

New Europe College
Ștefan Odobleja Program
Yearbook 2009-2010



RAFAEL-DORIAN G. CHELARU
ATTILA KIM
PUIU LĂȚEA
ANDREI MURARU
ALINA SILIAN
ANDREI FLORIN SORA
ÁRON ZSOLT TELEGDI-CSETRI
AURELIA VASILE

Editor: Irina Vainovski-Mihai

Copyright – New Europe College
ISSN 1584-0298

New Europe College
Str. Plantelor 21
023971 Bucharest
Romania

www.nec.ro; e-mail: nec@nec.ro
Tel. (+4) 021.307.99.10, Fax (+4) 021. 327.07.74



RAFAEL-DORIAN G. CHELARU

Born in 1976, in Câmpina

Ph.D. in History, Faculty of History, University of Bucharest (2009)

Assistant Professor, Faculty of Archival Sciences,
“Alexandru Ioan Cuza” Police Academy, Bucharest

Research grants and travels to Hungary, France and Italy

Participation in conferences and symposia in Romania, Hungary,
Czech Republic, Italy and United Kingdom

Articles and studies on the history of Catholicism and Catholic missionaryism
in Medieval and Early Modern Moldavia (16th – 19th cc.)

Book:

Colecția Microfilme “Vatican”. Ghid arhivistic,
Arhivele Naționale, Bucharest, 2007

CUTTING RELIGIOUS BOUNDARIES: “CONFESSIONAL” DISCOURSE AND ADAPTATION STRATEGIES OF THE CATHOLIC MISSIONARIES IN MOLDAVIA (18TH CENTURY)

Introduction

Sempre sono stati zelanti in promuovere anche i vantaggi temporali de' Serenissimi principi con predicare a loro parrocchiani la dipendenza, ubbidienza, fedeltà e tributo al loro principe, richiamandoli a riconducendoli nel di lui Stato quando fuggivano per li troppi aggravij; facendo a gara i padri per più moltiplicare e rendere fruttuoso al principe il suo villaggio, con condurvi novi abitatori da Stati vicini, talvolta anche con disgusto dell'Imperatore e de'Polacchi.¹

These words were used by Antonio Maria Mauro, mission prefect in Moldavia (1774-1777), in a letter sent to an unspecified recipient sometimes before October 11th, 1777.² In this letter, Mauro asked for diplomatic support needed to obtain from prince Grigore III Ghica the reconfirmation of fiscal privileges previously granted by the former princes to the missionaries who were sent in Moldavia by the Sacred Congregation “De Propaganda Fide” (hereafter SCPF). The other main objective of Mauro’s letter was to obtain a special permission from the Ottoman authorities, the suzerain power, to erect a stone made Catholic church in Iași.

The argument used by Mauro to support his claims is most interesting for our study: the prefect underlines the importance of the missionaries as agents of social discipline within the Catholic communities from Moldavia, enforcing through their efforts the state authority over its subjects.³ According to Mauro, the missionaries acted to transform the Catholics into

good citizens able to practice fidelity and obedience and to pay their due taxes to the prince. Last but not least, the same missionaries were praised to have succeeded in bringing back to their homes the fugitive Catholics and to organize the new settlements appeared in Moldavia through numerous waves of immigrants from Transylvanian and Polish territories.

In fact, Mauro used arguments that belong to the well known confessionalization theory which includes also concepts like social disciplining or confessional identity. Within this framework, the main goal of the present study is to identify and describe the specific features which could define a “confessional” discourse issued and used by the Catholic missionaries who were active in 18th century Moldavia. A subsequent objective is to draw a comparison with similar situations in other Orthodox areas within the Ottoman Empire and to see whether this sort of “missionary confessionalization” created or tended to create real “confessional frontiers” within Moldavian society.

In parallel, we plan to analyze also the missionaries’ strategies of adaptation as an indistinct and “necessary” part of their activities. We will not focus on the strategies themselves, but rather on the relation between these efforts of adaptation (including also personal career goals) and the main goal of the post-Tridentine missionarism, namely to strengthen the Catholic Church authority over its believers and maintaining the purity of the Catholic faith and rituals.

The key concepts that we are going to use to build our argument are *confessionalization* (with its corollary *confessional identity*), *social disciplining* and *popular religion*. These concepts provide the necessary theoretical and methodological framework for our study, being useful to create an interpretative scheme applicable to the missionary sources that we shall address, scheme that was never applied until now in the relevant scholarly literature concerning the Catholic missionarism in Moldavia.⁴ Before proceeding to the core of our study, a brief critical presentation of the above mentioned concepts is by all means useful for a better understanding of their explanatory possibilities and limitations.

Confessionalization, social disciplining, popular religion

The *confessionalization theory* was elaborated for the first time by the German scholars Heinz Schilling and Wolfgang Reinhard in the late 1970s and early 1980s to describe the complex processes that led

to the modern state and society in the German Empire.⁵ Schilling⁶ and Reinhard⁷ defined confessionalization as a structuring process of the confessional identities both *inwardly* (through the significant increase of the “confessional cohesion” within the communities) and *outwardly* (through the clear delimitation of the religious, cultural and social frontiers between various confessional communities). The new confessional churches⁸ (or “confessions”) created after Reformation tended to become political and cultural systems well defined in doctrine, spiritual life, rites and “popular culture”.

Confessionalization addresses four levels of description: *social*, *cultural*, *religious* and *political*. The *social* level includes the “Christianization” of the daily life,⁹ the refashioning of the social behavior according to the divine commandments, the strict regulation of the social assistance. The *cultural* level is represented mainly by the efforts carried to eradicate the so called “superstitions” and “abuses” and to strictly control the cultural products and manifestations (such as carnivals, feasts, etc.). On the *religious* level, confessionalization meant also the reinforcement of the clerical discipline along with the doctrinal clarification and “purification” of the rituals. The *political* level brings into discussion the existence of an alliance between the State and Church resulting in a top-down action of social disciplining over the communities and individuals.

On the historical time scale, confessionalization is generally placed between the second half of the 16th century and the beginning of the 18th century, although the scholars in the field are far from consensus concerning its periodization.¹⁰ Regarding the geographical and political area where the concept was and can be applied, most scholars agree that outside Catholic and Protestant European states there can be no discussion on confessionalization.¹¹

Social disciplining was introduced in the scholarly literature in the 1960s by the German sociologist Gerhard Oestreich, who used it as a substitute for absolutism, a concept whose theoretical limitations were put into light by the totalitarian regimes of the 20th century.¹² To Oestreich, the construction of the confessional identities and the consolidation of the ecclesiastic discipline within the “confessional churches” contributed to the “rationalization” of the state authority through the inculcation of the disciplined social behaviors. Following this argument, both Schilling¹³ and Reinhard considered that social disciplining cannot be separated from the confessionalization process, ensuring the consolidation of the confessional conformity. In other words, the confessional churches controlled their

faithful through social disciplining, leading to their slow transformation into obedient subjects of the state authority.

The limitations and weaknesses of confessionalization and social disciplining as explanatory concepts for a theory of state modernization were already put into light by various scholars since the 1990s. The most important criticism pointed out that the concept paradoxically misses the main stake, namely the understanding of the religious practices themselves.¹⁴ Another important criticism addressed the overemphasizing of the top-down perspective accused of neglecting the active participation of the subjects in their own confessionalization – what was called by Ronnie Po-Chia Hsia „horizontal disciplining” or self-disciplining.¹⁵ The interconnection between confessionalization and social disciplining was also criticized, Heinrich Richard Schmidt considering that it greatly limited the theoretical value of the former, while Po-Chia Hsia regarded the importance of social disciplining as modernizing factor overestimated.¹⁶

In relation with the Catholic Reformation, the applicability of the concept of confessionalization gave room to some necessary amendments. Heinz Schilling underlines the differences between Catholicism and Protestantism concerning mechanisms of social disciplining: while the Catholic ecclesiastic discipline is highly interiorized (its main vehicle being the individual confession), in the case of Protestants it is applied in public, at the community level.¹⁷ Moreover, Tridentine Catholicism promoted some principles that contradict the confessionalization paradigm such as the clear cut separation between the sacred and secular spheres (including the jurisdiction and penalties), the autonomy of the clergy, the transnational perspective (see the missionary policy of the Congregation “*De Propaganda Fide*”), the continuity with the “traditional” pre-Reformation Catholicism (even at the level of the so-called “popular piety”).¹⁸

Marc Forster’s well known study on the bishopric of Speyer ends with the conclusion that the traditional Catholicism was actually enforced during the Counter-Reformation whose most important result was the strengthening of the Catholic identity towards the non-Catholic confessions.¹⁹ Forster openly criticized the confessionalization approach as he clearly stated that in the diocese of Speyer there was no sign of a significant social disciplining policy during 16th – 18th centuries (except the activity of the Jesuits). According to him, the success of Catholic Reformation can be measured not regarding the level of “reformation” of the pre-Tridentine Catholicism, but taking into consideration the level of devotion manifested by the faithful – and this devotion seems to have been

preserved by maintaining many “traditional” religious practices through a flexible and adaptive policy of the local bishops. In this evolution, the state authority did not played practically any role.

Po-Chia Hsia nuanced Forster’s conclusions by stating that what happened in the Catholic villages from Speyer until 1720 was a long process of “horizontal disciplining”, complementary to the social disciplining exerted by the state and public authorities.²⁰ For Po-Chia Hsia, the Catholic confessionalization cannot be separated from social disciplining and this connection can be documented all over the Catholic Europe. However, there is a significant limitation of Catholic social discipline which derives from the way sin was defined and from the practice of individual confession and penitence. Unlike in the case of Protestant churches, many sins could not be converted in penal crimes punishable by the State and sometimes even not by the Church itself.

