Local Identities from Transylvania in the Modern Epoch*

SORIN MITU

STUDYING THE regions from a historical perspective was overshadowed for a long time by the importance given to the national factor. Even when regions were brought into the researchers' focus what was particularly had in view was emphasising the manner in which they contributed to configuring a unitary national framework. Alongside this special importance granted to the nation, it was also a question of favouring the whole as compared with its component fragments, which represents a technique of reading the social reality specific to the scientific approaches preceding post-modernism. Today, regions are rehabilitated, both as contemporary realities and as subjects of historical research. Medieval fragmentation is rediscovered and called upon to explain and substantiate administrative divisions, territorial rearrangements and recent identitary reorganisations.[1]

Transylvania (or, better said, the regions that comprise Transylvania) represents a subject less covered by this tendency of research. The situation can be explained by the fact that it is itself "a region," that is to say a component of certain national and unitary identitary projects, either Romanian or Hungarian.[2] The fact that its specificity (by comparison with Romania or Hungary) was emphasised and discussed, chiefly during the last decades,[3] has constituted an important progress towards taking into consideration the "peripheries," "fragments" or "regions." But Transylvania is and especially was, throughout its history, an independent piece, a whole (sometimes even "a country" and often "a motherland") whose unity expressed by its name nevertheless concealed an extraordinary diversity. In fact, most of the time, Transylvania was defined precisely through its specific heterogeneity.

Under these circumstances, studying the particular fragments that comprise Transylvania is a necessity, even the more so as until now it has rarely been achieved in a systematic manner. Although it has constituted the objective of numerous knowledge endeavours, Transylvania's unique and unmistakable identity frequently represents a false and, in any case, an overbid target. Transylvania does not have a unique identity and it can hardly be defined particularly because within it various competing identitary projects intersect, as they find themselves in a permanent evolution and rearrangement in the most diverse combinations.[4]

It is not only about the fact that there exists a Transylvania of the Romanians, one of the Hungarians and one of the Saxons. But even these, at their turn, are born from the interaction of other types of aggregations and solidarities, which decompose the face of the province in a multicoloured and dynamic mosaic: Transylvania is the historical Transylvania, but also Banat, Maramureş and *Partium*; the Romanians here claim to be, pre-eminently, Orthodox believers, but they are also Greek-Catholics; the Germans are Saxons defined by Lutheranism, but there are also Catholic Swabians; the Hungarians are the descendants of the "nobles' nation," but they are also Szeklers and many of them were serfs (as well as amongst the Romanians there were, alongside the serfs, numerous "nemeşi"), and, in the same manner, there also existed a class of Saxon serfs; for the Transylvanians, "the motherland" can mean, concomitantly, "Ţara Moţilor"[5] or "Ţara Făgăraşului,"[6] "Siculia," "Königsboden," the Principality of Transylvania, the Habsburgs' Monarchy, Hungary, Germany or Romania. In addition to the well-known three nations and four denominations, whose system did not include the Romanians, other groups—organised in juridically or identitary well-defined and often privileged entities—also existed: Armenians, Jews, Gypsies, "haidăi" (cowherds) from the county of Bihor, border guards (under three ethnic names), "Illyrians," "Greeks" and "şcheai" (Bulgarians or old Serbians) inhabiting Braşov, Aromanian "Tsintsars," "gugulani,"[7] "bufeni,"[8] "moţi,"[9] "pemi,"[10] "caraşoveni,"[11] "ţipţeri"[12] or "landleri."[13] Finally, from a religious viewpoint, one encounters "sabatarieni,"[14] Anabaptist "habani,"[15] Lutheran Hungarians, Calvinist Romanians, Catholic Bulgarians, Orthodox Serbians, Greek-Catholic Ruthenians and so many other least-expected combinations. The most different criteria, ethnic, social, denominational, sometimes even professional ones, mixed in order to give birth to this variegated landscape.

