The Exorcist of Sombor examines the life course, practice and mentality of an eighteenth-century Franciscan friar, based on his own letters and documentation, creating a frame around the tightly packed history of events that took place between 1766 and 1769, and analysing the series of exorcism scandals that erupted in the Hungarian town of Sombor, from the perspectives of social history and cultural history.
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As a highly accomplished source analysis within microhistory, *The Exorcist of Sombor* will be of great interest to early modern historians, anthropologists and culture researchers interested in microhistory and themes such as religion, magic, occultism and witchcraft.
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On the thirtieth day of March 1767, a Monday, two middle-aged priests of the Roman Catholic faith were approaching the town of Sombor (in Hungarian Zombor, today Sombor, Serbia) in the region of Bačka (in Hungarian: Bácska), along the main road which followed the course of the river Danube. The mission, ordered by the archbishop’s seat of Kalocsa, was headed by the younger of the two, 44-year-old Antonius Bajalich. As dean of his chapter, he had been commissioned by his superiors in the middle of the month to investigate some misconduct that had taken place at the parish church in the care of the Franciscans of Sombor. Although he had been gathering information about the affair by post and personal accounts ever since the end of February, the facts were so worrying that personal presence seemed inevitable. It was probably in the course of the journey, at a place called Szantova, that he was joined by Stephanus Jagodich, a man of about 50, parish priest of that village. At Sombor they discussed events with the prefects of the town and the more “educated” members of the local nobility.

Preliminary information revealed that the church of Sombor had been the scene of most unusual and in fact rather scandalous events for weeks or even months. It was reputed that a friar from the local friary was using the religious act of exorcism in a manner which caused consternation even among the common people. According to their previous notion, based on the description given by their informers, the holy liturgy of exorcism itself had been profaned through the ceremony being performed in public, prolonged, and repeated over and over again. As it continued, people of all ages and ranks and both sexes gathered together. What was worse, the Franciscan who performed the ceremony did not stop here – he had a tall dais built out of planks, like a stage, to carry the battle forth from that elevation. It appears that this was a case of group exorcism. The friar subjected some dozen women bewitchers of the Orthodox faith to the ceremony at once, which he continued during the holy mass which he himself celebrated, by making the possessed individuals stand around the altar, candles in hands. While others were serving mass, he retreated to one corner of the church and there continued his exorcist prayers. The
fascinated masses conglomerated, predictably, not at the mass, but around him and around those possessed, who would often shout. The people made enough noise and scuffle for the Franciscan to be forced to make desperate attempts to create some semblance of order, so he shoved them about, arranging them into rows and shouting orders at them all the while. From time to time he would quite deliberately merge the clearly separated orders of the “viewers” and “the protagonists” and, as if in some irregular stage play, involve the former in the ritual. For this purpose, he mingled the Latin text of the exorcism with added passages in the vernacular. He continued the ceremony even while demonstrating the sacrament of the altar in such a way that, it is rumoured, he turned his back on the monstrance, something highly irregular, and neglected to genuflect, although this may be no more than an indication that informers were bent on finding fault wherever they could.

After hearing the news, which was, indeed, most unusual and alarming, it was probably in a fairly perturbed frame of mind that the dean arrived in the town. He must have had good reason for putting off the journey as long as he could – it certainly promised to be more than awkward. As he wrote in his subsequent report, he was mindful that he would have to proceed with the utmost caution. Not only the common people, but some of the town leadership were also in a highly sensitive frame of mind. An inquest which would entail public questioning (inquisitio) might have brought about consequences that could hardly be predicted. Bajalich wished to gain evidence of the truth of the reports with his own eyes, catching the offenders in flagrante. The coming morning offered a chance to apprehend the culprit red-handed. The dean stealthily made his way up to the top corridor of the friary and peeping down from there had a chance to peruse the events for a good quarter of an hour. What he saw not only justified his previous forebodings but pointed far beyond their scope. The Franciscan performing the exorcism acted irregularly from the start by failing to wear the stole which was an indispensable part of liturgical procedures; what is worse, he was not holding the book of ceremonies required for the ritual. He uttered the prayers of consolation and coercion not in Latin but in the language of the people, obviously in order to enable those present to chant along with him texts such as “Be gone, Devil, be gone, impure soul. May you be annihilated by the suffering of Christ, may you be crushed by the blood of Christ” and others of the same kind. The scene, so absurd to the dean’s eyes, held another shocking element, whereby the priest kept knocking on the little finger of the possessed woman’s right hand, which he had tied round with two pieces of string, while he kept shouting along with the people, “To her little finger! To her little finger,” then he would alter his command, “To her tongue, to her tongue, devil!”

The dean tarried no longer; he summoned the Franciscan to his office, reproached him for his irregularities, inventoried for his benefit all that he
had heard from his trustworthy informers, and forthwith banned any further public performances of exorcism. For reasons that must have been sufficient, he did not ban the ritual of exorcism itself, permitting the Franciscan to perform it in the presence of a priest and a few lay witnesses in the retreat of a monastic cell, but only during the period of his own stay in Sombor. He obliged the friar to give detailed answers, in writing, to the nine groups of questions of the minutes of interrogation. The answers, accurate and proper, duly arrived in Kalocsa two weeks later, complete with the dean’s report. The administrators carefully filed the material among the miscellaneous documents of the consistorium. Over the coming two years a whole sequence of such missives was to follow regarding the antics of the Franciscan in question, many written by the dean himself. Later, while arranging the documents of the consistorium in thematic order, the shrewd archivist who separated the bundle of documents relating to the Franciscans of Sombor noticed that certain papers belonged together as they all focussed on the same friar of the friary and his exorcist pursuits. Accordingly, this was what he entered on the outside cover of the set of documents he had created.¹

As far as I have been able to ascertain, to the present date there has been no one whose interest has been awakened by these papers, guarded over two and a half centuries, occasionally dusted and disinfected, until the moment when they fell into my hands in the early 2000s in the Archives of the Archbishop of Kalocsa during my research into a different subject matter. Anyone who has ever worked in an archive which has not been thoroughly processed knows that it is an experience highly similar to fishing: a long, meditative line of actions, a prolonged wait interspersed with small routine acts, where the seemingly endless expanse of unknown source material (just like some dark and mysterious lake or river) provokes a tingling sense of excitement in the historian. At any moment “the big catch” may surface from the unfathomable depths. Whenever there is a catch, the excitement rises proportionate to the size of fish wriggling at the end of the hook. On this particular occasion in 2002 I, too, felt the tingling sensation in my back, when I first unfolded the front cover of the carefully assembled batch of papers of the aforementioned case. Looking back over a decade and a half I can still recall that curious feeling, uplifting rather than oppressive, which overcame me as I read the letters of the protagonist of this story in his tiny meticulous hand. The reader finds himself in a layer far more profound than mere clerical correspondence – a realm of astounding personal intimacy. Obviously, I could not take in the entire material at once, nor could I foresee the future, but I knew instantly that I had business with this story. At the time I believed I had found a nice group of sources – today I would say, the source itself found me. It grabbed me and would not let me go.

I am sure that many a researcher has had the experience of taking time to brood over a subject matter, cherishing it, devoting to it all the time it
takes to research and process, until it ripens into a final publication. I can safely say that in spite of my other engagements over the past 14 years I never lost sight of the case of the Franciscan of Sombor. Indeed, looking back I believe that, quite unawares, even the energy expended on my other research at this time came to serve, in fact, to contextualize this affair. From time to time I would take out the photocopy of the source material I had made at the time and report with varying intensity on the status of the work and on the versatile utility of this valuable documentation. It became obvious that, besides the relevant Hungarian archives, I would need to continue my research in certain archives in Croatia and Serbia, too. This kind of research never ends, since new source material, even of a substantial quantity, may surface anytime and anywhere concerning both the protagonist and the details of the central subject matter. Nevertheless, I am convinced that the amount of data that I have unearthed and processed over the years now constitutes a sufficient base for me to reconstruct the story as I perceive it. I make no pretence that the following book is about what actually happened at the friary at Sombor during the “dense years” of 1766–1769, or who the protagonist, the Franciscan friar Rochus Szmendrovich, really was. I can only offer my own, subjective reading both with regard to the history of events and the history of mentalities. In the background we find not so much my own imagination as the guiding principles of source criticism and philology used in the historical sciences, while the choice of sub-areas to highlight was mostly decided not by the material, but my own theoretical interests and certain traditions of the literature.

The structure of the volume follows the tradition of historiography whereby the chronicler unfolds the contents of the work progressing in concentric circles. First, we see a human life-course – the biographical sketch which emerges from the miniature details through all that has come to light so far. Gathering together the fragments of the biography has inevitably, and at the same time deliberately, resulted in an image which is fragmented to an almost disconcerting extent. The end result is like a picture puzzle that is irksomely incomplete, yet in spite of its irritating disjunctions clearly offers more than an inkling of an idealized whole which will never emerge in its entirety. There is a period of almost three years in the life of the protagonist which, as if under a magnifying lens, becomes abruptly sharp and allows us to offer a more tight-packed account of events. Since this period is, unsurprisingly, the same as that of the central story of this book, the nearest major chapter focuses particular attention on the events that took place in Sombor during the years 1766 to 1769. This story, however, is told not (only) as a part of the life story of the Franciscan, but offers the multiple perspectives of the affair that existed even at the time, showing the different “readings” of the various participants, but still relating the sequence of events with chronological accuracy. Altogether, therefore, we continue to piece together the puzzle,
and the middle of the picture begins to offer a slightly sharper and more cogent view.

In the section following the chapters which thus provide both a biography and a history of events so far as the sources allow, I attempt to explore certain other perspectives. Inseparable from one another, each of these will mutually reinforce and interpret the others. Progressing from chapter to chapter, I first apply a social historical approach while presenting the conditions that obtained at the time in the free royal city that sets the stage of the events; next I highlight the force fields of clerical history by presenting the internal life and set of relationships of the Franciscan friary. Due to the dearth of relevant processed sources, these two chapters are inevitably shorter, and so merely reflect the impressions I gathered as a researcher. These are followed by the cultural historical analyses which constitute the backbone of the book. Since I myself found that the forces which at depth determined the conflict in question were of this nature, the analysis of the line of events necessarily came from the angle of cultural rather than social history. Within this frame I paid special attention to questions of the contemporary notion of disease and of clerical medicine, to the problematic of demonic possession and of exorcism by the church deemed to be its remedy, and to the background of intellectual history behind the Catholic Enlightenment and “Counter-Enlightenment”. After such an analysis of the central conflict the protagonist once more comes centre-stage when I make an attempt to draw a portrait of his personality in the light of the available “ego-documents.” The main features are a basic attitude of enthusiasm, missionary thinking, charisma and the building of charisma and the importance of external confirmation, as one discerns the contours of the personal looming behind the well-equipped argumentative arsenal and rhetoric of his letters. My hope is that these analyses shed light on the depths of eighteenth-century Franciscan monastic mentality.

Notes
1 KFL I. 1. a. Egyházkormányzati iratok [Documents of Clerical Administration], Ordines religiosi, Franciscans, Sombor (ORFS).
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for alms,” where we shall make it clear that this seemingly neutral and legal collective term actually entails a very complex practice of pastoral services which strive to meet the everyday needs of believers.

In the last years of his life Father Rochus was mostly preoccupied with the affairs of his foundations. In his earlier letters he never speaks of his own potential death, but at this time a whole sequence of increasingly predictable allusions indicates that he is preparing to die. It is possible that all of this upheaval and legacy-leaving fervour were related to some kind of disease which had attacked him – a man in his fifties would by no means be considered old by our terms. It is interesting, however, that even at this stage he willingly travelled considerable distances, venturing outside of Croatia, even as far afield as Vienna. It seems that Szmendrovich spent the last phase of his life as assistant vicar at St. Michael’s Church near Csáktornya, although he is not mentioned by name in visitation minutes of this place. Nor is his name listed among the members of the Franciscan friary of Csáktornya. In spite of the fact that he never returned to the confines of a monastic centre, the Franciscans did not exclude him from among their members. The diligent administrative machinery of the order duly recorded the date of his death for posterity, stating that he died at Szentmihály on 7 December 1782. His earthly remains were laid to rest in the crypt of the nearby Franciscan friary.

Notes

1 The historical source material of the Odra Parish Office is presently located in the Library of the Archbishop of Zagreb (NAZ). I received confirmation about the absence of registry records from before 1780 from archivist Stepan Razum.

2 In my earlier publications I considered 1726 to be the probable date. There are several factors that render it difficult to attain accuracy on age data registered between 1750 and 1760 “on say-so.” When specifying a person’s age, they rarely make it clear whether the figure indicates the number of years completed or the year the person is in at the time. Szmendrovich himself wrote that he was 43 in a letter dated 19 June 1769: KFL I. 1. a. ORFS. In the minutes of a visitation of the order held on 11 March the same year (MFL II. Registrum DLXXVIII) he had figured as 42 years of age. In the past I concluded that he had completed his forty-third year between these two dates. This logic, however, is easy to disprove. One of the most important data in this respect is a visitation minutes recorded in July 1761 which mentions the age (34) of Szmendrovich, then a parish vicar, and adds that this refers to incomplete years (“annorum incompletorum”) – NAZ B. I. Kanonske vizitacije 31/III. 196. In the same function, during a visit in February 1758, he was considered to be 30 – NAZ B. I. Kanonske vizitacije 30/II. 376. These data clearly confirm that Szmendrovich was born in 1727, probably in the second half of the year. The author of a book on the clerical history of Turopolje came to the same conclusion regarding his year of birth. He mentions the name of “Petar Smendrović” among priests in the parish of Odra
and adds (perhaps based on a registry still available at the time) that this person was born in 1727 in the village of Velika Mlaka – Emilij Laszowski, *Plemenita općina Turopolje*. Općinske uredbe, povijest crkvi i odnosi nekih crkvenih redova prema općini Turopolskoj (Zagreb, 1911): 245.


5 Today a part of the town of Velika Gorica, Croatia.

6 Today Donja Lomnica, Croatia.


8 Katus, “A türmezei.”

9 Rokay, “A Túrmezei.”

10 In Hungarian, Pozsony; today Bratislava (Slovakia).

11 MNL OL C 71. 1782, F. 69. (Letter of the community of Turopolje to the Regency Council, 13 December 1782, January 1783).


