

STEFAN STEFANOWICZ ROSZKA¹
AND THE ARMENIAN CATHOLIC CHURCH
IN TRANSYLVANIA²

by

Kornél NAGY

ELTE HTK Research Institute of History, Budapest

As for the Polish-Armenian clergyman, Stefan Stefanowicz Roszka³ (Step'anos Step'anean Rōšk'ay) (1670–1739), or István Roska as he is rarely called in Hungarian, very little information is available as yet about his connections with the Armenian Catholic (Uniate) Church in Transylvania (Ardeal, Erdély, Siebenbürgen; present-day in Romania) as a former eastern province of the historical Kingdom of Hungary. In addition, his scientific activity is still less well-known. Namely, Roszka was not only a mere clergyman, but also carried out very serious scientific activities at the highest level of his time. He edited an Armenian-Latin dictionary, prepared scripture commentaries and theological treatises, and wrote, in Classical Armenian in 1737, the history of the Armenian people and church from the Roman Catholic Church's point of view.

1. "Like a humble servant, working in the Lord's vineyard" / "Come un umile servitore lavorando nella vigna Iddio." The missionaries often ended their reports, letters, and relations sent to the Apostolic Holy See in Rome with this formula in the 17th and 18th centuries. It was also often used by Stefan Stefanowicz Roszka himself, who sent also numerous reports and letters written in Italian with the contemporary Roman dialect (*dialetto romanesco*) about his ecclesiastical activities to the Apostolic Holy See in Rome.

2. My scholarly investigations on the subject were conducted in Rome and the Vatican City thanks to the Kuno Klebelsberg Scholarships donated by the Ministries of Culture and Foreign Affairs of Hungary in the years 2004, 2006, 2008, 2010, 2018, and 2024. As the author of this article, I wish to express personally my deepest gratitude for their financial and moral support.

3. Henceforth, I will use the Polish form Roszka in this article. In fact, Roszka was also a nickname of Romanian origin (Rosca in the meaning of "Little red one").

This work, entitled *Chronology* (*Žamanakagrowt'iwn*), which preserved for posterity a great deal of useful information about the history of the Armenian people and their communities living in Moldavia, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (*Rzeczpospolita Obojga Narodów*), and Transylvania from the beginning until the first third of the 18th century.⁴ For quite a long time, his outstanding historical work lay only in manuscript in the library of the Mechitarist Abbey in Vienna, Austria. A critical edition of it was published in 1964 in Vienna under the competent hand of a monk and philologist, Father Hamazasp Anton Oskean C.A.M./OMech. (1895–1968), under the supervision of the publisher's house of the Mechitarist Abbey.⁵

The historical memory of antiquity, and the obsolete scholarly literature remembered Roszka as their good clergyman, who purged the Armenian Catholic Church in Transylvania from heretical and schismatic customs in the first third of the 18th century, thereby consolidating people in their Armenian Catholic faith.⁶ However, in the light of recent archival research, this old and “fossilised” view needs to be significantly tinged and re-evaluated. Therefore, this study tries to investigate Stefan Stefanowicz Roszka's ecclesiastical activities related to Transylvania in the light of recently undiscovered archival sources kept in Hungary, Italy, Romania, and the Vatican. Furthermore, Stefan Stefanowicz Roszka came into contact with the Armenians of Transylvania during a period of great conflict, which focused on their allegedly erroneous religious practices, their supposed heresy, the vacancy of their Titular Bishopric's office and their ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Consequently, in order to understand this problem, it is necessary to briefly summarise the historical antecedents.

The Armenians fled to Transylvania between 1668 and 1672 from the territory of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the Principality of Moldavia, as a result of wars, religious and ethnic persecutions. Their leader was Minas Alek'sanean T'oxat'ec'i (ca 1610–1686), Armenian Apostolic (Eastern) Bishop of Moldavia.⁷

4. Kovács 2008, pp. 53–66; Mnacakanyan 2020, pp. 241–242, 249–250; Nagy 2020a, p. 21.

5. BMK MS. No. 266, fol. 401v–402r; Řošk'ay 1964, pp. i–iv; Kovács 2007, pp. 40–41; Mutaſian 2018, pp. 224–226; Bžškeanc' 2019, p. 170.

6. Lukácsy 1859, pp. 74, 78, 86–87, 107–110; Nilles 1885, p. 926; Vanyó 1933, pp. 116–117; K'olanjyan 1962, pp. 502–504, 518; Petrowicz 1988, pp. 166–167, 176–178, 181, 196.

The Armenians consciously chose Transylvania as the goal of their escape. The Principality of Transylvania, with its many religions and many ethnic groups,—a relatively independent satellite-state subjected to the Ottoman Empire from the mid-16th century—has been known for its relative religious tolerance for nearly 150 years. Romanians, Hungarians, Szeklers (*Secui, Siculi, Székelyek*),⁸ Saxons (*Siebenbürger Sachsen, Erdélyi szászok*),⁹ Catholics, Orthodox-believers, as well as Reformed

7. APF SOCG. vol. 471, fol. 324r; APF FA. vol. 1, fol. 525r–526v, fol. 602r–608v; APF SC FM. vol. 1, fol. 155r–156v, fol. 287r; APF SC FM. vol. 2, fol. 41r–46v; APF FV. vol. 8, fol. 74r–77v, fol. 80r–v; AAV ANVAR. vol. 98, fol. 641r–644v; APMV MS. no. 771, fol. 124r–v.

8. The Szeklers are today a Hungarian ethnic group living in eastern Transylvania. Their land is called Szeklerland (Ținutul Secuiesc, *Terra Siculorum*). However, initially, it used to denote not ethnic, but military administrative terms, which were settled by the Monarchs of the Kingdom of Hungary in the 13th century with extensive autonomy and noble privileges. Their meaning is a military social element of free and noble status. Their task was to guard the borders. The Szeklers were organised into so-called *székek* (Latin *sedes*), headed by the Szeklers' Reeve (Hungarian: *Székely ispán*; Latin: *Comes Siculorum*). Their origin has been much debated. It is now generally accepted that they are descendants of Hungarians. With regards their religion, in the early modern period, the majority of the Szeklers resisted the strong Reformation in Transylvania and preserved their Catholic faith. Nevertheless, some of them also converted to the Protestant faith in the mid-16th century (Calvinism, Anti-Trinitarianism). They were able to retain their privileges with little or no interruption until the 1870s, when they came under civil administration. See on this: Kálnoky 2004, pp. 29–54.

9. The German-speaking “Saxons” arrived in Transylvania in several waves at the invitation of the Hungarian Kings, namely Béla III (1172–1196), and Andrew II (1205–1235), who granted them broad autonomy and privileges. The ancestors of the Saxons came from the western part of the Holy Roman Empire and the eastern part of the Kingdom of France, which is far from the German province of Saxony as is known it today. In other words, despite their popular name, they have nothing to do with the Saxons there. Moreover, they were not originally called Saxons in Transylvania: a document from 1191 mentioned *Ecclesia Theotonicarum Ultrasilvanorum* and a document from 1192 mentioned *omnes Flandrenses*. The concrete name Saxons (*Saxones*) in Transylvania first appeared in 1206. The name Saxon is because these German- and French-speaking peoples organised their communities according to so-called Saxon law (known as Saxon Mirror or *Sachsenspiegel*), which were also supported by the Hungarian kings. Their main advocacy and administrative body were the so-called Saxons' University (*Nationsuniversität, Universitas Saxonum*) until 1876, which determined their daily lives. Several cities were founded throughout Transylvania such as Sibiu (Hermannstadt, Nagyszeben, Cibinium, Cibinio; present-day in Romania)

(Calvinist), Anti-Trinitarian (Unitarian), and Lutheran Protestants lived peacefully under the rule of the Protestant (Calvinist) ruling princes of Transylvania.¹⁰

However, until the last decades of the 17th century, the position of Catholics was controversial. Therefore, religious tolerance was relative in Transylvania. Although they were free to practice their Catholic faith in the daily life, they could not have a diocesan-Bishop since 1601, and the Jesuits, as “champions” of the Counter-Reformation, were not allowed officially to enter the territory of the Principality of Transylvania.¹¹ The leader of the Catholics was the Roman Catholic Episcopal Vicar directly appointed by the current Protestant prince of Transylvania.¹² Only the Franciscan friars (Conventuals/Minorites and Observants) were allowed to operate in the territory of the Principality under the close

and Braşov (Kronstadt, Brassó, Brassovia, Brassovie; present-day in Romania). They were famous miners, merchants and artisans. In 1544, the Saxon community in Transylvania, under the influence of the preacher Johannes Honter (Honterus) (1498–1549), converted from Catholicism to Lutheranism. See on this: Zimmermann 1996, pp. 83–101.

10. Nagy 2012, p. 82; Nagy 2021c, pp. 88–89.

11. At the same time, despite this ban, the Jesuits pursued their pastoral activities in Transylvania. During the 17th century (until about 1690), their ecclesiastical services were often carried out in strict secret. The Fathers, under pseudonyms, were dressed as simple village priests or (Conventual/Minorite and Observant) Franciscan friars among the Catholic-believers in Transylvania. However, if their true identities were revealed, they could expect severe punishments from secular authorities (such as torture, imprisonment, permanent exile from the Principality of Transylvania). See on this: Molnár 2009, pp. 147–211; Mihalik 2024, pp. 11–16, 30–39.

12. The Apostolic Holy See and the Hungarian Catholic Church attempted to resolve the question of the Catholic Bishopric of Transylvania in the 17th century (until 1696) by secretly appointing and consecrating the Episcopal Vicars of Transylvania as Titular Bishops (*in partibus infidelium*). However, they had to follow some unwritten rules. They had to keep their true identities secret all along, and like the secret Jesuits in Transylvania, they had to continue their ecclesiastical service in Transylvania dressed as simple priests and Franciscan friars (several Episcopal Vicars in Transylvania were indeed members of the Observant Franciscan Order.) All this was necessary in order not to draw the attention of the secular (Protestant) authorities in Transylvania. See on this: APF ASC. vol. 54, fol. 39r–40r; APF ASC. vol. 58, fol. 13r–16r; APF SOCG. vol. 492, fol. 209r–v, fol. 210r–v, fol. 211r–v, fol. 212r, fol. 213r, fol. 214r–v + fol. 216r–217v + fol. 220v, fol. 215r, fol. 221r–v + 222v; APF SOCG. vol. 500, fol. 58r–59v, fol. 60r; APF LDSC. vol. 74, fol. 84r–v; APF LDSC. vol. 77, fol. 2v–3r, fol. 27v–28r; GYFL I.1a. (1707) no. 2, pag. 12–13; Tóth 1998, pp. 51–85; Galla 2005, pp. 256–264; Mihalik 2021, pp. 631–670.

control of the Princely Court. For this reason, the Apostolic Holy See in Rome treated the Principality of Transylvania as a missionary destination or a target and constantly delegated mostly French-, Flemish-, German-, Hungarian- and Italian-speaking Franciscan friars to Transylvania for the spiritual care of the local Catholic population.¹³

After the defeat of the Ottoman troops at the battle of Vienna-Kahlenberg in 1683, the war of liberation from Ottoman rule began in Hungary. This also affected Transylvania, as the former eastern province of the historical Kingdom of Hungary. The Ottoman political influence of the Principality gradually dwindled and was replaced by the Habsburg Imperial Court of Vienna, which highly supported Catholicism and, of course, Counter-Reformation, too. By the year of 1690, Transylvania's political status had changed and become a province of the Habsburg Monarchy, headed by a Governor (*Gubernator Transylvaniae*) appointed by the Imperial Court of Vienna (*Diploma Leopoldinum*, *Leopoldean Hrovartak*). Thus, the political and religious situation of the Armenians in Transylvania must be placed and analysed in this complex historical and, of course, church-historical context.¹⁴

13. Mihalik 2020, pp. 123–135.

14. The *Diploma Leopoldinum* itself declared in 1690 was a legal document, which determined the basic government and legal status of the Principality of Transylvania in the Habsburg Monarchy, after Prince Michael (Mihály) Apafi I's death, the last ruling Prince of Transylvania. The document was drafted by Count Nicholas (Miklós) Bethlen (1642–1716), Chancellor of Transylvania. It was approved officially by Emperor and King Leopold I (1657–1705) in Vienna on 16th of October in 1690, which was announced in the Transylvanian Diet of Transylvania in Făgăraș (Fogaras, Fogarasch; present-day in Romania) on 4th of December in 1691. The *Diploma Leopoldinum* restored civil administration in the Principality of Transylvania, and furthermore, it confirmed the traditional liberties of the Three Nations (*Tres Nationes*) in Transylvania (Hungarians, Saxons, and Szeklers) and the freedom of the four "Received" Religions (Calvinist, Lutheran, Anti-Trinitarian, and Roman Catholic Churches in Transylvania) known in Latin as *Religio Recepta*. But in December of 1691, Emperor and King Leopold I issued a reformulated version of this Diploma, in which the confirmation of the elected (nominal and last) Prince of Transylvania, Michael (Mihály) Apafi II (1676–1713) was omitted. He established a *Gubernium* (Governorship), constituted in Sibiu in 1691 for the administration of Transylvania. By the year of 1693, the Court Chancery for Transylvania was established, and thus the Principality of Transylvania gradually got under control of the Viennese Court, losing its former independency. See on this: Trócsányi 1983, pp. 168–271; Oborni 2018, pp. 360–373; Nagy 2023b, p. 97.

The Armenians who fled to Transylvania came into the sight of the Catholic missions in the early 1680s, which practically coincided with the political expansion of the Habsburg Empire into Transylvania, highly supported to spread the Catholicism. The Catholic missions among them were initiated and co-ordinated jointly by the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith¹⁵ (*Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fide*), the Missionary Institute of the Apostolic Holy See in Rome, and the Armenian Catholic Archbishopric of Lviv¹⁶ (Lwów, Lemberg, Leopoldis, Ilov; present-day in Ukraine).¹⁷ Moreover, the conversion to Catholicism of the Apostolic-believer Armenians of Transylvania was ordered under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Armenian Catholic Archbishop of Lviv.¹⁸ Before long, the Apostolic Holy See sent Oxendio Virziresco Stefanowicz (1654–1715), born in Moldavia but with strong ties to Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and Transylvania,¹⁹ a former student

15. The Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of Faith (*Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fide*) as a Missionary Institution of the Apostolic Holy See directed by Cardinals of Pappal Court will hereafter be referred to as Propaganda Fide in this article. This Institution was established by a bull entitled in Latin as *Inscrutabili divinae providentiae* declared by Pope Gregory XV (1621–1623) on 6th of January (on the Feast of Epiphany) in 1622. APF CU. vol. 1, fol. 1r–27v; Tóth 2004, pp. 843–892.

