

## Capítulo 2

# Dominicans in Hungary in Relation to the Sovereign and the State Authority in the 18th Century

VILIAM ŠTEFAN DÓCI, O.P.\*

### **Background: the Habsburg Church-State policy**

The *Princeps in Compendio*, published in 1632 as a “speculum principum” on behalf of the Holy Roman Emperor Ferdinand II (1619-1637), states that the most important duty of the prince is the promotion of Catholic worship. This “protection and promotion of the Catholic religion was achieved by preventing the infiltration of heresies and by the effort to introduce the true faith publicly or secretly, or by any means, where it did not exist, in order to unite all the sheep which were entrusted to the prince into one sheepfold and under one Shepherd.” According to Gottlieb Eucharius Rinck, the biographer of the Emperor Leopold I (1657-1705), this publication was a government manual for the ruler (Coreth, 1982, pp. 9-10).

---

\* Investigador del Instituto Histórico de la Orden de Predicadores en Roma, Italia.

The Dominicans in Hungary had positive experiences working with the Emperor/King Leopold I<sup>1</sup>. He promoted the reintroduction of the Dominican Order in Hungary, which had been underway since the 1630s following the de facto termination of the previous *Provincia Hungariae* in 1611<sup>2</sup>. An excellent example of the ruler promoting the re-establishment of the monasteries is found in the eastern Slovak city of Košice, the former metropolis of Upper Hungary (Lat. Cassovia, Hung. Kassa, Germ. Kaschau) in 1698, which took place despite the strong resistance of the town magistrate and would have been impossible without special support from Leopold. In this regard, all decisions must be seen in the context of the Emperor's Re-Catholicization efforts<sup>3</sup>. At least implicitly, there was an expectation of a return of the favor connected to these efforts. The Dominicans had to serve the state political aims of Leopold through their pastoral activity (Dóci, 2014, pp. 27-31).

The re-establishment of the Hungarian province occurred in 1700. Thanks to the approval of Leopold I and after decades of effort, the Inner Austrian convents were able to separate from the Teutonia and to associate with the re-established or newly erected Hungarian convents in the revived Province Hungaria. An important argument for the brothers who were striving for the restoration of the province was that the re-establishment of Catholicism in the Kingdom of Hungary was useful for the state: although the country had been recaptured from the Ottomans, in religious matters it remained a devastated province. Hungary was, so to say, an ecclesiastical field that had to be carefully cultivated, cleaned of weed and brought to fertility by the Dominicans like farmers (*Collectanea Conventus Cremsensis*, cit. by Frank, 1973,

---

1 Members of the House of Habsburg had dominated over Hungary as Kings of Hungary continuously since 1526. The Kingdom was never part of the Holy Roman Empire.

2 On the observation regarding the termination of the province made by the contemporary Dominican Sigismund Ferrarius (†1646) see his opus *De Rebus Hungaricae Provinciae*, (1637), pp. 598-599.

3 On the Emperor's Counter-Reformation and Re-Catholicization policy, see (Evans, 1986, pp. 99-121).

p. 331, n. 126). On January 14, 1702 by an imperial intervention, the Master of the Order Antonin Cloche incorporated the convents of Tyrol, Lower Austria and Upper Austria into the Austro-Hungarian province. The name, which the Master of the Order used in the decree of incorporation, *Provincia Austriaco-Hungarica*, would have been better suited; particularly with respect to the larger number of Austrian convents and because of the numerous Austrian brothers who were active in the Hungarian convents. Nevertheless, at the recommendation of the Master of the Order they remained by the name *Provincia Hungariae* in order to keep possession of the privileges of the former province, one of the oldest provinces of the Order.<sup>4</sup> In regards to the effort of the ruler in this second case, it suited his political interests to build a strong and unified state structure in every respect (Frank, 1973, p. 339).

Leopold's successors also were directed according to the principle of the early modern church-state theory that the ruler holds authority over the Church (*potestas circa corpus Christi reale*; Frank, 1978, pp. 5960). They regulated the affairs of the Church directly or through their representatives. Depending on whether the state decrees regarding the Church, her institutions and communities were advantageous or not, this regulation was perceived positively or negatively by the Church. Even significant protests against the decrees occurred. The state intervention in the life of the Church by the Habsburg monarchy intensified during the reign of Maria Theresa (1740-1780)<sup>5</sup>. They acted according to the principle established by Councillor Franz Joseph von Heinke: "The prince is entrusted with his power solely from God, with which the intellectual property, rights of religion, and the Church is so inextricably linked that he must never relinquish this duty, because it is not without cause that this right has been bestowed on him by God"

---

4 On the beginning of the Dominican Order in Hungary, see (Pfeiffer, 1913). For the evolution of the Dominican provinces, see (Tugwell, 2000; for Hungary in particular, p. 50).

5 On the relationship between the state and the church in the period of Theresianism and Josephinism (Josephism), see (Pranzl, 2008, pp. 17-52). For the Theresian period, see (Beales, 1987, pp. 439-455).

(cit. by Raab, 1970, pp. 515-516). The church-state reforms recognized in the 1750s, which had as a goal the development of a strong modern state, however, only became manifest in Hungary in the 1770s. The reform measures were continued by Maria Theresa's son Joseph II (1780-1790) and reached such an extent that there was hardly an area of church life which remained unaffected<sup>6</sup>. A moderation of the Habsburg church-state policy only took place after the accession of Leopold II (1790-1792); but neither he nor his son and successor, Franz II/I (1792-1835) turned away entirely from the regalistic principles in their church policies<sup>7</sup>.

The title of this essay question can now be clarified. When we ask about the relationship of the Dominicans in Hungary to the ruler and state authorities in the 18th century (this means the Dominicans who were living and working in the territory of the Kingdom of Hungary at that time), we do so with the background knowledge of the church-state policy of the House of Habsburg. It must be remembered that there was a 'long century', in which the relationship of the ruler and the state authorities to the Order of Preachers changed from support to [only] toleration. The Dominicans in Hungary were also affected by the restrictions on the religious orders under Maria Theresa and the great wave of monastery closings and other measures under Joseph II. There are several examples of how the policy of the monarchs had an impact on their life:

Since September 15, 1774, the prior provincial has been forbidden to admit any brothers (and nuns as well), who were younger than 24, to solemn profession. (Regestum provinciae Hungariae sub provincialatu Antonini Thuille, fol. 228v).

