

Traditional Catholics had most cause for resentment. Direct contact of Austrian bishops with the Curia was prohibited, as was the publication of Papal acts without permission. Some 530 out of 1188 monasteries in the Austro-Slav lands, and a further 117 in Hungary, were dissolved and their property of 60 million florins taken over by the state on the grounds that they were merely 'contemplative' institutions lacking educational or welfare functions. Their libraries were distributed to teaching bodies or pulped; their raiment ended up in a depot in Vienna. The expropriation of monasteries in the eighteenth century was the equivalent for would-be progressives of the nationalisation of private enterprise in the twentieth, justified by the argument that their wealth resulted from past gifts made for public cultural and religious purposes, and had in this sense always been national. Accordingly, resources taken over by the state were used to form a Religious Fund from which about 1700 new parishes were created, as well as numerous welfare institutions. In Vienna the 'lying-in hospital for expectant mothers, the Deaf and Dumb Institute, and the vast General Hospital, with its two thousand beds, date from this time. Moreover, the expanded clergy were to be trained in six newly instituted 'General Seminaries', rather than in monastic centres or the diocesan seminaries favoured by the Council of Trent. The Marriage Patent of 1783 treated marriage essentially as a civil contract.

Yet that these changes were not just the diktat of an unsympathetic state can be seen from the readiness with which scholarly Reform Catholics participated in them, like the father of Czech studies, Josef Dobrovský, who headed the General Seminary in Moravia, or Abbot Rautenstrauch, who took on the overhaul of theological studies. The cataloguing of confiscated monastic books was carried out by a Josephinist-minded priest who believed 'superstitious and childish things' were best destroyed.<sup>3</sup> In Rautenstrauch's programme, authorised for the Monarchy as a whole, scholastic theology was down-graded in favour of moral and pastoral studies, a traditional Protestant emphasis. The relative importance of religious dogmas could only be judged, wrote the pastoral theologian Giffschütz in 1787, in terms of their effect on Christian action and on man's improvement and happiness.<sup>4</sup> The alliance between Enlightenment and Catholic Reform could hardly be more clearly stated.

Not all the clergy, of course, embraced these ideas. Archbishop Migazzi of Vienna had ended his flirtation with reform trends when

he rejected Febronius's critique of the Papal power in 1763. Embroiled by the 1780s in disputes with radical priests in his diocese, he argued that calls for a purported renewal of the Church did not strengthen its appeal but emboldened its enemies. Here Joseph's relaxation of censorship in 1781 was of crucial importance. It abolished provincial censorship organs and allowed free circulation of any material which did not systematically attack the Catholic faith. The result was a huge pamphlet literature in Vienna in which an unsophisticated public indulged a new-found taste for satire and irreverence at the expense of obvious authority symbols like the Church. While Joseph drew the line at a German-language edition of the anti-clerical Voltaire, the new guidelines passed material like Ignaz Born's classification of religious orders in terms of insects and Eybel's hostile *What is the Pope?* There is evidence that in the increasingly turbulent atmosphere of Josephinian Austria Jansenist and Reform Catholic ideas were indeed yielding to anti-clericalism and scepticism among certain radical artisans in the larger towns. Genuine anxieties about the fate of the Church as well as a struggle over power fuelled the conflict of Pope and Emperor in the 1780s, the most dramatic aspect of which was Pius VI's visit to Vienna to remonstrate with Joseph in 1782.

Joseph wrote sarcastically to Catherine of Russia about this sensibly fruitless visit, on the long daily conversations he and the Pope had had, 'talking nonsense about theology... in words which neither of us understood'.<sup>5</sup> In fact, the forces of state reform and Church tradition were more evenly matched than Joseph implied. Both sides had powerful weapons. Vienna could threaten Rome with the withholding of bishops' temporal possessions, even, *in extremis*, with the summons of a council of Austrian bishops independent of Rome along Febronian lines. Rome could hint that Joseph was following Luther's road. Twice a point of confrontation came. When the Pope compared Joseph to Martin Luther the Emperor haughtily returned the letter to Rome, only to follow it himself in a visit of conciliation (1783). Again, when Pius demanded that the Josephinist Bishop of Ljubljana should recant his praise of the 'heretically heretical' - Toleration Edict, a direct clash was averted by the bishop's timely death (1787). Ultimately, Joseph realised that as a Catholic sovereign he could not push matters to an open split.

No such restraint guided his policy towards his domestic opponents. As the provinces of the monarchy constitute a single whole, he wrote