

Enlightenment and Reform in Eighteenth-century Europe

DEREK BEALES

I.B. TAURIS
LONDON · NEW YORK

Contents

Acknowledgements | vii

Map: The Austrian Monarchy in the Eighteenth
Century | viii

Introduction	1
PART ONE Contexts: European and Austrian	5
1 Social Forces and Enlightened Policies	7
2 Philosophical Kingship and Enlightened Despotism	28
3 Christians and ' <i>Philosophes</i> ': The Case of the Austrian Enlightenment	60
4 Mozart and the Habsburgs	90
5 The False Joseph II	117
PART TWO Joseph II and Reform	155
6 Joseph II's <i>Rêveries</i>	157
7 Love and the Empire: Maria Theresa and Her Co-regents	182
8 Maria Theresa, Joseph II and the Suppression of the Jesuits	207
9 Joseph II and the Monasteries of Austria and Hungary	227
10 The Origins of the Pope's Visit to Joseph II in 1782	256
11 Was Joseph II an Enlightened Despot?	262
12 Joseph II and Josephism	287
Select Bibliography of Works in English	309
Index	314

Introduction

No period can outmatch the catalogue of fundamental changes that came to pass during the eighteenth century. Britain conquered India and much of North America; it then lost what became the United States, as a result of the American Revolution. Russia expanded vastly to the west, the south and the east. The continent of Australasia was discovered. As knowledge of the Scientific Revolution of the seventeenth century was diffused, the Enlightenment and the growth of the 'public sphere' transformed the attitudes of the elite in nearly all European countries, sapping the power and credit of the Christian Churches and their theology. The Roman Catholic Church was most affected, as it had preserved many of the beliefs and practices long abandoned in Protestant countries. The fact that it had a head, the pope, who claimed to exercise authority within all Catholic states, aroused growing opposition from their secular rulers, whose own power was increasing. Their first target was the Jesuits, who took a special vow of obedience to the pope. After a long campaign by the Catholic Powers, the pope was forced to suppress them in 1773. The French Revolution not only brought down the old regime in France; the revolutionary armies removed most Catholic rulers from power, including the pope, and brought about the abolition of monasteries and the seizure of all Church property in France, Belgium and Catholic Germany, and of nearly all of it in Italy.

It was during the eighteenth century that the great surge of world population growth began, that western technology eclipsed that of the East, and that the beginnings of rapid industrialisation became visible in Britain. The later decades of the century saw the birth of the theory of nationalism and its revival or first appearance in many countries. German, Czech, Hungarian and Italian feeling and languages were revived; among others, Flemish, Slovak, Romanian and Croatian made a tentative appearance.

All these changes, and many others only less spectacular, had effects that are still acutely felt in the twenty-first century. To give only a few examples, it is to the British conquest of India and North America that the hegemony of the English language is due; Russia's western

2 · Enlightenment and reform

and southern neighbours cannot efface roughly two centuries of its rule or feel confident that they can prevent its return; the American and French Revolutions changed political theory and practice for ever; though Catholicism and the papacy have regained some of their influence, they have never recovered their lands. Nationalism flourishes almost everywhere in the world; population growth remains out of control; economically backward countries still seek to learn from the Industrial Revolution; and opponents of repressive regimes still look to the examples of the American and French Revolutions.

Yet in Britain, at least at school level, the eighteenth century has never been a widely taught period. Once, most schools seemed to favour starting sixth-form work around 1500, which meant that few pupils ever reached the eighteenth century. Now Hitler and Stalin are the staple diet, and the stultifying effects of the National Curriculum include the extrusion of much of the eighteenth century from the syllabus altogether. Up to now, however, neglect in the schools has been compensated by enthusiasm in the universities. Few periods have attracted a galaxy of historians to compare with Tim Blanning, John Brewer, Owen Chadwick, Peter Dickson, Robert Evans, Olwen Hufton, John McManners, Isabel de Madariaga, the late Roy Porter, Simon Schama, Hamish Scott and Tony Wrigley – to name only some of the fine British historians whose work has transformed our knowledge of the century and, incidentally, influenced my own research and writing. These historians have illuminated, among other things, the development of states, bureaucracies and armies; the character and causes of economic development; the nature and diversity of the Enlightenment and its influence on governments; the complex interplay between Enlightenment, religion and the churches; related developments in the visual arts and music; and the connection of all these phenomena to Revolution.

This book brings together most of the essays, articles and special lectures I have written on eighteenth-century Europe, in some cases revised, in one case translated into English. Some of them are concerned with the whole Continent ('Social Forces and Enlightened Policies'; 'Christians and "*Philosophes*"'). Most form part of, or arise out of, my research on Joseph II, Holy Roman Emperor from 1765 to 1790 and ruler of the Austrian Monarchy from 1780 to 1790. Anyone who works on him and on the Austrian Monarchy in the eighteenth century is in effect studying the history of the modern states of Austria, Belgium, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary,

Italy, Luxembourg, Poland, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia and Ukraine. Joseph was a dedicated and tireless reformer, often credited with effecting from above enough changes to justify describing him as ‘the Revolution in a single man’ – or, at least, enough changes to stave off in his territories upheavals such as occurred in France.

Since his work affected such a huge area, it is particularly important to establish what precisely his ideas, aims and achievements were. It happens that the nature of his ‘revolution from above’ has commonly been characterised by historians with the use of historical sources that turn out to be spurious. Detailed research was required to peel away from his image the ideas erroneously attributed to him by these much-used sources (‘The False Joseph II’). On the other hand, his remarkably radical early *Rêveries* had never before been published complete and are now translated into English for the first time (see Chapter 6). These reassessments necessarily go with a re-consideration of the role of the Catholic Church, which was not only, in many aspects, an obstacle in the way of his reforms but also, in other aspects, their inspiration: he drew on the ideas of a ‘Catholic Enlightenment’ very different in tone from the French, was not in fact an enemy of the Jesuits, and saw himself as a Catholic reformer, inspired by God to purify the Church (‘Maria Theresa, Joseph II and the Suppression of the Jesuits’; ‘Joseph II and the Monasteries of Austria and Hungary’; ‘The Origins of the Pope’s Visit to Joseph II in 1782’; ‘Joseph II and Josephism’). The findings of these studies alter our view of his relationship to the Enlightenment, particularly the French Enlightenment (‘Christians and “Philosophes”’; ‘Was Joseph II an Enlightened Despot?’). The nature of his collaboration with his mother as her co-regent, and of their differences over policy, is also illuminated (‘Love and the Empire’; ‘Maria Theresa, Joseph II and the Suppression of the Jesuits’, ‘Joseph II and Josephism’). An appraisal of his ‘Enlightened despotism’, together with a detailed study of his legislation on monasteries and its implementation in Austria and Hungary, shows both what problems of enforcement he faced, and also how hopeless it was to try to apply the same policies and expect to achieve the same results in disparate provinces (‘Joseph II and the Monasteries of Austria and Hungary’; ‘Was Joseph II an Enlightened Despot?’). Finally, Joseph – contrary to the common view, disseminated by the play and film *Amadeus* – turns out to have been Mozart’s appreciative patron, thus significantly enhancing his role in cultural history (‘Mozart and the Habsburgs’).

4 · *Enlightenment and reform*

Pietro Verri, one of his Italian officials, wrote of Joseph's 'great project'. The emperor himself talked of his 'mission'. To understand his aims it is necessary to consider what he owed to the Enlightenment. But it is also necessary to grasp what the project and the mission amounted to in order to understand the Enlightenment as it manifested itself in his vast territories. To appraise properly the Enlightened absolutism or despotism characteristic of central and eastern Europe in the second half of the eighteenth century, the policies of Joseph, the most radical of all the rulers concerned, have to be properly assessed. They were certainly too radical for most of his subjects, and in some provinces provoked actual revolution against him. Although there was a strong reaction against his programme at his death, much of it survived – for example, religious toleration, the abolition of personal servitude, the suppression of nearly half of all monasteries. Those houses that survived mostly lasted until the Second World War, and in Austria many still exist. His linguistic policies, making German the language of nearly all the Monarchy, both encouraged the use of German, by Jews for example, and fostered the other vernaculars of his provinces and the nationalisms associated with them. In the age of Reaction after 1815, his heritage so dominated the countries he had ruled that the term 'Josephism' was invented to describe it by those in the 1830s, including Metternich, who wanted to pursue policies more friendly to the pope and Catholicism ('Joseph II and Josephism'). His great project was revolutionary enough to attract both the enthusiastic support of reformers and the violent opposition of conservatives.

CHAPTER 3

Christians and ‘*Philosophes*’: The Case of the Austrian Enlightenment

How influential were the great men of the French Enlightenment, the *philosophes*, outside France? Or, how typical were they of the Enlightenment as a whole? These questions have been much discussed, not least by Owen Chadwick.¹ This essay is a small contribution to the debate, from what I think is a fresh standpoint: a consideration of the concept *philosophe*, as understood by the leaders of the French Enlightenment, in relation to the attitudes of some prominent figures associated with the Austrian Enlightenment. Although this standpoint appears so restricted, I think that what is visible from it has wider significance.

I

The concept *philosophe* needs some elucidation. It has been well studied – in English, for example, by Commager, Dieckmann, Lough, Shackleton, Wade, White and Wilson.² But for my purposes their work must be brought together and given a particular emphasis.

Unlike the term Enlightenment,³ the word *philosophe*, used roughly as modern scholars use it, was current in the eighteenth century itself. The great men of the French Enlightenment – or most of them, most of the time – took pride in calling themselves, individually and collectively, *philosophes*. They can with plausibility be described as a party under that name, at least from the early 1750s. Even before that, but especially from the late 1750s, they were attacked as such, notably by their former comrade, Rousseau, and in Palissot’s play of 1760, *Les Philosophes*.

