

Joseph II's Reshaping of the Austrian Church

Author(s): P. G. M. Dickson

Source: *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 36, No. 1 (Mar., 1993), pp. 89-114

Published by: [Cambridge University Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2639517>

Accessed: 10/04/2011 16:11

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=cup>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



Cambridge University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Historical Journal*.

## JOSEPH II'S RESHAPING OF THE AUSTRIAN CHURCH\*

P. G. M. DICKSON  
*St Catherine's College, Oxford*

**ABSTRACT.** *The article draws on recently discovered manuscript sources to re-examine Joseph II's structural changes to the Catholic and Uniat church in the Austrian central lands between 1781 and 1790. In contrast to the extensive literature dealing with state policy towards church authority, or Josephinism, these changes have traditionally been the subject of guesswork and misstatement. Joseph has been credited with nationalizing the church, ruthlessly cutting down its monastic numbers, placing the secular clergy on fixed stipends, and financing a wholesale increase in bishoprics, parishes and secular clergy by extensive sales of monastic lands. The article presents new figures for clerical numbers and income before and after Joseph's reforms, and argues that while the latter were radical (though not always consistent) in intention, they were much less so in execution, partly because the church's resources, exposed by the emperor's massive investigation, proved less extensive than he had expected.*

---

Government policy towards the Catholic church in Austria in the second half of the eighteenth century, traditionally described as Josephinism or Josephism, and culminating in the extensive ecclesiastical reforms of Joseph II's reign (1780–90) has been the subject of a large, and still ramifying, literature. As a result, its aims and ideology, which formed an essential part of the Catholic Enlightenment in Central Europe, have been explored in detail.<sup>1</sup> In contrast, the actual shape of the Catholic and Uniat church affected, its personnel, revenues and functions, and the changes made in it by Joseph's actions, have been much less studied, and remain in many respects unclear. As a natural consequence, misconceptions about the content, and outcome, of his

\* I wish to thank the British Academy for financing my initial research, and Professor Domokos Kosáry, *Hofrat* Dr Leopold Auer, *Hofrat* DDr Gottfried Mraz and *Hofrat* Dr Lorenz Mikoletzky for answering inquiries and sending me micro-films and photocopies. Professor D. E. D. Beales, Dr T. C. W. Blanning, and Dr R. J. W. Evans made valuable comments and suggestions, which I have gratefully incorporated. Currency referred to is florins (*Gulden*), abbreviated fl.

<sup>1</sup> A. Wandruszka and P. Urbanitsch (eds.), *Die Habsburger Monarchie 1848–1918*. Vol. 4, *Die Konfessionen* (Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1985), pp. 3–15 is a useful recent survey, with full references to the literature. During his period (1765–80) as Co-Regent with his mother, Joseph exerted considerable influence on policy towards the church, see Derek Beales, *Joseph II. I: in the shadow of Maria Theresa 1741–1780* (C.U.P., 1987), ch. 14. The restriction of Josephinism to mean policy towards the church is more satisfactory than its extension to cover all 'modernising' Austrian reforms since the 1750s, an approach adopted by F. Valjavec, *Der Josephinismus* (2nd edn, Munich, 1945) and later writers. The term 'Josephinism' itself may not have been coined until the 1830s, see P. G. M. Dickson, *Finance and government under Maria Theresa 1740–1780* (2 vols. O.U.P., 1987), I, 59. For Joseph's own views, see below.

ecclesiastical reforms have flourished.<sup>2</sup> This article, which draws on new information from official sources about clerical numbers, structure, and revenues in the central lands of the Monarchy, attempts to assess more accurately how far Joseph's ambitious intentions were realized. As a comparative dimension, the structure of the church on the eve of the 1848 revolutions, after sixty years in its new mould, is discussed from printed sources. It is perhaps unnecessary to state that the data presented here leave many problems unresolved, and that the whole question of the Josephine church deserves a separate monograph, based on a much more extended investigation of original sources, including ecclesiastical records. The usual generalization that Joseph left the monarchy supported on the three pillars of a reformed church, a reformed officialdom, and a reformed army, would then acquire greater solidity.

## I

The philosophical basis of the emperor's ecclesiastical policy has been extensively exposed.<sup>3</sup> Indeed, Joseph himself showed a typical, and propagandist, satisfaction in exposing it. Drawing on discussions dating back to the 1760s, he asserted the right of the Austrian state to deal with all temporal aspects of the church, including its organization and revenues, without prior papal consent, leaving only matters of doctrine under church control. His ambitions included a revised and strengthened episcopate, an extensive

<sup>2</sup> Dickson, I, ch. 4 reviews some of these. The Uniat (Greek United) church was of importance in Galicia, Hungary and Transylvania. There was also a small number of Armenian United clergy in Galicia. The most substantial discussion of Joseph's church reforms is still C. Hock and H. I. Bidermann, *Der Österreichische Staatsrath. Eine geschichtliche Studie* (Vienna, 1879), pp. 395-450 'Klösteraufhebung', though it is fragmented and incomplete. P. von Mitrofanov, *Joseph II. Seine politische und kulturelle Tätigkeit* (tr. Vienna and Leipzig, 1910), pp. 673-801 draws extensively on Hock-Bidermann, but also on government decrees and foreign despatches. Some of his mistakes are noticed below. The posthumous third vol. of E. Tomek, *Kirchengeschichte Österreichs* (3 vols., Innsbruck, 1935-59) gives a general survey, with some additional research by its editor, Hugo Hantsch. *Die Konfessionen* (see n. 1) throws no light on the subject. I. Beidtel, *Untersuchungen über die kirchlichen Zustände in den kaiserlich österreichischen Staaten* (Vienna, 1849), though short on facts, has historical interest as a hostile survey of state policy towards the church, 1740-1848. The modern secondary literature, drawing on Mitrofanov and other sources, usually includes the great wealth of religious houses, the dissolution of 700 of them, the reduction of monastic personnel from 65,000 to 27,000, the rushed sale of monastic property which put 60 million gulden into the Religious Fund, the placing of the previously wealthy bishops on fixed stipends, the introduction of state salaries for the lower clergy, and the wholesale creation of new parishes. None of these statements is correct, see below.

<sup>3</sup> See H. Schlitter (ed. and introd.), *Die Reise des Papstes Pius VI nach Wien (Fontes Rerum Austriacarum vol. 47, Erster Hälfte, Vienna, 1892)*; idem, *Pius VI. und Josef II.* (ibid. *Zweite Hälfte, Vienna, 1894*), hereafter Schlitter, I and II; F. Maass (ed. and introd.), *Der Josephinismus. Quellen zu seiner Geschichte in Österreich 1760-1850*, vols. 1-5 (Vienna: Österr. Akad. d. Wiss. 1951-61); idem, *Der Frühjosephinismus* (Vienna, 1969). Georgine Holzknicht, *Ursprung und Herkunft der Reformideen Kaiser Josefs II auf kirchlichem Gebiete* (Innsbruck, 1914) is an especially interesting and trenchant, if hostile, exposition. P. Hersche, *Der Spätjansenismus in Österreich* (Vienna, 1977) is a valuable modern commentary, revising earlier views. J. Karniel, *Die Toleranzpolitik Kaiser Josefs II* (Gerlingen, 1985), p. 317 suggests that Joseph von Sonnenfels proposed a 'Josephinist' church policy, but the passages cited in support mostly show approval of existing measures.

reshaping of the church away from its traditional emphasis on monasticism towards a more numerous, better educated, secular clergy, and the abolition of foreign, especially papal, jurisdictions. He further claimed that the state had the right to grant a limited toleration to non-Catholic Christians, in effect to Lutherans, Calvinists and Greek Orthodox, and implemented this in the Toleration Patent of 1781. These views differed from those of his mother, who in her important but much less ambitious ecclesiastical reforms sought papal co-operation wherever possible, and detested the concept of legal toleration. Joseph, however, with only minor concessions, procured reluctant approval of his position from Pope Pius VI, ending in the Concordat over royal rights of presentation in Lombardy in January 1784.<sup>4</sup>

This story has often been told, and is satisfactorily documented. Joseph's investigation, and reorganization, of the church in the central lands of the Monarchy are, as already indicated, much less fully dealt with in the literature. The process of investigation appears to have been initiated in the Bohemian and Austrian lands and Galicia by a *Hofdekret* of 10 August 1782 requiring bishops and heads of religious houses to make returns of clerical numbers to the central *Geistliche Hofkommission* established less than a month earlier.<sup>5</sup> The decree, in turn, was a result of the emperor's extended draft agenda for the nascent Commission, dated 15 June, which included investigation of the numbers of clergy in town and country, and returns of all clerical property. He clearly already envisaged a massive re-shaping of the church.<sup>6</sup> It is hardly surprising therefore that orders for a declaration of

<sup>4</sup> Schlitter and Maass treat these aspects of Joseph's policies exhaustively; Tomek and *Die Konfessionen* give recent summaries. For the Toleration Patent (or patents) of 1781 see most recently Karniel, *Die Toleranzpolitik*, who also deals well with the increased toleration conceded to Jews 1781–5. Beidtel in his account of Joseph II's reign argues that the emperor was under the influence of an 'Aufklärungspartei' which had established a dominant position inside the administration before Maria Theresa's death. Its members were Sonnenfels, Martini, Kressel, Gottfried von Swieten, Rautenstrauch, Gebler, Born 'and others', *Untersuchungen*, Book 2. This is an early instance of the conservative thesis that Joseph was led astray by wicked advisers. Maass, as is well known, argues for the extensive influence of Kaunitz on policy towards the church. More recently, A. von Aretin, *Heiliges Römisches Reich 1776–1806* (2 vols., Wiesbaden, 1967) I, 138–9 has emphasized the activities of certain aristocratic Austrian bishops influenced by Febronian doctrines; and has contrasted Kaunitz's radical approach to church strategy inside Austria with his conservative approach to it in a *Reich* context. Joseph's central role, and characteristically extreme logic, in the formulation of policy, still seem incontestable.

<sup>5</sup> Johann Freiherr von Hempel-Kürsinger, *Alphabetisch-Chronologische Übersicht der k.k. Gesetze und Verordnungen vom Jahr 1740 bis zum Jahre 1830* (Vienna, 12 vols., 1825–33), III, 506–7. This index to government decrees in the non-Hungarian lands is a useful ancillary source, which historians have neglected.