During its entire existence, Transylvania had a complex structure, being comprised of several constituent elements, a fact that entitles us to speak about a federative structuring of its identity. The first such mention can be found in the very *Gesta Hungarorum*, the narrative referring to the legendary origins of Hungary and Transylvania, which shows that Tuhutum, the Hungarian chieftain, established his dominion by concluding a pact with Gelou's defeated Romanians.[16]

In the Middle Ages, Transylvania's composite structure was illustrated by the alliance of the three nations, whose bases were laid in 1437 and in which the Hungarians, the Szeklers and the Saxons represented the component elements. Despite the fact that they bore the name of *nationes* and thus seemed to refer to ethnic realities, in reality these categories were "class nations," privileged groups, specific to that particular epoch. They were based above all upon solidarities of political and social nature.[17] Each order also had its own designated territory, the nobility owning territories in the seven counties of Transylvania (nobiliary land), the Saxons inhabiting and enjoying privileges on *Fundus Regius* (Saxon land), while the Szeklers resided within *Székelyföld* (Szekler land). Even if the Romanians were not a component of this tripartite system, their presence was related as well to certain territories that they inhabited in a compact manner, the so-called Romanian "countries" or districts (*terrae, districtus Valachorum*).[18]

Nevertheless, this process of ethnicising Transylvania's space by administrative allotment (more correctly stated, by granting collective privileges to territorialised commu-

nities) did not lead to a complete segregation and neither to creating firm regional identities on these bases. The administrative divisions (counties, Szekler and Saxon chairs) had sinuous limits, with various extensions and enclaves, the "lands" of the three estates were not compactly grouped (for example, the Saxons' territory was broken down into three parts: the southern chairs, the district of Braşov and the district of Bistriţa), there existed numerous inhabitants belonging to other "nations" who lived amongst the Saxons or even amongst the Szeklers, etc. The territory was more clearly ethnically imprinted only in the situations imposed by physical geography. This was the case of the Szeklers occupying the mountains from eastern Transylvania, of the Romanians grouped in compact mountainous or depressional ethno-geographical areas (Făgăraş, Haţeg, Zarand, Beiuş, Maramureş, Chioar, Năsăud) or of the Hungarians from Kalotaszeg.

Beginning with the 16th century, the politico-social partition initiated in the 14th century was supplemented by a denominational division. The four acknowledged denominations (Catholic, Lutheran, Calvinist and Unitarian) were added to the three constituent nations of the Principality, although the former did not entirely coincide with the "national" delimitations.

The Saxons were the most coherent from this viewpoint, because their ethnic community and their politico-social organisation (*Universitas Saxonum*) completely identified with the Lutheran denomination of the Evangelical Church. But, even from the 16th century, a few Hungarian Lutheran communities were constituted and maintained (in Ţara Bârsei or in Cluj),[19] the final result being that, in the 20th century, they were brought under the jurisdiction of a Hungarian Lutheran (Synodical-Presbyterian) church, with an episcopal seat of its own.

Unlike the Saxons, who adopted *in corpore* a certain denomination (an action that also had the purpose of protecting their status as a distinct social class), the believers of the Hungarian and Szekler "nations" divided themselves amongst the three large Transylvanian denominations, being especially Catholics, Calvinists and Unitarians (to which a smaller group of Lutheran Hungarians can be added). Despite the fact that they are not very numerous, the Unitarians actually represent a denomination specific to Transylvania, the bishopric of Cluj being the most important centre of Unitarianism worldwide.

Although, in this manner, the Hungarians became segregated from a religious viewpoint, with time, the churches of the three denominations that were numerically dominated by them acquired a Hungarian defining character. But the religious dissensions between the Catholics and the Reformed played an important role in the 17th-18th centuries, by contributing to the creation of rival political solidarities amongst the Hungarians. The Protestant nobility was a constant adversary of the Habsburgs (for example, in the 17th century it preferred to ally itself with the Turks than with the Austrians), while the Hungarian Catholics accepted more easily the political collaboration with Vienna, being favoured, at their turn, by the imperial politics.

For a long time, the Romanians lived outside Transylvania's constitutional system. Excepting the notes from *Gesta Hungarorum* or from other narrative sources, the "Wallachians" are mentioned for the first time in the official documents of the 13th century. These acts suggest a tendency towards aggregating in the form of a social

class, similar to the other privileged groups from the Kingdom of Hungary and from Transylvania. The expression "*silva Blacorum et Bissenorum*" used in the *Diploma Andreanum* (1224) indicates the existence of a Romanian socio-identitary category, recognised as such by the Hungarian royalty, while in 1291 the Romanians' representatives are called to the Diet of Alba Iulia, alongside the nobles, Saxons and Szeklers.[20] The same thing happened in 1355 at Turda.[21] But this tendency was stopped during the 14th century, mainly due to the "schismatic" Romanians' Orthodox denomination, which was combated by both the Catholic Church and the Hungarian royalty.[22]

