

Bálint K. BANDI

The Role of Power in Shaping the Ethnic Structure of Transylvania during the Early Modern Era*

The demography of Transylvania constitutes a highly complex and, in many aspects, still insufficiently explored field of study. While its medieval dimensions—such as the settlement patterns of the population and general demographic trends—can be reconstructed with reasonable confidence despite the limited availability of sources, the early modern period remains characterized by considerable uncertainties and ongoing interpretative debates. Nonetheless, research over the past decades has made substantial progress in deepening our understanding of these issues, providing both a conceptual framework and a valuable point of reference for further investigation.

This study examines the role of power in shaping population trends in early modern Transylvania. Focusing on the interaction between political authority and local communities, it assesses how governance structures and consensual practices influenced the demographic trends and interethnic relations. By analysing these factors within the broader context of early modern state formation, the paper argues that the demography of Transylvania was not solely determined by social, economic, or environmental factors, but was also significantly influenced by external forces, which ultimately reshaped the principality's ethnic structure.

In order to provide a comprehensive overview, I aim to highlight key points of population trends that illustrate how power and consensus shaped the demographic processes. In this way, the study traces how political authority, negotiation, and local power intersected to shape the ethnic landscape of the principality.

Keywords: history of Transylvania, early modern period, power, authority, demography, population trends, ethnic structure, ethnic relations



The demographic landscape of early modern Transylvania was highly diverse and characterized by continual change, shaped by a complex interplay of social,

* The project 2024-2.1.1-EKÖP funded by the Ministry of Culture and Innovation, National Fund for Research, Development and Innovation, under the University Research Grant Programme EKÖP-24-1.

political, and environmental factors. Settlement patterns, population mobility, and the ethnic picture of communities varied widely across the principality, reflecting both local circumstances and broader regional processes. Waves of migration, war-related depopulation, and resettlement of the population repeatedly transformed the settlements, while differences in local authority, landownership, and economic opportunities both influenced and shaped local demographic outcomes. The ethnic balance of communities shifted over time, as Hungarian, Saxon, and Romanian populations interacted, merged, or were replaced in various localities. These processes created a constantly evolving social structure, in which stability and continuity were often disrupted by political upheaval, military campaigns, and changing power structures. Understanding the demographic complexity of early modern Transylvania therefore requires considering both the fluidity of population movements and the uneven distribution of authority across the principality.

In what follows, I focus on the transformation of the demographic landscape of the early modern Principality of Transylvania, with emphasis on the interplay between political authority and population processes. The analysis seeks to demonstrate how governance structures, local power relations, and institutional frameworks shaped demographic trends, influencing settlement patterns, population mobility, and the ethnic picture of communities. By highlighting these interconnections, the discussion aims to shed light on the mechanisms through which political and social forces interacted to produce the complex demographic landscape of the principality.

Intersections of Power and Consensus: The Demography of the Principality of Transylvania

The Battle of Mohács (1526), which has come to symbolise not only the political and institutional collapse of the medieval Kingdom of Hungary, but also marks a demographic turning point with far-reaching consequences. The resulting shifts in population trends affected not only Hungary but the entire East-Central European region, fundamentally reshaping the demography and ethnic relations of its states.

In Transylvania, demographic trends remained relatively stable during the first decades of this period, with no major events significantly affecting the population. Although Ottoman incursions and the political and constitutional instability caused by the election of two rival kings (John Zápolya, Ferdinand I) shaped the everyday life and may have induced minor migratory processes, they did not result in substantial changes to Transylvanian society. As Zsigmond Jakó emphasises, “[...] the Hungarians, Szeklers, Saxons, and Romanians were situated within their ancestral settlements in the early modern period, with scant intermingling dictated by long-established patterns of intercourse with neighbouring nations.”¹

¹ JAKÓ 1943. p. 508. “[...] a magyar-székelyt, szászt és románt, a felhajnáló újkor eredeti szállásterületén belül találta; jelentéktelen keveredésüket a szomszédos népek természetes érintkezéseinek ősi szabályai határozták meg” (translated by the author).

