

4-2009

From a Feudal Electorate to Nation State: Secularization and Reformation in Bavaria, 1700-1825

Christopher David Mapes

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/honors_etd



Part of the [History Commons](#)

From a Feudal Electorate to Nation State:
Secularization and Reformation in Bavaria, 1700-1825

by

Christopher David Mapes

Undergraduate honors thesis under the direction of

Dr. Suzanne Marchand

Department of History

Submitted to the LSU Honors College in partial fulfillment of
the Upper Division Honors Program.

April, 2009

Louisiana State University
& Agricultural and Mechanical College
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank all of those fantastic people who scan archival materials and books for future preservation and the great developers at Adobe for their OCR software. I would also like to thank the great faculty at LSU for all of their guidance and advice, particularly Dr Di Napoli, Dr Lindenfeld, and especially Dr Marchand. Without Dr Marchand's guidance and time, this work would not have been possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	2
ABSTRACT.....	4
CHAPTER	
1. Uniformity of Faith and State: Bavaria before 1799.....	6
2. Towards a Bavarian <i>Aufklärung</i> : The Era of Montgelas 1799-1817.....	29
3. The Consequences of Napoleonic Alliances: Bavaria after Napoleon to 1825.....	45
APPENDIX I.....	52
APPENDIX II.....	54
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	56

ABSTRACT

During the turn of the nineteenth-century Bavaria underwent a series of sweeping social, religious, and political reforms. Previously Bavaria had been a stronghold for conservative Catholicism which was closer to a medieval state than a modern one in its relationship to the Church as well as its level of economic development and the condition of its citizens. A young elector from a minor branch of the ruling dynasty, the Wittelsbachs, and his minister would usher in a new era of reform-minded and liberal principles that would help to raise Bavaria to contemporary European standards in the atmosphere of the more liberal Napoleonic Era. Bavaria thus became a center for intellectual liberalism and anti-clericalism targeting the Catholic Church in Bavaria. This generated a remarkable amount of Enlightenment activity in a few short years, which seemed to promise a new Bavarian *Aufklärung*. The ideas and methods of the Bavarian *Aufklärung* were a product of the reforms of Maximilian IV Joseph's chief Minister Montgelas. It would also be the elector—then king—and his government's inability to fund and enforce his new edicts, in tandem with the defeat of Napoleon, which would cause the Enlightenment movement in Bavaria to recede. By the end of the Napoleonic era the Francophiles became vilified, the progression of the anti-clericalism movement slowed and then completely changed

direction, and a new era of reaction began as Europe entered the Age of Metternich following the Congress of Vienna.

I would like to show the cyclical nature of liberal reform and conservative reaction in Bavaria and question whether Montgelas was truly unique in his efforts to limit the power of the Church. So many others in Bavaria seem to have begun or tried to accomplish this and failed; though Montgelas was the most successful. Ultimately a Bavarian Enlightenment did not occur, not due to a lack of effort, but do to social, political and economic circumstances.

Chapter I

Uniformity of Faith and State:

Bavaria Before 1799

Before the last elector of Bavaria, Maximilian IV Joseph, and his very capable minister Maximilian von Montgelas took the reins of state in the last year of the eighteenth century, Bavaria was a loose conglomerate of inherited Wittelsbach lands with little government infrastructure. To add further confusion, ecclesiastical boundaries often crossed state boundaries, something that complicated secular and ecclesiastic jurisdictions. Bavaria seemed more a semi-feudal territory than a European state in the midst of the German *Aufklärung*. This was primarily due to the position of the Electors of Bavaria who required the approval of both the nobility and clergy to accomplish even minute tasks. Bavaria was also in a state of constant flux and chaos, socially, politically and economically and for this reason Bavaria's Enlightenment would only last a few short years, coinciding with the reign of Napoleon Bonaparte in France.

Though Maximilian IV Joseph and Count Montgelas would eventually transform Bavaria into a modern nineteenth-century kingdom and the third most powerful German country by 1817—we should not overlook the contributions of the last three Bavarian electors. While this elector and minister pair seem to have wrought great change, the changes would be shallow, and transitory, shining brightly for over a decade as a liberal and enlightened beacon and then ebbing as conservative reaction set in. The years preceding Count Montgelas's ascent provide insight

into the cyclical nature of Bavaria's efforts to reform; that is to say, both the government's embrace and rejection of the *Aufklärung*.

Bavaria began the eighteenth century in a weakened political state and its survival seemed in doubt throughout most of the century as Austria and Prussia fought for domination of the German lands in central Europe. Bavaria's Elector Maximilian Emmanuel (1679-1726) was an able soldier who constantly sought to enhance his *gloire*. Maximilian Emmanuel had sided with King Louis XIV during the disastrous war of Spanish Succession (1701-1714) and Bavaria from this point on continued to bet on losers in major European conflicts. Following this conflict Bavaria strained under a war debt of 25 million Gulden and would remain in debt for years to come.¹

Despite the decade-long occupation of Bavaria by Austrians (1704-1714) under Maximilian Emmanuel, his son Charles Albert, did not give up the grandiose schemes of the Bavarian electors had pursued. The Holy Roman Emperor Charles VI of Austria worked for years to gain support for the Pragmatic Sanction that would enable his daughter, Maria Theresa to rule Austria. After Charles VI's death, Charles Albert, the elector of Bavaria in 1726, sought the throne of the Holy Roman Empire.² Frederick the Great took advantage of the situation, invading Silesia and claiming it as well as Bohemian lands. Charles Albert used this opportunity to make his own claims on Bohemia and invaded Austria with the help of France and Spain.³ France assisted monetarily, giving generous sums of money to Charles Albert, who never

¹ Karl Schelunes, *Schooling and Society: The Politics of Education in Prussia and Bavaria 1750-1900* (Oxford: Berg Publishers, 1989), 23.

² Neither prince recognized the Pragmatic Sanction. Charles W. Ingrao, *The Habsburg monarchy, 1618-1815* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 143-4.

³ Charles Albert had close ties to Louis XV. Orville T. Murphy, *Charles Gravier Comte de Vergennes: French Diplomacy in the Age of Revolution 1719-1787* (Albany: State of New York Press, 1982), 7-10.

seemed to have enough.⁴ In 1741 Charles Albert with the support of the other electors of the Holy Roman Empire became the Holy Roman Emperor. Though he was crowned Holy Roman Emperor Charles VII, his victory was pyrrhic. Austrian troops seized Munich the day following his coronation, forcing him to flee the seat of his throne, an event which is satirically recounted by Samuel Johnson.⁵ Charles Albert died four years later, ruined, gouty and as Voltaire noted, full of gravel and suffering from a variety of other maladies.⁶

Ultimately these glorious pretensions weakened the position of the Charles VII's son, the elector Maximilian III Joseph who succeeded his father in 1745. He held off for a few more weeks, but Maximilian III Joseph soon had no choice but to accept the Peace of Füssen—on Maria Theresa's terms. These included: his pledge to vote for Francis I as the next Holy Roman Emperor; his renunciation of all claims to Hapsburg lands; and a promise to remain neutral in the war with Prussia. Charles VII's actions led to the young elector Maximilian III Joseph signing an unfavorable treaty and being saddled with a total of 32 million Gulden in debt.⁷ Johann Riesbeck accurately describes Charles VII's actions, "the Emperor Charles VII has given great wounds to this house [Wittelsbach], wounds which however, it might have cured, had not religious prejudices and caprice rendered it blind, and insensible to its own internal situation."⁸ Despite

⁴ Charles VII asked for more and more money and keep himself in Royal dignity befitting a HRE. Ibid., 8-9.

⁵ Ibid., 10-11; Samuel Johnson, *Vanity of Human Wishes the Tenth Satire of Juvenal* (London: M. Cooper, 1749) lines 241-254. See Appendix II for excerpt.

⁶ Voltaire, *Siècles de Louis XIV et de Louis XV* (Paris: Jules Didot Fils, 1820), 244-46.

⁷ Schleunes, *Schooling and Society*, 23.

⁸ Johann Caspar Riesbeck, *Travels Through Germany: In a Series of Letters trans.* Paul Maty (London: White, Byrne and Whitelstone, 1787), 93.

Maximilian III Joseph's best efforts to reduce the state debt, he still left some 25 million Gulden in debt to Charles Theodore.⁹

The consequences of Bavaria's repeated failures in European affairs was one factor that ultimately led to the stagnation of its social, economic, political and intellectual development over much of the course of the eighteenth century. While the Electors of Bavaria attempted religious, social, political, educational and economic reform, they could not implement these reforms. Their deficiency is due to a lack of both funding and authority which stemmed from complications which arose from the feudal relationship between the clergy, aristocracy and monarchy. Essentially the powers and privileges held by the clergy and landed aristocracy, were, in fact, greater than those of the Elector. The nobles and clerics were exempt from taxes and would not cooperate with anything designed to limit or restrict their income, privileges or rights.

Economic Situation

Bavaria was one of the poorest German states in terms of population to land area. Bavarian farmers still clung to ancient practices, such as the three-field system, and were resistant to change that would make agricultural production more lucrative. In other parts of Germany and even some Bavarian duchies, enlightened individuals sought out new methods of cultivation to increase agricultural yields. Furthermore, the use of the Hoffuss system of holding classification, a complicated method of and subdivision and classification, complicated tax structure.¹⁰ Thus, in Bavaria, most agricultural pursuits were extremely inefficient, and, in tandem with climatic variation, which will be discussed further, led to poor crop yields. After

⁹ Ibid., 93.

¹⁰ Robert W. Lee, *Population Growth, Economic Change and Social Development in Bavaria: 1750-1850* (Oxford: Oxford Press 1972), 108-113.

saving a percentage of the harvest for the next sowing, and paying taxes and seigniorial dues, the average Bavarian peasant farmer had just enough on which to subsist and rarely anything to sell.¹¹ Moreover, blight and famine were common in each decade of the eighteenth century in central Europe, making the peasant's subsistence tenuous in the best of times.¹² Lord Nathaniel Wraxall, an English noble who toured Germany in 1777-79 corroborates,

The Bavarian Peasants appear to me a race of men far inferior to the Saxons in bodily formation, and not less in the plenty and riches of their farms, as well as in cultivation of manners. Superstition and poverty blended with distress, are visible in every village, and almost in every countenance. Such a contrast may partly result from physical causes, but must be principally attributed to the genius of the government. The approaches to Munich bear no familiarity, either in beauty or in fertility, to the environs of Dresden.¹³

The Church's role in economic affairs further stunted development and growth, compounding the plight of Bavarians. As mentioned below, the Church owned the majority of land in Bavaria, including one half of the farms in Bavaria.¹⁴ The clergy was not large enough to work the land itself, so it employed day laborers and leased land to peasants, in exchange for their labor, fees or a percentage of their crop yields. Though according to Lee, the arable land endowed to local churches was seldom cultivated.¹⁵

Johann Riesbeck, a Franco-German noble at the court of Charles Theodore made observations about the economic situation of the nobility in 1779. Riesbeck noticed on several occasions that the beggars in Bavaria were well-dressed. On one occasion he attended mass at

¹¹ Ibid., 108-147.

¹² John D. Post, *The Last Great Subsistence Crisis in the Western World* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977), viii-9.

¹³ William Wraxall, *Memoirs of the Courts of Berlin, Dresden, Warsaw, and Vienna, in the years 1777, 1778, and 1779* (London: A. Strahan 1800), 201.

¹⁴ James Sheehan, *Germany 1770-1866*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 100-1.

