

Documents of the Hungarian Council Fathers in Hungarian Archives. Lessons and perspectives of a teamwork¹

KRISZTINA TÓTH*

In the Second Vatican Council participated approximately 2000-2200 Council Fathers from all over the world². Most of them came from the “free world” and could express their opinion without any pressure, while others came from the “Church of Silence” – but it did not mean that they would not have an own opinion about the future of the Catholic Church. Their presence was a significant result of the diplomacy of the Holy See: 10 years before it probably would have been unimaginable³. From Hungary – if we consider all the sessions – 12 Council Fathers from 10 dioceses could participate; 9 other Hungarian bishops and titular bishops were invited, but could not actually

* Pázmány Péter Catholic University Piliscsaba, Budapest.

1 The researches have been supported by the OTKA NN-82307 project and by the MTA-PPKE (Hungarian Academy of Sciences – Pázmány Péter Catholic University), Lendület Church History Research Institute and this study was written in the frame of the mentioned projects.

2 PH. CHENAUX, *Il Concilio Vaticano II*, Roma 2012, p. 51.

3 Pope Pius XI and also Pope Pius XII dealt with the plan of summoning a Council. The latter also entrusted the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office with the preparation in 1948, but this work stopped under unclarified circumstances in 1951. Cfr. PH. CHENAUX, *Il Concilio Vaticano II*, cit., pp. 34-35. About the Ostpolitik many articles, studies and books were published, now I mention only some examples from the recently published volumes that give an overall picture: K.-J. HUMMEL (Hrsg.), *Vatikanische Ostpolitik unter Johannes XXIII. und Paul VI. 1958-1978*, Paderborn-München-Wien-Zürich 1999; A. CASAROLI, *Il martirio della pazienza. La Santa Sede e i paesi comunisti (1963-1989)*, a cura di C.F. CASULA-G.M. VIAN, Torino 2000; A. MELLONI (a cura di), *Il filo sottile. L'Ostpolitik vaticana di Agostino Casaroli*, Bologna 2006; G. BARBERINI, *L'Ostpolitik della Santa Sede. Un dialogo lungo e faticoso*, Bologna 2007.

come, as it was not the interest of the communist authorities⁴. In addition, the archbishop of Kalocsa was asked to participate in the work of the Preparatory Committee, but he died in 1961, before the Council would have started⁵. Furthermore there was the apostolic administrator of Veszprém, who was ordained a bishop only later, in 1972, so he could not be a Council Father, only a Council Expert⁶.

Their bequest, their correspondence and other documents in connection with their participation can be found sporadically in different institutions. Personal, substantial research in these, that we regard particularly important for thorough work, is considerably difficult, regarding that special permissions are needed and much material is still disordered. All the same, our research group that consists of ten people and has become a part of the MTA–PPKE ‘Lendület’ Church History Research Institute did an extensive research: we got in touch with 34 archives and 10 ecclesiastical libraries. From these we found mentionable results in 23 archives and in 3 ecclesiastical libraries. Here I would like to express my sincere thanks to the Hungarian ordinaries and to the leaders of the archives and libraries who provided information and made research possible. Special thanks to Archabbot Asztrik Várszegi, who placed at my disposal his manuscript about Archabbot Norbert Legányi and a thesis about the liturgical renewal in Pannonhalma after the Second Vatican Council⁷.

- 4 All the invited Council Fathers are enumerated: *Concilio Ecumenico Vaticano II. Elenco dei Padri Conciliari*, a cura della Segreteria generale del concilio MCMLXII; *Concilio Ecumenico Vaticano II. Elenco dei Padri Conciliari*, a cura della Segreteria generale del concilio MCMLXIII; *Concilio Ecumenico Vaticano II. Elenco dei Padri Conciliari*, a cura della Segreteria generale del concilio MCMLXIV; *Concilio Ecumenico Vaticano II. Elenco dei Padri Conciliari*, a cura della Segreteria generale del concilio, MCMLXV.
- 5 József Grósz (1887-1961) was the leader of the Episcopacy then, as the primate, Cardinal Joseph Mindszenty there was at the American legation in Budapest. Probably that is why the archbishop of Kalocsa was invited to join the work of the Committee. Cf.: The letter of Cardinal Tardini, dated 15 June 1960 and the letter of Pericle Felici, July 2 1960, in *Kalocsai Főegyházmegyei Levéltár* (=KFL), I.I.c., the bequest of József Grósz, in the box with the inscription: «Grósz József hivatali iratai». It does not have any folio numbers.
- 6 Sándor Klempa (1898-1985) got an invitation as a Council Expert already in the September of 1962, but he could participate only at the third and fourth session of the Council. At the first and second session Pál Brezanóczy, the apostolic administrator of Eger accompanied the Hungarian bishops as a Council Expert. See more relating documents: *Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár Veszprém Megyei Levéltára* (=MNL-VML), *A Veszprém megyei Tanács Egyházügyi titkára*, XXIII. 25., b. 10, item 76. Without folio numbers; *Veszprémi Érseki Levéltár* (=VÉL), the bequest of Sándor Klempa, b. 7. Without folio numbers.
- 7 A. VÁRSZEGI, *Legányi Norbert pannonhalmi főapát (1906-1981)*, manuscript; T.K. SÁRAI-SZABÓ, *Liturgikus megújulás Pannonhalmán a II. Vatikáni Zsinat után*, Budapest 2005.