Although the population of Szeklerland, the Saxon settlements, and the Transylvanian counties suffered minor losses, these were negligible both in scale and impact compared to the demographic catastrophes of later decades. Population losses were primarily caused by incursions and raids originating from the Romanian voivodeships (Principality of Moldavia, Principality of Wallachia), often compounded by subsequent waves of epidemic disease and famine. It is important to emphasise, however, that these devastations primarily affected peripheral areas and did not trigger major demographic crises.²

Migration flows towards the west—namely the Ottoman Hungary and the Habsburg ruled Kingdom of Hungary—and into the voivodeships during this period remain largely uncertain due to the scarcity of reliable data. In contrast, population movements into Transylvania are attested, albeit indirectly, in several sources. For instance, a letter from 1570 reports that villages in Doboka County, previously inhabited by Hungarians but later depopulated, were settled mostly by Romanians.³ László Makkai similarly notes that by the second half of the sixteenth century, migration towards the interior regions of Transylvania gradually became permanent⁴

The colonisation of the Romanian-speaking population was largely regulated by local authorities, notably the 'kenéz'⁵ and voivode, who, prior to the settlement, requested permission from the landowners and agreed on the conditions for habitation.⁶ While Romanian settlers in Hungarian or Saxon villages were eventually assimilated due to the numerical and cultural dominance of the original population⁷, settlers in regions predominantly inhabited by Romanians, by contrast, preserved their language, religion, and customs.⁸

The turn of the seventeenth century marked a decisive shift in demographic trends, leading to social and demographic crises. Initially, the campaigns of Mihai Viteazul, voivode of Wallachia, decimated the population of Transylvania, followed by the marauding forces of imperial general Giorgio Basta, which devastated numerous villages and towns. The most significant losses were suffered by the inhabitants of the counties, particularly in the central, interior regions of the principality.⁹

² BARTA 1979, p. 45; JAKÓ 1944, p. 72; JANCsó 1931, p. 98–99; MIKó 1998, p. 66.

³ KADAR 1901, p. 91–92. "[...] ut ibi et omnibus possessionibus, quae olim cristianis culte et inhabitate fuissent, et per varia disturbia et incursiones hostium devastate exitissent, nunc autem avalachis et aliis nationibus habitarentur."

⁴ MAKKAJ 1942b, p. 26–28.

⁵ The 'kenéz' functioned as a community leader responsible for settlement, serving simultaneously as the head and judicial authority of a medieval Romanian village in Transylvania.

⁶ JAKÓ 1943, p. 512; MAKKAJ – MÓCSY 1986, p. 494.

⁷ MAKKAJ 1943, p. 10.

⁸ JAKÓ 1943, p. 513; SZABó T. 1942, p. 141.

⁹ JAKÓ 1943, p. 515–516; JAKÓ 1944, p. 99–100; MAKKAJ 1942a, p. 236; MAKKAJ 1943, p. 10; SZABó T. 1942, 134.

Contemporary accounts vividly convey the harrowing events of these turbulent years, reporting numerous depopulated villages whose inhabitants had almost invariably fallen victim to relentless raids and pillaging. The more fortunate had fled their homes in advance, seeking refuge in surrounding forests; yet even this did not guarantee safety, as marauding soldiers often tracked down and killed those attempting to escape.¹⁰ The scale of human loss and the widespread impoverishment of the population is documented in the decrees of the 1604 Diet in Kolozsvár [Cluj-Napoca, RO]. One of them, for instance, was lamented that “[...] our poor serfs have been so devastated that in many villages only one or two people remain [...] due to the depopulation we cannot levy taxes according to the number of households; we demand fifty coins from each cattle-owning peasant, twenty from those without livestock.”¹¹