16. Hereafter, the Ukrainian form Lviv is used for the name of the city.

17. APF ASC. vol. 53, fol. 248r; APF SOCG. vol. 496, fol. 503r; APF CP. vol. 29, fol. 361r–366v; APF LDSC. vol. 72, fol. 1v–2r; APF SC FA. vol. 3, fol. 341r–v, fol. 342r–v, fol. 370r–v, fol. 371r–372r, fol. 378r–381v; APF SC FM. vol. 2, fol. 134r–135v; APF SC FMPR. vol. 2, fol. 195r–v; APF CV. vol. 2, fol. 166r; APF FV. vol. 8, fol. 162r–v, fol. 169r–v, fol. 189r–190v; APF FV. vol. 42, fol. 49v; AAV ANVAR. vol. 98, fol. 661r; AAV SSP. vol. 101, fol. 498r–499v.

18. APF ASC. vol. 51, fol. 114r–v, fol. 232r–v, fol. 255r–v; APF ASC. vol. 54, fol. 207r–v; APF ASC. vol. 55, fol. 60r–v; APF SOCG. vol. 490, fol. 110r–v, fol. 122r + fol. 123v; APF SOCG. vol. 491, fol. 12r–v, fol. 13v, fol. 143r, fol. 144r; APF SOCG. vol. 492, fol. 209r–v, fol. 210r–v, fol. 310v, fol. 313r–v; APF SOCG. vol. 493, fol. 30r + fol. 31v, fol. 376v + fol. 377v + fol. 378v; APF SOCG. vol. 495b, fol. 232r–234v; APF LDSC. vol. 70, fol. 53r–v, fol. 54r, fol. 58v; APF LDSC. vol. 73, fol. 252r–v; APF LDSC. vol. 74, fol. 19r–v; APF SC FA. vol. 3, fol. 417r, fol. 418r, fol. 419r; APF SC FM. vol. 2, fol. 260r–261v; APF CU. vol. 1, fol. 268r; APF GIUR. vol. 8/1, pag. 92.; APMV MS. no. 775, fol. 124r–v; BMK MS. no. 511, fol. 1r, fol. 199r.

19. Hereafter, I will use the Italianised form known as Virziresco form in this article. Otherwise, Virziresco was a nickname of Romanian origin (*Vărzărescul* in the meaning of ‘cabbage-bearer’; its Hungarianised form is *Verzár*). His real family name was originally Stefanowicz (Step’anean) and his kin came to Moldavia from Podolia

of the Armenian College²⁰ (*Collegium Armenum*) in Lviv and Urban College (*Collegium Urbanum*) in Rome for a mission to Transylvania among the Armenians in order to convert them to the Catholicism. His task was clear: to persuade the Armenians of Transylvania for the church-union with Rome and to organise their Armenian Catholic (Uniate) Church.²¹

Despite initial difficulties, the missionary's efforts were eventually crowned with a success.²² The Armenians of Transylvania officially made a Confession of Faith (*Confessio fidei*) in the presence of Armenian Catholic Archbishop Vardan Hunanean (1644–1715) on 28th of February in 1689 in the city of Lviv, and, at the same time, declared the church-union with Rome.²³ Thus, Oxendio Virziresco's pastoral efforts were also

(Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth) in the first half of the 17th century. Bishop Oxendio Virziresco was Stefan Stefanowicz Roszka's uncle from his father side. It is known from the thorough research of Edmond (Ödön) Schütz (1916–1999) that a small fraction of Polish Armenians and a significant part of the Moldavian Armenians' ancestors fled from Anatolia and Cilicia between the 14th and 16th centuries. The ancestors of the named Step'anean (Řōšk'ay/Roszka/Roska, Virziresco/Verzár) family came to Eastern Europe originated from the present-day city of Tokat (Eudokia, T'oxat') in Turkey in the second half of the 16th century. See on this: Éble 1915, pp. 11–19; Schütz 1978, pp. 116–135.

20. The Armenian College in Lviv was founded by the Apostolic Holy See in 1664 to ensure the supply of Armenian Catholic seminarians in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The rectors of this Seminary were representatives of the Theatine (Cajetan) Order with missionary experience in Armenia. Its first and founding rector was Father Clemente Galano CR. (1611–1664). From 1709, the name of this Seminary was changed to Armenian-Ruthenian College (*Collegium Armenum et Ruthenum*). It was closed by Emperor and King Joseph II of Habsburg (1765–1790) in 1784. See on this: APF ASC. vol. 32, fol. 68r–69v; APF CP. vol. 64, fol. 41r–47v; APF CP. vol. 133, fol. 270r–310v; APF CV. vol. 2, fol. 2r–23v, fol. 72r–81v; AGT CL. Portfolio. no. 1 (unnumbered folio); Blažejovskij 1975, pp. 109–121; Nagy 2020b, pp. 35–75.

21. The Seminary called Urban College in Rome was founded by Pope Urban VIII (1623–1644) on basis of his bull entitled in Latin as *Immortalis Dei Filius* and declared on 1st of August in 1627. APF CU. vol. 1, fol. 103r–120v, fol. 131r–139v, fol. 141r–142v.

22. APF ASC. vol. 57, fol. 81r–v; APF SOCG. vol. 497, fol. 335r–v; APF LDSC. vol. 76, fol. 33v–34v; APF SC FA. vol. 3, fol. 434r–v + fol. 435v, fol. 462r–v, fol. 465r, fol. 468r–469v, fol. 488r, fol. 490r, fol. 498r–v; APF IND. vol. 5, fol. 111r; ELTE EKK G. vol. 522, fol. 137r–v; Řōšk'ay 1964, pp. 185–186.

23. APF ASC. vol. 59, fol. 165r–169v; APF SOCG. vol. 504, fol. 103r, fol. 104r, fol. 105r; APF CP. vol. 29, fol. 644r + fol. 646v, fol. 645r, fol. 647r–v, fol. 648r–v; APF SC FA. vol. 4, fol. 82r–83v; APF IND. vol. 5, fol. 113v, fol. 114r, fol. 116r.

highly appreciated by the Apostolic Holy See: he was appointed as an Apostolic Vicar of the Armenians in Transylvania and Titular Bishop (*in partibus infidelium*) of Aladia in Hibernia (*Episcopus Aladiensis Hiberniae et Vicarius Apostolicus ad Armenos per Transylvaniam*) on 3rd of October in 1690.²⁴ However, despite the harsh protests of the Armenian Catholic Archdiocese of Lviv, Transylvanian Armenians were brought directly under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Propaganda Fide.²⁵ At the same time, this church-union did not detail the issue of the Armenian Uniate rite, the use of the Classical Armenian language in liturgies, and the old Armenian calendar for liturgy, the teaching of the Fourth Ecumenical Council in Chalcedon, which rejected Monophysitism, and the marital status of the converted priests, etc.²⁶

The lack of clarity of these problems had led to countless conflicts in the Armenian community over time. The tense situation was further compounded by the fact that Bishop Oxendio Virziresco himself initially pushed for Latinisation, which led to a lot of strife, apostasy, and emigration of a significant part of Transylvanian Armenians to Moldavia at the turn of the 17th and 18th centuries.²⁷ Towards the end of his life, however, Bishop Oxendio Virziresco realised his mistake and sought to retain the Armenian Catholic (Uniate) rite and the Armenian Titular Bishopric's office. He believed that these could be a guarantee for the effective survival of the Armenian community in Transylvania.²⁸ Soon after,

24. APF ASC. vol. 60, fol. 14r–19v; APF SOCG. vol. 506, fol. 63r–64r; APF SOCG. vol. 507, fol. 87r–88v; APF IND. vol. 5, fol. 114v, fol. 116v; ARSI FAH. vol. 155, fol. 81r–v; ELTE EKK CH. Cod. 21, pag. 77–84; ELTE EKK G. vol. 522, fol. 137r–v; PL AEV SPSZ. no. 273/2, no. 273/4.1, no. 273/4.2; *Řošk'ay* 1964, p. 187.

25. APF CP. vol. 29, fol. 602r–608v, fol. 610r, fol. 611r, fol. 612r–613v, fol. 618r, fol. 628r, fol. 630r–631r; APF LDSC. vol. 79, fol. 80v–81r, fol. 82v, fol. 123r–v, fol. 134v–135r; APF SC FA. vol. 4, fol. 142r, fol. 146r–v, fol. 220r–221v.

26. Nagy 2010, pp. 379–394; Nagy 2013, pp. 17–27; Nagy 2020c, pp. 179–221.

27. APF ASC. vol. 61, fol. 84r–87r; APF ASC. vol. 62, fol. 125r–128v; APF ASC. vol. 63, fol. 68r–70v; APF ASC. vol. 69, fol. 108r–v; APF SOCG. vol. 510, fol. 97r–98v; APF SOCG. vol. 512, fol. 180r–v; APF SOCG. vol. 514, fol. 495r–496v; APF SOCG. vol. 532, fol. 434r–440r; APF IND. vol. 5, fol. 124v, fol. 127r, fol. 128r; AAV ANV. vol. 196, fol. 203r–v, fol. 204r, fol. 206r–v; ELTE EKK G. vol. 522, fol. 96r–v; PL AEV SPSZ. no. 274/8.3, no. 274/8.4.1.

28. APF ASC. vol. 82, fol. 144v–147r, fol. 172r–v, fol. 443r–v; APF SOCG. vol. 572, fol. 283r–285r; APF SOCG. vol. 580, fol. 557r–557v, fol. 559r, fol. 560r–565v, fol. 566r–v, fol. 567r–568v; APF SOCG. vol. 581, fol. 99r–v; APF SOCG. vol. 583,

Bishop Oxendio Virziresco passed away in Vienna on 10th of March in 1715,²⁹ while negotiating with the Apostolic Nunciature to Vienna and Viennese Imperial Court upon the matter of the privilege of the newly-founded city called Armenopolis³⁰ (Gherla, Szamosújvár, Armenopoli, Armenierstadt, Arménopole; present-day in Romania).³¹

This sad event almost coincided with the actual re-organisation of the Roman Catholic (Latin rite) Bishopric and Diocese in Transylvania.³²

fol. 211r-v, fol. 212r-v; APF LDSC. vol. 101, fol. 36v-37v, fol. 47v-48r, fol. 255r-v, fol. 263r-264v; MNL-OL F 234. no. XII ½, fasc. 2, litt. A.

29. APF ASC. vol. 85, fol. 169r-171v, fol. 582r-v; APF SOCG. fol. 598, fol. 264r-v, fol. 265r-266v, fol. 267r-268v, fol. 269r-v; APF LDSC. vol. 104, fol. 58r-v; APF SC FA. vol. 6, fol. 544r-545v, fol. 552r-553v; APF IND. vol. 6, (1715) no. 169: 16 (unnumbered folio.); Rôšk'ay 1964, pp. 197-198.

30. Hereafter, for clarity, I will use the Latin *Armenopolis* for the name of the city.

31. The city of Armenopolis was officially founded in 1696 by the Armenians of Transylvania. Initially, the territory of the city was the estate of Gherla, formerly managed by the Transylvanian princely and Viennese Courts. In purchasing it, Bishop Oxendio Virziresco, Andrea Santacroce (1655-1712), Apostolic Nuncio to Vienna (previously to Warsaw) and Cardinal Leopold (Lipót) Kollonich (1631-1707), Primate of the Hungarian Catholic Church, Archbishop of Esztergom (Strigonium, Strigonie, Gran), earned undying merit. Namely, it was they who persuaded the officials of the Viennese Imperial Court to get the Armenians to buy the estate at a favourable price, where they could build their future city. Finally, Emperor and King Leopold I authorised the purchase of the estate by his Imperial and Royal decree dated on 20th of August in 1696. At the same time, the actual foundation of the city was significantly delayed due to the church strife among the Armenians (1697-1700), the harsh resistance of the secular and local administration of Transylvania (1696-1704), major epidemics broken out in 1709, and the War of Independence (1703-1711) led by Prince Francis (Ferenc) Rákóczi II (1676-1735). Finally, the Armenians of Transylvania led by Bishop Oxendio Virziresco settled only in Armenopolis from Bistrița (Beszterce, Bistritz, Bistrizzi; present-day in Romania) in 1712 and actually began building the city. See on this: APF ASC. vol. 84, fol. 23r-24v; APF ASC. vol. 85, fol. 169r-171v; APF SOCG. vol. 525, fol. 111r-v; APF SOCG. vol. 591, fol. 122r-v, fol. 123r-124v; APF SOCG. vol. 598, fol. 264r-v, fol. 267r-268v, fol. 269r; APF LDSC. vol. 103, fol. 3r-4v, fol. 5r-6v; APF LDSC. vol. 104, fol. 57r-58v; APF SC FA. vol. 4, fol. 434r; APF IND. vol. 5, fol. 122v; APF SC FA. vol. 6, fol. 544r-545v; AAV ANV. vol. 196, fol. 151r, fol. 152r; ÖSTA AVFHA FAH. Kt. fol. 344r-345v; MNL-OL B 2. no. 111, no. 233; MNL-OL F 46. no. 238.

32. The Roman Catholic Bishopric of Transylvania was elevated to an Archdiocese (*Archidioecesis Albae Iuliensis*) on 5th of August in 1991 by the bull of (Saint) Pope John Paul II (1978-2005). See more on this: <https://www.catholic-hierarchy.org/diocese/daliu.html> (Accessed on 30th of May, 2024.)

Bishop George (György) Mártonffy (1663–1721), newly appointed and consecrated in 1713, did everything possible to restore the authority of the Bishopric, which had been damaged in the 16th and 17th centuries due to the strong presence of Protestantism in Transylvania.³³ However, relations with the Apostolic Holy See soon became strained. Due to the lack of the Catholic clergy in Transylvania, Bishop Mártonffy asked the Propaganda Fide that missionaries delegated from the Apostolic Holy See under its authority, and serving in Transylvania, should be placed directly under own his bishopric jurisdiction and authority.³⁴ This request was eventually approved by the Propaganda Fide after some heated, harsh debate. However, because of this, relations between the Roman Catholic Bishopric of Transylvania with the centre of the city Alba Iulia

33. Towards the end of the 17th century, in 1689, Steven (István) Kada (1617–1695) who also held the Titular Bishop of Augustopolis (*in partibus infidelium*), (Secret) Bishop of the Catholics in Transylvania, was already a Bishop appointed by the Imperial Court of Vienna, but his candidacy and appointment were not approved by the Apostolic Holy See in Rome. However, he never made it to Transylvania as a Bishop of Catholics. After Bishop Steven Kada's death in 1695, the Transylvanian-born Andrew (András) Illyés (1637–1712) was appointed as a real diocesan Roman Catholic Bishop of Transylvania, but after two attempts to settle in Transylvania, which proved to be short-lived, he was unable to gain a permanent foothold in Transylvania due to the religious conditions in Transylvania and War of Liberation led by the afore-mentioned Prince Francis Rákóczi II. Thus, Bishop Illyés passed away in 1712 far from his diocese (Transylvania), alone and in exile. See more about this: APF ASC. vol. 58, fol. 13r–16r, fol. 127v–131r; APF ASC. vol. 59, fol. 33r–34r, fol. 114v–115r, fol. 151v–154r; APF ASC. vol. 74, fol. 55r–v, fol. 296r–v; APF SOCG. vol. 500, fol. 58r–59v, fol. 60r; APF SOCG. vol. 503, fol. 421r–422r, fol. 424r–425r, fol. 427r–v, fol. 429r–v, fol. 431r–v, fol. 432r–v; APF SOCG. vol. 504, fol. 58r–71r; APF SOCG. vol. 507, fol. 197r–201v; APF SOCG. vol. 526, fol. 275r; APF SOCG. vol. 535, fol. 1r–3v; APF LDSC. vol. 78, fol. 7v–8v, fol. 172v–173r; APF SC FUT. vol. 3, fol. 42r–43v; ARSI FAH. vol. 149, fol. 76r; ARSI FAH. vol. 155, fol. 75r; GYFL I.1a. (1689) no. 1, pag. 6; GYFL I.1a. (1697) no. 1, pag. 7; GYFL I.1a. (1713) no. 2, pag. 15; GYFL I/4. vol. 3, fol. 247r, fol. 248v; MNL-OL A 57. vol. 20, no. 101, pag. 385–386; MNL-OL A 57. vol. 24, no. 20, pag. 25; PL AEV ARER. no. 1840/1; HC, 1952, pp. 105, 386; Galla 2005, pp. 264–267, 272–274; Mihalik 2018, pp. 283–304.

