



Karl Heinz Frankl
Rupert Klöcher (Hg.)

Kirchliche Elite-Bildung für den Donau-Alpen-Adria-Raum

Das Priesterkolleg St. Augustin
(„Frintanum“) in Wien 1816 bis 1918

Böhlau

SONDIERUNGEN ZUR ZWEITEN ETAPPE DES
„FRINTANEUM-PROJEKTS“

Péter Tüsor

The Augustineum's Alumns from Lands of the Hungarian Holy Crown – an Introduction

The aim of this presentation is to sketch the Hungarian relations of the Augustineum, a special institution of ecclesiastical elite education of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy (“Caesareo-Regium Sublimioris Presbyterorum Educationis ad Sanctum Augustinum Institutum Viennense or A Szent Ágotonról Nevezett Bécsi Császári-királyi Felsőbb Papnevelő Intézet”)¹. This task has no little significance. The history and role within the Monarchy of the Augustineum cannot be uncovered without an analysis of the Hungarian contribution.

I. THE HUNGARIAN STUDENTS AND THE INSTITUTE

This statement will be underlined by the following data. During the existence of the institution between 1816 and 1918, 372 students arrived here from the dioceses of the Holy Crown of Hungary. This amounts to about 35% of the total number² of students!

Among the 24, and later 39, students in the Institute in a particular year,³ there were on average 8–10 students from Hungary per year, while only 6 in the years 1824–1848.⁴ The number of Latin-rite students was 321. Among these, the Province of Esztergom was represented by 146 persons, the Provinces of Kalocsa-Bács and Zágráb by 118 (61 from the Croatian dioceses), and the Province of Eger by 43. These numbers – as well as the more detailed registers⁵ – allude to the fact that the different dioceses were represented more or less in proportion to the number of their population and clerics.

1 Zschokke, *Die Theologischen Studien und Anstalten*, 571–585; Hosp, *Zwischen Aufklärung und katholischer Reform*, 69–81; Goldenits, *Das höhere Priester-Bildungsinstitut*, passim. – Special thanks to István Fazekas.

2 Weissensteiner, *Das höhere Weltpriesterinstitut*, 228.

3 Weissensteiner, *Das höhere Weltpriesterinstitut*, 227; Hosp, *Zwischen Aufklärung und katholischer Reform*, 75.

4 See the critical list of the alumns from Hungary between 1816–1918, followed by the publication of some documents in Tüsor, *A bécsi Frintaneum tagjai*, under press.

5 See the Appendix.

A slight over-representation relative to the number of the population can be observed in the case of the Greek Catholics (51 persons), the Croatian students (61), and the Province and Archdiocese of Esztergom. The great number of Greek Catholics may be explained by, besides the deficient nature of their education in Hungary, an effort to advance the adaptation to the peoples of the Monarchy of the Romanians and Ruthenians, whose integration into Western culture was relatively slow. The case of the Croatians is explained by the Habsburg-Croatian rapprochement in the 19th century and the person of Bishop Strossmayer, a former student and director of education of the Augustineum. From his diocese of Diakóvár alone 25 students arrived in Vienna.

The outstanding role of the Province of Esztergom requires more complex explanation. In the decades following the founding of the Institute, the Hungarian prelates, just as their Austrian colleagues,⁶ could directly commend to the monarch the priests whom they deemed worthy of further education, with more or less success. For example, in 1830 the Greek Catholic bishop of Nagyvárad requested the admission of one of his priests, Theodor Aron.⁷ In 1841 János Pyrker, archbishop of Eger, applied to the monarch in favour of József Balla, arguing that his archdiocese had not had a student in the Institute since 1832.⁸ In 1847 Prince-Primate József Kopácsy evaded the request of Béla Bartakovics, bishop of Rozsnyó, commending Sámuel Mozolányi, on the pretext that he had no direct influence (“directus influxus”) on admissions to the Augustineum. He advised Bartakovics to turn directly to the rector of the Institute.⁹ From the middle of the century a converse practice became stabilised, according to which the rector informed the prince-primate about expected vacancies,¹⁰ who then asked in a circular letter the other bishops and his vicars for proposals concerning candidates,¹¹ with the requisite credentials and certificates,¹² “testimonia requisita”.¹³ The names were then submitted to the monarch, asking at the same time for the rector’s cooperation, by the head of the Hungarian Church in the form of a nicely phrased application.¹⁴

6 Hosp, *Zwischen Aufklärung und katholischer Reform*, 72.

7 ÖstA HHStA Kabinettsarch., Kabinettskanzlei., n. 134/1830.