During the ensuing centuries, the Romanians were excluded from the system of the "three political nations" that ruled Transylvania, although a Romanian prince could enter "the nobiliary nation" and sometimes attain high positions, provided that he affiliated himself with a recognised denomination. However, the Romanians continued being recognised as a distinct entity, with their own common law (*ius Valachicum*) and specific taxes (*quinquagesima ovium*), even if this status was stipulated with the rather dishonourable phrase "tolerated for the benefit of the country" from the *Approbatae Constitutiones* (1653). In a similar manner, the Armenians, Jews, Serbians or Gypsies (of course, each with a different numerical and economic weight) appear as communities whose individuality was recognised, as they were attached to certain territories, fiscal obligations or privileges.

The premises for a change in the Transylvanian Romanians' status appeared in the 18th century, at the same time with the union of a large part of them with the Church of Rome. Being "Catholics" from that moment on, the Uniate Romanians, represented by Bishop Inochentie Micu, solicited their inclusion in Transylvania's constitutional system, alongside the other recognised "nations" and denominations (1744). After Joseph II's *Edict of Tolerance* and in the climate of the new enlightened ideas, the Orthodox believers also felt that they were entitled to demand the same thing, together with the Greek-Catholics, through *Supplex Libellus Valachorum* (1791). Although their requests were not granted, the idea of using the two Romanian denominational identities in order to obtain collective rights was contoured beginning with this period. In their identitary discourses, both churches claimed that they best identified with the interests of the Romanian nation, a tendency that led to rivalries and disputes between Orthodox and Greek-Catholic Romanians.

As the denominationalising process, which began in the 16th-17th centuries,[23] had as a result the overlap, even if partial, of one church over a certain ethnic group, an important issue that was raised during the 19th century was that of building "popular churches" in which the ethnicity would indissolubly merge with a particular denomination headed up by its own churchly organisation.[24] The Lutheran Saxons, led by Bishops Georg Daniel Teutsch (1867-1893) and Friedrich Teutsch (1903-1932) offered the exemplary model of a *Volkskirche* that desired to be an inexpugnable national and denominational fortress in the face of the Hungarian or Romanian threats.[25] In a similar manner, Bishop Andrei Şaguna tried to create an autonomous Orthodox Church as a shield that would protect the Romanians' threatened nationality.[26] However, contemporary researchers such as Krista Zach express their reservations regarding the monolithic, fissureless character of these attempts at an ethnodenominational fusion.[27] In the same way in which, during the Middle Ages, attaching a privileged class to a certain territory did not lead to the latter's complete homogenisation

on "national" (and so much the less on ethnic) criteria, the churches of the various Transylvanian communities left their believers sufficient manoeuvre space for reciprocal rivalries, transformations and relations, in a word, for diversity and mobility in matters of identity.

In the modern epoch, beginning with the end of the 18th century and especially during the 19th century, the traditional class solidarities inherited from the Middle Ages were transformed into identities of a national nature with a defining ethnic component.[28] The triad of the privileged estates, Hungarians, Szeklers and Saxons, was replaced by the ethnic triad of Transylvania's "peoples" or even "nations," which, from now on, were (in the order of their demographic weight) the Romanians, the Hungarians and the Saxons.

During the 1848-1849 Revolution, as well as in the period of the liberal experiment between the years 1860-1865, this symbolic reorganisation of Transylvania on ethno-national criteria fuelled the political projects of a modern national nature. The Hungarians and the Szeklers used Transylvania's autonomy, as well as their ruling position in the province as a springboard for the project of recreating a Hungarian national state within the historical borders of the Kingdom of Hungary. For this purpose, they acted in order to dissolve the old Transylvanian local identities, under the unifying umbrella of the new Hungarian citizenship. But their homogenisation project was not perfect, as shown by the fact that the roots of interwar Transylvanism, which emphasised Transylvania's specificity by comparison with Hungary, can be detected even from the Dualist period.[29]

Unlike the Hungarians, the Romanians and the Saxons fully used the symbolic resources provided by the Transylvanian particularism (historical, denominational, demographic, regional peculiarities) as arguments in favour of preserving a privileged status in the case of the Saxons, or in order to gain a better one, in the case of the Romanians. Up until the moment when Romania became the new actual motherland of the Transylvanian Romanians (namely after 1918) and Germany a symbolic one, called *Mutterland*, for the Transylvanian Saxons (beginning with the Dualist period), the two communities that were aggressed by Budapest's nationalism considered that Transylvania was their "motherland."[30] Due to the fact that it was conceived by both communities as multiethnic (as opposed to the Hungarians, who homogenised it within the large boundaries of the "Hungarian political nation"), the Romanians' and the Saxons' national objective was that of ensuring for themselves a place as comfortable and as safe as possible in this common motherland that had to be shared with others. In these circumstances, the autonomy on national criteria was considered to be the golden formula and it was going to be secured through the most suitable territorial, political, administrative, denominational, educational and cultural frames.

