

The relationship between religious and state press censorship in the Enlightenment-era Kingdom of Hungary

DÖBÖR ANDRÁS

PhD, Dean, assoc. prof., Univ. of Szeged, Juhász Gyula Faculty of Education

E-mail: dobor.andras@szte.hu

Abstract (*The relationship between religious and state press censorship in the Enlightenment-era Kingdom of Hungary*) In my study, I briefly summarize the process, as a result of which church press censorship in the Kingdom of Hungary from the 16th century was transformed into state censorship in the 18th century. Censorship, by controlling the content of written works appearing in print, served the purposes of enlightenment, enlightened absolutism instead of religion, and protected the interests of the ruler who controlled the absolutist state. After the definition of censorship and its historical antecedents in Europe, I present its beginnings in Hungary, during which the Catholic Church and the Protestants exercised control, and the rulers and the parliament fighting for orderly rights tried to create decrees to limit the operation of the press. By the end of the 17th century, overlapping jurisdictions created confusing conditions. Finally, I present the press policy of the enlightened absolutism that abolished church censorship, Maria Theresa's and Joseph II's decrees, which opened a new era in Hungarian press history.

Keywords press history; church censorship; state censorship; Kingdom of Hungary; enlightenment; enlightened absolutism

Rezumat (*Relația dintre cenzura presei religioase și cea de stat în Regatul Ungariei din epoca iluministă*)

În studiul meu, am rezumat pe scurt procesul în urma căruia cenzura presei bisericești din Regatul Ungariei din secolul al XVI-lea a fost transformată în cenzură de stat în secolul al XVIII-lea. Cenzura, prin controlul conținutului operelor scrise care apar în presa scrisă, servea scopurilor iluminismului, iluminând absolutismul în locul religiei și protejând interesele domnitorului care controla statul absolutist. După definirea cenzurii și a antecedentelor istorice ale acesteia în Europa, prezint începuturile sale în Ungaria, în timpul căreia Biserica Catolică și protestanții au exercitat controlul, iar domnitorii și parlamentul care luptau pentru drepturi ordonate au încercat să creeze decrete pentru a limita funcționarea presei. La sfârșitul secolului al XVII-lea, suprapunerea jurisdicțiilor a creat condiții confuze. În cele din urmă, prezint politica de presă a absolutismului luminat care a abolit cenzura bisericească, cea a Mariei Theresia și a lui Iosif al II-lea, care a deschis o nouă eră în istoria presei maghiare.

Cuvinte cheie storia presei; cenzura bisericească; cenzura de stat; Regatul Ungariei; iluminism; absolutism luminat

Definition and historical background of press censorship

Before we attempt to briefly summarize in this study everything that is worth knowing about press censorship of the church, and in the era of enlightened absolutism that replaced it in Hungary, and its process, it is important to clarify

the meaning of the word and its main categories. Among the many definitions of the word censorship, let us quote the one that most generally, yet most concisely reflects the meaning of the word: “Censorship is the judgement of works in manuscript or print from a principled point of view.”¹

There are two types of censorship, the application of which usually occurs together in the periods we are examining. One is prior censorship, the purpose of which is to prevent the publication of texts deemed harmful. The second type is post-publication censorship, which confiscates, bans, restricts, or destroys publications deemed dangerous to the state, the church, or the existing social, political, or religious elite after their publication. In the examined eras, the censors were usually royal officials, priests, university professors, scientists, and artists, who were carefully selected through competitive examination, highly educated and skilled in languages, who were bound by their oath of office to observe the rules of office. The censor office gave rank, respect, and some level of power. The basic categories of censorship were the formulas of judgment issued by the censors for different works, which, of course, changed constantly from one period to the next.²

Traders and publishers who got lost in the labyrinths of censorship had to adapt to a complicated, often difficult to interpret, subjective system of rules, which, moreover, changed a lot during its history. The existence of censorship was insignificant until it was made necessary by the widespread appearance of the readership that emerged as a result of the religious debates of Catholicism and the Reformation, the development of the bourgeoisie, and the emergence of the press as a medium with a large circulation. In the long period after the appearance of the Reformation, the purpose of book reviewing, which developed everywhere in Europe, was primarily to ensure the privilege of the dominant religion of the given state over other religions. In the Habsburg Empire, the dominant religion was Catholic, and it used its privilege to suppress Protestant doctrines.³

Of course, it was not only the Catholic Habsburg government that used censorship to protect the state religion, closing off their people from other religions and freer foreign ideas. There was state censorship in almost every country of Europe, in some Protestant countries, it was even stricter than in the Habsburg Empire.⁴

The reformers were the first to notice the possibilities inherent in printing and, taking advantage of the developing power of the public, they tried to put their principles into circulation and spread them widely through the press, thus increasing the importance of the new medium. Among other options, secular and ecclesiastical powers opposed to the spread of the Reformation had to make the press harmless at all costs, so they resorted to the tool of censorship. During the time of Pope Paul III (1534-49), the renewal of the Catholic Church and the fight against the Reformation began. In 1536, the Pope issued a bull convening the council meeting according to the old order, instead of the free council advocated by the Protestants. Finally, the council could only be opened on December 13, 1545, in the city of Trent, and proceeded rather haltingly for 18 years, passing

decisions on dogmatic resolutions about the doctrines attacked by Protestants, and also making reform provisions to end abuses.⁵

An important decision related to the scope of the development of censorship, which was later confirmed by the council, was the revival of the institution of the Inquisition, i.e., the *Sanctum officium*, whose aim was to eradicate the spirit of the Reformation and the spread of heresies of all kinds with the full support of the secular authorities. As early as 1543, only those books that had been previously approved by the Holy Office could be printed, and with this, the basis of religious censorship was born. The Inquisition was assisted in this plan by the *Index librorum prohibitorum*, a list of forbidden books first published in 1559 by Pope Paul IV (1555-1559), and later confirmed by Pius IV. The decisions of the Council of Trent were finally signed by 255 bishops, and Pope Pius IV confirmed them with a bull in 1564.⁶

In the course of enforcing the decrees, it was common for commissioners to confiscate Lutheran documents and books from citizens, which were later publicly burned in the markets. However, the persecution of Protestants and their press products was to no avail. The book printers, in the name of the Reformed and Lutheran spirit, set out wandering both abroad, and in our country, creating the so-called roving printing houses to circumvent the authorities' ban.⁷

