

JOSEPH AUGUSTIN GINZEL (1804 – 1876): A FORGOTTEN BOHEMIAN SCHOLAR OF THE CYRILLO- METHODIAN TRADITION AND CHURCH HISTORIAN

Jakub Zouhar

DOI: 10.17846/CL.2025.18.2.147-173

Abstract: ZOUHAR, Jakub. *Joseph Augustin Ginzel (1804 – 1876): A Forgotten Bohemian Scholar of the Cyrillo-Methodian Tradition and Church Historian*. This article examines the largely overlooked historian Joseph Augustin Ginzel (1804 – 1876), who devoted his scholarly efforts to the Cyrillo-Methodian question and to ecclesiastical history spanning the Middle Ages, the early modern period, and the 19th century. His seminal work on Saints Cyril and Methodius, entitled *Geschichte der Slawenapostel Cyrill und Method und der slawischen Liturgie* (Leitmeritz, 1857; 2nd ed., Wien, 1861), was, at the time of its publication and for several decades thereafter, an important source of knowledge about the lives and legacies of the two missionaries as well as about the Slavic liturgy. Although many of the claims presented in the book were later disproved by subsequent research, Ginzel's work nonetheless exerted a positive influence on numerous scholars within the territories of the former Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and the German Empire. Ginzel's significance also lies in his evolving relationship with the Catholic Church, which underwent dramatic changes over the course of his lifetime. Initially, he was a devoted supporter not only of the Catholic Church but also of the state, as he maintained a strong affinity for the Habsburgs and the Austrian Empire. However, when the state began to distance itself from the Catholic Church in the 1860s, Ginzel aligned himself more closely with the state than with the Church.

Keywords: *Joseph Augustin Ginzel; Cyrillo-Methodian Scholarship; History of Ecclesiastical Historical Writing; Bohemia; 19th Century*

I/ Interest in the Life and Work of Joseph Augustin Ginzel

There exists an extensive body of literature on Slavic studies, particularly on the mission and legacy of the apostles Constantine-Cyril and Methodius. A closer reading of this scholarship soon reveals the recurring mention of a figure who, though frequently cited, has yet to be the subject of a thorough and systematic analysis of his life and scholarly contributions. This figure is Joseph Augustin Ginzel, a native of Liberec, who, as late as 1904, was described as an “unbiased German” who had, in connection with Cyril and Methodius, “spoken the truth” (Anonym. Jubileum, 4).¹

A review of Stefan Albrecht's survey on Cyrillo-Methodian scholarship in the Czech lands and Slovakia reveals that Ginzel receives no more than a passing mention (Albrecht 2003, 44).² Nor is the situation significantly better in the classic Czech overviews of Slavic studies from the late 1980s and early 1990s, where – although his principal works are listed – the author himself

¹ “Měl tedy pravdu nepředpojatý Němec J. Ginzel, když o našich apoštolech slovanských Cyrillu a Methodu se pronesl, že *příchod jejich na Moravu byl nejpůsobivější událostí na duševní i národní rozvoj slovanských národů pro všecku budoucnost* (p. 36).”

² “Unter den deutschen Historikern Böhmens befaßte sich lediglich der Professor am bischöflichen Seminar zu Leitmeritz/Litoměřice Domkapitular J. A. Ginzel (1804 – 1876) mit dem Thema”.

is misidentified as “Josef Anton” instead of “Josef Augustin” (Kudělka – Šimeček – Večerka 1995, 220).³ Nevertheless, these authors rank Ginzel, in terms of his methodological approach and use of historical-critical methods, above Václav Svatopluk Štulc (1814 – 1887), a Catholic priest and Czech patriot (Vejvar 2006, 16-25; Zlámál 2013, 144-146).

Although experts in Cyrillo-Methodian studies often place Ginzel in an honourable position just after Josef Dobrovský, he has yet to receive more substantial scholarly attention (Tkadlčík 1995, 31; Snopek 1913, 31, 52, 59, 63 and 65). He is absent even from the *Biografický slovník českých zemí* [Biographical Dictionary of the Czech Lands],⁴ despite his inclusion in several older encyclopaedias and learned lexicons (Schulte 1879, 179-180 – the most extensive entry; Lišková 1994, 75; ČSB 1930, 532; BLGBL 1979, 439; OSN 1896, 136-137; RSN⁵ 1863, 386 and 1890, 805). The only somewhat comprehensive contribution to the understanding of his life and work remains his obituary, published in the *Jahresbericht der Königlich böhmischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften* in 1877 (Jahresbericht 1877, LII–LIII). This notice, however, presents only a series of basic facts, which are frequently repeated elsewhere (notably, with more detail, in Rieger’s dictionary). Its chief value lies in the bibliography of Ginzel’s works it provides, including his anonymously published articles in the *Bohemia* from 1869 to 1876 – although the titles are often imprecise and occasionally misdated. Notably, his Czech-language writings are not mentioned at all. As a result, Ginzel has remained largely unknown, even among specialists. The present study seeks to address, at least in part, this longstanding scholarly neglect.

II/ The Life of Joseph Augustin Ginzel

The biography of Joseph Augustin Ginzel is well documented today. Ginzel was born on 1 May 1804 into a Catholic family in Liberec/Reichenberg, in house No. 182 (2/4) (SOA Litoměřice, f. Matrika, N, I-N, inv. no. 4238, sign. L84/27, 1799–1807).⁶ He was baptised the following day by chaplain Ludovít Sommer.⁷ His father, Jacob, was a master tailor (*Schneidermeister*), and his mother, Elisabeth (née Hübner), was the daughter of Christian Hübner, a schoolteacher in the village of Ludvíkov pod Smrkem (Ludvíkov pod Smrkem 2025).⁸ Among his extended relatives was the noted academic painter Jacob Ginzel (1792 – 1862) (Müller 1879-80, 181-192; Výtisková 1992).

Ginzel devoted his life to the Catholic Church and the humanities – a path not uncommon in his time.⁹ He began his secondary education privately (residing at home), but completed it publicly in 1819 in Litoměřice.¹⁰ He then pursued studies in philosophy at the University of

³ His name, for example, is not even included in the overview Kudělka – Šimeček 1972 or Zlámál 2013. The name is not included in the online database *KDO JE KDO v české slavistice* (<https://www.slaviste.cz/index.php>), as well as in the work Ježek 1880.

⁴ See the list of names available online: https://obchod.hiu.cas.cz/user_uploads/Knihy%20ke%20sta%C5%BEn%C3%AD/heslar_bscz_komplet.pdf.

⁵ The entry was most likely authored by Ginzel himself and stands out as the most factually substantive and reliable among the available sources.

⁶ To the ancient draper’s trade family Ginzels see Státní okresní archiv v Liberci [District Archives in Liberec; hereafter SOKA Liberec], lb//855 Hübner Ludwig, no. aid 0192, inv. no. 19, box no. 5 (between 1500 and 1910).

⁷ Anton Augustin Heke, *Schönfärber*, and his wife Helena stood as godfather to him.

⁸ Until 1946 as Lusdorf pod Smrkem, in German Lusdorf or Lusdorf an der Tafelfichte.

⁹ To the phenomenon of the educated priests throughout the 19th century, see Fasora – Hanuš – Pavlíček et al. 2017.

¹⁰ For its history until 1850, see Klucak 1877, 19.

Prague (in the academic year 1819/20 under Bernard Bolzano [Pavlíková 1985, 109]), but due to serious illness, he completed his philosophical education only later, in Plzeň (1823/24).¹¹ This was a relatively rare choice; only 1.9% (52 individuals) of students from Litoměřice opted to continue their philosophical studies in Plzeň.¹² The reasons for Ginzel's selection of Plzeň remain unknown.

Upon graduation, Ginzel entered the seminary in Litoměřice, which at the time enjoyed a strong reputation and held significance beyond the region.¹³ After the appointment of Michal Josef Fesl¹⁴ (1788 – 1863) (Wesseling 2002, 494–499), a supporter of Bernard Bolzano, as rector in 1816 – with the backing of the local ordinary, Josef František Hurdálek¹⁵ (in office 1815 – 1822) – the intellectual standard at the seminary rose to international prominence. However, following Fesl's forced resignation in 1825, Ginzel came under the influence of his successor, Vinzent Eduard Johann Nepomuk Franz Milde (1777 – 1853), who served as bishop of Litoměřice from 1823 to 1832 and had a significant impact on Ginzel's subsequent path. Although Milde was more conservative than Hurdálek, he remained more moderate than his own successor, Bishop Augustin Bartoloměus Hille (1786 – 1865), who held office from 1831 to 1865 and with whom Ginzel ultimately collaborated most closely.

Ginzel played a notable role as a confidant or operative of Bishop Hille, particularly in monitoring and reporting on Bolzano's followers in Litoměřice. Bishop Hille sought to establish an advisory council within the chapter, distinct from the consistory, where the primary authority rested with

¹¹ Archiv města Plzně [Archives of the City of Plzeň; hereafter AMP], Fonds Filozofický ústav [hereafter f. FÚ], Imatrikulační kniha 1809–1839, inv. no. 1, sign. 13 b 125: *Im Jahr 1823*. Nationality: *Böhmen*; Place of Birth: *Reichenberg*; Age: 18; Father: Jacob Ginzel, „Schneider“; Place of Residence: Liberec; Student from the Boleslav Region; Legal Guardian (*Vormund*): Karl Bonte works as „Schönfärber“; Student came from Litoměřice; Marks: Religion 1, Latin *Eminenter*, Old Greek *Eminenter*, Geography and History 1, Mathematic 2, Manners 1. <https://digiarchiv.plzen.eu/vademecum/permalink?xid=55062148b61f46ddbafb484e9365300b&scan=98c136731783fb894ab47e6aaf359218>. See also RSN 1863, 386. AMP, f. FÚ, Hlavní katalog 1805–1834, inv. no. 3, sign. 13 b 127, 122. *Im Jahr 1823/24*. Throughout all four semesters, he achieved the highest possible evaluations in every subject: *Eminenter*. <https://digiarchiv.plzen.eu/vademecum/permalink?xid=3b1b7d3f4bf3497ea1fe01484bb1c80b&scan=c19d5d81b237144ef2914d8ad5305a99>.

¹² If Plzeň is excluded from consideration, the majority of students admitted to the institute originated from Cheb (312, 11.5%). Kotorová 2020, 73.

¹³ Unfortunately, no detailed history of the seminary exists to this day. Instruction at the newly established theological institute, known by its Latin name *Studium theologicum episcopale Litomericense*, commenced on 4 November 1804. The year 1806 marked a significant turning point. By decree of the imperial court dated 1 January 1806 the institute was granted use of the former Jesuit college building, as well as the Jesuit Church of the Annunciation of the Virgin Mary. At the same time, the institute was authorised not only to operate as a theological faculty under the direction of a director, but also as a diocesan episcopal seminary (*Episcopale seminarium Dioecesanum*), led by a rector and praeses. The theological institute was tasked with the education of future priests, while the episcopal seminary focused primarily on the formation of seminarians. In 1824, the seminary's leadership was expanded to include a spiritual director (*spiritualis*), whose role was to oversee the moral and religious development of the students. In practice, the theological institute and the episcopal seminary were closely integrated. During the 1850s and early 1860s, the institution struggled to survive. In 1861, only ten seminarians completed their studies. See Künne 2024, 628–641 and 701–707; Donat 1927, 119–123; to the bishopric, see Macek 2013.

¹⁴ His literary remains including correspondence in Literární archiv Památníku národního písemnictví, Praha, *Fesl Michal Josef* (archival collection no. 350), 41 boxes, the years (1771) 1805–1863, no inventory yet.

¹⁵ According to Ginzel ein „durchweg hochgebildete[r], erfahrene[r] und musterhafte[r] [Mann]“. Anonym 1876, 1.

the capitulars and consistory assessors. Ginzel's activities aligned well with Hille's broader strategic goals and ecclesiastical governance.¹⁶

Joseph Augustin Ginzel was ordained a priest on 3 September 1828. Between 1828 and 1831, he pursued advanced theological education at the renowned Viennese seminary *Frintaneum*, supported by Bishop Johann Michael Leonhard von Milde (Ginzel 1872, 207), where he also obtained the obligatory doctorate in theology.¹⁷ From 1831 to 1835, Ginzel served as a chaplain in Česká Kamenice/Böhmisch Kamnitz.¹⁸ However, his life and career were predominantly intertwined with the city of Litoměřice, where he initially worked as a municipal chaplain (*Stadtkaplan*). From the second semester of 1835 until the end of the first semester of 1836, he substituted at the local grammar school (*gymnasium*) as a licentiate of theology, teaching religion (Klucak 1877, 24).¹⁹ Subsequently, he held numerous ecclesiastical administrative and judicial roles: assessor of the diocesan consistory, vice-president of the matrimonial court (*Vicepräses*), *Defensor matrimonii*, synodic examiner (*Prosynodal Examiner*), and episcopal notary. Most notably, beginning in 1837, he served as professor of moral theology, and from 1841 on, also as professor of church history and canon law at the theological institute affiliated with the Litoměřice bishopric.

