

Religious Change in Europe 1650–1914: Essays for John McManners

Nigel Aston

Print publication date: 1997
Print ISBN-13: 9780198205968
Published to Oxford Scholarship Online: Oct-11
DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198205968.001.0001

Joseph II and the Monasteries of Austria and Hungary

Derek Beales

DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198205968.003.0009

Abstract and Keywords

While it is true that the policy of the emperor Joseph II, as ruler of the Austrian Monarchy in the 1780s, has often been described, certain of its aspects have still not been adequately covered. This chapter considers some of them, using new or little-known material from the Vatican, Austrian, and Hungarian archives. It focuses on the following issues: the relationship between Maria Theresa's monastic policy and her son's; the involvement of monasteries in parochial work; hitherto unsuspected opposition to Joseph's policy at the highest level of the bureaucracy; and the impact of his legislation in Hungary, which was significantly different from its effect in Austria itself. The author attempts to open up some neglected themes and to show how much remains to be found out.

Keywords: Joseph II, monastery, bureaucracy, Austria, Hungary, Maria Theresa

Everyone who visits rural Austria for the first time is struck by the number and size of the working monasteries that dominate its landscape. Among them are the vast Augustinian house of St Florian near Linz, Cistercian Wilhering with its exuberant rococo decoration, and the monumental Benedictine abbey of Melk towering above the Danube valley. In the cities of Salzburg and Vienna, too, ancient Benedictine abbeys, St Peter's and the Schottenstift, remain a formidable presence. Most of these institutions appear to date from the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, when they were lavishly refurbished or rebuilt. But one by one they are

celebrating their eight-hundredth, nine-hundredth, thousandth, even twelve-hundredth anniversaries. By contrast, almost everywhere in Western Europe monasteries were eradicated either by the Reformation, by the French Revolution, or under the aegis of Napoleon. Further east, in the Czech Republic, for example, many lasted into the twentieth century but succumbed to communist regimes after the Second World War. The almost unique continuity of monastic life in many of the great Austrian foundations was breached only for a few years, during the Nazi regime. If the visitor knows that the emperor Joseph II, as ruler of the Austrian Monarchy in the 1780s, is notorious for having carried through a drastic programme of church reform which included the suppression of numerous monasteries, he will wonder how on earth these vast establishments came to survive.

Figures about Joseph's suppressions remained inconsistent and unreliable until Professor Peter Dickson published in 1987 his *Finance and Government under Maria Theresia 1740-1780*, followed by his article in the *Historical Journal* of 1993, 'Joseph II's ReShaping of the Austrian Church'. These two magisterial works have cleared up most of the uncertainties in the statistics. In the entire Austrian Monarchy, including the geographically separated provinces of Belgium and Lombardy, there were just over 2,000 religious houses when Joseph II succeeded his mother in 1780. In the lands that were in a stricter sense Austrian (p. 162) provinces, that is, Upper and Lower Austria, Inner Austria, Tyrol and Vorarlberg, and Further Austria, monasteries held an especially important position. This area contained more than 500 houses, with altogether about 10,000 monks and over 1,000 nuns. As against these more than 11,000 regular clergy, there were only about 6,500 secular, that is non-monastic, clergy. Monasteries owned nearly half of all Church land, and therefore something like 20 per cent of all land. In most of these Austrian provinces, unlike other parts of the Monarchy except the Netherlands, the local representative assemblies or Estates were headed by a First Estate consisting entirely or largely of abbots of monasteries of ancient foundation. Bishops, of whom there were in any case very few, were not always included. The president of the First Estate of Lower Austria was the abbot of Melk, who, after the *Landmarschall* the government's representative, was usually the most important member of the permanent subcommittee (*Landes-Ausschuss*) which conducted the business of the Estates between Diets. There is some force in the ancient catchphrase 'Österreich, Klösterreich', which might be translated 'Austria, the monasteries' state'. During the 1780s, however, Joseph II directed a barrage of ordinances at the monasteries, and by 1790, when he died and a

halt was called, there remained in these Austrian provinces fewer than 250 houses and 5,000 regular clergy.

This policy evoked both enthusiasm and indignation in its day, and is still highly controversial in Austria itself. But its results seem rather limited if they are set against the total suppressions carried out in France by 1792, and in Germany and nearly all of Italy by 1812. On the other hand, it was easily the most radical monastic policy enacted by any eighteenth-century Catholic government before the Revolution. Dickson is not primarily concerned with the content of Joseph's ecclesiastical legislation nor with the philosophy behind it. He rightly points out that they have been much better studied than the matters he has examined—namely, Joseph's investigation and reorganization of the Church in the central lands. As he says, the emperor's principal aims are well known: to subject the Church to state control in all save purely spiritual matters; to introduce legal toleration for the main Protestant Churches and for Jews; to strengthen the episcopate; and to reshape 'the church away from its traditional emphasis on monasticism towards a more numerous, better educated, secular clergy'.¹

(p. 163) While it is true that Joseph's policy has often been described, certain of its aspects have still not been adequately covered. In this chapter I shall consider some of them, using new or little-known material from the Vatican, Austrian, and Hungarian archives. I shall concentrate on the following issues: the relationship between Maria Theresa's monastic policy and her son's; the involvement of monasteries in parochial work; hitherto unsuspected opposition to Joseph's policy at the highest level of the bureaucracy; and the impact of his legislation in Hungary, which was significantly different from its effect in Austria itself. The subject is so complex and the documentation so vast that I cannot pretend to deal exhaustively with any of these topics. What I hope to do is to open up some neglected themes and to show how much remains to be found out.

It was probably in 1750 that Maria Theresa dictated the first version of her political testament. This was just after she had forced through a reform of the constitution of her central lands, curbing the power of the Estates—and therefore of the great abbeys of Austria—in order to increase her revenue and army.² In this document she declared that the clergy of the German lands were in a good and flourishing condition and needed no more of the lavish assistance that they had been receiving from the State, or from her predecessors. In fact, she went on, 'they do not—alas!—apply what they have as they should, and moreover, they constitute a heavy burden on the

public. For no monastic House observes the limitations of its statutes, and many idlers are admitted; all this will call for a great remedy, which I propose to effect in good time and after due consideration.’ But, she continued,

I except from such measures the Kingdom of Hungary, where much still remains to be done for religion, in which task I shall require the clergy there to cooperate, but not work with them alone, but concert chiefly with laymen on the principles to be followed, the chief aim of which must be to introduce seminaries, colleges, academies, hospitals for the sick and injured, conservatories (as in Italy) for unmarried women, for the better instruction of the young etc., taking careful pains to support and develop what is useful to the public, and not what profits the private advantage of the clergy, monks and nuns in any Province.³

This is an astonishing pronouncement coming from a young and devout monarch, still with a Jesuit confessor, and heiress to Charles VI, who had yearned to complete a palace-monastery for himself by remodelling the ancient Augustinian house of Klosterneuburg.⁴ It is deservedly a famous passage, and it has been (p. 164) asserted that from this utterance stems the whole gamut of Church legislation associated with her and with Joseph II, that what is known as Josephism or Josephinism actually derives from Maria Theresa's ‘great remedy’.⁵

There are many difficulties about placing so much weight on this statement. The greatest is that, under examination, the programme, like the syntax, appears both incoherent and elusive. On the one hand, she says it is desirable that the Catholic religion should flourish and that the condition of the clergy should be good; on the other hand, *what is useful to the public* is a touchstone. She declares that monasteries should observe the limitations of their statutes and not admit idlers, but she does not condemn them in principle. She envisages different remedies for the central lands and for Hungary. It is with specific reference to Hungary that she makes one of her most radical statements: that she will require the clergy to cooperate with laymen in reform. But it sounds as though she thinks the Church in Hungary, unlike that in the central lands, needs *more* priests and *more* endowments. One cannot tell from her words what her concept of ‘utility to the public’ amounts to, or what her attitude is to monasteries of contemplative Orders. The meaning of ‘useful’ can be almost infinitely variable. Even in Joseph II's reign, in 1781, one of his most trusted ministers, Count Hatzfeld, president of the *Staatsrat*, argued that contemplative orders ought to be regarded as

contributing to *das allgemeine Beste*—the general advantage—through their prayers and worship.⁶ It is virtually certain that Maria Theresa would have agreed with him.