When examining the impact of the devastations on ethnic relations, it is worth citing Zsigmond Jakó’s enduring observation, which aptly characterises the demography of early modern Transylvania: “The Saxons were protected by their towns and fortified churches, the Szeklers and Romanians by impassable forests and mountains; only the counties stood defenceless before the enemy.”¹² Vasasszentgotthárd [Sicutard, RO] in Doboka County, which had already been ethnically mixed prior to the wars with both Hungarian and Romanian inhabitants, was completely destroyed during the conflicts. In the following decades, the landowners—faced with a lack of labour—resettled peasants from the Principality of Moldavia.¹³ Saxon communities in the counties were also severely affected: in 1553, their numbers in Belső-Szolnok and Doboka Counties were estimated at roughly 2,000, but half a century later the German-speaking population had fallen to no more than 250.¹⁴ Szászencs [Enciu, RO], situated on the border of Belső-Szolnok and Doboka Counties, similarly became depopulated and was later repopulated with new settlers. In 1601, the remaining peasants—likely Saxons—had been pledged as collateral by Farkas and Mihály Apafi, and by 1615, the settlement, still bearing the scars of the wars, stood largely abandoned. A 1640 charter, however, reports that settlers arriving from the voivodeships eventually repopulated the village that had been depopulated during the unrest.¹⁵

Ethnic relations in Transylvania were mainly influenced by a fundamental shift in settlement patterns. Unlike the earlier, organised and regulated colonisation practices, the period following the turn of the century saw a

¹⁰ JAKÓ 1944. p. 100.

¹¹ EOE V. p. 264. “[...] szegény jobbágyink úgy elpusztultanak, hogy igen kevés helyen lakik falun egy vagy két ember [...] az pusztaság miatt kapuszám szerint adót nem vehetünk, ígérünk minden marhás jobbágyinktól ötven-ötven pénzt, marhátlantól husz-husz pénzt” (translated by the author)

¹² JAKÓ 1943. p. 516. “A szászszágot városai, templomerődei, a székelyeket, románokat járhatatlan erdők, hegyek védtek, csak a megyék állottak védtelenül nyitva az ellenség előtt” (translated by the author).

¹³ MAKKAI 1942a. p. 237; MAKKAI 1942b. p. 21.

¹⁴ MAKKAI 1942b. p. 31, 34.

¹⁵ KÁDÁR 1900. p. 390; KELEMEN 1912. p. 244–246.

marked increase in spontaneous settlement. This shift rapidly accelerated the expansion of the Romanian-speaking population. Newcomers moving into villages previously inhabited primarily by Hungarians—or in some cases Saxons—immediately occupied the abandoned house lots. Yet the future of these settlements was closely shaped by the exercise of local authority: where landowners were able to assert their power, newcomers integrated into the local agricultural system; on the other hand, in areas where control was less effective, they often continued their traditional transhumant pastoralism.¹⁶

The integration of the newly settled population proved to be a complex and contested process, shaped both by their distinct socio-economic practices and by their resistance to the princely authority's consolidation policies. Contemporary Diet decrees repeatedly noted that Romanian peasants who had only recently settled often failed to remain in place, neglected their fiscal obligations, or absconded—frequently fleeing to the neighbouring voivodships. In response, a decree issued at the Diet convened in Kolozsvár in 1609 instructed the judge of Beszterce [Bistrița, RO] to prevent such movements towards the Principality of Moldavia.¹⁷ The reiteration of this decree at the Diet of 1615,¹⁸ accompanied by explicit threats of punishment against those who facilitated peasant flight for personal gain, suggests that earlier attempts at regulation had proven ineffective.¹⁹ Taken together, these repeated interventions point to the limited capacity of princely authority to regulate population mobility and suggest that, in the early decades of the seventeenth century, migratory processes—most notably widespread peasant mobility—exceeded the reach of effective institutional control.

The influx of newcomers into depopulated or abandoned villages, combined with the migratory pressures they generated and the pervasive uncertainty of livelihood, gradually undermined public order. To address these challenges, the Diets repeatedly issued decrees aimed at controlling mobility and regulating behaviour. For instance, the Diet convened in Gyulafehérvár [Alba Iulia, RO] in April 1620 mandated that “[...] thieves and other malevolent persons entering this country from foreign lands be identified, and no Romanian peasant shall carry arms, firearms, spears, sabres, or bows [...]”²⁰ A similar decree at the 1623 Diet extended restrictions to horse riding for Romanian peasants.²¹ These measures also targeted the itinerant and marginal elements of society, such as vagabonds, whose mobility and transhumant livelihoods made them difficult to control. While initial efforts to bind these populations to the land were only partially effective, over time the need for repeated regulations declined, reflecting both the gradual

¹⁶ JAKÓ 1941. p. 124–126; JAKÓ 1943. p. 511, 527–528.

