

# Vilmos Tánczos:

## Csángós in Moldavia

This study was prepared originally for the booklet titled "Magyar nemzeti kisebbségek Kelet-Közép-Európában" (Hungarian National Minorities in East-Central Europe) [1] (Published under the title "Hányan vannak a moldvai csángók?" in Magyar Kisebbség, No. 1-2, 1997. (III), Pages 370-390). Significantly expanded and modified version.

### 1. The Term "Csángó"

The eastern province of Roumania, called Moldavia - namely in counties Bacau, Botosani, Iasi, Neamt, Vaslui and Vrancea - has nearly a quarter of a million (exactly 243133) Catholic inhabitants, on the basis of the data of the Roumanian population census in 1992. The Hungarian and the international literature in this subject unanimously agree that the Catholic population living in Moldavia - apart from the small proportion of assimilated people - elements of Roumanian, German, Polish, Italian and Gypsy origin - are of Hungarian origin. This fact is acknowledged also by significant Roumanian researchers. [2] Furthermore, it is also probable that a certain part of the Greek Orthodox Roumanian population of Moldavia also used to belong to the Hungarian ethnic group some time, however, we cannot speak of any scientific research that was carried out specially in this subject. [3] In the lack of adequate results of such investigations today we may only guess that the assimilation of the Hungarian Moldavian Catholics in the 16-18th century was not only of linguistic but of religious nature, as well: in certain villages the people lost not only their language but - upon the pressure of the Boyars and of the princes, and as a result of the lack of priests - their religion, as well. Some village names of Moldavia [4], the geographical names of this region, the material of family names, as well as the above mentioned historical reports doubtlessly lead us to such conclusions. The reverse assimilation, namely the merging of the Greek Orthodox population with Roumanian mother tongue into the Roman Catholic Hungarian population could be significantly less in proportion, nevertheless, the family names of Roumanian origin that can be found in the Catholic villages draw the attention to the existence of such process.

The Catholics living in Moldavia are recorded both in science and in the public knowledge under the name of Csángó. Furthermore, the Hungarian ethnic group living in the Gyimes Pass and in the village Hétfalu near Brassó is also called Csángós, and this term is used sometimes also even for the Szeklers who had migrated to Bukovina at the end of the 18th century and were later resettled to the Carpathian Basin.) Etymology of the name of this ethnic group reveals also an important detail of the history of Csángós: according to a widespread scientific hypothesis that has never been verified convincingly, the word Csángó can be originated from the verb csang/csáng, that means "wander", "roam", "ramble", "tramp", etc., so the name of this ethnic group clearly indicates the wandering, settler nature of the Csángós. [5]

However, the Moldavian Hungarians do not constitute a homogeneous group either from historical or from linguistic-ethnographical points of view. The majority of the researchers do not agree with the use of the expression Csángó as a general designation for these people, they prefer to make difference between the Hungarians settled down here in the Middle Ages and the Szekler refugees who arrived in the 17th-19th centuries (mostly at the end of the 18th century) in smaller or larger waves. Some speak of Moldavian Hungarians and of Moldavian Szeklers [6], while others try to define the obvious differences by using the terms Csángó-Hungarians and Szekler-Hungarians. [7]

Nevertheless, the widespread use of the name Csángó seems to be general not only in the common language but also among the historians, linguists and ethnographers, as well. Assimilation and acculturation processes taking place in Moldavia merge the cultural differences of the traditional folk culture, language, historical awareness, etc., therefore the population of Szekler origin whose ancestors had never considered themselves Csángós, today seem to accept the designation Csángó for themselves. Today both groups use this term to describe someone who do not belong to either side, who has been alienated both from the Roumanians and from the Hungarians, while at the same time the word has the pejorative denotation of being degenerated, mixed, imperfect.

## 2. The Issue of Origin. The Regional-Historical Configuration of the Csángós

References to Moldavian Hungarians can be found in historical sources since the 13th century. However, as far as their origin is concerned, there is no scientifically convincing explanation up till now. The romantic theory according to which the Csángós are the successors of the Cumanians [8] has been refuted for a long time, and we can meet only sporadically with the supporters of the other view according to which the basic layer of the Moldavian Hungarians belong to a friction of the Hungarians who remained outside the Carpathians and did not take part in the original settlement, conquest of the Hungarians. [9] Today it has become a generally accepted concept that the Moldavian Hungarians arrived to their current location some time in the Middle Ages not from the east but from the west, from the Carpathian Basin. [10] However, ideas are different as to when and why the first settlements were established, and from which region of the Hungarian-populated area they settled out to Moldavia. The majority of the researchers assume a relationship between this group and the Hungarians of Szamos-valley and also of the Upper-Tisza region. [11] However, according to a theory based on linguistic geography, the majority of the Csángós broke away from the Hungarians of Mezőség from Inner Transylvania. [12] Presumably, in addition to the Hungarian population of non-Szekler origin some Szeklers also settled down in Moldavia even in the Middle Ages, their presence can be assumed mainly in the southern regions (at the lower course of the rivers Szeret and Tatros). [13]

It is a generally accepted view that the ancestors of the Csángós arrived to Moldavia supported by a systematic Hungarian imperial policy, their task was to control, to defend the eastern borders of the medieval Hungarian Kingdom. This borderline ran along the line of the river Szeret, indicating that eastward shifting of the Hungarians did not stop at the Carpathians. The Hungarian kings tried to exercise military control over the territories beyond their borderland, as well, by pushing forward their watchtowers, outposts, and border forts up to the line of the rivers Dniester and Danube. (Kilia, Dnesterfehervar/Akkerman, Braila, Orhei/-rhely, etc.). The systematic resettlement with the purpose of defending the borderlands could not have taken place, by any means, earlier than at the very end of the 13th century. The first settlements in the defended frontier region could be established following the Mongol invasion of Hungary in 1241-42 the earliest, then at the beginning of the 16th century. In the 15th century the number of the Moldavian Hungarians was increased further also by the arrival of the Hussite heretics who had left the southern part of Hungary escaping from the inquisition.

There is not any scientific backing for the Roumanian concept that the Moldavian Csángós are Roumanians who were Hungarianised by the Catholic Church. Today the aim of this theory born by ideological reasons is to facilitate the "re-Roumanianisation" of the Csángós. [14] The historical documents [15], the materials regarding the names of locations and persons [16], the ethnographic facts [17] all prove that in some areas of Moldavia - mainly in the river-valleys being in the foreground of the passes of the Carpathians, namely in key places from military and strategic

points of view - the presence of the Hungarian ethnic group preceded the settlement of the Roumanians.

The Moldavian Hungarians prior to the defeat at Mohács (in 1526) enjoyed the protection of the strong and centralised Hungarian Kingdom, since this ethnic group at that time was one of the vital factors of an imperial policy. Historical sources can prove that at the turn of the 15th-16th centuries within the ethnically mixed population of Moldavia the Hungarian was the largest non-Roumanian people [18], however, it is almost impossible to estimate the total number of the population in the voivodeship. In compliance with the statement made by Voivode Petre Schiopul in 1591, at this time Moldavia could have had only 47,167 inhabitants, however, we can hardly believe that this number regarded the whole territory of Moldavia. [19] Roumanian historians estimate the number of the populations of both voivodeship to half million at the end of the Middle Ages, however, this estimation lacks any basis, the real number shall be found somewhere between the two data. [20] Demographic importance of the Hungarians was by all means high and this was stressed also by the social, economic and political role of the Hungarians.

The Hungarian ethnic group settled down at the wide and productive flood area of the largest river, the Szeret, mainly around the delta of its western tributaries (Moldavia, Beszterce, Tatos). At this time the region populated by Hungarians were composed of settlements, interconnected by an unbroken chain of dwellings (e.g. between Szucsáva and Romanvasar, in the region of Bako, at the right bank of the river Szeret, at the lower course of the Tatos). Even towns were established in places of key importance from economic, commercial, military-strategic points of view (Roman = Roman[vasar]i, Bacau = Bako, Adjud = Egyed[halma], Trotus = Tat[a]ros, Targu-Ocna = Aknavásár, Baia [Moldavia]bánya, Iasi = Jász[vásár], Husz, Barlad, etc.), with Hungarian and partly German population. Urban life and trade in Moldavia developed due to the activities of the Hungarians and the Germans in the 14-15th centuries. (A meaningful evidence is that the Roumanian word "oras" (town, city) has been borrowed from the Hungarian word "város".) However, the civil development was retarded by the unfavourable political-military conditions already at the end of the 16th century and was ultimately ceased because of the unfavourable political-military situation, as a result of the Mongolian-Cossack military campaigns. The artisan and merchant population of the market-towns - most of them belong to the Hungarian ethnic group - got assimilated into the Roumanian majority.[21]

The inhabitants of the Csángó villages, who had settled down in the plain and were dealing first of all with plant cultivation created an ethnically and religiously homogenous group. They were originally free peasants, which meant that the village communities had to pay taxes directly to the voivode, without the intervention of the Moldavian nobility (Boyars), although later on, during the 17-18th century, many of them became serfs. It can be assumed that the free Moldavian Roumanian villages adopted some farming techniques and legal customs (e.g. certain forms of the local government, "arrow-lot" in the periodical distribution of the land of the village border, the role of the clan groups in land-ownership, etc.) [22] The inhabitants of the Moldavian free peasant villages were called "razesi" in the Middle Ages, this word can be originated from the Hungarians word "részes" (share-farmer). The settlement system of plot-groups and blind alleys reflecting the clan relations has remained in certain villages.[23]

From the Moldavian place-name material, from the location of the villages which were later Roumanianised and from the existing documentation it is obvious that the territory inhabited by the Hungarians settled down in Moldavia during the Middle Ages was significantly larger than the region occupied by their offsprings today. Over the years both owing to the wars and as a result of

the linguistic-religious assimilation, the Hungarian ethnic group completely disappeared from certain areas, the village-"chain" was disrupted at several places, the area occupied by Hungarians shrank. There are only two language enclaves where the offsprings of the medieval Moldavian Hungarians of non-Szekler origin could survive: in some villages north of Románvásár (the so called northern Csángós) and in some villages south of Bako (the so called southern Csángós) . The central geographic location of the villages existing even today and their advantageous economic conditions indicate that their inhabitants used to belong to the first settlers of this part of the country. Both the northern and the southern Csángós are characterised by the strongly archaism in their language (e.g. the sibilant pronunciation of the consonant "s", between "sh" and "s", the archaic pronunciation of the diphthong "lj", today spelled "ly", etc.), furthermore, the folk culture that has retained several old elements.