If one takes down the nine volumes of Maria Theresa's published edicts, it is disconcerting to find that the third item, of early 1741, is a prohibition on erecting maypoles because it employs labour and wastes wood.⁷ That might be an edict of Joseph's, though environmentalism seems here to take precedence over objections to superstition. Contrariwise, a month before he died, Joseph was taking great pains to ensure that the Catholic Church founded by Joseph I in St Petersburg should be well supplied with silver, missals, and vestments from dissolved monasteries, 'since [he said] it is highly desirable, indeed necessary, that I should give an example in supporting and glorifying my true religion, especially in foreign countries'.⁸ He and his mother, for all their violent disputes, were not *diametrically* opposed to each other. Both wished in some sense to promote Roman Catholicism in their dominions. But many historians of the last fifty (p. 165) years, by urging that Joseph's measures derived directly from Maria Theresa's, have underrated the differences between them.

Despite what she said in the first version of her testament—no similar passage occurs in the second of 1756—Maria Theresa did nothing concrete about general monastic reform until after 1765, when Joseph II succeeded his father and became Holy Roman Emperor and co-regent of the Austrian Monarchy. As emperor he had some rather ill-defined powers over the Church in the *Reich*. As co-regent he had no power in his own right, but much opportunity to put his views and influence policy. In a memorandum of 1765 'on the defects of the present system and the most effectual means of remedying them'—a document which is perhaps even more famous and notable than Maria Theresa's political testament—he set out his plans for the reform of the Monarchy. He devoted a section to the monasteries. He declares that they are too thriving for the good of the State. They ensnare people into taking vows who are too young to know what they are doing, thus depriving the State of the services of men of genius. He would raise the age of profession to 25—that was a very big rise: following the dictates of the Council of Trent, profession for men was legal at 16. He would appoint a commission to investigate all monasteries, to reform them, and to use them 'For pious purposes which would be at the same time useful to the state, such as the education of children who, while becoming Christians, would become good subjects'. Perhaps one in twenty monasteries should be reformed, in order to distribute ecclesiastics more evenly over the country.

This pronouncement shows that Joseph had no thought of abolishing all monasteries, at least in 1765. To reform one in twenty was a very modest proposal. On the other hand, he spoke very ill of Catholic education, much of which was in monastic hands, and urged that it should be drastically reformed.⁹

At Maria Theresa's request, Prince Kaunitz, her chief minister, wrote a lengthy response, dated 18 February 1766, to the vast range of proposals in this memorandum.¹⁰ What he had to say on monasteries is unexpected—indeed, given his reputation as an Enlightened reformer of the Church, positively embarrassing. Maaß, in his five indispensable volumes of documents on Josephism, whose thesis is that Kaunitz was the mastermind behind the movement, does not bring himself even to mention it;¹¹ and Dickson gives it only a reluctant footnote as (p. 166) evidence of Kaunitz's inconsistency.¹² The chancellor refutes the emperor's statements point by point. He questions whether there are too many monks in the German hereditary lands. There are only 23,000, he says—in fact this may be too high a figure.¹³ He scoffs at the idea that they include thwarted geniuses. Most monks are virtually unemployable outside their houses, and there are too few benefices to go round in any case. The convents are performing a service by maintaining such people. Then he defends the usefulness of monasteries. Unless religious worship is to be curtailed, the monks' contribution to it is indispensable: 'It is true that there could be fewer monks if there were more secular priests. But it is not less true that the cost of priests is much higher than that of monks, for it is clear that three monks can live in a community on what it would be necessary to pay one priest living on his own.' Among the assumptions behind this defence are, first, that the provision of parish priests is of prime concern to the State; secondly, that such provision is or ought to be the most important function of the Church, overriding all others; and, thirdly, that monasteries have a vital role in this provision. Parish priests were considered to be central not only to strictly religious activity, as the Council of Trent had laid down, but also to the life of society as a whole, and to the State. Religious teaching, whether in church or in school, was seen as a first essential of education, and was expected to inculcate obedience and service to the State. How useful the parish clergy could be to the State was shown when Joseph compelled them to assist his reforms by ordering them to read certain of his edicts from the pulpit. The number of persons who thereby gained knowledge of his ordinances must have exceeded by hundreds of times the ordinary print-run of publications in this period.¹⁴

In countries other than the *Reich* and the Austrian Monarchy, monks were normally thought of as distinct from parish clergy. This separation was nowhere complete. Throughout the Catholic world, for example, the Premonstratensian Order exploited a unique papal privilege allowing it to supply parish clergy from its own ranks—600 of them, for example, in France before the Revolution.¹⁵ The rule of the Augustinian canons permitted them to work outside their monasteries. But in the German and Austrian lands other orders did so too, in large numbers and as a normal practice—Franciscans, Benedictines, and Cistercians, for example. This point is seldom emphasized, and has sometimes not been grasped, by historians of the subject.¹⁶ But, unless it is appreciated, neither (p. 167) Kaunitz's attitude to the monasteries in his memorandum, nor Joseph II's policy towards them, can be understood.

The Austrian duchies are the most striking case. In 1780 at least 20 per cent of all the land of Lower Austria was owned by monasteries, and more than 70 per cent of all clergy were monastic.¹⁷ The Benedictine abbey of Melk, with an income of over 50,000 florins a year, supplied around twenty-five priests from its own numbers for the cure of souls in fourteen parishes.¹⁸ In 1743 the Augustinian house of St Florian in Upper Austria, which was nearly as rich, had thirty-one of its canons, that is two-thirds of them, working out of the monastery in twenty-three parishes.¹⁹ All large monasteries were also seminaries, and these clergy received their basic training in theology and philosophy in their houses. They did not necessarily go on to university—not even to the University of Salzburg, which was itself run by the Benedictines of St Peter's.²⁰

Kaunitz, despite what he had said in replying to Joseph's memorandum in 1766, began promoting monastic reform in the duchy of Milan, of which he was effectively the ruling minister, in 1767. He told Count Firmian, the governor there, that it would have to proceed step by step, because, first, it was necessary not to offend the religious sentiments of the sovereign, and, secondly, 'the number of monastic professions in Italy, though prodigious, is to some degree the result of the constitution of the country and of families.'²¹ While Maria Theresa had to be humoured, pressure in the opposite direction from the new co-regent must have been a factor in Kaunitz's espousing monastic reform. An inquiry was set up, and in 1769 the process began of abolishing small convents. The same justification was put forward as Pope Innocent X had given in the mid-seventeenth century, that a house with fewer than twelve religious was not viable. A deal was then done by Maria Theresa's government with Pope Clement XIV under

which small monasteries, rather than being straightforwardly dissolved, were united with others. The resulting rather limited profits were applied to parishes, hospitals, and orphanages. By the death of Maria Theresa, sixty-five out of 291 male monasteries had been suppressed in Lombardy, and the number of (p. 168) monks had fallen from 5,500 to 4,330. Only six out of 176 nunneries had gone, because the bishops fought for their retention. Monasteries had been suppressed mainly on the ground that they were small, but with some regard to their 'uselessness' and to the possible utility of their buildings. These Italian measures are often treated as a trial run for the whole Monarchy, and this is true in the limited sense that any dissolutions constituted a precedent for other dissolutions. It is also true that much the same criteria were adopted in dissolving a rather similar proportion of the monasteries of Galicia soon after Austria acquired that province by the first partition of Poland in 1772. There 214 houses were reduced to 187, and 3,212 regulars to 2,895 by 1777.²² But the situation in Lombardy was quite different from that in the German lands. Hardly any Italian monasteries were involved in parish provision, and they had no role in any form of Estates.

