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The **Union with Rome in the area inhabited by the Romanian population in North-Western Romania**, respectively in Transylvania, can be placed inside the conceptual framework of the partial unions, processes opened with the realization of the Union in Brest, at the end of the 16th century. After the defeat of the Turks under Vienna’s walls in 1683, the Austrians focused their political and military interests towards the East, engaging in a large offensive that settled the authority of the House of Habsburg over important territories in Central and South-Eastern Europe. Among these regions Transylvania became a part of the Habsburg Empire starting in 1691.

Vienna took control over a Principality characterized by multi-ethnicity and multi-denominationalism. Having deep medieval roots, the political and religious system of Transylvania was based on the existence of three privileged nations (Hungarians, Saxons, Szeklers) and of four officially recognized denominations (Catholicism, Calvinism, Lutheranism, Unitarianism). The Romanians found themselves outside this system from the political and national perspective as well as from the denominational one: Hence the Orthodox Church had no official recognition. The Romanians and their religion were considered as tolerated, being, mostly in the 17th century, under the strong influence and offensive of Calvinism, the denomination of the Transylvanian princes. The Romanian clergy, poorly educated, faced a severe state, with no social and economic rights, as the priests were equated to the serfs[[1]](#footnote-1).

After the spread of the religious Reformation in Transylvania, at the mid-16th century, the Roman-Catholic Church was also in a very precarious situation in the moment when the country was taken over by the House of Habsburg. The Viennese Court encouraged the activity of the Catholic missionaries in a serious attempt to revive Catholicism from the state of clear inferiority towards the other official religions of the Transylvanian Principality[[2]](#footnote-2). Among the methods considered by Vienna for the accomplishment of this major objective, one has to mention the attempt to attract the Romanian-Orthodox population to the Union with Rome, following the model that had already been put into practice in North and North-Eastern Hungary[[3]](#footnote-3), a plan that had been conceived by the future cardinal Leopold Kollonitsch. In order to succeed in the realization of the religious Union, the interests of the state met the denominational ones promoted by the Catholic Church. The solidity of the Catholic bloc of Transylvania, the internal cohesion of the state, the interruption of the Romanian population’s links with the neighbouring Orthodox states presented sufficient reasons for Vienna to see the Union as a proper solution for a part of the religious problems that needed special and urgent attention.[[4]](#footnote-4)

In spite of the serious shortcomings, the representatives of the Church of the Transylvanian Romanians started the negotiations for the union with the Church of Rome from a series of principles considered as intangible. They talked on behalf of a population that was very much attached to its old Eastern traditions, to its Byzantine rite, to its own theological and liturgical specificities. The Union with the Church of Rome seemed to be a solution for a part of their problems, but a total, hierarchic, structural, theological, and ritual integration was out of the question, unacceptable. The people and the clergy would have never accepted a “foreign” tradition, a rite, Latin, that could have led to the total loss of their identity. Moreover one should not forget the fact that Catholicism, alongside with Calvinism, represented the main enemy for Orthodoxy in this borderland, a zone of contact between the Western and the Eastern spiritual universes. The obvious answers to these constraints resided in the presentation of the model of Union as negotiated in 1439 at the Council in Florence, which ensured to the “Greeks” the unaltered preservation of their rite, Tradition, traditions, calendar, and institutional autonomy.

Under these conditions, **the Union of the Transylvanian Romanians was accomplished** in the years 1697 - 1700, as a result of three Unionist synods organized in Alba Iulia. The representatives of the clergy, led by Metropolitan Teofil (1692 - 1697), and Atanasie Anghel (1698 - 1713), signed three declarations proclaiming the union of the “Romanians’ Church in Transylvania” with the “Catholic Church of Rome”, accepting “all the elements believed and confessed by this church” and mostly the four elements (“Florentine points”) of faith discussed at the Council in Florence. The Eastern rite, their own traditions and the institutional organization were preserved. At the same time they requested the political, social and economic rights that had been promised by Emperor Leopold I, shortly after the integration of Transylvania in the empire (equal rights with the Roman-Catholics were confirmed by the two imperial diplomas of 1699 and 1701). For the realization of the Union, an essential role was played by the Jesuits, among whom Ladislau Baranyi, the chaplain of the Roman-Catholic church of Alba Iulia, was mentioned specifically in the documents of union.[[5]](#footnote-5)

The Uniate Church of Transylvania was thus born. The hierarchical seat was initially at Alba Iulia, being rapidly moved to Făgăraș, in the South of the country, because of the principle that stated that there could not be two Catholic hierarchs in the same city (the Roman-Catholic bishop traditionally resided in Alba Iulia as well). Făgăraș proved to be totally inappropriate, because it was found in the middle of a region with an Orthodox majority population. Thus, with the help of Emperor Charles VI, the residence was moved to Blaj, in 1737, during the pastoral rule of Bishop Inochentie Micu Klein (considered to be a Romanian national hero, as he was the first to lead the struggle for the political and national rights of the people), becoming the place with the greatest symbolic and identity value for Transylvanian Greek-Catholicism.

