



Școala doctorală de Teologie

Domeniul de doctorat: Teologie

DOCTORAL DISSERTATION
(ABSTRACT)

**BLAJ – A RELIGIOUS AND CULTURAL
CROSSROADS BETWEEN WEST AND
EAST**

Doctorand:

BENCHEA GABRIEL - IOAN

Conducător de doctorat:

Pr.Prof. Univ. Dr. NICOLAE CHIFĂR

DOCTORAL DISSERTATION

(ABSTRACT)

BLAJ – A RELIGIOUS AND CULTURAL CROSSROADS BETWEEN WEST AND EAST

Keywords: *The Schism of 1054, the Union of Lyon, the Council of Ferrara-Florence, Uniatism, Inochentie Micu-Klein, Școala Ardeleană (Transylvanian School), Samuil Micu, Gheorghe Șincai, Petru Maior, Supplex Libellus Valachorum, the 1848 Revolution, the Blaj Assembly, Andrei Șaguna, the Great Union of 1918, Blaj.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	6
PART I	18
I. THE DIVISION OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH	18
Preliminaries	18
1.1 The Political, Religious, and Cultural Causes Leading to the Schism of 16 July 1054	19
1.1.1 Political Causes – From Diocletian (284–305) to Constantine IX Monomachos (1042–1055)	19
1.1.2 Religious Causes – From Patriarch Alexander I of Constantinople (314–337) and Pope Sylvester I (314–335) to Patriarch Michael I Cerularius (1043–1059) and Pope Leo IX (1048–1054)	26
1.1.3 Cultural Causes	34
1.2 The Schism of 1054	35
1.2.1 The Disputes Between Patriarchs Photius and Ignatius – The First Phase of the Schism	35
1.2.2 The Second Phase of the Schism – The Conflict Between Patriarch Michael Cerularius and Cardinal Humbert	38
II. THE “UNION” OF LYON	43
2.1 Political and Religious Issues of the Empire Until the Palaiologos Dynasty	43
2.1.2 The Religious Context and Previous Union Attempts up to the Union of Lyon (1274)	47
2.2 The Unionist Council of Lyon (1274)	49
2.3 The “Benefits” of This Union and the “Sicilian Vespers”	54
III. THE UNION OF FERRARA-FLORENCE (1438–1439)	60
3.1 The Byzantine Empire Up to Emperor John VIII Palaiologos (1425–1448)	60
3.2 The Unionist Council of Ferrara-Florence (1438–1439)	63
3.3 The Consequences of This “Union” and the Fall of Constantinople	67
3.4 The Consequences of the Fall of Constantinople	75
3.4.1 Political and Economic Consequences	75
3.4.2 Religious Consequences	77
IV. UNIATISM	81
4.1 The Union of Brest-Litovsk	81
4.2 The Union of Uzhhorod-Munkács	85
4.3 Uniatism in Transylvania	86
4.3.1 Political and Religious Context	86
4.3.2 The Beginnings of Uniatism and the Forged Documents	89
4.3.3 Atanasie Anghel and the Resolutions of Cardinal Leopold Kollonich	90
4.3.4 The “Manifesto of Union”	92
4.3.5 The Post-Union Investigation and the Ambiguous Attitude of Atanasie Anghel	95
4.3.6 The Sad Consequences of the Union	98
PART II	102
V. Moments of Patriotism and Confessional Solidarity in Transylvania, from the 18th Century to the Early 20th Century (1744–1918)	102
VI. INOCHENTIE MICU-KLEIN	108
6.1 Biographical Data and Academic Formation	108
6.2 Political and Religious Activity	110
6.3 The Formation of Early National Consciousness in Transylvania	115
6.4 Uniatism and Maria Theresa	117
6.5 Klein and Visarion Sarai	120
6.6 The Roman Exile	123
VII. THE 1784 UPRISING	127
7.1 Historical Context, Development, and Impact	127
VIII. THE TRANSYLVANIAN SCHOOL	138
8.1 Preliminaries	138
8.2 Samuil Micu	147
8.2.1 Biography and Theological Work	147

