

***THE VICAR GAVRIIL HANGO ON THE HISTORY OF THE ORTHODOX CHAPEL IN
GHERLA PENITENTIARY***

Valeria Soroștineanu

Assist. Prof., PhD, "Lucian Blaga" University of Sibiu

Abstract: The present study doesn't only refer to the strict chronological aspects of a chapel construction, but also presents the activity of the vicar Gavriil Hango as an Orthodox confessor of the prisoners from the Correctional Institute in Gherla during 1900-1914.

*The yearly reports were initially sent to the Orthodox Consistory in Sibiu, most important of them being published in the pages of the *Telegraful Român* (The Romanian Telegraph). Hango is the author of a study, one of the few ones focused on the Orthodox background and here we refer to a similar article from 1874 of the priest Tit-Vespasian Gheaja, a former confessor in Gherla. Unlike priest Gheaja who offers a brief but interesting historical analysis of the society's attitudes towards the prisoners, priest Hango had the possibility to document for an ample study, published in *Telegraful Român* in 1903.*

Many problems are debated in the mentioned study, problems with which the vicar Hango had to deal as a confessor and spiritual guide (although the term is specific to the Roman-Catholic Church, it was used in the Orthodox milieu as well, in the inter-war period): the religious service, catechism, private discussions with every prisoner, moral evaluation, maintaining the relation with the prisoners' families, including a recommendation for a liberation for good behavior, censoring the prisoners' letter for their families and the interest for the elaboration of a historical account of his activity as a state clerk and Orthodox priest.

Keywords: prisoner, family, faith, rehabilitation, society

The present study is an attempt to retrace an interesting biography of an Orthodox priest of the Transylvanian Archdiocese and a clerk - Gavriil Hango – during 1900-1914. The mentioned priest was also teacher for Romanian state schools, journalist, writer, and editor of *Telegraful Român* (The Romanian Telegraph), ghostly father or confessor of the prisoners of Gherla penitentiary. He had carried out an important and worthwhile activity.

We started our study from Hango's ample article, published in 1903 in *The Romanian Telegraph* (no. 90-100) regarding the history of the Orthodox chapel in Gherla penitentiary, as the references to the construction of the chapel were propitious to mentioning the priest's activity as confessor of the prisoners of Orthodox confession. Hango's study is completed by a similar one, published in 1874 by Tit-Vespasian Gheaja.

Unlike priest Gheaja, who presented briefly some historical aspects of society's attitudes toward prisoners, priest Hango had the possibility to research thoroughly his mentioned study¹ due to his status between 1898-1914.

A great variety of facets were presented, starting with mentioning the Orthodox priests, the activity of a priest as a confessor, the religious service, catechetics, private discussions with the prisoners and ending with their moral evaluation, maintaining a relationship with prisoners' relatives, including a recommendation for a liberation for good behavior. At the same time, the priest Hango prepares his own statistics (like the penitentiary's chief); he acts as a censor for the letters sent by the Romanian prisoners of Orthodox confession.

¹ Hango, 1903, nr. 90-100.

From the available data, we may say that the state wasn't officially interested in the Romanian churches' involvement (Orthodox and Greek-Catholic) in Transylvanian penitentiaries. On the other hand, we can't deny the existing efforts in maintaining the morality standards, alongside the institutions of the state and other confessions from the dualist state.

The decades until 1914 were characterized by a need to revise the Criminal Code, which imposed another perspective on the underage delinquents (less than 18 years old). The authorities had to reconsider their behavior and to involve other institutions of the state, church and school included.

Within the dualist state, the law V of 1878 was imposed, the Hungarian code of crimes and felonies, respectively the Criminal Code of Contraventions of 1880, the Law no. XXXIII; in 1908 and 1910 the Criminal Law no. XXXVI, part I and II, meant some alterations of the Criminal Code, especially the underage delinquents. Basically, the changes were stating for both the adults and the underage delinquents with penalties of several years to be imprisoned only in some cases, while others were just rebuked and were left free for an established period of time (in probation) or interned in penitentiaries. Most of the references were concerning the underage delinquents, baring witness to the change of perspective – the desire to save and educate rather than only punish. This aspect was accompanied by another change that represented an influence from the American continent on European soil².