8 Ibid., n. 325/1841 and n. 690/1828. 180/1837.

9 AP AE Kopácsy, Cat. 6, fasc. C, n. 887/1847.

10 AP AE Scitovszky, Cat. 6, fasc. B, n. 2779/1857.

11 For instance *ibid.*, n. 3284/1862.

12 Ibid., n. 4920/1852.

13 Cf. *ibid.*, n. 1057/1682 (Szőgedy) and n. 3442/1862 (Hornig).

14 ”In Caesareo-Regio Sublimioris Presbyterorum Educationis ad Sanctum Augustinum Instituto, quod sub Augustissimo Caesareo-Regiae Apostolicae Maiestatis Vestrae tutela et protectione beneficentissimum exerit in promotionem educationis theologicae de Regni huius Apostolici clero...” Ibid. n. 3424/1866 (Rapaics). – See also the letter of József Kopácsy archbishop of Esztergom, prince-primate

The rector informed the primate about the decision, and he forwarded the news to the bishops concerned,¹⁵ who then had to send their priests into Vienna as soon as possible.¹⁶ Although in general the Hungarian prelates competed with each other to have one of their priests admitted, it also occasionally happened that they could not present a suitable person upon the primate's call. Especially in the 1850s several examples of this can be found.¹⁷ The archbishops of Esztergom insisted on their central role so much that, when at the beginning of the 20th century some of the Hungarian prelates tried to turn directly to the monarch and the rector of the Augustineum, Prince-Primate János Csernoch called upon his colleagues in a circular to respect his acquired rights.¹⁸ The slightly over-represented status of the Province of Esztergom (and archdiocese, 35 persons) is further explained by the fact that its seminary in Vienna, the Pazmaneum, provided suitable and readily available people to pursue studies in higher education.¹⁹

Although the final word was uttered by the monarch, at the level of preparing the decision the state, which provided the funds, did not interfere with the selection of candidates.²⁰ The opinion of the seminary superiors was a primary decisive factor. The rectors of the Pazmaneum regularly used this opportunity²¹ and the same is true for the Seminarium Centrale in Budapest. This institution was of primary importance in terms of the freshman supply of the Augustineum because it was unique in that in Hungary only this institution provided university-level theological education. We also find several examples for cases when people were admitted in Vienna who only held a degree in theology from a college outside of Budapest.²² Several people interrupted their service as priests or chaplains.²³

of Hungary to Emperor and King Ferdinand V, Esztergom, 8. August 1837 (AP AE Kopácsy, Cat. 6, fasc. C, n. 1201/1837; the original: ÖStA HHStA Kabinettsarch., Kabinettskanzlei., n. 158/1837; Tusor, A bécsi Frintaneum tagjai, n. II/5).

15 Cf. for example *ibid.* n. 156/1849 and 150/1850 and *passim*.

16 For instance AP AE Kopácsy, Cat. 6, fasc. C, n. 1095/1846.

17 AP AE Scitovszky, Cat. 6, fasc. B, 153. 222/1849 and *passim*; *ibid.*, n. 3478/1850 and n. 457/1857. – See also AP AE Kopácsy, Cat. 6, fasc. C, n. 492/1841.

18 Esztergom, 13 August 1914. AP AE Csernoch, Cat. 6, fasc. B, n. 4811/1914. – See also *ibid.* n. 4211/1914.

19 Cf. Fazekas, *Ein ungarisches Priesterseminar*, 265–286.

20 Cf. AP AE Csernoch, Cat. 6, fasc. B, ad n. 2579/1913.

21 Letter of József Kunszt, rector of the Pazmaneum to Bishop József Kollár, capitular vicar of Esztergom, Vienna, 1 August 1837 (AP AE Kopácsy, Cat. 6, fasc. C, n. 915/1837; Tusor, *A bécsi Frintaneum tagjai*, n. II/4) and *ibid.*, Csernoch, Cat. 6, fasc. B, ad n. 2579/1913.

22 See AP AE in various fasc. “Sublime” *passim*, and especiallly *ibid.*, Simor, Cat. 6, fasc. B, n. 1431/1879.

23 János Zalka – later bishop of Győr – was “cooperator” in Dorog. AP AE Kopácsy, Cat. 6, fasc. C, n. 1010/1846.

People who studied in Rome only seldom got admitted to the Augustineum.²⁴ Sometimes even the rectors of the Institute suggested to the ordinaries concerned the admission of a talented priest that they got to know during his theological studies in Vienna, as was the case with Lajos Haynald, who was proposed by Rector Josef Pletz in 1837.²⁵

There were also many self-nominated candidates, who asked their prelates to support their disposition to Vienna, but normally without success. Rudolf Kocsurek, a chaplain in Nagymánya, would have liked to go to Vienna in 1873 in spite of the fact that he did not even have a matriculation exam.²⁶ István Privács, a hospital curate, referred to his physical condition in his application.²⁷ György Kálmán, a last-year student of the Pazmaneum, on the other hand, referred to the encouragement of his professors in Vienna, and to the fact that the Augustineum would be an excellent place to perfect his knowledge of languages.²⁸ Károly Hornig based his application on the argument that he would like to pursue Biblical studies and that although he had already finished his compulsory studies he was still too young to be ordained.²⁹ In 1841 Primete Kopácsy also referred to this factor in a letter of recommendation to the monarch, which elucidates how the Institute admitted people who were not yet ordained.³⁰ There were only few people who made an effort directly in Vienna.³¹

The majority of students spent two years in the Institute and acquired a doctoral degree. Almost none left without taking the final comprehensive exam (“*rigorosum*”).³² At present we know relatively little about what the students did in their free time. Apart from pastoral, caritative and other scholarly activities (Lajos Haynald, for instance, studied the deaf-and-dumb),³³ they occasionally taught Hungarian to members of the Habsburg fam-

24 Like Albin Mészáros. ÖStA HHStA Kabinettsarch., Separatenakt., 28/1916.

25 Letter of Joseph Pletz, rector of the Augustineum to Bishop József Kollár, capitular vicar of Esztergom, Vienna, 5 Juny 1837 (AP AE Kopácsy, Cat. 6, fasc. C, n. 915/1837; Tusor, A bécsi Frintaneum tagjai, n. II/3).