8.2.2 Contributions in Historical and Philological-Linguistic Research	149
8.2.3 Micu's Eastern Theology	151
8.3 Gheorghe Șincai	163
8.3.1 Biographical Data; The Conflict with Bishop Bob	163
8.3.2 Cultural Activity	167
8.3.3 Șincai's Theology	169
8.4 Petru Maior	172
8.4.1 Biographical Data	172
8.4.2 Procanon. Structure	173
8.4.3 Petru Maior and the Doctrinal Innovations of Rome	177
8.4.4 Petru Maior and the Council of Ferrara-Florence	178
8.4.5 Other Criticisms by Petru Maior	179
IX. SUPPLEX LIBELLUS VALACHORUM	181
9.1 Preliminaries	181
9.2 Content and Analysis	187
X. THE REVOLUTIONARY YEAR 1848	196
10.1 The Social and Political Context	196
10.2 The Chronology of the Romanian Revolution in Transylvania	199
10.3 The National Assembly of Blaj (3/15 May – 5/17 May 1848)	202
10.4 The Impact and Echo of the Blaj Assembly. Șaguna's Actions	208
XI. THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE TWO CHURCHES TO THE GREAT UNION OF 1918	214
PART III	226
XII. HISTORICAL DOCUMENTS – BLAJ	226
12.1 The Interrogation Points of Bishop Inochentie Micu-Klein	227
12.2 The Response of the Congregation of Propaganda Fide in Rome to the Letter Addressed by Mons. Cardinal Paulucci	231
12.3 The Letter of Bishop Inochentie Micu-Klein to Empress Maria Theresa, Requesting Information on the Accusations Brought Against Him	232
12.4 The Memorandum of Bishop Inochentie Micu-Klein to Empress Maria Theresa, Requesting the Issuance of a New Foundational Diploma for the United Episcopate and Monastery of Blaj, Including the Eviction Clause Omitted in the Existing Diploma	234
12.5 Theological Considerations by Iosif Balogh on the State of the Union in Transylvania (Considerationes quaedam de Statu Unionis in Transylvania), Accompanied by the Observations of the Aulic Commission for Transylvanian Affairs	236
12.6 The Memorandum Submitted to Maria Theresa by the Basilian Delegates Regarding the Monastery and Church in Blaj, the Romanian United Schools, and Seminaries	240
12.7 The Opinion of the Transylvanian Aulic Chancellery Concerning the Requests of the United Clergy Submitted to Empress Maria Theresa	242
12.8 Petru Pavel Aron to the Governor of Transylvania	243
12.9 Bishop Petru Pavel Aron to the Congregation of Propaganda Fide	244
12.10 The Response of the Congregation of Propaganda Fide to the Letter of Petru Pavel Aron	245
12.11 The Letter of Ioan Inochentie Micu-Klein to the Bishop of Făgăraș [Petru Pavel Aron]	247
12.12 Bishop Petru Pavel Aron to the Congregation of Propaganda Fide	248
FINAL CONCLUSIONS	250
APPENDICES	260
BIBLIOGRAPHY	365

ABSTRACT

The present dissertation falls within the theological discipline of Church History, addressing a spiritual and cultural frontier that has played a pivotal role in shaping the religious and national identity of the Romanians in Transylvania. Blaj, both as a geographical location and as a symbolic space, became a point of convergence between the Eastern Byzantine tradition and the Western Roman Catholic influences, reflecting the tensions and syntheses that have characterized the confessional history of the region from the seventeenth to the twentieth century.

The selection of this theme was prompted by the necessity of attaining a deeper comprehension of Blaj's contribution to the cultural, religious, and national emancipation of the Transylvanian Romanians. Blaj was not solely an episcopal center, but also a veritable laboratory of ideas and a launching platform for the intellectual elite of its epoch. The present study seeks to elucidate the significance of this phenomenon of religious and cultural interpenetration, which has often been either neglected or approached only fragmentarily in previous scholarship.

The originality of this research resides in the direct engagement with original historical documents, particularly the correspondence conducted by the Greek-Catholic bishops of Blaj, such as Inochentie Micu-Klein, with the ecclesiastical authorities in Rome. The access to photographic reproductions of these documents has permitted an extensive process of transcription, translation, and in-depth analysis, enabling not only a philological understanding of their content, but also a faithful reconstruction of the spiritual and theological climate of the period. Through this investigation, I have sought to discern the manner in which the Transylvanian bishops articulated their discourse of identity before Rome—not as a Church merely subordinate, but as a Romanian Church, endowed with a distinct national consciousness, firmly attached to its Byzantine rite and local traditions, yet united through faith and dogmatic communion with Rome. This perspective, grounded in contemporary sources, offers a significant nuance to the understanding of Blaj's relations with the West and furnishes a particular interpretative framework for the confessional tensions and equilibria in Transylvania.