---

6 On the church policies of Joseph II, see (Beales, 2009, pp. 271-332). For the reform of monasteries, see also (Scheutz, 2012, pp. 321-338; Beales, 2005, pp. 227-255).

7 For example, (Adriányi, 2004, pp. 163-169) treats the church policies of Leopold II and Franz II/I in the chapter called "Josephinismus"

Three of the seven Dominican houses have been closed between 1784 and 1788. There were five other houses of the Hungarian Province in the Austrian lands which had been closed.

The brothers were put under the stronger jurisdiction of bishops, beginning with their pastoral work.

The pastoral mission outside the conventual churches had negative consequences for the community life.

Because of the abolition of confraternities, a very important pastoral field of the communities have ceased to exist.

The issue presented in this article has not yet been studied profoundly. I will depict several individual cases on the basis of which we can get a first image of the problem.

## Prayer for the Crown and the Queen

The first two selected sources, which furnish examples for our theme concern the Dominicans in Košice. Since 1744, the Confraternity of St. John Nepomucene was based at the convent church there. The cult of this Bohemian martyr of the 14th century as “Martyr of the Confessional” was very widespread in the Habsburg monarchy; and in 1729, he was canonized not least thanks to a special promotion by the Habsburgs. In the reign of Maria Theresa, his veneration rose to his becoming one of the patron saints of the monarchy. The occasion was the plight of the young ruler who had to defend parts of the Bohemian Crown in the first Silesian War (1740-1742) against the claims of Prussia, Bavaria and Saxony. On the occasion of her coronation as Queen of Bohemia on May 12, 1743, the famous Viennese preacher Pius Manzador from the Congregation of Barnabites gave a sermon on the upcoming feast of the saint, on May 16, in which he stylized him as the protector of the three crowns of the monarchy: the Crown of the Kingdom of Hungary, the recently received Bohemian crown, and the Roman imperial crown. Actually, the fact that the Habsburgs venerated and invoked the help of the saint who refused to obey the king’s orders and who “proved to be the perfect saint to remind the state of its limits” (Lehner, 2016, p. 159) shows that the Habsburgs modeled

themselves as rulers who intended to exercise their power according to “higher principles”. However, the well-recognized Austrian expert on the *Pietas Austriaca* Elisabeth Kovács pointed out that the cult of the Bohemian Martyr had gradually lost its former importance for the House of Habsburg in the context of the Enlightenment-era state reforms since the 1760s (Kovács, 1979a, pp. 79-80). The motive of that is easily understandable: no curbing of the state’s limits was desired.

As “guardian of the Crown” John Nepomucene was also venerated by the Dominicans in Košice and by the members of their fraternity. One of the rules the Fraternity demanded from every member was, “ut pro victoria et benedictione Coronae Hungaricae saepius preces fundat” (List of revenues and expenses of the Dominican convent and its confraternities, 1785, June). It is noteworthy that it speaks of the crown and not of the ruler or prince as individuals who stood at the head of the monarchy. In this way, one can understand which political ideas were held by the authors of the Confraternity’s statutes. Obviously, they never wanted to completely give up the independence of the country and so took advantage of almost every opportunity to express the privileged position of Hungary within the entire Monarchy (Dóci, 2014, pp. 115-119, 123-125).

Since early Christian times, prayers for rulers and the secular authorities belonged among basic Christian duties (see 1 Tim 2:1-2). The Preachers in Košice were conscious of this duty. According to the declaration of the Superior of the house Augustinus Marics, in a letter to the Royal Lieutenancy Council, from 1770 they considered it a special, official task of the Order: “Instituti nostri ratio exigeret, ut chorum frequentando, ibidemque laudes divinas decantando pro Sacratissimae Regiae Majestatis et successorum suorum incolumitate et apostolici istius regni prosperitate ac incremento preces ad Deum fundamus, cum autem hactenus nonnisi quinque sacerdotes ibidem fuerimus, chorum inducendi modum non habuimus” (Marics, 1770, before October 17. *Petition to the Lieutenancy Council*) The former regent Maria Theresia was entitled Apostolic Queen (‘Apostolic Queen’, the female version of the ‘Apostolic King’), the title she and her successors had been awarded by Pope Clement XIII in 1758. There arose heated discussions in Hungary about the meaning of the title. The Viennese court librarian

Franz Adam Kollár published in 1762 and 1764 two studies in which he dealt with the question of the laws of the patronage of the Hungarian kings. In a work from 1764 (*De originibus et uso perpetuo potestatis legislativae circa sacra Apostolicorum Regum Hungariae*) he argued that the rights of royal patronage had its origin in the princely absolute power, and was not something granted by the Pope. Due to resistance on the part of the Church and of the Hungarian Diet, the study was put on the Index in Hungary (Adriányi, 2004, pp. 158-159). The Dominicans in Košice certainly did not take this regalist theory to themselves, which fully corresponded to the conviction of the Viennese court; however, they recognized the care of the queen for the Church. It was in the aforementioned letter that the vicar appealed for approval for an increase in the number of friars in the convent.

## ‘Ruler’ and ‘state’ in Preaching

The pulpit was a special place from which the Dominicans were able to more openly express their relationship to the ruler and the state. Six sermons are presented below, which were given by the Fathers of the province in Hungary on several occasions in the 1780s and 1790s. Actually, in that time more than before the preachers were supposed to support their sovereign in his effort to build a strong state. The preaching constituted a form of public education.<sup>8</sup>

On 19 March 1783, Father Albert Tschick gave a sermon, in honor of Emperor Joseph II, in the Dominican Church at Sopron where members of the Grand Ducal Toscana Dragoon Regiment were celebrating the name day of the Emperor. Tschick served as military chaplain (Feldprediger) of the regiment. As a theme for the sermon, which

---

8 Urs Herzog (1991, p. 16) wrote about the absolutist state of the Baroque Era that it was interested in the religious education of its people “since only a devout citizen, subordinate to the Church and its preaching, could be a reliable citizen and a surety of the public stability.” This applies at least as well to the Habsburg monarchy of the Age of Enlightenment. On the requirements for the preachers during the Josephinian era, see (Hoppe, 1989, pp. 54-60).

later appeared at the Viennese Johann Nepomuk Ferdinand Schönfeld's publishing house under the title "Joseph the Second for the Spirit and Hearts of his Nations" (Joseph der Zweyte für den Geist und die Herzen seiner Nationen), the preacher selected the following quotation from 2 Chronicles "Vicisti famam virtutibus tuis. Quia diligit Deus Israel: idcirco posuit te super eum regem." (9, pp. 6-8) ("Thou hast exceeded thy reputation with thy virtues [...] Because God loveth Israel... he made thee king over them." Douay-Rheims) He represented the ruler as a wise and loving father of his people: everything he does, he does for the welfare of his subjects' sake. He himself was "fully the good of his people," he was an embodied "blessing from God" for them. The sacrifice of the subjects for their ruler should be a more willing obedience and a tender-grateful requited love (Tschick, 1783, pp. 6-8). These words of the introduction already indicate the contents of what he wanted in this sermon: a sort of apology for the reform measures that Joseph II had carried out in the early years of his reign.

