

The Augustinian Province of Austro-Moravia

With a previous sketch of the Moravian vicariate *

A previous study has shown us how the two Augustinian monasteries of Austria in 1604 were united with the five Bohemian monasteries of the order to form the province of Bohemia-Austria ¹⁾. When the province was founded in 1604 it was supposed to embrace not only these seven monasteries in Bohemia and Austria, but the Augustinian monasteries of Moravia and of Silesia as well. This is explicitly stated

*) List of Abbreviations : Aa = *Notizie circa le provincie, congregationi e conventi di tutta la nostra religione*, in ARG, Romae 1266 ff.; AA = *Analecta Augustiniana*, 1332, Romae 1905 ff.; AGR = Archivum generale O.S.A., Romae, Via S. Ufficio, 25; AKBMS = *Archiv für Kirchengeschichte von Böhmen-Mähren-Schlesien*, Königstein/Taunus 1967 ff.; Alph. = *Alphabetum Felicis Milensii de monachis et monasteriis Germaniae ... ord. Er. S. Aug.*, Prag 1613; ASW = Archiv der Stadt Wien, Rathaus (Klosterakten 21-22); AV = Archivio Vaticano; BAR = Biblioteca Angelica, Roma, Piazza S. Agostino; Br. = Bruxelles, Bibliothèque royale, II. 2590; Clm = *Codex latinus monacensis*; Dd ... *Registrum priorum generalium*, in AGR 1357 ff.; GAVIGAN, *Bohemia = The Augustinian province of Bohemia and Austria 1604-1637 in Augustiniana* 21 (1971) 151-217; idem, *Epp. = Epistulae inter priores generales O.S.A. atque imperatores austriacos annis 1635-1671 missae*, in *Augustiniana* 18 (1968) 425-513; idem, FELICE = FELICE MILENSIO O.S.A., *Mitgründer des Müllner Klosters*, to be published 1971 in *Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für Salzburger Landeskunde*; idem, *de primo = De primo augustiniano rectore provinciae Austriae*, in AA 23 (1969) 255-321; idem, *Übergabe = Die Übergabe des Wiener Augustinerklosters an die Barfüßer 1630*, in *Festschrift Franz Loidl*, II. Band, Wien 1971, 132-154; HÖGGMAYR = A. HÖGGMAYR, *Catalogus priorum provincialium O.E.S. Augustini per provinciam totius Germaniae seu Alamaniae, deinde per provinciam Bavariae*, Monachii 1729; HÜMPFNER = W. HÜMPFNER, *Äussere Geschichte der Augustiner-Eremiten in Deutschland*, in *St. Augustin*, Würzburg 1930, 147-196; JANETSCHKE = C. JANETSCHKE, *Das Augustiner-Eremitenstift S. Thomas in Brünn*, Brünn 1898; Kr. = *Catalogus Patrum, ac Fratrum ord. E.S.P. Augustini ... in Bohemia existentium biographicus tripartitus ... conscriptus Anno Domini MDCCC ... a P. Pachomio Kreybich ad S. Thomam Suppriori m.p.*; KUNZELMANN = A. KUNZELMANN, *Geschichte der deutschen Augustiner-Eremiten*, I. und II. Bände, Würzburg 1969-1970; ÖNB = Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Josefplatz, Wien; RENNHOFFER, *Kl. = Augustinerklöster in Österreich*, in *Augustiniana* 6 (1956) 490-536.

¹⁾ GAVIGAN, *Bohemia*.

by the vicar general of Germany, Felice Milensio, who explains how he brought this union into existence (on paper) in 1604: *Synodum ... provincialem celebravimus ... Austriacis, Moravis, Bohemisque Prioribus convocatis: et eorum coenobia, atque Silesiae in unam Bohemicam Provinciam decretis synodicalis ... redigentes, primum eius Provinciae universae Priorem, a Patribus electum, ipsum Christellium, confirmavimus ...* ²⁾. But the five Augustinian monasteries of Silesia had first to be recovered, since they had been lost without exception in the sixteenth century, as we shall briefly indicate below. And the two Moravian monasteries existing in 1604, those of Brünn and Gewitsch, were able to assert their independence from the newly-formed province and definitely attain recognition as an independent vicariate by 1611, as we shall see below in the present study.

Hence the short-lived province of Bohemia-Austria (1604-1637) contained juridically in 1604, the year of its foundation, all the monasteries of the Augustinian order in Bohemia, Austria and Moravia, as well as the lost monasteries of Silesia, which the enterprising vicar general Milensio ³⁾ believed could be either completely or partially recovered. In fact however, not a single Augustinian monastery of Silesia could ever be gained back to the Augustinian order. And the two monasteries in Moravia succeeded in asserting their independence from the province of Bohemia-Austria. Hence, our previous study of the latter province confined itself to the monasteries of Bohemia and of Austria. The present study will devote itself to the neglected aspect, and strive to show us how the two Moravian monasteries maintained their existence as a separate vicariate before being united into a single province with the Austrian monasteries in 1649. We beg the reader's patience for the circumstance that by far the longest part of our present study is devoted to the previous descriptions of the Moravian vicariate, which was formed in the early seventeenth century, and then was united with the province of Austria in 1649.

The three Austrian monasteries, which existed in 1637, had been formed into a vicariate which became recognized as a full-fledged province in 1646. In the latter year the province contained four monasteries, since the foundation of Bruck on the Leitha had been recovered in 1642 ⁴⁾. In the present study we shall see how the Austrian

²⁾ Alph. 238-239.

³⁾ GAVIGAN, *Felice*.

⁴⁾ GAVIGAN, *de primo*. For the recovery of Bruck an der Leitha in 1642, see RENNHOFFER, *Kl.* 418.

province was united with the two Moravian monasteries of the order in 1649 to form the short-lived province of Austro-Moravia, which lasted only two years and was dissolved in 1651.

Since the lost monasteries of Silesia were never regained by the order, and hence played no role in the history of the province for which it was hoped to regain them, we shall merely mention their names here as a matter of historical interest.

§ 1. *Lost monasteries in Silesia*

Little is to be said here about the Silesian Augustinian monasteries in connection with the province founded in 1604 outside of what we already know: that it was hoped to regain at least some of the five Augustinian monasteries in Silesia, all of which had one common characteristic: each of them had been founded in the middle ages, and all were lost to the order during the religious revolt provoked by Luther in the sixteenth century. We shall simply name them here according to their antiquity and at the same time indicate as closely as possible the year in which they were lost to the Augustinian order. The oldest monastery was that of Grottkau, founded before 1294 and lost in 1525⁵⁾. Then came Haynau, founded before 1299 and lost in 1530; Reichenbach, founded before 1329 and lost in 1525; Breslau, founded in 1331 and lost in 1529; and finally the monastery of Neisse, founded late in the fifteenth century and lost during the years which followed Luther's outbreak⁶⁾.

Hence we see that the idea could seem attractive in 1604, if a new province in the neighbourhood of these lost monasteries could be formed and developed. For it was not unreasonable to hope that the new province could bend its efforts to recovering the lost monasteries in Silesia. And naturally, the two existing monasteries in Moravia which were incorporated into the new province in 1604 would be expected to strive hard to regain the three lost monasteries of Moravia of which we shall speak in § 3. And some members of this new province were themselves Silesians, for example Caspar Malesius⁷⁾, Aegidius Zrembic and Reinhold Wogntroyk⁸⁾. The idea therefore of uniting in 1604

⁵⁾ KUNZELMANN, I, 226.

⁶⁾ HÜMPFNER, 150 and 173.

⁷⁾ *Alph.* 231; *Kr.* 45.

⁸⁾ C. JANETSCHEK, *Necrologia patrum et fratrum ord. E. calceatorum S. Augustini in Vicariatu Moraviae*, Brünn 1894, 17 and 20.

monasteries of four regions, that is, those already possessed and those which it was hoped to regain, had indeed much to recommend it.

But two great obstacles had to be overcome before this plan could be realized. And on both scores failure was destined to thwart the hopeful plan of 1604. The first obstacle was found in the very unsettled conditions of the times, the wide spread of Protestantism in all four regions, the troubles within the Habsburg family which broke out into armed conflict, and especially the Thirty Years' War, which led to the destruction and temporary loss of several Augustinian monasteries, and therefore made the reacquisition of previously lost monasteries more difficult. Of the second great obstacle, which proved insuperable, we shall speak in detail in § 9 : the reluctance of the Augustinians in Moravia to be ruled from out of Prague !

§ 2. *The Bavarian province and Moravia*

Just as the Augustinian monasteries in Bohemia, Austria and Silesia, the monasteries in Moravia also had belonged in the middle ages to the Bavarian province of the order. The Bavarian province had been founded in 1299 ⁹⁾, and was later divided into nine districts, known as Bavaria, Bohemia, Austria, Moravia, Silesia, Styro-Carinthia, Polonia, Massovia and Russia ¹⁰⁾. We are fortunate in possessing a valuable study about the central monastery of Moravia, that of Brünn, by Clemens Janetschek, O.S.A. ¹¹⁾. Since Janetschek gives us not only the history of Brünn, but of the four other monasteries also which made up the Moravian vicariate between the fourteenth and the sixteenth centuries, we shall offer here a very brief outline of these monasteries, referring the reader to Janetschek's useful work for more details.

The oldest Augustinian monastery of Moravia was that of Maria-kron, in the neighbourhood of Budigsdorf, founded in 1267 by Boreš von Riesenburg. It was burnt down in 1428 during the Hussite troubles. The friars who were unable to seek safety perished in the flames ¹²⁾. Although many attempts were made by the Augustinians to restore it,

⁹⁾ KUNZELMANN, I. 254.

¹⁰⁾ HÖGGMAYR, 11-12.

¹¹⁾ As in the list of abbreviations. The volume which appeared in 1898 was supposed to be the first of at least two. The second unfortunately never appeared.

¹²⁾ JANETSCHKE, 58.

it was completely lost about the year 1544 because of the hostility of the neighbouring Lutherans ¹³). Further attempts at restoration in 1577 and to substitute it by a new foundation in 1638 came to naught ¹⁴).

The most important Augustinian monastery in Moravia, that of St. Thomas the Apostle in Brünn, was founded in 1353 by the margraves Johann and Jodok ¹⁵). This monastery also suffered greatly in the Hussite attack of 1428 ¹⁶), but was able to get back upon its feet and to establish itself as unquestionably the chief monastery of the Augustinians in Moravia. Here the friars of every Augustinian monastery in the region had sought refuge from the Hussites by the year 1424 ¹⁷). Around this monastery and its dependent monastery of Gewitsch the Moravian vicariate was established and continued, as we shall see below.

The monastery of St. Barnabas in Mährisch Kromau was founded in 1355 by Ceněk von Lipa ¹⁸). When the lords of Lipa became Hussites, the friars had to flee to Brünn for refuge in 1424; although they later returned and tried to restore their monastery, the Augustinians were forced by the impossible conditions to abandon it definitely about 1497 ¹⁹). Attempts at restoration in the seventeenth century were fruitless ²⁰).

Shortly after the foundation of Mährisch Kromau, the Augustinians received in 1358 the monastery of St. Clement near Osvěteman, a foundation of the margrave Johann. But less than a century later, in 1421, the Augustinians of this monastery had to flee before the savage Hussites. The Taborites destroyed the monastery completely, and the Augustinians never returned. Hence this monastery lasted only two thirds of a century ²¹).

The last of the five Augustinian monasteries in Moravia is that of Gewitsch. This monastery was founded about 1370 and was destined to be, along with Brünn, included in the union with the Austrian

¹³) *Ibid.*, 59, 70, 83, 95, 109, 121, 128.

¹⁴) *Ibid.*, 221 and 233.

¹⁵) *Ibid.*, 5.

¹⁶) *Ibid.*, 64-65.

¹⁷) *Ibid.*, 59.

¹⁸) *Ibid.*, 5.

¹⁹) *Ibid.*, 58-59, 96.

²⁰) *Ibid.*, 231-233.

²¹) *Ibid.*, 5 and 58.

monasteries in 1649 ²²). But here also the friars would suffer during the Hussite and Protestant periods. In 1423 they fled before the former to Brünn. The monastery was devastated in 1429 ²³). Although some friars from Brünn returned here in 1447, they were able to do little more than make it into a filial of the more strongly established monastery of Brünn ²⁴). For a time, one and the same individual, Johann Geyer, was prior both of Gewitsch and Mariakron, but both monasteries were lost again during the Protestant troubles of the sixteenth century. Gewitsch was plundered and destroyed in 1523, and not until 1540 could the friars return to their long-plagued monastery ²⁵). A fire destroyed town and monastery in 1562, but the friars of Brünn were able to keep their hand sufficiently upon its few possessions, so that it was not lost to the Augustinian order ²⁶). From this time on, since the dependence of Gewitsch upon Brünn was so great, while the priors of Brünn — beginning with Bartolo de Fredi (1566-1573) — were called prelates, those of Gewitsch were called administrators or vicars of the prelate of Brünn ²⁷). The friars of both monasteries made their solemn profession before the prelate of Brünn. Those of Gewitsch were considered members of the community of Brünn, and had the right to vote in the chief monastery. This dependence of Gewitsch upon Brünn certainly lessened its position in one sense, but it saved the existence of the minor monastery, which lasted until its suppression by Brother Sacristan, Joseph II, on Sept. 7, 1784 ²⁸). An excellent prior, Jakob Kirschner, born 1580 in Mährisch Trübau, became prior here in 1615 and remained in this position until 1650. Even though his monastery was plundered by the Protestant rebels in 1619, Kirschner held out. In 1622, he dwelt here alone, occasionally assisted by an Augustinian canon. He had the satisfaction of supplying a pastor for the parish church of Gewitsch in 1624, Basilius Mernicky of the monastery of Brünn ²⁹). To Kirschner's credit we must record that he held out here even during the Thirty Years' War. In 1643 he found himself once again as the only priest who dwelt in this monastery, assisted

²²) *Ibid.*, 5.

²³) *Ibid.*, 58.

²⁴) *Ibid.*, 76.

²⁵) *Ibid.*, 95 and 131.

²⁶) *Ibid.*, 153.

²⁷) *Ibid.*, 154.

²⁸) *Ibid.*, 5 and 154.