The topical relevance of this research lies in the rediscovery and reassessment of Blaj's role in the construction of Romanian identity within a European framework of inter-

traditional dialogue. In an age wherein religious pluralism and the reconciliation of historical memory assume growing importance, such a study offers valuable insights into the historical mechanisms of confessional coexistence and interaction. In a context characterized by religious pluralism and the revalorization of European identity values, the theme of the interaction between East and West—with Blaj as such an eloquent exemplar—acquires enhanced significance. This study is of interest not solely to specialists in Church History or theology, but also to all those concerned with the dynamics of cultural and religious identities within the Romanian space. Blaj must be understood not merely as a local landmark, but as an interface between two theological worlds, a locus wherein affiliation to Catholicism was negotiated with refinement, without the renunciation of the Eastern ethos. Furthermore, Blaj represented a crucial center for the preservation and affirmation of Romanian identity in Transylvania, contributing decisively to the development of national consciousness through education, the printing press, and the Church. At a time when the dialogue between tradition and modernity is subject to intense scholarly debate, the present research provides a remarkable historical example of theological and cultural synthesis, of enduring relevance for contemporary reflection.

The working hypothesis underpinning this research posits that the existence and historical function of Blaj constituted a decisive factor in the preservation and transmission of the religious and cultural identity of the Romanians in Transylvania. The premise is advanced that, absent the role fulfilled by Blaj—as an ecclesiastical, educational, and typographical center—the religious and cultural history of the Transylvanian Romanians would have followed a different trajectory, possibly one far more fragmented or vulnerable to the pressures of assimilation. Blaj functioned as a veritable bridge between West and East, not solely in religious terms, but also as a space wherein a coherent collective identity was articulated, in which confessional affiliation harmoniously converged with fidelity to Romanian national tradition. This mediating function played a decisive role in the formation of the modern Romanian elite of Transylvania. The objective of this research is to demonstrate that the identity of Blaj is not the result of a mere confessional superimposition, but rather of a dynamic, creative synthesis, consciously aware of its historical vocation.

Blaj, the small town situated at the confluence of the Târnave Rivers, constituted for nearly two and a half centuries a reference center of Romanian culture, a genuine beacon of national enlightenment. From here emerged the first great scholars of the Romanian people, whose writings and activity awakened the national consciousness of a people of peasant serfs long deprived of any opportunity for education and emancipation. Blaj is not merely a

geographical settlement, but a symbol of national consciousness, faith, and Romanian identity—a veritable capital of the Romanian soul. “However far one may distance oneself from Blaj, its aura follows, suffused with nostalgia and melancholy. That same light, laden with memories, will find a permanent place in the soul, from where it will radiate throughout the entirety of our lives. Within our city there exists a spring of Christian and Romanian spirituality, which we ascribe to a glorious past, a past owed to the intellectual community of Blaj, represented above all by its priests and teachers.”

Through its past and present, Blaj symbolizes the consciousness, faith, and spirit of the Romanian people. These three fundamental values have decisively marked the existence of the city and its generations, shaping a distinct character. The spiritual legacy of Blaj is one of sobriety, perseverance, and inner strength—values imprinted both upon the character of its inhabitants and upon the collective consciousness of the Romanian people. Blaj has always been a center of passion for truth and justice, of the struggle for emancipation and national dignity. In essence, Blaj signifies more than a small town—it is a center of living spirituality, which for more than two centuries has nourished and influenced the destiny of the nation. Just as good leaven makes the bread rise, so too has Blaj leavened the national consciousness, giving rise to thinkers, fighters, and martyrs who have transformed ideals into reality: “Blaj is one of those few historical places which, though small in territorial extent, seem destined by providence to play a significant role in the cultural history of nations. At least the place of Blaj in the history of the Romanians, viewed through the lens of Transylvania, is too significant ever to be disregarded.”