While the confessionalization was put under criticism regarding its applicability as an explanatory concept of Catholic Reformation, social disciplining was questioned regarding also its roots, which were placed earlier than the Confessional Age. Starting from Norbert Elias’ famous essay on civilizing process, some scholars stated that the strict monastic *regula* from Middle Ages became models of regulating the community life in towns especially through the influential *Devotio Moderna*.²¹ Other opinions linked the concept to the communal movement in some German cities in the 15th century, which aimed to protect and safeguard the so called *bonus communis* through strict regulations and observance of the public behavior.²² Confessionalization was therefore regarded only as a factor that gave a new impetus to a process already under way.

Unlike in the case of the two concepts discussed above, we will not insist on the concept of *popular religion* as its area of meaning is much wider and rather controversial, and also it overlooks the limits of our study.²³ We’ll confine to underline the fact that popular religion will be discussed only as an object of the missionary confessional discourse which defines it as a mixture of Catholic devotional practices and “superstitions”, “abuses”, “contaminations” from other confessions (Protestantism or Orthodoxy) which have to be removed. The particular interest shown towards “popular religion” by the Catholic Church seems to increase significantly during 18th century and, to Marc Venard, this happens especially due to the fact that the process of Christianization in Western Europe reached its peak and the Tridentine institutions such as seminaries, catechizations or “popular” missions fully produced their effects.²⁴

Objectives. Sources

Given these considerations, the present article will try to answer the following questions: Is it possible to apply the confessionalization paradigm in the case of the Catholic missionaryism in 18th century Moldavia? If yes, did it create real confessional frontiers in relation with the Orthodox majority? What is the importance of the social disciplining in the missionary sources? Which are the features of the missionary discourse referring to the “popular religion”? Can we consider this discourse as “confessional”?

In order to answer these questions, we need to analyze the available missionary sources referring to 18th century Moldavia applying an interpretative scheme able to put into light the features of a confessional discourse. Although there are several editions comprising documents issued by the Catholic missionaries from Moldavia (including the Jesuits),²⁵ we identified for the 18th century many unpublished sources especially in the “Vatican” Microfilm Collection at the National Archives of Romania²⁶ (some of them being only mentioned in the recent relevant scholarly literature). It was mandatory for the superiors of the Catholic missionaries in Moldavia to exchange regular correspondence with SCPF.²⁷ This correspondence (consisting mainly of letters and annual and/or multi-annual reports)²⁸ is not only the main source on the history and evolution of the early modern Catholic communities in Moldavia, but it is also one of the richest sources of information on Moldavian society in general.

Most important of all this rich correspondence were the annual reports (*relazioni*) meant primarily to provide information on the Catholic communities in Moldavia, the ecclesiastical structure and functioning of the diocese of Bacău (which was the sole Catholic diocese in Moldavia from 1607 until 1880), the situation of the local churches and parishes and the economic status of the missionaries in the region. In addition to this “core” information, several reports also include details concerning the geography of the country, the general economic conditions, the state organization and administration, the society (daily life, social relations), and, last but not least, religious beliefs and practices shared not only by the Catholics but also by the Orthodox. This “contextual” information was required by SCPF in order to be able to adopt decisions as accurate as possible.

The amount of sources produced by Catholic communities and individuals from Moldavia that we identified is far too small in order to allow a comparison with those produced by the missionaries.²⁹

There are also very few documents issued by the state authorities and we did not identify any document issued by the Orthodox authorities regarding the Catholic clergy or communities for the period. Given the lack of non-missionary sources for Moldavia, we decided to include for comparative purposes documents issued in other areas with similar “confessional” features, such as the Balkans or the Near-East, territories being under Ottoman rule and dominated by an Orthodox majority. Last but not least, the “normative” sources with general applicability – papal constitutions and the decrees and instructions issued by SCPF and other congregations (e.g. Saint Office) cannot miss from our argumentation.

The Catholic missions in Moldavia – a short overview

In 1623, SCPF established the first new mission under its direct control in the principality of Moldavia. This mission was directed at that time by the Franciscan Andrea Bogoslavić, who bore the title of *commissarius missionis*. The Moldavian mission was placed under the supervision of the patriarchal vicar of Constantinople, who also bore the title of *praefectus* of the Moldavian and Walachian missions. The vicar appointed a vice-prefect who was formally obliged to reside there and to regulate the activity of the resident missionaries. After 1650, when the Franciscan Bonaventura da Campofranco was appointed by the cardinals of the Congregation as prefect of the apostolic missions in Walachia and Moldavia (and also provincial of the Franciscan missions in Transylvania), the control of the Constantinopolitan vicariate ceased and the missionaries in Moldavia and Wallachia came under the direct rule of Rome until the 19th century.³⁰

In the course of its evolution through the 17th and 18th centuries, the Moldavian mission was represented by a relatively small group (ranging from 1-2 up to 10-12) of Franciscan Conventual³¹ monks, mostly Italians, but also Polish, Hungarians and Germans, led by a mission prefect appointed by SCPF, who had the obligation to supervise them, to decide over their territorial distribution in the parishes, to maintain the connection with SCPF and to ensure good relations with the Moldavian authorities. These missionaries lived scattered in a few Catholic communities³² where every of them had to perform the usual tasks of a parish priest as well as catechizing the local population as part of their missionary duties. According to the Treaty of Karlowitz (1699), the Catholic missions of Moldavia were put under the protection of Poland, who also had the

right to propose the candidate for the bishopric of Bacău.³³ The secular and religious Orthodox authorities generally tolerated their activity and caused no significant hindrances as they considered the Catholic Church having a similar juridical status as the Orthodox Church.³⁴ However, the missionaries were not permitted, under severe penalties, to proselytize the Orthodox population.

The confessional discourse of the missionaries

Our study will focus on the confessional aspect of missionary discourse as it appears in their letters and reports sent to the Propaganda Fide. The analysis will address the following issues as they can be traced in the sources: **a)** the “contamination” of Catholicism with “superstitious” practices (named generally as “abusi”) taken from the Orthodox majority; **b)** the necessity of extirpating these “abusi”, which are seen as the main obstacles for a real purification of religious practices of the Moldavian Catholic faithful – in other words, the necessity of determining the Catholics to abandon the practices of the Orthodox; **c)** the problem of conversion of Catholics to Orthodoxy and vice-versa (problem of the mixed marriages will be treated subsequently).

When speaking about a confessional discourse, one should think first at those elements that pertain to the concepts of confessional identity and confessional frontiers (usually not very clear and easily traceable, but definitely necessary to preserve the identities). Therefore, in order to purify and to delimitate the Catholic confession in relation with other confessions and religions, the missionaries need to make efforts to eliminate or transform every belief and practice of the Catholic communities and individuals susceptible of not being in accordance with the Tridentine principles and rules. All these beliefs and practices are generally called “superstitions”, “abuses” or even “paganism”, terms that are quite usual in Western Europe as cultural references regarding the so called “popular religion”. The missionaries from Moldavia do not make exception and we may quote here several examples. However, we’ll not just simply enumerate these examples but make a sort of classification according to the context in which they are used.

In many cases, the missionaries refer to these “superstitions” as taken directly from the Orthodox majority. In his report sent to SCPF in 1745,³⁵ the vice-prefect Giovanni Maria Ausilia affirmed without hesitation that

all the “witchcrafts” practiced by the Catholics were “borrowed” from the Orthodox. Among these “witchcrafts”, Ausilia enumerated spells against the evil spirits, spells for binding and unbinding curses, belief in dreams, rituals for protecting the house and family,³⁶ for ensuring the prosperity,³⁷ funerary rituals,³⁸ etc.

The missionary Giovanni Bartolomeo Frontali in his richly detailed report from 1764³⁹ realized a veritable inventory of all “abuses” practiced by the Moldavian Catholics “per la corrispondentia che anno con li Scismatici”. Frontali categorized all these „abuses” according to the sacraments they related to. Thus, regarding *baptism*, Frontali pointed out the practice of postponing it for several months due to the belief that this will ensure a more rapid growth of the child; also, Frontali referred to the practice of appointing Orthodox as godparents. In relation to the *Eucharist*, Frontali mentioned the fact that many Catholics required their children to be administered it earlier than the age of 12, following the Orthodox practice which concentrated the baptism, the administration of the Eucharist and the anointing in a single ceremony. Concerning the practice of *confession*, most Catholics used to confess only three times per year (Easter, Christmas and the feast of the patron saint) like the Orthodox, but many of them came to church even more rarely.⁴⁰ Regarding the *final anointing* of the ill people, Frontali noted that many Catholics refused it as they thought that this will cause death (in other cases, they asked for anointing when they wanted to die more quickly). As for the *marriages*, the missionary recorded the practice of punishing the brides that proved to be not virgin before marrying and to force their parents to pay compensations to the groom’s family. Concerning the *funerary rites*, besides those already signaled by Ausilia, Frontali mentioned the habit of sacrificing a domestic animal over the burial place or pouring wine in order that the deceased not to suffer from thirst. Moreover, the dance around the fire practiced by girls and boys in the court of the deceased was particularly refuted by the missionary as pure „paganism”. Frontali criticized also the way in which excommunication was understood as stopping the normal process of body decaying and the missionaries were often asked by many Catholics who discovered their dead relatives non decayed to relieve the excommunication.⁴¹

In very few cases, the missionaries only enumerated and described these “superstitions”, without making reference to the Orthodox influence. Prefect Giovanni Francesco Bossi complained in 1725 about the many superstitions, deeply rooted in the souls of the Catholics, which destroyed their faith, for

example making them appealing to some “enchantresses” instead of praying to God, Jesus Christ and the Holy Virgin. In other cases, the issue is used as argument for criticizing the fellow missionaries’ or even prefect’s activity. In 1794, Angelo Cantone accused prefect Fedele Rocchi as he

non cura di levare gli abusi nelle parrocchie, come con gran fatica l’oratore [Cantone himself] sradicò in Huss in 1794. L’inveteratto abuso di visitare la sposa nella prima notte con festa pubblica, se ha dato segno di virginità, e portare poi la camigia in trionfo di allegrezza, e se per disgrazia non fosse stata vergine nascessano dissenzioni, liti (...) in publico (...).⁴²

In a letter from November 8th, 1799⁴³ the missionary Michele Sassano accused the new appointed prefect Vincenzo Gatt of allowing the old “abuses” and “paganisms”, previously removed by earlier missions, to flourish again among the Catholics:

gl’abusi e residui di gentilismo, estinti già dalla cura e viggilanza dei zelantissimi predecessori, come sono i conviti dopo d’aver sepoliti i morti volgarmente detti *commendar*;⁴⁴ le fiere ed i mercati nelle sacre delle chiese dette *bolgi*,⁴⁵ nelle quali si commettono dei più enormi peccati con scandalo degl’istessi Greci.

