

THE SZEKLETS AND HUNGARIANS FROM ROMANIA

GR. P. POP¹, A. NIȚĂ¹

ABSTRACT. – **The Szeklers and Hungarians from Romania.** This study regards, as its main topic, the possibility of establishing at present, a geodemographical entity on Romania's territory, since certain representatives of the Hungarian ethnical minority in our country, and with a particular insistence of those in the vicinity of the western border, always remember to bring into view the problem of establishing an autonomy, common to a **Székely Land**, located in the central area of our country, which would include Mureș, Harghita and Covasna counties. Without carrying out a detailed account of this situation, it needs to be mentioned, just as it will emerge of the following presentation, that such an approach has neither the most reduced geodemographical support, since the Szeklers, after being assimilated by the Hungarian ethnic group, are no longer present at the census of 20 October 2011. By taking into account the above mentioned aspects, in order to be able to respond to the insistent requests for autonomy in Transylvania, we proceeded to highlight, through a fairly detailed approach of the Hungarian ethnical minority, obviously in point of the number of inhabitants and of their distribution on Romania's territory, resulting of this the fact that the number of Hungarians is of 1,227,623 people, value which related to those 20,121,641 inhabitants of Romania, means 6.10%. The total number of mentioned Hungarians is characterized by a pronounced concentration on Romania's territory, standing out by creating a **corridor with a diagonal aspect, on the northwest-southeast direction**, consisting of seven counties, the first four (Satu Mare, Bihor, Sălaj and Cluj) being registered with 2.01% (404,561 inhabitants) of those 6.10% Hungarians, the following three (Mureș, Harghita and Covasna) accounting for 3.03% (609,033 inhabitants), and hence in the corridor are present 5.04% (1,013,594 Hungarians) of 6.10% at the level of the entire country. The above mentioned corridor is surrounded by a **ring** of 11 counties (Maramureș, Bistrița-Năsăud, Suceava, Neamț, Bacău, Vrancea, Buzău, Brașov, Sibiu, Alba and Arad), in which there are only 0.76% (153,397 people) of the Hungarians living in Romania, while in the other **18 counties and Bucharest municipality**, the Hungarian ethnic group enrolls only with 0.30% (60,632 people) at national level (Table 7).

Keywords: Romanians, Hungarians, Székely principalities, land, pashalics, corridor, ring, Glad, Menumorut, Gelu, Banat, Crișana, Transylvania

1. INTRODUCTION

During the long period of activity unfolded in higher education, in the field of Human Geography, we succeeded in elaborating many studies of Romanian Population Geography, as it can be noticed from the attached bibliography, and of course, as far as the ethnic structure is concerned, lately, an adequate analysis of the last three censuses was worked out and published, respectively those of the years of 1992, 2002 and 2011.

¹ Babeș-Bolyai University, Faculty of Geography, 400006, Cluj-Napoca, Romania;
grigor@geografie.ubbcluj.ro; nitaadrian@hotmail.com

Due to the presence of the Hungarian ethnic group and of the fact that some of its representatives, with a particular insistence from Hungary as well, frequently bring into view the issue of autonomy, of establishing a Székely Land or another of a different type, the conclusion of elaborating a study on the current state of this issue has emerged, based on the census from October 20, 2011.

In order to get an overview regarding the analysed topic, it was deemed necessary to first address, in a condition of a corresponding synthesis, the whole set of events, beginning with the first documentary evidence of the Hungarians in Pannonia, until the end of World War I, and then to analyze the situation regarding the presence of the Hungarian minority in Romania, registered in the census from October 20, 2011, due to the fact that those who always stir up the issue of autonomy, are in a great lack of knowledge regarding this issue.

2. THE MOST SIGNIFICANT EVENTS DURING 896-1918

2.1. *The 896-1526 period*

In connection with this issue, the first event is the **documentary evidence of the Hungarians** in the year of 896, in the north-eastern part of Pannonia (north-east of current Hungary), followed by their gradual settlement in the area of a significant geographical unit, respectively the Pannonian Plain, positioned in Central Europe.

The next period coincided with the desire of “knowing” certain territories from nearer or more remote areas, the attention being directed towards Western Europe, where they made raids, pillaging everything all the way to Germany and even France, the latter ending in the year of 955, with the **Battle of Lechfeld**, with the decisive victory of the German King, **Otto the Great** (Lech, a city on the valley bearing the same name, upstream of Ausburg, this, confluent on the right side of the Danube, gathering waters from the northern slope of the eastern part of the Alps. As a result of this decisive victory, the forming of the first **German Reich** took place in the year of 962, consisting of Germany, Italy and Lorraine, Otto becoming the emperor of the Holy Roman-German Empire.

