John Klassen

Joseph II and Church Reform

History Master of Arts

In 1782 Joseph II placed ecclesiastical affairs under the administration of a department of the government. Reflecting the influence of the school of Natural Law, Joseph tried to bring all of society including religion under the jurisdiction of the state. Being concerned for the welfare of the Catholic Church, he also set out to reform it so that it would be capable of reversing the trends towards unbelief. The Edict of Toleration gave to non-Catholics political and civil rights equal to those of Catholics. Although he rejected the use of force as a method, Joseph persisted in the drive to eliminate heresy. The government dissolved monasteries which were not socially useful and used the Church's human and material resources to improve the parish priesthood. The government also took measures affecting both laity and clergy which were designed to make the people express their piety through practical love rather than through ceremony.

JOSEPH II AND CHURCH REFORM

JOSEPH II AND CHURCH REFORM

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of
Graduate Studies and Research in
partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

by

John Klassen

Department of History
McGill University
Montreal

June, 1968

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

In the eighteenth century the government of Vienna took a number of steps which restricted the secular power and autonomy of the Catholic Church. At the same time, elements among the Austrian population exhibited an indifference for organized religion and a tendency towards secularization which is associated with the Enlightenment. These phenomena are described by historians as Josephinism. Since the government reforms were the most extensive and spectacular during the reign of Joseph II his name has been taken to characterize the period.

There are essentially two schools of thought with respect to the question of Josephinism. One school holds that it was basically the government's answer to a constitutional problem. As such it was a system of state-Church relations, the major characteristic being the subjection of the Church to the state, with the former serving the goals of the latter.[1] This school is mainly interested

---

1. Ferdinand Maass, Der Josephinismus, 5 vols. (Fontes rerum Austriacarum, vols. 71-75), Wien, 1951-1961, and Herbert Rieser, Der Geist des Josephinismus und sein Fortleben, Wien, 1963, are two authors who deal with the problem of Josephinism from this point of view. There are other writers who accept their definition and bias but discuss the Church reforms of Joseph II apart from the problem of Josephinism.

in describing the system's philosophical principles and the reasons which the state gave for subjecting the Church. According to this school, the system was concluded by 1770, ten years before Joseph took control of the government.[2] The origins of the system, as Maass contends, can be found in the writings of Prince Wenzel Kaunitz, the state chancellor of Maria Theresa and Joseph II, and Franz Joseph Heinke, Maria Theresa's privy councillor and under Joseph, a member of the executive of the State Board of Religion. According to this theory the government decrees regulating religious worship and other affairs of the Austrian Church offer no insight into the nature of Josephinism.[3] This school of thought further characterizes Josephinism as something which violated canon law and undermined the Catholic religion, resulting in conflict between Rome and Vienna.

The second school of thought, represented by E. Winter and F. Valjevec, sees the government measures pertaining to ecclesiastical matters as only one element of Josephinism. Both see it as developing independently of the will of the monarch and originating among intellectuals and society at large. According to Winter, Josephinism was one chapter in the story of Catholics trying to reform

---

2. Rieser, p. 39.

3. Maass, vol. 2, p. XXV.

their Church. He suggests that the movement began during Maria Theresa's reign with four intellectuals in Vienna, Gerhard van Swieten, Karl Martini, and two clerics, Ambros von Storck and Prior Ignaz Müller.[4] Since Winter's book concentrates on the Czech and Slovak lands it gives the impression that Josephinism was the work of intellectuals and priests working in Bohemia and Moravia. He holds that the monarchs co-operated with and used the efforts of the reform minded Catholics to their own advantage.

Valjavec describes Josephinism as the compromise reached by two opposing forces in Austrian society. The two forces were the traditional attitude to religion and politics and the new approach characterized by secularization and the spirit of Enlightenment.[5] Valjavec seeks for manifestations of this compromise in all of Austrian society.

The conception of Josephinism as merely a system of state-Church relations does not suffice since it neglects the total effort by the Josephinian state to reform the Austrian Catholic Church. This effort surely affected the arrangement of state-Church relations. Furthermore,

---

4. Eduard Winter, Der Josefinismus, Berlin, 1962, pp. 37-40.

5. Fritz Valjavec, Der Josephinismus, München, 1945, p. 8.

it makes little sense to label as Josephinism a constitutional system of regulating state-Church relations which was established by Kaunitz and Heinke before Joseph ruled.

Similarly, a discussion of Josephinism merely as an intellectual or spiritual movement is not justified. There undoubtedly were trends towards secularization and reform in eighteenth century Austria. There is, however, little point in calling them Josephinism when their relationship with Joseph II was mainly one of concomitance. It would be more useful to discuss Josephinism as the attempt to reform the Catholic Church as it originated with the Josephinian state. This discussion cannot exclude an examination of all the efforts of the state which were directed toward a reform of the Catholic religion in the monarchy.

The Church reforms of Joseph II were part of a larger attempt to reshape and build up the Austrian state and society. Joseph's efforts to strengthen the state affected the Church in two ways. For one thing the Church lost its secular privileges, continuing the trend already begun by Maria Theresa. Secondly the government assumed supervision over ecclesiastical affairs. Under state direction the Church was required to participate actively in society, and in Catholic worship the ceremonial and thaumaturgic features were restrained.

In reforming the Church the government sought to benefit the state as well as the Catholic religion. The dichotomy between the interest of the state and the interest of religion was not sharply defined in the minds of the Josephinian statesmen. They valued the Catholic faith and their conception of a healthy society included a strong Catholic Church.

There is not a great deal of literature on Joseph II in English. Neither of the two biographies, J. Franck Bright's Joseph II, and Saul K. Padover's The Revolutionary Emperor: Joseph II 1741-1790, contributes very much to the problems of Joseph's reign. According to Padover, Joseph's Church policy was based on the principles of Febronianism. He distorts Joseph's attitude to the Church further by describing him as anti-clerical.

Recently two specialized works on economic policy have appeared. Both make a valuable contribution to English historiography of the period. They are Edith Link's The Emancipation of the Austrian Peasant, 1740-1798 and William Wright's Serf, Seigneur and Sovereign: Agrarian Reform in Eighteenth Century Bohemia. Also Ernst Wangermann's From Joseph II to the Jacobin Trials is an excellent book on the period although its value for the reign of Joseph II is reduced by the fact that it begins after 1785, thereby omitting the most productive years of

the monarch's life.

The only work in English dealing with the problem of Josephinism is Paul P. Bernard's The Origins of Josephinism: Two Studies. The author limits his discussion to the various forces and movements of eighteenth century Europe which may have influenced the monarch in his youth. He does not analyse the activity of the monarch during his reign.

The inadequacy of English historiography on Joseph's reign is unfortunate. It is hoped that the following study will add to the information available to the English reader.

CHAPTER ONE

STATE-CHURCH RELATIONS IN AUSTRIA: 1740-1790

In the second half of the eighteenth century, the relationship between the Catholic Church and the Habsburg state underwent a significant alteration. As the government at Vienna strove for centralization and a more powerful state the Church lost the favoured status which the Habsburgs had granted it over previous centuries.

From the time of the Protestant reformation, the Habsburgs, generally, maintained a friendly relationship with the Church. This amity was extended to both the Pope at Rome and to the clergy in the Habsburg lands. Since they were themselves zealous Catholics, the Habsburgs aided the Church in its struggle to turn back the Protestant tide. To this end they extended to the Church financial, judicial and educational privileges, as well as a large degree of autonomy.

These privileges were the object of revision as the Habsburgs reappraised their relationship with the Church in the eighteenth century. Already in Maria Theresa's time the Church began to lose its secular jurisdiction and felt the threat of state supervision over its own

affairs. The process culminated in the reign of Joseph II when the state withdrew the support of the imperial army from the clergy's efforts to re-convert the Protestants. Moreover, ecclesiastical matters came to be administered by a department of the government, and the Church retained jurisdiction only over questions of dogma.

One of the developments which limited the Church's secular rights was Maria Theresa's policy to centralize the government. The administration which she inherited in 1740 was multipartite, making it difficult for her to raise a large army and control affairs in her monarchy. The provincial Estates had the right to determine the amount of taxes they paid to the government. Furthermore, because they held local administrative posts, members of the nobility were in a position to enforce or ignore the decrees of the central government.[1] The wars with Prussia and the loss of Silesia graphically illustrated to Maria Theresa the impotence of her decentralized and financially weak monarchy. In order to tap the resources of her lands she needed to concentrate government powers in Vienna. In an attempt to co-ordinate the financial affairs of the monarchy, the chanceries of Austria and Bohemia were united in the office of the Directorium in Pulicis et Cameralibus in 1749. This office was replaced by the Staatsrat

1. Josef Kallbrunner, Kaiserin Maria Theresias Politisches Testament, München, 1952, p. 8.

in 1760. The government also wanted to establish a closer rapport between itself and the people. To this end the Kreishauptmann, formerly an agent of the provincial Estates, was converted into a district officer, responsible to the central government for the implementation of royal orders.[2]

The efforts of the Theresan government were directed not only towards the creation of a strong central state and army but also to the formation of a healthy economy and society. This involved the setting up of schools and hospitals, the building of roads and the establishment of social services. Significant in this respect was Maria Theresa's endeavour to create a system of general education which was to reach even the lowest social class. During her reign, and largely because of the competence of Gerhard van Swieten, Vienna became one of the leading centres in Europe for medical education.[3]

The Church inevitably felt the effects of the government's drive for centralization. As the administration strove to become the single wielder of state power, the Church, along with the lay nobility, lost its political jurisdiction. The autonomy of the Church in material

---

2. R.J. White, Europe in the Eighteenth Century, New York, 1965, p. 211.

3. Robert A. Kann, A Study in Austrian Intellectual History, New York, 1960, pp. 132-133.

matters was also restricted because of the government's desire to keep capital in Austria. In general the measures of the Theresan government were partial, and although the Church felt its autonomy restricted during her reign this curtailment of power occurred primarily in the realm of secular privileges.

The trend towards centralization in government and the establishment of a powerful state found its intellectual justification in the political theory of the school of Natural Law, which in the eighteenth century was influenced by Samuel Pufendorf's concept of the state. Pufendorf saw the state as the result of the unified and voluntary submission of the people to the will of the ruler, be it one man or council. The ruler bound himself to care for the common safety and welfare, while the people pledged obedience in return. The deliberate subjection of the will of the citizens to the will of the ruler authorized him to use the subject's powers for the common defense. In sum, the state was one organism, consisting of ruler and people, having one will.[4]

Johann Bartenstein, one of Joseph's teachers, also discussed the state in terms of a unified relationship. He believed that the state was comprised of the subjects

---

4. Leonard Krieger, The Politics of Discretion, Pufendorf and the Acceptance of Natural Law, Chicago, 1965, pp. 120-121.

and the monarch, with full authority invested in the latter. He specified that in this arrangement the Church should not be permitted secular rights.[5]

Another aspect of the political theory of the school of Natural Law was the idea that the government was a beneficial agent working for the good of society. Both Pufendorf and Christian Wolff taught that the ruler had certain responsibilities towards society although these could not be forced upon him. Since the people had no legal machinery with which to coerce their ruler to serve society they depended on his ethical sensitivity.[6] Pufendorf and Wolff also taught that the ruler could not demand anything from his subjects which would hurt the common good. The ruler's function, they said, was to accomplish certain Staatszwecke. These purposes of state were not only to maintain law and order, but also to provide those things which served the needs, comforts and pleasures of his subjects.[7] The ruler who did not govern with these interests in mind was violating Natural Law.

The ideas of Natural Law influenced the intellectual and government circles in eighteenth century Austria.

---

5. Hans v. Voltelini, "Die Naturrechtlichen Ideen und die Reformen des Achtzehnjahrhunderts", in Historische Zeitschrift (Dritte Folge), vol. 105, 1910, p. 72.

6. Ibid., p. 76.

7. Ibid., pp. 79, 98.

At the University of Innsbruck Naturrecht became an obligatory subject in 1733. Karl Anton Martini held the first chair of Natural Law in the University of Vienna when the faculty opened in 1754.[8] He was later appointed to the government's Council of State,[9] and in his writings acknowledged his intellectual debt to both Pufendorf and Wolff.[10]

Joseph's education included the ideas of Natural Law. One of his tutors, Christian August Beck, prepared a compendium of legal philosophy based on the writings of Pufendorf, Locke and Montesquieu.[11] The concept of the state as a single unit of people and ruler with the latter working for the welfare of the former was reflected in Joseph's letter of instruction (Hirtenbrief) to his civil servants in 1783. In the letter, which was intended to encourage loyalty, honesty and diligence in his officials, Joseph reminded them that the interests and the welfare of the majority superseded their own and the monarch's

---

8. Ibid., p. 70.

9. Carl Hock and H.I. Bidermann, Der Österreichische Staatsrat, 1760-1848, Wien, 1879, p. 107.

10. Voltelini, p. 71.

11. Paul P. Bernard, The Origins of Josephinism: Two Studies (The Colorado College Studies, No. 7), Colorado Springs, 1964, pp. 20 and 40.

individual interest.[12]

In his admonishments Joseph made it clear that he demanded diligence and honesty because of the benefit that would accrue, as a result, to all of society. In the preamble Joseph wrote, "It follows from this that, beginning with oneself, one must not desire anything except the profit and the welfare of the majority".[13] Joseph also wanted to simplify the civil service and eliminate unnecessary office staff. Through this effort he hoped to save sufficient money to allow the state to reduce taxes. This, he said, would contribute more to the welfare of the subjects than would an excessively large bureaucracy.[14] He also warned that an official who did not fulfill his duty was indebted not only to his monarch but to all his fellow citizens.[15]

In Joseph's mind "welfare" or the "good" was closely associated with a unified state in which no group was privileged and all efforts were directed towards attaining that which was profitable for the greater number of people.

---

12. Friedrich Walter, Die Österreichische Zentralverwaltung, Band 4, Die Zeit Josephs II. and Leopold II. 1780-1792, Aktenstücke, (Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Neuere Geschichte Österreichs, vol. 36), Wien, 1950, p. 131.

13. Ibid., p. 123.

14. Ibid., p. 125.

15. Ibid., p. 126.

He defined the "good" as follows:

> The good can only be one thing, namely that which affects the general and the majority, hence all the provinces of the monarchy must be regarded as one whole . . . nation and religion must in all this not make any difference, and as brothers in one monarchy, all must apply themselves equally, in order to be profitable to each other.[16]

Joseph was attacking those elements of the civil service which depended on class rank to retain their official positions. He warned that he expected every person who held a government post to earn his placement. In the process of spelling out these terms Joseph indicated that this improved and updated civil service and the government machinery existed for the sake of serving society; to Joseph the government had no value in itself.

At the same time Joseph retained the right to decide what was in the people's best interest, allowing them little voice in determining their own affairs. He was not an adherent of the social contract theory of government when it came to questions about the source of his authority. For him the fact that he had power sufficed; consequently he attempted to rule for the benefit of society as he understood it. Part of the justification, used by Josephinian statesmen in reforming the Church, was that it was in the interest of the state. The state, as understood by these men, included all of society.

---

16. Ibid., p. 127.

The political theory of Joseph and his officials had important consequences for the Church in Austria. Because the government saw itself as the servant of the whole population, it assumed responsibility for services in the fields of legal justice, education, health and religion. As a result the Church lost her secular privileges, one of the most important being that in its drive to convert Protestants it could expect the legal and military support of the state. Another effect was that, because it wanted to insure improvement of religious services throughout the whole monarchy, the state assumed supervision over ecclesiastical matters.

The Josephinian reforms, much as they restricted the freedom of the Church, were not a denial of the values of the Catholic religion. In fact the state believed that it was serving the cause of Catholicism with its reform work. Furthermore, the state appealed to precedents in Church history and doctrine to justify its measures.

In the eighteenth century there were a number of movements within the Church with which the Josephinian state could identify. These movements with their anti-Roman Curia sentiments provided willing co-workers for the religious reforms of Joseph II. Whether or not the doctrines of these movements provided the inspiration for the reforms is open to debate. They did, however, provide

arguments which were used by Prince Kaunitz and Franz Joseph Heinke to support the reforms of the Church.