In 1770 Kaunitz emerged as a monastic reformer for the whole Monarchy. In this case he himself stated that he was partly influenced by the wishes of Joseph II. Kaunitz is now to be found vigorously arguing that the number of monks and nuns was 'far too high' and should be reduced by the State raising the age of profession to 24. This should be done without papal authority or concurrence. It was clear, he said, that Protestant countries benefited from having fewer monks, and fewer celibates generally. Monasteries, because their property was inalienable, distorted the market in land. Monks are not necessary to Christianity—they are not to be found in the Church before the fourth century. Then he produced another telling calculation: 'A parish priest in the countryside with three chaplains or "cooperators" can provide worship and cure of souls for 4,000 persons.' If that is so, the same four clergymen can do as much in a town. Yet the density of clergy in Vienna is far higher than that. The position will be better in every way if there are fewer monks and priests but all have a genuine vocation.²³ He has certainly changed his tune since 1766, but he still assumes that many parish priests will be regulars. However, he insists that they must be educated not as they have been hitherto, but on the same basis as in the universities, according to a curriculum approved by the government. He does not yet propose that the training of priests be taken out of the hands of their monasteries altogether.

Maria Theresa agreed to raise the age of profession to 24—not to 25, as appears in my *Joseph II*—and to imposing all kinds of often petty restrictions on monasteries, as to number of monks, reception of novices, education of priests, relations with superiors and foreign houses, and so forth.²⁴ But she never appointed (p. 169) a commission of inquiry into them and she dissolved none in the German lands or in Hungary—with the enormous exception of the Jesuits.

In 1773 the Society of Jesus was completely suppressed in Maria Theresa's territories. This was a draconian measure, and of huge importance. I cannot deal with it fully here, but it can hardly be ignored. What follows is a brief survey, based on work which I hope will soon be published elsewhere. Paradoxically, the story of the suppression of the Jesuits in the Austrian Monarchy reinforces the argument that Maria Theresa's policy—and even Joseph's—were not doctrinairely anti-monastic.²⁵

At least until the late 1750s, the Jesuits were from many points of view the most powerful of all monastic orders in the Monarchy. Their houses were not so wealthy as the greater monasteries of the old Orders. They had no seats in the Estates. But, as the vanguard of the Counter-Reformation, they had acquired a near-monopoly of university education and the major role in secondary education. They played the chief part in the censorship of books and they supplied confessors to all members of the royal family.

In the 1750s Maria Theresa began to assail the monopolies and privileges of the Society. In 1759 they were deprived of their controlling position in the universities and the censorship, and in the following year the first non-Jesuit royal confessor was appointed. Whatever the long-term implications of these measures for the power of the Church, in the short run they were a victory both for the secular clergy as against the regulars, and for the old religious orders as against the Jesuits. Theology could now, for example, be taught in universities by Benedictines, Augustinians, and Dominicans, whose approach and tradition were different from the Jesuits'. When Maria Theresa chose a non-Jesuit confessor for herself in 1767, he was Ignaz Miiller, provost of the Augustinian monastery of St Dorothea in Vienna. She came to believe that the moral teaching of the Jesuits was dangerous. In a certain sense she can even be classed as a Jansenist. She objected to certain aspects of baroque piety, she attached great importance to private devotions, and some of the religious books she recommended to her children were undoubtedly Jansenist.²⁶

Meanwhile, much more drastic measures were being taken against the Jesuits in other Catholic countries. In 1765 they were expelled from France, as they had previously been from other Catholic countries. In the circumstances it is **(p. 170)** extraordinary that Joseph did not so much as mention the issue in his great memorandum of that year, in which he discussed so many other matters; and nor did Kaunitz in his reply. Nor were the Jesuits considered in relation to the Italian monastic suppressions.²⁷

In 1769–71 a great debate took place at the highest level about how a State educational system might be established in the Monarchy. The role of the Jesuits in education was so important that this was almost a debate about the Society. There were those who, like Count Pergen in a notorious paper of 1769, argued that all regular clergy should simply be debarred from any role in education because their influence was inevitably pernicious. But Maria Theresa, Joseph, and Kaunitz, in a rare display of unanimity, all agreed that this was not a practical possibility. They concurred that there were nowhere near enough secular clergy, and especially secular clergy of calibre, to satisfy existing educational demands, let alone to man an expanded system. They went on to agree that, since it was necessary to go on using monks as teachers, it was essential to re-educate them so that they would not inculcate ‘superstition’ but would instead teach ‘sound religion’. Contrary to what is commonly believed, Joseph and Kaunitz as well as—perhaps more than—Maria Theresa were admirers of the Jesuits, or at least of some of them and of some of what they did, especially in education and scholarship, and refused to assist actively the movement for their suppression. The rulers of Austria acquiesced in it eventually in order to please their Bourbon allies, who were determined to force the pope to suppress the Society completely. Joseph could, of course, see how the dissolution could be turned to advantage provided that the Jesuits' property could be taken over by the State. A cartoon depicted him washing his hands and saying ‘I am innocent of the blood of this just Society.’ But he believed that most of the criticisms made of their activities in other countries did not apply in the Monarchy.

The suppression meant the dissolution of 192 houses in Austria and Hungary. Afterwards, the rulers of Austria demanded permission from the pope to continue employing ex-Jesuits in education, where their services were held to be indispensable. Those who did not find new posts were given a pension. Other Catholic states were much less generous. In 1775 the Empress gave remarkable testimony of her respect for Jesuit scholarship: she rejected the idea of forming a Vienna Academy on the ground that she would become a laughing-stock, since nearly all those who could possibly be appointed to it

were ex-Jesuits whom, in obedience to the pope, she had just turned out of their houses.²⁸

(p. 171) So it was the pope and the other Catholic powers who imposed on Maria Theresa and Joseph the suppression of the Jesuits. The only initiative she herself took in suppressing monasteries was the limited programme carried through in Lombardy and Galicia. On this basis it is hard to regard her actual legislation as amounting either to the 'great remedy' which she spoke of in 1750 but never defined, or to the blueprint for Joseph's programme.

Within a few months of the death of Maria Theresa, Joseph set about serious reform of the monasteries in the Monarchy. It is worth stressing that he rarely offered as a justification the existence of abuses such as laxity, frivolity, and cruelty in particular houses. He operated instead on general principles. He first abolished all the connections that existed between houses in his territories and superiors or monasteries in other states. Then, late in 1781, he decreed the suppression in the central lands of all purely contemplative monasteries, which, being 'utterly and completely useless to their neighbours', 'could not be pleasing to God'. These were the houses of Orders like the Carthusians, whose rule and vows prohibited them from doing what Joseph saw as useful work.

He next turned to other Orders, intending that no monastery of any kind would be allowed to survive unless it performed a useful function. That meant, in Joseph's own first draft for the Council of State (*Staatsrat*), only educating youth or looking after sick persons. To these qualifying functions were added, after discussion, 'preaching, hearing confessions and attending deathbeds', and, later still, cure of souls.²⁹ In the summer of 1782 an Ecclesiastical Commission was established to implement this policy in the central lands and in Hungary. The emperor appointed as its chairman Freiherr von Kressel, declaring that under his direction he was confident the commission would produce 'in this business so near to my heart ... the best results for religion and the state'.³⁰ Thirty-two years after Maria Theresa had spoken in her political testament of applying a 'great remedy' to the Church, Joseph at last ordered a full survey of monasteries as part of an elaborate and detailed survey of all Church land. Pending its report, Joseph forbade monasteries to take any new novices. On 24 October 1783 a decree was issued that envisaged the establishment of new parishes wherever too many people were included within an existing parish or were too far away from an existing church. It was now within this context of **(p. 172)** improving

the provision for the cure of souls that the fate of all monasteries was to be decided:

Among monasteries, those will be retained which are necessary either to staff their own parishes or to assist the cure of souls, and for these houses an appropriate number of clergy will be laid down, enough to meet all contingencies. The other monasteries that are entirely unnecessary for the cure of souls will wither away [*gehen nach und nach ein*] ...

