

Péter TUSOR

## Habsburg Hungary and the Papal Court (1605–1689)<sup>1</sup>

---

**Abstract:** *The study discusses the problems and evolvement of the 17th century relations of the Holy See and Hungary. One of the most important aspects of these were the debates about the royal right of patronage that culminated in appointing the bishops. As part of the latter, when someone was appointed as a bishop, canonical investigation process (processus informativus) was conducted. These processes were useful sources of information of the Holy See about the state of the Hungarian Catholic Church. Furthermore, the Pope and the dicasteries could gain information from the compulsory ad limina visits. The Holy See could follow the realization of the deliberations of the Council of Trent also through the nuncios. From the other side, the Hungarian Catholic Church could not do without its representation in Rome: the cardinal protectors, the imperial legates in Rome and the episcopal agents could effectively represent their interests.*

**Key words:** *The Holy See – Hungary – Habsburgs – diplomacy – catholic reform*

---

The development of Catholic confessionalisation in Hungary began only after the end of the Long Turkish War (1593–1606). The reform decrees of the Council of Trent (1545–1563) were enforced from the first decades of the seventeenth century. The impetus of the Catholic revival – accompanied by the powerful efforts of Counter-Reformation – lasted and triumphed until the wars of liberation against the Turks (1683–1699). Hereupon, it continued its expansion in the reorganization of church life in the territories that had been under Turkish rule.<sup>2</sup>

By the 1620s, the age of the reform popes had ended and the Catholic revival came to rest in its own centre; the administration of the offices in Rome was more and more characterized by a strong bureaucratism. Under the pontificate of Urban VIII (1623–1644) and his successors, the papacy became secluded and isolated within the continent. After the

---

1 Made in the MTA-PPKE Vilmos Fraknói Vatican Historical Research Group.

2 Still fundamental: Egyed HERMANN, *A katolikus egyház története Magyarországon 1914–ig*, München 1973<sup>2</sup> (= *Dissertationes Hungaricae ex historia ecclesiae* 1), pp. 207s.

defeat in the crusade against the Turks at the turn of the century, the interests of the Papal State came into prominence inasmuch as it had not experienced for a long time. The Holy See could not find its place in the new European politics formed in the Peace of Westphalia. The legal disputes with the national churches became frequent. The recently established church model of Trent was challenged by new trends such as Jansenism and Episcopatism, and in the secular field by Rationalism. With the establishment of the *Propaganda Fide*, the reform of the papacy ended in 1622. The popes of the mid-seventeenth century only succeeded in their missionary work.<sup>3</sup>

Ultimately, these circumstances determined the relations of the Holy See and Hungary's territories under the Habsburgs. The difficulties derived from the late realization of the reform in Hungary, the different political interests of the Hungarians and Rome – primarily in the handling of the Ottoman threat – became the source of numerous strained relations. However, by the time the new church discipline strengthened in Hungary, the practical ways of communication had crystallized. When Innocent XI (1676–1689) acceded to the throne, the papal foreign policy again strove to achieve a new aim, namely the expulsion of the Turks. The relationship between Catholic Hungary and Rome had begun a chapter that had not been experienced before, nor in the future.

## **The Framework: canonical regulations and the catholic reform**

The canonical regulations, which secured the primacy of Rome, were the guiding principles of the relations in this era, yet along with the reform acts, were in a new, more intensive and methodical form. As the successors of the apostles, the bishops headed the realization of the reforms of Trent. They were also the centre of the ecclesiastic contact between Hungary and the Holy See of the seventeenth century.

### ***Appointing of the bishops***

According to the practice which emerged at the end of the Middle Ages, the nomination of a prelate was the task of the Hungarian kings – the right of patronage – on the pretext of the foundations of Saint Stephen. However, the canonical procedure to consecrate a bishop was entirely supervised by the Curia.<sup>4</sup> Rome has wanted to appoint its own nominee as the head of a Hungarian diocese only once. In 1629, Rome suggested to the court of Vienna and Péter Pázmány, the archbishop of Esztergom (1616–1637), that János Marnavich Tomko – who later became the bishop of Bosnia – should be appointed as the bishop of

3 Péter TUSOR, *The Baroque Papacy (1600–1700)*, Viterbo 2016.

4 Vilmos FRAKNÓI, *A magyar királyi kegyúri jog Szent Istvántól Mária Teréziáig*, Budapest 1895.

Zagreb; but it was without success.<sup>5</sup> In many cases, however, the nominated prelates were devoid of the papal confirmation (*confirmatio*). They were not objected to due to personal incapability; however, they were always dismissed by reason of having Protestant parents or lacking the necessary theological and canonical degree.<sup>6</sup>

The on and off debate over the right of patronage caused constant problems. From the pontificate of Gregory XV (1621–1623), the Apostolic See endeavoured to replace the local hierarchy around the world that did not function properly or was hindered in its operation with administrators appointed by Rome itself; moreover, in these territories, it strived to establish a new, missionary structure. As a result of these efforts, Rome inevitably clashed with the states that wanted to fully preserve their traditional rights, especially with the monarchs of Portugal<sup>7</sup> and Hungary. The Portuguese crown asserted a right to supervise the church administration in the colonial empire, whereas the Habsburg monarchs adhered to the appointment of the prelates in the dioceses under Turkish rule (Bosnia, Knin, Smederevo, Syrmia, Pécs and Csanád) and the bishoprics of Várad and Transylvania, whose function in their seat was hindered.<sup>8</sup>

In addition, under the reign of the earnest Catholic Ferdinand II (1619–1637) numerous claims were made concerning the Balkan and Dalmatian bishoprics (Osor, Nin, Trebinje) that were under Turkish and Venetian rule.<sup>9</sup> Both parties insisted their side was correct by using historical argumentation during the debates. They led ardent research in the papal archives and the archives of the Hungarian chancery and the solicitors prepared lengthy memorials. The Hungarian claims were assisted by the forthwith forged bull of Pope Sylvester II (999–1003), the contemporary of the Founder of Hungary.<sup>10</sup> It is very

5 BAV, Barb. Lat. 6953, f. 50r–v; Hans KIEWNING (ed.), *Nuntiatur des Pallotto 1628–1630*, pars I., [= NBD IV, vol. 1], Berlin 1895, p. 126.