One of Palissot’s shafts, clearly well aimed, was that they sought to monopolise the concept *philosophe*. In so doing they were trying to eradicate its original and accepted meanings. Before the late seventeenth century, *philosophe* had two usual senses, both of them

equally applicable to the word 'philosopher' in English and to the corresponding words in other languages: first, the man who seeks wisdom through abstract thought and by reasoning from first principles, perhaps erecting an intellectual system supposed to explain the universe in all its aspects – the metaphysician; secondly, the thinker who withdraws from ordinary affairs, probably in a morose temper, to contemplate with detachment the follies of his fellow men and to suffer with resignation the outrages of fortune – loosely, the Stoic. In 1694 a third meaning was acknowledged by the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie française*: 'a man who, through waywardness of mind, puts himself above the ordinary duties and obligations of civil and Christian life. It is a man who denies himself nothing, who does not restrain himself in any way, and who leads the life of a philosopher.'⁴ This definition, of course, pejoratively recognised the use of the word by *esprits forts* like Bayle in anti-Catholic if not anti-Christian connotations. His *Commentaire philosophique* dates from 1686. From this third sense stems the usage of the great *philosophes* themselves. It never became fully established in any language other than French.

The *Encyclopédie* contains the classic statement of the concept *philosophe* in the article under that title in volume XII, published in 1765. This is a late appearance for a document so fundamental to the French Enlightenment. However, the article is in fact Diderot's version – much shortened but essentially faithful – of an essay first printed in a collection called *Nouvelles libertés de penser*, published in 1743. This compilation was the work of radicals and free-thinkers; its component pieces had previously circulated in manuscript; and its publication 'inaugurated ... a period of intense intellectual activity'.⁵ Voltaire wrote of the original essay *Le Philosophe* when he in his turn republished it in 1773: it 'has been known for a long time and has been kept to hand by all inquiring persons; it dates from the year 1730'. Its author was probably Dumarsais.⁶ So the article in the *Encyclopédie* has a very good claim to have embodied the view of the *philosophe* held by most writers of the French Enlightenment over a period of half a century.

It explicitly rejects both the traditional meanings of *philosophe*. The original essay included a lengthy critique of universalist systems of thought. Although Diderot cut this section severely, he left the essential points: the *philosophe*, though a rationalist, relies on proved observed facts and does not expect to be able to explain everything.

Rather more survives in the *Encyclopédie* article of the critique of Stoicism. For example,

Our *philosophe* does not imagine that he is in exile in this world; he does not suppose himself to be in enemy country ... He seeks pleasure from the company of others ... he is an *honnête homme* who desires to please and to make himself useful ... it is easy to grasp how far removed the unfeeling sage of the Stoics is from the perfection of our *philosophe*: such a *philosophe* is a man, and their sage was only a phantom. They blushed for humanity, and he glories in it.⁷

By very strong implication, the *philosophe* is represented as anti-Christian. For instance, in Diderot's version: 'Reason is in respect to the *philosophe* what Grace is in respect to the Christian ... Civil society is, so to speak, a divinity on earth for [the *philosophe*]; he worships it.'⁸ It seems plain that this rejection of Christianity is integrally related to the rejection both of *esprit de système* and of Stoicism. Roman Catholic theology had come to terms with Cartesianism, the reigning metaphysical system; and the resulting hybrid now dominated the teaching of philosophy in French universities.⁹ Similarly, the neo-Stoicism of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, especially associated with the writings of Lipsius, had been easily reconciled with Catholicism. The Jesuits themselves became the chief promoters of 'Christian Stoicism', and one of them published in 1637 a volume entitled *Seneca Christianus*.¹⁰ The *philosophe* naturally could not countenance any tendency of thought that subserved *l'infâme*.

However, as the article illustrates, his attitude to *esprit de système* differed from his attitude to Stoicism. Whereas he totally condemned the former he applauded aspects of Stoic thought – or Stoicism understood in a certain sense. Only five historical figures are mentioned in the article, four of them Roman, of whom two were Stoics. Cato the Younger receives praise for having always acted in a manner true to his character, and Marcus Aurelius is quoted with approval for having remarked: 'How happy peoples will be when kings are philosophers, or philosophers kings.'¹¹ This, of course, must rank as a disingenuous quotation, first since it originally derives from the arch-metaphysician, Plato, and secondly since Marcus Aurelius hardly meant by 'philosopher' what Diderot and his friends understood by *philosophe*. But the citation from Marcus Aurelius is heavy with significance. While the most Christian, servile and respectable authors admired him, and no exception could possibly be taken by minister or censor to

the glorification of his name, yet for the *philosophes* he counted as one of themselves, an enemy of superstition and a persecutor of Christianity. This was the guise under which they praised him, and the same applied to Stoicism as a whole. As Peter Gay has argued, the *philosophes* were influenced by Stoicism – but it was by Stoicism conceived as pagan and anti-Christian. Moreover, for their purposes it had also to be separated from its connotation of morose detachment. The true Stoic, the Stoic who was to be admired, played his part in society and politics, trying to give practical effect to his philosophy – like, they claimed, Marcus Aurelius.¹²

Voltaire's article *Philosophe* in the second edition of his *Dictionnaire philosophique* (1765) reinforces the argument. Unlike the article in the *Encyclopédie*, it contains no carefully stated definition. But it does offer a wider variety of examples of *philosophes*, who are chiefly commended for the supposed purity of their morals. Those who receive the greatest praise are Confucius; Bayle and Fontenelle; and, bracketed together, Epictetus, Marcus Aurelius and Julian. Further, one of the less orthodox seventeenth-century neo-Stoics, Charron, qualified for favourable reference on the ground that his life had been threatened by pious persecutors. In addition, 'Julian the *philosophe*' was honoured with a special article in which his hostility to Christianity was excused.¹³

So it formed an essential part of the programme of the *philosophes* to impose their new meaning on the word in place of older meanings. In particular, Stoicism had to be condemned if it was understood as unsocial and quietist or if it was treated as compatible with Christianity, and especially with Roman Catholicism.

II

In trying to assess the influence of the *philosophes* outside France, we can use as an index – though only one index among many – the way in which the concept *philosophe* was employed and Stoicism was regarded. White claimed that the new meaning of *philosophe* had won the day by the middle of the eighteenth century; and Oestreich, the author of notable studies of neo-Stoicism, asserted that by the same period the influence of Lipsius in Germany was 'played out'.¹⁴ These propositions can be tested when studying the attitudes of prominent figures associated with the Austrian Enlightenment.

It is natural to begin with the reign of Maria Theresa (1740–80)

and with the royal family, taking first Francis Stephen, her husband, emperor from 1745 to his death in 1765. Born and brought up in Lorraine, he married Maria Theresa in 1736. It was from this event that the prince de Ligne, an exemplar of Enlightened French culture and one of the few men who had standing both with the *philosophes* and at the Court of Vienna, dated the adoption there of French as 'the common language, which greatly contributed to the spread of urbanity'.¹⁵ Ligne exaggerated, of course. French had been much used at Court before the marriage or accession of Maria Theresa. Further, Francis Stephen was an imperfect advertisement for French culture: he shocked the more sophisticated by his tolerance of German comedies; and his spelling in French embarrassed even his wife.¹⁶ But he brought a number of French artists and *savants* to Vienna; and the pre-eminence of the French language there seems to date from the early years of Maria Theresa's reign.¹⁷

Students of the early Radical Enlightenment seize on Francis Stephen as proof of its influence in bigoted, benighted Austria, since he was initiated as a Freemason by Walpole at Houghton in 1731 and is believed to have practised the craft privately in Vienna even after it had been banned there by his wife.¹⁸ But his surviving writings give no encouragement to such students. He left two sets of instructions for his children, of 1752 and 1765, which urged on them sobriety, modesty and economy, together with regular prayer, communion, confession and self-examination. He also composed two tracts, whose dates are unknown, entitled 'The Hermit in the World' and 'Christian Reflections and Short Prayers'. The burden of these pieces is that the ruler, though enveloped in business, pomp and flattery, must keep his soul secret and entire for the service of God and in preparation for death. They seem to depend on writers of Jansenist tendency like Pascal, Fénelon and Muratori – and on Cicero and Marcus Aurelius. It is evident that the Stoic element is completely assimilated to Catholic Christianity and retains its connotation of withdrawal from the world. If the emperor, with his French background and Masonic affiliations, was aware of the attitudes associated with the new meaning of *philosophie*, he rejected them completely.¹⁹

During the 1750s he and his wife superintended, with much assistance from ministers and other advisers, an elaborate programme of education designed to fit their heir, the future Joseph II, for the throne. He was two years of age when *Nouvelles libertés de penser* was published, seven when *De l'esprit des lois* came out, and ten when the first

volumes of the *Encyclopédie* appeared. But the French Enlightenment had little part in his studies: the only major work by a *philosophe* to figure in them was the *Esprit des lois*, and that very selectively. Further, the Stoics, unless Cicero is counted among them, scarcely appear. On the other hand, Pufendorf dominated Joseph's education in political theory, and the Natural Law school that Pufendorf belonged to owed much to the Stoics.²⁰ But it is the prince's education in philosophy that is most interesting here. This was entrusted to a Jesuit, Father Frantz. The 'little treatise' he wrote in Latin for his pupil avoided 'the disputations of the schools' and 'all the subtleties that are more ingenious than useful, like categories, universals ...' – the formula comes from the Jansenist popularisation of Descartes, *L'art de penser*. In other words, it claimed to reject, in the Renaissance tradition, Aristotelianism and Scholasticism. But it dealt with logic, deductive reasoning and metaphysics. *Esprit de système* imbued it, and its system was Descartes's, Christianised or Catholicised. Such few later writers as are mentioned are almost all criticised, like Leibniz. In so far as it comes to grips with sceptics, it is with Spinoza, who had died as long ago as 1677.²¹ There is no sign of any awareness of the French *philosophes* whether as individuals or as a class of philosophers.