26 AP AE Simor, Cat. 6, fasc. B, n. 3079/1873.

27 AP AE Csernoch, Cat. 6, fasc. B, n. 4485/1913.

28 AP AE Csernoch, Cat. 6, fasc. B, n. 2579/1913.

29 His letter to Cardinal Scitovszky, Buda, 31 August 1862. AP AE Scitovszky, Cat. 6, fasc. B, ad 3284/1862.

30 ÖStA HHStA Kabinettsarch., Kabinettskanzlei., n. 379/1841.

31 For instance Máté Vuezich. ÖStA HHStA Kabinettsarch., Min. Kolowrat, n. 810 and 1122/1829 (Opinion of Ocskay).

32 Cf. Goldenits, *Das höhere Priester-Bildungsinstitut*, 116–436. – See also AP AE Scitovszky, Cat. 6, fasc. B, n. 1111/1857.

33 “... ac simul frequentat praelectiones in Instituto surdo-mutorum” Tabellaris informatio pro Anni Scholastici 1839 semestri altero, AP AE Kopácsy, Cat. 6, fasc. C, n. 840/1840.

ily. In the 1840s Károly Stegmüller from the diocese of Szombathely gave Hungarian lessons to Emperor Franz Josef's father and his brother Archduke Ludwig Viktor.³⁴ Although there were several Slovaks, Ruthenians and Romanians among the students from Hungary, there is no information about nationality conflicts before the beginning of the 1910s.³⁵ Even then, it was only the separatist activities of the Romanians of the Greek Rite that caused offence among the Hungarian students.³⁶

The Hungarian students of the Institute maintained direct contact with their ordinaries. In general, they informed them about the progress they made and the end of their studies.³⁷ The question of examination expenses was a recurring topic.³⁸ There is also the interesting case of László Schreiber. The deacon, who had been ordained seven months earlier, in September 1850 asked Prince-Primate Scitovszky to send him a *Breviarium Romanum* in order that he could fulfil his obligations of prayer. Previously he asked the same from the Esztergom seminary in vain, as he was told that “with respect to his substantial provisions, he should buy the prayer-book himself” (“intuitu splendidae, qua gaudeo, subsistentiae ipse mihi breviario procurem”). The Hungarian student, however, was not particularly impressed by the standard of living at the Augustineum (“Ea sit subsistentia haec, ut nequidem actissimis indigentis satisfaciatur, nisi respectu multiplicium gravissimarumque expensarum”).³⁹

The rectors, who were often abbots of a Hungarian abbey,⁴⁰ also sent the information about progress made in a particular semester (“tabellaris informatio”)⁴¹ to the prelates concerned, and informed them when at the end of the studies they could request the monarch to repost their priests.⁴²

34 Géfin, A Szombathelyi Egyházmegye története III, ad indicem.

35 Cf. Goldenits, Das höhere Priester-Bildungsinstitut, 13.

36 AP AE Csernoch, Cat. 6, fasc. B, ad n. 2579/1913.

37 AP AE Simor, Cat. 6, fasc. B, n. 3204/1873 (Aschenbrier).

38 The letters of Lajos Haynald, alumn of the Augustineum and József Kopácsy, prince-primate of Hungary to each others, Vienna, 21 July 1839 and Pozsony, 23 July 1839 (AP AE Kopácsy, Cat. 6, fasc. C, n. 84/1839; Tusor, A bécsi Frintaneum tagjai, n. II/6–7); and *ibid.*, Scitovszky, Cat. 6, fasc. B, 46616/1852 (Dankó) and 2489/1862 (Czibulka); Csernoch, Cat. 6, fasc. B, 964/1916 (Záborszky).

39 His letter Vienna, 3 September 1850. AP AE Scitovszky, Cat. 6, fasc. B, n. 1806/1850.

40 Meyer known as “Abbas Sancti Egidii Simigiensis”, Petz and Feigerle as “Abbas B.M.V de Pagrany”. AP AE Kopácsy, Cat. 6, fasc. C, ad n. 84/1839 and n. 389/1841; Simor, Cat. 6, fasc. B, n. 5569/1879.

41 For example AP AE Kopácsy, Cat. 6, fasc. C, n. 695/1847; *ibid.*, Simor, Cat. 6, fasc. B, n. 2097/1866 (Hornig and Roskoványi).