<sup>6</sup> Joseph's agenda for the committee appointed to implement a 'Geistliche Oekonomie' for the Austrian church in imitation of the *Giunta Economale* in Milan are summarized in Hock-Bidermann p. 447 and printed in detail in Schlitter, II, 41–6. Schlitter, 47–8, gives 2 July, against Hock-Bidermann's 3 Aug., for the adoption of the name 'Hofkommission', and 22 July for the commission's instruction. Its president was Baron Franz Kressel. Its *Hofräte* were Leopold von Haan, Franz von Heinke and abbot Stephen Rautenstrauch. It reported to the Bohemian–Austrian and Hungarian–Transylvanian chancelleries; Haan was from the latter. This arrangement aimed to satisfy the Hungarian Chancellor's initial opposition to the commission's scope.

ecclesiastical revenues followed in January 1783.<sup>7</sup> The documents surviving from the ensuing inquiry show that it constituted a kind of Domesday Survey of the Austrian church. It required precise statistics of clerical numbers, type (secular, regular etc.), organization (dioceses, parishes, chaplaincies, monastic houses, lay brotherhoods, and so on) and of ecclesiastical revenues, in various categories. Many of these headings were subdivided, for example, the monastic population into endowed ('gestiftete') and mendicant ('Bettel') and, in each, into 'priests', clerks ('clerici') and 'lay helpers'. The dissolution of the contemplative monastic orders, which Joseph had decreed nearly a year earlier (29 November 1781) on the first anniversary of his accession, and on which the attention of historians has tended to concentrate, could have been effected by a much more limited investigation. It seems clear that the emperor, in line with his whole approach to problems of government, was determined to uncover virtually all the church's temporal aspects.<sup>8</sup>

No doubt Joseph, with his usual impatience, expected the required information to appear immediately, but in practice several years were needed before the facts about church personnel and income could be established. Returns were made for Upper and Lower Austria in 1783-4, for the Bohemian lands and Tyrol in 1785, for Further Austria and Galicia in 1786, for Hungary in 1787, for Siebenbürgen (Transylvania) not until 1789. The totals obtained were built up from individual declarations ('Fassiones'), grouped in ever-larger units, and carefully supervised by the local secular authorities. The scale of the underlying paper-work is shown by references to nearly 8,000 completed declaration forms (*Bogen*) for Bohemia, over 9,500 for Galicia, and so on. The enormous enterprise was pulled into statistical shape by the *Stiftungs- und Städtische Buchhalterei*, a subordinate branch of the *Hofrechenkammer*, and thus represented another administrative triumph for the latter's unhappy president, Count Karl Zinzendorf.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Hock-Bidermann, p. 419n., 17 Jan. 1783.

<sup>8</sup> For the order to dissolve the contemplative orders, see Hock-Bidermann, p. 395. I am grateful to Miss Barbara Harvey for help on what a 'contemplative order' historically was. The statements in the text about the scope of the ecclesiastical inquiry are based on Vienna, Finanz- und Hofkammerarchiv, Oberster Rechnungshof A.94, 'Klösteraufhebung und Pfarren Einrichtung'; and Vienna, Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv, Nachlass Zinzendorf Hs. 146b, 'Fondations'. These archives are abbreviated below as HKA and HHSA respectively. The HKA source, which refers more than once to a huge 'Tabellenwerk', was extensively weeded in the last century, and only certain documents remain (letter from HKA, 26 Mar. 1991). Dr Lorenz Mikoletzky, Director of the Allgemeines Verwaltungsarchiv, Vienna, informs me that there is no systematic information about the church, monastic dissolutions etc., in the division *Kultus* in his archive (letter, 11 Sept. 1991). Perusal of the Staatsrats-Protokoll and the Index to it in the HHSA would probably clarify details, but not the larger picture.

<sup>9</sup> For the dates of the returns see Table 1. The numbers of declaration forms are stated in the HKA letter ref. to in n.8. The *Stiftungs-Buchhalterei* appears as the responsible authority in all the documents consulted. The emperor had suggested its use in his agenda of 15 Jun. 1782. Its place in the elaborate *Hofrechenkammer* structure is shown in the *Hof- und Staatsschematismus* or *Court Calendar*. For Zinzendorf as president see E. Graf von Pettenegg, *Ludwig und Karl Grafen und Herren von Zinzendorf* (Vienna, 1879); Dickson, II, 87; and n. 13 below. Joseph II, not untypically, was dissatisfied with the HRK's ecclesiastical statistics, and censured Zinzendorf for this, Hock-Bidermann, p. 422n.

The idea of investigating church numbers and revenues was not, however, a Josephine innovation, though the scope and rigour of the 1780s inquiry undoubtedly were. The assessment of ecclesiastical revenue in the Austrian–Bohemian lands to the Contribution under Haugwitz’s System of 1748–9, the separate listing of the clergy there, by categories, in the population censuses of 1762–8, the imposition of a regally determined levy on clerical incomes from 1768, and the contemporary discussions of a grand survey of the church, offered antecedents and precedents. Outside the central lands, an active policy of control, investigation and reform was implemented in Lombardy from the mid-1760s, with Kaunitz’s encouragement, by the *Giunta Economale* in Milan.<sup>10</sup> The statistical shape and scope of the Josephine inquiry probably also derived from, and were made possible by, experience in the Bohemian–Austrian lands from the 1750s with the census of population and the Contribution. Both relied on the technique of building up from individual declarations to increasing units of area, until totals could be arrived at.<sup>11</sup> This method was subsequently applied to the first complete population census of the Hungarian lands, initiated in 1784, and to the returns required for the new *Grundsteuer*, which was to replace the Contribution, in the years 1784–9.<sup>12</sup> The techniques involved, which most plausibly emanated from discussions between Joseph, Zinzendorf, and the latter’s adviser Johann Matthias Puechberg, represented a culmination of the Austrian belief, going back to Wilhelm von Schröder in the previous century, in statistics as a tool for governing the heterogeneous Monarchy. Under Joseph, it seems fair to say, rigorously compiled statistics became an essential tool of enlightened absolutism.<sup>13</sup> The docility with which the church, apparently even in the Hungarian lands, submitted to the application of this Benthamite approach, and to the changes which it preceded, is a graphic measure of its subordination to the state. In France a revolution, in England in the 1830s the threat of one, were needed to procure similar acquiescence. The increase in the power of Austrian secular government since the mid-century, epitomized by Joseph II himself; the

<sup>10</sup> A debate on church taxation, and a possible state survey of church wealth in the central lands, began in the 1750s and ran through the 1760s, Dickson, I, 65 n.; II, 33, 266–70. Maass, *Josephinismus*, I, Introd., argues that Kaunitz’s experience in Lombardy from the 1760s influenced his advice on church policy in the central lands. It seems plausible to infer that practice in investigating church property etc. was also transferable. Another precedent was the ending of the Jesuit order in 1773, referred to by Joseph in his instruction for dissolving the contemplative orders. Haugwitz’s System of 1748–9 was confined to the Austrian and Bohemian lands, and therefore left church revenue in the Hungarian lands uninvestigated. For Bohemian–Austrian clerical numbers in the censuses of the 1760s, see p. 8 below.

<sup>11</sup> See Dickson, I, 28 (census) and II, 206 (Contribution).

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.* I, 29 (Hungarian census); *idem*, ‘Joseph II’s Hungarian Land Survey’, *EHR*, CLVI (1991), 611–34.

<sup>13</sup> For Puechberg see Dickson, *Finance and government*, II, 26, 29, 34, 361, 366, 429; H. L. Mikoletzky, ‘Johann Matthias Puechberg und die Anfänge der Hofrechenkammer’, *Jahrb. des Vereines für Gesch. der Stadt Wien* 17/18 (1961/2), 133–48. Joseph’s statistical approach to government appears in most sectors: population, taxation, government finance, church affairs. For Schröder and the concept of statistics as ‘Staatsbrille’, see L. Sommer, *Die österreichischen Kameralisten* (Vienna, 1920–5), II, 113–18.

penetration of Febronian and Jansenist doctrines, or variants of them, at Court and within the episcopate; the ineffectuality of opposition of those, lay and ecclesiastical, who doubted the emperor's policies; perhaps explain this passivity.

## II

What were the results of the inquiry? Some of the data, based on surviving transcripts of official reports in Count Karl Zinzendorf's manuscripts, were presented earlier.<sup>14</sup> They showed a total church revenue in the central lands of the monarchy of just over 19 m. fl.; 994 monasteries; 194 convents; over 12,000 parishes and chaplaincies; and a probable ecclesiastical population (the information available in these reports is deficient) of 40,000 persons. Of these 40,000, it was estimated, perhaps 25,000 (62 per cent) were monastic, including laity serving in religious houses.<sup>15</sup> Recently-examined material makes it possible to amplify, and partly correct, these results.<sup>16</sup> With the help of some manipulation, figures for the areas still omitted from the reports (Inner Austria and Moravia-Silesia) can be added, and a revised view formed of the clerical numbers returned to the ambitious state inquiry. As Table 1 (Col. 2) shows, these approximated 22,000 seculars and 24,000 regulars (a minority of them nuns), or 46,000 persons in all, including lay servants. The figures for seculars acquire confirmation from those for the 'alter Stand' of the latter drawn up in 1790 and discussed later.<sup>17</sup> On this evidence, numbers of seculars, hence of all clergy, were initially 6,000 or so higher than previously estimated, and the proportion of religious therefore lower, fifty three per cent instead of sixty two per cent. The substantial agreement outside the Hungarian lands between the 1781 census figures (Col. 1) and those of the ecclesiastical inquiry (Col. 2) corroborates the latter's total, and encourages the conclusion that it includes the population of houses subsequently dissolved.<sup>18</sup> This is important, since official printed statistics of houses dissolved in the years 1782-5 inclusive, a period before the date of many of the ecclesiastical returns, show that 5,240 persons, male and female, were affected, all save 246 in the Bohemian and Austrian lands and Galicia.<sup>19</sup> If these were added to the inquiry

<sup>14</sup> Dickson, *Finance and government*, I, 68-70, and Table 4.1. This account was based on HHSA Nach. Zinzendorf Hs. 146b, 'Fondations', which drew on official returns but is less detailed.

<sup>15</sup> Dickson, I, 73-5. For the monastic laity see n. 20 below.