Before engaging in a more detailed analysis of certain decisive moments in the chronicle of Blaj, it is appropriate to first enumerate several general historical landmarks pertaining to the history of the locality:

In Prehistory and Antiquity: Blaj and its surroundings were inhabited since prehistoric and Neolithic times, as evidenced by discoveries of bronze, gold, and ceramic artifacts found in the area between the Mureș and Târnave rivers. The region held strategic importance during the Roman period as well, with roads and fortifications confirmed through archaeological discoveries.

In the Early Middle Ages: Following the Roman withdrawal from Dacia, Blaj and the surrounding province entered a period for which no clear written evidence survives. The earliest documented mention of Blaj dates from the 13th century, specifically the year 1271, when it appears under the name *Villa Herboldi*, derived from the name of its then-owner Herboldi, son of Ost, who had served as Voivode of Transylvania around 1266–1267. By the

end of the 13th century, Blaj was in the possession of a nobleman named Chyel, to whom it had been granted by King Stephen V of Hungary.

During the 14th–17th Centuries: In 1395, King Sigismund donated Blaj to Blasius Cserei, who had distinguished himself in battles against the Turks at Sirmium and Nicopolis. Subsequently, Blaj came into the possession of Gheorghe Bagdi (1535), Paul Orvendi (1606), and later Gavril Bethlen. Bethlen fortified the castle of Blaj, after which it passed into the hands of Simion Pechy, and following his death, to Petru Haller.

During the Principality of Transylvania: In the 17th century, the estate of Blaj came into the possession of Princess Anna Bornemisa, wife of Prince Michael Apafi I, who established her residence there. The castle of Blaj became an important site in the history of Transylvania, especially during the conflicts between the Turks and the Austrians.

The Treaty of Blaj (1687): On October 27, 1687, the Treaty of Blaj was signed at the castle between Prince Charles of Lorraine (representing the Emperor of Vienna) and Michael Apafi. The treaty provided for the quartering of Austrian troops in Transylvania during the winter months, an event of crucial significance for the fate of the principality, which subsequently came under the dominion of the House of Habsburg.

The Transfer to the Greek-Catholic Church: Following the death of Prince Michael Apafi and his successor, the domain came into the possession of the Greek-Catholic Church in 1713. In 1737, Blaj was designated the official seat of the Greek-Catholic episcopate.

From this period onward, for the next two centuries, Blaj became an emblematic site in Romanian history, particularly that of Transylvania, due to a series of essential events that marked the cultural, educational, and national development of the Romanian people.

Școala Ardeleană (The Transylvanian School): In 1754, the școala de obște (the public school), the first educational institution with instruction in the Romanian language, was established in Blaj. This institution would later give rise to the Școala Ardeleană, the cultural and Enlightenment movement that championed the emancipation of the Transylvanian Romanians. Through historical and philological studies, the Transylvanian scholars demonstrated the Latin origin of the Romanian people and advocated for the transition from the Cyrillic to the Latin alphabet.

“The teachers of Blaj—enlightened scholars and fervent patriots—inscribed among their highest ideals the cause of enlightening the people. Here, values were cultivated and characters were formed in the spirit of truth and social justice, reverence for the forefathers, boundless love for the ancestral land, and the virtues of the Romanian people. In the demanding atmosphere of these schools, students acquired a disciplined work ethic, modesty,

a thirst for knowledge, respect for human dignity and aspirations. They learned to know and cherish the nation's past and to face the future with confidence. From their youth, they were made aware of the great responsibility they would bear in the struggle for the upliftment of their nation.”

The *Supplex Libellus Valachorum* (1791–1792): It was likewise in Blaj, in 1791 and 1792, that the leaders of the Școala Ardeleană drafted the celebrated petitions *Supplex Libellus Valachorum Transsilvaniae*, addressed to Emperor Leopold II. Through these petitions, the Romanians demanded the recognition of their national, political, and economic rights within the Principality of Transylvania, on equal footing with the other recognized nations.

The Printing Press and the National Press: An important printing house was established in Blaj, which published fundamental works for Romanian culture and identity, including the Bible of Blaj (1795), along with numerous school textbooks. Furthermore, the Blaj press, beginning with *Organul Luminării* and continuing through various interwar publications, played a vital role in disseminating national and cultural ideas.