The largest, centrally located villages of the northern Csángós are Szabófalva and Kelgyest, there are some Catholic villages around these where there are some elderly people who can speak Hungarian more or less (Jugán, /jfalú/Traian, Bargován, etc.), while in other villages the Hungarians have been completely Roumanianised. The mother community of the population of Balusest and of Ploszkuceny, established later at the lower course of the river Szeret, was the centre of the northern language enclave (mostly Szabófalva).

The most important villages of the southern Csángós south of Bákó are Bogdánfalva, Trunk, Nagypatak and Gyoszény, this latter one shows a strong Szekler influence. Bogdánfalva is the mother community of /jfalú founded after the first World War. In Szeketura only the older generation speaks Hungarian.

Because of the devastation of the wars and of the epidemics, and not least because of the linguistic and religious assimilation to the Roumanians, the number of the Moldavian Hungarians was reduced very significantly. It began to rise again to a significant extent only from the middle of the 18th century, due to the increasing rate of Szekler emigration. Eastern Szeklers arrived here in a high number especially at the time of the massacre in Madéfalva (1764) - from the Catholic Csík and Gyergyó, as well as from Háromszék - and the majority of the so called Szeklerised Csángó villages existing even today were established in this time. Since the large part of the economically undeveloped Szeklerland was short of arable land, the flow of people from this area to Moldavia continued even in the 19th century because of overpopulation. Rate of emigration got a new impetus again at the time of the turn of the century, however, by this time larger towns of the Roumanian Kingdom (Regat) became the main targets for the Szekler emigrants who had been forced to leave their land.

In a small proportion there had been also Calvinists among the settlers to Moldavia, who were assimilated into the Catholic majority within a short time. Even in the villages (like Szászkereszt, Prálea, Vizánta) where Calvinists formed the majority of the inhabitants they did not preserve their original religion. This means that we cannot find any descendent of the Moldavian Csángós among the present-day Calvinists living here, the 518 Hungarian Calvinists recorded in the census of 1992 in Moldavia are more recent immigrants.

Moldavian settlements inhabited by Szekler Csángós significantly differ from one another:

a) At the time of the culmination of the emigration wave (i.e. at the end of the 18th century) large, homogenous masses started towards the east and these groups generally remained together in Moldavia, too. Probably, this is the period when the largest villages (Pusztina, Frumósza,

Lészped, Szölöhegy and its surroundings, Magyarfalu, Lábnik, Kaluragén, etc.) belonging to the Moldavian Szeklers, being homogeneous from ethnical and religious points of views, were established in the uninhabited or sparsely populated regions. Considering the fact that the best arable lands were already "reserved", the new settlers had to confine themselves with the narrow valleys of smaller rivers and streams. Thus, even these relatively big Moldavian Szekler villages have a kind a highland atmosphere.

b) It can be assumed in case of several villages that Szeklers joined an already existing Hungarian population there - sometimes their medieval origin could also be proved -, and significantly changed the language and the folk culture of the settlement. Clearly this happened in the following villages in the region of Szeret, like Gyoszény, Lujzikalagsor, Klézse and Forrófalva [24] and probably in Külsörekecsin and Szászka, as well. Some villages along the Tatros and its tributaries like Gorzafalva, Tatros and maybe Onyest may also have been inhabited by Hungarians earlier. However, the strong Szekler influence faded the original dialect and the categorisation of such villages according to dialects proved to be problematic for researchers using the methods of linguistic geography. [25] It is interesting to note that the northern Csángós never mixed with the Szeklers, this can be explained with the higher density of population of the Csángó territory and with the population emitting nature of their prolific villages.

c) Szeklers arriving in small, isolated groups, or the ones arriving later (during the 19th century) or those who moved away from the Moldavian villages settled down in or around existing Roumanian villages. Presumably, some villages had a mixed Szeklers Roumanian population. The small settlements at the valleys of the small rivers (Tatros, Tázló, Aranyos-Beszterce, other brooks) belong to this latter, ethnically mixed, third group of the Szekler Csángó villages (like Gerlény, Lilijecs, Szaloncka, Szerbek, Gyidráska, Jenekest, Turluján, Bogáta, Dormánfalva, Szárazpatak, etc), we can find such villages even in the region of Szeret (like Kétris, Furnikár, Dózsa/Álfalu, etc). Similar ethnical mixture could be witnessed also in the highlands of the Carpathians (Csügés, Bruszturósza, Gutinázs, Fqrészfalva, Vizánta, etc.). Some small Hungarian settlements or village districts can be found above the Roumanian villages located at the region of the mountain streams, at the lower course of the brook. (Kukujéc, Ripa, Larga, Esztrugár, Neszujest, Váleri, Berzunc/Butukár, Szálka, Szalánc, Csedák, Kápota, Prálea, etc.)

As a whole it can be stated that Szeklers who arrived to Moldavia during the 18th-19th centuries settled down mostly in the highland that had not been populated before - offering only a limited possibility for agriculture and vine cultivation, being suitable for animal breeding and sylviculture - and occupied a relatively large territory. The population of their villages are usually smaller than that of the medieval Moldavian Hungarian villages, and in several places they live in a mixed environment as far as ethnic groups and religion are concerned and this fact facilitates their linguistic assimilation to the Roumanians. Nevertheless, we have to stress that this part of the Moldavian Csángós - of Szekler origin - assimilated at a smaller extent than the medieval Hungarian population, in this way about the 80 percent of the Moldavian Catholics preserving their mother tongue belong to the Szeklerised layer.

### 3. Historical demography

According to sources from the 16th - 18th centuries (e.g. ecclesiastical census, records of travellers, etc.) the historical development of the number of the Moldavian Catholics can be

estimated only approximately. From the first half of the 19th century and mainly from the middle of the century we have some more exact data, since on the basis of the evaluations ordered by the ecclesiastic schematists and the princes, then of the first official censuses of the population (1859, 1899) and of the first scientific reports we can get a picture of the most important demographic processes. From among the censuses carried out in the 20th century applying modern methods we can rely mostly on the ones of the years 1930, 1941 and 1992, because these published also some data regarding the denomination of the village population. Censuses during the "socialist" era (1956, 1966, 1977) published the results only at the level of the large administrative units and even if they reported some data regarding the villages (1966), their religious denomination was not asked, therefore these records cannot be used to draw any conclusion regarding the Moldavian Csángós.

On the basis of the above mentioned deficient sources - first of all in the light of the data of the census in 1992 - nevertheless, we can follow the main demographic processes of the Moldavian Catholics (e.g. rate of increase in population, movement of the population to other administrative units, change in the rate of people compared to the majority Greek Orthodox population), however, researchers have not done this work, yet. [26] In this way today we have to confine ourselves with outlining the global historical data concerning the whole Moldavia, since we hardly have some comparable historical data (concerning the same regional or administrative units), and correct results of research.

Table 1. - Historical development of the number of the Moldavian Catholics

...

The above demographic data are justified by the events of the history of the Moldavian Hungarians, roughly outlined earlier.

The remarkably high increase during the last two centuries cannot be considered to result exclusively from the new immigrations, but to the extremely high natural growth. By the 19th and 20th centuries the epidemic diseases being common in the previous centuries ceased, health care improved, the infant mortality rate decreased, while the Moldavian Catholics preserved their earlier demographic attitude rooting in their archaic religious mentality, and this brought about an unexemplary population growth compared to the European rate.

The number of the Moldavian Catholics increased from 109953 to 240038 between the years 1930 and 1992 and this growth of 118 per cent significantly exceeds the also extremely high - 67% - growth in the population of Moldavia. At the same time we must bear in mind that the overpopulated Moldavia was the most important supplier of human resources in Roumania in the years of the "socialist industrialisation", and in this period a part of the Moldavian Csángós, together with many Roumanian people, moved to the Transylvanian towns, as well as to the industrial areas of the southern part of the country. Estimated number of people who moved to Transylvania is about 50 thousand, while who left for Wallachia and Dobrudja is about 15 thousand [32]. We do not have any data regarding the huge number of Csángó guest-workers labouring in foreign countries - particularly in Israel, Hungary and Russia - at the time the census was made (January 1992). Considering all these facts it can be stated that demographic growth after the year 1930 is actually not 118% but 180%, this means that the number of people of Csángó origin has almost trebled during the six decades between 1930 and 1992 on the whole territory of Roumania.

#### 4. Linguistic assimilation

In written records regarding the Moldavian Csángós we can find a lot of data confirming that this Hungarian people - group of basically medieval origin was exposed to a permanent Roumanianisation during their history of several centuries. As a result of the assimilation processes, today the majority of the Moldavian Catholics do not know the mother tongue of their ancestors and declare themselves Roumanians.

However, we have only extremely sporadic data about the fact of assimilation and very little is known about the assimilation processes of times before the 20th century, in the lack of adequate sources. As it could be seen, we have to rely only on estimations even regarding the development of the absolute number of the Catholics in the period from the Middle Ages to the 18th century, while we have only some reports and sporadic data about the assimilation processes that began already at this time. (First of all, we think of the news found in missionary reports and accounts of travellers.)

The data of Roumanian surveys made in the second half of the 19th century can be accepted as authentic ones not only concerning the absolute number of the Catholics but regarding the mother tongue of the population, as well. [33] It is not the reliability of the data but the deficiency of the surveys that means some problem.

Sematisms of the episcopacy of Jászvásár give information only about the total number of the Catholics (see Table 1), therefore the mother tongue data of the census of 1859 are extremely valuable. This census recorded 37825 people (71,6%) with Hungarian mother tongue from among the 52881 Moldavian Catholics, namely the mother tongue of the rest 15058 people was Roumanian even at that time. Returns of this census were published also broken down to counties [34], in this way this evaluation can serve as a starting point for further, more detailed researches. In the knowledge of the current conditions it is astonishing that in 1859 the 86.6% of the Catholic population of Bákó county (22426 people from 25896 Catholics) and the 94.6% of the Catholic population of Roman county (14736 people from 15588 Catholics) still declared themselves Hungarians. In the second third of the 19th century and even probably at the time of the turn of the century in the central, "classic" region of the Csángó-Hungarians - namely in the northern Csángó villages around Románvásár, in the southern Csángó villages south of Bákó and in all the Szeklerised Csángó villages - linguistic conditions were similar to those of the present-day Szeklerland. This means that assimilation began in the peripheral areas, among the Catholics who had got into a sporadic situation: this time only one fifth of the Moldavian Catholics were living out of Bakó and Roman counties (11397 people from 52811), however, only 633 of them (5.8%) declared themselves Hungarians.

