

Introduction

In the first volume of this biography,¹ covering his first thirty-nine years (1741–80), Joseph II remained always in the shadow of his mother, Maria Theresa. This was true even after he had become Holy Roman Emperor and co-regent of the Austrian Monarchy in 1765. He participated actively in her government and vigorously challenged her methods and principles. But it was she who was the absolute sovereign of the Monarchy and determined its policy, right down to the day of her death, 29 November 1780. His public life – and his private life too, such as it was – revolved round her; and their well-recorded confrontations inevitably dominated, as they greatly enlivened, my first volume.

Brought up both to rule the vast lands of the Monarchy and to lead its armies, Joseph had gone far beyond his mentors in developing a fanatical cult of the impersonal, unified state, strongly armed against its enemies, under a single absolute sovereign – a state requiring service from all its inhabitants, who ought all to count as his subjects but also as free men and women. The Monarchy embraced a score of provinces, some of them widely separated from its central territories, and the total length of its frontiers ran to many thousands of miles (see map 1, p. 16, and Table 1, p. 2).

Joseph saw the Monarchy as endangered not only by its geographical position, its relative military weakness and its lack of reliable allies, but also by its internal structure. The provinces that composed it were governed according to a variety of constitutions, many of which obstructed the ruler's imposition of the policies and the taxes that alone, according to Joseph, could prevent the Monarchy from 'going to ruin'. In confidential memoranda submitted to his mother he had made ferocious criticisms of her government and her officials. He also denounced the nobility of the various provinces, especially Hungary, the representative Estates which

¹ D. Beales, *Joseph II, 1: In the Shadow of Maria Theresa, 1741–1780* (Cambridge, 1987) [henceforward '*J. II 1*']. To give page references for this and the next paragraph is impractical, but thereafter I shall indicate in footnotes the main sections relevant to the points made in this Introduction.

Table 1. *The length of the Monarchy’s frontiers* * (as estimated in 1790)

Contiguous country	Length of frontier (in leagues)	Miles (assuming 1 league = 4.6 miles)
Ottoman Empire	263	1210
Poland	137	630
Prussia	63	290
Saxony	50	230
States of Holy Roman Empire	200	920
Republic of Venice	140	644
TOTAL	853	3924

*The original estimate comes from *Essai sur la monarchie autrichienne*, a manuscript account evidently written for the Neapolitan rulers on the occasion of their visit to Vienna for the marriage of three of their children with three of Leopold’s in 1790. Marquis Gallo, the Neapolitan ambassador, and Kaunitz clearly had a hand in it. There is a copy in the rare books section of the Austrian Studies Center Library at the University of Minnesota (MS z 943.6 f8 s 73), running to 528 pp., and another, I think identical in wording, in Acton MSS 4695, University of Cambridge, running to 452 pp. Its presence in the Acton collection seems explicable only on the assumption that it was passed down in the family from the Neapolitan minister of the period, Sir John Acton.

The very short boundaries with Russia and Switzerland are omitted from the calculations. The much longer frontiers of the detached provinces, including Belgium and Lombardy, are also excluded.

the higher clergy and the aristocracy usually dominated, what he saw as appalling abuses in the Church and its unacceptable independence of the state, what he considered the retrograde and pernicious education that was normal in the Monarchy, and what he condemned as out-of-date and inefficient social and economic attitudes and practices. He had put forward radical, almost revolutionary, proposals for change, involving drastic administrative reorganisation, a comprehensive restructuring of the relationship between lords and peasants, and fundamental Church reform, including religious toleration.

His more radical proposals had not been adopted. But his influence had grown as Maria Theresa’s vitality diminished, and by 1780 he had contributed to reforms in most areas of internal government, especially in Church matters, the legal system and the affairs of the Court. Placed in charge of the army, he had worked with Marshal Count Lacy, from 1766 to 1774 head of the War Council, to create a much bigger and better-organised force than the Monarchy had hitherto possessed.² In foreign

² *J. II* 1, esp. pp. 183–90, 222–9, 343–6.

affairs he had helped to procure the annexation of Galicia (1772), the Bukovina (1775) and the formerly Bavarian Innviertel (1779). But in the war of 1778–9 he and his 300,000 troops had failed to defeat Prussia and achieve his aim of annexing all of Bavaria. Both his policy and his generalship had misfired. In the summer of 1780, however, he had visited the Empress Catherine II and thereby brought closer the Russian alliance which the long-serving state chancellor (Staatskanzler), Prince Wenzel Anton von Kaunitz(-Rietberg), now agreed was desirable.³

