The Reception and Application of the Encyclical *Pascendi*
The Reports of the Diocesan Bishops and the Superiors
of the Religious Orders until 1914

edited by Claus Arnold and Giovanni Vian

"Petrus locutus est per Pium"
The Reception of *Pascendi dominici gregis* in Austria as Reflected in Episcopal Sources (1907-1914)

Michaela Sohn-Kronthaler
(Universität Graz, Österreich)

Abstract The article examines the reception of Pope Pius X's encyclical *Pascendi* by the Austrian bishops. In the first part, the bishops' reactions to *Pascendi* will be discussed on the basis of documents of the Austrian bishops' conference. The second part shows the reaction and response of the bishops to the papal circular letter against Modernism in particular dioceses.

Keywords Austria. Cisleithanian bishops. Reception of Pascendi. Modernism.

My article examines the reception of Pope Pius X's encyclical *Pascendi* by the Austrian bishops. In the first part I will discuss the bishops' reactions to *Pascendi* on the basis of documents of the Austrian bishops' conference. In the second part I will look into the reception of the papal circular letter against modernism in particular dioceses. My main sources are the reports that were sent to Rome or their concepts; these reports were obligatory and they can be found in the archives of the Austrian dioceses and the Vatican Archives. They were either sent as *relationes* or as direct letters to the Pope.

Studi di Storia 3
DOI 10.14277/6969-130-0/StStor-3-4
ISBN [ebook] 978-88-6969-130-0 | ISBN [print] 978-88-6969-131-7

1 The Encyclical *Pascendi* as Mirrored in the Bishops' Conference

1.1 About the Austrian Bishops' Conference

The first meeting of the Austrian bishops' conference took place in Vienna between April and June of 1849.[1] This conference is one of the first episcopal associations of the nineteenth century. Another bishops' convention was held in 1856 together with the Hungarian bishops. The main purpose of this meeting was the implementation of the concordat of 1855. Since the constitutional Austro-Hungarian Compromise of 1867 the Cisleithanian bishops met in their own conferences, independent from Hungary. During the time of the Austrian Culture war the bishops gathered in Vienna at differing intervals, depending on occasion and event. It was not until the spring of 1885 that the Cisleithanian bishops decided to meet on a regular basis, namely once a year. Since then the episcopacy discussed issues in two types of meetings:

- Firstly, in plenary assemblies – the general bishops' conferences – in which all Cisleithanian bishops participated. These were all in all about 34 bishops, among them those who were uniate with Rome. From 1885 until the declaration of the first republic in 1918 eight plenary assemblies took place in Vienna (1885, 1889, 1891, 1894, 1897, 1901, 1906, 1910). For our topic of interest only the meeting of 1910 is of relevance.
- Secondly, the bishops met in conferences of the standing episcopal committee, which can be compared to the current permanent episcopal council of the bishops' conference. This committee met once a year (before 1904 also twice a year). It consisted of a smaller group of bishops, whose participants were elected at the plenary assemblies.

Minutes of the assemblies of the bishops were taken and printed privately for distribution among the bishops since 1885.

1.2 The Encyclical *Pascendi dominici gregis* as Subject of the Debates of the Episcopal Committee in Autumn of 1907

From the 12th to the 19th of November 1907, nine weeks after the publication of the encyclical *Pascendi*, the episcopal committee gathered in

1 Cf. Kronthaler, "Die Entwicklung der Österreichischen Bischofskonferenz", 33-97; Kronthaler, *Kirchen- und gesellschaftspolitische Bestrebungen*.

Vienna for its yearly meeting.[2] All members were present, among them the cardinals of Prague and Salzburg, the archbishops of Salzburg, Olmütz, Lemberg and Görz as well as bishops from different dioceses of the Cisleithanian part of the empire.

