Demonology and Catholic Enlightenment in Eighteenth-Century Hungary

Dániel Bárth

EXPOSITION OF THE PROBLEM

It might come as a surprise at first that in Hungary research into ecclesiastic demonology in the narrow sense, and into the Catholic Enlightenment are still at a very early stage. This statement is relevant from the level of source discovery through to analytical studies. Our sense of loss (and in a way our confusion) is even more enhanced if we establish where our focus lies with respect to the international historical literature. The undiscovered status of the sources in Hungary and the lack of necessary preliminary investigations almost give rise to a sense of pointlessness in the researcher interested in the topic and intending to

During the research period to this study my work was supported by the János Bolyai Research Grant of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. The research leading to these results was financed by the European Research Council, in accordance with ERC grant agreement No. 324214 of the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (2007–2013). The latter proved to be a great help during the finalization of the text of this study.

D. Bárth (✉)

Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary

e-mail: barth.daniel@btk.elte.hu

© The Author(s) 2017

G. Klaniczay and É. Pócs (eds.), *Witchcraft and Demonology in Hungary and Transylvania*, Palgrave Historical Studies in Witchcraft and Magic, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-54756-5_8

write a paper on the connection between the two concepts mentioned in the title. In the following, however, my attempt to point out some of the issues which seem important to me, and which hopefully can moreover be supported by Hungarian data, is obviously not an attempt to summarize and conclude; it is rather along the perspectives of future directions in the research that I intend to establish my views.

DID CATHOLIC DEMONOLOGY HAVE A HUNGARIAN 'VERSION' IN THE EARLY MODERN PERIOD?

Even though the study of witch trials from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century has been a privileged research field of historical-anthropological and folkloristic source exploration and publication in recent decades in Hungary and the exploitation and contextualization of the trials in terms of demonology have given us satisfying results, the exploration of some related groups of sources have not received sufficient attention in recent research.¹ While there have been several ground-breaking and enticing studies of the various genres of Protestant demonological literature (handbooks, treatises, sermons, etc.) and of the numerous aspects of Protestant devil concepts (ecclesiastic, theological, literary, material, iconographic, etc.),² the Catholic equivalents of such phenomena have been neglected. I believe no one, whether closely or merely casually interested in this topic, would doubt the importance of the examination of sources related to the biggest religious denomination of its time. However, it is a fact, that while serious studies concerning the devil-perception of Protestant sermons have been undertaken,³ the exploration of similar Catholic sources has not even begun. While some pieces of demonological literature and their ethnographical and historical reception have appeared as bestsellers by 'celebrity authors'⁴ (and rightly so, by the way); we know nothing about the Hungarian Catholic point of view of the period in question. Until recent times, the situation was no better concerning liturgical texts: typically, one of the rare local relics of Protestant exorcist rituals was republished in print⁵ earlier than its Catholic version (from Esztergom), which literally served as a basis for the former.⁶

There is no need to scrutinize structural and personal elements of this conspicuous absence, since it seems far more important to consider the real research possibilities that arise from this situation. This present study attempts to approach this perspective from a focused angle, namely

through an instructive case study on the relationship between Catholic Enlightenment and demonology. Before we get to it, however, it seems necessary to establish certain preliminary hypotheses.

1. First and foremost, we have to establish that the Hungarian sources from the early modern age allow us to put the system of Catholic demonology under a microscope.
2. This Catholic demonology (as opposed to the prevailing theological views of the time) does not appear as a uniform and exclusive system; it is rather to be interpreted as a multi-layered cluster in which, beside the 'dominant' views, further 'alternative' mental systems materialize.
3. Even though Hungarian demonology is a part of European demonology, the use (or sometimes the non-use) of the European handbooks in Hungarian context also reveals a peculiar and specific side of demonology.

The acknowledgement of this last premise is especially important, since it might have been precisely the hypothesis ignoring the existence of an autonomous literature and source material demonology in Hungarian that impeded previous research into the issue.⁷ The rich material of benedictions and exorcisms discovered in collections published in Hungary and the analysis of the deeper layers of eighteenth-century exorcism scandals traced back thus far prove the opposite.⁸ Even in the case of the supranational, universal liturgical texts it has been possible to sense certain Eastern European, and even minor regional differences.⁹ We have no reason to presume that the case is any different with demonological handbooks, tractates and ceremonial books.¹⁰ The comparative analysis and contextualization of these latter would be the task of (several) other studies. In fortunate cases data has been found to confirm their parochial and monastic possession and use. The direct or indirect relationship between the Catholic demonological literature and witch-hunting—whether there are clear traces of a decisive interference in this field, or whether we should be content with the rather sceptical and negative answers obtained so far in terms of the Hungarian relevance of the matter—might be a separate issue for study.¹¹ The most interesting question, however, resides undoubtedly in the different concepts of demonology applied in practice, and the confrontation of the different opinions. Examples for the escalation of the conflicts proliferated parallel

to the spread of rationalism throughout Europe. The pace of this process can be traced throughout two centuries; it can be depicted as a prolonged and regionally changing process. Scepticism within the Church was already visible during the great waves of exorcism in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; nevertheless, it was not until the Enlightenment appeared within the Church in the second half of the eighteenth century that most of the related phenomena were spectacularly thrust back.¹²

POSSIBLE APPROACHES TO THE CATHOLIC ENLIGHTENMENT

With regard to the different forms of Catholic Enlightenment¹³ in Hungary, we encounter the most palpable silence among the representatives of reliable church history. Even in defining the concept of 'Catholic Enlightenment' we have for the most part to turn to the works of foreign authors.¹⁴ The main trends in the history of the Church already have an ambivalent take on the concept itself, sometimes interpreting it as an antagonistic opposition, sometimes cutting it short with a generalization.¹⁵ In Hungary there are as yet no comprehensive monographs that would present the changes of each diocese in terms of organization, religious practice and history of mentality, particularly with regard to this period. This despite there being an abundance of European examples! In the past century dozens of exemplary monographs were issued in this field, mostly within the discipline of German and French studies.¹⁶ These studies have usually arranged the data around the activities of one particular ecclesiastic leader.¹⁷ They often discuss issues like folk religion, folk traditions, folk beliefs, the fight against magic and superstition, etc.¹⁸ Internationally, one of the most exploited sources is the liturgical handbooks of the time, which inspired reform suggestions throughout Europe, especially concerning the use of native languages, the repression of 'superstitious' elements, and the simplification, explanation and individualization of the liturgy.¹⁹

These international studies remind us that there are in fact regional variants of Catholic Enlightenment in eighteenth-century Europe. The results of future Hungarian research—based on discovery of primary sources—can be only interpreted in a European perspective.

Besides the shortcomings of Hungarian church history, we can only give an account of the partial results obtained in the field of literary history.²⁰ We must, though, pay attention to the complexity and the overstrained nature of the concept of 'Enlightenment'—especially in

terms of literary history—which sometimes impairs the interdisciplinary value of the results. The studies emerging in segregated disciplinary areas lack proper communication precisely because of terminological confusions that cause dissent.

A fundamental matter when it comes to the analysis of Catholic Enlightenment is the determination of its 'golden age'. In French studies of church history, Bernard Plongeron defines the period as lying between 1770 and 1830, during which the effects of Catholic Enlightenment ideology were the strongest and most dynamic.²¹ In German studies, even the mid-eighteenth-century decades are considered part of the Enlightenment era, while the first half of the century is referred to within the Church as the 'early Enlightenment' (*Frühhaufklärung*).²² Compared to these Western examples, Hungarian church history shows some delay, which is mainly a consequence of Ottoman rule. In most parts of the country it was only at the end of the seventeenth, or more likely in the first third of the eighteenth century that the reform processes of the renewed Catholicism of the Tridentinum could start; although it occurred parallel to the process of the establishment of the Church organization and the consolidation of confessional borders. Catholic reform/renewal and parallel confessionalization in the first half of the eighteenth century make it a very busy and exciting period of research. Earlier Church historiography²³ referred to these decades under the umbrella term of 'late baroque', which—in my belief—has unduly become a much overloaded category in the fields of history of ideas, church history, history of literature, and art history; and has thus become unsuitable as a general reference. It is still not clear where the borderlines of the different tendencies of Catholic renewal lie: in the background different measures of the councils or the Consistory, how long we should still speak of reform, and when we should start using the term (early) Enlightenment? As for *rationalism* and *tolerance*, the two key concepts of the Catholic Enlightenment, we are mostly in trouble with the former; since reasonableness is also already detectable in several reform regulations in the first half of the eighteenth century, in particular concerning certain elements of popular culture. Tolerance only brings noticeable change in Hungary in the period of Josephinism.²⁴ Nevertheless, this in itself raises a question: to what extent should our calculations take into consideration the parallel nature of Catholic Enlightenment and enlightened absolutism in Hungary, which—compared to the Western model—seems to be a general phenomenon in this region?²⁵

CATHOLIC ENLIGHTENMENT AND POPULAR CULTURE

We are in an especially difficult position if we want to capture the changes in the ecclesiastical attitude towards popular culture, because the major trends of Church governance were often evolving in the same direction throughout the century. We have to identify the nodes by which changes in clerical attitude can be better observed.²⁶ In what follows, we attempt to do so within the framework of a case study.

