

nineteenth century. Through the few lines he wrote every day—and the masterful and incredibly detailed and nuanced contextualization by the editor, Monsignor Croce—we enter an extremely rich world—culturally and spiritually—of this Roman prelate with a vast web of relations in the Curia, in Rome, in Italy, and in Europe. Sometimes a zealot, even after 1870 Tizzani was not nostalgic of the past of papal Rome. Tizzani's idea of the Church after the end of the Papal States seems to echo the famous *dictum* of nineteenth-century Italian liberals that Cavour is believed to have said on his deathbed: “free Church in a free state” (*libera Chiesa in libero Stato*).

The works of Monsignor Giuseppe Maria Croce embody the best tradition of Catholic historical erudition. His previous, multi-volume studies and editions of documents, for example on the Badia Greca in Grottaferrata (1990) and on Cyrille Korolevskij (2007), constitute monuments of the historiography of the Church. This work on Vincenzo Tizzani is another jewel, and we look forward to the publication of the second volume in 2018.

Villanova University

MASSIMO FAGGIOLI

*Pressed by a Double Loyalty: Hungarian Attendance at the Second Vatican Council, 1959–1965.* By András Fejérdy. (Budapest and New York: Central European University Press. 2017. Pp. 440. €52.00; \$60.00. ISBN 978-963-386-142-4.)

Rarely are results of Hungarian historiography published in a foreign language.<sup>1</sup> Thus, András Fejérdy's volume, which examines the attendance of the Hungarian bishops at the Second Vatican Council, is particularly worthy of notice as it examines their participation in the light of the *Ostpolitik*, relying heavily, as it does on Hungarian government archives. The volume is a slightly amplified version of Dr. Fejérdy's doctoral dissertation, which was published in 2011 in Hungarian. It can be rightly stated that this comprehensive overview is presented by an expert familiar with several aspects of this subject.

The title of the book itself is revealing. The Hungarian bishops allowed to travel to Rome had to satisfy two expectations. On the one hand, a positive report of the state of the Hungarian Church had to be relayed. In their Council interventions, subjects of special importance to the government had to be presented positively, as, for example, during the fourth period, the social and economic conditions in Hungary as well as the efforts of the Hungarian government toward progress and peace had to be especially stressed. This was also the case during the bishops' meetings at the Vatican. The Holy See above all awaited authentic and objective information on the restricted freedom of the Catholic Church in general and of the various dioceses in particular. Such accurate information and valid advice were to provide the basis for future negotiations. At home, the bishops were expected to suggest effective means to carry out the conciliar teachings.

---

1. This review was prepared under the aegis of the MTA-PPKE Vilmos Fraknói Vatican Historical Research Group.

It is clear from the above few lines that the author did not strictly limit himself to the narration of the bishops' participation in the Council, but broadened his examination to the expectations of both the Holy See and the Hungarian Government for future contacts and negotiations. The presence of these members of the Hungarian hierarchy is particularly emphasized as Hungary was the first member of the socialist bloc to conclude in 1964 a secret agreement with the Holy See. However, it should not be forgotten, as the author points out, that the Vatican was holding parallel consultations with Czechoslovak bishops and Lithuanian priests.

The structure of the book is rational, being logically framed and easy to follow. On the one hand, it follows a chronological, on the other, a thematic thread. A separate section is dedicated to the preparatory phase of the Council, then to the Council itself, and finally to the reception of the Council's pronouncements. Each section is divided into three larger chapters, each presenting the opinions and the purposes of the Holy See, the Hungarian government, and the Hungarian Council Fathers. Hereinafter, I would like to enumerate the main viewpoints of these three groups.

By abandoning the policies of his predecessor, Pope St. John XXIII opened the dialogue with the Eastern Block. The ideological basis for this step can be found, among other places, in his *Pacem in terris* encyclical: "It is always perfectly justifiable to distinguish between error as such and the person who falls into error. . . ."<sup>2</sup> He considered the attendance of the hierarchies from the Iron Curtain countries of primary importance so that firsthand information concerning the conditions of these Churches might be obtained. Hungary was among these, as contact was maintained only through the nunciature in Vienna, the Budapest embassies of other countries with Catholic traditions, and the 1959 Roman visit of Miklós Esty, former *gentiluomo* of Cardinal-Primates János Csernoch, Jusztinian Serédi, and József Mindszenty, as Nuncio Angelo Rotta had been expelled in April, 1945, by the temporary government at the command of the Soviet president of the Allied Control Committee.

