

TEODORA DANIELA SECHEL

The Emergence of the Medical Profession in Transylvania (1770–1848)¹

According to Charles McClelland, “the professions in Modern times were associated with high social prestige and with a favorable economic position. In many cases, this prestige may derive from the association between professionals and their high status clientele in addition to respect for learning and expertise.”² However, in a comparative European perspective, the case of the doctors looks more ambiguous. In the Holy Roman Empire they usually graduated from a university with an education in medicine. Their studies prepared them not to be merely healers and practitioners but primarily to become members of the cultivated elite, which was still a rather marginal social status.³ Conditions, furthermore, varied from region to region. In Transylvania for instance, physicians had an uncertain, even marginalized social position, and a low economic status.

The way in which learned occupations became professions might be termed ‘professionalization.’ The scientific interest in these professions is relatively recent. In order to trace the professionalization of the medical field in Transylvania, it will be necessary to compare two different, yet primary models. The literature dealing with Continental Europe and the Anglo-Saxon world has argued that professionalization developed mainly in countries that had free-market economies with minimal state intervention. Therefore it flourished mainly in the Anglophone world, while in France and Germany bureaucratic administration hindered the process of professionalization. On the basis of this, sociologists such as Talcott Parsons raised the profession to a central role in society. He developed a functionalist approach of the profession, which had long dominated the literature.⁴ Sociologists and historians of professions following Parson’s line elaborated on two main models of

1 An earlier version of this article has been presented at the conference *Civil Society and Public Services in Early Modern Europe*. University of Leiden, Holland, 30 Nov -1Dec 2007. The paper is accessible at www.let.leidenuniv.nl/pdf/geschiedenis/civil/Sechel.pdf. For discussion and critical readings, I gratefully acknowledge the contributions of Emma C. Spary, László Kontler, Harold Cook, Mary Lindemann, Richard Wall, Vivian Nutton and Sonia Horn.

2 Charles E. McClelland, *The German Experience of Professionalization: Modern Learned Professions and Their Organizations from the Early Nineteenth Century to the Hitler Era* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 18–19.

3 Thomas Broman, “University Reform in the Medical Thought at the End of the Eighteenth Century”, *Osiris*, 2nd series, *Science in Germany: The Intersection of the Institutional and Intellectual Issues*, No 5, (1989), 2; McClelland, *German Experience*, 31.

4 McClelland, *German Experience*, 11.

professionalization: the Continental model, in which the state hindered the development of the professions; the second model, the Anglo-Saxon, professions developed within the free-market economy due to the minimal state intervention.

Charles McClelland's work further develops, elaborates, and refines this approach on the professions in a comparative study titled, *The German Experience of Professionalization*. It provides an insightful chapter on the problems and methods of research of the professions, and a detailed examination of various theories of professionalization. There are nine essential characteristics of the professions, which he uses as a framework for discussion, "Typically these lists include at least the following: 1) highly specialized and advanced education, 2) a special code of conduct ('ethics'), 3) altruism/public service, 4) rigorous competency tests, examination licensing, 5) high social prestige, 6) high economic rewards, 7) occupational career pattern or ladder, 8) monopolization of the market services, and 9) autonomy."⁵ He argues that although these characteristics are common to all professions, the two models of professionalization (the German and the Anglo-Saxon) are indeed different. The distinctions are to be found in the German values of education, in the involvement of the state in regulating the professions, and in the cooperation between professions and the state.

In regard to the medical profession, recent works of Claudia Huerkamp, Andrew Abbott, Konrad Jarausch, Geoffrey Cooks, Thomas Broman, and others are worth mentioning. Their use of a comparative and historical approach raises questions about the way in which professions are "distinguished from other occupational groups, about the institutions by which they are governed and their relationship to the public and to the state, and how they define their spheres of action and perform their work."⁶ They propose a broader definition of professions while arguing that professionalization of physicians was stimulated by state intervention. Andrew Abbott, in answer to questions concerning the interrelation of professions' control over knowledge and skill, defines professions as "exclusive occupational groups applying somewhat abstract knowledge to particular cases."⁷ Kees Gispens argues for an interrelation between professions and bureaucracy, as manifestations of a more general phenomenon, which he describes as "the rise of expertise and certification."⁸ Moreover, Thomas Broman examines the changing role of theory and practice in the professional ideology of German physicians during the eighteenth and early nineteenth century, and concludes that "the discussions of theory and practice that were so prominent in 1800 constituted a new discourse of medical professionalism through which physicians attempted to comprehend the

5 McClelland, *German Experience*, 14.

6 Thomas Broman, "Rethinking Professionalization: Theory, Practice, and Professional Ideology in Eighteenth-Century German Medicine", *The Journal of Modern History* 67, 4 (Dec 1995): 837.

7 Andrew Abbott, *The System of Professions: An Essay on the Division of Expert Labor* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988), 8-9.

8 Broman, Rethinking, 840, quoted from C. W. R. Gispens, "German Engineers and American Social Theory: Historical Perspectives on Professionalization", *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 30 (1988), 562.

altered social and institutional geography of medicine.”⁹ In the German lands, he argues, a shift occurred in medical education from *Bildung* to *Wissenschaft* around the middle of the eighteenth century.¹⁰

The gradual changes in the status of physicians in the Habsburg Monarchy followed the social, economic, and cultural reforms implemented by Maria Theresa and Joseph II in the second part of the eighteenth century. The sanitary reforms contributed to the professionalization of the medical personnel. In this article, I focus on the relationship of the establishment of the medical profession within the developing bureaucratic structures of the Habsburg Monarchy. My central claim is that the bureaucratization and professionalization of the medical practice were manifestations of a more general phenomenon, namely, the rise of physicians as experts designing initiatives to insure the public health of society. The need for well trained bureaucrats led to an increasing involvement of the state. I will also consider the relationship between the rise of the medical profession and public opinion on health matters, which is a topic hardly explored in the medical historiography of the Habsburg lands, especially when it comes to Transylvania.

I adopt Andrew Abbott’s definition of profession and his methodology that focuses on the work, rather than on structural markers. Relying also on McClelland and Broman, I will argue that the development of the medical profession was not only a result of the physician’s control over knowledge and skill, but it was primarily driven by the Habsburg authorities.¹¹ It was a process that began in the second part of the eighteenth century when medical doctors increasingly found employment as civil servants; a process that was to be fully accomplished in the nineteenth century. The latter process added a new quality to the patriotic engagement of physicians into the welfare of the populace. Consequently the status of the physician started to change from *Gelehrtenstand* to profession.¹² According to my findings, this process began in the second part of the eighteenth century, more specifically after 1770, and it was a peculiarity of the rather small, economically backward Habsburg provinces with complex political, ethnic, and confessional characteristics (i.e., Galicia, Bukovina, and Transylvania). Here the Habsburg authorities intended to integrate the educated intellectuals, also physicians, of *honoratior* (non-

9 Broman, *Rethinking*, 836–837.

10 I use *Wissenschaft* in order to address the scientific character of medicine. In the eighteenth century medicine was regarded as *ars* and *scientia*, *Kunst* and *Wissenschaft*. *Bildung* is used as a term to define the cultivation of personal character with the help of education, not only classical languages and philology, but also sciences. See Thomas Broman, *The Transformation of German Academic Medicine (1750–1820)* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), Id, “Bildung und praktische Erfahrung: konkurrierende Darstellungen des medizinischen Berufes und der Ausbildung an der frühen Berliner Universität”, *Jahrbuch für Universitätsgeschichte* 3 (2000), 19–35.

11 McClelland mentions the concept of ‘Berufskonstruktion’ used by Hans Albrecht Hesse in his book, *Beruf im Wandel. Ein Beitrag zum Problem der Professionalisierung* (Stuttgart: Enke, 1968).

12 Broman, *Rethinking*, 841, defines ‘*Gelehrtenstand*’ as a social caste defined by its members’ university education and by their share in the cultural heritage of classical antiquity.

noble) or petty noble background into the state administration in order to counteract the interests of the local political elites.

I will develop my argument in two directions. Firstly, I will examine the development of the institutional framework- more specifically the *Commissio Sanitatis* (sanitary commission) and the *cordons sanitaires*, with quarantine stations on the border of the Transylvanian Principality - which favored the construction of the medical profession. This institutional 'niche,' in Abbott's terms was created in response to the epidemiological circumstances of the province and the monarchy.¹³ The danger of epidemics required the presence and the 'expertise' of a physician. The involvement in decision making processes contributed to the admission of all physicians, irrespective of their religious denomination, into the higher administrative structures of the province (district, or town).¹⁴ This was an important innovation, which led to the improvement of the social and economic status of the physician.

Secondly, I will point out how university education linked the social role of the patriotic physician with that of the professional expert embedded into the state administration. In this regard Transylvania resembles the overall situation in the Habsburg hereditary lands and Prussia, where acquiring a professorial position qualified one as member of the *Geheimrat* (privy councilor). The professors were not only academics but also councilors of statesmen and members of health boards such as the *Collegium Medicum* and the *Commissio Sanitatis*. A *protomedicus* was both the 'Minister of Health' and the dean of the Medical School. The acquisition of a certificate from the Universities of Vienna, Prague, Buda (later Pest), and the other medical (surgical) schools of the Empire became a prerequisite for appointment in public services and functions. These bureaucratic positions had higher wages and offered an elevated social status and prestige. Professional competence and bureaucratic function would help the physicians to implement their ideas in organizing campaigns to fight epidemics and in promoting new sanitary policies that would protect the population against contagious diseases. Also, in the name of social utility they claimed authority and control over healers of lower social extraction and in matters of health. Their state-sanctioned authority and active contribution to social welfare enhanced eventually their social prestige. They became members of learned societies and Masonic Lodges and initiated cultural associations and learned journals where they could associate with the traditional elites in pursuit of similar patriotic goals.

13 Paul DiMaggio mentions that Abbott's perspective on the development and change of professions is 'ecological.' Professions grow when there are niches for them to grow into. Paul DiMaggio, "Review of Andrew Abbott, *The System of Professions: An Essay on the Division of Expert Labor*", *The American Journal of Sociology*, 95, 2 (Sept 1989), 534-535.

14 This was due to the fact that the highest number of Transylvanian physicians belonged to the protestant denomination. Protestant believers living in the Habsburg Monarchy were not allowed to rise into the higher administration of the lands/provinces. Conversions to Catholicism were encouraged by a subtle and persistent policy that favored Catholics in the higher administration. Georg Daniel Teutsch, *Geschichte der Siebenbürger Sachsen für das sächsische Volk*, vol. 2 (Hermannstadt: 1899), 125.

The Health Care Reforms, the Sanitary Network, and the Physicians (*Physici*)

In the mid-eighteenth-century Habsburg Monarchy, there were few trained civil servants, let alone a full-fledged bureaucratic structure to carry out the Emperors' administrative and economic reforms, including, among others the increasing of taxation revenues, opposed by the regional estates.¹⁵ The epidemiological circumstances of the Monarchy were in want of an efficient sanitary administrative structure capable of fighting plagues. The reforms of the eighteenth century addressed practical problems, while theoretically they were based on the German state sciences, as well as a new patriotic interest in increasing public welfare. Thus, the sanitary reforms were a combination of the theories and practices of governing, medical discoveries, and private initiatives. Two main proponents of the health reforms were the Dutch physician Gerhard van Swieten (1700–1772), Maria Theresa's personal physician and counselor, and Joseph von Sonnefels (1733–1817), professor of cameral sciences at the University of Vienna. Van Swieten was the director of the Court Library, the dean of the Vienna University, and the head of the monarchy's censorship commission. As a disciple of the famous Dutch scientist and physician Herman Boerhaave (1668–1738), he played a pivotal role in the implementation of health reforms throughout the entire Habsburg Monarchy. He advocated more governmental involvement in health matters. His recommended sanitation reforms targeted three issues: the eradication of epidemics, the creation of a modern medical education, and the centralization of the health administration system. The same views were presented in Joseph von Sonnefels' lectures on political economy at the University of Vienna, while Johann Peter Frank (1745–1821), a professor of internal medicine and director of the Vienna General Hospital, developed similar ideas in his book on medical police.¹⁶ There was a large audience for their ideas and several imperial councilors were receptive to a new health care policy. Furthermore, the desire to increase the population by imposing new sanitation standards made doctors key persons in promulgating sanitary laws and poverty relief measures. Thus, a step forward in the centralization project was accomplished only after the sanitary reform.

The main sanitation reform, the *Generale Normativum in Re Sanitatis*, put forward by van Swieten, reorganized administrative health structures in the entire monarchy. Maria Theresa issued it in 1770. It comprised three parts: 1) the structure and function of the sanitary network and administration, 2) the structure and the duties of medical practitioners, and 3) the prevention of epidemics – the inland and seaside quarantines. In Transylvania it was

15 Rita A. Kruger, "Mediating Progress in the Provinces: Central Authority, Local Elites, and Agrarian Societies in Bohemia and Moravia", *Austrian History Year Book* 35 (2004), 49–51.

16 Erna Leski, "Introduction", in *A System of Complete Medical Police: Selections from Johann Peter Frank* [Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976], xii–xiii (hereafter Leski, "Introduction" to J. P. Frank).

published in Latin and in German.¹⁷ Its stipulations were maintained, with small changes, until 1848. The law set a pyramidal sanitary administration consisting of the supreme Sanitary Commission in Vienna (*Sanitas Hof-Deputation*) led by a *protomedicus*. The administration of the sanitary commission was influenced by the Prussian one, establishing a central medical board (led by a *protomedicus*) with departments throughout the country led by physicians with a university degree. The Habsburg counterpart model was issued in Prague as a ‘Bohemian Medical Order’ in 1753. In the hereditary lands the physicians (*physici* or *Landschaftschirurgen*) employed by the local governments, were incorporated into the medical administration of the empire.¹⁸ In order to deal with sanitation problems, they created the *Commissio Sanitatis* (sanitary commission) in every province of the monarchy led by a *protomedicus*. The commissions were subordinated to the provincial authorities and to the *Sanitas Hof-Deputation* from Vienna. The territorial branches of the *Commissio* were led by *physici* appointed either by the Viennese Supreme Sanitary Commission or by the Gubernium of the provinces. These *physici* were the representatives of the Habsburg administration rather than of the local authorities (town or county). A peculiarity of the Habsburg Monarchy was the integration of medical schools into state administrative structures. The Medical Universities in Vienna and Prague were part of the sanitary commission.¹⁹ The same rule applied for University in Buda/Pest and for all the medical schools opened after 1770 in all the provinces of the monarchy. The *protomedicus* was the head of the medical schools of the provinces and the diploma issued had the empowerment of the *Commissio Sanitatis*.

The integration of all the provinces into the monarchy’s sanitary administration was the first step taken towards the centralization of the bureaucratic apparatus. All the lands and provinces of the Empire were affected by this process, and perceived this action as an infringement on their autonomy. The administration intervened with their traditional ways of governing and limited the sphere of influence of the local *Diets* in appointing health officers and deciding relevant legal matters. In Styria, for example, it multiplied the professional and administrative duties of the physicians and reduced their salaries.²⁰ The supervision of medical issues and the health of

17 *Generale Normativum in Re Sanitatis, (GNRS) 1770*, Document No: 1892/1770, B 31/1771, found at the Library of the Romanian Academy of Sciences, Cluj branch (hereafter BAR CJ), among unrecorded documents. This document was widely circulated in the empire, and was reproduced several times in German. I use the document No 7238/1831, BAR CJ), among unrecorded documents. X. F. Linzbauer also published “Generale Normativum in Re Sanitatis” in *Codex Sanitario-medicinalis Hungariae* (Buda, 1852–61.), vol. 2, 535–571 (Latin). The GNRS was sent from the Transylvanian Gubernium and to all the administrative units in the province.

18 Péter Balázs, “The Role of Hungary and The Habsburg Empire in the Development of Public Health Norms in 1770”, (paper delivered at the 40th International Congress on the History of Medicine, Budapest, Hungary, 2006), <http://www.ishm2006.hu/scientific> (accessed 4 August 2008).

19 Sonia Horn, “A Model for All? Healthcare and the State in 18th century Habsburg Inherited Countries”, (unpublished presentation paper).

20 Johannes Wimmer, *Gesundheit, Krankheit und Tod im Zeitalter der Aufklärung. Fallstudien aus den habsburgischen Erbländern* (Wien and Köln: Böhlau Verlag, 1991).

the rural population were complemented by the obligation to execute the orders issued by the Viennese Court and to send reports to the *Sanitas Hof Deputation*. In the Hereditary Lands this led to a conflict between Vienna and the regional sanitary administration, and was beneficial in the poorer provinces, like Transylvania.²¹

The integration of this province after 1770 into the central medical structures was a much smoother process than in Hungary. Due to more numerous plague epidemics, some health measures were more easily accepted. Prior to this, an earlier sanitary commission was established in 1740, which had several differences in comparison to the one established in 1770.²² For instance, it did not have a permanent administrative structure. It functioned intermittently during plague epidemics when physicians, delegated from Vienna (together with local physicians and surgeons), would organize the protection of the local population. Most of the decisions were made at the Vienna Court and sent to the provinces where they were adapted to the local circumstances.

In order to better understand the reforms of 1770, it will be necessary to outline the organization of medical matters in Transylvania prior to this date. The Austrian *cordon sanitaire* was created in 1726 and extended along the border of the province, with several quarantine stations placed under the authority of the border regiments after 1764.²³ The aim of this complex military and administrative operation was to prevent plague epidemics, and represented the beginning of a homogeneous medical organization in the monarchy. The quarantines had a qualified medical personnel, soldiers, workers, and priests. The quarantine physician or surgeon (*Pestärzt*), mentioned in several sanitary ordinances, was the classic embodiment of the physician-bureaucrat.²⁴ He was appointed directly by the Habsburg Emperor through the *Sanitas Hof-Deputation* and was paid from the Gubernium's treasury. His role was to control the health of the people who crossed the monarchy's borders. The visibility of such specialists was higher during the plague epidemics and their duties were to report monthly to the sanitary commission regarding epidemiological circumstances and activities inside the quarantine stations.²⁵ The headquarters

21 Wimmer, *Gesundheit*, 38–40. He mentions Maria Theresa's plans to reduce the number of the medical personnel and their salaries. In Styria, the *protomedicus* received 800 florins per year and the *physici* were paid 175–600 –175 florins according to their experience. The pharmacists received 300 florins. In 1749 an ordinance issued by Maria Theresa overloaded the *physici* with administrative work and proposed a diminution of the salaries (paid by the Gubernium of the province) to the medical personnel.

22 There was a Commission of Domestic Health – *Domestica Sanitatis Commissione* – which elaborated rules and orders to control the possible epidemics, see Ordinance 9745/1772, BAR CJ. The document does not have a call number.

23 The medical and the military functions of the *cordon sanitaire* were perceived as a burden by the inhabitants of the province, mainly by the Szeklers and Romanians who were part of the military regiments.

24 The main sanitary laws contained a *Formula Juramenti* (public oath) that was used for all the physicians and surgeons before being employed in the state service. "Generale Normativum 1770", reprinted in 1831, 38.

25 I.d., 30–31, 36–37.

of the sanitary commission was located at the residence of the Gubernium in Sibiu/Nagyszeben/Hermannstadt and later in Cluj/Kolozsvár/Klausenburg. The commission consisted of physicians, civilians, and military members of the Gubernium. There were also subordinate branches of the commission in the administrative centers of the districts, and these were led by a *physicus*.

The mining region in the Apuseni Mountains in the Western Carpathians had a separate and more sophisticated sanitary network relatively independent of the Transylvanian sanitary commission.²⁶ A series of documents from the Cluj State Archives bear witness to “the endowment of mining localities – first in the district headquarters [that] proved to be the new tendency to modernize, to centralize, and to ‘take the organization of healthcare administration into the state sector.’”²⁷ A large number of doctors, surgeons, and qualified midwives were appointed in the main mining towns of Hunedoara/Vajdahunyad and Zlatna/Zalatna/Schlatten districts, also in Abrud/Abrudbánya, Sebeş / Sebes/Mülbach, Rodna/Radna, Alba Iulia/Gyulafehérvár. Next to the local physician or surgeon (usually employed and paid by the community) there were surgeons employed to treat the illnesses and the accidents of the miners. All of them were under the control of the *physicus cameralis*, whose function was equivalent to that of the chief medical doctor responsible for the whole mining region. The *physicus cameralis* represented a prestigious position, following in rank the *protomedicus* of the province.²⁸ The economically oriented apparatus led to a more efficient sanitary network and also to the careful selection of medical personnel employed in the region. Those employed as physicians had good wages and other economic benefits (firewood, food for their horses, and a certain amount of money per diem).²⁹ The employees, surgeons, midwives, and apothecaries had to have a prior education at the Surgical Lyceum of Cluj/Kolozsvár/Klausenburg or in other schools of the monarchy.

The *Generale Normativum in Re Sanitatis*, issued in 1770, favored to a far greater extent the physicians’ involvement in the central and local administration. The *physici* became representatives of the Habsburg authorities and collaborated with the central and local authorities to impose health legislation. On the local level they were important agents of the municipal administration and of the town councils. They were mediators between the local governments and the

26 G. Rusu, “Obligațiile medicilor montanistici din Transilvania secolelor XVIII-XIX [The duties of the physicians in the mountain regions in Transylvania in the 18-19th centuries]”, in *Apărarea sănătății ieri și azi. Studii, note și documente* [Guarding health yesterday and today. Studies, notes and documents] (București: Editura Medicală, 1984), 103.

27 G. Rusu, “Extinderea rețelei medico-sanitare miniere din Transilvania. 1740 – 1840 (The extension of the medical-sanitary network in the mining regions of Transylvania, 1740-1840)”, in *Momente din trecutul medicinei. Studii, note și documente* [Moments from the past of medicine. Studies, notes and documents], ed. G. Brătescu (București: Editura Medicală, 1983), 226.

28 Alexandru Neamțu, “Din activitatea doctorului Vasile Popp pe domeniul minier al Zlatnei (1829 – 1842)” (From doctor Vasile Popp’s activity in mining affairs in Zlatna (1829-1842), *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie și Arheologie* (Yearbook of the Institute of History and Archeology), (Cluj, 1972), 105–144. (hereafter Neamțu, “Activitatea”).

29 *Opinio in Re Sanitatis*, 1793. The document is a report and/ or a proposal for a new sanitary legislation in Transylvania. BAR CJ, Unitarieni 457/ 1968; also MOL (Hungarian National Archives, Budapest), *Opinio in Re Sanitatis*, E 12 Cista diplomatica, 3497/1793.

population. The town physicians were drawn into the work of the town councils, and also in the management of the subordinated districts. If the town had quarantine stations nearby (such as Braşov/ Kronstadt/ Brassó and Bistriţa/ Bistritz/ Besztercebánya, where the town physicians would collaborate with quarantine physicians to prevent outbreaks of diseases and the spread of plague epidemics from the neighboring countries into Transylvania.

Besides their professional function, the *physici* also fulfilled the role of the ‘medical police.’³⁰ The magistrate of the town would appoint a committee composed of a physician and members of the town council to inspect the health status of the population.³¹ They surveyed the sanitary issues of the town and played an important role during plague epidemics when the towns were isolated. Another category of medical employees was the *physici circulatorum* whose main task was to solve public health issues in a county.³² The *physici* also had secondary tasks as public health inspectors and epidemiologists. They supervised medical practice and epidemic circumstances, collaborated on reports concerning diseases and epidemics, and gave medical assistance to the poor.³³ Furthermore, they were responsible for medical services, inoculation (later vaccination), and for reporting on the monthly health of the communities. Additionally, they were responsible for instructing the citizens how to obey the ordinances issued to preserve public health.

The sanitary reforms were aimed at eradicating the epidemic diseases responsible for the decimation of the population. These public health measures were carried out through a constant, coherent action in different fields and had, besides the obvious medical impact, political, economic, social, and cultural influences. The bureaucratic function transformed the *physici* into “the fingertip of the state in the public health issues” of the monarchy.³⁴ Moreover, reform of medical curricula contributed to the professionalization of medicine, and became one of the avenues of extending state control over the political, economic, social, and above all, the sanitary matters of the monarchy.³⁵

30 *Ordinance*, National Archives, Romania, District of Cluj, Fond Bistriţa, (hereafter ANCJ POB), Series II a, Sheet F. 71.

31 Document at ANCJ POB, Series II, Sheet F. 72. “The health inspectors’ duties”; also “About the health in the Principality”, Ordinance nr. 9745/1772: The physician of the district together with the Magistrate must inspect the territories. There was a Commission of Domestic Health (*Domestica Sanitatis Commisio*) which elaborated rules and orders in order to control the possible epidemics.

32 *Opinion in Re Sanitatis*, 1793, 5 – 6 recto.

33 Elisabeta Marin, “Primele instrucţiuni pentru medicul şi chirugul oraşului Braşov (1763) [The first instructions for the physician and surgeon of the town Braşov]”, in *Apărarea sănătăţii ieri şi azi. Apărarea sănătăţii ieri şi azi. Studii, note, documente*, Bucureşti: Meridiane, 1984), 93- 101. Johann Friedrich Millius drafted the instructions published by E. Marin. He studied medicine in Halle and was *physicus ordinarius* of Braşov (1738–1764).

34 Mary Lindmann, “The Enlightenment Encountered: The German Physicus and His World, 1750–1820”, in *Medicine in the Enlightenment* ed. Roy Porter (Amsterdam: Rodophy, 1995), 181–197.

35 Thomas Broman, *The Transformation of German Academic Medicine, 1750–1820* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 51.

The Medical Education

Reforms of education, especially the higher education, were a priority for the Habsburgs since the efficient administrative reorganization required qualified personnel. Unprecedented effort was invested into the modernization and enlargement of the university network, and the 1777 *Ratio educationis* established compulsory schooling for the whole population.³⁶

The education reforms also affected the curriculum of medical teaching at the University of Vienna. The university was responsible since 1517 for organizing campaigns to prevent plague epidemics and to certify licenses of physicians, surgeons, and barbers practicing medicine in the Austrian lands, the capital, and the adjacent district.³⁷ Starting from the second half of the seventeenth century, the medical faculty of the University of Prague had similar duties for the Bohemian lands and Moravia. The medical faculties were at the same time the headquarters of medical boards. They combined administrative and training attributes – one of the distinctive characteristics of the Habsburg sanitary administration. In 1749 Gerard van Swieten recommended a separation of the areas of training and administration of public health. He also drew up plans for the improvement of the Viennese Medical Faculty.³⁸

Van Swieten was one of the main initiators of the new health care system and education in the monarchy. At his advice, Maria Theresa issued an ordinance in 1749 prescribing courses in surgery, botany, chemistry, and clinical medicine (taught at the patient's bedside) at the University of Vienna. Van Swieten was the director of studies, and the dean of the faculty was Anton Störck (1731 – 1803). The curriculum grounded the medical theories in practice, while instructing and supervising the lower categories of medical personnel (surgeons, barbers, and obstetricians). At every medical faculty in the monarchy (Vienna, Prague, Padua, Buda/Pest, Lemberg) the theoretical explanation was linked with practical instruction at the bedside.

Zacharias Theophilus Huszty de Raßynya (1754-1803), in his book *Diskurs über die medizinische Polizey*, made a distinction between the medical education of the physicians at the faculty of medicine and the training of surgeons in the medical institutes. In addition to anatomy, physiology, medical herbalism (*die Kräuterkunde*), and internal/general medicine (*Die allgemeine Krankheitslehre*), the physicians would also learn chemistry, experimental physics, military medicine (*Arzneimittellehre*), the art of prescription of drugs (*Die Kunst Rezepte zu verschreiben*) and the science of the medical police (*Die*

36 This subject is discussed extensively by James Van Horn Melton, *Absolutism and the Eighteenth-Century Origins of Compulsory Schooling in Prussia and Austria* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

37 Sonia Horn mentions that since 1642 even midwives held and examination at the Vienna Medical University in order to practice their work. Sonia Horn, "Wiener Hebammen 1643–1753", *Studien zur Wiener Geschichte* 59 (2003), 35–102.

38 Sonia Horn, "[E]ine Akademie in Absicht der Erweiterung der medizinisch – chirurgischen Wissenschaft..." Hintergründe für die Entstehung der medizinisch-chirurgischen Akademie 'Josephinum' (unpublished manuscript). Hereafter cited as Sonia Horn, *Josephinum*.

medizinische Polizeiwissenschaft).³⁹ The content of the teaching was oriented in such a way as to train not only theoreticians, but ‘professional experts’ as well who would work in the provinces of the monarchy. The new chairs of surgery, anatomy, internal medicine, and obstetrics, as well as the performance of autopsies, dissection, and ‘scientific’ experiments, placed the University of Vienna amongst the elite medical schools in Europe. Surgery and anatomy were taught here both for physicians and surgeons. The language of instruction was Latin for physicians and German for surgeons. Generally the physicians would receive a double doctorate in philosophy and medicine, receiving a gentlemanly education, comprising classical studies and natural sciences, that qualified them as superior in rank to the surgeons. The latter were trained to be collaborators with the former and would become masters of surgery (*magister chirurgie*).⁴⁰ In this way the competition for wages, wealthy clients, and social status between doctors and surgeons was diminished.

After the death of Gerhard van Swieten in 1772, Joseph II strived to change the teaching of medicine at the Vienna University. Anton von Störck, the dean of the medical faculty, decreed in 1780 that surgery too became a liberal art and whoever wanted to study it, had to enroll at the Viennese medical faculty. The theoretical foundation and practical orientation of medical studies remained an important aspect, as pointed out by the director of the Vienna General Hospital, Johann Peter Frank.⁴¹ In 1785, Joseph II established a medical-surgical academy in Vienna. It was intended to train surgeons to increase the number of trained medical practitioners and also to train military surgeons.

The medical-surgical academy reflected the utilitarian principles of the emperor. Joseph II and his advisers wanted to extend the medical provision to poorer people, healthcare being seen as a reservoir for population growth, revenues, and the army. Accordingly, “young people must not be taught anything which they will use seldom or never at all, for the good of the state, the essential purpose of the study at university is to train the state officials and is not to be devoted merely to the education of the intellectuals.”⁴² Thomas Broman argues that the utilitarian view began “to break down physicians’ corporate identity forcing them to articulate a new vision for their profession.”⁴³ Moreover, the physicians and surgeons employed in the sanitary administration of the monarchy were required to study mathematics, statistics, and the sciences of the state in order to fill out their reports concerning the population’s health status as well as the census data of the population.⁴⁴ As the civil service started to consolidate in Europe, the links between education/schooling and

39 Zacharias Theophilus Huszty de Raſyňa, *Diskurs über die medizinische Polizei*, vol. 1 (Preßburg: Löwe, 1786), 67–74.

40 Broman, “Bildung”, 20–21.

41 Leski, “Introduction”, xii.

42 T.C.W. Blanning, *Joseph II*, (London: Longman, 1994), 69.

43 Broman, *The Transformation*, 9.

44 Information provided by Sonia Horn.

state became more interrelated.⁴⁵ “The Universities became seedbeds of disciplined professional behavior. The state ran and funded the educational system and it wanted competent well trained clergymen, teachers, physicians, and lawyers.”⁴⁶ Thus, the bureaucracy played an important role in reforming the medical curriculum. The theoretical disciplines were completed with those who offered a practical expertise.

In Transylvania, modern medical education followed the mainstream established in the capital. The Jesuit College of Cluj/Kolozsvár/Klausenburg was transformed into an Academy with three departments: Theology, Law, and Philosophy.⁴⁷ In 1775, a Faculty of Medicine was added with only two courses (surgery and anatomy, as well as obstetrics, taught in German by Joseph Laffner).⁴⁸ A course in veterinary medicine was introduced later in 1787, taught by Peter Fuhrmann.⁴⁹ Joseph II downgraded the faculty to the status of a surgical lyceum and gave it a structure similar to that of the medical-surgical academy in Vienna. Its status was changed later to that of Royal Academic Lyceum in the 1790s and in 1816 it was raised to that of a Medical-Surgical Institute.⁵⁰ The main mission of the school was to train surgeons and midwives.

Disciplines taught at the surgical lyceum were meant to help students in the theoretical knowledge and practical skills necessary to treat illnesses and prevent plague epidemics. The diploma granted by the surgical lyceum qualified the surgeons to be employed in a province’s sanitary network. There were debates about the language of instruction of the surgeons. Joseph II wanted to introduce German as the language of instruction in all the schools

45 A practical example: Brukenthal, the Transylvanian governor, made known that Joseph Laffner was appointed professor of Surgery and Obstetrics at the Surgical Lyceum of Cluj, and everybody who wanted to study medicine had to enroll for the classes of this professor. ANCJ, POB, Series II a, Sheet 5/ f. 99, Sibiu 1775.

46 McClelland, *German Experience*, 4–5.

47 These aspects were discussed in detail by Lucia Protopopescu, *Contribuții la istoria învățămîntului din Transilvania, 1774-1805* [Contributions to the history of education in Transylvania], (București: Editura Didactică și Pedagogică, 1966) and by Remus Câmpeanu, *Intellectualitatea română din Transilvania în veacul al XVIII-lea* (ClujNapoca: Presa Universitară Clujeană, 1999). The curriculum of the future students became more complex in the nineteenth century. Those who wanted to study medicine, theology, or law in the university, had to study the following subjects: theology, philosophy, history, mathematics, physics, and Latin and Greek philology, and for lawyers also the Saxon Municipal law, for theologians the Hebrew language. See Friedrich Teutsch, “Die siebenbürgisch-sächsischen Schulordnungen”, vol. 2 of *Monumenta Paedagogica Historica* (Berlin, 1892), 279.

48 These institutions were considered medical faculties. In Hungary the University of Tarnava/Nagyszombat was closed down and moved to Buda/Pest. However the status of ‘university’ was given only to the schools of Vienna, Prague, Padua, Lemberg and Buda/Pest.

49 I. Mainzer, *A Kolozsvári Orvos – sebészti tanítézet történeti vázlata 1775–1872* (The historical outline of the medical-surgical educational institute from Cluj, 1775-1872) (Cluj: 1890), 3. This professor was initially a barber, and an apprentice to a surgeon. ANCJ, POB, Series II A, Sheet 5, f. 135.

50 I. Mainzer, *A Kolozsvári Orvos – sebészti Tanítézet*, 2.

of the monarchy. In Transylvania, German was taught mainly to the Saxon students. Hungarians and Romanians were taught in Hungarian.

The medical schools in the monarchy were subordinated to the sanitary commission. Usually, the *protomedicus* of a province was also the head of the medical schools. Johann Peter Frank commented on the efficiency of this administrative function: “An additional advantage of this work is that I am in a position to put into effect a large part of my medical proposals and I am therefore able to adjudge their consequences and difficulties better than can most [physician] writers.”⁵¹ The *protomedicus* had the same degree of influence over all the provinces of the Habsburg Monarchy. The *protomedicus* and also the professors of the medical schools, as members of the sanitary commission, decided on health matters in the empire.

In Transylvania, during the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth century, there were only a few physicians in the province. Most of the professors at the Cluj/Kolozsvár/Klausenburg Academy and the Surgical Lyceum started their career as *Beamte* to organize the fight against epidemics in different regions. In general, a career in the provinces or districts made them eligible as professors in the medical schools of the monarchy. In Transylvania, Adam Chenot (1721–1798), the first *protomedicus* of the province, and André Étienne (1751–1797), *physicus cameralis* and organizer of the sanitary network in the mining region, both earned their professorships as distinguished *Beamter*. The latter taught mineralogy and metallurgy at the Cluj/Kolozsvár/Klausenburg Academy. Ferenc Nyulas (1758–1806), chemist, botanist, and pharmacist, was noted for his contributions to the successful campaigns against the plague in 1795 that affected 50 villages in the Szolnok district of Transylvania. He published several books and pamphlets to help the treatment of scurvy, goiter, and smallpox. He was appointed provincial *protomedicus* and head of the surgical lyceum. Vasile Popp (1789–1842), *physicus* of Braşov/Brassó/Kronstadt, requested the initiation of a course in *Politia Medica* (medical police) in 1820, and also appealed to the educational merits of medical instruction and a rich activity as *physicus cameralis* in the mining regions of the Principality.⁵² All the professors at the surgical lyceum had to demonstrate prowess in their fieldwork and private practice, and in providing free medical assistance for the poor.

The surgeons could also apply for a professorship in the schools in Cluj/Kolozsvár/Klausenburg if they were successful in serving the community and in their private practice. This was also the case of, Ioan Piuaru Molnar (1749–1815), a *physicus* of Hermannstadt, who was appointed to teach a new course (ophthalmology) at the Surgical Lyceum in 1790. As he stated in the inaugural lesson of November 1790, “I had many public appointments, I helped many blind people to regain their lost sight, I treated free of charge many poor people,

51 Leski, “Introduction” to J. P. Frank”, xii.

52 MOL, Budapest document no. 5781/1820 reproduced by Sámuel Izsak in “Propunerea doctorului Vasile Popp din 1820 privind crearea catedrei de ‘Politia medica’ la Liceul Medico-Chirurgical din Cluj” [The suggestion of Doctor Vasile Popp to teach a course on Medical police], in *Studii de istorie a medicinei* (Cluj, 1968), 123–135.

I healed many of the diseases of the eyes. This is the reason of this appointment as a professor.”⁵³

Those who pursued a career in surgery were initially apprentices to a physician or a *magister* in surgery. The most talented of them went to study at the surgical lyceum and some even further to a medical university. The surgeons were also obliged to sustain an examination before members of the *Commissio Sanitatis* and the professors at the lyceum before being allowed to practice. Molnar also studied in Vienna for a year with the financial support of the Gubernium to become a *magister chyrurgie*. Later, when already a professor, he too supported the higher medical education study of his students either at the Surgical Lyceum or at the University of Vienna and Pest.⁵⁴

Thus the institutionalization of medicine gave the *physicus* authority to control all other medical practitioners. As mentioned previously, surgeons too became subordinated to the physicians. The ordinances issued by the Gubernium and by the *protomedici* Ferenc Nyulas and Sámuel Pataki (1765–1824) stated that all the medical practitioners, before being employed in the administration, must fulfill the educational requirements, that is, to have a valid medical diploma issued on the territory of the monarchy.⁵⁵ *Physici* were also urged to follow the scientific and medical discoveries throughout Europe. Nyulas, in turn, expressed his desire that physicians should publish or translate a book or a brochure in one of the languages spoken in the Principality (Hungarian, German, and Romanian). He also stated that “the young scholars returning home [to Transylvania] after studying in foreign countries must not

53 Ioan Piurariu Molnar, “Sfătuire rostită în fața ascultătorilor de chirurgie de la Liceul Regal Academic Clujean” de Ioan Molnar de Müllersheim, profesor public al boalelor și artei vindecării ochilor când întâiu și-a deschis cursurile în anul 1791, luna Noiembrie [Counseling performed in front of the students of surgery at the Royal Academic Lyceum from Cluj, by de Ioan Molnar de Müllersheim, ordinary professor of sicknesses and the art of eye healing when he started his course in the year 1791, November month], cited by V. L. Bologa “Praenensis de Piurariu Molnar. Inceputul literaturii medicale științifice la romani [Paraenesis by Piurariu Molnar. The beginning of medical scientific literature among Romanians]”, in: V. L. Bologa and Samuel Izsák, *Studii de istorie a medicinei* (Studies in the history of medicine) (Cluj; [s.n.], 1968), 62–63.

54 Mircea Popa, *Ioan Piurariu Molnar* (Cluj-Napoca: Dacia, 1976); Iosif Spielmann and Z. Szókefalvi-Nagy, “Câteva precizări cu privire la bio- și ergografia lui Ioan Piurariu Molnar [Some precisions regarding the biography and professional activities of Ioan Piurariu Molnar]”, *Revista Medicală* (Medical journal), 23, no. 1 (1977): 18–21. Al Neamțu, “Date noi cu privire la Ioan Piurariu Molnar (1745–1815)”, *Studia Univesitatis Babeș-Bolyai*, *Seria Historica*, (January 15, 1970), 57–58.

55 *Instructio Pro Apotecarius*. Ordinance No. 8215/1808, BARCJ call number 1249/1968; also I. Spielmann, I., *Restituiri istorico-medicale. Studii de istoria științei și culturii* (București: Kriterion, 1980). 318–322 (hereafter, Spielmann, *Restituiri*); *Instructio Pro Obstetricibus Salaristi Magni Principatus Transylvaniae*. Ordinance No. 8018/ A 1809, BARCJ call number 1280/1968; *Instructio Pro Chirurgis & Civitatensibus Magni Principatus Transylvaniae*, Ordinance No. BARCJ 8018/1809, call number 1279/1968. The Governor Samuel Brukenthal issued in 1774 an ordinance that all *Stadtphysici* earning 400 florins per year had to take an examination at the Cluj/Kolozsvár/Klausenburg Academy. Those knowledge was insufficient, had to study anatomy, surgery, and obstetrics, ANCJ, POB, Series II a, Sheet 5/ f. 88.

be employed in any public function until they present a scientific discovery published in their mother language.”⁵⁶

There were specific rules applied to midwives and pharmacists as well. Since the middle ages the town councils had appointed midwives to serve within the walled city and to supervise the activity of other midwives who lived and worked in the neighboring countryside. From the 1770s onward, the Transylvanian sanitary commission, in collaboration with the town councils, introduced a number of ‘rules’ to standardize the midwifery system, such as compulsory education at the surgical lyceum and in the school of midwives in Sibiu/Hermannstadt/Nagyszeben.⁵⁷ Usually ‘specialization’ would be attained after the apprenticeship. The Surgical Lyceum became a training site for newly appointed midwives (*Beifrauen*) after 1775. The training took six months under the supervision of a surgeon or obstetrician. The examination for midwives was made under the medical supervision of the members of the *Commissio Sanitatis* and the *stadtphysicus*.⁵⁸

Much attention was given to the moral profile of medical practitioners. Physicians, surgeons, midwives, and pharmacists needed to demonstrate a good character,⁵⁹ honesty, and diligence. Ferenc Nyulas considered that only hard work, ‘love of the fatherland,’ and dedication would bridge the gap of backwardness between Transylvania and the other provinces of the monarchy.⁶⁰ He suggested that poor people should receive free medical consultations. Pharmacists and surgeons were asked to purchase the right medical instruments and good quality medicine in order to help patients. Yet the benevolent but costly efforts to raise the professional and moral requirements of the *protomedicus* caused protest, especially among the lower medical personnel. Ferenc Nyulas’s zeal to reorganize pharmacies was not welcome, and he might have been even poisoned to death by one of the apothecaries who were forced to close his workshop.⁶¹

56 Spielmann, *Restituiuri*, 319.

57 An ordinance issued in 1808 call no. BAR Cluj, Fond Unitarieni 1219 The midwives had to pursue education at the surgical lyceum from Cluj or at the midwives school in Sibiu. At the end of the training they were examined by the *protomedicus* and/ or by the *physicus* of the town and received a “diploma”.

58 Ordinance 1393/1815 states the fact that a midwife should study in a surgical lyceum in Cluj/Kolozsvár/Klausenburg or in Sibiu/Nagyszeben/Hermannstadt and should take an examination with a *protomedicus* or *physicus* before being appointed.