14 For a review of the clerical history of the village (as part of a description of the parish of Odra) see: Laszowski, *Plemenita*, 200–223.


18 NAZ B. I. 60/XVI. 291.


21 The winged altar, when open, shows a portrait of St. Barbara and key events of her life; when shut, the tableaux feature scenes from the passion narrative of Jesus Christ – each of these already mentioned in the minutes of the visitation of 1695. Laszowski, *Plemenita*, 214.

22 The condition of the church in the early twentieth century and its iconography are described in Laszowski, *Plemenita*, 213–223.

23 Certain examples of these wood-built cottages (clearly those built relatively late), their walls never whitewashed and growing ever darker, survive to this day and lend a unique character to the street view of the village.

Laszowski, *Povjesni*, 549, 558, 566, 599; Ivan von Bojničić, *Der Adel von Kroatien und Slavonien* (J. Siebmachers grosses und allgemeines Wappenbuch 4. Band, 13. Abt.) (Nürnberg: Verlag von Bauer und Raspe, 1899): 183, (Taf. 133). With regard to the word juratus, the most accurate interpretation is probably juror, which refers to a function filled at the district high court. This hypothesis is confirmed by the fact that in 1734 the title “vice assessor” also appears after the name of Georgius Szmendrovič in a context which is not very clear. Laszowski, *Povjesni*, 599.

Bojničić, *Der Adel*, 183 (Taf. 133).

This data comes from Bojničić’s heraldic work. I was unable to check the original.


Adalbertus Barits, *Scriptorum ex regno Sclavoniae*....


MNL OL C 71. 1782, F. 56. (A letter from the *communitas* of Turopolje to the Regency Concil. 13 December 1782, January 1783).


NAZ B. II. Officium dioecesanum 4. 1770, 126.


NAZ B. II. Officium dioecesanum 4. 1770, 126.


Razum, *Vjeroispovijedi*, 214.

MNL OL C 43 Okolicsányi, 1781, No. 78. (Velika Gorica, 3 January 1781.)

MNL OL C 43 Okolicsányi, 1781, No. 78. (Pleszo, 9 May 1779.)

MFL VIII. Prothocollon Friaryus Somboriensis 73. (19 March 1768)

MNL OL C 43 Okolicsányi, 1781, No. 78. (Zagreb, 1779. 25 October.)

MNL OL C 43 Okolicsányi, 1781, No. 78. (Zagreb, 1781. 23 February.)
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53 Today Dragoņozec (Croatia). With regard to the orthography of place names, not being acquainted with the original documents I use the forms used by Laszowski.

54 Today a part of the city of Velika Gorica.

55 Today Pleso, merged with Velika Gorica.

56 Today Donja Lomnica.

57 Laszowski, Povjesni, 545–614.

58 A longer term of captivity is indicated by the fact that for a long time one of the castle’s prison cells was referred to by locals as “the witches” prison.” Tarczay, “Boszorkányüldözés,” 163.

59 Laszowski, Povjesni, 547–556.

60 Connections based on family names were inferred from the later (1770s–1780s) data lines of the listings published by Laszowski in the same volume (Laszowski, Povjesni), maintaining that people may have changed their places of residence later, and this resulted in a degree of uncertainty.

61 Laszowski, Povjesni, 556–569.

62 Laszowski, Povjesni, 570–583.

63 Today Kobićić.

64 Laszowski, Povjesni, 584–600.

65 Laszowski, Povjesni, 600–614.

66 Laszowski, Povjesni, 549, 558, 566, 599.

67 Laszowski, Povjesni, 613–614.

68 The connections between Croatian witchcraft trials and the element of “eating hearts” and their cultural historical dimensions are pointed out by Vilmos Voigt in his studies. See e.g. Vilmos Voigt, Magyar, magyarországi és nemzetközi. Történeti folklorisztikai tanulmányok (Budapest: Universitas, 2004): 197–212.

69 NAZ B. II. Acta Officii Dioecesani (Series Centralis) Fasc. XI. 1774. (Velika Mlaka, 11 February 1774.)

70 It is instructive that in 1774 in this context they speak of 24 years, based on which the beginning of this kind of activity may be dated around 1750, that is, during the time he began to act as a clergyman. – NAZ B. II. Acta Officii Dioecesani (Series Centralis) Fasc. XI. 1774. (Certificate by Petrus Balog, 22 October 1773.)

71 KFL I. 1. a. ORFS.

72 The vicar of Odra mentions in 1774 that he had known Szmendrovich for a very long time: he knew him as a boy when he himself was a clergyman and as a young man at school. This latter remark indicates that Szmendrovich had gone to school in the village in his parish (Odra, Velika Mlaka) – NAZ B. II. Acta Officii Dioecesani (Series Centralis) Fasc. XI. 1774. (Odra, 15 October 1773.)

73 NAZ B. I. Kanonske vizitacije 30/I. 376.


75 NAZ B. III. 9. b. Liber ordinorum (1752–1830) 11–13. According to certain data he was granted full clerical legal authority two weeks later on 1 June,
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along with 30 other priests, by taking an examination in front of the general principal of the time (Adamus Chegetek) – Razum, Vjeroispovijedi, 138.

“Sub-lector” – head of the chapter school.

78 NAZ B. II. Acta Officii Dioecesani (Series Centralis) Fasc. XI. 1774. (Velika Mlaka, 11 February 1774.) The title “honourable provost” probably refers to Franciscus Popovich, later Vicar General, addressee of the letter from 1774.

79 NAZ B. II. Acta Officii Dioecesani (Series Centralis) Fasc. XI. 1774. (Velika Mlaka, 11 February 1774.)

80 NAZ B. II. Acta Officii Dioecesani (Series Centralis) Fasc. XI. 1774. (Velika Mlaka, 11 February 1774.)

81 NAZ B. I. Kanonske vizitacije 30/II. 376.

82 Today Pitomača.

83 Today Stražeman.


85 Hrg and Kolanović, Kanonske, 140; NAZ B. I. Kanonske vizitacije 96/VIII. 261, 304.

86 Later Požeske Sesvete, today Sesvete.

87 In Hungarian: Pozsega.


89 See in particular: NAZ B. I. Kanonske Vizitacije 30/II. (1757–58) 369–381; 31/III. (1761) 192–199.

90 NAZ B. I. Kanonske Vizitacije 30/II. 369–381.

91 NAZ B. I. Kanonske Vizitacije 31/III. 192–199.


93 In estimating the number of children our point of departure was the figures of the year 1746, when it was reported that there were 12 houses of 62 confessing inhabitants and, it seems, 26 children.

94 NAZ B. I. Kanonske Vizitacije 30/II. 381.

95 NAZ B. I. Kanonske Vizitacije 30/II. 369–370.

96 NAZ B. I. Kanonske Vizitacije 30/II. 371.

97 Identifying these volumes will be the subject of a later chapter.


99 NAZ B. I. Kanonske Vizitacije 30/II. 372.

100 NAZ B. I. Kanonske Vizitacije 30/II. 372.


102 NAZ B. II. Acta Officii Dioecesani (Series Centralis) Fasc. XI. 1774. (Velika Mlaka, 11 February 1774.)

103 NAZ B. I. Kanonske vizitacije 30/II. 376.

104 NAZ B. I. Kanonske vizitacije 30/II. 376–377.

105 NAZ B. I. Kanonske vizitacije 31/III. 196.

106 NAZ B. I. Kanonske vizitacije 31/III. 196.

107 NAZ B. I. Kanonske vizitacije 30/II. 377; 31/III. 196.


111 For the full list of books see: Bárth, A zombori, 39–41.
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112 NAZ B. I. Kanonske vizitacije 31/III. 197, 380.
113 NAZ B. I. Kanonske vizitacije 31/III. 381.
114 NAZ B. I. Kanonske vizitacije 31/III. 198.
115 NAZ B. I. Kanonske vizitacije 30/II. 381.
116 NAZ B. I. Kanonske vizitacije 31/III. 199.
117 NAZ B. II. Acta Officii Dioecesani (Series Centralis) Fasc. XI. 1774. (Velika Mlaka, 11 February 1774.)
118 NAZ B. III. 56. Historia Residentiae Poseganae SJ. 242. It is revealing that after the 1759 record of the Jesuit historia domus of Požega we find no further mention of this. Perhaps the event was not a complete success.
119 For more on this see the records of the historia domus of the Požega Jesuits in which, from around 1760 onwards, more and more attention is devoted to the successes of missions launched to nearby as well as more distant regions. – NAZ B. III. 56. Historia Residentiae Poseganae SJ. (e.g. concerning the missionary work carried out among the people of Sesvete in 1762 see: 270).
120 Today Hercegszántó.
121 Today Bački Breg (Serbia).
122 Today Kolut (Serbia).
124 “... for eight years I beseeched the Lord to grant me light to practice my zealous piety elsewhere ...” – NAZ B. II. Acta Officii Dioecesani (Series Centralis) Fasc. XI. 1774. (Velika Mlaka, 11 February 1774.)
125 NAZ B. II. Acta Officii Dioecesani (Series Centralis) Fasc. XI. 1774. (Velika Mlaka, 11 February 1774.)
126 MNL OL C 43 Okolicsányi, 1781, No. 78. (Zagreb, 23 February 1781.)
127 Today Šarengrad (Croatia).
128 MFL II. Registrum CLXXIX.
129 Today Novo mesto (Slovenia).
130 KFL I. 1. a. ORFS.
131 Our sources reveal nothing about the background to this name-change.
133 MFL II. Registrum CLXXIX.
134 MFL II. Registrum CXCVIII.
135 MFL II. Tabulae.
136 Today Našice, Croatia: its Hungarian name, not used in our sources, is Nekce.
137 Ratios in the population of the cities mentioned are most clearly reflected by the figures of the first Hungarian census held two decades later when the population of Sombor numbered 13,000 as opposed to a mere 3,000 in Zabreb and 2,000 in Požega. – Dezső Dányi and Zoltán Dávid, Az első magyarországi népszámlálás (1784–1787) (Budapest: Statisztikai, 1960), 368.
138 We have a small piece of evidence to prove that in August 1770 he had asked the decision-makers of his province to permit him to catechize at least at the parishes supervised by the monastic houses of the province. – MFL II. Registrum DCLXVII.
In Hungarian and in the sources: Diakovár, today Đakovo (Croatia).

He had been ordered to go to Đakovo at the chapter meeting of the province held at Našice on 6 August 1771 – ZFL A-IX-5. Đakovo. Protocolum Conventus Immaculatae C. B. M V. Diakovae anno Domini 1740. We cannot know at present where, or in which friary, he served between September 1769 and August 1771. The tabulae of the important year of 1770 are not available for research.

MFL II. Tabulae (1771–1773); ZFL A-IX-5. Đakovo. Protocolum 26–30.

A letter by Szmendrovich written in 1774 and an authenticated document mention that in 1772 at Đakovo he cured seven patients, several of whom had been bedridden for years – NAZ B II. Acta Officii Dioecesani (Series Centralis) Fasc. XI. 1774.

MFL II. Tabulae (1771–1773); ZFL A-IX-5. Đakovo. Protocolum 26.


A letter by Szmendrovich written in 1774 and an authenticated document mention that in 1772 at Đakovo he cured seven patients, several of whom had been bedridden for years – NAZ B II. Acta Officii Dioecesani (Series Centralis) Fasc. XI. 1774.

NAZ B II. Tabulae (1771–1773); ZFL A-IX-5. Đakovo. Protocolum 26–30.

NAZ B. II. Acta Officii Dioecesani (Series Centralis) Fasc. XI. 1774. (Velika Mlaka, 11 February 1774.)

NAZ B. II. Acta Officii Dioecesani (Series Centralis) Fasc. XI. 1774. (Appendices Nr. 3, 5)

NAZ B. II. Acta Officii Dioecesani (Series Centralis) Fasc. XI. 1774. (Appendices Nr. 3, 5.)

At the time this function was filled by Franciscus Popovich.

NAZ B. II. Acta Officii Dioecesani (Series Centralis) Fasc. XI. 1774. (Appendices Nr. 3, 5.)

NAZ B. II. Officium dioecesanum 7. 1773–1774, 408.

NAZ B. II. Acta Officii Dioecesani (Series Centralis) Fasc. XI. 1774. (Appendices Nr. 3, 5.)

NAZ B. II. Acta Officii Dioecesani (Series Centralis) Fasc. XI. 1774. (Appendices Nr. 3, 5.)

NAZ B. II. Acta Officii Dioecesani (Series Centralis) Fasc. XI. 1774. (Appendices Nr. 3, 5.)

At the time this function was filled by Franciscus Popovich.

NAZ B. II. Officium dioecesanum 7. 1773–1774, 408.

NAZ B. II. Acta Officii Dioecesani (Series Centralis) Fasc. XI. 1774. (Appendices Nr. 3, 5.)

Today Ćuntić (Croatia).

Plepelich confirmed in an authenticated document that there was a need for Szmendrovich’s teaching work – NAZ B II. Acta Officii Dioecesani (Series Centralis) Fasc. XI. 1774. (Appendices Nr. 4.)

A letter by the chaplain Matthias Grum on this subject was read out at the consistory of Zagreb on 26 September 1773 in which he pleaded permission to occupy the teaching post at Velika Mlaka where he could also assist the local vicar in hearing confessions, playing the organ and other spiritual functions. – NAZ B. II. Officium dioecesanum 7. 1773–1774, 261–262.

NAZ B. II. Acta Officii Dioecesani (Series Centralis) Fasc. XI. 1774. (Appendices Nr. 4.)

Today Novo Čiče (Croatia).

It is interesting that Ztepanich refers to Szmendrovich as his compatriot and school fellow.

NAZ B. II. Acta Officii Dioecesani (Series Centralis) Fasc. XI. 1774. (Appendices Nr. 2.)

NAZ B. II. Officium dioecesanum 7. 1773–74, 408.

ML OL C 43 Okolicsányi, 1781, No. 78. (Buda, 12 July 1781.)