In the institutional evolution of the Uniate Church from 1700 to 1948, one can identify four essential stages. The first period can be identified from the end of the 17th century until the moment when the impact of the reformism promoted by Maria Theresa and Joseph II produced its extraordinary effects, recognizable at the beginning of the rule of Bishop Grigore Maior (1773 - 1782). The second stage can be placed chronologically from 1773 until 1850, being a phase of continuous transformation, of implementation of new ecclesiastical institutions, determined especially by the reforms initiated by the state. Certain stability was felt only during the rule of Bishop Ioan Lemeni (1832 - 1850). The third period began with the rise of the Uniate Church to metropolitan rank in 1853 and continued until 1918, the year when Transylvania was united with the Romanian state at the end of the First World War. Finally, the last stage was marked by the events from the inter-war period, when the Greek-Catholic Church was active inside the new Romanian state. It ended with the decrees of abolishment of 1948 issued by the new Communist regime.

**The first period was generally characterized by the maintaining of the institutions from the 17th century**. In the very first years of the Union, two important changes took place on the institutional level: the founding of the bishopric and the introduction of a new system of election of bishops. The great novelty consisted in the transformation of the Metropolitan Seat of Transylvania (that was the rank of the Romanian Church at the moment of its union with Rome in 1700) into a bishopric, a decision taken during the rule of the unionist hierarch Atanasie Anghel and officially confirmed by the papal bulla *Rationi congruit*, in 1721, issued by Pope Innocent XIII. The second modification also imposed externally on the Uniate Church was made in the system of the election of bishops. The Great Synod, the main institution of the Church, gathering together the archpriests and the representatives of the church districts, lost its decisive role. From this moment on, it just had to elect three candidates. Its vote was rather consultative, because it was the emperor in Vienna that appointed the new hierarch without being forced to choose the one candidate that had received the majority of the votes in the elective synod. Even more, the sovereign could choose a fourth candidate if necessary, totally ignoring the suggestion made by the clergy. The chosen one was to be confirmed by the pope.

From the point of view of the institutional structure, at the central level, the Uniate hierarch was assisted by a vicar general (the first one was mentioned as early as 1701), which was a new institution for the Greek-Catholic Church, of Latin inspiration, being suggested by the Jesuits, who were a constant presence in the life of the church until the abolishment of their order (a Jesuit theologian had the role of accompanying the Greek-Catholic bishops with the aim to help and supervise them and to defend the preservation of the purity of the faith). The bishop also benefited from the assistance ensured by a consistory, created in 1728, having 12 members (assessors), appointed from amongst the archpriests. This institution was known as the “Little Synod”.

The main institution of the period was, without doubts, the Great Synod. It was a representative institution, whose decisions had normative role for the entire Church. Normally, it had to meet annually, thus ensuring an efficient control over the activity of the bishop, and it was attended by: the bishop, the archpriests, priests and, rarely, laymen. The Great Synod was organized quite regularly until 1772.

In 1747, the Monastery of the Holy Trinity was opened in Blaj, being destined to the monks of the Order of St. Basil. They were to replace the prebendaries of a Latin *capitulum*, at a time when the bishopric of Făgăraș did not have a proper institution of the kind. The recommendation that the monks were supposed to act as advisors, teachers, and missionaries in the diocese had been given by the papal bulla of 1721.[[6]](#footnote-6) Thus, this monastery of oriental type went beyond its spiritual purpose, and became an organism with an important role in the administration of the diocese and in the theological education. It represents another adaptation of a typical Western institution, the *capitulum*, to the effective realities of a bishopric of Greek rite.