Ginzel was appointed honorary canon (*Ehren-Domherr*) of the Litoměřice cathedral chapter on 3 March 1857 (Macek 2007, 273),²⁰ and became a resident canon on 13 January 1861,²¹ as the holder of the so-called Königsegg Canonry I.²² However, in 1863, he resigned from this specific canonry while remaining a resident canon.

¹⁶ In the final years of his episcopate, efforts to institute an additional canonry and to revive the office of provost became increasingly pronounced. Macek 2007, 273.

¹⁷ Bericht 1909-1910, in which there is a list of all students between 1816 and 1848. In these years, 364 students (58 of them from the Bohemian lands) graduated from it. To the *Frintaneum* students out of the Bohemian lands, see Frankl – Tropper 2006, 21-38; Šebek 2008, 181-194; see also a brief paragraph in Czech Tumpach 1910, 585; Zlámál 2008, 391-392. On the seminary formation, for instance, in Brno, see Husák 2021, 100-157.

¹⁸ He served there under the deans Georg Wenzel (1812 – 1834) and Florian Kindermann (1834 – 1862). In 1834, under the deanship of F. Kindermann, the Church of St. James the Greater (originally dating from the 15th century) underwent extensive restoration. The work primarily affected the façades, and the interior of the church was fitted with a granite floor.

¹⁹ On 9 March 1836 he was replaced as a religion professor with catechist Franz Roleczek, chaplain in the town of Nymburk.

²⁰ Until 1834, six honorary canons had existed, with records attesting to their presence since the 17th century. They were typically selected from among the meritorious clergy of the diocese, although Vienna could influence the selection process. In 1834, the Emperor decreed that two honorary canons would henceforth be appointed by himself, two by the bishop, and the remaining two elected by the cathedral chapter.

²¹ SOA Litoměřice, fond Kapitula Litoměřice, no. box 89, the charter of the Litoměřice bishop A. B. Hille, dated on 18 January 1861.

²² The two Königsegg Canonries were established by the third Bishop of Litoměřice, Hugo Franz von Königsegg-Rottenfels, on 1 October 1717. The endowment for their foundation amounted to 24,000 gulden, drawn from the so-called salt treasury (*Solní pokladna*). Since their inception, the Königsegg I and II canonries have been continuously filled by prominent clergy of the Litoměřice diocese. The holders of these canonries bear the titles *Königsegg Canon I* and *Königsegg Canon II*, respectively, and, as resident canons, they are entitled to wear the proper insignia of their office. *I. a II. königseggovský kanonikát v Litoměřicích* https://cs.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kanonik%C3%A1t_k%C3%B6nigseggovsk%C3%BD_I._a_II.

Ginzel was deeply engaged in the ecclesiastical life of Litoměřice. Canon Ignaz Jaksch (1792 – 1857), a devoted follower and former student (1809/1810) of Bernard Bolzano, described Ginzel in a letter to Fesl dated 1 May 1840:

“In him, the Roman Curia has a biting combatant. As a pupil of the *Frintaneum*, he was more than liberal. The first treatise of the yearbook he proposed was, as expected, directed against Bolzano [...] I had to engage in a harsh battle. It was nothing less than defending myself against false and malicious accusations – that I was supposedly leading an oppositional faction in the diocese created by our good Bolzano, that I was a Bolzanist, a Feslian, and who knows what other slanders they fabricated. Here you have further proof of the methods employed by our theological zealots, who have Christ on their lips and the devil in their hearts” (Winter 1945, 311).²³

As Eduard Winter – among the first historians to examine the situation in detail – noted:

“It was Ginzel who accused Jaksch and his associates of being Bolzanists and Feslians and who, in particular, fuelled suspicion in the mind of Bishop Hille, suggesting that these men sought once more to organise an opposition party against the bishop” (Winter 1945, 311).

In the revolutionary year of 1848, Ginzel firmly sided with the anti-reformist camp. Under the pseudonym “*Dr. Sylvius*” (Vopravil 1973, 574),²⁴ he published a pamphlet entitled *Über die Zukunft der Kirche in Österreich* [On the Future of the Church in Austria] (Regensburg, 1848), which he presented to the “Most Worthy Episcopate” and the “Highly Respected First Constitutional Imperial Assembly” for their consideration. Across seven letters, dated 8 to 30 June 1848, Ginzel addressed the question of church reform from a higher theological standpoint. He acknowledged the necessity of reform but insisted that it could only be legitimately carried out by “duly commissioned organs of the Holy Spirit and the Church” – namely, the bishops (Dr. Sylvius 1848, 15).

Ginzel argued that the Church in the Habsburg monarchy had been compromised by its subjugation to the state through police control and the monopolisation of ecclesiastical authority. He asserted that the Catholic Church could not flourish under secular rule and advocated a return of authority to the Pope and Rome, from whom it had been stripped by Maria Theresa and Joseph II. Ecclesiastical property, he contended, should be administered exclusively by bishops rather than by the state; monastic institutions should likewise be governed by Rome, not dissolved or diminished by civil power. Ginzel calls for a special concordat with the Holy See that would regulate all of these matters.

While he supported the Prague clergy’s proposal to increase the number of dioceses – as this would strengthen metropolitan and synodic structures – he diverged from them in rejecting the

²³ Originally Winter 1943, 405: “In ihm hat die römische Kurie einen bissigen Kämpfer. Als Zögling des Frintaneums war er mehr als liberal. Der erste Aufsatz des von ihm geplanten Jahrbuches soll gegen Bolzano, wie zu erwarten, gerichtet sein. [...] Ich hatte deswegen einen harten Kampf auszufechten. Es galt nichts geringeres als mich gegen die lügenhaften, boshaften Beschuldigungen, als sei ich an der Spitze einer von unserem guten Bolzano in der Diözese erst gebildeten feindseligen Partei, als sei ich Bolzanist, Feslianer und weiss der liebe Gott was noch man mir andichtete, zu verteidigen. Sie haben hier diesen neuen Beweis von der Handlungsart...”. Winter refers to Fesl’s remains, in which the letter was preserved.

²⁴ Ginzel also published under the pseudonym “Immanuel Reichenbach”. See Ginzel’s clarification to it in Ginzel 1872, 250–251. The identity of the author concealed under this pseudonym remained unknown even in the 1860s. See, for instance, Weller 1862, 233.

idea of a fully autonomous national church. Ginzel envisioned a Church detached entirely from the state and closely bound to Rome, to an even greater extent than Hermann Dichtl (1802 – 1887) (Huber – Bahlcke – Grulich 2005, 494-554). He also opposed the introduction of vernacular languages into the liturgy, defending “Latin as the unifying liturgical language rooted in Christianity’s universal mission”. He derided proponents of vernacularisation as men who “set the supposed necessity of national languages in liturgy as the demand of the times”. Unsurprisingly, he also vehemently opposed the abolition of clerical celibacy, which he viewed as “essential to the dignity and nature of the priestly office”. “Such an office and vocation – namely, the care for the eternal matters of the human soul, [...] the life of servants of the divine – is incompatible with married life”. Ginzel argues that in the early days of Christianity, priests did not strive to live as servants of the divine, for only priests living in celibacy attend to “the eternal matters of the human soul” (Winter 1943, 358-360).

However, times changed, and so did Ginzel’s views. As evidenced by his *Handbuch des neuesten in Österreich geltenden Kirchenrechtes* [A Handbook of the Most Recent Canon Law in Austria] (1856 – 1862), while he remained an ultramontanist in principle, he increasingly prioritised the education of the clergy and equitable governance within the Church. A committed patriot, he eventually distanced himself from his bishop and the prevailing ecclesiastical current when it became explicitly anti-statist – a stance evident in his post-1855 writings.

From the First Vatican Council onwards, Ginzel became a staunch opponent of what he termed “papal innovations”. His signed reviews of council-related brochures by theologians such as Hefele and Rauscher in the *Theologisches Literaturblatt*²⁵ (Bonn) unequivocally reflect his dissent. On the eve of the Council, in 1869, he anonymously published *Die Reform der Kirche an Haupt und Gliedern* [The Reform of the Church in Head and Members] (Leipzig, 1869), wherein he argued for de-centralisation, the curtailment of bureaucratic excesses in the Roman Curia, the restoration of episcopal privileges, and the renunciation of temporal power and hierarchical despotism. He called for the reassessment of marriage legislation, the suppression of certain monastic orders, the abolition of solemn vows for all religious, a revision of the celibacy requirement, the use of vernacular languages in the liturgy, greater lay involvement in Church affairs, and theological education at secular universities – an overall rejection of mediaeval theocratic aspirations.

The English Catholic historian and political thinker John Emerich Edward Dalberg-Acton (1834 – 1902) (Pezzimenti 2001; Hill 2000) noted the significance of Ginzel’s pamphlet in his 1870 article *The Vatican Council*, (Acton 1870, 183-229)²⁶ describing it as “the most important expression of reformist thought” regarding the Catholic Church, praising its empirical foundation over mere theory (Acton 1870, 185).²⁷ As Eduard Winter aptly remarked (Winter 1940, 274-275), not a single one of Ginzel’s reform proposals – neither from 1848 nor 1869 – was realised. Although the 1855 Concordat constituted a political victory for Rome, it did not bring about

²⁵ See, for instance, Jahrgang 5, 1870, no. 9, coll. 331-338; no. 11, coll. 419-421; no. 12, coll. 442-448 (Hefele); no. 14, coll. 529-537 (Rauscher); no. 15, coll. 569-581 (Hefele); no. 20, coll. 753-765; no. 23, coll. 880-883.

²⁶ Reprinted in *Selected Writings of Lord Acton*, vol. 3, 290-338. In the German-speaking world known thanks to the translation by Wilhelm Karl Reischl as the book *Zur Geschichte des vaticanischen Conciles*. Von Lord Acton, München 1871 (114 pp.). The translator is not mentioned. See in the book, anonymously, 5-6.

²⁷ “From a Bohemian priest, whose work, *The Reform of the Church in its Head and Members*, is founded on practical experience, not only on literary theory, is the most important manifesto of these ideas. The author exhorts the Council to restrict centralisation... Many Catholics in many countries concurred in great part of this programme; but it was not the symbol of a connected party.” See other opinions, 198 and 209.

the improvements Ginzl had envisioned for the Church in the monarchy (Valeš 2006).²⁸ Ginzl himself engaged in the public debate surrounding the Concordat, a matter which merits further discussion in this paper.

Even after 1870, Ginzl remained a vocal critic, especially of clerical education, although he never left the Catholic Church. At the likely behest of the government, he authored a controversial pamphlet in 1873, *Die theologischen Studien in Österreich und ihre Reform* [Theological Studies in Austria and Their Reform] (Wien, 1873), which stirred ecclesiastical tensions (Hlas 1873, 86-87). Nevertheless, he retained a respected position in the town of Litoměřice into the 1860s, especially among anti-liberal circles – a reputation that eventually propelled him into politics (Kotyza – Smetana – Toman 1997, 268).²⁹

Ginzl served as a deputy in the Bohemian Diet (*Landtag des Königreiches Böhmen*),³⁰ which subsequently elected him to the Imperial Council (*Reichsrat*) – at the time composed of delegates from the provincial assemblies rather than directly elected members. He took his oath on 11 November 1870, and again on 7 May 1872, for the following term (1871 – 1873). Notably, in 1871 he advocated for higher pensions for parish clergy.³¹ In autumn 1873, he resigned both mandates.³² Though representing the landed gentry (*Großgrundbesitzes*) of Bohemia, he somewhat surprisingly aligned himself with the liberal faction.

Ginzl also played a founding role in the *Verein für die Geschichte der Deutschen in Böhmen* [Association for the History of Germans in Bohemia],³³ which commemorated him upon his death.³⁴ For his contributions to the humanities, particularly to historical scholarship, he was elected in 1858 a corresponding member (*Correspondierendes Mitglied*) of the Royal Bohemian Society of Sciences, which also honoured him in an obituary.³⁵

Joseph Augustin Ginzl died of a heart attack (*Herzschlag*) on 1 June 1876, in Litoměřice, at house no. 6, at two o'clock in the afternoon. His funeral took place two days later, at 5:30

²⁸ The Concordat in the Czech translation is published on the pages 57 to 69.

²⁹ Based on a manuscript of the memorandum of mayor Dr. Fleischer, *Gedenkbuch 1862–1882*, 224 (dated 29 March 1868) and 227.

³⁰ See “Hoher Landtag! An der ans den 22. April l. J. anberaumten und auch vorgenommenen Wahl von 54 Landtagsabgeordneten ans dem Wahtkörper des mit keinem Fideikommißbände behafteten Großgrundbesitzes haben sich von den in der Wählerliste vom 22. April 1872 aufgenommenen 509 Wählern 261 Wähler u. z. 168 persönlich und 93 durch Bevollmächtigung betheilt und erhielten die absolute Stimmenmehrheit: [...] 14. P. Jos. Ginzl”. Online Stenographischer Bericht über die IV. Sitzung der ersten Jahres=Sesion des böhmischen Landtages vom Jahre 1872, am 29. April 1872 <https://www.psp.cz/eknih/1872skc/1/stenprot/004schuz/s004001.htm>. To the oath dated 30 April 1872 at the 5th meeting of I session of the Bohemian Diet, see the online protocol from the meeting <https://www.psp.cz/eknih/1872skc/1/stenprot/005schuz/s005001.htm>.

