, hence their relevance for the definition of students' ethnic background in any source of statistics which would not otherwise be primarily illustrative on the issue of nationality. Notwithstanding exceptions which bear little statistical relevance, we can take it for granted that in Transylvania the various Christian faiths cover for all practical purposes equally ethnic groups. Virtually all Calvinists and Unitarians of Transylvania were ethnic Magyars. Roman Catholics were also primarily Magyar, with the exception of 10% who were German (Swabian). Most of the Greek Orthodox were Romanians, with a minor share of Serbians among them (more precisely those coming from the Banat). The Greek Catholic group may be assumed to have consisted virtually in its entirety of Romanians. The Jews were clearly marked by their confessional membership; all having 'Mosaic' as their confession are of Jewish origin, although many bore Magyarized names and others German-sounding surnames. The few that figure in the "without confession" category are also of this latter background. (Jews as such were technically missing from ethnic categories proper applied during the period of Liberal assimilationist politics of the Dual Monarchy, so much so that Jews

1 To point out the general tendencies regarding recruitment patterns according to ethnic background, a combination of data referring to nationality (mother tongue) and religion seems the handiest. Usually statistics produced in the Dual Monarchy did not have a 'nationality' category, but the two others mentioned above. Ethnic belonging nevertheless can be deduced from the combination of these two markers. This is especially so in the case of the Romanians, since the two religions considered to be 'Romanian' had only an insignificant percentage of non-Romanian by ethnic affiliation whose birthplace fall within the region targeted by the present scrutiny, that is, Transylvania.

with Magyar-sounding names or Magyar mother tongue would be officially classified among Hungarians).

If we take into account the ethnic distribution of urban populations² in the ten largest cities in Transylvania, it is clear that the Romanian segment was far less urbanized than all others. Kolozsvár/Cluj for instance had 60,808 inhabitants in 1910³, out of which 50,704 were Hungarians, 1,676 Germans, and only 7,562 Romanians. To make the point on this indicator of inequalities regarding modernization even more clear, one can resort to data of the 1910 census: Transylvania's 794,864 Greek Orthodox together with virtually all the 749,404 Greek Catholics appear to make up the totality of the Romanian population, while the Calvinists (399,312), Catholics (375,325), and Unitarians (67,749) roughly fall together with the figure for the ethnic Hungarian population. The 229,028 Lutherans would make up for most of the Germans. There were 64,074 identified as Jews by religion, who can be divided between the Orthodox – listed among Germans as Yiddish speakers – and the Neolog, 'conservative' or 'Congress' Jews who were to be found among Hungarians (as well as those who, not quite infrequently, had converted to a Christian faith, that is, more likely to Protestantism).⁴

2. The Ethnic Stance in the Transylvanian Academe, with Special Regard to Romanians

Founded in 1872, the Royal Franz Joseph University of Kolozsvár/Cluj soon became Hungary's second largest institution of higher learning after the University of Budapest (and much ahead of the set of Legal Academies and other vocational colleges). Beyond the underlying strife for modernization, the University of Kolozsvár/Cluj was designed as a markedly Hungarian institution,

- 2 Interpreted as an index of modernization, there was a general increase in the number of town dwellers (82,063, 3.4% in 1880 and 133,759 in Transylvanian towns, that is, 4.5% of all Romanians). Between 1900 and 1910, there was thus an increase of slightly more than 13%. In other words, Romanians still formed only a relatively tiny minority of the urban population). In the 1900–1910 period, a little over 85% of Transylvania's Romanian population still lived in the countryside and depended mainly on agriculture (over two thirds of these being smallholders). At the same time, there was a falling death rate which largely accounts for the growth of the Romanian population, although this paralleled by a natural increase was somewhat lower than the Magyar one in the same period (that is, in 1896–1914, 8% compared to the 12.3% of the average in the Magyar population). Meanwhile, the Transylvanian Romanians were not much touched by the booming economy and the emergence of a relatively powerful (but altogether Hungarian) middle class. Their historically entrenched hatred or suspicion of the alien feudal landlord now could turn against the equally alien urban bourgeoisie, literate, civilized, and once again at a distance from 'Balkan standards.' Keith Hitchins, *A Nation Affirmed: The Romanian National Movement in Transylvania, 1860–1914* (Bucharest: The Encyclopedic Publishing House, 1999), 112; Endre Haraszti, *The Ethnic History of Transylvania* (Astor Park, Florida: Danubian Press Inc., 1971), 104–105.
- 3 Contrary to expectations, if we consider the relatively weak regional center effect produced by Kolozsvár/Cluj in the period, those coming from Kolozsvár/Cluj, or the immediate vicinity of the town are roughly overrepresented among medical students. Viktor Karády, *A kolozsvári egyetem orvostanhallgatói, 1872–1918* (Manuscript) [The student body of the Kolozsvár medical school, 1872–1918 (Manuscript)], 23.
- 4 Data cited by Haraszti, *The Ethnic History*, 126.

presenting the local ethnic minorities with the chance of upward social mobility but at the price of a virtual change in cultural and national loyalties in favor of Magyar. Romanians were one of the nationalities of the Dual Monarchy that most successfully avoided 'Magyarization' – the assimilationist drive that official circles keenly pursued in the last decades of the 19th century. This Magyarization had been contested by the Transylvanian Romanian elite long before the chance for reshaping the balance of political forces would emerge.

It is characteristic of the prewar Hungarian Liberal era that upward social mobility paths went very often together or in parallel with cultural assimilation for members of ethnic minorities. In sketching the general context, there are two groups that should be distinctively mentioned at this early point. First, there is a sharp contrast in the share of students of Jewish background (characteristically overrepresented throughout the period) and that of the students of Orthodox and Greek Catholic confession (no less typically underrepresented) reaching a mere 4.2% in the total of the student body of the period. Both extremes are due to a large extent to the prevalent differences of the socio-professional structure and the level of urbanization of these ethno-confessional groups. Second, both of these minority clusters should be viewed in contrast to the majority Magyar student contingent – a group that is nevertheless far from being homogenous in itself in terms of career path choices and use of different educational qualifications for upward mobility.⁵

As for the main Transylvanian minority contingent (in demographic terms), the Romanians (basically all of the Greek denominations), there were no institutions of higher learning in their own language available on Hungarian territory apart from theological seminaries.⁶ Romanian students would thus enroll either at the Hungarian universities in Kolozsvár/Cluj and Budapest, or at German language universities in Vienna, or even elsewhere in Western Europe. As the first decades of the new century were marked by a strengthening of national sentiments among ethnic minorities of the Monarchy in the face of the 'doom of assimilation,' as well as escalating irredentism and nationalist resentments, it was no wonder that the issue of a separate Romanian university in Transylvania came up again in 1913–14, during the Tisza reconciliatory

5 Andor Ladányi, *A magyar felsőoktatás a 20. században* [Hungarian higher education in the 20th century] (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1999), 16.

6 A total of six Romanian theological institutes functioned in prewar Hungary, three Orthodox (Szeben/Sibiu, Arad/Arad, and Karánsebes/Caransebeș), and three Greek Catholic (Balázsfalva/Blaj, Nagyvárad/Oradea, and Szamosújvár/Gherla). These institutes enjoyed considerable freedom, the Hungarian state generally refraining from interference with their internal affairs, except for the introduction of Hungarian as a subject of study, an academic task nevertheless seldom taken seriously at the Romanian theological academies. (Meanwhile, with all the ardent Romanian national spirit these institutions diffused, the salaries of the Romanian professors of theology were paid out of the state treasury, and there were four stipends per year granted to exceptional students.) Sándor Biró, *The Nationalities Problem in Transylvania, 1867–1940. A Social History of the Romanian Minority under Hungarian Rule, 1867–1918, and of the Hungarian Minority under Romanian Rule, 1918–1940* (Boulder, Colorado: Atlantic Research and Publications, 1992), 171, 271.

attempts.⁷ Moreover, it was made the chief topical claim by some Romanian leaders (some, like Onisifor Ghibu, made it the prime demand). It may be said that the great majority of the Romanian intelligentsia of the Dualist period was formed in extraterritorial institutions of higher learning.⁸ The negotiations, doomed to failure between István Tisza and the Romanian National Party, were not unique; quite to the contrary, they were symptomatic of the general irreconcilability between the ‘master nations’ of the Empire and the ‘mastered’ ones striving for a measure of national self-determination.⁹ Also, there was a similar antagonism, that of centralism versus federalism, as well as the idea that the minority problem was no longer a matter of ordinary political give-and-take, but one of national survival proper.

Beyond the underlying strife for modernization, manifesting itself during the decades around the turn of the century, universities were conceived of as markedly Magyar institutions. This drive toward Magyarization elicited protests for several reasons. With a relatively weak middle class, the Romanian ethnic group was most acutely lacking an educated elite, selected from within its ranks. In the long run, such an elite could have been an agent of modernization and integration. Meager as it was, this perspective seems to have been nevertheless rejected by many Romanians, since, in their view, integration in the above-mentioned sense would have equaled a ‘disintegration’ of sorts of their ethnic community.¹⁰ Instead, they argued for a separate institution of higher learning of their own, as stated. Beyond the strife for cultural emancipation, it was the majority share of ethnic Romanians in the population of Transylvania that appeared to vie for the entitlement to a separate university, something that the Hungarian authorities would not afford them.

7 Prime Minister István Tisza's reconciliatory attempts during 1913–1914 aimed at the reversal of the trend of alienation of Romanians and a better integration of Romanian ethnic elites into the structure of Hungarian society. Nevertheless Tisza was reluctant to discuss social matters with a party constituted on national basis. By this time, anyhow, the reconciliatory moves were viewed as belated and ineffective by Romanian leaders who already had national self-determination in mind when they argued for federalism. As the latest development, the idea of secession in favor of a Greater Romania also emerged, paralleled by further estrangement of the Romanian National Party from the government and from Hungarian society in general. Hence an agreement seemed less and less feasible right before the breakout of the Great War. Hitchins, *A Nation Affirmed*, 366.

8 Cornel Sigmirean, “The Cluj University, 1872–1918”, in *University and Society: A History of Higher Education in Cluj in the 20th Century*, ed. Vasile Pușcaș (Cluj-Napoca: Cluj University Press, 1999), 36–37.

9 Hitchins, *A Nation Affirmed*, 399–400.

10 Such leaders were aware of the peculiar position that the Romanian community of Transylvania by the turn of the 20th century had: it was its isolation that made it stable and immune to assimilation. The implied political logic foreshadowed claims of territorial supremacy, issues soon to carry the day on the political agenda in the context of weakening imperial ties. It is in this sense that Hungarian state-engineered nationalization in educational matters proved counter-productive: albeit indirectly, it did but foster the movement for national emancipation with its secessionist edge sharpening over time. There was yet another side to the above mentioned logic: Lay or ecclesiastical, cultural or political, the majority of Transylvania's Romanian leaders realized that maintaining their positions would be possible only by closing ranks in front of the challenges of integration into a ‘Magyarizing’ society.

It was clear from the beginning that Romanians, once they chose lay life paths,¹¹ manifested a predilection for the free professions. This 'inclination' was obviously heavily determined by the difficulties graduates faced when applying for civil service positions controlled by the Hungarian authorities. The law and medical faculty were hence their first choices. There was no hindrance for them, in principle, as ethnic Romanians, to pursue other careers, but as doctors and lawyers they could more closely cooperate with their co-nationals in aiding them not only in cultural, financial, and social matters, but at times as agents of political mobilization as well. Unlike the obviously Romanian-minded Orthodox and, to a lesser extent, Uniate (Greek Catholic) priesthood, those seeking a career in the free professions were often viewed as likely to assimilate both by their co-nationals and Hungarian observers, while the overcrowded civil service sector – more or less monopolized by Magyar incumbents – hardly offered ethnic minority candidates (especially Jews and Romanians) any profitable perspectives.¹² At the same time, the huge size of the state sector in the middle class job market left little place for private employment; a fragment of the market which benefited from a comparatively small rank-and-file demand, due to its lesser social prestige and enhanced work load – a misbalance so characteristic to Eastern Europe in general.

3. Enrollment Patterns by Native Tongue. The Larger Context Revisited.

Overall, the overwhelming majority of the students had Hungarian as their declared native tongue.¹³ In the period between 1900 and 1914, their share even

11 During the last decade of the 19th century, every second (48% in average!) Romanian secondary school graduates of the Greek Catholic (Uniate) confession chose priesthood as the target of his higher education track. Half of the average (5% as compared to the 10% in the case of other confessions) chose medicine. In the first decade of the 20th century, the pattern is still almost unchanged: 43.4% of the students graduating from the Uniate secondary schools intending to pursue further studies chose priesthood (in contrast with the average of 15.1% registered among those of other Christian confessions). In the same period, roughly every tenth graduate of Orthodox confession chose to be a medical doctor, and another tenth to be a priest. Karády: *A kolozsvári egyetem orvostanhallgatói*, 37.

12 Gyula Bisztray, Attila Szabó T., and Lajos Tamás, eds., *Erdély magyar egyeteme: Az erdélyi egyetemi gondolat és a M. Kir. Ferencz József Tudományegyetem története* [The Hungarian university of Transylvania: The Transylvanian university idea and the history of the Royal Hungarian Franz Joseph University] (Cluj-Kolozsvár: Erdélyi Tudományos Intézet, 1941), 298.

13 "Within the new elite, there was a segment mostly made up of foreign elements and taking a large part in social and economic modernization with its acquired assets (industrial and commercial capital, educational qualifications), a segment then of non-Magyar origin lacking the 'historic' symbolic value-system of the gentry, a segment that sought the most of cultural assimilation in order to gain full admittance in the historic middle class; that is to say, nationalist education was carried out on the lower levels with the aim of strengthening the Magyar element demographically and with a considerable result in building up a sizable school system and in eradicating illiteracy, but 'Magyarization' seems to have had a responsive target on the upper level – higher education was a major path not only of upward social mobility but in the foreign ethnic elements' acceptance into the dominant nation, one of the chief social functions of

grew from 84.9% to 88.9%. The low share of nationalities¹⁴ involved in higher education (that is, contrasted to their 48.6% among the total population in 1900 and 45.5% in 1910, as measured formally in the censuses) was partly due to the social structure of these ethnic groups, especially those of Eastern Christian faiths (most of whom were ethnic Romanians – as observed above – and a massive part of the population of Transylvania). The traditional setup, the bulk of which was composed of the peasantry, had a very thin layered urban middle class, and, consequently, a comparatively low average cultural level. The latter materialized, among other things, in a very limited propensity towards vertical social mobility through education. The control and, in part, suppression of ethno-national political movements could have also contributed to the alienation of many would-be minority intellectuals, who could nevertheless opt for studies abroad. When interpreting ethnic data based on declared mother tongue, one should also take into account many cases of active bilingualism, allowing for those concerned to qualify themselves as Magyar speakers, as well as the prevailing pressure for Magyarization, pushing many minority students of Hungarian secondary education to declare themselves as Magyars, even if their first language happened to be Romanian, Serbian, or Slovak. Interestingly enough for the minorities, Jews, and to a somewhat lesser extent, Germans managed to make the most of the chances of social elevation and middle-class type career options attainable via educational qualifications.¹⁵

Table 1. Distribution by religion and native tongue of all students enrolled in institutions of higher learning in Hungary, 1912–1913¹⁶

Confession	Absolute Numbers	%		Native Tongue	Absolute Numbers	%
Roman Catholic	7,619	44.5	1 9 1 2 – 1 9 1 3	Hungarian	13,897	81.2
Greek Catholic	792	4.6		Romanian	950	5.6
Orthodox	1,006	5.9		Serb	445	2.6
Evangelical	1,284	7.5		German	592	3.5
Calvinist	2,454	14.3		Croat	924	5.4
Unitarian	169	1.0		Ruthenian	4	0.02
Mosaic	3,747	21.9		Slovak	184	1.1
Other	41	0.2		Other	116	0.7
TOTAL	17,112	100.0		TOTAL	17,112	100.0

universities in the Liberal era.” Viktor Karády, “Assimilation and schooling: National and denominational minorities in the universities of Budapest around 1900”, in *Hungary and European Civilization*, ed. György Ránki and A. Pók (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989), 285–286.

14 As it has been pointed out elsewhere, in the Dualist period, there was no Hungarian legal terminology for what we call nationality today, so the term should be used only as a working hypothesis.

15 Ladányi, *A magyar felsőoktatás*, 16.

16 Based on Cornel Sigmirean, *Istoria formării intelectualității românești din Transilvania și Banat în epoca modernă* [The history of the formation of the Romanian intelligentsia from Transylvania and the Banat in the modern era] (Cluj: Presa Universitară Clujeană: 2000), 147–148.

Table 2. Distribution of students involved in higher learning by ethnic background and the percentage of ethnic groups in the overall population of the Dual Monarchy, 1910¹⁷

Nationality %	Share in the Population	Type of Institution				Total %
		University	Theology	Polytechnics	Other	
Germans	23.6	30.0	20.0	38.2	26.8	30.7
Czechs and Slovaks	16.5	11.8	14.7	27.3	9.8	14.9
Poles	9.8	17.7	6.6	13.8	9.0	15.2
Ruthenes	7.9	4.0	2.8	0.6	0.9	2.9
Slovenes	2.5	1.4	4.0	0.8	1.5	1.5
Croats and Serbs	11.1	5.5	6.9	2.4	3.2	4.8
Hungarians	19.8	22.5	32.1	12.2	44.8	23.4
Romanians	6.3	2.0	8.7	0.3	1.6	2.1
Others	2.5	5.1	4.2	4.4	2.4	4.5
Total %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Of which Jewish	4.4	20.4	0.4	17.1	24.5	17.3

The data above is illustrative not only for a characteristically uneven overall distribution of students but also gives a hint to the general tendencies regarding predilections for large study tracks in the case of each ethno-cultural (confessional) contingent for the whole Habsburg Monarchy.

4. Features of Enrollment by Specialization, Focusing on Legal and Medical Studies

Disregarding the average student numbers per population units (according to which Romanians were quite underrepresented at the Kolozsvár/Cluj faculties, even in law and medicine), there was still a considerable number of ethnic Romanians among students pursuing legal and medical studies, their figures showing a slow but steady growth that went parallel with the increase of the general enrollment figure. There was a sizable group of Romanian intellectuals trained at the Hungarian University of Kolozsvár/Cluj in the prewar period: altogether, 646 Romanians obtained doctoral degrees there, of which 519 studied law and state science (from *Staatswissenschaft*, a forerunner of the discipline of political science today). Such degrees, obtainable after 8 semesters of study, were roughly equivalent to a licentiate of our time. They were relatively easy to obtain in Kolozsvár/Cluj as compared to Budapest. Romanians were granted only 99 doctorates in Medicine, 10 at the Faculty of Philosophy, and 8 in Mathematics and the Natural Sciences at the University of Kolozsvár/Cluj.¹⁸

¹⁷ Ibid., 175.