The beginnings of book and press censorship in Hungary

In Hungary, King Louis II of Hungary implemented the anti-Lutheran laws of 1523 and 1525 of the “national party” majority parliament, which wanted to reduce foreign influence and elect a Hungarian king after the king's death, and acted in several decrees against documents spreading Lutheran ideas. On March 9, 1524, he ordered the city council of Nagyszében (Sibiu) to search for and burn Luther's writings in the places under their authority, and to make it public knowledge that it is forbidden to sell, buy, read, and comment on them under the burden of forfeiture of property.⁸

The orders of King Louis II with similar content for the town councils of Sopron⁹ and Bártfa¹⁰ have also survived.¹¹ In Sopron, the royal order also led to the burning of books, as the account of the town chamberlain shows: “Anno 1525, Montag nach dem Neujahr, dem Zuchtinger (Henker) dass er dye Lutherischen Puecher verprendt hat.”¹²

In our country, after the defeat in Mohács, during the period of the decline of the central power, Protestantism spread rapidly. A significant proportion of the nobility and the common people identified with the credos of the Reformation, so the works of Protestant writers played an increasingly important role in the lives of the literate classes, even at court. The fact that two archbishops and five bishops fell at Mohács also played a role, as their places were not filled by the warring kings, but their goods were pledged to lords, and these lords were not infrequently of Lutheran sentiment.¹³

However, both the ‘pro-German’ King Ferdinand, and the ‘pro-nationalist’ King John Szapolyai continued the ‘press policy’ of their predecessor, insofar as

they continued to persecute Protestant literature with their orders. Moreover, Ferdinand also warned his sister, the widowed Queen Mary, so that she and her entourage would not appear in Lutheran colours, and on August 20, 1527, he issued a decree against the reformers, which every priest had to read at Christmas and Easter for the next 10 years. This is the first such decree in the history of Hungarian censorship, which was not limited to one place, to a territorially limited authority, but aimed at national and permanent protection against the spread of Protestant literature and ideas.¹⁴

In 1553, at the Diet of Sopron, King Ferdinand reprimanded the Hungarian orders for the increasing number of books spreading false doctrines in the country. Ferdinand called on them to destroy such books without delay, but the orders, in a resolution which was included in the articles of law, denied the above accusations: “And since his Majesty has also mentioned the publication and printing of erroneous books, the faculties and orders could not do anything on their part in this matter, because they have no knowledge that there are any such books anywhere in their lying estates.”¹⁵ In other words, the parliament took under its protection the products of the Protestant press.¹⁶

In the territory of the Kingdom of Hungary, printing presses were under Protestant influence. Censorship in this period was represented by the royal power of Ferdinand and the Counter-Reformation, without the knowledge and consent of the parliament.

Maximilian II (1564-1576) allowed the establishment of a Lutheran printing house in Austria as a sign of religious tolerance. On February 7, 1574, however, he issued a decree¹⁷ addressed to the master porter László Bánffy and to Miklós Bánffy, the head cupbearer, and the Lord Lieutenant of Zala county, because a certain Rudolf Hofhalter, a printer promoting doctrines of Arianism, expelled from Transylvania by prince István Báthory, had printed heretical books in their printing house in Alsólendva.¹⁸

The importance of the decree lies in the fact that it stated that no one could print theological works without the prior approval of the Emperor. “...therefore, we strictly command you not to tolerate the said anti-Trinitarian printer in your possessions and goods, but to remove them immediately after receiving our present document. As for the printing press, as in our other countries and provinces, no one may print and publish a theological book without our special privilege and permission ... and next year be very careful not to print anything that has not first been submitted to our inspection and the publication and distribution of which we have not approved.”¹⁹

With this measure, he almost adopted the practice of prior censorship, and then permission to print theological works had to be requested from the monarch himself. The question was who was responsible for control and punishment under this system. According to Ballagi, the king entrusted the territorially competent bishop with supervision and possible punishment, since László Bánffy, who responded to his decree, denied that heretical books had been printed on his property with his knowledge, and indicated that punishment was the task of the bishop.²⁰ Shermann, however, says that this cannot be established based on the

sources, since it is not clear whether the bishop only investigates and punishes as the king's agent, or by virtue of his own office.²¹

During the reign of Rudolf II, the Counter-Reformation changed its tactics and fought the Reformation through the press. In 1577, Grand Provost of Esztergom, Miklós Telegdi established a printing press in Nagyszombat. The fight in the press between the two denominations then escalated. The name of Rudolf II is also significant in the history of censorship because he ordered the closure of printing presses that did not have royal privileges. His decree of 1584, according to which the licensing of book printers is a royal right, was not recognized by the Hungarian legislature, as it could not be proved on the basis of the *Corpus Juris*.²²

The Parliament reserved the right to take measures regarding the press. This is proven by the already mentioned 1553: XXIV. article of law, as well as the 1588: XXVIII. article of law passed on January 8, 1588, which provided for the abolition of the old calendars and prohibited their use,²³ as well as the 1599: XLV. article of law, which imposed penalties on those who neglected to use the new calendar in the name of the church and the king.²⁴ "And those towns and lords of the manor who dare to disobey this common law, and who are caught in the act of printing or using this calendar, His Majesty shall punish and fine them with the same thousand forints whenever they are found in defiance."²⁵

Thus, Rudolf made the licensing of book printers a royal right and privilege by means of a decree, but as we have seen it, its enforcement was doubtful. Moreover, Rudolf's actual power did not extend to the entire territory of the country. Later, in the Diet of 1830, the orders also refer to these laws when they protest against the arbitrary provisions made by the government to the detriment of the 'freedom of the press' in their proposals. It is true that in the time that had passed until then, the Hungarian Parliament had not paid much attention to the regulation of the press and the illegal royal decrees that were issued from time to time. In the course of the 17th century, only the Diet of Beszterce in 1620 decreed that priests belonging to any religious denomination that defame one of the three legal denominations (Catholic, Evangelical, Calvinist) verbally or in writing, were to lose their possessions and be exiled. However, we know of the Diet of Beszterce that its laws were only confirmed by Gábor Bethlen, who was proclaimed king there, not by Ferdinand II.²⁶

Yet censorship and privilege together were a great weapon in the hands of Catholicism. Moreover, the printing press in Nagyszombat was directly under the control of the Catholics, and was therefore in an exceptional position. At the same time, censorship in Hungary is very unregulated, and the exercise of the right of censorship during the 17th century is quite controversial; in some cases, the counties request protection from the Palatine because of certain printed documents, in other cases, the king orders the counties to confiscate and submit documents, or a bishop turns to the Chamber of Bratislava to hold an investigation on behalf of the king.²⁷

The reasons for this can be seen in the situation outlined above, that in the Austrian hereditary provinces, where there was no opposition from the orders and parliament similar to that of the Hungarians, the organization of censorship

was built up by issuing continuous decrees, and the Austrian emperors tried to operate this system as Hungarian rulers as well, as we have seen, with little success. In addition, Protestantism was considered anti-state in the Austrian hereditary provinces, so the separation of state and church censorship seemed pointless from the outset.