Before arriving at that point, however, we must mention the importance of the intermediary role of the lower clergy, another grey area in the eye of the historical inquiry focusing on this period.²⁷ Yet it is my opinion that in the contact zone of Church governance and local communities it is in fact the traces of the change of attitude and of the concrete measures of the lower clergy that we have to examine in order to understand the complex tissue of the relationship between Catholic Enlightenment and popular culture. Sándor Bálint, one of the best Hungarian researchers in the field of religious ethnography, refers on several occasions in his writings with a tone of resentment and disapproval to the indisposition of the 'josephinist clergy' towards certain forms of folk piety; he could, nevertheless, never conduct a deep analysis of changes in clerical attitudes.²⁸ Any extensive discovery of sources concerning the change of mentality and attitudes of seminary teachers is also missing²⁹; and we know very little of the local execution of the intentions and regulations of the state, and of the ways the local clergy responded to them.

The Catholic Enlightenment had an integral effect on every aspect of religious life: a thorough analysis should be made to clarify the extent and the intensity concerning each aspect. Since for the time being there are no existing studies concerning Hungarian dioceses, we have to accept the relevant conclusions of the international literature. We have no reason to assume that the effects of the Hungarian Catholic Enlightenment differed significantly from others. Following the monograph by Barbara Goy based on the source material from the dioceses of Würzburg and Bamberg we can consider, among others, the following aspects: holidays of the year; arrangements of holidays and workdays; veneration of saints; processions; pilgrimages; the possibility of obtaining indulgences; sacramentals; ringing the church bells against storms; rites of passage (the turning points in human life); prayers, religious songs, rituals.³⁰

This series can be naturally extended depending on the given diocese's source material. In this present study we have no room to make up for the shortcomings of monographs in this field, not even by enumerating a few mere examples of the above mentioned aspects. Fortunately there are some preliminary studies in Hungary which discuss some of these areas in a topical, non-regional approach; and which contain, even if sporadically, references to the changes induced by the Catholic Enlightenment. As examples I would mention the studies on pilgrimages,³¹ the changes concerning the cult of saints,³² and the analysis of the ecclesiastical benediction practices in the early modern period.³³ As a common denominator of the above-mentioned we can highlight an important new development, namely that the influence of the Catholic Enlightenment caused a change in the attitude towards the miracle³⁴: in the mindset of the upper levels of the ecclesiastical society the susceptibility towards various pseudo-miraculous phenomena has been gradually relegated into the background, and it became increasingly classified in the category of 'popular religion'. Meanwhile, we can observe that in the second half of the eighteenth century there existed in Hungary as elsewhere several representatives of the 'Counter-Enlightenment'³⁵ (*Gegen-Aufklärung*) the points of view of which have been discovered in legal files thanks to some scandalous events they were involved in. In the following, we will attempt to detect the conflict zones of these two kinds of ecclesiastic attitude in the framework of a micro-analytic case study.

ENLIGHTENMENT AND COUNTER-ENLIGHTENMENT AS REFLECTED IN THE CONFLICTS OF AN EIGHTEENTH CENTURY FRANCISCAN FRIAR FROM ZOMBOR

In the background of this chapter lie the exorcist, healing, catechization, preaching and confessional activities of Rókus Szmendrovich, the Illyrian festive preacher of the Franciscan convent of Zombor.³⁶ The repercussions of the case of the friar who exorcized dozens of Catholic and Greek Orthodox 'possessed' in the second half of the 1760s created immense documentation by the superior authorities of the diocese; which are today stored in the Kalocsa Archiepiscopal Archives.³⁷

The population of Zombor in the eighteenth century was excessively mixed in terms of ethnicity and religion.³⁸ The majority of the city's population was Catholic Southern Slav also referred to in the official

terminology of the time as 'Illyrians'. Besides them, there were Hungarians, Germans and Greek Orthodox Serbs living here. These last disposed of 12 Orthodox priests and two churches.³⁹

So far, we have only sporadic and indirect data on the life of Rókus Szmendrovich before he joined the local Franciscan convent in 1766; he was in his early forties when he conducted his outstanding activities. He was born in 1726 in the region of Turpolje, in Velika Mlaka, Croatia. He was originally baptized with the name of Peter. His ecclesiastic career—as a secular priest—was mostly related to the diocese of Zagreb. He had long been active in the city of Pozsega (Požega). With regard to our research it is worth mentioning that the parish priest of the city had given him written permission to practice exorcism. Later he was to take over the administration of the parish. It is still a mystery as to why the priest of more than 35 years standing asked him to join the Franciscans in the 1760s. (It is for further research to discover the—at present only assumed—connection between this action and his exorcist-healing activities.) What we do know for certain is that the former parish priest of Pozsega, Peter Szmendrovich joined the Franciscan order on 16th June, 1763 in the Sarengrad convent; and that exactly one year later he took an eternal vow. This is when he changed his name to Rókus. In the visitation of the convent they noted that besides Croatian and Latin, he also spoke some German, Slovakian and Hungarian. In Zombor, he was named Illyrian festive preacher (*concionator festivalis*), which title he held until May 1769.⁴⁰

The first exorcism started on 8th December, 1766. Following liturgical regulations, Rókus began the exorcism of the wife of the local Antal Matich after the morning mass. The woman, named Anna, had been suffering for long years from a peculiar illness that her husband, her relatives and her neighbors all interpreted as diabolical possession. They told him that besides being confused and having seizures, the woman had been inhibited by a mysterious force from being able to receive the holy communion. The news of the first exorcism,⁴¹ which lasted two weeks, went around the city and its surroundings. Huge crowds gathered around the parish church to witness this extraordinary attraction. It is difficult to tell who might have been the one to 'report' the somewhat scandalous conduct of the Franciscan monk to the superior Church authorities; but by the end of the winter, that is February and March of the following year, he was struggling to free a dozen members of the Greek Orthodox community from presumed diabolical possession. In all

events, in the spring of 1767 the case was in front of the Archiepiscopal Consistory court (*consistorium*) of Kalocsa.⁴² The canon leading the session announced that it had come to their knowledge that a Franciscan monk from Zombor had been unsuccessfully exorcizing 'allegedly possessed' individuals for more than a month. His actions had been utterly irregular, at the expense and ridicule of the liturgy. According to their sources the person in question had even raised a stage-like wooden podium inside the church where he conducted the ceremonies. During the noisy attraction, the audience of various ages and both sexes repeated collectively the text of the exorcism cited in the vernacular language after the priest who—as a part of the ritual—lined up the possessed Greek Orthodox people with candles in their hands. They immediately ordered a thorough investigation of the case. They gave the dean of the district a letter of credence to travel as soon as possible to the city to forbid the named Franciscan friar from conducting public exorcism; and to organize an investigation based on the given line of questioning. The dean secretly observed the process of the exorcism. He saw the following: the 'exorcist priest'—without a book and a stole—uttered the prayers in Croatian; the crowd repeated certain parts after him, for example "Get thee behind me, Satan, get thee behind me unclean spirit; may you be obliterated by the Passion of Christ, may his sacred blood crush you". The dean called Father Rókus to account for the abuses, and at the instruction of the Consistory he forbade him to conduct public exorcisms.⁴³ In his answers to the questioning, Father Rókus explained that after the news had spread of his first exorcism, more and more 'schismatics' suffering from different diseases had come to see him and he had identified the symptoms of true diabolical possession in nineteen out of thirty people. It was apparent that all of them were women. In vain did he try to tell them to go to their Orthodox priests and *kalugers*; they responded that they had already tried their help, unsuccessfully. Many of the liberated converted to Catholicism, as did several of the 'spectators'.⁴⁴

Rókus was present at the meeting of the Consistory at the end of April 1767, where he explained his defence and his justifications in detail.⁴⁵ The Franciscan even presented three letters of certificate from different notables of the city, claiming unanimously that they had attended the exorcism rituals where they have not noticed any irregularities; everything that happened was in honour and for the benefit of the Catholic faith. According to them, Father Rókus was very circumspect with the exorcisms of the people suffering—as they

said—undoubtedly from diabolical possession. They considered the conversion of those from other confessions as an obvious benefit resulting from the exorcisms.⁴⁶

The personal appearance of the Franciscan monk had a positive effect on the notables of the Consistory thus far. The resolution considered the friar's devotion, merits and virtuous lifestyle alongside the testimonies; therefore it only established the condition that the scandalous matter should not happen again. If the suspicion of possession arose again, he should seek the assistance of two fellow friars from the convent; detect the diabolical symptoms in their presence; and send the protocols to the Consistory. If the superior Church authority gave permission, he could then proceed with the exorcism, though only by following the regulations described in the rituals of the diocese.