34. APF ASC. vol. 85, fol. 263r–v, fol. 437r–438r; APF ASC. vol. 86, fol. 58r–59r; APF SOCG. vol. 599, fol. 196r + fol. 197v; APF SOCG. vol. 600, fol. 535r–536r; APF SC FUT. vol. 3, fol. 46r–52v; GYFL I/4. vol. 3, fol. 6r; MNL-OL A 57. vol. 28, no. 307, pag. 591; MNL-OL A 57. vol. 31, no. 34, pag. 23; ELTE EKK CH. Cod. 16, pag. 135–137, pag. 185–190; ELTE EKK CH. Cod. 26, pag. 265–274; PL AEV SPKER. no. 477.

(Gyulafehérvár, Weissenburg, Alba Carolina; present-day in Romania) and Rome remained very tense.³⁵

The other source of conflict was the issue of the Armenian and Romanian Uniates in Transylvania. Bishop Mártonffy did not approve of the fact that, with the effective support of the Viennese court and the Propaganda Fide, the Greek Catholic Romanians in Transylvania worked to establish an independent diocese under the leadership of Bishop Ioan Constantin Giurgiu Patachi (de Pataky) OSBM (1680–1727) in 1716.³⁶ Further on, following Bishop Oxendio Virziresco's death, Bishop Mártonffy wanted to extend his ecclesiastical jurisdiction to the Armenians in Transylvania. Under this pretext, in 1718 and in 1719, he accused the Armenians of Monophysite heresy and schismatism because of their rite.³⁷ This move by

35. APF ASC. vol. 85, fol. 437r–438r, fol. 587v–589r; APF SOCG. vol. 600, fol. 535r–536v; APF SOCG. vol. 603, fol. 349r, fol. 350r, fol. 352r–v, fol. 417r, fol. 418r–419v, fol. 420r, fol. 453r–v, fol. 453r–454r; APF SOCG. fol. 605, fol. 421r–422r; APF LDSC. vol. 110, fol. 112r–113v, fol. 168r–169v, fol. 700r–701v, fol. 702r–704v; APF SC FUT. vol. 5, fol. 99r, fol. 149r, fol. 305r–306v.

36. The Orthodox-believer Romanians in Transylvania united with Rome between 1697 and 1701 in the city of Alba Iulia with the leadership of the Bishop Theophilus of Srjem and Bishop Athanasius Anghel. After that, Uniate Romanians held “very hard talks” for almost two decades with representatives of the Apostolic Holy See, the Viennese Court, and the Hungarian Catholic Church regarding the establishment of an independent diocese. Finally, after lengthy negotiations, the Romanian Uniate (Greek Catholic) Diocesan Bishopric of Transylvania was established with the centre of Făgăraş on 3rd of February in 1721, based upon the bull of Pope Innocent XIII (1721–1723) entitled in Latin as *Ratione Congruit*. Bishop George Mártonffy harshly protested against it both at the Viennese Imperial Court and Apostolic Holy See. The first Diocesan Bishop was the aforementioned Ioan Constantin Giurgiu Patachi, who had served as an Episcopal Vicar previously. See on this: APF ASC, vol. 83, fol. 679–680r; APF ASC. vol. 86, fol. 231r–234v; APF ASC. vol. 90, fol. 677v–679v; APF SOCG. vol. 605, fol. 317r–334v; APF CP. vol. 100, fol. 94r–98v; APF LDSC. vol. 107, fol. 220v–221r; APF SC FGCDSTU. vol. 1, fol. 224r–233v; APF SC FUT. vol. 3, fol. 97r–98v; APF SC FUT. vol. 4, fol. 86r–v, fol. 94r–v, fol. 95r–v, fol. 367r–v; GYFL I.1a. (1718) no. 9, pag. 22; ELTE EKK CK. B. Cod. 20, pag. 201–212; HC 1952, p. 203; Szirtes 2021, pp. 273–291.

37. APF ASC. vol. 89/I, fol. 79r–81v, fol. 109r–114v, fol. 156r–158v, fol. 178r; APF SOCG. vol. 617, fol. 324r, fol. 325r + fol. 328v + fol. 329v, fol. 385r; APF LDSC. vol. 108, fol. 42r, fol. 47r–v, fol. 65v–66r; APF SC FA. vol. 7, fol. 39r, fol. 40r–41r, fol. 42r; APF IND. vol. 6, (1719) no. 156: 36 (unnumbered folio.); ARSI FAH. vol. 176, pag. 106; GYFL I/4. vol. 3, fol. 109r–111v, fol. 115v.

Bishop Mártonffy provoked the outrage of Giorgio Spínola (1667–1739), then Apostolic Nuncio to Vienna, and later Cardinal of the Propaganda Fide. Therefore, the Propaganda Fide ordered thorough investigations into the religious practices of Armenians in Transylvania. As a result, Stefan Stefanowicz Roszka came to the attention of the Propaganda Fide.³⁸

The clergyman mentioned in the title of this article was still less known to have stronger ties to Transylvania. His father was the Armenian Apostolic lay priest Stefan Sargis Stefanowicz Roszka (ca. 1631–1670), who studied theology at the seminary of Ējmiacin in Armenia, home to the seat of the Armenian Apostolic Church. From the late 1660s, he headed the Armenian Eastern (Apostolic rite) parish of Kamjaneć-Podilskýj (Kamieniec-Podolski; present-day in Ukraine). Stefan Stefanowicz Roszka was born there on 22nd of August in 1670.³⁹ When the Ottoman Turks occupied the city in 1672, like many Armenians from Podolia, Roszka and his family fled to Transylvania. He began his ecclesiastical career as an Eastern Rite student in the city of Bistrița under Bishop Minas Alek'sanean T'oxat'ec'i in the early 1680s.⁴⁰ After the death of the Armenian Apostolic Rite prelate in 1686, under the strong influence of his close relative Oxendio Virziresco, he became converted to Roman Catholic faith in 1687. Soon after, in 1690, due to the recommendation given by Archbishop Vardan Hunanean, Oxendio Virziresco and Francesco Giambattista Bonesana CR (1649–1709), a Theatine Father and then Rector of the Armenian College in Lviv, he continued his theological studies at the Urban College, the Seminary of the Propaganda Fide,

38. APF LDSC. vol. 104, fol. 57r; ACDF ST. UV 59, nr. 18.

39. Řōšk'ay 1964, p. 182; Nagy 2020a, pp. 86–87.

40. For a long time, the scientific (scholarly) belief held that in 1686, just before his death, Bishop Minas Alek'sanean T'oxat'ec'i made a Confession of Faith (*Confessio fidei*) in Lviv in the presence of Cardinal Opizio Pallavicini (1632–1700), Apostolic Nuncio to Warsaw, thereby proclaiming ecclesiastical union with Rome on behalf of the entire Armenian community in Transylvania. However, the archival sources have thoroughly refuted this. For Bishop Minas passed away as a prelate of Eastern (Apostolic Armenian) faith and never met the Nuncio Pallavicini himself. See on this: APF ASC. vol. 70, fol. 103r–107v; APF SOCG. vol. 532, fol. 456r–457r; APF SOCG. vol. 537, fol. 418r–v; APF LDSC. vol. 76, fol. 33r–34r, fol. 90v–91r; APF SC FA. vol. 4, fol. 13r–v, fol. 374r–375v; APF CU. vol. 3, fol. 472r–v; AAV ANV. vol. 196, fol. 219r–220r; Řōšk'ay 1964, pp. 182, 186.

in Rome, where he was ordained as a priest in 1700.⁴¹ A year later, he also obtained a doctorate in theology. From 1702 to 1704, he briefly headed the Armenian Catholic Parish of Saint Mary of Egypt (*Chiesa di Santa Maria Egiziaca*) in Rome.⁴² Then, at the behest of the Propaganda Fide and, further on, at the request of Archbishop Vardan Hunanean, he left for Lviv, where he taught at the Armenian College.⁴³ Nevertheless, in 1710, the Apostolic Holy See summoned him to Rome, where Pope Clement XI (1700–1721) appointed him as a Titular Bishop of Hymeria (*in partibus infidelium*) and Co-adjutor to the aiding Archbishop Vardan Hunanean in Lviv.⁴⁴ However, the majority of Armenian Catholic Church's circles in Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth did not support

41. APF SOCG. vol. 537, fol. 180r; APF SC FA. vol. 4, fol. 83r–84r, fol. 94r, fol. 96r; Stefan Stefanowicz Roszka took his so-called student's (seminarist's) oath (*Iuramentum, Giuramento*) at Urban College in the autumn of 1692. See on this: APF GIUR. vol. 8/1, pag. 157.

42. APF ASC. vol. 70, fol. 166r, fol. 341r–346v; APF SOCG. vol. 537, fol. 416r–417v, fol. 419r–v; Rōšk'ay 1964, p. 186.

43. Nevertheless, Stefan Stefanowicz Roszka performed his church service in the historical region of Pokuttia (Pokucie; present-day in Ukraine) among the Armenian Catholics living there. APF ASC vol. 71, fol. 69r–70v, fol. 79r–v, fol. 259r–v; APF SOCG. vol. 559, fol. 29r; APF SC FA. vol. 4, fol. 720r–721v; APF SC FA. vol. 5, fol. 101r–v; APF SC FA. vol. 6, fol. 37r; AGT CL. Portfolio. no. 2 (unnumbered folio).

44. The reason for this Episcopal appointment was the death of Deodatus Nersesowicz (1644–1709), one of the first Alumni of the Armenian College in Lviv, Titular Bishop of *Traianopolis in Rhodope* and Armenian Catholic Archbishopric Co-adjutor of Lviv. At the suggestion of Archbishop Vardan Hunanean, Roszka was then the first candidate for this ecclesiastical office. However, there are still many controversies surrounding Roszka's Episcopal appointment and Title. Although Roszka officially renounced this Episcopal title because of intrigues, the documents (letters) written to him from Rome often used the Italian formula *Eminentissimo Illustrissimmo Reverendissimo ed Colendissimo* (Latin: *Eminentissimus Illustrissimus Reverendissimus ac Colendissimus*) as an address after his resignation. In any case, further thorough archival research is needed to clarify this issue in the near future. See on this: APF ASC. vol. 80, fol. 178r–182r, fol. 297r–v; APF SOCG. vol. 563, fol. 185r–v; APF SOCG. vol. 573, fol. 365r–v, fol. 368r–v, fol. 370r; APF CP. vol. 48, fol. 148r–151v + fol. 155v; APF LDSC. vol. 98, fol. 90v; APF SC FA. vol. 5, fol. 588r–v; APF SC FA. vol. 6, fol. 225r–v, fol. 229r–v, fol. 230r, fol. 273r–v, fol. 342r, fol. 544r–545r; APF FV. vol. 43, fol. 43r–v; Rōšk'ay 1964, pp. 194–195; Petrowicz 1988, pp. 57–61; Nagy 2006, pp. 39–46.

his candidacy because they wanted someone else to head this very important ecclesiastical office. As a result, Archbishop Vardan Hunanean was also forced to back down. Due to the attacks and conflicts, he was obliged to resign as a coadjutor. Following Roszka's resignation, Jan Tobias Augustynowicz (1664–1751) (later on Archbishop of Lviv) was appointed and consecrated as a Titular Bishop of Hymeria and Co-adjutor of the Armenian Catholic Archbishopric in the city of Lviv in 1713.⁴⁵ Still, in 1704, by order of Archbishop Vardan Hunanean, Stefan Stefanowicz Roszka entered the Armenian Catholic parish of Stanyslaviv⁴⁶ (Stanisławów, Stanislau; present-day Ivano-Frankivsk in Ukraine), and from 1718 he became its parish priest.⁴⁷ Moreover, until his death in 1739, he held it with the rank of Titular Provost of Stanyslaviv (*praepositus Stanislavoviensis, preposito di Stanislavovia*).⁴⁸

However, Stefan Stefanowicz Roszka remained in close contact with Bishop Oxendio Virziresco, until his death in 1715. For example, when Bishop Oxendio Virziresco's assistant, Giuseppe Maria Bonalini CR. (ca. 1650–1703), an Italian-born Theatine missionary died suddenly in 1703, the prelate wanted him appointed as his deputy at the Propaganda Fide. However, after Archbishop Vardan Hunanean's intervention, the Propaganda Fide rejected his request.⁴⁹ The reason for this was that the archbishopric wanted to continue to employ Stefan Stefanowicz Roszka on the territory of its own archdiocese. Despite this, they remained in close contact. In fact, Oxendio Virziresco, Armenian Catholic (Titular)

45. APF ASC. vol. 80, fol. 297r-v, fol. 429r-v; APF SOCG. vol. 587, fol. 47r–51r; APF LDSC. vol. 101, fol. 169v–170v; APF SC FA. vol. 5, fol. 230r; APF ID. vol. B, fol. 138r–147v; Petrowicz 1988, pp. 58–61; Acta, 2009, pp. 25–30, 285, 378.

46. Hereafter, the old Ukrainian form Stanyslaviv is used for the name of city in this article.

47. APF SOCG. vol. 559, fol. 29r; APF SC FA. vol. 5, fol. 101r-v; APF SC FA. vol. 6, fol. 37r.

48. APF SC FA. vol. 5, fol. 101r, fol. 721r-v; APF SC FA. vol. 7, fol. 285r-v, fol. 795r-v; APF CU. vol. 3, fol. 170r, fol. 172r-v.

49. Father Bonalini, who spoke Armenian, Turkish (Ottoman, Crimean), Arabic and Persian languages, had been assisting Bishop Oxendio Virziresco's pastoral activity in Transylvania since 1692. APF SOCG. vol. 545, fol. 243r-v, fol. 244r–245v; APF LDSC. vol. 80, fol. 143v, fol. 155r-v; APF SC FA. vol. 4, fol. 265r-v; APF SC FA. vol. 5, fol. 34r–35v, fol. 101r-v; APF SC FMPR. vol. 2, fol. 386r-v; APF CU. vol. 3, fol. 118r, fol. 154r-v; APF CV. vol. 2, fol. 179r; APF IND. vol. 6, (1703) no. 166: 14 (unnumbered folio.); AGT CL. Portfolio. no. 2 (unnumbered folio).