In the first part, the wisdom of Joseph II was discussed. According to Tschick, the ideal of a wise ruler corresponds entirely to the following: 1. he knows the welfare of his people, 2. he selects the most effective means to achieve this welfare, and 3. he reaches this goal through his charitable acts (Tschick, 1783, p. 8).

Tschick recalls the young Joseph, who as co-regent, the "expectant father of his people", had taken the trouble of traveling in order to learn about the state of the monarchy personally (Tschick, 1783, p. 9). As is known, since the 1760s Joseph II made a number of trips under an official pseudonym, Count of Falkenstein.<sup>9</sup> Now he was praised by Tschick because in the "favorite years of human age, which are only once and irretrievable, he tore himself away from the Majesty and temper" and "from the arms of the Serene Highness, his tenderly beloved mother" and his movement through his countries had been in all humility. But he had also visited foreign countries to find inspiration there for improvements in his own monarchy. The preacher expressed

---

9 On Joseph's travels, see (Beales, 1987, pp. 242-271, 338-385; Beales, 2009, pp. 133-167).

the following words about Joseph's preparation for government business in this search for knowledge and experience: "self examination is his own wise way; He also knows the advantage of never being led astray by others, or to be led away by them" (Tschick, 1783, pp. 10-11).

Again, Tschick underlined the usefulness of these excursions: "Joseph had made this laborious knowledge his own, not to think much of himself in a profligate idleness, but as a trustee of his nations for their benefit to make them fruitful" (Tschick, 1783, p. 11). The maxim of the reforms of Maria Theresa and Joseph II, in the field of education as elsewhere, was: 'usefulness for the common good' and the Emperor was here given as an example to all students and scholars.

Joseph found that the most effective means to achieve the well-being of his peoples was in their "enlightenment": this essentially meant their freedom. The way to do this had already been opened by Maria Theresa who took away "the too heavy and oppressive yoke from the deeply bent neck of the country people with a maternal, graced hand." (What are meant here are the arrangements for restricting serfdom and compulsory servitude by subjects to their lords) She also took measures to "improve the rural schools" (which came about by the General School Rules (*Allgemeine Schulordnung*) of 1774 and the introduction of compulsory education for children). "Joseph's desire for the welfare of his people will turn this morning of the dawning Enlightenment into the best midday for his people," the preacher continued, and pointed to 1781 when the abolition of serfdom was carried out: "He was even bold enough to plead for adequate freedom of a nation which wished to love their king as its monarch, without having to tremble before him as a despot: he banished slavery and servitude from his states. Joseph wanted freely obedient people; his fatherly spirit knew that free men are easily noble-minded, and that by thinking, become happy; they are able to treat their well-being, which his fatherly hand creates, not simply as machines would, but with dignity, and are able to feel and enjoy it with noble souls" (Tschick, 1783, pp. 11-13).

It is very well known, however, that the emperor did not make only friends with his reform measures. In Hungary, the bishops were at the head of the opposition (Bahlcke, 2005, pp. 323-347). How did they handle the criticisms of Joseph according to the preacher? "To

fight the evil stubbornness and prejudice of centuries is very often a fruitless dispute. Nevertheless, Joseph has not triumphed as a striking example of a hero, but prevailed as a loving father, which is better for the people.” In order to emphasize the benevolence of the ruler’s government, Tschick compares Joseph with another contemporary ruler and representative of Enlightenment absolutism: Frederick II of Prussia (1740-1786). Joseph took him as a role model, without, however, calling him by name:

When a large, almost universally admired monarch of our century with his own system of government does wonders; when he, among subjects that he gained yesterday or has allotted to himself today, now creates something seemingly impossible: uniformity in all his states, peace, toleration, and the strictest obedience [...] What can the most strict Monarchy not gain with the wave of a hand in just a few moments? The wave of a hand which is also able to transform parts of the world with the help of cannons and swords? [...] The word ‘So we want’ coming from the throne of the monarch effects immediately everything that is desired. Has our loving monarch with all his great planning ever spoken with such a strong royal tone? Has he ruled with a more oppressive autonomy and in such a diverse manner that his dominions are now in some way essentially changed? ((Tschick, 1783).

Against those whom the Emperor accused of attacking the old privileges, he addressed the following words: “Has he in his highest beneficent ordinances ever offended such privilege which these honorary titles, in fact, deserve, that is: the true, fruitful privileges of the nation, and not the unjust advantages of individuals which are detrimental to of the rest?” (Tschick, 1783, pp. 13-15).

These words must have seemed very strange to many of the listeners, and later the readers, because as we know, the Emperor used his power and imposed his plans with great determination and steadfastness against the opposition. Of this, the preacher would probably have been aware. He clearly interpreted the willpower of Joseph as positive and in his character he would have discovered a characteristic

of Joseph that he described as “forbearance”, but which could also be interpreted as an expression of his indifference towards powerless opponents. “It [the forbearance] either allows them to be misled or to be cheated by the rumble of prejudice or by tears of imbecility: but it also gladly indulges its heartfelt pity to the vulnerable, and gives time to do penance for the misguided. Joseph hears and even reads what is being said and written against him while sitting upon his throne. Generally, his judgment about it is a touching decree of wisdom. I will, said the monarch, make use of the good and the truth of what is said against me; the false and mendacious, I will always despise” (Tschick, 1783, p. 15).