Much of this was pretty well known from the numerous previous works on Maria Theresa and her reign. But few historians had focussed specifically on Joseph's role during these years. Looked at from this angle, the picture turned out to differ in important respects from the accepted version. Some of the problems arose from the nature of the contemporary sources. Joseph's attitude in certain important respects had been distorted by many historians' use of lively letters falsely attributed to him, published in 1790, ostensibly at Constantinople, which represented him as more of a *philosophe* and a man of the Enlightenment than he actually was. With reference to the period before he came to the throne, this forgery was especially significant in causing him to be wrongly regarded as violently hostile to the Jesuits.⁴ Furthermore, the invaluable editions of his genuine letters published by Alfred Ritter von Arneth proved, when the originals were examined, to have omitted important and revealing passages.⁵ No previous historian had made much use of the elaborate 'General picture of the affairs of the Monarchy' which Joseph compiled in 1768,⁶ of the records of his extensive travels,⁷ or of the correspondence of his close friend, Princess Eleonore Liechtenstein, with her sister, Countess Leopoldine Kaunitz, which illuminates his attitudes, personality and private conduct.⁸

With the aid of these sources, proof was found of his influence on ecclesiastical legislation at a period when most historians had ascribed it largely or entirely to Maria Theresa and Kaunitz.⁹ The emperor's

³ On his role in foreign policy see *ibid.*, chs. 9 and 13. Kaunitz had held the office since 1753.

⁴ See my articles 'The False Joseph II' (*HJ* 1975), republished with modifications in my *Enlightenment and Reform in Eighteenth-Century Europe* (London, 2005), pp. 117–54, and 'Maria Theresa, Joseph II and the Suppression of the Jesuits', *ibid.*, pp. 207–26.

⁵ That there were omissions of importance (contrary to Arneth's explicit statements) from his *JuL* was first revealed in A. Wandruszka, *Leopold II*. (2 vols., Vienna, 1963–5), but in my first volume I pointed to many more that he had had no occasion to mention. Others will be referred to in the appropriate place in this volume.

⁶ See esp. *J. II* 1, pp. 176–91, 273–7. ⁷ *Ibid.*, chs. 8, 11 and 12.

⁸ *Ibid.*, esp. pp. 78–9, ch. 10.

⁹ *Ibid.*, esp. ch. 14. For the rest of this paragraph: on the impact of his travels chs. 8, 11 and 12; on foreign policy chs. 9 and 13; on domestic administration chs. 6 and 7; on serfdom ch. 11; and the Conclusion.

4 Introduction

little-studied travels turned out to have had significant effects on government policy towards nearly all the provinces he visited: the Banat, Lombardy, Bohemia, Galicia, Transylvania and Croatia. It emerged that in some areas of policy, especially in foreign affairs, the Monarchy was in effect ruled by a triumvirate of empress, emperor and chancellor. In 1774 Joseph was accorded an active role as co-ordinator of the work of the Staatsrat (council of state), a body charged with advising the empress on most major issues. Evidence was found that, while some of his early attitudes remained constant, others developed over time, and that he could be disconcertingly inconsistent, especially over relations between lords and their serfs. In foreign policy, it became apparent that, contrary to the assumptions of almost all previous historians, Joseph was not continually seeking war and aggrandisement but was at times a force for moderation, checking Kaunitz's bellicosity. It was suggested that his radical protests and proposals were brought forward only at specific periods when his discontent boiled over and that, in between, he operated within the existing system as 'one of his mother's ministers', serving on committees and transacting business with efficiency and reasonably good temper.

His dual role as both 'Holy Roman Emperor of the German Nation' and co-regent of the Monarchy was also examined. He had become emperor when his father, Emperor Francis I, died in 1765. In this capacity Joseph ranked as the senior European sovereign, and in the Empire he ruled alone. Its extremely complex structure, with its more than three hundred semi-independent political entities, left him with very limited powers. But parts of the Monarchy were geographically included in the Empire and were in varying degrees subject to imperial law, while on the other hand the interests of the two polities were different and were likely to clash. It emerged in my first volume that Maria Theresa devised and exploited Joseph's position as co-regent chiefly in order to prevent his acting too independently as emperor. The terms under which he became co-regent required him to take on any of her duties at her discretion, but preserved her sovereignty intact.¹⁰ In addition, within the Monarchy there were aspects of government from which she virtually excluded him, especially the affairs of Hungary and Belgium.