Bishop of Transylvania, named Stefan Stefanowicz Roszka as his successor in a testament dated on 4th of March in 1715 in Vienna a few days before his death.⁵⁰

The Propaganda Fide considered Roszka's candidacy as a Uniate Bishop of the Armenians for Transylvania several times between 1715 and 1718, but the Cardinals of the Apostolic Holy See were unable to come to an agreement, which was also due to the fact that the Hungarian Catholic Church did not support the Armenian Catholic (Titular) Bishopric's office in Transylvania or the candidacy of Roszka in Transylvania. They justified their objection by the fact that they preferred to re-organise the Roman Catholic Bishopric of Transylvania with the centre of Alba Iulia, which was still vacant or torn apart at that time, as soon as possible and to have it filled by the right person.⁵¹ There is another problem with this. Namely, Archbishop Jan Tobias Augustynowicz, who succeeded the late Vardan Hunanean, Armenian Catholic Archbishop of Lviv, indicated in a letter written to the Propaganda Fide in 1715 that Roszka was needed more now in the territory of his archdiocese than in Transylvania. Moreover, the new archbishop appointed Roszka as a Vicar next to him in Lviv. Thus, this ecclesiastical office, so important for Armenians, remained vacant in Transylvania.⁵²

As mentioned already above, this period coincided with the attack of Bishop Mártonffy upon the Armenians in Transylvania, which drew the disapproval of Giorgio Spínola, Apostolic Nuncio to Vienna and the Propaganda Fide. His accusations were rejected by the Armenians of Transylvania and they appealed to the Propaganda Fide for legal redress.⁵³ In 1719, at the General Session (*Congregatio Generalis, Congregazione Generale*) of the Propaganda Fide, headed by Cardinal-Prefect Giuseppe Sacripante (1642–1727) and General Secretary Pierluigi Caraffa (1677–1756),

50. APF ASC. vol. 85, fol. 170r-v, fol. 437r-v, fol. 582r-v; APF SC FA. vol. 6, fol. 588r-v, fol. 642r–643v; Bárány 1888, pp. 139–141.

51. APF ASC. vol. 85, fol. 582r, fol. 587r–589r; APF ASC. vol. 86, fol. 75r–76v, fol. 102r–103v; SOCG. vol. 600, fol. 509r–510r, fol. 550r–552v + fol. 553v; APF SOCG. vol. 601, fol. 268r; APF SOCG. vol. 608, fol. 435r-v; APF LDSC. vol. 104, fol. 231v; APF SC FA. vol. 5, fol. 588r-v, fol. 642r–643v; APF IND. vol. 6, (1715) no. 382: 40. (unnumbered folio).

52. APF ASC. vol. 85, fol. 430r–432v, fol. 520r–521v; APF SOCG. vol. 600, fol. 509r–510v, fol. 513r; Řošk'ay 1964, p. 198.

53. GYFL I/4. vol. 3, fol. 113r–114v.

after lengthy discussions and negotiations, it was decided to send apostolic visitors to Transylvania to investigate the matter.⁵⁴

Therefore, Yovnatan Tēr-Eliaean, Armenian Catholic Bishop of Sebasteia, who was carrying out a mission among Eastern Armenians in Belgrade, and Xač'atur Aṛak'elian Erzurumc'i (*Cacciaturus Araciel Erzurumiensis*) C.A.M. (1666–1740), a Mechitarist monk and Alumnus of Urban College in Rome,⁵⁵ were invited to visit Transylvania, and examine the religious customs of the Armenians.⁵⁶ The Propaganda Fide also asked them to prepare a detailed and comprehensive written report on their mission.⁵⁷

Bishop Yovnatan visited Ibaşfalău (Ebesfalva, Ebbeschdorf)⁵⁸ and Gheorgheni⁵⁹ (Gyergyószentmiklós, Niklasmarkt, Giorgiovia; present-day Romania), while Xač'atur Aṛak'elian visited Armenopolis. Both unanimously stated that the Armenians in Transylvania did not indulge in any heretical or schismatic customs. Their priests celebrated Mass according to the Armenian Uniate rite adopted by Rome, and they were all good Catholics. In their view, Bishop Mártonffy wanted to arbitrarily bring the Armenians under his ecclesiastical jurisdiction and use these accusations as a pretext against them. At the same time, the Propaganda Fide was drawn to the fact that since the death of Oxendio Virziresco on 10th of March in 1715, Armenians in Transylvania have not had a bishop and this ecclesiastical (vacant) office must be filled as soon as possible. It was also proposed that until this was filled with a suitable person, the Propaganda Fide should regularly delegate Armenian Catholic visitors to Transylvania with the intention of regularly monitoring the

54. GYFL I/4. vol. 3, fol. 115r.

55. APF CU. vol. 1, fol. 269r; APF CU. vol. 2, fol. 156r-v, fol. 372r; APF GIUR. vol. 8/1, pag. 125; Řošk'ay 1964, pp. 189, 192–193; Nagy 2021b, pp. 293–322.

56. APF ASC. vol. 110, fol. 207v–212r; Kovács 2013, pp. 61–62.

57. APF ASC. vol. 89/I, fol. 79r–81r; APF SOCG. vol. 617, fol. 319r-v, fol. 320r-v, fol. 503r–508v; APF SC FA. vol. 7, fol. 8r, fol. 37r, fol. 44r, fol. 46r, APF IND. vol. 6, (1721) no. 100: 3. (unnumbered folio).

58. Henceforth, the Romanian form Ibaşfalău is used for the name of the city. The name of the town was renamed Elisabethopolis (Erzsébetváros, Elisabethstadt, Elisabettopoli, Élisabethopole) shortly after in 1733 in honour of (Princess) Saint Elisabeth of Árpád Dynasty (1207–1231). Present-day Dumbrăveni in Romania. MNL-OL A 57. vol. 53, no. 104, pag. 135–144; MNL-OL E 156 UC. REG. no. 165: 4.

59. Hereafter, the Romanian form Gheorgheni is used for the name of this city.

religious practices of Armenians. Bishop Mártonffy, however, did not want to hear about this.⁶⁰

In light of the reports received, the Propaganda Fide also contacted Stefan Stefanowicz Roszka, who was already serving in Stanyslaviv, to express his opinion on Bishop Mártonffy's accusations against Armenians in Transylvania. He also shared the views of the two Armenian Catholic clergymen, but he was much blunter than them.⁶¹ According to Roszka, Mártonffy deliberately stated falsehoods and even unscrupulously lied about the alleged schismatic and heretical religious practices of Armenian Catholics in Transylvania. Roszka himself, to a certain degree, fully understood Bishop Mártonffy's intentions: he saw that Mártonffy's actions, on the one hand, wanted to bring the Armenians under his own control, and on the other hand, it was in his fundamental interest not to fill the office of Armenian Catholic Bishop in Transylvania under any circumstances, because it harmed his own ecclesiastical and political interests. In any case, these reports were shown by the Propaganda Fide to Bishop Mártonffy, who, angered, attacked the Armenian Visitors in a sharp tone. It should be added that as a result, a sharp, sometimes personal polemic developed between Bishop Mártonffy, Roszka and Xač'atur Aṛak'eleaṇ regarding the ecclesiastical situation of the Armenians in Transylvania.⁶²

At any rate, between 1720 and 1721, the Cardinals of the Propaganda Fide discussed the matter on several occasions. Finally, they decided to heed the suggestions of the aforementioned visitors and to fill the Bishopric's office of Transylvania and, further on, to send an apostolic missionary to Transylvania until the appropriate person was selected.⁶³

60. APF ASC. vol. 90, fol. 205r–208r; APF SOCG. vol. 620, fol. 21r, fol. 22r, fol. 112r, fol. 113r–v; APF SOCG. vol. 622, fol. 43r–44v, fol. 45r, fol. 46r–v; APF SOCG. vol. 632, fol. 448r–v; APF SC FA. vol. 7, fol. 62r, fol. 97r, fol. 135r, fol. 210r–220r, fol. 228r, fol. 255r–v, fol. 259r, fol. 531r–532r, fol. 554r–v; JTMRL IV. no. 212/b, Fond. 3, állag.

61. Roszka himself had a very friendly relationship with Xač'atur Aṛak'eleaṇ, which can be traced back to his years as students together at Urban College in Rome. Rõšk'ay 1964, p. 189.

62. APF ASC. vol. 89/II, fol. 345r–346v; APF SOCG. vol. 623, fol. 273r–277v, fol. 278r, fol. 282r, fol. 283r–284v, fol. 291r, fol. 293r, fol. 294r; APF LDSC. vol. 109, fol. 82v–83v, fol. 111v, fol. 112v–113r, fol. 191r; APF SC FA. vol. 7, fol. 80r–81v, fol. 285r–v, fol. 320r–v, fol. 350r; APF SC FA. vol. 8, fol. 80r, fol. 97r; GYFL I/4. vol. 3, fol. 115v–116r, fol. 116v–117r, fol. 119v–121r, fol. 121r, fol. 121v–122v, fol. 122v–123r.

63. APF LDSC. vol. 109, fol. 82v–83v, fol. 111v, fol. 112v–113r, fol. 191r.

After a short search, the Propaganda Fide found the suitable man of clergy in the person of Minas Barun (Minas Paronean) (1693–1745), born in Constantinople, who could be capable of performing the task of the mission among the Armenians in Transylvania.⁶⁴ The mentioned Armenian Catholic priest was recommended by Xač'atur Arak'elian, whom he had met during his previous mission to Constantinople, and on his recommendation, he was admitted to the Urban College in Rome.⁶⁵ Minas Barun, on the one hand, spoke in favour of his extensive knowledge of languages and, on the other hand, because of his theological training, he was very familiar with both the Latin and Armenian Uniate rites. In Rome, at the Propaganda Fide, it was an open secret that Minas Barun was also counted on as the future Apostolic Vicar and Bishop of the Armenians in Transylvania.⁶⁶ Notwithstanding, the Roman Catholic Bishopric of Transylvania was also informed about this by the Apostolic Holy See. At the same time, the Episcopacy led by Bishop George Mártonffy was not "so glad and pleased" to hear this news, which they also indicated in their reply that they did not want to see another Armenian priest in Transylvania, "suspected heretics and schismatics."⁶⁷ This, in turn, caused concern in Rome. Therefore, the Propaganda Fide conducted more and more negotiations. Even then, it was suggested that instead of Minas Barun, only Roszka should be sent to Transylvania, since he spent his childhood and youth there, and was a close relative of the late Bishop Oxendio Virziresco. Minas Barun was considered too young for the job because of his age.⁶⁸

Therefore, the Propaganda Fide contacted Msgr. Stefan Stefanowicz Roszka who was then active in Stanyslaviv.⁶⁹ In his letters, he also showed

64. APF LDSC. vol. 110, fol. 168r–169v; APF CU. vol. 4, fol. 688r; APF IND. vol. 6, (1721) no. 105: 42 (unnumbered folio); Kovács 2006a, pp. 62–66; Kovács 2006b, pp. 18–24; Nagy 2021a, pp. 427–457.

65. APF SC FA. vol. 3, fol. 53r; APF GIUR. vol. 8/1, pag. 276; PL AEV SPKOLL. no. 361.

66. APF SC FA. vol. 7, fol. 415r–v, fol. 422r–v.

67. APF ASC. vol. 91, fol. 491r–502r; APF ASC. vol. 92, fol. 58r–65v; APF SOCG. vol. 633, fol. 58r, fol. 314r–315r; APF LDSC. vol. 110, fol. 227r; APF SC FA. vol. 7, fol. 467r.

68. APF SOCG. vol. 632, fol. 446r–v, fol. 447r–v; APF FUT. vol. 5, fol. 36r–39r; APF CV. vol. 2, fol. 355r–356v.

69. APF LDSC. vol. 112, fol. 193r–v.

a willingness to come to Transylvania for ecclesiastical service. Moreover, in these documents, he indicated that he still fully agreed with the position of the previous visitors regarding the Armenians in Transylvania from religious point of view.⁷⁰ At the same time, Roszka made it a condition that he would only undertake this challenging missionary task if his immediate superior accepted and approved this.⁷¹ However, Archbishop Jan Tobias Augustynowicz, Armenian Catholic Archbishop of Lviv, disapproved of this. In his letters sent to the Propaganda Fide in Rome, Archbishop Augustynowicz justified this decision by saying that Roszka was also badly needed among the Armenian Catholics living in the territory of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. He asked the Propaganda Fide to name the successor of Bishop Oxendio Virziresco as soon as possible, but not Stefan Stefanowicz Roszka. Finally, he proposed that younger Armenian Catholic priests, newly graduated from Lviv and Rome, and at the same time, should be sent to Transylvania in order to strengthen the religious life of the Armenians against attacks coming from the Roman Catholic Bishopric of Transylvania.⁷²

In light of this, Roszka himself suggested that if the Propaganda Fide had any doubts about the success of Minas Barun's mission, he would send another and preferably older and more experienced Armenian Catholic clergyman to Transylvania. In another letter sent to Rome, Roszka also expressed that despite his outstanding theological training, Minas Barun's young age and inexperience may not allow him to cope with the harsh attacks coming from the Roman Catholic Bishopric of Transylvania.⁷³ Finally, after some hesitation and further consultation, the Propaganda Fide decided in the spring of 1722 to delegate only Minas Barun to Transylvania, who arrived at his missionary station in Armenopolis via Vienna in the summer of the same year. In the very beginning, the first year of his ecclesiastical service was hopeful: he celebrated Holy Masses, taught and constantly visited the Armenian communities in Transylvania.⁷⁴

70. APF SOCG. vol. 646, fol. 61r-v, fol. 62r.

71. APF SC FA. vol. 7, fol. 285r-v.

72. APF SC FA. vol. 8, fol. 789r-790r, fol. 795r, fol. 799r-v, fol. 800r-801r.

73. APF SC FA. vol. 7, fol. 372r-375v.

74. APF SOCG. vol. 652, fol. 197r; APF LDSC. vol. 112, fol. 192r-v, fol. 196v, fol. 197r-v, fol. 243r-v, fol. 268r-v; APF SC FA. vol. 7, fol. 431r, fol. 441r-442r, fol. 467r-v; APF IND. vol. 6, (1722) no. 14: 19, (1722) no. 194: 12. (unnumbered folio).