<sup>16</sup> See n. 8 for the new HKA source, and n. 17 for the new HHSA material, which shows the position in 1790. The former gives figures for Bohemia, Tyrol and Vorarlberg (separately) and Further Austria. Dickson, I, 74 has no figures for Bohemia, and erroneously treats those for Tyrol and Vorarlberg as being for Tyrol and Further Austria combined. For exact refs. see Table 1.

<sup>17</sup> See Table 3 and accompanying text.

<sup>18</sup> Protestant ministers and Orthodox priests were scarce outside the Hungarian lands, only 37 pastors being registered in 1782, 142 in 1788, Hock-Bidermann, p. 351 n. The census clergy was thus overwhelmingly Catholic and Uniat.

<sup>19</sup> [J. Kropatschek], *Handbuch aller unter der Regierung des Kaisers Joseph des II. für die k.k. Erbländer ergangenen Verordnungen und Gesetze* (Vienna: 18 vols., 1785-90), II, pp. 130-2, 'Verzeichniss aller vom Jahre 1782 bis 1783 inclusive in den sämtlichen k.k. Staaten erloschenen Manns- und Frauenorden'; *ibid.* VI, 520-1, similar return for 1784 and 1785. These list 203 dissolved

Table 1. *Numbers of clergy returned to 1781/7 population censuses, and to Joseph II's ecclesiastical inquiry*

Area	1781/7 census totals of clergy*	Inquiry total of clergy	Of which		Of which nuns	Regulars as %	Date of return
			Secular	Regular			
Lower Austria } Upper Austria }	6,918	{ 4,700 1,932	1,402	3,298	446	70.2	24.vi.83
Inner Austria	6,163	6,143 (est.)	597	1,335	?	69.0	24.i.84
Tyrol & Vorarlberg	No census	2,932	2,511 (est.)	3,632 (est.)	?	59.1 (est.)	—
Further Austria	No census	2,117	1,367	1,565	278	53.3	25.x.85
Bohemia	6,474	5,818	696	1,421	485	67.1	26.v.86
Moravia & Silesia	3,781	3,731 (est.)	2,671	3,147	185	54.0	20.vii.85
Galiccia	7,629	7,537	1,716 (est.)	2,015 (est.)	?	54.0 (est.)	—
Subtotal	36,014† (est.)	34,970 (est.)	5,128	2,409	?	40.0	6.iii.86
Hungary	13,263	8,690 (est.)	3,629	18,446 (est.)	?	52.8 (est.)	—
Transylvania	5,224	2,254	1,890	5,061	337‡	58.2	25.vii.87
Totals (est.)	54,591	45,854	21,607	24,248	?	16.1	5.ii.89

\* 1781: Austrian-Bohemian lands and Galicia (omitting Tyrol and Further Austria); 1787: Hungarian lands. Hungary included Croatia. The censuses included Protestant pastors and Orthodox priests, but these were scarce outside the Hungarian lands.

† Including col. 2 figures for Tyrol and Further Austria.

‡ Number of Hungarian nuns estimated from convent income.

Sources: For the 1781 census totals of clergy, Dickson, *Finance and government*, I, Table 3.3. 'Clergy' in the census included all regular and secular Catholic, Uniat and Greek Orthodox priests, and Protestant pastors, but not Jewish rabbis, *ibid.*, I, 43. For the 1787 Hungarian and Transylvanian figures, *ibid.*, Table 3.5 but including Croatia with Hungary. In Col. 2, clergy numbers in Tyrol and Vorarlberg. Further Austria and Bohemia, are from the General Summaries in HKA Oberster Rechnungshof A 94. 'Klösteraufhebung und Pfarreneinrichtung' 1785/551 (Bohemia), 1785/826 (Tyrol & Vorarlberg) and 1786/476 (Further Austria). The numbers for the other lands are from HHSA Nachlass Zinzendorf Hs 146 b, 'Fondations', fos. 211, 307, 465. Inquiry numbers are of Catholic and Uniat clergy only.

Estimates: For Inner Austria (Styria, Carinthia, Krain, Görz-Gradisca and Trieste), the census clergy are reduced by 20 as an allowance for Protestant pastors, and the proportion of regulars in Tyrol and Further Austria combined (59.1%) is applied. For Moravia-Silesia, a deduction of 50 is made and the Bohemian proportion of 54% is applied. The figures for Transylvania are from Table 3 below, with 11 pensioned regulars added.

total in Table 1, numbers would clearly become too high, though a fraction of the difference between the two totals may be accounted for by them. In general, an estimate of 25,000 regulars and 22,000 seculars overall, or 47,000 clergy (and lay helpers) seems plausible. Within this total, the average proportion of fifty three per cent for regulars was comfortably exceeded, as the table shows, in Upper, Lower and Further Austria, where it approached or reached seventy per cent, a level which probably helps to account for the mounting official criticism of monasticism. A further factor was the important division of male regulars between endowed and mendicant orders. It can be stated precisely for six areas (Lower Austria, Tyrol, Further Austria, Bohemia, Galicia and Hungary). Male regulars here totalled 14,936 persons, of whom no less than 10,498 (70 per cent) were attached to 'begging' houses. This high proportion must have provided further ammunition for critics of the religious life, headed by the emperor himself.<sup>20</sup>

The general pattern indicated by the Josephine inquiry is not markedly different from that revealed by the population censuses of the 1760s, which included the first government attempts to list clerical numbers. Those figures, while sometimes varying inexplicably, show a clerical population in the Austrian and Bohemian lands of about 24,000 persons, of whom 15,000 (62 per cent) were regulars. This higher ratio suggests that the dissolution of the Jesuit order in 1773, and the simultaneous acquisition of Galicia, with its large population of secular Uniat priests, many of them married, had, before Joseph's reign, already lowered the proportion of clergy representing, in the eyes of its critics, the 'dead hand' of monasticism. It would also have been possible for conservatives to argue that by Spanish or Portuguese standards the Austrian church in 1780 was already comparatively 'modern' in scale and structure.<sup>21</sup> Nonetheless, the returns of the 1780s, showing high overall clerical numbers, and regulars, the majority mendicant, still equal or ahead in nearly

---

monasteries and convents, with a population of 4,994 'Seelen', in the central lands outside Hungary, and a further 10 with 246 'Seelen' in Hungary. The Hungarian figures are probably defective.

<sup>20</sup> Figures for mendicants are from Table 2 below, with Galicia added (HHSa Nachl. Zinzendorf Hs. 146 b, fo. 465). Begging monks were a burden on an already poor population. It was also to these houses that lay brothers were attached in substantial numbers: 29% of the mendicant population in Lower Austria, 20% in Galicia, 24% in Hungary, 22% in Bohemia. Endowed houses had few lay brothers. Joseph's belief that mendicants exacerbated the problem of (secular) begging, and must be concentrated in the towns and stopped from taking novices, appears in his agenda of 15 June 1782, see n. 6 above. They were ordered in Oct. 1782 to take no more novices and in Oct. 1789 to cease collecting alms, Hempel-Kürsinger, III, 510-11 (*Verordnung* 1 Oct. 1782); 636-7 (*Hofdekret*, 6 Oct. 1789). Under the second decree they were to be paid from the *Religionsfond*. It seems doubtful if this took effect, but a small subsidy of 120,000 fl. to the mendicant orders in 1788 is shown in Hock-Bidermann, p. 427. All monastic houses were assigned a limit for their numbers, and this was not to be overstepped, Hempel-Kürsinger, III, 530-1, *Patent* of 24 Oct. 1783. For mendicant wealth (or lack of it) see below.

<sup>21</sup> Clerical figures for 1768 computed from H. Grossmann, 'Die Anfänge und geschichtliche Entwicklung der amtlichen Statistik in Österreich', *Statistische Monatschrift*, NF 21 (1916), 331-423

every province, can only have strengthened the official view, first eloquently stated by Kaunitz in 1770, that the church needed to be reduced in size and reshaped away from monasticism towards a more numerous, and better-educated, secular clergy. It is clear that Joseph himself thought that this would improve provision for the spiritual welfare of his subjects, an aim he had genuinely at heart. It would also strengthen the role of the secular clergy as a kind of second arm of the state, communicating government intentions, monitoring their outcome, and generally exercising social and political control.<sup>22</sup>

Beside clerical numbers, Joseph's commission investigated the revenue of the church in the central lands in detail, and with unprecedented accuracy (the earlier returns to the Contribution were notoriously defective). The estimated 19.2 m. fl. presented earlier as its total amount moves up, with the separate figures now available for Tyrol and Further Austria, by nearly 1 m. fl. to 20.2 m. fl. Its structure is not available for every province, but is shown for five important areas in Table 2. The monastic share of church revenue here, while varying from fifty per cent down to twenty eight per cent, was on average only thirty seven per cent, when monastic numbers (14,492) were 60 per cent of total numbers (24,257). As this indicates, revenue was higher both absolutely and per head (813 fl. compared with 327 fl.) for seculars than for regulars. The average for regulars, in turn, conceals a further important distinction. Because mendicants were twice as numerous as endowed monks, though having the same total revenue, their income per head (249 fl.) was less than half that of endowed regulars (521 fl.). The mendicants, in short, composed a sort of monastic slum population. They could only better their lot by the systematic begging which the state disliked. Nuns (1,731 were returned in these lands) were somewhat better off. Average revenue per *house*

---

at pp. 402-3, 406, substituting the 1762 results, however, in Lower Austria and Krain. The total was 24,203 clergy, of whom 15,076 were regulars and 9,127 seculars. The Galician clergy total in 1786 in Table 1 comprised 1,925 Catholics (378 of them regulars), 59 Armenians and 5,553 Uniate (2,291 of them regulars). In Portugal, half the population was allegedly dependent on the church in the earlier eighteenth century. In Spain, the 1787 census showed 2,067 monasteries, 1,122 convents, 62,249 monks and 33,630 nuns, when overall population was just over 10 million. T. Schieder (ed.), *Handb. der Europäischen Geschichte*, iv (Stuttgart, 1968), pp. 573, 581. Total Spanish clerical numbers are given there as 191,101, but in fact 59,000 of these were lay servants. The date 1787 is misprinted as 1778.