The two most important of these religious movements were Jansenism and Febronianism. Jansenism, named after Cornelius Jansen, bishop of Ypres in the seventeenth century, emphasized the weakness of man's nature and the necessity of God's grace for salvation. It thus undermined the ceremonial and sacerdotal system upon which the Roman Curia thrived, and according to its enemies threatened the whole Church.[17] In the eighteenth century, Jansenism received its impetus from Pasquier Quesnel's book Nouveau Testament en Francais avec des Reflexions Morals, which was condemned by Pope Clement XI. Quesnel restated the essential Jansenist doctrine and questioned the ultimate authority of the Church hierarchy in matters of faith. In the eighteenth century the controversy was not restricted to theological issues. The lower clergy also resented the wealth and authority which the higher clergy and Curia had gained as a result of successfully exploiting the sacerdotal system.[18]

A second reform movement within the Church with which the Josephinian State could ally itself was Febronianism, the German expression of Gallicanism.

---

17. Rieser, pp. 6-7.

18. M.S. Anderson, Europe in the Eighteenth Century; 1713-1783, Norwich, 1961, p. 324.

Gallicanism was a drive to make the French Catholic Church independent of foreign ecclesiastical authorities. It was supported by both the French clergy and monarch, and was associated with the aspirations of the bishops. The movement reached its climax under Louis XIV with the publication of the Declarato Cleri Gallicani. Signed by the leading clergy and theologians of France, the Declarato set forth the following principles; ecclesiastical authority applied only to the spiritual sphere; the pope's authority was subject to a general council and his aims had to comply with the institutions and arrangements of the /national/ monarch and Church.[19]

The German spokesman for these ideas was Johannes Nickolas von Hontheim, the Bishop of Trier. In 1763 he published the book Von dem Zustande der Kirche und die gesetzliche Macht des römischen Papstes, under the pseudoname of Justinius Febronius. The Emser Punktation issued in 1786 by four leading German bishops, one of whom was Hontheim, expressed even more clearly Febronian principles.

One of the Josephinian officials whose thinking was influenced by the ideas of Natural Law, Febronianism and by his concern for the welfare of the Catholic religion was Franz Joseph Heinke. Both Maria Theresa and

---

19. Rieser, p. 6.

Joseph[20] trusted his judgement in questions of state-Church relations. In 1768 Maria Theresa requested him to draw up a fundamental system in which he should establish the respective rights of the state and the Church. He was, furthermore, to suggest how the encroachments into the state's jurisdiction and the abuses in external religious affairs could be removed.[21] Heinke responded with a brief entitled Vorläufige Anmerkungen. As the title indicates, this was to be a tentative statement. It contained the basic principles and theoretical justification for a new policy of state-Church relations.

According to Heinke's proposed policy the state intended to exercise its sovereignty over the Church and reform it in order that the Catholic religion might regain the respect and devotion of the population. Heinke justified these measures by maintaining that they would benefit the Church. He also suggested that it was in the state's interest to solve the longstanding problem of state-Church jurisdiction by clearly defining the respective spheres of the two. He then indicated what he considered to be the nature and the function of the Church.

The Church, he said, was a community or assembly

---

20. Maass, vol. 3, pp. 42, 251.

21. Ibid., p. 10.

united through Christian baptism. This community gathered under its visible head and other clerical overseers through whose help the people achieved eternal salvation.[22] Its authority and responsibility were restricted to purely spiritual matters such as preaching and administering the sacraments. This, he said, is how it was in the early days of Christianity. Since the clergy, if they were involved only in spiritual matters, would no longer have an income, Heinke suggested that the state should provide them with the wages necessary for living.[23]

Heinke defined the state as the society of people who organized themselves according to certain constitutions (Verfassungen) in the interests of their temporal welfare and security. He added, however, that the monarch received his authority from God alone and directed his efforts only at the secular welfare of the state and its internal and external conditions.[24]

Heinke realized that the implementation of his plan of state-Church jurisdiction meant a total re-direction of the clergy's activities. The rest of his brief indicated that to him the question was more than one of constitutional reform. He was concerned with the problem

---

22. Ibid., p. 141.

23. Ibid., pp. 142-143.

24. Ibid., p. 141.

of heresy in general and the fact that people were turning from the Catholic religion in an increasingly fast rate. He attributed the rise of a "shameless Luther" in the past as well as the contemporary trend towards free thought (Freydenkerei), to the fact that the clergy had become materialistic and were involved in secular affairs.[25] For this reason the laity had lost respect for them and had eventually begun to examine the truths of their faith themselves. The voice of the clergy, because of their failures, had become suspect in the minds of the population.[26] Heinke felt that never in the past had man's soul been so threatened as it was now.

> Not since the beginning of the world has the devil, through the dangerous method of the disputation of the revealed word of God, mastered the hearts of men, as he has today; the general spread of so-called free thought can have unbelievable results, it flatters the passions, frees men from the pangs of conscience and finds acceptance since it frees them from the power of the Church. (geistliche Gewalt) . . . .[27]

The image of established religion, according to Heinke would be improved by a reform of the Church's material status. In addition, he expressed the hope that if the clergy were to concentrate on spiritual matters, they would be able to salvage their standing in the eyes of

---

25. Ibid., p. 144-145.

26. Ibid., p. 146.

27. Ibid., p. 146.

the public and reverse the trend towards free thought.[28]

Heinke advocated an intensified effort on the part of the state to turn back the tide of unbelief. He admitted that this was actually the responsibility of the clergy and the pope. Since the clergy, however, were interested in extending their privileges into secular and material spheres they were bound to perpetuate the present state of affairs. As a result there was only one course of action available, that was to appeal to the secular monarch, who ". . . receives his authority from God alone, and whose authority includes the right to protect (Schutzrecht) religion and the Church, ..."[29]

Heinke did not maintain the position which he outlined at the beginning of his brief where he advocated that the jurisdiction of the state and the Church be strictly delineated. He concluded, rather, by calling on the state to intervene in the affairs of the Church and reform it for its own benefit. He, in effect, advocated a state-dominated Church, and not a separation between the two. His suggestion contained the prospect of the state becoming involved in the spiritual and doctrinal aspects of the Church in order to save the people from the danger of free thought. He recognized the inconsistency in his position but justified it by claiming

---

28. Ibid., p. 144.

29. Ibid., p. 147.

that the clergy and the ecclesiastical hierarchy were not interested in change and that the defense of religion was part of the monarch's divine mandate.

Heinke's program to revive the Church was twofold. The government should limit the material and judicial rights of the clergy, and then educate them regarding the extent of their privileges and what their duties as pastors were. Maria Theresa was reluctant to implement such a fullscale reform but it was essentially the course adopted by Joseph.

The Theresan government repaid the trust of the Church by leaving its autonomy in ecclesiastical affairs generally intact. Nevertheless, isolated incidents did occur in which the state pressured the Church. In 1764 the pope refused to accept the Austrian government's nominee to fill the vacancy of the bishopric of Como. As a result Kaunitz issued an attack on the "despotic pope" and called for a complete re-evaluation of the rights of ecclesiastical appointments. This reassessment was later to extend into all areas of the Church's status which threatened to interfere with the Habsburg's desire to reform their society.

Maria Theresa was concerned about the Church's use of its physical resources and about the material conditions of the secular priests. Consequently she took

action in individual cases by putting pressure on the Church when she felt that the welfare of the state and religion gave her no other choice. An example of this was the affair of the Bohemian Salt Fund.

The issue concerned the inactive funds of the Society of Propagation, which were administered by the papal office. In 1630 Ferdinand II and Pope Urban VIII concluded an agreement whereby the Church in Bohemia would receive the sum of fifteen kreuzer for each barrel of salt produced in Bohemia. This was to compensate the Church for damages suffered during the disturbances under Rudolf II (1576-1612).[30] During Maria Theresa's reign the Church was not making full use of the money and as a result a total of 14,000 florins had accumulated. In June 1770, the empress complained to Kaunitz that the money was simply lying dormant. It was not used to pay the pastors and teachers were not being appointed. She said that despite this she would not force Rome's hand at this time.[31]

Kaunitz, however, thought that she was allowing Rome too much. He responded with a suggestion that Maria Theresa give the Society one month to dispose of

---

30. J.R. Kušej, Joseph II. und die äussere Kirchenverfassung Innerösterreichs, Stuttgart, 1908 (reprinted in Amsterdam, 1965), p. 318. See also Maass vol. 1, p. 81.

31. Maass, vol. 2, p. 129.

the money in a creative way. If this was not done, he said, the empress had the

> difficult obligation to care for the welfare of religion in her states . . . and to dispose of the money which was in stock from the salt fund in such a way as her highness will find is most necessary and beneficial for the advancement of religion and the salvation of souls.[32]

His resolution received the ruler's consent and the pope was informed that the state would expropriate the money unless it was put to practical use. In August Kaunitz wrote to the empress that the pope had acceded to their demands.[33]

This incident showed that Maria Theresa was prepared to instruct the Church on how to dispose of its material assets, but only when she thought the Church's use of its funds was not in the best interest of religion. In this case Rome was clearly hindering the pastoral and teaching work of the clergy by not freeing the Salt Fund. The government gave the Church the opportunity to use the money constructively, and only when no action resulted did the government feel free to intervene. The government attempted to prod the Church into fulfilling its function of serving the spiritual needs of society.

The Theresan government did not threaten the basic

---

32. Ibid., p. 130.

33. Ibid., p. 147.

freedom of the Church in Austria but it did assume supervision of ecclesiastical affairs in the province of Lombardy. In the 1760s the Habsburg state disputed with the pope on the question of ecclesiastical appointments and jurisdiction. As a means whereby these issues could be settled and in order to establish administrative machinery which might later be applied to the hereditary lands, Kaunitz prepared the office through which the state could manage the administrative aspects of the Church in Lombardy. The result was the Milan Royal Board of Control which supervised the "external Church discipline, public worship service and the property of the Churches, monasteries, religious communities and endowed institutions".[34] The Board was responsible to the governor-general of Austrian Lombardy, and represented the first concrete expression of the government's plan to supervise the affairs of the Church. As such it was the forerunner of the State Board of Religion, which Joseph established in the hereditary lands in 1782.[35]

At the beginning of Joseph's reign the state issued an official declaration containing the principles which were to govern the relations between state and Church. According to this statement the Church's freedom was to

---

34. Walter, p. 71. See also Maass, vol. 1, pp. 333-334.

35. Walter, p. 74.

end as the state assumed authority over ecclesiastical affairs.

The declaration took the form of Kaunitz's response to a note of complaint from the papal nuncio, Garampi. In his note the nuncio disapproved of Joseph's measures affecting the status of monasteries as well as those concerning marriage.[36] Kaunitz's reply contained in outline the rights and jurisdiction which the Church could expect to retain as well as the theoretical and legal justification for the government assuming control of ecclesiastical affairs. Joseph informed the State Chancellory and the State Council of War that Kaunitz's brief contained the basic principles which were to be applied to state-Church relations.[37] The bishops and their consisteries were also to be notified of these principles.[38]

Garampi's main grievance was that the government's measures affecting Church property were "disadvantageous to religion, the Church and the salvation of souls". He believed the measures to be contrary to established ecclesiastical principles and accused Joseph of transferring

---

36. Maass, vol. 2, p. 280.

37. Ibid., p. 296.

38. Ibid., p. 298.

the exclusive rights of the pope to the Austrian bishops. Furthermore, he charged that Joseph had extended his rights and powers into ecclesiastical affairs to a greater degree than any previous German prince. As a result, the papacy would be forced to conclude that Joseph was not to be treated as a Catholic monarch. Garampi hinted that if the government persisted in its policy some subjects would be obliged to withhold their loyalty from the Austrian state.[39]

Kaunitz maintained that the removal of malpractices would not be disadvantageous to the Church. On the contrary, he claimed that it could expect to profit and grow because of the government sponsored reforms.[40] He aligned himself with Heinke in expecting the Church to be improved through the changes. He did not, however, point out the specific defects in the Church and how the reforms were to remove the faults as Heinke did. In cases where Kaunitz did specify abuses, as when he discussed monasteries,[41] he emphasized how the reforms would benefit the state.

Kaunitz defined Church abuses as those attributes of the eighteenth century ecclesiastical practice which

---

39. Ibid., pp. 291-292.

40. Ibid., p. 292.

41. See below, p. 73.

were not present in apostolic Christianity, and those features which were not concerned with dogma or the salvation of souls.[42] Anything the clergy were involved in which could be classified as an abuse the state assumed the right to change. Actually the state did not honour these guidelines, because the monasteries of the service orders were encouraged to continue their healing and teaching. Furthermore, in the state supervised General Seminaries the pastor was trained to fill a role which would bring material advantage as well as spiritual salvation to those whom he served.

Kaunitz then justified the government's jurisdiction over ecclesiastical affairs. He asserted that whatever judicial and material rights the clergy enjoyed had been given them voluntarily by the state. The Church did not possess them as something essential to its nature. Hence the state had the right to withhold privileges which it had previously granted. Kaunitz continued that the monarch had not only the right, but the obligation, to reform the non-spiritual aspects of the Church. For the clergy, through their involvement in the material and secular activities of life, had violated the spirit of apostolic Christianity. Hence the monarch, if he were a Christian, was compelled to reform their activities. Kaunitz assured

---

42. Maass, vol. 2, p. 292.

the Church that the state had no desire to interfere in matters of dogma. At the same time the monarch would not tolerate interference into the affairs which he felt were within his own jurisdiction. In sum, the government intended to restrict previously granted privileges insofar as "reasons of state, Church abuses or changing times and conditions make it necessary".[43]

In Kaunitz's eyes the Church's function was limited to spiritual and doctrinal matters and it was responsible for the salvation of men's souls. In this task it could expect the assistance of the state although the state retained the right to decide to what extent it would support the Church. At the same time Kaunitz re-iterated that the state considered itself sovereign over all of society. This meant that the state had the right to reform the Church when and as it saw fit.

The revised state-Church relations in Austria benefitted the native bishops who were able to increase their influence at the expense of Rome. Insofar as the state's main attack was directed against the Roman Curia, Joseph's reforms were an effort to avoid foreign interference in Austrian affairs. The native clergy were, however, not exempt from the sovereignty of the state. One of the rights which Joseph assisted the Austrian bishops in

---

43. Ibid., p. 293.

obtaining was the responsibility of disciplining the regular clergy. This was formerly the concern of the heads of the orders, who resided in Rome. The nuns and the monks were in the future to swear the oath of loyalty to the bishop instead of to the pope. The bishops received the power to grant marriage dispensation. This not only enlarged their incomes but it also meant that less money would leave Austria.[44] The transfer of papal prerogatives to Austrian bishops was the subject of one of Garampi's complaints. Kaunitz's justification for the transfer was that these rights belonged traditionally to the bishops, who had possessed them for centuries before the pope had seized them.[45]

The jurisdiction of the bishops over marriage and divorce lasted only for a short time because in January 1783, marriage became a matter of a civil contract. The bishops retained their control over marriage only insofar as it was considered a sacrament. If a couple wanted to marry or separate, they had to meet the requirements of the state.[46]

---

44. Paul Mitrofanov, Joseph II. Seine Politische und Kulturelle Tätigkeit (translated by Vera von Demelic), Wien, 1910, p. 682.

45. Maass, vol. 2, p. 294.

46. Anton Riehl and Rainer von Reinöhl, Kaiser Joseph II. als Reformator auf Kirchlichem Gebiete, Wien, 1881, p. 83.

A strong native Catholic Church along Febronian lines could also work at cross purposes with the Josephinian reforms. A case in point was the meeting at Ems of three clerical Electors--the bishops of Mainz, Cologne and Trier--and the Archbishop of Salzburg. The Emser conference had significance for the Habsburg lands, not only because of the prestige of the Electors, but because the Archbishop of Salzburg, at that time independent of Vienna, possessed Archiepiscopal and metropolitan jurisdiction over most of Inner Austria and part of Tyrol.[47]

The Emser conference most clearly manifested the movement towards a German national Church. The participants were concerned with establishing episcopal rights, which they felt the pope had usurped.[48] The Emser Punktation which they issued expressed their concern. The Emser bishops claimed jurisdiction over marriage, divorce, the age at which a monk should take his vows and the right to withhold approval of papal bulls. The anxiety which these claims elicited was reflected in Kaunitz's reaction to the bishop's statement. In the memo, in which he informed Joseph of the threat contained in the bishop's statement, Kaunitz acknowledged that the

---

47. Kuše̊j, pp. 197-201. See also Herman Meynert, Kaiser Joseph II., Wien, 1862, p. 72.

48. Anderson, p. 331.

demands were valid and in harmony with the measures taken in Austria. He took exception to the basis upon which the bishops rested their claims. Since the propositions were dangerous to the state, he suggested that a precise answer be drawn up. He also advocated that a Board be established which would investigate, together with the bishops, their specific concerns.[49]

Joseph rejected the idea of a joint commission to study individual topics. He did not want to be looked on as a referee by the bishops nor did he want to draw on himself the hostility of all the factions. He authorized Kaunitz to draw up a reply but suggested that he restrict himself to general principles.