ML OL C 43 Okolicsányi, 1781, No. 78. (Zagreb, 23 February 1781.)

These affairs in fact dragged on well after Szmendrovich’s death.

We cannot identify and provide closer information on Katarinchich. What is certain is that a person of this name, a native of Požega, received a Jesuit...
education until 1759 and was in a novice status. He taught at the school of Požega and, between 1758 and 1759, also at Pécs. The records of the order do not note the exact date of his departure, only the fact. By the 1760s his name is no longer present in any of the records or listings. I take this occasion to thank Béla Mihalik for kindly supplying this information by letter.

165 MNL OL C 43 Okolicsányi, 1781, No. 78. (Velika Gorica, 3 January 1781.)

Regrettably, documents of the consistory of Požega are available only from 1773 onwards. – NAZ Consistorium Subalternum Požeganum.

167 NAZ B. II. Officium dioecesanum 3. 1769, 31–32.

168 NAZ B. II. Officium dioecesanum 4. 1770, 125–126.

169 NAZ B. II. Officium dioecesanum 4. 1770, 258–259.


171 NAZ B. II. Officium dioecesanum 7. 1773–1774, 408.

172 This phrase leads us to suspect that by this time the founder may have joined in with correspondence about the administrative procedures related to his funds, since on all earlier occasions they kept referring to Petrus Szmendrovich as the founder. The appearance of his earlier and later names allows us to conclude that he was already in correspondence, in this quality, with higher level state organizations (Regency Council, the Royal Chamber).


174 MNL OL C 43 Okolicsányi, 1781, No. 78; 1782, No. 229; C 71 1782, F. 56; 1783, F. 69; A 39 1782/5442.

175 MNL OL C 43 Okolicsányi, 1781, No. 78. (Velika Gorica, 3 January 1781)

176 The sum of 20 Forints due to relatives in education and of 30 Forints for the teacher at Velika Mlaka, for instance, were supposed to be paid to the beneficiaries not annually but in quarterly instalments.

177 MNL OL C 43 Okolicsányi, 1781, No. 78. (Velika Gorica, 23 July 1779.)

178 MNL OL C 43 Okolicsányi, 1781, No. 78. (Zagreb, 25 October 1779.)

179 MNL OL C 43 Okolicsányi, 1781, No. 78. (Pleszó, 9 May 1779.)

180 MNL OL C 43 Okolicsányi, 1781, No. 78.

181 “... si licet in Domino quid in sui laudem ex bono fine dicere ...”.

182 MNL OL C 43 Okolicsányi, 1781, No. 78. (Zagreb, 22 February 1781.)

183 MNL OL C 43 Okolicsányi, 1781, No. 78. (Zagreb, 15 June 1781.)

184 MNL OL C 43 Okolicsányi, 1781, No. 78. The original letter of the Regency Council has accidentally survived in the Hungarian Franciscan Archives: MFL XII. 3. Jakosics Collection, Volume 7.

185 MNL OL C 43 Okolicsányi, 1781, No. 78.

186 MNL OL A 39 1782/5442. (Vienna, 14 August 1782.)

187 MNL OL C 71 F. 56.

188 According to this, 1,000 Forints were deposited with the County of Varasd, 100 Forints with the community of Turopolje, 100 Forints with Georgius Szmendrovich, vicar of Gorica, 100 Forints with the assessor Plepelich, 300 Forints with perceptor Adam Arbanasz, 50 Forints with Joannes Brigleyevich and 10 Forints with Michael Barberich. There was a sum of 500 Forints which never reached its intended beneficiaries, since 300 of it remained in Zagreb and 200 was held by Georgius Szmendrovich.

189 MNL OL C 71 F. 69. (Velika Gorica, 13 December 1782; January 1783.)

190 MNL OL C 43 Okolicsányi, 1781, No. 78. (Zagreb, 23 February 1781.)

191 MNL OL C 43 Okolicsányi, 1781, No. 78. (Velika Gorica, 3 January, 1781.)
Splinters of a biography

192 MNL OL C 43 Okolicsányi, 1781, No. 78. (Velika Gorica, 23 July 1779.)
193 MNL OL C 43 Okolicsányi, 1781, No. 78. (Velika Gorica, 3 January 1781.)
194 MNL OL C 43 Okolicsányi, 1781, No. 78. (Zagreb, 23 February 1781.)
195 MNL OL C 43 Okolicsányi, 1781, No. 78. (Zagreb, 23 February 1781.)
196 This piece of data can also be found in the register of the Capistrano District: MFL II. Syllabus 1784.
This is the end of the last letter that Rochus Szmendrovich is known to have written to the leadership of the archdiocese of Kalocsa.\(^4\)

On 24 August 1769 the irregular assembly of the province congregation held at Brod removed Rochus Szmendrovich from the friary at Sombor. A listing recorded in the local house history seems to indicate that he headed to Našice.\(^5\) After his rise and fall he had finally found his way back to the place whence he had started.

Notes

1 I have attempted this on several occasions in the past with varying degree of detail (cf. e.g. Bárth, “Ördögűző Rókus testvér”; “Demonology”), but in the present chapter I discuss the content of the sources which constitute the foundation of this story at far greater length than ever before. An unusually detailed description of the content of the documentation is meant not merely to unfold the minutest elements of the source material originally written in Latin but also to reflect my own process of interpretation, in other words it is suited to offer a representation of the research process itself. A verbatim or content-focussed translation of the Latin sources for this book was my own work, therefore all responsibility for any possible subjectivity of emphasis or possible mistakes rests solely with me.

2 The venue for the congregation used to shift from one friary to the other; on this occasion it was held in Sombor. – MFL II Registrum CDXVI.

3 IAS F. 9. Zbiska matičnik knjige (Diocese Registry), Sombor.


7 Events are easiest to reconstruct from the above quoted letters of Father Rochus and testimonies of those present. For exact references of individual elements see below.

8 The frequency and content of these sessions can be best established from the minutes of the consistorium (KFL I. 1. e. A.) PC 1761–1765, 1765–1766, 1766–1769, 1769–1772.)


10 Katona, A kalocsai, II. 253–254.

11 Katona, A kalocsai, II. 254–255.

12 Katona, A kalocsai, II. 256.

13 Katona, A kalocsai, II. 254.
Three years – one story

14 Katona, A kalocsai, II. 257.
17 KFL I. 1. e. A.) PC 1766–1969. (14 March 1767.)
18 During February and March, according to the text.
19 There was another matter the dean had to clarify at Sombor which was related to the extradition of an asylant condemned to death – KFL I. 1. e. A.) PC 1766–1969. (14 March 1767.)
20 KFL I. 1. e. A.) PC 1766–1969. (15 March 1767.)
21 The more accurate biographical data come from the minutes of the 1767 visitations: KFL I. 1. e. E.) PSB, 398. Comparatively sparser information is contained in Katona, A kalocsai, II. 262. This latter source, however, states that Bajalich died at Bezdan in 1784.
22 At least these are the “reliable” informers he considered worth mentioning in his later account.
23 KFL I. 1. a. ORFS.
24 Pál Varbói Kruspér was one of the central factors of power in eighteenth-century Báčka. For more on him see Samu Borovszky (ed.), Bács-Bodrog vármegye I–II. (Budapest: Országos Monográfia Társaság, 1909); János Muhi, Zombor története (Zombor: Kalangya, 1944).
25 Both family names occur among the families of the Bács-Bodrog county nobility of this period. We are probably talking here about Chamber prefect Károly Köröskényi and János Késmárki. Cf. Borovszky (ed.), Bács-Bodrog.
26 Borovszky (ed.), Bács-Bodrog.
27 Priglevicza-Szentiván, later Bácsszentiván, today Prigrevica (Serbia).
28 Katona, A kalocsai, II. 263.
29 KFL I. 1. a. ORFS.
30 Today Hercegszántó (Hungary).
31 In the house history of the Franciscan friary Jagodich was referred to as the dean’s secretary – MFL VIII. PCZ, 60.
33 Katona, A kalocsai, II. 268.
34 The fact of the visit by the two priests and its purpose were briefly mentioned in the house history of Sombor: MFL VIII. PCZ, 60.
35 KFL I. 1. a. ORFS.
36 KFL I. 1. a. ORFS.
37 So the counter-argument referred to the status of Sombor as a free royal city (which it had been since 1749).
38 KFL I. 1. a. ORFS.
39 KFL I. 1. a. ORFS.
40 KFL I. 1. a. ORFS. (Literal translation). Let me remark here that in the typography of the present volume long verbatim quotes and summaries of the content of various sources both appear without quotation marks and with an increased left-hand margin. I indicate in the footnote at the end of every such section which of these two solutions is being applied. Both varieties rely on my own work as translator or interpreter.
41 KFL I. 1. a. ORFS.
Three years – one story

42 The earliest letter by Szmendrovich in this documentation is dated 9 April. Either we are talking about a genuine letter which is not presently available, or about a fictional one which is similar in content to that written after the dean’s visit.

43 Here Szmendrovich could not remember the husband’s surname and left its place empty.

44 Particularly when he offered her the cross and particularly the limbs of the crucified Christ to kiss.

45 Construction of the church was under way at this time.

46 We shall be referring back to Girolamo Menghi’s manual (Hieronymus Mengus:旗ellum daemonum, Fustis daemonum) repeatedly in the analytic chapters.

47 A side-building of an agricultural nature used for storage and adjoining the church.

48 KFL I. 1. a. ORFS. (Summary.)

49 The document amounted to five pages including the parts that were left blank.

50 Today Stapar (Serbia).

51 Today Ridica (Serbia).

52 Today Sivac (Serbia).

53 This telling reference alludes to the kind of journal which other exorcists also often kept. Sadly, no such listing has come to light so far.

54 There was one name that occurred more than once, but this is no accident, since Szmendrovich had written “iterum” (repeat) next to the second Usein, but crossed it out later. In this publication we follow the order and orthography used by Szmendrovich: Hassan, Assaboth, Goiko, Zailo, Usein, Gavro, Natailo (?), Janko, Gyurgya, Vestelin, Damjan, Nikola, Usein, Mirko, Ivan, Usein, Gyurgya, Senyanin, Cosma, Jelenka, Kovinda, Grozdienka, Vestelin, Jovan, Selena, Anika, Mariane, Marine, Usein, Illia, Busein, Mirko, Goiko, Janko, Pavao, Salamun, David, Simeon, Todor, Spirida, Usein, Gligoria, Theodor, Janko, Demun, Carun.

55 KFL I. 1. a. ORFS. (Summary.)

56 KFL I. 1. a. ORFS.

57 A note on the text refers to this, “Fr. Rochi Szmendrovics longior sermo de Energumenis et eorum probationis.”

58 These were the following: an unnatural twisting of her limbs, her eyes turning inward, her body throwing itself on the floor in an extraordinary manner; extreme bodily strength; understanding and to a small extent speaking Latin words; transportations through her body, like fire, like the wind, ants, like cold and hot; copious tears; an unusual blowing up of her chest; choking at the throat; a terrible stench caused; an unnatural grinding of the teeth, etc.

59 I shall say more about these later, in the chapter on exorcism.

60 KFL I. 1. a. ORFS. (Content summary.)

61 KFL I. 1. a. ORFS.

62 Katona, A kalocsai, II. 295.

63 Katona, A kalocsai, II. 296.

64 Katona, A kalocsai, II. 260.

65 “… subinde etiam ipsemet personaliter adstans, copiosioribus verbis modum et factum suum legitimare et excusare, imo quorundam etiam senatorum
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66 The abstract issued and authenticated by the notary of the archbishopric contains a slightly different text which calls upon him to

send the signs detected most circumspectly to this consistory and not to start exorcism until in possession of the relevant licence, according to the rules laid down in the diocesan book of rituals, any diversion from which by anyone would incur sanctions.

KFL I. 1. a. ORFS

67 In the same year, but on another occasion, several of his fellow-Franciscans appeared in front of the archbishopric with the same purpose – KFL I. 1. e. A.) PC 1766–1769.

68 Atra or nigra bilis refers in an indirect sense to rampaging, madness.

69 Disease of the uterus with symptoms associated with hysteria.

70 KFL I. 1. a. ORFS. (Verbatim translation of the original Latin minutes.)

71 KFL I. 1. e. A.) PC 1766–1769 (29 April 1767).

72 KFL I. 1. a. ORFS.

73 According to a remark here added by Joachimus a Sabaria, the devil’s name was Hassan, while that of his master was Assabaoth. These demon names also figured in the accounts of the exorcism of the woman called Anna from Sombor which took place in December 1766.

74 KFL I. 1. a. ORFS. (Near-verbatim summary of content.)

75 KFL I. 1. a. ORFS. The date of the final clause is incomplete, “The 20th day, 1767” (name of the month missing). We have reason to believe that the month is August.

76 KFL I. 1. a. ORFS.

77 Szmedrovich is referring in a positive sense to the events that took place in the winter and early spring of the same year.

78 This office was at the time fulfilled by Josephus Teklits, also a member of the consistory.

79 The name of Sükösd appears in its Croatian form in the text. We cannot know when and to what end Szmedrovich visited the village. There was a regular Franciscan monk acting as a “co-operator” alongside the local vicar, but this person came from the friary not of Sombor but of Baja. The registries of the period in question do not include the name of Pater Rochus. The vicar of the village in these years was one Mathias Kristoff. We shall later come back to the question of possibly identifying the books.

