

UNIVERSITATEA „BABEȘ-BOLYAI” CLUJ-NAPOCA
FACULTATEA DE ISTORIE ȘI FILOSOFIE
DEPARTAMENTUL DE ISTORIE

TEZĂ DE DOCTORAT

PRESA ȘI BISERICILE ROMÂNEȘTI DIN
TRANSILVANIA ÎN A DOUA JUMĂTATE A
SECOLULUI AL XIX-LEA (1865-1873)

Coordonator

Prof. univ. dr. Nicolae Bocșan

Doctorand

Mihaela Bedecan

Cluj-Napoca
2010

Cuprins

I. Introducere	1
II. Presa ecleziastică românească din Transilvania	8
III. Mitropoliile și mitropoliții bisericilor românești în presa epocii	31
1. Mitropolia greco-catolică	38
2. Mitropolia ortodoxă	44
3. Alexandru Șterca Șuluțiu	54
4. Andrei Șaguna	67
5. Ioan Vancea	91
IV. Relația stat-biserică reflectată în presă	103
1. Statistici oficiale în presă	106
2. Audiențe ale ierarhilor români la autoritățile statului	109
3. Activitatea Dietei	113
4. Petiții către autoritățile politice	126
5. Acte oficiale ale autorităților statului	130
6. Reglementări școlare	142
7. Bisericile românești și Casa de Habsburg	160
8. Bisericile și națiunea	166
V. Probleme fundamentale ale vieții bisericești reflectate în presă	186
1. Alegeri și numiri de ierarhi	186
A. Biserica Română Unită	188
a. Alegerile mitropolitane din 1868	188
b. Episcopia de Gherla	199
Desemnarea episcopului Ioan Vancea (1865)	
Desemnarea episcopului Mihail Pavel (1872)	
B. Biserica Ortodoxă Română	209
a. Alegerile mitropolitane din 1873	209
b. Episcopia de Caransebeș	230
Desemnarea episcopului Ioan Popasu (1865)	
c. Episcopia de Arad	237
Alegerea episcopului Miron Romanul (1873)	

2. Problema sinodalității în bisericile românești	
Dezbateri asupra temei sinodalității în presă	243
A. Biserica Ortodoxă Română	258
a. Congresul Național Bisericesc din 1868	258
b. Congresul Național Bisericesc din 1870	279
c. Sinodul arhieresc din 1866	288
d. Sinodul arhidiecezan din 1870	291
e. Sinodul arhidiecezan din 1871	296
f. Sinodul arhidiecezan din 1872	301
g. Sinodul arhidiecezan din 1873	304
h. Sinodul eparhial Arad din 1870	307
i. Sinodul eparhial Arad din 1871	310
j. Sinodul eparhial extraordinar Arad din 1871	313
k. Sinodul eparhial Arad din 1872	314
l. Sinodul eparhial Arad din 1873	316
m. Sinodul eparhial Caransebeș din 1870	321
n. Sinodul eparhial Caransebeș din 1871	325
o. Sinodul eparhial Caransebeș din 1873	327
p. Sinoade protopopești	329
B. Biserica Română Unită	335
a. Discuții asupra întrunirii Congresului	335
b. Congresul arhidiecezan din 1873	337
c. Sinodul arhidiecezan din 1869	339
d. Sinodul provincial din 1872	342
e. Sinodul vicarial Făgăraș din 1867	343
f. Sinodul vicarial Făgăraș din 1868	344
g. Sinodul vicarial Făgăraș din 1869	345
h. Sinodul vicarial Făgăraș din 1870	348
i. Sinodul vicarial Rodna din 1868	350
j. Sinodul vicarial Rodna din 1870	353
k. Sinodul vicarial Rodna din 1872	357
l. Sinodul vicarial din Șimleul Silvaniei din 1870	359
m. Sinoade protopopești	360
3. Organizarea și evoluția internă a vieții bisericești	376
a. Adunări și reuniuni bisericești	376
b. Documente bisericești privind organizarea internă	379
c. Apariții editoriale cu caracter bisericesc	390
d. Sfântiri, construcții și reparații ale locașurilor de cult	392

4. Profilul comportamental al clerului oglindit în presă	399
5. Asociații și fonduri bisericești	414
a. Aspecte generale	414
b. Fonduri și fundații	418
c. Societăți literar-bisericești	
Biserica Română Unită	430
Biserica Ortodoxă Română	443
d. Donații și testamente	446
6. Alterități confesionale	450
a. Separația ierarhică de Biserica Ortodoxă Sârbă	450
b. Relația ortodocși – greco-catolici în presă	550
c. Ortodocși români – ortodocși greci	555
d. Greco-catolici – romano-catolici.	
Autonomia catolică din Ungaria	561
e. Greco-catolici români – greco-catolici ruteni	590
VI. Concluzii	595
VII. Bibliografie	613