6 Ferenc GALLA, *Magyar tárgyú pápai felhatalmazások, felmentések és kiváltságok a katolikus megújulás korából I*, Budapest 1947 (= Regnum–Könyvek. I: Egyháztörténeti források 1–Excerptum ex: LK 24–25 [1946–1947]), passim; CVH II/3, passim.

7 Giuseppe SORGE, *Santa Sede e Corona Porthogese. Le controversie giuspatronali nei secoli XVII e XVIII*, Bologna 1988 (= Occidentale e Oriente Christianità 1); Giovanni PIZZORUSSO – Gaetano PLATANIA – Matteo SANFILIPPO (edd.), *Gli archivi della Santa Sede come fonte per la storia del Portogallo in età moderna*, Viterbo 2012.

8 V. FRAKNÓI, *A magyar királyi kegyúri jog*; Ferenc GALLA, *Simándi István választott erdélyi püspök pápai kinevezésének ügye*, in: P. Angyal Pál – J. Baranyay – M. Móra (edd.), *Notter Antal Emlékkönyv. Dolgozatok az egyházi jogból és a vele kapcsolatos jogterületekről*, Budapest 1941, pp. 561–587; Antal JAKAB, *Az erdélyi római katolikus püspöki szék betöltésének vitája a XVII. században*, Kolozsvár 1944 (= Erdélyi Tudományos Füzetek 172).

9 Cfr. Remigius. RITZLER, *Die Bischöfe der Ungarischen Krone*, Römische Historische Mitteilungen 13, 1971, pp. 127–164; Joachim BAHLCKE, A “Magyar Korona püspökei”. *Adalék az egyház 17–18. századi társadalom- és alkotmánytörténetéhez*, Történelmi Szemle 48, n. 1–2, 2006, pp. 1–24.

10 Sándor BENE, *A Szilveszter-bulla nyomában*, A Ráday Gyűjtemény Évkönyve 10, 2002, pp. 39–80.

likely that the above mentioned János Marnavich Tomkó, who had excellent relations in Rome, was the forger.

The debates over the right of patronage culminated in the 1660s, owing to the filling of the bishoprics of Syrmia and Bosnia. The case was examined by a special committee of cardinals. Subsequently, it was the custom that Rome confirmed bishops appointed by the Hungarian monarch (as the head of the dioceses, established by King Saint Stephen) without protest. The situation of Transylvania and the territories under Turkish rule was settled when they were re-occupied by the Habsburgs.<sup>11</sup>

The other main obstacle to the consecration of the bishops was the question of the *annata* that had to be paid for the bulls of confirmation. The papal court, (of which the administration showed a deficit until the budget reform of Innocent XI) by withdrawing the century-old allowance, redemanded the settlement of the duties imposed through medieval incomes. In case of fulfilment, it would have laid a great burden upon the Hungarian Catholicism. For the archdiocese of Esztergom, the *taxa* meant 4000 forint. While the Hungarian church considered an exemption from dues as an acquired right, Rome only granted allowances from time to time for a special request, however they were significant. By 1645, it enforced its view concerning this question.<sup>12</sup>

### ***Canonical processes, ad limina reports, faculties***

The canonical investigation process (*processus informativus*) was also related to papal confirmation. According to the practice rooted in the Middle Ages and renewed by Trent, witnesses were asked about the characteristics of the nominee and the state of his diocese. The statements issued in the form of a notarial document were sent to the Holy See, augmented by the new prelate's certificate of birth, education and his letter of appointment (in many cases). Based on this, the papal court decided on the suitability of the appointed person. From 1613 until the end of the century, there are about 140 statements that have survived and about 300 witnesses' names that are known. Rome were able to gather information about the state of the Hungarian church from the testimonies of bishops, canons, diocesan and regular clergy; the novices of the *Pazmaneum* in Vienna; officials of the Chancery and the Chamber; aristocrats, estate stewards, noblemen and merchants who knew the local circumstances well.<sup>13</sup>

11 Vilmos. FRAKNÓI, *Oklevéltár a magyar királyi kegyúri jog történetéhez*, Budapest 1899, APF, *Scrittura. Ungheria-Transilvania*, vol. 1–2, passim.

12 V. FRAKNÓI, *Oklevéltár*, pp. 255–264.

13 Ferenc GALLA, *A püspökjelöltek kánoni kivizsgálásának jegyzőkönyvei a vatikáni levéltárban. A magyar katolikus megújulás korának püspökei*, Levéltári Közlemények 20–23, 1942–1945, pp. 141–186.