This resolution calmed the emotions for a while. Father Rókus even acquired a permit to become confessor priest for the whole diocese, thereby continuing his activities under official approval. Locals suspected of diabolical possession still went to see him now and again. After a couple of months the first lengthy protocol arrived at Kalocsa; it contained the description of the symptoms of the possession of a woman from Szabadka (Subotica).⁴⁷ In September 1767 the Consistory permitted the exorcism of two diabolically possessed. After the procedure, he had to send a report of the outcome signed by two witnesses.⁴⁸

Subsequently, the public exorcisms stopped for a while. In the period between 1767 and 1769, father Rókus excelled not only as a preacher, but as a catechist both of the young and of adults.⁴⁹ He participated in the organization of religious associations. Later the city notables praised his skills as an orator and virtues as a catechist. The friar also took his fair share of other priestly duties. We can suspect from indirect references that, with his exceptional personality, he attracted many believers for confession. In later letters many extolled his confessor skills. Besides the obvious reason—his exorcisms—such talents surely contributed to the enthusiasm for the charismatic friar. However, the real key to the secret of his immense popularity and appeal was surely his clandestine healing activities. This is what the sources barely reveal, and what the letters of praise never mention. Nevertheless, this was the basis for the problems with and the accusation against him. By healing activities we refer not only to the public exorcisms, but also the secretly exercised incantations, a benediction practice with medieval roots that the friar cared to perform to comfort those of his supporters who were struggling with

physical complaints. No wonder that Rókus was so popular among the relatives of the dying. Most of those asking for the last unction asked specifically for him. (Contrary to his fellow friars, they say he entered the house smiling, and the patients already felt better at his sight.) People also ran to him in cases of severe illness. The friar never turned down a request. He discussed his view in several of his letters, claiming that the Devil often possessed his victims disguised as seemingly obvious diseases. According to this point of view, his healing method frequently consisted of benedictions and exorcism. Apparently, he only performed public exorcisms in severe cases of demonstrable diabolical possession that also manifested mental symptoms. Therefore the above mentioned spectacular exorcisms were only the tipping points of his hidden healing activities.⁵⁰

The series of events resulting in similar exorcist séances and eventually leading to the end of Szmendrovich's activities in Zombor started in the late spring of 1769. The news arrived at the Consistory of Kalocsa in May: the Franciscans in Zombor were exorcizing again. This time it was a local man and a woman who were the subjects of the ritual. Three fellow friars gave testimonial letters to confirm the diabolical possession of the two Catholics.⁵¹ The archbishop József Batthyány also contributed to the case, ordering that the diabolical possession of these people should be confirmed in front of the Consistory and that they should be confined until the truth was discovered. Batthyány's impatient tone in his commanding letter suggests that he was becoming increasingly exasperated with the activities of the 'often mentioned' Franciscan friar.⁵²

The Consistory investigation which made the final decision in the case took place in May 1769.⁵³ The sick man was carried on a coach: he lay with his eyes closed, twitching, choking, and grinding his teeth. After the county doctor had examined him, he opened his eyes and presented his lengthy and confused story. The woman also told her story of her diabolical possession in which she involved the encounter with father Rókus. After that, one of the canons of the Consistory made an attempt to exorcize her, but the woman showed no sign of being diabolically possessed during the ceremony conducted according to the regulations of the official Roman Ritual. When they asked her what she felt during the exorcism, she said that besides the usual heart-strain she felt nothing. Next, it was the turn of Rókus—who thus far had only been a spectator of the events—to perform the exorcism. First there were no visible signs, but then in the second half of the ceremony, in the

afternoon, she manifested some signs (distortion, seizures, the grinding of her teeth, screaming, trembling); nonetheless, the Church leaders were not convinced. They were already disturbed by the fact that the friar had performed this part of the exorcism in faint whispers. It was already evening by the time they started exorcizing the man. He claimed that his hand was mysteriously restrained by some force whenever he wanted to cross himself. He also felt terrible pain when he heard praying. To confirm this they started to pray, first in Croatian and then in Latin. The man was squirming in agony from the pain. The notabilities of the Consistory tricked him by gradually changing the text of the Latin prayer into a profane, unreligious text. The man naturally felt the same pain. His fraud was uncovered.

The next morning, after hearing two witnesses, they issued a resolution establishing that the two allegedly possessed were in fact suffering from natural diseases. The man was insane (*maniacus*) and the woman epileptic. The specification of the diseases⁵⁴ was based on the official medical records of the examination conducted by the county doctor Henrik Kerschner. However, this was not the reason on the basis of which they cast off the possibility of diabolical possession. The conclusive decision was made by the members of the Consistory, based on the fact that the woman showed no sign during the exorcism by the Consistory canon and the threefold exorcism by the Franciscan friar that would have proven unequivocally the presence of supernatural forces.

The resolution did not favor the Franciscan. They pronounced that through the exorcisms he had violated the previous resolutions of the Consistory concerning him; the exorcism had incited a scandal among the 'schismatics'; and the holy rituals had become a subject of ridicule among the people. For all this he had to face a double punishment: he was banned from performing any kind of exorcism, and his confessor license was revoked. The leader of the convent went even further: he disabled him in all of his capacities as a pastor and he confined him within the walls of the convent.⁵⁵

The banning of their 'favorite' friar from all interaction with his followers sparked a huge upheaval in the city. The notables launched a new, desperate assault to fight the resolution. The Consistory of Kalocsa received a deluge of testimonies and letters certifying, requesting, and begging for the reinstatement of the monk. The honest and often passionate tone of the letters bears out just how fond the notables of the city were of Father Rókus. In an interrogation record they mention ten

cases related to him highlighting his activities in healing and comforting the sick. The document also clarifies the reason why his supporters bemoaned the banning of the friar from confessions.⁵⁶

Their convulsion, however, must have achieved an effect opposite to what they intended. The Church leaders were only reassured in the correctness of their decision to ask their superiors to remove the scandalously popular Franciscan friar. His transfer to another diocese was encouraged by the archbishop himself.

The further life of the Franciscan remains in pitch-black void. He was probably transferred to a monastery in the South, in Slavonia or Croatia. His name later comes up as a monk with no function in a convent in Diakóvár. He passed away on 7th December 1782 in Szentmihály (Drávaszentmihály, today: *Mihovljan*), and is buried in the crypt of a nearby Franciscan church.⁵⁷

A GERMAN PARALLEL: JOHANN JOSEPH GASSNER, THE EXORCIST WONDER HEALER

It has been a decade now since I come across this wonderful and 'intact' source material in the archives. The story of the exorcist from Zombor—among other topics—has been occupying me ever since. In the beginning, my initial hypothesis was that we were dealing with the conflict between the medieval, 'folkish' Franciscan attitude and the rational Church leadership permeated by Catholic Enlightenment. I have considered the use of exorcism as this spectacular healing method a unique and belated phenomenon here, in view of the observations on the vogue and the subsequent fade away of similar scandals in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Europe.⁵⁸ This seemed to be justified by the fact that I have not found any other similar cases in Hungary from this period. In my search for European analogies, however, it was quite easy to come across the story of John Gassner,⁵⁹ the most famous exorcist of the eighteenth century. Born in Vorarlberg, after his ordination this priest carried out his activities in the dioceses of Chur, Konstanz, Augsburg and Regensburg. He was involved in what might have been the biggest European scandal of the 1770s, which resulted in a multitude of contemporary manuscripts and printed source materials. Based on these materials researchers in church history (first Zimmermann,⁶⁰ then more extensively Hanauer,⁶¹ and others exploring subtopics)⁶² presented meticulous analyses of the life of Gassner and the history of his impact.

