

## NEW DETAILS REGARDING THE EXPULSION OF BISHOP GYULA GLATTFELDER FROM ROMANIA

SZABOLCS ANDRÁS<sup>1</sup>

**Abstract.** This paper discusses the diplomatic tensions between Romania, the Holy See and Hungary that have followed the expulsion of Gyula Glattfelder, Bishop of Temesvár (Timișoara) and the steps taken by Hungarian diplomats to rescue Glattfelder. Bishop Glattfelder was the most vehement critic of the 1921 Romanian land reform which led to the expropriation of the landed properties of the Catholic Church in Transylvania. His removal from Romania was a blow to the Catholic Church in Transylvania and had a significant impact on the diplomatic relationship between Romania and the Holy See. Based on so-far unexamined records from the National Archive of Hungary I discuss the diplomatic steps taken by Hungarian officials in the attempt to rescue Bishop Glattfelder and the reasons for which these steps have ultimately failed.

**Keywords:** Gyula Glattfelder, land reform, Romania, Transylvania, Hungary, Vatican, Ion I. C. Brătianu, Raymund Netzhammer, Pietro Gasparri.

### Introduction

For Transylvanian Catholics the interwar period was marked by substantial political and social changes. With the treaty of Trianon (1920) Hungary lost Transylvania to Romania. As a consequence the Transylvanian Roman Catholic Church had to face a new political, social and economic reality. One of the first events with a serious impact on the Catholic Church was the Romanian land reform. The Church owned large landed properties whose revenues sustained numerous institutions, including the Catholic schools. The confiscation of the lands had important consequences for the Church, more generally for the Hungarian minority living in Romania, which experienced the land reform as an oblique expropriation. The most vehement protest against this decision was voiced by Gyula Glattfelder, the Catholic Bishop of the diocese of Csanád/Temesvár (today Timișoara).<sup>2</sup> His critique of

---

<sup>1</sup> Babes-Bolyai University, Cluj, Faculty of Roman Catholic Theology, email: andrasszabolcs78@gmail.com.

<sup>2</sup> Gyula Glattfelder was born in Budapest in 1874 and died in the same city in 1943. He was appointed bishop of Csanád in 1911. The territory of his diocese was divided by the Hungarian-Romanian border following the Treaty of Trianon, and he remained in the

the Romanian government resulted in a diplomatic scandal, as the government sought to silence the vocal opponent and weaken the influence of the Catholic Church by expelling the remonstrant bishop. His expulsion from Romania was a serious blow to the Catholic Church in Transylvania and had a significant impact on the diplomatic relationship between Romania and the Holy See. On the other hand, the permissive stance of Rome towards the Romanian Government was a source of frustration for the Hungarian minority.

This paper explores so far unresearched aspects of the diplomatic actions taken by Hungarian officials at the Vatican in the attempt to rescue bishop Glattfelder and to preserve the position of the Catholic Church in Transylvania. These details explain the ultimate failure of the Hungarian diplomacy in this endeavour. This research is mainly based on the examination of records from the National Archive of Hungary.

As the expulsion of Bishop Gyula Glattfelder from Romania was intimately connected with the agrarian reform, I start by briefly discussing the consequences of the land reform for the Hungarian minority and the Catholic Church in Transylvania. I then turn to the position of Bishop Glattfelder on the matter, the ensuing political conflicts and the subsequent diplomatic steps undertaken by Hungary and the Vatican in the attempt to prevent his banishment.

### **The consequences of the land reform**

The land reform had been envisaged already in 1917, when the Romanian Government that took refuge in Iași<sup>3</sup> promised land distribution to peasants in order to prevent the expansion of Russian bolshevism in Romania. As a consequence two land reforms were carried out: in 1918 and in 1921. In 1923 the large landed properties were nationalized, and plots were partially distributed to peasants. The need for an agrarian reform was recognized even by conservative politicians. On the whole, however, the land reforms did not attain the expected economic results. The landed properties were fragmented, and the situation of the peasantry did not improve significantly.<sup>4</sup>

---

Romanian part, in Temesvár (Timișoara). After the conflicts with the Romanian government addressed in this paper, he moved to Szeged, in Hungary. He was appointed archbishop of Kalocsa in 1942.