At the end of XIX-th century, 1886 was the year of mentioning for the first time a penitentiary for underage delinquents (male and female), grouped in families, formed of 25-40 underage, under the supervision of a teacher. The entire mechanism was reorganized after the changes of the Criminal Code.

Throughout the mentioned period (1867-1908), priests of Orthodox confession had ensured the care for the spiritual needs of the delinquents. But, as consequences of the bigger effort required in order to educate the underage delinquents, starting with 1910, the Orthodox Archdiocese of Sibiu answered the official addresses of that year by issuance, through which they asked the priests statistics on underage delinquents of Orthodox confession and proposals to deal with that matter.

Therefore, the Consistory of Sibiu named archpriests Ioan Hamsea, Tului Rosescu and Stefan Russu as "spirituals" in 1910 at the High Court of Justice in Brasov, Cluj and Mures-Osorheiu. They were to establish the exact number of underage delinquents and to transmit the data, with the approval of Consistory, Reunion of patronage in Cluj – a special institution created to supervise the changes of the Criminal Code in 1908 and 1910 regarding the underage delinquents.

From statistical data, it was clear that in 1910 in the penitentiary of Cluj there was one Orthodox delinquent, condemned to 4 months in prison. Archpriest Tului Rosescu visited him several times and assigned as "spiritual" the catechist Andrei Ludu. In the same way, in Targu-Mures, there was no underage delinquent of Orthodox confession, but 71 Romanian adults, of whom 17 were Orthodox and 54 Greek-Catholic. Archpriest Stefan Russu visited them twice a month and prepared a speech for them.

In Brasov it was established that "there were not so many delinquents of our confession". The royal High Court of Justice had vicar Ioan Priscu as an employee to pay attention to the underage delinquents. The authorities decided to establish an institution in Bistrita-Nasaud county as in Cluj and then in every county. In the mentioned Reunion the Orthodox confession was to be represented by archpriest Gregoriu Pletosu and two other

²Brutaru, 2013, p. 21.

older priests, but in time all priests from the entire Archdiocese were to take care of this aspect.

The report of the Consistory of Archdiocese no. 2786 of 1910, the new criminal Law of 1908 and the role of the priests and teachers of the Transylvanian Archdiocese was also presented in Sibiu.

Reunion of patronage in Cluj was to establish a branch near every High Court and an agency at every praetorial office, according to the changes brought to the Criminal Code of 1908. The praetorial offices were meant to offer the necessary information in order to educate the "delinquents between 12 and 18 years old, their family and social background to correct their bad habits".

The most comprehensive presentation of the new legislation in the Orthodox milieu concerning the underage delinquents was made by the teacher Pompiliu Dan, headmaster of the confessional school in Zarnesti, archpriestship of Brasov. He demanded that the Romanian society would point out the practical matters to undertake as teachers and priests, alongside Astra and Reunion of Romanian Women in Brasov and Sibiu³.

Due to the fact that priests and teachers, members of the Orthodox Church, had to apply the changes of the Criminal Code regarding the underage delinquents, they were warned to wait instructions from Sibiu in case agencies were to be established throughout archpriestships and parishes. There was a report from in Sibiu in March 16, 1910, signed by the vicar of the Archiepiscopate – Ilarion Puscaru – and the secretary of the Consistory – dr. George Proca.

The first interested in Archdiocese and the regulations of this Reunion was the lawyer Ioan de Preda, who was intrigued by the 3rd Article from the Status of the mentioned Reunion, according to which "migration in other lands of the people subjected to their patronage" was allowed. Ioan de Preda was wondering if that wasn't a legal way to "transport our boys in other regions to Hungarianise them, as it was known that it was to be done with the poor Slovaks".