After this date, respectively the year of 955, the Hungarians, not having any other interests concerning the west, turned their attention to the eastern neighborhood of Pannonia, namely towards the voivodeships of Glad, Menumorut and Gelu.

a) The Voivodeship of Glad, located on the territory of Banat, with its residence in *Morisena* (Cenad, nowadays), entered gradually under the Hungarian domination, beginning with the second half of the 10th century and the early years of the following century, after many battles, followed by the closing of a peace treaty.

b) The Voivodeship of Menumorut, expanded territorially in the region of Crișana, with its residence in **Biharia** (just north of Oradea), was subjected to the conquest of **Arpad's** Hungarians. To this purpose, an errand was sent to Menumorut, in order to give up the voivodship. The answer being negative, Arpad sent a powerful army, which after several days manages to overcome the resistance of Menumorut's soldiers, the situation ending with the disposal of certain territories, on the one hand, and on the other, Arpad agreed that Menumorut's daughter, would become the wife of his son, *Zulta*.

c) The Voivodeship of Gelu, with its capital at Dăbâca (on Luna Valley), with expansion on the Someșuri (Cluj and Dej Hills) and Almaș Valley, came to the attention of the Hungarian conquerors during the time of **Tuhutum**, which sent many spies in the voivodeship, whom at their return spoke about the wealth of the investigated territory. The result of this fact is that Tuhutum receives the approval from Duke **Arpad** for entering in the Voivodeship of Gelu. Tuhutum's army meets **Gelu's** army in Almaș Valley. After losing the battle, he ran away trying to escape, but, being pursued, was caught and killed at Căpuș Valley (near Gilău), the inhabitants of this territory submitting themselves to Tuhutum afterwards.

As a result of the acquired territories, the Hungarians continued their advancing towards east, with the Szeklers **as their front line**, these living for a certain period in Săcuieni area (the geographical-historical Province of Crișana), then on the Lower Arieș and Middle Mureș, their course continuing on Târnava Mare, then moving into Brașov Depression, where a part of them occupied the northern half of the unit, in front of Oituz Pass (866 m), other Szeklers being established in the depressions of Ciuc (the defense of Ghimeș Pass, 1159 m) and Giurgeu (Bicaz Pass, 1256 m). For the other Carpathian passes, the **Saxons** were colonized: in Bistrița areas (Tihuța Pass, 1200 m), Reghin (in the inferior part of Toplița-Deda Gorge), Sighișoara and Mediaș (on Târnava Mare), Brașov (for Giuvala Pass, 1290 m, from Bran-Rucăr Corridor), Sibiu (Olt River Gorge) and Sebeș to Novaci (Lotru Pass, 1588 m), thus taking place, towards the end of the 12th century and the beginning of the next one, the end of Transylvania's conquest by Hungary.

The gradual strengthening of the Hungarians in Pannonia, led to their Christianization and forming of the **Hungarian Feudal Kingdom**, in the year of 1000, with certain consequences, after which, in some situations, they interfered with the affairs of the Romanians from Wallachia, Oltenia and Moldavia, this leading to the battles from Posada and Baia.

a) The Battle of Posada, November 9-12, 1330, determined by the emancipation of Prince **Basarab I** from under the wing of the Hungarian crown, situation which led to the entering of **Carol Robert of Anjou** in Oltenia and Wallachia, with his departure from Timișoara towards Turnu Severin, up to Curtea de Argeș, from where Basarab I had gone to another place (narrow, with high, wooded slopes, etc.), where the battle between the two armies took place, clearly won by Basarab I, (the leader of the Hungarian army remaining alive by changing uniforms with one of his soldiers). The result of this battle was **the birth of the Romanian Country**.

The location of the battle has never been determined, "the specialists" indicating several places known as "Posada": *the one from Mehedinți, Gorj, Loviște-Olt (on Olt River), Argeș, Prahova* etc.

b) The Battle of Baia, incited by the occupation of the Hungarian military base set at Chilia (January 25, 1465) by **Stephen the Great**, and by Stephen's entry in the Szeklers's area, in the summer of 1467, in order to attract the people towards his interests. As a result of these actions, **Matthew Corvin**, the king of Hungary, organizes and carries out, in September 1467, an expedition of reprisals against Stephen. The action began in Brașov, with the crossing of the Eastern Carpathians, through Oituz Pass (866 m), the march being continued by way of Bacău and Roman, then on Moldavia Valley,

reaching to **Baia** (Moldavia) on December 14, 1467. The battle took place precisely on the night of the 14th to the 15th of December, 1467, ending with the complete victory of Stephen the Great. Matthew Corvin, being wounded, was quickly transported to Hungary.

Among other things, it is worth observing that after the mentioned event, *Stephen* received from *Matia*, 67 villages in Transylvania, of which 60 were to be found in the Cluj-Dej-Năsăud area and seven in the region of Cetatea de Baltă, at that time, the stone church of Vad being built up, and in the case of Feleac locality giving just the command to cover a Tetravanghel completely in gold (hence the Diocese of Vad, Feleac and Cluj).