The other information source of the Curia that was ordered by canon law was the diocesan bishops' compulsory *ad limina* reports every four years. The Hungarian prelates appear only to have rarely met their commitments, as there are merely 22 related texts in the Vatican Archives from this period. However, there are lengthy and detailed reports such as those of Primate György Lippay's (1642–1666) and Primate György Szelepchény's (1666–1685) from 1650 and 1676, and the information of György Pongrácz (the bishop of Vác from 1675).<sup>14</sup> The lack of reports is closely connected to the problems around the papal confirmation. Namely, the bishops themselves engaged to send regular reports only with their oath, taken before their consecration; therefore, prior to that they felt relieved of this canonical regulation. This lack is retrieved by the letters addressed to the pope which report on the occasional successes, the establishment of new institutions, and the mass conversions (especially from the second half of the century).<sup>15</sup>

However late and accompanied with many shortcomings, Rome faced a constantly renewing church life in Hungary. The diocesan bishops made somewhat frequent pastoral visitations in their dioceses or had them visited;<sup>16</sup> established seminaries, schools and convents;<sup>17</sup> and participated in reforming religious orders. The most significant result was the revival of the Pauline Order, founded in Hungary with the active cooperation of the Holy See.<sup>18</sup> The Roman Rite and Breviary were introduced<sup>19</sup> and great efforts were made to create a union with the Orthodox Ruthenians.<sup>20</sup> In the territories under the Habsburgs, the bishops resided in their sees, preached, administered the sacrament of confirmation, and held diocesan and provincial councils – though not at stated intervals.<sup>21</sup> The majority of the new bishops continued their studies in papal colleges (mostly in the *Collegium*

14 Cf. ASV, Archivio della Congregazione del Concilio. Decreta, vol. 29, ff. 159r–160v.

15 Péter TUSOR, *A katolikus felekezet-szervezés problémái az 1630–1640-es évek fordulóján (Egy Rómába írt egri püspöki jelentés alapján)*, in: A. Szabó (ed.), *Mezőváros, reformáció és irodalom (16–18. század)*, Budapest 2005 (= *Historia Litteraria* 18), pp. 123–138, 123–126.

16 Klára DÓKA (ed.), *Egyházlátogatási jegyzőkönyvek katalógusa*, vol. I–IX, Budapest 1994–2000.

17 Lósy I. Imre (1637–1642), Lippay IV. György (1642–1666), Szelepchény V. György (1666–1685), in: Margit BEKE, *Esztergomi érsekek (1001–2003)*, Budapest 2003, pp. 291–310.

18 Ferenc GALLA, *A pálosrend reformálása a XVII. században*, in: *Regnum Egyháztörténeti Évkönyv*, Budapest 1940–1941, pp. 123–223.

19 Péter TUSOR, *A magyar egyház és a Sacra Rituum Congregatio a katolikus megújulás korában (A kongregáció megalapításától 1689-ig)*, *Magyar Egyháztörténeti Vázlatok–Regnum* 11, n. 1–2, 1999, pp. 33–64.

20 Tamás VÉGHSEŐ, *Missionari paolini e cristiani orientali nell'Ungheria (1642–1681)*, *Folia Athanasiana* 16, 2003, pp. 99–122; IDEM, "...patriarcham Graecum convertit ad unionem..." *A római Német-Magyar Kollégium három egykori növendéke és az ungvári unió*, *Athanasiana* 23, 2006, pp. 29–48.

21 Carolus PÉTERFY, *Sacra Concilia Ecclesiae Romano-catholicae in Regno Hungariae celebrata...*, vol. II, Posonii 1742, pp. 300s; Michael SZVORÉNYI, *Synopsis critico-historica decretorum synodaliū pro ecclesia Hungaro-catholica*, Vesprii 1807, pp. 250 s.

*Germanicum et Hungaricum* in Rome) and made an effort to find a place for their pupils at one of these institutes.<sup>22</sup>

The various exemptions, authorizations given by the Holy See, represented the last area of relations that were defined by canon law. Not only the prelacy, but the whole Hungarian church was connected to the centre Church administration, with thousands of threads. The priority of Rome became a constant reality in the reviving church life, as shown through the faculties related to benedictions, liturgy and celebration of mass; the privilege of having a mobile altar and private chapel; the authorization of entering an enclosure of a monastery; the granting of indulgences; and the bulk of the Hungarian requests concerning the dispensations from an oath, vows, fasting and impediments to marriage.<sup>23</sup>

## The threads: nuncios, legates, cardinal-protectors, agents

### Nuncios

The Holy See followed the realization of the reforms with the assistance of its permanent diplomatic representatives. The institution of the nunciatures covered the whole of contemporary Catholic Europe. Hungary, together with the hereditary provinces, was under the authority of the nunciature of Vienna.<sup>24</sup> The nuncio and its office had a key role in communication with Rome. The nuncio informed the papal secretariat of state through numerous weekly reports about current political and ecclesiastical issues, many of which were related to Hungary.<sup>25</sup> Furthermore, he conducted the canonical investigation process

22 István BITSKEY, *Il Collegio Germanico-Ungarico di Roma. Contributo alla storia della cultura ungherese in età barocca*, Roma 1996 (= Studi e fonti per la storia dell'Università di Roma, n. s. 3), pp. 203–235.

23 F. GALLA, *Magyar tárgyú pápai felhatalmazások*.

24 On the nuncios working in the court of Vienna after 1592: Donato SQUICCIARINI, *Die apostolischen Nuntien in Wien*, Città del Vaticano 1999, pp. 103 s.

25 ASV, Segreteria di Stato. Germania, passim; BAV, Barb. Lat. 6916–6921 [–6923]; 6924–6925; 6922–6952 and 7060; 6963–6976 and 7063–7067; 6981–7016 and 7068–7076; Arnold Oskar MEYER (ed.), *Die Prager Nuntiatur des Giovanni Stefano Ferreri und die Wiener Nuntiatur des Giacomo Serra (1603–1606)*, [= NBD IV, vol. 3], Berlin 1915; Zdeněk KRISTEN (ed.), *Johannis Stephani Ferrerii nuntii apostolici apud imperatorem epistulae et acta. I/1: 1604 Ian.–Iul.*, Pragae 1944 (= EAAC); Milena LINHARTOVÁ (ed.), *Antonii Caetani nuntii apostolici apud imperatorem epistulae et acta. I: 1607. II: 1608 Ian.–Mai. III/1 1608 Mai.–Aug.*, Pragae 1932–1940 (= EAAC); H. KIEWNING (ed.), *Nuntiatur des Pallotto; Rotraut BECKER (ed.), Nuntiaturen des Malatesta Baglioni, des Ciriaco Rocci und des Mario Filonardi; Sendung des P. Alessandro d'Ales (1634–1635)*, [= NBD IV, vol. 7], Tübingen 2004; Tihamér VANYÓ, *A bécsi nunciusok jelentései Magyarországról 1666–1683*, Pannonhalma 1935 (= Pannonhalmi Főiskola Könyvei 3); IDEM, *A bécsi pápai követség levéltárának iratai Magyarországról 1611–1786*, Budapest 1986 (= Fontes Historiae Hungaricae Aevi Recentioris), passim.

in his court of Vienna;<sup>26</sup> he sent letters, requests addressed to the Holy See through his diplomatic post, and had the papal breves and bulls reach their addressee.