In the revolutionary tumult of 1848, the Romanian leaders attempted to build a genuine "Romanian country" in Transylvania, whose regional components were the 15 "legions" (Auraria Gemina, Auraria et Salinae, Blasiana, Legiunea de Câmpie,[31] Ţara Bârsei and Făgăraş, etc.).[32] The manner in which the names and responsibility areas of these divisions were chosen reflects a Romantic, emotional mentality, that combined scholarly references with the Roman antiquity and Transylvania's administrative map with the tactical, from the terrain, situation of the "prefects," namely the commanders of the Romanian irregular troops.

The need to confer a territorial component on the Romanian identity, in competition with the other Transylvanian nationalities, was felt during the liberal period also, when the Romanian leaders requested the assignment of a national territory of their own from the authorities, on the model of the other Transylvanian nations.[33] The Saxons overbid in the same way by demanding (and even receiving, in 1849, as a reward for their loyalty towards Vienna) the national territory named *Sachsenland*. Between the years 1861 and 1865, the Romanian leaders of the districts Făgăraş and Năsăud introduced numerous identitary marks and practices, such as writing the administrative documents in the Romanian language or manufacturing seals of the local communities meant to emphasise the Romanian character of the respective territories.[34]

As it could be seen so far, the Transylvanian local identities of the modern epoch incorporated, on the one hand, this multicultural historical legacy, which stems from the province's medieval past and is illustrated by the three (in reality four) nations and the four (in reality six) denominations. On the other hand, in configuring the local identities, an extremely important role was played by the traditional solidarities from the level of the peasant mentality.

In the case of the Romanians, who comprised the majority of the rural population in Transylvania during the modern era, ethnographic research pointed out the existence of specific and extremely complex local solidarities. The peasant universe was centred around the village, which was considered a veritable *axis mundi* whose members formed a community that was extremely well welded together.[35] From an identitary viewpoint, the peasants firstly identified themselves as belonging to their native village, this being the most concrete element of their social identity. Their attributes of peasants, Orthodox believers or Romanian ethnics derived from this fundamental belonging to the village in which they lived.

However, the village was not a monolithic unit. As it was constituted by the assemblage of other fundamental elements, namely houses and households, the village was frequently divided into an "upper" and a "lower" part and was sometimes also amongst the "nemeşi" (the noblemen) and the "iobagi" (the serfs). The families, relatives, vicinities, age groups of girls and boys structured a complex federation of solidarities and alliances, overlapping the parish's ecclesiastical frame, which sometimes coincided with the village, was the same for several villages on occasion or, in the contrary, partitioned a multidenominational (and at times also multiethnic) village.

At the superior level of the rural solidarities, one of the peasant social identity's larger circles included the so-called "country," which comprised a group of villages that usually formed a physical-geographical unit (a valley, a depression, a piedmont or a plain) and, in the same time, a homogeneous and familiar cultural space. Most marriages were concluded within this area,[36] as the "country" always had a centre that served as a marketplace, a meeting place, a space for economic and symbolic exchanges. For the Transylvanian peasant, beyond the boundaries of these "countries" began the realm of alterity, all those who lived outside the respective limits being viewed as "strangers."[37]

Very much was written about these "countries" in the Romanian historical and social literature, beginning with Nicolae Iorga's "Romaniile populare," continuing with the

"Romanian districts" mapped by the contemporary medieval historians[38] and ending with Paul H. Stahl's "peasant confederations."[39] The most thorough studies concerning Transylvania in the modern epoch were realised by the regretted Barbu Ştefănescu.[40]

Nevertheless, we are still far from an in-depth knowledge of these types of territorial and communitarian identities, especially in what regards their concrete, in the field, identification and their specific traits during different historical periods. An important issue which, in our opinion, must be tackled is that of the relationship between the "country" (this term referring to a traditional community with distinct ethnographic traits) and other types of territorial configurations, which were also capable of engendering particular identities and solidarities.