59 See ordinance 8018/1809, *Instructio pro ostetricibus salarissatis Magni Principatus Tansylvaniae*. It was recommended that “a midwife should be well spoken, honest, with a good conscience, capable of keeping professional secret, not talkative, wise, she must know her profession well and also she must collaborate with the local surgeon and/or physician.”

60 “Generale Normativum 1770”, p. 40, presents a simple formula of public oath (*Juramenti*) in which the doctor and surgeon obliges himself to obey sanitary rules and diligently work in order to cure the diseases. *Opinio in Re Sanitatis*, 1793, 8–9 presents a more elaborated formula in which the doctor obliges himself to obey the sanitary norms and to diligently work for the *Publica salutis rationis*, to help the paupers, to keep professional secrecy, not to make deals with pharmacists to the detriment of patients, and to collaborate with other doctors without envy, hatred, etc. in order to fight together with the magistrates to eradicate epidemics.

61 Spielmann, *Restituiuri*, 317.

The Physician as a Man of Letters

The development of new forms of sociability centering on learned societies generated a broad cultural movement. Many physicians were members of the main learned societies such as the German *Societas Polihistorum* the *Transylvanian Society for the Hungarian Language* and the Romanian *Philosophical Society*. Conform to the patriotic discourse of the day, they highlighted a variety of problems within Transylvania's multiethnic and multidenominational society. The economic and cultural backwardness of the province, the social problems, the frequent epidemics of plague, and other health issues were debated in the meetings of the societies and occasionally published. Attention was directed towards practical issues, and mostly towards the spread of useful information. Nyulas commented: "To resume our activity of healing the sick is not the highest priority, we are paid to do this work. In this respect we are in a similar position to a merchant who sells his goods. How valuable is the science if we keep it secret, for our own knowledge? Who can use it if we do not share with the greater public?"⁶² Transylvanian physicians and other members of the learned elites were involved in the translation and publication of books and pamphlets, satires, and brochures covering all fields of life.

They discussed history, geography, ecclesiastic history, literature, and political as well as economic issues. Many physicians, such as Ioan Piuaru Molnar, István Mátyus (1724–1802), Vasile Popp, and George Constantin Rozsa/Roja (1786–1847) were involved in the scholarly life of their fatherland. An important agenda for the enlightened physicians was the geographical description and mapping of the province's regions. Medical topography was especially popular in Transylvania in the last part of the eighteenth and in the beginning of the nineteenth century. This map described environmental, economical, and cultural aspects, mainly mining areas, which had an impact on health in a given geographical unit: "They give a detailed account on the miners' work, their salary, workplaces and housing, lifestyle, alimentation, clothing, family relations, the structure and order of miners' dwellings, their ethnic and religious differences, and the characteristic use of language."⁶³

In addition to strict medical expertise, medical topographies provided broader information about the regional spread of different diseases. During the entire eighteenth century, regions from Hungary, Banat of Timișoara (Temesvár Bánát) and Transylvania were called by Western Europeans the 'cemetery for foreigners'⁶⁴ due to the high mortality rate caused by diseases such as malaria,

62 I.d., 318.

63 Deáky Zita, *Landscape, History And The People – Health And Medical Conditions in 18th and 19th Century Hungary*, <http://www.ishm2006.hu/scientific/abstract.php?ID=275>, (accessed October 19, 2006).

64 Friedrich Jakob Fuker (1748–1805), *De salubritate et morbis Hungariae* (Preßburg, Loewe, 1775). This book was also translated into Slovakian and published in a Latin-Slovak edition: Friedrich Jakob Fuker, *De salubritate et morbis Hungariae*, trans. and ed. František Šimon (Košice: Univerzita Pavla Jozefa Šafárika, 2003).

or the exotic disease called ‘csömör.’⁶⁵ In the spirit of Hippocratic theories, the air, the water, and the geography in a region were considered to be the cause of specific diseases. In his introduction to the second edition of *The Mineral Waters of the Rodna Region*, Ferenc Nyulas, analyzed the climate, the population, and the regional spread of the goiter in Transylvania. He mentioned that in certain regions of the Carpathian Mountains, people and sometimes even birds had a propensity for particular diseases.⁶⁶ In addition to scientific medical explanation, the author maintained “that due to the external and internal characteristics of this disease, goitrous people had evolved a particular, closed lifestyle, and practiced endogamy.”⁶⁷

Interest in agriculture and improved agricultural techniques were combined with the advocacy of the draining of marshes in order to improve the resources of agriculture and to prevent famines and diseases. The physician Ioan Piariu Molnar translated a book on beekeeping. The book, entitled *Economy of beehives*, aimed to encourage beekeeping in Transylvania and to popularize techniques that increased honey production and wax quality.⁶⁸ Another important issue for the physicians was the promotion of new plants such as potatoes and maize as famine and nutritional diseases, which haunted Transylvania during the entire eighteenth century. It is known today that eighteenth-century Europe had a colder climate than ours, and natural calamities occurred more often. The harvest was often affected by excessive rain or draught, the result of which was often famine.⁶⁹ Famine was present even in years with an average harvest. This is why István Mátyus intended to popularize new plants such as potatoes and maize. He mentioned that his work *Old and New Dietetics* aimed to teach people “not to be obliged to be guided, as blind people, in the vital problems of health by some ignorant and stupid barbers, poor in spirit.”⁷⁰ His work and other publications on agriculture and animal breeding aimed at instructing and transmitting new, practical knowledge. It informed the peasants about new plants and crops for animals in order to avoid famine and the resulting epidemic. This so called ‘economic literature’⁷¹ was flourishing in the province. The Court and the Transylvanian Gubernium provided substantial help in translating and publishing such

65 This Hungarian name cannot be translated. It probably was a group of symptoms, which indicated a digestive problem.

66 Iosif Spielmann, “Un savant ardelean din secolul XVIII: Nyulas Ferenc” [A Transylvanian savant from the eighteenth century: Ferenc Nyulas], in *Istoria Medicinii. Studii și Cercetări* [The history of medicine. Studies and research papers] (București: Editura Medicală, 1957), 103–120.

67 I.d., 115.

68 Ioan Piariu Molnar, *Economia stupilor* [The economy of beehives], (Vienna, 1785). See also N. Edroiu and Pompiliu Teodor, ed., “Economic Literature of the 1780–1820 Period and Romanian Society”, in *Enlightenment and Romanian Society*, (Cluj-Napoca: Dacia, 1980), 42–44.

69 Paul Binder and Paul Cernovodeanu, *Cavalerii Apocalipsului. Calamitățile din trecutul României* [The knights of apocalypse. Calamities from the past of Romania] (București: Silex 1993), passim.

70 Mátyus István, *The Old and New Dietetics*. Quoted by Spielmann, *Restituiri*, 315.

71 Edroiu, “Economic Literature”, 43.

works. Many enlightened intellectuals envisioned a program of teaching in which men would acquire knowledge about new comestible plants, master crafts, and new agricultural techniques.

The working conditions of miners and occupational diseases featured the physicians' attempts to improve public health. The exchange of ideas in Hungarian and German learned societies made people aware of the importance and benefits of new medical discoveries and treatments. Medical science and public health were the central focus of the debates. The goal was to improve the health of individuals through public policies and education.⁷² Hygiene (domestic and individual) and dietetics gave many insights about medicine. All these debates had a strong impact on the attitudes of the provincial elite who disseminated useful knowledge either in the form of books, as did Nyulas, or as articles in the main journals of the province, such as the *Siebenbürgische Quartalschrift*.⁷³ Andreas Wolf (1741–1812) wrote in an article that “we warn against the lethal effect of closed air, especially in the cellars, closed fumes, fermenting cider.”⁷⁴ Another article in the *Quartalschrift* mentioned that,

*One reads with patriotic joy that the article written by Doctor Andreas Wolf in number three of this Quartalschrift, about drinking water in Hermannstadt was well received by the municipality. The water reservoirs of the town from the Heltau Gate were cleansed under the supervision of the tireless and dignified magistrate Mr. Friedrich Schreyer. He took the right measures for the preservation of the inhabitants' health.*⁷⁵

Members of the learned elite also subscribed to the salient opinion that the spread of science and medicine would lead to the cultivation of morals and eventually to the disciplining of the body. Medical knowledge was taught also to instill moral sentiments and civic responsibility in human relationships. Advice on how to prevent the spread of venereal diseases was translated into the local languages of most frequent use. Thus, André Etienne's book, *Methodus facillissima et rusticis comodissima, praetio quoque levissimo luem veneream curandi* (Easy method on the treatment of syphilis), was published in Romanian and Hungarian, a difficult enterprise due to the lack of medical terminology.

The *physici* played also an important role in the improvement of the national languages, as a main scientific goal of the provincial learned societies. The translations revealed their effort to improve the Hungarian and Romanian vernaculars and to enrich the scientific vocabulary. The Romanian translation,

72 Anne Hardy, “The medical response during the long eighteenth century”, in *Epidemic Diseases in London*, ed. J. A. I. Champion (working paper, series 1, Center for Metropolitan History, University, London, 1993), 67.

73 The *Siebenbürgische Quartalschrift* was published in seven volumes between 1790 and 1805.

74 The *Quartalschrift* also mentions that Professor Slambos from Aiud/Nagy Enyed/Strassburg am Mirch, died drunk in his cellar due to the lack of oxygen. *Siebenbürgische Quartalschrift* I, 1790, p. 125.

75 “Medizinische Polizey”, *Siebenbürgische Quartalschrift*, IV, (1794).

for instance, introduced 150 neologisms and used numerous regionalisms.⁷⁶ Another important Romanian medical translation was *Lehrbuch der Geburtskunde* (Manual for obstetrics), by Simon Zeller von Zellenberg (1746–1816).⁷⁷ Ioan Piuariu Molnar mentioned that “it is difficult to find Romanian words to match the German terminology”, and therefore asked more than 200 florins for the translation commissioned by the Galician Gubernium for the “well-being of the people” (*publici boni rationem*).⁷⁸

Information about health matters was disseminated in print. Articles, pamphlets, and sanitary brochures were among the most important tools used by physicians to promote scientific and medical knowledge amongst the educated social strata. They aimed to create a public receptive to the issues of health and bodily discipline, both as civic responsibilities. The physicians used scientific, educational, and moral arguments to improve both the health of the population, as well as its inner qualities. They worked to shape public behavior by combining education about health and moralizing stories, employing medicine and science as the driving force.

Conclusion

This article argued that in the Habsburg Monarchy, as in all German-speaking lands, the development of the medical profession was closely linked with state initiatives. In the Monarchy, professionalization was uniquely shaped by the composite social, economic, and health environments. The economic backwardness of some provinces (Transylvania, Bukovina, and Galicia) the shortage of trained medical professionals, the lack of a centralized bureaucratic apparatus, and conflicts among the local elites and central authorities, set the stage for the conditions that had to be overcome by government intervention. The lack of a unitary language in the administration, and the multiplicity of denominations, which were a particular challenge in this process, could not be discussed here. Rather, attention is given to the professional characteristics, namely, that of the construction of the modern medical profession in the Habsburg Monarchy, beginning after 1770, and overlapping with the doctors’ transformation into civil servants. Moreover, the bureaucratization of the medical profession transformed the physicians into a hybrid of public officer (*Beamter*, medical practitioner, health inspector) and private scholar (man of letters), who worked for the improvement of their fatherland and the empire.

The Transylvanian example reflects the fact that, even in the small and economically backward provinces of the monarchy, the incorporation of the medical personnel in the sanitary administration fostered professionalization. The employment in the administrative system required certain qualifications

76 Brătescu, *Grija pentru sănătate*, 95.

77 Simon Zeller von Zellenberg, *Lehrbuch der Geburtskunde*, 2nd ed. (Vienna: Binz, 1802).

78 Cited by Al. Neamțu, “Date noi cu privire la Ioan Piuariu Molnar (1745–1815)” [New data regarding Ioan Piuariu Molnar (1745–1815)], *Studia Univesitatis Babeș-Bolyai. Series Historica*, 15, 1 (1970), 69.

that could be obtained only by attending medical school, and especially those of the Monarchy. The state controlled the professional training of doctors, surgeons, midwives, and pharmacists by imposing a similar curriculum into all the medical schools. The medical education for a physician had a theoretical and practical aspect. Anatomy, physiology, pathology, and *materia medica*, besides Latin, were taught in order to transform physicians into practitioners and not only members of an educated elite. The theoretical knowledge as well as the practical skills assigned the physicians with a leading position that made them superior to surgeons, midwives, obstetricians, and pharmacists in their practices. Medical faculties within the universities of Vienna, Prague, and Buda/Pest, and the surgical lyceums functioning in every province, were an extension and instrument of an administratively controlled sanitary commission. The sanitary commission had a double role. On the one hand it monitored medical practice and training. On the other hand, it was an administrative institution, and transformed the medical practitioners into civil servants paid by the state and obliged to undertake a public oath.

Transylvanian physicians (*physici*) sought to integrate themselves within the administrative apparatus because this position improved their role in the local communities and in provincial politics. They were the channels of enlightened knowledge via the local government. The power over the health and life of the population invested them with greater authority and favored their social ascension, irrespective of their religious beliefs (e.g., as members of the discriminated Protestant or Orthodox denominations within a Catholic empire) or national allegiance. They used their *Beamter* position and their social prestige to develop medical education and to design a health policy to fight epidemics. The medical curricula at the surgical lyceum in Cluj/Kolozsvár/Klausenburg were improved with new courses (ophthalmology and veterinary medicine) and new quarantine legislation was imposed in the province.

The measures on sanitation, public health, and treatment applied in epidemics (plague, small pox) were not only the result of the development of the medical science, but also the result of social, political, and economic realities. The physicians affirmed themselves as individuals that put forward new sanitary laws (e.g., the 1785 *Normativum de peste*, the 1793 *Opinio in Re Sanitatis*, and the 1813 *Normativum de peste*), and initiated and imposed sanitation campaigns (such as vaccination against small pox). They published books, brochures, and pamphlets that popularized medical knowledge. Moreover, their involvement in cultural and scientific activities transformed physicians into a 'hybrid' category, as they were at once scientists and medical practitioners, as well as writers, poets, linguists, and philanthropists. All in all, the professionalization of physicians in this region enhanced the raising of their social status and prestige.

BORBÁLA ZSUZSANNA TÖRÖK

The Ethnic Design of Scholarship: Learned Societies and State Intervention in 19th Century Transylvania

The study of the social context of scholarly activities has a respectable tradition. In the broader field of educational history, analysts of Central European learning have long demonstrated its crucial role in reproducing social categories and societal relations in the modern era.¹ More recently the effort to understand social developments has been correlated with the scrutiny of content-related, internal changes within scientific disciplines. Such contextual studies of the sciences are looking for their manifestations not only in the centers of intellectual milieus, but also in their relative peripheries. They compare the structures of scholarly disciplines in their contemporary institutional framing, to understand how participation in the broader scholarly culture yielded local patterns.² Research in France, Britain, and the USA has for instance explored the impact of sociability on scholarly communication. These studies investigate frameworks outside the formal academe along official educational institutions (esp. colleges and universities), and considerable attention has been paid to provincial learned societies, but also to informal networks of learning.³

Local adaptations of scholarship and the socially induced differences between them are the concern also of the present study. It traces a specific

- 1 Just a few representative examples: *Europe, Scotland, and the United States from the 16th to the 20th Century*, vol.2, *The University in Society*, ed. Lawrence Stone (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975); Jürgen Schriewer, Edwin Keiner and Christophe Charle eds. *Sozialer Raum und akademische Kulturen: Studien zur europäischen Hochschul- und Wissenschaftsgeschichte im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert / A la recherche de l'espace universitaire européen: études sur l'enseignement supérieur aux XIXe et XXe siècles* (Frankfurt, New York: P. Lang, 1993); Charles E. McClelland, *State, Society and University in Germany, 1700-1914* (Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1980); Detlef K. Müller, Fritz Ringer and Brian Simon eds. *The Rise of the Modern Educational System: Structural Change and Social Reproduction, 1870-1920* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987); Viktor Karady, *Iskolarendszer és felekezeti egyenlőtlenségek Magyarországon, 1867-1945* [Schooling and denominational inequalities in Hungary, 1867-1945] (Budapest: Replika Kőr, 1997).
- 2 William Clark, Jan Golinski, and Simon Schaffer, eds., "Introduction", in *The Sciences in Enlightened Europe* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1999), 3-31, 20.
- 3 I use the term 'intellectual milieu' instead of the older and less precise 'Republic of Letters'. See Antonella Boutier, Brigitte Marin and Antonella Romano eds. *Naples, Roma, Florence. Une histoire comparée des milieux intellectuels italiens (XVIIe-XVIIIe siècles)*. Collection de l'Ecole Française de Rome, 355 (Rome: École Française de Rome, 2005).

German tradition of thinking about the state, the region and its society, *Landeskunde*, related to what came to be identified as the sciences of state, *Staatswissenschaften*.⁴ This strand of scholarship emerged as a variant of the 18th century state science destined to train administrators in effective state management. Although highly popular in the Habsburg Monarchy in the long nineteenth century, *Landeskunde* has been ignored by university-based historical research after World War II. Its reputation today as the amateurish pastime of narrow-minded provincials might also distract the attention from its prominent role in both the eighteenth and nineteenth century education and politics. Also, since such forms of non-institutional scholarship were widely practiced within German-speaking Europe, they offer an excellent opportunity to reflect on the circulation of knowledge between intellectual centers based in German cities, Vienna, Buda-Pest and their respective provinces such as Transylvania under Habsburg rule. The latter was at considerable distance from universities, whereto academic peregrinations remained an integral feature of the pursuit of higher learning well into the twentieth century.

The *Verein für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde* (Association for Transylvanian *Landeskunde*, VSL, 1842-1944), and the Hungarian *Erdélyi Múzeum Egyesület* (Transylvanian Museum Society, EME, 1857-1945), were both established for the pursuit of *Landeskunde/honismeret*, in multiethnic Transylvania. They were instances of distinct, though entangled knowledge production. They both served the patriotic education of their ethnic clientele, thus the most immediate question emerging here is the nature of this knowledge with regard to political power.⁵ While reconstructing the late nineteenth-century history of the two traditional regional learned societies, and the primary social and institutional mechanisms that shaped their organizational frameworks, my essay investigates how scholarly agendas were fostered by shifting conjunctures of selective, even discriminating nation-state support, and how the latter generated oppositional ethnonationalist responses in a regionalist framing.

Originating in the academic movement of the previous century, the two learned societies in question were actually founded in the mid-nineteenth century. This moment coincided with the reorganization of scholarship, dominated by the Humboldt-type research-university on the European scale. Indeed, the organizational transformation of higher learning after the French Revolution recast the scholarly landscape into more recognizably modern forms.⁶ The university became the standard venue of scientific research as against the older types of knowledge production, like the learned societies and

4 David F. Lindenfeld, *The Practical Imagination. The German Sciences of State in the Nineteenth Century* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1997).

5 Dorinda Outram, "The Enlightenment Our Contemporary", in *The Sciences in Enlightened Europe* ed. William Clark, Jan Golinski, and Simon Schaffer (Chicago-London: University of Chicago Press, 1999); 32-40, 39; Thomas Munck, "The 'Public Sphere' and its Limits", in *The Enlightenment. A Comparative Social History 1721-1794* (New York: Oxford University Press Inc., 2000), 14-17.

6 James McClellan III, "Scientific Institutions and the Organization of Science", in *Eighteenth-Century Science*, vol. 4, *The Cambridge History of Science* ed. Roy Porter (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 87-106, 105.

academies – which lost their earlier pioneering role. They could survive only through specialization, as discipline-oriented venues of research. The major national academies continued to exist, but they were mostly transformed into honorary organizations destined to the legitimization and the official recognition of scholarly accomplishments. Universities were endowed with, and partly legitimized by a national mission, and their supporter and sponsor, the emerging nation-state aimed to control their knowledge claims.⁷

The Habsburg Monarchy followed the general pattern, even if the process of a substantial educational modernization in its eastern provinces took place with delay, following essentially the Austro-Hungarian Compromise. In Transylvania proper, a modern university was founded in 1872 only. The integration of local institutions into the emerging state-run educational infrastructure was a complex and conflict-ridden process; and the tensions emerging illustrate the unequal accommodation of citizens belonging to divergent ethnic, religious, gender and status clusters into the national polity. The two following passages provide a contrastive analysis of two distinct ethnic patterns, illustrating how social standing and political conjunctures interrelated with the production and circulation of knowledge, particularly after 1867. While the Vienna-centric post-revolutionary regime privileged the German institution, in the aftermath of the Austro-Hungarian Compromise selective policies of support strengthened the Budapest-oriented centralization at the expense of intra-regional, interethnic ties. In Dualist Hungary, the modernization of education and academic training went hand in hand with state initiatives to enforce the cultural assimilation of non Magyar ethnic clusters. How did regional scholarship respond to the conflicting demands of ethnic ‘belonging’ and professional needs?

Scholarly sociability: universal principles, national practices

Regional scholarly associations like the *Verein für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde* and the *Transylvanian Museum Society* should be considered in relation to modern urban sociability. Simultaneously materializing plans of such institutions in linguistically and geographically isolated milieus are inexplicable without the existence of a common discursive background and shared social practices. These were widespread and “European” enough to permeate societies as traditional and fragmented as that in Transylvania by the early nineteenth century. The scholarly institutions founded in the towns of the province had little in common with the state-generated and sponsored royal academies and learned societies formed in Western Europe. Rather, such provincial institutions should be regarded as rooted in the liberal principles guiding modern patterns of exchange as practiced by the associations of civil society and the press.

The discourse of voluntary associations and the attendant social practices were a common European and transatlantic occurrence in the eighteenth and

7 Christophe Charle, Jürgen Schriewer, and Peter Wagner eds. *Transnational Intellectual Networks: Forms of Academic Knowledge and the Search for Cultural Identities* (Frankfurt: Campus, 2004), 18; Jürgen Schriewer et al, eds. *Sozialer Raum*.

nineteenth centuries. There was a shared belief, originating in the Enlightenment that “sociability led to ‘mutual improvement, for increasing our knowledge and mending our heart.’”⁸ Such plans for improvement were present in the Hungarian and Transylvanian Reform Era as well; indeed, they were an integral part of prevalent modernization programs. In contemporary Hungarian liberal usage, *polgári*, or civil society equaled an opposition to traditional order, which was perceived to be governed by “barbaric” feudal distinctions, the latter including a sharp differentiation among the estates, between the privileged and bonded serfs, and between religions and languages. *Polgári* also connoted the political project to replace heterogeneous and fragmented legislation by unitary laws applicable to everyone, together with the eventual formation of an educated and politically empowered citizenry in the framework of a unified nation-state, incorporating all the “lands of the Hungarian Crown”, that is Hungary proper, Transylvania and Croatia.⁹

The general model was to be implemented amidst the specific regional socio-political circumstances. The infrastructure of public debate, which Thomas Munck described as the “interface between the individual subject or citizen and the complex structure of government and collective authority”, and which thrived in contemporary northwestern Europe, lagged behind in Southern and Eastern Europe. To explain this lag, Munck cites the “restraints of tradition, state-backed religious conservatism, far lower literacy rates, [the] persistence of censorship controls abandoned or unenforceable in the northwest, [and the] absence of explosive economic growth, which [had] loosened social barriers, facilitated consumer spending, raised expectations, and spawned genuine liberalization in northwestern Europe in the century before the French Revolution.”¹⁰

Indeed, in Transylvania, the ethno-confessional inequalities of the urban social structure and the gap between towns and ethnically different countryside created serious barriers to public communication. The larger towns had a predominantly Hungarian and German character, as did the urban middle classes and the bureaucracy. This structure did not change significantly until World War I. The largest ethnic population of the region, the Romanians, was overwhelmingly rural and started to become socially mobile only in the second half of the nineteenth century. Their intellectual and professional elite established themselves on the fringes of Magyar and Saxon urban societies

8 Stefan-Ludwig Hoffmann, “Democracy and Associations in the Long Nineteenth Century: Toward a Transnational Perspective”, *Journal of Modern History* 75, no. 2 (2003): 269-99, esp. 275.

9 László Péter, “Volt-e magyar társadalom a XIX. században? A jogrend és a civil társadalom képződése” [Was there a Hungarian society in the 19th century? The order of law and the formation of the civil society] in *Az Elbától keletre. Tanulmányok a magyar és kelet-európai történelemből* [East of the Elba: Studies in Hungarian and East European history] (Budapest: Osiris, 1998), 148-86, esp. 156-58; András Gergely and János Veliky, “A politikai közvélemény fogalma Magyarországon a XIX. század közepén” [The concept of political public opinion in Hungary in the middle of the 19th century], in *Magyar Történelmi tanulmányok* [Hungarian historical studies] ed. Fehér András, (Debrecen, 1974), 5-42.

10 Munck, “Preface”, in *idem*, vii-xii, esp. ix-x.

while keeping their ties to the villages.¹¹ This ethno-demographic segmentation formed the very rigid ethno-social background of the civic networks and organized public exchanges that unfolded in Transylvania at the outset of the modern era.

How did the universalistic program of civil society interact with those of the regional scholarly associations in question? The fact that the latter were in principle public, open to everyone, explains for their adaptation of liberal norms of communication (such as freedom of opinion, unrestrained participation of educated clusters in public exchange irrespective of social and ideological, religious etc. background), even if this principle was selectively applied in the regional context. Practice, resulting from the socio-cultural background of the agents of civil society concerned, brought out the differences. Of course, not only in the crown lands of the Austrian Monarchy but throughout the continent claims to the abstract common good had been linked already in the Enlightenment to conflicting national perspectives.¹² Both the new political elites but the clientele of the associations interpreted education and *Bildung* in ethnocultural terms. This is visible in the practice of the Transylvanian cultural associations: their encompassing programs and projected openness had a regional and European scope, though, in practice, they served the identity politics of their national clientele.

Verein für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde

Despite appeals to inter-ethnic regional cooperation, the Saxon learned society was founded as an institution by and for the Saxon educated middle class. An invitation to the founding assembly was addressed to the whole Transylvanian public, to “all the friends of the Transylvanian *Landeskunde*, of all nations and ranks”, but the list of members gathered in Mediasch/Medias/ Medgyes on 8-9 October 1840, reveals that the call did not have resonance outside the Saxon public. All the 97 men who signed up were Transylvania-based Lutheran-Germans. It was an exclusive gathering, involving the typical ‘movers and shakers’ of contemporary educated civic life and amateurs of *Landeskunde*, that is middle to high standing state functionaries and intellectuals: gymnasium professors and pastors (see Table1.).

11 Irina Livezeanu, *Cultural Politics in Greater Romania: Regionalism, Nation Building and Ethnic Struggle, 1918-1930* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1995), 138; George Marica et al., *Ideologia generației române de la 1848 în Transilvania*. [The ideology of the Transylvanian Romanian generation of 1848] (Bucharest: Editura Politica, 1968), 161.

12 Hoffman, “Democracy”, 273; László Péter, “Volt-e magyar társadalom a XIX. században? A jogrend és a civil társadalom képződése” [Was there a Hungarian society in the 19th century? The order of law and the formation of the civil society] in *Az Elbától keletre* [East of the Elbe], (Budapest: Osiris, 1998), 158.

Table 1. Social-Professional Distribution of VSL Members before 1848.

PROFESSION	1840		1842		1847	
Middle-status state employees	26	26.8	54	23.6	130	20.9
High-qualified teaching staff: gymnasium professors etc.	24	24.7	36	15.7	54	8.7
High-status state/city officials	19	19.6	27	11.8	156	25.0
Pastors	13	13.4	42	18.3	145	23.3
Businessmen	7	7.2	11	4.8	30	4.8
Free profession: lawyers, physicists	5	5.1	10	4.4	50	8.0
Students (law, theology)	3	3.1	19	8.3	13	2.1
Others: Army ,Lower teaching staff, Landowners, artisans, unidentified			11		45	
Total	97=100%		229=100%		623=100%	

Source: “Protokoll über die Verhandlungen der ersten in Schußburg abgehaltenen General-Versammlung des Allerhöchsten benehmigten Vereines für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde. 19 Mai 1842.” In: *Protokolle des VSL (Hermannstadt, 1846); Verzeichniß sämtlicher wirklicher Mitglieder des Vereins für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde welche für das Jahr 1847 ihre Beiträge entrichtet haben (Hermannstadt, 1847).*

Similarly, by the 1840s, *Landeskunde* waived the flag of ‘national’ scholarship: its stated purpose in the *Verein* was to advance the sense of community by bridging the distance between the Saxon settlements scattered in the province, and advancing communication between them via scholarship: “that our people would feel its unity, and the prejudices of the districts towards each other would cease, and we would stop being Hermannstädter, Mediascher, Schässburger, Kronstädter, but Saxons, and feel like Saxons.” It is thus worth asking to what extent it fulfilled its mission both in terms of producing canonical knowledge, and in acquiring a top position in the Transylvanian Saxon society.

In terms of social standing, the history of the learned society was a success story until World War I. Already in the first decade, the young institution established ties beyond local reach, and soon thereafter it had members from all the larger settlements of the Saxon-inhabited area in Southern Transylvania. The leadership of the association consisted of the *kaisertreu* Saxon *Bildungsbürger*, including the ecclesiastic, economic and political elite, and this remained unchanged until World War I despite the generation change of the 1860-80s. Johann Karl Schuller (1794-1865), Georg Paul Binder (1784-1867), Georg Daniel Teutsch (1817-1893), but also Josef Bedeus von Schharberg (1782-1858), Bishop Friedrich Müller (1828-1915) Franz Gebbel (1835-1877), Carl Wolff (1849-1929), and other prominent members of the learned society were influential politicians, high state functionaries and members of the Saxon ecclesiastic elite, representing Saxon interest in conformity with Vienna, and in opposition to the Hungarian unionist policies of the Reform Era. These men were active in maximizing cultural-educational autonomy, and only secondarily interested in keeping good neighborly relations with the newly created Hungarian and Romanian cultural institutions.

The post-revolutionary decade brought institutional consolidation. Separate specialized sections of the association were established by districts and localities. Strong chapters, cores of future branch associations, were founded in the towns of Hermannstadt/Sibiu/Nagyszeben, Kronstadt/Braşov/Brassó, Schäßburg/Sighişoara/Segesvár, Mediasch/Mediaş/Medgyes, Mühlbach/Sebeş/Szászsebes, but also Vienna and Pest.¹³ The presidential committee was enlarged, and the network of corresponding members spanned scholarly connections until Budapest, Vienna and Berlin. During the fifties and the sixties the association took up contact with the Hungarian Academy, the Royal Academies in Berlin and Munich, among other European and overseas learned institutions. In 1853, the *Landeskundeverein* corresponded with 22 partner institutions; in 1870 this number rose to 76.¹⁴ The board made sure that all the members of the associations could receive the journal *Archiv des Vereins für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde* in exchange for a higher membership fee.¹⁵ The number of those enrolled grew steadily despite the raising fees, reaching the maximum of 799 in 1883. The Saxon academy attained the size of its Hungarian counterpart, and so it was *socially more representative*.¹⁶

The association launched its program already in 1843. Committee meetings and yearly assemblies were held regularly, and shortly after the end of the war of independence (a civil war, to be true, for Saxons, who sided collectively with the imperial power), activity resumed with new impetus in 1850/1851. This stood in remarkable contrast with the contemporary Transylvanian Hungarian academic movement, which suffered tremendously both in the aftermath of post-revolutionary purges and the tribulations of the Hungarian revolutionary elite. Temporary Hungarian disenchantment with the modernizing and patriotic potential of civic activism also hindered the regeneration of the associational movement that came to a halt during the war of independence of 1848-49.¹⁷ The administrative difficulties accompanying the foundation of the *EME* (see next section), also serve as a contrastive

13 Heinz Herbert, "Geschichte des Vereines für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde", *Archiv des Vereins für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde* 28 (1898), 139-236, 158.

14 Id. 163.

15 Id. 185-189.

16 Id.168-189. The approximate number of practitioners of the free professions and civil servants together in the 1860s in Transylvania was 86,000, out of which two-third were Hungarians and less than one quarter Romanians – this illustrates the differences in relative representativity of each learned society, vol. III of Köpeczy, Béla, ed. *Erdély története három kötetben* [The history of Transylvania in three volumes], (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1986), 1610.

17 Veliky, János, "A szociális mozgalmakat szervező Kossuth társadalomfelfogása" [The social vision of Kossuth, organizer of social movements] in *Nemzeti és társadalmi átalakulás a XIX. században Magyarországon* [National and social transformation in Hungary in the nineteenth century] ed. István Orosz and Ferenc Pölöskei (Budapest: Korona Kiadó, 1994), 225-234; Gábor Halmai, *Az egyesülés szabadsága. Az egyesülési jog története*. (Budapest: Atlantisz Kiadó, 1990); Károly Halmos, "Magyarországi polgárosodás. Tallózás az 1988-1992 közötti történeti irodalomban" ["Polgárosodás" in Hungary. A selection from historical literature from 1988-1992] *Aetas* 3 (1994): 95-154; Béla G. Németh, ed., *Forradalom után – kiegészés előtt. A magyar polgárosodás az abszolutizmus korában*. [After the revolution – before the Compromise. Hungarian polgárosodás during the time of absolutism] (Budapest: Gondolat, 1988), 1; Péter, 148-186.

example for the unequal political conjunctures affecting the institutionalization of knowledge in the period.

Saxon education in general benefited from the modernization that began in 1849–1850 with the introduction of the extensive Austrian school reforms, including – the establishment of the gymnasium as the central piece in the hierarchical ‘systematization’ of the educational network. By the fifties the society was fully consolidated thanks to an energetic committee and successful co-operation with the Austrian authorities. Thus, the preface of the new *Archiv* series did not pay merely lip service to the authorities when announcing that “the new political institutions of the country open a wonderful perspective for the knowledge of Transylvania’s past and present. They link the scientific endeavors of this crown land more closely to the scholarship of the whole Austrian Empire and so they give encouragement and secure support.”¹⁸ The *Landeskundeverein* benefited also from personal contacts with organizers of the Austrian educational reforms. Johann Karl Schuller, one of the key personalities of the *Landeskundeverein*, was appointed by the Ministry of Cults and Education with the reorganization of the Transylvanian school system. It was his merit that the Saxon academy established ties to the Historical Commission of the Viennese Academy of Sciences and embarked on its most extensive project of publishing Saxon historical sources in the series *Fontes rerum Austriacum*.¹⁹ Also, the *Jahrbuch der k.k. Central-Kommission zur Erforschung und Erhaltung der Baudenkmale* (Yearbook of the Imperial and Royal Central Commission for the Research and Preservation of Historic Buildings) enabled Transylvanian Saxons to reach a wider international audience with publications in the history of art and architecture.²⁰

However, financially the *Landeskundeverein* relied on the wealthy urban *Bildungsbürger*, and remained the only scholarly institution in the province without substantial state support. The directors of the savings banks, the co-operative credit institutions, well-to-do traders (factory and sawmill owners, timber traders) and also the less affluent book sellers, clerks, etc. faithfully attended the yearly meetings and supported the association with donations. The association relied on membership fees, but of course, it also received various gifts. After 1867, the former Saxon self-government, henceforth a mere cultural fund, the *Nationsuniversität*, became its steady subsidizer. Besides, the city councils of Hermannstadt, Kronstadt, Mühlbach and Schässburg subscribed as full members of the association, and so did several credit institutions. Beginning with 1880, the *Sparkassa* (Savings bank) from Hermannstadt provided the *Landeskundeverein* generous extra yearly support,

18 “Introduction”, *Archiv des Vereins für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde*, vol.1 (1853), without page numbers.

19 *Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte Siebenbürgens*, vol.1 of *Fontes rerum Austriacarum* (1858).

20 See the studies of M. J. Ackner and Friedrich Müller on Roman ruins and Saxon Church-Fortresses with the support of the Viennese Academy Ackner. Gustav Gündisch, “Der Verein für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde. Eine Wissenschaftsgeschichte”, in: *Wege Landeskundlicher Forschung. 25 Jahre Arbeitskreis für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde. 1962-1987 Siebenbürgisches. Archiv des Vereins für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde* vol. 21 (Köln-Vienna: Böhlau, 1987), 13-51, 23-24.

which amounted by 1896/97 to 2,500 Gulden. So did its counterpart in Kronstadt, as well as the savings associations from Mühlbach. After 1867, even the Hungarian Ministry for Cults and Education contributed funds occasionally.²¹

Financial independence from the central government did not mean isolation and withdrawal. Quite the contrary, the share of high-ranking city and state functionaries remained high in the presidential board. After 1867, parliamentary politicians and members of ministerial staff were elected into the board and even a few Hungarians in the years of the so-called “Saxon-Hungarian Compromise” of the 1890s. One can interpret this development as a response to Hungarian educational policies, generating an attitude of rapprochement. Adaptation to state norms secured the benefit of institutional safety and the non-intervention of the state authorities, a stance distinguishing not only the Saxon ‘academy,’ but the whole German Lutheran educational network in general. Explicit criticism of the increasing nationalizing efforts of the state since the 1870s was rather the exception than the norm. It is true though that on occasion of the protest campaign in 1883 against the enforcement of the teaching of Hungarian in minority schools, the *Landeskundeverein* featured in the German press as the champion of resistance against state interference in nationality affairs, and gained considerable international visibility.²²

The *Landeskundeverein* constituted an interface between the political, the civic, the educational and the ecclesiastical sphere within Saxon society. Controlled by the higher clergy, it attracted all sorts of higher state bureaucrats, gymnasium professors and entrepreneurs. They were the chief consumers of the cultural goods produced by the association: scholarly and popular books on Saxon history and culture, such as the *Sachsengeschichte* (Saxon History, abbreviated form of the History of the Saxons for the Saxon people) of the Lutheran bishop Georg Daniel Teutsch and his son, Friedrich Teutsch, *Bilder aus der vaterländischen Geschichte* (Pictures from the Fatherland’s history), the tale collections of Johann Haltrich, the accomplished maps and linoleum cuts of townscapes sold at the yearly meetings. The social distinction of the association was also indicated by the decreasing number of lower-status employees.²³

The *Landeskundeverein* established itself as the informal Saxon academy, a meeting place for men of higher social standing that fostered and popularized patriotic scholarship. After the retirement of its second president, Franz Josef Trausch (1795–1871) in 1869, the presidency passed to Georg Daniel Teutsch (1817–1893), and then to the latter’s son, Friedrich Teutsch (1852–1933), who also became bishop after the retirement of his father. The passage of the seat

21 Joseph Bedeus von Scharberg, *Bericht über die Entstehung, die Schicksale und Leistungen des Vereines für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde bis zum Jahr 1853*, 23-24, Heinz Herbert, “Geschichte des Vereines für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde”, 168, 174-179.

22 Andreas Beyer, “Geschichtsbewusstsein und Nationalprogramm der Siebenbürger Sachsen,” in *Studien zur Geschichtsschreibung im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert ed. Paul Philippi* (Köln-Graz: Böhlau, 1967), 56-115, 96-97.

23 In comparison to the registered 130 members of this social group in 1847, there were only 22 in 1914.

from the higher state bureaucracy to the Lutheran ecclesiastical elite signified an important turn in Saxon scholarly tradition. After the general disintegration of the encyclopedic state science by the mid-19th century and its replacement by the modern social sciences as well as economics, a newly defined *Landeskunde* was instrumental in building the Lutheran *Bildungsreligion*, under the tutelage of the Church, and in the service of Saxon patriotic education. Under the bishop-presidents the *Landeskundeverein* became the central organ of the Saxon educational system. Institutions, schools, religious congregations, even town and village councils subscribed as members of the association. Permanent public presence and mild pressure on the pastors and teachers did their share in recruiting the congregations, communities and civil organizations. According to the ambitious plans of the president, all Saxon congregations had the patriotic and religious duty to subscribe. Though the plan was never fulfilled, but due to the conscientious agency of individual parish priests, local collectivities joined the association in ever growing number. Thus on occasion of the yearly meeting in 1879, Samuel Schiel, dean of the Kronstadt Church district, reported that all the congregations from his district had joined the *Landeskundeverein*.²⁴

The importance of the *Landeskundeverein* is also visible in its contribution to the Transylvanian Saxon cultural canon. While in Germany regional patriotic scholarship became the politically rather insignificant preoccupation with the *Heimat*, its counterpart in Transylvania bore a pronounced political message.²⁵ The *Landeskundeverein* became the authoritative institution for producing the “national” Saxon scholarship. The canonical texts on the Saxon cultural heritage were written under its aegis, and found direct application in the school curricula. These texts emphasized a common Saxon national ideology, the idea of the Lutheran *Kulturträger* – understood as culturally superior to their ethnic neighbors. They expressed the outlook of the political and ecclesiastical elite, and were resistant to the weak professional criticism arising at the turn of the century.

The standard works and school curricula in Transylvanian history, geography, ethnography, and philology were thus mostly written and debated in the *Landeskundeverein*. Most prominent example was the *Sachsengeschichte* by Georg Daniel Teutsch, to be completed later by his son, Friedrich, but well-known were also the history and geography textbooks put to use in Saxon schools.²⁶ Along the history and geography of the state, the textbooks created the parallel map of Saxon Transylvania, designed not only for schoolchildren

24 Herbert, “Geschichte des Vereines”, 169.

25 Heins Heimpel, “Geschichtsvereine einst und jetzt”, in *Geschichtswissenschaft und Vereinswesen im 19. Jahrhundert* ed. Boockmann et al (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972), 45-73, 53.

26 Johann Michaelis, *Erdbeschreibung und Geschichte von Ungarn*, reprint, edited by E. Albert Bielz (Hermannstadt, 1880); Carl Werner, *Geschichte Ungarns mit besonderer Berücksichtigung Siebenbürgens. Ein Leitfaden für höhere Volksschulen, Bürgerschulen und die unteren Klassen der Mittelschulen der ev. Landeskirche A. B. in Siebenbürgen* (Hermannstadt, 1880); Karl Thomas, *Bilder aus der ungarischen Geschichte* (Kronstadt, 1894).

but for the general public.²⁷ Patriotic education was especially important in the villages, and the Lutheran Consistory strongly recommended to local pastors the “evening readings”. A thorough bibliography, including the *Sachsen-geschichte*, was to instruct the mature male population in natural history, ethnography, the history of the fatherland, and as regards daily political and economic news.²⁸

The *Landeskundeverein* was prolific in studies in regional and local history, topics strongly emphasized in school education. Scholarship and education were pragmatically linked under the presidency of Bishop Freidrich Teutsch, following in the footsteps of his father both in his ecclesiastic and scholarly career. After numerous publications in Saxon political, cultural and economic history and historiography, Teutsch published a major piece of synthetic Saxon history continuing his father’s *Saxengeschichte*. The second volume on contemporary history bore the suggestive title *Hundert Jahre sächsischer Kämpfe* (Hundred year Saxon struggle) – harking back to Heinrich von Treitschke’s *Zehn Jahre deutscher Kämpfe* (Ten year German struggle) – and became the most authoritative publication of Saxon ethnic ideology. Like the earlier work, its goal was the “heroic elevation of the past and the leading men.”²⁹ Saxons were presented here as “first ranking cultural factor” and “teaching master” of the Transylvanian “tribes”, received and treated with respect by the Hungarian kings, only to be marginalized and antagonized by their later successors.³⁰ Teutsch’s book, with its demand for “national tolerance and cultural-ecclesiastical self-determination”, exemplifies the ethnic tensions of the fin-de-siècle post-liberal era.³¹ The agreement with the government for non-intervention in cultural and educational matters strengthened the position of the moderately nationalist Saxon elite that controlled the *Landeskundeverein*. The alliance secured the status quo and isolated political opponents from the right and the left. Co-opting or marginalizing the *völkisch* thrust of the younger radicals, the “Greens”, this older generation remained faithful to the older Saxon *Bildungreligion*. The scholarly canon reinforced the

27 Georg Manchen, *Bilder aus der ungarischen Geschichte. Ein Hilfs- und Lesebuch für Schule und Haus* (Kronstadt, 1889); Friedrich Teutsch ed., *Bilder aus der vaterländischen Geschichte*, vols. 1-2 (Hermannstadt, 1895-1899).