The chairman of the conference was the 87-year-old Viennese cardinal Anton Joseph Gruscha (1820-1911), who had led the archdiocese since 1890. However, his state of health was poor during his last years of life; he was almost deaf and blind. Gruscha did not receive an archbishop's coadjutor with the right of succession until January of 1910, one and a half years before his death, when Franz Xaver Nagl (1855-1913), the bishop of Triest-Koper, was appointed. Within the modernism-controversy Gruscha belonged to the integralist wing of Catholicism. As an irreconcilable opponent of the well-known byzantist and church historian Albert Ehrhard (1862-1940), who taught in Vienna from 1898 to 1902, he brought about the latter's downfall, ousting him from the theological faculty because of Ehrhard's treatise *Catholicism and the 20th century* (1902) which he wanted to put on the index of prohibited books.[3] The 'issue Ehrhard' was a prominent topic at the bishops' conference at the beginning of the twentieth century and demonstrates the bishops' different interests and schools of thought within the modernist crisis in Austria.[4] Ehrhard's biggest opponent among the colleagues of the Viennese faculty was the professor of dogmatics Ernst Commer (1847-1928), who was the integralists' spokesman.[5] Therefore, it is no coincidence that Gruscha published a letter from Pope Pius X to Commer from the 14th of June 1907 in his diocesan journal, which praised Commer's theological opinion in his publication against the Würzburg reform theologian Herman Schell.[6]

The agenda of the conference and the actual course of the meeting clearly show the emphasis placed on the issues that had to be talked about. The first item on the agenda was the jubilees in the year 1908, namely the 'Pope- and Emperor-Jubilee'. The monarch Franz Joseph I, whom the bishops were loyal to, celebrated the 60th anniversary of his ascension to the throne, whereas the Pope remembered the 50th anniversary of his priestly ordination. In this context they decided on two texts, so-called 'addresses' to the Pope and the monarch, as well as a pilgrimage to Rome.

2 As did the bishops of Gurk, Lavant/Marbug, St. Pölten, Triest-Capodistria, Trient, Königgrätz, Brünn and Seckau. *Protokoll*, 1907, 3.

3 Ehrhard, *Der Katholizismus und das zwanzigste Jahrhundert*.

4 Sohn-Kronthaler, "Österreich im Modernismusstreit".

5 Cf. Lenzenweger, "Kirchengeschichte", 100-8; Greshake, Schulte, "Dogmatische Theologie".

6 *Wiener Diöcesanblatt*, 13, 1907, 145.

In the context of the congratulations and blessings on the double golden jubilee the bishops explicitly mentioned the papal circular letter *Pascendi*.[7] They considered it as petrine and explicitly emphasized that "Peter spoke words of truth through Pius" (*Petrus locutus est per Pium*). Then they emphasized that these words proved in an enlightening way the fathers' wisdom considering the present-day progress of the sciences and culture. Linguistically they used a reference to the description of God's creation according to Genesis, the first book of the Old Testament (Gen 1:3-4): "You [the Pope] spoke and light was created, and darkness was separated from light" (*Dixisti, et facta est lux, et divisae sunt tenebrae a luce*). An address of submissiveness – if we do not consider the argumentative coherence – could not be phrased more clearly. The conclusion is obvious. Those who do not follow the encyclical oppose the papacy and the revealed faith.

Thus, the result of the second item on the agenda – the *Holy Father's encyclical on modernism* as it was called in the minutes – had already been anticipated.[8] The reason why the discussions about the encyclical were interrupted several times and took a number of days, was the debate on the new papal laws of marriage rights, the practical execution of which was considered even more important by the bishops than the papal reprimands in *Pascendi*. The minutes say literally: "Due to important reasons, the intended further debate about the papal encyclical *de Modernistarum doctrinis* is removed from the agenda".

As a reaction to the circular letter *Pascendi* that recommended numerous measures such as the maintenance of the scholastic philosophy, the removal of modernistic lecturers, a strict censorship of theological writings and the formation of a Council of Vigilance in each diocese, the episcopal committee decided to increase the hours of lectures in fundamental theology from five to nine, a part of which was dedicated to the Christian philosophy. Scholastic philosophy was supposed to be studied more extensively in the seminaries. Following the bishops' conference all age-groups of candidates for priestly ordination were supposed to read an article of the *Summa Theologica* by Thomas Aquinas for one hour on a weekly basis. Whether this decision was actually implemented in the individual seminaries has yet to be researched. Where the censorship of books had already been handled by the individual ordinaries, no new Councils of Vigilance had to be founded. If need be existing institutions were to be

7 "Adresse des österreichischen Episkopates an den Heiligen Vater Pius X.". *Wiener Diöcesanblatt*, 22, 18.09.1908, 253-5. The letter was written in November 1907, but published under the date of the 18th of September 1908 and handed over personally to the Pope by some members of the Austrian Episcopate. The "Huldigungsadresse der Bischöfe an den Kaiser" can be found in *Wiener Diöcesanblatt*, 24, 22.12.1908, 277-9, and also in *Linzer Diözesanblatt*, 54, 1908, 177-9.