42 For instance AP AE Simor, Cat. 6, fasc. B, n. 3674/1873.

2. THE HUNGARIAN FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTION TO THE RUNNING OF THE AUGUSTINEUM

According to the literature, the annual Hungarian contribution to the running of the Institute was 5,000 forints. The sum was covered from the incomes of the Abbey of Saint Benedict at Kaposfő, which was left in vacancy to this purpose.⁴³ This was a ridiculously little amount. Franz I in his *Handbillet* of 29 October 1819 asked Archbishop Rudnay to propose a solution to the question of financing.⁴⁴ The head of the Hungarian Church suggested in his answer that the incomes of the abbey of Kaposfő, amounting now to 7,000 forints, should be tied up until 1837. According to his calculations, by then the annual interests of the accumulating capital would have amounted to 8,014 forints. This amount, supplemented by the 7,000 forints annual income (a total of some 15,000) would safely have covered the Hungarian students' costs from 1838, in his opinion. In the interim period, he promised offerings from the Hungarian bishops. This would also have amounted to 15,000 forints.

The greatest share, some 3000 forints, was to be his own contribution.⁴⁵ In his lengthy memorandum to the monarch, the prince-primate insisted on the presence of 10 students from Hungary in the Institute, and the yearly costs of one theologian he estimated at 1500 forints. This is how the annual Hungarian contribution of ca. 15,000 forints was calculated in the short-term as well as the long-term solution.

Rudnay rightly assumed that the Hungarian bishops would recognize the importance of the Augustineum in the life of Hungarian Catholicism and would not be reluctant to offer donations. ("Si episcopi Hungariae, quod maxime interest, idoneos fidei catholicae pugiles formari eodem mecum sensu fuerint animati, nihil est profecto, quod Instituto ex parte Cleri Hungariae metuamus" he wrote.)⁴⁶ However, in the National Synod of 1822 the Hungarian prelates voted in favour of the undertakings in vain. The founding director of the Institute, Jakob Frint, was not satisfied with the solution. One reason was that it did not

43 Zschokke, *Die Theologischen Studien und Anstalten*, 574; Goldenits, *Das höhere Priester-Bildungsinstitut*, 113.

44 AP AE Rudnay, *Act. Fund. Eccl.*, No. 1/6, n. 213/1819. "Sua Maiestas Sacratissima super propositione cancellariae Hungaricae Aulicae intuitu 10 alumnorum Hungarorum in Sublimiore Instituto intertenendorum erga Directoris hoc in merito relationem substrata opinionem depromi benigne iubet. – Exhibita est humillime propositio ad benignas manus cum opinione Instituti citra diminutionem alumnorum relata ad clerum Hungariae et Transilvaniae manutenendorum."

45 *Ibid.*, n. 213/1819. Cf. the opinion of Sándor Rudnay, archbishop of Esztergom, prince-primate of Hungary, Pozsony, 15 November 1819 (*Ibid.* and Tusor, *A bécsi Frintaneum tagjai*, n. II/1.)

46 *Ibid.*

settle the residue left by the under-financing of the first years. On the other hand, the annual collection of the offerings seemed rather uncertain. Therefore, in his letter of 23 June 1823 to King and Emperor Franz he suggested that the incomes of Abbey of Saint James at Zselic, which was in vacancy, should also be devoted to the purposes of the Augustineum.⁴⁷ These two *beneficia* together he considered adequate to cover the costs of the Hungarian priests. The accumulated deficit of 49.769 forints and 19 2/8 kreuzers he planned to redeem by temporarily decreasing the number of Hungarian students from 10 to 6.⁴⁸

In his answer of 5 August 1823, Prince-Primate Rudnay, who received Frint's proposal through the Hungarian Court Chancellery, insisted on his original idea contained in the decrees of the National Synod. He was willing to submit only if the monarch would put aside his (and his colleagues') offerings.⁴⁹ The case of the Hungarian contribution went a few rounds between the primates' courts in Esztergom and Vienna and the Council of the Governor-General in Buda.⁵⁰ The documents now contained a modified amount of 39.234 forints and 55 kreuzers deficit, which was divided into two parts. The deficit accumulated as the result of the costs of the Hungarian students during 1817–1823 was 14.415 forints and 25 kreuzers. This was redeemed in the spring of 1825 by the monarch, along Frint's ideas, by a transfer from the bursary of the Abbey of Saint James at Zselic to the Austrian Central Religious Fund, which had covered the expenses. Parallel with this, the Hungarian presence in the Institute was reduced to a minimum. During 1823–1828 there were only six students from the countries of the Holy Crown of Hungary. There was yet no decision about how the founding contribution ("primaeva Instituti instructio") of 24.819 forints and 30 kreuzers was to be redeemed.⁵¹ It may have been covered in the way that was often mentioned in the documents: from the incomes of the vacant episcopacies administered by the Treasury and from the Hungarian Religious Fund ("Fundus Religiosus").⁵²

The same sources may have served to supplement the current expenses in later years. Conditions seem to have been normalized after 1828, but according to the signs the total

47 A copy: AP AE Rudnay, Act. Fund. Eccl., No. 1/6, ad n. 1726/1823.

48 Ibid., n. 1726/1823. Cf. the letter of Count Ignác Almásy Royal Aulic Vice-chancellor to Sándor Rudnay, prince-primate of Hungary, Vienna, 25 July 1823. (Ibid. and Tusor, A bécsi Frintaneum tagjai, n. II/2.)