With the death of Maria Theresa a new prospect opened. The Monarchy now had one head only, who was also emperor. Hence the biographer's task becomes rather different, and in some ways more difficult. Joseph could now exercise such powers as the emperor had, untrammelled by the constraints of the co-regency. As the absolute ruler of the Monarchy, he now

¹⁰ See, as well as my vol. 1, my article 'Love and the Empire: Maria Theresa and her Co-Regents', in *Enlightenment and Reform*, pp. 182–206.

had, and proudly accepted, full legal and personal responsibility for foreign policy and for the entire administration of all his provinces, not to mention his Court in Vienna. All these matters therefore have a claim to a place in his biography. But the quantity of laws, orders and letters he generated is vast, many times greater annually than his mother produced. Her annual output of decrees for the central lands in the 1770s did not quite reach one hundred. Joseph's average during his sole reign (1781–9) was 690.¹¹

The biographer has other problems to contend with than the sheer weight of material. Though vast collections of his laws were printed at his insistence, they are incomplete.¹² Copies of his official letters were kept in large volumes in the Vienna archives, but they are not comprehensive.¹³ Few of the numerous comments he wrote on documents submitted to him have been brought together. Not only Vienna but every major provincial centre in the Monarchy has at least one significant archive, as do many country houses, churches and monasteries, and all of them contain some unique documents of relevance. The material is not only widely scattered but is also, as is the way with both bureaucracies and archives, compartmentalised in unexpected ways, so that a historian is very likely to conclude after working on a particular class of papers in particular archives that he has read everything pertinent to a certain theme, only to learn that crucial additional sources are to be found under other headings and/or in other places. To give just one example: in the archive of Joseph's health commission for Hungary in Budapest, I came across copies of government-sponsored printed pamphlets, translated into seven vernacular languages so that they could be distributed to tell citizens of the eastern lands how to deal with fire, flood, plague and famine. No doubt these highly significant pamphlets exist elsewhere, but

¹¹ These figures come from P. G. M. Dickson, *Finance and Government under Maria Theresia, 1740–1780* (2 vols., Oxford, 1987), vol. 1, pp. 318–19.

¹² The nearest to a standard compilation of J.'s laws is *Handbuch aller unter der Regierung des Kaisers Joseph des II. für die K. K. Erbländer ergangenen Verordnungen und Gesetze in einer systematischen Verbindung* (18 vols., Vienna, 1785–90, of which the later vols are stated to have J. Kropatschek as editor). He acknowledges that his collection was inspired by J. himself, as does J. Keresztury in his collection of some Hungarian laws: *Introductio in opus collectionis normalium constitutorum, quae regnante august. Imperatore et rege apostol. Josepho II. pro regno Hungariae et ei adnexis provinciis, magno item principatu Transilvaniae condita sunt* (Pars I, Vienna, 1788, no more published). Other more specialist collections, e.g. on *Justiz* and ecclesiastical legislation, were also produced. For Belgium there is the excellent later *Recueil des ordonnances des Pays-Bas autrichiens* (ed. L. P. Gachard and P. Verhaegen, 3^e série, vols. XII and XIII for J.'s sole reign (Brussels, 1910, 1914) [OPBA]).

¹³ The most important are the *Handbilletenprotokollen*, of which there are at least two series, one general and one concerning the Staatsrat. They are in HHSA. But there are many others, some of which will be referred to later.

6 Introduction

I have not encountered them anywhere else myself, and I have not seen them referred to.¹⁴ Problems of this kind affect archive work of every kind in every country, but they are much increased in the case of the Monarchy by its many administrative divisions. In addition, material about Joseph's work is to be found in archives all over Germany and in all European countries, particularly with reference to his activity as emperor and to foreign policy. A historian who devoted his entire life to studying him could not possibly read all the material relevant to the origins, announcement and implementation of his decisions.