¹⁵ Lee, *Population Growth*, 294.

court and a well-dressed member of the court nobility sat next to him, offered him snuff and they made polite conversation. Before leaving, the noble asked Riesbeck for money, allowing him to make assumptions about the economic status of the Bavarian nobility.¹⁶

According to Robert Lee, the Church further hampered economic development by stifling those elements necessary for entrepreneurship, such as capital and the innovation that comes with education.¹⁷ The Catholic Church has been accused by its detractors of keeping the peasants ignorant in such a way that they would remain pious and obedient.¹⁸ The establishment of a new abbey or monastery in the countryside could also inhibit growth. The peasants could look forward to alms and the possibility for employment from the monks, which may have led to further stagnation of the entrepreneurial spirit.¹⁹

According to Owen Chadwick, there was an excessive number of compulsory feast days in the eighteenth century throughout Catholic Europe. One could be fined for working on a feast day, or could apply for a special license to work. This institution promoted by the Church directly affected the social conditions, values and norms of the peasantry. The peasants were thus given to idleness and revelry, which led to debauchery and lower productivity. As a consequence, in some particularly rustic communities, the peasantry could not sustain their families or pay taxes. These conditions inevitably worked to keep the Bavarian peasants destitute and seditious. Naturally the government wanted to increase the productivity of the peasants not only to extract taxes, but also to maintain its role as a paternal protector. Additionally the

¹⁶ Riesbeck, *Travels through Germany*, 83-84.

¹⁷ Lee, *Population Growth*, 291-2.

¹⁸ Owen Chadwick, *The Popes and European Revolution* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), 29. and Sheehan, *Germany 1770-1866*, 185.

¹⁹ Chadwick, *Popes and the European Revolution*, 235.

government was motivated by contemporary moralists, those individuals who always raised the banners of good Christian morality. The Church influenced much more than the economy; all facets of Bavarian life revolved around the Church.

A discussion of the Church in Bavaria is necessary to understand the power it enjoyed and why the monarchy's reforms were directed towards it. Due not only to its proximity to Italy, but also to its traditions, Bavaria was the fortress from which the German Counter-Reformation was launched.²⁰ The strong Catholic tradition in Bavaria directly affected all other aspects of Bavarian life. The Catholic Church in Bavaria at this time had substantial powers and exercised enormous influence over the laity, from the lowest peasant to the elector. Agatha Ramm claims, "Nowhere else in Europe, outside the papacy, did religious authorities still exercise temporal jurisdiction that hardly fell short of independent power."²¹ The ecclesiastical and lay networks of the Church owned 56% of the land in Bavaria.²² Furthermore, Robert Lee reveals, "By the end of the eighteenth century 50.5% of all peasant families were tenants of ecclesiastical foundations."²³

The Church also exercised power over other faiths in Bavaria. Only Catholics could pursue a trade, testify in court or worship publicly.²⁴ Decrees were continuously passed throughout the eighteenth century to prevent non-Catholics—particularly Jews—from settling in Bavaria or gaining permanent residence.²⁵ Jews were universally mistreated in Europe, but in Bavaria there was a particularly zealous inclination to be less than cordial to the Jews. Riesbeck

²⁰ Philip M. Soergel, *Wondrous in His Saints Counter-Reformation Propaganda in Bavaria* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), Chapter 3.

²¹ Agatha Ramm, *Germany 1789-1919: A Political History* (London: Methuen, 1967), 19.

²² Schleunes, *Schooling and Society*, 24.

²³ Lee, *Population Growth*, 293.

²⁴ C.P. Higby, *The Religious Policy of the Bavarian Government During the Napoleonic Period* (New York: Longmans Green & Co, 1919), 34.

²⁵ Higby, *The Religious Policy of the Bavarian Government*, 37.

recalls his first encounter with an innkeeper who mistook him for a Jew, due to his long beard. The innkeeper revealed that she had taken an oath to a saint that she would never host a Jew.²⁶ Moreover, punishments for religious crimes, such as conversion from Catholicism or the theft of holy items, could be draconian, ranging from beheading to burning alive. This intolerance naturally extended to those who disagreed with the orthodoxy of Catholicism including various Catholic sects and groups such as the Illuminati, which will be discussed below.

In order to maintain Catholic exclusivity, the Church maintained a grip on the governing body of Bavaria—the aristocracy and the electors. The clergy surrounded the electors with influential confessors like ex-Jesuit Father Frank Lippert,²⁷ a practice that was centuries old. The rights held by the Church and clergy had not changed substantially since the late medieval period. These rights were reaffirmed by the Treaty of Westphalia and various concordats between the papacy and individual bishoprics within Bavaria over the seventeenth and eighteenth century. The clergy maintained powers that exceeded the government's in many spheres, most prominently religious, social, and economic. One must understand that spiritual and secular authorities did not have identical boundaries in Bavaria. Parishes could reach beyond the boundaries of secular authorities, complicating the ecclesiastical and secular jurisdiction. Often the secular and spiritual authorities were in conflict with one another for this reason. In most cases, ecclesiastical authorities claimed precedence of their authority and powers over the government and in most cases the Church won. Bavaria was controlled by the Catholic Church, but electors had been trying to wrest power into their hands since the seventeenth century.

²⁶ Riesbeck, *Travels through Germany*, 63.

²⁷ Ursula Rumpler. "FRANCK, Franciscus Ignatius," *Biographisch-Bibliographische Kirchenlexikon* XXIII (2004): 398-413.

From the time of birth the Church controlled one's life in Bavaria, starting with baptism and registration into a *Familienbuch*.²⁸ Priests were tasked with registering all important events of life for each member in their congregation in this book. After baptism the Church felt primary education was its prerogative and any encroachment on their rights to primary education was met with fierce resistance.²⁹ Furthermore the Church dictated when one was to work and when to feast, where no work was to be performed lest the offender be punished. Though the Church did offer some assistance to the peasantry and its followers, the insistence on the uniformity of faith (Catholic) and the clergy's insistence on maintaining this uniformity was often more detrimental to its flock. This had the unfortunate consequence of keeping Bavarians among the poorest and least educated of the western European nations.³⁰ Montgelas and Maximilian IV Joseph wanted to implement reforms because the Church allowed these conditions to persist in Bavaria.

Education

Before the nineteenth century, education in Bavaria was dominated by the clergy on all levels. There did, however, exist institutions that were on the fringes of society which taught without authority from the Church.³¹ As dictated by the Treaty of Westphalia, public education, that is, the education of the peasants, was under the sole discretion of the Catholic Church, an institution which focused on instituting doctrine unto the subjects of the Holy Roman Empire. Education regarding both spiritual and temporal affairs was certainly limited. In fact, Lee claims that the peasants lacked "basic religious knowledge and understanding" which prevented them

²⁸ Lee, *Population Growth*, 280.

²⁹ Ibid., 298-99.

³⁰ Chadwick, *The Popes and European Revolution*, 4-5.

³¹ Schleunes, *Schooling and Society*, 12, 37.

from realistically differentiating between good and evil, revealing the Church's failure in rural society to impress basic morality on the peasants, a fundamental tenet of the Catholic Church.³² Lorenz von Westenrieder also paints a grim picture of the state of education in Bavaria during the eighteenth century. Few rural villages offered education; what existed in many were *Wanderschule*. These schools consisted of a temporary schoolmaster, who was often a disabled veteran, day laborer, or other transient who was less than qualified to teach. Classes would often be conducted in a hay loft, cellar, the teacher's living quarters or wherever else an empty room could be secured; often the children learned beside domesticated animals.³³ Naturally, due to the low salaries offered to teachers, only those least qualified fell into the position.³⁴ The Church's monopoly on education was another cause for Bavaria to lag behind many of the other German provinces.

Why the Church needed to be reformed:

Not only did the government need control over the Church to implement broad social and political reforms, such as those affecting the economy and education, but the electors of Bavaria also wished to solidify their power and position. The Church needed to be reformed, in the view of politicians, because of Church practices that asserted the primacy of ecclesiastical authorities over the electors, their ministers, and local officials. Mortmain was one of the most problematic conditions that arose because of these practices. Mortmain, in this case, refers to those properties owned by the Catholic Church in Bavaria, as well as the rest of Europe. In Bavaria the “dead

³² Lee, *Population Growth*, 298.

³³ Lorenz von Westenrieder, *Beyträge zur vaterländischen Historie, Geo-graphie, Statistik und Landwirthschaft samt einer Uebersicht der schönen Literatur* (Munich 1790), 350-70.

³⁴ Schleunes, *Schooling and Society*, 37.

hand” was quite large. As previously mentioned, the Church owned over half the land and employed half of the laity. The Church did not have to pay taxes on its land or other wealth, and to further exacerbate the situation, these properties were held in perpetuity. Losing private property to the Catholic Church was catastrophic for the Bavarian government that was always in debt and required money to proceed with reform, go to war, or pay off its substantial debt. Maximilian III Joseph had, in 1764, attempted to prevent the further acquisition of land by the Church by requiring a royal patent for any transfer of land to the Church.³⁵ However, this legislation did not free the sizeable amount of land held by the Church. Reform or seizure of the Church’s land was necessary to assert the primacy of the secular government over the Church.

A common overlap in jurisdiction often arose when a member of the Clergy committed a crime in Bavaria; whether religious or secular in nature, the offending member was brought before the ecclesiastic authorities. These authorities made the determination of sentence and whether or not to turn the member over to the secular authorities. Naturally this created situations where the two groups of authorities would come into conflict. To further complicate matters, ecclesiastic authorities had jurisdiction on ecclesiastic property of the laity.³⁶

Another example of the ecclesiastical and lay authorities coming into conflict can be seen in the medieval practice of sanctuary. Parishioners of a church who sought sanctuary in a Catholic church could not be forcibly removed from the altar or a perimeter that surrounded the Church by local authorities. Should the parishioner be removed by force, those responsible were to be excommunicated immediately. This practice was in dire need of reform by the Bavarian

³⁵ Henry Charles Lea, *The Dead Hand*, (Philadelphia: William Dornan, 1900), 7.

³⁶ Higby, *Religious Policy of the Bavarian Government*, 64-70.

government not only because of its suggestion of the primacy of ecclesiastical power, but also due to fugitives abusing the practice. Criminals would set up camps in parish churches and even brought printing presses to continue illegal activity with immunity.³⁷

Both state and ecclesiastical requirements for tickets of confession were problematic for Bavarians. Tickets of confession, proof that one had confessed which often were not given without remittance of payment, began in Italy and moved to France in the middle of the eighteenth century to root out Jansenists, a dissident Catholic sect.³⁸ The Church in Bavaria also began to require tickets of confession, for both the ecclesiastical and secular authorities. Thus jurisdiction between the Church and state overlapped, which could create confusion.³⁹

Traditional Church Rituals

In Bavaria the Church continued to encourage various traditional practices which were dying out in most other western European countries. These included the worship of saints and holy relics, pilgrimages, praying and ringing bells during storms, faith healings, and the persecution of witches. These practices were of concern to the government not only because the government looked down on them as unenlightened practices, but rather because these practices could limit productivity of the people or even lead to death. One particularly fatal practice occurred during thunder storms, where local priests would ring the Church bells, or read passages from the Bible to the four points of the compass, or discharge firearms into the sky. When either reading the Bible during storms or ringing the bells of a church, priests and laymen

³⁷ Chadwick, *Popes and the European Revolution*, 47-50.

³⁸ Voltaire, *A Philosophical Dictionary from the French of M. de Voltaire*, vol. 2 trans. John G Gorton, (London: John and H.L. Hunt, 1824), 253-4.