Before I would go into detail about the realisation of the first phase of project, I think it appropriate to outline the structure of my research report. First of all, I will give an overall picture about the members of the research group and the source keeping places. Then I will carry on with delineating the used methods, touching upon the main aspects on the basis of which we made the survey. Afterwards I will examine the results, mentioning the most interesting sources that enrich with new aspects the existing literature. Finally I will shortly outline the perspectives of the research.

1. THE MEMBERS OF THE RESEARCH GROUP AND THE SOURCE-KEEPING PLACES

The revealing of sources started in 2011. Finding the financial background of such a huge and significant project was not easy, but fortunately Prof. Péter Tusor integrated this important research into his own project of the Hungarian Scientific Research Fund („Hungary and the Holy See between the 13th and 20th century”) and into the research programme of MTA-PPKE ‘Lendület’ Church History Research Institute. Furthermore, if we needed any help, he was always at our disposal with his expertise and experience. We asked 9 researchers, who cooperated in the project with pleasure. Most of them were young historians, who either did their postgraduate studies at the Pázmány Péter Catholic University or already worked in the profession. The principal criteria of the selection were diligence and precise work. The members of the team were in alphabetical order – apart from me –: Máté János Hornyák, Miklós Jávör, Zsuzsanna Jenőffy, Richárd Nádas, Barnabás Pálkás, Balázs Rétfalvi, György Sági, Kata Sümeghy and Gergő Tőser. In regional archives and ecclesiastical libraries usually each of us worked on the bequest of one or two Council Fathers – but there were such who did more or helped only in the archives of Budapest. In the archives of the capital regarding the great number of documents everybody joined in the research. As the leader of the group, I regarded it important not only giving guidelines to the researchers, but also showing them an example by visiting certain archives and libraries personally.

Parallel with selecting the workmates, I had to take into consideration the institutions where we could find the written bequest of the Hungarian Council Fathers and the records in connection with their participation.

Most of these were not revealed by the relating literature⁸ that uses almost exclusively the material of the archives of Budapest (mainly the Hungarian National Archives and the Historical Archives of the Hungarian State Security) and the already published sources. It can be partly due to the fact, that usually documents in ecclesiastical archives can be researched only 50 years after their issue and bequests even more later, usually 70 years after the death of the given person, hence special permissions are needed⁹. From the other hand there are also such source-keeping places that so far only escaped historians' attention. What makes difficult forming an objective view on the basis of the material of the communist State Security and the organs of the communist government is, that many documents are missing and the remained are strongly determined by the ideology of the regime – the context, the way of phrasing and even the contemporary criteria of selecting which of them had to be annihilated. This way we can find only what they left, what they intended to leave to the posterity. So indirectly it transmits also their way of thinking. In the Historical Archives of the Hungarian State Security records were sorted out according to the philosophy and rules of this organ, around the changing of regime – so around 1989 – plenty of documents were annihilated and others are still retained by the succession organs¹⁰. The files of the State Office for Church Affairs – that is the most researched fond of the Hungarian National Archives in connection with the church history of the second half of the 20th century –, are also fragmentary, mainly as many affairs were settled without making records. This was usual in the age that means a challenge for historians, who would like to deal with this period of time. In case

8 Now I mention only some of the most important monographies (more can be get to know from the cited works' bibliography): G. VITÁNYI, *A II. Vatikáni Zsinat*, Budapest 1967 (particolarmente: 343-422); B. SAÁD, *A zsinat budapesti szemmel*, Budapest 1967; C. SZABÓ, *A Szentszék és a Magyar Népköztársaság kapcsolatai a hatvanas években*, Budapest 2005; F. KAHLER, *III/III-as történelmi olvasókönyv 3. A „Canale” dosszié. A magyar titkosrendőrség és a II. Vatikáni Zsinat. Az „Ibolya” dosszié. Hiányzó lapok „A magyarországi görögkatolikusok történeté”-ből*, Budapest 2005; A. FEJÉRDY, *Magyarország és a II. Vatikáni Zsinat 1959-1965*, Budapest 2011.

9 As we could observe, there not exist common criteria, it depends on the regulation of the given archive.

10 Cfr. G. MÓZESSY, *Amiről az iratok sem beszélnek... Forráskritikai megfontolások a közelmúlt egyháztörténet kutatásához (Kommunizmuskutatás és levéltárak konferencia, Esztergom, 2012. szeptember 13-14)*, in: <http://nyitottleveltarak.archivportal.hu/data/files/249166259.pdf> (last download: 22.01.2013.). Usually I would not quote an internet site, but in this case I make an exception, as the material of the lectures of the scientific conference *Research of communism and archives*, kept in Esztergom on the 13-14 of September 2012, are only available in this form.

of ecclesiastical archives the situation is similar: a lot of things were discussed orally and the registered documents are rather laconic, announcing only dry facts in some lines but do not go beyond them. Although the attentive historian can come to some conclusions from them, the unregistered documents – that can be found also in these archives – often can be more informative, can contribute to the understanding of the way of thinking of the Council Fathers to a greater extent¹¹.

