

Péter Tusor

VILMOS FRAKNÓI'S HERITAGE IN ROME

The Hungarian Historical Research
in the Vatican



Sette Città

2024

STORIA D'UNGHERIA – HISTORY OF HUNGARY I

Collana diretta da

Péter Tusor (Università Cattolica di Budapest)

Matteo Sanfilippo (Università della Tuscia)

Péter Tusor

VILMOS FRAKNÓI'S
HERITAGE IN ROME

The Hungarian Historical Research
in the Vatican

Sette Città

2024

All rights reserved.

Reproduction in any form, storage or transcription by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or in any other ways, including movie, radio, television or internet) is prohibited without the written permission of the publisher.

© 2024 edition of Sette Città
Via Mazzini, 87 • 01100 Viterbo
Tel 0761.304967 Fax 0761.303020
www.settecitta.eu • info@settecitta.eu

English text proofread by László Kristó

ISBN: 979-12-5524-086-0
ISBN ebook: 979-12-5524-096-9

Finished printing in May 2024

The project was conducted in the frame
of the Collegium Professorum Hungarorum.

STORIA D'UNGHERIA – HISTORY OF HUNGARY is a scientific series
of the PPKE-PTE Vilmos Fraknói Research Institute
and of the Gyula Moravcsik Institute (HUN-REN).

Scientific Comittee: Alessandro Boccolini, Tamás Fedeles, Viktor Kanász,
Gaetano Platania, Giovanni Pizzorusso, Kornél Szovák

Table of Contents

<i>Preface</i>	7
I. Source collection during the Baroque era	9
II. Monumenta Vaticana Hungariae (1881–1892)	15
III. The Hungarian Institute of History in Rome and the Monumenta Romana Episcopatus Vesprimiensis (1894–1904)	29
IV. Institutional Interregnum (1905/1906–1924)	51
V. The Hungarian Institute of History in Rome and the (Regia) Accademia d’Ungheria di Roma (1924–[1944]–1950)	67
VI. The Age of Banishment and of Gradual Resumption (1950–2004)	111
VII. Hungarian Research in the Vatican in the 21 st Century (An Outlook)	125
<i>Documents</i>	135
1. 22 January 1913, Budapest. Vilmos Fraknói to Count János Zichy – translation from Hungarian	135
2. 3 March 1913, Budapest. Deed of gift between the Hungarian state and Vilmos Fraknói (Authentic Italian notarial transcription)	137i
<i>Sources</i> (including the abbreviation of each archival material)	149

Bibliography 153

Abbreviations 171

Register 173

Preface

I wrote the main part of this historiography in Hungarian in 2004. The period of research covered here is up to 2004. I quote the later published secondary literature only in special cases, or in relation to the new Vatican-Hungarian historical series, the *Collectanea Vaticana Hungariae*, which was founded also in 2004 (see below, Chapter VII.)

Now, on the centenary of the death of Bishop Vilmos Fraknói, the story of the enormous work he and his colleagues carried out at the end of the 19th century is being made available in English in full detail to international scholarship. But it also reveals the increasingly intractable problems yet in Fraknói's lifetime. The Roman heritage of the scholarly abbot-canon, secretary-general of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences: the systematic and organised Vatican research into Hungarian history in the 20th century was not, in the end, a success comparable to that of the late 19th century. I publish this volume in the hope that the historiographer of the future will be able to paint a much more favourable picture of our era, thanks to the work and results of the research group bearing Vilmos Fraknói's name at the Catholic University of Budapest, which is working on his Roman academic heritage, from 2012 with the financial support of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and the Hungarian Research Network.

In memory of Vilmos Fraknói, who died 100 years ago, we organised an international symposium at Aventine in Rome (*"Protagonisti e collaboratori.*

Studiosi provenienti dall'Europa centro-orientale presso gli archivi della Santa Sede tra il 1881 e il 1918"). The present historiography is published especially for this occasion. I thank my Italian colleagues, above all Gaetano Platania, President of the *Istituto Nazionale di Studi Romani*, and Matteo Sanfilippo and Alessandro Boccolini, professors at the University of Viterbo, for their contribution to the organisation of this commemorative conference. Thanks are also due to Emmanuel Paris for the publication of this work by his publisher, Edizioni Sette Città of Viterbo.

Budaörs–Tura, on February 27, 2024

I

Source Collection during the Baroque

“It is impossible to write a history of Hungary without the knowledge of the archives in Italy, especially in the Vatican”

Already at the time of the Baroque Jesuit historiographic school, historical scholarship in Hungary made every effort to uncover the Hungarian-related sources of the Vatican Library and Archives. The aim, never attained, was to produce a comprehensive church history of Hungary, including the relations between Hungary and the Holy See in every respect.¹

The Hungarian historical research in Rome, apart from the request for information² by István Báthory, prince of Transylvania and king of Poland (1571–1575–1586), practically began with Menyhért Inchoffer.³ The

¹ The motto is: L. FEJÉRPATAKY, *A pápai levéltárak* [*The Papal Archives*], Századok 18 (1884) 66–73, 73.

² Both Vilmos Fraknói and Albert Berzeviczy mention that Cardinal Sirleto, probably with the mediation of the Jesuit István Szántó, had documents of Hungarian and Polish interest copied from the Vatican Archives for Báthory. *A római magyar gyóntatók* [*The Hungarian Confessors in Rome*], Katholikus Szemle (KSz) 15 (1901) 385–394, 392–393; Századok 46 (1912) 318–321, 319 (Berzeviczy’s letter to János Zichy, the minister of education and religion). – For a short outline of the beginnings see, for example, VILMOS FRANKÓI, *Nyomozások a pápai levéltárakban* [*Investigations in the Papal Archives*], (offprint from Századok), Budapest 1892, 3–4; [IDEM], *A vatikáni levéltár* [*The Vatican Archives*] Magyarország és a római Szentszék [see below], I, 341–356 (see also the introduction of this volume, v–xi); and Arnold Ipolyi’s later quoted *Preface* [Monumenta Vaticana Hungariae (MVH) I, 1 and II, 1].

³ On Inchoffer’s role in the history of science: BÁLINT HÓMAN, *A forráskutatás és forráskritika története Magyarországon* [*The History of Source Research and Source Criticism in Hungary*], (A magyar történettudomány kézikönyve I/3a), Budapest 1925, 5; LÁSZLÓ SZELESTEI N[AGY], *Irodalom és tudományszervezési törekvések a 18. századi Magyarországon 1690–1790* [*Efforts of Literary and Scientific Organization in Hungary of the Eighteenth Century 1690–1790*], (Az Országos Széchényi Könyvtár Kiadványai [n.s.] 4), Budapest 1989, 49–54. – Dezső Dümmerth dealt with Inchoffer and his work in his study, which is useful concerning its subject material, yet its conclusions and statements should be read with a sophisticated criticism: *Inchoffer Menyhért küzdelmei és tragédiája Rómában 1641–1648. A magyar forráskritikai történetírás megszületése és a Jézus Társaság meghiúsult reformja* [*The Struggles and Tragedy of Menyhért Inchoffer in Rome 1641–1648. The birth of the Hungarian Historiography of Source Criticism and the Unrealised Reform of the Society of Jesus*], (A

Kőszeg-born Jesuit published his work on the events taking place before 1059 under the title *Annales Ecclesiastici Regni Hungariae* in 1644 in Rome. Within the frames of the church-historical programme worked out by the Hungarian Jesuit research organizers, the way paved by Inchoffer was furthered by a Hungarian confessor in Rome, Márton Cseles. If not systematically, without temporal limitations he collected various materials during 1697–1698.⁴ In his applications, making reference to the commission and support of Lipót Kollonich, cardinal and archbishop of Esztergom (1695–1707), he asked for and was granted permission by Pope Innocent XII (1691–1700) himself to write the prosopography of Hungarian bishops and archbishops.⁵

There only two smaller surviving publications by the Jesuit Márton Cseles.⁶ His collection was not only preserved by the eighteenth century generation of Jesuit historiographers but was partly utilized and

Budapesti Egyetemi Könyvtár Kiadványai 38), Budapest 1977 (offprint from *Filológiai Közöny* 1976/2). – The traces of the Hungarian Jesuit research in the Vatican library: CHRISTINE MARIA GRAFINGER, *Die Ausleihe vatikanischer Handschriften und Druckwerke (1563–1700)* (Studi e Testi [ST] 360), Città del Vaticano 1994, 599 and 629.

⁴ Cseles's brief biography: FERENC MONAY, *A római magyar gyóntatók*, Róma 1956, 101–107; on his relation with Gábor Hevenesi and Márton Szentiványi, who worked out the church history program: HÓMAN, *A forráskutatás és forráskritika története*, 9–11 and especially SZELESTEI, *Irodalom és tudomány-szervezési törekvések*, 49–54 (where the false statements of Dümmerth's concerning Cseles were corrected); on his medieval research, more literature by Hóman and Szelestei. His collection's present place: Library of Eötvös Loránd University, Collection of Manuscripts (ELTE EKK), Collectio Kapriniana, vol. A/12–14; Ms. Ab 50, vol. I–XI. In the volumes, which borrow the certified material of the Vatican collections with Primate Lipót Kollonich's signature and seal, there are mainly copies of medieval charters, as well as documents from the modern period, like the verbal of the papal examination after Cardinal György Martinuzzi's assassination (Ms. Ab 50, vol. XI, fol. 1–322), the papal breves to the Hungarian bishops from 1522–1628 (*ibid.*, fol. 323 et sequ.), or the memoirs of Péter Pázmány, archbishop of Esztergom, and Péter Domitrovich, bishop of Zagreb, addressed to the newly established Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in 1622 on the Hungarian Catholicism's situation. These (vol. IV, fol. 160–163. 169–171) are from the following place: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (BAV), Vat. Lat., vol. 6696.

⁵ The originals of the requests date from 17 April and 22 June 1697: Archivio Apostolico Vaticano (AAV), Miscellanea (Armadi I–XV), Armadio I, vol. 12, fol. 90r – 91v (Cseles's other copies can be found in this very volume). See also *Collectanea Vaticana Hungariae* (CVH), I/20, Appendix, I, n. vi and Lajos Pásztor's later quoted study of basic importance. (L'Istituto Storico Ungherese, 145–146, n. 13.)

⁶ *Elucidatio historico-chronologica de episcopatu Transilvaniae*, Romae 1702; and the *Descriptio amplitudinis episcopatus Sirmiensis* published after his death.

expanded as well.⁷ In their collections, there are numerous other Roman copies and documents from the Holy See found in Hungary,⁸ among which there are many original copies.⁹ Especially the syntheses by Károly Péterffy,¹⁰ György Pray¹¹ and István Katona drew much, in different ways, upon Roman sources, mostly the Vatican registers.¹² In addition, Gábor Hevenesi charted the archives of the imperial (and Hungarian royal) apostolic nunciature, which were stored in Vienna at the time.¹³ In addition to the canonical examination records of the Vienna archives, József Koller, who discovered the accounts of Hungarian tithe-notaries, also utilized, for his monograph on the history of the episcopacy of Pécs, a good number of Roman consistorial documents.¹⁴ During the eighteenth century, the most extensive collection in the papal archives was done and commissioned by, apart from the Piarist Ince József Desericzky,¹⁵ Count Ignác Batthyány, later bishop of Gyulafehérvár (Alba Iulia).¹⁶

The aristocratic prelate was the first in Hungarian historiography who considered the far-reaching exploration of the Hungarian-related sources of Vatican to be important. He had been an alumn of the *Collegium Germanicum Hungaricum* for hardly a month when he introduced his plans to György

⁷ On them, see Hóman and Szelestei's quoted works, furthermore DOMOKOS KOSÁRY, *Művelődés a XVIII. századi Magyarországon* [Culture in Eighteenth Century Hungary], Budapest 1996, 144–153, 571–584.

⁸ *Catalogus manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Regiae Scientiarum Universitatis Budapestinensis III–IV, Budapestini 1907–1910, passim* (the *Collectio Hevenesiana*, *Prayana* and *Kaprinaiana*'s repertoire and index).

⁹ For instance ELTE EKK *Collectio Prayana*, vol. 32, *passim*.

¹⁰ CAROLUS PÉTERFFY, *Sacra concilia ecclesiae Romano-catholicae in regno Hungariae celebrata I–II*, Viennae–Posonii 1741–1742.

¹¹ GEORGIUS PRAY, *Specimen hierarchiae Hungariae I–II*, Posonii–Cassoviae 1776–1779; *Annales rerum Hungariae ab anno Chr. 997 ad annum 1564 deducti I*, Vindobonae 1764.

¹² STEPHANUS KATONA, *Historia critica regum Hungariae I–XLII*, Budae–Vacii–Colocae, 1779–1817. The same statement holds for the source publication of György Fejér: *Codex diplomaticus Hungariae ecclesiasticus ac civilis I–XI*, Budae 1829–1844.

¹³ His copies of the nunciature material: ELTE EKK *Collectio Hevenesiana*, vol. 41, fol. 1–197.

¹⁴ *Historia episcopatus Quinque Ecclesiarum I–VII*, Posonii 1782–1812. It was also him to make Antonio Burgio's reports known to the Hungarian scientific community. Pray's work of *Epistolae Procerum regni Hungariae* (II–III, Posonii 1806) publishes Koller's collection of 12 pieces in Latin translation. Cf. MVH II/1, CLIII.

¹⁵ He stayed in Rome from 1742 to 1746 as the assistant of the general of the order. His related work: *De initii ac maioribus Hungarorum commentaria I–V*, Budae–Pestini 1748–1760. He is famous for being the historian of the diocese of Vác. Cf. HÓMAN, *A forráskutatás és forráskritika története*, 18.

¹⁶ ZSIGMOND JAKÓ, *Batthyány Ignác, a tudós és a tudományszervező* [Ignác Batthyány, the Scholar and Research Organizer], [IDEM], Társadalom, egyház, művelődés (METEM Könyvek 18), Budapest 1997, 359–382.

Pray¹⁷ in his letter of December 1763, after which he almost immediately set about the task.¹⁸ As the provost of Eger, with the mediation of the nuncio of Vienna, Giuseppe Garampi, he entrusted Abbot Gaetano Marini with continuing his research.¹⁹ He was already the bishop of Transylvania, when he delegated the task to his librarian, Imre Dániel, to pursue a comprehensive collection in the library of the Vatican, moreover in the Secret Archives for the purpose of writing the (church) history of Hungary (as well as of Transylvania) (*“per dare alla luce l’istoria sagra del regno d’Ungheria e Transilvania”*).²⁰ Imre Dániel, who stayed in Italy between 1783 and 1785, besides Rome, also visited Venice, Milan, Pavia, Parma, Modena, Florence and Naples. The number of his copies reaches some thousand pages; in his research journal is an unparalleled written record of the Hungarian history of science.²¹ Batthyány organized his source-exploring programme in Rome around given document collections and historical questions. His concrete ideas were preserved for posterity in an appendix attached to one of his applications for permission to carry out research. According to the program of the bishop, the following were of great importance (from Hungarian point of view) and to be brought together from the Vatican collections:

1. All those documents which are related to any bishopric of the country or to its monarch
2. The documents of the bishopric of Milkó
3. Reports on the wars in Hungary and on the state of religion

¹⁷ JAKÓ, *Batthyány Ignác, a tudós*, 360.

¹⁸ As a “Germanicus”, he analysed the following volumes: BAV Vat. Lat., vol. 3922. 3934. 3901. 3934. 4013. 4118. 6531. 6941. 7021. 7022. 6168. 6199. 6198. 6210. 6222. 6223. 6263. 6420. 2934. 3477. 3901; Urb. Lat., vol. 816. 839. 864. 866; Ottob. Lat., vol. 2068. 2206. 2416. 2419. 2434. 2482. 2682. 2604. 2776. 2068. 2510. 2676. 2114. CHRISTINE MARIA GRAFINGER, *Die Ausleihe Vatikanischer Handschriften und Druckwerke (18. Jahrhundert)*. I: *Biblioteca Vaticana*. II: *Archivio Segreto Vaticano* (ST 406–407), Città del Vaticano 2002, I, n. 395.

¹⁹ Marini’s request for his research in the Vatican Archives was dated on 14 October 1778. GRAFINGER, *Die Ausleihe Vatikanischer Handschriften*, II, 337.

²⁰ The requests for the research of the bishop to Pius VI (1775–1799) were brought by: GRAFINGER, *Die Ausleihe Vatikanischer Handschriften*, I, n. 265. II, n. 399.

²¹ *Diarium historicum Italici mei itineris litterarii, seu vera, adcurata et continuata narratio eorum, quae toto itineris mei tempore Romae, seu in aliis Italiae urbibus inde a primo profectionis die vidi, legi, scripsi, observavi, atque perfeci I–II*. Batthyaneum, Ms. X/128. The first part was published: Dániel Imre „*Diarium*” [*The “Diarium” of Imre Dániel*], *Közművelődés* [Politikai és Társadalmi és Szépirodalmi Katholikus Hetilap, Gyulafehérvár] 33 (1910) nr. 2–38. Cf. JAKÓ, *Batthyány Ignác, a tudós*, 376.

4. The bull of Urban II (1088–1099) addressed to Lőrinc, bishop of Milkó (this was definitely a mistake, since the bishopric of Milkó had not been established yet)
5. The documents of the negotiations led by the nuncios who were sent to Hungary and to Transylvania
6. The sources on the reign of Louis II (1516–1526), John I Szapolyai (1526–1540) and Ferdinand I (1526–1564)
7. The documents and acts of the Hungarian diets
8. The decisions of the Hungarian councils
9. The material of György Draskovich and Bishop András Dudith, who participated in the Council of Trent
10. The Hungarian relations of the sources referring to Germany from the age of Ferdinand I
11. Papal bulls, letters, answers, *tractati*, and other ancient documents which are about the bishopric of Transylvania
12. The letters of the princes of Transylvania to the popes and the Holy See
13. The reports of the Transylvanian bishops to the successors of Saint Peter between 1000 and 1529
14. The documents of Cardinal György Martinuzzi, O.S.P.P.E. and Cardinal András Báthory
15. Finally, all those files, documents, in which the words Transylvania or Transylvanian can be found²²

The full realization of Bishop Batthyány's remarkable plan lacked the personal and material conditions.²³ His chief work, the *Leges ecclesiasticae regni Hungariae* published in 1785, however, can be regarded as fundamental.²⁴

Apart from this, there are only few occasional attempts from the second half of the eighteenth century. In 1776, Sebastiano Ronconi wanted to send the portrait of King Matthias from the apostolic library to

²² GRAFINGER, *Die Ausleihe Vatikanischer Handschriften*, I, n. 266.

²³ Cf. JAKÓ, *Batthyány Ignác, a tudós*, 380.

²⁴ Volumes II and III were published only in 1827. For its source appendix, it should be mentioned: IGNATIUS COMES DE BATTHYAN, *Sancti Gerardi episcopi Chanadiensis scripta et acta cum serie episcoporum Chanadiensium*, Alba Iulia 1790.

Hungary; besides, Maximilianus Hell endeavoured to enter the Secret Archives to write the history of the archbishops and the councils of Kalocsá.²⁵ A few ecclesiastical petitioners wanted to gather the copy of the legal documents.²⁶ After a long struggle, in the early 1800's, Albert Volstán Berzeviczy prepared some abstracts through Archduke Joseph, Palatine of Hungary's good offices.²⁷

²⁵ GRAFINGER, *Die Ausleibe Vatikanischer Handschriften*, I, n. 203, II, 338.

²⁶ Around 1770–1780 Abbot Ruschi collected Alexander VI's bull (1492–1503) of 1493, in which the pope confirmed the decision of Vladislaus II (1490–1516) to let the abbacy of Szentjobb fall into the hands of the Paulines from the Benedictines; in 1773 the general of the observant Franciscans the documents of the Holy See that exempted the Hungarian custody (because of their trial in Eger) from the *quarta funerale*; in 1774, Maximilian Iacobus, the administrator of the *Schottenstift* in Vienna, the abbacy of Telek's bull of foundation. None of them were fruitful. GRAFINGER, *Die Ausleibe Vatikanischer Handschriften*, II, n. 140. 202. 219.

²⁷ Between 26 December 1818 and 24 April 1819. He did not get permission to prepare copies, his drafts were to be shown to the palatine. Besides, he visited the libraries of the Vatican, Casanatense, Angelica, Barberini and the Corsini, with much success. LAJOS SZÁDECZKY, *Berzeviczy Albert utazásai 1818–1820* [*The Travels of Albert Berzeviczy in 1818–1820*], *Földrajzi Közlemények* 17 (1889) 286–321, 307–309; ALBERT BERZEVICZY, *Magyar utazók Olaszországban a múlt század első felében* [*Hungarian Travellers in Italy in the First Part of the Last Century*], Budapest 1903, 23. – About the international research conducted, or planned to be conducted before the opening of the archives: JOHANN RAINER, *Historische Forschungen in Rom vor der Öffnung des Vatikanischen Archivs*, *Römische Historische Mitteilungen* (RHM) 23 (1981) 181–193 (furthermore Antal Hodinka's later quoted work).

II

Monumenta Vaticana Hungariae (1881–1892)

The eruption of Hungarian researches in the Vatican arrived with the age of positivism, which made the awareness of history equal to the exploration of the data and sources as much as it was possible. Upon Ágoston Roskoványi's request, who was bishop of Vác then of Nyitra, Augustin Theiner, the expert prefect of the archives of Pápa, published a monumental collection of 2219 pieces of documentation (*Vetera monumenta historica Hungariam sacram illustrantia*. I: 1216–1352. II: 1352–1526) at the expense of the conference of the Hungarian Bench of Bishops.²⁸ The Southern Slav volume,²⁹ which was compiled by him, also contains a fair number of Hungarian-related sources, as well as his publication of material relating to Poland and Lithuania from the fourteenth century.³⁰

In the 1860's, Hungarian historians began charting the most important Italian source locations, partly under the commission and direction of the Historical Committee of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (in Hungarian “Magyar Tudományos Akadémia”, abbrev. ‘MTA’ or ‘HAS’) and partly

²⁸ Romae 1859–1860.

²⁹ *Vetera Monumenta Slavorum meridionalium historiam illustrantia maximam partem nondum edita ex Tabulariis Vaticanis deprompta collecta ac serie chronologica disposita*. I: *Ab Innocentio PP. III. usque ad Paulum PP. III.* (1198–1549). II: *A Clemente VII. usque ad Pium VII.* (1524–1800) *cum additamentis saec. XIII. et XIV.*, Romae–Zagrabiae 1863–1875. His second volume was welcomed by Gyula Pauler's unusually sharp criticism, and he expressed his opinion that the documentary value of the papal nuncios' reports is less than that of the legates of Venice. Századok 10 (1877) 570–573.

³⁰ *Vetera Monumenta Poloniae et Lithuaniae gentiumque finitimarum historiam illustrantia maximam partem nondum edita, ex tabulariis Vaticanis deprompta, collecta ac serie chronologica disposita*. I: *Ab Honorio PP. III. usque ad Gregorium PP. XII.* (1217–1409). II: *Ab Ioanne PP. XXIII. usque ad Pium PP. V.* 1410–1572. III: *A Sixto V. usque ad Innocentium XII.* 1585–1696, Romae 1860–1861–1863. The above statement is hardly valid to the fourth volume of the publication, therefore I do not quote it.

according to their own work plans.³¹ As a result of this research enterprise, Lipót Óváry's small volume, *III. Pál pápa és Farnese Sándor bíbornok Magyarországra vonatkozó diplomáciai levelezései (1535–1549)*, i.e. *The Diplomatic Correspondence of Pope Paul III and Cardinal Alexander Farnese Related to Hungary (1535–1549)*, appeared as early as 1879.³² Apart from the historiography at the Baroque age and the achievements of Theiner, the documents, which were originally in the possession of the nunciature of the Holy See and later kept at the archives of the Farneses in Naples – published by Óváry –, further increased the interest in the archives of the Apostolic See, which are among the most considerable source locations of Italy. Although at that time the papal archives had been closed for public research, around the end of Pius IX's (1846–1878) pontificate, it was possible to study the fonds of the Vatican Secret Archives with special permission. This enabled Vilmos Fraknói, as well, to conduct research in Rome four times in the 1860s and 1870s.³³ Apart from

³¹ On the significance of the program with the list of the important series and works: JÁNOSNÉ FRÁTER, *A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Történettudományi Bizottságának működése (1854–1949)* [*The Work of the Historical Committee of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (1854–1949)*], (A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Könyvtárának kiadványai 52), Budapest 1966. On the Italian copies, which unfortunately do not contain the material of the Vatican, with the exception of Antal Beke's manuscript from Innocent VIII's (1484–1492) supplications and Béla Tárkányi's later found collection (cf. CVH I/20, *Appendix*, I, n. 1 and IV): IMRE LUKINICH, *A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Történettudományi Bizottsága másolat- és kéziratgyűjteményének ismertetése* [*The representation of the Historical Committee of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences' Collection of Copies and Manuscripts*], Budapest 1935, 20–30. 33–41. 75.

³² Monumenta Hungariae Historica (MHH) I/16, Budapest. Óváry's account and the representation of the examined material: *Kutatások a nápolyi Farnese levéltárban* [*Research material in the Farnese Archives in Naples*], Századok 11 (1877) 1–17.

³³ His request of 1867 to continue his researches in Rome from Prince-Primate János Simor, and his account of 1870, 1873 and 1874: Prímási Levéltár [Primate Archives] (PL), Archivum Ecclesiasticum (AE), Primate János Simor, Archivum Secretum, 1867, n. 154; PL AE Primate János Simor, Categoria A, fasc. 1; Cat. 44, fasc. 3, n. 5734/1874. In the latter mentioned year, Fraknói called the attention of the primate to the importance of the nuncios' reports' research. PL AE Simor, Arch. Secr., 1874, n. 9. (See also Simor Cat. 20, 24.) Cf. GYÖRGY BÓNIS, *Útmutató az esztergomi prímási levéltárhoz. Archivum Ecclesiasticum I–II* [*A Guide to the Primate Archives in Esztergom*], (Levéltári leltárak 24), Budapest 1964, I, 106. 136. 139. 142. II, 389–390 and 521–522. During his research, he visited the collection of the Borgheses and the Barberinis preserved in their family palace, furthermore the archives of the Jesuits, Dominicans and other Italian cities. His collection was partly used in his Pázmány monograph. VILMOS FRANKL, *Pázmány Péter és kora I–III* [*Péter Pázmány and his Age I–III*], Pest 1868–1872. Cf. also *Egy ismeretlen Corvin-Codex Rómában (Naplótöredék)* [*An Unknown Corvin-Codex in Rome (Extract from a Diary)*], Századok 2 (1868) 445–447. In May 1878 he travelled to Milan, Florence, Bologna, Pisa, Lucca, Ravenna and Modena. *Két hét olaszországi könyv- és levéltárakban* [*Two Weeks in Italian Libraries and Archives*], Magyar Könyvszemle (MKSz) 3 (1878) 121–153.

him, on behalf of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, only Béla Tárkányi had the chance to make copies.³⁴

After the “opening” of the Vatican archives in principle in January 1881, Vilmos Fraknói³⁵ immediately travelled to the Eternal City in May. Together with Tárkányi and Vince Bunyitay he had talks with the archivists, Cardinal Ludovico Jacobini, Secretary of State and Cardinal Joseph Hergenröther, archivist of the Holy Roman Church. He was even granted a private audience by Pope Leo XIII (1878–1903). Fraknói’s plan, which he presented on these occasions, was to have Hungarian-related Vatican sources published, mostly with the help of priest-historians and at the expense of the Hungarian Church, in an independent series by the Holy See itself. As he explained in various ways, with this enterprise, the Vatican could line up with the states actively supporting modern historical scholarship without much sacrifice, contributing, at the same time, to the growth of the international reputation of Hungarian Catholicism and scholarship. His large-scale plan, provided he was able to raise the necessary funds, was met favourably in the Roman Curia.³⁶

³⁴ Cf. the above quoted related literature.

³⁵ The summary of the life, various titles and work of the founder of Hungarian-related research in Rome in the modern period: ALBERT BERZEVICZY, *Fraknói Vilmos emlékezete* [*The Memory of Vilmos Fraknói*] (*Felolvastott az Akadémia 1927. május 8-án tartott ünnepi ülésén*), Budapest 1927 (however, some of its details related to our topic are wrong, for example p. 15.).

³⁶ The history of Hungarian research in Rome in positivism’s age can get to be known from many studies. Arnold Ipolyi’s *Introduction* is – among others – about the very beginning (MVH II, x–xvi and II, xv–xxi); with publishing many sources, the main events are shown by Vilmos Fraknói himself (*Monumenta Vaticana Hungariae historiam illustrantia. Fraknói Vilmos jelentése* [*The Report of Vilmos Fraknói*], (Új) Magyar Sion (MS) 13 [1882] 441–453 and 509–525). Not only about the beginnings, but also until the beginning of the twentieth century, it supplies with interesting, valuable details and gives a summary: ANTAL HODINKA, *Arómai levéltárak*, Bossányi’s later noted work, I, 7–165 and II, 7–148, I, 72–79; and to a certain degree REZSŐ VÁRI, *Történeti intézetek Rómában. Adalék a legújabb kor tudománytörténelméhez* [*Institutes of History in Rome*], Budapest 1916, 45–52; furthermore, ANTAL ÁLDÁSY, *Fraknói Vilmos emlékezete* [*The Memory of Vilmos Fraknói*], KSz 39 (1925) 449–460, 456–457; above all LAJOS PÁSZTOR, *AVatikáni Levéltár* [*The Vatican Archives*], Levéltári Közlemények (LK) 20–23 (1942–45) 100–129. It excels the latest publications: LAJOS PÁSZTOR, *L’Istituto Storico Ungherese a Roma e il vescovo Vilmos Fraknói*, Archivio della Società Romana di Storia Patria 100 (1977) 143–166; [IDEM], *Le origini dell’Accademia d’Ungheria di Roma*, Un istituto scientifico a Roma: L’Accademia d’Ungheria (1895–1950) (Studi e Ricerche 7, a c. di Péter Sárközy–Rita Tolomeo), Roma 1993, 9–24; [IDEM], *Vilmos Fraknói e i «Monumenta Vaticana historiam regni Hungariae illustrantia»*, Rivista di Studi Ungheresi 10 (1995) 44–59; GÁBOR ADRIÁNYI, *Fraknói Vilmos és a „Monumenta Vaticana Hungariae Historiam illustrantia” megindítása* [*Vilmos Fraknói and the Launch of the “Monumenta Vaticana Hungariae Historiam illustrantia”*], Magyar Egyháztörténeti Vázlatok [Essays in Church History in Hungary] (MEV)–Regnum 8 (1996) 3, 61–72; LÁSZLÓ CSORBA, *Fondazione dell’Istituto Storico Ungherese a Roma (1895–1922)*, Cento anni al servizio delle relazioni ungaro-italiane. Gli istituti ungheresi, scientifici, culturali ed ecclesiastici di Roma (1895–1995) (a c. di László Csorba), Budapest 1998, 7–17. (The important volume of essays and studies was also published

After having led quick preliminary research – during the year, the prefect of the archives lent him a couple of charters –, Fraknói returned home and immediately started organizing.³⁷ First of all, he informed Cardinal János Simor, Prince-Primate of Hungary, archbishop of Esztergom, Cardinal Lajos Haynald, archbishop of Kalocsa, Arnold Ipolyi, bishop of Besztercebánya and Lőrinc Schlauch, bishop of Szatmár about the results of his discussions in Rome. Confident in their support, on 16 August 1881 – together with a fellow-canon Flóris Rómer – he requested the cathedral chapter of Nagyvárad to offer a yearly sum of 500 Forints for the expenses of the newly established Vatican series, *Monumenta Vaticana*, and further “to request all the cathedral chapters of the country to offer a certain yearly contribution for this purpose.”³⁸ On the very same day, the canons of Nagyvárad asked for the donations of all the cathedral chapters and the richest monastic orders and beneficiaries of the country, and one or two bishops. As the other members of the bench of bishops felt ignored, Fraknói decided to address them in a letter on 23 November.

With one or two exceptions (such as the cathedral chapter of Pécs and Székesfehérvár, or Nándor Dulánszky, bishop of Pécs),³⁹ the answers were so favourable that by the spring of 1882, he had at his disposal a total of 130,000 Liras for a period of ten years. The sum further increased owing to the growing voluntary offers, and became 170,000 Liras by the summer. The final sum – as we will see in the chart later – reached the total of 90,000 Forints. This meant approximately 8–9000 Forints annually. Consequently, not only

in Hungarian: *Száz év a magyar–olasz kapcsolatok szolgálatában. Magyar tudományos, kulturális és egyházi intézetek Rómában [1895–1995]* [*Hundred Years in the Service of the Hungarian-Italian Relations. Hungarian Scientific, Cultural and Church Institutes in Rome [1895–1995]*], ed. by LÁSZLÓ CSORBA, Budapest 1998.) Numerous sub-information, more: LEO SANTIFALLER, *Briefe von Wilhelm Fraknói zu Theodor Sickel aus den Jahren 1877 bis 1906*, RHM 6–7 (1962–1964) 193–351. (Tihamér Vanyó's assumption that Sickel's letters written to Fraknói were in the Manuscript Collection of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences [MTAKK] is unfortunately wrong. I checked, there are some letters – for instance to Fejérfpatak – of his in the Manuscript Collection of National Széchényi Library [OSzKK]. Cf. VANYÓ's study of *Újabb publikációk...*, which is noted later.) – In the centre of my work is the history of research; however, I also tried to include aspects of institutional history. In the latter aspect, though, I did not endeavour to completely integrate the results and data of the earlier analyses. Therefore, the works of Lajos Pásztor, László Csorba, Jánosné Fráter and Gábor Ujváry, in particular, cannot be omitted. In addition, in most cases I used primary literature and the sources themselves, therefore the unavoidable overlaps with these studies are noted only in some important places.

³⁷ On the borrowing of documents: MTAKK Régi Akadémiai Levéltár [Old Academic Archives] (RAL), 1881/544.

³⁸ MS 13 (1882) 444.

³⁹ MS 13 (1882) 511 and 513; PÁSZTOR, *Vilmos Fraknói e i «Monumenta Vaticana»*, 51.

did they achieve Fraknói's aim of 200,000 Liras, but they also exceeded it. As the major amount of the sum, even if only in the form of obligation, had been collected by the end of autumn 1881, the assembling of the participants and the election of the editorial staff to discuss the practical duties became due by December. Cardinal Haynald, who was appointed to organize the meeting, deemed it more advisable to turn to Rome again before any actions were made. There was a certain consideration in the background of his decision; namely, the enterprise – not in its essentials but on its scale – surpassed the initiator Fraknói, who could negotiate in the Curia practically only on his own behalf, as a scholar canon (and the abbot of Szekszárd). It might have looked more diplomatic if they had discussed certain details, namely those related to the nature of the publication, with the Roman party before they made their decisions. They wanted to avoid confronting the Curia with the resolutions agreed upon during the meeting. Besides, Haynald often expressed his firm belief that the “centre of the *Monumenta Vaticana*'s administration and editorship should be in Hungary, moreover a Hungarian printing house should release the publications.”⁴⁰

The archbishop of Kalocsa wrote a letter to Jacobini, secretary of state, on 9 March 1882 in this spirit. He introduced the steps taken, gave an account of the results of the collection, then he asked for a permission for Fraknói to visit Rome again. The cardinal gave no reply. Nevertheless, Fraknói travelled to the Eternal City with Tárkányi in early May, where due to the real tasks he faced more obstacles than in the previous year. On the one hand, the secretary of state wanted the Holy See to directly control the publications; on the other hand, he had scruples about publicising the nuncios' reports and commands. Finally, the scholar prefect of the archives, Pietro Balan (who at first seemed rather unpleasant to Fraknói) came to the aid of the Hungarians and vouched for the content of the documents. After numerous discussions, where Fraknói expressed his concept in a memorandum composed in eloquent Latin, Jacobini finally raised no objections, not even to the nature of publication. Fraknói was heading home, when the secretary of state replied to Haynald in his letter of 19 May and announced that the Holy Father would give his blessing to the enterprise of the Hungarian clergy.

⁴⁰ A quotation from the letter that Fraknói received on 19 December 1881. MS 13 (1882) 446. Haynald expressed this opinion also personally on 22 October. ADRIÁNYI, *Fraknói Vilmos és a „Monumenta Vaticana”*, 68.

After settling the questions of detail with the Curia, the archbishop of Kalocsa summoned the founding meeting of the participants in Budapest on 4 June 1882. Arnold Ipolyi, diocesan bishop of Besztercebánya, György Császka, diocesan bishop of Szepes and Konstantin Schusztér, diocesan bishop of Kassa, József Németh, auxiliary bishop, major provost of Csanád, Gyula Markusz, canon of Esztergom, Gábor Latinovich, canon of Kalocsa, Béla Tárkányi, canon of Eger, Zsigmond Bubics, canon of Várad, József Vágner, canon of Nyitra, and furthermore, Tivadar Ortway, Tamás Füßy and Benedek Csaplár, as the representatives of the prelates and cathedral chapters that made an offer participated in the meeting organized in the conference hall of the Szent István Társulat (Saint Stephen Association). By the proposition of Fraknói, the meeting precisely defined the aims previously approved of by Rome and determined the title of the series, then elected the editorial committee.

In their words, the aim of the enterprise was to “publish the historical relics of the papal archives concerning our Church and country. In two series: a) the publication of the correspondence of papal nuncios at the Hungarian royal court; b) the correction, complementation and continuation of Theiner’s work *Monumenta Hungariam Sacram illustrantia*. The title of the work shall be: *Hungarian Chartulary in the Vatican. Monumenta Tabularii Vaticani Hungarica*,” which was later modified as *Monumenta Vaticana historiam Regni Hungariae illustrantia* (*Monumenta Vaticana Hungariae [MVH]*).⁴¹ Arnold Ipolyi was elected as the head of the editorial committee of the series, of which members were József Dankó, Nándor Knauz, Béla Tárkányi, Flóris Rómer and Vilmos Fraknói. The meeting entrusted the committee – in reality only Fraknói – with establishing the order of the publications, organizing the copies and administering the practical duties of editing and printing. They were obliged to prepare a working plan and manage the finances for each year, which were to be presented annually to the bidders together with the report about the work performed. The institutional background and the administration of the capitals were provided by the St. Stephen Association. In addition, the founders precisely defined the conditions of payments until July 1892 – the circle of those who received complimentary copies – furthermore, they decided on the distribution of the remaining volumes and the money from their marketing

⁴¹ MS 13 (1882) 523. – The above mentioned were – with some correction, like in the case of the sums – based on the previously noted abundant literature on institutional history.

and how that money should be returned to the funds of the enterprise. Three thousand Forints were allowed to be spent in the first year. Above all, those who offered money were taken into account as well. There were all in all 29 persons and church institutions, as follow:

<i>Name of the bidder</i>	<i>Duration</i>	<i>Sum of the offer for a year</i>
1. Cardinal János Simor, Prince-Primate of Hungary	1 year	200 gold
2. Cardinal Lajos Haynald, archbishop of Kalocsa-Bács	10 years	500 Ft
3. Ágoston Roskoványi, bishop of Nyitra	annual	1000 Ft
4. József Peitler, bishop of Vác	10 years	500 Ft
5. Sándor Bonnáz, bishop of Csanád	5 years	500 Ft
6. Arnold Ipolyi, bishop of Besztercebánya then Nagyvárád	10 years	250 Ft
7. György Császka, bishop of Szepes	10 years	300 Ft
8. Konstantin Schusztér, bishop of Kassa then Vác	10 years	100 Ft
9. Metropolitan Chapter of Esztergom	10 years	600 Ft
10. Metropolitan Chapter of Kalocsa-Bács	1 year	150 Ft
11. Metropolitan Chapter of Eger	10 years	500 Ft
12. Cathedral Chapter of Várád	10 years	500 Ft
13. Cathedral Chapter of Csanád	10 years	100 Ft
14. Cathedral Chapter of Nyitra	1 year	200 Ft
15. Cathedral Chapter of Vác	10 years	50 Ft
16. Cathedral Chapter of Szepes	10 years	50 Ft
17. Cathedral Chapter of Rozsnyó	10 years	50 Ft
18. Collegiate Chapter of Pozsony	10 years	100 Ft
19. Krizosztom Kreusz, Kolozs Vaszary archabbot of P.halma	10 years	300 Ft
20. György Modrovics O.S.B. abbot of Zalavár	10 years	50 Ft
21. András Kalmár O.Sch.P. provincial	10 years	30 Ft
22. Bishop József Németh, major provost of Csanád	10 years	50 Ft
23. Béla Tárkányi, canon of Eger	10 years	500 Ft
24. Vilmos Fraknói, canon of Nagyvárád, abbot of Szekszárd	10 years	500 Ft
25. Zsigmond Bubits, canon of Várád then bishop of Kassa	10 years	250 Ft
26. József Dankó, canon of Esztergom	10 years	150 Ft
27. Károly Rimely, canon of Pozsony, abbot of Lekér	10 years	100 Ft
28. János Rácsek, major provost of Nagyvárád	1 year	500 Ft
29. Antal Sujánszky, canon of Esztergom	1 year	500 Ft
<i>Total:</i>	1. year (<i>part I</i>)	8380 Ft + 200 gold

The participants of the session did not want to despair those who had not determined their exact sum, or those who had given an evasive answer.⁴² Moreover, the circle of the bidders expanded right after the session⁴³ and by the date of the publication there were all in all further 14 members, mainly bishops:⁴⁴

30. István Lipovniczky, bishop of Nagyvárád	5 years	500 Ft
31. Vince Simon, Adolf Kuncz O. Praem., provost of Csorna	10 years	100 Ft
32. Cathedral Chapter of Székesfehérvár	10 years	150 Ft
33. Cardinal József Mihajlovics, archbishop of Zagreb	10 years	200 Ft
34. János Zalka, bishop of Győr	[1 year]	200 Ft
35. Zsigmond Kovács, bishop of Veszprém	10 years	100 Ft
36. Lőrinc Schlauch, bishop of Szatmár, then Nagyvárád	10 years	400 Ft
37. Nándor Dulánszky, bishop of Pécs	10 years	100 Ft
38. Viktor Kaczvinszky O. Praem., provost of Jászó	10 years	100 Ft
39. Jeromos Supka O.Cist., abbot of Zirc	10 years	300 Ft
40. Cathedral Chapter of Pécs	10 years	100 Ft
41. Cathedral Chapter of Győr	[1 year]	200 Ft
42. Cathedral Chapter of Szatmár	10 years	50 Ft
43. Cathedral Chapter of Besztercebánya	10 years	50 Ft
<i>Total:</i>	<i>1. year (part II)</i>	2550 Ft
<i>The total sum of the offers in the first year:</i>		10 930 Ft + 200 gold
<i>The sum of the offers in a year in the 2-5. years:</i>		9180 Ft
<i>The sum of the offers in a year in the 3-10. years:</i>		8180 Ft
<i>The total sum of the offers in the 1-10. years:</i>		88 550 Ft + 200 gold

The long preparation, the negotiations conducted on the highest level, the impressive number of contributors – as shown in the tables –, nonetheless, the

⁴² Including the archbishop of Zagreb, the bishop of Szatmár and Pécs, the provost of Jászó and the abbot of Zirc, furthermore the chapter of Pécs, Székesfehérvár and Szatmár. MS 13 (1882) 522.

⁴³ MS 13 (1882) 522. See their names in the table, n. 30–32.

⁴⁴ The data of the table are from the collation of the quoted places of the MS 13 (1882) and the lists at the end of the volumes of the MVH. The final sums show the optimised value. The actual numbers could be somewhat smaller than these. Namely some of the bidders died in the meantime and the remaining sums were not compensated from their bequest. This is indicated in the last (but one) volume published in 1892, where József Peitler, bishop of Vác, Zsigmond Kovács, of Veszprém, Arnold Ipolyi, of Nagyvárád, and Béla Tárkányi's names were missing.

creation of the stable financial background held out promises of the enterprise's success. The continuation justified the intensified excitement. Between 1884 and 1891 eight bulky volumes of the *Monumenta Vaticana historiam Regni Hungariae illustrantia* (*Monumenta Vaticana Hungariae*) in two series appeared in rapid succession. They were of magnificent and exacting quality, with a long historical introduction in Latin and in Hungarian, an index and, if not very numerous but relevant, annotations. By no question, there was a striking solution found concerning the publisher's identity. On the cover page of the volumes which all appeared in Budapest, neither the Committee, which produced the publication, nor the St. Stephen Association, which supplied the administration and the publisher(s), were named. On the inner pages, only the names of the authors of the *Preface* and *Introduction* – as well as the names of those who did do the technical side (copying, collation) within the text –, and finally the last pages names the contributors were seen. Naturally, it was out of the question that the publisher would be the Apostolic See as Fraknói first brought up. Instead, at the beginning of each work, right after the front matter, a text – which resembled the papal breves – of Pope Leo XIII's speech on 25 May 1884, praising the endeavour and the papal and Hungarian coats of arms was placed.⁴⁵ In this way the series won the appearance of a mutual papal-Hungarian enterprise, which was made full of character by the outlook of the prefaces and introduction and the illustration of the volumes.

The volumes of the unique series contained a variety of topics and justified the fast and confident inquiry of Fraknói in the Vatican Secret Archives,⁴⁶ more precisely in the Roman archives:

First series. First volume: *Pápai tizedszedők számadásai 1281–1375* [*The Accounts of the Papal Tithe Collectors 1281–1375*], Budapest 1887 (p. LXXVII + 524) (with the *Preface* of ARNOLD IPOLYI, bishop of Besztercebánya, x–xvi; with the *Introduction* of LÁSZLÓ FEJÉRPATAKY,

⁴⁵ The text of the papal speech can be found in the issues of the volumes (MVH IIIr [Campeggio–Buonvisi] and I2 [Gentilis], cf. Századok 18 [1884] 552–555.), which were sent to binding mainly after the audience. (The first volume of the first series, the collection of the papal tithe collectors' accounts was published after three years.)

⁴⁶ A short review about the medieval material assigned to be copied by the Monumenta: VILMOS FRANKNÓI, *Nyomozások a pápai levéltárakban*, 4–5. In this article of Fraknói some registers of the bulls are presented also from the age of Clement VI (1342–1352). Despite the tense expectations – cf. Antal Pór noted review –, their complete publication, however, was never realised.

II–LXXIII)⁴⁷ – Second volume: *Gentilis bíbornok magyarországi követségének okiratai 1307–1311* [*The documents of Cardinal Gentilis's Hungarian legation 1307–1311*], Budapest 1885 (p. CXX+512) (with the *Introduction* of ANTAL PÓR, XLVIX–CVII; and with the *Preface* of LÁSZLÓ FEJÉRPATAKY [*Az oklevéltár ismertetése*] CIX–CXX) – Third and fourth volume: IX. *Bonifác pápa bullái. I: 1389–1396. II: 1396–1404* [*The bulls of Boniface IX*], Budapest 1888–1889 (p. XXXVIII + 368 and 656) (with the *Introduction* of VILMOS FRANKÓI, XXI–XXXVIII) – Fifth volume: *A római Szentlélek-Társulat anyakönyve 1446–1523* [*The Matricula of the Roman Society of the Holy Spirit 1446–1523*], Budapest 1889 (p. XXVIII+168) (with the *Preface* of VINCE BUNYITAY, XVII–XXVIII) – Sixth volume: *Mátyás király levelezése a római pápákkal 1458–1490* [*The Correspondence of King Matthias with the Roman Popes 1458–1490*], Budapest 1891 (p. LXXV+280) (with the *Introduction* of VILMOS FRANKÓI, XXXIX–LXIV; with the *Preface* of GYULA DÉCSÉNYI-SCHÖNHERR, LXV–LXXV) – *Second series*. First volume: *Magyarországi pápai követek jelentései 1524–1526* [*The Reports of the Hungarian Papal Legates 1524–1526*], Budapest 1884 (p. CLIV+472) (with the *Preface* of Bishop ARNOLD IPOLYI, XV–XXI; with the *Introduction* of VILMOS FRANKÓI, LXXXIX+CLIII) [edited by LIPÓT ÓVÁRI] – Second volume: *Buonvisi bíbornok bécsi nuntius jelentései. Budavár felszabadításának kétszázados emlék-ünnepé alkalmából közrebocsátva* [*The Reports of Cardinal Buonvisi, Nuncio of Vienna*], Budapestini 1886 (p. CLVI+310) (with the *Introduction* of VILMOS FRANKÓI, LXXV–CLVI) [edited by LIPÓT ÓVÁRI]⁴⁸

Although, Frankói, as the secretary-general of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, handed the committee's present of 300 volumes to Leo XIII upon his papal audience in 1881,⁴⁹ and among the founders there are many and among the editors there are only academicians, this enterprise of scientifically and historically high importance was unanimously the outstanding intellectual accomplishment of Hungarian Catholicism in the nineteenth century. This, however, does not mean that it was not followed by sympathetic attention from the secular forums. For instance, the paper of the Hungarian Historical Society, *Századok*, informed its readers about the events in detail on many occasions.⁵⁰ The quality and value of the volumes – for sure – rose above the

⁴⁷ The promised “indexes” (LXXVII) were prepared after four and five years. *Magyarország egyházi földleírása a XIV. század elején. A pápai tizedjegyzékek alapján feltüntetve I–II* [*Hungary's Ecclesiastical Description of Land at the Beginning of the Fourteenth Century. Indicated According to the Papal Tithe Catalogue I–II*], by the order of the Archival Committee of the Vatican, it was edited by TIVADAR ORTVAY, Budapest 1891–1892. (The names of the planned contributors: *Századok* 21 [1887] 179–181; the names of those who accomplished the actual work are at certain sub-chapters of the volumes.)

⁴⁸ See the last published issue of the series of 1909 below.

⁴⁹ More precisely the publications made during the fifty-year long existence of the institute. Cf. – among others – MTAKK RAL 1881/480.

⁵⁰ *Századok* 15 (1881) 637 (A short review about the negotiations in Rome of 1881); *A vatikáni levéltár kincseinek publicitása* [*The Publication of the Treasures of the Vatican Archives*], *Századok* 16 (1882) 521–522 (A report on the meeting of foundation); *Századok* 18 (1884) 552–555 (The publication of Frankói and Tárkányi's

source publications of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and the Historical Society at that time, which was acknowledged by contemporary criticism. The known authors of the reviews of numerous numbers praised, in unison, the generosity of the Hungarian clergy and the historical (topographical, statistical, archontological, etc.) value of certain works.⁵¹ It is true that without the knowledge of the rich sources of the Vatican, not only the relations of the papacy and Hungary, but medieval Hungarian history, too, could not have been told the way it had been. The same can be said in relation to the events of key importance during the following century, such as recapturing Buda in 1686. The judgement of the succeeding generations could only add to the appraisal that Hungarian ecclesiastical studies were among the first ones to make the best of the opportunities given by the opening of the Vatican Secret Archives, having scientific debates on the highest level and establishing a unique structure. After Leo XIII's decision of 1881, they contributed considerably to the realization of the total access of any visitor⁵² and to the enlargement of the papal archives that were allowed to be explored. The unknown and supremely valuable archives of *Dataria Apostolica*, which was one of the most important offices of the late medieval times, kept in the Lateran Palace were made accessible and transferred to the Vatican on the urges of Fraknói through Cardinal Carlo Sacconi.⁵³ Later Fraknói published two thick volumes from its material.⁵⁴

speech in Latin given at the introduction of the first two volumes). (See also the report on the opening of the papal archival school, *Paleographiai mozgalmak a Vatikánban* [*Palaeographic Movements in the Vatican*], *Ibid.*, 555–556.)

⁵¹ For example, MVH I: Századok 21 (1887) 184; MS [n.v.] 1 (1887) 470–474 (Ferenc Horváth); KSz 1 (1887) 532–536 (Vince Bunyitay). MVH I2: MS 16 (1885) 456–459 (Cs.); MVH I3]–4: KSz 4 (1890) 630–635 (Antal Pór, who mentions some misprints and expresses his wish to “publish and make public the esteemed bulls of the earlier popes, namely Clement VI’s, as soon as possible.”); Századok 24 (1890) 485–495 (János Karácsonyi: “The recently published volume of the Monumenta Vaticana is a splendid proof of how rich the archives of Rome are in the historical data related to Hungary... The big number, we can assure, also meets the value.”); MVH I6: Századok 25 (1891) 425.

⁵² The regulation of research was prepared by 1884, therefore many consider this date as the year of the real opening. The related literature: ADRIÁNYI, *Fraknói Vilmos és a „Monumenta Vaticana”*, 62–63, n. 10; and CH. BURNS, *L’apertura dell’Archivio Segreto Vaticano alle ricerche storiche*, *Archivi e archivistica a Roma dopo l’Unità. Genesi storica, ordinamenti, interrelazioni* (Pubblicazioni degli Archivi di Stato. Saggi 30), Roma 1994, 33–50. – This transition period of three years is explained by the necessity of Fraknói’s initial negotiations in Rome. See the *Excursus*.

⁵³ Századok 21 (1887) 179–181. (Fraknói’s report on the Monumenta Vaticana Committee’s meeting of 27 January 1887.) His report on the Dataria to Prince-Primate Simor: PL AE Simor, Cat. 44, fasc. 3, n. 778/1885.

⁵⁴ MVH I3]–4.

The *Monumenta Vaticana* created the international prestige of Hungarian scientific life overnight. This is vividly proved by the fact that from the foreign researchers visiting the Eternal City only the Hungarian historians were allowed into the source-deposit halls of the Secret Archives of the Vatican, which was forbidden for other researchers.⁵⁵ The prediction of László Fejérpataky – that “we would have such a source in the volumes of the *Monumenta Vaticana Hungarica* that would be essential for every Hungarian historiographer” – proved to be true.⁵⁶

Excursus

The short but thorough treatise by Gábor Adriányi, *Vilmos Fraknói and the “Monumenta Vaticana”*, which covered almost every related source – and was noted many times earlier in this paper – can be regarded as the best in its subject, concerning the depth of historical criticism. In his focus there is the idea that Fraknói had originally endeavoured to establish such a Roman series in which the Apostolic See would have itself published the sources of its archives with Hungarian participation and providence; moreover, not only those that were related to Hungary. According to Adriányi, this idea would have been reduced only by November–December 1881 to the publication of the *Hungaricums*. (See especially *op. cit.*, 61. 64–66. 67–69.) I do not find it impossible that the monographical elaboration – which should be written once – of the Hungarian research in Rome would justify or completely contradict the well-known historian’s assumption. I, personally, interpret the events above in another way. In contrast to the naturally occurring ideas during reinforcing the facts, the course of the negotiations was steady, which excludes the possibility of a radical change of conception. Let us see why in brief. 1. In the related notifications, neither Ipolyi, nor Fraknói mentioned this, though, they could have hidden it. 2. The *Monumenta Vaticana* instead of *Monumenta Vaticana Hungariae* often occurs in the sources, indeed yet not only in 1881 but also in 1882 and later. In my view, it is all about carelessness which could partly have deceived Adriányi as well as many canons and cathedral chapters of that time, such as the ones in Szepes and Rozsnyó. They supported a series of such a general character in their answers to the invitation of the cathedral chapter of Nagyvárád on 16 August 1881. (MS

⁵⁵ “The Hungarian researcher is welcomed in the Vatican, since our good reputation has been already founded by Bishop Fraknói with the bulky folios of the *Monumenta Vaticana*, which are just increasing in number through his unflagging work and being completed only after many decades. He deserves credit for the fact that the Hungarian scholars are welcomed with signal favour in the Vatican, moreover, they are allowed to conduct research in the inner rooms of the archives; as it happened to me, who could work for weeks without supervision in those rooms, where only few researchers are let in by special favour. This is an undoubted sign of trust, which is enjoyed by the work of the Hungarian researcher.” MENYHÉRT ÉRDÚJHELYI, *Kutatásaim a római levéltárakban [My Researches in the Archives of Rome]*, KSz 10 (1896) 605–646, 605.

⁵⁶ *A pápai levéltárak*, 73.

