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The Occasions series was launched in 1996 with the publication of two presentations by the late Sir Ernst Gombrich. Ten years and eight issues later, the Austrian Cultural Forum London, in its quest to stimulate discussion on many diverse aspects of Austria, continues to greatly benefit from its host country’s enduring tradition of brilliant scholarship and lively academic debate, providing us with thought-provoking and enlightening insights into our history and culture.

Professor Ritchie Robertson’s text on Anticlericalism in Austrian Literature from Joseph II to Thomas Bernhard is a most pertinent example in this respect. I am grateful to Martin Liebscher, coordinator of the Ingeborg Bachmann Centre for Contemporary Austrian Literature at the Institute of Germanic & Romance Studies, University of London, for having invited Professor Robertson to inaugurate the Centre’s new biennial Lecture, aimed at giving special recognition to outstanding achievements in the study of Austrian cultural history.

In his lecture, initially entitled Enlightenment and Anticlericalism in Austrian Literature from Aloys Blumauer to Thomas Bernhard, Professor Robertson deals with a cluster of highly contentious issues. He does so with elegant ease and in the most accessible manner. His remarks on the question of Churches and the state, intellectual authority (including a carefully placed reference to the category of the sacred and its possible loss in a secular,
‘fully enlightened society’)*, and the moral authority of the Church, put in a nutshell some 1672 years of repeatedly very fierce struggles for authority and equality in crucial areas, resulting, among other things, in the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion, famously enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948.

While looking at important ideological aspects of this contest, as reflected in Austrian literature over a period of two centuries, the author does not shy away from pointing to “the emotions that underpin, qualify, or even contradict [...] ideologies”. I trust that such analytical differentiation could also prove very helpful in examining the many conflicting emotions that fuel current debates on the new variations of a very old theme, as open and hidden claims to truth and superiority apparently drown out subtler approaches to pivotal questions concerning religion, freedom, and the public sphere, which in our time have become global concerns.

Johannes Wimmer
Director of the Austrian Cultural Forum London
Autumn 2006

* On a rather conciliatory exchange concerning related themes, see: Edward Skidelsky, Habermas vs the Pope. The darling of the 68ers and Benedict XVI find a surprising amount to agree on. In: Prospect Magazine, Issue 116, November 2005

The foundation in 2002 of the Ingeborg Bachmann Centre for Austrian Literature was an important initiative in bringing to a wider audience the rich and varied contribution made by Austria to modern German-language literature. With the support of the Austrian Cultural Forum London, the Erste Bank and the Österreich Kooperation, the Centre has established itself at the forefront of research on Austrian culture and literature in the UK, reaching out beyond the confines of academia and provoking a lively interest in Austrian literature amongst the English-speaking public.

The Bachmann Centre cooperates closely with other academic institutions in the field of Germanic Studies in the UK, where research in Austrian literature and culture is very well established. It is therefore appropriate that the first Bachmann Centre lecture, – an event intended to honour outstanding contributions to our understanding of Austrian cultural history –, was given by one of Britain’s most distinguished scholars, Professor Ritchie Robertson at St. John’s College, Oxford. The present text is a revised version of the lecture he gave on 13 October 2005 at the Institute of Germanic & Romance Studies (University of London).

Professor Robertson has published extensively in the field of Austrian literature, including texts on Franz Grillparzer, Arthur Schnitzler, Hugo von Hofmannsthal, Franz Werfel, Elias Canetti and Joseph Roth – to mention only a few writers. Of particular significance is his 1985 study of Franz Kafka entitled Kafka: Judaism,
By anticlericalism I do not mean mere sniping at aspects of the Church, but rather a set of principled standpoints concerning issues that remain urgent in today’s society. The first issue is the political relation between the Churches and the state. At one extreme the Church may be bound up with the state as a state church or ‘Staatskirche’. That is the – perhaps anachronistic – position of the established Church of England, whose bishops and archbishops are appointed by the state. At the other, the Church may be a foreign body within the state with its activities exempted from state control, and these activities may include education. The case for ‘faith schools’ is contentious in present-day Britain. The Churches and the state clashed over the control of education in the German Kulturkampf of the 1870s, when Bismarck brought education entirely under the control of the state. Austria, however, had its Kulturkampf in the 1780s. Joseph II insisted on his right to appoint bishops. He reorganized the system of seminaries for training priests. He instituted a high degree of religious toleration. He abolished a number of monastic orders, including all those that were simply contemplative, using their property to expand the system of parish clergy. In general, we may agree that it is good for the state to organize major aspects of national life. But to avert the danger of the state’s extending its activities too far, even to the point of totalitarianism, it may also be good to have separate institutions such as the Churches which shield the individual from the state.