¹⁸ Bisztray, Szabó, and Tamás, eds., *Erdély magyar egyeteme*, 299; Sigmirean, "The Cluj University", 47.

In general, the available data regarding the social extraction of the student population is somewhat approximate, since the different statistics produced in the period do not always make possible an exact delimitation of the most relevant social and occupational categories from which the would-be intelligentsia was actually emanating. (As a matter of fact, such categories are always constructions, just as are all social clusters.) On the average, around 70% of the students are shown to have had a 'middle-class' background. Within this category, 17.1% had fathers listed as army officers and public servants, 20.5% came from families belonging to the educated middle class, 12.7% whose background was listed as private employee, and 19.4% belonged to families whose income derived from retail trade and small-scale industry. The share of the wealthy classes was of about 10%, that of those with peasant background was also 10% (but, among the latter, almost every second student chose theology), and the lowest share (6%) belonged to industrial and agricultural workers.¹⁹ This is a rather classic pattern marked by the social reproduction of the ruling strata and educational mobility of some lower middle-class clusters (typical of Jews, among others). The pattern can be well illustrated in the recruitment of the medical faculty of the University of Kolozsvár/Cluj.

The 'dominant (Western) Christian' paradigm (Roman Catholic and Protestant) in the student recruitment of the turn of the century Transylvanian medical faculty (but in Budapest as well, at least as far as Transylvanian medical students were concerned) was, in a general sense, also of the self-reproducing type (in terms of combined categories of class and occupation), while in a more specific sense it served the horizontal mobility – that is, within the educated middle class - of those coming from the same class or from the economically independent brackets. A second type, that of the Jews, was closest to the average 'bourgeois' mobility pattern: the absolute majority of Jewish medical students came from the 'independent' strata, almost half of their parents (45%) were retail merchants, 14% were entrepreneurs and business owners, 11% were of lower-rank intellectual extraction while the parents of 8% were private employees. In the same period one observes the very low representation quotas of craftsmen (4%) and clerical staff (rabbis, teachers - 5%). Here too, upward mobility patterns were characteristic as against the horizontal mobility leading to middle class self-reproduction, the latter being typical of the student body with 'dominant Christian' background.²⁰

The recruitment of students coming from the ethnic Romanian group is almost diametrically opposed to the above mentioned one²¹: in the case of both

19 Ladányi, *A magyar felsőoktatás*, 15.

20 Karády, *A kolozsvári egyetem orvostanhallgatói*, 36–37.

21 There is a sharp contrast between the Jews and the Romanians in terms of academic performance and age of graduation as well. While the first as a group attained the earliest average age of graduation (which is a significant indication of excellency in studies), with two-thirds attaining the Matura at the 'normal' age (18 years) or as even younger, the Romanians, especially those of the Orthodox faith displayed the highest average age of graduation, only about one quarter of them attaining the Matura at the normal age. The same contrast holds true for the marks obtained by these groups

'Romanian' confessions, a considerable part of the parents belonged to the priesthood (34% in the case of the Greek Catholics and 24% in the case of the Orthodox faith) and to the small intellectual class, that is, primary school teachers (slightly above 10%). This means that from one third to one half of the medical students had such 'petty intellectual' family backgrounds. As an apparent paradox, the peasantry had a massive representation among ethnic Romanians. Almost one third of the Orthodox students (31%) and a sixth of the Uniates (17%) originated from the peasantry. Paralleling this ethnically based pattern of recruitment, one can remark on the striking lack of representation of the Romanian petty bourgeoisie (3-4%), especially if we take into consideration the average share of around 13% among the students of the same social category in the other denominational groups. Altogether, the Uniate and Orthodox contingent offers an example of upward, vertical mobility via studies introducing them to one of the major sectors of the free professions. Of course, the educated middle class itself was relatively weak among Transylvanian Romanians, hence the extremely low figures²² of those coming from this background. Romanians in general and, as it was demonstrated above, the Orthodox in particular, were massively underrepresented in the medical faculty, and in higher learning as such.²³

Among medical students of the dominant Magyar ethnic group, the presence of the 'educated middle classes' was continuously important (up to 62% in the early years of the University of Kolozsvár/Cluj, reaching 69.4% by the turn of the century), that is, the self-reproduction effect clearly prevailed in this case to the detriment of a 'bourgeois' recruitment. The Romanians obviously displayed a different pattern, a majority being drawn from among rank and file petty intellectuals and the peasantry, with a slight 'embourgeoisement' of their student body emerging on the whole as time passed. In the meantime the Jewish pattern remained unchanged, dominated by bourgeois elements, with a growth of five times registered by students with parents belonging to the private employee category. It may be assumed that similar trends of social extraction in ethnically based recruitment patterns applied by and large to other branches of study as well at the Kolozsvár/Cluj University, and they continued up to the 1910s.²⁴

Thus, at the beginning, those of ethnic Hungarian background strongly dominated the student body of the medical faculty in Kolozsvár/Cluj, but their positions subsequently weakened. By the turn of the century and after there was indeed a marked strengthening of ethnic minority representation, especially by Jewish, Romanian, and German students,²⁵ evidently to the

(another index of excellency in studies): Jews and Lutheran students had the highest average in marks at the Matura, the Romanians being at the bottom of the list in this regard. *Ibid.*, 31.

22 To make things more complicated, they were generally less willingly following paths of embourgeoisement, since they felt it was a move away from their ethnic self.

23 Karády: *A kolozsvári egyetem orvostanhallgatói*, 36–37.

24 *Ibid.*, 39.

25 While the determination of the Romanian background is relatively simple, that of the 'German' origin is blurred by the fact that there is always a larger or smaller segment here that actually comes from a Jewish background. All in all, it is not erroneous to

detriment of ethnic Magyars. The general tendencies at the Kolozsvár medical faculty thus included the growth in absolute numbers of the proportion of minority student contingents, especially Jews and Greek Catholic (Uniate) Romanians. The latter had an average share of around 18%, showing a marked preference for medical studies in their home region as opposed to their conationals of Orthodox faith, who, though a majority compared to the Uniates (both in terms of population and in the number of *Matura* –holders) seemed to be inclined to avoid medical studies in Kolozsvár/Cluj proper. The same feature of geographical orientation may be assumed to have dominated the choice patterns of other Orthodox Romanian students as well.²⁶

As for the local law faculty, intraethnic Romanian enrollment patterns according to social category (estimated via fathers' occupation), especially as contrasted to those of the majority Magyar element, show noteworthy peculiarities. Most important of these is that practically every third Romanian student had his father in the category of peasants owning small or medium-size 'estates.' The following table is illustrative in this sense:

Table 3. A general view on ethnic Romanian law students enrolled in the University of Kolozsvár/Cluj, 1872–1918: distribution by fathers' occupation and the share of departments in the whole student body²⁷

Faculty of Law and Political Sciences			Average in All Faculties (%)	
Father's Occupation	Absolute Numbers	Percentage		
Self-employed in agriculture	508	27.60	28.6	1.
Public/state official	150	8.15	8.55	2.
Free professional	118	6.14	5.87	3.
Intellectual in public/state service	692	37.60	38.23	4.
Higher-rank public/state official	97	5.27	5.08	5.
Merchant	55	2.39	2.52	6.
Entrepreneur	24	1.30	1.15	7.
Craftsman	28	1.52	1.65	8.
Worker (skilled)	8	0.43	0.35	9.
Unskilled worker	10	0.54	0.45	10.
Higher-rank official in private businesses	11	0.59	0.60	11.
Great land-owners	150	8.15	7.48	12.
Total	1,851	100.00	100.00	
Percentage of law and political science students in the whole:			73.0%	

conclude that in the prewar period – according to name analysis – the majority of the student body at the medical faculty of Kolozsvár/Cluj was of an ethnic origin other than Hungarian. *Ibid.*, 14.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 14–15.

²⁷ Based on Sigmirean, *Istoria formării intelectualității românești*, 225–227.

Note: The table contains only an estimated greater majority of Romanian students, that is, those cases where social origins (expressed by father's occupation) could be based on firm evidence. Beyond the 2,537 mentioned in the compilation of data referred to above, there are another 109 ethnic Romanian students registered at the Budapest Theology Department (37% had their fathers self-employed in agriculture and 47% came from families of publicly (or semi-publicly) employed intellectuals - mostly teachers and priests) and a contingent of 110 who enrolled to the Chemnitz Academy of Mining and Forestry. (Here, too, the above-mentioned two categories had a preponderance of 64 %.)

As it could be expected, students of Jewish origin presented a situation regarding fathers' occupation that did not fit either (Western and Eastern Christian) model discussed above. With the Jews, the relative majority, about 45% of fathers belonged to the petty independent (self-employed) category, one which was far less numerous in both the Hungarian and (even less) the Romanian case.²⁸

5. The Regional Setup Revisited: Kolozsvár versus Budapest

Table 4. Average shares of students by native tongue and Faculties in the average of four sample years (1900–1901, 1905–1906, 1910–1911, 1913–1914) at the University of Budapest.²⁹

Year	Department	Hungarian	German	Slavic	Romanian	Other	Total (average)
1900–1914	Law and Pol. Sc.	3,417 92.00%	109 2.93%	98 2.63%	76 2.04%	55 1.48%	3,714
	Medicine	1,572 86.80%	56 3.09%	60 3.31%	45 2.48%	10 0.55%	1,811
	Philology	1,031 86.27%	81 6.77%	33 2.76%	32 2.67%	8 0.66%	1,195
	Theology	49 52.12%	8 8.51%	19 20.21%	15 15.95%	3 3.19%	94
	Total	6,609 87.63%	253 3.65%	210 3.03%	168 2.42%	76 1.09%	6,925 (100%)

Note: The 'Slavic' category includes Slovaks, Serbs, Croats, and Ruthenes. The 'missing' 2.00% in the last row is due to the lack of a separate listing of students in pharmacology (pharmacology is not included in the 'average' categories enumerated in the final section of the table, since it appears separately among the Faculties only in the first sample year).

That is to say, a very important segment of the Transylvanian student body – those of ethnic Romanians included, and in a prominent position in this respect! – was nevertheless not studying in Kolozsvár/Cluj, but in Budapest. The topmost and by far the largest academic center of the Hungarian nation

28 Viktor Karády and Nastasă Lucian, *The University of Kolozsvár/Cluj and the Students of the Medical Faculty (1872–1918)* (Budapest/Cluj: CEU Press/Ethnocultural Diversity Resource Center, 2004), 130–131.

29 Based on Sigmirean, *Istoria formării intelectualității românești*, 490, 493, 495–96.

state had manifestly a much greater attraction³⁰ for Romanians who could afford studying there. Even the stipends coming from Romanian nongovernmental sources seem to have favored this choice. Many of those having consecrated themselves as leading figures of Transylvania's Romanian political, scientific, or ecclesiastical life had studied in Budapest. This was the case of Octavian Goga, poet and politician, Miron Cristea, Orthodox archbishop, Ioan Lupăș, Constantin Daicoviciu, and Nicolae Drăganu later to become professors at the Romanian University of Kolozsvár/Cluj, to mention but a few of the better known names.³¹ The enrollment by the confession of students at the Budapest universities³² by the turn of the century was somewhat similar to those in Kolozsvár/Cluj (with the exception of the much more significant presence of Jews in the capital, especially in the medical faculty). Thus, there was a sizable overrepresentation of Hungarians and Germans (if the national status is defined by mother tongue³³) as against other nationalities. There was an even more striking overrepresentation of those with Jewish background. They made up one quarter of the total student population by the turn of the century, though Jews represented only 5–6% of the population,³⁴ (the high proportion of Jewish students with Magyar names, a sign of voluntary assimilation, is worth noting here). These trends were paralleled with a less sizable overrepresentation of Lutherans as against other Christian denominations, and consequently, a slight under-representation of Catholics

30 Paradoxically enough, while it was the Kolozsvár/Cluj University that had no theological faculty and was from the moment of its foundation a comparatively secular institution in its character, the University of Budapest, with all its Catholic theological faculty and remains of clerical traces in its policies of appointing professors, was, due to the general cosmopolitan and bourgeois surrounding of the capital, a more 'bourgeois' university in its social character than its younger but provincial counterpart. Karády, *A kolozsvári egyetem orvostanhallgatói*, 12.

31 Bisztray, Szabó, and Tamás, eds., *Erdély magyar egyeteme*, 302.

32 Besides the classical University (the one which is the reference point in the present case study) there was, and in the given period only in Budapest a Technical University as well.

33 Karády states: "The bulk of the new educated elite trained in universities came from families of non-Magyar background. Indeed, if we add the proportions of all students with alien names to those of all Jewish students, a proportion almost two-thirds of the total (65%) is formally reached." If we consider the assimilationist trends, the number may be estimated even higher, that is, to an astonishing 75–80%. [...] "the overwhelming presence of ethnically-assimilated alien members in the educated middle classes provides an essential explanatory principle to account for their social and intellectual 'openness' and innovative potential [...] for the fragmented nature of the emerging Hungarian intelligentsia and professional elite, as well as for the grave tensions it has experienced [...] indirect evidence suggests that high schooling frequencies were typical of mobile ethnic minorities, especially those which were not based substantially in the poor, servile peasantry. These mobile minorities were Jews, Germans, and some of the Slavs." Karády, "Assimilation and schooling", 291–292.

34 It is noteworthy that students of Jewish background, who otherwise formed a near majority in the whole of the medical study segment of the academic market of Hungary (rising at times to almost two-thirds in Budapest) had a markedly low rate of representation in Kolozsvár/Cluj. All throughout the prewar period their share did not exceed 2 to 4%. Even their highest recorded share, that around 1910 was not higher than 6% of all Hungarian Jewish medical students at that moment. Karády, *A kolozsvári egyetem orvostanhallgatói*, 9.

and Calvinists among Christians, and a strikingly scanty presence in higher education of students belonging to the Orthodox and Greek Catholic population (in terms of absolute numbers).³⁵

As for the comparative share of the Budapest University in the production of Transylvanian educated elites, we have the following data for the two decades in view:

Table 5. *Distribution of Transylvanians among graduates of the Faculties of Law and Medicine in Budapest by religion (1900–1920, selected years)*³⁶

	Roman Catho- lic	Calvi- nist	Unitari- an + Other	Luthe- ran	Greek Catho- lic	Greek Ortho- dox	Mo- saic	Other, Par- tium	Total
1900–1905									
Law, State	67	28	2(L)	8	19	22	47	148	191
Sc. and	25	7	+	6	5	11	26	50	79
Medicine, Together	92	35	0	14	24	33	73	198	270
1905–1909									
Law, State	83	30	2(L)	9	17	36	58	160	235
Sc. and	28	15	+	20	18	14	45	80	137
Medicine, Together	111	45	0	29	35	50	103	240	372
1910–1911									
Law, State	145	43	7	17	26	51	102	282	391
Sc. and	61	27	2*	34	29	45	117	212	315
Medicine, Together	206	70		51	55	96	219	494	706
1915–1916									
Law, State	104	49	6	11	19	16	46	154	249
Sc. and	58	29	+2	15	23	30	53	167	238
Medicine, Together	162	78	26*	26	42	46	99	321	487

35 Karády, “Assimilation and schooling”, 294–295.

36 Data extracted by author from *Doctori nyilvántartások. Doktorok származási lapjai, 1–20. kötet, 1900–1920* [Doctors’ registers. Doctors’ provenience files. Volumes 1–20, 1900–1920], (Budapest: Budapest University).

Totals of the 1900–1920 period									
Law, State Sc.	399	150	11+2L 4+2M	45	81	125	253	744	1,066
Medicine	172	78	+	75	75	100	241	509	769
Total	571	228	26*	120	156	225	494	1,253	1,835

*Note: *As there is but a very small number of Unitarians here, the “Other” category with only four cases proper was packed together with the former. Also, the altogether 26 cases where graduates initially registered as of the Mosaic faith but left the “Confession” category blank in 1919, are listed here among Jews. The whole contingent has four “Others” proper, an Armenian Catholic in the 1913 contingent, the three others “without confession” appearing in the last third of the period under scrutiny. Altogether, the setup shows a formidable stability in terms of confessional affiliation in the sense that the “Other” category was practically empty, and virtually all graduates of the enlarged Transylvanian contingent belonged to one of the historical faiths.*

The penultimate column contains all those graduates whose birthplace does not fall within the limits of historic or Inner Transylvania,³⁷ that is, it includes by approximation the regions of the Partium and the Banat.³⁸ Máramaros/Maramureş is also included for the same reason for which we have an enlarged Transylvania in mind, since a considerable part of it fell outside Trianon Hungary after 1920. That is to say, Larger Transylvania in this paper equals to roughly the territory that Greater Romania gained from Dualist Hungary after World War I.³⁹

The twenty years within reach do not by far represent an even or homogenous period. Roughly speaking, the first five years display an

37 In the Dualist setup, historical Transylvania consisted of the following counties: Alsó-Fehér/(Alba, Beszterce-Naszód/Bistrița-Năsăud, Brassó/Braşov, Csík/Ciuc, Fogaras/Făgăraş, Háromszék/Trei-Scaune, Hunyad/Hunedoara, Kis-Küküllő/Târnava-Mică, Kolozs/Cluj, Maros-Torda/Mureş-Turda, Nagy-Küküllő/Târnava-Mare, Szeben/Sibiu, Szolnok-Doboka/Solnoc-Dăbâca, Torda-Aranyos/Turda-Arieş, and Udvarhely/Odorhei. In contrast to the counties listed here as belonging to the Partium and the Banat, these are relatively small and less populated counties, with scarce urban concentrations. This, and the fact that they are farthest from Budapest also account for the very small number of diploma-holders born here, again, as contrasted to those originating from the North-South stripe that comes in between Inner Hungary and Inner Transylvania.

38 More precisely, the Partium, as I here refer to it includes the counties of Bihar/Bihor, Szatmár/Satu-Mare, Szilágy/Sălaj. Arad/Arad county is actually divided between the Partium and the Banat, while only two extra-Carpathian counties are included in what I take as the Banat here, Krassó-Szörény/Caraş-Severin and Temes/Timiş, that is, the North-Eastern part of the Banat proper.