The only viable solution would have been offered by Romanian penitentiaries, and the initiative should have been on the behalf of the Romanian community, as they were numerous and considered illiterate, thus the most adult criminals in Transylvania were Romanians. Ioan de Preda remarked with sadness that the legal changes created occasions for Hungarianisation; it was imperative that the regulations of the Reunion of patronage would become known⁴.

Regarding the priest-confessor Gavriil Hango, we mention that he was born in Magoaja, archpriestship of Dej in 1862, in a family where the love for books was inspired by his father, graduate of pedagogy course in Sibiu. Gavriil graduated theology in Sibiu, although he was encouraged to follow a military career or in law. He was Miron Cristea's and Ioan Stroia's colleague during 1887-1890.

Hango was ordained in 1891 for the parish Bontida, archpriestship of Cluj. He became a widower in 1893 and came back to Sibiu, at the Theologic-Pedagogic Institute, where he was manager, catechist of Romanian pupils at state schools in the city and editor of *The Romanian Telegraph* in 1896-1897. He was named priest or "spiritual" in 1898 at penitentiary in Gherla after Tit-Vespasian Gheaja. At Aiud penitentiary another priest widower carried out his duties in 1884-1890 – Nicolae Ivan.

Gavriil Hango was also teacher of religion for the Romanian pupils in state schools in Gherla during the same period. His sudden death on October, 6 1914, was surprising, and

³ Pompiliu, 1912, pp. 9-10

⁴ Archive of the Sibiu Archdiocese, 1912, III, 39/1290, 39/14203, 2529, 2786, 1290.

there were even accusations of poisoning, because he was in conflict with Hungarian authorities. Another explanation was given to his sudden death and quick burial – a contagious disease.

Among his most important articles published in *The Romanian Telegraph* we mention: *Șaguna și purgatoriul. Un răspuns dat unui ziar maghiar* [*Saguna and Purgatory. A Response to a Hungarian Newspaper*] - 1898; *Concubinajul. Originea și cauzele lui, rele ce rezultă din el și mijloacele pentru împiedecarea și stârpirea lui* [*Concubinage. Its Origins and Causes, Its Bad Consequences and Means to Prevent and Stop It*] - 1901; *Monografia capelei de la Penitenciarul din Gherla* [*Monograph of the Chapel of Gherla Penitentiary*] - 1903; *Din cronica parohiei greco-ortodoxe Mănăsturul unguresc* [*From the Chronicle of the Greek-Orthodox Parish in Hungarian Manastur*] - 1904; *Pregătirea pruncilor pentru prima mărturisire și cuminecare* [*Preparing the Children for the First Confession and Communion*] - 1906; *Monografia școlilor elementare populare greco-ortodoxe române din Măgoaja* [*Monograph of Romanian Elementary Popular Greek-Orthodox Schools in Magoaja*] - 1912.

Hango's literary talent was evident in his literary sketch *Un vis. Narațiune din viața unui preot din anul 1897* [*A Dream. Narration from A Priest's Life in 1897*]. Colaborator of the *Theological Journal*, edited by Nicolae Balan, Gavriil Hango proved his skills in the study of dogmatic theology, mentioned in his studies: *Paștile* [*Passover*] - 1910, *Izvoarele Duhului Sfânt în actul transsubstanțierii la Sf. Euharistie* [*Sources of the Holy Spirit in the Act of Transubstantiation at the Saint Eucharist*] - 1910 or *Catehizațiune. Istoric. Îndrumări* [*Catechesis. A History and Guidance*] – 1911. He was also among the contributors to the Romanian Encyclopedia in 3 volumes, published in Sibiu in 1898-1904, under the aegis of Astra's and Cornel Diaconovici's guidance⁵.