Finally, the superstitions are also mentioned in some of the circular letters issued by the prefects especially in the second half of the 18th century. Such an example is the letter from 1778 issued by prefect Giuseppe Martinotti where the use of candles during wedding and funeral celebrations and also the funeral feasts were strictly forbidden.⁴⁶

What is to be noticed here is the fact that, although, the practices themselves are described in a very similar manner with those identified and condemned in the case of Catholic faithful from Western Europe, the missionaries made a change in argumentation opting for an *outward explanation*, i.e., the influence of the “Greek” confession instead of an *inward causality* (ignorance, lack of spiritual assistance, lack of proper catechization). The problem of *ignorance* is not totally dismissed: the missionaries tried to explain to the SCPF that this is the main cause of the *persistence* of the “superstitions” as it makes the Catholics an “easy prey” for the Orthodox religious contamination.⁴⁷ This approach is not new as Bernard Heyberger pointed out for the Catholic communities living near Orthodox and Muslims in the Near East:⁴⁸ the Franciscan, Carmelitan or

Jesuit missionaries in this region used the same arguments to underline the wide spread usage of “abusive” religious practices. Heyberger explains this type of argumentation as being a justifying discourse meant to underline the merits of the missionaries and the obstacles they had to overrun.⁴⁹

Missionaries refer to the superstitions also when trying to emphasize the efficiency of their catechizations over their flock. An anonymous draft produced at the secretariat of SCPF summarizes three letters sent to Rome in May 3rd, September 4th and October 18th, 1724 by mission prefect Bossi, in which the latter asked repeatedly for the due annual subsidies. Bossi’s argument was cited as following:

Oltre di ciò riferisce i vantaggi spirituali che va riportando dalli fatiche de’ suoi missionari e consistono nell’aver già estirpati varj abusi tanto nei sacerdoti come nei secolari.⁵⁰

In 1777, prefect Francescantonio Minotto, refuting the accusations brought by some fellow missionaries against him, underlined his efforts in preventing the Catholics from taking part in Orthodox feasts and rituals and even from using the wooden boards instead of bells:

Chi ancor per questa casa fui criticato, dicendomi che io voglio fare cose che mai in Moldavia praticate, cose patimenti posi tutta la mia attenzione nel fare che i Cattolici ne suoi ancora divertimenti non si uniscono con li Moldovani. Chi procuro da fare casa per abitazione de missionari, chiese e campane col sbandire loro d’una tavola, che sensiva per campana quando la baterana ab’usanza de Moldovani, se non io?⁵¹

A similar language is used also in sources that do not come from missionary milieu such as the letter sent to SCPF by the bishop of Transylvania, Ignác Batthyány, in October 1st, 1787, regarding the replacement of Italian missionaries with Hungarian ones:

Ruditatem e vestigio excipit superstitionum confertus numerus quem auget Schismaticorum contubernium qui superstitionibus ultra omnem modum dediti sunt.⁵²

Even lay people that were involved in the missionary activity in Moldavia use a similar language. Countess Agnes Kalnoki Ferrati, in her letter sent in 1740, praised the activity of missionary Giacinto Lisa in Moldavia just before his nomination as prefect:

richiamando molti traviati e dispersi da quella scismatica gente al retto sentiere del Cattolico gregge, soccorendoli, istruendoli, e confirmandoli nell'osservanza della legge da vero pastore ed'imitatore degl'Apostoli con levare molti abusi e superstizioni che per il continuo commercio de' Tartari, Turchi e Scismatici appresi aveano.⁵³

Although rarely, theological issues were also used from a confessional perspective. In 1745, vice-prefect Ausilia commented on the belief, widely spread among Catholics, according to which redemption could be granted by God to every Christian no matter his/her confession ("secondo la sua legge"), including here also the Orthodox, in contradiction with the Tridentine principle "Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus". Ausilia bitterly criticized also the interpretation – identified as an "Orthodox error" – that gave full credit to the external rituals (such as Lent) as having sufficient value for ensuring the redemption of the faithful. The Moldavian Catholics believed – as Ausilia noted – that only God knew how to discern the good deeds from the bad ones and they mistrusted the missionaries' spiritual competences as they could not have access to God's own intentions.⁵⁴

The confessional features of the missionary letters are potentiated when the necessity of preserving the Catholic faith within the Orthodox majority is particularly stressed. In 1764, Giovanni Frontali noted that there was no without importance the effort of the missionaries "to preserve our Catholics" in Moldavia dominated by the "false Greek faith".⁵⁵ In his report sent to SCPF in March 25th, 1799, prefect Michele Sassano praised his missionaries' efforts in Moldavia:

I Missionari oltre gl'in'umerabili beni che prestano alla salute delle anime, conservano i Cattolici in mezzo ad una nazione perversa nella vera religione.⁵⁶

Sometimes, the merits of the missionaries are engrossed only by underlining the fact that they perform all their duties correspondingly. Prefect Bossi informed SCPF about the progress of the Latin rite Catholicism in Moldavia in 1743 due to his own efforts in organizing public prayers, processions, more catechization sessions, etc.⁵⁷ In 1791, prefect Fedele Rocchi depicted a similar situation:

Il Battisterio fù introdotto in tutte le chiese di Moldavia, e come in Roma istessa, vi è il culto della propria Religione, così regna in Moldavia; noi abbiamo campane in tutte le chiese, pubblicamente si fanno tutte le funzioni,

si erigge Croce e si canta anche qui nelle strade pubbliche, ad alta voce, in tempo di devozioni e si sepoliscono morti.⁵⁸

What is important for us concerning these positive accounts is that the missionaries clearly stressed the confessional pattern of their activities in Moldavia, i.e. the conformity of the practices to the Tridentine principles as in Rome itself.

The preservation of the Catholic faith consisted also in the interdiction of any *communicatio in divinis* with any other Christian confession.⁵⁹ In his report from 1762, prefect Giovanni Hrisostomo dei Giovanni mentioned at the point #34 that the Catholics “do not interfere with the Orthodox”, referring to the religious practices.⁶⁰ Michele Sassano pointed out in 1799 that the interdiction was fully respected in Moldavia:

“I Cattolici non comunicano active, ma passive solamente, perchè essendo questi [i.e. the Orthodox] Dominanti non ci è lecito scacciarli dalle nostre chiese; in Divinis però in nessuna maniera comunicano.”⁶¹

One of the main objectives of the missionary activity carried by SCPF was the conversion of the “heretics” and “schismatics” to Catholicism in order to recompose the lost unity of the *Repubblica Christiana*. In the case of the territories under the Ottoman rule (including here Moldavia), this objective was concealed due to obvious political and practical reasons. However, in the missionary sources available for the 18th century. Moldavia, there are some glimpses of this unspoken utopian plan, and a less diplomatic Franciscan like Giovanni Ausilia could even recall the possibility of convincing the sultan to issue a decree allowing the freedom of conversions to Catholicism in his empire, thus forcing also the Orthodox authorities from Moldavia to adopt a similar attitude⁶². Conversions of the Orthodox were almost impossible, due to the strict interdiction applicable under very severe penalties⁶³. The only legal possibility was the re-conversion of the Catholic apostates that had been converted to Orthodoxy.⁶⁴

Actually, many missionaries were aware of the fact that a real danger in Moldavia was not the impossibility of converting any Orthodox faithful, but the very possibility of losing many Catholics through conversions to Orthodoxy. The former prefect Felix Zauli gave word to older fears when he wrote in 1716 that “essere in queste parti [Moldavia] non pochi Cattolici inclinati alla schisma”.⁶⁵ This “inclination” was manifested due to the fact that, according to Bossi, many Catholics used the religious

assistance provided by Orthodox priests,⁶⁶ especially because of the lack of sufficient Catholic sacerdotes.

