

THE FOUNDATION OF THE ARCHBISHOPRIC OF KALOCSA: THE BYZANTINE ORIGIN OF THE SECOND ARCHDIOCESE IN HUNGARY

István Baán¹

The treatment of the situation of the Byzantine Church in Hungary during the tenth and eleventh centuries by Hungarian historians is deeply dependent on the general evaluation of the political relationship of the Hungarians and Byzantium². Although there are relatively few documents on the direct links and the question of the exact chronology of the political events in the first two centuries of the Hungarian state has been much discussed, several assumptions have been taken for granted by most scholars and consequently by the wider public as well.

A PARALLEL BETWEEN THE GROWTH OF THE HUNGARIAN AND RUSSIAN CHURCHES

Although historians disagree over its significance, the relationship of the Hungarians and Byzantium always included an ecclesiastical dimension. A unique feature of Hungary, that two archbishoprics existed side by side from the beginning of the kingdom, directs our attention to the parallel missionary activities of the Eastern and Western churches. Among newly converted people the establishment of two archbishoprics within such a short period of time was unprecedented, because the age understood the word "archiepiscopus" as a synonym of "primate".

During the last few decades three Byzantine documents have been brought to light, which demonstrate that an Orthodox ecclesiastical province, known as the "Metropolitanate of Tourkia", existed in Hungary under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Constantinople during the eleventh and twelfth centuries³. When and how was this Byzantine ecclesiastical province established.

¹ Institute of Philosophy, Miskolc University.

² Cf. F. Makk — S. Szádeczky-Kardoss, *Bizánci-magyar kapcsolatok* [Byzantine-Hungarian Relations], "Korai magyar történelmi Lexikon" [Early Hungarian Historical Lexicon], ed. Gy. Kristó, Budapest 1994, 111-113.; F. Makk, *Magyar külpolitika (896-1196)* [Foreign Policy of Hungary 896-1196], Szeged 1996.

³ István Baán, *Turkia metropolitája. Újabb adatok a bizánci egyház történetéhez a középkori Magyarországon* [The Metropolitanate of Tourkia: A New Contribution to the History of the Byzantine Church in Hungary during the Middle Ages], "Századok" 129(1995): 1167- 1170. Some scholars affirm

where was it located, and what were its significant centers? One of the previously mentioned documents, a list of bishoprics, provides a clue for helping us to establish the time of its foundation. On the list the sixty — first is Rhôsia and follows immediately after the Metropolitanate of Tourkia. Therefore the Russian ecclesiastical province rose to the rank of metropolitanate at some time after the one in Hungary. The appearance on the list of these two metropolitanates is probably not accidental and in all likelihood the pace of their development was also similar. Since we have a more detailed knowledge on the formation of the Orthodox church in Russia than in Hungary, I would like to argue by analogy with the better documented Russian example.

Vladimir was baptized along with his people in 988. During his reign the original missionary bishopric expanded to five or six bishoprics: Kiev, Belgorod, Novgorod, Chernyogov, Pereyasavl, and possibly Polotsk. Nevertheless, these did not immediately become an independent archbishopric⁴. The exact time when the large Russian ecclesiastical province became a metropolitanate remains a subject for dispute. A document from 1039, which is the earliest evidence, refers to Theopemptos as enjoying the rank of Metropolitan of Kiev⁵. But only by the 1160s did the Metropolitanate of Kiev develop into an ecclesiastical province made up of twelve bishoprics⁶.

Based on these developments, we may conclude that in order to form a metropolitanate four or five bishoprics needed to have functioned successfully for several decades. This practice can be observed among the Christianized people living outside the Byzantine Empire and also among those who were only nominally dependent on it. Naturally the elevation to the rank of metropolitanate had not only ecclesiastical but also political dimensions.

