



ca

colecția  
athanasiana

STUDIA

MÁRIA-TISZTELET  
ÉS MÁRIA-KEGYHELYEK  
KÖZÉP-KELET-EURÓPÁBAN  
A 18. SZÁZADBAN

I/17

MÁRIA-TISZTELET  
ÉS MÁRIA-KEGYHELYEK  
KÖZÉP-KELET-EURÓPÁBAN  
A 18. SZÁZADBAN

Szerkesztette:

**Terdik Szilveszter**

Nyíregyháza

2024

# COLLECTANEA ATHANASIANA

I. Studia

*vol. 17.*

Kiadja a

Szent Atanáz Görögkatolikus Hittudományi Főiskola

H-4400 Nyíregyháza, Bethlen G. u. 13–19.

Tel. +36 42 597 600

[www.szentatanaz.hu](http://www.szentatanaz.hu)

[kiadvanyok@szentatanaz.hu](mailto:kiadvanyok@szentatanaz.hu)

Felelős kiadó: *Odrobina László mb. rektor*

© Szerzők, 2024

A borítón:

*A második máriapócsi könnyező ikon. Ismeretlen festő, 1707 körül.*

*Makói Juhász István felvétele, 2005.*

ISSN 2060-1603

ISBN ISBN 978-615-6201-34-8

Nyomdai kivitelezés: *Kapitális Nyomda, Debrecen*

Felelős vezető: *Joó László*

## Tartalom

Véghseő Tamás: Kegyhely – és szakrális táj – születik. Bevezető gondolatok .....	7
Jakab Attila: Régészeti kutatások a máriapócsi kegytemplomban .....	13
<i>Appendix: Istvánovits Eszter: Kora népvándorláskori     temetkezés a máriapócsi templom kriptája alatt</i> .....	30
Terdik Szilveszter: A pócsi Istenszülő tisztelete az ortodox világban .....	51
Golub Xénia: Csodatévő Mária-ikonok és másolataik a magyarországi szerb templomok Istenszülő-trónjain .....	93
Hegedűs Enikő: A kolozsvári Könnyező Szűz kegyképének ábrázolásairól .....	133
Ana Dumitran: An unwelcome miracle: the weeping of the Virgin Mary's icon from Vidrasău (1780) .....	157
Tüskés Anna: „ <i>Lectulus noster floridus</i> ”. A győri székesegyház kegyképének ikonográfiájához .....	171
A konferencia programja .....	188

## An unwelcome miracle: the weeping of the Virgin Mary's icon from Vidrasău (1780)

ANA DUMITRAN

The first century of Habsburg rule in Transylvania was marked several times by icons of the Virgin Mary who wept. The most renowned event took place in the church from Nicula/Füzesmikola (Cluj County), in February 1699. The icon from there (most probably the weeping icon) is still the object of the most important pilgrimage of the Transylvanian Romanians and the most often reproduced image of Virgin Mary from the history of the Romanian icon<sup>1</sup>. Conceded to the Jesuits and made up a protector of Transylvania and even Hungary<sup>2</sup>, exhibited for worship in the academic church from Cluj/Kolozsvár, the icon acquired in 1699 from Nicula (different from the weeping one) was an efficient instrument of (re)conversion to Catholicism, intensely promoted by means of publications and engraved handouts. Yet its custodians were careful to keep singular the emotion animating annually thousands of pilgrims around it. The other icons displaying a similar miraculous behavior were quickly removed by the Catholic authorities from the midst of the believers or just from the midst of the curious ones willing to see the tears. The reasons for which such an action was undertaken were – in the first half of the 18th century – from the desire to assign the icons a more dignified displaying place than the Romanians' modest wooden churches and, later, because of the changes of attitude generated by the Enlightenment and the effort to impose an introverted faith, responsibly assumed. As such, the icon from Nicula, more specifically, its rival from Cluj, continued to remain in attention, important artists of the time being periodically hired to make reproductions, yet the knowledge of the other weepings was transmitted only through the documents resulted from the investigations set up for establishing the miracle's authenticity. Most

---

1 For perspective image on the miracle and the artistic phenomenon it generated, see Ana Dumitran – Hegedűs Enikő – Vasile Rus: *Fecioarele înlăcrimate ale Transilvaniei. Preliminarii la o istorie ilustrată a toleranței religioase*. Alba Iulia, 2011. [Dumitran – Hegedűs – Rus, 2011].

2 It was presented in 1701 in this state, alongside the icon that wept at Máriapócs (ibidem, 32, fig. 1).

often, these documents were more fortunate than the icons, as they were the only ones to survive, such a state of facts being subject to the present article.