On the other hand, bishop Stanislas Jezierski, *ordinarius* of the diocese of Bacău, accused also the “negligence” of the missionaries in performing their duties (especially catechization): “Catholici sunt devotissimi sed ob defectum sacerdotum et negligentiam missionariorum non omnes bene instructi.”⁶⁷ The same “negligence” of the missionaries regarding catechization was recalled also by the Polish Jesuit from Iași, Jan Regarski, who accused them of being the main cause for the ignorance of the Catholics in matters of faith, that made them vulnerable to conversion:

Catholici sunt hic rudissimi, non mysteria Fidei, non praecepta Dei, non orationem Dominicam, aliasque preces callent, signum crucis vix norunt efformare, ob christianae doctrinae defectum. Unde fit, quod Catholicum fidem facile deserant, erroresque Schismaticorum quavis de causa amplectantur.⁶⁸

Even some missionaries used this kind of accusations against their fellows, such as Francantonio Minotto who blamed prefect Martinotti in 1779 for poor administration of the mission, resulting in many conversions of the Catholics.⁶⁹ Failing the main task of a missionary, that is the preservation of his flock within the Roman Catholic Church, was a serious accusation which, due to its gravity, was rarely used, as much as there was not only an individual but a collective responsibility.

Another cause of the conversions of Catholics to Orthodoxy was represented by the mixed marriages. According to some missionaries, in these cases the conversions were very difficult to prevent, especially regarding the situation of the women. In 1745, vice-prefect Ausilia complained that during the habitual reunions and dances held in villages (rom. *șezători, hore*), where took part Catholics and Orthodox altogether, Catholic girls were often taken by Orthodox young boys and accepted to convert to Orthodoxy in order to marry them⁷⁰. In 1764, Frontali noted that the missionaries needed to be very careful at the mixed marriages as the Catholic women usually adopted the religion of their Orthodox husbands.⁷¹ Prefect Rocchi, replying to the accusations of Jesuits regarding the negligence of the missionaries in catechizing their flock, underlined that there were only few cases of conversions of Catholics, namely the case of the girls married with Orthodox.⁷² In fewer cases nevertheless, mixed marriages could result in the conversion of one of the partners to Catholicism.⁷³

Taking into account these realities, the ordinance no. 4 issued by bishop of Bacău, Stanislas Jezierski, in August 31st, 1741 instructed the missionaries and the parish clergy to handle very carefully the mixed marriages between Catholics and Orthodox and, in any case, they had to prevent the conversion of the Catholic partner.⁷⁴

Apart from the mixed marriages, the missionaries from Moldavia complained in their letters sent to SCPF about the wide spread practice of concubinage, with significant occurrence especially in Iași, where many foreign Catholics lived.⁷⁵ In 1799, prefect Michele Sassano even accused them of bigamy, asserting that most of them came to Iași due to the more “liberal” perspective of the Orthodox Church regarding divorce and marriage.⁷⁶ In 1787, prefect Rocchi noted with bitterness what he considered to be an outrageous situation:

Riguardo ai Luterani mescolati con Cattolici mi regolarò come mi viene prescritto; ma mi crepa il cuore nel vedere Cattolici tenere preso di se Luterane, e viceversa senza essere congiunti, vivendo in un continuo concubinato, e con pompa e trionfo portano i loro figli alla chiesa cattolica per battezzarli.⁷⁷

The confessionalization and social disciplining

As we have already discussed in the theoretical preamble, the social disciplining is intricately linked with the confessionalization and the missionary sources concerning the Moldavian Catholicism make no exception. When speaking about their efforts in restoring and preserving the purity of the Catholic faith, the missionaries cannot miss to mention the methods they use to ensure the efficiency of their actions.

Consequently, we shall discuss the way the social disciplining is reflected in the letters of the missionaries from Moldavia addressing the following issues: **a)** the capacity of the missionaries in monitoring and punishing the disobedient faithful (including also the implication of the secular authorities); **b)** the forms of the social disciplining and their frequency, and **c)** the degree of resistance of the Catholics towards the missionary social disciplining.

To maximize the dimension of their missionary work, the Italian Minorites from Moldavia tended to complain about the many obstacles that hampered an efficient exertion of the ecclesiastic authority over their

flock. One of these obstacles, often invoked to explain the low capacity of the Catholic mission in controlling the faithful, was the general attitude of reluctance of the Moldavian Catholics towards any form of ecclesiastic authority. This was explained as being caused by either the absence or irregular exercise of the Church authority. The prefect Giovanni Bossi claimed in 1726 that, although he performed several visitations in the parishes, their results were quite modest: “*mà tutto non si è potuto ottenere da questo popolo, parte impedito dalla miseria grande, e parte distolto dal ben operare dalla mala autorità*”.⁷⁸ In another letter from that year, Bossi noted that this attitude of the Catholics made them perceiving his admonitions as being unusually rough (“*e duro li pare ogni mio sermone*”).⁷⁹

In other cases, the „undisciplined” nature of the Moldavian Catholics is invoked to explain some particular situations. In 1779, when the missionaries Bartolomeo Montaldi, Giuseppe Borioli and Francantonio Minotto accused prefect Giuseppe Martinotti of being a poor administrator of the mission, this caused the loss of credibility of the missionaries themselves in front of their parishioners inasmuch that they dared to threaten their own priests saying that “*se non gli piace il loro padre lo battino e lo discaccino pure dalla parochia*”.⁸⁰ In 1795, prefect Rocchi labelled the Catholic Szekler immigrants from the villages of Grozești and Trotuș (Southeastern Moldavia) as “*impertinenti e disubbidienti*” in response to their complaints about the Hungarian speaking missionary István Bialis accused to be “*tropo rigoroso*”.⁸¹

In the second half of the 18th century, we could notice the tendency of the missionary sources to describe a more obedient Catholic who respected the ecclesiastic authority. We have already seen the positive reports concerning the missionaries’ success in maintaining and strengthening the confessional conformity of their flock. In 1762, prefect Hrisostomo dei Giovanni noted at the point #69 from the usual standard questionnaire that the customs of the Moldavian Catholics resembled to those of the Catholics from Italy, thus being unnecessary any method of correction. Describing the Catholic community of Fărăoani – the greatest and richest at that time in Moldavia –, the prefect remarked the obedient and respectful attitude of the people, who came to ask for spiritual assistance and advice every day during his 10 day visit in the parish.⁸² According to Hrisostomo, the Catholics from Fărăoani were not an exception: all the parishes (except Iași, where most Catholics were foreigners) paid the due obedience to their ministers.

This is not, however, the usual way in explaining the success in turning the Catholics into submissive subjects. Some missionaries actually insist on their own role as active agents of social disciplining. We have already discussed prefect Mauro's letter from 1777 regarding the social function of the Catholic clergy. In 1716, the former prefect Felix Zauli urged SCPF to appoint him as apostolic visitor in Moldavia in order to re-establish the authority of the Church, warning that without this authority "accompagnata con ammonizioni caritative possa succedere anche peggio".⁸³ Prefect Bossi convinced SCPF to adopt his system of Easter tickets, a method considered to be successful in determining the Catholics to go to confession on a regular basis.⁸⁴ In 1785, prefect Fedele Rocchi presented his actions for enforcing the degree of obedience of the Catholic faithful to the commandments of the Church especially in cases of sexual morality:

e per porre fine a tanti scandali e inconvenienti che quotidianamente succedono ne' nostri villaggi cattolici, stante le veglie notturne praticate dalla nostra sfrenata gioventù (...). Nella passata visita ho avuto molti giudizi, essendosi presentate varie ragazze col parto nelle braccia senza potersi scuoprire il delinquente; nonostante sono stati da me condannati li stimati, ed accusati colpevoli e convinti colla pena della ... secondo le leggi e norma del Paese [...] Cio che riguarda poi il servizio di Dio, si sono in parte emendati gl'abusi e negligenze.⁸⁵

In 1790, the same Rocchi imposed a pecuniary fine to all Catholics living in the Valley of Siret who did not come to be anointed.⁸⁶

There is also mentioned the practice of *circular letters* issued by mission prefects and directed to their flock (sometimes also to the missionaries and the parish priests), a widely spread instrument for social disciplining in the 18th century Western Europe. These circular letters contained various admonitions, interdictions and counsels regarding the proper way to conduct a religious life according to the Catholic doctrine. In 1778, the already mentioned letter issued by prefect Mauro included some restrictions and interdictions for the Moldavian Catholics such as the interdiction of using the see-saw (labeled as "perniciosa animae et corpori machina"), the interdiction of participating in communal reunions ("șezători") or the interdiction of consuming dairies during the Lent to avoid offending the Orthodox.⁸⁷

In 1782, the same Mauro mentioned that the publication of the papal constitution issued by Clement XIV concerning the suppression of certain feasts common with the Orthodox need to be published and distributed in Moldavia in order that the Catholic calendar would not be mixed up anymore with the Orthodox one.

As we have seen in the discussion regarding the superstitions, one of the social practices that represented a preferred target of the missionaries' criticism was the participation of the Catholics in public fairs ("bâlciori") organized by each parish with the occasion of the feast of the patron saint. Considered to be an Orthodox custom and often counted by missionaries among the "abusi", these fairs were not something wrong by themselves, but they had a negative effect for the Catholic faithful as they offered plenty of room for sinful manifestations (i.e., drinking, cursing, debauchery etc.).⁸⁸ The missionaries tried firstly to forbid them, but being opposed by the resistance of many Catholics, they had to allow them, but only for the communities having a parish church and under the strict supervision of the deacon, who had the task to detect and suppress any trace of "wrong" behavior among the participants.⁸⁹ We have here a clear example of a social disciplining strategy aimed at controlling the public morality of the Catholic villagers.