What was the relationship between a "country" and a "Romanian district" of the Middle Ages? How about that between a "country" and a county (or judicial seat)? Or that between a "country" and the administrative divisions of an inferior rank, the "vidic" (*vidék, districtus*) or the "plasa" (*járás, processus*—an administrative term that, to the best of our knowledge, had no correspondent in the period's Romanian popular language)? Ioan-Aurel Pop discusses the case of Maramureş, the only example in which a "ţară-voievodat"[41] (representing, at its turn, a federation of valley principalities)[42] first transformed itself into a district and later into a county with the same name.[43] Barbu Ştefănescu cites some notes written on old books that reveal peasant localisation within the village, region, "country," county, as well as the relations that existed between these identitary frames ("from Hunedoara's 'varmeghia',[44] from the Haţeg 'vidic', from the village Râul Alb, 'nemeş' Herţa Boldijar and the priest of the parish from Preuţi;" "in the year 1810 the entire stock of cattle died in the entire country, namely in the 'vidic' of Beliu and in the 'vidic' of Beiinş").[45]

What type of a relationship existed, on the other hand, between the traditional ethnographic communities and the churchly administrative divisions, the archpriesthoods and the vicariates, which were so important for the Romanian public life in the 18th-19th centuries? What was the relationship between the Romanian "countries" and the border regiments? At the end of the 18th century, Haţeg, an old "Romanian country," attested from the 13th century,[46] was a "vidic" (*Hátszeg vidék, Districtus Hatzeg*),[47] that is to say a territorial subdivision of the Hunedoara county (that, at its turn, comprised several subunits with administrative and fiscal purposes—i.e. *járások*, "plase"—amongst which one was also situated in the Haţeg market town).[48] At the same time, the headquarters of the second company of the first border regiment of Orlat and the commanding offices of the first battalion of the same unit were also located here.[49] Moreover, Haţeg was also a parish, the seat of the archpriest and, from the year 1786, the residence of the Uniate vicariate bearing the same name, which had jurisdiction over the Uniate parishes from the counties Hunedoara and Zarand.[50] In a similar manner, Năsăud, the centre of the area compactly inhabited by the Romanians from the Rodna district who were under the authority of the Magistrate from Bistriţa, became the headquarters of the second border regiment (1764), of the Năsăud Border District, of the Rodna archpriesthood and vicariate (from 1786),[51] as well as of the Năsăud district (1861-1876), led by Alexandru Bohăţel as supreme captain. The almost complete overlap of these

territorial and organisational frames gave birth to one of the most conspicuous local identities from Transylvania.[52]

The other Greek-Catholic vicariates that have functioned in the 18th-19th centuries (those of Făgăraş, Silvania and Maramureş) played similar roles. They engendered particular local identities and solidarities in areas with a compact Romanian population and with distinct ethnographic profiles, situated in border regions, "threatened" from political, ethnic or denominational viewpoints.[53]

Comparable problems arise in relation to the Saxons or to the Szeklers. The Szeklers were, originally, an almost exclusively rural population, the village representing the referential frame of their social identity in their case also.[54] It was only during the 19th century that the urbanisation process gathered momentum in this area too.[55] However, the Szeklers' military obligations caused their village organisation to be influenced by the principles of a "military democracy" that had the purpose of mobilising the combatants as efficiently as possible. The Szekler villages were divided into "tenths" ("zecimi," *tízes*), subunits comprising ten persons with military and administrative roles.[56] The villages were grouped into a complex structure of chairs (seven of them), from which some gave birth to filial-chairs (*fiúszékek*).[57] In the 18th-19th centuries, similar systems of structuring the Romanian villages from the area of the border regiments can be encountered, due to the same military obligations. This was the case of the companies that composed the regiments, which included one or several villages, located in a valley or depression. In these cases, namely those of the Szeklers and of the Romanian border guards, strengthening the traditional manners of structuring the village by adding those imposed by a system of military organisation generated distinct effects, leading to the development of an identitary profile specific to those areas and also to powerful local solidarities.