³¹ Moravské noviny 1871, 1; to the issue see Hlas 1871, 349-350.

³² He resigned at the first meeting of the II session of the Bohemian Diet, on 26 November 1873. See the online protocol from the meeting: <https://www.psp.cz/eknih/1872skc/2/stenprot/001schuz/s001001.htm>.

³³ He was a member of the Association as far back as in 1862. See MVGBD 1, no. 1, 1862-3, 18, where he is labelled as the *Ordentlicher Mitglied* [Full Member]. Further see, for instance, the year 1873 (MVGBD 11, 1873, 17). On the Association see Oberdorfer 1962, 9-29.

³⁴ Bericht 1876-1877, 3: “Am 1. Juni 1876 aber hat der Verein [für Geschichte der Deutschen in Böhmen; J.Z.] in der Person des Leitmeritzer Domherrn W. Ginzl [!] ein Mitglied verloren, dessen literarische Leistungen namentlich zu dem lebhaften Wunsche berechtigen, daß diesem verdienstvollen Manne recht bald von berufener Feder ein würdiges biographisches Denkmal in der Zeitschrift unseres Vereines gesetzt werde”. He is always named “W. Ginzl” in the *Bericht*.

³⁵ Sitzungsberichte 1859, 2d.

p.m., and was conducted by the chair of the diocesan consistory, Canon Jan Nepomuk Řehák³⁶ (1811 – 1901).³⁷

III/ The Work

It appears that Ginzel devoted himself to ecclesiastical and legal-historical research from his school years onwards. Even as a theology student, he authored a piece for the Würzburg theological journal titled *Briefe über christliche Dogmatik als Wissenschaft* [Letters on Christian Dogmatics as a Science].³⁸ Several stimuli for his future scholarly orientation stemmed from his studies at the *Frintaneum* in Vienna.³⁹ He also demonstrated an interest in the modern history of his diocese, as evidenced by his letter dated 4 May 1854, in which he requested materials from Fesl for a history of the Diocese of Litoměřice at the beginning of the 19th century (Winter 1943, 353).⁴⁰ This request came despite the fact that Fesl had criticized the first volume of Ginzel's church history in 1846 (Ginzel 1846), describing it as resembling a novel – “perhaps legitimately recounting a kind of struggle, yet full of conjecture” (Neumaier 2023, 70, footnote 332).⁴¹ Bolzano alludes to this criticism in his letter to Fesl dated 10 August 1846 (Neumaier 2023, 70).⁴² Nonetheless, Bishop Hille consistently supported Ginzel's scholarly (albeit not necessarily ecclesio-political) interests and provided him with enthusiastic encouragement (*eifrige Förderung*) (Reike 1910, 150, footnote 1).

In the early 1850s, Ginzel published three volumes of the *Archiv für Kirchengeschichte und Kirchenrecht* [Archives for Ecclesiastical History and Canon Law], a compendium intended “for all ecclesiastical and secular educated men, theologians, canonists, clergy, legal experts, historians, and friends of history.”⁴³ In these volumes, he assembled sources that were, in his view, difficult

³⁶ For his person, see https://cs.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jan_Nepomuk_%C5%98eh%C3%A1k.

³⁷ SOA Litoměřice, Matrika zemřelých, Z, I-Z, inv. no. 9970, sign. 99/13, 1826–1929, Litoměřice, Rybáře, 94, Online: <https://vademecum.soalitomerice.cz/vademecum/permalink?xid=09ddd7cea03b9b8d:4e496e4e:12216bae987:-6c88&scan=4b639b341d764ab6b41a09a314dff152>.

³⁸ In Benkert 1828. The journal was published by Benkert between 1822 and 1847, bearing this title from the year 1828 onwards.

³⁹ See the prefaces of the texts of 1831 and 1840.

⁴⁰ Based on the literary remains of Fesl. See also a note in Ginzel 1856, 485.

⁴¹ “[S]ie mir wie ein Roman vorkome, von dem Strauß mit Recht sagen würde, sie sei vol Voraussetzungen”. Fesl's letter, 29 July 1846.

⁴² “Der dumme Streich, dessen Sie sich in Betreff des Prof[essors] Ginzel a[us] L[e]i[tm]e[r]i[tz] anklagen, hat w[o]hl nicht viel zu bedeuten; sintemal wir w[o]hl einmal schwarz sind u[nd] uns nicht weiß brennen wollen” [= sich als unschuldig darzustellen suchen; J.Z.].

⁴³ *Archiv für Kirchengeschichte und Kirchenrecht* 1, 1851, s. IV. The preface is dated in Litoměřice, at Pentecost 1851. The second volume contains a preface dated in Litoměřice at the beginning of November 1851, and the third volume at Easter 1852. Ginzel had wished to publish such a collection earlier, but he reportedly lacked support, funding, and time. All of these, he found only later in Germany. According to Fesl's correspondence, the project had encountered opposition already in the 1840s, when the censor Josef Scheiner stood against it; Ginzel had reached out to Bernard Bolzano, which apparently provoked disapproval from the authorities. See Neumaier 2022, 367, footnote 1626 (Bolzano's letter to Fesl, 19 October 1840). See also Fesl's letter to Bolzano from 22 July 1840 and from 14 October 1840 in Neumaier – Schenkel 2022. See at last *Der Correspondent* 1840: “Der Professor der Moralthologie an der theologischen Lehranstalt zu Leitmeritz in Böhmen, Dr. J. A. Ginzel, beabsichtigte die Herausgabe eines katholischen Archivs für kirchliche Wissenschaft, die aber ungeachtet der Approbation des bischöflichen Ordinariats von der Zensurhofstelle nicht gestattet wurde. Die deßfalls von dem k. k. Gubernium in Prag erlassene Entschließung enthält nachstehende beachtenswerthe Stelle: *Nach der übereinstimmenden*

to access, concerning the (recent) history of the Catholic Church, portraying a church free from state interference. The documents are presented in their original form (i.e. mostly Latin) and – if not in German – translated into German. If originally written in a vernacular language, only the German translation is provided. Some reviewers criticised Ginzl for this editorial practice. It is evident that in so doing, he sought to contribute to the future reform of the Church – well before the 1855 Concordat.

The Concordat, in fact, became one of his most publicly discussed topics. Among other provisions, the agreement granted the Catholic Church a privileged role in the field of education, including oversight of schools and textbooks. However, it was soon violated in many respects by Austrian legislation. After 1866, a series of educational laws gradually undermined the rights guaranteed by the Concordat,⁴⁴ culminating in the so-called Hasner Law of 1869, which effectively secularised Austrian public education. Even prior to this, the Fundamental State Law of 21 December 1867 had enshrined full freedom of religion and conscience (Article 14). The law of 25 May 1868, “On the Relationship Between School and Church,” continued in this vein, curtailing ecclesiastical authority over textbooks and school supervision. In response, Pope Pius IX, in an allocution dated 22 June 1868, protested the violation of the Concordat, declaring those provisions of law and the so-called fundamental state laws invalid and non-binding insofar as they contravened the doctrine and rights of the Catholic Church. A joint pastoral letter and instruction from the Bohemian bishops, dated 24 June 1868, was confiscated, and civil courts deemed its contents criminal for disturbing public order.

Ultimately, the Concordat was unilaterally annulled in the wake of the First Vatican Council by a dispatch from Foreign Minister Count Beust dated 30 July 1870;⁴⁵ however, the Vatican

Manuskript an jener Ruhe und Unparteilichkeit, welche stets, besonders aber in unseren Tagen, zu würdiger Behandlung kirchlicher Zustände unerlässlich ist, und ohne welche die schwebenden Fragen der Zeit, statt ihre Lösung zu finden, nur noch mehr verwickelt und das Verständniß der Parteiensichere wird. Eben so wie die Richtung dieser Schrift im Allgemeinen, erklären die Wiener Zensoren auch die einzelnen Aufsätze, theils wegen der leidenschaftlichen Hitze der Darstellung, theils wegen der Wiederanfachung literarischen Streitigkeiten, welche für immer der Vergessenheit überantwortet werden sollten, theils endlich wegen der Behandlung von Streitfragen, deren Lösung auf andern Wegen als auf die Druckzulässigkeit des erwähnten Manuskripts aussprechen könnten. – Diesem Antrag der Wiener Weisung wegen Hintanhaltung der Verbreitung von Druckschriften, durch welche unter den religiösen Parteien Erbitterungen und Reibungen veranlaßt werden könnten, beizupflichten bestimmt u. s. w.” Quoted from Berg 2005, 478, footnote 941.

⁴⁴ In 1867, the acting Minister of Education, Hye, summoned Professor Johann Friedrich Schulte from Prague in order to draft proposals for the revision of certain articles of the Concordat. Schulte subsequently discussed these proposed revisions in Rome together with the ambassador, Baron Hübner. In the meantime, Imperial Chancellor Count Beust secured the Emperor's permission to deliberate, in the *Reichsrat*, on proposals put forward by the Prague professor Herbst, later Minister of Justice, which were submitted to the *Reichsrat* on 13 June 1867. These proposals aimed to abolish two key articles of the Concordat: those concerning the civil validity of ecclesiastical marriage and the Church's substantial influence over education. They also sought to balance interconfessional relations. On 10 July 1867, Deputy Mühlfeld even submitted a motion for the complete abrogation of the Concordat and its replacement with a comprehensive religious law. The following day, Herbst introduced several proposals, including an education bill intended to emancipate schools from ecclesiastical control. In response, the Austrian bishops objected to the draft legislation in a letter dated 28 September 1867, addressed to the Emperor. The Emperor replied in a stern tone, invoking his duties as a constitutional monarch.

⁴⁵ In their memorandum dated 20 March 1874, the bishops also declared that they did not consider the Concordat to be abrogated and that they would submit to the provisions of the draft law “On the External Legal Relations of the Catholic Church” only insofar as they were consistent with the Concordat. This resolution was communicated to the Pope, who approved it on 29 April 1874. It was not until 21

did not recognise this unilateral abrogation. As the Austrian government increasingly violated the Concordat, Ginzel defended governmental measures and publicly rebutted accusations that Austria intended to terminate the agreement. In so doing, he contributed to the prevailing public perception of the Catholic Church as an extension of state authority within the monarchy. As early as 1868, Ginzel argued that the Concordat was revocable and had ceased to apply in the former Italian territories and post-1867 Cisleithania. He ultimately expressed his conviction that political and constitutional liberty would best ensure the Church's development.⁴⁶

This stance provoked fierce polemics. Ginzel's views garnered both praise and defence (Zur Verständigung 1868, 1-2)⁴⁷ from the liberal political camp – for instance, the Litoměřice city council sent him a letter of commendation (*Anerkennungsadresse*) (Leitmeritzer Wochenblatt 1868, 108) – and condemnation from the conservative wing of society.⁴⁸ He responded to these criticisms by refining his views further, asserting that while he did not support unilateral revocation of the Concordat by Austria, he did advocate a “free Church in a free state”.⁴⁹ This declaration caused further outrage in conservative circles. Ginzel eventually retracted certain statements, declaring: “nichts fürchte ich aber mehr, als worin immer und wenn auch wider meinen Willen in einen Gegensatz mit dem heiligen Stuhle und dem hochwürdigsten Episcopate zu kommen” [I fear nothing more than to come, in any way and even against my will, into conflict with the Holy See and the most venerable episcopate] (Volksfreund 1868, 1). The liberal press sought to clarify his position for their readers (Ueber Dr. Ginzels „Erklärung“ 1868, 2). Conservative groups, meanwhile, attempted to portray Ginzel as a defender of the Catholic Church, misunderstood by liberals and by those ignorant of ecclesiastical matters⁵⁰ – despite the fact that a circular letter from the bishopric of Litoměřice was circulating at the time, condemning Ginzel's initial positions.⁵¹

November 1921, through an allocution of Benedict XV, and subsequently through the constitution *Fin dall primo* issued by Pius XI on 23 December 1922, that the Roman Curia declared it did not consider the successor states to be legal successors of the defunct states with regard to the rights and obligations owed to the Catholic Church.

⁴⁶ Eine Stimme 1868, 1-2: “Ich lebe vielmehr der Hoffnung, es werde der Kirche in den nichtungarischen Ländern Österreichs auch bei revidirten oder aufgehobenem Concordate nicht an jener Freiheit und Selbstständigkeit fehlen, deren sie zur fruchtbringenden Erfüllung ihrer erhabenen Sendung bedarf. Dafür ist mir Bürge das Wort der Reichsvertretung, welches in der Adresse des Abgeordnetenhauses an den Stufen des Thrones niedergelegt wurde: *Wir ehren die Unabhängigkeit der Kirche und sind weit entfernt, derselben jemals nahetreten zu wollen*. Dafür bürgt mir aber vorzüglich die dem Reiche gewordene politische, verfassungsmäßige Freiheit. In ihr ist dem katholischen Volke das beste Mittel gegeben, seiner Kirche die nöthige Freiheit und Selbstständigkeit – falls sie ihr vorenthalten werden wollte – zu erringen, und diese erstrittene Freiheit wird sicher reichere Frucht bringen, als die ohne Mühe und Streit erworbene”.