²⁹) *Ibid.*, 220-221.

by an Augustinian canon from Sternberg ³⁰). In 1645, Kirschner was elected by the general chapter in Rome assistant general for Germany. But nothing could bring him to leave the monastery to which he had devoted so many long years of faithful service ³¹).

In this sketch of the Augustinian monasteries of Moravia, we have devoted more attention to Gewitsch than to the other monasteries, since it was secondary only to Bränn in importance. In later parts of our study we shall naturally have to dedicate much more space to the chief monastery, that of Bränn.

§ 3. *The Moravian vicariate before 1570.*

We have now seen just what Augustinian monasteries were founded in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries in Moravia, and how only two of them — Bränn und Gewitsch — survived the hard blows dealt by the Hussites in the fifteenth and by the Protestants in the sixteenth century. Now we can return to the fourteenth century to sketch briefly the development of the Moravian monasteries into a vicariate, first in dependence upon the Bavarian province, and then some years after the last confirmation in 1594 of the prelate of Bränn by the vicar general of the Augustinians in Germany or by the provincial of Bavaria ³²), in independence of the same. As early as 1357 it was decided to make a separate province called Bohemia, which embraced not only the region of Bohemia, but those of Moravia and Poland also. This separation was actually carried out in 1358, and the prior of the monastery of Prague, friar Wenzel, became provincial ³³). But the province lasted

³⁰) *Ibid.*, 261.

³¹) *Ibid.*, 261; Clm 8423. 58. It is interesting to note who were the two other Augustinians proposed in the general chapter on May 5, 1645 for the post of assistant general. One was the Flemish professional trouble-maker, Patritius de Rau, whom Ferdinand II has expelled from his lands in February of the same year. The other was Carlo Torello, a professed of the monastery of Bränn, who had spent his life almost exclusively in Italy, Poland and Germany. For de Rau, see Gavigan, *de primo* 269-308. For Tirello, there are many details in the Dd series of the AGR, but a study of his life remains to be written. His death notice is not included in the Necrologia of Janetschek which we have cited in note 8. This can probably be explained by the fact that he received on Nov. 3, 1641 permission to transfer into the Rheno-Swabian province; Dd 77. 75r.

³²) JANETSCHEK, 186.

³³) Clm 8423. 105 and 358-362.

only until 1359, when the monasteries of these regions were restored to the Bavarian province ³⁴).

Although the idea of a separate province rapidly disappeared in the fourteenth century, the idea of having at least a local vicar for Moravia, subject to the provincial of the Bavarian province, had become a reality by 1391, when a certain Bartholomaeus appears as vicar of the district of Moravia ³⁵). The monasteries under his jurisdiction were probably five, that is the five we already know, and possibly a sixth, that of Leitomischl, although this seems less probable, since a request made in 1400 for faculties to be granted to the monasteries of Moravia did not include Leitomischl, which was situated in Bohemia ³⁶). This monastery had been founded in 1355 ³⁷), and had received its first friars from the monastery of Brünn ³⁸). Certainly in the year 1421, when the Augustinians of Leitomischl were forced to flee before the Hussites, some members of its community fled to Gewitsch, others to Brünn ³⁹). Since the Hussites completely destroyed the monastery in Leitomischl, it was in Brünn that the last prior of Leitomischl, Simon, and his lector of theology Petrus died respectively in the years 1441 and 1445 ⁴⁰). This monastery was never recovered and whether or not it was considered a part of the vicariate of Moravia in 1391, it certainly belonged to the Bavarian province; and its very short existence (1355-1421) kept it from playing an important role in any vicariate.

What is important at the end of the fourteenth century is the fact that Moravia was still a part of the Bavarian province, which had been founded in 1299 ⁴¹), but was already considered a vicariate of the same province, over which a local superior was placed, who was considered the vicar of the Bavarian provincial. This juridical position of Moravia remained clear until the year 1594, and even for a few years later, since in the latter year we find the last confirmation of the prelate of Brünn being given by the superior of the Bavarian province, as

³⁴) HÜMPFNER, 178-179.

³⁵) JANETSCHEK, 39.

³⁶) *Ibid.*, 44.

³⁷) J. HEMMERLE, *Nikolaus von Laun*, in *Studien zur Geschichte der Karls Universität zu Prag*, II. Band, Freilassing-Salzburg 1954, 116.

³⁸) JANETSCHEK, 18.

³⁹) *Ibid.*, 58.

⁴⁰) *Ibid.*

⁴¹) KUNZELMAN, 1.254.

we shall see below. Without wishing to stress the obvious, we think it wise to make clear by several examples that the prior of Brünn claimed and sometimes received certain special prerogatives. Then we can better understand how in the early seventeenth century the two monasteries of Moravia felt themselves strong enough to insist upon their position as a separate — and now independent — district, completely separated from the province of Bohemia-Austria founded in 1604.

In 1536 or 1537 the provincial of Bavaria, Peter Stigler, approved the election of the prior of Brünn, named Hieronymus, and named him as provincial vicar for Moravia ⁴²). Naturally, the great confusion caused by the Protestant troubles in Germany of the sixteenth century brought many problems, disciplinary and otherwise, for the far-flung Bavarian province. Between 1545 and 1550, the prior general in Rome did not know anything definite about the Bavarian provincial, about whom he had heard many rumors. Only in 1550, when friar Johannes of Prague visited Rome in the jubilee year could the prior general Seripando learn something definite. What he learnt was far from encouraging! The provincial Jakob Schott had disappeared about five years earlier. Since that time the Bavarian province had found itself not only without a provincial, but even without vicars for various districts! Seripando therefore wrote on Jan. 19, 1550 to the prior of Brünn, Johannes Evangelist Herr, appointing him as vicar general of the Bavarian province, with instructions to summon a chapter to elect a new provincial for Bavaria ⁴³). This appointment certainly remained in the memory of the Moravian Augustinians, who could now show an historical instance, where the prior of Brünn had held, even if only for a very short time, the first place in the Bavarian province. But the situation was very complicated, and the «chapter» turned out to be a very sorry affair, celebrated in Lubiana and attended by only a few Augustinians, who complained to the general that the prior of Brünn had not tried earnestly to summon the chapter according to the general's directions. Hence only a rump chapter had been held, and it elected as Bavarian provincial the prior of Fürstenfeld, Johannes Ambrosiades of Fiume. The new prior general, Christoforo da Padova, declared on February 22, 1552 that the prior of Brünn, Johannes Evangelist Herr, was now relieved of his post as vicar general, and recognized Ambrosiades provisionally as rector of the province ⁴⁴).

⁴²) JANETSCHKE, 121-122.

⁴³) Dd 23.159v-160v.

⁴⁴) Dd 24.II.142-144.

Herr died shortly after, on June 3 of the same year ⁴⁵), and so the previous situation was juridically reestablished: the elected prior of Brünn was supposed to seek his confirmation from the Bavarian provincial. As late as July 6, 1547, the prior general Seripando had made clear that this was the established and accepted system. Hence he explicitly granted confirmation to the elected prior of Brünn, Herr, for only this one time, « as if it had been granted by the provincial of Bavaria » ⁴⁶). And yet, an inkling was given by Seripando that dependence upon Bavaria was not absolutely necessary for all time, since he wrote on the same day to the convent of Brünn — he knew nothing of the fate of Gewitsch — that the community should consider whether it would be better for its religious life to belong to the Bavarian or to the Polish province, which had been separated on that very same day from the Bavarian province ⁴⁷). Later events would show that the convent of Brünn preferred to belong to neither of these provinces, but rather to exist in an independent vicariate.

A good example of this desire of independence from the Bavarian province is to be seen in the prior of Brünn, Martin (1558-1562) ⁴⁸). Both he and his predecessor Johannes Frühwirth (1552-1558) seem to have received no confirmation from the Bavarian provincials — all of whom came in a helter-skelter way from the monastery of Fiume at this time, and probably knew little or nothing about the necessity of such a confirmation ⁴⁹). Hence when the provincial of Bavaria intimated in 1560 to prior Martin that he intended to make a visitation in the monastery of Brünn, the prior energetically refused to permit it. He stated that he had received no confirmation from the provincial, that he was not his subject, and that the priors of Brünn belonged to the prelates of Moravia and swore fealty to the ruler of the land. The provincial complained to the emperor Ferdinand I that the prior of Brünn had refused obedience to his superior, and so the emperor referred the case to the officials of Moravia — who judged in favor of Brünn! The visitation therefore was not permitted. This marked an important step forward in the development of Brünn and

⁴⁵) JANETSCHKE, 137.

⁴⁶) Dd 22.105v.

⁴⁷) Dd 24.105v.

⁴⁸) His term in Brünn is described by JANETSCHKE, 142-144; his predecessor Frühwirth, *ibid.*, 138-141.

⁴⁹) Dd 28.243r.

Gewitsch into a completely independent vicariate, subject directly to the Augustinian prior general.

Yet, the authority of the Augustinian vicar general for Germany over the monastery of Brünn was reasserted in 1566 and caused a temporary change in this tendency. The prior of Brünn was then Georg Koller (1562-1566), who was strongly suspected of Lutheran tendencies. Quite probably he had gotten wind of the plan to depose him for this reason, since he left Brünn on March 20, 1566 under the pretense that he wished to visit the monastery's possessions. He disappeared completely from this date. Only eight days later, on March 28, the Augustinian Fulgenz Eyssmann presented himself in the monastery as having been appointed to the subpriorship of Brünn by the Augustinian vicar general for Germany, Egidio da Volterra, who was still ignorant of Koller's flight. Eyssmann was indeed installed as subprior. When he learned of Koller's flight, he wrote to the vicar general Egidio. The latter promptly communicated the affair to the emperor, Ferdinand I, and took steps towards having a new prior, Bartolo de Fredi of Fiume, elected. De Fredi then received on Oct. 20 his confirmation from the vicar general who had recommended him to the emperor, whose recommendation had made his « election » a foregone conclusion ⁵⁰). Since de Fredi's record had hitherto not been of high quality, he found no difficulty in letting himself be confirmed by the vicar general and provincial, Egidio, who was deposed by the general chapter held in 1570 in the convent of Perugia, principally because he had made de Fredi Prior in Brünn ⁵¹).

§ 4. *The Moravian vicariate from 1570 to 1604*

With the priorship of de Fredi (1566-1573) in Brünn, one might think that the delicate problem of the relation between the prior of Brünn and the provincial or vicar general of the Bavarian province was solved in favor of the latter, since de Fredi had received his confirmation as prior from the provincial Egidio da Volterra and thereby recognized, one might think, his dependency upon this superior. But the problem was more complicated. Egidio was deposed as vicar general by the general chapter in Perugia, as we have already seen in § 3.

⁵⁰) JANETSCHKE, 135-148, who cites sources unavailable to us, which we have no reason to suspect and which are confirmed by Clm 8423.102-103.

⁵¹) Clm 8423.102-103.

His successor as provincial of Bavaria was named in the same chapter, Maestro Antonio Veneto ⁵²). But the fathers of the chapter reached yet another important decision, which would have important results, first for Bohemia and then in the same year for Moravia also : « because of the great distance, the provinces of Bavaria and Bohemia are separated ». As provincial of Bohemia, Maestro Giovanni da Carticeto was appointed ⁵³). We are convinced that Giovanni da Carticeto and Johannes Musconius (Mosconi) referred to in Janetschek ⁵⁴), are one and the same person. Mosconi was not only named as provincial for Bohemia by the general chapter, but received at the same time the order to make a visitation in the Monastery of Brünn ⁵⁵). Later in the same year, on Nov. 30, the general Taddeo da Perugia wrote to Mosconi that « not only the monasteries of Bohemia, but those of Moravia also were under his jurisdiction, since the regal power of the kingdom of Bohemia extends here also » ⁵⁶). Here then is a clear juridic separation of both Bohemia and Moravia from the Bavarian province in 1570, which, it is true, lasted a very short time. Nonetheless it certainly prepared the way for a further and permanent separation, which actually took place in the seventeenth century, and has lasted down to our own days.

Mosconi as provincial resided often, but not permanently, in Brünn ⁵⁷). He made a canonical visitation in March 1571, as he had been ordered by the general chapter, and found a community of seven priests, of whom two were from Fiume, four from Italy, and only one German : the Silesian Caspar Malesius ⁵⁸). Since the last was transferred in the same year to Stockau in Bohemia, he left behind a community in which the knowledge of the two native languages, German and Bohemian, was sadly lacking — even though de Fredi by the end of his term had a sufficient speaking knowledge of both languages. His native tongue was Croatian, and he had been several years in Vienna and Styria before coming to Brünn. The Italian occupation of Brünn seems to have begun with de Fredi, who at the very beginning of his

⁵²) BAR 148.55r.

⁵³) *Ibid.*

⁵⁴) 158, note 1.

⁵⁵) Clm 8423.102.

⁵⁶) BAR 148.55r.

⁵⁷) JANETSCHKE, 160.

⁵⁸) *Ibid.*, 168.

term brought to the monastery as subprior Pasquale da San Miniato, whose record in Vienna had been very bad ⁵⁹).

But what impression did Brünn make on the provincial Mosconi in 1571? A bad one, indeed, provoked particularly by the conduct of the prior de Fredi, who, as we recall, had given a poor account of himself on previous occasions also, and owed his election simply to the fact that the previous provincial, Egidio da Volterra, had recommended him to the emperor. But what interests us particularly here is that the prior of Brünn seems to have denied the provincial the right to make a visitation in temporal affairs, since de Fredi claimed that these were subject to the land ruler, to whom alone, he stated, the prior was responsible ⁶⁰).

Yet another interesting point for us here is that the imperial commissaries visited the monastery of Brünn on the temporal side on June 8, 1571. The provincial Mosconi was living here (purposely?) during the visitation and made an open attempt to bring the monastery of Brünn more closely into the province (of Bohemia and Moravia), by his suggestion that the prior of Brünn have a term of three years, in the same way as other priors, in order that lifelong priors could not weaken the connections between Brünn and the province. But the imperial commissaries refused to go along with this suggestion. They pointed out that the community of Brünn was almost entirely Italian, as was Mosconi himself, and that only the prior had a sufficient knowledge of the languages of the region ⁶¹). Hence, the presence of the provincial of Bohemia in Brünn seems on this occasion to have made no contribution towards cementing the relations between this monastery and the province of « Bohemia and Moravia », and still less with the Bavarian province from which it was at this time formally separated. And in any case, the separate province of Bohemia (and Moravia) was of short duration, since the vicar general in Rome, Alessio Stradella, on Aug. 28, 1573 ordered Mosconi to return to Italy, and restored the monasteries in Bohemia and Moravia to the province of Bavaria, from which they had been separated only three years earlier ⁶²). But in any event the monasteries of both regions had been

⁵⁹) BAR 147.55r; JANETSCHEK, 148 and 168.