The exemplary studies reveal not only the unusual biographical facts of a priest's life, but also the pros and cons of the evaluations of activities of the 'wonder healer' (*Wunderheiler*), his healing methods and a long list of the diseases he treated. Recently Gassner's character even attracted the attention of American historical anthropology: Eric Midelfort, a specialist in early modern religious demonology, mostly working with German sources, presented the story to a wider readership in an autonomous mini-monograph in 2005.⁶³

Taking all into account, we can decipher in detail the elements of the South German exorcising and healing events. The most apparent feature is the extended size of the scandal. Gassner started his healing activities at the end of the 1750s after having healed himself of a mysterious disease with benedictions and exorcism. After having been healed, he tried out the texts and the procedure on the parish congregation. The 1760s passed in his performing continuous, but relatively quiet healing activities. The news, however, started to spread quickly over a wider circle. Whichever parish he was assigned to, soon a crowd of blind, crippled, epileptic people and others suffering from various ailments started to gather around him. He started to keep his own records of his healings in a *Diarium*. Then the events reached fever-pitch in the middle of the 1770s. At this point we see a travelling 'wonder healer' whose arrival at every new venue was an occasion that attracted big crowds. His activities not only occupied the attention of the contemporary media, but also engaged the highest levels of Church and state leadership. His personality divided the intelligentsia: the number of pamphlets and tracts against and for him was approximately equal (in total there were more than a hundred individual publications). Among his supporters and opponents we find powerful Church leaders as well as prominent Church personalities on the Catholic and the Protestant side alike. The state leadership also voiced their opinion of him: Joseph II expressed his disapproval concerning the noisy miracles. That Gassner did eventually end his healing activities not long before he died was due directly to a ban issued by the highest of all earthly authorities: the Pope. During the more than one and a half decades that Gassner practiced his healings, he treated over tens of thousands of people, mostly from the lower echelons of society. According to contemporary evaluations he met for the most part with success. Subsequent scholarly opinions highlight the priest's capacities as 'Suggestor' and 'Hypnositeur'.⁶⁴ Our task—in my

opinion—is not to examine the true or false nature of the healing powers of Gassner and his epigones,⁶⁵ but rather to interpret the entire series of events in its own socio-cultural milieu.

PARALLELS AND CONCLUSIONS

After briefly presenting the biographies of the exorcist from Zombor and his famous German precursor, let us discuss the issues that lie in the background of the parallel nature of the two lives. In what follows—essentially by ignoring the differences—I have aimed to focus on and highlight the analogies between the two. The topical clusters below might be the basis of a more extensive future analysis.

PERSONALITY

Gassner and Szmendrovich spent the somewhat more than five decades of their lives over the same period, almost to the day, but separated by a distance of 1000 kilometres. They obviously did not know each other. They were both priests of the enthusiastic kind. As parish priests they applied every pastoral tool to care for their flock. Their charismatic personalities made them popular priests. In both cases they mention the suggestive capacity of their eyes. They appeared as strong servants of God, even in the eyes of those of other faiths. This type of evaluation is often seen in present day ethnographical and anthropological descriptions studying the relations between priests and the community. It is especially true concerning the practice of both Catholic and Protestant Hungarians living today in Romania who, even today, in the twenty-first century, resort to the services of benediction/malediction performed by Romanian priests and friars.⁶⁶ Informants often explain this phenomenon with the extraordinary personality of the bearded Orthodox priests: their ‘mesmerizing eyes’ and the more powerful and effective nature of their liturgical texts.⁶⁷ The Southern Hungarian story is even more exciting because there we see the inverse of these services: in the given religious zone members of the Serbian Orthodox community expected help from the Franciscan friar who, in fact, appeared as the stronger priestly personality. Both Gassner and Father Rókus excelled not only in their healing capacities, but also with their utmost dedication which manifested in other areas of their priestly activities. People showed a preference towards their preaching; they preferred to confess to them as opposed to other priests; and they always chose them when they called a priest to the dying.

PERCEPTION OF DISEASE

Evidently the background to their great popularity lay in the cures they provided to human diseases. Here we must turn our attention to their peculiar perception of diseases. Researching on a seventeenth-century exorcist from Piedmont, Giovanni Levi makes the observation that by using a language form prevailing in his age and used in the perception of diseases (which he calls personalistic; and according to which various natural, supernatural, social and personal causes lie in the background of all diseases) the priest preached an earlier and simpler causal perception. Levi calls this latter naturalistic; which is the explanation of a disease arising from the disturbed balance of Nature.⁶⁸ We encounter this simplified perception in the case of the exorcist of Piedmont as in those of our parallel personalities, since in their belief it is the devil/demon who is behind the diseases most of the time. This perception was one of the keys to their success. The other important element was that they identified themselves with demonological views, which were considered outdated in the second half of the eighteenth century. They have decisively distinguished the basic types of possession; the manifestations of *circumpossessio*, *obsessio* and *possessio*. The latter two were healed with large-scale, ceremonial exorcism, while the effects of the demonic *circumpossessio* were cured with benedictions and 'minor' exorcisms. As an argument against rationality and empiricism they claimed that the Devil was capable of disguising possession as a natural disease. Only certain people and texts were able to discover this treacherous circumstance. At the beginning of their procedures they performed a trial exorcism (*exorcismus probativus*) with texts different from and stronger than the official (Roman) ritual.⁶⁹

'WHITE MAGIC'

Gassner and Szmendrovich both worked with handbooks and demonological treatises that referred to either medieval or 'semi-official' practices tolerated for a while after the Tridentinum. In the beginning of the eighteenth century, the books of Menghi, Stampa, Eynatten and others were integrated one after the other into the list of forbidden books, the Index of the Vatican.⁷⁰ Their "*superstitiosus*" content linked them, among other things, to the mentality of ecclesiastic 'white magic'⁷¹; and—by their emphasis on bewitchment (*maleficium*)—to

the already fading memory of the witchcraft hysteria. These were the sources based on which Father Rókus deployed the widespread arsenal of weapons of the millennial exorcism practices of the Western Church: besides the holy water he also used wax medallions blessed by the Pope; the Gospel of Saint John and other publications containing holy scripture; prayers to the Virgin Mary, Saint Francis and Saint Anthony; consecrated bread; and so forth. He made incense from blessed flowers and plants to smoke the demons out. He made the possessed drink holy water with a drop of holy oil in it. But it was not only the exorcist handbooks that were 'outdated'; so were the collections containing the positive benedictions.⁷² The voluminous early modern handbooks by Martin von Cochem, Bernard Sannig, Gelasio di Cilia and others still show an equally rich arsenal of religious benediction and malediction texts, such as the one gathered by Adolph Franz concerning the medieval practice.⁷³ The system of Church services providing a prompt and effective aid to every necessity of life was discarded only gradually from everyday practice. Earlier I prepared a selection of texts from the collections of benedictions published in Hungary, based on which we were able to distinguish about a hundred and sixty types of benediction and exorcism procedures used in the period covering the sixteenth to eighteenth century.⁷⁴ There was a demand for sacramentals on the part of believers, a demand primarily met by the friars. We have mentioned that Father Rókus might have joined the Franciscans at a mature age in order to be able to exercise these kinds of services.

SPECTACULUM

It is certain that the two priests were not the only ones to use these texts and sacramental objects in the second half of the eighteenth century. There probably would not have been a scandal if they had performed their healings secretly, in quiet, and if they had not become an attraction. The *Rituale Romanum*⁷⁵ and the ceremonial books of the diocese published in adherence to it all strictly forbid public exorcisms in front of an audience. The struggles, often dragging on for weeks, were understandably prone to becoming spectacular local events. Although the arguments made by the opposition included various other reasons, this might have been the severest problem for both religious and secular leaders: in the second half of the eighteenth century no one wanted to make the consecrated Catholic Church the venue of circus spectacles.

CATHOLIC ENLIGHTENMENT

The stories of the two exorcists provide us with an opportunity to study the several mentalities in the different layers of the given period's ecclesiastical society. It is especially informative to examine the differences in attitudes toward demonology, sacramentals, miracles, and so on in terms of the propagation of the 'Catholic Enlightenment'.⁷⁶ Unfortunately we are still missing exemplary monographs that would analyse the relationship of this ideology and popular religion based on sources of each diocese. There should be detailed theoretical and analytic studies to clarify the transition from Catholic reform to Catholic Enlightenment. In the case of Rókus Szmendrovich it is clear that the high clergy leading the diocese in the 1760s was operating in the spirit of the Enlightenment; this is also proven by several of his other ordinances which we cannot discuss here. Of the two leading concepts of the Catholic Enlightenment, rationalism and tolerance, he especially favored the former. The Franciscan friar at the bottom of the religious hierarchical ladder confronted him on this issue; who—based on his mentality—can be considered as the Hungarian representative of the 'Counter-Enlightenment'. It is very exciting to observe how the easily influenced group of monastic notables, lower clergy of the parish, deans, canons and vicars wavered between the two poles. This obvious wavering between faith in miracles and scepticism only proves the transitional and liminal nature of this period.