It involves a group of documents kept in the Archives of the Roman-Catholic Archdiocese of Alba Iulia/Gyulafehérvár, issued in April-May 1780 and referring to the weeping of the Virgin Mary's icon from the church of the Orthodox Romanians from Vidrasău/Vidrászeg (Küküllő County, nowadays Mureș County<sup>3</sup>), of which the rumor spread saying that it “weeps out of itself and from its eyes drops in the shape of tears” and that “a lot of people from everywhere swarm to see it”. Objectively, we are dealing with a correspondence conducted between provost Anton Szereday, bishop Ladislau Kollonics and the Transylvanian Gubernium regarding an event known to all those drafting the text only by means of “hearsay”, but treated with a lot of seriousness due to the potential issues a miracle occurring in a non-Catholic worship area might generate.

Staying strictly within the boundaries of the information offered by these documents, the events can be rendered as such: warned of the weeping of the icon from Vidrasău and concerned that “already there are a lot of witnesses of the thing seen”, provost Anton Szereday elaborates a report which, on April 2nd 1780, he sends to his superior, the Roman-Catholic bishop Ladislau Kollonics, the Transylvanian Gubernium and the Greek-Catholic bishop, Grigore Maior (*annexes I-III*). The Gubernium reacts by sending on April 4th an order to the Tabula Judiciaria of the Küküllő County, requesting that 2 commissaries, one Catholic, the other Reformed, along with two Roman-Catholic priests recommended by Anton Szereday and two “naturally peaceful” Orthodox priests, to be tasked with studying the icon, to convince the people that it is the victim of its own credulity and to move the icon to Sibiu/Szeben. Should the Romanians resist, the commissaries should address to the Gubernium, which, in the same day of April 4th, informs bishop Kollonics (*annex IV*) and provost Szereday (*annex V*) on the measures undertaken. On April 6th, the latter responds to the Gubernium that he designated “the archdeacon of that district” (we deduce of Küküllő) and the priests from Sânpaul/Kerelőszentpál and Seuca/Szőkefalva “on fulfilling that which was to be fulfilled” (*annex VII*). He put down on the same sheet of paper the draft of the letter to the archdeacon, in which yet he only names the priest from Sânpaul, inviting both of them “to meditate to that reason according to which God does not do miracles for strengthening the false doctrine which the schismatic confess, least of all inside a church of such a doctrine” (*annex VI*). Finally, the representatives of the Gubernium inform Kollonics again, on May 16th 1780, that the Tabula

---

3 For the texts' elaboration for editing we benefited of the support of Mr. Prof. Vasile Rus from the „George Bariț” Institute of History from Cluj-Napoca, who also elaborated a translation in Romanian, for which see Dumitran – Hegedűs – Rus, 2011, 397–409.



of Küküllő County received the icon “without any resentment” and that one of the commissaries even brought the icon to Sibiu, being, thus, stored in the Gubernium’s archives, where it awaits a disposition from the bishop (*annex VIII*).

The information that may be added to this story is not much, but may help to a better understanding of what happened.

The date of the first documents, that is April 2nd 1780, and the concern the big number of witnesses to the weeping provoked Szereday suggests that the event was already lasting for some time, a time probably we should also include Szereday’s journey to Târgu-Mureş/Maros Vásárhely, from where we see he dispatches his missives. Thus, the icon began weeping at the very least at the end of March, or rather to leak, as it is said that it weeps tears “from itself and from its eyes”. The miraculous phenomenon and the pilgrims’ attraction seems similar with that which happened in 1764 in the chapel of the bishop’s palace from Blaj/Balázsfalva, where the Virgin Mary’s icon started weeping on March 18th, keeping weeping and leaking until October 12th when it was dispatched to Vienna for a more competent examination. One of those who dealt with gathering testimonies on the weeping<sup>4</sup>, hearing and writing down the statements made under oath on seeing and even tasting the tears, was the same provost Szereday, who, thus, might be considered an expert. Except that his mission was now very different, because, in contrast to the icon that wept in 1764 at the bier of a Greek-Catholic bishop, the icon from Vidrasău was weeping in a “schismatic” church, thus, “the phenomenon should be attributed rather to false pretenses than to God’s omnipotence”, as – the venerable canon was obviously not rhetorically asking himself – “who would think that God performs miracles in a church or abode of a false doctrine?”. The issue was yet much more complicated, because if these words are the reflection of the time’s Catholic mindset, the stakes of the icon’s weeping could have been very dangerous for the Transylvanian Catholicism of the same time. In other words, if no one promptly intervened, there remained room for construing the event as a veritable miracle, which, occurring in the Orthodox environment, could incite the Romanian populace, “easily minded to and inclined to believe anything, to slip into credulity’s aberration, from aberration into bad habits,