13 [1882] 512 and 513. However, that of Szepes highlighted that it was mainly Hungary that would benefit from the close relations.) Without any comments, many responders spoke about the “publication of the mainly unpublished historical memories found in the archives of the Holy See under the title of Monumenta Vaticana and by the Pope His Holiness”. So did the cathedral chapter of Pécs, however, writing about the “complete exploration of the Roman sources of Hungarian church history” later. (*Ibid.*, 511.) Besides, in the reply by a very influential person, viz. Arnold Ipolyi, on 1 September 1881 (!) the “*Monumenta Vaticana Hungarica*” is mentioned and Ipolyi emphasises the “importance and significance of a Hungarian ecclesiastical scientific enterprise”. (*Ibid.*, 448.) 3. Adriányi bases his statement on Fraknói’s letters of 10, 12 and 14 June 1881, mainly about the first papal audience. (*Op. cit.*, 64–66.) For instance: “I told him [the pope] that I would be even luckier if I could take part in a monumental source publication under the auspices of the Holy See, which would be in proportion to the history of the Church and the treasures of its archives. I would appreciate if I could offer my experience and income.” This itself supports Adriányi’s assumption, but Leo XIII in his reply “emphasised his affection towards Hungary, his inclination to give more and more assistance to it...”, which immediately disproves it. (All citations are from Adriányi’s publication.) The papal statement only makes sense in the case of a *Monumenta Vaticana Hungariae*. 4. Cardinal Haynald, already before the so-called “change of conception”, insisted on keeping the edition and publication in Hungarian hands, in Budapest, which obviously would have been nonsense regarding a historical series of the Holy See. (*Op. cit.*, 68.) 5. The cardinal of Kalocsa mentioned in his letter to the secretary of state on 8 March 1882 that Fraknói had had negotiations in Rome about the publication of the Hungarian-related sources. If it was not the case, Haynald distorted the truth on purpose, which he could hardly allow towards his cardinal colleague, at the same time his ecclesiastical superior. (See Haynald’s letter later in point 7.) 6. Through personal experience and through Theiner’s numerous publications, Fraknói was aware of the size of the Vatican Archives as well as of the limitedness of his opportunities. 7. Adriányi, finally, has no decisive evidence for the existence of the change of conception, behind which he suspects Béla Tárkányi. (*Op. cit.*, 68.) Therefore, his thesis can only be considered as intuition. – Consequently, it would be much more proper to suspect that all through the *Monumenta Vaticana Hungarica* was the subject of Fraknói’s negotiations in Rome, and not a general *Monumenta Vaticana*. It should not be forgotten that the Hungarian-related sources of the Vatican are the documents of the Holy See and the history of the Church as much as of Hungary. This is referred to in Haynald’s letter of 9 March 1882, which concludes the events of the previous year: „*Quia vero simul nobis exposuit [sclt. Fraknói] eam se ex apostolicis Beatissimi Patris et benignis Eminentiae Vestrae enunciationibus spem concepissee fore, ut si viri pro documentis ad historiam Regni et Ecclesiae Hungariae illustrandam vi sive specialis naturae suae, sive universalis pro tota Ecclesia destinationis eximie idoneis, post altissimam Suae Sanctitatis vel ab Eadem deutorum Virorum pro singulis scriptis obtentam singularem permissionem, luci publicae dandis, vires suas intellectuales et pecuniarias conferrent, facultas scripta talia in archivio Vaticano exquirendi, describendi et tum imprimendi benignissime tribuatur.*” MS 13 (1882) 515–517. These

remarks born in 2004 in connection with the beginnings of the Hungarian research in the Vatican were not accepted and strongly criticised later by GÁBOR ADRIÁNYI, *Fraknói Vilmos javaslata a Szentszék levéltári forráskiadására* [*The proposal of Vilmos Fraknói for the publication of sources of the Holy See*], MEV–Regnum 19 [2007] 149–160; cf. also GABRIEL ADRIÁNYI, *Der Beitrag des ungarischen Domkapitulars und Historikers Vilmos Fraknói (1843–1924) zur Öffnung der Vatikanischen Geheimarchiv*, Festgabe für Karl Josef Rivinius SVD (Theologie und Hochschule 1; hrsg. v. Reimund Haas–Eric W. Steinhauer), Münster 2006, 183–203). I regard the source (3. The pro-memoria of Vilmos Fraknói about the Monumenta Vaticana. 20 October 1881. Esztergom, Primatial Archives, Acta Simor. Cat. A. Nr. 49/1882) he mentions at pages 157–160 as conclusive in justifying his point of view. Nevertheless, I didn't manage to find it in the Primatial Archives at the given reference code (and neither at other relevant places). Hence, I consider it essential to publish the punctual reference code and facsimile of this key-document. Particularly that the recently revealed sources in the Vatican Archives justify my above outlined remarks. AAV Segr. Stato, 1881, Rubr. 222, fol. 7rv, 8rv, 9r; Rubr. 283, fasc. 2, fol. 3rv, 5rv, 7rv; Rubr. 67, fol. 5rv, 7r, 9r; 1882, Rubr. 67, 14r–15r. These sources are referred to and described by CHRISTINE MARIA GRAFINGER, *Ricerche di Vilmos Fraknói nel Vaticano*, Gli Archivi della Santa Sede e il Regno d'Ungheria (secc. 15–20). In memoriam Lajos Pásztor (CVH I/4), Budapest–Roma 2008, 247–254, 248–249. In the meantime, an exploration at my request by Katalin Nagy in the “Archivio della Prefettura” of the Vatican archives has settled the question. Fraknói's research requests of May–June 1881 were, in fact, directed exclusively at Hungarian material. Cf. KATALIN NAGY, *Vilmos Fraknói's research requests in the Vatican Apostolic Archives (1881–1885)*, Hungary and the Holy See of Rome. III. Exquisitae lucubrationes Cornelio Szovák amicabiliter dicatae (CVH I/21), Budapest–Rome 2022, 307–322, 315–318.

III

The Hungarian Institute of History in Rome and the MREV (1894–1904)

With the passing of the very promising and intense first decade the work continued in a completely new framework and direction. Although the Monumenta Vaticana Committee, which was reshaped in 1887,⁵⁷ did not dissolve and made certain practical activities,⁵⁸ after the publication of King Matthias's letters in 1891 the series terminated, or to be more precise, stopped continuing for a rather long period. After the end of the ten-year-commitment of the Hungarian cathedral chapters and prelates in July 1892, it was not renewed. The financial system invented in the "golden age" did not prove to be ideal and maintainable in light of the experience and the rapid development of international research in Rome. Fraknói inevitably had to find a more stable, practical and durable solution to the support than the annual collection of sums and the summoning of the donors' representatives, along with the fatiguing administration. Furthermore it might have had also a driving force that the Hungarian researchers working in Rome for shorter or longer times by the commission of the Committee did not have a solid base; they sometimes accomplished their work in adverse circumstances. Above all, there was no continuous Roman presence. Fraknói expressed his concern already in 1887 that "he did not meet a young, well-prepared member of the Catholic clergy who was willing to stay longer in Rome for the sake of participating in the en-

⁵⁷ Arnold Ipolyi and Béla Tárkányi died in the meantime, Lőrinc Schlauch, diocesan bishop of Nagyvárad (cardinal from 1893) became the new president and Kolozs Vaszary, Antal Poór, Vince Bunyitay, Benedek Csaplár, Gyula Városy and Rajmund Rapaics joined the old members (Fraknói, Knauz, Rómer, Dankó). *Századok* 21 (1887) 179–181.

⁵⁸ See the information later concerning Czaich, Beke and Áldásy, then the *Monumenta*-volume of Veress.

terprise.”⁵⁹ However, after the edition of the most important and easily accessible complex Hungarian documents of the Vatican Secret Archives, new publications and mostly further wider investigations were required.

Fraknoi – who in 1882 with his Austrian colleague, Theodor Sickel had planned to establish a permanent seat or at least a hall in the that time residence of the Austrian-Hungarian ambassadors, in the *Palazzo Venezia*⁶⁰ – believed that the key to future success was the foundation of a Hungarian institute of history in Rome, rather than the renewal of the old structure. A model was already provided. For the sake of exploring the documents of the Vatican, one after the other, the Western European states established their scientific institutes in the city of the popes, and later launched some monumental series.⁶¹ The French made their institute in Rome independent from the one in Athens already in 1875,⁶² by the help of the German bishops the German historical society of Bonn, the *Görres Gesellschaft* in 1887/1888⁶³ and the Prussian state

⁵⁹ Századok 21 (1887) 179–181. (A report on the Monumenta Vaticana Committee’s meeting of 27 January 1887.)

⁶⁰ PÁSZTOR, *L’Istituto Storico Ungherese*, 157; [IDEM], *Le origini dell’Accademia d’Ungheria*, 12.

⁶¹ For the summary of the initial period, I relied on the works of Antal Hodinka (*A Római levéltárak*, I, 61–79) and especially Rezső Vári (*Történeti intézetek Rómában*) and on the comprehensive volume of essays and studies, which can be considered the best in its historical content as well as its bibliographical data: *Speculum mundi. Roma centro internazionale di ricerche umanistiche*, a c. di PAOLO VIAN, Roma 1992. – On and from the other – abundant and newer – literature: CVH I/20, 106–116.

⁶² *L’École Française de Rome*. His residence is in the *Palazzo Farnese*. From 1875, on the basis of Pius IX’s permission, they start the publication of the registers of the thirteenth century popes from Gregory IX (1227–1241) (volume I in 1884, at the same time of the *Monumenta*), and the French relations of the popes of Avignon from 1899, then John XXII’s (1316–1334) and Benedict XII’s (1334–1342) complete documentation. (Bibliography: VÁRI, *Történeti intézetek*, 29–30.) The own series of its members’ – who could spend years in Rome – work: *La bibliothèque des Écoles de Rome et d’Athènes*; from 1877 to the beginning of the 1910s there were 105 volumes published. Selected bibliography, review: VÁRI, *Történeti intézetek*, 28–29; CHARLES PIETRI–PHILIPPE BOUTRY–F. CHARLES UGINET, *La Scuola Francese di Roma*, *Speculum mundi*, 215–237, 233–237.

⁶³ *Römisches Institut der Görres-Gesellschaft*. It did not have a building of its own, the infrastructure of the old German ecclesiastical institutes (*Santa Maria dell’Anima*, *Campo Santo Teutonico*) was (and is) used. Its publications: *Quellen und Forschungen aus dem Gebiete der Geschichte* (QF). Basically it publishes the reports of the nuncios in 1585–1604 (in reality in 1585–1590), yet there were many medieval volumes published (annates, *collectoriae*). The first volume published in 1892 is in an overlap with the Prussian’s publication. Furthermore, the *Vatikanische Quellen zur Geschichte der päpstlichen Hof- und Finanzverwaltung 1316–1378* was launched in 1910. The periodical of the *Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und für Kirchengeschichte*, which was first issued in 1887, is more important, since it has a series of monographs since 1893, called *Supplementheft*. On the bibliography of the initial period: VÁRI, *Történeti intézetek*, 33–36; and ERWIN GATZ, *L’Istituto Romano della Società Görres*, *Speculum mundi*, 470–486.

formed its historical institute in 1888/1889 in the Eternal City.⁶⁴ The Austrians institutionalized their scientific presence in 1890.⁶⁵

Along with these encouraging examples the personal motivation should be mentioned, about which Fraknói wrote the following: “I am glad that I could pay a tribute not only by my literary works, but also by a more lasting achievement to the historical memory, traditions and lessons of our nation, which if we neglect, can «*make the past emptier, the present drearier, the future more precarious*», as our late friend and master, Arnold Ipolyi said.”⁶⁶

From 1889, after having replaced his commission as an academic secretary-general for the vice president, Fraknói spent more and more time in Rome, then after abandoning this position, moved permanently to Rome in the autumn of 1891. He did not receive any genuine support in Hungary to accomplish his plan to establish an institute. (It remained to be an open question, whether he would have received any in case of renewing the older system, or if the initial enthusiasm had completely died out.) Under all circumstances, a temporary fall of real estate prices in Rome made it possible for him to buy a piece of land from his own benefice.

According to his initial plans, the Hungarian Institute of History would have been located on the grounds of the Corsini villa, on the *Gianicolo* (*Ianiculus*) hill, near the Vatican. However, he had to give up the chosen estate given the knowledge of the city-planning. Finally, his choice fell on the park of the former *Villa Patrizzi*, which was farther from the Vatican, but it was quiet.

⁶⁴ *Königlich Preussisches Historisches Institut*. It *de facto* opened in 1889 on the *Capitolium*, then after three years, from 1895 resided in the *Palazzo Giustiniani*. Its publications: *Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland nebst ergänzenden Aktenstücken* (NB). *Abteilung I*: 1533–1559. *Abteilung III*: 1572–1585. *Abteilung IV*: 17. *Jahrhundert* (on the years after 1605) (cf. CVH I/20, *Appendix*, III, n. 19, notes). *Repertorium Germanicum*, from 1897, yet until the early 1910s, there was only one volume published (cf. CVH I/20, *Appendix*, III, n. 8, note). REINHARD ELZE, *L'Istituto Storico Germanico di Roma*, *Speculum mundi*, 182–211; in Hungarian recently: ARNOLD ESCH, *A római Porosz Történeti Intézet 1888–1936 [The Prussian Institute of History in Rome 1888–1936]*, *MEV* 7 (1995) 3–4, 179–184 (translated by ÁDÁM SOMORJAI).

⁶⁵ *K. u. K. Österreichisches Historisches Institut [Istituto Austriaco di Studi Storici]*. It existed actually from 1890 in a tenement. Apart from some thematic works published from 1897, like the one dealing with the history of the Council of Trent, its series of publication from 1901: *Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland nebst ergänzenden Aktenstücken* (NB). *Abteilung II*: 1560–1572. Ludwig von Pastor's, who succeeded Theodor Sickel as the director, grandiose work published in many volumes from 1899, the *Geschichte der Päpste seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters* is also related to the institute. VÁRI, *Történeti intézetek*, 5–16; KARL RUDOLF, *L'Istituto Storico Austriaco*, *Speculum mundi*, 348–389.

⁶⁶ *Századok* 26 (1892) 185–186. The admirers of his career deservedly place his institute-foundation into the centre of his oeuvre. For example, DEZSŐ CSÁNKI, *Fraknói Vilmos*, *LK* 2 (1924) 208–211, 211.

He had the plans prepared within a few weeks. In the vicinity of the *Porta Pia*, on the *Piazzale del Policlinico*, the building of moderately elegant style was erected by 1894. On the ground floor, there was the flat of the founder, the future head of the institute, and other rooms; upstairs, there was the library and five rooms for the researchers.⁶⁷ In accordance with the intention of Fraknói, this building welcomed the “Hungarian history buffs, at the same time the Hungarian workers of universal history, archaeology and art history” of the main scientific fields sent by the main scenes of his Hungarian work, by the Archdiocese of Esztergom, the Diocese of Várad, the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, the Saint Stephen Association and the National Museum.⁶⁸

The focus of the Hungarian Institute of History in Rome, which in a short time became a scholarly and cultural centre, was still on the exploration of the papal archives. Since French research was aimed at fully utilizing thirteenth century papal registers, Germans and Austrians, on the other hand, had already divided between themselves the sixteenth and seventeenth century materials of the nuncios in Vienna (and Prague), which amply contained Hungarian connections as well, Fraknói put the emphasis of research in his institute on the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.⁶⁹ The researchers of the Institute started to systematically examine the various series of the Vatican and the other possible – primarily Roman – places of occurrence.

As a result of their activity, the Institute soon published a new *Monumenta*-series. The essence of the radical innovation was that the choice of the documents was not determined by a historical programme (for example the letters of King Matthias), nor by the place of discovery (like the *matricula* of the Society of the Holy Spirit), or by the peculiarity and the unique size of the given group of sources (like the bulls of Boniface IX [1389–1404]). This time, they wanted to explore and publish all the historical sources – which could be found in Rome or of a papal origin – of Hungarian dioceses, in chronological order. This change was required for many reasons. On the one hand, it ac-

⁶⁷ The elaboration of its building and future: LÁSZLÓ CSORBA, *A Fraknói-villa. A Magyar Köztársaság Szentszék melletti nagykövetségének székhelye* [*The Villa Fraknói. The Residence of the Embassy of the Hungarian Republic next to the Holy See*], Magyarország és a Szentszék diplomáciai kapcsolata (1920–2000) (ed. by István Zombori), Budapest 2001, 113–135.

⁶⁸ Cf. GABRIELLA SOMKUTI, *Fraknói Vilmos a Széchenyi Könyvtár élén* [*Vilmos Fraknói at the Head of the Széchenyi Library*], *A Könyvtáros* 40 (1991) 481–487.

⁶⁹ Századok 26 (1892) 411–415, 415. Cf. HODINKA, *A római levéltárak*, 75.

corded with the character of the papal register volumes of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, since certain registers of the various supplications, bulls and breves were marked by the names of the *diocesis*. After checking of the series, the division and publication of the documents of dioceses were a suitable method to fully publish the important sources. Certain volumes served together as complex data sources. And, not least of all, it could be expected that the prelate or cathedral chapter of the diocese in question would support the publication of the Roman sources of its own history, which meant not only a simpler, but also safer, solution compared to the earlier financial system of the *Monumenta Vaticana Hungariae*.

However, it was rather a conscious change of conception than begotten by compulsion. Besides the institutionalisation, Fraknói saw the future of Hungarian research in the Vatican in a series of a different type. This is evidently shown by the fact that, although there was a significant sum remaining from the fund of the *Monumenta Vaticana*,⁷⁰ the publication of the from Hungary submitted requests or applications (*supplicationes Datariae Apostolicae*) of the fourteenth century, despite the manuscript ready for the press, had never appeared.⁷¹ Namely the collected requests might have been planned to be published according to the dioceses. Naturally, the launch of another *Monumenta* did not mean that the professional concept of the *Monumenta Vaticana* was outdated. As a matter of fact, a *series* with a new structure suited the sources the 14–16 centuries preferred by the Institute more, which structure however, to be clear, was not appropriate for publishing the sources of more modern times.

As a proof, after a two-decade long pause, by the assistance of Fraknói and the approval of the Committee, the subject matter of Endre Veress from the late sixteenth century was published again in the older series. (*MVH II.; Erdélyországi pápai követek jelentései VIII. Kelemen idejéből [1592–1600]* [*The reports of the Transylvanian papal legates under Clement VIII [1592–1600]*]). Collected and published by ENDRE VERESS by the commission of the Monumenta Vaticana Committee, Budapest 1909 [xxxvi + p. 488.] [with the introduction of V(ILMOS) F(RAKNÓI), v–xx.] Furthermore, in 1902 the scholar bishop – parallel to the

⁷⁰ Even in 1912, namely after the publication of Veress's work, there was a total of 13,000 crowns to be spent. OSzKK Fol. Hung. 1749, fol. 27 et sequ. and 82 et sequ. There are many who attribute the cessation of the *Monumenta Vaticana* to the exhaustion of the fund. So do Ferenc Dőry (LK 10 [1932] 141) and László Tóth (Századok 68 [1934] 426). Only Lajos Pásztor suspected a change of conception by referring later to the existence of a bigger sum. (*A vatikáni levéltár*, 118–120; PÁSZTOR, *Vilmos Fraknói e i «Monumenta Vaticana»*, 59.)

⁷¹ See later, especially CVH I/20, *Appendix*, I, n. 11.

beginning crisis of his institute – declared that the series had not met its end, moreover he emphasised its necessity and that there was a huge archival “copy-set to be published”.⁷²

In practice, apart from the Institute, the new concept also worked well. As Baron Károly Hornig, bishop of Veszprém and cardinal from 1912, covered the expenses of the publication, the first volume of the Roman sources of one of the greatest medieval dioceses could be published already in the year of the millenary, in 1896. The introductions to the *Monumenta Romana Episcopatus Veszprimiensis*’s (MREV) four bulky volumes, prepared with a remarkably ornamented typography, were bilingual like the *Monumenta Vaticana*; concerning their historical value, they might surpass the previous ones due to their comprehensiveness.

A veszprémi püspökség római oklevéltára. Báró Hornig Károly veszprémi püspök megbízásából közrebocsátja a Római Magyar Történeti Intézet [The Roman Archives of the Bishopric of Veszprém. Published by the Hungarian Institute of History in Rome commissioned by Baron Károly Hornig, bishop of Veszprém]. Volume I.: 1103–1276, Budapest 1896 (CLX + p. 410.) (with the Introduction of VILMOS FRANKÓI, LXIX–CLX) – Volume II.: 1276–1415, Budapest 1899 (CII + p. 468.) (with the Introduction of VILMOS FRANKÓI, XXXIX–CII) – Volume III.: 1416–1492, Budapest 1902 (CXXVI + p. 394.) (with the Introduction of JÓZSEF LUKCSICS, LXV–CXXVI) – A veszprémi püspökség római oklevéltára. Báró Hornig Károly veszprémi püspök megbízásából közrebocsátja Lukcsics József dr. [The Roman Archives of the Bishopric of Veszprém, Published by József Lukcsics, PhD. Commissioned by Baron Károly Hornig, Bishop of Veszprém]. Volume IV.: 1492–1526. Pótlékkal az I–III. kötethez [With Contribution to Volume I–III], Budapest 1907 (CXII + p. 564.) (Introduction LXIX–CXII [I: The bishops of Veszprém 1492–1526. II: The corrected list of the bishops of Veszprém based on documents. III: The completion of the archives]).⁷³

The scientific public opinion followed the foundation of the Hungarian Institute of History in Rome and its publications with such interest as was experienced around the launch of the research in the Vatican. The periodica of the Hungarian Historical Society, the *Századok* often reported on the important events and praised them due to their closing up to the French and Aus-

⁷² VILMOS FRANKÓI, *A vatikáni levéltár és a római magyar történeti intézet [The Vatican Archives and the Hungarian Institute of History in Rome]*, A katolikus Magyarország 1001–1901. A magyarok megtérésének és a magyar királyság megalapításának kilencszázados évfordulója alkalmából I–II (ed. by Kiss János–Sziklay János), Budapest 1902, 425–429. In his necrology, László Tóth writes about the twenty-five years of the *Monumenta Vaticana* and mentions that the Frankói institute operated for the sake of the continuation of this series. LÁSZLÓ TÓTH, *Frankói Vilmos (1843–1924) [Vilmos Frankói (1843–1924)]*, MKSz 1924, 98–105, 100.

⁷³ According to Lukcsics’s epilogue, at first Frankói was the editor, then director of the works (IV, CXII). Namely, volumes I–II should be quoted under Frankói, while the III–IV under Lukcsics.

trian historical science.⁷⁴ It published the letters of Fraknói addressed to the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and the Hungarian Historical Society about his ideas and the state of the building,⁷⁵ and informed about the first volume of the *Monumenta Romana* in advance.⁷⁶ Without exception all the works were given a warm critical reception. Out of the numerous critiques,⁷⁷ Antal Áldásy's reviews excelled, which – beyond appreciation – cast light on the fact that apart from the Roman ones, the low number of the Hungarian domestic sources had also been covered. On the other hand, he emphasised that the supplications sent to the pope from Hungary were published in these volumes for the first time and additionally, those which had already been edited for the *Monumenta Vaticana*.⁷⁸

* * *

If one wants to ponder over the golden age of Hungarian research in Rome, namely the twenty-three-year long activities of the *Monumenta Vaticana* Committee and the Fraknói-institute, it appears that the overall picture would be even better than the one according only to the two series. This observation encourages us to analyse the publications and concerted work of the Hungarian researchers visiting the Eternal City.

⁷⁴ Századok 28 (1894) 670. 850–851. 861. In the latter place, the editors expressed their concern that the founder and Miklós Pallay, diocesan priest of Veszprém, who was sent to Rome by Bishop Hornig, temporarily had to move out of the building, since the walls had not been dried yet.

⁷⁵ The letter written to Sándor Szilágyi on 14 February 1892: Századok 26 (1892) 185–186. Fraknói's letter of 4 October 1894 about the completion of his work was read on the session of the Academy on 8 October 1894. Századok 28 (1894) 763–768. The letter, which requested the collaboration of the scientific body in order for the “establishment of the institute's system”, was sent to the department II on 11 October. Its original version: MTAKK RAL 1894/116 (substitution).

⁷⁶ Századok 29 (1895) 291.

⁷⁷ About the first volume: KSz 10 (1896) 857–863; MS 10 (1896) 686–690. About the second volume: MS 13 (1899) 871–872; KSz 14 (1900) 82–85 (János Karácsonyi, who mentions only a fake monastery-foundation as his criticism). About the fourth volume: KSz 22 (1908) 594–595. See also the next note.

⁷⁸ Out of the *Supplicationes Datariae Apostolicae* there were known only 99 volumes of the fourteenth century. Áldásy, from a methodological point of view, felt it necessary to leave out the parts of the charters containing only formulas, and in case of the third volume, he claimed some smaller structural changes and the consideration for the archival arrangements at indicating the reference. His review on the first two volumes: Századok 33 (1899) 920–924. Cf. also *ibid.* 756. On the third volume: Századok 37 (1903) 852–853.

In the first place, by borrowing and employing the sources of Vatican, there are the numerous publications⁷⁹ and books⁸⁰ of Vilmos Fraknói, who had the title of the titular bishop of Arbe (Rab) from 1892. Two gorgeous syntheses stand out: *A magyar királyi kegyúri jog Szent Istvántól Mária Teréziáig* [*The Hungarian Royal Patronage and Supremacy from Saint Stephen to Maria Theresa*] (Budapest 1895)⁸¹ and *Magyarország egyházi és politikai összeköttetései a római szent-székekkel I–III* [*The Ecclesiastical and Political Relations of Hungary with the Holy See I–III*] (Budapest 1901–1903). As the scholars of the age highlighted, such comprehensive works had no match even in international historiography.⁸² In the latter monograph of Fraknói, he did not only draw the historical quintessence

⁷⁹ Apart from the already quoted ones: *Egy magyar jezsuita a XVI. században* [*A Hungarian Jesuit in the Sixteenth Century*], KSz 1 (1887) 385–433; *Az új vatikáni könyvtár* [*The New Library of the Vatican*], MKSz [n.v.] 1 (1892–1893) 235–240 (a short outline about the material of the manuscripts); *A Szent Istvántól Rómában alapított magyar zarándokház* [*The Saint Stephen House for Pilgrims in Rome*], KSz 7 (1893) 168–195; *Zrínyi Miklós pályájának vége* (Közlémények a vatikáni levéltárból) [*The End of Miklós Zrínyi's Career (Publications from the Vatican Archives)*], Történelmi Társulat (TT) 1894, 577–595 (with the publication of reports of the nuncios, breves, letters of the Secretariat of State [Principi]); *Adalék a vatikáni levéltárból a Corvina történetéhez* [*Contributions to the History of the Corvina from the Vatican Archives*], MKSz 2 (1894) 94 (report of the nuncio of Vienna from 1666); *Miklós modrusi püspök élete, munkái és könyvtára* [*The Life, Work and Library of Miklós, Bishop of Modrus*], MKSz 5 (1897) 1–23 (From the *Acta cameralia*, from numerous libraries in Rome, like from the Barberini, etc.); *I. Lipót császár és Marco d'Aviano kapuczinus atya levelezése 1680–1699* [*The Correspondence of Emperor Leopold I and Marco d'Aviano, Capuchin Father 1680–1699*], KSz 2 (1898) 534–543; *Mátyás király magyar diplomatái* [*The Hungarian Diplomats of King Matthias*], Századok 32 (1898) [6 publications]; 33 (1899) [5 publications] (numerous supplications, data of registers from the Lateran); *János király és a római Szent-szék* [*King John and the Holy See*], Századok 36 (1902) 697–715, 794–911; *Egy jezsuita-diplomata hazánkban 1583–1584* [*A Jesuit Diplomat in Hungary 1583–1584*], KSz 16 (1902) 585–607, 685–811; *Ífjabb Vitéz János pontificáléja a vatikáni könyvtárban* [*The Pontifical of Junior János Vitéz in the Vatican Library*], Róma 1903 (review: MKSz 11 [1903] 179–180); etc.

⁸⁰ For example: *Magyarország és a cambray-i liga 1509–1511* [*Hungary and the League of Cambrai 1509–1511*], Budapest 1883; *XI. Ince pápa és Magyarország felszabadítása a török uralom alól. A vatikáni levéltár diplomatai irományai alapján* [*Innocent XI and the Liberation of Hungary from the Turkish Rule on the Basis of the Diplomatic Documents of the Archives*], Budapest 1886; [WILHELM FRANKNÓI], *Ungarn vor der Schlacht bei Mohács (1524–1526). Auf Grund der päpstlichen Nuntiaturberichte*, Budapest 1886; *Várad felszabadítása és XII. Ince pápa* [*The Liberation of Várad and Pope Innocent XII*], Róma 1892; [WILHELM FRANKNÓI], *Papst Immoenz XI. und Ungarns Befreiung von der Türkenherrschaft*, Freiburg im Breisgau 1902 (it was published in Italian in Florence); etc. See also: *Fraknói Vilmos negyed-százados irodalmi munkássága 1861–1885* [*Vilmos Fraknói's Literary Work of Twenty-Five Years 1861–1885*], Budapest 1886.

⁸¹ The important sources of the monograph, which were of Vatican origin, were separately published four years later: *Oklevéltár a magyar királyi kegyúri jog történetéhez* [*Archives to the History of the Hungarian Royal Patronage and Supremacy*], Budapest 1899.

⁸² MS 9 (1895) 768–776 (Ferenc Horváth); KSz 9 (1895) 852–855 (Gyula Városvy); Századok 33 (1899) 628–640 (Tamás Vécsey) – KSz 16 (1902) 373–374 and 17 (1903) 891–895; MS 17 (1903) 547–548. (In relation to some statements of the first volume, like the Council of Constance, Gyula Városvy questioned the rightness of Fraknói's ideas: KSz 15 [1901] 460–464.)

of the Hungarian researches in Vatican, but in the preface and the appendix⁸³ of the first volume, he briefly took the achieved archival research results⁸⁴ of the relations between Hungary and the Holy See and the exploration of the fonds of Vatican into consideration, then by name, he commemorated his colleagues and the researchers working under his administration.⁸⁵ The dignified – and complemented by important publications in the notes⁸⁶ – list is the following:

a) By the commission and assistance of the Monumenta Vaticana Committee

1. Professor Jenő Ábel, Budapest

“The good, young philologist, Jenő Ábel, PhD who has been doing research in the most noted libraries of Italy for ten months, has recently worked in the Vatican, where he cross-checked many esteemed Greek codices and collected interesting data on the renaissance literature of Hungary.” Apart from his Corvina-researches, he collected from the supplications of Eugene IV (1431–1447) with János Karácsonyi somewhat before 1889 (earlier also Martin V’s [1417–1431], perhaps).⁸⁷

2. Lajos Balics, teacher of religion, Budapest⁸⁸

His stay in Rome could have inspired his undertaking to write the church history of the Arpadian age.

3. Vince Bunyitay, episcopal librarian, Nagyvárad

He was in Rome from the autumn of 1887 to the spring of 1888⁸⁹

⁸³ *Magyarország és a római Szentszék*, I, v–xi and 341–356 [*The Vatican Archives*].

⁸⁴ See CVH I/20, 106–116.

⁸⁵ FRANKÓI, *A vatikáni levéltár*, 354–355. 1882 and 1890 are indicated here, which is an obvious mistake instead of 1882–1900.

⁸⁶ With a few notable exceptions, the two *Monumenta (Vaticana & Romana)* series outside and specifically Roman (Italian) sources based publications, and, the practical archival research activity are listed, in both cases without claiming to be exhaustive. The official titles of the single researchers are from the time when the research was carried out.

⁸⁷ MTAKK Tört. 2^o 282/IX, fol. 116; GYULA DÉCSÉNYI, *Olaszországi történelmi kutatások* [*Historical Researches in Italy*], Századok 26 (1892) 467–475 and 550–559, 550. – Its bequest-fragment: CVH I/20, *Appendix*, I, n. III.

⁸⁸ Cf. MTAKK Tört. 2^o 282/IX, fol. 116.

⁸⁹ See the related volume of the MVH (especially xvii and xxviii).

4. Gilbert Czaich, Hungarian confessor in Rome

By the request of Fraknói, he started his work in the registers of bulls of Lateran, where Érdűhelyi finished (see later), and he collected and published in form of regesta all the Hungarian-related documents from 1467–1497. If Fraknói's entry is not false, the research of the Hungarian confessor proves that the Monumenta Vaticana Committee did financially support the research in the Vatican also at the end of the 1890s.⁹⁰ Irrespectively, Czaich often visited the Vatican Archives in his free time, which is so praised by Fraknói that once he drew a parallel between the gentle Father and his predecessor, Márton Cseles (*A római magyar gyóntatók*, 394).

5. László Fejérpataky, assistant custodian of the National Museum, Budapest

He spent two months in the Eternal City in the autumn of 1885.⁹¹ His archival review was mentioned many times (*A pápai levéltárak*). In the 1910s, as an academic of influence, he played a role in the history of Hungarian research in Rome, again.

6. János Karácsonyi, teacher of religion, Nagyvárad

With Jenő Ábel he collected the Hungarian-related supplications of Eugene IV before 1889 (earlier, also Martin V's, perhaps).⁹²

7. Ferenc Kollányi, chaplain, Esztergom

In the spring of 1893, he spent four months in Rome. He also copied the *supplicatio*s of Eugene IV (he wrote some of them down); and he searched for

⁹⁰ CZAICH Á. GILBERT, *Regesták a római Dataria-levéltárnak Magyarországra vonatkozó bulláiból II. Pál és IV. Sixtus pápák idejéből* [Regesta from the Hungarian-Related Bulls of the Archives of the Datary in Rome under Paul II and Sixtus IV], TT 1899, 1–17; *Regesták VII. Imre [!] pápa korából 1484–1492* [Regesta from the Age of Pope Emeric VII [!] 1484–1492], TT 1902, 511–527; *Regesták VI. Sándor pápa korából* [Regesta from the Age of Pope Alexander VI], TT 1904, 161–181. (The latter is, though, a first publication, the sub-documents of the second part from the years of 1498–1503 have not been published, to the best of my knowledge.)

⁹¹ See the related volume of the MVH. His study based on his research in Rome: *Pápai adószedők Magyarországon a XIII. és XIV. században* [Papal Tax-Collectors in Hungary in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Century], Századok 21 (1887) 493–517. 589–609.

⁹² DÉCSÉNYI, *Olaszországi történelmi kutatások*, 550.

details from 1471–1560 in the *Annata*-series of the state archives.⁹³ See also his second trip and his work in the Academic Committee later.

8. Lajos Merényi, archivist of Esterházy dukes, Kismarton⁹⁴

He copied all the Hungarian requests from the supplications addressed to Innocent VII (1404–1406) in 1889.

9. Frigyes Pesty, academic, Budapest

He participated in the publication of the register of the papal tithe collectors.⁹⁵ He also could have taken part in the preparation of Ortway's topography, though, his name in the volumes is not indicated.

10. Gyula (Décsényi)-Schönherr, custodian assistant of the National Museum, Budapest

At the end of 1889, he collected data for the volume MVH II/6 (the letters of Matthias) in Venice and Florence, then he checked the supplications from the age of Matthias in the Vatican, furthermore he continued the work of Ábel and Karácsonyi with the requests of Eugene IV. "The material that I copied for the Hungarian Archives in the Vatican during my research has been utilized partly in the volume containing the correspondence of Matthias, partly it will be used in the later volumes. These lines should inform about my notes written for myself...", he writes and mentions some data on the bulls and breves of Eugene IV and Martin V, then he gives an outline – according to the volumes – until 1486 on everything that he copied and noted down.⁹⁶

⁹³ FERENC KOLLÁNYI, *A vatikáni levéltár [The Vatican Archives]*, MS 7 (1893) 362–370; [IDEM], *Római levelek*, Esztergom 1893). His report on his activities in Rome to Primate Kolozs Vaszary: PL AE Primate Kolozs Vaszary, Cat. 9, n. 4551/1892 (!).

⁹⁴ DÉCSÉNYI, *Olaszországi történelmi kutatások*, 550.

⁹⁵ PÁSZTOR, *L'Istituto Storico Ungherese*, 152–153, n. 42.

⁹⁶ DÉCSÉNYI, *Olaszországi történelmi kutatások*, 467–475 and 550–559. – According to the admission cards of the Sixtus chapel issued by the papal *maggiordomo*, he stayed in Rome from August 1889 to January 1890. MTAKK Tört. 2^o 282/VIII, fol. 195–201.

b) *By the commission of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, with Forster-scholarship*⁹⁷

1. Antal Beke, canon, Gyulafehérvár

He stayed in the city of the popes from October 1898 to June 1899. His research, then his publication, is divided into two parts. On the one hand it contains abstracts related to the diocese of Transylvania from Martin V to Alexander VI (1417–1492). (He handed the total transcripts written by the copyists of the archives to the “editors of the Monumenta Vaticana Hungariae for utilization”). On the other hand, he collected all the Hungarian requests from the 120 volumes of Innocent VIII’s supplications. His impressions were very favourable: “There are no such rich archives as at the Vatican. There is no such kind, precise and intelligent service anywhere else, who is not aware of this, give it a try. He would be convinced that there is only one Vatican Archives in the world”, he enthused.⁹⁸

2. Antal Hodinka, imperial and court librarian, Vienna

He collected documents on the union of the Ruthenians in the second half of 1895. He analysed the volumes of the *Fondo Clemente XII (Fondo Albani)* in the Vatican and the diplomatic correspondence of the Secretariat of State’s *Germania* division in the important years, though with a moderate success in connection to the latter. His main material was from the – inaccessible – archives of the Congregation for the Propagation of Faith, from where, via Fraknói’s mediation, he had 200 documents copied from 1641–1735. He joined the work of the Institute with the – already noted – study on the Vatican Archives.⁹⁹

⁹⁷ Baron Gyula Forster’s church historical foundation at the Hungarian Academy of Sciences named after Primate János Scitovszky provided a six month long stay in Rome to some grant holders. See for example HODINKA, *A római levéltárak*, 76.

⁹⁸ ANTAL BEKE, *Római emlékek a magyar egyház XV-ik századi történetéből [Memories of Rome from the History of the Hungarian Church in the Fifteenth Century]*, TT 1900, 1–15. – His bequest: CVH I/20, *Appendix*, I, n. IV.

⁹⁹ Dr. Hodinka Antal jelentése [*The Report of Antal Hodinka, PhD*], Akadémiai Értesítő (AÉ) 7 (1896) 497–499. His work of *Tanulmányok a bosnyák-djakovári püspökség történetéből [Studies on the History of the Bosnia-Dakovo Bishopric]* (Értekezések a Történeti Tudományok Köréből 17/3, Budapest 1898) derives from his Roman research; and also: *Hazai vonatkozású kéziratok az olasz könyv- és levéltárakban*, MKSz 14 (1889) 35–83 (The abridgement of the Hungarian material from V. Makusev’s *repertoriums*.) His other related works are being quoted in the next chapter. – His bequest: CVH I/20, *Appendix*, I, n. v.

3. Ferenc Kollányi, custodian of the National Museum's library, Budapest

He spent the first half of 1897 in Italy. He mainly dealt with the decades after Mohács. First, he checked the 25 volumes of the *Principi* fond of the Secretariat of State, though, as he wrote, the important charters had already been copied by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences' Committee of History years earlier. Then he analysed the bull regesta of Clement VII (1523–1534) (*Registri Vaticani*, 1317 *et seq.* volumes), yet out of 28 he found Hungarian relations only in two (vol. 1320 and 1343). Later, he read the volumes of 1744–1748 from the age of Julius III (1550–1555). He could not find anything here, either, neither in the supplications, which were written under Julius III and the first years of the pontificate of Pius IV (1559–1565). He reviewed the *Minutae Brevium* (Armarius XL. XLI and XLII) and some other divisions, furthermore the library of the Barberinis and Corsinis as well as the *Carteggio Farnesiano* that he analysed in Parma in the Easter break. The latter one was from 1530–1552, however from the later years he did not find anything. “What I collected in the archives of Rome and Parma, I will give account of in the next regesta”, he wrote (311–313.), as he had to give up the composition of his planned work.¹⁰⁰

4. Gyula (Décsényi)-Schönherr, archivist of the National Museum, Budapest

There is no bibliographical data on his second stay at the Institute. His request to be able to research in the Vatican library was dated from 27 February 1899. At the beginning of the twentieth century, he again turned up on the Roman historian congress in the Eternal City, when he also visited the Casanate library.¹⁰¹

¹⁰⁰ As a result of his collection, he published numerous regesta in Hungarian from 1524–1597, gathered mainly from the mentioned places. Cf. FERENC KOLLÁNYI, *Regesták a római és parmai levéltárakból [Regesta from the Archives of Rome and Parma]*, TT 1905, 311–376. In addition, he studied the Italian library-case on behalf of the “cultusminister”: *Az olasz állami könyvtárak [The Italian State Libraries]*, Budapest 1898 (31 p., offprint from the MKSz). It might be written by him: *Az olasz könyvtárak 1885. évi pragmatikája [The Italian Libraries' Pragmatics of 1885]*, MKSz 15 (1890) 191–218 (translation from German).

¹⁰¹ MTAKK Tört. 2^o 282/VIII, fol. 204. On this research of his, see CVH I/20, *Appendix*, I, n. III. – Cf. GYULA SCHÖNHERR, *A római Casanate-könyvtár Korvin-kódexe [The Corvin-Codex of the Casanate-library of Rome]*, MKSz 12 (1904) 435–469. In the course of his depiction he mentioned that the collection was one of the most favourite targets of Hungarians for research, although its catalogues were rather incomplete, and therefore “there is always something to be found in it...” (436–437).

5. Pál Tóth Szabó, teacher at the Premonstratens. chief-secondary school, Kassa

In the first half of 1901, with the leadership of Fraknói, he examined the supplications of Pope Alexander VI until the end of 1500, all in all 130 volumes (vol. 982–1111). Besides, from the *Registri Vaticani* he collected the registers of Veszprém of Innocent VIII's age, in relation to which he calls the attention to the imperfection of Theiner's publications on the period of both popes. (He published only 12 volumes out of 120 of Alexander VI.) Finally, in relation to Cardinal György Martinuzzi's assassination, he read through the reports of the nuncio of Vienna written in 1551–1554. "These reports are so much Hungarian-related that they could be published as they are, collectively or one by one...", he stated. After having postponed the review of the 600 promotions – picked from the supplications – according to dioceses (178), he intensively discussed the content and source value of the requests.¹⁰²

6. Endre Veress, chief-secondary school teacher, Kolozsvár

He was a member of the Institute from January 1901.¹⁰³ See also the related volume of the MVH; his other works are mentioned in the following chapters.

c) *By the commission of the Saint Stephen Association*

1. Menyhért Érdújhelyi, parish priest, Kiskőrös

He visited Rome in February–June 1896. On behalf of the Saint Stephen Association, as the member of the Fraknói Institute he collected "historical data being generally of interest to the Hungarian Cath. churches", on the other hand György Császka, archbishop of Kalocsa, entrusted him to explore the "documents closely related to the diocese of Kalocsa". As the result of his double task, he published 185 Hungarian abstracts from the *Registri Lateranensi*

¹⁰² SZABÓ PÁL TÓTH, *Jelentés vatikáni kutatásaimról [A Report on my Research in the Vatican]*, AÉ 13 (1902) 177–186. He does the same with vast number of data and precise notes in his following study: *Magyarország a XV. század végén a pápai supplicatiók világánál [Hungary at the End of the Fifteenth Century in the Light of the Papal Supplications]*, Századok 37 (1903) 1–15. 151–159. 217–239. 327–344. Primate György Szatmári (1457–1524) (Magyar Történeti Életrajzok) also used many requests in his work of Budapest 1906 (for example 56. 60–61).

¹⁰³ ENDRE VERESS, *A bolognai Marsigli-iratok magyar vonatkozásai, [The Hungarian Relations of the Marsigli-Documents of Bologna]*, MKSz 14 (1906) 109–130. 211–231, 109; DHI III, v. – His bequest: CVH I/20, Appendix, I, n. vi.

from the period of 1419–1510, mainly from the age of Pius II (1458–1464) and Paul II (1464–1471). Czaich Á. Gilbert, who continued his research, mentioned at the beginning of his article of 1899 that upon Fraknói's recommendation Érdűhelyi undertook the examination of Pius II and Paul II's "Datary-regesta", and he analysed all the registers of Lateran from the age of Pius II and the first two years of Paul II; however, he could elaborate only on certain volumes from the later years. Besides, Érdűhelyi mentioned some data of the sixteenth-seventeenth century from the reports of the nuncios found in the *Germania and Venezia* fonds, furthermore published 35 abstracts from various materials of the Roman state archives from the second half of the fifteenth century.¹⁰⁴

d) By the commission of Baron Károly Hornig, bishop of Veszprém

1. József Lukcsics, priest of Veszprém

He spent years in Rome; he edited the second two volumes of the MREV. Besides, he examined the fonds of Apostolic Chamber and wrote a short but valuable summary from the data.¹⁰⁵

2. Miklós Pallay, priest of Veszprém¹⁰⁶

He participated in the preparation of the MREV.

e) By the commission of *Ipoly Fehér*, archabbot of *Pannonhalma*

1. Pongrác Sörös O.S.B., teacher at the chief-secondary school

He collected data on the history of the order of Pannonhalma and for the biography of Forgách from the *Germania* and the *Fondo Borghese* series of the Vatican Archives.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁴ ÉRDŰJHELYI, *Kutatásaim a római levéltárakban*, 605–646. His publication ends with the list of some sources of less importance.

¹⁰⁵ See the next chapter.

¹⁰⁶ Századok 28 (1894) 861.

¹⁰⁷ He included his notes in his work of *Forgách Ferencz a bíboros [Ferencz Forgách the Cardinal]*, Századok 34 (1901) 577–608. 691–723. 774–818. The critic of the published work praised the usage of the Vatican material; however, he criticised him – wrongly – for using the term of “cardinal of Esztergom”. KSz 16 (1902) 875–876 (Aladár Zubriczky).

2. Szaniszló Villányi O.S.B., abbot of Bakonybél¹⁰⁸

f) Other members of the Institute

The original list of Fraknói, complete with seventeen names (Kollányi and Schönherr won the scholarship twice) should be complemented, since other three persons demonstrably worked for the Monumenta Vaticana Committee, or were members of the Institute.

1. Lipót Óváry

After having examined the Mircse copies in Venice and collected material from the Bethlen age, he travelled to Naples again: “The subject of my research in Naples would be formed by the total collection of the reports – kept in the Farnese-archives – of the nuncios in Hungary under Paul III for the monumental work of our zealous prelates, the Monumenta Vaticana; since only a part of them, and mainly only their abstracts, were consulted in my work of the Diplomatic correspondence of Paul III. As a result of my work, there are 400 reports of the nuncios and other charters in here from 1535–1545...” (507–508). He also wrote about the Anjou Regesta and the Margaret Legend. Finally, he went to Florence, where “I searched for the contemporary reports of the nuncios of Hungary under Clement VII and other charters of Hungarian relation for the above mentioned Monumenta Vaticana...”, he noted. Last but not least, he informed about finding many Burgio-reports, furthermore letters written by Louis II and Archbishop Szalkay.¹⁰⁹

2. Adolf Zsák J.

Fraknói cannot have mentioned him, since he went to Rome around 1903–1905. However, Lukcsics cited him as a member of the institute, who dealt with the supplications (MREV IV, CVIII).¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁸ He conducted research primarily for the history of the order of Pannonhalma.

¹⁰⁹ LIPÓT ÓVÁRY, *Jelentés olaszországi kutatásaimról* [*A Report on my Researches in Italy*], Századok 18 (1884) 504–510. – See also the related parts of the MVH and the CVH I/20, *Appendix*, I, n. 11.

¹¹⁰ His publication: *A római Ottoboni-könyvtár hazai vonatkozásai* [*The Hungarian Relations of the Ottoboni-Library in Rome*], MKSz 17 (1909) 244–251. 335–346. Without the demand of perfection, though as the useful pair of the repertory, the catalogue of the Vatican library’s *Bibliotheca Palatina* collection was constructed. This is mentioned by the author himself, yet without a precise note (346). Unfortunately, I have not seen his article yet.

3. Tihamér Turchány¹¹¹

g) *Private researchers*

Apart from them, there were many of those who could spend some time in the Eternal City at their own expense or thanks to other donations.

1. Antal Áldásy

He was in Italy in the winter of 1892/1893, he visited Rome as well as Bologna. In his account, he gives a marvellous summary about the development, forms and the method of administration of the requests addressed to the popes (241–244). He introduces the sources from the age of Clement VI to Benedict XIII (antipope, 1394–1417) (244–248) and Martin V: “...By examining these supplications, I abstracted the Hungarian-related ones and completely copied some of them. These regesta were prepared for the Monumenta Vaticana, I did not extend the space for their content. I will publish certain regesta with some abstracts of bulls in the TT’ volume of 1894. I only concluded here, how many such Hungarian-related regesta there are.” From 1417–1431, in yearly breaking down, he mentions only 301 pieces out of 142 volumes accompanied by the appraisalment of their historical value (248–251). – He analysed the bullregisters from 1342 to 1362, though without the demand of perfection. He accomplished the documents of Innocent VI (1352–1362) (*Registra Vaticana*: 24 volumes [vol. 220–244.] = 79 pieces of document; *Registra Avinionensia*: 29 volumes = 139 pieces of document; + 13 „breve” volumes = 139 pieces of document). He examined only 5 volumes from the age of Clement VI from the *Reg. Vat.* (86 pieces of document), he did not have time for the others and the 66 volumes of the *Reg. Avin.* He checked 3 volumes from Urban VI from the *Reg. Vat.*, but he found only 5 Hungarian-related sources.¹¹²

¹¹¹ Lukacsics mentions him (MREV IV, cviii).

¹¹² ANTAL ÁLDÁSY, *Olaszországi történelmi kutatások [Historical Research in Italy]*, MKSz 1 (1892–1893) 240–277. He published the results of his latter research in the TT: ANTAL ÁLDÁSY, *Regesták a Vatikáni Levéltárból [Regesta from the Vatican Archives]*, TT 1894, 15–28 and 1895, 58–89. 260–288. – Apart from these, he surveyed the *Germania* reports of the nuncios from 1625–1650 for the *Erdélyi Országgyűlési Emlékek*. He found few data on George I Rákóczy, but more on Bethlen, which he handled over to the editors of the series. It should be noted that he found only one indirect Hungarian data from the *Instrumenta Miscellanea* from 1378–1385. – The third field of his research was formed by the private and public libraries of Rome (251–258). He gives a rather sketchy but undoubtedly helpful outline on their divisions: 1. Barberini (251–253); 2. Borghese (253–255); 3. Angelica (255); 4. Casanatense (255–256); Chigi (256); 5. Corsini

2. Béla Pettkó¹¹³

3. György Müller

He was from Brassó (Kronstadt), and in Rome helped the work of Fraknói by examining the register-series (from the age of Louis the Great, 1342–1382) on the history of Transylvania. By Fraknói's advice, he explored the documents of Gregory XI (1370–1378).¹¹⁴

4. Baron Ervin Rosner¹¹⁵

5. Gyula Kovács

6. Gyula Lánczy

Lánczy, who was not respected by the contemporaries by reason, visited the Vatican Archives in 1899–1909. In his study, he mainly publishes data from the Miscellanea, Arm. I, vol. 12.¹¹⁶

7. Árpád Károlyi

He conducted research in the family archives of the Borgheses for the *Magyar Országgyűlési Emlékek*, and he elaborated on the history of the Diet of 1609 in an exemplary study.¹¹⁷

(256–257) 6. Vallicelliana (257–258). Finally, he discussed the Marsigli-bequest of Bologna (258 et sequ.) at length. The lesser result of his research in the Borghese-collection: ANTAL ÁLDÁSY, *Magyar tanuló Rómában* [*A Hungarian Student in Rome*], MKSz 2 (1894) 94–95. On his bequest: CVH I/20, Appendix, I, n. VIII.

¹¹³ His source publication from the Barberini-collection: BÉLA PETTKÓ, *Olasz emlékirat Bethlen Gábor megbuktatásáról* [*Italian Memoirs about the Rejection of Gábor Bethlen*], Századok 24 (1890) 144–153. [vol. LVII. 81, fol. 14–21.]

¹¹⁴ Fraknói wrote that the painstakingly elaborated abstracts of Müller would be offered to the TT (*Nyomozások a pápai levéltárakban*, 4). This was not realised, but 47 pieces of Transylvanian-related documents were published in another journal and without any particular introduction. GEORG EDUARD MÜLLER, *Vatikanische Urkunden und Regesten zur Geschichte Siebenbürgens in den Jahren 1371–1377*, Archiv des Vereins für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde [N.F.] 24 (1892) 583–622. Cf. HODINKA, *Arómai levéltárak*, I, 76.

¹¹⁵ In his work of *Régi magyar házassági jog* [*The Old Hungarian Matrimonial Law*], (Budapest 1887) he quotes and publishes many sources from the Borghese-collection.

¹¹⁶ GYULA LÁNCZY, *Vatikáni anyagok Magyarországnak Szent István király által pápai bűbériül való felajánlásához* [*Materials of the Vatican to Hungary for the Offer as Papal Tenure by King Saint Stephen*], Századok 35 (1901) 905–921.

¹¹⁷ *He abundantly exploited the data of the Fondo Borghese: Magyar Országgyűlési Emlékek X–XII* [Monumenta comitialia Regni Hungariae] (MHH III/10–12, Budapest 1899–1917); cf. Az ellenreformáció kezdetei és Thurzó

8. Lajos Thallóczy

It is provable that out of them,¹¹⁸ Áldásy and Pettkó joined the systematical source collection and the work of the *Monumenta Vaticana*.¹¹⁹ Along with them, Ágoston Haudek, O.S.B., professor of the Saint Anselm University of Rome,¹²⁰ often visited the Vatican to search for documents related to the Hungarian Benedictines, furthermore Béla Ambró, the secretary of the imperial and royal embassy, examined the Transylvanian sources found in the Borghese-collection preserved in the palace of the family on the Ripetta, and wrote an essay of high quality. It can hardly be feasible for a diplomat today.¹²¹

The well-known representatives of the Hungarian research's golden age in the Vatican did not only follow the path of a labyrinth of the archival fonds, but they gave their utmost attention to each other's important publications¹²² – in Rome as well as at home – and to the multiplying number of the international papers especially to the Hungarian-related issues. Primarily, they followed the German publication of the nuncios' reports that were to be published in the monumental series of *Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland*. With some exaggeration, one could state that mainly the abstracts of Antal Áldásy – which amply enumerated the Hungarian data – substituted for the postponed the Hungary related *dispacchi*'s Hungarian publication.¹²³ Apart from the reviews and the representations of a descriptive nature, sometimes they were not without some polemics. For instance, Fraknói blamed the first two volumes of the *Nuntiaturberichte*-series for avoiding the earlier work of Óváry,¹²⁴ and then Antal Áldásy did the same in connection with the third and fourth volumes. His still compelling notions are the following: “It is true that one cannot be required to be fully aware of what has or has not already been published. How-

György nádorrá választása [The Beginning of Counter-Reformation and György Thurzó's Election to be the Palatine], *Századok* 53 (1919) 1–28 and 124–163. – *His bequest*: CVH I/20, *Appendix*, I, n. VII.

¹¹⁸ The majority of the names can be found at: HODINKA, *A római levéltárak*, I, 76.

¹¹⁹ Áldásy mentions this himself in his already noted publication, the participation of the official of the state archives is referred to by Fraknói in the middle of the 1880s. *Századok* 21 (1887) 179–181.

¹²⁰ DÉCSÉNYI, *Olaszországi történelmi kutatások*, 550.

¹²¹ BÉLA AMBRÓ, *Malaspina pápai nuntius működése Erdélyben 1599. A Borghese-berczégek római levéltárának diplomatiai iratai nyomán* [The Work of Malaspina Papal Nuncio in Transylvania 1599. On the Basis of the Diplomatic Documents of the Roman Archives of the Borghese-Princes], *KSz* 1 (1887) 253–290.

¹²² See the reviews listed in connection with the two *Monumenta*.

¹²³ Apart from the previously noted: *Századok* 34 (1900) 810–819 (NB I/7–9; II/1; III/ 1–2; IV/1–2). See also in the following chapter.

¹²⁴ *Századok* 26 (1892) 411–415 (NB I/1–2); *Századok* 26 (1892) 679–683 (NB III/1 and QF *Nunt. Morones*).

ever, it holds true of only certain cases, and not such, like the present case which releases documents limited to a rather narrow circle. Nevertheless, it can be deservedly expected of such an enterprise as the particular first-rate scientific institute that it inquire about the related literature and publications.”¹²⁵ Apart from the reports of the nuncios, the works of Andreas Steinhuber,¹²⁶ Ludwig von Pastor¹²⁷ and the Southern Slav historiography as well as other publications¹²⁸ were paid marked attention. Áldásy nearly tore Eusebius Fermendžin’s *Acta Bosnae*, published by the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts, to shreds.¹²⁹ He criticized its act of sorting, or rather the lack thereof, of its philological inaccuracy, especially the repeated post-publications without any critical reflection. As an addendum – with the indication of every single document’s serial number – he also compiled the list of the strikingly varied source locations. The first place was taken by the archive of the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, about which Áldásy wrote the following: “Most genuine documents were found in the archive of the Propaganda in Rome, which are precious concerning our interests of historical memories. Yet, F. [i.e. *Fermendžin*] by no means did exhaust the reports there, as we know this archives. There are so many that their publication would need several volumes.”¹³⁰ One of the most significant archives was mentioned here in the Hungarian historiography.

It was apparent that the reviews allowed the authors to express their views. Fraknói, too, informed about the method¹³¹ of the Hungarian research activi-

¹²⁵ Századok 27 (1893) 902–905, 905 (NB I/3–4).

¹²⁶ The Jesuit cardinal’s monograph about the *Collegium Germanicum et Hungaricum* was evaluated by Fraknói and Áldásy. The latter criticized it for lacking the deeper exploit of the *Collegium*’s archives. KSz 9 (1895) 138–150; MKSz 3 (1895) 361–363.

¹²⁷ Not only in relation to his classical history of the papacy, but also to his source publications. For example: KSz 19 (1905) 432–433 (*Ungedruckte Akten...* János Karácsonyi). Pastor, who was personally known by many Hungarian researchers in the Vatican, published many Hungarian-relations from his collection in the *Történelmi Tár*’s volume of 1890. (*Szemelvények külföldi levéltárakból*, [Selections from foreign archives], 700–720.)

¹²⁸ ANTAL ÁLDÁSY, *Újabb egyháztörténeti monográfiák*, [Further monographs of church history], KSz 8 (1894) 154–156 (sourcebook from the Vatican mainly on Henry VIII); [IDEM], *Az 1431-i összeesküvés IV. Eugén pápa ellen*, [The conspiracy against Pope Eugene IV in 1431], MS 10 (1896) 200–208 (as an article with the addenda). See also: *Századok Repertoriuma* (1867–1975) [The Repertory of Centuries], ed. by ERVIN PAMLÉNYI ET AL., Budapest 1987, 574–576.

¹²⁹ *Acta Bosnae potissimum ecclesiastica cum insertis editorum documentorum regestis ab anno 925 usque ad annum 1752* (Monumenta spectantia historiam Slavorum meridionalium 23), Zagrabiae 1892.

¹³⁰ Századok 27 (1893) 609–623.

¹³¹ As we saw above. (Századok 26 [1892] 411–415.)

ties in the Vatican this way; hearing of the crisis of the Prussian institute at the turn of the century Áldásy pronounced his opinion concerning the mission of the Roman institutes of history. On the one hand, he agreed that “the first requirement of the head of such an institute is to have a generally known name, great prestige and influence; certain researchers could rely on him, namely he has to be an outstanding person on the field of science and society, moreover he has to be familiar with the material of the private and public Italian archives to give adequate instructions to the researchers in the archival labyrinth...”. On the other hand, he added that “with regard to the quality of the new institute’s members, there is no doubt – generally speaking – that it should be the most ideal task of such an institute to train the young historians and researchers in such a place where at every step one faces the cycle of historical tradition. However, this is such a task which can be accomplished only by a destined person, who is hard to find. He has to be an integral person in every respect; he cannot be exclusively a bureaucrat, neither purely a scientist, but suitable for supporting the younger scholars with word and advice, he should not be only with and by them, but work for their sake.”¹³² It is beneficial to appreciate the views of Áldásy, since a decade later, after having overcome a difficult period, his academic colleagues, also partly the aging Fraknói, unfortunately drew another conclusion.¹³³

¹³² Századok 35 (1901) 819–824 (NB I/13). Áldásy devotes the majority of his review (821–824) to the polemy in the German press evolved in relation to the Prussian Institute of Rome. The essence of this dispute was rooted in the change of head of the institute; the historian was replaced by a bureaucrat. Moreover, the work of the institution – being reshaped as all-German – was “only” restricted to the edition of the *Nuntiaturberichte* and of a register-volume of the fifteenth century, while its original task, the “systematic examination and the indexing of the materials” of the Vatican Archives (and other Italian archives) was not accomplished.