Kaunitz began by welcoming the attempts of the bishops to reform the Church. He then pointed out that the Habsburg state objected to the bishop's claim that they had a God-given jurisdiction over the matters named in the Punktation since this challenged the sovereign rights of the monarch.[50] After insisting that the monarch retained ultimate authority in his lands Kaunitz explained that if reforms were dependent on the initiative of the various bishops the results would be uneven and

---

49. Maass, vol. 2, p. 459.

50. Ibid., pp. 60-61, 456.

partial.[51] He claimed that a unified reform would be impossible since the political remnants of the Holy Roman Empire obscured the respective lines of ecclesiastical and secular jurisdiction. He reminded the bishops that the Austrian state intended to practice complete sovereignty over all of her lands even if a foreign bishop might have ecclesiastical authority over some areas.

Many of the Austrian clergy supported the reforms of the state.[52] There was, however, a large number of the clergy who were passionately opposed to the reforms, the most important being the Archbishop of Vienna, Cardinal Migazzi, and the Archbishop of Esztergom (Hungary), Count Batthyany. Referring to the dissatisfied clergy, Garampi hinted that if Joseph continued his reform program some of his subjects would be forced into disloyalty. Kaunitz answered that the government hoped it would never have to pass a law that contravened the conscience of its citizens; if this should happen the subject was free to leave his country for another.[53]

---

51. Ibid., p. 460.

52. See Valjavec, p. 28, and Sebastian Brunner, Die Theologische Dienerschaft am Hofe Joseph II., Wien, 1868, for discussion of the support among the Austrian clergy for the Josephinian reforms.

53. Maass, vol. 2, pp. 293-294.

The government, in anticipation of Garampi's hint, composed a nationally oriented oath of allegiance to the state which it required of the Austrian bishops. If the clergy took their oath seriously the government would not need to fear treachery on their part. Phrases stressing loyalty to the state were repeated throughout the oath. It ran in part: "I swear . . . in all occasions offered to me, insofar as it depends on me, to always promote in words the glory and the good of the state and the most sacred Caesar."[54] This oath was applied for only a short time. As a concession to the pope on his visit to Vienna in 1782, Joseph agreed to accept the slightly less state oriented Gallican oath form.[55]

Joseph did not want the clergy to profess a loyalty to the Church which transcended the limits of the Austrian lands. Since he was interested in the welfare of the Catholic religion he did not see the oath as a problem for the conscientious cleric. As far as Joseph was concerned a priest could in all loyalty to the Church swear this oath, because "his most sacred majesty" had no intention of betraying the Catholic faith. There was no contradiction in Joseph's mind between being a good Austrian citizen and a good Catholic. He would not,

---

54. Ibid., p. 336.

55. Ibid., pp. 93, 336.

however, permit his subjects a higher loyalty to the head of an institution located outside of Austria.

The financial plight of the Habsburgs in the eighteenth century inspired administrative changes designed to replenish government coffers. These reforms developed into a program which aimed to modernize all of Austrian society. In an effort to create a viable state which could compete in the military and diplomatic circles of Europe, the Habsburgs concentrated political power in the government at Vienna. The state, especially under Joseph II, wanted to establish its sovereignty over all of society, including religion. Because religious matters were administered by a department of the government, under his regime, the Church lost her traditional autonomy.

There were factors, in addition to the fiscal needs of the state, which supported the Habsburg's inclination to centralize their government. There was the constitutional and legal theory of the Natural Law school which had many adherents among Austrian intellectuals and statesmen. According to this theory the will of society was represented in the state, which was granted sovereignty over its entire territorial community. Consequently all other institutions, including the Church, were subject to the state's authority.

Within the Church a number of trends augmented the

state's attempts to reduce the power of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Febronianism, for example, restricted the jurisdiction of clerical authorities to spiritual questions and attempted to curb the influence of the papal office in the native Church. Similarly the theological position of Jansenism undermined the powers and influence of the centralized ecclesiastical authority. The clergy, who were influenced by these tendencies, called for a reform of the Church's status, not because they sought the advantage of the state, but because they wanted to improve the Church.

The line between the secular and the ecclesiastical should not be drawn too rigidly. For Joseph and for some of his officials religion was important for mankind and thus was one of the many areas in which the government found it necessary to intervene because the religious needs of the people were not being met.

The state retained the right to decide what its role would be in governing religious affairs in the monarchy. Formerly, the Habsburg army had supported the Church in her attempts to eliminate heresy from the land. The Josephinian government appraised the value of this policy for the state. The decision to withdraw the military support from the Church's missionary endeavours resulted from the judgement that the welfare of the state and religion were being undermined by the traditional policy.

CHAPTER TWO

JOSEPHINIAN TOLERATION

The Josephinian government rejected the policy of prosecuting non-Catholics, not because it considered their faith to have a legitimate claim to the Christian gospel, but because practical disadvantages to the state associated with the policy of intolerance forced it to reassess its policy towards heresy. The state and the Church agreed that the Catholic faith was the only religion capable of saving men's souls and that heresy was to be rooted out.

The disagreement between state and the Church existed in the area of procedure; namely, how were the people to be won back to the Catholic faith and how intensely should the conversion be pursued. Towards the end of Maria Theresa's reign the state began to question the wisdom of using force. In the first place a policy whereby non-Catholics were treated as criminals was not in the interests of the state. Secondly, the state pointed out to the Church that it was contrary to the spirit of apostolic Christianity to coerce people into accepting a particular faith. Since the state agreed

with the Church that heretics should be converted to Catholicism, it was faced with the task of deciding whether it should, nevertheless, grant non-Catholics civil and political rights. The state's affirmative answer to this question resulted in the Edict of Toleration of 1781.

The conditions of the non-Catholics varied throughout the monarchy. In Hungary they enjoyed a limited amount of freedom despite Bethlon Gabor's assistance to the Protestant Estates of Austria and Bohemia in 1620.[1] Near the end of the seventeenth century, Leopold I, shaken by a revolt of the Hungarian magnates, embarked on a crusade to extirpate heresy from Hungary. With parliamentary acts in 1681 and 1687 the free exercise of the Protestant religion was restricted to specified towns in eleven counties.[2] The Protestants of Moravia travelled to some of these towns in order to participate in the observation of the Eucharist.[3] In 1731 Charles VI regulated further the status of the Protestants in Hungary. They were excluded from holding public office and

---

1. Grete Mecenseffy, Geschichte des Protestantismus in Österreich, Graz-Koln, 1956, p. 199.

2. Henry Marczali, Hungary in the Eighteenth Century, Cambridge, 1910, pp. 251-255.

3. Maass, vol. 2, p. 255.

restrictions were placed on their schools.[4] Although they were not allowed to proselytize they could legally worship as Protestants. In this their lot was considerably better than that of the Protestants in the hereditary lands.

The Greek Orthodox Church was assured similar privileges in Hungary. The Orthodox population consisted mostly of Serbs who fled from Turkish occupied territory into Hungary. The annexation of Galicia brought more Orthodox Christians into the Habsburg lands. In 1690 Leopold I gave the Hungarian Orthodox population a "Letter of Liberty" granting them religious freedom and the protection of a Metropolitan. Maria Theresa reaffirmed their rights in 1743. The Diet of Hungary, however, urged the government to force the Serbs into union with the Catholic Church. In 1754 the Diet tried to unite the Orthodox with force when they removed the monks from the Orthodox monastery at Marsca and set them to the task of "reconverting" their people to Catholicism. Inevitably this attempt at ecumenicism failed. The net result was a migration of Serbs to Russia.[5]

The first measures taken against the Protestants in Austria occurred in Inner and Lower Austria in 1576

---

4. Marczali, p. 255.

5. Riehl-Reinöhl, p. 37.

and 1596 under the arch-duke Ferdinand. In these cases the government closed Protestant schools. After 1600 all Protestant townsmen were ordered to attend Catholic services or leave the land. In this way Protestantism was removed from the towns although the nobility were allowed to retain freedom of worship.[6]

The victory of the Habsburgs at White Mountain meant the virtual demise of the power of the Austrian and Czech Estates and the end of the relative peace for the Protestant religion. Due to their weakened position the Estates were unable to exercise all their previous rights, one of which was the freedom to worship as Protestants. As a result the monarch was able to enforce the Catholic way of worship. To this end all Protestant pastors were expelled, and the laymen, including the nobility, had the choice of accepting Catholicism or emigrating.[7] If they left, their property was confiscated and given to Catholics.

In Bohemia the Catholic Church itself received large tracts of land. The university and gymnasia came under the control of the Jesuits, while the elementary schools were run by the Piarist order. Under Charles VI the anti-Protestant campaign received new vigor

---

6. Mecenseffy, p. 81.

7. Ibid., pp. 160-163.

resulting in many Slavs being forced to flee and settle in Prussia.[8]

Charles did not always give the Protestants the choice of converting to Catholicism or emigrating. In November 1731 in his capacity as Holy Roman Emperor, and in cooperation with the Archbishop of Salzburg, he published an Emigrationspatent. According to this edict all Protestants were obliged to leave the lands of the Salzburg bishopric within five months. Most of these emigrés found their way to Prussia, and by April 1732 over 200,000 Austrians had left their homeland to settle there.[9]

Near the end of Charles' reign the government began to see that a large population could be an advantage to the state. It was one of the tenets of the Cameralist school of political economy, whose main representative in eighteenth century Austria was Joseph Sonnenfels, that the power, security, wealth and cultural progress of a state depended on a large population.[10] Not wanting to lose citizens to neighbouring states, the government

---

8. Robert J. Kerner, Bohemia in the Eighteenth Century, New York, 1939, pp. 310-312.

9. Mecenseffy, pp. 196-198.

10. Louise Sommer, "Die Wirtschaftslehre von Josef v. Sonnenfels", in Zeitschrift für Volkswirtschaft und Sozialpolitik (Neue Folge), III Band, Heft 4-6, Wien-Leipzig (1923), p. 225. See also Kann, p. 175.

changed its policy of mass expulsion to one of general resettlement. Under this policy adult Protestants were transplanted from the heartlands of Austria to Transylvania and the Turkish frontier, while the children were detained for retraining in the Catholic faith.[11]

Under Maria Theresa the emphasis shifted from a policy of resettlement to one of reconversion. To this end she authorized the building of houses of instruction in certain key cities such as Rottenmann, Kremsmunster, Judenburg and Klagenfurt. Furthermore, a special catechism was prepared to retrain the heretics in the "true religion".[12] In 1770 the catechism as well as other Catholic literature appeared in Czech.[13] If under this milder policy the heretic remained obdurate, he was resettled in the borderlands of the monarchy.

Maria Theresa also tried to circumscribe the religious beliefs of her subjects by forming local Boards of Religion. The purpose of these Boards was "to foster for the future a good Catholic, constructive people and thereby insure for it the blessing of God." The Boards were to ferret out heterodoxy and restrict amusements and dances which might lead to the abandonment of the

---

11. Mecenseffy, p. 202.

12. Ibid., pp. 203-204.

13. Winter, p. 166.

traditional way of life. The method used to achieve this was to confiscate heretical books and to station ecclesiastics in bars and taverns where people tended to discuss religious matters.[14] In this way the concerned ruler attempted to protect her subjects and to maintain peace and order in her lands.

For the non-Catholic Austrian, interdiction of his religion meant living with harassment and without civil rights. The attitude of the Habsburg state was reflected in the decree of December 28, 1725, according to which anyone who was proved a heretic by either secular or ecclesiastical officials was to be sentenced to one year at hard labour. If after one year he did not accept the Catholic faith, he was sentenced to two more years. If the subject still refused to accept Catholicism he was exiled with a punishment of death awaiting him if he returned. This same decree stipulated that all civil and government officials had to swear that both they and their families were Catholic.[15] The spirit of this decree was retained in Maria Theresa's edict of 1754.[16]

---

14. Gustav Frank, Das Toleranz-Patent Joseph's II. Wien, 1881, p. 10.

15. Winter, p. 164.

16. Maass, vol. 2, p. 220.

An example of the type of harassment the Protestants had to suffer in eighteenth century Austria can be seen in the case of Ruep Friz of Ranton. Having resisted conversion, Fritz was first imprisoned for forty-nine weeks, then expelled from the lands. His family was kept in Austria. When he returned to visit his wife, he was seized by the authorities and sent to the galleys.[17]

The Habsburgs' active support of the Catholic Church lasted into Maria Theresa's time. In the past one had to belong to the Catholic Church in order to possess the rights of Austrian citizenship. Catholicism was the state religion: a denial of it was a denial of Habsburg state authority and a crime against the state. The Habsburgs assumed that their mandate, which they believed came from God, included the right and the obligation to protect the Catholic religion. This was not a passive relationship. The Habsburg state lent the Church its police and military might in order to sustain her missionary and inquisitorial efforts. This alliance was challenged near the end of Maria Theresa's reign and the state was faced with two questions: whether it should grant the Protestants civil and political rights and whether it should lend its legal authority and military force to the Church's missionary effort.

---

17. Mecenseffy, p. 189.

There were a number of factors which compelled the state to reappraise its policy of prosecuting non-Catholics. There was first of all the relationship between the peasants' economic grievances and their religious discontent. From 1770 to 1775 Bohemia experienced a series of devastating famines. By 1772 over 250,000 people had died from the famine and related causes.[18] Besides this, the exploitation of the peasants was especially acute in Bohemia where serfs were obliged, until 1750, to serve their landlords up to seven days a week during the harvest time. With the Robotpatent of 1775 the labour services were reduced considerably, and the serfs were required to work a varying number of days but no more than three days a week. The edict was, however, ineffective since the nobles were given a year to implement it. They used the time to work out ways of avoiding the requirements of the plan. Furthermore, Franz von Blanc, the official in charge of putting the edict into practice was given no effective powers of enforcement.[19] The peasant's response to the famine and exploitation was a wave of violent uprisings which began in the early 1770s and receded during Joseph's reign.

---

18. William Wright, Serf, Seigneur and Sovereign: Agrarian Reform in Eighteenth Century Bohemia, Minneapolis, 1966, p. 44.

19. Ibid., pp. 50-52.

The ecclesiastical landlords were as guilty of exploiting labour as were the lay landlords. The archbishop of Prague, Count Prichovsky, was the biggest landowner in Bohemia and apparently one of the worst offenders. In relation to peasant unrest, the papal ambassador had the following to say of Prichovsky:

> The archbishop of Prague, who without doubt is fully informed about these events of the peasant revolts in Bohemia, and who has enough intelligence and experience to understand the relationships, is not the person upon whom to rely . . . . There is also no lack of people who ascribe to him the main blame for the discontent of the peasants which has broken out with such noise and devastation in Bohemia.[20]

A letter from a pastor of Kreisdorf to the abbot of Hohenfurt offers further evidence that the social and economic grievances of the peasants were related to their religious discontent. The pastor wrote that during an uprising his parsonage had been broken into, robbed and then destroyed. He himself had been forced to sign a declaration promising he would no longer collect the tithe nor charge more than seven kreuzer for a baptism. After signing it, he was dragged to the neighbouring parish in his underclothes.[21]

Kaunitz saw in the uprisings the possibility of political leadership developing among the peasants. He

---

20. Winter, p. 166.

21. Ibid., p. 167.

wanted to separate the political elements of the peasant's unrest from the purely religious features. He said a distinction should be made when judging these people between those who were

> simply heretical . . . , but at the same time maintain themselves quietly and peacefully and fulfill the remaining obligations of their Estate, and those who are guilty of such external deeds as disturb the public peace.[22]

Those who fell in the latter category, he advised, should be punished as criminals.