Monks were encouraged to leave their Order and become parish clergy or be pensioned. If they stayed in their Order, they might still become parish priests but otherwise would find themselves in the course of time moved, and brought together with members of other suppressed monasteries of their Order into one house until they died out. It must be emphasized that, unlike the initial dissolution of contemplative Orders, these measures were not, at least in principle, directed at entire Orders. Every single monastery was to be considered on its merits—a recipe for delay, uncertainty, ill feeling, and inconsistency.³¹

The financial mechanics of the process were that the property of the suppressed houses, or the proceeds of its sale, was transferred to a religious fund, established early in 1782. Maria Theresa had set up a fund of the same name, but that was entirely devoted to converting Protestants to Catholicism.³² The first charge on the new fund was the payment of pensions to the ejected monks and nuns who could not find employment. The emperor was especially hostile to nuns as almost wholly useless: they could not be priests, confessors, or preachers, and few of them undertook charitable work. Most nunneries were therefore suppressed but, since former nuns were unlikely to find jobs, to pension them proved particularly costly. The second charge on the religious fund was the creation and endowment of the new parishes, parish clergy, and parish churches.

How these measures worked in practice has not been fully studied, but Dr Ludwig Raber has written an excellent account of their impact on the Franciscan houses of Austria, with special reference to Lower Austria, in which he has published many of the original documents.³³ The Franciscan Order, of course, is a mendicant Order, which raises an important question not yet addressed, the emperor's attitude to begging. He would have liked to stop it altogether. He disapproved of it on principle, as obstructing market forces, discouraging people from working hard, and denying personal responsibility. He believed that the regularized mendicancy of the Orders

imposed a special and unjustifiable burden (p. 173) on the poor. Further, he and his sympathizers thought that mendicant monks used improper spiritual inducements to extract alms, and that during their begging tours they preached superstition and bigotry. However, he was forced to admit that the monasteries of these Orders could not survive financially without some revenue additional to that supplied by their endowments. He was therefore compelled in the short run to make numerous exceptions to the prohibition on begging, and in the longer run to provide alternative revenue for the monks, confusingly known as pensions, further reducing the financial returns from his ecclesiastical measures.

There were sixteen Franciscan monasteries in Austria at the beginning of Joseph's reign. They were the largest single Order in the area. On the basis of the returns they made to the inquiry on ecclesiastical revenues and provision, the Commission decided that thirteen of the sixteen should be suppressed, leaving only the three located in Vienna and its suburbs. These three were to supply parish priests from their own number, to house secular priests to whom some of the Franciscan monks would act as assistants in parish work, and to maintain a kind of reserve of clergy to stand in when incumbents were ill or absent or died. Perhaps the most striking detail to emerge from Raber's account is that the thirteen monasteries were not all suppressed at once. The bureaucracy pointed out that, under the terms of the emperor's edicts, this was impossible. In Raber's words,

The priority was to make room in the monasteries by transferring the younger Fathers, and later the lay brothers, to the cure of souls or to other available posts. Thus a logical sequence was arrived at: monasteries were suppressed in order to procure personnel for the cure of souls, and monks were sent to parish work in order that monasteries could be dissolved.

The most that could be hoped for was to suppress one house a year, and that target was not always achieved. By the time Joseph died in February 1790, four of the thirteen houses had still not been dissolved, one saved by the intercession of the bishop of St Pölten, the others waiting their turn to be suppressed. The death of Joseph and the accession of Leopold II procured them a stay of execution. If this pattern was applicable to all Orders, it becomes easier to understand how Joseph's policy turned out to be less drastic in result than in intention. Some of the statistical uncertainties may spring from confusion between those houses that were

actually suppressed and other houses that had been condemned but were not actually suppressed in time. This issue needs further research.

However, the policy of converting monks into parish clergy certainly achieved notable success with the Franciscans of Austria. Raber reports: (p. 174)

Between 1783 and 1790 were transferred to the cure of souls:

in the diocese of Linz	15 Fathers
in the diocese of St Pölten	55 Fathers
in the archdiocese of Vienna	107 Fathers
as army chaplains	4 Fathers
total	181 Fathers

In Lower Austria there had been 325 Fathers in 1783. Clearly that figure is not calculated for the same area as those in the table, but it would appear that a very considerable proportion of all Franciscan priests—perhaps a half—became parish clergy.

Taking again the example of the Austrian duchies, according to Dickson's tables, 1,178 additional secular clergy, over and above the 6,500 recorded in 1780, were in post or in training in 1790 as a result of Joseph's suppressions. In the whole Monarchy, almost 5,000 secular clergy were added to the previous total.³⁴

Suppression of monasteries and the creation of new parishes formed part of a much broader programme of Church reform. In 1783 all religious brotherhoods were dissolved—thousands of them, involving tens of thousands of lay persons. All seminaries run by bishops and monasteries were shut down, and it was decreed that all those training for the priesthood must go into the small number of new general seminaries established to teach the sort of theology and canon law that the regime approved. Not only begging, but also the giving of unsystematic charity, was condemned. All charity, or poor relief, was in future to be distributed by a single 'institution for the love of one's neighbour', relying on the confiscated funds of the brotherhoods and on contributions from the private sector.³⁵

So far as the monasteries were concerned, it is important to understand that Joseph was not content with suppressing half of them outright. He did not leave the other half untouched. It was not only the dissolved monasteries whose funds were tapped. If a house had surplus revenue, the religious fund might take it without the house being dissolved. When an abbot died, Joseph generally forbade the monks to elect a successor. Instead, they were allowed to choose a prior to be the spiritual head of the institution on a three-year tenure, while an outsider, perhaps a layman, was appointed to administer the temporalities to the benefit of the religious fund. This arrangement incidentally deprived the abbey of representation in the Estates. A house might be peremptorily ordered to create (p. 175) a new parish out of its existing benefices and to build a parish church out of its own revenues—as the Vienna Schottenstift was compelled to do with the church of St Laurenz in the eighth district of Vienna. According to a modern abbot, his predecessor in Joseph's reign, Benno Pointner,

made a courageous stand against the Josephist pamphlets and also fought for the rights of the parishes, to which he sent at least half his priests for the cure of souls ... There was no avoiding the incorporation of more parishes into the foundation, so that the number of Schotten parishes reached 18—a much too high number considering the heavy obligations associated with the foundation in Vienna. But perhaps that excessive burden was necessary in order to stave off the danger of the monastery's suppression by Joseph's administration or of the appointment of a so-called 'commendatory abbot' who would not have to belong to the Order.

Melk too now sent the majority of its monks into parishes. The Premonstratensian monastery of Geras raised the number of parishes it owned and serviced from ten to seventeen. Between 1782 and 1791 it spent 14,000 florins on four new priest houses, eight schools, and a new church.³⁶ This must have been the pattern in all the surviving houses, except for the few which had been allowed to exist because of their contribution to education and the care of the sick rather than because they provided parishes and clergy. Overall figures appear not to be available, but the increased provision of parish clergy by the remaining monasteries from the ranks of their own monks must have added substantially to the total number of those charged with the cure of souls, over and above those supplied by the religious fund. Doubtless these people would have been classed as regulars in the statistics.

With their young monks away at the general seminaries and their able-bodied priests working in parishes, monasteries found it difficult, if not impossible, to maintain a proper community life. Choral services were drastically cut down, on the ground that, now that monks were required to be useful, all this singing, especially in the middle of the night, would be injurious to their health and therefore to the spiritual well-being of their flocks. Half the monasteries survived, it is true, but only as half-monasteries. In cases where it seemed to the government more convenient or economical, they were allowed to live on, but as depleted, cowed communities to be bullied, mulcted, scattered, and stripped of their traditions, of their independence and of their role in the Estates.³⁷ (p. 176) In attempting to answer the question why Joseph allowed so many monasteries to survive, another part of the explanation must lie in the relations between the emperor and his civil servants. New light is thrown on this aspect of the problem, as on the whole story of Joseph's reign, by material in the dispatches sent to Rome by the papal nuncios, Giuseppe Garampi down to 1785 and Giovanni Battista Caprara thereafter.³⁸ For ordinary purposes the dispatches of nuncios are not as valuable for this as for earlier periods, when the pope was a militant player in international politics. But on religious questions, which in Joseph's reign bulked so large, the reports of Garampi and Caprara are far superior to those of other envoys. While 2,500 parish priests in Austria could be compelled to read the emperor's edicts from the pulpit, at least as many clergy may well have been happy to provide unsolicited information to the pope's representatives. Although some of their dispatches have been published, many of them have been neglected by historians,³⁹ and they turn out to be wonderfully full.

