

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-52588-6 - Joseph II: I - In the Shadow of Maria Theresa, 1741-1780

Derek Beales

Excerpt

[More information](#)

Introduction

Joseph II is the classic example of a radical monarch who tried to transform society from above. For one authority he ranks as ‘perhaps the completest enlightened despot in European history’, for another as ‘the revolutionary emperor’ who on the eve of the French Revolution anticipated much of its programme.¹ This book tells the story of his life, and investigates his policies, their origins and their fate.

He became emperor at the age of twenty-four when his father, Francis I, died in 1765. For the next twenty-five years until his death in 1790, Joseph presided over the vast and ancient ‘Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation’ and claimed precedence as the first of Europe’s lay sovereigns. But in fact he possessed little power, and played no great role, in that capacity.

He set his mark on history not as emperor, but as ruler under numerous other titles of the immense agglomeration of lands in Central and Eastern Europe, Italy and the Netherlands accumulated by the Austrian branch of the Habsburg dynasty, a complex which he and his contemporaries generally called either ‘the Austrian Monarchy’ or simply ‘the Monarchy’.² In 1765 he

¹ See p. 6 and n. 13 below.

² I believe it to be true that J. and M. T. never used the word ‘Empire’ of the lands inherited under the Pragmatic Sanction. It was normal to speak of the Russian and Ottoman empires, but in relation to central Europe the term ‘Empire’ was reserved for the *Reich*.

My first two quotations from J. show that he talked sometimes of his *patrie* and of *l’état*, but by far the commonest term for the whole complex of Habsburg (or Habsburg-Lorraine) territories was ‘the Monarchy’ or ‘the Austrian Monarchy’, though ‘the lands of the House of Austria’ and ‘the Austrian states’ were also employed.

I do not know of a detailed discussion of this terminology for the eighteenth century, but there are interesting points in O. Stolz, ‘Wesen und Zweck des Staates in der Geschichte Österreichs’, in *Festschrift zur Feier des zweihundertjährigen Bestandes des Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchivs*, ed. L. Santifaller, vol II (Vienna, 1951), pp. 94–110. He finds a first use of ‘Empire’ to refer to the Monarchy in 1786. Certainly the author of the ‘Constantinople letters’ (see below, p. 9) so uses it.

I know that there is some question whether it is right to speak of the ‘Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation’, but the phrase was used at the time. See J. F. Noël, ‘Traditions universalistes et aspects nationaux dans la notion de Saint-Empire Romain Germanique au XVIII^e siècle’, *RHD*, LXXXII (1968), 193–212.

When people talked of leaving Vienna to go *en empire*, they obviously meant in fact southern Germany (cf. H. Raab, *Clemens Wenzeslaus von Sachsen und seine Zeit 1739–1812* (Freiburg, 1962), p. 1).

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-52588-6 - Joseph II: I - In the Shadow of Maria Theresa, 1741-1780

Derek Beales

Excerpt

[More information](#)

Map 1. The Austrian Monarchy and the Holy Roman Empire from the 1740s to 1780. The political boundaries, especially within the Empire, have had to be simplified for the sake of clarity.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-52588-6 - Joseph II: I - In the Shadow of Maria Theresa, 1741-1780

Derek Beales

Excerpt

[More information](#)



became ‘co-regent’ of these territories with his mother, Maria Theresa. When she died in 1780 he succeeded her as their absolute sovereign for the last decade of his life.

His double role creates difficulties both of understanding and of terminology. Map 1 will clarify the geographical position: the Empire included virtually the whole of modern Germany and much else besides; but only about half of the Monarchy lay within it. As for terminology, I shall follow the practice, universal in the eighteenth century and thereafter, of using ‘the emperor’ as a straightforward synonym for Joseph II in all his capacities after 1765. I shall also call Maria Theresa ‘the empress’, as her contemporaries did, although her sole right to the title was as wife and widow of Francis I. But when I write of ‘the Empire’ or ‘the *Reich*’, I shall invariably be referring to the Holy Roman Empire. What is often nowadays known as ‘the Austrian Empire’ or ‘the Habsburg Empire’ I shall always call ‘the Monarchy’ or, where no confusion can arise with the region or republic of the same name, ‘Austria’.