The second factor which impelled the government to reappraise its policy of non-toleration was the emigration of many Austrian Slavs to Prussia. In an attempt to strengthen his own state and weaken Austria, Frederick II sent his agents into the Habsburg lands to encourage skilled Bohemians with Protestant inclinations to emigrate to Prussia. As a result a sizable Czech community existed in Potsdam.[23] The Austrian government had learned in the years since Charles VI's forceful evacuation of the Salzburgers that in the competitive, growing industrial world she could not afford to lose her skilled workers to her arch-foe. Joseph acknowledged the relationship between Austria's need for craftsmen and the need for the state to tolerate heretics. In a letter to his mother he wrote:

---

22. Maass, vol. 2, p. 222.

23. Winter, p. 163.

> I understand freedom of religion in the following way: I would in purely secular matters accept everyone's service, paying no attention to his confession of faith. May everyone who is capable occupy himself in agriculture or in the handicrafts. I would be prepared to grant the right of citizenship to everyone who can benefit and can raise the industrial activity of the state.[24]

The Protestant citizen also represented a potential fifth column. The state, remembering the loss of Silesia, was uneasy over the possibility that if Frederick II should invade Bohemia, he would be greeted by the discontented Bohemian Protestants. That this was a well founded fear can be seen from a letter written by some Czech insurgents to Frederick:

> . . . We are only 20,000, but God will help us and we will be victorious; we will besiege heaven with our tears and with our prayers until the Lord puts all of the kingdom of Bohemia under your kingdom.[25]

Under the impact of this unrest the state reshaped its traditional policy of denying civil rights to the non-Catholics in the Habsburg lands. In 1777 the peasant disorders in Bohemia and Moravia reached a crisis. Certain missionaries, who were working in Vsetin, promised the people that freedom of religion was imminent. They urged those who were not Catholic to indicate this openly.

---

24. Mitrofanov, p. 712. See also Otto Krack, (ed.) Briefe Eines Kaisers, Joseph II. an seine Mutter und Geschwister, Berlin, 1912, p. 63.

25. Francais Fejtö, Un Habsbourg Revolutionaire Joseph II, Paris, 1953, p. 147.

Their intention was to expose the heretics in order to root them out with force. As a result, 48,000 people in this one area declared that they were not Catholic.[26] This was a serious affair since the government now had on its hands 48,000 Moravians who, according to the law of the land, were guilty of a major crime. The incident had led to more lawbreaking as the peasants, realizing they had been duped, resorted to violence and destruction of property.[27]

Maria Theresa had no solution for ending the peasant unrest. Because of her religious convictions she could not leave the heretics in peace, yet she knew that her son favoured such a policy. In her quest for an answer she turned to Kaunitz for advice. He responded with a report in which he supported the desire of the empress and the Church to root out heresy and outlined a policy whereby this might be accomplished. His intention can be seen from the conclusion of the report:

> Most Gracious Lady! Herein are contained the only methods, which the principles of religion and the state allow and whose exact execution offer the hope that this evil will at least not spread to the descendants of the heretics and even that the conversion of the heretics themselves will follow.[28]

Kaunitz agreed that Protestantism was an evil which

---

26. Winter, pp. 167-168.

27. Maass, vol. 2, p. 220.

28. Ibid., p. 223.

should be eliminated. He did not, however, agree that non-Catholics should be converted by force, and he outlined to Maria Theresa his reasons. Coercion was a method which violated the essence and spirit of Christianity and in this particular case undermined the welfare of the state.[29] He maintained that anything which contradicted the examples and teaching of Jesus Christ and his apostles could not be in agreement with the spirit of Christianity. He also argued that since God never forced men into faith, the ruler, who was God's regent, had no right to do so.[30]

Kaunitz then outlined a plan which would not threaten the state. He believed that Maria Theresa's rights restricted her to three courses of action. She could refuse to admit the heretic into her lands; she could expel her heretical subjects; or she could resettle them elsewhere in her monarchy.[31] Kaunitz rejected these possibilities by appealing to social and economic principles. He argued that the refusal to admit non-Catholics into Austria and expulsion of those already in the country would hinder the population growth. Resettlement within the monarchy would be costly because it would de-populate regions which were productive. Furthermore, it was

---

29. Ibid., p. 220.

30. Ibid., pp. 220-221.

31. Ibid., p. 221.

impractical for the government to prosecute the 48,000 inhabitants of Vsetin. It was out of the question for the government to treat them all as criminals for Kaunitz did not intend to follow the precedent set by Charles VI.

The means the Habsburgs traditionally used in their efforts to rid the land of heretics were, for one reason or other, out of the question. Kaunitz suggested one channel that still remained open to the state. This was a policy of

> . . . on the one hand a more or less limited political tolerance and on the other hand an anticipatory and effective application of discreet apostolic zeal by the clergy accompanied by Christian love and constructive behaviour.[32]

Kaunitz did not advocate the publication of an edict of toleration, but hoped that the peasant unrest would end if the state and the Church simply stopped seeking out unbelievers for prosecution. In this way he remained faithful to the aim of both the Church and the Theresan government to convert heretics. His solution as to how this was to be done meant that non-Catholics would be left in peace and eventually receive political and civil rights.

Kaunitz sent a secret memorandum to the Moravian provincial government indicating how it was to treat the heretics. The instructions authorized local officials

---

32. Ibid., p. 221.

to restrain the Protestants only if they disturbed the Catholics, or if they worshipped publicly. The Protestants were still required to attend classes in Catholic doctrine, although if adults refused to attend instruction they were not to be forced. If they met privately to worship, but fulfilled their obligations as citizens, they were to be left in peace.[33] Kaunitz did not want to invalidate the edicts of 1726 and 1754. He wanted the state to show restraint when its citizens disobeyed these edicts as long as they fulfilled their secular responsibilities.

In January 1780 Prior Johann Hay, the man in charge of the Brünn Board of Religion, complained that it was extremely difficult to do missionary work among the heretics since they expected that they would be granted toleration. He submitted the draft of an edict which he hoped would clarify the status of heretics in the monarchy. Kaunitz revised the document and presented it to Maria Theresa.

The purpose of this decree, he said, was to show the people what was allowed and what was forbidden.[34] It aimed at restraining the peasants while at the same time showing the state's support for the Catholic Church. It

---

33. Ibid., pp. 53, 54, and 222.

34. Ibid., p. 246.

stated that "very important reasons of state do not allow the government to permit in Moravia any other public worship service than the Roman Catholic."[35] The edict then suggested that if the Protestants lived quietly, not engaging in proselytizing activities, they would not be punished. In this respect it was aimed at the political elements of the disturbances. The leaders in the uprisings who attempted to rally the people on various issues were to be sought out by the government for punishment.

When Joseph was informed of the proposed edict, he reacted negatively. He regarded it simply as a tool for the reconversion of the heretics. He said it was useless for this purpose since it depended on force to convert people, a method known to be unworkable. He maintained that the people were well aware of the law of the land which forbade the free exercise of religion. The release of this edict would only give rise to renewed violence. He suggested that the Brünn Board of Religion be dissolved and that all secular and clerical officials be instructed

---

35. Ibid., p. 243. He did not indicate what these reasons were. For one thing he was afraid that Protestant missionaries were waiting in Saxony and Prussia and that they would enter Bohemia causing conflict and disturbances once religious tolerance was officially granted. See Hock-Bidermann, p. 343.

not to spy on Protestants, nor treat their villages differently than those whose population was Catholic.[36] He refused to give his consent to the edict, which was meant to apply only to Moravia, unless its principles and those of Kaunitz's secret memorandum were enforced in the whole monarchy.[37] Joseph was aware that the Church was involved in undercover attempts to discover Protestantism in the hope that the state would punish the heretics. He agreed with Kaunitz that this practice should end. While taking this position he adhered to the traditional policy of supporting the Church's aim to root out heresy. He insisted, however, that the state withdraw its police and legal support from this crusade and suggested the following alternative.

> Rather one ought simply to pursue most zealously and constructively the Catholic worship and practice, through which, with time, many souls will be led back to the Catholic religion and become truly good Catholics. . . .[38]

Maria Theresa died towards the end of 1780 without granting the edict. She could not meet Joseph's conditions since her "conscience would find a public and general act repugnant."[39]

---

36. Ibid., p. 248.

37. Ibid., p. 250.

38. Ibid., p. 248.

39. Ibid., p. 252.

Joseph waited nearly a year before he issued the Edict of Toleration which granted political and limited religious rights to the Calvinists, Lutherans and Greek Orthodox. Joseph's policy of toleration, as reflected in his edict and in his subsequent treatment of non-Catholics, outlined specifically the rights of the non-Roman confessions. It was not, as he advised his mother, characterized by a treatment which paid no attention to whether the people were Catholic or Protestant, but rather it differentiated between those heretics who were to receive the limited rights of the edict and those who were excluded from it.

Essentially, Joseph's policy of religious liberty had the same goals as that advocated by Kaunitz: both wanted to maintain peace in the monarchy. Joseph granted what he thought were the minimum rights to the non-Catholics in order to maintain order. This involved removing the power of the state from the efforts of the Church to convert heretics. The government intended to support the Church's missionary goal to root out heretical ideas, but it did not intend to use force on Calvinists, Lutherans or the Orthodox.

The granting of the tolerance received impetus from the news of further uprisings. In October 1781 Joseph received reports that non-Catholics in the Chrudimer

Circle had revolted and formed a committee which was to seek and kill any Catholics living in the area.[40] The October 13, 1781, Edict of Toleration was designed to avoid this type of violence.

The Edict granted civil rights in four areas. Members of the three major non-Catholic groups were granted the right of company and guild. They were free to attend the universities and compete for degrees and other academic honours. They were allowed to swear an oath of loyalty which did not conflict with their faith. In voting and in hiring for the civil service (Wahlen und Dienstvergebung) attention was to be paid only to integrity and competence, not to religious affiliation. The Edict added that this policy had been practiced in the army with much success.[41] The Edict represented an attempt to incorporate the non-Catholic into the general civil, economic and cultural life of Austria without admitting to the validity of the non-Catholic religions.

With respect to religious privileges, the three major groups were allowed to exercise their religion in private (exercito religionis privato). They were also allowed to have churches, but they had to look like ordinary buildings without steeples, bells or street front

---

40. G. Wolf, Josephina, Wien, 1890, pp. 75-76.

41. Maass, vol. 2, p. 279.

entrances.[42] Although the Edict was not intended to make non-Catholics equal to Catholics, Joseph claimed it represented "a truly Christian tolerance."[43] Its purpose was to satisfy those who wanted to worship quietly in their own way, and involve them as productive members of society by granting them the political and civil rights of Austrian citizens.

The Edict was not entirely successful in solving the religious problems in Bohemia and Moravia. This was due partly to its limited nature and partly to the opposition it aroused among the local officials who were responsible for its execution. The subsequent measures taken by Joseph, since they reflect a desire for law, order and the dominance of the Catholic faith, indicate that the Edict was granted primarily for political reasons. The reactionary steps taken by the state denote the extent to which it supported the values and goals of the Church.

The Bohemian government exaggerated the disruptive activities of the non-Catholics. The provincial officials knew that Joseph wanted order. Consequently their reports distorted the peasant's reception of the Edict, in the expectation that when Joseph heard of continued

---

42. Ibid., p. 279.

43. Ibid., p. 278.

violence he might vacillate in his policy. In December 1781, the Bohemian officials reported that the inhabitants of the town of Slaupnitz had destroyed a holy statue and had threatened to take over the local Catholic chapel. Investigation of the incident showed that the local authorities had not published the Edict until the beginning of December and had published it only in the German language. They assumed that it affected only German speaking citizens. Some members of the Council of State in Vienna suspected that the local government's neglect had been deliberate, and Joseph admonished both the Protestants and the authorities for their actions.[44]

The Bohemian government also presented an exaggerated picture of the number of people who claimed belief in non-tolerated religions. It was able to do this because the non-Catholic groups had to apply to a committee appointed by the provincial government if they wanted to build a church. When a group applied for the right to build a chapel, the committee could refuse it on the grounds that they were not one of the tolerated groups. The local officials were in a position to label any group an illegal sect and thus frustrate the toleration policy. The state suspected that the members of the committee did not possess sufficient knowledge about the beliefs of the

---

44. Hock-Bidermann, pp. 344-346.

Protestant religion for them to distinguish between a sect that was tolerated and one which was not.[45] Joseph did not want a proliferation of religious sects, and reports that large numbers of people were joining illicit groups tended to precipitate reactionary measures from the emperor.

Joseph was aware that the local officials were aggravating the religious situation by treating the non-Catholic subject with excessive severity. In an effort to end this, he ordered the authorities to operate with the greatest care and moderation when dealing with religious offences. The officials, he said, were always to consider the effect of their acts on the peace and order of the community.[46] If the authorities found it necessary to punish non-Catholics for slanderous activities and violence against Catholics, they were to explain to the offenders that they were not being punished for their faith but for their acts which were illegal for all citizens. He also instructed the officials not to treat non-Catholic subjects differently from Catholics when dealing with other than religious violations of the law.[47]

---

45. Ibid., p. 368.

46. Riehl-Reinöhl, p. 1.

47. Meynert, pp. 53-54.

The provincial authorities were not the only people who misrepresented Joseph's policy of toleration. In April 1782 it was reported to Joseph that his subjects believed he was not a Catholic. They also believed that he preferred the decline of the Catholic religion, that those who left the Church could expect advantages, and that it sufficed for a person to declare himself non-Catholic without naming the religion which he had chosen and he would be tolerated.[48]

Joseph's reply indicated his resolve to advance the interests of the Catholic faith. He ordered that measures be taken to insure that when people left the Church they did so because they genuinely believed in their chosen faith. Unbelievers and sectarians could not expect official toleration. Joseph began his reply by indicating what his desire was:

> His majesty's beloved duty and pressing concern, namely the maintaining of the Catholic religion, which alone can save, and whose acceptance and spread can only be achieved through education and genuine conviction, remains unchanged. . . .[49]

He ordered that circulars be distributed telling the people what his beliefs were and warning that anyone who tried to convert his serf or family from Catholicism by threats or misrepresentation would be prosecuted.

---

48. Riehl-Reinöhl, pp. 137-139. See also Hock-Biderman, p. 348.

49. Riehl-Reinöhl, pp. 138-139.

The Josephinian state was concerned that the Edict of Toleration should not become the occasion for people to accept any latter-day belief or idea which struck their fancy. The state also intended to retain within the Church any nominal believer or person who was not sure of his beliefs. This can be seen from a government decree of January 31, 1782, which shows the steps the state was prepared to take in order to insure an orderly religious situation. Local officials were informed that if a village declared itself Protestant, the declaration was not to be accepted at face value. Instead, the people were to be summoned individually before a priest, who was to question them about their faith. The people were then to sign a statement of faith. However,

> . . . those who are completely ignorant, or who waver in the principles of the faith which they have chosen, are to be shown the way to return to the Catholic Church with good, soft and persuasive words and clarifying examples.[50]

Such measures indicated the inadequacy of the policy of toleration. Most of the non-Catholics in the Habsburg monarchy had not had the opportunity of studying Protestant doctrine systematically. They had not been allowed to have pastors or churches for the past 160 years. Because they had been forced into a clandestine existence, the possibility of people believing themselves to be

---

50. Ibid., p. 130.

Protestant, yet not knowing the basic doctrines of their faith, was indeed high.

If persons claimed to belong to a sect not included in the Edict of Toleration, they were to be told that such a religion did not exist, and would not be permitted if it did.[51] The Deist sect, being relatively small, was treated as were all non-Catholics before 1781. Although Joseph would have left them alone, provided they did not attempt to spread their ideas, he found it necessary to send a group of forty-nine Deist families from Pardubitz, in Bohemia to Transylvania because they refused to keep their beliefs to themselves.[52]

At the beginning of 1783 Joseph took another reactionary step when he ordered that all the people who had not yet registered as non-Catholics be classified and treated as Catholics. Henceforth, if a person wanted to register as a Protestant he had to submit to a six week course in Catholic doctrine. If he still continued in his heresy after completing the course, he was to be given an identification card without which he could not enter a Protestant church. The card was proof that the holder had changed his faith voluntarily and that the Church had

---

51. Ibid., p. 130.

52. Meynert, p. 58. See also Mitrofanov, p. 726 and Winter, pp. 174-175.

done all it could to save him. The measure was taken in an effort to reduce the number of people who were leaving the Church.[53]

The 1781 Edict of Toleration marked the beginning of the legal existence of the modern Protestant church in Austria. It did not, however, mean that the non-Catholics were allowed the unobstructed observation of their religion. Due to the limited nature of the Edict and the obstructing actions of the local government officials, the non-Catholic's freedom of religion was indeed restricted. Only those who could convince the authorities that they were acquainted with the fundamentals of their faith could register and worship as Protestants.