⁴⁷ In detail Bozner Zeitung no. 97, 28 April 1868, 1-2, which praises Ginzel for having the courage, as a priest and faithful Catholic, to hold his own opinions – even when they may not align with those of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. To the point Zur Concordats-Revision 1868, 225-226.

⁴⁸ He was reportedly not invited to the bishop's table during Easter Week and did not perform any ecclesiastical rites during Holy Week either. See Neues Fremden-Blatt 1868, 4.

⁴⁹ See, for instance, Wiener Kirchenzeitung 1868, 268-269; against Ginzel see an anonymous text in the Catholic-aristocratic oriented newspaper Das Vaterland 1868a, 1 and ibidem, 9/117, 28 April 1868, *Abschluß der Sache „Ginzel und das Concordat“*, 1. The author, writing in this newspaper, argued that the liberals had either misunderstood Ginzel's views or, worse, deliberately distorted them.

⁵⁰ See, for instance, Moravské noviny 1868, 1: “Již kanovník Litoměřický, dr. Ginzel, dokázal, že konkordát potřebí není”.

⁵¹ Das Vaterland 1868b, 1: “...nach dem *Volksfreund* unter den Geistlichen der Leitmeritzer Diöcese ein Rundschreiben ihres hochw. Bischofs circulirt, welches sich entschieden gegen die früher von uns

Even for post-1867 Cisleithania, Ginzel considered the legal validity of the Concordat in 1868 to be highly questionable in light of the many transformations that had occurred since 1855. By 1874, the majority of Austrian bishops – including the Archbishop of Vienna, Cardinal Rauscher – had effectively capitulated to the state (Kadlec 1991, 208).

With regard to nationalism, Ginzel proceeded with considerable impartiality. He drew on editions and scholarly works from across the monarchy, including from the German-speaking world and occasionally from authors of Balkan origin, although his referencing of Czech-language titles sometimes contained errors. Toward his scholarly opponents, he was uncompromising; however, he did not hesitate to commend them on specific points even when he disagreed with them – for example, in the case of Wattenbach. Confessional bias appears not to have played a significant role in his scholarly methodology. His works were cited both by contemporaneous and slightly later historians (Gieseler 1880, 195, footnote 1),⁵² and in some cases, they still appear in footnotes today (Fillfer 2020, 203, footnote 24).⁵³

The primary focus in what follows will be Ginzel's work on Great Moravia and, more specifically, on the Thessalonian brothers, Constantine-Cyril and Methodius. His other works will be addressed only briefly.

III/1 Research on Cyril and Methodius

The foundations of Slavonic and Old Church Slavonic studies were unquestionably laid by Josef Dobrovský (Dudášová-Křišáková 2019, 156-165). The culmination of his efforts was the monumental *Institutiones linguae slavicae dialecti veteris* (Vienna, 1822; 2nd edition 1852; Russian translation 1833 – 1834) (Weingart 1923 and 1925; Hannick 2004, 243-260), a comprehensive and detailed grammar of Old Church Slavonic which, through its comparative method, effectively served as a substitute for a full comparative Slavic grammar at the time (Večerka 1989-2003). In 1835, Franz Bopp – the father of Indo-European comparative linguistics – under Dobrovský's influence, included *Altslawisch* (Old Slavonic) in his six-volume Indo-European grammar alongside the Indian, Persian, Greek, Latin, and Germanic branches. He grouped it with Armenian, Lithuanian, and Celtic as part of the Indo-European family. Many within the German-speaking academic world were reluctant to accept this classification, and it continued to be doubted well into the mid-20th century.

Ginzel was undoubtedly influenced by the broader European atmosphere of interest in Constantine-Cyril and Methodius. As early as the 1840s, he contributed numerous entries on early mediaeval Bohemia and the spread of Christianity there to a newly emerging theological and related scholarly encyclopaedia.⁵⁴ This work served as a kind of prelude to his later engagement with the Cyrillo-Methodian theme, which is of particular relevance to our inquiry here.

besprochene, thatsächlich mehrfach irrige Ansicht des Canonicus Dr. Ginzel ausspricht”.

⁵² It is stated there that Ginzel opposed the view that Clement XIV had been poisoned, citing his work as evidence *Wie lebte und starb Ganganelli? Aus den Quellen beantwortet von Immanuel Reichenbach*, Neustadt an der Orla 1831. Ginzel's name is not given.

⁵³ In it Ginzel's work *Bischof Hurdálek, ein Charakterbild aus der Geschichte der böhmischen Kirche* (Prag, 1873) is cited.

⁵⁴ *Böhmen, Einführung des Christenthums daselbst* (Bd. 2, 1848, 61-64); *Böhmische und mährische Brüder* (Bd. 2, 1848, 65-69); *Johannes von Nepomuk* (Bd. 5, 1850, 725-732); *Leitmeritz, Bisthum* (Bd. 6, 1851, 432-434); *Slawen, Bekehrung derselben zum Christenthum* (Bd. 10, 1853, 220-230). In *Kirchen-Lexikon: oder, Encyclopädie der katholischen Theologie und ihrer Hilfswissenschaften*, 13 Bde., Hrsg. von Heinrich Joseph Wetzer und Benedikt Welte, Freiburg im Breisgau 1847-1856.

Ginzel addressed the topic in several extensive studies as well as shorter articles. The first major issue he tackled was the authenticity – or spuriousness – of the papal letters of Hadrian II and Stephen V addressed to Great Moravia, discussed in his article *Zur Geschichte der Slawenapostel Cyrill und Method* [A Study on the History of Saints Cyril and Methodius, Apostles to the Slavs].⁵⁵ In this piece, he critically responded to several works published since 1847⁵⁶ and would return to the issue repeatedly, warranting a more detailed examination in a separate section of this study.

However, Ginzel's most significant contribution to Cyrillo-Methodian scholarship was undoubtedly his book *Geschichte der Slawenapostel Cyrill und Method und der slawischen Liturgie* [A History of Apostles of the Slavs, Cyril and Methodius, and the Slavonic Liturgy] (Leitmeritz, 1857; 2nd unchanged edition, Vienna, 1861; reprint of the second edition, 1969), which he dedicated to Jacob Beer (Tříšková 2005, 334), described as a “connoisseur, protector, and patron of scholarship” (Ginzel 1861, dedication). This work quickly gained Ginzel recognition and respect on a European scale. A Czech summary of the book was prepared as early as 1857 by František Egert (1815 – 1896), a parish priest in Neklěrov, for the journal *Blahověst* (Egert 1857, 130-139). Egert added nothing of his own, admitting he did not feel qualified to do so (Egert 1857, 139).⁵⁷ The journal's editorial board, however, appended a note expressing disagreement with many of Ginzel's views and referred readers to Václav Štulc's Czech-language treatise (Štulc 1857), as well as the forthcoming work of Jan Evangelista Bílý (1819 – 1888), who had in 1850 initiated the founding of the Czech Catholic association *Dědictví sv. Cyrilla a Methoděje* [The Legacy of Saints Cyril and Methodius] (Masák 1932; Zlámal 2013, 222-224). Štulc's work, however, is considerably more superficial in comparison with Ginzel's book and does not meet the standards of professional historiography. It is also rarely mentioned that František Vodička (1812 – 1884) later authored a Czech-language book based directly on Ginzel's work (Vodička 1863).⁵⁸

Ginzel's book is situated within a wider context of interest in the two missionaries both within and beyond the Habsburg Monarchy. As the author states, “the history of the two missionaries enjoys considerable and enduring interest among the Slavic nations of the monarchy” (Ginzel 1861, Vorwort). This interest, he claims, was the very reason he devoted his “leisure hours” (*Mußestunden*) to their history. He is also careful to note that the two brothers are of significance not only for the Slavic peoples but also for the non-Slavic nations of “Austria”, as they were “representatives of the Greek side, which in the 9th century did not oppose Rome and in which the unity of the Eastern and Western Churches was harmoniously joined” (Ginzel 1861, Vorwort). According to Ginzel, this is the greatest legacy of the Thessalonian brothers.

The book is divided into two main parts: the first (pp. 1–104) deals with the life and mission of the two apostles, including a critical analysis of the relevant historical sources; the second (pp. 105–174) focuses on the history of the Slavonic liturgy. These are followed by three extensive and important appendices (132 pages, separately paginated), which not only introduce numerous new findings but also reprint several essential historical texts. Many of these are drawn from the work of Josef Dobrovský (e.g. Salajka 1962, 194-239), whose “estimable achievements” (*schätzenswerthen Leistungen*) Ginzel acknowledges in the preface dated 3 April 1857. There he

⁵⁵ In *Zeitschrift für die gesammte katholische Theologie* 7, 1855, 345-380. Ginzel himself states incorrectly pages 348 to 380. Ginzel 1871, 19.

⁵⁶ Miklosisch 1847; Wattenbach 1849; Šafařík 1851 (Ginzel renders the title with a linguistic inaccuracy); Dümmler 1854, 145-199.

⁵⁷ “Obširnější zprávu o pořádanosti spisu toho a především úsudek o ceně celého díla nastavujeme jiným, jmenovitě pak výtečným našim znatelům dějin církve slovanské”.

⁵⁸ See Zíbrt 1902, 893, no. 7733.

admits that he adopted much from Dobrovský and other “learned men”.⁵⁹ This includes (Ginzel 1861, Anhang 19-20), for example, the Latin legend *Diffuntente sole*, which survives in seven Latin manuscripts from the 15th and early 16th centuries and in three Old Czech translations from the late 14th and 15th centuries – critically edited for the first time by Dobrovský (Dobrovský 1803, 70).⁶⁰ Ginzel (Ginzel 1861, Anhang 12-18) also relied on Dobrovský’s edition and commentary (Dobrovský 1826) for the so-called *Moravian Legend* (*Tempore Michaelis Imperatoris – Legenda Moravica*).⁶¹ Because the book also discusses the contemporary use of the Slavonic liturgy, a third supplementary appendix contains statistical data from South Slavic dioceses within the monarchy where the liturgy was still in use at the time.⁶²

In his preface, Ginzel also informs the reader that his views differ from those of many learned men on specific points, but this, he claims, in no way diminishes their merit, and he expresses hope that they will regard him not as an adversary but as a fellow collaborator. The German-language press of the 1860s had no doubt that Ginzel was “a German,” and insisted that his work on the apostles of the Slavs in no way detracted from this identity, since it was a purely scholarly endeavour (*rein wissenschaftlich*), and any pro-Slavic bias could be assumed only by someone who had never read the work (Neue Freie Presse 1868, 3-4).

Ginzel also published a Czech-language version (Ginzel 1872, 16)⁶³ of a related article in the *Časopis katolického duchovenstva*, the oldest theological journal to publish in Czech.⁶⁴ The article, titled *Historicko-kritické příspěvky k dějinám sv. apoštolů Slovanských Cyrilla a Methoděje* [Historical-Critical Contributions to the History of the Holy Apostles of the Slavs, Cyril and Methodius],⁶⁵ again focuses primarily on an analysis of the papal letters of Hadrian II and Stephen V. Ginzel’s aim was to definitively prove the spuriousness of both documents and to refute scholars such as Wattenbach, Dümmler, Štulc, and Dudík, who defended their authenticity. Despite his considerable effort and scholarly diligence, Ginzel was ultimately unsuccessful in achieving this goal. The Czech-language article merely repeats the arguments he had already laid out in 1855, 1857, and 1861 respectively.

⁵⁹ Dobrovský’s study Dobrovský 1948 likewise served as a model for Ginzel. Originally published in German in 1823, Dobrovský’s treatise aimed to shed light on the obscure and, at the time, confused history of the brothers Cyril and Methodius. His goal was to demonstrate the activity and significance of the Slavic apostles, the beginnings of Christianity in the Bohemian lands, and the fate of the Slavonic liturgy on Bohemian soil.

⁶⁰ Mentioned, for instance, in MMFH II, 1967, 277 (The 2010 edition does not contribute any new findings.); Rogov – Bláhová – Konzal 1976, 268-269, footnote 7.

⁶¹ For a critical edition, see MMFH II, 1967, 257-268 (ed. 2010, 229-241).

⁶² See a note dated 5 May 1857 in Litoměřice. Ginzel 1861, 124 (Anhang III).

⁶³ The translation was allegedly made by Tomáš Novák, “a young priest from the Diocese of Prague”, and edited by Klement Borový as an editor of the journal.

⁶⁴ The periodical was founded in 1828 under the title *Časopis pro katolické duchovenstvo* (Journal for the Catholic Clergy, abbreviated ČKD), with the aim of enlightening and educating Czech Catholic priests. The initiative for its establishment came from Karel Alois Vinařický. The journal focused on all areas of theology as well as related disciplines (such as church history and religious literature), and it exclusively published texts in the Czech language. Until 1851, it was issued quarterly; in 1852, its frequency was first increased to monthly, and then to every six weeks (resulting in a total of 11 issues that year). However, at the end of that same year, publication was discontinued due to a decline in subscribers and increasing censorship pressure. Eight years later, thanks to Vinařický’s efforts, the periodical was revived. From its renewal in 1860 until its cessation in 1949 (with the exception of the 1939 volume), ČKD was published continuously, albeit with varying frequency.