³⁹ G. Laubmann, and M. Doeberl, *Denkwürdigkeiten des Grafen Maximilian Joseph v. Montgelas über die innere Staatsverwaltung Bayerns 1799-1817* (Munich, 1908), 120-21.

exposed themselves to lightening and consequently were struck far more often than those who took cover.⁴⁰ In a country such as Bavaria, where the population stagnated⁴¹ and more men were always needed to pay taxes and join the military, the need to prevent senseless deaths was paramount to the government.

Other archaic rituals included faith healings and the persecution of witches. These practices also threatened the Bavarian government's power and position. Faith healings led to social disorder and a decrease in peasant productivity as it took peasants away from the fields and their seigniorial obligations. Moreover, Catholic governments simply objected to them.⁴² Bavaria was also one of the last countries in Europe to end the persecution of witches. The University of Munich even had a debate on the existence of witches as late as 1760.⁴³ Just like faith healings the persecution of witches could lead to the formation of mobs causing social disorder, but was more dangerous because it could also lead to murder.

Both pilgrimages and leaving dough to rise on the dead were other traditional practices that needed to be ended. Pilgrimages could be a terrific source of revenue for locales that had an object of interest or a shrine to a particular Saint. Otherwise, they wasted the labor of peasants and took money away from their home parishes. For some parishes that already could not pay taxes due to poor agricultural yields, an increase in pilgrimages to a site that promised an increase in those yields would only serve to decrease them. Baking cakes from the dough left to rise on the dead and then eating those cakes, while crowded in a small room was another

⁴⁰ Higby, *Religious Policy of the Bavarian Government*, 88-90. Also Chadwick, *Popes and the European Revolution*, 4-5.

⁴¹ Lee, *Population Growth*, 6-8; appendix II.

⁴² Chadwick, *Popes and the European Revolution*, 6.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 8-10.

common superstitious practice. This needed to be ended for sanitary reasons, as sometimes the body would be left out for days before burial.⁴⁴

Corruption

Even after the Reformation moral corruption within the Catholic Church was always cited by detractors and reformers, especially in those countries where Catholicism was the official religion. This was a problem that electors had attempted to remedy but its prevalence and acceptance made the efforts tenuous at best. Papal bulls and various decrees shed some light on the corruption that existed within the Church and efforts made to squelch it. Indecent acts included the taking of snuff in church, fighting, hunting—both large game and foxing—gambling, and the drinking of libations by the clergy.⁴⁵ Riesbeck also noticed these debaucheries, “Priests gamble and drink with the people,” and “The priest fought and then called for a prayer of the Ave Maria and everyone stopped to pray,” and finally, “No pen can describe the ridiculous mixtures of debauchery and devotion which every day happen.”⁴⁶ Additionally the celibacy of the clergy was often in question, particularly in rural areas of Bavaria where a priest might spend long snowbound nights with his house maid.⁴⁷ The government wanted to address and reform this corruption to demonstrate the primacy of its power over the members of the clergy.

Dispersion of Churches and Clergy

⁴⁴ Ibid., 43. and Higby, *Religious Policy of the Bavarian Government*, 86-89.

⁴⁵ Chadwick, *Popes and the European Revolution*, 108-9.

⁴⁶ Riesbeck, *Travels through Germany*, 105-107.

⁴⁷ Chadwick, *Popes and the European Revolution*, 109-10.

In the eighteenth century the number of churches in Germany skyrocketed as German architects began to supplant foreign Italians as the primary designers of chapels. As a result, the number of churches in a parish did not always match the population of parishioners.⁴⁸ The distribution of the clergy throughout ecclesiastical parishes in Bavaria also could be nightmarishly inefficient and illogical. A priest in some areas would be required to walk through multiple parishes from his dwelling to reach his flock and say mass.⁴⁹ Also the numbers of clergy dedicated to different areas could be just as lopsided. For instance, one parish in rural Kranzberg had one priest for every 174 parishioners, and another had one priest for 1,115 parishioners.⁵⁰ This made the priest's job as caretaker of souls impossible.

Not only were there too few secular clergy, those who cared for souls, but Bavaria also had too many ecclesiastic clergy. During the time he spent in Bavaria Riesbeck noted, "The secular priests are as few in number as the monks are many."⁵¹ Among these superfluous clergymen were the monks and hermits who served no function. Religious hermits were men both from the clergy and the laity who had religious experiences and thus would retire from the world to experience the power of God in solitude, on average they were over middle-age. Most hermits drew small stipends from the Church or begged. Understandably many governments saw these religious hermits as useless.⁵² Voltaire was an ardent critic of the monks who poignantly describes their utility with the following passage from *The Man of Forty-Crowns*,

⁴⁸Higby, *Religious Policy of the Bavarian Government*, 50-2.

⁴⁹ Ibid., chapter 5

⁵⁰ Lee, *Population Growth*, 296.

⁵¹ Riesbeck, *Travels through Germany*, 116.

⁵² Chadwick, *Popes and the European Revolution*, 232-35.

She was born in the neighborhood of a rich abbey of a hundred thousand livres a year. Her husband asked me one day why those gentlemen [monks], who were so few in number, had swallowed so many of the forty-crown lots?

"Are they more useful to their country than I am?"

"No, dear neighbor."

"Do they, like me, contribute at least to the population of it?"

"No."

"Do they cultivate the land ? Do they defend the state when it is attacked?"

"No, they pray to God for us."

"Well, then, I will pray to God for them in return."⁵³

Voltaire clearly thought contemporary Catholic Monks served little use to secular society.

Riesbeck also believed Monks served no function other than to drain the income of the country, claiming that cloisters accounted for a drain of two-thirds of the countries income.⁵⁴ These writers identify reasons reformers needed to be spurred into action.

Poor Religious Instruction

Due to a lack of standardization of the seminaries in Bavaria, as well as the rest of Catholic Europe, the clergy often were ill prepared to instruct their flocks. Depending on the resources of the parish where a seminary was located, priests could become well trained theologians or parish priests who could read just enough Latin to say mass. A far reaching and uniform curriculum for the clergy did not exist, nor did requirements for their entrance into a parish. Furthermore, the *Patronage* of the parish determined the priest to be accepted, or a retiring priest would cede his parish to a new priest. This meant that the barely literate son of a local noble could install his son as a parish priest.

Not only did the clergy receive poor religious instruction, but they also gave poor religious instruction that was out of touch with their parishioners. Priests would try to influence

⁵³ John Morely, *The Complete Works of Voltaire*, trans. William Flemming, vol. 2, *The Man of Forty-Crowns*, 275.

⁵⁴ Riesbeck, *Travels through Germany*, 114.

the laity's political views with sermons dedicated to avoiding the corrupting influences of seditious literature when few if any of their flock had read or even seen a book.⁵⁵ Chadwick apologizes for parish priests' inability to hear confession due to a lack of a comprehensive method for training confessors and the number of confessions they were required to hear. He cites the difficulty of their jobs and the numerous books published on the subject by the Church in an effort to rectify the situation.⁵⁶ Reformers within the Bavarian government wanted to change the quality of religious instruction, both to help their citizens, and to keep firebrands in the clergy from inciting the people against the government. The reformers' efforts however were complicated by some electors—like Charles Theodore.

The Role of the Elector

Charles Theodore also significantly contributed to intolerance and the stagnation of the *Aufklärung* in Bavaria through his carelessness and apathy, which is surprising when weighed against his accomplishments at the court of Mannheim. Before circumstances thrust him upon the Bavarian throne, Charles Theodore was an Elector ruling over the Palatinate of the Rhine from his court at Mannheim, which he styled as a miniature Versailles. J.C. Easton aptly describes the character of Charles Theodore “He was a striking example of a prince who, through the accident of birth and the childlessness of relatives, accumulated a multitude of powers and honors, without meriting them.”⁵⁷ While at Mannheim, the Elector preferred hunting, women and playing the role of patron of the arts rather than performing the duties of an enlightened

⁵⁵ Lee, *Population Growth*, 298-9.

⁵⁶ Chadwick, *Popes and the European Revolution*, 143.

⁵⁷ J.C. Easton, “Charles Theodore of Bavaria and Count Rumford,” *The Journal of Modern History* 12:2 (1940): 156 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1874894> (Accessed 21/07/2008). Also “So far as he cared for anything except the gratification of his own pleasures,” C.T. Atkinson, *History of Germany 1715-1815*, (London: Methuen & Co, 1908), 311.

monarch, for which, it would seem he strove. Charles Theodore not only established the Mannheim School, at the time one of Europe's premiere academies for music,⁵⁸ but also established several galleries.⁵⁹ Furthermore, Charles Theodore hosted Voltaire for a few weeks in 1753; together they watched French plays, hunted and conversed after dinner every night. Charles Theodore even impressed Voltaire with "all that this prince [Charles Theodore] had done in so short a time for the progress of the sciences," referring to his newly established galleries and royal library.⁶⁰

After developing Mannheim to suit his tastes, Charles Theodore was disappointed indeed when he found himself in Munich—the uncouth capital of Bavaria. His behavior just before becoming Elector⁶¹ reveals Charles Theodore's apathy towards ruling. In 1777, Charles Theodore desperately tried to escape his plight, attempting to trade Bavaria for the Austrian Netherlands. Charles was partial to the Netherlands, having been educated in Brussels, so when Emperor Joseph II clandestinely proposed that Charles Theodore recognize Austrian claims to the Bavarian throne, in exchange for the Austrian Netherlands, he readily consented. This plan however, was thwarted by the intervention of Frederick the Great, leading to the War of Bavarian Succession and resulting in the Peace of Teschen, in which Bavaria lost the Innviertel, a small parcel of land, to Austria in addition to an indemnity.⁶² This did not stop Joseph II's future attempts to persuade Charles Theodore to exchange his inheritance, and over the course of

⁵⁸ Charles Theodore's orchestra and opera were the best in Europe. Riesbeck, *Travels Through Germany*, 78.

⁵⁹ Franz V. Reber, *Catalogue of the Paintings in the Old Pinakothek Munich* (Munich: Knorr & Hirth, 1885), xii-xv.

⁶⁰ James Parton, *The Life of Voltaire*: vol. 2, (Cambridge: The Riverside Press, 1881), 155-6.

⁶¹ Though he is referred to as Elector of Bavaria, he was the Duke of Bavaria and Elector of the Palatinate. Ibid., 145.

⁶² André Lebon, *Recueil des Instructions Données aux Ambassadeurs et Ministres de France Depuis les Traités de Westphalie jusqu'à la Révolution Française: VII Bavière, Palatinat, Deux-ponts* (Paris 1889), 532-3.

the next decade Joseph II continued to send envoys to tantalize him with the bounty of the Austrian Netherlands.⁶³ If he could not have the more enlightened Austrian Netherlands, Charles Theodore decided that he would have to make Bavaria more palatable for himself, or simply move the court from Munich back to Mannheim, which he did—twice—during his reign.⁶⁴

In order to remake Munich, Charles Theodore first brought his court from Mannheim, comprised of a large entourage of superfluous attendants, and expanded it—to make Munich a city more appropriate for his new status and tastes. As a result, the Bavarian court ultimately consumed one-fifth of the state's yearly budget. This display of ostentation was acceptable to the citizens of the Palatinate, but a scandal for the inhabitants of Munich.⁶⁵ Charles Theodore also had other aesthetic needs that would have to be met. Franz Reber's catalogue of paintings acquired for the Alte Pinakothek sheds some light on Charles's accumulation of art while in Munich.⁶⁶ Charles's devotion to his own aesthetic passions at court, rather than to the welfare of his subjects, reveals his apathy and brazen self-interest which ultimately drained the treasury. These conditions strengthened the Church and weakened Bavaria at a time when Austria was threatening to annex the smaller country.