2.2. The 1526-1918 period

The first part of the 16th century corresponded with the evident increasing of the Ottoman Empire's power, which, after the **Battle of Mohács** in 1526, extended its domination in the Balkan Peninsula and then more towards north, on Hungary territory, where **Buda** and **Timișoara pashalics** were formed, in 1541 and 1542, while the **Pashalic of Oradea** was created in 1660. It must be pointed out the fact that Transylvania had, within the interval after the Battle of Mohács (1526) and up to the year of 1686, the statute of an **autonomous Principality under Ottoman suzerainty**.

Later, the Ottoman power declined gradually, reason that led to the entering of the Austrian army on *Transylvania's* territory, in 1686, the surrender of this geographical-historical province and of *Hungary* to the Habsburg Empire, being decided in 1699 by the *Treaty of Karlowitz*, after which *Banat* is incorporated into the Habsburg Empire until 1718, following the Treaty between the Ottomans and the Austrians, that took place at *Passarowitz*. This situation continued until 1867 (excepting the period of the Hungarian occupation during the years of 1848-1849), when the **Austro-Hungarian Empire** was formed, lasting for only 51 years, its disruption taking place in 1918, at the end of the First World War, the main event consisting in the union of Transylvania, Banat, Crișana and Maramureș, with Romania.

3. THE CURRENT SITUATION

After this brief presentation of the geographical-historical frame of the territory that is linked to the approached topic, the possibility of emphasizing of the next steps, namely the current situation of the *Szekler* ethnic group, within the space where they have been established by the Hungarian royalty at their arrival in the south-eastern and eastern part of Transylvania, and then of the *Hungarian ethnic group* existing in Romania.

3.1. The Issue of the Szeklers

As it was already mentioned above, the **Szeklers** have always lived next to the Hungarians, in the places in which they have been settled, the final locations being in the northern half of Brașov Depression and within the two depressions situated in its northern area, respectively *Ciuc* (on the Upper Olt) and *Giurgeu* (on the Upper Mureș),

THE SZEKLETS AND HUNGARIANS FROM ROMANIA

especially in the last two, the conditions of the geographical environment being among the most unfavorable in all its aspects (orographically these being characterized by a special narrowness, therefore with a land that was agriculturally insignificant, low temperatures, relative territorial isolation, etc.), in this situation always having in their mind the idea of moving closer to the Transylvanian Depression.

However, the Szeklers continued to live in the territory where they have been located right from the very beginning, physically being present in the same location even nowadays, but the long period of time, the close relationship with those who established them in a vanguard position and in guarding the borders, led to **their full assimilation**.

Consequently, at the census from 1992, 817 Szeklers were registered (Table 1), then in 2002 a number of 532, which were included together with the Hungarians, and in 2011, this ethnic group has not been recorded in the census at all.

Table 1.

The frequency of the Székely population from Romania, on counties, at the census from the year of 1992

Crt. no.	Counties	Overall population	No. of Szeklers	%	Crt. no.	Counties	Overall population	No. of Szeklers	%
1	Alba	413919	4	0,00	22	Harghita	348335	68	0,02
2	Argeş	681206	1	0,00	23	M. Bucureşti	2354510	73	0,00
3	Arad	487617	65	0,01	24	Ilfov	286968	2	0,00
4	Bacău	737512	8	0,00	25	Ialomiţa	306145	1	0,00
5	Bihor	638863	58	0,01	26	Iaşi	811342	2	0,00
6	B-Năsăud	326820	5	0,00	27	Mehedinţi	332673	0	0,00
7	Brăila	392031	1	0,00	28	Maramureş	540099	7	0,00
8	Botoşani	461305	0	0,00	29	Mureş	610053	138	0,02
9	Braşov	643261	67	0,01	30	Neamţ	578420	2	0,00
10	Buzău	516961	4	0,00	31	Olt	523291	4	0,00
11	Cluj	736301	51	0,01	32	Prahova	874349	6	0,00
12	Călăraşi	338804	1	0,00	33	Sibiu	452873	19	0,00
13	C-Severin	376347	19	0,01	34	Sălaj	266797	3	0,00
14	Constanţa	748769	6	0,00	35	Satu Mare	400789	35	0,01
15	Covasna	233256	38	0,02	36	Suceava	701830	0	0,00
6	Dâmboviţa	562041	1	0,00	37	Tulcea	270997	0	0,00
17	Dolj	762142	0	0,00	38	Timiş	700033	68	0,01
18	Gorj	401021	0	0,00	30	Teleorman	483840	1	0,00
19	Galaţi	641011	1	0,00	40	Vaslui	461374	1	0,00
20	Giurgiu	313352	0	0,00	41	Vâlcea	438388	0	0,00
21	Hunedoara	547950	57	0,01	42	Vrancea	393408	0	0,00
Total							22810035	817	0,00

B-Năsăud = Bistriţa-Năsăud; C-Severin = Caraş-Severin

As for the distribution of the Szeklers in 1992, at the counties' level, it is to be noticed that a number of 17 of those 41 counties of Romania, at which Bucharest municipality is to be added, fall into the category **exceeding 5 people**, within them, the following administrative-territorial units being remarked: Mureș (138 Szeklers), Bucharest (73) Harghita (68), Timiș (68), Brașov (67), Arad (65), Bihor (58), Hunedoara (57), Cluj (51), Covasna (38), Satu Mare (35), Sibiu (19), Caraș-Severin (19) etc. Values of **1-5 individuals** were registered in 16 counties of Romania, the highest one being of 5 Szeklers in Bistrița-Năsăud, then of 4 in Alba, Buzău and Olt, and 3 in Sălaj etc., in the other 9 counties, the Szekler ethnic group is not present (Table 1).