<sup>3</sup> King Ferdinand and the Romanian Government were forced to take refuge in Iași following the defeat of the Romanian army and the occupation of Bucharest and much of Southern Romania by the troops of the Central Powers.

<sup>4</sup> Mihai BĂRBULESCU, Dennis DELETANT, Keith HITCHINS, Șerban PAPACOSTEA, Pompiliu TEODOR, *Istoria României*, București: Ed. Corint, 2005, 360.

From the perspective of the Hungarian minority the agrarian reform was more than a distribution of land; it meant the spoliation of the national wealth. The law of 1921 expropriated most of the private lands, rented plots, the estates of the foundations, churches, monasteries, chapters, universities and schools. For the annexed regions (Transylvania, Banat, Partium) this meant the loss of over three million acres of landed properties.<sup>5</sup> As in the Szeklerland (the Eastern region of Transylvania) most of the land belonged to various commonage associations, like the Csíki Magánjavak [Private Wealth of Csík County] or similar, the agrarian reform had catastrophic effects precisely on the social class on whose behalf it was carried out. The expropriated properties were so large that they could not even be allocated to new owners; they became therefore the property of the state. 37,17% of the expropriated lands in Szekler counties was released to ethnic Romanians, whereas their proportion in the overall population of these counties was below 10%. This detail shows clearly the real intention of the law.<sup>6</sup>

### **Gyula Glattfelder and the Land Reform**

The inequities induced by the enactment of the law and their impact on the Catholic Church caught the attention of Cardinal Pietro Gasparri, Secretary of State of the Holy See. He summoned the Romanian ambassador, Dimitrie C. Pennescu and informed him that the Holy See did not oppose the agrarian reform but could not agree with the expropriation of the lands of the religious schools, which were of utmost importance for their subsistence.<sup>7</sup>

Gyula Glattfelder, Bishop of Csanád voiced a strong critique against the expropriation and the accompanying inequities, stirring thereby the anger of Prime Minister Ion I.C. Brătianu<sup>8</sup>, who decided to dispose of this uncomfortable cleric as soon as possible. In 1922 Glattfelder formulated his position in a circular letter addressed to his diocese, showing that the Romanian

---

<sup>5</sup> EGYED Ákos, *A székelyek rövid története a megtelepedéstől 1989-ig*, Csíkszereda: Pallas – Akadémia, 2013, 279.

<sup>6</sup> EGYED, *A székelyek rövid története*, 282.

<sup>7</sup> Raport al lui Dimitrie C. Pennescu, trimis extraordinar și ministru plenipotențiar pe lângă Sfântul Scaun, adresat lui I. Gh. Duca, ministru al afacerilor străine al României, privind unele sesisări ale Vaticanului în legătură cu aplicarea reformei agrare față de instituțiile catolice, Nr. 513/24. oct. 1922, in Marius Ioan BUCUR, Dumitru PREDA (eds.), *România – Vatican, Relații diplomatice I, 1920–1950*, București: Ed. Enciclopedică, 2003, 12.

<sup>8</sup> Ion I.C. Brătianu was a prominent Romanian politician, head of the National Liberal Party, and Prime Minister of Romania for five terms (1909–1910; 1914–1918; 1918–1919; 1922–1926, and 1927).

agrarian reform had put the Church in an impossible situation. He did not contest the reform as such; he had already parcelled out a part of his estate. But the bishop objected to the small state compensation, of only two quintals of wheat per acre, which amounted in fact to nationalization without compensation. He urged the parishes to claim plots from the lands of the diocese at the allotment. He dissuaded the communities from participating in the festivities prescribed by the Government at the occasion of the land reform.<sup>9</sup> From the diary of Raymund Netzhammer, archbishop of Bucharest<sup>10</sup> it seems though that it was not this circular which caused the anger of the Government, but his letter to Constantin Banu, Minister of Religious Affairs.<sup>11</sup> The minister had encouraged Netzhammer to share his thoughts on the issue frankly, and Glattfelder did just that: he demonstrated the inequity of the law with categorical arguments. His letter reached Prime Minister Ion I.C. Brătianu, who decided to retaliate. “Those bishops [from Transylvania] have a close relationship not only with the Government from Budapest, but also with the most reprobate irredentist organizations”, – the Prime Minister claimed, “and the worst of them is Glattfelder. He must be quickly removed; if he does not go away, we will interrupt every relationship with his diocese. We cannot tolerate him anymore, especially because he wrote this terrible letter to minister