POPULAR RELIGION

How do the 'people' and popular religion come into the picture? Mostly through bottom-up demands/needs which the religious services offered by the Franciscans (and other religious orders) were meant to satisfy. On the other hand, they also appear in the form of enthusiasm. There were in fact minor 'fan clubs' around the personalities of Gassner and Szmendrovich. In the background of their 'stardom' we can find their efficacy, the respect of *potentia*; which for example in the Middle Ages was associated with the shrines guarding holy relics, or with the exorcist healings related to 'living saints'. It was through them that their environment experienced the (healing) flow of God's mercy, its *praesentia*, its existence.⁷⁷ Through the analysis of the sources we also gain an insight into the deep layers of local religion and popular

beliefs; for example, with the analysis of the names of demons and demonological notions mentioned by Rókus, which originally were pronounced by the possessed. This task, nonetheless, goes beyond the frameworks of the present question-raising study.

Finally, as an epilogue, I would like to point out that the similar endings to our parallel stories might be deceptive. They appear in the guise of the last crusaders of the 'Counter-Enlightenment' in an era where the former common sense of *thinking with demons*⁷⁸ seemed to be diminishing; when the Catholic Enlightenment was staging loud scandals to overthrow the healing, enthusiastic movements. The latter were in fact effectively pushed to the background for a while, only to manifest themselves again and again under different socio-cultural circumstances. The mentality of the two priests, in various appearances, lives on to this day. In the autumn of 2012 there was a large international conference in Pécs of religious studies focusing on Spirit Possession. Many made the observation that in recent years, especially in the USA and Italy, there has been an increased demand on behalf of the clergy to apply exorcism more frequently. This reassured me of the tangible purpose of my research, if of course the anthropologists studying the exorcist healing activities of contemporary charismatic movements are open to historic examples. I believe that the retelling of the above mentioned stories—which is primarily the task of ethnography—can be useful even if it is not for practical and contemporary use. If certain aspects of eighteenth-century religious and everyday life have become more accessible through this method, I have attained my goal.

NOTES

1. Here I only mention a few extensive works also serving further orientation: Éva Pócs (ed.), *Demonológia és boszorkányság Európában* [Demonology and witchcraft in Europe] (Budapest and Pécs: L'Harmattan and PTE Néprajz Tanszék, 2001); ead. (ed.), *Démonok, látók, szentek. Vallásetnológiai fogalmak tudományközi megközelítésben* [Demons, seers, saints. Concepts of ethnology of religion from an interdisciplinary approach] (Budapest: Balassi, 2008); Gábor Klaniczay and Éva Pócs (eds), *Demons, Spirits, Witches 1–3*. (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2005–2008).
2. For Hungarian works in this regard see above all the work of Ildikó Kristóf and Éva Szacsvay. For example: Ildikó Kristóf, "Bűvös-bájos varázslók" vagy "a Sátán sáska farkú katonái": demonológiai elemek a

- 16–17. századi református irodalomban’ [“Enchanting sorcerers” or “locust-tailed soldiers of Satan”: demonological elements in Calvinist literature from sixteenth and seventeenth century] in Éva Pócs (ed.), *Demonológia és boszorkányság Európában* (Budapest: L’Harmattan and PTE Néprajz Tanszék, 2001), 107–135; Éva Szacsvay, ‘Protestáns ördöggépzetek: kép és üzenet’ [Protestant devil figures: picture and message], in Éva Pócs (ed.), *Lélek, halál, túlvilág. Vallásethnológiai fogalmak tudományos megközelítésben*. (Budapest: Balassi, 2001), 100–110.
3. Here I primarily refer to the partly published works of Éva Szacsvay. E.g.: Éva Szacsvay, ‘Protestant Devil Figures in Hungary’, in Gábor Klaniczay and Éva Pócs (eds), *Christian Demonology and Popular Mythology* (Budapest and New York: CEU Press, 2006), 89–108.
 4. See for example *Diabolical temptations* by Péter Bornemisza.
 5. Éva Szacsvay, ‘Az ördögűzés református szabályozása 1636-ban I.’ [The Calvinist regulation of exorcism in 1636] in Gábor Barna and Erzsébet Kótyuk (eds), *Test, lélek, természet. Tanulmányok a népi orvoslás emlékeiből. Köszöntő kötet Grynaeus Tamás 70. születésnapjára* (Budapest and Szeged: Kairosz, 2002), 79–92.
 6. Dániel Bárány, *Benedikció és exorcizmus a kora újkori Magyarországon* [Benediction and exorcism in Early Modern Hungary] (Budapest and Pécs: L’Harmattan, 2010), 429–438.
 7. Thus far, Éva Pócs has written the most extensive and most monumental study providing a complete overview within the Hungarian literature—in terms of historical references—based on European sources and scientific literary background: Éva Pócs, ‘Démoni megszállottság és ördögűzés a közép-kelet-európai népi hiedelemrendszerekben’ [Demonic possession and exorcism in the popular cultures of Central Eastern Europe], in ead. (ed.), *Demonológia és boszorkányság Európában* (Budapest and Pécs: L’Harmattan, 2001), 137–198.
 8. For antecedents see: Dániel Bárány, ‘Papok és démonok viadala: exorcizmus a kora újkori Magyarországon’ [The fight of priests and demons: exorcism in early modern Hungary], in Éva Pócs (ed.), *Démonok, látók, szentek. Vallásethnológiai fogalmak tudományos megközelítésben* (Budapest: Balassi, 2008), 59–68; id., *Exorcizmus és erotika. Egy XVIII. századi székelyföldi ördögűzés szokatlan körülményei* [Exorcism and erotica. The unusual circumstances of an 18th century exorcism in Székelyföld] (Kecskemét: BKMÖ Múzeumi Szervezete, 2008); id., *Benedikció és exorcizmus*, especially: 77–90).
 9. Cf. Bárány, *Benedikció és exorcizmus*.
 10. In the Eastern European context we do not have such a rich bibliography as is reflected in the gigantic work of Clark: Stuart Clark, *Thinking*

with Demons. *The Idea of Witchcraft in Early Modern Europe* (Oxford and New York: Oxford UP, 1997 [1977]), 687–726. During my research I have often used the handbooks of Girolamo Menghi *Flagellum daemonum, exorcismos terribiles, potentissimos et efficaces, remediaque probatissima, ac doctrinam singularem in malignos spiritus expellendos, facturasque et maleficia fuganda de obsessis corporibus complectens, cum suis benedictionibus, et omnibus requisitis ad eorum expulsionem. Accessit postremo pars secunda, quae Fustis daemonum inscribitur...* (Venetiis, 1697); Girolamo Menghi and Maximilian von Eynatten, *Fustis daemonum, adjurationes formidabiles, potentissimas et efficaces in malignos spiritus fugandos de oppressis corporibus humanis. Ex sacrae apocalypsis fonte, variisque sanctorum patrum auctoritatibus haustus complectens...* (Venetiis, 1697); Maximilian von Eynatten, *Manuale exorcismorum, continens instructiones et exorcismos ad ejiciendos e corporibus obsessis spiritus malignos, et ad quaevis maleficia depellenda, et ad quascumque infestationes daemonum reprimendas* (Antverpiae, 1626), of which see the contextual literature: Massimo Petrocchi, *Esorcismi e magia nell'Italia del cinquecento e del seicento* (Napoli: Libreria scientifica editrice, 1957); Manfred Probst, *Besessenheit, Zauberei und ihre Heilmittel. Dokumentation und Untersuchung von Exorzismushandbüchern des Girolamo Menghi (1523–1609) und des Maximilian von Eynatten (1574/75–1631)* (Münster: Aschendorff, 2008). Moreover, I have used the relevant chapters of the benediction books. Bárth, *Benedikció és exorcizmus*, 109–121, and the following handbooks: Petrus Antonius Stampa, *Fuga Satanae exorcismus. Ex sacrarum litterarum fontibus, pioque S. Ecclesiae instituto exhaustus* (Venetiis, 1605); Valerius Polidorus, *Practica exorcistarum ad daemones et maleficia de Christi fidelibus expellendum. Additionibus multis studiosissimae locupletata* (Patavii, 1585); Joannes Weyer, *De praestigiis daemonum, et incantationibus ac veneficiis libri sex...* (Basiliae, 1568); Joannes Laurentius Anania, *De natura daemonum libri IV.* (Venetiis, 1589); *Tomus secundus Malleorum quorundam Maleficarum, tam veterum, quam recentium autorum; continens...* (Francofurti ad Moenum, 1582).