The great changes took place in **the second period under the influence of the reforms imposed by the Viennese Court.**[[7]](#footnote-7) In this stage, the role of Rome was almost nil. The reformism of Maria Theresa and Joseph II affected the institutional evolution of the Uniate Church, which faced the necessity to adapt to the new realities. On the other hand, the Church found itself in a period when the need for modernization and transformation was obvious and rather urgent. The slow ecclesiastical administration, which often only partially controlled the territory of the large diocese, needed to become more efficient. The diocese of Făgăraș was the largest Catholic bishopric of the empire. The central institutions in Blaj could not have a real and clear picture of the local situation. Various problems occurred because of the diverse and complicated denominational mixture especially in the border areas with direct contact with the extra-Carpathian Orthodoxy (a powerful anti-Unionist movement was led in Transylvania between 1759 and 1961 by Sofronie from Cioara, a monk sent in the region by the Orthodox metropolitan of Karlowitz), but also because of the bishops’ difficulty to impose their authority over the local clerical elite, the archpriests who held a large influence and enough prerogatives as leaders of their districts. The changes made between 1772 and 1850, freely or under the impulse of the imperial reforms, affected many of the traditional institutional structures.

Most of the transformations took place at the central level. Because of Joseph II’s policies against the monasteries, the number of monks of the main monastery, of Holy Trinity, was reduced to 11, the friars being forced to be involved only in activities regarding youth education. In 1804 there were only 3 monks left and in 1821 only 2.[[8]](#footnote-8) In spite of some attempts to revitalize the monastic life in Blaj and in the Greek-Catholic Church in general, the signs of a revival were noticeable only towards the end of the 19th century and in the inter-war period (one must mention the monasteries of Bixad and Nicula, which were important spiritual centres for Transylvanian Greek-Catholicism, flourishing mainly in the third and fourth decades of the 20th century).

Under these conditions, the leadership system of the diocese was seriously affected, as the monks were the central part of the consistory. Thus, the measures taken to reform the central administration of the diocese focused on two directions: the foundation of the *capitulum cathedralis* – in 1807 under the rule of bishop Ioan Bob (1782 - 1830); and the reformation of the consistory with a broader structure – it was joined also by representatives of the local ecclesiastical elite, of the professors of the Blaj theological academy (totally restructured in 1831) and of the monastery.

Thus, one can notice the existence of a process of power centralization, the authority being more and more concentrated in the hand of the bishops and of the organisms directly conducted by them. This reality was also strengthened by the evolution of the institution of the diocesan synod starting with the 8th decade of the 18th century, influenced by the position of the Austrian state that constantly opposed the gathering of large ecclesiastical assemblies that could so easily deviate into political and national movements. On the other hand, its competences were severely reduced over these decades, especially after the constitution of the *capitulum* and the renovation of the consistory. Between 1773 and 1850, the Great Synod met only for 6 times, for the election of a new bishop, or for declarations of loyalty towards the emperor. The only occasions when ecclesiastical and school matters were discussed were in 1821 and 1833.

The non-functionality of the diocesan synod led to a certain deviation from the collegial system of leadership of Eastern origin towards a more hierarchical and pyramidal system that brought the Greek-Catholic Church of Transylvania closer to the model of organization and functioning of a Roman-Catholic bishopric. This was the model followed by the Greek-Catholic elite in the process of reformation of the ecclesiastical institutions. It was the obvious and natural option. The period of structural stability was short (1830 - 1850), as another series of unavoidable changes occurred at the moment the bishopric of Făgăraș was raised to metropolitan rank and two other bishoprics were founded – Gherla and Lugoj.

In 1853, the bulla *Ecclesiam Christi* of Pope Pius IX raised the bishopric of Făgăraș to metropolitan rank. Thus, the **Metropolitan Seat of Alba Iulia and Făgăraș was founded** – the name is in use until today. The first metropolitan elected was Alexandru Șterca Șuluțiu (1853 - 1868).[[9]](#footnote-9) There were three subordinate bishoprics: the diocese of Oradea (this Uniate bishopric was founded in 1777 in the Bihor area, outside the Principality of Transylvania[[10]](#footnote-10)); and the newly created dioceses of Lugoj and Gherla.[[11]](#footnote-11) These transformations led to another specific situation: On the territory of the metropolitan church several organizational models coexisted for a rather long period of time. In the archdiocese of Alba Iulia and Făgăraș the pre-1850 institutional and administrative model continued to function, whereas the diocese of Oradea had the same structure as a Latin bishopric, which was maintained until the beginning of the 20th century. On the other hand, at first, the new dioceses of Lugoj and Gherla took over a lot of structural elements characteristic for Oradea, which coexisted with the institutional realities specific of Blaj. A tendency for uniformity was visible after 1870, but the imposing of a single model – the central model of Blaj – was possible only in the inter-war period. The administrative territorial structure of the Greek-Catholic Church in Romania became complete only in 1930 when the new diocese of Maramureș was constituted in the Northern part of the country.