¹⁷ EOE VI. p. 124.

¹⁸ EOE VII. p. 284.

¹⁹ SZABÓ T. 1942. p. 135–136.

²⁰ EOE VII. p. 544. “[...] tolvajok és egyéb gonosz tévő emberek kiüsmertessenek, ennek utánna senki oláh jobbágya fegyverrel, puskával, dárdával, szablyával és tegezzel ne járjon [...]” (translated by the author).

²¹ EOE VIII. p. 131–132.

consolidation of social order and the increasing capacity of landowners to assert authority over formerly ungoverned groups.²²

Throughout the sixteenth century and especially in the decades surrounding the turn of the century, the demography of Transylvania unfolded in a context of divided and unevenly exercised authority. Princely power consistently attempted to keep demographic processes within institutional bounds—through legislation and repeated efforts to curb uncontrolled mobility—but these initiatives rarely translated into practice. The devastation caused by warfare and political instability created conditions in which migration often outpaced regulation, exposing the practical limits of central power. In this context, it was primarily the landowners who retained the capacity to influence the ethnic structure locally: by regulating access to land, determining the terms of settlement, and enforcing—or failing to enforce—labour obligations. As a result, while the central power sought to channel and stabilise these processes, it was the landowners who played a decisive role in shaping these population processes.

The decades following the turn-of-the-century upheavals brought a measure of social and economic stability, temporarily restoring demographic processes. By mid-century, however, new crises—most notably George Rákóczi II's ill-fated 1657 Polish campaign and subsequent Ottoman and Tatar punitive expeditions—once again devastated Transylvania and inflicted heavy losses on its population.²³

The devastation and widespread violence rendered many settlements completely depopulated, as inhabitants either perished or fled from the armies. Unlike the resettlement movements encouraged by princely authority at the turn of the century, a large share of the original population did not return.²⁴ Among the communities affected was Váralmás [Almaşu, RO] in Szilágy [Sălaj, RO] County, where 99 Hungarian-speaking heads of households were recorded in 1644, yet by the mid-1650s the population had declined so sharply that the community could no longer afford to maintain the Calvinist pastor.²⁵ Kalotaszeg [Țara Călatei, RO] and its surroundings were also heavily affected, with substantial human losses in towns and villages such as Bánffyhunyd [Huedin, RO], Gyalu [Gilău, RO], and Körösfő [Izvoru Crişului, RO].²⁶

The devastation of war once again stimulated internal migration, in the course of which entire villages were abandoned and later occupied by newcomers. To address labour shortages, landowners resorted to a tried-and-true method: they resettled Romanian-speaking peasants on depopulated settlements. Most newcomers were shepherds from the Transylvanian

²² JAKÓ 1941. p. 124–125; JAKÓ 1943. p. 524–525.

²³ JAKÓ 1941. p. 127; JAKÓ 1943. p. 534–535; MAKKAI 1942a. p. 238.

²⁴ MAKKAI – SZÁSZ 1986. p. 806.

²⁵ MAKKAI 1942a. p. 238.

²⁶ SZABÓ T. 1942. p. 136.

highlands, but additional settlers arrived from the Romanian voivodeships.²⁷ Migration into Transylvania was further accelerated by general insecurity in the voivodeships and the predations of Wallachian authorities, contributing to a growing Romanian presence in the principality.²⁸ Although voivodes often claimed the return of fugitive peasants, princely power—aware of the labour shortage—rarely enforced these demands.²⁹ Both princely and landlords' interests, therefore, converged on quickly placing peasants on war-ravaged lands. In fiscal estates, Romanian peasants from the highlands replaced the former Hungarian or Saxon tenants, inheriting house lots burdened with more rents and services. Smaller landowners, by contrast, relied on spontaneously arriving settlers from regions such as Kővár-vidék [Țara Chioarului, RO] and Máramaros [Maramureș, RO], integrating them into agricultural production to revive farming.³⁰

