

## BYZANTINE ARCHIEPISCOPAL ECCLESIASTICAL SYSTEM IN HUNGARY?

Latin and Byzantine rite Christianity both joined in the Christianisation of the Hungarians. Opinions on the evaluation of Byzantine participation and its results widely differ. To measure the influence of Western and Eastern Church the institutionalisation of Christianity, the ecclesiastical system provides a basis for quantification.

In the field of monastic ecclesiastical system most recent research puts the number of Latin rite monastic communities established until the end of the 11<sup>th</sup> century to approximately 30. As opposed to this, the foundation of only 7 Byzantine rite monastic communities can be dated to the 11<sup>th</sup> century based on firm evidence.<sup>1</sup> In the case of monastic ecclesiastical system Latin dominance is obvious, but not exclusive. It must be stressed that in the vicinity of important political centres (Veszprém, Marosvár, Visegrád), the presence of Byzantine monasticism can be observed.

The influence of Episcopal system from political, ecclesiastical and governmental viewpoints far exceeds that of the monastic communities. In keeping the relations with the flock, besides the parishes, or in the 11<sup>th</sup> century, better to say, pastoral churches, bishoprics had a decisive role. Accordingly, the best indicator of the role of Byzantine Christianity in the early Árpád Era is whether it was present in the Episcopal ecclesiastical system, or not. Earlier literature on this issue – almost unanimously – gave a negative answer to this question.<sup>2</sup> However, one of the biggest mysteries of early Hungarian ecclesiastical system is that – contrary to other freshly Christianised territories – at

---

\* Department of Medieval and Early Modern Hungarian History, University of Szeged; e-mail: koszta@hist.u-szeged.hu

1 We know of seven Greek rite monastic communities (Veszprémvölgy, Marosvár-Oroszlámos, Pentele, Visegrád, Zebegény cave monastery, Tihany-Oroszkő cave monastery, Szávaszentdemeter) founded in the 11th century; Moravcsik 1938, 227–260. On the contrary, if we regard only the Benedictine monasteries, more than 150 functioned in the realm, and the foundation of at least 27 of them can certainly be dated to the 11th century; Hervay 2001, 474–547; Kristó 2004, 404–405.

2 In the second half of the 20th century György Györffy and László Mezey held the view that a Byzantine rite diocese functioned in the southern part of the realm in the 11th century and at the beginning of the 12th. According to Györffy the Hungarians after having taken Sirmium, translated the orthodox bishopric found there to Bács. At the end of the 11th century the Latin rite diocese of Kalocsa was united with the Byzantine rite bishopric of Bács. In this way the orthodox diocese functioned in Hungary only for two decades at the end of the 11th century; Györffy 1952, 337–343. László Mezey in a short reference mentions that the orthodox metropolitan in Sirmium was the predecessor of the Greek rite archbishop of Bács, and it was united with the Latin rite Kalocsa during the 12th century. The united diocese was of Latin rite; Mezey 1979, 131. These notions are reflected in the editions of *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche* from the 1960's, in the entries 'Kalocsa' and 'Ungarn'. Bogyay 1960, 1264 and Mezey 1965, 489.

the foundation of Hungarian Episcopal ecclesiastical system, two archbishoprics were founded, one in Esztergom, the other in Kalocsa.

Research has long been attempting to provide a feasible explanation as to why the archbishopric of Kalocsa was founded, and several hypotheses have been put forward.<sup>3</sup> Among the possible reasons for this duality, the double-faced characteristics of Hungarian Christianity – as a working hypothesis – may be suggested, i.e. the fact that Kalocsa was an archbishopric was the result of its Byzantine features. According to this, the archbishopric of Esztergom founded in 1001 was of Latin rite, while the archbishopric of Kalocsa established shortly after, probably in 1009, may have been of Byzantine rite. This hypothesis in Hungarian Byzantine Studies was proposed by István Baán some 25 years ago. I deem it highly important, that when we attempt to measure the influence of Byzantine Christianity, we refer to this notion, which can, to some extent, be supported by contemporary sources. I should like to examine whether this explanation can seriously be taken into consideration among the possible solutions of the Kalocsa issue.

According to sources, Byzantine Christianity evidently participated in Hungarian Christianisation, so scholars have attempted to link the archbishopric of Kalocsa to Byzantium on the basis, that it exerted its influence on the southern and eastern territories neighbouring with Byzantine Christianity. This was first attempted by N. Oikonomidés in 1971,<sup>4</sup> then in Hungarian Byzantine Studies, first as a reference in 1988,<sup>5</sup> and finally in the middle of the 1990's, István Baán set it forth in detail.<sup>6</sup> A few years later István Baán published his conception in foreign language making it available for international Byzantine research as well.<sup>7</sup>

The basis for this hypothesis was provided by the fact that in 1028, at the synod of the patriarch in Constantinople, Joannes, metropolitan of Turkia was mentioned.<sup>8</sup> The word 'Turkia' in Byzantine sources also meant Hungary,<sup>9</sup> so Oikonomidés thought that the above mentioned prelate arrived from Hungary at the synod as the head of a Greek rite archbishopric. Archbishop Joannes was mentioned at the end of the register of metropolitans, so according to the author it cannot have been an archbishopric established

3 Former hypotheses are summarised by Gyetvai 1987, 31–43; latest summary by Koszta 2013, 1–133.

4 Oikonomidés 1971, 527–533. The issue of the archbishopric of Kalocsa is a highly complex problem. Beside the seat established in Kalocsa in the 11th century, the centre of the archbishopric was translated to Bács in the 12th century, but the original seat in Kalocsa did not cease to exist either, and in this way Kalocsa emerged as a unique, double-seated diocese. Earlier scholars thought that two separate dioceses existed, one in Kalocsa the other in Bács, and they were united in the 12th century. On this see Városy 1885, VII–XXXVII; Gyetvai 1987, 31–43. Oikonomidés employed this – already refuted – theory. That is why he viewed Bács as the seat of the orthodox archbishopric.