28 Cited by Oskar von Meltzl, *Statistik der sächsischen Landbevölkerung in Siebenbürgen*, (Hermannstadt, 1886), 253-254.

29 Georg Daniel Teutsch, *Geschichte der Siebenbürger Sachsen für das sächsische Volk. Eine vom Vereine für sächsische Landeskunde gekrönte Preisschrift*, vols. 1-3 (Kronstadt, 1852-1853); Friedrich Teutsch, *Hundert Jahre sächsischer Kämpfe* (Hermannstadt, 1910); *Geschichte der Siebenbürger Sachsen für das sächsische Volk*, vol. IV, *Unter dem Dualismus, 1868-1919* (Hermannstadt, 1926); Heinrich von Treitschke, *Zehn Jahre deutscher Kämpfe: Schriften zur Tagespolitik*, 2nd ed. (Berlin, 1897); Andreas Möckel, “Nachwort”, in: Friedrich Teutsch, *Kleine Geschichte der Siebenbürger Sachsen*, edited by Arbeitskreis für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1965), 367-380, 372-374 passim.

30 Andreas Möckel, “Geschichtsschreibung und Geschichtsbewusstsein bei den siebenbürger Sachsen”, in *Studien zur Geschichtsschreibung im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* ed. Paul Philippi (Köln-Graz: Böhlau, 1967), 56-115.

31 Beyer, “Geschichtsbewusstsein”, 68; Möckel, “Nachwort”, 374; Elemér Kelemen, *Hagyomány és korszerűség. Oktatáspolitikai a 19-20 századi magyarországon* [Tradition and modernity. Educational politics in 19-20th century Hungary] (Budapest: Új Mandátum, 2002), 39-40.

thesis of the Protestant *Kirchenvolk*, assimilating at places elements of the radical nationalist ideology.³²

The *Landeskundeverein* never though became a mass organization. Until the First World War, it remained under the tutelage of the intellectual-ecclesiastic and political elite. Neither did it abandon its academic character, intensifying cooperation with German and Austrian academies. But with the crisis of fin-de-siècle liberalism, a new genre of political pamphlet with a sharper nationalist – occasionally social Darwinist – undertone emerged among its publications. The President legitimized them saying that “politics used historical weapons ... and the border between history and political essay is difficult to draw, or even impossible altogether.”³³ Bishop Teutsch went as far as welcoming the ‘political turn’ and hoped that beyond uncovering the “laws of being” these writings “shaped the will” of the reader. He regarded scholarship a means for “developing our national consciousness.”

The compromise with such populist ideologists went hand in hand with advocating or patronizing dilettante work, next to the academic one. The circle of active scholars was limited, argued Teutsch, and since they were mostly gymnasium professors and pastors, they worked under worse conditions than their luckier German (and Hungarian) counterparts. “Due to these institutional and social conditions the activity of the *Landeskundeverein* remained consciously eclectic, despite repeated demands for more coordination and professionalism.”³⁴ Such pronouncedly dilettante self-image, seeking to anchor the *Landeskundeverein* among the larger Saxon public, contrasted the real academic achievements. By that time the society was corresponding with more than one hundred academic institutions in Europe and America, a number never achieved by its Transylvanian Hungarian counterpart. This dual intellectual identity served in any case one important goal: popularizing Saxon Science.³⁵

Table 2. Socioprofessional Distribution of VSL Members 1853-1914

PROFESSION	1853	1863	1883	1893	1914
Middle-ranking employees (secretaries, drafters, archivists etc.)	14.3	11.8	3.5	5.8	4.1
Highly qualified teaching staff: university and gymnasium professors	13.5	19.4	18.3	14.1	16.7

32 Beyer, “Geschichtsbewusstsein”, 111-113; Günther Schödl ed., *Deutsche Geschichte im Osten Europas. Land an der Donau* (Berlin: Siedler Verlag, 1995).

33 Friedrich Teutsch, “Unsere Geschichtsschreibung in den letzten zwanzig Jahren (1869–1889)”, *Archiv* 22 (1889), 619-687, 643.

34 Ibid. 684-686.

35 Ibid. 684. Compare: “Verzeichnis der Akademien, Vereine und Gesellschaften, mit welchen der VSL in Verbindung steht, sammt Angabe der im gegenseitigen Schriftentausche gewechselten Druckwerk,“ in *Jahresbericht des VSL, 1879-1880*, 25-33.

High-ranking state officials	31.4	17.8	17.3	23.4	21,3
Ecclesiastics	21.4	21.5	19.9	18.8	19.8
Traders	–	–	7.4	9.1	6.6
Free professions: lawyers and physicians	6.0	5.6	7.2	9.7	8.2
Others: Army, lower teaching staff (teachers), land-owners, artisans	13.1	23.7	13.2	12.7	14.3
Institutions (congregations, communities, associations)	–	–	12.8	6.4	9.0
Total	397=100%	474=100%	850=100%	664=100%	707=100%

Sources: Bericht über die Entstehung, die Schicksale und Leistungen des VSL bis zum Jahr 1853 vom Vereins-Vorsteher (Hermannstadt, 1853), 3-14, Jahresbericht des VSL für das Jahr 1863-1864 (Hermannstadt, 1864), 4-19, Jahresbericht des VSL für das Jahr 1883-1884, (Hermannstadt, 1864), 4-19, Jahresbericht des VSL für das Jahr 1893-1894 (Hermannstadt, 1894), 3-24, Jahresbericht des VSL für das Jahr 1914 (Hermannstadt, 1915), 3-23.

Erdélyi Múzeum Egyesület (Transylvanian Hungarian Association, EME)

The different careers of the *Landeskundeverein* and its Hungarian counterpart illustrate well the ethnic preferences of the post-revolutionary Austrian government. The *Erdélyi Múzeum Egyesület* was founded in 1859, thanks to initiatives of the higher regional nobility led by Count Imre Mikó (1805–1876), provisional governor in 1861, superintendent of the Transylvanian Calvinist Church, and outstanding civic activist in the post-1848 decades.

Similar to the earlier Saxon initiative, Mikó too relied on civic support. The Hungarian press of Kolozsvár/Cluj was his chief ally, demanding ‘national improvement’ with a subdued anti-Habsburg edge. One contrasted national self-formation with the alien nature of the absolutist regime, but also with the “cosmopolitanism” and the “radicalism” of the 1848 revolution.³⁶ Yet Mikó continued to consider Transylvanian scholarship also as deriving from a common, though competing, Saxon and Hungarian tradition. He saw how the reorganization of Saxon education and scholarship benefited from the Austrian cultural politics. He and his learned circle promoted the project of the national

36 See János Veliky, ed., *Polgárosodás és Szabadság. Magyarország a XIX. Században* [Embourgeoisement and freedom. Hungary in the nineteenth century] (Budapest: Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó, 1999), 329.

museum with an eye on the *Landeskundeverein*, the *Brukenthal Museum* and other Saxon scholarly organizations.³⁷

It illustrates the limits of official tolerance how János Somlyai, Mikó's representative, was negotiating the "national" implications of the project at the Viennese Ministries. His correspondence with Mikó testifies that "the Government did not want to hear about national brackets, it was none of its aims to cultivate them, and it did not know about a Magyar Transylvania but only of a Transylvanian hereditary land, and that the *Gubernium* too asked to modify the name of the project (from *national*, TZS) to *Transylvanian Museum*."³⁸ Finally, in 1859 the "Transylvanian Museum" received permission, together with – though somewhat later – the affiliated association. Soon thereafter the founders' meeting was held in Kolozsvár/Cluj with 383 members.³⁹ The public was remarkably supportive in the first years: almost two thousand private individuals and institutions signed the donation lists.⁴⁰ The members' lists attest to the general Hungarian trend: the strata with the most civic engagement in Hungarian society were still the aristocracy and the nobility, in contrast with the *Bildungsbürger* background of the *Landeskundeverein* membership. It was only later, when non-noble commoners, most notably Jews, became visible as noted philanthropists, or other 'movers and shakers' in support of the regional civil society.

Mikó's main ally was thus the traditional Transylvanian Hungarian social elite. True, the high fees and exclusive categories of membership, demanding substantial financial contributions or valuable donations of historic value to the *EME* museum, were designed for a wealthy clientele. Thus, one could become "board member" by paying in the society's fund at least 500 florins or donating artifacts in the same value. This was the category of Mikó's aristocratic network par excellence: in 1868, out of the 126 board members 97 were titled aristocrats, including 12 countesses and baronesses. The second most prestigious category involved the "founding members"; in 1868 out of the 382 founding members 70 were aristocrats, half of whom women. The "shareholders" formed the third category, members who obliged themselves to contribute 5 forints per year for a certain period. This category melted away relatively quickly: the initial 930 members, including 30 noblemen, dropped by 1903 to a mere 80, consisting mainly of highly qualified professionals (35

37 László Kőváry, "Általánosságok" [Generalities], in *Ibid.*, *Erdély Régiségei* [The antiquities of Transylvania] (Pest, 1852), 6-7; Imre Mikó, *A kióvi csata* [The battle of Kiovi] (Pest, 1854); *Magyar Sajtó* 121, 123, and 124. See also Lajos Kántor, "Hídvégi gróf Mikó Imre szózata" 1856-ban az Erdélyi Múzeum és az Erdélyi Múzeum Egyesület megalakítása érdekében [The oration of Count Imre Mikó of Hídvég in 1856, for the foundation of the Transylvanian Museum and the Society for the Transylvanian Museum], *Erdélyi Tudományos Füzetek* 37 (1931), 3-21, 15-17.

38 *Somlyai to Mikó* (Vienna, 27 August 1856), M – R F54, State Archives Cluj, 97b.

39 Pál Erdélyi, *Emlékkönyv az Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyesület félszázados ünnepére 1859-1909* [Memorial volume in honor of the half-century anniversary of the Transylvanian Museum Society] (Kolozsvár/Cluj: EME, 1942), 33.

40 *Kolozsvári Közlöny* 27 (December 31 1856).

members with a *doctorate*).⁴¹ Even if their initial enthusiasm about the scholarly project subsided after the first years, aristocrats tended to return later as ordinary, fee-paying members, forming ca. 4% of the academic sections by the turn of the century (see table 4). Their actual share must have been higher, “hidden” in the category of the high-ranking state officials (forming 12 percent of the sections), recruited typically from the higher tiers of nobility.⁴² By that time the membership of the *EME* would oscillate between eight hundred and one thousand, that is, it would never become a mass organization. Similar to the *Landeskundeverein*, it maintained its exclusive academic character within the Transylvanian Hungarian social elite. The presidents of the association were also mostly aristocrats.

The name lists do not enable the assessment of the religious background of the members, who probably were of the typical “Hungarian religions”, that is, Calvinists, Roman Catholics and Unitarians. The participation of Protestants is conspicuous, especially of Unitarians, a minority particularly conscious of its history as a marginalized community. One finds Unitarian scholars and high ecclesiastics already among the earliest advocates of a regional Hungarian academy in the *Vormärz*, like Farkas Sándor Bölöni (1795–1842), later László Kővári (1819–1907), Elek Jakab (1820–1897), Sámuel Brassai (1800–1897), and János Kriza (1811–1875). Hungarian Jews had supported the *EME* project already in the early 1840s, like the merchant and philanthropist József Woititz. Most prominent among them was the future university professor Henrik Finály (1825–1898), but already in the early 1860s one finds several dozen traditional Jewish names in the lists. Although the fluctuation is great in the first years, the registers from the beginning of the 20th century reveal with great certainty that at least 4.3% of the association members were Jewish. The participation of Jews in a voluntary association like the *EME* reveals a liberal climate. Also, regional Jewish history made part of the scholarly agenda. However, before drawing hasty conclusions about the *EME*'s progressive stance, one should consider the University of Kolozsvár, with a share of ca. 6% Jewish students in the 1880s that grew to 16-17% by World War I.⁴³

Women were visibly present in the *EME*, a notable contrast with the more *Bürger*-type male sociability of *Landeskundeverein*, where women would make their entrance later, in lesser number, and less vocally. Especially in the first years the women's share is conspicuously high, all of them from the aristocracy

41 Henrik Finály, ed., *Az EME évi tudósítása, 1869* [The yearbook of the EME, 1869] (Kolozsvár, 1868–1870).

42 *Erdély Története* III, 1586-1591.

43 See the members' list from 1908, in Lajos Schilling, ed., *Az EME évkönyve, 1908* (Kolozsvár: EME, 1909), 105-123; Victor Karady and Lucian Nastasa, *The University of Kolozsvár/Cluj and the Students of the Medical Faculty (1872–1918)* (Budapest/Cluj Napoca: Central European University, Ethnocultural Diversity Resource Center, 2004), 98; Viktor Karády and István Kozma, *Név és nemzet. Családnév-változtatás, névpolitika és nemzetiségi erőviszonyok Magyarországon a feudalizmustól a kommunizmusig* [Name and nation. Changes of family name, name politics and nationality power relations in Hungary, from feudalism to communism] (Budapest: Osiris, 2002), 58-64, Miklós Szabó, *Az újkonzervativizmus és a jobboldali radikalizmus története, 1867–1918* [The history of neo-conservatism and right-wing radicalism, 1867–1918] (Budapest: Új Mandátum, 2003).

or the higher nobility. Their relatively early emergence in academic sociability stands in sharp contrast to women's late entry to Hungarian higher education in 1895. But this was a passive membership; while the active and publishing members were almost exclusively men, women fulfilled the more conventional role as benefactors. The exceptions, like the academican-aristocrat Zsófia Torma (1840-1899), active already in the 1860s, only reinforce the rule.⁴⁴ Other names include Antonina de Gerando (1845-1914), lecturing on women's education, and Josephine Lorenz, who wrote about Florence, and after the turn of the century one non-noble professional, the archeologist Irén Magoss. The admission of women into the Hungarian circles of academic sociability is indeed remarkable; on the other hand, it should not be over interpreted as it originated in the traditional gender inclusiveness of aristocratic sociability, and not in an emancipatory stance. Already Mikó devoted much attention to women's education, and the *EME* would maintain this line of interest, however only in the form of assigning women their traditional roles as nurturers and caretakers in subordinate positions. What emerges is an image of a socially exclusive liberalism, embracing Jewish integration and making paternalist gestures toward women.

The specialized articles in the *EME* journals on philosophy and political science reflected the same social conservatism.⁴⁵ They dismissed individualism, Darwinism, socialism, but also clericalism, to be accurate.⁴⁶ This was liberalism turning inward by the fin-de-siècle, entrenching itself against political challenges from the lower classes, the uneducated, and militant feminism. "Progress" became here a rhetorical cliché, masking the unwillingness to change.⁴⁷ The surveys of international currents of political thought, women's

44 Márton Roska, "Bevezetés [Introduction]", in idem, *A Torma Zsófia-Gyűjtemény az Erdélyi Nemzeti Múzeum érem- és régiségtárában* [The Zsófia Torma collection in the holdings of numismatics and archeology of the Transylvanian National Museum], (Kolozsvár, Minerva, 1941), 3-6.

45 A few examples: Károly Békésy, "A természettudományos felfogás a politikában" [The natural scientific approach in politics], *EM* (1893), 220-225; 323-329; 401-410; Lajos Felméri, "Draper J. W. legújabb műve: a vallás és tudomány bírközása" [The latest work of J. W. Draper, the struggle of religion and science], *EM* (1875), 41-44; Kelemen Gál, "Nietzsche Frigyes" [Friedrich Nietzsche], *EM* (1900), 196-212, Gerő Bárány, "Lapozgatás a filozófia történelmében" [Browsing the history of philosophy], *EM* (1909), 311-322.

46 More telling are the reviews of the German reception of Darwinism and positivism: *Geschichte des Materialismus und Kritik seiner Bedeutung in der Gegenwart*, review by Mátyás Szlávik *EM* (1903), 418-421; J. Müller, *System der Philosophie*, review by Mátyás Szlávik *EM* (1899), 530-533; Paulsen, *Philosophia militans. Gegen Klerikalismus und Naturalismus*, review by Mátyás Szlávik *EM* (1901), 241-245, the interest in the work of Wilhelm Wundt, *Grundrisse der Psychologie*, review by Mátyás Szlávik *EM* (1899): 48-50, in the radical critique of Nietzsche. Compare Sámuel Brassai, "Fejlődés és erkölcsstan", [Development and ethics] *EM* (1894), 1-6, 85-102, 153-171; László Kóváry, "Brassai száz éves pályafutása", [The hundred year career of Brassai] *EM* (1897), 337-338, 402-412, 581-583; Ágnes Várkonyi R., *A pozitivisták történetiszemlélet a magyar történetírásban* [The positivist perspective in the Hungarian historiography] I-II, vol. II (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1973), 151-156.

47 Béla Erődi jun., "A szabadtanítás története és jelentőségeinek társadalombölcseleti alapjai", [The history of free teaching and its social philosophical significance] *EM* (1908), 101-111; Károly Békésy, "A választási rendszer bírálata" [The critique of the election system] *EM* (1894), 127-139, 202-214, 359-372.

higher education and enfranchisement, all ends in the same tone. The *EME* authors acknowledged women's psychological equality with men; but they relegated female influence into the higher, therefore politically harmless realms of the private sphere. The feminine ideals were the heroines of early Liberalism: Mme de Stael and George Sand.⁴⁸ Women were to be employed in social welfare and lower teaching positions, but not in academe.⁴⁹

Another ideological trait of the *EME*, unique to contemporary Hungarian academic establishment in Transylvania was its a-religious stance. This was perhaps the most significant contrast to the *Landeskundeverein*, illustrating thus on the individual institutional level the major difference between the state-dominated educational network of the titular nation and those of the national minorities under the aegis of the churches.

In its early years, the association failed to capture a large audience. In the 1860s, the number of the "shareholders", that is, those ordinary members who accepted the payment of a fee over five or ten years, dropped dramatically at the end of the first decade (from 930 in 1867 and 898 in 1868, to a mere 121 in 1869). The leadership blamed infrastructural handicaps (the museum collections and its library were not yet accessible), and the fragmentation of the educated public.⁵⁰ Yet the fundamental problems had to do with the adaptation of modern science to the local milieu. When scholarly practice transcended gentlemanly-patriotic sociability, the gap opened between the association and the public. The *EME* did not have yet institutional ties to the regional civic sphere, nor to other institutions, as did the *Landeskundeverein*, already on the top of the Saxon educational system. On the other hand, the scholarly ambitions of the Hungarian counterpart targeted less the school curricula but rather assumed the scientific program of the Hungarian Academy, destined to a specialized audience. The lay character of the association was manifest also in the composition of membership, with a low percent of ecclesiastics (see table), in sharp distinction to the scholarly institutions of national minorities such as the *Landeskundeverein* or the Romanian *Asociația Transilvană pentru Literatura Română și Cultura Poporului Român* [The Transylvanian Association for Romanian Literature and the Culture of the Romanian People, ASTRA].

Could the *EME* have 'caught up' with the *Landeskundeverein* without 1867? The decisive turn, which reversed the status balance between the two learned societies, came with the state-sponsored educational boom following the Compromise. Conform to the restrictions of the 1850s the *EME* had begun its career as a voluntary association with no stated academic ambitions.⁵¹ This

48 Felméri Lajos, "Nők a társadalomban", [Women in society] *EM* (1893): 489-506; Ibid., "Dürring a nők iskolázatásáról" [Dürring about the schooling of women] *EM* (1878), 12-16, (without author); "Nők az egyetemen" [Women at the university] *EM* (1896), 285, (without author), "Nők, mint vizsgáló-bizottsági tagok", [Women as members of examination committees] *EM* (1893), 141.

49 Zoltán Pálffy, *National Controversy in the Hungarian Academe: The Cluj/Kolozsvár University, 1900-1950*. Doctoral dissertation submitted at the Central European University (2003), 82.

50 Lajos Kelemen, "Az *EME* története", in Erdélyi, *Emlékkönyv*, 47-48.

51 *Az EME szabályai* (Kolozsvár, 1959), 3-4.

article was modified after 1867 with the launching of separate fields of research in the humanities and natural sciences. The so-called “academic”, that is, research-oriented program intensified in the 1870’s and brought about further specialization.⁵² The natural sciences (Section of Natural Science, 1879) were formally separated from the study of humanities (Humanities Section, 1860), to be followed by the Section of Medical Science (1879) and – though much later (1906) – finally by the Section for Legal and Social Science.

After the formal unification of Hungary and Transylvania, there was for the first time open room for regional higher education. The country’s second university was established in Kolozsvár in 1872, symbolizing both “national emancipation and unity” in the new state, and an effort to integrate the largest national minorities in the eastern geographic region. Compared to the University of Budapest, the Franz Joseph University of Kolozsvár was small.⁵³ There had been an older medical-surgical institute and, since 1863, a Law Academy in the city. They provided the basis on which the new university was built. Since the university brought better prospects of institutional support thanks to ministerial subsidies, the *EME* played no little part in the preparations.⁵⁴ As soon as negotiations started with the Ministry of Education in 1868, the society offered its facilities and premises for use in exchange for government grants. The negotiations ended with a contract between the two parties in 1872, regulating in great detail the respective competences and autonomies enjoyed by the *EME* and the university in the new setup. The university declared itself responsible for the maintenance of the premises in exchange for a yearly subsidy of 5,000 Ft to the research conducted by the *EME*. The contract was claimed binding for 50 years (i.e. until 1922) and unless contested by any of the members before the expiration, it was to be automatically extended for another 40 years.⁵⁵

The alliance with the University of Kolozsvár launched a period of unforeseen innovation from above. The *EME* gradually became the university’s research institution, and its structure changed entirely by the end of the century. First of all, it accelerated academic modernization by attracting new professors who came to teach at the university from all over Hungary. Only 49 out of the 150 university professors, that is, less than one-third, came from Transylvania and the neighboring regions Banat and Partium.⁵⁶ The infrastructural development brought by the governmental deal catalyzed professionalism and specialization, also within the *EME*. From the early 1880s

52 Lajos Kelemen, *Az Erdélyi Nemzeti Múzeum tárai* (Kolozsvár, 1909), 2.

53 Initially it had only 40 academic chairs, which grew to 50 until World War I, while the teaching staff grew from 43 to 135. The first enrollment counted 285 students, out of whom 173 studied law, 18 philosophy, 21 medicine and 26 mathematics or natural sciences. Pálffy, *Controversy*, 76.

54 László Makkai, “A kolozsvári kir. Ferenc József Tudományegyetem történelme 1872-1919”, [The history of the Ferenc József University, 1872-1919] in *Erdély magyar egyeteme* [The Hungarian university of Transylvania] (Kolozsvár, 1941), 153-185.

55 Erdélyi, *Emlékkönyv*, 50-53.

56 See Lucian Nastasă, *Kolozsvári nyilvános rendes és nyilvános rendkívüli egyetemi tanárok 1920 előtt*. [University professors in Cluj before 1920] Unpublished manuscript without date.

onwards, the sections became quasi-independent institutions with a separate budget and directory boards of their own. When the university facilities were enlarged through considerable state investments in the years 1892-1902, the *EME* too renegotiated its ties to the university. Thanks to a renewed governmental agreement in 1895, the museum collections were attached to the university, and their directors were now directly appointed by the state.⁵⁷ A completely reorganized museum as well as a fully modernized library opened its doors to the public, in addition to more investment in archeology and librarian sciences. The process exceeded by far the local financial capacities, and the *EME* became dependent on state funds and came under the administrative supervision of the Ministry of Cults and Education.

Table 3. Socioprofessional Distribution of Ordinary EME Members 1907-1914⁵⁸

PROFESSION	1907	1914
Middle-ranking employees (secretaries, clerks, archivists etc.)	6.3	7.5
Highly qualified teaching staff: university and gymnasium professors, Privatdozenten, qualified university employees	37.6	28.6
High-ranking officials	12.9	12.8
Primary teachers	6.1	6.4
Ecclesiastics	2.6	1.6
Traders	6.1	5.2
Free professionals: lawyers, physicians	13.2	11.2
Army	0.9	0.6
Artisans	0.3	0.2
Titled aristocrats	4.2	3.1
Institutions (congregations, communities, associations)	4.4	4.9
Unidentified	5.4	2.4
Total	491=100%	606=100%

Sources: *Az EME évkönyve, 106 [The EME yearbook, 1906] (Kolozsvár, 1907), 5-17, Az EME évkönyve, 108 [The EME yearbook, 1908] (Kolozsvár, 1909), 107-119, Az EME évkönyve, 1914 [The EME yearbook, 1914], (Kolozsvár, 1914).*

The rapid integration of the learned society into the university infrastructure was not necessarily welcome by many amateur members, who resented the dominance of the academic faculty, unsympathetic with or unaware of the

57 Pálffy, *Controversy*, 82; *Az EME alapszabályai [Statutes of the EME] (Kolozsvár, 1905), 5, 19-20.*

58 There are no professions registered in the early name lists; only in the yearbooks series beginning with 1906.

local traditions. Also, the newcomers were often indifferent to the intellectual demand of the regional public.⁵⁹ This is clearly visible in the publications of the *EME*, in the diversification of the initial format, its division into ever more specialized publications.⁶⁰ So the amateurs, like the writer István Petelei, lamented the loss of the Transylvanian character of the association:

The *EME* has a large [social] basis. On paper the *EME* has obligations to fulfill towards this [basis]. The *EME* is preoccupied with Greeks, Romans, and all kinds of dead nations and *hapaxlegomanae* and alliterations of poems forgotten by the world. Yet we live and there is [enough] to study about us and we have our yearnings and poetry and we have a future. Does the *EME* have any purpose with the *hapaxlegomenae*?⁶¹

The association eventually solved the problem by dividing its activity between research and its popularization activities among the wider public in Transylvania. These lectures combined topics of regional interest that were left out of the university curricula, and subjects of general concern. The combination of patriotic education and specialized public-oriented services paid off soon: in 1908 almost half of the association members were recruited again from among the provincial urban public and not the university (372 out of 809).⁶²

The process of voluntary ‘nationalization’ was not unusual in the contemporary European praxis. Unusual was rather the unequal ethno-national context, the contrastive example of the Saxon and Romanian institutions, with very different experiences in state-sponsored education. The frustration of the Transylvanian Romanian intellectual elite with the government is a historical topic today. In contrast, the *EME* adopted a state-legitimizing language with anti-nationality overtones when addressing its (Hungarian) audience outside the academic milieu. This coincided with the fin-de-siècle *étatiste* nationalism and the Magyarizing efforts in education.

Where was the moderate nationalism of Imre Mikó by then! In the pioneering decade of the 1850’s Greek Catholic Bishop Ioan Alexi’s had expected the *EME* to promote the cultural heritage of the “common patria”, with all its ethnic citizens, hoping that “the numerous Romanians who live in this patria, and especially the Romanian youth ... should benefit of the *Bildung* emanating from the future Museum, together with students of other nationalities.”⁶³ Obviously, the invocation of ethnic tolerance and co-operation coincided with governmental rhetoric, and echoed similar (although marginal) voices around the birth of the *Landeskundeverein*. But by the turn of the

59 László Makkai, “Tudományegyetem”, 163.

60 Henrik Finály, “A szerkesztőség bemutatja magát az olvasó közönségnek” [The editorial committee introduces itself to the reading public] *EM* 1 (1874), 1-4, 3-4; Dezső Kozma, “Az EM első két évtizedének történetéből”, [From the last two decades’ history of the Transylvanian Museum] *Nyelv- és Irodalomtudományi Közlemények* XV (Bucharest: RSZK Akadémiájának Kiadója, 1971), 113-121, 114.

61 P.I. (István Petelei), “Szerény kérés”, [Modest proposal] *Kolozsvári Közlöny* (10 August 1886), cited by Dezső Kozma, “Az EM első két évtizedének történetéből”, 115.

62 See members’ list, *EME Évkönyv 1908* (EME yearbook, 1908), 105-123.

63 *Ioan Alexi to Imre Mikó* (Szamosújvár, 24 December 1856), M – R F 54, SA Cluj, 107-108.

century, the *EME* itinerary meetings displayed a sharply nationalist rhetoric. Lajos Schilling for instance asserted at a public lecture in Marosvásárhely/Târgu Mureş in 1906 that the state had the duty to support substantially the association to help Hungarians in their competition with the ‘nationalities:’ “Our museum can fulfill its modern destination only through the common effort of the society and the state... Our leading Hungarian race would not need to be ashamed by a handful of Saxon people who achieved on their own, without state support, a museum, which is in many regards more advanced than ours.”⁶⁴ The event brought 332 new enrollments, which more than doubled the number of active members.

In a similarly competing manner, hostility towards Transylvanian Romanians was massively present in the *EME* publications. Already the choice of authors was problematic: after a short cooperation with Grigore Silaşi, professor of Romanian, doyen of Romanian studies at the University of Kolozsvár, the exclusive contributor on Romanian matters to the *EME* became Gheorghe Moldovan. Successor of Silaşi at the department, Moldovan represented the official views on the most politicized issue of Transylvanian history, the ethnic origins of Romanians. Since “the one who owns the plains, owns the country; and the first conquerors are those whose language has been preserved in the toponyms”, Moldovan argued for Magyar supremacy in the region. Contrary to the more diplomatic *Landeskundeverein*, he condemned the “tendentious intentions of Romanian historiography” and the “tale of Dacian continuity and its falsifications.”⁶⁵ Unusual for a scholarly piece, his writings openly attacked the political movement of Transylvanian Romanians which he considered irredentist and in effect “dangerous for the Hungarian state.” Against the pan-Romanian agitation of the Bucharest-based *Liga Culturală Română* (Romanian Cultural League), he praised the Magyarizing efforts of the nationalist *Erdélyi Magyar Közművelődési Egyesület* [Transylvanian Hungarian Association for the Popularization of Hungarian Culture, EMKE] as “useful and excellent work.”⁶⁶

Moldovan also contributed with valuable comparative ethnographic descriptions of the Transylvanian Romanians to the *EME* periodical. But it is noteworthy that while both Saxon and Hungarian institutions spent most of their energies on research of the national histories, the writings on their predominantly rural ethnic neighbor belonged to the discipline of ethnography, which widened the contrast between the scholarly self-image of the ‘historical’ nations and their compatriots ‘without history’.

64 Lajos Schilling, “Erdélyi Nemzeti Múzeumról”, [About the Transylvanian National Museum] in *Az EME évkönyve 1908* ed. Lajos Schilling, 9-11.

65 Moldován Gergely, “A románság balkáni eredetéhez”, [About the Balkan origins of the Romanians] *EM* (1899), 61-71.

66 Ibid., “A román nemzetiségi törekvések” [The Romanian nationality political efforts] *EM* (1896), 392-394; Ibid., “Nyílt levelek a bukaresti román kulturális liga elnökéhez”, [Open letters to the president of the Romanian cultural league in Bucharest] *EM* (1895), 38-39; Ibid., “Román kérdés-magyar nemzetpolitika”, [Romanian question, Hungarian national politics] *EM* (1895), 40-44, 450, 512, 561; Ibid., “Magyar-szász szövetség”, [Hungarian-Saxon alliance] *EM* (1904), 431, About the pro-Magyar nationalist stance of Moldovan see also Makkai, *Erdély magyar egyeteme*, 298-299.

Conclusions

My case study on “regional science” or *Landeskunde* in 19th century Transylvania, was focused on the local adaptations of European scholarly sociability, in view of the differences resulting from the social and political inequalities within a multiethnic and multi-denominational setup. Comparing the diverging careers of a German and a Hungarian learned association in Transylvania, it explored the institutional underpinnings and the social context of scholarly activity. Taking a sociocultural stance, science is regarded as a social practice, inseparable from the norms and institutional dynamics of its societal setting. These norms and dynamics resulted partly from the nature of sociability in a given intellectual milieu, and reflected its ethnic, confessional and gender-related peculiarities. This explains partly the differences in the social composition and intellectual profile of the two Transylvanian ‘academies.’

The institutional plan of the *EME* and the *Landeskundeverein* emerged from the civic blueprints of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century. They had a reduced number of educated clientele recruited from the political and ecclesiastic elite and the higher staff of the state administration. Social historians have shown that exclusive circles of this kind encountered difficulties in the second half of the century. Some of them were structural: after the upheavals of 1848, civic life showed tendencies of democratization. Throughout Europe and America, ever broader social strata established their own associations. Women made themselves increasingly present in the public sphere as well, although in East-Central Europe this was far from subverting the traditional order.⁶⁷ Nevertheless, the modification of sociability, the social-professional fragmentation, but even more significantly, the radicalizing nationalisms constituted developments that brought about Europe-wide the “crisis of the moral vision of a society built on associations.”⁶⁸ In Transylvania too, the associations of the first generation, like the two learned societies, found themselves with a deficit of legitimacy at the end of the nineteenth century. They had to face massive professional and ideological challenge.

The interrelation between the strategies of the individual associations and their respective publics was crucial for institutional growth. Social exclusivity, the nature of communication and self-governance within, as well as the changing motivations of the members and sympathizers played a determining role in the intensity of associational activity. Decisive was the capability to cater for the interests of their members and clients. The size and public appeal of each association was to a great extent influenced by their mobilization of institutional resources (churches, schools and the state), but also of historical knowledge and memories. Public representations of “national values”

67 For Austria see Pieter M. Judson, *Exclusive Revolutionaries. Liberal Politics, Social Experience, and National Identity in the Austrian Empire, 1848-1914* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1996); About the neo-conservative social movement in Hungary see Miklós Szabó, “Újkonzervativizmus.”

68 Hoffmann, “Democracy”, 292.

(exhibitions, public readings) and social events (e.g. the annual and mass celebrations) became indispensable elements of their activities.

The formal educational infrastructure and the related institutions, such as the churches and the state, proved as important as the internal social dynamics of associative agency. Obviously, the bulk of infrastructural support came from the state. But in a centralizing framework, governmental financing proved to be Janus-faced, with unforeseeable impact on local developments. It was based – and this was the central argument of the essay – on ethnically discriminating policies of the successive Austrian and Hungarian administrations. Although the educational system as a whole witnessed an unprecedented growth in the second half of the 19th century, selective state intervention contributed also to uneven growth within an increasingly professionalizing and cost-intensive associative framework. Scholarly practices and the resulting knowledge production were socio-culturally and politically conditioned. They were deeply rooted in the social order and its inequalities, a legislation that reproduced them, as well as in the educational system. That made these cleavages so resilient in Transylvania. The scope of scholarship was thus decisively shaped by competing nationalisms that evolved along intraregional ethno-confessional dividing lines. Saxon, Hungarian, and Romanian practitioners of scholarship measured their own standing against that of their neighbors, creating a symbolic map of civilizational differences between their reference group and its “other.”

JUDIT PÁL

The Transylvanian Lord-Lieutenants after the Austro-Hungarian Compromise

Methodology and Sources

This essay attempts to summarize the first partial findings of a broader research into the transformation of the Transylvanian political elite during the second half of the nineteenth century. The Austro-Hungarian Compromise, which among other things meant the union of Transylvania with Hungary, brought significant changes in to political life of the province. During the turbulent years of 1848–1867, there were attempts to renew the local political elite. Hungarian historiography has cherished a longstanding myth about passive opposition in the time of neo-absolutism, namely, that the Hungarian political elite withdrew from politics after 1849 and boycotted the new regime. The administration supposedly fell into the hands of the so-called Bach Hussars who were swept away by the year 1867 and replaced by the returning liberal elite.¹ Recently, one has witnessed an intense de-mythologizing process targeting especially the structure of both the public administration and the corps of county officials.² Many studies have been published on the various elite groups from the period of Dualism, i.e., the army and the elites of economic, academic, and political circles. In the case of the latter, these studies

- 1 They were ironically called Bach-hussars, mostly foreign functionaries from the time of the neo-absolutist regime, because they wore Hungarian-looking uniforms.
- 2 Ágnes Deák, “Nemzeti egyenjogúsítás.” *Kormányzati nemzetiségpolitika Magyarországon 1849–1860* [“Granting national equal rights.” Governmental nationality politics in Hungary, 1849–1860] (Budapest: Osiris, 2000); Gábor Benedek, “Ciszlajtániai tisztviselők a neoabszolutizmuskori Magyarországon”, [Functionaries from Cisleithania in Hungary in the neo-absolutist age] *Aetas* 4 (1995); József Pap, *Magyarország vármegyei tisztikara a reformkor végétől a kiegyezésig* [The county officials in Hungary from the end of the Reform Era until the Compromise], (Szeged: Belvedere Meridionale, 2003).

referred to both local and central political elites.³ While in Hungary the research on the post-revolutionary political elite has brought significant results, in Transylvania it is still in its early stages.

This study will attempt to find how much of the political elite managed to keep its position after the changes following the year 1848. This is the social milieu from where the lord-lieutenant corps recruited its members. Furthermore, I will also examine the participation of aristocrats within its ranks, as well as the nature of the careers of lord-lieutenants (*főispánok*). I included in my research all the lord-lieutenants, who held this office in the period between 1867–1872 (when Transylvania was governed by a royal commissioner). Since lord-lieutenants were the local executants of governmental policies, they held a very important position of trust and political responsibility. It is also worth examining the degree of local recruitment of lord-lieutenants, as well as the way they were connected to the respective counties concerned.

Because the leaders of the Saxon seats were recruited from a completely different social stratum than their Magyar counterparts, this study only covers the higher state appointed civil servants from the counties, the Szekler seats, and the Comes Saxonum (leader of the *Universitas Saxonum*). Moreover, it is very difficult to find personal data on the Saxon group. In this period, the old guard largely remained at the helm of the Saxon seats. I resorted to a prosopographic analysis of the high state functionaries thanks to an electronic database. Although the model is too small to be statistically evaluated, one can still draw new conclusions from the partially quantified evaluation of the data collection. In the following, I will compare this model to the one concerning the lord-lieutenants from turn-of-the-century Transylvania to be able to follow the changes that occurred in the second half of the 19th century.

- 3 Some examples for the study of the urban elite are: Károly Vörös, *Budapest legnagyobb adófizetői 1873–1917* [The most significant tax payers in Budapest, 1873–1917] (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1979); Gábor Gyáni, “Hódmezővásárhely társadalma”, [The society of Hódmezővásárhely] in *Hódmezővásárhely története, A polgári forradalomtól az öszirozsás forradalomig 1848–1918*, [The history of Hódmezővásárhely, From the civil revolution to the aster revolution, 1848–1918] ed. István Kovács, István Gábor Kruzslicz, and János Szigeti (Hódmezővásárhely: Verzál, 1993), 221–276; Judit Tóvári, *Az elit Miskolc város társadalmában 1872–1917* [The elite in the society of the city of Miskolc] (Nyíregyháza: Stúdium, 1997). For the county elite see, Magdolna Balázs, “A középszintű közigazgatási apparátus személyi állományának vizsgálata a dualizmus időszakában”, [The survey of the constituency of the middle-rank public administrative body] in *Híd a századok felett. Tanulmányok Katus László 70. születésnapjára*, [Bridge over the centuries. Essays in honor of the seventieth birthday of László Katus] ed. Péter Hanák (Pécs: University Press, 1997), 247–254; András Cieger, “A Bereg megyei politikai elit a dualizmus időszakában”, [The political elite from county Bereg in the era of Dualism] in *A Szabolcs-Szatmár-Bereg Megyei Önkormányzat Levéltárának Kiadványai. Levéltári Évkönyv*, [The publications of the self-governmental archive of Szabolcs-Szatmár-Bereg county] vol. XII (Nyíregyháza: Önkormányzati Levéltár, 1997), 213–281; András Cieger, “A dualizmus kori helyi politikai elit kutatása regionális szinten”, [A regional survey of the local political elite during Dualism] in *Mi végre a tudomány? Fiatal Kutatók Fóruma* [Why the science? Forum of young researchers] vol. 1 (Budapest: MTA, 2004), 297–313. For the deputies see Adalbert Toth, *Parteien und Reichstagswahlen in Ungarn 1848–1892* (München: Oldenbourg, 1973).

The data were partly collected from the archives of the Transylvanian central governing bodies (the Gubernium and the Royal Commissioner's Office), which can be found in the Hungarian National Archives. I also collected data from the archives of the Prime Minister's Office and the Ministry of the Interior. Other data derive from the published yearly directories of public employees, family history works, catalogues, encyclopedias, the almanacs of the Parliament, and other similar sources.⁴ András Cieger has already summarized the difficulties that such researches carry, and that is why I touch upon only one question here. The data on the estates are indeed problematic because there are no reliable contemporary documents on their size and distribution. It would be too complicated to retrieve the relevant data from the family archives, if at all possible. Therefore I used the 1893 landowner directory as a source, assuming the risk that my calculations would not be entirely precise. However, it is rather useful for an overall appraisal of the landowners' estates according to their size and location. Though it appears necessary to explore further data on their wealth (for instance by reviewing the list of the so-called *virilists*, (the largest taxpayers represented as such in local legislative bodies), it is precisely on this initial period that there are fewer sources at my disposal.