8 *Protokoll*, 1907, 5-7.

extended and organized so that they were in accordance with the aim of the mentioned institutions.

Thus, most bishops fell back on the institutes of censorship which already existed in their dioceses or else established a Council of Vigilance according to the regulations in *Pascendi*. In the second part of this paper I will briefly describe specific examples of individual dioceses.

At the bishops' conference the proposal was made – the name of the bishop is not mentioned – to address a collective pastoral letter on modernism to all the faithful. However, the minutes show that the episcopal committee could not agree on that proposal, even if this would have correlated with the "Holy Father's intentions", as it is said in the minutes. The decision to write such a letter was therefore left to the individual ordinaries.

While the encyclical *Pascendi* was published reliably and completely by all bishops in their diocesan gazettes, I could not find a single pastoral letter that explicitly dealt with modernism. Therefore, I have reviewed the pastoral letters of the following years of all dioceses that are located in the territory of today's Austria.

In their pastoral letters of 1908 the bishops concentrated on the Pope's and emperor's jubilees. Only bishop Kahn from Gurk, who was also a member of the episcopal committee, briefly mentioned 'modernism' in addition to the two important jubilees in his pastoral letter from the 15th of August 1908. He mentioned that "in the last few years dangerous deviations, at least dangerous intentions" had become obvious, which can be summarized by the "foreign word modernism".[9] He defined it as "a new direction of time concerning the holy church and its teachings and concerning the arising circles of thought, which cannot be aligned with the teachings of the holy apostles and church fathers".[10] In the first place, however, Kahn complained about modernism in ecclesiastical art, architecture and style of new churches, "which are more similar to saloons than churches".[11] The bishop of Gurk referred to the Pope as highest pastor of the church and reminded the faithful of his infallibility in issues of faith and morals. He thereby used the old manner of speaking *Roma locuta, causa finita*.

A single vague phrase can be found in the pastoral letter in Lent by the archbishop of Salzburg cardinal Katschthaler in 1908, namely that the Pope had received the order from Christ to give regulations for the purity of the holy faith and of morals, in order to, as a good shepherd, restrain the believers with his restrictions and bans "from such pasture grounds"

9 Kahn, "Hirtenbrief".

10 Kahn, "Hirtenbrief", 53.

11 Kahn, "Hirtenbrief", 54.

"where there are poisonous plants".[12] The pastoral letter by the Vienna cardinal Gruscha in Lent from the year 1909 reminds his parish that the Catholics own "the true Christ and the true Christianity", that our faith cannot be confused "with the modern spirit of the time" and should not be attached to "a so-called modern Christianity, and a so-called modern Christ".[13] In his pastoral letter from 1908 bishop Schuster from Seckau indeed talked about disbelief, error and the enemies of truth as well as prosecution of the church.[14] However, he did not explicitly mention modernism with so much as a single word; neither did the Viennese cardinal, nor the bishops from Linz and St. Pölten.[15]

Another decision that was made at the bishops' conference in November 1907 was to thank the Pope for the encyclical via telegram, which was directed at the Cardinal Secretary of State, and to assure the spiritual head of the Catholic Church "that the Austrian episcopate will willingly carry out the given instructions".[16] The proposal made by an anonymous member of the committee was "immediately executed". Pius X responded with a thankful telegram, where he praised the gathered bishops' willingness to execute the instructions against modernism in his encyclical.[17] In accordance with the bishops' wishes the papal response was published in the morning papers of the two catholic newspapers *Vaterland* and *Reichspost*.

1.3 Condemnation of Modernism at the Bishops' Convention in 1910

In November 1910 the general bishops' conference dealt with modernism and the anti-modernist oath, which was introduced on the 1st of September 1910 and had to be taken before accepting an ecclesiastical office.[18]

12 Archiv der Erzdiözese Salzburg, Hirtenbriefe Feb. Johannes Katschthaler, 1900-1914, Fastenhirtenbrief of 2 February 1908, 9 (offprint).

13 Gruscha, Anton Josef. "Hirtenbrief vom 6. Fastensonntag". *Wiener Diöcesanblatt*, 3, 12.02.1909, 25-7: 26.

14 Schuster, "Hirtenschreiben über die Verfolgungen der Kirche".

15 The papers from the archive in Brixen, where the local bishop was responsible for the part of northern Tyrol, were unfortunately not accessible.

16 *Protokoll*, 1907, 7. The letter to the Cardinal Secretary of State, signed by Gruscha, can be found as Annex III of the „Protokoll des bischöflichen Komitees", *Protokoll*, 1907, 13.