However, after one year, in 1723, the atmosphere suddenly became unfavourable for him. Minas Barun was viewed with increasing suspicion by the ecclesiastical and lay leaders of the Armenian community in Armenopolis. In particular, the parish priest of the city, Michál Minas Theodorowicz (1689–1764), Alumnus of the Armenian College in Lviv, looked at him with slanted eyes. Since 1715, there has been a dispute among Transylvanian Armenians over who should inherit the office of the late Bishop Oxendio Virziresco. The Armenians in Transylvania wanted to elect a Bishop from themselves and this is what they wanted to achieve at the Propaganda Fide, whereas in Rome they considered it an open secret that they regarded Minas Barun as a potential candidate for Armenian Uniate Bishop in Transylvania. This hurt the interests of Michál Minas Theodorowicz, who had great ambitions for the Episcopal office. Therefore, in 1724, the parish-priest of Armenopolis betrayed Minas Barun to John (János) Antalffy (1644–1728), the newly-appointed Roman Catholic Bishop of Transylvania.⁷⁵ Theodorowicz accused the missionary of Monophysite heresy, incest, sodomy, and corruption. Moreover, Bishop Antalffy—who, like his predecessor George Mártonffy,⁷⁶ did not really like the Armenian Catholic rite—ordered detailed investigations. Subsequently, the Bishopric prepared detailed reports on Minas Barun's alleged crimes, which were sent to the Propaganda Fide.⁷⁷

The Apostolic Holy See did not believe the accusations and asked Bishop Antalffy for thorough evidence, and did not receive a concrete answer. At the same time, the Propaganda Fide asked Minas Barun to continue his missionary work in Transylvania despite the hardships

75. APF SOCG. vol. 652, fol. 198r; APF LDSC. vol. 113, fol. 707r; APF LDSC. vol. 114, fol. 1r–3r; APF SC FA. vol. 7. fol. 651r; APF IND. vol. 6, (1723) no. 428: 22 (unnumbered folio); MNL-OL A 57. vol. 35, no. 76, pag. 229–230; HC 1952, p. 386.

76. After the death of Bishop George Mártonffy on 5th of September in 1721, Francis (Ferenc) Mednyánszky (1678–1733) was appointed and consecrated as a Roman Catholic Bishop of Transylvania in 1722, but he renounced this title, soon. He later became Titular Bishop of Leuca (*in partibus infidelium*) in 1731. Thus, until 1724, the Roman Catholic Bishopric of Transylvania remained vacant. APF LDSC. vol. 112, fol. 197r; MNL-OL A 57. vol. 33, no. 382, pag. 598–599; MNL-OL A 57. vol. 34, no. 168, pag. 358–359; HC 1958, p. 261.

77. APF ASC. vol. 93, fol. 429r; APF SOCG. vol. 652, fol. 199r-v, fol. 200r-v; APF LDSC. vol. 114, fol. 345r–346r; APF SC FA. vol. 8, fol. 332r-v.

committed against him.⁷⁸ However, the young Armenian priest could not bear the pressure on him, and in the late autumn of the year 1724, he left Armenopolis and went to the Apostolic Nunciature to Vienna.⁷⁹ In letters sent from there, he tried to explain his move to the Propaganda Fide that the accusations against him reflected falsehoods and were based on "vile lies."⁸⁰ However, the Propaganda Fide and Girolamo Grimaldi (1674–1733), the Apostolic Nuncio to Vienna, tried for years to convince the priest that he should return to Transylvania as soon as possible.⁸¹

In the year of 1726, the Propaganda Fide asked Stefan Stefanowicz Roszka to travel from Stanyslaviv to Vienna and meet Minas Barun personally. They asked him to persuade the missionary to continue his ecclesiastical and pastoral service in Transylvania. At the meeting in Vienna, Roszka expressed his moral support for Minas Barun above all, too.⁸² Subsequently, Roszka also objected to the accusations of Michál Minas Theodorowicz and Roman Catholic Bishopric of Transylvania that Minas Barun had spread heresy within his community in Armenopolis. In his report, he recommended filling the Armenian Catholic Episcopal see as soon as possible. Moreover, he saw it as the real and true cause of the conflict. The accusation of heresy was a mere distraction from the Roman Catholic bishopric of Transylvania.⁸³ Roszka also stated that, unfortunately, the Armenian clergy in Transylvania, led by Michál Minas Theodorowicz, had committed a grave crime by turning against Minas Barun, and, therefore, his action played into the hands of the Roman Catholic Bishopric in Transylvania, which was hostile to the Armenians. In his opinion, members of the Armenian clergy, headed by Michál Minas Theodorowicz, had ambitions for the title of Bishop and, therefore, viewed Minas Barun, delegated from Rome, with jealousy. The Roman Catholic Bishopric of Transylvania did not clearly regard Minas Barun as a true man of church serving to the Apostolic Holy See and, also,

78. APF SOCG. vol. 652, fol. 210r.

79. APF LDSC. vol. 121, fol. 108v; APF SC FA. vol. 9, fol. 93r.

80. APF ASC. vol. 96, fol. 143v–144r; APF SOCG. vol. 652, fol. 191r–v, fol. 211r–212v; APF SOCG. vol. 654, fol. 422r–v; APF LDSC. vol. 121, fol. 108v, fol. 110r–111r.

81. APF SOCG. vol. 656, fol. 429r–430v.

82. APF SOCG. vol. 656, fol. 427r; APF LDSC. vol. 114, fol. 2/v; APF IND. vol. 6, (1726) no. 437: 21. (unnumbered folio).

83. APF SC FA. vol. 8, fol. 333r–v.

saw him as a potential successor to the late Bishop Oxendio Virziresco.⁸⁴ In fact, they still did not want to have an Armenian Catholic Bishop again in Transylvania. Thus, the Bishopric did not approve of Minas Barun's missionary and pastoral activity in Transylvania.⁸⁵ That is, both sides had a vested interest in discrediting Minas Barun, and removing him from Transylvania.⁸⁶

In any case, Roszka also suggested to the Propaganda Fide that Minas Barun should be returned with a greater authority to Transylvania. He also added that Bishop Antalffy is now essentially governing the Armenian Catholics, although he had no real authority to do so, because his ecclesiastical jurisdiction extended only to those of Latin rite in Transylvania. In fact, he tried to pursue the same church-policy as his predecessor, Bishop George Mártonffy. In Stefan Stefanowicz Roszka's point of view, the Propaganda Fide should act much more decisively on this issue.⁸⁷ Despite this, Minas Barun remained untied and stayed in Vienna for several years (1724–1731), after which, with the reluctant approval of the Propaganda Fide, he left for Constantinople for a mission by hesitant consent of the Apostolic Holy See.⁸⁸

84. APF LDSC. vol. 121, fol. 109r-v; GYFL I/4. vol. 3, fol. 117v–119r; APF SC FA. vol. 9, fol. 92r, fol. 93r–94v.

85. APF SOCG. vol. 656, fol. 427v.

86. APF SOCG. vol. 656, fol. 428r.

87. APF SOCG. vol. 656, fol. 428v.

88. APF ASC. vol. 101, fol. 39r-v; APF ASC. vol. 103, fol. 481v–483v; APF SOCG. vol. 670, fol. 773r-v + fol. 776v; APF SOCG. vol. 673, fol. 291r-v; APF LDSC. vol. 137, fol. 237r–239r; Minas Barun's mission to Constantinople also failed, and after one year he returned to Vienna in 1732. At this time, Béla Adalbert Falkenstein OSB (1661–1739), Bishop of Csanád (historical Count and Diocese in South-Eastern Hungary and South-Western Romania), invited the Armenian Uniate priest to serve as a missionary in his own diocese. After the Propaganda Fide approved Bishop Falkenstein's request with great difficulty, Minas Barun successfully proselytised in the province of Banat (Bánát; present-day in Romania and Serbia) and city of Timișoara (Temesvár, Temeswar; present-day in Romania). Moreover, in 1736, he changed rites and continued to work as a priest of the Latin rite in the territory of the diocese of Csanád, which was being re-organised and renewed at that time, because of the long-term Ottoman-Turk occupation. Highly respected, Minas Barun died in Timișoara in 1745, buried in the Jesuits church's crypt in the mentioned city. About this see: APF ASC. vol. 103, fol. 364r, fol. 483v; APF ASC. vol. 108, fol. 287v–290r; APF ASC. vol. 115, fol. 199v–200v; APF SOCG. vol. 686,

The Propaganda Fide, seeing that Minas Barun refused to return to Transylvania because of the attacks and failures he had suffered, asked Stefan Stefanowicz Roszka in 1728 to come to Transylvania and visit the whole Armenian community.⁸⁹ At the same time, the leadership of the Propaganda Fide had to negotiate with Jan Tobias Augustynowicz, Armenian Catholic Archbishop of Lviv. Although the Archbishop reluctantly released Roszka, he made it a condition that he must return to the territory of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Upon hearing this news, the Armenian community of Armenopolis wrote a letter to the newly consecrated Roman Catholic Bishop of Transylvania, Gregory (Gergely) Sorger (1687–1739), the successor of the late Bishop Antalfy, asking him to allow Roszka to enter Transylvania.⁹⁰ Like his predecessors, Bishop Sorger did not have much sympathy for the Armenian Catholics, but nevertheless allowed Roszka to enter to the territory of Transylvania, in which also played a role the fact that the Propaganda Fide itself forcefully and emphatically asked him to do so.⁹¹

After brief consultation, Roszka arrived in Transylvania in the spring of the year 1729 and began his canonical visitation in Armenopolis. In his report sent to Rome, he also reported in his relations that Armenopolis had received the privilege from the Viennese court a few years earlier, in 1726, and this was good for the life of the community there.⁹²

Roszka examined closely the religious practices of the Armenian community there and the preparedness of the priests. After all this,

fol. 68r, fol. 70r; APF SOCG. vol. 697, fol. 37r-v, fol. 38r-v + fol. 39v; APF SOCG. vol. 724, fol. 169r + fol. 170v; APF LDSC. vol. 137, fol. 194r-v; APF LDSC. vol. 148, fol. 52r–53v; APF LDSC. vol. 164, fol. 223r-v; APF SC FA. vol. 9, fol. 255r + fol. 256v, fol. 348r–349r, fol. 531r-v; APF SC FA. vol. 11, fol. 432r; APF IND. vol. 6, (1745) no. 199: 14. (unnumbered folio).

89. APF SC FA. vol. 9, fol. 92r, fol. 93r–94r, fol. 250v, fol. 252r; GYFL I/4. vol. 3, fol. 124r.

90. APF ASC. vol. 99, fol. 534r; APF SOCG. vol. 666, fol. 228r + fol. 231v; APF SOCG. vol. 670/a, fol. 24/r-v; APF SC FA. vol. 10, fol. 29r; APF SC FUT. vol. 5, fol. 89r, fol. 90r, fol. 113r–114v, fol. 444r; GYFL I.1a. (1728) no. 7, pag. 34; GYFL. I.1a. (1728) no. 8, pag. 34–35; GYFL I/4. vol. 3, fol. 126v; MNL-OL A 57. vol. 57, no. 122/d, pag. 450–474; HC 1952, pp. 381, 386.

91. APF ASC. vol. 98, fol. 314v–321r.

92. APF SC FA. vol. 9, fol. 253r, fol. 603r; GYFL I/4. vol. 3, fol. 107r-v; MNL-OL A 57. vol. 53, no. 279/a, pag. 431–436; Rôšk'ay 1964, p. 201.

he stated that he did not perceive among them any element of the old Eastern Armenian “heresy.”⁹³ Moreover, five (religious) confraternities (*confraternitas, elbayrut'iwk'*) were founded for the community. The aim of this act was to strengthen the Armenians of Armenopolis in their daily religious life faithful to Rome.⁹⁴

Furthermore, Roszka described that their church dedicated to the Holy Annunciation (better known as the church of Solomon) had recently been built, consecrated by Bishop Antalffy himself in 1726, but it had already become clear that this church building was too small for the Armenian community, and in due time they would have to build a new and larger church. Roszka also reported that at that time he had a conflict over the Armenian rite between Bishop Sorger and Michál Minas Theodorowicz, parish priest of Armenopolis. Roszka defended the priest from Armenopolis, saying that the Armenian Uniates are not heretics and are doing their duty according to the correct Catholic faith. In addition, Bishop Roszka expressed concern that there are very few Armenian Catholic priests and that the Armenian College in Lviv and Propaganda Fide should put more emphasis upon the supply of well-educated and highly educated clerics in Transylvania. Finally, he continued to be concerned about the religious intolerance committed by the Roman Catholic Bishopric of Transylvania against the Armenians.⁹⁵

Subsequently, in September of 1729, Bishop Roszka left Armenopolis and arrived in Ibaşfalău. The religious situation in the settlement was very tense at that time, because a year earlier, taking advantage of the death of Bishop Antalffy in the meantime, with the blessing of Propaganda Fide, the Mechitarist Order had settled in the town. One of the most important tasks of the monastic community, besides its unwavering faith in Rome, was to nurture and preserve the Armenian culture and language.⁹⁶ The Founder-Abbot Mxit'ar Sebastac'i C.A.M. (1675–1749) sent one of his faithful men, Yovhannēs Yohanean C.A.M. from Venice, the centre of the monastic order, to Transylvania to lead the newly-founded abbey there.

93. GYFL I/4. vol. 3, fol. 109r–111v.

94. GYFL I/4. vol. 3, fol. 108r-v.

95. APF SOCG. vol. 656, fol. 427v–428r; GYFL I.1a. (1725) no. 5, pag. 30; GYFL I.1a. (1733) no. 21, pag. 49; GYFL I.1a. (1733) no. 26, pag. 50; GYFL. I/4. vol. 2, pag. 148; GYFL I/4. vol. 3, fol. 93r–98v, fol. 111v–112r.

96. APF SC FA. vol. 5, fol. 69r-v, fol. 125r-v, fol. 153r-v; Rđšk'ay 1964, pp. 192–193.

The reason for the settlement of the Mechitarists in Ibaşfalău was clear, since the death of Oxendio Virziresco, especially from the already mentioned reports of their confrere, Xač'atur Arak'elian, they knew exactly how much pressure the Armenian Catholics in Transylvania were under and lived. However, their appearance attracted the displeasure and anger of the Latin rite Catholics in Transylvania, and, in 1729, Bishop Sorger also protested against the Mechitarists' settlement in Transylvania at the Apostolic Holy See in Rome.⁹⁷ Another reason for the tense religious situation in Ibaşfalău was that Hungarian Roman Catholic families settled in Ibaşfalău from Moldavia around 1724. Soon, they founded an independent parish and, with the effective support of Bishop Antalffy, they started building a church.⁹⁸ The local Armenians feared that by settling Latin Rite Catholics, the denominational proportions of the settlement would change to their detriment. As a result, by the end of the 1720s, the situation between Uniate Armenians and Catholic Hungarians became very tense.⁹⁹

In any case, Bishop Roszka was received with great joy by the Mechitarists, and together with Abbot Yovhannēs Yohanean they visited the Armenians of Ibaşfalău, Roszka wrote that the city of Ibaşfalău, similarly to Armenopolis, had recently received their privileges from the Viennese court, in which the above-mentioned Minas Barun, who was in Vienna at that time, also played a very important role. Indeed, according to the sources, he acted as a good Catholic and a mediator among the negotiators.¹⁰⁰ At the same time, in Ibaşfalău, signs of heresy and schism, objected to by the Roman Catholic Bishopric of Transylvania, were neither found nor experienced in relation to their ecclesiastical and religious

97. JTMRL V/1, No. 1740/II, pag. 97; GYFL I.1a. (1753) no. 19, pag. 118; GYFL I.1a. (1772) no. 271, pag. 442; GYFL I.1a. (1772) no. 337, pag. 446; Fokolean 1985, pp. 267–293; Kovács 2012, pp. 70, 73–76.