KEY WORDS

1. Orthodox
2. Greek-Catholic
3. Metropolitan church
4. Ecclesiastic institutions
5. Confessional identity
6. Church-state relationship
7. Metropolitan bishops
8. Ecclesiastic press
9. Synodality
10. Church funds
11. Church associations

Structure of thesis

The present paper wanted to be an image of the Romanian churches, Orthodox and Greek-Catholic, as it was surprised in the pages of Romanian press. It is the image of the ecclesiastic world of Transylvanian Romanians under all its aspects that, by newspapers and magazines, revealed itself to the general public. They shaped an overview of the church environment that arrived at the disposal of readers an elite category, by which it spread to the masses.

The problematic covered was a very rich one and diversified, containing a wide palette of subjects in a time when the church, by its representatives, was present in the life of society.

The period to which we halted was marked by important transformations at political level, with effects on the development of the Transylvanian nation. The

Romanian churches, as national institutions underwent essential transformations that reflected in their internal organization and in the relationship with the society.

The paper is structured in four main chapters, each of them containing several subchapters, depending on the subject approached. To them add up the introduction, the conclusions and the bibliographical list.

The press was an effective means of defense of the national and church interests and an important segment was the ecclesiastic press. Unlike similar newspapers from the Romanian provinces beyond Carpathians, the Transylvanian church gazettes did not have a strictly theological character but approached a wider subject. The explanation resides in the role that the Church, as institution, played in Transylvania until 1918. In the absence of political institutions representative for Romanians, the churches were obliged to take over the initiatives of representation of the nationality, by formulas that found their expression not only on church ground, but on cultural or school ground as well.

As for the church newspapers of the decade 1864-1873, six in number, there is a clear demarcation line between the Orthodox press and the Greek-Catholic press, from two points of view. The Orthodox press had a more pronounced vigor and a larger period of printing. The representative newspaper was *Telegraful român*, but worthwhile steps were taken at the level of the diocese of Arad, by *Speranța* and *Lumina*.

The second difference that imposed itself regarding the church newspapers is the subject, at the opening they displayed compared to society, the extra-ecclesiastic environment. From this point of view, the Orthodox press was incomparably more dynamic, adjusted to changes and transformations of the society and it explains the long span of life of the metropolitan semi-official newspaper, and the spread and recognition of it as a symbol in Transylvanian press.

Much more limited, the Greek-Catholic newspapers offer the image of a press limited to its own themes, with very small exceptions. *Sionul românesc*, for example, appeared because of the major contribution of Silași who drew up most of the material, and *Foii administrative arhidiecezane*, which, apart from its short appearance, was an official publication of the metropolitan church, in the classical meaning of the word, publishing only orders with official character. *Amvonul* does not have the characteristics

of a newspaper, being a profoundly theological gazette which published only material with dogmatic content, at which it aimed from the very beginning.

As for the spread of church gazettes, there are differences, for each title, but the area of spread was not very wide.

The aimed party was the clergy, the conexe world of the ecclesiastic environment, and a part of the Romanian intellectuals. From here results another aspect, related to the beneficiaries of this type of press, since the list of subscribers was not similar to the list of readers, as the gazettes were read in public when the situation required it. The confessional colour was decisive for the propagation of newspapers because the Orthodox environment claimed a gazette of the same type. Another kind of difference was the geographical environment from which came the readers, the areas limitrophe to the printing places of newspapers being a safe outlet for them. The influence of the urban environment counted, with a higher weight of intellectuality that facilitated the spread of the press.

We must not forget the competition done by the lay press, so that the number of subscribers to the church newspapers was influenced by the market of Transylvanian press.

The problem of metropolitan church appeared in the press as a matter of necessity and church and national legitimacy. The re-acquisition of the metropolitan statute appears as a repossession of rights, fully justified and not as a concession done to Romanians. The message had in the centre the metropolitan church as institution usurped abusively that the Romanians, Orthodox or united, were entitled to receive. The differences between the two confessions are major. While the Greek-Catholic metropolitan church had an age of over a decade, the Orthodox seat had barely refounded. The restoration moment was positively commented by the whole Romanian press, being assimilated to a new beginning.