17 *Protokoll*, 1907, 8. The reply by Cardinal Secretary of State Merry del Val is printed in *Protokoll*, 1907, 13.

18 The anti-modernist oath, which was an extensive item on the agenda, cannot be further considered in this paper. Cf. Kronthaler, *Kirchen- und gesellschaftspolitische Bestrebungen sowie pastorale Bemühungen der Österreichischen Bischofskonferenzen 1848-1918*, 609-15; Liebmann, "Die Theologische Fakultät"; Schachmayr, "Die Rezeption des Antimodernisteneides"; Arnold, "Antimodernismus und römisches Lehramt", 81-2.

In three writings the bishops' conference condemned modernism: in an address of homage to the Pope, in a pastoral writing to the clergy and a pastoral letter to the believers. In the address of homage to the Pope the entire episcopate expressed its "admiration" for the measures against modernism that were taken by the Pope.[19]

The pastoral letter addressed to the clergy that was decided upon in that bishops' conference in 1910 "warned of the errors of the era, especially the errors of modernists whose meaningless talk was condemned by the gloriously reigning Pope Pius X numerous times". The modernists were called "false prophets" and "ferocious wolves in sheep's clothing". Within the walls of the church there is a fight against modernists, "outside the walls against rationalism, materialism, and anarchism". They would deny the fundamental truths of faith such as revelation, creation, redemption, and the historical existence of Jesus Christ. The priests were called on to "cooperate" with the Pope and to renew "us and our flock" in Christ.[20]

In the pastoral letter to the faithful, which was published in all diocesan papers, the bishops warned against the contemporary errors and dangers and urged the execution of the Christian virtues.[21] The spiritual leaders considered the "disordered seeking and striving for independence" as one of the "main evils of the era", which would also lead to contempt and degradation of the ecclesiastical authorities that were appointed by God. The bishops explicitly named "the modernists, who pervade the Catholic teachings of faith and morals with the ideas of unbelieving philosophies of false wisdom of the world, and try to alter and change it until it is unrecognizable. They do not just want to weaken the demands of a life of faith, but also to shake off the dependence on ecclesiastical authority as an uncomfortable oppression of human freedom". Modernism was called a "great religious force of destruction" of the era; it was said to cause "unmeasurable devastation in faith and morals". The bishops could state that in Austria only a few Catholics had fallen victim to modernism, which was, however, promoted by the institutions of science.[22] Modernism was defined as the "embodiment of all heresies". The believers were asked according to the teachings in the bible

19 *Protokoll*, 1910, 7-74. The reply by Pope Pius X was published in *Wiener Diözesanblatt*, 2, 25.1.1911, 13-4.

20 The pastoral letter to the clergy ("Pastorale an den Klerus") was written in Latin, it dates from the 16th of November 1910 and was signed by all bishops. Printed as document no. XXXIX in: *Protokoll*, 1910, 74-81. The pastoral letter was published in the official gazettes of the dioceses, as in *Kirchliches Verordnungs-Blatt für die Diözese Seckau*, 31.10.1910, 10, 121-8; *Wiener Diözesanblatt*, 24, 24.12.1910, 271-9.

21 The pastoral letter to the faithful dates from the 17th of November 1910 and is printed as document no. XL in: *Protokoll*, 1910, 81-7; *Kirchliches Verordnungs-Blatt für die Diözese Seckau*, 1, 2.02.1911, 1-10; *Wiener Diözesanblatt*, 1, 12.1.1911, 1-9.

22 *Kirchliches Verordnungs-Blatt für die Diözese Seckau*, 1, 2.02.1911, 7.

in Eph 6:13 and 1 Kor 16:13 to put on the "full armor of god", to be watchful, to stand their ground in faith and take care of a "thorough education in the Christian truths of faith and teachings of morals".

2 About the Implementation of *Pascendi* in the Austrian Dioceses

Only a few sources about the reception of the encyclical can be found in the archives of the Austrian dioceses and the Vatican for the timespan of interest – from the publication of *Pascendi* until 1914. The diocese of Linz is documented the best.

