Attempts of revising the historiographic image of the non-Uniate Romanians (Orthodox) from XVIIIth century Transylvania, which we proposed in the first part of this study (based on cases of the non-Uniates from three localities of the Principality: Brașov/Șcheii Brașovului, Alba Iulia and Făgăraș), continues here with a more extensive analysis, from territorial and chronological point of view. Objectives set on that occasion (a new reading of primary sources and effort for identification of new relevant sources, on the one hand; usage of modern methodology from the area of ecclesiastic and social history, on the other hand) find obvious justification through results of this analysis. Consistent documentary sources and secondary bibliography necessitated a nuanced interpretation and similarly ample, of aspects had in view. Yet their fragmentation would have impeded providing some pertinent answers.

Structurally the study comprises the following sections that we opted for (investigations conducted by the authorities of the Principality in 1698-1699; period of bishop Atanasie Anghel; period of sedes vacantes and of bishop Ioan Patachi; period of Inochești Micu-Klein’s episcopacy (until 1744); years 1744-1747, marked by action of monk Visarion Sarai and its consequences) are not accidental. They were proposed for the final phase of a research project that I collaborated on, dealing with religious union from Transylvania. Thus, it represents result of a longer reflection and at the same time of my wish of proposing a coherent interpretation on the subject, based on available sources at that time. The time span of half of century between the attesting of start of talks for the religious union of Romanians from Transylvania and that of consequences of the first major confessional crisis (1697-1747) represents a chronological sequence that can only be approached integrally. I mainly focused on those sources (investigations and conscriptiones), either published or unpublished, which may help writing possible social history of the union and overcoming too persistent confessionalizing interpretations on the subject.
The two documentary sources copied in the annexes are extremely representative examples on this line. They reflect, at local level (of Sebeș Saxon seat and Alba district, respectively Făgăraș district), two manners of relating to union of the local elites. Then, I have followed development of terminology by which were termed in primary sources Orthodox Romanians and their attitude as for issue of rite. The conclusion that we arrived at is similar to that resulted from the first part of the study: confessional differentiation is still at the middle of the century an ongoing process, yet which cannot be interpreted according to one tendency or another; on the contrary, more obvious is confessional instability (mobility) of the communities, connected with external stimuli that acted on them. Not in the least this means negation of their fundamental religious sensibility. Yet, this cannot be debated endlessly in terms of abstract references to notions of “law” and faith, which cannot lead to valid results. Richness of spiritual life of former believers deserves to be paid a greater attention, starting from those tokens that reflect it, even diffusely. At the same time, it is in the historians’ interest to propose nuanced interpretations relevant also from the perspective of the development along a longer period, until contemporaneity.
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