---

4 The file constituted in Vienna, submitted to Budapest after the dividing of the imperial archives, in 1868, was published by Miskolczy Ambrus, V. András János, A balázsfalvi könnyező ikon irataiból. In: *Europa balcanica-danubiana-carpatica*, 2/B, 1995, 427–469 and later with the Romanian translation by Ioan Chindriş in *Icoana plângătoare de la Blaj. 1764*. Cluj-Napoca, 1997, 32–147. The statements of the witnesses and an entire correspondence are kept at the Cluj County Service of the National Archives, Colecția Documente Blaj, inv. nr. 426–427, 449–459, 461, 465–467, 469, 471–472. Disparate acts of the file are also kept at the Batthyaneum Library and in the archives of the Roman-Catholic Archdiocese from Alba Iulia.

from bad habits into hatred towards the (religious) Union with Rome, from hatred towards the Union into re-assimilating the schism, and would make these the easier the more it would see that the non-united Greeks from around the place (...) already prepare and bring pious offers to the icon and that it is already revered publicly as a thaumaturgic object”.

It is questionable whether the icon from Blaj could have become a contender to the icon from Cluj, meaning that it could leave the latter without Romanian pilgrims, pilgrims who, until then, aimed their prayers at this icon. Most probably, yet, it could draw in towards Greek-Catholicism a certain number from those who, a few years before, incited by monk Sophronius from Cioara, had chosen to return to the “schism”. The icon from Vidrasău, in turn, quite likely, could bring back to Transylvania the state of mind of Sophronius’ movement, yet with the risk of snatching other souls from the Greek-Catholic Church’s drastically narrow group of believers. Still, if the icon that could service the religious union had to be removed from Transylvania, so much more had the one that could harm the union, as the credulity accusation was brought to the Romanian populace in general, including the Greek-Catholic part, otherwise the descent into the Orthodox environment’s intimacy would have not been justified.

The authorities’ fear was justified by the rumor – which needed some time to spread – that “a lot of people rush from all around” to see the icon, among the witnesses of the weeping also being, without a doubt, Greek-Catholics from the neighboring villages, as at Vidrasău the entire community abandoned the union, the church ending up being assigned to the Orthodox confession<sup>5</sup>. In spite of this definite victory of Orthodoxy, a Greek-Catholic parish will reappear towards the end of the 18th century, the migration phenomenon from one confession to another becoming fairly intense after the spirits have settled. Yet, was a miracle for the Orthodox from Vidrasău or from the vicinity enough not to betray the decision taken while in the presence of general Buccow? In other words, could there be a forgery?

However, the documents analyzed talk of false pretenses, the terms of Szereday’s assertion virtually leaving no room for ambiguity, as God himself is almost forbidden from bestowing miracles upon a schismatic church. For what is worth, Szereday only reports, he does not suggest the taking of measures, that is why it is hard to deduce how did he imagined the finding of the truth. From sincere reverence or maybe just from circumspection, after his previous experience from 1764, Szereday left everything to the superiors from the ecclesiastic and administrative-political hierarchy. The decision on

---

5 Virgil Ciobanu: Statistica românilor ardeleni din anii 1760–1762. *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie Națională*, III, Cluj, 1926, 636.



how to proceed, as we see, belonged to the latter, who propose to approach the Romanians from Vidrasău via a dialogue, dialogue apparently lacking any biased intention: of the two laic commissaries, one had to be of Reformed confession, the Orthodox also had to be represented by two priests, preferably protopopes, but the selection had to target especially the pacificator quality, hence we conclude that the rank of protopope was necessary only for an additional authority over the believers, in case they would refuse to give over the icon. We do not know whether the two persons were involved in the end, as Szereday's competence was only in regard to the Roman-Catholic priests. To whom did address the governors for assigning Orthodox clerics, given that the Episcopal See from Sibiu was vacant? The Orthodox community's lack of reluctance is slightly suspicious, a sign that either the mission was very convincing or that the miracle could no longer be advocated after the investigations. The mission's task itself was suspicious, as, even if it would have been commanded to inspect the cause, the main duty entrusted to it was to convince the Romanians that no miracle happened. Yet, the most suspicious is the fact that there is no mention of the documents resulted after the investigation, nor the eventual testimonials of the witnesses that could have been submitted to the Gubernium's archives along with the icon.

Because of these doubts, it is possible the scenario of the events was different and the icon's requisition made through intimidation, without having been taken statements from those who saw the icon weeping, the purpose not being, in fact, to establish the truthfulness of the miracle, but to remove the icon from the midst of those inclined to consider it a thaumaturgic one. The Jesuits from Cluj have the same attitude in 1714, when the Virgin Mary's icon from the Romanian church from Cluj-Mănăştur/Kolozsmonostor started weeping abundantly. But because the community was Greek-Catholic, the weeping was not doubted, being witnessed and confirmed by the Jesuits. Then the greatest care had been to prevent the event from giving the Protestants a reason for mocking the poor, simple minded Wallachians, a fact which would have inevitably affected the image of the Jesuits themselves, equally simple minded if they were praising themselves by possessing the icon that wept at Nicula. That is why "the icon hiding the menace of a mockery of a church amid heretics [...] was secretly moved" from the Romanian church to the Jesuit college, where it continued to "often be cleaned of tears", but public worship was still not allowed, on the contrary actually, the believers were removed from the proximity of the icon until they gave up on complaints and questions and "eventually all started keeping a deep silence towards this matter"<sup>6</sup>. In