⁶⁰) Clm 8423.103.

⁶¹) JANETSCHEK, 164.

⁶²) BAR 148.58r.

temporarily freed from the rule of the Bavarian provincial and would remain restive until they were permanently freed from it.

Under the prior Augustin Clementin of Fiume (1573-1594) the monastery of Brünn was subjected to visitation by two vicars general for Germany, first by the Portuguese Augustinian Agostinho de Castro in 1581, then by the Italian Agostino da Vicenza in 1587. The former found on his visitation eight priests in the monastery, about equally divided between friars from Fiume and from Italy⁶³). Shortly after the second visitation it came out how miserable the studies of the monastery's candidates were, although Antonio da Macerata and after him Taddeo da Bologna had borne the title of lector. A young candidate for the priesthood, friar Thomas, was presented on March 30, 1591 to the bishop of Olmütz for his theological examination. The ignorance friar Thomas manifested in the examination was so great that the bishop wrote a warning letter on the same day to the monastery, indicating that more attention to studies was necessary as a means of ameliorating the monastery's fallen discipline⁶⁴). Since there were so few priests in Brünn at this time, we can be sure that the community of Gewitsch was even smaller, so that the intellectual life was greatly neglected. In fact, the provincial of Bavaria in 1589, Anton Kerbeeck of Louvain had found himself in 1586 forced to complain about the refusal of the prior of Brünn, Clementin, to make any contribution towards erecting a study-house in Prague, for which the pope Gregory XIII had made a contribution⁶⁵). The monastery of Brünn wished to go its own way, even in studies! And it was at this time no glorious one. The day of the great scientist, Gregor Mendel, Abbot of Brünn, had not yet dawned.

We now come to the last prior of Brünn before the founding of a new province in 1604, Basilio de Mezzi of Carpineto (1594-1608). Just how he became prior is not clear, since no election seems to have been held. Probably he was merely appointed, perhaps by the emperor, at least indirectly. De Mezzi received at once his confirmation for matters spiritual from the Augustinian vicar general for Germany, Ippolito Fabriani of Ravenna, who later became prior general of the order⁶⁶). His confirmation of prior Basilio in 1594 was to be the last confirmation granted to the prior of Brünn by a vicar general or a provincial as we

⁶³) JANETSCHEK, 180-181.

⁶⁴) *Ibid.*, 183-184.

⁶⁵) Clm 8423.225.

shall see below. De Mezzi, himself an Italian, found himself obliged to seek more friars from Italy for his monastery, and on May 28, 1602 obtained during the general chapter, which he had attended as definitor of the Bavarian province, permission to bring friars from Italy to his monastery of Brünn ⁶⁷⁾. Hence we see clearly in this last general chapter celebrated before the founding of a new province in 1604 — which was supposed to embrace not only Bohemia and Austria, but Moravia also — that the monastery of Brünn was considered part of the Bavarian province of which it still constituted a district dependent upon the provincial of Bavaria. The next general chapter, celebrated in 1608, would witness a different story! De Mezzi's term shows us certain other contacts, beyond his confirmation as prior, with the Augustinian vicar general of Germany. Thus, on Jan. 3, 1597 the prior general, Andrea Securani, gave the vicar general for Germany, Giovanni Maria da Concordia, permission to confer upon de Mezzi the title of magister in theology, considered at that time a necessary ornament for important superiors, although their proficiency in theology was often more than doubtful ⁶⁸⁾. For Dec. 21, 1600 a mention is found in the general's register about the death of the Italian Giacomo d'Amandula in Brünn. It is almost certain from the wording of the text that the death had occurred several weeks earlier. This friar had an unenviable record in the province of Styro-Carinthia before he was transferred to Brünn, which seems to have been in the late years of the sixteenth century a *refugium peccatorum*, that is a place of refuge for those who were not desired elsewhere ⁶⁹⁾.

So we come to the end of an era. The beginning of the seventeenth century found two Augustinian monasteries in Moravia, that of Brünn and its dependent monastery of Gewitsch, which stood in such close relations with the mother monastery that its members were considered to belong to Brünn and had the right to vote in electing Brünn's new prior. The two monasteries together constituted at this time a part of the Bavarian province. The prior of Brünn was considered

⁶⁶⁾ JANETSCHKE, 186.

⁶⁷⁾ Dd 53.3v and 11v; BAR 148.81v-82r.

⁶⁸⁾ Dd 50.92v. The lector's degree also had been conferred on de Mezzi by mail, so to speak, on Aug. 30, 1596 while he was already prior; Dd 50.72v. We hardly believe that he continued his studies in theology after election to this coveted office.

⁶⁹⁾ Notice of the death in Dd 52.51v. For earlier mentions cf. Dd 38.120r; Dd 41.131r; Dd 42.26v.

from the middle ages as vicar of the provincial of the Bavarian province of the order for the Augustinian monasteries in this district. A fundamental change in this relationship would be produced by the founding in 1604 of a new province, which was supposed to embrace the existing Augustinian monasteries in Bohemia, Austria and Moravia, as well as the lost Augustinian monasteries in Silesia, which it was hoped to regain.

§ 5. *The evolution of Moravia's importance*

The two Moravian monasteries of Brünn and Gewitsch had better hopes for the future as they began the seventeenth than they had possessed half a century earlier. The inhabitants of Brünn were by this time returning to the Catholic faith which they had given up during the troubles of the sixteenth century under the propaganda of the Protestants, who had found a fertile soil prepared by the Hussites and united themselves with the Moravian Brethren. But the bishops Wilhelm Prusinovsky, Stanislaus Pavlosky and Franz von Dietrichstein took a decided stand in favor of the ancient religion, and were able to recatholicize the region of Moravia ⁷⁰).

An important circumstance must be noted here, and that is the development of a Moravian self-consciousness in the Catholic hierarchy during the second half of the sixteenth century, which manifested itself by an attitude of independence from the archbishopric of Prague. When the diocese of Prague in Bohemia was elevated in 1344 to the rank of an archbishopric and metropolitan see, the diocese of Olmütz in Moravia (to which Brünn belonged) not only had to give up thirty parishes in northern Moravia for the newly-planned suffragan see of Leitomischl, but Olmütz itself was placed under the new metropolitan see of Prague. When however Prague found itself for a long time deprived of an archbishop by the fierce religious storms of the time (1421-1561), the Moravian bishops of Olmütz greatly enjoyed their freedom from the Bohemian metropolitan see. And when Prague received finally another archbishop, Anton Brus (1561-1580), it was found that the Moravian bishops of Olmütz were by no means disposed to permit the renewal of their dependence upon Prague. The emperor Rudolph II renewed in 1588 the title of prince for the bishops of Olmütz. And the beginning of the seventeenth century found in the

⁷⁰) J. MATZKE, *Die mährische Kirchenprovinz*, in AKBMS I (1967) 29.

episcopal see of Olmütz the capable and resolute Cardinal Franz von Dietrichstein (1599-1636) ⁷¹⁾.

It is absolutely necessary to keep this ecclesiastical background in mind in order to understand how and why the tiny Augustinian district of Moravia was able to assert its independence of the newly founded Augustinian province in 1604 — which had as its first provincial the energetic Bohemian, Johannes Baptist Kristl of Prague! The cardinal-bishop of Olmütz, Franz von Dietrichstein saw to it that the Moravian Augustinian monasteries of his territory — and both Brünn and Gewitsch were in his territory — would not be subjected to rule from Prague, any more than he himself was disposed to comport himself as a suffragan bishop of the Bohemian metropolis!

With this background it will be easier to see how the small Augustinian vicariate of Moravia was able to assert and establish its freedom from the Bohemian-ruled new Augustinian province founded in 1604. The combination of the cardinal-bishop of Olmütz and of the Augustinian prior of Brünn working together proved its efficiency.

§ 6. *A new Province founded 1604*

We have already devoted a special study to the province of Bohemia and Austria ⁷²⁾. We have no intention therefore of repeating the whole story here. But in our previous study we deliberately refrained from fully explaining how and why the monasteries of Moravia were not a part of this province, although this was a part of the original plan. We need merely translate here from the Latin the words which the vicar general in Germany, Felice Milensio, wrote in 1608 about the foundatoin of the new province in 1604: « Here [in Prague] we celebrated a provincial chapter in the second year of our superiorship ⁷³⁾. We summoned to it the priors of Austria, Bohemia and Moravia, and united their monasteries, and those of Silesia as well ⁷⁴⁾ into a single Bohemian province... we confirmed the first provincial of that province, Kristl, whom the fathers had elected » ⁷⁵⁾. Yet Milensio himself adds

⁷¹⁾ *Ibid.*, 28-29; also A.K. HUBER, *Die Erzdiözese Prag, ibid.*, 11-16.

⁷²⁾ GAVIGAN, *Bohemia*.

⁷³⁾ We know from Br. 86r that the exact date was Dec. 1, 1604.

⁷⁴⁾ We already know that no more Augustinian monasteries existed in Silesia at this time, but that hope of recovering some or all five of them had not yet been given up. None however could be recovered.

⁷⁵⁾ *Alph.*, 238-239.

immediately : « ... by this arrangement we provided for the good of the monasteries, the friars and the order, *provided that each one is content with his own* and attends to his own tasks, not seeking that which is his, but that which is of Jesus Christ » ⁷⁶).

Here Milensio wrote almost four years after the province had been founded, and his words indicate that certain tensions existed within the young province, chiefly along regional lines. The centre of the province was the Bohemian city of Prague, the provincial was the Bohemian Kristl of Prague, the interests of the ruling members of the province lay in Bohemia and especially in Prague, as we have tried to make clear in our previous study of the province of Bohemia and Austria. Hence, both the Austrian and the Moravian monasteries were destined to play a secondary role in this new province. But we saw in § 5 how precisely at this time the powerful bishop of Olmütz in Moravia, Cardinal Franz von Dietrichstein, continued the successful battle initiated by his immediate predecessors to assert the independence of Olmütz from the metropolitan see of Prague! And we shall make it undeniably clear below that precisely Dietrichstein made it possible for the Augustinian vicariate of Moravia to assert in a similar way its independence from the new Bohemian-ruled province of the order.

Not only the Moravian Augustinians, but the Austrian Augustinians as well showed their displeasure over this arrangement by which Prague played such an important role in the short-lived province, from which the Austrians were finally able to have themselves freed by the intervention of the emperor Ferdinand II early in 1637. That this explanation is the true one can not be denied after reading the words of the Augustinian prior general, Ippolito Monti, on March 21, 1637, after he had formally separated the Austrian from the Bohemian monasteries on February 6 of the same year : « We appoint the Belgian Ignatius Dycker as vicar general ... not only of Vienna, but of Austria also, transferring these monasteries from the rule of the provincial of Bohemia at the assiduous request of the Austrian friars » ⁷⁷). But we already know from our previous study the long story of the Austrian Augustinians' repeated attempts to free themselves from Bohemia, which were crowned with success only in 1637. What interests us

⁷⁶) *Ibid.*, 239.

⁷⁷) Dd 72.44r.

particularly here is how the two Moravian monasteries were able almost from the beginning, not only to have their independence from Bohemia recognized, but even to keep entirely out of the province, practically from the year 1608, if not earlier.

The sources are not so numerous nor so clear as we could wish, but the chief ideas seem clear.

§ 7. *Moravia made part of the new province*

At the start it is useful to recall once again that the Austrian monasteries which entered into the union of 1604 were only two in number: Vienna and Baden. They had not yet recovered from the hard blows of the sixteenth century and were hardly in a position to insist upon their wish for independence from Prague, if this wish really existed from the very beginning, as it certainly did exist in later years. Besides, the two Austrian monasteries possessed at this time no powerful patron who was disposed to defend their rights. At the time of the union, the emperor Rudolph II resided in Prague, and it was precisely he who had demanded a Bohemian superior for the monasteries in Bohemia ⁷⁸). Quite naturally, the emperor got his wish, in the person of the Bohemian provincial, Johannes Baptist Kristl, who directed the Bohemian-Austrian province during practically two thirds of its existence.

But the situation of the two Moravian monasteries, Brünn and Gewitsch, which were supposed to take part in the same provincial union, was more favorable than the position of the Austrians for the assertion of their independence. It is true that the prior general in Rome at the time of the union, Ippolito Fabriani, and his immediate successor Gianbattista de Aste, believed that the two Moravian monasteries were indeed included in the newly founded province. Hence as late as the year 1609 we find a reference in the general's register for Jan. 17 that Kristl's successor in the superiorship, Gabriele Cariddi, was still considered by the prior general to be provincial over the Moravian monasteries. Here are the prior general's exact words, which give us a little glimpse behind the scenes, and show how the ropes were being pulled in more than one direction: « The provincial of Austria, *Moravia* and Bohemia wrote to us about what has happened in our monastery of Brünn, and informed us about the condition of *that whole province*.

⁷⁸) AA 3 (1909-1910) 391.

He promised to give us more definite news in a later letter » ⁷⁹⁾. What a pity that these letters of Cariddi are not to be found ! They would certainly have enriched greatly our knowledge of the theme that interests us here. But even without these letters we can reconstruct the essentials. And the essentials are the following : Moravia was indeed included in the union by the wish of the prior general, Ippolito Fabriani and his vicar general for Germany, Felice Milensio, when the province was founded in 1604. Unfortunately we do not know whether the Moravian monasteries sent their representatives to the provincial chapter convoked for Dec. 1, 1604 in Prague by Milensio. We incline to believe that they did, since the prior of Brünn at this time was Basilio de Mezzi, who had received his confirmation from Ippolito Fabriani as prior in 1594, when the latter was vicar general of the order in Germany. On Sept. 18, 1594 the same Fabriani had, after his visitation in Brünn, given to the prior de Mezzi a bull of pope Clement VIII, by which de Mezzi and his canonically elected successors were created protonotaries apostolic and counts of the Lateran ⁸⁰⁾. Did de Mezzi attend the second provincial chapter of the newly founded province which in 1608 elected Gabriele Cariddi as provincial ? Unfortunately this also can not be established by any sources known to us, but we tend to believe that de Mezzi attended. He was still in normal health and only forty-eight years of age on Sept. 2 of this year 1608 when he left Brünn to attend a session of the Moravian Diet. During the diet de Mezzi died suddenly of a stroke ⁸¹⁾, so that it was necessary to select a successor. Who would it be ?