With his decree of November 5, 1528, Ferdinand I already established a book inspection authority, which was made up of the bishop of Vienna, the mayor, and three other members. On November 13, 1559, a delegate from the University of Vienna became a member of the authority to help the bishop and the mayor in the examination of manuscripts and books imported from abroad, and then, on August 7, 1623, Ferdinand II entrusted the operation of the book inspection authority, i.e. censorship, to the University of Vienna, and thus placed it in the hands of the Jesuits, since they were the only ones teaching at the university at that time.²⁸ The establishment of censorship in Hungary also tried to follow this organic development, but it went more slowly and encountered the resistance already discussed above.

Religious censorship was already present among Protestants in Hungary in the 16th century and the first half of the 17th century. Post-publication censorship was practiced based on canons.²⁹ Prior censorship was initially carried out by Protestant scholarly bishops and professors, later it was taken over by city magistrates and preachers, even in the absence of state or church permission. Canon 25 of the 1646 Synod of Szatmárnémeti finally provided for post-publication censorship and stated that no book could be printed without the examination and permission of scholars selected by the Protestant Church, and those who violated the canon would face confiscation of the book and other more severe punishments. This decree was repeated by subsequent synods and district councils. It is true, knowing the Protestant printings, that even these synodal decrees were not systematically and consistently enforced.³⁰

In the 17th century, of course, the Catholic Church also exercised the right of book inspections, based on instructions from Rome. In addition to the two denominations, the rulers also formed the right to restrict the operation of the press. Their goal was officially to preserve state authority and to ensure peace between religious denominations, however, the fact that censorship was put in the hands of the Jesuits, and that the Jesuits' opinion also counted in the distribution of privileges to book printers, make the direction of state censorship clear.

In the Kingdom of Hungary, the never fully extended and unacknowledged jurisdiction of the Viennese state censorship over the press ceased under Leopold I. On June 7, 1673, György Szelepcsényi, Archbishop of Esztergom and Royal Viceroy, issued a document to the city of Kassa, in which he called on printing presses and booksellers not to dare to print or bring books into the country without prior censorship exercised by him. He entrusted the management of the censorship to Márton Szentiványi (1633-1705), a Jesuit monk, professor of theology at the University of Nagyszombat, and governor of the Pazmaneum in Vienna.³¹

Later, Palatine Pál Esterházy, and then Leopold I himself, confirmed Szentiványi in his office in a document dated 4 March 1688, as follows; "...as long as Márton Szentiványi, as an authorized book inspector, or to whom he delegates his authority, can not only inspect and approve the works or documents to be printed, but also, if someone dares to print any documents, works or books without his or his agent's consent, in addition to the confiscation of all books can also duly punish the printers, renewing this authority to the said Márton Szentiványi or to the deputy censors to be so appointed in the aforementioned manner, we hereby, by our imperial and royal authority, accept, approve, and confirm by our present document and to all our followers we strictly command, especially to the lord lieutenants and vice-ispáns, the mayors, judges and leaders of free royal and other towns and villages to make this public and to make those to whom it belongs keep it..."³²

Thus, making the office even more prestigious, Leopold I himself entrusted Szentiványi and, as the quotation indicates, his deputy censors with the management of the Hungarian censorship. Interestingly, Szentiványi, who was appointed chief censor, was himself an editor and writer, editing the calendars of Nagyszombat from 1675 and author of one of the most significant works of 17th century Hungarian scholarship, the 'Miscellanea',³³ which surpasses Apáczai's Encyclopaedia³⁴ in its scope.

By the end of the 17th century, censorship thus became a state institution, so the press was censored by the state as well as the church. Overlapping jurisdictions created confusing situations. The government strictly inspected books and controlled the printing presses. Printing houses that offended the clergy by publishing certain books lost their privilege. According to some assumptions, from Szentiványi's death in 1705 until 1721, there was no Hungarian censorship. It is true that Joseph I did not fill the position of Szentiványi, but the subsequent revision of books was imported from abroad, church censorship, and the distribution of privileges maintained control. In his decrees issued for his Austrian provinces on November 13, 1705 and September 9, 1706, Joseph I stipulated that books with political content must be submitted separately to the court after the regular censorship.³⁵

Here, a special mention should be made of the Latin-language *Mercurius Hungaricus*, the journal of Rákóczi's War of Independence, edited by Chancellor Pál Ráday, which, of course, bypassed censorship and was able to present the political and military events of the War of Independence from the point of view of the rebels, primarily to the foreign public, counterbalancing the Viennese court propaganda.³⁶

After the Treaty of Szatmár, the Diet of 1712-15 was marked by a search for compromise between the monarch and the orders, and the guarantees of the constitution of the orders were enacted into law. An important change in public law from the point of view of state censorship was the independence of the Hungarian Royal Court Chancellery from the Vienna Chancellery within the framework of this settlement.³⁷ The Parliament decreed by law that the authority of the Hungarian court chancellery should remain intact; "And it should not depend on any

other court seat of government, rather, it should be on an equal footing with the other direct seats of government of one and the same prince, just as they are with him, with regard to existing affairs.”³⁸ This marked a significant change in terms of book and press censorship, as the Hungarian Chancellery exercised supervision over the printing presses in Hungary on behalf of the king.