¹³³ MTAKK K 1591, n. 3. See later and also the CVH I/20, *Appendix*, III, n. 6.

IV

Institutional Interregnum (1905/1906–1924)

The difficulties of the Prussians – detailed by Áldásy – at the turn of the century proved to be only temporary. The fact that more and more national institutes of history were established in Rome shows that the problems did not mark the crisis of the positivist historical view, but they were only of a structural nature. The Bömische Historische Expedition and the Polnische Historische Expedition, which existed already in 1887 and 1886, started the essential work from 1901 and 1903 under the aegis of the Austrian institute.¹³⁴ The Belgian¹³⁵ and Dutch¹³⁶ institutes started functioning in 1904. The Finnish expedition, which was established in 1905–1906, was rather small; however, it obtained considerable significance within a short period of time thanks to Henry Biaudet and Liisi Karttunen's papers related to the history of nunciatures, and to the publications elaborated on the papal-Scandinavian relations.¹³⁷ The Spanish school, founded in 1910 functioned only for a couple of years.¹³⁸

¹³⁴ The medieval publications which survived in a couple of volumes: *Monumenta Vaticana res gestas Bobemicas illustrantia* (from 1903), and *Monumenta Poloniae Vaticana* (from 1913, he publishes mainly documents on the chamber and nunciatures – Nuncio Caligari and Bolognetti). Nevertheless, the Polish published the repertory of the documents concerning their history from the Vatican Archives already in 1889! See in Hungarian: KRZYSZTOF ŻABOKLICKI, *Alengyel történészek Rómában Fraknói Vilmos idejében és a Lengyel Könyvtár megalapítása [Polish Historians in Rome in the Days of Vilmos Fraknói and the Establishment of the Polish Library]*, MEV 7 (1995) 3–4, 171–178 (translated by Ádám Somorjai).

¹³⁵ *Institut historique Belge de Rome* from 1904, *Analecta Vaticano-Belgica* from 1906 (Papal supplications and charters related to Belgium). JOZEF MERTENS, *L'Accademia Belgica*, *Speculum mundi*, 19–27.

¹³⁶ *Nederlandsch Historisch Instituut te Rome*, its beginnings in 1904, independently from 1907. PETER VAN KESSEL–HANS DE VALK *et al.*, *L'Istituto Olandese di Roma*, *Speculum mundi*, 299–329.

¹³⁷ With bibliography: VÁRI, *Történeti intézetek*, 53–54; and UNTO PAANANEN, *L'Institutum Romanum Finlandiae*, *Speculum mundi*, 258–276.

¹³⁸ *Escuela Española de Arqueología y Historia en Roma* (its contemporary series with similar title). ARNAU PUIG GRAU–JAVIER ARCE, *La Scuola Spagnola di Storia e Archeologia*, *Speculum mundi*, 239–256.

Apart from them, the series of the *Acta Pontificum Danica* (1904), the *Acta Pontificum Helvetica* (1906), and the *Calendar of Entries in the Papal Registers relating to Great Britain and Ireland* (1893) were established and continued without much institutional support. While these enterprises, similarly to the German, Austrian and Hungarian ones, were established to elaborate on the resources of the Vatican, more precisely of Holy See provenance, the German archaeological institute, the American (1894/1895) and the British school (1901) – with regard to the historical antecedents – focused on the Ancient Times and the literature.¹³⁹

It was a strange twist of fate that after twelve fruitful years of functioning, in 1905–1906, the Fraknói institute ceased to exist just at the time of the growth of the number of historical institutes in Rome. The golden age of Hungarian research in Rome starting with the *Monumenta Vaticana* finished with one stroke.¹⁴⁰

The reasons for the failure, which was not unavoidable despite the increasing problems, were far-reaching. Primarily, it was not of a financial nature, since beside the already existing one, Fraknói launched the raising of another building for artists in 1902, which opened its doors in 1904 from the incomes

¹³⁹ Nevertheless, already by 1911, the latter prepared the repertory partially of the Vatican sources related to the Americans (C. R. FISH, *Guide to the materials for American History in Roman and other Italian Archives*, Washington 1911), the latter became the centre of the British research in the Vatican from the 1950s. – For the sake of completeness, apart from the *American School of Classical Studies* and the *British School at Rome*, the German archaeological institute should be mentioned, which functioned – after significant antecedents – from 1874 (*Kaiserlich Deutsches Archaeologisches Institut*), and also the *Bibliotheca Herziana*. – On all these listed institutes and publications (with bibliography) VÁRI, *Történeti intézetek, passim*; HODINKA, *A Római levéltárak*, I, 61–79, *passim*; RUSSEL T. SCOTT, *La Scuola di Studi Classici dell'Accademia Americana in Roma*, *Speculum mundi*, 31–45; TIMOTHY PETER WISEMAN, *La Scuola Britannica di Roma*, *Speculum mundi*, 83–117; CHRISTOF THOENES–ERNST GULDA–DIETER GRAF, *La Bibliotheca Herziana*, *Speculum mundi*, 56–79; BERNARD ANDREAE, *L'Istituto Archeologico Germanico di Roma*, *Speculum mundi*, 155–179.

¹⁴⁰ On the history of the cessation and the long re-foundation: HODINKA, *A római levéltárak*, I, 72–79; VÁRI, 45–52; ÁLDÁSY, *Fraknói Vilmos emlékezete*, 456–457; especially PÁSZTOR, *A Vatikáni Levéltár*, 100–129; PÁSZTOR, *L'Istituto Storico Ungherese*, 143–166; [IDEM], *Le origini dell'Accademia d'Ungheria*, 9–24; CSORBA, *Fondazione dell'Istituto Storico Ungherese*, 7–17 related places; and JÁNOSNÉ FRÁTER, *A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia állandó bizottságai 1854–1949 [The Standing Committees of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences 1854–1949]* (A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Könyvtárának kiadványai 70), Budapest 1974, 251–254. (252–262: *A Római Magyar Történeti Intézet Bizottsága*.) – It should be noted that the literature dates the closing to 1906, sometimes to 1907 and 1912. The authentic witness, József Lukács mentions 1905 in his writings of 1907. (MREV IV, cviii.) 1906 is the date of the institute of history's building's lease (and not the house of arts). SANTIFALLER, *Briefe von Wilhelm Fraknói*, 337; PÁSZTOR, *Le origini dell'Accademia d'Ungheria*, 18.

of the Szentjobb abbey's estates – bestowed by Franz Joseph and renovated by Fraknói. It was more relevant that the relations of the Institute with Hungarian scientific life had been loosening, and the replacements kept stalling. Except for Lukcsics and Veress, there were no young, talented researchers, priests or historians who were willing to join the work of the Institute for a long term. The lack of the younger generation can be blamed for the fact that – despite the systematized research – the institute had to depart from Fraknói's original workplan. The *Monumenta Romana Episcopatus Vespri-miensis* was not continued, and the Vatican documents of the other Hungarian dioceses were not published.

In addition, it is striking that out of the beneficiaries noted at the foundation, neither the National Museum, nor the diocese of Esztergom and Várad¹⁴¹ grasped the opportunity offered, though there were many Hungarian bishops visiting Fraknói's villa in Rome; moreover, the St. Stephen Association took advantage of the situation only once. The Institute's character as a private establishment could not be forgotten by the Forster Scholarship Programme, established there by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, by the by the occasional – presumable – support of the Monumenta Vaticana Committee, nor by the active financial participation of the diocese of Veszprém in the series.

Mainly this private character proved to be fatal, namely, legally the Institute did not exist. In reality, it was created, then maintained “only” by its founder's determination, pragmatism and generosity. Although Fraknói had the further development of his small institute in mind from the very beginning,¹⁴² and perhaps already in the middle of the 1890s a deed of foundation maybe had been compiled,¹⁴³ the reason for its existence could be, and had to be, established first by scientific activities. However, the lack of the legal

¹⁴¹ From the letter of Bishop Szmrecsányi – quoted later – it is known for sure that Fraknói's offer was accepted.

¹⁴² I will ask for the advice and command of the Hungarian competent authorities on the subject of the formulation of the charter of foundation..., he wrote to Sándor Szilágyi in 1892. *Századok* 26 (1892) 185–186.

¹⁴³ Cf. Bishop of Nagyvárad, Pál Szmrecsányi's letter to Fraknói of 29 January 1905: “The latest plan, however... means the change of the original plan to the direction of...” *A Római Történeti és Művészeti Intézetek ügyében. Fraknói Vilmos bizalmas előterjesztése jóakaróiboz és barátaihoz* [Concerning the Institutes of History and Arts in Rome. The Confidential Proposal of Vilmos Fraknói to his Benefactors and Friends], Budapest 1905 (as a manuscript), 5.

ground proved to be a more and more urgent problem. Fraknói – who in 1904 could welcome Pius X (1903–1914)¹⁴⁴ on the throne as the *doyen* of the foreign researchers of Vatican and in the name of all the scientific institutes – seldom visited the Vatican Archives and library due to his advanced age and deteriorating state of health. He found himself less and less suitable to head his institute, and was willing to return home for good.

With the opening line, “in the firm belief that the exploration of Rome’s scientific and artistic treasures, monuments and antiquities will enforce the improving and ennobling effect that has been practiced in the past; at the same time being conducted by the wish that Hungary did not fail to belong to the nations having scientific and artistic institutes in the Eternal City...” Fraknói prepared – according to previous agreements – a detailed draft for a deed of foundation around the end of 1904. He wished to submit his institute, more precisely his historical and artistic institutes, to the control and authority of royal and ministerial patronage. For directing them, he suggested establishing a committee, involving the president of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, the scientific department of the St. Stephen Association and the Hungarian council of art, the head of the Ministry of Education’s department of art and the abbot of Szentjobb (in case of vacancy, the rector of the Central Seminary). Although, he expressed his hope “concerning the maintenance and future of these institutes... besides the assistance of other factors, they will be improved and complemented harmoniously with the cultural interests and constitutional state of the country...”, Fraknói ensured the necessary financial basis in the form of various engagements and foundations.¹⁴⁵

As the majority of the sum spent on the lasting operation was from the benefice of the abbacy of Szentjobb, Fraknói endeavoured to win the support primarily of Pál Szmrecsányi, diocesan bishop. Yet, even after the repeated revisions of the draft, in 1905, the diocese of Várad did not support the ideas of Vilmos Fraknói. Finally, Fraknói had to acknowledge that “it was absolutely impossible to establish and maintain institutes in Rome, which cannot rely on my Church’s sympathetic welcome and effective assistance and which can only be borne by my Church; since they would lack the conditions of

¹⁴⁴ PÁSZTOR, *L’Istituto Storico Ungherese*, 161; [IDEM], *Le origini dell’Accademia d’Ungheria*, 13–14.

¹⁴⁵ The plan is published: FRAKNÓI, *A Római Történeti és Művészeti Intézetek ügyében*, 2–5.

identity and vitality.”¹⁴⁶ He withdrew his plan, then, in 1906, he leased his Roman villa to a doctor of the clinique nearby, who set up a private sanatorium there.

Having arrived at Budapest and moving to the National Museum as the national chief-inspector,¹⁴⁷ Fraknói restored his negotiations with the bench of bishops. Although he found influential supporters in the person of Károly Hornig, bishop of Veszprém, and Ágoston Fischer-Colbrie, bishop of Kassa, and the bench of bishops discussed the question many times, his endeavour was not crowned by success.¹⁴⁸ The difficulties were caused again by the same reason as ever before. On the one hand, the planned *in perpetuum* engagement of the abbacy of Szentjobb’s incomes raised many (canon) legal misgivings; on the other hand, the bishops all the while insisted on having an institute which would have a pure Catholic character given the fact that it would be founded from church benefices. However, they did not find the fulfilment of this wish entirely guaranteed.¹⁴⁹

Furthermore the planned institute would have faced such serious difference of interests in the official form under state control,¹⁵⁰ financially main-

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, here and there.

¹⁴⁷ Fraknói administered his state commission in 1897–1915. Cf. for instance Tóth, *Fraknói Vilmos*, 101.

¹⁴⁸ After the *Budapesti Hírlap*’s issue of 1 February 1911 announced his ideas, just after the negotiations fell through, Fraknói published his plan of foundation submitted to Prince-Primate Kolozs Vaszary on 20 August 1910 in the columns of the *Századok*. *Századok* 45 (1911) 153–155. He wrote here that he established a building for an institute of history in 1894 and for the painters and sculptors in 1902. “Throughout a decade, in the institute of history, the members of the bench of bishops, the heads of the orders and the historians sent by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences conducted fruitful work, to which significant publications bore witness. In the house of arts, there are three artists working, who receive an annual grant of 10,000 crowns, and I also charged some of them with commissions.” As a final offer for the permanent foundation of the two institutions, he suggested that “the filling of given granted places in the institute of history should be introduced and done by the Latin-rite diocese of Nagyvárad, the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and the Saint Stephen Association according to such regulation that would be established by the bench of bishops.” In case of refusal, he held out the prospect of selling the buildings and of dividing the incoming sum, the foundation and his bequest of 100,000 crowns into three parts and place them at the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, the Saint Stephen Association and a future national committee of church art’s disposal.

¹⁴⁹ See, first of all, the answer publication of the cathedral chapter of Váradi addressed to Fraknói, subscribed by Vicar Antal Fetsner, *A római magyar történeti és művészeti intézetek ügyéhez* [In Contribution to the Hungarian Institutes of History and Art in Rome], Nagyvárad 1911 (as a manuscript). OSzKK Fol. Hung. 1749, s.f., and the material found here. – Fraknói’s further letter to Primate Vaszary in support of the institute in Rome: PL AE Vaszary, Cat. Da. 12 November 1910.

¹⁵⁰ The maintenance of a scientific and artistic institute abroad is not possible without the moral support and providence of the government”, Fraknói wrote to Szmrecsányi. *A Római Történeti és Művészeti Intézetek ügyében*, 2.

tained by church support, ruled by representatives of various committees and visited by candidates following art, church or secular studies and sciences that it would have made its effective work impossible. Although, earlier in practice it had operated this way and it was something the Catholic Church could take pride in,¹⁵¹ without the presence, direction, and prestige of the founder it would have proved to be so incapable of survival that it had not even started. Fraknói's pragmatism proved to be idealism around 1906.

Nevertheless his negotiations – followed by the vivid attention of the media –, the sequence of open letters, the collection of the ecclesiastical and secular intellectuals' signatures for the institute in Rome,¹⁵² moreover its productive operation, finally bore fruit. While, at the beginning of the 1890s, Fraknói could not gain any official support for the plan of a Hungarian institute of history in Rome despite the success of the *Monumenta Vaticana*,¹⁵³ by the 1910s, the Hungarian hierarchy realised the need of its own, *ecclesiastical* institute in the Eternal City, meanwhile the Hungarian Academy of Sciences being of a *secular scientific* institute. Yet, as the bench of bishops considered that the practical steps should be prolonged, the private institute of history of Fraknói existed exclusively within the framework of state reestablishment. (The house of art ceased to exist by the beginning of 1913. At the time it found no new owner, its builder had to offer it for sale. After a brief decade-long life, the still intact building disappeared from the pages of Hungarian existence in Rome for good.)¹⁵⁴

¹⁵¹ Apart from the *Pazmaneum* of Vienna and the *Collegium Germanicum et Hungaricum*, Fraknói could introduce his institute, its activities, in addition, he informed about the papal archives, and its important colleagues, furthermore about the direct and previous antecedents of the Hungarian research in the Vatican. *A katolikus Magyarország 1001–1901. A magyarok megtérése és a magyar királyság megalapításának kilencszázadik évfordulója alkalmából [The Catholic Hungary 1001–1901. On occasion of the ninth centenary of the Hungarians' conversion and the foundation of the Hungarian Kingdom]*, 425–429 (FRANKÓI, *A vatikáni levéltár és a római magyar történeti intézet*).

¹⁵² Cf. especially OSzKK Fol. Hung. 1749, *passim*; PÁSZTOR, *L'Istituto Storico Ungherese*, 165. (The negotiations' sources compiled by Fraknói were abundantly drawn upon by Lajos Pásztor as well as László Csorba. Their reading was however very informative.)

¹⁵³ "...our attempts to establish a Hungarian institute in Rome were unsuccessful." *Századok* 26 (1892) 185–186.

¹⁵⁴ By referring to the *Pesti Napló*'s issue of 12 January 1913, Pásztor (*L'Istituto Storico Ungherese*, 163, 98. and *Le origini dell'Accademia d'Ungheria*, 18, 40. and in the note 20, 47.) proves that the house of arts still existed in the beginning of 1913, though, this very same paper wrote articles – in past tense – about the bankruptcy and closing of the house on 24 March 1912 (n. 72.). The clipping of the interview with Fraknói can be found: OSzKK Fol. Hung. 1749.

After long preparation and correspondence, Fraknói finally – along with the Forster scholarship – deposited 100,000 crowns from his own income with the St. Stephen Association, and a further 50,000 with the Hungarian Academy of Sciences for “the promotion of the research and studies in the Roman archives and libraries”, and for “the publishing of the Hungarian related historical sources – explored in the archives and libraries of Rome – or of the secondary literatures that covered them...”¹⁵⁵ In relation to the foundation, the Hungarian Academy of Sciences made a proposition for the establishment of such a state institute that “held a sure prospect of research of major interest and viable scientific results by the century-long relations of Hungary with Italy and especially with the Holy See.”¹⁵⁶ By the proposal of the president of the scientific committee, Albert Berzeviczy,¹⁵⁷ in the budget of 1913 Count János Zichy, Minister of Education, allocated 20,000 crowns for the state establishment, operation and further scholarships of the Hungarian Institute of History in Rome (*Istituto Ungherese di Studi Storici*).¹⁵⁸

After the ministerial decision, to be true to his promise, Fraknói offered his Roman estate, his villa and its equipment to the Hungarian state. The letter of bestowing was dated 22 January 1913 that became the basis of the deed of gift, which firmly followed the content of the letter. For example, in the third

¹⁵⁵ In his letter of 20 January 1912 Fraknói announced that “since my state of health and getting well on in years do not let me stay in Rome and head the institute; and my re-attempts to permanently establish and ensure the institute remained to be a failure: I am facing the sorrowful necessity that I have to give up maintenance of the institute”, then he requested the following: “please, take over my foundation for the encouragement of the research done in the libraries and archives of Rome, and for the publication thereof; and the delegated committee should prepare the regulation of the foundation in agreement with me.” The Hungarian Academy of Sciences committee was already dispatched on 29 January. *Századok* 46 (1912) 157–158; *ÁÉ* 43 (1912) 127.

¹⁵⁶ The resolutions and the proposal of the committee to be established by the regulation of the foundation (Berzeviczy, Fraknói, Forster, Fejérpataky and Gyula Wlassics) were published on 26 February 1912: *ÁÉ* 43 (1912) 153–154. The assent of the academic board of directors was dated 3 March. *Ibid.*, 156.

¹⁵⁷ Published: *Századok* 46 (1912) 318–321. In his long proposition of 11 March 1912, Albert Berzeviczy highlighted the Roman research activities’ international significance and the former Hungarian results. He held the foundation of the institute as state duty, and to ensure its rank, he asked for a royal patronage practiced through the embassy of Rome. He demanded an annual sum of 30,000 crowns – by taking the Austrians’ costs into consideration – only for covering the annual expenses of activities. According to Berzeviczy, “the aim of the Hungarian institute of history to be founded would be to constantly examine the Italian archives and libraries rich in sources of the Roman as well as Hungarian history, and to periodically publish the results in separate publications. Besides, the institute would be to provide means and opportunities for individual archaeological and art historical studies and research and their publication.”

¹⁵⁸ His notice was dated 28 November 1912. *Századok* 47 (1913) 157.

point, where after having laid down the fact of donation, the historian involved an important safety guarantee by revealing his precaution. Namely, Fraknói provided that if the Hungarian state had refused the maintenance of a *Hungarian institute of history* in the Eternal City, the legitimate Hungarian government should give the villa – or in case of paying its price – to the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and the St. Stephen Association, on a fifty-fifty basis. Among the few reservations of the granting bishop, it was stated that he kept the portrait of Pázmány in his possession, moreover, the Italian servant, who had been loyally serving in the house for eight years (and later in the course of the World War defended the building with its furnishings), should be kept in his position.¹⁵⁹

After long hesitation, the regulations of the old-new institution were prepared by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences which took a great part in the initiative. According to which

“the institute welcomes, directs and supports the Hungarian workers on history, archaeology, history of art, the classics and history of literature, who carried on research work or studies in the libraries, archives, art and scientific collections of Rome or other parts of Italy. The institute provides the publication of these works in accordance with the circumstances.”¹⁶⁰

In accordance with the intentions of the founder, the Hungarian Minister of Education and Cultus seized control over the pronouncedly scientific insti-

¹⁵⁹ His handwritten letter to Minister Zichy, and the text of the deed of gift of 3 March, which served a basis of the Roman transcription in the land register, is indicated in the end of this volume. Its publication in original language: CVH I/20, *Appendix*, III, n. 1 and 2; in English translation with the original document of the Roman land register below in this volume, *Documents*, n. 1 and 2. – In 1921 Fraknói had misgivings about not having published a proper deed of foundation. Although, after his petition of 10 August, József Vass, minister of education, held out the promise of immediate measures (Cf. CSORBA, *A Fraknói-villa*, 122, n. 21), yet they were not realised. In the proposition of 12 April 1922 (filed as 1922/508), the royal director of the public funds properly proved that this contract – due to its content and being completed with a regulation of function – can be considered a deed of foundation, and that “new deed of foundation would be necessary only if the Hungarian state renounced the maintenance of the given institute, or with this, the capital was divided between the two heirs in expectancy appointed by the founder.” K 1224/147. (The catalogue of numerous official documents *ibid.*, n. 149.)

¹⁶⁰ The Institute-regulation prepared by 27 January 1913 was conducted by the former committee, which was enlarged by Dezső Csánki and bestowed a new mandate on 6 December 1912. Századok 47 (1913) 157; AÉ 24 (1913) 86. The text of the Institute-regulation in original form accompanied with the approving ministerial letter of 6 August 1913, which made only few changes, was published: AÉ 24 (1913) 132–134 and 679–681; furthermore VÁRI, *Történeti intézetek*, 48–50. The original of the ministerial letter: MTAKK K 1224/4. – From the offer of Fraknói to the constitution, the important documents were re-published and the events were summarized: *A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia alapszabályai és ügyrendje* [The Articles and Regulations of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences], Budapest 1936, 79–84.

tution, who practiced his authority through the “Committee of History in Rome” within the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, or through the “Committee of the Hungarian Institute of History in Rome”.¹⁶¹ For instance, he decided on the director, secretary and state scholarship holders sent to the Eternal City by the proposal of the body. (Apart from the Committee’s opinion, the donors as well as the administrators like the St. Stephen Association, decided on the private scholars.)

The first definitive agenda of the already second Committee – as a matter of fact it replaced the organization that published the *Monumenta Vaticana* – in the historiography of the Hungarian research work in the Vatican was elaborated by Fraknói, Áldásy and Fejérpataky and adopted on the session of 20 December 1913.¹⁶² The twenty points declared that the scholars’ field and direction of studies, by considering their ideas, were determined by the academics (who could exercise control in Rome even without announcing it), similarly to the circle of results that had to be handled to the Institute and the ones which could be used for its own purpose. The scholars had to briefly report on the result of their work each month, and before their return, they had to give a comprehensive presentation to the director and secretary of the Institute.¹⁶³ After having voted for the agenda of the Committee, they established the regulations of the Institute of History on 18 March 1914, then the new members of

¹⁶¹ The members of the standing committee of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences were: the vice president, who was directly under the leadership of the president, the chief secretary, three members from the committee for history and two members from the committee for archaeology and classical philology each, and the representative of the minister of education. The work of the Committee was coordinated by an executive elected for three years. On its work and members from 1910–1920s: FRÁTERNÉ, *A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia állandó bizottságai* [The Standing Committees of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences], l.c. and 258–259. The related most important sources *ibid.*, 261–262 (*A Római Magyar Történeti Intézet Bizottságának működésére vonatkozó közlemények, források*). Out of the documents without closer reference, the register of those which were kept in the archives of the Academy: A Római Magyar Történeti Intézet Bizottságának jegyzőkönyvei 1913–1939. [The verbals of the Hungarian Institute of History in Rome 1913–1939], MTAKK K 1591; the documents of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences’ Committee of the Hungarian Institute of History in Rome 1902–1948, MTAKK K 1224.

¹⁶² MTAKK K 1224/10. – Fraknói, who was in Dresden, could not participate in the statutory meeting of 17 November; therefore, he emphatically requested not to make any decisions about personal issues without him. It is hardly accidental that only the points given by him were discussed on the meeting. See CVH I/20, *Appendix*, III, n. 3, and AÉ 26 (1915) 277–281. In the latter place, the 12th point of the report on the Hungarian Academy of Sciences’ work of 1914 gives a good summary of the sources of the Academy’s archives related to the period of foundation. (From verbals, letters, reports, etc.).

¹⁶³ MTAKK K 1591/1 (the verbal of the meeting of 20 December 1913). The agenda of the committee is published: AÉ 25 (1914) 124–127. Áldásy, Fejérpataky, Gyula Forster and naturally Fraknói can be found among the first members.

the Institute were elected at the session of 18 May.¹⁶⁴ It all happened after a long debate, which resulted in the veto on sending young researchers to Rome, true, the resolution *in personam* did not concern historians, but classical philologists.¹⁶⁵ In addition, the work schedule of the Institute, mainly with regards to historical research, was detailed.¹⁶⁶

The handler of the annual state support became the Hungarian Academy of Sciences' apparatus,¹⁶⁷ and as another noble gesture, Fraknói held responsibility for the publication of the future studies.¹⁶⁸ The offer of Vilmos Ormódy, the head manager of the First Hungarian General Insurance Company, also initiated promising prospects for the publications, since in April 1915 he offered half of his public foundation's – established on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of his firm's formation – income of interest payment of that year, all in all 10,000 crowns for the Institute of History in Rome to publish the "Hungarian history related sources".¹⁶⁹

The process of foundation – though a couple of official documents had to be remedied later – ended by the spring of 1914. The secretary entrusted with the organization and appointed on 10 January 1914, Rezső Vári, a clas-

¹⁶⁴ The sometimes instructive, but sometimes expressly entertaining regulations, as well as the tasks of the secretary of the institute are published: CVH I/20, Appendix, III, n. 4–5.

¹⁶⁵ MTAKK K 1591/3. See CVH I/20, Appendix, III, n. 6. Short news about the grant holders: AÉ 25 (1914) 474; more AÉ 26 (1915) 279–281.

¹⁶⁶ Its elaboration was suggested by László Fejérpataky on 18 March to provide continuity for the institute for years. Concerning history, he, Fraknói and Áldásy, in the field of classical philology István Hegedűs and Géza Némethy, in the field of archaeology and history of art Gyula Forster and Bálint Kuzsinszky received a request. MTAKK K 1591/2. There is no data on the latter's completion, on the former, see later and the CVH I/20, Appendix, III, n. 6.

¹⁶⁷ Out of the 20,000 crowns of the budget of 1914, the secretary received 4,000 as personal expenses, the "servant" 1,000, the grant holders 5,000, while the committee executive was granted 800 crowns. The division of the material expenditure was the following: loan payment, insurance, water, heating, lighting: 5,500; improving the library: 1,000; archival copies: 1,000; free sum to spend on anything with subsequent arrangement at the secretary's disposal: 500; smaller committee expenses: 200, travelling expenses in case of delegation: 1,000 crowns. MTAKK K 1591/1 (the verbal of the meeting of 20 December 1913). – The annual interest of Fraknói's foundation at the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and the Saint Stephen Association – with proceeds of 4 % – was 17,500, the Forster scholarship came to 1,350 crowns. These, along with what was supported by the state, were or rather would have been enough for six granted members. Fraknói desired to see among them three historians, a classical scholar, an archaeologist and an art historian. MTAKK K 1591/2 (the verbal of the meeting of 18 March 1914).

¹⁶⁸ MTAKK K 1591/1; AÉ 25 (1914) 249–250. – Fraknói – as all occasions until his death except for the period of his illnesses – took part in the meeting of the Committee, on 20 December 1913, where his offer was warmly welcomed and accepted.

¹⁶⁹ MTAKK K 1224 /86; AÉ 26 (1915) 437–438. Cf. CSORBA, *Fondazione dell'Istituto Storico Ungherese*, 14.

sical philologist, travelled to Rome shortly afterwards.¹⁷⁰ Having arrived, he launched the supplying process of the institution, the classification of its library¹⁷¹ and he thoroughly studied the functioning of the other institutes, about which he subsequently published some minor material.¹⁷² He put his own programme, the publication of his series of volumes, *Sylloge Tacticorum Graecorum* in the centre of his scientific, simultaneously institutional work.¹⁷³

Due to the outbreak of the world war, the opening of the institute planned for the autumn of 1914, was put off. After Italy joined the war in the following year, Vári got stuck in Budapest, the supervision of the building was provided for by the Austro-Hungarian embassy of the Holy See, then after the removal of the imperial and royal diplomats, the villa fell under the protectorate of the Spanish embassy. The Hungarian state's estate could not be rescued from being impounded and seized.¹⁷⁴

¹⁷⁰ For the sake of his efficiency's development – until the filling of the seat of the director – the holding of the deputy head office was permitted. MTAKK K 1224/61. Vári was not capable become a head, since he was not a historian, neither did he have a lot of experience in archival research in the Vatican.

¹⁷¹ The catalogue of the Fraknói-institute's library (including 2692 items) in 1–5 volumes (1801–1900): Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár, Országos Levéltár [The National Archives of Hungary] (MNL-OL), Mikrofilmár X 9982; OSzKK Fol. Hung. 3638/1–5 (photocopy). Its original can be found in the Hungarian Academy in Rome. There are data from those volumes, which were bestowed by Fraknói to the Institute on 18 March 1914: “Vilmos Fraknói, committee member, announced that out of his books in his flat in Budapest, he offered the useful ones to the library of the institute, and asked permission for the executive to choose, index and send them.” MTAKK K 1591/2 (the verbal of the meeting of 18 March 1914). The 8 pages long list of the volumes and journals, with which the collection of Fraknói was willing to be extended, is the proof of the planned library development (MTAKK K 1224/14), however, for the same reason a part of Károly Patthy's donation of 1729 volumes was planned to be sorted out. See Vári's final report of 9 June 1914. MTAKK K 1224/58 and ad 81. Cf. also AÉ 25 (1914) 476.

¹⁷² His short, but strict review criticises that Vári mainly focuses on the archaeological activities, though; the institutes in Rome were established to continue the research work in the Vatican. *Századok* 50 (1916) 667.

¹⁷³ Bibliography: FRÁTERNÉ, *A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia állandó bizottságai*, 260.

¹⁷⁴ The majority of the committee-verbals of the 1910s are concerned with the Committee, including those which engaged Fraknói the most, the cases of organization and economics, the technical questions of transfer and furnishing, then with the problems of the seizing, furthermore with the philological work of Vári, who was compelled to accomplish them in Budapest from 1915 within the scope of the Institute. Apart from the above mentioned: MTAKK K 1591/4 (20 June 1914); K 1591/5 (25 September 1914); K 1591/6 (7 December 1914); K 1591/7 (15 February 1915); K 1591/8 (19 March 1915); K 1591/9 (29 November 1915); K 1591/10 (20 March 1916); K 1591/11 (13 June 1916); K 1591/12 (30 October 1916); K 1591/13 (26 March 1917); K 1591/14 (29 May 1917); K 1591/15 (29 October 1917) K 1591/16 (18 March 1918). The related documents: MTAKK K 1224/1–132 (bonds, contracts, regulations, letters and drafts – Fraknói, Áldásy, Károly Patthy etc. –, proposals, ordinances, catalogues, plans, reports, inventories, invoices etc.). Cf. also AÉ 27 (1916) 314–316; 28 (1917) 248–249; 29 (1918) 189–190; 30 (1919) 123–125.

After a course of long negotiations and the temporary quartering of the Hungarian embassy,¹⁷⁵ the building confiscated in 1918 by the Italian government, was completely recovered only by 1923. Vári¹⁷⁶ and Tibor Gerevich, who was among the scholars appointed first but who could not reach Rome, played a crucial role in the achievement of this success.¹⁷⁷ After the closing of the preparation¹⁷⁸ in 1924, the actual work started under Gerevich's supervision. Not only did Fraknói hear of the pleasing developments,¹⁷⁹ but after some wavering, he also decided to return Rome. However a few weeks later, he died, which put a sad end to his plans.¹⁸⁰

* * *

The crisis of the Fraknói Institute and the prolongation of its re-establishment, including many difficulties, did not mean the complete end of the Hungarian research activities in the Vatican. They resulted "only" that the research's earlier experienced concerted nature, continuity, and intensity ceased to exist; on the other hand, the publications prepared by private diligence were revealed dispersedly: in various series or independently.

The work definitely enriched Hungarian historical science, but they practically did not exist – not internationally, at least. They lacked the giant surplus that the *Monumenta Vaticana* and the *Monumenta Romana* offered, namely the opportunity to present the Roman sources of Hungarian history in a gradually expanding series aimed at a specific purpose. Yet, the publication of the last couple of volumes of the *Monumenta* – in 1907 and 1909 – shows that they

¹⁷⁵ MTAKK K 1591/18 (27 November 1919); K 1591/19 (29 January 1920); K 1591/20 (3 November 1920); K 1591/21 (8 May 1921); K 1591/22 (6 June 1921); K 1591/23 (4 November 1921), the latter confirmed the lift of the ban and the move in of the embassy. Cf. AÉ 31 (1920) 7–10; 33 (1922) 82.

¹⁷⁶ His lengthy reports of 10 September 1920, then of 12 October on his journey to Rome in August, the important sources of the Villa Fraknói's history. MTAKK K 1224/141–142.

¹⁷⁷ On Vári's replacement by Gerevich: MTAKK K 1224/133; K 1591/17; cf. AÉ 30 [1919] 109; MTAKK K 1224/143; MTAKK K 1224/135; K 1591/23–24; MTAKK K 1591/25.

¹⁷⁸ Cf. MTAKK K 1591/26–27 (5 May 1923 and 19 September).

¹⁷⁹ ÁLDÁSY, *Fraknói Vilmos emlékezete*, 457.

¹⁸⁰ The Nestor of the Hungarian historians, who lost the largest part of his ecclesiastical benefices after the Treaty of Trianon, was obliged to apply for one of the state scholarships of the Committee. The academics, though they reckoned his health conditions did not make his journey possible, were uniformly of the opinion that his wish should be satisfied and instead of a scholarship, they would find another solution. MTAKK K 1591/30. (10 November 1924)

could have temporarily been continued even without a Roman centre. Beyond the already mentioned professional aspects, one can hardly be mistaken if the publication of the last piece of the *Monumenta Vaticana* after an eighteen-year break is regarded as an attempt to revive the series in a critical period, or as the consumption of the remaining money.¹⁸¹ Additionally, there were many books, which contained the results of the Fraknói Institute's collection by former members.

Having written his synthetic works, the founder practically concluded his research in this field,¹⁸² and his interest turned to another direction. Most of all, the work of Endre Veress has to be mentioned from this period. His power to express his interests reached only the publication of one volume of the *Monumenta Vaticana*; however, his other publications, like the documents of Carillo,¹⁸³ or the Hungarian notes of the *Collegium Germanicum et Hungaricum's matricula* should have been approved of in the series of the Vatican.¹⁸⁴ The scope of Veress's research of long decades exceeded not only the borders of Rome, but those of Italy, too. To utilize his gorgeous collection, he launched his own series, which earned some volumes (*Fontes Rerum Transylvanicarum* and *Fontes Rerum Hungaricarum*), furthermore, he accepted the support of every cooperative institute like that of the Romanian Academy of Sciences. Among his collections of documents arranged along various themes, but

¹⁸¹ József Lukcsics, in his review – that lacks only the regesta in Hungarian –, which introduces the work as a worthy continuation of the earlier volumes, also expressed his hope that “the publication of the excellent volume proclaims Bishop Fraknói's peerless generosity and Veress's exemplary zeal. We strongly believe that the Hungarian Institute of History in Rome, which boasts such beautiful publications, cannot cease to exist.” KSz 23 (1909) 749–752.

¹⁸² The often noted appendix of the first volume of *Magyarország és a római Szentszék [Hungary and the Holy See]* almost clearly states this. The only exception might be his publications of the *A római magyar Seminarium története [The History of the Hungarian Seminarium in Rome]* (KSz 26 [1912] 444–453) and some supplications of the fourteenth century from the work of *Visegrádon 1367-ben írt kodex a klosterneuburgi könyvtárban [The Codex Written in Visegrád in 1367 from the Library of Klosterneuburg]* (MKSz 23 [1915] 148–150).

¹⁸³ *Carillo Alfonz jezsuita atya levelezése és iratai I [The Correspondence and documents of Carillo Alfonz Jesuit Priest I]* (MHH I/32), Budapest 1906.

¹⁸⁴ *A római Collegium Germanicum et Hungaricum magyarországi tanulóinak anyakönyve és iratai [The Matricula and Documents of the Hungarian Students of the Collegium Germanicum et Hungaricum in Rome]* (*Fontes rerum Hungaricarum* 2), ed. by ENDRE VERESS, Budapest 1917. The first volume of the series including the data of the Hungarian students of the University of Padua was published by the support of Károly Hornig, similarly to *Monumenta Romana*. József Lukcsics's praising abstract: KSz 30 (1916) 210–211.

mainly focused on the Báthory era, one can hardly find any which would not have utilized the sources of the Vatican.¹⁸⁵

Fraknói's assistant in the institute, József Lukcsics, presented only a couple of lesser works and some reviews.¹⁸⁶ Antal Hodinka published his important Roman results also after the institute had been closed. According to his original programme, these documents supplied precious contribution only to a general topic, to the history of the Hungarian Greek Catholics.¹⁸⁷ However, his work, some hundred page long, the *Római Levéltárak* (Roman Archives) related strictly to the historiography of the Hungarian research done in Rome. He was encouraged to write it by Fraknói.¹⁸⁸

This outline of Hodinka is actually incomplete. He did not deal with the state and private archives and with the libraries; besides, in the case of the papal archives, perhaps the most important supplications were not analysed, since the promised continuation failed to come about. Yet, the review in the international secondary literature, like Fraknói's synthesis, was unique. Not only did he elaborate on the structure, the history¹⁸⁹ and the history of research¹⁹⁰ of the Vatican archives by a bibliography aiming at completeness, but he also mentions several Hungarian-related data.¹⁹¹ Although he did not reach the profundity of a *Hungaricum*-repertory, it can and should be read as a useful source, which is undoubtedly not an easy task, since the material in the Vatican Archives was rearranged within a couple of years after its publication.

¹⁸⁵ The outline of his activity of publishing pursued until 1948 from Kálmán Benda in the 7th volume of the *Adattár XVI–XVIII. századi szellemi mozgalmaink történetéhez* [Data on the History of our Intellectual Movements in the 16th–18th Century] series: 217–219 (Epilogue). – On Veress's work see also the following chapter.

¹⁸⁶ *Uski János veszprémi püspök Zsigmond király diplomatája* [The Diplomat of King Sigismund János Uski, Bishop of Veszprém], Századok 42 (1908) 1–28; *A középkori pápai adókönyvek* [The Medieval Papal Register of Taxpayers], Budapest 1908. The message of the latter is emphasised by its reviewer that "Hungary paid less to the popes than they did to us, this is the main moral" KSz 23 (1909) 650–651 (László Tóth). – Besides, Lukcsics also introduced Ferenc Chobot's history of papacy. KSz 24 (1910) 221–223. On his main work, apart from the *Monumenta Romana*, see especially the CVH I/20, Appendix, III, n. 10 (and 19). The manuscript of the *Camera Apostolica*, which was found after a long search and contains Hungarian related data, has been published in the CVH (I/9–10).

¹⁸⁷ *A munkácsi görög-katolikus püspökség története* [The History of the Greek Catholic Bishoprics of Munkács], Budapest 1910; and *A munkácsi görög szertartású püspökség okmánytára. I: 1448–1715* [The Archives of the Greek Rite Bishoprics of Munkács I: 1448–1715], Ungvár 1911.

¹⁸⁸ *Dr. Hodinka Antal jelentése*, 499.

¹⁸⁹ HODINKA, *A római levéltárak*, I, 9–36.

¹⁹⁰ HODINKA, *A római levéltárak*, I, 36–79 and 79–93.

¹⁹¹ HODINKA, *A római levéltárak*, I, 93–165 and II, 9–148.

Antal Hodinka's large-scale study could not possibly have had a considerable effect, since – despite its importance, it was not published as a monograph, but as the appendix to Árpád Bossányi's *Regesta supplicationum*, the important work which was conducted absolutely independently of the Fraknói Institute.¹⁹² The collection of Bossányi, diocesan priest of Győr and papal chamberlain, was already independent of the activities of the old Institute, but at the same time so much an integral continuation of the Monumenta Vaticana that the 14th century petitions he published in extract form (to Clement VI, Innocent VI, to Urban V [1362–1370] and to Clement VII [1378–1394] of the antipope) were transcribed in full text by the Fraknói's team, and, as we know, the manuscript was already prepared to be printed. As a consequence, Bossányi – first but not last in the history of the research activities in the Vatican – accomplished such a task as had already been solved more thoroughly by his predecessors. Therefore, József Lukcsics and Antal Áldásy showered a genuine volley on the work published by the support of Antal Fetser, bishop of Győr.¹⁹³ They scornfully criticized its introduction, use of concepts, the mistakes made in the abstracts as well as its index. Bossányi's private enterprise did not seem rewarding in the short run – moreover, he had to accept Lukcsics's comment that “the whole publication is of little use to Hungarian church history, even less serves for its glory.”¹⁹⁴ Despite the less favourable welcome, like the volumes of the *Monumenta Vaticana*, during the last century, this work became quite estab-

¹⁹² The review of Hodinka about the archives was welcomed equally well by the contemporary criticism (Lukcsics and Áldásy) and by Lajos Pásztor. KSz 32 (1918) 471–473; Századok 52 (1918) 281–282; PÁSZTOR, *A Vatikáni Levéltár*, 100 et sequ.

¹⁹³ Its long title: *Regesta supplicationum. A pápai kérvénykönyvek magyar vonatkozású okmányai. Avignoni korszak. I: VI. Kelemen pápa 1342–1352. II: VI. Ince pápa 1352–1362. V. Orbán pápa 1362–1370. VII. Kelemen ellenpápa 1378–1394 [Regesta supplicationum. The Hungarian Related Documents of the Papal Petition-books. Avignon era I: Pope Clement VI 1342–1352, II: Pope Innocent VI 1352–1362, Pope Urban V 1362–1370. Antipope Clement VII 1378–1394]*, Budapest 1916–1918.

¹⁹⁴ KSz 32 (1918) 471–473 and Századok 52 (1918) 280–285. From the criticism of Áldásy: “Back in time, Bishop Vilmos Fraknói had the Hungarian relations of the supplications of Clement VI and Innocent VI copied and examined, the Hungarian relations of the supplications from later times were systematically analysed, copied and partly extracted by the historians staying in Rome for longer or shorter period of time. This work – as far as we are concerned – lasted until Pope Callixtus III. The prepared material from the supplications of Clement VI and Innocent VI for the Monumenta Vaticana is kept in the Hungarian National Museum at the moment, therefore, Bossányi copied such material that was not only copied and examined by the Hungarian scholars, but whose careful and precise publication was also arranged...” – On the lot of the inventory and copies of the researches of the Fraknói Institute in the Vatican and their long oblivion, see: CVH I/20, 109–111; the detailed description of the material: *ibid.*, 117–123.

lished in Hungarian historiography. Scarcely independently from the content of the criticism, a further source publication, the *Monumenta [Romana] Ecclesiae Iauriensis* was not printed.¹⁹⁵

Out of the historians working without any guiding principle or continuity, no one stirred up such a hornets' nest as Bossányi did. For instance, the reaction¹⁹⁶ to the doctoral dissertation of the martyr János Scheffler, later bishop of Szatmár, was rather pleasing (*VIII. Sándor pápa és a bécsi udvar 1689–1691. A vatikáni levéltár okmányai alapján [Pope Alexander VIII and the Court of Vienna 1689–1691. On the Basis of the Vatican Archives' Documents]*).¹⁹⁷ From a closer academic perspective, the less extensive publication of Ferenc Luttor¹⁹⁸ proved to be useful. In addition, the collection of Pázmány's letters, published by Ferenc Hanuy, made use of the Roman sources.¹⁹⁹

This critical period of Hungarian research in the Vatican can be left behind by recalling the contemporary international secondary literature's recensing made mainly by Antal Áldásy.²⁰⁰

¹⁹⁵ However, Antal Hodinka mentioned it in 1916 as having been under press. (*A római levéltárak*, I, 128.)

¹⁹⁶ Ungvár 1914.

¹⁹⁷ Századok 50 (1916) 185–186 (Ferenc Patek).

¹⁹⁸ *Mária Terézia halála és a római Kúria [The Death of Maria Theresa and the Roman Curia]*, Budapest 1914.

¹⁹⁹ *Pázmány Péter... összegyűjtött levelei I–II [The Collected Letters of... Péter Pázmány I–II]*, ed. by FERENC HANUY, Budapest 1910–1911. Hanuy's report on his collection in Rome according to Fraknói's instruction: *Kutatás Pázmány levelei után [A Search for Pázmány's Letters]*, *Religio* 67 (1908) 310–312. 325–327. 341–343. 358–361 (in the first two publications).

²⁰⁰ Many volumes of the NB II/3 and the QF from 1585–1590: Századok 40 (1906) 554–563 (Antal Áldásy); NB I/10: Századok 42 (1908) 63–69 (Antal Áldásy); *Pápai intézkedés a XVI. században a kéziratok szétrombolása ellen [Papal Measures against the Destroying of the Manuscripts in the Sixteenth Century]*, *MKSz* 15 (1907) 378. (Unknown author's summary of one of the articles of J.A.F. Orbaan, a colleague of the starting Dutch institute.)

V

The Hungarian Institute of History in Rome and the *Accademia d'Ungheria di Roma* (1924–[1944]–1950)

After a break of some twenty years, from 1924, not only did the real work in the Villa Fraknói²⁰¹ begin with the guidance of art historian Tibor Gerevich, but it also seemed that Fraknói's dream of an academic and art centre in Rome could be finally realised by the help of Count Kuno Klebelsberg, minister of education. The "Hungarian Institute in Rome"²⁰² – established in the Palazzo Falconieri and within the frame of a vast *Collegium Hungaricum*-program – was divided into four departments. (Its Italian name became *Regia Accademia d'Ungheria di Roma*, from which the name of the Hungarian Academy in Rome [in Hungarian "*Római Magyar Akadémia*", abbrev. 'RMA'] de-

²⁰¹ Cf. TIBOR GEREVICH, *A Római Magyar Történeti Intézet [The Hungarian Institute of History in Rome]*, LK 2 (1924) 200–201. Due to his appointment as professor, Gerevich resigned from his position as director already on 12 January 1925, which was rejected by Kuno Klebelsberg, minister of education, in his answer of 3 February 1925, "in consideration of the fact that" he could not be devoid of Gerevich's "expertise and connections at the leadership of the Institute", moreover the minister himself asked the art historian to "administer the duties of the Hungarian Institute of History in Rome's director besides his tasks as a professor." MTAKK K 1224/155. Gerevich again resigned on 18 April, which was accepted by the minister on 28 April, however, Klebelsberg commissioned him to temporarily head the Institute until further measures, therefore from this time, Gerevich was regarded as managing director only. (*Ibid.*, K 1224/159.) also Cf. *ibid.*, K 1224/161.

²⁰² On its foundation and history until the Second World War: FRÁTERNÉ, *A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia állandó bizottságai*, 254–258; PÁSZTOR, *Le origini dell'Accademia d'Ungheria*, 24–27; [IDEM], *La fondazione dell'Accademia d'Ungheria in Roma*, *Annuario dell'Accademia d'Ungheria* (1997, noted later), 85–100; GÁBOR UJVÁRY, *Tudományszervezés–Történetkutatás–Forráskritika. Klebelsberg Kuno és a Bécsi Magyar Történeti Intéze [Organization of Research – Historiography – Source Criticism. Kuno Klebelsberg and the Hungarian Institute of History in Vienna]* (the publication of the Győr–Moson–Sopron county's archives of Győr), Győr 1996, 43–67 (*A római magyar intézetek [The Hungarian Institutes in Rome]*). (Cf. [IDEM], „Iskola” a batáron túl. *A Római Magyar Intézet története (1912–1945)* [“School” Abroad. *The History of the Hungarian Institute of History in Rome (1912–1945)*], *Levéltári Szemle* (LSz) 45 [1995] 4, 3–37); [IDEM], *La storia dell'Istituto Ungherese a Roma dal 1912 al 1945*, *Cento anni*, 19–43.

rived, then became official in the course of the decades.)²⁰³ There was a scholarly, artistic, theological educational department and a “secondary college”. The purpose of the latter was to support the university studies of teacher trainees in Rome. The ecclesiastical department became independent in 1936, then, from 1940, it continued its work under the name of Papal Hungarian Ecclesiastical Institute.²⁰⁴ After having moved to the *Via Giulia*, the scholarly (historical) department kept its original name (later by assuming the name of Vilmos Fraknói), the Hungarian Institute of History in Rome.²⁰⁵

The Hungarian Academy in Rome’s original function was defined as follows:

“To enhance scholarly research, professional study, general knowledge, a good command of Italian and the relationships with Italian expert circles of the Hungarian scholars and artists who were employed as members of the institute and young people who prepared for such profession; to welcome the Hungarian scholars and artists, who visited Rome for the purpose of research or deepening the Hungarian-Italian cultural relations; through social intercourses, organizing lectures, courses, exhibitions, concerts, publications, etc. to cultivate and deepen the Italian-Hungarian cultural relations; to operate by informing and mediating as regards the Italian and Hungarian cultural institutes, bodies and people doing scholarly or artistic work.”²⁰⁶

Such expression of the aims reflects the ideas of Klebelsberg, who, without underestimating the importance of the past – which is proved by the organized and extended historical research in Vienna²⁰⁷ –, expected the representa-

²⁰³ For the sake of simplicity, I always use the latter term.

²⁰⁴ The Hungarian state was its founder, according to its disciplinary regulation it was subordinated to the Holy See, in agreement with the minister of education its head was appointed by the archbishop of Esztergom. Its existence is definitely rooted in Fraknói’s negotiations with the bench of bishops at the beginning of the century. Its regulation is edited: *A külföldi magyar intézetek működése és a magas műveltség célját szolgáló külföldi ösztöndíjak az 1932/33. tanévben* [*The Work of the Hungarian Foreign Institutes and the Foreign Scholarships Representing the Purpose of Higher Education in 1932/1933*], which is published by the Országos Ösztöndíjtanács [Hungarian Scholarship Board], Budapest 1934, 86–89. Its short history until the Second World War: MARGIT BEKE, *L’Istituto Pontificio Ecclesiastico Ungherese a Roma (1929–1945)*, Cento anni, 69–73; [IDEM], *Das päpstliche Ungarische Kirchliche Institut in Rom*, MEV–Regnum 7 (1995) 3–4, 185–203.

²⁰⁵ Cf. *A külföldi magyar intézetek működése... az 1931/32. tanévben* [*The Work of the Hungarian Foreign Institutes... in 1931/1932*], Budapest 1933, 109–112, 109; AÉ 50 (1940) 383–385; *A külföldi magyar intézetek működése... az 1927/28. tanévben* [*The Work of the Hungarian Foreign Institutes... in 1927/1928*], Budapest 1929, 7.

²⁰⁶ *A külföldi magyar intézetek működése... az 1931/32. tanévben* [*The Work of the Hungarian Foreign Institutes... in 1931/1932*], 109–112, 109.

²⁰⁷ Cf. UJVÁRY, *Tudományszervezés–Történetkutatás*, 144 et sequ.

tion of the “present and the future”.²⁰⁸ The alignment with the new fundamental principles was also an eternal commitment, as in the case of the Institute of History including the one of Fraknói's. Thanks to the purchase of the *Palazzo Falconieri*, not only a worthy, but equal – to the most influential countries, like the French's *Palazzo Farnese* – and still existing conditions were created for Hungarian presence in Rome. Nonetheless, the way the Hungarian Academy in Rome was run obtained a lot of criticism already from the first years and its *raison d'être* was also questioned; moreover, Bálint Hóman, minister of education, was willing to sell the palace in the mid 1930s (though the transaction did never take place). Despite certain bad patches, the institution could mostly meet its cultural, artistic, representative and political role. The number of the grant holders, who did research, studied and operated in the Eternal city, increased; and after having returned home, they became significant members of the Hungarian intellectual elite.²⁰⁹ The interdisciplinary atmosphere of the Hungarian Academy in Rome was already productive by itself. The works of the “Roman School” branded with the name of Vilmos Aba Novák, proved to be especially lasting.²¹⁰ There was an exhibition – which was opened by the Italian king himself – that clearly shows how the institute became the citadel of Italian-Hungarian cultural relations.

However, it is undoubtedly true that the framework provided by the Falconieri palace²¹¹ had never been totally exploited. The forty scholarships were rarely completely filled; the empty rooms and flats were utilized by welcoming numerous Hungarian guests and visitors, or they were leased. While the former one might meet the aim of Klebelsberg to deepen the social relations, the real estate trade hardly did so.²¹² Oddly, the criticism of the time

²⁰⁸ PÁSZTOR, *Le origini dell'Accademia d'Ungheria*, 26.

²⁰⁹ Between 1924 and 1928, there were 34 grant holders in the Villa Fraknói, in 1928–1944, some 240 grant holders visited the Falconieri-palace. The approx. 270 members were around 350 in reality, which shows the period of mainly two and sometimes one term, since many of them got to the Eternal City many times. About 90% of the scholarships were supported by the Hungarian state. UJVÁRY, *Tudományszervezés–Történetkutatás*, 58–59.

²¹⁰ JULIANNA P. SZŰCS, *La «scuola romana»*, Cento anni, 95–126. On their first Hungarian entry: *A Római Magyar Intézet (R. Accademia d'Ungheria di Roma) ösztöndíjas művészeinek első kiállítása [The First Exhibition of the Grant Holder Artists of the Hungarian Institute in Rome]*, Budapest 1931.

²¹¹ The latest art historical introduction of the palace by Francesco Borromini: ÁGNES HETÉNYI, *Il Palazzo Falconieri di Roma, Cento anni*, 127–145.

²¹² According to the director of the Hungarian Academy in Rome, the presence of the tenants did not hinder the life of the institute at all. MNL-OL Az Országos Magyar Gyűjteménygyetem Tanácsa 1922–1949 (A Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum Tanácsa 1934–1949) (K 726), 1932/164 and 1933/335–49.

found the root of the problems primarily in the “constraint” on the representatives of the various scholarly and artistic fields of living under the same roof, or in the lack of being closed into an ivory tower which could be necessary for intellectual work. Therefore, as a partial solution, the return to the Villa Fraknói was suggested.²¹³

It would have hardly been acceptable if the process initiated by Klebelsberg would have had to be reorganized. It is a problem far more grave than the failure of realizing the original plans about how the planned departments should eventually function.²¹⁴ Even the earlier, formally autonomous, Institute of History did not have the necessary independence, namely a real scholarly institutional character, though it had its own roots. This inevitably raises the question whether the wish of Fraknói’s – laid down in 1912–1913 and legally bulwarked –, which required the state’s provision of a Hungarian institute of *history* in Rome, was already violated in the 1930s. It is obvious that the Hungarian Academy in Rome cannot be regarded as the legal successor, or “further development” of the Hungarian Institute of History in Rome; however, the contrast has been advertised by a marble plaque for a couple of years. In reality it was a completely new institute, into which building the Institute of History was moved for economical and organizational reasons.²¹⁵

The answer is that the bishop-historian’s intentions were not damaged, – not from a legal point of view. On the one hand, in contrast to the artistic and teacher trainees’ departments, the Institute of History was at least always separated – within the scope of the Hungarian Academy in Rome –, on the other hand, it could officially keep the name of its institute, which followed the work only “in organizational collaboration”²¹⁶ with the Hungarian Academy in Rome, according to the ministerial reports. Furthermore, the direct control of the Roman Historical Committee of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences

²¹³ A word for word quotation from the criticism of Tibor Gerevich: FRÁTERNÉ, *A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia állandó bizottságai*, 257.

²¹⁴ Cf. UJVÁRY, *Tudományszervezés–Történetkutatás*, 59.

²¹⁵ See Klebelsberg’s ordinance of 10 July 1927 to Gerevich, in which he orders him to start negotiating with Berzeviczy about the utilization of the Villa Fraknói, and “this time be so kind as to elaborate a suggestion also to the Hungarian Institute of History in Rome’s connection with the Collegium Hungaricum. This measure is necessary since I cannot maintain two institutes in a city on principle.” UJVÁRY, *Tudományszervezés–Történetkutatás*, 51, n. 82.

²¹⁶ See the noted and later noted issue of the *A külföldi magyar intézetek működése...* [*The Work of the Hungarian Foreign Institutes...*]

did not cease to exist either. Not only was the scholar think-tank responsible for the Institute of History's selection of the grant holders, their duties and judging the research and institutional reports, but theoretically it could intervene in the appointment of the secretary of the Hungarian Academy in Rome, who filled the position of the director of the Institute of History.²¹⁷ Moreover, as the administrator of the Villa Fraknói it could allot the incomes of the leased building for the purposes of the Institute of History – namely to the publications –, and the same could have been done with the purchase price in case of sale.²¹⁸ What is more, the Committee took steps to keep the Institute of History as a separate item in the state budget. Although the attempt was rejected by Klebelsberg, its own chapter within the budget of the Hungarian Academy in Rome was fulfilled for the Institute of History, which was approved – and defended by historian members such as e.g. Ferenc Galla – by the Committee, every year. Above all, the Institute of History was also physically separated by taking the rooms on the third floor of the Falconieri palace.²¹⁹

With the establishment of the Roman *Collegium Hungaricum*, namely the Hungarian Academy in Rome, the Hungarian state did not renounce the maintenance of a *historical* institute in the Eternal City, the Villa Fraknói, precisely because its incomes were aimed to cover the institute's costs. There was a reasonable change – as shown by the following Belgian and Austrian examples, successful up to the present – only in the location and autonomy of the institution.