5 Baán 1988, 749–750.

6 Baán 1995a, 1167–1170; Baán 1995, 19–26.

7 Baán 1997, 67–73; Baán 1999, 45–53.

8 The importance of this source was highlighted by Makk 1995, 30; Holler 1996, 940; Makk 1999, 99; Makk 2012, 57.

9 On the meaning of the word 'Turkia' see among others Holler 1996, 935–944.

long before. Therefore, he dated the foundation of the archbishopric to 1002–1028 as a sign of the establishment of favourable relations between Byzantium and Hungary. The task of this archbishopric would have been the organisation into church of those who acknowledged the authority of the patriarch of Constantinople, i.e. of those who converted to Christianity according to Byzantine rite. As the centre of the Greek metropolitan – interpreting the information of Kinnamos made in 1164 – Oikonomidés specified Bács.<sup>10</sup> István Baán, who complemented and extended Oikonomidés' point of view, contended that the office of the Byzantine metropolitan in Hungary existed until the end of the 12<sup>th</sup> century. Its cessation was in accordance with the decay of the Byzantine Empire and its withdrawal from the Carpathian Basin and north-Balkan. Baán considered the Greek nunnery of Veszprémvölgy to have been under the jurisdiction of the Byzantine archbishop, because its Greek language charter of foundation, which said the nunnery was directly under control of a metropolitan. The lead seal, which emerged from an unknown place and contained the circumscription, which translates 'the seal of Antonios, protosynkellos and president of Turkia', Baán describes it as belonging to an archbishop of the Greek archbishopric in Hungary called 'Antonios'. Another lead seal dated to the 11<sup>th</sup> century emerged whose circumscription translates 'Lord, aid Theophylaktos, bishop of the Turks'.<sup>11</sup> Since then the number of seals having belonged to the prelates of the Turks further increased. V. Laurent published a third seal, which had belonged to a bishop called 'Demetrios'. The inscription on its dorso means 'Lord, protect me, Demetrios, priest of the Turks', and the picture of the seal shows the bust of the Holy Virgin with the legend "God's mother".<sup>12</sup>

István Baán increased the number of sources that can be associated with the possible Greek archbishopric in Hungary with a 12<sup>th</sup> century Byzantine bishop register (*notitia episcopatuuum*), which emerged in the 1980's.<sup>13</sup> The enumeration mentions the metropolitan of Turkia at the sixtieth entry. However, Baán dates its foundation somewhat later than Oikonomédés, to the second half of the reign of Saint Stephen. The above mentioned list enumerates the Russian archbishopric at the sixty-first entry, about which the first piece of evidence dates from 1039. Therefore, the Byzantine rite Hungarian archbishopric may have come into being some time before 1039. According to Baán, the monastery of Veszprémvölgy, which was established before 1018, also came under the jurisdiction of the Greek archbishop, therefore he dates the foundation of the archbishopric to the middle of the 1010's. In his view the alliance between Saint Stephen and emperor Basileos II played a decisive role in its foundation, which was further enhanced by the marriage of

10 The notion put forward by Oikonomidés was accepted by Beck 1980, 129.

11 On the original text and interpretation of the seals and their legends see Moravcsik 1984, 253.

12 In Hungarian scholarly literature László Holler and Éva Révész drew attention to this seal. Holler 1996, 943–944; Révész 2011, 39; Révész 2012, 85–87 and 98–101 (the photos of all three seals and the transcription of their legends). Révész 2014, 17–18.

13 The importance of this source piece was emphasised by Holler 1996, 940; Makk 1999, 99. and Makk 2012, 57–58.

prince Imre to an unknown Byzantine princess. He interpreted the dynastic marriage and the establishment of the Greek archbishopric as a sign of Saint Stephen's taking up a clear Byzantine orientation in the second half of his reign.

However, two studies of István Baán on the topic, published almost simultaneously, depicted a somewhat different picture about the emergence of the second Hungarian archbishopric, which he regards as a Byzantine rite one. In his study, based on a conference lecture and published in Szeged, he identified the orthodox archbishopric with Kalocsa, which controlled three bishoprics, which had been established earlier and which Baán regards as Greek rite ones, the bishoprics of Transylvania, Bihar and Csanád. According to his point of view, with the creation of the Greek archbishopric, the Byzantine bishoprics in eastern Hungary were linked together. In this way, before 1015 in the western part of the realm Latin rite, east of river Danube Greek rite bishoprics may have been founded. The *Annals of Pozsony* says about the bishopric of Csanád<sup>14</sup> allegedly founded in 1030 that a Latin rite prelate, Saint Gerard was appointed to the bishopric, but a Latin rite bishop does not necessarily mean the change of its Greek characteristics. Baán supposes that the Latin archbishopric in Esztergom and the Greek one in Kalocsa peacefully coexisted in the 11<sup>th</sup> century. According to his study published in Szeged, the Greek archbishopric had transformed into a Latin rite one by the beginning of the 12<sup>th</sup> century, because the legend of Saint Stephen written by bishop Hartvik describes Kalocsa as having been Latin rite one from the very beginning. As Baán describes it, due to the Latin prelates, Kalocsa gradually slipped out of the control of the patriarch, but still retained its Greek priests and ecclesiastical communities.<sup>15</sup>

In another short study published in the journal 'Századok', he maintains that there had been Byzantine bishoprics in Hungary before the establishment of the Greek archbishopric, so the foundation of it in reality meant the amalgamation of the Greek ecclesiastical system, and it ceased to exist only at the end of the 12<sup>th</sup> century. Though hypothetically, Baán identifies the archbishopric of Turkuia with Bács, which was united with the Latin rite Kalocsa in 1135.<sup>16</sup> Due to their shortness and contradictions, both studies of István Baán can only be regarded as general outline of the question. Hungarian research has practically rejected the possible existence of a Greek archbishopric without further reference.<sup>17</sup>

Lately, however, supporters of the concept outlined by István Baán have also appeared. The German scholar, Marcel Eliáš, based on the studies of Baán published abroad, and

---

<sup>14</sup> The *Annals* in fact does not mention foundation, but Gerard's ordination as bishop. SRH. I. 125. However, comparison between the *Annals* and the legends of Gerard makes it obvious that 1030 does not only mark the bishop's consecration, but the diocese was also founded at Marosvár (Csanád). Kristó 1998, 62; Koszta 1999, 304; Thoroczkay 2001, 62.

<sup>15</sup> Baán 1995, 21–24.

<sup>16</sup> Baán 1995a, 1167–1170.