In 1721, Charles III put book inspections in the hands of the chancellors of the University of Nagyszombat, and they were also given the right to employ sub-censors if they deemed it necessary. Even in Charles III’s later period, post-censorship was strictly practiced, i.e., the subsequent criticism of books and documents already printed without permission.³⁹

After the death of Charles III, there was a turning point in the regulation of the press. Maria Theresa was the first ruler to lay down the guidelines for book inspection to be followed in the future, as well as to organize the state authorities tasked with carrying out censorship duties.⁴⁰

The press policy of enlightened absolutism and the era of ‘Pozsony censorship’

The most accurate definition of enlightened absolutism to date in Hungary was given by Domokos Kosáry, according to which it is a specific attempt by the backward states of Europe, pushed to the periphery, to catch up, through the centralization of forces and the increase of efficiency, through the modernization of the state. In this modernisation, they would also have to make up for the processes which classical absolutism had already established in Western Europe in the 17th century “in the fields of political unification, centralization, population, economic policy, patronage of industry, technical organization, education, public health.”⁴¹

The central idea of the enlightened absolutist government system is the common good, which the state and its officials, as well as the ruler, must serve for the happiness of all subjects. Therefore, the government and the state intervene directly in all areas of society, bringing it under its control. In addition, due to her religiosity, Maria Theresa believed that she was responsible before God for the physical and spiritual well-being of her subjects, so she tried to implement her enlightened reforms in this spirit.⁴²

In the implementation of these reforms, both she and, from 1765, her co-ruler and later heir, Joseph II assigned an important role to the press and censorship. The enlightened absolutist and Josephinist press policy in Vienna had a great influence on the transformation of Austrian and Hungarian censorship relations. During the reign of Maria Theresa, the process took place gradually, during which the religious censorship in the hands of the Jesuits, supported by the state, was replaced by a court committee promoting a new kind of humanism based on natural law.⁴³

From the very beginning, Maria Theresa kept the press under the strictest control, as her rise to power led to the spread of offensive literature in Europe, which resulted in numerous mockeries and pamphlets against the queen. A

superficial examination of pamphlets spread during the War of Succession and their infiltration into the monarchy prompted the government to further develop and tighten censorship.⁴⁴

The Catholic queen, impatient in terms of religion, launched a planned campaign against the Protestant press. The import of Protestant books was forbidden. It was forbidden to publish Protestant school books without the approval of the Catholic censors. Religious books were not allowed in Protestant schools. She ordered the book police she created, the *Bücherpolizei*, to search for and burn anti-state and anti-Church books, Bibles, and catechisms. Censorship was biased, because it adopted measures that were lenient with Catholic writers and merciless with Protestants.⁴⁵

It was Maria Theresa that completely reorganized the authorities dealing with press matters and censorship. In addition to the official reorganization, she implemented new regulations regarding the procedures. In 1745, in the Kingdom of Hungary, she established the “Pozsony Censorship”, that is, entrusted the Royal Council of Governor, based in Pozsony (Bratislava), with the preliminary book inspection. We know the book inspection procedure in detail from the pen of the Jesuit auditor Imre Vajkovics,⁴⁶ who worked under the Royal Council of Governor. According to the decree of 1745, if a book arrived at the thirtieth office, the prosecutor’s office made a report about it to the chairman of the ecclesiastical committee under the Royal Council of Governor, who was the Archbishop of Esztergom or his deputy, the archbishop’s vicar. The ecclesiastical committee forwarded the work to the auditors for evaluation. The auditors played a significant role in the book inspection. The clergy appointed only reliable persons as auditors that showed unconditional obedience to their church, and that regarded censorship as a means of power for Catholicism alone. The auditors put their criticism in writing and immediately returned it to the ecclesiastical committee, at whose meeting the submitted criticism was discussed, and with their own opinion attached, it was brought to the Royal Council of Governor. The judgment of the Royal Council of Governor was submitted to the monarch for confirmation through the chancellery, which, in the case of a positive assessment, was sent back to the Royal Council of Governor for execution.⁴⁷

The task of the auditors was considered very important, and compliance with their work was strictly monitored. The auditors’ instructions formulated by the clergy, which listed the auditors’ obligations, were announced in 1747, in the Royal Council of Governor. Maria Theresa’s book inspection system is called dualistic, since in addition to the ecclesiastical authorities, the secular Pozsony censorship also claimed to practice censorship. It is true that secular censorship also had the task of protecting the interests of the Catholic Church.⁴⁸

The book police later introduced a list of prohibited books called *Catalogus librorum prohibitorum*, which was printed in 1765. The book police were also responsible for checking book stores. This body also took care of the printing presses, which could only operate with the possession of a patent.⁴⁹

The queen thus began to curb the influence of the church by invoking her sovereign rights. The next step was the establishment of a court censorship

commission in Vienna in 1751, chaired from 1759 to 1772 by *Gerhard van Swieten*,⁵⁰ a confidant of Maria Theresa, which initially included the Jesuits, albeit in decreasing numbers. However, their loss of space was still noticeable, since the Jesuit monopoly of censorship ended. Gerhard van Swieten reduced their number to one person in 1760, and in 1764, he removed the last Jesuit from the committee.⁵¹ The change was symbolized by the precedent-setting decision of Joseph II's wife in 1760 to appoint a non-Jesuit priest as her confessor, an example which spread rapidly through the court, so that the influence of the Jesuits steadily declined, e.g., they played a much smaller role in the education of the future Leopold II.⁵² Joseph II, who became co-ruler in 1765, sharply attacked the spirit of censorship, religious intolerance, and the backwardness of the monarchy's educational system in his memorandum. As a result, in 1767, Maria Theresa appointed Ignaz Müller, the provost of the St. Dorothea Monastery, a fierce enemy of the Jesuits and a supporter of reforms, as her confessor, who was consulted before all her later important decisions and who helped to allay the empress's conscientious objections.⁵³

However, it was also a problem that the state censorship committees of the individual provinces did not form a unit. They often differed from the court censorship committee in their administration and principles. She attempted to unify the censorship committees and centralize them under the Vienna court committee openly, however, only in the last year of her reign.⁵⁴ Nevertheless, she strove for this as early as in 1754, starting the process by issuing a multitude of decrees, the ultimate goal of which was to subordinate Pozsony censorship to that of Vienna. For example, in the royal decree of November 9, 1756, she ordered that books approved by the Viennese censorship should not be confiscated in the Kingdom of Hungary. Thus, the works approved by the Austrian censorship, which was increasingly under the influence of van Swieten, and which was increasingly open to the Enlightenment, had to be allowed on Hungarian territory as well. This process also corresponded to the imperial centralization aspirations.⁵⁵