39 With the dissolution of the imperial bondage (that is, of the multinational Monarchy and its educational ‘commonwealth’ in 1918), the new political paradigms of successor states (all redefining themselves as nation states) reshaped the self-identifying goals of ethnic groups, both majorities and minorities, new and old alike. Among problem areas of heavily state engineered political and socioeconomic integration, cultural nationalization figures as both a means and a purpose. Meanwhile, the majority of the attempts to carry out ‘modernization’ in general terms also falls in line with exclusionary national goals. Together with several other universities of the region, the University of Cluj/Kolozsvár becomes an instrument of nationalist militancy and ethnic survival. With all the officially promoted ethnic ‘change of the guard’, it acquires a dual character, with specific and significantly different functions for local Hungarian and Romanian elites (as well as, for the matter, other ethnic middle-class clusters).

undisturbed slow-paced development, while the second five years herald the general boom in enrollment figures throughout the institutions of higher learning of the Monarchy. The tendency is most visible in the years immediately preceding the war. The last quarter of the twenty years included in this analysis bears the heavy marks of the war juncture, involving the loss of the peacetime balance, as relative as it had been, in regional, ethnic, and professional recruitment, reflected in the figures of both enrollments and graduates. Finally, the 1918–1920 period clearly reflects the dramatically altering geopolitical situation and the split-up of the Monarchy into nation states already under way even before the 1920 Paris peace settlement ratified the new status quo. All this means that the five-year totals in the table are worth considering separately, the first three revealing peacetime tendencies, while the latter five years are illustrative for what the war and the ensuing breakup of the educational ‘commonwealth’ altered in the habitual patterns of university recruitment.⁴⁰

There were further regional and geographical disparities as well, since the probability of enrollment was enhanced by geographical proximity of residence⁴¹ as demonstrated by variables such as urban origins or by place of birth and education of the student body. The most characteristic segments of city dwellers among them belonged to the mobile lower middle classes or the educated elite, their possibilities and willingness to seek higher education being much greater than those of the rural peasant masses. These factors acted irrespective of nationality. This is all the more important since – as observed above – nationality was also connected to the hierarchy of excellence attained in studies as expressed by the age of graduation. As a rule, earlier ages of graduation both from high school and from university were paralleled by greater degrees of excellence as expressed in average marks obtained by every student cluster, whatever their ethnic and denominational background. As to interregional transfers, there seems to have been relatively few of them. For instance, of the 2,541 medical students of the prewar period as many as 24% had their *Matura* from a Kolozsvár/Cluj high school, while a little more than half of them, 51–52% graduated from other Transylvanian high schools, so that only a little less than a quarter, 22–23% of the *Matura* holders came from elsewhere in Hungary, with around 1–2% from foreign countries.⁴²

Before going any further into details, it must be argued why only law and medicine are included in the table above. Within the classical university setup (that is, if we do not consider polytechnic studies, available only in Budapest and so making a Budapest–Kolozsvár/Cluj comparison problematic), these two

40 As it shall be seen, most evident of these alterations is the almost complete withdrawal of Romanians from the University of Budapest, a phenomenon due to the Romanianization of the Transylvanian university effective as of May 1919.

41 The massive presence of students coming from the Partium and the Banat in the surveyed Budapest contingent is most probably due to the fact that Budapest and Kolozsvár/Cluj were at roughly the same distance, but the centrifugal absorbing power of the capital city was ever so greater (and that not only in terms of educational attractiveness).

42 Karády, “Assimilation and schooling”, 297–298; Karády, *A kolozsvári egyetem orvostanhallgatói*, 20–21.

tracks attracted the absolute majority of students at that time, law and state science alone accounting for an average of a little over 50% of students and graduates⁴³ throughout the prewar decades. Medical studies came second, accounting for about a quarter of the academic market, while the other specializations together shared the rest. As to degrees, the faculties of law and medicine issued only doctorates, which in these specializations equaled a final professional degree. The difference can be illustrated by doctorates assigned in other specializations: a doctoral degree in philology, for instance, was just one option at the Arts and Sciences Faculties, since the latter also issued a vocational degree for secondary school teachers. The fact that the great majority of degrees were in these two specializations, stands in a sense for the statistical relevance of these figures for the whole academic market.

In addition, the choice between law and medicine alone reveals very significant differentials between elite groups of various ethnic and social backgrounds. Law was the classical study path for the 'Magyar historic middle class,' for those belonging to the political, ethnic, and confessional majority (among them members of the gentry) in the elites, and, last but not least, those who were seeking to assimilate into the Magyar 'gentlemanly' ruling strata via certified higher learning. Law also secured most chances for state employment, while what is termed 'state science' here allowed to aspire for positions in the higher echelons of civil service, including political careers proper. It is understandable, hence, that, as a rule, holders of legal degrees of ethnic minority extraction were oriented towards the far narrower segment of the academically based labor market, that of the Bar and private employment. By contrast, medicine implied lesser chances for public employment, pushing most medical graduates towards the underdeveloped and undersized private segment of the intellectual labor market. While the overproduction of degrees in law, so characteristic of the period under scrutiny, on the one hand made legal graduates face the decreasing value of their degrees and the increasing risk of underemployment owing to the saturation of the market, on the other hand medical doctors had to come to terms with the relative narrowness of the public sphere of employment, that is, with severe selection mechanisms implying more competition there. The career chances offered by the two main tracks had then clear consequences on their respective recruitment patterns, following both social and ethnocultural criteria. By approximation, medical studies in the Liberal age preferentially attracted members of minority groups. Roughly speaking, if law facilitated entrance into the traditional Magyar gentry-dominated society, medicine allowed one to make headway into the more modern, bourgeois, and often non-Magyar 'new middle class.' Nevertheless, both provided thus a path of upward social mobility. Last but

43 Law habitually presented the highest rate of study abandonment among the faculties of the classical university. Nevertheless, already by the 1910s the market value of law degrees became so inflated that very few drop-out students with partial qualifications could ever get proper employment. All the while medical studies did not at all present diploma pursuers with any rewards in case of partial fulfillment. It is in this sense, too, that this latter was a steeper and narrower path of study: once begun, it could not be abandoned, unless students renounced altogether to the labor market benefits that a medical doctor degree could have rewarded them with.

not least, these were two faculties where Transylvanians could benefit from a chance to study 'at home'. The parallel existence of law and medical faculties at the University of Kolozsvár/Cluj and in the capital makes a straight comparison possible as to what could be the options open to young Transylvanians liable to rise into the academically trained elite.

The distribution of all medical students within the Dual Monarchy between Kolozsvár/Cluj and Budapest is telling about the size of the two universities in general. In between 1900 and 1918, the Budapest share of the medical training market varied from about 73% as the lowest percentage (in the former part of the period) to 86% as the highest (in the last academic year of the period). Meanwhile, the Kolozsvár/Cluj contingent never rose to more than 13% (by the middle of the period), although it never fell under 7% (and that during the most unfavorable of the war years). Some of the decrease benefited Budapest, while the segment of the market which was covered by universities abroad (especially Vienna) also registered some loss. From both directions, the students tended to be absorbed by the Budapest medical faculty. While the one provincial university of Transylvania satisfied an almost exclusively local demand, the University of Budapest forced itself into sharing even this local Transylvanian market.⁴⁴

In the same vein, very few Transylvanians who started to study elsewhere (those affording or being compelled to choose Budapest from the beginning, for instance) transferred eventually to Kolozsvár/Cluj to continue studies there. While an average of 88.5% of Transylvanians started their studies at the Kolozsvár/Cluj Medical Faculty, only 8.6% and a mere 2.3% respectively of those who had begun medical studies in Budapest or abroad enrolled later at the Transylvanian university. Student peregrinations, even to Budapest, hardly ever attained considerable proportions, while Budapest students appeared to be more mobile in this regard. Among Transylvanian students most prone to peregrination were those of Mosaic, Lutheran, and, somewhat unexpectedly, the Greek Orthodox faith, while the least willing to peregrinate proved to be students of Roman and Greek Catholic faith, as well as Hungarian Calvinists.⁴⁵

We may well presume that somewhat similar averages applied in this respect to law students as well. It is well known from contemporary literature that it was relatively easier to get a law degree at the Transylvanian university than in Budapest and even those enrolled in medical studies there faced lesser non-academic hardships than students in Budapest. To compensate for these difficulties, one must take into account the perspective of earning a degree from the capital city which, obviously enough, 'sold better' on the labor market. Consequently, there were probably fewer medical students from Transylvania who, once having begun studies in Budapest, would have returned to Kolozsvár/Cluj to take their final exams. Although there is very little palpable evidence on such 'strategic peregrinations' in general, we may also presume that law students would also prefer qualifications issued in Budapest whenever they could afford them. Once one began in Budapest, it was certainly easier to

44 Karády and Nastasă, *The University of Kolozsvár/Cluj*, 75.

45 Ibid., 135–137.

complete studies in the Transylvanian alma mater, but few of those concerned actually seem to have taken this chance unless they were compelled to do so (notably for financial reasons). Budapest might have been somewhat reluctant to finalize and accredit individual academic qualifications initiated in the province. There were, though, some student clusters, especially Orthodox Romanians but also Jews, who preferred Budapest for their studies for what we may call ethno-strategic reasons. At least before 1914, beyond the above-mentioned extra value of the diploma from the capital, the cosmopolitan big city and its university secured them considerably better chances to pass unobserved as 'ethnic aliens', as compared to the small, provincial university 'at home.' For such clusters, the Budapest University offered an ethnically less challenging (if not necessarily less alienating) surrounding than the Kolozsvár one. This latter would indeed tend to compensate for smaller size and less professional fame by stressing its local and Magyar character.

In a somewhat similar vein, we may well presume that it was not only medical studies as such that confronted students with higher intellectual and existential stakes (and thus made the finalization of studies more compelling than in law). Once someone chose to study 'away from home' even as 'far' as Budapest, the risks of dropping out grew proportionally with geographical and cultural distance. In this regard alone, Romanians and Jews were obliged to resort to similar strategies, since neither proved to be liable to abandon their studies, that is, compared to other ethnic clusters of students. As minorities, they both clung stubbornly to the chance they might earn in higher learning, albeit with different means and outcomes. While Romanians may have been forced by circumstances to protract their studies, Jews tended to be the most swift of all in finishing them as soon as possible. It may be said that Transylvanian Romanians who chose to study at the Budapest University found themselves on a rather steep path upward, but the coercive effect of a peculiar double-or-nothing option pushed them to make the most of their resources to complete studies successfully.

To assert the size of the Transylvanian graduate contingent who earned their diplomas at the Budapest University, let us see the total number of doctoral degrees awarded there yearly in the early 20th century.

Table 6. Doctoral degrees awarded at the University of Budapest from 1900–1920 by specialization⁴⁶

	All doctoral degrees awarded				Shares of Transylvanian graduates				
	Philology & Theology	Law & Canon Law	State Science	Medicine and Pharmacy	All degrees, Law Faculty Budapest	% of Transylvanians in the Law Faculty Budapest	% of Transylvanians in the Faculty of Medicine	Transylvanians in Law and Medicine in Budapest	% of Transylvanians in Law and Medicine Budapest
1900/01	31+3	226+5	80	118+7	311	10.6%	15.2%	429	11.9%
1900/01	31+3	226+5	80	118+7	311	10.6%	15.2%	429	11.9%
1901/02	48+2	198+1	85	96+2	284	18.6%	14.6%	380	17.6%
1902/03	41+4	225+3	87	121+1	315	10.8%	14.9%	436	11.9%
1903/04	42+5	211+7	71	86+9	289	9.6%	11.6%	385	9.8%
1904/05	56+7	230+3	50	125+10	283	15.2%	15.2%	408	15.2%
1905/06	64+4	234+8	66	154+0	308	14.6%	14.3%	462	14.5%
1906/07	76+6	256+7	86	146+2	349	11.1%	15.0%	495	12.3%
1907/08	65+6	306+4	72	171+12	382	12.0%	19.3%	553	14.3%
1908/09	95+5	301+5	86	184+8	392	12.2%	16.3%	586	13.3%
1909/10	96+8	357+4	109	239+15	470	12.1%	13.8%	609	14.7%
1910/11	84+8	424+1	136	252+7	561	12.4%	17.8%	813	14.1%
1911/12	91+4	438+2	150	296+9	590	14.2%	17.9%	886	15.4%
1912/13	86+7	512+2	228	296+8	742	12.8%	20.9%	1,038	15.1%
1913/14	106+9	449+6	232	414+6	687	14.2%	15.4%	1,101	14.7%
1914/15	39+6	199+4	112	512+3	315	13.9%	17.7%	827	16.3%
1915/16	51+4	137+3	95	220+2	235	13.2%	15.4%	455	14.3%
1916/17	46+2	167+5	140	205+0	312	10.5%	18.0%	517	13.5%
1917/18	61+3	225+5	252	196+2	482	14.3%	21.9%	678	16.5%
1918/19	73+5	216+4	180	495+2	400	13.7%	18.4%	895	16.3%
1919/20	46+7	203+0	303	242+0	506	12.0%	13.6%	748	12.5%
TOTAL	1,297 (+107)	5,514 (+81)	2,620	4,568 (Medicine only)	8,213			12,781	
Total of Transylvanians	–	–	–	769	1,066	13.0%	16.8%	1,835	14.4%

Note: As for qualifications other than in law and medicine there is no evidence for Transylvanians in the present study.

46 Data compiled by the author from *Doctori nyilvántartások*.

Nevertheless, if we take into account the figures for Inner Transylvania separately from those of the border counties (in the Partium, the Banat, and the county of Máramaros/Maramureş), the totals of the twenty years will stand as follows: 582 graduates in the Budapest contingent with their birthplace in historic Transylvania. Of these, 322 earned a law degree and 260 a medical doctorate. Interestingly enough, within the Partium-Banat group, the law-medicine balance inclines a little more towards the former: in the twenty years observed, out of the 1,253 graduates from the region, only 509 obtained a diploma in medicine, while 744 graduated from one of the law tracks, with a predilection for law proper. The distribution of Inner Transylvanians within the law faculty was, on the contrary, more in favor of state science. In the background of these regional dissimilarities in terms of choice of study track one identifies ethnic and, to a lesser extent, social inequalities.

Beyond the split along the lines of this somewhat simplified regional setup presented above, the percentages and ratios of confessional and ethnic subgroups supply important information regarding professional preferences. These are worth considering in a temporal setup as well, that is, in each of the four five-year segments. In the 1900–1905 period, out of a total of 270 Transylvanian graduates, there were 34% Roman Catholics, 13% Calvinists, 5% Lutherans while the two Eastern Christian faiths made up 21% of the whole (with roughly two thirds of Greek Catholics among them). Jews alone constituted as much as 27%. There were only two Unitarians. Students born in Inner Transylvania represented only a small minority of 72, that is, 26.7% of the total. The intra-confessional distribution among faculties betrays the most decisive predilection for law among Calvinists, almost equaled by that of the Greek Catholics. Roman Catholics follow suit by a rough three quarters in law, while two thirds of the Greek Orthodox and the Jews are to be found in this faculty. In other words, medicine was generally much less preferred than law. While there is nothing unusual in that, it is quite surprising that three quarters of the Jewish students would also choose law, similarly to Greek Orthodox. It is also to be noted that the balance leans more pronouncedly towards law among those born in Partium-Banat as compared to Inner Transylvanian graduates. One reason for this may be that, throughout the surveyed period, the overwhelming majority of the Jews (both by percentages and in absolute numbers) came from the former subregion. One should remember that the choice of this last confessional group for law implied a marked willingness of Magyar assimilation and a quest for social integration in the ruling majority, while in the case of Greek Orthodox, especially Romanians, professional mobility may have been the main target.

Between 1905 and 1910, we have 372 Transylvanian graduates. Of them 30% were Roman Catholics, 12.1% Calvinists, 7.8% Lutherans, and 22.8% belonged to the two Greek confessions (with a slight relative majority represented this times by the Orthodox), while 27.7% Jews made up the rest of the contingent. Compared to the former temporal segment, the intra-confessional balance between the two study tracks presented the following novelties: Even less Catholics chose medical studies, which nevertheless registered some minor gains against law among Calvinists (one-third as compared to one-fifth previously) and Lutherans (two-thirds gained medical

doctor's diplomas now), the balance swinging pronouncedly in favor of medicine among Greek Catholics (more than half of the degrees earned by them in this period were in medicine), and again considerable gains among Jews. Finally, the Orthodox group of this period also shows a very slight preference for medicine. Just as earlier, the share of Inner Transylvanians amounts to only 36.3%. Most Jews and Romanians are to be found in the subgroups with birthplace in the Partium-Banat.⁴⁷ Again, there are but two Unitarian law graduates.

The 1910–1915 period betrays a spectacular leap in the absolute numbers of enrolled students generally, and, parallel to this, Transylvanian graduates as well. The bulk of the whole prewar contingent is concentrated in this period, especially in the 1911–12 and 1913–13 academic years. Though still much higher than any other pre-1910 figure, the total of Transylvanian graduates already reflects the early effects of the war juncture, and that even in the average distribution of diplomas among the study tracks under scrutiny, the number of medical degrees coming closer than ever before to those in law. The spectacular sum of 706 degrees was divided among the confessions as follows: 29.2% Roman Catholics, 9.9% Calvinists, 7.2% Lutherans, as well as 21.4% Greek Catholics and Orthodox, with an unprecedented large share of the latter against the former (almost twice as many Orthodox as Uniates). Altogether, compared to the first five years' sum, Transylvanian Eastern Christian graduates of Budapest boasted a threefold growth in absolute numbers, a clear sign of a significant opening up of the intellectual market towards this ethnic category. In the same vein, there was a great number of Jewish Transylvanians, up to 31% of the total. The quantitative basis of this general growth was to be found once again outside Inner Transylvania proper; only 216 belonged to the latter subregion in this period. Intraconfessional shares of the two study tracks among Transylvanians went as follows: roughly unchanged for the two Catholic faiths and the Lutherans in comparison with the previous period, with some further gains in the number of medical doctors from Transylvanian against co-regionals with law degrees, while among Jews the contingent of medical doctors even slightly exceeded that of the law graduates, a phenomena without a precedent before, but one that shall stay subsequently unaltered. Their reorientation is symptomatic for the end of the Liberal era, just as the drastically decreasing number of Jewish students in Hungarian universities in the dramatically altered cultural-political setup after 1919.

The last five years within reach are clearly marked by the war juncture, while the last discussed academic year is already halfway into the new geopolitical situation that divided the academic market into keenly guarded national enclaves after the 1919–1920 turnover. Symptomatic for the split-up of the market along ethno-political borderlines was that in this last year observed there were only three graduates of the Greek faiths in the University of Budapest,

47 To be sure, the bulk of the Transylvanian Jews came from the Partium (with a somewhat lesser contingent from the Banat), while comparatively most Romanians came from the Banat counties. It is also worth noting that – beyond the sheer geographical distribution of the population along ethnic lines in the subregions – it was what we may call Outer Transylvania that presented higher urbanization standards and population density than what Inner Transylvania could ever boast about.

while the previous four years had still produced more of them than any prewar period. The somewhat altered Partium-Banat to Inner Transylvania ratio (to the relative advantage of the latter within the whole) is also due to the war juncture. This visibly altered study demands and diploma-issuing priorities, conducing to a considerable increase of the demand for medical doctorates as contrasted to law degrees. Although drafting in the army affected both student contingents greatly, aspiring medical doctors were encouraged to take their degrees as early as possible, so that they could be sent to the front as military staff. On the contrary, there seems to have been much less practical use ascribed to law degrees in wartime, and would-be legal experts could be easily sent into combat without having completed their studies.