When Charles Theodore ascended the throne in 1777 just days after the death of the enlightened elector Maximilian III Joseph, Bavaria was a state in flux. The Catholic Church had controlled both the government and the people since the Wittelsbachs chose Catholicism as the

⁶³ J.C. Easton, "Charles Theodore of Bavaria," 150.

⁶⁴ Charles moved the courts in 1788 and 1790. *Ibid.*, 148.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 148.

⁶⁶ The catalogue enumerates the paintings Charles acquired for the *Alte Pinakothek* Gallery in Munich. Apparently his taste in art also reflected his passions, including hunting, women, and religion. Charles acquired depictions of St Joseph, the Virgin, Venus and *Deer Pursued by Dogs*. Franz V. Reber, *Catalogue of Alte Pinakothek*. 37, 218, 226, 192.

official religion of Bavaria.⁶⁷ This had the unfortunate consequence of keeping the Bavarian people among the most poor, ignorant and intolerant of all of Germany, while their Protestant neighbors were prospering.⁶⁸

In May 1780, shortly after becoming the elector of Bavaria, Charles Gravier Comte de Vergennes, the French minister of Foreign Affairs under Louis XVI, characterized him as apathetic and only concerned with pleasure. Vergennes reported that Charles Theodore never ruled by himself, but rather under the influence of an entourage which shaped his opinion, and that Charles preferred music, hunting and liaisons to the duties of governing.⁶⁹ The ministers in the Elector's entourage consisted of more notorious than noteworthy men, including: the ex-Jesuit, and Charles's personal confessor, Father Frank Lippert, whom the scholar Lorenz Westenrieder called the "Bavarian Robespierre", as well as Commander Zetwiz, Count Tattenbach, von Vieregg, Count Leiningen and the American, Benjamin Thompson Count of Rumford.⁷⁰ All of these men, with the exception of Count Rumford, were anti-intellectual and religious conservatives who dictated the policies for the apathetic Charles Theodore creating an atmosphere of Catholic oppression and terror for intellectuals, which contributed to the prevention of a Bavarian *Aufklärung*.

⁶⁷ Since 1524 Higby, *The Religious Policy of the Bavarian*, 42.

⁶⁸ Sheehan, *Germany 1770-1866*, 185.

⁶⁹ André Lebon, *Recueil des Instructions Données*, 536. Also see C.P. Higby, *Religious Policy Bavarian Government*, 29. Also corroborated by Riesbeck, *Travels Through Germany*, 79 "He who could see things as they are, and would trace every intrigue back to its origin would find the first movers of the machine in a monk's cowl or a petticoat."

⁷⁰ Higby, *Religious Policy Bavarian Government*, 29; August Kluckhohn, *Aus dem handschriftlichen Nachlasse L. Westenrieders*, 2. Abteilung: *Briefe Westenrieders*, (München: Verlag der K. Akademie, 1882) 59; *Ibid.*, 61.

Following his religious convictions, or rather those of his confessor and entourage,⁷¹ Charles Theodore established an order of the Knights of Malta at the expense of his subjects' education. Maximilian III Joseph had confiscated the Jesuits' Bavarian holdings in 1773 and granted them as an endowment for public schools.⁷² Charles Theodore granted this endowment to the Knights of Malta in 1781 allowing them to operate the newly founded schools, thereby undoing Maximilian III Joseph's attempt to break the Catholic monopoly on public education. Johann Riesbeck, a German noble from Strasbourg who attended court, offers an explanation in this telling passage:

Of the general maxims, or leading principles of the people of this court, I can say but little to you. Immediate self-interest is apparently the pursuit of every one; or if they do profess any principles, they are certainly the most pliant and versatile in the world. Indeed if we may judge by the way of thinking of inferiors, of the sentiments of their superiors, many of the principal people of this court have adopted the most execrable theory in politics: for instance, that religion serves only for the purpose of keeping the crowd of mankind slaves to them; that a courtier must put on the externals of religion, but leave the practice to the vulgar; that men are by nature wicked, seditious turbulent, and only to be governed by being kept in perpetual servitude, and not permitted to use their faculties; finally, that too much knowledge is dangerous, and that the great hold their rights over the people immediately from God, are no ways accountable for their conduct, nor under any obligation to their subjects.⁷³

According to Riesbeck, Charles Theodore and his ministers were more interested in maintaining their hold on Bavarians, using religion, rather than educating them. The prevention of secular education would further prevent efforts to enlighten Bavarians.

Further evidence of his lack of interest in governing, or perhaps his attempts to please everyone, comes from Charles Theodore's quixotic behavior as Elector of Bavaria. While in

⁷¹ Johann Caspar Riesbeck, *Travels through Germany*, 86.

⁷² Henry Sire, *The Knights of Malta* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), 226. Also Higby, *Religious Policy Bavarian Government*, 27.

⁷³ Johann Caspar Riesbeck, *Travels through Germany*, 79-80.

Mannheim, Charles Theodore supported German literature and theatre by establishing the *Deutsche Gesellschaft* in 1775, and shortly thereafter he recruited Gotthold Lessing, known to be a radical, offering him a pension of one hundred Louis d'Or in 1776.⁷⁴ Less than two decades later, Charles Theodore's apathy allowed his minister Schneider, the director of the College of Censorship, to ban all of Lessing's plays in Bavaria, the very same Lessing the government had patronized!⁷⁵ Furthermore, Charles Theodore incessantly persecuted the Bavarian Illuminati, yet one of his chief ministers, Count Rumford was a liberal minded scientist.⁷⁶ In 1796, Charles Theodore also fled the capital when a French Revolutionary army approached, leaving a privy council with Count Rumford in charge, attesting to his lack of interest in remaining on the Bavarian throne.⁷⁷ Though he would die only three years later, Charles Theodore's self-serving, and contradictory rule had led to consequences which not only alienated the intelligentsia of Bavaria, but also allowed the Church unchecked power, weakening Bavaria at a pivotal moment in its history.

Religious reform in Bavaria during the Enlightenment began with Maximilian III Joseph, but efforts to curtail the power of the clergy were nothing new. Charles VII had attempted in 1730 to limit the acquisition of property by the Church.⁷⁸ This Elector tried to limit the power of the Catholic Church in Bavaria and assert the primacy of the elector. Maximilian started early in 1750, taking Ingolstadt back from the Jesuits, issuing a decree limiting the acquisition of

⁷⁴ W. Danzel und E. Guhrauer, *Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, Sein Leben und seine Werke* (Berlin: Verlag von Theodor Hofmann, 1881), 551.

⁷⁵ August Klockhohn, *Aus dem handschriftlichen Nachlasse Westenrieders*, 53.

⁷⁶ As a scientist Count Rumford principally studied illumination, contributing much to the field and even establishing the Rumford prize for developments in heating and light, which is still awarded today.

⁷⁷ J.C. Easton, "Charles Theodore of Bavaria," 159.

⁷⁸ Samuel John Klingensmith, Christian F. Otto, Mark Ashton, *The Utility of Splendor: Ceremony, Social Life, and Architecture at the Court of Bavaria, 1600-1800* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993), 75.

property by the Church in 1764. Later he even went so far as to expel the Society of Jesus in 1773 from Bavaria.

Beginning with Maximilian IV Joseph and his minister Count Montgelas, Bavaria was transformed from a medieval and intolerant Catholic conglomeration of territories into a more tolerant modern state with a contiguous boundary. While the boundary changes remained mostly intact following the defeat of Napoleon, the momentum of the legislation enacted by Montgelas was lost. The seemingly teleological progression Montgelas and his fellow ministers had begun was halted. This cessation was due not only to the indifference of the first King of Bavaria, Maximilian I, but also to the influence of his son, the Crown Prince Ludwig who was influenced by the prominent Catholic theologian Johann Michael Sailer.

Reforming institutions of the Catholic Church was seen as an act of aggression towards the Church, and while this certainly was so, doing so before the Napoleon's secularizations of 1803 was clearly not something to be taken lightly. Before Montgelas and Maximilian IV Joseph came to power at the beginning of the nineteenth century, Bavaria had already had a series of rulers intent on reforming the Catholic Church as it existed within their domain. These rulers did this primarily to assert their authority over the Catholic Church's grip on the populace. These electors had begun trying to wrest the control of Bavaria from the Catholic Church, but were not as successful as Count Montgelas and King Maximilian I in their efforts, due in large part to the temporal specificity in which they acted. Count Montgelas and Maximilian I benefited, using Napoleon's momentum to carry out broad social, political, and economic reforms to assert the primacy of the state over the Church.

Chapter II

Towards a Bavarian *Aufklärung*

The Era of Montgelas 1799-1817

Europe was in turmoil at the turn of the nineteenth century as France's revolution gained momentum and spilled over into German territory. With the accession of Napoleon Bonaparte to First Consul, the Bavarian leaders Maximilian IV Joseph and Count Maximilian von Montgelas—as products of France and the Enlightenment—understood that change was coming to Europe. Montgelas understood that this change would be rational and secular in keeping with the ideals of the Enlightenment. Montgelas and his patron were not unique in their efforts to consolidate government power in Bavaria by reforming the Church and both secularizing and rationalizing the mechanisms of the Bavarian government. However, the pair was the most successful of Bavarian reformers, in large part due to their methods, persistence, and the temporal specificity which allowed them the latitude to reorganize the hodgepodge of inherited lands and newly acquired territories of mediatized princes into the third largest and powerful German kingdom. Catholic orthodoxy had hamstrung efforts by previous electors, but the Church was now in a weakened state, reeling from its losses to France.⁷⁹ To better understand how so much changed in Bavaria during this period, a look at the primary catalysts for change—Maximilian von Montgelas and his Enlightened Elector—is necessary.

⁷⁹ *Mediatization*, defined broadly, is the subsumption of one monarchy into another monarchy in such a way that the ruler of the annexed state keeps his or her sovereign title and, sometimes, a measure of local power. Secularization is often a component of *Mediatization* in the German states during this time period.

Count Maximilian von Montgelas began his career two decades before he rose to prominence, first as the personal secretary to, then as the primary minister for, Maximilian IV Joseph, the last elector and also the first king of Bavaria. As a young Savoyard Montgelas was of Italian descent, but born in Germany and educated in France. From the beginning the young German noble seemed destined to be a supporter of Napoleon Bonaparte and Revolutionary France; after all, he never felt as comfortable with the German language as he did with French.⁸⁰ What better ally could Napoleon have to secure an alliance with the third largest German state and thereby solidify his eastern border? After Montgelas's legal education in France at Nancy, the young noble participated in the government of Charles Theodore. While in the elector's service Montgelas served a minor role as a censor under the government of Charles Theodore until his name was discovered in the registers of the Illuminati around 1785 and he subsequently departed.⁸¹

The Illuminati were a secret society which formed in the late eighteenth century at the University of Ingolstadt. The group promoted liberal ideas through the use of education and disliked organized religion, particularly Catholicism, and the intolerance it promoted. Charles Theodore ordered them to be suppressed in 1784 and again in 1785.⁸² Under these new decrees designed to ferret out Illuminati, everyone was suspect. The system allowed individuals to anonymously accuse others of seditious behavior. Once the accused was apprehended and prosecuted—even if he or she was innocent—the accuser was rewarded for his services,

⁸⁰ Montgelas's memoirs and memorandums were written in French, and he did not learn proper German until 1780. Sheehan, *Germany 1760-1866*, 263-64.

⁸¹ Eberhard Weis, *Montgelas. 1759-1799. Zwischen Revolution und Reform* (Munich, CH Beck Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1971), 31.