From the moment when Joseph became involved in affairs of state, he maintained that the Monarchy needed drastic reform, and worked to achieve it. In 1768 he wrote to his brother Leopold, grand duke of Tuscany,

Love of country, the welfare of the Monarchy, that is genuinely . . . the only passion I feel, and I would undertake anything for its sake. I am so committed to it that, if I cannot satisfy myself that its condition is good and that the arrangements we are making are beneficial, my mind cannot be at peace nor my body in good health.³

He set about trying to expand and improve the army, to reform and control the Roman Catholic Church within the Monarchy, to extend religious toleration and relax censorship, to improve the position of the serfs, to introduce a tax system that took no account of social privilege, and to impose on the variegated provinces of his dominions homogeneous laws and a unified, centralised administration. He asserted that, as the sovereign, he knew better than anyone else what was for the good of his people. In 1783 he published a manifesto or ‘pastoral letter’ addressed to his officials:

I have sought to implant in all servants of the state the love that I have for the general good and the zeal that inspires me to promote it; from which it necessarily follows that, in accordance with my example, each man should have no other aim in all his actions but utility and the welfare of the greatest number.⁴

³ Arnetz, *MTuJ* 1, p. 225 (25 July 1768).

⁴ This document was published at the time in at least French, German, Italian and Hungarian, e.g. *Joseph des Zweyten Erinnerung an seinen Staatsbeamten am Schluss des 1783ten Jahres* (Vienna, [1784]). The original (French) text in J.’s hand is in HNSA SKV 138 (1783). It is published in *OPBA*, 3rd series, XII (1910), 333–8 (as a footnote). German text in J. Wendrinsky, *Kaiser Joseph II.* (Vienna, 1880), pp. 330–6.

Introduction

5

As late as June 1789 he told his recalcitrant subjects in the southern Netherlands: 'I do not need your consent for doing good.'⁵

Yet in January 1790, with Belgium lost and Hungary in ferment, he had to admit disillusionment and acknowledge defeat:

I confess to you [he told Leopold] that, humiliated by what has happened to me, seeing that I am unfortunate in everything I undertake, the appalling ingratitude with which my good arrangements are received and I am treated – for there is now no conceivable insolence or curse that people do not allow themselves to utter about me publicly – all this makes me doubt myself, I no longer dare to have an opinion and put it into effect, I allow myself to be ruled by the advice of the ministers even when I don't think it is the best, since I dare not hold out for my own view and indeed I haven't the strength to impose it and argue for it.⁶

A few days later he rescinded most of his reforms. Within a month he was dead, aged only forty-eight. His failure seemed abject.

Few rulers have evoked stronger and more diverse reactions. In Hungary his entire reign was written off as a usurpation.⁷ In rebellious Belgium he was likened to every notorious villain of history: Tiberius, Caligula, Nero, Caracalla, Alaric, Attila, Mahomet, Amurath, Machiavelli, Alva and Oliver Cromwell.⁸ But he was also extravagantly admired – and not only in the early days of his rule. Foreign writers as well as his chief minister, prince Kaunitz, flattered him as another Trajan, Marcus Aurelius or Henri Quatre. To Da Ponte, Mozart's librettist, Joseph was a man of discerning taste, approachable, affable, 'this adorable prince'.⁹ Although his death came as a relief to most government officials, Roman Catholic clergy, nobles, Belgians and Hungarians, he was regretted by many, especially among groups like Protestants, Jews, Romanians and former serfs whose status he had tried to improve.¹⁰ His contemporaries did not all accept that he had failed. Beet-

⁵ J. to the Estates of Brabant, 7 June 1789: P. A. F. Gérard, *Ferdinand Rapedius de Berg . . . Mémoires et documents pour servir à l'histoire de la révolution brabançonne* (2 vols., Brussels, 1842–3), vol. II, p. 210. I shall use 'Belgium' as shorthand for 'the Austrian possessions in the southern Netherlands', except where confusion might result. See *MTIZ*, p. 21, for a reference to 'Belgium Austriacum' in 1770.

I am using 'province' very loosely, to mean 'region in some way constitutionally distinct'.

⁶ Arneth, *JuL* II, p. 312 (21 Jan. 1790).

⁷ His laws are simply omitted from some Hungarian constitutional compilations, on the ground that he was never crowned king and never took an oath to maintain the constitution.

⁸ Some of these comparisons, such as those with Tiberius and Nero, appear very frequently in the pamphlet literature of the revolution in Belgium. One of the richest sources is [S. N. H. Linguet], *Choix des lettres paternelles de Joseph Néron, second du nom, Empereur des Romains, à Richard D'Alton, son Assassin en Chef, aux Pays-Bas, en 1788, & 1789* [Brussels, 1790]. Cromwell is cited in *Joseph II aux enfers, et son entrevue avec Richard D'Alton* ([Brussels], 1790).