---

<sup>9</sup> Esztergom Primate Archives (EPA), I.13.e. Erdély, 3730/1922 D/c. *The Letter of Bishop Glattfelder about Romanian Agrarian Reform.*

<sup>10</sup> Albin (Raymund) Netzhammer was a Benedictine monk of the Abbey of Einsiedeln, archbishop of Bucharest between 1905–1924. He was born in 1862 in Klettgau-Erzingen, Baden. He joined the Abbey of Einsiedeln in 1880, made his vows one year later, and was ordained priest in Chur in 1886. Netzhammer was appointed archbishop of Bucharest by Pope Pius X, in 1905. He had a difficult mission, given the complicated political, ethnic, and religious situation of Romania. Pope Pius XI demanded his resignation and appointed him titular archbishop of Anazarbus. After his resignation, Netzhammer returned to Einsiedeln. He died in 1945 on the Island of Werd (between Stein am Rhein and Eschenz) in Thurgau, Switzerland. For a short biography of Raymund Netzhammer see *Biographia Benedictina (Benedictine Biography)*, Version vom 17.9.2011, [http://www.benediktinerlexikon.de/wiki/Netzhammer,\\_Raymund](http://www.benediktinerlexikon.de/wiki/Netzhammer,_Raymund). He is not mentioned in Erwin GATZ, *Die Bischöfe der deutschsprachigen Länder 1785/1803 bis 1945: ein biographisches Lexikon*, Berlin: Duncker und Humblot, 1983. His diary, published posthumously is a most valuable source of information concerning his mission and the political and ecclesiastic situation in Romania in the first three decades of the twentieth century. Raymund NETZHAMMER, *Bischof in Rumänien: im Spannungsfeld zwischen Staat und Vatikan*, I-II (Veröffentlichungen des Südostdeutschen Kulturwerks 70–71), edited by Nikolaus Netzhammer in collaboration with Krista Zach, München: Verlag Südostdeutsches Kulturwerk, 1995–1996.

<sup>11</sup> NETZHAMMER, *Bischof in Rumänien* II, 1206–1207.

Banu.”<sup>12</sup> In his memoirs Archbishop Netzhhammer also shows that King Ferdinand supported the actions of the Government and did not respond to his letters. The king was displeased already in 1921 with the fact that the bishop with Swabian origins proved to be the most combative Hungarian public figure.<sup>13</sup>

In a letter from November 3<sup>rd</sup> 1922 written in French, I. Gh. Duca, the Minister of Foreign Affairs informed the Vatican about the standpoint of the Government and its discontentment with the protest of Bishop Glattfelder: he was the spokesman of the interests of the Hungarian aristocrats, owners of large estates, and he had launched a discrediting campaign against the Romanian legal order in the foreign press. The Catholic Church was not supposed to be indifferent to the social reforms, Duca argued. With his actions the bishop engaged the clergy in the Hungarian irredentist movement. Therefore the Secretariat of State has to act accordingly, if the Vatican wanted to preserve the good relationship with Romania.<sup>14</sup>

From the exchange between Banu and Netzhhammer we learn that the Government took the irrevocable decision to banish the bishop already in December 1922, regardless of whether Glattfelder apologised or not. The next step was to convince the Holy See to accept this decision. Nuncio Francesco Marmaggi called Glattfelder to Bucharest on December 19, and showed him the exchange of letters between the Government and the Secretary of State of the Vatican. Gasparri informed Glattfelder in a letter about the objections of the Romanian government and the steps taken to expel him.<sup>15</sup> It was probably on this occasion that the bishop expressed his willingness to move to the Hungarian part of the Csanád diocese, had the Holy See desired it, to allow a peaceful resolution of the tensions between the parties. According to Netzhhammer the decision of the Holy See was taken at the end of January or beginning of February 1923, because the Government immediately changed the