An interesting aspect was the analysis of Hango's interventions at the priests' conferences in archpriestship of Dej, where in 1899 he referred to the foreign influences over the Orthodox confession that may have exerted over the believers by buying icons from Nicula monastery, "papist-united"⁶. On the same occasion, he insisted that the wealthier parishioners with no children were urged to be more generous toward the church for the payment of parish taxes, and addresses to be made in the name of the guardians so that the vicar wouldn't be considered only a collector of church taxes⁷.

During another conference in 1901, his monograph concerning the Orthodox Chapel from Gherla's Regal Hungarian Penitentiary was considered exemplary for all the parish monographies, imposed by the Consistory, according to Gavriil Hango's initiative. At the same time, *Monografia școlilor elementare populare greco-ortodoxe greco-române din Măgoaja* [*Monograph of Elementary Popular Greek-Orthodox Greek-Romanian Schools in Magoaja*], from 1912 for the teachers' conferences, as well as another monograph from 1906, regarding the presence of Anabaptists and requiring more zeal in fulfilling priestly duties were considered guides in writing monographs.

Priest Hango was also interested in clarifying aspects about the prayer of absolution, uttered at funerals, according to orders of Consistory of Sibiu from September 10, 1896. This prayer became mandatory after the funeral, but it didn't refer to all those present, as "praying is one thing and pronouncing absolution is another"⁸.

Gavriil Hango is mentioned as consistorial commissioner in the Hungarian Manastur due to his capacity of clarifying things; he warned the priest and the teacher on their conflict,

⁵ Păcurariu, 2002, pp. 310-312.

⁶ Soroștineanu, 2007a, pp. 87-88.

⁷ Archive of the Sibiu Archdiocese, III, 490, 1906, Archpriestship Dej.

⁸ Hango, 1913, nr.8, pp. 225-227, 249.

and the latter was punished for not attending church and for "harmful phrases about the church". He considered it normal to teach Religion in Romanian to Romanian pupils from the state schools in Gherla (the same example was set by Alexandru Jantea in Sibiu), he was paid in 1906 by the Archdiocese, after the schools refused to pay⁹.

The priest-confessor Hango mentioned a monograph of the Gherla penitentiary, written in Hungarian in 1898, as he used important data for his presentation of the Orthodox chapel. The existing building of the penitentiary dates back to 1291, and it was a noble's residence for Cardinal Martinuzzi or for Rackozi family; it was transformed in a regional penitentiary of the Empire by Emperor Joseph II in 1787 after the Transylvanian occupation.

The chapel seemed to be there in 1859 when the central building of the penitentiary was built, in three floors, because in 1837 the Orthodox Bishop Vasile Moga sent to the local priest an antimensium so that he would be able to officiate the service with no relics and church. The chapel was used on a monthly basis, mainly at funerals. In the new building, the Orthodox chapel was mentioned in 1903 in the Northern part of the penitentiary, between the ground floor and the first floor.

The government established in 1845 the yearly sum of 20 florins for all expenses (it was 10 florins before that) – candles, incense, washing the priestly clothes. The director of the penitentiary Racz Peter sent an address to the Orthodox Bishop Vasile Moga in 1843 to inform on the end of the construction of the new building, and that he needed 200 florins for the 2 bells, as he bought all the necessary books for 102 florins (with Cyrillic letters, as we find out that in 1903 Hango bought other ritual books with Latin letters). While initially anyone could visit the chapel of the prisoners, that was forbidden in 1868¹⁰.

Gavriil Hango was able to establish the list of the Orthodox priests from the penitentiary in Gherla due to the data in the archive of the penitentiary, although they were some deficiencies in the first decades of its existence. Thus in 1837 the presence of the Orthodox priest was on a monthly basis, while in 1834 a permanent Orthodox priest was required; due to the radical changes in 1868, priests are named definitely for every confession and they became "clerks of the state"¹¹.