80 KFL I. 1. a. ORFS.

81 KFL I. 1. e. A.) PC 1766–1769. (7 September 1767.).

82 On the volume of the three deans’ districts see Bárth, “A hercegszántói,” 311–312.


84 KFL I. 1. e. E.) PSB, 223.

85 KFL I. 1. e. E.) PSB, 229.

86 MFL VIII. PCZ 58.

87 MFL II. Tabulae 1767. Zombor.

88 KFL I. 1. a. ORFS.

89 KFL I. 1. a. ORFS.
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90 E. g. KFL I. 1. a. ORFS.
91 MFL VIII. PCZ 71. A shorter description of the item is found in: Muhi, Zombor, 135.
92 The original letter itself has been placed into a (thus far) unidentified fascicule of the archive, because it was related to the exorcism scandal of Sombor only by its author but not by its subject matter.
93 KFL I. 1. e. A.) PC 1766–1769. (20 December 1768.)
95 MFL VIII. PCZ 73. (19 March 1768.)
96 During his visitation tour of 1767 the city magistrate wanted to reduce the fee of 24 Forints for a crypt burial, which he considered to be very high. – KFL I. 1. e. E.) PSB, 240–241.
97 This is indicated by a remark inserted into one of the documents paraphrased below which was authenticated in June 1769 and refers to that same year. Speaking of the exorcism of Anna Buday it says, “at this point a prohibition from the archbishop intervened which must have been related to accusations by certain of the monks.” Who these fathers might have been can be identified with near-certainty from a later letter by Szmendrovich. – KFL I. 1. a. ORFS.
98 KFL I. 1. a. ORFS.
99 KFL I. 1. a. ORFS.
100 KFL I. 1. a. ORFS. (Abstract.)
101 KFL I. 1. a. ORFS.
102 Franciscus Gáll, former theologian at Kalocsa was ordained at Kalocsa in 1758. Afterwards he became a chaplain at Baja and then a vicar at Csonoplya. He died in this latter position in 1785. Cf. Katona, A kalocsai, II. 256.
103 Cf. Rituale Romano-Colocense ...
104 KFL I. 1. a. ORFS. (Abstract.)
105 This is most likely a reference to none other than Antonius Matich’s wife Anna.
106 Probably Stephanus Mandich.
107 The woman may have been Anna Balatinac a.k.a. Buday, but the young man is not mentioned again.
108 Emericus de Quinqueecclesiis, otherwise Zomborcsevich, will be discussed in detail later. Custos = province guard.
109 KFL I. 1. a. ORFS. (Abstract.)
110 KFL I. 1. e. A.) PC 1766–1769. (18 May 1769.)
111 MFL VIII. PCZ 79.
112 KFL I. 1. a. ORFS. (Abstract.)
113 The function of notary was fulfilled at this time by Josephus Pausz.
114 KFL I. 1. e. A.) PC 1766–1769. (18–19 May 1769.)
115 KFL I. 1. e. A.) PC 1766–1769. (18–19 May 1769.) (Abstract.)
116 KFL I. 1. e. A.) PC 1766–1769 (18–19 May 1769). (Abstract.)
117 KFL I. 1. e. A.) PC 1766–1769. (18–19 May 1769.) (Abstract.)
118 KFL I. 1. a. ORFS.
119 KFL I. 1. a. ORFS.
120 KFL I. 1. e. A.) PC 1766–1769. (26 May 1769.)
121 KFL I. 1. a. ORFS.
Sadly we were unable to locate in the town archives the original minutes of the interrogation, probably written in Croatian.

Perhaps we are talking about Bartholomaeus Relich, who arrived at the friary in 1769. – MFL VIII. PCZ 81.

The source, a post factum copy of the original minutes, contains the phrase “in honorem S. Marthae,” but it may be that the transcriber overlooked an original abbreviation and used this shorter name to replace the form “S. Margarithae.”

This is more than likely a reference to Stephanus Marelich, Pater Spiritual of the friary. – MFL II. Registrum DLXXVIII.

This function was fulfilled at this time in Sombor by Vincentius Sinicsich. – MFL II. Registrum DLXXVIII.

It is likely to be Joannes Lukich, who held his primicia in Sombor in 1766 (MFL VIII. PCZ, 55). The later vicar of Kula was record-keeper of the frequently mentioned visitation tour of 1767.

According to the letter, these include the guardian and Father Nicolaus (“the most passionate opponent of my zealous piety”).


Namely Anna Gavranova, Anna Strangarov widow, Jaga Josephi Antunovity, Oliva Martini Goricski, Martha Budimaczka Mathaei, Mara Reberity.

We don’t know whether the letter authenticated on 26 June also arrived at Kalocsa on time along with the cover letter of 19 June and the testimonies. It probably did not, but they did not alter the decree, once passed, on its account later.

It is easily possible that the testimony authenticated on 26 June arrived at Kalocsa along with this letter from Szmendrovich.

Josephus Teklits.

MFL VIII. PCZ 82.
living with a population group of another denomination. He had already quoted this consideration with regard to possessed individuals who made noises and shouted in the street, as this formed an important part of his argumentation about scandalizing the Orthodox. But even aside from the tactical intentions of the Franciscan we need to bear such considerations in mind when we explore the background of the supportive attitude shown by the city magistrates’ board.

And with this we have arrived at the question of confessional motivations. Why did the city leadership behave so passively with regard to the scandal that developed in early 1767 when viewed from above that the superior authorities (the county and the diocese) even reproached them for it? When the relevant dean inquired into the reason why they had neglected their obligation to report the instance, why did the chief judge and the notary offer such arrogant and dismissive answers, claiming it was only to the king that they were obligated to report anything? Why did the leaders of the city admit in a whole multitude of testimonies that they were not merely not passive, but indeed active and enthusiastic participants of the Franciscan’s prolonged exorcisms? And why did they unanimously claim that these events caused, instead of outrage, a wave of conversions among the Orthodox population of the town?

It is quite obvious that, from the point of view of the city, the role which Rochus Szmandrovich accepted and carried through went well beyond the obligation of keeping law and order intact. Anyone who brings peace and quiet to the public spaces used by Catholics and the Orthodox will have a positive effect on the way in which the work of the city leadership is perceived. If this is performed by a Catholic priest, this may win votes from the opposing camp to the board of city magistrates, which also had a Catholic majority. But there is even more than this in the background of the story we are exploring here. It truly seems as if several members of the city leadership had been overcome by the kind of zeal which was partly based on recognizing the missionary potential in having a highly effective priest from their own camp – “our” priest – within a power field in which a religious divide was balanced with pinpoint accuracy and partly on the intention to translate this into direct political capital. In order to unfold the exploration of the religious background which is in the focus of our attention here, in the next chapter we need to devote some time to certain dimensions of clerical history related to the conflict at Sombor.

Notes
2 Bernardin Unyi, Sokácok-bunyevákok és a bosnyák ferencesek története (Budapest: Magyar Barát, 1947); Antal Molnár, Tanulmányok az alfoldi katolicizmus török kori történetéhez (Budapest: METEM, 2004), 41–79.

3 Báráth, “On the border.”


6 Today Ruski Krstur and Kucura (Serbia).

7 KFL I. 1. e. E.) PIB, 61–110.

8 KFL I. 1. e. E.) PIB, 141–156.

9 Kosáry, Művelődés, 89–93.

10 In practice this meant that taverns and shops were kept closed. On lesser holidays they were only prohibited from opening between 8 and 11 o’clock in the morning. It is a question whether and how far this applied to Orthodox events celebrated according to a different calendar order.

11 During the visitation to Topolya the following was recorded: “The Orthodox offend against all Roman Catholic holidays without any distinction, even Sundays. While our bells are silent during Good Week, the Orthodox always toll their own.” KFL I. 1. e. E.) PDT, 160. For more on the same see a complaint by the magistrates’ board of Sombor at the same time, claiming that the Orthodox never paid due respect to the Catholic procession: KFL I. 1. e. E.) PSB, 244.


14 The best known of the jointly used shrines was “the Northern-most holy well of the Mosonga,” Máriakónnye [Mary’s Tears]. Vodica was also recognized by the Catholic church in the early nineteenth century. István Silling, Vallási néphagyomány (Újvidék: Forum, 2002): 199–205.

15 Báráth, “On the border.”

16 The most complete monograph on local history written to date in Hungarian is the following: Muhi, Zombor. For further literature on South Slavic local history see Milenko Beljanski: Letopis Sombora od 1360. do 1800. godine (Sombor: Beljanski, 1974); Milan Stepanović, Somborska kronika Fra Bone Mihaljevića 1717–1787 (Sombor: Bunjevačko kolo, Istorijski Arhiv Sombor, 2012): 5–74.

17 Muhi, Zombor, 106.

18 Dányi and Dávid, Az első magyarszági, 368.


20 According to the records there were 453 Illyrian couples, 1,682 confessing adults and 517 young children, altogether 2,170 Illyrian persons living in the city. With regard to Germans, they reported 47 couples, 167 confessing adults and 38 children, altogether 205 persons. The uncertainty of visitation data is reflected by the fact that in the summary at the end of the volume they put the number of couples at 611, speak of 2,258 confessing adults and 796 unable to confess, the total number now being 3,054. – KFL I. 1. e. E.) PSB, 421.

21 The creation of a district in 1763 primarily triggered the emigration of Serbian families. Cf. Muhi, Zombor, 108.

22 At the same time the leadership of Újvidék (Neoplanta), which had developed from the fortification of Pétervárad and won the legal status from the Queen in 1748, was “lobbying” for the same cause. The third free royal city of the Bačka region was Subotica, which won this status in 1779, but functioned as a licensed market town of the treasury from as early on as 1743 under the name of Szent Mária – Báráth J, “Népcsportok,” 11.
Religious and ethnic plurality

23 Muhi, Zombor, 115–119. Codification did not take place until two years later, in 1751.
24 Scholarship on local history states that the families leaving the town around this time were mostly Bunevats: Muhi, Zombor, 130.
26 Silling, Tegnap és ma, 7–20.
27 Henceforth we are going to use the same contemporary concept referring to the corresponding groups of Catholic Croatians (Bunevats, Shokats, Rats-Croatians).
29 Other contemporary sources suggest that the boundary between the two ethnic groups (Hungarian and Bunevats) was not sharp in the period. This circumstance might be attributed to a collective religious identity emerging in opposition to the Orthodox ritual and in the early assimilation of Catholic Southern Slavs.
30 KFL I. 1. e. E.) PSB, 224.
31 Muhi, Zombor, 244–245.
32 The operation of the friary of Sombor can be dated back with certainty to the late seventeenth century. On the early phase of its history cf. János Karácsonyi, Szt. Ferencz rendjének története Magyarországon 1711-ig. Nos. I–II. (Budapest: MTA, 1923–1924): II. 383; Unyi, Sokáck, 133. A few significant moments of the history of this friary have been preserved for us, outside of the local house history, by the historia domus of the Franciscan friary of the city of Baja. The first part was published in both Latin and in Hungarian translation: Kapocs–Kőhegyi, Historia Domus; A bajai ferencesek háztörténete I. 1694–1840 (Baja: Türr István Múzeum, 2000).
33 With regard to the reorganization of the friary, several authors estimate it to have been the year 1718 when the local friars began to keep a regular registry. – Muhi, Zombor, 105.
34 On the church built between 1717 and 1719, which is 12 fathoms in length and four fathoms in width and dedicated to St. Francis see Muhi, Zombor, 77–78, 103–104.
35 On laying the foundation stone of the church see MFL VIII. PCZ, 22–26; Kapocs and Kőhegyi, A bajai, 33.
37 The chapel built by the treasury land agent and royal councillor Franciscus Redl was obviously seen as the house chapel of the treasury administration. On the day of St. John of Nepomuk (16 May) the Franciscans served mass in this chapel amid great festivities. In 1767 and 1769 it was Rochus Szmendrovich himself who gave a celebratory sermon here in Illyrian.
38 On the process of construction see: Silling, “Zombor katolikus,” 52–53. Silling identifies this structure with the chapel of the Holy Cross. A small chapel of that name was built in the Catholic cemetery of the time as early as 1725 by one Matthias Mandich. – Nándor Kaizer, “A zombori szentferencrendi zárdának története 1717–1787,” Ferences Közlöny XIX (1939): 140–144, 180–184. here 142. The chapel of the Holy Cross still stood in that location in 1767. – KFL I. 1. e. E.) PSB, 216–217. The Calvary hill and chapel built by the affluent Stephanus Nagy was consecrated on 14 April 1767; the ceremony was performed by Dean Antonius Bajalich. The commissioner of the construction gave a festive lunch on the same day in honour of the illustrious guests. – MFL VIII. PCZ, 61.
40 St. Rochus’s chapel at Sombor was probably built in several stages. There are contradictory data in the literature concerning the date of construction of the first variant. What is certain is that in 1767 St. Rochus’s Chapel was not standing (as it is not mentioned in the visitation records – KFL I. 1. e. E. PSB, 217.), but that by 1781 it was, since the first lay vicar (Stephanus Jagodich) was forced to hold his masses there. Since the above-mentioned chapel of the Holy Cross, also located in the Catholic cemetery, disappears from the sources at exactly this period in time (1767–1784) it is highly suspicious that this may have been rebuilt and given a new name.

41 Muhi, Zombor, 244.
42 IAS F. 5., 7. 1765–1774.

43 The history of the friary of Sombor has been a fairly adventurous sequence over the past centuries. Following on from the earlier records in 1749 they began to write a Protocollum which may be considered a seminal source. In the 1780s one of the inmates made a brief summary of this history (Extractus). This is what the majority of local historians used for their work. The original protocollum finally wound up at the Franciscan friary of Baja. A typescript of the extract, written in Latin, was made by Nándor Kaizer in Budapest in the early 1930s. For a long time, this 46-page typescript was the only document accessible for research in the Franciscan Friary Budapest: MFL MS Archives, legacy of Nándor Kaizer, “A Zombori Zárda 1717–1787” [The Friary of Sombor, 1717–1787]. Today, the original Extractus (under the title Extractus Protocollorum Conventus L. R. Civitatis Zomboriensis P. P. Ordinis Minorum Observantiae …) is also available for use at the same place. – MFL VI. 6. Bajai rendház iratai [Documents of the Friary of Baja], No. 3. An abridged Hungarian translation of Extractus was published by Kaizer: Kaizer, “A zombori.” One of the most important sources on the history of the city in the eighteenth century was also recently published in Croatian translation: Stepanović, Somborska. The original, long-lost volume of the protocol turned up quite unexpectedly in Budapest during the period of writing this book, enabling me to integrate in this work the data contained therein: MFL VIII. Prothocollon Conventus Zomboriensis (1749–1786). It will be the work of future researchers to compare the two variants of the house history (the complete volume and the abstract) and to write the Catholic ecclesiastic history of Sombor (by involving other sources).