In her decrees issued in 1763 and 1766, Maria Theresa imposed the regulations of the Vienna censorship committee on the censorship operated by the Hungarian Royal Council of Governor. Van Swieten repeatedly criticized the book revision lists presented to the court chamber by Royal Council of Governor of Pozsony. Since the monarch always supported his proposals in this direction, in 1771, the Hungarian court chamber itself asked the monarch to entrust the Vienna court committee proposing the banning of 94 books proposed by the Pozsony censorship, and even requested that it be able to forward all such proposals in the future, and based on the opinion of van Swieten, they can expedite the royal transcript. Co-ruler Joseph fulfilled the chancellor's request to give up their rights. From then on, Hungarian state censorship came under the control of the Viennese court censorship committee. And the royal decree of March 23, 1772 made the printing of church publications with religious content subject to the imprimatur permission of the censor of Royal Council of Governor, thus effectively ending religious censorship in Hungary.⁵⁶

The press policy of Josephinism, the press decree of Joseph II and the establishment of the ‘Vienna censorship’

There is still no complete agreement among historians regarding the essence of Josephinism. In addition to Kálmán Benda,⁵⁷ who defines Hungarian literature to this day and dates Josephinism to the reign of Joseph II, the view that, although it got its name from the *‘hatted king’*, it is a much larger historical period, from the reign of Maria Theresa to 1850, is gaining more and more ground nowadays, during which in the Habsburg Empire and its provinces, the church became a means of building the modern state, while the state increasingly intervened in the life of the church establishing the so-called state church system. Unquestionably, Josephinism drew a lot from the thought system of the Enlightenment.⁵⁸ The purpose of this thesis is not to reconcile the conflicting views, and the international literature is also divided on this complicated topic, so I only quote the most significant ones here. Ferdinand Maass undoubtedly exerted the greatest influence on international literature, who defined Josephinism as a typical example of the state church system as a kind of caesaropapism, and in his five-volume monumental work, he published the documents relating to the period.⁵⁹ According to Derek Beales, this concept overshadowed Joseph II’s role in the establishment of the Josephinist system,⁶⁰ and, according to his other critic, Ernst Wangermann, Maria Theresa and her advisers actually wanted to protect Catholicism from Protestantism by building the system.⁶¹ According to Fritz Valjavec, the definition of Josephinism, which is also disputed by many, is a kind of political, cultural, and ecclesiastical compromise between the baroque perception and the new, enlightened ideas,⁶² and for the state, religion is important not because of transcendence, but because of the moral values that help people prosper, i.e. for Josephinism, religion is only a means to ensure the welfare of its subjects.⁶³ In Hungarian literature, Péter Zakar pointed out that in the system of Josephinism, the state, which also performed moral duties, became primary, the church had a subordinate role to the state in the service of human well-being, based on common sense, and because of this, the state restricted and supervised religion and essentially perceived it as part of the politics.⁶⁴

The heir of Maria Theresa, Joseph II, was above all concerned with the implementation of Josephinist reforms in his politics. His measures related to book and press printing were an integral part of his reform policy, so he continued and completed the centralization that had begun earlier in this area as well. Censorship is a powerful spiritual weapon that the leaders of public life at all times wish for themselves – so the enlightened absolute rulers were only able to obtain it from the hands of the church step by step through serious internal struggles. The next step was to officially fully make censorship a state function and focus it on the entire empire.⁶⁵

Censorship matters were handled separately in individual provinces and countries, the Hungarian ones were under the responsibility of the ecclesiastical committee of the Royal Council of Governor in Pozsony, and on the one hand, this was opposed to the unified central principles and practices of the empire,

and on the other hand, it was operated more strictly than the one in Vienna. In order to put an end to this situation, Joseph II's censorship decree issued on June 11, 1781 for his Austrian provinces was also applied to Hungary a year later, on June 8, 1782.⁶⁶

The independence of the office, abolished by decree, and the entire Hungarian censorship was subordinated to the Vienna censorship committee. In a completely rationalistic manner, the ruler wanted to centralise the censorship affairs of the empire without regard to national differences. This period of the history of Hungarian censorship, from 1782 to 1840, is usually called the age of Vienna censorship. The old censorship office was reduced to a mere auditor's office, without any independence or central character.⁶⁷

On April 8, 1782, Joseph II also dissolved the court censorship committee established by Maria Theresa in 1751, he transferred some of the old censors with their powers to the study committee, creating the court censorship and study committee, and dismissed the others. With this, the former censorship under the influence of the Jesuits was replaced by the Masonic censorship.⁶⁸

The essence of the system was the decentralization of prior censorship and the centralization of post-censorship throughout the empire. Local and provincial censors checked the first finished copy of the texts before printing, and after permission was granted, reproduction could begin. The press was subsequently checked by the Vienna committee, and if texts dangerous to the interests of the state were found in newspapers and books, measures were taken to ban or confiscate them, and the censors were punished or dismissed.

The political idea of Joseph II's chief adviser on censorship, Gottfried Van Swieten, was later to remove press censorship from the jurisdiction of the court censorship and study committee and transfer it to the jurisdiction of the court authorities, i.e., the chancelleries, as this would hinder the pace of publication of the press only a little. That is why in 1787 the investigation of the first serious case of censorship of the *Magyar Kurir*, a Hungarian-language newspaper published in Vienna, was handed over to the court's Hungarian chancellery. According to the version of the censorship regulations that applied to Hungary, the Hungarian chancellery was granted supervisory rights over publications on Hungarian public law issues, even in the case of Viennese newspapers, but not in other matters.⁶⁹

Taking a closer look at the press regulation, it can be concluded that its free spirit far exceeds the European press laws, in the spirit of the Enlightenment. The decree did not abolish censorship, but it significantly eased it. It helped to free the printing industry and the book trade, as well as to lay the foundations of bourgeois literary life by stimulating newspaper literature.

In the introductory general part of the decree,⁷⁰ Joseph II formulated his decision for centralization, in which he entrusted the book inspection of the German and Hungarian 'hereditary provinces' to a single body: "His Majesty found it his highest task to change the present way of auditing, in order to make it easier and simpler in the future. For this purpose, he orders that henceforth there shall be only one auditor-general commission (*Bücher-Zensur-Hauptkommission*) operating in Vienna for all the hereditary provinces;

the orders issued by this commission act as a yardstick for permitted and prohibited books in Vienna as well as in the provinces; the previous auditing commissions (Zensur-Kommissionen) shall be dissolved in each province, only one auditing office (Bücher-Revisionsamt) is maintained in each province, the national authorities shall be entrusted with the implementation of the necessary regulations regarding audit matters.”⁷¹

He took strict action against obscenity and immorality, which he saw no use for, and was lenient towards works of scientific knowledge, “in which science, knowledge and honest principles are contained... the latter, on the contrary, are now in the hands of people of calmer temper and more firm in their principles.”⁷²