For the Saxons, the "neighbourhoods" ("vecinătăţile," *Nachbarschaft*) represented a solidarity frame smaller than the community, both in the towns, but also in the Saxon villages, a system that was later on extended inclusively amongst the Romanians inhabiting "Königsboden."[58] The chairs' organisation and the municipal statutes, overlapping the Saxon University and additionally united by the Lutheran Church (to which, in the 19th century, a strong network of economic or cultural associations were added as well) completed the profile of a Saxon community that was particularly homogeneous and that cultivated, through its self-image, the fiction of a monolithic identity. Nevertheless, the Saxons also knew numerous local peculiarities, as were, for example, those that differentiated Bistriţa, Sibiu and Braşov. The differences between the conservative Sibiu and the liberal Braşov generated political divergences, distinct attitudes with respect to the Saxons' relationship with the Hungarian revolution of 1848 or with the Dualist state after 1867.[59] In a similar manner, the Romanians from Banat, *Partium* or Maramureş had a different political conduct from that of their compatriots from historical Transylvania regarding their relations with the revolution or with the Hungarian state. In 1848, the majority of the inhabitants of Banat, Bihor or Maramureş who were politically active sided with Kossuth's supporters and, during the Dualist period, they promoted political activism by participating in the works of the Budapest Parliament. Actually, all these cases are illustrative of substanti-

ating certain major political and ideological commitments on regional bases, a fact that points out the special force of these local identitary traditions and particularities.

All these issues referring to the relations amongst historical tradition, demographic map, ethnographic peculiarities and Transylvania's administrative, military or churchly organisation in the modern epoch open up promising research leads for studying the province's complex identities. One can affirm that the extremely diverse local solidarities and affiliations represented the primary material from which the social identity of Transylvania's inhabitants was configured.

□

Notes

1. See Ovidiu Pecican, *Regionalism românesc: Organizare prestatală și stat la nordul Dunării în perioada medievală și modernă* (Bucharest: Curtea Veche, 2009).
2. About the "peripheral" character attributed to Transylvania, see László Kürti, *The remote borderland: Transylvania in the Hungarian imagination* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1999), 16–22.
3. Gabriel Andreescu, Gusztáv Molnár, eds., *Problema transilvana* (Jassy: Polirom, 1999); Sorin Mitu, *Transilvania mea: Istorii, mentalități, identități* (Jassy: Polirom, 2006), 86–101.
4. For a presentation of Transylvania as a "double space," defined differently by Romanians and Hungarians, see Enikő Magyari-Vincze, *Antropologia politicii identitare naționaliste* (Cluj-Napoca: EFES, 1997), 193–230.
5. A region in the Apuseni Mountains (translator's note—t.n.).
6. A region in the meridional area of the Carpathian Mountains (t.n.).
7. Inhabitants of the area around Gugu mountain peak in Banat (t.n.).
8. Inhabitants of Banat who were born in Oltenia (t.n.).
9. Romanians from the Apuseni Mountains (t.n.).
10. Bohemian colonists in the Banat region (t.n.).
11. Catholics of Slavic origin inhabiting Carașova and other nearby localities in the county of Caraș-Severin (t.n.).
12. German colonists from the Zips region in the Tatra Mountains, brought by the Austrian administration in the Vișeu area (Maramureș county) in the second half of the 18th century in order to systematically exploit the forests (t.n.).
13. Representatives of an ethnic minority in Romania; they speak a dialect of the German language and live alongside the Saxons in a few localities from the Sibiu county, namely Turnișor (nowadays a district of Sibiu), Cristian and Apoldu de Sus (t.n.).
14. Szeklers who respected the Sabbath, namely honoured God on Saturdays (t.n.).
15. Members of a Baptist sect from Hanover and Rhineland who emigrated in the 16th century in Moravia, Slovakia and Transylvania; in 1760, under Maria Theresa's rule, they were forced to become Catholics (t.n.).
16. Gabriel Silagi, ed., *Die „Gesta Hungarorum" des anonymen Notars: Die älteste Darstellung der ungarischen Geschichte* (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1991), chapt. 27.
17. Ioan-Aurel Pop, Thomas Nägler, eds., *Istoria Transilvaniei*, vol. 1 (Cluj-Napoca: Institutul Cultural Român, 2003), 257-258, considers that these classes also had a defining ethnic component. See also Ionuț Costea, *Solam virtutem et nomen bonum: Nobilitate, Etnie, Regionalism în Transilvania Princiară* (Cluj-Napoca: Argonaut, 2005), 228–245.