Among their most interesting features are the strikingly different impressions that the two nuncios give of Joseph II's relationship with his officials. Garampi, who had been in Vienna during the last five years of Maria Theresa's reign, was emphatic that tremendous changes were occurring. Even before a single monastery had been suppressed, he talked of 'a crisis similar to that which the Church suffered in the sixteenth century'.

All the regulars [he wrote] are so shaken that they not only carry out punctiliously the orders they receive but they actually go beyond the royal instructions ... I'm reminded at this juncture of the fatalism of the Turks who, unnerved by the fear that their monarchy is in decay, calmly await its end, making no effort to prevent it, and excusing their supine inaction as what they call resignation to the divine will and to the inevitability of Fate.

He had no doubt at all that the emperor himself was the prime mover and that he was having to dragoon his officials into implementing his policy. Garampi informed Rome in July 1781, and again in November, that he could not square it with his conscience to administer the Easter sacrament to Joseph, the nuncio's traditional privilege, because the emperor's measures revealed him to be a (p. 177) Jansenist heretic. This suggestion clearly alarmed the pope and must have helped to induce him to make his famous journey to Vienna, where he arrived in time to administer communion personally to the emperor on Easter Day.⁴⁰

One of the commonplaces of historians, without a single exception, is that the president of the ecclesiastical commission, Baron Kressel, said to have been a Freemason, was a zealous promoter of Church reform.⁴¹ As we have seen, Joseph thought so too. But on 5 May 1783 Garampi, in one of his huge, especially confidential dispatches sent by safe courier, reported a secret conversation with Kressel. The baron

in no way concealed the torment he suffered [in carrying through these reforms]; but he added that ... despite his feelings he remains in his post, no longer with the hope of doing good, but merely of diminishing evil. He foresees that, if he gives it up, there are now too many capital enemies of the Church and blind flatterers of the sovereign who would weakly follow instantly every hasty idea or command he gives.

Kressel, while bitterly regretting the harm done to the Church, thinks he has succeeded in minimizing its effects. 'He assured me that, once the emperor has adopted a principle, it is a waste of time to try to oppose it. The only thing to do is to bring up one by one the difficulties that make it awkward to carry out.' By this means, he said, he had succeeded in preventing Joseph carrying out his plan to put all clergy on fixed salaries, and had persuaded him that the best course was to leave them with their possessions and in control of them. He believes that anyone else would have acquiesced in Joseph's scheme of destroying all ecclesiastical foundations. Some of his colleagues, he said, 'professed a hatred of everything that is piety, church, order, hierarchy and monks'. He reckoned that 'the multiplication of parishes was a bottomless pit for which the funds would never suffice'.⁴²

The nuncio can hardly have invented this conversation, surprising though it is, and Kressel would hardly have spoken in this foolhardy way if he had not felt passionately about these issues. Had Joseph known of Kressel's private views and of his contacts with the nuncio, far from expressing such

confidence in him, he would surely have sacked him. But the obstruction Kressel describes himself as practising is uncannily like the sort of behaviour Joseph complained of among bureaucrats in his famous pastoral letter of December 1783.⁴³ The bitter disputes among his servants, and their secret undermining of his plans, go far to account for the dilution of his policies as they were translated into decrees.

(p. 178) On the other hand, as the nuncios realized with horror, there were also genuine radicals near the centre of power. Joseph von Sonnenfels, famous as Professor of Political Economy, dramatic critic, official censor, and Freemason, wrote confidently and rejoicingly, when the Jesuits were dissolved, that all other Orders would shortly follow.⁴⁴ Ignaz von Born, a noted metallurgist and an even more prominent Freemason than Sonnenfels, published in 1783 *Monachologia*, a satirical classification of monks on the Linnaean system, anticipating the extinction of all their species.⁴⁵ The progressive canonist, Johann Valentin Eybel, wrote not only *Was ist der Pabst? (What is the Pope?)*, *Sieben Kapitel von Klosterleuten (Seven Chapters of Monks and Nuns)*, and sundry other pamphlets highly critical of the traditional Church, but was also employed by Joseph II as ecclesiastical commissioner in Upper Austria, where he derived particular pleasure from ordering great abbots about and taking part in the formalities attending the suppression of monastic houses.⁴⁶

Caprara was as certain as Garampi had been that it was Joseph who genuinely took the decisions. But he saw the emperor, for all that he abominated his measures, as the only bulwark against still worse changes. Joseph alone, he thought, stood in the way of the total abolition of clerical celibacy, which Eybel and others advocated. If Caprara both exaggerated the influence of the extremists and sometimes proved too optimistic about Joseph's attitudes, he was certainly right that the emperor's radicalism had its limits, and that a married clergy was beyond them.⁴⁷ Joseph undoubtedly saved some monasteries from suppression. Eybel kept on recommending that the great house of St Florian should be dissolved to endow the new bishopric of Linz. In the end the bishop was assigned some of the monastery's revenues and the provost's house in Linz for his palace. But Joseph ordered Eybel never again to raise the question of suppressing the foundation. It was too useful as a provider of parish priests.⁴⁸ In Bohemia, the emperor was asked to suppress the rich Premonstratensian house at Strahov on the castle hill in Prague. It had just built itself a second 'philosophical' library to match its 'theological' library of the seventeenth century. In so doing it used bookcases and accommodated books from

dissolved monasteries, and placed a bust of Joseph in the pediment of the new building. He declared the monastery (p. 179) too useful to destroy.⁴⁹ On the other hand, as late as 1789 the emperor agreed to suppress the major Cistercian monastery of Lilienfeld on the special ground that its spendthrift abbot had run it into debt. Since the religious fund was overstretched, Joseph's officials were always looking for excuses for dissolving juicy foundations.⁵⁰

The emperor had travelled a long way since he had proposed to his mother in 1765 that one in twenty monasteries should be abolished. Evidence known to me does not settle the question whether by the end of his life he would have had any religious qualms about suppressing all monasteries. But he certainly still held the view that there were practical advantages in preserving some of them.

In her testament of 1750 Maria Theresa had promised to give special treatment to Hungary, 'where much remains to be done for religion'. It is likely that she had in mind, first, that there remained many Protestants in Hungary—perhaps a quarter of the population—and that the campaign waged by the Catholic Church, with the support of the Habsburg dynasty, to convert them to Rome had so far achieved only partial success. Secondly, she must have known that the overall provision of Catholic parishes was thin. To try to remedy this lack, her father Charles VI had established in 1733 a fund to create new parishes. But after her death, while the population of Hungary was twice as large as that of the Austrian lands, there were one-and-a-half times as many Austrian as Hungarian clergy, and the total revenues of the Hungarian Church fell much below those of the Austrian. The provision was also very uneven. In the western and northwestern counties the Church was strong and comparatively rich; in the rest of the country much less so. In two of the ten districts into which Joseph divided Hungary, his inspectors in 1786–7 credited the Church with a million florins of income, and four districts had over 1,000 clergy. In four there were under 500 clergy and Church income was under 300,000 florins. This variation arose partly because some of the strongholds of Protestantism lay in the east. But it had much more to do with the historical experience of the different regions of the country. The extreme west had experienced only rare Turkish incursions and was closely tied to Austria. An intervening area had been won back from the Turks immediately after the siege of Vienna of 1683. But the more easterly regions had come under the effective control of the Habsburgs only after the great Rákóczi revolt had been defeated in 1711. Here the Catholic Church was truly a missionary church. The central and western lands of

the Monarchy had seen a massive rebuilding and refurbishing of churches and monasteries in the late seventeenth (p. 180) and early eighteenth centuries—by Italian standards a much delayed flowering of the Counter-Reformation. The Hungarian Counter-Reformation came even later, and Hungarian churches were mostly rebuilt from ruins or from scratch in the eighteenth century, and in a distinctly less opulent manner than to the west. Whereas the Austrian Church seems virtually to have stopped building and to have lost its missionary *élan* around 1750, the Hungarian Church was advancing and expanding right up to Joseph's accession.⁵¹

In Marczali's words.