The quotation from the Bible used as a guiding principle of the sermon is a passage from the Queen of Sheba, who visited King Solomon in order to be convinced of his wisdom. It was used by the preacher as an example for all foreigners, that is, non-subjects of the Emperor, who came from afar to admire his wisdom. For Tschick, it was Pope Pius VI, who had been on a visit to Vienna from April 22nd to May 22nd 1782,<sup>10</sup> that was the most important admirer of the Emperor: “[He] came and saw the peoples’ father on the throne of Germany; he spoke, a wise and staunch advocate of his nations and even wondered at him, full of feeling. Have you read, my dears! Have you read it with overflowing heart, what the high priest, the Vicar of Christ on earth has spoken, written and solemnly preached of Joseph the father of our country?” (Tschick, 1783, p. 17). Tschick here speaks of the speech that the Pope gave on the occasion of the public consistory held on 19 April. At this consistory, two new cardinals were created and added to the College of Cardinals: Leopold Firmian, the Prince-Bishop of Passau, and Joseph Batthyány, the Archbishop of Esztergom. In fact, the Pope spoke exceedingly positively and heaped praise on the emperor (see Kovács, 1983, p. 82). However, the remark about Joseph’s special piety toward God was inserted into the speech only after an intervention by the Vienna Archbishop Christoph Cardinal Migazzi. Originally,

---

10 On the pope’s visit, see (Beales, 2009, pp. 214-238; Kovács, 1983; Kovács, 1979b).

the Pope did not want to praise the piety of the ruler, because his policy, according to the Pope's words, threatened religion (Beales, 2009, p. 235). Even if this fact was probably not known to Father Tschick, it is amazing to what conclusion he came: "Brethren in the Catholic faith! Do you worship the Blessed who were been seated upon the altars by the Holy dictum of our Pontiff? Go! Stamp it into your souls! Pius the Sixth had Joseph the Second canonized, indeed, not for our altars, but for our hearts" (Tschick, 1783, pp. 17-18).

At the beginning of the second part of the sermon, the love of Joseph to his subjects is underlined (Tschick, 1783, pp. 19-21). His reforms, which are further discussed in detail, he indicates, are principally acts of a loving father of his country [Landesvater]. First, the church reforms are addressed. Tschick shows appreciation for the abolition of "irrational religious abuses," the establishment of an Ecclesiastical Commission (Geistliche Hofkommission), closure of the "inactive monasteries for the common good" and the establishment of the religious fund (Religionsfond). (Tschick, 1783, pp. 22-23) He devotes a long passage to the educational reform of the clergy, the beginnings of which already reach back to the reign of Maria Theresa. According to the revised curriculum, the candidates for the priesthood should be better prepared for pastoral practice. After the closing of the diocesan seminaries in 1782, several general seminaries were established in the monarchy, in which the future priests were to be trained simultaneously as loyal civil servants. "The noble, divinely benevolent plan for the true, worthy, enlightened education of budding pastors is strange in our countries, and geared to the well-being of the future periods? [...] Pastors! What can you be, what will you be for the people, if you are worthy? Fathers of their spirits! What can you all contribute, if you can think yourselves, to their enlightenment (Aufklärung), to their education, even unto their possible perfection?" Finally, the preacher firmly emphasized that, because of the involvement of the monarchs in these matters, they deserve to be loved by the priests with their full hearts (Tschick, 1783, pp. 23-25).

As an expression of the desire of the emperor that among the people of his monarchy brotherly love would reign, Tschick indicates the adoption of the policy of tolerance of 1781 (for Protestants) and 1782

(for Jews). He condemns the “spirit of religious persecution” and the “thirst for blood which wishes to be holy” and describes Joseph as an opponent of religious hatred and an apostle of the Divine law of love: “He wants to see some generally prevailing and effective love to reign among those who worship the same God, and recognize the same Savior of the world” (Tschick, 1783, pp. 25-28). The Nuncio of Vienna, Giuseppe Garampi, protested against these laws with great vehemence, and so the Pope himself, during his visit to Vienna and after long talks, approved certain concessions on the part of the emperor. The emperor’s concessions remained a thorn in the side of some Catholics: “Is Joseph prompting through his gracious command of tolerance more than Christ himself has made lawful and confirmed by his most sublime examples? [...] Who has ever been improved by their hatred? Who has paid attention to truth and religious obligations by persecution? [...] Your rumbling, your reproach about education and regulations for improvement, even your reverently intentioned groans, are a thing of pagans and publicans” (Tschick, 1783, pp. 28-29). Perhaps the preacher was thinking also of the Hungarian bishops, who still revealed themselves to be opponents to the ruler’s policy of tolerance? (Bahlcke, 2005, pp. 332-335).

The sermon of Tschick on Joseph II is an excellent example of an Enlightenment sermon. Actually, we find therein all the typical features included in the list presented by Pasi Ihalainen (2009, p. 225). As mentioned above, it was published at the publishing house belonging to Johannes Nepomuk Ferdinand von Schönfeld who was one of the most important publishers of that time. From 1782 to 1784, he also published the weekly magazine *Wöchentliche Wahrheiten für und über die Prediger in Wien* (Weekly Truths for and about the Preachers in Vienna) containing reviews on sermons which were held by Catholic preachers, particularly in Vienna, during this period. The aim of the journal was to help reform preaching according to ideals of the Catholic Enlightenment.<sup>11</sup> It was no wonder that the sermon of Tschick passed

---

11 In addition to the recent book on this phenomenon from Ulrich L. Lehner (2016), I want to refer to the study of Harm Klueping (2013), which deals particularly with the situation in Austrian parts of the Habsburg monarchy.

through Josephist state censorship. Yet it is no surprising either that it received a very positive review in the *Wöchentliche Wahrheiten*.<sup>12</sup>

The review praised the honest and zealous speech about the monarch and the Enlightenment; the preacher's patriotic sentiment was so strong that his expressions were sometimes more poetical than rhetorical. It pointed out the loyalty of Tschick to the ruler and presented him as an example worthy to be followed by teachers everywhere. (Hoffmann, 1783, pp. 245-246) In fact, besides presenting his own opinion, the reviewer also stated that there were a variety of reactions to the sermon in Sopron, i.e. in the town where the sermon was held, both positive and negative. He quoted a Sopron correspondent: "There was a huge noise in consequence of the sermon here. [...] Jubilation and grumbling! Acclamation and women's expression of anger accompanied the preacher descending from the pulpit" (Hoffmann, 1783, pp. 253-254). The enthusiastic discourse of Father Tschick about the Emperor Joseph II and his Enlightenment reforms obviously did not appear convincing to all listeners. However, the question is: would he have spoken similarly a few years later, after his own Order's province was hit hard by various measures, for example by the already mentioned suppressions of priories? In any case, the question remained: was Joseph II so clearly a famous and successful ruler?