11. See the immense literature on this topic, for example: Clark, *Thinking with Demons*; Pócs, ‘Démoni megszállottság’; David Lederer, ‘“Exorzisieren ohne Lizenz...” Befugnis, Skepsis und Glauben im frühneuzeitlichen Bayern’, in Hans de Waardt et al. (eds), *Dämonische Besessenheit. Zur Interpretation eines kulturhistorischen Phänomens* (Bielefeld: Verlag für Regionalgeschichte, 2005), 213–232.
12. Cécile Ernst, *Teufelaustreibungen. Die Praxis der katholischen Kirche im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert* (Bern: H. Huber, 1972); Brian P. Levack (ed.), *Possession and Exorcism* (New York and London: Garland, 1992); Trevor

- Johnson, 'Besessenheit, Heiligkeit und Jesuitenspiritualität', in de Waardt et al., *Dämonische Besessenheit.*, 233–247.
13. In the present study—for reasons of brevity—I am not considering questions and data concerning the intellectual movement of the eighteenth-century Protestant Churches.
 14. In relation to this concept: Bernard Plongeron, 'Recherches sur l'"Aufklärung" catholique en Europe occidentale (1770–1830)', *Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine*, 16 (1969), 555–605; Elisabeth Kovács (ed.), *Katholische Aufklärung und Josephinismus* (Wien: R. Oldenbourg, 1979); Harm Klueting (ed.), *Katholische Aufklärung—Aufklärung im katholischen Deutschland* (Hamburg: Meiner, 1993); Albrecht Beutel, *Kirchengeschichte im Zeitalter der Aufklärung. Ein Kompendium* (Göttingen: UTB GmbH, 2009).
 15. Egyed Hermann, *A katolikus egyház története Magyarországon 1914-ig* [The History of the Catholic Church in Hungary until 1914] (München: Aurora, 1973). See also the entry "Enlightenment" in the new Hungarian Catholic encyclopedia. István Diós (ed.), *Magyar Katolikus Lexikon III.* [Hungarian Catholic lexicon] (Budapest: Szent István Társulat, 1997). Concerning the new perception of the religious historiography see András Forgó, 'Katolikus felvilágosodás és politikai reformmozgalom. Szerzetesek a megújulás szolgálatában' [Catholic Enlightenment and political reform movement. Monks in the service of renewal], in M. István Szijártó and Zoltán Gábor Szűcs (eds), *Politikai elit és politikai kultúra a 18. század végi Magyarországon* (Budapest: Eötvös 2012), 120–146.
 16. Sebastian Merkle, *Die kirchliche Aufklärung im katholischen Deutschland. Eine Abwehr und zugleich ein Beitrag zur Charakteristik "kirchlicher" und "unkirchlicher" Geschichtsschreibung* (Berlin: Reichl, 1910); Andreas Posch, *Die kirchliche Aufklärung in Graz und an der Grazer Hochschule* (Graz: Leuschner & Lubensky, 1937); Gustav Schnürer, *Katholische Kirche und Kultur im 18. Jahrhundert* (Paderborn: F. Schöningh, 1941), 205–72; August Hagen, *Die kirchliche Aufklärung in der Diözese Rottenburg. Bildnisse aus einem Zeitalter des Übergangs* (Stuttgart: Schwabenverlag, 1953); Eduard Winter, *Der Josephinismus. Die Geschichte der österreichischen Reformkatholizismus 1740–1848.* (Berlin, 1962); Franz Wehrl, *Der "neue Geist". Eine Untersuchung der Geistesrichtungen des Klerus in Wien von 1750–1790.* (Phil. Diss.) (Wien. 1966); Barbara Goy, *Aufklärung und Volksfrömmigkeit in den Bistümern Würzburg und Bamberg* (Würzburg: Schöningh in Komm, 1969); Konrad Baumgartner, *Die Seelsorge im Bistum Passau zwischen barocker Tradition, Aufklärung und Restauration* (St. Ottilien: EOS, 1975); Bruno Lengenfelder, *Die Diözese Eichstätt zwischen Aufklärung und Restauration. Kirche und*

- Staat 1773–1821*. (Regensburg: F. Pustet, 1990); Dieter Breuer (ed.), *Die Aufklärung in den deutschsprachigen katholischen Ländern 1750–1800. Kulturelle Ausgleichsprozesse im Spiegel von Bibliotheken in Luzern, Eichstätt und Klosterneuburg* (Paderborn: F. Schöningh, 2001); Matthias J. Fritsch, *Religiöse Toleranz im Zeitalter der Aufklärung. Naturrechtliche Begründung—konfessionelle Differenzen* (Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 2004); Christopher Spehr, *Aufklärung und Ökumene. Reunionsversuche zwischen Katholiken und Protestanten im deutschsprachigen Raum des späteren 18. Jahrhunderts* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005).
17. Johann Baptist Sägmüller, *Die kirchliche Aufklärung am Hofe des Herzogs Karl Eugen von Württemberg (1744–1793). Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der kirchlichen Aufklärung* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1906); Johannes Rössler, *Die kirchliche Aufklärung unter dem Speierer Fürstbischof August von Limburg-Stirum (1770–1797). Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte und Beurteilung des Aufklärungszeitalters* (Speier am Rhein: H. Gilardonesche Buchdruckerei, inh. L. Gross, 1914); Josef Schöttl, *Kirchliche Reformen des Salzburger Erzbischofs Hieronymus von Colloredo im Zeitalter der Aufklärung* (Hirschenhausen: Verl. der Südstbayer. Heimatstudien, Weber, 1939); Richard van Dülmen, *Propst Franziskus Töpsl (1711–1796) und das Augustiner-Chorherrenstift Polling. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der katholischen Aufklärung in Bayern* (Kallmünz: Laßleben, 1967); Klaus Fronzek, *Kirchliche Leitungstätigkeit: in der katholischen Pastoraltheologie der deutschen Aufklärung nach der Lehre von Franz Christian Pittruff (1739–1814)* (Leipzig: St. Benno-Verlag, 1983); Wilhelm Haefs, *Aufklärung in Altbayern. Leben, Werk und Wirkung Lorenz Westenrieders* (Neuried: Neuried Ars Una, 1998); Winfried Romberg, *Johann Ignaz von Felbiger und Kardinal Johann Heinrich von Franckenberg. Wege der religiösen Reform im 18. Jahrhundert* (Sigmaringen: J. Thorbecke, 1999); Michael Müller, *Fürstbischof Heinrich von Bibra und die Katholische Aufklärung im Hochstift Fulda (1759–1788). Wandel und Kontinuität des kirchlichen Lebens* (Fulda: Parzeller, 2005); Siegfried Rudolf Pichl, *Joseph Anton Gall. Josephiner auf dem Bischofsstuhl* (Frankfurt am Main and New York: P. Lang, 2007); Claudius Stein, *Staatskirchentum, Reformkatholizismus und Orthodoxie im Kurfürstentum Bayern der Spätaufklärung. Der Erdinger Landrichter Joseph von Widmann und sein Umfeld (1781–1803)* (München: Beck, 2007).
 18. For example: Eva Kimminich, *Religiöse Volksbräuche im Räderwerk der Obrigkeiten. Ein Beitrag zur Auswirkung aufklärerischer Reformprogramme am Oberrhein und Vorarlberg* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1989); Martin Pott, *Aufklärung und Aberglaube. Die deutsche Frühaufklärung im Spiegel ihrer Aberglaubenskritik* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1992); Rudolf