Having in view the observation made concerning the situation of the Szekler ethnic group on the territory of Romania, and the constant requests for autonomy addressed

Table 2.

The Frequency of Romanian and Hungarian population in 1992, 2002 and 2011

Year	Overall population	Romanians	%	Hungarians	%
1992	22.810.035	20.408.542	89,47	1.624.959	7,12
2002	21.680.974	19.399.597	89,48	1.431.807	6,60
2011	20.121.641	16.792.878	83,46	1.227.623	6,10

by the Hungarian ethnic group and especially of some of its "representatives" from among our western neighbors, we point out its manner of presence in our country down below.

3.2. The presence of the Hungarian minority in Romania at the census from 2011

Before carrying out the mentioned analysis, we note, for a brief insight regarding this issue, the evolution of the number of inhabitants belonging to the Romanian and Hungarian ethnicities, during the years of 1992, 2002 and 2011 (Table 2), thereof ascertaining the fact that Romania's total population decreased from nearly 23 mil. in 1992, to 20 mil. in 2011, along with whom it decreased the relative value as well, during the years concerned being of 88.47% and 83.46%, and in the case of the Hungarian ethnic group is of 1.6 mil. and 7.12% in 1992, then of 1,2mil. and 6.10%, in 2011.

The research regarding the territorial distribution of the Hungarian ethnicity across Romania, registered at the Census from 2011, reveals, on the county level, two of the most relevant specific features (Table 3 and Fig. 1):

- the disposition along a **corridor** that is oriented towards northwest - southeast, consisting of Satu Mare, Bihor, Sălaj, Cluj, Mureș, Harghita and Covasna counties, in which the frequency of this ethnic group recorded the highest percentage values, starting at 32.69% in Satu Mare, then 24.02% in Bihor, 22.36% in Sălaj and 14.99% in Cluj, after which, in the last three counties, the relative values are the highest, respectively of 36.46% in Mureș, 82.90% in Harghita and 71.59% in Covasna²;

² Regarding the representation of the inhabitants' number frequency in relative values (percentage), it is also necessary to mention the absolute value, because, for example, it is not the same thing, if we take Cluj County into consideration, with 691,106 people or Covasna County, with only 210,177 inhabitants.

Table 3.

The Frequency of Romanian and Hungarian population in counties from Maramureş, Crişana, Transylvania, Moldavia, Walachia and Banat, at the census of 2011

Crt. No.	Counties	Abbreviation for counties	Overall population	Romanians	%	Hungarians	%
1	Satu Mare	SM	344360	188155	54,64	112580	32,69
2	Bihor	BH	575398	366245	63,65	138217	24,02
3	Sălaj	SJ	224384	148396	66,13	50177	22,36
4	Cluj	CJ	691106	520885	75,37	103591	14,99
5	Mureş	MS	550846	227372	50,35	200858	36,46
6	Harghita	HR	310867	39196	12,61	257707	82,90
7	Covasna	CV	210177	45021	21,42	150468	71,59
1	Maramureş	MM	478659	374488	78,24	32618	6,81
2	Bistriţa-Năsăud	BN	286225	247627	86,51	14350	5,01
3	Suceava	SV	634810	588358	92,68	183	0,03
4	Neamţ	NT	470766	439834	93,43	98	0,02
5	Bacău	BC	616168	558507	90,64	4028	0,68
6	Vrancea	VN	340310	308390	90,62	68	0,02
7	Buzău	BZ	451069	409316	90,74	81	0,02
8	Braşov	BV	549217	453325	82,54	39661	7,22
9	Sibiu	SB	397322	338505	85,20	10893	2,74
10	Alba	AB	342376	291850	85,24	14849	4,34
11	Arad	AR	430629	340970	79,11	36568	8,49

- the mentioned corridor is surrounded by a **ring** of 11 counties on three of its sides, respectively Maramureş, Bistriţa-Năsăud, Suceava, Neamţ, Bacău, Vrancea, Buzău, Braşov, Sibiu, Alba and Arad, where the frequency of the Hungarian ethnic group is conditioned, on the one hand, by their geographical position, in relation with the nearness of the place of origin of the analyzed ethnicity, in this situation being the counties from the ring's extremities, respectively Maramureş (6.81% Hungarians) and Arad (8.49%), and on the other hand, by the vicinity with the situation specific to Mureş, Covasna and Harghita counties, in this condition being Bistriţa-Năsăud county (5.01% Hungarians) and Braşov county (7.22% Hungarians). Of course, most naturally, the counties of Moldavia, excepting Bacău County (0.68% Hungarians), have relative values lower than 0.04%, into this category being Suceava, Neamţ, Vrancea şi Buzău (Table 3 and Fig. 1).