Roman Catholics made up 33.3% of this war contingent. Calvinists attained the peak of their quantitative presence with 16% in the student body, while Lutherans, on the contrary, were almost halved in absolute numbers (compared to the preceding period) yet still attaining a share of 5.4% in the decreased total. Together, graduates of the two Greek rites made up only 18.1%. What is absolutely unprecedented is that within the group, Greek Catholics nearly equaled the Orthodox in absolute numbers. The number of Jews decreased drastically, to less than half of the lowest total they had ever registered in the period under scrutiny, that of 1900–1905, with a share in the total down to 20.3%. Interestingly enough, roughly two-thirds of the Roman Catholics earned medical doctorates, almost inverting their intra-confessional distribution among the two study tracks. On the contrary, Calvinists continued to display a marked concentration along the most traditional choice; virtually all the substantial growth they boasted of in absolute numbers in this temporal segment was due to the spectacular growth of their numbers of law graduates. The Lutheran minority stayed most stable, but even here the decline in numbers can be attributed to the rarity of Transylvanian Lutheran medical students graduating in Budapest. As for Greek Catholics, they too maintained their prewar balance between the two tracks, that is, a little more than half of them chose medicine. Not so the Orthodox, who completely reversed their prewar ratios with two-thirds of them graduating from the medical faculty of Budapest. Jews went along their traditional preferences with a little more than half of them graduating in medicine. Last but not least, beyond the two Unitarian students and the two others “without a confession” there were 26 graduates listed in the present survey in the “Other” category. All appeared in the 1918–1919 contingent, all of them being medical doctors with Jewish background. One should remember here that the same applied to the few listed under the heading “without a confession” in the preceding twenty years – four only, two in law prior to 1912 and two in medicine after that time.

For reasons mentioned above, it is worth breaking further down the surveyed period into two temporal segments. The first fifteen years include degree earning patterns characteristic of the classical academic market setting in a time of peace (with the relatively minor exception of a switch towards medical degrees right in the final year of the period). Beyond a constant growth of the number of degrees granted, there was an almost unchanging average interethnic and interregional share in the body of graduates. The last five years included in the survey present evident signs of how war and the ensuing

differential ethnonational closing down of the academic market affected enrollments, applying to students of the University of Budapest in general and those from Transylvania in particular.

Thus, taking the total of the first fifteen years, that is 1348 diplomas earned by Transylvanians in the two Budapest faculties, Roman Catholics made up 30.3%, Calvinists 11.1%, Lutherans 7%, Greek Catholics 8.5%, and Greek Orthodox 13.3%. The altogether 293 graduates of the Greek rites amounted to 21.7% of the prewar total. The share of the Jews in the whole contingent was 29.3%. There were only 9 Unitarians and 2 “without a confession.” All medical doctorates taken together, they represented 39.4% of all diplomas, the rest, 60.6% being degrees of the law faculties, with an evident majority in law proper as against state science.

In interregional terms, we have 932 diplomas earned by students whose birthplace was either in the Partium, the Banat, or Máramaros/Maramureş county. These together make 69.1% of the total figure of ‘Transylvanians’ in the two Budapest faculties observed. With them, medicine had a share of 36.7%, a bit more than in the whole observed student body, while the 416 prewar Inner Transylvanian graduates of Budapest had as many as 45.4% medicine graduates among them. Although, expressed in absolute numbers, the Inner Transylvanian graduates’ predilection for medicine would supply a mere 189 as contrasted to the 354 medical degrees granted to students from the former subregion, it may be assumed that Inner Transylvanians were somewhat more inclined towards this more modern and ‘bourgeois’ study track than their Partium-Banat counterparts. Interestingly enough, these proved to be more conservative and/or willing to assimilate to the traditional Magyar middle class. One of the main reasons for this relative preference for law degrees lies in the fact that the bulk of the Jews in the contingent originated exactly from these regions outside Inner Transylvania. The other side of the coin is that, intraregionally, state science was somewhat more often chosen by Inner Transylvanians than by students from the other subregions, that is, once they were enrolled in the law faculty.

The average intraconfessional pattern of enrollment during the fifteen years before the war is as follows: As much as 72.1% of the Catholics chose law, while only 28.7% and 36.2% graduated in law among the Calvinists and the Lutherans respectively. Greek Catholics also betrayed a predilection for law with 63.3% of law degrees, while we have slightly fewer of these among the Greek Orthodox, 60.1%. As for Jews, only a very slight majority among them (52.4%) earned degrees from a law faculty. Nevertheless, in absolute numbers even this share went up to considerable figures, especially among those originating from the Partium-Banat subregion.

In general, war conditions were manifested by a considerable decrease in the number of diplomas, even though there was, especially during 1916–1918, an upsurge in enrollment and temporary individual student transfers to the university of the capital at the expense of the peripherally situated University of Kolozsvár/Cluj. Transylvanians earned 487 diplomas altogether in this period, which is only 68.5% of the prewar peak of 706 degrees awarded to Transylvanians. The decrease of the overall number is nevertheless paralleled by a hitherto unprecedented balance between law and medical doctorates

(only 51.12% being from the first category). This applied both to Inner Transylvanians and those from the other subregions for which the share of law and medical doctorates came without precedent equally close to each other. The cause of this hasty switch towards medicine cannot be found with enrollment figures proper. Rather, it comes from the demand emanating from the battlefields that pushed the university to offer medical doctorates to as many aspiring military doctors as possible. In other words, the relative gains in medical degree figures appear to be the most direct outcome of the war juncture, accompanied by the devaluation of law degrees.

The 321 diplomas earned by graduates whose birthplace falls within the Partium-Banat subregion make almost 66% of the total, only about 4% less than the average of the prewar period (up to 1915). Yet, even this slight shift indicates that Inner Transylvanians might have clung more stubbornly to the perspectives expected to open up via a Budapest diploma. The minor relative decrease is also explained through a somewhat modified inter-confessional setup; in the two faculties taken together, we have 33.3% Catholics, 16% Calvinists, altogether four Unitarians, a conspicuously high number of 26 listed as “without confession” (all Jews, as observed above, and all appearing in the 1918/19 academic year, obviously enough, in connection with new perspectives of purely secular self-definition opened by the fall of the Monarchy and the October Revolution of 1918). Lutherans made up again but 5.3%, while the number of Greek Catholics (8.6%) almost equaled that of the Greek Orthodox (9.4%) – the two Eastern Christian confessions representing thus 18.1% of the total.

As a proof of still lingering earlier interethnic patterns of recruitment, there are two trends worth mentioning here as to Eastern Christian graduates. There was a relative increase registered by Greek Catholics, bringing their numbers close to their Orthodox counterparts, something unseen before. This development was accompanied by their evident preference for medical doctorates in both contingents when compared to peacetime averages, which is a neat inversion of earlier preferences displayed by the Orthodox. Still, the most meaningful of all changes in interethnic enrollment patterns concerned Jews: if expressed in absolute numbers, there was a sharp relative decrease of the Jewish share among graduates in the last years under scrutiny, down to an unprecedented 20.3% of the whole student body. This must be attributed to the anti-Jewish crisis staged by the White Terror starting in mid-1919. Somewhat similarly to the Eastern Christians, there is a relative increase though of medical doctorates among Jewish graduates, but in their case the shift of the balance towards medicine proved to be the outcome of a long-term development.

Notwithstanding the considerable distortions of the peacetime inter-faculty, intraconfessional, and interconfessional patterns of recruitment observable in the 1919–1920 academic year, it is worth summing up the survey with a closer focus upon the global figures of the twenty years under scrutiny. Taking the 1,835 graduates from the Transylvanian regions, overall interregional shares were as follows: Historic Transylvania provided 31.7% of the segment, all the rest being accounted for by the Partium-Banat and Máramaros/Maramureş subregions. Law degrees made up altogether 59.4% of the total

with 40.6% of medical doctorates. Within the Inner Transylvanian contingent, 55.3% graduated in law and 46.7% in medicine, respectively. This is a somewhat altered pattern as compared to the one presented above as being the more 'modern' Inner Transylvanian orientation. The reasons for the reversal are to be found with the changes of the war years affecting the overall pattern of enrollment. In the last years of the period, more and more students from Inner Transylvania graduated in law at the Budapest University.

The share of the Roman Catholics in the total was 30.8%, that of medical graduates among them being only 30.1%. Calvinists accounted for 12.4% of the total, with 34.2% medical doctors among them. The Lutheran contingent provided a mere 6.5% of all graduates but with as much as 62.5% medical doctors in the group (an indirect indication of the overwhelmingly German ethnic background and more 'modern' orientation of this contingent). Greek Catholics amounted to 9.0%, of whom 49.1% became medical doctors in Budapest, while among the Greek Orthodox which totaled 12.3%, 44.4% earned a medical doctorate. The two Greek faiths together made up 21.25% of the total and among them medical diplomas had a share of 46.4%. Western Christian faiths lumped together made up 50.9% of the whole contingent. Of the latter inter-confessional Transylvanian subdivision, 35.2% completed a medical specialization in Budapest. Jews accounted for 26.9% of the whole Transylvanian contingent in Budapest, 48.8% having taken a medical degree. All in all, medical degrees represented 41.9% and law doctorates 48.10% of the 1,835 degrees earned in these two specializations in Budapest by Transylvanians in the twenty years under scrutiny.

Notwithstanding the sheer absolute numbers, the 'modernization paradigm' (medicine being regarded as a more 'modern' or 'bourgeois' option as against the more 'gentry-like' law) offers somewhat unexpected results in an inter-confessional (and implicitly interethnic) comparison. Having in mind the average share of the medical faculty among all Transylvanian graduates between 1900 and 1920, Roman Catholics are placed somewhat below the line, followed upwards by Calvinists and Greek Orthodox, with Jews above the line, the Greek Catholics closely following suit, and being surpassed only by the Lutherans. It is owing solely to these mostly German Lutherans that the relative majority gained by medicine comes to the side of the Western Christians and that Protestants so obviously surpass Roman Catholics in terms of intraconfessional medical specialization ratios. All in all, the Budapest contingent of Transylvanian graduates were undeniably the most dynamic and perseverant among their co-regionals, both in terms of a faculty by faculty comparison and in the sense that once they chose the capital city for their studies, they tended to be attracted by medicine; the most rewarding segments of the academic market for them – where ethnic competition was unavoidably also present – even at the price of extra hardships. Compared to their more numerous but less versatile co-nationals remaining at their 'home university,' it is especially the Romanian students who, once they made their way to the capital city for studies, could embark on a more 'modern' study option.

As regards the size and regional distribution of the Romanian student contingents, we have the following comparative table:

Table 7. Ethnic Romanian students by regions of origin in the Faculties of Law & State Science and Medicine & Pharmacology at the Universities of Kolozsvár/Cluj and Budapest (up to 1918)⁴⁸

Region of Origin	University				Totals by Regions of origin	
	Kolozsvár/Cluj		Budapest		Law & P. Sc.	Medicine & Pharm.
	Law & P. Sc.	Medicine & Pharm.	Law & P. Sc.	Medicine & Pharm.		
Transylvania proper	1,226	424	268	145	1,491	569
Partium	213	54	111	53	324	107
Banat	177	68	256	124	433	192
Inner Hungary	11	6	27	10	38	16
Other within Dualist Hungary	4	6	20	16	24	22
Total by Faculty	1,631	558	682	348	2,310	906
					Law & P. Sc.	Med. & Pharm.
Percentages by faculties as referred to:						
All of the identical faculty	70.6	61.6	29.5	38.4	100.0	100.0
All the students in both universities	43.1	14.7	18.0	9.2	100.0 (N=3,781)	
Percentages reflecting regional distribution as referred to totals in identical faculties:						
Transylvania	82.1	74.6	17.9	26.5	100.0	100.0
Partium	65.7	50.5	34.3	49.4	100.0	100.0
Banat	40.9	35.4	59.1	64.6	100.0	100.0
Other (Hungary)	24.2	31.6	75.8	68.4	100.0	100.0

Note: With all the impediments regarding the possibility of a direct comparison to the 1900–1920 Transylvanian contingent of graduates of Budapest University (they mirror a larger period than what we have focused on in the present paper, and they represent enrolled student figures, that is, not graduates) the data in this table is still worth consideration, since they give a closer view of intra-ethnic regional disparities and the overall intra-ethnic study preferences of Romanians – the most peculiar and ‘problematic’ ethnic contingent, both in terms of numerical representation and career orientation, of all Transylvanians.

Still, as an ethnic minority group, the Romanians of Transylvania were in many respects placed on the other extremity of the above-mentioned modernization axis represented by Germans and Jews. As already observed, the great majority of the Romanian population was of a markedly rural and traditional character, being only sporadically touched by trends of modernization that occurred elsewhere in Central Europe. Insularity and

⁴⁸ Source: Sigmirean, *Istoria formării intelectualității românești*, 205–207.

political apathy persisted until the end of the 19th century. Social grievances were all directed against the ruling Magyar element. There was scarcely any intraethnic clash among Romanians on the social plane. On the one hand, they tended to strive for a collective self-preservation of sorts via passive resistance. Many a time, their educational choices reflected and reinforced the same sense of group solidarity and ethnically oriented strategy of social mobility. On the other hand, they were on the average not in the position to afford breaking away from cultural traditions. This is illustrated by the lowest relative ratio of academically based secular career paths displayed by students of this ethnic cluster.

While the over-performance regarding academic requirements typical of the Jewish contingent may be interpreted as an effort to make the best of one's studies as a channel towards assimilation, later ages of graduation and lower average marks of Romanian students may, at least in part, be due to linguistic hardships and cultural alienation faced by students in academic institutions whose teaching language and civilization setting was not those of their own. Also, early age of graduation and excellence seemed to be a largely cross-ethnic social class privilege,⁴⁹ in which respect the ethnic Romanians were on the average disadvantaged, if compared to the other major groups (Jews and Magyars), given their largely rural and lower class background. The age of graduation with a doctor's degree was the lowest among Jewish students, with those belonging to the 'dominant confessions' coming in between, and the most advanced in age at graduation were Romanians of both confessions. This goes in parallel with the phenomena regarding age of graduation from high school and those of learning excellence as observed above.⁵⁰

Concluding Remarks

Owing to its uniquely mixed ethnic surroundings, the national and confessional composition of the educated Transylvanian elite, whether trained at the local university or in Budapest, was symptomatic of the underlying social inequalities as well as the advantages that only members of the ruling clusters (and those culturally or socially associated with them) could benefit from. This local segment of the educational 'commonwealth' of the Monarchy proved to be limited in scope and specifically selective as regards ethnic minorities.

On the one hand, Germans and Jews fared relatively well in this respect, since they tended to draw profit from opportunities opened up in higher learning via the most 'modern' paths of study, or those sectors of the intellectual market which were out of reach for or neglected by their competitors. The state-managed sectors were anyhow overcrowded with members of the traditional Hungarian middle class. These two ethnic clusters were somewhat

49 Those with substantial cultural capital accumulated in the family are more likely to obtain better results and at an earlier age than those emanating from the 'lower' bourgeois or petit bourgeois strata, hence newcomers in the cultural capital market, and thus coming somewhat late and 'from behind.' See Karády, *A kolozsvári egyetem orvostanhallgatói*, 33.

50 Ibid., 32, 47.

atypically 'modern' also as regards their ratio of urbanization, occupational strategies, primary level of 'embourgeoisement,' and cultural orientations. In other words (and beyond situations when they felt compelled to act otherwise), they could in general afford to engage themselves in study tracks that promoted them the most on the road of upward social mobility. The predilection of Germans for engineering and the massive overrepresentation of Jews in the medical profession (not to speak of their general overinvestment in education), together with the all but exclusive taste for legal studies on the part of the average Magyar element, are just the best known examples of ethno-culturally grounded patterns of academic (and career) orientations.

On the other hand, despite their apparent under-representation as regards sheer enrollment ratios, Romanians benefited of relative gains which are not visible at first sight. Those of them who chose lay life-paths were quite successful in enhancing their social capital. Coming from either university of Dualist Hungary, Transylvanian Romanian graduates added substantially to the middle-class layer of their ethnic society. As it has been demonstrated by intra-ethnically perceived social recruitment patterns, relatively far more Romanians switched from lower class standing for a higher social rank via studies than in the case of Magyars.

Hungarians did not, on the average, make use of much intra-ethnic social mobility. They tended to reproduce and reiterate middle-class positions which were already redundant among them at that time. While Romanians managed to produce a considerable part of their middle class via higher education, Transylvanian Hungarians merely conserved it in most cases. While the latter did not excel in taking up modern career-paths, many Romanians were compelled to resort to alternative solutions, that is, to take up academically-based careers that were not closely tied to the state-managed job-market, anyway overcrowded by the Magyar 'titular elite'. Their investment into higher learning seems to have been far more strategic in the long run than that of their Magyar counterparts. Such relative gains are specifically evident if we regard enrollment ratios at both universities of Dualist Hungary together. Despite their - not once only imagined - ethnic advantage, inner Transylvanian Magyars behaved far less dynamically as regards academically-based careers or the location of their studies than Romanians. Once Romanians could afford higher learning, formal fulfillment of requirements of assimilation paradoxically helped them to maintain high positions within their own ethnic society, and that especially when the political context changed from a multiethnic setup to that of the nation-states, to be carved out of the defunct Monarchy.

VICTOR KARADY

Denominational Inequalities of Elite Training in Transylvania during the Dual Monarchy¹

Recent research, due to inquisitive explorations made by Peter-Tibor Nagy of the Hungarian census archives (in search of unpublished data sets relative to matters sociohistorical in old regime Hungary), has yielded unprecedented results as to differences in levels of education among ethnic and denominational clusters. The statistical tables for Transylvania and Banat, and also for the rest of the country, are to be published in separate volumes with introductions comparing the various provinces under scrutiny, as it has already been done for several other provinces.²

This extremely refined and quantified evidence offers insights into local educational attainments of large social clusters defined simultaneously by not less than five statistically combined variables. Levels of schooling represent the dependent variable with values ranging from illiteracy to 8th grade secondary school training and above. (Unfortunately the archival sources surviving from the 1910 census do not distinguish those having started or accomplished post-secondary studies – university students or graduates – from secondary school degree holders, nor does it specify the different possible meanings of secondary studies concerned, such as, among others, certified graduation or class examinations from the 8th grade of a gymnasium, a ‘real school’, a higher commercial college or a teacher training ‘normal school’, all these being liable to be included in the given category.) The independent variables are as follows: region (counties and big towns with administrative autonomy – the latter being Kolozsvár/Cluj and Marosvásárhely/Târgu Mureş for the period concerned), gender, religion, and age. Other information is included with this, which is indirectly or partially connected to the education related data proper. These are, for example, the populations in absolute numbers and proportions by age brackets and religion, the percentage of the denominational clusters in the global population of the regional unit, the break-up of the denominational groups by mother tongue (indicating ethnicity). Three global indices of educational attainments are also

- 1 This study has benefited from data gathered thanks to research programmes supported by the Hungarian National Research Support Scheme NKFP, the OTKA and the Research Support Fund of the Central European University.
- 2 See V. Karady and P. T. Nagy, *Denominational Inequalities of Education in Dualist Hungary. A Data Bank for Transdanubia, 1910*. (Budapest: Oktatóskutató Intézet, 2003); *idem*, *Educational Inequalities and Denominations. Database for Western Slovakia, 1910* (Budapest, Wesleyan Theological Academy, 2004); *idem*, *Educational Inequalities and Denominations. Database for Eastern Slovakia, 1910* (Budapest: Wesleyan Theological Academy, 2006); *idem*, *Educational Inequalities and Denominations. Database for Transylvania, 1910* (Budapest: Wesleyan Theological Academy, 2008 forthcoming).

added for each denominational group concerned. They are constructed in a way that they indicate the cluster's over or underrepresentation on various levels of education as compared to the regional (county or city) average.