98. APF ASC. vol. 98, fol. 513r-v; APF ASC. vol. 99, fol. 9v–10v, fol. 534r; APF SOCG. vol. 662, fol. 254r-v; APF SOCG. vol. 663, fol. 19r-v; APF SOCG. vol. 666, fol. 228r + fol. 231v; APF LDSC. vol. 126, fol. 84r–85v; APF LDSC. vol. 128, pag. 131–134; APF SC FA. vol. 9, fol. 126r, fol. 129r.

99. APF ASC. vol. 95, fol. 49v–50r; APF ASC. vol. 96, fol. 143v–144r; APF SOCG. fol. 646, fol. 143r; APF SOCG. vol. 664, fol. 53r, 54r–59v; APF SOCG. vol. 691, fol. 275r-v + fol. 276v; APF LDSC. vol. 119, fol. 21v–22v, fol. 320r-v; APF LDSC. vol. 123, fol. 276r–277r.

100. APF SC FA. vol. 9, fol. 250r, fol. 351r; GYFL I/4. vol. 3, fol. 117v–119r; MNL-OLA 57. vol. 53, no. 279a, pag. 431–436.

practices. Roszka and Yohanean also reported on their stone-church, currently under construction, built with financial supports and donations given by the Armenian community of Ibaşfalău, the Mechitarists, and, the Propaganda Fide. It also turned out that the Bishopric led by Antalffy and Sorger did not financially or morally support the construction of the church, and even tried to hinder it.¹⁰¹

During Bishop Roszka's stay in Ibaşfalău, together with Abbot Yovhannēs Yohanean, they drafted a memorandum composed of 15 points, dated on 3rd of October 3 in 1729, which was sent to Lviv, to the Armenian Catholic Archdiocese, and Rome, to the Cardinals of Propaganda Fide, and also to Alba Iulia, centre of the Roman Catholic Bishopric of Transylvania.¹⁰² Roszka, together with Abbot Yovhannēs Yohanean, proposed that Armenians in Transylvania should also adopt the statutes of the Armenian Catholic Archdiocesan Council of Lviv in 1689.¹⁰³ After all, they were put into practice in the territory of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, and they were also adopted by the Mechitarists founded in 1701. At the same time, the decisions of this council were not adopted by the Armenians of Transylvania, even though in 1689 Oxendio Virziresco, who was only leading the mission at that time, was invited to the archdiocesan council.¹⁰⁴ The document drafted by Roszka and Abbot Yovhanean also included the use of the Classical Armenian language, Holy Communion (Eucharist) and the calendar, the veneration of Armenian saints, the adoption of fasting customs in the Latin Church, etc. Finally, together with Roszka and Abbot Yovhanean, he established five (religious) confraternities, also with the aim of consolidating the religious life of the local Armenian Catholics.¹⁰⁵

Subsequently, Bishop Roszka left for Gheorgheni in November 1729. He also stated during his visitation that the local Armenian Uniate community was firmly Catholic loyal to Rome and that the two priests who ministered there were very theologically qualified, and that their faithful, along with the clergy, did not indulge in any heretical or schismatic

101. APF SOCG. vol. 652, fol. 191r-v; APF SOCG. vol. 661, fol. 209v; APF LDSC. vol. 126, fol. 16r-v; GYFL I/4. vol. 1, pag. 259–269.

102. APF SC FA. vol. 9, fol. 597r–598r + fol. 604v.

103. APF ASC. 59. fol. 83r; APF SOCG. vol. 504, fol. 104r-v; APF CP. vol. 29, fol. 629r, fol. 638r; APF SC FA. vol. 4, fol. 124r-v, fol. 125r-v, fol. 128r-v, fol. 130r, fol. 148r-v; AAV ANVAR. vol. 107, fol. 151r–152v, fol. 514r–515v.

104. APF SC FAM. vol. 14, fol. 1r-v.

105. GYFL I/4. vol. 3, fol. 99r–101v, fol. 101v–107r.

practices.¹⁰⁶ Their stone-church was still under construction, and until then they had held their liturgy in a chapel. Similarly to his visits to Armenopolis and Ibaşfalău, he founded two (religious) confraternities for Armenians in the city.¹⁰⁷ However, according to the current state of research, Bishop Roszka did not visit to Frumoasa (Csíkszépvíz, Sipvizi; present-day in Romania) during his visitation.¹⁰⁸

These events were not received with great enthusiasm by Bishop Sorger, and between 1729 and 1733 he constantly complained that an Armenian Catholic clergyman (i.e. Roszka) and a Mechitarist monk continued to favour heretical and schismatic church practices and encouraged Transylvanian Armenians to do so. According to the Bishop Sorger, the Propaganda Fide had always supported them in their “horrible” activities, both financially and morally. The most important objection on Bishop Sorger’s part was the use of Classical Armenian language in Holy Masses and the Calendar. He also expressed indignation that the decrees of the “heretical” Council of Lviv of 1689 were intended to be introduced among the Armenians in Transylvania.¹⁰⁹ However, the Propaganda Fide did not take this seriously and emphasised in letters addressed to Bishop Sorger that Armenians in Transylvania do not practice any heretical customs or rites and are true believers in Catholicism. And, this was confirmed by several written reports and relations received from Transylvania.¹¹⁰

106. GYFL I.1a. (1731) no. 10, pag. 41; GYFL I/4. vol. 7, pag. 262–263, pag. 265–266.

107. GYFL I/4. vol. 3, fol. 124r.

108. There are contradictory data in the documents regarding the Armenian community of Frumoasa. During his visitation in 1726, Bishop John Antalffy reported on 22 Armenian families living in the city. Other documents described it as an uninhabited and ruined settlement. The reason for the latter was “due” to the Crimean Tatar invasion of 1694, when the settlement was destroyed during their raid. Many Armenians were dragged away and killed. The survivors fled to Ibaşfalău and Gheorgheni. APF ASC. vol. 64, fol. 21v–22r; APF SOCG. vol. 517, fol. 102r-v, fol. 103r; APF SOCG. vol. 518, fol. 66r-v + fol. 69v; APF SOCG. vol. 661, fol. 217r, fol. 219r-v; APF CP. vol. 31, fol. 390r-v; APF LDSC. vol. 83, fol. 44r-v; APF SC FA. vol. 4, fol. 287r-v, fol. 325r-v; AAV ANV. vol. 196, fol. 148v–149r; ARSI FAH. vol. 152, fol. 18r-v; GYFL I/4. vol. 3, fol. 126v, fol. 127r.

109. APF SOCG. vol. 670, fol. 291r-v; APF SOCG. vol. 670a, fol. 23r-v, fol. 24r-v, fol. 25r-v + fol. 26v.

110. APF LDSC. vol. 132, fol. 244r–245r; APF LDSC. vol. 135, fol. 135r–136r; APF LDSC. vol. 137, fol. 194r-v, fol. 237r–239r.

In connection with Roszka's visitation in Transylvania, the issue of Armenian Catholic liturgical books was also discussed. In his reports, Roszka wrote in several places that the Armenian Catholic parishes in Transylvania suffered greatly from lack of liturgical books. In this connection, it is important to mention that the Roszka was himself a famous collector of books, and during his ecclesiastical ministry in Lviv, Rome, and Stanyslaviv he acquired a considerable private collection. Most of these were Armenian Catholic prints from Rome and Venice, as well as Bibles and missals. At the same time, Roszka had several Bibles (*Astuacašunč*) and Gospels (*Awetaran*), Missals (*Pataragatetr*) and Lectionaries (*Čašoc*), as well as Books of Divine Service (*Kargaworut'iw*) in Classical Armenian but in the Catholic spirit. Being well-informed about the dire religious situation of the Armenians in Transylvania, during his visitation, he brought several books and gave them to the Armenian Catholic parishes. However, Bishop Sorger objected to this, saying that Armenians in Transylvania should use liturgical books written exclusively in Latin and not heretical ones written in Armenian.¹¹¹ In essence, Bishop Sorger was referring to his desire to impose uniformly the use of the Latin missal and the celebration of Holy Mass in Latin upon the Armenians, which obviously led to further conflict with the community and Propaganda Fide. However, despite this objection, Armenians continued to use Armenian because, ignoring Bishop Sorger's protests, the Propaganda Fide allowed them to use these liturgical books.¹¹²

In any case, it is a fact that Roszka's presence and activities in Transylvania were considered dangerous for the Roman Catholic Bishopric of Transylvania. They feared that Roszka could actually become the Apostolic Vicar and Uniate Bishop of the Armenians in Transylvania (*vicario apostolico e vescovo degl'Armeni Uniti in Transilvania*), which would spread again the alleged heresy in the community. Bishop Roszka himself was forced to face this rumour, and at the very beginning of 1730s he returned to Stanyslaviv despite the pleading requests of the Armenian Catholic faithful in Transylvania. One of the reasons for his departure was clearly that he did not want to add to the already tense situation with Bishop Sorger. The other reason was his failing health, as he was almost 60 years old at that time, and we know from sources that Bishop Roszka

111. APF SC FA. vol. 9, fol. 579/r-v.

112. Nagy 2017, p. 207–210.

had been also suffering from severe gout-disease (*gotta, artrita, arthritis*) since years.¹¹³

At the same time, Roszka informed the Apostolic Nunciature to Vienna and Warsaw, and, of course, the Propaganda Fide about his visitation, his experiences and impressions in Transylvania.¹¹⁴ In his letters sent to the Apostolic Holy See, he expressed very dismal criticisms of Bishop Sorger's relations with the Armenians of Transylvania in his reports dated on 15th of February in 1730. In these letters sent to Rome, Roszka described that he had established religious confraternities with the intention of strengthening and organising Armenians in their Catholic (Uniate) faith because of the constant attacks coming from the Roman Catholic Bishopric of Transylvania, and even for this reason he helped to draft these founding documents. He also mentioned the late Bishop Oxendio Virziresco, about whom he wrote that although he initially acted as a supporter of the Latin rite in Transylvania, over time Roszka realised that the recent situation of the Armenians in Transylvania proved unsatisfactory from a religious and confessional point of view, moreover, he considered it very critical. Further on, he also rightly recognised at that time that Armenians could survive in Transylvania only if they were not harassed in their Armenian Catholic religious practice and finally filled their Titular Bishopric's office. Roszka also added that if a Bishop were not appointed or the Armenian Catholic rite were not allowed, Armenian culture would wither away in Transylvania, and they would eventually assimilate into the Catholic Hungarians.¹¹⁵ The latter has not happened since the death of the afore-mentioned Bishop Oxendio Virziresco, and Roszka considered it very untenable. Therefore, the Roman Catholic Bishopric of Transylvania should not be allowed to extend its ecclesiastical jurisdiction to the Armenians, because, mentioned again and again in his report addressed to Rome, it considered it extremely fatal for them, i.e. it could lead to their actual assimilation. Finally, in his letters, he repeatedly emphasised that Armenians had not

113. APF SC FA. vol. 9, fol. 250r-v, fol. 251r-252r, fol. 475r-v, fol. 597r-598v + fol. 604r-v.

114. APF ASC. vol. 99, fol. 278r, fol. 281r-v, fol. 333v-334r, fol. 491r; APF ASC. vol. 101, fol. 427r-v, fol. 429r-v; APF ASC. vol. 102, fol. 120r; APF ASC. vol. 103, fol. 481v-483v.

115. APF SOCG. vol. 664, fol. 129r-v + fol. 130v, fol. 504r-v + fol. 505v, fol. 530r + fol. 531v; APF SC FA. vol. 9, fol. 595r-v.

been heretics under any circumstances since the end of the 17th century. He did not experience apostasy among them. He also considered this to be a fabrication of the Roman Catholic Bishopric in Transylvania, which was used as a pretext against the Armenians. Roszka also wrote that during his visitation, Bishop Sorger constantly harassed him with his clergymen and did everything possible to drive him out of Transylvania. At the very end of his lengthy letters sent to Rome, Roszka decidedly and repeatedly drew the attention of the Propaganda Fide to the fact that there are very few priests among the Armenians in Transylvania, and most of them are already in old age. He, therefore, asked the Propaganda Fide to pay greater attention to the supply of qualified Armenian Catholic priests.¹¹⁶

In July of 1730, Roszka wrote another letter about his church-visit to Transylvania. He reported that after his visitation he had received letters from the Armenian Catholic clergy in Transylvania on several occasions. In these letters sent by the priests to him, they asked him personally to convey, through his excellent contacts with the Apostolic Holy See, their need for a true Bishop in Transylvania, and in this the position of the whole community remains firm and determined. Therefore, Roszka complied, and informed Rome.¹¹⁷

Moreover, Girolamo Grimaldi, Apostolic Nuncio to Vienna and Camillo Paolucci-Merlini (1692–1763), Apostolic Nuncio to Warsaw (later on in Vienna), similarly wrote letters to the Propaganda Fide in the autumn of 1730. The content of their letters was crystal-clear: the Propaganda Fide, as the superior ecclesiastical authority of the Armenians in Transylvania, should give priority to the issue of Episcopal appointment.¹¹⁸ Two years later, Paolucci-Merlini, Apostolic Nuncio to Warsaw, reported in his letters sent to Rome that he exchanged letters with Roszka on several occasions concerning the ecclesiastical case of the Armenians in Transylvania between 1730 and 1732. He also described that regardless of Roszka's information, he learned about the unhappy and miserable religious situation among the Armenians in Transylvania.

116. APF SOCG. vol. 670, fol. 773r-v + fol. 776v; APF SOCG. vol. 670a, fol. 13r, fol. 14r + fol. 16v; APF CU. vol. 5, fol. 29r, fol. 52v–53r, fol. 137r–138v, fol. 153r + fol. 154v, fol. 290r, fol. 477r, fol. 479r, fol. 493r + fol. 494v; GYFL I/4. vol. 3, fol. 124r–125r.