The first mentioned year was 1787, when the priest from Sec, Archpriestship of Dej, assigned to be chaplain comitatens; in 1831 Vasile Balan from Sec was named confessor in Gherla until 1848. From that year the archpriest of Cluj – Gregoriu Gall – named chaplain Ioan Mezei, vicar in Divinciorii Mari, who wasn't remunerated for his activity during all the mentioned years (until 1860). The next confessor, vicar from Sec – Ioan Farkas – converts to Greek-Catholicism with the entire parish in 1879. After the instauration of dualism, according to the new laws regarding confessions in the dualist state, even in the penitentiary, every confession must have been represented so that Tit-Vespasian Gheaja was the one to put things in order in the chapel (1869-1898), when he was chosen as honorary archpriest of Hateg region. The next important activity was carried on by Gavriil Hango in 1898-1914, while during the war years Augustin Cupsa was the confessor there¹².

Hango's salary was a motif for debate in 1867 when priests were integrated as clerks in the Ministry of Justice; he was named in agreement with his confession. In 1869, the salary was 800 florins and 120 florins for the rent, but the priests' complete integration into the new status of "clerks of the state" with pension was only in 1887¹³.

⁹Soroștineanu, 2007b, p. 56, p.63.

¹⁰Hango, 1903, no. 90, p.370.

¹¹Hango, 1903, no. 92, p. 278.

¹²Hango, 1903, no. 100, p. 411.

¹³Hango, 1903, no. 100, p. 411.

From an organizational perspective, Gavriil Hango mentioned in the first part of his study the evolution of the existing rules, from the oldest to those valid during the writing of the study, in 1903. The older regulations were mentioned – 1821, 1837 and 1843, but for Hango the first model of demeanor was given by *Învățăături religioase-morale pentru cei eliberați* [*Moral-Religious Teachings for the Released Prisoners*] from 1860¹⁴.

After the establishment of dualism, there was a reorganization of the system of detention according to regulations of 1870, modified in 1880, when out of four components (general dispositions, special instructions for officials and instructions for the security personnel), only the last ones remained valid. It was certain that priests were considered state officials, subordinated directly to the head of the penitentiary and indirectly to the Ministry of Justice, but at the same time the canonical link with the Orthodox or Greek-Catholic Church was maintained.

The role of the priest-confessors in prisons consisted in the moral correction of the believers, which was a complex activity. The first objective was the divine service on Sundays and on holydays. In time, depending on talent and behavior, the cantors and the verger were chosen among the prisoners, who were instructed weekly by the priest, while the church music was taught by priest Cuntan from the Theological Institute of Sibiu. There were situations when the 2 positions were held by 2 wardens.

There were no certain data on the Romanian Orthodox prisoners until the anointing of an Orthodox priest at the penitentiary in 1831 so that till 1801 there was no mentioning of Orthodox prisoners. The only explanation for that situation would be that the Romanians were converted to Greek Catholicism. The system of recording data was changed in 1870 when the registers had to be separated from the confessional perspective¹⁵.

According to statistical data, there were huge differences in the number of Orthodox prisoners – 2 in 1802, 39 in 1849 or 100 in 1883, 11 in 1912. It is interesting to mention the Orthodox female prisoners in Gherla – 2 in 1804 and 4 in 1814. The last female prisoner was mentioned in 1849¹⁶. In total, throughout 114 years, in Gherla penitentiary were held 16,468 prisoners; priest Hango calculated 24,11% being Orthodox, although he was convinced that among those some were Serbian or Rroma (see Annexe 1)¹⁷.

For the priest Gavriil Hango the mission as priest-confessor starting 1898 meant entering a difficult world, spending time with those who were imprisoned for reprehensible acts. As the correction of the sinner was among priest's objectives, the religious services held on Sundays and holydays were followed by catechesis hours every Thursday. Moreover, there were other mentioned services: Sacrament of penance, eucharist, unction of the sick at the funeral services. Hango urged the prisoners to confess and to participate at Oblation 4 times a year. The priest also mentioned the "improvement of sanitary conditions" and thus the decrease of the rate of mortality (as in other penitentiaries in the European space).