The Jesuits retained their monopoly of theological teaching at the University of Vienna until 1759. It was only in 1735 that they had been instructed to teach Cartesian metaphysics; they had previously been identified with Scholasticism. But Father Frantz was one of their most progressive scholars, concerned not only with the reform of the university curriculum but also with mitigating the rigours of the censorship. Both these processes advanced during the 1750s under the aegis of Gerard van Swieten, the empress's physician. One of his most notable successes was to secure the admission into the Monarchy of the *Esprit des lois*.²² So Joseph's education took place during a decade of reform. But it was painfully slow reform and, by European standards, from a remote starting-point. To Prince Albert of Saxony, brought up as a Catholic but in a Protestant state, Joseph's education in logic and metaphysics was indistinguishable from 'peripatetic philosophy'.²³

In 1760 Joseph married Isabella of Parma, whose intelligence and personality were to make a profound impression on him and on the whole Court during her three remaining years of life. Her mother was a French princess, Louis XV's daughter, and their personal ties were with France rather than with Spain, where Isabella had been

born. In the late 1750s the duchy of Parma became heavily dependent on France. In 1758 Condillac was summoned from Paris to tutor the heir to the throne; and in the next year its ruler appointed a prime minister of French extraction and reformist views, Du Tillot.²⁴ Isabella had received an unusually sophisticated education: she not only played the violin well and patronised Gluck's new brand of opera; she also read such books as *La Nouvelle Héloïse*, and herself wrote with some distinction. But her temperament was 'sombre', she yearned for an early death, and her remarkable writings are suffused with religious melancholy. After she died, her *Christian Meditations* were published by Maria Theresa.²⁵

One of Isabella's essays was entitled 'The True Philosopher'. 'I have developed the habit', she wrote, 'of considering what affects me personally without any emotion.' But she finds that she does not always succeed. Where her friendships are concerned, she cannot remain indifferent. She – and, she believes, all other self-styled 'philosophers' – are 'philosophers *manqués*'. Nevertheless, she is emphatic that 'The principles that a philosopher sets up for himself ... can be summed up as follows: indifference to all the chances of life ... and absolute disinterestedness, which makes [him] love what is good by reference only to good itself.'²⁶ Her idea of a philosopher corresponds exactly to the Stoicism rejected by the *Encyclopédie*.

However, she also wrote a treatise called 'On Fashionable Philosophy'. Unfortunately, only its table of contents seems to survive. From this it appears that she knew a good deal about some other brand of philosophy, presumably that associated with the French *philosophes*, in particular Condillac, but that she rejected it almost wholly:

- 1 The Principles are varied
- 2 The Principles are extreme
- 3 The Principles are false
- 4 The Principles are dangerous
- 5 The Attitudes are not consistent
- 6 The Attitudes are culpable
- 7 There is, however, some good in them
- 8 This is what leads them astray
- 9 This is what gives them their reputation
- 10 What use ought to be made both of the good and the bad that they contain.²⁷

Maria Theresa herself considered French the appropriate language for her family correspondence, promoted the alliance of 1756 with France and employed a number of officials who were influenced by the French Enlightenment. In the early 1750s Voltaire sent her copies of his historical works and in 1752 received from her for the *Siècle de Louis XIV* a watch and a snuff-box. The Diplomatic Revolution no doubt accounts for Voltaire's two uncharacteristic effusions of 1756, a contribution to the *Festschrift* compiled to celebrate the opening of the new Aula of the University of Vienna, and the following 'quatrain' commemorating the empress's visit to Carnuntum:

Marc-Aurèle autrefois des princes le modèle
 Sur le devoir des Roys écrivoit en ces lieux;
 Et Marie Thérèse fait à nos yeux
 Tout ce qu'écrivoit Marc-Aurèle²⁸

Voltaire can hardly have supposed that Maria Theresa resembled his vision of Marcus Aurelius, and this verse is clearly inconsistent with his usual attitude. Equally, Maria Theresa's graciousness towards him at this period was unnatural. It is notorious that she frequently denounced *philosophie* and the *philosophes*, and particularly dreaded the prospect of Joseph's visiting Voltaire during the journey to France planned for 1774 and eventually undertaken in 1777.

The precise terms of her denunciations bear examination. Her first onslaught on *philosophie*, like most of them, refers to Joseph. On 17 November 1768 she wrote about her younger son, Ferdinand:

He will not have Leopold's great industry, but more charm, and will be fonder of pleasures, if the emperor doesn't turn him, as he puts it, into a philosopher. I'm not worried on this score, since I see no attractions in this so-called philosophy, which consists of avoiding close ties and of enjoying nothing, whether theatre, hunting, cards, dancing or conversation.²⁹

In May-July 1772 she and Ferdinand exchanged letters about philosophy. She declared:

All these titles so fashionable at the moment hero, *savant*, *philosophe*, are simply the inventions of *amour-propre* to cover up weaknesses. Those who are so called do not deserve it; they just want to cut some sort of figure.

Again,

It is better to feel too much than too little. Honest men can be attracted by sentiment alone, but not by philosophy, which is so fashionable at present, and which is only refined *amour-propre* and harshness towards others. Don't let yourself be carried away ... If we accept worldly things as Christian philosophers, we feel the same in all situations, in adversity as in prosperity.

And finally she compliments him on quoting the adage 'neither philosophy nor reason stands when the heart speaks'.³⁰

In 1774 she corresponded with her ambassador in Paris, the comte de Mercy-Argenteau, about Joseph's projected visit to France and especially his 'idea of returning through Switzerland to see Voltaire, Tissot, Haller and all these extremists'. Mercy replied:

I think [the project] will not materialise; first because it would take H.M. too much out of his way, secondly because there will be objections to be made against Voltaire which might dispel the desire to make his acquaintance. Tissot is a doctor, Haller a poet. Further, I shall make a point of showing H.M. here a sample from which he will be able to judge the worth of these modern *savants* and *philosophes* who, in their private lives, their works and their detestable principles, set a pattern calculated to overturn society and introduce trouble and disorder.

The empress answered: 'It is true that even here people can't stop praising these wretches as great men and superior geniuses, but I hope you'll succeed in bringing home to the emperor all that is base, inconsistent and contemptible in their characters and behaviour.'³¹

Later in the same year, she sent her youngest son, Maximilian, a similar diatribe:

If I saw these self-styled *savants*, these *philosophes*, achieving more success in their enterprises and more happiness in their private lives, I should be able to charge myself with bias, pride, prejudices, obstinacy for not following them. But ... no one is weaker, more easily discouraged than these *esprits forts*, no one more cringing, more frantic at the least slight. They are bad fathers, sons, husbands, ministers, generals, citizens. Why? They lack the essential foundation. All their *philosophie*, all their maxims derive simply from their *amour-propre*.³²

These statements of 1774 show that Maria Theresa thought she knew what the French *philosophes* stood for, and purveyed a crude

critique of their position as she understood it. But she evidently had not grasped the implications of the new meaning of *philosophe*; and her indiscriminate bracketing of Voltaire with Haller and Tissot reveals her ignorance of their work. Her earlier attacks on 'philosophy' seem directed against the sort of unfeeling and misanthropic Stoicism that the *Encyclopédie* itself denounced. But in her mind the chief exemplar of this outlook must surely have been Frederick the Great – together with Joseph II, in so far as he was modelling himself on her great enemy.

It is 'Christian philosophers' she applauds. The use of the phrase in her letter to Ferdinand can be matched in several others. When Joseph's only daughter died in 1770, she wrote: 'He feels this loss very deeply, but as a Christian philosopher.' She spoke in 1772 of Gerard van Swieten dying 'as a philosopher the death of a saint, a great consolation for me'. Seven years later she said her son Maximilian bore his painful illness 'as a philosopher, but Christian'. Most tellingly, when in April 1778 she was praising Joseph for his letters to Frederick about the Bavarian crisis, she announced: 'I love my Cato, my Christian philosopher.'³³ Her ideal remained the neo-Stoic, Catholicised.

III

While Maria Theresa lived, she ensured that the Monarchy was insulated from many aspects of French cultural influence. Contemporary travellers found her regime bigoted, superstitious and intolerant. They were astonished to have their books impounded at the frontier.³⁴ Even ambassadors had difficulty in bringing in their libraries.³⁵ The Monarchy's index of prohibited books was longer than the pope's.³⁶ Wraxall, who spent some months in Vienna in 1778–79, made the severest judgement. He was 'inclined to believe, that fewer persons of extensive reading and information are found [here], proportion observed, than in any of the German Courts' – 'The Austrian youth of rank or condition are in general insupportable ... distinguished only by pride, ignorance and illiberality.' He met no learned women at all. 'Natural philosophy has scarcely made greater progress in Vienna, than sound reason and real religion.' He estimated that 3,000 persons were engaged in seeking the philosopher's stone.³⁷

Yet, according to one notable scholar, Hans Wagner, the latter part of Maria Theresa's reign marked 'the highpoint of French cultural influence in Austria'.³⁸ The judgement can be sustained, if at all,

only by placing great emphasis on the attitudes of a small circle of wealthy nobles and officials. However, it must be acknowledged that among this group was to be found a remarkable awareness of the latest developments in the French Enlightenment and an extraordinary freedom in discussing them. The empress, while enjoining bigotry on the vast majority of her subjects, would permit a few trusted servants to defy it and would even, within strict limits, listen to advice founded on progressive views.

A special place must be accorded to count (from 1763 prince) Kaunitz, who after a spell as Austrian ambassador in Paris returned to Vienna to direct the Monarchy's foreign policy in 1753, and continued to do so for the next forty or so years. It was not long before he became a force in internal politics too, especially from the foundation of the Staatsrat in 1760.³⁹ He was known for his admiration of France both as a potential ally and for its culture. He was in touch with Voltaire.⁴⁰ From the mid-1760s he became a ruthless promoter of ecclesiastical reforms which he justified by reference to many sources, including the *Encyclopédie*.⁴¹ But in fact he never accepted the *philosophes'* approach to traditional philosophy. Professor Klingenstein, who has studied his early life and work, writes of him:

Perhaps there was no Enlightened statesman in whom the mathematical–deductive method in political thought was so strongly rooted as in [Kaunitz]. The statement of political premises *more geometrico*, the deductions following logically from them about the possible decisions and actions available to the various European states within the European state-system, the related bases for making predictions about future trends and events – the deployment of this method gave Kaunitz that superiority and self-assurance among Maria Theresa's ministers which ... brought [her] under his spell.