The Great National Assembly of 1848: The memory of the year 1848 remains indelibly linked to the name of Blaj. On May 15, the Great National Assembly of the Transylvanian Romanians convened on the Câmpia Libertății (Field of Liberty). At this historic assembly, a proclamation was adopted and addressed to Emperor Ferdinand I of Austria, demanding the recognition of the Romanians as a nation equal in rights with the other ethnic groups of Transylvania. During the same assembly, the approximately 30,000 to 40,000 participants chanted the famous slogan “Noi vrem să ne unim cu Țara!” (“We want to unite with the Country!”), thereby foreshadowing the ideal of uniting all Romanians.

In an article published in *Universul literar*, year XX, no. 9, Bucharest, 1902, the poet George Coșbuc wrote: “A beautiful episode, perhaps the most beautiful in the entire history of the Romanians beyond the mountains, was undoubtedly the gathering of forty thousand people on the Field of Blaj, thereafter named the Field of Liberty. The name is a beautiful one! A field where the Romanians, long suffering as serfs and barely tolerated on the land of their forefathers, would gather, and from where they would return free and sovereign in the wide land of Transylvania.”

The Blaj Pronouncement (1868): In response to the annexation of Transylvania by Hungary, on May 15, 1868, in the presence of approximately 60,000 participants, the *Pronunciamentul de la Blaj* (Blaj Pronouncement) was adopted. This document demanded the

autonomy of Transylvania, political and confessional equality for the Romanians with the other ethnicities, and official recognition of the Romanian language.

The Transylvanian Association for Romanian Literature and the Culture of the Romanian People (ASTRA):

Founded between 23–26 October / 4–7 November 1861 in Sibiu, at the initiative of Transylvanian Romanian intellectuals, ASTRA was conceived from its inception as a veritable fortress of Romanian solidarity and spirituality, a blessing of national identity. ASTRA represents a foundational institution established by patriotic Romanian scholars, supported by the two national Churches of Transylvania, under the guidance of Orthodox Metropolitan Andrei Șaguna and Greek-Catholic Metropolitan Alexandru Șterca-Șuluțiu. The Blaj branch of ASTRA was founded during the district assembly held in Blaj on 28 June 1870, constituting an event of profound cultural and political significance for the local community. The first elected president was the eminent scholar and founding father of Romanian philology, Timotei Cipariu, canon and encyclopedic personality of the nineteenth century.

The Preparation of the Great Union of 1918: The Blaj Territorial Romanian National Council, under the coordination of the Central Romanian National Council, played an essential role in organizing the Great National Assembly of Alba Iulia, which resulted in the union of Transylvania with Romania on 1 December 1918.

Blaj stands as the birthplace of the struggles for national emancipation, the cradle of the conscious movement for the awakening of Romanian national consciousness. For over two centuries, Blaj has consistently represented a “nest of the Vlachs,” feared and despised by the former ruling powers, serving as a center of cultural and national initiatives and achievements. Blaj never had the fortune to develop into a great city, nor into a significant commercial or industrial center; however, it was destined to become and to remain a cultural center whose teachers and disciples bore, almost single-handedly, the burdens of political struggle while devoutly sustaining the cultural efforts of the Romanian nation in Transylvania. The struggles and endeavors that radiated from this small town of Blaj resonated even beyond the Carpathians, succeeding in consolidating all Romanian national aspirations within its confines.

“From Blaj radiated, to all Romanian-inhabited provinces, the sentiment of belonging to the Romanian nation, in the pursuit and attainment of national dignity and freedom. At the same time, Blaj constitutes a center of Romanian culture and spirituality. The ideas shaped in

Blaj through the program of the 1848 Transylvanian Revolution under Simion Bărnuțiu would form the foundation for the future struggle for national freedom and unity.”

Blaj, this little Rome of our Dacian Latinity, as it has been called, together with its ancient cultural institutions, naturally and movingly returns to the center of national commemorations in our times. The role that Blaj has played in the formation of Romanian culture and in the awakening of ethnic consciousness ranks among the most significant. To evoke it, whenever the occasion arises, is not merely an act of cultural piety, but an imperative duty. Therefore, any documentary research, however quiet and painstaking, is to be welcomed with joy, as a sign of genuine appreciation for the tireless efforts of those who labored in the service of truth, history, and the Romanian soul.