⁸² *Mayerische Generalien Sammlung* cited in Higby, *Religious Policy of the Bavarian Government*, 38.

effectively allowing for witch hunt-like chaos.⁸³ Once Montgelas's name was discovered in the register he resigned his post in government, fled Bavaria, and sought employment with the younger brother of the Duke of Deux-Ponts (Zweibrücken) in 1788. The duke was the next in line for Bavarian succession on the condition that Charles Theodore failed to produce a legitimate heir. The duke died in 1795 and thus, Montgelas's employer, Maximilian IV Joseph, became the next in line to inherit Bavaria.

Little is known about Montgelas's service to the Duke of Deux-Ponts during this time, other than what he himself has revealed in his memoirs, just as little is known about this future Elector of Bavaria. There does, however, exist a memorandum, which is attributed to Montgelas though he penned it anonymously, written in 1796. This Ansbacher Memorandum outlines the changes Montgelas felt would be necessary once the Duke became elector following Charles Theodore's death. In this memo Montgelas calls for sweeping change in the organization of the Bavarian government. Montgelas calls the government as it existed in 1796 archaic, corrupt and suitable for the Middle Ages, stating that government has become more complicated and requires trained ministers who are sufficiently paid, so as to avoid future corruption. To this end, Montgelas goes on to suggest reorganization of the government into five departments: foreign affairs, finances, law, religious affairs and war. Montgelas then explicitly defines how each department will function and how much personnel each will require. In doing so Montgelas identifies the various problems facing Bavaria—most of which stem from religious intolerance, primarily Bavarian intolerance of non-Catholics and educational backwardness. Montgelas

⁸³ Schleunes, *Schooling and Society*, 35-6. Also August Kluckhohn, *Aus dem handschriftlichen Nachlasse L. Westenrieders*, 2. Abteilung: *Briefe Westenrieders* (München: Verlag der K. Akademie, 1882), 49-55.

devotes a disproportionately large portion of the memo (about one third) discussing the problems which arose from Bavaria's exclusive Catholic policies.⁸⁴ This Ansbacher Memorandum tells us that already in 1796 Montgelas was an ardent proponent of secularization and anti-clericalism.

Before becoming the last Elector of Bavaria, Maximilian IV Joseph was a minor gentleman who lived in France. Not only was Maximilian IV Joseph the Duke of Deux-Ponts, but he also served as a colonel in the French army before the Revolution of 1789, and spent the majority of his youth in France. During this time, Montgelas served as a private secretary to the Duke, probably so that he would later have an opportunity to change those aspects of the Bavarian government which led to his initiation in the Illuminati and his ultimate resignation from the government of Charles Theodore and also to preserve the independence of Bavaria. As first-hand witnesses to the French Revolution, both the Duke of Deux-Ponts and Montgelas understood that the archaic institutions of the nearly theocratic Bavarian government would have to change if Bavaria's sovereignty and estates were to survive.

Maximilian IV Joseph became the last elector of Bavaria in early 1799 following the death of Charles Theodore. Lorenz von Westenrieder, an esteemed author and a contemporary minister in the Bavarian government, described the death of Charles Theodore in his diary as a refreshing new start for Bavaria after which everyone seemed to breathe easier.⁸⁵ Montgelas offers an explanation for why the air in Munich was so stifling,

Towards the end of [Charles Theodore's] reign the court became sombre and religious devoting extra activity towards the continuation and the execution of old

⁸⁴ Montgelas. *Mémoire présenté à M(onsei)g(neu)r le Duc le 30 Septembre 1796*. Full text online at, <<http://www.hdbg.de/montgelas/pages/hmv33.htm>>

⁸⁵ August Kluckhohn, *Aus dem handschriftlichen Nachlasse L. Westenrieders, 2. Abteilung: Briefe Westenrieders* (Munich: Verlag der K. Akademie, 1882), 61.

ordinances on the uniformity of worship [Catholic]. The use of meat was scrupulously defended on the days prescribed by the Church. The censorship of books and the policing of the bookstore became more severe; [the elector] endeavored with force to prevent suspect publications and to prevent the penetration of outside knowledge. People were required to possess tickets of confession and of communion. Several individuals were persecuted and even punished due to expressed opinion in a very indiscreet manner [this is in reference to the secret police]. This system did much evil...⁸⁶

Indeed, Montgelas's arrival alongside the new Elector promised a new era, one of enlightened despotism and perhaps, a Bavarian Aufklärung, as this new elector's, and his minister's worldviews had been shaped by the French Enlightenment. According to Westenrieder people even frolicked in the streets and wished one another luck.⁸⁷

Maximilian IV Joseph and Montgelas wasted little time in implementing reforms. Within the first weeks of his accession to the throne, Maximilian IV Joseph allowed Montgelas to begin issuing decrees to change the intolerant tone set by the previous bigoted elector. Upon their arrival in Munich in late February, the secular arm of the law was ordered to stop the enforcement of the external practices of the Catholic religion, such as tithing, in the Bavaro-Palatine States—particularly in regards to the previously required tickets of confession.⁸⁸ Within the first week Montgelas's plan, as detailed in the Ansbacher Memorandum, for the establishment of a new government with four departments, was realized.⁸⁹ William Wickham, a British ambassador in Munich, describes Montgelas and assures the emperor, "That he was leading man among the Illuminèes is certain; that he has filled the offices [of the four newly

⁸⁶ G. Laubmann, and M. Doeberl, *Denkwürdigkeiten des Grafen Maximilian Joseph v. Montgelas über die innere Staatsverwaltung Bayerns 1799-1817* (Munich, 1908), 120-121.

⁸⁷ August Klockhohn, *dem handschriftlichen Nachlasse Westenrieders*, 62.

⁸⁸ G. Laubmann, and M. Doeberl, *Maximilian Joseph v. Montgelas*, 121.

⁸⁹ Electoral decree of February 25 1799, Irene Elizabeth Baker, *The Napoleonic System in Bavaria, 1799-1813* (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1928), 128.

established departments] with Illuminè is equally so;”⁹⁰ In addition, the previous parasitic ministers, recruited from the ranks of the clergy, were dismissed, though some talent from the previous government was retained.⁹¹

Toleration Reforms

Toleration reforms began immediately after Montgelas’s government came to power, but were granted gradually. By the spring of 1800 the new government issued two decrees establishing a private Protestant chapel for the court in Munich. Furthermore, these decrees also allowed Protestants the right to religious instruction for their children, administer sacraments and take part in private Protestant services. However, they still had to pay the Catholic clergy for marriage licenses, tithes, report marriages and births to the Catholic registers and clerics were required to appear in public in civil dress. Later that year, on 10 November 1800, Catholicism ceased to be a requirement for permanent settlement in Bavaria.⁹²

Motivation for these immediate decrees allowing for Protestant services in Munich, the recognition of marriages between Protestants and Catholics, as well as the toleration of Protestant subjects was not entirely to foster ideas of the *Aufklärung*. The new elector had formerly been married to a Protestant princess of Hesse-Darmstadt with whom he had five children. Shortly after Maximilian became the Duke of Deux-Ponts the Duchess died. Two years

⁹⁰ Walter Fitzpatrick, *Report on the Manuscripts of J.B. Fortescue, Esq.*, vol. VI (Dublin: Wymann and Sons 1908)169.

⁹¹ Among those dismissed was the infamous Father Lippert, though he and the rest were given generous pensions. August Klockhohn, *Aus dem handschriftlichen Nachlasse Westenrieders*, 63.

⁹² Except for the Jews. G. Laubmann, and M. Doeberl, *Maximilian Joseph v. Montgelas*, 122.

later Maximilian IV Joseph married Caroline of Baden, another Protestant Princess.⁹³ Given his choice in spouses, the Elector's support of toleration edicts for Protestants is hardly surprising.

Bavaria expanded in the first six years of the nineteenth century, gaining new territories—many of which were inhabited by a Protestant majority; or a minority large enough that any oppression by the Catholics would not go unanswered. In these chaotic times, in which the Bavarian army was spread thin, toleration was a necessity for the peaceful and successful integration of these new territories and subjects. Thus, by 10 January 1803 religious toleration was granted to subjects of Bavaria whose territories came under Bavarian control, just before Bavaria was to be compensated for the loss of lands on the left bank of the Rhine. This toleration still required members of other faiths to pay clerical dues within their parish, where a parish of their own faith did not exist. However, if a sufficient number of non-Catholics lived in an area, they were allowed to form a parish of their own faith, which would no longer require them to pay the Catholic parish. Furthermore, the government no longer required members of other faiths to observe Catholic holidays, so long as respect was shown for celebrants. This legislation was intended to allow members of other confessions to work on compulsory feast days. This new toleration edict was extended to all Protestants, but only Calvinists and Lutherans could hold public office alongside Catholics. Bavaria was still not yet ready to accept Mennonites, *Herrnhutters* or Jews.⁹⁴

After the Fourth Peace of Pressburg was concluded in 1805 and the Confederation of the Rhine was formed, Bavaria became a kingdom as a reward for its alliance with Napoleon. A

⁹³ Elizabeth Peake, *History of the German Emperors and Their Contemporaries* (Philadelphia: J.P. Lippincott & CO., 1874), 532. G. Laubmann, and M. Doeberl, *Maximilian Joseph v. Montgelas*, 122.

⁹⁴ Higby, *Religious Policy of the Bavarian Government*, 121-23.

series of treaties was concluded between France and Bavaria in which exchange for future military support, Bavaria was granted large tracts of lands from what remained of Franconia, and the cities of Nuremberg and Ansbach and other less recognizable cities.⁹⁵ With these new acquisitions came hundreds of thousands of new Protestant subjects to the nearly all Catholic state. Complete equality for these new subjects (Calvinists and Lutherans only) did not come with the Bavarian constitution of May 1808, but a year later with the edict of 24 March 1809.⁹⁶ This new edict prevented discrimination against any faith, allowing both citizens of Bavaria and new settlers to enjoy the rights of citizenship and protection by civil law, but only to those whose members enjoyed all of the privileges of citizenship.⁹⁷ Among the rights gained by other faiths was: to have their own ministers; the same rights in transferred territories they formerly had; mixed marriages were allowed (though this issue was not really resolved until the twentieth-century); allowed various ecclesiastical authorities supervise their clergy in ecclesiastical affairs while civil authorities supervised civil affairs related to the clergy. Religious toleration for most Christians was at last granted after only nine years of reform.⁹⁸

Not until the edict of 10 June 1813 did the Jews of Bavaria gain something close to equal footing with their Christian fellows, although reforms were made as early as November 1803 regarding their integration into mainstream Bavarian society. A number of laws were passed between 1799 and 1813 that complicated Jewish rights, starting first by relaxing the rules

⁹⁵ M. de Clercq, *Recueil des traités de la France, 1713-1906*, vol. II (Paris: Amyot, Éditeur Des Archives Diplomatiques, 1864), 145-54.

⁹⁶ G. Laubmann, and M. Doeberl, *Maximilian Joseph v. Montgelas*, 124.

⁹⁷ The Mennonites did not fully participate in society because they refused to serve in the army, although eventually they would be allowed to hire substitutes or pay extra-taxes in exchange for exemption from conscription, a right also extended to Jewish families.