Consequently, where I hoped to find the most material were the diocesan archives. Because of the mentioned research restrictions, it was a relatively untouched research field. In Hungary there are thirteen diocesan archives from which eleven could be taken into account, regarding that in 1993 John Paul II with the bull *Hungarorum gens* erected two new dioceses and in their archives only the documents of some relating parishes and the passed 20 years can be found¹². Accordingly, we had to restrict our examination to the material of the following archives: the Primatial Archives (*Prímási Levéltár*), the Archdiocesan Archives of Kalocsa (*Kalocsai Főegyházmegyei Levéltár*), the Archdiocesan Archives of Eger (*Egri Főegyházmegyei Levéltár*), the Archiepiscopal and Cathedral Chapter Archives of Veszprém (*Veszprémi Érseki és Főkáptalani Levéltár*), the Diocesan Archives of Győr (*Győri Egyházmegyei Levéltár*), the Episcopal and Capitular Archives of Pécs (*Pécsi Püspöki és Káptalani Levéltár*), the Episcopal Archives of Szeged-Csanád (*Szeged-Csanádi Püspöki Levéltár*), the Episcopal and Cathedral Chapter Archives of Székesfehérvár (*Székesfehérvári Püspöki és Székeskáptalani Levéltár*), the Diocesan Archives of Szombathely (*Szombathelyi Egyházmegyei Levéltár*), the Episcopal and Capitular Archives of Vác (*Váci Püspöki és Káptalani Levéltár*) and the Greek Catholic Episcopal Archives (*Görögkatolikus Püspöki Levéltár*). Additionally, it is also important to mention the Archives of the Archabbey of Pannonhalma¹³. From the above listed archives – as it turned out – in the Primatial Archives those documents are kept, that were issued until 1955, after this date until 1993 they are kept in a separate archive, that is unfortunately not researchable.

¹¹ *Ibidem*.

¹² *Nova Hungaricarum circumscriptionum ecclesiasticarum compositio*, in «Acta Apostolicae Sedis», 85 (1993), pp. 871-876. The two new dioceses were: the diocese of Kaposvár and the diocese of Debrecen-Nyíregyháza.

¹³ It is a territorial abbey and belongs immediately under the jurisdiction of the Holy See. The common people often speak about it as a diocese. Cfr. P. ERDŐ, *Egyházjog*, Esztergom 1991, p. 242.

Other important source keeping places that had to be taken into account were the manuscript collections of the diocesan libraries, as the written bequest of those ecclesiastical people, who died in the 20th century often can be found in them. Thus, I devoted great care to inquire also at the leaders of these institutions. Basically, there were ten libraries in which we hoped to find primary sources in connection with the participation of the Hungarian Council Fathers at the Council: the Cathedral Library of Esztergom (*Esztergomi Főszékesegyházi Könyvtár*), the Cathedral Library of Kalocsa (*Főszékesegyházi Könyvtár, Kalocsa*), the Archdiocesan Library of Eger (*Főegyházmegyei Könyvtár, Eger*), the Archiepiscopal Library of Veszprém (*Veszprémi Érseki Könyvtár*), the Diocesan Thesaurus and Library of Győr (*Győri Egyházmegyei Kincstár és Könyvtár*), the Diocesan Library of Pécs (*Egyházmegyei Könyvtár, Pécs*), the Episcopal Library of Székesfehérvár (*Székesfehérvári Püspöki Könyvtár*), the Diocesan Library of Szombathely (*Szombathelyi Egyházmegyei Könyvtár*), the Diocesan Library of Vác (*Váci Egyházmegyei Könyvtár*) and the Library of the Archabbey of Pannonhalma (*Főapátsági Könyvtár, Pannonhalma*). I sent also an inquiring letter to the Library of the Ferenc Gál Theological College in Szeged, about which I found the information that functions also as the diocesan library of the diocese Szeged-Csanád. In most of them there was not relating material, yet it can be declared that it worthed it, as we found mentionable results in three of them.

Thirdly, I thought it important to check the remained documents of the referendaries of church affairs of the given secretariat of the local council's executive committee and also other possible resources of the local system of council, mainly on the level of counties. In the background of my conception on the one hand, there was the idea that the copy of those reports, letters and other documents that were sent further to the centre could remain in the local county archives. In this way, if the original got lost we can reconstruct its content. On the other hand, certain documents, handwritten notes were made only for local use. As Hungary divided into 19 counties with separate county archives we had a board field for examination. Among them we conducted research mainly in those archives that there were in the same county, where the given Episcopal see was found, but where we regarded reasonable also in the neighbouring counties.

Then as some invited Council Fathers were not allowed to go to the Council, but I supposed, that they yet followed its happenings and had thoughts about its subjects about which they made notes or wrote letters

to ask passport to travel to Rome or other ones, we inquired at such source keeping places, where they were staying during the Council or keep their written bequest. For instance it seems that there are interesting documents in the archives of the Old People's Home of Hejce. Before our research no one thought that there could be important records in connection with this subject. We tracked down also some of the descendants of the relatives of the Council Fathers, who could have own relating documents, but they could not help us.

Finally, we also made the survey in the archives of Budapest, as we thought there might be such documents that had been escaped historians' attention.