Fig. 1. The frequency of Romanian and Hungarian populations in the counties from Maramureș, Crișana, Transylvania, Moldavia, Wallachia and Banat, at the census of 2011 (Table 3).

Within the mentioned corridor and ring (Fig. 1), with a northwest - southeast orientation, as a result of an accessible orography (part of Crasna Hills, north of Meseș Mountains, as well as of Almaș-Agrij Depression), it is found what's defined as **Sălaj Gate**, this being the space through which the Hungarians managed to enter in Transylvania, following the routing along Crasna and Barcău valleys, respectively on Marca, Ip, Camăr, Nușfalău, Boghiș, Măeriște, Carastelec, **Șimleu Silvaniei**, Pericei, Vârșolț, Crasna, Horoatu Crasnei, Meseșenii de Jos, Sărmășag, Șamșud, Coșeiu, Bocșa, Hereclean, Crișeni, **Zalău**, **Cehu Silvaniei**, Sălățig, Dobrin, Benesat, **Jibou**, Cuzăplac, Almașu and Fildu de Jos. Monitoring the frequency of the Hungarian ethnic group from these four cities and 24 communes, located in Sălaj Gate and in its neighborhoods, highlights the fact that eight of these fall in the gap **under 25%** (Marca, Măeriște, **Șimleu Silvaniei**, Horoatu Crasnei, **Zalău**, **Jibou**, Cuzăplac and Fildu de Jos), seven others, within the **25-50%** (Ip, Bocșa, Crișeni, **Cehu Silvaniei**, Benesat, Almașu and Meseșenii de Jos), then the frequency is of **50-75%** in nine communes (Nușfalău, Boghiș, Pericei, Vârșolț, Crasna, Sărmășag, Coșeiu, Hereclean and Sălățig) and **over 75%** in only four communes (Camăr, Carastelec, Șamșud and Dobrin) (Table 4 and Fig. 2).

Table 4.

Localities from Sălaj Gate (Sălaj County), with frequency of Romanian and Hungarian populations (the latter one exceeding 10%), at the census of 2011

Crt. no.	Communes and cities	Documentary evidence	Overall population	Romanians	%	Hungarians	%
1	Marca	1314	2542	1925	75,73	350	13,77
2	Ip	1208	3648	1348	36,95	1716	47,04
3	Camăr	1349	1741	107	6,15	1509	86,67
4	Nușfalău	1213	3600	442	12,28	2494	69,28
5	Boghiș	1214	1858	129	6,94	1282	69,00
6	Măeriște	1351	3081	2541	82,47	323	10,48
7	Carastelec	1241	1089	67	6,15	964	88,52
8	Șimleu Silvaniei	1251	14436	8730	60,47	3000	20,78
9	Pericei	1259	3768	1314	34,87	2129	56,50
10	Vârșolț	1341	2209	616	27,89	1458	66,00
11	Crasna	1213	6485	1602	24,70	4103	63,27
12	Horoatu Crasnei	1213	2485	1856	74,69	339	13,64
13	Meseșenii de Jos	1341	3117	1929	61,89	954	30,61
14	Sărmășag	1355	6092	870	14,28	4568	74,98
15	Șamșud	1349	1723	27	1,57	1580	91,70
16	Coșeiu	1299	1198	553	46,16	611	51,00
17	Bocșa	1349	3206	1572	49,03	1284	40,05
18	Hereclean	1415	3575	1315	36,78	2084	58,29
19	Crișeni	1387	2641	1731	65,54	754	28,55
20	Zalău	1220	56202	42967	76,45	8662	15,41
21	Cehu Silvaniei	1405	7214	3136	43,47	3564	49,40
22	Sălățig	1329	2913	1253	43,01	1601	54,96
23	Dobrin	1423	1660	292	17,59	1295	78,01
24	Benasat	1475	1536	1099	71,55	423	27,54
25	Jibou	1219	10407	8210	78,89	1192	11,45
26	Cuzăplac	1219	1864	1346	72,21	325	17,44
27	Almașu	1239	2237	1233	55,12	725	32,41
28	Fildu de Jos	1249	1441	782	54,27	299	20,75




Fig. 2. Localities from Sălaj Gate (Sălaj county) and Almaș-Agrij Depression, with the frequency of Romanian and Hungarian populations (the latter one exceeding 10%), at the census of 2011.

Of course, most naturally, the Hungarians which arrived in Sălaj Gate, representing the most suitable area for getting into the middle of our country, made their way towards east, crossing the Someșan Plateau, while settling in a certain number, in Cluj, Dej, Huedin, Turda, etc. areas, after that, moving forward, came to conquer the entire territory of Transylvania. A most obvious fact to be noticed in relation to the settlement of the Hungarians in Transylvania, Banat, Crișana and Maramureș, is that they avoided the mountainous areas, the examples in this respect being multiple.