The function of the deacon as supervisor of the public morality in the Catholic communities is not singular. In 1820 the apostolic visitor Giovanni Paroni mentioned the fact that, before its interdiction by bishop Karwosiecki in 1779, the "old people" of the Catholic villages used a beating instrument for publicly punish those who were guilty of immoral acts, no matter if they were men or women. This instrument was called "tiba" and he was also used by the missionaries, being placed in front of the church, as it was seen also by Paroni himself in 1820.⁹⁰ The "old people" mentioned by Paroni seem to be the same with those called "bătrânii satului", a representative body which led the local community and who seem to have been a support for missionaries' efforts in disciplining their subjects. Later sources mention also the role of the so called "sons of the Church" (rom. "feciori de biserică") who were auxiliaries of the deacons (i.e., cantors), but they could fulfill also administrative (i.e., gathering from each family the due contributions for the deacon and priest) and social disciplining tasks (i.e., monitoring the morality of the villagers), thus helping the priest or the missionary in controlling their flock.⁹¹

Another auxiliary of the missionaries, the so-called *vătaf*, appears in sources at the end of the 18th century as the person who supervised the behavior of the participants at the communal reunions and dances

organized usually in Sundays.⁹² All these functions define a sort of a “disciplinary apparatus”, partly “inherited” (as “traditional” local institutions) and partly built and modified by the missionaries with clear purposes of control and punishment of the deviators.

Still, what was the role of the state in this ongoing process of turning the Catholics into obedient subjects of the ecclesiastic authority? As we have seen in the preamble, confessionalization and social disciplining in Western Europe implied an active role of the secular authorities, with the important specification that they shared the same confession as the “confessionalized” population. Or, in the case of Moldavian Catholics, there is obviously a different situation: the state shared a different confession and this seems to make the theoretical model inapplicable for Moldavia.

Some missionary sources actually speak very clearly and with frustration about the non-implication of the secular power regarding the disciplining of the Catholic subjects. In 1721, prefect Silvestro d’Amelio expressed such a frustration regarding the conversion of a Catholic from Baia to Orthodoxy.⁹³ Brought at the princely court by his former wife (who remained Catholic) with the implication of the Catholic Bartolomeo Ferrati, the apostate was acquitted as the prince declined any jurisdiction concerning ecclesiastic matters. Amelio noted that the princely decision was unjust and, moreover, turned the apostate into a very popular figure, respected by the Orthodox. His exclamation “à che fine à servito puoco che abbiamo studiato?” expresses his powerless state in face of such a situation.

Vice-prefect Giovanni Ausilia complained in 1745 about the fact that the secular power refused to assist the missionaries, invoking the same argument i.e. the limited jurisdiction in ecclesiastic disciplinary cases. Ausilia noted with bitterness that the spiritual punishments had no effect and, if the situation persisted, the authority of the Church would value nothing in the near future for the Moldavian Catholics.⁹⁴ However, this “passive” attitude of the princes was not the expression of an arbitrary discriminatory policy regarding the Catholics, but moreover the expression of the principle of toleration and equal juridical treatment for all confessions.⁹⁵ In the 17th and 18th century there were issued several privileges granting total jurisdiction over the Catholic faithful to the bishop of Bacău and the mission prefect.⁹⁶ Similar privileges were granted also to the Orthodox clergy.⁹⁷

In the second half of the 18th century, the situation seems to have changed significantly – the state authority begun to be much more aware of the importance of social disciplining exerted by the Church. In 1740,

prince Grigore II Ghica, in his letter addressed to the SCPF demanding for the nomination of Manzi as prefect of the Moldavian mission, invoked as argument the principle of “public utility”:

Nos tamen magis considerantes publicam utilitatem atque annuentes subditae nobis unanimes communitati catholicae maxime autem cum nobis constaret (...).⁹⁸

In 1741, prince Constantin Mavrocordat ordered the captain of Dorohoi to investigate the complaint of Manzi, regarding the attempt of forceful conversion to Orthodoxy of a Catholic man from Cotnari, married with an Orthodox woman.⁹⁹ A year later, Mavrocordat sent the governor of Roman county to investigate Manzi’s other complaint regarding the refusal of some Catholics from the village of Răchiteni to pay their due taxes to the prefect; the governor – Mihalache Sturza – was required to take the necessary measures to regulate the debts.¹⁰⁰

In 1782, following the complaints of prefect Mauro, the prince Constantin Moruzi ordered the investigation and punishment of the Catholic cantor from Răchiteni, Gál János, “seminatore delle zizanie”.¹⁰¹ In 1785, prefect Fedele Rocchi mentioned that he got the support of the prince Alexandru II Mavrocordat for punishing the young Catholics guilty of sexual immorality during the communal reunions (“clacă”): “sono ricorso al principe, acciò mi somministra ajuto ad estirpare le suddette veglie”.¹⁰²

A missionary could be used by the princely house even as supervisor like in the case of Giovanni Cajoni, who was appointed in 1765 by the secretary of prince Grigore III Ghica, Pietro Nagni, to oversee the Polish Catholic workers employed at the manufactory of cloth from Chiperești.¹⁰³

The missionaries had also an important role in ensuring the stability of the Catholic communities by providing religious services, promoting obedience to the authorities and, sometimes, by building also a church with the help of the parishioners. The secular authorities and the landowners could collect the due taxes more easily when the parish priests accomplished their role. Prefect Giuseppe Cambioli noted in 1762 that the prince Grigore Callimachi was worried about the fact that the Catholic community from Moghilău (at the Moldavian-Polish border) could dissipate because of the absence of a parish priest: “per mancanza del missionario si destrugge il Paese”.¹⁰⁴ The boyars owning Catholic villages were also interested in maintaining missionaries on their lands:

Questi [the boyars] non vedendo crescere c.e. vorrebbero, ma con loro dispiacere vedendo mancare il numero de' suoi sudditi perche non s'ho possuto provederli di missionario accrescono avversione sopra avversione, e per quanto possono non mancano di far del male a qualsiasi cattolico, che incontrano, non escludendo verono ancor che pò religioso.¹⁰⁵

The social disciplining program, whose features glimpse in the missionary sources, could not be accepted by the local communities without opposition. There are several mentions regarding this in the sources discussed in our study. In 1726, prefect Giovanni Bossi informed SCPF¹⁰⁶ about a case of disobedience from the part of a Catholic, Iacob Karakai, appointed as cantor in an unnamed parish church. This Karakai, who had been imprisoned following accusations of theft, rejected Bossi's admonitions and warnings with the reply "non siamo in Italia", recalling the lack of real coercive authority of the Catholic Church in Moldavia.

In 1781, the missionary Ignazio Trigona from the parish of Săbăoani noted that his fellow, Giuseppe Buriolli, could not convince his parishioners of Răchiteni to replace his servants with others (following prefect Mauro's order).¹⁰⁷ Even when Buriolli decided to "punish" them by leaving the parish for a month and a half, he had to return without any success.

Such deficit of authority, as we have seen, was explained by invoking the lack of support from secular power, as the missionaries themselves did not have real means to control the parishes, except their charisma and, in certain cases, using the local forms of social disciplining.

Another type of opposition was that manifested towards the attempts of the missionaries to put the religious practices of the Moldavian Catholics in accordance with the Roman ritual. In some cases, the missionaries were forced to make compromises. In 1769, prefect Giuseppe Carisi asked for a dispense allowing him to administer the confession and Eucharist on the Sacred Friday before Easter because the Catholics refused to go in other days.¹⁰⁸

Sometimes, the resistances seem to be the result of those actions and initiatives of the missionaries considered as excessive or even abusive. In 1779, the missionaries Montaldi, Buriolli and Minotto accused the prefect Martinotti of stirring the protests of the Catholic villagers by his suspicious attitude and abusive interrogations taken from the women who worked as servants for the missionaries.¹⁰⁹ According to the missionaries, Martinotti determined many Catholics to refuse to obey their authority and some of them even decided to convert to Orthodoxy. The Hungarian missionary, Toma Pozsony, parish

priest at Grozești, was accused in 1792 by the prefect Rocchi of using penalties considered too severe and abusive by the faithful.

Moreover, by the end of the 18th century the introduction of a new system of *iura stola* or ecclesiastic taxes (until then paid only on an irregular basis as voluntary contributions), which was imposed to the Moldavian Catholics by prefect Vincenzo Gatt, caused widespread protests.¹¹⁰ The Catholics from the parishes of Fărăoani, Valea Seacă and Călugăra addressed a collective letter to SCPF in which they complained about the onerous taxes levied by the missionaries, accused of “scandalous” and “immoral” behavior to de-legitimize their financial pretensions. The Catholics urged SCPF to eliminate the new taxes, otherwise they would convert to Orthodoxy: “Rogamus ergo enixe Eminentias Vestras liberare nos miseros a continuis rixis et a multis pecuniis dandis Patribus nobisque dare responsum consolans, aliter multi Catholici excutient jugum, transeundo ad presbiteros non unitos.”¹¹¹ Despite all the complaints, on March 13th, 1801 the representatives of the princely authority, the boyars Constantin Balș (high chancellor of the Low Moldavia) and lordachi Ruset (high treasurer) decided to give justice to prefect Gatt, maintaining the taxes with only some minor reductions. The secular power had decided to enforce the authority of the Catholic Church over its faithful.

Conclusion

The present study proposed in the first place to analyze the confessional features of the missionary discourse practiced in the sources regarding 18th century Moldavia and to compare them with the theoretical model of confessionalization as it was defined by the Western historiography. From this point of view, we think that our analysis succeeded in evidencing the presence of “confessional” themes, such as the necessity of strengthening the confessional identity of the Moldavian Catholics by following as strictly as possible the Tridentine model and by eliminating every practice that bore the influence of other confessions i.e. Orthodoxy. We may also affirm that from this point of view, the evolution of the missionary interest towards confessionalization represents clearly a moment of breach in comparison with the 17th century. If before 1700, the missionaries were more preoccupied by the theological confessional dialogue and polemic with the Orthodox and Protestants, dialogue embedded with utopian ideas of reuniting the divided Christianity, in the next century the missions took

a more “pragmatic” approach, being preoccupied to ensure the purity of the Catholicism. Even more than in the 17th century, the missionaries went to the level of the rural communities and made extensive efforts (or at least they declared that they did it) to “confessionalize” them.