After Maria Theresa's death there was no near-equal with whom he lived, corresponded and battled, and he reduced to a minimum the social functions of the Court. In consequence, his motives, attitudes and behaviour were in some respects less fully exposed and described than before 1780, especially since he now seldom needed to write memoranda justifying his proposals and, when he did, no one was in a position to combat them so uninhibitedly as his mother had. Joseph's correspondence with his brother and heir-presumptive, Grand Duke Leopold of Tuscany, is revealing up to a point, though they rarely disagreed openly – Joseph was much more frank with Leopold than *vice versa*. But Leopold also composed one document of the first importance which has scarcely been used by historians, a huge, secret 'Relazione', which offers an unvarnished description and critique of his brother's rule, based on what he saw and learned on an extended visit to Vienna in 1784; and in the last year of the reign Leopold was writing confidential letters in invisible ink to his elder sister Marie Christine, denouncing Joseph's policies and preparing to reverse them if and when he succeeded to the throne. So Leopold provides the nearest parallel to the counterpoint of Maria Theresa's letters in volume I. Although the brothers avoided the confrontations that occurred between empress and co-regent, in fact they stood for two entirely different conceptions of monarchical rule: Joseph believed that good government, especially in the Monarchy, depended on the unchallenged, absolute, even despotic authority of a sovereign, while Leopold was committed to ruling in accordance with constitutions and by negotiation with established authorities.¹⁵

¹⁴ MOL c 66, Dep. Sanitatis, Normalia 490, 491.

¹⁵ Arneth, *JuL*; Wandruszka, *L. II*; originals of *JuL* in HHSA FA Sbde 7, 8; *Relazione* of 1784 in HHSA FA Sbde 16; letters of L. and M. C. in Wolf, *LuMC*. Cf. my 'Philosophic Kingship and Enlightened Despotism', in my *Enlightenment and Reform*, pp. 28–59. See Wandruszka's important article 'Österreich am Ende der Regierungszeit Maria Theresias', in *Anzeiger der phil.-hist. Klasse der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 111, pp. 41–60, drawing on L.'s earlier *Relazione* of 1778.

Joseph's relations with Kaunitz, who remained the chief minister, continued to be touchy and became more difficult in the late 1780s. They are less fully documented than a historian would wish since the two men transacted so much business *tête-à-tête* or through intermediaries, but many disputes between the two men were well recorded.¹⁶ The best available single source for Joseph's differences with ministers in general is the indispensable compilation of Hock and Bidermann on the work of the Staatsrat, which concentrates on the 1780s and uses many documents now lost.¹⁷ As for his private life, in so far as he had one, princess Liechtenstein's correspondence remains of great interest, though her relationship with him became less friendly during his sole reign.

The picture of both his public and private activity is filled out by a source which was available for the earlier period but now comes into its own: the diary of count Karl von Zinzendorf. He provides us with a detailed entry for every single day, recording what he did, whom he met in society and, often, what was discussed, as well as his personal feelings of inadequacy and 'erotic melancholy' – he was a Knight of the Teutonic Order and so had made a vow of celibacy. At the beginning of the reign he was governor of Trieste, but he was in Vienna in the early months of 1781. In March 1782 Joseph made him head of a major department, and he thereafter remained at the centre of government. Zinzendorf considered it his duty 'to contribute with all his power to diminish the barbarism and obscurantism in a great Monarchy, and to promote the reign of justice and virtue'.¹⁸ Hence he struggled against what he saw as the less rational, enlightened and philanthropic attitudes of the emperor, other ministers and most of the bureaucracy. He records all his numerous audiences with the emperor, many in considerable detail, tells us much of the emperor's attitudes and behaviour, and much about how he ruled, how his administration operated and how his methods and policies were viewed. Taken together with the vast collection of official documents he left behind, his diary forms probably the most complete picture of a minister's relationship with an absolute ruler which survives for any country or period.¹⁹

¹⁶ The chief official letters between J. and K. are to be found in HHSA SKV for foreign policy, HHSA Belgien Vorträge for Belgium, HHSA Italien for Italy. Other letters are in HHSA Grosse Correspondenz 405 and 406 and F.A. 70. Many are printed in Beer, *JLuK* and S. Brunner (ed.), *Correspondances intimes de l'Empereur Joseph II avec ... le comte de Cobenzl et ... le prince de Kaunitz* (Mainz, 1871).

¹⁷ C. Freiherr von Hock and H. I. Bidermann, *Der österreichische Staatsrath* (Vienna, 1879).
¹⁸ HHSA TZ, 12 July 1783.