Unfortunately, the next census in Moldavia (1899) did not investigate the mother tongue and ethnic relations. However, these deficiencies are retrieved a little by a sophisticated scientific work titled *Marele Dictionar Geographic al Romaniei* (Great Geographic Dictionary of Roumania) published in five volumes between 1989 and 1902, in which data of official origin were outlined, broken down to villages. In the case of the most important villages dwelt (also) by Catholics the ethnic status and the mother tongue of the population are also indicated in figures. However, the Hungarian Csángó-researchers did not pay too much attention to this important work, although they had been aware of its existence. [36] On the basis of the demographic data included in this dictionary we can arrive at the conclusion that the rate of Catholics declaring themselves Hungarians diminished in the second

half of the 19th century both in Bako and in Roman counties. [37]

Namely, the linguistic assimilation of the Moldavian Csángós grew to mass proportion in the second half of the 19th century, however, this process probably concerned only the Catholics living sporadically within the villages, and the inhabitants of the settlements enclosed by the Orthodox Roumanian villages, first of all the peripheral areas of the northern Csángó block. On the basis of the two above sources it can be seen that a significant proportion of the Hungarian Catholic population, exposed to the risk of assimilation the most, moved from the traditional areas of the Csángó blocks at Románvásár and of Bákó because of the overpopulation in the second half of the 19th century. [38] Csángó fragments, created as a result of immigration, were assimilated even in this century together with some larger but isolated villages. In the centre of the northern language enclave (in Szabófalva and its direct environment), but mostly among the southern Csángós of Bákó region, as well as in the larger Szeklerised Csángó villages along the rivers Tatros and Tázló, the linguistic assimilation did not begin at the turn of the century, yet, the Hungarian population could even not speak Roumanian here at that time.

In the lack of correct data it is almost impossible to grasp with numerical accuracy the assimilation processes taken place during the 20th century. The official Roumanian evaluations following the turn of the century can be considered as authentic ones regarding the Moldavian Hungarians only about their religious status [39] and in this way they are completely inadequate for giving a total view regarding the command of Hungarian language by the Moldavian Catholics, their ethnical-national identity, namely the progress of the assimilation processes. The intentional distortions of the censuses of 1930 and 1992 are revealed by their own internal contradictions [40], and also the experimental facts. It is enough to refer only to the data accumulated in ethnographic, linguistic, historical publications [41] that can prove unanimously that there are Hungarian people living in Moldavia also in places where it was not recorded by the Roumanian censuses at all.

According to the official Roumanian censuses of the 20th century the Moldavian Catholics have become completely Roumanians by the year 1992 both as to their mother tongue and as to their nationality.

Table 2. - The development of the number and rate of the Moldavian Hungarians according to the official Roumanian censuses

...

It can be clearly seen from the above figures that the number of the Moldavian Catholics increased nearly to its five-fold between 1859 and 1992 (from 52881 to 240038 people) and their rate within the total population changed also to their favour: while in the middle of the 19th century they amounted to the 4% of the population of Moldavia, today their rate within this part of the country is about 6%. This growth is remarkable mainly if we consider the high rate of increase characteristic to Moldavia and also the migration of the Csángós (as it was mentioned earlier it concerned about 65 thousand people in the last decades).

At the same time it is also obvious that the Catholic Csángós of Hungarian origin totally lost their mother tongue and Hungarian-awareness in the examined period - at least according to the data of the censuses. In the middle of the last century 71.5% of them declared themselves Hungarians (37825 people from 52881 Catholics at that time), while today only 0.8% of them declare themselves Hungarians. If we consider the regional division of the 1826 Moldavian Catholics we



can see that in the census the 1301 Hungarian Catholics were recorded in the towns, while the number of Catholics declaring themselves Hungarian in the villages was only 525. Namely: according to the census by the end of the 20th century the number of the Hungarians living in Moldavian Csángó villages diminished to about half thousand people.

#### 5. Present-day command of Hungarian language

Namely, on the basis of the above figures we cannot form an idea about the linguistic-ethnic identity-awareness of the Moldavian Csángós. As to the official data the assimilation processes - the existence of which can also be detected in the same data - have been ultimately closed, the proportion of the Moldavian Catholic (Csángó) Hungarians has become totally negligible within the total population of this part of the country. (Their number together with the town-dwellers is 1826, this represents 0.04%.)

Here we are not in a position to investigate how the official Roumanian surveys in the 20th century got to the above mentioned data. We only note that the diminishing figures reflecting the development of the Moldavian Hungarians show actual assimilation processes on the one hand, however, it is obvious on the other hand, that these figures were influenced also by the artificially created circumstances of the censuses, namely, the existing assimilation processes had been strongly "enhanced" during the surveys. [62]

By 1992 the official Roumanian standpoint could be verified by the returns of the census: namely, that today there is no Hungarian issue in Moldavia any more. The Roumanian state does not take notice of the existence of the Moldavian Hungarian ethnic group officially. Since the Csángós are considered to be fully Roumanians by the Roumanian state, the most fundamental minority rights are not provided for them, either, thus forcing the complete assimilation of this ethnic group to the Roumanians both in their language and in their mind.

In the knowledge of the actual situation the question seems well-grounded: how many Moldavian Csángós can still speak the language of their ancestors?

In the lack of authentic official data below I try to estimate the development of the number of Moldavian Csángós understanding and speaking Hungarian following the census of 1930 in Roumania, on the basis of my local experiences obtained during my ethnographic field work. [63]

In Moldavia I have carried out researches - first of all researches of religious ethnographic nature - since 1980 among the Catholic Csángós. Beside, between 1992 and 1996 I performed investigations regarding the Csángó identity awareness. The data below (see Table 3) reflect the linguistic conditions of the first half of the 90"s.

During my field work I tried to visit each village where I had assumed to find any dwellers speaking Hungarian, on the basis of the denomination data of the census of 1992, of the ethnographic literature and of the communication on the spot. Finally, I could find 83 such villages. There may be some other small Moldavian settlements where some elderly people can speak/understand Hungarian, however, they have escaped the attention of the researchers up till now. [64] But even if there are such villages, the total number of their Hungarian inhabitants cannot possibly be more than a few hundred, therefore this does not change the picture as a whole.

For the interpretation of the columns in Table 3 it is important to note the following:

1. During my work I could see that the progress of language loss is different in each village, this can be detected in the different nature of the mother tongue competence of the generations. In villages being just before the stage of total Roumanianisation only the eldest people can speak Hungarian, in some other villages command of Hungarian is general even among the middle aged generation and only the youngest one cannot speak Hungarian. The best chance for the survival of the language is in places where the children are taught Hungarian. Naturally, the generational language border cannot be determined by a strict accuracy in the majority of the villages, as the Hungarian language competence is different in each family, nevertheless, the deviancies between the villages are obvious in this respect. (The Moldavian Csángós are also aware of these differences themselves, the opinion of my partners in conversation were similar to mine as to which villages the Hungarian language is spoken more or less.) Beside the regional and generational differences in the command of the Hungarian language the differences between the sexes were also significant: women who had rarely left the enclosed space of their villages could better preserve the language as the men with larger social mobility.

My estimations about the command of the Hungarian language are based on the approximate determination of the generational language border. In places where small children are taught also Hungarian beside Roumanian I considered the command of Hungarian language to be 100%. (I could not find any village where the children are taught only Hungarian.) In the villages where the linguistic assimilation began only lately, during the recent decades, I deducted the number of children or young people who do not speak Hungarian at all from the number of the Catholic inhabitants. In the villages where I indicate only 10-20% (or even less) who can speak Hungarian from among the Catholics, only the eldest generation (or only a part of it) can still speak Hungarian. The proportional rate of Hungarian speaking people were determined by taking into account also the data of the 1992 census, reflecting the division of the population according to their ages.

2. Travellers and researchers visiting Moldavia have been reporting about the degrees of language loss, the differences between the generations" command of the language. However, it is obvious that the "traditional" processes of linguistic-ethnic assimilation also change in the conditions of modernisation and globalisation. The cultural unity of the traditional village is being degraded: it is enough to think of the everyday connections with the town, schooling, organisation of religious life, wide spreading of the telecommunication means and of the other acculturation factors - namely, the Moldavian Csángós are being influenced by cultural effects facilitating the balancing of the previous differences between the linguistic assimilation processes. The gradual differences (between the settlements, the generations and the sexes) inherited from the traditional world begin to lose their earlier importance, the termination of the relatively enclosed life-spaces connected to the rural culture seems to bring about also the acceleration, the "globalisation" of the linguistic assimilation processes.

The phenomenon of the linguistic assimilation taking place in modern condition is well illustrated by the situation of Csángó families moving to the towns: in these families the children do not learn Hungarian at all, regardless to the place of birth of their parents. Therefore the data of the Csángó population settled down in Moldavian large towns (like Bákó, Románvásár, Jászvásár, etc.) are not indicated in the table at all, in spite of the fact that many of them still surely speak Hungarian, regardless to their place of birth. However, the newly built housing estates and industrial quarters of the Moldavian towns are the scenes of the quick - we may say instant - assimilation of the Csángós, so in these places we could only give an unbased "floating" of the number of the

"Hungarian inhabitants". (In turn, we have indicated the attached parts, outskirts of the Moldavian towns where the Csángós are living in their traditional settlement structure that used to be a village some time, such as Onyest, Aknavásár, Szlanikfördö.)

As a result of acculturation and cultural globalisation brought about by the modernisation factors, the assimilation processes also get accelerated: more and more assimilation phenomena can be observed all over Moldavia that are independent of the linguistic, cultural traditions of a community or group. Therefore it becomes more and more difficult to describe the assimilation processes with the traditional view and methods: namely, by grasping the differences between the identity of the settlements, religious communities, generations and sexes. However, during my field work and its procession I have used this method considering the traditional identity structure, because I thought that the above mentioned differences still exist among the Moldavian Csángós, relying strongly on traditional communities. Furthermore, my view was that I could get to numerical results by grasping the differences between the language command of the villages and generations.

3. In the traditional world the development of someone's linguistic competence was dominantly influenced by his spontaneous breeding into the parlance of the local community. Today the development of the individual command of a language depends mostly on the individual's choice: parents do their best to meet the future expectations of the wider social environment and speak to their children in Roumanian language; later on the growing children are also on the same standpoint since the school, the Church, the telecommunication media all convince them that they are to acquire the state language enjoying a higher social prestige. It is a common phenomenon that the children who were taught Roumanian in their families acquire the local Hungarian dialect almost "incidentally" in the street, so the main role in the development of the Hungarian linguistic competence is still played by the spontaneous parlance. As the importance of the Hungarian language diminishes in the social communication more and more serious disturbances can be observed in the transmittance of the language, as well.