2. THE USED METHODS AND MAIN ASPECTS OF THE RESEARCH

After getting in touch with the leaders of the above mentioned archives and libraries and where it was necessary having asked and got the permission of the given archbishop or bishop, we visited personally all those institutions, where we thought to find relating material. I decided to make the survey with this method, as I am convinced, that we could do a thorough work only in this way. If we merely corresponded with the archivists, who have many other tasks, they might have not had enough time to examine page by page the often disordered bequest of the given Council Father or other disordered material. Before starting research, we made a group-meeting, where we discussed the main aspects and the methods on the basis of which we intended to carry out research.

First of all, we looked over everywhere the given prelate's bequest, putting the emphasis on whether that contained anything in connection with his participation at the Council. We devoted a great care also to their correspondence with ecclesiastical people and authorities. Then we examined the notes of the register of the Bishop's Office and the Cathedral Chapter¹⁴ and as usually it did not contain enough information for filling the chart, we also requested them and skimmed them through. Furthermore we looked into the

14 According to the 1917 Code of Canon Law the cathedral chapter was the advice giving organ and senate of the bishop in certain matters determined by Canon Law, but the practice often differed from it in the age. Hence, it was less possible to find anything among these documents, but to do a careful work we needed to skim through also these. Cfr. *Codex Iuris Canonici, Pii X pontificis maximi iussu digestus Benedicti papae XV auctoritate promulgatus*, Roma 1918, can. 391. § 1. pp. 105-106.

Circulars, as well, that were censored, but yet could reflect some things, that the given ordinary regarded important to communicate with the believers.

I also asked the members of the team to look into the bequests of the Council-attendants of the bishops, if that was available, but I did not receive positive feedbacks. Hence, the tracking down of these materials remains the task of the future. As some of them were also agents of the Hungarian State Security, we could read their reports in the Historical Archives of the Hungarian State Security. This word “agent” has a negative connotation in the common knowledge, as these people were the informers of the communist authorities. But it can not be declared that all of them would have been evil and convinced communists. Maybe some of them joined from free will – because of conviction or interest, but most of them under pressure and threat. Moreover there were such agents, who did not write any incriminating reports, only noted such events or facts that were irrelevant or less important from the point of view of Hungarian State Security. There were even such, who wrote the report together with the monitored person¹⁵. All the same, as among the attendants of the bishops there were more agents¹⁶, there could remain in these documents such details that serve as useful additions to the history of the participation of the Hungarian Council Fathers at the council. Therefore it is advisable examining together the material of ecclesiastical and secular archives, this later with keeping a certain distance, a bit trying to look beyond the fates and intentions of these informators and always comparing with the data, that can be found in other, more reliable sources. With this approach – parallel to ecclesiastical archives –, we visited also secular archives, both local and national, where we looked up relating material.

To do a thorough work it was also important to know in which session, how many Hungarian Council Fathers were present. Regarding that literature mentions it, ascertaining about it was not difficult¹⁷. In the first session of

15 Many monographies, studies and round-table discussions with experts have been dealing with „agent” question in historiography. Now I quote only from the latter two good summaries: *Műtfeldolgozás és történetírás az „ügynökkérdés” kapcsán*, in «Regio, Kisebbség, politika, társadalom», 2006 (17) Nr. 4, pp. 5-28; Z. KRAHULCSÁN, *Ügynökkérdés a tudományos történetírásban. Beszámoló a Történeti Levéltárban tartott kerekasztal-beszélgetésről*, in *Betekintő 2* (2012) – it is available on the internet: http://www.betekinto.hu/sites/default/files/2012_2_krahulcsan.pdf (last download: 24.01.2013.)

16 See more detailed A. FEJÉRDY, *Magyarország...*, cit., pp. 281-285.

17 In the following footnotes I quote such books, studies, lexicon articles, from which an overall picture can be got about their life, their *oeuvre*.

the Council Sándor Kovács, the bishop of Szombathely¹⁸ and Endre Hamvas, the bishop of Csanád attended¹⁹. In the second session besides the already mentioned two Council Fathers: Vince Kovács, the apostolic administrator of Vác²⁰, Kálmán Papp, the bishop of Győr²¹ and Imre Szabó, auxiliary bishop of Esztergom²². At the first and second session there was also Pál Brezanóczy, who was the apostolic administrator of Eger, but was not a bishop then, hence, he could participate only as a Council Expert²³.

For the third session a quite populous group of the Hungarian ordinaries arrived as a result of the agreement of Hungary and the Holy See. As a consequence five such prelates could be present who were ordained bishops on the 28 October 1964 in the St Stephen's Basilica in Budapest. They were: József Bánk, the auxiliary bishop of Győr²⁴, Pál Brezanóczy, the apostolic adminis-