- 4 Iván Nagy, *Magyarország családai. Címerekkel és nemzedékrendi táblákkal*, [The families of Hungary. With coats of arms and tables on generations] vols. I–XIII (Budapest, 1857–1865), CD-ROM; Béla Kempelen, *Magyar nemes családok* [Hungarian noble families] vols. I–X. (Budapest, 1911–1931), CD-ROM; János József Gudenus, *A magyarországi főnemesség XX. századi genealógiája*, [The twentieth-century genealogy of the Hungarian high nobility] vols. I–V (Budapest, 1990–1999); *Magyar nemzetiségi zsebkönyv*, [Notebook on the Hungarian nationalities] vols. I–II (Budapest, 1888); *Novum et vetus Calendarium* (Kolozsvár, 1840–45); *Új és Ó Naptár* [New and old calendar] (Kolozsvár, 1846–48); Albert Sturm, ed., *Új országgyűlési almanach 1887–1892* [New parliamentary almanach, 1887–1892] (Budapest.); József Szinnyei, *Magyar írók élete és munkái*, [The life and works of Hungarian authors] vols. I–XIV (Budapest, 1891–1914); *A magyar korona országainak mezőgazdasági statisztikája* [The agricultural statistics of the countries of the Hungarian crown] vol. 2, *Gazdacsintár* [Farmers] (Budapest, Hungarian Royal Central Statistical Office, 1897); László Szögi, *Magyarországi diákok a Habsburg Birodalom egyetemlein* [Hungarian students at the universities of the Habsburg Empire] vol. 1, *Magyarországi diákok egyetemjárása az újkorban, 1790–1850* [Hungarian student peregrination in the modern era, 1790–1850] (Budapest-Szeged: ELTE Levéltár, 1994); Miklós Szabó and László Szögi, *Erdélyi peregrinusok. Erdélyi diákok európai egyetemeken 1701–1849* [Transylvanian peregrinators. Transylvanian students at European universities, 1701–1849] (Marosvásárhely: Mentor Kiadó, 1998); Sándor Tonk, *A marosvásárhelyi Református Kollégium diáksága 1653–1848* [The student body of the protestant college in Marosvásárhely, 1653–1848] (Szeged: JATE, 1994); Zsigmond Jakó and István Juhász, *Nagyenyed diákok 1662–1848* [Students of Nagyenyed, 1662–1848] (Bucharest: Kriterion, 1979); Júlia Varga, *A kolozsvári Királyi Líceum hallgatósága 1784–1848* [The students of the royal lyceum at Kolozsvár, 1784–1848] (Budapest: ELTE Levéltár, 2000). Walter Myß, ed., *Die Siebenbürger Sachsen Lexikon* (Thaur bei Innsbruck: Kraft Verlag, 1993); Gábor Bona, *Tábornokok és törzstisztek az 1848/49. évi szabadságharcban*, [Generals and officers in the revolution of 1848–1849] 3rd ed. (Budapest: Heraldika, 2000).

The Reorganization of the Local Administration

Counties (*vármegyék*) played a major role in Hungarian history, even though, as recent historiography has indicated, they actually started to act as “defending bastions” of the rule of law only from the end of the eighteenth century onwards and later tried to project this role onto earlier periods as well. The counties from the Reform Era (1830–1848) had a jurisdiction with a wide range of autonomy, albeit it was narrower in Transylvania than in Hungary. Actual reform initiatives were scarce before 1848. It was indeed the year 1848 that brought the first significant change in this respect, even if the third section of the *Transylvanian Law I/1848* stipulated that “[i]n Transylvania, the procedure and personnel structure of the public administration and judicature remain the same until the dispositions of the next *Congregatio Generalis*.” Some transformations were implemented in the year 1849 as well, but the administrative reform was postponed because of the civil war and the defeat suffered by the independentist camp in the war of independence.

The period 1849–1867 is characterized by renewed attempts at the political integration of Transylvania, while representing a continuous transition period. The integration of Transylvania (among other provinces) into the Empire turned its administration into a veritable laboratory of reform initiatives, targeted mostly against the counties which were considered the main centers of opposition. In 1851, the county system was indeed dissolved and Transylvania was divided into five districts (Kreise): Nagyszeben/Sibiu/Hermannstadt, Gyulafehérvár/Alba Iulia/Stuhlweissenburg, Kolozsvár/Cluj/Klausenburg, Dés/Dej/Desch, and Marosvásárhely/Târgu Mureş/Neumarkt am Mieresch. When the thirty-six sub-districts (*Bezirke*) were created, one of the main goals was the equal statistical representation of the nationalities.⁵ In June 1854, the administration was reorganized once again. This time, the government created ten districts, which were divided into seventy-two sub-districts. District tribunals functioned in the seats of districts with courts in the seats of subdistricts. This meant that the administrative and judicial branches were separated and the local administration centralized.

After the issuing of the October Diploma (October 20, 1860), which reinstated the internal self-administration of some of the historic countries and provinces, the Hungarian and Transylvanian Court Chancelleries were reestablished as well. The organization of the old administrative units was undertaken as the next step which generated heated debates among the Romanian and Saxon representatives. However, the experiment proved to be short-lived this time as well, because the following year the Hungarian leaders of administrative units resigned one by one in a form of political protest and thus began what is known in Hungarian historiography as the *Provisorium* (provisional administration). In November 1861, the Sovereign appointed Count Ferenc Nádasdy as Chancellor and Lieutenant-General Ludwig Folliot de Crenville as the new Governor. Chancellor Nádasdy, in order to achieve his goal – the summoning of the Transylvanian Diet and the representation of

5 Albert Berzeviczy, *Az absolutismus kora Magyarországon 1849–1865* [The age of absolutism in Hungary, 1849–1865] vol. 1 (Budapest, 1922), 218.

Transylvania in the *Reichsrat* – started his mandate with the reorganization of the administration of the counties and the Szekler seats. He dissolved the municipal committees and replaced them with newly created ones, in which the appointed civil servants would play the main role. The Hungarian liberal elite managed to preserve its influence only in Székelyföld/Szeklerland and the Hungarian cities.

However, at the end of 1864, secret negotiations started, which finally led to the Compromise (*Ausgleich/kiegyezés*). In the summer of 1865, Count Ferenc Haller was named Chancellor of Transylvania and a new Diet was summoned in Kolozsvár/Cluj/Klausenburg on November 19th, 1865. Its sole mission was the revision of the 1848 Union Law. The Lord-Lieutenant of Abauj County, Emanuel Péchy, was appointed Royal Commissioner for the transitional period of Transylvania's integration (1867–72). The old administrative system and the *Gubernium* (the central governing body of Transylvania until 1869) was preserved provisionally, although the latter functioned now with limited competence. This turn of events (in favor of Hungarians) took the Saxons and Romanians completely off-guard.

The Compromise found Transylvania's administrative units in an ambiguous situation. At that time Hungary and Transylvania together comprised fifty-seven counties (*vármegye*), three regions (*vidék*), five districts (*kerület*), five Szekler seats (*szék*) and the traditional Saxon settlement, the *Königsboden* (*Fundus Regius* or *Királyföld*, involving nine Saxon seats and two regions).⁶ Out of these, Transylvania comprised eight counties, two regions, five Szekler seats and the *Königsboden*. The administrative reform that meant the restructuring of the counties was no easy task for the government because their prestige in the eyes of the Hungarian inhabitants grew during the passive resistance of the post-revolutionary decade. Moreover, the vast majority of the political establishment also developed social relations in the counties and was strongly connected to the county institutions.

In May 1866 the Chamber of Deputies adopted a law on administrative remodeling. The goal was the reconciliation between county autonomy and the responsible parliamentary administration, and thus the creation of the so-called “little compromise.” After the appointment of the government, the renewal of the civil service corps became high on the agenda. On March 7th, 1867, the government presented a bill on the “restoration of administrative units”, which stipulated the reinstatement of the authority of counties. Since the general renewal of the civil service corps could not be enacted on the basis of Laws XVI and XVII from 1848, the government requested an extraordinary authorization to empower the committees created in 1861 with its implementation. These committees received the task of conducting the full renewal of the civil service corps, in addition to the appointment of the lord-lieutenants. The Parliament adopted this measure.⁷

6 Iván Meznerics and Lajos Torday, *A magyar közigazgatás szervei 1867–1937* [The organs of the Hungarian public administration, 1867–1937] (Budapest, 1937).

7 István Stipta, *Törekvések a vármegyék polgári átalakítására. Tervezetek, javaslatok, törvények* [Initiatives for the modernization of the counties. Plans, suggestions, laws] (Budapest: Osiris, 1995), 126.

The decree did not apply to Transylvania, which provoked the discontent of the Hungarian counties. In the months following the adoption of the decree, the Transylvanian counties constantly petitioned the government to extend the reform over Transylvania as well. Finally, the government adopted a decree to this effect on 27 June 1867. Here, they also convened the committees created in 1861, which retained the right to appoint lord-lieutenants, but were ordered to appoint three to five of them by taking into account the religious and national composition of the population in the province. This was a new concession made in view of Transylvania's particular situation, especially as regards the tradition of freely elected civil servants in the Szekler seats. Apart from this, the decrees adopted prior to 1867 remained in force and the separation of the judicial branch was maintained. The consequence of preservation of the status quo was that the administrative units did not communicate directly with the ministries but through the mediation of the Gubernium and the royal commissioner. The situation provoked the discontent of Hungarians and Szeklers. Another departure from the situation in Hungary proper concerned language use: the governmental decree preserved Romanian and German as languages of administrative deliberations.⁸

In the beginning, Prime Minister Gyula Andrásy supported the preservation of county autonomy, however, the immediate effect of this was a quickly emerging governmental opposition to reforms in some of the municipalities. The majority of counties insisted on obtaining more autonomy, albeit they admitted the necessity of certain other changes as well. This ambiguous attitude is reflected in the confidential petition from the Udvarhely Seat: "In the interest of a prospective compromise with the government, we do not oppose possible modernizing changes to our ancient rights, referring to the free vote and grounded in still valid laws, but we consider that they should be done in the regular manner."⁹

However, it was in the government's interest to promote the creation of an efficient state administration. Therefore, it initiated a policy of centralization, which incrementally curtailed the autonomy of the local administrative units. The bill signed by the state undersecretary Vilmos Tóth, favored centralism in the dispute between the government and the counties, even if it did not implement anything but the most indispensable reforms. The Law XLII/1870 preserved several elements of the county system, but it curtailed their authority. With the exception of the administrative capital and *Königsboden*, the other administrative units were given a uniform internal organization. The counties remained the agents of public administration; they exercised some autonomy, and could express their opinion on state affairs. The goal was to remodel them

8 Judit Pál, "Az Erdélyi Főkormányzók és a 'Királyi Biztosság' működése (1867–1872)", [The functioning of the Transylvanian Gubernium and the Royal Commission] *Levéltári Szemle* 4 (2006): 23–34; Judit Pál, "A hivatalos nyelv és a hivatali nyelvhasználat kérdése Erdélyben a 19. század közepén", [The official language and the question of language use in offices in Transylvania in the mid-nineteenth century] *Regio* 1 (2005): 3–26.

9 Magyar Országos Levéltár [Hungarian National Archives] (MOL) K 150, *Belügyminisztérium. Általános iratok, 1867-VII-2-13257* [Ministry for Interior Affairs. General documents, 1867-VII-2-13257].

so that they could fulfill their tasks and implement government decrees more efficiently.¹⁰

The regulation of the responsibilities of lord-lieutenants also reflected the centralization drive and the greater role attributed henceforth to the state. The lord-lieutenants were the representatives of the executive power; they supervised the activity of the local government and were entitled to initiate legal procedures against indolent or culpable functionaries, and had great power in appointing new members of the civil service corps. It was the responsibility of lord-lieutenants to supervise the reform of the counties. According to the law, the general assemblies (*közgyűlések*) had to form a delegation, which elaborated, under the chairmanship of the lord-lieutenant, a plan on the boundaries of the districts (*szolgabírói járások*) and constituencies, and on the number, jurisdiction, and wages of members of the civil service and the assisting personnel. Additionally, it had to prepare the elections and the list of “virilists” (the greatest taxpayers).

The Lord-Lieutenant Corps and the Compromise

As indicated above, it was important for the government that the lord-lieutenants be trustworthy and loyal, especially in the regions where the national minorities formed the majority in the population. In 1867, the government appointed the lord-lieutenants, while the Szekler seats were still electing their chief royal justices. The *Comes Saxonum* (*szász ispán*) as well as the lesser leaders of the Saxon seats, were also elected.

The status of the *Comes Saxonum*

The status of the *Comes Saxonum* was exceptional. Until 1848, he was the head of the *Universitas Saxonum*, the self-governing administrative body of the Transylvanian Saxon community – the remaining part of the feudal “nation” – elected in a complex voting process on the quasi-autonomous territory of *Königsboden/Fundus Regius*. The Saxon self-government did not fit to the absolutist government’s concept of centralization. Franz Salmen, the then *Comes Saxonum*, was removed from Transylvania and received a position at the court of appeal in Vienna.

The *Königsboden* was a thorn in the eye of the government after 1867 as well, and the replacement of the *Comes Saxonum*, Konrad Schmidt was considered from the start. A jurist and deputy of Hermannstadt/ Sibiu/ Nagyszeben in 1848, he participated in the Transylvanian Diet. Despite his opposition to the Union, he voted for it under the pressure of the (revolutionary) public opinion (in Kolozsvár/Cluj). The Compromise had its price, he was later impeached at home. Still in 1848 he represented the interests of Saxons in the Pest Diet. Later in September of the same year, together with other fellow Saxon deputies, Schmidt broke his ties with the Hungarian government.

10 Béla Sarlós, *Közigazgatás és hatalompolitika a dualizmus rendszerében* [Public administration and power politics in the system of Dualism] (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1976), 23; Sipta, *Törekvések*, 147–148.

During the revolution, the Austrian government appointed him Royal Commissioner in Székelyföld. According to the Saxon historian Friedrich Teusch, he was an “ardent Saxon patriot” and the exponent of the “greater-Austrian” mentality.¹¹ In November 1861, he became the leader of the *Universitas Saxonum* replacing the former *Comes*, Franz Salmen. In this capacity, he acted as councilor to the Gubernium as well. After being elected to the Hermannstadt/Sibiu/Nagyszeben Diet (1863–1864), he also became the vice-chairman of the *Reichsrat*.

From the start, Schmidt came into conflict with the Hungarian government. On March 18th, 1867, the Gubernium forbade the summoning of the *Universitas Saxonum*. He protested by stating that, through this measure, they infringed on the authority of the *Universitas* and the *Comes Saxonum*. This was one of the reasons for his dismissal, which the Royal Commissioner requested from the Prime Minister in May 1867. On February 24, 1868, Schmidt was dismissed, and his temporary successor became Moritz Conrad. The Saxons considered Conrad a government puppet, whose only merit was that he turned his back on the interests of Saxons and adopted the line of the majority. A contemporary described him as benefiting from total mistrust from below and limited trust from above.¹² However, the new Saxons saluted his appointment: the cities of Brassó/Braşov/Kronstadt and Segesvár/Sighişoara/Schäßsburg sent letters to the government, expressing their gratitude.¹³

Earlier, Conrad was a lawyer in Kóhalom/Rupea/Reps and one of the representatives of the so-called Young Saxons. He voted for the Union in the Kolozsvár Diet in 1865. Then he acted as a deputy in the Pest Diet, and in 1867, he was appointed departmental counselor at the Justice Ministry. According to Friedrich Teusch, Conrad was a jovial person, but not appropriate for the job, because he lacked vigor and was powerless in front of the government.¹⁴ He rigidly distanced himself from the more conservative Old Saxons, who boycotted him. Hereby, he was practically unable to fulfill his duties.

A year and a half later, Péchy, the Royal Commissioner proposed Conrad’s dismissal. Now, the government was contemplating the removal of Saxon autonomy.

The changes after 1867

Let us now turn to the high civil servants, that is, to the lord-lieutenant, the captain general, and the royal chief justice from the eight counties, the two

11 Friedrich Teusch, *Die Siebenbürger Sachsen in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart* (Hermannstadt, W. Krafft Verlag, 1924), 212–213.

12 Carl Göllner, ed., *Die Siebenbürger Sachsen in den Jahren 1848–1918* (Cologne-Vienna: Böhlau, 1988), 145.

13 MOL K 148 *Belügyminisztérium. Elnöki iratok, 1868-III-629* [Ministry for Interior Affairs. Presidential documents, 1868-III-629].

14 Friedrich Teusch, *Geschichte der Siebenbürger Sachsen für das sächsische Volk*, vol. IV, 1868–1919. *Unter dem Dualismus* (Cologne-Vienna: Böhlau, 1984), 8. Reprint of the 1926 edition.

regions and the five Szekler Seats in Transylvania.¹⁵ After the appointment of the royal commissioner, the reform of the counties and the appointment of new lord-lieutenants, as well as the strengthening of their powers, became ever more stringent. In April and at the beginning of May 1867, the newspapers were full of different speculations and scenarios concerning these issues. It was very important to the government to appoint trustworthy and faithful people who could help preserve its administrative authority at the local level. At the same time, it was also important to the government to reward the “heroes” of the passive opposition, i.e., the members of the Hungarian liberal political elite.

But who were these long-awaited “new people”? Assessing the 1867 situation of lord-lieutenants in the counties (including the two regions *vidék*) and that of the royal chief justices from the Szekler seats, one finds only one third of them, namely five, holding the same office during the Provisorium as well, but out of these five, three soon left their office for various reasons. Lajos Jósika (1807–1891), Lord-Lieutenant of Kolozs County, resigned. The central government dismissed Augustin (Ágoston) Láday (1815–1893), Lord-Lieutenant of Felső-Fehér/Alba de Sus County, and in December 1867, appointed him judge at the Royal Curia, the highest forum of the Hungarian judicial branch. In fact, he was demoted, albeit it might have looked like a promotion. Ferenc Nopcsa (1815–1904), Lord-Lieutenant of Hunyad/Hunedoara County, was appointed an undersecretary at the ministry acting under the Monarch’s authority. The two remaining “survivors” were György Pogány (1815–1900), Lord-Lieutenant of Alsó Fehér/Alba de Jos County, and Alexandru Bohățiel (1816–1897), Lord-Lieutenant of Naszód/Năsăud County. They had both been governing their counties since 1861, moreover, both retained their positions until 1876, the year of the general administrative reform. Ioan Pușcariu (1824–1911), Captain General of Fogaras/Făgăraș, and Albert Petrichevich-Horváth (1802–1872), Royal Chief Justice of the Maros/Mureș Seat, were ultimately dismissed due to their role in the previous period. The Royal Commissioner, who requested Petrichevich-Horváth’s removal from office, wrote about him: “[H]is debut and professional activity happened in such a way, for such a goal, and under such circumstances that, despite his abilities, he would not have been able to win the trust of his Seat.”¹⁶ Therefore, they replaced them with people, who were “trustworthy” and started with a clean slate.

Apart from the stable counties, there were also problematic ones, such as the Felső-Fehér/Alba de Sus County, which was the bone of contention of Transylvania’s administration. More than a dozen splinters of this “bone” were embedded in other counties and thus, it was almost impossible to govern efficiently. This county had three lord-lieutenants in five years; moreover, Ferenc Haller, Jr. (1815–1893), who replaced Augustin (Ágoston) Láday, was removed from office following a series of scandals after merely one year of service. Hunyad/Hunedoara County also had three lord-lieutenants in a short period. The first, as we have seen, became an undersecretary, his successor,

15 The eight counties were the following: Alsó-Fehér, Belső-Szolnok, Doboka, Felső-Fehér, Hunyad, Kolozs, Küküllő, and Torda; the two regions were Fogaras and Naszód, and the five Szekler Seats were Aranyos, Csik, Háromszék, Maros, and Udvarhely.

16 MOL F 270, 1867/37.

Count Kocsárd Kun (1803–1895), resigned due to the county intrigues at the end of 1867, being replaced by László Barcsay (1802–1880).

Out of all the high state functionaries, who were appointed or validated in 1867, eleven remained in office until 1872. One of them, Károly Torma (1829–1897), Lord-Lieutenant of Belső-Szolnok/Solnocul Interior County, resigned in 1872.

The social background of Lord-Lieutenants

Who were the members of the lord-lieutenant corps between 1867 and 1872? I will analyze all those who held this office between these years, namely, twenty-two individuals. The high number of aristocrats within their ranks is notable, confirming thus the *topos* of Hungarian historiography about their leading role in the politics of the Liberal Era, and enables a comparison with the *gentry*.¹⁷ Out of the fifteen lord-lieutenants nine were aristocrats. However, the others also had noble origins, some of them belonging to that part of the nobility which in Transylvania were mocked as “quarter barons” and remained close to the aristocracy with whom they had many marriage relations. For instance, László Barcsay, Lord-Lieutenant of Hunyad/Hunedoara County, who did not have either the title of baron or count, was proud of his princely descent (Prince Ákos Barcsay was the family ancestor), while his wife was the daughter of the regional commissioner, Baron Josef Brukenthal. The two regional captain generals were Romanians. It is certain that one of them came from a noble family, while the other one allegedly had the same social background. All the royal chief justices were nobles, but only one out of five was an aristocrat: Count Dénes Kálnoky, Royal Chief Justice of Háromszék/Trei Scaune, while another, Gábor Daniel, Royal Chief Justice of the Udvarhely Seat, became an aristocrat much later, that is, before his death when he was awarded the title of baron.

The percentage of Romanians decreased in 1867, when the only Romanian lord-lieutenant, Láday, was demoted by being appointed to a higher position. Therefore, only the two regional captain generals were Romanians. Conversely, in this period, the *Comes Saxonum* and the leaders of the *Königsboden* Seats and regions were Saxons. Láday and one of the two Romanian captain generals (Alexandru Bohățiel) were Greek-Catholics. The religious denomination of the other one, László Tamás, Captain General of Fogaras/Făgăraș County, could not be established, but it is likely that he was also Greek-Catholic. Among the Hungarians, Catholics appear to have had a slight majority: ten Catholics compared to seven Calvinists and one Unitarian, while the religious denomination of one of them is uncertain. All throughout the eighteenth century, the Court favored Catholics to the appointment of high offices and the balance started to be redressed only at the beginning of the nineteenth century.

17 Ernő Lakatos, *A magyar politikai vezetőréteg 1848–1918* [The Hungarian political leadership, 1848–1918] (Budapest, 1942); László Péter, “Az arisztokrácia, a dzsenti és a parlamentáris tradíció a XIX. századi Magyarországon”, [The aristocracy, the gentry, and the parliamentary tradition in Hungary in the nineteenth century] in *Túlélők. Eliték és társadalmi változás az újkori Európában*, [Survivors. Elites and social change in modern Europe] ed. László Kontler (Budapest: Atlantisz, 1993), 191–241.

After the Compromise, the central government tried to instate a proportional representation of religious denominations, although confession did not play an important role in the appointment. We can find several instances, when a Protestant was replaced by a Catholic or vice versa (for instance, in the Küküllő/Târnava and Belső-Szolnok/Solnocul Interior Counties).

There are only partial data about the *education* of the lord-lieutenants concerned. Therefore, as a starting point, I used their biographies and the student lists of the more important Transylvanian schools. I could not find any data on the education of three lord-lieutenants out of the twenty-two under scrutiny. The Calvinist ones studied at the Reformed Colleges in Kolozsvár/Cluj/Klausenburg and Nagyenyed/Aiud, and the lord-lieutenants from Hunyad/Hunedoara County studied at the Szászváros/Orăștie College. The only Unitarian lord-lieutenant attended the Unitary College in Kolozsvár/Cluj/Klausenburg, whereas the eleven Catholics attended, almost without exception, the Royal Catholic Lyceum of the same city. The Greek-Catholic lord-lieutenants attended the Balázsfalva/Blaj Lyceum and/or the Royal Catholic Lyceum in Kolozsvár/Cluj. For instance, Bohățiel, after his studies in Balázsfalva/Blaj, attended the Lyceum in Kolozsvár/Cluj as an arts student between 1832 and 1833, and a law student between 1834 and 1835. László Tamás, Captain General of Fogaras/Făgăraș County, attended the Lyceum between 1837 and 1840, whereas Láday, after his theological studies in Balázsfalva/Blaj, went straight to the *Tabula Regia* (*Királyi Tábla, The High Court of Justice of Transylvania*) in Marosvásárhely/Târgu Mureș as a law apprentice. Typically, the *Tabula Regia* was the final stage in the education of future high civil servants; their legal apprenticeship at this institution and then the lawyer's exam being compulsory for them. According to the scarce data at my disposal, very few of them attended a university. Among the rare exceptions, one can mention the name of Count Sándor Bethlen, Lord-Lieutenant of Belső-Szolnok/Solnocul Interior County, who had been enrolled to the University of Berlin between 1842 and 1844, and Baron Dániel Bánffy (1812–1886), Lord-Lieutenant of Doboka County, who attended the same university between 1836 and 1838. The education of Count Kocsárd Kun, Lord-Lieutenant of Hunyad/Hunedoara County, is also exceptional. Between 1819 and 1820, Kun was a student at the Military Engineering Academy in Vienna, whereas his predecessor, Ferenc Nopcsa, studied at the Theresianum Academy in Vienna. Dénes Kálnoky (1814–1888), Royal Chief Justice of Háromszék/Trei Scaune, also studied at the Theresianum Academy between 1829 and 1832 and, after returning home, he was enrolled in the law department at the Royal Lyceum in Kolozsvár/Cluj, from where he later graduated. Gergely Béldi (1819–1889), Royal Chief Justice of the Aranyos/Arieș Seat, after graduating at the Lyceum in Kolozsvár/Cluj, attended for a year (in 1832) the Diplomatic Academy in Vienna. Count Ferenc Haller, following family tradition, enlisted in the army at the age of sixteen and served as a Hussar officer for ten years.

In those times, it was not necessary for one to hold a university degree in order to become a high civil servant. It was enough – and expected – that one graduated from at least one of the traditional denominational colleges of Transylvania offering legal or “philosophical” (arts and sciences) training in

their outgoing classes. Most would-be incumbents of a high public position usually attended the Royal Lyceum, the Reformed College, or the Unitarian College in Kolozsvár/Cluj, as well as the Reformed College in Nagyenyed/Aiud; then, as the highest level of their studies, they completed the law apprenticeship and took the lawyer's exam at the *Tabula Regia* in Marosvásárhely/Târgu Mureş.

Lord-lieutenant career tracks

What did the career of lord-lieutenants look like? What was the age at which they were appointed to this office and what kind of county service or other position was behind them? I could find only partial answers to these questions, and I was not able to fully reconstruct their career tracks either.

According to their age, only some of them could have held offices before 1848. Half of the high state functionaries held some kind of position of authority or were deputies in the Diet before 1848. Out of them, Lajos Jósika held the highest position, obviously due to his family connections. In 1835, he became the administrator of Torda/Turda County, between 1836 and 1838 he was appointed lord-lieutenant in the same county, then in 1842, after some time spent abroad, he was appointed a councilor to the Gubernium. Between 1846 and 1848 he acted as lord-lieutenant of Doboka County. Except for him, only Count Dénes Kálnoky was a high state appointee, namely Royal Chief Justice of Háromszék/Trei Scaune. He started his career as royal justice in Miklósvárszék/Micloşoara at the end of the 1830's, and was made lord-lieutenant of Felső-Fehér/Alba de Sus County in 1847. Apart from them, we find one chief justice, four deputy lord-lieutenants (*alispánok*) and deputy chief justices, three deputies in the Diet, a tax collector, a provincial commissioner, a treasurer, and one, Gábor Daniel (1824–1903), who worked as a clerk at the Court Chancellery (*Udvari Kancellária*). Two of them served in the army and Ferenc Nopcsa served as the court chamberlain of Archduke Karl Ferdinand between 1840 and 1843. Bohățiel was a practicing lawyer in Kolozsvár/Cluj/Klausenburg. It was Kocsárd Kun, Lord-Lieutenant of Hunyad/Hunedoara County, who had the longest career at county level; between 1823 and 1833, he was a county clerk while in the meantime holding the positions of deputy lord-lieutenant in the Hátszeg district as well as deputy in the Diet between 1833 and 1834. There was nothing in the career of Antal Mikó which could have indicated his later rise to a high office because, before 1848, he only held the position of treasurer in the Csík/Ciuc Seat for a decade.

Half of the lord-lieutenants played some kind of role in the events of the 1848–49 revolution and the war of independence, albeit we have only partial data on this. Almost half of them also exerted some military functions as well; for instance, Count Kálmán Eszterházy (1830–1916) participated in the Battle of Nagyszeben/Sibiu/Hermannstadt, where he lost an arm. After the defeat of the revolution, three of them – Kocsárd Kun, Mihály Mikó (1817–1881), and Ferenc Haller – received the death penalty, which was later commuted into various imprisonment terms. However, between 1856 and 1857, they were all set free.

Conversely, there were four high civil servants of the post-Compromise period with a “shady” past, having held positions during the 1850s or the

Provisorium. As we mentioned above, several of the latter were removed from office in 1867, and it is very likely that this was also the reason for the dismissal of Baron Lajos Jósika, who was the chairman of the Feudal Supreme Court (*úrbéri főtörvényszék*) of Transylvania from 1858 and Lord-Lieutenant of Kolozs/Cluj County from 1864. György Pogány was also a chairman of Feudal Court. László Barcsay, the Lord-Lieutenant of Hunyad/Hunedoara County, held a relatively neutral position and after the revolution, he was allowed to remain a provincial commissioner in Déva/Deva. On the other hand, the opposition repeatedly reproached Lázár Ugron (d. 1884), Lord-Lieutenant of Felső-Fehér/Alba de Sus County, for having been a sub-divisional commissioner (*alkerületi biztos*) between 1850 and 1854.

There was a rearrangement of power relations after the issuing of the October Diploma in 1860. It was then that the subsequent generation of '67 really surfaced on the scene. Almost half of them (a total of ten) were then appointed or elected as high civil servants, but we can also find among them one councilor to the Gubernium, a chief judge, a chief clerk, a provincial commissioner, a royal justice, and a deputy royal justice. Out of the ten, seven *homo novus* had never held any county office before. Several among them are the embodiment of the "typical lord-lieutenant's career", whose family background "destined" them for this office (for instance, Count Ferenc Béldi, Baron Dániel Bánffy, Baron György Kemény, Ferenc Nopcsa, and partly Gábor Daniel). The two Romanian high civil servants – Ládáy and Bohățiel – owed their unexpected and rapidly advancing careers to the political circumstances.

In 1862, nine resigned from office. Only four of them remained in office, namely Bohățiel, Ládáy, Pogány, and Nopcsa. In the case of the last three, it was considered that they kept their lord-lieutenancy due to the arrangement among the Hungarian elites not to renounce the respective counties in favor of Romanians. Gábor Daniel, the former royal chief justice of the Udvarhely/Odorheiu Seat, wrote that the high civil servants, who gathered at the Kolozsvár/Cluj/Klausenburg meeting in 1862, "agreed to resign from [their] offices, but put the condition that György Pogány, Lord-Lieutenant of Alsó-Fehér/Alba de Jos County, Ferenc Nopcsa, Lord-Lieutenant of Hunyad County, and Ágoston Ládáy, Lord-Lieutenant of Felső-Fehér/Alba de Sus County, agreed to remain at the helm of their counties because there the Romanians formed the majority, and they would appoint such successors, who would secure the dominance of Hungarians."¹⁸ Two other persons also held offices during the Provisorium: Barcsay continued to be a provincial commissioner, while Jósika was appointed as the lord-lieutenant of Kolozs County.

Actually, in 1867, they appointed only two such lord-lieutenants, who had not held any county office or had not been a high civil servant before, namely Károly Torma and Count Kálmán Eszterházy, although Torma was appointed honorary chief clerk. Most of them (eleven), i.e., more than two thirds of the high state functionaries in 1867, were recruited from the ranks of those in office in 1861, thus symbolizing legal continuity. All returned to the helm of

18 Éva Ádám, ed., *Báró Daniel Gábor Udvarhelyszék utolsó főkirálybírójának ismeretlen emlékezése* [The unknown memoirs of Baron Gábor Daniel, the last chief royal judge in Udvarhelyszék] (Szeged, 1938), 17.

their county, with the exception of Count Ferenc Béldi (1798– 1880), who was transferred from Kolozs/Cluj to Küküllő/Târnava County.

Concerning their age, the average age of the “initial” corps was slightly beyond fifty – quite an advanced age in this epoch – but after the changes in 1867 it would drop to forty-six and a half. If we analyze the time when they were appointed to a high office, the average age is forty-one and a half. The youngest appointee was Baron Lajos Jósika, who became the administrator of Torda County in 1835 at the age of twenty-eight, and a year later, he was already appointed as lord-lieutenant of the same county. The oldest appointee was Count Ferenc Béldi, Lord-Lieutenant of Küküllő/Târnava County, who was first appointed at the age of sixty-three. In 1867, the youngest appointees were Károly Torma, thirty-eight, and Count Kálman Eszterházy, thirty-seven. Both were appointed to the office of lord-lieutenant for the first time.

To summarize, we can say that despite the transition period, the lord-lieutenant career type that prevailed was the so-called political career, that is, the relationship with government circles which was more important than services accomplished in the local administration. This applied to the 1867 generation with the exception of Székelyföld, where four out of the five royal chief justices appear to have built their careers step by step. Indeed, one of them started in a different Seat than the one where he was appointed in 1867. Six future lord-lieutenants were deputies in the last Transylvanian Diet, convened in 1865, as well as in the Pest Diet. In the case of two out of the six aforementioned persons, i.e., Kocsárd Kun and Mihály Mikó, it is almost certain that their appointment was connected to their activity as deputies. Mihály Mikó was active during his mandate in the Pest Diet, publishing a series of articles on the situation in Transylvania in one of the leading newspapers. Although his career and estate were connected to the Csík/Ciuc Seat, the government chose him to replace the contested Albert Petrichevich-Horváth as royal chief justice of the Maros/Mureş Seat.

In the counties, one finds among the later appointed high civil servants much fewer careers “built from below”, since they owed their advancement more to their previous mandates as deputies at the Diet. An interesting case is that of László Barcsay, who was a long-time county administrator before 1848, a deputy in the Diet, but since 1840 until his appointment, he was regional commissioner in Déva/Deva. Ferenc Haller was a chief justice before his appointment as lord-lieutenant, and his successor, Lázár Ugron, was the deputy chief justice in the Udvarhely Seat before. The only individual, who was made lord-lieutenant after holding a position in the central administration, was the councilor to the Gubernium, László Tamás, who took the position of captain general of Fogaras/Făgăraş. György Pogány best embodies the type who built his career steadily without being affected by the regime changes. He held a position at county level even before 1848; he acted as deputy lord-lieutenant from 1846, held several minor positions during the neo-absolutist regime, and then, from 1861 until the administrative reform, he was maintained as head of Alsó-Fehér/Alba de Jos County (1861-1875) and Hunyad/Hunedoara County (1876-1890).

Regarding the career paths, it is important to know what happened to the high civil servants after 1867. One would assume that this represented the

peak from where they either retired or perhaps became deputies. The calculation of the average time spent in office is misleading, due to the scarcity of data and their disparity. Two extreme cases are represented by the careers of György Pogány and Gábor Daniel. The former held the office of lord-lieutenant continuously for twenty-nine years. The latter was first the lord-lieutenant of the Udvarhely/Odorheiu Seat between 1861 and 1862, and then, after the Compromise until 1891, he was first royal chief justice and from 1876 acted as lord-lieutenant of the newly organized Udvarhely/Odorheiu County. Alexandru Bohățiel also had a long-standing career as lord-lieutenant, remaining at the helm of Naszód/Năsăud County for fourteen years (1861–75). Mihály Mikó, after spending eight years (1867–75) as royal chief justice of the Maros/Mureș Seat, “returned home” and served as lord-lieutenant of Csík County until 1881, the year of his death. The other extreme is represented by Lajos Barcsay and Ferenc Haller, Jr., who directed their counties for less than a year. In the latter cases the reason of retirement was due to personal inadequacies. Thus Haller was relieved of his duties as lord-lieutenant after a disciplinary inquest following a series of scandals. Ferenc Béldi was dismissed because he could not fulfill his duties anymore due to his advanced age and also for his absence from the county. But apart from these exceptional cases, fluctuation was rather low. The majority of high state functionaries who were reconfirmed in office in 1867 kept their positions until the general administrative reform.

For the vast majority of these officials this was the peak as well as the end of their career. They usually retired voluntarily either for reasons of age and/or for starting another professional career in the civil sphere. Only one of them, Ferenc Nopcsa, worked at a ministry. He was made state undersecretary shortly after the Compromise. Later, he was the chief chamberlain of Queen Elisabeth, holding this position until 1894. Láday, who was dismissed in 1867, became a judge at the highest Transylvanian section of the Royal Curia, holding this position until 1881, when he retired. Three of them became deputies after their career as lord-lieutenant had ended. From the last category, Károly Torma deserves a special attention, because after his withdrawal from politics, he was first named professor of common law in 1876 at the recently founded University of Kolozsvár/Cluj, and then, in 1879, an archeology professor at the Budapest University.

The question thus emerges about the extent to which high civil servants had local affiliations and connections. Seeking the answer, one usually refers to their birthplace, family ties, location of their estates, and places of activities. In several cases, the birthplace either cannot be established or is not significant (for instance, in the case of an aristocrat, whose estates extended over several counties). The same applies to family ties, because in many cases they spread across the whole of Transylvania. The vast majority of them held a position in the same county as their birthplace. In total, four lord-lieutenants were appointed to a county different than their birthplace (Béldi, Mikó, Ugron, and Tamás). Béldi for instance, was resented for his displacement, and for a while did not even take his seat in the county allotted to him, which contributed to his dismissal. Almost two thirds (fifteen out of twenty-two) of the officials concerned were also landowners in their county. Whether the respective state officials had an estate is uncertain in three cases, but in four cases they had

estates in other counties as well (for instance, Mihály Mikó, Lázár Ugron, Ágoston Ládai, and Alexandru Bohățiel). Compared to the circumstances from later periods – at least as it results from the research conducted so far – the local “roots” of the cluster active between 1867 and 1872 were decisively strong.

It would be interesting to compare the above results with Magdolna Balázs’s similar cross-country analysis. She established the degree to which the holders of county offices were locally attached based on their earlier social-political career, the location of their estates, their birthplace, and the origin of their family. In her opinion, the highest number of lord-lieutenants without local ties was in Transylvania.¹⁹ In order to verify her thesis, one must analyze the whole period of Dualism, but for its early years, this does not appear to be true at all.

One can only estimate *the size of estates*, and in many cases even this is not possible. One group consists of those who had a small estate (between 200 and 500 acres), such as, the officials from Székelyföld/Szeklerland (Mihály Mikó and Antal Mikó) and the Romanian office holders (Bohățiel and Ládai). The next group is made up of those who owned between 1,000 and 5,000 acres of land (György Pogány, Kocsárd Kun, Baron Sándor Bethlen, László Barcsay, Ferenc Haller, Lázár Ugron, and Gábor Daniel). The group of those who owned more than 10,000 acres of land was necessarily small and exclusively made up of titled aristocrats (Baron Lajos Jósika, Count Ferenc Béldy, Baron Dániel Bánffy, and Baron György Kemény). Baron Lajos Jósika owned more than 20,000 acres of land in Zemplén, Hunyad/Hunedoara, Kolozs/Cluj, and Doboka Counties.

Therefore, the two smaller groups of high civil servants needed to hold an office in order to make a living, while on the other end of the scale there were big landowners who held positions out of “lordly passion.” The vast majority originated from the group of landowners with 1,000 to 5,000 acres, whose estate was substantial enough for a gentlemanly living and provided the necessary prestige to the person concerned for the assumption of his office within his county. However, the holding of an office gave them the possibility to enhance their prestige, social capital, and even wealth. Still, we find an example of one lord-lieutenant, Károly Torma, whose old family estate from Csicsókeresztúr/Cristeștii Ciceiului was sold by auction after his resignation. He actually wrote a bitter letter to his sister when he found out that his brother-in-law would be appointed lord-lieutenant of Hunyad/Hunedoara County: “I have to admit I do not wish this for his own interest because I am familiar with the hardships and troubles of this office, its slow and silent harm with which it attacks the man’s material status; and it *certainly* and *fully* attacks it.”

Fathers, sons, and family ties

Important factors that concerned high civil servants’ careers were family background and family ties, two interlinking parameters of the state career. I have already mentioned that a significant part of those concerned were aristocrats. Analyzing the profession of the fathers – as much as it is observable in the sources – one notices that most of them, twenty-two individuals, did not

19 Balázs Magdolna, “A középszintű közigazgatási apparátus”, 250–251.

hold an office or this could not be determined. However, the fathers of more than a third (nine) did have some kind of public position. For instance, Baron Lajos Jósika's father held the highest office available in Transylvania, i.e., president of the Gubernium, and this explains his son's rapidly advancing career. The fathers of four others also held high offices (Ferenc Béldy, György Kemény, Gábor Daniel, and Ferenc Nopcsa). In some cases, the fathers held other positions. Károly Torma's father was a chief county clerk as well as a chief tax collector. László Barcsay's father was chief justice of Hunyad/Hunedoara County. Gergely Béldi's father was a councilor to the *Gubernium*. It is unclear whether Antal Mikó's father was a councilor to the *Gubernium* or not. The fathers of the Romanian officials, with the exception of László Tamás on whom we do not have any data, were priests.

It is even more rewarding to extend our analysis over other family members. To what extent did the fathers manage to promote their sons to similar positions by using their social capital? Six out of the twenty-two individuals under scrutiny did not have sons (some of them were bachelors), the three Romanians started from a disadvantageous political position, and in one case I was not able to reconstruct the family tree. The sons of eleven high officials out of the thirteen were also made lord-lieutenants as well as deputies (the sons of eight became lord-lieutenants and deputies, and the sons of three only deputies). From among the sons, three became ministers and one, Dezső Bánffy, later took the office of prime minister as well. In some cases (five), it is known that the grandsons also followed in the footsteps of their grandfathers. They also became lord-lieutenants, as was the case of the grandson of Gábor Daniel who would become minister of interior.

Aristocrats tended to maintain their closely-knit network through marriage within the same social category. Most interesting was the vast family network around Baron Dániel Bánffy and Baron György Kemény (1813-1896), but also the one built by Baron Lajos Jósika and Count Kálman Eszterházy. Moreover, there were slight links between the two family networks despite their religious differences (the former two being Calvinists, whereas the latter Catholics).

The *Jósika family* had been one of the most prominent in Transylvania ever since the time of the historic Principality, and several of its members held public offices. Lajos Jósika's father János was president of the Gubernium and his older brother Sámuel, considered one of the most talented Transylvanian politicians, was the president of the Transylvanian Court Chancellery. His mother Rozália Csáky was also interested in politics, albeit she could influence it only from behind the scene. The brothers of his wife Adél Bethlen also were trusted with important positions. Gábor was lord-lieutenant of Zaránd County, while József was lord-lieutenant of Torontál County. His nephew Miklós Bethlen was also lord-lieutenant of Torontál County.

Lajos Jósika had four sons with two wives, Franciska Haller and Adél Bethlen. Sámuel, the son from his second marriage, followed his father's career path. His parents took good care of his upbringing. First, he studied in Nagyszeben/Sibiu/Hermannstadt, then in Paris and England, and afterwards completed legal studies in Pozsony/Bratislava and Kolozsvár/Cluj. He was lord-lieutenant of Kolozs/Cluj County between 1885 and 1888. Then he was a member of the Parliament and in January 1893, he was appointed as state

undersecretary at the Ministry of the Interior. After Dezső Bánffy became prime minister, he was appointed minister of the ministry under the Monarch's authority in January 1895 and held this office until January 20th, 1898. He was deputy-chairman of the Hungarian Upper House and its chairman from 1910. In 1912, he was appointed Lord-Lieutenant. After the First World War, he became a member of the Romanian Senate. He was also the vice-president of the Transylvanian Economic Association, a collaborator of the Transylvanian Farmer's Association, and the president of the Roman Catholic Status. Sámuel's first wife Irén Jósika was the niece of Miklós Jósika, the famous writer, who came from the other branch of the Jósika family.