- Schlögl, *Glaube und Religion in der Säkularisierung. Die katholische Stadt—Köln, Aachen, Münster—1700–1840*. (München: Oldenbourg, 1995); Wolfgang Brückner, 'Konfessionsfrömmigkeit zwischen Trienter Konzil und kirchlicher Aufklärung in Unterfranken', in id., *Frömmigkeit und Konfession: Verstehensprobleme, Denkformen, Lebenspraxis. Gesammelte Schriften von Wolfgang Brückner* (Würzburg: Bayerische Blätter für Volkskunde, 2000), 324–382; Stefan Siemons, *Frömmigkeit im Wandel. Veränderungen in den Formen der Volksfrömmigkeit durch Aufklärung und Säkularisation. Eine Untersuchung zu den Eigenheiten in der Reichsstadt Augsburg und ihrem schwäbischen Umland* (Augsburg: Heimatverein für den Landkreis, 2002).
19. Josef Steiner, *Liturgiereform in der Aufklärungszeit. Eine Darstellung am Beispiel Vitus Anton Winters* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1976); Hans Hollerweger, *Die Reform des Gottesdienstes zur Zeit des Josephinismus in Österreich* (Regensburg: Pustet, 1976); Leonard Swidler, *Aufklärung Catholicism 1780–1850. Liturgical and Other Reforms in the Catholic Aufklärung* (Missoula: Scholars, 1978); Franz Kohlschein und Kurt Küppers, "Der grosse Sänger David euer Muster". *Studien zu den ersten diözesanen Gesang- und Gebetbücher der katholischen Aufklärung* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1993); Benedikt Kranemann, *Die Krankensalbung in der Zeit der Aufklärung. Ritualien und pastoralliturgische Studien im deutschen Sprachgebiet* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1990); Hans-Joachim Ignatzi, *Die Liturgie des Begräbnisses in der katholischen Aufklärung. Eine Untersuchung von Reformentwürfen im südlichen deutschen Sprachgebiet* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1994); Klaus Keller, *Die Liturgie der Eheschliessung in der katholischen Aufklärung. Eine Untersuchung der Reformentwürfe im deutschen Sprachraum* (St. Ottilien: EOS, 1996).
 20. Gábor Tüskés und Éva Knapp, *Népi vallásosság Magyarországon a 17–18. században. Források, formák, közvetítők* [Folk religion in Hungary in the seventeenth-eighteenth centuries. Sources, forms, intermediaries] (Budapest: Osiris, 2001); Zoltán Lukácsi, 'Szószék és világosság. A magyar katolikus prédikáció a felvilágosodás korában' [The pulpit and the light. The Hungarian Catholic sermon in the age of Enlightenment] (PhD-thesis) (Budapest: ELTE, 2010).
 21. Plongeron, 'Recherches sur l'"Aufklärung"'.
 22. Walter Hartinger, 'Kirchliche Frühaufklärung in Ostbayern. Massnahmen gegen Wallfahrten und geistliche Spiele in den Bistümern Passau und Regensburg am Beginn des 18. Jahrhunderts', *Ostbairische Grenzenmarken. Passauer Jahrbuch für Geschichte, Kunst und Volkskunde*, 27 (1985), 142–157; Eduard Winter, *Frühaufklärung. Der Kampf*

- gegen den Konfessionalismus in Mittel- und Osteuropa und die deutsch-slawische Begegnung* (Berlin: Akademie, 1966).
23. See e.g. Domokos Kosáry, *Művelődés a XVIII. századi Magyarországon* [Cultural History of Hungary in the eighteenth century] (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1980).
 24. Fritsch, *Religiöse Toleranz*.
 25. On this matter see: Adam Wandruszka, 'Der Reformkatholizismus des 18. Jahrhunderts in Italien und in Österreich. Neue Forschungen und Fragestellungen', in Alexander Novotny and Othmar Pickl (eds), *Festschrift Hermann Wiesflecker zum sechzigsten Geburtstag* (Graz: Historisches Institut der Universität Graz, 1973), 231–240; Gábor Klaniczay, 'Gerard van Swieten és a babonák elleni harc kezdetei a Habsburg monarchiában' [Gerard Van Swieten and the fight against superstitions in the Habsburg Empire], in Gábor Klaniczay, János Poór and Éva Ring (eds), *A felvilágosodás jegyében. Tanulmányok H. Balázs Éva 70. születésnapjára* (Budapest: ELTE, 1985), 33–69.
 26. See for example: Georg Rückert, 'Brauchtum und Diözesanrituale im Aufklärungszeitalter. Das Rituale Augustanum vom Jahre 1764', *Volk und Volksstum. Jahrbuch für Volkskunde*, 2 (1937), 297–313; Ludwig Andreas Veit and Ludwig Lenhart, *Kirche und Volksfrömmigkeit im Zeitalter des Barock* (Freiburg in Breisgau: Herder, 1956); Goy, *Aufklärung und Volksfrömmigkeit*; Wolfgang Brückner, 'Zum Wandel der religiösen Kultur im 18. Jahrhundert. Einkreisungsversuche des "Barockfrommen" zwischen Mittelalter und Massenmissionierung', in Ernst Hinrichs and Günter Wiegmann (eds), *Sozialer und kultureller Wandel in der ländlichen Welt des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Wolfenbüttel: Herzog August Bibliothek, 1982), 65–83; id., 'Volkskultur und Wandel vom 18. zum 19. Jahrhundert', in id., *Volkskunde als historische Kulturwissenschaft: Kultur und Volk: Begriffe, Probleme, Ideengeschichte I. Gesammelte Schriften von Wolfgang Brückner* (Würzburg: Bayer, 2000), 184–206; Ernesto de Martino, *Katholizismus, Magie, Aufklärung. Religionswissenschaftliche Studie am Beispiel Süd-Italiens* (München: Trikont-Dianus Buchverlag, 1982); Hartinger, 'Kirchliche Frühaufklärung'; Daniel Drascek, 'Der Papstbesuch in Wien und Augsburg 1782. Zum Wandel spätbarocker Alltags- und Frömmigkeitskultur unter dem Einfluss süddeutscher Gegenauflärer', in Burkhart Lauterbach and Christoph Köck (eds), *Volkskundliche Fallstudien. Profile empirischer Kulturforschung heute* (Münster: Waxmann, 1998), 25–44; Walter Hartinger, 'Aufklärung und Säkularization als Wendepunkte der Volksfrömmigkeit', in Anton von Landersdorfer (ed.), *Vor 200 Jahren—Die Säkularization in Passau* (Passau: Klinger, 2003), 53–79.

27. Bernard Plongeron, *La vie quotidienne du clergé Français au XVIIIe siècle* (Paris: Hachette, 1974); Timothy Tackett, *Priest and Parish in Eighteenth-Century France. A Social and Political Study of the Curés in Diocese of Dauphiné 1750–1791*. (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1977); Dominique Julia, 'Der Priester', in Michel Vovelle (ed.), *Der Mensch der Aufklärung* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus-Verl, 1996), 282–320; John McManners, *Church and Society in Eighteenth-Century France I-II*. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998); Rainer Beck, 'Der Pfarrer und das Dorf. Konformismus und Eigensinn im katholischen Bayern des 17–18. Jahrhunderts', in Richard van Dülmen (ed.), *Armut, Liebe, Ehre. Studien zur historischen Kulturforschung* (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer-TB, 1988), 107–143; Günter Dippold, 'Klerus und Katholische Reform im Hochstift Bamberg', *Jahrbuch für Volkskunde* 21 (1998), 57–83; Werner Freitag, *Pfarrer, Kirche und ländliche Gemeinschaft. Das Dekanat Vechta 1400–1803* (Bielefeld: Verlag für Regionalgeschichte, 1998); Norbert Haag, Sabine Holtz and Wolfgang Zimmermann (eds), *Ländliche Frömmigkeit. Konfessionskulturen und Lebenswelten 1500–1850* (Stuttgart: Thorbecke, 2002). See most recently: Dániel Báth (ed.), *Alsópapság, lokális társadalom és népi kultúra a 18–20. századi Magyarországon* [Lower clergy, local society and folk culture in eighteenth–twentieth century Hungary] (Budapest: ELTE BTK Folklore Tanszék, 2013).
28. Sándor Bálint, *Sacra Hungaria. Tanulmányok a magyar vallásos népelet köréből* [Sacra Hungaria. Studies from Hungarian Religious Folk Life] (Kassa: Veritas, 1944).
29. Wehrl, Der "neue Geist".
30. Goy, *Aufklärung und Volksfrömmigkeit*.
31. Tüskés and Knapp, *Népi vallásosság*; Gábor Tüskés, *Búcsújárás a barokk kori Magyarországon a mirákulumirodalom tükrében* [Pilgrimage in Baroque Hungary reflected in the miracle literature] (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1993).
32. Tüskés and Knapp, *Népi vallásosság*.
33. Báth, *Benedikció és exorcizmus*.
34. Plongeron, 'Recherches sur l'"Aufklärung"'.
35. More on this notion: Daniel Drascek, *Gegenaufklärung im süddeutschen Raum. Zur Transformation der spätbarocken Alltags- und Frömmigkeitskultur im letzten Drittel des 18. Jahrhunderts*, (Habil. Diss.) (München, 1997); Brückner, 'Volkskultur und Wandel', 190–1; Darrin M. McMahon, *Enemies of the Enlightenment. The French Counter-Enlightenment and the Making of Modernity* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2001).
36. Available publications: Dániel Báth, 'Ördögűző Rókus testvér. Képek egy 18. századi zombori ferences életéből' [The exorcist Frater Rókus: Scenes from the life of a eighteenth century Franciscan of Zombor], in Sándor