- 18 Sándor Kovács (1893-1972) was the bishop of Szombathely from 1944 to 1972. About his life see more *Prominent Hungarians home and abroad*, M. FEKETE (ed.), München 1966, p. 174; *Schematismus Dioecesis Sabariensis*, Szombathely 1972, pp. 25-27; *Prominent Hungarians home and abroad*, M. FEKETE (ed.), 2nd edition, London 1973, p. 231; F. SINKÓ-János VICZIÁN, Kovács Sándor, in *Magyar Katolikus Lexikon* (=MKL) VII, Budapest 2002, p. 292; *Új Magyar Életrajzi Lexikon* (=ÚMÉL) III, chief editor: L. MARKÓ, Budapest 2002, p. 1149; V.A. Soós, Kovács Sándor szombathelyi megyéspüspök és a kommunista állambiztonság, in «Vasi szemle» 62 (2008) Nr. 6, pp. 945-953.
- 19 Endre Hamvas (1890-1970) was appointed the bishop of Csanád in 1944. From 1952 he was also the apostolic administrator of the Hungarian part of the diocese Oradea. In 1964 as a consequence of the *intesa pratica* between Hungary and the Holy See he was appointed the archbishop of Kalocsa. See more: *Csanád egyházmegye jubileumi évkönyve 1980*, Szeged 1980, pp. 39-40; J. PÁL, *Hamvas Endre csanádi püspök és a németek kitelepítése*, in «Magyar szemle» 2 (1993) Nr. 12, pp. 1298-1308; J. PÁL, *Hamvas Endre csanádi püspök és a felvidéki magyarok, 1945-1948*, in «Magyar szemle» 3 (1994) Nr. 9, pp. 990-999; J. VICZIÁN, *Hamvas Endre*, in MKL IV, Budapest 1998, pp. 567-568; ÚMÉL III, Budapest 2002, pp. 92-93.
- 20 V. Kovács (1886-1974) was the apostolic administrator of Vác from 1959 to 1969. Cfr. J. VICZIÁN, Kovács Vince, in MKL VII, Budapest 2002, pp. 293-394. M. FEKETE, *Prominent Hungarians...*, cit., p. 174; M. FEKETE, *Prominent Hungarians...*, cit., 2nd edition, p. 231.
- 21 Kálmán Papp (1886-1966) was appointed the bishop of Győr in 1946 and he remained in this position until his death. In 1964 he got an auxiliary bishop, in the person of József Bánk. Cfr. ÚMÉL V, Budapest 2004, p. 125; J. VICZIÁN, *Papp Kálmán*, in MKL X, Budapest 2005, p. 594.
- 22 Imre Szabó (1901-1976) was from 1951 the auxiliary bishop of Esztergom. Cfr. J. VICZIÁN, *Szabó Imre*, in MKL XII, Budapest 2007, p. 481; M. FEKETE, *Prominent Hungarians...*, cit., pp. 267-268; M. FEKETE, *Prominent Hungarians...*, cit., 2nd edition, p. 380.
- 23 Pál Brezanóczy (1912-1972) was the apostolic administrator of Eger from 1959 to 1964, when he was ordained a bishop. *Magyar Életrajzi Lexikon* (=MÉL) III, chief editor Á. KENYERES, Budapest 1967-1981, p. 104; J. VICZIÁN, *Brezanóczy Pál*, in MKL II, Budapest 1993, p. 44; M. FEKETE, *Prominent Hungarians...*, cit., 2nd edition, 62; M. FEKETE, *Prominent Hungarians...*, cit., p. 52.; ÚMÉL I, p. 932.
- 24 József Bánk (1911-2002) was already a Council-attendant of the bishops in 1963. In 1964 he was appointed the auxiliary bishop of Kálmán Papp and he practiced this function until the death of the bishop. Then he became the apostolic administrator of Győr. In 1969 he was appointed the

trator of Eger, József Cserhádi, the apostolic administrator of Pécs²⁵, József Ijjas, the apostolic administrator of Csanád²⁶, and József Winkler, the auxiliary bishop of Szombathely²⁷. In addition, Endre Hamvas was transferred to the archiepiscopal see of Kalocsa. Apart from them Sándor Kovács, the bishop of Szombathely, Vince Kovács, the apostolic administrator of Vác, Norbert Legányi the archabbot of Pannonhalma²⁸, and Imre Szabó, the auxiliary bishop of Esztergom were present at the third session. In the fourth session from the enumerated prelates Imre Szabó and Norbert Legányi could not participate. Instead of the later, Miklós Dudás, the greek catholic bishop of

bishop of Vác. In 1974 he was transferred into the archdiocese of Eger, but he returned to the head of his old diocese in 1978. He retired in 1987. He was the longest lived Hungarian Council Father, died in 2002. See more: J. BÁNK (ed.), *Az egri főegyházmegye schematismusa az 1975. szentévbén*, Eger 1975, p. 9; *Váci egyházmegyei almanach II*, Vác 1980, pp. 53-67; L. TURÁNYI, *Magyar katolikus Almanach 1984*, Budapest 1984, pp. 377-379; J. VICZIÁN, *Bánk József*, in MKL I, Budapest 1993, pp. 592-593; P. ERDŐ, *Huszadik századi magyar egyházjogászok az európai kölcsönhatások összefüggésében*, in *Magyarok Kelet és Nyugat metszésvonalán*, edited by M. BEKE-I. BÁRDOS, Esztergom 1994, pp. 365-378; I. ELMER, *Tisztelegően legettette a báránycákat. A 90 éves Bánk József érsek-püspök köszöntése*, in «Új Ember» 57 (2001) Nr. 4, p. 2740; P. ERDŐ, *Bánk József érsek-püspök emlékére*, in «Kanonjog» 4 (2002) pp. 73-77; S.A. SZUROMI, *Bánk József érsek-püspök kánonjogi munkája*, in «Jogtörténeti Szemle» (2009) Nr. 2, pp. 58-60.