§ 8. *Moravia changes under Barnabé*

From the answer to this question depended at least in part the future position of the Moravian vicariate, that is the two monasteries of Brünn and Gewitsch its dependent. Up until 1604 these two monasteries had formed, as we know, a part of the Bavarian province, directed by the prior of Brünn, who was considered the vicar for the provincial of Bavaria. But since 1604, as we recall, the Augustinian monasteries in Bohemia, Austria and Moravia had been separated

⁷⁹⁾ Dd. 54.21r.

⁸⁰⁾ Clm 8423.104 (where however the copyist has falsely written palatinis for lateranensis) and 347.

⁸¹⁾ JANETSCHEK, 195.

from the Bavarian province. Hence, in 1608 there could now be no further question of the subordination of Brünn and Gewitsch to the province of Bavaria.

So long as de Mezzi lived, the problem had not been acute. He had received, according to a long-standing tradition, his confirmation at the beginning of his term in 1594 from the superior of the Bavarian province. But now in 1608 the logical successor of the Bavarian provincial or vicar general was the provincial of the new province, which was called in Rome the province of Bohemia, Moravia and Austria. Since 1608 this provincial was Gabriele Cariddi da Montolmo ⁸²⁾.

But logical successors are not always actual successors! Cariddi found himself in 1609, the year after his election as provincial, confronted with an unpleasant situation. The prior general in Rome had appointed Johannes Baptist Kristl of Prague as vicar general for Bohemia — over which Cariddi was provincial ⁸³⁾. And the same prior general in Rome — under pressure from outside, as we shall see — had appointed (probably in late 1608) the new prior of Brünn, Johannes Vinzenz Barnabé, as vicar general for Moravia — over which Cariddi was provincial, or at least had been up to this time! We shall explain in § 9 how the provincial Cariddi, whose jurisdiction was supposed to extend over Austria, Moravia and Bohemia suddenly found himself faced in the second and third of these two territories with vicars general, who were not disposed to take orders from him. Under his period as provincial (1608-1611) not only did the prior in Prague, Kristl, retain a great deal of independence in the chief monastery of St. Thomas — Kristl himself lived as provincial in the monastery of Schopka or Melnik ⁸⁴⁾ — but the two monasteries of Moravia succeeded in having themselves recognized as a separate vicariate, completely independent of the young province. Before Cariddi's term as provincial, this new province had been called by the Roman superiors of the order the province of Bohemia, Austria and Moravia. Shortly

⁸²⁾ Br. 86r.

⁸³⁾ Dd 54.33v. Already on Sept. 2, 1608 Kristl obtained thoughtfully from the new prior general, Gianbattista de Aste, his confirmation as prior of the monastery of St. Thomas in Prague in such a way that no one less than the general himself could remove him from this office; Dd 55.24. A clear indication for the new provincial in Bohemia, Gabriele Cariddi, that he was to keep his hands off of Kristl and the monastery of St. Thomas, in which Kristl reigned supreme until his death in 1637.

⁸⁴⁾ Kr. 289.

after his term was elapsed, the province came gradually to be called simply that of Bohemia-Austria.

§ 9. *Moravia asserts its independence from the province*

As so often occurred in the history of the monastery of Brünn, a man was in 1609 «elected» as prior, who was not even known to the electors. In other words, a powerful recommendation — not always a happy one — was often given to someone, who then simply had to be elected by the community willy nilly. This occurred again on Sept. 10, 1608. The election was presided over by representatives of the powerful bishop of Olmütz, Cardinal Franz von Dietrichstein, who was also the official of the emperor in this region. The choice fell upon the young native of Fiume, Johannes Vinzenz Barnabé, who at the time was prior of the Augustinian monastery in Gratz ⁸⁵). It seems certain that von Dietrichstein had recommended the election of Barnabé, who was now about thirty-four years of age ⁸⁶). And von Dietrichstein proved to be a powerful patron of Barnabé, to such an extent that the prior general in Rome admitted that his hands were tied in the question of the Moravian vicariate. Almost certainly Barnabé would have found great difficulty in prying the Moravian monasteries loose from the province into which they had been juridically incorporated only four years before his «election» as prior of Brünn. But, backed up by the powerful, and unquestionably capable, Cardinal von Dietrichstein, Barnabé was able to assert the independence of his monastery from a provincial in Bohemia. In doing so, he played the game of the powerful cardinal who was determined to prevent a return of the predominance of Prague in Moravia, as we saw in § 5.

But let us see the developments briefly in chronological order. After Barnabé's election to the priorship of Brünn on Sept. 10, 1608, he received his confirmation from Cardinal von Dietrichstein in the latter's capacity of local governor and representative of the emperor. The same powerful patron von Dietrichstein immediately obtained Barnabé's confirmation from both the future emperor Matthias and from the Augustinian prior general, Gianbattista de Aste ⁸⁷). The

⁸⁵) JANETSCHEK, 196.

⁸⁶) His age is deduced from the fact that his grave inscription shows that he died on Dec. 1, 1631 in his fifty-eighth year; JANETSCHEK, 228.

⁸⁷) JANETSCHEK, 196.

question which many could at this time naturally ask was : did this not violate the right of the provincial of the province to which Brünn was supposed to belong ? Whatever answer might be given from the juridical viewpoint, Cardinal von Dietrichstein passed over completely the provincial of the new province, Cariddi. Nor did von Dietrichstein stop here : at the same time that he obtained from the Augustinian prior general Gianbattista de Aste Barnabé's confirmation as prior of Brünn — probably late in 1608 — he obtained for Barnabé another authoritative title also, that of vicar general of the Augustinians in Moravia ⁸⁸) ! Hence the cardinal sternly forbade in 1611 any Augustinian, outside of the prior general, to try to exercise any authority over the prior of Brünn in his territory, since he was vicar general of the Augustinians in Moravia : *Itaque omnibus et singulis praesertim vero dicti ordinis s. Augustini Eremitarum fratribus eademque qua supra autoritate praecipimus et mandamus, ne quis sub poena excommunicationis ipso facto incurrendae et ammissionis graduum et dignitatis ... saepedictum Joannem Vincentium priorem, occasione electionis, confirmationis et exemptionis praedictarum turbare, inquietare vel quomodolibet inhoneste molestare praesumat* ⁸⁹).

We see therefore the essential point in the plan followed by von Dietrichstein and Barnabé. Since the prior of Brünn was subject only to the prior general, whose vicar he was for Moravia, other superiors had nothing to say here ! We shall see below that even greater clarity about this point was reached in 1611 and later years, but from the beginning of Barnabé's period as prior of Brünn in late 1608, the development was a natural one — from an independent vicar general to a recognized independent vicariate.

Naturally, this arrangement hardly gave a great deal of pleasure to the Augustinian superior of Bohemia, Cariddi. The latter provincial from 1608 to 1611, lost no time in protesting to the prior general about his not quite enviable situation — two vicars general in his

⁸⁸) *Ibid.*, 196-208, especially 205, where Janetschek quotes a decree made by von Dietrichstein on Nov. 22, 1611, in which it is explicitly declared that the Augustinian prior general had made Barnabé his vicar general in Moravia, when he approved his election as prior of Brünn : *reverendus quoque P. Generalis praefati ordinis eundem et electionem ipsius approbens etiam vicarium generalem in Moravia creavit, fecit et deputavit.*

⁸⁹) JANETSCHEK, 207, who does not quote the archives from which he took this decree, but possibly indicates on p. 208 that it came from Kremsier, where it was signed. Later in our study, above notes 98 and 99 we shall quote part of this same text in our English translation.

territory ! Hence, Cariddi complained on two occasions. Late in the year 1608 he wrote to the prior general a letter which left something to be desired from the viewpoint of clarity, at least so far as it is known to us today. But in the light of his second complaint, made in the early spring of 1609, we find a fairly clear picture of the events, presented from the viewpoint of Cariddi and of the Roman superiors of the order. We should like to translate here from the Latin of the general's registers two brief notations about Cariddi's complaints, since they help us to see the development of the situation.

On Jan. 17, 1609, we find an entry in which Moravia is still considered a part of the province founded in 1604. This is particularly noteworthy, since the next entry about this subject, dated May 2, 1609, in a certain way corrects this concept, as we shall see below. Here is the entry on Jan. 17 : « The provincial of Austria, Moravia and Bohemia [Cariddi] wrote to us about what has happened in our monastery of Brünn, and informed us about the condition of that whole province. He promised to give us more definite news in a later letter » ⁹⁰). Unless we are greatly mistaken, Cariddi meant by « what happened in our monastery of Brünn », not only the election of Barnabé under the patronage of Cardinal von Dietrichstein, but also the latter's obtaining confirmation for Barnabé as prior and vicar general without consulting the provincial, Cariddi, himself. This impression is strengthened by the entry of May 2 of the same year, which reads thus : « The provincial of Bohemia, Austria and Moravia informed us by his letters of the state of that province » ⁹¹). But in the general's register itself, a correction is here made from « of that province » to « of those provinces ». Then the register adds a complaint by Cariddi about the prior of the Bohemian monastery of Stockau who had obtained his confirmation from the imperial officials. But what interests us here particularly is Cariddi's second complaint : « Likewise, he [Cariddi] asked us not to allow the priors of Prague [J.B. Kristl] and of Brünn [J.V. Barnabé] to enjoy the title and privilege of a vicar general » ⁹²).

This last request was from Cariddi's standpoint quite understandable. In the province of Austria, Bohemia and Moravia founded in 1604, only nine monasteries had been included. Now in 1609, the five monasteries of Bohemia and the two monasteries of Moravia

⁹⁰) Dd 54.21r.

⁹¹) *Ibid.*, 33v.

⁹²) *Ibid.*

were each under a vicar general, over whom Cariddi could exercise no authority. Hence, in practice, Cariddi found himself with only two monasteries in the province, the Austrian monasteries of Vienna and Baden, which were not subject to a vicar general!

Naturally we are interested in the answer sent to Cariddi by the Augustinian vicar general in Rome, Guglielmo da Foligno, who directed the order while the prior general was absent on visitation. The vicar general's answer shows the helplessness of a religious superior who had to consider not only the religious of his own order, but also the « recommendations » and the « requests » of their powerful patrons, which often left the priors general helpless and unable to make any other decision than that which was « requested » by powerful patrons. This becomes clear in our present case, where the general's registers note: « We answered [Cariddi] ... that the prior of Prague [Kristl] was named vicar general [for Bohemia] by letters patent of the Most Rev. Prior and Vicar General, which we desire to have carried out. The prior of Brünn [Barnabé] became vicar general for Moravia by the mandate of our Most Illustrious Cardinal Protector, at the request of the Most Illustrious Cardinal Dietrichstein » ⁹³).

We believe that this answer convinced Cariddi that it was useless to try further to put an end to the — for him — unpleasant situation. The two vicars general would remain in Bohemia and Moravia, whether he liked it or not. Hence Cariddi finished his term as provincial (1608-1611). So far as we know, the delicate problem simply remained in statu quo, until a new provincial, or rather a former provincial, took over the direction of the young province by the prior general's appointment on March 19, 1611. The reappointed superior of the young province was Johannes Baptist Kristl!

§ 10. *Moravia's independence recognized*

So long as Kristl was vicar general and Cariddi was provincial in Bohemia, the problem of Moravia called for no demonstration of power from either side, after Cariddi saw the uselessness of further protests about the existence of two vicars general. Kristl and Barnabé were vicars general in their respective districts, and the distressed provincial Cariddi evidently followed the not unwise principle of letting sleeping dogs lie. A serious problem could have arisen in 1611, when

⁹³) *Ibid.*

Cariddi's term as provincial had expired, if a provincial chapter had been held. But, as we have seen, the prior general simply appointed Kristl as provincial on March 19 of this year, giving as his reason for the appointment that no chapter could be held because of war. The war really existed since the two Habsburg brothers, the emperor Rudolph II and his brother the archduke Matthias had resorted to arms to settle their quarrels⁹⁴). Had a chapter been held, then the problem of Moravian representation would have arisen. We can only speculate as to what would have happened if the two Moravian monasteries had sent, or had not sent, voters to such a chapter. Fortunately, the sources show us exactly what did happen in the year 1611, so that we can lay speculations happily aside and explain the interesting facts.

The first fact is this: two strong characters, Kristl and Barnabé, now found themselves pitted against each other. Both of them were priors of the most important monasteries of their respective regions. Both of them were now recognized vicars general in their districts. Both of them enjoyed the protection of powerful patrons. But now a certain added weight could seem to turn the scales in favor of Kristl, who had once again become provincial rector in March 1611. This situation had not existed under Kristl's first term as provincial (1604-1608), since the prior of Brünn at that time was Basilio de Mezzi. Although we are not very well informed about the relations between Kristl and de Mezzi during between 1604 and 1608, (the year of the latter's death and also the year of Cariddi's election to the provincialship,) we know of no quarrel between the superiors of Prague and of Brünn. But now in 1611 it was a different story! The new provincial of Brünn, Barnabé, had been confirmed not by a provincial of the Augustinian order, but by the powerful Cardinal von Dietrichstein; and the latter had obtained directly from the prior general of the order the title of vicar general in Moravia for the prior of Brünn!

Hence the problem could and did now in 1611 become acute. The question now was this: did the title of vicar general for Moravia, held by Barnabé, mean that he was responsible and subject to the prior general alone, so that the provincial of the young province of Austria, Bohemia — and Moravia? — had no right to make a visita-

⁹⁴) E.J. GORLICH / F. ROMANIK, *Geschichte Österreichs*, Innsbruck-Wien-München, 1970, 185-187.

tion in Moravia? Or was it possible that the title could still be interpreted analogously to the former way, that is, did the provincial superior of the young province founded in 1604 have the right to assert his authority not only in Bohemia and Austria, but in Moravia also? The former opinion was that of Barnabé, the latter was the opinion of Kristl. We shall now see that the victory was gained for Brunn, chiefly by the authority of Cardinal von Dietrichstein, who was determined to lessen the influence of Bohemia in his Moravian territories.