---

<sup>12</sup> “Die drübigen Bischöfe stehen nicht nur mit der Regierung in Budapest in Verbindung sondern auch mit den ärgsten irredentischen Organisationen. Der schlimmste unter ihnen ist Glattfelder. Dieser muß in kürzester Frist entfernt werden; wenn er nicht geht, werden wir mit ihm und mit seiner Diözese jede Verbindung abbrechen. Wir können ihn schon deshalb nicht dulden, weil er dem Kultusminister Banu einen fürchterlichen Brief geschrieben hat.” NETZHAMMER, *Bischof in Rumänien*, II, 1206.

<sup>13</sup> NETZHAMMER, *Bischof in Rumänien*, II, 1076.

<sup>14</sup> *Telegramă a lui I. Gh. Duca, ministru al Afacerilor Străine al României către Dimitrie C. Pennescu, trimis extraordinar și ministru plenipotențiar pe lângă Sfântul Scaun, privind unele aspecte ale relațiilor cu Vaticanul legate de aplicarea Legii Agrare în Transilvania*, Nr. 56 825/ 3. noiembrie 1922, București, in BUCUR, PREDĂ, *România – Vatican*, 13.

<sup>15</sup> NETZHAMMER, *Bischof in Rumänien*, II, 1207.

tone and informed the Nunciature in a friendly letter that the measures against the diocese and the clergy (other than those regarding the bishop) were revoked. As Archbishop Netzhammer remarked,

The note of the Government is an obvious sign that the Holy See yielded to the pressure, leaving without any support the absolutely brave bishop dr. Glattfelder. And it is the task of the nuncios to carry out and sign such things! I would not be surprised to learn that after having expelled the bishop, the Romanian Minister of Foreign Affairs and the Minister of Religious Affairs would recommended him at the Holy See for a high distinction.<sup>16</sup>

One day later the nuncio informed Glattfelder that the Holy See did not reproach him anything, but in order to restore the good relationship with Romania he had to move to Hungary. On the 6<sup>th</sup> of March Glattfelder took farewell from the king, concelebrated his last mass with Bishop Gusztáv Károly Mailáth of Transylvania and his successor, the Apostolic Administrator Ágoston Pacha.<sup>17</sup>

### **The role of Hungary in the Glattfelder-affair**

If the assessment of the Archbishop of Bucharest, cited above, is correct, the attempt of the Hungarian diplomacy to keep Glattfelder in Timișoara was belated. According to archive records at the end of February 1923 the Hungarians asked Francesco Borgongini Duca, Secretary of the Holy Congregation for Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs to demand the bishop to remain in his diocese. The Hungarian ambassador József Somssich, familiar with the Vatican diplomacy, admitted that they acted too late, especially because Glattfelder offered his resignation: “This being the case we will have to face the situation that as strongly as we would object, the Holy See will argue that they did nothing else but fulfil the explicit wish of the Hungarian bishop: they cannot object, even if that wish is contrary to the interests of the

---

<sup>16</sup> “Die Note der Regierung ist das sicherste Zeichen, daß der Heilige Stuhl nachgegeben und den ganz ausgezeichneten Bischof Dr. Glattfelder fallengelassen hat. Solche Dinge durchzuführen und zu unterzeichnen ist Sache der Nuntien! Es möchte mich nicht wundern, wenn jetzt nach Entfernung des Bischofs der rumänische Außenminister und der Kultusminister dem Heiligen Stuhl zur Verleihung eines hohen Ordens vorge schlagen würden!” NETZHAMMER, *Bischof in Rumänien*, II, 1213. Engl. tr. Sz.A.

<sup>17</sup> NETZHAMMER, *Bischof in Rumänien*, II, 1224.