49 AP AE Rudnay, Act. Fund. Eccl., No. 1/6, ad n. 1726/1823.

50 Ibid., n. 1824/1823. and ad n. 1824/1823.

51 Letter of the "Consilarii Locumtenentiae Regiae" to the prince-primate. Buda, 12 April 1825. AP AE Rudnay, Act. Fund. Eccl., No. 1/6, n. 718/1825.

52 See "Relatio super informatione Exactoratus Consilii Locumtenentialis in merito rebonificandourm 1^o Sumptuum in primaevam Presbyterii Viennensis instructionem factorum; 2^o Supererogati ab anno 1817 usque 1823 per quinquennium in 10 eiusdem Instituti alumnos Hungaricos et Transilvanos facti..." AP AE Rudnay, Act. Fund. Eccl., No. 1/6, ad n. 1824/1823.

number of Hungarian students had not exceeded 6 until 1849, in accordance with Frint's proposal. According to the documents kept in the Institute's archive, Kaposfő ensured the basic expenses until 1846.⁵³ After that, this burden was placed more and more on the Hungarian Religious Fund.⁵⁴ On 3 October 1849 Minister Bach informed János Scitovszky, archbishop of Esztergom, that a *moneta conventualis* of 4.800 forints was separated for the 8 students from Hungary, who all arrived in the imperial city in order.⁵⁵

After the Settlement of 1867 between Austria and Hungary, the way and degree of the Hungarian contribution to the Augustineum can be traced in detail. Every year, the rector of the Institute, with the mediation of the prince-primate, submitted an application, with a list of the Hungarian students attached, to the Hungarian Royal Ministry of Religion and Public Education. The ministry then sent a transcript to the joint Ministry of Finance in Vienna, asking for permission to transfer the requested and assigned amount for the next financial year to the Institution. A copy of the resolution was sent to the prince-primate, who on this basis informed the rector of the Institute about the amount of the support.⁵⁶ In the financial year of 1880, 5.600 forints were transferred for the food and house rental expenses of 8 persons from the Hungarian Religious Fund, while in the case of one person the contribution was covered from the minister's separate budget reserved for Greek Catholics.⁵⁷ In 1883 a support of 1.000 forints per person was paid for 9 students.⁵⁸ In 1913 the support, paid in a similar way, amounted to 2.000 crowns per student. The only change was that now the money was transferred for the 1912/13 school year subsequently.⁵⁹ There was a separate chapter for travelling subsidies⁶⁰ and contributions in kind, as for instance in the case of providing the Institute with flour and beans during the months of the collapse in the autumn of 1918.⁶¹

The number of Hungarian students occasionally exceeded the number of "state-financed" places. Exceptionally, some people were allowed to become members of the Insti-

53 Cf. the letter of Laurenz Mayer to Cardinal Simor. Vienna, 25 April 1890. AP AE Simor, Cat. 6, fasc. B, n. 2482/1890.

54 Cf. Zschokke, *Die Theologischen Studien und Anstalten*, 580–581; Csorba, A Vallásalap "jogi természete", *passim*.

55 Letter of Minister Bach to Archbishop Scitovszky. Vienna, 3 October 1849. AP AE Scitovszky, Cat. 6, fasc. B, n. 156/1849.

56 See below.

57 AP AE Simor, Cat. 6, fasc. B, n. 5569/1879 and 257/1879 and n. 704/1880.

58 *Ibid.*, n. 135 and 1032/1883.

59 AP AE Csernoch, Cat. 6, fasc. B, n. 1779/1913.

60 Zschokke, *Die Theologischen Studien und Anstalten*, 580–581.

61 AP AE Csernoch, Cat. 6, fasc. B, ad n. 5377/1918.

tute on their own expenses. This is, for instance, how Sándor Kovács⁶² or the majority of the 14 Hungarian monastic students⁶³ were admitted. After the first year, Kovács was easily able to acquire the fund's support.

3. THE HUNGARIAN MEMBERS OF THE AUGUSTINEUM AND HUNGARIAN CATHOLICISM

The superiors of the Institute could make a proposal concerning the placement of graduated students. For instance, in 1867 Rector Johann Schwetz suggested that Jenő Roskovány should not in any case be employed in pastoral service but in education or court service.⁶⁴ During the reign of Franz I the Hungarian Chancellery⁶⁵ and the ordinaries concerned or their vicars⁶⁶ had to inform the ruler in writing about how the graduates of the Institute were employed in Hungary and also about their later progress. Although there is no sign of such intense interest from later periods, the result of the years spent in the direct vicinity of the Emperor and King and of the postgraduate studies is obvious.

Of the 55 bishops appointed until 1891 from among the graduates of the Augustineum there were 21 from Hungary.⁶⁷ This is 37%, which is roughly the same as the Hungarians' proportion within the Institute. We have good reason to believe that this number did not decrease in later years. Here I only allude to Gyula Vározy and Árpád Várady, archbishops of Kalocsa, and to Ágoston Fischer-Colbrie, bishop of Kassa, the only prelate in Northern Hungary left in his office after the Czech occupation. I also believe that the proportion of the Institute's graduates among the bishops appointed in Hungary between 1816 and 1918 may even surpass the 33% rate⁶⁸ calculated for the whole of the Monarchy between 1846 and 1903. The Hungarian directors of the Institute, who were also court chaplains at the same time, with the exception of the last one, Endre Werdenich, an outstanding dogmatist,

62 ÖStA HHStA Kabinettsarch., Separatenakt., 67/1915 and 28/1916.