As priest Hango recognized, the most difficult task for him was to take care of those prisoners who were on their deathbed and to lead them on their last journey. According to Article 7 from the penitentiary regulations from 1843, if there wasn't enough money for a coffin, the money had to be obtained from selling the possessions of the prisoner. At the service only several people could attend: priest, cantor, verger and 2 wardens; the bell of the chapel rang only during the exit of the penitentiary, as the cemetery was situated outside the

¹⁴ Hango, 1903, no. 97, p. 398.

¹⁵ Hango, 1903, no. 96, pp. 394 -395.

¹⁶ Hango, 1903, no. 96, pp. 394 -395.

¹⁷ Hango, 1903, no. 96, pp. 394 -395.

city, where were allowed to go only the priest, a warden and 2 prisoners. Gavriil Hango concluded: "the fate of those who die alone is sad, as their family is far away", "comforting the dying people is one of the most difficult pastoral problems for priests from such institutions".

The priest had also the obligation to prepare his own file for every prisoner of the same confession and according to prisoners' previous history, they were classified in one of the existing 4 classes: the 4th class was constituted of subsequent offenders with sentencing against people or possessions, the 3rd class was for the first time offenders or any other felony. The first 2 classes were available for those who earned through good behavior that better status. 1868 is the year that marks a difference, as it established the fact that prisoners could earn money by being involved in different activities and send some money to their families or buy books for the library of the penitentiary or tools. At the end of the sentence, money were a great help for prisoners. During the first months of detention most of the prisoners were in "separate chambers", where they were visited by the priest; the others were in bigger rooms set up for work, hospital, school or in disciplinary rooms. The breaks in the working schedule were spent in the common dormitories, under the surveillance of a specially assigned prisoner.

When he visited the hospital of the penitentiary, Hango advised the sick ones "to put things in order in their lives", and had words of encouragement for those who were working on the fields, away from the prison, having earned that privilege.

The school within the penitentiary was another background where the prisoners were evaluated by the priest, as those prisoners who were under 30 and were illiterate attended the courses. Those two hours of Religion per week were used by Hango to continue his weekly efforts with the prisoners's moral improvement. The elementary school within the prison had only 2 classes: the 1st one was for those who knew nothing or just a little bit, the 2nd class was for the rest. Curriculum, with some changes was identical to the one in confessional schools, and the final exam, in front of the head of the penitentiary, had marks (good, satisfactory and unsatisfactory) and prizes (there was a fund for every confession of 7 crowns and 50 filers and alternatively a prize of 10 or 5 crowns).

Gavriil Hango mentioned the fact that it was difficult to approach every prisoner and to make him conscious of the evil he had done, offering hope, at the same time, that the correction was possible through one's will. In time, according to their initial classification and subsequent behaviour, the prisoners were classified in two groups: incorrigible and corrigible. The most difficult ones were considered those sentenced for life and those who were "leaning over suicide".

The rebuke wasn't desirable either, at least not in front of all the prisoners; it was better for such discussions to take place face to face, as in that context the confessor could also use the letters from the relatives. The correspondence between the prisoner and his family was necessary for another reason – the dissolution of a family could have easily occurred. Besides, from such crumbled families children were easy targets to become thieves and criminals so that the vicious circle may start anytime.

Throughout the sentencing, every prisoner was evaluated by the priest-confessor; priest's role was highly important in reducing the sentence or classifying the prisoner in a better class from the moral point of view. Such evaluations were decisive when the authorities of the penitentiary decided upon such matters. From Hango's perspective, a complete rehabilitation was possible only for those who were sentenced for the first time; as for the rest of the prisoners, the percentage varied greatly despite the fact that the system of advancing from one class to another was complex and the priest had to write a report every 2 months. Advancing to another class could mean reducing the sentence or changing the classification: I

– completely rehabilitated, II – generally rehabilitated; III – partly rehabilitated, IV – not rehabilitated.

For good behavior there were 22 prizes of 4 crowns each (given on King's birthday, St. Stephen) from the fundation established by one of the leading figures of the penitentiary – baron Jasintzi Josef. Another prize was 0,5 l of wine on the birthday of Emperor Francis-Joseph (December 2).