The Holy See was ready even to compromise in order to re-establish contact with the Hungarian Church. The main items to be settled were the following: First, the appointment of bishops, which was especially urgently needed as out of eleven dioceses only five were led by unimpeded bishops, all of which were greatly advanced in age; next, the loyalty-oath question, which was left to the conscience of each bishop; and the ability to rule freely their diocese as well as maintain free contact with the Holy See. Finally, it was hoped that the attendance of all bishops at the Council would be permitted. Although in the *Intesa Pratica* the main items were resolved, such as appointments, loyalty oaths, and the possession of the Pontifical Hungarian Institute, many questions were not; thus the results of the *Intesa*

---

2. John XXIII, *Pacem in terris* [Encyclical on Establishing Universal Peace in Truth, Justice, Charity, and Liberty] (April 11, 1963), §158, *Acta Apostolica Sedis* 55 (1963), 300, accessed online at [http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-xxiii/en/ebccckucaks/diczebts/hf\\_j-xxiii\\_enc\\_11041963\\_pacem.html](http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-xxiii/en/ebccckucaks/diczebts/hf_j-xxiii_enc_11041963_pacem.html)

were inconclusive. At the same time, the political dialogues were continued while the Holy See attempted to include the Hungarian ordinaries in the work of the various committees and congregations.<sup>3</sup>

A favorable change in attitude toward ecclesiastical affairs took place at the turn from the 1950's to the 1960's. The June 10, 1958, a resolution of the Political Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, Central Committee, declared that since the churches were going to co-exist for a long time with socialism, co-operation with them was necessary. The next resolution on July 22, 1958, differentiated between "clerical reaction" and "religious world views." Accordingly, it was necessary to fight only against the former. However, the principles and methods used for keeping the Church under total control did not change. The Council was used as a means to consolidate state control and to break the isolation of the country. However, bishops allowed to attend the Council still were under strict surveillance as a great number of their staff were government agents.

The author uses with great success the sources contained in the socialist governmental archives to demonstrate this fact admirably. The government attempted to reflect a positive picture through the bishops in order to influence the negotiations, and through which it was able to obtain concessions. Later, the dialogues were continued, with the intent of gaining advantages for the state through theological debate.

Participation in the Council laid a heavy burden on those Fathers who were able to attend it, as they had to maneuver between their loyalty to Church and State, both officially and privately. In 1959 they were not allowed to forward their suggestions to the preparatory committees; their circulars were censored, and their travel privileges were granted as a favor of the State. Gaining information and promoting negotiations were carried forward both by Archbishop Endre Hamvas, head of the Bishops' Conference, and Pál Brezanóczy, whose experience and knowledge of languages, played an important role within their active participation. Their submissions and contributions are ably demonstrated in the *Acta Synodalia*. The reviewer personally examined each of the documents in the Archives of the Vatican Council II: the actual texts, covering letters, the Hungarian signatures on other submissions—which were also a means for the Hungarians to express their opinions confidentially—as well as the signatures of other Council Fathers on Hungarian contributions; had they been included they all could have provided much important information in the writing of this volume had the author elected to use these important sources. They all provided much important information in

---

3. For example, Sándor Kovács, Bishop of Szombathely, was a member of the Pontifical Liturgical Council; József Ijjas from 1967 was a member of the Pontifical Council for the Laity; and József Bánk from 1967 was a member of the Pontifical Commission for the Revision of the Code of Canon Law. Likewise, József Ijjas became a member of the *Sacra Congregatio pro Institutione Catholica* in 1967, and Bishop Miklós Dudás became a member of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches in 1968.

the writing of his volume, and the author thoughtfully made them accessible to the writer of this review.

In the light of these, the chart of the oral contributions and written submissions of the Hungarian Council Fathers found at the end of this volume needs clarification here and there. Within the realm of their possibilities, the Hungarian bishops attempted to carry out the Council's teaching with the encouragement received from the Holy See, in the renewal of liturgical life, the increase of religious life, the reform of priestly education, and other areas.

The volume is amplified by chronological charts on the activities of the Hungarian Fathers and their proposals and an extensive bibliography. The former is particularly useful for a quick review while the latter provides further insight into the subject. Although a more thorough examination of the archives would have permitted wider research, the seventy-year time limit renders them inaccessible. This is why the author could include only a few of them.

All in all, it is my opinion that this volume fills the void surrounding the Hungarian Hierarchy's conciliar activities very precisely, clearly, and in an interesting fashion.

*MTA-PPKE Vilmos Fraknói Vatican Historical  
Research Group*

KRISZTINA TÓTH

*Holy Rus': The Rebirth of Orthodoxy in the New Russia.* By John P. Burgess. (New Haven and London: Yale University Press. 2017. Pp. xiv, 264. \$30.00. ISBN: 978-0-300-22224-1.)

In his highly readable volume, Burgess provides a systematic account of the lived religious experiences of ordinary Russians and how they interact with and shape the structures that the official Russian Orthodox Church (ROC) has developed since 1991. His central research question is whether "re-Christianisation [is] actually taking place and if so, just what difference does it make (. . .) for people's lives individually and as a nation?" (p. 16). Burgess uses the somewhat ambiguous term "Holy Rus'" to refer to the ROC's aspirations for itself and the Russian people. This aspiration obviously involves attracting Russians to the Church and encouraging them to participate in its rituals and to accept its beliefs and values as their own.

Burgess argues that social initiatives in a wider sense can be seen as a contribution to realizing the Church's vision of Holy Rus' and has consequently included chapters on the ROC's missionary activities, religious education at various levels, drug rehabilitation programs, and the canonization of the new martyrs in 2000 in his monograph. The author seeks to explain the Church's understanding of all these topics and includes the relevant historical background in each chapter.

Burgess works his personal experiences into the narrative and draws extensively on his Russian contacts' views. This gives his book a light touch, which makes it accessible to a non-expert audience. At the same time, the volume's aca-

Copyright of Catholic Historical Review is the property of Catholic University of America Press and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.