**Early History of the Székesfehérvár Basilica and Provostship**

*Thoroczkay, Gábor*

This study shows the early history and treasures of the Székesfehérvár Basilica and provostship which was founded by the first Hungarian king, Saint Stephen (1000/1001–1038), also serving as a burial place of his. The study covers the descriptions of the building destroyed at the very beginning of the 17th century during the Turkish occupation from the Árpád ages (Hungarian Chronicle and the legends of Saint Stephen). It also covers the attempts to reconstruct the building, the coronations taking place in the Basilica from the early ages, the royal burials getting more frequent from the 12th century and the canonizations of King Stephen and his son, Imre taking place within the Basilica in the year 1083. The study describes in detail the issue of the Holy Crown of Hungary, the royal lance of German origin which has been lost, the still remaining coronation mantle of unique value which originally belonged to the provost of the Basilica as his chasuble, and the issue of the Székesfehérvár rationales, the pontificals wore by the coronizing bishops, which had presumably existed.

**Poetical Representation of the Installation Ceremony of Sándor Rudnay**

*Vaderna, Gábor*

The highest position of the Hungarian Catholic Church, the Primateship of Esztergom was vacant between 1809 and 1820. This vacancy was one of the most important issues of Hungarian politics that time. The Habsburg Court did not want to remedy for this grievance as the revenue of the archbishopric had been collected by the Habsburg Monarchy itself and had been spent on the Napoleonic wars. Hence the Hungarian orders waited hopefully for the great moment of a nomination. Finally, the king, Franz II chose the bishop of Transylvania, Sándor Rudnay (1760–1831) who was approved of by the Vatican too. This paper presents the poetical representation of the installation ceremony, which was held in May 1820. More than a hundred poems were born in several languages (Latin, Hungarian, German, Slovakian, and French) by numerous kinds of authors (such as clerics, nobles, students, or simple citizens). Of course, in these laudations (encomiasticums as it is termed) they all praised the excellence and virtue of Rudnay, but they also tried to articulate what their wishes were, what expectations they had, what they thought about their political chances, and how an archbishop should support a political cause at the Court. In this sense, the poetry that appeared for this occasion was a specific tool of political communication by which one could express one’s opinions and desires.
**Milestone in the Hungarian and Romanian Greek Catholic Historiography**

*Katkó, Márton Áron*

Present article’s issue is Cecilia Cârja’s monograph published in 2012, titled *Church and Politics. The Creation of the Hajdúdorogh Diocese* (1912). This article’s goal is not only the presentation of Cârja’s work, but also to synchronize with the results of the Hungarian researches. The mentioned book is unique at the map of the Hungarian and Romanian historiography. After many short articles and chapters this is the first experience of a complex review of one of the last great nationality confrontations in the old Hungary. Cârja’s work presents not only ecclesiastical questions of the creation of diocese, but it is also useful for the exploration of the differences and contradictions between the Hungarian and Romanian national self-reflection (lingual nation vs. confessional nation) or the different nationbuildings.

The author starts her argumentation with the Hajdúdorog movement in the 1860’s and presents its development: claims and struggles for own bishopric institution with Hungarian liturgical language.

By processing the documents of the Archivio Segreto Vaticano, Cârja sketches the goals of this movement and the difficulties of its achievement from the point of view of the higher ecclesiastical authorities’ attitudes, primarily the Vatican refusing the national campaign in the church. The author explores many new sources, but she doesn’t use Hungarian documents thus her interpretation of the most significant secular authority, the Hungarian government’s goals is incomplete.

Indirectly the government’s opinion determined the limits of movement’s wishes. Before the 1910’s, because of national reasons the government refused the erection of a new diocese, but supported the introduction of the Hungarian liturgical language because of the same motives. Cârja describes these two questions in separate chapters correctly, but without the governmental sources she cannot reconstruct all aspects of their connection, especially in the period between 1902–1910, when the government step by step gravitated from the introduction of the new liturgical language towards the erection of the diocese.

The most interesting part of the book is the interpretation of Romanian Greek catholic society’s reaction to the erection of the Hajdúdorog diocese, in 1912. During the Romanian protestation evolved a division of labour among all affected members. Priests and their parishes edited memorandums, the high clergy protested at Rome and tried to slow down the foundation of the diocese, the secular Romanians reached to get support from the Romanian government and heir to the Habsburg throne.
Economic Conditions of the Roman Catholic Community in Transylvania after the Change of Countries, with Special Regards to the Properties of the Transylvanian Catholic Status

Romania’s estate politics after the Trianon treaty caused about 24,297,138 lei deficit in the school and religious funds managed by the Transylvanian Catholic Status. It is understandable that such a dramatic loss of income had serious consequences. Education was the most affected field, just as intended by the creators of the edict. The number of denominational schools decreased due to source redistributions and other obstructive decisions, and even the maintenance of the remainder was possible only through the selflessness of the followers.

But it must be noted, as our analysis shows, that an exact explanation for such a situation, according to present expectations, cannot be given today. The difference between clerical and liberal views is rooted in the essential difference between the feudal and modern civil concepts of property. The primary goal of those who worked much on the elimination and abolishment of the Status was to acquire the money of these funds. For this purpose, they attempted to confuse the legal interpretation of the time when the Status and the funds were created with the interpretation of their own time. Such a confusion attempt is actually ‘an abuse of scholarship’, its ‘violation’ and an opportunity for false explanations.