The thinker to whom he owed most was not Descartes, but nor was it any *philosophe*; it was Wolff, in whose method he had been schooled at Leipzig.⁴² He drew upon the work of the great men of the French Enlightenment, but within an alien metaphysical framework. Moreover, contrary to what has often been claimed, he was not a Freemason, and he was some sort of Catholic.⁴³

One especially valuable source enables us to observe the French Enlightenment percolating into aristocratic and bureaucratic circles in Vienna after 1761. Count Karl von Zinzendorf arrived there in February of that year prospecting for a career in government service.

Every day he recorded in his diary what he had read and talked about and with whom. He immediately gained an *entrée* into the highest social circles because his brother was already an established official. As early as 16 March 1761 he was discussing Voltaire and the *Encyclopédie* at Princess Esterházy's. In January 1762 he came across in his reading the problem of defining 'philosopher' – though not in a recent work: '[Fontenelle's] *Dialogue between Anacreon and Aristotle* [1683] pleased me very much, when Anacreon says that the name "Philosopher" is nowadays given only to astronomers and physicists, while the Philosopher ought to think only of himself; but since no one would want to be a Philosopher on this condition, people had banished Philosophy as far as possible from themselves.'

In 1763 we find him at the French ambassador's talking about Rousseau and Helvétius, and reading some Hume and the *Contrat social*.⁴⁴ In the following year, having obtained a permanent post in the administration, he travelled to Switzerland at government expense and met both Rousseau and Voltaire. He had been recommended to the latter as travelling *en philosophe*.⁴⁵ Among his numerous later references to advanced writings two may be singled out. Discussing *L'esprit de l'Encyclopédie* enlivened one of his flirtations in 1771; and at almost the same time he was much impressed by Voltaire's *Questions sur l'Encyclopédie*, the enlarged version of the *Dictionnaire philosophique*.⁴⁶

It is tempting to present this remarkable record as evidence for the unadulterated influence of the *philosophes* in the Vienna of Maria Theresa. But the context makes this impossible, even in so far as Zinzendorf's own thinking is concerned. He arrived in Austria a devout Pietist. But his brother, Kaunitz and the empress herself made it clear that if he wished for a prosperous career in the bureaucracy he must become a Roman Catholic. The issue came to a head in the early months of 1764. On 10 January he wrote that he would convert only in 'ultimate despair', and two days later he thought of fleeing the country. On 1 February he prepared a letter of resignation from his temporary post, heard Count Philipp Sinzendorff and the French ambassador vying with each other in satirising the Christian religion, but – on the recommendation of this same Count Philipp – began reading Bossuet. He found 'both good and bad' in Voltaire on toleration.⁴⁷ On 1 March he decided that one of his great misfortunes was never to have taken a course in philosophy, which meant that he lacked 'the philosophical and geometric spirit'. He had been put

off the subject, presumably in his Pietist youth, as effacing 'from the heart those tender feelings which the great truths of the Christian religion have implanted there'. He finally made his general confession to Müller, the Jansenist abbot of St Dorothea, on 13 March, and his confession of faith the next day – but on the 15th did not dare acknowledge himself a Catholic before Kaunitz's assembly. On the 23rd he read Isabella's *Christian Meditations*, where he found 'traces of the purest and soundest piety'. He later took vows of celibacy as a member of the Teutonic Order, although throughout his long life he hankered after the religion of his youth.⁴⁸

Hence it is no wonder that, after his visit to Voltaire, he recorded that he could not trust everything the great man had said. And what he especially admired in the *Questions sur l'Encyclopédie* were Voltaire's attack on despotism and his defence of the existence of God.⁴⁹ It is clear that Zinzendorf saw his deep and broad interest in French Enlightened writing as compatible with strong religious feelings. He must have grasped the implications of the concept *philosophe*, yet rejected them.

The cosmopolitan prince de Ligne – great landowner in Belgium, prince of the Holy Roman Empire, grandee of Spain, etc., etc. – serving in the army of Maria Theresa, visited Voltaire in 1763. They corresponded regularly, and in 1772 the *philosophe* wrote to the prince: 'I prophesy that you will make wholesome *philosophie* known to minds still somewhat removed from it.' This has been assumed to mean that Voltaire expected Ligne to spread the gospel to the *philosophes* in Vienna.⁵⁰

Ligne cut a figure at the Court of Vienna for sixty years, was a friend and general of Joseph II, and won a reputation all over Europe for intelligence, Enlightenment and self-indulgence. It has seemed impossible to associate this master of persiflage with serious, still less religious, opinions.⁵¹ But of all my examples, he showed the clearest understanding of the issues raised by the new usage of *philosophe*. He composed – when seems unfortunately to be unknown – a dialogue between an *esprit fort* and a Capuchin. Both men pride themselves on their philosophy. For the Capuchin it is the crown of his religious development, and is both Stoic and metaphysical. He declares: 'I involve myself in nothing, because I am a philosopher.' He denies to the *esprit fort* the right to call himself a philosopher at all. But the *esprit fort* responds: 'I involve myself in everything, because I am a *philosophe*. I'm always writing; I study everything deeply; I remove

from Divinity its thunderbolts, from kings their sceptres, from Europe its Balance of Power, and from the dead their immortality.⁵²

Ligne's correspondence with Voltaire survives only in part, but what remains has considerable interest for the views of both men. Each flatters the other archly and wittily. In particular, Ligne often expresses his indebtedness to Voltaire's *philosophie*.⁵³ A letter of 10 November 1768 thanks the old man for sending by Gottfried van Swieten, who has just visited him *en philosophe*, 'all your new *gaietés philosophiques* – and thoroughly Christian of course. May the God of Abraham, if you like, or of the Rock, or of Socrates always treat you as favourably as you have treated us.' In his reply of 3 December Voltaire is triumphant over the rapid decay of superstition.⁵⁴

It is never easy to determine what either writer really means. But behind the calculated flippancy some letters of 1772 seem to embody a serious clash of opinions. Ligne writes that he has been demonstrating to his friends that Voltaire has 'never denied the truths of religion', ranks indeed as a Father of the Church, 'only rather more amusing than your comrades'. 'The declamations of Diderot and the arid conversation of D'Alembert, that cold if perhaps able geometer, almost induce in me the desire to become a Capuchin.' Voltaire, he goes on, has a more salutary religious influence. He has 'blasted the seven or eight atheists of the great Frederick'. Ligne then imagines many Classical writers glorying in the role of bishops, praises the Roman Catholic Church for its patronage of the arts, denounces Jansenists, suggests that Voltaire quite likes Jesuits and enlists him to purify the Church: 'I should like good *curés*, Christian magistrates, polite and politic, speaking only from the pulpit (without wishing to set up teachers of transfiguration, transubstantiation etc.) and always preaching morality and good sense on duty to family and to society and on the practice of religion. Unbelievers would have to be ridiculed.'

Voltaire's reply contains his prophecy, already quoted, that Ligne 'will make wholesome *philosophie* known to minds still somewhat removed from it'. But in context the remark seems less than enthusiastic:

Since, then, you make me realise I'm a prophet, I predict for you that you will continue to be what you already are, one of the most amiable and one of the most respectable men in Europe. I predict that you will introduce taste and style to a nation which up to now has perhaps supposed that its good qualities ought to be a substitute for charms.

I predict for you that you will make wholesome *philosophie* known to minds still somewhat removed from it, and that you will be happy in cultivating it.⁵⁵

It looks as though Ligne has gone rather too far in associating Voltaire with the defence of established religion. Certainly, what the prince has been advocating does not sound much like the *philosophe's* usual brand of 'wholesome *philosophie*'.

So even these three luminaries of the Austrian Enlightenment, Kaunitz, Zinzendorf and Ligne, wore their *philosophie* with a difference. Kaunitz revelled in traditional, deductive philosophy; Zinzendorf remained at heart a Pietist; and Ligne understood, and felt the force of, Catholic neo-Stoicism.

IV

With the accession of Joseph II as sole ruler of the Monarchy at the end of 1780, the position was transformed. One of his advisers, Gebler, wrote exultantly to Nicolai in Berlin three years later:

For a man who thinks philosophically, no period is more remarkable than that which began in 1781. Such a rapid change in the general attitude – even among the common people, who put many obscurantist members of higher classes to shame – is, so far as I know, unexampled. The ... abolition of the religious brotherhoods, of most so-called devotions and of all monastic sermons has now given the final blow to all superstition ... But freedom of the press, and still more, *freedom of reading* (for, practically speaking, there is almost no book left that is not openly for sale) also contributes greatly.⁵⁶

This was the time of the 'pamphlet flood' in Austria – or of a sudden 'thaw' after a long chill winter.⁵⁷ Vienna could now be represented as 'the *philosophes'* homeland'.⁵⁸

It is impossible to deal here with the immense range of writings published during Joseph's sole reign, the decade 1780–90, though a study from the standpoint of this chapter would surely be revealing. But it is instructive to consider two individuals, each in his own way of striking significance: the emperor himself, and one of the humbler supporters of his reforms, I. A. Fessler.

The *philosophes* had claimed Joseph for themselves since the 1760s.