⁹ Beer, *JLuK*, p. 48 (K. to J., 24 Mar. 1781). Cf. 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), vol. I, pp. 6, 14 etc. A. Livingston (ed.), *Memoirs of Lorenzo da Ponte* (New York, 1967), esp. pp. 151–3.

¹⁰ These groups were not of course unanimous or without reservations. See for those favourable to J., e.g. Mitrofanov II, pp. 647–59, 771–5; C. H. O'Brien, 'Ideas of religious toleration at the

hoven set to music an ode on the emperor's death which contained this passage:

A monster, whose name was Fanaticism, rose from the caverns of Hell, got between the earth and the sun, and it was night. Then came Joseph . . . dragged the frenzied monster down . . . and crushed it. Then mankind rose up into light.¹¹

The Viennese writer Caroline Pichler remembered his reign, in a classic mixed metaphor, as 'that period of burgeoning intellectual life in Austria, quickened by the sparks that fell on it from Joseph's genius'.¹²

Not only his contemporaries but also historians have vied with one another in minting colourful phrases to characterise the man and his work. Three of his twentieth-century biographers, Fejtő, Magenschab and Padover, label him 'revolutionary'. The author of the best book about his rule, the Russian Mitrofanov, called him 'a democrat from head to toe'. For Taylor he is 'the [French Revolutionary] Convention in a single man'. It was Macartney, who wrote the best account of the modern development of the Monarchy, who described him as 'perhaps the completest enlightened despot in European history'. 'Sovereignty bound up with the idea of renovation', wrote the great Ranke, 'has never had a more decided proponent than this monarch. He certainly became a martyr for it.'¹³

All these historians' judgements reflect a measure of admiration for Joseph. But the same writers also find in him thoroughly unattractive traits. Macartney, for example, remarks on his meanness and rudeness, and detects in him a

time of Joseph II', *TAPS*, new series, LIX (1969), part 7; *Politisch-kirchliches Manch Hermaeon von den Reformen Kayser Josephs überhaupt vorzüglich in Ungarn* . . . [n.p., 1790]; R. Mahler, *A History of Modern Jewry, 1780-1815* (London, 1971), esp. pp. 229-333; D. Prodan, *Supplex Libellus Valachorum* (Budapest, 1971).

¹¹ The text from *Ludwig van Beethoven's Werke. Serie 25: Supplement* (Leipzig, 1887), pp. 1-54. The author was apparently S. A. Averdonk. The Bonn *Lesegesellschaft* commissioned it, but it was not in fact performed, as had been intended, at the Society's commemoration of the emperor in 1790, or indeed until 1884. See E. Forbes (ed.), *Thayer's Life of Beethoven* (Princeton, 1967), pp. 119-20. The sentiments it embodied, however, resembled those in elegies given before the Society and elsewhere by its most active member, Eulogius Schneider. Bonn was of course the capital of Max Franz, J.'s brother, as elector of Cologne, and the Society was under his patronage. On the other hand, Schneider was soon afterwards in trouble, partly because of the radical opinions he had expressed in the course of these tributes. See J. Hansen, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Rheinlandes im Zeitalter der französischen Revolution*, vol. 1 (Bonn, 1931), esp. pp. 563-5, 575-6, 615-19. Strangely, the Ode is mentioned neither by Hansen nor in F. Engel-Jánosi, 'Josephs II. Tod im Urteil der Zeitgenossen', *MÖIG*, XLIV (1930), 324-46.

¹² C. Pichler, *Denkwürdigkeiten aus meinem Leben*, ed. E. K. Blümml (2 vols., Munich, 1914), vol. II, p. 398; originally published in 4 vols., Vienna, 1844.

¹³ F. Fejtő, *Un Habsbourg révolutionnaire, Joseph II. Portrait d'un despote éclairé* (Paris, 1953); H. Magenschab, *Josef II. Revolutionär von Gottes Gnaden* (Graz, 1979); S. K. Padover, *The Revolutionary Emperor: Joseph II of Austria* (2nd edn, London, 1967). Mitrofanov II, p. 582. A. J. P. Taylor, *The Habsburg Monarchy, 1809-1918* (Harmondsworth, 1964), p. 22. C. A. Macartney, *The Habsburg Empire, 1790-1918* (London, 1968), p. 119. L. von Ranke, *Die deutschen Mächte und der Fürstenbund: Deutsche Geschichte von 1780 bis 1790* (2 vols., Leipzig, 1871-2), vol. II, p. 161.