The last independent variable, age, distinguishing age five through age 60 and above, appears to be particularly precious, since it permits the reinterpretation of age group specific educational attainments in terms of those typical of historical generational brackets, allowing for the (in fact unverifiable and certainly not quite exact) hypothesis of identical death rates and migratory movements of the denominational groups concerned ere 1910. On the whole one can suppose, for example, that the distribution of levels of education, as observed among 60 year old and beyond in 1910, illustrates, at least approximatively, the differences in schooling investment among those born before 1850, entering primary school mostly in the 1850s and liable to be enrolled in secondary schools mostly somewhat later, in the 1850s and 1860s.

In this exposé I will sum up first our main results of this statistical data on Transylvania with a few references to educational patterns identified elsewhere for the same period. In the end I will try to offer cues to explain the typical discrepancies emerging from our tables. (See below, 90-101).

The General Hierarchy of Performances

The first observation concerns the very sharp hierarchical order of educational attainments by denominations.

Taking first into consideration data related to men, the general results of Jews appear to be by far the best, since their representation among those with the highest educational attainments exceeded by a factor surpassing 3-4 times the average. Roman Catholics come second on this ladder with approximately twice as many educated men above 4th grade secondary level than the average, but they are followed closely by Lutherans with levels almost as good. Unitarians are somewhat below them and Calvinists much lower, but still significantly exceeding the mean level of attainments. On the contrary, the two Christian groups of Greek ritual, with a slight relative advantage for the Greek Catholics, are located much below average on this scale.

This general rank order applies largely to women as well, but with some variations. Jewish preeminence was not so pronounced for women as for men and it asserted itself above all among those with a 4th grade secondary school level (but there exceeding the average by a mean factor of 5 times) and falling slightly behind Roman Catholics among those with 8th grade level or higher. For the rest, the hierarchy proved to be quite similar to those proper to the male population, with a stronger relative preeminence of Catholics, a somewhat poorer performance of Unitarians and a relatively lower one with the Greek Orthodox as compared to the Greek Catholics.

Thus, taken as a whole, the evidence of our data attests to an extraordinary diversity of levels of certified education, the gap between the most and the less advanced confessional clusters being very large. Moreover, in each denominational bracket the proportion of those with the highest attainment does not always correlate with similarly high proportions to those with 4th or 6th grade levels or simple literates. We can pursue the study of this diversity on

the basis of some details of our tables allowing further qualifications of the given general hierarchy. They indeed bring into the picture elements capable to modify to some extent the main patterns hitherto identified.

The first qualification of that order must bear upon discrepancies related to literacy levels and the proportions of the highly educated. While among males Jews and Roman Catholics surpass Lutherans (and by the same token, incidentally, all the other groups) with high proportions of their best educated brackets, levels of literacy of rank and file Lutherans (with only 3-4% of illiterates among adolescent and young adult males) were definitely significantly better than those of all other groups, including Jews (who had at least 6% illiterates in their younger adult age groups) and Roman Catholics (with at least as much as 12% illiterates in their younger adult population). Even Unitarians (8%) and Calvinists (11%) had less illiterates in the age group of 12-14 years than among similar Roman Catholic adolescents (13%). Rates of illiteracy were of course of a much higher order among those of Greek ritual, but while the majority of Uniates (Greek Catholics) had no certified writing and reading skills, this applied to a large but still only minority group of young Orthodox (39% in the 12-14 age bracket).

Similar but not identical discrepancies can be found among women. The contrast is indeed stark between the very low illiteracy rate of Lutherans (less than 5% in all young age groups and in some of these even remarkably lower than among male Lutheran adolescents) as well as the somewhat higher rates of Jews (6-9% among adolescents and young adults) and the much higher ones of Roman Catholics (13-16% in similar age brackets). For the rest there was a comparable rank order as among the male brackets.

This means that the 'educational hierarchy' differed significantly following the way it was measured. In more concrete terms, among the three most educated denominational clusters, Jews and Roman Catholics were definitely surpassing Lutherans by their share among those having obtained elite training, but they fell behind Lutherans as to the eradication of illiteracy. Such a conclusion calls for at least three specific remarks.

The first concerns the specific status of Lutherans in Transylvanian society, since our data call partially into question the commonly accepted idea of Lutheran over-education, an apparent truism, if not a fallacy, of Transylvanian history.³ All but a few Transylvanian Lutherans were German speaking Saxons (formally 87%, even in 1910, after decades of Magyarizing 'assimilationist' policies in the country).⁴ The 'Saxon University' – heritage of the medieval organisation of the privileged Saxon community in feudal times – did provide apparently for the generalization of literacy from very early on. Male Lutherans of the elderly generations in 1910 for example, born between 1851 and 1860, displayed already a merely marginal proportion of illiterates – 11%, as compared even to Jews – 19%, let alone Roman Catholics – 39%. Moreover, such an early spread of basic

3 See Joachim von Puttkamer, *Schulalltag und nationale Integration in Ungarn*, (München: Oldenburg, 2003), 149-152.

4 The most competent authors considered that practically all Lutherans in Transylvania were German Speaking Saxons. See for example Nyárády R. Károly, *Erdély népesedéstörténete* [History of the population in Transylvania], (Budapest: Központi Statisztikai Hivatal, 2003), 178.

education was equally extended over Lutheran women, since in the same generations the latter had only 15% of illiterates as opposed to a majority (54%) of Jewish women and as many as 63% of Roman Catholics. The efficiency of the Lutheran-Saxon school network is thus far from being a historical myth. It cannot be regarded merely as fully applicable to the same extent to the more advanced levels of education, at least in Transylvania, much to the contrary of what could be established in this respect for the the whole Dualist Hungary.⁵

The second remark is related to Jews who, though largely Magyarized by 1910 (with 74% Magyar speakers in Transylvania) achieved this status only lately. This involved two important qualifications of Jewish linguistic and educational skills. First, still one quarter of them continued to profess Yiddish mother tongue or 'first usual language', so they appeared in statistical data as 'German speakers'. Indeed Yiddish was not recognized by the state as one of the 'national' or 'ethnic' languages of the Monarchy, following the legal fiction that Jews did not constitute a 'national minority' (*nemzetiség*, *Nationalität*) but a religious cluster only. Second, Jewish male literacy, especially in the elderly generations, was considered rather general, but acquired in traditional religious schools (*chederim*, *yeshivot*) and thus often limited to Yiddish and/or Hebrew. For census inspectors, who did not, most of the times, have means to control Yiddish or Hebrew literacy, such skills were not acknowledged as equivalent to literacy in one of the official languages of the Empire. *Yeshivot* often trained their students in talmudic studies beyond 20 years of age without issuing certifications accepted by state authorities (except the exam for Orthodox Rabbis in the Pozsony/Bratislava/Pressburg *Yeshiva*). We do not know whether such advanced religious learning qualified students for a classification in the category of those with 6th or 8th grade levels, but it is most probable that some Jewish literates in Yiddish and/or Hebrew could be easily recorded as illiterates. Hence the officially observed rate of Jewish literacy (as well as, possibly, more advanced levels of learning) must have corresponded to actually much higher intellectual competences which lacked the usual certifications by recognized scholarly bodies. This remark, far from modifying our conclusions, confirms one of its main findings, the relative Jewish preeminence in educational matters in Transylvania which, as it has been established elsewhere, corresponds to similar conclusions for the whole Dualist Hungary.⁶

5 If measured by various criteria, like the qualifications of *érettségi* exams, other marks obtained in the main gymnasium subjects, access frequencies to higher education, Lutherans were on top of the hierarchy of school excellence during and, indeed, even after the Dualist era. See some of my studies relevant in this respect: "Social Mobility, Reproduction and Qualitative Schooling Differentials in Old Regime Hungary", *History Department Yearbook 1994–1995* (Budapest: Central European University, 1996), 134–156; "Zsidók és evangélikusok a magyar iskolarendszerben" [Jews and Lutherans in the Hungarian school system] in *Iskolarendszer és felekezeti egyenlőtlenségek Magyarországon (1867–1945)* [School system and denominational inequalities in Hungary, 1867–1945] (Budapest: Replika-könyvek, 1997), 95–110, and "Nemzeti és felekezeti kisebbségek a budapesti egyetemeken a századfordulón", [National and confessional minorities in the universities of Budapest around 1900], *ibidem*, 195–215.

6 See, besides my book in Hungarian, cited above, some of my other relevant studies: "Social Mobility, Reproduction and Qualitative Schooling Differentials in Old Regime Hungary", *op. cit.*; Victor Karady and István Kemény, "Antisémitisme universitaire et concurrence de classe: la loi de numerus clausus en Hongrie entre les deux guerres", *Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales*, 34, Sept. 1980, 67–96; "Jewish Enrollment Patterns

For an illustration of the fact that Jewish literacy could be acquired outside the official school channels, let us quote data on the rates of schooling by denominations in 1890, an early period when – following our generational data – male Jewish illiteracy had fallen already to the level below 10%, but when still close to one third of Jewish children subject to obligatory schooling would not turn up in public schools. Our findings indeed show that 95% of Lutherans, 82% of Roman Catholics, 78% of Unitarians, 77% of Calvinists of compulsory school age were actually enrolled while only 65% of Greek Catholics, 66% of Greek Orthodox and not much more than 69% of Jews⁷. The hierarchy of enrollment frequencies followed thus very closely that of educational performances observed in the generational groups concerned in various denominations – except for Jews. This could happen only if we take into account those Jewish children who attended *chederim* and *yeshivot* only, instead of primary schools of public status. This occurred probably more often in Transylvania than elsewhere in the country, since the network of Jewish primary schools of public status proved to be indeed very small (7 altogether in 1900⁸). This also involved the fact, by the way, that Jews could attend practically only state or municipal school, due to their difficulties to find admission in Christian schools and/or their reluctance to attend them. Preference for non confessional schools was a general and very special trend of Jewish primary schooling at that time.⁹

These circumstances of Jewish schooling are well reflected in the vast regional differences of Jewish presence in primary schools of public status. In

in Classical Secondary Education in Old Regime and Inter-War Hungary”, *Studies in Contemporary Jewry* (Bloomington), 1984, 1, 225-252; “Assimilation and Schooling: National and Denominational Minorities in the Universities of Budapest around 1900” in *Hungary and European Civilization*, ed. G. Ránki (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989), 285-319; “Jewish Over-Schooling in Hungary. Its Sociological Dimensions” in *Sozialstruktur und Bildungswesen in Mitteleuropa* [Social Structure and Education in Central Europe], ed. V. Karady, W. Mitter (Köln, Wien, Böhlau Verlag, 1990), 209-246; “Schulbildung und Religion. Zu den ethnisch-konfessionellen Strukturmerkmalen der ungarischen Intelligenz in der Zwischenkriegszeit” in *Vergleichende Erziehungswissenschaft, Herausforderung, Vermittlung, Praxis. Festschrift für Wolfgang Mitter zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. Christoph Kodron, Botho von Kopp, Uwe Lauterbach, Ulrich Schäfer, Gerlind Schmidt (Köln-Wien, Böhlau Verlag, 1997), Band 2., 621-641. “Jewish Over-Schooling Revisited: the Case of Hungarian Secondary Education in the Old Regime (1900–1941)”, *Yearbook of the Jewish Studies Programme, 1998/1999*, (Budapest: Central European University, 2000), 75-91; Victor Karady and with Lucian Nastasa, *The University of Kolozsvár/Cluj and the Students of the Medical Faculty (1872–1918)*, (Cluj, Ethnocultural Diversity Resource Center, Budapest-New York, Central European University Press, 2004).

- 7 Calculations made on the basis of information on the size of denominational populations subject to obligatory schooling in *A magyar királyi Vallás és Közoktatásügyi miniszter jelentése az 1890-es évről*, [Report of the royal Hungarian minister of cults and public instruction for 1890], (Budapest: 1891), 154-155, and on those among them who actually attended state recognized schools (*ibid.* 162-163).
- 8 Cf. *Magyar statisztikai évkönyv* [Hungarian statistical yearbook], (Budapest: 1901), 320.
- 9 Indeed Jews were the only confessional group around 1900 which sent a mere minority of its offspring to its own confessional schools (37% in 1904), the majority attending state or municipal schools (48%), those of other denominations (13%) or private institutions (3%). See my study: “Szegregáció, asszimiláció és disszimiláció. Felekezetek az elemi iskolai piacon (1867–1942)” [Segregation, assimilation and dissimulation. Denominations in the Hungarian school market, 1867–1942], in *Világosság* (Budapest) 2003, XLIII/8-9, 61-83, especially 78-80.

counties representing the main track of migration and settlement of the most traditional Orthodox Jewry, the regional extensions of *Galicianers*, just South of Máramaros county, the settlement center of Hungary's *Ostjuden* – there were no Jewish schools of public status at all, and the rate of attendance of Jewish children in the age of school obligation also remained for long very low. For 1890 the proportions were only 52% in Szolnok-Doboka, 25% in Maros-Torda (equal to that of Máramaros) and 27% in Kis-Küküllő counties.¹⁰ Some 37% of Transylvanian Jewish children concerned lived in these counties at that time.

The third issue has to do with the general and so to say 'disrupted' nature of the global level of educational attainments in Transylvania. On the one hand, some groups showed high attainments as compared to the country wide average in Hungary, while on the other hand, several others had only modest if not actually depressed educational scores, the latter marking strongly the majority denominations of Greek ritual (amounting to 58% of the local population around 1900¹¹). All this in spite of the decent good level of institutional investments in schooling as shown in the following table:

Table 1. The share of Transylvanian population, schools and pupils in those of Hungary (outside Croatia) in 1910¹²

	share of Transyl- vania in % of Hungary	numbers in Hungary
population of 6-19 years old ¹³	14.1 %	5,455,244
Educational institutions		
nursery schools	11.4 %	1 995
primary daily schools	16.1 %	16 530
'civic' lower secondary school (polgári)	11.9 %	471
male teacher training Normal Schools	18.1 %	49
female teacher training Normal Schools	9.8 %	41
gymnasiums and reáliskolák	19.0 %	210
high schools for girls	5.7 %	35
higher educational institutions	16.9 %	59
Educated clientele		
children in nursery schools	8.7 %	187,697
pupils in primary daily schools	12.1 %	1,942,438
pupils in 'civic' (polgári) schools	9.7 %	87,509
male students in teacher training Normal Schools	17.0%	4,877
female students in teacher training Normal Schools	9.1 %	4,867

10 See the above cited passage of the Report of the Minister of Cults and public instruction in note 5.

11 Cf. Károly R. Nyárády, op. cit., 387.

12 Calculations concerning schools, pupils and students based on data in *Magyar statisztikai évkönyv* [Hungarian statistical yearbook], (Budapest: 1911), 332-333.

Denominational Inequalities of Elite Training in Transylvania

students in gymnasiums	16.5 %	60,613
students in reáliskolák	11.4 %	10,688
students in high schools for girls	5.6 %	6,318
university, academy and seminary students	18.8 %	14,021

This simple listing of proportions of institutions and school clientele in Transylvania as compared to those in the whole country demonstrate the fundamental duality of the educational market in the region, torn aside by contradictory instances of both under and overdevelopment. On the one hand, the province was endowed well over average with primary, secondary and even higher educational institutions, except for those dedicated to women. Moreover, in these schools the proportion of students in the post-primary institutions was also above the country wide average, that is, above the Transylvanian proportion of young people in 1910. On the other hand, the structure of the educational provision in Transylvania was markedly backward or ‘premodern’ at that time, as illustrated, among others, by the scarcity of women’s schools and (in part as a consequence) the much below the average enrollments in the female educational tracks, the generally low enrollments in primary schools¹⁴ or – not exemplified in the above table – the high percentage of kids in the age of obligatory schooling exempted from schooling (38% of all those in the country in 1907–1913¹⁵) or simply not enrolled in a primary school (26% of all similar cases in the country in 1907–1913¹⁶), or the distinctly high proportion of teachers without proper qualification (22% as against the country wide average of 16% in 1897/8¹⁷), etc.

Age and Generation Specific Inequalities

If we consider the data referring to various levels of schooling as well as those pertaining to different age groups, our global observations related to educational inequalities must be subject to substantial revisions.

Starting with the evidence on levels related to men, one striking difference opposes Jews to all other groups as to their proportions with lower grade secondary schooling and those with 8 classes or more, the latter representing the clusters having achieved education due to the gentlemanly ruling class – including fully completed secondary school training with or without *érettségi* certification (*Matura*,

13 Calculated on the basis of data in Magyar statisztikai közlemények /Hungarian statistical reports/, 61, 302-431.

14 Just over 71% of children of obligatory schooling age attended a school in 1900 as against a country wide average of 82%. Cf. *Magyar statisztikai évkönyv* [Hungarian statistical yearbook], (Budapest: 1901), 314.

15 Cf. *Magyar statisztikai évkönyv* [Hungarian statistical yearbook], (Budapest: 1915), 240.

16 *Ibid. loc.cit.*

17 *Ibid.* 1898, 299.

Abitur)¹⁸ or equivalent,¹⁹ together with, occasionally, higher studies in universities, vocational academies or theological seminaries. It is certainly a pity that the ‘8th grade’ category is not defined more clearly, especially that those having begun or graduated from universities, academies, or seminaries are not distinguishable here.