---

6 Nonis Augusti rumor in credulum vulgus temere sparsus imaginem Deiparae Iesulum gestantis in tempello Walachico territorii nostril Monostoriensis unacum coolacrymante filiolo lacrymas copiosius fundere, cum plurimos ac videndum prodigium excivisset,

these circumstances, it might be believed that the miracle was tacitly accepted, but the entire story was titled “The tear weeping icon’s deception discovered in a Romanian church”<sup>7</sup>, the conclusion of the “thorough research” to which the icon was subject being that the so-called tears had been just a liquor dripped “by someone’s worst kind of arduousness” through the crevices dug by the painting’s age and dryness. Still, how is it possible that a dryness that provoked such slits, refused to absorb the “liquor”, whose removal lasted days and even weeks after the alleged dripping? It is possible that it is not just us who ask that question, but also the people of those times, as they harbored the icon, at least for a time, inside the college, of course, with the condescendence required for sacred objects. Yet, we must also observe that the “ingredients” of the narration are the same in 1714 as those from 1780, and even 1764: the credulity of the Wallachian populace (both Greek-Catholic and schismatic), the rumor quickly spread, long before a verdict could be given on the nature of the liquid that was dripping on the icon (that is the uncertainty under which the event is listed, to be that easier to derisively label it), the existence of certain enemies of the Catholicism (the heretics in 1714, the schismatics in 1780, the superstition in 1764), the removal of the icon from the place it wept (the equivalent of its disappearance). Even the story of the weeping of the icon from Nicula is subject to this design, with the only and essential difference of fate owed to the Jesuits having assumed the miracle. On why such an assumption was no longer permitted from others, the documents are fairly clarifying: it would have represented a danger, a danger which the Transylvanian Catholicism was no longer willing to confront with, not even in alliance with the Greek-Catholic Romanians. On the one hand, the limits of the Catholic Reconquista had been established, both in regard to the Protestants and the Orthodox. Then, the faith’s reasoning, following up in the tracks of the Enlightenment, was starting to bear fruit in Transylvania as well, regardless of how tender those fruits might have been. There was no more need of miracles. Still, they did not stop appearing, and that is why a prompt intervention was required, so as

---

nos famae eius antea inscios, nunc conscios excitavit ad eam, cui superat ecclesiae inter haereticos cavillandae oericulum accuratius explorandam. Omnibus ipsa etiam imagine et lignea, cui appicta videbatur tabula probe inspectis et lustrates, aliud non eo comperimus strias aliquas ex cerebro et oculis tam Virginis quam pusionis divini sacrilege utique cuiuspian arte deorum sculptas liquoremque iisdem pessima alicuius industria fuisse instillatum. Quapropter imago inde ad collegium nostrum occulte traecta ac saepius lustrate lacrymis populous vero primum superstition subinde etiam querelis et quaestionibus ita abstinit, ut modo ea de re altum omnes sileant. See *Historia Collegii Claudiopolitani Societatis Iesu Anni 1714 a Ianuario ad Ianuarius 1715*, in Vasile Rus: *Operarii in vinea Domini. Misionarii iezuiți in Transilvania, Banat și Partium (1579–1715) vol. II. Fontes*. Presa Universitară Clujeană, Cluj-Napoca, 2008, 342.

7 Lacrymantis in templo Valachico iconis fraus detecta.

to prevent the shaking of a social-confessional structure, whose instability was periodically tested by the fluctuation of the Romanian population.

The event from Vidrasău from 1780 confirms these fears of seeing the Catholic predominance questioned, only guaranteed by the religious union of a part of the Romanians. We find ourselves just short time before the Edict of Tolerance of Joseph II, whose application also exposed the insecurity of the conversions coming from the Protestant environment<sup>8</sup>. Expression of reason, this Edict brought to light a society unprepared to become modern and for which it would function as an arm for a last struggle to anchor into the shadows of confessionalism. In this light, only apparently retrospective, it was meaningless whether the icon from Vidrasău would have made a significant number of victims or not among the subjects of the Holy See. Each soul had to be kept with the same care given to a crowd. That is why it was imperative that the icon disappeared, even with the risk of invalidating a miracle, admitting that its occurrence in a non-Catholic church was possible in the first place. As such, the investigation was not of importance, but rather the population's persuasion that it was the victim of an illusion. And that is why there's no wonder we do not know what the Roman-Catholic bishop decided concerning the icon's storing into the Gubernium's archives. It was enough that the icon was extracted from the environment which – overwhelmed by superstition – would have made out of it a touchstone for its weak consciousness. It is just as possible that no missive was dispatched and that the icon remained there until it was forgotten why and where it was brought from. It is possible that it was sent to the Roman-Catholic clergy house from Sibiu. It is even possible that it was destroyed. What is certain is that its destiny was brought down by the very same tears that were supposed to exalt it.