Beyond other theological implications, the 18th century Tridentine Catholicism emphasized the importance of the moral constraints, social discipline, the necessity of abandoning the “barbarous”, “uncivilized” beliefs and rituals¹¹² and makes appeal to the religious baroque sensibility aimed to revitalize the collective ceremonies like processions and pilgrimages. The harsh critique towards the Orthodoxy produced in the 18th century represented the reflex of a cultural axiology nurtured by the Catholic West.¹¹³ The “ignorance” and the “superstitious” practices (“abuses”) became common references in the missionary writings regarding the Orthodox world (especially the territories under Ottoman rule) and the missionaries from Moldavia do not make separate voice as we have seen in the sources analyzed in this study. Therefore, the necessity of tracing clearer areas of demarcation between Catholics and other confessions is more visible in the missionary sources and we’ll quote here only the issue of the community reunions (“șezători”) or the mixed marriages. Moreover, a new target of the Catholic Church in the 18th century, the popular fairs (carnivals or the Moldavian “bâlciuri” etc.) and feasts, provided the opportunity for strenghtening the instruments of social discipline. In Moldavia, we have seen that the missionaries did not succeed in stopping them but, with the help of local disciplining factors, they tried to control and limit the possibilities of “sinful” manifestations.

To conclude, we may consider at this point that the missionary discourse concerning the Catholicism in 18th century Moldavia can be considered a product of the early modern “confessional” age. However, to measure the impact of the missionary confessionalization over the Moldavian communities is much more difficult, as we did not identified sufficient “autonomous” internal sources to control the information provided by the missionaries. To our opinion, such an important task can be better accomplished for the 19th century when the secular power and local authorities begun to interfere more visibly (at the “documentary” level also) with the life of the communities. Nevertheless, as Liviu Pilat had noticed for the parish of Săbăoa,¹¹⁴ the evolutions after 1800 had their origins in the confessionalization of the previous century.

NOTES

- ¹ See Nicolae Iorga, *Studii și documente cu privire la istoria românilor*. Vol. II. *Acte relative la istoria cultului catolic în principate*. Bucharest: Ed. I.V. Socec, 1901, 114-5.
- ² Iorga assumed that the letter was sent to the diplomatic representatives of the Catholic Great Powers in Constantinople, namely France, the Habsburg Empire and Poland.
- ³ See a similar argument in Violeta Barbu, "Purgatorium missionarium. Catolicii în Moldova în a doua jumătate a secolului al XVIII-lea (1753-1817)". In *honorem Ioan Caproșu*, edited by Lucian Leuștean, Maria Magdalena-Szekely, Mihai Răzvan Ungureanu, Iași: Polirom, 2002, 321-352.
- ⁴ For the 17th century, it is worth mentioning the recent contribution of researcher Violeta Barbu, *Purgatoriul misionarilor. Contrareforma în Țările Române în secolul al XVII-lea*, Bucharest: Ed. Academiei, 2008, a massive and important study that applies the concepts *confession* and *social disciplining* as to the missionary activity in both Romanian principalities.
- ⁵ For a recent and extensive presentation of the confessionalization theory see Thomas A. Brady jr. "Confessionalization – the career of a concept". *Confessionalization in Europe 1550-1700: Essays in honor and memory of Bodo Nischan*, edited by John M. Headley, J. Hillerbrand and Anthony M. Papallas, Ashgate: Aldershot, 2004, 1-20.
- ⁶ I will quote here one of Schilling's recent synthesis on confessionalization, "Confessionalisation and the rise of religious and cultural frontiers in Early Modern Europe". *Frontiers of faith. Religious exchange and the constitution of religious identities 1400-1750*, edited by Eszter Andor and István György Tóth, Budapest: Central European University – European Science Foundation, 2001, 21-36.
- ⁷ See Wolfgang Reinhard, "Pressures towards confessionalization? Prolegomena to a theory of the Confessional age". *The German Reformation. The essential readings*, edited by C. Scott Dixon, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1999, 169-192.
- ⁸ While Schilling addressed the case of the Protestant churches in the Empire, Reinhard focused mainly on the Catholic confessionalization (within the frame of Counter-Reformation).
- ⁹ By Christianization of the daily life we understand here the efforts made by the Church in order to ensure the active participation of the believers in the daily religious rituals following the sacred temporal rhythms.
- ¹⁰ There are two main interpretations regarding the temporal extent of the confessionalization (or confessional age): one proposed by Schilling, who placed its limits from 1555 (the Peace of Augsburg) until 1648 (the Treaty from Westphalia) and the other, more widely accepted, which defines two

stages of confessionalization: 1) the “top-down” confessionalization (mid 16th c. – end of 17th c. and 2) the „horizontal” confessionalization (18th c.). The first stage can be described as the era of the confessionalization imposed from above, while the second one refers to its “internalization” by the individuals and communities that were “confessionalized” in the first stage. According to Joel F. Harrington and Helmuth Walser Smith: “historians would not simply narrate the late seventeenth century as the end of the confessional age: rather, they would redirect the focus of their research on confessionalization from a concentration on the questions of state building to a concern with meaning and identity.” – see their study “Confessionalization, Community and State Building in Germany, 1555-1870”. *Journal of Modern History*, no. 69, March 1997, 88-89.

- ¹¹ According to Schilling, the areas dominated by Orthodox Christianity did not experienced any form of confessionalization – see “Confessionalisation and the rise of religious and cultural frontiers”, p. 24.
- ¹² A discussion on Oestreich’s argument in Wolfgang Reinhard, “Disciplinamento sociale, confessionalizzazione, modernizzazione. Un discorso storiografico”. *Disciplina dell’anima, disciplina del corpo e disciplina della società tra medioevo ed età moderna*, edited by Paolo Prodi, Bologna: Il Mulino, 1994, 101-123.
- ¹³ Heinz Schilling, “Chiese confessionali e disciplinamento sociale. Un bilancio provvisorio della ricerca storica”. *Ibid.*, 125-160.
- ¹⁴ See Thomas A. Brady jr. “Confessionalization – the career of a concept”, 16.
- ¹⁵ Ronnie Po-Chia Hsia, “Social discipline and Catholicism in Europe of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries”. *Chiesa cattolica e mondo moderno. Scritti in onore di Paolo Prodi*, edited by Adriano Prosperi, Pierangelo Schiera, Gabriella Zara, Bologna: Il Mulino, 2007, 177.
- ¹⁶ See “The concept of social disciplining and its applicability in current historiographical debate. A discussion initiated by Maria Crăciun”. *Colloquia: Journal of Central European History*, vol. X-XI, 2003-2004, 70-85.
- ¹⁷ Heinz Schilling, “Chiese confessionali e disciplinamento sociale”, 145.
- ¹⁸ Thomas A. Brady jr. “Confessionalization – the career of a concept”, 17.
- ¹⁹ Marc Forster, *The Counter-reformation in the villages: religion and reform in the bishopric of Speyer, 1560-1720*. Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press, 1992, 243-247.
- ²⁰ Ronnie Po-Chia Hsia, “Social discipline and Catholicism in Europe”, 177.
- ²¹ *Ibid.*, 171.
- ²² *Ibid.*
- ²³ For an extensive discussion on the concept, see the collection of studies *La religion populaire: Paris 17-19 Octobre 1977 – Colloques Internationaux du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique*. Paris: Editions du CNRS, 1979.

- 24 Marc Venard, "Popular religion in the eighteenth century". *Church and Society in the Catholic Europe of the Eighteenth Century*, edited by William J. Callahan and David Higgs, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979, 141.
- 25 See for example Nicolae Iorga, *Studii și documente cu privire la istoria românilor*. Vol. II: *Acte relative la istoria cultului catolic în principate*. Bucharest: Ed. I.V. Socec, 1901; Gheorghe Călinescu, "Alcuni missionari cattolici italiani nella Moldavia nei secoli XVII e XVIII". *Diplomatarium Italicum I* (Rome: Libreria di scienze e lettere, 1925), 1-223; *idem*, "Altre notizie sui missionari cattolici nei Paesi Romeni". *Ibid.*, II, 305-514; *Moldvai csángó-magyar okmánytar/Documenta Hungarorum in Moldavia (1467-1706)*, vol. II, edited by Benda Kálmán, Gabriella Jászay, Gyöző Kenéz, István György Tóth, Budapest: Magyarságkutató Intézet/Institutum pro studiis Hungarorum, 1989; *Călători străini despre Țările Române*, vol. IX. Edited by Maria Holban, M. M. Alexandrescu Dersca-Bulgaru, Paul Cernovodeanu, Bucharest: Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, 1997; *Documenta Catholicorum Moldaviae. A. Documente românești. I. Fondul episcopiei romano-catolice Iași*, Vol. I (1627-1750). Edited by Silviu Văcaru and Anton Despinescu, Iași: Editura Presa Bună, 2002; Emil Dumea, *Catolicismul în Moldova în secolul al XVIII-lea*. Iași, Ed. Sapienția, 2003; Anton Coșa, *Catolicii din Moldova în izvoarele Sfântului Scaun (secolele XVII-XVIII)*. Iași: Ed. Sapienția, 2007, 293-558.
- 26 For a description and index of the collection see Rafael-Dorian Chelaru, *Colecția Microfilme Vatican. Ghid arhivistic*, Bucharest: Arhivele Naționale ale României, 2007.
- 27 The Congregation required at least one annual detailed report of the missionary activity, which had to be compiled by the mission prefect. For the correspondence carried by the missionaries from Moldavia, see the article of Teresa Ferro, "The Correspondence between the Italian Catholic missionaries and Fide Propaganda Congregation during the 17th – 18th centuries". *Romanian and Polish Peoples in East-Central Europe (17th-20th Centuries)*, edited by Veniamin Ciobanu, Iași: Ed. Junimea, 2003, 196-212.
- 28 Most of the missionary reports were written in Italian.
- 29 Some of these sources (especially collective letters) are more likely to have been produced either by or with the help of the missionaries.
- 30 For further details on the Moldavian mission, see Petru Tocanel O.F.M., "Laboriosa organizzazione delle missioni in Bulgaria, Moldavia, Valachia e Transilvania". *Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide memoria rerum: 1622-1972*, edited by Josef Metzler, I/2 (Rome: Herder, 1972), 239-273; *idem*, "Assestamento delle missioni in Bulgaria, Valachia, Transilvania e Moldavia," in *ibid.* II/1 (Rome: Herder, 1973), 722-742. The most recent synthesis on the Catholic missions from 18th c. Moldavia was written by Emil Dumea, *Catolicismul în Moldova în secolul al XVIII-lea*. Iași: Ed. Sapienția, 2003.