The first mention in the general's registers of the relations between the two monasteries of Brunn and Prague — or between Barnabé and Kristl — after Kristl's designation as rector provincial in 1611, occurs on Nov. 7 of this year. It shows us that certain things still had to be ironed out. The general's registers note on this day: « Once permission, again we granted by letter permission to the prior of our monastery of Brunn [Barnabé] to receive four friars with the prior general's, but with knowledge and consent of the provincial of Bohemia » [Kristl] ⁹⁵). Here seems to be an indication that Barnabé might wish to proceed without « knowledge and consent of the provincial of Bohemia » — and that the general of the order sided with the viewpoint of Kristl.

Yet another letter from the Roman superiors of the order, which we shall immediately quote, sided with Kristl's viewpoint. Here is the entry in the general's register for Dec. 11, 1611: « We admonished in a private letter the prior of Brunn [Barnabé] *of the province of Bohemia*, that he must receive the vicar general of that province [Kristl in the same way in which former provincials [evidently of the Bavarian province] were received on other occasions, while they journeyed through the province and made a visitation » ⁹⁶). According to this letter, the prior general had solved the controversy between Barnabé and Kristl in favor of Kristl: Barnabé had been unwilling to permit Kristl to make a visitation in Brunn, Kristl had complained about this to the prior general, and the prior general had informed Barnabé that he must give up his viewpoint, since the superior of the young province founded in 1604 — and in which Moravia was included — had indeed the right to visit canonically the monasteries in his province. Here the prior general simply followed the usual practice in the Augus-

⁹⁵) Dd 56.161.

⁹⁶) *Ibid.*, 204; Clm 8423.31.

tinian order, applying the rule of 1604 to the monasteries of Moravia : they had been included in the new province founded in this year, and hence were subject to the provincial superiors of this province. The hesitation manifested in the answer given by the Roman superior on May 2, 1609 ⁹⁷), had given way to certainty : the Moravian monasteries of the Augustinian order were part of the province of Austria, Bohemia and Moravia, and therefore were subject to visitation by the provincial superior of this province !

But we already know that Barnabé enjoyed the patronage of the resolute bishop of the Moravian diocese of Olmütz, Cardinal Franz von Dietrichstein. His decree of Nov. 22, 1611 ^{97a}) in favor of Barnabé suggests that Kristl had tried shortly before this date to insist upon his right to make a visitation in Brünn. Certainly Kristl's name or office are not mention in the cardinal's document — this would hardly have been good taste and was certainly not necessary. Since the prior general's letter to Barnabé admonishing him to accept the visitation of Brünn by Kristl is dated Dec. 11, 1611, we can be sure that Kristl's written complaint about Barnabé's refusal to accept him as visitor or provincial had been written about a month earlier, that is about Nov. 10. And the stern Latin decree of Cardinal von Dietrichstein is dated Nov. 22 ! Would it not be dangerous to deny that a connection exists on the one hand between Kristl's attempted visitation of Brünn and his subsequent complaint that he was not properly received, and on the other hand the decree of Cardinal von Dietrichstein ? This decree, after stating that Barnabé had been appointed by his prior general as vicar general of Moravia — interpreting the term vicar general completely in the sense most favorable to Brünn's claim to exemption from any Augustinian superior below the prior general — concludes with this threat : « And so to each and every person, especially of the order of St. Augustine ⁹⁸), ... we order and command that no one under pain of excommunication to be incurred ipso facto and of loss of degrees and offices, presume to disturb, annoy or in any other way molest the prior Johannes Vinzenz [Barnabé] by reason of his election, confirmation and exemption... Notwithstanding any

⁹⁷) See the texts cited from Dd 54.33v above our note 83.

^{97a}) From which we have already quoted. Cf. notes 88 and 89.

⁹⁸) Was it necessary to refer more clearly to Kristl ? We believe that Kristl understood at once that he was the person against whom this document was primarily directed. Cf. JANETSCHKE, 209-210.

constitutions or orders of the Holy See or of the order of St. Augustine... or anything else, since the pope by faculties given to us desires that there be no impediment... » ⁹⁹⁾). Since this decree of the cardinal was accompanied by a papal bull in favor of Barnabé ¹⁰⁰⁾, the prior general and the provincial of Bohemia found themselves unable to proceed further. The pope himself and the powerful cardinal had decided the juridical question in favor of Barnabé and of Brünn! Hence, from Nov. 22, 1611 on, no provincial of the Bohemian-Austrian or of any other province had authority to make in his own name a visitation in the Moravian vicariate.

This naturally cleared up another question: the two monasteries of the Moravian district, Brünn and Gewitsch, in practice did not belong to the province founded in 1604, whatever may have been the intentions of the founder, and whatever may have been the relationship between the Moravian district and the new province so long as Basilio de Mezzi was prior of Brünn (1604-1608). But since Barnabé had become prior of Brünn on Sept. 10, 1608, juridical problems had developed — and had ultimately been resolved by the influence of a powerful Moravian prelate, who jealously guarded the rights of the region, especially where Prague was concerned. And we know that Prague was Kristl's stronghold.

§ 11. *New honors for the prior of Brünn*

We recall that the priors of Brünn became since 1594 protonotaries apostolic and counts of the Lateran. Now in 1612, Cardinal von Dietrichstein obtained from the pope for all future priors of Brünn the privilege of mitred prelates, even though this privilege must be renewed by every newly elected prior. Again on Aug. 12, 1613 Barnabé went to Rome as the emissary of Cardinal von Dietrichstein. Naturally the prior of Brünn used this occasion to discuss with the Augustinian prior general, Nicola da Sant'Angelo, the problem of the relations between the Moravian district and the province of Bohemia-Austria — one could hardly with propriety add the name of Moravia to the province since von Dietrichstein's decree of Nov. 11, 1611, even though this practice was occasionally continued for some years by secretaries in Rome, who were not too sure of their geography or of the compli-

⁹⁹⁾ JANETSCHKE, 207.

¹⁰⁰⁾ *Ibid.*, 208.

cated situation of some provinces. An amicable arrangement was reached between prior general and the prior of Brünn in 1614 as a result of Barnabé's trip to Rome. In the month of June of this year two decisions were made in Rome which interest us here. On June 18 the prior general approved the reelection of Kristl as provincial of Bohemia and Moravia (no mention of Austria!) and sent to Prague letters patent with the order that in future no one should be immediately reelected to this office ¹⁰¹). Hence we see that a provincial chapter had taken place in Prague, probably in April or May of this year. Although we do not possess the chapter acts, we venture to state that the chapter was definitely not graced by the presence of a Moravian delegation, which would have automatically recognized the jurisdiction of the province of Bohemia over Moravia. And we know that this was definitely not the case, as the events of 1611 had made clear.

On June 27 of the same year 1614 the prior general's register informs us of the following official decision with regard to the Moravian district and its superior, the prior of Brünn: « We granted once again all privileges and immunities, conferred by our predecessors to the prior of our monastery of Brünn, to the present incumbent Johannes Vinzenz of Fiume [Barnabé]. We confirm him also as our vicar general for Moravia, and desire that according to the ancient custom the prior of the monastery of Brünn be elected by the priests of the same monastery. This confirmation however shall pertain to the prior general » ¹⁰²). Not only was it explicitly declared here that the prior of Brünn was now definitely vicar of the prior general for Moravia — and therefore no longer merely vicar of the provincial of a determined province as had been definitely the case until the priorship of Basilio de Mezzi in Brünn (1594-1608); yet another indication of the independent status of Moravia was added. According to the custom of the Augustinian order and of other orders, each province or independent vicariate had to pay the prior general a specific tax to help him meet the necessary running expenses of an international order. Hence it was now further specified on June 27 that the prior of Brünn should pay forty thalers yearly to the prior general. Finally, the confirmation of each prior of Brünn made by the prior general should be understood as confirmation for life ¹⁰³).

¹⁰¹) Dd 58.24v.

¹⁰²) *Ibid.*, 25r.

¹⁰³) *Ibid.*

This document of June 27, 1614 referred to by the general's registers, left little room for doubt as to the status of the two monasteries in Moravia. Although they were not formally declared to be separated from the province of Bohemia and Austria, they were de facto recognized as a separate vicariate, independent of any provincial, and ruled by the prior of Brünn who was vicar of the prior general for the region. The imposition of a provincial tax to be paid yearly to the prior general made the matter even more definite. Kristl was indeed powerful in Bohemia and in Austria. But in Moravia he had met his match in Barnabé — backed up by von Dietrichstein!

According to the custom of the time the Moravian Augustinians were not content with merely one formal statement of their « privileges and immunities ». Hence, when a new prior general, Fulgenzo Gallucci, was elected in 1620, they requested a confirmation of their privileges. Hence on March 30, 1621 we find this entry in the registers of the new prior general: « We granted again and confirmed the privileges and immunities granted by our predecessor to the monastery of Brünn according to the request made » ¹⁰⁴). If the hard-won « privileges and immunities » gained by the Moravian vicariate should fall into oblivion, it would certainly not be the fault of the watchful prior of Brünn!

§ 12. *Losses from the war*

The frightful period of the Thirty Years' War (1618-1648) naturally brought its due share of losses to the Augustinian vicariate of Moravia. We do not wish to describe them here at length, for two reasons. First, they have already been described ¹⁰⁵): second, our chief interest here is to explain briefly the religious and juridical history of the vicariate, as a preparation for the history of the province of Austro-Moravia. We say but little about Austria in the present study, since we have elsewhere spoken of the Austrian monasteries of this time at sufficient length ¹⁰⁶). Suffice it to say therefore that a strong party in Moravia declared itself in favor of the German Protestant Friedrich against the young Habsburger Ferdinand in 1619. The church and monastery of Brünn were plundered in the same year. The Catholic victory on Nov. 8, 1620 made it possible to regain the monastery and part of

¹⁰⁴) Dd 62.110r.

¹⁰⁵) JANETSCHEK, 215ff.

¹⁰⁶) GAVIGAN, *Bohemia*.

the stolen goods. The prior Barnabé was a capable administrator on the economic side, and was able before his death in 1631 to restore a certain stability in the economy of the monastery of Brünn, while Jakob Kirschner did the same for Gewitsch in so far as possible during his long priorship (1615-1650), after this monastery also had been plundered in 1619. He courageously held out here even though he seems to have been at times the only priest living in the monastery. As in other regions also, the barbarous Swedish soldiers spread ruin in Brünn in 1643 when they attacked the city for the first time and cannonaded the city and its suburbs, damaging severely the landed possessions of the monastery. The Swedes returned in 1645 with stronger forces than before. They tried to undermine the church and monastery of the Augustinians but a countermine foiled their efforts. On the fest of the Assumption the Swedes launched their greatest attack and severely damaged the Augustinian church of St. Thomas. Directly before the church the bloodiest battle of the day took place, in which the Swedes were driven back. Even to modern times the citizens of Brünn attribute this victory to the special intercession of the Mother of God, whose image in the Augustinian church has enjoyed great popularity for centuries¹⁰⁷). On this occasion the Augustinian church and monastery of Brünn, situated on a particularly exposed part of the city walls, suffered such destruction that the prior had to rent lodgings in the city. The roof of the church had been destroyed by a storm wind in 1641, and for thirty years the middle aisle of the church had neither roof nor vaults. It was therefore changed into a flower-garden, and mass was celebrated on altars situated on the sides of the church. In spite of this unpleasant situation thousands of visitors came yearly to the church during these years¹⁰⁸).

§ 13. *Entrenchment despite hardships*

So much for the losses in the Thirty Years' War, which visited not only the Augustinians, but countless families in the German-speaking regions. Yet the whole picture was not one of complete

¹⁰⁷) See H.M. FRÖHLICH, *Ein Bildnis der schwarzen Muttergottes von Brünn in Aachen*, Aachen 1967, for a description of the picture which seems to come from the eighth or ninth century. On pp. 24-26 Fröhlich gives the German text of the song which even in our century was sung on Aug. 15 by the inhabitants of Brünn. In refrains it describes the overconfidence of the attacking Swedes and the successful defense of the city.

¹⁰⁸) JANETSCHKE, 245-246.

loss. Thus, the recognized position of Moravia as a separate vicariate was clearly admitted by the prior general, Fulgenzo Gallucci, in 1621. He had on March 30 of this year, as we already know, confirmed the privileges and immunities of Brünn. On Nov. 21 of the same year his registers have an entry which not only confirms once again the established right of Moravia to its independence, but which shows us how great was the ignorance in Rome of the Moravian vicariate, as we shall now see. The head of the order did not know on this day whether or not other Augustinian monasteries existed outside of Brünn! He appointed Nikolaus Crusenius as visitator general for the provinces of Bohemia-Austria and of Styro-Carinthia. Two important restrictions however were placed upon this authority: the monastery of Brünn was explicitly excluded from the monasteries which Crusenius had the right to visit, and also « the other monasteries in Moravia, if other Augustinian monasteries exist there ». Secondly, Crusenius was empowered to exercise in the monasteries visited the authority of the prior general in affairs both spiritual and temporal, « provided that he refrain from uniting or dividing provinces and from changing monasteries » ¹⁰⁹). We are not quite sure whether the phrase « changing monasteries » means transferring them from one province to another, or changing their personnel. The former meaning seems more likely. But what interests us is quite clear: Crusenius could visit all the monasteries belonging to the province of Bohemia-Austria, but was warned not to include Brünn or other possibly existing monasteries in Moravia in their number. Moravia's position as an independent vicariate was established!