In 1769 Voltaire was assured that he was 'one of us'.⁵⁹ When the emperor visited Paris in 1777, Grimm's *Correspondance littéraire* declared: 'Only in this century has *philosophie* persuaded rulers to travel purely for instruction.' The same source recorded Joseph showing respect towards Buffon, attending a demonstration by Lavoisier, listening to D'Alembert and (and less attentively) to Marmontel and La Harpe, asking why Diderot and Raynal were not members of the French Academy, and visiting Tissot and Haller in Switzerland.⁶⁰ He met Turgot and studied his state papers.⁶¹ Next year, Le Bret, a prominent populariser of Enlightenment in Germany, remarked 'how benignly the Philosopher on the Viennese throne smiles on the Muses'.⁶² The traveller Riesbeck called him 'a philosopher in the true sense of the word' – whatever that meant.⁶³ In 1781 Joseph won further favourable publicity from the *philosophes* by sitting down to dinner at Spa with Grimm and Raynal.⁶⁴ On his death the following famous manifesto was ascribed to him, and accepted very widely as genuine: 'I have made Philosophy the legislator of my Empire.'⁶⁵

Most elaborately, there appeared in 1774 a three-volume work by Lanjuinais entitled *Le Monarque accompli*, 'The Accomplished Monarch, or Prodigies of Benevolence, Knowledge and Wisdom which redound to the Credit ... of Joseph II'.⁶⁶ Voltaire docketed his copy of this astonishing production 'Roast Monarch'.⁶⁷ After it was banned in France as part of the battle between Turgot and his rivals in 1776, it became well known.⁶⁸ In it, Lanjuinais, referring occasionally to some fact about the emperor, and more frequently inventing some myth about him, painted the portrait of an ideal king. This paragon in the guise of Joseph is favourably compared to the most respectable Roman emperors such as Trajan and Marcus Aurelius, and to the most notable kings of France. He is wise, tolerant, humane, 'enlightened' and *philosophe* – *ad nauseam*. Towards the end of the third volume Lanjuinais embarks on a disquisition about philosophy. No one, he asserts, knows better than the emperor how *l'esprit philosophique* differs from *philosophie*. Philosophy is just one branch of knowledge, whereas *l'esprit philosophique* embraces all branches. The basis of *l'esprit philosophique* is 'enlightened metaphysics'. According to Lanjuinais, Joseph has reacted against 'modern peripatetics', finds Voltaire instructive but is very judicious in appraising his, Rousseau's and Montesquieu's works. Surprisingly, the emperor turns out also to be 'pious' and 'Christian', a prince who wants the clergy better educated, an enemy of *libertinage* and a man proof against the blandishments not only of

Greeks and Romans but also of ‘contemporary unbelievers, modern blasphemers’.⁶⁹

Lord Acton pronounced, in one of his maddening displays of fantastic erudition, that ‘Joseph II borrowed his ideas from the *Monarque accompli*’.⁷⁰ But any resemblance between Lanjuinais’s paragon and the living emperor, whether before or after the book was published, seems accidental. It is true that his knowledge of Voltaire passed muster with Frederick the Great;⁷¹ that a close friend wrote of his weakness for the ideas of Holbach and Helvétius;⁷² and that the French strategist, Guibert, having met him in 1773, claimed that the word *philosophie* was often in his mouth.⁷³ Moreover, Joseph was violently opposed to many of his mother’s policies, and soon after he gained power embarked on the reform programme which Gebler partly described in his letter to Nicolai.

Yet Joseph ostentatiously drove past the gates of Voltaire’s estate in 1777, and in 1789 refused to permit the circulation within the Monarchy of a German translation of his works on the ground that ‘in this tawdry dress, as always in a translation, the wit is lost, and the bald result becomes all the more harmful to religion and morals’.⁷⁴ Unlike Frederick II and Catherine II, he carried on no correspondence with *philosophes*. Writers as a breed excited his scorn.⁷⁵ He explicitly denied the influence on him of theoretical approaches. He wrote in 1765: ‘I have learned nothing more firmly than to fear intelligence and all its subtleties. I recognise no argument which comes from the ancient Greeks or the modern French.’⁷⁶ Zinzendorf thought him ‘very well versed in the maxims that are at present being applied [by the government], and very ignorant of any kind of principles’.⁷⁷ Although both these remarks referred specifically to financial affairs, they have wider relevance.

As for Guibert’s statement that the word *philosophie* was always in Joseph’s mouth, if it relates to the new meaning of *philosophie*, it is not borne out by the emperor’s surviving writings. He never said he had made philosophy the legislator of his empire – or anything like it.⁷⁸ He did employ the word quite often, but in senses that can loosely be called Stoic. ‘One must be content’, he wrote, ‘with the smallest of blessings, that is what we learn from Philosophy, and unfortunately from experience as well.’⁷⁹ This, like several other instances, occurs in a discussion of the limitations of women – in one of which he says his ‘system ... is close to Epicurus’.⁸⁰ But, even when writing to Mercy about his projected visit to France, with the *philosophes* in his

mind, he called them *savants* and spoke of himself as being 'pretty philosophical about the chapter of accidents'.⁸¹ He refers at least once to an *encyclopédiste*, but calls Voltaire 'the self-styled *philosophe*'.⁸² This is his longest passage of self-conscious philosophy:

The idea of being able to do good and render one's subjects happy is undoubtedly the finest and the only attractive aspect of power, as it is the most powerful spur for any feeling and honest man. But when one knows at the same time that every false step is counter-productive, that evil is so easily and quickly done, and good is of its very nature so difficult and slow and cannot (except slowly) impress itself solidly on a vast state – then this comforting illusion is much weakened, and there rests only the satisfaction that one has inside oneself, which makes one uniquely contented through knowing oneself in good company when one is alone and through seeking, without the least regard to any personal consideration, to do only what the general good of the State and the great number requires.

It is rarely possible to look after the happiness of individuals without spoiling the whole, and it is apparent that under good laws and a good system, founded and regulated in accordance with the spirit and character of the nation as well as the geographical position of the State, each citizen ought to find a way of being happy if he has intelligence and is willing to take the trouble – the sovereign being the upholder of the laws and the shield protecting them against any violence, administering the money entrusted to him by his subjects simply and solely for this purpose.

If there is too much philosophy in all that, if I have gone too far in laying aside the royal mantle, the crown and the sceptre, and shown the sovereign *déshabillé* and in front of his *valet de chambre*, please forgive me for having always held the principles of going back to the primitive source of everything and of trying to see every person and thing in its natural state, plain and unadorned. I don't on that account feel more unhappy. No, every individual, I say to myself, is created to occupy a position in the world for a certain span of years. Well, I am one of those marionettes that Providence, without my being able to choose, ask or seek it, has been pleased to put in the place I occupy so that I can complete my term. She has given me only the intelligence and abilities that she intended, she will offer me only such opportunities and conditions as she pleases for being or appearing to be of some consequence; and when she has had enough, the curtain

will fall and the farce will be over for me, as for all those who have preceded me.⁸³

This is certainly not *philosophes' philosophie*, but it breathes the spirit of Stoicism.

However, it is not specifically Christian, still less Catholic. In this respect it gives a misleading impression of Joseph's attitude. When he was disputing with his mother about her treatment of Moravian Protestants, he said both that he favoured 'complete freedom of worship' and that he would 'give what I possess if all the Protestants of your states could become Catholic'.⁸⁴ One of the principles of his legislation was that much of the proceeds from his suppressions of contemplative monasteries should go to funding more parish clergy. He was not atheist, deist or Protestant, but a Catholic reformer.⁸⁵

As well as the *philosophes*, their opponents had tried to claim his allegiance. He was eulogised in Italy during his visit of 1769 as a 'Christian hero', 'the true Catholic Marcus Aurelius'.⁸⁶ In 1781 Belgian propagandists urged him to keep the influence of *philosophie* at bay.⁸⁷ Joseph contrived to hold at the same time opinions that were sponsored by both groups and were considered by them mutually incompatible.

Ignatius Fessler was born in Hungary in 1756. He was destined for the Jesuit Order and educated in its schools, but with its suppression in 1773 he became a novice of the Capuchins under the name Innocent. However, the views of his superiors and the discipline they exercised alienated him. He made contact with the Church reformers who looked forward to the accession of Joseph II and who thereafter supported his programme. In the early 1780s he left the cloister for the University of Vienna, published the first two parts of what was intended to be a massive disquisition on the emperor's rights in ecclesiastical matters, *What is the Emperor?*, and was appointed by Joseph to a Chair of Old Testament and Oriental Studies in the University of Lemberg in Austrian Poland. Fessler's views meanwhile fluctuated between atheism, deism and Jansenism. After 1787 he became disillusioned with the emperor's policies, and in 1788 he left the Monarchy. He converted to Lutheranism and henceforth called himself Ignatius Aurelius Fessler. Both before and after his departure from Lemberg he was an active Freemason. While in Prussia he fell in and out of love with the philosophy of Kant, and was much influenced by Herder. He ended his days in 1839, after a spell teaching at a Russian

Orthodox seminary, as the Lutheran bishop of Saratov on the Volga. In 1824 he had published an autobiography, *Dr Fessler's Retrospects on his Seventy-Year Pilgrimage*.⁸⁸

His special interest for this chapter arises from his enthusiasm for the Stoics. His novice-master recommended him to study Seneca's philosophical works with the words: 'Learn from the pagan Christian humility, mortification of the flesh, and resignation.' Fessler revelled in Seneca, in whom he 'discovered a certain mysticism' which he thought could only have derived from divine inspiration. When he read writings of Jansenist spirit like Fleury's *Church History* and Muratori's *True Devotion*, his dedication to the monastic life was shaken. But he was held back from abandoning his profession, and from moral depravity, by the influence of Seneca. Fessler always took with him on his journeys an edition of the Stoic philosopher's works. Further, he wrote, 'As for what is called Philosophy, I had enough in Plato, Cicero, Seneca, Bacon of Verulam, Stanley, Malebranche and Brucker. Of what Philosophy is, I had as yet no inkling.'⁸⁹

He continued to love Seneca, but his exile and conversion were associated with study of Marcus Aurelius. In 1790 appeared the first three volumes of what Fessler called his 'psychological novel' about the Stoic emperor, which went into three editions and achieved considerable notoriety. As the author acknowledges, anyone who took the work for an attempt at history found it 'bad'. The emperor is represented, for example, as a model of the constitutional monarch. According to Fessler, 'the whole book is written, not with art as its midwife, but with feeling as its inspiration, that is, from a heart steadfast and peaceful in God. If I have written anything good and true, it comes from God, the source of all goodness and truth.' He was at pains to deny that he had desired 'to be counted among those who in our day have arrogated to themselves the titles of Philosophers and Men of Enlightenment'.⁹⁰ Through all the changing scenes and attitudes of his bizarre 'pilgrimage', Fessler clung to a view of Stoicism as essentially Christian.