Josephinian toleration was born out of the desire to maintain peace in the Habsburg lands. In the light of the threat to the state, contained in the unrest in Moravia, the Josephinian government decided to withdraw its military support from the Church's attempt to Catholicize society. The significance of the withdrawal was reduced by the fact that the government continued to support the goals of the Church.

---

53. Sammlung der Kaiserlich-Königlichen Landesfürstlichen Gesetze und Verordnungen in Publico-Ecclesiasticis vom Jahre 1784, Dritte Teil, Wien, 1785, Court decree No. 13, February 21, 1783, and No. 17, May 15, 1783. See also Frank, pp. 81-84.

The policy of the state contained an ambiguity. Joseph and his statesmen desired a universal Catholic society. Yet in an effort to stabilize the Austrian state the government practiced a limited freedom of religion. This tolerance, however, assisted those forces which worked against the Catholization of society. Consequently the state placed impediments in the way of those elements which worked for the decline of the Church. These restrictive measures, although aiding the Church, did not strengthen the state.

Both Joseph and Kaunitz suggested that the monarchy would not have a problem of heresy if the clergy had been more zealous and constructive in presenting their faith to the people. The measures which the government took with respect to monasteries, represent actions aimed in part at introducing the monks to the task of teaching the population the meaning of the Catholic faith.

CHAPTER THREE

THE DISSOLUTION OF THE MONASTERIES

The dissolution of monasteries by the Josephinian state was not a denial of the values of the Catholic religion. The way in which the policy of dissolution was conceived and carried out indicated that the state regarded the religious orders as a legitimate expression of the Christian faith, but at the same time insisted that the orders should in some way serve the community.

The state was guided by the principle of utility when it dissolved monasteries. It determined whether a monastery was useful by asking the following questions: was it exploiting its property in the best interests of the state; was it offering a professional service to society; could it be employed in the pastoral ministry. If the answer to any of these questions was no, the status of the monastery was likely to be modified. Sometimes it was placed under lay administration with the members allowed to remain in the community and sometimes it was dissolved. In monasteries which were not dissolved the members of the community were employed as the state saw fit; in most cases they were given pastoral responsibilities.

Less than half of the monasteries in Austria were disbanded. Of the more than 2,000 cloisters, a total of 750 were actually dissolved.[1] The proceeds from the sale of these institutions and the income from those which remained as well as the rest of the property of the Church was administered by the state. The state did not regard this property as its own which it could use for secular purposes, but recognized it as belonging to the Church and dedicated exclusively to the advancement of religion.

The religious orders were important to the political and social life of seventeenth and eighteenth century Austria. The monastic clergy were the torchbearers of the Counter-Reformation. After 1620 Ferdinand II encouraged the establishment of religious houses, hoping that through them the Catholic Church would gain the devotion of his subjects. Consequently, monasteries became the tools whereby the heretics of the Habsburg lands were reconverted to Catholicism. According to a report of the Bohemian Recatholicizing Committee in 1648, 160,000 non-Catholics out of an estimated 200,000 were converted within a few years. This rich harvest of souls was the result of the missionary work of various orders,

---

1. Adam Wolf, Die Aufhebung der Klöster in Inner-österreich 1782-1790, Wien, 1871, pp. 158-163. See also Riehl-Reinöhl, p. 97.

including the Jesuits, Benedictines and Capuchins.[2]

The method employed by the orders in converting the heretics can be seen from a report by the Archbishop of Salzburg in the early seventeenth century. The Capuchin monks went to a village and informed the people that they had the choice either of accepting the Catholic faith or emigrating. The monks then offered to instruct the people in Catholic doctrine. If the people declined the offer, the imperial soldiers were summoned. Those who submitted to instruction were given a pass; those who did not were forced to sell their lands and leave the country. In this way whole towns were converted to Catholicism. In these incidents it was the monastic clergy who gave the directions which the local ecclesiastical and secular officials had to obey.[3]

The favours and privileges which the orders received from the Habsburgs substantiated the clergy's claim to be the first Estate and permitted them to wield an enormous influence in Austrian society. Abbots and bishops exercised the rights of secular landlords and the administrative powers which they possessed gave them a status equal to that of small princes. The Benedictines

---

2. Bertold Bretholz, Geschichte Böhmens und Mährens, 4 vols., Reichberg, 1924, vol. 3, pp. 41-42.

3. Adam Wolf, Geschichtliche Bilder aus Oesterreich, 2 vols., Wien, 1880, vol. 1, pp. 186-187.

and Cistercians were especially powerful in this respect.[4]

The Benedictine cloister at St. Lambrecht was typical of the larger monastic establishments that bordered on being principalities. It possessed estates, woods, hunting grounds, fishing pools, dairies, vineyards, mills, lime and brick kilns, marble quarries and peat diggings, a salt pit and an iron foundry. It governed twenty-four parishes, and farmers from over one hundred villages owed it duties. The monastery issued loans and conducted its own courts of justice and commanded its own police force. It had produced pastors, carpenters, scholars and members of the provincial Diet. In secular affairs it was responsible only to the monarch and in religious matters only to the pope.[5]

The favours bestowed on the orders had obscured the original monastic ideal of honouring and serving God at the expense of personal comfort and survival. Some monasteries had forsaken the ideal completely and resembled houses of pleasure. The diary of a Premonstratensian monk of the Abbey of Tepl indicates that a considerable part of the life of this monastery consisted of all-night parties. The institution resembled a training school for

---

4. Ibid., vol. 2, pp. 203-204 and pp. 10-11.

5. A. Wolf, Aufhebung, p. 29.

the young nobility in the arts of riding, dancing, fencing and French. The abbot's main pastimes were riding, shooting, eating and entertaining.[6]

The Mendicant order had abrogated its original purpose in a similar way. It was one of the few orders in the Habsburg lands entitled to collect alms. Each monk was allowed to keep one-third of the people's donations. Given this incentive for personal gain, many of the monks neglected their spiritual tasks and devoted themselves to improving their financial well-being. It was also common to see the monks from the Mendicant monastery in Prague strolling through the parks with the ladies of the city.[7]

Despite the fact that Maria Theresa ordered the closing of all monastic dungeons, there were cases in which orders dealt cruelly with their members as late as the 1780's. In 1782 the Galician government had before it a report that a Carmelite monk had died as a result of mistreatment on the part of his superior. The monk, on a number of occasions in the past year, had tried to escape from the monastery. In his last attempt he attacked his captors with an iron instrument when they caught him. For punishment the prior shackled the monk to the floor where

---

6. Winter, p. 115.

7. Ibid., pp. 116-118.

he died of hunger and exposure.[8]

A similar case involving a nun was reported to the Bishop of Seckau in 1780. No action was taken in her case at that time. When the convent was dissolved three years later, government officials found the girl in a state of mental collapse in an underground room.[9] These cases of cruelty prompted Joseph to investigate monasteries for dungeons and to enforce the law of 1771 which prohibited them from imprisoning their members.

The use of the dungeon to enforce obedience was not widespread, nor were all monasteries houses of pleasure. The minor abuses and general preoccupation with non-spiritual activities that marked most monasteries indicated, however, that the original purposes of monasticism were being neglected and raised the question of whether the houses should continue to exist. The Josephinian state was not concerned as much with the original purposes of the monasteries as it was with whether they were contributing to the general welfare of society.

Maria Theresa took tentative steps to curtail the legal and financial freedom of the Austrian monasteries. In 1767 the state placed a restriction on the number of

---

8. G. Wolf, Josephina, Wien, 1890, p. 62.

9. A. Wolf, Aufhebung, pp. 73-75. See also Rudolf Hittmair, Der Josephinische Klostersturm im Land ob der Enns, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1907, pp. 130-131.

postulants who could be admitted to the houses. In 1770 the age at which a novice could take his vows was raised from eighteen to twenty-four.[10] A year later Maria Theresa ordered the monastic dungeons to be closed; all charges of lawbreaking were henceforth to be brought before the criminal courts of the state. Persons were to be punished only if they had broken a state law. In the same year Maria Theresa issued decrees affecting the economic freedom of monastic life. The monasteries were forbidden to make loans, sell wine and beer, or operate as bars and taverns. The monasteries were obligated to provide their members with medical and sundry services, which were formerly dispensed only on the payment of fees by the family or friends of the member. Furthermore, the state set a limit on the amount of money a postulant could take with him when he entered the monastery. In the interest of state finance, the empress restricted the transfer of funds from Austrian monasteries to heads of the orders in foreign countries. She also forbade monasteries the right to buy additional land without the state's consent, thereby limiting the houses' opportunity to increase their capital.[11]

---

10. Gerhard Winner, Die Klosteraufhebungen in Niederösterreich und Wien, Wien, 1967, p. 55.

11. Winter, pp. 118-119. See also A. Wolf, Aufhebung, p. 5.

These measures did not threaten the very existence of the orders. The monasteries were permitted to pursue their interests as before, and only in cases of extreme abuses did the Theresan state attempt to legislate against them. Maria Theresa did, however, establish administrative machinery for the dissolution of monasteries. In 1765 she authorized Kaunitz to establish a government board which dissolved and administered the assets of eighty monasteries in Lombardy. The government also learned from the precedent of the suppression of the Jesuit order by Clement XIV in 1773. The Austrian state took over and administered the Jesuits' assets for the advancement of education.

Although Maria Theresa took no action against the monasteries in the hereditary lands, both Joseph and Kaunitz advised that the number of the monasteries should be reduced. Joseph submitted a brief to his mother upon becoming co-regent in 1765. In it he suggested that all monastic foundations should be examined for their social utility, and those found wanting should be abolished.[12]

In a brief to Maria Theresa in 1770, Kaunitz reviewed the social and economic reasons for dissolution.

---

12. Bernard, p. 23.

He felt that monasteries were a "corroding evil," harmful to both the state and the Church. He warned that as long as they were allowed to continue their parasitic life, the Catholic states of Europe would keep falling behind the Protestant states in power and in wealth.[13] Kaunitz then explained how monasticism was eating away at the power and wealth of the state. His concerns regarding population, the value of labour and the basis of taxation resembled the political-economic theory of the Cameralists.

In the first place, he held that the propagation of the human race was retarded by the celibacy of the clergy. Secondly, some of the most competent people had withdrawn from agricultural, military, magisterial, artistic, professional, manufacturing and commercial pursuits to pursue a contemplative life. Despite the fact that in certain regions the orders owned more property than did the combined lay population, the monks did not assume the general responsibilities of the citizens. In addition most of the goods and produce from ecclesiastical institutions were withdrawn from circulating among the population, causing the state to lose those advantages which it gained from the traffic of merchandise and property. In the third place Kaunitz pointed out that the government had no effective method of taxing the religious foundations.

---

13. Maass, vol. 2, p. 140.

The wealth of the orders could not be assessed and therefore not taxed since most of it came from secret donations and from honoraria paid for the clergy for saying the Mass. Kaunitz concluded that the welfare of the people and the state required that monastic institutions be reduced as much as possible.[14]

Kaunitz also had to show that it was possible to reduce the cloisters without harming the real interests of the Catholic religion. He insisted that it was possible, even in the Church's own interests, to have the monasteries dissolved. In an argument reminiscent of the sixteenth century reformers, he reasoned that for the first three centuries of its history the Church had been without monasteries. Their introduction was an arbitrary act, having nothing to do with the essence of Christianity. He maintained that the period before monasticism had entered the Church was its most pure and perfect era. Hence, he said, religion and the Church could dispense entirely with the regular clergy and replace them with a few hundred secular priests and pastors.[15]

Kaunitz was also concerned with monasticism's effect on the individual. Monastic orders, he said, recruited their candidates at an early age before boys or girls

---

14. Ibid., p. 140.

15. Ibid., p. 141.

could intelligently decide whether or not they had a religious vocation. As a result, some individuals later found themselves in situations from which they wanted to escape but could not.

Kaunitz summed up his arguments for the reduction of the rights and property of the monasteries in the following words:

> In essence we desire to perform a most important service, first of all to the state, /secondly/ to the individual, and /thirdly/ to the Church itself.[16]

Joseph was aware of how the monasteries curbed the economic expansion of Austria but he did not agree with Kaunitz that all monasteries should be dissolved and that only the required number of pastors should be retained. Joseph saw a useful role for monasteries in society. He thought the orders could serve in the fields of education and medicine and provide pastoral services. If a monastery was involved in a socially useful work, he wanted its members to remain at their tasks while living under the rule of their order. As far as he was concerned, it was the state's duty to see to it that the members were professionally qualified to carry on their chosen work. This was consistent with the character of Josephinism, namely that the state supervised the activities of the

---

16. Ibid., p. 144.

Church while at the same time respecting its religious values. However, the conflict between the particular interests of religion and the general values of the state were never entirely resolved.

In November, 1781, two monks of the monastery at Mauerbach accused their superior of illegal practices. An investigation by the state revealed that the affairs of the house were in general disarray. The incident provided the occasion for the government to begin to disband the religious foundations. Shortly thereafter Joseph decreed the dissolution of those religious institutions which did not maintain schools or care for the sick. He said his action was not only in response to the Mauerbach case, but that he had long been aware that those monasteries which were not useful to their fellowmen were displeasing to God.[17]

With respect to the male orders, Joseph felt this applied to the Carthusians, the Camuldulensers and the Eremites. With respect to the female convents, he felt this applied to the Carmelites, the Clarissites, and the Capuchins. He reiterated, however, that other cloisters which were not involved in education or hospital tasks and whose members led a contemplative life were also included in the decree.[18] In practice, the criteria for

---

17. Hock-Bidermann, p. 395. See also Maass, vol. 3, p. 311.

18. Hock-Bidermann, p. 396.

dissolution were not as clear as the decree suggests. The fate of a monastery depended on whether the state thought it could make a contribution to society and religion. The government's policy on this question developed over the years as it became aware of the various social and religious needs of the population and the monasteries' abilities to meet them.

In the first place the state did not intend to dissolve all of the houses of the orders in question. Provision was made for those ecclesiastics who wanted to continue their communal life. The Carthusans, for example, were allowed to retain a few houses for this purpose, but these establishments were administered by the state. Their property was controlled by the Religious Fund into which the assets of all the disbanded monasteries went, and the monks and nuns in their respective communities were given an annual pension of 150 florins.[19]

The factors which determined whether a monastery was dissolved fall into three categories. First, the economic condition of the institution was investigated and the government asked whether the potential contribution of the monastery to the Austrian economy was being realized. Secondly, the professional quality of the members as teachers or attendants of the sick was examined.

---

19. Maass, vol. 3, p. 318.

Thirdly, it was asked how a monastery could best serve the pastoral ministry.