For example, the situation that occurred on Crișul Repede, continuing with Căpuș, Someșul Mic and Nadăș, generalized within Oradea - Cluj-Napoca sector, where the presence of the Hungarian ethnicity highlights three specific sectors (Table 5 and Fig. 3):

Table 5.

**The Frequency of Romanian and Hungarian populations on
Oradea - Cluj-Napoca route, at the census of 2011³**

Crt. no.	Communes and cities	Documentary evidence	Overall population	Romanians	%	Hungarians	%
1	Oradea	1113	196367	132718	67,59	45305	23,07
2	Oșorhei	1351	6532	4188	64,12	1162	17,79
3	Îneu	1214	4399	2516	57,19	414	9,41
4	Săcădat	1256	1910	1622	84,92	22	1,15
5	Tileagd	1256	6968	4556	65,38	1409	20,22
6	Lugașu de Jos	1291-1294	3580	1528	42,68	1024	28,60
7	Tețchea	1256	3141	2021	64,34	277	8,82
8	Aleșd	1291-1294	10066	6134	60,94	1559	15,49
9	Aușeu	1406	3033	2545	83,91	10	0,33
10	Măgești	1508	2717	2396	88,19	120	4,42
11	Vadu Crișului	1259	4009	2753	68,67	751	18,73
12	Borod	1291-1294	3843	3093	80,48	237	6,17
13	Șuncuiuş	1256-1264	3259	2847	87,36	68	2,09
14	Bratca	1435	5158	4782	92,71	30	0,58
15	Bulz	1406	2104	1990	94,58	7	0,33
16	Negreni	1406	2321	2125	91,56	11	0,47
16	Ciucea	1384	1647	1488	90,35	5	0,30
17	Poieni	1500	4842	4445	91,80	27	0,56
16	Huedin	1332	9348	5282	56,50	2598	27,79
17	Izvoru Crișului	1276	1632	324	19,85	1290	79,04
18	Săcuieu	1461	1466	1238	84,45	2	0,14
19	Sâncraiu	1337	1633	332	20,33	1281	78,44
20	Mărgău	1408	1484	1430	96,36	6	0,40
21	Călățele	1408	2243	1742	77,66	244	10,88
22	Mănăstireni	1332	1481	1192	80,49	157	10,60
23	Căpușu Mare	1282	3295	1828	55,48	1228	37,27
24	Gilău	1246	8300	6586	79,35	722	8,70
25	Florești	1272	22813	17154	75,19	3276	14,36
26	Aghireșu	1263	7116	3694	51,91	2615	36,75
27	Gârbău	1487	2440	1190	48,77	1082	44,34
28	Baciu	1263	10317	6348	61,53	2994	29,02
29	Cluj-Napoca	1183	324576	245737	75,71	49565	15,27
30	Almașu	1239	2237	1233	55,12	725	32,41
31	Fildu de Jos	1249	1441	782	54,27	299	20,75

³ The localities from Oradea - Vadu Crișului sector can be identified by Berindei I.O., Pop P. Gr., 1972, on the colored map found at end of the paper, and those from Huedin - Cluj-Napoca sector in Pop P. Gr., 2007, on the colored map found at the end of the paper.




Fig. 3. The Frequency of Romanian and Hungarian populations on Oradea - Cluj-Napoca route, in Vadu Crișului-Izvoru Crișului sector, at the census of 2011.

- *Oradea-Vadu Crișului sector*, corresponding to Crișul Repede Corridor, where the frequency of the Hungarian ethnic group, in its 12 localities, registers relative values from 23.07% at Oradea and 0.33% at Aușeu (the eastern area of the Corridor);

- *Crișul Repede Gorge sector*, from Vadu Crișului, to Poieni, in which six localities are present, registers the highest frequency of the analyzed ethnicity, of 2.09% in Șuncuius and the lowest, of 0.30%, at Ciucea;

- *Poieni - Cluj-Napoca sector*, located in the upper basin of Crișul Repede and on Căpuș, respectively Nadăș valleys, is represented by two urban localities (Huedin and Cluj-Napoca) and 12 communes, the rate of the Hungarian ethnic group being of 27.79%, in Huedin and of 15.27%, in Cluj-Napoca. As far as the communes are concerned, the highest frequency of Hungarians is registered at Izvoru Crișului (79.04%), Sâncraiu (78.44%), Căpușu Mare (37.27%) (the central area of Huedin Depression), Gârbău (44.34%), Aghireșu (36.75%), Baci (29.02%) (Nadăș Valley) etc., and the lowest values are at Săcuieu (0.14%) and Mărgău (0.40%), the situation of the latter ones being a consequence of their vicinity to the mountainous space of Vlădeasa Massif.