V

So, in the Austrian Monarchy during the Age of Enlightenment, there were few who grasped the significance of the redefinition by Diderot and others of the term *philosophe*; and even those few did not fully accept it. For many, not only of the older generation such

as Francis Stephen and Maria Theresa, but also of the younger like Joseph II and Isabella, the word remained for ordinary purposes a synonym for Stoic or Stoical – understood more or less loosely. For the empress, ‘Christian philosopher’, as used by neo-Stoics, was a natural expression. For her children, ‘philosophy’ and Catholicism were perfectly compatible. Even to her more advanced ministers like Kaunitz and Zinzendorf, and to the prince de Ligne, the new usage was for differing reasons and in varying degrees unpalatable. Whereas the writings of Seneca helped to inspire Rousseau’s ideas on education, and Diderot devoted years of labour to rehabilitating the philosopher’s reputation as an Enlightened minister of state,⁹¹ for Fessler he ranked as a forerunner of Christian mysticism, the stern teacher of morality who held him to his monastic obligations.

It would not be difficult to widen the range of evidence in support of the argument of this chapter. Here are a few further examples. In Fessler’s homeland, Hungary, Lipsius was twice reprinted in the vernacular after the date when Oestreich considered his influence at an end.⁹² Leopold II, younger brother and successor of Joseph II, though patron of the second Italian edition of the *Encyclopédie*, still used the word *philosophe* in the traditional sense, and combined with deep interest in the French Enlightenment dogmatic zeal for the reform of the Roman Catholic Church.⁹³ In the 1780s the great monastery of Strahov in Prague, spared from dissolution by Joseph because of its proven usefulness, began building a second, ‘philosophical’ library to match its theological collection. When frescoes were applied to the new building in the 1790s, the incorrigibly Baroque painter, Maulbertsch, was asked to depict, in a scheme that glorified divine revelation, along with other ancient and modern philosophers, the Encyclopaedists.⁹⁴

According to Peter Gay, ‘neither Gibbon nor the other *philosophes* could ever grant that philosophical Christians or Stoic Christians were men with a coherent world view’.⁹⁵ Historians have been inclined to feel the same. On the one hand, all Josephists have been condemned as heretical by some modern Catholic scholars;⁹⁶ on the other, signs of Enlightenment and Jacobinism within the Monarchy have been studied out of their Christian, generally Catholic, context.⁹⁷ The combinations of influences acknowledged at any one time by, say, Francis Stephen, Zinzendorf and Fessler seem as mutually irreconcilable as the Catholicism, Classicism, astrology and alchemy that jostled together at the Court of Rudolf II. But the latter *mélange* has recently

been studied with sympathy, among others by Robert Evans.⁹⁸ It is unhistorical not to accord the same respect to the mentality of the Austrian Enlightenment.

The study of intellectual influences is notoriously treacherous ground. An obvious pitfall, not always avoided, is to assume that in the period roughly from 1740 to 1790 French influence meant Enlightened influence. The vogue of the French language and of French thought at the Court of Maria Theresa, and even under Joseph II, gave as much scope to the ideas of Bossuet, Pascal, Descartes and Fénelon – not to mention Mesmer⁹⁹ – as to those of Voltaire and Diderot. Jansenism was primarily a French movement, and the height of its influence in Vienna coincided with the age of Enlightenment.¹⁰⁰ Yet for Voltaire, Jansenists were worse even than Jesuits.¹⁰¹

No doubt the Monarchy was peculiar by the standards of Enlightened Europe as a whole. But these considerations apply, at least to some extent, everywhere. Voltaire usually saw himself as embattled against *l'infâme*, and did not always imagine that he was winning. He complained in 1769 that he had not found three *philosophes* to follow him, while 'a madman and an imbecile like St Ignatius' had found a dozen.¹⁰² His full doctrine – like the redefinition of *philosophe* – won few converts. On the other hand, his many ferocious enemies did not include all Roman Catholics, all priests and all Austrians. It was the king of England, where Voltaire thought everyone was a *philosophe*, who talked to Zinzendorf 'of burning Voltaire with his books, and said he would never permit him to come to England'.¹⁰³ More typical than the strident and self-conscious French *philosophes* or their rabid opponents were Lutheran *Aufklärer*, Enlightened Italian clergy like Pope Benedict XIV and Muratori, and even the *abbés* who contributed to the *Encyclopédie*.¹⁰⁴ A *curé* of Mouzay, though he read and recommended to others writings critical of Voltaire and Rousseau, paid the two *philosophes* the unique compliment of incorporating funeral eulogies for them in his parish register.¹⁰⁵

One does not usually expect to find in Bentham's work penetrating insights into ecclesiastical history. But allowing for his prejudices, one may regard the following remarks, published in 1789, as impressive evidence for the interrelationship between religion and Enlightenment with which this chapter has been concerned:

Happily, the dictates of religion seem to approach nearer and nearer to a coincidence with those of utility every day. But why? Because the

dictates of the moral sanction do so; and those coincide with or are influenced by these. Men of the worst religions, influenced by the voice and practice of the surrounding world, borrow continually a new and a new leaf out of the book of utility: and with these, in order not to break with their religion, they endeavour, sometimes with violence enough, to patch together and adorn the repositories of their faith.¹⁰⁶

Like Bentham, Peter Gay, while recognising this development, sees it as ‘treason of the clerks’, ‘doing the philosophes’ work’.¹⁰⁷ But the Christian, even the Catholic, philosopher, though he could hardly become a full-blown *philosophe*, could adopt, even promote, some elements of French Enlightened thinking, not merely without doing violence to his religion, but under its banner and to its perceived advantage.

Notes

This chapter originally appeared in D. Beales and G. Best (eds), *History, Society and the Churches: Essays in Honour of Owen Chadwick* (Cambridge, 1985). I am grateful for help and references given me by my wife, Professor T. C. W. Blanning, Professor J. A. Crook, Dr J. C. McKeown, Professor H. B. Nisbet, the late Dr S. O’Cathasaigh, the late Professor R. S. Porter, Mr S. P. Salt, Professor Q. R. D. Skinner, Mr R. C. Smail, Professor E. Wangermann and Dr R. L. Wokler. Professor Blanning and Dr Wokler very kindly read and commented on the text, but they are of course not responsible for it. I should also like to acknowledge that this essay benefited from opportunities I had to lecture on a similar theme at the universities of Leeds and Newcastle and at Clare College and Trinity Hall, Cambridge. I was assisted by grants from the British Academy and the Leverhulme Trust.

1 E.g. O. Chadwick. *The Popes and European Revolution* (Oxford, 1981), pp. 406–7 and *passim*.

2 H. S. Commager, *The Empire of Reason* (London 1978), esp. Appendix, ‘The Term “Philosophe”’, pp. 236–45; E. Dieckmann, *Le Philosophe: Texts and Interpretation* (St Louis, 1948); J. Lough, ‘Who Were the Philosophes?’, in J. H. Fox, M. H. Waddicor and D. A. Watts (eds), *Studies in Eighteenth-Century French Literature Presented to Robert Niklaus* (Exeter, 1975), pp. 139–50; R. Shackleton, ‘When Did the French “Philosophes” Become a Party?’, *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* (hereafter *BJRL*), LX (1978): 181–99; I. O. Wade, ‘The *Philosophe*’ in the French Drama of the Eighteenth Century (Princeton, 1926); R. J. White, *The Anti-Philosophers* (London, 1970), esp. ch. I; A. M. Wilson, *Diderot* (Oxford, 1972), esp. pp. 70–2, 181–2, 210, 221–2, 245–6. The next few paragraphs derive mainly from these works.

3 Cf. O. Chadwick. *The Secularization of the European Mind in the*

Nineteenth Century (Cambridge, 1975), esp. p. 144. *Aufklärung* is of course an eighteenth-century usage.

4 Quoted in Dieckmann, *Le Philosophe*, p. 72: 'un homme, qui, par libertinage d'esprit, se met au dessus des devoirs et des obligations ordinaires de la vie civile et chrétienne. *C'est un homme qui ne se refuse rien, qui ne se contraint sur rien, et qui mène une vie de Philosophe.*' It seems right to give the original French version of quotations whose precise phrasing is important to a study of the *philosophe*, while noting that it is always difficult to decide whether to render the word in English as 'philosopher' or as *philosophe*.

5 Shackleton, *BJRL*, LX (1978): 189. Cf. M. C. Jacob, *The Radical Enlightenment* (London, 1981), p. 217.

6 The quotation from Dieckmann, *Le Philosophe*, p. 7. A. W. Fairbairn, 'Dumarsais and *Le Philosophe*', *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century*, LXXXVII (1972): 375–95. I am most grateful to Dr Fairbairn for giving me a copy of this article.

7 Dieckmann, *Le Philosophe*, pp. 44, 60: 'Notre *philosophe* ne se croit pas en exil dans ce monde; il ne croit pas être en pays ennemi ... Il veut trouver du plaisir avec les autres ... c'est un honnête homme qui veut plaire et se rendre utile ... il est aisé de conclure combien le sage insensible des stoïciens est éloigné de la perfection de notre *philosophe*: un tel *philosophe* est homme, et leur sage n'était qu'un fantôme. Ils rougissaient de l'humanité, et il en fait gloire.'

8 *Ibid.*, pp. 32, 46: 'La raison est à l'égard du *philosophe* ce que la grâce est à l'égard du chrétien ... La société civile est, pour ainsi dire, une divinité pour lui sur la terre; il l'encense ...'. The original essay is less categorical in the first passage, more so in the second, and contains lengthy aspersions on superstition, dogma, religion, etc., that Diderot largely omitted.

9 L. W. B. Brockliss, 'Philosophy Teaching in France, 1600–1740', in *History of Universities*, vol. I (1981), pp. 131–68. Cf. O. Chadwick, *From Bossuet to Newman: The Idea of Doctrinal Development* (Cambridge, 1957), p. 55.

10 In English, G. Oestreich, *Neostoicism and the Early Modern State*, ed. B. Oestreich and H. G. Koenigsberger (Cambridge, 1982), esp. pp. 63–4, 99–109; N. O. Keohane, *Philosophy and the State in France* (Princeton, 1980), esp. pp. 129–33; R. J. W. Evans, *The Making of the Habsburg Monarchy, 1550–1700* (Oxford, 1979), esp. p. 113. T. Zielinski, *Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte* (3rd edn, Leipzig, 1912).