- ³¹ The Conventuals held an official monopoly over Moldavian missions; even SCPF recognized it. As a general principle, SCPF was reluctant to accept missionaries from various orders within the same missionary territory in order to avoid competition and disputes. The cardinals preferred the lesser disadvantages of keeping a single order within a missionary territory. Sometimes competition was unavoidable, especially due to the Jesuits which were not under the authority of SCPF, but of pope – see the detailed presentation of the conflicts between the Conventuals and the Jesuits in Moldavia in Francisc Páll, “Le controversie tra i Minori conventuali e i Gesuiti nelle missioni di Moldavia (Romania)”. *Diplomatarium Italicum*, IV (Rome: Libreria di scienze e lettere, 1939), 136-357.
- ³² If in 1745, according to vice-prefect Ausilia, the number of the Catholics from Moldavia could be estimated at around 4,000 individuals (in 21 communities), at the end of the century (1799), prefect Michele Sassano counted around 14,000 Catholics living in 9 parishes (each one with several filial churches) – see Emil Dumea, *Catholicismul în Moldova*, 168-170.
- ³³ For the problem of the protectorate see Anton Coșa, *Catolicii din Moldova*, 87-111. In 1731-1732 and 1744-1747, the mission prefects Romualdo Cardi and Francescantonio Manzi tried to obtain the French protectorate over the missions from Moldavia, but with no success – see V. Mihordea, *Contribuție la istoria catolicismului în Moldova în secolul al XVIII-lea. Protecția franceză pentru călugării franciscani*. Vălenii de Munte: Tipografia “Datina românească”, 1934, 1-32.
- ³⁴ For the problem of juridical status of the Catholic clergy in Moldavia see Emil Dumea, *Catholicismul în Moldova*, 232-241; Violeta Barbu, “Dreptul de protectorat al puterii seculare asupra misiunilor și comunităților catolice din Țările române în secolul al XVII-lea”. *Studii și materiale de istorie medie* XXV (2007), pp. 135-158 (part I) and XXVI (2008), 69-89 (part II); Rafael-Dorian Chelaru, „Contribuții privind statutul juridic al catolicilor din Moldova (sec. XVII-XIX)”. *Buletin Istoric*, nr. 6/2005, 103-116.
- ³⁵ See Ausilia’s report published in original in Gh. Călinescu, “Alcuni misionari”, 183-198.
- ³⁶ Ausilia describes the practice of anointing the doors and windows with crosses made from garlic or animal excrements.
- ³⁷ The vice-prefect mentioned the habit of giving nothing from home on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays.
- ³⁸ It is mentioned the practice of placing a coin into the hand of the dead for paying the custom tax in heaven or the practice of praying for dead through dances and songs similar to those practiced by the Orthodox. Moreover, the dead are buried dressed in their best clothes in order that they will face properly the Last Judgment.
- ³⁹ See Frontali’s report published in original in Gh. Călinescu, “Altre notizie”, 477-485.

- 40 Frontali noted that some Catholics justified their absence from the confessional with the fact that they did not succeed in reconciling their enemies; according to Frontali, actually many Catholics feared that they would be forced to pay their due taxes if they would appear at the church.
- 41 Frontali mentioned that there was a custom to dig out the bodies of the dead every one or two years to check whether the process of decaying went normally.
- 42 Archivio Storico della Sacra Congregazione per l'Evangelizzazione dei Popoli, fond "Scritture riferite nei Congressi della Sacra Congregazione – Fondo di Vienna" (hereinafter APF – Fondo di Vienna), vol. 31, f. 345 apud National Archives of Romania, "Vatican" Microfilm Collection (hereinafter NAR – VMC), reel no. 59, frame 453.
- 43 Archivio Storico della Sacra Congregazione per l'Evangelizzazione dei Popoli, fond "Scritture riferite nei Congressi della Sacra Congregazione – Moldavia" (hereinafter APF - Moldavia), vol. 6, ff. 64-5 apud NAR – VMC, reel no. 30, frame 322.
- 44 Rom. *comândare*, funeral feast.
- 45 Rom. *bâlciuri*, fairs.
- 46 See N. Iorga, *Studii și documente*, 117 – the circular letter was entitled *Modus agendi apostolicum ministerium in Moldavia patribus missionariis per epistolam instructivam exhibitus ab eorum patre praefecto anno 1778*.
- 47 And of course, the Orthodox themselves (especially the priests) are accused of ignorance regarding the theological basis of the faith. An example of such criticism at Ausilia (1745) – Gh. Călinescu, "Alcuni missionari", 191.
- 48 Bernard Heyberger, *Les chrétiens du Proche Orient au temps de la Réforme Catholique (Syrie, Liban, Palestine, XVII-XVIII siècle)*. Rome: Ecole française de Rome, 1994, 139.
- 49 To Heyberger, such arguments were used by the missionaries also in order to promote among the Catholics in the Near East the necessity of adopting the Roman rituals.
- 50 APF – Moldavia, vol. 3, ff. 322-3, apud NAR – VMC, reel 29, frame 212.
- 51 *Ibid.*, vol. 5, f. 163, apud NAR – VMC, reel 30, frame 293.
- 52 APF – Fondo di Vienna, vol. 31, f. 60, apud NAR – VMC, reel 58, frame 311 – see also Marius Diaconescu, „Peter Zöld și «descoperirea» ceangăilor din Moldova în a doua jumătate a secolului al XVIII-lea”. *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie “A. D. Xenopol”*, vol. XXXIX-XL, 2002-2003, 290 (copy identified in an archival fond from Transylvania).
- 53 *Ibid.*, vol. 4, f. 3, apud NAR – VMC, reel 29, frame 260. The letter may have been written in fact by a missionary, the Conventual Francesco Maria Madrelli, who served at that time as private chaplain of the countess, although he was sent by SCPF to activate in Moldavia. The countess praised Lisa as she intended to obtain the approval of SCPF to erect a missionary center on her domain in South-eastern Transylvania – for details see Emil Dumea, *Catolicismul în Moldova*, 98-100.

- 54 See Gh. Călinescu, "Alcuni missionari", 168. In 1783, prefect Antonio Mauro mentioned the same belief as being adopted by the Greek-Catholic immigrants from Transylvania – see his letter in APF – Moldavia, vol. 5, f. 267 apud NAR – VMC, reel 30, frame 284.
- 55 Gh. Călinescu, "Altre notizie", 483.
- 56 Emil Dumea, *Catholicismul în Moldova*, 274.
- 57 Gh. Călinescu, "Alcuni missionari", 172.
- 58 *Ibid.*, 263.
- 59 In May 15th, 1704, the Congregation of the Sacred Office issued a decree that forbade any active participation of the Catholics in either Orthodox or Protestant divine services: "et eorum confessiones [non] audire, nec coram illis emittere, nec iis sacram Eucharistiam conferre". SCPF sent in 1729 an instruction to the missionaries from Orient in which reiterated the interdiction aimed to avoid any contamination with non-Catholic influences: "vix ullus sit ritus apud heterodoxos qui aliquo errore in materia fidei in materia non maculetur."- *Collectanea Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide* (I). Rome: Typographia Polyglotta, 1907, 92, 99-100.
- 60 Gh. Călinescu, "Alcuni missionari", 210.
- 61 Emil Dumea, *Catholicismul în Moldova*, 269.
- 62 See Ausilia's plan entitled *Impedimenti alla Santa Fede. Bisogni e Rimedij* in Gh. Călinescu, "Alcuni missionari", 199-200.
- 63 In 1744, prefect Manzi informed SCPF about the fact that some missionaries suffered persecutions ("travagli, percosse e mali trattamenti") from the Orthodox metropolitan "a cagione di aver convertiti alcuni del suo partito" – see APF – Moldavia, vol. 4, f. 280 apud NAR – VMC, reel 30, frame 304. In 1745, Ausilia noted that if a missionary dared to convert an Orthodox to Catholicism, he would be punished by beating and prison and the apostate would be executed by drowning - Gh. Călinescu, *Alcuni missionari*, 172. Even when bishop Jezierski mentioned in 1742 the apparent more liberal position of prince Constantin Mavrocordat towards this issue, the Catholic prelate was aware of prince's irony when he said to Jezierski: "Ego permitto ut quos vocatis Schismaticos fiant Catholici sed monstrent mihi vestri missionarii si vel unum converterunt et ego monstrabo plures Catholicos qui facti sunt nostrae Religionis et a vobis transierunt" – see APF – Moldavia, vol. 4, f. 131 apud NAR – VMC, reel 30, frame 243.
- 64 In 1743, Manzi noted that he succeeded in re-converting more than 100 apostate Catholics with the support of the prince Mavrocordat – Gh. Călinescu, *Alcuni missionari*, 168.
- 65 APF – Moldavia, vol. 3, f. 264 apud NAR – VMC, reel 29, frame 177.
- 66 *Ibid.*, ff. 365-6 apud NAR – VMC, reel 29, frames 298-9. Bossi mentioned that "onde un male senza riparo sarebbe diffuso per tutta la provincia in discapito di nostra e SS Romana Chiesa".