In this way it is very difficult to measure up the actual command of Hungarian - the Hungarian speakers feel the Hungarian dialect to be stigmatised, they are ashamed to start to speak Hungarian because they believe that their Hungarian is imperfect so they prefer to communicate in Roumanian language, etc. - therefore I tried to establish the command of language on the basis of an external observance of the spontaneous parlance and in doubt I had checked my data for several times. I had visited the most significant Csángó villages several times and I had many occasions to listen to actual speech situations.

Table 3 - Command of Hungarian language in the Moldavian Csángó villages

...

Interpreting the above figures we arrive at the following conclusion:

1. Today only the 43 percent (103543 people from the total 240038) of the Moldavian Catholics - who are considered as people of Hungarian origin on the basis of well established arguments - live in settlements where the Hungarian language is still spoken at all. However, a significant part of the Catholic population of these villages - about one hundred people - has been totally Roumanianised, so the current number of Hungarian speaker Csángós living in Moldavia can be estimated in about 62 thousand. This amounts only to about one fourth (25.8%) of the Moldavian Catholics. Nevertheless, this number shows that the Moldavian Csángós as a whole did not lose their language completely as it was shown in the last Roumanian census (1992). (As we could see,

this census recorded only 522 Hungarian Catholics in more or less the same villages.)

2. In the settlements listed in the above table (namely in the villages where Hungarian language is still spoken a little) in 1930 there were 50469 Catholics. This figure should be taken as a basis for estimating the development of the number and proportion of Hungarian speakers in the 20th century.

On the one hand, it is quite sure that a part of the Catholic population shown in the table definitely did not speak Hungarian in 1930, either, as the process of losing the Hungarian language had already started at this time. Such villages were in the south Szeketura, in the north Jugán, Balusest, Bargován and even Szabófalva. Some 40 smaller villages in the region of the rivers Szeret, Tatros and Tázló had also been Roumanianised. Looking up the contemporary records it is hard to imagine how in certain settlements the Hungarian language survived at all. Therefore, if we want to get the number of Hungarian speakers in 1930 we have to decrease the figure 50469 by at least 5-6 thousand.

On the other hand, presumably, six-seven decades ago a part of the old generation still spoke Hungarian in villages which have become completely Roumanianised since then (and so they are not indicated in the table). From among the northern villages some, like Gyerejest (Gheraesti), Dokia (Dochia) were certainly in this situation, together with Szeráta (Sarata), Horgyest (Horgesti), Valény (Valeni) from the region of Bákó, and maybe some smaller villages, too. [117] The number of the old generation who could still speak Hungarian in 1930 was possibly not more than 1-2 thousand, so we have to add this number to that of the Hungarian speakers. Considering our calculations the number of Hungarian-speaking Csángós in Moldavia in 1930 could be around 43 thousand and this amounted to about 40% of the entire Catholic population of the province at that time. [118]

3. Between 1930 and 1992 the absolute number of Hungarian speakers increased from 45 thousand to 62 thousand people and this 17 thousand people means a growth of 37%. If the number of the Hungarian speakers had increased at the same rate as the Moldavian Catholic population as a whole, that is, by 118%, the number of the 45 thousand Hungarian speakers estimated for the year 1930 would have increased with another 53 thousand people by the year 1992: this calculation gives some idea of the rate of linguistic assimilation. In other words: in the absence of linguistic assimilation the number of Hungarian-speaking Moldavian Csángós could have really reached the mythical 100 thousand by now. However, because of the loss of nearly 40 thousand people because of the assimilation the proportion of Hungarian speakers among the Catholic population fell from 41% (in 1930) to 26% in 1992, in spite of some moderate growth. Thus, the main feature of the demographic behaviour of the Moldavian Csángós are a high fertility index and rapid linguistic assimilation.

4. There are differences among Csángó settlements in terms of the extent, intensity of linguistic assimilation. Therefore, since 1930 the division of the number and ratio of the Hungarian speakers have changed substantially: in certain villages assimilation was complete or almost complete, while in others a significant increase could be seen in the number of people who spoke (also) Hungarian.

With regard of Csángós living in sporadic groups, the number of Hungarian speakers decreased or remained the same in villages with small, mixed populations and/or in the ones surrounded by Roumanian environment, altogether in more than 50 settlements. (The lack of increase in the number of Hungarian speakers - for example in case of /falu/Traian, Balusest, Ploszkucény,

Szerbek, Onyest - where fertility rate was very high also indicates the high degree of assimilation.)

A clear and significant increase could be observed in the absolute number of Hungarian speakers between 1930 and 1992 only in altogether 25-30 settlements, in the largest and the best known villages of the Moldavian Csángós. Growth occurred mainly in the ethnically homogenous and more populous villages, where the danger of linguistic assimilation became obvious only in the recent few decades. (These are generally settlements in which - according to Table 3 - today the proportion of Hungarian speakers is above 80%.) In many villages the number of Hungarian speakers today is twice as high as the number of Catholics in 1930, sometimes it is even higher. From among the northern Csángó villages increase can be observed only in Kelgyest, while in the other settlements there was a significant drop in both the proportion and the absolute number of the Hungarian speakers, so this Hungarian enclave stands just before the total disappearance. The situation of the southern Csángós is only a slightly better, where only the considerably assimilating /falu (N. Balcescu) and Nagypatak show any increase in the number of Hungarian speakers, together with Gyoszeny whose classification as a southern Csángó settlement should only be taken with reservations. The greatest increase is actually due to the ethnically homogenous Szeklerised Csángó villages where some favourable factors (for example the proximity to and closer relation with the Szekler Land, the fact that their dialect is closer to the literary Hungarian language, that the settlements were established relatively recently, that there is a stronger awareness of Hungarian origin, that there is no surrounding Roumanian population and that there are still people who remember the Hungarian schools of the 1950's, etc.) have slowed down the linguistic assimilation. Twenty villages belong to this category: Lészped, Lujzikalagor, Forrófalva, Klézse, Somoska, Pokolpatak, Csík, Külsörekecsin, Magyarfalva, Lábnik, Frumósza, Pusztina, Largauca, Gajdár, Csügés, Diószeg, Szölöhegy, Szitás, /falu (Satu Nou), Bahána.

It would be doubtlessly rather misleading to state that the balance is positive in favour of Hungarian speakers without emphasising at the same time that the increase is due to the high natural fertility index and that it was produced within - and mostly in spite of - an omnipresent and strong tendency towards linguistic assimilation. Therefore, the figures indicate an increase even in places where the younger generation speaks very little, if any, Hungarian. (/falu/N. Balcescu, Trunk, Lilijecs, Gírlény, Tatros, Gorzafalva, Fqrészfalva, VÍ zánta, etc.) Today, however, these figures do not always mean people with Hungarian mother tongue or even who use the Hungarian language in everyday life, but refer only to those who have some degree of Hungarian knowledge. In many villages these figures indicate young people being in the advanced stage of linguistic assimilation, whose first language is the Roumanian and who are able to use a Hungarian dialect in certain situations as a second language and it is not sure that they will pass this language on to their children. Consequently, the estimated increase of about 17 thousand people among the Hungarian-speaking population - being an extremely "fragile" growth compared to the increase of the whole population - between 1930 and 1992 does not suggest any potential for further increase. Sixty-seventy years ago Hungarian speakers had used Hungarian dialects as their "first" language, their mother tongue, expressing the lifestyle of the traditional village, as a whole. Since then, modernisation and the greater degree of social mobility have diminished the importance of these dialects and for young people the dialect has been downgraded to the position of a "second" language, at best, which they feel ashamed to use in public. Thus, when comparing the 1930 and 1992 data on Hungarian speakers it is important to bear in mind that the backgrounds of the two sets of figures are very different.

6. Command of language and Csángó ethnical identity. Some features

The above listed demographic figures confirm the fact indicated by linguists, ethnographers, politologists and public writers that a considerable assimilation is in process even today, and these data focus the proportions of this process. However, these numbers cannot explain the relation between the command of language and the ethnical-national identity awareness: How can in Moldavia the language assimilation be proceeded by the giving up of the Hungarian identity? (There are many ethnic groups in Europe that are able to keep their particular group-identity even following the lost of their languages.) What is the reason for the extremely rapid and even total loss of the mother tongue during already one or two generations in some Csángó villages?

Finally, we would like to add some facts to the quite particular identity concept [119] of the Moldavian Csángós being different from that of the other Hungarian ethnographic groups living in the Carpathian Basin, in order to help understand the assimilation process indicated by the figures of the present study.

Moldavian Csángó identity has still been dominantly determined by the fact that this is the only ethnic group that played no part in the great historical movements of the first half of the 19th century which created the modern Hungarian nation and society (language reform, the political and cultural movements of the Reform Age, the War of Independence in 1848). Therefore, they did not become part of the Hungarian nation. In spite of their obvious linguistic, cultural, genetic, etc. relationship with the Hungarians, the most important factors for the unification are absent in case of the Moldavian Csángós.

For example, it is obvious that beyond its practical role as a means of communication, the Moldavian Csángós do not attribute any symbolic or cohesive value to the Hungarian language. Their archaic relation to the Hungarian language is similar to the one prevailing in Europe prior to the development of the modern nation-awareness. As their relation to the language is free of any ideology, they realise the language change as an inevitable consequence of modernisation rather than a tragic loss. (This naturally does not mean that the collective language change did not cause any serious psychical hurts or disturbances in their self-identity.)

The development of the symbolic, community-forming functions of the language is also hindered by the fact that the Csángós do not consider the Moldavian dialect to be identical to the Hungarian language spoken in the Carpathian Basin. Because of the mass of Roumanian loan-words and the Roumanian ideological influence the Csángós feel the Roumanian public language to be as near to the local Csángó dialects as the language of the Hungarians in Transylvania or in Hungary. They are quite unaware of the fact that the different Hungarian dialects are the variants of the same national language and they totally neglect the fact that the language of the Csángós also belong to these variants.

Therefore, the language does not play so significant role in the development of the common identity awareness of the Moldavian Csángós as in the case of the Hungarians living within the Carpathian Basin. There is no close connection between the Csángó group identity and the linguistic identity. The Csángós feel the Catholic population of the other Csángó villages to be the nearest to themselves, regardless to the fact whether they preserved their original language or not. The symbolic way of relationship to the language has been replaced first of all by the common religion and the common lifestyle.