⁹⁸ Edict of 24 March 1809 appears in Higby, *Religious Policy of the Bavarian Government*, 131-135. Also G. Laubmann, and M. Doeberl, *Maximilian Joseph v. Montgelas*, 125-26.

limiting Jewish travel in Bavaria, so long as they were engaged in lucrative industry.⁹⁹ Next the Jews were allowed to attend public education in the edict of 18 June 1804, and later compelled by the edict of 31 December 1810.¹⁰⁰ During this period the numerous restrictions on Jews both relaxed gradually for settled Jews and complicated the lives of vagrant Jews. Laws limiting the population of Jews in Bavaria and keeping foreign Jews from settling were still strictly enforced. Concessions were granted but only at considerable monetary costs. The edict of June 1813 did not allow full toleration of Jews, but rather religious toleration of those Jews already settled in Bavaria, both through royal patent and those who came into Bavaria as a consequence of territorial annexations.¹⁰¹ Full equality for Bavarian Jews would not come until 1861.¹⁰² The Enlightenment was coming to Bavaria but watered down from the full equality promised in France.

Reforming the Clergy

The clergy and aristocracy in Bavaria had long dictated state policy. While absolutism developed in other European nations, Bavarian electors remained dependent on the gentry and especially the clergy. Together these two estates owned over eighty percent of the land in Bavaria, the primary source of almost all income in the pre-industrialized state. To not only relieve the economic burdens imposed on the laity, but also in an effort to appropriate state funds thereby decreasing state dependence on the clergy, the government of Montgelas began a policy of state secularization. For immediate relief from the economic burden felt by the impoverished

⁹⁹ Ibid., 139.

¹⁰⁰ Higby, *Religious Policy of the Bavarian Government*, 148-9.

¹⁰¹ Eric Yondorf, "The Edict of June 10, 1813 Regarding the Status of Persons of Jewish Faith in the Kingdom of Bavaria," n.d., < http://www.rjjo.homepage.t-online.de/pdf/EN_BY_JU_edikt_e.pdf > (21 October 2006).

¹⁰² Friedrich Curtius, *Memoirs of Prince Chlodwig of Hohenlohe Schillingfuerst* vol. I trans. George W. Crystal, (London: William Heinemann, 1907) 99.

populace, the ordinance of 30 August 1799 required the laity to give only half of what they normally would to mendicant Friars, of which Munich was overrun.¹⁰³ Later, Mendicant orders were prohibited to beg entirely by April of 1802, following an ordinance passed the previous March.

The secularization trend begun in France moved across its borders after the *Reichsdeputationshauptschluss* (in France *Recès principal de la députation extraordinaire de l'Empire*) was uniformly enacted in those German states not annexed during the French Revolution on 25 February 1803. Among the provisions of the far-reaching treaty, territorial concessions were awarded to the Bavarian elector as an indemnity for land annexed by France west of the Rhine. Furthermore, the treaty allowed the elector of Bavaria to take into possession all land owned by monasteries, abbeys, chapters and convents within new land granted to Bavaria, as well as those which existed in its former borders. This granted the elector rights to all the property, revenues, capital and seigniorial rights these institutions used to support themselves, with the exception of funds for the maintenance of churches, cathedrals and pensions for the clergy.¹⁰⁴ The elector was thus given an enormous amount of Church property and his position as head of the state was solidified.¹⁰⁵ With the support of Napoleonic France, Montgelas could now rebuild Bavaria along secular lines.

A commission was ordered by Montgelas in March 1803 to assess and sell the newly obtained Church property. Montgelas claims the Bavarian government gained no less than one

¹⁰³ Higby, *Religious Policy of the Bavarian Government*, 110.

¹⁰⁴ George F. de Martens, *Recueil des Principaux traités d'alliance... depuis 1761-1806* vol. VII (Paris: La librairie de Dietrich, 1835), 435-505.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 497-500.

million florins from the immediate sale of the property. Additionally the secularization of the property allowed for new secular owners. These were to be peasants who would bring revenue to the state through an increase in agricultural production from land left uncultivated by the Church. This in turn would lead to commerce and newly taxable assets for the state.¹⁰⁶

The anti-clerical Montgelas also began to craft legislation that would strip the clergy of its powers over civil and ecclesiastical affairs as they had existed before 1799 and thereby consolidate the power of the elector. Since the Treaty of Westphalia, the clergy had claimed substantial powers, leaving the government weak and a virtual extension of the Papacy. Montgelas stripped the Church of most of its powers and supervised, codified and regulated what few powers and privileges it allowed the Church to keep. Under Montgelas's government, both the Catholic and Protestant clergy were to be evaluated for efficacy in spiritual matters to ensure proper religious instruction and better serve the spiritual needs of Bavarians. Moreover, ecclesiastic authorities could no longer use the secular authorities to enforce the uniformity of religious practices. For instance, the ecclesiastic authorities also were no longer able to secure the assistance of the secular authorities in forbidding the consumption of meat on certain days. Additionally, should a member of the clergy commit a secular crime, such as rape, murder, or anything else not relating directly to a violation of religious practice, the secular authorities judgment now took precedence over ecclesiastic authorities.¹⁰⁷

By the end of the Napoleonic period the relationship between the ecclesiastical authorities and the state had been completely transformed. Rather than the state relying on the

¹⁰⁶ G. Laubmann and M. Doeberl, *Maximilian Joseph v. Montgelas*, 129.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 130-3.

Church for money or bowing to papal pressure, the state now supervised the most of the churches internal activities. The state regulated clerical qualifications, pensions, appointment, education, and publications. Most importantly, by decree of 27 February 1804, the state monitored correspondence between the Bavarian Catholic Church and foreign bishops, including the Pope.¹⁰⁸

Intellectual and Educational Reforms

Under the regime of the previous elector, intellectuals had been persecuted and dismissed from several universities and positions for their enlightened views. Maximilian IV Joseph's government called these men back to Bavaria and offered them influential positions including several professorial positions.¹⁰⁹ By April 1799 Montgelas and Maximilian IV Joseph dissolved the oppressive College for the Censorship of Books (Büchercensurcollegium). The same institution Montgelas had worked for before being revealed to be an Illuminist. In its place a new Book Censorship Commission (Büchercensur-Specialcommission) was founded, overseen by the department of ecclesiastical affairs, with the enlightened writer Westenrieder placed as the director.¹¹⁰ Westenrieder was also placed at the head of a commission overseeing Latin schools.¹¹¹ The decision to place an author such as Westenrieder, who was often at odds with the former regime's censors, at the head of these posts showed the liberal intentions of the new government of Maximilian IV Joseph.

¹⁰⁸ Higby, *Religious Policy of the Bavarian Government*, 215; 240-1.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 110-11.

¹¹⁰ August Klockhohn, *Aus dem handschriftlichen Nachlasse Westenrieders*, 65. Also G. Laubmann and M. Doeberl, *Maximilian Joseph v. Montgelas*, 33-34.

¹¹¹ Ibid., 65.

Secularizing and reforming education in Bavaria was one of the most ambitious and therefore problematic of the reforms enacted by Montgelas and his new government. Enlightened thinkers believed that the lower orders, particularly the peasantry, could be raised out of their ignorance and destitution to be made more productive through compulsory public education. To begin this task Montgelas's government appointed the liberal—and suspected Illuminist—cleric J.M. von Frauenberg to oversee the General School and Studies Directory in 1802. The newly appointed minister's first act was compulsory education for children six to twelve years of age.¹¹² Not only did the government lack the necessary funding and manpower, but prevailing socio-economic conditions and the traditional position of the clergy hobbled Frauenberg and the new government's efforts to reform schools in Bavaria.

The government found itself pressed for funds at the onset. Charles Theodore had drained the treasury just before his death, and those funds seized from the Order of Malta not only had to be returned but also augmented for the insult.¹¹³ When Montgelas and Maximilian IV Joseph began their educational reforms the Bavarian treasury was fifteen million Gulden in debt.¹¹⁴ This lack of funding had also deterred the enlightened Maximilian III Joseph who attempted to reform education in Bavaria during the middle of the seventeenth century. As mentioned above, Montgelas searched for money and facilities for education in seized Church properties. To support the University of Ingolstadt and the lower schools in Munich, Church lands, including monasteries and convents were seized.¹¹⁵ The Carmelites were suppressed 19 December 1801

¹¹² Schleunes, *Schooling and Society*, 54.

¹¹³ Higby, *Religious Policy of the Bavarian Government*, 109.

¹¹⁴ Schleunes, *Schooling and Society*, 52.

¹¹⁵ G. Laubmann and M. Doeberl, *Maximilian Joseph v. Montgelas*, 126-7. Also Higby, *Religious Policy of the Bavarian Government*, 175.

and the buildings of their monastery were given to use by the Latin school in Munich.¹¹⁶ Wars resulting in constant territorial shifts and later the real estate glut caused by the secularization of Church lands prevented further capital from being appropriated to support education in Bavaria.

The two most immediate problems for further reformation of education in Bavaria were a lack of funding and qualified teachers. This left the government to rely on the Church to help implement educational reforms, which certainly presented difficulties considering the government wanted the Church to not interfere with education. Without money the government could not train new teachers, leaving members of the clergy to staff public schools as their only realistic alternative. The GSSD also did not have the ability to redraw the school districts overnight. Therefore the new ministers decided to use the already extant Church parishes, which required help from the clergy. Finally, attendance from the peasant class was further limited by parental consent arising from socio-economic norms. Peasant families relied heavily on the labor of their children for sowing and reaping crops, hand-crafts, spinning and intense manual labor.¹¹⁷ In addition, few peasant families saw benefit from the education offered to their children. School fees further exacerbated the impoverished peasants' attitudes towards public education.

With the GSSD's reliance on the clergy for buildings, administration, staff, and enforcement of attendance and with resistance from peasant parents, few conditions in Bavarian schools changed in the first years of reform efforts.¹¹⁸ This was due not only to the lack of funding, buildings and teachers, but also due to the far-reaching and optimistic aspirations of the architect of the reform plan, Josef Wismayr. The new enlightened curriculum he proposed was

¹¹⁶ August Klockhohn, *Aus dem handschriftlichen Nachlasse Westenrieders*, 68.

¹¹⁷ Lee, *Population Growth*, 161.

¹¹⁸ Schleunes, *Schooling and Society*, 58-9.

too expansive and rigorous to allow for the speedy and efficient training of a new army of teachers. In a fashion very typical of Enlightened thinkers, like Rousseau, the bar had been set unattainably high with excessive *utilitarian* knowledge.¹¹⁹ The edict of September 1808 in regards to public education allowed for local supervisory officials, but these positions could only be filled with the clergy at the lower levels. Later in 1810 public school districts were finally separated from Church parishes after only eight years of sharing boundaries and non-confessional schools at last became possible.¹²⁰ Non-confessional public schooling was intended to begin 26 November 1804.¹²¹ Though the government had passed several rounds of legislation attempting to secularize education, ultimately little had changed between 1799 and 1817 due to the aforementioned complications. Their efforts were also retarded when Montgelas was ousted and the concordat between Bavaria and the Roman Curia was signed in 1817.

Immediate Reaction to the Government's Decrees

The new government's assault on religion was not without consequences. A noteworthy example of negative reaction began with the suppression of the Order of the Knights of Malta. After the Jesuits were suppressed by Charles Theodore, the Order of Malta was endowed with the land formerly used by the Jesuits. Charles Theodore died and days later, in February of 1799 the Order's land and finances were seized, and according to Westenrieder, the Order was declared abolished.¹²² Unfortunately, the new Grand Master of the Order was the Russian Tsar Paul. After learning of the suppression of his Order, Tsar Paul ordered his troops, en route to

¹¹⁹ Terry Pinkard, *Hegel: A Biography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 270-1.

¹²⁰ Schleunes, *Schooling and Society*, 64-5.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, 58.

¹²² August Klockhohn, *Aus dem handschriftlichen Nachlasse Westenrieders*, 62.