Hungarian Royal Government.”<sup>18</sup> As a result of the activity of the Hungarian diplomacy, the Holy See issued an official notice in Italian to the embassy, informing the Government in Budapest that in return for Glattfelder’s leave the Romanian Government revoked the retaliatory measures against the diocese. At the same time, out of respect for the bishop, the Holy See accepted the proposal of Glattfelder and appointed Apostolic Administrator Ágoston Pacha as his successor:

Mons. Glattfelder, Vescovo di Temesvar, in seguito alla forte opposizione fatta contro di lui dal Governo rumeno, ritenendo quanto mai difficile la sua posizione di fronte a detto Governo, e considerando i gravi danni che potevano derivare alle istituzioni cattoliche dal prolungarsi di tale situazione, ha chiesto alla Santa Sede di potersi ritirare nella parte ungherese della sua diocesi ed ivi porre la sua stabile residenza, lasciando ad altri al cura della parte rumena della diocesi stessa. La Santa Sede però esigeva anzi tutto che il Governo rumeno revocasse le misure adottate contro le persone e le istituzioni cattoliche di Temesvar, per la questione sorta con Mons. Glattfelder, ciò ottenuto concedeva che nella parte rumena della diocesi fosse costituito un Amministratore Apostolico a tal proposito le comunico con tutta riserva che la persona del nominate è stata fatta designare dal medesimo Mons. Glattfelder. E’ stato quindi nominato Amministratore Apostolico di tale parte della Diocesi di Temesvar, il Rev.mo Can. Pacha Cancelliere della medesima diocesi, persona di fiducia del Vescovo stesso.<sup>19</sup>

Glattfelder sent a similar letter to Primate Archbishop of Esztergom, János Csernoch, in which he blamed the Romanian Government for his situation and announced that he would move his residence to Szeged:

With respectful deference I take the liberty to inform you, Eminence, that following the demand addressed by the Romanian Government to the Apostolic Holy See concerning my removal from my Episcopal See, based on unjust arguments, which I did not have the possibility to disprove, and due to the fact that it [the Government] even envisaged to break the relationship with the Church, had I denied this demand, moreover considering that it applied this step to my diocese, His Holiness the Pope decided that I had to move my seat to the

<sup>18</sup> National Archives of Hungary (NAH), K105 Vatican Embassy, bundle 39: 1920–1931. R1 Romania 18/pol. 1923 February 15 (*Glattfelder Gyula csanádi püspök ügye*). Engl. tr. Sz.A.

<sup>19</sup> NAH, K105 Vatican Embassy, bundle 39: 1920–1931. R1 Romania 14539/pol. 1923 March 2 (*Glattfelder Gyula csanádi püspök ügye*).

Hungarian part of my diocese, and he appointed for the Romanian part [of the diocese] an Apostolic Administrator in the person of provost prebend, Episcopal Director Ágoston Pacha. As a consequence of this measure I shall move my seat to Szeged as soon as possible.<sup>20</sup>

Glattfelder's letter did not quiet down the spirits in the Hungarian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and in the Office of the Primate, as they disapproved the decision of the bishop to offer to leave Timișoara, which made that the Hungarian part had no legal basis for effective actions.<sup>21</sup>

On May 17 1923, Romanian ambassador Dimitrie Pennescu reported the successful finalization of the affair; he and Gasparri had re-discussed the issue on the occasion of a reception, and decided that both would demand bishop Glattfelder to abstain from any political manifestations in the future.<sup>22</sup>

In an interview published in *Új Nemzedék*<sup>23</sup> Glattfelder related the details of his exile, and referred to someone from the bishopric who had urged the Romanian Government to remove him: he had found out that the speedy decision concerning his removal was due to the remark of one of his priests before a Romanian official and alluded to the scandal the bishop would provoke, had he spent the upcoming Easter in Timisoara and preached on that occasion.<sup>24</sup> The archive records indicate that the Hungarian Government had a clear standpoint on this issue and knew that the “traitor” was no one else but the bishop's person of trust, Ágoston Pacha. The Hungarian Government had been monitoring Pacha at least since January 1922, during his trip to Rome. The ambassador of Hungary to the Holy See, József Somssich was mandated to keep an eye on his movements. He was seen as a sleek person who could easily ingratiate himself everywhere, but his loyalty to the ideals of the Hungarian state were doubtful, to say the least.<sup>25</sup> His monitoring was pursued in 1923 as

<sup>20</sup> NAH, K105 Vatican Embassy, bundle 39: 1920–1931. R1 Romania 688/pol. 1923 February 24 (*Glattfelder Gyula csanádi püspök ügye*). Tr. Sz.A.