However imprecise our data may be, the main result in this context is that the percentage of graduates of 8th grade and above exceeded for all Christian males in each age group that of those with only 4th grade level. The educational pyramid of Christians proved thus to be grounded on a narrow basis with an enlargement on its top, with the obvious exception of the 15-19 year age group (most of its members being yet technically unable to reach a level of 8th grade or beyond). Such a narrow basis was particularly striking for Unitarians, for whom men with 4th grade level represented mostly less than a third of those with 8th grade level and above. For men of Greek ritual similar discrepancies, insignificant or even inexistent in the oldest generations, also tended to grow excessively in the younger age groups. Such a ‘reversed pyramid’ of educational attainments can be found for Jews only in the very youngest age groups (below 30) but not in the older ones. This meant that relative Jewish overrepresentation in elite schooling rose much more above average with the 4th grade level than with the 8th grade and above. This applied to some extent – though in a much milder way – to Lutherans and Roman Catholics, the two other best educated clusters, while Unitarians showed significantly less overrepresentation as compared to the average with the 4th grade level than with the 8th grade level. Men of Greek ritual were also, similarly, as a consequence, more poorly represented in the 4th grade level than among those in the 8th grade or above. This is illustrated in the following table, summarizing our findings among relevant census data.

Table 2. A summary of age group specific proportions of men with various levels of schooling by denominations in Transylvania (1910)²⁰

	4 classes among 15 years of age and above	6 classes among 20 years of age and above	8 classes and above among 20 years of age and above
Roman Catholics	4.7 %	1.9 %	6.9 %
Greek Catholics	0.7 %	0.4 %	1.4 %
Calvinists	3.4 %	1.4 %	4.8 %
Lutherans	4.6 %	0.35 %	6.1 %
Unitarians	2.3 %	1.1 %	5.5 %

18 In the contemporary educational system the *érettségi* was already made (since the 1849 imperial *Entwurf*) a necessary condition for university studies, but not yet for all kinds of post-secondary vocational studies, like military schools, agricultural colleges or some theologies. In the Ludovica Akadémia (training institution for officers of the Honvéd Army) for example, the completion of eight secondary classes was a requirement, but not the final secondary school grade, the *érettségi* proper.

19 The obvious and popular equivalent could be the completion of a Normal School (*tanítóképző*) for primary school teachers. But it could also be a higher commercial school (*felső kereskedelmi*) offering a special *érettségi*.

20 All relevant evidence used for calculations here are to be found in the tables annexed.

Denominational Inequalities of Elite Training in Transylvania

Greek Orthodox	0.8 %	0.3 %	1.1 %
Jews	11.9 %	4.6 %	11.9 %
All	2.3 %	0.9 %	3.1 %

Such discrepancies demand a special inquiry to be duely interpreted. Logically, the 'normal' pyramid should have been the rule, many achieving a 4th grade level and a select few going further in the educational ladder. This is precisely what observed numbers of the size of gymnasium and *reáliskola* classes actually reflected for the Dualist Era. In the years 1882 for example there were 4383 pupils in the 4th forms of gymnasiums and 558 in those of *reáliskolák*. Four years later, in 1886, only 2316 and 218 of them, respectively, were enrolled in the 8th forms, the drop-out rate being thus 51% for gymnasiums and as high as 58% for *reáliskolák*.²¹ If I could not mobilize comparable evidence for later periods of the Dualist era, other data demonstrate that the quantitative relationship between the size of the lower classes of secondary education and that of the higher classes had not evolved momentarily by that time. Among male students 47,426 finished grades 1-4 of secondary school compared to only 22,572 – some 48% of the latter – in the 5-8th grades in the interwar years.²² For girls the proportions remaining in the higher classes were even much smaller. Our own finding cannot thus be explained with reference to drop out rates, since they would suggest the generality of the 'normal' pyramid.

Such an argumentation ignores the existence of non classical secondary educational tracks open to candidates during the Dual Monarchy, which could occasionally qualify students for the category of at least those completing 8th grade. These were the already mentioned commercial high schools, the Normal Schools, the military secondary institutions (*kadétiskolák*) and several other vocational schools of uncertain status in the educational hierarchy (agricultural, horticultural, forestry, vinicultural, mining, etc.), which would train higher technicians mostly after their having graduated from the 4 year *polgári iskola*. Most of the graduates of these schools could claim to have completed 8 years of 'secondary' classes. Just for the sake of illustration, in 1910/11 3906 male students graduated with *érettségi* from gymnasiums and *reáliskolák*,²³ while 1150 young men took a teacher's degree from a Normal School out of 4877 enrolled students.²⁴ In 1911/12 1397 students were registered on the files of vocational secondary schools (men and women not distinguished here), out of which, one can estimate that one fifth (some 240) could actually graduate. Thus, there may have been in the final decade of the Dualist era a large group of young men, corresponding approximately to as many as one third of holders

21 See Lajos Láng, *Középköztetés hazánkban, 1867–1886*, [Secondary education in our fatherland] (Budapest: 1887).

22 Cf. Joseph Asztalos, *La statistique des écoles secondaires hongroises jusqu'à l'année scolaire 1932/33*, (Budapest: 1934) 36.

23 Cf. *Magyar statisztikai évkönyv* [Hungarian statistical yearbook], (Budapest: 1911) 385.

24 *Ibid.* 373.

of the classical *érettségi*, who had accomplished the equivalent to the 8th grade secondary in a vocational track. Now all but a few of the former were demonstrably Christians, since Jews did not represent more than 2.8% of Normal School and even less, 1.1%, of other vocational school students at that time.²⁵ Consequently, this can substantially enhance the number of Christians who could and probably did declare 8th grade secondary education at the census as against Jews as well as those Christians who declared the completion of 4th or 6th grades only.

Secondarily, but certainly to a very limited degree only, the relative proportion of those having finished the 8th grade or above as compared to those with lower school qualifications may also be due to inequalities of mortality benefiting the better educated. But this could not much affect denominational differentials in this respect.

A much more intriguing difference separates Jews from Gentiles when one compares age group specific educational performances.

Logically, there must have developed within the dynamics of the modernization and growth of the school network a general expansion of educational qualifications for the whole population. This can indeed be observed in Transylvania as well in the sense that the oldest generations had lower proportions of formally educated but, and this is an indeed astonishing observation, the actual increase proved to be rather limited, amounting to a mere doubling of the proportions of men with an 8th grade level and above, and an even much lower extension of educational assets for those with lower grades: the proportions of those males with 4th through 6th grade levels grew from 1.9% to 2.8%-2.9% only from the generations born before 1850 to those born after 1880. General illiteracy rates of men were also somewhat less than halved over those thirty odd decades covered by the birth dates of the oldest and the youngest generations appearing in our tables.

For the latter, especially for those men under 35 in 1910, the standstill in the development of general educational performances is particularly visible. If progress was manifestly rapid for the preceding generational cohorts, stagnation or even decline seems to be the rule for the youngest age groups. Illiteracy rates were 35.6% for the 30-34 years old men and 34.1% for the 20-24 years old men – not much above the 32.7% for the 15-19 year old men, who could have, by that age, completed their study cycles necessary for the acquisition of basic writing and reading skills. But the decline is even more manifest for men at the 4th grade level, since their proportions remained exactly the same (2.2%) in the 40-44 years group as in the 20-24 year group. Among those men with 6th grade level no systematic change, only oscillations between 0.6% and 0.8% can be observed in all age groups (except for adolescents under 20 in 1910).

Progress between generations and in time proved to be much more significant for women following our data, even if the very high initial illiteracy rate came only to be halved by the youngest adult generation. More advanced levels of training, though significantly growing over time, remained desperately low in 1910 even for the younger groups (hardly exceeding 4 % for those with any kind

25 Same sources as in the precedent footnotes.

of secondary education or above). For women a sign of stagnation also seems clear from the generational cluster of 30-34 years down to the 20-24 year old for the proportion of those with 8th grade levels or above (a mere 0.7%-0.8%).

For our purposes it is of course interesting to note that these general trends of limited progress or even stagnation over generations and time was very unevenly distributed among denominational groups. This is a very complex issue since historical developments were different for each cluster following the level of education by which progress was measured in our tables. Still, allowing for some simplifications, two drastically contrasting patterns can be discerned, if we ground our analysis on evidence concerning men. Such marked differences oppose Jews on the one hand, displaying a rapid and spectacular increase of their educational assets over generations and Christians as such, with a much slower growth, if any. A secondary differentiation can be introduced between somewhat faster developing Lutherans together with Roman Catholics and the other gentile groups, for the latter lesser progress appears on the whole to have been the rule. But this secondary division is slightly controversial at instances and definitely less spectacular than the first one.

The development for Jews was unilinear and constant indeed in the field under scrutiny, though their general educational scores were already among the best for the oldest generations as well. Over 9% of Jewish men over 60 (born before 1850) had a smattering of secondary education, but 31% was still illiterate. Among the youngest adult Jews (20-24 years old) almost one third (32.5%) held in 1910 some secondary school qualifications and the rate of illiteracy was diminished by five times (down to 6%). The proportion of those with 8th grade level qualification was also multiplied by a factor exceeding five. For Jewish women the cadence of growth was obviously even more spectacular, since the proportions with secondary training (4th grade and above) increased over time from less than 2% for the oldest generations to more than 21%. The Jewish pattern of constant progress over time is well established thanks to our data.

The Christian pattern, as hinted at above, was much more complex and to some extent ambiguous.

For the generally better educated Lutherans and Roman Catholics one can easily observe signs of relatively fast historical and generational progress. The proportions of those with some secondary education doubled over time and the rates of illiteracy – already very low, initially, for Lutherans – diminished by a factor of four to five for both clusters. There again, progress was more rapid but, ultimately, much more modest for women; Lutheran and Catholic women with some secondary education among the 60 year old and above segment reached a marginal level of 2%, while this proportion reached around 10% for both groups in the youngest adult generations. The rate of illiteracy also decreased by a factor of five for Roman Catholics and as much as by a factor of eight or more (if we compare the oldest generations with the adolescent age groups).

For the other Christians progress was much more uneven, limited, and occasionally irrelevant, at least for the male population.

Calvinist and Unitarian men, relatively well educated in the oldest generations (on approximately the same level as Roman Catholics), fell significantly behind Roman Catholics in the youngest adult generations, though

they too benefitted from a radical diminution of their rates of illiteracy. Their proportions in the youngest adult generations of those with 8th grade level and above grew by a mere half of what they had been among men born before 1850. The same limited progress applied equally to Calvinist and Unitarian women.

For Greek Orthodox and, even more, Greek Catholics every aspect of educational progress over time remained extremely limited. Neither the proportions of men with a smattering of secondary education reached doubling, nor did their rates of illiteracy diminish to much below half of their adult groups. The educational progress made by women of Greek ritual – though formally perceptible – is even technically difficult to estimate. In the oldest generations practically none of them (!) held the slightest secondary school qualification. This could only improve over time and actually did so for the generations of young adults, though not exceeding a very marginal 1%. In spite of progress, the rates of illiteracy were still much over 50% for young adult and adolescent women of Greek ritual in 1910, falling back, truly enough, from an almost total lack of writing and reading skills in the oldest generational clusters (97%-98%).

Frameworks of Interpretation

First of all one should deal with the school system, the very particularities of educational supply, to raise the question of whether they allow an interpretation of denominational differences in school performance. The obvious starting point here should be the denominational composition of the school network, since institutional education remained in the Dualist period largely the privilege of ecclesiastical authorities, which, at least in primary schools, practiced a policy of often openly preferential selection of pupils of their own denomination.²⁶

Table 3. Distribution of secondary and primary schools by authorities of control in Transylvania (1900)

	primary schools ²⁷			gymnasiums ²⁸
State	507	16.9	-	5
Municipal	167	5.6	-	1
Private, 'associational'	32	1.1	-	-
Roman Catholic	234	7.8	10.2	6
Greek Catholic	788	26.2	34.3	3
Greek Orthodox	760	25.3	33.1	2
Lutheran	271	9.0	11.8	7
Calvinist	202	6.7	8.8	6

26 On this problem see my study: "Szegregáció, asszimiláció és disszimiláció", *op.cit.*, *passim*.

27 Cf. *Magyar statisztikai évkönyv* [Hungarian statistical yearbook], (Budapest: 1900), 332.

28 Cf. *Ibid*, 337-338.

Denominational Inequalities of Elite Training in Transylvania

Unitarian	33	1.1	1.4	2
Jewish	8	0.3	0.3	-
all	3,002	32		32
% with public schools		100.0		
% without public schools			100.0	

It is obvious from this table that observed confessions specific educational performances are only in a loose statistical relation, if any, with the number of schools run at that time by various ecclesiastical authorities.

As far as primary schools, formally, both Greek Catholics and Orthodox had a somewhat larger share in the institutional market than expected, given their share in the population (28% and 29% respectively), if we suppose that they could enter state and municipal establishments in proportionally equal numbers. Lutherans also had a larger primary school network than expected due to their smaller share (8%) in the population. Thus for Lutherans their very good scores of literacy can be correlated to the large size of their school network, this cannot apply to the primary schools run by churches of Greek ritual. But all other denominational clusters appear to be crassly under-represented in the school market, especially the Roman Catholics and the Calvinists holding not much more (or even less) than half as many schools (in proportion of all schools) than their share in the population (14% and 15% respectively). The case of Jews is particularly striking with their negligible presence in the market of primary schools.

The situation was rather different for gymnasiums. Here the public (state or municipality run) institutions had a similar one fifth share in the market, but the distribution of the rest corresponded somewhat more to the observed performances of various denominational clusters. The Churches of Greek ritual had a markedly backward position with only 5 schools (teaching all in Romanian) for the majority population in the province, while the market was dominated (up to two thirds) by the Western Christian Churches. Still, there again, dissimilarities are worth noting. The relatively smallest 'Western' (that is, ethnically mostly German and Magyar) denominations, the Lutherans (8% in the population) had more gymnasiums (7 German institutions) than any other clusters, that is, the Roman Catholics and the Calvinists (with 6 gymnasiums but with 14-15% of the population for each). The Unitarians (with 2 gymnasiums and 2.5% of the population) can also be regarded as better endowed than demographically expected or justified. There were no full scale Jewish secondary schools at all in Dualist Hungary.²⁹

Thus the above detailed educational hierarchy is far from being clearly reflected in the supply of church schools, which is more astonishing for the primary than the secondary level. The latter was indeed actually hardly marked by trends of denominational segregation, if preferential school choices

²⁹ With the exception of an 'incomplete' gymnasium in Vágújhely, in Northern Hungary, not granting graduation.

related to the 'social distance', cultural differences and 'ritual alienation' between religious clusters are disregarded. Greek Catholic or Orthodox students would, hence, allegedly prefer Roman Catholic gymnasiums, when they opted for Hungarian training³⁰ and Protestants and Catholics would mutually tend to avoid enrollment in institutions of the other faith. Similarly Jews could, occasionally prefer state gymnasiums or Protestant ones to other ecclesiastical institutions, when they had the choice, but they did not suffer any discrimination proper in this period in secondary education.³¹ There was probably no discrimination but certainly a strategic avoidance of Romanian gymnasiums of Greek ritual by all non Romanian pupils, because tuition was offered there in a language lacking much promotional value in the Magyar nation state ruled by Hungarian and German speaking national elites. This proved to be much less reciprocated, for exactly the same reasons, by Romanians – often accepting or seeking Magyar or German cultural and social assimilation in Magyar or German gymnasiums.³² But it is undeniable that studies in institutions with alien tuition language represented – specifically for Romanians – a supplementary hardship and could obviously put a brake on their efforts at upwards educational mobility.

Thus, if the denominational setup of the gymnasium network, that is the mere size of the school supply accessible for each denominational group, was not quite neutral in matters religious, this cannot be considered as a serious reason for the indeed enormous discrepancies found among denominational clusters in terms of educational performance.

30 To this point see Simion Retegan, "Scolarizare si desvoltare. Elevii Romani ai Liceului Piarist din Cluj, intre 1850-1910", *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie* (Cluj-Napoca: XXXII, 1993), 121-139. Still, by 1900, students with Romanian mother tongue would behave like students of most other ethnico-denominational groups. They attended mostly a gymnasium of Greek religious persuasion (46%), public gymnasiums (29%) and only to a limited extent a Roman Catholic (12%) or another Protestant institution (13%). This data includes students in Hungary from outside historic Transylvania as well. Calculated from *Magyar statisztikai évkönyv* [Hungarian statistical yearbook], (Budapest: 1900), 353.

31 On this point see some empirical findings in my *Iskolarendszer és felekezeti egyenlőtlenségek*, *op. cit.*, 162.

32 As demonstrated in the preceding footnote, a qualified majority of Romanian students actually opted for Magyar and German gymnasiums. The most concrete reason for this may have been the fact that Romanian gymnasiums directed their students mostly towards Greek Catholic or Greek Orthodox ecclesiastic status and less to modern intellectual professions.

Table 4. Degrees of urbanization by denominations in Transylvania (1900)

	urban population ³³	general population ³⁴
Roman Catholics	25.1	13.4
Greek Catholics	12.2	27.9
Greek Orthodox	18.7	30.2
Lutherans	19.0	9.0
Calvinists	17.9	14.7
Unitarians	2.1	2.6
Jews	5.1	2.1
All	100.0	100.0

But one can consider another aspect of the educational supply, its regional or local distribution, as compared to that of its potential denominational clientele, for a more plausible explanation of the inequalities observed. Indeed the accessibility in terms of both physical distance from schools and the cost of schooling investment depend manifestly upon the location of the schools and the respective settlement of their clientele. The primary school network was, by that time, fairly decentralized, so that direct access to schools could be provided for most if not all pupils, even in remote villages. This was not the case of secondary and higher educational institutions almost exclusively established in towns with ‘organized councils’ (small townships, earlier ‘county towns’ – *megyei városok*) or bigger cities with administrative autonomy. The unequal urbanization of potential school clientele could, thus, be a factor defining and to a large extent positively or negatively determining the chances of access to post-primary schooling. The table above shows the basic data to this effect for 1900 related to the population in all the 26 towns of both administrative status in Transylvania.

The evidence points clearly to a strong statistical relationship between degrees of urbanization and the level of school performances. Significantly over-urbanized groups belonged to the best educated clusters as well (with more than double share among the urban population compared to their proportions among rank and file inhabitants, like Jews and Lutherans, or with close to double, like Roman Catholics) belonged to the best educated clusters as well. Those slightly over-urbanized (like Calvinists and Unitarians) displayed equally close to average educational scores. On the contrary, the firmly under-urbanized brackets – the Greek Orthodox and, and more so, the Greek Catholics, appear among the clusters with the poorest educational attainments as well. In other terms, when the residential disposition of the schooling supply is matched with a similar distribution of the potential

33 Calculations made on the evidence published in *Magyar városok adminisztratív évkönyve*, vol. I. [Administrative yearbook of Hungarian towns I], (Budapest: 1912), 75-77. There were only two cities in Transylvania at that time with ‘legal independence’ (*önálló törvényhatósági jogú város*), Marosvásárhely/Târgu Mureș and Kolozsvár/Cluj.

34 Calculated following Károly R. Nyárády, *op. cit.* 466-474. These results are somewhat different from what can be read in our tables, without altering their relative size.

demand by denomination, there is a positive response in form of a measure of over-schooling. The contrasted geographical composition of the supply and the demand generated sharp trends of under-investment in education.