- 25 József Cserhádi (1914-1994) was ordained a bishop in 1964 and was nominated the apostolic administrator of Pécs. In 1989 he offered his renunciation – because he reached 75 years –, that was accepted. See more: M. FEKETE, *Prominent Hungarians...*, cit., p. 59; M. FEKETE, *Prominent Hungarians...*, cit., 2nd edition, p. 71; J. CSERHÁTI, *Másokért élünk, egymásnak szolgálunk*, Szeged 1990; Magyar ki kicsoda 1990: Több mint 6000 élő magyar személy életrajza, Budapest 1990, p. 107; L. LUKÁCS, *A vigília beszélgetése Cserhádi Józseffel*, in «Vigília» 59 (1994) Nr. 4, pp. 303-309; J. VICZIÁN, *Cserhádi József*, in MKL II, Budapest 1993, pp. 419-420; ÚMÉL I, Budapest 2001, pp. 1135-1136.
- 26 József Ijjas (1901-1989) from 1964 was the apostolic administrator of Szeged-Csanád, then from 1969 to 1976 the archbishop of Kalocsa. Cfr. M. FEKETE, *Prominent Hungarians...*, cit., 2nd edition, pp. 175-176; M. FEKETE, *Prominent Hungarians...*, cit., p. 132; *Csanád egyházmegye jubileumi évkönyve 1980*, Szeged 1980, pp. 40-41; J. VICZIÁN, *Ijjas József*, in MKL V, Budapest 2000, pp. 214-215; ÚMÉL III, Budapest 2002, pp. 443-444.
- 27 József Winkler (1905-1981) was appointed the auxiliary bishop of Sándor Kovács, the bishop of Szombathely in 1964. Cf.: István Diós, *Winkler József*, in MKL XV, Budapest 2010, p. 383; M. FEKETE, *Prominent Hungarians...*, cit., p. 318; M. FEKETE, *Prominent Hungarians...*, cit., 2nd edition, p. 461.
- 28 Norbert Legányi (1906-1987) was regarded reactionary that is why he could not go to the first and second, then the fourth session of the Council. He was the archabbot of Pannonhalma from 1957 to 1968. Cfr. M. FEKETE, *Prominent Hungarians...*, cit., 2nd edition, p. 246; *A pannonhalmi szent Benedek-rend névtára, 1802-1986*, Pannonhalma 1987, p. 189; A. VÁRSZEGI, *Legányi Norbert pannonhalmi főapát (1906-1981)*, manuscript; A. VÁRSZEGI, *Legányi Norbert pannonhalmi főapát születésének centenáriuma*, in «Bencés hírlévl» 8 (2006) Nr. 2, pp. 1-2.; J. VICZIÁN, *Legányi Norbert Béla, OSB*, in MKL VII, Budapest 2002, p. 709; ÚMÉL, IV, Budapest 2002, p. 156. About the liturgical renewal after the II Vatican Council T.K. SÁRAI-SZABÓ, *Liturgikus megújulás Pannonhalmán a II. Vatikáni Zsinat után*, Budapest 2005.

Hajdúdorog was allowed to travel to the Council²⁹. To sum up, the following Council Fathers could be present: József Bánk, Pál Brezanóczy, József Cserhádi, Miklós Dudás, Endre Hamvas, József Ijjas, Sándor Kovács, Vince Kovács, József Winkler. Besides, as a Council Expert there was the apostolic administrator of Veszprém, Sándor Klempa.

We put the emphasize principally on the bequest of those Council Fathers, who were practically present in the council-aula, revealing their intentions, way of thinking, circumstances of their travelling to the Council, their contributions and where it was possible a bit also the introduction of the deliberations into the practice. On the other hand, we tried to find the bequest also of those Council Fathers (Bertalan Badalik, János Bárd, Gellért Bellon, Mihály Endrey, Imre Kisberk, József Mindszenty, József Pétery, Lajos Shvoy, István Uzdóczy-Zadravec), who could not travel to Rome to take part at this outstanding event³⁰.

3. THE RESULTS OF THE RESEARCH

As I referred to it in the introduction part of my research report, we found mentionable results – in connection with Hungarian Council Fathers – in 23 archives and in 3 ecclesiastical libraries. About the results we made a 90 pages long chart. We managed to get in almost everywhere, except for a separate ecclesiastical archive in Esztergom for documents between 1955 and 1993 that is not researchable. Before I would give a detailed list about these institutions, I have to remark, that in the October of 2012 due to the modification of the Acts of 1995/LXVI and of 2003/III, the county archives assimilated into the Hungarian National Archives. As a result, their maintainer (former it was the given county, now it is the state) and their name changed, but their tasks remained the same. These changes came into effect on the 1st of October 2012³¹. Hence, in the filled chart we used their old names, but now I list the new ones.

29 Miklós Dudás (1902-1972) was appointed the bishop of Hajdúdorog in 1939. Cfr. M. FEKETE, *Prominent Hungarians...*, cit., p. 74; M. FEKETE, *Prominent Hungarians...*, cit., 2nd edition, p. 94; *A hajdúdorogi egyházmegye és a miskolci apostoli kormányzáság schematizmusa*, Pécs 1982, pp. 27-30; MÉL III, p. 167; I. PRIGYI, *Dudás Miklós*, in MKL II, Budapest 1993, pp. 717-718; ÚMÉL II, Budapest 2001, pp. 267-268.