Lajos Jósika became related to Count Kálman Eszterházy, his successor as lord-lieutenant of Kolozs/Cluj County, through the marriage of his son, Lajos, to Eszterházy's daughter, Ágnes in 1886. Lajos's son, János Jósika, was appointed lord-lieutenant of Szilágy County after the Vienna Award (1940). His youngest son, Gábor, served in the military for fifteen years and reached the rank of captain by the time he was discharged. He owned a model farm in Szamosfalva/Someșeni. In 1892, he became a liberal deputy representing the Kőrösbánya/Baia de Criș district in Hunyad/Hunedoara County.

Kálmán Eszterházy came from the Csesznek line (which included the so-called Transylvanian line) of the *House of Eszterházy*. His parents were Count Dénes Eszterházy and Countess Cecilia Haller. In 1857, Kálmán married Countess Paulina Bethlen with whom he had two daughters: Irma, who would marry László Makray, Jr., a member of the Parliament, and Ágnes, who would marry the previous lord-lieutenant, Lajos Jósika's son, who bore the same name as his father. His wife's younger sister, Vilma, was married to the finance minister Béni Kállay, while her other younger sister, Margit, was first married to Count Géza Teleki and then to Baron György Bánffy. His wife's younger brothers married into the Baron Wesselényi, Count Batthány, Count Béldi, and Tisza families. Thus, Kálmán Eszterházy practically became related to the entire Transylvanian aristocracy. He established family ties in Hungary as well. Cecilia, the daughter of Kálmán Eszterházy's older brother János, married Ernő Bánffy, the son of the Lord-Lieutenant Dániel Bánffy.

The *Bánffy family* was one of the most extended aristocratic families. Dániel Bánffy came from the baronial branch of the family and many of his ancestors held the office of lord-lieutenant of Doboka and Kraszna Counties. His father was János Bánffy and his mother was Zsuzsanna Zeyk, the daughter of Dániel Zeyk, who was lord-lieutenant of Fehér/Alba County. His older brother János was lord-lieutenant of Küküllő/Târnava County in 1848, and then in 1869, two years after the Compromise, he became a member of parliament. From among his children, Zoltán became lord-lieutenant of Maros-Torda/Mureș-Turda County and Marosvásárhely/Târgu Mureș, and the husband of his daughter Polyxena, Baron Kálmán Kemény, was appointed lord-lieutenant of Alsó-Fehér/Alba de Jos County and was elected a member of parliament. Dániel's older sister Katalin was also married to a member of parliament, Baron István Kemény. From his mother's side he was also the first cousin to Károly Zeyk, who was a member of parliament and an undersecretary at the Ministry of the Interior.

Dániel Bánffy and his wife Anna Gyárfás of Lécfalva, the daughter of the councilor to the Chancellery Lajos Gyárfás and Katalin Zeyk, had three children: Dezső, Jenő, and Ernő. Later, Dezső would become lord-lieutenant of Szolnok-Doboka and Beszterce-Naszód Counties, and then prime minister of Hungary. His first wife was Baroness Mária Kemény, the daughter of György Kemény, the lord-lieutenant of Torda/Turda County. Ernő was the chairman of the Hungarian Economic Association of Transylvania and the chief curator of the Transylvanian Calvinist diocese and the Calvinist College in Kolozsvár/Cluj. His wife was Countess Cecilia Eszterházy, the niece of the lord-lieutenant Kálman Eszterházy.

The *Kemény Family* was also one of Transylvania's large princely families, which gave a ruling prince in the seventeenth century. György Kemény was the son of Baron Simon Kemény, an assessor at the Royal Table, and Anna Teleki. Perhaps György Kemény developed the widest family network in the field of politics. From among his brothers, István had been lord-lieutenant of Alsó-Fehér/Alba de Jos County earlier and then a member of parliament, while Domokos did not accept any political position but acted as the chief curator of the Transylvanian Calvinist diocese. His sister Katalin married Baron Dénes Kemény, one of the leading figures of the Transylvanian opposition from the Reform Era (1830-1848) and an undersecretary in 1848. From among their children, Gábor would become a deputy, an undersecretary in the ministry of the interior, minister of industry and trade, and later minister of transport, and Géza was a member of parliament as well. Through the marriage of his sister Judit, György Kemény became the brother-in-law of Károly Zeyk, who was a member of parliament, an undersecretary in the ministry of the interior, and later lord-lieutenant of Alsó-Fehér/Alba de Jos County.

György Kemény's wife, Countess Mária Bethlen, gave birth to six children. From among them two, Kálmán and Endre, later became members of parliament. The former acted as lord-lieutenant of Alsó-Fehér/Alba de Jos County between 1885 and 1892, deputy chairman of the Upper House, and a chief curator of the Transylvanian Calvinist diocese. Kálmán married Polyxena Bánffy and their winter receptions represented one of the focal events within the Transylvanian community in Pest. His father-in-law, János Bánffy, was the former lord-lieutenant of Küküllő/Târnava County. Kemény's older son Ödön did not accept any role in the public life. Ödön's wife Gizella was the daughter of the governmental councilor Elek Nagy of Kál, who held the second highest office after the royal commissioner in Transylvania during the transition period between 1869 and 1872. His daughter, Mária married Dezső Bánffy, the later prime minister. His grandson Ákos (the son of Ödön) was lord-lieutenant of Kis-Küküllő County and the vice-president of *EMKE* (Hungarian-Transylvanian Cultural Association).

Apart from these families, there were other smaller family networks as well. Count Ákos Béldi's father was the regional captain general, Vince Béldi, and his mother was Baroness Róza Szentkereszty. The Béldis established several kinship connections with the Bethlen family. For instance, his sister, Róza, married Count János Bethlen. Ákos Béldi's younger brother, Gyula, married Baroness Berta Brukenthal. Thus, he became related to the Brukenthals, and through this he was indirectly related to László Barcsay, the lord-lieutenant

of Hunyad/Hunedoara County, whose wife was also a Brukenthal. Ákos Béldi's wife, Zsófia Daniel, gave birth to two sons, Ákos and Kálmán. The older son, Ákos, would also become a lord-lieutenant later.

Béldi's brother-in-law was Gábor Daniel, who was chief royal justice in the Udvarhely/Odorheiu Seat and later its first lord-lieutenant. Daniel's son, the lawyer Gábor Daniel, Jr., was a member of parliament and deputy chairman of the House of Deputies. Gábor Daniel, Jr., married Malvin, the daughter of Frigyes Korányi, the famous doctor from Pest and the rector of the medical faculty. The Korányi (Kronfeld) family, of Jewish origin, was ennobled in 1884 and was awarded a baronial title in 1908. Frigyes Korányi, Jr., the brother-in-law of Gábor Daniel, Jr., was general manager of the National Central Credit Union, a member of parliament, minister of finances and trade on several occasions, and ambassador in Paris and Madrid. His son, Gábor (1880–1957), was the lawyer of the Central Credit Union – where his uncle Frigyes Korányi Jr acted as general manager – and the chief curator of the Unitarian Church in Budapest. During the First World War he also acted as minister of the interior for a short time.

The other Béldi, Gergely Béldi came from the noble branch of the Béldi family. His father was the councilor to the Gubernium István Béldi and his mother was Baroness Anna Bornemisza. His wife was Countess Rozália Nemes. They did not have any children. His brother-in-law, Count Vince Nemes, married Gabriella, the daughter of Mór Wodianer, the chairman of the Vienna Stock Exchange and the Hungarian National Railways Company. Thus, Albert Wodianer, one of the main Jewish representatives of the high bourgeoisie, became Béldi's brother-in-law. Béldi's other brother-in-law, Count János Nemes, married Countess Polyxena Bethlen, the daughter of Sándor Bethlen, another member of parliament.

It would also be interesting to scrutinize the social, cultural, and economic role played by those of our cluster in order to see how “multi-positional” the Transylvanian political elite happened to be. The data collection is not complete, as yet, hence we will shortly examine only their *church positions*. Traditionally, in Transylvania the chief curators of religious denominations were also in charge of the highest positions in the administration, thus it is not surprising that several such individuals can be found among those under scrutiny. Lajos Jósika was the secular president of the Roman Catholic Status. Kocsárd Kun was the chief curator of the Transylvanian Calvinist diocese, as well as the chief curator and Maecenas of the Calvinist College in Szászváros/Orăștie. Gábor Daniel was the chief curator of the Unitarian Church in Transylvania and in this capacity he was also a member of the Upper House. Concerning Ládai, we know that he donated his assets to the Greek-Catholic Consistory in Balázsfalva/Blaj for the purpose of scholarships and assistance to the Romanian schools.

Thus, 1867 was not a turning point in the history of the elites. Practically, the pre-1848 elites managed to preserve their power base beyond this year – accompanied by the noticeable strengthening of the liberal camp. In 1861 they were already holding most of the high offices, and in 1867 they were the ones who returned to power. Professional qualification did not play an important

role then, but it seems that those who wished to follow a political or administrative career, though in practice we still cannot separate the two, usually graduated from one of the prestigious denominational high schools from Transylvania and took the lawyer's exam after legal practice at the Royal Table in Marosvásárhely/Târgu Mureș.

We can divide our officials into two major groups. The first group – made up of those with a modest wealth – had a steady rise on the ladder and assumed their high responsibilities only after a rather lengthy service in the administration. In general, this applies to the Szekler royal chief justices as well as a few lord-lieutenants (for instance, György Pogány). They were also the ones who had the longest careers, since they, for existential reasons, had to adapt themselves to the political changes. The Romanians of the cluster represent a particular group. They were appointed to their positions by taking advantage either of the neo-absolutism or the favorable circumstances that presented themselves in 1861. Then, the Romanians acquired several important posts in the name of a more equitable representation of national minorities. After the Compromise, for a while, it was still considered – at least formally – that officials in the regions with a predominant national minority should be appointed from the ranks of the latter. At the time, all high state appointees in the *Königsboden*, with two exceptions, were still Saxons, whereas the Romanians acquired the office of captain general only in two “Romanian” districts, i.e., Fogaras/Făgăraș and Naszód/Năsăud. After Kálmán Tisza came to power and implemented the administrative reform, the two districts ceased to exist and with them the Romanian officials in charge disappeared as well.

The 1867 corps of high civil servants was characterized by strong local ties. Most of them were deeply rooted into their respective county due to their estates and kinship connections. If this was not the case, then they either came from the neighboring county, or had family relations in the county where they were appointed. In any case, they were socially rooted in Transylvania without exception. This rootedness of sorts was indeed an important factor in the making of their careers.

Translated by Leonard Ciocan

JOHN NEUBAUER

Conflicts and Cooperation between the Romanian, Hungarian, and Saxon Literary Elites, 1850–1945

On September 28, 1929 a remarkable event took place in the Redut Hall of Brassó/Kronstadt: the Transylvanian-Hungarian writers around the journal *Erdélyi Helikon* introduced themselves to the Transylvanian-Saxon community around Heinrich Zillich's journal *Klingsor*. One of highlights was when Mária Berde (1889-1949) read her deeply moving but meanwhile forgotten "Erdélyi ballada."¹ I include the Hungarian original in Appendix A.

The subject of Berde's ballad is a dramatic event of the 1848-49 Hungarian revolution that involved Berde's maternal grandfather, Ónodi-Weress Károly and his family, who had to flee to Kolozsvár when the Austrian and Russian troops started to take over Transylvania in the spring of 1849. The ballad evokes distressing images of refugee life before turning to a long discussion between Károly and his pregnant wife: he had been called up to serve as a member of a court-martial that is to try Stefan Ludwig Roth (1796-1849), leader of the Transylvania Saxons, who is accused of having been responsible for the Saxon support of the Emperor against the revolutionary Hungarians: "he is to blame that his people are the Emperor's pawns" ("ő felel, hogy népe a császárnak eszköze"). Károly rehearses the official arguments, while his wife thinks more independently. Though she suffers bitterly under the Emperor's arbitrary rule, she believes that the Hungarians should fight for their rights instead of taking revenge. If Roth worked against the (Hungarian-Transylvanian) Union, perhaps he thought about it differently, considered another solution better. She has no reply to Károly's revolutionary slogan, "Whoever wants things differently now is a traitor" ("Ki most másképp akar, az hazaáruló"), but she passionately urges him not to vote for Roth's death, not so much on humanitarian grounds (although she reminds Károly that Roth is a protestant minister with a family) but above all because voting for death would be a betrayal of Károly's own convictions. Saying farewell she assumes the voice of her yet unborn, eighth, child: he'd rather be a refugee than child of a murderous father ("Hadd jöjjen nyolcadik földönfutónak, / De soha gyilkos apa gyermekének!").

Károly seems to consent, but for a while the readers are left in the dark about what really happened. The ballad skips eleven years, to a scene in which Károly and his wife mourn the death of the eighth child. Károly is ready to curse god for the injustice, but she tries to calm him down. After another long time gap, a

1 Mária Berde, "Erdélyi Ballada", [Transylvanian ballad] *Erdélyi Helikon* [to be abbreviated as *EH*] 1929: 668-670. Egon Hajek's German translation of the ballad appeared in the *Siebenbürgisch-Deutsches Tagesblatt* on February 5, 1930 and the *Kronstädter Zeitung* on February 16, 1930.

grandchild finds in Károly's bible words that constitute the closing lines of the ballad: "god gave it, god took it";, more significantly, she finds in his hand-writing the Transylvanian saying, "happy is he who did not deserve his cross" ("Boldog, aki keresztjét meg nem érdemelte"): Károly did not deserve the "cross" of his son's death because he did not make himself guilty by voting for the death-penalty.

Offering the ballad as a gift to her Saxon hosts Berde became herself a courageous dissenter, for she addressed a particularly painful historical event that still generated then anger and hatred between Saxons and Hungarians.² The historical Stephan Ludwig Roth,³ a student of Pestalozzi and author of *Der Sprachkampf in Siebenbürgen* (1842), pleaded for tolerance and equality. Assuming that all civic rights would be extended to all people living in Transylvania, he consented to its annexation to Hungary in March 1848: "When Hungary declared his inhabitants free and formally declared the equality of all citizens, my heart too, I don't deny, was beating for the Union, because at that time one could choose only between two very unequal things, namely Hungarian freedom and Austrian bureaucracy."⁴ Roth switched to the Austrian side when the Hungarian diet did not guarantee the minorities their rights and their freedom to use their own language. The new Austrian Constitution of April 25, 1848 split the Saxons between supporters and opponents of the union with Hungary. The latter group appealed for help to the Russians at the end of 1848, and Lajos Kossuth (1802-1894) ordered on January 27 1849 that they should be court martialled. Roth was condemned to death and immediately executed in Kolozsvár on May 11, in spite of the safe conduct ("menlevél") that Józef Bem (1794-1850), the Polish military leader of the Hungarian troops, had granted him. Learning about the execution, Bem claimed he would have come to Roth's rescue had he been notified in time; Kossuth called the execution a "misunderstanding" – but only later. Upon returning to Erdély, Bem suspended the court martial. The matter remains controversial.

Transylvanian Literary Relations Between 1849 and 1919

The time span between Roth's execution and Berde's reading her ballad about it covers most of the history indicated in my title. The burden of my

2 Among the Saxon hosts was Otto Folberth, editor of Roth's works, who spoke and wrote excellent Hungarian. In the *Mediascher Zeitung* Folberth declared that great progress had been made in Hungarian-Saxon understanding if it was possible to speak with such salutary freedom in public about a most painful historical event that had occasioned, even recently, outbursts of anger. Folberth was a teacher and later the director of the Lutheran gymnasium in his hometown; he fought in the Romanian army during World War II, and settled after the war in Salzburg, where he became professor at the university. He recalled Berde's reading even in 1981, in his thank-you words for the Mozart medal.

3 See János Ritoók, *Kettős tükrök. A magyar-szász együttélés multjából és a két világhábrú közötti irodalmi kapcsolatok történetéből* [Double Mirror. From the Past of the Hungarian-Saxon Coexistence; About the their Literary Relations during the Interwar Period] (Bucharest: Kriterion, 1979), 28-32. Ritoók's excellent book, to which I am greatly indebted, will be abbreviated throughout this article as "R."

4 Quoted in R 28, based on the original in Carl Göllner, *Die Siebenbürger Sachsen in den Revolutionsjahren 1848-1849* [The Transylvania Saxons in the Revolutionary Years of 1848-1849] (Bucharest, 1967), 44.

treatment will concern the literary relations that developed but ultimately failed during Berde's lifetime, but before I turn to her generation a few words need to be said of the dynamics of transcultural interaction in Transylvania in the period 1849-1918.

How did Transylvania's literary culture look in the nineteenth century? The region had German and Hungarian theaters, above all in Kolozsvár/Klausenburg/Cluj, and some good libraries, notably the Hermannstadt/Nagyszeben/Sibiu library and the museum of Baron Samuel von Bruckenthal (1721–1803) that opened to the public in 1817, the Honterus Library in Kronstandt/Brassó/Braşov), and the Marosvásárhely/Târgu Mureş library of the Teleki family that opened to the public in 1798.⁵ But its rich tradition in printing, which started with Johannes Honterus (1498–1548), Gáspár Heltai (c. 1520–1575), and Miklós Tótfalusy Kis (c. 1650–1702), and continued in the 1830s and 40s with the publishing activities of Johann Gött (1810–1888), a German from Frankfurt who settled in Kronstadt, had withered by the second half of the century. Transylvania became somewhat of a cultural backwater, and not only because the events during 1848–49 and the subsequent severe Austrian suppression devastated it. Two of its greatest Hungarian writers, Miklós Jósika (1794–1865) and Zsigmond Kemény (1814–1875), had moved to Budapest already prior to 1848, and the literary cultures of the Saxons and the Romanians were still just emerging. The writers of all three nations attempted to strengthen the ethnic identity of their group by writing historical novels and dramas that evoked and (re)constructed the great figures and events of their national past. Their horizon was limited.

1848-49 deeply divided the Transylvanians, for the Hungarian diet did little to assure the autonomy and privileges of the Saxons and Romanians. Stephan Ludwig Roth was, as we saw, tragically executed. His Romanian counterpart was Avram Iancu (1824–1872), the leader of the Transylvanian Romanians, who initially supported Kossuth but turned against him when the Romanian demands were ignored. He became a national hero and a symbolic descendant of the Dacians in *Avram Iancu* (1934) by Lucian Blaga (1895-1961). Still, many liberal Saxons, some of them expatriates from Germany and Austria, supported the Hungarian revolution. Anton Kurz (1799-1849) was Bem's adjutant and died with Petőfi in the battle of Segesvár. Leopold Max Moltke (1819-1894), an immigrant from Prussia, praised Kossuth as "the president of the first Republic of Eastern Europe."

The Austrian neo-Absolutism of the 1850s further weakened Transylvania's independent cultural life. By the time it started to recover, it was hit by the 1867 Compromise between Austria and Hungary, which recognized Transylvania's 1848 annexation. The actions of the Hungarian authorities once more differed from their rhetoric: the diet enacted laws about minority rights in 1868, but the government started an aggressive policy of Magyarization that increasingly forced Transylvania's embittered Romanian and Saxon political elite to seek help and alliance beyond the borders, in Vienna and Bucharest.

The most important literary activity during the post-1848 decades was the collection and publication of folklore in all three of the major languages and

5 I shall introduce the Transylvanian place names in three languages but will subsequently use the version that is most appropriate for the specific context.

cultures. Joseph Haltrich (1822-1886) published in 1856 Saxon folk tales, and Friedrich Müller (1828-1915) a year later a volume of Saxon legends. Atanasie Marian Marienescu (1830-1915) followed with the publication of Transylvanian Romanian carols and folk ballads in 1859, and, last but not least, János Kriza (1811-1875) published in 1863 his *Vadrózsák* (Wild Roses), the most important nineteenth-century collection of folk poetry, not only in Transylvania but in the whole of Hungary.

The development of literary and cultural institutions in the second half of the nineteenth century was encouraging though slow. Imre Mikó (1805-1876) led a campaign in 1857 that resulted in the foundation of a Hungarian cultural and scientific association in Kolozsvár, the *Erdélyi Múzeum Egylet* (Transylvanian Museum Association). In 1861, Timotei Cipariu (1805-1887) launched in Sibiu the *Asociațiunea Transilvană pentru Literatura Română și Cultura Poporului Român* or ASTRA (The Transylvanian Society for the Literature and Culture of the Romanian People), whose activities extended into the Transcarpathian provinces. The *Kemény Zsigmond Társaság* (Zsigmond Kemény Literary Society) was founded in Marosvásárhely in 1876, the *Erdélyi Irodalmi Társaság* in 1888 in Kolozsvár. Prior to World War I, more than a third of the books published in Hungary went to Transylvania, but local printing shriveled.⁶ The University of Kolozsvár was founded in 1872; though it did not become bilingual as the Romanians requested, it did receive a Romanian Chair. In retrospect, the most important literary event at the new university was perhaps Hugó Meltzl's *Acta comparationis litterarum universalum / Összehasonlító Irodalomtörténeti Lapok* (Papers on Comparative Literature; 1877-88), the first of its kind in the world, which adopted a broadly international attitude in opposition to the nationalist trends.

There were no great Saxon writers in the nineteenth century, though literary production slowly started to improve in the second half with historical novels, historical dramas, and plenty of *Heimatsliteratur*, romantic and idyllic poetry and prose concerned with rural and small-town provincial life. Saxon historical fiction concerned itself with cultural rather than military heroes, figures that had gotten involved in politics and war because of their cultural roles. Michael Weiss, the wise judge and leader of Hermannstadt, figures prominently in Jósika's *Az utolsó Báthory* (and later also Zsigmond Móricz's *Erdély* trilogy), but the first important Saxon work about him, *Michael Weiss* by Adolf Meschendörfer (1877-1963), was published only in 1919. Traugott Teutsch (1829-1913), the most important nineteenth-century Saxon writer, published in 1874 a work on Sachs von Harteneck (1664-1703), who fled to Hermannstadt because of religious persecution. Harteneck is said to have been responsible for securing from the Emperor the *Diploma Leopoldinum* (1690), which regulated the status of Transylvania's ethnic and religious constituents, but was executed in 1703 for having overstepped his jurisdiction, and, above all, because his adulterous wife became involved in a murder case. In Saxon literary and cultural history he is remembered as a loyal subject of the Emperor victimized by Hungarian intrigues. Teutsch's main drama was *Johannes Honterus* (1898), a rather undramatic account of the great scholar, educator,

6 Gábor Barta et al., ed., *History of Transylvania*. (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1994), 596.

and geographer. Michael Albert (1836–1893) was the first that tried in 1883 his hand at something like a foundational myth with *Die Flandrer am Alt* (The Flemish at the Alt/Olt), which dramatizes the arrival of early Saxon settlers in Transylvania and their battle with the indigenous pagan tribes. Those early settlers, if indeed there were any, came not from Saxony but rather from the lower Rhine area and may have included some Flemish people.

The great opening of Saxon literature came with Meschendörfer's journal *Die Karpathen* (The Carpathians; 1907-14). Meschendörfer studied in Strassbourg, returned in his twenties to his native city Kronstadt, for which he later erected a literary monument in his novel *Die Stadt im Osten* (City in the East; 1931). He started in Kronstadt a modern library and a society to further the city's culture; between 1926 and 1940 he was rector of its famous Honterus gymnasium. He started his literary career at the Herrmannstadt *Tagesblatt*, where he attacked the provincial manifestations of *Heimatliteratur*. In 1908 he published the first modern Saxon novel, *Leonore*. *Die Karpathen* introduced its Saxon readers to the modern literary trends of western Europe, but also to Hungarian folk poetry and to such Hungarian writers as Gyula Juhász (1883–1937), Dezső Kosztolányi (1885–1936), Ferenc Molnár (1878–1952), Elek Benedek (1859–1929), and István Petelei (1852–1910).

The main figures of the Transylvanian-Romanian literary elite in the second half of the nineteenth century were George Barițiu (1812–1893), Iosif Vulcan (1841–1907), and, above all, Ioan Slavici (1848–1925). Barițiu published the *Foaie pentru minte, inimă și literatură* (Paper for the Mind, the Soul and Literature) in Sibiu. Vulcan launched his *Familia* (1865), the first important Romanian cultural periodical, in Pest but moved it to Nagyvárad/Oradea in 1880. He was elected both to the Hungarian literary society *Kisfaludy Társaság* and the Romanian Academy. Slavici, moved to Bucharest after his studies in Vienna but started in 1884 in Sibiu the cultural daily *Tribuna*. Slavici translated works of Mór Jókai, and he also wrote about the situation of Jews in Romania and Romanians in Hungary. In his novel *Mara* (1894) the various ethnic groups of Transylvania interact but preserve their individuality. *Tribuna* became a platform for Romanian Transylvanian intellectuals. It encouraged, for example, the "Memorandum" movement, initiated in 1892 by Ioan Rațiu (1828–1902) and his National Romanian Party. After extended conflicts, severe Hungarian repression followed: books and actors from the Romanian provinces were not allowed to enter Transylvania, the "Congress of Nationalities" (with Romanians, Serbs, and Slovaks) was prevented from meeting, and *Tribuna* was suppressed in 1903. Gheorghe Coșbuc (1866–1918), perhaps the most important writer in the generation after that of Slavici, wrote in his first collection, *Balade și idile* (Ballads and Idylls; 1893), about the hardships of the Transylvanian Romanian peasants under Hungarian rule.

The Fin-de-siècle Generation

A remarkable new generation of Romanian, Hungarian, and Saxon writers was born in Transylvania during the last two decades of the nineteenth century. The Hungarians included Dezső Szabó (1879–1945) and Sándor Reményik, (1890–1941), both born in Kolozsvár, Lajos Áprily [Jékely] (1887–1967), born in Brassó, Endre Ady (1877–1919), born Érdmindszent, József Nyirő (1889–1953),

Áron Tamási (1897–1966), Marcell Benedek (1885–1969), Mária Berde, Gábor Gaál (1891–1954), Károly Kós (1883–1977), Aladár Kuncz (1885–1931), Károly Molter (1890–1981) and Sándor Makkai (1890–1952).

Of the Romanians I mention in this context Liviu Rebreanu (1885–1944), born in Tîrlîşiu, near Naszód/Năsăud, Octavian Goga (1881–1938), born in Răşinari/Resinár, just south–west of Sibiu, Emil Isac (1886–1954), born in Cluj, Lucian Blaga, born in Lancrăm/Lámkerék, Aron Cotruş, (1891–1957), and Nichifor Crainic (1889–1972).

The Saxon generation included Heinrich Zillich (1898–1988), born in Bod/Botfalu, just north of Kronstadt, Oskar Walter Cisek (1897–1966), Ernst Jekelius (1896–1958), born in Hermannstadt, Egon Hajek (1888–1963), Hermann Klöß (1880–1948), and Otto Folberth (1896–?), born in Medias/Medgyes, Harald Krasser (?–?), Erwin Wittstock (1899–1962), and Richard Csaki (1886–1943).

I start my discussion with two slightly older key figures, the Hungarian Miklós Bánffy (1873–1950) and the Romanian Nicolae Iorga (1871–1940), for both of them had an important impact on their country outside Transylvania. Bánffy, a descendant of an ancient Transylvanian aristocratic family, was not only a writer and painter, but also the representative of Kolozsvár in the Hungarian parliament between 1910–1912, director of the Budapest Opera and the National Theater (1913–18), and Minister of Foreign Affairs in 1921–22. Like Aladár Kuncz and others, he moved back to Transylvania in the interwar period, and became a Romanian citizen in 1926. In 1943 the Hungarian government commissioned Bánffy to negotiate with the Romanian opposition leader Iuliu Maniu (1873–1951) about turning jointly against the Nazis, but Maniu insisted on the return of Northern Transylvania to Romania and the attempt failed. Bánffy stayed in Transylvania in the first postwar years but finally moved to Budapest in 1950.

The Romanian writer, polymath, and politician Nicolae Iorga was born in Botoşani/Botoşány, formally outside the borders of Transylvania, but his controversial and contradictory perspectives are quite relevant for us. In 1903 he joined Coşbuc and Al[exandru] Vlahuţă (1858–1919) to edit their newly launched populist and nationalist review *Sămănătorul* (The Sower), but Iorga founded in 1906 his own newspaper *Neamul românesc* (The Romanian Nation), to which he wrote daily contributions to the very end of his life. In 1910, Iorga co-founded with A.C. Cuza (1857–1947) the Democratic Nationalist Party. By 1920, Cuza, a violent anti-Semite, split from the party and gradually shifted further and further to the extreme right. Iorga, who was a more moderate anti-Semite, briefly participated in but then took his distance from Maniu's National Peasant Party. When the fascist General Ion Antonescu seized power in 1940 Iorga courageously defended the abdicated king and attacked the now ruling Iron Guard, which responded by assassinating him.

Iorga's Romanian literary history was the first to unite the various Romanian texts and writers into a grand narrative of an organic and spontaneous growth of native creativity, based on local tradition and folklore. But Iorga wanted to relate his inward looking nationalism to the Romance cultures, and, as a Byzantologist, to the extension of Byzantine culture. In *Byzantium after Byzantium* (1935) Iorga wanted to show the after life of that Empire, especially in the Romanian principalities. He also wanted to show that Roman customs were preserved by

the Romanian peasantry, that certain “Romanii populare” (“People’s Roman-like polities”) survived through the Middle Ages and served as the basis for the specifically Romanian relations between peasant-voivodes and the people. Iorga’s organic theory of national culture supported the myth that the ancient Thracians and Dacians were the foundation of a Carpathian-Balkan-Byzantine spirit. In Hunedoara/Vajdahunyad county Iorga found his Dacians, those “who won, the onetime lords of this land who have prevailed in spite of the chains and the bloodletting imposed on them by their foes. Their invincible courage and patient perseverance triumphed in the end. Look around you now, here are the true Dacians, the new Dacians of 2,000 years past, who carry with them as a sign of their triumph the language of a Rome long consigned to dust. The peasants here are indeed Dacians, with their tough and reserved features, their tight-lipped and ancient custom of paying everyone their due with a sense of justice and not the vengeful ‘an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth’.”⁷

In view of this myth-based national theory it is astonishing that Iorga should have advocated minority rights and a reconciliation between Romanians, Hungarians, and Saxons. When the Saxons published in 1919 a volume about themselves, *Cine sînt și ce vor sașii din Ardeal* (Who are the Transylvanian Saxons and what they want), Iorga wrote a friendly preface to it, praising their high level of civilization and their function as a bridge between East and West.⁸ In the early 1920s, he organized a free university at Vălenii de Munte, to which he invited Saxon lecturers as well as the Hungarian scholars Árpád Bitay (1896–1937) and Imre Kádár (1894–1972).⁹ As Prime Minister of Romania (1931–32), he created an under-secretary post for minority affairs and filled it with a Saxon, and a Saxon, Gustav Rösler, was appointed as adviser in the Ministry of Education.¹⁰ In a parliamentary speech of 1931 Iorga declared:

*“[we Romanians] do not wish to annihilate people that have historical traditions [...] We do not want to shape a good German or a good Hungarian into a pharisaic Romanian who surrenders his past and sells his soul for some profit, for this would be disadvantageous for the Romanian people, an insidious poison that could be detrimental for the whole nation. Coercion of a nation’s soul always turns against those who forced the coercion.”*¹¹

7 Nicolai Iorga, *Válogatott Írások* [Selected Writings] (Bucharest: Kriterion, 1971), 167-69.

8 *Cine sunt și ce vor fii sașii din Ardeal. Expunere din izvor competent, cu o prefață Nicolae Iorga* [Who are the Transylvanian Saxons and what they want. An Exposition from a trustworthy source with a preface by Nicolae Iorga] (Bucharest: Cultura neamului românesc, 1919). Bilingual edition: *Die Siebenbürger Sachsen. Wer sie sind und was sie wollen*. Ed. Paul Philippi (Köln: Böhlau, 1969).

9 On Bitay’s lectures see Ferenc Kovács, “Bitay Árpád előadásai Nicolae Iorga szabadegyetemén” [The lectures of Árpád Bitay at the free university of Nicolae Iorga] *Korunk* 1975: 712-16 (qtd. in R 220)

10 On Iorga and the minorities see Dan Berindei, “Nicolae Iorga centenáriumán” [On the centenary of Nicolae Iorga] *Korunk* (1971): 1136.

11 Quoted in R 71, from “Ministerpräsident Iorga über das Untersekretariat für Minderheiten.” *Siebenbürgisch-Deutsches Tageblatt*, December 16, 1931, p. 1. When Berde appealed to Iorga that they made her fail her Romanian language examination, Iorga personally intervened on August 22, 1934 (R 220).

In contrast to Iorga, Lucian Blaga spent most of his adult life in Cluj/Kolozsvár, where a special university chair of philosophy and culture was created for him.¹² He translated works by Ady and others; in turn, translations of his poems and dramas were published in the *Erdélyi Helikon* (1930: 42-43, 56; 1933: 658) by Lajos Áprily, Oszkár Bárd (1892–1942), Berde, Imre Kádár (1894–1972), and Ferenc Szemlér (1906–1978); *Klingsor* published his poems in translations by Harald Krasser, Zillich, and others. He corresponded with Bárd, Szemlér, Zillich, Cisek, and others in the interwar years, and he protested against the prohibition of performing Madách's *Az ember tragédiája* in the Hungarian theater of Cluj/Kolozsvár in 1923.¹³ Of the tensions that inevitably remained, Reményik's moving poem, "A kinyújtott és a visszahúzott kéz" (The Extended and the Withdrawn Hand), testifies. The Hungarian poet notes that a kinship exists between Blaga's poetry and his own because they both speak of trees and woods, of echo and thundering; and yet, Reményik's poem concludes with a withheld gesture:

"Kinyújtanám most feléd a kezem
És mégse nyújtom.
Fekete erdő van közöttünk,
Keserű árok van közöttünk,
Ledöntött szobrok, elnémult harangok
Kísértenek közöttünk.
Tudom, te mindezekről nem tehetsz,
De hordozod a "győztes" végzetét,
Amint az "elbukottát" hordom én. »¹⁴

I would extend my hand to you / and yet I don't extend it. A black forest is between us / a bitter ditch is between us, / Toppled monuments, muted bells swerve as ghosts between us. / I know, all this is not your fault, / But you carry the fate of the victor, / While I that of one who "failed."

If Reményik's poem speaks of the psychological and physical barriers between Romanians and Hungarians after 1919, Liviu Rebreanu's life and writings illuminate the bitter antecedents, when Hungary acted as the "victor". Rebreanu, one of the greatest twentieth-century Romanian novelists, attended the Hungarian high schools in Beszterce/Bistrița (1897-1899) and Sopron (1900-1903) before enrolling in the Ludoviceum Military Academy (Ludovika) in 1903-1906. Well-read in German and Hungarian literature, Rebreanu began his literary career by writing in Hungarian for Hungarian journals. Due to erroneous accusations that he embezzled military funds Rebreanu shuttled between Romania and Hungary, was briefly arrested, but finally exonerated

12 Between 1940 and 1944, when Cluj belonged to Hungary, Blaga taught in Sibiu. He returned to Cluj after the war, but the communists deprived him of his chair.

13 "Tragedia omului", [The tragedy of man] *Patria*, January 27, 1923. The Romanian National Theater of Bucharest prepared in 1929 a presentation of Madács's tragedy, but the production did not materialize.

14 Quoted in Jancsó Elemér, "Erdély irodalmi élete 1918-tól napjainkig" [The literary life of Transylvania from 1918 until today] (*Nyugat* 1935/4).

when the culprit confessed. He settled in Bucharest, but much of what he wrote, especially his greatest novel, *Pădurea spînzuraților* (Forest of the Hanged; 1922), deals with Transylvania and the problems of double loyalty.

The gruesome opening scene of *Pădurea spînzuraților* depicts the hanging of a Czech officer of the Austro-Hungarian army who attempted to desert. The novel's Romanian protagonist, Apostol Bologa, unhesitatingly votes for the death sentence as a member of the military tribunal adjudicating the case. The remainder of the novel portrays how Bologa gradually follows the path of the hanged man. First he wavers between his growing sense of ethnicity and his loyalty towards the Monarchy, whose Transylvanian-born citizen he is. When he is to face the Romanian army he requests to be transferred; his request is denied, and after much reflection he makes a half-hearted attempt to cross to the other side. He is caught, condemned to death, and executed, just as the Czech officer he himself condemned, and just as Rebreanu's own brother, who was executed in 1917. Refusing both the fanaticism of his Romanian brothers and the imperial chauvinism of Lieutenant Varga, who calls on all nations to fight for the Empire against a "common foe", Bologa opts for a martyrdom that questions fanaticism and war. In this sense, *Pădurea spînzuraților* is a profound psychological drama about divided loyalties in a complex society such as Transylvania.

The poet and politician Octavian Goga chose the path of the fanatics. Born in Rășinari, just outside Sibiu, of a priest and a mother who taught him German and Hungarian (and published herself some poetry in *Familia*), Goga enrolled at age nine in the Hungarian High School in Sibiu. Due to some conflict with his history teacher he had to leave this school and transfer to into the 8th grade at the Romanian High School in Brașov, where his teachers included some Romanian nationalists. Between 1900 and 1904 he studied with a grant from the Gojdu foundation at the University of Budapest but received no degree. With a grant from the cultural society "Transylvania" he also studied in Berlin.

Goga published in *Luceafărul* (The Morning Star) and became co-editor in 1902 of this magazine, which, as he explained, was a magazine for followers of Eminescu in Budapest. The related Luceafărul Publishing Institute also printed his first collection, *Poezii*, in Budapest in 1905. Initially entitled "At Home", it was supposed to be a new *Georgicon*, describing the occupations and traditions of Transylvanian Romanians, especially those living in villages. He won with the volume a prize of the Romanian Academy. Between 1910 and 1912 he was imprisoned in Budapest and Szeged for attacking the Monarchy.

When the Hungarian Minister of Religion and Culture, János Zichy, declared on December 13, 1912 that the minorities in Hungary had a right to their language but the Hungarian state could allow only a single culture within its borders, namely, the all-powerful and imperishable one inspired by the Hungarian soul, Goga responded in the January 7, 1913 issue of *Românul* (The Romanian), the leading Romanian paper in Hungary, that in the so-called Hungarian literature the dying race of Hungarians had been replaced by figures called Meyer, Durand and Löwy, or, for that matter, Kiss (referring to the highly respected József Kiss, editor of the liberal journal *A hét* (The week)). The culprit in all this was Budapest, "this sudden city, with its Americanism, cabarets, Jews, jargon of Dohány utca, obscenities of the night." Kiss, with all his talent and charm, was part of this: "Hungarian national literature came to an end in

poetry with Petőfi and János Arany, in prose with Mikszáth, yielding to a Jewish national literature of Budapest, which rules today.” Ady, a friend of Goga who had attempted earlier to bring him closer to the new generation of Hungarian writers around the journal *Nyugat*, responded on May 16, 1913: as a “fanatic friend of the Romanians”, he thought that Goga spoke out of envy, for Hungary “had lived its life always a bit with Europe”, and Jewish-Hungarian literature was part of this.¹⁵

World War I terminated the Ady-Goga relation, though Goga, for all his anti-Semitism and chauvinism, continued to respect Ady, and even bought his castle in Csucs/Ciucea after Ady’s death. During the war, Goga’s journalism and poetry focused on the Romanians in Transylvania, urging Romanians to turn against the Central Powers. He became Minister of Culture and Religious Affairs immediately after the war. Though he continued to move towards the radical right wing, his contacts with the Transylvanian Hungarians did not completely break down. According to Géza Tabéry (1890-1958),¹⁶ he was even present at the occasion when János Kemény (1903-1971) proposed to host yearly Hungarian writers at the castle he inherited in Marosvécs.¹⁷ Goga completed his Romanian translation of Madách’s *Az Ember tragédiája*, the *Tragedia omului*, in 1934.¹⁸ In 1937 he became Romania’s Prime Minister, and, trying to outflank the Iron Guard, he pushed through the legislature Romania’s first anti-Semitic laws. The measure triggered a diplomatic row with England and France, so that Goga had to resign after only forty days in office. He died from a stroke soon afterwards.

Ady’s response to Goga’s anti-Semitic article of 1913 actually released a flurry of further responses, both in Hungary and in Romania. Two of them are most relevant here: Emil Isac’s “Kolozsvári levél Ady Endrének”, an enthusiastically supportive open letter of Ady’s position that Isac published in the February 17 issue of the Budapest paper *Világ*,¹⁹ and the very warm open letter to Isac that Ignotus, editor of *Nyugat*, published in his journal (*Nyugat*, 1913/6), entitled “Az új magyar irodalom” (The New Hungarian Literature), which inaugurated a brief but intensive contact between Isac and the *Nyugat* until the war broke out.²⁰ Isac published in *Nyugat* (1913/12) an article entitled “Új románság” (New Romanians), which argued that Romanians and Hungarians needed each other because they were both isolated in a Slavic region increasingly dominated by Russia. In the remaining few months prior to World War I Isac’s

15 The relevant texts and their historical background are excellently edited by József Láng in vol. 11 of Ady’s *Összes prózai művei* [The collected works in prose of Endre Ady] (Budapest: Akadémiai könyvkiadó, 1982), pp. 17-19, 63-65, 198-214, and 271-84.

16 *Emlékkönyv* [Book of Remembrances] (Kolozsvár: Erdélyi Szépmíves Céh, 1930).

17 Kemény was actually born in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, where his penniless father worked as a secretary. It was after the death of his father that the remaining family returned to Transylvania.

18 Bucharest: Fundația Regele Carol. Szemlér gave the translation a superlative review in *EH* 1935: 176-81.

19 P. 9. The text is reprinted in Ady’s *Összes prózai művei* (see note 15) p. 284-85; Isac’s letter was also published in the Bucharest daily *Adevărul*.

20 Isac came from a distinguished Romanian family in Cluj and remained in the city all his life, helping to bring its Romanian literary life to a flowering.

name frequently appeared in the *Nyugat*: the journal announced his book (1914/1), printed a little dialogue of his entitled “A szerecsen” (1914/3), and his critical review of Goga’s play “Domnul Notar”, a play that portrayed Hungary’s political and social disorder and was staged with great success in the Bucharest National Theater (1914/7). Furthermore, Isac published in *Nyugat* a necrology of the Romanian King Carol, praising him as a great and wise king (1914. 21), and, last but not least, an article entitled “A román-magyar béke” (The Romanian-Hungarian Peace; *Nyugat* 1914/24), which somewhat naïvely expressed faith in the Romanians and Hungarians, and even trust in the “békeakció” (peace campaign) that the Hungarian prime minister István Tisza (1861-1918) initiated just before the outbreak of World War I.