- 67 APF – Moldavia, vol. 4, f. 131 apud NAR – VMC, reel 30, frame 243 – letter from November 26th, 1742 from Lublin (Poland).
- 68 Francisc Pall, “Le controversie tra i Minori conventuali e i Gesuiti nelle missioni di Moldavia (Romania)”. *Diplomatarium Italicum*, vol. IV, Rome: Libreria di scienze e lettere, 1939, 326.
- 69 APF – Moldavia, vol. 5, f. 194 apud NAR – VMC, reel 30, frame 248.
- 70 Gh. Călinescu, *Alcuni missionari*, 193. Ausilia accused the Orthodox metropolitan, Nicholas the Peloponesian of allowing such practices despite his demands for stopping them.
- 71 Gh. Călinescu, *Altre notizie*, 484. Frontali added that in some cases the missionaries succeeded in convincing the local authorities – i.e. the boyar who owned the village – to annul such marriages. According to Heyberger, the missionaries in the Near East were very careful to prevent any mixed marriage, especially when the woman was Catholic, as she would have been obliged to convert to her husband’s confession (or religion, in the case of Islam), even if SCPF recommended that the mixed marriages being allowed as in the German principalities – Heyberger, 544-5.
- 72 APF – Fondo di Vienna, vol. 31, f. 224 apud NAR – VMC, reel 58, frame 203 – letter from December 18th, 1788.
- 73 In 1782, prefect Mauro related the conversion of a young Orthodox boy, the son of an apostate Catholic, as he prepared to marry a Catholic girl - APF – Moldavia, vol. 5, f. 238 apud NAR – VMC, reel 30, frame 266. Mauro mentioned that he was obliged to move the young couple in the town of Oituz to confirm their marriage, due to the harsh opposition of boy’s family.
- 74 APF – Moldavia, vol. 4, f. 317 apud NAR – VMC, reel 30, frame 331. In fact, some missionaries speak about the possibility of annulling those marriages, which led to the conversion of the Catholic partner, with the help of the state authorities or the local boyars.
- 75 These Catholics were generally Polish, German, French and Austrian residents.
- 76 Emil Dumea, *Catolicismul în Moldova*, 274.
- 77 APF – Fondo di Vienna, vol. 31, ff. 41 apud NAR – VMC, reel 58, frame 390.
- 78 APF – Moldavia, vol. 3, f. 336 apud NAR – VCM, reel 29, frame 381 – letter from March 4th.
- 79 *Ibid.*, f. 343 apud NAR – VCM, reel 29, frame 417 – letter from November 20th.
- 80 APF – Moldavia, vol. 5, f. 195 apud NAR – CMV, reel 30, frame 238.
- 81 Anton Coșa, *Catolicii din Moldova*, 539-540. Rocchi considered Bialis as the best option to keep control over these Szeklers because he was an Hungarian too – “acciò li tenesse in freno”.
- 82 Gh. Călinescu, “Alcuni missionari”, 211.

- 83 APF – Moldavia, vol. 3, f. 264 apud NAR – VMC, reel 29, frame 177.
- 84 Fr. Pall, “Le controversie”, 319-320. The system can be described as such: each Catholic who was administered confession received a small piece of paper with the name of the confessor on it; this paper was then required by the prefect on St. Peter and Paul’s Day (June 29th). Those Catholics who did not have any ticket to show entered under ecclesiastical penalty administered by the prefect.
- 85 APF – Fondo di Vienna, vol. 31, ff. 7-9 apud NAR – VMC, reel 58, frame 112.
- 86 Emil Dumea, *Catholicismul în Moldova*, 172. The anointing was administered by the mission prefect instead of the bishop, who could not come to Moldavia.
- 87 N. Iorga, *Studii și documente*, 116-7. The interdiction of consuming diaries, although not imposed by the Catholic doctrine, can be considered as a method of disciplining aimed at maintaining a good perception of the Catholic religious practices among the Orthodox (who practiced very rigorous alimentary interdictions during Lent).
- 88 We recall here the description of Michele Sassano from 1799: “le fiere ed i mercati nelle sacre delle chiese dette *bolgi*, nelle quali si commettono dei più enormi peccati con scandalo degl’istessi Greci”.
- 89 See Fedele Rocchi’s letter from 1792 in Emil Dumea, *Catholicismul în Moldova*, 217, footnote 147.
- 90 APF – Moldavia, vol. 7, ff. 511-4 apud NAR – VMC, reel 34, frames 513-520: “Mons(igno)r Karvosieski vescovo coadiutore di mons(igno)r Stanislao Raimondi nella visita di questa diocesi fatta da lui nel 1779 [s.a.] proibì un istromento penale detto *tiba* [s.a.], dove il reo serrato nel collo e nelle mani tra due pezzi di legno era ne battuto. Non ostante però io lo vedo avanti la porta grande di tutta la chiesa e si adopera dai P.P. specialmente contro li bestemmiatori rei di peccato di disonestà. Io non ho voluto ordinare l’osservanza di quanto comandò l’anzid(ett)o prelato perchè conosco che dispiacerebbe gli anziani del popolo, che vogliono così tenere in freno li licenziosi e non timorati di Dio.”
- 91 See Liviu Pilat, *Comunități tăcute. Satele din parohia Săbăoani (secolele XVII-XVIII)*. Bacău: Ed. „Dumitru Mărtinaș”, 2002, 192-3.
- 92 *Ibid.*, 199.
- 93 Gh. Călinescu, “Alcuni missionari”, 148-9. According to Amelio, this conversion (performed by adopting the Orthodox monastic habit) was made only to avoid paying the due taxes.
- 94 *Ibid.*, 190.
- 95 See Violeta Barbu, *Dreptul de protectorat (I,II), passim*.
- 96 See Chelaru, “Contribuții”, *passim*.
- 97 See the privilege granted by Nicolae Mavrocordat to the bishop of Huși, Teofil, in 1734 - *Condica lui Constantin Mavrocordat (II)*. Edited by Corneliu Istrati, Iași: Editura Universității “Al. I. Cuza”, 2008, 656-7.

- 98 APF – Moldavia, vol. 4, f. 57 apud NAR – VMC, reel 30, frame 67.
- 99 *Condica lui Constantin Mavrocordat*, II, 25.
- 100 Cited by Liviu Pilat, *Comunități tăcute*, 177.
- 101 APF – Moldavia, vol. 5, f. 242 apud NAR – VMC, reel 30, frame 471.
- 102 APF – Fondo di Vienna, vol. 31, f. 9 apud NAR – VMC, reel 58, frame 112.
- 103 APF – Moldavia, vol. 5, ff. 129-131 apud NAR – VMC, reel 30, frames 342-3. In his position, Cajoni was also assisted by armed people (“arnăuți”). The scandal created by this situation led to Cajoni’s transfer to Constantinople.
- 104 E. Dumea, *Catholicismul în Moldova*, 251.
- 105 *Ibid.*
- 106 APF – Moldavia, vol. 3, f. 342 apud NAR – VMC, reel 29, frame 361.
- 107 APF – Moldavia, vol. 5, f. 237 apud NAR – VMC, reel 30, frame 374. Buriolli was suspected of committing “il vizio di donne”.
- 108 Gh. Călinescu, “Altre notizie”, 500. Although, according to the decree of the Sacred Congregation of the Rites issued in 1622 this practice was strictly forbidden, Carisi motivated his request by mentioning the fact that in Moldavia Friday was the most sacred day.
- 109 APF – Moldavia, vol. 5, f. 195 apud NAR – VMC, reel 30, frame 233. Martinotti was accused of unjustly suspecting the women of committing sexual intercourses with the missionaries, although most of them were elder, calling them “whores” and forcing them to swear on the crucifixe.
- 110 See Gatt’s circular letter issued in April 16th, 1800 in N. Iorga, *Studii și documente*, 145-146. The Catholics were also obliged to assist the parish priests with two married servants. Gatt warned that those communities who refused or failed to comply with the new obligations would not be spiritually assisted.
- 111 APF – Moldavia, vol. 6, f. 6 apud NAR – VMC, reel 30, frame 401.
- 112 Philippe Martin noticed, for example, that the Catholic clergy from Lorraine developed after 1700 a strong criticism against all superstitious practices in the rural parishes – see Philippe Martin, *Les processions: outil de christianisation des campagnes lorraines (fin XVI^e – milieu XVIII^e siècle). La christianisation des campagnes. Actes du colloque du C.I.H.E.C. (25-27 août 1994)*, edited by J. P. Massaut and M. E. Henneau, Bruxelles – Rome: Institut Historique Belge de Rome, 1996, 306-7.
- 113 Mihaela Grancea, *Western Travellers on Romanians’ religiosity: 1683-1789. Church and society in Central and Eastern Europe*, edited by Maria Crăciun and Ovidiu Ghitta, Cluj Napoca: European Studies Foundation Publishing House, 1998, 408.
- 114 See Liviu Pilat, *Comunități tăcute*, *passim*.