In the counties formerly occupied by the Turks, where there was scarcely any other foe to contend with except the havoc and destruction that had been wrought, and where the life not merely of the Catholic Church but of Western Christianity had become entirely extinct, the chief rôle among the champions of the Church was still played by the Franciscans ... their numbers continually grew in dimensions.⁵²

In Hungary there were four times as many mendicants, mainly Franciscans, as endowed monks, whereas in Austria the mendicants outnumbered the non-mendicants by less than two to one. The ancient Orders that dominated Austria had only a few houses in Hungary, and their role in the Church was relatively insignificant. One of them, Pannonhalma, celebrates its nine-hundredth anniversary in 1996, but in fact they had ceased to exist during the Turkish occupation and had to be refounded after the Turks had been driven out. The relative poverty and weakness of Hungarian monasteries overall is shown by Table 8.1, based on Dickson's figures.⁵³

So Maria Theresa was absolutely right that the religious situation in Hungary was markedly different from that in the central and western lands of the Monarchy. However, despite what she said in her testament of 1750, her legislation did not take much account of the difference. The most distinctive of her Hungarian Church measures, apart from those especially concerning the Greek Orthodox minority, was the establishment of three new bishoprics in 1777, though even that was paralleled in Bohemia.⁵⁴ (p. 181)

Table 8.1 *Monastic Wealth in Lower Austria and Hungary*

Area	Population (approx.)	Mendicants	Endowed monks	Monastic revenue
------	-------------------------	------------	------------------	---------------------

				(approx.) (florins)
Lower Austria	1 m.	1,805	1,047	1.4 m.
Hungary	8 m.	3,736	988	1.2 m.

Joseph's approach was in some respects the opposite of his mother's. His travels had given him unique first-hand knowledge of the varied character of his dominions. But this only strengthened his determination to unite his disparate territories and to make them as uniform as possible. In his orders to the Hungarian authorities he regularly spoke of the need for *Gleichförmigkeit* in the Monarchy's legislation. His instructions about monastic reform were virtually identical for Hungary and the central lands, and Kressel's Ecclesiastical Commission, despite considerable Hungarian opposition, was placed in charge of both areas.⁵⁵ But the situation in Hungary was so unlike the position in Austria that identical policies, administered by the same men, produced significantly different results.

One perhaps unimportant difference was that the main group of suppressions, which in Austria began in 1783, did not start in Hungary until 1786-7, which was when the inquiry into the Church's revenues reported. Once the process had started, however, it seems to have proceeded rapidly. As always, it is difficult to establish precise figures for monastic suppressions. A major part of the problem is that the emperor's officials used varying definitions of Hungary, and it is not easy for historians to sort them out and decide between them. The most thorough study, a recently published article by Peter Ban, relying on a series of tables prepared for the Hungarian Diet of 1790-1, concludes that, in Hungary widely defined, there were 255 monasteries in 1782, not including those of the Piarists, the Brothers of Mercy and the Basilians. Out of the 255, 136 were dissolved and 119 survived.⁵⁶ To make the comparison with Lower Austria again, Dickson's (p. 182) calculations show that in 1790 the revenue of that province's monasteries was still almost a million florins, having been reduced by only a third since 1780. In Hungary total monastic revenue was in 1790 less than 600,000 florins, under half the total in 1780. However, both in Lower Austria and in Hungary the number of regulars in 1790 was about half the number in 1780.⁵⁷

In total contrast to what happened in the German lands (and in Belgium), in Hungary only two of the eight Benedictine houses, and those not the richest, were spared, and all eight Premonstratensian houses were suppressed.

Despite the prejudice of the Emperor and his supporters against mendicant Orders, eighty-one out of 116 Franciscan houses and eleven out of nineteen Capuchin houses survived.⁵⁸ This difference between Hungary and other parts of the Monarchy has scarcely been noticed, let alone studied. Much more research is needed before a full analysis can be provided. But here is a tentative explanation. The abbots of the great Hungarian monasteries had places in the Diet, but they were few and unimportant compared with their Austrian counterparts. In Hungary the bishops, and especially the archbishop of Esztergom, dominated the First Estate.⁵⁹ However, this difference was of limited importance, because Joseph had no intention of calling a Diet, whereas the Austrian Estates continued, if grudgingly, to work with his government. He deliberately flouted Hungarian susceptibilities, imposing his preferred policies regardless of opposition. It must be significant that, unlike in Austria, the monasteries he suppressed in Hungary were the rich ones. The Benedictine and Premonstratensian houses might be few, but they were on average *forty* times wealthier than Franciscan houses.⁶⁰ In the case of Pannonhalma at least, there was an inconclusive negotiation between the monastery and the government as to whether the monks would run a school in order to make their institution qualify as useful. It appears that even the Premonstratensians supplied few parish priests, but they surely could have supplied more.⁶¹ Presumably, given the especially poor provision of clergy and the relatively low income of the Church in Hungary, the government simply could not finance the creation and maintenance of a satisfactory number of new parish clergy without taking over the revenues of the particularly wealthy monasteries. It was the Franciscans who had been conspicuous in parochial work before 1780, and it is to be presumed that they played an even greater role in it after Joseph II's reforms. Overall, the suppressions seem to have made it possible to supply (p. 183) 2,212 additional secular clergy for Hungary, a percentage increase much greater than elsewhere in the Monarchy.⁶²

The policy of Joseph II towards the monasteries owed little to his mother's example. She took only limited measures against them, and much of what she did do—most importantly, the raising of the age of profession—was influenced by his views. There is no reason to think that she was hostile to contemplative monasteries as such, or to nunneries—two of Joseph's main targets. But his overriding concern was to improve parochial provision, either by dissolving monasteries and using the resulting funds to create new parishes and parish clergy, or by forcing surviving monasteries to make such provision themselves.

Both Garampi and Caprara may have been right in their differing estimates of the emperor's role in the 1780s. At the beginning of his sole reign he was goading a reluctant bureaucracy to drastic reform. By the end, many of the officials in charge of ecclesiastical matters were extremists whom he was reining in. The treatment meted out to the surviving monasteries showed little respect for their rules and traditions, and seemed to threaten the whole basis of monasticism. But, in the central lands at least, many of the major communities managed to maintain themselves after a fashion. When Joseph died in February 1790, it was still easy to muster the prescribed eight mitred abbots to accompany his corpse to the crypt of the Capuchins.⁶³

By then the French Revolution had withdrawn State recognition from monastic vows and seized most Church lands. In the Monarchy, however, Joseph's successor Leopold inaugurated at almost the same time the opposite process of restoring the monasteries' position, abolishing the general seminaries, and permitting the revival of theological training in the cloister, re-establishing Lilienfeld and allowing abbots to be elected. He seemed to agree in principle to the restoration of some Hungarian monasteries, but no action was taken.⁶⁴ In 1801 Francis I was finally persuaded to assist the revival of the old Orders in Hungary, and in 1827 he permitted new foundations of contemplative Orders in his empire.⁶⁵ Though he maintained Joseph's ecclesiastical position in most respects, here he diverged from it. Those monasteries that had been spared in Austria now enjoyed again the favour of the government, some of them were given an important role in higher education, and they could return to a monastic regimen closer to that of the period before 1770.

(p. 184) A book published in 1951 to celebrate the mere five-hundredth anniversary of the Franciscan Order in Austria contains this passage:

Certainly parishes were imposed on us by necessity, for both under Joseph II and also under the Nazi persecution the acceptance of a parish was the last expedient to preserve the monastery from suppression ... [But] what originally happened under duress is also in the line of modern development, and it is possible to see here the hand of Providence.⁶⁶

Austrian monasteries play a larger role in parochial work than those of any other European country. This peculiarity, and the fact that Austria is the one state in Europe where a large number of ancient and splendid Catholic houses can boast an almost continuous existence from the Middle Ages into

the late twentieth century, are largely explained by the complex story of Joseph II's dealings with the monasteries.