After 1914 Isac did not publish anymore in *Nyugat* but he managed to sustain his warm relations with Hungarian writers (Aladár Kuncz, for instance, befriended him during his studies in Kolozsvár) and his faith in Romanian-Hungarian cooperation. As he wrote in the 1920 article “Egy magyar költőhöz” (To a Hungarian Poet):

“There is only one possible politics in Romania: the politics of true democracy. By its very nature such politics safeguards the rights of everybody, our Romanian one just as much as that of you, Hungarians, who lead today an isolated life in Transylvania though you could enjoy rights that nations deserve [...] it is the duty of Romanian writers to initiate divorce proceedings from the negative traditions and to start getting to know you. And then, the great masses that are under the influence of circles that control the cultural life of the minorities will rise to that level of human consciousness from which they were removed because of the great war.”²¹

Isac advocated similar ideas elsewhere, for instance in the Hungarian journal *Napkelet*.²²

Three Novels on Pre-1919 Transylvania

Before we turn to Transylvania’s literary life in the 1920s, it will be instructive to see how prominent Hungarian and Saxon writers of the new generation portrayed the final decades of the Monarchy in Transylvania in three important but problematic novels, from different ethnic perspectives and at different historical moments: Dezső Szabó’s *Az elsodort falu* (The Swept-Away Village; 1919), Miklós Bánffy’s trilogy *Erdélyi történet* (Transylvanian History; 1934-40), and Heinrich Zillich’s *Zwischen Grenzen und Zeiten* (Between Borders and Times; 1936).

Only Szabó’s novel was written before Transylvania became Romanian. The author, a former member of the *Nyugat* circle, turned here against his

21 Quoted in R 70 and 219.

22 See Béla Pomogáts, *Transzilvánizmus. Az Erdélyi Helikon ideológiája* [Transylvanianism. The ideology of Erdélyi Helikon] (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1983), p. 101.

liberal and western-oriented friends, chastising them in a highly emotional, metaphoric-mystic language. *Az elsodort falu*, published on May 23, 1919, ends with an apotheosis of its idealized Szekler hero, János Bőjthe, who returns to his Transylvanian village after the war devastations, to start a new life and family. Unaware as yet of the short-lived Soviet Republic in Hungary, and Transylvania's integration into Romania, he embodies the superhuman energies and ethical purity that lay, according to Szabó, dormant in the Szeklers. János's two village friends (as well as all the remaining important characters) are failures: Miklós Farkas, the great poet resembling Endre Ady, vacillates between his belief in peasant values and his (mental, physical, urban, and cosmopolitan) decadence. He finally goes insane. Judit Farcády, the angelic beauty of the village, loves Miklós but becomes the mistress of Jews and finally a dissolute prostitute in Budapest.

The novel's true villains are Hungarians who import destructive foreign values into the country. Foremost among them are the Jews (whose depiction include some shocking stereotypes), western-oriented intellectuals and writers, feminists, the aristocrats, the clerics, officers that champion a war that the narrator portrays as senseless, the corrupt and foreign-oriented middle class, and many lower-class people overwhelmed by poverty, greed or alcohol. Applying Nietzsche to Transylvania, Szabó believes that the weak and ugly rule over the strong and healthy. He glorifies in János Bőjthe the strength and purity of the Szeklers as well as their un-Nietzschean compassion with the downtrodden.

Bánffy's Transylvanian trilogy shuttles back and forth between aristocratic life in Transylvania and Hungarian politics in Budapest, between the private life of a young conservative Transylvanian politician and Hungarian politicking. The portrayal of Transylvania is affectionate, the sketches of its declining aristocracy both ironic and sympathetic. Bálint Abády, somewhat of an autobiographical figure, cares little for the liberals and admires the conservative István Tisza. But he understands that change is inevitable, and he is sensitive to Transylvania's ethnic plurality. He is present when "the banner of the Transylvanian Movement" is unfurled on March 12, 1910 in Marosvásárhely. As the novel suggests from the perspective of the later 1930s, when Bánffy wrote his book:

*"[This movement] had come into being as a result of a widespread feeling in Transylvania that its individual traditions and history, as well as its own very special spirit, had become less and less recognized, let alone respected, by the central government in Budapest, who were all too apt to think of Transylvania as just one of a string of otherwise insignificant provinces. Nothing of its riches, neither of historical achievement and individual culture, nor of its real problems, was accorded any real importance in the capital. The Transylvanian spirit was slowly being drained away in the maw of Hungarian self-sufficiency and at best was ignored."*²³

Tisza, who is in the opposition at this point, listens politely but offers no support because he thinks that the movement smacks of particularism (31).

23 Bánffy, *And They Were Divided* (London: Arcadia, 2000), p. 30 f.

Bálint subsequently promises support “for a new law governing the rights of minorities” (32), but he is forced to postpone discussing the details when the Szekler representatives start “to demur” (32). His speech to the delegates, entitled “To all the Peoples of Transylvania” (32-36), is supposed to encapsulate (according to a note by Bánffy’s daughter) Bánffy’s maiden speech in the Hungarian Parliament in 1910. It is a particularist complaint that addresses the question of minority rights, but only in general terms:

“...we are forced to witness the degradation of our ethnic minorities [...] A national policy that is as uncaring as it is ignorant regarding our minority problems is now increasingly producing dangerous irredentist and seditious tendencies, tendencies which can be justified as provoked by unfair treatment. [...] [F]or centuries in Transylvania people have lived happily together regardless of race or creed or language. Everybody who is or wishes to be at home in this country must be welcomed and made to feel at home with confidence that nowhere will he find any form of discrimination.”²⁴

As if to illustrate this, Bálint successfully defends some Romanians who are ruthlessly exploited by corrupt Hungarian local potentates. But non-Hungarians appear only in this episode, and the novel does not address concretely the question how to grant linguistic, political, and cultural autonomy for the minorities.

Zillich’s *Zwischen Grenzen und Zeiten* relies on autobiographical material to portray the tensions within the Saxon community and between Transylvania’s ethnic constituents, turning Bánffy’s 1914 *Götterdämmerung* into an extended agony that reaches into 1919. Like Bánffy’s trilogy and Szabó’s *Az elsodort falu*, *Zwischen Grenzen und Zeiten* shuttles back and forth between a small Transylvanian community and the metropolis of Budapest. Like Szabó’s novel, it contains war scenes and devotes several chapters to the misery of people fleeing the invading Romanian army in 1916. Unlike Szabó, Zillich does not portray scenes of cruelty perpetrated by the invaders. All three writers employ traditional “omniscient” external narrators, whose perspectives and language essentially coincide with that of the “hero.” Zillich follows the Saxon/Hungarian/Romanian generation born just before 1900 through the eyes of a Saxon narrator who is firmly convinced as to the Saxons’ cultural, historical, and ethical superiority. His Saxons resent the Magyarization and increasingly identify with their linguistic kins in Austria and Germany. Nevertheless, Zillich’s novel gives ample attention to members of the other ethnic communities, many of whom are attractive, except for the novel’s only Jew. In the final scene from 1919, the Saxon protagonist is drafted into the Romanian army to fight the Hungarian Soviet Republic.

24 Ibid. p. 33 and 34.

Attempting, and Failing, to Build a Transylvanian Transnational Literary Community

World War I ended with the dissolution of the Habsburg Monarchy and the annexation of Transylvania to Romania. What was a dream-come-true for the Romanians became a traumatic adjustment to minority status for the Hungarians, and a reorientation for the Saxons. For Romanian literature, the annexation of Transylvania and Bukovina brought new opportunities, but also tensions, resulting from a conversion to a multi-ethnic state, and a clash between national and regional interests. The Hungarian writers of Transylvania had to come to terms with their minority status, which also involved a reconceptualization of their relation to the literary scene in Hungary; the Saxons writers, who had functioned already in a minority culture, had to assume a new attitude with respect to the now dominant Romanian culture, and reconsider their relation to the German literary culture beyond Transylvania's borders.

Right after the war, no Saxon writer wrote, to my knowledge, extreme right-wing or chauvinistic texts. Those emerged, as we shall see, only after Hitler's takeover in 1933. Because of Romania's repressive censorship, revisionist, irredentist, or just protesting Hungarian writings could not be published in Transylvania. The bitter and angry poems that Reményik wrote under the pseudonym "Végvári" first circulated as typescripts and were then published in Budapest.²⁵ It was different with the Transylvanian Romanian writers, foremost among them Goga and Cotruș. The latter edited after 1919 new publications in Arad and Timișoara and continued to write expressionist, often violent poetry. Like the Hungarian József Nyirő, who badly veered towards the extreme right during the war, Cotruș had to flee with the Germans and settled in Madrid after the war. (Did the two right-wingers on the opposite ethnic side ever meet in Franco's Spain?) But Nyirő wrote as an émigré about the bitter life of exiles and the fate of Transylvania,²⁶ Cotruș continued to write on the ethnic and social battles of the Romanians.

Though the political conditions and relations were unfavorable, a rich Transylvanian literature emerged in all three languages in the 1920s. One index to this is to be found in high-quality journals. The most substantial Romanian intellectual journal, *Gândirea* (Thought; 1921-44), was launched in Cluj by the Moldavian-born Cezar Petrescu (1892-1961) and published in its first two years translations from Ady, Mihály Babits (1883-1941), and others. Unfortunately, the journal moved to Bucharest at the end of 1922 and became decidedly nationalistic after 1926, when Nichifor Crainic became its sole editor. As we shall see, the venerable *Familia* of Oradea remained much more open in the bordering Partium.

The first important Saxon post-war organ, the *Ostland*, launched by Richard Csaki in Sibiu in June 1921, brought next to literature also articles on

25 *Segítsetek!* (*Hangok a végekről*) [Help me! (Voices from the fringes)] in 1919, and *Mindhalálig* [Until I die] in 1921, followed in 1921 by a collection that brought these two slender volumes together.

26 See Béla Pomogáts, *Erdély hűségében* [Remaining faithful to Transylvania] (Csíkszereda: Pallas-Akadémia, 2002), pp. 101-102.

history, politics and other topics. The same year Egon Hajek started a successful yearbook for *Ostland*. Both publications actively sought an opening towards the other Transylvanian cultures, but *Ostland* had to close down already in 1921 and could be restarted only in 1926. By the end of the decade Csaki became a prominent spokesman for Transylvania in Germany and he subsequently made a questionable career by becoming the Director of the *Deutsches Auslandsinstitut* in Stuttgart under Hitler. Several of his publications were banned after the war.

The Saxon journal that replaced and went beyond Meschendörfer's *Die Karpathen* was *Klingsor* in Braşov, launched in 1924 by Zillich, after his return from Berlin with a doctorate in political science (*Staatskunde*). Zillich used the financial means of his father, who was the director of a Saxon sugar factory in his native village, and the talents of his friend Gustav Ongyerth (1897-1969)²⁷ to link the journal to a publishing house, an artistic salon, and a concert bureau. Most of the latter institutions had to close down for financial reasons after a few years, but *Klingsor* survived until 1939, and opened Saxon literature up to the world and to the other Transylvanian communities until the arrival of Hitler. As we shall see, from 1933 onward a rhetoric of "German Renaissance" smothered expressions of Transylvanian cooperation and understanding. The change was as much due to Zillich's own ideological reorientation as to the emergence of Saxon Nazi sympathizers, and political pressure from Germany. When Zillich departed for Germany in 1936, Harald Krasser took over the editorship and gave, once more, greater prominence to literary matters, but he was finally forced to close down *Klingsor* in 1939.

The Transylvania Hungarians were slow to recover from the war and the transfer to Romania. Leaving aside Reményik's "Végvári" poems (whose authorial pseudonym implied that he defended Hungarian culture as the defenders of outpost fortresses did against the Turks), the first important Hungarian literary and cultural event was the publication of the leaflet *Kiáltó szó* that Károly Kós (1883-1977), Árpád Paál (1889-1943), and István Zágoni published on January 23, 1921.²⁸ The same year, the journal *Pásztortűz* (Campfire; 1921-45) was launched under the chief editorship of Reményik, whose position became gradually more conciliatory and open over the next ten years. In 1927 another highly talented poet, Jenő Dsida (1907-1938), became the editor of *Pásztortűz*. Two additional high-quality Hungarian literary journals started publication in the 1920s: the Marxist and internationalist *Korunk* (Our Times; 1926-40), edited from 1929 onward by Gábor Gaál (until its demise when Northern Transylvania was reannexed by Hungary); and the *Erdélyi Helikon* (1928-44), whose chief editor became Bánffy, flanked by the editors Kuncz and Kós. As Áprily wrote in the greetings of the first issue the

27 Ongyerth established the German *Landestheater* in Sibiu in 1933 and directed it until 1945, when he fled to Germany.

28 *Kiáltó szó Erdély, Bánság, Körös-vidék és Máramaros magyarságához* [Shouting word to the Hungarians of Transylvania, Banat, the region of Körös and Máramaros] (Cluj/Kolozsvár, 1921). See Pomogáts's *A transzilvanizmus* (note 22), pp. 45-47. Although the pamphlet called for realism and self-examination, it was immediately suppressed by the Romanian authorities, who also initiated an investigation against the censor that permitted the printing.

Erdélyi Helikon, its Transylvanian orientation was no provincialism but an “observation deck unto the world.”

Of the three Hungarian literary journals the *Erdélyi Helikon* became the most influential, on account of its close ties with two other Hungarian literary initiatives, the *Erdélyi Szépmíves Céh* (Transylvanian Artist's Guild) and the *Helikon*, a loose association of Transylvanian writers. Indeed, the *EH* was a publication of the *Szépmíves Céh*, a publishing house founded in Cluj in 1924 by the architect and cultural historian Kós, together with his former colleagues at the *Keleti Ujság*, Paál, Nyirő, Imre Kádár, Ernő Ligeti, and Zágoni. *Szépmíves Céh* produced until 1944 hundred sixty-four high-quality Transylvanian books, among them works by Áprily, Dsida, Kós, Molter, Kuncz, and Tamási. The *EH* was also linked to the *Helikon*, a loose association of writers that the young János Kemény gathered in his castle at Marosvécs/Brâncovenesti, for the first time in July 1926.²⁹ The invited Saxon writer Robert Maurer reported to the readers of *Klingsor* that he sensed at the meeting both the tragedy and the inexhaustible vitality of Transylvania.³⁰ The leader of *Helikon* became Bánffy. This “literary plein-air parliament”, as Babits called it in his article “Transszilvanizmus” in the *Nyugat* (1931: 481), was dedicated to the ideals of coexistence and cooperation with the other Transylvanian nations, though not everybody subscribed to these principles all the time.

Although Transylvanianism was a widely shared idea among the Transylvanian Hungarian writers, it was only one of several cultural concepts. Four clashing political views emerged in Hungary and Transylvania: 1) irredentists demanded that Transylvania be reunited with Hungary; 2) Transylvanianists sought coexistence and local autonomy within a federalist structure, expressed by the slogan, “Transylvania belongs to the Transylvanian nations!”; 3) the Danubianists sought a transnational federation of the Danubian countries in the spirit of Oszkár Jászi (1875-1957); and 4) the communists, allied with the radical left around Gaál's *Korunk* (Our Age), wanted to reconstitute all of Eastern Europe by means of a transnational social revolution. Due to the persecution of the leftists under Horthy's regime, some radical intellectuals sought refuge in Transylvania and became cultural mediators. Gaál was able to recruit also a number of non-Hungarian contributors.

The four groups actually overlapped, and each of them was internally divided. *Korunk* published writings by liberal opponents of the Horthy regime; The populist Nyirő, heavily influenced by Szabó's *Az elsodort falu*, was a co-founder of the *Erdélyi Szépmíves Céh*, a regular member of the *Helikon* meetings, and a contributor to the *EH*. Various Hungarian writers and intellectuals adopted Transylvanianism, which meant for most of them a vaguely autonomous Transylvania, with equal rights for and participation from the three major constituents, the Romanians, Hungarians, and Saxons, and full freedom for the Jewish, Armenian, and other smaller minorities. This found certain parallels and support Blaga, whose work sought to define Transylvania's cultural-topographic specificity, or Zillich, who sought in the

29 The twenty-eight writers at the first meeting included Áprily, Bánffy, Berde, Dsida, Kós, Kuncz, Nyirő, Makkai, Reményik, and Tamási.

30 “Marosvécsesi Helikon”, *Klingsor* (1926): 367-69.

1920s elements that bind Transylvania's ethnic groups together. But the idea should have been launched when Transylvania was still part of Hungary. Bánffy's Transylvanianism around 1910 was still firmly based on the idea of Hungarian supremacy; by the 1920s it could no longer attract Romanian and Saxon support. As Zsigmond Vita (1906-1998) reported in 1934, the Romanian writers – he mentions specifically the novelist Teodor Mureșanu (1891–1966) – suspected political motives behind the Hungarian Transylvanianism, which could not be reconciled with the regionalist tendencies in Romanian writers like Coșbuc, Goga, and Ion Agârbiceanu (1882–1963).³¹ The problem with the Saxons was different. When Friedrich Müller-Langenthal (1884–1969), later Lutheran bishop of Transylvania, published an article in *Klingsor* with the title “Die siebenbürgische Seele” (1926: 252-57), a number of Hungarian writers felt uneasy, for they did not like the author's mystifying language. When Zillich entered the discussion it became apparent that the differences were group specific rather than individual.³² Still, the Transylvanianists had some success in opposing Hungarian irredentism by advocating the acceptance of the new borders and striving only for regional autonomy within Romania – which was, of course, an anathema on both sides of the border.

Kós, the leading and most consistent spokesman for Transylvanianism, held that the externally imposed decisions of 1848, 1867, and 1918 were neither desired nor accepted by the majority of Transylvania's inhabitants. The votes in the Hungarian Transylvanian Diet in 1848 and in the Romanian one in 1918 were divided.³³ Kós saw the region's uniqueness precisely in the variety and coexistence unknown in other parts of Hungary and Romania. In Transylvania, the national constituents traditionally “lived their own lives, building their own social and cultural institutions side by side, not mingling with each other, but not really bothering each other; rarely crossing each other's path, yet in touch with each other, learning from each other, influencing each other.”³⁴ Centuries of living side by side meant “sharing a common fate” (namely dependency on powers beyond Transylvania's borders) and being exposed to, even enriched by, external cultural currents, including the Turkish one.³⁵

The 1920s brought a renewal of Transylvanian Hungarian literature, but, above all, they initiated highly promising exchanges and cooperations between Transylvania's three ethnic groups, especially between Saxons and Hungarians. The prelude was the Petőfi commemoration that took place in 1922 at the site of his death in Segesvár/Sighisoara/Schässburg. More important was the year

31 Zsigmond Vita, “Transzilvánizmus a román irodalomban”, [Transylvaniam in Romanian Literature], *EH* (1934): 73-75.

32 See Molter, “Erdély egyénisége” [Transylvania's Individuality], *Korunk* 1926: 476-77; Zillich “Über die siebenbürgische Diskussion” [About the Transylvanian Dispute], *Klingsor* (1929): 235-37, and its Hungarian version, *EH* (1929): 470-72. Tamási was also skeptical.

33 Kós, *Transylvania. An Outline of its Cultural History* (Budapest: Szépirodalmi, 1989), 106-107. Trans. by Lorna K. Dunbar of *Erdély: kultúrtörténeti vázlat* [Transylvania, a cultural historical outline] 1934 (Budapest: Szépirodalmi Kiadó, 1988).

34 *Ibid.* p. 81.

35 *Ibid.* p. 87.

1926, when *Klingsor* brought out on June 6 a Hungarian issue³⁶ and the *Pásztortűz* on July 13 a Saxon issue. July of that year was also when the first *Helikon* meeting in Marosvécs took place (see R 77-80).

The first meeting of the Hungarian and Saxon writers took place in Nagyenyed/Aiud, in the first half of July, 1928, upon the initiative of Áprily, who worked there at the Collegium. The Saxon participants were Folberth, Jekelius, Wittstock, and Zillich; next to Áprily, the Hungarians included Berde, Kemény, Kós, Kuncz, Makkai, Molter, Tabéry, and Jenő Szentimrei (1891-1959). According to reports by Tabéry, and later by Folberth, it was a great success: wine and the natural setting quickly led to joviality and friendship, a fund on which the cooperation could thrive for about three years.³⁷

Indeed, the exchanges and personal encounters intensified first. In November 1928 *Pásztortűz* published its second Saxon issue, containing poems by Meschendörfer, Folberth, Klöß, and Zillich; several texts on Zillich, and Friedrich Müller-Langenthal's mentioned article on the "Transylvanian soul" (R 78). On the 17th of the same month the Saxon writers Meschendörfer, Klöß, Hajek, Folberth, Wittstock, and Zillich introduced themselves to a Hungarian audience in the Hungarian Piarist gymnasium of Cluj. On the Hungarian side Berde, Makkai, and Molter were especially active. Emil Isac, then inspector of the Transylvanian theaters, and Ion Clopoșel, chief editor of the paper *Patria* were also present (R 60-64). The return visit, postponed several times, took place in Brașov on September 28, 1929; this was the evening that Mária Berde read her "Erdélyi ballada"; Kemény, Bánffy, Molter, Sándor Kacsó (1901-?), János Bartalis (1893-1976), Imre Kádár (1894-1972), and Nyirő were also present. The banquet speech was given by Bánffy.³⁸ The same month *Klingsor* came out with another Hungarian issue, which contained novellas by Molter, Kacsó, and Jenő Székely, poems by Áprily and Bartalis, and Zillich's friendly report about the Marosvécs meeting of the *Helikon* that he attended (R 80-81). Unfortunately, this was the last of the Saxon-Hungarian meetings, though a Saxon-Hungarian-Romanian meeting was still held in Medias/Medgyes/Mediasch on March 19, 1931 with a nice program: an essay by Folberth, a novella by Tamási, poems by Szentimrei, Saxon songs, Romanian songs, and songs by Bartók and Kodály.³⁹

Translations, personal encounters, and friendly written exchanges continued for a while. Saxon writers were invited to meetings of the *Kemény Zsigmond Literary Society* of Marosvásárhely, where Wittstock read his novella

36 The issue contained poems by Áprily and Reményi; Folberth's article on literary history and his overview of the Hungarian journals; a review by Adolf Heltmann; and a study by László Rajka (R 77).

37 See Tabéry, *Emlékkönyv. Erdélyi Szépmíves Céh 1930, 81-82*; Folberth, "Die Stunde der 'Siebenbürgischen Seele' Vor 40 Jahren erklang ihr Glockenschlag." *Südostdeutsche Vierteljahresblätter* 1 (1968): 18-23. See also Zillich in R 106 and 216). The only heated discussion apparently occurred between the Hungarians about Dezső Szabó. Makkai and Szentimrei were on one side, Kuncz and Berde on the other.

38 The Hungarians were greeted by Zillich in the *Kronstädter Zeitung* ("Zum Vortragsabend des 'Erdélyi Helikon.'" (September 29): 4; Berde gave an account of the meeting: "A brassói Helikon napok", *EH* (1929): 748-50.

39 R 67, 71, and 214.

“Man ignoriert” on January 10, 1929, Zillich his story “Das Blut” on January 5, 1930, and Folberth seven of his poems on December 21, 1930.⁴⁰ When Kuncz died in 1931 several Saxon writers remembered him with extreme warmth. In May 1931 the *Erdélyi Helikon* brought out a Saxon number and *Klingsor* “responded” in June 1932 with another Hungarian issue that printed poems by Bartalis and László Tompa (1883–1964), an article by Jekelius on Székely novels, and Folberth’s travel diary about his visit to the painter Imre Nagy. In Marosvásárhely Molter and Berde organized a lecture series: the Romanian literary scholar Ion Chinezu talked about Hungarian literature,⁴¹ Hungarians lectured on Eminescu and Bălcescu, and Molter on Goethe (in German).⁴²

The series of promising meetings and exchanges ran against growing nationalism in all of Europe, and it stranded soon after Hitler came to power in Germany in 1933. When Meschendörfer published in 1931 his novel *Die Stadt im Osten* (City in the East) about young people growing up in Kronstadt, Molter wrote a warm, if not uncritical, review of it, praising it as a great advancement in Saxon literature, and Kós, who was also positive about it,⁴³ set out to translate the novel. It was published under the title *Corona* by the *Szépírók Céh* in 1933, with more than a few howlers (for which Berde took Kós to task). But this contribution to Saxon-Hungarian cooperation backfired. Already Kós cautioned in his epilogue that for all its artistic value the novel was not free of “exaggerations” and “errors” concerning the Hungarian past. In quieter times this might have passed unnoticed, or settled in private conversations. But the newly polarized atmosphere now led to broader and more violent accusations, recriminations, and exchanges. A few months later, Makkai started his reflections on the novel from the premise that the Saxons have always been isolated in Transylvania, and the Hungarians knew too little about them. Meschendörfer’s novel, according to Makkai, opened a first window on the Saxon mentality, revealing that their faith consisted of an almost pathological attachment to their community in the villages and cities. As to the image of the Hungarians: the novel contained no genuine Hungarian characters, and it made no attempt to portray the Hungarian soul. The novel dealt only with the Hungarian state, and the treatment revealed that the Saxon people were hostile to it.⁴⁴

In mid-summer 1933 Molter published in the *EH* an article entitled “A német szellem belháborúja” (The Internal War of the German Spirit; 1933: 459-70), and Zillich, who just expressed his support of the Nazi order,⁴⁵ responded furiously. According to Zillich, the Hungarians campaigned against the new German order, the Transylvanian Hungarian press was under Jewish influence.

40 R 217-18.

41 Chinezu published in 1930 a recent history of Transylvanian Hungarian literature: *Aspecte din literatura maghiară ardeleană: 1919-1929*, which has recently been translated into English: *Aspects of Transylvanian Hungarian Literature (1919-1929)*. Cluj-Napoca: Fundatia Culturala Romana, 1997.

42 See Berde, “A kultúrcsere-akció kistükre”, [The story of the cultural exchange] *Pásztortűz* (1932): 162.

43 Molter, *EH* (1932): 204-206; Kós, *Pásztortűz* (1932): 329-30.

44 Makkai, “Erdélyi sorsok”, [Transylvanian destinies] *EH* (1933): 305-15.

45 “Das Echo der zeitwandelnden Geschehnisse in Deutschland” (The echo of the epochal events in Germany), *Klingsor* (1933): 154-55.

Molter only spoke of the leftist German writers, the Remarques, the Zweigs, and the Kästners, but ignored writers that supported the new order, for instance Hanns Johst (1890-1978), Erwin Guido Kolbenheyer (1878-1962), and Hans Grimm (1875-1959).⁴⁶ Molter's response was a devastating critique of *Klingsor* and its new German orientation: "Zillich and his journal have believed in their ideology for a long time already, though they concealed it. Transylvanian good taste and the sense of propriety of this multi-peopled soil had restrained them from making more forceful declarations. But since [the arrival of] Hitler, since Jews and other minorities are ever more exposed Europe-wide to the fists of an ever-more unrestrained nationalism, suddenly all nationalists become heady with their race and start Jew baiting, start to instill a sense of weakness in all those that are less numerable than the sons of his nation."⁴⁷

The Nazi sympathies of Zillich and the "new" *Klingsor* became all too evident in the "Festschrift" that appeared in 1934 to celebrate the tenth anniversary of the journal. Zillich's introduction mentioned in passing a hand that *Klingsor* stretched out to the Transylvanian neighbors, but it immediately added that deeper and more urgently did the journal "melody" sing of a rebirth of the whole (German) Volk.⁴⁸ In recent years a great "clearance" has dissipated the "morning mist", so that *Klingsor* can now "march towards Noon."⁴⁹ The texts of the Festschrift continued with militant Nazi propaganda (some of the worst examples were by Zillich and his old-time collaborator Bernhard Capesius), and from now at least until Zillich's departure in 1936 this tone dominated *Klingsor*.⁵⁰ It had, of course, disastrous consequences for the Saxon-Hungarian literary relations. No Hungarian took part in *Klingsor's* anniversary celebration on March 11, 1934, and soon another war of words erupted, involving the theologian Sándor Tavaszy (1888-1951), the literary historian Gusztáv Abafáy (1901-1995), Kós, and Szemlér on the Hungarian side, and Jekelius, next to Zillich,⁵¹ on the German one. Szemlér, Kós, and Jekelius

46 "Ungarn und Deutsche" [Hungarians and Germans], *Klingsor* (1934): 76-78. The *EH* did publish translations of politically harmless poems by Johst and Kolbenheyer in 1935. Whether this was a reaction to Zillich's accusations is unclear.

47 Molter, "Az elvarázolt varázsló. Válasz Heinrich Zillichnek" [The Spellbound Sorcerer: Response to Heinrich Zillich] *EH* (1934): 459-65. Here 461.

48 "Aber dunkler und zwingender erklang uns immer die Melodie [...] Melodie der Neugeburt, der neuen Wege, nicht nur für Heimat und Land, sondern für unser ganzes Volk, so weit es siedeln mag." (p. 7)

49 "was sich verschob, war der Nebel der Frühe, aus dem wir jetzt in den Mittag schreiten. Freudig sehen wir hinter uns in der Helle die Jugend angetreten, marschbereit und geschlossen" (8).

50 Between 1933 and 1936 no article of *Klingsor* questioned Nazi power in Germany. The only article that suggested that Transylvanian Saxon literature should focus on problems at home – Emil Witting's "Aufgaben des siebenbürgisch-sächsischen Schrifttums" [Tasks of the Transylvanian Saxon Literature], *Klingsor*, 1934: 119-22 – was introduced with an editorial remark that distanced itself from the article's position. Such unanimity on Nazi Germany was not reached in the Saxon community itself, as Zillich noted several times in *Klingsor*, for instance 1934: 122-23.

51 Zillich's "Ungarn und Deutsche" *Klingsor* (1934): 76-78 was arrogant and full of innuendoes as well as explicit references to an allegedly Jewish domination of Hungarian and Hungarian-Transylvanian culture.

sought reconciliation,⁵² but the situation became irremediable when Zillich published his novella “Der baltische Graf” (The Baltic Count)⁵³ and his above-discussed opus magnum, *Zwischen Grenzen und Zeiten* (1936). Szemlér remarked in his review that the novel was based on a single idea, the mission of Germans in Europe and even in the world. The memory that Zillich evoked of the age was “dangerous and artless”, for it aggressively arrogated to German culture everything beautiful and good from the Rhine to the Volga and from the Baltic sea to the Mediterranean.⁵⁴

In retrospect, one is struck in this 1930s conflict between the Saxon and Hungarian journals not by the deterioration of the relations but by the courage and forthrightness of the Hungarian writers in opposing Nazi ideology – a daring that generally superseded that of the writers in Hungary itself, especially if we consider that in Transylvania it involved conflict with former friends, and that the community of Hungarian writers was by no means united. The communist sympathizers around *Korunk* and the other writers around the other journals strongly disagreed about the course to follow. Indeed, Viktor Aradi (1883-1937) and the *Korunk* camp criticized the idea of Transylvanianism and interpreted the earlier rapprochement between *EH* and *Klingsor* as founded on anti-Communism (R 94). On the right wing, Hungarian authors who later became Nazi sympathizers, like Nyírő, remained silent during this debate and did not come out to defend *Klingsor's* Nazi tendency. On the whole, the Hungarian writers were much more united in opposing Saxon Nazism than the Hungarian and Hungarian Transylvanian politicians were in defending their minority rights in Romania.

After 1933 *Klingsor* stopped publishing translations of Hungarian literature and severely curtailed reviews of it.⁵⁵ In the 1930s, especially after the Saxon-

52 See Jekelius, “Ungarisch-sächsische Literaturbeziehungen in Siebenbürgen” [Hungarian-Saxon Literary Relations in Transylvania], *Klingsor* (1935): 330-31; Kós, *EH* (1935): 617-19; Szemlér, *Független Ujság*, August 18-25, 1935: 7; Jekelius, *Klingsor* (1935): 453. Even when seeking reconciliation, Jekelius demanded “reverence” (*Ehrfurcht*) for the German “revolution.”

53 Rpt.: “Der baltische Graf”, *Klingsor*, 1936: 321-35. The novella won a prize in Hitler’s Germany for portraying German military virtues. The Hungarians were irritated because it portrayed the defeat of the Hungarian revolution of 1948-49 from a rather arrogant German-Russian perspective. Gusztáv Abafáy attacked it in the *Független Ujság* as anti-Hungarian; Zillich defended himself by claiming that the critique of the Hungarians was uttered by his fictional characters *Klingsor* (1935): 211 – which was only partly true.

54 “Korszerűtlen elmékedések”, [Untimely Meditations] *EH* (1936): 679-82. Zillich left Transylvania in 1935 already, but only in 1936 did it become evident that he would not return. His resignation from the editorship of *Klingsor* was made public only in the autumn of 1936. He sent in November 1936 an angry protest against a review of his book in the Hungarian paper *Brassói Lapok* in *Klingsor* (1936): 468-72, but no longer responded to Szemlér’s review. Zillich became a General Staff officer of the Wehrmacht in World War II and still published several books after the war. In an article entitled “Das Verdämmern der ‘Siebenbürgischen Seele,’” published as late as 1968 (*Südosstdeutsche Vierteljahresblätter* 1 (1968) 18-23) he would still claim (on information allegedly received from Kós) that the Hungarian writers were afraid to keep contact with the Saxons because of some powerful Jewish donors.

55 One major exception was a lengthy review in *Klingsor* (1936): 317-20 by A. Heltmann of three Hungarian novels (by Kós, Bánffy, and Sándor Makkai) and Antal Szerb’s *Magyar irodalomtörténet* [History of Hungarian literature] (Cluj: Erdélyi Szépművészeti Céh, 1934). The review of the latter was nothing short of ecstatic.

Hungarian literary relations had cooled, both minority literary communities devoted increased attention to their relations with the Romanian authorities and Romanian writers – with mixed success. To be sure, there were some exchanges in the twenties, and both *Klingsor* and the *EH* regularly published translations of contemporary Romanian writers. Furthermore, Romanian representatives frequently attended Saxon and Hungarian literary events. For instance, the *EH* reports that Emanoil Bucuța, a Romanian writer and Minister of Culture at that time, attended the Helikon meeting of 1934. He expressed his wish to improve and formalize the Romanian-Hungarian literary relations, and announced that the state publishing house *Fundația Regele Carol* (which, as we saw, just published Goga's translation of Madách's *Ember tragédiája*) wanted to publish translations of ten Hungarian novels (*EH* 1934: 555). Unfortunately, such plans and expressions of good-will often did not bring the desired results. In the late 1920s lengthy discussions took place on Crainic's proposal that the Saxon and Hungarian writers should join the Romanian PEN Club. The Hungarians finally did so in June 1932, but the experience turned out to be disappointing. The case of publishing the novel *Baltagul* by Mihail Sadoveanu (1880–1961) into German grotesquely exemplified how culture was a plaything of ideology. Once the novel was selected with all due caution on both the German and the Romanian side, Krasser from *Klingsor* translated it, and the highly reputable Munich publisher Langen-Müller was about to bring it to the market. Unfortunately, just three days before the publication date it became known that Sadoveanu took over the editorship of two small "Jewish-Marxist" papers, which caused a scandal in Germany and Krasser was severely taken to task. "Krasser's own account of the affair (*Klingsor* 1936: 472-75) makes evident that he saved himself by rejecting in a most cowardly (or ideologically biased) manner the politics, if not the artistry, of his author."

A more positive story emerges from the attempt of the Romanian *Familia* at Oradea to bring the Romanian and Hungarian writers closer to each other. This journal, which had a long history of mediation between the two cultures,⁵⁶ devoted in 1935 three consecutive issues to the question whether Romanians and Hungarians could get along and understand each other (*Ne putem înțelege noi și ungurii*). The topic was broken down into a set of five questions that were distributed to Hungarian and Romanian writers living in Transylvania and beyond its border:

*"Do you think a Romanian-Hungarian collaboration is possible? 2. If yes, how do you see this collaboration? What efforts should both sides make? 3. Can the culture of the two people constitute a base solid enough to build on it a monument of mutual understanding? 4. Can the writer, through his writing, counteract the divisive action that politicians perform consciously or unconsciously? 5. What is your opinion of the initiative for rapprochement, launched by the magazine Familia in Oradea?"*⁵⁷

56 See Károly Engel, "Hídverők példamutatása" [The Example of Bridge-Builders], *Korunk*, 1970: 853.

57 *Familia*, 1935, 2.5-6: 66.

Familia printed the responses of thirteen Hungarian writers, among them Babits, Berde, Lajos Zilahy (1891-1974), Gyula Illyés (1902-1983), and Sándor Márai (1900-1989), and twelve Romanian writers, including Blaga, Sadoveanu, Camil Petrescu (1894-1957), and Cezar Petrescu. The editor of *Familia* planned a conference on this topic with these writers for October 1935 in Oradea, but the event had to be postponed several times and was finally cancelled.

G.M. Samariteanu, the editor, was positive: Hungarians and Romanians had been divided historically because of policies that did not respect the other's cultural values and right to self-determination (*Familia*, 2.7-8: 74). But the complex postwar world allowed no isolation. Since the two nations had a common path to travel, dialogue was necessary (2.5-6: 65), and this should start with a study of the other's literature, for it offered an intimate understanding of the neighboring culture (2.7-8: 75). National approaches had to acknowledge the virtues and weaknesses of the other (2.5-6: 65).

Camil Petrescu praised *Familia*'s publisher for initiating an honest cultural dialogue (2.5-6: 71), but he added that "cultural exchanges are insufficient for creating a genuine rapprochement between peoples." Others specified what more would be needed: "We Romanians will have to forget our past suffering. Hungarians will have to forget that they once ruled over millions of Romanians" (2.5-6: 72) wrote Corneliu Moldovanu (1883-1952), and Octav Șuluțiu (1909-1949) argued that sustained work was needed, not just occasional conferences (2.7-8: 83).

Most responses accepted *Familia*'s premises, though few of them went beyond predictable clichés that overestimated literature's power and underestimated political coercion. Zilahy pleaded for an honest analysis of the linguistic, cultural, and religious similarities and differences (2.5-6: 67); Szemlér suggested that Hungarians and Romanians had a common Danubian destiny (2.9-10: 78); Marcell Benedek contrasted self-centered and greedy politicians with writers and scholars who "think in centuries and millennia and do not focus on themselves but on humanity" (2.5-6: 68); and Sadoveanu argued that spiritual and cultural action could resist the passing interests of politicians (2.5-6: 70).

More concrete and useful were the remarks about the need to translate and to popularize each other's literatures. Indeed, several of the respondents, among them Babits, Cezar Petrescu, and Berde, were themselves also translators. Pompiliu Constantinescu (1901-1946) suggested a systematic collection of Hungarian literature in translation and the launching of a Hungarian magazine in Romanian, so that Romanians outside Transylvania could get access to Hungarian cultural news (2.7-8: 82). Șuluțiu proposed the creation of an Association of Romanian and Hungarian writers interested in the mutual translation and promotion of literary culture (2.7-8: 84). A third topic was oral literature. As Berde put it, cultural dialogues had always been taking place in the crafts, jokes, popular festivities, and dances of the lower classes (2.7-8: 75); Romulus Dianu (1905-1975) agreed, noting that Bartók and Liszt drew heavily on intercultural folklore (2.5-6: 74). Indeed, one could add that the most remarkable Romanian-Hungarian artistic achievement of the interwar years was probably Béla Bartók's *Cantata Profana* (1930), a unique narrative for chorus and orchestra based on a Romanian colinda that Bartók had collected earlier in Hungary. Preparing it, he worked together with Constantin Brăiloiu (1893-1958).

Unfortunately, subsequent events confirmed Camil Petrescu's somber conclusion that "writers cannot prevent war" (Familia 2.5-6: 71). In the end the paths of what we have called the "fin-de-siècle generation" sharply diverged, though for a moment around 1930 they seemed to converge. As we have seen, several members of that generation, including Goga, Rebreanu, Dezsó Szabó, and Ady, had left Transylvania already before World War I. Surprisingly, hardly any Hungarian writers left the now Romanian Transylvania in the years immediately after 1919. Indeed, Bánffy, Kuncz, and others settled there; the Saxons Csaki, Folberth, Jekelius, Maurer, Zillich and other studied abroad, usually in Germany, but came back to Transylvania to live and work there. The major losses started only in 1929, when Áprily went to Budapest and Hajek to Vienna. Departures accelerated in the 1930s, partly because the Iron Guard and other right-wing formations were gaining in power in Romania, and, above all, because of the rise of Hitler in Germany. Two of the major Saxon figures, Csaki and Zillich, left for Germany; both believed in the Nazis and Csaki was appointed to a major Nazi cultural position. The greatest and painful loss for the Hungarians was Makkai, who served for years in the Romanian Senate and wrote in 1931 the self-searching essay *Magunk revíziója* (Revision of Ourselves). He suddenly moved to Hungary in 1936 and reversed himself in *Nem lehet* (It Can't Be; 1937). Noting correctly that nationalism was rising in all of Europe, he concluded, incorrectly, that the Hungarian minority's existence in Romania was "impossible." This, together with his strong anti-communist position, led to his support of Nazi Germany during the war.

Of the Romanians Isac and Blaga (partly) remained in Transylvania, attached to its cultural center Cluj. The Saxons Jekelius, Wittstock, Krasser, and others also stayed, usually as teachers or Protestant ministers in smaller cities and villages. The Hungarians Reményik, Kós, Tamási, Bánffy, Berde, Benedek, Nyiró, Szemlér, Molter, Gaál, and others remained in Transylvania, at least until the later war years, which Kuncz (d. 1931) and Reményik (d. 1941) no longer lived through. Some of the survivors still had a minor career after the war, in Transylvania or beyond it, but the most creative and hopeful years of the generation died with the war.

I conclude with the name I started with, Mária Berde, for it seems to me that she has done perhaps the most to bring the Romanian, Saxon, and Hungarian literary communities of Transylvania together – and she has received little recognition for it. This teacher in Nagyenyed, Marosvásárhely, and Nagyvárad was editor of the journal *Zord Idő* (1920-21), a major force in reviving the *Kemény Zsigmond Társaság* (which, as we saw, she used to develop cross-cultural ties), and a tireless initiator of new ideas and projects that did not shy away from controversy.⁵⁸ It is only appropriate therefore that this article should end with the text of her "Erdélyi ballada."

58 One of these, was her article "Vallani és vállalni" [To profess and to undertake] *EH* (1929): 623-25, creating much discussion, which I could not include here.

APPENDIX

Mária R. Berde, "Erdélyi ballada" (*Erdélyi Helikon* 1929, 9: 668-670)

Zászlók virágoztak a háztetőkön.
Az ifjú Isten járt alattuk, a megszabadított Szabadság.
Mámorosan, szárnyasan, boldogan járt,
Negyvenkilencnek tavaszán.

Enyed akkor Kolozsváron lakott, a Farkasutcai kollégiumban,
S a nagyanyám is, hét kis gyermekével.
Kegyelemkenyér: keserű
Kegyelemköntös: horzsol.
Kegyelemágyon az álom sem nyugalom.
De nagyapám azt mondta, semmiember, ki panaszt s könnyet ejt most
Földi limlomért.