---

8 For the ampleness of the confessional mobility determined by the Edict of tolerance from 1781 see Daniel Dumitran (ed.): *Sub semnul toleranței. Bisericile din Transilvania în documente inedite: 1781–1790*. Mega Publishing House, Cluj-Napoca, 2012.

## Annexes

The Archives of the Roman-Catholic Archdiocese of Alba Iulia  
The Acts of the Episcopal Ordinary no. 212 and no. 222/1780.

### I

/1<sup>r</sup>/ N<umero> 567 Praes<entatae> die 8va Aprilis 1780.

R<everendissi>mus D<ominus> Praepositus Ant<onius> Szereday refert [*deletum*: se] / [*deletum*: ad Regiu<m> Gub] in pago Vidrászeg in templo / Valachor<um> Schismaticor<um> Iconem Lachrymantem, / quae Deiparam refert, existere et vulgi ore mi/raculosam dici.

Inferius: 1780 2° Aprilis / N<ume>ro 212.

/2<sup>r</sup>/ Excellentissime, Illustrissime, ac Reverendissime Domine Comes, Epi/scope, Domine et Praelate mihi Gratosissime !

Ad partes muneris mei existimavi pertinere, ut ad Excellentiam Ve/stram demisse referrem diffuso iam hic spargi rumore, quod in possessionis Vidrászeg [in margine sinistro adiectum: prope hic ad Szent Pál, / ad iura Exc<e>ll<entissi>mae D<ominae> Viduae Guber-/ natricis perti/nentis] templo Valachorum Non-Unitorum / exposita Icon Beatae Mariae Virginis lachrymarum formae guttas / ex se suisque oculis emittat.

Referendum autem istud esse / existimavi propterea, quod ad videndam eam undique confluere perhibeatur hominum multitudo ideoque eius rei a se / visae copiosissimi iam sint testes; tum, quod tametsi causam / eius cuidam potius imposturae quam Omnipotentiae Divinae / tribuendam esse existimem (quis enim in animum inducat, ut / credat Deum in templo, seu cathedra falsae doctrinae mira/cula patrare?), contingere nihilominus haud aegre possit, ut / rudis plebs Valachica, ad quaevis credenda facilis, ac prona / in credulitatis errorem, ex errore in pertinaciam, ex pertinacia in Unionis aversationem, ex aversatione in Schisma/tis resorbtionem delabatur et tanto quidem facilius, si vi/deat per Non-Unitos (quod fertur) huiates Graecos eidem / Iconi iam pia anathemata parari et offerri iamque illam / ut Thaumaturgam publice coli.

Atque his in assiduo sin/gularis venerationis cultu iugiter persevero  
Excellentiae Vestrae

humillimus servus et  
devotissimus cultor

Antonius Szereday m<anu> p<ropria>

M<aros> Vásárhelyni 2° Apr<ilis> 1780.

## II

/1'/ [Conceptum]

[In medietate sinistra scriptum:]

Excelsum Regium Gubernium! / Domini mihi Gratosissimi !

Ad partes muneris mei existimavi pertinere, ut ad Excelsum Regium Gubernium / demisse referrem diffuso iam hic sparsi ru/more, quod in possessionis Vidradszeg templo / Valachorum Non-Unitorum exposita Icon Beatae / Mariae Virginis lachrymarum formae guttas ex se / susisq<ue> oculis [*deletum*: exmitt] emittat.

[In medietate dextra adiectum:] Referendum autem istud esse existimavi propterea, / quod ad videndam eam undiq<ue> confluere / perhibeatur hominum multitudo [*deletum*: Tametsi] / [*deletum*: vero] ideoque eius rei a se visae copiosissimi iam / sint testes. [*deletum*: Tametsi ver]; tum, quod tametsi causam eius] eius rei [*deletum*: visae] a se / visae [*deletum*: licet] copiosissimi iam sint testes [*sequitur deletum*: cum tamen / causam eius cuidam potius imposturae quam Di/vinae – *deletum* oper – Omnipotentiae tribuendam esse existimem. Quis enim in animum inducat, ut credat Deum / in Templo falsae doctrinae miracula patrare, ut et cur ...] cuidam potius imposturae quam Divinae Omni/potentiae tribuendam esse existimem (quis enim in animum inducat, ut credat Deum in templo [*deletum*: falsae do] seu cathedra falsae doctrinae miracula patrare, con/tingere nihilominus haud aegre possit, ut rudis plebs Valacha / et ad quaevis credenda facilis, ac prona in credulitatis errorem, ex errore in pertinaciam, ex pertinacia in / Unionis aversationem [*correctum ex*: aversivexationem], ex aversatione in Schismatis resorptionem delabatur et tanto quidem facilius, si vi/deat [*correctum ex*: videant] per Non-Unitos (quod fertur) huiates Graecos / eidem Iconi iam pia anathemata parari et offerri iamq<ue> / illam ut Thaumaturgam publice [*deletum*: cultu venerari] coli.