Introduction

7

streak of sadism; moreover, he says, ‘the noun in the phrase [enlightened despot] is quite as fully operative as the adjective’. It is often claimed, too, that there were irreconcilable contradictions in Joseph’s character and plans. ‘Of all the eighteenth-century rulers’, declared Ogg, ‘he was the most complicated, because he was at once militarist, absolutist, liberal and humanitarian.’ ‘The humane egalitarian’, writes Blanning, ‘is countered by the brutal martinet, the disciple of the Enlightenment by the crude aggressor.’ Some historians condemn him out of hand, most crushingly Crankshaw in his *Maria Theresa*: ‘his reforms . . . sprang from self-love tempered by abstract ideals of justice and from disdain of all who differed from him . . . As a human being he seems hardly to have existed.’¹⁴

The stridency of these judgements is a natural response to the challenging tone and actions of the emperor himself. The wide variation of opinion largely reflects inevitable differences of approach among historians arising from their emotional, national, political and religious attitudes. But it stems in part from the wayward development of historiography, and to some degree from sheer ignorance and error.

There exists, first, a broad distinction between historians who have written in English or French and those who have written in Central and East European languages. For most of the former, the context within which Joseph II is to be considered is that of ‘enlightened despotism’, together with his great contemporaries, Catherine II of Russia and Frederick II of Prussia, and many lesser rulers and ministers of the second half of the eighteenth century; and the Enlightenment in question is primarily the movement in France and Britain, which owed little to the governments of those countries, often assailed them, was generally constitutionalist, commonly libertarian and sometimes free-thinking. Many of the historians concerned, most particularly Padover, author of the best-known biography of the emperor in English, have sought to identify Joseph with this movement.¹⁵

For most historians writing in German, Italian, Hungarian and so on, the frame of reference is quite different. They commonly insist on the usage ‘enlightened *absolutism*’ as opposed to ‘enlightened despotism’; and it is an important truth that Joseph, like most of his fellow rulers, condemned ‘despotism’ and regarded himself as bound in general to observe his own and his territories’ laws. However, to the confusion of scholars and their terminology, he himself describes the regime he favours as ‘*despotisme lié*’, ‘tied

¹⁴ Macartney, *Habsburg Empire*, pp. 119–20. D. Ogg, *Europe of The Ancien Régime 1715–1783* (London, 1965), p. 211. T. C. W. Blanning, *Joseph II and Enlightened Despotism* (London, 1970), p. 116. E. Crankshaw, *Maria Theresa* (London, 1971), pp. 275–292.

¹⁵ Padover, *Revolutionary Emperor*, pp. 17–18 is a blatant example, but the whole book, as we shall see, is tainted. Those other English and French historians who have notably exaggerated J.’s enthusiasm for the *philosophes* mostly depend on Padover. Some of the principal cases are mentioned in D. Beales, ‘The false Joseph II’, *HJ*, XVIII (1975), 467–95. See also n. 19 below.

despotism'.¹⁶ Further, these historians think of the Enlightenment in its Central European, and especially its German and Italian manifestations: a movement among employees of governments, such as bureaucrats, priests and professors, often anti-clerical but rarely freethinking, who expected reform to come from above and not from below. In the Monarchy the Enlightenment is associated with a movement for change named after Joseph, 'Joseph(in)ism', affecting many aspects of life, but especially associated with claims made and measures taken by the state to control and reform the Roman Catholic Church within its borders, involving not only obviously ecclesiastical matters like the exclusion of papal bulls, the dissolution of monasteries and the introduction of religious toleration but also wider issues such as the reform of education in all its aspects, the liberalisation of censorship and the reorganisation of poor relief.¹⁷

I must make it clear that I have drawn the distinction between these two groups of historians too crudely. There are of course writers in English and French who themselves belong to the Central and East European tradition, like Wangermann¹⁸ and Fejtő; and others who, like Macartney and Blanning, have steeped themselves in it. Contrariwise, there are writers in German who have been influenced by the English and French tradition. But there is a very marked difference of approach between some well-known books in English and French, and most of those in other languages. In so far as the former are

¹⁶ In the document called 'Rêveries', dating (I think) from 1763. See D. Beales, 'Joseph II's "Rêveries"', *MÖSA*, xxxiii (1980), 142–60. The phrase quoted is on p. 156.