* * *

Yet, the conditions were not quite favourable. Except for a housemaid, from 1929, the Institute did not have its own personell; moreover, from 1930 on, it did not have its own head, the tasks of the secretary or the director being

²¹⁷ For example CVH I/20, *Appendix*, III, n. 16.

²¹⁸ The text of the agreement between the Hungarian National University of Collection and the Hungarian Academy of Sciences' board of directors about the Institute of History as the "Sezione Storica «Fraknói» della R. Accademia Ungherese di Roma" CVH I/20, *Appendix*, III, n. 12. – The Committee agreed on the rehousing at its meeting of 26 April 1928, on one condition that the new relation must be regulated in detail. On the other hand, they decided to spend the released incomes of the Villa Fraknói on publications of the institute. MTAKK K 1591/37.

²¹⁹ CVH I/20, *Appendix*, III, n. 11. 13. 17. 21. 22.

administered by the current head of the Hungarian Academy in Rome.²²⁰ Nonetheless, the original mission that was created at the beginning, namely the Hungarian research work in the Vatican, was gradually becoming lost. Compared to the 1910s, despite the results, glamorous palace or no glamorous palace, the effort remained on the level of private undertakings.

However, it was (and might always be) evident that Fraknói had established his institute primarily for Hungarian-related research in the Vatican. He couldn't have possibly regarded that research, at the beginning of the century, as complete. "Nobody has pursued any research to such an extent as that of the Mon. Vat. Hungarica now; yet, do not believe that – although these research activities require a further ten to fifteen years – everything has been exhausted there, that which relates to our country", wrote László Fejérpataky.²²¹ In fact, an outline about the research attached to Fraknói's synthesis furthered the cause of picking up the dropped stitches after the forced interval.²²²

After all, the general objectives of the re-established institution in 1912–1914 can give rise to uncertainty.²²³ Above all, they discuss historical research in general terms only. However, it should be mentioned that, in many cases, the regulations drafted by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences were a word for word adoption of Fraknói's earlier plan, in which the use of the *Monumenta*

²²⁰ Until 1930, Tibor Gerevich was the curator and director of the Hungarian Academy in Rome and the head of the Institute of History in one person. However, as an ordinary professor, he spent most of his time in Budapest; the practical duties were carried out by László Tóth. Yet, he did not properly enjoy the trust of Klebelsberg, who was not satisfied with the standing situation either. Therefore, Tóth was ordered to return home and Gerevich was dismissed from the board of directors. He was replaced by his trustee and employee, Gyula Miskolczy, who became not only a director and deputy-curator, but in a personal letter, he also applied for the directorship of the Institute of History from the Committee. His main supporter was Gerevich, who might have found the maintenance of his influence more guaranteed by him than dealing with two directors, one of whose might also be professional, as him. Finally, the Committee accepted Miskolczy, and beyond all understanding, only an office clerk or an accountant was sent with him. It is evident that the development of the structure, which gravely threatened the independent and efficient work of the Institute of History in the Falconieri Palace, can be traced back to the *ad hoc* personal combinations and interests. It is clearly proved by Gerevich's well-expected success; shortly, he could acquire the professional leadership again. See later. On all of this: MTAKK K 1591/41 and [43] (1 May and 2 July 1930); K 1224/194; RAL 1930/609 and 638; see, furthermore, UJVÁRY, *Tudományszervezés-Történet-kutatás*, 54–55.

²²¹ *A pápai levéltárak*, 73.

²²² *A vatikáni levéltár*, *op. cit.* See above.

²²³ Already noted above in the main text.

Vaticana fund for further publications also occurred.²²⁴ To satisfactorily interpret the intention of (re)establishment, a remark of Antal Áldásy's gives us a clue: "when the institute of history in Rome shifted to the Hungarian state's possession by Fraknói's generous donation, the first place in the work schedule of the institute was taken by the publication of just these supplications [i.e. published by Bossányi]."²²⁵ Besides, the work schedule itself settles all the doubts, which – apart from maintaining the possibility of private research interest – referred exclusively to archival research within the Vatican; moreover, by no means on a general plane.²²⁶ As a consequence, it is barely surprising that the first act of the classical-philologist Rezső Vári, secretary of the institute, was to get permission for the smooth and continuing use of the Vatican archives and library for the members of the institute.²²⁷ Already in 1913, Albert Berzeviczy – the president of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and its competent Committee, as well as of the Hungarian Institute of History in Rome – agreed with the Monarchy's embassy to the Holy See that on the occasion of the Institute's opening, along with the other members he would have a visitation at the pope and the cardinal secretary of state.²²⁸

In the course of the reopening hallmarked by the name of Tibor Gerevich in 1924, the changing of accent, connected with the paradigm shift of positivism and the history of ideas, can be detected. The ministerial report on the operation of the first year is as follows:

"The research programme of the newly (in 1923) established institute covered universal and ecclesiastical history, archaeology, history of art and literature and the Hungarian-Italian related philology. According to Gerevich's objectives, the work of the researchers in the institute in the frame of the given fields of scholarship is not only reproductive, but productive, as well: it aims not only at copying documents, but also at the scholarly solution of the occurring problems on the basis of the material of the

²²⁴ "If the capital of the institute allows, the institute will publish scientific work. For this purpose, the board of directors can use the remains of the VMO's [Monumenta Vaticana Hungariae] capital..." OSzKK Fol. Hung. 1749, fol. 27 et sequ. Cf. also fol. 82 et sequ.

²²⁵ Századok 52 (1918) 281–282.

²²⁶ The earlier mentioned plan of work, which was included in the verbal of the committee, was published CVH I/20, *Appendix*, III, n. 6. Its lengthy abstract: AÉ 26 (1915) 279–280.

²²⁷ "In the Austrian institute of history, I obtained knowledge of the advantages that the members of the institute can receive... 3. Permission for the use of the Vatican library and Archives. I have already drafted the related request, which was countersigned by our embassy in the Vatican, and I am personally handing it in the Vatican..." Vári's report of 9 June 1914. MTAKK K 1224/58.

²²⁸ AÉ 26 (1915) 280.

Roman libraries and archives, museums, etc. Besides, the institute methodically continued the collection of the Hungarian-related documents of the Vatican Archives, examined the newer manuscripts of the Vatican (Fondo Chigi, Fondo Barberini) and those Roman collections which had not yet been examined from a Hungarian point of view. (The manuscripts of the Biblioteca Vallicelliana, the Bibl. Casanatense, the R. Acc. dei Lincei and S. Antonio, and the documents of the Accademia di S. Luca, the Soc. Ponte Molle and the S. Iridion monks, which are valuable from the point of view of art history.) Through this sort of research, in the first year of the reestablishment, the institute received an overall view of the Hungarian-related sources in Rome. Apart from Rome, the institute extended its sphere of activity to the whole country as well, and – as early as its first year of activity – it launched an examination programme of the Hungarian-related material found in the library and archives of Bologna, Florence and Siena.”²²⁹

The conception of Gerevich was not only appealing, but correct. The chief reason was that, in contrast with its secondary role, in the middle of the 1920s, a manifold exploration, directly continuing the collection by Fraknói,²³⁰ was launched in the Vatican Archives.²³¹ Many grant holders also completed the courses of the *Scuola Paleografica* of the Vatican, and multiple studies, which were based on Roman research and elaborated on valuable topics from various branches of science according to a sophisticated methodology, were published in a range of Hungarian journals. In the long run, however, the Gerevich-era had a detrimental effect – to which Klebelsberg’s expansion of duties must have contributed – in that no scientific profile, which could show serious and spectacular accomplishments, was to be developed by the institute.²³² Yet the

²²⁹ *A külföldi magyar intézetek megalapítása és 1924/25. tanévi működése* [The Establishment and Work of the Hungarian Foreign Institutes in 1924/1925], published by the Hungarian Royal Ministry of Religion and Education, Budapest 1926, 19–20. The same in more detailed form in Gerevich’s report of 1924. Published by LAJOS PÁSZTOR, *Gerevich Tibor a Római Magyar Történeti Intézet működéséről 1924–1926* [Tibor Gerevich about the Work of the Hungarian Institute of History in Rome 1924–1926], MEV–Regnum 8 (1996) 333–350, 335–336 and 342.

²³⁰ Cf. The preface of Pál Lukcsics’s later noted work. (*XV. századi pápák oklevelei*, I, 1–3 and II, 1–2.)

²³¹ “The historians of the Institute have a complete view of the rich material of the Vatican Archives and especially of the Hungarian-related documents, moreover, the continuity of the archival researches of the Institute is guaranteed by the work of the historian grant holders staying in Rome for one and a half or two years, in accordance with the new members of the institute”, Gerevich wrote with fair optimism in December 1926. PÁSZTOR, *Gerevich Tibor a Római Magyar Történeti Intézet működéséről*, 342. – In course of the preparation of the Institute’s operation, Gerevich made a bartering agreement of publications with the Vatican Library, moreover he was welcomed on an audience by Pius XI (1922–1939). His letter to Kuno Klebelsberg. 7 August 1922. OSZKK.

²³² More important sources of the resumption: MTAKK K 1224/151–179 (until 1928) (regulation, applications for grants, cases, reports and budgets); Gerevich–Tóth-period in the Falconieri palace: MTAKK K 1224/180–198 (the moving in, the new constitutional structure, the documents on the budget’s estab-

interaction of the interdisciplinarity organized around it could have created the international competitiveness besides longevity. Instead of this, by the 1930s, the activity of the Institute of History fatally fell apart.²³³

The trouble was felt by many. As already mentioned, one of the responsible people in charge, notably Gerevich, found the solution in returning to the Villa Fraknói.²³⁴ The work schedule of 1931 elaborated by the Roman Historical Committee of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, namely Dezső Csánki, Ferenc Kollányi and Antal Áldásy prescribed – in accordance with the traditions and the activities of the other institutes in Rome – the necessity of historical research in the Vatican as the primary duty of the Institute. According to the plan, in association with an already started international project, the publication of a *Hungaria Pontifica* should have been prepared along with the examination of the papal registers before 1301, then the collection of the documents from 1301–1417 and the systematic exploration and the creation of a catalogue from 1458–1526 seemed expedient. From among modern sources, Áldásy, Csánki and Kollányi urged the complete processing of the Hungarian relations in the eighteenth century reports of the papal nuncios and related documents, and the exploitation of the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith's fonds. Apart from Ferenc Galla's work, the programme – which here and there manifested a thorough knowledge, however, sometimes its opposite and was partly incomplete²³⁵ – remained to be only a written memorabilia in its scrawled form. The accomplishment of the work on medieval sources was automatically delayed by the academics' referring to a "lack of expertise" (however, Pál Lukcsics could have been re-sent to the Eternal City),

lishment, the question of the Villa Fraknói's letting and the use of its rent, reports, requests of the grant holders, cases of publication); Miskolczy-period: MTAKK K 1224/199–229 (except for the questions of moving, the same points as in the case of the previous documents). See also the verbals of the committee, about which there will not be given a separate outline.

²³³ The relations are demonstrated by the fact that the director of the Hungarian Academy in Rome and the Institute of History highlighted – in the report of 14 January 1933 given to his state superiors – the recommendations bestowed to the grant holders as the main duty and merit of 1932, which is almost unbelievable. MNL-OL Az Országos Magyar Gyűjteményegyetem Tanácsa (K 726), 1933/335–49. (The same source touches upon the drawn personal consequences. See later in the text.)

²³⁴ See above (from the criticism of Gerevich).

²³⁵ While the plan of work is regarded complete in medieval relations, from the period after 1526, neither the correspondence of the Secretariat of State, the collection of the other congregations, nor the *processus informativus* examinations and the private archives of the nunciatures are taken into account. True, a part of these sources was kept outside the Vatican Archives at that time.

moreover, after Galla returned home, the systematic research of the Propaganda's archives was also interrupted.²³⁶

It is hardly a surprise that a note from 1935 repeatedly mentioned the lack of any systematic research; moreover, it expressed the almost explicit wish that Fraknói's old institution should return. In connection with the other institutes in Rome, it rightly emphasised that "they often devote their time on internationally important research or on investigating on certain groups of sources of the Vatican", and voted for quitting "scientific wandering" and for the selection of subjects to be systematically prepared. Furthermore, it called attention to the fact that there were many unqualified grant holders, and to the results achieved by the successor states in the Vatican; finally, it urged the publications of an international scientific nature.²³⁷

Although the publications grew, the difficulties could not be surmounted despite the fact that the new regulations of the Institute of History in 1940 headed the word for word program of 1913, and in light of the decade-long experience, the relations of the Institute and the Hungarian Academy in Rome were reorganised in many practical points.²³⁸ The actual reasons for the problems are quite far-reaching, and they are not rooted in the purchase of the Falconieri Palace, neither in the "over-development" of the institute.

What was more decisive was that neither the Institute of History nor the Hungarian Academy in Rome had a responsible head; namely, the latter was administered by such directors who, although they had been members of the Fraknói institute and visited the Vatican Archives before,²³⁹ had no expansive Roman and Italian research experience. The weight of the problems was felt by the supervisors as well. It is proved by the Regulations of 1932 September, which withdrew the professional powers of Gyula Miskolczy and gave it

²³⁶ The text of the plan of work published: CVH I/20, *Appendix*, III, n. 19.

²³⁷ UJVÁRY, *Tudományszervezés–Történetkutatás*, 61–62. It is conceivable indeed that the note was written by Gyula Miskolczy, one of the main begetters of the criticised circumstances. Cf. CVH I/20, *Appendix*, III, n. 15 and 18.

²³⁸ *A Római Magyar Intézet „Fraknói Vilmos” Történeti Osztályának új szervezeti szabályzata* [*The New Constitutional Regulation of the “Vilmos Fraknói” Department of History of the Hungarian Institute in Rome*], 383–385. In contrast to the title, always the term of Institute of History occurred.

²³⁹ See the list of the grant holders below. In 1928/29 Miskolczy would have had to conduct researches on the period of Gábor Bethlen for his grant of 10,000 liras in the Vatican Archives. MTAKK K 1591/38. (13 June 1928) – István Genthon lived in the Villa Fraknói in 1927/28. *A külföldi magyar intézetek működése... az 1927/28. tanévben* [*The Work of the Hungarian Foreign Institutes... in 1927/1928*], 6.

(back) to the curator of the institution, Tibor Gerevich.²⁴⁰ This included the powers to organize the research project of the Hungarian Academy in Rome and the supervision of the artists and art historians. However, it is questionable how well Gerevich, who had a profound knowledge of the place and had had a promising career, could direct the institute from Budapest. It gave credit to Miskolczy that he realised the gravity of the problem and his own incompetency in this field. However, he expected an effectual solution from the Committee²⁴¹ in vain, though he invited Áldásy to a personal consultation in Rome.²⁴² The competence of Jenő Koltay-Kastner – director from 1935 – concerning the research done in the Vatican is clearly presented by the fact that, when the editors of the *Rivista Storica Italiana* asked for an article about the scientific activity and the publications of the Hungarian Academy in Rome, he desperately turned to the secretary-general of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences for help, saying that “the Institute’s library lacked the related publications of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences”.²⁴³ The situation did not improve in the following two years, either. At that time, Koltay-Kastner turned with the question to the secretary-general of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, if “the members’ scope of duties in the Vilmos Fraknói Institute of History was part of an organic and continuous research programme in the Vatican Archives” and expressed his interest in “what guiding principles were to be followed in controlling them.”²⁴⁴

Another serious problem was that the Hungarian Institute of History on Rome did not have permanent members – internal or external (correspondents). The relations with the grant holders, no matter how much scientific achievement they had had, were broken after they returned home. Further-

²⁴⁰ See the annual report of Miskolczy, Rome, 14 January 1933. MNL-OL Az Országos Magyar Gyűjteményegyetem Tanácsa (K 726), 1933/335–49.

²⁴¹ CVH I/20, *Appendix*, III, n. 15 (second document) and 16, furthermore 18 (first document). On the consultation, apart from the emphasis of the necessity of the former researches’ examination and the connections with the Hungarian universities, he had further constructive ideas, like the Institute of History needed a member of archaeology, namely, “it is unfortunate that in such a big institute in Rome we cannot present a scientifically qualified archaeologist”. His letter to Áldásy, Rome, 16 May 1931. MTAKK K 1224/220.

²⁴² His letter to Áldásy, Rome, 16 May 1931. MTAKK K 1224/220.

²⁴³ His letter of 25 October, 1937, Rome and the answer of Géza Voinovich, secretary general, of 30 October: MTAKK RAL 1937/660. (From the publications sent by the MTA, Koltay desired to create at least an exchange connection with the other institutes in Rome.)

²⁴⁴ 3 October 1939, Rome. *Ibid.* 1939/576.

more, there was no Hungarian scientific institution to establish the conditions for an analysis of the material collected in Rome, for instance the access of the growing international secondary literature. Unfortunately, a theoretically well-founded system, which was based on a double maintenance mechanism – on state control with the administration of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences –, did not work in practice. Although the state control provided lastingness, the Hungarian Academy of Sciences legally preserved Fraknói's Roman heritage,²⁴⁵ the competent academic Committee was not suitable for the creation of overall and well-structured scientific results.

In retrospection of a few decades, the first members of this general staff drifting away from the theatre of war could recall their research in the Vatican as good old memories. The newcomers, if they happened to be in Rome, mainly did not visit the papal archives, or if they did so, left with poor results.²⁴⁶ In fact, the problem was not rooted in the attitude of the members, although, in their statements we sometimes face some indifference combined with powerful arrogance, or rarely some antipathy tracing back to their denominational status. The unfruitful, autotelic bureaucracy must be blamed for the problems, the one which under the name of professional fastidiousness hardly advanced the research but supported it in a perfunctory way.

It is striking that nobody from the members of the committee – who made the final decisions, though maintained useless theoretical opinions in reality and expressed practical objections²⁴⁷ – felt the necessity to organize the re-

²⁴⁵ At the beginning of the 1930s, in the course of planning of the further ministerial reorganizations, one by one the members of the Committee were of the opinion that they would not intervene in the state decision until it assured the maintenance of the Fraknói inheritance in any forms, whose fostering was the proper duty of the Committee. See the verbals of the 1930s, MTAKK K 1591. On the plans of move UJVÁRY, *Tudományszervezés-Történetkutatás*, I.c. (62–64.) (It might be worth dealing with that on 1 December 1933, there was such an item on the agenda that the Institute of History would return to the Villa Fraknói. From a part of the Falconieri-palace's price, a new residence would have been built for the actual *Collegium Hungaricum* on the plot of land given by Rome, near the *Villa Borghese* – where, at present there are the Dutch, Austrian, etc. institutes which accepted similar tenement-offer. The department of clerics was planned to be moved to the neighbourhood of the *Santo Stefano Rotondo*. On 15 April 1935, the move of the church department to the Villa Fraknói was on the agenda, in which case, the rent would have been paid by the bench of bishops to the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. K 1591/[50] and [52].)

²⁴⁶ The list of the members and lecturers of the Committee in the 1930–1940s: FRÁTERNÉ, *A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia állandó bizottságai*, 259.

²⁴⁷ The remarks, which often urged the director's reports, the execution of the non-existent plan of works, or the comments on the unsuitability of the library in the *Palazzo Falconieri* due to its darkness can be mentioned here. MTAKK K 1591/34. 36. 41 and [44]. (26 April 1926, 17 June 1927, 1 May 1930, 14 January 1931)

search from Rome, like Fraknói had done, and to gather a group of young scholars, of whom there was no lack.²⁴⁸ A perfect example for the actual attitude of the academics is represented by István Hoór Tempis. While Lajos Pásztor, who was almost the only one to work seriously and create a huge Roman oeuvre, was rudely condemned in a trivial case, a few years earlier, István Hoór Tempis could spend three untroubled years in Rome by a programme exploring the fiscal sources and the “Turkish policy” of the Holy See in the fifteenth century. Above all, in the meantime, on the desk of the Committee there was the manuscript, ready to be printed, of József Lukcsics including the complete Hungarian documents of the Apostolic Camera, not to mention Edgár Artner’s collection of records.²⁴⁹

We can hardly be surprised by the apparent indifference, that in 1943, while the young researches were to publish their results at their own expenses, there was an unspent sum of 15,000 pengő, almost 50,000 liras, in the safe of the Committee supervising the Institute of History. The money, as we know, was from the lease of the Villa Fraknói,²⁵⁰ which should have been earmarked according to the original function for “the publication of the Hungarian related historical sources found in the Roman archives and libraries, or the historical works which elaborated these data”.²⁵¹

* * *

The seemingly harsh criticism stands the test only in the light of the opportunities and their exploitation or underuse. However, if – by treating the official and private publications alike – one compares the accomplishment of the period between the two world wars and the previous two decades or the ap-

²⁴⁸ See primarily the sources for the illustration or verification of the above mentioned statements on Pál Lukcsics (CVH I/20, *Appendix*, III, n. 13. 20. 30), Tihamér Vanyó (*ibid.*, III, n. 23–28) and Lajos Pásztor (*ibid.*, III, n. 31–33).

²⁴⁹ CVH I/20, *Appendix*, III, n. 31–33. 14. 10. 19. See also CVH I/9–10 and CVH I/1.

²⁵⁰ Cf. FRÁTERNÉ, *A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia állandó bizottságai*, 258; MTAKK K 1591/(53–55); CVH I/20, *Appendix*, III, n. 30.

²⁵¹ Between the two world wars, despite the practical problems, the Ministry as well as the Hungarian Academy of Sciences took their stand on this principle and utilized the villa for the purposes of the Institute of History, despite the fact that the Hungarian state provided – henceforward – another building and budget for the Fraknói institute. See, for example, CVH I/20, *Appendix*, III, n. 11 and 12; MTAKK K 1224/200 and 230; K 1591/46; AÉ 51 (1940) 375; 53 (1942) 123 and 263; 54 (1943) 332.

proaching some fifty years, the balance is not so unfavourable. The Institute of History could keep its character of a scientific institute in its publications more than what the official political conditions provided for. Its name is recorded in historiography by two series as well.

Their origin is rarely detailed. On behalf of Kuno Klebelsberg, Zoltán Magyary urged a detailed plan and publications of the institute already on the Committee's meeting of 27 March 1926 to enable the arrangement as a satisfactory item in the following year's budget.²⁵² Two brief months later, Gerevich also asked the academicians to get contributions from the Ministry for institutional publications.²⁵³ Although the idea to revive the *Monumenta Vaticana* was seriously entertained – see the *Preface* of Edgár Artner's source publication –, it was replaced by the *Monumenta Hungariae Italica* or the *Hungarian Archives in Italy* (MHI).²⁵⁴ The term reflects the change of conception of Gerevich–Klebelsberg, and hardly devoid of other tasks of the Hungarian Academy in Rome subordinated to the interests of the foreign affairs of the 30s. The grounds for the research on Hungarian–Italian relations related to Venice, Milano, Florence, etc., were wider in scope than those of investigating relations of the Holy See and Hungary; their *raison d'être* was undeniable. However the tradition hallmarked by Fraknói, the special character of the documents in the Holy See, the direction of the other institutes in Rome and the practical considerations preventing the dispersing of the research powers would have required the launch of a special series of the Vatican, or the continuation of the *Monumenta Vaticana* for the Hungarian Institute of History in Rome collocated in the *Palazzo Falconieri*. In particular, the majority of the official as well as private publications could have been inserted in a *series* of the Vatican.

The “official” and “private” publications' differentiation is by all means reasonable. Although under the title of the series one can always see the subtitle “Published by the Hungarian Institute of History in Rome” (“*Edidit Collegium Historicorum Hungaricorum Romanum*”), instead of the real publisher, the name of the documents' editor occurs in half of the cases. While they omitted to indicate their works in the volume number of the legal publi-

²⁵² MTAKK K 1591/33.

²⁵³ On 14 May 1926. MTAKK K 1591/35.

²⁵⁴ The allusion on the volume of Veress: *Olaszországi Magyar Emlékek* [*Hungarian Memorabilia from Italy*]. – On the plan of the revival of the *Monumenta Vaticana* between the two world wars cf. also later. – For the the idea to revive the *Monumenta Vaticana* in the 1920s: CVH I/1, 3–6 (*Preface* of Edgár Artner).

cations, one cannot speak about “pirated editions”. In consideration of their works’ close incorporation into Hungarian historiography, who could deny that Tihamér Vanyó and Ferenc Galla, the two well-known church historians, represented the Hungarian Institute of History in Rome and regarded themselves as the true successors of Vilmos Fraknói?

Following the “official” channels, namely by the confirmation and support of the Committee and in the publication of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, there were three volumes published altogether throughout two decades:

MHI 1: *XV. századi pápák oklevelei. I: V. Márton pápa (1417–1431)* [*The popes’ charters of the fifteenth century. I: Pope Martin V (1417–1431)*], ed. by PÁL LUKCSICS, Budapest 1931²⁵⁵ – MHI 2: *XV. századi pápák oklevelei. II: IV. Jenő pápa (1431–1447). V. Miklós pápa (1447–1455)* [*The popes’ charters of the fifteenth century. II: Pope Eugene IV (1431–1447). Pope Martin V (1447–1455)*], ed. by PÁL LUKCSICS, Budapest 1938²⁵⁶ – MHI 3: *Olasz egyetemeken járt magyarországi tanulók anyakönyve és iratai 1224–1864* [*The matricula and documents of the Hungarian students visiting Italian universities 1224–1864*], ed. by ENDRE VERESS, Budapest 1941²⁵⁷

The “official” series would have been supplemented with Endre Veress’s work, *Argenti János jezsuita atya: Adalékok Erdély és Magyarország történetéhez 1603–1623* [*Pater Jesuit János Argenti: Contributions to the history of Transylvania and Hungary 1603–1623*].²⁵⁸ However, the already set up manuscript – perhaps due to the events of the war – was not copied. In 1946, a new cover page was drafted to it, which would have been published as the fifth volume of the MHI in Rome by marking – instead of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences – the *Collegium Hungaricum, Rome* as the real publisher. The preparation process, which included only some corrections after proofreading, came to an end in 1947 and indicated Endre Veress as the responsible publisher.²⁵⁹ Yet, in the end, the Argenti-documents were excluded even from the works published pri-

²⁵⁵ p. 320.

²⁵⁶ p. 400.

²⁵⁷ CLX + p. 704. The Hungarian Academy of Sciences supported not only the publication but the previous researches, as well (XLI–XLII).

²⁵⁸ MHI 4; Budapest 1944, XLVIII + p. 216.

²⁵⁹ See the later quoted cover-facsimiles (232–233), 239–240 and 216 published in the seventh volume of the *Adattár XVI–XVIII. századi szellemi mozgalmaink történetéhez* [*Data on the History of our Intellectual Movements in the 16th–18th century*] series.

vately, partially at private costs,²⁶⁰ with overlaps of volume numbers, or without volume numbers, as the following list shows:

MHI 2 [I]: TIHAMÉR VANYÓ, *Püspöki jelentések a Magyar Szent Korona országainak egyházmegyéiről 1600–1850* [Episcopal reports on the dioceses of the countries of the Holy Crown of Hungary 1600–1850], Pannonhalma 1933 (XXXII + p. 456)²⁶¹ – MHI s.n.:²⁶²
 FERENC GALLA, *A Pázmáneum alapítása és a Szentszék* [The foundation of the Pázmáneum and the Holy See], Vác 1935²⁶³ (p. 98)²⁶⁴ – MHI s.n.: *Harminckilenc kiadatlan Pázmány-levél* [Thirty-nine unpublished letters of Pázmány], ed. by FERENC GALLA, [Vác 1936]²⁶⁵ (116 + p. 98*)²⁶⁶

The series called *A Római Magyar Történeti Intézet Kiadványai* [The Publications of the Hungarian Institute of History in Rome] closely connected to the not very splendide series of source publication. Its duty was to publish the various elaborations – primarily the non-source publications – related to the work of the Institute. One cannot talk about independent publications, since the majority of them were publications as offprint of papers issued in different – historical, art, literary and church historical – Hungarian (*Századok*, *Corvina*, *Protestáns Szemle*, *Katolikus Szemle*) scholarly periodicals. Tibor Gerevich listed some sixteen papers of such kind until 1930 in his scientific outline.²⁶⁷

²⁶⁰ FRÁTERNÉ, *A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia állandó bizottságai*, 260–261; CVH I/20, *Appendix*, III, n. 23–28.

²⁶¹ See also later, especially CVH I/20, *Appendix*, III, n. 23–28.

²⁶² It should be noted that only the Hungarian name variant occurs on this and the following volume.

²⁶³ With ecclesiastical 'Imprimatur'.

²⁶⁴ With an abstract in German (91–98).

²⁶⁵ A private publication.

²⁶⁶ The latter page number indicates the separate source collection, which was constructed based on rather accidental aspects of choice. Its quality, however, is that it goes to the sources of the less covered places of occurrence of the previous researches. For instance, apart from the archives of the Propaganda, it draws from the Barberini Latini series of the Vatican library, the episcopal processes of the consistorial archives and the registers of the Secretariat of Briefs, etc. by pointing out the direction of the continuation of the planned researches and the publication of documents.

²⁶⁷ *A Római Magyar Történeti Intézet munkássága az 1920–1930. években*, [The Work of the Hungarian Institute of History in Rome in 1920–1930s], AÉ 41 (1931) 243–247, 243–244. The list of the authors of certain works – with complete entry – given by Gerevich is the following: István Miskolczy (1.); Henrik Horváth (2–4.), Albin Balogh (5.); Lajos Nagy (6–7.); Gyula Moravcsik (8.); Pál Lukcsics (9.); György Gombosi (10.); Sándor Mihalik (11–13); László Tóth (14–16). – The offprint of Edgár Artner's study in the Mohács Emlékkönyv was left out from the series of the institutional publications by Gerevich. The same happened to the paper of Jenő [Koltay-] Kastner, moreover also to the first study (IMRE VÁRADY, *A legújabb olasz irodalom* [Recent Italian Literature], Szombathely 1925), therefore, his compilation is considered to be only a reference. See also FRÁTERNÉ, *A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia állandó bizottságai*, 259–260; UJVÁRY, *Tudományszervezés–Történetkutatás*, 60; MTAKK K 1591/[45].

From the subject matter of the research work in the Vatican (or Hungarian church history), the following booklets can be mentioned:

EDGÁR ARTNER, *Magyarország és az Apostoli Szentszék viszonya a mobácsi vést megelőző években (1521–1526)* [*The relations of Hungary and the Apostolic See before the Mohács Disaster (1521–1526)*], Budapest 1926 (offprint from the Mohács Emlékkönyv, Budapest 1926);²⁶⁸ LADISLAUS TÓTH, *Zwei Berichte des Wiener Nuntius Garampi über die kirchlichen Verhältnisse um 1776*, Bolzano 1926 (Sonder-Abdruck aus der Römischen Quartalschrift 34 [1926]); PÁL LUKSICS, *Az esztergomi főkapitán a mobácsi vész idején (1500–1527)* [*The Cathedral Chapter of Esztergom under the Mohács Disaster (1500–1527)*], Esztergom 1927 (offprint from the Esztergom Évlapjai 3 [1927] 2., 69–97); LÁSZLÓ TÓTH, *A jubileumi búcsú kibirdetése Magyarországon 1776-ban* [*The announcement of the jubilee indulgence in Hungary in 1776*], Budapest 1928 (offprint from the Századok 62 [1928]);²⁶⁹ TIHAMÉR VANYÓ, *A trienti zsinat határozatainak végrehajtása Magyarországon* [*The execution of the decrees of Trent in Hungary*], Budapest 1933 (offprint from the Püspöki Jelentések).²⁷⁰

Nevertheless, this practical – however not unique – accomplishment accompanied by a small series²⁷¹ called *A Római Magyar Intézet Kiadványai* [*The Publications of the Hungarian Institute in Rome*] (*Pubblicazioni della R. Accademia Ungherese di Roma*), which had four volumes between 1931–1936, could not substitute for the lack of an almanac representing the results to international research. The urgent need of which is showed by the act of many who were able to publish the results of their research in the Vatican only in the almanac of the “Count Kuno Klebelsberg Hungarian Historical Research Institute” of the better organized Viennese *Collegium Hungaricum*.²⁷²

²⁶⁸ With ecclesiastical ‘Imprimatur’.

²⁶⁹ This serial title (*Veröffentlichungen des Ungarischen Historischen Institutes in Rom*) also occurs on the issue of the *A jubileumi búcsú...* [*Jubilee indulgence*] by showing that, unlike in the journal version, a lengthy German conclusion belongs to the study (47–56). On the studies written in Italian and related primarily to Italianism and art history naturally the *Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto Storico Ungherese di Roma* heading is indicated.

²⁷⁰ The serial title here is in Latin: *Publicationes Collegii Historicorum Romani*. It is obvious that despite the titles in different languages, there is only one series discussed.

²⁷¹ Sándor Mihalik's three art historical booklets – mainly *Corvina* offprint – and Rózsi Wolf's volume are involved: *Ismeretlen Michelangelo iratok* [*Unknown Documents of Michelangelo*], Roma–Budapest 1931 (p. 94). Cf. MTAKK K 1591/42. 45. 48; K 1224/224. The work of Mihalik *Il calice ungherese della cattedrale di Monza* (Budapest 1929) is reckoned among the publications of the Institute of History. – A complete list of the publications of the *Accademia d'Ungheria* until 1948 see <http://www.roma.balassintezet.hu/bu/kiadvanyaink/>.

²⁷² LÁSZLÓ TÓTH, *Verancsics Faustus csanádi püspök és emlékiratai V. Pál pápához: a magyar katolikus egyház állapotáról* [*Faustus Verancsics, Bishop of Csanád, and his Memoirs to Pope Paul V about the State of the Hungarian Catholic Church*], A gróf Klebelsberg Kuno Magyar Történetkutató Intézet Évkönyve (ed. by Dávid Angyal), Budapest 1933, 155–211; FERENC GALLA, *A csíksomlyói ferencrendi kolostor viszontagságai Bethlen Gábor idején* [*The Adversities of the Franciscan Monastery of Csíksomlyó under Gábor Bethlen*], A gr. Klebelsberg Kuno Magyar Történetkutató Intézet Évkönyve IV, ed. by Dávid Angyal, Bp. 1934, 283–302.

In 1937, after a rather long preparation,²⁷³ the *Annuario* launched as the almanac of the Hungarian Academy in Rome, not the Institute of History. Until 1942 it had only four volumes in the editorship of Jenő Koltay-Kastner, then István Genthon. (*Studi e Documenti Italo-Ungheresi della R. Accademia d'Ungheria. Annuario I–IV, Roma 1936–1941.*)²⁷⁴ In parallel, the series of the *Római Magyar Történeti Intézet Kiadványai* [*Publications of the Hungarian Institute of History in Rome*] could finally shift to the publication of the individual works, as it is proved by the book of Dénes Huszti, *Olasz–magyar kereskedelmi kapcsolatok a középkorban* [*Italian–Hungarian trade relations in the Middle Ages*]²⁷⁵.²⁷⁶ The booklets were replaced by the *Biblioteca dell'Accademia d'Ungheria di Roma*,²⁷⁷ which lived to see another series in 1947–1948 under the directorship of Tibor Kardos.²⁷⁸

It seems that by the second half of the 1930s, the age of consolidation arrived. Besides the cultural policy of Klebelsberg, a structure of publication was realised that represented a scientific profile, viz. the *Monumenta Italica* published by the Institute of History, the *Publications*, containing greater elaborations and the *Annuario* of the Hungarian Academy in Rome, which published studies in foreign languages. The verdict of the succeeding generation cannot

²⁷³ Cf. CVH I/20, *Appendix*, III, n. 15. (first document) and its notes, furthermore n. 18 (second document).

²⁷⁴ Conceitedly the names of the director-editors – as on every offprint mentioned later – were written in the serial title (*dirett. da Koltay/Genthon*). From scientific point of view, the fourth volume is regarded as the most valuable, primarily due to Genthon's bibliographical paper and Florio Bánfi's collection related to the Hungarian memorabilia in Italy.

²⁷⁵ Budapest 1941 (p.128). Cf. MTAKK K 1591/[54].

²⁷⁶ Jr. László Gerő's work of *A római Santo Stefano Rotondo, a magyarok nemzeti temploma* [*The Santo Stefano Rotondo in Rome, the National Church of the Hungarians*] (Budapest 1940; p. 120, with pictures and ample Italian summaries) cannot be directly reckoned here, since exceptionally it was not published by the Institute, but directly by the Committee. ("Published by the Roman Historical Committee of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences".) Cf. MTAKK RAL 1940/507.

²⁷⁷ Practically, the offprints of the studies published in the issues of the *Annuario* were summarized separately in a series, which had volume numbers, typography similar to the almanac and a beautifully drawn Hungarian coat of arms. However, we cannot talk about an independent series, neither in case of the *Kiadványok* [*Publications*]. I know all in all 29 numbered issues, the last one from 1942. (There is a list, which reaches number 27, at the end of volume 3 of the *Annuario*.)

²⁷⁸ The authors of the series of 24 numbered issues, which dominantly did not include post-publications: Alfredo Castello, Károly Kerényi (2), Pál Ruzicska, Tibor Kardos (2), Ilona Berkovits, Florio Bánfi (3), György Lukács, Máriusz Rabinovszky, Artúr Nagy, Rosina Tamássy [Rózsa Wolf] (2), Guido de Ruggiero, Giacomo de Benedetti, László Szabó, Sándor Lénárd, Antonio Altamura, József Révai, Lajos Vayer, Péter Hanák and Guiditta Torrò. – Presumably, a non-published *Annuario*'s offprints are under discussion.

be entirely favourable. After the launch of the almanac, unlike earlier, nobody felt the necessity to consider²⁷⁹ the scientific work of the grant holders in Rome, namely the members, as Gerevich had done before.²⁸⁰ Neither was it possible that the former members' enthusiasm filled the hiatus of the official structures. After the objection of the Committee, Tihamér Vanyó published his booklet, *A Bécsi nunciosok jelentései Magyarországról 1666–1683* [*The reports of the nuncios of Vienna on Hungary 1666–1683*], as a volume of the *Pannonhalmi Főiskola Könyvei* 3. [*Books of the College of Pannonhalma* 3.] in 1935.²⁸¹ From the second half of the 1930s, Ferenc Galla – whose earlier good connections with the Committee had already worsened – individually released many of his shorter-longer works published in various journals or volumes, in offprint by the approval of the church and in private publications.²⁸² There might have been only one exception – out of the printed ones –, his most significant monograph, the *Marnavics Tomkó János boszniai püspök Magyar vonatkozásai* [*Hungarian relations of János Marnavics Tomkó, bishop of Bosnia*].²⁸³ In the place of the title of the series on the work, of the author's own publication,²⁸⁴ the in-

²⁷⁹ There is a short annual report on the work only in the second (216–219) and third (248–251) volumes of the *Annuario*. The Fraknói-institute obtains only a few lines, and already at this time, the representative programmes, conferences are in the focus.

²⁸⁰ The following members are listed by Gerevich in “the bibliography of the important scientific publications of the institute's members published in other forms”: István Miskolczy (1–9.); Gyula Moravcsik (10–19.); Sándor Mihalik (20–21.); István Genthon (22–23.); Antal Somolyi (24.); György Gombosi (25–27.); Lajos Nagy (28–29.); Ernő Mihályi (30–31.); Henrik Horváth (32–34.); Albin Balogh (35–36.); Béla Iványi (37–40.); Pál Lukcsics (41–48.); László Tóth (49–54.); István Justh (55–56.); Jenő Kastner (56–58.); József Huszti (59–66.); András Péter (67.); Edgár Artner (68–69.). (As we saw earlier, certain works of Kastner and Artner were published by the Institute.) The authors of the own publications “under press or ready to be printed”: István Miskolczy (1); Pál Lukcsics (4); György Gombosi (2); Gyula Moravcsik (1); Edgár Artner (1) (The numbers here are pieces and not serial numbers.) Apart from all, the scholars living in the institute by ministerial permission were also registered: Emma Bartoniek (1.); Edith Hoffmann (2.); Ákos Szalay (3–4.). *A Római Magyar Történeti Intézet munkássága* [*The work of the Hungarian Institute of History in Rome*], 244–247.

²⁸¹ With ecclesiastical ‘*Nihil obstat*’.

²⁸² For instance: *Borromei Szent Károly hatása Magyarországon* (*L'influsso di San Carlo Borromeo in Ungheria*) [*The Effect of Saint Carlo Borromeo in Hungary*] (Offprint from the issues of 4/1938 and 1–2/1939 of the *Theologia*), Budapest 1939; *A pálosrend reformálása a 17. században* [*The Reformation of the Order of Saint Paul in the 17th century*] (Offprint from the *Regnum Egyháztörténeti Évkönyv* [Regnum Church Historical Almanac] 1940–1941, 123–223), Budapest 1941; *A magyar katolikus restauráció misszionáriusa* [*The Missionary of the Hungarian Catholic Restoration*] (Offprint from the issues of February–October 1946 of the “Egyházi Körirat” [“Ecclesiastical Circular”]), Budapest 1946.

²⁸³ Budapest 1940. (p. 262)

²⁸⁴ Published with the ‘permission of church authorities’.

dication of the “Published by the Hungarian Historical Research Institute in Rome and the Papal Hungarian Ecclesiastical Institute in Rome” can be seen, which is a unique curiosity in the historiography of Hungarian research in the Vatican.

The independent initiatives were ended by the already mentioned new constitutional regulation of the Institute in 1940, which stated the following, “all publications of the Hungarian Institute in Rome related to the Institute [*i.e. of History*] can gain publicity only after listening to, and accepting, the [*i.e. Hungarian Academy of Sciences*] Committee’s opinion”.²⁸⁵

The diagnosis of the more and more unfavourable opportunities of publication is contrasted by the fact that, to cite an example, the *Annuario* issued numerous pieces of writing by other people than the actual or former members. Moreover, the statement was only true from the second issue that “there is no such paper in the volume, which directly or indirectly would not be of Hungarian relation and which would not deal with the Italian–Hungarian relations’ cultural history, or with the Latin culture and role of the Magyars”.²⁸⁶ The appreciation of the contemporary criticism also opens up to the definite drawback of the consolidation. Namely, that despite the earlier notice and the program of the academicians researching in the Vatican, Fraknói’s proper heritage, the case of Hungarian research in the Vatican – apart from some grant holders, especially Lajos Pásztor’s zeal – had already been omitted from the official program. Yet, without it, the scientific activity of the Hungarian Academy in Rome became as ambiguous as it would have been with the eventual negligence of some aspects of the Italian–Hungarian relations and its tasks of cultural policy.

How did it happen? It will be the task of a future monographer to answer this question after having explored the material of the archives and the manuscript archives from every angle. Apart from the already discussed academic bureaucratic constitutional problems, which evolved sometimes due to personal interests, Rezső Vári’s ability to enforce his interests should be alluded to. His *Sylloge*-program must have hindered the issue of the his-

²⁸⁵ *A Római Magyar Intézet „Fraknói Vilmos” Történeti Osztályának új szervezeti szabályzata* [*The New Constitutional Regulation of the “Vilmos Fraknói” Department of History of the Hungarian Institute in Rome*], 384.

²⁸⁶ *Századok* 74 (1940) 84–87 (Tibor Kardos). Strangely, in his review about the first volume of the *Annuario* Kardos does not express such criticism. *Századok* 72 (1938) 348–352.

torical publications.²⁸⁷ Yet, if we search for conceptional reasons, the outstanding importance of the relations with Mussolini's Italy and the Hungarian Italianistica's rapid development should be mentioned, moreover, the attention of the bench of bishops was directed only to the Papal Hungarian Ecclesiastical Institute, and not any more the historical research in the Vatican, already. Nevertheless, it was certain that there cannot have been any obstacles to the establishment of a more efficient structure as regards the personal condition,²⁸⁸ which is proved by the achievements and list of the grant holders – except for some idlers and masters of the art of life – conducting research in the Vatican.

* * *

During the period between 1924 and 1944,²⁸⁹ out of the 270 grant holders in the Villa Fraknói and the Falconieri-palace there were only few who under-

²⁸⁷ The incriminated works: REZSŐ VÁRI, *Leonis imperatoris Tactica I–II*[I–2] (Sylloge Tacticorum Graecorum 3), Budapest 1917–1922 and n.d.; E. KORZENSZKY–R. VÁRI, *Onosandri Strategicus* (Sylloge Tacticorum Graecorum 2), Budapest 1935. – It is notable that Gerevich omits the already published volumes from the often quoted bibliography that lists the works of the Institute of History, moreover, Galla also found them inappropriate (CVH I/20, *Appendix*, III, n. 22). Nonetheless, the question is not as simple as it seems, since Vári's argumentation that his enterprise based on partially Italian codices and some from the Vatican library could only be accomplished with the contribution of the Institute of History in Rome and its result, "which is also an important part of our closing up to the West", is undoubtedly worth considering. (His report of 10 November 1919: MTAKK K 1224/135.) Apart from this, in the objectives of the Institute, which was established in 1913–1914, besides the research in the Vatican, classical philology as well as archaeology and art history is also mentioned. However, the solution is given by the proportions, since according to the distribution of 1914, four historians and one art historian should have launched their researches in the Vatican. They would have been accompanied by only an archaeologist and a classical philologist. (CVH I/20, *Appendix*, III, n. 6. Cf. also MTAKK RAL 1933/1373. 1934/1321. 1935/94; K 1591/41. 52. 54.)

²⁸⁸ A more effective structure could have been the following: The Hungarian Institute of History in Rome in the Falconieri-palace named after Vilmos Fraknói: **1.** it will systematically continue its eponym's work – also for the sake of tradition – with its inside and outside members, apparatus who have adequate experience in research; **2.** it will publish its related results in various own publications; **3.** it operates in a complete institutional independence under direct ministerial or – henceforward – Hungarian Academy of Sciences control; **4a.** simultaneously, as an independent co-institute it helps the scientific work of the Hungarian Academy in Rome and coordinates the examination of the Italian–Hungarian relations in every area of science; **4b.** and as such, actively takes part in the programmes, publications of the Hungarian Academy in Rome.

²⁸⁹ Although, the intermission which affected decades started in the 1950s, despite Lajos Pásztor's job as a secretary in Rome, after the Second World War the researches in the Vatican were not restarted. Therefore, this short period, which is history now, will be mentioned mainly at the end of the chapter on a level of an outline.

took research in the papal archives. Some of them were already mentioned at the outline of the publications' series. In a rough chronological order – many of them visited Rome more than once – the following names can be listed. Their field of studies are clearly illustrated by the contemporary reports, accounts, and their publications.

1. Edgár Artner (February 1924 – September 1925)

“Edgár Artner’s main topic was <the role of Hungary in the defence of Catholicism and the Western culture against the Eastern attacks>. We set the aim of elaborating this great problem not only because it had not been comprehensively concluded yet, or some parts required a detailed completion and elucidation, or because Rome is a proper site for exploring information, but because it is suitable for the higher level of national historiography, whose objective documentation would contribute to the national life’s active and guiding aspect. We could entrust Artner to undertake this task, since its elaboration requires historian who is particularly acquainted with church history. By realising new aspects, Artner relies upon many new data in his work. His archives contain some 200 unknown documents related mainly to the Turkish wars; out of which the most remarkable might be the letters of Louis II written to the pope before the Mohács Disaster, which dramatically report on the imminent destruction of the country. One of his new aspects was the documentary analysis of the foreign countries’ opinion about Hungary’s heroic role, and how the European common knowledge evolved that regarded Hungary as the bulwark of Christianity and how it was later forgotten and cried only by Hungarians in the hours of despair in the wilderness. He searched for and elaborated on the documents about the papal tithe collectors working in Hungary in the fourteenth century. These were chiefly notarial documents, in which the way of the money collected in the Hungarian churches from the tithe collectors through various trustees and merchants to the chamber of the Avignon popes can be traced back. He established with sharp criticism that these sums were embezzled in many cases, they were accounted for belatedly or falsely, the expenses were repeated or exaggerated on paper, which were reported and complained in the papal court. In addition, Artner pursued thorough studies and researches in the field of Christian archaeology, for which a great opportunity arised in Rome. He accurately realised the connection between certain fields of history and as a young historian, he honourably endeavoured to get acquainted with and study the related branches to mature a higher historical approach. In a longer treatise, with the usage of numerous original documents, he elaborated on one of the most debated questions of Christian archaeology, the question of the origin and representation of the nimbus. Into the study of the halo’s genesis he involved the examination of the ancient Greek and Roman tiara, whereby he was able to give a new and appropriate explanation to the origin of the Byzantine nimbus that differed from the Latin one. As regards the iconography of the nimbus, he could present new rules of depiction with a classification of symbols and history of art.

The outstanding value of this study is proved by the fact that the Pázmány Péter University Faculty of Theology accepted it as a thesis of habilitation...²⁹⁰ Edgár Artner also has got a pile of Hungarian charters from the Vatican to be printed, which is partly a collection of his own and partly the correction of the faulty or incomplete published documents of Theiner. His main task in Rome, however, was to write the role of the Holy See in the anti-Turkish warfare of Hungary based on sources of the Vatican. In the Mohácsi Emlékkönyv [*Memorial Volume of Mohács*] and in the publication of the Institute in Rome he issued a lengthy study on the period before the Mohács Disaster, while the rest remained in manuscripts. Apart from the historical researches, he learnt the Early Christian archaeology in Rome, a field which had never had a professor on the Faculty of Theology of the Pázmány-University; the need of which is vividly proved by the fact that on the basis of his longer study on the Early Christian nimbus written in Rome, after having returned from Rome, the Faculty habilitated him as the private tutor of Roman Christian archaeology. Artner left to Rome as a secondary school teacher of theology, and after spending two years with thorough researches in our Institute, he returned as an assistant and private tutor of the university and the superintendent of studies at the Central Seminary; besides, he gained such a command in Italian that he could teach Italian to the theologians in Budapest, whose benefit and importance was increased by the circumstance that after Trianon, only a few Hungarian seminarists can learn in the Roman Collegium Germanicum.”²⁹¹

2. József Fögel (1924)

“Fögel’s researches primarily aimed at an important chapter of the Hungarian renaissance and humanism: the history of Matthias Corvinus’s library. He extended his earlier collected material and took the newer Italian humanist-researches into account. His Corvina-discoveries were enriched by another Corvin-codex in Rome (in the library of the Vatican), which contains Frater Andreas Pannonius’s work of «De Virtutibus» in an original copy offered to Matthias. His work, which deals with the history of the Corvina, is ready in the form of a manuscript and constitutes a main part of the monumental publication launched by Fraknói and written

²⁹⁰ Gerevich’s evaluation published: PÁSZTOR, Gerevich Tibor *a Római Magyar Történeti Intézet működéséről*, 337–338. The same in summary: *A külföldi magyar intézetek megalapítása és 1924/25. tanévi működése* [*The Establishment and Work of the Hungarian Foreign Institutes in 1924/1925*], 20–21.

²⁹¹ PÁSZTOR, Gerevich Tibor *a Római Magyar Történeti Intézet működéséről*, 343. In summary: *A külföldi magyar intézetek működése és a magas műveltség célját szolgáló külföldi ösztöndíjak az 1925/26. tanévben* [*The Work of the Hungarian Foreign Institutes and the Foreign Scholarships Representing the Purpose of Higher Education in 1925/1926*], published by the Magyar Királyi Vallás- és Közoktatásügyi Minisztérium [Hungarian Royal Ministry of Religion and Education], Budapest 1927, 13. – Cf. also GEREVICH, *A Római Magyar Történeti Intézet munkássága*, 244–247. (Its short description above.) In addition, in his oral report given to the Committee on 23 June 1924, Gerevich mentioned that Artner also made Louis II’s contemporary foreign judgement the subject of his examination, furthermore in consideration of his striking interest in archaeology, he called the young priest’s attention to the *Santo Stefano Rotondo*, with which – and with the Hungarian house for pilgrims in Rome – he also started dealing. MTAKK K 1591/29.

by many. This latter introduces the library of Matthias in terms of history, literature, bibliography and history of art and of which forthcoming publication is insured. From a Hungarian view, he explored the two new manuscript-collections of the Vatican library, the Fondo Chigi and the Fondo Barberini; concerning the latter one, he was the first among the Hungarian researchers.²⁹² In the former one, he found more codices related to Pius II and two charters of Vladislaus I, moreover, he re-examined the codex from the fourteenth century that contained the Legend of Saint Margaret and had already been analysed by Fraknói.²⁹³ “In the Biblioteca Vallicelliana he studied the manuscripts on the Transylvanian and Polish role of the Báthoris. In the Biblioteca Casanatense he found an unknown codex of János Vitéz, which includes Aegidius Romanus’ work of the “De Anima”. In the Biblioteca Nazionale of Florence, he explored the biography of János Hunyadi and Matthias Corvinus in Italian from the sixteenth century.”²⁹⁴

3. József Huszti (1924 and 1925/26)

“He brought to light new data to the life and work of László Vetési, Hungarian humanist from the fifteenth century, as well as of Galeotto Marzio and Pandolfo Pisano – he found many Hungary related works of the latter, out of which the most important was the Italian translation of some parts of the Thuróczi Chronicle – from the manuscript archives of the Vatican. He found an unknown work of Andreas de Pannonia, a Hungarian humanist, Albert Hangács’s speech given on the congress of Mantua, Celio Calcagnini’s poems written in Eger, Tito Vespasiano Strozza’s speech addressed to King Matthias, Callimachus Siculus’s poem to Miklós Báthori, bishop of Vác and Federico de Montefeltre’s, the great renaissance Duke of Urbino, 7 letters to Matthias and 2 to the bishop of Eger. He revealed the Hungarian relations of Raffaello Zovenzoni, an unknown humanist of Trieste and Janus Pannonius’s fellow student, moreover he explored that Pál Ivanich, the Hungarian humanist worked as a Turkish interpreter in the court of Pope Nicholas V.”²⁹⁵

4. Jenő [Koltay-] Kastner (1924–1926)

“...he dealt with the collection of data on the history of the Hungarian emigration after 1849. Besides, he followed researches in literature, as a result of which he found six

²⁹² There are numerous notes above that prove this statement does not stand the test.

²⁹³ PÁSZTOR, *Gerevich Tibor a Római Magyar Történeti Intézet működéséről*, 338. In shorter: *A külföldi magyar intézetek megalapítása és 1924/25. tanévi működése*, 21; *A külföldi magyar intézetek működése... az 1925/26. tanévben*, 14. – Fraknói supported Fögel’s commission in his letter, he required only the continuation of the Corvina-researches, Áldásy, however, entrusted him with the examination of the Datini family’s archives in Prato. (K 1591/28.)

²⁹⁴ *A külföldi magyar intézetek megalapítása és 1924/25. tanévi működése*, 21. In more detail: PÁSZTOR, *Gerevich Tibor a Római Magyar Történeti Intézet működéséről*, 338. – Apart from Fögel, in his letter Fraknói supported his stay in Rome, as well. (K 1591/28.)

²⁹⁵ PÁSZTOR, *Gerevich Tibor a Római Magyar Történeti Intézet működéséről*, 347–348. On Huszti’s short stay in 1924 *ibid.*, 338–339. See also *A külföldi magyar intézetek megalapítása és 1924/25. tanévi működése*, 21; GEREVICH, *A Római Magyar Történeti Intézet munkássága*, 244–247.

sonnets of Verancsics in one of the codices of the Vatican library. He introduced the results of his Roman researches in the Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények, in the Egyetemes Filológiai Közlöny and in the Napkelet.”²⁹⁶

5. Pál Lukcsics (February 1924 – January 1926)

“On the occasion of thoroughly examining the Hungarian related chronicles in the Vatican, Pál Lukcsics explored and prepared for publication the incomplete Hungarian chronicle deposited by Lucius at the beginning of the seventeenth century, which was edited under Charles Robert, drafted under Sigismund and its text was close to the chronicles of Buda and Dubnic. He established the origin of the «Brevis narratio de regibus Hungariae» already published by Florianus and Toldy, he collected Pope Martin V's Hungarian *supplicatio*s, he searched for Ferenc Rákóczi II's letters addressed to the Holy See. In Bologna, he searched for King Matthias and Janus Pannonius's letters to the municipal council, he analysed the account books – including mainly data of economic history – of the chapter of Esztergom between 1501 and 1527 found among the Marsigli manuscripts of the university library of Bologna. In the library of Siena, he did some research on the basis of Antal Áldásy's basic work on Sigismund's visit of the town.”²⁹⁷

6. István Miskolczy (1925/26 and 1929/30)

“...in the archives of the Vatican and Naples, he searched for the documents on the Hungarian Anjous, he reconsidered the files copied by Lipót Óváry a generation before

²⁹⁶ *A külföldi magyar intézetek megalapítása és 1924/25. tanévi működése*, 21. In more detail: PÁSZTOR, Gerevich Tibor *a Római Magyar Történeti Intézet működéséről*, 339–340. (On its work in 1925/26 *ibid.*, 348; *A külföldi magyar intézetek működése... az 1925/26. tanévben*, 14.) Cf. also GEREVICH, *A Római Magyar Történeti Intézet munkássága*, 244–247; and the already noted annuals of the Hungarian Academy in Rome. During his scholarship he also administered the duties of the secretary of the institute. MTAKK K 1224/160. Out of the grant holders, he was the only one who – according to the resolution of the Committee – was not obliged to do research in the Vatican, since on 5 January 1924 he was entrusted with the analysis of the Italian-Hungarian literary relations. (K 1591/28.)