Usually the emperor initiated the process of raising a bishopric or archbishopric to the rank of metropolitanate⁷ and entrusted the task to the patriarch, who completed the work at a synod. The metropolitans always had close connections with the patriarch, and they were always required to answer his call to assemblies. A patriarchal trustee supervised the election of a metropolitan, and the patriarch recognized the authority of a metropolitan only after installing him in office by issuing an *omophorion*⁸. Our documents refer to the presence of Joannes, Metropolitan of Tourkia, at Constantinople in 1028. The visit could have had several reasons. Metropolitan Joannes could have been

that the Metropolitanate of Tourkia was a mere titular one, which held the claim of Byzantium for the ecclesiastical jurisdiction over the Hungarian territories, but the prelates never resided in Hungary. Cf. F. Malck, *Byzanci egyház* [Byzantine Church], "Korai magyar történeti lexikon" [Early Hungarian Historical Lexicon], (ed. Gy. Kristó), Budapest 1994, 109. This hypothesis does not correspond to the practice of the Church of Constantinople in the first millennium, which never raised a bishopric to a higher rank without it having been an active ecclesiastical province. The Metropolitanate of Tourkia was not considered later as one in *partibus infidelium*, as the Roman Catholic Church has looked on the Eastern dioceses having a Greek prelate for their bishop.

⁴ G. Podskalsky, *Christentum und theologische Literatur in der Kiever Rus (988-1237)*, München, 1982, 28-33.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 282.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 35.

⁷ Cf. F. Dölger, *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches*, München 1925, II, no. 974. "The emperor promotes the Bishopric of Nazianzos to the rank of Metropolitanate." See also: V. Grumel and J. Darrouzès, *Les Regestes des Actes du Patriarcat de Constantinople. Vol. I: Les Actes des Patriarches. Fasc. II-III. Les Regestes de 715 à 1206*, Paris 1989, no. 899, 383.

⁸ L. Bréhier, *Les institutions de l'empire byzantin*, Paris 1970, 391.

attending a session of the synod held by Patriarch Alexios Studites. Joannes could also have come to receive the *omophorion* or to discuss matters concerning Hungary that could not be handled through correspondence.

The alliance between St. Stephen and Basil II in all likelihood played a decisive role in the establishment of the metropolitanate in Hungary. Their alliance was certainly stabilized and strengthened not only by a dynastic marriage between the two houses but also by ecclesiastical cooperation. The founding document of the Greek monastery at Veszprémvölgy states that the monastery belongs under the jurisdiction of the metropolitan, who — in light of the preceding discussion — is unlikely to have been the Archbishop of Esztergom. As N. Oikonomidés has noted the document most probably refers to the Metropolitan of Tourkia⁹. György Györffy has dated the founding charter of Veszprémvölgy to 1018¹⁰. In a document of May 1020 Basil II regulated the future of the bishoprics under the jurisdiction of the Archbishopric of Ochrida. Since the Metropolitanate of Tourkia was not mentioned in this regulation, clearly we need to look for it in the territory of the Hungarian kingdom¹¹. If we take into consideration that the Russian church needed one half century (988-1039) to become a metropolitanate, then we may note that in all likelihood the process in Hungary was not much slower. The missionary Bishop Hierotheos was ordained in 953 and the latest date for the founding of a metropolitanate in Hungary is 1018. In short, the Greek church in Hungary had six and a half decades to develop into a metropolitanate. If we accept this evidence, then the growth and stabilization of the Orthodox church in Hungary does not appear to have been characterized by as many hardships as earlier thought. ,

THE COEXISTENCE OF THE GREEK AND LATIN CHURCHES

Returning to the problem to which we alluded earlier, we need again to raise the question: when we consider the two archbishoprics of St. Stephen, are we not talking about the Archbishopric of Esztergom and the Metropolitanate of Tourkia? And if so, can we logically conclude that the Metropolitanate of Tourkia was the predecessor of the Archbishopric of Kalocsa, or perhaps entirely the same?