<sup>21</sup> NAH, K105 Vatican Embassy, bundle 39: 1920–1931. R1 Romania 36/pol. 1923 March 9 (*Glattfelder Gyula csanádi püspök ügye*).

<sup>22</sup> Raport al lui Dimitrie C. Pennescu, trimis extraordinar și ministru plenipotențiar pe lângă Sfântul Scaun, adresat lui I. Gh. Duca, ministru al Afacerilor Străine al României, privind măsura luată de autoritățile Vaticanului de rechemare a episcopului romano-catolic de la Timișoara, 230/17 mai 1923, in: BUCUR, PREDA, *România – Vatican*, 14–15.

<sup>23</sup> Hungarian daily newspaper published between 1913–1944 (*New Generation*).

<sup>24</sup> NAH, K105 Vatican Embassy, bundle 39: 1920–1931. R1 Romania 1570/pol. 1923 March 27 (*Glattfelder Gyula csanádi püspök ügye*).

<sup>25</sup> NAH, K105 Vatican Embassy, bundle 40: 1920–1929, R2 Romania, 42/pol. 1922 January 20 (*Pacha*).



well, and the reports describe him as the “spineless Swabian” who was not willing to speak anything else but Romanian in the girls’ school of Timișoara. According to another report, on November 15, 1922 Pacha claimed before Lorenzo Schioppa, the nuncio of the Holy See to Hungary, that the Archbishop of Kalocsa, Árpád Lipót Várady would have said of Glattfelder that he “was up to no good”.<sup>26</sup>

The Hungarian Government intended to object to the nomination of Pacha for Apostolic Administrator, but the decision could not be implemented because he was the choice of Glattfelder, moreover the bishop had demanded his transfer to Hungary, and he had never consulted the Hungarian Embassy in Rome, but negotiated only with the Romanian ambassador Pennescu.<sup>27</sup> On the whole the steps of the Hungarian diplomacy were entirely ineffective, and in both cases (that of Glattfelder and of Pacha) no public, official measures were taken. The most pertinent assessment of the Glattfelder-affair comes from the Archbishop of Bucharest, Raymund Netzhammer:

For Romanians, Glattfelder was a too strong personality. A strong-minded and logically reasoning person like him was uncomfortable. From the very beginning, of all the bishops he was treated with the most antipathy. He was reproached for being a radical Hungarian chauvinist in spite of his Swabian origins. The controversy flared up when he objected to the unjust expropriation, holding against the Romanians that they wanted to offer compensation for only 3% of the real value of the property. The Nuntiature eventually abandoned the bishop, on account of who knows what unfulfillable promise. Bishop Count Széchenyi [Miklós Széchenyi, bishop of Nagyvárád/Oradea] was also on the point of being sacrificed, when death took care of the final step on behalf of the Romanians.”<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> NAH, K105 Vatican Embassy, bundle 39: 1920–1931. R1 Romania 2039/pol. 1923 May 15 (*Glattfelder Gyula csanádi püspök ügye*).

<sup>27</sup> NAH, K105 Vatican Embassy, bundle 39: 1920–1931. R1 Romania 51/pol. 1923 April 2 (*Glattfelder Gyula csanádi püspök ügye*).

<sup>28</sup> NETZHAMMER, *Bischof in Rumänien* II, 1280 (“Exzellenz! Glattfelder ist eine zu starke Persönlichkeit für die Rumänen. Ein solcher entschiedener und logisch denkender Mann ist ihnen unbequem! Die Rumänen waren ihm auch von Anfang an wie keinem anderen Bischof aufsässig. Dann haben sie ihm vorgehalten, er sei, obgleich im Grunde Schwabe, ein extremer magyarischer Chauvinist. Der offene Streit brach aus, als sich Glattfelder gegen die ungerechte Enteignung wehrte und den Rumänen vorrechnete, daß sie nicht mehr als 3 % des wahren Wertes eines Gutes bezahlen wollen. Die Nuntiatur, wer weiß gegen welches nicht erfüllbare Versprechen, ließ schließlich den Bischof auch fallen. Bischof Graf Széchenyi war gleichfalls für die Absägung reif, als gerade der Tod den letzten Schritt für die Rumänen besorgte!”). (Engl. tr. Sz.A.).