Notes:

(1) This essay follows from the discussion of monasteries and their reform in P. G. M. Dickson, *Finance and Government under Maria Theresia* (2 vols.; Oxford, 1987), esp. i, chs. 4, 11, and pp. 103, 446, and 'Joseph Us Reshaping of the Austrian Church', *Historical Journal* 36 (1993), 89–114. Professor Dickson not only gave me copies of these works but has been unfailingly generous with help and advice over many years. He made most useful comments on an earlier draft of this essay. On the Estates, see also H. Stradal, 'Die Prälatenkurie der österreichischen Landstände', *Ancienspays et assemblées d'états*, 53 (1970), 117–80. The Austrian provinces of the eighteenth century include all of modern Austria except Salzburg and its region, which then made up an independent prince-archbishopric, and Burgenland, then a part of Hungary. On the other hand, part of the Tyrol and all of Further Austria are no longer Austrian territory. There is no general survey of the history or place of monasteries in the Austrian Monarchy.

(2) J. Kallbrunner (ed.), *Kaiserin Maria Theresias politisches Testament* (Vienna, 1952), has the best text of the testament. A. Ritter von Arneth, 'Zwei Denkschriften der Kaiserin Maria Theresias', *Archiv für österreichische Geschichte* (hereafter *AÖG*), xlvii (1871), 267–354, is more accessible. On the dates of the two versions see Dickson, *Finance and Government*, ii. 3n. On the constitutional reform, see F. Walter, *Die theresianische Staatsreform von 1749* (Vienna., 1958).

(3) Kallbrunner, *Kaiserin Maria Theresias politisches Testament*, 38.

(4) D. Beales, *Joseph II*, i. *In the Shadow of Maria Theresa, 1741–1780* (Cambridge, 1987), 23.

(5) See F. Maaß, *Der Josephinismus: Quellen zu seiner Geschichte in Österreich, 1760–1850* (Fontes rerum austriacarum (hereafter *FRA*); 5 vols.; Vienna, 1951–61), i. 5–9, and *Der Frühjosephinismus* (Vienna, 1969); E. Wangermann, *The Austrian Achievement, 1700–1800* (London, 1973), 74–88.

(6) C. Freiherr von Hock, *Der österreichische Staatsrath* (Vienna, 1879), 397–8.

(7) *Sammlungalter k.k. Verordnungen und Gesetze vom Jahre 1740, bis 1780 ...* (9 vols.; Vienna, 1787), i. 6.

(8) Hock, *Staatsrath*, 413.

(9) A. Ritter von Arneht (ed.), *Maria Theresia und Joseph II. Ihre Correspondenz* (3 vols.; Vienna, 1867–8), iii. 348–51.

(10) Kaunitz's response to Joseph's memorandum was published in A. Beer, 'Denkschriften des Fürsten Wenzel Kaunitz-Rittberg', *AÖG* xlvi (1872). See esp. pp. 107–9.

(11) Maaß, *Josephinismus*. Maaß does make one back-handed reference to the document in his article 'Vorbereitung und Anfänge des Josephinismus im amtlichen Schriftwechsel des Staatskanzlers ... mit ... Firmian, 1763 bis 1770', *Mitteilungen des österreichischen Staatsarchivs* (hereafter *MÖSA*), i (1948), 301.

(12) Dickson, 'Joseph II's Reshaping', 97 n.

(13) *Ibid.* 94 ff.

(14) *Ibid.* 97 n. My calculation is as follows: in the Austrian duchies there were about 2,500 parishes. If we suppose that only 100 persons on average attended the main service at which these edicts were read out, 250,000 heard them in Austria alone.

(15) J. de Viguierie (ed.), *La Vocation religieuse et sacerdotale en France, XVII–XIX siècles* (Angers, 1979), 52.

(16) P. von Mitrofanov (*Josef II* (2 vols.; Vienna, 1910)) appears to miss this point, and even Dickson (see n. 1 above) barely refers to it. It emerges clearly from such works as G. Winner, *Die Klostersaufhebungen in Niederösterreich und Wien* (Vienna, 1967); *Welt des Barock* (2 vols.; Linz, 1986); *Josefinische Pfarrgrundungen in Wien* (Historisches Museum der Stadt Wien, 1985); L. Raber, *Die österreichischen Franziskaner im Josefinismus* (Maria Enzersdorf, ?1983).

(17) Dickson, *Finance and Government*, i. 103, and 'Joseph II's Reshaping', 95–8.

(18) B. Ellegast, 'Vernunft und Glaube', in *900 Jahre Benediktiner in Melk* (Melk, 1989), 364, and data in the permanent exhibition on view at Melk.

(19) F. Reisinger, 'Ein Herz und eine Seele in Gott', *Welt des Barock*, ii. 326.

(20) For the University of Salzburg, see, most recently, H. Klueting (ed.), *Katholische Aufklärung—Aufklärung im katholischen Deutschland* (Hamburg, 1993), esp. the essays of G. Heilingsetzer and L. Hammermayer.

(21) C. Capra in D. Sella and C. Capra, *Il ducato di Milano dal 1535 al 1796* (*Storia d'Italia*, ed. G. Galasso, vol. xi), 398 (19 Nov. 1768). Kaunitz is presumably referring to the practice, widespread and generally accepted among the Italian landed classes, of placing surplus sons and (especially) daughters in monasteries.

(22) For the whole paragraph, see *ibid.* 398–400, 497. For Galicia, H. Glassl, *Das österreichische Einrichtungswerk in Galizien (1772–1790)* (Wiesbaden, 1975), 135–40.

(23) Maaß, *Josephinismus*, ii. 139–41.

(24) See Beales, *Joseph II*, 450–2 and the sources there cited. I owe thanks to Prof. E. Wangermann for pointing out to me my mistake about the age of profession.

(25) On Joseph II and the Jesuits, see *ibid.* 460–4, and my forthcoming paper in a collection on their suppression edited by Dr R. Oresko, based on the proceedings of a conference which he organized some years ago at the Institute of Historical Research in London.

(26) Beales, *Joseph II*, 54, 60, 65–6, 81, 441–4. The classic treatment is G. Klingenstein, *Staatsverwaltung und kirchliche Autorität im 18. Jahrhundert* (Vienna, 1970). Cf. P. Hersche, 'War Maria Theresia eine Jansenistin?', *Österreich in Geschichte und Literatur*, 15 (1971), 14–25 and his important book, *Der Spdtjansenismus in Österreich* (Vienna, 1977).

(27) See the works cited in nn. 9, 10, and 21.

(28) For this and the previous paragraph, see Beales, *Joseph II*, 455–64; Dickson, *Finance and Government*, i. 65–8. More recently, on education J. V. H. Melton, *Absolutism and the Eighteenth-Century Origins of Compulsory Schooling in Prussia and Austria* (Cambridge, 1988), esp. 204–9. On Pergen, see P. P. Bernard, *From the Enlightenment to the Police State: The Public Life of Johann Anton Pergen* (Urbana, Ill., 1991), esp. ch. 3. Franz A. J. Szabo, *Kaunitz and Enlightened Absolutism 1753–1780* (Cambridge, 1994), esp.

241–7, supports this view of Kaunitz's attitude to the Jesuits. For the cartoon about Joseph, see Winner, *Klosteraufhebungen*, 29.

(29) For this and the previous paragraph, see Hock, *Staatsrath*, 295–6.

(30) Joseph to Kressel, 22 July 1782, in H. Schlitter (ed.), *Pius VI. und Joseff II* (FRAXLVII/2; Vienna, 1894), 147–8. Schlitter prints the draft instruction for the Ecclesiastical Commission on pp. 41–6.

(31) *Sammlung der kaiserlichen-königlichen Landesfürstlichen Gesetze und Verordnungen in Publico-Ecclesiasticis vom Jahre 1782 bis 1783* (Vienna, 1784), 109–13.

(32) Hock, *Staatsrath*, 415.

(33) For this and the next paragraph, see Raber, *Die österreichischen Franziskaner, passim*. The quotations come from pp. 139 and 236. See esp. p. 219. Dickson ('Joseph II's Reshaping') draws attention to the importance of the distinction between mendicant and other Orders.

(34) *Ibid.* 105, 110.

(35) A convenient account of the whole policy is E. Bradler-Rottmann, *Die Reformen Kaiser Josephs II* (Göppingen, 1973), ch. VI. On brotherhoods, see P. Ardaillou, 'Les Confréries viennoises aux 17^e et 18^e siècles', *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, 87 (1992), 745–58.