Priest Hango also referred to the events after the prisoners were released, as their good behavior was the proof of the priest's success. On the other hand, that was a success that had to be confirmed by the society, parish and school. Hango's article, published in 1909 in *The Romanian Telegraph - Păstorirea păcătoșilor eliberați din prinsoni [Pastoring Sinners Released from Prisons]* – referred to every segment of society potentially guilty of these sinners' fall or multiple offences.

Gavriil Hango offered guidance that would help society to be more efficient in saving the families with various problems, the young people with no religious education. He also mentioned the lack of attention to families that had someone imprisoned, while priests approached with greater difficulty families in such situations. Poor orphans were in a dreadful situation, an easy target for those who exploited their cheap work. The article also pointed out an example from penitentiary, when a prisoner refused to leave, as prison was the only society he knew of and where he belonged, as after a sentence of 12 years he had nowhere to go¹⁸.

After identifying the sensitive aspects, confessor Hango highlighted potential steps to be made in order to attenuate some social deficiencies: medical and spiritual help for the families with convicted members; encouraging children to attend school; encouraging families to maintain moral standards; support for released prisoners from penitentiaries till they found work¹⁹.

The most inspired conclusion regarding the debated subject was expressed by another priest-confessor at the end of the mentioned above article on the possible correction of fate of those released from prisons – "they have to be given a second chance from society, and here the priest has a very important role"²⁰.

Annexe 1.

Year	Prisoners of Orthodox Confession *
1802	1
1803	2
1804	17
1805	27
1806	29
1807	20
1808	16
1809	21
1810	18
1811	5
1812	17
1813	13
1814	23
1815	35
1816	24

¹⁸ Hango, 1909, no. 70, p. 289-294.

¹⁹ Hango, 1909, no. 77, p. 318.

²⁰ Hango, 1909, no. 80, p. 329-330.

1817	16
1818	9
1819	10
1820	1
1821	-
1832	1
1833	5
1834	2
1835	10
1836	2
1837	4
1838	4
1839	6
1840	7
1841	27
1842	14
1843	21
1844	20
1845	21
1846	40
1847	27
1848	14
1849	39
1850	8
1851	25
1852	27
1853	76
1854	47
1855	28
1856	129
1857	59
1858	119
1859	189
1860	128
1861	56
1862	32
1863	42
1864	121
1865	50
1866	98
1867	103
1868	54
1869	53
1870	47
1871	60
1872	75
1873	62

1874	98
1875	74
1876	56
1877	65
1878	75
1879	73
1880	64
1881	85
1882	90
1883	100
1884	70
1885	48
1886	104
1887	64
1888	85
1889	70
1890	91
1891	80
1892	57
1893	30
1894	43
1895	36
1896	9
1897	30
1898	31
1899	38
1900	28
1901	13
1902	11
Total Years 100	Total Orthodox Prisoners 16468

* - It wasn't possible to establish the exact number of the Romanian Orthodox prisoners because there were also mentioned Serbian and Romma prisoners, who declared themselves as Orthodox believers. Data was provided by priest Gavriil Hango in an ample article, published in *The Romanian Telegraph - Istoricul construirii Capelei Ortodoxe din Penitenciarul Gherla [A History of Building the Orthodox Chapel in Gherla Penitentiary]*, 1903, nr. 96, p. 394-395.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Archive of the Sibiu Archdiocese, 1912, III, 39/1290, 39/14203, 2529, 2786, 1290.

Archive of the Sibiu Archdiocese, 1906, III, 490, Archpriestship Dej.

Brutaru, 2013: Versavia Brutaru, *Tratamentul penal al minorului [The Penal Treatment of the Underage]*, Editura Hamangiu, București, 2013.

Hango, 1903: Gavriil Hango, Istoricul construirii Capelei Ortodoxe din Penitenciarul Gherla [History of the Orthodox Chapel in Gherla Penitentiary] in: *Telegraful Român [The Romanian Telegraph]*, year L, nr. 90-100, 1903.

