Starting with the Austro-Hungarian Compromise, Habsburg multinational rhetoric tended to reconcile any apparent contradiction between national equality, obtained as a consequence of the 1848 Revolution, and the political necessity of retaining distinctions between Hungarian and Transylvanian Romanian nationalisms. The relationship of the Transylvanian Romanian nationalist leaders with Vienna and Budapest shaped their new nationalist rhetoric, thereby ensuring the increasing popularity of such rhetoric throughout much of the socially and regionally diverse Habsburg Empire.

As the only source of authority and guarantees the Habsburg dynasty was naturally the object of national strategies, that effectively reflected the combination of imperial ideology embodied by *Habsburgtreue* with the emerging nationalist discourse. At the end of the nineteenth century, this relationship provided both rhetorical and real space for the mediation of the Monarchy's two powerful yet contradictory urges: between egalitarian demands of all nationalities as well as the Hungarian and Austrian desire to prevent a potential change of their political hegemony.

This project pictures the political activity of one of the most prominent Hungarian born-Romanian nationalist at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century, Aurel C. Popovici and contextualises its interaction with the Hungarian complement. At the end of the nineteenth century, Transylvanian Romanian nationalists forged a radical discourse that challenged the legitimacy of the reigning system of the Austro-Hungarian Compromise. The ensuing struggles between Hungarian and Transylvanian Romanian nationalisms were highly politicised by the emergence of new political discourses.

On the one hand, the Hungarian nationalists instrumentalised their "battle" with Transylvanian Romanians using two strategies. The first produced an "interregional political culture" specific to the Hungarian part of the Empire meant to serve as an alternative ideology to the unsatisfactory *Unio Trio Natiorum* structure of the Ancient Regime. The other strategy elaborated by some Hungarian nationalists, such as Béla Grünwald and Gusztáv Beksits, involved the elaboration of a powerful public rhetoric developed to justify the political Compromise of 1867 and "the Magyar Unitary State."

On the other hand, an archaeology of Transylvanian Romanian nationalism in the late Habsburg Empire indicates that many intellectuals with strong identity resentments engaged in instituted but unauthorised transgressions of established political order. Nationalism provided many Transylvanian Romanian intellectuals with a powerful and positive source of identity. Between them and Hungarian nationalists the icons of nationalism and competition for power co-existed and competed with other symbols rooted in the social interaction of Transylvanian ethnic communities that preceded the intrusion of modern ideologies.

Scholars have framed the national movement of Transylvanian Romanians in the Habsburg Empire as a result of Imperial political propaganda that stimulated the efforts of Romanian nationalists to build a separate national identity from Hungarian nationalism. This picture was particularly reinforced at the end of the nineteenth century, when the importance of a distinct cultural and political identity began to radicalise Transylvanian Romanian nationalists causing their nationalism to become fundamentally opposed to Hungarian nationalist principles and discourses. This period initiated a fervent debate about a new type of national identity for both Transylvanian Romanians and Hungarians. Paradoxically, historians have generally ignored the vitality of the interaction between Hungarian and Transylvanian Romanian nationalism to focus more narrowly on the irreconciability of the two movements.

This project suggests that the conflictual political discourse developed by Hungarians and Transylvanian Romanians can be attributed to the simultaneous political mobilisation determined by Hungarian nationalism and to the emergence of a new Transylvanian Romanian nationalist élite. The anatomy of this "intertwined" nationalism requires a particular exercise: sufficient emersion to grasp its predominant modes of expression and to avoid a seductive reproduction of the conventional dichotomic history of Hungarians and Romanians in the Habsburg Empire.

Aurel C. Popovici, Béla Grünwald and Gusztáv Beksits, introduced a new national ideology, in which traditional terms such as "religion," "language" and "politic" were transformed. This project particularly insists on the modalities through which they inaugurated a new discourse and dialogue about nation in the Habsburg Monarchy. Within this framework, the focus is on nationalist discourse and political culture of the Austro-Hungarian scene. By clarifying it, one may address a larger question about the extent of collective national identities as expressed by the Hungarian and Transylvanian Romanian nationalists at the end of the nineteenth century Habsburg Monarchy. Analysing the nationalist discourse of Aurel C. Popovici, Béla Grünwald and Gusztáv Beksits, I attempt to illuminate their

intrinsic relationship and to explain why a divergent nationalism exploded in the Habsburg Empire. To construct this analysis, one can organise it into four parts.

The first concentrates on the theoretical issue of nationalism and reflects upon the historical and political context of the discussion. The second part describes Aurel C. Popovici's political activity and reveals its intimate connection with Hungarian and Habsburg national politics. The history of Hungarian and Transylvanian Romanian theory of national identity/nationalism can be convincingly converted to the study of those intellectuals who related the formation of cultural and social identities to Vienna and Budapest. This identification of the intellectual as the symbolic producer of the social and cultural national signifiers is precisely supported by the topic of ethnic/national identity itself. In an attempt to assess the problem of nationalism in the Habsburg Empire, this project situates Aurel C. Popovici, Béla Grünwald and Gusztáv Beksits in their respective milieu and suggestively illustrates how the argument about *assimilation* project articulated itself.

The third part traces nationalism and the national ideology of the Transylvanian Romanians and Hungarians. It analyses the growth in discourse about *Romanianness* and *Hungarianness*, concentrating on how Aurel C. Popovici, Béla Grünwald and Gusztáv Beksits exercised these concepts. They emphasised the *ethnic* component of nationalism and intrinsically related it to Hungarian and, respectively, Romanian nationalism. Focusing on this relationship, one can interestingly explain nineteenth century Transylvania's *Ethnoradikalismus*. This can be defined as a *reaction* stemming from Aurel C. Popovici's *Risorgimento* nationalism to Béla Grünwald and Gusztáv Beksits's *Integral* nationalism. Their debatable issue was the assimilation project as envisioned by the Hungarian state. Both proponents agreed that assimilation was an organic part of the nation-building process. Characteristically, they fundamentally disagreed on its purpose. A sociology of this debate is required if one attempts to understand the history of that period.

Finally, the concluding part synthesises these issues and stresses the need to use a variety of theoretical perspectives in order to reflect the historical challenges suggested by fin-de-siècle Austro-Hungarian nationalism.

This project represents a naturally elaboration of my MA thesis, *From Federalism to Nationalism: The Case of Aurel C. Popovici*, and reflects my current research that I am carrying on in Budapest and Vienna. I hope that my cultural background, the intellectual interests and my involvement in Romanian and Hungarian historical studies recommend me as an eligible candidate for the Ph. D. Program at the Central European University.