The period after 1850 was marked by the great effort of redefining the specific and fundamental elements of the theological, doctrinal, disciplinary and ritual system of the Uniate Church. This aim was achieved in the years that followed the participation of the Romanian hierarchs at Vatican Council I[[12]](#footnote-12) (Metropolitan Ioan Vancea (1869 - 1892[[13]](#footnote-13)) and the bishop of Oradea, Iosif Pop Szilagyi), during three provincial synods: 1872, 1882 and 1900. They asserted the Eastern specificity of Transylvanian Greek-Catholicism, but also aligned the church to the doctrinal directions supported by Rome.

In 1918, Transylvania was united with Romania, which put the Romanian Uniate Church in a new situation: that of a minority church.[[14]](#footnote-14) This led to a complicated relationship between the Church and the new Romanian government, visible in the discussions regarding the Law of the Cults, the salaries of the priests, or the issue of the denominational schools. In all these situations, the key-element was the relation between the Catholics, Roman and Greek, and the Romanian Orthodox Church.

In the old Kingdom of Romania, before the First World War, the number of Roman-Catholics was rather small. After the union of Transylvania, the situation changed significantly. For instance, in the census of 1930, it is illustrated that the Orthodox people numbered 13.108.227; the Greek-Catholics were 1.427.391; and the Roman-Catholics were 1.234.151.[[15]](#footnote-15)

The relationship between the Orthodox and the Catholic people was rather tense, the causes of this situation being multiple and extremely complex. Firstly, in the Kingdom of Romania, before 1918, the manner in which the Catholics interacted with the rest of the society could be considered as a real exercise of alterity to the Romanian-Orthodox people (the Catholics of Romanian origin were often equated in treatment with foreigners). Whereas the Catholic hierarchy was looked upon as “a foreign, insidious object, as a permanent threat in their midst (of the Romanian people – n. n.)”[[16]](#footnote-16).

Therefore, the relation between the Uniates and the Romanian-Orthodox Church continued to be marked by numerous tense moments at the central level as well as locally. The most important one was the conclusion of the Concordat between the Romanian state and the Vatican in 1929, as a result of long negotiations started in 1918. This event led to large protests of the Orthodox hierarchy, clergy, religious press, and lay associations.[[17]](#footnote-17) The Greek-Catholic Church was included in the treaty alongside the Roman-Catholic one, in an unitary vision, starting from the following principle: In Romania there is only one Catholic Church with three rites – Latin (Hungarians, Germans, Romanians), Greek (Romanians, Ruthenians), and Armenian (Armenians).

Among the main reasons for the achievement of an agreement with the Holy See, we can mention the following ones: The Catholic ecclesiastic jurisdictions had to be reorganized according to the new Romanian borders; the decisive clarification of the statute of the Romanian parishes annexed in 1912 to the Hungarian Greek-Catholic diocese of Hajdudorogh[[18]](#footnote-18); the clarification of the statute of the functioning of the Catholic institutions and cultural and charity foundations[[19]](#footnote-19).

The relationship between the Uniates and the Orthodox was more obvious in Transylvania, but also in Bucharest, because of the increasing number of Greek-Catholics who moved to the capital, especially after 1918, many of them being involved in politics. At the local level, the frictions were caused by pastoral, material, political issues, but also by the claim of each of the two parts of being the real national church of the Romanian people.[[20]](#footnote-20)

In 1948, the Romanian Uniate Church was supposed to celebrate 250 years of history. At the moment when **the Greek-Catholic Church was suppressed by the newly installed Communist regime**, this church had a very specific denominational identity combining Eastern and Latin elements. In the 18th century, the Orthodox polemists pointed out that this combination made the Union be “a third way”, an observation meant to have an accusatory and ironic accent.[[21]](#footnote-21) Regardless of this, the Greek-Catholic Church construed a unique profile, maintaining the purity of the Catholic faith, but developing and adapting its own Tradition, starting from the Greek rite and the Eastern traditions. Therefore, in the inter-war period, the discourse on the identity of the Uniate Church reached its climax, promoting a series of fundamental themes, some old and traditional, and other new ones, generated by the realities and the historical and denominational evolutions of the time.