2.1 Diocese of Linz

The diocese of Linz was at that time (1907-1914) led by two bishops, Franz Martin Doppelbauer (1889-1908) and Rudolph Hittmair (1909-1915). Doppelbauer stated in his introductory remarks in the diocesan paper, where *Pascendi* had already been published in 1907, that in his bishopric "thank God modernism which was stigmatized by the Holy Father, had not yet fallen on fertile ground".[23] However, the bishop had since his ordination worked "as a pioneer of integralism" and had opposed so-called modernistic tendencies not just in theology and church, but also in public life. He was also an opponent of the Christian-social party and forbade their newspaper Reichspost "in his seminary".[24]

At the beginning of his episcopate Doppelbauer immediately demanded censorship for the *Theologisch-praktische Quartalschrift* (*Theological-practical Quarterly Papers*). This periodical had been published in Linz by the professors of the theological educational institution of the diocese since 1893. In 1893 Doppelbauer induced the end of the collaboration of the dedicated Christian-social politician, priest and professor Josef Scheicher (1842-1924), who was in charge of the journal's section *Course of Time (Zeitläufe)*. According to Doppelbauer, Scheicher had undermined "the bishop's authority" several times in his column. His resignation from the editorial office even caused a stir in the press, since Scheicher had many supporters especially among the young priests.[25] As is well-known, Scheicher was accused of modernist tendencies and reported to the Vati-

23 *Linzer Diözesanblatt*, 53, 1907, 129-60.

24 Zinnhobler, "Die Modernismuskrise", 84.

25 Zinnhobler, "Die Modernismuskrise", 85-8.

can Index Congregation; he was censured in 1904.[26] Deserving of brief mention is the Dominican Father Albert Maria Weiß (1844-1925)[27] who also used the quarterly papers for his fights against modernism for almost two decades and was supported by Doppelbauer.[28] The conflict between Albert Ehrhard and his opponents also took place in this periodical. Professors of theology in Linz encouraged the Viennese cardinal Gruscha's negative opinion about Ehrhard, whose rejection of *Pascendi* caused the Pope to deprive him of his title of prelate in 1908.[29]

A victim of the fights against modernism in Linz was the priest Karl Fruhstorfer (1875-1956). He was by all means loyal to the church but was suspected to be a 'modernist' by bishop Doppelbauer because he included the modern Protestant exegesis in his lectures. While sitting at a lunch at the seminary the bishop said to Fruhstorfer without previous notice: "Professor, you will not be here next year". As a reaction Fruhstorfer left the table without a greeting and became chaplain in a small parish. After he had distanced himself in August 1908 in the periodical *The Catholic* from Thaddäus Engert (1875-1945),[30] an exegete who was accused of modernism and who was completely dedicated to the historical-critical method and had therefore been excommunicated in 1908, Fruhstorfer was reinstated as a professor by Doppelbauer.[31]

There are no reports from Doppelbauer to be found about the implementation of *Pascendi*, but there are two by his successor Hittmair. In the first report to Pius X of the end of January 1910 the bishop mentioned that in his diocese all orders of the encyclical *Pascendi* had been executed.[32] Thus, censors had been named and once every two months the *Concilium vigilantiae* met, but had only minor issues such as devotions to discuss. Only a single case was reported by the bishop: the Council of Vigilance had to act against an unnamed priest in a stricter way because he had written a problematic booklet about the Virgin Mary. It had been, however, published outside of the diocese. This priest had commendably accepted the regulations of the ordinary and the Council of Vigilance.

26 Schepers, "Dokumentation der römischen Zensurverfahren", 614-8.

27 Landersdorfer, "Albert Maria Weiß OP"; Weiß, *Modernismus und Antimodernismus*, 134-215.

28 Zinnhobler, "Die Modernismuskrise", 90-1.

29 Zinnhobler, "Die Modernismuskrise", 91-3.

30 Hausberger, *Thaddäus Engert*.

31 Zinnhobler, "Die Modernismuskrise", 94-5.

32 Diözesanarchiv Linz, CA/8, Sch. 3, Fasz. I/2a: Relatio vom 29.01.1910. I am grateful to Monika Würthinger for the information. This report could not be found in the ACDF or the ASV.

Almost two years later, on the 7th of December 1911, Hittmair sent another report to the Pope.[33] According to the regulations of *Pascendi,* he described the teachings of the theological educational institutions of the diocese as well as the composition of the seminary. He emphasized the existence of a special chair for scholastic philosophy, where the teachings were in the spirit of Thomas Aquinas. All eight professors of theology had taken the anti-modernist oath. Not a single one of the professors had been suspected of modernism. The alumni were conscientiously instructed and monitored, either by the bishop himself or by an appointed commissioner. There was a second theological educational institution led by the Augustinian canons of the monastery St. Florian. The provost was a member of the Council of Vigilance. The professors were immune against modernist tendencies. Three more secular priests were studying in Innsbruck, but nothing negative concerning faith, morals or discipline was known about them.