Still, residential distribution does certainly not explain all the observed denominational inequalities, since, on the whole, a fraction only of the Transylvanian population (not more than a mere 9,4 % in 1900³⁵) was actually urbanised in the Dualist era. For a better interpretation of our main results one has to look closer into the denominational set-up of the potential demand side, that is, the main social strata providing advanced school clienteles in this period. Thus we must resort to an analysis – let alone a summary one - of the socioprofessional composition of Transylvanian society in the early 20th century broken down by confessional clusters.

Table 5. The distribution of selected intellectual (non manual) professions in Transylvania by denominations (1900)³⁶

	Roman Catho- lics	Greek Catho- lics	Greek Ortho- dox	Luthe- rans	Calvi- nists	Unita- rians	Jews	All
Private employees (industry, trade, banks)	20.6	4.6	6.3	29.3	10.4	5.9	62.0	18.6
free professionals	5.3	4.8	3.2	7.0	5.9	6.6	8.6	5.7
employees in transports	20.9	2.3	1.6	6.5	14.4	12.4	12.3	10.6
civil servants, public employees	28.0	15.0	17.5	13.5	27.7	26.8	6.0	17.9
priests, clerics	6.6	40.5	42.6	13.9	15.2	18.5	4.7	20.1
primary school teachers	14.0	36.0	37.5	24.9	23.1	25.9	6.0	24.0
highschool teachers	4.5	1.8	1.8	4.9	3.6	3.9	0.5	3.2
all	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
numbers	3,295	2,364	2,012	2,260	2,848	541	1,309	14,629
%	22.5	16.2	13.7	15.4	19.5	3.4	8.9	100.0
% in general population	13.4	27.9	30.2	9.0	14.7	2.6	2.1	100.0

Educational investments are indeed always made in any given society in a sharply stratified manner, all the strata better endowed with educational and other goods offering more and better than average education to their offspring either in form of social 'self-reproduction' or/and in form of conversion of part

35 Following data used in the two preceding notes.

36 Cf. *Magyar statisztikai közlemények* [Hungarian statistical reports] no. 16, 134-236 passim.

of their economic or relational assets into educational ones. Hence the importance of the social stratification of denominational clusters for the explanation of their respective educational performances. Let us content ourselves in this study with the reference to a small number of selected intellectual occupations, capable of exemplifying the very unequal distribution of 'educated professions', especially in the active male population.³⁷

Here again, considering the two last lines of table, we have a quite similar pattern as for degrees of urbanization. The best educated denominational clusters – Jews above all, but also Lutherans and Roman Catholics – were by far the most over-represented among the intellectual professions, Calvinists and Unitarians being still overrepresented, but to a much lesser extent, and those of the two Greek faiths almost equally underrepresented (with a relative advantage of the Greek Catholics).

However, if we take into account the internal distribution of our professionals following their type of employment or activities (in private employment and free markets, under – at least partly – semi-public authorities, the – more or less – publicly employed) new forms of fundamental inequalities emerge. One can sum up these findings in four patterns.

The first one is represented by Jews who combined features which may be qualified as the most 'modern', in the sense that in 1900 their absolute majority (up to four fifths) was active in recently developing branches of non manual professions in free economic markets, above all in private industry and trade. Now high educational qualifications were not always necessary for private employees. This may explain why the Jewish educational pyramid could maintain a large basis (with many having only 4 secondary classes worth of certified schooling). But this means also that the very important educational attainments observed among Jews had been often reached by people not obliged to acquire such degrees of certified knowledge for their professional advancement. Hence the conclusion that a good part of 'Jewish over-schooling' was due to educational mobility proper, to some kind of in-built 'aspiration for knowledge' and cultural goods providing all kinds of symbolic benefits (among them some convertible into highly advantageous 'assimilationist social assets', obviously relevant for a stigmatized cluster) and not (at least much less than in other denominational circles) to the self-reproduction of the educated strata.

The second pattern is proper to Lutherans and Roman Catholics whose substantial proportions – more than two fifths of them – were active in the same 'new fields'. Their proportions did certainly not reach that of Jews, still they exceeded those typical of all other groups. Among Lutherans the proportions of private employees and free professionals were second only to Jews. Thus, there again we can suppose the existence of a large extent of educational mobility from noneducated strata. But the majority of Roman Catholics and Lutherans concerned were involved in professions controlled by the state (civil service) or by the churches (clerics, teachers) with a

37 Females could not be distinguished in the sources from male professionals but, obviously enough, most of these 'non manuals' were men at that time for reasons related to the subsistence of a quasi-exclusion of women from most educational tracks leading to the intellectual professions.

significant proportion of secondary school professors teaching mostly in confessional gymnasiums.

The third pattern, embodied by Calvinists and Unitarians, was not very far from the preceding one, but with a very modest proportion of private employees in industry and trade, a larger proportion of employees in the 'semi-private' transportation business (railways, coach services, taxis, etc.) and a strong presence of civil servants, clerics, and teachers.

The fourth pattern, equally typical of both clusters of Greek ritual, is characterized by insignificant proportions of those in free private markets and an overwhelming share of semi-public professionals, especially clerics and teachers. In fact the last two 'petty intellectual professions' take up as much as three-fourths of all 'intellectual professionals' in these denominational clusters compared to only less than one half in all the other denominational groups. Thus, typically, educated Romanians belonged to professions controlled mostly by the churches in Transylvania.

As the conclusion of this essay one cannot but confirm the main hypothesis to which converge all the indices resorted to, which, as it has been demonstrated, explain at least in part the observed denominational hierarchy of educational attainments. This hierarchy ranges from Jews at the top together with Roman Catholics and Lutherans, to Calvinists and Unitarians in the middle level and to Greek Orthodox and Catholics at the bottom. Levels of education appear indeed as a more or less direct product of degrees of modernization of the confessional clusters concerned. Aspirations for modernity, professional and cultural mobility ('assimilation' among Jews or some Germans) or resistance to it (among Saxons and Romanians alike), as well as other similar factors were instrumental in generating or maintaining most of the educational demand under scrutiny. This demand had of course to meet the available supply of schooling. But educational institutions remained open to all almost indiscriminately in the post-primary level and easily accessible (at least for urbanized groups) on the secondary level. In primary schooling, in spite of a generally heavy confessional segregation or self-segregation exercised in ecclesiastical schools, the rapid growth of the public network provided for a large (if not complete) compensation for disadvantaged minorities (like Jews) to get access to elementary education, especially when they accepted Magyar language tuition.³⁸ This implies that the very nature of the regional school supply did play a role, but probably a subordinate one only in the emergence of denominational inequalities. Its functions, often translated into ethnic-linguistic fragmentation and segregation prevailing in confessional primary school networks, should not however be underestimated in the explanation of the, on the whole rather, low region specific level of educational capital acquired by the Transylvanian population by the end of the Dualist Era.

38 While the language of tuition in confessional schools of public status was largely determined by the language use of the local religious community concerned, except for Jewish schools – paragons of 'self-assimilation' of sorts – state schools almost exclusively promoted Hungarian tuition. In 1896/7 for example only a mere 1% of state primary schools admitted non Magyar tuition as against 5% of Jewish schools, 28% of village community schools, 34% of Roman Catholic schools, 69% of Lutheran schools, 86% of Greek Catholic and as much as 99 % of Greek Orthodox schools. Data calculated from *Magyar statisztikai évkönyv* [Hungarian statistical yearbook], (Budapest: 1897), 346.

Denominational Inequalities of Elite Training in Transylvania

ANNEX

Transylvanian counties and towns					Levels of education by age group and denomination						
Men, 1910	N	representation index average for all = 1			Total	0-5	6	7-11	12-14	15-19	20-24
		20-24	40-44	total		years old					
Roman Catholics								14.20		% of popul.	
8 class	7,389	1.88	2.07	2.05	3.9	0	0	0	0	1.9	7.5
6 class	2,011				1.1	0	0	0	0	3.2	1.5
4 class*	5,922	1.93	2.08	2.08	3.1	0	0	0	2.5	5.8	4.3
W/R	106,718				55.8	0	20.9	81.1	84.5	77.1	74.1
Illit.	69,095	0.37	0.57	0.69	36.1	100	79.1	18.9	12.9	12	12.5
Total	191,135				100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Rat.					100	15.2	2.2	10.3	6.2	9.7	8.8
Num.					191,135	29,146	4,129	19,739	11,907	18,457	16,749
Greek Catholics								28.30		% of popul.	
8 class	2,980	0.43	0.41	0.42	0.8	0	0	0	0	0.2	1.7
6 class	764				0.2	0	0	0	0	0.7	0.3
4 class*	1,721	0.38	0.32	0.36	0.4	0	0	0	0.3	1.1	0.6
W/R	109,734				28.7	0	9.1	49.8	52.2	44.4	41.4
Illit.	267,411	1.64	1.51	1.33	69.9	100	90.9	50.2	47.5	53.6	55.9
Total	382,610				100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Rat.					100	15.4	2.3	10.2	6.2	9.7	8.4
Num.					382,610	58,869	8,777	39,012	23,872	36,930	32,294
Calvinists								14.90		% of popul.	
8 class	5,427	1.35	1.41	1.42	2.7	0	0	0	0	1.3	5.4
6 class	1,619				0.8	0	0	0	0	2.6	0.9
4 class*	4,490	1.39	1.44	1.46	2.2	0	0	0	2.1	4.9	3.3
W/R	115,041				57	0	21.2	76.6	87.1	76.8	74.8
Illit.	75,086	0.46	0.55	0.71	37.2	100	78.8	23.4	10.7	14.4	15.6
Total	201,663				100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Rat.					100	15.1	2.2	10.2	6.4	9.8	8.5
Num.					201,663	30,390	4,514	20,571	12,890	19,816	17,102

*Rat.: Ratio of age group within total of denomination. Num.: Number of age group. * Age specific percentages here are calculated on the basis of the N of "4 classes". The representation index is calculated on the basis of the number of those who have completed at least 4 classes, that is on the basis of all those listed here as in classes 4+6+8. Database by Victor Karády and Peter Tibor Nagy. Original source: Archive of the Census Department, Central Statistical Office, Budapest.*

Transylvanian counties and towns				cont. of prev. page!					
Men, 1910	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-59	60-		
	years old								
Roman Catholic				14.20		% of popul.			Nat.
8 class	8.6	7.9	7.4	6	6.2	5.2	3.6	Hu:	92.1
6 class	1.2	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.3	1.1	1.1	Ge:	4.3
4 class*	4.8	5	4.9	4.8	4.1	3.6	2.7	Sl:	0.5
W/R	70.9	71.6	65.2	60.7	56.9	50.7	38.2	Ro:	0.9
Illit.	14.4	14.1	21	26.9	31.5	39.4	54.4	Ru:	0.0
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	Cr:	0.2
Rat.	7.8	6.6	5.9	5.8	5.1	8.1	8.3	Se:	0.0
Num.	14,983	12,622	11,235	11,024	9,816	15,392	15,908	Ot:	2.1
Greek Catholics				28.30		% of popul.			Nat.
8 class	1.7	2	1.4	1.2	1.1	0.9	0.9	Hu:	3.6
6 class	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.2	Ge:	0.0
4 class*	0.5	0.7	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.6	Sl:	0.0
W/R	38.9	36.5	33.8	27.4	23	17.6	11.4	Ro:	93.1
Illit.	58.7	60.7	64.2	70.6	75.1	80.6	86.9	Ru:	0.3
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	Cr:	0.0
Rat.	8.1	6	5.1	5.3	5.3	9.2	8.9	Se:	0.0
Num.	31,118	22,953	19,470	20,125	20,176	35,091	33,918	Ot:	2.8
Calvinists				14.90		% of popul.			Nat.
8 class	5.5	5.3	5	4.1	3.8	3.6	3.7	Hu:	98.4
6 class	0.6	1.1	1.2	1.2	0.9	0.9	1	Ge:	0.2
4 class*	2.9	3.1	3.1	3.2	3.2	2.6	1.9	Sl:	0.0
W/R	76.6	72.2	69.6	65.8	62.3	50	42.1	Ro:	0.3
Illit.	14.4	18.2	21.1	25.7	29.8	42.9	51.3	Ru:	0.0
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	Cr:	0.0
Rat.	8.3	6.4	5.2	5.2	5.1	8.9	8.7	Se:	0.0
Num.	16,825	12,837	10,557	10,456	10,269	17,849	17,580	Ot:	1.0

Rat.: Ratio of age group within total of denomination. Num.: Number of age group. Database by Victor Karády and Peter Tibor Nagy. Original source: Archive of the Census Department, Central Statistical Office, Budapest.

Denominational Inequalities of Elite Training in Transylvania

Transylvanian counties and towns					Levels of education by age group and denomination						
Men, 1910	N	representation index average for all = 1			Total	0-5	6	7-11	12-14	15-19	20-24
		20-24	40-44	total		years old					
Lutherans								8.30		% of popul.	
8 class	3,939	1.78	1.93	1.84	3.5	0	0	0	0	1.6	7.1
6 class	1,222				1.1	0	0	0	0	4	1.5
4 class*	3,434	1.93	1.88	1.97	3.1	0	0	0	2.7	7.3	4.7
W/R	78,537				69.8	0	24.3	86.9	94.3	83.8	83.2
Illit.	25,432	0.1	0.1	0.43	22.6	100	75.7	13.1	3	3.3	3.4
Total	112,566				100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Rat.					100	14.5	2.2	10.7	6.3	9.3	7.5
Num.					112,566	16,334	2,482	12,017	7,059	10,474	8,391
Greek Orthodox								29.30		% of popul.	
8 class	2598	0.38	0.31	0.37	0.7	0	0	0	0	0.2	1.5
6 class	741				0.2	0	0	0	0	0.6	0.2
4 class*	2,042	0.35	0.27	0.36	0.5	0	0	0	0.3	1.3	0.7
W/R	140,333				35.5	0	10.3	55.9	60.9	53.7	52.7
Illit.	249,772	1.32	1.33	1.21	63.2	100	89.7	44.1	38.9	44.1	44.9
Total	395,487				100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Rat.					100	15.1	2.4	10.5	6.2	9.7	8.3
Num.					395,487	59,785	9,530	41,684	24,621	38,339	32,934
Unitarians								2.50		% of popul.	
8 class	1,081	1.95	1.34	1.68	3.2	0	0	0	0	1	7.8
6 class	210				0.6	0	0	0	0	2.1	0.7
4 class*	532	1.61	1.19	1.38	1.6	0	0	0	2.2	4	2.6
W/R	21,163				62.2	0	20.3	82.5	89.5	82.5	75.8
Illit.	11,050	0.38	0.41	0.62	32.5	100	79.7	17.5	8.2	10.4	13
Total	34,036				100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Rat.					100	14.5	2.2	10.4	6.2	9.4	7.2
Num.					34,036	4,921	738	3,523	2,113	3,214	2,466

*Rat.: Ratio of age group within total of denomination. Num.: Number of age group. * Age specific percentages here are calculated on the basis of the N of "4 classes". The representation index is calculated on the basis of the number of those who have completed at least 4 classes, that is on the basis of all those listed here as in classes 4+6+8. Database by Victor Karády and Peter Tibor Nagy. Original source: Archive of the Census Department, Central Statistical Office, Budapest.*

Transylvanian counties and towns				cont. of prev. page!					
Men, 1910	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-59	60-		
	years old								
Lutherans				8.30		% of popul.			Nat.
8 class	8	7.6	6.4	5.6	5.3	4.3	4.3	Hu:	11.3
6 class	1.2	1.2	1.4	1.4	1.3	1.1	1	Ge:	87.0
4 class*	4.4	4.6	5.2	4.1	3.9	3	2.4	Sl:	0.3
W/R	82.8	83.1	82.6	84.1	82.3	80.8	74.5	Ro:	0.7
Illit.	3.6	3.5	4.4	4.8	7.3	10.8	17.8	Ru:	0.0
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	Cr:	0.0
Rat.	7	6.3	5.4	5.4	5.4	9.7	10.4	Se:	0.0
Num.	7,902	7,053	6,108	6,028	6,080	10,878	11,757	Ot:	0.9
Greek Orthodox				29.30		% of popul.			Nat.
8 class	2.3	1.5	1.2	0.9	0.9	0.6	0.6	Hu:	1.7
6 class	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.2	Ge:	0.0
4 class*	0.8	1.2	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.6	Sl:	0.0
W/R	51.9	49.7	44	36	33.3	23.1	13.2	Ro:	96.2
Illit.	44.8	47.4	54	62.4	65	75.6	85.4	Ru:	0.0
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	Cr:	0.0
Rat.	7.3	6	4.9	5.4	5	9.3	9.8	Se:	0.1
Num.	28,696	23,858	19,251	21,169	19,929	36,741	38,932	Ot:	2.0
Unitarians				2.50		% of popul.			Nat.
8 class	6.4	6.1	5	3.9	4.7	4.2	4.9	Hu:	99.1
6 class	0.8	0.3	0.8	1.1	0.8	0.7	0.7	Ge:	0.1
4 class*	2.1	1.6	1.9	2	1.6	1.6	1.4	Sl:	0.0
W/R	77.3	80.6	75.4	74	66.7	62.7	54.7	Ro:	0.5
Illit.	13.4	11.5	16.9	19	26.2	30.8	38.2	Ru:	0.0
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	Cr:	0.0
Rat.	7.2	6.4	5.3	5.7	5.5	9.8	10.2	Se:	0.0
Num.	2,461	2,181	1,817	1,940	1,860	3,345	3,456	Ot:	0.2

Rat.: Ratio of age group within total of denomination. Num.: Number of age group. Database by Victor Karády and Peter Tibor Nagy. Original source: Archive of the Census Department, Central Statistical Office, Budapest.