There were various economic factors which influenced the government's attitude towards a monastery. One suffering financial difficulties was a prime target for dissolution. If a monastery was in debt Joseph wanted to dissolve it before its debts increased to the point where they exceeded its assets. This was evident in a decree of September 12, 1782, by which Joseph dissolved a Benedictine cloister. He explained his action by saying that he was attempting to avoid the total loss which would have resulted from the monastery's imminent collapse.[20] Sometimes the initiative came from a monastery itself. One near Seckau in financial trouble requested dissolution, offering to build a cathedral in Graz with its remaining assets. The monastery was dissolved but its assets were applied to the Religious Fund.[21]

The fact that ecclesiastical property seldom contributed to the advantage of the Austrian economy also influenced Joseph's dissolution policy. A monastery on a site which would lend itself to business or industrial enterprise could become a target for liquidation, as was

---

20. A. Wolf, Aufhebung, p. 95.

21. Hock-Bidermann, p. 400.

the case with a Cistercian house situated on the Danube at Baumgarten. After the abbot of the monastery died in 1783 the Austrian newspapers carried notices that the institution's buildings would be sold to anyone who would establish a factory on the site. Although several offers from lumber mills came in, they were not accepted. The government committee had in the meantime pointed out that another plant in the area would compete with a nearby salt mine for labour. The process of dissolution, however, was completed and the buildings used for a prison.[22]

A similar case involved an Augustinian convent near Vienna which owned some flour mills. Joseph wanted the complex to be developed into a business which would fully exploit the mills. He was not particularly interested in assisting private entrepreneurs, but a profitable factory, he said, would benefit the state more than the occasional fee collected by the convent for the use of its machinery. The mills were confiscated and sold to a private company, although the convent was allowed to remain.[23]

In some cases townspeople petitioned the state when they thought that a monastery had an adverse effect on their commercial life. The citizens of Kremsmunster, for example, complained that the nearby monastery contributed

---

22. Hittmair, p. 167.

23. Hock-Bidermann, p. 441.

nothing to local business. The cloister was involved in brewing, selling wine, baking, and tailoring; in short, in all handicrafts. The townspeople asked, "What can we possibly gain from them?"[24] Despite the fact that the school at this monastery drew many students to the town, the inhabitants could not profit from them since the monastery provided the students with most of their daily needs. The townspeople hoped that a factory or secular school on the monastic site would improve their own business.

Other factors contributed to the decline of the Kremsmunster house. During Maria Theresa's reign its school was a famous seat of higher learning. Besides the standard religious subjects, the curriculum included natural, constitutional and social law. Furthermore, lectures were given in public finance and administration, in logic, physics, geometry, and in military and civil engineering. Various arts and language courses were also taught. The prize possession of the school was its astronomical observatory.[25] With the death of Maria Theresa the school lost imperial favour, and the state's decision in 1782 to remove university education from the hands of the monasteries was the final blow. In 1787 the state

---

24. Hittmair, p. 237.

25. Ibid., p. 128.

assumed the direct administration of the monastery, but since some of the monks were required for the pastoral ministry in the area, the house survived.

Joseph was reluctant to dissolve a monastery or convent that dispensed medical or education services. He was, however, sometimes compelled to place it under direct lay or state administration when its members were not professionally qualified. In an Ursuline convent in Upper Austria, only six of thirty-two nuns engaged in education were qualified to teach the curriculum which the state required. Furthermore twenty-four of the nuns were dissatisfied with their convent and wanted to leave it.[26] Under such conditions the state could not expect the convent to make a serious contribution in the field of education.

Some of Joseph's officials on the other hand, like Joseph Eybel, the head of the Board responsible for monastic dissolution in Upper Austria, advocated that the government cease allowing the convents to care for the sick. Nuns, he said, were not qualified to care for the infirm since much of their time was occupied with choir and other ascetic activities. He also felt that the state would save money on wages and pensions if it used only lay sisters as nurses.

---

26. Ibid., p. 144.

Joseph's handling of the Elizabethan convent in Upper Austria shows that he wished to keep an order together for sanative work. In 1785 the nuns complained of illness and of their inability to carry out hospital duties and asked to be relieved of their tasks. An investigation conducted by two doctors and two surgeons examined the nuns and found that only nine of the thirty-two could meet the professional qualifications required of lay nurses. Of these nine only four were themselves healthy.[27] The team of doctors recommended that the convent be converted into a hospital, but Joseph did not follow their advice. In 1788 a new superior was elected who tried to improve the level of care in the convent. Her efforts were in vain and the next year the provincial government was authorized to assume the direct administration of the convent. The bishop was willing to free the nuns from their oath and Joseph could have dissolved the convent and used its assets for the establishment of a secular state-run hospital. The fact that he wished to keep the Ursuline and Elizabethan orders intact indicates his desire to include Church institutions in the task of creating a vigorous society.

A very important consideration in dissolving a monastery was its ability to assist and to fit into the

---

27. Ibid., pp. 426-427.

state's plan for comprehensive parishional care. The reform of pastoral services affected the government's policy in two ways. On the one hand, since Joseph wanted to establish new curacies in communities where they were needed, monasteries whose priests could be used in this respect were generally allowed to remain. On the other hand, Joseph needed money to establish new pastorates and to equalize the income of the clergy. As a result a few wealthy monasteries were liquidated so as to fill the treasury of the Religious Fund.

In its reorganisation of parishes, the state sought to provide places of worship for the people. Sometimes new chapels were built; sometimes a monastic chapel was converted for public use. If a monastic chapel duplicated the service of a pastoral chapel, one of the two was closed. Into the newly created parishes were placed the monks from the nearby monasteries. Consequently the regular clergy subordinated the vocational duties of their order to pastoral tasks.

In 1782 the state required the bishops and the provincial governments to report on the clerical needs in their areas. They were to indicate the monasteries which were now providing pastoral services and those which could be used for these purposes. The state intended to dissolve those monasteries which were superfluous for the

secular priesthood.[28] The state did not necessarily follow the recommendations of the provincial officials. Generally the local authorities urged the creation of a larger number of curacies than the state was prepared to allow. The central government was reluctant to establish the recommended number of parishes since it did not want to overdraw the financial resources of the Religious Fund. Nevertheless, the government awaited the reports of the local officials before deciding which and how many monasteries were to be disbanded.

The relationship between pastoral needs and dissolution of monasteries can be seen clearly in the measures taken in Lower Austria, Styria and Carinthia. After the state had determined the number of priests needed in Lower Austria, with one decree it dissolved thirty-two cloisters. Those remaining were to supply priests for the parishes.[29] In Styria twenty-five monasteries were dissolved and twenty-seven retained to provide pastors.[30] In Carinthia, of the seventeen monasteries, nine were broken up and eight retained for the parish priesthood.[31]

---

28. Kušej, pp. 239-240.

29. Winner, pp. 148, 157-158.

30. Kušej, pp. 258-260.

31. Ibid., pp. 263-266.

The monasteries that remained had to supply two priests for each parish for which they were responsible. The number of monks in the houses was also to be limited. A monastery with over thirty members on July 20, 1783, the date of the decree, was to be reduced by half and one with less than thirty was to be diminished by one third.[32] The clerics in excess of these limits were not to be driven from their monasteries; the membership was to be reduced naturally. Whenever possible the surplus monks were to be placed in a pastoral post. When an institution's membership fell below the quota stipulated in the decree it was required to take monks from cloisters which were above their limit before it could accept novices. Those monks which could not be placed into any ecclesiastical setting were allowed to remain in their monastery until they died. Joseph expected that with time the monastic population would be reduced to the number required for the pastoral ministry.[33]

The fate of some monasteries was dictated by strictly financial considerations which were linked to the welfare of the Religious Fund.[34] In the decree of February

---

32. Winner, pp. 156-157.

33. Ibid., pp. 158-159.

34. Georgine Holzknecht, Ursprung und Herkunft der Reformideen Kaiser Josefs II. auf kirchlichem Gebiete, Innsbruck, 1914, pp. 79-81. The author claims that the Church reforms were intended to fill the state treasury.

28, 1782, which established the Fund, Joseph stipulated that the money acquired from dissolutions was to be used first of all to pay pensions to displaced monks and nuns. The remainder was to be used strictly for the advancement of religion and the welfare of mankind.[35]

Besides the capital derived from the dissolved monasteries, the Fund had other sources of income. The wages of the clergy were standardized and scaled from the bishops' 12,000 florins to the sextons' 150. The clergy were obliged to remit any excess income to the Fund. Monies from the sale of land owned by secular clergy, the proceeds from the sale of superfluous Church buildings, clerical incomes between appointments and the assets of the various missionary societies which were created during the Counter-Reformation reverted to the Fund. A seven and one half percent tax was also imposed on clerical incomes which exceeded 600 florins.[36]

The Religious Fund provided the money for the activities of the Church. It paid for the building of new chapels insofar as this was not borne by patronage or the local community. It remunerated the occupants of the newly created bishoprics and parishes. It replaced the loss of income sustained by the Church when the

---

35. Winner, p. 89.

36. Kušej, pp. 295, 317.

government forbade it to collect the baptismal fee. The Fund subsidized the General Seminaries and the Mendicant monks who lost the right to collect alms. The major portion of the Fund's budget, the salaries of the clergy, was a permanent expense. The major source of income, the sale of Church property, was of temporary duration since there was a limit to the available property.[37]

When Joseph established the State Board of Religion in June 1782, he expressed his intention to equalize the income of the clergy. He suggested to the Board that they tap the excessive wealth of the rich monasteries for use among the priesthood.[38] For the first four years of its life the Religious Fund had sufficient money to carry on its activities. The proceeds from the dissolved cloisters supported the newly established parishes and the pensions of the displaced monks.

By the beginning of 1786 the Fund was seriously depleted. Because of the establishment of the new curacies in Styria it had a deficit of over one million florins. In an attempt to cover this shortage the government dissolved two wealthy monasteries, the Benedictine abbey at Lambrecht and a Cistercian house at Neuberg. The Benedictine's net assets alone amounted to over one and

---

37. Ibid., p. 316.

38. Walter, p. 76.

three quarter million florins.[39] The dissolution of these two monasteries was a straightforward attempt to fill the coffers of the Religious Fund.

In March of the same year two wealthy monasteries in Prague were dissolved because of the financial needs of the Fund in Bohemia. With respect to these institutions Joseph said he did not like to dissolve useful monasteries but when necessary "one land /should/ subsidize the other".[40]

The Josephinian government hoped that the Church would assist in the task of improving Austrian society by serving in secular vocations like education and nursing. Since it thought that the Church was not using its human and material resources for the maximum benefit of society, the government felt justified in assuming management over ecclesiastical affairs.

The government recognized that religion was an important element in the life of its citizens but was not satisfied with the religious situation in Austria. Part of the problem was that the clergy were not fulfilling their pastoral responsibilities. Consequently the government sought to involve the monastic clergy in socially

---

39. A. Wolf, Aufhebung, p. 131. See also Kušej, pp. 281-282.

40. Hock-Bidermann, p. 407.

useful tasks as well as in serving the religious needs of the people in the parishes. Monastic reform, however, did not represent the limit of Joseph's view of a renovated religious life. In an attempt to shift the Austrian population's preoccupation with ceremony to an emphasis on morality the government introduced a program of reform of the worship and ministry of the Church.

CHAPTER FOUR

REFORM OF RELIGIOUS LIFE AND SERVICE

The Josephinian state exercised its sovereignty over the Church by legislating worship practices and by defining to the clergy their responsibilities. The state took these steps in order to eliminate meaningless ceremonies and to insure that the people would receive correct instruction.

The state objected to those elements in the popular religion which played up miracles and superstition. The people believed in an immanent God who controlled all aspects of their lives, but they felt that he was mysterious and difficult to reach. They preferred to call upon their local saints who because of their virtuous lives could intercede before God and perform miracles on their behalf. The people felt close to the saints because each chapel contained material relics of at least one saint.

Also significant for the people were celebrations of important days of local saints, as well as days which marked the lives of Jesus Christ and the Virgin Mary. The spots where the saints had allegedly performed miracles were made into holy shrines which became objects of

innumerable pilgrimages. The more popular holy places were those dedicated to Mary. Expeditions to these shrines, originally taken up in gratefulness to the Holy Mother for her protection from the Turks, had developed into lighthearted days of festivity. The people marched along to the accompaniment of music, dressed up in native costume and bearing flags before them.[1]

Woven into the religious life of pageantry and miracles was a commercialism which for the peasant was hard to distinguish from genuine worship. The Church encouraged this buying and selling and reaped a rich income from the people's willingness to pay for spiritual and material blessings.

Joseph wanted to replace ecclesiastical practices which were oriented towards superstition and ceremony with a religion which was fundamentally ethical. He and his officials thought Catholicism should emphasize morals and duty and concentrate on seeking the welfare of mankind. The government directed a two-pronged attack at the customs of worship. First it tried to prohibit commercial and thaumaturgic practices that marked the people's worship. Among the state's goals in this regard was the desire to eliminate the bartering activities of the clergy,

---

1. Gustav Schnürer, Katholische Kirche und Kultur in der Barockzeit, Paderborn, 1937, p. 725.

to remove commercial and material reasons for low church attendance, to reduce the number of holidays, to end the public's faith in miracles and to restrain the outward pomp in divine worship. Secondly, the government took action to insure that the clergy would be educated in the ethical principles of the Catholic faith as understood by the Josephinian state.

The dissatisfaction of the government with the religious situation in Austria was reflected in the preamble to a decree of October 24, 1783, which dealt with issues ranging from the availability of pastoral services to the quality of theological education.[2] The decree was primarily concerned with the commercialism that had entered religious life. Priests and nuns capitalized on the sentimentality of the people. Knowing the populace's penchant for consecrated rosaries, candles, incense and the like, the clergy willingly entered into what often became a lucrative business by manufacturing and retailing a wide assortment of cult objects. The Mendicant orders made themselves intolerable in the eyes of the government with their compulsory methods of collecting alms. The government was also unhappy that the priests were charging fees for performing their sacramental duties. The decree also charged that because of the people's desire

---

2. Riehl-Reinöhl, pp. 57-58. See also Winner, p. 164.

to endow masses for the dead the priests spent a disproportionate amount of their time performing these services.

The government sought to end these abuses with legislative acts. The decree ordered that no fee be charged for a baptism and forbade the Mendicant orders to take collections or to beg. Only the monk-hospitallers were excepted since they collected for the sick.[3] In April 1784, Joseph prohibited monks and nuns from selling consecrated articles,[4] and in 1785 the number of masses which a priest could say was regulated.[5]

The government also was concerned about low church attendance. People stayed away from Sunday masses for both secular and cultic reasons. By the decree of March 2, 1783, the government hoped to eliminate both causes. The decree pointed out that young people were absent especially in summer because they were taking care of the cattle during divine service. In order to eliminate this worldly threat to spiritual welfare, the government decreed, "It is forbidden to drive out cattle before the end

---

3. Riehl-Reinöhl, pp. 60-61.

4. Sammlung, Decree of April 28, 1784, No. 36.

5. Heinrich Ferihumer, Die kirchliche Gliederung des Landes ob der Enns im Zeitalter Kaiser Josefs II., Linz, 1952, p. 99.

of the worship hours on Sundays and holidays. . . ."[6] The other cause of low attendance was that Sundays and holidays were a favorite time to go on pilgrimages. The government suspected that many people went on these excursions not for religious but for economic reasons. Peasants and artisans took their produce to popular holy places because they knew they would find an active market there among other pilgrims. In an effort to discourage this practice and increase church attendance the government prohibited trade on Sundays and holidays. According to the decree the people were to attend services so that "through the voice of the pastor, ignorance will be removed, abuses eradicated and morality improved."[7]

While Joseph wanted his subjects to attend church on Sundays and holidays, he felt that the number of feast days was excessive. The Church recognized so many saints that the number of holidays cut into the production levels in both agriculture and industry. Because the Theresan and Josephinian governments felt that the observation of saints' days was merely an excuse for idleness they reduced the number of Catholic holidays. Since the populace was not easily persuaded to work on days formerly considered to be holidays Joseph attempted to use the

---

6. Riehl-Reinöhl, p. 72.

7. Ibid., p. 72.

influence of the clergy to encourage the people to work on these days. To achieve this the government was aware that it needed to change popular religious concepts. The government ordered the clergy to instruct the people that it was a greater service to God to work industriously on an annulled holiday than it was to spend one's time in idleness under cover of celebrating.[8] In addition the priests were to set a good example by putting their own servants to work on these days. The government was aware that the decree would make a better impression on the people if it was conveyed to them by the clergy rather than by state officials.

In the countryside peasant culture was still marked by magic and superstition. Since much of the community life of the villages revolved around local chapels, the priests themselves played a central role in thaumaturgic practices. For example, they blessed plants which the peasants used for healing their sick animals. In an effort to exchange the people's dependence on superstition for more rational methods of cure, the government ordered the priests not to participate in such magical-religious activities.[9]

---

8. Sammlung, Decree of January 1, 1782, No. 1. See also Riehl-Reinöhl, p. 74.

9. Peter K. Jaksch, Gesetzlexikon im Geistlichen, Religions und Toleranzsache wie auch in Güter-Stiftungs-Studien und Zensursachen für das Königreich Böhmen von 1601 bis ende 1800, Prague, 1828, vol. 4, p. 199. See also Hock-Bidermann, p. 512.