44 A single but symptomatic instance from this point of view is the fact that during the spring of 1768, during the construction of the steeple which was to be inaugurated in June of that year, the board of city magistrates kindly conceded the request of the guardian of the friary and allowed use of the spot suitable for firing several thousand bricks which lay next to the Calvary on the edge of the city on the bank of the Mostonga – IAS F. 5. Copia prothocolli sessionalis (557. – 29 April 1768).

45 For the text of the contract made between the city and the Franciscan friary in 1760 which stipulates, in detail, the mutual obligations, see: MFL VIII. PCZ, 31–33.

46 The most accurate information about these developments is offered by the Franciscan house history: MFL VIII. PCZ.

48 This arrangement was recorded well in advance, in the contract of 1760: MFL VIII. PCZ, 32.
49 Muhi, Zombor, 130–132.
In all probability it is this building in which a class offering secondary grammar school education operated between 1763 and 1768 but which was transferred in 1768 to one of the halls of the Town Hall. From this time onwards this building was used as a primary school. Cf. Kaizer, “A zombori,” 184; MFL VIII. PCZ, 75. Previously the primary school had operated in the teachers’ own homes – a fact which by 1767 was clearly frowned upon by Canon Glaser during his visitation tour of the parish. The above-mentioned solution was probably the consequence of the measures inspired by his extreme anger the following year – KFL I. 1. e. E.) PSB, 230, 238.

The map also contains the house of Josephus Nagy, another among those supporting Szmendrovich.

In 1764 Csóka was already working as notary of the town. – MFL VIII. PCZ, 43.

His family name was listed by Muhi among the Catholic Hungarians (Muhi, Zombor, 138). Szontay had been an active figure of the public life of the city. His name appeared as early as 1749 in the first elected leadership of the free royal city: Muhi, Zombor, 119.

For more information on the character and works of the chief justice, probably coming originally from Požega, cf. Muhi, Zombor, 133–134; Silling, “Zombor katolikus,” 53.

Associated with establishing the chapel of Our Lady of the Snow (Maria Schnee/“Sné”) on the edge of this city which became one of the popular places of pilgrimage in the area (5 August). The site of the future shrine was marked out in 1767 during the visitation tour by Glaser (cf. MFL VIII. PCZ, 67), but it was not consecrated until 14 years later: Silling, “Zombor katolikus,” 53–54.

Members of the Parchetich family had played a determining role in the public affairs of the city for decades. Martinus became the first chief justice of the free royal city in 1749, Nicolaus being appointed city notary at the same time. – Muhi, Zombor, 119.


The social standing of Matarich is indicated not only by the way in which he is always referred to emphatically as “Dominus,” even in the testimonies, but also by the fact that even though he bore no office in the city that year, his name was included in the document deposited in the bauble on top of the cross on the steeple of the Franciscan church in 1768. – Silling, “Zombor katolikus,” 51.

On family names in Sombor cf. Muhi, Zombor, 137–144.

For more on the persons involved cf. Borovszky, Bács-Bodrog; Muhi, Zombor; MFL VIII. PCZ.

Records of the original protocol were tendentiously reviewed from this perspective by the above-mentioned author of the Extractus. Cf. Kaizer, “A zombori,” 180–181.


Silling, Tegnap és ma, 45–59.

It is not easy to ascertain who exactly kept these minutes. In some periods this function was separate from that of house leadership. In 1765, for instance, Emericus a Quinqueecclesis added “simul protocollista” next to his name.
Then, at one point of the records for 1767, the handwriting changes. – MFL VIII. PCZ, 49.

67 MFL VIII. PCZ 71. Cf. also the abstracts: Muhi, Zombor, 135; Stepanović, Somborska, 130.

68 In 1769, in the course of a royal enquiry initiated by chief justice Markovich, it was mentioned with disapproval that the senators refused the Franciscan father access to two Orthodox convicts. Certain other points of contention also came to the surface: apparently two Orthodox servant women wished to convert but were forcefully prevented; Orthodox believers had failed to grant the Catholic processions due respect; and the affiliation of a sacred spot in the vicinity was disputed – MFL VIII. PCZ, 77.
of new sources. Until this happens, we must make do with use of the tendentious letters of our protagonist for gaining a glimpse into the everyday life and conflicts of an eighteenth-century Franciscan friary.

Notes

1 Cf. the time frame of one of the most complete comprehensive work: Karácsonyi, Szt. Ferencz. On the early stage of the historiography of the Franciscan order see: Molnár, Tanulmányok, 130–136.

2 It is characteristic that even those grand-scale data collections which had been completed earlier remained in MS, for example, J. Ince P. Takács and János Pfeiffer, Szent Ferenc fiai a veszprémi egyházmegyében a 17–18. században I–II. (Pápa–Zalaegerszeg: Déak Ferenc Megyei Könyvtár, 2001).

3 From a now vast body of literature we might highlight: Antal Molnár, Katolikus missziók a bódolt Magyarországon I. (1572–1647) (Budapest: Balassi, 2002); István György Tóth, Misszionáriusok a kora újkori Magyarországon (Budapest: Balassi, 2007).

4 The work of Hoško is particularly relevant to our theme: Franjo Emanuel Hoško, Franjevci u kontinentalnoj Hrvatskoj kroz stoljeća Kršćanska sadašnjost (Zagreb: Kršćanska sadašnjost, 2000); Franjevci i poslanje Crkve u kontinentalnoj Hrvatskoj (Zagreb: Kršćanska sadašnjost, 2001); Franjevačke visoke škole u kontinentalnoj Hrvatskoj (Zagreb: Kršćanska sadašnjost, 2002).

5 Concerning the various functions see the various editions of the regulae of the order: Regula.

6 MFL II.

7 This seminal work from 1800 was also published in Hungarian translation: Katona, A kalocsai.


12 The most powerful writing in ethnographic literature on the connection between “Franciscan spirituality and folk culture” is found in: Sándor Bálint, Sacra Hungaria. Tanulmányok a magyar vallásos népélet köréből (Košice: Veritas, 1944) (particularly relevant to the region we are interested in: 78–86).

13 MFL II. Tabulae.

14 MFL II. Registrum, Syllabus.

15 MFL II. Registrum, CDXVI., Tabulae, 1766.

16 MFL II. Registrum, D. Here the list of Szmendrovich’s functions also includes directing the Illyrian society for religious instruction.

17 MFL II. Registrum, DXXI.

18 MFL II. Registrum, DLXXXVIII.
19 MFL II. Registrum, DLXXVIII. At this time seven Illyrian friar priests were registered in the province who had come from Croatia. – MFL II. Registrum, DCXIX.

20 MFL II. Registrum, DCXXXIII.

21 MFL II. Registrum, DCXXX.

22 MFL II. Registrum, DCLXVII.

23 MFL II. Registrum, DCLXXXV.


26 For a summary see: Hegedüs, Patachich Gábor; Tóth, A Kalocsai-bácsi.


29 Rituale Romanoc-Colocense. For more on the book of ceremonies see Hegedüs, Patachich Gábor, 80–82.


31 For a summary see: Katona, A kalocsai, II. 196–217.

32 Katona, A kalocsai, II. 201–202.

33 Cf. information about the same Jesuit missionary from Požega in the first chapter. The house history of Sombor notes that the same Jesuit missionary developed the first congregation of theological analysis from Illyrian believers living in the town – the body which Father Rochus was later commissioned to lead. – MFL VIII. PCZ, 40.

34 Katona, A kalocsai, II. 206.

35 Cf. Unyi, Sokácok, 153.

36 In Baja, the Illyrian parish remained in the administration of the local friary until 1781: Kapocs–Kőhegyi, Historia Domus, 114. The friary of Subotica (Szentmária) belonged to another province, called the Salvatorian. The parish was served by Franciscans until 1773.

37 Unyi, Sokácok, 153.

38 This danger proved most realistic in the case of Sombor as a consequence of increasingly radical political relations, when in 1781, five years after the parish was appropriated, the friary was also disbanded.


40 Signs of preparation are also evident in Szmendrovich’s letters as references to being busy.

41 MFL VIII. PCZ, 66.

42 MFL VIII. PCZ, 67.

43 For more on this see the numerous relevant notes of the house history of Sombor MFL VIII. PCZ.

44 KFL I. 1. a. ORFS.

45 Developing a positive relationship was aided, for instance, by the “usual Carnival lunches” which were noted with great satisfaction, year by year, on the pages of the house history, taking great care to list all of the notabilities who attended. See, for example, on the feast given on 11 February 1770: MFL VIII. PCZ, 85.

46 This is emphasized through the example of the archdiocese of Kalocsa: Hegedüs, Patachich Gábor, 62–63. In the sources we examined for the relevant years we found few signs of the kind of financial debate which was common between lay vicars and their believers in other places. – KFL I. 1. e. E.) PSB, 234–235, 239–241.
Clerical history from beneath

47 MFL II. Registrum, DII.
48 Indeed, in 1761 he was also active as guardian of the friary of Sombor. – MFL VIII. PCZ, 37.
49 MFL II. Registrum, DXVII.
50 MFL II. Registrum, DCLXIX, DCLXXII.
52 MFL II. Tabulae, 1767.
53 MFL II. Tabulae, 1767, 1769.; MFL VIII. PCZ.
54 MFL II. Registrum, DLXXVII–DLXXIX.
55 The Franciscan regula exists in innumerable copies. For my work I used Regula.
56 Stephanus Nagy died on 31 March 1769 at the age of 63 and was buried amid great state and pomp in the crypt of the friars. – MFL VIII. PCZ, 78.
57 Cf. Regula, 57–58. (De eleemosynarum mendicacione).
58 The names of the following vicars stand out in this context: Andreas Fabry from Béreg, Mathias Szloboda from Kolluth, Martinus Firan from Miletics and Franciscus Gall from Csonoplya. – KFL I. 1. a. ORFS.
59 The same may be stated about the house histories of other Franciscan friaries: Kapocs and Kőhegyi, Historia Domus.
60 MFL II. Registrum, DLXXVIII.
61 MFL II. Registrum, DLXXVIII.
62 His first name is mentioned in Statement No. 6. of the testimonial of 1769 on the confessions taken by Father Rochus. According to this, the guardian who refused to allow Szmendrovich out to his patient finally, after repeated entreaties, allowed Father Stephanus to visit, but the ailing boy, instead of getting better, soon died. – KFL I. 1. a. ORFS.
63 MFL II. Registrum, DLXXVIII.
64 MFL VIII. PCZ, 78.
65 Among the possible witnesses a certain Father Augusztin is mentioned; he has not been identified more closely but was in charge of the parish of Szonta at the time.
66 MFL VIII. PCZ, 82.
67 MFL VIII. PCZ, 89.
68 MFL II. Registrum, DLXXVIII.
69 MFL II. Registrum, CXCVI–CXCVII.
70 KFL I. 1. a. ORFS.
71 MFL II. Registrum, DLXXVIII.
72 KFL I. 1. a. ORFS.
73 For his biography also cf. Stepanović, Somborska, 129.
74 MFL II. Registrum, DLXXVIII.
75 MFL VIII. PCZ, 46.
76 At any rate it was in this capacity that he arrived at the Sombor friary in October, where he may have also taken measures regarding Szmendrovich. – MFL VIII. PCZ, 68.
78 One such public debate probably took place during a visit to Sombor of province commissioner (commissarius), Joannes Bapt. de Calvatone on 11 May 1767 (MFL VIII. PCZ, 62), as Szmendrovich himself refers to this in a letter written in the August of the same year. KFL I. 1. a. ORFS.
79 MFL VIII. PCZ, 106.
80 MFL MS Archives, Legacy of Nándor Kaizer, “A Zombori Zárda 1717–1787” [“The Friary of Sombor”], 36. The original house history merely commemorates transferring the crypt and makes no mention whatever of the body being found in a good condition (MFL VIII. PCZ, 151).
treatment. Most believers who visited one of the shrines did so because they wanted to pray for recovery in front of the sacred image or statue (in this century supplicating, in most cases, for mediation from the Virgin Mother). Prayers that were heard resulted in a flood of votive gifts (votive images, silver, gold and wax objects, plaques of gratitude) on the walls of the shrines. The miraculous recoveries and events which took place were diligently recorded by members of the clerical body “maintaining” and attending to the shrines, usually one of the religious orders (in this period and in this part of the world this usually meant the Franciscans). Such narratives played a weighty part in obtaining official status for the shrines.

In cases when prayers at a shrine are heard, the priesthood is a passive participant, as the recovery itself takes place entirely independently of them – at best they play the part of eye-witness and of the chronicler of the miracle. By contrast, the exorcist is an active agent, as a healer whose personality plays a decisive part in the effectiveness of his actions. In the second half of the eighteenth century the clerical leadership began increasingly to frown on cases in which a priest’s (or, worse still, a friar’s) individual personality and charisma stood in the centre of such dubious miracle-cases. Below we shall discuss in more detail the layers of change which formed the process of Catholic enlightenment and the transformation of miracle belief, but even at this point it is important to indicate that there were to be major changes in attitude in that area. If the process of official recognition for these shrines, which could boast hundreds of miraculous healings and heard prayers, became slow and difficult in this period, what could one expect concerning the way in which the prayers of priests, so diverse and so dependent on personality, were evaluated?

Over the second half of the eighteenth century the medical profession was becoming increasingly institutionalized and the state financed the development of a country-level network of physicians. This, however, did not mean that experiential medicinal practices or healing methods relying on the transcendent were rendered unnecessary or obsolete. Even in these decades we find cases when some members of the local lower clergy would offer direct help to the parishioners, while at the same time others members with a different attitude pursued the noble intention of disseminating scientifically based medical and hygiene information to the ignorant population. The option, far from exclusive, of recovery through faith, however, never entirely disappeared from the way of thinking of religious people, since this is rooted in the profoundest psychological strata of any religion.

Notes
1 Most recently, an excellent synthesis is also offered on this question in a comprehensive cultural historical review by: Brian P. Levack, The Devil
The friar who heals


2 From a vast literature I merely refer here to a new collection of essays working along general considerations of religious studies: Éva Pócs (ed.) Mágikus és szakrális medicina. Vallásetnológiai fogalmak tudományközi megközelítésben (Budapest: Balassi Kiadó, 2010).