With both interest and amusement we learn what happened after the general chapter of 1625 in which Girolamo de' Ghetti became prior general. Provision was made on the same day, Sept. 25, for the two giants, Kristl in Prague and Barnabé in Brünn! Kristl was confirmed for six more years as prior of St. Thomas' in Prague (where he had been prior since 1601, even during his time as provincial), and at the same time was confirmed in his right to special rooms in the monastery and in the use of certain funds. Then, immediately afterwards comes the text which refers to Barnabé: « For Johannes Vinzenz Barnabé, prior of the monastery of Brünn, we confirm the immunities and privileges granted by our predecessors, along with all clauses,

¹⁰⁹) Dd 62. 195v-197r; Clm 8423.44.

conditions and tenors, particularly that he be vicar general of Moravia and perpetual prior of the above-mentioned monastery of Brünn. He is indeed to be elected by the priests of the same monastery, but the confirmation of the elected prior pertains to us as prior general for the time being. Likewise, the above-mentioned prior is bound to give us in the name of the monastery forty thalers yearly as the usual tax, according to law and with benefit of our changing the rate » ¹¹⁰). It would seem that Kristl and Barnabé had much in common. Neither let the grass grow under his feet, and both of them were definitely interested in being vicars general and priors of a determined monastery. It is true that Kristl possessing during nearly twenty years the title of provincial also (in Bohemia-Austria). But it had been made clear to him that he was definitely not provincial in Moravia, the Augustinian district ruled by Barnabé with the titles of perpetual prior of Brünn, vicar general for Moravia, protonotary apostolic, count of the Lateran, and mitred prelate. We suspect that in both their cases the saying was verified — at least for their own territories: « I am Sir Oracle, and when I ope my mouth, let no dog bark » !

§ 14. *Prior Georg Gladich 1632-1653*

Barnabé's numerous titles did not save him from the common lot of mortals. He died on Dec. 1, 1631 at the age of fifty-seven. He was a native of Fiume, and had been thirty-four years old when « elected » prior of Brünn, and had been prior of Gratz in the province of Styro-Carinthia at the time of his « election », which had been a foregone conclusion owing to the high patronage which he enjoyed. Strikingly enough, the same story was now repeated in the election of his successor. Georg Gladich was a native of Fiume, about thirty-five years old at the time of his election as prior of Brünn, and was at the time provincial of the Augustinian province of Styro-Carinthia. He and another Croat, Franz Possich, « happened » to be in Brünn for the election of a successor to Barnabé on February 4, 1632. Since Gladich had the recommendation of the emperor, Ferdinand II, and of his overcourtmaster Ulrich von Eggenberg, he was « elected » by the priests of Brünn. The freedom of the election seems to have consisted in this: the electors felt themselves free to choose the so highly recommended stranger — or to face the consequences. They chose the

¹¹⁰) Dd 66.51rv.

stranger ¹¹¹). Gladich appointed as procurator of the monastery his companion from Styro-Carinthia, Franz Possich, so that the new monastery at once had two strangers in most important positions.

We know by a reference in the general's registers ¹¹²) that the prior general Girolamo Rigoli approved on March 19 of the same year the election of Gladich, whom he confirmed as prior for life and appointed vicar general of Moravia — again a proof that Cardinal von Dietrichstein and Barnabé had done their work well. We might add that Dietrichstein still lived, since his death did not occur until 1636, and this was sufficient to keep in check any attempts which Kristl might have been tempted to make to change the situation. Since Kristl himself died on July 19, 1637 ¹¹³), and since Gladich lived as prior of Brünn and vicar general for Moravia until Aug. 20, 1653 ¹¹⁴), the system of the vicariate of Moravia now established itself by the added title of prescription.

Like his predecessor and compatriot Barnabé, Gladich was a person used to authority. His twenty-one years as prior in Brünn coincided with the very difficult times of the Thirty Years' War and hence witnessed many economic set-backs. Yet, all in all, his rule seems to have been satisfactory. During his regime the problem of recovering the lost monasteries in Mährisch Kromau and in Mariakron was treated, but the troubled times made it impossible. He enjoyed a certain prestige by reason of his being appointed on two occasions general commissary for the monastery of Vienna. On Aug. 16, 1638 he was given by the prior general Ippolito Monti authority not only to visit this monastery and to examine into the state of its discipline, but also to remove from it any members, including the regent of Studies, Patritius de Rau, if he saw fit ¹¹⁵). Again in June 1640 Gladich received a similar appointment from the same prior general Monti to visit Vienna in the same way as in 1638, and to appoint a new vicar general for Austria in place of Ignatius Dycker, who wished to resign ¹¹⁶). Nor was the monastery of Vienna the only part of the order outside Moravia where Gladich received important missions. In April 1639 he

¹¹¹) JANETSCHKE, 229-230.

¹¹²) Dd 69.183v.

¹¹³) Kr. 49.

¹¹⁴) JANETSCHKE, 266.

¹¹⁵) Dd 74.106.

¹¹⁶) Dd 76.5v-6r. See for this visitation Gavigan, de primo 274.

was appointed visitator general of the province of Bavaria with faculties to change friars from one monastery to another, depose priors if need be, etc. He was ordered also to convoke a provincial chapter for Bavaria over which he was to preside. At the same time Gladich was given the same faculties and appointment for yet another Augustinian province, that of Styro-Carinthia. Here he was free to make a general visitation of all the monasteries, including even the general convent of Lubiana. In this last monastery however he was explicitly forbidden to remove the prior, Johannes Hozhevar, who enjoyed the title here which Gladich himself enjoyed in Brünn, that of perpetual prior ¹¹⁷). Gladich actually presided over the provincial chapter of Bavaria in Sept. 1639, and was praised by the newly elected provincial, Jordan Degler, in a letter of Sept. 20 to the prior general for the zeal and dexterity displayed in his visitation of the province ¹¹⁸). Perhaps the most striking of Gladich's appointments was in June 1640. We recall from above that he was now designated for the second time commissary general for Vienna. And on the sixteenth of this month ¹¹⁹), he received yet another appointment, which perhaps caused some of the older members of the province in question to swallow hard — Gladich became commissary and visitator general for the province of Bohemia, with permission to visit all its monasteries. Not only this: Gladich was empowered to convoke a provincial chapter for this province also, and to preside over it; but if the troubles of the Thirty Years' War should impede the holding of a chapter, Gladich could appoint the new provincial ¹¹⁹). What a change since the times of the now deceased Kristl! The prior of the monastery which in 1611 refused to allow Kristl to visit it as vicar general now had power to visit the region where Kristl himself had been supreme from 1601 until his death in 1637, yes even Kristl's favorite monastery of St. Thomas in Prague ¹²⁰)!

¹¹⁷) Dd 74.259-260.

¹¹⁸) Clm 8423.4-5; JANETSCHEK, 244.

¹¹⁹) Dd 76.4r-5v.

¹²⁰) As a matter of fact, Gladich made a visitation of the province, summoned the priests to the monastery of St. Thomas in Prague, and appointed as provincial Nicola Spernazatti; cf. Br. 86v; GAVIGAN, *Epp.*, note 147.

§ 15. Gladich reports about Vienna 1640

After the visitation in the province of Bohemia, Gladich proceeded in the late summer of 1640 to Vienna where, amongst other delicate tasks, he was supposed to try to recover for his brethren the church and monastery of St. Augustine which had in 1630 been handed over to the barefoot Augustinians. Now in 1640 one of the barefoot Augustinians of Vienna, Wilhelm a S. Martino, had given public scandal by adultery and heresy, and it was thought that the time was propitious to regain the monastery back from the barefoot Augustinians ¹²¹). Gladich made a sincere attempt to regain the lost church and monastery, or at least to obtain an equivalent inside the city walls, instead of the site assigned to the Augustinians for a new foundation on the Landstrasse, outside of the so-called Hungarian gate. His attempts ended in failure, although he even went to Regensburg to consult with the ministers of the emperor, Ferdinand III, who was there in the autumn. From this city Gladich wrote on Nov. 19, 1640 an Italian letter to the prior general, Ippolito Monti ¹²²). In this letter Gladich gives a first-hand report about the Augustinian community of Vienna at this time, part of which was in the new foundation on the Landstrasse, part still in the city in rented lodgings. The letter has great historical and personal interest, since it was written by the man who nine years later became the first and only provincial of the short-lived Austro-Moravian province, and since this represents a close personal relation between Gladich and the Austrian monasteries over which he was to become provincial. Because the letter is a private one and does not spare feelings — offendere non potest quod nescitur — we find opinions expressed here which are not to be found in public documents.

Gladich begins his letter with the clear statement that it is impossible to obtain for the Augustinians a church and monastery within the walls of the city of Vienna. So he has been informed a few days earlier by officials close to the emperor. The chief reason is that the citizens of the city feel that already too many monasteries of men and women are found there, where there is not room enough for all. Hence the Augustinians on the Landstrasse must be satisfied

¹²¹) Dd 76.46r; GAVIGAN, *Übergabe*, 148.

¹²²) The original is contained in AGR, Aa 36.446r-447v.

with what they have, even though it is outside the city walls, since they are slated to receive nothing else. « This is the result of the great hopes, with which time and time again the fathers of Vienna have treated Your Paternity, in order to pass themselves off as cavaliers and persons of great talent in dealings » is the unsparing remark of Gladich. The decision now reached at Regensburg by the emperor to make no further offers to the Augustinians of the Landstrasse had already been made previously by the council of the city of Vienna. Gladich had learned this from a letter sent by the regent of studies in Vienna, Patritius de Rau, to him Gladich, while the latter was in Prague », attributing as he [de Rau] always does, the fault to Fr. Ignatius » [Dycker, vicar general in Vienna]. During the late summer the prior general had written to Gladich that it would now be easy (!) to recover the monastery of St. Augustine, because of the scandal given by the barefoot Augustinian, Wilhelm a S. Martino ¹²³). Gladich himself had never shared this opinion., and events have proved that he was right ! The regent de Rau and the other Augustinians of Vienna who believed that the monastery of St. Augustine would certainly be recovered are men who are mere youths, if not in age, then certainly in experience. They thought that a smile from the emperor or the empress meant that victory was already in their hands ! Gladich inclines to believe that Cardinal Pallotto, papal nuntius in Vienna in 1630, was chiefly responsible for the handing over the church and monastery of St. Augustine to the barefooted Augustinians, at least he has heard this from several sources. Gladich confirms that the community on the Landstrasse had asked for the church of St. Ruprecht and some nearby houses for a foundation within the city, if it should be impossible to recover St. Augustine's. The emperor, Gladich believes, would have granted this request, if the city had not opposed such vigorous resistance because of the already great number of monasteries within the walls of the crowded city.

Furthermore the bishop of Vienna [Philip Friedrich Breuner] has personally told Gladich that he desires that the Augustinians remain on the Landstrasse to take care of the religious services of the neighbourhood.

¹²³) A brief account of this scandal in GAVIGAN, *Übergabe* 148. Since it was the first and probably the most serious of the very few scandals given in Vienna by the discaled Augustinians, they were left in peaceful possession of the monastery of St. Augustine.

On this occasion Gladich shows that he had come into contact even with the inner currents of Augustinian life in Vienna. The experience was certainly useful, since he became provincial of these religious in 1649. Further Gladich fled to Vienna in the year 1645 when the Swedish army was approaching Brünn ¹²³), so that he certainly knew before 1649 more than a little about the Augustinians of Austria.

§ 16. *Austria and Moravia united 1649*

The time has now come to speak about the union of the Augustinian monasteries of Austria and Moravia in 1649. At the beginning of this study, we begged the reader's indulgence for the somewhat long treatment given to the Moravian vicariate before taking up directly the union of Austria and Moravia in 1649. We feel that the treatment was necessary for two reasons in particular. First, we now understand how and why Moravia did not form a permanent part of the province founded in 1604 under the name of Bohemia, Austria and Moravia, even though this was the original plan at the time of foundation. Second, we now understand how the prior of Brünn was a person of a certain importance in the Augustinian monasteries north of the Alps. This importance had developed greatly under the prior Barnabé (1608-1631) and had been carried even further by Gladich as we have just seen. Hence we shall not be too surprised that Gladich became provincial when the province of Austro-Moravia was founded in 1649.

We already know the situation of the Moravian vicariate, which consisted of the important monastery of Brünn under its prior, who was vicar general of the vicariate. The only other Moravian monastery therein was the small monastery of Gewitsch, which lived in the shadow of and in close dependence upon Brünn. The vicariate contained only about twenty members ¹²⁵).

What was the situation of the Austrian monasteries at the time of the union? They were a small province, consisting of four monasteries and about fifty-two members, which had been separated from their union with the Bohemian monasteries in 1637 and recognized as an independent province in 1646 ¹²⁶). Hence a union between the two

¹²⁴) JANETSCHKE, 256.

¹²⁵) This estimate is based on the number of religious of the monasteries of Brünn (16) and of Gewitsch (3) in the years 1649 and 1651. A few others lived outside these monasteries, chiefly in parishes; ÖNB 8466.20v-21v; JANETSCHKE, 264-265.

¹²⁶) See GAVIGAN, *Bohemia*, and *de primo* 315-316, where we have tried to explain both points in detail.

groups would amount to a province of roughly seventy-five members, which could dispose of more facilities for the training of their candidates. Brünn seemed disposed in 1644 to accept members from other provinces, since on Aug. 27 of this year a Polish Augustinian priest Franciscus had been recommended to the prior of Brünn and sent to him with letters of obedience ¹²⁷). It seemed to be a long-standing custom in the Moravian vicariate to station some of its priests in various parishes even outside the order, for example in Hwězdltitz, Opatowitz, and Naumburg ^{127a}). Besides, it was hoped to recover for the new province some of the lost monasteries in Moravia and Silesia, as we shall see below in the seventh article of union. Increased numbers would naturally help out in this situation. Whether the economic interests of both parties would be favored by a union we can not say, but it is certain that the income of Brünn, Vienna and Baden at this time came chiefly from their vineyards ²²⁸). Brünn received a part of its income from beer also, produced by the peasants who worked for the monastery, but the incomes were drastically reduced by the Swedish plunderings, especially in 1645. If we may judge from the short duration of the province (1649-1651), we may say that the union was found disappointing on both sides, since both parties accepted separation, as we shall see. But it is hard to believe that no mutual advantages were hoped for by both parties before the union of 1649.

Who were the superiors of each group? In Moravia, as we know, Gladich had been prior of Brünn and vicar general of Moravia since 1632. In Austria the first provincial, elected on Apr. 21, 1646, was the young Italian, Simone Pontanari da Empoli ¹²⁹). He went to Rome in the spring of 1649, and was present there on May 22 when the new general, Filippo Visconti, was elected ¹³⁰). Hence he left behind in Austria as vicar provincial the deserving Irish Augustinian, Nicholas Donellan. We can be sure that Pontanari knew how sufficient members of the Austrian province and of the Moravian vicariate had expressed themselves favorably on the subject of uniting both groups into a

¹²⁷) Dd 79.118v-119r.