Due to the vacancy of the episcopate there had been interruptions in the meetings of the Council of Vigilance; until then 13 meetings had been held and recorded. One case caused a stir in public, but was probably forgotten soon afterwards. A religious had made an "arrogant and stupid" statement in a liberal newspaper against the anti-modernist oath. The priest was reprimanded by the bishop and by the provost of St. Florian with success and admitted his mistake. He reconciled again with the church. The anti-modernist oath was taken by all secular and religious priests that were under obligation to do so.

In his response letter from the 20th of December 1911 Pius X praised the anti-modernistic measures taken by the diocese of Linz and bishop Hittmair's pastoral enthusiasm. He also expressed the greater hope "that your priests and people turn far away from the plague of modernism and gradually also those, who diverged from the path, will return to the modest lifestyle".[34]

In a report from the year 1913 Hittmair answered questions about modernism and the "reception of Pascendi" according to the scheme that was published in 1910 by the Sacred Consistorial Congregation.[35] He stated that "no one among the clergy is affiliated with the misbelief or sects. In fact many Catholics are neither good nor bad nor enemies of the Catholic church". In one parish there would be a few members of the sect of the Mormons, in two or three parishes in the mountains there would be some belief in superhuman phenomena (*Spiritism*). Since the Council of Vigilance had had no cases to discuss lately, the meetings were ended.

33 ASV, *Congr. Concist., Relat. Dioec.* 446, prot. 1732/11.

34 *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 4, 1912, 269; German translation in Zinnhobler, "Die Modernismuskrise", 109.

35 Diözesanarchiv Linz, CA/8, Sch. 8, Fasz. II/1: Relatio vom 20.03.1913.

2.2 Diocese of Seckau

For the diocese of Seckau bishop Leopold Schuster (1842-1927) approached Pius X on the 24th of September 1908.[36] He could not find any supporters of modernism in the ecclesiastical institutions and seminaries, but among the laity. He was of the opinion that the leaders of the "choir of modernists" were the lay professors at the universities, especially the professors of philosophy and medicine. Since they were appointed by the government, they had full freedom in their teaching and research. Very often they would ridicule religion or the Catholic Church, would not care about ecclesiastical teachings and would not follow reprimands by the church.

Another group that was suspected to include modernists by bishop Schuster was the "political parties". He explicitly mentioned the Christian-social party which due to indifference now also accepted Protestants, Old Catholics and members of Christian sects. The young priests were easily attracted to the Christian-socials. The party would to some extent confuse religious Catholics and weaken their readiness for the religion. *Pascendi* was received with joy in his diocese and the recommended tasks had been carried out. On the 30th of March 1908 Schuster had installed the Council of Vigilance which consisted of 9 priests (7 secular priests and 2 religious priests). An institute of censorship had been constituted on the 3rd of April 1908 and consisted of 14 secular and religious priests. Additionally, all books were reviewed according to *Pascendi*, a special censor for the Catholic newspapers was appointed. However, the heretics', nonbelievers' and 'Jewish' newspapers would flood the region because they were not prohibited by law.

In bishop Schuster's papers an additional concept for a report from 1913 could be found which dealt with the years 1908 until 1912. He reported again that the clergy of the diocese was not affected by modernism.[37] Referring to the scheme of the Sacred Consistorial Congregation the bishop reported on the composition of the Council of Vigilance as well as the institute of censorship, the members of which thoroughly and accurately fulfilled their duties.

36 ASV, *Segr. Stato*, 1908, rubr. 82, fasc. 8, ff. 44*r*-49*v*.

37 Diözesanarchiv Graz, *Nachlass Fürstbischof* Schuster, Heft 104, Relationes quinquennales 1908-1917, Relatio de statu ecclesiae Seccoviensis in quinquennio praeterito 1908-1912, 5.08.1913, 5.