18. Ibid., 239–246.
19. Jászay Károly, *Magyar lutheránus megmozdulások Cluj–Kolozsváron: 1798–1861* (Kolozsvár: Minerva, 1937).
20. Pop, Nägler, *Istoria*, vol. 1, 259.
21. Ibid., 260.
22. This thesis was argued at length in Ioan-Aurel Pop, *Naţiunea română medievală* (Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică, 1998); Id., „*Din mâinile valahilor schismatici. . . :*" *Românii şi puterea în Regatul Ungariei medievale* (Bucharest: Litera, 2011). Harald Roth, *Kleine Geschichte Siebenbürgens* (Köln: Böhlau, 1996), 36, considers that in addition to denominational hostility other causes that prevented the creation of a *natio Valachica* also existed: the Romanians' dispersed territorial distribution, the princes' tendency to assimilate themselves within the nobiliary nation and also "the lack, to a great extent, of an ethnic consciousness" (an affirmation that contradicts Ioan-Aurel Pop's theses).
23. Edit Szegedi, *Identităţi premoderne în Transilvania* (Cluj-Napoca: EFES, 2002), 31–62; Ioan-Aurel Pop, Thomas Nägler, Magyari András, eds., *Istoria Transilvaniei*, vol. 2 (Cluj-Napoca: Centrul de Studii Transilvane, 2005), 237–262.
24. Krista Zach, "Religiöse Toleranz und Stereotypenbildung in einer multikulturellen Region: Volkskirchen in Siebenbürgen," in *Das Bild des Anderen in Siebenbürgen. Stereotype in einer multiethnischen Region*, ed. Konrad Gündisch, Wolfgang Höpken and Michael Markel (Köln: Böhlau, 1998), 109–154.
25. Mircea Gheorghe Abrudan, "The Confessional Identity of the Transylvanian Saxons: 1848-1920," *Studia Universitatis "Babeş-Bolyai": Historia* 57, Special Issue (December 2012): 97–123.
26. Keith Hitchins, *Ortodoxie şi naţionalitate: Andrei Şaguna şi românii din Transilvania* (Bucharest: Univers Enciclopedic, 1995).
27. Zach, *Religiöse Toleranz*, 133–142.
28. For this period's Romanian identitary transformations, see Sorin Mitu, *Geneza identităţii naţionale la românii ardeleni* (Bucharest: Humanitas, 1997); Luminiţa Ignat-Coman, *Imagine de sine la românii ardeleni în perioada dualistă* (Cluj-Napoca: Argonaut, 2009). For the Szeklers: Gusztáv Mihály Hermann, *Náció és nemzet: Székely rendi nacionalizmus és magyar nemzettudat 1848-ig* (Csíkszereda: Pro-Print, 2003). For the Saxons: Andreas Möckel, "Geschichtsschreibung und Geschichtsbewußtsein bei den Siebenbürger Sachsen," in *Studien zur Geschichtsschreibung im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. Paul Philippi (Köln: Böhlau, 1967), 1–23; Id., "Kleinsächsisch oder Alldeutsch? Zum Selbstverständnis der Siebenbürger Sachsen von 1867-1933," in *Siebenbürgen zwischen den beiden Weltkriegen*, ed. Walter König (Köln: Böhlau, 1994), 129–148.
29. K. Lengyel Zsolt, *A kompromisszum keresése: Tanulmányok a 20. századi transzszilvanizmus korai történetéhez* (Csíkszereda: Pro-Print, 2007), 41–45.
30. Sorin Mitu, "Formation de l'idée de patrie chez les Roumains de Transylvanie pendant la première moitié du XIX⁵ siècle," *Studia Politica. Romanian Political Science Review* 2, 2 (April 2002): 369–375; Nicolae Teşculă, "The media, the idea of German affiliation and the Transylvanian Saxons in the 1860s," *Studia Universitatis "Babeş-Bolyai." Historia* 57, 2 (June 2012): 30–31.
31. Literally, „The Plain Legion" (t.n.).
32. Silviu Dragomir, *Studii privind istoria revoluţiei române de la 1848* (Cluj-Napoca: Dacia, 1989), 186-213; Liviu Maior, *1848–1849: Români şi unguri în revoluţie* (Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică, 1998), 303–318.
33. Pop, Nägler, Magyari, *Istoria*, vol. 3 (Cluj-Napoca: Centrul de Studii Transilvane, 2008), 405.
34. Simion Lupşan, Adrian Onofreiu, eds., *Poruncile primăriei Năsăud: 1863-1867* (Năsăud: Editura Fundaţiei „George Coşbuc," 2006); Adrian Onofreiu, *Districtul Năsăud: 1861–1876* (Cluj-Napoca: Argonaut, 2010).