The villagers also believed that if one rang church bells during a thunderstorm the clouds and rain would be dispersed. When a thunderstorm threatened, the villagers gathered around the local chapel while the priest rang the bells in an attempt to drive away the storm. In the months preceding the decree of November 26, 1783, lightning had caused a number of deaths at these ceremonies. It was the opinion of the government that the movement of the large bells attracted the lightning to the church steeple. The government tried to avoid further accidents and decreed:

> We are convinced that our subjects will see it as a sign of our concern for their welfare that we . . . forbid the ringing of bells during a storm.[10]

Joseph attempted to suppress the practice of decorating churches with votive gifts. Many Austrians expressed their piety by hanging clothing and trinkets like stockings, shoes, wigs, golden and silver hearts and rings on the statues and pictures in chapels and cathedrals. The people also decorated the walls with items like wooden feet, swords, coats of arms and chains. The government felt that this over-decoration gave non-Catholics an occasion to scoff at the Catholic religion and that the decorations were leading Catholics themselves away from

---

10. Riehl-Reinöhl, p. 76.

the worship of God and the truth towards undue adoration of the saints and artificiality. The government decreed that everything which contributed to a distortion of worship was to be removed from the churches.[11]

In the years that followed the government passed other edicts aimed at simplifying worship. In order to stop the clergy from capitalizing on the emotional climate of the service, in which the people readily parted with their money, the government ordered that the offertory bag was not to be passed more than once, nor during the Mass. Moreover, the offering was to be taken before the sermon. In addition, the side altars were to be removed from the churches; instrumental music was to be replaced with singing and the distribution of amulets and the kissing of relics was forbidden during divine services.[12]

Despite all its efforts, the government found it almost impossible to reform the religious mentality of the people by government decree. In Carinthia some women threatened their pastor with violence when he refused to hold services on the traditional holy days. The law forbidding the practice of ringing church bells during thunderstorms was impossible to enforce because of popular

---

11. Sammlung, Decree of February 9, 1784, No. 9.

12. A. Wolf, Aufhebung, pp. 106-107. See also Hock-Bidermann, p. 510 and Mitrofanov, pp. 708-709.

opposition. The efforts of government officials to remove the elaborate apparel from the statues of the saints also resulted in violence. In Carinthia, the valley town of Eisenkappel was able to keep out the imperial troops sent in to execute the reform of the superstitious and ceremonial aspects of the people's religion.[13]

At the same time that the state was trying to forbid certain practices by decree, it set about to reform the clergy and required them to pay more attention to parishional responsibilities. Furthermore, the government sought to provide the necessary pastors to guide the people in their spiritual life and to train the priests in the concepts of religion endorsed by the Josephinian state.

In pursuing this end the government had to contend with the fact that the diocesan rights to a large part of Austria belonged to foreign prelates, among them the bishops of Salzburg and Passau. Joseph believed that although the foreign ecclesiastics might be sympathetic to his reform program, they were remote from the problems of the Austrian dioceses. He felt that smaller bishoprics were required so that bishops could be in closer contact with the problems of their dioceses and

---

13. Kušej, pp. 323-325.

be in a position to know where pastors were required.[14] In addition the state intended to use the wealth of the Church to restructure the parish priesthood. If the diocesan rights to all the Austrian lands belonged to native bishops, the State Board of Religion could administer ecclesiastical affairs freely and expropriate Church assets when and as needed. When the diocesan rights belonged to outsiders, the state had the problem of administering foreign property.

After negotiating with the Archbishop of Salzburg, Joseph was able to obtain for his native bishops the diocesan rights of those Austrian lands administered by the Archbishop. Part of this land went into the newly formed bishopric of Leoben and the remainder was added to the bishoprics of Lavant, Seckau and Gurk.[15] Similarly, the land in Upper Austria, formerly administered by the Bishop of Passau, was used to establish the new bishopric of Linz and to extend the bishopric of Neustadt.[16] The state was now free to initiate the reform of the pastoral services.

One of the problems which Joseph sought to eliminate was that of patronage. Because they or their ancestors

---

14. Ibid., p. 54.

15. Ibid., pp. 197-199.

16. Ferihumer, pp. 188-190.

had endowed clerical posts with an income, individuals retained, in their gift, the preferment to certain parishes. In many cases patrons chose pastors according to their own inclination with little regard to the theological training of the appointee. The emperor was concerned that unqualified persons were being appointed as curates. Consequently after October 1783 all pastoral nominees had to pass a test administered by their bishop before they could assume their posts.[17]

The intention of Joseph's overall plan for pastoral reform was to remove any difficulties which the people might have in attending services. He wanted parishes to be established so that no one would need to travel over mountains or across rivers and deep snow in order to get to church. He also felt that no one should have to walk more than one hour to attend divine services. Furthermore he wanted parish boundaries redrawn so that curates would not have to travel through another parish in order to visit their parishioners. As to size, Joseph thought that a congregation should not exceed 700 souls.[18]

The reforms were well intentioned. Joseph wanted his subjects to attend church and he wanted to supply

---

17. Riehl-Reinöhl, p. 59.

18. Ferihumer, p. 84.

them with pastors. The state did increase the number of parishes and drew a large number of monastic clergy into the parish priesthood. A total of 511 new parishes were created in the hereditary lands and by 1784 at least 718 monks were appointed as curates.[19]

Despite the government's efforts it soon became obvious that Austria was going to encounter a shortage of priests by the end of the 1780s. The monasteries no longer offered a source upon which the Church could draw for its pastors. Young men were no longer interested in joining ecclesiastical professions, which had lost wealth and prestige because of the Josephinian reforms. The trend towards secularization associated with the Enlightenment also contributed to drawing potential candidates for the priesthood into non-clerical professions.[20]

The State Board of Religion hoped to increase the number of men studying for the priesthood by abolishing tuition fees at the gymnasia. They anticipated that the number of students prepared to enter institutions of higher learning would grow if young people did not have to pay for their secondary education. From the increased pool of students, they expected some would enter theological

---

19. Kušej, pp. 258-260 and 263-265 gives the figures for Styria and Carinthia. See Ferihumer, pp. 131 and 367-368 for Upper Austria and Winter, p. 133 for Bohemia.

20. Hock-Bidermann, pp. 491-492.

studies. The State Board of Education recommended that the problem of the shortage of priests would be solved by abolishing clerical celibacy. Joseph rejected this suggestion, but did abolish the tuition fee at the gymnasia and reduced the academic requirements of the seminary students from six years to five.[21]

In pursuing its goal of changing the religious mentality of the people, the government realized that it was not enough simply to provide the people with a sufficient number of pastors. The government recognized that the clergy themselves held views on religion not in harmony with its own and decided to enter the field of theological education in order to train the clergy to think of Catholicism as an ethical religion.

Kaunitz expressed in 1773 his ideas on the role of the priests in society. According to him they were to have a "Christian peasant morality" and an understanding of the conditions of the general population. The pastors were to reprimand the people when they sinned against God, the ruler or against themselves. Furthermore, they were to cultivate in the people a love for the regime.[22] In the rural areas, where the priest often served as the teacher, Kaunitz felt he should translate books on

---

21. Ibid., pp. 488-489. See also Winter, p. 129.

22. Maass, vol. 2, p. 180.

husbandry and the official language of government decrees into the vernacular of the peasants. He was also to keep the people up to date on the latest laws and developments pertaining to their livelihood, thus helping to improve the "national spirit".[23]

Joseph accepted Kaunitz's ideas on the role of the priest, agreeing that he should reflect the values of the state and look after the general welfare of the people. Joseph did not regard it as out of place for a priest to use his pulpit to inform parishioners about the latest discoveries in cattle breeding and other farm problems. He was influenced by the Jansenist Johann Opstraet who saw the priest as a caretaker or shepherd of men's souls. For Joseph the pastor was as vital to the state as was the medical doctor or the soldier. Whereas the latter saw after the physical well-being of the country the priest was primarily responsible for its spiritual and moral welfare.[24]

Joseph was mainly concerned with the teaching and preaching methods of the priests as these pertained to Christian doctrine. He expected the pastors to root out what he called the thoughtlessness and superstition of

---

23. Ibid., p. 181.

24. Winter, pp. 123, 126.

the peasants. He instructed that the candidates for the priesthood were to be examined to see if they understood the incompatibility of superstition with the Catholic faith.[25] Joseph even outlined, in an order of February 4, 1783, what he expected in a priest's sermon. In the first place, he was not to make negative statements about the laws and administration of the land. He was to substantiate the truths of the gospel but avoid controversial doctrinal issues. The pastor was to present the practical teachings of Christ and their application to daily life. Joseph pointed out that sermons were not for enlightening the mind but for improving the heart. The pastors, especially the rural ones, were to give their sermons the tone of a friendly conversation and not of a formal speech.[26]

The state was dissatisfied with the view of canon law and concept of morality which priests were taught in the monastic schools. Kaunitz raised the question of the interpretation of canon law in 1770 when he discussed the age at which candidates for the priesthood should be allowed to enter monasteries. He said that in the monastic schools the students were trained in "an abstract,

---

25. Sammlung, Dritte Teil, p. 17.

26. Jaksch, vol. 4, pp. 507-508. See also Riehl-Reinöhl, p. 73 and Winter, p. 127.

incomprehensible and useless speculation in the place of practical teaching, genuine morality and correct canon law. . . ."[27] Kaunitz urged that candidates for the priesthood receive their education at public universities where they would not learn principles which conflicted with the prerogatives of the monarch. He felt that the curriculum of the public universities would also insure a uniform spirit among the clergy and an education whose principles were based on facts.

The question of the education of the clergy came up again in 1773 when it became evident that the Jesuit order was to be dissolved. Although their control had been weakened by the reforms of van Swieten, Jesuits dominated higher education in the Habsburg lands until the dissolution of their order. The State Board of Education, headed in 1773 by Franz Karl von Kressel, was faced with the task of finding teachers in the fields of theology, ethics, metaphysics and Church history to replace the Jesuit instructors. Kressel proposed that the Board use the monastic as well as the secular clergy as instructors since the secular clergy were in general not as well qualified to teach as were the monks.[28]

Kaunitz, on the other hand, opposed the use of

---

27. Maass, vol. 2, pp. 145-146.

28. Ibid., p. 185.

monastic clergy as instructors. He felt that they could not be trusted to teach the authentic principles of theology and related courses. Their interpretation of these subjects was conditioned by a party spirit ("esprit du /sic/ corps" and "Parteygeist") and was thus biased. The secular clergy's interpretation of this material was not dominated by a party spirit nor, he said, did they have suspicious connections with a general in a foreign land or interests that were divorced from the general welfare of the state.[29] The Theresan government did not settle the controversy, and the dilemma of providing theological education which did not conflict with the state was left for Joseph to solve.

On August 6, 1782, the State Board of Education delivered a report to the government which showed how much the nature of theological education in monastic schools was at variance with Josephinian ideas. The prescribed books were not being used for courses on canon law and in general students were taught legal interpretations which favoured Rome at the expense of the national state. The report warned that the Church was forming a state within a state in its attempts to strengthen the ties with the Roman Curia. It also drew attention to some of the objectionable principles which were being taught in the

---

29. Ibid., p. 183.

courses on morality and ethics.[30]

The ethics textbooks of the monastic schools taught that a person was not always obligated to pay the monarch taxes. Moreover, if a person considered himself inadequately paid for a service he had performed, he was justified in pilfering additional money provided he did not place himself in danger by doing so. The monastic schools taught that a person could judge for himself whether a law was just or unjust and then act accordingly. Some books justified, in certain conditions, the assassination of the monarch. The clergy were also taught that the pope was their immediate lord, even in secular affairs.[31]

The Josephinian state saw ethics (Moraltheologie) as the most important of all the doctrinal subjects.[32] In an instruction to the theological schools Joseph explained that Christian ethics was not a legalistic obedience to laws set up by a despotic God, but an obedience to the law of love. This love for God found its fullest expression in love for one's neighbour. The purpose of the Christian religion was to develop in man a spirit of selflessness which sought the general welfare. This spirit

---

30. G. Wolf, Kaiser Joseph II. und die Österreichischen Generalseminarien (Historisches Taschenbuch, Fünfte Folge, Siebenten Jahrgang), Leipzig, 1877, p. 340.

31. Ibid., p. 343.

32. Jaksch, vol. 4, p. 74.

conquered the selfish spirit and transformed the human animal into a sensible, well-meaning and virtuous man. People who understood Christian ethics would attempt to further the welfare of mankind with all their abilities and strength. Self-denial, Joseph concluded, was not the suppression of the individual's feelings but the ability to put one's energies at the disposal of one's fellow man.[33] Christian ethics as expressed in these terms fit in well with the Josephinian concept of the state, wherein all members worked together to improve Austrian society. In order to educate the clergy in this ethically oriented religion, the state decided to supervise their education.

In Maria Theresa's reign the changes at the seminary at Brünn foreshadowed the pattern of theological education that was to come under Joseph II. In 1777 the seminary was moved from Olmütz to Brünn. Even after the dissolution of their order the Jesuits retained an influence as individuals in Olmütz. The transfer of the school removed it from the domination of the Jesuits. The Brünn faculty was led by Kaspar Karl and Wenzel Schanza, both convinced Jansenists, who emphasized that salvation was achieved through grace and not through the superfluous use of the mass and confession. They also accepted state supervision of the school much to the chagrin of the Archbishop of

---

33. Ibid., pp. 78-80.

Vienna, Migazzi.[34] The Brünn school was exceptional, however, for by 1782 the education of the clergy was generally still in the hands of ultramontane clergy.

In 1782 the State Board of Education, submitted recommendations for a policy regarding theological education. Since it had not reached agreement the Board submitted a minority and a majority report. The minority recommended that the state keep out of theological education and permit the monasteries to continue training the priests. The majority advised that because of the effect which the clergy had on the moral ideas of the country, their education should not be left in the hands of the Church. The social and cultural influence which they exerted through the confessional chair, the curacy and as teachers was too great for the state to allow them to be educated in the ideas which the monastic schools offered. The Board suggested that the candidates for the priesthood attend the public universities where they could receive all the education they needed.[35] In choosing the middle road Joseph developed the idea of state-run schools of theological education or General Seminaries as he called them.

In creating the seminaries Joseph elaborated one of the main principles of Josephinism, that is, he attempted

---

34. Winter, pp. 135-137.

35. G. Wolf, Generalseminarien, pp. 339-341.

to preserve the values and the institutions of the Catholic religion while subordinating them to the supervision of the state. The priestly candidates were encouraged to live under the rule of their order while studying the theological curriculum established by the state.

Joseph agreed that the theological and philosophical education in the monasteries would always remain faulty and that their schools should be closed. On the other hand, he said, one could not wait until the candidate was in his twenties and had finished the course at the university before one implanted the ideas of Christian morality and chastity in him. No potential priest could survive the years at the university with his aims intact unless he was secure in his vocation and his moral training.[36]

It was Joseph's intention that the students from the various orders who were studying at the seminaries should maintain as much of the unique character of their order as possible while at the same time achieving a uniform standard in their studies. After the monastic schools were closed, their students were to go to the university in their province. At each university where there was a sufficient number of clerical students a Seminarium generale was established, where the candidates studied and

---

36. Ibid., pp. 346-347.

lived. Each monastery sent a lecturer along with its students, who served as the students' guardians and provided the priestly and spiritual services which the rules of the orders required. The lecturers were responsible to the rector of the seminary who was elected by the secular clergy. The overall administration of the system was in the hands of a cleric appointed by the government. The seminaries were to provide two types of meals, one for the Mendicants and one for the other orders. The candidates were to dress in the habit of their order and observe its rules, but were not allowed to take their vows until they had finished the academic studies. After the course, the candidate practised parishional work under the supervision of his bishop.[37]

In the decree of October 24, 1783, Joseph outlined briefly what he expected from the seminaries. He hoped that a uniform interpretation of theology would be established and that the disparity in the education of the clergy would be removed by the use of standard books and the best professors. Furthermore, he expected that the clergy would be trained in good manners and would be taught the correct principles of Christian doctrine and the active love of their fellow man.[38]

---

37. Ibid., pp. 347-348.

38. Riehl-Reinöhl, p. 61.

Joseph ordered Archbishop Migazzi, Bishop Kerens of Neustadt and Abbot Rautenstrauch to submit proposals outlining how they would like to see the seminaries instituted. Both Migazzi and Kerens were opposed to the idea of state supervised seminaries and refused to cooperate. Migazzi suggested that the former Jesuit program be instituted. As a result, Rautenstrauch's plan was chosen. His plan reflected Joseph's desire for uniformity in education and his concern that the priests receive correct training in ethics and practical religion.