France, to treat Bavaria as a hostile nation. Luckily for the new government, Montgelas's diplomatic experience as minister of foreign affairs in Zweibrücken, a nation constantly on the brink of French annexation, allowed him to soothe the enraged Tsar.¹²³ This led to a treaty in July of 1799 which granted considerable monetary concessions to the Order and requiring a member of the royal family to serve as Grand Prior to the Munich Branch and to swear fealty to the Tsar as Grand Master.¹²⁴

Other than this early misstep the Bavarian government managed to successfully strip power from the Church with little incidence. For so Catholic a state, there was very little popular reaction against the state during the dissolution of Catholic power. There are a few incidences of complaints by various religious committees against the elector.¹²⁵ The populace did however react by destroying crosses, abbeys, shrines, oratories and small parish churches, using the materials to improve buildings in their districts.¹²⁶ While the displaced ecclesiastics and their relatives in the aristocracy did not embrace the new path Bavaria had taken, popular support seems to have been behind Montgelas. Lee explains that a communication gap developed between the peasantry and the Church, due to the "latinised ecclesiastical ritual, [which] may well have weakened the overall influence of the Church."¹²⁷ On reaction to the newly secularized lands and buildings that came with some lands, Chadwick also offers, "the looters were Catholics as well as Protestants."¹²⁸ Montgelas even eventually managed to have the Order of Malta

¹²³ Maximilian von Montgelas, *Denkwürdigkeiten des bayerischen Staatsministers Maximilian Grafen von Montgelas (1799-1817)*. (Stuttgart: Verlag der Cotta'schen Buchhandlung, 1887), 36-38.

¹²⁴ George F. de Martens, *Recueil des Principaux traités d'alliance..., depuis 1761-1806* vol. VII, 694.

¹²⁵ Higby, *Religious Policy of the Bavarian Government*, 198-200.

¹²⁶ G. Laubmann and M. Doeberl, *Maximilian Joseph v. Montgelas*, 129-132.

¹²⁷ Lee, *Population Growth*, 298.

¹²⁸ Chadwick, *Popes and the European Revolution*, 500.

suppressed after the death of Tsar Paul and the creation of the Kingdom of Bavaria, which consolidated state power for the minister. In August of 1808 the Knights of Malta were declared abolished in Bavaria.¹²⁹

After Montgelas joined the coalition against Napoleon in 1813, reform efforts in Bavaria gradually lost momentum and came less frequently. Two years later when Napoleon was defeated in 1815, Montgelas's French sympathies, once an asset, became a liability. Montgelas found his French liberalism at odds with a new sense of Bavarian nationalism that developed with Napoleon's defeat while at the Bavarian court. Without Napoleon's liberal influence and suppression of Rome, state secularization in all probability would not have come to Bavaria as quickly as it did. However Montgelas's role as negotiator and state builder, and Maximilian IV Joseph as enlightened ruler were just as essential to the success of Bavaria in weathering this chaotic period. Though the reform efforts were mostly successful during the age of Napoleon, the ideals of the *Aufklärung* were not permanent in Bavaria. As with the rest of Europe, Bavaria slid backwards into reaction and religious obscurantism beginning in the age of Metternich in the years following Napoleon's final defeat.

¹²⁹ Higby, *Religious Policy of the Bavarian Government*, 204.

Chapter III:

Bavaria after Napoleon: The Consequences of Napoleonic Alliances and Permanence of Montgelas's Liberal Reforms

After 1815, the social and political climate of Europe and especially the German states began to change. The rulers of the Germanies had lost vast resources supplying and then defeating Napoleon. Under the wily direction of Montgelas, Bavaria managed to reap all of the benefits of an alliance with Napoleon while remaining a continental power. The antiquated and cumbersome Bavarian bureaucracy was reorganized along rational and secular lines with the Church following the lead of the state. Laws were codified and the arbitrary will of the King was held somewhat in check with the new constitution Maximilian I granted in 1808. Moreover, Bavarian territory was finally centralized and organized into a nation with a contiguous border. Just before Napoleon's first defeat, Bavaria realigned itself with Great Britain and the coalition against Napoleon in 1813 with the Treaty of Ried. This allowed Bavaria to maintain most of its territorial acquisitions and to participate as a victor during the Congress of Vienna, where the boundaries of Europe were redrawn. War against Napoleon did not come at a small price to the already strained resources of Bavaria.

Bavaria was already known as an impoverished state with a population that showed little growth over the last few decades,¹³⁰ so the loss of both men and money was particularly poignant to the first King of Bavaria, Maximilian I. The Napoleonic Wars left thousands dead. Requisitioning to support the French and Bavarian armies took large quantities of resources from the already impoverished peasants, saddling them with heavy debts from money-lenders. Artillery destroyed roads and agricultural improvements. With the loss of life, destruction of property from the constant shifts in Bavarian territory, and the constant strain placed on the population, its resources, and the state treasury, the Bavarian economy was severely retarded.¹³¹

The new Kingdom of Bavaria and its newly established constitutional monarchy had to operate under these chaotic circumstances, without the umbrella of Napoleon's support. Naturally, conservatives sought peace where they could find it after the tumult experienced by Bavarian society during the years of Napoleonic rule. Conservative and young new nationalistic elements within the Bavarian government and court grew antagonistic to Montgelas soon thereafter. This was due in large part to his anti-clerical, pro-French, and pro-Napoleonic sympathies. Maximilian I, the King of Bavaria, was secure in his new position after Napoleon had been neutralized; Montgelas was no longer necessary. Therefore, Montgelas, the archetype of French ideals and liberal reform, was dismissed by Maximilian IV Joseph, who had, like Charles Theodore, begun to favor Catholic zealots, in his case the Crown Prince Ludwig, and the Crown Prince's tutor, the Jesuit scholar Johann Michael Sailer.¹³² The pious Crown Prince Ludwig, no doubt under the influence of Sailer, had insisted Montgelas, the enemy of

¹³⁰ Lee, *Population Growth*, 166-75.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, 174-79.

¹³² James J. Sheehan, *German History, 1770-1866* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), 556.

Catholicism, was a detriment to Bavaria. Additionally Ludwig was thoroughly nationalistic and loathed the French and Napoleon, so it is little surprise that he disliked Montgelas.¹³³ Ludwig hated Montgelas even though Montgelas had secured the Zweibrücken's holdings, among a plethora of other achievements, including establishing the constitution of 1808, which helped Bavaria weather the difficult Napoleonic years.¹³⁴ After Montgelas's dismissal in 1817, a new constitution of 1818 was introduced which, "broke least with the principles and practices of corporate estates."¹³⁵ Bavaria thus began its regression into conservative reaction.

Of his other reforms, Montgelas's toleration and government centralization reforms weathered best under this climate. Religious toleration survived due in most part to the weakened position and influence of the Church, though there was a toleration lapse in 1819 with the infamous Hep Hep Riots.

A severe subsistence crisis occurred between 1816-1817 leaving a Bavaria that had recently been devastated, hungry and in debt. Jews were the primary money lenders and traders at this time. Rumors began that the *Kornjuden*, or grain Jews, were hoarding grain in a speculation scheme to drive up prices and profit from Christian misfortune. The reading public demanded the works of philosopher Jakob Friedrich Fries, especially his pamphlet *Über die Gefährdung des Wohlstandes und des Charakters der Deutschen durch die Juden* which insisted that Judaism must disappear. Many peasants at this time also bought farming implements, grain,

¹³³ David Watkin, "The Transformation of Munich into a Royal Capital by Kings Maximilian I and Ludwig I of Bavaria," *The Court Historian* 11:1 (July, 2006): 3-4.

¹³⁴ G. Laubmann, and M. Doeberl, *Denkwürdigkeiten des Grafen Maximilian Joseph v. Montgelas über die innere Staatsverwaltung Bayerns 1799-1817* (Munich, 1908), 10-11. Montgelas apologizes for his discretions and then enumerates all of the changes he helped to precipitate in Bavaria.

¹³⁵ Daniel Klang, "Bavaria and the War of Liberation, 1813-1814," *French Historical Studies* 4:1 (Spring, 1965): 32-33.

and cattle from Jews. After the last few years of poor yields the peasants fell into debt to these Jews, leading to popular discontent and anti-Semitism. All of these conditions coalesced into violence on 2 August 1819 becoming the Hep Hep riots, a series of *pogroms* throughout central Europe.¹³⁶

Catholics, Protestants and even Jews lived together peacefully with little incident otherwise. Catholics and Protestants lived side by side harmoniously in many instances.¹³⁷ In some parishes where few churches existed, a single church was shared for Catholic and Protestant services. In Munich a Catholic Church was given to the Protestants for worship. Finally a settlement was established near the city of Rosanhain, where a community of Protestants and Catholics was established, coexisting without violence.¹³⁸

School reforms secularizing public education on the other hand were almost entirely undone. In 1817 after Montgelas was dismissed, the new kingdom signed a Concordat, which included provisions concerning public education. Once again the Church was granted control of the bodies of public education in Bavaria.¹³⁹ Furthermore, one of the goals of public education was to destroy the superstitious and inefficient practices of the peasants. This did not happen as the new government had hoped. Superstition and magic still prevailed in the countryside. As a consequence, cultivators still would not accept better agricultural techniques that would increase yields and instead focused on the three field system and the intensive production of grains,

¹³⁶ Post, *Subsistence Crisis*, 166-173. Also Christhard Hoffmann, Werner Bergmann, Helmut Walser Smith, *Exclusionary Violence* (University of Michigan Press, 2002), 36-7.

¹³⁷ G. Laubmann and M. Doeberl, *Maximilian Joseph v. Montgelas*, 124.

¹³⁸ Higby, *The Religious Policy of the Bavarian Government*, 137.

¹³⁹ Schleunes, *Schooling and Society*, 81-2.

without the use of manure, which had proven to be ineffective. Over 90% of farmers would continue this trend until well after German unification.¹⁴⁰

The government's land reforms begun during the secularizations of 1803 never really accomplished their intended goals. The government wanted to foster industry and stimulate commerce by allowing the peasants to purchase lands formerly owned by the Church and thus increasing the number of small holders. This was problematic for two reasons: the government had trouble selling the land, as few peasants, many of whom lived just above subsistence, had the capital for such an endeavor; and the quality of the land. Lee estimates that only about three percent of the land which became available from the Church was arable and suitable for intense agricultural production that could yield sufficient surplus for commerce.¹⁴¹

John Post offers another explanation for the age of reaction following Napoleon's defeat until the *Vormärz*. Post asserts that volcanic ash caused a cooling trend from 1550-1850, disrupting weather patterns for several centuries. This caused summer time frosts and the destruction of large quantities of grain crops. The worst of these effects he dates to the period 1815-16. This, in tandem with the European landscape ravaged by Napoleonic Wars, caused a subsistence crisis. This crisis retarded the Enlightenment's ideals, which were on the rise until 1815.¹⁴² A huge depression followed Napoleon's defeat, the cost of living and grain shot up while wages stagnated and crop yields were incredibly low. Grain riots and social unrest coalesced during 1817, which came to be known as the *Year of the Beggars*.¹⁴³ Post then

¹⁴⁰ Lee, *Population Growth*, 177.

¹⁴¹ Ibid., 172.

¹⁴² Post, *Subsistence Crisis*, 1-6.

¹⁴³ Ibid., 37-86.

observes, “A tendency to confuse economic discontent with political disaffection became unavoidable as social disorder mounted and at the same time, economic and social complaints became inextricably tied up with political demands.”¹⁴⁴ Post provides convincing analysis that climatic variation led to factors that would produce the reactionary Age of Metternich, however it was only one of the many symptoms that produced the more conservative era that fell over Europe.