<sup>22</sup> Kaunitz's opinions are discussed by A. Ritter von Arneth, *Gesch. Maria Theresia's* (10 vols., Vienna, 1863-79), ix, ch. 3, and are printed at length in Maass, *Josephinismus*, I, no. 158/36 (probably 1768) and II, nos. 6, 8-9, 144 (21 Jun. and 2 Jul. 1770). He was not wholly consistent: in 1766 he had defended monks against Joseph's criticisms, Beales, pp. 446-7. For government orders that the clergy should register government edicts, and read them from the pulpit, see Hempel-Kürsinger, III, 482-3 (11 Mar. 1780), 502-3 (17 May, 28 Sept., 11 Dec. 1782), 514-5 (4 Jan. 1783), 602-3 (13 Mar. 1787). Hofrat von Kees in 1781 said that 'the statesman must regard the clergyman (*Geistliche*) in the state as having the position of a state servant (*eines Staatsbeamten*)', Mitrofanov, p. 795. It is significant in this context that a *Hofdekret* of 11 Jun. 1787 denied the emperor's rumoured intention of abolishing clerical celibacy, *ibid.* 700. The composition of the secular clergy is discussed below.

Table 2. *Pre-dissolution structure of Catholic clergy and church revenue in five areas (all revenue in fl.)*

Area	Total clergy	Total church revenue	Secular clergy	Revenue of secular clergy	Regular clergy	Revenue of regular clergy
Lower Austria	4,700	2,761,710	1,402	1,378,941	3,298	1,382,769
%				49.9		50.1
Tyrol and Vorarlberg	2,932	1,240,753	1,367	832,421	1,565	408,332
%				67.1		32.9
Further Austria	2,117	1,031,206	696	514,337	1,421	516,869
%				49.9		50.1
Bohemia	5,818	3,052,605	2,671	1,901,681	3,147	1,150,924
%				62.3		37.7
Hungary	8,690	4,603,461	3,629	3,312,324	5,061	1,291,137
%				71.9		28.1
Totals	24,257	12,689,735	9,765	7,939,704	14,492	4,750,031
%				62.6		37.4
Of which						
Area	Mendicants	Mendicant revenue	Endowed monks	Revenue of endowed monks	Nuns	Nuns' revenue
Lower Austria	1,805	567,914	1,047	686,803	446	128,052
Tyrol and Vorarlberg	945	214,887	342	147,244	278	46,201
Further Austria	360	126,513	576	235,091	485	155,265
Bohemia	1,790	517,624	1,172	594,123	185	39,177
Hungary	3,736	723,450	988	488,008	337 est	79,679
Totals	8,636	2,150,388	4,125	2,151,269	1,731	488,374

Source: HHSA, Nachl, Zinzendorf Hs. 146b, 'Fondations' fos. 211 (Lower Austria) and 533 (Hungary, including Croatia); for Tyrol and Vorarlberg, Further Austria and Bohemia, HKA Oberster Rechnungshof A.94, see Table 1.

The table divides 377,299 fl. revenue stated to be for dissolved houses equally between mendicants and endowed monks. It omits 261,000 fl. revenue of lay brotherhoods.

(there were 607 in these lands) was 7,825 fl., a figure in line with other observations. There was obviously considerable variation around this between endowed, mendicant and female houses, but it cannot be determined from the sources.<sup>23</sup>

The income of the secular clergy in these returns is divided between parishes (*Pfarreyen*), sometimes with the addition 'and chaplaincies' (*Kaplaneyen*); churches and chapels (*Kirchen und Kapellen*); and 'simple benefices' (*Beneficia simplicia*), the latter being ones without cure of souls. The sources of the revenue each received, however, are not specified. A fuller analysis is available for 1790, covering all seculars not paid from the new Religious Fund, and this is discussed below.<sup>24</sup>

The picture revealed by the *Geistliche Hofkommission's* massive investigation of the Austrian church thus confirmed the view that its monastic sector was, by the criteria of the new utilitarian philosophy, much too large. But it also showed that monks and nuns were not endowed with the fabled wealth almost universally imputed to them, as it had been earlier to the Society of Jesus.<sup>25</sup> The restructuring of the church to ensure more provision at parish level, and less 'unnecessary' praying and fasting, therefore proceeded in conditions of relative financial stringency. The main outline of what Joseph did is well established: extensive dissolution of religious houses, and use of their endowments to provide for new bishoprics, parishes, priests and auxiliaries. Secular clergy increased, regular clergy diminished, and a more effective and economically-run church, at least in the view of the emperor and his advisers, emerged. But just as reliable information about the shape of the church when Joseph started his reforms has been lacking, so too has information about how he actually changed it. This is something for which the assertions of contemporaries, mediated through the secondary literature, are not an adequate substitute.<sup>26</sup>

<sup>23</sup> For the numbers of religious houses, and the revised total of church revenue, see Dickson, I, 446, Table 4.1, corrected by inclusion of over 1 m. fl. church income in Further Austria, erroneously included there with Tyrol. Table 2 corrects ib. Table 4.2, where the same mistake is repeated. Lower Austrian monastic revenue is also set too low there, and the Croatian clergy excluded from the Hungarian total. For the average revenue of dissolved houses see ib. I, 75 and n. 29 below.

<sup>24</sup> See Table 7 below and accompanying text. Secular revenue in the returns from 1783 is stated as being 'from all *Beneficiaten* of the secular clergy from the bishop to the last *Stipendiaten*'. The income of religious houses is divided into 'all...religious houses (*Klöster*)' and 'endowments for masses, litanies, candles etc.' Simple benefices are defined in *Grosses vollständiges Universal Lexicon* (64 vols., Halle-Leipzig, 1732-50) s.v. 'Beneficia simplicia' and 'Pfründe'. Cathedral prebends are given there as an example.

<sup>25</sup> For the S.J., see Dickson, I, 65-8. The Austrian Jesuits were in fact quite poor. The evidence reviewed here suggests that this was comparatively true of the whole Austrian church. It was presumably standard Enlightenment theory that the opposite must be so. Mitrofanov emphasizes the church's wealth (*Joseph II*, pp. 683, 691-2) and is followed by other authors. For the partial evidence of relatively low episcopal revenues see n. 44 below.

<sup>26</sup> See Dickson, I, 69-70, and n. 29 below. The generalized, though not inaccurate, statement by Professor E. Wangermann in *New Camb. Mod. Hist.*, VIII (1965) p. 292 is typical of the modern literature: 'The secularized property of the suppressed monasteries constituted the basis of the

Table 3. *Catholic and Uniat clerical numbers at 31 March 1790*

Area	Total clergy	Secular nos before additions	New secular clergy created	Total secular clergy	Regular clergy	Of which nuns	Regular clergy as % of total clergy
Lower Austria	3,362	1,445	366	1,811	1,551	201	46.1
Upper Austria	1,193	735	84	819	374	78	31.3
Inner Austria	4,390	2,552	472	3,024	1,366	251	30.6
Tyrol and Vorarlberg	1,872	1,367	178	1,545	327	58	17.5
Further Austria	1,978	737	78	815	1,163	409	58.8
Bohemia	4,945	2,823	758	3,581	1,364	38	27.6
Moravia-Silesia	2,830	1,660	509	2,169	661	37	23.4
Galicja	7,157	5,128	309	5,437	1,720	190	24.0
<i>Sub total</i>	<i>27,727</i>	<i>16,447</i>	<i>2,754</i>	<i>19,201</i>	<i>8,526</i>	<i>1,262</i>	<i>30.7</i>
Hungary	8,505	3,882	2,212	6,094	2,411	361	28.3
Transylvania	2,243	1,890	—	1,890	353	14	15.7
Totals	38,475	22,219	4,966	27,185	11,290	1,637	29.3

Regulars are not divided in the source into endowed and mendicant. 'New secular clergy' includes seminary students, see Table 5 and text. Source: HHSA Nachl. Zinzendorf Hs 14, a miscellany on ecclesiastical and other subjects, fos. 67-79, 'Ausweis der in sämmtlichen deutschen Erblanden amnoch bestehenden Säkular und Regular Geistlichkeit', part of a report from *Hofrat* Schimelfenning of the *Stiftungs und Städtische Buchhalterei* dated 31 Mar. 1790.

The question of numbers will be addressed first. Table 3, which is based on a series of returns from the *Stiftungs- und Städtische Buchhalterei* dated 31 March 1790, preserved in Count Karl Zinzendorf's papers, shows clerical personnel at this date in the central lands of the Monarchy divided into seculars and regulars. The picture is striking. The total clerical population, numbering perhaps 47,000 before the emperor got to work, as argued earlier, had fallen to 38,000.<sup>27</sup> Within this total, however, thanks to the creation of nearly 5,000 new secular clergy (including students), secular numbers had increased from an original 22,000, a figure substantially in line with that presented in Table 1, to over 27,000. In stark contrast, regular numbers had shrunk from an estimated 25,000 before the 'Klostersturm' to just over 11,000, reducing the proportion of religious from fifty three to twenty nine per cent. Here, by contemporary radical criteria, was enlightened reform indeed.

It is noticeable from the table that female religious contracted especially sharply. Only 1,637 nuns remained in service in the entire central lands of the Monarchy, whereas the 1768 census of population had listed 3,256 in the Austrian and Bohemian lands alone.<sup>28</sup> The new, leaner, church was a male domain. The documents consulted throw no light on the still controversial question of how many religious houses were dissolved; but appear authoritative on the issue of clerical numbers, a subject on which, as noted, disparate, and sometimes absurd, contemporary estimates abound.<sup>29</sup> The 1790 returns show 4,006 pensioned religious (2,104 of them nuns) at this date in the Austrian-Bohemian lands and Galicia, and 1,369 (167 of them nuns) in the Hungarian lands, a total of 5,375 persons. What happened to the remainder of the 14,000 evicted religious cannot be elucidated from these sources. Some monks must have been used as parish priests, and there are references to this, but the detail requires investigation. Presumably there was no future within the church for former nuns.<sup>30</sup>

---

*Religionsfond* with which the government financed a wholesale diocesan and parochial reorganization... Old parishes were reorganized and new ones created.'

<sup>27</sup> As a partial check, the numbers in the table for the Bohemian and Austrian lands and Galicia, less Tyrol and Further Austria, come to 23,877. The 1790 population census, excluding Tyrol and Further Austria, listed 24,051 clergy in this area, Dickson, 1, Table 3.2. As already noted, in the Hungarian lands the large numbers of Protestant pastors and Orthodox priests included in the census totals make similar corroboration unfeasible.