The chronological advance of Greek-Catholics led to sensitive differences of the media message regarding the organizational structures of the two confessions. The Orthodox metropolitan province, barely founded, experiences a period of reforms, when the bases of a new internal organization are laid, the acquired independence is affirmed and its consolidation is attempted.

The differences between the two confessions were not major from the organization point of view, because both metropolitan churches dealt with similar problems. Moreover, the Orthodox seem to fast recover the lost time, due to the insistence of Şaguna, who, by the elaboration of the Organic Statute, laid the bases of constitutionalism in his church. The lack of a similar act for the United Church represented a handicap and a reason of discontent of the clergy and the united parishioners. To this aspect adds up another aspect, related to the internal controversies in the Romanian union. If the image of the Orthodox Church appears to be homogenous and unitary, we cannot say the same about the united church. The differences of vision between Blaj and suphragan dioceses, especially the diocese of Oradea, were visible, perceivable and often criticized by the press of the time. The excessive latinization that the seat of Bihor was willing to accept generated virulent criticism, being considered a reason of stagnation, from the point of view of internal organization.

The collaboration between the church and the state was influenced by the attempt of Romanian hierarchies to preserve the church autonomy. The idea is more pregnant in the metropolitan bishop Şaguna, who was preoccupied to clarify the limits of the state power, in order not to endanger the principle of autonomy. The press mirrored these efforts and surprised the attempts at redefinition of the relations state-Church, made difficult by the political post-dualism context. The ecclesiastic press departs from the lay press regarding the method of approaching problems. Thus, in the church press, the relationship of the church with the state institutions was within the limits of legality. Therefore, most of the articles printed in these gazettes focused on the official addresses, the petitions of the ecclesiastic hierarchy to the political authorities or the governmental acts, and the main goal was the information of the public, invited to apply and observe the legislation. The precise target was to facilitate the dialogue between the two parties. The lay press focused on the image of the political act and its consequences on the Romanian nation. Another difference aimed at the language. In the church press, the state politics is seldom criticized up-front because they avoided the accusing language resorting to a speech that expresses disappointment or resignation in front of reality. The lay press used another dialogue, sharper, condemning often the official politics, in articles

that were often fined by the political forces. All the newspapers defended the Romanian general interests.

A special relationship existed with the dynastic institution. Both Romanian churches cultivated the trust in the crown and the respect for dynasty, as the throne represented in their vision a guarantee of Romanian rights.

A special chapter was represented by the political activity of the Romanian clergy. The image offered to the public and readers by the Romanian press was the priests willing to stay in front of the people and fight for its rights. The pathway was always legal, the path of petitions and official claims.

Among the subjects on which press persisted were a few sensitive issues, the appointments on the superior hierarchical seats. The decade on which we stopped was marked by a few successions of hierarchs in the metropolitan and diocese seats. The replacements were done by the procedure of selection or appointment. Around this method focused the whole public speech, reflected in the pages of the press. Each occasion illustrated the desire of Romanians to use and preserve the right of choosing. Stringent in the united church, the desideratum highlighted at the vacancy of bishop seats, by the steps taken by the clergy and the laymen.

If the major transformations, at the level of metropolitan provinces were well illustrated in the press, we cannot say the same about the Romanian Episcopal office. The differences between the two confessions were slightly perceivable. For the Orthodox Episcopal offices, both installations in the seat (1865-Caransebeș, 1873-Arad) were publicized, while the united bishops did not enjoy the same treatment. The only exception was the appointment of Vancea, in 1865, because the other changes did not have a public echo. The explanation of this kind of gazette attitude could be determined by a few factors. A first explanation is related to the confessional colour of newspapers. In the absence of a united press, the appointment of 1871 and 1873, of Olteanu in Lugoj, and Oradea, escaped the attention of journals. If for Lugoj and Oradea propaganda done in the press seems to be absent, we cannot say the same thing about Gherla. The appointment of Vancea, and the appointment of Mihail Pavel were preceded by torments among the clergy and the parishioners of the Episcopal office. Feeling threatened in the right of choosing or confronted with the appointment of an undesirable person, as were the

rumours about the possible appointment of Gulovics, they petitioned for a long time to the ecclesiastic authorities and the political authorities. The prolonged steps during the years of Episcopal holiday came to the attention of the public opinion. The Romanian newspapers did a wide publicity to the claiming actions, the emphasis going from the private position of the seat at Gherla to the preservation of a sacred right in the church, the elections of hierarchs. The publicity was maintained by the rumours that spread easily in troubled times so that the editorial staffs of the newspapers, speculating the interest in the subject, made public all the information related to a possible appointment, even if most of it proved to be false. After a period in which a maximal interest was shown in the occupation of the vacant seat, the appointments were summarily treated. If the appointment of Vancea was surprised in passage by a few gazettes, the appointment of Mihail Pavel went almost unnoticed. As there were no objections to the appointed persons which could trigger discontent, it all came down to news. The preoccupation of the Romanian society for the formula used in the occupation of diocese seats is obvious, and only at the second level, for the characters on which the election stopped.