Atq<ue> his in assiduo singularis venerationis cultu iu/giter persevero

Excelsi Regii Gubernii

humillimus servus

M<aros> Vásárhelyni / 2a Apr<ilis> 1780.

[Inferius scriptum:] Fogarasiensi. / Excellentissime, ac Ill<ustrissi>me, ac R<everen>dissime Domine Episcopo, / Domine mihi singulariter Colendissime. / Mutatis mutandis, ut supra.

/1'/ Relatio de Icone Vidradszegi visa / die 2a Apr<ilis> 1780.

### III

/1<sup>r</sup>/ [*Superius, in margine sinistro scriptum:*] 1707. Copia

Ad partes muneris mei pertinere existimavi, ut ad E<xcelsum> R<egium> / Gub<er-  
nium> demisse referrem diffuso iam hic spargi rumore, / quod in pos<session>nis  
Vidrátseg templo Valachor<um> Non-Uni<tor><um> exposita Icon B<eatissimae>  
Virginis Mariae lacry-mar<um> for/mae guttas ex se suisque oculis emittat.

Referendum / autem istud existimavi propterea, quod ad videndam / eam  
undiq<ue> confluere perhibeat<ur> hominum multi<tudo> ideoq<ue> eius rei a se  
visae copiosissimi iam sint / testes; tum quod tametsi causam eius cuidam po<tius>  
imposturae quam divinae omnipotentiae / tribuendam esse existimem (quis enim in  
ani<um> inducat, ut credat Deum in templo / seu cathedram <sic> falsae doctrinae  
miracula pa<trare>?), contingere nihilominus haud aegre possit, ut rudis plebs Valacha,  
ad quaevis credenda facilis, ac prona, in credulitatis errorem, ex errore in pertinaciam,  
ex pertinacia in Unionis aversa<ti><on>em, ex aver<sa><ti><on>e in Schismatis resor<-  
biti<onem> delabat<ur> et tanto quide<m> facilius, si vi<deat> per Non-Unitos (quod  
fert<ur>) huiates Grae<cos> eid<em> Iconi iam pia anathemata parari et of<ferri>, iam  
illam ut Thaumaturga<m> publice / coli.

Excelsi R<egii> G<ubernii>

humill<imus> servus Antonius Szeredai etc.

### IV

/1<sup>r</sup>/ N<umero> 566 Praes<entatae> die 8a Aprilis 1780.

#### Intimatum

Regii Gubernii, quo significatur ad pagum Vidrátseg duos e Tab<ula> Cont<inua>  
Küküllőiensis de utra</>qua religione Calviniana et Catholica exmissos esse, / ut Ico<-  
nem Deiparae in templo Schismaticor<um>, ut fert<ur>, lachrymantem videant et  
R<egio> gubernio referant.

4 Apr<ilis> <1>780.

[*Inferius, ab alia manu scriptum:*] De Icone Deiparae Vidrátseg/ensi in templo  
Schismaticor<um> / lachrymante acta.

N<ume>ro 222.

[*Sigillum rotundum in papyro applicatum et copertum*]

[*Sub sigillo scriptum:*] 1780 4 April<is>

[*Transverse scriptum:*] 1707. / Excellentissimo, ac Reverendissimo Domino La</  
dislao e Comitibus Kollonits de Kollegrad et / Zaj-Ugrotz, Dei et Apost<olicae> Sedis  
gratia Episco<po> Transyl<vaniensi>, necnon S<acratis>simae Caes<areo> R<egi>ae et



Apostolicae / Matris Status et Guberniali Consiliario utroque / actuali intimo etc., Domino Nobis collendissimo.

Ex officio

Inclutae Tabulae Continuae / Alvincensis

1707. / Excellentissime Domine Comes, Episcopo Transylvaniensis!  
Domine Nobis Colendissime.