<sup>28</sup> For 1768 see Grossmann, p. 403. This excluded Tyrol. Three returns were for 1763. The partial data for nuns in Table 1 above, however, suggest that they were proportionally much less important than in Spain even before Joseph's reforms.

<sup>29</sup> J. Pezzl's statement in 1790 that there were 2,024 religious houses 'in the Austrian states' with 63,000 monks and nuns, and that Joseph dissolved 700 houses, reducing numbers to 27,000, is most often cited, but variations exist, see Dickson, 1, 70. In V.-L. Tapié, *Monarchie et pays du Danube* (1969), p. 243 the same numbers are applied to Bohemia alone. On the present state of the evidence, 530 out of 1,188 houses in the central lands were dissolved, Dickson, 1, 76. Dividing this into the 3.6 m. fl. revenue of the Religious Fund (see Table 6 below) gives an average revenue per dissolved house of 6,830 fl.

<sup>30</sup> Numbers of regulars at the start of the dissolutions were c. 25,000, as argued above. Deducting c. 11,000 (Table 3) in service in 1790 leaves 14,000 persons. The returns in HKA

The composition of the secular clergy whose provincial totals form the second to fourth columns of Table 3 is a subject of considerable interest. This was, after all, the section of the church which, according to Joseph and his advisers, was most useful, and particularly needed to expand. Its pre-reform structure, labelled in the 1790 returns the 'Alter Stand', is set out in Table 4. On the eve of Joseph's additions to their numbers, the seculars comprised eight archbishops, 36 bishops, 2,347 'beneficed persons' (*Benefiziaten*), a title which is not adequately explained in the returns, 12,857 parish priests, (*Pfarrer*), 1,094 local chaplains (*Lokalkapläne*) and 5,877 co-operators (*Ko-operatoren*), presumably helpers or assistants.<sup>31</sup> The irregularity of the figures is noteworthy. The Hungarian lands, for instance, with less population (and a lower proportion of Catholics) than the others had 21 bishoprics against their fifteen. Galicia had over half the parish priests in the non-Hungarian lands, the majority Uniat; but none of the 'co-operators' who were numerous elsewhere. As the last column in the table, which is additional to those in the source, indicates, the population (of 1780) served by each member of the secular clergy varied between 309 for Görz-Gradisca, and 377 for pious Tyrol, to nearly 1,000 in the Bohemian lands. The relative thinness of provision there helps explain official concern about this at the time of the outbreak of Moravian Protestantism in 1777-80, which provided the trigger to the Toleration Patent of 1781.<sup>32</sup>

Although the precise meaning of all the clerical categories is not clear, the secular army of the pre-reform church, with its phalanx of archbishops, bishops and beneficed persons, its solid body of parish priests, and its long tail of clerical auxiliaries, appears rather like a Catholic version of the contemporary Anglican church, with its disparate bishoprics, parishes of widely differing worth, and army of indigent, often married, curates. Joseph's clerical reforms, much trumpeted at the time, often in terms which implied a considerable increase in the numbers of parish priests, enlarged this structure rather than changing it.<sup>33</sup> The figures, already given as totals in Table 3, are

---

Oberster Rechnungshof A.94 refer to 186 monks used as priests in Bohemia, 64 in Tyrol, 33 in Further Austria. Presumably they continued to serve even if their houses were later dissolved. A *Hofentschliessung* of 21 Jul. 1786 ordered that pensioned ex-religious should be brought into parish duties (*Seelsorge*), Hempel-Kürsinger, III, 588-9. Cp. also n. 33 below.

<sup>31</sup> 'Benefiziaten' was applied in the earlier returns to all who had a share in church revenues, see n. 24. In Table 3 it is obviously less inclusive. It may include holders of 'simple benefices', discussed *ibid.* For the sees involved, see the notes to the table.

<sup>32</sup> For the composition of the Galician clergy see n. 21 above. The 1786 figs. were simply repeated in 1790. The issue of Moravian Protestantism is most recently discussed in Beales, pp. 465-73.

<sup>33</sup> *Handbuch aller Verordnungen*, II, 219-24 prints the often-cited patent of 24 Oct. 1783 stipulating creation of new priests and local chaplains wherever people were more than an hour from their parish church. The patent stated that 263 new 'Seelsorger' had already been installed in Lower Austria, partly from ex-religious. The term 'Seelsorger' (someone with cure of souls), often employed in government edicts, blurred the distinction between priests and lower grades of clergy. Cp. Mitrofanov, p. 703, citing government decrees: 'a thick net of parishes was now extended over the whole country', 263 in Austria (*sic*), 158 in Styria, 180 in Moravia.

Table 4. Structure of the secular clergy before Joseph II's additions to their numbers

Area	Arch- bishops	Bishops	Beneficed persons	Parish priests	Local chaplains	Co- operators	Total	Ratio of persons to secular clergy (1780 census)
Lower Austria	1	2	265	502	52	623	1,445	688 (est.)
Upper Austria	—	—	65	303	57	310	735	822 (est.)
Styria	—	1	62	312	76	459	910	886
Carinthia	—	2	76	233	70	129	510	573
Krain	1	1	144	228	139	182	695	578
Trieste	—	—	36	3	9	5	53	377 (est.)
Görs-Gradiska	—	1	137	64	97	85	384	300
Tyrol	—	—	422	480	108	357	1,367	481
Further Austria	—	—	197	405	64	71	737	462
Bohemia	1	2	236	1,238	141	1,205	2,823	903
Moravia-Silesia	1	2	96	538	235	788	1,660	870
Galicja	2	4	318	4,775	29	—	5,128	541
<i>Subtotal</i>	6	15	2,054	9081	1,077	4,214	16,447	668
Hungary	2	19	283	2,465	—	1,113	3,882	n.a.
Transylvania	—	2	10	1,311	17	550	1,890	n.a.
<i>Subtotal</i>	2	21	293	3,776	17	1,663	5,772	
Total	8	36	2,347	12,857	1,094	5,877	22,219	

Sources: The ratios in the last column are calculated from the 1780 population figures in Dickson, *Finance and government*, Table 2.2. The combined census population in Lower and Upper Austria is separated by applying the ratio between their populations in 1790. Trieste population is estimated as 20,000. For the remaining data, see Table 3.

*Notes*

*Archbishopsrics and bishoprics.* The source gives only numbers. The archdioceses and sees involved were probably (there are still some uncertainties) as follows: *Lower Austria*: Vienna (archbishop), Passau and Wiener-Neustadt; *Styria*: Seckau; *Carinthia*: Gurk, Lavant; *Krain*: Görz (archbishop), Laibach; *Bohemia*: Prague (archbishop), Königgrätz, Leitmeritz; *Moravia-Silesia*: Olmütz (archbishop), Breslau, Brünn; *Galicja*: Lemberg (Roman Catholic and Armenian Catholic archbishops), Gracow and Przemysl (Roman Catholic bishops) Lemberg and Przemysl (Uniat bishops). In *Hungary* Gran (Esztergom) and Kalocsa (archbishops). Bishops: Agram, Csanád, Erlau, Fünfkirchen, Grosswardein, Neusohl, Neutra, Raab, Rosenau, Steinamanger, Stuhlweissenburg, Syrmia, Veszprem, Wäizen, Zengg, Zips, all Roman Catholic; Kreuz, Grosswardein, and Munkács (Uniat). Neusohl, Rosenau, and Zips were new Catholic sees created in 1776. In Transylvania the sees were Karlsburg (R.C.), also denominated 'Transylvania' and Blasendorf. Austrian dioceses are identified from Österr. Akad. d. Wissenschaften, *Historischer Atlas der österreichischen Alpenländer* (5 pts., Vienna, 1906-51) II/ii (1951), *Pfarr- und Diözesankarte von Österreich*, p. 1, episcopal boundaries in 1750, no later dates shown. For Galicja, see H. Glassl, *Das österreichische Einrichtungswerk in Galizien 1772-1790* (Wiesbaden, 1975), pp. 126-35. Hungarian and Transylvanian sees are named (defectively) in Latin in the *Court Calendar*. I am greatly indebted to Dr R. J. W. Evans for an amended list, and for referring me to J. Pelesz, *Gesch. d. Union der römischen Kirche mit Rom* (2 vols., Vienna, 1881) and J. Tomko, *Die Errichtung der Diözesen Zips, Neusohl und Rosenau, und das königliche Patronatsrecht in Ungarn* (Vienna, 1968). The latter is an important monograph, with a supporting annexe of documents.

set out in detail in Table 5, and show a clear pattern. Joseph made 4,966 new appointments, nearly half of them in Hungary (no additions were made in Transylvania). But 2,110 of these were students (*Alumni*) in the nine new, and highly controversial, General Seminaries, 1,161 were local chaplains, and 1,040 'co-operators' or helpers.<sup>34</sup> Together they composed no less than 87 per cent of the new clergy; only 24 'beneficed persons' and 628 parish priests were appointed, with three new bishops to round off the operation.

The last point deserves amplification. The new bishoprics, of Budweis in Bohemia, Linz in Upper Austria, and Leoben in Styria, to which Tarnów in Galicia (see below) should probably be added, were the remnant of a much more ambitious plan to reconstruct the entire episcopate in the Bohemian–Austrian lands. (The Hungarian sees, revised in the 1770s, were left as they were.) The emperor's original intention, expounded to the Pope in November 1783, was to exclude a dozen foreign prelates, notably the important sees of Constanz, Cracow, Passau and Salzburg, from their lands and jurisdictions in the Monarchy, and to create from these five new bishoprics (Bregenz, Budweis, Judenburg, Linz, Tarnów) as well as reconstructing those of Trent and Brixen which, though within Austrian territory, were formally independent Estates of the Holy Roman Empire. His aim was to exclude foreign spiritual jurisdiction and make episcopal and secular boundaries coincide.