117. GYFL I/4. vol. 3, fol. 125v.

118. GYFL I/4. vol. 3, fol. 126r, fol. 126r-v.

Therefore, he asked the Propaganda Fide to speed up the process of appointing as a bishop. Nuncio Paolucci-Merlini believed that solving this problem as soon as possible could remedy and, at the same time, stabilise the religious situation of the Armenians in Transylvania.¹¹⁹

The news of the reports written by Roszka and Paolucci-Merlini, Apostolic Nuncio to Warsaw reached Alba Iulia, centre of the Roman Catholic Bishopric of Transylvania, in the autumn of 1730. Bishop Sorger reflected on what he said in a very indignant and personal letter to the Propaganda Fide. He called Roszka a liar because he wanted to discredit him before the Apostolic Holy See's authorities with his alleged accusations, indicating that he was in fact completely unfit to perform his office. According to him, Nuncio Paolucci-Merlini was misled and misinformed by Roszka. He maintained the opinion expressed by him and his predecessors (constantly proclaimed and repeated) that Armenians in Transylvania were not Catholics of the true faith, and that their Uniate rite had always been a hotbed and latent germ of Monophysite heresy.¹²⁰ In his point of view, this is what must be relentlessly weeded out of the "Lord's vineyard" (*ab vinea Domini*), that is, from the territory of his diocese. He also informed the Propaganda Fide that as long as he was at the head of the Transylvanian diocese, there would be no bishop or pastor of the Transylvanian Armenians. If it were up to him, then all Armenians would be true Latin-rite Catholics.¹²¹

The Propaganda Fide did not respond to the Bishop Sorger's personal letter in substance, nor did it deal with it in depth. The Congregation was aware of the real situation in Transylvania through other information channels, and Roszka's findings contained neither slips nor falsehoods. In any case, between 1732 and 1733, the Propaganda Fide was already looking for a suitable candidate as a Titular Bishop of the Armenians in Transylvania. Moreover, the leadership of the Propaganda Fide counted on the person of Roszka himself regarding this office.¹²²

Moreover, in 1732, at a General Session of the Apostolic Holy See's Missionary Institute, chaired by Cardinal-Prefect Vincenzo Petra (1662–1747) and General Secretary Niccolò Forteguerra (1674–1735),

119. APF SOCG. vol. 673, fol. 191r + fol. 192v, fol. 291r-v.

120. APF SC FA. vol. 9, fol. 474r-v.

121. APF SC FA. vol. 9, fol. 596r-v.

122. APF SC FA. vol. 9, fol. 601r.

the Propaganda Fide decided to contact Roszka again on this matter and, furthermore, initiate his appointment as a Titular Bishop of the Armenians in Transylvania with Pope Clement XII (1730–1740). In any case, they wanted to ask Roszka to return to Transylvania after careful consideration and take over the ecclesiastical office of the late Bishop Oxendio Virziresco. Of course, the Roman Catholic Bishopric of Transylvania led by Bishop Gregory Sorger did not want to hear about this.¹²³

However, Roszka indicated that due to his failing health, he would be reluctant to accept this honourable candidacy. He certainly considered a younger Armenian Catholic clergyman with even stronger ties to Transylvania to be suitable for this very important ecclesiastical office. On the one hand, he justified this by the fact that the relationship between him and Bishop Sorger was basically very bad and strained during his stay in Transylvania. On the other hand, Archbishop Augustynowicz continued to count on his work as a Vicar and Provost despite his excruciating gout-disease. In addition, he emphasised to the Archbishop of Lviv that he did not want to hear about his possible candidacy for Bishop in Transylvania. Finally, he concluded his letter with two suggestions. First, the Propaganda Fide should provide greater financial support and send Armenian Catholic books from Rome to the Armenian Uniate Church in Transylvania. Secondly, regarding the Bishopric's office, Roszka proposed the candidacy of Michál Minas Theodorowicz, the parish-priest of Armenopolis who was at least two decades younger than him.¹²⁴ Despite the fact that, due to his birth in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, he had been serving as a priest in Transylvania for a long time, Roszka spoke in favour of his person. It is true, he added in his written proposal sent to Rome, Theodorowicz made a mistake at the time by attacking in the back Minas Barun, the Armenian Catholic missionary delegated by of the Propaganda Fide, in the 1720s, together with the Roman Catholic Bishopric of Transylvania, which was fundamentally hostile to Armenians. But, in his point of view, Theodorowicz made up for this damage by defending the Armenian Uniate rite all along, which he experienced several times during his visitation.¹²⁵

123. APF ASC. vol. 102, fol. 362r.

124. APF LDSC. vol. 135, fol. 239r; APF SC FA. vol. 9, fol. 475r-v, fol. 596r-v.

125. APF LDSC. vol. 135, fol. 237r–238r, fol. 238r-v, fol. 238v–239v; APF LDSC. vol. 204, fol. 465v–466v; APF SC FA. vol. 13, fol. 258r; APF SC FA. vol. 14, fol. 179r-v; GYFL I.1a. (1733) no. 26, pag. 50; Nagy 2023a, pp. 442, 449–454.

Aware of the contents of these documents, Camillo Paolucci-Merlini, Apostolic Nuncio to Warsaw, also wrote a report to Rome. In his letter, he agreed with Stefan Stefanowicz Roszka's insights and asked the Propaganda Fide to heed Roszka's thoughts and suggestions regarding Armenians in Transylvania.¹²⁶ At the same time, in 1733, the Propaganda Fide itself tried one last time to persuade Roszka to return to Transylvania, and even his immediate superior, Archbishop Augustynowicz, after effective consultations with the Propaganda Fide, was already inclined to accept this decision, but Roszka again refused to accept his nomination as a Bishop of the Armenians in Transylvania for the reasons mentioned above. Nevertheless, he continued to propose the person of Michál Minas Theodorowicz as a would-be Bishop.¹²⁷

Finally, at two successive General Sessions held in the autumn of 1733, the Propaganda Fide discussed Roszka's visitation and his candidacy for Armenian Catholic Bishop in Transylvania. The religious situation of the Armenians in Transylvania and their contradictory relationship with the Roman Catholic Bishopric of Transylvania were thoroughly analysed again. They took note of the decision of Roszka not to assume this position, and therefore began to examine Theodorowicz's candidacy and his suitability. However, other candidates for this ecclesiastical office were also sought in Rome from among members of the Armenian Catholic clergy in Transylvania.¹²⁸ At the same time, it is an undeniable fact that during this period the Propaganda Fide showed great determination to finally fill the office of Armenian Catholic Bishopric in Transylvania, which had been vacant for more than a decade and half. In light of this, the relationship between the Propaganda Fide and the Roman Catholic Bishopric of Transylvania with its prelate, Bishop Sorger, remained very cold and full of tensions in the 1730s.¹²⁹

126. APF SC FA. vol. 9, fol. 595r-v.

127. APF ASC. vol. 103, fol. 245r; APF LDSC. vol. 137, fol. 27r-29r.

128. APF ASC. vol. 107, fol. 300r-302r; APF SOCG. vol. 691, fol. 275r-v + fol. 276v; APF SOCG. vol. 708, fol. 364r-366v, fol. 373r, fol. 374r-375r, fol. 383r-v; APF LDSC. vol. 135, fol. 237r-238r, fol. 238r-v, fol. 238v-239r; APF LDSC. vol. 147, fol. 239v-241v; APF SC FA. vol. 10, fol. 284r-v, fol. 299r, fol. 377r, fol. 388r-v + fol. 389v; APF SC FA. vol. 11, fol. 27r; GYFL I/4. vol. 3, fol. 100v.

129. APF ASC. vol. 103, fol. 481v-483v, fol. 564r-566v; APF LDSC. vol. 137, fol. 110v-111r, fol. 194r-v, fol. 237r-239r.

After that, Stefan Stefanowicz Roszka did not deal with Transylvanian Armenians in any meaningful way. Of course, he continued to look at their problem with concern, but he was very confident in the effective decision of the Propaganda Fide to solve the matter. He spent the rest of his life serving in the Church, teaching and writing his historical work.¹³⁰ Roszka passed away on 31st of October 31 in 1739, in the 70th year of his life. He was buried in the crypt of the Armenian Catholic Parish Church dedicated to the Holy Trinity in Stanyslaviv. In his person, the Armenian Catholic Church lost a clergyman of great authority and education.¹³¹

To sum up, the old (scholarly) literature on the history of Armenians in Transylvania remembered Stefan Stefanowicz Roszka as the one who finally weeded out the seeds of heresy and schismatism among the Armenians in Transylvania, and thus successfully converted them to the faith of Rome.¹³² In contrast, recently uncovered archival documents reported something completely different. It is known precisely from Roszka's reports that, in the 1720s and 1730s, the Armenians in Transylvania were not heretics at all, nor did they need to be converted to Rome again. In fact, at that time, the Armenians of Transylvania were already Christians of the Catholic faith, who stubbornly adhered to their Armenian Catholic (Uniate) customs and rites, which were also accepted and authorised by the Apostolic Holy See. In fact, Roszka did not marginalise the Armenian heresy in Transylvania, nor did he proselytise them, but, on the contrary, he sought to stabilise and strengthen the Armenian Catholic Church against the increasingly violent, centralising efforts coming from the Roman Catholic Bishopric of Transylvania with a centre of the city Alba Iulia. In this way, he also earned the wrath of the Roman Catholic Bishopric of Transylvania. In fact, he was the first Armenian Catholic clergyman who recognised the danger that the then still alive ancient Armenian culture could wither away in Transylvania due to the (centralised) imposition of exaggerated Latinisation's church-policy and the vacancy of the Armenian Catholic Bishopric's office. He saw the survival of the Armenians in Transylvania as the only guarantee in the free exercise of the Armenian Catholic rite and the final filling of the (Titular)

130. Řošk'ay 1964, p. 202.

131. Mnacakanyan 2010, pp. 123–133; Mutaian 2018, p. 246; Agopsowicz 2019, pp. 59–60.

132. Petrowicz 1988, pp. 180–181.

Bishopric's office. Last but not least, through the activity of Msgr. Stefan Stefanowicz Roszka, the scholarship received an insight into the Armenians' denominational conditions in Transylvania in the first third of the 18th century, which is still regarded, more or less, as an undiscovered area from an international scholarly point of view.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archival Sources

Austria

BMK = Bibliothek des Mechitaristenklosters, Vienna.

BMK MS. = Manuscripta.

ÖSTA = Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, Vienna.

ÖSTA AVFHA = Allgemeines Verwaltungsarchiv Finanz- und Hofkammerarchiv.

ÖSTA AVFHA FAH. = Familienarchiv Harrach.

Hungary

ELTE EKK = Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem Egyetemi Könyvtár és Kézirattár [Loránd Eötvös State University's Library and Archive], Budapest

ELTE EKK CH. = Collectio Hevenesiana.

ELTE EKK, CK. B. = Collectio Kaprinayana. Második Sorozat [Second Series].

ELTE EKK G. = Historia. (Res Transylvanica.)

JTMRL = Jézus Társasága Magyarországi Rendtartományának Levéltára [Archive of the Jesuit/ Society of Jesus (Societas Iesu) Province in Hungary], Budapest.

JTMRL IV. = Lukácsi László SJ Rendentörténeti Gyűjtemény [Collection on the History of Jesuits Donated by Father Ladislaus (*László*) Lukács].

- JTMRL V/1. = Gyűjtemények–Rendtörténeti Gyűjtemény, *Litterae Annuae* – Fotómásolatok [Collections; Collections of Jesuits' History/*Litterae Annuae*; Photocopies].
- MNL-OL = Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár Országos Levéltára [Hungarian National Archive], Budapest
- MNL-OL A 57. = Magyar Kancellária Levéltára, Királyi Könyvek – Libri Regii [Hungarian Chancery's Archive, Royal Book-Registers – Libri Regii].
- MNL-OL B 2. = Erdélyi Kancelláriai Levéltár, *Acta Generalia* [Archive of Chancery of Transylvania – *Acta Generalia*].
- MNL-OL E 156 UC. REG. = Magyar Kamarai Archívum [Archive of Hungarian Chamber], *Urbaria et Conscriptiones. Registrata*.
- MNL-OL F 46. = Gubernium Transylvanicum Levéltára, Ügyiratok [Archive of the Governorship in Transylvania, Files and Actes].
- MNL-OL F 234. = Erdélyi Fiscalis Levéltár [Fiscal Archive of Transylvania].
- PL = Prímási Levéltár [Primate's Archive], Esztergom (Strigonie)
- PL AEV = Archivum Ecclesiasticum Vetus.
- PL AEV ARER. = *Acta Religionario – Ecclesiastica et Religionaria*
- PL AEV SPSZ. = Sub Primatae Széchenyi.
- PL AEV SPKOLL. = Sub Primatae Kollonich.
- PL AEV SPKER. = Sub Primatae Keresztély.

Italy

- AGT = Archivio Generale dei Teatini, Rome
- AGT CL. = Collegio di Leopoli.
- APMV = Archivio dei Padri Mechitaristi di Venezia, Venice
- APMV MS. = Manuscripta.
- APF = Archivio storico della Sacra Congregazione per l'Evangelizzazione dei Popoli o de „Propaganda Fide”, Rome
- APF Acta SC. = *Acta Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide*
- APF CP. = Congregazioni Particolari.
- APF CU. = Collegio Urbano.
- APF CV. = Collegi Vari.

- APF FV. = Fondo di Vienna.
- APF GIUR. = Giuramento dell'Alunni di Collegio Urbano.
- APF ID. = Istruzioni Diverse.
- APF IND. = Indice per località degli atti di rito Orientale S. C.
- APF LDSC. = Lettere e Decreti della Sacra Congregazione.
- APF SC FA = Scritture riferite nei Congressi. Fondo Armeni.
- APF SC FAM. = Scritture riferite nei Congressi. Fondo Armeni. Miscellanea.
- APF SC FM. = Scritture riferite nei Congressi. Fondo Moldavia.
- APF SC FMPR. = Scritture riferite nei Congressi. Fondo Moscovia, Polonia, Rutheni.
- APF SC FGCDSTU. = Scritture riferite nei Congressi. Fondo Greci di Croazia, Dalmazia, Schiavonia, Transilvania ed Ungheria.
- APF SC FUT. = Scritture riferite nei Congressi. Fondo Ungheria e Transilvania.
- APF SOCG. = Scritture Originali riferite nelle Congregazioni Generali.
- ARSI = Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu, Rome
- ARSI FAH. = Fondo Austria. Historia.

Romania

- GYFL = Gyulafehérvári Főegyházmegyei Levéltár [Archive of Roman Catholic Archdioces in Alba Iulia], Alba Iulia (*Gyulafehérvár*)
- GYFL I.1a. = Püspöki iratok/ Iktatókönyvek, 1222–1778 (Bishopric Actes and Files, 1222–1778).
- GYFL I/4. = Egyházlátogatási Könyvek – Canonica Visitationes (Canonic Visitationes).

Vatican

- AAV = Archivio Apostolico Vaticano, Vatican City
- AAV ANVAR. = Archivio della Nunziatura in Varsavia.
- AAV ANV. = Archivio della Nunziatura in Vienna.
- AAV SSP. = Segreteria di Stato. Polonia.
- ACDF = Archivio della Congregazione per la Dottrina della Fede, Vatican City
- ACDF ST. = Stanza Storica.

Printed Sources

- ACTA, 2009. = *Acta Nuntiaturae Poloniae. Tomus XLIII. Benedictus Odelaschi-Erba (1711–1713). Vol. 1. (5 IX 1711–31 XII 1712)*. Ed. Józef Andrzej Gierowski – Jan Kopiec. Cracoviae, 2009.
- BŽŠKEANC‘ 2019. = *Der Reisebericht des Minas Bžškeanc‘ über die Armenier im Östlichen Europa (1830)*.
- Hrsg. Bálint Kovács – Grigor Grigoryan. Wien–Köln–Weimar, 2019. (Armenier im Östlichen Europa – Armenians in Eastern Europe, Vol. 5.)
- HC, 1952. = *Hierarchia Catholica medii et recentioris aevi*. Ed. Remigius Ritzler – Pirminius Sefrin O. F. M. Conv. Vol. 5. (1667–1730). Patavii, 1952.
- HC, 1958. = *Hierarchia Catholica medii et recentioris aevi*. Ed. Remigius Ritzler – Pirminius Sefrin O. F. M. Conv. Vol. 6. (1730–1799). Patavii, 1958.
- NILLES 1885. = *Symbolae ad illustrandam historiam ecclesia orientalis in terris Coronae Sancti Stephani*. Vol. 2. Ed. Nicholaus Nilles SJ. Oeniponte, 1885.
- ŘŮŠK‘AY, 1964. = *Step‘anosı ŖŮšk‘ay Žamanakagrowt‘ıwn kam tarekank‘ ekelec‘a-kank‘* [Chronology or An Ecclesiastical Annals]. Ašx. Hamazasp Anton Oskean. Vienna, 1964.