For 'enlightened absolutism' see K. O. Freiherr von Aretin (ed.), *Der aufgeklärte Absolutismus* (Cologne, 1974), esp. the editor's introduction. There is a difficult recent discussion in English by L. Krieger, *An Essay on the Theory of Enlightened Despotism* (Chicago, 1975). For the contrast between German and French Enlightenment see the excellent *exposé* in T. C. W. Blanning, *Reform and Revolution in Mainz, 1743–1803* (Cambridge, 1974), pp. 1–38.

¹⁷ For Josephism the best treatments in English are in Blanning, *J. II and Enlightened Despotism*, esp. ch. 2, and E. Wangermann, *The Austrian Achievement, 1700–1800* (London, 1973). The three classics are E. Winter, *Der Josefismus und seine Geschichte* (Brünn, 1943), revised as *Der Josefismus. Die Geschichte des österreichischen Reformkatholizismus, 1740–1848* (Berlin, 1962); F. Valjavec, *Der Josephinismus. Zur geistigen Entwicklung Österreichs im achtzehnten und neunzehnten Jahrhundert* (2nd edn, Munich, 1945); and F. Maass (ed.), *Der Josephinismus. Quellen zu seiner Geschichte in Österreich, 1760–1850*, FRA (5 vols., Vienna, 1951–61). See the valuable surveys of R. Bauer, 'Le Joséphisme', *Critique*, xiv (1958), 622–39; K. Benda, 'Probleme des Josephinismus und des Jakobinertums in der Habsburgischen Monarchie', *Südost-Forschungen*, xxv (1966), 38–71; E. Kovács, 'Giuseppinismo', in *Dizionario degli Istituti di Perfezione*, ed. G. Pelliccia and G. Rocca (Rome, 1974–), vol. iv, cols. 1357–67; S. F. Romano, 'Studi su Giuseppe II e il "Giuseppinismo"', *RSI*, lxix, 110–27. See further for a subtle discussion in relation to censorship, G. Klingenstein, *Staatsverwaltung und kirchliche Autorität im 18. Jahrhundert* (Vienna, 1970).

I am sorry to learn from K. Vocelka in *Austrian History Yearbook*, xiv (1978), 328, that 'Josephism' seems an unacceptable term to Austrian scholars. I cannot prefer the German-derived form 'Josephinismus'. I note that the French generally use 'Joséphisme' and that 'Josephism' is well established in English-language writing. In J. Pezzl's *Faustin* (3rd edn, n.p., 1785), p. 344, occurs the phrase 'die Josephische Aere'.

¹⁸ His main contributions are: *From Joseph II to the Jacobin Trials* (2nd edn, Oxford 1969) and *Austrian Achievement*.

Introduction

9

preoccupied with placing Joseph against a background of British and French Enlightenment and with assessing his work by the criteria usually applied to British, French and even American history of the same period, it is evident that they are adopting inappropriate standards.

Further, many historians have failed to appreciate that the remarks most frequently ascribed to the emperor are spurious. He did not proclaim 'I have made philosophy the legislator of my empire', a statement which, ever since it was fathered on him, has naturally been accorded pride of place in many accounts of his reign. He did not say 'prejudice, fanaticism, partiality, and slavery of the mind must cease, and each of my subjects be re-instated in the enjoyment of his native liberties'; or 'I have to reduce the host of monks, I have to transform Fakirs into men.' Nor did he make the famous pronouncement which ends:

Tolerance is an effect of that beneficent increase of knowledge which now enlightens Europe, and which is owing to philosophy and the efforts of great men; it is a convincing proof of the improvement of the human mind, which has boldly reopened a road through the dominions of superstition, which was trodden centuries ago by Zoroaster and Confucius, and which, fortunately for mankind, has now become the highway of monarchs.

All these resounding utterances, which appear to stamp him as a devotee of the French Enlightenment in its more radical phase, derive, together with much else in the same vein, from a collection called *Newly Assembled Letters of Joseph II, Emperor of the Germans*, published in the year of his death, with the manifestly false imprint 'Constantinople, printed in the private Court press'. Of the forty-nine letters it contains, probably only seven derive from genuine originals. Almost all of the remainder are demonstrably pure invention, the work of a clever and mischievous author who has yet to be identified with certainty. But they are so lively and trenchant, and have tallied so well with what many people believed or hoped about the emperor's views, that they have become the prize exhibits of biographers and historians. Although they were declared suspect over a century ago, they continue to make a good showing in history books, especially in English.¹⁹ Even Taylor, on one of the

¹⁹ I have discussed the spuriousness of the Constantinople collection, its authorship, the use made of it by historians (esp. Padover) and its impact on their views of J. in *HJ* (1975), 467–95. I should like to add three points here. First, I have now seen the original of the letter to the magistrates of Ofen, discussed on pp. 482–3 of my article. It is a furious scribble on MOL AG 1784/7049 (26 June 1784). I think *Circulation* is the correct reading, but it is one of the most difficult of J.'s annotations to decipher.