²⁹⁷ *A külföldi magyar intézetek megalapítása és 1924/25. tanévi működése*, 21–22. In more detail: PÁSZTOR, Gerevich Tibor *a Római Magyar Történeti Intézet működéséről*, 336–337, and Lukcsics's own report, published CVH I/20, *Appendix*, III, n. 7. According to Gerevich's report of 23 June 1924 Lukcsics's first tasks were the already published material's registering, the start to explore the *Instrumenta Miscellanea* and the examination of the connections between Hungary and the Holy See under the kings of the House of Árpád and Francis II Rákóczi. MTAKK K 1591/29. His report of 1926 repeats, details the former, besides it announces that “Pál Lukcsics has collected the Hungarian-related supplications of Martin V and Eugene IV's pontificate, whose material of two volumes with notes and introduction is being printed in the University Press” *Ibid.*, 342. See also *A külföldi magyar intézetek működése... az 1925/26. tanévben*, 13. In the summer of 1925, the director wanted to send him also to Lucca and Turin to “examine the Hungarian material, in the latter place especially the medieval French chronicle about our king Solomon, about which we do not know much except for one reference.” MTAKK K 1224/160. – Apart from his already noted publications: *A vatikáni Magyar Krónika kódexéről és szövegéről* [*About the Codex and Text of the Hungarian Chronicle in the Vatican*], MKSz 36 (1929) 141–146. See the rest GEREVICH, *A Római Magyar Történeti Intézet munkássága*, 244–247. (Its short description above.) His bequest: CVH I/20, *Appendix*, I, n. VIII. On his researches and publications also: CVH I/20, *Appendix*, III, n. 7. 8. 13. 20. 30.

and found numerous important documents, which enabled him to cast a new light on the reforms of the Anjous in Hungary, especially concerning the economy and their far-reaching plans in foreign policy. In the un-published papal regesta from the Anjou-era, he found precious data on the period of Louis the Great and the intrigue after prince Endre's assassination... Apart from his main topic, the Anjou family, he came across other Hungarian related sources. As an example, he found the unknown letters of Balach, an Italian humanist, which were addressed directly to the pope and many secular monarchs, like to Louis II before the Mohács Disaster. These letters encouraged the anti-Turkish crusade... Finally, in the Vatican Archives his sharp scientist eyes caught on new and valuable data about the Hungarian church history of the seventeenth century, mainly about the Hungarian supreme royal patronate and the annates."²⁹⁸

7. László Tóth (1925/26; 1926/27; 1927/28)

"With László Tóth, the Institute's historical researches spread over the Hungarian and European history, especially church history of the modern times... his task is to analyse and elaborate on the reports of the nunciature of Vienna and the related papal and secretary of state's orders from 1780 to 1875... The above mentioned reports are not only of interests of ecclesiastical policy, but also important sources in connection to the Habsburg countries' general political state. László Tóth accomplished this work by 1926/27,²⁹⁹ in the meantime he published certain sub-questions... In the summer months, he followed archival researches in Vienna, Budapest, Esztergom, Kalocsa, Pécs and Pannonhalma. He also worked in the manuscript archives of the Vatican, and as a result, he found unpublished historical church sources of another kind, like a manuscript on the Franciscans' debate of poverty and an unknown work of Ágoston Gazottus, bishop of Zagreb."³⁰⁰

²⁹⁸ PÁSZTOR, Gerevich Tibor a Római Magyar Történeti Intézet működéséről, 343–344. In summary: *A külföldi magyar intézetek működése... az 1925/26. tanévben*, 13; *A külföldi magyar intézetek működése... az 1929/30. tanévben*, Budapest 1931, 35. – See his related writings GEREVICH, *A Római Magyar Történeti Intézet munkássága*, 244–247. (Its short description above.) See furthermore CVH I/20, *Appendix*, III, n. 16.

²⁹⁹ Cf. *A külföldi magyar intézetek működése... az 1926/27. tanévben*, Budapest 1929, 6. This work was continued in the following academic year, as well, besides – as we saw – he administered the duties of the secretary of the Institute. *A külföldi magyar intézetek működése... az 1927/28. tanévben*, 6–7. – Tóth's commission was already discussed on 5 January 1924, on the session about the first grant holders, though, the academics could not give him any tasks yet, they postponed it, which caused the shift of the scholarship. (MTAKK K 1591/28.) On 14 May 1926 Gerevich suggested the prolongation of his stay (for the place of 5,000 lira) and allotted him the examination of Joseph II's church policy as well as the exploration – which had been started by Lukcsics – of the *Instrumenta Miscellanea* and the copy of the supplications of Eugene IV in whole texts. (K 1591/35.) The prolongation of 17 June 1927 and 13 June 1928 (with 8,000 lira at this time) was given to enable him to finish his research on Joseph II. (K 1591/36 and 38.)

³⁰⁰ PÁSZTOR, Gerevich Tibor a Római Magyar Történeti Intézet működéséről, 344–345. In summary: *A külföldi magyar intézetek működése... az 1925/26. tanévben*, 13.

8. Ferenc Tassy (1926/27 and 1927/28)

“...he was an immatriculated student of the university of Rome, he attended lectures on Italian language and literature and collected data in the Vatican Archives about the history of Buda’s siege of 1684.”³⁰¹

9. Ferenc Galla (1927/1928; 1930/31; 1931/32; 1932/33)³⁰²

1927/1928: “...a priest from the diocese of Vác [Doctor of Theology and Philosophy, certified secondary school teacher], who collected the Hungarian related reports of the Congregatio de Propaganda Fide, which were of great importance especially for the history of the Turkish occupation of Hungary. He conducted researches for his topic besides the archives of the Congregatio, in the Vatican Archives, the Congregation of the Briefs and the so-called Barberini-collection of the Vatican library.”³⁰³

1930/31: “...on behalf of the committee that wrote the history of the university of Budapest he looked through 63 indexes and the Jesuit manuscripts of the Vittorio Emmanuele-library. In the archives of the Propaganda-Congregatio he went through the protocollums from 1633 to 1707 and the correspondence registers from 1629 to 1640, by noting down the Hungarian material. He edited his work of «Cluny» and held a exclusive lecture, as well.”³⁰⁴ 1931/32: “...he continued his earlier researches about the missionary work under the Turkish occupation mainly in the archives of the Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fide, furthermore about the contemporary missions in Transylvania and the restoration in the royal territories, for which the Congregatio was partly responsible. Above all, he did some complementary researches in the Vatican library and archives to collect documents for the illustration and publication of Severoli’s, nuncio of Vienna, diary of Hungary (1809–1810). In the autumn of 1931, his work of «The effect of the Cluny reform in Hungary» published by the Saint Stephen Academy, was issued and later men-

³⁰¹ *A külföldi magyar intézetek működése... az 1926/27. tanévben*, 6. He continued the same academic work in the following academic year. *A külföldi magyar intézetek működése... az 1927/28. tanévben*, 7.

³⁰² The official documents of Galla’s commission: MTAKK K 1591/36; MNL-OL Az Országos Magyar Gyűjteményegyetem Tanácsa (K 726), 1927/675. 1931/500. 1932/658.

³⁰³ *A külföldi magyar intézetek működése... az 1927/28. tanévben*, 6. Originally, the later minister of education, Bálint Hóman member of the committee would have given the topic of “The role of Hungary in the tax system of the Holy See from King Emeric to Louis the Great” to Galla – who received his degree on humanities and teaching in 1926 after his theological studies in Italy –, which work would have been important for the sake of the medieval history of economics and the “history of church policy”. MTAKK K 1591/36 (17 June 1927).

³⁰⁴ *A külföldi magyar intézetek működése... az 1930/31. tanévben*, published by the Hungarian Scholarship Board, Budapest 1932, 7. – In his report of 16 May 1931, Miskolczy wrote the following in relation to Galla’s researches on the question of the territories under Turkish rule: “This year he examined the verals of the meetings of the cardinals from 1630 to 1700 and noted down all the Hungarian-related data. The most important part of the research is still to come: the exploration of the files about the discussed cases on the meeting, and their copy. He prepared his greater study in manuscript «A Pázmáneum alapítása és a Propaganda Congregatio» [The establishment of the Pázmáneum and the Propaganda Congregatio].” MTAKK K 1224/221.

tioned by many Hungarian and foreign journals. On 10 March, on the first inter-institutional meeting of the Hungarian academy of Rome, he read a study on the Hungarian missions of the seventeenth century based on his researches in the archives of the Propaganda. In the *Katbolikus Jövő* [Catholic Future] a longer paper of his on Saint Januarius's miracle was published, furthermore, he wrote shorter historical studies in the *Avvenire d'Italia* about Saint Elizabeth of Hungary and in the *Osservatore Romano* about Saint Adalbert and Saint Ladislaus. Finally, he prepared his study about the connections of the Pázmáneum in Vienna and the Propaganda Congregation, which was about 6–7 printed sheet-long with bibliography. In the summer he visited Italy's more important towns and their neighbourhood in the following itinerary: Rome – Assisi – Perugia – Siena – Bologna – Bolzano – Lake Garda – Milan – Pavia – Genoa – Pisa – Lucca – Rome – Naples – Pompeii – Castellammare di Stabia – Valley of the Sarno – Sorrento – Capri – Bari – Cumae – Palermo – Monreale – Naples – Rome.³⁰⁵ 1932/33: “Galla... entered the Hungarian Institute in Rome for the fourth time, after having had a study-tour in Fiume, Ancona, Loreto, Fabriano, Urbino, Foligno, Spoleto and Orvieto. In that year, he continued his already started researches in the archives of the Congregatio de Propaganda Fide, he made notes of the Hungarian related material from the late seventeenth century and the following three decades, moreover, in certain connected questions (like the Jesuits' annual reports on their missionary work) he reached the end of the eighteenth century. The collected documents serve abundant material for the composition of many independent works and numerous studies about the age of Turkish rule and the history of Catholic restoration. His work of «The Transylvanian Catholic status and the Holy See» was prepared in the form of a manuscript, besides, he wrote articles of less importance in the journals of the *Osservatore Romano*, the *Katbolikus Élet* and the *Katbolikus Jövő*. He visited Monte Cassino, Subiaco and Anagni. In the Vatican Archives, he mainly copied the processus informativus of the Hungarian bishops from the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth century.”³⁰⁶

10. István Hoór-Tempis (1928/29; 1929/30; 1930/31)

“...Doctor of Philosophy and certified chemical engineer, member of the Institute for the second time, he took special studies in diplomatics and palaeography, he attended the lectures of the Scuola paleografica della S. Sede, then he started the analysis of the papal account books of the fifteenth century to compile the unknown material about

³⁰⁵ *A külföldi magyar intézetek működése... az 1931/32. tanévben*, 9.

³⁰⁶ *A külföldi magyar intézetek működése... az 1932/33. tanévben*, 10. – His bibliography, which was not noted separately, can be found: ISTVÁN FAZEKAS, *Galla Ferenc „Pálos missziók Magyarországon” című kiadatlan munkája* [The Unpublished Work, “Pauline Missions in Hungary”, of Ferenc Galla], Pálos rendtörténeti tanulmányok [Studies of the history of the Pauline Order] (Varia Paulina 1, ed. by Gábor Sarbak), Csorna 1994, 219–228, 227–228. Latest, his manuscript published by József Borovi: *Otrokocsi Főris Ferenc gályarab Rómában* [Ferenc Otrókocsi Főris Galley-Slave in Rome], MEV–Regnum 10 (1998) 1–2, 185–202. His bequest: CVH I/20, *Appendix*, I, n. x. On his researches, also *ibid.*, III, n. 21. 22. 29.

the Turkish policy of the Holy See. In addition, he endeavoured to introduce the modern Hungarian composers in Rome.”³⁰⁷

11. Károly Buday (1929/1930)

“... secondary school teacher, historian, he won a scholarship to Roman researches for the first time in this year. His plans are threefold: *a*) to elaborate on the Hungarian culture in the fourteenth century; *b*) the examination of Pope Callixtus III's regesta and volumes for Hungarian related information; *c*) the analysis of the Italian chronicles from the fourteenth century. He undertook his researches with great enthusiasm in the Vatican Archives and library. He had a study-tour in Naples, Pompeii, Florence, Padua, Venice and Rome.”³⁰⁸

12. József Kinczli (1929/30)

“... Doctor of Theology, he studied the auxiliary sciences of history in theory and in practice. He enrolled on the two-year long course of the «Scuola di Archivio». Here, he attended the lectures of the Gregoriana-university, Katterbach (palaeography) and Capello S.J. At the end of the year, he began to explore the unprocessed written records from the territories under Turkish rule in the archives of the S. Congregatio de Propaganda Fide.”³⁰⁹

13. Antal Meszlényi (1929/30)

“... a priest of the archdiocese of Esztergom, private university tutor, he elaborated the Hungarian related reports of the nuncios from the first half of the nineteenth century. He did researches in this topic in the Vatican Archives and library focusing on 1790–1844. This material shed light on contemporary Hungary's religious and cultural problems. Besides, also in the Archivio della S. Congregazione del Concilio, he studied the diocesan reports of Péter Pázmány, György Lippay and György Szelepcsényi, archbishops of Esztergom.”³¹⁰

³⁰⁷ *A külföldi magyar intézetek működése... az 1929/30. tanévben*, 6–7. He continued these investigations in his third granted year, though, in the second term he left the Institution (*ibid.*). His above mentioned program, primarily on Paul II and Pius II's account books, was accepted by the academics already on 17 June 1927. Elemér Rácz, who was to be sent to Rome to do the comparative analysis of the papal and Hungarian diplomatics, might not have travelled there. MTA KK K 1591/36.

³⁰⁸ *A külföldi magyar intézetek működése... az 1929/30. tanévben*, 31–32. In more detail CVH I/20, *Appendix*, III, n. 16.

³⁰⁹ *A külföldi magyar intézetek működése... az 1929/30. tanévben*, 33. The originally diocesan priest of Szatmár by being incardinated in Vác *per adoptionem* Hungarianized his name to Félegyházy. József Török's courteous oral message.

³¹⁰ *A külföldi magyar intézetek működése... az 1929/30. tanévben*, 35. However, Meszlényi was not the grant holder of the Institute of History but the Hungarian Academy in Rome, he sent reports to the Committee. Cf. CVH I/20, *Appendix*, III, n. 16. His study based on the material of the Congregation of the Council: Szelepcsényi prímás és Északmagyarország rekatolizálása [*Primate Szelepcsényi and the Recatholicization of Northern Hungary*], *Theologia* 2 (1935) 215–225 and 325–337. His monograph based on the correspondence of the nuncios: *A jozefinizmus kora Magyarországon (1780–1846)* [*The Age of Josephinism in Hungary*

14. Gyula Ribiczey (1929/30 and 1930/31)

“...Doctor of Political Science, police officer, the member of the Institute for the first time, in the Vatican Archives, he strenuously searched for material of two topics: the codifying efforts of Péter Illicini Mengin, Hungarian jurist (sixteenth century) and the history of the Hungarian advowson. He took a copy of the first constitutional volume of the explored Illicini-codex and found an interesting correspondence as well as many old privileges relating to the advowson”³¹¹ “...in his second year as a grant holder, he continued his work in the Vatican collections, and finished his search for material relating to the Hungarian royal advowson. He elaborated his exciting material until the age of Béla III in a study of approximately twelve sheets, and compiled a huge diplomatarium from the unpublished charters of the same topic. Furthermore, he wrote a shorter study, «The effort of the papal confirmation of certain rules of the Tripartitum and the decretum III from 1498». On his study-tour to Florence and Venice, he visited these cities’ libraries.”³¹²

15. Tihamér Vanyó (1930/31 and 1934/35 I)

1930/31: “...a teacher at the Benedictine high school of Pannonhalma, he collected the reports of the nuncios of Vienna and the notes and answers of the Papal Secretariat of State from 1666–83, by amplifying Fraknói’s related work. (From the Vatican Archives.) From the archives of the Congregatio Concilii, he copied and abstracted the “ad limina” relations of all the Hungarian bishoprics as well as the answers of the Congregatio from 1600–1850. The latter is so long that even in abstract form it would be a 4–500 page-long publication. This collection is the concise summary of the Hungarian dioceses’ life of 250 years. Moreover, he explored a material about the financial situation of the Hungarian Catholic church, about the relations of the Catholics and other confessions, about the connections of the atmosphere of the age and the church life, about the Council of Trent’s adoption in Hungary and about the contact of the Holy See and the Hungarian bishops. A part of this material was published in the Pannon-

(1780–1846)], Budapest 1934. In his preface, he mentions that he originally desired to publish the material – which was copied by him – of the nunciature of Vienna from the late eighteenth, early nineteenth century; however, he gave it up due to financial difficulties. The support of his work’s publication was declined by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences’ Historical Committee on the authority of Ferenc Eckhart and István Hajnal’s opinion, the Hungarian Academy of Sciences’ Committee of Rome, however, considering that “professor Meszlényi, as a grant holder in Rome, industriously elaborated the documents of the Vatican Archives in his work” voted for him to obtain 1,000 pengő from the income of the Villa Fraknói, with the reservation that the name of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences was not allowed to be indicated on the publication (!). MTA KK 1592/51 and RAL 1935/94.) – Out of Meszlényi’s publications, it should be mentioned by all means: *Az egri érsekség felállításának, s a kassai és szatmári püspökség kibasításának története [The History of the Establishment of the Archbishoprics of Eger and the Carving out of the Bishoprics of Kassa and Szatmár]*, Budapest 1938.

³¹¹ *A külföldi magyar intézetek működése... az 1929/30. tanévben*, 36.

³¹² *A külföldi magyar intézetek működése... az 1930/31. tanévben*, 34–35. In both occasions he was a member of the Hungarian Academy in Rome.

halmi Szemle's volume of 1931 with the title of «The bishopric of Győr in 1629».³¹³ 1934/35 I: "...[philologist, from the university of Budapest's Faculty of Humanities (professor Szekfű), Benedictine professor] grant holder in the first term. In the Vatican Archives, he noted down the Hungarian bishops' processus informativus from 1759–1802 for the sake of publication, furthermore, he examined the Hungarian related documents of the series Acta Congregationum Consistorialium and the Acta Camerarii from the same period. As a supplement, he utilized the material of the Acta Miscellanea Consistorialia and the Consistoria series in relation to the late eighteenth and the early nineteenth century. In addition, he wrote out the Hungarian related *processus-propositio*s (sixteenth–seventeenth century) from the Archivio Sant'Angelo Arm. I–XVIII. and the Miscellanea Arm. XIII. tom. 144. 145. 146. 214. 216. 218. From the collected material he prepared a publication of sources with the employment of printed documents and secondary literature about the Hungarian bishops and dioceses in the Enlightenment. He worked in the Vatican library and in the libraries of the Austrian, Romanian, Polish and Czech institutes of history. He dealt with the theses of Fascism a lot... His work of «The reports of the nuncios of Vienna about Hungary in 1666–1683» was published during the time of his granted years."³¹⁴

16. Gyula Géfin (1931/32)

"...a teacher of theology in Szombathely, with his half-year long scholarship, from February to June, he studied the sources and secondary literature related to the diocese of Szombathely in its first decades (1777–1825). He dealt especially with the life and activity of Count Ferenc Herzan, the last cardinal-legate of the Holy Roman Empire. In the Vatican Archives, he looked through the official archives of the nuncios of Vienna and the papal secretaries of state (Nunz. in Vienna and Nunz. in Germania), furthermore the reports of Cardinal Herzan handed in the papal Secretariat of State and the answers of the secretary of state (Nunz. in Germ. 691. 691A 692. 693.). He copied Szily and Herzan's processus informativus, Herzan's processus of Rota, Szily's report of 1781 on the state of his diocese, which was missing in Szombathely. He checked Fondo Grampi's related documents, many volumes of Vescovi and Cardinali and the volumes of the Epistolae ad Principes from 1779–1804. As Herzan had made many aristocratic friends while he was in Rome, Géfin tried to examine the cardinal's correspondence with these families. Therefore, he did research in the archives of the Odescalchis and the Archivio Capitolino, which kept Herzan's closest friend, Count Bracciano's archive; moreover, the archivists of the Orsinis and Pallavicini-Rospigliosis' archives made a promise to examine thoroughly their collection and give the results to him. For the same reason did he write letters to the Cistercian abbess of Marienthal (Silesia) to

³¹³ *A külföldi magyar intézetek működése... az 1930/31. tanévben*, 37. First, Vanyó was the grant holder of the Hungarian Academy in Rome and not the Institute of History.

³¹⁴ *A külföldi magyar intézetek működése... az 1934/35. tanévben*, Budapest 1937, 8–9. – The bibliography which was not noted separately: ANTAL MOLNÁR, *Egy magyar egyháztörténész a 20. században: Vanyó Tibamér OSB [A Hungarian Church Historian in the 20th Century: Tibamér Vanyó OSB]*, MEV 6 (1994) 1–2, 37–50, 43–50.

get the copy of the cardinal's correspondence with his sister, the late abbess. He examined the whole archive of the chapter Santa Maria in via Lata, in which he found interesting data on Emiliani, the secretary of Herzan. By his request, the general archives of the Piarists and Jesuits were explored, the former was searched for the relics of Saint Stanislaus to return them to Szombathely and the latter in relation to Ferenc Faludi. His latter researches revealed interesting data. He also analysed the indexes of the archives of the Secretaria Brevium concerning the age of Pius VI and VII. Apart from the libraries of the Hungarian Academy in Rome and the Vatican, he used the Biblioteca Vittorio Emmanuele and also the Austrian and Prussian libraries of the institute of history. He desires to use his collected material in the biography of János Szily and Cardinal Ferenc Herzan. During his stay in Rome, two articles were published by him in the *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények*. (1932/I: «Bitnicz és Bacsányi levelezése címen, a II. füzetben egy Faludi Ferencre vonatkozó közlemény» [The correspondence of Bitnicz and Bacsányi, A poem related to Ferenc Faludi in the booklet II]). He wrote articles in the *Vasvármegye* newspaper, with the titles: «Szombathelyi püspök a Vatikán egyik freskóján» [A bishop of Szombathely on one of the frescoes of the Vatican], and «Szent Quirin emlékezete Rómában» [The memory of Saint Quirinus in Rome]. He was on a study-tour in Naples, Pompei and Ostia Antica.³¹⁵

17. Ernő Gerendás (1934/35)

“...Doctor of Philosophy, teacher trainee, from the Faculty of Humanities of the university of Budapest (at Prof. Domanovszky). He started his research in the Vatican Archives on Count Ferenc Barkóczy, archbishop of Eger, then Esztergom, then he noted down the processus informativus of the Hungarian bishops of 1705–1759 – in addition to them, the bishops and suffragan bishops of Belgrade and Tinin – with the supplement of the nuncios of Vienna's reports. At the university of Rome, he attended the lectures of Professor Ghisalberti on the history of Risorgimento and Professor V. Rossi and F. Ermini's lectures on the history of literature. He profoundly studied the historic buildings of Rome and had a study-tour in Albano, Frascati, Castel Gandolfo, Ostia, Naples and Pompeii. Throughout the academic year, he also administered the duties of the institutional librarian.”³¹⁶

18. Lajos Pásztor (1936/37 and 1937/38)³¹⁷

1936/37: “...the former member of the College of József B. Eötvös (at Professor Gyula Szekfű). For his doctoral thesis he collected material in many archives under the topic

³¹⁵ *A külföldi magyar intézetek működése... az 1931/32. tanévben*, 32. Géfin was not a member of the Institute, either, but the Hungarian Academy in Rome, with an Italian state scholarship. – He has inscribed his name upon the pages of historiography with his monograph: *A szombathelyi egyházmegye története I–II* [The History of the Diocese of Szombathely I–II], Szombathely 1929.

³¹⁶ *A külföldi magyar intézetek működése... az 1934/35. tanévben*, 26. He was a member of the Hungarian Academy in Rome.

³¹⁷ Cf. MTAKK RAL 1936/376 and 1937/432, furthermore on his researches CVH I/20, *Appendix*, III, n. 31–33.

of «A vallásos élet Magyarországon a Jagellók korában» [The religious life in Hungary under the Jagellos]. In the state archives of Rome, he found many, unknown, Hungarian-related charters in connection to the archives of the Holy Spirit-hospital; in the archives of Bologna, he copied the tithe-register of the cathedral chapter of Esztergom from 1500–1527.³¹⁸ The core of his work in the archives was his work in the Vatican, where he copied the Hungarian-related parts of the supplications from the Jagello-era. He has already examined 150 volumes out of the 1009 volumes from the years of 1490–1498 in the Jagello-era. Besides his archival work, he visited the libraries of the Vatican, national, university, Casanatense, the Austrian and German institutes of history, where apart from examining the secondary literature of the old religiosity, he dealt with the problems of the religious life in the late Middle Ages, in the renaissance. At the university... he attended the seminary of János Engel, professor of the university of Vienna, on which he delivered a lecture with the title of «La mediazione europea nella questione italiana alla vigilia della Guerra del 1859». On behalf of the Hungarian Academy of Science, he accomplished the proofreading of one of Pál Lukcsics's charter editions.³¹⁹ Besides his scientific work, he tried to join the Italian life to get to know the new Italy's mental state... During his journeys, he visited Naples, Bologna, Florence and Perugia. In the Academy, he held a speech – entitled «Nemzeti újjászületésünk» [Our national revival]. – to the Hungarians in Rome on the celebration of 15 March.³²⁰ 1937/38: "...he continued his archival research in the Vatican Archives that he started the year before. He examined the volumes of the Reg. Suppl., the Reg. Lat. and the Reg. Vat. until 1513, and he collected the Hungarian-related material. He worked in the Biblioteca Vaticana, Casanatense, Gregoriana, Herziana, Alessandrina and the libraries of the German and French institutes. Through this study, he examined the literature related to primarily the connection of folk religious life, the renaissance and religion. He dealt with the development of the Italian historical studies and its present state. As a result of his activities, his doctoral thesis is near completion... During this year his work of «Temesvári Pelbárt és Laskai Osvát az egyházi és világi pályáról» [Pelbárt Temesvári and Osvát Laskai about the ecclesiastical and secular vocation] was published in the «Regnum» almanac of church history.³²¹

19. József Balogh (1940/41 and 1941/42)

"...a priest of the diocese of Veszprém (alumn of Professor Szekfű)... As an ordinary student of the Scuola di Paleografia e Diplomatica he completed the first year of the course... He attended the lectures and seminars of the Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana's faculty of church history... He undertook researches on sources of church history in the Vatican Secret Archives. He gave a lecture on «VII. Gergely és Magyar-

³¹⁸ Cf. see the above mentioned at Lukcsics.

³¹⁹ Cf. CVH I/20, *Appendix*, III, n. 31–33.

³²⁰ *A külföldi magyar intézetek működése... az 1936/37. tanévben*, Budapest 1938, 10.

³²¹ *A külföldi magyar intézetek működése... az 1937/38. tanévben*, Budapest 1939, 9. – We have already come across his name and some of his main publications. His role in the Hungarian research in Rome will be later detailed.

ország» [Gregory VII and Hungary] in the Ecclesiastical Institute.³²² “...[besides his studies] in the papal secret archives and the archive of the Propaganda Fide he conducted church historical researches. He primarily dealt with the Moldovan Hungarians’ ecclesiastical life in the seventeenth century. On the conferences for the priests of Rome, he held lectures on the pastoral care of the Moldovan Hungarians in the late eighteenth century.”³²³

The list is obviously not complete. On the one hand, out of the members of the Institute of History and the Hungarian Academy in Rome there were many to visit the Vatican collections, however, considerable work creating secondary literature based on basic research, or any accounts of research, were given only by these nineteen grant holders.³²⁴ On the other hand, the historical research was in focus of this selection of the Hungarian “borsisti”, although it appears that the exploration of the Hungarian-related material of the archives is itself interdisciplinary.³²⁵ Furthermore, the scholars spending little time in Rome were not mentioned.³²⁶ For instance, Gyula Szekfű spent a few

³²² *A külföldi magyar intézetek működése... az 1940/41. tanévben*, Budapest 1942, 8. Although, he was a member of the Institute of History, considering his priesthood, he stayed in the Church Institute in both years. BEKE, *Das päpstliche Ungarische Kirchliche Institut*, 195–202 he lists all the priest-historians (Galla, Miskolczy, Vanyó, Meszlényi, Géfin) among the members of the Papal Hungarian Institute. Yet, the ministerial publications clearly separate the grant holders of this institute and the above mentioned scholars who were mentioned among the members of the Institute of History, partly of the Hungarian Academy in Rome. Cf. also CVH I/1, CXCI–CC and 322–328.

³²³ *A külföldi magyar intézetek működése... az 1941/42. tanévben*, published by the Hungarian Scholarship Board, Budapest 1943, 6–7. Perhaps his sole related work: *Existenz und Rechtslage der Katholischen Kirche in Ungarn zur Zeit der Türkenherrschaft*, Rom 1939.

³²⁴ The enforcement of the double aspects explains why Lajos Tomcsányi (*A főkegyúr szerepe a püspökök kinevezésénél* [The Role of the Patron in the Appointment of the Bishops], Budapest 1922) and others were failed to be mentioned. In the same manner, I neglected – like in the previous periods of the history of research – the serious consideration of the writings regarded as scientific journalism or educational studies. Solely some examples: GYÖRGY BALANYI, *A szentszék és a magyarság szerepe Budavár visszafoglalásában* [The Role of the Holy See and the Hungarians in the Reoccupation of Buda], KSz 51 (1937) 541–548; JÓZSEF ERŐSS, *AVatikán. Hogyan kormányozza a pápa az egyházat? A pápai udvar élete* [The Vatican. How Does the Pope Rule the Church? The Life of the Papal Court], Vác 1939.

³²⁵ A further example for this is Andor Péter, who dealt with the Hungarian-related frescos of the Vatican Archives and library in 1925/26 (PÁSZTOR, *Gerevich Tibor a Római Magyar Történeti Intézet működéséről*, 347; *A külföldi magyar intézetek működése... az 1925/26. tanévben*, 14), Ottó Gombosi, who led collection on the history of liturgy in the second term of the academic year of 1934/35 (*A külföldi magyar intézetek működése... az 1934/35. tanévben*, 8), furthermore the hard-working church musician priest, Géza Koudela, who not only collected material on the age of King Matthias, on the relations of András Báthory and Palestrina, and on the introduction of the Roman rite in Hungary, but also wrote studies (*A külföldi magyar intézetek működése... az 1929/30. tanévben*, 34).

³²⁶ Apart from this, it is not mentioned that many times for shorter periods of time many of the listed people returned to the Eternal City to complete their work.

weeks in the Institute in the academic year of 1925/26, yet, it was enough for him to find the unexploited parts of the papal examination's verbal conducted after the assassination of György Fráter.³²⁷

A further chapter is formed by the activity of the priests working in the Vatican collections as the grant holders of the Papal Hungarian Institute, as well as the historians living in the Institute of History as guests or closely contacting it:

1. Antal Jakab

The future prelate of Transylvania pursued studies in canon law in 1940/41 and 1941/42. His booklet based on the documents of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith is an outstanding work of a historian.³²⁸

2. József Taksonyi and Erasmus Kováts

Taksonyi "did some research and collection of material in the Vatican Archives about the Hungarian-related reports of the nunciature of Vienna in the eighteenth century, whereas in the Vatican library he examined the Polish-Hungarian relations of the sixteenth century." Kováts "pursued his studies in the Vatican library in relation to his doctoral dissertation on «The Council of Vatican and Hungary». In the Vatican Archives he collected data on Ágost Keresztély's, duke of Saxony and archbishop of Esztergom, diplomatic and public activity to create his portrait, in connection to which he elaborated on the data found related to the Rákóczi's insurrection... he gave a lecture himself to the Papal Hungarian Ecclesiastical Institute with the title of «Ágost Keresztély, the portrait of the first prince-primate».³²⁹

³²⁷ "Gyula Szeffű practically inspired the members of the institute; he was searching for the files on Cardinal György Fráter's work and the inquiry conducted after his assassination for weeks, and he was pleased to send his esteemed results his letter addressed to the directorate of the Institute." MTAKK K 1224/174 (I could not find the letter); PÁSZTOR, *Gerevich Tibor a Római Magyar Történeti Intézet működéséről*, 348–349; *A külföldi magyar intézetek működése... az 1925/26. tanévben*, 15. – Szeffű utilized his result in a synthesis: "Other unpublished verbals, like Captain Schernstein's, Vatican Archives, Miscellanea Arm. II vol. 61." – says his note. BÁLINT HÓMAN –GYULA SZEKFŰ, *Magyar történet. III [Hungarian History. III]* (written by GYULA SZEKFŰ), Budapest 1939⁶, 579. Later the German secondary literature also called the attention to this source: HELMUT GOETZ, *Die Finalrelation des venezianischen Gesandten Michele Suriano von 1555*, Quellen und Forschungen aus Italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken 41 (1961), 235–322, 303 [see also Misc., Arm. II, vol. 55]. (Gábor Barta used the verbals about the testimonies of other witnesses from the Castle of Saint Angelo in his later noted work.)

³²⁸ BEKE, *Das päpstliche Ungarische Kirchliche Institut*, 201–202; and *A külföldi magyar intézetek működése... az 1940/41. tanévben*, 23; *A külföldi magyar intézetek működése... az 1941/42. tanévben*, 27; ANTAL JAKAB, *Az erdélyi római katolikus püspöki szék betöltésének vitája a XVII. században [The Dispute over the Filling of the Roman Catholic Episcopal See of Transylvania in the 17th Century]* (Erdélyi Tudományos füzetek 172), Kolozsvár 1944.

³²⁹ *A külföldi magyar intézetek működése... az 1941/42. tanévben*, 26–27.

3. Emma Bartoniek

She stayed in Rome in the academic year 1926/27.³³⁰

4. Béla Iványi

“Béla Iványi dr., full ordinary professor of the University of Szeged, worked in the Institute of History in Rome as a guest scholar and in the archives of Rome, he collected medieval material for the archives of Budapest and about the history of the Dominicans in Hungary.”³³¹

5. Mór Kárpáthy-Kravjánszky³³²

Taksonyi “did some research and collection of material in the Vatican Archives about the Hungarian-related

6. Florio Bánfi³³³

³³⁰ Cf. GEREVICH, *A Római Magyar Történeti Intézet munkássága*, 244–247. (Its short description above); and MTAKK Ms. 493/39 (the letter of the Vatican library’s prefect, 10 December 1926).

³³¹ *A külföldi magyar intézetek működése... az 1926/27. tanévben*, 6. However, the Committee on the meeting of 14 May 1926 accepted his request (CVH I/20, *Appendix*, III, n. 9) and appointed him to the Italian state position of 3,000 líras. MTAKK K 1591/35. – Béla Iványi collected the complete Hungarian material of the central archives of the Dominican order. *A Szent Domonkos-rend római központi levéltára (Részletek a magyar dominikánus provincia múltjából)* [The Roman Central Archives of the Saint Dominican Order (Selections from the History of the Hungarian Dominican Province)] LK 7 (1929) 1–30. His copies of the registers were partly elaborated: ANDRÁS HARSÁNYI, *A domonkos rend Magyarországon a reformáció előtt* [The Dominican Order in Hungary before the Reformation], Debrecen 1938. Cf. yet CVH I/20, *Appendix*, I, n. 1x. See also by him Bátor Sennyey László S.J. *nagyszombati rector római utazásai (1687., 1693., 1696.)* [The Roman Travels of Baron László Sennyey S.J. Rector of Nagyszombat] (A Szent István Akadémia Történelmi-, Jog- és Társadalomtudományi Osztályának Felolvasásai 2/1), Budapest 1929; *A vatikáni levéltári főiskola* [The Archival College of the Vatican], LK 5 (1927) 264–271; and *Agróf Széchenyi család leszármazása* [The Descent of the Count Széchenyi Family], Turul 41 (1927) 76–83; furthermore, GEREVICH, *A Római Magyar Történeti Intézet munkássága*, 244–247.

³³² See for example: MÓR KÁRPÁTHY-KRAVJÁNSZKY, *Forgách Ferenc bíbornok-érsek történetéhez* [To the History of Ferenc Forgách cardinal-archbishop], *Regnum* 3 (1938/39) 169–176. (He clears up the question of Forgách’s birth and Catholicization on the basis of the Vatican Archives.) Besides, he also dealt with the verbals of the canonical examinations. Cf. *Századok* 70 (1936) 445–450 and 81 (1947) 316–317. The emphasis of his Italian researches fell on Venice, concerning Hungarian history, the archives of which he found – with some exaggeration but not groundlessly – more important than that of the Romans, therefore he conveyed the suggestion that a “Hungarian institute or seminary of history in Venice” should be established. MÓR KRAVJÁNSZKY, *A velencei állami levéltár* [The State Archives of Venice], LK 4 (1926) 1–19.

³³³ FLORIO BÁNFI, *Gianfrancesco Aldobrandini magyarországi hadivállalatai* [The Military Ventures of Gianfrancesco Aldobrandini in Hungary], *Hadtörténelmi Közlemények* (HK) 40 (1939) 1–33 and 213–228; 41 (1940) 143–156. – Bánfi, however, besides having published in the publications of the Hungarian Academy in Rome, also became its secretary at the end of the 1940s. The researches of the historian, who was registered as Flórián Holik, – somewhat similarly to Endre Veress – went beyond the borders of Rome by far. An example: *Bátory István és Domenico Ridolfino* [István Bátory and Domenico Ridolfino], HK 42 (1941) 22–37. As a matter of curiosity, Bánfi wanted to join the first grant holders of 1924, but the Committee

Out of them, Iványi and Bánfi's research in Rome can be considered notable. Finally, it should be mentioned that Cardinal József Mindszenty (of blessed memory) also used sources of the Vatican in his historical monograph written in his years as a parish priest of Zalaegerszeg.³³⁴

Although, the work of the generation between the two World Wars should not be underestimated despite the lack of organization, the reception of the results by the contemporaries was rather diverse – in contrast to earlier generally favorable reviews of the *Monumenta Vaticana* and the *Monumenta Romana* –, which was in relation to the eventuality of the researches. The most fruitful, Pál Lukcsics received the sharpest criticism.³³⁵ However, apart from the compliments, Tihamér Vanyó also had his share of the sharp critics. He was criticised for his publications including abstracts in Hungarian, for his inaccurate references and for having neglected many documents related to his sources.³³⁶

“unfortunately” could not take his request into consideration. MTAKK K 1591/28 (5 January 1924). His bequest: CVH I/20, *Appendix*, I, n. XI.

³³⁴ JÓZSEF PEHM, *Padányi Bíró Márton veszprémi püspök élete és kora* [*The Life and Age of Bíró Márton Padányi, Bishop of Veszprém*] (A Veszprémi Egyházmegye Múltjából 2), Zalaegerszeg 1934, 18. It cannot be forgotten that there were many out of the historians of the age, who asked for and utilized data from the Vatican Archives, like Béla Szabady, Gyula Szarka, etc.

³³⁵ His introduction, the method of his abridgement, his indexes and notes, moreover his command of Latin was criticised. LK 10 (1932) 141–145 (Ferenc Döry); LK 10 (1932) 345–347 (the answer of Pál Lukcsics) and 348 (the reply of Döry); *Századok* 68 (1934) 426–429 (László Tóth). See also CVH I/20, *Appendix*, III, n. 30. – According to Tóth, József Lukcsics's independent work in progress – finally never published, cf. for example *ibid.*, III, n. 10 and 19 – “does not either give reasons why L[ukcsics] neglected the examination and the Hungarian data's registering of the other complete [*i.e. cameralistic*] series. With this, L[ukcsics] only increased the number of the incomplete charter-publications, whose tragically high number makes the efficient work on the medieval Hungarian history impossible.” – However, Lajos Novák's descriptive review is positive: KSZ 46 (1932) 236–237; and the abstract about his earlier published work (*Az esztergomi főkapitán...* [*The Cathedral Chapter of Esztergom*]). *Századok* 62 (1928) 820 (Ambrus Peidl).

³³⁶ About the *Püspöki jelentések* János Bakács expressed that “We received morsels from the great treasure, samples and hints from the fortune, whose value just grew in our eyes.” He cannot agree with the publisher's such observation that he left out the repetitive, meaningless parts. According to Bakács, “This judgement, however, is a subjective statement, since it is possible that certain pieces are long-winded and empty in the eye of a church historian, but it is doubtful whether a social historian or a biographer would say the same.” LK 12 (1934) 192–195. (Áldásy and his colleagues were also not enthusiastic about the method of abridgement, though, in another context. Cf. CVH I/20, *Appendix*, III, n. 19.) The Piarist György Balanyi somehow shared this opinion, who found the extracts in Hungarian less scientific than their complete publication, though, more laborious solution that can interest wider public; moreover, he reproves the omission of the earlier published *dispacci*. True, he does not forget to mention that “the merit of the publisher is bigger, since the attractive book on the cover was published from his own money.” KSz 48 (1934) 60. While the reviews that emphasised the “young crudeness” were favourable, László Tóth's criticism, which also touched upon the *Bécsi nunciások jelentései* [*The reports of the nuncios of Vienna*] is ex-

Galla's two main works³³⁷, as well as other authors' smaller publications³³⁸ received a positive response.

The reviews afforded the chance to summarise the past, the current state and tasks of the Hungarian researches in the Vatican on the level of scientific journalism. The director of the national archives, Ferenc Dóry called attention to the examination and continuation of Fraknói and his colleagues' collection:

"What is worse... that – as we used to learn from the participants of the work – the exploration of the Vatican Archives had not been conducted with full precision and regularity. One cannot trust in the completeness of the collection, as Lukcsics had been convinced at the compilation of this volume. The Hungarian historical research, if it desires to accomplish a truly serious work, should systematically examine the archival material collected under Fraknói, which was enlarged by newer volumes, and then compare it with the already existing copies and regesta. The very first task of the Hungarian Institute of History in Rome – which enjoys state support now – would be to establish the program of this work and to consistently fulfil it. Instead of the regular supervision, it seems, however, that the executive boards give the researchers of the institute part tasks. This way, though, the researchers gain more favourable commissions than undermining their capacity and time with the supervision of the predecessors' work, the Hungarian historiography, however, would still lack the survey of the Vatican Archives' Hungarian-related documents."³³⁹

László Tóth, a former grant holder, who directed the Institute as a secretary in 1929–1930, not only discussed the historical value of the Vatican Ar-

pressively negative, he could not even agree with the chosen time limits. *Századok* 69 (1935) 205–210. However, Ödön Málnási expressed his absolute satisfaction with the latter work. In his view, Vanyó had already pointed out the direction of the Hungarian church history with his work, "the evaluation of data based on the Tridentinum and the further papal resolutions". *KSz* 51 (1937) 166–167.

³³⁷ The *Pálos rend reformálása* [*The Reformation of the Pauline Order*] was introduced by József Félegyházy: *KSz* 56 (1942) 284–285; the Tomkó-biography was reviewed again by László Tóth. Galla is essentially praised, and he highlights the importance of the archives of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in the recognition of the history of the territories under Turkish rule. He expresses his own opinions only in the case of Tomkó's bull-forgery. *Századok* 75 (1941) 97–99.

³³⁸ While Sándor Sármándi wrote about his Verancsics-booklet (*KSz* 48 [1938] 326), also László Tóth recenssed Meszlényi's Szelepchény-study and Iványi's Sennyey-book (*KSz* 50 [1936] 210 and *Századok* 64 [1930] 774–776). In connection with the latter, he emphasises how important it would be to prepare a uniform publication from the letters of the Hungarians and especially priests, who visited Rome. For the compilation of such opus, after the publications of Levente Závodszy (*Pongrácz Imre báró egri kanonok római útja és iskoláztatása* [*The Roman Travel and Education of Baron Imre Pongrácz, Canon of Eger*], Religio 1901, 646–647 and 662–663) and L. Árpád Várady (*Lonovics József római küldetése* [Függelékül: *Lonovics római naplója*] [*The Roman Commission of József Lonovics*] [Szent István Akadémia], Budapest 1924) Iványi's work is regarded as a really important station.

³³⁹ *LK* 10 (1932) 141–145.

chives' material³⁴⁰ and urged the continuation of the *Monumenta Vaticana*, but he also argued about an intensive division of the research tasks between the institutes in Rome:

“It is a question, and a theoretical problem raised by the volume of L[uksics]. and by other part publications from the Vatican, whether the time to institutionally organize the historical source publications of universal European value from the Vatican has already come, or not. Since 1881, there is countless number of incomplete and confused works. [He finds it important to give the same guidelines, the categorization of the sources according to the popes by certain institutes in Rome, in which the Hungarian Institute of History in Rome would also participate by getting a program for its researchers and activity for a long time.] In the meantime, until this monumental program comes, it would be desirable to guide the activity of the Institute – if the Institute also wants to undertake independent works, as currently, apart from advancing the individual research activities in the present state of Hungarian historical research – towards the completion of the rather gleaning-like former works' hiatus. At least, the medieval series of the *Monumenta Vaticana Hungariae* should be finished, even if not in such rich execution as the older ones, but in the form of a complex regesta-collection by aiming at the possible fullness, namely by paying attention not to leave out a complete group of documents, as it happened earlier. The most remarkable result of the volume of L[uksics], which contains a source material of great value, would be, if those competent were encouraged to such a decision, until the Institute could join the work of the international historical researches.”³⁴¹

Ödön Málnási, who also visited the Vatican³⁴² – facing his stormy career –, regarding Vanyó Tihamér's work spoke about the importance of the synchronisation of the Viennese and Roman research by emphasising the interdependence of the sources:

“The question of the Hungarian church historiography's total lack of organization and negligence cannot be abandoned, while reading the latest work of the author, who reinterpreted the provincial Hungarian church historiography from the prospect of the universal church. In parallel to such work, the reader desires to see a twin-work of another author, which is on the Roman reports of the legates revealed in the state and court archives of Vienna without difficulties and on the correspondence of the emperor with his legates of Rome. In the institutes of history in Vienna and Rome, on the one hand the total reports of the nuncios of Vienna can be explored, on the other hand

³⁴⁰ He finds the exploration of the divisions from the modern times, despite the fact that he stresses: the fonds after Reformation considerably lost from their universal historical value. *Századok* 69 (1935) 205–206.

³⁴¹ *Századok* 68 (1934) 426–429.

³⁴² See his grandiose monograph: *Gróf Csáky Imre bíbornok élete és kora (1672–1732)* [*The Life and Age of Count Cardinal Imre Csáky (1672–1732)*], Kalocsa 1933.

the reports of the legates of Rome and the commands of the emperor. Until this has not been done, in the material of the last four centuries, the Hungarian Catholic church historiography is pattering only on the field of individual actions. Tihamér Vanyó's achievements might draw the attention of those, whose vocation would be the organization of our historiography on the basis of the division of labour."³⁴³

Finally, in this era, the results of the international research were again being taken into consideration. While Ferenc Galla was introducing the Czech and Southern Slav-related documents, found in the archives of the Sacred Congregation for the Propaganda of the Faith, he seized the opportunity to touch upon the description of the important archive's history of researches, structure and historical value.³⁴⁴ László Tóth referred to the Transylvanian correspondence of Cardinal Federico Borromeo.³⁴⁵ Tihamér Vanyó analysed the Czech nunciature-publications of the seventeenth century (*Epistulae et acta nuntiorum apostolicorum apud Imperatorem, 1592–1628*), he collected their Hungarian data and missed the disregard of the latest Hungarian secondary literature, moreover by branding the total document publication as wordy, he broke a lance on behalf of the methods containing abstracts in his own national language.³⁴⁶ It was also he, who examined the latest publications of the Belgian research, through which not only did he draw attention to the opportunities of the consistorial archives, but he also announced the launch of systematic research of all the processus informativus from the second half of the eighteenth century.³⁴⁷

* * *

The new start after the Second World War generated even bigger confidence than the situation two decades earlier. The long-winded results of the collections of the 1930s were prepared by this time.³⁴⁸ To publish

³⁴³ KSz 51 (1937) 166–167.

³⁴⁴ Századok 62 (1928) 921–932.

³⁴⁵ Századok 72 (1938) 393. In connection with the small booklet (OSCAR MÁRFFY, *Lettere inedite mandate dalla Transilvania al Cardinale Federico Borromeo*, Milano 1935) Tóth mentions the necessity of the examination of the *Biblioteca Ambrosiana* in Milan.

³⁴⁶ Századok 70 (1936) 204–206 and 72 (1938) 393–394.

³⁴⁷ Primarily, it is about the *processus informativi* (i.e. the protocols of the canonical investigations about the bishops), and deals with the sporadic Hungarian preparatory works, as well. Századok 70 (1936) 445–450 and 72 (1938) 87–89.

³⁴⁸ See mostly CVH I/20, *Appendix*, I, n. x, 26. t. a–b.

them, Galla – practically alone – created the supplement-series of the *Regnum Egyháztörténeti Évkönyv* [*Regnum Almanac of Church History*], where he published some shorter works.³⁴⁹ Although his enterprise cannot be regarded as ideal from the point of view of the research in the Vatican, it meant a more worthy form than private expenditure. Tihamér Vanyó – to reflect the similar results of his colleague – declared the completion of his consistorial material and demanded publication.³⁵⁰ It seemed that there was a healthy competition between them, namely with some malice Tihamér Vanyó called upon Ferenc Galla to account for his main task, the writing of the church history of the territory under Turkish occupation based on Roman sources.³⁵¹

It was a more favourable development that they could learn from the mistakes of the last two decades. In a short but thorough study, the former grant holder, Lajos Pásztor outlined the altered structure of the Vatican Archives, furthermore he summarized the results of the past six decades with detailed bibliography and published the program of the Hungarian researches in Rome, which is still valid today:

“...it is obvious that the Hungarian research work under Fraknói's leadership and the one after the First World War (1914–1918) differentiated. The first signifi-

³⁴⁹ *Magyar tárgyú pápai felbatalmazások, felmentések és kiváltságok a katolikus megújulás korából I* [Hungarian-related papal authorizations, exemptions and privileges from the age of the Catholic revival I] (Regnum-Könyvek. I: Egyháztörténeti források 1 – offprint from the 24th and 25th volumes of the Levéltári Közlemények 1946–47), Budapest 1947; *Fulgenzio da Jesi ferences misszionárius vitája a böjtről a gyöngyösi jezsuitákkal. Fejezet a magyar katolikus restauráció misszióiból* [Fulgenzio da Jesi, Franciscan Missionary's Debate with the Jesuits in Gyöngyös over Lent. A Chapter from the Missions of the Hungarian Catholic Restoration] (Regnum-könyvek. II: Egyháztörténeti értekezések 1 – offprint from the 1944–46. volumes of the „Regnum” egyháztörténeti évkönyv), Budapest 1947. – These publications, on the other hand, are also from Galla's own expenses, similarly to the earlier ones.

³⁵⁰ Századok 81 (1947) 316–317. – He published a part of his work in German: *Das Archiv der Konsistorialkongregation in Rom und die kirchliche Zustände Ungarns in der zweiten Hälfte des 18. Jahrhunderts*, Festschrift zur Feier des zweihundertjährigen Bestandes des Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv I, Wien 1949, 151–179. – According to Elréd Borian's information of 2003, the manuscript of the author, who died in 2005, is not in the state to be published.

³⁵¹ “We are looking forward to the lengthier and more systematic publication of the Hungarian-related material until the middle of the eighteenth century of the Congregatio Consistorialis's archives from the author. His work so far is a promise that he would substitute for the loss left after the death of Mór Kárpáthy Kravjánszky and Ernő Gerendás. Our historiography is even more keen on reading G[alla]'s elaboration and collection on the religious relations of the territories under Turkish rule, based on the Roman archives of the Congregatio de Propaganda Fide. Namely, our author has conducted researches for years there, and his smaller-longer studies published in the last difficult years were – at least partly – based on this material.” Századok 81 (1947) 316–317.

cant character was the systematic, purposeful source publication; a whole team worked under Fraknói. In the second period, however, the Hungarian research work was limited to only certain people and out of them there were only four researchers who published material on merit: the already deceased Árpád Bossányi and Pál Lukcsics, and from the living, Ferenc Galla and Tihamér Vanyó. While Fraknói then Bossányi and Lukcsics put the emphasis on source publication, these days, certain researchers endeavour to use the data of the Vatican Archives in their monographs, rather than to publish them. Yet, this is not enough. In this way, it is inevitable to miss some data of highest value that other authors could make use of, if they do not belong to the given subject and to the works of certain objectives. Consequently, the once missed detail may get lost for good. The publication of the Hungarian-related documents of the foreign archives should only be in the form of source publication, therefore it is a must to explore and publish the whole material. The new research work launched in the Vatican Archives is closely related to the activity of the Hungarian Institute in Rome and the Hungarian Institute of History in Rome. The reason for the halt of the fruitful research work is that these institutes could not fulfil the task given by Fraknói at the foundation, namely they could not handle the organization of the archival researches in the Vatican. Yet, that would have been the most important task of these institutes. As a consequence, due to the interests of the Hungarian historical scholarship, a historian who is familiar with the Vatican Archives should head the Hungarian Institute in Rome, and if it can not be realized, the Hungarian Institute of History in Rome should be restored in reality, since it is only on paper and does not operate. Until now, it could not have functioned, since there were only two historians annually who obtained a scholarship there, moreover, one of them was usually a historian of antiquity. More historians' grants should be provided and an appointed head of the Hungarian Institute of History in Rome should control their work. Every historian, who won a commission to Rome, should be obliged to undertake a certain part of the Institute's program, even if they wished to conduct researches for individual purpose. Naturally, there is need for such grant holders, whose sole task is to realise the program of the Institute with their systematic work.³⁵² The program cannot be else but the exploration of the Hungarian-related documents of the Vatican Archives' corpus, of other smaller libraries (Barberini, Chigi, Ottoboni, Reginalde, etc.) and of other archives and libraries in Rome. This would be controlled by the director of the Institute, in concert with the Hungarian Committee of History in Rome founded from historians. Fraknói's words – that he said at the foundation of the «*Monumenta Hungariae Vaticana*» Committee – are still current, «In modern times, without exception the intellectual states of Europe comprehended that the collection and publication of the memorabilia, which serve the exploration of the historical past, should not depend on certain scholars and societies' zeal and generosity». We could only add to it that the exploration of the Hungarian-related documents of the foreign archives is na-

³⁵² The commission of the grant holders with compulsory duties in the institute had also a distinguished place in Miskolczy's ideas. CVH I/20, *Appendix*, III, n. 15 (second document).

tional business, therefore, through the research work only one aspect can prevail: the interests of the nation, not certain researchers' individual purposes."³⁵³

For a short period it seemed that Pásztor could fulfil his program, since in 1946 Dezső Keresztury, Minister of Education, appointed him to the leading secretary of the Hungarian Institute of History in Rome, and he defined the continuation of Fraknói's work as his primary task.³⁵⁴ Knowing the qualities, working capacity and achievements of the former Piarist student of Kecske-mét and later of the Eötvös Collegium, it is sure that with him, the Hungarian research in the Vatican would have re-experienced its golden age. However, history, again, intervened. A little less than two years later, following the Communist takeover, Pásztor was to leave his position. Thereafter, he stayed in Rome, Pope Pius XII (1939–1958) appointed him as the official of the Vatican Archives. Due to his duties, his scientific activity turned to a more universal direction. The most precise description of the Vatican Archives, for exam-

³⁵³ PÁSZTOR, *A Vatikáni Levéltár*, 100–129 (the quotation: 127–129). The continuation of the *Monumenta Vaticana* was in the focus of his message, in a way that the material should be explored according to fonds, then published according to dioceses, which would be greatly supported by certain prelates (120). After Fraknói, in his unquestionably important outline – concerning historiography – he introduces the results of Áldásy, Czaich, Érdűhelyi, Kollányi and praises them for striving for fond-like perfection from given periods. He finds Beke and Tóth Szabó's work contingent, however, Bossányi and Lukcsics's valuable. (He himself examined the supplications from 1492–1500 – that we already know of –, yet, to be able to publish them he would need further researches, since he would have to re-examine the vast medieval material, he argues (120–122, cf. but *Appendix*, III, n. 32, where the date of 1502 is indicated). He emphasises the continuation of the exploration to further centuries, as well, since the Germans, on the one hand, often neglect the Hungarian relations; on the other hand, they show a great uncertainty in their publication. Therefore, he draws the right conclusion; this work should be done by Hungarians. In his view, apart from the nunciature of Vienna, many other fonds can be mentioned (from the Secretariat of State to the *Polonia, Venezia, „Lettere”,* and the *Fondo Borgese* and the *Miscellanea*). He writes about Veress and Vanyó's related results, then he turns to the material of the congregations (123–125). He stresses that in Fraknói's days they were hardly open to researches, the collection of the Consistorial Congregation was only placed to the Vatican Secret Archives in 1907. Since then, however, Kárpáthy-Kravjánszky, Ernő Gerendás, Vanyó and Galla undertook their examination. He believes that “the source publications, which contain the documents of the canonical processes, by Tihamér Vanyó and Ferenc Galla will prove that hope that in case of the systematic and complete exploration of the archives, Hungary would win as rich material as the Low Countries and Belgium has...” (125–126). By not undervaluing Vanyó's *ad limina* reports, he regards the archives of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith as the most important source and indicates that Galla plans to write the history of the missions in the territories under Turkish rule from here (126–127).

³⁵⁴ LÁSZLÓ CSORBA, *Storia dell'Accademia d'Ungheria a Roma dopo il 1945*, *Cento anni*, 45–68, 48, n. 13.

ple, is still thanks to him.³⁵⁵ After a couple of decades, he joined the Hungarian research in Rome chiefly with his studies of historiography.³⁵⁶

After the forced emigration of Lajos Pásztor in 1950, the Hungarian Institute of History in Rome was officially abolished. The Papal Hungarian Ecclesiastical Institute practically also terminated its functional operation after being exposed to constant harassment and being isolated from Hungary.³⁵⁷ The Hungarian Academy in Rome did not cease to exist; however, its scientific, cultural and artistic mission was replaced by absolutely different tasks for many decades.³⁵⁸

The monumental works, based on the research conducted in the 1920–1930s, remained to be manuscripts and became part of the neglected bequests in the progression of time.

³⁵⁵ LAJOS PÁSZTOR, *Guida delle fonti per la storia dell'America Latina negli archivi della Santa Sede e negli archivi ecclesiastici d'Italia* (Collectanea Archivi Vaticani [CAV] 2), Città del Vaticano 1970. – This work of Pásztor is way more than a simple archival repertory – as it is proved by the fact that it is often quoted and praised by the international secondary literature –, practically, this is the first attempt to make a survey of the papal Curia's function in the modern times.

³⁵⁶ His *In memoriam* volume with the bibliography of his works: CVH I/4 (291–306).

³⁵⁷ The principals left the institute of the ecclesiastical emigration centre after the Vatican-Hungarian *intesa pratica* in 1964. The variegated events after the world war with an outlook to the present times: LÁSZLÓ CSORBA, *La storia dell'Istituto Pontificio Ecclesiastico Ungherese a Roma dal 1945 fino ad oggi*, Cento anni, 75–94.

³⁵⁸ Cf. CSORBA, *Storia dell'Accademia d'Ungheria a Roma dopo il 1945*, *op. cit.*

VI

The Age of Banishment and of Gradual Resumption (1950–2004)

The dissolution³⁵⁹ of the Roman Hungarian Institute of History and the Historical Committee in Rome of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences meant nothing but the case of the research in the Vatican formally left the official area of science. Yet, the research did not stop completely. Until the middle of the 1980s, the Hungarian Jesuits had the main role in Rome like in the seventeenth century. They were headed by László Lukács. His series of source publication (*Monumenta Antiquae Hungariae I–IV: 1500–1600* [Monumenta Historica Societatis Iesu 101. 112. 121. 131]), which was started by him and exploited their own central archives' documents from the sixteenth century, should be mentioned from his oeuvre.³⁶⁰ The long-needed volumes are completed by his numerous other works based on Roman sources, by reference books/prosopographies, source publications and outstanding studies. A part of them deals with the Hungarian (and Austrian) history of the Society of Jesus; the others thoroughly discuss the universal and sometimes current questions of the history of the order.³⁶¹

³⁵⁹ More precisely, the decision of 1947 said that it would not be re-established. FRÁTERNÉ, *A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia állandó bizottságai*, 258.