In the third instance, the matrimonial cases, inheritances, and disciplinary proceedings that were discussed in front of the ecclesiastical tribunals were sent to the tribunal of the nunciature. Here, they were usually reviewed by a local prelate of legal knowledge. In numerous cases, the Hungarian prelates (as well as Pázmány) tried to help or influence the decision making by providing necessary background information.<sup>27</sup> Furthermore, the nuncio also passed judgement on the missionaries sent from Italy to Hungary.<sup>28</sup> From the end of the century, due in large part to Lipót Kollonich (1695–1707), the Hungarian primates' tribunal of third instance was restored, which remains unique in canon law.<sup>29</sup>

The nuncio rarely passed the conclusion of legal proceedings on to the Curia. The exceptions were in cases of controversies between the ordinaries and the orders, or in the case of a monastery's foundation. In the second half of the century, these cases were sent to the Sacred Congregation of Bishops and Regulars, who had previously had a negligible role in the Hungarian relations. In Rome, only the chapter of Zagreb initiated proceedings against Bologna for the estates of its college and was successful.<sup>30</sup>

The papal legates visited the countries only in the case of a diet, where they closely collaborated with the Catholic party against the Protestants. The visit of Nuncio Giovanni Battista Pallotto to Pázmány and Palatine Esterházy, before his recall and his cordial report on his experience of June 1630, was a rare exception.<sup>31</sup>

### ***Cardinal-protectors, imperial legates***

The Hungarian Church logically could not do without its representation in Rome. The institution of the cardinal-protectors was established in the late Middle Ages to represent and support particular countries and orders. Hungary shared the same protector with the hereditary provinces during that time. The most important task of the cardinal-protector was to induce the pope into confirming the nominations of the bishops during the joint meeting of the pope and the cardinals. In the consistory, he presented the name of the nominees, reported on their characteristics, and the state of their dioceses; based on the extracts from the verbals of the canonical investigation. The duty paid for the cardinal-

26 F. GALLA, *Püspökjelöltek kánoni kivizsgálásának jegyzőkönyvei*.

27 ASV, Archivio della Nunziatura in Vienna. Cause civili, n. 22.

28 As Nuncio Camillo Melzi did with Conv Francesco Cosmi da Mogliano, the chaplain of Miklós Zrínyi in 1645–47. ASV, Archivio della Nunziatura Apostolica in Vienna. Negotia regularium, n. 27.

29 T. VANYÓ, *A bécsi pápai követség levéltárának iratai*, pp. 191–201.

30 BAV, Barb. Lat. 6900, ff. 77r–v e 78r–v; 7056, f. 64r–v.

31 BAV, Barb. Lat. 6219, fol. 152r–v.

protector's activities was called *propina*; the Hungarian prelates (beside the moderation of the *annatas*) had to fight for its remission.<sup>32</sup>

The performance of the cardinal-protectors – who were usually of aristocratic Italian origin and an adherent of the Emperor – was considered inadequate. By demanding their dismissal, the Hungarian prelates often blamed them for the postponement of their consecration. Péter Pázmány felt it was necessary to establish an independent Hungarian protectorate that required no compensation: “The Hungarian Protection, methinks, should be only Titular and not Venal”, he wrote in 1635.<sup>33</sup> The lack of accomplishment of this problem may have played a role in the unfulfilled ambitions of his successors, Lippay and Szelepcsény in becoming cardinals – beyond the fact that they endeavoured to establish a constant Hungarian presence in the College of Cardinals.<sup>34</sup>

The role of the imperial legation in Rome in the first half of the century is also significant. They delivered royal letters on the cases concerning the Hungarian church to the pope at the usual Friday audiences; they followed and urged the fulfilment of their content. Although their personal presence exerted a positive influence on the fulfilment of the requests, it was mainly the foreign prelates with Hungarian titles who grasped the rising opportunity.<sup>35</sup> However, there are few exceptions, like that of the later bishop of Pécs, then of Zagreb, Benedek Vinkovich who contacted Paolo Savelli, imperial legate already as a grand provost of Zagreb for the sake of receiving the papal privilege of wearing a mitre (*infula*).<sup>36</sup> The cardinal-protectors of Germany took over the duties of the permanent legates from the 1650s.

### ***The episcopal agents***

The most important members of the Hungarian Catholic representation in Rome were the permanent agents beside the contribution of the German assessors of the papal tribunal, the *Sacra Rota Romana*, partly of the *Collegium Germanicum Hungaricum*'s rectors and of the reluctant Hungarian clerics studying in Rome.

32 Cfr. Martin FABER, *Scipione Borghese als Kardinalprotektor. Studien zur römischen Mikropolitik in der frühen Neuzeit*, Mainz 2005, pp. 387s.

33 Published in Péter TUSOR, *Pázmány állandó római követségének terve 1632–1634*, in: Emil Hargittay (ed.), *Pázmány Péter és kora*, Piliscsaba 2001 (= Pázmány Irodalmi Műhely. Tanulmányok 2), pp. 151–175, here p. 174.