<sup>17</sup> To the best of my knowledge few scholars referred critically to the concept of István Baán, e.g. Koszta 1996, 114; Koszta 1999, 310; Makk 1996, 61 and Makk 1999a, 40; Kiss 2007, 61–62.; Koszta 2013. 25–31.

more or less repeating the argument of the Hungarian researcher of Byzantine studies, identifies the second Hungarian archbishopric with the archbishopric of Turkia, which, according to him, was either the forerunner of the archbishopric of Kalocsa, or it was the archbishopric of Kalocsa itself. He regards the Byzantine missionary bishopric created by the appointment of Hierotheos in the middle of the 10<sup>th</sup> century as a forerunner of the alleged Greek archbishopric in Hungary. In his opinion the establishment of the Byzantine archbishopric can be dated to between 953, the beginning of the Greek missionary bishopric's activity, and the foundation of the allegedly archiepiscopal, Greek rite monastery of Veszprémvölgy dated by him to 1018. In order to provide a more accurate dating he studied the evolution of the Russian ecclesiastical system, where the independent archbishopric came into being in 1039, 5 decades after the baptism of the grand prince in 988. He thinks that in Hungary, too, several decades had had to pass before the patriarch of Constantinople consented to the establishment of an independent Byzantine archbishopric. Thus, in accordance with Baán, Eliaš regards the alliance of Saint Stephen and emperor Basileos II as the decisive step towards the establishment of the archbishopric. So its creation is associated with Saint Stephen and a nearly six and a half decades long Byzantine mission paved the way for the foundation of the second Hungarian archbishopric. As a parallel of the somewhat unique Hungarian situation, he refers to southern Italy, where in the 10–11<sup>th</sup> centuries the Greek and Latin ecclesiastical systems coexisted. According to him, the Greek archbishopric in Hungary in the 12<sup>th</sup> century slowly slipped out of the control of the patriarch and became a Latin rite archbishopric.<sup>18</sup>

Éva Révész in her study surveying the situation of Byzantine Christianity in Hungary also dealt with the problem of the Greek archbishopric. Taking the above mentioned prelate seals into consideration, she regards the three prelates as the successors of the missionary bishop Hierotheos, who functioned from the 950's. According to the circumscription of the seals they were called Theophylaktos, Antonios and Démétrios respectively. She considers it possible that the bishops had functioned on the territory of Gyula until 1003, until the end of the 10<sup>th</sup> century in Transylvania, and then they had to transfer their activity to the territory of Ajtony, to the area between river Maros and the lower Danube. The Greek bishopric was transformed to archbishopric between the end of the 10<sup>th</sup> century and 1028. Révész also associates the transformation with the alliance of Saint Stephen and the Byzantine emperor, or the Byzantine rite baptism of Ajtony.<sup>19</sup> In her opinion, the Greek archbishopric could function until the downfall of Ajtony around 1028, so the Greek archbishop must have been active for three decades at the most, and she did not associate the presumed archbishopric with the archbishopric title of Kalocsa, so she did not link the roots of Kalocsa to the possible Byzantine archbishopric.<sup>20</sup>

18 Eliaš 2012, 135–146.

19 The *Legenda Maior* of Gerard makes a reference to it, „*princeps in urbe Morisena, nomine Achtun, potens valde, qui secundum ritum grecorum in civitate Budin fuerat baptisatus*”. SRH. II. 489. On the Christianity of Ajtony see Kristó 1981, 129–135.

20 Révész 2012, 96–97.

In the evaluation of the role of Byzantine Christianity in Hungary, it is a crucial issue whether a Greek ecclesiastical system could be built up beside the missionary activity, or not. While the point of view of literature dealing with the evolution of the ecclesiastical system seems to be profoundly negative,<sup>21</sup> I deem it necessary to put forward a few critical comments in connection with the Byzantine Kalocsa/Bács concept, and in general, the alleged Byzantine archbishopric. While it is doubtless that Greek sources meant Hungary under the name 'Turkia', it is notable that they called the Hungarian population 'Turks' moving to the Vardar valley from the Carpathian Basin in the 10<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>22</sup> Their ecclesiastical system was of Byzantine rite; their bishopric was under control of Thessaloniki. Therefore, clergymen mentioned as prelates of 'Turkia' do not necessarily and exclusively refer to the Hungarians living in the Carpathian Basin. The seals of Antonios and Theophylaktos Byzantine bishops of Turkia were associated by their publisher<sup>23</sup> and István Bóna<sup>24</sup> with the Turks in the Vardar valley; furthermore Gyula Moravcsik also voiced his misgivings.<sup>25</sup> The work which collected the list of prelates of the Patriarch of Constantinople as a database also regarded the owners of the three seals to have been prelates of Turkia diocese in the Vardar valley.<sup>26</sup> In his reaction to these allegations István Baán voices his opinion that the Turks in the Vardar valley had only a bishopric, which was under the control of Thessaloniki.<sup>27</sup>

However, the bishop's register, which lists the archbishopric of Turkia, cannot be regarded as a fully reliable source. According to the outstanding scholar of Byzantine studies, Georg Beck, the so-called *notitia episcopatum* lists cannot be regarded as an absolutely trustworthy source. These lists occasionally reflected only claims, not the actual reality. It cannot be taken for granted that a bishopric enumerated in the list did indeed exist at the time the list was compiled. Information provided by the lists should be compared with other contemporary sources.<sup>28</sup> Bearing in mind all these considerations in connection with the enumeration discovered and published in 1981, too, we have to regard it a possibility that Byzantine church excluded from the Hungarian Episcopal system, which was built up at the beginning of the 11<sup>th</sup> century, included in its list

21 E. g. Makk 1996, 61; Makk 1999a, 40 and Koszta 1996, 114; Koszta 1999, 310.

22 They moved to the Vardar valley around 960 or even earlier, and the sources keep mentioning them until the 14th century as Turks of the Vardar valley. (Kristó 1999, 121; Kristó–Makk 2001, 143; Oikonomidès 1973, 1–8) However, it is also possible that the Turks of the Vardar valley were not descendants of the Hungarians having moved there, but Turkish people settled there from the eastern border areas of the Byzantine Empire, who were also called 'Turks' by the sources. Kapitánffy 1994, 713.

23 Oikonomidès 1971, 529–530.

24 Bóna 1989, 113, footnote 16.

25 Moravcsik 1984, 253, footnote 2.

26 Fedalto 1988, 456.

27 Baán 1995a, 1169; the Greek bishopric functioning in the valley of river Vardar (Axios) and dependent on the metropolitan of Thessaloniki appears in the *notitia episcopatum* lists in the 10th century. Oikonomidès 1971, 530, footnote 18.

28 Beck 1959, 148.

enumerating Byzantine bishoprics an archbishopric in Hungary in order to somehow maintain a kind of claim, which in reality did not play any role in ecclesiastical control of the Carpathian Basin.<sup>29</sup> In fact it did not function at all. The historical forerunner of the archbishopric of Turkuia was the missionary bishopric led by Hierotheos at the time of its establishment around 950. This missionary diocese, perhaps institutionalised in some way, may have existed until 1003 in the territory controlled by the Gyulas. After Saint Stephen's victory over his brother-in-law, Gyula junior, the Greek bishop had to leave his former place of activity and flee to a territory under Byzantine jurisdiction.<sup>30</sup> For a certain period in Constantinople they still appointed prelates for Turkuia to maintain the claim, and formally they even transformed it to the rank of archbishopric. The three emerging seals and the protocols of the Constantinople synod of 1028 may have preserved the memory of the nominally functioning prelates. However, the owners of the seals can no way be associated with Kalocsa or Bács, because the formerly published seals do not show their patrons, Saint Paul, but Saint Demeter, and the newly discovered third portrays the Holy Virgin. It must also be stressed that none of the three seals were found in Hungary, but in Byzantine territory. It must also be taken into consideration that after 1028 we do not hear of a single bishop of Turkuia. The mentioned *notitia episcopatum* list emerged in 1981 does not include the seat of the possible Hungarian archbishopric, which rather shows its missionary feature upholding only a claim.