30 Cfr. note 4.

31 Cfr. Act of 2012/LXI, in «Magyar Közlöny», Nr. 63 (2012), pp. 10061-10065.

3.1. Ecclesiastical archives

Archidiocesan Archives of Eger (*Egri Főegyházmegyei Levéltár*, 3300 Eger, Széchenyi tér 1).

Archabbey's Archives (*Főapátsági Levéltár*, 9090 Pannonhalma, Vár 1).

Greek Catholic Episcopal Archives (*Görögkatolikus Püspöki Levéltár*, 4400 Nyíregyháza, Bethlen Gábor tér 5).

Diocesan Archives of Győr (*Győri Egyházmegyei Levéltár*, 9021 Győr, Káptalandomb 5/a).

Archidiocesan Archives of Kalocsa (*Kalocsai Főegyházmegyei Levéltár*, 6300 Kalocsa, Szentháromság tér 1).

Episcopal and Capitular Archives of Pécs (*Pécsi Püspöki és Káptalani Levéltár*, 7624 Pécs, Szent István tér 23).

Episcopal Archives of Szeged-Csanád (*Szeged-Csanádi Püspöki Levéltár*, 6720 Szeged, Aradi vértanúk tere 2).

Diocesan Archives of Szombathely (*Szombathelyi Egyházmegyei Levéltár*, 9700 Szombathely, Szily János utca 2).

Episcopal and Cathedral Chapter Archives of Székesfehérvár (*Székesfehérvári Püspöki és Székeskáptalani Levéltár*, Székesfehérvár 8000, Városház tér 5).

Episcopal and Capitular Archives (*Püspöki és Káptalani Levéltár*, 2600 Vác, Migazzi Kristóf tér 2).

3.2. Secular archives

Historical Archives of the Hungarian State Security (*Állambiztonsági Szolgálatok Történeti Levéltára*, 1067 Budapest, Eötvös utca 7).

Branch Archives of the Archives of the County Borsod-Abaúj-Zemplén of the Hungarian National Archives in Alsózsolca (*Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár Borsod-Abaúj-Zemplén Megyei Levéltárának Alsózsolcai Fióklevéltára*, 3571 Alsózsolca, Kossuth Lajos utca, 149).

Archives of the Capital Budapest (*Budapest Főváros Levéltára*, 1139 Budapest, Teve u. 3-5).

Archives of the County Bács-Kiskun of the Hungarian National Archives (*Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár Bács-Kiskun Megyei Levéltára*, 6000 Kecskemét, Klapka utca 13-15).

Archives of the County Baranya of the Hungarian National Archives (*Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár Baranya Megyei Levéltára*, 7621 Pécs, Király utca 11).

Archives of the County Csongrád of the Hungarian National Archives (*Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár Csongrád Megyei Levéltára*, 6720 Szeged, Dóm tér 1-2).

Archives of the County Győr-Moson-Sopron of the Hungarian National Archives (*Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár Győr-Moson-Sopron Megyei Levéltára*, 9022 Győr, Liszt Ferenc utca 13).

Archives of the County Heves of the Hungarian National Archives (*Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár Heves Megyei Levéltára*, 3300 Eger, Mátyás király út 62).

Hungarian National Archives (*Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár Országos Levéltára*, 1014 Budapest, Hess András tér 5).

Hungarian National Archives (*Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár Országos Levéltára*, 1037 Budapest, Lángliliom utca 4).

Archives of the County Nógrád of the Hungarian National Archives (*Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár Nógrád Megyei Levéltára*, 3100 Salgótarján, Bem út 18).

Archives of the County Tolna of the Hungarian National Archives (*Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár Tolna Megyei Levéltára*, H-7100 Szekszárd, Béla király tér 1).

3.3. Other archives

Archives of the Old People's Home of Hejce (*Hejcei szociális otthon adattára*, 3892 Hejce, Béke tér 1).

3.4. Ecclesiastical libraries

Library of the Archabbey (*Főapátsági Könyvtár*, 9090 Pannonhalma, Vár 1).

Cathedral Library of Kalocsa (*Főszékesegyházi Könyvtár*, 6300 Kalocsa, Szentháromság tér 1).

Diocesan Library of Vác (*Váci Egyházmegyei Könyvtár*, 2600 Vác, Migazzi tér 2).

In the library of the archabbey of Pannonhalma the relating documentation had been discovered in an armoire in the library and had been carried to the archive, right before I arrived there to research, hence, now it can be researched there. In the Diocesan Library of Vác the legacy of Vince Kovács is under arrange, so although we visited that personally and theoretically had

got the permission to research, practically we could not look over the material yet.