As with his other ecclesiastical reforms, Joseph, despite his declarations of a right to act unilaterally on temporal issues, repeatedly tried to procure papal consent for his rationalizing policy. His main problem, however, was not Petrine opposition, Pius VI in December 1783 nervously declaring assent in principle, but that of his episcopal neighbours, most of them Estates of the Empire with influence in the Diet at Ratisbon. The new see of Budweis only needed the agreement of the archbishop of Prague (January 1786). Tarnów, which had been in contemplation since 1773, was more difficult, requiring prolonged discussion with the Republic of Poland and the papacy before agreement was reached with the former in July 1785, the latter in March 1786. The new sees (1783–4) of Linz and St Pölten, the latter a reconstruction of the existing diocese of Wiener-Neustadt, involved an assault on the rights of the see of Passau which caused political repercussions at the highest imperial level, agitating the Elector Archbishop of Mainz, and eliciting embarrassing offers of support at the *Reichstag* from the four Protestant Electors. This was at a time when Kaunitz was desperately trying to improve Austria's imperial image. The archbishop of Salzburg mounted an even more bitter resistance over his rights in Inner Austria, where the new see of Leoben (a substitute for Judenburg) was to be flanked by increments, at his expense, to Gurk, Lavant and Seckau. The issues were settled by a treaty (April 1786) in which the

<sup>34</sup> The General Seminaries, state-supervised institutions for clerical training, were in Vienna, Prague, Olmütz, Graz, Innsbruck, Freiburg-im-Breisgau, Lemberg, Pressburg and Pest, the last an amalgamation of two others, ex inf. Dr R. J. W. Evans. Three more were established in Louvain, Luxembourg and Pavia. Episcopal and monastic training colleges were closed and their resources transferred to the seminaries, Hempel-Kürsinger, III, 518–19 (30 Mar. 1783), 548–9 (8 Jun. 1784).

Table 5. *Joseph II's additions to numbers of secular clergy*

	Archbishops	Bishops	Beneficed persons	General				Total
				General seminary students	Parish priests	Local chaplains	Co-operators	
Lower Austria	—	—	—	170	58	49	89	366
Upper Austria	—	1	8	—	17	20	38	84
Styria	—	1	8	157	36	88	23	313
Carinthia	—	—	—	—	13	4	48	65
Krain	—	—	—	—	9	37	10	56
Görz-Gradisca	—	—	—	—	3	18	6	27
Trieste	—	—	—	—	—	2	9	11
Tyrol	—	—	—	137	1	9	31	178
Further Austria	—	—	—	63	1	4	10	78
Bohemia	—	1	8	190	118	298	143	758
Moravia-Silesia	—	—	—	96	79	206	128	509
Galicia	—	—	—	274	7	17	11	309
<i>Subtotal</i>	—	3	24	1087	342	752	546	2754
Hungary	—	—	—	1023	286	409	494	2212
Transylvania	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	—	3	24	2110	628	1161	1040	4966

*Source:* see Table 3.

archbishop retained his metropolitan jurisdiction, including rights of nomination, which it had been a primary object of Joseph's policies to exclude. The remainder of the emperor's episcopal master-plan could not be realized. The project for a see of Bregenz was resisted in Tyrol, and by the bishops of Trent and Brixen, who moved closer to the *Fürstenbund*. The powerful bishop of Constanz successfully defended his rights in Further Austria. Prussia refused an accord over episcopal boundaries in Silesia. In the same year (1787) the Pope refused to make the see of Laibach, whose holder he suspected of heresy, into an archbishopric. The completion of Joseph's design for the Austrian episcopate had to wait till the teeth of the *Reich* bishops were drawn by the *Reichsdeputationshauptschluss* in 1803.<sup>35</sup>

Returning from the bishoprics to the emperor's subordinate appointments, the 'Neue Zuwachs', or new increase, to use the nomenclature of the returns of 1790, did have the intended effect of lessening the populations served by each secular. If seminary students are, somewhat simplistically, included in the calculation, Bohemian numbers dropped to 791, those in Moravia-Silesia to 732, those in Lower Austria to 549, for example.<sup>36</sup> Whether this purely arithmetical effect was mirrored in higher church attendance is another matter. It should also be noted that the new clergy created were not conspicuously well paid. The patent for the Hereditary Lands of 24 October 1783 stated that new *Pfarrer* were to be paid 600 fl. annually, *Lokalkapläne* 350 fl. and *Ko-operatoren* only 250 fl. Everyone else was to keep their existing revenues.<sup>37</sup> These amounts, equivalent, significantly, to those of lower officialdom, suggest that the increase in numbers was done on the cheap. Lastly, there is evidence that the government would have liked the increase (and perhaps the salaries) to be larger, but could not afford it. A return by

<sup>35</sup> The 24 beneficed persons in Table 5 must have been the canons of the three new cathedrals: cathedrals were in future to have eight each, Hempel-Kürsinger, III, 598-9, *Hofdekret* 2 Feb. 1787. The three bishops and their chapters were paid 120,000 fl., see p. 19 below. For the emperor's episcopal plans see Schlitter, II, 59-66, based on Joseph's undated letter to Pius VI of 16 or 17 Nov. 1783; Aretin, I, 137-47, the fullest account, though not drawing on Schlitter; Maass, *Josephinismus* II, documents of 1783-9, especially those of 1787 on the proposed archbishopric for Laibach; T. C. W. Blanning, *Reform and Revolution in Mainz 1743-1803* (C.U.P., 1974), pp. 213-15; H. Glassl, *Das österreichische Einrichtungswerk in Galizien (1772-1790)* (Wiesbaden, 1975), pp. 126-35. For the Hungarian bishoprics, see the notes to Table 4. It seems clear from Glassl that the acquisition of Galicia forced the issue of new sees on the Austrians, and formed a precedent for Joseph. The absence of an entry for Tarnów in Table 5 is curious. The failure to enter St Pölten under Lower Austria is perhaps due to its being a merger rather than a fresh creation, Hempel-Kürsinger, III, 530-1, *Hofentschliessung* 21 Nov. 1783, bishopric of Wiener-Neustadt to be transferred to St Pölten. For discussions after 1803, see Maass, *Josephinismus*, IV (1957), introd. section 4 and 1804 docts., esp. 46, Colloredo to emperor, 11 Apr. 1804.

<sup>36</sup> Dividing combined numbers of secular clergy including students, in Tables 4 and 5 into the population of 1790 in Dickson, I, Table 2.2. Claims for much greater reductions were made at the time.

<sup>37</sup> For this patent see n. 33 above. The passage about the remaining clergy runs 'von Bischofe anzufangen mithin auch Stifter, Klöster, Pfarreien und Benefiziaten bleiben vollkommen bei ihrem ieszigen Genüsse'. Mitrofanov, p. 702, treats the salaries of 600 fl., 350 fl. and 250 fl. as applying to all clergy, citing a *Hofdekret* of 18 June 1785. This in fact referred only to the new appointments, Hempel-Kürsinger, III, 568-9.

Table 6. *Structure of net ecclesiastical revenues, 1 March 1790 (fl.)*

	Austrian-Bohemian lands and Galicia	Hungarian lands	Total
Ordinary net revenues	11,987,945	4,248,508	16,236,453
Religious Fund	2,667,939	951,985	3,619,924
Total	14,655,884	5,200,493	19,856,377

Source: HHSa Nachl. Zinzendorf Hs. 14 fos. 143-55.

*Hofrat* Kressel dated March 1787 shows the number of new parishes (hence priests) in the non-Hungarian lands as 562, instead of the 342 actually created, and the number of local chaplaincies as 1,095, instead of 752. *Ko-operatoren* totalled 509, compared with 546 actually started. The larger figures in the first two classes must represent unrealized state ambitions.<sup>38</sup>

To explain this, it is necessary to return to the subject of ecclesiastical revenue. The 1790 returns specify this in some detail, its structure reflecting the changes made in the personnel and duties of the church. The overall position can be summarized as follows. (See Table 6.)

Gross total income, from which 357,952 fl. interest payable out of the ordinary revenues was deducted to yield the net figure stated here, was 20,214,329 fl., the same as the 20.2 m. fl. estimated earlier for 1780. Now, however, 3.6 m. fl. of it was administered by the Religious Fund (*Religionsfond*) set up in 1782, intended to receive the revenues from dissolved houses, and finance the appointments of new clergy and the pensions of ex-monks and nuns. As has long been recognized, and was recognized at the time, this was a momentous development, perhaps a half-way house to total confiscation of ecclesiastical income. But the new material, even though sparing in its information about the Fund in 1790, shows that in purely accounting terms it was only precariously solvent, with an expenditure, 3,522,000 fl., perilously close to revenue. This confirms, as the partial record in Hock and Bidermann's history of the *Staatsrat* has long indicated, that the whole operation of milking the church was more problematical than was initially realized. Their study shows that in 1788 the Fund outside the Hungarian lands was in an even worse position, with 2,005,000 fl. revenue and 2,096,000 fl. expenditure. The

<sup>38</sup> HHSa Kaiser Franz Akten, Karton 72 (includes old refs. 73-75a) 75a fos. 1-3, 'Verzeichnis der neu-errichteten Pfarren sowie der aufgehobenen u. weiter bestehenden Stifte und Klöster in den österreichischen Erblanden'. None of the figures in this return can be accepted uncritically. The conflict over numbers of new clerical appointments is referred to in Hock-Bidermann, pp. 423-4, but not examined systematically. Tomek, *Kirchengeschichte*, III, 449 gives numbers of new appointments in Upper and Lower Austria which appear to be taken from Kressel's return. This is also true of J. Wodka, *Kirche in Österreich* (Vienna, 1959), p. 309, figures for Upper Austria and Styria (those for Lower Austria are higher).