¹⁹ A small selection from the Count's diary, translated from the original French into German, was published by F. Walter, *Wien von Maria Theresia bis zur Franzosenzeit* (Vienna, 1972). The diaries are now being published, but very slowly and in relation to

8 Introduction

Joseph's reign was the period of the celebrated *Broschürenflut* (flood of pamphlets), mainly in Vienna and, towards the end of the decade, in Belgium. The pamphlets belong to a type of historical source hitherto virtually non-existent in the Monarchy. Although very few of them have literary merit, the information they give about Viennese society, their polemics for and against the Church and the emperor's policies, and in some cases their humour add a dimension to the story. But their limitations have to be recognised. They were made possible only by Joseph's remodelling of the censorship in 1781, and a number of them are known to have been commissioned or inspired by him or his ministers. Yet they rarely show personal knowledge of him or of the workings of government. Pamphlets hostile to Joseph and his policies were also promoted, and in some cases written, by churchmen and nobles, especially in Belgium, and by discontented officials. But it is usually difficult to tell how far the views expressed on either side were representative or influential.²⁰

With the aid of this immense range of material, what is most important to a biographer is to distinguish Joseph's personal contribution to the policies and actions of the government carried on in his name. I shall describe how he conducted business and how decisions were made, and seek to determine how far he personally inspired the new policies that were adopted during his reign and how much he influenced their implementation.

I shall also seek to reconsider in the light of all the available evidence some of the wider questions about Joseph's character and actions, most of which have already attracted the attention of historians. How far was he Enlightened, even revolutionary, and how far despotic? Were his policies wise and reasonable, and was the failure of so many of his schemes due to factors beyond his control, or were they doomed to shipwreck by his over-ambition, inconsistency, mismanagement and faults of personality? Did his foreign policy ruin his domestic plans, or *vice versa*? How much did the movement known as 'Joseph(in)ism' really owe to him? And to

Z.'s extensive travels rather than chronologically. As yet, the only section fully published which reaches the reign of J. II concerns Z.'s period as governor of Trieste. His early diaries were published in M. Breunlich and M. Mader, *Karl Graf von Zinzendorf aus den Jugendtagebüchern 1747, 1752 bis 1763* (Vienna, 1997). Z.'s short autobiography was published in G. von Pettenegg, *Ludwig und Karl ... von Zinzendorf* (Vienna, 1879). I owe much of my knowledge of these documents to the generosity of Dr Eva Faber, Mag. E. Fattinger and Prof. G. Klingenstein.

²⁰ By far the best study of the brochures from the standpoint of German-language literature is L. Bodi, *Tauwetter in Wien* (Frankfurt am Main, 1977). E. Wangermann, *Die Waffen der Publizität* (Vienna, 2004), concerned specifically with politics, produces some evidence of influence by J., K. and other officials on the pamphleteers. Unfortunately, he virtually confines himself to material published in the area of modern Austria in German on domestic affairs. Linguet is unmentioned (see below, pp. 152–3, 615–16) and nothing is said of the Belgian outpouring at the end of the decade.

what extent did he influence the subsequent history of the Monarchy and its individual provinces?

Since I published my first volume, works have continued to appear which are vitiated by the use of unauthentic sources, most conspicuously H. Magenschab's unscholarly *Life of the emperor*.²¹ Karl Gutkas's biography, on the other hand, is a worthy and usually reliable account, though not deeply grounded in the archives.²² Among books about Joseph's rule T. C. W. Blanning's *Joseph II* stands out as an original and penetrating short study, making excellent use of the emperor's letter-books and other little-used sources in analysing 'his ill-fated attempt to construct a modern state'. On many issues I cannot do much more than elaborate on his trenchant conclusions.²³ Other recent writings will be cited in the course of this volume, but mention should be made here of the immense contribution of P. G. M. Dickson. His monumental book, *Finance and Government under Maria Theresia*, provides much material complementary to my first volume, and throws considerable light on Joseph II's reign as well.²⁴ On the 1780s he has produced four masterly articles, to which I am profoundly indebted, on the reshaping of the Austrian Church, the bureaucracy, the land-survey and finance.²⁵ A very recent book by Antal Szántay, *Regional Policy in Old Europe*, has added immensely to our understanding of the emperor's plans for Belgium, Hungary and Lombardy and of the opposition they aroused.²⁶

Paul von Mitrofanov's *Joseph II*.²⁷ Still stands as the most notable full treatment of the reign so far published, although it is nearly a hundred years old. Ever since it appeared, it has been true that only those historians who have read and rely on it can hope to write good books on the period, while those who do not know Mitrofanov's work have found themselves duped by unauthentic material.