⁶⁵ ČKD 12/1, 1871, 18-53; 12/2, 137-151.

We will now turn our attention to three selected and specific issues that Ginzel addressed in his writings on Cyril and Methodius.

III/1.1 Old Church Slavonic and Latin Legends of Saints Constantine-Cyril and Methodius

The first group of scholarly questions arose around the authenticity and authorship of the Old Church Slavonic legends of Saints Constantine-Cyril and Methodius. These texts initially sparked enthusiasm in A. V. Gorskij, who published on the topic in *Moskvityanin* (1843), an enthusiasm conveyed to Czech audiences by Václav Hanka (Hanka 1846, 5-33) and shared by Pavel Josef Šafařík and others. However, by the mid-19th century, sceptical voices began to emerge concerning the reliability of the information contained in these legends. Ginzel expressed doubts (Ginzel 1857, 17-18), which were echoed – more forcefully – by Alexander Brückner (Brückner 1913) in the early 20th century, and even by František Snopek (Snopek 1916, 11-45) who otherwise defended the legends against Brückner's critique (Vašica 1996, 97).

Unlike Ginzel, however, both Brückner and Snopek had access to the papal *regesta* from the 9th century, discovered in the 1870s at the British Museum. These documents confirmed the account found in the *Life of Methodius* regarding his imprisonment in Pannonia. Ultimately, both hagiographies were definitively accepted by František Dvorník, who demonstrated that they belong among the finest examples of 9th-century Byzantine literature (Dvorník 1933, 336).

Ginzel also contributed to the scholarly debates surrounding the so-called Roman (or Italian) legend – a Latin text serving as a source for the *Life of Saint Constantine* (Ginzel 1861, 47). He was among the few scholars to assert that the statement in chapter nine of this legend, regarding Constantine's ordination as a bishop, was historically accurate.

III/1.2 The Nature of the Slavic Liturgy

The question of the Slavic liturgy is even more complex. A number of scholars began to examine the nature and origins of the Slavic liturgical rite. Josef Dobrovský, the Freiburg cathedral capitular vicar Joseph Kössing (1804 – 1891), the German historian Ernst Ludwig Dümmler (1830 – 1902), and various linguists considered the Slavonic liturgy to have been of Greek origin. Advocates of its Roman character included the Lebanese scholar Joseph Assemani (1710 – 1782), the Bohemian historian Gelasius Dobner (1719 – 1790), the Benedictine of Rajhrad, Moravia, Beda Dudík (1815 – 1890), and Ginzel himself,⁶⁶ who thus took a position directly opposed to that of Dobrovský (Ginzel 1861, 107-108).

The ambiguity and contested nature of the issue were highlighted by the Moravian linguist František Bartoš (1837 – 1906), the Slovene Slavist Bartolomäus Kopitar (1780 – 1844), and the Austrian philologist Franz von Miklosich (1813 – 1891) (Bílý 1862, 42). The Sinaitic Leaves (a fragment of the Euchologion of Sinai, containing parts of the liturgies of St. John Chrysostom

⁶⁶ Ginzel even claimed that Saint Cyril celebrated the Holy Mass in Latin while in Moravia, and that it was only Saint Methodius who later celebrated it in the Slavic language – yet according to the Roman rite. V. TKADLČÍK, *Východní a západní obřad ve slovanské liturgii cyrilometodějské*, (typescript), 2. The inventory of the literary remains of prof. ThDr. Vojtěch Tkadlčík (1915 – 1997) preserved in the Centrum Aletti, Olomouc, no. box 48. Quoted from Hudec 2013, 37.

and St. Basil the Great⁶⁷) provide evidence that Constantine, at least upon his arrival in Moravia, celebrated the liturgy according to the Eastern rite. However, the Kiev Folia provide a counterpoint, indicating that after the Slavonic liturgy was approved by Popes Adrian II and John VIII, Methodius celebrated Mass according to the Western rite (Dobrovský 1948, 169). Ginzel (Ginzel 1861, 42) reproached Dobrovský for what he considered an erroneous claim – that the Slavonic language had been introduced into the liturgy under the Eastern rite prior to 867. Ginzel viewed this assertion as premature, even if he was ultimately closer to the truth on this point than the “Patriarch of Slavistics” himself.⁶⁸ This also relates to Dobrovský’s interpretation of the hostility shown by Latin Western clergy toward Methodius, which he attributed to the use of the Eastern rite. Ginzel rejected this explanation as unfounded (Ginzel 1861, 42).

III/1.3 The Letters of Popes Hadrian II and Stephen V to Great Moravia

As we have seen, Ginzel (Ginzel 1861, 8 and 14; Ginzel 1871, 18-53) also denied the authenticity of Hadrian’s letter *Gloria in excelsis Deo* (869), which is today considered genuine, even though precise dating of the document remains difficult.⁶⁹ He was not alone in his view; his position was shared by Václav Vondrák (Vondrák 1898, 141-147),⁷⁰ Alexander Brückner (Brückner 1913, 60), August Naegle (Naegle 1915, 72 and 285), František Hýbl (Hýbl 1908, 1-18, 153-171, 287-297, 406-416), and, more broadly, by Johann Friedrich (Friedrich 1892, 411), Leopold Karl Goetz (Goetz 1897, 13-17 and 50-58), and others. Conversely, Vatroslav Jagić (Jagić 1913, 41), František Pastrnek (1902, 94), František Snopek (Snopek 1902), and naturally many other scholars argued in favour of the letter’s authenticity.

Ginzel likewise denied the authenticity of the 885 letter of Pope Stephen V, in which the pope informs Svatopluk that he will be his protector in all matters and embraces him as a spiritual son.⁷¹ Ginzel (Ginzel 1861, 9-10, Anhang I, 63-67; Ginzel 1872, 24-25; Ginzel 1871, 137-151) considered the letter to be the work of Wiching – a view also held by numerous other scholars. Gustav Friedrich (CDB I, 32), however, had already noted that the letter closely matches the *commonitorium* issued by Pope Stephen V to his legates Bishop Dominic and the clerics John and Stephen, to such an extent that its authenticity can hardly be doubted. This view is supported by most contemporary experts, although certain passages in the letter remain difficult to explain, and interpretations vary among individual scholars.

III/2 Other Topics

Setting aside contemporary issues concerning the activities of the Catholic Church and research on Saints Cyril and Methodius, two thematic areas remain that engaged Ginzel to such an extent that he dedicated both his time and scholarly expertise to them.

The first of these is the history of the Catholic Church in Bohemia. This interest is reflected both in his entries written between 1848 and 1853 for the aforementioned German encyclopaedia focused on the mediaeval period, and in the biographical sketches he published in the Bohemian

⁶⁷ Today, we know that Constantine-Cyril indeed translated both the liturgy of St. John Chrysostom and that of St. Basil the Great, as well as a sacramentary according to the Western rite.

⁶⁸ Still Bishop Gorazd II does not agree with him. See Gorazd 2013, 97.

⁶⁹ For a summary of research on the letter, see MMFH III, 154-155, no. 39 (ed. 2011, 121-122).

⁷⁰ In Czech in Vondrák 1903, 104.

⁷¹ Published with comments in MMFH III, 215-226, no. 101 (ed. 2011, 179-190).

regional periodical *Bohemia*⁷² toward the end of his life. The figures he profiled hailed from the Catholic Enlightenment milieu of Bohemia (Joseph Anton Riegger, Stephan Rautenstrauch, and Kaspar Royko). He consistently praised and highlighted their contributions, valuing Riegger in particular for his advocacy of the Czech language in schools and for supporting the establishment of a Czech language professorship at the University of Prague (Joseph Anton Riegger 1876, 1).⁷³ Ginzel did, however, regard Riegger's lack of proficiency in Czech as a shortcoming, one that proved disadvantageous on several occasions during the preparation of his works, since as editor he was unable to assess Czech-language texts. Of Rautenstrauch, Ginzel commended his concept of theological education, which, in his view, should not serve as a mere "handmaiden of theology", but rather, thanks to Rautenstrauch's influence, should support theology as a scholarly discipline. The learned abbot also emphasised training in Oriental languages, particularly Old Greek and Hebrew, in order to enable young theologians to gain a proper understanding of the Bible (Stephan Rautenstrauch 1876, 1).

In these texts from 1876, Ginzel unequivocally aligns himself with Catholic Enlightenment ideals, positioning himself against censorship and the state bureaucracy of the Josephine era. The writings are objective and, although the author nowhere cites sources or literature, they represent, from a historiographical perspective, factual and well-informed contributions to the intellectual history of Enlightenment era in Bohemia.

Conclusion

Joseph Augustin Ginzel was a formidable polemicist who did not shy away from contemporary church-political issues, nor from the popularisation of (church) history through the daily press – most notably the Prague-based German-language newspaper *Bohemia*. His textbooks on canon law and church history fulfilled their function from the state's perspective at the time, yet they never achieved widespread dissemination or popularity. Ginzel's greatest scholarly contribution thus lies in the field of Cyrillo-Methodian research, where he received both praise and agreement on many specific points. He was commended by both Czech- and German-speaking colleagues and successors, as he was consistently regarded as an "unbiased German". Even those who frequently debated with him did not question the scholarly value of his texts in this domain. František Pastrnek (Pastrnek 1902, 30 and 36), for instance, praised Ginzel for advancing the view – supported by a sound reading of Latin sources – that the missionaries arrived in Great Moravia directly from Constantinople, rather than from Bulgaria (Ginzel 1861, 25). As late as 1948, Josef Vajs still leaned toward Ginzel's interpretation (Ginzel 1861, 32-33) concerning the political success that Prince Rastislav of Great Moravia achieved by inviting the two missionaries from Constantinople. Vajs, in fact, referred to Ginzel positively on several occasions in his commentary (Dobrovský 1948, 168 and 178).

⁷² *Bohemia* was a German-language daily newspaper published in Prague from 1828 to 1938. Following the restoration of constitutional government in 1861, it positioned itself as the principal press organ of the German liberal political current in Bohemia (the so-called Constitutional Party).

⁷³ "Wirklich ist es nur Riegger zu danken, daß an der Hochschule in Prag ein Lehrstuhl der böhmischen Sprache errichtet wurde. Es ist nicht überflüssig zu bemerken, daß Riegger mit der čechischen Sprache durchweg unbekannt war; er versuchte wohl sie zu lernen, seine Zunge war aber zu ungelent, zu widerspänstig, um sich in den čechischen Wort- und Satzbildungen heimisch finden zu können". To a history of the first Department of the Czech language within the Bohemian lands, see Johanides – Šimeček – Koblížek 1993.

From the perspective of the Catholic Church, Ginzl's figure is somewhat ambivalent. Initially, he was a devoted supporter not only of the Catholic Church but also of the state, as he maintained a strong affinity for the Habsburgs and the Austrian Empire. However, when the state began to distance itself from the Catholic Church in the 1860s, Ginzl aligned himself more closely with the state than with the Church. Toward the end of his life, he withdrew from public life, published his articles anonymously, and resigned from both the Bohemian Diet and the Imperial Council (*Reichsrat*).

Nonetheless, his name continued to resonate after his death, especially among scholars engaged in Cyrillo-Methodian studies. His legacy began to fade only in the second half of the twentieth century, as his research was superseded by new discoveries and the interpretive paradigms they introduced. This, however, is the fate of many scholars – only a few exert influence that endures for centuries.

REFERENCES

- Acton, John.* 1870. The Vatican Council. In *The North British Review* 53, October, 183-229.
- Albrecht Stefan.* 2003. Geschichte der Grossmährenforschung in den Tschechischen Ländern und in der Slowakei. Praha.
- Anonym* 1876. Stephan Rautenstrauch. In *Bohemia* 49 (Beilage zur *Bohemia* Nr. 172), 23. Juni 1876, 1.
- Anonym.* Jubileum encykliky cyrillomethodějské (Jubileum 25leté, trvá do 30. září 1905), část XII.: Ještě o slovanské bohoslužbě. In *Hlas. Týdeník politicko-náboženský* LXXXI/2, 8. prosince 1904, 4.
- Archiv města Plzně [Archives of the City of Plzeň; hereafter AMP], fond Filosofický ústav [hereafter FÚ], Imatrikulační kniha 1809–1839, inv. no. 1, sign. 13 b 125. <https://digiarchiv.plzen.eu/vademecum/permalink?xid=55062148b61f46ddbafb484e9365300b&scan=98c136731783fb894ab47e6aaf359218>.
- Archiv města Plzně [Archives of the City of Plzeň; hereafter AMP], fond Filosofický ústav [hereafter FÚ], Hlavní katalog 1805–1834, inv. no. 3, sign. 13 b 127. <https://digiarchiv.plzen.eu/vademecum/permalink?xid=3b1b7d3f4bf3497ea1fe01484bb1c80b&scan=c19d5d81b237144ef2914d8ad5305a99>.
- Benkert, Franz Georg (ed.).* 1828. Allgemeiner Religions- und Kirchenfreund und Kirchen correspondent. Eine theologische und kirchenhistorische Zeitschrift, Jahrgang 1, Bd. 2, Würzburg.
- Berg, Jan (ed.).* 2005. Bernard Bolzano – Gesamtausgabe. Reihe III, Briefwechsel. Band 3, Bernard Bolzano Briefe an František Příhonský (1824–1848). Stuttgart – Bad Cannstatt.
- Bericht* 1876 – 1877. Bericht über den Stand und die Thätigkeit des Vereines während des 14. Vereinsjahres. In *Mitteilungen des Vereins für Geschichte der Deutschen in Böhmen* 15/1, 3.
- Bericht* 1909 – 1910. Bericht über das K. und K. Höhere Weltpriester-Bildungs-Institut zum Heil. Augustin (Frintaneum) in Wien im Studienjahre 1909-10, 6. Jahrgang.
- Bílý, Jan Evangelista.* 1862. Dějiny ss. apoštolů slovanských Cyrilla a Methoda. Praha.
- BLGBL* 1979. Biographisches Lexikon zur Geschichte der böhmischen Länder 1. München.
- Brückner, Alexander.* 1913. Die Wahrheit über die Slavenapostel. Tübingen.
- CDB* 1904. Friedrich, Gustav (ed.). Codex diplomaticus regni Bohemiae I. Pragae.
- ČSB* 1930. Český slovník bohovědný 4. Praha.
- Das Vaterland* 1868a. Das Vaterland. Zeitung für die österreichische Monarchie 9/108, 19 April 1868, Ginzl und das Concordat, 1.