The Rautenstrauch draft justified the state's intervention in the education of the priests. It claimed that the monarch could not remain indifferent to the disadvantages which resulted to religion and to the state when young people joined a vocation and became spiritual leaders, not knowing the obligations of their calling, nor educated in morality and Christian principles.

Rautenstrauch described the characteristics of an acceptable pastor by introducing the intention of the General Seminaries. Its purpose was not to train citizens for useless contemplative lives, but to educate servants of religion: men who could teach and lead the public to eternal salvation. Since purity in ethics and the active love of one's fellow man were requirements for this task, these were to receive priority in the student's education.

Rautenstrauch understood ethics as the true, active love of one's neighbor, a love practiced in gentleness, earnestness, moderation and prudence. The students were to absorb these virtues while they lived in community in the seminaries.[39]

With respect to worship practices, the seminaries were to root out the customs which were not authentic, that is, whose origins were subsequent to the apostolic church. Such practices, along with those that served as a source of illegitimate income for the clergy, were forbidden to the students.[40] Rautenstrauch assumed that by teaching the priestly candidates morality and wholesome worship practices the abuses would be removed.

In the same way he hoped to instill in the candidates a desire to work for the welfare of humanity while taking pride in being Austrians. This can be seen in one of the items which he included under Moral Education. The students were not to be egoists but were to work for the welfare of all mankind. The rector was to show through appropriate readings how mankind had progressed towards perfection and how this progress could be seen in Austria, thereby arousing patriotism in the candidates.[41]

---

39. G. Wolf, Generalseminarien, p. 350.

40. Ibid., p. 351.

41. Ibid., pp. 353-354.

In sum, the Josephinian state felt that Christianity was a beneficial religion and could contribute to the moral fiber of Austrian society. In order to make this view of Christianity prevalent the government needed to overcome difficulties among both popular cultic practices and training of the clergy. The solution of the government was to take steps designed to eliminate superstitious and erroneous elements from popular customs and to require the priests to take an active role in guiding the people towards a spiritual life consistent with Josephinian expectations.

CONCLUSION

In the second half of the eighteenth century the Roman Catholic Church in Austria was subjected to the authority of the state. The new status of the Church was the result of a process whereby governmental powers became concentrated in Vienna. As the government extended its jurisdiction over more political and social matters, the Church lost its secular privileges which it had received from the Habsburgs in previous centuries. The trend towards centralizing the government represented a part of the effort of the Habsburgs to establish a strong Austrian state and society.

In Austria, the concept of the state which was to look after all the needs of society affected the Church also in another way. The Josephinian state regarded the Catholic religion as a constructive and necessary force in society. Since it felt that the clergy were negligent in their duties, the state ended the autonomy of the Church even in ecclesiastical matters.

The revised state-Church relations found expression in the state's treatment of non-Catholics, in the dissolution of monasteries and in the government measures to reform

the religious practices and teaching. The right of the Church to call on the imperial troops to assist in missionary enterprises was a secular privilege which was rescinded through the Edict of Toleration. Through dissolution of monasteries the clergy automatically lost the political powers which they possessed by virtue of being landlords. In addition, the Church lost its freedom because the monks were obligated to perform tasks assigned by the state. The government's control of ecclesiastical matters is seen more clearly in its attempt to influence the public's ideas of Christianity by passing laws affecting their worship practices. Moreover, the government prescribed texts and course material for the candidates for the priesthood, in the expectation that the clergy would eventually change the religious mentality of the people.

On the surface the measures taken by the Josephinian state seem antagonistic to the Church. In reality the reform of the Church was not a hostile act. The state wanted to strengthen Catholicism and to combat the trend towards irreligiousity which it regarded as a consequence of the clergy's laxity.

Although not a part of the plan to reform the Church, the Edict of Toleration did not contradict the spirit of the reforms. The Edict's primary aim was to establish peace in Moravia and Bohemia. It did not represent a rejection of the Church's aim to convert all heretics. The

state expected the clergy to pursue this task with means more in harmony with enlightened thinking and with the spirit of apostolic Christianity. Up to the point of using force, the Church could expect the support of the state in this endeavour.

Nor was it hostility which motivated the state to assume supervision of ecclesiastical affairs. Since the state regarded the active and practical love of one's fellow man as the true expression of Christianity, it felt that most clergy were serving neither the interests of society nor those of Catholicism. When insisting that the clergy participate in tasks which contributed to the betterment of society, the state regarded itself as doing the Church a service. The numerous edicts issued by the state, prohibiting thaumaturgic and ceremonial worship practices and those aiming to change the curriculum of the young men studying for the priesthood, were likewise meant to strengthen the Church, not to undermine it.

Whereas the state sought the welfare of Catholicism through its reforms it hoped that they would also be advantageous to the state. The Edict of Toleration, for example, increased the chances for peace in the monarchy and augmented the supply of skilled labour by making it unnecessary for non-Catholics to emigrate.

The state also stood to gain from dissolution

through which some of the dormant material, financial and human resources of the Church were put at the disposal of society. That ecclesiastical property which came into secular hands was utilized by laymen for the purpose of making material gain. Insofar as this object was achieved the government's tax base was increased. The formerly idle clergy who entered socially useful professions also contributed to the overall welfare of society. The state eventually benefited from a society fortified in such a way.

The proposed change in the ideas of Christian ethics and worship among the population also held advantages for the state. Through additional working days, obtained by reducing the number of holidays, the state expected an increase in production. On the question of theological education, the state and the clergy admitted that one of the purposes of the changed curriculum was to remove those elements which were harmful to the state.

The problem of Josephinism should not be restricted to one where the state and Church stand in opposition to each other. No such dichotomy of interests was present in Joseph's mind. He was a Catholic monarch who was trying to solve some social, economic and religious problems in his monarchy. To him Christianity was a religion of action which should contribute to the society which he

wanted to restructure.

The path of support, however, ran both ways. Not only did Joseph see in the Church a helper in the task of reinforcing the state, but his state also assumed responsibility for working in the interests of the Catholic religion. Consequently the Josephinian state opposed those forces which undermined the strength of the Catholic Church. The non-Catholic faiths were tolerated only in order to avoid rebellion. Insofar as the state felt it could maintain peace, it limited the freedom of worship of non-Catholics. One of the main incentives for the state to reform the pastoral service was the trend towards religious anarchy which it saw in free thought. The state wanted to stimulate and prepare the Church to cope with heresy and irreligiousity. Of the various tendencies in the eighteenth century which undermined the Catholic religion, Josephinism was not one.

Josephinism was an attempt by the state to reform the Catholic Church within the Habsburg monarchy. In order to do this the state felt obliged to exercise sovereignty over the Church. This attempt was part of a greater effort to build a healthy state and society, but at the same time it was an endeavour to uphold Catholicism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, M.S., Europe in the Eighteenth Century: 1713-1783, Norwich, 1961.

Arneth, Alfred Ritter von, Joseph II. und Leopold von Tuscana. Ihr Briefwechsel von 1781 bis 1790, Wien, 1872.

Benedict, Ernst, Kaiser Joseph II.: 1741-1790, Wien, 1936.

Bernard, Paul P., The Origins of Josephinism: Two Studies (The Colorado College Studies, No. 7), Colorado Springs, 1964.

Bibl, Viktor, Kaiser Josef II. Ein Vorkämpfer der Grosdeutschen Idee, Wien-Leipzig, 1943.

Bloch, Ernst, Naturrecht und Menschliche Würde, Frankfurt/Main, 1961.

Bretholz, Brecht, Geschichte Böhmens und Mährens, 4 vols., Reichberg, 1921-24.

Bright, J. Franck, Joseph II, London, 1905.

Brunner, Sebastian, Die Mysterien der Aufklärung in Österreich: 1770-1800, Mainz, 1869.

_____, Die Theologische Dienerschaft am Hofe Joseph II., Wien, 1868.

Eder, Karl, Der Liberalismus in Altösterreich, Wien, 1955.

Fejtö, Francais, Un Habsburg Revolutionaire: Joseph II, Paris, 1953.

Ferihumer, Heinrich, Die kirchliche Gliederung des Landes ob der Enns im Zeitalter Kaiser Josefs II., Linz, 1952.

Frank, Gustav, Das Toleranz-Patent Kaiser Joseph's II., Wien, 1881.

Friedberg, Emil, Die Grenzen Zwischen Staat und Kirche und die Garantien gegen deren Verletzung, Tübingen, 1872 (reprinted in Aalen, 1962).

Frischauer, Paul, The Imperial Crown, London, 1939.

Gooch, George P., Maria Theresa and Other Studies, London, 1951.

Gross-Hoffinger, A.J., Geschichte Josephs des Zweiten, Leipzig, 1847.

Grüll, Georg, Die Robot in Oberösterreich, Linz, 1952.

Hantsch, Hugo, Die Geschichte Österreichs, 2 vols., 4th ed., Graz, 1960.

Hittmair, Rudolf, Der Josephinische Klostersturm im Land ob der Enns, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1907.

Hock, Carl, und Bidermann, H.I., Der Österreichische Staatsrat: 1760-1848, Wien, 1879.

Holzknecht, Georgine, Ursprung und Herkunft der Reformideen Kaiser Josefs II. auf kirchlichem Gebiete, Innsbruck, 1914.

Hubatsch, Walter, Das Zeitalter des Absolutismus: 1600-1789, Braunschweig, 1962.

Huber, Franz Xaver, Geschichte Josephs II. römischen Kaiser Königs von Hungarn und Böheim, 2 vols. Wien, 1792. (Only vol. 1 was available to the author.)

Jaeger, Albert, Kaiser Joseph II. und Leopold II.: Reform und Gegenreform: 1780-1792, Wien, 1867.

Jaksch, Peter Karl, Gesetzlexikon im Geistlichen, Religions und Toleranzsache wie auch in Güter-Stiftungs-Studien und Zenzursachen für das Königreich Böhmen von 1601 bis ende 1800, Prague, 1828. (Only vol. 4, L-Q, was available to the author.)

Jaszi, Oscar, The Dissolution of the Habsburg Monarchy, Chicago, 1929.

Kallbrunner, Josef, Kaiserin Maria Theresias Politisches Testament, München, 1952.

Kann, Robert A., A Study in Austrian Intellectual History, New York, 1960.

Kerner, Robert J., Bohemia in the Eighteenth Century, New York, 1939.

Krack, O. (ed.), Briefe Eines Kaisers. Joseph II. an seine Mutter und Geschwister, Berlin, 1912.

Kralik, Richard, Österreichische Geschichte, Wien, 1913.

Krieger, Leonard, The Politics of Discretion: Pufendorf and the Acceptance of Natural Law, Chicago, 1965.

Kruck, Maria J., Kaiser Joseph der Deutsche, Stuttgart, 1933.

Kušej, J.R., Joseph II. und die äussere Kirchenverfassung Innerösterreichs, Stuttgart, 1908 (reprinted in Amsterdam, 1965).

Lindner, August, Die Aufhebung der Klöster in Deutschtyrol: 1782-1787, Innsbruck, 1886.

Link, Edith, The Emancipation of the Austrian Peasant: 1740-1798, New York, 1949.

Lustkandl, W., Die Josephinische Ideen und ihr Erfolg, Wien, 1881.

Maass, Ferdinand, Der Josephinismus, 5 vols. (Fontes rerum Austriacarum, vols. 71-75), Wien, 1951-1961. (Only vols. 1-3 are relevant for the period under discussion. The main part of the work consists of primary material.)

Marczali, Henry, Hungary in the Eighteenth Century, Cambridge, 1910.

Matl, Josef, Europa und die Slaven, Wiesbaden, 1964.

Mecenseffy, Grete, Geschichte des Protestantismus in Österreich, Graz, 1956.

Meynert, Herman, Kaiser Joseph II., Wien, 1862.

Mitrofanov, Paul, Joseph II. Seine Politische und Kulturelle Tätigkeit (translated by Vera von Demelic), Wien, 1910.

Padover, Saul K., The Revolutionary Emperor: Joseph II, 1741-1790, London, 1934.

Pirchegger, Hans, Geschichte und Kulturleben Österreichs, 3 vols. Wien, 1960.

Riehl, Anton, und Reinöhl, Rainer von, Kaiser Joseph II. als Reformator aufs Kirchlichem Gebiete, Wien, 1881. (Mostly a collection of state acts affecting religious affairs.)

Rieser, Herbert, Der Geist des Josephinismus und sein Fortleben, Wien, 1963.

Sammlung der Kaiserlich-Königlichen Landesfürstlichen Gesetze und Verordnungen in Publico-Ecclesiasticis 1767-1800, Dritte Teil, Wien, 1785. (Only Part 3 was available to the author. While it contains laws passed mainly in 1784, it also includes some laws passed earlier.)

Schnürer, Gustav, Katholische Kirche und Kultur in der Barockzeit, Paderborn, 1937.

Valjevec, Fritz, Der Josephinismus, München, 1945.

Walter, Friederich, Die Österreichische Zentralverwaltung, Band 4, Die Zeit Josephs II. und Leopold II. 1780-1792, Aktenstücke, (Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Neuere Geschichte Österreichs, vol. 36), Wien, 1950.

Wangermann, Ernst, From Joseph II to the Jacobin Trials, London, 1959.

Weyebüller, M. (ed.), Briefe von Joseph dem Zweyten, Leipzig, 1822. (The letters contained in this work are generally believed to be forgeries.)

White, R.J., Europe in the Eighteenth Century, New York, 1965.

Winner, Gerhard, Die Klosteraufhebungen in Niederösterreich und Wien, Wien, 1967.

Winter, Eduard, Der Josefinismus, Berlin, 1962.

Wolf, Adam, Die Aufhebung der Klöster in Innerösterreich: 1782-1790, Wien, 1871.

_____, Geschichtliche Bilder aus Oesterreich, 2 vols., Wien, 1880.

Wolf, G., Josephina, Wien, 1890.

_____, Kaiser Joseph II. und die Österreichischen Generalseminarien (Historisches Taschenbuch, Fünfte Folge, Siebenten Jahrgang), Leipzig, 1877.

Wright, William, Serf, Seigneur and Sovereign: Agrarian Reform in Eighteenth Century Bohemia, Minneapolis, 1966.

Articles and Periodicals

Auty, Robert, "Czech and Slovak Thought in the Second half of the Eighteenth Century," Le mouvement des Idées Dans les Pays Slaves pendant la Seconde Moitié du XVIIIe Siecle, (Collana di Richerche Slavistiche, No. 2), Rome, 1962.

Engel-Janosi, Friedrich, "Joseph II. Tod im Urteil der Zeitgenossen," Mitteilungen des Österreichische Instituts für Geschichtsforschung, No. 44 (1930).

_____, "Kaiser Josef II. in der Wiener Bewegung des Jahres 1848," Mitteilungen des Vereines für Geschichte der Stadt Wien, No. 11 (1931).

Freudenberger, Herman, "Industrialization in Bohemia and Moravia in the Eighteenth Century," Journal of Central European Affairs, vol. 19 (1960).

Ilwof, F., "Kaiser Joseph II. als Volkswirt," Preussische Jahrbücher, vol. 129 (1907).

Kristinkovich, Maria H., "Anabaptist Book Confiscations in Hungary During the Eighteenth Century," The Mennonite Quarterly Review, vol. 39 (1965).

Sommer, Louise, "Die Wirtschaftslehre von Josef v. Sonnenfels," Zeitschrift für Volkswirtschaft und Sozialpolitik (Neue Folge), III Band, Heft 4-6 (1923).

Voltelini, Hans v., "Die Naturrechtlichen Ideen und die Reformen des Achtzehnjahrhunderts," Historische Zeitschrift (Dritte Folge), vol. 105 (1910).

Wright, William, "The Initiation of the Robota Abolition in Bohemia," Journal of Central European Affairs, vol. 18 (1958).