3 As does, for instance, Levack, who firmly declares that he will not extend the main strand of his investigations to exorcists who cure people from all manner of diseases (e.g. the activity of recently mentioned Chiesa from Piemont or Gassner from Germany) – Levack, The Devil Within, 18.


5 For more on this question with further references see: Báth, “Papok és démonok.”

6 For an example of Hungarian studies concerning missions, an area that has attracted intense research from a cultural historical point of view over the recent decades, see: Molnár, Katolikus missziók; Mezőváros és katolizmus. Katolikus egyház az egri piispóskép bődölségi területein a 17. században (Budapest: METEM, 2005); Tóth, Misszionáriusok.

7 Molnár, Mezőváros, 145–147.

8 In the first half of the seventeenth century, for instance, the activities of Gergely Vásárhelyi and Don Simone Matkovich from the South of Transdanubia, or the work of István Szini who treated a great many people in Belgrade and Gyulafehervár may be highlighted from this respect. For more on their healing activity see: Mihály Balázs, Ádám Fricsy, László Lukács and István Monok (eds.) Erdélyi és bődölségi jésuita missziók I/1–2. (Szeged: Scriptum,1990): I/1. 32., 33., 37., 168., 172., 241., 243., 255.; I/2. 306., 380., 432., 434.

9 Molnár, Katolikus missziók, 163.


11 We shall be returning to this question in a broader context; certain questions are worth exploring with the help of earlier results: Báth, Benedikció.

12 This process took place at a different rate in Central, Southern and Eastern Europe. All of this will be discussed in more detail in forthcoming chapters.


14 I have discussed this case in a separate study: Dániel Báth, Exorcizmus és erotik. Egy XVIII. századi székezföldi ördöngizés szokatlan körülményei (Kecskemét: BKMÖ Múzeumi Szervezete, 2008).

15 Báth, Benedikció.
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17 For more, with accurate references and including the original texts, see: Báth, “Benedikciók.”

18 An illustrative example of the kind of pastoral service which addresses spiritual and physical problems at the same time is Martin von Cochem’s famous manual of benedictions which gained great popularity not only in Germany, but all over Central Europe (particularly in monastic practice). *Libellus benedictionum* was published in a compilation where the other work in the same volume was *Infermitatis humanis praesidium sive libellus infirmorum* by the same author. The joint publication of the two volumes was the result of a conscious authorial and editorial decision. – Martin von Cochem, *Libellus benedictionum et exorcismorum* … On the contents of this volume cf. Báth, *Benedikció*, 38–39.

19 It is instructive that in the vast collection of testimonials which father Rochus arranged to have authenticated in 1769 reference is made to an earlier, regretfully undated permission which licensed Szmendrovich to exorcize possessed individuals freely in the Zagreb diocese. The document names Lucas Pejakovich, vicar of Požega, assessor of the local consistory, as signatory. Nowhere was the licence from Požega more relevant than in the case of the vicar of Sesvete. – KFL I. 1. a. ORFS.

20 NAZ B. III. 56. Historia Residentiae Poseganae SJ. passim.

21 He continued to act as healer even after he left Sombor. He himself refers to his healings performed at Đakovo in an autobiographic letter written in 1774 and quoted above. He is believed to have cured seven sick people in the town in 1772. – NAZ B. II. Acta Officii Dioecesani (Series Centralis) Fasc. XI. 1774. (Velika Mlaka, 11 February 1774).

22 In later chapters we shall return to the question of connections between confession and exorcism.

23 KFL I. 1. a. ORFS.

24 In an exceptional case a little boy, seriously ill, was taken to the church where, with great difficulty, they could arrange for the Franciscan then under penalty to pray over the sick child.

25 See, for instance, the description of the ceremony in the Kalocsa ritual valid there and then: *Rituale Romano-Colocense*, 117–161.

26 The source, a later copy of the original minutes, contains the phrase “in honorem S. Marthae.” However, to the best of my knowledge, St. Martha did not have a patron function of this kind. If, however, an abbreviation was used in the original, this could, by a lapse in the copyist’s attention, have been misunderstood when in fact the original was referring to “S. Margarithae.” This would lead us to the veneration of St. Margaret of Antioch who did indeed have attributes of killing dragons and exorcizing the devil, as well as a well-known function as patron saint of pregnant women and mothers in childbirth. There are also data from Hungary claiming that as one of the 14 helping saints she intervened to bring about the pregnancy of an infertile woman. – Bálint, *Únnepi kalendárium*, II. 34–45.

27 KFL I. 1. a. ORFS.


31 On his personality and activity see: Antonius J. Zimmermann, Johann Joseph Gassner, der berühmte Exorzist. Sein Leben und wundersames Wirken aus Anlass seiner hundertjährigen Todesfeier neuerdings erzählt und gewürdiget vom (Kempten: Kösel, 1878); Josef Hanauer, “Der Teufelsbanner und Wunderheiler
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32 Midelfort, Exorcism.

33 Midelfort, Exorcism, 62–79.

34 Vö. Hanauer, “Der Teufelsbanner.”


41 For a summary see: Sándor Bálint–Gábor Barna, Búcsújáró magyarok. A magyarországi búcsújárási története és néprajza (Budapest: Szent István Társulat, 1994); Gábor Tüske, Búcsújárás a barokk korai Magyarországon a mirákulumirodalom tükrében (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1993).

42 For more on mediaeval practice see: Peter Brown, A szentkultusz (Budapest: Atlantisz, 1993).

43 It is an important element of the exorcism story which took place at Csikszentgyörgy in 1726–1727 that after lengthy attempts made locally, the woman who was assumed to be possessed was taken by a party headed by the vicar himself to the shrine of Csiksomlyó, to be looked after by the Franciscan friars maintaining that church. – Bárh, Exorcizmus és erotiká. For earlier precursors of the same from seventeenth-century missionary practice see: Balázs et al. (eds.) Erdélyi, I/1. 116; I/2. 434.

44 For an earlier example see the various levels of the recovery accounts from the shrine at Csiksomlyó (both as personal accounts and in literary form): János Bárth, A vígasztaló Napbaöltözzött Asszony. Csdás gyógyulások egyházi vizsgálata Csiksomlyón 1784-ben (Szeged: Agapé, 2000); Tamás Mohay, “Istennek kincses tárháza …” P. Losteiner Leonárd ferences kézirata Szűz Mária csiksomlyói kegyzsobráról (Csiksomlyó–Budapest: Csiksomlyói Ferences Kolostor–Szent István Társulat, 2015).

45 These so-called miracle books were kept up-to-date even after the shrine was officially recognized. A grand-scale monograph by Gábor Tüske is the determining source of information in Hungary concerning their source value, prevalence, structure, the topical character of the records and a number of other aspects. – Tüske, Búcsújárás.

the cathartic moments of the ceremonies one could behold flies, geese, crows and other birds flying about among the walls of the Church of the Holy Trinity at Sombor.

It appears that the demons acting in the town knew of each other: they welcomed each other’s successes (e.g. upon the death of physician Henricus Kerschner) and wailed each time that one of their fellow demons was finally expelled by the exorcist (e.g. when this happened to Hassan, all the demons residing in various Orthodox sufferers declared that it had indeed been he who had departed and smashed the church window). The demons themselves also distinguished people according to their faith, behaving differently within Catholics than in the Orthodox. Sometimes they would trouble people with their unsolicited chatter, expounding at length the nature of torments in the other world, divulging secrets from this world, often including some that might have been embarrassing even for the priest performing the ceremony. The demons would regularly taunt and mock the priest. They formed alliances so as to help disguise their hiding places. We may recall the conversations overheard between the demons of Anna Buday and Stephanus Mandich aligning their tactics to be followed in front of the consistory of Kalocsa. At other times the demons hiding inside the possessed individuals were noted to have reacted with amazing precision to every little resonance of the exorcist. Point 21 of the minutes describing the signs manifested by the woman at Subotica is illustrative.

While I was writing all of this next to him [the demon], saying nothing about what I was writing, he started shouting, “I know what you are writing, oh, I wish I had never told you things like that, nor had done anything before; you are writing to cause me even more torment, I wish I had never been created,” he cried to himself.

Usein, the demon living inside the woman, knew exactly the kind of consequences that would follow were the minutes to reach Kalocsa – Father Rochus’s intentions would reach their goal and he would be granted permission for a major assault of exorcism which, it appears, the infernal enemy already considered a battle it was losing.

It is obvious that the behaviours which the demons of Sombor exhibited according to Szmendrovich’s letters were perfectly in line with the Franciscan’s goals. The demonic conversations, chattering, asides and other manifestations formed an organic part of the system of argumentations with which Father Rochus tried to fortify himself and legitimize his missionary work of exorcism.

Notes

1 For a concise summary of the concept of demonology as it has been used since the eighteenth century and its changes in content from the earliest uses in
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8 From the truly rich literature of the subject I merely name a few books that offer a comprehensive picture and can serve as a basis for further investigations: Éva Pócs (ed.), *Demonológia és boszorkányság Európában* (Budapest: L’Harmattan, 2001); Démonok, látók, szentek. Vallásetnológiai fogalmak tudományközi megközelítésben (Budapest: Balassi, 2008); Klaniczay and Pócs (eds.) *Communicating; Christian Demonology; Witchcraft Mythologies; Witchcraft and Demonology*.


10 Pócs, “Démoni megszállottság.” Pócs’s activity is outstanding even in an international comparison in its progressive and organic nature – together with András Zempléni she organized a grand-scale conference on “Spirit Possession” held at Pécs in 2012; the proceedings of this event cover an impressive range of subjects and are currently being edited.
Demonology and possession

11 For more on the antecedents see: Bárth, “Papok és démonok”; Exorcizmus és erotika; Benedikció, (especially: 77–90).
12 Cf. Bárth, Benedikció.
13 From the vast literature of the subject see, for example: Clark, Thinking with Demons; Pócs, “Démoni megszállottság”; Lederer, “Exorzisieren.”
14 This process is closely related to the stigmatization of “superstition” and magic and expunging practices labelled as such from the area of official, semi-official and rural religious life. On these extremely complex processes of the early modern period see Thomas, Religion; Dieter Harmening, Zauberei im Abendland: Vom Anteil der Gelehrten am Wahn der Leute. Skizzen zur Geschichte des Aberglaubens (Würzburg: Königshausen und Neumann, 1991); Sluhovsky, Believe; Davies, 2009.
16 The Central European research area does not as yet boast such a rich bibliography as is reflected in Clark’s gigantic work: Clark, Thinking with Demons, 687–726. During my project I worked from the following demonological treatises: Joannes Weyer, De praestigiis daemonum; Joannes Laurentius Anania, De natura daemonum; Candidus Brognolus, Manuale exorcistarum ac parochorum; Alexicacon hoc est de maleficiis, ac morbis maleficiis cognoscendis.
17 Weyer is known as one of the most famous sceptical authors; his oft-quoted work is De praestigiis daemonum (1563). For further context on this see: Levack, The Devil Within, 75–76.
18 Besides the works already mentioned I have also used: Valerius Polidorus, Practica exorcistarum; Zaccharias Vicecomes, Complementum artis exorcisticae; Exorcista rite edoctus; Ubaldus Stoiber, Armamentarium ecclesiasticum.
19 During my work I frequently referred to manuals of Menghi and Eynatten (Mengus, Flagellum; Fustis; Maximilian von Eynatten, Manuale exorcismorum); for further context on these works cf.: 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).
20 One of the most popular compilations which selects from the works of Mengus, Polidorus, Vicecomes and Stampa is: Thesaurus exorcismorum.
21 Index librorum prohibitorum, 156,
22 Polidorus, Practica exorcistarum; Index librorum prohibitorum, 177.
23 Vicecomes, Complementum artis exorcisticae; Index librorum prohibitorum, 219.
24 Brognolus, Manuale; Index librorum prohibitorum, 67–68.
25 Index librorum prohibitorum, 207.
27 Monok and Zvara, Katolikus, 51.
28 Monok and Zvara, Katolikus, 65.
29 Báth, Exorcizmus és erotika.
30 Exorcista rite edoctus ...
31 In the case of the parish of Kapoly: Egyed Hermann and Béla Eberhardt, A veszprémi egyházmegye papságának könyvkultúrája és könyvállománya a XIX. század elején (Veszprém: Egyházmegyei Könyvnyomda, 1942): 214.


The page number and place of publication of the previous note also applies to: Mengus, *Flagellum*, 43.

It is widely known that after Joseph II disbanded the religious orders, the books of these orders had a troubled history. For a reconstruction of the library of over 400 books that once belonged to the friary of Sombor, most heavily affected, see: Antal Hagedus, “Knjige somborskog franjevačkog manastira 1786. g.” *Bibliotekarski godišnjak Vojvodine* 1977. (Novi Sad, 1978): 19–34; Stepanović, *Somborska*, 52–55.


"Cathecismus Romanus", 504–514.

Guilielmus Stanihurstus, *Veteris hominis per expensa quattuor novissima metamorphosis*.

Franciscus Herzig, *Manuale Parochi ...*

*Manuale Parochorum ...*

"Parochus meditans ..." (especially caput IV: De zelo animarum).

To mention only the most evocative book titles: *Methodus expedire confessionis* (Tamburini); *Ratio status animae; Bellum contra hostes capitale animae; Instructio practica de confessionibus; Instructio confessarii et paenitentis* (Segneri); *Idea boni confessarii*, etc.


Teretius, *Confessio et instructio idiotae*, 114–140.

Teretius, *Confessio et instructio idiotae*, 125.

Teretius, *Confessio et instructio idiotae*, 134.


NAZ B. I. Kanonske vizitacije 30/II. 371.

For instance, the eighteenth-century edition of *Circulus aureus* was listed in the book inventory of as many as three different parishes of the Veszprém diocese. See: Hermann–Eberhardt, *A veszprémi*, 151. This book of ceremonies, in the company of other alternative manuals (*Rituale Franciscanum; Fasciculus bene­dictionum; Exorcista rite edoctus*) was also found in 1779 at the parish of Szentmihály, right next to Csáktornya, where Szmendrovich was acting as assistant pastor at the time. – NAZ B. I. Kanonske vizitacije 81/XII. (1779) 198.