Naturally, there are transplanted elements of Byzantine Christianity in 11–12<sup>th</sup> century Hungarian ecclesiastical culture. We may think here of the Byzantine links of the cult of saints, patrocinia, ecclesiastical feasts and other elements of liturgy as well as some archaeological finds with Byzantine background. In this respect, it is impossible to deny that Byzantine ecclesiastical relations played a part in the Christianisation of the Hungarians; however, the dominance of Latin Christianity is beyond dispute. If a Greek archbishopric had been functioning in Hungary for nearly two centuries, it is unthinkable that the culture of Greek Church would have played such a subordinate role in contemporary use of records, book transcription or ecclesiastical art. There is only one known example of Greek language charters from the Arpad Era, the foundation charter of the monastery in Veszprémvölgy. It is also significant that upon its 12<sup>th</sup> century renewal a Latin translation was also provided for its better understanding.<sup>31</sup> Among the early cathedrals of dioceses thought to have been of Byzantine rite (Kalocsa-Bács, Bihar-Várad, Transylvania and Csanád) only the ground-plans of Kalocsa<sup>32</sup> built at the beginning of 11<sup>th</sup> and of Gyulafehérvár built at the turn of 11–12<sup>th</sup> centuries are known.<sup>33</sup> The layout of both cathedrals can clearly be identified with the

29 Makk 1996, 61; Makk 1999a, 40 and Koszta 1996, 114; Koszta 1999, 310.

30 Moravcsik 2003, 55 voices a similar opinion; Ripoche 1974, 11–14; Ripoche 1977, 82–83 and Szegfű 1981, 86.

31 DHA. I. 378–379.

32 Foerk 1915, 50–53.

33 Entz 1958, 70–76.

Latin rite.<sup>34</sup> The patron saints of the cathedrals (in case of Kalocsa/Bács: Saint Paul; Transylvania: Saint Michael; Bihar/Várad: the Holy Virgin; Csanád: Saint George) do not suggest their Byzantine origin either.

Saint Stephen occupied Transylvania as a result of military intervention. It is noted in the *Annals of Hildesheim*, which also mentions the Christianisation of the territory, but does not speak of its Byzantine characteristics. There is not a single piece of evidence on the basis of which we could refute the diocese's Latin feature.<sup>35</sup> The bishopric of Bihar, which István Baán also thinks to have been of Greek rite, was established four decades after the foundation of Kalocsa, around 1050.<sup>36</sup> Its first bishop was a priest of French origin called Leodvin.<sup>37</sup>

In connection with the foundation of Csanád the Greek monastery established by Ajtony in Marosvár was translated to Oroszlámos, which makes it clear that the new diocese was of Latin rite. The example of Csanád proves that at the establishment of the Hungarian episcopal system the founders were keen on the fact that the centres of the newly founded system should be independent of Byzantine. Saint Stephen attempted to create a ecclesiastical administration, which practically functioned as the king's private church, formally belonging directly to Rome, but completely independent of the German Imperial Church and the Greek ecclesiastical system controlled by the emperor of Byzantium.<sup>38</sup> In the episcopal system, which was significant from the perspective of politics and government, neither the German Empire, nor Byzantium could play a role. Greek Christianity could only be present in the monastic ecclesiastical system, which was secondary from the governmental viewpoint, and even in that it was numerically inferior to that of the Benedictine monasteries.<sup>39</sup>

Among the prelates<sup>40</sup> of those eastern dioceses, which István Baán considers to have been of Byzantine rite, none could be found, who was proved to have been of Greek origin, on the contrary, sources relating to them prove the opposite. George, archbishop of

---

34 In case of the first cathedral of Kalocsa, though, the characteristic Byzantine building technology, which alternated stone and brick rows continuously, can clearly be observed. (Entz 1967, 241) However, this does not necessarily mean that the church was of Byzantine rite, because this way of building can be identified with other, obviously Latin rite churches as well. The first simple cathedral of Kalocsa with its atrium connected to the western facade refers to the Orthodox Church building traditions. Late antique orthodox building traditions were apparent in sacral architecture of Italy at the turn of the 10–11th centuries. On this see Reiche 2002, 375. Török 1999, 11 and Török 2002, 40 refers to the Italian relations of the first church of Kalocsa. All this, in my opinion, rather suggests Kalocsa being founded in the presence of legate Azo, because at that time, the future layout of the cathedral may have come up.

35 Koszta 1999, 301; Kristó 1998, 57–58; Thoroczkay 2001, 57–58.

36 Koszta 1999, 304; Kristó 1998, 63; Thoroczkay 2001, 65.

37 Tóth 2007, 33–34.

38 Bréhier 2003, 438–452.

39 For the exact numbers see footnote 1.

40 For the biography of the archbishops of Kalocsa see Udvardy 1991, 13–176; for the bishops of Csanád Juhász 1930, 1–132; for the bishops of Várad Bunyitay 1883, 51–158; for the bishops of Transylvania Temesváry 1922, 4–12.