³⁶⁰ Romae 1969–1987. His bequest: CVH I/20, *Appendix*, I, n. XIV.

³⁶¹ His bibliography compiled by Mihály Balázs: LÁSZLÓ LUKÁCS, *A független magyar jezsuita rendtartomány kérdése és az osztrák abszolutizmus* [The Question of the Independent Hungarian Jesuit Province and the Austrian Absolutism], Szeged 1989, 132–137; the appreciation of his source publishing series, important studies: ANTAL MOLNÁR, *A 85 éves P. Lukács László S.J. köszöntése* [The Festschrift of the 85

Apart from him, the work of László Szilas,³⁶² the teacher of the faculty of church history at the Pontifical Gregorian University, and of László Polgár,³⁶³ bibliographer, then Pál Arató,³⁶⁴ Miklós Óry,³⁶⁵ Ferenc Szabó³⁶⁶ and the Piarist János Sántha is to be mentioned.³⁶⁷ True, the work of the majority belongs to the history of the Hungarian scientific presence in Rome rather than to the research in the Vatican. Furthermore, the zeal of József Zágón and István Mester prelates – who had to leave the Papal Hungarian Institute in the course of time –, the Saint Stephen House built on the outskirts of the city in the 1960s owing to Erzsébet Fáy's noble donation and the still functioning Tamagno House established from Hungarian money by Hungarian nuns also had indirect effects, which should not be dismissed lightly. Pilgrims, as well as historians, could find shelter in them.³⁶⁸

The “*intesa pratica*”, which was concluded between the Vatican and the Hungarian Communists in 1964, despite its historical disputableness can hardly be neglected. Owing to the agreement, the Papal Hungarian Eccle-

years Old László P. Lukács SJ], MEV–Regnum 7 (1995) 1–2, 247–260. – Lukács's publications were followed and appreciated by the Hungarian scientific life, as well, in the person of Kálmán Benda. Századok 98 (1964) 574; Századok 103 (1969) 1239–1240 (LUKÁCS–POLGÁR, *Documenta Romana... I–II*). However, Benda remarks that Lukács did not mention the fellow member Dénes Szittyay, who collected between the two World Wars the documents and correspondence of István Szántó, then prepared them for the press after 1945, though, their publication in the MHH failed to come about; one proof-copy can be found in the Hungarian Academy of Sciences' manuscript archive. The Xerox-copy of Szittyay's introduction placed before the Szántó-correspondece in László Lukács's bequest: OSZKK Fond 366/302 (55 fol.).

³⁶² For example: *Der Jesuit Alfonso Carillo in Siebenbürgen 1591–1599*, Roma 1976.

³⁶³ For example: *Bibliographia de historia Societatis Iesu in regnis olim Corona Hungarica unitis (1560–1773)* (Subsidia ad historiam S.I. [Bibliothecae Instituti Historici S.I. series minor] 2), Romae 1957; *Pázmány bibliográfia [The Bibliography of Pázmány]*, Pázmány Péter emlékezete. Halálának 350. évfordulójára (ed. by László Lukács–Ferenc Szabó), Róma 1987, 449–480.

³⁶⁴ Until his death, he compiled the important bibliography of the history of the papacy in the annual journal of the Pontifical Gregorian University's department of church history, the *Archivum Historiae Pontificiae*, which was launched in 1963.

³⁶⁵ For example: *Pázmány Péter tanulmányi évei [The Studies of Péter Pázmány]*, Eisenstadt 1970.

³⁶⁶ For example: *Autour de la nomination de Péter Pázmány au siège primate d'Esztergom (1614–1616)*, Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu 54 (1985) 77–148 (jointly with László Lukács); *A teológus Pázmány [The theologian Pázmány]* (METEM Könyvek 1), Róma 1990.

³⁶⁷ The series of the historical documents of the Piarist order was published under his editorship.

³⁶⁸ Specific examples could be listed from the 1990s.

siaistical Institute was restored, then many churchmen, József Borovi,³⁶⁹ Tihamér Vanyó, who continued his activity as a historian, József Körmeny³⁷⁰ and József Horváth,³⁷¹ diocesan priests of Veszprém had the opportunity to spend more time in the Eternal City as the citizens of the “Eastern Block”.³⁷²

Vanyó, who was provided the possibility to publish, was interested partly in the history of the territories under Turkish rule,³⁷³ partly in the papal nunciatures. In connection with the latter, not only did he organize the latest results of the international science,³⁷⁴ but he also collected and published a volume from the data of the archives of the nunciature of Vienna.³⁷⁵ This time,

³⁶⁹ His basic work: *Az esztergomi érseki egyházmegye felosztása* [The Division of the Archbishopric of Esztergom] (METEM Könyvek 25), Budapest 2000.

³⁷⁰ The result of the episcopal archivist of Veszprém’s collection, made in the early 1980s by partly repeating his predecessor, József Lukcsics’s researches: *Annatae e regno Hungariae provenientes in Archivio Secreto Vaticano 1421–1536* (A Magyar Országos Levéltár Kiadványai II/21), Budapest 1990; and *Gr. Volkra Ottó Ker. János veszprémi püspök élete és munkássága 1665–1720* [The Life and Work of Count Ottó Volkra Ker. János Bishop of Veszprém 1665–1720] (A Veszprémi Egyházmegye Múltjából 16), Veszprém 1995. On his researches and bequest: CVH I/8, 157–178.

³⁷¹ The priest of Vöröserény and the librarian of the Veszprém episcopacy worked in Rome in 1982. A short representation of his bequest: CVH I/20, *Appendix*, I, n. XII. On his researches and bequest: CVH I/8, 157–178.

³⁷² Borovi could get there already in 1964; Vanyó stayed in Rome for 9 months in 1968/69.

³⁷³ *Belgrádi püspökök jelentései a magyarországi bódoltság viszonyairól 1649–1673* [The Reports of the Bishops of Belgrade about the Conditions of Hungary under Turkish Rule 1649–1673], LK 42 (1971) 323–339; and *A hazai bódoltság vatikáni források tükrében* [The Hungarian Territories under Turkish Rule in the Light of Vatican Sources], Vigilia 38 (1973) 88–97.

³⁷⁴ *Újabb publikációk a pápai nunciatura-történeti kutatások köréből* [Newer Publications from the Sphere of the Historical Researches of the Papal Nunciatures], LK 40 (1969) 368–373.

³⁷⁵ After a decade-long waiting. *A bécsi pápai követtség levéltárának iratai Magyarországról 1611–1786* [The Documents of the Papal Delegation’s Archives of Vienna from Hungary 1611–1789] (Fontes Historiae Hungaricae Aevi Recentioris), Budapest 1986. (Earlier published as a preliminary study: *A szerzetesi életforma válsága hazánkban a 18. század második felében* [The Crisis of the Monastic Life in Hungary in the Second Half of the 18th Century], Történelmi Szemle [TSz] 25 [1982] 211–228.) The welcome of Vanyó’s latter work was mixed (see Borbála Bak’s justified criticism and appraisal LSz 38 [1988] 1, 76–80). The Benedictine historian made abstracts only about the *Hungarica* of the nunciature’s chancellery, and the two other big series (the gigantic material of the canonical processes and trials at the nunciature) are not even mentioned. Vanyó gathered information mainly on the basis of Walter Wagner’s description (*Die Bestände des Archivio della Nunziatura in Vienna bis 1792*,

he tried to cast an account and create a programme. In international comparison, he judged the Hungarian achievements as satisfactory and suggested that his own source-extraction method should be followed by avoiding the German “wordy style” and the Austrian “inventory-like conciseness”. As opposed to Fraknói’s medieval orientation, he marked the seventeenth–nineteenth centuries as the focus of the examinations.³⁷⁶ However, he did not detail how and with whom his program should be realised.

Nevertheless, at the time of the Benedictine revitalization, the microfilming of the Hungarian documents in the Vatican started, which was organized by the Hungarian National Archives and supported mainly via the Hungarian Scholarship Board’s Italian exchange scholarships. There were many archivists and historians, who explored considerable archival material from the Vatican and brought closer to the Hungarian science on microfilms: for instance, Vilmos Bélay (1967, 1970, 1974, 1980, 1984), Alfréd Lengyel (1969), Miklós Komjáthy (1969), Tibor Tóth (1971), Ferenc Maksay (1972), Péter Balázs (1972, 1986), Géza Érszegi (1977, 1981, 1983, 1986, 1986/87, 1992), László Solymosi (1977), Gábor Barta (1979), Iván Borsa (1984), Péter [E.] Kovács (1985/86), István György Tóth (1986), Eszter Magyar (1989), Péter Tóth (1990) and Teréz Oborni (1989).³⁷⁷ Two young priests’ work, Ferenc Berán and László Németh, can be linked to them. They were purposely sent to the Papal Hungarian Institute in 1985/86 to undertake research in the Vatican Archives by Cardinal László Lékai, archbishop of Esztergom, who had the Hungarian

RHM 2 [1957–1958] 82–203), however, a catalogue of a part of the canonical processes’ archives of the nunciature was already made known by Patricius Gauchat in 1935 (*Hierarchia Catholica medii et recentioris aevi IV, Monasterii* 1935, 377–382), furthermore, Remigius Ritzler and Priminus Sefrin also used their data (*Hierarchia Catholica medii et recentioris aevi V, Patavii* 1952, *passim*).

³⁷⁶ *AVatikáni Levéltár és kutatása [The Vatican Archives and its Research]*, LK 43 (1972) 157–162; *A bécsi pápai követtség levéltárának iratai*, 22–24.

³⁷⁷ The list unfortunately is not complete. Only those names are there, whose reports could be found among the documents relating to the foreign *Hungarica*-collection, which were kept in the Reprographical Department of the MNL-OL without any closer reference (Italy, I–II. box). From Ferenc Szakály’s verbal communication – given during our journey in Tuscany – I know that in the 1970s, he and István Draskóczy joined the program.

chapel built³⁷⁸ in the basement of the Saint Peter's Basilica and realised the ecclesiastical-historical importance of the research in the Vatican.³⁷⁹

The enterprise of microfilming, which mainly focused on the Middle Ages and was planned by Iván Borsa,³⁸⁰ according to the latest criticism became rather relative³⁸¹ considering its final results and ran out of breath by the 1990s. There were no newer recordings made after this.³⁸² In parallel, however, the activity of the historians restarted and became more and more considerable. Géza Érszegi drew the attention to the sources of the Vatican in a fundamental study;³⁸³ and Lajos Lukács, who had been living in Italy for a long time, by continuing the work of Antal Meszlényi, published and analysed materials of the nunciature of Vienna from the nineteenth century.³⁸⁴ As far as the official science of history is concerned, Kálmán

³⁷⁸ The catalogue and material of the exhibition organized on this occasion: *Monumenta Vaticana res Hungariae illustrantia. Documenti et manoscritti*, Budapest, 1981 (*Archivio Segreto Vaticano. Documenti riguardanti l'Ungheria*. Prof. Dr. LAJOS PÁSZTOR archivist); LAJOS PÁSZTOR, *Magyar kiállítás a Vatikáni Titkos Levéltárban [Hungarian Exhibition in the Vatican Secret Archives]*, LK 51–52 (1981–1982) 365–371.

³⁷⁹ The verbal communication of László Németh, the former rector of the Papal Hungarian Ecclesiastical Institute. Their professional guide was Géza Érszegi.

³⁸⁰ His report on the Reprographical Department of the MNL-OL. (Italy, II. box) – His important Roman source publication: *Benlich Máté belgrádi püspök jelentése a török bódoltság katolikusairól 1651–1658 [The Report of Máté Benlich, Bishop of Belgrade, on the Catholics of the Territories under Turkish Rule 1651–1658]*, LK 60 (1989) 13–142 (jointly with István György Tóth).

³⁸¹ “The background research could not have been supplemented by the work of the *Hungarica*-collection in the past decades, either. It was random; neither the source exploration nor the microfilming of the examined material was systematic, moreover the majority of the ordered microfilms has not gotten into the Diplomatic Photographic Archives of the MNL-OL yet.” ENIKŐ CSUKOVITS, *Középkori magyar zarándokok [Hungarian Pilgrims in the Middle Ages]* (História Könyvtár, Monográfiák 20), Budapest 2003, 22, n. 66. – The already explored material's practical usage is considerable in the latest volumes of the *Archives from the Period of the Anjous and Sigismund*. As well as in the monograph of József Köblös: *Az egyházi középréteg Mátyás és a Jagellók korában [The Ecclesiastical Middle Layer under Matthias and the Jagiellons]* (Társadalom- és Művelődéstörténeti Tanulmányok 12), Budapest 1994, 98. – The outlook of the microfilm-collection: CVH I/20, *Appendix*, II, n. 1.

³⁸² At least they cannot be found in the Microfilm Archives of the MNL-OL.

³⁸³ *A Curia Romana levéltárai [The Archives of the Curia Romana]*, LSz 28 (1978) 321–339. His doctoral dissertation at the Academy: *Eredeti pápai oklevelek Magyarországon (1199–1417) [Original Papal Charters in Hungary (1199–1417)]*, 1989 (MTAKK D/14240).

³⁸⁴ *The Vatican and Hungary 1846–1878. Reports and correspondence of the apostolic nuncios in Vienna on Hungary*, ed. by LAJOS LUKÁCS, Budapest 1981 and [Id.], *A Vatikán és Magyarország*

Benda's turn to Rome was the great breakthrough. Vanyó's latest publications³⁸⁵ or Endre Veress's grandiose bequest might have had a role in it, from which Benda first published the Argenti-correspondence,³⁸⁶ then the *Moldvai csángó-magyar okmánytár* [*Chartulary of the Csángó-Hungarians in Moldavia*] amplifying it with own results.³⁸⁷

Kálmán Benda's research was continued by his colleague, György Tóth István. Already, the Csángó collection mainly relied on the incredibly rich materials of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, which were praised and examined by Áldásy, Hodinka and Galla. Tóth also published the reports and correspondence of the papal missionaries working in Hungary – including the territories under Turkish rule and Transylvania – in bulky volumes; furthermore he elaborated important topics in individual studies in Hungarian as well as in foreign languages.³⁸⁸ In parallel, Antal Molnár, who

1846–1878. *A bécsi apostoli nunciások jelentései és levelezése Magyarországról* [*The Vatican and Hungary 1846–1878. The Reports and Correspondence of the Apostolic Nuncios of Vienna from Hungary*], Budapest 1981 (with some history of research and the emphasis put on the importance of the Roman place of occurrences by the secular part: 13–17 and 17–21). His bequest: CVH I/20, *Appendix*, I, n. XIII.

³⁸⁵ Who gave a lecture in the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Institute of History in 1973. ANTAL MOLNÁR, *Egy magyar egyháztörténész a 20. században*, op. cit. Vanyó grasped all the opportunities to highlight the importance of the Vatican sources. For instance: *Orvostörténeti vonatkozások a Vatikáni Levéltárból* [*The Aspects of Medical History from the Vatican Archives*], *Orvostörténeti Közlemények* 60–61 (1971) 241–248.

³⁸⁶ *Giovanni Argenti jelentései magyar ügyekről 1603–1623* [*The Reports of Giovanni Argenti about the Hungarian Cases 1603–1623*] (Adattár XVI–XVIII. századi szellemi mozgalmaink történetéhez 7, established by Bálint Keserű), ed. by ENDRE VERESS [–KÁLMÁN BENDA], Szeged 1983.

³⁸⁷ I–II, Budapest 1989. Using Roman sources, the introductory study of the preliminary publications' bibliography of Benda is in his footnotes (I, 9–48). See also *Rákóczi és a Vatikán. Brenner apát küldetése XI. Kelemen pápához (1707–1708)* [*Rákóczi and the Vatican. The Legation of Abbot Brenner to Pope Clement XI (1707–1708)*], TSz 2 (1959) 8–24 (on the basis of Hungarian sources). Its amplification: BÉLA KÖPECZI, *Rákóczi követe Rómában* [*Rákóczi's Legate in Rome*], TSz 25 (1982) 404–415. According to Lajos Pásztor's guidance, the latter author introduces the documents (Brenner's requests to the Curia) found in the 197th volume of the *Fondo Albani* as amplification (406 et sequ., and *Germania*, vol. 244.). Cf. Gerevich's noted report on the similar result of Pál Lukcsics.

³⁸⁸ His source publications: *Misszionáriusok jelentései Magyarországról és Erdélyről (1627–1707)* [*The Reports of the Missionaries about Hungary and Transylvania (1627–1707)*], Budapest–Roma 1994; *Misszionáriusok levelei Magyarországról és Erdélyről (1572–1717)* I–V [*The Letters of the Missionaries about Hungary and Transylvania (1572–1717)*], Roma–Budapest 2002–2008 (Bibliotheca

became more and more interested in the history of the territories under Turkish rule, wrote the history of the papal missions in the territories under Turkish rule until the middle of the seventeenth century in an impressive monograph and series of preliminary studies.³⁸⁹

For the sake of historical fidelity it should be stated that Ferenc Galla,³⁹⁰ who was, back in time, entrusted with the examination of the comprehensive sources of the Propaganda's archives, also accomplished the task – that was very lacked by Vanyó in the 1940s – by the beginning of 1970s, and in fact until the end of the seventeenth century wrote the history of Catholicism in Hungary under Turkish rule.³⁹¹ But he did so in a much more concise form, and the manuscript, partly written in pencil and heavily corrected, would take an incredible amount of work to publish today.³⁹² However, all these hardly lessen Molnár's credits, who also collected supplementary material. In any case, as Bossányi did it with supplications collected by Fraknoi, Hungarian historiography has once again accomplished a task in Rome that its predecessors had already fulfilled... The collection and monograph of János Sávai,³⁹³ Antal

Academiae Hungariae – Roma. Fontes 1 and 4). See his related other publications in the bibliographies and notes of the above mentioned works (423 and 68–80). In addition: *Between Islam and Catholicism: Bosnian Franciscan Missionaries in Turkish Hungary 1584–1716*, Catholic Historical Review 89 (2003) 3, 3–30; *Missions and Missionaries in the 17th Century Slovak Territory*, Krestanstvo v Dejínach Slovenska (ed. by Mária Kohútová), Pozsony 2003, 72–77; *The Introduction of the Gregorian Calendar and the Turks (The Investigation of the Bishop of Scardona in 1628)*, „Quasi liber et pictura”. Tanulmányok Kubinyi András hetvenedik születésnapjára (ed. by Gyöngyi Kovács et al.), Budapest 2004, 581–588; see also *Ab imo pectore: In memoriam di István György Tóth*, [a cura di GAETANO PLATANIA–MATTEO SANFILIPPO], Viterbo 2005.

³⁸⁹ ANTAL MOLNÁR, *Katolikus missziók a bódolt Magyarországon. I: 1572–1647* [*Catholic Missions in the Hungarian Territories under Turkish Rule I: 1572–1647*] (Humanizmus és reformáció 26), Budapest 2002. His studies in the bibliography of this work, 481 and 504–505.

³⁹⁰ See the above mentioned information about him, especially CVH I/20, *Appendix*, III, n. 19.

³⁹¹ MOLNÁR, *Katolikus missziók*, 19 (especially in note 23) he has other opinion about this question.

³⁹² Cf. CVH I/20, *Appendix*, I, n. x, 26. t. d.

³⁹³ From his series (*Documenta missionaria Hungariam et regionem sub ditione Turcica existentem spectantia* – *Missziós dokumentumok Magyarországról és a bódoltságról* [*Missionary Documents about Hungary and the Territories under Turkish Rule*]) the following volumes can be mentioned: I/1: *A Propaganda Fide Kongregáció levéltárából. Acta vol. 1–12 and SOCG vol. 56–79* [*From the Archives of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith*], Szeged 1993; II/1: *Missziók, mesterek, licenciátusok* [*Missions, Masters, Lay Brothers*], Szeged 1997 (its earlier version in Italian: *La partecipazione dei laici al lavoro pastorale in Ungheria nei secoli XVI–XVII*, Roma 1982); II/2: *A csíksomlyói és a kantai iskola története* [*The History of the School in Csíksomlyó and Kanta*], Szeged 1997.

Hodinka's successors', István Baán³⁹⁴ and the examinations of Tamás Véghseő,³⁹⁵ also drew on the sources of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, furthermore, the publications of István Fazekas also deal with the history of the missions in Hungary.³⁹⁶

This list brings us to the closest present. However, those moments of the researches in the Vatican in 1980–1990 cannot be forgotten, like Gábor Barta elaborated on the trial of György Fráter's murder based essentially on the material of the Castle of Saint Angelo's archives; and with the leadership of Mihály Balázs, the school of history of literature in Szeged continued and completed the oeuvre of László Lukács with the documents of the Jesuit missions in Transylvanian and in the territories under Turkish rule until 1625.³⁹⁷

The method of the first volume, which attempted fond-like perfection, can only be approved and set as an example, however, the classification of the processings and their attitude is disputable. The published sources must be handled with due foresight, which was already suggested in other places (cf. ISTVÁN GYÖRGY TÓTH –KÁLMÁN BENDA, *A jezsuiták mecsetje. Egy forráskiadvány margójára* [*The Mosque of the Jesuits. On the Margin of a Source Publication*], Budapesti Könyvszemle 6 [1994] 20–25). Yet, Sávai's far-reaching mastery of the material cannot be completely omitted as the latest Transylvanian-related volumes of his series and his Pázmány-publication proves (*Pázmány és a szomszokok. A szomszokok genovai levéltárának dokumentumai* [*Pázmány and the Somascans. The Documents of the Somascans in the Archives of Geneva*], Lymbus. Művelődéstörténeti Tár IV [ed. by István Monok], Szeged 1992, 123–141).

³⁹⁴ Cf. TÓTH, *Misszionáriusok levelei*; I 60; CVH I/4, 113–131.

³⁹⁵ For example: *Egy misszionáriusi életút indulása a XVII. században. Vanoviczi János OSPPE (1614–1678)* [*The Beginning of Life as a Missionary in the 17th Century. János Vanoviczi OSPPE (1614–1678)*], A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Szabolcs-Szatmár-Bereg megyei Tudományos Testülete 10 éves jubileumi közgyűléssel egybekötött tudományos ülésének előadásai, Nyíregyháza 2002, II, 684–691; Benkovich Ágoston váradai püspök működésének görög katolikus vonatkozásai (1682–1702) [*The Greek Catholic Relations of Ágoston Benkovich's Activity, Bishop of Várad (1682–1702)*], Athanasia 16 (2003) 99–122 (with the publication of the verbal of the prelate's canonical examination).

³⁹⁶ The „*Missio Segneriana*” kezdetei Magyarországon (1714–1717) [*The Beginnings of the “Missio Segneriana” in Hungary (1714–1717)*], Perlekedő évszázadok. Tanulmányok Für Lajos történész 60. születésnapjára (ed. by Ildikó Horn), Budapest 1993, 410–431; *Szerzetesrendek Kelet-Magyarországon a XVII. században* [*Monastic Orders in Eastern Hungary in the 17th Century*], Miscellanea Anno 1999 (Acta Collegii Evangelici 7), Eperjes 2000, 69–77.

³⁹⁷ GÁBOR BARTA, *Vajon kié az ország?* [*Who Owns this Country?*] (Labirintus), Budapest 1988. (Cf. though, above.) – *Jezsuita okmánytár. I/1–2: Erdély és Magyarországot érintő iratok 1601–1606* [*Jesuit Archives. I/1–2: The Documents Related to Hungary and Transylvania 1601–1606*] (Adattár XVI–XVIII. századi szellemi mozgalmaink történetéhez 34), publ. by MIHÁLY BALÁZS–TAMÁS KRUPPA–ISTVÁN DÁVID LÁZÁR–LÁSZLÓ LUKÁCS, Szeged 1995; *Erdélyi és bódoltságú jezsuita missziók. I/1: 1609–1616. I/2: 1617–1625* [*Jesuit Missions in Transylvania*

Out of the publishers, Tamás Kruppa is alone engaged in the papal-Hungarian relations under the Báthory era.³⁹⁸ Besides him, Ádám Füzes explored sources on the initiation of the Roman rites in Hungary from the Vatican Archives,³⁹⁹ as for the writer of these lines, he is industrious to become engrossed in the Roman relations of the Hungarian hierarchy in the seventeenth century.⁴⁰⁰

The above mentioned examples expressly prove that the focus of renewed research in the Vatican – with broader time limits – falls to the early modern period. Gabriella Erdélyi touches upon the borderland of this period and the late Middle Ages with exploring the unknown verbal of the monastery in Körmend's trial of 1518 preserved in the Vatican library,⁴⁰¹ which the author of these lines found in early December 1997 during a sys-

and in the Territories under Turkish Rule. I/1: 1609–1616. I/2: 1617–1625] Adattár XVI–XVIII. századi szellemi mozgalmaink történetéhez 26/1–2), publ. by MIHÁLY BALÁZS–ÁDÁM FRICSY–LÁSZLÓ LUKÁCS–ISTVÁN MONOK, Szeged 1990. – I point out here that my work, though it would be its task, cannot also touch upon the results of the examinations of literature, history of art and codicology. The publication of László Szelestei N. from the Vatican library (*Zrínyi Miklós tanácsai a császárnak 1664 tavaszán [The Advice of Miklós Zrínyi to the Emperor in the Spring of 1664]*, Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények 84 [1980] 185–198), and the renewing program of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, which prepares microfilms of the Corvinus manuscripts, ancient, partly Eastern texts from the Vatican library, should be mentioned. Their direct results are shown in the CVH I/20, Appendix, II, n. III–IV.

³⁹⁸ For example: Erdély és a Porta 1594–1597. évi békealkudozásainak történetéhez [*On the History of Transylvania and the Porte's Peace Negotiations in 1594–1597*], Századok 137 (2003) 603–652. See his volume of *Erdély és a Szentsek [Transylvania and the Holy See]* published in the series of *Adattár... [Archives...]* of Szeged and its continuation: CVH I/5.

³⁹⁹ His study published in the series of the *Studia Theologica Budapestinensia: A trentói reformliturgia átvétele az esztergomi érseki tartomány területén Pázmány Péter érseksége alatt. A magyarországi rítusváltás történetének és hátterének bemutatása [The Adoption of the Reform-Liturgy of Trent in the Territory of the Archdiocese of Esztergom under the Archbishopric of Péter Pázmány. The Presentation of the History and Background of the Change of Rites in Hungary]*, Budapest 2003.

⁴⁰⁰ The outline of the already elaborated results and bibliography of my research in Rome in 1996–2000: *A magyar hierarchia és a pápaság a 17. században (Problémák és fordulópontok) [The Hungarian Hierarchy and the Papacy in the 17th Century (Problems and Turning Points)]*, Századok 136 (2002) 527–545; and *I vescovi ungheresi e la Santa Sede nel Seicento (Problemi e svolte decisive)*, Annuario dell'Accademia d'Ungheria in Roma, 2005 (the newest volumes of the *Annuario* see later).

⁴⁰¹ For example: *Bakócz Tamás és a szerzetesrendek (Esettanulmány) [Tamás Bakócz and the Monastic Orders (A Case Study)]*, TSz 44 (2002) 1–2, 21–64; *Crisis or Revival? The Hungarian Province of the Order of Augustinian Friars in the Late Middle Ages*, *Analecta Augustiniana* 67 (2004) 115–140; and CVH II/1.

tematic search of the *Fondo Barberini Latini*. She worked for some time at our advice and encouragement on the publication of the from Hungary submitted requests or applications (“*supplications*”) of the very important papal dicastery, the Apostolic Penitentiary, which were closed from the research work until the 1980s.⁴⁰²

All this is more likely to be late medieval research. And indeed, despite the early modern focus of the resurgent Vatican Hungarian studies, the results concerning the Middle Ages cannot be neglected. Enikő Csukovits’s work is definitely classed as medieval studies; she analysed the Roman pilgrimages in her monograph on the medieval Hungarian pilgrimages.⁴⁰³ András Kubinyi outlined the Hungarian existence in the Eternal City of the fifteenth century in his study.⁴⁰⁴ Not only did Péter E. Kovács, Péter Erdő, György Rácz, László Solymosi and Kornél Szovák conclude the medieval relations of the Holy See and Hungary in valuable studies, but they also examined the register-volumes of high esteem many times.⁴⁰⁵ Moreover, with the leadership of Iván Borsa and with the support of the Lajos Pásztor Scholarship founded by Edit Pásztor, Csukovits, Rácz and Szovák also made great strides in the complete collection of Hungarian requests (*supplicationes*) submitted to the Holy See in the Middle Ages.

The eighteenth century, which was favoured in the plans of the 1930s, has the most adverse lot. Luckily, György Tóth István’s researches reach across this period or at least its beginning. Primarily owing to Gábor Adriányi, the

⁴⁰² A „*Sacra Poenitentiaria Apostolica*” hivatala és magyar kérvényei a XV–XVI. században (I) [*The Office and the Hungarian Requests of the “Sacra Poenitentiaria Apostolica” in the XV–XVI. Century*], LK 74 (2003) 33–57; *Gyónás és áldozás a késő középkorban* [*Confession and Communion in the Late Middle Ages*], Századok 137 (2003) 525–548.

⁴⁰³ Apart from the above mentioned monograph: *A római Szentlélek-Társulat magyar tagjai* [*The Hungarian Members of the Holy Spirit Association in Rome*], Századok 134 (2000) 211–244.

⁴⁰⁴ *Magyarok a késő-középkori Rómában* [*Hungarians in Late Medieval Rome*], Studia Miskolciensia III, Miskolc 1999, 83–91.

⁴⁰⁵ *Magyarország és a Szentszék kapcsolatának ezer éve* [*One Thousand Years of the Connection between Hungary and the Holy See*], ed. by Zombori István, Budapest 1996.

doyen of the Hungarian church history,⁴⁰⁶ to István Eördögh and Márk Aurél Érszegi situation of the nineteenth and twentieth century is not that unfavourable. It is true, looking back from 2024, the academic achievements of both Eördögh⁴⁰⁷ and especially Márk Aurél Érszegi⁴⁰⁸ in the field of Hungarian historical research at the Vatican have unfortunately not at all fulfilled earlier hopes.

These more recent studies have been linked only sporadically and occasionally with a scientific institution in Hungary, and in the Eternal City have been largely deprived of any institutional framework.⁴⁰⁹ However, it should not be underestimated that from the 1990s the Hungarian Academy in Rome – which organized a range of exhibitions, conferences and screenings as early as in the 1970s and 1980s⁴¹⁰ – welcomed more and more researchers who visited the Vatican, even if they did not have a state scholarship. It shows the overture of a new period that throughout 1996, within the scope of the Hungarian Academy in Rome, the Vilmos Fraknoi Hungarian Institute of History in Rome was formally formed again, which became the member of the scientific “institute”, the International Association of the Ar-

⁴⁰⁶ Besides his publication mentioned in the previous note, also see his study of *Scitovszky és Simor érsekek harca a prímási jogokért* [*The Battle of Archbishops Scitovszky and Simor for the Rights of the Primate*] (Ministerio nemzetközi történész konferencia előadásai [ed. by István Bárdos–Margit Beke], Esztergom 1998, 29–38); and his book based on the documents of the Index Congregation and the Roman Inquisition made accessible in 1998, *Probászka és a Római Index* [*Probászka and the Roman Index*] (Budapest 2002).

⁴⁰⁷ For example: *A Rendkívüli Egyházi Ügyek Szent Kongregációja Levéltárának* [*Vatikánváros*] *a magyarországi egyházakra vonatkozó forrásai 1803–1903* [*The Hungarian Related Sources of the Archives of the Sacred Congregation of Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs 1803–1903*], Szeged 1992; *A pápai nunciatúra újraalakulása Magyarországon 1920-ban* (Ismeretlen római dokumentumok alapján) [*The Re-establishment of the Papal Nunciature in Hungary in 1920 (On the Basis of Unknown Roman Documents)*], TSz 39 (1997) 1, 99–110. See also CVH I/20, Appendix, II, n. 11.

⁴⁰⁸ *Il ristabilimento delle relazioni diplomatiche tra la Santa Sede e l'Ungheria 1918–1920* (Tesi di laurea), Trieste 1998. – The sources of the Hungarian embassy to the Holy See, which functioned between the two World Wars, and the works utilizing the related ministerial and church archival material organically contributes to the research of the relations of Hungary and the Holy See. Yet, their historical aspects due to their date of origin cannot be considered to be objective; their detailed citing is left out.

⁴⁰⁹ Except for the activity of the Hungarian Jesuits in their order's institute of history.

⁴¹⁰ These have some bibliographical traces, their reciting is omitted now. From the 1960s see: *Quaderni di documentazione, Accademia d'Ungheria in Roma* 1 (1960) – 4 (1963) [1–2: *Catalogo per titoli della Biblioteca dell'Accademia d'Ungheria in Roma*].

chaeological, Historical and Art Historical Institutes in Rome.⁴¹¹ Due to the re-foundation, there was a motion against the illegal situation that despite the obligation settled in the contract of donation in 1913, the Hungarian state possesses the Villa Fraknói without maintaining a *Hungarian institute of history* in the Eternal City. Yet, the contract with the granting bishop clearly states that the Hungarian state obliged itself to give the building (or the purchase price in case of sale) fifty-fifty to the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and the Saint Stephen Association in this case. This agreement is still in force, since it can be found in the contract, according to which the Hungarian state could have the building – at the moment the Hungarian embassy of the Vatican – in its own right.⁴¹²

⁴¹¹ The *Unione Internazionale degli Istituti di Archeologia, Storia e Storia dell'Arte in Roma* gathers solely the foreign institutes and the ones of Italy and the Vatican, which follow active scientific activities and it coordinates the researches of the Vatican collections. See «*Nobile munus*». *Origini e primi sviluppi dell'Unione Internazionale degli Istituti di Archeologia, Storia e Storia dell'Arte in Roma (1946–1953). Per la storia della collaborazione internazionale a Roma nelle ricerche umanistiche nel secondo dopoguerra*, a c. di ERLAND BILLIG–CARL NYLANDER–PAOLO VIAN, Roma 1996, 3–81 (and the later published selection of documents); see, furthermore, MASSIMO PALLOTTINO, *Introduzione – Un Centro mondiale di cultura umanistica: l'Unione Internazionale degli Istituti di archeologia, Storia e Storia dell'Arte in Roma, Speculum mundi*, 9–13 (with bibliography).

⁴¹² By thoroughly reading Fraknói's letter and the third point of the contract (CVH I/20, *Appendix*, III, n. 1–2; in English translation with the original document of the Roman land register below in this volume, *Documents*, n. 1 and 2, cf. above note 159) it remains an open question, whether it is permissible – even in case of the maintenance of a real scientific institute – that the villa or its profit would not be assigned to a Hungarian Institute of History in Rome. – As a matter of curiosity, the villa was temporarily regarded as the property of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences in 1948–1949, due to the 4th point of the contract of 1930 (CVH I/20, *Appendix* III, n. 12). (See the letter of József Huszti of 5 July 1949, in which he endeavours to prove the property of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences with documents. MTAKK RAL 1949/78, and *ibid.* K 1224/231–234.) Of course, if we look only at the text itself, from the fact that the MTA would have been entitled to the purchase price of the villa if it had been sold. However, from the deed of foundation and from the contract based on it (CVH I/20, *Appendix*, III, n. 1–2; and here, *Documents*, n. 1 and 2) it is obvious that the , or rather its Committee of History in Rome, could have obtained the money only to save Fraknói's purpose and the sum would have serve the needs of the Institute of History through the scholarly body. In a paradox way, from the following year, from the cessation of the Hungarian Academy in Rome's original objects and the Fraknói-institute, the academics – in accordance with the Saint Stephen Association – could have enforced their real claim to property. Moreover, they could enforce it still today, until the moment when the re-established Fraknói-institute's real constitu-

The old-new institutional unity exists only on paper. It lacks its own budget, head, personell, institutional regulation, rooms, members, plan of work and constant publications, etc. However, the present and future of Hungarian research of a great – sometimes turbulent – past in the Vatican, the exploration of the Hungarian sources in Rome and their presentation to the international scientific community will basically depend on the strengthening of the institutional autonomy of the Fraknói-institute within (*or outside*) the Hungarian Academy in Rome, on the reinforcement of its actual institutional and scientific character and on the establishment of a programme, which by being well-defined and purposeful could gather and coordinate the already existing powers and would focus categorially on the research in the Vatican. It is obvious that the worthiest form of keeping Vilmos Fraknói's memory alive is to continue his work according to particular professional aspects.⁴¹³

tional character, existence can be somehow questioned. In this respect, that would not mean an obstacle either that Hungarian Academy of Sciences dissolved its competent Committee, whose role was of primarily a practical nature and even if it rendered undying services to the defence of Fraknói's heritage, it could not continue its illustrious member's work in Rome. – To conclude my thoughts, I find it necessary to make it clear that the revival of the real Hungarian Institute of History in Rome – which is the evident duty of the Hungarian state – would require only minimal reorganization, as well as the initiation of the definitely complex professional capital which was presented on the previous pages and accumulated after the change of the social regime.

⁴¹³ Apart from the already noted bibliography of György Tóth István, a less remarkable volume is mentioned as a scientific initiative: *Hungarici monasterii ordinis Sancti Pauli primi heremitae de urbe Roma instrumenta et priorum registra*, ed. by LORENZ WEINRICH, Roma–Budapest 1999; *Lettere di Principi. Litterae Principum ad Papam (1518–1578). Fejedelmi levelek a pápának (1518–1578) [Princely Letters to the Pope (1518–1578)]*, ed. by JÓZSEF BESSENVEI, Roma–Budapest 2002 (Bibliotheca Academiae Hungariae – Roma. Fontes 2 and 3); Antal MOLNÁR, *Le Saint-Siège, Raguse et les missions catholiques de la Hongrie Ottomane 1572–1647*, Rome–Budapest 2007; *La Chiesa cattolica dell'Europa centro-orientale di fronte al comunismo, Atteggiamenti, strategie, tattiche*, a cura di ANDRÁS FEJÉRDY, Roma 2013; *L'Ungheria angioina*, a cura di ENIKŐ CSUKOVITS, Roma 2013 (Bibliotheca Academiae Hungariae – Roma. Studia 1. 2. 3). These seem to be very modest results in the recent years. – See also *Annuario dell'Accademia d'Ungheria. Studi e documenti italo-ungheresi*, 1996, 1998–1999, 2000–2001, 2002, 1998–2002, 2004, 2002–2004, 2005, Ricordi Ungheresi, Numero Speciale, Il palazzo Falconieri, 2005–2006 e 2006–2007 2007–2008 e 2008–2009 (8–20), a cura di JÓZSEF PÁL–LÁSZLÓ CSORBA–GYÖRGY KOMLÓSSY, NÓRA PÁLMAI–ZSUZSA KOVÁCS–ÉVA VÍGH, Roma e Roma–Szeged e Szeged 1997–2010. These volumes contain publications based on partly Roman and Italian researches. Unfortunately the *Annuario* in 2010 ceased to exist.

One can have confidence about the future for one reason: in 2004, as the continuation of the *Monumenta Vaticana Hungariae*, the series of *Collectanea Vaticana Hungariae*⁴¹⁴ was launched under the editorship of the Church History Research Team of the Pázmány Péter Catholic University, through which this outline on the history of research can also be published. Above all, from 2012 the research team, which resides in Budapest partly as a little institute of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (MTA-PPKE ‘Lendület’ Church History Research Institute) and enjoys its enhanced support, can continue its work, which means that after more than fifty years of halt, the most dignified Hungarian scientific body – even if only partially yet – could again institutionally participate in Hungarian research in the Vatican.

⁴¹⁴ See the home page of the series: <https://institutumfraknoi.hu/en/kiadvanyok/cvh> and the next, VII. Chapter.

VII

Hungarian Research in the Vatican in the 21st Century (An Outlook)

In 2024 by continuing the text of Chapter I–VI that were written and published in Hungarian two decades ago,⁴¹⁵ the focus should be put on the content of Chapter VI's last part. At the time, in 2004 I considered the development of the “*Istituto Storico «Fraknoi»*”s – that formally existed within the Hungarian Academy of Rome – actual and effective academic institutional character as one of the pillars of the systematic Hungarian research in the Vatican.⁴¹⁶ The future did not satisfy these expectations. In 1996, an attempt to restore the structural framework that had evolved in the late 1920s started, turned quickly to ashes. The “*Istituto Storico «Fraknoi»*” survived the Hungarian Academy of Rome's merge into the Institute of Balassi in 2006; until 2011 it had its own director, who also operated as the scientific director of the Hungarian Academy of Rome besides the “proper” director. Yet, since 2011 there is no scientific director, and in the last years, the existence of the “*Istituto Storico «Fraknoi»*” was mainly marked by the director himself, apart from the invitations of the casual events. If not otherwise, they appeared at least in the almanac of the *Unione Internazionale degli Istituti di Archeologia, Storia e Storia dell'Arte in Roma* that is

⁴¹⁵ CVH I/1 (and CVH I/exc.), ccxv–ccxxix). Open access: https://institutumfraknoi.hu/en/hungary_propugnaculum_western_christianity_documents_vatican_secret_archives_ca_1214_1606. The English summaries: CVH I/1, 305–319 (and CVH I/exc., ccxv–ccxxix).

⁴¹⁶ Cf. in more detail in Hungarian CVH I/1 (and CVH I/exc.), civ–cvi (= CVH I/20, Chapter II, especially 104–106).

published in every second year and on its website.⁴¹⁷ In 2016, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs started to assume direct authority over the Hungarian Academy of Rome. *Collegium Hungaricum Roma* became the official name of the institution. Since 2016 (effectively since the previous year), the position of the scientific secretary ceased to exist. With this momentum, the attempt starting in 1996 to revive Fraknói's Hungarian Institute of History in Rome came to an end. The "Istituto Storico «Fraknói»" is not even mentioned in the relating new government regulation, besides it also disappeared from the website of the *Collegium Hungaricum Roma*.⁴¹⁸

History has obviously repeated itself. The institute that was removed from the Fraknói Villa to the Falconieri Palace between the two world wars and was incorporated into the Hungarian Academy of Rome – that was established by Count Kuno Klebelsberg in 1927 – showed several symptoms of crisis as early as the 1930s. The rehousing itself was not the core of the problem: it was the independent institutional character's withering, as described above in Chapter V. Thereupon, the failure came because this character could not develop after 1996.

⁴¹⁷ <http://www.unioneinternazionale.it/istituti-membri/istituti-membri-non-italiani/>. – The relating notes of the almanacs: *Unione Internazionale degli Studi di Archeologia Storia e Storia dell'Arte in Roma*. Annuario 45–53 (2003–2012), Rome 2003–2011, 91–93, 97–98, 103–104, 215–219, 101–102, 105–106, 109–110, 105–106; and 54–59 (2012–2018) Rome 2012–2018, 269–273, 121–123, 113–115, 119–121, 165–168, 460–463. In the n. 54 the important elements of the activity in 2007/2008–2012 (269–273) and in the n. 59 the activity in 2012–2017 (460–463) are surveyed in retrospect. It is clearly proven here that the representation of Klebelsberg's concept, which can be traced back to 1927, is undoubtedly in question. The institution that bears the name of *Collegium Hungaricum Roma* since 2016 should be indicated as a member of the *Unione Internazionale*. The "Istituto Storico «Fraknói»" as such has not been operating since 2011/2016, neither formally nor seemingly. It should be noted that in the meantime, the *Istituto Storico Slovacco di Roma* established in 2014 by state foundation undertakes serious and spectacular work concerning research in the Vatican archives, (too). Cf. n. 56, 117–119, n. 57, 123–126, n. 58, 169–173, n. 59, 464–472 (with the list of the compelling accomplishment in 2014–2017). – The story, which is annually cited by the prestigious almanach's *Cenni Storici* column, can be ended. (JÓZSEF PÁL, *L'Istituto Storico «Fraknói» presso l'Accademia d'Ungheria di Roma*, *Annuario* 40 [1998–1999] [Roma 1998], 167–179; cf. e.g. n. 59, p. 21, note 16). The continuance of the heritage of Vilmos Fraknói's institution requires the opening of a new chapter.

⁴¹⁸ However, the name of the non-existent "Istituto Storico «Fraknói»" still can be found on the website and almanac of the *Unione Internazionale*, the head of the *Collegium Hungaricum Roma* is indicated as director. Cf. the previous note.

It is a sad fact that within the framework of the Hungarian Academy of Rome the organization and systematism – therefore the results – of Vilmos Fraknói's *Monumenta Vaticana* and the Hungarian Institute of History in Rome could not have been realized concerning the methodical research in the Vatican neither in the past, nor at present. Despite the mastery of many unique works, the structure of the publications virtually shows the same unsystematic feature in the third millennium as in the era between the two world wars. By 2010 the “*Annuario. Studi e documenti italo-ungheresi*”⁴¹⁹ and by 2018 the *Bibliotheca Academiae Hungariae – Roma* seemed to conclude their hectic nature,⁴²⁰ especially because the name of the institution in this form ceased to exist, as we could see, it was changed to *Collegium Hungaricum Roma* in 2016.

It is certain that the heritage of the Hungarian Academy of Rome, established by Count Kuno Klebelsberg in 1927, has a representant in the Eternal City. The institution, called from 2016 *Collegium Hungaricum Roma* has more or less been fulfilling the function of nursing the Italian-Hungarian connections and promoting Hungary in Italy, for which reason Klebelsberg established it. In contrast to Klebelsberg's, the true heritage of Vilmos Fraknói is without institutional representative or permanent protector in the Eternal City. This heritage is precisely palpable while holding the volumes of the *Monumenta Vaticana* and the *Monumenta Romana Episcopatus Vesprimiensis*, the chief enterprise of the Hungarian Institute of History in Rome: they are methodical and sequential basic research in the Vatican collections; the systematic exploitation of the *Hungarica*-material, and then its organized and systematic publication, and its analysis in a relevant way for the Hungarian as well as in-

⁴¹⁹ *Annuario 1998–2002*, a cura di László Csorba–Gyöngyi Komlóssy, Roma 2005; *Annuario 2002–2004*, a cura di László Csorba–Gyöngyi Komlóssy, Roma 2005; *Annuario 2005–2006. 2006–2007*, a cura di Nóra Pálmai, Roma 2010; *Annuario*, a cura di József Pál, Roma–Szeged 2004; *Annuario*, a cura di József Pál, Roma–Szeged 2005; *Florio Banfi: Ricordi Ungheresi in Italia* (Annuario), a cura di Péter Sárközy, Roma–Szeged 2005; the Hungarian version: *Florio Bánfi: Magyar emlékek Itáliában* (Magyar–olasz tanulmányok. Studi e documenti italo-ungheresi) [Hungarian Memories in Italy], ed. by Péter Sárközy–Zsuzsa Kovács, Szeged 2005.

⁴²⁰ Cf. <https://www.viella.it/catalogo/collana/52>. – The completion of György Tóth István's – who died in 2005 – earlier mentioned grandiose source-publication should be particularly commemorated: the Volume III and IV of the *Litterae missionariorum de Hungaria et Transilvania* (1572–1717) were published in 2005, while Volume V in 2008.

ternational academic community. Our historiographical survey of these enterprises in this book duly illustrates them.⁴²¹

* * *

Apart from the functional revival of Vilmos Fraknói's establishment and heritage in Rome, the other pillar I did find crucial in terms of the Hungarian historical research's potential future twenty years ago upon the methodical re-organization was the establishment of a "Hungarian scientific institutional basis". I clearly determined its tasks to provide an opportunity to access the international secondary literature in Hungary, to teach the new generation and to publish the old and new research results in an effective way.⁴²²

The Hungarian scientific institutional and tender system proved to be convenient to meet this challenge. The institutional background of the *Collectanea Vaticana Hungariae*'s foundation and its first volumes was provided by the Church Historical Research Group of the Catholic University bearing the name of Péter Pázmány, which was established by Rector Péter Erdő in 1999. This inter-faculty, practically virtual body created ideal professional circumstances for the beginning.⁴²³

The ten volumes (I/1–7 and II/1–3) of the CVH published in two classes before 2012 included earlier made – kept in manuscripts – and recent research results. The organically created relationship with the Central-European and church historical research centre of the University of Viterbo, personally with Gaetano Platania and Matteo Sanfilippo had particularly great significance during the archival works in the Vatican. The volume of studies of *Gli archivi della Santa Sede e il Regno d'Ungheria* (CVH I/4) – which was compiled with a broad international collaboration and was dedicated to the memory of Lajos

⁴²¹ In more detail in Hungarian: CVH I/20, pp. 6–13, notes 7–31. – The following newly occurred link completely misleadingly suggests that the "Istituto Storico «Fraknói»" would operate in Rome: <https://culture.hu/it/roma/istitutostoricofraknoi> (14. 01. 2022.). At present, it has no legal background whatsoever, neither does it have scientific activity in the field of the research in the Vatican.

⁴²² See above, note 415.

⁴²³ The history of the *Collectanea Vaticana*'s foundation was already written in 2004. In English: CVH I/1, 320–322 (in more length in Hungarian: *ibid.*, CIXC–CXCI.).

Pásztor – was the initial result of this cooperation.⁴²⁴ The entering into the ‘Impetus’ program of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences in 2012 raised the research in the Vatican and the *Collectanea Vaticana* – that takes on the heritage of the *Monumenta Vaticana* – to new dimensions. On the one hand, the era of financial insecurity ended. In the past, one could have reached Rome only through various fellowship programmes, even for brief periods; therefore, this insecurity factor, which caused many problems, from 2012 mostly disappeared. The availability of the historical sources became more secure. Furthermore, and more significantly, a functional academic research group started to support the CVH that put the research in the Vatican in their focus with an independent budget. The attention surrounding the ‘Impetus’-program contributed to the indoctrination and propagation of the research in the Vatican’s past, present, and its significance. Above all, thanks to the ‘Impetus’ programme, the Hungarian Academy of Sciences – that started and supported the programme – restored its decisive role in organizing the exploratory research in the Vatican. The word ‘restore’ does not imply the academic committee that controlled the Hungarian Historical Institute in Rome and the Fraknói Villa and was dissolved in 1948, but Vilmos Fraknói, who was not only the canon of Nagyvárad and the abbot of Szekszárd at the time of the *Monumenta Vaticana*’s publication and the related research (1881–1892), but he was also the Hungarian Academy of Sciences’ secretary general, and then its vice-president (1879–1889 and 1889–1892). The Hungarian academic society – that was founded in 1825 – participated in the establishment of the Hungarian scientific positions in Rome not only through its illustrious leaders, but also in an institutional form, which is proven by its book-packages available on the open-shelves of the Vatican Library.⁴²⁵

In 2017, the research group adopted the name of Vilmos Fraknói, the founder of the Hungarian historical research in the Vatican. About the work of the Vilmos Fraknói Vatican Research Group: the Hungarian-English bilingual website of the group serves with regular and informative orientation about their academic programmes in Hungary, as well as in Rome (*institutumfraknoi.hu*). Among them, one can find there the scientific events organized in the *Università Pontificia Gregoriana* (2012 and 2015), in the *Università Pontificia della Santa*

⁴²⁴ See the complete list of the CVH-volumes below at the end of the chapter.

⁴²⁵ Cf. CVH I/20, note II/49.

Croce (2019) and in the *Istituto di Studi Romani* (2019) on the *Aventinus*.⁴²⁶ Besides, the grand international conferences on the history of the papacy – organized in 2013 in the Károlyi Palace and in 2018 in the hall of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences⁴²⁷ – and the publications issued based on their content are also mentioned. Above all, the website lists the result of the systematic research in the Vatican published in the framework of the CVH, and makes them available in their entirety; there are 23 volumes in two classes (CVH I/8–22 and CVH II/4–10) from 2012–2023. All their important and relevant theses for the international academic community can be read in their English summaries; besides the Latin and Italian texts of the publications can also be used by the international history of papacy.

The volumes with bilingual front page can be downloaded for free: <https://institutumfraknoi.hu/en/kiadvanyok/cvh>.⁴²⁸

Collectanea Vaticana Hungariae 2004–2023

CLASSIS I. ARTNER EDGÁR, “Hungary as Propugnaculum of Western Christianity”. *Documents from the Vatican Secret Archives (ca 1214–1606)* (CVH I/1), ed. by SZOVÁK KORNÉL–TÖRÖK JÓZSEF–TUSOR PÉTER, Budapest–Róma 2004 [CCVI + 336 p.] – TUSOR PÉTER, *Hungarian Historical Research in the Vatican* (CVH I/1exc.), Budapest–Róma 2004 [CCXXIX p.] – GALLA FERENC, *Franciscan Missionaries in Hungary: in the Kingdom*

⁴²⁶ See the details of the mentioned events: <https://institutumfraknoi.hu/en/kronologia/>. – The presentation of the *Formularium Ecclesiae Strigoniensis* (Collectanea Studiorum et Textuum I/4) in the presence of Cardinal Péter Erdő was an important Roman event of the Fraknoi Research Group in the *Istituto Claretiano* on the *Giamicolo*, although it is not a part of the research in the Vatican. Cf. https://institutumfraknoi.hu/en/birek/formularium_ecclesiae_strigoniensis_introduction_fraknoi_research_group_rome.

⁴²⁷ See https://institutumfraknoi.hu/en/birek/international_symposium_organised_fraknoi_research_group

⁴²⁸ Here and now it seems sufficient to list only the most important results and publications. The functioning of the CVH, the Fraknoi Research Group, and the other valuable and less valuable results produced after 2004 will be the subject of a detailed inventory and classification by future historiographers. A fine example of an understanding and appreciative academic reception: GÉZA HEGYI, *Újjáéledő hungarikafeltárás a Vatikáni Titkos Levéltárban. Regesta Supplicationum 1522–1523...* [Reviving the search for Hungarica in the Vatican Secret Archives. *Regesta Supplicationum 1522–1523...*], Erdélyi Múzeum 81 (2019) 1, 135–138. See also: ANTAL MOLNÁR, *Accademia d'Ungheria in Roma. Le ricerche ungheresi nell'Archivio Segreto Vaticano (1980–2010)*, Religiosa Archivorum Custodia. IV Centenario della Fondazione dell'Archivio Segreto Vaticano (1612–2012). Atti del Convegno di Studi. Città del Vaticano. 17–18 aprile 2012 (CAV 98), Città del Vaticano 2015, 686–698.

and in Transylvania during the 17th and 18th Centuries (CVH I/2), ed. by FAZEKAS ISTVÁN, Budapest–Róma 2005 [xx + 408 p.] – TUSOR PÉTER, *Purpura Pannonica. The “Cardinalitial See” of Strigonium and its Antecedents in the 17th Century* (CVH I/3), Budapest–Róma 2005 [334 p.] – *Gli archivi della Santa Sede e il regno d’Ungheria (secc. 15–20). In memoriam di Lajos Pásztor* (CVH I/4), a cura di GAETANO PLATANIA–MATTEO SANFILIPPO–PÉTER TUSOR, Budapest–Róma 2008 [xviii + 322 p.] – KRUPPA TAMÁS, *Transilvania and the Papacy in the Age of the Báthorys. Documents II (1595–1613)* (CVH I/5), Budapest–Róma–Szeged 2009 [xxxi + 303 p.] – TAMÁS TÓTH, «*Si nullus incipiat, nullus finiet*». *La rinascita della Chiesa d’Ungheria dopo la conquista turca nell’attività di Gábor Patachich e di Ádám Patachich, Arcivescovi di Kalocsa–Bács (1733–1784)* (CVH I/6), Budapest–Róma–Szeged 2011 [374 p.] – TUSOR PÉTER–NEMES GÁBOR, *Consistorialia Documenta Pontificia de Regnis Sacrae Coronae Hungariae (1426–1605)* (CVH I/7), Budapest–Róma 2011 [lxviii + 304 p.] – *Hungary and the Holy See of Rome. [I:] Sources and Perspectives (Studies in Honour of Cardinal Erdő)* (CVH I/8), ed. by TUSOR PÉTER, Budapest–Róma 2012 [466 p.] – *Cameralia Documenta Pontificia de Regnis Sacrae Coronae Hungariae (1297–1536). I: Obligationes, Solutiones. II: Divisiones, Provisiones, Visitationes, Quindennia, Rationes, Annatae, Obligationes particulares, Legationes, Varia, Taxae*, ed. † LUKSICS JÓZSEF–TUSOR PÉTER–FEDELES TAMÁS ET AL. (NEMES GÁBOR; KOLTAI ANDRÁS–KALOTAI NOÉMI–KISS GERGELY–MATUS ZSANETT; C. TÓTH NORBERT–BUJDOSÓ ÁDÁM) (CVH I/9–10), Budapest–Róma 2014 [lxiv + 384 p. és 488 p.] – GALLA FERENC, *The Pauline Order’s Missions in Hungary in the 17–18th Centuries* (CVH I/11), ed. by FAZEKAS ISTVÁN, Budapest–Róma 2015 [x+536 p.] – NEMES GÁBOR, *Brevia Clementina. The Hungarian-related Breves of Pope Clement VII (1523–1526)* (CVH I/12), Budapest–Győr–Róma 2015 [xxii + 207. p.] – TUSOR PÉTER, *Pázmány, the Jesuit Prelate. His Appointment as Primate of Hungary, 1615–1616 (A Micropolitical Study)* (CVH I/13), Budapest–Róma 2016 [460 p.] – TÓTH KRISZTINA–TUSOR PÉTER, *Inventarium Vaticanum I. The Archives of the Apostolic Nunciature in Budapest (1920–1939)* (CVH I/14), Budapest–Róma 2016 [lxii + 360 p.] – *Hungary and the Holy See of Rome. II: Hungarian Historical Research of the 21st Century in the Vatican [Studies in Honour of the 70 year-old Professor József Török]* (CVH I/15), ed. by TUSOR PÉTER–SZOVÁK KORNÉL–FEDELES TAMÁS, Budapest–Róma 2017 [436 p.] – LAKATOS BÁLINT, *Regesta Supplicationum, 1522–1523. The Supplications Relating to the Kingdom of Hungary Approved under Pope Hadrian VI* (CVH I/16), Budapest–Róma 2018 [288 p.] – KRUPPA TAMÁS, *Papal Troops in Hungary (1595–1597, 1601) [The Correspondence of Gianfrancesco Aldobrandini]*, Budapest–Róma 2020 [xxix + 290. p.] – FEDELES TAMÁS, *Ordinationum Documenta Pontificia de Regnis Sacrae Coronae Hungariae (1426– 1523). Ex Libris Formatarum Camerae Apostolicae collecta* (CVH I/18), Budapest–Róma 2021 [lxxxvi + 576 p.] – TUSOR PÉTER, *Lósy, Lippay, Szelepcbény. Microbiographical Studies from the Early Modern Age (With the Verbalis of Enquiry Processes, 1625–1666)* (CVH I/19), Budapest–Róma 2022 [368 p.] – TUSOR PÉTER, *Monumenta and Collectanea. Hungarian Historical Research in the Vatican (1881–2021)* (CVH I/20), Budapest– Róma 2022 [262 p.] – *Hungary and the Holy See of Rome III. Exquisiteae lucubrationes Cornelio Szovák amicabilem dicatae* (CVH I/21), ed. by TUSOR PÉTER–KANÁSZ VIKTOR, Budapest–Róma 2022 [468 p.] – GIULIO MERLANI, *Papato e politica internazionale nel Seicento. Il nunzio Francesco Buonvisi alla corte di Leopoldo*

I d'Asburgo imperatore e re d'Ungheria (CVH I/22), Budapest–Roma 2023 [280 p.] – **CLASSIS II.** GABRIELLA ERDÉLYI, *The Register of a Convent Controversy (1517–1518). Pope Leo X, Cardinal Bakócz, the Augustinians and the Observant Franciscans in Contest* (CVH II/1), Budapest–Roma 2006 [LXXXVIII + 230 p.] – TAMÁS VÉGHSEŐ, „*Catholic reformare*”. Ágoston Benkovich O.S.P.P.E., *missionario apostolico, vescovo di Várad (1631–1702)* (CVH II/2), Budapest–Roma 2007 [430 p.] – GALLA FERENC, *Pontifical Provisions, Faculties and Commissions in Transylvania, Habsburg and Ottoman Hungary (1550–1711)* (CVH II/3), ed. by TUSOR PÉTER–TÓTH KRISZTINA, Budapest–Roma 2010 [XXII + 202 p.] – PÉTER TUSOR, *The Papal Consistories and Hungary in the 15th–16th Centuries. To the History of the Hungarian Royal Patronage and Supremacy* (CVH II/4), Budapest–Roma 2012 [186 p.] – KRUPPA TAMÁS, *The Cross, the Eagle and the Dragon's tooth. Plans for an anti-Ottoman league and battles against the Ottomans in the Báthory era (1578–1597)* (CVH II/5), Budapest–Roma 2014 [516 p.] – TUSOR PÉTER, *Péter Pázmány's Process of Enquiry. His Family, Catholicisation, Missions (With the Papers of the Pázmány–Tholdy Archives)* (CVH II/6), Budapest–Roma 2017 [462 p.] – ROTRAUD BECKER–PÉTER TUSOR, “*Negozio del S.r Card. Pasman*”. *Péter Pázmány's Imperial Embassy to Rome in 1632 (With Unpublished Vatican Documents)* (CVH II/7), Budapest–Roma 2019 [482 p.] – ANTONÍN KALOUS, *The Legation of Angelo Pecchinoli at the Court of the King of Hungary (1488–1490)* (CVH II/8), Budapest–Roma 2021 [LXXIX + 307 p.] – KRUPPA TAMÁS, *Ferenc Forgách Chaturary. Letters and Papers (1586–1615)* (CVH II/9), Budapest–Roma 2022 [XXXIII + 496 p.] – NEMES GÁBOR, *Repertorium Documentorum Pontificiorum in Regnis Sacrae Coronae Hungariae existentium* (CVH II/10), Budapest–Roma 2022 [XXV + 342] – **CLASSIS III.** TÓTH KRISZTINA, *The Apostolic See and the Consequences of the Treaty of Trianon in the Church Administration* (CVH III/1), Budapest–Roma 2021 [44 p.]