34 Cfr. CVH vol. I/3, Budapest–Roma 2005.

35 A part of the material on the imperial legates of Rome can be found: ASR, Archivio Sforza–Cesarini (Paolo e Federigo Savelli); Archivio Giustiniani (Paolo Savelli); Biblioteca Statale Santa Scolastica (Subiaco), Archivio Colonna (Girolamo Colonna).

36 ASR, Archivio Sforza–Cesarini, parte II, busta 224, s.f.



The permanent agents' role in the administration was irreplaceable. They had access to the Secretariat of State; to the influential cardinal-nephew; to the Datary that granted papal privileges; and to the Apostolic Chamber that handled the finances and issued the bulls. Moreover, they had access to the Consistorial Congregation, which supervised Hungary as a missionary field (and was responsible for the appointment of the bishops), as well as to the Congregation of the Council, which supervised the execution of the decrees of Trent. They delivered letters; on which they commented by following the instructions they received; they managed the money transfers with the assistance of the Jesuits; and they posted the answers.

Based on the information given by the low-ranking officials of the Holy See and the secretaries of the congregations, the permanent agents regularly informed the leadership of the Hungarian church about the occurring difficulties, the recent papal orders and the most recent news in Rome. Apart from the Nuncio of Vienna, the contribution of the Hungarian agents ensured continued relations with the Curia.

Originally, the permanent agents were directly employed by the archbishop of Esztergom (e.g. Matteo Renzi or the previous official of the nunciature of Prague, Abbot Camillo Cattaneo). The first agent, Pietro Giacomo Favilla – who was Neapolitan by birth and represented the Hungarian church itself (*Agens Cleri/Praelatorum Hungariae in Urbe*) – was elected by the gathered prelates at the diet of 1637/38, headed by Primate Imre Lósy (1637–1642). The new agent was raised to Hungarian nobility and obtained the title of royal councillor. However, Ferdinand III (1637–1657) rejected the further suggestions of Lósy, namely for the establishment of the independent Hungarian cardinal-protectorate.

Favilla, who was active for almost two decades, was also commissioned by the Hungarian aristocrats. In 1642, on behalf of Palatine Miklós Esterházy, he tried to recover Nuncio Malatesta Baglioni's debt of thousands of Hungarian forints. Baglioni returned to Vienna in 1639. Throughout the sources, Favilla is referred to as the representative of the whole country (*l'Agente d'Ongaria*). After Antonio Francesco Gallo (a previous auditor of a nunciature) and Abbot Alessandro Vecchi of Siena (from 1676 Giovanni Giani (Jány)), the Abbot of Báta became the Hungarian agent. He was a member of an Italian family, a law graduate who settled in Hungary and had gained ecclesiastical benefices.

The delegation of this Italian lawyer, who had a Hungarian background as well as the title of a royal councillor, was a fortunate decision of Primate Szelepcshény. The Hungarian agency in Rome finally functioned properly under his service. His predecessors had been accused of embezzling the Hungarian bishops' money transfers to Rome and causing the postponements of papal confirmations. Giani seemed to be able to avoid the intricate local conflicting interests and in 1679 he was granted a monopoly by Leopold I to solely manage the Hungarian cases.

The execution of Giani's commission was significantly eased due to the representation of the Hungarian cases became bipolar. From 1666, the German protectorate (who had handled the diplomatic tasks from the middle of the century) and the protectorate of Hungary (with the hereditary provinces) were headed by the same cardinal. This change ended the previous rivalry between the two institutions. The protectorate that was practically united in a personal union had an exclusive jurisdiction over the supervision and abridgement of the verbals which the canonical investigation sent from Vienna; sometimes they conducted the process themselves. In contrast to its positive role, the dissolution of the imperial legation and the *Rota*'s German auditors' loss of importance made the often-confused division of labour even more arranged. This was not changed by the occasional contribution of János Klobusiczky, the Jesuit Hungarian father-confessor (penitentiary) who lived in Rome from 1659.<sup>37</sup>

### ***The occasional legates***

The permanent forms of communication were functionally completed by the occurrence of the occasional legates in the Eternal City. In 1611, representing the dissolved chapter of Eger, Grand Provost Miklós Dallos personally asked for Paul V's assistance in the restoration of the body.<sup>38</sup> On behalf of Primate Ferenc Forgách – whose travel to Rome was hindered by the court of Vienna<sup>39</sup> – he extensively informed him about the state of the Hungarian Catholicism and about the progress of the missionary work (as Péter Pázmány had in 1614–1615).<sup>40</sup> In 1637, György Szelepchény and István Baghy, the canons of Esztergom,<sup>41</sup> were involved in the procuring of the *pallium*, the metropolitan insignia of the newly appointed archbishop of Esztergom. This was thirty years later the Pauline János Vanoviczy,<sup>42</sup> who also did his utmost to realize the Order of St. Paul's settlement in Rome and the foundation of a Hungarian national church. The prelates of Zagreb were frequently running errands in Rome through their own representatives.<sup>43</sup>

The Hungarian bishops rarely fulfilled their attendance obligations and their *ad limina* reports were usually presented by their representatives. The short relations of Pázmány

37 Péter TUSOR, *Gli agenti dei prelati ungheresi a Roma nel Seicento*, QFIAB 92, 2012, pp. 359–380.

38 BAV, Boncompagni e Ludovisi, vol. E 13, ff. 132r–133v and vol. E 18, ff. 276r–277v.

39 ASV, Segr. Stato. Principi, vol. 56 I, ff. 322r–323v and 397r–398v.

40 BAV, Boncompagni e Ludovisi, vol. E 15, ff. 27r–28v.

41 BAV, Barb. Lat. 6894, f. 10r–v.

42 István György TÓTH, *A remeterend vándormisszionáriusa. Vanoviczy János, az első pálos misszionárius levelei (1642–1677)*, Levéltári Közlemények 72, 2001, pp. 187–245.