In order to gain a profound understanding of the role played by Blaj in the religious and cultural history of the Romanians of Transylvania, a retrospective causal research approach was required—namely, a form of historical backtracking analysis—by which the sequence of events leading to the emergence of this spiritual and identity-forming center was reconstructed in reverse. Although the present dissertation focuses on Blaj, its full significance cannot be grasped without a meticulous, layered deconstruction of the broader context from which it emerged, akin to the gradual unfolding of a Matryoshka doll. Thus, the investigation proceeded from the immediate historical consequences toward increasingly remote antecedents: from Blaj as a center of national emancipation, to the phenomenon of Uniatism in Transylvania, further to the context of Uniatism in post-Tridentine Europe, and ultimately to the original rupture of Christendom occasioned by the Great Schism of 1054. This reverse chronological approach aims not merely at a simple historical reconstruction, but rather at establishing a genealogy of the ideas and events that made possible the emergence of Blaj as a point of convergence between East and West. For these reasons, in order to fully apprehend its identity and historical significance, it proved necessary to adopt a concentric analytical model, with Blaj at the center, around which various historical and theological layers gravitate.

Although the central theme of this dissertation concerns Blaj, the present investigation does not commence with a direct local analysis. It was deemed essential to adopt a progressive contextual unfolding in order to achieve a comprehensive understanding of the issue at hand. Far from being an isolated phenomenon, Blaj represents the outcome of extensive historical and theological processes, with ramifications extending throughout the Christian world. Only within this broad European and confessional framework may the true importance of Blaj in the history of Transylvania and Romania be adequately apprehended.

This methodological construction—from the universal to the particular, from the pan-European dogmatic and geopolitical context to the concrete historical reality of Blaj—proved indispensable for achieving the aims of this research. One cannot comprehend the significance of Blaj without first understanding why the rupture between East and West occurred, what mechanisms governed church unions in Central and Eastern Europe, and how these developments uniquely manifested themselves within the Transylvanian context. This stratified approach represents not merely a structural choice but rather a hermeneutical necessity.

Based on these methodological considerations, the dissertation was structured into three major and distinct parts, which follow both the chronological and evolutionary course of the subject as well as the deeper strata of its interpretation.

The first part of the study seeks to analyze the causes, development, and consequences of the principal rupture that divided the Christian Church through a prolonged historical process, beginning in the fourth century and culminating in the eighteenth century, with particular emphasis on the events in Transylvania.

Chapter I investigates the division of the Christian Church, taking as its symbolic reference point the date of the schism on 16 July 1054. The work extensively presents the multiple causes that fueled this rupture. On the political level, it traces the trajectory from the administrative division of the Roman Empire under Diocletian (284–305), which separated the eastern and western parts of the empire, to the conflict of interests and authority between Rome and Constantinople during the reign of Emperor Constantine IX Monomachos (1042–1055). On the religious level, it analyzes the dogmatic, ecclesiological, and jurisdictional differences between the Patriarchate of Constantinople and the papal see, beginning with Patriarch Alexander I (314–337) and Pope Sylvester I (314–335), and extending to Patriarch Michael I Cerularius and Pope Leo IX. On the cultural level, it highlights the discrepancies of language, mentality, canonical tradition, and differing philosophical influences between the Greek East and the Latin West.

The study then explores in depth the concrete stages of the schism, outlining its two principal phases: the first phase centers on the conflict between the patriarchs Photius and Ignatius of Constantinople, marking an initial episode of tension and separation; the second phase leads to the definitive rupture, through the conflict between Patriarch Michael Cerularius and the papal legate, Cardinal Humbert.

Chapter II addresses the first major attempt at reunification of the two Churches, namely the Union of Lyon in 1274. Prior to the actual presentation of the unionist council of Lyon, the author surveys the political and religious context of Byzantium up to the establishment of the Palaiologos dynasty, as well as earlier unification attempts. The Council of Lyon, convened under the pressure of both external and internal challenges faced by the empire, resulted in a formal union; however, its implementation was limited and met with broad opposition from both the Byzantine clergy and laity. The work also analyzes the aftermath of this union, emphasizing the role of popular dissatisfaction, which culminated in the revolt known as the Sicilian Vespers, contributing to the failure of the agreement.