^{127a}) JANETSCHKE, 184, 233-235, 264-265.

¹²⁸) For Brünn, see JANETSCHKE, 249 and 256; for Vienna, see ASW, Kl. A. 21,30; for Baden, see ÖNB 8466,22v and U. ANZINGER, *Das Kloster der Augustiner-Eremiten in Baden*, in *Augustiniana* 18 (1968) 311.

¹²⁹) GAVIGAN, *de primo* 312-313.

¹³⁰) ÖNB 7236.IV.143r; AA 11 (1925-1926) 25.

single province. If we are not mistaken, Pontanari remained in Italy after the general chapter, and died here in his native land during the summer of the same year, hardly forty years of age. The register of the new prior general has this entry for Aug. 30, 1649 : « The death of Maestro Simone da Empoli, who served with great distinction as regent of studies in Vienna and provincial of Austria, well-pleasing to the emperor and to the order » ¹³¹). Hence the two superiors in April 1649 were Gladich and Donellan. The Austrian province had held on March 5 its election of the representatives for the general chapter ¹³²), so that the provincial Pontanari and his Austrian confrere, the definitor Amadeus Wallmayr, probably had to leave Vienna early in April to arrive in good time for the chapter. The Austrian province was therefore represented by the vicar provincial Donellan in the handlings with the Moravian vicariate which took place in the new monastery on the Landstrasse in Vienna and were concluded by an official document of union on Apr. 19, 1649 ¹³³). It is explicitly stated in the introduction to this document that not only Donellan but Gladich also and the monastery of Gewitsch were completely in favor of the union. Hence Janetschek ¹³⁴) does not portray the situation accurately when he states that the union was a continuation of the attempts made by the provincials of the Bohemian-Austrian province to bring the Moravian monasteries into the province. Since the Moravian monasteries themselves were in favor of the union, it is incorrect to suggest that it was forced upon them, as Janetschek would have us believe. One thing however is certainly true : the worthy prior of Brünn insisted in every possible way upon his dignity and that of his monastery.

§ 17. *Conditions of union*

The two remaining copies of the act of union known to us are in Dd 84. 302-305 and ÖNB 8466. 15r-16v. We shall quote them here in a slightly shortened form, so that the nature of the union may be clearly seen. We shall at once note the strong insistence upon the position of Brünn and its pompous prelate Gladich .

¹³¹) Dd 84.199. We believe his death occurred in Italy, since the necrology of the province of Austria in ÖNB 10214 p. 27r ff., although it is quite complete for this time, makes no mention of fra Simone. The same is true of ÖNB 7236. I.71v-72r, and *ibid.*, IV.146v.

¹³²) ÖNB 8466.15r.

¹³³) Copies of the document are found in ÖNB 8466.15r-16v, and in Dd 84.302-305.

¹³⁴) 262-263.

1. The priorship of Brünn shall remain as it now is [elective and lifelong].

2. The election of the prior of Brünn shall be made by all members of this community who live in the new province of Austro-Moravia, or who are legitimately absent.

3. The prior of Brünn has in the Monastery and city of Brünn precedence over the provincial. In other places the provincial shall offer the prior of Brünn the first place, or will place a seat opposite his own, so that no difference in rank appears (!!).

4. In provincial chapters the monastery of Brünn shall send a discrete along with the prior. The latter, if he is mitred, shall sit immediately after the chapter president. If he is not mitred and the chapter is celebrated in Austria, he shall sit after the provincial, but before the definitors. But if the chapter is celebrated in Brünn, the prelate shall have precedence over past and present provincials.

5. The community of Brünn shall be appointed in the definitory of the provincial chapter. From this community no one may be transferred by the provincial to another monastery without an urgent cause and only with consent of the prelate. In difficult cases the definitors will vote to advise the prior.

6. The prior and community of Gewitsch will be appointed by the definitory.

7. When the provincial is an Austrian, the prior of Brünn shall have the title of vicar provincial in emergency cases when the provincial is distant and authority over Gewitsch and all other monasteries which may be acquired in Moravia and Silesia. But when the prior of Brünn is the provincial, the prior of the monastery of Vienna will make decisions in such emergency cases which admit no delay.

8. The novitiate shall be in Brünn and the expenses of the novices shall be paid by the convent to which they are affiliated.

9. The house of study for philosophy and theology shall be in Vienna, and the expenses of students from Moravia shall be paid by the monastery of Brünn. The possibility of study in Brünn by agreement of prelate and provincial is not excluded ¹³⁵).

10. All degrees are rejected, except those in accordance with the disposition of the prior general for Austria and with the exception

¹³⁵) We shall see below that Gladich already in 1650 began to insist upon this «possibility» for Brünn. This was one of the causes, or perhaps signs, of the imminent dissolution of the short-lived province.

of the prior of Brünn, who « after his election, for the honor of the order, may receive the doctor's degree in any university whatsoever ».

11. The prelate of Brünn, if he is provincial, shall not cause more expenses than are caused by ordinary provincials. If he should decide to dwell in Vienna the convent of Brünn will provide what he needs in victuals, servants, and horses.

12. With regard to dress and externals, the religious shall conform themselves to the place.

Two completely similar copies were made of the document of union. The signataries expressed their desire that the prior general ratify the union made under these conditions, and we shall see that this was done on Nov. 13 of this year. Both copies of the document received seven seals, that is of the two Moravian monasteries of Brünn and Gewitsch, then the seal of the province of Austria, plus those of the convents of Vienna, Baden, Korneuburg and Bruck an der Leitha. Finally, eight signatures were placed for Moravia and nine for Austria. For Moravia signed Georg Gladich, prior of Brünn, and Jakob Kirschner, prior of Gewitsch; then Alfons Staimos, subprior of Brünn, and five other priests of the community: Augustin Riemer, Aurelius Augustin Comes, Gelasius of Brünn [Kamensky]¹³⁶), Fulgenz Klein, and Anton Kreissel. The signatures were affixed for Austria by Nicholas Donellan, vicar provincial and regent of studies; then by the four definitors: Augustin Gudendorffer, Silvester Koch, Eusebius Mayr, and Christian Weber¹³⁷). Three priors of Austrian convents followed: of Baden, Constantin Staudinger; of Korneuburg, Bertram Strauss; of Bruck an der Leitha, Caesarius Syrott. Finally, the Belgian Jan Lem signed as visitator secundus¹³⁸).

The words with which the prior general Filippo Visconti on Nov. 13, 1649 approved the union are curious since they refer to the union

¹³⁶) JANETSCHKE, *Necrologia patrum et fratrum ord. E. calceatorum S. Augustini in Vicariatu Moraviae*, Brünn 1894, 20.

¹³⁷) This is the Christian Sartorius, who as a clerical student was placed in charge of the school in Korneuburg, which the Augustinians had reopened in 1636 after a fire had caused its temporary closing. We mention him here particularly since the love of latinized names which then prevailed in some officials made him appear with yet a third form of his name: Textor.

¹³⁸) Perhaps it is well to mention here that this young native of Ghent died on Sept. 24 of this same year; ÖNB 7236.IV.146v. He died in the monastery of Bruck an der Leitha and was buried by the prior Syrott who had signed this document with him in April; *ibid.*, I.71v.

of two provinces into one, whereas Moravia had been up to this time not a province but a vicariate. We translate the general's words from the Latin : « By our authority, insofar as it pertains to us, and under due conditions, we approve and confirm the agreement and union of two provinces (!) into one, that is Austria and Moravia, since it contributes to the public weal and utility of the order and to the honor of our patriarch, St. Augustine. Rome, Nov. 13, 1639, Filippo Visconti, general » ¹³⁹).

§ 18. *The sole provincial chapter 1649*

Naturally it was necessary to hold a provincial chapter of the new province to determine the new superiors. Quite probably the election of Gladich was taken for granted. Certainly in Moravia, it was hardly to be expected that any one other than the prelate of Brünn should be considered. In the young province of Austria, the provincial Pontanari had died during the summer of 1649, and the vicar provincial in Austria, Nicholas Donellan, seems to have had little stomach for such positions, since he had as vicar general (1643-1646) often requested to be relieved of the post ¹⁴⁰). The election fell, as a matter of fact, as we shall now see, on Gladich. On Sept. 25 the prior general had named as president of the coming chapter Augustin Gundendorffer or, in case he should be impeded, the new regent of studies in Vienna, Giuseppe Sabbatini of Ravenna ¹⁴¹). On Nov. 27, 1649 the chapter met in the monastery of Korneuburg near Vienna. A short speech was held by the vicar provincial of Austria and prior on the Landstrasse, Donellan. The secretary of the Austrian province, Columban Sifferlinger, read aloud the letters by which the general had appointed Augustin Gundendorffer president of the chapter ¹⁴²). On the following day, after the mass of the Holy Ghost, a Latin discourse was held by the brilliant preacher, Alfons Staimos, who had come as the discrete of Brünn along with his prior Gladich to the chapter ¹⁴³). The list of those who

¹³⁹) ÖNB 8466.16v; Dd 84.305-306.

¹⁴⁰) Dd 81.116v-117r.

¹⁴¹) Dd 84.328.

¹⁴²) Text of the letters copied in ÖNB 8466.17rv.

¹⁴³) JANETSCHKE, 263, states incorrectly that Jakob Kirschner also, prior of Gewitsch, had come to the chapter as one of the delegates of Moravia. But, instead of coming, Kirschner sent a note of excuse, as was done by the third definitor of Austria, Eusebius Mayr, also; ÖNB 8466.18r.

had the right to vote was then read. We already know most of the fifteen names of those who were announced as qualified to vote. They were given in this order: Augustin Gudendorffer, first definitor and president of the chapter; Georg Gladich, prelate of Brünn; Nicholas Donellan, vicar provincial; Giuseppe Sabbatini, regent of studies in Vienna; Silvester Koch, Eusebius Mayr, and Christian Weber, the second, third and fourth definitors ¹⁴⁴); Amadeus Wallmayr, the first visitor ¹⁴⁵); Bertram Strauss, Caesarius Syrott, Jakob Kirschner ^{145a}), Constantin Staudinger, priors respectively of Korneuburg, Bruck an der Leitha, Gewitsch and Baden; Columban Sifferlinger, provincial secretary; Alfons Staimos, discrete of the monastery of Brünn; Ferdinand Boiarius (Bayer), discrete of the general chapter of Vienna ¹⁴⁶).

Since two of these were absent, thirteen votes were cast. The choice fell unanimously upon Gladich. After the Te Deum and the other usual ceremonies the following new definitors were elected: Giuseppe Sabbatini, Augustin Riemer, Bertram Strauss, and Constantine Staudinger. As supplementary definitor Ferdinand Boiarius was chosen ¹⁴⁷). We note that of these five definitors only one, Riemer, was from Moravia. Yet there would be little question about authority and influence so long as the mitred and mighty prelate of Brünn was provincial! As visitors two Austrians were elected: Erthinod Cordin and Columban Sifferlinger ¹⁴⁸).

§ 19. Chapter decrees and communities

Fourteen decrees were published by the new provincial and his definitory in the chapter ¹⁴⁹). We shall give merely a few of them here, which shed some light upon the new province and upon the customs of the time.

¹⁴⁴) We saw in the preceding note that Eusebius Mayr had sent a written excuse to explain his forced absence.

¹⁴⁵) As we saw in note 138, the second visitor, Jan Lem, had died on Sept. 24 of this year.

^{145a}) See note 143.

¹⁴⁶) ÖNB 8466.18r.

¹⁴⁷) *Ibid.*

¹⁴⁸) Dd 84.306-310.

¹⁴⁹) Given completely in ÖNB 8466.18v-20v.

Chapter two insisted upon the choral recitation of the breviary with due seriousness. This insistence upon choral recitation of divine office had been given up for weighty reasons by St. Ignatius of Loyola in founding his society, but the older orders, both monastic and mendicant, at this time still insisted upon it.

With great exactitude the third chapter described the quantity and quality of clothing which each prior was bound to give the members of his community during his term of three years.

Priors were by the fifth chapter forbidden to sell, buy or pawn anything without the consent of the provincial and his definitory, under pain of deposition. This is a point which has remained ever present in religious life, whose non-observance causes results sometimes painful, sometimes humorous. In somewhat a similar vein, the thirteenth chapter forbids priors to undertake changes in buildings without consulting architects.

The sixth and seventh chapters contained the usual prescriptions of this time about silence in the refectory and against card-playing.

The eight chapter repeated the usual strict orders about writing no letters without approbation of the superior, while the ninth declares habitual alcoholics as incapable of holding any position.

To encourage preaching, the so-called primary preachers (*concionatores*) of every monastery had the right to a seat immediately after the sub-prior according to the tenth chapter. The eleventh gave all priors two weeks to replace female cooks by men.

The thirteenth chapter threatens calumniators with severe punishments.

The fourteenth and last chapter has a pleasant note which we gladly repeat here. It expressed the desire that the elderly Augustin Gundendorffer, well deserving of the province, be assigned a warm room and a lay brother to care for him in the community to which he would be assigned. Hitherto he had been in Korneuburg, and was now assigned to Baden.

If this province of Austro-Moravia had lasted longer, it would here demand too much space to give the complete families of the six monasteries of the new province. Since however this province held only one provincial chapter and we are fortunate enough to have its complete acts, we wish to take advantage of the opportunity to show at a glance how the forces of the united groups were now distributed. We denote priests here with a P. before their name, clerical students with Fr.,

laybrothers with F. By th. after the name is meant student of theology; by l. is meant student of logic. Interesting is it to note that almost no Austrians were sent to the Moravian monasteries, and vice versa, with very few exceptions. The outstanding exception was the brilliant orator of Brünn, P. Alfons Staimos, who was logically enough sent to the monastery of Vienna where he soon became famous as one of the best controversial preachers in Germany. At the wish of the emperor, he was brought to the imperial diets on several occasions ¹⁵⁰⁾.

Here are the communities of the newly formed province, given apparently according to the order of importance ¹⁵¹⁾. It will be noted that Brünn stands in the first and Vienna only in the second place, although it was a general convent and up to 1649 the residence of the provincial of Austria. So far as we know the list of the Viennese community here given is the earliest complete list of its community since the founding of the monastery on the Landstrasse, which had taken place in 1636.