For the present work I used the mid-seventeenth century, Venice edition of the book: *Circulus aureus, seu breve compendium caerimoniarum et rituum*....

The most important parallel from this point of view is the popular Franciscan book of ceremonies by Sannig: *Rituale Franciscanum*. For more on its content see: Bárh, *Benedikció*, 37–38. For further parallels see: *Manuale benedictionum; Nucleus; Locupletissimus thesaurus*.

For more on the tactics followed by the editors and publishers and an analysis of the contents of these manuals see: Bárh, *Benedikció*, 37–42.

For more on this question see: Bárh, *Benedikció*.

"Fasciculus triplex exorcismorum et benedictionum*.

For a contents list and more detailed analysis of this manual see: Bárh, *Benedikció*, 69–75.
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57 *Fasciculus triplex* was disseminated not only by Jesuits. The book inventory of the parish of Kolluth, Bačka region, notes in 1756 that a copy of this manual was donated by none other than Nicolaus Csáky, Archbishop of Kalocsa. The same book was also listed in nearby Bezdán in 1767, during the time of our present history. For more on these books and the way they spread further see: Bárth, *Benedikció*, 75.

58 The most important items are: *Rituale Franciscanum; Arca Domini; Fasciculus benedictionum*. For a summary of contemporary Franciscan benediction practices see: Bárth, *Benedikció*, 61–69.

59 Pócs, “Démoni megszállottság,” 140.


61 For more on this see: Bárth, *Benedikció*.

62 Similar argumentation was used by Gassner from Germany: Midelfort, *Exorcism*, 96, 101.

63 Speaking of the early modern period, Levack distinguishes 16 categories of socially accepted signs of possession. Naturally, these would be mentioned not at one place and one time, but could be retrieved from the various sources of sixteenth- to eighteenth-century European religious culture available to the author. They are the following: (1) convulsions; (2) physical pain; (3) rigidity of the limbs; (4) muscular flexibility and contortions; (5) preternatural strength; (6) levitation; (7) swelling; (8) vomiting; (9) loss of bodily function; (10) fasting; (11) language; (12) voice; (13) trance experiences and visions; (14) clairvoyance; (15) blasphemy and sacred objects; (16) immoral gestures and actions. Levack, *The Devil Within*, 6–15.

64 *Rituale Romanum*, 198–199.


67 For more on parallels see in the secondary literature the previously mentioned chapter by Levack where phenomena such as “a passage of ants,” “burning blisters” or “tearing at the clothes” appear in their pan-European context: Levack, *The Devil Within*, 6–15.

68 KFL I. 1. a. ORFS.


70 The first official book of ceremonies in the early modern period at Kalocsa was published in 1738 by Archbishop Patachich under the title *Rituale Romano-Colocense*. This is the edition which was in use during the time of our story. The chapter on exorcism is a verbatim copy of its Roman forerunner: *Rituale Romano-Colocense*, 351–372. For more on the content of the Kalocsa book of ceremonies cf. Bárth, *Benedikció*, 54.


invaded by the devil as a consequence of their sins. As on this occasion all of the sufferers happened to be women, the sins easily became entangled with the question of sexuality. Women of youthful or riper years writhing spasmodically on the ground and tearing at their clothes in a state of near-insanity would have represented a spectacle in themselves. Now, when sexuality stood in association with possession, the events gained an added piquancy.\footnote{Szmendrovich concluded with complacency that the sight of the torments caused by the devil inspired atonement in many. Blasphemers discontinued their foul habit; those in states of mortal sin “were overcome with full grief.” Many in the crowd wept, so touched were they with all that went on. Such cathartic feelings were further enhanced if the possessed individual screamed and performed supernatural acts. The onlookers’ excitement increased as the protagonist priest flashed out ever newer tricks and devices. \textit{Fumigatio}, an incense produced from consecrated plants and suitable for driving out the devil, must have touched everybody’s senses. They could see the religious amulets, the holy water with a drop of consecrated oil floating on it, they could feel the smell of incense and camphor. Mass exorcism of Orthodox believers did indeed develop into a public theatrical performance – stood in a row, the possessed each held a burning candle in their hands. The enthusiastic Franciscan even involved the viewers in the performance – he got them to repeat the words of exorcism in chorus. To make sure that everyone understood and said the words correctly, exorcism at this point was carried out in the vernacular.}

There is no doubt whatsoever that what took place in the Sombor church of the Franciscan order was no less than a veritable theatrical performance directed and conducted by an inspired and fanatical Franciscan who vexed the possessed and directed the chorus of the viewers to act according to his instructions. This curious phenomenon certainly must have counted a curiosity at the time. By the second half of the eighteenth century, to transform a consecrated Catholic church into the venue of such a circus spectacle had certainly come to be an act open to penal sanction.

\section*{Notes}


Since the publication of Adolf Franz’s seminal work (Franz, Die kirchlichen), questions related to the “grand” or “solemn” exorcism, with regard to liturgical history, have preoccupied fewer scholars than one would expect based on the vast body of literature existing on the subject. The essays of Manfred Probst, that excellent liturgical historian of the second half of the twentieth century, mostly focus on questions of official and contemporary exorcist liturgy (cf. Probst and Richter, Exorzismus); his attention has only recently turned towards questions related to the content of early modern exorcism manuals (Probst, Besessenheit). For an excellent summary on the mediaeval aspects of the matter recently see: Florence Chave-Mahir, L’exorcisme des possédés dans l’Église d’Occident (Xe–XIVe siècle) (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011). A work with the intention of a full-ranging review from the perspective of liturgical history: Scala, Der Exorzismus.

Daniel P. Walker, Unclean Spirits: Possession and Exorcism in France and England in the late Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Centuries (London: Scolar Press, 1981); Levack (ed.) Possession; The Devil Within; Dittelbacher, Angst im Mittelalter; Clark, Thinking with Demons; Levi, Egy falusi; Almond, Demonic possession; Ferber, Demonic Possession; Sluhovsky, Believe; Young, A History of Exorcism.
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8 Lederer, “Exorzisieren.” For a basic work on the same processes as they took place in France, see: Ferber, Demonic Possession.

9 Lederer, “Exorzisieren,” 214.

10 Cf. Clark, Thinking with Demons.


13 For example: Molnár, Mezőváros, (particularly) 144–148.

14 For the text of the ruling of the synod see: Carolus Péterffy, Sacra concilia ecclesiae ... II, 253–254.

15 On the anonymous letter of 1758, which reported on the Franciscan practice of healing with slips of paper, see: Tihamér Vanyó, A bécsi pápai követség levéltárának iratai Magyarországról 1611–1786 (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1986): 126, 439. For reference to the practice of exorcism among the Greek Catholic priests seen as conspicuous and reprehensible from the Roman Catholic point of view in the early 1770s see: Vanyó, A bécsi, 111–112.

16 On the instance of exorcism which took place in 1727–1728 at Csíkszentgyörgy see: Bárth, Exorcizmus és erotik.

17 These three brief testimonials were published as an ethnographic curiosity in: R. Kiss, “Történeti adalékok.”
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18 This phrase is mostly used by the Protestant literature: Thomas, Religion, 25–30. A Catholic theologian will discuss the survival of the same phenomena (sacramentalia, benedictions, religious amulets, etc.) in Baroque Catholicism with an approach best summed up by the phrase “when things were still sacred”: Christoph Kürzeder, Als die Dinge heilig waren. Gelebte Frömmigkeit im Zeitalter des Barock (Regensburg: Schnell & Steiner, 2005). For more on this subject also cf.: Rudolf Kriss, “Zum Problem der religiösen magie und ihrer Rolle im volkstümlichen Opferbrauchtum und Sakramentalien-Wesen,” in Magie und Religion. Beiträge zu einer Theorie der Magie, ed. Petzoldt, Leander (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1978): 385–403. Most recently, a seminal work in a broader context has been: Wolfgang Brückner, Bilddenken. Mensch und Magie oder Missverständnisse der Moderne (Münster: Waxmann, 2013).


20 This rite was omitted from the book of ceremonies printed at Esztergom in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Cf. Báth, Benedikció, 46–54.


22 Nineteenth- and twentieth-century editions of Rituale Strigoniense no longer included this sequence, instead they referred any readers interested in it (i.e. priests with a permission) to Rituale Romanum. – Báth, Benedikció, 79.

23 Rituale Romano-Colocense, 351–372.


25 For example: Polidorus, Practica exorcistarum; Vicecomes, Complementum artis exorcisticae; Thesaurus exorcismorum; Eynatten, Manuale exorcismorum; Mengus, Flagellum; Fustis; Exorcista rite edoctus; Stoiber, Armamentarium ecclesiasticum.

26 Gassner, the closest parallel, would have been bound to have used the following alternative manuals: Stoiber, Armamentarium ecclesiasticum; Brognolus, Manuale; Mengus, Flagellum; Fustis; Manuale benedictionum. Cf. Midelfort, Exorcism, 184–185.

27 Circulus aureus.


29 “Conjuratio cartae, in qua debent scribi verba, appendenda collo vexati, vel secum deferenda” – Circulus aureus, 234–236. For a parallel to the text written on this slip of paper see: Báth, Benedikció, 323–324.

30 Circulus aureus, 239–251.

31 The title “Ritualia 2” may have referred to the book of ceremonies issued by the Zagreb diocese in 1729, or to the 1738 book of ceremonies of the diocese of Kalocsa (as the relevant clerical district), but equally any other official book of rituals. On the bibliographic data of such books of ceremony see: Báth, Benedikció, 109–121.

32 Fasciculus triplex exorcismorum et benedictionum.

33 List published in: Hegedűs, “Knjige.”

34 By way of comparison, see: Monok and Zvara, Katolikus.


36 Hegedűs, “Knjige,” 27.
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37 Under Item 243 in the list: Hegedűs, “Knjige,” 27. For the present work I used an edition published a few years earlier in Milan: Alexander Albertinus a Rocha, Malleus daemonum.

38 The book was also included in Clark’s vast thematic bibliography: Clark, Thinking with Demons, 687. I have not come across use of this volume in Hungary, to date.


40 Rituale Franciscanum. For more on this book of ceremonies and its various editions see: Báth, Benedikció, 37–38.

41 Various editions of Sannig’s work were found, according to a survey made in the early nineteenth century, in the book inventory of at least ten parishes, as well as at the seminary of Veszprém: Hermann–Eberhardt, A veszprémi, 151–152. An Italian copy of Sannig’s collection and a volume by Floriano Canale (Del modo di cognoscer …) provided the material for Jensen’s excellent analysis and source publication: Jürgen Jensen, Kirchliche Rituale als Waffen gegen Dämonenwirken und Zauberei. Ein Beitrag zu einem Komplex von Schutz- und Abwehrritualen der Katholischen Kirche des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts in Italien unter besonderer Berücksichtigung systematisch-ethnologischer Gesichtspunkte (Berlin: Lit Verlag, 2007).

42 Rituale Franciscanum, 335–356.

43 Rituale Franciscanum, 357–408.

44 Hegedűs, “Knjige,” 27.

45 We used the following edition published in Vienna: Nucleus.

46 For more on its contents and various editions see: Báth, Benedikció, 40–41.


48 A more thorough presentation of this collection, including its full list of contents is found in: Báth, Benedikció, 62–66.

49 Mengus, Flagellum; Fustis. For more on the background to these manuals see: Massimo Petrocchi, Esorcismi e magia nell’Italia del cinquecento e del seicento (Napoli: Libreria Scientifica, 1957); Probst, Besessenheit. The works of Mengus (Menghi) were placed in context by presenting the interactions of sixteenth-century Italian clerical and folk culture in: Mary R. O’Neil, “Sacerdote ovvero strione: ecclesiastical and superstitious remedies in 16th century Italy,” in Understanding Popular Culture: Europe from the Middle Ages to the Nineteenth Century, ed. Kaplan, Steven L. (Berlin–New York–Amsterdam: Mouton, 1984): 53–83.


51 Fasciculus benedictionum.

52 Cf. Báth, Benedikció, 62.

53 For example, in the case of the Lyon edition of 1614.

54 On the contents of the manuscript see: Sluhovsky, Believe, 67.

55 Monok and Zvara, Katolikus, 44.


59 One manuscript version of the same text was inventoried at some point under the title Liber exorcismorum et benedictionum (1751) (mark the first two
words of the title!) and this title was also used in the same form by the catalogue of the Moravian district library (Brno) which holds the copy today. The blessing of the sacramentia referred to as Lukas-Zettel (Lucas’s slip) also features in a recently found eighteenth-century manuscript book of benedictions held in the library of ELTE Budapest University. The manuscript bears the title Cumulus selectiorum benedictionum, exorcismorum, ac conjurationum ad depellenda maleficia ... and also contains a number of benedictions and exorcisms whose parallels are found in contemporary “semi-official” printed collections. It is my intention to carry out a comparative philological analysis of these copies in a separate study.