Chapter III is dedicated to the second great attempt at reunification, namely the Union of Ferrara-Florence (1438–1439). The study presents the critical situation of the Byzantine Empire on the eve of its fall, under the rule of Emperor John VIII Palaiologos. Under the imminent Ottoman threat, the Byzantine delegation participated in the council, where, following theological debates and political pressures, a new agreement of union with Rome was concluded. Nevertheless, this union failed to yield the intended effects, as it was rejected by much of the Orthodox clergy and the population of Byzantium. The work proceeds to analyze the dramatic consequences of the fall of Constantinople in 1453 on multiple levels: political (the definitive disappearance of the Byzantine Empire), economic (the disruption of traditional trade routes), and religious (the irreversible consolidation of the separation between the two Churches).

Chapter IV addresses the phenomenon of Uniatism as a new form of restoring communion with Rome within the Eastern Christian sphere. Three major cases are analyzed: the Union of Brest-Litovsk (1596), through which part of the Orthodox hierarchy in the Polish-Lithuanian territories entered into communion with Rome; the Union of Uzhhorod-Munkács (1646), involving the Orthodox hierarchy of Maramureș, Subcarpathia, and parts of Upper Hungary; and, in detail, the Union of Transylvania.

In this final subsection, the author examines the political and religious context of Transylvania at the end of the seventeenth century and the beginning of the eighteenth century, the origins of the unionist movement, the difficulties encountered in drafting the official documents, the essential role of Bishop Atanasie Anghel, and the decisive influence of Cardinal Leopold Kollonich. The drafting of the Manifesto of Union, the post-union investigation, and the fluctuating stance of Bishop Atanasie are analyzed, along with the long-term impact of the union—often negative—upon the communal and religious life of the Transylvanian Romanians.

The second part of the dissertation traces the manner in which Romanian national consciousness crystallized within the Transylvanian space under the influence of political, cultural, and religious factors, with the decisive involvement of both Romanian Churches, Greek-Catholic and Orthodox, during the period extending from the mid-eighteenth century to the Great Union of 1918.

Chapter V opens this section with an overview of the moments of confessional solidarity and patriotic affirmation in Transylvania between 1744 and 1918. The principal episodes are outlined, through which the Transylvanian Romanians, despite confessional divisions, succeeded in preserving a spirit of national unity, reflected in the struggle for equal rights, the affirmation of cultural identity, and participation in the major political events of the time.

Chapter VI is dedicated to the remarkable figure of the Greek-Catholic bishop Inochentie Micu-Klein. His biography, academic studies, and intellectual formation are presented. His political and ecclesiastical activity is analyzed within the context of the struggles of the Romanians in the Habsburg Empire, emphasizing his fight for the recognition of the rights of the Romanian nation. His role in the formation of an early national consciousness in Transylvania is examined, along with his political endeavors in Vienna, and the opposition he encountered, including from Empress Maria Theresa. The chapter also addresses his controversy with the Orthodox monk Visarion Sarai, Micu's position regarding the Union, and the context in which he was compelled to spend his final years in exile in Rome.

Chapter VII analyzes the peasant uprising of 1784, known as the Rebellion of Horea, Cloșca, and Crișan. The social, economic, and political causes that generated the movement are presented, together with the unfolding of events and the consequences of the uprising upon ethnic and confessional relations in Transylvania, as well as upon subsequent imperial policies concerning the Romanians.

Chapter VIII is entirely dedicated to Școala Ardeleană (The Transylvanian School), a quintessentially Enlightenment and national movement that contributed decisively to the definition of the identity consciousness of the Transylvanian Romanians. Following a general introduction to the movement, the author undertakes an extensive analysis of the contributions of its most prominent representatives:

Samuil Micu — his biography, theological works, historical and linguistic research, his position within Eastern theology, and his involvement in supporting the union with Rome are presented. Gheorghe Șincai — his biography, his conflict with Greek-Catholic Bishop

Ioan Bob, his remarkable cultural activity, and his theological contributions are analyzed. Petru Maior — his life and his fundamental work *Procanon* (including its structural presentation) are examined, along with his critical position toward certain doctrinal innovations of Rome, his stance in relation to the Council of Ferrara-Florence, and his various critical observations directed at specific Western dogmatic innovations.

Chapter IX discusses the drafting and significance of the *Supplex Libellus Valachorum* (1791), the memorandum addressed to the Emperor by the Transylvanian Romanian nation. After introducing the context in which it was drafted, the author analyzes the content of the petition, the arguments advanced, the national demands, and the manner in which this document ideologically grounded the Romanians' struggle for equal rights within the Habsburg state.