35. Ernest Bernea, *Spațiu, timp și cauzalitate la poporul român* (Bucharest: Humanitas, 1997), 86–87.

36. Sometimes, the girls' fairs took place at the border between two "countries," when their limits proved to be too narrow.

37. Barbu Ştefănescu, *Sociabilitate rurală, violență și ritual: Cartea în practicile oblative de răscumpărare a păcii comunitare, Transilvania, sec. XVII–XIX* (Oradea: Editura Universității din Oradea, 2004), 140.

38. Pop, Nägler, *Istoria*, Appendices, map no. 12: *Transilvania medievală [Medieval Transylvania]*, where 27 "more important Romanian districts" are hachured. Moreover, at p. 245 the authors mention approximately "60 Romanian districts in Transylvania and in the neighbouring counties from the west and north."

39. Paul H. Stahl, *Triburi și sate din sud-estul Europei* (Bucharest: Paideia, 2000), 115–158.

40. Barbu Ştefănescu, *Le monde rural de l'ouest de la Transylvanie: Du Moyen Âge à la Modernité* (Cluj-Napoca: Centrul de Studii Transilvane, 2007), 83–140; Id., *Sociabilitate rurală*, 36–149.

41. Literally, "voivodeship-country" (t.n.).

42. See Radu Popa, *Țara Maramureșului în veacul al XIV-lea* (Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică, 1997).

43. Pop, Nägler, *Istoria*, 246.

44. Another word for "county" (t.n.).

45. Ştefănescu, *Sociabilitate rurală*, 141.

46. Radu Popa, *La începuturile Evului Mediu românesc: Țara Hațegului* (Bucharest: Editura Ştiințifică și Enciclopedică, 1988).

47. See the maps of the first topographical measurements ordered by Joseph II (*Josephinische Landesaufnahme*), available from *Kriegsarchiv*, Vienna, on www.wikipedia.de, *sub voce*.

48. Pop, Nägler, Magyari, *Istoria*, vol. 3, 23.

49. Carol Göllner, *Regimentele grănicerești din Transilvania: 1764-1851* (Bucharest: Editura Militară, 1973), 55–56.

50. Camelia Vulea, *Biserica greco-catolică din Vicariatul Hațegului: 1850-1918* (Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitară Clujeană, 2009), 41–44.

51. Mirela Andrei, *La granița Imperiului: Vicariatul Rodnei* (Cluj-Napoca: Argonaut, 2006), 38–40.

52. See Oana-Ramona Ilovan, *Țara Năsăudului: Studiu de geografie regională* (Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitară Clujeană, 2009).

53. Ibid., 31.

54. Gusztáv Mihály Hermann, *Secuii: Istorie, cultură, identitate* (Miercurea-Ciuc: Pro-Print, 2009), 34–39.

55. Judit Pál, *Procesul de urbanizare în scaunele secuiești în secolul al XIX-lea* (Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitară Clujeană, 1999).

56. Hermann, *Secuii*, 34–35.

57. Ibid., 29–34.

58. Pop, Nägler, Magyari, *Istoria*, vol. 2, 181; Vintilă Mihăilescu, "Vecinătatea și fraternitatea economică," www.icca.ro/pdf/Vintila_Mihailescu.pdf, accessed in 28.02.2013.

59. For an analysis of the political divergences between the Saxon communities of Sibiu and Braşov based on the distinct profiles of these two towns, see Jonathan Kwan, "Transylvanian Saxon politics, Hungarian state building and the case of the Allgemeiner Deutscher Schulverein (1881–82)," *English Historical Review* 127, 526 (June 2012): 8–11.

Abstract

Local Identities from Transylvania in the Modern Epoch

The study analyses the manner in which the local, particular, fragmentary identities from Transylvania participated in building the social identity of the province's inhabitants. An emphasis is placed on the complex relationship amongst the folkloric identities of the peasant communities, Transylvania's administrative divisions and subdivisions, the Szeklers' traditional military organisation and, at a later moment, that of the border regiments and, finally, the churchly organisation at the local level. The suggested conclusion is that the local identities that were the most conspicuous appeared where these different frames overlapped, as was the case of the Saxons, the Szeklers and the Romanians from Făgăraş, Haţeg or Năsăud.

Keywords

Transylvania, 18th-19th centuries, local identities, peasant solidarities, denominational identity