Denominational Inequalities of Elite Training in Transylvania

Transylvanian counties and towns					Levels of education by age group and denomination							
Men, 1910	N	representation index average for all = 1			Total	0-5	6	7-11	12-14	15-19	20-24	
		20-24	40-44	total								years old
Israelites								2.30		% of popul.		
8 class	1,961	4.18	3.1	3.26	6.2	0	0	0	0	5.2	16.7	
6 class	752				2.4	0	0	0	0	7.6	3.6	
4 class*	2,319	4.71	4.08	4.08	7.3	0	0	0	7	12.7	12.2	
W/R	17,799				56.1	0	31.7	85.2	86.7	68.5	61	
Illit.	8,902	0.19	0.26	0.54	28.1	100	68.3	14.8	6.3	6	6.4	
Total	31,733				100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
Rat.					100	16.8	2.9	11.7	7	9.7	8.1	
Num.					31,733	5,345	908	3,711	2,218	3,091	2581	
Other								0.00		% of popul.		
8 class	25	4.8	0	3.95	7.5	0	0	0	0	5.9	19.2	
6 class	9				2.7	0	0	0	0	0	11.5	
4 class*	8	5.57	0.61	3.23	2.4	0	0	0	0	5.9	7.7	
W/R	198				59.1	0	0	77.8	40	58.8	50	
Illit.	335	0.34	0.69	0.54	28.4	100	100	22.2	60	29.4	11.5	
Total	335				100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
Rat.					100	3.6	0.3	2.7	1.5	5.1	7.8	
Num.					335	12	1	9	5	17	26	
Together								100.00		% of popul.		
8 class	25,523	1	1	1	1.9	0	0	0	0	0.9	4	
6 class	7,360				0.5	0	0	0	0	1.8	0.7	
4 class*	20,565	1	1	1	1.5	0	0	0	1.3	3.3	2.2	
W/R	590,016				43.7	0	14.9	64.9	69.9	61.4	59	
Illit.	707,013	1	1	1	52.4	100	85.1	35.1	28.7	32.7	34.1	
Total	1,350,480				100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
Rat.					100	15.2	2.3	10.4	6.3	9.7	8.3	
Num.					1,350,480	204,879	31,090	140,340	84,746	130,396	112,604	

*Rat.: Ratio of age group within total of denomination. Num.: Number of age group. * Age specific percentages here are calculated on the basis of the N of "4 classes". The representation index is calculated on the basis of the number of those who have completed at least 4 classes, that is on the basis of all those listed here as in classes 4+6+8. Database by Victor Karády and Peter Tibor Nagy. Original source: Archive of the Census Department, Central Statistical Office, Budapest.*

Transylvanian counties and towns				cont. of prev. page!					
Men, 1910	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-59	60-		
	years old								
Israelites				2.30		% of popul.			Nat.
8 class	17	13.5	10.1	9	7.7	5.4	3	Hu:	73.9
6 class	2.9	3.6	3.9	3.9	3.1	2.4	1.8	Ge:	25.2
4 class*	11.4	13.2	13.2	11.2	11.3	8.4	4.4	Sl:	0.0
W/R	62.1	62.1	63.6	64	64.6	64.5	60	Ro:	0.7
Illit.	6.6	7.6	9.2	12	13.3	19.2	30.8	Ru:	0.0
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	Cr:	0.0
Rat.	8.2	7.2	5.2	5.6	4.7	7.1	5.7	Se:	0.0
Num.	2,594	2,284	1,654	1,787	1,489	2,245	1,808	Ot:	0.2
Other				0.00		% of popul.			Nat.
8 class	8.5	12.9	5.9	0	19.2	2.4	3.4	Hu:	55.5
6 class	1.7	0	0	3.6	11.5	2.4	0	Ge:	10.1
4 class*	1.7	0	5.9	0	0	0	3.4	Sl:	0.9
W/R	78	71	72.5	64.3	50	43.9	41.4	Ro:	22.7
Illit.	10.2	16.1	15.7	32.1	19.2	51.2	51.7	Ru:	0.0
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	Cr:	0.0
Rat.	17.6	9.3	15.2	8.4	7.8	12.2	8.7	Se:	0.0
Num.	59	31	51	28	26	41	29	Ot:	10.7
Together				100.00		% of popul.			Nat.
8 class	4.4	4.2	3.6	2.9	2.8	2.2	2	Hu:	34.5
6 class	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.6	0.6	Ge:	8.5
4 class*	2.2	2.5	2.4	2.2	2	1.7	1.3	Sl:	0.1
W/R	57.7	57	53	47.4	43.8	36	27.8	Ro:	54.8
Illit.	35	35.6	40.2	46.8	50.8	59.5	68.3	Ru:	0.1
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	Cr:	0.0
Rat.	7.8	6.2	5.2	5.4	5.2	9	9.1	Se:	0.0
Num.	104,692	83,881	70,193	72,617	69,694	121,704	123,564	Ot:	1.9

Rat.: Ratio of age group within total of denomination. Num.: Number of age group. Database by Victor Karády and Peter Tibor Nagy. Original source: Archive of the Census Department, Central Statistical Office, Budapest.

Denominational Inequalities of Elite Training in Transylvania

Transylvanian counties and towns					Levels of education by age group and denomination						
Women, 1910	N	representation index average for all = 1			Total	0-5	6	7-11	12-14	15-19	20-24
		20-24	40-44	total		years old					
Roman Catholics								13.70		% of popul.	
8 class	1,596	2.75	3.5	3	0.9	0	0	0	0	0.7	2.2
6 class	1,124				0.6	0	0	0	0	1.4	1.1
4 class*	5,916	2.42	2.65	2.47	3.2	0	0	0	2.3	7.3	7.1
W/R	91,593				50.3	0	19.6	75.2	84.8	75.5	73.1
Illit.	81,908	0.37	0.62	0.73	45	100	80.4	24.8	12.9	15.2	16.4
Total	182,137				100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Rat.					100	15.7	2.3	10.8	6.4	9.6	8.1
Num.					182,137	28,676	4,134	19,599	11,743	17,535	14,832
Greek Catholics								27.60		% of popul.	
8 class	175	0.13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.1
6 class	118				0	0	0	0	0	0.1	0.1
4 class*	960	0.21	0.09	0.16	0.3	0	0	0	0.2	0.7	0.7
W/R	68,538				18.7	0	7.1	41.1	48.3	36.4	25.9
Illit.	297,003	1.65	1.41	1.31	81	100	92.9	58.9	51.5	62.9	73.2
Total	366,794				100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Rat.					100	15.7	2.5	10.3	6.1	10.5	8.8
Num.					366,794	57,515	8,990	37,768	22,543	38,379	32,234
Calvinists								14.90		% of popul.	
8 class	929	1.63	1.25	1.67	0.5	0	0	0	0	0.4	1.3
6 class	723				0.4	0	0	0	0	0.8	0.6
4 class*	4,264	1.44	1.65	1.63	2.2	0	0	0	1.7	5	4.3
W/R	99,585				50.4	0	22.7	79	80.5	75.7	73.3
Illit.	92,147	0.46	0.7	0.75	46.6	100	77.3	21	17.7	18.1	20.5
Total	197,649				100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Rat.					100	15.4	2.2	10	6.4	10.1	8.8
Num.					197,649	30,526	4,273	19,847	12,640	19,888	17,322

*Rat.: Ratio of age group within total of denomination. Num.: Number of age group. * Age specific percentages here are calculated on the basis of the N of "4 classes". The representation index is calculated on the basis of the number of those who have completed at least 4 classes, that is on the basis of all those listed here as in classes 4+6+8. Database by Victor Karády and Peter Tibor Nagy. Original source: Archive of the Census Department, Central Statistical Office, Budapest.*

Transylvanian counties and towns				cont. of prev. page!					
Women, 1910	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-59	60-		
	years old								
Roman Catholic				13.70		% of popul.			Nat.
8 class	2.1	2.1	1.5	1.4	1.1	0.9	0.5	Hu:	93.1
6 class	1.1	1.2	1.1	0.8	1	0.6	0.3	Ge:	4.1
4 class*	6	5.7	4.8	3.9	2.8	2.8	1.5	Sl:	0.4
W/R	67	67.6	62.3	53.4	49.7	33.3	21.6	Ro:	0.9
Illit.	23.7	23.4	30.2	40.6	45.4	62.5	76.1	Ru:	0.0
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	Cr:	0.1
Rat.	7.8	6.5	5.8	5.3	5	7.6	8.9	Se:	0.0
Num.	14,259	11,882	10,576	9,713	9,102	13,821	16,259	Ot:	1.4
Greek Catholics				27.60		% of popul.			Nat.
8 class	0.2	0.1	0.1	0	0	0	0	Hu:	3.2
6 class	0	0.1	0.1	0	0	0	0	Ge:	0.0
4 class*	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	Sl:	0.0
W/R	21.8	17.1	21.6	8.1	6.3	5.3	2.2	Ro:	93.9
Illit.	77.5	82.3	77.9	91.6	93.4	94.5	97.7	Ru:	0.1
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	Cr:	0.0
Rat.	7.8	5.9	5.2	5.7	4.8	8.6	8.2	Se:	0.0
Num.	28,428	21,778	19,061	20,833	17,738	31,522	29,997	Ot:	2.8
Calvinists				14.90		% of popul.			Nat.
8 class	1.2	1.1	0.7	0.5	0.6	0.5	0.3	Hu:	98.5
6 class	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.5	0.3	0.4	0.2	Ge:	0.2
4 class*	4	3.7	3	2.8	2	1.5	1.1	Sl:	0.0
W/R	65.7	63.3	60.6	50.8	44.6	38.7	27.1	Ro:	0.3
Illit.	28.4	31.1	35	45.3	52.5	58.8	71.4	Ru:	0.0
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	Cr:	0.0
Rat.	7.5	6.1	5.3	5.3	5.1	8.5	9.4	Se:	0.0
Num.	14,794	12,022	10,469	10,469	10,021	16,718	18,652	Ot:	1.0

Rat.: Ratio of age group within total of denomination. Num.: Number of age group. Database by Victor Karády and Peter Tibor Nagy. Original source: Archive of the Census Department, Central Statistical Office, Budapest.

Denominational Inequalities of Elite Training in Transylvania

Transylvanian counties and towns					Levels of education by age group and denomination							
Women, 1910	N	representation index average for all = 1			Total	0-5	6	7-11	12-14	15-19	20-24	
		20-24	40-44	total								
								years old				
Lutherans								8.80		% of popul.		
8 class	776	2.5	1.75	2.33	0.7	0	0	0	0	0.9	2	
6 class	695				0.6	0	0	0	0	1.1	1.1	
4 class*	3,185	2.21	2.17	2.11	2.7	0	0	0	1.9	6.9	6.4	
W/R	82,494				70.8	0	24.4	87.5	95.4	88.2	85.5	
Illit.	29,312	0.11	0.11	0.41	25.2	100	75.6	12.5	2.7	2.9	5	
Total	116,462				100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
Rat.					100	13.6	2.1	10	5.7	8.9	7.8	
Num.					116,462	15,849	2,434	11,680	6,598	10,311	9,140	
Greek Orthodox								29.90		% of popul.		
8 class	234	0.13	0.25	0.33	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	0.1	
6 class	128				0	0	0	0	0	0.1	0.1	
4 class*	979	0.23	0.13	0.16	0.2	0	0	0	0.1	0.7	0.8	
W/R	99,239				25	0	9.9	50.3	52.9	45.1	40.9	
Illit.	296,797	1.31	1.27	1.2	74.7	100	90.1	49.7	46.9	54	58.2	
Total	397,377				100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
Rat.					100	14.6	2.3	10.4	6.4	10	8.5	
Num.					397,377	57,955	9,315	41,415	25,543	39,694	33,647	
Unitarians								2.50		% of popul.		
8 class	140	1.38	0.5	1.33	0.4	0	0	0	0	0.3	1.1	
6 class	84				0.2	0	0	0	0	0.5	0.4	
4 class*	396	0.91	0.83	0.95	1.2	0	0	0	1	3.3	2.4	
W/R	18,161				53.9	0	23.3	81.4	87.7	83.8	80.9	
Illit.	14,932	0.34	0.59	0.71	44.3	100	76.7	18.6	11.3	12	15.2	
Total	33,713				100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
Rat.					100	14.7	2.1	10.1	6.3	9.5	8.7	
Num.					33,713	4,952	718	3,417	2,133	3,191	2,928	

*Rat.: Ratio of age group within total of denomination. Num.: Number of age group. * Age specific percentages here are calculated on the basis of the N of "4 classes". The representation index is calculated on the basis of the number of those who have completed at least 4 classes, that is on the basis of all those listed here as in classes 4+6+8. Database by Victor Karády and Peter Tibor Nagy. Original source: Archive of the Census Department, Central Statistical Office, Budapest.*

Transylvanian counties and towns				cont. of prev. page!					
Women, 1910	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-59	60-		
	years old								
Lutherans				8.80		% of popul.			Nat.
8 class	1.6	1.5	1.1	0.7	0.8	0.4	0.3	Hu:	10.5
6 class	1.2	1	1.3	0.9	0.9	0.5	0.4	Ge:	87.8
4 class*	5.4	4.7	4	3.4	2.6	1.6	0.9	Sl:	0.2
W/R	87.7	88.4	88.2	87.9	86.4	82.2	58.8	Ro:	0.6
Illit.	4.2	4.4	5.4	7.1	9.3	15.3	39.6	Ru:	0.0
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	Cr:	0.0
Rat.	7.2	6.6	5.6	5.6	5.4	9.9	11.6	Se:	0.0
Num.	8,401	7,689	6,475	6,496	6,299	11,560	13,529	Ot:	0.8
Greek Orthodox				29.90		% of popul.			Nat.
8 class	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0	Hu:	1.5
6 class	0.1	0.1	0.1	0	0	0	0	Ge:	0.0
4 class*	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.1	0	Sl:	0.0
W/R	35.4	27.3	19.8	17.2	11.6	10.1	2.8	Ro:	96.6
Illit.	64	72.1	79.7	82.5	88.1	89.7	97.1	Ru:	0.0
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	Cr:	0.0
Rat.	7.5	6.6	5	5.4	5.1	9	9.3	Se:	0.0
Num.	29,753	26,364	19,759	21,264	20,092	35,687	36,880	Ot:	1.8
Unitarians				2.50		% of popul.			Nat.
8 class	1.4	1.2	0.6	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.2	Hu:	99.2
6 class	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.1	Ge:	0.1
4 class*	1.9	2.2	1.8	1.4	0.6	0.9	0.4	Sl:	0.0
W/R	77.9	74.2	68.4	59.8	50.8	32.8	19.7	Ro:	0.4
Illit.	18	21.9	28.8	38.3	48.1	65.9	79.7	Ru:	0.0
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	Cr:	0.0
Rat.	7.2	6	5.3	5.4	5.2	8.9	10.4	Se:	0.0
Num.	2,443	2,020	1,802	1,833	1,757	3,009	3,510	Ot:	0.3

Rat.: Ratio of age group within total of denomination. Num.: Number of age group. Database by Victor Karády and Peter Tibor Nagy. Original source: Archive of the Census Department, Central Statistical Office, Budapest.

Denominational Inequalities of Elite Training in Transylvania

Transylvanian counties and towns					Levels of education by age group and denomination							
Women, 1910	N	representation index average for all = 1			Total	0-5	6	7-11	12-14	15-19	20-24	
		20-24	40-44	total								
								years old				
Israelites								2.40		% of popul.		
8 class	231	2.25	2.25	2.33	0.7	0	0	0	0	0.8	1.8	
6 class	317				1	0	0	0	0	2.2	1.9	
4 class*	2585	4.93	4.74	5.11	8	0	0	0	6.4	16.9	17.5	
W/R	17,799				55	0	27.1	85.1	87.1	72.1	69.7	
Illit.	11,409	0.2	0.5	0.57	35.3	100	72.9	14.9	6.5	8.1	9.1	
Total	32,341				100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
Rat.					100	15.7	2.5	11.9	7.5	11.9	9.9	
Num.					32,341	5,076	811	3,847	2,415	3,860	3,199	
Other								0.00		% of popul.		
8 class	6	7	9.5	7.33	2.2	0	0	0	0	0	5.6	
6 class	2				0.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	
4 class*	7	3.88	1.65	2.84	2.5	0	0	0	0	0	11.1	
W/R	129				46.7	0	0	100	100	100	66.7	
Illit.	276	0.38	1.06	0.77	47.8	100	0	0	0	0	16.7	
Total	276				100	100	0	100	100	100	100	
Rat.					100	3.6	0	1.4	2.2	5.4	6.5	
Num.					276	10	0	4	6	15	18	
Together								100.00		% of popul.		
8 class	4,115	1	1	1	0.3	0	0	0	0	0.3	0.8	
6 class	3,211				0.2	0	0	0	0	0.5	0.4	
4 class*	18,400	1	1	1	1.4	0	0	0	1	3.2	3.1	
W/R	478,244				36	0	14.1	60.4	65.6	56.3	51.2	
Illit.	823,916	1	1	1	62	100	85.9	39.6	33.4	39.7	44.4	
Total	1,327,887				100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
Rat.					100	15.1	2.3	10.4	6.3	10	8.5	
Num.					1,327,887	200,644	30,687	137,683	83,679	132,951	113,394	

*Rat.: Ratio of age group within total of denomination. Num.: Number of age group. * Age specific percentages here are calculated on the basis of the N of "4 classes". The representation index is calculated on the basis of the number of those who have completed at least 4 classes, that is on the basis of all those listed here as in classes 4+6+8. Database by Victor Karády and Peter Tibor Nagy. Original source: Archive of the Census Department, Central Statistical Office, Budapest.*

Transylvanian counties and towns				cont. of prev. page!					
Women, 1910	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-59	60-		
	years old								
Israelites				2.40		% of popul.			Nat.
8 class	2.2	1.5	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.5	0.2	Hu:	72.8
6 class	2.2	1.7	1.4	1.4	1.1	0.6	0.2	Ge:	26.2
4 class*	15.8	13.9	9.3	8.6	5.9	4.7	1.3	Sl:	0.0
W/R	66.7	66.5	62	57	52	39.8	30	Ro:	0.8
Illit.	13.1	16.4	26.4	32.2	40.2	54.4	68.3	Ru:	0.0
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	Cr:	0.0
Rat.	8.3	6.5	5.6	5.1	4	5.6	5.4	Se:	0.0
Num.	2,700	2,118	1,801	1,647	1,305	1,812	1,748	Ot:	0.1
Other				0.00		% of popul.			Nat.
8 class	5	2.3	0	3.8	0	2.6	0	Hu:	60.9
6 class	0	0	0	0	0	0	7.1	Ge:	9.8
4 class*	2.5	0	5.9	0	15.4	0	0	Sl:	0.4
W/R	62.5	55.8	47.1	26.9	38.5	20.5	25	Ro:	25.0
Illit.	30	41.9	47.1	69.2	46.2	76.9	67.9	Ru:	0.0
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	Cr:	0.0
Rat.	14.5	15.6	12.3	9.4	4.7	14.1	10.1	Se:	0.0
Num.	40	43	34	26	13	39	28	Ot:	4.0
Together				100.00		% of popul.			Nat.
8 class	0.8	0.7	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.2	Hu:	34.0
6 class	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.1	Ge:	9.0
4 class*	2.6	2.4	2	1.6	1.2	0.9	0.5	Sl:	0.1
W/R	46.7	43.3	41.5	32.7	29.4	24.2	16.2	Ro:	55.1
Illit.	49.3	53.1	55.4	65	68.7	74.4	83	Ru:	0.0
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	Cr:	0.0
Rat.	7.6	6.3	5.3	5.4	5	8.6	9.1	Se:	0.0
Num.	100,899	83,985	70,036	72,356	66,375	114,328	120,836	Ot:	1.8

Rat.: Ratio of age group within total of denomination. Num.: Number of age group. Database by Victor Karády and Peter Tibor Nagy. Original source: Archive of the Census Department, Central Statistical Office, Budapest.