The problem of synodality was another subject with visibility in the press of the times, inciting the interest of the clergy and the laymen. We can make a parallel with the subject of elections. For both subjects, the major interest was shown to the subject itself and then to the event. Just as the problem of right of choice stirred the public interest, the church felt threatened with the loss of this sacred privilege, the mould can be applied to the subject regarding the convening of synods. The absence of this type of meetings and the negative consequences resulting from the lack of synodal meetings preoccupied the society to a large extent.

Just like the elections of hierarchs, when the interest was in the occupation of seats of Blaj and Sibiu, the press publicized the Church National Congresses and the Provincial Synods.

The difference that imposes relates to the differences that appeared between the two Romanian confessions. Just as the right of choosing was present in the united speech the problem of synodal meetings appears more stringent in the Greek-Catholic church, the subject of synodality was actual, more than a decade from the foundation of the metropolitan province. The public speech was marked by disappointment, as the

reactivation of the metropolitan seat was considered a condition for the application of this principle.

As for the Orthodox Church, just like the elections of hierarchs, the speech on the subject of synodality was much poorer. The situation is explainable, as Şaguna took the necessary steps for the fulfillment of the formality and shortly after the refoundation of the metropolitan church, the convening of the Church National Congress was applied. We add another positive element, the elaboration of the organic state that laid the basis of legality in the Orthodox church, regulating punctually the problem of synodality.

As for the subject of synods, you can see resemblances between the two confessions, materialized in a few subjects, always on the agenda. It is about the financial situation of the church institutions and their servants, problems of the confessional education, of church foundations, the field of stipends, disciplinary matters, matrimonial matters or matters of internal organization, most of them returned annually to the agenda of the synodal meetings as they did not find solutions because of financial or organizational difficulties. The effort of the Orthodox Church was more visible from this point of view so that the equipment of priests and the attempt to improve their material condition materialized in the measures regarding the system of organization at the level of parochial budgets, by the attempt to reduce the number of positions in the rural communities.

The major differences were imposed by three pressing subjects for the united church: the desire of convening of the metropolitan Congress, the problem of the right of choosing and the problem of preservation of autonomy. The last one counteracted the Catholic autonomy from Hungary, in the wider subject that aimed at the relationship with the Roman-Catholic Church. They were problems that returned in each synodal meeting, but without a final solution.

The dynamics of the church life in the decade 1865-1873, were surprised in the pages of Romanian press, with its torments, failures and successes. It was a period of transformations for both Romanian churches, preoccupied to perfect the system of organization of internal structures.

More than ten years away from the metropolitan restoration, the united church was still in a period of metamorphoses, trying to make its own way, based on the

principles of autonomy. The relationship with the Sacred Seat influenced directly the evolution of the Romanian union, the Transylvanian province trying to make itself known to the Vatican, but to impose the observance of its dogmatic principles resulting from the four Florentine points. We add the split-up between the centre and the diocese entities, among which Oradea was different. Its pro-Latin policy came in contradiction with the direction traced by Blaj, which tried to maintain the oriental features of the Romanian Greek-Catholicism. All this overlays a precarious internal organization of the church life which missed a fundament materialized in a constitutional charta. In spite of the steps of Şuluţiu and then Vancea, the process was only beginning, because the influence and the dependency to Vatican and the Catholic Church caused a slowness and a tergiversation of efforts. The theory of privileged position, legislatively and materially, of the Greek-Catholic church and its servants does not seem to support itself in practice where we encounter the same issues as in the Orthodox confession.

In the Orthodox Church things are a little bit different. Even if in the beginning, the persistence of Şaguna, materialized in the possibility of convening the church national congressional meetings, meant a real advantage. The elaboration of the Organic Statute represented the starting point of consolidation of the church internal organization, in all its structures.

In the effort of crystallization of a church legislation that traces the future confessional evolution, but also its application, two factors were involved: the clergy, at the basis of the pyramid and the ecclesiastic hierarchy, which traced the direction to follow. The competition of both partners was indispensable in this complex process and it was thus surprised by the gazettes of the time.