In order to explore this issue more thoroughly, we need to clarify whether the question can be raised in this manner at all. Our views on ecclesiastical history are filled with prejudices that invite a negative answer. Consequently we need to examine the relationship between the Greek and Latin churches during the first half of the eleventh century. We have no evidence from Hungarian source to help us. Thus, we must again consider using an analogy based on a region where the two churches and their adherents lived side by side, namely southern Italy. This analogy cannot be employed on all the major points, because in southern Italy the different churches were closely tied to the different ethnic groups, Norman and Greek. Nevertheless the analogy may still

⁹ N. Oikonomidés, *A propos des relations ecclésiastiques entre Byzance et la Hongrie au XIe siècle: le métropolitain de Turquie*, "Revue des Études Sud-Est Européennes" 9(1971): 527.

¹⁰ György Györffy, *Diplomata Hungariae Antiquissima*, Budapest 1992, I, 81-85.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 429-430.

be helpful because over the course of time the factors liable to cause disagreement declined. We may follow P Herde's observation that confrontations in the political arena significantly increased tensions in the religious sphere¹². In southern Italy, the cause of differences was primarily language and not the different rites. The popes did not organize Latinization. Assimilation arose primarily where the Greek church significantly decreased in comparison with a growing Latin majority. "We do not know much about the everyday coexistence of Greek and Latin Christians. The sources only occasionally shed light on the darkness surrounding these relations. But we can discern that conflicts arose where Latin and Greek rites were practiced side by side, or even in the same church building¹³". If this was the situation in an area where the popes could, or at least attempted to, exercise their authority directly, and the Byzantine influence was considerably greater, then the relations between the two churches in Hungary would have been much more favorable. Here neither ethnic nor linguistic (vernacular) differences coloured the situation, and their alienation did not foreshadow the unfortunate schism between the two churches.

Even if not always harmoniously, the two churches and their respective hierarchies could have peacefully existed side by side in Hungary. Nevertheless, they would have had to be geographically separate, because the regulations of neither church recognized the possibility of two bishoprics existing simultaneously in the same place. This practice, based on the results of the Fourth Crusade, was only introduced by the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215. Several factors helped to determine whether a Greek or a Latin would be consecrated as bishop in a particular bishopric, but the choice of one or the other did not determine the ritual affiliation of the diocese¹⁴. Nor did this choice presuppose that future bishops would follow the same rite. Thus it was theoretically possible to have Greek clergy under a Latin bishop and Latin clergy under Greek jurisdiction¹⁵.

IS THE ARCHBISHOPRIC OF KALOCSA OF GREEK ORIGIN?

We may propose an answer to this question by noting that the Metropolitanate of Tourkia and the Archbishopric of Kalocsa were probably one and the same from the beginning. Our first document comes from 1050 and mentions a Georgius as the Hungarians Archbishop of Kalocsa¹⁶, whose name could suggest that he was Greek. In 1075 the archbishop was Desiderius¹⁷. The early twelfth-century prelates had Latin names also: Ugolinus¹⁸, Fulbertus¹⁹, and in 1111 a Paulus, who could have been either a Greek or a Latin²⁰. Therefore

¹² P. Herde, *Das Papsttum und die Griechische Kirche in Süditalien vom 11. bis zum 13. Jahrhundert*. "Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters", 26(1971): 1–46.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 25.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 10.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 11.

¹⁶ *Diplomata Hungariae*, 138–139.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 218.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 335.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 408.