The traditional themes are: The Union with Rome followed the Florentine model; the Catholic faith is true and redemptory; the union in faith allows the diversity of the rites; the Union with the Church of Rome brought a lot of benefices to the Romanian people, culturally and spiritually, dragging the people out of ignorance and opening the links with the Western culture. The new themes were: the theme of Catholicity – the idea of belonging to the Catholic universe, to the great Catholic family, having the Pope of Rome as parent and ruler; it is very much connected to the consciousness of this universality; the Catholic faith is the faith of the forefathers of the Romanian people; the development of the feeling of fidelity towards the Roman pontiff; the development of a Catholic piety that included ritual practices of Latin origin: Way of the Cross (The Passions), Rosary, devotions to the Latin saints, such as St. Anthony of Padua; the development of the Catholic Action – the growth of the lay and clerical associations in the Romanian Uniate Church – especially after 1929 - 1931; the Greek-Catholic Church is the true national church – a very important theme especially in a period when the nationalistic tendencies were strong, in Europe as well as in Romania; the accent put on the image of Blaj as the spiritual and cultural centre of the Greek-Catholic Romanians that brought the cultural enlightenment for the Romanian nation; a double otherness – not only the traditional otherness to the Orthodox, but also the new otherness to the new Protestant cults – Adventists, Nazarenes, Baptists.

Unfortunately, the celebrations had to be cancelled, as the Communist regime was installed in Romania at the end of 1947. The Church was initially affected by a series of measures taken by the new government: June 11th, 1948 – the Law for the Nationalization of the main means of industrial production, banking, transport, mining and insurance; July 18th, 1948 – the Romanian State annulled the Concordat with the Vatican state; August 3rd, 1948 (Decree 176), the denominational schools entered in the property of the state; August 22nd, 1948 (Decree 177) – the Law of the Cults; September 3rd, 1948 – the salaries of the priests were cancelled.

On the 1st of October, 1948, the Orthodox Church organized a general assembly of the Greek-Catholic clergy at Cluj and then another one in Bucharest (on the 3rd of October, in the Palace of the Patriarchy). At Cluj the assembly was attended under threat by 38 priests. They signed the return of the Greek-Catholics to the Orthodox Church. None of the Uniate bishops was present. The act was ratified on the 18th of October, 1948 by the Orthodox Church and the Communist state considered it to be definitive. On the 21st of October, 1948, exactly 250 years after the signing of the Union between the Romanian Church in Transylvania and Rome in 1698, the Synod of the Romanian-Orthodox Church celebrated the reunion of the Orthodoxy in Transylvania. On October 27 to 28th, 1948, all the Greek-Catholic bishops were arrested: Valeriu Traian Frenţiu, Alexandru Rusu, Ioan Bălan, Iuliu Hossu, Ioan Suciu, Vasile Aftenie – all of them were going to suffer long years of imprisonment (in the Communist prisons of Bucharest, Sighet, Gherla, Aiud) and some of them died in prison (Vasile Aftenie, Valeriu Traian Frentiu, Ioan Suciu, Alexandru Rusu). Finally, on the 1st of December, 1948 (Decree 358) – the Communist regime abolished the Greek-Catholic Church.

As a result of the anti-Communist revolution of December 1989, the Greek-Catholic Church reappeared as an active member of the denominational life in Romania. The bishoprics were reorganized following the structure of 1948, the diocesan theological seminars were reopened and the parishes were reactivated in the regions where the faithful were present again. The church was led by Metropolitan Alexandru Todea, appointed cardinal in 1991 by Pope John Paul II, then followed starting from 1994 by Metropolitan Lucian Mureșan. In 2005, the Uniate Church of Romania was raised to the rank of Major Archbishopric. On the 6th of January 2012, Metropolitan Lucian Muresan was appointed cardinal by Pope Benedict XVI.

The Greek-Catholic Church is facing a special situation once again: As a result of the Communist persecution, the number of its believers was very much reduced as compared with the decades before 1948; thus, its character as a minority church is more emphasized today, in a country with a very large Orthodox majority: in the 2002 census, 18.817.975 people were Orthodox, 191.556 were Greek-Catholics and 1.026.429 were Roman-Catholics.[[22]](#footnote-22) The number of Greek-Catholics decreased in the following 10 years, following a trend that affected all of the traditional churches in Romania. There were 16.367.267 Orthodox believers in 2011 (86% of the total population), which meant that the Romanian-Orthodox Church lost 13% of its believers as compared with the situation in 2002; but there were only 160.275 Uniates in 2011 (0,8% of population), meaning that the Greek-Catholic Church lost 16,4% of its believers as compared with the situation in 2002.

The Greek-Catholic Church still has to manage a very tense relation with the Romanian-Orthodox Church, and in some situations also with the Romanian state, as the issues related to the properties and the churches held before 1948 led to numerous conflicts especially in the 1990s. Local conflicts continue to emerge because of problems related to the buildings of the churches, to the alternative celebrations of the liturgies, to the cemeteries, possible conversions, land properties etc. A Greek-Catholic – Orthodox bilateral commission worked between 1998 and 2004 on the issue of property restitution. The success was limited as only about 300 churches were restituted to the Uniate Church out of 2600.
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