Writings mocking and ridiculing the Catholic and in general, the Christian religion, or which “made the sacred religion ... contemptible by superstitious distortions of the attributes of God and hypocrisy”, were not tolerated under any circumstances, but he supported the criticism.⁷³

As the most striking proof of the free spirit of the decree, the monarch also subjected himself to public criticism: “Criticisms, unless they are mockeries, can be directed at anyone from the prince of the country to the last, especially if the author prints his own name and thereby vouches for the truth of the matter, – cannot be forbidden, for every man who loves justice must rejoice if the truth is made known to him in this way.”⁷⁴

Publications useful from the point of view of the public good, if they contained one or two scandalous expressions, were not banned, only if they contained things that were particularly scandalous against religion, morality or the state and the prince: “Whole works, periodical writings – provided, that they also contain useful things, – cannot be banned because of some scandalous expressions... (only) if the prohibited work contains very scandalous things against religion, morality, the state, or the prince.”⁷⁵ He authorized the works on law, medicine, military, science, and the liberal arts, which were previously included in the list of semi-banned books: “‘ergaschedam’, ‘coutinantibus’, ‘eruditis’, ‘acatholicis’ books hitherto authorised, may henceforth be published quite freely as purely scientific works; so that, except for the authorised and prohibited books, of which a new catalogue will be published, there will be no further distinction by any name.”⁷⁶

In the decree, the monarch determined which books were under the control and influence of censorship. In this decree, we find for the first time a specific comment on the censorship of newspapers: “As for advertisements, newspapers, prayers, etc. respectively, these are to be examined only briefly by the referral council in censorship cases, which exists alongside the individual national authorities. The same council makes sure that the prayers are written in the true spirit of the church...”⁷⁷

The principle of centralization to the Viennese court censorship is also formulated here in the decree, when it states that “regarding the publication of theses intended for printing in the individual provinces, all works of any kind which have a substantial influence on science, learning and religion are to be submitted to the Viennese censorship for approval, in such a form, however,

that the work in question be certified and signed by a scholar, teacher, secular or ecclesiastical authority from the province in which it is written, that it contains nothing contrary to religion, good morals or the laws of the land, and that it is in accordance with the laws of the land.⁷⁸ At the same time, in the event of rejection, it was possible to submit an appeal to the audit committee, albeit at one's own expense.⁷⁹

It also regulated the reprinting of books imported from abroad, and with various restrictions, the decree gave permission to individual national authorities to authorise reprinting, since, as he put it extremely clearly, "it is regarded as merely a branch of trade".⁸⁰ However, with regard to previously prohibited, but now, permitted books and state documents, the publisher undertaking the reprint had to apply to the Viennese court censorship committee for permission to distribute the book to be reprinted.⁸¹

Joseph II, being a Catholic, allowed Protestants to use the books necessary for the practice of their religion, but in those parts of the provinces where Protestants were not tolerated, the sale of Protestant Bibles and catechisms was tied to a special written permission (*erga schedam*). The most significant effect of his censorship decree was the complete abolition of religious censorship and its subordination to state censorship. It abolished the previous ecclesiastical restrictions, and allowed the critical intellectuals to have insight to public affairs while guaranteeing freedom of conscience.⁸²

Joseph II's censorship was of an enlightened spirit, but not anti-religious, as is commonly believed. Although he banned religious works that were considered 'superstition' and 'out of date' according to modern thinking, he also banned blasphemous, obscene, and even atheistic writings. At the same time, he enabled the publication of church-political and theological struggles, and even the publication of Protestant theology and religious literature, which had previously been excluded. It is a fact that he considered the main goal of the press to be the positive promotion of the ideas of the Enlightenment, but primarily his own measures, and with a freer atmosphere, and this freer atmosphere helped the press flourish, alongside the spirit and the artists, and the Hungarian-language press to be born. And since the emergence of our Hungarian-language periodical press coincided with the stage in the development of European newspaper literature, when the role of the press moved from a referential phase to an opinion-forming phase, this trend appeared and had a beneficial effect on the development of our newspaper literature, since it was able to assert this role in the context of Josephine reforms and the cause of national language, literature, and culture.⁸³

The literature on press history now agrees that he was unaware of the genie he let out of the bottle with regard to political newspapers, the reason being that Joseph II did not consider colourless refereeing newspapers, which only reported news, dangerous, so he regulated their investigation in §7 of his decree by referring it, in short order, to the local authorities. Later on, in several cases, he tightened censorship and its punishments, if his intentions were misunderstood and permission was given to publish works that he considered dangerous for his reforms and the state power.⁸⁴

According to Sashegyi, the intentions of the decree were never fully realized in Hungary, the structure of the organization and the proceedings were slowed down by resistance, and enlightened censorship was hindered by the conservatism of the persons practicing censorship, perhaps because of this, the conservative turn after Joseph's death was less noticeable in Hungary than in Austria.⁸⁵

This statement is also confirmed by the fact, as we would later see, that, due to the Josephinist press censorship in Vienna, the Josephinist⁸⁶ and even the Hungarian-language newspapers connected⁸⁷ to the order movement, the enlightened order⁸⁸ were also published in Vienna, where their enlightened spirit was more protected against the attacks of the conservative orders and of the church.

And it cannot be denied that the development of the 'free' press quickly exceeded the desirable standards for it. At first, he tried to control the subsequent inspection by means of regulations on the provision of obligatory copies. An important change in the organization of domestic newspaper censorship was the transfer of the Royal Council of Governor from Pozsony to Buda in 1784, which brought the censorship of the leading Hungarian newspapers, the Magyar Hírmondó, Pressburger Zeitung and Presspurske Noiny, under the jurisdiction of the city council. However, the government quickly became dissatisfied with the work of the censors in Pozsony, because in the reports on the serf uprising in Transylvania, they broke the regulation that prohibited any article that offends the person of the ruler, the interests of the state or morals, and in 1785 they decreed that the city magistrate had to send a copy of the published papers to the Royal Council of Governor every week, thereby tightening the subsequent control. From 1787, the official copies had to be sent to the chancellery as well.⁸⁹ Finally, in June 1789, the introduction of the newspaper stamp imposed a burden on the newspapers which was expected to slow down their development.⁹⁰

According to Bodi, Joseph II's censorship system thus formed a unique and historically significant transition between the earlier religious censorship and the later police censorship, "as a strange mixture of liberalism and barracks discipline."⁹¹

Bibliography:

Acásdy, Ignác (1886). *Magyarország Budavár visszafoglalása korában*, Budapest, Franklin Társulat. Ballagi Géza (1888). *A politikai irodalom Magyarországon 1825-ig*, Budapest, Franklin Társulat, Magyar Irodalmi Intézet és Könyvnyomda.