Brünn

- P. Georg Gladich, perpetual prior and provincial.
- P. Augustin Riemer, second definitor.
- P. Wilhelm Hehenperger, primary preacher.
- P. Ammonius Mayer, secondary preacher.
- P. Eusebius Mayr, P. Aurelius Comes, P. Augustinus Menschik, P. Anton Kreissel.

Clerical students were: Fr. Wilhelm of Brünn, and the four novices Franz Freithofer, Georg Haller, Leo Raimicida, and Ambros Trabenitz.

Vienna

- P. Nicholas Donellan, prior until the general should designate a successor.
- P. Giuseppe [Sabbatini] da Ravenna, regent of studies.
- P. Ferdinand Boiarius, subprior.
- P. Alfons Staimos, preacher.
- P. Constantin Staudinger, fourth definitor.
- P. Erthinod Cordin, first visitator.
- P. Columban Sifferlinger, provincial secretary.
- P. Jakob, cursor.

¹⁵⁰⁾ See GAVIGAN, *Epp.*, notes 113 and 187.

¹⁵¹⁾ ÖNB 8466.20v-21v.

P. Johannes Bonus Hauswirth, sacristan and th.

P. Angelus Widmann, sollicitator.

P. Thomas Acushlar of Laibach, l.

Clerical students were : Fr. Heinrich Gazappi, l., deacon ; Fr. Gabriel Huefnagel, th., deacon ; Fr. Fulgenz Püchler, th., subdeacon ; Fr. Aegidius Knor, th. ; Fr. Christoph Knipselperger, th. ; Fr. Leopold Holsperger, l. ; Fr. Maximilian Frey, l. ; Fr. Franciscus Malfati, l. ; Fr. Simon Griesmayer, l. ; Fr. Josef Prein, l., novice.

Laybrothers were :

F. Valentin, kitchen procurator.

F. Mark, doortender.

F. Paulin Sigl, director of vineyards and woods.

F. Nikolaus Widman, subsacristan and cellarmaster.

F. Rochus Heidlperger, infirmarian.

F. Donatus Graf, companion of the sollicitator.

F. Marianus Pöppel, director of refectory and guestmaster.

F. Alypius, carpenter, novice.

Baden

P. Caesarius Syrott, prior and preacher.

P. Christian Weber, subprior.

P. Augustin Gundendorffer.

P. Bertram Strauss, third definator.

P. Hilarius Härb.

Fr. Nikolaus Werlich, deacon.

Clerics were Fr. Aurelius Oder and Fr. Sebastian Dietl, and the one laybrother was F. Severin.

Korneuburg

P. Silvester Koch, prior.

P. Johannes Molitor, pastor in Harmersdorf.

P. Thaddeus Kettner, pastor in St. Veit ¹⁵²).

P. Navigius Kirchpächer, procurator.

P. Reinhold Hölzl.

Fr. Cristoph Bärtich.

F. Friedrich.

¹⁵²) This mention of the pastors in Harmersdorf and St. Veit, and of Masbirbaum — the last-named from the monastery of Bruck an der Leitha — is the only source by which the present writer knows that these parishes were attended to by the monasteries of Korneuburg and Bruck an der Leitha.

Bruck an der Leitha

P. Amadeus Wallmayer, prior.
 P. Bonaventura Lindenperger, preacher.
 P. Reinhold Schwabauer, pastor in Masbirbaum.
 P. Karl Turner, procurator
 Fr. Jakob.
 F. Adeodatus.

Gewitsch

P. Jakob Kirschner, prior.
 P. Fulgenz Klein.
 F. Josef.

The usual sermons and defense of theological theses were held on Sunday and Monday, Nov. 28-29, and the stereotyped phrase recurs that «they were received with great applause». The chapter was concluded on Nov. 29 ¹⁵³).

§ 20. *Obscure period*

The history of the united province is almost unbelievably short. Between the act of union in April 1649 and the dissolution of the province in April 1651, only two years elapsed. But the time of actual union amounted to only seventeen months, since the provincial chapter was held, as we have seen, in the last week of Nov. 1649. Hence we can hardly be surprised if we have very few records from the brief period of union. Yet we are not completely in the dark, for a few outstanding names have left their mark even for this short period: Donellan, Staimos and Gladich. One gets the impression that Donellan and Staimos had excellent relations. Donellan was a prudent, diplomatic, calm friar, who was highly thought of by the emperor Leopold. He held from 1644 until his death in 1679 a chair of moral theology in the university of Vienna, and was sent on several occasions as visitor to the provinces of Bohemia and Styro-Carinthia ¹⁵⁵). We have seen above that Donellan wisely refrained from trying to perpetuate himself in the post of superior. We recall also that Donellan appeared in the acts of the provincial chapter in Nov. 1649 as prior of Vienna until the

¹⁵³) ÖNB 8466.22r.

¹⁵⁴) Dd 84.496.

¹⁵⁵) An excellent summary of what we know up to the present about Donellan is found in K. HÖRMANN, *Nikolaus Donellan, Ein Ire auf dem moraltheologischen Lehrstuhl der Universität Wien (1644 bis 1679)*, in *Festschrift Franz Loidl*, I. Band, Wien 1970, 65-95.

prior general should designate another, since this was the practice in general convents, of which Vienna was one. The registers of the prior general Visconti on Nov. 20 of the same year 1649¹⁵⁶) inform us that on this day Staimos was appointed to the post of prior in Vienna. Naturally this news had not reached the provincial chapter which began in Korneuburg only seven days later, but it is very probable that Donellan had previously declared himself satisfied with such an appointment. We might indicate here that Donellan was proposed in this year, along with Adeodatus Draodemski the provincial of Bohemia, and the renowned theologian of the province of Cologne Michael Paludanus, for the assistency of the Augustinian order beyond the Alps. The choice however was made, not in general chapter, but by the Sacred Congregation of Bishops and Regulars on Jan. 7, 1650, and fell upon the Spaniard, Martín Blas¹⁵⁷).

Possibly also, Donellan knew at the time that the prior general intended to present his name for a bishopric in his native Ireland. In fact, on the last day of Jan. in the year 1651, the prior general wrote letters to this effect, both to the reigning pope, Innocent X, and to the emperor, Ferdinand III¹⁵⁸). This honor was not conferred upon Donellan, but he was made a privy counsellor of the emperor in 1655¹⁵⁹). The excellent reputation which Donellan enjoyed is confirmed by a letter of the papal nuntius in Vienna, Camillo de' Melzi, to Cardinal Astalli on February 25, 1651. The nuntius expressed here his opinion that Donellan was a worthy, capable and admirable person, and would be an excellent choice for the bishopric of Elphin in the ecclesiastical province of Tuam¹⁶⁰). According to the Cardinal de Hassia, Donellan was a good friend of the emperor Leopold also¹⁶¹).

Alfons Staimos obtained rapid recognition in the imperial city and even in Germany by his exceptional talent as a controversial preacher. While still in Brünn, he had on Septuagesima Sunday 1648 resumed the Sunday sermons which in the disorders of the Thirty Years' War had been neglected for many years¹⁶²). He continued

¹⁵⁶) Dd 84.382.

¹⁵⁷) *Ibid.*, 452-454.

¹⁵⁸) *Ibid.*, 466 and 469.

¹⁵⁹) ÖNB 7372.8r.

¹⁶⁰) AV, Nunziatura di Germania 149.64r.

¹⁶¹) Dd 104.II.89v, d. 28 dec. 1668.

¹⁶²) JANETSCHKE, 268.

his preaching in the new Augustinian church of Vienna on the Landstrasse, where he was wisely chosen as primary preacher by the provincial chapter of 1649. His excellent sermons attracted in a very short time the attention of the emperor Ferdinand III who summoned him on several occasions, beginning in 1652, to the diets of Regensburg, where his sermons brought large audiences of non-Catholics to visit the Church, some of whom embraced the Catholic faith ¹⁶³). It is well to bear this in mind, and then one can more easily understand why the prior general Visconti was anxious to keep Staimos in Vienna even after the union with his native Moravia was dissolved in 1651.

And Gladich? The sources are somewhat scarce about him for the time of the provincial union, yet one essential point is clear. It seems due in great part to his dissatisfaction that the union between Austria and Moravia came to a quick end! Gladich was at this time, if the year of his birth was 1597 ¹⁶⁴), not yet an old man, but unquestionably suffered from ill health ¹⁶⁵). Further — and we suspect that this point also was decisive — he seems to have made as superior no good impression upon Donellan, who by his high connections rated as an eminence grise. More research upon this matter may shed greater light upon the reasons which led Gladich to resign as provincial, probably in late February or early March 1651 ¹⁶⁶).

§ 21. *Separation and independent development*

Even in 1650 certain signs indicated that the agreement about studies was not working out quite satisfactorily. We recall that the studies of philosophy and theology were according to the agreement of 1649 to be made in Vienna. But we must realize that the new Augustinian monastery on the Landstrasse in Vienna was by this time not

¹⁶³) Cf. GAVIGAN, *Epp.* note 113, where several letters from Regensburg of the papal nuntius Pannochieschi are cited, which express admiration and delight over Staimos's success.

¹⁶⁴) JANETSCHKE, 230, indicates this when he says that Gladich was thirty-one years of age in 1628. Yet in his earlier work, *Necrologia patrum et fratrum ord. E. calicatorum S. Augustini in Vicariatu Moraviae*, Brünn 1894, 18, he states that Gladich was sixty years old when he died on Aug. 20, 1654. In the former case, Gladich would have been fifty-four years of age in 1651, in the latter case fifty-seven.

¹⁶⁶) This follows from the date of the prior general's acceptance of his resignation, April 15; Dd 85.182rv.

yet completed ¹⁶⁷). This led to disappointments and disagreements, so that Gladich late in 1650 decided not to send his young students to Vienna but to have them instructed in Brünn itself in philosophy and theology. He therefore requested from the prior general a lector, that is a professor for the students of Brünn; is this not a sad commentary upon the incapacity in studies within the Moravian monasteries? A young Irish Augustinian, Mark Forstall, who had made his studies in Valladolid and Salamanca, was created bachelor of theology on Jan. 2, 1650, after a successful examination ¹⁶⁸). Four days later, Jan 6, Forstall received the order to proceed to Brünn as director of studies and teacher of the students there ¹⁶⁹).

This break on the question of studies was followed by a definite break, which Gladich brought about. Not only did he resign as provincial, but quite evidently he suggested at the same time the full separation of the monasteries of Austria and Moravia with the consequent dissolution of the young province. This seems clear from the words of the prior general's letter on Apr. 15, 1651, by which he formally accepted Gladich's resignation and decreed the dissolution of the province, which was wished by both parties. Here are the general's words in his register: « Since ... Georg Gladich, the prior of Brünn, has resigned as provincial, and since the religious of both Austria and Moravia request separation, we grant consent » ¹⁷⁰). In the letter which the general sent on the same day, and which was to be read first in the monastery of Vienna and then in the other Austrian monasteries, the general gave this explanation: « Georg Gladich is prevented by various forms of illness from visiting the monasteries subjected to his authority, and since other causes also exist ... he freely resigns as provincial ... We ... therefore accept his resignation, separate the provinces (!) of Austria and Moravia from each other, and restore them

¹⁶⁷) As late as Oct. 26, 1652, Staimos wrote to the prior general that it was then hoped to finish the second part of the monastery on the Landstrasse by 1653, so that all the confreres could sleep in the same section; AGR, Aa 36a.647v.

¹⁶⁸) Dd 85.144v. For a brief sketch of Forstall's career, see GAVIGAN, *De doctoribus theologiae O.S.A. in universitate vindobonensi*, in *Augustinianum* 5 (1965) 298-302. An unbelievably confused picture of this Irish bishop is given by Janetschek 289-298, who believed that Forstall was sent to Ireland in disgrace, and had no knowledge of the fact that he was made a bishop.

¹⁶⁹) Dd 85.144v-146v.

¹⁷⁰) *Ibid.*, 182r.

to their earlier condition... » ¹⁷¹). A quick end to the experiment begun in 1649! Austria returned to the condition of an independent province which it had officially won in 1646. Moravia returned to the status of an independent vicariate, which it had brought to formal recognition as early as 1611. It continued as a vicariate, made up of the two monasteries of Brünn and Gewitsch until Sept. 7, 1784, when Joseph II suppressed the monastery of Gewitsch ¹⁷²). Then the monastery of Brünn remained as the only Augustinian monastery in Moravia down to our own day. Perhaps its greatest glory is the scientist, Johann Gregor Mendel (1822-1884), who was superior here in the last years of his life, and made his famous experiments on the laws of heredity in the monastery garden ¹⁷³).

The Austrian province now made good strides. As provincial it had received by appointment of the prior general on April 15, 1651, the day of the dissolution of the Austro-Moravian province, the brilliant preacher, Alfons Staimos ¹⁷⁴). On May 21 of the same year the capable Caesarius Syrott was appointed prior of the monastery of Vienna ¹⁷⁵). Staimos received an increase in authority and prestige by his designation as visitator general on Aug. 12 of the same year ¹⁷⁶). A month later, on Sept. 18, the prior general gave Staimos permission to receive the necessary ornament of those days, the magisterium in theology, with his friend Donellan as promotor ¹⁷⁷). We hope to describe in the near future the process by which Staimos, aided by Nicholas Donellan and others, brought about in 1653 the union between the former provinces of Austria and of Styro-Carinthia under the name of the province of Austria. We reserve likewise for later publications the problems of studies in the Austrian monasteries, which we have partially treated in earlier studies ¹⁷⁸).

P. DDr. J.-J. GAVIGAN, O.S.A.

Augustinerkonvent, Wien.

¹⁷¹) *Ibid.*, 182rv; ÖNB 8466.27v.

¹⁷²) JANETSCHKE, 5.

¹⁷³) See a good life of Mendel see J.G. MEIKNECHT, *Gregor Mendel im Kloster*, in AA 29 (1966) 255-271.

¹⁷⁴) Dd 85.182rv; ÖNB 8466. 27v.

¹⁷⁵) ÖNB 8466.28v; cf. Dd. 85.195r.

¹⁷⁶) ÖNB 8466.29r.

¹⁷⁷) ÖNB 8236.41r.

¹⁷⁸) See the work cited in note 168 and *De theologiae professoribus augustinianis universitatis graecensis*, in *Augustiniana* 17 (1967) 333-388 and 18 (1968) 5-47.