- Óze and Norbert Medgyesy-Schmikli (eds), *A ferences lelkiiség hatása az újkori Közép-Európa történetére és kultúrájára 1–2.* (Piliscsaba and Budapest: PPKE BTK, 2005), 1. 271–287; id., ‘A zombori ördögűző. Egy 18. századi bácskai ferences tündöklése és bukása I–II.’ [The exorcist of Zombor. The rise and fall of an 18th century Franciscan from Bácska] *Bácsország Vajdasági Honismereti Szemle*, 3 (2009), 20–25; 4 (2009), 78–81.
37. Archives of the Archdiocese of Kalocsa I. Kalocsa Archiepiscopal Archives (*Kalocsai Érseki Levéltár*, hereafter: KÉL) Church government files (1. a.) *Ordines religiosi*, Franciscans, Zombor 1761–1787.
 38. János Muhi, *Zombor története* [History of Zombor] (Zombor, 1944).
 39. Vols. 1. e. *Prothocollum Canonicae Visitationis Districtus Superioris Bacsensis* a. 1767. 215–246.
 40. Hungarian Franciscan Archives (*Magyar Ferences Levéltár* hereafter MFL) *Tabulae...* 1767. Zombor; *Registrum de alma et antiquissima almae S. Joannis a Capistrano neo-erectae Provinciae Frat. Min. Reg. Obser. comparatum*. CDXVI.; Bárh, ‘A zombori ördögűző’.
 41. For further detail see: Bárh, ‘Papok és démonok’.
 42. KÉL 1. e. Vols. *Protocollum Consistoriale* 1766–1769. (March 14. 1767).
 43. KÉL 1. a. *Ordines religiosi*. Franciscans, Zombor (April 8. 1767).
 44. KÉL 1. a. *Ordines religiosi*. Franciscans, Zombor. Szmendrovich Rókus levele (April 9. 1767).
 45. KÉL 1. e. Vols. *Protocollum Consistoriale* 1766–1769. (April 29. 1767).
 46. KÉL 1. a. *Ordines religiosi*. Franciscans, Zombor. Zomboriak levelezése (April 25–27. 1767).
 47. KÉL 1. a. *Ordines religiosi*. Franciscans, Zombor.
 48. KÉL 1. a. *Ordines religiosi*. Franciscans, Zombor. Szmendrovich Rókus levelei (August 28., 30. 1767).
 49. KÉL 1. e. Vols. *Prothocollum Canonicae Visitationis Districtus Superioris Bacsensis* a. 1767. 229.
 50. KÉL 1. a. *Ordines religiosi*. Franciscans, Zombor.
 51. KÉL 1. a. *Ordines religiosi*. Franciscans, Zombor. Certificates (May 9–14. 1769.)
 52. KÉL 1. a. *Ordines religiosi*. Franciscans, Zombor. Letter of archbishop Batthyány József (May 16. 1769.)
 53. See the records: KÉL 1. e. Vols. *Protocollum Consistoriale* 1766–1769. (May 18–19. 1769.)
 54. KÉL 1. a. *Ordines religiosi*. Franciscans, Zombor. Henricus Kerschner tanúsítványa (May 19. 1769.)
 55. Bárh, ‘Ördögűző Rókus testvér’, 280.
 56. KÉL 1. a. *Ordines religiosi*. Franciscans, Zombor, June (13–26. 1769.)
 57. MFL Syllabus 1784.

58. Ernst, *Teufelaustreibungen*; Levack, *Possession and Exorcism*; Clark, *Thinking with Demons*; Philip C. Almond, *Demonic possession and exorcism in early modern England. Contemporary texts and their cultural contexts* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004); Sarah Ferber, *Demonic Possession and Exorcism in Early Modern France* (London and New York: Routledge, 2004; de Waardt et al., *Dämonische Besessenheit*; Philipp Stenzig, *Die Schule des Teufels. Der Exorzismus in den Glaubenskämpfen der Reformationszeit* (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2006).
59. 1727–1779.
60. J. Antonius Zimmermann, *Johann Joseph Gassner, der berühmte Exorzist. Sein Leben und wundersames Wirken aus Anlass seiner hundertjährigen Todesfeier neuerdings erzählt und gewürdigt vom –* (Kempten, 1878).
61. Josef Hanauer, 'Der Teufelsbanner und Wunderheiler Johann Joseph Gassner (1729–1779)', *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Bistums Regensburg*, 19 (1985), 303–545; id., 'Johann Joseph Gassner (1727–1779). Teufelsbanner und Wunderheiler', *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Bistums Regensburg*, 23 (1989), 430–439.
62. Georg Pfeilschifter, 'Des Exorzisten Gassner Tätigkeit in der Konstanzer Diözese im Jahre 1774' *Historisches Jahrbuch*, 52 (1932), 401–441; Gerhard Ammerer, "'Gegen die unbefugten Unternehmungen gewisser Exorcisten"—Der Hirtenbrief Erzbischof Colloredos gegen den Wunderheiler Johann Joseph Gassner von 1776' *Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für Salzburger Landeskunde*, 142 (2002), 141–180.
63. H.C. Erik Midelfort, *Exorcism and Enlightenment. Johann Joseph Gassner and the Demons of Eighteenth-Century Germany* (New Haven and London: Yale UP, 2005).
64. It is no accident that the only mention of Gassner in the Hungarian literature explicitly calls him a "mesmerizer" and not an exorcist: Iván Fónagy, *A mágia és a titkos tudományok története* [History of magic and of the secret sciences] (Budapest: Tinódi, 1943), 62–64.
65. Manfred Eder, 'Teufelsglaube, "Besessenheit" und Exorzismus in Deggendorf (1785–1791)', *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Bistums Regensburg*, 26 (1992), 295–321; Nils Freytag and Benoît Van den Bossche, 'Aberglauben, Krankheit und das Böse. Exorzismus und Teufelsglaube im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert', *Rheinisch-westfälische Zeitschrift für Volkskunde*, 44 (1999), 67–93.
66. Here I refer only to two sources from the now fortunately rich literature on the topic: Vilmos Keszeg 'A román pap és hiedelemköre a mezőségi folklórban' [The Romanian priest and his beliefs in the folklore of the Transylvanian Plain], *Ethnographia*, 107 (1996), 335–369; Tünde Komáromi, 'Rontásformák Aranyosszéken. A gyógyító román pap' [Forms of evil magic in Aranyosszék. The faith-healer Romanian Orthodox priest], *Néprajzi Látóhatár* 5 (1–2) (1996), 87–98.

67. Dóra Czégényi, 'Magyar-román interetnikus kapcsolatok vallási vetülete' [Religious aspects of Hungarian-Romanian inter-ethnic contacts], in Éva Borbély and Dóra Czégényi (eds), *Változó társadalom* (Kolozsvár: Kriza János Néprajzi Társaság, 1999), 31; ead., 'A román pap alakja egy szilágysági közösség hiedelemrendszerében. (Gyógyítás és rontás)' [The figure of a Romanian priest in the belief system of a community in Szilágyság (Healing and bewitchment)], in Éva Pócs (ed.), *Áldás és átok, csoda és boszorkányság. Vallásetnológiai fogalmak tudományközi megközelítésben* (Budapest: Balassi, 2004), 383–394.
68. Giovanni Levi, *Inheriting Power. The Story of an Exorcist* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988), I/7.
69. Midelfort, *Exorcism and Enlightenment*; Moshe Sluhovsky, 'Discerning Spirits in Early Modern Europe', in Gábor Klaniczay and Éva Pócs (eds), *Communicating with the Spirits* (Budapest and New York: CEU Press, 2005), 53–70.
70. Probst, *Besessenheit, Zauberei*.
71. This notion is primarily part of the vocabulary of Protestant authors. For more on the expression see László Makkai, 'A középkori magyar hitvilág problematikájához' [To the problems of medieval Hungarian beliefs], *Ethnographia*, 94 (1983), 106–16; Keith Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic: Studies in Popular Beliefs in Sixteenth and Seventeenth-century England* (New York: Scribner, 1971), especially: 25–50.
72. See Bárh, *Benedikció és exorcizmus*, 23–42.
73. Adolph Franz, *Die kirchlichen Benediktionen im Mittelalter I-II*. (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1909).
74. Bárh, *Benedikció és exorcizmus*.
75. 1614.
76. See the fundamental views of Midelfort concerning the story of Gassner: Midelfort, *Exorcism and Enlightenment*.
77. Peter Brown, *The Cult of the Saints. Its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), 106–127.
78. Clark, *Thinking with Demons*.