Table 7. *Net revenue (excluding Religious Fund) of the Austrian church by area, 1790 (fl.)*

	Mendicant houses	Endowed houses	Convents	Regulars subtotal	Parishes and local chaplains	Churches and chapels	Simple benefices	Seculars subtotal	Total net revenue
Lower Austria	352,835	577,353	56,941	987,129	569,789	437,599	201,316	1,208,704	2,195,833
Upper Austria	39,300	287,512	17,691	344,503	329,662	260,532	27,013	617,207	961,710
Styria	146,797	63,946	17,765	228,508	312,966	189,392	29,480	531,838	760,346
Carinthia	26,893	41,042	13,637	81,572	170,455	125,124	75,819	371,398	452,970
Krain	33,417	—	7,421	40,838	159,601	105,524	58,421	323,546	364,384
Görz- Gradisca	22,200	4,413	10,084	36,697	62,822	50,650	49,584	163,056	199,753
Trieste	4,668	—	5,017	9,685	5,406	4,572	12,067	22,045	31,730
Tyrol & Vb.	105,458	110,622	36,725	252,805	360,913	326,669	139,653	827,235	1,080,040
Further Austria	110,419	189,863	142,719	443,001	253,316	168,871	85,260	507,447	950,448
Bohemia	230,593	301,769	35,224	567,586	936,513	693,929	258,661	1,889,103	2,456,689
Moravia- Silesia	134,511	76,105	8,075	218,691	555,265	237,601	247,889	1,040,755	1,259,446
Galicia	212,347	93,131	43,159	348,637	522,199	208,940	194,820	925,959	1,274,596
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>1,419,438</i>	<i>1,745,756</i>	<i>394,458</i>	<i>3,559,652</i>	<i>4,238,907</i>	<i>2,809,403</i>	<i>1,379,983</i>	<i>8,428,293</i>	<i>11,987,945</i>
% subtotal	11·8	14·6	3·3	29·7	35·4	23·4	11·5	70·3	100·0
Hungary	369,958	136,884	79,149	585,991	1,208,151	463,310	1,597,188	3,268,649	3,854,640
Transylvania	49,377	4,910	3,309	57,596	261,172	33,948	41,152	336,272	393,868
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>419,335</i>	<i>141,794</i>	<i>82,458</i>	<i>643,587</i>	<i>1,469,323</i>	<i>497,258</i>	<i>1,638,340</i>	<i>3,604,921</i>	<i>4,248,508</i>
Total	1,838,773	1,887,550	476,916	4,203,239	5,708,230	3,306,661	3,018,323	12,033,214	16,236,453
% of total revenue	11·3	11·6	2·9	25·9	35·2	20·4	18·6	74·1	100·0

Source: HHSA Nachl. Zinzendorf Hs. 14 fos. 87-142.

shortfall had to be made good from capital. Their analysis of (non-Hungarian) expenditure exposes the nature of the problem. The new bishoprics and their chapters took 120,000 fl., the General Seminaries 149,000 fl. and the new priests (*sic*) 321,000 fl., in all 590,000 fl., or 60 per cent of an 'ordinary' expenditure of 991,000 fl. Of the remaining, extraordinary, expenditure of 1,105,000 fl., no less than 846,000 fl. (77 per cent) comprised monastic and other pensions. If it had been possible to shoot the ex-monks and nuns, the Fund's problems could have been resolved. Failing this, a better use of monastic property in hand was the only way forward. But Joseph did not decide on a policy of land sales or leases until September 1789, and was still arguing about the price of sales in Hungary in January 1790, a month before his death.<sup>39</sup>

The 1790 returns set out more extensively the much larger revenues which the church continued to administer itself, though even here more information, and in particular more explanation, would be welcome. A summary of net revenue by provinces and types of proprietor (mendicant houses, endowed houses etc.) is presented in Table 7. The original reduces the sources of gross revenue to three, land (*Realitäten*), capital (*Kapitalien*), presumably government and other bonds, and 'particular receipts' (*Besondere Zuflüsse*), which probably largely comprised endowments for saying Masses, lighting candles to the dead, and so on. The subtotals of the revenue sources were land 6,437,300 fl. (38·8 per cent), capital 3,511,428 fl. (21·2 per cent) and 'particular receipts' 6,645,677 fl. (40·0 per cent). This indicates that while land was an important source of revenue, funds perhaps also derived from lands, but earmarked for particular purposes, were equally so. Church holdings of bonds, assuming these were mostly those of the government, were substantial, perhaps approaching 90 million fl. of a state debt of *c.* 350 millions. The three categories add to a gross revenue of 16,594,405 fl., which interest payable, shown above, reduces to the net total in the table.

<sup>39</sup> Hock-Bidermann, pp. 427-32, the only account based on archival material, though not systematic in treatment. Table 6 shows that the estimate of 3·3 m. fl. for the revenue of the Religious Fund in Dickson, *Finance and government*, I, 76 is too low. The source for the table gives the Fund's expenditure as 2,650,073 fl. in the Austrian-Bohemian lands and Galicia and 872,139 fl. (842,569 fl. in Hungary) in the Hungarian lands, a total of 3,522,212 fl. The capitalized value of the revenues is stated as 16,449,372 fl. in the Hungarian lands and 44,422,682 fl. in the remainder, giving a total of 60,872,054 fl., the '60 million gulden' often cited in the literature. The capitalization took land at 5% (i.e. 20 years' purchase). No analysis of revenue is given for the Hungarian lands, but on this basis rents there cannot have exceeded 800,000 fl. In the remainder, land was worth 25,854,280 fl., implying a revenue of 1,292,714 fl., the capital value of bonds was 18,194,908 fl., and 373,494 fl. was held in cash. The figures are close to those in Hock-Bidermann, p. 427. The data show that applying 20 years' purchase to the whole revenue of the Fund, as in Dickson, *Finance and government*, gives too high a valuation. The question of monastic sales has not been satisfactorily examined, though the literature always makes large general statements. A modern treatment of the dissolutions in Lower Austria, G. Winner, *Die Klosteraufhebungen in Niederösterreich und Wien* (Vienna, 1967) contains a mass of confusing detail, out no overall picture. It seems clear from the existing evidence that while movables (church ornaments etc.) were sold or given to seculars, there was no extensive sale of monastic lands before Joseph's death.

The recipients of revenue are those defined by the *Geistliche Hofkommission* in its initial giant inquiry into the church.<sup>40</sup> As the table shows, mendicant and endowed religious houses, which presumably still contained unequal numbers, continued to have more or less equal incomes, and convents to be poor. For mendicants, 'other sources' provided the largest revenue, for endowed houses, rents. Nuns had a little of each. Parish revenue (35 per cent of the total) was of primary importance, but 'churches and chapels' (20 per cent) and 'simple benefices' (19 per cent), had far from negligible shares. Parish income was largely from land and 'other sources', rather than securities. The revenue of 'churches and chapels' and 'simple benefices' came from all three more or less equally. The biggest structural change by 1790, reflecting the altered composition of the clergy itself, was the reduction in monastic income. Table 2 showed that in five areas before the dissolutions it averaged thirty seven per cent of total church income, and this seems likely to have been a representative figure for the central lands as a whole. By 1790 (combining Tables 6 and 7) it was reduced to a mere twenty one per cent. Even when allowance is made for the monastic pensions charged on the Religious Fund, which would somewhat raise this proportion, the contrast with the pre-Josephine position is striking. For true radicals, the lure of a service church, uncluttered by 'useless' religious members, no doubt already beckoned.

Summarizing from the preceding exposition, and rounding, Joseph found the Austrian church in the central lands staffed with 47,000 clergy, of whom 25,000 were regulars, or their lay helpers. His creation of 5,000 new secular clergy (including students) brought secular numbers up from 22,000 to 27,000 by 1790, but the simultaneous ejection of 14,000 religious reduced the overall clerical total to 38,000, a reduction of twenty five per cent. Church revenue remained constant at about 20 m. fl., but by 1790 3.6 m. fl. of this had been hived off to the Religious Fund, which paid for the new clergy, monastic pensions, and so on. Over 600 new parishes were created, and a serious attempt, at least, was made to rationalize the diocesan structure. Kaunitz and others had proposed a revolution in the church. Joseph effected it.

The qualifications to this assessment must, however, be recalled. First, Joseph's revolution was less revolutionary than it might have been. He was initially credited with the wish to create a state-financed church based on a total confiscation of ecclesiastical property. In apparent confirmation, he had plans drawn up as early as 1781 to put the Austrian clergy on fixed salaries, and declared two years later that expropriation was the surer course to follow. Mitrofanov and other authors say that he did follow it. Had he actually done so, the new Austrian church would have resembled the French church under the Civil Constitution of the Clergy of 1790. But Joseph in fact drew back, ordering instead the systematic investigation of clerical revenues examined here.<sup>41</sup> Its results may have suggested the policy in fact adopted, of leaving

<sup>40</sup> See also n. 24 above. The statement about church bondholdings assumes that the interest received was 4%.

<sup>41</sup> For the views imputed to Joseph see Mitrofanov, p. 792, Barthélemy to Vergennes, 16 Jun. 1781, 'On connaît depuis longtemps la volonté qu'a l'Empereur de s'emparer des biens du Clergé

most revenues under church control, but regularly monitored by the state, while the Religious Fund financed new appointments.<sup>42</sup> Certainly in doing this Joseph lessened the opposition which a frontal assault on church property as a whole would have caused, coming on the heels of his battles with the Pope, and the *Reich* bishops, his dissolution of half the monastic houses, and the apparent threat his new *Grundsteuer* offered to all landed income. An almost equally drastic step would have been to close the monasteries down completely. Although, however, the logic of the arguments used by Kaunitz and others, as noted earlier, implied this, it was not taken.<sup>43</sup> Again, the church might have proved a crock of gold, able to finance a really well-paid and highly-qualified secular clergy. On inquiry, its revenues proved inadequate to this vision, and the new Josephine clergy were less numerous than was initially hoped, less well paid, and heavily weighted towards subaltern appointments. The partial evidence for archiepiscopal and episcopal incomes, which shows that average revenue was well short of 100,000 fl., suggests that even had a grand policy of expropriation been pursued, there would not have been enough to pay everybody properly.<sup>44</sup> Connected to this, Joseph's recasting of Austrian

---

et son peu de respect pour la propriété de ses sujets.' For Joseph's view that expropriation was the surer policy, see Hock-Bidermann, p. 419n., Joseph to *Hofrat* Kressel, 17 Jan. 1783, also in Schlitter, II, 58-9. The official line was that the church was only a trustee for the lands that it held, and that the state had the right to appropriate any surplus over and above clerical needs, Hock-Bidermann, p. 418, citing Joseph's patent of 5 Oct. 1782. Pius VI feared in Aug. 1782 that Joseph meant to confiscate all church property, leading him to compare the Emperor to Wycliffe and Hus, Schlitter, II, 51-2. For *Hofrat* Heinke's scale of proposed clerical salaries, dated 14 Mar. 1781, see Maass, *Josephinismus*, III, 284-91. In this plan, which was supported by the arguments just referred to, all clergy would remain in possession of their property, but pay its revenues into a 'Religions- und Pfarr Cassa' in each land. Archbishops would then draw 24,000 fl. yearly, bishops 6-18,000 fl., other clergy 2,000 down to 200 fl. Mitrofanov, pp. 683-4, 701-2, says episcopal property was expropriated and the archbishops, bishops and clergy placed on fixed salaries, and has been followed by later writers.