60 KFL I. 1. a. ORFS.
61 For more on this manuscript and the sacramentia see: Báth, Benedikció, 66–68. This is also where I published the text of the ritual sequence found in the Franciscan material at Kalocsa (300–301).
62 The role of the Franciscans was first pointed out to me by Sándor Bálint, mostly based on ethnographic data from Bačka: Bálint, Ünnepi kalendárium, I, 479.
63 Quite specifically, it constituted Appendix No. 7. of one of the documents.
64 For more on this see: Báth, Benedikció.
65 Rituale Strigoniense.
66 The text of Rituale Romano-Colocense (1798) was published in: Báth, Benedikció, 371–372. It is remarkable that this text “happened to” be included even in the late eighteenth-century edition of the manual.
68 For the relevant ordo in the Benedictine collection Sacra arca benedictionum (1697) see: Báth, Benedikció, 182–190 (the commanding text specifically: 184).
69 For the relevant ceremony of Fasciculus triplex see: Báth, Benedikció, 221.
70 Cf. the ceremony for blessing a coin with the image of St. Benedict, which appears in the Benedictine collection Sacra arca benedictionum (1697), in: Báth, Benedikció, 328–336 (for the commanding passage specifically, see: 334).
71 For more in this context see the “Breverl” Prayers of the collection Arca Domini (1774) in: Báth, Benedikció, 323–328 (especially: 326–327). On the role of religious amulets in the baroque period see: Kürzeder, Als die Dinge.
72 See the prayer in Arca Domini: Báth, Benedikció, 384–385.
73 Mengus, Fustis, 193–216.
74 See the ordos of Sacra arca benedictionum (1697) in: Báth, Benedikció, 413–428.
75 Cf. Clark, Thinking with Demons.
76 Cf. Rituale Strigoniense, 263.
77 Listing the references connected to each would far exceed the framework of the present chapter apparatus. Examples come from a reader that I myself compiled and source references may also be found there: Báth, Benedikció.
78 Possible differences in content related to names and adjectival structures could only be identified in possession of a close and meticulous analysis of mediaeval and early modern demonological literature. Thus, for example, it is hard to identify exactly the kind of demonological aspects related to the direct addressing formulas used in exorcisms against thunderstorms. The collection...
of benedictions published under the title *Fasciculus benedictionum* at Csíksomlyó in 1749 (cf.: Bárth, *Benedikció*, 62) includes a sequence of four orders of ceremony, occupying Pages 7–53, for averting thunderstorms. In these the priest, facing the storm clouds, addresses the following forces: *nubes et tempestates* (clouds and tempests); *daemones* (demons); *angeli tartarei* (demons of the underworld); *angeli nigermi* (the darkest angels); *angeli praecipitati* (fallen angels); *spiritus maligni* (malignant spirits); *maledicti daemones* (accursed demons); *superbissimi daemones* (the most arrogant demons); *aereas potestates* (powers of the air); *angeli tenebrarum* (angels of darkness); *ministri Sathane* (servants of Satan); *scelestitissimos daemones* (the most sinful demons), etc.

80 In connection with all of this cf: Jensen, *Kirchliche Rituale*; Bárth, *Benedikció*, 91–100.


86 The ceremony in *Sacra arca benedictionum* is quoted in: Bárth, *Benedikció*, 164–166 (for “blowing on a possessed person” see: 165).
87 Mengus, *Flagellum*, 1697b.
88 Bárth, *Exorcizmus és erotik*a.


90 I have referred repeatedly to the Transylvanian example, a reverse of the present case, where the Catholic (and Protestant) Hungarians of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries took advantage of the services of Orthodox priests and friars (and still do to this very day) in cases when they needed a “strong priest.” With regard to the folklore aspects of the “priest of magical powers,” I merely refer here to one study which exposes the problem (Vilmos Keszeg,


92 Referring repeatedly to his past as a lay priest and the education he had received at the Zagreb seminary represented important arguments in terms of complying with the criterion of *prudentia* and only fully make sense in the above-outlined “Franciscan paradigm.”

93 KFL I. 1. a. ORFS.

94 For more on the subject see, for example: Certau, *The Possession*, 85–108; Levack, *The Devil Within*, 139–168.

95 Báráth, *Benedikció*, 430.


97 Báráth, *Exorcizmus és erotiká.*

98 This must be why Peter Brown compares early mediaeval exorcism to Roman court trials, interpreting them as a mirror image of the legal procedures that affected Christians in the past: Brown, *A szentkultusz*, 137.


The background of a conflict

with their mediaeval approach, and on the friars who employed the various strange procedures contained therein. The latent message from the higher powers was that perpetuating such, latterly prohibited, practices was not only failing to benefit the church – it was indeed a shameful activity which damaged its reputation. Arguing in an unending chain of letters written in his characteristic small hand, Szmendrovich, the unusually beligerent Franciscan, represents a world view of the Counter-Enlightenment, standing on the wrong side, as it were, of the Catholic Enlightenment.
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59 I hasten to add that before such claims may be finalized, a considerable amount of further extensive and circumspect basic research will be required. This will need to weigh differences in mentality carefully for each individual involved, after developing the appropriate criteria. We may remember that several members of the archbishopric consistory of Kalocsa appeared in the sources, at least to start with, as supporters of Szmendrovich, including Antonius Gaslevich from Požega or general assessor Josephus Kiss. Just how divided the lower priesthood of Bačka was may be deduced from the fact that Father Rochus seems to have had supporters and opponents in near-equal numbers.
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65 Cf. Sluhovsky, *Believe*.
At the end of a prolonged dispute the offices of Joseph II decided that the behaviour he demonstrated was altogether to their liking and ruled to favour the applicant in all of the disputed questions. It seems that the strivings which Szmendrovich allowed to be seen on the surface were in line with the priestly attitude that the central powers favoured. The offices of the monarch represented enlightened absolutist power, loathed the “Franciscan spirit” and in fact actively restricted the activity of the order and disbanded the very friary at Sombor. Little did they know that in fact, beneath the surface, the vagrant Franciscan, offspring of impoverished nobles from Turopolje, had amassed the capital of these spectacular and laudable funds through the most obsolete, obscure and forbidden pursuits … to the greater glory of God, his country and his own name.
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F. 5. Zombor szabad királyi város magisztrátusának jegyzőkönyvei
(Minutes of the Magistrates’ Board of Sombor Free Royal City)
7. 1765–1774. (662.)
F. 5. Copia prothocolli sessionalis
(555. – 1766, 556. – 1767, 557. – 1768, 558. – 1769)
F. 5. Zombor szabad királyi város magisztrátusának iratai
/Documents of the Free Royal City of Sombor
Acta anni 1769.
F. 9. Zbiska matičnik knjige (Matricula), Sombor
KFL Kalocsai Főegyházmegyei Levéltár (Archives of Kalocsa Diocese)
I. Kalocsai Érseki Levéltár (Archbishops Archives of Kalocsa)
1. Kalocsai Érseki Hivatal (Archbishops Office of Kalocsa)
1. a. Egyházkormányzati iratok (Dokuments of Church Direction)
ORFS Ordines religiosi, Franciscans, Sombor/Zombor
1. b. Plébániiai iratok (Documents of Parishes)
1. e. Kötetek (Volumes)
A.)
PC Protocollum Consistoriale
E.) Protocolla mixta
PSB Prothocollum Canonicae Visitationis Districtus Superioris Bac­siensis a. 1767
PIB Prothocollum Canonicae Visitationis Districtus Inferioris Bacsien­sis a. 1767
PDT Prothocollum Canonicae Visitationis Districtus Tybiscani a. 1767
MFL Magyar Ferences Levéltár (Hungarian Franciscan Archives)
II. Kapisztrán Rendtartomány iratai (Documents of Provincia Capist­rano)
Registrum de alma et antiquissima alma S. Joannis a Capistrano
Syllabus Religiosorum Provinciae Bosnae quondam Argentinae, at
nunc S. Joannis a Capistrano, inde ab anno 1750 inclusive vita
defunctorum, et adhuc vita fungentium conscriptus 1784
Tabulae
270 **Bibliography**

VI. A Kapisztrán Rendtartomány rendházai (Konvents of Provincia Cap.)


VII. Idegen rendházak iratai (Documents of other friary’s)

PCZ *Protocollon Conventus Zomboriensis* 1749–1786

XII. Gyűjtemények (Collections)

3. Jakosics-gyűjtemény, 7. kötet

MFKL Magyar Ferences Könyvtár (Hungarian Franciscan Library)

K Kézirattár (Manuscripts)

MNL OL Magyar Nemzeti Országos Levéltár

C Helytartótanácsi Levéltár (Consilium Regium Locumtenentiale)

C 43 Acta secundum referentes

Okolicsányi, 1781, No. 78; Okolicsányi, 1782. No. 229

C 71 Departamentum ecclesiasticum cleri saecularis et regularis

1782, F. 56; 1783, F. 69

A Magyar Kancelláriai Levéltár (Cancellaria Regia Hungariae)

A 39 Acta generalia

1782/5442

NAZ Nadbiskupijski Archiv u Zagrebu (Zagreb Archdiocesan Archives)

B. Protokoli

B. I. Kanonske Vizitacije

B. II. Officium dioecesanum

Acta Officii Dioecesani

B. III. Prothocola varia

B. III. 9. b. Liber ordinatorium (1752–1830)

56. Historia Residentiae Poseganae Societatis Jesu (1698–1772)

ZFL Zágrábi Ferences Levéltár (Zagreb Franciscan Archives)

Hrvatska Franjevačka Provincija Sv. Cirila i Metoda

Provincijalni Arhiv (Zagreb)

A-IX-5. Dakovo

Protocolum Protocolum Conventus Immaculatae C. B. M. V. Diakovae anno

Domini 1740

**Printed sources**


Barits, Adalbertus. *Scriptorum ex regno Sclavoniae a saeculo XIV. usque ad XVII. inclusive collectio publico et auditoribus oblata dum assertiones ex universo
studio politico excerptas ex praelectionibus...Varasdini: Typis Joan. Thomae Trattnern, 1774.

Brognolus, Candidus. Manuale exorcistarum ac parochorum, hoc est tractatus de curatione, ac protectione divina, in quo, variis reprobatis erroribus, veris, certis, securis, catholicis, aposolicis, et evangelicis, ejiciendi daemones ab hominibus, et e rebus ad homines spectantibus; curandi infirmos; ab inimicis se tuendi; Deumque in cunctis necessitatibus propitium habendi modus traditur; opus a nemine hactenus attentatum, nedum exorcistis, et parochis necessarium: sed medicis, theologis, concionatoribus, obsessis, aegrotis, ac in quacunque necessitate constitutis apprime utile. Bergomi: typis Marci Antonii Rubei, 1651.

Brognolus, Candidus. Alexicacon hoc est de maleficiis, ac morbis maleficiis cognoscendis. Opus tam exorcistis, quam medicis, ac theologis, confessariis, parochis, inquisitoribus, ac in quacunque necessitate constitutis, utilissimum I−II. Venetiis: apud Nicolaum Pezzana, 1664.


Cathecismus Romanus ex decreto sacrosancti concilii Tridentini jussu Pii V. pontificis maximi editus ... Bassani: ex typographia Joannis Antonii Remondini, 1739.

Exorcista rite edoctus, seu accurata methodus omne maleficiorum genus probe ac prudenter curandi. Lucae: typis Marescandoli, 1705.


Fasciculus triplex exorcismorum et benedictionum in Romano-Catholica Ecclesia usitatorum, ex variis authoribus approbatis collectus, et historiis ac exemplis subinde illustratus, cum adnexo tractatu de indulgentiis et jubilaeo, ac resolutionibus morali­bus, in gratiam curatorem ecclesiae, ac priorem fidelium utilitatem luci publicae datus. Tyrnaviae: Typis Academicis, 1739.


Locupletissimus thesaurus, continens varias et selectissimas benedictiones, conjura­tiones, exorcismos, absoluitiones, ritus, administrationem sacramentorum, alio­rumque numerum pastoralium ad utilitatem Christi fidelium, et commodiorem usum parochorum, omniumque sacerdotum tam saecularium, quam religiosorum. Ex diversis ritualibus et probatissimis authoribus collectus a Gelasio di Cila. Vohburgi: Heyll, 1709.


Mengus, Hieronymus. Flagellum daemonum, exorcismos terribiles, potentissimos et efficaces, remediaque probatissima, ac doctrinam singularem in malignos spir­i­tus expellendos, facturasque et maleficia fuganda de obsessis corporibus com­pectens, cum suis benedictionibus, et omnibus requisitis ad eorum expulsionem. Accessit postremo pars secunda, quae Fustis daemonum inscriptur ... Venetiis: apud Paulum Balleonium, 1697.

Mengus, Hieronymus. Fustis daemonum, adjurationes formidabiles, potentissimas et efficaces in malignos spiritus fugandos de oppressis corporibus humanis. Ex sacrae apocalypsis fonte, variisque sanctorum patrum auctoritatibus haustus com­plete... Venetiis: apud Paulum Balleonium, 1697.

Herzig, Franciscus S. J. Manuale parochi, seu methodus compendiosa munus parochi apostolicum rite obeundi... (Editio septima). Augustae Vindelicorum: sumptibus Martini Veith, 1743.


Nucleus continens benedictiones rerum diversarum, item exorcismos ad varia maleficia depellenda, conjugationes item ad fugandas a daemonibus eorumque excitatas aerese tempestates. Collectus tam ex Romano, quam diversarum dioec­esis ritu­lum in cleri ruralis usum. Viennae Austriae, 1706.

Péterffy, Carolus. Sacra concilia ecclesiae romano-catholicae in regno Hungariae celeb­rate... I. Vienne, II. Posonii, 1742.

Parochus meditans, seu modus pie secum loquendi in usum cleri maxime ruralis... Salisbury: sumptibus Johannis Dratzieher, 1733.


Regula et constitutiones generales ordinis fratrvm minorum. Quaracchi: Ex typographia Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1922.


Stoiber, Ubaldus. Armamentarium ecclesiasticum complectens arma spiritualia fortissima ad insultus diabolicos elidendos, et feliciter superandos ... (Editio tertia). Augastae Vincelicorum: sumptibus Martini Veith, 1744.


Thesaurus exorcismorum atque conjurationum terribilium, potentissimorum, efficacissimorum, cum practica probatissima ... Coloniae: Impensis Lazari Zetzneri, 1608.


Weyer, Joannes. De praestigii daemonum, et incantationibus ac veneficiis libri V. ... Basiliae: Per Joannem Oporinum, 1563.

Secondary literature


Balázs, Mihály, Fricsy, Ádám, Lukács, László and Monok, István (eds.) Erdélyi és bódoltsági jezsuita missziók I/1–2. [Jesuit missions in Transylvania and


Bibliography


Hermann, Egyed and Eberhardt, Béla. A veszprémi egyházmegye papságának könyvkultúrája és könyvvállománya a XIX. század elején. (A veszprémi egyházmegye
Bibliography

múltjából 8.) [The Book Culture and Book Stock of the Priesthood of the Veszprém Diocese in the early 19th Century (From the Past of the Veszprém Diocese, No. 8)] Veszprém: Egyházmegyei Könyvnyomda, 1942.


Bibliography


Bibliography


Szeberényi, Gábor. Noble communities in Spiš and Turopolje in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. In Homza, Martin, Lukačka, Ján and Budak, Neven (eds.): *Slovakia and Croatia: Historical Parallels and Connections (until 1780).* Bratislava: Comenius University, 2013.


Bibliography