Regarding the positioning of the settlements on Oradea - Cluj-Napoca route, there are differences of documentary evidence that are to be noted. Thus, those with a less acceptable orography, are mentioned in the 15th century, among them being registered: Aușeu (1406), Bratca (1435), Bulz (1406), Negreni (1406), Săcuieu (1461), Mărgău (1408), Călățele (1408) etc., or even in the 16th century, in the case of Măgești locality (1508).

Keeping and recording documents was obviously a highly developed activity during the 13th century, in terms of significantly more appropriate geographical environment conditions, on the mentioned alignment the following settlements being noticed: Ineu (1214), Săcădat (1256), Tileagd (1256), Lugaşu de Jos (1291-1294), Țețchea (1256), Aleşd (1256), Vadu Crişului (1259), Izvoru Crişului (1276), Căpuşu Mare (1282), Gilău (1286), Floreşti (1272), Aghireşu (1263), Baci (1263)⁴, Almaşu (1239) and Fildu de Jos (1249).

To highlight, in a clearer way, the fact that the Hungarians have avoided the mountainous areas, in almost every case, we illustrate the situation with data recorded in Table 6 and Fig. 4, where only two of those 14 localities had one Hungarian person,

Table 6.
Few geographical features for 14 localities from the Gilău Mountains area, at the census of 1992⁵

Crt. no.	Locality	Doc. evid.	Overall of inhabitants	Romanians	%	Hungarians	%
1	Dealul Botii	1954	62	62	100,00	0	0
2	Giurcuța de Sus	1954	215	215	100,00	0	0
3	Bălcești	1909	160	160	100,00	0	0
4	Beliș	1913	600	600	100,00	0	0
5	Dealul Negru	1954	506	506	100,00	0	0
6	Rișca	1909	1233	1233	100,00	0	0
7	Mărcești	1956	322	321	99,95	1	0,05
8	Dealul Mare	1954	419	419	100,00	0	0
9	Dângău Mare	1805	382	382	100,00	0	0
10	Dângău Mic	1909	327	327	100,00	0	0
11	Lăpuștești	1850	135	135	100,00	0	0
12	Mărișel	1854	1951	1950	99,95	1	0,05
13	Măguri-Răcățău	1956	889	889	100,00	0	0
14	Măguri	1805	1033	1033	100,00	0	0

Doc. evid. = Documentary evidence.

at the census of 1992, respectively Mărcești and Mărișel. With regards to the presented situation, the moment of documentary evidence of those 14 localities has a specific meaning as well, in the order of this event's period, the situation presenting itself as follows: Măguri and Dângău Mare (1805), Lăpuștești (1850), Mărișel (1854), Bălcești, Rișca, Dângău Mic (1909), Beliș (1913), Dealul Botii, Giurcuța de Sus, Dealul Negru and Dealul Mare (1954), Mărcești and Măguri-Răcățău (1956).

⁴ The penultimate two on Nadăș Valley and the last two on Almaş Valley.

⁵ This was done using information from 1992, because at the 2002 and 2011 Censuses the corresponding data at village level were not to be found.




Fig. 4. Localities from Gilău Mountains where the Hungarian ethnic group was represented, in 1992, only by two individuals (Table 6).

4. CONCLUSIONS

This study seeks to make known to some “representatives”, who are always seeking autonomy for the Hungarian ethnic group from Romania, the realities of the situation in this regard, a fact which emerges most clearly from the manner of approaching this issue.

Table 7.

The presence of the Hungarian ethnicity on national and territorial levels, according to the 2011 census

Content	Overall population	Hungarians	%
ROMANIA	20121641	1227623	6,10
Corridor	20121641	1013594	5,04
First four counties	20121641	404561	2,01
Last three counties	20121641	609033	3,03
Ring	20121641	153397	0,76
Other counties and Bucharest	20121641	60632	0,30

Firstly, it is worth noting that at the last census (2011), the Szekler population has not been identified, being fully assimilated by the Hungarians. So, specific elements of the Hungarian ethnicity were analyzed, on which the following aspects are to be mentioned:

- the research concerning the placement of the Hungarian population on Romania's territory reveals, firstly, a *corridor*, in the northwest – southeast direction, very clearly expressed by seven of the counties of the country, respectively Satu Mare,

Bihor, Sălaj, Cluj, Mureș, Harghita and Covasna (Table 3, Fig. 1), in which 5.04% (1013594 Hungarians) of the 6.10% frequency registered on Romania's level (20,121,641 inhabitants), the first four counties accounting for 2.01% (404,561 Hungarians), and the last three ones of 3.03% (609,033 Hungarians);

- the mentioned corridor is surrounded by a **ring** consisting of 11 counties, respectively Maramureș, Bistrița-Năsăud, Suceava, Neamț, Bacău, Vrancea, Buzău, Brașov, Sibiu, Alba and Arad, in which there are only 0.76% (153,397 Hungarians) of those 6.10% from Romania;

- in the other 23 counties and in Bucharest municipality, the frequency of the Hungarian population is lower, accounting for only 0.30% it (60,632 inhabitants) from that of the Romanian state.