Beales, Derek (1987). *Joseph II. I. In the Shadow of Maria Theresia 1741-1780*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Benda Kálmán (1965). A jozefinizmus és a jakobinusság kérdései a Habsburg Monarchiában, *Történelmi Szemle*, 4. sz. 390.

Bodi, Leslie (1995). *Tauwetter in Wien. Zur Prosa der österreichischen Aufklärung 1781-1795*, Schriftenreihe der Österreichischen Gesellschaft zur Erforschung des 18. Jahrhunderts 6. Wien-Köln-Weimar.

Buzinkay Géza (1993). *Kis magyar sajtótörténet*, Budapest.

Davies, Norman (2002). *Európa története*. Budapest, Osiris.

- Dezsényi Béla (1967). A Magyar Kurir és a cenzúra 1787-1793, *Magyar Könyvszemle*, 14.
- Döbör András (2018). *Sajtópolitika es politikai sajtó Magyarországon (1780-1840)*, Budapest, Gondolat Kiadó.
- Fraknoi Vilmos (1881). *Magyar országgyűlési emlékek*, VII. k. Budapest.
- Gecse Gusztáv (1980). *Vallástörténet*, Budapest.
- Gnau, Hermann (1911). *Die Zensur unter Joseph II.* Leipzig.
- Jankovich Miklós (Source) (1833). II. Miksa 1574. február 7-i rendelete, *Tudományos Gyűjtemény* IV., 52-57. Klaniczay Tibor (ed.) (1964). *A magyar irodalom története II. A magyar irodalom története 1600-tól 1722-ig*, Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Kókay György (ed.) (1979). *A magyar sajtó története I. 1705-1848*, Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Kókay, György – Buzinkay, Géza – Murányi, Gábor (2001). *A magyar sajtó története*, Budapest, Sajtóház Kiadó.
- Kosáry Domokos (1980). *Művelődés a XVIII. századi Magyarországon*, Budapest.
- Kovács Magda (1969). A Pesti Hírlap cenzúrázása (1841-44), *Magyar Könyvszemle*, 4. sz. 332-341.
- Maas, Ferdinand (1951-1956). *Der Josephinismus: Quellen zu seiner Geschichte in Österreich 1760-1790*, Wien, Herold.
- Mályuszné Császár Edit (ed.) (1985). *Megbíráltak és megbírálok. Válogatás a cenzúrahivatal aktáiból (1780-1867)*, Budapest, Gondolat Kiadó.
- Marczali Henrik (1997). *Magyarország története a szatmári békétől a bécsi congressusig 1711-1815. Reprint*, Budapest, Laude Kiadó.
- Romsics, Ignác (editor-in-chief.) (2010). *Magyarország története*, Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Sashegyi Oszkár (1938): *Német felvilágosodás és magyar cenzúra 1800-1830*, Budapest.
- Sashegyi Oszkár (1958). II. József sajtópolitikája, *Századok*, 1958. Vol. 92. 90.
- Schermann Egyed (1928). *Adalékok az állami könyvcenzúra történetéhez Magyarországon Mária Terézia haláláig*, Budapest, Stephanus Nyomda és Könyvkiadó Rt.
- Szakály Ferenc (1995). *Virágkor és hanyatlás 1440-1711*, In: *Magyarok Európában II.*, Budapest, Háttér Kiadó.
- Uemura, Toshiro (2011). *Die Öffentlichkeit anhand der Wiener Broschüren zur Zeit Josephs II. Die Informationsverbreitung unter dem aufgeklärten Absolutismus*, Wien, Universität Wien, (PhD. Dissertation).
- Valjavec, Fritz (1944). *Der Josephinismus. Zur geistigen Entwicklung Österreichs im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert*, Brünn–München–Wien.
- Zakar Péter (2010). *A tábori püspökség története 1773-1868*, Szeged, Gerhardus Kiadó.

Notes:

- 1 Mályuszné Császár Edit (ed.) (1985). *Megbíráltak és megbírálok. Válogatás a cenzúrahivatal aktáiból (1780-1867)*, Budapest, Gondolat Kiadó, 5.
- 2 See more: Mályuszné Császár, 1985, 5-7.; Ballagi Géza (1888). *A politikai irodalom Magyarországon 1825-ig*, Budapest, Franklin Társulat, Magyar Irodalmi Intézet és Könyvnyomda, 109-110. and 800-806.; Döbör András (2018). *Sajtópolitika es politikai sajtó Magyarországon (1780-1840)*, Budapest, Gondolat Kiadó, 18.
- 3 Mályuszné Császár, 1985, 5.
- 4 Schermann Egyed (1928). *Adalékok az állami könyvcenzúra történetéhez Magyarországon Mária Terézia haláláig*, Budapest, Stephanus Nyomda és Könyvkiadó Rt., 4.
- 5 Davies, Norman (2002). *Európa története*. Budapest, Osiris, 468-469.; Szakály Ferenc (1995). *Virágkor és hanyatlás 1440-1711*, In: *Magyarok Európában II.*, Budapest, Háttér Kiadó, 94-96.; Gecse Gusztáv (1980). *Vallástörténet*, Budapest, 184-185.
- 6 Davies, 2002, 468-469.; Szakály, 1995, 97.; Gecse, 1980, 185-186.
- 7 Ballagi, 1888, 3-4.
- 8 Schermann, 1928, 5.
- 9 October 14, 1524.
- 10 February 3, 1525.
- 11 Schermann, 1928, 5.
- 12 Cf.: Ballagi, 1888, 4-5.; Szakály, 1995, 158.
- 13 Cf.: Szakály, 1995, 114; Romsics, Ignác (editor-in-chief.) (2010). *Magyarország története*, Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó, 370-471.
- 14 Schermann, 1928, 5.
- 15 1553: XXIV. article of law
- 16 Ballagi, 1888, 4-5.
- 17 Jankovich Miklós (Source) (1833). II. Miksa 1574. február 7-i rendelete, *Tudományos Gyűjtemény IV.*, 52-57.
- 18 Schermann, 1928, 10.
- 19 Jankovich, 1833, 57.
- 20 Ballagi, 1888, 6-7.
- 21 Schermann, 1928, 10.
- 22 Ballagi, 1888, 8.
- 23 Fraknói Vilmos (1881). *Magyar országgyűlési emlékek*, VII. k. Budapest, 375.
- 24 Ballagi, 1888, -10.
- 25 1599. XLV. article of law § 2
- 26 Ballagi, 1888, 10-11.
- 27 Cf.: Schermann, 1928, 13.; Ballagi, 1888, 21-22.; Acsády, Ignác (1886). *Magyarország Budavár visszafoglalása korában*, Budapest, Franklin Társulat, 315-316.
- 28 Schermann, 1928, 14-17.