(36) J. Kellner (ed.), *Pfarre Sankt Lorenz am Schottenfeld 1786–1796* (St Pölten, 1986). H. Peichl, 'Die Schottenabtei in der Neuzeit', in F. Krones (ed.), *800 Jahre Schottenabtei* (Vienna, 1960), 56–7. For Melk, see Ellegast, 'Vernunft und Glaube', 362–4; for Geras, J. Ambrósý and A. J. Pfiffig, *Stifi Geras und seine Kunstschatze* (St Pölten, 1989), 34. I owe my knowledge of Kellner's book to Professor Donal Kerr.

(37) See the accounts of Winner, *Klosteraufhebungen*, and R. Hittmair, *Der josephinische Klostersturm im Land ob der Enns* (Freiburg im Breisgan, 1907).

(38) Archivio segreto vaticano: Nunziatura di Vienna (hereafter ASVNV), 179–84, 197A, 199–200. I am grateful to Mgr Charles Burns for much generous help during my work in the Vatican Archives.

(39) H. Schlitter (*Die Reise des Papstes Pius VI. nach Wien* and *Pius VI. und Joseff II*. (FRA XLVII; Vienna, 1892, 1894)) uses these files and gives extensive

extracts from them, but it seems clear that many of the most confidential documents were not available to him. G. Soranzo, *Peregrinus apostolicus* (Milan, 1937), is rather fuller on the papal side. E. Kovács, *Der Pabstin TeutschUnd* (Munich, 1983), relies on these two works. T. Vanyó, *A bécsi pápai követség levéltárának iratai Magyarországról, 1611–1786* (Budapest, 1986), is largely confined to references to specifically Hungarian affairs. I am grateful to Professor István Tóth for the reference to Vanyó's book. Since I wrote this essay Father Umberto Dell'Orto, with whom I had valuable conversations in Rome, has generously sent me a copy of his very important study, *La Nunziatura a Vienna di Giuseppe Garampi, 1776–1785* (Collectanea Archivi Vaticani; Vatican City, 1995).

(40) ASVNV 180, Garampi's dispatches of 20 July and 18 Nov. 1781.

(41) e.g. E. Wangermann, *From Joseph II to the Jacobin Trials* (2nd edn., Oxford, 1969), 6; L. Bodi, *Tauwetter in Wien* (Frankfurt, 1977), 228.

(42) ASVNV 182, Garampi's dispatch of 5 May 1783, section on 'Kroesel'.

(43) *Joseph des Zweyten Erinnerung an seine Staatsbeamten, am Schlusse des 1783ten Jahres* (Vienna, [1783]).

(44) *Sonnenfels gesammelte Schriften* (10 vols.; Vienna, 1783–7), viii. 329–30 (from *Deutsches Museum*, Apr. 1782).

(45) The first edition was in Latin: *Joannis Physiophili Specimen Monachologiae methodo Linnaeana* (Augsburg, 1783).

(46) See Bodi, *Tauwetter in Wien*, 53, 125. Hittmair, *Der josephinische Klostersturm*, is very informative about Eybel's activities in Upper Austria, and M. Brandl, *Der Kanonist Joseph Valentin Eybel (1741–1805): Sein Beitrag zur Aufklärung in Österreich* (Steyr, 1976), about his writings.

(47) e.g. Caprara's dispatch of 3 Aug. 1786 (ASVNV 199). Cf. Dickson, 'Joseph II's Reshaping', 97n.

(48) Hittmair, *Der josephinische Klostersturm*, 253–4.

(49) Hock, *Staatsrath*, 407; F. and R. Malecek, *Strahov Praha* (Prague, ?1993). I owe the latter reference to Dr L. C. Van Dijck.

(50) For supplying me with material about the case of Lilienfeld, I am very grateful to Miss E. Fattinger.

(51) My main published sources on the Hungarian Church are Dickson, *Finance and Government*, i, esp. ch. 4, and 'Joseph II's Reshaping'; H. Marczali, *Hungary in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1910), esp. ch. IV; B. K. Király, 'The Hungarian Church', in the maddeningly footnote-less collection, W. J. Callahan and D. Higgs, *Church and Society in Catholic Europe in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1979); and L. Csóka, *Geschichte des benediktinischen Mönchtums in Ungarn* (Studia Hungarica, Munich, 1980), esp. 312–64. For sources in the Hungarian National Archives, see n. 55 below—my comments on uneven provision derive from file C.107 of the Ecclesiastical Commission, reinforced by the graphic evidence in the remarkable articles of G. Tüskés and E. Knapp, esp. 'Österreichisch-ungarische interethnische Verbindungen im Spiegel des barockzeitlichen Wallfahrtwesens', *Bayerisches Jahrbuch für Volkskunde* (1990), 1–42, and 'Bruderschaften in Ungarn im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert', *ibid.* (1992), 1–23. Many Hungarian scholars have helped me to understand better the differences between the Hungarian and Austrian churches. I should particularly like to thank here Professor D. Kosáry and Professor L. Péter.

(52) Marczali, *Hungary in the Eighteenth Century*, 271.

(53) From *Finance and Government*, i. 35, 39, and 'Joseph II's Reshaping', 98.

(54) J. Tomko, *Die Errichtung der Diözesen Zips, Neusohl und Rosenau (1776) und das königliche Patronatsrecht in Ungarn* (Vienna, 1968). I owe this reference to Professor R. J. W. Evans.

(55) These remarks are based partly on research in the Hungarian National Archives on the collections of Joseph's Normalia (A 58) and the papers of the Ecclesiastical Commission (C 70–107). Professor Éva Balázs made my work there possible, and I was greatly assisted by Dr Éva Hoós and Dr Márta Velladics, who unselfishly abstracted material for me and directed me to appropriate files. I owe special thanks too to the staff of the National Archives, who gave me help far beyond the call of duty.

(56) P. Bán, 'Új adatok a szerzetesrendek II. József korabeli megszüntetéséről', *Baranya*, 3 (1990–1), 61–71. The three Orders mentioned are excluded because the source lacks figures for their houses. Dr Velladics very kindly supplied me with a xerox of Bán's important article. Dickson's figure of 117 Hungarian monasteries dissolved (*Finance and Government*, i. 76) refers to a smaller definition of Hungary, but still including Croatia. His figure of 154 as the total number before dissolution (*ibid.* 446 and 'Joseph II's Reshaping', 114 n.) is not comparable, since it excludes e.g. Croatia.

M. von Schwartner, *Statistik des Königreiches Ungern* (2 vols.; Budapest, 1809), i. 171, gives a figure of 147 Hungarian monasteries spared by Joseph II, including Piarist houses.

(57) Dickson, 'Joseph II's Reshaping', 98, 108.

(58) Bán, 'Új adatok', 61-2, 65-6.

(59) The nature of ecclesiastical representation in the Diet is remarkably difficult to discover. I here rely, uncomfortably, on Király, 'The Hungarian Church', 111.

(60) Bán, 'Új adatok', 68.

(61) Cf. Csóka, *Geschichte des benediktinischen Mönchtums in Ungarn*, 348-52, 262. The tables in C.107 (see n. 55 above) give tiny figures for monks acting as parish clergy in Hungary before 1786 (cf. Dickson, 'Joseph II's Reshaping', 101 n. 30, for figures for other provinces).

(62) Dickson, 'Joseph II's Reshaping', 105.

(63) ASVNV 200, Caprara's dispatch of 22 Feb. 1790.

(64) Winner, *Klosteraufhebungen; Maaß, Josefinismus*, iv. esp. 3-13.

(65) *Ibid.* iv. 51; J. L. E. Graf von Barth-Barthenstein, *Das Ganze der österreichischen politischen Administration* (4 vols.; Vienna, 1838-43), ii. 133. This, of course, helps to account for the fact, noted by Dickson ('Joseph II's Reshaping', 114), that there were more Hungarian monasteries in 1847 than in 1780.

(66) *500 Jahre Franziskaner der österreichischen Ordens-Provinz* (Vienna, 1951), 189. Cf. J. Hollnsteiner, 'Die Orden und Kongregationen in Österreich', in A. Hudal (ed.), *Der Katholizismus in Österreich* (Innsbruck, 1931), 110-19.