We gain a different impression from the sermon of his confrere Rupert Zöhrer, which he gave on the feast of St. Elisabeth in 1790 (19 November) in St. Michael's Church in Košice. Zöhrer was at the time prior of the Dominican convent there. In the first main part of his praise to the city's patron Elisabeth, he spoke of the question of obedience, whose example he had recognized in the saints. According to Zöhrer, it belongs to the God-given social order that there are people who rule over other people: God gave them "the authority with jurisdiction to command the others and to preserve unanimity; he designated them with crowns and scepters; he gave them rods in their hands with which to rule and he girded them with swords to

---

12 On the journal *Wöchentliche Wahrheiten für und über die Prediger in Wien*, its historical context and the aims of the evaluation of sermons, see the doctoral dissertation of Bernard M. Hoppe (1989)

punish those who oppose them.” Zöhrrer made clear what circumstances can lead to disobedience and disregard for the Ruler ordained by God through a reference to some relatively recent events, such as the rebellion in the Austrian Netherlands in 1789, the chaos in the State, the bloodshed of the citizens, and the devastated towns and villages. He continued: “We would have soon experienced the same in this country; indeed, in secret and silence the riotous spirit smoldered through malicious attacks. It would have perhaps broken out had it not been inhibited by the quick death of Joseph the Second and by the wise precautions of the reigning Roman Emperor and crowned King of Hungary, Leopold the Second” (Zöhrrer, 1790, p. 4).

Although the reforms of Joseph II had been quite well accepted for a time by the enlightened circles in Hungary after his accession to power in 1780, his method of governing, which partially violated the Hungarian constitution, actually led to general dissatisfaction. Zöhrrer seems to have judged the change in rulers quite positively. Unlike his older brother, Leopold II acted very carefully in both domestic and in foreign policy, through which he was able to prevent the outbreak of crises, which appeared to be inevitable at the end of the reign of Joseph II. The preacher challenged the audience to be obedient to the Hungarian King Leopold II who had been crowned only four days previously, on 15 November 1790 in Prešporok (Hung. Pozsony; today: Bratislava). “Use this great opportunity to hasten to help your King, Leopold the Second, upon whom only 4 days previously the crown was placed on his head. I assure you, he will reign over your hearts, for his wealth is in the hearts of his subjects.” The call for assistance was related to the war against the Ottomans, led by Leopold II, and was very radical. Zöhrrer says: “We die out of obedience to our king, we die out of loyalty to our homeland” (Zöhrrer, 1790, pp. 5-6).

As has already been said, Zöhrrer founded his call to obedience toward the rulers on religious grounds. In order to do that, it was first important to stress obedience to God. With reference to the Book of Leviticus 25:17-19, he said:

‘Let every one fear his God. Because I am the Lord your God. Do my precepts, and keep my judgments, and fulfill them: that you

may dwell in the land without any fear. And the ground may yield you its fruits, of which you may eat your fill, fearing no man's invasion.' Who does not see herein the most precise link of religion with the welfare of the State reaffirmed by the mouth of God? Fear of God and fulfillment of the holy law of God is the cornerstone of an empire as the first thing which leads to happiness in the state, and the inhabitants of the state, who make this obligation to rule, can in truth be spoken of as wisdom's children (Zöhrer, 1790, p. 3).

Respect for the authority of God and the King are inextricably linked for the preacher. One can still see in the homily an interesting thought, which refers to the role of the ruler as the representative of God. Immediately in the prologue, Zöhrer spoke of God as the "Father and origin of all generations" (Zöhrer, 1790, p. 1). The idea of God as father of all the mankind, incidentally, was a typical idea of the Enlightenment. Later, in the second part of the sermon,<sup>13</sup> he said of Leopold II that he was the "common father" of the Germans and the Hungarians (Zöhrer, 1790, p. 8).

In concluding the first main part, Zöhrer pointed repeatedly to Saint Elisabeth, who "sacrificed" her virginity for the plans of her royal father and for the state matters and married as an extraordinary example of the obedience. He called on his "beloved Hungarians" to follow "the holiest example of Elisabeth's obedience" in order to become "happy inhabitants of [their] state" (Zöhrer, 1790, pp. 5-6).

---

13 In the second part, which was dedicated to the mutual love among the Hungarians as well as to the Hungarian's love to other nations, especially to the Germans, the person of the monarch was addressed only briefly. For this reason, I refrain from its detailed presentation. However, exactly this part caused a conflict between Košice's Hungarians and Zöhrer. Several members of the high nobility accused the preacher before the ecclesiastical and state authorities of offending the Hungarian nation. On this conflict, see Dóci (2014, pp. 235-241). I have to point out that of all the sermons presented in this article only the sermon of Zöhrer had not been printed. Despite speaking unambiguously in favour of the ruler, publishing would have been "politically incorrect", just as the sermon was considered by the authorities to be.

As a conclusion to our examination of the preaching of Rupert Zöhler, something in the closing [of the whole sermon] should also be mentioned, for here, the State becomes, in that constant image of the vineyard used in the Bible to represent the people of God, something was planted by God Himself. This reference to the divine origin of the state was a special appeal to the audience, to seek its well-being, especially since they themselves indeed constituted this vineyard. The preacher used yet another biblical image, namely that of the vine and the branches (see Jn 15:5). In the grapevine, he sees the “doctrine of the Divine Founder”. When the listener follows the teachings of Jesus Christ and does good works, they are like “good branches in the vineyard”, i.e., “Good citizens of the state”, which is able to be “a merry sunshine of happiness with the dew of heaven and the fatness of the earth” (Zöhler, 1790, p. 11).

On August 20, 1791, on the feast of the first Hungarian king St. Stephan, Father Leopold Walther held a preaching for the feast in the Castle Parish Church of St. Sigismund in Buda. It was an encomium of the saint, in which the main characteristics one can recognize in a good ruler were mentioned.

At the beginning of the first principle part, the preacher presents in brief the theory of the sacred nature of the monarchy. He says of the royal dignity that it was “the greatest destiny which can be given a mortal, to imitate God himself, to become a creator of happiness for many thousands. What greatness of spirit calls upon an office which puts the human being close to the divinity itself: he, a Vicar of the one eternal Ruler among his fellow men, rises to be an instrument of His providence!” (Walther, 1791, p. 6).