Four qualities make his book likely to endure. First, he made excellent use of genuine documents in print, including Joseph's published decrees and letters and many pamphlets, and he had combed the unpublished French, Prussian and Saxon ambassadors' despatches. He remains the only scholar to have made use of the evidently valuable reports of the

²¹ Vienna, 1979. ²² Vienna, 1989. ²³ London, 1994. ²⁴ 2 vols., Oxford, 1987.

²⁵ P. G. M. Dickson, 'Joseph II's Hungarian Land Survey', *EHR* 106 (1991), pp. 611–34; 'Joseph II's Reshaping of the Austrian Church', *HJ* 36 (1993), pp. 89–114; 'Monarchy and Bureaucracy in Late Eighteenth-Century Austria', *EHR* 110 (1995), pp. 323–67; 'Count Karl von Zinzendorf's "New Accountancy": the Structure of Austrian Government Finance in Peace and War, 1781–1791', *IHR* 29 (2007), pp. 22–56.

²⁶ A. Szántay, *Regionalpolitik im alten Europa* (Budapest, 2005). Dr Szántay generously sent me a copy of this work.

²⁷ First published in Russian in 1907, the book appeared in German as *Josef II. Seine politische und kulturelle Tätigkeit* (2 vols., Vienna, 1910). Cf. my comments in *J. II* 1, p. 12.

10 Introduction

Saxon envoys. Perhaps he should have used them more critically, since the Prussian minister in Vienna described his Saxon colleague as ‘too credulous and imaginative a reporter for his flighty notions and conjectures to be trusted’. But in the particular case referred to, the Saxon was right and the Prussian wrong.²⁸ Mitrofanov’s reluctance to accept as authentic certain letters ascribed to the emperor which were published in the eighteenth century saved him from much error, though it prevented him from using a few important documents that were in fact genuine. Secondly, he marshalled and expounded his material lucidly and brilliantly. It is of great value to have Joseph’s activities divided up and analysed for the whole reign under separate subject-headings. Thirdly, Mitrofanov had a clear though somewhat questionable view of the reasons for the emperor’s failures.

Fourthly, he had the great advantage, denied to all writers after 1917, that he did not have to exercise his imagination in order to picture a vast polyglot multinational empire ruled from Vienna by an absolute sovereign whose basic aim was necessarily to preserve his territory intact with the aid of a large army and by the most cunning diplomacy he could devise. Mitrofanov was privately inclined to hostility to Austria as a Great Power and fearful of the Prusso-Austrian bloc of the early years of the twentieth century.²⁹ But he had always lived with the implications of the power-political relationship between the empires of Austria and Russia, oscillating between alliance and hostility. In this area and context much of the historiography of the Monarchy since his time has lost touch with the eighteenth-century perspective. Many historians from modern Austria, the Czech Republic, Italy and, to a lesser extent, from Hungary think only of their present-day country when claiming to write of the whole Monarchy. They are liable too to forget – or, what is equally unhistorical, to deplore – the centrality of military and foreign policy to the rulers of the Monarchy. Valuable and interesting though the work of Ernst Wangermann and his numerous disciples has often proved, its blinkered concentration on Vienna, on the area of the modern Austrian Republic and on domestic affairs renders it incapable of grasping Joseph II’s overall problems and the way in which they shaped his attitudes.

Mitrofanov had no doubt that the main initiating force of the 1780s was Joseph himself, and he wrote many telling paragraphs on the emperor’s personality. But, as he made clear, he was not writing a biography of the emperor; and his method, appropriate to a study of the actions of Joseph’s

²⁸ Riedesel to F., 2 Feb. 1785 (ZStA, R 96 49 J). Riedesel was casting doubt on the news that J. had been working for the Bavarian–Belgian exchange.

²⁹ See Mitrofanov’s article, reprinted in H. Delbrück (ed.), *Die Motive und Ziele der russischen Politik nach zwei Russen* (2nd edn, Berlin, 1915).