2.3 Archdiocese of Salzburg

There are only a few sources for the archdiocese of Salzburg. On the suggestion of cardinal Katschthaler the theological faculty had directed a writing at the Pope on the 8th of December 1907 to congratulate him on the golden jubilee and to thank him for *Pascendi* as well as to emphasize its obedience to the Apostolic See.[38] In spring of 1908 a recommendation for the *Catechism about Modernism* (1908) by the French theologian Jean-Baptiste Lémius (1851-1938),[39] which was recommended for the educated laity for a better understanding of *Pascendi* and which should be used for the teaching of Christians, can be found in the gazette of the archdiocese.[40]

Moreover, a concept of a report for Salzburg from 1913 can be found. In the report the cardinal emphasized that neither in the Catholic people nor in the clergy grave errors against faith had spread. He named the members of the institute of censorship and Council of Vigilance and mentioned that they thoroughly fulfilled their duties.[41]

2.4 Diocese of Lavant

There is a very detailed report to Rome from the 15th of November 1908 by the Bishop of Lavant, Michael Napotnik (1850-1922), on the implementation of *Pascendi*. He also mentions publishing the papal circular in the paper of his diocese,[42] so that it would be read by all his priests repeatedly and "the clergy would contemplate whether anything in their thinking, feeling, writing or acting would need to be reconsidered or corrected, according to these norms […] and, if necessary, they would make adjustments". For the implementation of the encyclical, Napotnik invited *testes synodales* (synodal witnesses) to an extraordinary meeting in his episcopal buildings in the following spring (1908).The dean of the cathedral chapter, Johann Mlakar, interpreted, in presence of the bishop, the didactic and critical part of the encyclical. In his 24 pages *Relatio* to the Apostolic See the bishop complained that he had actually found occasional

38 *Verordnungsblatt für die Erzdiözese* Salzburg, 3, 5.3.1908, 262-3.

39 He was the brother of Joseph-Pierre Lémius (1860-1923), who was the chief author of *Pascendi*. Cf. Wolf, *Prosopographie von römischer Inquisition*, 858-9. Arnold, "P. Joseph Lemius OMI".

40 *Verordnungsblatt für die Erzdiözese* Salzburg, 4, 28.3.1908, 292.

41 Archiv der Erzdiözese Salzburg, 20/73, *Konsistorial-Rats- und Kanzelordnung 1921-1933*, Ad limina Besuche Rom, Berichte 1918, 1906, 1907, 1913.

42 *Kirchliches Verordnungs-Blatt für die Lavanter Diözese/Cerkveni zaukaznik za Lavantinsko škofijo*, 1907, 11, 121-40.

errors in written entries and papers of his diocese, which were not "dissimilar" to the views of the Modernists. However, he could not find a single priest who would have publicly followed the teachings of the Modernists in his diocese. Napotnik elaborated on the fact that, as requested, he had implemented all the papal regulations against Modernism in his diocese during the past few years. To his knowledge, neither the priests, nor teachers or educators of the young generation had veered away from these regulations. Also the bishop of Lavant established the Episcopal Institute of Censorship and the Council of Vigilance as stipulated in *Pascendi*; the latter was presided by the Dean of the Cathedral Chapter, Johann Mlakar.

3 Concluding Remark

Neither in the Vatican Archives nor in the archives of the respective local churches any reports about the reception of *Pascendi* can be found for the other dioceses in the region of nowadays Austria, namely Vienna, St. Pölten and Gurk. The reason of the absence of reports for Vienna could be, on the one hand, cardinal Gruscha's poor health; he died when he was ninety years old in 1911. On the other hand, his successor cardinal Nagl led the archdioceses only for two years (1911-1913) himself.

Bibliography

Arnold, Claus. "P. Joseph Lemius OMI und die Entstehung der Enzyklika 'Pascendi'". Fleckenstein, Gisela; Klöcker, Michael; Schloßmacher, Norbert (Hrsgg.), *Kirchengeschichte. Alte und neue Wege. Festschrift für Christoph Weber*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2008, 299-320.

Arnold, Claus. "Antimodernismus und römisches Lehramt". Bucher, Rainer; Heil, Christoph; Larcher, Gerhard; Sohn-Kronthaler, Michaela (Hrsgg.), *'Blick zurück im Zorn?' Kreative Potentiale des Modernismusstreits*. Innsbruck; Wien: Tyrolia 2009, 61-84.

Ehrhard, Albert. *Der Katholizismus und das zwanzigste Jahrhundert im Lichte der kirchlichen Entwicklung der Neuzeit*. Stuttgart; Wien: Roth**,** 1902.

Greshake, Gisbert; Schulte, Raphael. "Dogmatische Theologie und Dogmengeschichte". Suttner, Ernst Christoph (Hrsg.), *Die Kath.-Theologische Fakultät der Universität Wien 1884-1984. Festschrift zum 600-Jahr-Jubiläum*. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1984, 157-73.