Furthermore, no other symbolic ways of relationship characteristic to the nation-awareness have developed among the Csángós, either. They are unaware of the national values contained within

folklore and folk culture, they do not know that traditional culture can be a powerful means of strengthening national unity. The same regards their common origin and history with the Hungarians living in Hungary and in Transylvania: the past-awareness of the Moldavian Csángós almost totally lacks the folk traditions about the distant past, preserving the memory of the historical connections with the Hungarians, up to the 20th century. History of the Moldavian Hungarians and the Hungarians living in the Carpathian Basin connected only up to the 16th century, so the folklorist memories of this era are not considered to be significant identification factors in Moldavia. The awareness of Transylvanian origin is fading away even among Szeklerised Csángós and the importance of the still existing connections with the Szekler Land has diminished considerably (e.g. pilgrimage in CsÎk somlyó, economic connections, kinship, etc.).

It is well-known that in Europe it was the intellectuals who had established the symbolic ways of relationship inevitable for the development of modern nation-awareness. However, in Moldavia no ecclesiastical or secular intelligentsia could emerge that could have been able to integrate this ethnic group threatened by assimilation to the Hungarian national development and that could have undertaken to transfer the values of the Hungarian "high culture" towards the Moldavian Csángós. In the lack of an adequate institutional network the Moldavian Csángós could not acquire the Hungarian public language and the Hungarian reading and writing at all, although this would have been the most important linguistic condition to the emergence of a Hungarian group identity.

The young Roumanian state which was established in 1859 and won her independence following the Russian-Turkish war in 1877 tried to achieve first the linguistic assimilation of the Moldavian Catholic population, then the establishment of the Roumanian national identity among the Csángós, as a result of the activity of the intelligentsia. From the middle of the last century onwards one could read permanently in the relevant Csángó literature about the ways and means which hindered the formation of the Moldavian Hungarian intelligentsia and institutional network. The Roumanian power (political administration, ecclesiastical and secular leading intelligentsia and recently the telecommunication media), instead, has always taken care to send to Moldavia priests, teachers, officials who were brought up in the spirit of Roumanian nationalism, to act as channels of the official ideology in the most important issues which form the nation-awareness (e.g.: that Csángós are Hungarianised Roumanians, the Roman Catholics are, in fact, Roumanian Catholics, that Csángó "pidgin-talk" is something to be ashamed of, etc.).

The formation of the Roumanian Catholic ecclesiastical intelligentsia resulted from the efforts of the seminary and later the printing presses and cantor schools of the episcopacy in Jászvásár, established in 1884. This meant that the Catholic religion which for centuries has been the most important factor in the separation of Moldavian Hungarian ethnic group from the Roumanians and in the survival of the Hungarian language, from the end of the 19th century became a vehicle of Roumanianisation. After the establishment of a network of modern state-owned schools, the language of education in Moldavia became exclusively the state language. The use of the Hungarian language was forbidden in schools and numerous accounts reveal that teachers punished the students who used Hungarian, urging the parents to speak Roumanian to their children even at home. (Today, the need for such a strict intervention in language use is disappearing since now there are virtually no villages in which schoolchildren still communicate in Hungarian with each other.) In the first years of the communist dictatorship, between 1948 and 1953, the Hungarian People's Association ran schools in about 40-50 villages but they did not play any significant role in the formation of national identity, due to several reasons. The schools were poorly equipped and students from the first to the fourth class were taught together in the same class, by teachers who - in many cases - had been sent to Moldavia as a punishment. The religious population felt repugnance to these communist schools, while the local Roumanian

intellectuals continuously stirred up opposition to them, and thus, in most of the villages such schools proved short-lived.

The peculiarities of assimilation processes taking place among the Csángós can be explained with the history of the Moldavian Csángós, mainly their development in a "separate way" in the 19-20th centuries. Considering the fact that there is no close connection between the language use and the common identity-awareness, the figures indicating the two types of assimilation must be examined separately:

1. As far as the command of Hungarian language is concerned, I think the above mentioned total amount of 62 thousand people to be true, based on local investigations, broken down to villages (so it can be checked item by item, too). Although this is not an official data but only an estimation following a survey on the spot, nevertheless, it is important to publish the figure received in this survey, because while the Roumanian official view is the "zero version"[120], categorically, which was "confirmed" also by the censuses, for the Hungarian and non-Hungarian specialists, (education) politicians, etc. who are interested in the after all existing Csángó issue, no useful data are available, at all. Figures that appeared in political discussions and public statements during the last decades were entirely without foundation and moved between totally extreme limits. (Global estimations regarded a number between 4 and 400 thousand people, depending on the political party affiliation of the speaker, namely depending on this personal ideas regarding the "solution" of the Csángó problem.) In this way, I think that the above data, broken down to villages, may bring - for want of something better - some "profit" from social and scientific points of view.

2. We are not in a position to give any numerical estimations regarding the national identity. The vague, confused and contradictory state in which today the Moldavian Csángós are living cannot be grasped in the form of numbers and figures, this may be possible only by individual case studies, probably. Naturally, all this means that the data of the official censuses in the 20th century regarding the nationalities - getting to the "zero version" by the year 1992 - do not reveal anything about this state, as a matter of fact.

#### Bibliography - References

ALMANAHUL "Presă Buna" 1995 Iasi (Almanach of the Roman Catholic Episcopacy of Jászvásár)

AUNER, Károly

- 1908 A romániai magyar telepek történeti vázlatja [Historical Sketch of the Hungarian Colonies in Roumania] Temesvár

BAKER, Robin

1997 On the Origin of the Moldavian Csángós. The Slavonic and East European Review Vol. 75. No. 4. 658-680

BENDA, Kálmán (edited)

1989 Moldvai csángó magyar okmánytár [Documents on Csángó Hungarians in Moldavia] I-II. Budapest

BENKP, Loránd

1990 A csángók eredete és települése a nyelvtudomány szemszögéből [Origin and Settlement of the



Csángós from a Linguistic Perspective] Budapest (A Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság Kiadványai 188)

BUCUR, Ioan Micu

1997 Incercari violente de maghiarizare a "ceangailor" romani. 1944-1997 Bucuresti

CALINESCU, Gheorghe (edited)

1925-1939 Diplomatarium Italicum. Documenti raccolti negli archivi italiani I-IV. Roma, Vol.1. (1925); Vol. 2 (1930); Vol. 3. (1934); Vol. 4. (1939)

CANDEA, Romulus

1917 Catolicismul in Moldova in secolul al XVII lea. Sibiu (Nagyszeben)

CSOMA, Gergely - BOGDÁNFALVY, János

1993 Népszámlálás a moldvai csángó falvakban [Census in the Moldavian Csángó Villages] In: HALÁSZ, Péter (edited): "Megfog vala apóm szokcor kezemtül..." Studies in memoriam Domokos Pál Péter. Budapest, 165-167

DOMOKOS, Pál Péter

1931 A moldvai magyarság. [Moldavian Hungarians] Csű ksomlyó (Also 5th enlarged edition, Budapest 1987)

1938 A moldvai magyarság történeti számadatai [Historical Data of the Moldavian Hungarians] Hitel, 295-308 (Republished unchanged in: Honismeret 3, 1986 (XIV) 16-22).

ELEKES, Lajos

1940 A román fejlődés alapvetése [Establishment of Roumanian Development] Századok 278-313, 361-404.

GUNDA, Béla

1988 A moldvai csángók eredete [Origins of the Moldavian Hungarians] Magyar Nyelv 1. 12-24  
GYPRFFY, István

1942 A romániai magyarság sorsa [Fate of Hungarians Living in Roumania] In: Magyar nép - magyar föld. Budapest, 450-465

HAJDU, Mihály

1980 Az 1646-47 évi Bandinus féle összeű rás névstatistikái [Name Statistics of Bandinus-Census in 1646-47] Budapest (Magyar Személynévi Adattárak 30.)

HALÁSZ, Péter

1992 A moldvai magyarok Románia Nagy Földrajzi Szótárában (1898). [Moldavian Hungarians in the Large Geographic Dictionary of Roumania] Honismeret 4, (XX), 56-59

HORVÁTH, Antal

1994 Stramosii catolicilor din Moldova. Documente istorice 1227-1702. Sf. Gheorge (Sepsiszentgyörgy)

IORDAN, Iorgu

1963 Toponimia romaeasca. Bucuresti

1983 Dictionar al numelor de familie romanesti. Bucuresti

JERNEY, János

1851 Keleti utazása a Magyarok őshelyeinek kinyomozása végett 1844 és 1845. [János Jerney's Oriental Journey to Discover the Ancient Homeland of the Magyars] Pest, I-II

K"S, Károly, Dr. SZENTIMREI, Judit NAGY, Jenő, Dr.

1981 Moldvai csángó népművészet [Moldavian Csángó Folk Art] Bukarest

LAHOVARI, George Ioan BRATIANU, C.I. TOCILESCU, Grigore G.

1998-1902 Marele Dictionar Geografic al Romaniei I-V. Bucuresti

LECCA, O[ctav] G[eorge]

1937 Dictionar istoric, arheologic si geografic al Romaniei. Bucuresti

L"KP, Gábor

1936 A moldvai csángók, I. A csángók kapcsolatai az erdélyi magyarsággal. [Csángós in Moldavia I. Relations between the Csángós and the Transylvanian Hungarians] Budapest (Néprajzi Füzetek 3)

MAKKAI, László

1936 A milkói (kun) püspökség és népei [The Milkó (Cumanian) Episcopacy and Its Peoples] Debrecen

MANUILA, Sabin

1938 Recensământul general al populației României din 29 decembrie 1930. II. Bucuresti

MARTINAS, Dumitru

1985 Originea ceangailor din Moldova. Bucuresti

MIKECS, László

1941 Csángók [The Csángós] Budapest (reprinted in 1989)

1943 A Kárpátokon túli magyarság. [Hungarians over the Carpathians] In: Deér, József - Gáldi, László (eds): Magyarok és románok I. (Hungarians and Roumanians I.) Budapest, 441-507.

MUNKÁCSI, Bernát

1902 A moldvai csángók eredete [Origin of the Moldavian Csángós] Ethnographia 433-440

NASTASE, Gh. I.

1934, 1935 Ungurii din Moldova la 1646 după "Codex Bandinus" Arhivele Basarabiei VI. (1934) 397-414 and VII. (1935) 74-88.

RACOVITA, Ortensia

1985 Dictionar geografic al jud. Bacau. Bucuresti

RECENSĂMĂNTUL populației și locuințelor din 7 ianuarie 1992. Structura etnică și confesională a populației. București, 1995

ROSETTI, Radu

1905 Despre ungurii și episcopiile catolice din Moldova. Bucuresti

RUBINYI, Mózes

A moldvai csángók múltja és jelene [Past and Present of the Moldavian Csángós] Ethnographia 115-124, 166-175

SZABÓ, T. Attila

1959 A moldvai csángó nyelvjárás kutatása. [Research on the Moldavian Csángó Dialect] Magyar Nyelvjárások V. Budapest 3-38 (In: Nyelv és irodalom, V. Bukarest, 1981. 482-527, 599-609).