11 Dieckmann, *Le Philosophe*, p. 56. The other individuals named in the article are Velleius Paterculus for the information on Cato, and Terence and La Rochefoucauld, also for quotations.

12 P. Gay, *The Enlightenment: An Interpretation* (2 vols, London, 1967–70), esp. vol. I, pp. 50–1, 120–1, 300–4, 320.

On Marcus Aurelius and the Stoics themselves I have found most useful, apart from A. Birley (ed.), the *Meditations, Lives of the Later Caesars* (Harmondsworth, 1976), see esp. p. 135; A. S. L. Farquharson, *Marcus Aurelius, His Life and His World*, ed. D. A. Rees (Oxford, 1951); A. Birley, *Marcus Aurelius*

(London, 1966); and P. A. Brunt, 'Stoicism and the Principate', *Papers of the British School at Rome*, vol. XLIII (1975), pp. 7–35.

13 Voltaire, *Dictionnaire philosophique*, ed. J. Benda (Paris, 1954), esp. pp. 342–7; English translation ed. T. Besterman (Harmondsworth, 1971), esp. pp. 334–8.

14 White, *The Anti-Philosophers*, pp. 6–7; Oestreich, *Neostoicism*, p. 101.

15 Prince de Ligne, *Fragments de l'histoire de ma vie*, ed. F. Leuridan (2 vols, Paris 1927–28), vol. I, p. 264n.

16 A. Wolf, 'Relationen des Grafen von Podewils, Gesandten K. Friedrich's II, von Preussen, über den Wiener Hof in den Jahren 1746, 1747, 1748', *Sitzungsberichte der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, vol. V (1850), p. 499; H. O. Mikoletzky, 'Kaiser Franz I. Stephan in Briefen', in *Études européennes; Mélanges offerts à Victor Tapié* (Paris, 1973), pp. 270–1.

17 Information about French influence in Vienna is brought together usefully by J. Schmidt, 'Voltaire und Maria Theresia', *Mitteilungen des Vereines für Geschichte der Stadt Wien* [hereafter MVGSW], XI (1931): 73–115 – a much broader article than its title suggests. See also H. Wagner, 'Der Höhepunkt des französischen Kultureinflusses in Österreich', *Österreich in Geschichte und Literatur* [hereafter ÖGL] V (1961): 507–17. I am grateful to the Librarian of the Austrian Cultural Institute in London for supplying me with a copy of this article.

18 E.g. Jacob, *The Radical Enlightenment*, p. 111.

19 A. Wandruszka, 'Die Religiosität Franz Stephan von Lothringen', *Mitteilungen des österreichischen Staatsarchivs* [hereafter MÖSA], XII (1959): 162–73.

20 D. Beales, *Joseph II. I: In the Shadow of Maria Theresa, 1741–80* (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 43–68; R. F. Tuck, *Natural Rights Theories: Their Origins and Development* (Cambridge, 1979), p. 17; Oestreich, *Neostoicism*, esp. pp. 123–4.

21 'Das Lehrbuch der Metaphysik für Kaiser Josef II., verfasst von P. Josef Frantz', ed. T. M. Wehofer (Paderborn, 1895), in supp. Vol. II of *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und spekulative Theologie*, with a valuable commentary. See Beales, *Joseph II*, pp. 46–7.

22 E. Winter, *Der Josefismus* (2nd edn, Berlin, 1962), p. 41. G. Klingenstein, *Staatsverwaltung und kirchliche Autorität im 18. Jahrhundert* (Vienna, 1970), esp. pp. 165, 176–8. Wehofer's edn of Frantz (see previous note), p. 102.

23 Quoted from Albert's MSS memoirs by A. Ritter von Arneth, *Geschichte Maria Theresias* [hereafter GMT], 10 vols, Vienna, 1863–79), vol. VII, p. 532.

24 U. Benassi wrote a long series of excellent articles on 'Guglielmo du Tillot, un ministro riformatore del secolo XVIII' in *Archivio storico per le province parmensi*, new series, vols XV–XVI (1915–16), XIX–XXV (1919–25). The rise of Du Tillot is described in vol. XVI, esp. pp. 193–213, 334–68. More accessibly, F. Venturi, *Settecento riformatore*, vol. II (Turin, 1976), pp. 214–16. On the cultural side, in English, A. Yorke-Long, *Music at Court* (London, 1954), esp. pp. 19–32.

25 J. Hrazky, 'Die Persönlichkeit der Infantin Isabella von Parma', *MÖSA*, XII (1959): 174–239.

26 *Ibid.*, p. 194.

27 Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv [hereafter HHSA], Vienna, Familien-Archiv, Sammelbände 68.

28 Schmidt, *MVGSW*, XI (1931): esp. 91–7; Wagner, *ÖGL*, V (1961): esp. 509–13.

29 Maria Theresa to Maria Beatrix, printed in *Briefe der Kaiserin Maria Theresia an ihre Kinder und Freunde* [hereafter *MTKuF*], ed. A. Ritter von Arneth (4 vols, Vienna, 1881), vol. I, p. 99.

30 *Ibid.*, vol. I, pp. 125, 130, 135 (Maria Theresa to Ferdinand, 22 May, 11 June and 9 July 1772).

31 Maria Theresa to Mercy, 1 Jan. and 3 Feb. 1774; Mercy to Maria Theresa, 19 Jan. 1774. In *Marie-Antoinette: Correspondance secrète entre Marie-Thérèse et le comte de Mercy-Argenteau*, ed. A. von Arneth and M. A. Geffroy (3 vols, 2nd edn, Paris, 1875), vol. II, pp. 89, 101–2, 105.

32 Maria Theresa's instructions for Maximilian, Apr. 1774: *MTKuF*, vol. IV, p. 322. The empress's references to *amour-propre* must be related to the important tradition of writing on this theme discussed in Keohane, *Philosophy and the State*, esp. pp. 184–97, 255, 294–302, 427–32. In this connection she appears to follow Bossuet (or Rousseau) rather than the Jansenists.

On French influence at the Court of Vienna under Maria Theresa and Joseph II, from a rather different standpoint but using some of the same material, see A. D. Hytier, 'Joseph II, la cour de Vienne et les philosophes', *Studies in Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century*, CVI (1973): 225–51.

33 To Maria Beatrix, 23 Jan. 1770 and 12 Apr. 1779; to Countess Enzenberg, 15 June 1772: *MTKuF*, vol. III, pp. 107, 354; vol. IV, p. 506. Cf. also her letter to Ferdinand, 14 Aug. 1779. To Joseph, 21 Apr. 1778, in *Maria Theresia und Joseph II. Ihre Correspondenz*, ed. A. Ritter von Arneth (3 vols), (Vienna, 1867–68), vol. II, p. 214.

34 E.g. *Journal d'un Voyage en Allemagne, fait en 1773, par G. A. H. Guibert* (Paris, 1803), pp. 248, 276–7; [J. Moore], *A View of Society and Manners in France, Switzerland and Germany* (2 vols, London, 1779), vol. II, p. 300; [C. A. Pilati] *Voyages en differens pays de l'Europe en 1774, 1775 & 1776* (2 vols, The Hague, 1777), vol. II, pp. 103–4.

35 *GMT*, vol. VII, pp. 197–8.

36 [Pilati], *Voyages*, vol. I, p. 6. Cf. L. Bodi, *Tauwetter in Wien* (Frankfurt, 1977), esp. pp. 47, 51.

37 N. W. Wraxall, *Memoirs of the Courts of Berlin, Dresden, Warsaw and Vienna, in the Years 1777, 1778 and 1779* (2 vols) (3rd edn, London, 1806), vol. II, pp. 246–7, 249, 257–9, 278–89. I am very grateful to Professor L. Colley for helping me to obtain from Yale the MSS of this work on microfilm, which tends to confirm its value as a record of the years of Wraxall's stay in central Europe, despite the fact that the book was not published until 1799.

38 Wagner, *ÖGL*, V (1961). Cf. E. Wangermann, *The Austrian Achievement, 1700–1800* (London, 1973), pp. 80–8, 130–4.

39 F. Walter, 'Kaunitz' Eintritt in die innere Politik', *Mitteilungen des*

österreichischen Instituts für Geschichtsforschung, XLVI (1932), pp. 37–79; F. A. J. Szabo, *Kaunitz and Enlightened Absolutism, 1753-1780* (Cambridge, 1994).

40 Schmidt, *MVGSW*, XI (1931): 115. See *Voltaire's Correspondence*, ed. T. Besterman (107 vols, Geneva, 1953–65), e.g. vol. CLIII, p. 128, Voltaire to Kaunitz, 25 Nov. 1763.

41 F. Maass, *Der Josephinismus* (5 vols, Vienna, 1951–61), vol. I, esp. pp. 94n., 347.

42 G. Klingenstein, *Der Aufstieg des Hauses Kaunitz* (Göttingen, 1975), esp. pp. 170–1.

43 H. Wagner, 'Die Lombardei und das Freimaurer Patent Josephs II', *MÖSA*, XXXI (1978), p. 143; A. Novotny, *Staatskanzler Kaunitz als geistige Persönlichkeit* (Vienna, 1947), pp. 145–71.

44 The diary is in HNSA, Vienna. There is a volume a year. I give references only where the exact date does not appear in my text. The discussion of Fontenelle is to be found under 18 Jan. 1762, the reference to Rousseau and Helvétius under 17 Jan. 1763. The early years of the diary have been published as *Karl Graf von Zinzendorf. Aus den Jugentagebüchern, 1747, 1752–63*, ed. M. Breunlich and M. Mader (Vienna, 1997).

45 Zinzendorf's diary, 7–10 Sept. and 3 Oct. 1764. Zinzendorf's entries are reproduced in *Correspondance complète de Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, ed. R. A. Leigh, vol. XXI (Geneva 1974), pp. 328–34. Louis Eugene, prince of Würtemberg, to Voltaire, 28 Sept. 1764 (*Voltaire's Correspondence*, ed. Besterman, vol. LVI, p. 54).