63 AP AE Scitovszky, Cat. 6, fasc. B, n. 393 and 1111/1857. See also *ibid.*, Csernoch, Cat. 6, fasc. B, ad n. 2579/1913.

64 His letter to Archbishop Simor, Vienna, 7 January 1867. AP AE Simor, Cat. 6, fasc. B, n. 779/1867.

65 ÖStA HHStA Kabinettsarch., Kabinettskanzlei., n. 210/1823 (e.g. Máté, Szaniszló, Horvátovszky).

66 ÖStA HHStA Kabinettsarch., Kabinettskanzlei., n. 285/1823 (Dobra). 539/1824 (Máté). 545/1824 (Horvátovszky). 49/1825 (Karner). 791/1825 (Máté) 100 / 1825 (Horvátovszky). 342/1826 (Máté). 632/1828 (Karner) etc.

67 Zschokke, *Die Theologischen Studien und Anstalten*, 584–585.

68 Weißensteiner, *Das höhere Weltpriesterinstitut*, 228.

all finished their careers as bishops.⁶⁹ Another, József Dankó, a prolific historian, was only an elected bishop of the Hungarian Holy Crown⁷⁰ and, as such, was never ordained. It also needs to be emphasized that the two cardinal-prince-primates, the absolute heads of the Hungarian Church, of the era after the 1867 settlement between Austria and Hungary were also closely linked with the Institute. One of them, Cardinal János Simor (1867-1891), was director of education, the other, Cardinal János Csernoch (1913-1927) a student of the institution (1874). Beside these two, we should mention the names of two other graduates of the Augustineum who became members of the *Senatus Divinus*: Lajos Haynald, archbishop of Kalocsa, and Károly Hornig, bishop of Veszprém.

At the present stage of research it is impossible to even estimate the proportion of the members of the Augustineum in the middle layer of ecclesiastics or its effect on ecclesiastical and secular scholarship, education and culture. There is a long line of theologians, historians and spiritual writers in front of us. Here I shall only mention Rajmund Rapaics, a historian who was not afraid to write a universal church historical synthesis,⁷¹ Márton Pirhalla, the monographer of the Chapter of Szepes,⁷² Ede Mihalovics, writer of a fundamental sermon-historical monograph,⁷³ and József Lukcsics, who earned imperishable merits in Hungarian researches in the Vatican.⁷⁴ They are all classics of Hungarian church historiography. Another interesting figure was the later apostatised Gergely Csiky, who, as the creator of modern Hungarian drama,⁷⁵ is commemorated by the state theatre of Kaposvár wearing his name. We can also mention from among the better-known members of the middle class István Csárszky, director of the Austro-Hungarian house of pilgrims in Jerusalem⁷⁶ and primate's chancellor, and János Csiszárík,⁷⁷ a diplomat at the Roman embassy of the Monarchy, who in 1916 refused the Greek Catholic episcopal seat of Eperjes.

69 Antal Ocskay bishop of Kassa († 1848), Mihály Fogarassy bishop of Erdély († 1882), József Strossmayer bishop of Diakóvár († 1905), Cardinal János Simor, János Nogáll canon and consecrated bishop in Nagyvárád († 1899), József Dankó provost of Pozsony (Pressburg) elected bishop of Pristina († 1895), Fülöp Steiner bishop of Székesfehérvár († 1900), Kálmán Belopotoczky consecrated bishop, vicarius castrensis († 1914), Ágoston Fischer-Colbrie bishop of Kassa († 1925), Nándor Rott bishop of Veszprém († 1939), Endre Werdenich canon in Győr († 1933). – Their names in the list of alumns is segnalated with a *. See Tusor, A bécsi Frintaneum tagjai, under press.

70 Cf. Ritzler, Die Bischöfe der Ungarischen Krone, 127–164.

71 Rapaics, Egyetemes egyháztörténelem ...

72 Pirhalla, A szepesi prépostság ...

73 Mihalovich, A katolikus prédikáció története ...

74 Lukcsics, Monumenta Romana episcopatus Vesprimiensis ...

75 Janovics, Csiky Gergely élete, passim.

76 Cf. Hóvári, Magyar címer, 39.

77 Pfeiffer, A veszprémi egyházmegye történeti névtára, 87.

All this calls the attention to the fact that the history of 19th and 20th century Hungarian Catholicism cannot be truly understood without analyzing the effect of this supra-national Habsburg institution. The years of a major part of the Hungarian Catholic clergy of the Modern Times spent in the direct vicinity of the Emperor and King strengthened their devotion to the state-church, sometimes even in opposition to Rome, and also their doubts concerning the pope's primacy. These years also certainly contributed to their clinging to the Habsburg dynasty even after the demolition of the Monarchy. Traces of the intertwining of ecclesiastical career and loyalty towards the state, inspired by the Viennese Burg's milieu, were still obvious during Hungary's military and political occupation by the Russians. It is at least thought-provoking that the two prelates most willing to cooperate with the communist regime, Gyula Czapik, archbishop of Eger (1943–1956), and Sándor Kovács, bishop of Szombathely (1945–1972), were also students of the Institute, the only two from among their prelate contemporaries.