Kalocsa mentioned in 1050/1051, whom István Baán and Eliáš suspect of having been of Greek origin, cannot be regarded as that. Certainly, a bishop called *Georgius* can equally be considered to have originated from a Greek or a Latin territory, but there is greater evidence suggesting that archbishop George of Kalocsa was a Latin rite prelate<sup>41</sup> as well as his other successive archbishops of Kalocsa and Bács, about whom we have more information. His being of Latin rite is further enhanced by the fact that sources mention him in the retinue of Pope Leo IX; he participated in liturgical activity in Alsace-Lorraine together with the pope and French bishops in the pope's retinue.<sup>42</sup> Naturally, there may have been occasionally Greek prelates among the followers of the pope, but the decisive majority of bishops present in the papal court were undoubtedly members of the Latin ecclesiastical system. In fact, the person of George, archbishop of Kalocsa mentioned in connection with the visit to Alsace-Lorraine fits into the series of clergymen, who moved to Hungary from French territory and became bishop here in the second half of the 1040's.<sup>43</sup> We know for sure that in this period 24 canons of Verdun fled to Hungary<sup>44</sup> and being promoted to prelates here, they strengthened the relations of early Hungarian church with Alsace-Lorraine, which is also supported by some elements of medieval Hungarian liturgy and several of our early ritual books originating from this territory.<sup>45</sup> Therefore, the person of Archbishop George can be paralleled with his contemporary, Leodvin, bishop of Bihar, about who we know that he also originated from French territory, and he even visited Alsace-Lorraine as a Hungarian bishop and participated in a church foundation in Namur.<sup>46</sup> Among the prelates of Kalocsa there is only one about whom we can surely state that he spoke Greek, Archbishop Simon, who was translated from Pécs to Kalocsa at the end of the first third of the 12<sup>th</sup> century. Simon came to Hungary from southern Italy in the retinue of the first Norman origin wife of King Koloman. Therefore, he brought with him his knowledge of Greek from southern Italy.<sup>47</sup>

The Russian archbishopric, founded nearly simultaneously with the alleged Hungarian Byzantine archbishopric, was under strong Byzantine control. With one exception the archbishops were all sent there from Constantinople, and they all were of Greek origin.<sup>48</sup> After 1024 archbishops of Ohrid (Akhrida) and their suffragans were also all Greek.<sup>49</sup> If the foundation of Kalocsa had been in connection with Byzantium, its situa-

41 Udvardy 1991, 28–32.

42 Gombos 1937/1938, II. 1451. (3427.) and 1641. (3736.); DHA I. 138–139.

43 Tóth 2007, 31–36; on the Walloon origin of George see especially 32–33.

44 Gombos 1937/1938, II. 1395.

45 Concise summary of influence of Alsace-Lorrainean liturgy on Hungary is provided by Török 1986, 51–52.

46 Gombos 1937/1938, II. 969970; Hungarian translation with footnotes ÁKIF 226–227; Veszprémy 1994, 406.

47 Udvardy 1991, 59; Fedeles–Koszta 2011, 50–53.

48 Lübke 2003, 30. List of archbishops of Kiev: Podskasky 1982, 282–283.

49 Bréhier 2003, 476.

tion would have been similar. The archbishops of Kalocsa, who had their seat from the beginning of the 12<sup>th</sup> century mainly in Bács, all belonged to the retinue of the Hungarian kings, it is out of question that they had come from Byzantium. The Latin character of Kalocsa at the beginning of the 12<sup>th</sup> century is irrefutably proves the fact that its prelate got his pallium from pope Paschalis II.<sup>50</sup> Byzantine archbishops, on the other hand, did not use pallium as a symbol of dignity.

Kalocsa got into connection with the papacy not only through the stay of Archbishop George in the papal court in the 1050's and the pallium donation of pope Paschalis II. The diocese of Kalocsa was established in 1009 together with the bishoprics of Pécs and Eger.<sup>51</sup> At the foundation Bishop Azo of Ostia, papal bibliothecarius, papal legate was present and even played an active role. As to the rite of Pécs and Eger no one doubted their Latin character. This all adds up to the fact that the character of the third diocese founded in the presence of Azo, Kalocsa cannot have been different. They even seem to have been eager to express the thought *imitatio Romae*, which was the case elsewhere in contemporary Western Europe, whenever a diocese was established with the cooperation of papal legates. The patrons of all three cathedrals refer to the papal basilica in Rome, in case of Pécs Saint Peter, the Vatican basilica, Kalocsa, Saint Paul, basilica S. Paulo fuori le mura, Eger, Saint John, basilica of the Lateran.<sup>52</sup> There is no doubt about the fact that Kalocsa had functioned since its foundation as Latin rite diocese, though on its territory, especially in the Szerémség (Sirmium) bordering the Byzantine Empire, there lived Byzantine rite Christians, too. The archbishopric of Kalocsa, however, cannot be regarded as the diocese controlling and uniting the Byzantine rite Christians of Hungary and their orthodox bishoprics, because, according to my research, Kalocsa functioned as a titular archbishopric without a province up to 1161, and then Hungary was divided into two archbishoprics. In this way, the Hungarian ecclesiastical system was under the control of the archbishopric of Esztergom till the middle of the 12<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>53</sup>

I cannot accept the suggestion of Éva Révész, according to which the alleged Greek archbishopric may have functioned on the territory of Ajtony. Thanks to the *Legenda Maior* of Gerard<sup>54</sup> we have relatively reliable information on the emergence of the ecclesiastical system in the Maros region. The legend, better to say its basic text<sup>55</sup> prepared at the beginning of the 12<sup>th</sup> century, discusses the foundation of the bishopric of Csanád, and does not remain in silence about the former Byzantine ecclesiastical traditions of the territory, like the Byzantine rite baptism of Ajtony and the existence of a Greek monastery in Marosvár. However, there is no reference in the legend to a possible Greek Episcopal system even in an indirect form. As the sole church of the territory up to the

50 DHA I. 345–346.

51 Kristó 1998, 60–61; Koszta 1999, 303.

52 Fedeles–Koszta 2011, 22–31.

53 Koszta 2001, 57–64 and Koszta 2013, 33–120.

54 SRH II. 480–506.

55 On the emergence of the legend and its reliability see Horváth 1958, 21–82.

foundation of the Latin rite bishopric in 1030 the Greek rite Saint John the Baptist monastery is mentioned, where Christians, who fell in the battle against Ajtony, were buried without respect to their rite.<sup>56</sup> Of the seals of the three prelates, who Révész suspects to have been Greek rite bishops in Hungary, none of them was found in this territory, and the saints depicted in their legends, Demeter and Virgin Mary – as I reiterated in connection with Kalocsa – do not fit in with the Saint John the Baptist title of the Byzantine monastery in Marosvár, and the patron of the bishopric founded in 1030, i.e. Saint George. Therefore, the above mentioned three prelates did not function in the Maros region, but somewhere in Byzantine territory.