TÁNCZOS, Vilmos

1997, 1998 Hányan vannak a moldvai csángók? [How Many Csángós Are Living in Moldavia?] Magyar Kisebbség. Új folyam, (III) 1-2. 370-390 (In English translation, with a map, as a separate booklet of Teleki László Foundation: Hungarians in Moldavia Teleki László Foundation. Institute for Central European Studies. Budapest, April 1998. No.8.)

TREBICI, Vladimir

1995 Demografie contemporana Academia Romana. Centrul de Cercetari demografice. Bucuresti  
1996 Minoritatile nationale din Romania: prezenta si estimatie prospectiva. Revista de cercetari sociale. Anul 3. 1. 106-123.

VARGA, E. Árpád

1998 Hiteles vagy harci statisztika? Az 1992. januári romániai népszámlálás kérdőjelei. [Authentic or Fighting Statistics? Question Marks in Census of January 1992 in Roumania] In: uo: Fejezetek a jelenkori Erdély népesedéstörténetéből [Chapters from the Demographical History of the Present-Day Transylvania] Budapest, 220-239

VERESS, Endre

1934 A moldvai csángók származása és neve [Origins and Denomination of the Moldavian Csángós] Erdélyi Múzeum XXXIX, 29-64.

Notes

[1] Field researches which served as a basis to this study were sponsored by the Teleki László Foundation.

[2] This is confirmed also by the following works: LAHOVARI et alii 1898-1902, ROSETTI 1905, AUNER 1908, NASTASE 1934/1935. From the international literature I emphasize the recent study written by Robin Baker. The well-informed author lists the most important linguistic, ethnographic and historical arguments then states that the first groups of the Moldavian Csángós were settled down to Moldavia by the Hungarian kings in the Middle Ages (BAKER 1997). The Hungarian origin of the Csángós are denied only in the pseudo-scientific works created in the spirit of the Roumanian national state ideology. (e.g.: MARTINAS 1985, BUCUR 1997)

[3] We can mention only some works revealing historical facts or containing linguistic data regarding geographical denomination and family names that can serve as a basis for such kind of scientific hypothesis. For example: RACOVITA 1895, LAHOVARI et alii 1898-1902, CANDEA 1917, LŐKP 1936, MAKKAI 1936, LECCA 1937, NASTASE 1934-1935, MIKECS 1941 and 1943, IORDAN 1963 and 1983, HAJDU 1980, BENKP 1990, etc.

- [4] For example the names like Ungureni, Secueni, Slobozia, Bejenari, etc.
- [5] BENKP 1990. 6., GUNDA 1988. 12-13., SZAB” T. 1981. 520.
- [6] L<KP 1936, MIKECS 1941
- [7] BENKP 1990
- [8] JERNEY 1851, MUNKÁCSI 1902, VERESS 1934
- [9] RUBINYI 1901, DOMOKOS 1930, GUNDA 1988
- [10] AUNER 1908, L<KP 1936, NASTASE 1934, MIKECS 1941 and 1943, BENDA 1989, BENKP 1990
- [11] L<KP 1936, NASTASE 1934, MIKECS 1941 and 1943, BENDA 1989
- [12] BENKP 1990
- [13] L<KP 1936, MIKECS 1941
- [14] MARTINAS 1985, BUCUR 1997
- [15] See: CALINESCU 1925-1939, DOMOKOS 1987, BENDA 1989, HORVÁTH 1994
- [16] ROSETTI 1905, VERESS 1934, L<KP 1936, MIKECS 1943, BENKP 1990
- [17] K”S NAGY SZENTIMREI 1981
- [18] DOMOKOS 1938, MIKECS 1941, BENDA 1989
- [19] MIKECS 1941. 246
- [20] ELEKES 1940. 371, MIKECS same
- [21] MIKECS 1941. 168-178, BENDA 1989. 35-37
- [22] MIKECS 1941. 158-165
- [23] K”S NAGY SZENTIMREI 1981 17-22
- [24] SZAB” T. 1981. 518
- [25] L<KP 1936, SZAB” T. 1981
- [26] The study of Mihály Szabados, published in the 1989 Annual of the Research Institute for Hungarians (SZABADOS 1989) was made before the 1992 census. The author has not got any data after 1930 so he can rely only on estimations even regarding the absolute number of the Moldavian Catholics.

[27] The ecclesiastical records from the 17th century and the first half of the 18th century are rather incomplete - except for the one by Bandinus - the number of the Moldavian Hungarians were always more in all probability than indicated in these records. Data of the Moldavian Hungarians were first summarised by Pal Péter DOMOKOS. (DOMOKOS 1938)

[28] At the end of his book (78-83) AUNER summarises the number of the Catholics on the basis of the sematism issued by the diocese of Jászvásár for the year 1902, however, he lists only the villages he mentioned in his book or the ones where the number of the Catholics exceeded 100. Therefore the total number (64601) is well below the actual number of the Moldavian Catholics at that time. These data of his was taken over also by other authors (e.g.: Mikecs). We have to accept the data of 88803 people recorded at the 1899 census, bearing in mind that this survey includes also the Catholics who were working in Moldavia temporarily (in the field of timbering, railway construction, salt mines, etc.) and had arrived from the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. In this census the Greek Orthodox people coming from Transylvania were also recorded among the Catholics (they converted gradually to the Catholic religion), together with the about 2 thousand Italian forest-workers. GYPRFFY 1942. 459)

[29] SCARLATESCU, I. Statistica demografica a Romaniei. Extras din Buletinul Statistic al Romaniei. 1921. Nr. 6-7, 55. 70.

The 1912 census found 97771 Catholics in the territory of Moldavia, from them only 77227 were Roumanian citizens. The number of foreign citizens was 19429 (from them 8226 Hungarians), while 1103 people were qualified as homeless. Presumably, a part of the Catholics (like Szeklers) staying in Moldavia as guest-workers returned to their original home, however, the number of foreigners assimilated to the Csángós and settled down entirely in Moldavia could also be significant. The majority of Greek Catholic Roumanians with Transylvanian origin converted to the Orthodox faith and assimilated into the Moldavian Roumanians. No numbers are available regarding these demographic movements.

[30] See: MANUILA 1938. Excluding Bukovina and, of course, Bessarabia. Results of the 1930 census concerning Moldavian Catholics are given by village, by DOMOKOS Pal Péter (1987. 521-535). The figures are based on the official Roumanian publication (Recensământul general al populației Rumaniei din 29 Decembrie 1930, Vol. II. neam, limba maternă, religie. București, 1938)

[31] Within the present borders of the Moldavian counties there are altogether 243133 Catholics (12805 in Bacău, 62374 in Neamț, 39627 in Iași, 6924 in Vaslui, 5075 in Vrancea, 2463 in Galați and 865 in Botoșani). This number, however, includes the data of Gyimesbükk, too, that formerly belonged to Csík county and in the beginning of the 1960's it was attached to Bacău. The 3095 Catholics (and the 2933 Hungarians, respectively) recorded as living there cannot be counted among the Moldavian Csángós. Nor does this total number include the 9542 Catholics living in Suceava county since almost the whole territory of this county belongs to the former Bukovina, the figures of which were not incorporated in the summary regarding Moldavia in the 1930 returns. Today more than half (4882) of the Catholics of Suceava are of Polish, German and Ukrainian nationality and therefore have no connection with the Csángós.

[32] The 1992 census recorded 79337 Roman Catholics from the Roumanian ethnic group in Transylvania. The majority of them live in the industrial regions of Southern Transylvania - in Temes (14436), Brassó (9835), Hunyad (9119), Krassó-Szörény (6269), Arad (5742), Széchenyi

(2000) counties and in the Szekler Land, in Hargita (3357), Kovászna (2829), Maros (2091) counties. Since these territories have been the target of the Roumanian influx from Moldavia into Transylvania during the last decades, we have a good reason to presume that the majority of the almost 80.000 Transylvanian Catholics who consider themselves Roumanians are of Csángó origin, and the rest of them are made up of assimilated Transylvanian Hungarians, Germans and Slovaks. Ecclesiastical reports also attest to the presence of Csángós in Transylvania. Csángó migration towards the area south of the Carpathians was aimed at the petrol producing region of Ploiesti, the seaport of Constanta and, in particular, the capital: Bucharest.

[33] Several Hungarian researchers have pointed out their merits. See for example: SZABADOS 1989, HALÁSZ 1992.

[34] Population de la Moldavia, 1859. Bucuresti

[35] LAHOVARI et alii 1989-1902. Vol.I-V.

[36] Interest of Hungarian researchers were kindled mostly by the demographic data (DOMOKOS 1938 and 1987, SZABADOS 1989), no other kind of research work - e.g. regarding the denomination of the Moldavian villages - was carried out. In 1938 DOMOKOS, Pál Péter in his study summarising the historical figures of the Moldavian Hungarians lists 71 Moldavian settlements, on the basis of the dictionary, where (also) Hungarians are living, indicates the number of the total population and their breakdown to nationalities (DOMOKOS 1938), in the Moldvai Magyarorság he publishes the dictionary entries regarding the Csángó villages (DOMOKOS 1987. 119-124).

[37] As to the calculations of Mihály Szabados in the 31 villages of Bakó and Roman counties where the Large Geographic Dictionary indicates Hungarians, the proportion of the Hungarians diminished from 89.6% to 71.1% in the last four decades of the 19th century, namely "within 35 years one third of the Hungarians have become Roumanians". (SZABADOS 1989. 94-95.) In the work of Szabados the 1859 nationality data regard the total Catholic population of the two counties (89.6%) and since he does not have the same kind of data from 1989 he points out the proportion of 71.1 only by counting the Catholic population of the 31 villages mentioned in the Marele Dictionar Geografic. However, if we consider the whole county territories a much more significant assimilation can be presumed: this dictionary indicates 8728 Hungarians from the 23123 Catholic inhabitants of Roman county (37.7% instead of 94.6% in 1859), while 15538 Hungarians from the 35489 Catholic inhabitants of Bákó county (43.7% instead of 86.6%). In fact, assimilation did not reach such an extent, as the reference work does not mention several villages with completely Hungarian inhabitants, furthermore, the number of other unmentioned villages, where Hungarians live sporadically is also considerable. These deficiencies of the dictionary are listed by Pál Péter DOMOKOS, in his study published in Hitel he mentions 71 Moldavian settlements having Hungarian inhabitants, too (DOMOKOS 1938, 304-308). List consisting of several hundreds of village names, as well as the enclosed map, published by Gábor L<K' (L<KP 1936) are not exact, they fail to indicate Hungarians in many villages where they are living still today, respectively, indicate Hungarian population in places where the existence of Hungarians is rather doubtful. Although it is an official source, the conditions of the survey of this Large Geographical Dictionary are unknown: we do not know the criteria on the basis of which a part of the inhabitants were considered to be Hungarians, while the other parts to be Roumanians. Furthermore, when we estimate the extent of assimilation we have to take into account the fact, too, that the total number of the Catholics in the 1899 census includes also the people who arrived from Transylvania since

1859 and belong to non-Hungarian ethnic groups.