Internet source

<https://www.catholic-hierarchy.org/>

Secondary Literature

AGOPSOWICZ, Monika

- 2019 “Ormanie Kamienecy w Ostatniej ćwierci w XVII wieku. – Próba rekonstrukcji spisu imiennego [Armenians in Kamieniec-Podolski in the Last Quarter of the 17th Century. – An Attempt to Reconstruct the Census Records],” *Lehahayer – Czasopismo poświęcone dziejom Ormian Polskich*, 6 (2019), pp. 5–69.

BÁRÁNY, Lukács

- 1888 “Verzirescul Auxendius III,” *Arménia*, 4 (1888), No. 5, pp. 137–142.

BLAŽEJOVSKYJ, Dmytro

- 1975 *Ukrainian and Armenian Pontifical Seminaries of L’viv (1665–1784)* (Analecta OSBM, Series 2, Sectio 1, Vol. 29), Rome.

ÉBLE, Gábor

- 1915 *A szamosújvári Verzár család. Levéltári és anyakönyvi biteles adatok alapján* [History of the Verzár/Virziresco Family from Armenopolis. Based on Authentic Data from Archival Sources and Parish Registers], Budapest.

FOKOLEAN, Łukas

- 1985 "Mxit'ar Abbahayr ew T'ransilvanioy Mxit'arean Ařak'elowt'ean (1723–1736) [Abbot Mechitar and Mechitarists' Mission in Transylvania, 1723–1736]," *Bazmavēp*, 143 (1985), No. 3–4, pp. 267–293.

GALLA, Ferenc

- 2005 *Ferences misszionáriusok Magyarországon: a Királyságban és Erdélyben a 17–18. században* [Franciscan Missionaries in Hungary: in the Kingdom and Transylvania in the 17th and 18th Centuries], S.a.r. István Fazekas (Collectanea Vaticana Hungariae, Vol. 2), Budapest – Róma.

KÁLNOKY, Nathalie

- 2004 *Les constitutions et privilèges de la Noble Nation Sicule. Acculturation et maintien d'un système coutumier dans la Transylvanie médiévale*, (Publication de l'Institut Hongrois de Paris, Dissertationes, Vol. 2), Budapest – Paris – Szeged.

K'OLANĴYAN, Suren

- 1962 "Gerla hayak'alak'ə ev nra hayeren jeřagrerı žolovacown" [The Armenian City of Gherla and Its Collection of Armenian Manuscripts], *Banber Matenadarani*, 6 (1962), No. 2, pp. 499–531.

KOVÁCS, Bálint

- 2006a "Az erdélyi örmény katolikus egyház és a Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fide a 18. század első évtizedeiben" [The Armenian Catholic Church in Transylvania and the Sacred Congregation for Propagation of Faith in the First Decades of the 18th Century], in: *Örmény diaszpóra a Kárpát-medencében* [Armenian Diaspora in the Carpathian Basin], vol. 1, Szerk. Sándor Őze – Bálint Kovács, Piliscsaba, pp. 47–68.
- 2006b "Über Rom nach Siebenbürgen. Der armenische Missionar Minas Barun und die Siebenbürger armenische Kirche in den ersten Jahrzehnten des 18. Jahrhunderts," in: *Zeitschrift für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde*, 29 (2006), No. 1, pp. 18–24.
- 2007 "Az erdélyi örmények interregionális kapcsolatai a 17–18. Században [The Interregional Connections of the Armenians in Transylvania in the 17th and 18th Centuries]," in: *Örmény Diaszpóra a Kárpát-medencében* [Armenian Diaspora in the Carpathian Basin], vol. 2, Szerk. Sándor Őze – Bálint Kovács, Piliscsaba, pp. 29–46.
- 2008 "A galíciiai örmények hagyatéka Varsóban [The Legacy of Armenians of Galicia in Warsaw]," *Látó – Szépirodalmi Folyóirat*, 19 (2008), No. 4, pp. 53–66.

- 2012 “Az erzsébetvárosi örmény könyvtár” [The Armenian Library of Elisabethopolis], *Erdélyi Múzeum*, 74 (2012), No. 2, pp. 68–89.
- 2013 “Armenian Book Culture and Armenian Literary Treasures in the Carpathian Basin,” in: *Far away from Mount Ararat. Armenian Culture in the Carpathian Basin*, eds. Emese Pál – Bálint Kovács, Budapest, pp. 53–63.

LUKÁCSY, Christophorus

- 1859 *Historia Armenorum Transsilvaniae a primordiis usque nostram memoriam e fontibus et documentis antea ineditis elaborate*, Viennae.

MIHALIK, Vilmos Béla

- 2018 “A Szentszék és az erdélyi katolikus restauráció ügye. Illyés András erdélyi püspök kinevezési ügye” [The Apostolic Holy See and the Case of the Catholic Restoration in Transylvania: The Case of Andrew Illyés’s Appointment as a Diocesan Bishop in Transylvania], in: *Catholice reformare: a katolikus egyház a fejedelemség korában* [Catholice reformare: The Catholic Church during the Period of the Principality of Transylvania], Szerk. Dávid Diós – József Marton, Budapest – Kolozsvár, pp. 283–304.
- 2020 “Az erdélyi katolikus újjászerveződés ügye az 1690-es évek elején [The Case of the Catholic Restoration in Transylvania at the Beginning of the 1690’s],” in: *Reformer vagy lázadó? Bethlen Miklós és kora* [A Reformist or An Insurgent? Count Nicholas/Miklós Bethlen and His Age], Szerk. Ildikó Horn – Gyula Laczházi, Budapest, pp. 123–135.
- 2021 “A Szentszék magyarországi egyházpolitikája a 17. század végén [The Apostolic Holy See’s Church Policy in Hungary at the end of the 17th Century],” *Történelmi Szemle*, 63 (2021), No. 4, pp. 631–670.
- 2024 *The Ever-Reviving Phoenix. Jesuits in Hungary*, Leiden – Boston (MA).

MNACKANYAN, Piruz

- 2010 “Księga zgonów parafii ormiańskokatolickiej w Stanisławowie, 1715–1729 [The Book of Death of the Armenian Catholic Parish in Stanyslaviv/Stanisławów, 1715–1729],” *Lehahayer – Czasopismo poświęcone dziejom Ormian Polskich*, 1 (2010), pp. 123–133.
- 2020 “Swiadectwa o dawnej Polsce w źródłach ormiańskich. Współczesna wzmianka o Unii Lubelskiej” [Mentions of the Late Medieval and Early Modern Kingdom of Poland in the Armenian Sources. Contemporary Mentions of the Union of Lublin], in: *Unie Lubelska 1569 Roku i Unie w Europie środkowo-wschodniej* [The Union of Lublin of 1569 in Europe in the Memory of Posterity], Pod red. Jacek Krochmal, Warszawa, pp. 235–258.

MOLNÁR, Antal

- 2009 *Lehetetlen küldetés? Jezsuiták Erdélyben és Felső-Magyarországon a 16–17. században* [A Mission Impossible? Jesuits in Transylvania and Upper-Hungary in the 16th–17th Centuries] (TDI Könyvek, Vol. 8), Budapest.

MUTAFIAN, Claude

- 2018 *Le Saga des Arméniens de L'Ararat aux Carpates*, Paris.

NAGY, Kornél

- 2006 “Stefano Stefanowicz Roszka koadjutori kinvezése [Stefano Stefanowicz Roszka's Appointment as a Co-adjutor],” in: Örmény diaszpóra a Kárpát-medencében [Armenian Diaspora in the Carpathian Basin], vol. 1, Szerk. Sándor Óze – Bálint Kovács, Piliscsaba, pp. 39–46.
- 2010 “The Document *Fidelis Relatio* (1693) and the Armenians in Transylvania. (A Memorial about the Armenians' Church in Transylvania),” *Haigazian Armenological Review*, 30 (2010), pp. 379–394.
- 2012 *Az erdélyi örmények katolizációja (1685–1715)* [The Catholicisation of the Armenians in Transylvania, 1685–1715], (Magyar Történelmi Emlékek – Értekezések), Budapest.
- 2013 “The Church-Union of the Armenians in Transylvania: A Portrait of Uniate Bishop Oxendio Virziresco,” in: *Far away from Mount Ararat. Armenian Culture in the Carpathian Basin*, eds. Emese Pál – Bálint Kovács, Budapest, pp. 17–27.
- 2017 “Egy 17. századi örmény katolikus Breviárium az MTA Könyvtárának a Keleti Gyűjteményében [An Armenian Catholic Breviary from the 17th Century at the Oriental Collection of the Library of Hungarian Academy of Sciences],” *Magyar Könyvszemle*, 17 (2017), No. 2, pp. 197–212.
- 2020a *Lembergben kezdődött... Az örménykatolikus egyház születése* [It Began in Lemberg/ Lviv... Birth of the Armenian Catholic Church in Eastern Europe] (Collectanea Athanasiana, Studia I, vol. 12), Nyíregyháza.
- 2020b “The Foundation of Armenian (Ruthenian) College of Lviv (Lemberg) (1664–1681),” *Eastern Theological Journal*, 6 (2020), No. 1, pp. 35–75.
- 2020c “The History of Ecclesiastical Conflict within the Armenian Community of Transylvania (1697–1700). Bishop Oxendio Virziresco, and the ‘Elia Mendrul’ Case,” *Eastern Theological Journal*, 6 (2020), No. 2, pp. 179–221.
- 2021a “Konstantinápolyból Temesvárra. Minas Paronean örmény unitus misszionárius viszontagságai Erdélyben (1720–1738) [From Constantinople to Temesvár/Timișoara. Misfortunes of Minas Paronean

- (Barun), an Armenian Uniate Missionary, in Transylvania, 1720–1738],” *Történelmi Szemle*, 63 (2021), No. 3, pp. 427–457.
- 2021b “Xaçatur Aġak’ean OMech. (1666–1740) örmény unitus szerzetes-misszionárius erdélyi kapcsolatai, [The Transylvanian Relations of Xaçatur Aġak’ean OMech. (1666–1740),]” in: „...*Tanácsaid hűség és igazság.*” *Tisztelgő írárok Dienes István Professzor Úr 65. születésnapjára* [“Your Advice is Fidelity and Truth.” Tribute Writings to the 65th Anniversary of Professor István Dienes], szerk. Csorba Dávid – Szatmári Emília, vol. 1., (Reformáció Öröksége Könyvek; Vol. 7/1), Budapest – Sárospatak, pp. 293–322.
- 2021c *The Church-Union of the Armenians in Transylvania (1685–1715)*, (Refo500 Academic Studies = R5AS, Vol. 81), Göttingen.
- 2023a “„Egy füstbe ment terv.” Michál Minas Theodorowicz örmény unitus püspöki jelöltsége Erdélyben (1731–1742) [„A Plan Gone Up in Smoke.” Candidacy of Michál Minas Theodorowicz as an Armenian Uniate/Catholic Bishop in Transylvania, 1731–1742],” *Történelmi Szemle*, 63 (2023), No. 3, pp. 441–462.
- 2023b “Between Lwów and Rome. The Armenians in Transylvania and the Armenian Archeparchy of Lwów (1681–1691),” *Lehabayer – Czasopismo poświęcone dziejom Ormian Polskich*, 10 (2023), pp. 77–104.
- OBORNI, Teréz
- 2018 *Erdélyi országgyűlések a 16–17. században* [History of the Diets in Transylvania in the 16th and 17th Centuries], Budapest.
- PETROWICZ, Gregorio
- 1988 *La chiesa armena in Polonia e nei paesi limitrofi. Parte terza (1686–1954)* (Studia Ecclesiastica 17, Historica 10), Roma.
- SCHÜTZ, Edmund (Ödön)
- 1978 “The Stages of Armenian Settlements in the Crimea,” *Transcaucasia*, 2 (1978), pp. 116–135.
- SZIRTES, Zsófia
- 2021 “Kircheunion und Übergang im neu eroberten Siebenbürgen. Der Prozess von Gabriel Nagyszegi und János Sárosi,” in: *Neuaufbau im Donauraum nach der Türkenzeit. Tagungsband der internationalen Konferenz anlässlich der 300-jährigen Jubiläums des Friedens von Passarowitz*, Hrsg. von András Oross, (Publikationen der ungarischen Geschichtsforschung in Wien, Bd. 19), Wien, pp. 273–291.

TÓTH, István György

- 1998 "Az első székelyföldi katolikus népszámlálás. Szalinal István bosnyák ferences szerzetes jelentése 1638-ból [The First Catholic Census of Szeklerland in Transylvania. The Missionary Report by Stephen of Salina (*Giovanni da Salina*), A Franciscan Friar from Bosnia, in 1638.]" *Történelmi Szemle*, 40 (1998), No. 1, pp. 58–85.
- 2004 "A szaggatott kapcsolat. A Propaganda és a magyarországi missziók, 1622–1700 [The Connection Interrupted. The Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of Faith and the Catholic Missions in Hungary, 1622–1700]," *Századok*, 138 (2004), No. 6, pp. 843–892.

TRÓCSÁNYI, Zsolt

- 1983 "Transilvaniayi hayeri iravakan kac'owt'yownə Leopoldyan hrovar-taki šrjanowm (1690–1848) [The Legal Status of the Armenians in Transylvania during the Period of *Diploma Leopoldinum*, 1690–1848]," in: *Hay-hownagarakan patmakan ew mšakowyt'ayin kaperi patmowt'yownic'* [On the History of the Armenian-Hungarian Historical and Cultural Connections], Ašx. Vladimir Barxowdaryan – Antal Vörös, Erevan, pp. 168–271.

VANYÓ, Aladár Tihamér

- 1933 *Püspöki jelentések a Magyar Szent Korona országainak egyházmegyéiről, 1600–1815* [Bishopric Relations on the Countries of the Hungarian Saint Crown, 1600–1815] (Olaszországi Magyar Oklevéltár, Vol. 2), Pannonhalma.

ZIMMERMANN, Harald

- 1996 "Die deutsch–ungarischen Beziehungen in der Mittedes 12. Jahrhunderts und die Berufung der Siebenbürger Sachsen," in: *Siebenbürgen und seine Hospites Theutonici. Vorträge und Forschungen zur südost-deutschen Geschichte*, Hrsg. von Konrad Gündisch, (Schriften zur Landeskunde Siebenbürgens, Bd. 20), Wien, pp. 83–101.