Álmukban mégis, a gyermekek felsírtak néha.
Kicsikanalát kérte az egyik. Sikoltott a másik:
– Anyám válláról ne húzd le a bundát!
És dédanyám, a halál küszöbén már, sokszor rebeg'e:
– Mikor indulunk haza innét?
Csak álmodtuk, hogy porig ég a ház, a mi házunk –

Feketét viselt minden enyedi. Mégis, ha jönni látták nagyapámat,
Az ámbitusra elébe siettek és felragyogtak;
Ő csillagfényű szavakat hozott:
– Isaszeg, Tokaj, Hatvan, Branyiszko –
S egyszer Kossuthról érkezett a hírrel:
Kossuthot sírni láttam Enyedért!

De májusban, harsány zászlók alatt,
Melyek mint vadult szárnyak, csattogtak fent a szélben,
Egy délelőtt oly csendben jött haza.
Az ajtót maga után behúzta:
– Küld ki mind a hetet, fiam.
S utánuk bámult árnyékos szemekkel –
– A haditörvényszék beszólított
Maga közé három polgárszemélyt.
Beválasztottak vérbírónak, asszony.
– Itélni élet és halál felett?
– S még ma.
– Kiról?
– Stefan Ludvig Roth. A szászok vezére.

- Károly, te bánkódól.
- Csak felnézett a nagyapám s megint le. A szemöldöke összébb szaladt.
- Akkorát vétett?
- Mondják: ő felel, hogy népe a császárnak eszköze.

Mi tudjuk, mi a császári parancs.
Isten mikor meghallja, vére fagy!
– Novemberben garázda kézre ment
Ezüstöm, ékszerem, mind a császár nevében.
Januárban mit farkas kölykivel
Oly fagyban bujdokoltam, hogy a könnyem,
Ha földrehullt, kopogott mint a gyöngyszem ...
De hát nem jogainkért harcolunk most,
Hanem hogy szem legyen szemért,
És fog legyen fogért?
– Ellene dolgozott az uniónak!
– Másképp akarta mint mi. Háttha ő úgy hitte jónak?
– Ki most másképp akar, az hazaáruló.
– Mégis ember. Pap is, családos is ...
– Pecsét van már a sorsán.
– Akkor ne menj az ítélelhozásra.
– Pilátusként megmossam a kezem?
– Hát menj, s a bosszut lágyítsd irgalomra,
S ha nem tudod, mondj egyedül n e m e t!
– Leköpnék mint a gyávát.
– Csak a vér szennyez.
– Az ellenfélnek vére nem.
– Az is, ha nem csatában freccsen. Szégyen,
– Fegyvertelennek osztani halált.
– Reájaszolgált.
– De te szomoru vagy Károly fiam.
– Hallgass ...
– Ölelj magadhoz. Érzed, mit izen jövendő sarjad?
“Hét földönfutó testvér közé
Hadd jöjjen nyolcadik földönfutónak,
De soha gyilkos apa gyermekének!”
Eredj, tégy jó szót Stefan Ludwig Rothért
A küszöbön a nagyapám kiejtett egy jámbor “úgy legyen”-t.

De mi egy ámen szélviharral szembemondva?
És részeg volt már a Szabadság-Isten,
Tetszett neki a zászlók vérpirosa,
A kegyelem fehérét megtagadta –

S a remény zöldje feketére égett

Koromesztendő, pernyeévek.
Romok közé, de hazatért Enyed.

Romokon nőtt, de nőtt, mint a fű, az ifjuság.
Tizenegy évbe fordult a nyolcadik fiu.
Lánghajú, lobogó nyugtalanság.

Szája tüzes kemence, a szó belőle szikra,
Mint fáklya járt az emberek között.
– A Szabadság hagyta őt zálogul, – mondotta néha nagyapám, –
A többi gyerek fél-gond s fél-remény,
A nyolcadik ígéret, bizonyosság, Az Isten ennek sokkal tartozik,
Isten ezért még megfizet.
Mire ez felserdül, feje fölött ki kell nyilni a behúnyt csillagoknak.

Tüzet a víz: a nagypatak oltotta ki.
Nagyapám reáogyott a tetemére:
– Keresztény voltál már az anyaméhben,
Irgalmat akartál s az Isten
Nem irgalmazott népednek s neked.
... Öklöt emelt az égre.

De nagyanyám lefogta a kezét s az átkát:
– Jó. hogy irgalmas volt, s hogy irgalmat parancsolt neked is.
Hogy bírniél elviselni a halálát,
Ha hinnünk kéne, hogy ez a halál
Szemet szemért, fogat fogért;
S hogy mivel ítélteél, hát most íteltettél te is?
Így jó, így jó, v i s s z a soha se vétnei
Császárinak, szásznak, románnak, senkinek!
... S az Istennek is megbocsátni tudni,
Hogy amit rád mér, azt ne kaphassd büntetés,
Csak meg nem szolgált kereszt gyanánt.

S a bibliába, a halott nevéhez,
Ahogy szokás, beírta reszkető alázat.
“Isten adta, Isten elvette,
Szentséges szent neve áldassék érette.”
S külön találtam ott még egy ígét erdélyi vigaszul:
“Boldog, aki keresztjét meg nem érdemelte.”

GÁBOR EGRY

Minority Elite, Continuity, and Identity Politics in Northern Transylvania: The Case of the Transylvanian Party

An interesting scene occurred in the Hungarian parliament on a long summer day in 1941. Gusztáv Kövér, an engineer from the city of Nagyvárad/Oradea, took the opportunity to make an announcement. Previously Kövér had been one of the leaders of the Hungarian minority party in Romania in the 1920s and early 1930s. Later he became an important lobbyist at the Union of Nations in Geneva and worked as one of the deputy chairmen of the Transylvanian Party from its founding in February 1941 to the end of May of that same year. At this moment in the building of parliament he was eager to denounce a statement of the party leadership aimed at explaining an astonishing decision; the exclusion of the former vice-president of the Transylvanian Party from the party itself.¹ In his short speech, Kövér also denied allegations that he was not enthusiastic enough to support the anti-Jewish legislation because of his eight year long stay in Switzerland, where he purportedly became too closely attached to liberal ideas. Quite to the contrary – stated the politician – he was one of their most ardent initiators. The parliament was at that time debating the follow-up bill regarding miscegenation, the mixed marriage and “interracial sex” of Jews with non-Jews. We have no reason to be surprised, knowing that the question of the application of the so called first and second anti-Jewish racial laws (*zsidótörvények*) was one of the most delicate issues in the process of the reintegration of Northern Transylvania into Hungary.

A further significant allegation was leveled against Kövér due to another speech given at the foundation rally of the party in Kolozsvár/Cluj on May 28, 1941. Here he offended the public officials – who had come from Hungary proper to Northern Transylvania after the Vienna Arbitrage – when he emphasized the conflicts between the newly occupied territories and the “Motherland.” Therefore the party chairman, Béla Teleki was forced to dismiss his views on the spot.² This small yet telling episode reveals the complexities of the much graver problem of the reintegration of Northern Transylvania, not only with respect to the legal and political system or the public administration, but to the much larger problem of the unification of the Hungarian nation. As its existence was taken formerly as granted, denying it was equal to high

1 *Az 1939. június 10-re összehívott Országgyűlés képviselőházának naplója* [Budapest: Journal of the House of Representatives, 1941], X, 303–304.

2 Dezső Saly, *Szigorúan bizalmas! Fekete könyv* [Strictly confidential! Black book] (Budapest: 1945), 370.

treason. But, as Kövér's uncovered remarks show, the sudden reality of the Hungarian unitary nation state in this region proved to be far more problem laden than the simplified political fiction. Not only Kövér, a member of the higher political leadership, but a large part of the Hungarians from the region experienced disillusionment after some months of regained Hungarian sovereignty. The "parachutist" – a public official from Hungary – who knew nothing of the local situation, behaved with arrogance, and moreover occupied the well-deserved posts of the Transylvanians, fed discontent and gave opportunity for bitter remarks about the prevailing situation.³

Although the desire for the revision of the Peace Treaty of Trianon was able to disguise certain social processes, some keen observers of this era noted that one of the most important developments after the First World War was a certain differentiation between Hungary proper and its minorities beyond the new borders. For example, Gyula Szekfű (whose contribution to the ideology of the political system named after Regent Miklós Horthy cannot be overestimated) stated in the third edition of his famous book *Három nemzedék* (Three generations), that the social and ideological development of Hungarian minorities, especially those of Transylvania, diverged from that in Hungary. He argued, that these regional societies were free from the experience of the short-lived communist regime in the spring and summer of 1919, therefore the liberal-radical and leftist conceptions of the leaders of the Hungarian Republic from November 1918 were not discredited among their members.⁴ In his view the most important example of this differentiation was the ideology of Transylvanism, formulated as a political and ideological program by Károly Kós, Árpád Pál, and István Zágoni in their well-known work, *Kiáltó Szó* (Shouting word).⁵

Instead of enumerating the other supporters of this opinion, it is enough to stress here once again that the process of differentiation came clearly in conflict with the unitary fiction promoted by the ideology of the reintegration of the country after the territorial revisions. The sudden confrontation with reality caused similar discontent among the Hungarians of the former Czechoslovakia,⁶ but the minority society of the Transylvanian Hungarians was better organized, endowed with more resources, and represented by more prominent political leaders. They not only were able to create their own party (this was achieved by politicians from the former Czechoslovakia as well), but they were able to keep their relative independence while retaining a dominant political role in Northern Transylvania.

But the Transylvanian Party had to confront itself during the entire period with the challenge of one inescapable question: how can a regional party subsist in a unitary Hungarian nation? This was expressed from the Transylvanian point of view by Dezső László (an MP of the party and a Calvinist

3 Sándor Oláh, "Gyakorlati gondolkodásmód és megmerevedett etatizmus" [Pragmatical thinking and rigid etatism], *Korall* 18 (2004): 98–112.

4 Gyula Szekfű, *Három nemzedék és ami utána következik* [Three generations and its aftermath] (Budapest: Magyar Királyi Egyetemi Nyomda, 1935), 456.

5 Károly Kós, Árpád Paál, and István Zágoni, *Kiáltó szó* [Shouting word] (Kolozsvár: 1921).

6 László Szarka, "Kisebbségi nemzetértelmezések Jócsik Lajos politikai publicisztikájában" [Concepts of Nation from a Minority Point of View in Jócsik Lajos' Political Journalism] in IV Conference of Minority History (Marosvásárhely/Târgu Mures: August 30–31, 2007).

minister) in the title of one of his lectures, “Why we need the Transylvanian Party?”,⁷ given to the assembly of the “greater committee” (*nagyválasztmány*) of the party in March 1943 in Nagyvárad/Oradea. László’s line of reasoning was aimed at coming to terms with the fact that for Hungarians in Transylvania there existed not one but two different histories: the common Hungarian one – which was somehow “suspended” for two decades after 1918, its existence remaining still basic for the revisionist argumentation – and their own history under very different auspices compared to that of the rump state between the end of the First World War and the Vienna Arbitrage.

Though this occasion was a party meeting, the group on behalf of whom László spoke, the “we” in his question, was not only this political organization, but included the whole Hungarian community in Northern Transylvania. As a member of this larger constituency, he expressed a possible and clearly desirable identity. He pointed out the mission of this regional society, enumerated its different virtues, and drew its borders against not only the “traditional” or “recognizable” others, but the Hungarians from the “Motherland” as well. It was a textbook example of identity politics in quite unique circumstances. But why and how could this political party successfully propose his “Transylvanism” (*erdélyiség*) for the Hungarians from Northern Transylvania? To answer these questions, central in this study, we must turn to another key problem: the recruitment of the minority elite, which played a leading role in the party and marked its organization.

Continuity and the Minority Elite

The Transylvanian Party held its first – foundation – rally on May 28, 1941, in Kolozsvár/Cluj in the historical building of the Redout. The leading article of the party newspaper, the renowned *Ellenzék* (Opposition), described the event as the first true manifestation of the will of the Hungarians from the region since 1848, and characterized the assembly in the same writing as the “real parliament of Transylvania.”⁸ This notion was – deliberately – strengthened by the fact, that the Redout was the place where the then existing feudal Diet voted for union with Hungary in 1848. It was not only the symbolism of the event that suggested that the party wanted to be more than an ordinary political organization; the programmatic manifesto, published here, and the speeches of the party leaders explicitly stated that the Transylvanian Party was the only true organization of the Hungarians in Northern Transylvania, and not merely their simple political representative, but the very framework of their community. They presented the program not as a party program, but as the program of a specific local society.⁹ Only a few sectors of the population were meant to be excluded, those who were “poisoned by the humbug coming from outside.”

7 Dezső László, “Miért van szükség az Erdély Pártra?” [Why do we need the Transylvanian Party?], in *Erdélyi szellem – magyar lélek* [Transylvanian spirit – Hungarian soul] (Kolozsvár: Erdélyi Párt, 1943).

8 “A nagy küszöb” [The great threshold], *Ellenzék*, May 29, 1941.

9 *Ibid.*

One can discount these manifestations as part of a simple ideological game, but the composition of the party leadership on the local and regional level, its relationship to the other social institutions such as the churches, civil and economic associations, agencies of the public administration, the press, and the dimensions of the party (one scholar estimates the size of its membership at more than 243,000 with over 700 local organizations, though another estimate runs only as high as 20,000),¹⁰ all prove that this self-portrayal was well founded. In this sense the party was the successor of the minority era, when the single Hungarian political party was the focal point of the organization of the related community with every important personality participating in its leadership.

But the roots of this type of community organization (which will be analyzed later) reach back well before 1918. As to the Transylvanian Party we can distinguish three dimensions of continuity at the end of the Dualist era and in the minority period. The first one has to do simply with prominent personalities, that is, some public figures play important social roles throughout the whole period. The second one concerns institutional continuity, not only via the unbroken existence of elements of social structure, but by the continuity of certain models of public action in various and varying singular institutions. The third one refers to ideological continuities, the constant ingredients of the answer to the obvious question: why should the Transylvanian Hungarian community be organized in this specific way?

Personal Continuity of the Political Elite

Although the change of sovereignty in 1918 over Eastern Hungary and Transylvania is often pictured, rightly, as a great collective shock (several tens of thousands from the middle classes emigrated to Hungary), the opinion making cluster remained largely the same in the region as before Trianon. As to the political elite proper, it is quite simple to prove this fact. Taking into account the political leadership of the Hungarian party (OMP) between the two World Wars, the majority of its leading politicians had been politically active (or at least active in public life) and prominent before 1918 as well. This does not mean that the political elite was not reduced in numbers through the emigration of many of its members (the two obvious examples are István Bethlen and Pál Teleki), but the social composition of this group did not change significantly as compared to that of the antebellum political elite, mainly because most of its prominent members remained in their place.

10 Nándor Bárdi, "A múlt mint tapasztalat. A kisebbségből többségbe került erdélyi magyar politika szemléletváltozása, 1940–1944" [The past as an experience. The change of perspective of the Hungarian elite becoming from minority to majority], in *Az emlékezet konstrukciói* [Constructions of memory], ed. Gábor Czoch and Csilla Fedinecz, (Budapest: TLA, 2006), 237–292, 240; Péter Sipos, *Imrédy Béla és a Magyar Megújulás Pártja* [Béla Imrédy and the Party of Hungarian Renewal] (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1970) 219. Bárdi's data means that one fifth of the Hungarian population of Northern Transylvania would have belonged to the party. Sipos' data can be compared with another organization, the agricultural society EMGE (Hungarian Economic Society of Transylvania). In the late 30s it was the single largest Hungarian organization with circa 40,000 members in the territories annexed to Romania in 1920.

The leadership of the Hungarian party (president, 13 vice-presidents, and members of the central executive committee) consisted of 48 persons at the end of 1922,¹¹ of whom nine were MPs in the Lower House before 1918, five were county prefects (*főispán*) of whom three belonged to the previously mentioned contingent of MPs, three were mayors or deputy mayors of whom one was an MP as well, two persons were vice-prefects (*alispán*), and one person was a diplomat, ambassador in Belgrade before the First World War.¹² This adds up to 16 persons altogether, or one third of the leadership. Some of them were actually quite high profile politicians, for example, Samu Jósika, who held the office of Speaker of the upper house, Béla Barabás, who was chairman of the Hungarian delegation in 1907, and József Sándor who was aulic councilor, and one of the founders and general secretary of the EMKE (Transylvanian Hungarian Cultural Association).

The remaining members were also important figures in the public life in the local, district, or county level, or in influential social institutions: Árpád Apáthy was the county attorney of Hunyad/Hunedoara and a member of the board of directors in five different companies; Kálmán Asztalos was secretary of the local organization of the Independence and 1848 Party in Nagyenyed/Aiud; Gyula Ferenczy, a former member of the executive committee of the Independence and 1848 Party in Kolozsvár/Cluj, was several times a member of the representative body of the city and general director of the local Agricultural Bank; Jenő Nagy, a lawyer from Csíkszereda/Miercurea Ciuc, was also a member of the municipal council; Hugó Roth was the attorney of the Incorporated Law Society at Kolozsvár/Cluj; Péter Szakács managed the affairs of the Chamber of Industry and Commerce in Marosvásárhely/Târgu Mureş for 24 years as its secretary; Béla Szele was known as an editor of the newspaper *Brassói Lapok* and an organizer and one of the leaders of the Unitary Hungarian Party in Brassó/Braşov, which replaced the formerly existing Hungarian parties (Party of National Labor, Party of Constitution, Independence and 1848 Party) there in 1910; Mihály Szabolcska, a recognized poet at that time, held the position of a Roman Catholic dean in Temesvár/Timişoara; László Székely was an urban architect in the same city; László Szoboszlay played a political role in the public life of the county Maros-Torda/Mureş-Turda and held the office of a deputy government commissioner for the county in 1917; Aurél Váradi was an editor of the important newspaper *Ellenzék* (Opposition); István Zágoni, after being one of its journalists, ran the newspaper *Újság* (the official newspaper of the Independence and 1848 Party) as its chief editor in Kolozsvár/Cluj between 1913–1915. This proves that at least 28 persons, or some 58% of the members of this body, had belonged to the political elite on a local, county, or regional level before 1918.

11 Béla György, ed., *Iratok a romániai Országos Magyar Párt történetéhez 1. A vezető testületek jegyzőkönyvei* [Documents on the history of the Countrywide Hungarian Party in Romania 1. Minutes of meeting of the leading bodies] (Kolozsvár - Csíkszereda: Erdélyi Múzeum Egyesület - Pro Print, 2003).

12 MPs: Baron Samu Jósika, Béla Barabás, György Bernády, Elemér Jakabffy, István Kecskeméthy, József Sándor, Kálmán Cziffra, Géza Ferenczy, Viktor Issekutz; Prefects: Barabás, Bernády, Cziffra from the MPs and Count Béla Wass, Elemér Gyárfás; Mayors: Gusztáv Haller, György Bernády, Béla Fekete Nagy; Vice-prefects: János Sebesi, Árpád Paál. The diplomat was István Ugron.

Regarding the case of some of the other members, there is proof, although indirect, of their presence in public life before 1918. The newspaper of the Independence Party (*Ujság*) published an article in which the author criticized and commented on a piece in the *Budapesti Hírlap*. The Budapest newspaper reported on the alleged formation of a so-called "Transylvanian anti-suffrage league." According to the *Budapesti Hírlap*, it mobilized important politicians, mainly from the Party of National Labor and other leading personalities from Transylvania.¹³ It does not seem too far-fetched to consider the supposed members of this group as part of the political elite. We can find in this list published by the *Ujság* another vice-president of the Hungarian party (Baron Béla Szentkereszthy) and three other members of the executive committee (Lajos Albrecht, Count Kálmán Bélydy, and Count György Bethlen). Taking into account this fact, we can state that in the case of about two thirds of the party leadership, their belonging to the political elite of the Dualist era can be duly demonstrated.

Two years later, at the end of 1924, after the death of Samu Jósika, the party leadership was extended to 64 members (four vice-presidents, a new Council of the Chairman with eight members, the rest of the additional staff being members of the executive committee). A portion of the new personalities functioned as representatives of entire social groups or classes, demonstrating their national unity: Lajos Sárosi, a craftsman from Brassó/Brasov; János Nagy, a shoemaker from Székelyudvarhely/Odorheiu Secuiesc; János Dóczi, a merchant from Csíkszereda/Mirecurea-Ciuc; Dénes Szabó from Zetelaka/Zetea; and Sándor Makkay, a smallholder from Backamadaras/Păsăreni. In some cases they had real institutional background, such as József Berky, who was a smallholder from Kolozsvár and chairman of the local economic association.

Other newly elected members were equally prominent figures of public life. Elemér Domahidy (in 1924 the general lay superintendent of the Királyhágó/Pasul Craiului district of the Calvinist Church) served as prefect of the city of Debrecen before the World War. Joachim Görög held the office of the episcopal commissioner for Hungarian Catholics of the Armenian Rite. Ödön Inczédy-Joksmann was vice-prefect of the county Alsó-Fehér/Albă de Jos in 1917–18. Kálmán Kovács was a Unitarian episcopal secretary. Sándor Makkai became Calvinist bishop of the Church District of Transylvania after the repatriation of László Ravasz. Andor Török made himself known before the World War as mayor of the city of Kézdivásárhely/Târgu Secuiesc and vice-prefect of the county of Háromszék/Trei Scaune.¹⁴

This shows not only evidence of the personal continuity of the traditional elite and middle class, but also suggests that the composition of the leading bodies of the party was largely determined by the social position and status of aspirants. Some members, mainly from the lower classes, were elected as representatives of their whole social strata. Their participation served as proof of the unity of the Hungarian community in Romania. Others played an

13 *Újság*, September 13, 1917. The paper reported that the chairman would be Mihály Réz, an intimate of István Tisza, professor on the University of Cluj, vice-chairmen János Sándor the minister of interior in the former Tisza-government, Samu Jósika and István Bethlen; directors György Bernády, Count István Lázár and Ödön Bethlen, both of the last two former prefects.

14 Béla György, ed., *Iratok a romániai Országos Magyar Párt történetéhez*, 413.

important role in their local or sub-regional communities and it was key for their entry into the leadership on the national level.

But we have some scattered evidence that the manifestations of personal continuity were quite natural on the local level as well. Here too one finds most of the prominent personalities before 1918, and in some cases even members of the parliament, or prefects. At the rally of the party in Sepsiszentgyörgy/Sfântu Gheorghe on September 4, 1937, the chairman proposed to mention some defunct members in the minutes, among them László László,¹⁵ a lawyer with a degree from the Commercial Academy, who lived in Nagykíklód/Iclod, in the county of Szolnok-Doboka/Solnoc-Doboca, and between 1906 and 1910 represented this constituency in parliament. He was never a member of the highest bodies in the party, but as this proposal suggests, he certainly played an important role on the lower levels. Similarly, this can apply to Zoltán Ugron, a landowner from the county of Udvarhely/Odorhei, who was twice MP before 1918. Although he never became a prominent figure of the party on the national level, he was an active member on the local level and his proposals were well received by the party leadership. For example the Council of the Chairman dealt with one of his proposals – initially published in the newspaper *Székegy Közelet* – on October 31, 1925.¹⁶

Considering that personal continuity was so strong and can be so easily demonstrated, it is hardly surprising, even taking into account the unquestionable shock of the change of sovereignty and the emigration of a considerable part of the middle class, that the same is true for the period after the Vienna Arbitrage in 1940. Moreover, this was true not only in terms of social composition (the new generation of the 1930s came from the same middle-class milieu), but in an amazingly lot of cases the organizers and leaders of the new political organization, the Transylvanian Party, had been active in public life even before 1918. Besides the list of MPs belonging to the party, we can scrutinize another source, the (incomplete) list of the participants of the foundation rally consisting of more than 430 names¹⁷ ordered by county and municipality. We have reason to look at this source as equivalent to the roster of the local and regional political elite, because it seems that they were delegated according to the principle of regional representation, and the occupation and social standing of those members, who could be identified, suggest that they were holding prominent positions in the local or county public life.¹⁸

Comparing the list of the party MPs to the list of members of the leadership of the Hungarian party in Romania, we find an extensive correspondence with each other. From the initial 45 MPs after 1940, 27 were members of one of the leading bodies of the former Hungarian party; among them the former chairman, György Bethlen, and the general secretary, Gyula Deák. A considerable number of the new parliamentary representatives belonged to the new middle-class generation.

15 Béla György, ed., *Iratok a romániai Országos Magyar Párt történetéhez*, 375.

16 Béla György, ed., *Iratok a romániai Országos Magyar Párt történetéhez*, 242.

17 The list was published in the official newspaper of the party, *Ellenzék*, May 29, 1941.

18 For a more detailed analysis see: Gábor Egry, *Az erdélyiség színeváltozása. Kísérlet az Erdélyi Párt ideológiájának és identitáspolitikájának elemzésére* [Transfiguration of Transylvania] (Budapest: Napvilág Kiadó, 2008).

We can point out as an example Imre Mikó, son of a judge from Kolozsvár/Cluj, who served as the head of office of the Hungarian People's Community, a corporatist organization integrated into the Front of National Salvation, the single political organization in Romania in the years of the so-called "royal dictatorship;" the aforementioned Dezső László, who was the son of a teacher of the renowned Székely Mikó College (highschool) and director of the Szekler National Museum in Sepsiszentgyörgy/Sfântu Gheorghe; Sándor Vita, an absolvent of the Commercial Academies of Budapest and Vienna, leader of the statistical section of *EMGE* (Hungarian Economic Society of Transylvania), who was the son of a lieutenant colonel;¹⁹ and Dezső Albrecht, the son of Lajos Albrecht, a lawyer from Bánffyhunjad/Huedin, who himself was a lawyer, editor of the review *Hitel*, and secretary of one of the sections of the People's Community.²⁰

Turning our attention to the register of the participants of the founding rally, which is supposedly a more complete list of the politically active elite than the list of the MPs, we can draw the same conclusions: the main feature here is continuity. Besides well known personalities who were not among the MPs – such as József Nyírő, the writer; Albert Maksay, professor of theology; the architect Károly Kós; József Geley, professor of biology and lay superintendent of the Unitarian church; and Alajos Boga, a Roman Catholic canon – we can find a significant number of delegates who had been active members of the higher leadership of the former Hungarian party and a small but not insignificant group of personalities who had played a role in public life even before 1918. To the first group belongs, for example, Count Kálmán Béldi Jr., chairman of EMKE, member of the executive committee of the Hungarian party, and chairman of its section in the county of Szilágy/Sălaj, who held these offices in the Transylvanian Party as well. Vilmos Kornhoffer could just as well have been one of the leaders of the local party section in the city of Szászrégen/Reghin, as was Dénes Molnár from Kézdivásárhely/Târgu Secuiesc, and József Tevelly from Szatmárnémeti/Satu Mare.

An evident example for the existence of the second group is Count György Bethlen, an MP of the newly founded party, but we can identify the continuity with the political elite of the Dualist era on lower levels too. Zoltán Bölöni, an MP from the county of Szilágy/Sălaj in 1941, served as chairman of the Independence and 1848 Party in Zilah/Zălău in 1917–1918. Árpád Paál was chief county notary in Udvarhely/Odorhei County before 1918. Lajos Simó, chairman of the Transylvanian Party in the county of Szolnok-Doboka/Solnoc-Doboca, held the post of section leader of the Transylvanian Alliance in the constituency of Nagyilonda/Ileanda in 1917–1918. Miklós Czeglédy, chairman of the Independence and 1848 Party in Kovászna/Covasna and a member of the steering committee of the Transylvanian Alliance after 1914, became a delegate of the section of the Transylvanian Party in Nagyvárad/Oradea not only for the foundation rally, but for the executive committee of the new political organization as well. György Kaizler, a retired county prefect, was once again appointed to be prefect in the county of Szilágy/Sălaj, as in 1917. He would play a significant

19 Éva Záhony, ed., *Hitel – Kolozsvár 1935–1944 I.* (Budapest: Bethlen Gábor Könyvkiadó, 1991), 58.

20 Éva Záhony, ed., *Hitel – Kolozsvár 1935–1944 I.*, 47–48.

role on the county level in the Transylvanian Party too, being a delegate of the section at the foundation rally. We can also mention Jenő *Hye*, a member of the leading council of the Transylvanian Party in the county of Szolnok-Doboka/Solnoc-Doboca in 1941, who was a member of the alleged anti-suffrage league.

The sheer number of these examples can support the assumption of continuity, despite the fact that we lack a systematic and detailed analysis of this social phenomenon. It is clear that the public life of the Hungarian community in Transylvania was dominated by the educated middle class (and in a not insignificant proportion by the aristocracy) even before 1918. The same remained true after 1918, with some modification of the occupational structure of this elite, in the sense that being step by step excluded from the civil service, they had to turn to other professional careers.

In the case of the Transylvanian Party, we have the opportunity to analyze the social composition of a large group of delegates at the foundation rally. The representation was implemented according to the principle of regionalism. Every section in the counties and municipalities of Northern Transylvania was entitled to send delegates proportionally to the number of party members. Besides them, the leadership of every section became automatically part of the delegation. As for the distribution of the elected delegates, we can state that it reflects the districts of the counties. Although we lack the list of the elected delegates for some counties, and for almost one fourth of the delegates we have no indication of their profession, the remaining list with 323 names allows a formulation of some basic conclusions.

Table 1.

Occupational composition of the delegates at the foundation rally of the Transylvanian Party (delegates with known occupations only).

Occupational Category	Number of Delegates	Percentage of Delegates (%)
Ecclesiastics	68	21.0
Lawyers	51	15.7
Landowners	41	12.7
Craftsmen, Merchants	39	12.1
Public and Private Officials	22	6.8
Smallholders	20	6.2
Professors, University Lecturers	19	5.9
Factory Owners, Directors	13	4.0
Journalists, Writers, Newspaper Editors	12	3.7
Schoolmasters	11	3.4
Workers	11	3.4
Engineers, Architects, Medical Doctors	8	2.5
Others	9	2.8
Total*	323	100.0

*One person was priest and teacher simultaneously.

Sources: *Ellenzék*, 29 May 1941; Stefano Bottoni, *Az 1956-os forradalom és a romániai magyarság (1956-1959) (The 1956 Revolution and the Hungarians in Romania)* (Csíkszereda:

Pro Print Kiadó, 2006), and oral information from the late Mária Csorja, school teacher from Papolc/Păpăuți.

It is unnecessary for this study to analyze this data in detail. Regarding the phenomenon of continuity the picture is quite clear, the overwhelming majority of the delegates belonged to the educated middle class (upper and lower) and the social elite (landowners, factory owners, etc.). The proportion of workers and smallholders was much below their share of the population, while the ecclesiastical personalities were clearly overrepresented. We can emphasize besides them the weight of the free professions. We can conclude that although the number and share of officials were low in the party, the leading role belonged to the middle class, which became largely engaged in the free professions during the interwar years. Taking into account this change, the social composition of the political elite remained the same as before 1918, despite the two decades of Romanian rule.

Institutional Continuity

The second dimension of the continuity in question is closely connected to its aspects related to personalities. If we speak about the political elite (in the sense that it is the group of persons who participates in decision making as members of bodies or who has significant influence on these, either formally or informally) we cannot disregard the role of institutions, especially in a minority society that resides within the power relations of another nation state. Institutions can have a relatively small weight regarding the personal composition of the elite in the framework of an ethnically homogenous state, because in this case the institutions of the political system do not legitimate their leaders directly. Although their influence on decisions mainly derives from their position in institutions, their role in them is connected to some kind of plebiscitary or electoral legitimation. For minority communities this is only valid with certain limitations. In a unitary nation state, without a state organized institutional framework or an autonomy anchored in public law exclusively for the minority, these structures have to be replaced to secure the uniform political direction corresponding to the legitimate national interest of the community. Taking into account that in national issues the minority is facing a constant majority in representative political bodies on the national level, and there is no other parallel structure, the decision making inside the community has to be realized in other institutions usually deprived of the necessary coercive force. Moreover, without the political apparatus of the state, destined to give an opportunity of representation and participation for every single citizen, minority politics is hardly able to reach every member of the community, which would be necessary for the regular practice of participational politics. Meanwhile, the minority needs at least a credible facade of the unitary will of all its members to get a chance to successfully promote their interests. They must draw their own borders and fill out this space with institutions that are able to secure the effective membership of every “national” and make effective the legitimacy of their leaders in the decision-making bodies.

The easiest way is to incorporate the leaders of all the significant “national” institutions into the decision-making bodies.²¹ They have the necessary legitimation from the membership since the different societies represented by them are clearly inside the community. Sometimes they are even on the frontier defending the minority from the “outer world.” Without the clearly defined borders of a nation state, these institutions begin to replace state agencies. They are substitutes, like the churches defending and maintaining the national language, the private or church-run schools securing the “right” national socialization, the agricultural societies and cooperatives holding or even extending the “national territory” with the help of financial institutions. Now these agencies themselves represent the very “nation” and their leaders and staff come self-evidently to be called up to share the burden of collective decision-making concerning the whole minority society. From the bottom-up they symbolize the consent of the members, whose confidence is delegated to them. In the opposite direction they are able to secure the execution of collective decisions, the “national will”, with the means of their organizations.

The political party stood at the center of the whole community. It was not alone, but was the focal point. It represented the nationality towards the majority. It was its partner in political negotiations and mainly it was present in the public life of the majority. Other institutions with significant importance (churches, economic societies, cooperatives, financial institutions, cultural associations, professional organizations, etc.) were linked to it with personal ties. We saw earlier that smallholders, craftsmen, and merchants were present in the executive committee of the party as representatives of their respective social or professional brackets. But besides them we can find more members with important institutional backgrounds: Unitarian episcopal secretary (Kálmán Kovács), the Unitarian superintendent of the parish of Kolozsvár/Cluj (József Ferencz), a lay Lutheran superintendent (Aurél Ambrózy), the leader of the Catholic Popular Union in Nagyvárad/Oradea (Kálmán Cziffra), a Roman Catholic canon and episcopal commissioner (Joachim Görög), a member of the directorate of the Roman Catholic Status (László Szoboszlay), a Calvinist vice-bishop (Sándor Makkai), another Calvinist vice-bishop and chief notary (János Vásárhelyi), the chief attorney of the Calvinist Királyhágó/Pasul Craiului Church District (Kálmán Thury), Lay Calvinist superintendents of their diocese (János Sebessi, Andor Török), bank presidents (for example count Kálmán Béldi), the secretary of the Chamber of Industry and Commerce (Tibor Zima), the secretary of EMKE (József Sándor), president and vice-president of the Szekler National Museum in Sepsiszentgyörgy (respectively Andor Török and Jenő Nagy), and newspaper editors (Béla Szele, István Zágoni, Tibor Zima).²² It was of symbolic importance, considering this organizational model, when György Bethlen, then chairman of the party, acquired the post of the president

21 Meanwhile, of course, there is a need for excluding the non-nationals from these institutions, either formally or informally, for example using the minority language in the inner administration, or to formulate unacceptable aims for them. See for example the Saxon cooperatives at the end of the 19th century. Gábor Egry, “Az erdélyi százsz Raiffeisen-mozgalom kezdetei” [Beginnings of the Transylvanian Saxon Raiffeisen-movement] *AETAS* 19, no. 1. (2004): 100–131.

22 Béla György, ed., *Iratok a romániai Országos Magyar Párt történetéhez*

of *EMGE*, the largest Hungarian Transylvanian economic association and held it until 1936.

Almost every member of the party leadership had a special institutional background and therefore some influence on the affiliated social structures. The whole system rather closely resembled the corporatist organization of society. This ideological model, popular in the thirties, emphasized the unity of the community, tried to secure legitimate particular interests through the representation of social or professional organizations in collective decision-making, and aimed at the harmonization of these particular interests as subordinated to the national interests. At the end of the minority period, after the dissolution of the political parties, the Hungarian community of Romania was reorganized explicitly according to these ideas in the framework of the People's Community. Its sections were not only groups of lobbyists or policy-making workshops, but also mass organizations of the respective social groups with the participation of every member of the cluster.

One can argue that the main reason to choose this model was the pressure from outside. The Front of National Salvation was organized according to corporatist ideas, and the People's Community was built up inside the latter. But the elite from Northern Transylvania chose a similar model after the reestablishment of Hungarian sovereignty, although the pressure from outside ceased. The new sovereign state, despite certain efforts of the prime minister Count Pál Teleki, preserved its multi-party parliamentary system, inherited from the 19th century, while the Transylvanian Party tried to monopolize public political action in the newly annexed region, unmistakably using corporatist guidelines, rooted in the experience of the minority period or even before.

In the organization of the party this was relevant from the beginning. The first local organizations were built on the former Hungarian party structures, sometimes in cooperation with other institutions. For example the Organization of Hungarian Industrialists in Nagyvárad/Oradea formed one of the first local sections with the former minority party section.²³ The government and the prime minister himself allowed the formation of some regional institutions, like the Economic Council of the Transylvanian Parts (*Erdélyrészi Gazdasági Tanács*) and he also consented to a Szekler Committee.

Data on the social extraction of participants at the foundation rally of the Transylvanian Party not only suggest the dominance of the middle-class in the leadership on every level, but also makes plausible the hypothesis that the new political organization was based on the same principles as those of the former Hungarian parties. The scrutiny of the composition of the leading bodies (Executive Committee, Chairman's Committee) confirms this. Among the 16 members of the latter we can find Kálmán Szócs, president of the Workers House in Szatmárnémeti/Satu Mare, an important institution which was a source of dispute between the National Center of Labor (a corporatist organization, close to the government) and the social democratic trade unions.

23 Árpád Kovács, "Dr. Kovács Árpád hozzászólása az erdélyi értekezleten", [Comments of Dr. Árpád Kovács on the Transylvanian conference] (Az 1940. október 18-19-én tartott erdélyi értekezlet jegyzőkönyve, 78 [Minutes of the meeting of the Transylvanian conference, 78. October 18-19, 1940] Kolozsvár, October 18-19, 1940). Copy of a typescript, in possession of the author.

Szöcs's position came at the price of securing it for the former.²⁴ The party's general secretary, György Páll, was the organizer and leader of the National Center of Labor in Kolozsvár/Cluj. He tried to persuade the leaders of the social democratic trade unions (among them some communists, like Lajos Jordáky) to join his organization.²⁵ László Bethlen, another member of the Chairman's Committee, was the chairman of the Center of the Cooperatives. We can find in the Executive Committee three inspectors of the *EMGE*. Meanwhile Béla Teleki, the chairman himself, was the chairman of *EMGE* also.²⁶ Two chairmen of the craftsmen's association were members of the Executive Committee and eight of them (!) participated in the foundation rally, every one of them being an assumed member of the local leadership.

Even more pronounced were the links between the party and the press. Besides the official newspaper (its chief editor, Gyula Zathureczky, was a member of the Executive Committee), the party had certain influence on other important organs. The chief editor of the semi-official government newspaper *Keleti Újság* was József Nyírő, chairman of the Kolozsvár/Cluj section of the party and member of the Chairman's Committee.²⁷ In the case of two other newspapers from Kolozsvár/Cluj the situation was similar. Domokos Olajos (*Magyar Újság*) and Béla Demeter (*Estilap*) was either a member of the executive committee or at least a delegate at the foundation rally. The three press organs of Nagyvárad/Oradea were managed by Árpád Paál (MP, *Magyar Lapok*), Árpád Árvay (MP, *Estilap*), and Lajos Daróczy-Kiss (*Nagyvárad*) – who was one of the leaders of the party's section in the city and therefore member of the Executive Committee too. Albert Figus-Illinyi, another MP and member of the Chairman's Committee, ran the newspaper *Szamos* in Szatmárnémeti/Satu Mare. In Marosvásárhely/Tirgu Mures, two MPs, István Bíró and Olivér Szilágyi, organized the new newspaper *Székely Szó*.²⁸

The story of *Hargita* in Székelyudvarhely/Odorheiu Secuiesc appears to be symptomatic. This journal was edited by Ákos Hinléder-Fels, and printed in the printing press of Gábor Jodál. Both were MPs of the party, but later they became dissidents. The local leadership tried to reorganize the loyal press. One of the owners of *Hargita* was *EMGE*. With its help Hinléder was dismissed and temporarily replaced by Zoltán Szakács, a member of the upper house of parliament, inspector of the *EMGE* section, and secretary of the party in the county. After a short transitional period his responsibilities were taken over by Lajos Bíró, the chairman of the party in Székelyudvarhely/Odorheiu Secuiesc.

Outside the circle of the daily newspapers the influence of the party was less strong. While more than 70% of them can be linked to the party, only a

24 Dániel Csatári, *Forgószélben. A magyar-román viszony 1940–1945* [The Hungarian-Romanian relations in 1940–1945] (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1968).

25 Lajos Jordáky, *Jordáky Lajos naplója* [Lajos Jordáky's journal] 3 k. 162, 167, 170; Erdélyi Múzeum Egyesület (EME) Kézirattár, Kolozsvár, Jordáky Lajos hagyatéka, I, 2.

26 Four *EMGE* inspectors participated on the founding rally, all of them as members of the leadership of different county sections.

27 He later became member of the parliament too.

28 The story is pictured in Bözödi György's journal (although this part is seemingly a memoir): *Bözödi György naplója. Bözödi György hagyatéka*. [The journal of György Bözödi. Nachlass of György Bözödi] EME Manuscript Collection, Cluj, I, 5. 1 k. 1–20.

third of the weekly papers were directly connected to it. The ratio is even lower for other categories, yet still in the case of church papers, those of professional association, or the official county bulletins, the institutions publishing them stood very close to the party.

The support and symbiotic relationship between the party and other institutions was manifested not only in the participation of members and leaders – the latter in the life of the former – but in their explicit support offered in crisis situations. The most important event was the rally of the party on September 12, 1943. Originally this event was designed to announce some special Transylvanian demands on the government, such as establishing a Transylvanian radio, a Transylvanian Academy of Sciences, maybe a Transylvanian workers' organization in place of the National Center of Labor.²⁹ The party section of Kolozsvár/Cluj made preliminary public readings and outstanding public figures argued in favor of the radio and the Academy. But the rapid change of the international situation following the armistice of Italy generated a critical situation. The party had to demonstrate its unity and let fall its new demands. Instead the rally became a tour de force of the Transylvanian Hungarians, where everyone important was present. We can find among the participants, besides the parliamentary representatives, and Jenő Szinnyei-Merse, the minister of Cults and Public Instruction, important public officials (two prefects, the mayor of Kolozsvár/Cluj, one vice-prefect, the chief of the Transylvanian Agency of the Ministry of Agriculture, the head of the Section for Transylvanian Estate Policy, a ministerial counselor from the Prime Minister's Office), the most important judges and the chief-attorney, the rector and the professorate from the university, the managing vice-chairman of the *EMGE*, etc. The churches were represented at the highest level. Those present were Miklós Józán, Unitarian bishop, Sándor Tavaszy, the Calvinist vice-bishop, Imre Sándor, an episcopal vicar, Béla Baráth, canon and, dean of Kolozsvár/Cluj, Andor Járossy, Lutheran dean, and János Abrudbányai Fikker, dean of Unitarian Theology, suggesting that their institutions were behind the party in this grave situation. Besides them we cannot underestimate the symbolic importance of Áron Tamási, who even gave a talk at the rally.³⁰

The Transylvanian Party, now as a majority party, was organized like the Hungarian party of the interwar period. It was in the center of the national society, enjoying the support of the most important social structures as well. Moreover, it built up a symbiotic existence with them. The party became the organizational agency of the whole society and it had the necessary tools and authority to enforce its norms and ideology. The institutional continuity with the former system is clear. But as in the case of the personal continuity, the roots reach farther back, before the First World War.