Next, there is the question of intellectual authority. An enlight-
ened and democratic society is based on a culture of debate in which every position has to be justified by reason. Such a society cannot easily accommodate an institution whose authority is based on an unarguable appeal to the sacred, whether sanctity attaches to the origins and history of the institution, or to the texts which contain the institution’s teaching. These matters have to be subject to free inquiry. Adherents of the Austrian Enlightenment, for example, wanted to contest the claim of the Papacy to supreme rule of the Church, and they did so by scrutinizing the bases of this claim in the New Testament and in early Church history. Similarly, the Enlightenment in general developed the critical study of the text of the Bible, but at the risk of annulling its sanctity and making it into a book like any other. It may be that in a fully enlightened society, where nothing was beyond debate, there would be nothing sacred. The category of the sacred would be lost, and with it a whole dimension of human experience.

Third comes the moral authority of the Church. In a society permeated by Enlightenment, the Church is no longer the sole source of moral authority. Even earlier, moral treatises surviving from the ancient world, particularly those of Stoicism, suggested an alternative morality. After Kant, however, a secular morality becomes possible which may conflict with the teachings of the Church and may be superior to them. At the present day, the Anglican Communion as a whole appears unable to adopt the tolerance of homosexual practice that is standard among secular liberals. Even worse, the Churches at times appear to defend positive immorality. The obvious instance would be the many cases of child abuse by clerics that have emerged in recent decades throughout the world, notably in Austria. In April 1995 Cardinal Hans Hermann Groer of Vienna was forced by the Vatican to retire because of allegations that in the 1970s he had abused a large number of school students. His most vigorous supporter was the conservative Bishop Kurt Krenn of St. Pölten. Krenn himself was obliged to resign in 2004, however, after some forty thousand pornographic images, including those of paedophilia, were discovered on computers at a seminary in his diocese. These scandals have caused thousands, perhaps tens of thousands of Austrians to leave the Church, disgusted not only by the fact of child abuse but by the hypocrisy and dishonesty shown by the authorities in concealing it. It remains to be seen how far the unimpeachably liberal Cardinal Schönborn can restore the Church’s standing in Austria.

If we move back to the later eighteenth century, we find a new sense of possibility in the Catholic Church and its relation to the state. Something happened in 1773 that nobody expected: Pope Clement XIV formally dissolved the Society of Jesus, which had been expelled from one country after another – France, Spain, Portugal – because it was suspected of wishing to set up a state within the state. More generally, the tide of Baroque Catholicism, set flowing by the Counter-Reformation, was beginning to ebb. Its ceremonial practices, including pilgrimages, Mariolatry, special masses for confraternities, and the sale of indulgences, were coming to be seen as superstitious and time-wasting even within the Church. The Catholic Enlightenment, represented most influentially by the historian Lodovico Antonio Muratori (1672–1760), condemned processions, pilgrimages and festivals as leading to disorder and impiety; church services should be orderly; devotion should be inward, focusing on the word of Scripture rather than images, under the guidance of well-educated parish priests. The Jansenist movement, which likewise advocated austerity and inwardness, was suppressed in France when its monastery of Port Royal was demolished in 1710, but survived in Italy and came from there to Austria, where even the Empress Maria Theresia and her consort shared its preference for simplicity. Derek Beales remarks: ‘Even Maria Theresa’s interest in plans for lavish altar-pieces seems to
have been confined to the question whether they would be easy to dust.³ Under her rule, the number of festivals (‘Feiertage’) was reduced from over a hundred to seventeen; the powers of the Church were curtailed, on the grounds that its kingdom is not of this world; and the state assumed responsibility for schools.

This gradual reform prepared the way for the much more drastic reforms introduced by Joseph II when he became sole ruler of the Monarchy on his mother’s death in 1780. Remaining a pious Catholic, he issued the Patents of Toleration allowing Protestants, Orthodox and Jews to practise their religion and to have equal access to education and employment. He undertook what tendentious historians call the ‘Klostersturm’, abolishing the contemplative monastic orders and reducing the autonomy of the rest.⁴ The property confiscated from the monasteries was used to build up the system of parishes which was to provide the entire population with reliable pastoral care. He embarked on a collision course with the Papacy not only by thus seizing Church property but by claiming the right to appoint bishops and abbots in Austrian Lombardy. Under such provocation, in the spring of 1782 Pope Pius VI came to Vienna in order to remonstrate with the Emperor in person. This was the first time a Pope had visited German territory since the Council of Constance in 1415. Joseph’s dealings with the Pope were frosty and inconclusive. The visit impressed contemporaries by its competitive display of ceremonial, culminating in the Pope’s celebration of Mass in St Stephen’s Cathedral on Easter Sunday and his blessing a crowd of some fifty thousand people. The Pope returned home, however, without weakening Joseph’s determination to conduct reforms. Little did he suspect that in 1808 he would be arrested by Napoleon’s troops and removed from the Papal States to exile on the Italian Riviera – anticlericalism far harsher than Joseph ever dreamed of.