Saint Stephen aimed at the establishment of a heavily centralised state system in organising a bishopric system with the character of the ruler's private church. This conception rules out the possibility of two archbishoprics with different rites, one of them bearing a Byzantine character and being controlled through the patriarch by the Byzantine emperor.<sup>57</sup> The second part of Saint Stephen's rule cannot be described either as a period of strong, possibly exclusive Byzantine orientation. The Byzantine dynastic marriage<sup>58</sup> of prince Imre dated to around 1023 is not beyond doubt either. According to one view, the fiancée of Imre may have been Croatian.<sup>59</sup> Undoubtedly, the troops of Stephen participated in the siege of Ohrid in 1015 as allies of the Byzantine emperor, which resulted in the complete occupation of Bulgaria, and around 1025 there were Hungarian warriors in southern Italy in Byzantine pay. Shortly after the military action in Ohrid, however, in 1018 five hundred Hungarian warriors participated in the campaign of Boleslaw the Brave in Russia, so Hungarians fought against Kiev, which belonged to the Byzantine sphere of interest.<sup>60</sup> It is remarkable that the transit of Werner, bishop of Strasbourg, the envoy of Emperor Conrad II to Byzantium was denied in 1027/1028<sup>61</sup>, and almost simultaneously, Byzantine authorities prevented the entrance of Simeon, Greek ascetic monk to Hungary.<sup>62</sup>

The information of Kinnamos and Idrisi<sup>63</sup> dating from the middle of the 12<sup>th</sup> century and the fact that Bács had a Greek name, Pagatzion, do not prove that the archiepiscopal

56 On the Byzantine ecclesiastical relations of Marosvár in general see SRH II. 489–492; '*Corpora vero Christianiorum, qui ceciderant in prelio, tollentes duxerunt in Moroswar et sepelierunt in cimeterio Sancti Iohannis Baptiste in monasterio Grecorum, quia in eadem provincia aliud monasterium illis temporibus non erat.*' SRH II. 491–492.

57 Bréhier 2003. 438–452.

58 Makk 1996, 63 and Makk 1999a, 42.

59 On the literature of the possible Croatian wife of Imre see Vajay 1967, 90. Lately Kristó 2001. 121–122.

60 Makk 1996, 59–63 and Makk 1999a, 39–42.

61 Berschin 1980, 225; Wolfram 1992, 163–164; Makk 1996, 63–64; Makk 1999a, 42–43.

62 Bayer 1991, 335.

63 Idrisi writes on Bács: 'a famous city considered to be in line with the other big cities. Markets, trading houses, craftsmen and Greek scholars can be found here ...' Elter 1985, 59.

centre was of Greek rite.<sup>64</sup> However, the early mention<sup>65</sup> of the cathedral chapter of Bács unanimously refutes it, because in the Byzantine church the institute of the cathedral chapter did not exist.<sup>66</sup> The existence of the cathedral chapter in the case of the dioceses considered Byzantine rite by Baán and Eliáš can be proved in the 11<sup>th</sup> century in Csanád on the basis of the information provided by the *Legenda Maior* of Gerard,<sup>67</sup> local canons are also mentioned early, in 1134 in Várad.<sup>68</sup> Furthermore, reference to a Greek archbishopric in Hungary or its cessation in the near future is missing in the first years of the 13<sup>th</sup> century, when King Imre was planning to unite the Greek monasteries in Hungary under control of a bishopric.<sup>69</sup> Taking all this information into consideration we can fairly certainly state that the establishment of the second Hungarian archbishopric, Kalocsa cannot be associated with Byzantine Christianity. The latter, therefore, could not be institutionalised in the episcopal ecclesiastical system. During the internal Christianisation following the mission, in the strengthening of Christianity, accordingly, Byzantium could not play a role; this was exclusively the task of the Latin rite episcopal system. All this rather limited the chances of Byzantine Christianity in Hungary. In the second half of the 10<sup>th</sup> and at the beginning of the 11<sup>th</sup> centuries the population baptised by the Byzantine mission,<sup>70</sup> i.e. the Greek rite Christians also came under control of the Latin rite episcopal system. The building up of the Latin episcopal system and the lack of the Byzantine one meant that at the beginning of the 11<sup>th</sup> century, the orientation of Hungarian Christianity was decided. The episcopal system of Saint Stephen was the

---

64 Kinnamos writes on Bács: 'The city of ... Pagatzion is the metropolis of the people of Sirmion, whose prelate resides here ...' (Moravcsik 1984, 221.) In the 11th century as well as in the next one Hungary was in trade relation of an eastern, south-eastern European economic region in the first place, the centre of which was Constantinople. (Fügedi 1981, 318; Mesterházy 1993, 450–468; Kristó 1999, 158–160) Byzantine merchants often visited Hungary. Their presence may have been especially predominant in the southern part of the realm. Accordingly, it is not a coincidence that the central settlement of the southern territories, Bács had a Greek name, too.

65 In 1158 canons of Bács are already mentioned. Though the charter in its present form is a forgery, but taking into account the prelate names included, it may have been forged on the basis of a contemporary charter. The charter will be analysed hereafter in detail. *MonVat.* I/4. 574. Kubinyi 1975. 43.

66 Bréhier 2003, 522–532.

67 SRH II. 494–505; Koszta 2007, 16–17.

68 MES I 86.

69 Györffy 1953, 85–86.

70 There is very little reliable evidence known about the Byzantine missionary activity. We are aware of written sources, which mention solely the Byzantine mission initially led by Hierotheos and functioning at the beginning of the 950's. Presumably, we can count on an organised Byzantine mission in the vicinity of Marosvár after the conversion of Ajtony. As compared to the only documented Byzantine mission we possess much more written evidence on the Latin rite missionary activity, e.g. the mission led by Prunwart, monk of St. Gallen after 972, the mission of St Adalbert in the retinue of prince Géza, which can be dated to the 980's, we know of the missionaries arriving in the middle of the 990's with queen Gizella. In the first decade of the 11th century Bruno of Querfurt evangelized in Hungary in two phases, we also have written evidence on two missionary groups sent by the Italian hermit, Romuald. Taking all this into account we can conclude that the Latin rite evangelization was more intense and affected more territories than its Byzantine counterpart.