- Das Vaterland 1868b.* Das Vaterland. Zeitung für die österreichische Monarchie 9/117, 28 April 1868, Abschluß der Sache „Ginzel und das Concordat“, 1.
- Der Correspondent 1840.* Der Correspondent von und für Deutschland, Jahrgang 1840 (Wien, 27 September), column Oesterreich †.
- Dobrovský, Josef.* 1803. Kritische Versuche I.: Bořiwoy's Taufe. Prag.
- Dobrovský, Josef.* 1826. Mährische Legende von Cyrill und Method. Prag.
- Dobrovský, Josef.* 1948. Cyril a Metod, apoštolové slovanští, ed. a komentáře Josef Vajs. Praha.
- Donat, Heinrich.* 1927. Das Priesterseminar in Leitmeritz. In Festschrift Leitmeritz 700 Jahre Stadt. Leitmeritz, 119-123.
- Dr. Sylvius [= J. A. Ginzel].* 1848. Über die Zukunft der Kirche in Österreich. Regensburg.
- Dudášová-Kriššáková, Júlia.* 2019. Od staroslovienčiny k cirkevnej slovančine. In *Slavica Slovaca* 54/2, 156-165.
- Dümmeler, Ernst (ed.).* 1854. Die pannonische Legende vom heiligen Methodius. In *Archiv für Kunde österreichischer Geschichtsquellen*, Bd. 13, Heft 1, Wien, 145-199.
- Dvorník, František.* 1933. Les légendes de Constantin et de Méthode vues de Byzance. Prague.
- Egert, František.* 1857. Život a působení sv. Cyrilla a Methoděje, apoštolů slovanských. Dle Dr. A. Ginsla. In *Blahověst. Katolický týdeník pro Čechy, Morawany, Slowáky a Slezany* 2 (17 December 1857), 130-139.
- Eine Stimme 1868.* Eine Stimme aus dem Clerus über das Concordat. In *Neue Freie Presse, Abendblatt*, no. 1287, Wien, 30 March 1868, 1-2.
- Fasora, Lukáš – Hanuš, Jiří – Pavlíček, Tomáš et al.* 2017. Kněžské identity v českých zemích (1820–1938). Praha.
- Fillfer, Franz Leander.* 2020. Aufklärung habsburgisch. Staatsbildung, Wissenskultur und Geschichtspolitik in Zentraleuropa 1750–1850. Göttingen.
- Frankl, Karl H. – Tropper, Peter G. (ed.).* 2006. Das „Frintaneum“ in Wien und seine Absolventen aus den Kirchenprovinzen Wien, Salzburg und Görz (1816–1919). Ein biographisches Lexikon = Dunajski Frintaneum in njegovi člani iz cerkvenih pokrajin Dunaj, Salzburg in Gorica (1816–1918). Biografski leksikon. = Il Frintaneum di Vienna ed i suoi allievi delle Provincie ecclesiastiche di Vienna, Salisburgo e Gorizia (1816–1918). Un dizionario biografico. = Bečki Frintaneum i njegovi članovi iz crkvenih pokrajina Beč, Salzburg i Gorica (1816–1918). Biografski leksikon. (= Studien zum Frintaneum. Bd. 1). Hermagoras/Mohorjeva. Klagenfurt u. a.
- Friedrich, Johann.* 1892. Ein Brief des Anastasius bibliothecarius an den Bischof Gaudericus von Velletri über die Abfassung der „Vita cum translatione s. Clementis Papae“: Eine neue Quelle zur Cyrillus- und Methodius-Frage. In *Sitzungsberichte der königlichen bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-philologische Classe, Sitzung vom 2. Juli 1892*, 393-442.
- Gieseler, John C. L.* 1880. A Text-Book of Church History, vol. 5 (1517–1834), translated by Henry B. Smith. New York.
- Ginzel, Joseph Augustin* 1857. Geschichte der Slavenapostel Cyrill und Method und der slawischen Liturgie. Leitmeritz.
- Ginzel, Joseph Augustin* 1861. Geschichte der Slavenapostel Cyrill und Method und der slawischen Liturgie. Wien.
- Ginzel, Joseph Augustin* 1871. Historicko-kritické příspěvky k dějinám sv. apoštolů Slovanských Cyrilla a Methoděje. In *Časopis katolického duchovenstva* 12/1, 18-53; 12/2, 137-151.
- Ginzel, Joseph Augustin.* 1846. Geschichte der Kirche, Band 1. Wien.
- Ginzel, Joseph Augustin.* 1856. Urkundlicher Bericht über die Säcularisirung des Bisthums Meissen unter dem Bischofe Johann von Haugwitz, und die Erhaltung des Collegiatstiftes von St. Peter zu Budissin in der Lausitz. In *Theologische Quartalschrift (Tübingen)* 38/3, 485-528.

- Ginzel, Joseph Augustin. 1872. *Kirchenhistorische Schriften*, Bd. 2. Wien.
- Goetz, Leopold Karl. 1897. *Geschichte der Slavenapostel Konstantinus (Kyrillus) und Methodius*. Gotha.
- Gorazd II., biskup. 2013. *Cyril a Metoděj: apoštolové Slovanů*. Praha.
- Hanka, Václav. 1846. O sv. Kyrille i Methodiu (překl. z ruštiny). In *Časopis českého musea* 20/1, 5-33.
- Hannick, Christian. 2004. Die Institutiones linguae slavicae von Dobrovský und seine sprachgeschichtlichen Auffassungen. In *Josef Dobrovský – Fundator studiorum slavicum: příspěvky z mezinárodní vědecké konference v Praze 10.-13. června 2003*. Praha, 243-260.
- Hill, Roland. 2000. *Lord Acton*. New Haven, CT – London.
- Hlas 1871. Hlas. Týdeník politicko-náboženský 23/28, 13 July 1871, 349-350.
- Hlas 1873. Hlas. Týdeník politicko-náboženský 25/2, 14 March 1873, 86-87.
- Huber, Kurt Augustinus – Bahlcke, Joachim – Grulich, Rudolf (ed.). 2005. *Katholische Kirche und Kultur in Böhmen: ausgewählte Abhandlungen*. Münster.
- Hudec, Petr. 2013. *Svátost jednoty: historie slavení slovanské liturgie na Velehradě*, rigorous work, Teologická fakulta, Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci. Olomouc.
- Husák, Petr. 2021. *Když rozpínají ruce, dotýkají se temnot: proměny kněžské identity v prostředí českého katolicismu v 19. a 20. století*. Brno.
- Hýbl, František. 1908. Slovanská liturgie na Moravě v IX. století. In *Český časopis historický* 14/1, 1-18; 14/2, 153-171; 14/3, 287-297; 14/4, 406-416.
- I. a II. königseggovský kanonikát v Litoměřicích https://cs.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kanonik%C3%A1t_k%C3%B6nigseggovsk%C3%BD_I._a_II.
- Jagić, Vatroslav von. 1913. *Entstehungsgeschichte der kirchenslavischen Sprache*. Berlin.
- Jahresbericht 1877*. Jahresbericht der Königlich böhmischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, Jg. 1877 (9 May 1877). Prag.
- Ježek, J[an]. 1880. *Zásluhy duchovenstva o řeč a literaturu českou (1780–1880)*. Praha.
- Johanides, Josef – Šimeček, Zdeněk – Koblížek, Vladimír. 1993. František Martin Pelcl, první profesor české řeči a literatury na pražské univerzitě. Rychnov nad Kněžnou.
- Joseph Anton Riegger. 1876. Anonym. Joseph Anton Riegger. In *Bohemia* 49 (Beilage zur Bohemia Nr. 133), 14. Mai 1876, 1.
- Kadlec, Jaroslav. 1991. *Přehled českých církevních dějin*, vol. 2. Praha.
- KDO JE KDO v české slavistice (<https://www.slaviste.cz/index.php>).
- Klucak, Heinrich. 1877. *Geschichte des Leitmeritzer Gymnasiums 1 (Bis 1850)*. In *Jahres-Bericht des K.K. Ober-Gymnasiums zu Leitmeritz in Böhmen 1877*. Leitmeritz, 3-40.
- Kotorová, Dagmar. 2020. *Filozofický ústav v Plzni 1804–1849*, MA thesis, Filozofická fakulta, Západočeská univerzita v Plzni. Plzeň.
- Kotyza, Oldřich – Smetana, Jan – Toman, Jindřich. 1997. *Dějiny města Litoměřic*. Litoměřice.
- Kudělka, Milan – Šimeček, Zdeněk – Večerka, Radoslav. 1995. *Česká slavistika v prvním období svého vývoje do počátku 60. let 19. století*. Praha.
- Kudělka, Milan – Šimeček, Zdeněk. 1972. *Československé práce o jazyce, dějinách a kultuře slovanských národů od r. 1760: biograficko-bibliografický slovník*. Praha.
- Künne, Wolfgang. 2024. *Bernard Bolzano. Seine Zeit und sein Leben, sein Werk und seine Wirkung*, 4 Bde. Frankfurt am Main.
- Leitmeritzer Wochenblatt 1868*. Leitmeritzer Wochenblatt zu allem Wissenswerthen für Stadt und Land 13/14, 4 April 1868, 108.
- Lišková, Marie. 1994. *Slovník představitelů zemské samosprávy v Čechách v letech 1861–1913*. Praha.
- Ludvíkov pod Smrkem 2025. https://cs.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ludv%C3%ADkov_pod_Smrkem.