Joseph’s reforming measures were supported by a vast number of pamphleteers who benefited from his introduction of press freedom.⁵ Their productions range from the serious to the scurrilous. At one extreme we find the scholarly investigation by Joseph Valentin Eybel, Was ist der Papst? (What is the Pope?), which shows that the New Testament has no conception of a supreme head of the Church and that the Pope should at most be a kind of chairman mediating among the bishops.⁶ At the other, we have such squibs as the dialogue Der Jesuit und der Teufel (The Jesuit and the Devil), which warns that the Jesuits, though nominally abolished, are still a powerful underground force intent on undermining Joseph’s plans. The Jesuit tells the Devil to give Pluto the following message:

Sag ihm, daß wir als seine treuesten Untertanen Verwirrung, Feindschaft, Heucheley und alle Laster, die aus Pandorens Büchse kamen, im Menschengeschlecht zu verbreiten suchen, und nicht eher ruhen wollen, bis die Kriegsfackel lodert, und Josephs System, sein Volk glücklich zu machen, zerstört ist.⁷

Tell him that we, as his most loyal subjects, seek to spread confusion, hostility, hypocrisy and all the vices that emerged from Pandora’s box among the human race, and shall not rest before the torch of war blazes and Joseph’s system of making his people happy has been destroyed.

Between the two there are innumerable attacks on clerical abuses and superstition. A Viennese Catholic, it is said, can spend his whole life in external devotion, scarcely ever thinking about God. Superstition is nourished by the public display of saints’ images in rooms and stairwells, on houses, bridges, and public buildings, ‘öfters in so grotesker, und bizarrer Gestalt, daß sie vielmehr ungeheuern Mißgeburtan, als Bildern irgend eines Menschen ähnlich scheinen’ (often in such grotesque and bizarre shape that they
resemble monstrous births rather than the images of any human being). At ‘Segenmessen’, burly fellows rush out of churches and shout to passers-by, ‘gehts zum Seegen’ (‘go to the blessing’) so that they can witness the elevation of the Host. The Church encourages ostentatious funerals which impoverish the living without benefiting the dead. It exploits credulity by selling indulgences, including even the ‘Portiunkulaablaß’, which gives remission of all sins to anyone who receives the sacrament of penance in any Franciscan church between noon on 1 August and sunset on 2 August, the anniversary of St Francis’s visions of Jesus. Processions and pilgrimages are derided as occasions for merry-making, disorder, and immorality. A much-read pamphlet describes pilgrimages to Mariazell, the chief Marian shrine of Austria, as social outings on which people took elaborate picnics. The actual church was thronged with jostling visitors, and the queues outside the confessional boxes destroyed any vestige of piety:

*Man drängte sich in die Kirche – erhielt Rippenstösse [sic], und gab Rippenstösse – bahnte sich mit vielen Brumen, Stos sen und Schelten einen Weg zum Beichtstuhl, lud da die Last seiner Sünden ab – verrichtete seine Busse – opferte ein paar wärcherne Männchen – ließ einige Messen lesen – wohnte den außerbaulichen Predigten bey – ließ sich aber bey allen diesem frommen Bußleben an Essen und Trinken nichts abgehen, und trat endlich nach einigen Rasttägen [sic], an Leib und Seele gestärkt, seine Rückreise an.*

People crowded into the church – were jostled, and jostled others in return – forced their way, with much muttering, pushing and scolding, to the confessional box and there unloaded the burden of their sins – performed penance – sacrificed a couple of wax statuettes – had a few masses read – attended the edifying sermons –

but amid all this pious penitential life, had their full share of eating and drinking, and after some days of rest, began the journey home, strengthened in body and soul.

Some of these critiques came from clerics who welcomed Joseph’s reforms. Thus a country priest calls for the complete abolition of pilgrimages, deploring among other abuses the absurdities which are solemnly told to the credulous devotees. One of his parishioners seriously reported to him the following tale told at Mariazell: a woman on her way to Mariazell was attacked by robbers; when she told them she had no money, but was going to offer her heart to the Virgin at Mariazell, they cut out her heart and entrails, wrapped them in a cloth, and told her to offer that up; she travelled for two more days, arrived at Mariazell, took communion, offered up her heart and entrails to the Virgin, and died; her heart and entrails are preserved, uncorrupted, and are shown to all pilgrims.