### The situation of Bishop Gusztáv Mailáth of Transylvania

This last sentence of the Archbishop of Bucharest hints to the pressure put by the media and Romanian political circles on other outspoken Catholic clerics. The same arises from the letter of Bishop Gusztáv Mailáth of Alba Iulia, addressed to Msgr. János Csiszárík.<sup>29</sup> Mailáth informs the Hungarian diplomat about the offensive of the liberal government against Catholic schools and about the intent to expel him as well as canon József Hirschler, following the departure of Glattfelder.<sup>30</sup> (Hirschler was a prominent cleric, parish priest of St Michael's Parish in Cluj and founder of the Marianum, a reputed Hungarian Catholic School for girls in the same city.) The bishop informs Csiszárík about the attacks fired against him and Hirschler in the liberal newspaper *Înfrățirea* from Cluj; they had even reported at the Ministry of Education the alleged irredentist spirit of the Marianum (manifested in pupils' wear, and the use of textbooks approved by the Hungarian Ministry of Education). The charges voiced in the article were reiterated shortly thereafter by Senator Vasile Bianu, professor at the University of Cluj, in an interpellation addressed to the Senate.<sup>31</sup> (The bishop wrote the letter one day before he addressed the Senate to refute the charges of irredentism brought by Vianu.) In his letter to Csiszárík, Mailáth also informed the Hungarian diplomat about the farewell visit paid by Glattfelder. His departure was perceived as a great loss to the Catholic Church in Transylvania and a dangerous precedent that could be used to put pressure on other clerics to leave the country. Coercion occurred, metaphorically speaking, through the "lowly weapons of starvation", meant to deprive the ecclesial institutions of their resources. Bishop Mailáth related the attacks against Catholics to a broader political-ecclesiastic issue, namely the intention of Greek

---

<sup>29</sup> János Csiszárík (1860-1936) was a cleric, titular bishop and Hungarian diplomat in the service of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, with connections to the Vatican. He served as secretary of the canon law advisor of the Austrian-Hungarian Monarchy in Rome in 1910. Between 1916-1918 he worked in Vienna at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. In the early twenties he participated in several diplomatic missions in Germany, Poland and Turkey. He was appointed to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 1920. *Magyar Katolikus Lexikon* II, ed. István DIÓS, Budapest: Szent István Társulat, 1993, s.v.

<sup>30</sup> On the intention to remove Hirschler from Cluj see also NETZHAMMER, *Bischof in Rumänien*, 1265.

<sup>31</sup> In 1925 Bianu would also accuse Transylvanian Jewish schools of being hotspots of Hungarian irredentism. GIDÓ Attila, *Două decenii. Evreii din Cluj în perioada interbelică*, Cluj-Napoca: Institutul Pentru Studierea Problemelor Minorităților Naționale, 2014, 115, referring to Vasile BIANU, "Școlile evreiești din Ardeal", in *Ațiunea Românească*, September 1 (1925) 8–9.

Catholics to object against articles 21-23 of the draft of the Constitution (which defined the position of the denominations and stipulated that the Orthodox Church was the dominant Church in Romania). Mailáth also suspected that the grudge against the Catholic schools of the Hungarian minority was due to the higher educational standards of these institutions, in particular those of the Teacher Training College of the Marianum. Whatever we would make of these deductions, the concluding lines of the letter show that the bishop expected Hungarian authorities to take some (diplomatic) steps on behalf of the Catholic Church. Mailáth encouraged Csizsárik to use this information if the opportunity emerged. The clergy was determined to resist the pressure and remain in place.<sup>32</sup> Ambassador Somssich, who also received Mailáth's letter, took the bishop's complaint to Borgongini, Secretary of the Holy Congregation for Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs, but the latter denied that the Secretariat of State had such issues on the agenda. Moreover, he mentioned that the Romanian ambassador Pennescu spoke highly of bishop Mailáth, contrasting him to his colleague from Timisoara.<sup>33</sup> Responding to the Hungarian concerns Cardinal Gasparri officially informed the Hungarian Embassy that the Romanian Government had not asked the Holy See to expel either Mailáth or Hirschler.<sup>34</sup>