Diet decrees aimed at encouraging the return of former inhabitants to abandoned villages and at controlling the increasingly extensive migratory movements by urging the population to settle permanently and to abandon forests and mountainous refuges. Persistent exposure to warfare and the resulting existential insecurity, however, strongly discouraged people from returning to their former homes. The decree issued at the Diet of Beszterce in 1668 sought to address this situation through coercive measures, ordering those who had left their original villages and established dwellings in forests or mountainous areas to be forced back to their former settlements, and authorising officials to destroy such hideouts if compliance was refused.³¹

Yet the princely authority faced difficulties not only in resettling fugitives but also in keeping newly settled communities in place. As Jakó notes with regard to the predominantly Romanian-speaking population settled along the border between the principality and the Ottoman-controlled western territories, as soon as both the Pasha of Várad [Oradea, RO] and the local landowner attempted to collect the taxes, the newly settled inhabitants promptly abandoned the settlement.³²

Despite attempts by the princely authority to support Hungarian- and German-speaking communities that had lost their former majority position, these initiatives proved insufficient to counteract the structural forces reshaping the ethnic picture. A decree of 1668 Diet, for instance, ordered that in settlements “[...] where formerly Hungarian churches existed, but which, through the many upheavals, have been destroyed and are now inhabited by Romanians who, having come to outnumber the Hungarian community, refuse to contribute to its maintenance; just as in Saxon villages inhabited by Romanians, where they are accustomed to paying the Saxon priests, so too do

²⁷ JAKÓ 1941. p. 128; MAKKAI 1943. p. 12.

²⁸ JAKÓ 1941. p. 128; JAKÓ 1944. p. 110.

²⁹ MAKKAI – SZÁSZ 1986. p. 806.

³⁰ JAKÓ 1943. p. 537, 539–540.

³¹ EOE XIV. p. 320–321.

³² JAKÓ 1943. p. 536.

we require that in such Hungarian villages the Romanians who have settled there shall render contribution to the Hungarian church [...].³³ Although a decree of similar content was adopted at the Diet of Radnót [Iernut, RO] in 1689,³⁴ its implementation appears to have met with resistance, and the decree was annulled only two years later.³⁵

The “wars of reconquest” (1683–1697), followed by the War of Independence led by Francis II Rákóczi, further uprooted the population of a country whose demographic balance was already fragile. War devastation, together with the resettlement of the peasantry to territories liberated from Ottoman rule, once again generated significant population movements. Temporary exemptions from manorial obligations and the promise of various concessions mobilised the population of Northern Transylvania to such an extent that, according to some contemporary accounts, as much as one half—or at least one third—of the inhabitants abandoned their homes and resettled in the uninhabited regions of Bihar [Bihor, RO] or Szatmár [Satu Mare, RO] Counties. The Diets also sought to curb the migration through legislation, particularly aiming to reduce peasant flight, yet their efforts met with very limited success.³⁶ In Fogarasföld [Țara Făgărașului, RO], keeping the population in place proved equally challenging; here, however, it was not the promise of exemptions but the increased tax burdens that prompted people to abandon their homes.³⁷

Another characteristic of the period was that the population of villages sometimes underwent complete replacement, occasionally multiple times over several decades. A governmental survey of 1751, for instance, reports that in Újegyházszék [Stuhl Leschkirch, RO] of the 186 recorded Romanian-speaking inhabitants, only 85 still resided in their birthplace at the time of the census, and the vast majority of these 85 were themselves descendants of migrants.³⁸ Likewise, the 1713 census of the Beszterce region indicates a recently completed population turnover. In settlements mostly inhabited by Romanian communities, officials in charge of the census categorized the taxable heads of households as follows: earlier residents, later arrivals, newcomers and vagus³⁹, as well as priests and exempted individuals. Notably, among those classified as earlier residents, very few were present in the same locality during the previous census of 1698. This also highlights that successive waves of migration, mostly arriving from beyond the Carpathians, repeatedly