According to Walther, every good king has to be distinguished primarily by three characteristics. First, he has wisdom, that is, “to strive for clearer, more correct, more true knowledge”. The following words are to be understood not only as an explanation, but also as an appeal to the audience: “Alas! May the wisdom of the rulers be never misjudged, may the people not act contrary to the best designs of the rulers from lack of understanding, so that their active zeal not slacken by mortifications.” Thanks to true knowledge, a ruler succeeds in being

meeq, but in a way through which sometimes also requires strictness in order that justice not suffer. (Walther, 1791, pp. 6-7).

Stephen, who himself aspired for wisdom and truth, advocated that his subjects know the truth. This was nothing more than the “salvific religion of Jesus Christ,” the dissemination of which the king diligently strove for in his kingdom. The formation of the “solid character” of the people was important for the ruler. This formation was, at its heart, the same as the mediation of the Christian faith by the preacher. (Walther, 1791, pp. 8-9).

Furthermore, the love of St. Stephen was all-embracing, following the model of the goodness of God, and was not confined to the children of his country, but was also for foreigners who found refuge and restoration in his country. This was made particularly evident in the forgiveness of Stephen for his enemies. He recounted the story of a failed assassination attempt on the king, who had with his benevolent gaze alone disarmed and brought the assassin to repentance, concluding with the words: “to mend the heart of a villain, is a far greater deed than to punish great vices.” Nor was this admirable goodness which the preacher sought in any case to be equated with “softness”. He therefore underlined that Stephen could take quite severe action “against those who instigated secret conspiracies affecting the public peace”, “The laws which fought the onset of vice; the wise precautions, which safeguarded the weak against the superior force of the strong; the prestige that he was able to provide to his laws and regulations, were the unmistakable public evidence that he reigned for righteousness sake”. For the first time, Walther now bridges the gap between King Stephen’s time and the current King of Hungary, Leopold II: “His laws, his paternal teaching to his son still breathe the spirit of the regent Leopold, zealous for justice, and they can not be read without emotion. How much unworthy would we be of such a king, if the patriotic laws and the public ordinances were not sacred for us, if we would not prove by willing obedience to them that we most ardently wish justice and peace among our fellow citizens.” (Walther, 1791, pp. 13-14).

In the second principle part of his speech, Walther concentrates on the activities of St. Stephen in the field of public education. He presents the Hungarians as a war-like people that after the seizure of the

land had to “be enlisted for quiet civic life in society”. It was a difficult task, which the king had taken upon himself, because there was a risk that the people would regard this education as “an insult to their freedoms.” They had presupposed “a courageous determination of a King” and Stephen had it (Walther, 1791, pp. 15-16). The preacher is further concerned with the question of how important it is that the people can clearly see the laws that guarantee an orderly civic life. The solution he sees is that laws of the state “represent the direct consequences of divine laws,” and they indicate what the consequences of human actions are for the future life, of which the preacher assumes that people strive for. “And by what means,” asks Walther, “can one do this more than by the sublime truths of revealed religion? What means could be more seemly to instill in a people morality, obedience, [and] love of virtue, than the promotion of public religious education.” Walther further indicates the numerous bishoprics endowed by Stephen in the whole kingdom, and designated them as “chairs of the true religion of Christ.” They [the endowed bishoprics] were an important act in the process of public education, as well as the “abundant donation for the preservation of the servants of religion with public authority.” (Walther, 1791, pp. 17-19) No mention is made of the ecclesiastical reforms of recent Hungarian rulers who had worn the Crown of St. Stephen, Maria Theresa and Joseph II. However, it is quite possible that the preacher had in mind the educational reform by Maria Theresa, which took place between the years 1771 and 1777 establishing eight dioceses in Hungary, and also the establishment of the religion funds by Joseph II in 1782. By the simple story of King Stephen, he could plant in his audience the idea that even with these relatively recent measures the Habsburgs followed the example of St. Stephen in their concern for the education and the spiritual welfare of the people.

Yet the following is said about the importance of the Christian faith: “As soon as the spirit of Christianity blows over a nation with the fullness of its power, as soon as the hearts of men become capable of the noblest feelings, trust, friendship, and true reciprocal love chains them more tightly and reinforces the bonds of civil society. The more widespread the knowledge of God, the brighter the concept of the same will be, the more vivid the portrayal of God as a common

Father and the human race as a single family will be; and this concept makes national prejudices disappear, so that similarly disposed strangers and travelers encounter acceptance, support, protection and safety.” (Walther, 1791, pp. 19-20) What is called for here are actually features of a modern society, corresponding to the ideas of the Enlightenment. Already at the beginning of the sermon, Walther spoke of the “distribution of light among the people” (Walther, 1791, p. 8) and of the “enlightenment of people” which happens thanks to the Christian religion (Walther, 1791, p. 9). The preacher seems to want to emphasize that a state, which is to be truly enlightened must stand on the pillars of the Christian faith. In consequence, it seems to imply, only a ruler faithful to the Christian faith is actually enlightened. Evidently, Walther wished such rulers on the throne of Hungary.

During the sermon, which Leopold Walther gave on the occasion of the final profession of a nun of an Institute of English Ladies on August 24, 1794, he raised the issue of obedience. In it, Walther presents obedience together with love as the right answer to the spiritual vocation that God gives a person. (Walther, 1794, p. 5) The preacher, however, was not only concerned with obedience to God, but he treated the question with regard to the relationship of citizens to the state authorities, whose God-given task he sees to be the concern for social order. The magistrates have the power to command and punish, and the subordinates are obliged to submit to the lawful authority on the grounds of divine commandment (as it is stated in Rom. 13:2). Obedience guarantees “the prosperity of the fatherland”. “The good agreement of the subjects with the superior and the exact fulfillment of what is reasonably ordered is the linchpin of the blessedness of all countries and of all classes.” (Walther, 1794, pp. 6-7) From what has been said above, it is clear that Walther is not in favor of arbitrary rule. In what such a reasonable order might consist, however, will not be discussed further. The necessity of obedience is also argued for with an image known in political theory: A “subordinate” was “a member of the civic body politic”. Anyone who does not want to be a “harmful member” must not live according to an “unfettered freedom,” but needs special guidance from the government. Disregard for authority

would lead to disaster and eventually cause one to fall “into the hands of criminal justice” (Walther, 1794, pp. 7-8).