46 Zinzendorf's diary, 24 and 31 Dec. 1771, 7 Jan. 1772.

47 *Ibid.*, 27 Feb. 1764.

48 Zinzendorf's religious difficulties are discussed in A. Wolf, *Geschichtliche Bilder aus Oesterreich* (2 vols, Vienna, 1880), esp. vol. II, pp. 265–7, 305–6.

49 Zinzendorf's diary, 3 Oct. 1764, 7 Jan. 1772.

50 E.g. by Schmidt, *MVGSW*, XI (1931): 98. See n.55 below.

51 See, e.g., the introduction by L. Ashton to *Letters and Memoirs of the Prince de Ligne* (London, 1927). Maria Theresa spoke of his *légèreté* (*Marie Antoinette*, ed. Arneth and Geffroy, vol. II, p. 485), Zinzendorf of his lack of *sens commun* (diary, 10 Nov. 1770).

52 *Mémoires et mélanges historiques et littéraires, par le Prince de Ligne* (5 vols, Paris, 1827–28), vol. II, pp. 127–47. Quotation from p. 135.

53 E.g. Ligne to Voltaire, 30 Dec. 1763, 1 June 1766, ?June/July 1774 (*Voltaire's Correspondence*, ed. Besterman, vol. LIII, pp. 213–14; vol. LXI, pp. 122–3; vol. LXXXVIII, pp. 74–5).

54 *Ibid.*, vol. LXX, pp. 177–8. See also Hennin to Voltaire, 2 Oct. 1768 (*ibid.*, pp. 84–5).

55 Ligne to Voltaire, ?Aug./Sept. 1772, and Voltaire to Ligne, 29 Sept. 1772 (*ibid.*, vol. LXXXII, pp. 188–91, and LXXXIII, p. 53). There is a difficulty about the text as well as the date of the Ligne letter, since it is known only in its later printed version; but it makes a very plausible provocation for this reply of Voltaire's.

56 Gebler to Nicolai, 16 Nov. 1763 in *Aus dem josephinischen Wien*, ed. R. M. Werner (Berlin, 1888), p. 12.

57 See Bodi, *Tauwetter in Wien*.

58 [J. Pezzl] *Skizze aus Wien* (Vienna, 1789–90), p. 45. Cf. his *philosophischer Roman* of 1784, *Faustin*.

59 Voltaire to D'Alembert, 28 Oct. 1769 (*Voltaire's Correspondence*, ed. Besterman, vol. LXXIII, p. 142), quoting Grimm.

60 *Correspondance littéraire, philosophique et critique par Grimm, Diderot, Raynal, Meister etc.*, ed. M. Tourneux (16 vols, 1877–82), vol. XI, pp. 468, 471–4, 526, 529.

61 H. Wagner, 'Die Reise Josephs II. nach Frankreich 1767 und die Reformen in Österreich', in *Österreich und Europe. Festgabe für Hugo Hantsch zum 70. Geburtstag* (Graz, 1965), pp. 224–6. This useful article much exaggerates the influence of the visit on Joseph. See my *Joseph II*, pp. 379–80.

62 Le Bret to Bertolà, 7 Jan. 1778. In J. U. Fechner, *Erfahrene und erfundene Landschaft: ... Bertolà's Deutschlandbild* (Opladen, 1974), p. 230. On Le Bret, M. L. Pesante, *Stato e religione nella storiografia di Goettingen* (Turin, 1971).

63 C. Riesbeck, *Travels through Germany*, trans. Maty (3 vols, London, 1787), vol. I, pp. 255–6.

64 *Correspondance littéraire*, ed. Tourneux, vol. XIII, p. 6.

65 See Chapter 5, 'The False Joseph II', pp. 117, 121–2, 142–3.

66 J. Lanjuinais, *Le Monarque accompli, ou prodiges de bonté, de savoir, et de sagesse qui font l'éloge de ... Joseph II* (3 vols, Lausanne, 1774).

67 *Voltaire's Correspondence*, ed. Besterman, vol. XCIV, p. 165.

68 See E. Faure, *La Disgrâce de Turgot* (Paris, 1961), pp. 505–6.

69 Lanjuinais, *Le Monarque accompli*, esp. vol. III, pp. 250–62, 284–91. Joseph is a 'monarque philosophe' from vol. I, p. 1. Comparison with Trajan and Marcus Aurelius is reached on vol. I, p. 6.

70 Lord Acton, *Essays on Church and State*, ed. D. Woodruff (London, 1952), p. 355.

71 Frederick the Great to Voltaire, 18. Aug. 1770 (*Voltaire's Correspondence*, ed. Besterman, vol. LXXVI, pp. 112–13).

72 Countess Leopoldine Kaunitz to Princess Eleonore Liechtenstein, 1782, in A. Wolf, *Fürstin Eleonore Liechtenstein* (Vienna, 1875), p. 165.

73 *Journal d'un voyage en Allemagne, fait en 1773, par G. A. H. Guibert*, vol. II, p. 250.

74 Quoted in O. Sashegyi, *Zensur and Geistesfreiheit unter Joseph II* (Budapest, 1958), p. 117.

75 See Chapter 5, 'The False Joseph II', pp. 138–9.

76 Memorandum of 1765 (*MTuJ*, ed. Arneth, vol. III, p. 338).

77 Zinzendorf's diary, 27 Oct. 1773.

78 See Chapter 5, 'The False Joseph II'.

79 Joseph to Lacy, 12 June 1773 (HHSA Familien-Archiv, Sammelbände 72).

80 Joseph to Leopold, 28 July 1768 (MTuJ, vol. I, p. 228).

81 *Correspondance secrète du Comte de Mercy-Argenteau avec l'Empereur Joseph II et le Prince de Kaunitz*, ed. A. von Arneth and J. Flammermont (2 vols, Paris, 1889–91), vol. II, p. 446: Joseph to Mercy, 4 April 1774.

82 W. C. Langsam, *Francis the Good: The Education of an Emperor, 1768–1792* (New York, 1949), p. 38. Joseph to his circle of ladies, 16 July 1777 (Czechoslovak state archive, Litomerice – Žitenice section: LRRRA – P-16/22-3 [copies]).

83 A. Beer and J. von Fiedler, *Joseph II. und Graf Ludwig Cobenzl: Ihr Briefwechsel* (2 vols, Vienna, 1901), vol. II, pp. 391–2: Joseph to Grand-Duke Paul of Russia and his wife, 24 Feb. 1781.

84 Joseph to Maria Theresa, 20 July 1777 (MTuJ, vol. II, p. 152).

85 The best evidence for these statements is to be found in Maass, *Josephinismus*, vol. II; Winter, *Josefinismus*, pp. 100–14; and in H. Schlitter, *Die Reise des Papstes Pius VI. nach Wien* (2 vols, Vienna, 1892–94).

86 HNSA Familien-Akten, Hofreisen I: report from Naples, 8 Apr. 1769.

87 E.g. Delobel, *A S.M.I. Joseph II, père de la patrie* (Mons, [1781]).

88 *Dr Fessler's Rückblicke auf seine siebenzigjährige Pilgerschaft* (Breslau, 1824) can be supplemented by the works of P. F. Barton, esp. *Jesuiten, Jansenisten, Josephiner, Eine Fallstudie zur frühen Toleranzzeit: Der Fall Innocentius Fessler*, part I (Vienna, 1978). *Was ist der Kaiser?* was published in Vienna in 1782.

89 *Fessler's Rückblicke*, esp. pp. 35–6, 43–5, 158, 324n.

90 *Ibid.*, pp. 241–4, 487, 489.

91 G. Pire, 'De l'Influence de Sénèque sur les théories pédagogiques de J.-J. Rousseau', *Annales de la Société Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, XXXII (1953–55), pp. 57–92; W. T. Conroy, Jr, 'Diderot's 'Essai sur Sénèque'', *Studies in Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century*, CXXXI (1975).

92 Evans, *Making of the Habsburg Monarchy*, p. 113n.

93 A. Wandruszka, *Leopold II* (2 vols, Vienna, 1963–65), esp. vol. I, pp. 219–26, 279–87, vol. II, part IV.

94 K. Garas, *Franz Anton Maulbertsch 1724–1796* (Budapest, 1960), pp. 154–7, 276.

95 Gay, *Enlightenment*, vol. I, p. 320.

96 Explicitly by H. Rieser, *Der Geist des Josephinismus und sein Fortleben* (Vienna, 1963), who divides Joseph's subjects into those who were *Romtreu* and the rest. See e.g. p. 82 for a denial that the Josephists' reforms were Catholic reforms.

97 This seems to be true e.g. of E. Wangermann, *From Joseph II to the Jacobin Trials* (2nd edn, Oxford, 1969), though not of his more recent writing.

98 R. J. W. Evans, *Rudolf II and His World* (Oxford, 1973).

99 R. Darnton, *Mesmerism and the End of the Enlightenment in France* (Cambridge, MA, 1968).

100 See P. Hersche, *Der Spätjansenismus in Österreich* (Vienna, 1977).

101 R. Pomeau, *La religion de Voltaire* (Paris, 1956), esp. pp. 25–7.

102 Voltaire to Frederick the Great, 30 Oct. 1769 (*Voltaire's Correspondence*, ed. Besterman, vol. LXXIII, p. 145).

103 Zinzendorf's diary, 28 Apr. 1768.

104 Cf. T. C. W. Blanning, *Reform and Revolution in Mainz* (Cambridge, 1974), pp. 23–32; Chadwick, *Popes and European Revolution*, esp. pp. 395–402; R. Shackleton, *The 'Encyclopédie' and the Clerks* (Zaharoff lecture, Oxford, 1970). More generally, *The Enlightenment in National Context*, ed. R. Porter and M. Teich (Cambridge, 1981).

105 Pomeau, *Religion de Voltaire*, p. 343 and n.

106 J. Bentham, *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*, ed. W. Harrison (Oxford, 1948), p. 241.

107 Gay, *Enlightenment*, vol. I, p. 22.