- 29 E.g., based on point 88 of the collection of canons entitled *Canones ecclesiastici* by the Reformed bishop György P. Zoványi, published in Kolozsvár (Cluj-Napoca) in 1733.
- 30 Ballagi, 1888, 12-14.
- 31 Klaniczay Tibor (ed.) (1964). *A magyar irodalom története II. A magyar irodalom története 1600-tól 1722-ig*, Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó, 408.
- 32 Publishes: Schermann, 1928, 17-18.
- 33 *Curiosiora et Selectiora Variarum Scientiarum Miscellanea*. Nagyszombat, 1689-1709.
- 34 Klaniczay, 1964, 408-409.
- 35 Schermann, 1928, 19.
- 36 Kókay György (ed.) (1979). *A magyar sajtó története I. 1705-1848*, Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó, 39-47.; Kókay, György – Buzinkay, Géza – Murányi, Gábor (2001). *A magyar sajtó története*, Budapest, Sajtóház Kiadó, 19-20.
- 37 Romsics, 2010, 498.
- 38 1715: XVII. Article of law 1 §.
- 39 Ballagi, 1888, 19-26.
- 40 *Ibid.*, 26-28.
- 41 Kosáry Domokos (1980). *Művelődés a XVIII. századi Magyarországon*, Budapest, 274.
- 42 Marczali Henrik (1997). *Magyarország története a szatmári békétől a bécsi congressusig 1711-1815. Reprint*, Budapest, Laude Kiadó, 326-327. and 350.; Romsics, 2010, 519.
- 43 Mályuszné Császár, 1985, 5.
- 44 Schermann, 1928, 26.
- 45 Ballagi, 1888, 49-50.
- 46 Vajkovics Imre. *Dissertatio de potestate principum sæcularium in censuram librorum*. 24.
- 47 Ballagi, 1888, 53-54.
- 48 *Ibid.*, 54-56.
- 49 *Ibid.*, 57.
- 50 Gottfried van Swieten: son of Gerhard von Swieten, one of the most important Austrian representatives of the enlightened, progressive spirit, promoting humanism, the Reform Catholic trend, Maria Theresa's advisor.
- 51 Schermann, 1928, 31-32.; Uemura, Toshiro (2011). *Die Öffentlichkeit anhand der Wiener Broschüren zur Zeit Josephs II. Die Informationsverbreitung unter dem aufgeklärten Absolutismus*, Wien, Universität Wien, (PhD. Dissertation) 59.
- 52 Zakar Péter (2010). *A tábori püspökség története 1773-1868*, Szeged, Gerhardus Kiadó, 35.
- 53 Beales, Derek (1987). *Joseph II. I. In the Shadow of Maria Theresia 1741-1780*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 441-449.
- 54 Sashegyi Oszkár (1958). II. József sajtópolitikája, *Századok*, 1958. Vol. 92. 90.
- 55 Schermann, 1928, 33-34.
- 56 *Ibid.*, 38-51.

57 'Josephinism is used for the political aspirations embodied by Joseph II'
Benda Kálmán (1965). A jozefinizmus és a jakobinusság kérdései a Habsburg Monarchiában, *Történelmi Szemle*, 4. sz. 390.

58 Zakar, 2010, 42.

59 Maas, Ferdinand (1951-1956). *Der Josephinismus: Quellen zu seiner Geschichte in Österreich 1760-1790*, Wien, Herold.

60 Beales, 1987, 440-441.

61 Kovács Magda (1969). A Pesti Hírlap cenzúrázása (1841-44), *Magyar Könyvszemle*, 4. sz. 332-341.

62 Valjavec, Fritz (1944). *Der Josephinismus. Zur geistigen Entwicklung Österreichs im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert*, Brünn–München–Wien, 6-7.

63 Valjavec, 1944, 23-25.

64 Zakar, 2010, 44-45.

65 Uemura, 2011, 61.

66 Buzinkay Géza (1993). *Kis magyar sajtótörténet*, Budapest, 12.; Sashegyi, Oszkár (1938): *Német felvilágosodás és magyar cenzúra 1800-1830*, Budapest, 9.

67 Sashegyi, 1938, 8-9.

68 Buzinkay, 1993, 12.

69 Dezsényi Béla (1967). A Magyar Kurir és a cenzúra 1787-1793, *Magyar Könyvszemle*, 14.

70 Full Hungarian text: Ballagi, 1888, 106-110.; In German: Gnau, Hermann (1911). *Die Zensur unter Joseph II.* Leipzig, 253-268.

71 Joseph II's censorship decree, para. 1.

72 § 1 of Joseph II's censorship decree

73 § 2 of Joseph II's censorship decree

74 § 3 of Joseph II's censorship decree

75 § 4 of Joseph II's censorship decree

76 § 5 of Joseph II's censorship decree

77 § 7 of Joseph II's censorship decree

78 *Ibid.*

79 *Ibid.*

80 § 8 of Joseph II's censorship decree

81 § 9-10 of Joseph II's censorship decree

82 Sashegyi, 1958, 90.

83 Kókay, 1979, 178.

84 *Ibid.*, 171-172.

85 Sashegyi, 1938, 9-10.

86 Magyar Kurir

87 Hadi és Más Nevezetes Történetek, later Magyar Hírmondó

88 Romsics, 2010, 583.

89 Kókay, 1979, 175-176.

90 Buzinkay, 1993, 12.

91 „Eine sonderbare Mischung von Liberalität und Kasernendisziplin.”
Bodi, Leslie (1995). *Tauwetter in Wien. Zur Prosa der österreichischen Aufklärung 1781-1795*, Schriftenreihe der Österreichischen Gesellschaft zur Erforschung des 18. Jahrhunderts 6. Wien–Köln–Weimar, 50.



Szél-szaggatta fények. Förster Ottó felvétele