Outlining the results we regard it important to note, that most of the written bequests of the Council Fathers – that are located principally in Ecclesiastical archives except for the legacy of Vince Kovács –, are disordered and contain unregistered documents. Sometimes there is a certain order in the boxes – presumably this primary systematization had been done before the archives would have got them –, but other times one could have the feeling that the records were put into the given box by chance, does not have any conception. So we had to look up every single page to find information in connection with the participation of the given Council Father on the Council. As these documents are unregistered and disordered, it is possible, that at the future arranging they will be put in other boxes with different numbers than we indicated in the filled chart. That is why we decided to record these findings more detailed. In the great part of the bequests important and worthy documents can be found: the drafts of their contributions to the council, records about their conceptions and their correspondence (letters and postcards). Very often turned up in these boxes printed schemes – sometimes with the handwritten notes of the bishops –, the press of the Council, newspapers – most of them in black and white, but sometimes also in colour. Mentioning the media, it occurred, that in one of the archives we found a tape, too, that we regard an inestimable source for reconstructing the way of thinking of the given Council Father. Besides of these, the worthiest are the diaries of Council Fathers that show the Council from their point of view. Now I would like to mention only one example: the diary of Norbert Legányi, who was considered to be reactionary by the authorities, and could participate only at the third session of the Council as a result of a compromise of the Holy See and Hungary. From his diary it can be delineated his careful preparation for the Council, the atmosphere of the discussions, the people with who he met, and also what he experienced³². The boxes contain also some photos: we can see the Hungarian bishops in them meeting the pope, celebrating the mass, standing on the St Peter's Square, attending receptions or other programs, etc. Furthermore there are in their bequests invitation cards, program bro-

32 A. VÁRSZEGI, *Legányi Norbert pannonhalmi főapát (1906-1981)*, manuscript. The original of the diary can be found: Pannonhalmi Főapátsági Levéltár, *The personal documents of Norbert Legányi*, diary of the Archiabbate.

chures, other prospectuses, small prints, Council-passes. Many times these documents tell us a lot about the atmosphere of the age and the system of relationships of the Council Fathers as well. From the other hand, in case of some Council Fathers their legacy is not so rich of documents of the Council.

Those records, the numbers of which there are in the registry book in this period of time are usually short and do not tell us much about the way of thinking of the bishops. Most of them are administrative letters: asking passport, settlement of the Council-expenses, correspondence about travelling, copy of the constitutions, decrees, declarations of the council, their Hungarian translation and some documentation in connection with building into practise the deliberations. Furthermore, at some places Circulars of the Episcopacy and of the bishop can be found in them. Usually these later type of sources were collected in separate volumes, too.

As it is clear from the filled chart in the county archives the most frequent type of resources is the report, but there can be found also some administrative letters. The number of the guides of the State Office for Church Affairs is also significant. Sometimes there are Circulars as well, that shows the working of censure. Among the secular archives, I need to mention separately the matter of the Historical Archives of the Hungarian State Security and the Hungarian National Archives. Along with the personal bequests of the Council Fathers in the diocesan archives the files of these two archives are the most useful for reconstructing the participation of the Hungarian bishops at the Council. The former archive has a special system of arranging, documents are kept in different kind of files (there are e.g.: investigation files, operational files, work files, enlisting files, etc.). Most of the mentionable results are in operative and work files. The "Canale-dossier" is the most well-known among them. In these files there are detailed reports about the Council Fathers, we can get to know from them even what the colour of their pyjamas was. But reading these pieces of information many questions arise in a historian: how far these rapports were accurate, why they wrote so detailed about some seemingly unimportant things, while they were silent or laconic about others. Did they intend to cloak with it that they did not know or did not want to write detailed about other happenings? What was the intention of their writer with them? Naturally these questions can be answered only after careful pondering and getting to know the circumstances.

In the matter of the Hungarian National Archives the most frequent type of sources are the letters and reports. Most of them are about the possibility

of the participation of certain Hungarian bishops and titular bishops at the Council, copies and translations of the different changing of letters with the Holy See, administrative letters, reports of moods – what the priests thought about the council and about the speeches of the Council Fathers –, reports about visiting the bishops in their own diocese. In addition, the plan of some contributions can be also read in them.

In case of those Council Fathers, who were invited to the Council, but could not participate, we did not find too much remarkable results, mainly not regarding their way of thinking about the subjects of the Sessions. What we found is usually only asking of passport to participate at the Council and the response of the State that they are not allowed to go. So either they practically did not write down their conceptions or it is possible, that those documents exist somewhere, so our survey could not be full, only partial in case of them. We wrote into the chart only those results concerning these Council Fathers that promise new and interesting additions to the existing literature. These are: the correspondence of Lajos Shvoy and the pieces of information of the Council of two Council Fathers: Bertalan Badalik and József Pétery, who could not go to the Council and were staying in the Old People's Home of Hejce.

4. THE PERSPECTIVES OF THE RESEARCH

After we carried out the research, we had another research-group meeting, where we shared experiences and we talked about the continuation of the project. We all agreed that we are ready to continue the work by detailed revealing of the found material for which the financial and academic background will be provided by the mentioned MTA-PPKE 'Lendület' Church History Research Institute.

Reviewing the enormous work of the team, I am proud of the diligence of its members and I sincerely hope that our work could give a useful aid for those, who would like to deal with the history of the Council. Notwithstanding the mapped material is very rich, we think that there is yet a lot to do. For instance finding the bequests of the attendants of the Council Fathers, getting in touch with their relatives and looking through contemporary newspapers published home and abroad. Though it can be only one part of the work, the other, more important task of the future research should be to

compare the new results with the already existing literature, the more detailed study of the material of the provincial archives – both ecclesiastical and secular – and diocesan libraries, mainly the handwritten notes and diaries of the Hungarian Council Fathers and to separate how their own ideas and the expectations of the State were built in their independent and common contributions. Finally it would be also interesting to make a comparison what have been realized from the deliberations of the Council in Hungary: how they built them into the local practice.