This is not only a symbolic link to the historiographical preliminaries, but also a real and effective institutional link: to Fraknói, who established the Monumenta Vaticana as the secretary general of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, and to the academic Roman Historical Committee which was in function until 1948. At the same time, it is still the challenge of the future to unite Fraknói's institutional and scientific heritage in Rome with functionality.⁴²⁹

⁴²⁹ On the institutional and scientific heritage see besides the above mentioned, CVH II/20, *Appendix* (pp. 117–190.). It contains a short description of the Vatican bequests (collections and manuscripts) of the Hungarian researchers (I), of microfilms and photos in Hungary from the Vatican collections (II), and some historiographical documents from 1913–1938 (III). The purpose of its compilation is, on the one hand, to survey hitherto unpublished research results and, on the other hand, to illustrate (with original documents) the material contained in this historiographical summary. And of course above all in this volume, *Documents*, n. 1 and 2.

The Hungarian state's newly founded archival delegation in the Vatican may have offered a solution for this. The delegation, which was established in 2020–2021 based on a Viennese model, will operate under the authority of the Hungarian embassy to the Holy See residing in the Fraknói Villa, which was originally built for the institute of history and was granted to the Hungarian state.⁴³⁰

Unfortunately, however, it has so far failed to live up to expectations. The activities of the Hungarian archival “delegation” at the Vatican are from the point of view of the heritage of Vilmos Fraknói i.e. the exploratory archival research in the Vatican collections and the scholarship based on it, they can be said to be as dysfunctional in 2024 as the functioning of the Hungarian Academy of Rome was in the past and has been ever since.

⁴³⁰ See in more detail in Hungarian: CVH I/20, pp. 13–20*, notes 32–50.

Documents

I.

22 January 1913, Budapest

Vilmos Fraknói to Count János Zichy

– translation from Hungarian –⁴³¹

Your Excellency Count, Minister of Religion and Education!

In the belief that the ancient monuments and scientific and artistic treasures of Rome have not lost the educating and ennobling influence that they exerted in the past, furthermore being guided by the wish that Hungary could join the educated nations which maintain scientific and artistic institutes in the Eternal City: I raised two magnificent buildings for the reception of history buffs, painters and sculptors.⁴³²

As Your Excellency resolved on the establishment of a Hungarian institute of history in Rome upon the proposition of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, and provided the covering of its maintenance's expenses in the budget of 1913: for the purposes of this institute, I offer and bestow my house on the corner of Piazza del Policlinico and the Via Falloppio with its land of 780 square meters (including the built in plot), which is depicted by the attached picture and plan.⁴³³

⁴³¹ Signature: MTAKK 1224/3. The letter seems to be original.

⁴³² This *praeambulum* almost literally corresponds to the draft of the deed of foundation from 1904, which I have already mentioned in my study. See within the text under note 145.

⁴³³ The supplements are missing but can be found (along with another variant reading): OSzKK Fol. Hung. 1749.

Similarly, I offer my library of the given house (which will be completed by my book stock in Budapest), furthermore my furniture and other personal properties, out of which I reserve the portrait of Pázmány, a painting of Ligeti and two Sévre-lamps.

Regarding this matter, I take the liberty of proposing the following:

1. By bestowing the house to the state, I could make no objections if it purchased it and allotted the income to the purposes of the institute if the circumstances demand that. However, in case the government renounces the maintenance of the institute, I wish the sum to be shared between the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and the Saint Stephen Association.

2. Half of the amortisation loan of 55,000 liras – which was taken out from the cassa di risparmio financial institution for the process of construction and mortgaged the two buildings – should be partly imposed on the institute bestowed on the state, and from 1 January 1913, the remittance of 1,726 liras, as well as the tax and the insurance charges should be covered by the state from the budget of the institute.

3. Nicolo Onori, who has been serving me for eight years, should be employed by the institute.

4. My Roman lawyer, Mister Emidio Marconi (27 Via Sistina) shall be entrusted with the legal processes of the building's transference under the supervision of the imperial and royal embassy and the chief consulate; since the necessary documents are kept by him.

After all, I respectfully ask to accept my offer and donation and to take measures to issue the deed of gift.

With all my deep respect, I remain Your Excellency's humble servant

Vilmos Fraknói

22 January 1913, Budapest

2.

3 March 1913, Budapest

*Deed of gift between the Hungarian state and Vilmos Fraknói*⁴³⁴

Vitorio Emanuele Terzo

Per grazia di Dio e per volontà della Nazione

Re d'Italia

L'anno millenovecento tredici il giorno venti Ottobre in Roma

Innanzi di me Dr. Francesco Stame r. notaro in Roma con studio in piazza di Pietra No. 26 iscritto al Consilio Notarile di questo distretto.

Si é costituito il Sig. Avvocato Emidio Marconi di Pietro nato e domiciliato a Roma. Il medesimo e a me noatio cognito e dichiara di rinunciare alla assistenza dei testimoni.

Detto Avv. Marconi mi deposita per che io notaro li conservi tra i miei rogiti i seguenti documenti.

1) Atto di donazione stipulato a Budapest il 5 maggio 1913 dal Notario Aladár Kiss registrato a Roma il 9 agosto 1913 No. 3362 atti privati, volume 282 con L. 7844.60 con raltiva traduzione ll allegata.

2) Atto 24 settembre 1913 visto dal R. Consolato Generale d'Italia a Budapest registrato a Roma il 5 ottobre 1913 No. 5632 atti privati, volume 302 con L. 3.66.

Io notaio allego al presente atto i detti due documenti sotto le lettere "A" e "B". Il comparente mi esonera dal dare lettura di detti allegati dichiarando di averne esatta conoscenza.

Atto fatto e letto nel mio studio da me notaro al Sig. Comparente il quale si firma con me notaro e da me interpellato mi dichiara che questo atto scritto da

⁴³⁴ Typed true copy. The Italian parts of the document are original. Signature: Archivio Notarile Superiore di Roma, Repertorio No. 13072, Deposito di documenti fatto dal Sig. Avv. Emilio Marconi.

persona cioè da notaro in uni circa tre pagnie di un foglio e conforme alle sua volontà.

[Firmato] Avv. Emidio Marconi]

[F.to] Francesco Stame

Registrato a Roma il 6 Novembre 1913 al No. 3170 del Reg. 344 Atti Pubbl.
Esatte Lire Trentasei e centesimi sessantasei

Il Ricevitore [F.to] Fiorini ||

Allegato “A”

496/1913. ügyszám

Hiteles kiadmány

Közjegyzői okirat

Én Kiss Aladár, budapesti királyi közjegyző az alulírott helyen és napon megjelentem a magyar képviselőházban, ahol is dr. Jankovich Béla valóságos belső titkos tanácsos, magyar királyi vallás- és közoktatásügyi miniszter úr (lakása Budapesten VII. Rákoczi út 6. szám), kit személyesen ismerek és Fraknói Vilmos ur, választott püspök, szentjobbi apát, nagyváradi latin szertartású kanonok (lakása Budapesten a Nemzeti Muzeumban), kit szintén személyesen ismerek és akinek itt megjelölt lakásán szintén megjelentem, közjegyzői okiratba foglalták a következő közöttük létrejött

AJÁNDÉKOZÁSI SZERZŐDÉST

Mely egyrészről a magyar állam nevében Jankovich Béla v. b. t. t., vallás- és közoktatásügyi m. kir. Miniszter, Béla fia, másrészről Fraknói Vilmos Sándor fia, választott püspök, szentjobbi apát, nagyváradi latin szertartású kanonok között a következő feltételek alatt kötötten.

1. Fraknói Vilmos, Sándor fia a jelen okirat || erejénél fogva 1913. (ezerkilencszáztizenharmadik) évi január 1-től kezdődő hatályossággal öröktu-

lajdonul és visszavonhatatlanul odaajándékozza és tényleges birtokába bocsátja a magyar államnak egy Rómában létesítendő Magyar Történeti Intézet céljaira az Olaszországban, Róma városában fekvő és az ő kizárólagos tulajdonát képező telkét a rajta fölépült házzal és minden berendezéssel együtt, nevezetesen a házban létező könyvtárral, úgyszintén a benne levő összes bútorokkal és minden ingóságokkal. Ez a telek az egykori Patrizzi villa területén álló kétemeletes lakóházat körülvéve kerttel foglal magában, amelynek a beépített telek beszámításával kiterjedése 780 (hét-száznyolcvan) négyzetméter, ^a a telek ki van tüntetve a római 65. telek-könyvi térképen 864. szám alatt. Bejárata a Policlinico téren; határai a Policlinico tér (Corso d'Italia), a Falloppio és Cesalpino utcák, végre az ajándékozónak megmaradó területe^a.⁴³⁵

A házban létező ingóságok közül egyedül a Pázmány Péter arczképét ábrázoló festményt, aztán a Ligeti magyar festőművész által készített festményt és végre még két darab Sévre-lámpát vesz ki az ajándékozó püspök a jelen szerződésből, mely tárgyakra nézve a saját tulajdonjogát és szabad rendelkezését ezentúlra is korlátlanul || fönntartja.

2. A magyar állam a jelen szerződés 1. pontjában körülírt ajándékozást egész terjedelmében ezennel joghatályosan elfogadja.

3. Az ajándékozó püspök megengedi, hogy az 1. pontban körülírt ingatlanra vonatkozólag a korlátlan és kizárólagos tulajdonjog a magyar állam által kijelentett elfogadás alapján ennek nevére teljes és végleges hatályossággal nyilvánkönyvileg átírható legyen. Megengedi továbbá az ajándékozó azt is, hogy a magyar állam az ajándékul kapott telket, házat és azoknak összes berendezési tárgyait bármikor és egyedül a saját független megítélése és elhatározása szerint eladhassa, elidegeníthesse, elcserélhesse, szóval bármily módon az ingatlant és tartozékait értékesíthesse és aztán ebből az értékesítésből befolyandó összeget fordíthassa a Rómában létesítendő Magyar Történeti Intézet céljaira. Csakis azt köti ki az ajándékozó, mit a megajándékozott magyar állam kötelezőleg elfogad, hogy abban az esetben, ha a magyar állam valamikor ennek a Magyar Történeti Intézetnek Rómában leendő fönntartásáról lemond-

⁴³⁵ The part ^{a-a} misses from the copy MTAKK K 1224/148, published in CVH I/1exc, CXLI–CXLIH.

na, úgy az ingatlan és berendezése, illetőleg az időközben netán eladott teleknek, háznak és berendezési || tárgyakkal a befolyt értéke egyenlő fele-fele részben a Magyar Tudományos Akadémia és a Szent István Társulat között lesz megosztandó.⁴³⁶

4. A magyar állam, mint megajándékozott, ezennel kötelezőleg kijelenti, hogy beleegyezik abba, miszerint a Fraknoi Vilmos püspök által az ajándékozás tárgyát képező telket jelzálogilag terhelőleg a római Cassa di risparmio nevű pénzügyintézet-től fölvetett 55 000 (szóval ötvenötezer) líra törlesztéses kölcsöntőke felerészben a jelen szerződés tárgyát képező ingatlant is terhelje, és ebből kifolyólag a magyar állam kötelezi magát arra, hogy a szóban levő jelzálogos kölcsön felerésze után a törlesztési járulékot, vagyis évenként 1726 (szóval egyezerhét-százhuszonhat) lírát 1913. (ezerkilencszáztizenharmadik) évi január 1-től kezdődőleg a sajátjából fizeti, ezenfölül pedig a magyar állam kötelezi magát arra, hogy az ajándékul kapott ingatlanra eső összes adókat és közterheket, valamint a biztosítás díját is 1913. január 1-től kezdődő hatállyal ugyancsak a sajátjából hordozza.

5. A magyar állam kötelezőleg kijelenti, hogy || az ajándékul nyert házban ez idő szerint kapus gyanánt alkalmazott Onori Miklós szolgát a Magyar Történeti Intézet céljaira átveszi és alkalmazza mindaddig, ameddig a nevezett szolgálatát képes tenni.

6. A jelen ajándékozási szerződés kiállításával, hitelesítésével, olasz nyelvre hiteles alakban leendő átfordításával, úgyszintén az okmány alapján a római nyilvánkönyvi hatóságoknál keresztülviendő tulajdonjogi átíratással fölmerülő összes költségeket és jogügyleti illeket a magyar állam^b és Fraknoi Vilmos püspök, az utóbbi által 1913. (ezerkilencszáztizenharmadik) évi március 29. (huszonkilencedik) napján kiállított és 45242/1913. vallás- és közoktatásügyi miniszteri szám alatt iktatott megajándékozásban tárgyalt értelemben^b viselik.⁴³⁷

⁴³⁶ The first two points of the deed is published on the basis of a national archival document, the others – except for the ominous third point – are shortly outlined by CSORBA, *A Fraknoi-villa*, 121. (The copy used by Csorba, which can be found in MNL-OL, does not contain this point.)

⁴³⁷ The part ^{b-b} misses from the copy MTAKK K 1224/148, published in CVH I/1exc, CXLI–CXLIH.

7. A jelen szerződés kiegészítő részét képezi a ‘megajándékozottat illető hiteles kiadványhoz’^c hozzáfűzött és a szerződő felek által aláírt vázrajz, mely vázrajzon a BMHOE DCB. betűkkel megjelölt 780 négyszög méter nagyságú terület képezi a jelen szerződés tárgyát.⁴³⁸

8. A jelen szerződés egy eredeti közjegyzői okiratpéldányban állíttatott ki, mely a magyar II törvények értelmében az okiratot felvevő királyi közjegyző okmánytárában őriztetett meg s arról két hiteles kiadvány készült, melyek egyike a megajándékozót, a másik pedig, melyhez a jelen szerződés 7. (hetedik) pontja szerint az eredeti vázlatrajz van hozzáfűzve, a megajándékozottat illeti.

Ezen okirat a felek előtt felolvastatván általuk helyben hagyólag előttem sajátkezűleg aláíratott.

Kelt Budapest 1913. (ezerkilencszáztizenharmadik) évi május hó 5. (ötödik) napján.

Fraknói Vilmos s.k.

Jankovich Béla s.k.

Kiss Aladár kir. közjegyző s.k.

P.H.

[English translation: Deed of gift which was concluded on the one side by the son of Béla, Béla Jankovich, Privy Councillor, Minister of Religion and Education and on the other side by the son of Sándor, Vilmos Fraknói, elected bishop, abbot of Szent Jobb and canon of Nagyvárád of Latin Rite.

1. By dint of this deed being effective from 1 January 1913, for the purpose of establishing a Hungarian Institute of History in Rome as a perpetual property, Vilmos Fraknói, son of Sándor, irrevocably grants and allows the Hungarian state to possess his exclusive estate of Rome along with its complete furnishing, namely its library and also its furniture and chattels. On the territory of the former Patrizzi villa, this plot of land

⁴³⁸ The part ^{c-c} misses from the copy MTAKK K 1224/148, published in CVH I/1exc, CXLI–CXLIH.

consists of the two-storied building surrounded by a garden, whose extension is 780 square meters⁴³⁹ including the built in plot.

From the existing movable properties the munificent bishop removes only the portrait of Péter Pázmány, the painting of Ligeti, Hungarian painter, and two Sévre-lamps from the contract and maintains his own ownership and his free disposition over these objects.

2. The Hungarian state legally accepts the donation circumscribed in the first point of this deed.

3. With regard to the real estate circumscribed in the first point, the granting bishop allows the unlimited and absolute ownership to be transferred to the Hungarian state in the land register on the basis of its acceptance with complete and definite effectiveness. Furthermore, the donor empowers the Hungarian state to sell, alienate or exchange, namely to dispose of the granted estate, building with its belongings and furniture any-time and in any ways according to its own independent determination and judgement to enable it to devote the incoming sum to the purposes of the Hungarian Institute of History in Rome. *There is only one condition which is compulsorily acquiesced by the Hungarian state, if the Hungarian state renounced the maintenance of this Hungarian Institute of History in Rome, the real estate and its belongings, or the sum of the meanwhile sold real estate would be shared between the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and the Saint Stephen Association.*

4. The Hungarian state, as a beneficiary, compulsorily states that it agrees the conditions, according to which half of the amortisation loan of 55,000 liras, which was taken out from the Cassa di risparmio financial institution in Rome, should be partly imposed on the real estate bestowed by Bishop Vilmos Fraknói, therefore, the Hungarian state undertakes to cover the remittance of 1,726 lira annually as well as the tax and the insurance charges from 1 January 1913.

5. The Hungarian state compulsorily states that it will take over Nicola Onori, the concierge of the bestowed building, for the purposes of the Hungarian Institute of History and employ until he is fit for service.

6. The cost of the issue of this deed of gift, of its verification and authentic translation into Italian, the transfer and legal transaction fee paid for the authorities of the Roman land registers will be met by the Hungarian state from its own wealth.

⁴³⁹ It was noted by a mark in the document.

7. *The attached diagrammatic plan, which is signed by the signatories, constitutes the integral part of this deed, and the land of 780 square meters, which is marked by the letters of BMHOE DCB on the diagrammatic plan, constitutes the subject of this deed.*

8. *This deed was done in double original; one of them is due to the donor, the other to the beneficiary.]*

[3 March 1913, Budapest]

[Vilmos Fraknói m.p.

Béla Jankovich m.p.

Aladár Kiss royal notary public m.p.]

[L.S.]

Díjjegyzék [...] Összesen 80 k. 10 f.

Tanúsítom, hogy ezen magyar királyi vallás és közoktatásügyi minisztérium részére kiadott hiteles kiadmány, melyhez az annak 7. pontjában érintett és a szerződő felek által aláírt vázrajz általam hozzáfűzetett, az irataim között 496/1913 ügyszám alatt őrzött, három íves, ívenként egy korona bélyegű és a budapesti m. kir. központi díj- és illetékkiszabási hivatalnak általam a mai napon Aszfk. 1287 szám alatt bemutatott eredeti közjegyzői okirattal II egyező. Kelt Budapest 1913. (ezekilencszáztizenharmadik) évi május hó 8. (nyolcadik) napján. Kiss Aladár kir. közjegyző s.k. P.H.

Díjjegyzék [...] Összesen 9 k. 70 f.

[...]⁴⁴⁰

332 Registrato a Roma 19-8-1913 Atti Privati vol. 282 Esatte [...]

Visto Alla Regia Ambasciata d'Italia buono per legalizzazione della firma dle Ministero I E R Degli Affari Esteri. Vienna 14 Maggio 1913.

[F.to Illegibile]

⁴⁴⁰Various official authorisations of names and stamps.

Ministero Degli Affari Esteri Visto Si Attesta l'Autenticità della Firma del
Sig. Cerutti. Roma 6 Giu. 1913. De'Ordine Del Ministero Ft. De Gregoris.

Dr. Holló József ügyvéd *Dr. Giuseppe Holló avvocato*
Kir. Törvényszéki Hites olasz Tomács Interprete giurato per la lingua italiana
al R. Tribunale

BUDAPEST

TRADUZIONE DEL TESTO UNGHERESE QUI UNITO

No. d'affari 496/1913
– Spedizione Autentica –

ATTO NOTARILE

Io Aladár Kiss, r. pubblico notaio in Budapest, mi sono presentato in luogo e data sottoscritti alla camera ungherese dei deputati, ove il sig. dottore Béla Jankovich, consigliere intimo, regio ungarico Ministro del Culto e pubblica istruzione – abitante a Budapest, VIII, Rákóczi út 6 a me personalmente noto, ed il sig. Guglielmo Fraknoi, vescovo suffraganeo, abate di Szentjobb, canonico di rito latino di Nagyvárád, abitante a Budapest, nel Museo Nazionale, pure a me personalmente noto e nella di cui abitazione sono pure comparso, mi fecero redigere in atto notarile il seguente

CONTRATTO DI DONAZIONE

Conchiuso tra Béla Jankovich, di Béla, consigliere intimo, regio incaricato ministro del culto e pubblica istruzione, in nome dello Stato ungarico da una parte, e Guglielmo Fraknoi di Alessandro, vescovo suffraganeo, abate di Szentjobb, canonico di rito latino di Nagyvárád dall'altra parte, alle seguenti condizioni:

1) Guglielmo Fraknói di Alessandro in virtù del presente atto dona irrevocabilmente ed in proprietà perpetua con efficacia del primo (1.º) gennaio millenovecentotredici (1913) allo Stato Ungarico ed immette in suo possesso effettivo per gli scopi di un istituto storico ungherese da istituirsi a Roma, il fondo di sua esclusiva proprietà sito nella città di Roma in Italia colla costruita casa e con ogni arredo, precisamente la biblioteca esistente nella medesima e tutte le mobiglie ed i mobili ivi trovantisi.

Tale fondo comprende la casa d'abitazione di due piani sita nel terreno della ex Villa Patrizzi e circondata da un giardino; la sua estensione inclusivamente al fondo costruito importa 780 settecentoottanta metri quadrati, il fondo è registrato nella mappa tavolare No. 65 di Roma, al No. 864.

L'ingresso si trova in Piazza Policlinico ed il fondo è confinato dalla Piazza Policlinico, Corso d'Italia, dalle vie Faloppo e Cesalpino ed infine dal fondo rimanente proprietà del donatore. Dei mobili trovantisi nella casa il vescovo donatore sottrae al presente contratto soltanto un ritratto Petro Pázmány, poi un quadro del pittore ungherese Ligeti ed infine due lampade di Sevres, sui quali oggetti si riserva anche per il futuro il suo diritto di proprietà e quello di disporre illimitatamente dei medesimi.

2) Lo Stato ungarico col presente accetta con efficacia legale la donazione descritta nel punto 1 (primo) del presente contratto con le ivi indicate riserve.

3) Il vescovo donatore permette relativamente allo stabile indicato nel punto 1.º (primo) del presente contratto in base alla dichiarazione di accettazione dello Stato ungarico la trascrizione con pieno e definitivo effetto al nome del medesimo nei libri tavolari dell'illimitato ed esclusivo diritto di proprietà.

Il donatore permette inoltre che lo Stato ungarico, venda, alieni, scambi quanto sia e scondo il proprio libero criterio e decisione il fondo, la casa e tutti gli arredi ricevuti in donazione, in somma che realizzi in qualsiasi modo il fondo ed ogni sua pertinenza, impiegando gli importi ricavati da tale realizzazione agli scopi dell'istituto Strocio Ungherese da istituirsi a Roma.

Il donatore impone soltanto la condizione – obbligatoriamente accettata dallo Stato ungarico quale donatario, che qualora lo Stato ungarico rinunciasse in epoca indeterminata al mantenimento in Roma dell'Istituto Sto-

rico Ungherese, lo stabile ed ogni suo arredo rispettivamente il valore ricavato dalla eventuale vendita dello stabile, casa ed arredi venga diviso per metà tra l'Accademia Ungherese delle Scienze, e l'Associazione di Santo Stefano.

4) Lo Stato ungarico nella sua veste di donatario col presente dichiara obbligatoriamente di acconsentire affinché il mutuo per ammortizzazione di 55.000 (cinquantacinquemila) lire assunto presso la Cassa di Risparmio di Roma dal vescovo Guglielmo Fraknói aggtavando d'ipoteca lo stabile formante oggetto della donazione per metà a carico dello stabile oggetto del presente contratto ed in seguito a ciò lo Stato ungarico si obbliga a pagare del proprio incominciando dal primo (1.0) gennaio millenovecentotredici (1913) la quota da ammortizzazione della metà del sudetto prestito ipotecario, precisamente annue millesettencentotrentasei (1726) lire, lo Stato ungarico si obbliga inoltre a supporre parimente col proprio incominciando dal primo 1.0 gennaio millenovecentotredici (1913) a tutte le composte e gli oneri pubblici aggravanti lo stabile ricevuto in virtù della donazione, come pure ai premi di assicurazione.

5) Lo Stato ungarico dichiara obbligatoriamente di assumere agli scopi dell'Istituto Strocio Ungherese il servo Michele Onori, presentemente addetto alla casa donata in qualità di protiere e da tenerlo al suo servizio fino a che il sudetto sarà capaci di prestar servizio.

6) Tutte le spese e tasse legali inerenti alla redazione, legalizzazione e traduzione autentica italiana del presente contratto di donazione ed alla trascrizione del diritto di proprietà da effettuarsi in base al documento presso le Autorità tavolari romane vanno a carico dello Stato ungarico e del Vescovo Guglielmo Fraknói come nell'offerta presentata da questo ultimo in data 29 ventinove marzo millenovecentotredici, e registrato al No. 45242/1913 del Ministero del Culto e Pubblica Istruzione.

7) Forma parte integrante del presente contratto il piano firmato dalle parti contraenti ed unito alla spedizione autentica spettante al donatario, nel qual piano il fondo dell'estensione di 780 settecottanta

metri quadrati segnato con B. M. N. O. E. D. C. B. è l'oggetto del presente contratto.⁴⁴¹

8) Il presente contratto è stato redatto in atto notarile originale, che in base alle leggi ungheresi viene conservato nell'archivio del regio pubblico notaio rogatore e del medesimo furono estese due spedizioni autentiche, una per il donatore, l'altra munita secondo il punto settimo 7 del presente contratto del piano originale, per il donatario.

Il presente atto predetto innanzi alle parti fu dalle medesime in segno di approvazione firmato di proprio pugno in mia presenza.

Dato a Budapest, li cinque (5) maggio millenovecentotredici (1913)

- Guglielmo Fraknói m.p.
- Béla Jankovich M.P. L.S.
- Aladár Kiss r. pubblico notaio m.p.

Nota onorario 70 cor. Esetesa 3 cor. 60 cent. Bollo 3 cor. Copia per la commisurazione delle tasse 2 cor. 50 cent. Presentazione 1 cor. Somma: 80 cor 10 cent.

Attesto, che questa spedizione autentica, rilasciata per il regio Ungarico Ministero del Culato e Pubblica Istruzione ed alla quale è stato da me unito il piano menzionato nel punto 7 del medesimo e firmato dalle parti contraenti, è conforme all'atto notarile custodito tra i miei atti al No. 496/1913, esteso su tre fogli di carta muniti ognuno di un bollo da una corona e da me presentato in data odierna al No. Aszkfk 12878 al r. ung. Ufficio centrale di commisurazione delle tasse e bolli in Budapest.

Dato a Budapest, addì otto (8) maggio millenovecentotredici (1913).

[F.to:] Aladár Kiss m.p. r. pubblico notaio

Nota: [...] ⁴⁴²

⁴⁴¹ The plan is attached in a transparent „Pauss”-paper.

⁴⁴² Various subscriptions, official authorizations.

Allegato “B”

Io sottoscritto Monsignor Guglielmo Fraknói fu Alessandro, domiciliato a Budapest, Museo Nazionale, dichiaro col presente di valor rinunciare, come effettivamente rinuncio ad ogni ipoteca legale che a me potesse competere in confronto del R. Stato Ungherese, in virtù del contratto di donazione da me stipulato con questo ultimo il 5 maggio 1913 a Budapest e registrato a Roma il 9 agosto 1913 al No. 3362 atti privati vol. 282 con L. 7.977,50 –.

Autorizzo quindi il Conservatore delle ipoteche di Roma a non iscriverla e la esonero da ogni responsabilità in proposito.

Budapest 24 settembre 1913

Monsignor Guglielmo Fraknói II

Visto nel R. Consolato Generale d'Italia in Budapest per la autenticazione della qui sopra apposta firma di Monsignor Guglielmo Fraknói, dimorante in Budapest, a noi personalmente conosciuto, che ebbe a sottoscrivere in nostra presenza l'atto qui sopra.

Budapest 24 settembre 1913.

Il Regio Vice Console Reggente

[F.to] Serpi

Ministero degli affari esteri si attesta l'autenticità della firma del sig. Serpi.
Roma 4 ottobre 1913.

D'Ordine del Ministro

[F.to] De Gregorio

No. 5632 registrato a Roma li 5. 10. 1913. atti privati vol. 304. Esatte lire tre e cent. 66.

Il Ricevitore [F.to *Illeg.*]

Sources

Archivio Notarile Superiore di Roma

Repertorio n. 13072

Archivio Apostolico Vaticano
– Città del Vaticano (AAV) –

Miscellanea (Armadi I–XV), Armadio I, vol. 12
Segreteria di Stato, 1881, Rubr. 222. 283; 1882, Rubr. 67

Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana
– Città del Vaticano (BAV) –

Vat. Lat., vol. 6696

Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem Könyvtára, Kézirattár
– Budapest (ELTE EKK) –

Library of Eötvös Loránd University, Collection of Manuscripts

Collectio Hevenesiana, vol. 41

Collectio Kaprinaiana, vol. A/12–14

Collectio Prayana, vol. 32

Ms. Ab 50, vol. I–XI

Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár, Országos Levéltár

– Budapest (MNL-OL) –

The National Archives of Hungary

Az Országos Magyar Gyűjteményegyetem Tanácsa 1922–1949 (A Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum Tanácsa 1934–1949) (K 726), 1927/675. 1931/384. 500. 1932/164. 658. 1933/335-49

Mikrofilmár, X 9982

Reprográfiai Osztály, [A külföldi Hungarica-gyűjtésre vonatkozó iratok], Olaszország, I–II. doboz

Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Könyvtár és Információs Központ, Kézirattár

– Budapest (MTAKK) –

Manuscript Collection of the Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences

D 14240

K 1591 (Az MTA Római Magyar Történeti Intézet Bizottságának jegyzőkönyvei 1913–1939)

K 1224 (Az MTA Római Magyar Történeti Intézet Bizottságának iratai 1902–1948)

K 1225 (Az MTA Római Magyar Történeti Intézet Bizottságának számlái és kimutatásai 1914–1923)

Ms. 493/39

Régi Akadémiai Levéltár – (RAL), 1881/544. 480. 1894/116 (pótlás). 1930/609. 638. 1931/883. 1932/521. 815. 1933/141. 1373. 1934/92. 1321. 1935/94. 528. 801. 1936/376. 1937/23. 432. 576. 660. 1938/132. 138. 1940/507. 1949/78

K 1823–1855 (RAL Mutatókönyvek, 1890–1949)

Tört. 2^o 282/VIII–IX

Országos Széchényi Könyvtár, Kézirattár

– Budapest (OSzKK) –

Manuscript Collection of National Széchényi Library

Fol. Hung. 1749

Fol. Hung. 3638/1–5

Levelestár

Prímási Levéltár
– Esztergom (PL) –
Primatial Archives

Archivum Ecclesiasticum – (AE)

Simor János prímás, Archivum Secretum, 1867, n. 154. 1874, n. 9

Simor János prímás, Categoria A, fasc. 1. Cat. 20, 24. Cat. 44, fasc. 3, n. 5734/1874 és n.
778/1885

Vaszary Kolozs prímás, Cat. 9, n. 4551/1892. Cat. Da. 1910. november 12.

Bibliography

- A külföldi magyar intézetek működése és a magas műveltség célját szolgáló külföldi ösztöndíjak az 1924/1925. 1925/26. 1926/27. [skk] tanévben* [The Work of the Hungarian Foreign Institutes and the Foreign Scholarships Representing the Purpose of Higher Education in 1924/1925. 1925/26. 1926/27. ss.], Budapest 1926. 1927. 1928. [skk].
- A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia alapszabályai és ügyrendje* [The Articles and Regulations of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences], Budapest 1936.
- A római magyar Seminarium története* [The History of the Hungarian Seminarium in Rome], KSz 26 (1912) 444–453.
- A vatikáni levéltár kincseinek publicatiója* [The Publication of the Treasures of the Vatican Archives], Századok 16 (1882) 521–522.
- Ab imo pectore: In memoriam di István György Tóth*, [a cura di GAETANO PLATANIA–MATTEO SANFILIPPO], Viterbo 2005.
- HEGYI GÉZA: *Újjáéledő hungarikafeltárás a Vatikáni Titkos Levéltárban. Regesta Supplicationum 1522–1523...* [Reviving the search for Hungarica in the Vatican Secret Archives. Regesta Supplicationum 1522–1523...], Erdélyi Múzeum 81 (2019) 1, 135–138.
- ADRIÁNYI, GABRIEL: *Der Beitrag des ungarischen Domkapitulars und Historikers Vilmos Fraknói (1843–1924) zur Öffnung der Vatikanischen Geheimarchiv*, Festgabe für Karl Josef Rivinius SVD (Theologie und Hochschule 1; hrsg. v. Reimund Haas–Eric W. Steinhauer), Münster 2006, 183–203.
- ADRIÁNYI GÁBOR: *Fraknói Vilmos és a „Monumenta Vaticana Hungariae Historiam illustrantia” megindítása* [Vilmos Fraknói and the Launch of the “Monumenta Vaticana Hungariae Historiam illustrantia”], MEV–Regnum 8 (1996) 3, 61–72.
- ADRIÁNYI GÁBOR: *Fraknói Vilmos javaslata a Szentszék levéltári forráskiadására* [The proposal of Vilmos Fraknói for the publication of sources of the Holy See], MEV–Regnum 19 (2007) 149–160.
- ADRIÁNYI GÁBOR: *Probászka és a Római Index* [Probászka and the Roman Index], Budapest 2002.

- ADRIÁNYI GÁBOR: *Scitovszky és Simor érsekek harca a prímási jogokért [The Battle of Archbishops Scitovszky and Simor for the Rights of the Primate]* (Ministerio nemzetközi történész konferencia előadásai) (ed. by István Bárdos –Margit Beke), Esztergom 1998, 29–38.
- ÁLDÁSY ANTAL: *Az 1431-i összeesküvés IV. Eugén pápa ellen [The Conspiracy against Pope Eugene IV in 1431]*, MS 10 (1896) 200–208.
- ÁLDÁSY ANTAL: *Fraknói Vilmos emlékezete [The Memory of Vilmos Fraknói]*, KSz 39 (1925) 449–460.
- ÁLDÁSY ANTAL: *Magyar tanuló Rómában [A Hungarian Student in Rome]*, MKSz 2 (1894) 94–95.
- ÁLDÁSY ANTAL: *Olaszországi történelmi kutatások [Historical Researches in Italy]*, MKSz 1 (1892–1893) 240–277.
- ÁLDÁSY ANTAL: *Regesták a Vatikáni Levéltárból [Regesta from the Vatican Archives]*, TT 1894, 15–28 and 1895, 58–89. 260–288.
- ÁLDÁSY ANTAL: *Újabb egyháztörténeti monográfiák [Further Monographs of Church History]*, KSz 8 (1894) 154–156.
- AMBRÓ BÉLA: *Malaspina pápai nuntius működése Erdélyben 1599. A Borghese-hercegek római levéltárának diplomáciai iratai nyomán [The Work of Malaspina Papal Nuncio in Transylvania 1599. On the Basis of the Diplomatic Documents of the Roman Archives of the Borghese-Princes]*, KSz 1 (1887) 253–290.
- ANDREA, BERNARD: *L'Istituto Archeologico Germanico di Roma*, Speculum mundi. Roma centro internazionale di ricerche umanistiche, a c. di PAOLO VIAN, Roma 1992, 155–179.
- Annales rerum Hungariae ab anno Chr. 997 ad annum 1564 deducti I*, Vindobonae 1764.
- Annuario dell'Accademia d'Ungheria. Studi e documenti italo-ungheresi*, 1996, 1998–1999, 2000–2001, 2002, 1998–2002, 2004, 2002–2004, 2005, Ricordi Ungheresi, Numero Speciale, Il palazzo Falconieri, 2005–2006 e 2006–2007 2007–2008 e 2008–2009 (8–20), a cura di JÓZSEF PÁL–LÁSZLÓ CSORBA–GYÖRGY KOMLÓSSY, NÓRA PÁLMAI–ZSUZSA KOVÁCS–ÉVA VÍGH, Roma e Roma–Szeged e Szeged 1997–2010.
- BALANYI GYÖRGY: *ASzentszék és a magyarság szerepe Budavár visszafoglalásában [The Role of the Holy See and the Hungarians in the Reoccupation of Buda]*, KSz 51 (1937) 541–548.
- BALOGH JÓZSEF: *Existenz und Rechtslage der Katholischen Kirche in Ungarn zur Zeit der Türkenherrschaft*, Rom 1939.
- BÁNFI FLORIO: *Báthory István és Domenico Ridolfino [István Báthory and Domenico Ridolfino]*, HK 42 (1941) 22–37.
- BÁNFI FLORIO: *Gianfrancesco Aldobrandini magyarországi hadivállalatai [The Military Ventures of Gianfrancesco Aldobrandini in Hungary]*, HK 40 (1939) 1–33 and 213–228; 41 (1940) 143–156.

- BARTA GÁBOR: *Vajon kié az ország? [Who Owns this Country?]*, Labirintus, Budapest 1988.
- BATTHYAN, IGNATIUS COMES DE, *Sancti Gerardi episcopi Chanadiensis scripta et acta cum serie episcoporum Chanadiensium*, Alba Iulia 1790.
- BEKE ANTAL: *Római emlékek a magyar egyház XV-ik századi történetéből [Memories of Rome from the History of the Hungarian Church in the Fifteenth Century]*, TT 1900, 1–15.
- BEKE ANTAL: *Tanulmányok a bosnyák-djakovári püspökség történetéből [Studies on the History of the Bosnia-Dakovo Bishoprics]* (Értekezések a Történeti Tudományok Köréből 17/3), Budapest 1898.
- BEKE MARGIT: *Das päpstliche Ungarische Kirchliche Institut in Rom*, MEV–Regnum 7 (1995) 3–4, 185–203.
- BEKE MARGIT: *L'Istituto Pontificio Ecclesiastico Ungherese a Roma (1929–1945)*, Cento anni al servizio delle relazioni ungaro-italiane. Gli istituti ungheresi, scientifici, culturali ed ecclesiastici di Roma (1895–1995) (a c. di László Csorba), Budapest 1998, 69–73.
- BENDA KÁLMÁN: *Rákóczi és a Vatikán. Brenner apát küldetése XI. Kelemen pápához (1707–1708) [Rákóczi and the Vatican. The Legation of Abbot Brenner to Pope Clement XI (1707–1708)]*, TSz 2 (1959) 8–24.
- BERZEVICZY ALBERT: *Fraknói Vilmos emlékezete [The Memory of Vilmos Fraknói]* (Felolvasatott az Akadémia 1927. május 8-án tartott ünnepi ülésén), Budapest 1927.
- BERZEVICZY ALBERT: *Magyar utazók Olaszországban a múlt század első felében [Hungarian Travellers in Italy in the First Part of the Last Century]*, Budapest 1903.
- BESSENYEI JÓZSEF (ed.): *Lettere di Principi. Litterae Principum ad Papam (1518–1578). Fejedelmi levelek a pápának (1518–1578) [Princely Letters to the Pope (1518–1578)]* (Bibliotheca Academiae Hungariae in Roma. Fontes 3), Roma–Budapest 2002.
- BÓNIS GYÖRGY: *Útmutató az esztergomi prímási levéltárhoz. Archivum Ecclesiasticum I–II [A Guide to the Primatial Archives in Esztergom]* (Levéltári leltárak 24), Budapest 1964, I, 106. 136. 139. 142. II, 389–390 and 521–522.
- BORÓVI JÓZSEF: *Az esztergomi érseki egyházmegye felosztása [The Division of the Archbishopric of Esztergom]* (METEM Könyvek 25), Budapest 2000.
- BORSA IVÁN: *Benlich Máté belgrádi püspök jelentése a török hódoltság katolikusairól 1651–1658 [The Report of Máté Benlich, Bishop of Belgrade, on the Catholics of the Territories under Turkish Rule 1651–1658]*, LK 60 (1989) 13–142.
- BURNS, CHARLES: *L'apertura dell'Archivio Segreto Vaticano alle ricerche storiche, Archivi e archivistica a Roma dopo l'Unità. Genesi storica, ordinamenti, interrelazioni* (Pubblicazioni degli Archivi di Stato. Saggi 30), Roma 1994, 33–50.
- CZAICH Á. GILBERT: *Regesták a római Dataria-levéltárnak Magyarországra vonatkozó bulláiból II. Pál és IV. Sixtus pápák idejéből [Regesta from the Hungarian-Related Bulls of the Archives of the Datary in Rome under Paul II and Sixtus IV]*, TT 1899, 1–17.

- CZAICH Á. GILBERT: *Regesták VI. Sándor pápa korából* [*Regesta from the Age of Pope Alexander VI*], TT 1904, 161–181.
- CZAICH Á. GILBERT: *Regesták VII. Imre [!] pápa korából 1484–1492* [*Regesta from the Age of Pope Emeric VII [!] 1484–1492*], TT 1902, 511–527.
- CSÁNKI DEZSŐ: *Fraknói Vilmos* [*Vilmos Fraknói*], LK 2 (1924) 208–211.
- CSORBA LÁSZLÓ (ed.): *Száz év a magyar–olasz kapcsolatok szolgálatában. Magyar tudományos, kulturális és egyházi intézetek Rómában [1895–1995]* [*Hundred Years in the Service of the Hungarian-Italian Relations. Hungarian Scientific, Cultural and Church Institutes in Rome [1895–1995]*], Budapest 1998.
- CSORBA LÁSZLÓ: *A Fraknói-villa. A Magyar Köztársaság Szentszék melletti nagykövetségének székhelye* [*The Villa Fraknói. The Residence of the Embassy of the Hungarian Republic Next to the Holy See*], Magyarország és a Szentszék diplomáciai kapcsolata (1920–2000) (ed. by Zombori István), Budapest 2001, 113–135.
- CSORBA LÁSZLÓ: *Fondazione dell'Istituto Storico Ungherese a Roma (1895–1922)*, Cento anni al servizio delle relazioni ungaro-italiane. Gli istituti ungheresi, scientifici, culturali ed ecclesiastici di Roma (1895–1995) (a c. di László Csorba), Budapest 1998, 7–17.
- CSORBA LÁSZLÓ: *La storia dell'Istituto Pontificio Ecclesiastico Ungherese a Roma dal 1945 fino ad oggi*, Cento anni, Cento anni al servizio delle relazioni ungaro-italiane. Gli istituti ungheresi, scientifici, culturali ed ecclesiastici di Roma (1895–1995) (a c. di László Csorba), Budapest 1998, 75–94.
- CSORBA LÁSZLÓ: *Storia dell'Accademia d'Ungheria a Roma dopo il 1945*, Cento anni al servizio delle relazioni ungaro-italiane. Gli istituti ungheresi, scientifici, culturali ed ecclesiastici di Roma (1895–1995) (a c. di László Csorba), Budapest 1998, 45–68.
- CSUKOVITS ENIKŐ: *A római Szentlélek-Társulat magyar tagjai* [*The Hungarian Members of the Holy Spirit Association in Rome*], Századok 134 (2000) 211–244.
- CSUKOVITS ENIKŐ: *Középkori magyar zarándokok* [*Hungarian Pilgrims in the Middle Ages*] (História Könyvtár, Monográfiák 20), Budapest 2003.
- DÉCSÉNYI GYULA: *Olaszországi történelmi kutatások* [*Historical Researches in Italy*], Századok 26 (1892) 467–475 and 550–559.
- DÜMMERTH DEZSŐ: *Inchoffer Menyhért küzdelmei és tragédiája Rómában 1641–1648. A magyar forráskritikai történetírás megszületése és a Jézus Társaság megbiúsult reformja* [*The Struggles and Tragedy of Menyhért Inchoffer in Rome 1641–1648. The Birth of the Hungarian Historiography of Source Criticism and the Unrealised Reforms of the Society of Jesus*], (A Budapesti Egyetemi Könyvtár Kiadványai 38), Budapest 1977 (offprint from the Filológiai Közlöny 1976/2).
- ELZE, REINHARD: *L'Istituto Storico Germanico di Roma*, Speculum mundi. Roma centro internazionale di ricerche umanistiche, a c. di PAOLO VIAN, Roma 1992, 182–211.

- EÖRDÖGH ISTVÁN: *A pápai nunciatura újraalakulása Magyarországon 1920-ban (Ismeretlen római dokumentumok alapján)* [The Re-establishment of the Papal Nunciature in Hungary in 1920 (On the Basis of Unknown Roman Documents)], TSz 39 (1997) 1, 99–110.
- EÖRDÖGH ISTVÁN: *A Rendkívüli Egyházi Ügyek Szent Kongregációja Levéltárának [Vatikánváros] a magyarországi egyházakra vonatkozó forrásai 1803–1903* [The Hungarian Related Sources of the Archives of the Sacred Congregation of Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs 1803–1903], Szeged 1992.
- Erdélyi és bódoltsági jezsuita missziók. I/1: 1609–1616. I/2: 1617–1625 [Jesuit Missions in Transylvania and in the Territories under Turkish Rule. I/1: 1609–1616. I/2: 1617–1625] (Adattár XVI–XVIII. századi szellemi mozgalmaink történetéhez 26/1–2; publ. by BALÁZS, MIHÁLY–FRICSY, ÁDÁM–LUKÁCS, LÁSZLÓ–MONOK, ISTVÁN), Szeged 1990.
- ERDÉLYI GABRIELLA: *A „Sacra Poenitentiaria Apostolica” hivatala és magyar kérvényei a XV–XVI. században (I)* [The Office and the Hungarian Requests of the “Sacra Poenitentiaria Apostolica” in the XV–XVI. Century], LK 74 (2003) 33–57.
- ERDÉLYI GABRIELLA: *Bakócz Tamás és a szerzetesrendek (Esettanulmány)* [Tamás Bakócz and the Monastic Orders (A Case Study)], TSz 44 (2002) 1–2, 21–64.
- ERDÉLYI GABRIELLA: *Crisis or Revival? The Hungarian Province of the Order of Augustinian Friars in the late Middle Ages*, *Analecta Augustiniana* 67 (2004) 115–140.
- ERDÉLYI GABRIELLA: *Gyónás és áldozás a késő középkorban* [Confession and Communion in the late Middle Ages], *Századok* 137 (2003) 525–548.
- ÉRDÚJHELYI MENYHÉRT: *Kutatásaim a római levéltárakban* [My Researches in the Archives of Rome], KSz 10 (1896) 605–646.
- ERŐSS JÓZSEF: *AVatikán. Hogyan kormányozza a pápa az egyházat? A pápai udvar élete* [The Vatican. How Does the Pope Rule the Church? The Life of the Papal Court], Vác 1939.
- ÉRSZEGI GÉZA: *A Curia Romana levéltárai* [The Archives of the Curia Romana], LSz 28 (1978) 321–339.
- GÉZA ÉRSZEGI, *Eredeti pápai oklevelek Magyarországon (1199–1417)* [Original Papal Charters in Hungary (1199–1417)], 1989 (MTAKK D/14240).
- ÉRSZEGI MÁRK AURÉL: *Il ristabilimento delle relazioni diplomatiche tra la Santa Sede e l’Ungheria 1918–1920* (Tesi di laurea), Trieste 1998.
- ESCH, ARNOLD: *A római Porosz Történeti Intézet 1888–1936* [The Prussian Institute of History in Rome 1888–1936], MEV 7 (1995) 3–4, 179–184.
- FAZEKAS ISTVÁN: „Missio Segneriana” kezdetei Magyarországon (1714–1717) [The Beginnings of the “Missio Segneriana” in Hungary (1714–1717)], *Perlekedő évszázadok. Tanulmányok Für Lajos történész 60. születésnapjára* (ed. by Ildikó Horn), Budapest 1993, 410–431.
- FAZEKAS ISTVÁN: *Galla Ferenc „Pálos missziók Magyarországon” című kiadatlan munkája* [The Unpublished Work, “Pauline Missions in Hungary”, of Ferenc Galla], *Pálos rendtörténeti tanulmányok* [Studies of the history of the Pauline Order] (Varia Paulina 1; ed. by Gábor Sarbak), Csorna 1994, 219–228.

- FAZEKAS ISTVÁN: *Szerzetesrendek Kelet-Magyarországon a XVII. században* [*Monastic Orders in Eastern Hungary in the 17th Century*], Miscellanea Anno 1999 (Acta Collegii Evangelici 7), Eperjes 2000, 69–77.
- FEJÉRPATAKY LÁSZLÓ: *Apápai levéltárak* [*The Papal Archives*], Századok 18 (1884) 66–73.
- FEJÉRPATAKY LÁSZLÓ: *Pápai adószedők Magyarországon a XIII. és XIV. században* [*Papal Tax-Collectors in Hungary in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Century*], Századok 21 (1887) 493–517. 589–609.
- RUSSELL, FISH CARL: *Guide to the materials for American History in Roman and other Italian Archives*, Washington 1911.
- FRAKNÓI VILMOS: *Fraknói Vilmos negyed-százados irodalmi munkássága 1861–1885* [*Vilmos Fraknói's Literary Work of Twenty-Five Years 1861–1885*], Budapest 1886.
- FRAKNÓI VILMOS: *A Szent Istvántól Rómában alapított magyar zarándokház* [*The Saint Stephen House for Pilgrims in Rome*], KSz 7 (1893) 168–195.
- FRAKNÓI VILMOS: *A vatikáni levéltár* [*The Vatican Archives*], Magyarország és a római Szentszék I. Magyarország egyházi és politikai összeköttetései a római Szent-székekkel, Budapest 1901, 341–356.
- FRAKNÓI VILMOS: *A vatikáni levéltár és a római magyar történeti intézet* [*The Vatican Archives and the Hungarian Institute of History in Rome*], A katolikus Magyarország 1001–1901. A magyarok megtérésének és a magyar királyság megalapításának kilencszázados évfordulója alkalmából I–II (ed. by Kiss János–Sziklay János), Budapest 1902, 425–429.
- FRAKNÓI VILMOS: *Adalék a vatikáni levéltárból a Corvina történetéhez* [*Contributions to the History of the Corvina from the Vatican Archives*], MKSz 2 (1894) 94.
- FRAKNÓI VILMOS: *Az új vatikáni könyvtár* [*The New Library of the Vatican*], MKSz [n.v.] 1 (1892–1893) 235–240.
- FRAKNÓI VILMOS: *Egy jezsuita-diplomata hazánkban 1583–1584* [*A Jesuit Diplomat in Hungary 1583–1584*], KSz 16 (1902) 585–607. 685–811.
- FRAKNÓI VILMOS: *Egy magyar jezsuita a XVI. században* [*A Hungarian Jesuit in the Sixteenth Century*], KSz 1 (1887) 385–433.
- FRAKNÓI VILMOS: *I. Lipót császár és Marco d'Aviano kapuczinus atya levelezése 1680–1699* [*The Correspondence of Emperor Leopold I and Marco d'Aviano, Capuchin Father 1680–1699*], KSz 2 (1898) 534–543.
- FRAKNÓI VILMOS: *Ifjabb Vitéz János pontificaléja a vatikáni könyvtárban* [*The Pontifical of Junior János Vitéz in the Vatican Library*], Róma 1903 (review: MKSz 11 [1903] 179–180).
- FRAKNÓI VILMOS: *János király és a római Szent-szék* [*King John and the Holy See*], Századok 36 (1902) 697–715. 794–911.
- FRAKNÓI VILMOS: *Magyarország és a cambray-i liga 1509–1511* [*Hungary and the League of Cambrai 1509–1511*], Budapest 1883.
- FRAKNÓI VILMOS: *Mátyás király magyar diplomatái* [*The Hungarian Diplomats of King Matthias*], Századok 32 (1898) 1–14. 97–112. 385–404. 481–489. 769–781. 865–875.

- FRANKÓI VILMOS: *Miklós modrusi püspök élete, munkái és könyvtára* [The Life, Work and Library of Miklós, Bishop of Modrus], MKSz 5 (1897) 1–23.
- FRANKÓI VILMOS: *Monumenta Vaticana Hungariae historiam illustrantia. Frankói Vilmos jelentése*, MS 13 [1882] 441–453 and 509–525.
- FRANKÓI VILMOS: *Nyomozások a pápai levéltárakban* [Investigations in the Papal Archives], (offprint from the Századok), Budapest 1892, 3–4.
- FRANKÓI VILMOS: *Oklevéltár a magyar királyi kegyúri jog történetéhez* [Archives to the History of the Hungarian Royal Patronage and Supremacy], Budapest 1899.
- FRANKÓI VILMOS: *Visegrádon 1367-ben írt kodex a klosterneuburgi könyvtárban* [The Codex Written in Visegrád in 1367 from the Library of Klosterneuburg], Magyar Könyvszemle (MKSz) 23 [1915] 148–150.
- FRANKÓI VILMOS: *XI. Incze pápa és Magyarország felszabadítása a török uralom alól. A vatikáni levéltár diplomatai irományai alapján* [Innocent XI and the Liberation of Hungary from the Turkish Rule. On the Basis of the Diplomatic Documents of the Vatican Archives], Budapest 1886.
- FRANKÓI VILMOS: *Zrínyi Miklós pályájának vége* (Közlemények a vatikáni levéltárból) [The End of Miklós Zrínyi's Career (Publications from the Vatican Archives)], TT 1894, 577–595.
- FRANKÓI, WILHELM: *Papst Innocenz XI. und Ungarns Befreiung von der Türkenherrschaft*, Freiburg im Breisgau 1902.
- FRANKÓI, WILHELM: *Ungarn vor der Schlacht bei Mohács (1524–1526). Auf Grund der päpstlichen Nuntiaturberichte*, Budapest 1886.
- FRANKÓI, WILHELM: *Várad felszabadítása és XII. Ince pápa* [The Liberation of Várad and Pope Innocent XII], Róma 1892.
- FRANKL VILMOS: *Egy ismeretlen Corvin-Codex Rómában (Naplótöredék)* [An Unknown Corvin-Codex in Rome (Extract from a Diary)], Századok 2 (1868) 445–447.
- FRANKL VILMOS: *Két hét olaszországi könyv- és levéltárakban* [Two Weeks in Italian Libraries and Archives], MKSz 3 (1878) 121–153.
- FRANKL VILMOS: *Pázmány Péter és kora I–III* [Péter Pázmány and his Age I–III], Pest 1868–1872.
- FRÁTER JÁNOSNÉ: *A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia állandó bizottságai 1854–1949* [The Standing Committees of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences 1854–1949] (A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Könyvtárának kiadványai 70), Budapest 1974, 251–254.
- FRÁTER JÁNOSNÉ: *A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Történettudományi Bizottságának működése (1854–1949)* [The Work of the Historical Committee of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (1854–1949)], (A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Könyvtárának kiadványai 52), Budapest 1966.
- FÜZES ÁDÁM: *A trentói reformliturgia átvétele az esztergomi érseki tartomány területén Pázmány Péter érseksége alatt. A magyarországi rítusváltás történetének és hátterének*

- bemutatása [*The Adoption of the Reform-Liturgy of Trent in the Territory of the Archdiocese of Esztergom under the Archbishoprics of Péter Pázmány. The Presentation of the History and Background of the Change of Rites in Hungary*] (Studia Theologica Budapestinensia), Budapest 2003.
- GALLA FERENC: *A csíksomlyói ferencrendi kolostor viszontagságai Bethlen Gábor idején* [*The Adversities of the Franciscan Monastery of Csíksomlyó under Gábor Bethlen*], A gr. Klebelsberg Kuno Magyar Történetkutató Intézet Évkönyve IV (ed. by Dávid Angyal), Budapest 1934, 283–302.
- GALLA FERENC: *A magyar katolikus restauráció misszionáriusa* [*The Missionary of the Hungarian Catholic Restoration*] (Offprint from the issues of February–October 1946 of the “Egyházi Körirat” [“Ecclesiastical Circular”]), Budapest 1946.
- GALLA FERENC: *A pálosrend reformálása a 17. században* [*The Reformation of the Order of Saint Paul in the 17th century*] (Offprint from the Regnum Egyháztörténeti Évkönyv [Regnum Church Historical Almanac] 1940–1941, 123–223), Budapest 1941.
- GALLA FERENC: *Borromei Szent Károly hatása Magyarországon* (*L’influsso di San Carlo Borromeo in Ungheria*) [*The Effect of Saint Carlo Borromeo in Hungary*] (Offprint from the issues of 4/1938 and 1–2/1939 of the Theologia), Budapest 1939.
- GALLA FERENC: *Fulgenzio da Jesi ferences misszionárius vitája a böjtről a gyöngyösi jezsuitákkal. Fejezet a magyar katolikus restauráció misszióiból* [*Fulgenzio da Jesi, Franciscan Missionary’s Debate with the Jesuits in Gyöngyös over Lent. A Chapter from the Missions of the Hungarian Catholic Restoration*] (Regnum-könyvek. II: Egyháztörténeti értekezések 1 – offprint from „Regnum” egyháztörténeti évkönyv 1944–46), Budapest 1947.
- GALLA FERENC: *Magyar tárgyú pápai felbatalmazások, felmentések és kiváltságok a katolikus megújulás korából I* [*Hungarian-Related Papal Authorizations, Exemptions and Privileges from the Age of the Catholic Revival I*] (Regnum-Könyvek. I: Egyháztörténeti források 1 – offprint from Levéltári Közlemények 24 and 25 1946–47), Budapest 1947.
- GATZ, ERWIN: *L’Istituto Romano della Società Görres*, Speculum mundi. Roma centro internazionale di ricerche umanistiche, a c. di PAOLO VIAN, Roma 1992, 470–486.
- GAUCHAT, PATRICIUS: *Hierarchia Catholica medii et recentioris aevi IV*, Monasterii 1935.
- GÉFIN GYULA: *A szombathelyi egyházmegye története I–II* [*The History of the Diocese of Szombathely I–II*], Szombathely 1929.
- GEREVICH TIBOR: *A Római Magyar Történeti Intézet* [*The Hungarian Institute of History in Rome*], LK 2 (1924) 200–201.
- GERŐ LÁSZLÓ: *A római Santo Stefano Rotondo, a magyarok nemzeti temploma* [*The Santo Stefano Rotondo in Rome, the National Church of the Hungarians*], Budapest 1940.
- GOETZ, HELMUT *Die Finalrelation des venezianischen Gesandten Michele Suriano von 1555, Quellen und Forschungen aus Italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken* 41 (1961), 235–322.