Ultimately the *Aufklärung* did fully come to Bavaria. Circumstances prevented an over-ambitious government’s reforms, which came in too quick of succession. The government’s speed in proclaiming reform did not allow enough time for dissemination of those reforms throughout rural areas. This was particularly necessary in Bavaria as most of the nation was composed of rural areas. The problem was further exacerbated by insufficient government resources and constant warfare. However, the largest problems facing Bavaria, including: the enormous influence of the Church on the state, the size of the Church’s land holdings, and the forced uniformity of Catholicism throughout the population were mitigated by the government’s reform efforts. Montgelas and Maximilian IV Joseph weathered an incredibly turbulent period in Bavaria’s history, where at any time the nation could be annexed by another larger nation, by adapting to the changing European atmosphere. While much of what was accomplished was not permanent, Bavaria—as a sovereign nation—managed to survive when it seemed likely to be engulfed by one of its larger neighbors.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., 166.

Appendix I: Napoleonic Wars Territory Changes¹⁴⁵

1. Altbayern: Lay

Tirol-Vorarlberg 1805 (parts to Italy in 1809) Transferred to Austria 1814

Innviertel 1809 Transferred to Austria in 1814

Part of the Hauruckviertel 1809 Transferred to Austria in 1814

Grafschaft Ortenburg 1806

Ecclesiastical

Bishopric of Freising 1803, Passau 1803-05, Brixen 1805, Trient 1805

(latter two transferred to Austria in 1814). Bishopric of Salzburg 1809,

1814 to Austria, Propstei Berchtesgaden 1809, Primatialstaat Regensburg

1810. Various Monastic foundations 1803.

2. Franken: Lay

Castell, Hohenlohe, Schwarzenberg, Schönborn-Wiesentheid 1806,

Markgrafschaft Ansbach 1806, Grossherzogtum Würzburg 1810-1814,

Markgrafschaft Bayreuth 1810, Fürstentum Aschaffenburg 1814. Imperial

Cities of Rothenburg, Schweinfurt 1804, Weissenburg, Windsheim and

Nürnberg 1806

Ecclesiastical

Bishopric of Würzburg 1803, Bamberg 1803, Eichstädt 1803-5 and the

abbeys of Ebrach and Langheim 1803

¹⁴⁵ Lee, *Population Growth*, 389.

3.Schwaben: Lay

Markgrafschaft Burgau 1805, Herrschaften of Fugger and Oettingen 1806,
Imperial cities of Dinkelsbühl, Kaufbeuren, Kempten, Memmingen and
Nördling 1803. Ulm 1803 and Augsburg and Lindau 1805.

Ecclesiastical

Bishopric of Augsburg 1803, Monastic foundations of St. Afra, Irsee,
Kausheim, Kempten, Ottobeuren, Ulrich, and Ursperge.
Deutschordenskommenden Donauwörth Oettingen.

Appendix II: Excerpts

Excerpt from *Vanity of Human Wishes*

The bold *Bavarian*, in a luckless Hour,
Tries the dread Summits of *Cesarean* Pow'r,
With unexpected Legions bursts away,
And sees defenceless Realms receive his Sway;
Short Sway! fair *Austria* spreads her mournful Charms,
The Queen, the Beauty, sets the World in Arms;
From Hill to Hill the Beacons rousing Blaze
Spreads wide the Hope of Plunder and of Praise;
The fierce *Croatian*, and the wild *Hussar*,
And all the Sons of Ravage croud the War;
The baffled Prince in Honour's flatt'ring Bloom
Of hasty Greatness finds the fatal Doom,
His foes Derision, and his Subjects Blame,
And steals to Death from Anguish and from Shame.

Excerpt from Voltaire: Siècles de Louis XIV et de Louis XV

L'empereur Charles VII, si peu respecté dans l'Empire, et n'y ayant d'autre appui que le roi de Prusse, qui alors était poursuivi par le prince Charles, craignant que la reine de Hongrie ne le forcât encore de sortir de Munich, sa capitale, se voyant toujours le jouet de la fortune, accablé de maladies que les chagrins redoublaient, succomba enfin et mourut à Munich, à l'âge de quarante-sept ans et demi, en laissant cette leçon au monde, que le plus haut degré de la grandeur humaine peut être le comble de la calamité. Il n'avait été malheureux que depuis qu'il avait été empereur. La nature dès-lors lui avait fait plus de mal encore que la fortune : une complication de maladies douloureuses rendit plus violents les chagrins de l'ame par les souffrances du corps, et le conduisit au tombeau : il avait la goutte et la pierre ; on trouva ses poumons, son foie et son estomac gangrenés, des pierres dans ses reins, un polype dans son cœur; on jugea qu'il n'avait pu dès long-temps être un moment sans souffrir. Peu de princes ont eu de meilleures qualités : elles ne servirent qu'à son malheur, et ce malheur vint d'avoir pris un fardeau qu'il ne pouvait soutenir.

Le corps de cet infortuné prince fut exposé vêtu à l'ancienne mode espagnole ; étiquette établie par Charles-Quint, quoique depuis lui aucun empereur n'ait été Espagnol, et que Charles VII n'eût rien de commun avec cette nation. Il fut enseveli avec les cérémonies de l'Empire, et, dans cet appareil de la vanité de la misère humaine, on porta le globe du monde devant celui qui, pendant la courte

durée de son empire, n'avait pas même possédé une petite et malheureuse province : on lui donna dans quelques rescrits le titre d'invincible, titre attaché par l'usage à la dignité d'empereur, et qui ne faisait que mieux sentir les malheurs de celui qui l'avait possédée.

Selected Bibliography

- Acton, John Emerich Edward Dalberg Acton, Baron. *The Cambridge Modern History*. New York: Macmillan Company, 1902-12.
- Baten, Jorg, Murray John. "Bastardy in South Germany Revisited: An Anthropometric Synthesis." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, Vol. 28, No. 1, (Summer, 1997), pp. 47-56. JSTOR. Baton Rouge, LA. 21/07/2008 01:24.
- Blackbourn, David. *History of Germany, 1780-1918: The Long Nineteenth Century*. USA: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Blanning, T. C. W. *The French Revolution in Germany: Occupation and Resistance in the Rhineland, 1792-1802*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983.
- Chadwick, Owen. *The Popes and European Revolution*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981.
- Doeberl, Ludwig. *Maximilian von Montgelas und das Prinzip der Staatssouveränität*. München: Veröffentlicht von H. Schmidt, 1925.
- Dunan, Marcel. *Napoléon et l'Allemagne; le système continental et les débuts du royaume de Bavière, 1806-1810*. Paris: Librairie Plon, 1942.
- Dummer, Edwin Heyse. *J. C. von Aretin and the library scene in Bavaria in the secularization period*. Rochester, N.Y.: University of Rochester Press for the Association of College and Reference Libraries, 1955.
- Easton, J.C. "Charles Theodore of Bavaria and Count Rumford." *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 12, No. 2, (Jun., 1940), pp. 145-160. JSTOR. Baton Rouge, LA. 21/07/2008 01:24.
- Eldridge, Bourne, Henry. *The Revolutionary Period in Europe (1763-1815)*. New York: The Century co, 1914.
- Feuerbach, Ludwig. *Paul Johann Anselm Ritter von Feuerbachs Leben und wirken Von Paul Johann Anselm Feuerbach*. (missing): Wolfgang Harich Veröffentlicht von Akademie-Verlag, 1976.
- Gottfried, Paul. *Conservative millenarians :The Romantic Experience in Bavaria*. New York : Fordham University Press, 1979.

- Hebermann, Charles George. *The Catholic encyclopedia; an international work of reference on the constitution, doctrine, discipline, and history of the Catholic church*. New York: The Encyclopedia Press, 1913.
- Higby, Chester Penn. *The Religious Policy of the Bavarian Government During the Napoleonic Period*. New York: Longmans, Green & Co, 1919.
- Huber, Ernst Rudolf. *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte seit 1789*. Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer GmbH, 1957.
- Huber, Ernst Rudolf. *Dokumente zur deutschen Verfassungsgeschichte, Band I*. Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer GmbH, 1961.
- Junkelmann, Marcus. *Napoleon und Bayern: von den Anfängen des Königreiches*. Regensburg: Pustet, 1985.
- Klang, Daniel. "Bavaria and the War of Liberation, 1813-1814." *French Historical Studies*, Vol. 4, No. 1 (Spring, 1965), pp. 22-41. JSTOR. Baton Rouge, LA. 21/07/2008 01:30.
- Lee, Robert, W. *Population Growth, Economic Development, and Social Change in Bavaria, 1750-1850*. University of Michigan: Arno Press, 1977.
- Montgelas, Laubmann, Doeberl. *Denkwürdigkeiten des Grafen Maximilian Joseph V. Montgelas über die innere Staatsverwaltung Bayerns(1799-1817): (1799 - 1817): nebst einer Einleitung über die Entstehung des modernen Staates in Bayern von M. Doeberl*. München: C.H. Beck, 1908.
- Post, John D. *The Last Great Subsistence Crisis in the Western World*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977.
- Ramm, Agatha. *Germany 1789-1919 - A Political History*. London: Methuen, 1981.
- Schleunes, Karl A. *Schooling and Society: The Politics of Education in Prussia and Bavaria*. US: St. Martin's Press, 1989.
- Schiel, Hubert. *Leben und Briefe von Johann Michael Sailer*. Regensburg: Pustet, 1948.
- Schmitt, Hans A. "Germany without Prussia: A Closer Look at the Confederation of the Rhine." *German Studies Review*, Vol. 6, No. 1, (Feb., 1983), pp. 9-39. JSTOR. Baton Rouge, LA. 21/07/2008 01:26.
- Schnabel, Franz. *Deutsche geschichte im neunzehnten jahrhundert*. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1948

- Sheehan, James J. *German History, 1770-1866*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.
- Smith, Helmut Walser. *The Continuities of German History : Nation, Religion, and Race Across the Long Nineteenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Smith, Helmut Walser. *Protestants, Catholics, and Jews in Germany, 1800-1914*. Oxford; New York : Berg, 2001.
- Spindler, Max. *Bayerische Geschichte im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert : 1800-1970, Erster Teilband Staat und Politik*. München: Verlag C.H. Beck, 1978.
- Spindler, Max. *Bayerische Geschichte im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert : 1800-1970, Zweiter Teilband Innere Entwicklung, Land, Gesellschaft, Wirtschaft, Kirche, geistiges Leben*. München: Verlag C.H. Beck, 1978.
- Ward ,Adolphus William, Sir. *Germany, 1815-1890: Volume I*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1916.
- Weis, Eberhard. *Reformen im rheinbündischen Deutschland*. München: Oldenbourg Verlag GmbH, 1984.
- Weis, Eberhard. *Geschichtsschreibung und Staatsauffassung in der Französischen Enzyklopädie*. Wiesbaden, F. Steiner, 1956.
- Weis, Eberhard. *Bayern und Frankreich in der Zeit des Konsulats und des Ersten Empire (1799-1815)*. München: Stiftung Historisches Kolleg, 1984.
- Werner, George S. *Bavaria in the German Confederation, 1820-1848*. New Jersey: Associated University Presses, Inc, 1977.
- Vanden Heuvel, Jon. *A German life in the age of revolution : Joseph Görres, 1776-1848*. Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 2001.
- Vedeler, Harold C. "The Genesis of the Toleration Reforms in Bavaria under Montgelas." *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 10, No. 4, (Dec., 1938), pp. 473-495. JSTOR. Baton Rouge, LA. 21/07/2008 01:16.
- Zamoyski, Adam. *Rites of peace : The Fall of Napoleon and the Congress of Vienna*. New York: HarpersCollins, 2007.