Hartvik, writing at the turn of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, could have presumed that the Archbishopric of Kalocsa was always led by Latins, and this understanding would have been reflected in that part of his story where he provided a fantastic explanation to support the existence of a second archbishopric²¹. However this embellished story cannot be supported by canon law. The only acceptable explanation must be that over time an originally Orthodox metropolitanate, which started out under the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Constantinople, came gradually to be ruled by Latin prelates. Thus through the deepening schism it slowly slipped from the *de facto* control of the patriarchs and became a Latin archbishopric by the twelfth century. At the same time this does not exclude the continued existence of Greek clergy and parishes. The first Orthodox archbishops could have been Joannes and Antonius²², but we do not know which one came first. Furthermore, if the Russian example can again serve us here, we can presume that Georgius was also a Greek, because we know that the first metropolitans in Kiev were Greeks. The fact that from October 1050 Georgius was with Pope Leo IX in Lotharingia and on January 11, 1051 took part in the dedication in Besanon of St. Stephens First Martyr Church does not contradict his Greek origin. At that time the Eastern and Western churches were still not formally split and remained united. We can also presume that Georgius was on a diplomatic mission, a task for which he was well suited by his connections and linguistic abilities²³. The assertion, in Hartvik's tale that "when St. Imre's soul was brought by angels to the palace of heaven, it was revealed to a saintly Greek bishop on the hour of his death," may perhaps be connected to the Archbishopric of Kalocsa²⁴. Since according to the St. Imre legend, which was written after Hartvik, Eusebius, the Archbishop of Kaisareia — not the church historian — also saw the event described above, he cannot be the Greek bishop mentioned by Hartvik. The Greek prelates must have left a profound impact on the church because as late as the early fifteenth century it was noted that Kalocsa, "was for a long period in the hand of the schismatics or men of the Greek rite²⁵".

We must raise one additional question: which would have been the suffragan bishoprics of the Metropolitanate of Tourkia? I believe they were the suffragans of the Archbishopric of Kalocsa: the dioceses of Transylvania²⁶,

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 382.

²¹ Hartvik, *Vita Sancti Stephani regis*, cap. 8–9 in "Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum tempore ducum regumque stirpis Arpadianae gestarum", ed. E. Szentpétery, Budapest 1937–1938, II, 411–412, 417.

²² Gy. Moravcsik, *Fontes Byzantini historiae Hungariae aevi ducum et regum ex stirpe Árpád descendantium*, Budapest 1984, 253.

²³ *Diplomata Hungariae*, 138–139.

²⁴ Hartvik, *Vita Sancti Stephani regis*, 47.

²⁵ In a papal supplication dated 1420 Scolari Carnianus, a Canon of Várad, requested the leadership of the Archbishopric of Kalocsa for himself because the archbishop was occupied elsewhere. See Lukacsics, *XV. századi pápák oklevelei* [Diplomas of the Popes in the Fifteenth Century], I, 91; also cited in György Győrffy, *A szászszentdemeteri görög monostor XII. századi birtokösszeírása*, [A List of the Properties of the Greek Monastery at Szászszentdemeter in the Twelfth Century], in "Magyar Tudományos Akadémia II. Oszt. Közleményei", 1953: 342.

²⁶ Cf. G. Ertz, *A Szent István alapítású erdélyi püspökség első székesegyháza* [The First Cathedral of the Bishopric of Transylvania, Founded by Saint Stephen], *Doctor et apostol. Szent István-tanulmányok* [Doctor et apostol. Essays on Saint Stephen], ed. J. Török, "Studia Theologica Budapestinensia" 10, Budapest 1994, 104.

Bihar and Csanád²⁷. We do not have their founding charters, nor do we know the one for Kalocsa, and up to now we only have assumptions about the time of their establishment and features. If it could be demonstrated that they were actually parts of the Metropolitanate of Tourkia, then the time of their founding would be earlier than is now believed. The Bishopric of Transylvania would for example have been founded in the time of Prince Géza. In the case of Marosvár, or Csanád, we should consider this to be a situation not where a new bishopric was founded, but where a Latin cleric was ordained to preside over an Orthodox entity. The four bishoprics of the Kalocsa ecclesiastical province would fulfill the requirements for being a metropolitanate. Another important center would have been Szávasszentdemeter. The monastery there was refounded in 1018, and St. Stephen was probably its first patron²⁸. The monastery at Szer may also have been an ecclesiastical center. During the 1970s a Tau-shaped croiser from the eleventh century was found in one of the graves of the monastery. Its owner has been identified as either an abbot or a bishop²⁹. Titel could also be given consideration because its church was dedicated to the honor of the Holy Wisdom, Hagia Sophia. As is well known only the most important churches, which were centers in the most significant territories such as Constantinople, Thessaloniki, Monembasia, Ochrid, Kiev, and Novgorod, received this title. The examination of church dedications can provide much needed help for determining the borders of the Metropolitanate of Tourkia. The comparison of dedications in Hungary and Macadonia has already shown some positive results³⁰.