[38] See calculations of Mihály Szabados. (1989. 91-93)

[39] In case of 1992 census, some people doubt the authenticity of the data concerning the denomination status since the representatives of the Moldavian Catholic Church reported during the survey that the census-takers recorded the Catholic people as Orthodox ones. Had such case happened, this could hardly modify the total picture because there is no significant difference between the published internal statistics of the Church (see the Annuals of the Jászvásár episcopacy, Almanahul "Presă Buna") and the census returns.

[40] The above mentioned demographic study (SZABADOS 1989) points out that the 1930 census reports population of Hungarian mother tongue or Hungarian origin ("originea etnica") where the Catholics are living sporadically, more or less Roumanianised, while in places where the Moldavian Hungarians live in a block, they are absolutely neglected by the survey.

[41] After the World War II the following ethnographic books were published in the subject of Csángós: BOSNYÁK, Sándor: A moldvai magyarok hitvilága (Faith of the Moldavian Hungarians) Budapest, 1980 (Folklór Archivum 12.); DOMOKOS, Pál Péter - RAJECZKY, Benjámín: Csángó népzene (Csángó Folk Music) I-III, Budapest, 1956, 1961, 1991.; FARAG", József - JAGAMAS, János: Moldvai csángó népdalok és népballadák (Moldavian Csángó Folk Songs and Folk Ballads), Bucharest, 1954; HALÁSZ, Péter (ed): "Megfog vala apóm szokcor kezemtől... Tanulmányok DOMOKOS Pál Péter emlékére (Studies in memoriam Pál Péter DOMOKOS), Budapest, 1993; HEGEDP S Lajos: Moldvai csángó népmesék és beszélgetések. Népnyelvi szövegek moldvai telepeseiktől (Moldavian Csángó Folk Tales and Conversations. Vernacular texts from Moldavian settlers), Budapest, 1952; KALL" S, Zoltán: Balladák könyve (Book of Ballads) Bucharest, 1970; KALL" S, Zoltán: /j guzsalyam mellett. Egy Klézsei asszony énekei (By My New Distaff. Songs of a Woman from Klézse) Bucharest, 1973; KALL" S, Zoltán: Ez az utazólevelem. Balladák j könyve. (This is My Travelling Letter. New Book of Ballads) Budapest, 1996; Dr. K" S, Károly - SZENTIMREI, Judit - Dr. NAGY Jenő: Moldvai csángó népművészet (Moldavian Csángó Folk Art), Bucharest, 1981; PÉTERBENCZE, Anikó (ed.): Moldovának szép tájai and születem... Magyarországi csángó fesztivál és konferencia (Born in Nice Landscapes of Moldova. Csángó Festival and Conference in Hungary) Jászberény, 1993; POZSONY, Ferenc: Szeret vize martján. Moldvai csángómagyar népköltészet. (On the Bank of River Szeret. Moldavian Csángó Hungarian Folk Poetry) Kolozsvár, 1995; SERES, András - SZAB", Csaba: Csángómagyar daloskönyv. (Booklet of Csángó Hungarian Songs) Moldva 1972-1988. Budapest; TÁNCZOS, Vilmos: Gyöngyökkel gyökereztél. Gyimesi és moldvai archaikus imádságok. (Rooted by Pearls. Archaic Prayers from Gyimes and Moldavia) CsÍ kszereda, 1995; VERESS, Sándor: Moldvai Gyűjtés (Moldavian Collection), Budapest 1989. (Hungarian Collection of Popular Poetry XVI); VIGA, Gyula (ed): Tanulmányok és közlemények a moldvai magyarokról (Studies and Publications about the Moldavian Hungarians) The thematic issue of the Néprajzi Látóhatár. III. 1994. 1-2.

We do not list here the historical and linguistic works, report books, literary works. Further bibliographic data can be found in the booklet assembled by HALÁSZ, Péter (A moldvai magyarság bibliográfiája. (Bibliography of the Moldavian Hungarians) Budapest, 1996) This booklet gives a prospect for the future processing of the Csángó literature in a more complete form.

[42] A part of them - at least 15 thousand - are foreigners. (see also data of 1912)

[43] In the Marele Dictionar Geografic al Romaniei this is the number of the Catholics with Hungarian mother tongue in 19 villages of Bákó county and in 12 villages of Roman county. (SZABADOS 1989. 94). Beside them Hungarians were living in some other villages (for example in the Catholic villages surrounding Aknavásár), however, their Hungarian population is not mentioned in the dictionary. These - often completely Hungarian - settlements are indicated correctly by Pál Péter DOMOKOS on the basis of his local experiences (DOMOKOS 1938. 304-308). In the majority of these villages Hungarian language is still alive (see Table 3. of the present study). Therefore, the number of the people with Hungarian mother tongue was far much higher at the time of the turn of the century than it was indicated in the dictionary.

[44] From them 77227 were Roumanian citizens (3.6%), 19429 foreign citizens (0.9% from this 8226 Hungarian citizens, that is 0.4%), 1103 homeless (0.1%), 12 unknown (0.0%).

[45] Reference: SCARLATESCU, I.: Statistica demografica a Romaniei. Extras din Buletinul Statistic al Romaniei. 1921 Nr. 6-7. 55. 70.p.

[46] Mother tongue data. At the same time 20964 inhabitants were qualified as Hungarians as to their nationalities.

[47] Reference: MANUILA 1938

[48] As to ethnic origin.

[49] Recesamantul general al Romaniei din 1941 6 aprilie. Date sumare provizorii. Bucuresti, 1944. XI. p.

[50] As to mother tongue.

[51] GOLOPENTIA A. - GEORGESCU, D.C.: Populatia Republicii Populare Romane la 25 ianuarie 1948. Rezultate provizorii ale recensamantului. Extras din Probleme Economice. 1948. Nr. 2. 38

[52] As to the administrative division of 1992, excluding Suceava county and Gyimesbükk.

[53] As to nationality. As to mother tongue about 7 thousand people.

[54] As to the administrative division of 1992, excluding Suceava county and Gyimesbükk.

[55] Nationality data. As to mother tongue about 7 thousand people.

[56] Excluding Suceava county and Gyimesbükk.

[57] Nationality data

[58] Excluding Suceava county and Gyimesbükk.

[59] Excluding Suceava county and Gyimesbükk.

[60] Nationality data (As to mother tongue 3118 people) From them the number of Roman



Catholics are 1826.

[61] Source: Recensământul populației și locuințelor din 7 ianuarie 1992. Structure etnică și confesională a populației. București, 1995

[62] Several local reports appeared in the press, in the light of which the correctness of the 1992 survey is rather doubtful. In the *Felebarát* in Kolozsvár (No. 1992/1-2), in the *Romániai Magyar Szó* of Bucharest (11-12 April 1992, Page b of the enclosure) and in the *Kapu* (No. 5, 1992, Page 53-55) László Vetési reports about the census in Lészped. Authors Gergely Csoma and János Bogdánfalvy gives definite examples for the anti-Hungarian campaign of the Moldavian Catholic priests and the violence of the regulations by the census takers upon superior instructions. (1993. 165-167). The 23 April 1993 issue of *Romániai Magyar Szó* (RMSZ) publishes the unfavourable statement of the Association of the Moldavian Csángó Hungarians. The actions intimidating the Csángó population was reported by Zoltán Kallós folklore researcher in the programme of the Hungarian Television, titled *Panorama*, on 24 January 1992. Several papers accounted about the protesting statement of the census taker Perca Margareta of Szabófalva, in which - among others - she revealed the role of the Moldavian Catholic Church: "From 1 January 1992 onwards the commissioner of the Roman Catholic Episcopal Office of Jászvásár and the village priest urged systematically the population every day to declare themselves ethnic Roumanian at the census. They argued that the expression "Roman Catholic" derives from the name Roumanian. The propaganda among the inhabitants culminated on 6 January 1992 when the priest menaced the parishioners saying that should they not declare themselves ethnic Roumanians the situation would be similar to that of 1940 when the transfer of the Moldavian Csángós to Hungary was on the agenda. Protesting against this rude intervention which had come from an institution that had a significant influence on the population of the village and which had had an obvious aim to falsify the census returns - I submitted the file with the records to the mayor's office on 7 January 1992 morning." (RMSZ, 22 January 1992, page 3).

Telecommunication media, propaganda and intimidation on behalf of the Catholic priests and the local intelligentsia played a dominant role in the fact that the Csángós of doubtful origin declared themselves ethnic Roumanians everywhere. This was the time when the Catholic priests succeeded to spread the idea among the Csángós that the Roman Catholic religion (in Roumanian language: romano catolic) actually means Roumanian Catholic (in Roumanian language: roman catolic). Data can also prove that the census takers were instructed to fill in the census forms only in pencil on the spot and not to record anyone as Hungarian, respectively.

Therefore, the total disappearance of the Hungarian ethnic group from the figures was the consequence of not only the existing assimilation processes but an artificially created psychical situation and the manipulations during the census, as well. When Árpád E. Varga reports about the disorders of the 1992 census gets to the following conclusion: "It can be taken for granted that because of the pressure on behalf of the Church and the authorities all the population living in the Csángó villages were recorded as people of Roumanian mother tongue and nationality". (VARGA 1998. 225) (As it was mentioned above, the census recorded altogether 525 Catholic Hungarians in the Csángó villages.)

[63] I have already reported the most important data (Tánczos 1997 and 1998), the aim of the present study is to interpret the data and to project them to historical prospect.

[64] No data are available for example about the villages of Fantanele[-Noi] (in 1992 it had 249 Catholic and 1800 Orthodox inhabitants) and Jázu Porkuluj (today: Iazu Vechi, with 272 Orthodox and 56 Catholic inhabitants), which were declared as "totally Hungarian villages" by Pál Péter

DOMOKOS. (DOMOKOS 1987. 255). In this latter village in the 1950's the linguists from Kolozsvár could find some people who were speaking Hungarian. (SZAB" T. 1981. 518.). The 1930 census recorded 185 Roman Catholics and 266(!) people of Hungarian mother tongue in the mountain village Podul Schiopului in Putna (today: Vrancea) county.