The attempts at modernization of the internal structures of the church environment did not reduce to statistics. You can perceive in the pages of the press the attempts of the church authorities to change the mentalities of the believers. It is about deeply seated habits that could be broken with difficulty by the mass of parishioners and the rural priests. The changes are not sudden or significant and extended for a long period of time, so that the difficulty of dislocating such a thinking system was a difficult task.

A media opening showed towards charitable actions so that, in spite of the financial difficulties dealt with by the communities of both confessions, the Christian

availability towards the aid of people was surprised by all the newspapers of the time. Here, the references aim at minor donations, for the erection or repair of churches or schools, up to the financial support to the powerless priests, their heirs or young men of merit in the future of whom those with possibility were willing to invest in all trust.

In this category fall the church foundations and the donations and wills done in favour of institutions under the patronage of both confessions.

Apart from the publicity done to the charitable activity of foundations, the press was used as a means of advertising done to donors, benevolent people, whose financial situation allowed them to offer support, attempting to cultivate models that had to be followed. The imposition in the collective conscience of these church associations depended on their material scope, the most publicized were the ones that had a consistent activity and stood out by the benefits brought in the educational, cultural and charitable field.

The creation of foundations was a current present in both Romanian churches, in a general preoccupation of the time. The positive image offered by the press to the activity carried out by the church associations and foundations was shadowed by the discontent regarding the confidential statute of the financial situation of these institutions. Members of intellectuality are annoyed by the lack of transparency proven by the ecclesiastic hierarchy in the management of capital of foundations. People claimed the absence of current situations, official statistics to which all parishioners have access and give a full image of this kind of activities.

An overview of the ecclesiastic institution as it appeared in the press would not be full without approaching the complex chapter of confessional alterities, highlighted in its various nuances.

Not accidentally, a great attention was paid to the hierarchical separation from the Serbian church. Properties were at stake, church foundations and an important capital were at stake, which is why the process of separation preoccupied the Romanian society.

The whole preliminary stage, of discussions with the Serbs was surprised by the Romanian gazettes who informed their readers about the evolution of negotiations between Carloviț and Sibiu, insisting on the efforts of Romanian delegates to solve the situation as advantageously as possible. The whole Romanian press, irrespective of the

confessional colour, was favourable to the Romanian Orthodox church whose point of view supported unconditionally.

Unlike the general process that aimed at the situation at the level of the whole metropolitan province about which most Romanian gazettes wrote, the newspapers that were distributed in this region like *Lumina* and *Albina* were more interested in the private cases of separation from the mixed communities in the western area. To the editorial staffs of these newspapers were sent Protocols of separation concluded in the communes of Banat, by the members of commissions.

A second weight, by the information sent, regarded the problems of Catholic autonomy, the relations between the Romanian Greek-Catholic and the Hungarian Roman-Catholic.

Unlike the subject of hierarchical separation, where we had a unanimous opinion, favorable to the Romanians, in this case two current of opinion formed, favourable or against the adhesion to the Catholic autonomy. The attitudes were influenced by the options from within the Romanian Greek-Catholicism, the disagreement between Blaj and the supragan Episcopal offices, especially in Oradea, adept of pro-Latin option.

In this context the press became the field of public debates, triggered by those who wanted to fight for the preservation of original Greek-Catholic tradition, sketched at the moment of religious union.

Much more superficial were treated the interconfessional relations between the Orthodox and Greek-Catholics or the interethnic ones, inside the confessions, as was the case of relationships between the Romanians and the united Rhutens, or the Romanians and Orthodox Greeks from Braşov.

For the first category the centre of attention fell to the passages from a confession to another, the newspapers presented such cases only when it was a mass phenomenon of tenths or hundreds of persons.

The press seldom wrote about the good collaboration between the two Romanian confessions, at the level of village communities, although it existed, but only rarely became subject of press. An exception is the dialogue in the national movement, the signal being given by the hierarchy of the two churches.

As for the relations with other nationalities, with whom there were confessional conflicts, the newspapers were on the side of Romanians, irrespective of the confessional colour.

At the end of the paper, after a supported work, it is hard to settle a single conclusion, in a few lines. The press was undoubtedly a rich source of research for an overview of the Romanian ecclesiastic institutions. With inherent emphases, dictated by concrete situations and the time in which we integrate, the general image was a positive one, favourable to the Church, with everything that this institution meant.