foundation stone and guarantee of Latin rite Christianisation in Hungary. Obviously, we should not read into the choice of the king a kind of differentiation between the two Christian rites, but a political decision. As he made the influence of the prelates of the Imperial German church on the episcopal system impossible, he also excluded the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Constantinople by preventing the establishment of Greek rite bishoprics and an archiepiscopal province. An episcopal system, which bore the characteristics of a ruler's private church, and which was symbolically under the control of Rome, therefore Latin rite, was established at the beginning of the 11<sup>th</sup> century.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- Baán 1988 = BAÁN I., A körtvélyesi monostor. *Vigilia* 53 (1988) 749–754.
- Baán 1995 = BAÁN I., „Turkia metropolíája”. Kísérlet a Szent István-kori magyarországi orthodox egyházszerkezet rekonstrukciójára. In: *Az ortodoxia története Magyarországon a XVIII. századig*. Szerk. H. Tóth Imre. Szeged 1995. 19–26.
- Baán 1995a = BAÁN I., „Turkia metropolitája” Újabb adalék a bizánci egyház történetéhez a középkori Magyarországon. *Századok* 129 (1995) 1167–1170.
- Baán 1997 = I. BAÁN, The Foundation of the Archibishopric of Kalocsa: The Byzantine Origin of the Second Archdiocese in Hungary. In: *Early Christianity in Central and East Europe*. Ed. P. Urbańczyk. Warsaw 1997. 67–73.
- Baán 1999 = I. BAÁN, The Metropolitanate of Tourkia. The Organization of the Byzantine Church in Hungary in the Middle Ages. In: *Byzanz und Ostmittelluropa 950–1453. Beiträge zu einer table-ronde des XIX. International Congress of Byzantine Studies, Copenhagen 1996*. Hrg. G. Prinzing – M. Salamon. Wiesbaden, 1999. 45–53.
- Bayer 1991 = A. BAYER, Griechen im Westen im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert: Simeon von Trier und Simeon von Reichenau. In: *Kaiserin Theophanu. Begegnung des Ostens und Westens*. I. Hrg. A. Euw – P. Schreiner. Köln 1991. 335–341.
- Beck 1959 = H.-G. BECK, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich*. München 1959.
- Beck 1980 = H.-G. BECK, *Geschichte der Orthodoxen Kirche im Byzantinischen Reich*. (Die Kirche in ihrer Geschichte I/1). Göttingen 1980.
- Berschin 1980 = W. BERSCHIN, *Griechisch-lateinisches Mittelalter*. München 1980.
- Bogyay 1960 = Th. v. BOGYAY, Kalocsa. In: *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche* V. Freiburg 1960. 1264.
- Bóna 1989 = BÓNA I., Magyar-szláv korszak (895–1162). In: *Erdély rövid története*. Főszerk. Köpeczi B. Budapest 1989. 101–157.
- Bréhier 2003 = L. BRÉHIER, A bizánci birodalom intézményei. Budapest 2003.
- DHA I. = *Diplomata Hungariae antiquissima* I. Ed. G. GYÖRFFY. Budapest 1992.
- Eliáš 2012 = M. ELIÁŠ, Zwischen Rom und Byzanz. Kirche und Kirchenrecht Ungarns im 11. Jahrhundert. In: *Cogito, scribo, spero*. Ed. M. Bolom-Kotari – J. Zouhař. Hradec Králove 2012. 135–146.
- Elter 1985 = ELTER I., Magyarország Idrisi földrajzi művében (1154). *Acta Universitatis Szegediensis de Attila József nominatae. Acta Historica* 87 (1985) 53–63.
- Entz 1958 = ENTZ G., *A gyulafehérvári székesegyház*. Budapest 1958.
- Fedalto 1988 = G. FEDALTO, *Hierarchia ecclesiastica orientalis: series episcoporum ecclesiarum christianarum orientalium I. Patriarchatus Constantinopolitanus*. Padova 1988.
- Fedeles-Kosztá 2011 = T. FEDELES – L. KOSZTA, *Pécs (Fünfkirchen). Das Bistum und die Bischofssatdt im Mittelalter*. Wien 2011.
- Foerk 1915 = FOERK E., A kalocsai székesegyház. In: *Magyarország műemlékei* 4. Szerk. Forster Gy. Budapest 1915. 43–70.

Fügedi 1981 = FÜGEDI E., Városok kialakulása a Magyarországon. In: Fügedi E., *Kolduló barátok, polgárok, nemesek*. Budapest 1981. 311–335.

Gombos 1937/1938 = *Catalogus fontium historiae Hungaricae* I–IV. Ed. A. GOMBOS. Budapest 1937–1938.

Gyetzvai 1987 = GYETVAI P., *Egyházi szervezés főleg az egykori déli magyar területeken és a bácskai Tisza mentén*. München 1987.

Györffy 1952 = GYÖRFFY Gy., A szávaszentdemeteri görög monostor XII. századi birtokösszeírása I. *A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Filozófiai és Történettudományi Osztályának Közleményei* 2 (1952) 325–362.

Györffy 1953 = GYÖRFFY Gy., A szávaszentdemeteri görög monostor XII. századi birtokösszeírása II. *A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Filozófiai és Történettudományi Osztályának Közleményei* 3 (1953) 69–104.

Hervay 2001 = HERVAY L., A bencések és apátságok története a középkori Magyarországon. In: *Paradisum plantavit. Bencés monostorok a középkori Magyarországon*. Szerk. Takács I. Pannonhalma 2001. 461–547.

Holler 1996 = HOLLER L., A magyar korona néhány alapkérdéséről. *Századok* 130 (1996) 906–963.

Horváth 1958 = HORVÁTH J., A Gellért-legendák forrásértéke. *A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Nyelv- és Irodalomtudományi Osztályának Közleményei* 13 (1958) 21–82.

Juhász 1930 = JUHÁSZ K., *A csanádi püspökség története I. Alapítástól a tatárjárásig*. Makó 1930.

Kapitányffy 1994 = KAPITÁNYFFY I., Vardarióták. In: *KMTL*. 713.

Kiss 2007 = KISS G., Les influences de l'Église orthodoxe en Hongrie aux X<sup>e</sup>–XI<sup>e</sup> siècles. In: *Specimina nova. Pars Prima. Sectio mediaevalis* IV (2007) 51–71.

KMTL = *Korai magyar történeti lexikon*. Főszerk. KRISTÓ Gy. Szerk. Engel P.–Makk F. Budapest 1994.

Kosztá 1996 = KOSZTA L., A keresztény egyházszerkezet kialakulása. In: *Árpád előtt és után*. Szerk. Kristó Gy. és Makk F. Szeged 1996. 105–115.

Kosztá 1999 = L. KOSZTA, L'organisation de l'Église chrétienne en Hongrie. In: *Les Hongrois et l'Europe: conquête et intégration*. Cons. Csernus, S. et Korompay, K. Paris–Szeged 1999. 239–312.

Kosztá 2001 = KOSZTA L., Esztergom és Kalocsa kapcsolata a 12. században. In: „*Lux Pannoniae*” *Esztergom az ezeréves kulturális metropolis*. Szerk. Horváth I. Esztergom 2001. 57–64.

Kosztá 2007 = KOSZTA L., Székeskáptalanok és kanonokaik Magyarországon a 12. század elejéig. In: *Kosztá L., Írásbeliség és egyházszerkezet*. Szeged 2007. 9–21.

Kosztá 2013 = KOSZTA L., *A kalocsai érseki tartomány kialakulása*. Pécs 2013.

Kristó 1981 = Gy. KRISTÓ, Ajtony and Vidin. In: *Turkic–Bulgarian–Hungarian Relations (VIIth–XIth Centuries)*. *Studia Turco-Hungarica*. V. Budapest 1981. 129–135.