43 Ivan KUKULJEVIĆ SAKCINSKI (ed.), *Arkiv za povjestnicu Jugoslavensku*, vol. X, Zagreb 1869, pp. 185ss.

were often submitted by Mátyás Senkviczy (a canon of Esztergom),<sup>44</sup> the above mentioned reports of Primate Lippay and Szelephény (1650 and 1676) by Jácint Macripodari (auxiliary bishop of Esztergom),<sup>45</sup> and by the intercession of Francesco Giani (the brother of Giovanni, the agent of Rome).<sup>46</sup> György Pongrácz, Bishop of Vác was the only one who travelled to Rome solely to do his *ad limina* visit and present his report, in 1675.<sup>47</sup>

The journey of many prelates was motivated by obtaining their bull of confirmation. János Thelegdy (Bishop of Bosnia, 1611,<sup>48</sup> then Archbishop of Kalocsa, 1625),<sup>49</sup> György Jakusith (Bishop of Veszprém, 1639),<sup>50</sup> György Bielavich (Bishop of Tinin), Péter Jurjevich (Bishop of Szerém),<sup>51</sup> Count Tamás Pálffy (Bishop of Csanád, mid-century),<sup>52</sup> and Count János Kéry (Bishop of Szerém, 1676)<sup>53</sup> undertook the inconvenient travel primarily for their bull of confirmation and not for nothing at times.

The focus of Pázmány and Jakusith's legation of 1632<sup>54</sup> and 1645 was their political commission.<sup>55</sup> In 1687, the later bishop of Csanád, the Pauline László Nádasdy returned to Rome primarily to ask Pope Innocent XI to mediate between Thököly and Leopold I (1657–1705).<sup>56</sup> Between 1632 and 1634, the often raised idea of Pázmány to have a permanent imperial legation in Rome<sup>57</sup> and the imperial mission of 1658 of his successor, György Lippay<sup>58</sup> remained to be only plans.

44 Ferenc HANUY (ed.), *Petri cardinalis Pázmány ecclesiae Strigoniensis archiepiscopi et regni Hungariae primatis epistolae collectae*, vol. I–II, Budapest 1910–1911, here vol. II, pp. 769–773.

45 ASV, Segr. Stato. Vescovi, vol. 25, f. 369r–v.

46 Ernest BOUYDOS, *The Quadrennial Reports of the Archbishops of Strigonia to Rome*, Slovak Studies 5, 1965, pp. 7–98, here pp. 47–67; BAV, Barb. Lat. 6894, f. 43r–v.

47 BAV, Barb. Lat. 6898, ff. 62r–70v.

48 BAV, Boncompagni e Ludovisi, vol. E 13, ff. 126r–127v.

49 BAV, Barb. Lat. 6872, ff. 145r–146v.

50 Péter TUSOR, *Az 1639. évi nagyszombati püspökkari konferencia (A magyar klérus és a római Kúria kapcsolatainak válsága és reformja)*, Századok 134, 2000, pp. 431–459, here pp. 432–433.

51 AP, Archivum Saeculare. Acta Radicalia, Classis X, n. 196, busta 28, ff. 152–153.

52 AP, Archivum Saeculare. Acta Radicalia, Classis X, n. 196, busta 24, ff. 171–172.

53 ASM, Archivio Cybo–Malaspina. Archivio Alderano Cybo, vol. 65, n. 84.

54 Vilmos FRANKL [FRAKNÓI], *Pázmány Péter és kora*, vol. I–III, Pest 1868–1872, here vol. III, pp. 14–46; Konrad REGEN, *Finanzen, Kirchenrecht und Politik unter Urban VIII. Eine unbekannte Denkschrift aus dem Frühjahr 1632*, Römische Quartalschrift für Christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte 56, 1961, pp. 62–74.

55 Péter TUSOR, *Jakusith György egri püspök római követjárása 1644–45-ben (A magyar rendek kísérlete a Szentszék bevonására a török és az erdélyi protestantizmus elleni fegyveres harcban)*, Hadtörténelmi Közlemények 113, 2000, pp. 237–268.

56 ASV, Segr. Stato. Principi, vol. 115, ff. 38r–39v and 490rv.

57 Péter TUSOR, *Le origini della bolla "Sancta Synodus Tridentina": (I cardinali degli Asburgo e papa Urbano VIII, 1632–1634)*, in: José Martínez Millán – Rubén González Cuerva (coords.), *La Dinastía de los Austria: Las relaciones entre la Monarquía Católica y el Imperio*, Madrid 2011, pp. 205–227.

58 M. BEKE, *Esztergomi érsekek*, pp. 296–303.

## Lights and shadows

### *The beginning of the century: collaboration*

Beyond the institutional relations and the connections regulated by canon law, Rome and the Hungarian ecclesiastical administration collaborated best in the first decades of the century. The papal diplomacy, moreover, the spiritual supremacy of the popes – that still had an influence on the monarchs – was the greatest political support of Ferenc Forgách, the initiator of the long process of re-Catholicization, who obtained his appointment as an archbishop at the same time when he was created cardinal.