- Macek, Jaroslav. 2007. 950 let litoměřické kapituly. Kostelní Vydří.
- Macek, Jaroslav. 2013. Das Bistum Leitmeritz: die Bischöfe und das Schicksal der Leitmeritzer Diözese 1655–2005, aus dem Tschechischen übersetzt von Jana Niedermaier. München.
- Masák, Emanuel. 1932. Dějiny Dědictví sv. Cyrila a Metoděje v Brně 1850–1930. Brno.
- Miklosisch, Franz (ed.). 1847. Vita S. Clementis Episcopi Bulgarum, Graece. Wien.
- MMFH 1967, 1969. Bartoňková, Dagmar – Večerka, Radoslav (eds.). Magnae Moraviae fontes historici = Prameny k dějinám Velké Moravy II, III. Brno.
- Moravské noviny 1868. Moravské noviny 20/62, 23 May 1868, Z Vídně, dne 22. května: Katoličtí bohoslovci o konkordátu rakouském, 1.
- Moravské noviny 1871. Moravské noviny 33/33 (18 March 1871), 1.
- Müller, Rudolf. 1879-1880. Künstler der Neuzeit Böhmens VIII: Jacob Ginzel. In Mitteilungen des Vereins für Geschichte der Deutschen in Böhmen 18/3, 181-192.
- Naegle, August. 1915. Kirchengeschichte Böhmens, Bd. 1. Berlin.
- Neue Freie Presse 1868. Leitmeritz. 8. April [Orig.-Corr.]. In Neue Freie Presse, Morgenblatt, Wien, no. 1299, Samstag, 11 April 1868, 3-4.
- Neues Fremden-Blatt 1868. Neues Fremden-Blatt, Morgenblatt, Wien, 4/112, 23 April 1868, 4.
- Neumaier, Otto – Schenkel, Peter Michael (ed.). 2022. Michael Josef Fesl: Briefe an Bernard Bolzano 1839–1841 (Beiträge zur Bolzano-Forschung 32). Baden – Baden.
- Neumaier, Otto (ed.). 2022. Bernard Bolzano – Gesamtausgabe. Reihe III, Briefwechsel. Band 3, Briefwechsel mit Michael Josef Fesl (1834–1840). Stuttgart – Bad Cannstatt.
- Neumaier, Otto (ed.). 2023. Bernard Bolzano – Gesamtausgabe. Reihe III, Briefwechsel. Band 5, Briefwechsel mit Michael Josef Fesl (1841–1846). Stuttgart – Bad Cannstatt.
- Oberdorfler, Kurt. 1962. Verein für die Geschichte der Deutschen in Böhmen 1862–1938. In Bohemia 3/1, 9-29.
- OSN 1896. Ottův slovník naučný 10. Praha.
- Pastrnek, František. 1902. Dějiny slovanských apoštolů Cyrilla a Methoda s rozbohem a otiskem hlavních pramenů. Praha.
- Pavlíková, Marie. 1985. Bolzanovo působení na pražské univerzitě. Praha.
- Pezzimenti, Rocco. 2001. The Political Thought of Lord Acton: The English Catholics in the Nineteenth Century. Leominster.
- Reike, Franz Xaver. 1910. Augustinus Bartholomäus Hille, Bischof von Leitmeritz. Ein Lebensbild. Wien.
- Rogov, Aleksandr Ivanovich – Bláhová, Emilie – Konzal, Václav (ed.). 1976. Staroslověnské legendy českého původu. Nejstarší kapitoly z dějin česko-ruských kulturních vztahů. Praha.
- RSN 1863. Riegrův slovník naučný 3. Praha.
- RSN 1890. Riegrův slovník naučný 12. Praha (abbr. Bč).
- Salajka, Antonín. 1962. Prameny k životu a dějinám Konstantina-Cyrila a Metoděje. In Václav Bartůňek (ed.). Soluňští bratři. 1100 let od příchodu sv. Cyrila a Metoděje na Moravu. Praha, 194-239.
- Schulte, Johann Friedrich von. 1879. Ginzel, Joseph Augustin. In Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie 9, 179-180 [Digitale Volltext-Ausgabe in Wikisource, URL: https://de.wikisource.org/w/index.php?title=ADB:Ginzel,_Josef_Augustin&oldid].
- Sitzungsberichte 1859. Sitzungsberichte der königlichen böhmischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften in Prag, Jahrgang 1859, Prag.
- Snopek, František. 1896. List papeže Hadriána II. v panonských legendách a bulla Jana VIII. Industriae tuae. Historicko-kritický pokus. In Sborník velehradský 6, 1-131.
- Snopek, František. 1913. Apoštolové slovanští Konstantin-Cyryll a Methoděj: slovo odvetu univ. prof. dru Brücknerovi. Praha.

- Snopek, František*. 1916. Studie Cyrilometodějské. Brno.
- Státní oblastní archiv Litoměřice [County Archives in Litoměřice; hereafter SOA Litoměřice], Matrika, N, I-N, inv. no. 4238, sign. L84/27, 1799–1807: <https://vademecum.soalitomerice.cz/vademecum/permalink?xid=09ddd7cea03b9b8d:30bdd2c7:1201ea2ef5b:-7363&scan=49f1799ad8c34998bf0433159e660456>.
- Státní oblastní archiv Litoměřice [County Archives in Litoměřice; hereafter SOA Litoměřice], fond Kapitula Litoměřice, no. box 89.
- Státní oblastní archiv Litoměřice [County Archives in Litoměřice; hereafter SOA Litoměřice], Matrika zemřelých, Z, I-Z, inv. no. 9970, sign. 99/13, 1826–1929, Litoměřice, Rybáře, 94, Online: <https://vademecum.soalitomerice.cz/vademecum/permalink?xid=09ddd7cea03b9b8d:4e496e4e:12216bae987:-6c88&scan=4b639b341d764ab6b41a09a314dff152>.
- Stenographischer Bericht über die IV. Sitzung der ersten Jahres=Sesion des böhmischen Landtages vom Jahre 1872, am 29. April 1872 <https://www.psp.cz/eknih/1872skc/1/stenprot/004schuz/s004001.htm>.
- Stephan Rautenstrauch* 1876. Anonym. Stephan Rautenstrauch. In *Bohemia* 49 (Beilage zur *Bohemia* Nr. 171), 22. Juni 1876, 1.
- Šafařík, Pavel Josef*. 1851. Památky dřevního písemnictví Jihoslovanův. Praha.
- Šebek, Jaroslav*. 2008. Im Dienst für Gott und die Nation. Katholische Kirche und Klerus in den Böhmisches Ländern im 19 und Frühen 20. Jahrhunder. In Frankl, Karl H. – Klieber, Rupert (ed.). *Das Priesterkolleg St. Augustin „Frintaneum“ in Wien 1816 bis 1918. Kirchliche Elite-Bildung für den Donau-Alpen-Adria-Raum (= Studien zum Frintaneum. Bd. 2)*. Wien u. a., 181–194.
- Štulc, Václav*. 1857. Život sv. Cyrilla a Methodia. Brno.
- Tkadlčík, Vojtěch*. 1995. Cyrilometodějský kult na křesťanském Západě. Olomouc.
- Tříšková, Alena*. 2005. Beer, Jakob. In *Biografický slovník českých zemí* 3. Praha. (Online: <https://biography.hiu.cas.cz/wiki/index.php?curid=40702>).
- Tumpach, Josef*. 1910. C. a k. Frintaneum ve Vídni. In *Časopis katolického duchovenstva* 51, 585.
- Ueber Dr. Ginzels „Erklärung“* 1868. *Ueber Dr. Ginzels „Erklärung“*. In *Salzburger Zeitung* 99, 30 April 1868, 2.
- Valeš, Václav*. 2006. Konkordát z roku 1855 mezi Apoštolským stolcem a Rakouským císařstvím, bachelor's thesis, Katolická teologická fakulta, Univerzita Karlova. Praha (online https://dspace.cuni.cz/bitstream/handle/20.500.11956/4749/BPTX_2005_1_11260_KBAK000_48773_0_14816.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y).
- Vašica, Josef*. 1996. Literární památky epochy velkomoravské 863–885, 2nd ed. Praha.
- Večerka, Radoslav*. 1989–2003. Altkirchenslavische (altbulgarische) Syntax. T. 27, Bd. 1: Die Lineare Satzorganisation; Bd. 2: Die innere Satzstruktur; Bd. 3: Die Satztypen: der einfache Satz; Bd. 4: Die Satztypen: der zusammengesetzte Satz; Bd. 5, Registerband. Freiburg im Breisgau.
- Vejvar, Stanislav*. 2006. Prelát Václav Svatopluk Štulc a konzervativní vlastenectví 19. století. K národně buditeckému působení kladenského rodáka V. S. Štulce, probošta vyšehradského, spisovatele, básníka a publicisty. In *Posel z Budče: almanach poutníků na staroslavnou Budeč, Kladno: Sládečkovo vlastivědné muzeum v Kladně* 23, 16–25.
- Vodička, František*. 1863. Tisíciletá památka swatých aposstolů slowanských Cyrilla a Methoda. Olomouc.
- Volksfreund* 1868. *Volksfreund*, 18 April 1868. Quoted from *Das Vaterland. Zeitung für die österreichische Monarchie* 9/117, 28 April 1868, Abschluß der Sache „Ginzels und das Concordat“, 1.
- Vondrák, Václav*. 1898. Einige Bedenken gegen die Echtheit des Briefes v. P. Hadrian II. in der Vita S. Methodii c. VIII. In *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 20, 141–147.

- Vondrák, Václav. 1898. Studie z oboru církevněslovanského písemnictví. Praha.
- Vopravil, Stanislav Jaroslav. 1973. Slovník pseudonymů v české a slovenské literatuře (anagramů, kryptonymů, značek, jmen původních, přijatých, dvojitých, polatinštělých atd.). Praha.
- Výtisková, Eva. 1992. Jacob Ginzel (1792–1862), soupis díla, katalogové údaje, OG. Liberec.
- Wattenbach, Wilhelm. 1849. Beiträge zur Geschichte der christlichen Kirche in Mähren und Böhmen. Wien.
- Weingart, Miloš. 1923 and 1925. Dobrovského Institutiones: na vděčnou paměť jejich stoletého jubilea. Part I, Církevněslovanské mluvnice před Dobrovským. In Sborník Filozofické fakulty University Komenského v Bratislavě 1/16, 635–695; Part II, Rozbor Institucí, ibidem 3/38 (12.), 67–232.
- Weller, Emil. 1862. Index pseudonymorum. Wörterbuch der Pseudonymen oder Verzeichniss aller Autoren, die sich falscher Namen bedienen, 2. neuvermehrte Ausgabe. Leipzig.
- Wesseling, Klaus-Gunther. 2002. Fesl Michael Josef. In: Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon 20, 494–499 (online: <https://www.bbkl.de/index.php/frontend/lexicon/F/Fe/fesl-michael-josef-56066>).
- Wiener Kirchenzeitung 1868. Wiener Kirchenzeitung 17, 25 April 1868, 268–269.
- Winter, Eduard. 1940. Tisíc let duchovního zápasu [náboženské zápolení dvou národů]. Praha.
- Winter, Eduard. 1943. Der Josefinismus und seine Geschichte. Beiträge zur Geistesgeschichte Österreichs 1740–1848. Brünn – München – Wien.
- Winter, Eduard. 1945. Josefinismus a jeho dějiny. Příspěvky k duchovním dějinám Čech a Moravy: 1740–1848. Praha.
- Zíbrt, Čeněk (ed.). 1902. Bibliografie české historie, vol. II. Praha.
- Zlámal, Bohumil. 2008. Příručka českých církevních dějin V. Doba barokní katolicity (1650–1750), Doba osvícenská (1750–1848). Olomouc.
- Zlámal, Bohumil. 2013. Galerie cyrilometodějských pracovníků nové doby. Olomouc–Roma.
- Zur Concordats-Revision 1868. Zur Concordats-Revision. In Salzburger Chronik für Stadt und Land 4/45, 22 April 1868, 225–226.
- Zur Verständigung 1868. Zur Verständigung und Abwehr. In Deutsche Volks-Zeitung 2/16, 17 April 1868, 210.

Doc. PhDr. et Mgr. Jakub Zouhar, Ph.D.
University of Hradec Králové
Philosophical Faculty
Department of Auxiliary Sciences of History and Archival Studies
Náměstí Svobody 331
500 03 Hradec Králové 3
Czech Republic
jakub.zouhar@uhk.cz
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-4681-7214
SCOPUS Author ID: 35759984300

Appendix

Bibliography of the Works of Joseph Augustin Ginzel⁷⁴

1828

- *Briefe über christliche Dogmatik als Wissenschaft*, in: Franz Georg BENKERT (ed.), *Allgemeiner Religions- und Kirchenfreund und Kirchenrespondent. Eine theologische und kirchenhistorische Zeitschrift* 1, Bd. 2, Würzburg, 1828.

1831

- *Wie lebte und starb Ganganelli? Aus den Quellen beantwortet von Immanuel Reichenbach*, Neustadt an der Orla, 1831 (VIII + 56 pp.) [revised and reprinted under the title *Papst Clemens XIV. Eine biographische Skizze mit besonderer Rücksichtnahme auf die durch ihn vollzogene Aufhebung der Gesellschaft Jesu und auf die Art seines Todes*, in: *Kirchenhistorische Schriften*, Bd. 2, Wien, 1872, pp. 205-282].

1840

- *Legatio apostolica Petri Aloysii Carafae episc. Tricaricensis etc. ad tractum Rheni et ad provincias inferioris Germaniae ab anno 1624 usque ad 1638*, Wirceburgi, 1840 (VI + 202 pp.).

1843

- *Evangelium und Kirche. Eine katholische Protestation gegen den Protestantismus, welcher sich „Kirche“ nennt*, Regensburg 1843 (200 pp.) [pseudonym “Dr. Sylvius”].

1846

- *Geschichte der Kirche*, Band 1, Wien, 1846 (XIV + 353 pp.).
- *Katholische Wahrheit und protestantischer Irrthum in fünfzig Fragen und Antworten. Ein Controverskatechismus für's katholische Volk*, Regensburg, 1846 (168 pp.) [anonym].
- *Lehren der katholischen Kirche gegenüber den Irrthümmern der deutschen Sectirer: ein Vademecum für jeden Katholiken*, Regensburg, 1846 (VI + 153 pp.) [anonym].

1847

- *Geschichte der Kirche*, Band 2, Wien, 1847 (XV + 395 pp.).

1848

- *Über die Zukunft der Kirche in Österreich. Briefe von Dr. Sylvius*, Regensburg, 1848 (132 pp.).
- *Der Geist des heiligen Augustinus in seinen Briefen*, *Theologische Quartalschrift* (Tübingen) 30, 4. Heft, 1848, pp. 540-599 and 31, 1. and 3. Heft, 1849, pp. 44-99 and 379-438 [reprinted and supplemented with the original Latin versions of the letters in *Kirchenhistorische Schriften*, Bd. 1, Wien, 1872, pp. 123-245].

1851

- *Die canonische Lebensweise der Geistlichen. Ein Votum für die Wiedereinführung derselben*, Regensburg, 1851 (239 pp.).
- *Archiv für Kirchengeschichte und Kirchenrecht*, 3 Bände, Regensburg, 1851-1852 (VIII + 488 pp.; VIII + 311 pp.; VIII + 218 pp.) [Edited by Ginzel; reprint edition, 1968].