It is obvious that the problem of the Metropolitanate of Tourkia cannot be decided solely on the basis of written documents. On the other hand the written evidence for its existence can assist scholars in other historical disciplines, who are engaged with the same problem. If, working under the assumption that after St. Stephen there was no longer a Greek ecclesiastical hierarchy in Hungary, an archeologist were to find Byzantine style items dating from the tenth to the twelfth centuries, he would be in a difficult situation. He would most likely date his findings in light of his assumptions about the demise of the Greek hierarchy in St. Stephens time, and avoid the later dates³¹. Let us hope that much partial data, which has previously been mistakenly interpreted or existed only as some inexplicable anomaly, will now find its place in a new more coherent and accurate view.

BYZANTINE CULTURE AND CHURCH IN HUNGARY

Based on these sparse documents and references, it is difficult to determine exactly what role the Greek metropolitanate enjoyed in Hungary's cultural

²⁷ Cf. P. Püspöki Nagy, *Szent István egyházszerkezete* [Saint Stephens Ecclesiastical Organization], in "Szent István" Budapest 1991, 76.

²⁸ György Györfly, *A szávasszentdemeteri*, 339.

²⁹ O. Trognayer, *A pusztaszeri templomrom* [The Church Ruins at Pusztaszer], "Műemlékvédelem" 36/2(1992): 93.

³⁰ Cf. Zs. Nagy, *Bizánci eredetű szentek az Árpád-kori templomtitulusokban* [Saints of Byzantine Origin in the Titles of the Churches from the Age of the Árpád Dynasty] (manuscript), Budapest 1997.

³¹ Cf. I. Szatmári, *Bizánci típusú ereklytartó mellkereszték Békés és Csongrád megyében* [A Relic Bearing Byzantine Style Pectoral Crosses in Békés and Csongrád Counties], "A Móra Ferenc Múzeum Évkönyve — Studia Archaeologica", I(1995): 248-249.

life. Basing his conclusions on a collection of fragmentary translations of the Bible, L. Bencze assumes that in Hungary, "there must have been a good and rather early, most likely predating the twelfth century, school of translation, which was probably of Greek origin ... From the twelfth century on that school was probably suppressed by the Latin tradition ... The Greek school may have been responsible for the differences in the Lords Prayer, for the knowledge of Greek in Hungary, as well as for the outstanding translations and well-developed philosophical and theological language of the eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Its disappearance could be responsible for the relatively poor translations and comparatively underdeveloped language of the translations in the Hungarian codices of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries³²". In the early twelfth century at the request of David, the Abbot of Pannonhalma Cerbanus in Pászto translated into Latin some parts from the works of St. John of Damascus and St. Maximus Confessor. The translation of St. John of Damascus spread to the West and was employed by Peter Lombard³³. Through the intermediary Demetrios Tornikes, Job, the Archbishop of Esztergom, held a dogmatic debate with the Emperor Isaac II himself³⁴. These events reveal that the Byzantine church helped to integrate Hungary into Europe, and the retreat of the Orthodox church reflects the shift of Europe's center once again to the West away from Constantinople.

³² L. Bencze, *Behold Thy Son. On the Source of Bible Translations in Medieval Hungary* in "Annales Universitatis Scientiarum Budapestinensis de Rolando Eötvös Nominatae. Sectio Linguistica, tomus XVIII", ed. I. Szatmári, Budapest 1987, 63.

³³ Gy. Moravcsik, *Byzantium and the Magyars*, Budapest 1970, 121.

³⁴ Gy. Moravcsik, *Fontes Byzantini historiae Hungaricae*, 248-251.