The Catholic scope for action could only be established by the active contribution of the Holy See against the Protestant dominance, which was realized in the ecclesiastical regulations of the diet of 1608 that was hallmarked by the persons of Palatine István Illésházy and György Thurzó, and which was realized in the ecclesiastical regulations of the diet of 1608 under Matthias II, who was raised to power mainly by the help of the Lutheran and Calvinist estates. On a motion from Forgách, the Sacred Office (*Sacrum Officium*, headed by the pope) initiated an inquiry against the Habsburg monarch due to his confirmation of the regulations against the Catholic Church. The court of Vienna eventually backed the procrastination of the practical execution of the regulations to avoid the possibility of excommunication.<sup>59</sup>

In contrast to his predecessors, Paul V (1605–1621) showed considerable understanding of the observance of the canonical regulations. For instance, in the case of aristocratic mixed marriages, he granted the necessary dispensations even before the Catholicization of the Protestant party. According to the secretly assumed obligation, the public conversion took place after the marriage when parental authority had lapsed. The first event of this manner took place in 1610, at the nuptials of Mihály Czobor and Zsuzsanna Thurzó (the above-mentioned palatine's daughter), where Primate Forgách prepared the conversion of the bride.<sup>60</sup>

It was also the above-named Borghese pope who made Pázmány's withdrawal from the Jesuit order possible, which enabled him to become an archbishop despite his vows (although it was eventually not legally realised). The filling of the archiepiscopal see was persistently urged by the papal nuncios. The cathedral chapter of Esztergom did not touch upon the contribution of Paul V by mistake in his letter to Rome on the appointment: "*God has heard our heart's desire and through the good offices of our Blessed Virgin Mary*

59 Péter TUSOR, *Az 1608. évi magyar törvények a római inkvizíció előtt: II. Mátyás kiközösítése*, Aetas 4, 2000, pp. 89–105.

60 BAV, Boncompagni e Ludovisi, vol. E 7, ff. 7r–8v and vol. E 12, ff. 250r–254v.

*and all the saints, especially the heavenly patrons of our motherland tainted by heresy, His Imperial and Royal Majesty...*"<sup>61</sup>

Pázmány's activities as a prelate entirely fulfilled these expectations. In the last phase of his life, however, a significant breach appeared between Rome and the Hungarian church. Until the early 1630s, the collaboration was undiminished. (Even in political terms – Pázmány owed his appointment of a cardinal to it.) The Hungarian clerics made running efforts to "*entirely conform to our and everybody's mother, to the Sacred Church of Rome as much as possible*."<sup>62</sup> After this time, there were more considerable disappointments and discontent could be read between their lines.

## The middle of the century: problems

Pázmány's legation of 1632 was a turning point. The primate (representing the Habsburgs) came into conflict with Pope Urban VIII (who had a more pro-French policy) and the Hungarian primate became a *persona non grata* at the Vatican. Pázmány was specifically banned from being a permanent legate by the diplomacy of the Holy See and from returning as a cardinal-protector. Although, the papal nuncios regarded the disobedience of the Hungarian prelates and the negligence of canonical duties as Pázmány's personal dissatisfaction and authority, the reasons were much more complex.

The Hungarian prelates were fighting daily against Protestantism in the papal authority's defence; they spent significant sums on the establishment of new institutions and on defending against the Turks. Simultaneously, they felt that they got less and less help from the Barberini's Rome: it was a common feeling that "*they were denied every door to have any privilege or to have a fair judgement*".<sup>63</sup> The Hungarian Church was unique, as they were still reliant on Rome's support and needed constant political assistance.

The increasingly introverted papacy, with a mounting deficit, could not cope with the Hungarian suggestion of forcing the Turks out. It fervently insisted on the enforcement of its rights, especially regarding the payment of various duties. This dichotomy affected the relationship between Hungarian Catholicism and the Holy See until Innocent XI's accession to the throne; both the aversions to the intensified demands and, conversely, their nonfulfilment.

61 BAV, Boncompagni e Ludovisi, vol. E 19, ff. 164r–165v.

62 Archivio Storico della Congregazione per le Cause dei Santi, Litterae et Rescripta, n. 8497.

63 BAV, Barb. Lat. 7002, ff. 124r–127v.

The apostolic missionaries sent to Hungary also did not help the situation, as they had a wider spiritual authority – namely, they had several such faculties, to which one had to resort in Rome – and caused only further tension.<sup>64</sup>

The episcopal conference of Nagyszombat in September 1639 was the peak of the crisis. In the submission to the monarch about the conference, which the papal nuncio incidentally tried to get in vain, the bishops held the “curial ministers” exclusively responsible for their problems. By relying on historical precedents, they encouraged Ferdinand III to stick to his right of appointment at every episcopal see under the Hungarian Crown. The resolution wanted to base the representation in Rome on the cooperation of the imperial legate and the agent by excluding the protectorate.

Regarding canon law, two statements should be highlighted. According to the alleged former practice, they suggested that the Nuncio of Vienna should be deprived of the right of the canonical investigation process related to the appointment of the bishops. Instead this should be given to the archbishop of Esztergom, namely the primate and the legate of the Holy See (*legatus natus*). Their idea shows a striking similarity to a long-debated, then denied suggestion of the Council of Trent, who wanted to entrust the investigation to the metropolitan of the new bishop. Instead, they expressed their viewpoint that the pope’s right of confirmation required for the valid consecration of a bishop was based on the special respect that the Hungarian monarchs had for the Apostolic See in Hungary. The past monarchs “*could have adopted the practice of the Early Church that after the royal election the Hungarian bishops were consecrated by their metropolitan with the assistance of two other bishops; yet, they assigned and reserved the right of confirmation of the royal nomination to the most sacred prelate of Rome, albeit they could have initiated the practice of the Early Church by the consent of the Holy See since the conversion of the Magyars*”.<sup>65</sup> This proposal hints at the possibility of a national church – independent of Rome – that one could have seen in the Gallican movements of the French church at that time.<sup>66</sup>