³³ EOE XIV. p. 293. “[...] kikben annak előtte magyar ecclesiák voltak, kik az sok változásokban elpusztulva, oláhok ülték meg és számmal az magyar ecclesiát meghaladván, ahhoz fizetni nem akarnak; az mint azért az szász falukban is, melyekben oláhok laknak, az szász papoknak fizetni szoktak, megkivánjuk mű is, hogy az ilyen magyar falukban szállott oláhok az magyar ecclesiához valamivel tartoznak, megadják [...]” (translated by the author).

³⁴ EOE XX. p. 261.

³⁵ JAKÓ 1941. p. 129; JAKÓ 1943. p. 550.

³⁶ JAKÓ 1943. p. 543–544.

³⁷ JAKÓ 1941. p. 130–131.

³⁸ MAKKAI–SZÁSZ 1986. p. 975.

³⁹ For the social category of vagus, see: BANDI 2024.

compelled communities that had only just been settled on the land to abandon their homes once more.⁴⁰

Conclusion

The demographic transformation of early modern Transylvania cannot be fully understood without considering the decisive role of power in shaping local and regional population processes. As the analysis above demonstrates, princely authority sought to regulate settlement and migration through legislation and repeated interventions, yet the practical implementation of these measures often fell short. Warfare, political instability, and the limited reach of central power created circumstances under which migration frequently outpaced regulatory capacity, compelling landowners to assume primary responsibility for repopulating abandoned villages and maintaining economic productivity. In this context, the exercise of power was highly localized: landowners determined who could settle, under what conditions, and how newcomers were integrated into the local agricultural system. The interplay between formal authority and local practices thus structured the demographic landscape, producing patterns of settlement, mobility, and population turnover that were contingent on both institutional capacity and social negotiation.

These processes, in turn, profoundly shaped the ethnic structure of the principality. Successive waves of migration, together with resettlement policies and spontaneous movements, contributed to the expansion of the Romanian-speaking population, often at the expense of previously dominant Hungarian or Saxon communities. Ethnic balances were repeatedly reshaped as villages were abandoned, repopulated, or reorganised—sometimes under the authority of local elites, yet often through largely autonomous, spontaneous settlement. As observed throughout the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, population movements were primarily driven by local initiative, with princely authority having only limited capacity to influence these processes. In this way, the demographic evolution of Transylvania emerges not merely as a product of policy or formal authority, but as the outcome of the continuous interaction between largely self-directed local dynamics and broader structural forces across the principality.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sources

- | | |
|-------|--|
| EOEV | <i>Erdélyi Országgyűlési Emlékek V. 1601–1607</i> [Documents of the Transylvanian Diets Vol. 5. 1601–1607]. Ed. SZILÁGYI, Sándor. Budapest. 1879. |
| EOEVI | <i>Erdélyi Országgyűlési Emlékek VI. 1608–1614</i> [Documents of the Transylvanian Diets Vol. 6. 1608–1614]. Ed. SZILÁGYI, Sándor. Budapest. 1879. |

⁴⁰ JAKÓ 1943. p. 557.

- EOE VII *Erdélyi Országgyűlési Emlékek VII. 1614–1621* [Documents of the Transylvanian Diets Vol. 7. 1614–1621]. Ed. SZILÁGYI, Sándor. Budapest. 1881.
- EOE VIII *Erdélyi Országgyűlési Emlékek VIII. 1621–1629* [Documents of the Transylvanian Diets Vol. 8. 1621–1629]. Ed. SZILÁGYI, Sándor. Budapest. 1882.
- EOEXIV *Erdélyi Országgyűlési Emlékek XIV. 1664–1669* [Documents of the Transylvanian Diets Vol. 14. 1664–1669]. Ed. SZILÁGYI, Sándor. Budapest. 1889.
- EOEXX *Erdélyi Országgyűlési Emlékek XX. 1688–1691* [Documents of the Transylvanian Diets Vol. 20. 1688–1691]. Ed. SZILÁGYI, Sándor. Budapest. 1897.
- KÁDÁR 1900 KÁDÁR, József: *Szolnok-Dobokavármegye monographiája III. A vármegye községeinek részletes története* [Monograph of Szolnok-Doboka County Vol. III. Detailed History of the County's Settlements]. Dés. 1900.
- KÁDÁR 1901 POKOLY, József – RÉTHY, László – TAGÁNYI, Károly: *Szolnok-Dobokavármegye monographiája I. A vármegye általános jellemzése, története és megalakulásának bemutatása* [Monograph of Szolnok-Doboka County Vol. I. General Description, History, and the Establishment of the County]. Dés. 1901.