- GRAFINGER, CHRISTINE MARIA: *Die Ausleihe vatikanischer Handschriften und Druckwerke (1563–1700)* (Studi e Testi [ST] 360), Città del Vaticano 1994.
- GRAFINGER, CHRISTINE MARIA: *Die Ausleihe Vatikanischer Handschriften und Druckwerke (18. Jahrhundert). I: Biblioteca Vaticana. II: Archivio Segreto Vaticano* (ST 406–407), Città del Vaticano 2002.
- GRAFINGER, CHRISTINE MARIA: *Ricerche di Vilmos Fraknói nel Vaticano, Gli Archivi della Santa Sede e il Regno d'Ungheria (secc. 15–20). In memoriam Lajos Pásztor* (CVH I/4), Budapest–Roma 2008, 247–254, 248–249.
- PUIG GRAU, ARNAU–ARCE, JAVIER: *La Scuola Spagnola di Storia e Archeologia, Speculum mundi*. Roma centro internazionale di ricerche umanistiche, a c. di PAOLO VIAN, Roma 1992, 239–256.
- HANUY FERENC (ed.): *Pázmány Péter... összegyűjtött levelei I–II [The Collected Letters of... Péter Pázmány I–II]*, Budapest 1910–1911.
- HANUY FERENC: *Kutatás Pázmány levelei után [A Search for Pázmány's Letters]*, Religio 67 (1908) 310–312. 325–327. 341–343. 358–361.
- HARSÁNYI ANDRÁS: *A domonkos rend Magyarországon a reformáció előtt [The Dominican Order in Hungary before the Reformation]*, Debrecen 1938.
- HARSÁNYI ANDRÁS: *A gróf Széchenyi család leszármazása [The Descent of the Count Széchenyi family]*, Turul 41 (1927) 76–83.
- HARSÁNYI ANDRÁS: *A vatikáni levéltári főiskola [The Archival College of the Vatican]*, LK 5 (1927) 264–271.
- HARSÁNYI ANDRÁS: *Báró Sennyey László S. J. nagyszombati rector római utazásai (1687., 1693., 1696.) [The Roman Travels of Baron László Sennyey S. J. Rector of Nagyszombat]* (A Szent István Akadémia Történelmi-, Jog- és Társadalomtudományi Osztályának Felolvasásai 2/1), Budapest 1929.
- HETÉNYI ÁGNES: *Il Palazzo Falconieri di Roma, Cento anni al servizio delle relazioni ungaro-italiane. Gli istituti ungheresi, scientifici, culturali ed ecclesiastici di Roma (1895–1995)* (a c. di László Csorba), Budapest 1998, 127–145.
- HODINKA ANTAL: *A munkácsi görög szertartású püspökség okmánytára. I: 1448–1715 [The Archives of the Greek Rite Bishoprics of Munkács]*, Ungvár 1911.
- HODINKA ANTAL: *A munkácsi görög-katolikus püspökség története [The History of the Greek Catholic Bishoprics of Munkács]*, Budapest 1910.
- HODINKA ANTAL: *A római levéltárak, Regesta supplicationum. A pápai kérvénykönyvek magyar vonatkozású okmányai. Avignoni korszak. I: VI. Kelemen pápa 1342–1352. II: VI. Ince pápa 1352–1362. V. Orbán pápa 1362–1370. VII. Kelemen ellenpápa 1378–1394 [Regesta supplicationum. The Hungarian Related Documents of the Papal Petition-books. Avignon era. I: Pope Clement VI 1342–1352. II: Pope Innocent VI 1352–1362. Pope Urban V 1362–1370. Antipope Clement VII 1378–1394]* (published by Árpád Bossányi), Budapest 1916–1918.
- HÓMAN BÁLINT–SZEKFŰ GYULA: *Magyar történet. III [Hungarian History. III]* (written by GYULA SZEKFŰ), Budapest 1939.

- HÓMAN BÁLINT: *A forráskutatás és forráskritika története Magyarországon* [*The History of Source Research and Source Criticism in Hungary*], (A magyar történettudomány kézikönyve I/3a), Budapest 1925.
- IVÁNYI BÉLA: *A Szent Domonkos-rend római központi levéltára (Részletek a magyar dominikánus provincia múltjából)* [*The Roman Central Archives of the Saint Dominican Order (Selections from the History of the Hungarian Dominican Province)*] LK 7 (1929) 1–30.
- JAKAB ANTAL: *Az erdélyi római katolikus püspöki szék betöltésének vitája a XVII. században* [*The Dispute over the Filling of the Roman Catholic Episcopal See of Transylvania in the 17th Century*] (Erdélyi Tudományos füzetek 172), Kolozsvár 1944.
- JAKÓ ZSIGMOND: *Batthyány Ignác, a tudós és a tudányszervező* [Ignác Batthyány, the Scholar and Research Organizer], [IDEM], Társadalom, egyház, művelődés (METEM Könyvek 18), Budapest 1997.
- Jézusita okmánytár. I/1–2: *Erdélyt és Magyarországot érintő iratok 1601–1606* [*Jesuit Archives. I/1–2: The Documents Related to Hungary and Transylvania 1601–1606*] (Adattár XVI–XVIII. századi szellemi mozgalmaink történetéhez 34; publ. by BALÁZS, MIHÁLY–KRUPPA, TAMÁS–LÁZÁR, ISTVÁN DÁVID–LUKÁCS, LÁSZLÓ), Szeged 1995.
- KÁROLYI ÁRPÁD: *Az ellenreformáció kezdetei és Thurzó György nádorrá választása* [*The Beginning of Counter-Reformation and György Thurzó's Election to be the Palatine*], Századok 53 (1919) 1–28 and 124–163.
- KÁRPÁTHY-KRAVJÁNSZKY MÓR: *Forgách Ferenc bíbornok-érsek történetéhez* [*To the History of Ferenc Forgách Cardinal-Archbishop*], Regnum 3 (1938/39) 169–176.
- KATONA, STEPHANUS: *Historia critica regum Hungariae I–XLII*, Budae–Vacii–Colocae, 1779–1817.
- KESSEL, PETER VAN–VALK, HANS DE ET AL.: *L'Istituto Olandese di Roma*, Speculum mundi. Roma centro internazionale di ricerche umanistiche, a c. di PAOLO VIAN, Roma 1992, 299–329.
- JÓZSEF KÖBLÖS: *Az egyházi középréteg Mátyás és a Jagellók korában* [*The Ecclesiastical Middle Layer under Matthias and the Jagiellons*] (Társadalom- és Művelődéstudományi Tanulmányok 12), Budapest 1994.
- KOLLÁNYI FERENC: *A vatikáni levéltár* [*The Vatican Archives*], MS 7 (1893) 362–370.
- KOLLÁNYI FERENC: *Az olasz állami könyvtárak* [*The Italian State Libraries*], Budapest 1898 (31 p., offprint from MKSz).
- KOLLÁNYI FERENC: *Az olasz könyvtárak 1885. évi pragmatikája* [*The Italian Libraries' Pragmatics of 1885*], MKSz 15 (1890) 191–218.
- KOLLÁNYI FERENC: *Regesták a római és parmai levéltárakból* [*Regesta from the Archives of Rome and Parma*], TT 1905, 311–376.
- KÖPECZI BÉLA: *Rákóczi követe Rómában* [*Rákóczi's Legate in Rome*], TSz 25 (1982) 404–415.

- KÖRMENDY JÓZSEF: *Annatae e regno Hungariae provenientes in Archivio Secreto Vaticano 1421–1536* (A Magyar Országos Levéltár Kiadványai II/21), Budapest 1990.
- KÖRMENDY JÓZSEF: *Gr. Volkra Ottó Ker. János veszprémi püspök élete és munkássága 1665–1720 [The Life and Work of János Gr. Volkra Ottó Ker. Bishop of Veszprém 1665–1720]* (A Veszprémi Egyházmegye Múltjából 16), Veszprém 1995.
- KORZENSZKY E.–VÁRI R., *Onosandri Strategicus* (Sylloge Tacticorum Graecorum 2), Budapest 1935.
- KOSÁRY DOMONKOS: *Művelődés a XVIII. századi Magyarországon [Culture in Eighteenth Century Hungary]*, Budapest 1996.
- KRAVJÁNSZKY MÓR: *A velencei állami levéltár [The State Archives of Venice]*, LK 4 (1926) 1–19.
- NAGY KATALIN: *Vilmos Fraknói's research requests in the Vatican Apostolic Archives (1881–1885), Hungary and the Holy See of Rome. III. Exquisitae lucubrationes Cornelio Szovák amicabiliter dicatae* (CVH I/21), Budapest–Rome 2022, 307–322.
- KRUPPA TAMÁS: *Erdély és a Porta 1594–1597. évi békealkudozásainak történetéhez [On the History of Transylvania and the Porte's Peace Negotiations in 1594–1597]*, Századok 137 (2003) 603–652.
- KUBINYI ANDRÁS: *Magyarok a késő-középkori Rómában [Hungarians in late Medieval Rome]* (Studia Miskolciensia 3), Miskolc 1999, 83–91.
- La Chiesa cattolica dell'Europa centro-orientale di fronte al comunismo, Atteggiamenti, strategie, tattiche*, a cura di ANDRÁS FEJÉRDY, Roma 2013.
- L'Ungheria angioina*, a cura di ENIKŐ CSUKOVITS, Roma 2013.
- LÁNCZY GYULA: *Vatikáni anyagok Magyarországnak Szent István király által pápai bűbérül való felajánlásához [Materials of the Vatican to Hungary for the Offer as Papal Tenure by King Saint Stephen]*, Századok 35 (1901) 905–921.
- LUKÁCS LAJOS (ed.): *A Vatikán és Magyarország 1846–1878. A bécsi apostoli nunciusok jelentései és levelezése Magyarországról [The Vatican and Hungary 1846–1878. The Reports and Correspondence of the Apostolic Nuncios of Vienna from Hungary]*, Budapest 1981.
- LUKÁCS LAJOS (ed.): *The Vatican and Hungary 1846–1878. Reports and Correspondence of the Apostolic Nuncios in Vienna on Hungary*, Budapest 1981.
- LUKÁCS LAJOS: *A független magyar jezsuita rendtartomány kérdése és az osztrák abszolutizmus [The Question of the Independent Hungarian Jesuit Province and the Austrian Absolutism]*, Szeged 1989.
- LUKÁCS LÁSZLÓ–SZABÓ FERENC: *Autour de la nomination de Péter Pázmány au siège primatial d'Esztergom (1614–1616)*, Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu 54 (1985) 77–148.
- LUKACSICS JÓZSEF: *A középkori pápai adókönyvek [The Medieval Papal Register of Tax-payers]*, Budapest 1908.

- LUKCSICS JÓZSEF: *Uski János veszprémi püspök Zsigmond király diplomatája* [The Diplomate of King Sigismund János Uski, Bishop of Veszprém], Századok 42 (1908) 1–28.
- LUKCSICS PÁL: *A vatikáni Magyar Krónika kódexéről és szövegéről* [About the Codex and Text of the Hungarian Chronicle in the Vatican], MKSz 36 (1929) 141–146.
- LUKINICH IMRE: *A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Történettudományi Bizottsága másolat- és kéziratgyűjteményének ismertetése* [The Representation of the Historical Committee of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences' Collection of Copies and Manuscripts], Budapest 1935, 20–30. 33–41. 75.
- LUTTOR FERENC: *Mária Terézia halála és a római Kúria* [The Death of Maria Theresa and the Roman Curia], Budapest 1914.
- Magyar Országgyűlési Emlékek X–XII* [Monumenta comitialia Regni Hungariae], MHH III/10–12, Budapest 1899–1917.
- MÁRFFY OSCAR: *Lettere inedite mandate dalla Transilvania al Cardinale Federico Borromeo*, Milano 1935.
- MERTENS JOZEF: *L'Accademia Belgica, Speculum mundi*. Roma centro internazionale di ricerche umanistiche, a c. di PAOLO VIAN, Roma 1992, 19–27.
- MESZLÉNYI ANTAL: *A jozefinizmus kora Magyarországon (1780–1846)* [The Age of Josephinism in Hungary (1780–1846)], Budapest 1934.
- MESZLÉNYI ANTAL: *Az egri érsekség felállításának, s a kassai és szatmári püspökség kibasításának története* [The History of the Establishment of the Archbishoprics of Eger and the Carving out of the Bishoprics of Kassa and Szatmár], Budapest 1938.
- MESZLÉNYI ANTAL: *Szelepcsényi prímás és Északmagyarország rekatolizálása* [Primate Szelepcsényi and the Recatholicization of Northern Hungary], Theologia 2 (1935) 215–225 and 325–337.
- MOLNÁR ANTAL: *A 85 éves P. Lukács László Sŷ köszöntése* [The Festschrift of the 85 Years Old László P. Lukács Sŷ], MEV–Regnum 7 (1995) 1–2, 247–260.
- MOLNÁR ANTAL: *Egy magyar egyháztörténész a 20. században: Ványó Tibamér OSB* [A Hungarian Church Historian in the 20th Century: Tibamér Ványó OSB], MEV 6 (1994) 1–2, 37–50, 43–50.
- MOLNÁR ANTAL: *Katolikus missziók a bódolt Magyarországon. I: 1572–1647* [Catholic Missions in the Hungarian Territories under Turkish Rule I: 1572–1647] (Humanizmus és reformáció 26), Budapest 2002.
- MOLNÁR ANTAL: *Le Saint-Siège, Raguse et les missions catholiques de la Hongrie Ottomane 1572–1647*, Rome–Budapest 2007.
- MOLNÁR ANTAL: *Accademia d'Ungheria in Roma. Le ricerche ungheresi nell'Archivio Segreto Vaticano (1980–2010)*, Religiosa Archivorum Custodia. IV Centenario della Fondazione dell'Archivio Segreto Vaticano (1612–2012). Atti del Convegno di Studi. Città del Vaticano. 17–18 aprile 2012 (CAV 98), Città del Vaticano 2015, 686–698.
- MONAY FERENC: *A római magyar gyóntatók* [The Hungarian Confessors in Rome], Katholikus Szemle (KSz) 15 (1901) 385–394.

- MÜLLER, GEORG EDUARD: *Vatikanische Urkunden und Regesten zur Geschichte Siebenbürgens in den Jahren 1371–1377*, Archiv des Vereins für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde [N.F.] 24 (1892) 583–622.
- NAGY IVÁN: *Római magyar regesták*, Magyar TT 4 (1857) 225–260 [Dr. Dudik 1852–1853. évi kutatási nyomán közli – –].
- «*Nobile munus*». *Origini e primi sviluppi dell'Unione Internazionale degli Istituti di Archeologia, Storia e Storia dell'Arte in Roma* (1946–1953). *Per la storia della collaborazione internazionale a Roma nelle ricerche umanistiche nel secondo dopoguerra*, a c. di ERLAND BILLIG–CARL NYLANDER–PAOLO VIAN, Roma 1996, 3–81.
- ORTVAY TIVADAR (ed.): *Magyarország egyházi földleírása a XIV. század elején. A pápai tizedjegyzékek alapján feltüntetve I–II [Hungary's Ecclesiastical Description of Land at the Beginning of the Fourteenth Century. Indicated According to the Papal Tithe Catalogue I–II]*, Budapest 1891–1892.
- ÓRY MIKLÓS: *Pázmány Péter tanulmányi évei [The Studies of Péter Pázmány]*, Eisenstadt 1970.
- ÓVÁRY LIPÓT: *Jelentés olaszországi kutatásaimról [A Report on my Researches in Italy]*, Századok 18 (1884) 504–510.
- ÓVÁRY LIPÓT: *Kutatások a nápolyi Farnese levéltárban [Researches in the Farnese Archives in Naples]*, Századok 11 (1877) 1–17.
- P. SZŰCS JULIANNA: *La «scuola romana»*, Cento anni al servizio delle relazioni ungaro-italiane. Gli istituti ungheresi, scientifici, culturali ed ecclesiastici di Roma (1895–1995) (a c. di László Csorba), Budapest 1998, 95–126.
- PAANANEN, UNTO: *L'Institutum Romanum Finlandiae, Speculum mundi*. Roma centro internazionale di ricerche umanistiche, a c. di PAOLO VIAN, Roma 1992, 258–276.
- PALLOTTINO, MASSIMO: *Introduzione – Un Centro mondiale di cultura umanistica: l'Unione Internazionale degli Istituti di archeologia, Storia e Storia dell'Arte in Roma*, Speculum mundi. Roma centro internazionale di ricerche umanistiche, a c. di PAOLO VIAN, Roma 1992, 9–13.
- PAMLÉNYI ERVIN ET AL. (ed.): *Századok Repertoriuma (1867–1975) [The Repertory of Centuries (1867–1975)]*, Budapest 1987, 574–576.
- Pápai intézkedés a XVI. században a kéziratok szétrombolása ellen [Papal Measures against the Destroying of the Manuscripts in the Sixteenth Century]*, MKSz 15 (1907) 378.
- PÁSZTOR LAJOS: *A Vatikáni Levéltár [The Vatican Archives]*, LK 20–23 (1942–45) 100–129.
- PÁSZTOR LAJOS: *Gerevich Tibor a Római Magyar Történeti Intézet működéséről 1924–1926 [Tibor Gerevich About the Work of the Hungarian Institute of History in Rome 1924–1926]*, MEV–Regnum 8 (1996) 333–350, 335–336 and 342.
- PÁSZTOR LAJOS: *Guida delle fonti per la storia dell'America Latina negli archivi della Santa Sede e negli archivi ecclesiastici d'Italia* (CAV 2), Città del Vaticano 1970.

- PÁSZTOR LAJOS: *L'Istituto Storico Ungherese a Roma e il vescovo Vilmos Fraknói*, Archivio della Società Romana di Storia Patria 100 (1977) 143–166.
- PÁSZTOR LAJOS: *Le origini dell'Accademia d'Ungheria di Roma*, Un istituto scientifico a Roma: L'Accademia d'Ungheria (1895–1950) (Studi e Ricerche 7, a c. di Sárközy, Péter–Tolomeo, Rita), Roma 1993, 9–24.
- PÁSZTOR LAJOS: *Magyar kiállítás a Vatikáni Titkos Levéltárban [Hungarian Exhibition in the Vatican Secret Archives]*, LK 51–52 (1981–1982) 365–371.
- PÁSZTOR LAJOS: *Monumenta Vaticana res Hungariae illustrantia. Documenti et manuscritti*, Budapest, 1981 (*Archivio Segreto Vaticano. Documenti riguardanti l'Ungheria*. Prof. Dr. LAJOS PÁSZTOR archivista)
- PÁSZTOR LAJOS: *Vilmos Fraknói e i «Monumenta Vaticana historiam regni Hungariae illustrantia»*, Rivista di Studi Ungheresi 10 (1995) 44–59.
- PEHM JÓZSEF: *Padányi Bíró Márton veszprémi püspök élete és kora [The Life and Age of Bíró Márton Padányi, Bishop of Veszprém]* (A Veszprémi Egyházmegye Múltjából 2), Zalaegerszeg 1934.
- PÉTERFFY, CAROLUS: *Sacra concilia ecclesiae Romano-catholicae in regno Hungariae celebrata I–II*, Viennae–Posonii 1741–1742.
- PETTKÓ BÉLA: *Olasz emlékirat Bethlen Gábor megbuktatásáról [Italian Memoirs about the Rejection of Gábor Bethlen]*, Századok 24 (1890) 144–153.
- PIETRI, CHARLES–BOUTRY, PHILIPPE–UGINET, F. CHARLES, *La Scuola Francese di Roma*, Speculum mundi. Roma centro internazionale di ricerche umanistiche, a c. di PAOLO VIAN, Roma 1992, 215–237.
- POLGÁR LÁSZLÓ: *Bibliographia de historia Societatis Iesu in regnis olim Corona Hungarica unitis (1560–1773)* (Subsidia ad historiam S.I. [Bibliothecae Instituti Historici S.I. series minor] 2), Romae 1957.
- POLGÁR LÁSZLÓ: *Pázmány bibliográfia [The Bibliography of Pázmány]*, Pázmány Péter emlékezete. Halálának 350. évfordulójára (ed. by László Lukács–Ferenc Szabó), Róma 1987, 449–480.
- PRAY, GEORGIUS: *Specimen hierarchiae Hungariae I–II*, Posonii–Cassoviae 1776–1779.
- RAINER, JOHANN: *Historische Forschungen in Roma vor der Öffnung des Vatikanischen Archivs*, Römische Historische Mitteilungen (RHM) 23 (1981) 181–193.
- ROSNER, ERVIN: *Régi magyar házassági jog [The Old Hungarian Matrimonial Law]*, Budapest 1887.
- RUDOLF, KARL: *L'Istituto Storico Austriaco*, Speculum mundi. Roma centro internazionale di ricerche umanistiche, a c. di PAOLO VIAN, Roma 1992, 348–389.
- SANTIFALLER, LEO: *Briefe von Wilhelm Fraknói zu Theodor Sickel aus den Jahren 1877 bis 1906*, RHM 6–7 (1962–1964) 193–351.
- SÁVAI JÁNOS: *A csíksomlyói és a kantai iskola története [The History of the School in Csíksomlyó and Kanta]*, Szeged 1997.
- SÁVAI JÁNOS: *A Propaganda Fide Kongregáció levéltárából. Acta vol. 1–12 and SOCG vol. 56–79, [From the Archives of the Congregation for the Prop. of the Faith]*, Szeged 1993.

- SÁVAI JÁNOS: *Missziók, mesterek, licenciátusok [Missions, Masters, Lay Brothers]*, Szeged 1997 (its earlier version in Italian: *La partecipazione dei laici al lavoro pastorale in Ungheria nei secoli XVI–XVII*, Roma 1982).
- SÁVAI JÁNOS: *Pázmány és a szomaszokok. A szomaszokok genovai levéltárának dokumentumai [Pázmány and the Somascans. The Documents of the Somascans in the Archives of Geneva]*, Lymbus. Művelődéstörténeti Tár IV [ed. by István Monok], Szeged 1992, 123–141.
- SCHÖNHERR GYULA: *A római Casanate-könyvtár Korvin-kódexe [The Corvin-Codex of the Casanate-Library of Rome]*, MKSz 12 (1904) 435–469.
- SCOTT, RUSSEL T.: *La Scuola di Studi Classici dell'Accademia Americana in Roma, Speculum mundi*. Roma centro internazionale di ricerche umanistiche, a c. di PAOLO VIAN, Roma 1992, 31–45.
- SOMKUTI GABRIELLA: *Fraknói Vilmos a Széchényi Könyvtár élén [Vilmos Fraknói at the Head of the Széchényi Library]*, A Könyvtáros 40 (1991) 481–487.
- SÖRÖS PONGRÁC: *Forgách Ferencz a bíboros [Ferencz Forgách the Cardinal]*, Századok 34 (1901) 577–608. 691–723. 774–818.
- SZABÓ FERENC: *A teológus Pázmány [The Theologian Pázmány]* (METEM Könyvek 1), Róma 1990.
- SZÁDECZKY LAJOS: *Berzeviczy Albert utazásai 1818–1820 [The Travels of Albert Berzeviczy in 1818–1820]*, Földrajzi Közlemények 17 (1889) 286–321.
- SZELESTEI NAGY LÁSZLÓ: *Irodalom és tudományszervezési törekvések a 18. századi Magyarországon 1690–1790 [Efforts of Literature and Science Organization in Hungary of the Eighteenth Century 1690–1790]*, (Az Országos Széchényi Könyvtár Kiadványai [n.s.] 4), Budapest 1989, 49–54.
- SZELESTEI NAGY LÁSZLÓ: *Zrínyi Miklós tanácsai a császárnak 1664 tavaszán [The Advice of Miklós Zrínyi to the Emperor in the Spring of 1664]*, Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények 84 [1980] 185–198.
- SZILAS LÁSZLÓ: *Der Jesuit Alfonso Carillo in Siebenbürgen 1591–1599*, Roma 1976.
- THOENES, CHRISTOF–GULDA, ERNST–GRAF, DIETER, *La Bibliotheca Herziana, Speculum mundi*. Roma centro internazionale di ricerche umanistiche, a c. di PAOLO VIAN, Roma 1992, 56–79.
- TOMCSÁNYI LAJOS: *A főkegyúr szerepe a püspökök kinevezésénél [The Role of the Patron in the Appointment of the Bishops]*, Budapest 1922.
- TÓTH ISTVÁN GYÖRGY: *Between Islam and Catholicism: Bosnian Franciscan Missionaries in Turkish Hungary 1584–1716*, Catholic Historical Review 89 (2003) 3, 3–30.
- TÓTH ISTVÁN GYÖRGY: *Missions and Missionaries in the 17th Century Slovak Territory, Krestanstvo v Dejínach Slovenska* (ed. by Mária Kohútová), Pozsony 2003, 72–77.
- TÓTH ISTVÁN GYÖRGY: *Misszionáriusok jelentései Magyarországról és Erdélyről (1627–1707) [The Reports of the Missionaries about Hungary and Transylvania (1627–1707)]* (Bibliotheca Academiae Hungariae in Roma. Fontes 1), Budapest–Roma 1994.

- TÓTH ISTVÁN GYÖRGY: *Misszionáriusok levelei Magyarországról és Erdélyről (1572–1717) I–V [The Letters of the Missionaries about Hungary and Transylvania (1572–1717)]* (Bibliotheca Academiae Hungariae in Roma. Fontes 4), Roma–Budapest 2008.
- TÓTH ISTVÁN GYÖRGY: *The Introduction of the Gregorian Calendar and the Turks (The investigation of the bishop of Scardona in 1628)*, „Quasi liber et pictura”. Tanulmányok Kubinyi András hetvenedik születésnapjára (ed. by Gyöngyi Kovács et al.), Budapest 2004, 581–588.
- TÓTH ISTVÁN GYÖRGY–BENDA KÁLMÁN: *A jezsuiták mecsetje. Egy forráskiadvány margójára [The Mosque of the Jesuits. On the Margin of a Source Publication]*, Budapesti Könyvszemle 6 [1994] 20–25.
- TÓTH LÁSZLÓ: *Fraknoi Vilmos (1843–1924) [Vilmos Fraknoi (1843–1924)]*, MKSz 1924, 98–105.
- TÓTH LÁSZLÓ: *Vérancsics Faustus csanádi püspök és emlékiratai V. Pál pápához a magyar katolikus egyház állapotáról [Faustus Verancsics, Bishop of Csanád, and his Memoirs to Pope Paul V about the State of the Hungarian Catholic Church]*, A gróf Klebelsberg Kuno Magyar Történetkutató Intézet Évkönyve (ed. by Dávid Angyal), Budapest 1933, 155–211.
- TÓTH SZABÓ PÁL: *Magyarország a XV. század végén a pápai supplicatiók világánál [Hungary at the End of the Fifteenth Century in the light of the the Papal Supplications]*, Századok 37 (1903) 1–15. 151–159. 217–239. 327–344.
- TÓTH SZABÓ PÁL: *Jelentés vatikáni kutatásaimról [A Report on my Researches in the Vatican]*, AÉ 13 (1902) 177–186.
- TUSOR PÉTER: *A magyar hierarchia és a pápaság a 17. században (Problémák és fordulópontok) [The Hungarian Hierarchy and the Papacy in the 17th Century (Problems and Turning Points)]*, Századok 136 (2002) 527–545.
- TUSOR PÉTER: *I vescovi ungheresi e la Santa Sede Apostolica nel Seicento (Problemi e svolte decisive)*, Annuario dell’Accademia d’Ungheria in Roma, 2005, 138–161.
- UJVÁRY GÁBOR: *„Iskola” a határon túl. A Római Magyar Intézet története (1912–1945) [“School” Abroad. The History of the Hungarian Institute of History in Rome (1912–1945)]*, Levéltári Szemle (LSz) 45 [1995] 4, 3–37.
- UJVÁRY GÁBOR: *La storia dell’Istituto Ungherese a Roma dal 1912 al 1945, Cento anni al servizio delle relazioni ungaro-italiane. Gli istituti ungheresi, scientifici, culturali ed ecclesiastici di Roma (1895–1995) (a c. di László Csorba)*, Budapest 1998, 19–43.
- UJVÁRY GÁBOR: *Tudományszervezés–Történetkutatás–Forráskritika. Klebelsberg Kuno és a Bécsi Magyar Történeti Intézet [Organization of Research – Historiography – Source Criticism. Kuno Klebelsberg and the Hungarian Institute of History in Vienna]* (the publication of the Győr–Moson–Sopron county’s archives of Győr), Győr 1996, 43–67 (*A római magyar intézetek [The Hungarian Institutes in Rome]*).

- VANYÓ TIHAMÉR: *A bécsi pápai követség levéltárának iratai Magyarországról 1611–1786* [*The Documents of the Papal Delegation's Archives of Vienna from Hungary 1611–1789*] (Fontes Historiae Hungaricae Aevi Recentioris), Budapest 1986.
- VANYÓ TIHAMÉR: *A hazai bódoltság vatikáni források tükrében* [*The Hungarian Territories under Turkish Rule in the Light of Vatican Sources*], Vigilia 38 (1973) 88–97.
- VANYÓ TIHAMÉR: *A szerzetesi életforma válsága hazánkban a 18. század második felében* [*The Crisis of the Monastic Life in Hungary in the Second Half of the 18th Century*], Történelmi Szemle [TSz] 25 [1982] 211–228.
- VANYÓ TIHAMÉR: *Belgrádi püspökök jelentései a magyarországi bódoltság viszonyairól 1649–1673* [*The Reports of the Bishops of Belgrade about the Conditions of Hungary under Turkish Rule 1649–1673*], LK 42 (1971) 323–339.
- VANYÓ TIHAMÉR: *Das Archiv der Konsistorialkongregation in Rom und die kirchliche Zustände Ungarns in der zweiten Hälfte des 18. Jahrhunderts*, Festschrift zur Feier des zweihundertjährigen Bestandes des Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv I, Wien 1949, 151–179.
- VANYÓ TIHAMÉR: *Orvostörténeti vonatkozások a Vatikáni Levéltárból* [*The Aspects of Medical History from the Vatican Archives*], Orvostörténeti Közlemények 60–61 (1971) 241–248.
- VANYÓ TIHAMÉR: *Újabb publikációk a pápai nunciatura-történeti kutatások köréből* [*Newer Publications from the Sphere of the Historical Researches of the Papal Nunciatures*], LK 40 (1969) 368–373.
- VANYÓ TIHAMÉR: *A Vatikáni Levéltár és kutatása* [*The Vatican Archives and its Research*], LK 43 (1972) 157–162.
- VÁRADY IMRE: *Alegújabb olasz irodalom* [*The Latest Italian Literature*], Szombathely 1925.
- VÁRADY L. ÁRPÁD: *Lonovics József római küldetése. Függelékül: Lonovics római naplója* [*The Roman Commission of József Lonovics. As an Appendix: the Roman Diary of Lonovics*] Budapest 1924.
- VÁRI REZSŐ: *Leonis imperatoris Tactica I–II* [1–2] (Sylloge Tacticorum Graecorum 3), Budapest 1917–1922.
- VÁRI REZSŐ: *Történeti intézetek Rómában. Adalék a legújabb kor tudománytörténelméhez* [*Institutes of History in Rome*], Budapest 1916, 45–52.
- VÉGHSEŐ TAMÁS: *Benkovich Ágoston váradai püspök működésének görög katolikus vonatkozásai (1682–1702)* [*The Greek Catholic Relations of Ágoston Benkovich's Activity, Bishop of Várad (1682–1702)*], Athanasia 16 (2003) 99–122.
- VÉGHSEŐ TAMÁS: *Egy misszionáriusi életút indulása a XVII. században. Vanoviczi János OSPPE (1614–1678)* [*The Beginning of Life as a Missionary in the 17th Century. János Vanoviczi OSPPE (1614–1678)*], A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Szabolcs–Szatmár–Bereg megyei Tudományos Testülete 10 éves jubileumi közgyűléssel egybekötött tudományos ülésének előadásai, Nyíregyháza 2002, II, 684–691.

- VERESS ENDRE (ed.): *A római Collegium Germanicum et Hungaricum magyarországi tanulóinak anyakönyve és iratai* [*Matricula and Documents of the Hungarian Students of the Collegium Germanicum et Hungaricum in Rome*] (Fontes rerum Hungaricarum 2), Budapest 1917.
- VERESS ENDRE (ed.): *A bolognai Marsigli-iratok magyar vonatkozásai* [*The Hungarian Relations of the Marsigli-Documents of Bologna*], MKSz 14 (1906) 109–130, 211–231.
- VERESS ENDRE (ed.): *Carillo Alfonz jezsuita atya levelezése és iratai I* [*The Correspondence and Documents of Alfonz Carillo Jesuit Priest I*] (MHH I/32), Budapest 1906.
- VERESS ENDRE[–BENDA KÁLMÁN] (ed.): *Giovanni Argenti jelentései magyar ügyekről 1603–1623* [*The Reports of Giovanni Argenti about the Hungarian Cases 1603–1623*] (Adattár XVI–XVIII. századi szellemi mozgalmaink történetéhez 7), Szeged 1983.
- VIAN, PAOLO (ed.): *Speculum mundi. Roma centro internazionale di ricerche umanistiche*, Roma 1992.
- WAGNER, WALTER: *Die Bestände des Archivio della Nunziatura Vienna bis 1792*, RHM 2 [1957–1958] 82–203.
- WEINRICH, LORENZ (ed.): *Hungarici monasterii ordinis Sancti Pauli primi beremitaie de urbe Roma instrumenta et priorum registra*, Roma–Budapest 1999.
- TIMOTHY PETER WISEMAN, *La Scuola Britannica di Roma*, *Speculum mundi. Roma centro internazionale di ricerche umanistiche*, a c. di PAOLO VIAN, Roma 1992, 83–117.
- WOLF RÓZSI: *Ismeretlen Michelangelo iratok* [*Unknown Documents of Michelangelo*], Roma–Budapest 1931.
- ŻABOKLICKI, KRZYSZTOF: *A lengyel történészek Rómában Fraknói Vilmos idejében és a Lengyel Könyvtár megalapítása* [*Polish Historians in Rome in the Days of Vilmos Fraknói and the Establishment of the Polish Library*], MEV 7 (1995) 3–4, 171–178 (translated by Ádám Somorjai).
- ZÁVODSZKY, LEVENTE: *Pongrácz Imre báró egri kanonok római útja és iskoláztatása* [*The Roman Travel and Education of Baron Imre Pongrácz, Canon of Eger*], Religio 1901, 646–647 and 662–663.
- ZOMBORI, ISTVÁN (ed.): *Magyarország és a Szentsték kapcsolatának ezer éve* [*One Thousand Years of the Connection between Hungary and the Holy See*], Budapest 1996.
- ZSÁK J. ADOLF: *A római Ottoboni-könyvtár hazai vonatkozásai* [*The Hungarian Relations of the Ottoboni-Library in Rome*], MKSz 17 (1909) 244–251. 335–346.

Abbreviations

AÉ	Akadémiai Értesítő [<i>Academical Bulletin</i>]
BDHIR	Bibliothek des Deutschen Historischen Instituts in Rom
CAV	Collectanea Archivi Vaticani
CVH	Collectanea Hungariae Vaticana
HK	Hadtörténelmi Közlemények [<i>Communications of War History</i>]
KSz	Katholikus Szemle [<i>Catholic Review</i>]
LK	Levéltári Közlemények [<i>Archival Communications</i>]
MEV	Magyar Egyháztörténeti Vázlatok [<i>Hungarian Essay on Church history</i>]
MHH	Monumenta Hungariae Historica
MHI	Monumenta Hungariae Italica (Olaszországi Magyar Oklevéltár / Emlékek)
MKSz	Magyar Könyvszemle [<i>Hungarian Book Review</i>]
MREV	Monumenta Romana Episcopatus Vesprimiensis
MS	Magyar Sion [<i>Hungarian Sion</i>]
MTA	Magyar Tudományos Akadémia [<i>Hungarian Academy of Sciences</i>]
MVH	Monumenta Vaticana historiam Regni Hungariae illustrantia (Monumenta Vaticana Hungariae – Vatikáni Magyar Okirattár)
NB	Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland nebst ergänzenden Aktenstücken
QF	Quellen und Forschungen aus dem Gebiete der Geschichte
RHM	Römische Historische Mitteilungen
RMA	Római Magyar Akadémia [<i>Hungarian Academy in Rom</i>]
ST	Studi e Testi
TSz	Történelmi Szemle [<i>Historical Review</i>]
TT	Történelmi Tár [<i>Historical Archives</i>]

Register

- Aba Novák Vilmos 69.
Ábel Jenő 37. 38. 39.
Adriányi Gábor 26. 27. 120.
Albani 40. 116.
Áldásy Antal 29. 35. 45. 47. 48. 49. 51. 59.
60. 61. 65. 66. 75. 77. 90. 103. 109. 116.
Alexander VI 14. 40. 42.
Alexander VIII 66.
Altamura, Antonio 84.
Ambró Béla 47.
Anjou 44. 91. 92.
Arató Pál 112.
Argenti, Giovanni 81. 116.
Artner Edgár 85. 88. 89.
- Baán István 118.
Bacsányi János 98.
Bak Borbála 113.
Bakács János 103.
Balacchi, Balacco 92.
Balach, *see* Balacchi, Balacco
Balan, Pietro 19.
Balanyi György 103.
Balázs Mihály 111. 118.
Balázs Péter 114.
Balics Lajos 37.
Balogh Albin 82. 85.
Balogh József 99.
Bánfi Florio (Holik Flóris) 84. 102. 103.
- Barberini 14. 16. 36. 41. 45. 46. 74. 82.
90. 93. 108. 120.
Barkóczy Ferenc 98.
Barta Gábor 101. 114. 118.
Bartonek Emma 85. 102.
Báthori[y] Miklós 90.
Báthory András 13. 100.
Báthory István 9.
Báthory[i] 64. 90. 119.
Batthyány Ignác 11. 12. 13.
Beke Antal 29. 40. 109.
Béla III (Árpáds) 96.
Bélay Vilmos 114.
Benda Kálmán 64. 112. 116.
Benedetti, Giacomo de 84.
Benedict XII 30.
Benedict XIII 45.
Berán Ferenc 114.
Berkovits Ilona 84.
Bernjakovics Mátyás
Berzeviczy Albert 9. 57. 70. 73.
Berzeviczy Albert Volstán 14.
Bethlen Gábor 44. 45. 76.
Biaudet, Henry 51.
Bitnicz Lajos 98.
Bolognetti, Alberto 51.
Boniface IX 32.
Bonnaz Sándor 21.
Borghese 16. 43. 45. 46. 47. 78. 109.

- Borián Elréd 107.
 Borovi József 94. 113.
 Borromeo, Federico 106.
 Borromini, Francesco 69.
 Borsa Iván 114. 115. 120.
 Bossányi Árpád 17. 65. 66. 73. 108. 109. 117.
 Bracciano, Duke of *see* Del Grillo, Onofrio
 Brenner Domokos 116.
 Bubics Zsigmond 20. 21.
 Buday Károly 95.
 Bunyitay Vince 17. 25. 29. 37.
 Buonvisi, Francesco 23.
 Burgio, Antonio 11. 44.

 Calcagnini, Celio 90.
 Caligari, Giovanni Andrea 51.
 Callixtus III 65. 95.
 Capello[i], Adriano 95.
 Carillo, Alfonso 63.
 Casanate, Girolamo 14. 41. 45. 74. 90. 99.
 Castello, Alfredo 84.
 Charles Robert I (Anjou) 91.
 Chigi 45. 74. 90. 108.
 Chobot Ferenc 64.
 Clement VI 23. 25. 45. 65.
 Clement VII 41. 44. 45. 65.
 Clement VII (antipope) 162.
 Clement VIII 33.
 Clement XII 40.
 Corsini 14. 31. 45.
 Czaich Gilbert 29. 38. 43. 109.
 Csánki Dezső 58. 75.
 Csaplár Benedek 20. 29.
 Császka György 20. 21. 42.
 Cseles Márton 10. 38.
 Csorba László 56. 140.
 Csukovits Enikő 120.

 Dániel Imre 12.
 Dankó József 20. 21. 29.
 Datini 90.
 Décsényi-Schönherr Gyula *see* Schönherr Gyula
 Del Grillo, Onofrio 97.
 Desericzky Ince József 11.
 Domanovszky Sándor 98.
 Domitrovich Péter 10.
 Dóry Ferenc 33. 103. 104.
 Draskóczy István 114.
 Draskovich György 13.
 Dudith András 13.
 Dulánszky Nándor 18. 22.
 Dümmerth Dezső 9. 10.

 Eckhart Ferenc 96.
 E. Kovács Péter 120.
 Emeric I (Árpáds) 93.
 Emiliani, Aloysio 98.
 Endre Anjou) 92.
 Engel János 99.
 Eördögh István 121.
 Erdélyi Gabriella 119.
 Erdő Péter 120. 128. 130.
 Érdújhelyi Menyhért 38. 42. 43. 109.
 Ermini, F. 98.
 Érszegi Géza 114. 115.
 Érszegi Márk Aurél 121.
 Eugene IV 37. 38. 39. 91. 92.

 Faludi Ferenc 98.
 Farnese 16. 30. 44. 69.
 Farnese, Alessandro 16.
 Fáy Erzsébet 112.
 Fazekas István 118.
 Fehér Ipoly 43.
 Fejér György 11.
 Fejérpataky László 18. 26. 38. 57. 59. 60. 72.
 Félegyházy József 95. 104.

- Ferdinand I (Habsburg) 13.
 Fermendžin, Eusebius 48.
 Fetser Antal 55. 65.
 Fischer-Colbrie Ágoston 55.
 Florianus, Ioannes 91.
 Főgel József 89. 90.
 Forgách Ferenc 43.
 Forster Gyula 40. 53. 57. 59. 60.
 Fraknói (Frankl) Vilmos 42. 43. 44. 46.
 47. 48. 49. 52–81. 85. 86. 87. 89. 90.
 96. 104. 107. 108. 109. 114. 117. 121.
 122. 123. 125. 126. 127. 128. 129. 132. 133.
 135. 136. 137. 138. 140. 141. 142. 143.
 144. 145. 146. 147. 148.
 Francis Joseph I (Habsburg-Lorraine) 53.
 Frankl Sándor 138. 141.
 Fráter György *see* Martinuzzi György
 Fráter János, Mrs 18.
 Füssy Tamás 20.
 Füzes Ádám 119.

 Galla Ferenc 76. 81. 85. 87. 93. 94. 100.
 104. 106. 107. 108. 109. 116. 117.
 Garampi, Giuseppe 12.
 Gauchat, Patricius 114.
 Gazottus, Ágoston 92.
 Géfin Gyula 97. 98. 100.
 Genthon István 76. 84. 85.
 Gerendás Ernő 98. 107. 109.
 Gerevich Tibor 62. 67. 70. 72. 73. 74. 75.
 76. 77. 80. 82. 85. 87. 89. 92.
 Gerő László Jr 84.
 Ghisalberti, Carlo 98.
 Gombosi György 82. 85.
 Gombosi Ottó 100.
 Gregory VII 100.
 Gregory IX 30.
 Gregory XI 46.

 Hajnal István 96.

 Hanák Péter 84.
 Hangács Albert 90.
 Hanuy Ferenc 66.
 Haudek Ágoston 47.
 Haynald Lajos 18. 19. 21. 27.
 Hegedűs István 60.
 Hell, Maximilianus 14.
 Henry VIII (Tudor) 48.
 Hergenröther, Joseph 17.
 Herzan Ferenc 97. 98.
 Hevenesí Gábor 10. 11. 149.
 Hodinka Antal 14. 30. 40. 64. 65. 66.
 116. 118.
 Hoffmann Edith 85.
 Hóman Bálint 10. 11. 69. 93.
 Hoór-Tempis István 79. 94.
 Hornig Károly 34. 35. 43. 55. 63.
 Horváth Ferenc 25. 36.
 Horváth Henrik 82. 85.
 Horváth József 113.
 Hunyadi János 90.
 Huszti Dénes 84.
 Huszti József 85. 90. 122.

 Iacobus, Maximilian 14.
 Illicini (Mengin) Péter 96.
 Inchoffer Menyhért 9. 10.
 Innocent VI 45. 65.
 Innocent VII 39.
 Innocent VIII 16. 40. 42.
 Innocent XII 10.
 Ipolyi Arnold 9. 17. 18. 20. 21. 22. 26. 27.
 29. 31.
 Ivanich Pál 90.
 Iványi Béla 85. 102. 103.

 Jacobini, Ludovico 17. 19.
 Jagiellon 99.
 Jakab Antal 101.
 John I (Szapolyai) 13.

- John XXII 30.
 Joseph II (Habsburg-Lorraine) 92.
 Joseph, palatin (Habsburg-Lorraine) 14.
 Julius III 41.
 Justh István 85.

 Kaczvinsky Viktor 22.
 Kalmár András 21.
 Karácsonyi János 25. 35. 37. 38. 39. 48.
 Kardos Tibor 84. 86.
 Károlyi Árpád 46.
 Kárpáthy-Kravánszky Mór 102. 107. 109.
 Karttunen, Liisi 51.
 Kastner Jenő *see* Koltay-Kastner Jenő
 Katona István 11.
 Katterbach, Bruno 95.
 Kerényi Károly 84.
 Keresztély Ágost (Saxe-Weitz) 101.
 Keresztury Dezső 109.
 Kinczli József *see* Félegyházy József
 Klebelsberg Kuno 67. 68. 69. 70. 71. 72.
 74. 80. 83. 84. 126. 127.
 Knauz Nándor 20. 29.
 Kollányi Ferenc 38. 41. 44. 75. 109.
 Koller József 11.
 Kollonich Lipót 10.
 Koltay-Kastner Jenő 77. 82. 84. 85. 90.
 Komjáthy Miklós 114.
 Koudela Géza 100.
 Kovács Gyula 46.
 Kovács Zsigmond 22.
 Kováts Erasmus 101.
 Körmendy József 113.
 Kreusz Krizosztom 21.
 Kruppa Tamás 119.
 Kubinyi András 120.
 Kuncz Adolf 22.
 Kuzsinszky Bálint 60.

 Láczy Gyula 46.

 Laskai Osvát 99.
 Latinovich Gábor 20.
 Lékai László 114.
 Lénárd Sándor 84.
 Lengyel Alfréd 114.
 Leo XIII 17. 23. 24. 25. 27.
 Ligeti Antal 136. 139. 142. 145.
 Lipovniczky István 22.
 Lippay György 95. 131.
 Louis I, the Great (Anjou) 46. 92. 93.
 Louis II (Jagiellon) 13. 44. 88. 89.
 Lőrinc, bishop of Munkács 13.
 Lucius, Iacobus 91.
 Lukács György 84.
 Lukács Lajos 115.
 Lukács László 111. 112. 118.
 Lukács József 103. 113.
 Lukács Pál 34. 85. 91. 92. 99. 103. 104.
 108. 109. 116.
 Luttor Ferenc 66.

 Magyar Eszter 114.
 Magyary Zoltán 80.
 Maksay Ferenc 114.
 Málnási Ödön 104. 105.
 Marconi, Emidio 136. 137. 138.
 Marini, Gaetano 12.
 Markusz Gyula 20.
 Marnavich Tomkó János 85. 104.
 Marsigli, Ferdinando 46. 91.
 Martin V 40. 45. 91.
 Martinuzzi György 101.
 Martius, G. *see* Marzio, Galeotto
 Marzio, Galeotto 90.
 Matthias I (Hunyadi/Corvinus) 13. 29.
 32. 39. 89. 90. 91. 100.
 Merényi Lajos 39.
 Mester István 112.
 Meszlényi Antal 95. 96. 100. 104. 115.
 Mihajlovics József 22.

Mihalik Sándor 82. 83. 85.
 Mihályi Ernő 85.
 Mindszenty (Pehm) József 103.
 Mircse János 44.
 Miskolczy Gyula 72. 75. 76. 77.
 Miskolczy István 82. 85. 91. 93. 100.
 Modrovics György 21.
 Molnár Antal 116. 117.
 Montefeltre, Federico de 90.
 Moravcsik Gyula 82. 85.
 Morone, Giovanni 47.
 Mussolini, Benito 87.
 Müller György 46.

 Nagy Artúr 84.
 Nagy Katalin 28.
 Nagy Lajos 82. 85.
 Németh József 20. 21.
 Németh László 114. 115.
 Némethy Géza 60.
 Nicholas V 90.

 Oborni Teréz 114.
 Odescalchi 97.
 Onori, Nicola 136. 140. 142. 146.
 Ormódy Vilmos 60.
 Orsini 97.
 Ortvyar Tivadar 20.
 Ottoboni 108.
 Óváry Lipót 16. 44. 47. 91.

 Palestrina, Giovanni Pierluigi 100.
 Pallavicini-Rospigliosi 97.
 Pallay Miklós 35. 43.
 Pannonius (de Pannonia), Andreas 89.
 Pannonius, Janus 90. 91.
 Pastor, Ludwig von 48.
 Pásztor Edit 120.
 Pásztor Lajos 18. 28. 33. 56. 65. 79. 98.
 107. 109. 110. 120. 128. 129.

Patthy Károly 61.
 Paul II 43. 95.
 Paul III 44.
 Pauler Gyula 15.
 Pázmány Péter 10. 16. 58. 95. 118. 136.
 139. 142. 145.
 Peitler József 21. 22.
 Pesty Frigyes 39.
 Péter Andor 100.
 Péter András 85.
 Péterffy Károly 11.
 Pisano, Pandolfo 90.
 Pius II 43. 90. 95.
 Pius IV 41.
 Pius VI 12. 98.
 Pius VII 98.
 Pius IX 16. 30.
 Pius X 54.
 Pius XI 74.
 Pius XII 109.
 Platania, Gaetano 7. 128.
 Polgár László 112.
 Pór Antal 23. 25.
 Pray György 11. 12.

 Rabinovszky Márius 84.
 Rácz Elemér 95.
 Rácz György 120.
 Ráczek János 21.
 Rákóczi Ferenc, II 91. 101.
 Rákóczi György, I 45.
 Rapaics Rajmund 29.
 Révai József 84.
 Ribiczey Gyula 96.
 Rimely Károly 21.
 Ritzler, Remigius 114.
 Romanus, Aegidius 90.
 Rómer Flóris 18. 20. 29.
 Ronconi, Sebastiano 13.
 Roskoványi Ágoston 15. 21.

- Rosner Ervin 46.
 Rossi, V. 98.
 Ruggiero, Guido de 84.
 Ruschi, abbot 14.
 Ruzicska Pál 84.

 Sacconi, Carlo 25.
 Saint Adalbert of Prague 94.
 Saint Elizabeth of Hungary/Thuringia (Árpáds) 94.
 Saint Januarius 94.
 Saint Ladislaus I (Árpáds) 94.
 Saint Margaret (Árpáds) 44. 90.
 Saint Quirinus 98.
 Saint Stanislaus 98.
 Sanfilippo, Matteo 7. 128.
 Sántha János 112.
 Sármándi Sándor 104.
 Sávai János 117. 118.
 Scheffler János 66.
 Schernstein, captain 101.
 Schlauch Lőrinc 18. 22. 29.
 Schönherr Gyula 39. 41. 44.
 Schusztter Konstantin 20. 21.
 Scitovszky János 40.
 Sefrin, Priminus 114.
 Sennyey László 104.
 Severoli, Antonio Gabriele 93.
 Sickel, Theodor 18. 30. 31.
 Siculus, Callimachus 90.
 Sigismund (of Luxembourg) 91.
 Simon Vince 22.
 Simor János 16. 18. 21. 25. 28. 151.
 Sirleto, Guglielmo 9.
 Sixtus IV 39.
 Solomon (Árpáds) 91.
 Solymosi László 114. 120.
 Sörös Pongrác 43.
 Steinhuber, Andreas 48.
 Strozza, Tito Vespasiano 90.

 Sujánszky Antal 21.
 Supka Jeromos 22.
 Szabady Béla 103.
 Szabó Ferenc 112.
 Szabó László 84.
 Szakály Ferenc 114.
 Szalay Ákos 85.
 Szalkai László 44.
 Szántó István 9. 112.
 Szarka Gyula 103.
 Szekfű Gyula 97. 98. 99. 100. 101.
 Szelepcényi (Szelepcsényi) György 95. 104.
 Szentiványi Márton 10.
 Szilágyi Sándor 35. 53.
 Szilas László 112.
 Szily János 97. 98.
 Szittyay Dénes 112.
 Szmrecsányi Pál 53. 54. 55.
 Szovák Kornél 120.

 Taksonyi József 101. 102.
 Tárkányi Béla 16. 17. 19. 20. 21. 22. 25. 27. 29.
 Tassy Ferenc 93.
 Temesvári Pelbárt 99.
 Thallóczy Lajos 47.
 Theiner, Augustin 15. 16. 20. 27. 42. 89.
 Thuróczi János 90.
 Toldy Ferenc 91.
 Tomcsányi Lajos 100.
 Torrò, Guiditta 84.
 Tóth István György 114. 115. 116. 120. 123. 127.
 Tóth László 33. 34. 85. 92. 103. 104. 106.
 Tóth Péter 114.
 Tóth-Szabó Pál 42. 109.
 Tóth Tibor 114.
 Török József 95.
 Turchány Tihamér 45.

- Ujváry Gábor 18.
Urban II 13.
Urban VI 45.

Vágner József 20.
Vanyó Tihamér 18. 79. 81. 85. 96. 97.
100. 103. 104. 105. 106. 107. 108. 109.
113. 116. 117.
Várady L. Árpád 104.
Vári Rezső 30. 60. 61. 62. 73. 86. 87.
Vározy Gyula 29. 36.
Vass József 58.
Vaszary Kolozs 21. 29. 39. 55. 151.
Vayer Lajos 84.
Véghseő Tamás 118.
Verancsics Antal 91.
Verancsics Faustus 104.

Veress Endre 29. 33. 42. 53. 63. 64. 80. 81.
102. 109. 116.
Vetési László 90.
Villányi Szaniszló 44.
Vitéz János 90.
Vladislaus I (Jagiellon) 90.
Vladislaus II (Jagiellon) 14.
Voinovich Géza 77.
Wlassics Gyula 57.
Wolf Rózsi (Tamássy Rosina) 83. 84.

Zágon József 112.
Zalka János 22.
Zichy János 9. 57. 58. 135.
Zovenzoni, Raffaello 90.
Zubriczky Aladár 43.
Zsák J. Adolf 44.



The volume presents Hungarian historical research in the Vatican and various collections in Rome and Italy. The monograph describes, point by point, the different periods of research history, from the Baroque to the positivist period, up to the end of the 20th century, with a view to the 21st century. Its main source material can be found in the manuscript collection of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (Budapest). This historiography diagnoses the significant problems of the Hungarian academic presence in Rome in relation to other Western European projects and institutions. The narrative focuses on the elected Bishop and Abbot-Canon Vilmos Fraknói, Secretary General of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and his heritage, who died a hundred years ago in 1924.



Péter Tusor was born in 1967 in Gödöllő, Hungary. Currently, he is a full professor at the Institute of History at Pázmány Péter Catholic University, a research advisor at the HUN-REN Gyula Moravcsik Institute and head of the Vilmos Fraknói Research Institute (Budapest–Rome). See <https://institutumfraknoi.hu/en>

ISBN: 979-12-5524-086-0



9 791255 240860 >

€ 15,00