Qualemnam repraesentationem Gubernio submiserit Reverendus / Dominus Praepositus Albo Carolinensis ex advoluto exemplo [*supra scriptum*: Excellentia] Vestrâ perspiciet uberius; ne itaque plebs Valachica credulitati suae porro quoque / inhaereat, commissum est sub hodierno Tabulae Comitatus Küküllö, / ut duos e sui gremio, unum Catholicum, alterum Reformatum / exmittat Commissarios, quorum erit assumptis duobus per Reverendissimum / Dominum Praepositum denominandis Praesbyteris Catholicis, duobus / item pacati ingenii Non-Unitis, quidem si fieri poterit Petru Popis <sic!>, in possessionem Vidratszeg exire, in omnes notas et circumstantias Iconis illius inquirere et pro re comperta nimiam plebi eiat credulitatem exponere eandemque ab eiusmodi credulitatibus dehortari, ac Iconem ipam ex templo Valachorum recipere, ac huc Cibinium ad domum parochilaem transmittere; / in casu vero, quo se Valachi receptioni et transmissioni Iconis illius / opponerent, ad Gubernium referre.

Quod Excellentiae Vestrae pro / directione et faciendis sui etiam ex parte, si quae videbuntur, dispositionibus infirmandum invenit Gubernium.

Solitae venerationis cultu perseverantes

Excellentiae Vestrae

obligatissimi servi

Nicolaus Bethlen proprius

Carolus Comes Teleki proprius

Iosephus Donáth proprius

E Regio Principatus Transylvaniae

Gubernio Cibinii die 4a Aprilis Anno Domini 1780.

[*Inferius, in margine sinistro scriptum*.:] Donationalium Collectio.

## V

1707. / Sacrae Caesareae Regiae et Apostolicae Matris, Archiducis / Austriae, Ducis Burgundiae, Magnae Principis Transylvaniae / et Siculorum Comitatus Dominae, Dominae Nostrae Clementissimae / nomine

Reverendissime Nobis observande salutem et gratiae Caesaraeo-Regiae incrementum.

Ad repraesentationem Reverendissimae Dominationis Vestrae / intuitu Iconis, uti praetenditur, in templo Non-Unitorum Vidra/czegiensi lacry-

mantis Gubernio submissam commissum esse / sub hodierno Tabulae Continuae Co<mi>t<a>tus de Küküllő, ut duos / e sui gremio, unum Catholicum, alterum Reformatum, / exmittat co<mmi>ssarios, quorum erit assumptis duobus per / R<evereren>dissima<m> D<ominationem> V<est>ram denominandis Presbyteris Catholics, / duobus item pacati ingenii Non-Unitis, et quidem si fieri / poterit Petru Popis <sic!>, in po<sse>ssionem Vidraczeg exire, in omnes / notas et circumstantias iconis illius inquirere et pro re / comperta nimiam plebi eiati credulitatem exponere eandem-q<ue> / ab eiusmodi credulitatib<us> dehortari, ac iconem ipsam ex / templo Valachorum recipere, ac huc Cibinium ad domum / parochialem transmittere; in casu vero, quo se Valachi re<ceptioni> et transmissioni iconis illius opponerent, ad Reg<ium> / Gubernium referre: praetit<ulatae> D<ominationi> V<est>rae pro directione exmittendisq<ue> / duobus Presbyteris Catholicis significat Gubernium. Sic fact<is> / atefata Sua Ma<ies>tas benigne pro pensata manet.

E Regio / Magni P<rin>cipatus Tran<sylva>niae Gubernio Cibinii die 4 Aprilis / Anno 1780.

Nic<olaus> Bethlen m<anu> p<ropria>

Carolus C<omes> Teleki m<anu> p<ropria>

Iosephus Donáth m<anu> p<ropria>

R<everendissimo> D<omino> Praeposito Szeredai.

## VI-VII

/1' / [*Conceptum*]

[*In medietate sinistra scriptum:*]

Adm<odum> R<eve>nde Domine et Fr<ater> in Ch<ris>to Colendissime !

Ex ordinatione ad me edita necessarium erit, / ut, dum per duos dominos Commissarios ex Inclyta Tabula Con<tinua> illius Comitatus [*deletum*: ten] exmittendos [in medietate dextra adiectum: de termino exitus] praemonita [*deletum*: utimur] fuerit / V<est>ra Do<minati>o a<dmodum> R<evere>nda unacum illis et cum Do<mi>no Parocho K<erelő> Sz<ent> Pa<liensi> ad Possessionem Vidraczeg ingrediatur et, quae ibi circa / praetensam lachrymantem B<eatis-simae> M<ariae> V<irginis> iconem agenda Excelsum Regium / Gubernium iisdem do<mi>nis Commissariis praecipit, unitis studiis perfu<erant>, [*in medietate dextra adiectum*: cavendum tamen diligenter erit – *deletum*: ut quid - utrisq<ue>, ne quid circa Ico<nem> illam tale ex indiscreta et / praematura pietate committitur / quod aliquam adferat offensionem / vel Religionis nostrae irrisionem / habita reflexione ad illud Theologi<cum>, quod Deus in confirmatione / falsae doctrinae, quam Schismatici / profitentur, miracula non pa<tret> tanto minus in Ecclesia / talis doctrinae], ac de rei peractae serie una subinde informet, qui interea / etiam persevero

Vestrae Do<mi>naci<on>is a<dmodum> R<everen>dae

Servus et Fr<ater> in Ch<ris>to addictissi<mus>

[*Inferius scriptum.*] Inclyta Tabula Continua

Domini mihi colendissimi!