Secondary Literature

- BANDI 2024 BANDI, Kristóf Bálint: *The Social Structure of the Transylvanian Rural Society at the Beginning of the Eighteenth Century. Specimina Nova Pars Prima Sectio Mediaevalis* 13 (2024), p. 207–215.
- BARTA 1979 BARTA, Gábor: *Az Erdélyi Fejedelemség születése* [The Birth of the Principality of Transylvania]. Budapest. 1979.
- JAKÓ 1941 JAKÓ, Zsigmond: A románság megtelepülése az újkorban [The Settlement of the Romanian Population in the Early Modern Period] In: *Erdély és népei*. Ed. MÁLYUSZ, Elemér. Budapest. 1941. p. 118–141.
- JAKÓ 1943 JAKÓ, Zsigmond: Újkori román települések Erdélyben és a Partiumban [Early Modern Romanian Settlements in Transylvania and in the Partium] In: *Magyarok és románok I*. Ed. DEÉR, József – GALDI, László. Budapest. 1943. p. 508–571.
- JAKÓ 1944 JAKÓ, Zsigmond: Belső-Szolnok és Doboka magyarsága az újkorban [The Hungarian Population of Belső-Szolnok and Doboka in the Early Modern Period] In: *Szolnok-Doboka magyarsága*. Ed. SZABÓ T., Attila. Dés –Kolozsvár. 1944. p. 71–130.
- JANCSÓ 1931 JANCSÓ, Benedek: *Erdély története* [The History of Transylvania]. Kolozsvár. 1931.
- KELEMEN 1912 KELEMEN, Lajos: A szászencsi oláhok [The Vlachs of Szászencs]. *Erdélyi Múzeum* 29 (1912:3), p. 244–246.
- MAKKAI 1942a MAKKAI, László: *Északerdély nemzetiségi viszonyainak kialakulása* [The Development of Ethnic Relations in Northern Transylvania]. *Hitel* 7 (1942:4), p. 225–242.
- MAKKAI 1942b MAKKAI, László: *Szolnok-Doboka megye magyarságának pusztulása a XVII. század elején* [The Destruction of the

- MAKKAI 1943 Hungarian Population of Szolnok-Doboka County in the Early Seventeenth Century]. Kolozsvár. 1942.
MAKKAI, László: *Szolnok-Doboka megye magyarsága*. [The Hungarian Population of Szolnok-Doboka County]. Kolozsvár. 1943.
- MAKKAI – MÓCSY 1986 *Erdély története I. A kezdetektől 1606-ig* [History of Transylvania Vol. 1. From the Beginnings to 1606]. Ed. MAKKAI, László – MÓCSY, András. Budapest. 1986.
- MAKKAI – SZÁSZ 1986 *Erdély története II. 1606-tól 1830-ig* [History of Transylvania Vol. 2. From 1606 to 1830]. Ed. MAKKAI, László – SZÁSZ, Zoltán. Budapest. 1986.
- MIKÓ 1998 MIKÓ, Imre: *Az erdélyi falu és a nemzetiségi kérdés* [The Transylvanian Village and the Question of Nationality]. Csíkszereda. 1998.
- SZABÓ T. 1942 SZABÓ T., Attila: *A románok újabkori erdélyi betelepülése* [The Settlement of Romanians in Transylvania in the Early Modern Period]. *Hitel* 7 (1942:3), p. 133–143.