Chapter X addresses the Revolution of 1848 in Transylvania, with particular emphasis on the participation of the Transylvanian Romanians. The social and political causes of the revolution are analyzed, along with the chronology of local events, the central moment represented by the National Assembly of Blaj in May 1848, its message of national unity, and the demands presented to the imperial authorities. The chapter also examines the consequences of the Blaj Assembly and the involvement of Metropolitan Andrei Șaguna in defending the rights of the Romanians after 1848.

Chapter XI concludes the second part by analyzing the contribution of both the Orthodox and Greek-Catholic Churches to the realization of the Great Union of 1918. The active role of the clergy is highlighted, as well as the involvement of hierarchs from both confessions in mobilizing national consciousness and participating in the proclamation of Union at Alba Iulia, the culminating moment in the affirmation of the national unity ideal of the Romanians of Transylvania.

The third part of the dissertation constitutes an extensive documentary section, in which a series of essential historical documents are presented, transcribed, translated, and analyzed for the purpose of understanding the stages, disputes, and internal dynamics of the process of the Union of the Romanian Church of Transylvania with the Church of Rome, as well as the organization of the United Episcopate of Blaj in the eighteenth century.

The selected documents originate from the correspondence of the Romanian Greek-Catholic hierarchs, particularly Bishops Inochentie Micu-Klein and Petru Pavel Aron, as well as from the official archives of the Congregation of Propaganda Fide, the Habsburg authorities in Vienna, specifically the Aulic Chancellery of Transylvania, and from the writings of certain collaborators of the imperial court, such as the theologian Iosif Balogh.

Through their content, these historical sources reflect the numerous administrative, political, and theological difficulties faced by the United Church of Transylvania in its endeavor to consolidate and stabilize itself within the broader context of internal turmoil in the Habsburg Empire and in the relations between the Viennese Court and the Holy See.

The interrogation of Inochentie Micu-Klein presents the accusations brought against him, as well as the pressures to which the bishop was subjected due to his political activity in defense of the rights of the Romanian nation. The response of the Congregation of Propaganda Fide, addressed to Cardinal Paulucci, offers insight into the manner in which the Roman ecclesiastical authorities perceived the issues arising in Transylvania and sought to mediate the tensions between the imperial authority and the United Episcopate.

The letters of Bishop Inochentie Micu-Klein to Empress Maria Theresa illustrate his persistent efforts to defend his position, to request clarification of the accusations brought against him, and to obtain the issuance of new foundational diplomas for the United Episcopate of Blaj, in order to ensure its institutional stability. In the memorandum of the theologian Iosif Balogh, entitled *Considerationes quaedam de statu Unionis in Transylvania*, accompanied by the observations of the Aulic Commission, a series of theological and administrative reflections are presented concerning the state of the Union in Transylvania, the difficulties encountered, and the limitations in the practical application of the union within the concrete realities of the Empire.

The memorandum submitted to the Empress by the Basilian delegates of Transylvania addresses issues related to the organization of monasteries, churches, schools, and Romanian seminaries in Blaj, highlighting the continual concerns of the Greek-Catholic clergy for strengthening ecclesiastical life and the theological education of the youth. The opinion of the Transylvanian Aulic Chancellery regarding these requests reflects the tense relationship between the demands of the Romanian Greek-Catholic clergy and the interests of the Habsburg administration, characterized by ongoing negotiations over prerogatives.

The correspondence of Bishop Petru Pavel Aron, conducted both with the governor of Transylvania and with the Congregation of Propaganda Fide, underscores the persistent concern of Micu-Klein's successor for consolidating the position of the United Episcopate, for organizing ecclesiastical life, and for securing a clear recognition of the rights of the Greek-Catholic clergy and faithful. Within the same context, the letter sent by Inochentie Micu-Klein to Petru Pavel Aron reveals the continuity of episcopal concerns and the former bishop's abiding care for the future of the United Church and its faithful.

This documentary section does not limit itself to the mere reproduction of sources but also offers contextual analysis intended to provide a more comprehensive understanding of how negotiations were conducted, demands were formulated, and the positions of the United Church hierarchy were advanced before the imperial and ecclesiastical authorities, within the political, confessional, and administrative context of eighteenth-century Transylvania.