I should, secondly, like to acknowledge that I was unfair to Bibl on p. 467: he knew that the letter to Herzan was spurious (V. Bibl, *Kaiser Josef II. Ein Vorkämpfer der grossdeutschen Idee* (Vienna, 1943), p. 141).

Thirdly, when I wrote the article, I had not seen F. Engel-Jánosi, 'Kaiser Josef II. in der Wiener Bewegung des Jahres 1848', *MVGSW*, XI (1931), 65–6 and 65n, where both the spuriousness and the influence of the collection are stressed, though not with reference to the

two occasions when he claims to quote directly from Joseph in *The Habsburg Monarchy*, picks a 'Constantinople letter'. Crankshaw relies on others to show how insufferable the emperor could be. Magenschab, author of the latest Austrian biography, trundles out all the well-known faked passages.²⁰ But the worst offender was Padover. About a quarter of all his numerous quotations come from this collection, and he gives extracts from twenty-six out of its forty-nine letters. His biography has been widely treated as a standard work, and so the portions he reproduced have been much copied. There is other spurious material in the field, including several volumes of letters from Marie Antoinette, Joseph's sister and queen of France, which were forged in the middle nineteenth century, and two bogus *Political Testaments* ascribed to the emperor.²¹ Many of the anecdotes told about him must also be regarded as dubious.²² Historians' judgements of Joseph have in many cases been vitiated by reliance on these discredited sources.

Because of these problems of evidence, it is peculiarly unfortunate that the emperor's biographers have been so sparing with note references. Padover provides just two, to sources located in the United States. Otherwise, apart from Mitrofanov, only Bernard conforms to scholarly practice in this respect.²³ Here is a clear instance where the effort to avoid pedantry has allowed errors to flourish and made them unusually hard to detect and eradicate. Partly for this reason, I have been careful to supply very full references.

Of course, much of high quality has been written on related topics, especially in German. From the 1860s the bulk of the Austrian archives became available to historians. Many substantial portions were published,

other writings about J. published immediately after his death, nor to the authorship of the *Briefe*, nor entirely accurately.

²⁰ Taylor, *Habsburg Monarchy*, p. 20; Crankshaw, *Maria Theresa*, pp. 293, 314; Magenschab, *J. II.*, the lengthy quotations on pp. 150–2, 162, 181, 187, 250–1, 253–4, 291.

²¹ See Christoph, *MTuMA*, pp. 9–13; H. von Sybel, 'Briefwechsel der Königin Maria Antoinette', *HZ*, XIII (1865), 164–78, and 'Die Briefe der Königin Marie Antoinette', *HZ*, XIV (1865), 319–50; A. Geffroy (ed.), *Gustave III et la cour de France* (2 vols., Paris, 1867), vol. II pp. 303–48. The forgery was disseminated in P. V. d'Hunolstein, *Correspondance inédite de Marie Antoinette* (Paris, 1864) and F. S. Feuilleton de Conches, *Louis XVI, Marie Antoinette, et Madame Élisabeth* (5 vols., Paris, 1864–9). Padover, in *The Life and Death of Louis XVI* (London, 1963), pp. 354, 356–7, showed himself aware of these and other spurious collections relating to Louis and his queen.

The *Testament de Joseph II* . . . *Traduit par M. Linguet* (Brussels, 1790) could deceive no one; but *Testament politique de l'Empereur Joseph II, Roi des Romains* (2 vols., Vienna, 1791) was accepted as authentic by at least one participant in the Joseph II bicentenary conference in Vienna, October 1980, though the Jacobin Martinovics claimed its authorship (Wangermann, *From J. II. to the Jacobin Trials*, p. 23n).

²² Cf. R. Pick, *Empress Maria Theresa: The Earlier Years, 1717–1757* (London, 1966), p. 14, warning against anecdotes about M. T. that 'bear the stamp of the bourgeois sentimentality of a much later period'. See pp. 87n, 263, 335, 377n below.

²³ P. P. Bernard, *Joseph II* (New York, 1968). Fejtő, *J. II.*, however, uses some unpublished sources.