- Hango,1913:Gavriil Hango, *Rugăciunea de dezlegare [Prayer of Absolution]* in:Revista Teologică, [The Theological Journal],an VI, 1913, nr.8.
- Hango,1903:Gavriil Hango, *Istoricul construirii Capelei Ortodoxe din Penitenciarul Gherla [A History of Building the Orthodox Chapel in Gherla Penitentiary]* in: *Telegraful Român[The Romanian Telegraph]*,year L, no. 90, 1903.
- Hango,1903:Gavriil Hango, *Istoricul construirii Capelei Ortodoxe din Penitenciarul Gherla [A History of Building the Orthodox Chapel in Gherla Penitentiary]* in: *Telegraful Român[The Romanian Telegraph]*,year L, no. 92, 1903.
- Hango,1903:Gavriil Hango, *Istoricul construirii Capelei Ortodoxe din Penitenciarul Gherla [A History of Building the Orthodox Chapel in Gherla Penitentiary]* in: *Telegraful Român[The Romanian Telegraph]*,year L, no. 100, 1903.
- Hango,1903:Gavriil Hango, *Istoricul construirii Capelei Ortodoxe din Penitenciarul Gherla [A History of Building the Orthodox Chapel in Gherla Penitentiary]* in: *Telegraful Român[The Romanian Telegraph]*,no. 97,1903.
- Hango,1903:Gavriil Hango, *Istoricul construirii Capelei Ortodoxe din Penitenciarul Gherla [A History of Building the Orthodox Chapel in Gherla Penitentiary]* in: *Telegraful Român[The Romanian Telegraph]*,no. 96,1903.
- Hango,1909:Gavriil Hango, *Păstoriarea păcătoșilor eliberați din prinsori [Pastoring Sinners Released from Prisons]* in: *Telegraful Român*, year LVII, no.70, 1909. *Telegraph*,no. 96,1903.
- Hango,1909:Gavriil Hango, *Păstoriarea păcătoșilor eliberați din prinsori [Pastoring Sinners Released from Prisons]* in: *Telegraful Român*, year LV, no. 77,1909. *Telegraph*,no. 96, 1903.
- Hango,1909:Gavriil Hango, *Păstoriarea păcătoșilor eliberați din prinsori [Pastoring Sinners Released from Prisons]* in: *Telegraful Român*, year LV, no. 80,1909.
- Păcurariu,2002:Mircea Păcurariu, *Cărturari sibieni de altădată [Sibiu's Scholars of Old]*, Ed. Cluj-Napoca, 2002.
- Pompiliu,1912:Pompiliu,Dan,*Patronagiile școlare-dizertație cetită în conferința cercuală a învățătorilor gr.ort. români din tractele Brașov, Bran și Treiscaune, ținută în Brașov în 13/26 octobrie 1912. Reproducere din „Gazeta Transilvaniei „, Nrii 228 și 229 din anul 1912 [School Patronages – dissertation read at the conference of Romanian teachers from Brasov, Bran and Treiscaune, held in Brasov October, 13/26 1912.Reproduction from “Gazeta Transilvaniei”]*,Tipografia A. Mureșianu : Branisce & Comp.,Brașov, 1912.
- Soroștineanu 2007a:Valeria Soroștineanu,*Manifestări ale sentimentului religiosla români ortodocși din Transilvania, 1899-1916 [Manifestations of the Religious Feelings of Romanian Orthodox People in Transylvania, 1899-1916]*, Editura Universității „Lucian Blaga” din Sibiu, 2005.
- Soroștineanu, 2007b:Soroștineanu, *Școalaconfesională românească din Arhiepiscopia Ortodoxă a Transilvaniei (1899-1916) [Romanian Confessional School in the Orthodox Archdiocese of Transylvania (1899-1916)]*, Editura Universității „Lucian Blaga” din Sibiu, 2007.