64 CVH vol. I/2, Budapest–Rome 2005.

65 “[...] *eum primitivae Ecclesiae usum ac praxim potuissent sibi vindicare, ut a metropolitano et duobus episcopis, facta regia electione, episcopi regni consecrari possent, confirmationem tamen electionis regiae et electionem ad consecrationem Sanctissimo Romano Pontifici deferre et reservare voluerunt, non obstante eo, quod annotatum usum ac praxim citra praeiudicium iuris positivi sibi appropriare a primordio suae conversionis etiam assensu Sedis Apostolicae potuissent.*” AP, Archivum Ecclesiasticum Vetus, n. 204, fol. 32. Cfr. J. GRISAR, *Francesco Ingoli über die Aufgaben des kommenden Papstes nach dem Tode Urbans VIII. (1644)*, Archivum Historiae Pontificiae 5, 1967, pp. 289–324, 324: “*Questi due officij [this is Dataria and Cancellaria] per il rigore [...] sono stati di gran pregiudizio alla Sede Apostolica [...] e se non rimedia, non solo bisognerà concordar con Spagno, mà anche seguiranno de scisme di Provincie, come è stato per succedere da vescovi ungari sotto Urbano 8°.*”

66 P. TUSOR, *Az 1639*.

In the lasting debate over the duties, this theory moved towards a practical realization. In 1645, during the Roman audiences of György Jakusith, the Bishop of Eger held out the prospect that if the Holy See was reluctant to make allowances, the Hungarian prelates “*would provide for the salvation of souls and by ancient right they would consecrate themselves by three summoned bishops, since they could not obtain the consecration of a bishop owing to the impossibility of the taxes’ payment*”.<sup>67</sup> They would do this accompanied by a ceremonial protest and without a papal approval.

The radical opinion succeeded. An agreement was reached with the new pope, Innocent X (1644–1655), by which Hungary had to pay only a symbolic *annata*. Previously, the act of consecrating a bishop without Rome’s confirmation would have carried the threat of schism. After the agreement was signed, it was no longer necessary.<sup>68</sup>

However, a sign of certain independence remained, despite all the efforts of the papal nuncios. After the royal nomination and without waiting for the confirmation from the Holy See, the Hungarian bishops immediately undertook the spiritual and secular ruling of their dioceses and started to wear their episcopal insignia. In truth, the supreme protector of the Hungarian right of patronage was not the court of Vienna but the Hungarian church itself.<sup>69</sup>

## The end of the century: the expulsion of the Turks

It would result in a wrong and one-sided approach if one put the emphasis on an anti-Rome attitude based on the overestimation of the difficulties concerning the introduction of the new church discipline, or of the often-occurring functional inconveniences of the Roman representation. Namely, these problems were only symptoms of the restoration between the relationship of Hungarian Catholicism and the papacy; the fundamental issue is the development and consolidation of a manifold interrelationship.

There was no emergency in the seventeenth century when Hungarian Catholicism did not reach for their supreme foreign support, the Apostolic See. Innocent X was asked for help to stop the Protestant György Rákóczi’s campaign of 1644–1645 in Upper Hungary; the primary aim of Jakusith’s legation was its attainment.<sup>70</sup> Over the course of the Ottoman attacks between 1658 and 1664, which led to the loss of Várad and Érsekújvár, Primate György Lippay desperately did his utmost to ensure that Alexander VII (1655–1667) efficiently intervened for the sake of Transylvania’s defence and re-Catholicization.<sup>71</sup>

67 BAV, Barb. Lat. 6870, f. 30r–v.

68 See above.

69 V. FRAKNÓI, *A magyar királyi kegyúri jog*.

70 P. TUSOR, *Jakusith György egri püspök római követjárása*.

71 ASV, Segr. Stato. Vescovi, vol. 43, ff. 33r–34r.

After the Treaty of Vasvár, it was suggested that Hungary should be directly put under the protectorate and rule of the Apostolic See instead of the Habsburgs, knowing the nation's "*ancient and deeply ingrained respect for the Holy See, which is regarded as their patron.*" This was reported to Nuncio Spinola by Chancellor György Szelepcshény, then archbishop of Kalocsa in strict confidence in November 1665.<sup>72</sup>

In the second half of the 1670s, Szelepcshény (as the archbishop of Esztergom) regularly informed Cardinal Secretary of State Alderano Cybo about the commotion of the Turks and the Kuruc. He called attention to the heads of the Papal State to the extent of the reviving pagan danger that was realized in the siege of Vienna in 1683.<sup>73</sup>

As Hungarian Catholicism took late measures to the idea of renewal, the papacy undoubtedly also took a lengthy time to respond to the Hungarian expectation of increased provision. When Rome was finally open the idea of the expulsion of the Turks, everything became possible concerning expenses, which had been neuralgic. According to the annual statements of the Apostolic Chamber, between 1683 and 1688, Innocent XI invested 1,083,753,22 scudi<sup>74</sup> on the liberation of Hungary, with the assistance of Cardinal Francesco Buonvisi (Nuncio of Vienna). Additionally, it indirectly provided funds for the restoration of the rump church administration which had been the cause of many problems previously.

Given the knowledge of the previous events, the fact that in the autumn of 1682 the Hungarian church was the first to condemn the anti-Roman "Gallican articles", which were finalized on the national council of France, and bore testimony to its unconditional adherence to the Holy See, was of special importance.<sup>75</sup>

72 ASV, Segr. Stato. Germania, vol. 175, ff. 636r–638v.

73 ASV, Segr. Stato. Vescovi e prelati, vol. 62–69, passim; ASM, Archivio Cybo–Malaspina. Archivio Alderano Cybo, vol. 65, n. 62. 84. 136 (Appendice, n. 14); vol. 66, n. 35 and vol. 87, parte V, n. 19. parte VIII, n. 32.

74 ÖStA, HHStA, Allgemeine Urkunden, the appendix of the brief dated 20 February 1690.

75 Gabriel ADRIÁNYI, *Die angebliche ungarische Nationalsynode von 1682*, *Annuario Historiae Conciliorum* 27/28, 1995–1996, pp. 841–851; Archivio di Stato di Lucca, Archivio Buonvisi, parte II, vol. 44, n. 13.