Kristó 1998 = Gy. KRISTÓ, The Bishoprics of Saint Stephen, King of Hungary. In: *In honorem Paul Cernovodeanu*. Ed. V. Barbu. București 1998. 55–66.

- Kristó 1999 = KRISTÓ Gy., *A tizenegyedik század története*. Budapest 1999.
- Kristó 2001 = KRISTÓ Gy., *Szent István király*. Budapest 2001.
- Kristó – Makk 2001 = KRISTÓ Gy.–MAKK F., *A kilencedik és a tizedik század története*. Budapest 2001.
- Kristó 2004 = KRISTÓ Gy., Tatárjárás előtti bencés monostorainkról. *Századok* 138 (2004) 403–411.
- Makk 1995 = MAKK F., Külföldi források és a korai magyar történelem. *Acta Universitatis Szegediensis de Attila József nominatae. Acta Historica* 102 (1995) 25–41.
- Makk 1996 = MAKK F., *Magyar külpolitika (896–1196)*. Szeged 1996.<sup>2</sup>
- Makk 1999 = MAKK F., Külföldi források és a korai magyar történelem. In: Makk F.: *A turulmadártól a kettőskeresztig*. Szeged 1999, 95–115.
- Makk 1999 = F. MAKK, *Ungarische Außenpolitik (896–1196)*. Herne 1999.
- Makk 2012 = F. MAKK, *Ausländische Quellen und die frühe ungarische Geschichte (10.–12. Jahrhundert)*. In: Makk, F., *Vom mytischen Vogel Turul bis zum Doppelkreuz*. Herne 2012, 51–81.
- Mesterházy 1993 = MESTERHÁZY K., Régészeti adatok Magyarország 10–11. századi kereskedelméhez. *Századok* 127 (1993) 450–468.
- Mezey 1965 = L. MEZEY, Ungarn. In: *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche* X. Freiburg 1965. 489.
- Mezey 1978 = MEZEY L., *Deákság és Európa*. Budapest 1978.
- MonVat. I/4 = *Vatikáni magyar okirattár I/4*. Budapest 2000. (reprint)
- Moravcsik 1938 = MORAVCSIK Gy., Görögnyelvű monostorok Szent István korában. In: *Emlékkönyv Szent István király halálának kilencszázadik évfordulóján I*. Szerk. Serédi J. Budapest 1938, 387–422.
- Moravcsik 1984 = MORAVCSIK Gy., *Az Árpád-kori magyar történet bizánci forrásai*. Budapest 1984.
- Oikonomidès 1971 = N. OIKONOMIDÈS, 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) 527–533.
- Oikonomidès 1973 = N. OIKONOMIDÈS, Vardariotes – W.l.nd.r – V.n.nd.r: Hongrois installés dans la vallée du Vardar en 934. *Südost-Forschungen* 32 (1973) 1–8.
- Podskasky 1982 = G. PODSKASKY, *Christentum und theologische Literatur in der Kijevër Rus (988–1237)*. München 1982.
- Reiche 2002 = J. REICHE, Kirchenbaukunst des 10. und frühen 11. Jahrhunderts in Italien. In: *Die Ottonen. Kunst – Architektur – Geschichte*. Hg. K. G. Beuckers– J. Cramer– M. Imhof. Petersberg 2002, 351–384.
- Révész 2011 = RÉVÉSZ É., Régészeti és történeti adatok a kora Árpád-kori bizánci-bolgár-magyar egyházi kapcsolatokhoz. Doktori értekezés. Szeged 2011.
- Révész 2012 = É. RÉVÉSZ, Die Siegel der Bischöfe von Turkia und die Rolle der Orthodoxie um das ersten Millennium im Königreich Ungarn. In: *Cogito, scribo, spero*. Ed. M. Bolom-Kotari–J. Zouhar. Hradec Králove 2012, 79–97.



Révész 2014 = RÉVÉSZ É., Turkia keleti keresztény főpapjai az első ezredforduló magyar történelmében. *Belvedere Meridionale* 26 (2014) 7-22.

Ripoche 1974 = J. P. RIPOCHE, La Hongrie entre Byzance et Rome. Problème du choix religieux. *Ungarn Jahrbuch* 6 (1974-1975) 9-23.

Ripoche 1977 = J. P. RIPOCHE, Bizánc vagy Róma. Magyarország vallásválasztási kérdése a középkorban. *Századok* 111 (1977) 79-92.

SRH = *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum* I-II. Ed. E. SZENTPÉTERY. Budapest 1937-938.

Szegfű 1981 = SZEGFŰ L., Pogányság és kereszténység a XI. századi Magyarországon. In: *Fejezetek a régebbi magyar történelemből*. I. Szerk. Makk F. Szeged 1981, 73-95.

Thoroczkay 2001 = G. THOROCZKAY, The Dioceses and Bishops of Saint Stephen. In: *Saint Stephen and His Country*. Ed. A. Zsoldos. Budapest 2011, 49-68.

Tóth 2007 = TÓTH P., Vallon főpapok a magyar egyház újjászervezésében a pogánylázadás után. In: *Tanulmányok a 950 éves tihanyi alapítólevél tiszteletére*. Szerk. Érszegi G. Tihany 2007, 31-36.

Török 1986 = TÖRÖK J., A középkori magyarországi liturgia története. In: *Kódexek a középkori Magyarországon*. Szerk. Vizkelety A. Budapest 1986, 49-66.

Török 2002 = TÖRÖK J., *A tizenegyedik század magyar egyháztörténete*. Budapest 2002.

Török-Legeza 1999 = TÖRÖK J.-LEGEZA L., *A kalocsai érsekség évezrede*. Budapest 1999.

Udvardy 1991 = UDVARDY J., *A kalocsai érsekek életrajza (1000-1526)*. Köln 1991.

Vajay 1967 = VAJAY Sz., Géza nagyfejedelem és családja. In: *Székesfehérvár évszázadai* I. Szerk. Kralovánszky A. Székesfehérvár 1967, 63-100.

Városy 1885 = J. VÁROSY, Disquisitio historica de unione ecclesiarum Colocensis et Bachiensis. In: *Schematismus cleri archi-dioecesis Colocensis et Bacsiensis ad annum Christi 1885*. Coloczae 1885, VII-XXXVII.

Veszprémy 1994 = VESZPRÉMY L., Leodvin. In: *KMTL* 406.

Wolfram 1992 = H. WOLFRAM, Die Gesandtschaft Konrads II. nach Konstantinopel (1027/29). In: *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 100 (1992) 161-174.