The treatment of the obedience to which the secular persons are bound leads to the conclusion that a person who binds himself by a vow to God, must be absolutely and in everything obedient to him. (Walther, 1794, p. 8) This conclusion is not at all surprising in a sermon for religious profession. Remarkable, however, is the fairly extensive treatment of “worldly” obedience. It was not a rhetorical prelude to a major issue, but its own point was targeted toward the general audience: a small “lesson on citizenship” [Bürgerlehre].

The last two sermons that will be mentioned were given in Smolník, a former mining town in present-day Slovakia, namely on the occasion of the Feast of St. Catherine of Alexandria, patron saint of the local church and of the mines. In these sermons, the preachers not only show their unambiguously positive attitude toward the state and its head, but also explicitly invited the audience to adopt such an attitude.

Father Edmund Wenninger, prior of the convent in Košice, presented the Saint as a model of wisdom and faith for the “confused, terrible times” (Wenninger, 1794, p. 6), contrasted with the former era, and with respect to the true wisdom and the principles of the Christian religion. With regard to France, which was profoundly shaken by the Revolution, he urged the people to steadfastness in faith and also warned against the «the smallest unlawful act” against “God the Most High, against his revealed religion, and against his anointed,” their “most gracious King who rules in God’s place over his country.” (Wenninger, 1794, pp. 24-25) In the same breath as the demand for fidelity to God and to religion, the demand for loyalty toward the king is pronounced, for the King ensures a representative of God in the divinely-willed order, [and] deserves the respect of his subjects precisely due to his sacred function. In the prayer, with which the whole sermon is finished, he said, among other things: “Give us your holy peace and undisturbed tranquility under the protection of laws and under the glorious scepter of our good monarch, who seeks his fortune in the welfare of his subjects.” (Wenninger, 1794, p. 26) Wenninger seems to see in the laws and the scepter of the king two guarantors of peace, which are not easily replaceable. As stated above, Wenninger grants

to the ruler the role of the Vicar of God unto the people. However, he sees him [the ruler] more as a guardian of the God-given order than as somebody whose power is totally unrestricted. He praises King Franz (1792-1835) as an ideal ruler, who does not place his personal interests over the welfare of the people. Having quite recently demanded that the listeners give obedience to the king, he provides the rationale at this point, as to why they should do this: they thus contribute to their own benefit.

In 1796, fray Stanislaus Stayer, also a member of the Dominican convent in Košice, preached at the Catherine's day celebrations in Smolník. He saw in Catherine a great example of chastity and appealed to people to behave with sexual morality, for in his opinion, only a chaste body was capable of "faithfully serving the fatherland." (Stayer, 1796, p. 8) If he talks about the courageous witness to the faith of the Saint, he also draws attention to the various threats which he sees exposed in his time: "The world is not afraid to make known the errors and principles of death and sin – it considers its folly as glory – it arrogantly contradicts and ridicules religion, it revolts against the Gospel, it spares not the servant of God, has a hatred of priests and kings, sets atheism to the throne, which announces war to the deity and kingship and stretches its claws out for the life and property of citizens—should we not oppose them?" (Stayer, 1796, p. 23) One recognizes in this passage very clear allusions to the revolutionary activities in France. What Stayer names and shames here is not a simple unbelief, but an aggressive, anti-religious attitude with their consequences for the Church, the state and the citizens. However, it raises the question of what response he expected from his audience. The preacher probably did not expect concrete, exterior acts as a response of the people to his sermon. His aim may have been more likely to instill in the audience the conviction of the indispensable role of religion for a stable political and social order and to awaken a disgust against all who attack traditional Christianity.

In the closing prayer —among others "for the welfare of our best sovereigns, for a happy continuation of the Austrian arms, for our apostolic Fatherland"—, Stayer, again, turns to comment on the current events. It is a prayer for the success of the Austrian army. Here

is meant the First Coalition War waged against France from 1792, in which, after the 1795 withdrawal of Prussia, the Habsburg monarchy thereafter stood alone. The preacher draws attention to the interests of the ruler and the state through presenting those interests as prayer intentions to the faithful. Therefore, the prayer manifests the existing alliance between throne and pulpit.

## Conclusion

One particular point in the mandate of 16 December 1697 by Leopold I, which sets in motion the process for the restoration of the Dominican convent in Košice, is the proclamation of the reincorporation of the Order of Preachers in the Kingdom of Hungary (“regno nostro reincorporari, in integrumque restitui”). (Leopold I. (1697, December 16). Mandate for the City of Košice.) The convent was depicted as an organ of the political body (Staatskörper), which consequently proved that the welfare of the state - at least from the perspective of the ruler - had to be a major concern for the convent.

This expectation toward the clergy applied both to the reign of Leopold I and to his successors throughout the 18th century (most of all for Joseph II), that they would promote the state’s interests in the performance of their pastoral duties. It has been demonstrated that the Preachers operating in Hungary had taken on this task in a two-fold manner.

They themselves prayed for the ruler and the kingdom and in the process used the prayer as a means of educating the faithful to be faithful citizens of the state. The sermon was another, potentially more effective educational tool envisaging loyalty to the heads of state and rulers. These virtues were demanded with varying intensity in the sermons we have examined. The religious dimension was highlighted both by speaking about the roots of the political order in the will of God and also regarding the role of the ruler as God’s representative. The Dominicans, whose sermons were presented here, acted as the mouthpiece of the Josephine State-Church. Loyalty to the State and ruler were, however, as can be seen on closer inspection of the sermon texts, not

seen as ends in themselves; but rather, the means by which the good of the people and of the state would be achieved. For the preachers, an important requirement of loyalty to the ruler was necessarily that the ruler himself was loyal to God by promoting the Christian religion and the Church. However, every preacher had his own criteria for the assessment of what was conducive to religion and the Church.