[65] The table includes the villages in which Hungarian language is still spoken. I had identified the variations of the village names - where it was possible - on the basis of the Magyar Helyiségnév-azonosító szótár (Dictionary for the Identification of Hungarian Village Names) (edited by LELKES, György, Budapest, 1992), however, I give their present-day Roumanian names, as well. The figures for those village districts which the censuses (and sometimes the related Hungarian Csángó literature) treat rather arbitrarily as separate villages, have been added to the data for the villages to which these districts really belong (e.g. districts of Bogdánfalva, Lujzikalagsor, Lábnik, etc.). Where, on the contrary, the censuses have united separate villages, we have tried to give the corresponding figures separately (e.g. Forrófalva and Nagypatak, the villages attached to Aknavásár or Szlanikfürdő, etc.).

[66] Census return

[67] Census return

[68] On-site estimation. In some villages the figure added with sign + indicates the number of Hungarian speaking Orthodox inhabitants.

[69] Data calculated on the basis of the estimated number of Hungarian speaking people. At the same time it indicates the progress of linguistic assimilation in the given village.

[70] Census return

[71] Excluding the Hungarian speaking Orthodox population. (The same hereafter in similar cases)

[72] Under the name Secatura.

[73] The 1930 census gives separate figures for the following districts of Bogdánfalva: Albeni, Buchila, Damuc, Valea de Sus, Floresti, Frasinioaia and Rujinca. In 1992 only Buchila was listed separately.

[74] Under the name Ferdinand.

[75] Hungarian-speaking Gypsies. They follow the Greek Orthodox and Pentecostal faith.

[76] Church figure. (ALMANAHUL 1995. 135.)

[77] With the population of the following districts: Costita, Valea Draga, Valea de Jos (Mare) and Valea de Sus.

[78] Rácsila is actually (ecclesiastically) a part of Lészped.

[79] Bergyila is one of the districts of the village Gura Vaii, belonging to Racova village centre. Its census returns were not given either in 1930 or in 1992, however, it is sure that the majority of Catholics of Gura Vaii live in Bergyila.

[80] Only those people can speak Hungarian who married into the village from the neighbouring Catholic villages.

[81] Together with the population of districts Corhana and Osebiti, treated by the censuses separately.

[82] See note on Nagypatak, above.

[83] Church figure. (ALMANAHUL 1995. 121 p.) The 1992 census gives the data of Forrófalva (Faraoani) and Nagypatak (Valea Mare) together. (Altogether 5400 Catholic and 51 Orthodox people.)

[84] Together with the population of Alexandrina district, treated separately.

[85] Under the name Vale Rea.

[86] Under the name Gheorghe Buzdugan.

[87] Almost all of the figures of the mainly Catholic Berindesti were incorporated with the data of the almost entire Orthodox Gsteni. Namely, these numbers are relevant to both villages.

[88] Under the name Unguri.

[89] Podu Rosu (Podoros) which is treated separately by the census (and sometimes in Hungarian literature, as well) is the part of Lábnik.

[90] Catholic village district, under the name Fantanele in 1930.

[91] About 200 Orthodox Gypsies and Roumanians speak Hungarian, as well.

[92] Under the name Rápa Epei.

[93] Under the name Gura Solonti.

[94] Under the name Sarbi.

[95] The Catholics are living in the district Neszujest/Nasuiesti of village Strugari, as well as in Cetatuia and Rachitsu villages.

[96] In 1930 Gaidar and Coman are listed separately, the former with 369 inhabitants, the latter with 42 inhabitants.

[97] The village Váleri is a district of the newly built Livezi. In the 1930 it was recorded under the name Vale Rea.

[98] In the villages Butucari, Dragomir, Martin Berzunti and Moreni together. The Hungarian speakers live mostly in Butukár district.

[99] Together with the small district Cadaresti, listed separately. Csügés is actually consists of two settlements - Románcsügés and Magyarcsügés - however, census does not reflect this division. Cadaresti is a district of Magyarcsügés.

[100] All the Greek Orthodox inhabitants of Magyarcsügés can speak Hungarian and the majority of the population of Románcsügés, too.

[101] The censuses give detailed figures for the districts. The figures refer to the whole village. Hungarian speakers live mostly in districts Cuchinis and Buruienis.

[102] Total figures are given here in case of both censuses. Those Catholics who still speak Hungarian live mainly in Vermesti village in the outskirts.

[103] Total Catholic population of Moinesti, Luca Moinesti and Lucacesti.

[104] Catholics live mainly in the district Magyardormán/Bratulesti.

[105] Total Catholic population of Dofteana, Bogata, Valea Campului and Seaca which were not listed separately in 1930.

[106] Today Valea Campului is a district of Stefan Voda village. Figures of 1992 census regard the whole village.

[107] The 1930 census found 2539 Catholics in Targul Ocna (Aknavásár) and 998 Catholics in Slanic: the latter cannot be precisely identified today. Both settlements are composed of several villages and here it is impossible to break down the total figures to the present-day villages. It is true, however, that the 3537 Catholics recorded by the census live in Aknavásár (Targul Ocna), Szalantorka (Gura Slanic), Degettes (Pacura), Szlanikfürdő (Slanic Bai), Szalánc (Ciresoaia) and Cserdak (Cerdac).

[108] The Catholic Degettes (Pacura) is a district of the Orthodox village Poieni, that is on the outskirts of Aknavásár. The census returns refer to Poieni but all 235 Catholics live in Degettes.

[109] Today this village is situated on the outskirts of Aknavásár. It is impossible to estimate the total population due to the lack of data.

[110] In the 1930 census: Slanic bai. See note on Aknavásár.

[111] The 1930 census incorporated the data from Diószeg (Tuta) and Viisoara with the figures of Tatros (Targu Trotus) There are no Catholics in Viisoara. The total number of the Catholics in Tatros and Diószeg is 1796.

[112] The 1930 census incorporated the data from the Csángó villages of Szitás (Nicoresti), /jfalú (Satu Nou), Szölöhegy (Pargaresti) and Bahána (Bahna) wit the figures of the Greek Orthodox village Bodanesti.

[113] The village Calcai listed in the censuses is a district of Gorzafalva.

[114] The town has a traditional Hungarian district. The estimated absolute figure of the population

refers only to this district while the ratio corresponds to the whole town. We do not have data on language of the population living in the housing estates.

[115] Today Valiszaka is a district of the village Stefan cel Mare. The figures refer to this village.

[116] Today the village belongs to Vrancea county.

[117] At the beginning of the 1930's Pál Péter DOMOKOS could meet Hungarian speaking elderly people in Horgesti and considers the "half Valen" to be Hungarian speaking settlement. (DOMOKOS 1987. 233)

[118] This number is 10 thousand less than the estimation of Pal Péter DOMOKOS made in 1930, who at that time - still unaware of the 1930 census returns - set the number of the Moldavian Hungarians at 55 thousand. Later, László Mikecs found this estimation "a little optimistic" (MIKECS 1941. page 249.)

[119] Recently several smaller or longer studies and articles were published in the topic of Csángó identity awareness. Let me emphasize some of them like ones that have enriched the Csángó researches with some new points of views: BARNÁK, Gábor: Moldvai magyarok a Csángó kőszmlyói b'cs'n (Moldavian Hungarians at the Pilgrimage of Csángó kőszmlyó), In: edited by HALÁSZ, Péter: "Megfog vala apóm, szokcor kezemtül" Studies in memoriam Pal Péter DOMOKOS. Budapest, 1993. 45-61.; DIÓSZEGI, László - POZSONY, Ferenc: A moldvai csángók identitásának összetevői (Elements of the Moldavian Csángó Identity); In: edited by DIÓSZEGI, László: Magyarságkutatás (Research of Hungarians) 1995-96 Budapest, 1996. 105-112); FODOR, Katalin: A csángók identitásproblémájának nyelvi és nyelven kívüli okairól (About the Linguistic and Non-Linguistic Reasons of the Identity Problem of the Csángós); In: edited by KASSAI, Ilona: Kétnyelvűség és magyar nyelvhasználat (Bilingualism and the Use of Hungarian Language), Budapest, 1995. 121-127.; GAZDA, József: A nyelv és a magyarságtudat szintjei a moldvai csángóknál (Language and Levels of Hungarian Awareness at the Moldavian Csángós), Néprajzi Látóhatár III. 1994. 1-2. 269-282; LUKÁCS, László: Problems in the Ethnic Identity of the Moldavian Hungarians. Studia Fennica Ethnologica 1995. 3. Látóhatár III. 1994. 1-2. 75-88.; MURÁDIN, László: A kétnyelvűség egy sajátos megnyilvánulása a moldvai csángómagyarok nyelvi tudatában. (A Particular Manifestation of Bilingualism in the Linguistic Awareness of the Moldavian Csángó Hungarians). Nyelv- és Irodalomtudományi Közlemények XXXVIII. 1994. 1-2. 159-162.; PÁVAI, István: A moldvai magyarok megnevezései (Name of Moldavian Hungarians) Regio 1994. R. 149-164.; PÁVAI, István: Vallási és etnikai identitás konfliktusai a moldvai magyaroknál (Conflicts of Regional and Ethnic Identity at the Moldavian Hungarians), Néprajzi Értesítő 1996. LXXVIII. 7-27.; POZSONY, Ferenc: Etnokulturális folyamatok a moldvai csángó falvakban. (Ethnocultural Processes in the Moldavian Csángó Villages), In: edited by KATONA, Judit - VIGA, Gyula: Az interetnikus kapcsolatok kutatásának újabb eredményei. Miskolc, 1996, 173-179.; SÁNDOR, Klára: A nyelvcsere és a vallás összefüggése a csángóknál. Korunk 1996. 11. 60-75.

[120] The competent Roumanian publications processing the 1992 census returns - in the light of the recorded data - consider the Csángó problematic to be a non-existing one. (See for example: TREBICI 1995 and 1996). Academic V. Trebici writes in one of his publications: "According to some Hungarian sources the number of the Moldavian Csángós would be around 50-100 thousand. Nevertheless, during the 1992 census 2100 Csángós were recorded and they all were incorporated in the "other nationalities" category. [...] The spreading of the Roman Catholic

religion in Moldavia has quite an other history, this cannot be explained by the so called "Roumanianization" of the Roman Catholic Csángós. (TREBICI 1996. 110 and 122., Study 4).