The plans and desires for autonomy of the analyzed ethnicity, brought to the surface especially by some "personalities" belonging to the western neighbors and in a less extent by ours, asserting that the ordinary people, respectively the minorities, live in conditions of normality with the inhabitants of our country, have in view the last three counties within the corridor: Mureș, Harghita and Covasna, with only 3.03% (606,033 Hungarians), on a national level, having no justification for constituting a Hungarian land within the **heart of Romania**.

REFERENCES

1. Berindei, I. O., Pop, Gr. (1972), *Județele Patriei, Județul Bihor*, Edit. Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, București, 1972.
2. Cocean, P., Niță, A., Dombay, Șt. (2013), *Județele României, Județul Harghita*, Edit. Academiei Române, București.
3. Coordonatori: Pop, Ioan-Aurel, Năgler, Thomas, Autori: Bărbulescu, Mihai; Pop Gr. P., Dörner, Anton, E., Pop Ioan-Aurel, Glodariu Ioan, Rotea Mihai, Năgler Thomas, Vasiliev Valentin (2003), *Istoria Transilvaniei, vol. I (până la 1541)*, Institutul Cultural Român, Centrul de Studii Transilvane, Cluj-Napoca, 2003.
4. Horedt, Kurt (1958), *Contribuții la Istoria Transilvaniei în secolele IV-XIII*, București, p. 117-123 (vezi Thomas Năgler, *Istoria Transilvaniei, vol. I*, 2003, p. 212-225).
5. Năgler, Th. (1992), *Așezarea sașilor în Transilvania*, ediția a II-a, Edit. Kriterion, București.
6. Niță, A., Roșian Gh. (2012), *Some Aspects Regarding the Territorial Evolution of Odorheiu Secuiesc Town*, Geographia Napocensis, VI, 1, Cluj-Napoca.
7. Niță, A. (2006), *Modificări în structura etnică a populației Depresiunii Brașov, în ultimul secol și jumătate*, Studia Universitatis Babeș-Bolyai, Geographia, LI, 1, Cluj-Napoca.
8. Opreanu, S. (1929), *Ținutul Săcuilor. Contribuțiuni de Geografie Umană și de Etnografie*, Lucrările Institutului de Geografie al Universității din Cluj, vol. III. 1926-1929, p. 39-208 și 9 p. de fotografii, Cluj, Institutul de Geografie, Tiparul „Ardealul”, 1929.
9. Pop, Ioan-Aurel (2011), *Din mâinile valahilor schismatici, Rumâni și puterea în Regatul Ungariei medievale (secolele XIII-XIV)*, Editura Litera, București.
10. Pop, P. Gr. (1972), *România. Geografie Economică, Partea I-a*, 427 p., Structura națională a populației, p. 71-77, Institutul Pedagogic Oradea, Facultatea de Istorie-Geografie, Oradea, 1972.

11. Pop, Gr. (1991), *The National Structure of Romania's Population*, Studia UBB, Anul XXXVI, Geographia, 2, Cluj-Napoca, p. 3-15, 13 p. Lucrarea este publicată și în *Românul Liber*, London (în limba română), în aprilie, 1993, p. 16-17 (partea I-a) și mai, 1993, p. 16-17 (partea a II-a).
12. Pop, Gr. (1993), *Ancestry of the Population in the United States (1990 Census)*, Studia Geographia, 2, Cluj-Napoca.
13. Pop, P. Gr. (2004), *Structura etnică a României, în anul 2002*, Revista Română de Geografie Politică, Anul VI, nr. 1-2, p. 17-34, Edit. Universității din Oradea.
14. Pop, Gr. (2005), *Dealurile de Vest și Câmpia de Vest*, Editura Universității din Oradea, 2005.
15. Pop, Gr. (2005), *Cadrul natural, populația și dezvoltarea așezărilor*, p. 22-39 (20 pagini), p. 42-43 (2 pagini, Harta generală), p. 49-73 (25 pagini), p. 345-352, Summary, Geography, 8 pagini (Total = 55 pagini, format A 4), în *Mănăstireni și Mănăsturu Românesc. Satul sufletului meu*, Edit. Studia, Cluj-Napoca.
16. Pop, P. Gr. (2007), *Județele României, Județul Cluj*, Edit. Academiei Române, București, 2007.
17. Pop, P. Gr., Rusu R. (2014), *The National Structure of the Romanian Population at the 20th of October 2011 Census*, Studia UBB, Geographia, volume 59 (LIX) 2014 aprilie 1.
18. Sălăgean T. (2006), *Țara lui Gelou, Contribuții de Istoria Transilvaniei de Nord în secolele IX-XI*, p. 5-26), Edit. Argonaut, 2006, Cluj-Napoca.
19. Suci, C. (1967), *Dicționar Istoric al Localităților din Transilvania*, Vol. I. A – N, Edit. Academiei Socialiste România, București, 1967.
20. Suci, C. (1968), *Dicționar Istoric al Localităților din Transilvania*, Vol. II. O – YZ, Edit. Academiei Socialiste România, București, 1968.