Hausberger, Karl. *Thaddäus Engert 1875-1945. Leben und Streben eines deutschen 'Modernisten'*. Regensburg: Pustet, 1996.

Kahn, Josef. "Hirtenbrief". *Kirchliches Verordnungsblatt für die Diözese Gurk*, 4, 15.08.1908, 49-54.

Kronthaler, Michaela. "Die Entwicklung der Österreichischen Bischofskonferenz. Von den ersten gesamtbischöflichen Beratungen 1849 bis zum Ende des Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzils". Sekretariat der Österreichischen Bischofskonferenz (Hrsg.), *Festschrift 150 Jahre Österreichische Bischofskonferenz 1849-1999*. Wien: Selbstverlag, 1999, 33-97.

Kronthaler, Michaela. *Kirchen- und gesellschaftspolitische Bestrebungen sowie pastorale Bemühungen der Österreichischen Bischofskonferenzen 1848-1918. Studie zur Geschichte der Katholischen Kirche Mittel-, Ost- und Südeuropas anhand der Akten der Österreichischen Bischofskonferenzen* [Habilitationsschrift]. 2001.

Landersdorfer, Anton. "Albert Maria Weiß OP (1844-1925). Ein leidenschaftlicher Kämpfer wider den Modernismus". Wolf, Hubert (Hrsg.), *Antimodernismus und Modernismus in der katholischen Kirche. Beiträge zum theologiegeschichtlichen Vorfeld des II. Vatikanischen Konzils*. Paderborn [u.a.]: Schöningh, 1998, 195-216.

Lenzenweger, Josef. "Kirchengeschichte". Suttner, Ernst Christoph (Hrsg.), *Die Kath.-Theologische Fakultät der Universität Wien 1884-1984. Festschrift zum 600-Jahr-Jubiläum*. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1984, 97-117.

Liebmann, Maximilian. "Die Theologische Fakultät im Spannungsfeld von Universität, Kirche und Staat von 1827 bis zur Gegenwart". Freisitzer, Kurt; Höflechner, Walter; Holzer, Hans-Ludwig; Mantl, Wolfgang

(Hrsgg.), *Tradition und Herausforderung. 400 Jahre Universität Graz*. Graz: Styria, 1985, 156-85.

Protokoll der XXXIX. Konferenz des bischöflichen Komitees in Wien vom 12.-19. November 1907. Olmütz, 1907.

Protokoll der bischöflichen Versammlung 8.-17. November 1910, 1910.

Schachmayr, Alkuin. "Die Rezeption des Antimodernisteneides in Wien". *Forum Katholische Theologie: Vierteljahresschrift für das Gesamtgebiet der Katholischen Theologie*, 28, 2012, 33-49.

Schepers, Judith. "Dokumentation der römischen Zensurverfahren gegen deutschsprachige Publikationen (1893-1922)". Wolf, Hubert; Schepers, Judith (Hrsgg.), *'In wilder zügelloser Jagd nach Neuem'. 100 Jahre Modernismus und Antimodernismus in der katholischen Kirche*. Paderborn: Schöningh, 2009, 625-63.

Schuster, Leopold. "Hirtenschreiben über die Verfolgungen der Kirche". *Kirchliches Verordnungs-Blatt für die Seckauer Diözese*, 1, 1908, 1-12.

Sohn-Kronthaler, Michaela. "Österreich im Modernismusstreit. Die Causa Albert Ehrhard und die Österreichische Bischofskonferenz". Bucher, Rainer; Heil, Christoph; Larcher, Gerhard; Sohn-Kronthaler, Michaela (Hrsgg.), *'Blick zurück im Zorn?' Kreative Potentiale des Modernismusstreits*. Innsbruck; Wien: Tyrolia 2009, 131-53.

Weiß, Otto. *Modernismus und Antimodernismus im Dominikanerorden. Zugleich ein Beitrag zum 'Sodalitium Pianum'*. Regensburg: Pustet, 1998.

Wolf, Hubert (ed.). *Prosopographie von römischer Inquisition und Indexkongregation 1814-1917*. Paderborn: Schöningh, 2005.

Zinnhobler, Rudolf. "Die Modernismuskrise in Oberösterreich". Zinnhobler, Rudolf, *Der lange Weg der Kirche vom Ersten zum Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzil. Beiträge zu Bewegungen und Ereignissen in der katholischen Kirche*. Linz: Wagner, 2005, 77-109.