The suppletory and necessary nature of the Augustineum is testified by its functional survival. Its role in the education of the Hungarian ecclesiastical elite was taken over in 1928 after a gap of 10 years by the ecclesiastical department of the *Collegium Hungaricum* founded in Rome ("Regia Accademia d'Ungheria in Roma"), soon to become independent under the name of Pontifical Hungarian Ecclesiastical Institute and running to this day. Its first director was of course a graduate of the Augustineum, Ferenc Luttor.⁷⁸

4. PROSPECTS OF THE RESEARCH

My talk is but a rudimentary introduction into the topic, prepared upon the friendly request of Professor Rupert Klieber, mainly on the basis of archival research, in the lack of corresponding literature.⁷⁹ Having got to know the aims and results of the project "The Frintaneum and the dioceses of the Empire", which was initiated in 2002, and part of the source base in Vienna and Budapest, I think that the uncovering of the role of Hungarians is an important and realistic endeavour.

It is relatively easy to prepare, and also to publish in German, a biographical encyclopaedia of the Hungarian students of the Frintaneum. Many of them have already become entries in Hungarian biographical encyclopaedias. The necessary modifications and supplementation of these as well as the writing of the missing ones will hardly prove a problem for a research team organized with this aim at the Catholic University of Budapest, for

78 Tusor, Magyar történelmi kutatások a Vatikánban, lviii

79 Cf. Katolikus lexikon I, 126; Magyar katolikus lexikon I, ord. alph.

instance. In the monographic processing of the questions touched upon in my talk the difficulty will be the abundance of sources rather than the lack of them. Upon my inquiry almost all of the diocesan archives confirmed that they keep a considerable number of materials about the Hungarian members of the Augustineum. With the help of these documents supplemented by the material in Vienna it seems possible to reconstruct in detail the contacts between the students and their prelates and superiors as well as the everyday life of the Institute. Let me just mention one example: From the days of Cardinal Haynald in the Institute there are ca. 40 corresponding documents under 14 file numbers in the Primate's Archive in Esztergom.⁸⁰ Another promising direction seems to be the charting of the correspondence and contacts of earlier students of the Augustineum with each other.

The task is crucial not only for Austrian but also for Hungarian ecclesiastical scholarship. This is a way to fill the space, virtually at least, that was left in Hungarian presence in Vienna after the abolishment of the Augustineum.

APPENDIX

Alumns by Dioceses and Provinces

Ritus Latini:

Esztergom: 35, Veszprém: 22, Rozsnyó: 15, Győr: 14, Vác: 13, Pécs: 12, Székesfehérvár 11, Nyitra: 11, Szombathely: 8, Besztercebánya: 5 = Province of Esztergom: 146

Eger: 10, Kassa: 13, Szatmár: 11, Szepes: 9 = Province of Eger: 43

Kalocsa-Bács: 15, Erdély: 14, Nagyvárad: 12, Csanád: 16; Zágráb: 20, Diakóvár: 25, Zeng-Modrus: 16 = Provinces of Kalocsa-Bács and Zágráb: 118

Regulars:

O.S.B. (Pannonhalma): 7, O.Cist. (Zirc): 4, O.Praem. (Jászó): 1, O.F.M.Conv. (Erdély): 2 = Regulars total: 14

Ritus Graeci:

Munkács: 13, Eperjes: 4, Hajdúdorog: 1 = Province of Esztergom: 18

Fogaras: 16, Nagyvárad: 7, Szamosújvár: 6, Lugos: 4 = Province of Fogaras: 33

Körös: –

⁸⁰ AP AE Kopácsy, Cat. 6, fasc. C, n. 915. 1187. 1201. 1380/1837; n. 868/1838; n. 84. 127/1839; n. 345. 533A. 840/1840; n. 332. 389. 435. 595/1841. Cf. Tusor, A bécsi Frintaneum tagjai, n. II//3–7. – A larger, Hungarian version of this study: Tusor, A bécsi Augustineum és Magyarország, under press.

Concordance of Dioceses' names:

Besztercebánya – Neozolien. (Neusohl); Csanád – Csanadien; Diakóvár – Diákovarien (Diakovar); Eger – Agrien (Erlau); Eperjes – Eperjesien; Erdély – Transilvan (Siebenbürgen); Esztergom – Strigonien (Gran); Fogaras – Fogarassien; Győr – Iaurien (Raab); Kalocsa-Bács – Colocen et Bachien; Kassa – Cassovien (Kaschau); Kőrös – Crisien (Kreuz, Křiževci); Lugos – Lugosien; Munkács – Munkacsien; Nagyvárad – Magno-Varadien (Großwardein); Nyitra – Nittrien (Neutra); Pécs – Quinqueeccelsien (Fünfkirchen); Rozsnyó – Rosnavien (Rosenau); Szamosújvár – Armenopolen (Neuschloss); Szatmár – Sathmarien (Sathmar); Székesfehérvár – Albaregalen, Alben (Stuhlweißenburg); Szepes – Scepusien (Zips); Szombathely – Sabarien (Steinamanger); Vác – Vacien (Waitzen); Veszprém – Veszprimien; Zágráb – Zagrabien (Agram, Zagreb); Zengg–Modrus – Segnien et Modrusien (Senj)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- László Csorba, A Vallásalap „jogi természeté”. Az egyházi vagyon problémája a polgári átalakulás korának Magyarországon 1782-1918, Budapest 1999.
- István Fazekas, Ein ungarisches Priesterseminar am Rande des deutschen Sprachgebietes. Drei Jahrhunderte Wiener Pazmaneum 1623-1915 (1953), Peregrinatio Hungarica. Studenten aus Ungarn an deutschen und österreichischen Hochschulen vom 16. bis zum 20. Jahrhundert (Contubernium Band 64, hg. v. Márta Fata-Gyula Kurucz–Anton Schindling), Stuttgart 2006, 265–286.
- Gyula Géfin, A Szombathelyi Egyházmegye története. III: Történelmi névtár 1777–1935, Szombathely 1935.
- Walter Goldenits, Das höhere Priester-Bildungsinstitut für Weltpriester zum hl. Augustin in Wien oder „Das Frintaneum” bzw. „Das Augustineum”, Dissertation Univ. Wien 1969; Franz Loidl, Geschichte des Erzbistums Wien, Wien 1983.
- Eduard Hosp, Zwischen Aufklärung und katholischer Reform. Jakob Frint Bishcof von St. Pölten, Gründer des Frintaneums in Wien (Forschungen zur Kirchengeschichte Österreichs 1), Wien-München 1962, 69-81.
- János Hóvári, Magyar címer Jeruzsálemben, História, 2006, 3. sz.
- J. Janovics, Csiky Gergely élete és művei I-II, Budapest 1900–1902.
- Katolikus lexikon I, ed. by Béla Bangha, Budapest 1932.
- Iosephus Lukcsics, Monumenta Romana episcopatus Vesprimiensis I-IV, Budapest, 1896–1907.
- Ede Mihalovich, A katolikus prédikáció története Magyarországon I-II, Budapest 1900–1901.

- János Pfeiffer, *A veszprémi egyházmegye történeti névtára (1630–1950)* (Dissertationes Hungaricae ex historia ecclesiae 8), München 1987.
- Magyar katolikus lexikon I, ed. by István Diós–János Viczián, Budapest 1993.
- Márton Pirhalla, *A szepesi prépostság vázlatos története kezdetétől a püspökség felállításáig*, Lőcse, 1899.
- Rajmund Rapaics, *Egyetemes egyháztörténelem I–III*, Eger, 1879–1886.
- Remigius Ritzler, *Die Bischöfe der Ungarischen Krone*, Römische Historische Mitteilungen 13 (1971) 127–164.
- Tusor Péter, *A bécsi Augustineum és Magyarország (Vázlat)*, Aetas, 2007, under press.
- Péter Tusor, *A bécsi Frintaneum tagjai Magyarországról, 1816–1918. Adat- és forrásközlés*, Lymbus (Magyarságtudományi Forrásközlemények), Budapest 2007, under press.
- Péter Tusor, *Magyar történeti kutatások a Vatikánban (Collectanea Vaticana Hungariae I/1exc.)*, Budapest-Róma 2004 [Hungarian Historical Researches in the Vatican].
- Johann Weißensteiner, *Das höhere Weltpriesterinstitut zum hl. Augustinus in Wien („Frintaneum“)*, Priesterausbildungsstätten der deutschsprachigen Länder zwischen Aufklärung und zweitem Vatikanischen Konzil. Mit Weihestatistiken der deutschsprachigen diözesen (Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte. Supplementheft 49, Hg. v. Erwin Gatz), Rom-Freiburg-Wien 1994, 226–228.
- Hermann Zschokke, *Die Theologischen Studien und Anstalten der Katholischen Kirche in Österreich*, Wien-Leipzig 1894, 571–585.

Sources

- AP AE Prince-Primate Rudnay, 4/3: Acta Fundationalia Ecclesiastica (r.sz. 991–1012), No. 1/6
- AP AE Prince-Primate Kopácsy, 5/13: Categoria 6 (r.sz. 1211–1216), fasc. C: “Sublime”
- AP AE Prince-Primate Scitovszky, 7/14: Categoria 6 (r.sz. 1369–1379), fasc. B: “Sublime”
- AP AE Prince-Primate Simor, 8A/13: Categoria 6 (r.sz. 1671–1677), fasc. B: “Sublime”
- AP AE Prince-Primate Csernoch, 10A/12: Categoria 6 (r.sz. 2464–2470), fasc. B: “Sublime”
- ÖStA HHStA Kabinettsarchiv, Kabinettskanzleiakten – Separatenakten – Minister Kolowrat Akten

Abbreviations

- AE: Archivum Ecclesiasticum
- AP: Archivum Primatiale, Strigonium (Esztergom)
- HHStA: Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv
- ÖStA: Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, Wien