## References

### Primary sources

- Hoffmann, L. M. (Ed.) (1783). *Wöchentliche Wahrheiten für und über die Prediger in Wien*. (Vol. 5). Wien & Prag: bei J. F. Edlen von Schönfeld.
- Leopold I. (1697, December 16). *Mandate for the City of Košice*. XIII. 80541. (Fasc. 1, 32). Rome, Italy: Archivum Generale Ordinis Praedicatorum.
- List of revenues and expenses of the Dominican convent and its confraternities. (1785, June). *Dominikáni Košice, Stará manipulácia*, O 16. Štátny archív, Košice, Slovakia.
- Marics, A. (1770, before October 17). Petition to the Lieutenancy Council. *Košické biskupstvo, Acta Religiosorum - Dominikáni*. Archív Košickej arcidiecézy, Košice, Slovakia.
- Regestum provinciae Hungariae fratrum Praedicatorum inchoatum 28. Aprilis 1765 sub provincialatu admodum reverendi ac eximii P. fray Antonini Thuille ordinis Praedicatorum ss. theologiae magistri ac provinciae Hungariae prioris provincialis. Bücher Nr. 55, Archiv des Wiener Dominikanerkonvents, Wien, Austria.
- Stayer, S. (1796). *Lob- und Sittenrede auf das Fest der heiligen Catharina Jungfrau und Martyrin*. Kaschau: gedruckt bey Franz Landerer.
- Tschick, A. (1783). *Joseph der Zweyte für den Geist und die Herzen seiner Nationen*. Wien: bei J. F. Edlen von Schönfeld.
- Walther, L. (1791). *Rede am Festtage des heiligen Stephan, ersten König und Apostels Ungerlandes*. Pest: gedruckt mit Patzkoischen Schriften.
- Walther, L. (1794). *Lob- und Sittenrede, so bey Ablegung geistlicher Profession der tugendreichen Jungfrau Anna Koppens, des Hoch- und Ehrwürdigen*

*Instituts Mariae gehalten wurde.* N. p.: gedruckt bey Franz Augustin Patzko.

Wenninger, E. (1794). *Predigt auf das Fest der heiligen Katharina Jungfrau und Martyrin.* Kaschau: mit von Landerschen Schriften.

Zöhler, R. (1790, November 19). Rede am Festage der heiligen Elisabeth, Patronin der kk. *Freystadt Kaschau.* *Košické biskupstvo, Acta Religiosorum – Dominikáni.* Archív Košickej arcidiecézy, Košice, Slovakia.

## Secondary sources

Adriányi, G. (2004). *Geschichte der katholischen Kirche in Ungarn.* Köln. Weimar & Wien: Böhlau Verlag.

Bahlcke, J. (2005). *Ungarischer Episkopat und österreichische Monarchie. Von einer Partnerschaft zur Konfrontation (1686-1790).* Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Beales, D. (1987). Joseph II. Vol. 1. *In the shadow of Maria Theresa (1741-1780).* Cambridge: University Press.

Beales, D. (2005). *Enlightenment and Reform in Eighteenth-century Europe.* London & New York: I. B. Tauris.

Beales, D. (2009). Joseph II. Vol. 2. *Against the World (1780-1790).* Cambridge: University Press.

Coreth, A. (1982). *Pietas Austriaca. Österreichische Frömmigkeit im Barock.* (2nd ed). Wien: Verlag für Geschichte und Politik.

Dóci, Š. (2014). *Ein Dominikanerkonvent im Ambiente von Pfarrei, Stadt und Staat: Die seelsorgliche Tätigkeit der Kaschauer Predigerbrüder im 18. Jahrhundert* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Universität Wien.

Evans, R. J. W. (1986). *Das Werden der Habsburgermonarchie 1550-1700. Gesellschaft, Kultur, Institutionen.* Leipzig: Koehler & Amelang.

Ferrarius, S. (1637). *De Rebus Hungaricae Provinciae Ordinis Praedicatorum.* Viennae Austriae: Typis Matthaei Formicae, in Aula Coloniensi.

Frank, I. W. (1973). Zur Errichtung der Österreichisch-Ungarischen Dominikanerprovinz zu Beginn des 18. Jahrhunderts und zu ihrer Vorgeschichte (1569/1704). *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, (43): 287-341.

- Frank, I. W. (1978). Kirchengewalt und Kirchenregiment in Spätmittelalter und Früher Neuzeit. *Innsbrucker Historische Studien*, (1): 3360.
- Herzog, U. (1991). *Geistliche Wohlredenheit. Die katholische Barockpredigt*. München: C. H. Beck.
- Hoppe, B. M. (1989). *Predigtkritik im Josephinismus. Die Wöchentlichen Wahrheiten für und über die Prediger in Wien(1782-1784)*. St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag.
- Ihalainen, P. (2009). The Enlightenment Sermon: Towards Practical Religion and a Sacred National Community. In J. van Eijnatten (Ed.). *Preaching, Sermon and Cultural Change in the Long Eighteenth Century*. Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- Klueting, H. (2013). The Catholic Enlightenment in Austria or the Habsburg Lands. In U. L. Lehner & M. Printy (Ed.). *A Companion to the Catholic Enlightenment in Europe*. Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- Kovács, E. (1979a). Die Verehrung des hl. Johannes von Nepomuk am habsburgischen Hof und in der Reichs- und Residenzstadt Wien im 18. Jahrhundert. In 250 Jahre hl. Johannes von Nepomuk. Katalog der IV. Sonderschau des Dommuseums zu Salzburg Mai bis Oktober 1979. Salzburg: Selbstverlag des Dommuseums.
- Kovács, E. (1979b). *Pius VI. bei Joseph II. zu Gast*. Archivum Historiae Pontificiae, 17.
- Kovács, E. (1983). *Der Pabst in Teutschland. Die Reise Pius VI. Im Jahre 1782*. Wien: Verlag für Geschichte und Politik.
- Lehner, U. L. (2016). *The Catholic Enlightenment. The Forgotten History of a Global Movement*. Oxford: University Press.
- Pfeiffer, N. (1913). *Die ungarische Dominikanerprovinz von ihrer Gründung 1221 bis zur Tatarenverwüstung 1241-1242*. Zürich: Verlag von Gebr. Leeman & Co.
- Pranzl, R. (2008). Das Verhältnis von Staat und Kirche/Religion im there-sianisch-josephinischen Zeitalter. In H. Reinalter (Ed.). *Josephinismus als Aufgeklärter Absolutismus*. Wien, Köln & Weimar: Böhlau Verlag.
- Raab, H. (1970). Staatskirchentum und Aufklärung in den weltlichen Territorien des Reiches. Theresianismus und Josephinismus. In H. Jedin (Ed.). *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte*. (Vol. 5). Die Kirche im Zeitalter des Absolutismus und der Aufklärung. Freiburg, Basel & Wien: Herder.
- Scheutz, M. (2012). Ein Lutheraner “auf dem Habsburgerthron. Die josephinischen Reformen und die Klösteraufhebungen in der

Habsburgermonarchie. In *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung*,(120): 321-338.

Tugwell, S. (2000). *The evolution of Dominican structures of government. II: The first Dominican provinces*. *Archivum fratrum Praedicatorum*, 70.