<sup>42</sup> As seen, the patent of 24 Oct. 1783 stated that the clergy were to retain their existing revenues. However, the emperor wanted initially to redistribute church revenue surpluses towards poor clergy and new clergy, as his agenda of 15 June 1782 (n. 6 above) show. An intention to restrict clerics to self-assessed levels of 'necessary' income, and cream off the surplus for new clergy and the retained regulars, is clear from the returns procured by the *Geistliche Hofkommission* (see Table 1). These contained a series of columns for this purpose, under the heading 'Future need' (*Künftiger Bedarf*). Significantly, apart from Lower Austria all are left blank. Beidtel, Book 2, argues that the church, save the dissolved houses, kept its property, but was subjected to strict state supervision and became gradually poorer.

<sup>43</sup> Cp. Mitrofanov, p. 695, a report from Vienna to the Duke of Hesse (*sic*), 24 Sept. 1785: all the religious houses will be dissolved if war comes. Beidtel p. 65 states, though as usual without adducing evidence, 'Under Joseph II people did not believe that religious houses would last long. The plans of many persons of importance envisaged their complete dissolution.'

<sup>44</sup> In Galicia, the archbishop of Lemberg's revenue in 1777 was 20,000 fl.; the richest bishopric, Przemysl, had 41,000 fl., the Uniát bishop of Lemberg 15,000 fl., the Armenian Catholic archbishop of Lemberg 1,250 fl., Glassl, *Einrichtungswerk*, pp. 128-30. In Hungary in 1784, the vacant archbishopric of Kalocsa was credited with a gross revenue of over 79,000 fl., reduced by compulsory deductions to 47,000 fl. The net revenues of the vacant sees of Győr (Raab) and Nyitra were put at 28,000 fl. and 20,000 fl., Magyar Országos Levéltár, A.39, 1784/10, 112. I am grateful to Professor Kosáry for sending me photocopies of the relevant Chancellery documents. Austrian domestic bishoprics were small: Wiener-Neustadt, Gurk, Seckau, Lavant. Great

dioceses, and exclusion of external episcopal jurisdictions, was far less extensive than he originally intended. The Josephine church, in short, was a compromise between the emperor's characteristically extreme and logical, though not always consistent, intentions and the limitations imposed by political and financial reality, a state of affairs encountered in many of his other policies.

### III

What happened later? Did the Josephine church, whose restricted status Metternich notoriously disliked, but the Emperor Francis I was determined to preserve, change its shape in the *Biedermeierzeit*?<sup>45</sup> The final set of figures (Table 8) attempts at least a statistical response to this question by displaying the church's structure on the eve of the 1848 revolutions. The subheadings across the Table are archbishoprics, bishoprics, cathedrals, parishes and local chaplaincies. The cross totals of these entities do not add up to the figures in the next column for total secular clergy, even when allowance is made for cathedral canons and the inclusion in the total of 4,398 theological students. This implies that parishes and local chaplaincies may have had more than one incumbent. The table excludes Further Austria, lost to the Monarchy in 1797/1805, also Lombardy, Venetia and Dalmatia, where there was a numerous clergy (21,628, 3,630 of whom were regulars). It includes Uniat priests, important in Galicia and the Hungarian lands, but excludes Greek Orthodox and Protestant ones, numerous in the latter.<sup>46</sup> The fullness of the statistics for clergy, though not for their revenue, as is shown next, indicates that the government still kept a watchful eye on the personnel of the church.

The most surprising feature of the Table is perhaps that overall secular and regular numbers were not significantly higher than those of 1790 (see Table 3), even though population had by now nearly doubled. Joseph II's intention

---

religious houses like Melk, which remained undissolved, did not have princely incomes, see Dickson, I, 98. The evidence about bishoprics is admittedly suggestive not conclusive.

<sup>45</sup> Metternich's advocacy of loosening control over the church and recruiting its political support is sketched in Srbik's biography, and documented at length in Maass, *Der Josephinismus*, vols. IV and V. The variations in his policy towards the papacy 1809-38 are examined in detail in Alan J. Reinerman, *Austria and the Papacy in the Age of Metternich* (Cath. U. Amer. P., 2 vols. 1979, 1989). While definitive for state policy, these studies do not discuss church structure or finance. Other literature on this subject in the period 1815-48 is also unsatisfactory. Wandruszka and Urbanitsch, *Die Konfessionen* and Tomek, *Kirchengeschichte*, III, are not informative. Nor is E. Hosp, *Kirche Österreichs im Vormärz 1815-1850* (Vienna and Munich, 1971), though containing much other information. Beidtel, Books 4-6, covering 1792-1848, and A. Beer, 'Kirchliche Angelegenheiten in Österreich (1816-1842)', *Mitt. d. Inst. f. österr. Geschichtsforschung*, XVIII (1897), 493-581 are similarly unhelpful.

<sup>46</sup> *Tafeln zur Statistik der Österreichischen Monarchie für die Jahre 1847 und 1848* (2 vols., Vienna, 1853), Tafel 10, 'Clerus in den Jahren 1847 und 1848'. In Galicia, the secular clergy at this date comprised 1,761 Catholics, 2,335 Uniat and 301 Greek Orthodox. In the Bohemian-Austrian lands and Galicia, only 208 Protestant pastors are shown. Hungary had 6,358 Catholic priests, 1,128 Uniat, 1,830 Greek Orthodox and 2,422 Protestant pastors. In Transylvania, these figures were 299, 1,490, 1,043 and 1,672; in the Military Frontier, 547, 131, 706 and 194.

Table 8. *Structure of the Austrian Catholic and Unitat church in the central lands, 1847*

	Archpriests.	Bpriests.	Cathedr.	Parishes	Local chaplaincies	Total secular clergy	Monast. houses	Regular clergy	As % total	Total clergy
Lower Austria	1	1	2	732	183	1,584	55	1,745	52.4	3,329
Upper Austria	1	1	2	458	68	1,092	30	868	44.3	1,960
Styria	—	2	1	445	131	1,315	32	729	35.7	2,044
Carinthia } Krain }	—	3	3	458	214	1,361	15	279	17.0	1,640
<i>Küstenland</i>	1	3	6	212	137	1,094	20	248	18.5	1,342
Tyrol	—	3	2	353	290	2,639	86	1,955	42.6	4,594
Bohemia	1	3	7	1,347	419	3,882	88	1,403	26.5	5,285
Moravia— Silesia	1	2	4	705	327	2,256	43	557	19.8	2,813
Galiccia	3	3	6	2,182	302	4,096	90	965	19.1	5,061
<i>Sub total</i>	8	21	33	6,892	2,071	19,319	459	8,749	31.2	28,068
Hungary	3	20	26	3,920	12	7,486	223	3,208	30.0	10,694
Transylvania	—	2	2	1,599	102	1,789	38	267	12.9	2056
Military Frontier	—	1	1	445	—	678	17	112	14.1	790
Total	11	44	62	12,856	2,185	29,272	737	12,336	29.6	41,608

Source: *Tafeln zur Statistik der Österreichischen Monarchie für die Jahre 1847 und 1848* (Vienna: 2 vols., 1853), *Tafel 10*, 'Clerus in den Jahren 1847 und 1848.'

to reduce numbers served by each *Seelsorger* had evidently been foiled by the growth of society. It is not implausible (and is in line with Beidtel's complaints) that church revenues, considered next, had not increased enough to permit expansion, and that the state could not afford to finance it. Looking at secular clergy, even the small apparent increase over 1790 may be illusory if the much larger population of theological students at the later date is taken into account. Within the total of seculars, the increase of numbers in Tyrol and Hungary, and the considerable decrease in Galicia, are noteworthy. The monastic life, whose very existence was threatened in the 1780s, was still well in evidence, and the 1790 proportion (29 per cent) of regulars to seculars was unchanged. In Hungary, there were actually more religious houses than in 1780, though the regular population was now reduced. Interestingly, too, nuns had made something of a comeback, 2,929 being returned, no less than 790 of them in Tyrol. The line between secular and regular clergy was blurred, however, since 1,162 monks are noted as serving in parishes.<sup>47</sup>

While it seems plausible, if not absolutely secure, to treat the 1847 returns of clerical structure and numbers as accurate, the same cannot be said about revenue. The compilers of the tables recognized this by distinguishing them as 'incomplete'. In the Bohemian and Austrian lands and Galicia (no figures were available for the Hungarian lands) church income was put at only 8.58 million fl., of which 2.47 million fl. (29 per cent) was monastic. This included 1.47 million fl. from the Religious Fund.<sup>48</sup> In 1790, revenue had been 12 million fl. in the same area (see Table 3). But a different return, for 1845, ascribes to the church the much higher revenue of 12.87 million fl.<sup>49</sup> And even this cannot be accepted as authoritative, since an appendix showing the incomes of selected bishoprics and religious houses notes that 'the accuracy of these statements cannot be guaranteed, for they are mostly based on old inventories and valuations'.<sup>50</sup> It seems safe to conclude that the revenues of the Austrian church at this date need an archival examination which they have not so far received. That apart, the church on the eve of Metternich's fall evidently retained the broad shape given to it by the 'revolutionary emperor' sixty years earlier.

<sup>47</sup> 'Auf Pfarreien angestellt', p. 4. This practice undoubtedly existed earlier, but its extent requires investigation. In 1780 there were 141 Hungarian monasteries and 13 convents, Dickson, 1, 446.

<sup>48</sup> *Tafeln* 1847-8, pp. 1-2.

<sup>49</sup> *Tafeln zur Statistik... für die Jahre 1845 und 1846* (2 vols. Vienna, 1850-1) *Tafel* 39, returns of 1845 for 'Nicht dotierte Fonde, Stiftungen und Anstalten' shows a total church revenue outside the Hungarian lands of 12,878,640 fl. (The relevant volume for 1847 is not in the British Library.) 'Nicht dotierte Fonde' are defined (*Tafel* 39 p. 15) as 'those which, under government oversight (*Oberaufsicht*) follow public purposes, but receive no regular yearly endowment from the state.' This is relevant to the issue of supposed confiscation of church revenues discussed earlier.

<sup>50</sup> *Tafel* 39 p. 18. Several of the figures there for monastic revenue are close to those of 1790.