Ad Inclytam Tabulam Continuam officiosissime refe/rendum esse duxi, quod ad effectum exequendae ordinationis Excelsi / Regii Gubernii circa Iconem Vidraczegiensem editae deputave/rim, do<mi>nu<m> Archidiaconum illius districtus simulq<ue> Parochum Sző/kefalvensi, ac do<mi>num Parochum K<erelő> Sz<ent> Paliensem, eos proinde / de termino exitus per dictos do<mi>nos Commissarios praevie prae-emo/nitos, ad exequendorum executionem pro<m>tos futuros nihil addubi/tem, [in medietate dextera adiectum: cum Tit<ula>t<is> do<mi>nis Commissariis / inde exmittendis], qui ceterum in assiduo peculiaris observantiae officio propter / persevero

Inclytae Tabulae Continuae  
obsequentiss<imus> et observantiss<imus> servus  
M<aros> Vásárhelyni / 6 Apr<ilis> 1780.

/1<sup>v</sup>/ [*Supra sigillum, in medietate dextra scriptum:*] <...> 1780. circa / <...> [N.B! *Obuliginem non liquet*] / N<umer>o 1707 / 4 Apr<ilis> <1>780

[*Inferius, in eadem medietate scriptum:*] 1780 4 Apr<ilis>

[*Sigillum rotundum in papyro applicatum et copertum*]

[Sub sigillo scriptum:] 1707. / Reverendissimo Antonio Szeredai Incl<yti> Capituli / Cathedralis Eccl<esiae> Albae Carolinensis Praeposito Maiori / Infulato, ac Incl<ytae> Tabulae Reg<iae> per Mag<num> Tran<sylva>niae / Pr<inci>patum Iudi<ciar>iae Praelato Nobis Observando.

Ex officio

M<aros> Vásárhelly

## VIII

/1<sup>v</sup>/ Excellentissime, ac Reverendissime Domine Comes, Episcopo,  
Domine Nobis Colendissime!

Tabula Comitatus de Küküllő medio suorum Commissariorum Iconem / Beatae Mariae Virginis in templo Non-Unitorum possessionis / Vidrátszeg, uti praetensum fuit, lacrymantem in consequen/tiam Decreti Gubernialis sub 4a m<ensis> Aprilis a<nni> c<urrentis> exarati / absque omni tumultu ad se recipiente et Regio Gubernio / medio unius Commissarii exhibente, illam ad Archivum Gu/berniale translocatam esse Excellentiae Vestrae eo fine hono/rifice notificatur, ut congruos eatenus disposi-tiones facere / dignetur.

In reliquo solito venerationis cultu manemus  
Excellentiae Vestrae

obligatissimi servi

Nic<olaus> Bethlen m<anu> p<ropria>  
Iosephus Donáth m<anu> p<ropria> scr<ipsit>

E Regio M<agni> Tran<sylva>/niae P<rinici>patus Gubernio Cibinii / die 16a  
Maii A<nno> 1780.

[*Inferius, in margine sinistro scriptum:*] Don<ationalium> / 2186 Coll<ectio>

[*In margine dextro scriptum:*] Excell<entissimo> D<omi>no Ep<isco>po  
Tran<sylva>niensis Ladislao C<omiti> Kollonits

/1<sup>v</sup>/ [*Sigillum rotundum in papyro applicatum et copertum*]

[*Sub sigillo scriptum:*] 2532. / Cibinio. / Excellentissimo, ac Reverendissimo Domi-  
no / Comiti Ladislao Kolonits de Kollegrad Perpe/tuo in Zay Ugrotz, Leward et Zay  
Ugrotz <sic!> Dei / et Apost<olicae> Sedis gratia Eppiscopo <sic!> Tra<nsylva>niensi,  
/ Sacrae Cae<sare>o-Re<gi>ae Apost<olicae>q<ue> Ma<ies>t<a>tis Status et Guber/  
niali in Tran<sylva>niae Consistorio utrobique / actuali intimo Venerabilis Capituli  
Ecclesiae / Cathedralis Olomucensis Domino Nobis colendissimo.

Ex officio

Albae Carolinae

[*Transverse, ab alia manu scriptum:*] 16 Maii <1>780. / Iconem B<eatissimae>  
V<irginis> Mariae Vidratzegien/sem medio commissarii Tabulae / Co<mi>t<a>tus de  
Küküllő ad E<xcelsum> R<egium> Guberniu<m> / delatam ad Archivum Gubernia-  
le / ad ulteriores usq<ue> disp<osi-ti>ones Excell<entissi>mi / D<omini> Ep<isco>pi  
translatam esse notificat<ur>.