⁷⁴ The bibliography does not claim to be exhaustive, as it is particularly difficult – and in practice virtually impossible – to comprehensively identify polemical articles and certain reviews published anonymously.

1852

- *Beiträge zur Dogmengeschichte I. und II.*, Zeitschrift für die gesammte katholische Theologie 3 and 4, 1852, pp. 3-53 and 255-296 [reprinted in incomplete form in Kirchenhistorische Schriften, Bd. 1, Wien, 1872, pp. 247-409].

1853

- *Reliquien von Vincenz Eduard Milde, weiland Fürsten-Erzbischofe der Kirche von Wien. Nebst einem Abrisse seines Lebens*, Prag, 1853, 2nd ed., Wien, 1855 (XLVII + 188 pp.).

1855

- *Zur Geschichte der Slawenapostel Cyrill und Method*, Zeitschrift für die gesammte katholische Theologie 7, 1855, pp. 345-380 [reprinted in Kirchenhistorische Schriften, Bd. 2, Wien, 1872, pp. 15-66].

- *Die Pfarrconcurs-Prüfung nach Staats- und Kirchengesetz*, Wien, 1855 (183 pp.).

1856

- *Handbuch des neuesten in Österreich geltenden Kirchenrechtes*, Band 1, Wien, 1856 (389 pp.).

- *Urkundlicher Bericht über die Säcularisirung des Bisthums Meißen unter dem Bischofe Johann von Haugwitz, und die Erhaltung des Collegiatstiftes von St. Peter zu Budissin in der Lausitz*, Theologische Quartalschrift (Tübingen) 38, 3. Heft, 1856, pp. 485-528 [reprinted with additions and corrections in Kirchenhistorische Schriften, Bd. 2, Wien, 1872, pp. 123-203].

- *Gegen eine ungebührliche Kritik*, Wien, 1856 (14 pp.)

1857

- *Geschichte der Slawenapostel Cyrill und Method und der slawischen Liturgie* (Leitmeritz, 1857, XI + 174 pp. and 132 pp.; 2nd ed., Wien, 1861, XI + 174 pp. and 132 pp.; reprint, 1969).

1859

- *Handbuch des neuesten in Österreich geltenden Kirchenrechtes*, Band 2, Abteilung 1, Wien, 1859 (XI + 317 pp.).

1862

- *Handbuch des neuesten in Österreich geltenden Kirchenrechtes*, Band 2, Abteilung 2, Wien, 1862 (XVIII + 653 pp.).

- *Ein Wort über mein kirchenrechtliches Handbuch gegen Herrn Dr. Vering*, Wien, 1862 (7 pp.).

1867

- *Zur achtzehnten Säcularfeier des Martyriums Petri. Neue Untersuchung über den Episcopat und den Martyrtod des heiligen Petrus in Rom*, Österreichische Vierteljahresschrift für katholische Theologie 6, 1867, pp. 449-491 [Reprinted, revised, and expanded in Kirchenhistorische Schriften, Bd. 1, Wien, 1872, pp. 1-112].

1868

- *Der h. Malachias und die ihm zugeschriebene Weissagung von den Päpsten*, Österreichische Vierteljahresschrift für katholische Theologie 7, 1. Heft, 1868, pp. 71-132 [reprinted in Kirchenhistorische Schriften, Bd. 2, Wien 1872, pp. 67-122].

- [Short press reports on the 1855 Concordat appearing in various periodicals of the Habsburg Monarchy in 1868.].

- *Zum Frieden zwischen Kirche und Staat*, Sammlung von Aufsätzen, die unter dem Titel *Wiener Briefe über die Zukunft der Kirche in Österreich* in den *Kölnischen Blättern* erschienen waren,

Leipzig, 1868 (101 pp.) [Selected press coverage from June–July 1868 reflecting the favourable stance of Charles-Forbes-René de Montalembert regarding the Concordat.].

1869

- *Politische Zustände Oesterreichs. Von einem Oesterreicher*, Leipzig, 1869 (VI + 128 pp.) [anonym].
- *Reform der römischen Kirche in Haupt und Gliedern. Aufgabe des bevorstehenden römischen Concils*, Leipzig, 1869 (IV + 187 pp.).
- *Das Concil*, Bohemia 42, I. no. 280, 24. November, pp. 2889-2890; II. no. 282, 26. November, pp. 3915-3916; no. 283, 27. November, pp. 3929-3930; III. no. 287, 2. December, pp. 3999-4000; no. 288, 3. December, pp. 4013-4014; no. 289, 4. December, pp. 4027; IV. no. 292, 8. December 1869, pp. 4080-4081 [anonym; it is noted in the article that the author is identified as a Catholic priest].

1870

- *Die Werbungen des russischen Schisma*, Bohemia 43, I. no. 191, 12. August, pp. 2885-2886; II. no. 222, 17. September, pp. 3312-3313; III. no. 226, 22. September, pp. 3376-3377; IV. no. 227, 23. September, pp. 3392-3393; V. no. 230, 27. September, pp. 3447-3448; VI. no. 231, 28. September 1870, pp. 3463-3464 [anonym].

1871

- *Historicko-kritické příspěvky k dějinám sv. apoštolů Slovanských Cyrilla a Methoděje*, Časopis katolického duchovenstva 12, 1871, no. 1, pp. 18-53; no. 2, pp. 137-151.
- *Die Geschäftsordnung des Concils von Trient: aus einer Handschrift des Vaticanischen Archives zum Erstenmale genau und vollständig an's Licht gestellt*, Wien, 1871 (XLVIII + 56 pp.) [anonym; 2 editions].⁷⁵
- *Die Vorgänge des Jahres 1871 auf kirchlich-politischem Gebiete*, Bohemia 44, I. no. 303, 21. December, pp. 4586-4588; II. no. 306, 24. December, pp. 4641-4643; III. no. 307, 27. December, pp. 4673-4674; IV. no. 309, 29. December 1871, pp. 4704 [anonym].

1872

- *Kirchenhistorische Schriften*, 2 Bände, Wien, 1872 (XVII + 409 pp.; XV + 282 pp.) [previously published texts revised, corrected, and supplemented].

1873

- *Bischof Hurdálek, ein Charakterbild aus der Geschichte der böhmischen Kirche*, Prag, 1873 (132 pp.) [originally in Bohemia 45, no. 114, 115, 117, 119, 121, 123, 125, 128 (Beilage), 129, 1872].
- *Die Papstwahl*, Bohemia 46, III. no. 112, 10. Mai, pp. 1-2; IV. no. 115, 14. Mai, pp. 1-2; VI. no. 122, 22. Mai, pp. 1-2; 1873 [anonym].
- *Die Jesuiten-Gymnasien in Österreich*, Bohemia 46, no. 167, 15. Juli (Beilage), pp. 1-2; no. 168, 16. Juli (Beilage), pp. 1-3; no. 169, 17. Juli (Beilage), 1873, pp. 1-2 [anonym].
- *Die theologischen Studien in Österreich und ihre Reform: eine theologisch-historisch-politische Monographie*, Wien, 1873 (149 pp.) [anonym].

⁷⁵ See the information by Johann Friedrich von Schulte in ADB (https://de.wikisource.org/wiki/ADB:Ginzel,_Josef_Augustin): “mit verschiedenem geharnischten Vorberichte; der Abdruck ist erfolgt nach dem von Theiner veranstalteten Abdruck, den ich G[inzel] durch den damaligen Professor Sal[esius] Meyer in Prag, zustellte”.

1874

- *Staat und Kirche*, Bohemia 47, I. no. 1, 1. Jänner, pp. 1-3; II. no. 3, 3. Jänner, pp. 1-4; III. no. 8, 8. Jänner, pp. 1-2; IV. no. 10, 10. Jänner, pp. 1-3; V. no. 17, 17. Jänner, pp. 1-2; VI. no. 21, 21. Jänner, pp. 1-2; VII. no. 24, 24. Jänner, pp. 1-2; VIII. no. 30, 30. Jänner, pp. 1-2 and no. 31, 31. Jänner 1874, pp. 1-2 [anonym].
- *Zur Congrua- und Stolaltar-Frage*, Bohemia 47, I. no. 224, 16. August, pp. 1-2; II. no. 227, 19. August, pp. 1-2; III. no. 229, 21. August, pp. 1-2; IV. no. 230, 22. August, pp. 1-2; V. no. 236, 28. August, pp. 1-2; VI. no. 237, 29. August, pp. 2-3; VII. no. 238, 30. August, pp. 1-2; VIII. no. 241, 2. September, pp. 1-2; IX. no. 243, 4. September, p. 2; X. no. 245, 6. September 1874, pp. 2-3 [anonym].
- *Die Confessionelle Vorlagen*, Bohemia 47, no. 25, 25. Jänner 1874, pp. 1-4 and *Zu den confessionellen Regierungsvorlagen*, I. no. 41, 11. Februar, p. 1; II. no. 47, 17. Februar 1874, pp. 1-3; [anonym].
- *Die Besetzung der bischöflichen Stühle in Österreich*, Bohemia 47, I. no. 293, 25. Oktober, pp. 1-2; II. no. 296, 28. Oktober, pp. 1-2; III. no. 297, 29. Oktober, pp. 1-2; IV. no. 298, 30. Oktober, p. 3; V. no. 300, 1. November, pp. 3-4; VI. no. 302, 3. November, pp. 1-2; VII. no. 314, 25. November, pp. 2-3; VIII. no. 318, 19. November, pp. 2-3; IX. no. 320, 21. November 1874, pp. 1-2; [anonym].

1875

- *Joseph Othmar Ritter von Rauscher, wailand Cardinal und Fürst-Erzbischof von Wien*, Bohemia 48, no. 326, 25. November, pp. 1-2; no. 331, 30. November, pp. 1-2; no. 334, 3. Dezember, pp. 1-2; no. 434, 12. Dezember, pp. 2-3; no. 346, 15. Dezember 1875, pp. 2-3 [anonym].
- *Die kirchlich-politischen Strömungen im Jahre 1874*, Bohemia 48, I. no. 9, 9. Jänner, pp. 1-2; II. no. 12, 12. Jänner, pp. 1-2; III. no. 13, 13. Jänner, pp. 1-2; IV. no. 16, 16. Jänner, pp. 2-3; V. no. 17, 17. Jänner, pp. 2-3; VI. no. 21, 21. Jänner, pp. 2-3; VIII. no. 37, 6. Februar 1875, pp. 1-3 [anonym; Part VII is missing].

1876

- *Joseph Anton Riegger*, Bohemia 49 (Beilage zur Bohemia Nr. 128–133), 9. Mai, p. 1; 10. Mai, p. 1; 11. Mai, p. 1; 12. Mai, pp. 1–2; 13. Mai, pp. 1–2; 14. Mai 1876, p. 1 [anonym].
- *Stephan Rautenstrauch*, Bohemia 49 (Beilage zur Bohemia Nr. 167, 169–173), 18. Juni, p. 1; 20. Juni, pp. 1-2; 21. Juni, p. 1; 22. Juni, pp. 1-3; 23. Juni, p. 1; 24. Juni 1876, pp. 1-2 [anonym].
- *Kaspar Royko*, Bohemia 49 (Beilage zur Bohemia Nr. 184–188), 5. Juli, pp. 1-2; 6. Juli, pp. 1-2; 7. Juli, pp. 1-2; 8. Juli, pp. 1-2; 9. Juli 1876, pp. 2-4 [anonym].

Entries in the Encyclopaedia:

- *Kirchen-Lexikon: oder, Encyklopädie der katholischen Theologie und ihrer Hilfswissenschaften*, 13 Bde., Hrsg. von Heinrich Joseph Wetzer und Benedikt Welte, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1847–1856: *Basilius, der Große* (Bd. 1, 1847, pp. 660–663 [reprinted with additions in *Kirchenhistorische Schriften*, Bd. 1, Wien, 1872, pp. 113–122]); *Beda* (Bd. 1, 1847, pp. 723–724 [reprinted with additions in *Kirchenhistorische Schriften*, Bd. 2, Wien, 1872, pp. 1–14]); *Böhmen, Einführung des Christenthums daselbst* (Bd. 2, 1848, pp. 61–64); *Böhmische und mährische Brüder* (Bd. 2, 1848, pp. 65–69); *Johannes von Nepomuk* (Bd. 5, 1850, pp. 725–732); *Leitmeritz, Bisthum* (Bd. 6, 1851, pp. 432–434); *Slawen, Bekehrung derselben zum Christenthum* (Bd. 10, 1853, pp. 220–230).

Printed Sermons:

- Predigt zur Feier der Sekundiz des Hochwürdigen und Hochwohlgebornen Herrn Philipp Degel, infulirten Seniors des Leitmeritzer Domkapitels, Rathes und Assessors beim bischöflichen Leitmeritzer Consistorium, Kanzlei-Direktors, Ritters des Franz-Josephsordens, emeritirten Pfarrers von Rosawitz und bischöflichen Vikärs und Schulinspektors im Kamnitzer Bezirke am sechzehnten Sonntage nach Pfingsten (16. September) 1855, Leitmeritz, 1855 (23 pp.).