### Conclusion

The archive records elucidate some unknown circumstances of the Glattfelder-affair and clarify some misunderstandings. The conflicts surrounding the expulsion of the bishop and the ensuing diplomatic steps show that Transylvania was an area of confrontation between the interests of the Holy See, Romania and Hungary. These conflicting interests emerged in this case on the margin of an apparently personal affair, but in fact they had political and ecclesiastic implications that transcended the borders of Romania. The Holy See attempted to find a solution to the conflict that would preserve the good relationship with Romania and secure the signing of the Concordat, defending on the other hand the interests of the Church and the position of the Catholic bishops. However the accommodating stance of Rome towards the

---

<sup>32</sup> NAH, K105 Vatican Embassy, bundle 41: 1921–1928. RE-3-C Erdélyi ügyek 1308/pol. 1923 March 12. *Mailáth*.

<sup>33</sup> NAH, K105 Vatican Embassy, bundle 41: 1921–1928. RE-3-C Erdélyi ügyek 59/pol. 1923 April 6. *Mailáth*.

<sup>34</sup> NAH, K105 Vatican Embassy, bundle 41: 1921–1928. RE-3-C Erdélyi ügyek 16337/pol. 1923 April 13. *Mailáth*.

Romanian Government was a source of real frustration for Catholics in Romania belonging to the Hungarian minority.

The diplomatic steps of Hungary meant to defend Bishop Glattfelder were somewhat delayed and inefficient. However archive records show that irrespective of the disappointment of the Hungarian minority in Transylvania, the main reason for the failure to keep the bishop in Transylvania did not lie with the Hungarian diplomacy or the unassertive position of the Vatican, but were due to his decision to leave Romania, in order to prevent a deeper diplomatic conflict between Romania and the Holy See.

### Literature

- Esztergom Primate Archives, I.13.e. Erdély, 3730/1922 D/c. *The Letter of Bishop Glattfelder about the Romanian agrarian reform.*
- National Archive of Hungary, K105 Vatican Embassy, bundle 39: 1920 – 1931, R1 Romania 18/pol. 1923 February 15; 688/pol. 1923 February 24; 14539/pol. 1923 March 2; 2039/pol. 1923 May 15; 36/pol. 1923 March 9; 51/pol. 1923 April 2; *Glattfelder Gyula csanádi püspök ügye (The case of Gyula Glattfelder, bishop of Csanád)*
- National Archive of Hungary, K105 Vatican Embassy, bundle 40: 1920–1929, R2 Romania, 42/pol. 1922 January 20; *Pacha*
- National Archive of Hungary, K105 Vatican Embassy, bundle 41: 1921–1928. RE-3-C Erdélyi ügyek 1308/pol. 1923 March 12; 59/pol. 1923 April 6; 16337/pol. 1923 April 13 (*Mailáth*).
- Bărbulescu, Mihai, Dennis Deletant, Keith Hitchins, Șerban Papacostea, Teodor Pompiliu, *Istoria României*, București: Ed. Corint, 2005.
- Bucur, Marius Ioan, Dumitru Preda (red.), *România – Vatican, Relații diplomatice, I., 1920 – 1950*, București: Ed. Enciclopedică, 2003.
- Egyed Ákos, *A székegyek rövid története a meglepedéstől 1989-ig*, Csíkszereda: Pallas – Akadémia, 2013.
- Gidó Attila, *Două decenii. Evreii din Cluj în perioada interbelică*, Cluj-Napoca: Institutul Pentru Studiarea Problemelor Minorităților Naționale, 2014.
- Netzhammer, Raymund, *Bischof in Rumänien: im Spannungsfeld zwischen Staat und Vatikan*, Bd. II (Veröffentlichungen des Südostdeutschen Kulturwerks 71), edited by Nikolaus Netzhammer in collaboration with Krista Zach), München: Verlag Südostdeutsches Kulturwerk, 1996.