29 *Jordáky Lajos naplója vol. 5.* 193; EME EME Manuscript Collection, Cluj, Jordáky Nachlass, I, 2.

30 "A nagyválasztmányi ülés résztvevői", [The list of participants of the rally] *Ellenzék*, September 13, 1943, 5; Tamási was accepted even by the leftist opposition and the illegal communists too. Therefore his part was considered as the sign of some political overture towards the political left. See Dániel Csatári, *Forgószeiben*.

The Transylvanian Alliance (*Erdélyi Szövetség*) was founded on December 7, 1913, and its program was adopted on June 7, 1914.³¹ The aim of this organization was to promote Transylvanian interests despite obvious political conflicts. Originally it was designed as a framework, which could integrate every politician and prominent personality of the province, but finally it changed into the gathering of politicians from the Independence Party, and those in favor of the compromise of 1867, but outside the Party of National Labor. The most prominent member was István Bethlen, this time recognized as being “the” major Transylvanian politician besides Gábor Ugron, the *spiritus movens*, and István Apáthy, biologist and professor at the University. Apáthy began his political career as a member of Dezső Bánffy’s New Party, later he switched to the Independence Party and led its organization in Kolozsvár/Cluj. Although being a politician from the left side of the political spectrum of that era, he was accepted and recognized in large sectors of Transylvanian society as an internationally renowned scholar and organizer of the Hungarians in Transylvania.

Despite the fact that the Alliance was very close to the political opposition of the Tisza government (from the originally 114 members of the Alliance, 26 can be identified as active members of these parties either at the parliamentary or local level, among them 16 were MPs), they never gave up their claim to represent the whole Hungarian community of Transylvania, and to concentrate the different political forces inside this framework. Besides, they proposed a close cooperation with other institutions. Originally the founders wanted to define their organization as the political organ of *EMKE* (Transylvanian Hungarian Cultural Association), but after some internal dispute they modified their conception, adopted a softer formulation, and stated that the Alliance wanted to take part efficiently in the activities of *EMKE* and that they supported *EME* (Transylvanian Museum Society) with their full strength.

The outbreak of the First World War left no opportunity for the Alliance to proceed with its proposals and plans, its activities came to a standstill until the fall of the Party of Labor government. The political turn, and the nomination of governments with the parliamentary support of the Independence and Constitutional Parties totally changed the political landscape. The new governments nominated new prefects and the former oppositional politicians became the best lobbyists because of their strong ties to their party leadership in Budapest. The Alliance renewed its activity on September 30, 1917, when the program was revised and some new members were also co-opted.

The perspectives of the Transylvanian Alliance appeared to be bright from that point onward. Although there was an internal division regarding the problem of general suffrage, they got the chance to carry out other aspects of their program with the help of the new ministers and prefects. The first sign of the new opportunities was the participation, at the sitting of September 30, 1917, of two ministers (Albert Apponyi, Minister of Cults and Public Instruction, and Béla Földes, Minister of Economic Transition) and two

31 Nándor Bárdi, “Az erdélyi magyar (és regionális) érdekek megjelenítése az 1910-es években. Az Erdélyi Szövetség programváltozatai” [Promotion of the Transylvanian Hungarian (and regional) interests in the 1910s. Program versions of the Transylvanian Alliance], *Magyar Kisebbség* 8, no. 2–3 (2003): 93–105.

prefects as delegates of the Ministers of Agriculture and Internal Affairs.³² Their presence, especially that of Apponyi's, suggested the support of the government. Equally important was the fact that the new prefects were co-opted into the steering committee.³³ As the process of the organization rolled forward, it became obvious that the system was deliberately based on the local and county organizations of the Independence Party.³⁴ The boards of the Alliance on the county level were filled with politicians, public officials, and clergymen from the respective counties.³⁵ As well as on the highest level, in the steering committee, and on the local level, the Alliance set the precedent on how to promote Transylvanian interests in a unitary state.

Among members of the steering committee, besides the aforementioned politicians and prefects, we can find county public officials, officials of chambers of industry and commerce, editors of newspapers (like István Zágoni or Vilmos Sümegi), as well as local officials of EMKE, secondary school teachers, university professors, the head of the Office of the Association of Hungarian Industrialists (Ödön Hirsch), and clergymen. In 1914, the participation of the latter was mainly limited to Catholics, but after 1917 the Alliance took up important personalities from the Calvinist and the Unitarian church. Samu Barabás, Calvinist dean, was a well-known figure in Kolozsvár/Cluj, György Boros, professor of Unitarian Theology, was notary-in-chief of the Church and later became bishop. The Catholic contingent consisted of László Zombori, teacher at the Marianum Gymnasium in Kolozsvár/Cluj and section-chief of the Roman Catholic Status, Károly Rasch, co-founder and chairman of the Transylvanian Roman Catholic Society of Literature, József Hirschler, founder of the Marianum and the Providentia press, Gerő Fejér, canon, referent of the Roman Catholic Status and member of the National Council of Public Instruction, and Lukács Bárány, canon, member of the Status, Armenian rite dean of Szamosújvár/Gherla.³⁶

32 Minutes of the meeting of the Transylvanian Alliance. September 30, 1917. OSZK Kézirattár, Quart. Hung. 2456.

33 Gábor Ugron's letter to Apáthy on November 16, 1917. OSZK Manuscript Collection, Quart. Hung. 2456.

34 Minutes of the meeting on November 21, 1917, OSZK Manuscript Collection, Quart. Hung. 2456; Elemér Gyárfás to István Apáthy on January 22, 1918; January 29, 1918. OSZK Manuscript Collection, Quart. Hung. 2456; Zoltán Bölöni to Apáthy on April 6, 1918; Minutes of the meeting of the Board of the Independence and '48er Party of the County of Szilágy OSZK Kézirattár, Quart. Hung. 2456.

35 The chairman in the Magyarláros/Târgu Lăpuș constituency (Szolnok-Doboka/Solnoc-Doboca county) was Ádám Huszár Roman Catholic priest. László Lázár to Apáthy on March 22, 1918. OSZK Kézirattár, Quart. Hung. 2456; Even more revealing is the case of the constituency board of Sepsiszentgyörgy/Sfântu Gheorghe. Participants at a preliminary meeting on the 4th of August 1918 were Károly Székely, Roman Catholic dean, Jenő Hinléder, county chief-attorney, Áron Útő, chairman of the orphan's court, Pál Gábor, chief-constable, Gábor Kovásznay, vice-mayor. Árpád Király to Apáthy on August 5, 1918. OSZK Kézirattár, Quart. Hung. 2456.

36 The members in 1914 and in 1917 are listed by Apáthy's handwriting in a booklet with the title: *Az Erdélyi Szövetségnek 1914. június 7-én Marosvásárhelyt megalapított szervezete, munkaterve és megválasztott vezetőtanácsa* [The organization, work plan and elected steering committee of the Transylvanian Union, as defined on 7 June 1914] (Kolozsvár: Gombos Lyceum Nyomda, 1917) OSZK Manuscript Collection, Quart. Hung. 2456.

Many members of the Alliance, as it was illustrated before, later became important figures in the Hungarian party in the interwar period.

One additional point of this organizational model, which remained implemented until 1944 remains still to be emphasized; the importance of the position of negotiators. As the community defined itself as a single entity, blocking all internal debate, even demonizing it as mere “party politics” contrary to the unitary national interest, they needed to present this interest or will in an as concentrated form as possible. Moreover, this community was a minority even before 1918 in the sense of having little influence on decision-makers in the centers of political power, while – paradoxically – their only chance of success in realizing their aims, conceptualized as “national interest” was to secure the support of the former. The presence of government ministers, or at least their delegates at various events was seen as a sign of this support. Among these circumstances, the key persons became those who were able to command the necessary networks to mobilize decision-makers, or were at least acceptable for them as negotiation partners.³⁷

It is possible to identify one striking similarity between the Hungarian organizations of the minority period and those of Hungarian sovereignty. One could suppose that under foreign rule, politics were oriented toward getting concessions in matters of nationality, while under Hungarian rule regional politicians mainly lobbied for the support of local development. This assumption proves though to be somewhat misleading, not only because the regional development was connected to the national supremacy and therefore to the nationality politics, but the Transylvanian Party, just as the Transylvanian Alliance, declared that they only had the exclusive recipe for successful nationality politics. Thus we can state that they lobbied for concessions regarding regional nationality politics from Budapest and Bucharest similarly, aimed at the realization of their national program that was clearly different from the program of the power centers of the respective states.

Ideological Continuity

As institutional continuity was tied to continuity of personalities, ideological continuity was inseparable from both. These continuities were not simply existing, nor was their existence simply accepted by participants of public life, but rather they were supported by a coherent ideology prescribing this model as the only imaginable form of community organization in Transylvania. Although I will analyze this ideology later, as a part of the

37 Besides these Hungarian organizations we can point out the Saxons as an example for this model even from 1890. See Gábor Egry, “Az erdélyi szászok pénzügyi rendszere és a nemzeti mozgalom kapcsolata a 19. században. 1835–1914” [The financial system of the Transylvanian Saxons and its relationship to the national movement in the 19th century. 1835–1944] (PhD dissertation, ELTE, Budapest, 2006.); Gábor Egry, “Nemzeti védgát vagy szolid haszonszerzés? Az erdélyi szászok pénzügyi rendszere és a nemzet mozgalom kapcsolata, 1835–1914” [National dike or a moderate drive for profit? The financial system of the Transylvanian Saxons and its relationship to the national movement, 1835–1914] (Csíkszereda: Pro Print, forthcoming).

identity politics of the Transylvanian Party, some important elements of it must be stressed already at this stage.

As we saw earlier, the core idea of this ideology was the national unity. Its necessity was supported by the defensive (one could call it paranoid) perception of the Hungarian-Romanian relations in Transylvania. The program of the Transylvanian Alliance chose as its starting point the defenselessness of Transylvanian Hungarians against a Romanian military threat. They also argued that the electoral system was discriminating against Hungarians, granting Romanians a two or threefold weight in some constituencies through the reduction of the number of electors for one representative in comparison to the “Hungarian” constituencies. Moreover, they stressed that the Romanians were underdeveloped in matters economic and intellectual as compared to the Hungarians. Therefore they urged the introduction of universal suffrage with a slight bias in favor of the urban population (who were mainly Hungarians at that time). In one of the points of the program, they mentioned a Transylvanian organization of self-defense (it would have been the Transylvanian Alliance and some other organizations connected to it), and demanded that people should be integrated into it. They also proposed to use the state as a tool of Hungarian national politics, offering state aid for the reversal of the redistribution process of landed property and to provide for the upbringing of schoolchildren in a “national spirit.” In 1917, after the military aggression by Romania, they urged for the installation of special administrative units along the borders, the foundation of an autonomous Greek Catholic Church for Hungarians, the nationalization of the school network of the Romanian Churches with a kind of “cultural zone organization”, colonization efforts to make a “population bridge” between the Szeklerland and the Partium, and several other discriminative regulations.³⁸

Ironically enough, these demands were regularly mirrored by the Romanian nationality politics in the interwar era, but it did not modify substantially the core ideas proposed by the Hungarian parties. What remained of the ideological stock of the Hungarian parties was the conflictual perception of the relationship of the two national communities the need for a unitary organization of the nation, the implementation of this unity via the possible elimination of social differences (or at least their subordination to the national interest), the perception of the state as a tool to realize the objectives of one of the nations, the difference from the center of the state, and the emphasis of specific regional interests and the need of policies of their own. Together they supported the organizational model of the national minority, showing it as a necessity, an inevitable development. On the other hand the continuity in terms of personalities guaranteed the authenticity of both the ideology and the institutional system. The idea of Transylvanism integrated all these elements well before the First World War³⁹ and stressed them even against Budapest. Its

38 Bárdi, “Az erdélyi magyar (és regionális) érdekek megjelenítése.”

39 Zsolt K. Lengyel, “Kós Károly és a Kalotaszeg” 1912 [Károly Kós and the Kalotaszeg], in *A kompromisszum keresése. Tanulmányok a 20. századi transzilvanizmus korai történetéhez* [In search of compromise. Studies on the early history of the 20th century transylvanism] (Csíkszereda, Pro Print, 2007), 33–72.

classical tenet was based on the idea of the regional autonomy of Transylvania and on the drawing of clear borders between national communities, but portrayed it as a kind of democratic coexistence. After August 30, 1940, the Transylvanist idea did not lose its validity and although its redefinition was inevitable, it was meant to be possible with the preservation of its substance.

Ideology and Identity

As an organization integrating the most important social agencies in Northern Transylvania, supported by a “non-aggression pact” with the government party (Pál Teleki and his successors agreed not to extend their party organization into Northern Transylvania in exchange for a coalition and later alliance with the Transylvanian Party), having a significant influence on the press and the public, and maintaining a symbiotic coexistence with the churches (most of the leaders of local sections were actually priests⁴⁰), the Hungarian party was capable of pursuing an effective identity politics. It was able to present and promote the self-definition of the Hungarian community in Northern Transylvania as generally accepted by the very members of the community. In the public space the content of this self-definition was mainly homogeneous, identical in every similar situation and for everybody. Through the norms involved in the definition of the “others” and in the perception of the relationship between the “we” and “them”, the party was able to regulate the interactions as well. Everybody knew how to behave in the given situations, among themselves or in meeting with members of the adjacent entities.

It is very important to stress that this self-definition applied only to Hungarians in Northern Transylvania. The party considered this community as its point of reference and acted not only as its representative, but also as the community itself. Ideologically, identity politics was based on Transylvanist as a traditional form of identity remaining prevalent in the new circumstances as well, even against the idea of national unity.

Self-Definition: The National Mission

The self-definition of the Transylvanian Hungarians was intended to express the difference of this community in respect to the Hungarians from the “Motherland”, and to other “visible outgroups” – Romanians and Jews. The most relevant and specific relation among the three was the one relating to the Hungarians at large because this was somewhat in conflict with the Hungarian national idea, which was the very basis of the territorial revision. Therefore this conflictual situation had to be resolved, and the two identities (Hungarian and Transylvanian Hungarian) had to be harmonized by the implementation of both the differences and unity. The first step was the adequate interpretation of history.

The earlier Transylvanist had its own historical interpretation in line with the traditional romantic national history. The separate existence of two states after the mid-16th century, Transylvania and the Kingdom of Hungary, led to a special interpretation even at the beginning of the 19th century. From

40 See Gábor Egry, *Az erdélyiség színeváltozása* [Transfiguration of Transylvanist].

the perspective of the national history, Transylvania became the guardian of the Hungarian nation and Hungarian culture, while it was, according to this historical perception suppressed in the Hungarian Kingdom by the Habsburgs. Transylvania was conceptualized as a mythic place, where tolerance secured the existence of the Hungarians and where the idea of an independent Hungarian state was kept alive for 150 years. For many, it became the Hungarian state par excellence.⁴¹

Transylvaniam was able to capitalize from these dialectically separated and united histories.⁴² The small Hungarian community was portrayed as the keeper of the nation and the promoter of the national culture and language in an era when these were driven back in other parts of the Carpathian Basin. They formed their own pantheon with historical figures like Gábor Bethlen, János Apáczai Csere, Péter Bod, Mikós Misztótfalusi Kiss, and Miklós Wesselényi, etc., which was later integrated into the larger, national pantheon. They offered even what was needed: a regional history recognized as the main part of the all-national one, this way producing difference and unity.

The party and its politicians tried to exploit this traditional historical interpretation from the beginning. The above-mentioned leading article in the newspaper *Ellenzék*, on the occasion of the foundation rally, stated that the spirit of Miklós Wesselényi was present at this event. Furthermore, it referred to the so-called “guardians of Transylvania” to portray the historical context (an allusion in itself, because György Rákóczi I was presented by his contemporaries as the “guardian prince with the Bible”): the Rákóczis, the Wesselényis, the Gábor Bethlens (*sic!*), the Telekis, the Péter Bods, the János [Apáczai] Cserys (*sic!*) were often lumped together in this historical representation of local cultural heroes of the past.⁴³ Besides them, the party chose as its principal symbol king Saint Ladislau,⁴⁴ “the knight king”, who triumphed over the Cumans at Kerlés/Chiraleş in Transylvania and who was a popular holy figure in the region, frequently shown on wall paintings with his legend in churches (he was actually buried in Nagyvárad/Oradea, one of the principal cities of Partium, the border region adjacent to Transylvania).

More important for the self-definition of Transylvanian Hungarians was the interpretation of the minority period, the two decades between 1918 and 1940. This was, contrary to the “grand history”, a personal experience for all the different Hungarian communities of separate existence. It was almost impossible to present the different social realities as part of some unitary historical scheme. The situation was worsened by the conflicts between the

41 Revealing is the story of Mihály Táncsics’s journey in 1830. Táncsics, who was socialized in accordance with this national history, thought that only Hungarians are living in Transylvania and as he reached the peak of the Királyhágó/Pasul Craiului he saw only the mythic and sublime country before himself.

42 See for example Sándor Makkai, “Bethlen Gábor lelki arca” [Gábor Bethlen’s spiritual face], in *Egyedül* [Alone] (Kolozsvár: Erdélyi Szépművés Céh, without year), 1–75.

43 “The great program”, *Ellenzék*, May 29, 1941.

44 Dezső Albrecht, “Az Erdélyi Párt Szent László nevével és gondolatával indul el útjára!” [The Transylvanian Party begins its journey with St. László’s name and spirit], in *Erdélyi szellem – magyar lélek*, 15–17. Szent László was the horsed figure pictured in the coat of arms of the party.

public officials coming or returning from the “Motherland” and those living in Northern Transylvania even before the Vienna Arbitrage. The differences were too obvious and the existence of a separate, monopolistic political organization in the region had a strong relevance in this context.⁴⁵

The solution was simple: what was impossible in the present should become possible in the future. The minority period was interpreted as a great social transformation, similar to those experienced by the Italian and German societies,⁴⁶ and its result was a new, united community, not divided by social conflicts. The leaders of the party used every opportunity to stress that the social differences were eliminated by the common destiny, the common suffering. The Transylvanian Hungarians no longer used those socially distinctive titles and status symbols common in Hungary, and they cared for every Hungarian, be it a simple smallholder or worker, and not only for the well-being of the middle class. In their perception they produced a harmonious society, in which every legitimate interest was promoted as far as it did not enter into conflict with the unitary national interest.⁴⁷

This was a markedly anti-liberal, anti-individualist, and communitarian view. The social history of the whole minority period was presented as exactly the opposite of that of the “liberal” Dualist era. Authors like Dezső László argued that the politicians before 1918 neglected the real social problems, had an unfounded belief in the assimilation of the national minorities, and therefore they let these groups build up their own societies while the Hungarians failed to achieve the same, concentrating instead on the central state and the occupation of public offices. László concluded that from the two “leverages” of the nation, the Hungarians only had one, the state, which remained without a solid base, conducive to the disorders and revolutions in 1918–1919. But the minority communities were forced to build up their own societies without the state, realizing a social revolution of sorts by the same token.⁴⁸ Now, returning to the “Motherland” and being again equipped with the tools of the state, they could accomplish the real national existence. Although this had to do with the whole nation, the Transylvanians were the forerunners of this indispensable transformation, which was lagging behind in Hungary proper. Their mission was to lead this transformation. Since they suffered for the salvation of the whole nation, they had to present their model for the remaining constituents of the nation, but in this situation they could

45 Dezső László, “*Miért van szükség az Erdélyi Pártra?*.”

46 Some authors emphasized this similarity as far as pointing out that in the German and Italian cases the transformation started from the countryside as an opposition to the cosmopolitan capital cities, and considered Transylvania as a similar countryside related to Budapest.

47 Béla Teleki, Dezső László.

48 Imre Mikó called it “revolution without revolution.” See Mikó Imre, “Erdélyi politika”, in Éva Záhony, ed., *Hitel - Kolozsvár 1935–1944*.

not be subjected by the center. They have to exist separately until the transformation is completed in the rest of Hungary proper.⁴⁹

The ideologists of the party postulated the so-called Transylvanian characteristics differentiating the members of this community from other Hungarians: sense of duty, readiness to take responsibility, and sacrifice. These were closely connected to the so-called “serving the people” ideology of the thirties, formulated by the Calvinist theologians Lajos Imre and Sándor Tavaszy. Even the chairman of the party thought it important enough to be mentioned in his speech when he accepted his election. According to him the Hungarian intelligence in Transylvania is destined to serve the whole community where their destiny placed them. They must return from the cities to the countryside after completing their education and become the leaders of their communities. The state must help them in this task and give them the opportunity of achieving promotion.⁵⁰

At the meeting of the board of the party in Nagyvárad/Oradea in March of 1943, Teleki once again emphasized these characteristics, clearly with the aim of making them accepted by all. He stated that the “Hungarian idea” represented by the Transylvanian Party is nothing more than the readiness for sacrifice and taking responsibility.⁵¹ Another leading member, Dezső Albrecht, declared that the liberal-democratic state had outlived its time, it had to be replaced by the totalitarian state based on the responsibility of individuals.⁵² This was the draft of a new hierarchy of moral values. Individual liberty and equality were subjected to the duty of accomplishment for the community. Sacrifice for the community and duty became the new horizon of morality. Members had to place them before the classical liberal values. This was regarded as the very model of national behavior.⁵³ Dezső László went even further when he wrote an article with the title “Against Equality.”⁵⁴ He stated that instead of the balancing of rights and duties (which he declared as “Jewish”) everybody had to do more for the community than it would result from the doctrine of equal duties. Individual success is possible only through the success of the community, and for this success the principle of equal rights must be undone and replaced by that of unequal duties. Those, who are capable of doing more than the others, are obliged to do it.

This part of the self-definition was consistent with the other elements of the Transylvanist ideology. As the Transylvanian politicians pictured their regional community as illustrating these characteristics, they distinguished it from the other sectors of the nation. At the same time they placed the

49 Dezső László, “Miért van szükség az Erdélyi Pártra?” Sometimes this was explicitly formulated as a theologically based interpretation; the story of salvation. See Sándor Tavaszy: “Isten tette nemzetünk életében” [Deeds of the Lord in the life of our nation], *Az Út (The Road)* XXII, no. 9 (1940): 220–226.

50 Béla Teleki, “Új magyar élet felé”, [Towards a new Hungarian life] *Ellenzék*, May 29, 1941.

51 Béla Teleki, “Áldozatkészség és felelősségvállalás.”

52 Dezső Albrecht, “A jobb magyar jövőendő” [Better Hungarian future], *Ellenzék*, January 23, 1943.

53 Dezső László, Korszzerű magyarság.

54 Dezső László, “Az egyenlőség ellen”, [Against equality] *Ellenzék*, October 3, 1942.

Hungarians of Transylvania higher in the new moral hierarchy, as a communitarian people of sorts without social conflict and capable of realizing the new social order. This new society was imagined as comparable to the models set by the Nazi conception of the “New Europe”, but not identical to them. It was rather a special Hungarian pattern of an organic and somewhat corporatist community of which the Transylvanians were featured as the pioneers.

This ideological construction gave rise to a quite special relationship between Hungary proper and Transylvania. Although in theory Transylvania was considered as part of the same and unitary nation, the Transylvanian Party proposed a special identification based on the differences. According to the traditional view Transylvania was the periphery of the nation and Budapest its center. But the ideologists of the party turned this upside down. In their view the Transylvanians stood morally higher; they were in charge of a special mission, they were pioneers of an inevitable social transformation, and besides forerunners in the defense of the nation against its archenemies the Romanians. They had to be supported by the Hungarians of the “Motherland” without any demand for reciprocity. Moreover, the “other” Hungarians had to accept the new social order proposed by the Transylvanians and accommodate themselves to it. The new Transylvania and its Hungarian society again became the figure of the present and the future of the nation as it once had been – according to the traditional historical interpretation – in the 16th and 17th centuries.

“Them”: Romanians and Jews

The Transylvanian Party used two communities in its discourse of identity politics as relevant outgroups to be distinguished from their own group: the Romanians and the Jews. The relationship to the former was traditionally part of the self-identification of the Hungarian community in Transylvania, but the later emerged to this status only a few decades earlier, in the disorder of the collapse of the Dual Monarchy. Therefore the perception of Hungarian-Romanian coexistence had a traditional core, which was renewed and brought into accordance with the experiences of the minority era, while the so-called “Jewish question” was conceptualized in the terms borrowed both from contemporary Hungary and the Romanian majority, this even before the change of sovereignty.

The major change of view regarding the Romanians was the acknowledgement of their social transformation. The Hungarian elite was ready to praise the extent of the social mobility, the strengthening of the middle-class, the rapid improvement of literacy rates, and the transformation of peasant strata endowed with considerable landed property.⁵⁵ But they saw in it the imminent danger of losing their own social positions. Therefore, although they considered the change of the Romanian community as a model, they conceptualized this relationship as a permanent conflict. The reaction of the younger generations of the Hungarian elite, which was aware of the new situation, consisted in the demand to draw a clear border between the two

55 László Ravasz: “Erdély” [Transylvania], in *Magyar Szemle*, XXXIX, no. 4 (158) (October 1940): 225–230.

communities. Its radicalism marked its proponents off from the perception of the older generations, whose socialization was based on the paternalist view of the Hungarian landlords to their Romanian peasants.

A very interesting debate between Pál Teleki and Árpád Paál, at the so-called Transylvanian Conference in Kolozsvár on the 18th and 19th of October 1940, expressed these two perspectives. The present prime minister gave voice to his views that the key point of the solution of the “Romanian question” would be provided via the public official, speaking Romanian. It is a part of gentlemanlike behavior to address someone in his native language – reasoned Teleki. Therefore it is necessary to make the Romanian language a compulsory subject in the secondary schools in Transylvania. The authority of István Bethlen and László Ravasz backed this proposal. Everybody seemed to agree with them, only Paál ventured to argue with the prime minister, and – surprisingly enough – his speech was followed by general approval. Paál stated that learning the Romanian language was not only unnecessary, but even harmful, because the process of learning a language of lesser value distorts the brain, and is conducive to the “denationalization” of the Hungarian youth.⁵⁶

The episode reveals not only the differences of perception, but a kind of “double speak”, which was typical in the rhetoric of the Transylvanian Party. They stressed at every opportunity that in contrast to the mistaken nationality politics of the Dualist era, the party had no intention to pursue the assimilation of the Romanians. Quite to the contrary, they were ready to guarantee their rights regarding the official use of their language, the public instruction system, and the preservation of their folk characteristics. But all this was made dependent upon two conditions: the similar treatment of Hungarians in Southern Transylvania and the recognition of the so-called Hungarian idea of statehood (*magyar állameszme*). The former proposal was clear, it meant the acknowledgment of the policy of reciprocity, that is, retribution against the Romanians in the northern part of the region when the Romanian government acted against the Hungarians in the South. But the latter proposal relating to statehood was something amorphous and very hard to convey to outsiders.

Its core element was the historic destiny of the Hungarians based on their allegedly unique capacity to form a unitary state in the Carpathian Basin. According to this ideological conception it was the task of the Hungarians to make this state live and to guide the other nationalities towards its acceptance. It was a recurring idea echoed by Béla Teleki, Gábor Tusa, and the nationality politicians of the party, Imre Mikó and Artúr Balogh, on various occasions.⁵⁷ A somewhat popular version can be identified in the remark of Gábor Ugron, district secretary of the party, made at a meeting with the MPs György Váró and Kálmán Kiss in Székelyhidegkút/Vidacutul Roman on the eve of October 1942. Ugron told the audience (mainly Romanians) that: “the Hungarians were

56 *Minutes of the meeting of the Transylvanian Conference*. Copy of a typescript, in possession of the author.

57 *Erdély a magyar képviselőházban I* [Transylvania in the Hungarian House of Representatives] 11, 13, 99–100; *Képviselőházi Napló*, XVI, 16; Gábor Tusa, *A magyar alkotmány továbbfejlesztése. Választójogi reform és a miniszterelnöki hatáskör kiszélesítése* [Improvement of the Hungarian Constitution. Franchise reform and enlargement of the prime minister's competence] (Kolozsvár: 1940), 7–10.

the ruling race in the Carpathian Basin for a thousand years and they will remain so, without suppressing the other nationalities.”⁵⁸ Baron Antal Braunecker pointed out another dimension of the Hungarian superiority when he stated in a parliamentary debate that the Romanians would never know law and order without the Hungarians.⁵⁹

The idea of this historical mission presupposed the unity of the state, so that the Hungarian politicians, among them members of the Transylvanian Party, demanded more from the national minorities than the simple loyalty of the citizens, that is, acceptance of the legal system and the authority of the state. They denied, albeit implicitly, the legitimacy of any autonomist national politics and limited the issue to the recognition of basic language rights and unbiased public services.⁶⁰ Everything else was treated as a matter of disloyalty, sometimes even as treachery. In some cases this conception was connected to the patriarchal view of national minorities. For example, Imre Mikó wrote in an article that the Romanians misused the liberty that they had been granted by the Hungarians.⁶¹ The formulation suggests that in this case Mikó treated civic liberties as a kind of property of the ruling Hungarians and not as an irrevocable right of birth by every citizen.

The perception of the relationship between Hungarians and Romanians was, to be sure, conflictual, therefore the Transylvanian Party urged the Hungarian government to use the state for strengthening the Hungarian establishment in Transylvania. They demanded an active policy of development in the overwhelmingly ethnic Hungarian region of the Szeklerland and financial support for the so-called diaspora communities, and outlined different plans for further colonization. These renewed the idea of the necessity of an ethnic bridge between the Partium and the Szeklerland, but as to its realization, besides the population surplus of the Szekler counties, they also counted on the immigration of the Hungarian population from Bukovina.

We can conclude that the most important elements of this Transylvanist ideology consisted in the conflictual perception of the relationship and the asymmetrical view of the two communities. Either from a traditional paternalist or from a modern (racial) biological perspective, the Romanians were seen as inferior to the Hungarians, even when their great social advancement, accomplished in the interwar period, was recognized. The doctrine of “Hungarian destiny” equaled, in practice, a significant limitation of minority rights. Hence behind the facade of a tolerant minority policy there was a supremacist one. The Hungarians (in fact a minority in the province) felt it justified using the “common” state as a national state of their own. Meanwhile the denial of the legitimacy of an autonomist program for Romanians meant that the oft mentioned guarantee of the preservation of the ethnic characteristics of the minorities boiled down to the permission to keep their folklore traits. A

58 “Váró György és Kiss Kálmán együttes beszámoló körútja”, [Report of György Váró and Kálmán Kiss] *Ellenzék*, no. 226 (October 7 1942), 2.

59 *Képviselőházi Napló*, X, 37 and *Erdély a magyar képviselőházban*, I, 69.

60 See Artúr Balogh’s speech in *Erdély a magyar képviselőházban* 99–100.

61 Imre Mikó, “Erdély és a nemzetiségi kérdés II”, [Transylvania and the nationality question] *Ellenzék*, December 24, 1942.

merely rural existence was considered as their predestined place besides the “knightly Hungarians”, destined to rule.

In contrast to the Romanians, the Jews were relatively new among those regarded as a significant outgroup. Besides the dissimilationist politics imposed by the Romanian state on Jews with a significant Hungarian cultural inheritance after 1918, anti-Semitism had its own specific roots both in Hungary and in Transylvania itself. But the Hungarian-Jewish relationship lacked the traditional established pattern characterizing the Romanian-Hungarian relationship. Therefore the main ideological schemes were simply taken over in this respect from the anti-Semitic drive currently implemented both in Hungary and Romania. For example, a Catholic review in Brassó/Brasov published a study by Béla Bangha even in early 1920. In this characteristic piece, the well-known conservative Jesuit voiced his view that cosmopolitans, Freemasons, and Jews were responsible for the collapse of Hungary.

After a short period of respite, the economic and social crisis of the thirties, and the emergence of Nazi Germany as the only successful revisionist great power, the renewal of anti-Semitism served as a possibly legitimate source of compensation for the losses due to the minority status of Hungarians under alien rule. Some prominent figures (among them Árpád Paál and István Sulyok) urged for the social exclusion of Jews indifferent to their actual behavior – whether dissimilationist or assimilationist – manifested in the Romanian era. This policy was obviously dictated by the pro-German political course, but also by motivations linked to the opportunity it offered to gain important middle-class market positions for Hungarians to the detriment of Jews.⁶²

Although this anti-Semitic view was far from being common even at the end of the thirties, it was not merely a direct importation from Hungary proper after the change of sovereignty. Even the authors of the party program felt it important to formulate it as a special item of their political agenda, the only one with its own title in block capitals. In this point the party agreed with the gradual exclusion of the Jews from the economic and social life, and condemned the so-called “Strohman” (or “Aladár”) arrangements. To justify their demands, they employed the argument related to the attitude of dissimilation, which was attributed to the Jews. It stated that after 1918, the Jews sought only their own advantage, so that in order to secure their social position, they made a separate agreement with the Romanians, this way significantly weakening the Hungarian community.

It is not surprising that in an organization working almost in symbiosis with the Christian churches, anti-Semitic views were mainly formulated according to schemes of Christian anti-Judaism. Béla Bangha is once again a point of reference. József Bálint, a priest and leader of the *Actio Catholica*, echoed Bangha's point of view in the parliamentary debate on the bill concerning the abolition of the “received” status of the Israelite religion.⁶³ But the Christian reservations towards racial anti-Semitism did not mean that the topic was absent in the public

62 See F. Szabolcs Horváth, “Népcsoortpolitika, szociális kompenzáció és gazdasági jóvátétel. A holokauszt Észak-Erdélyben”, [Population politics, social and economic compensation] *Múltunk*, LI, no. 3. (2006): 102–143.

63 *Képviselőházi Napló*, XII, 569–573.

discourse, and sometimes even in a paradoxical way. For example, Dezső László stated in one of his numerous articles that racial anti-Semitism had unacceptable theological consequences but, at the same time, he dismissed the Jews from the possibility of being converted to Christianity because it would mean simply to hide from the inevitable consequences of their racial character.⁶⁴

The whole anti-Semitic discourse was in general built up from stereotypical bits and pieces, in part because of the lack of a local tradition to treat Jews as an entity separate from Hungarians. Some MPs voiced the well-known stereotype of “Jewish Budapest”,⁶⁵ others equated the international workers movement and internationalism in general with the Jews.⁶⁶ Others interpreted the Dualist era and its politics essentially as a failure that opened the gates before the Jews and gave them the possibility of occupying the most important social positions at the expense of Hungarians.⁶⁷ Party members extensively used phrases like the “Jewish spirit” as opposed to the “Christian” or “Hungarian spirit”, and they spoke constantly about immigrant Galician Jewry as some dangerous downcast social cluster.⁶⁸

In practical politics, the party was neither among the most radical, nor among the most moderate in its anti-Jewish drive among contemporary political forces. It is not only the episode of Kövér’s exclusion that supports this conclusion, showing that the accusation of being “not enough anti-Semitic” was an operational tool in internal conflicts. Although they accepted that the whole “problem” had to be “solved” on a European level by unitary means, they also urged for the deportation of Galician Jews, or those without proof of Hungarian citizenship, even before this general “solution” could be implemented.⁶⁹ Sometimes they tried to point out, very oddly that the restriction of the rights of Jews was a part of Transylvanian traditions and the Transylvanians showed even in this case precedence over the Hungarians from the “Motherland.” Dezső Albrecht said in his speech at the rally of the board of the party, at Nagyvárad/Oradea in March 1943, that Saint László, the emblematic historic hero of the party, was the first to make a law against Jews, entailing limitations of Jewish commerce and prohibiting the employment of Christians by Jews.⁷⁰

The “Pendulum” of Identity and Suspended Time

As we have seen, three important outgroups had an impact on the ideology of the self-definition of Hungarians in Transylvania and in the identity politics of the Transylvanian Party. The image of the Romanians and the

64 Dezső László, “A korszerűség kísértései a református egyházban” [Temptations of modernity in the Calvinist church], *Az Út* XXV, no. 3 (1943): 67–74.

65 Dezső Albrecht, see *Erdély a magyar képviselőházban* I, 103.

66 József Bálint, see *Képviselőházi Napló* XII, 569–573.

67 Dezső László, “Korszerű magyarság.”

68 Béla Teleki in the parliament, see *Képviselőházi Napló* XVI, 226, idem. “Áldozatkészség és felelősségérzet”, 13–14.

69 Ibid.

70 Dezső Albrecht, “Az Erdélyi Párt Szent László nevével és gondolatával indult el útjára!”, 15–17.

conceptualization of the relationship between them and the Hungarians was a historical given, only slightly modified by the social processes of the interwar era. Stereotypes about the Jews were available even before 1940 and the Transylvanian Party adopted the prevailing tenets of the contemporary Hungarian establishment in this respect as well. These relationships were relatively easy to handle in the framework of their identity politics because the opposing entities had long since been defined (as in the case of Romanians) or they seemed readily fixable (as in the case of Jews).

More paradoxical was the relationship to the Hungarians from the "Motherland." Despite the unquestionable doctrine of national unity (with the subsumption of the unitary nation state), the Transylvanian Party referred to this group as an outgroup proper. In their perception (and in their self-perception) the Transylvanian politicians emphasized the differences. The political demands resulting from this conception were almost identical with the demands emanating from a national minority: administrative autonomy, unitary organization of the community, the restriction of parties from Hungary imposing on political activities in Transylvania, and independent or at least semi-independent institutions of their own for Transylvanians (like an Economic Council of the Transylvanian Parts, a special Academy of Sciences, a university, a radio station, etc.). All this could have been found in the program of a movement representing a national minority. The differences, the separate traditions, and a history or a social system of their own were more important for the party to sustain than the recognition of similarities with the "Motherland." On the other hand, as against the Romanians and the Jews, the Transylvanian Hungarians – in fact a minority in the region – needed the national unity. But living among Romanians with everyday interactions represented by itself an important difference as compared to the social experience of people in Budapest. In this situation, the unique way to preserve "national unity" was to adopt common Hungarian stereotypes of the "others", whether traditional or modern.

Two important problems emerged from this complex of differences and uniformities. The first one was the situational, or relational, aspect of political options. The definition of the Transylvanians – the *erdélyiség* – always depended on the given situation, more precisely on the question: in relation to whom was it defined at the moment? As against the ethnic outgroups, they were Hungarians, mainly without any qualification. As against Hungarians of the "Motherland", they were Transylvanians with a legitimate demand for certain autonomy, but also with a legitimate demand for unconditional help against Romanians. Thus, to define themselves as Hungarians or Transylvanians was like the movement of a pendulum.

The second problem was how to cope with unity in these circumstances. The identity politics of the Transylvanian Party offered an interesting solution, the suspension of time in the system of identity. As we have seen above, national unity and differences were interpreted in the same way. The national unity belonged to history and represented a promise for the future but it was not part of the reality, at least not as a real social experience. The differences were accepted as inevitable consequences of the pioneering role attributed to Transylvania in the social revolution of the nation, the Transylvanians being

considered as bearers of a major national mission. They became a model for the rest of the nation with their existing society, allegedly without social differences, and – as the “saviors” – they were placed on the highest level of the moral hierarchy of the nation. To make them similar to Hungarians proper, with their merger with the nation state, would have been the greatest of faults. They had to remain autonomous from the “Motherland” until their special “Transylvanian spirit” would prevail and assimilate the “Hungarian soul.” But what if that were never to happen?

Conclusions: Continuity and the Supremacist Transylvanism

In the first part of this study the threefold continuity (personal, institutional, and ideological) of the Hungarian minority society in Transylvania was demonstrated. The same persons (or if deceased, at least persons from the same social milieu and with the same pattern of socialization) tried to realize the same organizational model on the same ideological basis from the beginning of the 20th Century until 1944. This organizational model was first outlined in the program of the Transylvanian Alliance and even partially achieved in its political action in 1917–18. It continued to prevail in the minority period (it was ideologically accepted by the whole community after the Vásárhely Meeting in 1937) and it was maintained by the monopolistic organization of the Transylvanian Party. The supporting ideology of this model was Transylvanism (*erdélyiség*), promoting a supposedly united community without social differences, organized according to the organic perception of the nation.

Although in our historical conscience, Transylvanism is mainly regarded as a “democratic” idea, accepting the equality and friendly coexistence of the three Transylvanian nations, before 1918 and after 1940 the very same persons (for example Áron Tamási) in the same or successively formed organizations stood for Hungarian supremacy in the region, based on the conflictual perception of coexistence among ethnic clusters.⁷¹ Those who earlier had praised the social transformations in interwar Romanian society, seeing in it a model of sorts, after 1940 became advocates of implicitly discriminative politics (reservation of state aid for special Hungarian national purposes) and promoted the idea of the “Hungarian historical mission” in the Carpathian Basin.

The question emerges naturally: was this conception of supremacy not a core element of the Transylvanist ideology? We can surely interpret the “democratic period” of this ideology as an attempt to preserve the Hungarians in Transylvania from inevitable changes, resulting not directly from the political hegemony of Romanians but rather from the social transformations it entailed, the consolidation of a Romanian middle class, and the differential figures of the population movement at the expense of the Hungarians, etc. From this perspective the classical Transylvanism is the ideology of the division; separate existence with regulated interactions and clear borders

71 For the period before 1918 and the so-called “proto-Transylvanism” see Zsolt K. Lengyel, “Kós Károly és a Kalotaszeg 1912.”

between the communities. Similarly divisive is the supremacist version of Transylvanism during the periods of Hungarian sovereignty. Neither the conception of the Transylvanian Alliance, nor the program of the Transylvanian Party counted on the assimilation of the Romanian minority. They demanded only the stabilization of the situation of the Hungarians as a dominant minority and the use of the power of the nation state to this end. They wanted predominance, not assimilation.

From the other perspective, the Transylvanist ideology admitted the differences between Hungary and Transylvania from the beginning and made it an important ingredient of Transylvanian identity. But the reality of a “conflictual” coexistence with the Romanians did not allow for the drawing of all the consequences of the situation, and this de facto minority needed the help of the whole nation and the nation state for the achievement of its project of “Hungarian Transylvania.” The result was a supremacist Hungarian identity promoted by a regional elite in the institutional framework of an organized unitary minority community. They regarded the Romanians as culturally inferior and vindicated the right to rule in Transylvania. Such were the results of the common doctrine of the Hungarian “historical mission.” As compared to Hungarians from the “Motherland”, the Transylvanists considered themselves in a position of authenticity and superiority both in moral and national terms. Their conception of a national mission positioned Transylvanians above all other sectors of the nation as pioneers of a “social revolution” and as veritable “saviors” of the nation. To be a Transylvanian Hungarian, for adepts of Transylvanism, was to be unique and exceptional during a short historical period.