The Josephinist pamphleteers sought among other things to take command of the public sphere by displacing Catholic preachers from their position of authority. To this end they published many reviews of sermons (‘Predigtkritiken’), coolly assessing the intellectual content of addresses delivered from the pulpit. They also engaged in direct polemic with leading clerics, notably Patrizius Fast, curate of St Stephen’s, and Aloys Merz, a famous preacher in Augsburg. The rejoinders from Fast, Merz and others are woefully inadequate. They refuse to yield an inch of ground, defending even such open absurdities as the Portiuncula indulgence. A notorious performance was Merz’s Whitsun sermon against toleration, based on the text ‘Non veni pacem mittere, sed gladium’ (‘I come not to bring peace, but a sword’, Matt. 10:35), and arguing that those who tolerate or teach error are as bad as criminals.

A major topic of anticlerical polemic, in Austria and elsewhere, is monasticism. It was argued that monasteries and convents had
no authority from the New Testament; that monastic life went against man’s natural sociability, and encouraged petty tyranny, malice, idleness, depression, and unnatural vice; that it removed a large number of able-bodied people from the service of the state, and prevented the increase of the population and the circulation of goods in the economy; and that prayer and contemplation were of far less value than the active pastoral care exercised by the secular clergy. These arguments impressed Maria Theresia and her minister Kaunitz, who as early as 1770 planned to reduce the number of monks. They also impressed the Josephinist pamphleteers, some of whom had themselves undergone a novitiate. We find innumerable accounts of how monastic discipline reduces its subjects to mechanical obedience and mental inertia. Besides straightforward polemic, we find both savage and gentle satire. The former is best represented by the work of a central Enlightenment figure, Ignaz von Born. His Specimen monachologiae methodo Linnaeana purports to classify the various orders of monks as species according to the classification of Linnaeus, distinguishing them by their appearance, their dress, their behaviour, their smell, and even their farts. When this satire was published in German translation, under the pseudonym Ignaz Loyola Kuttenpeitscher, two thousand copies were sold in three weeks in Vienna. Gentle satire on monastic abuses came often from monks who were sympathetic to many of Joseph’s aims. Thus Ulrich Petrak of Melk, in ‘Ein Mirakel’, tells how a monk returns dead drunk and is thought to have been restored to life by a miracle; while Anselm von Edling of St. Paul in Carinthia agrees with critiques of lazy abbots and impudent friars, maintaining that the latter deserve to be likened to the Harpies:

Indeß hat doch Blumauer Recht,
Daß in dem Bettelorden
Oft mancher Mendikantenknecht

More seriously, we find many attacks on monastery prisons. These institutions, before their abolition by Maria Theresia in 1771, appear to have served not only to punish misbehaviour but to confine troublesome monks whom their colleagues did not know how to handle. Many of them either were or became mentally ill. Thus the last inmate of the monastic prison at Melk, Aemilian Rambseli, who took his vows in 1678, could not be admitted to holy orders because of his misbehaviour, and, after running way from the monastery and living a vagrant life, at last returned, destitute and afflicted with venereal disease, and was imprisoned continuously until his death in 1719. A few inmates seem to have been genuine proponents of the Enlightenment. In 1781 the public was scandalized by a pamphlet recounting the fate of Nonos Gschall, a young Bavarian monk whose attempts to enlighten his fellow-monks by advocating religious toleration and investigating Biblical chronology led to his being charged with heresy, placed under arrest, imprisoned, and compelled to sign (without reading it) a confession that he was a renegade and sinner; he committed suicide by cutting his throat with a penknife. Perhaps the most remarkable and thorough-going anticlerical text to emerge from the Austrian Enlightenment is the Marokkanische Briefe (Moroccan Letters) by Johann Pezzl. Pezzl was a Bavarian who...
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had already distinguished himself with his Candide-like novel Faustin (1780), whose hero, after searching in vain for real Enlightenment in every country, at last finds it in Joseph’s Austria, and a fictional account of monastic training in Briefe aus dem Noviziat (Letters from the Novitiate, 1780–1). The Marokkanische Briefe purport to be translated from Arabic and to be the letters of ‘Sidi’ to ‘Hamid’, describing Europe, on the model of Montesquieu’s Lettres persanes. The fiction is maintained less consistently than in Montesquieu, but it enables the author to mount a sweeping attack on religious orders (calling monks ‘die Faulthiere und Stinkthiere des Menschengeschlechts’\(^{20}\), the sloths and skunks of the human race), auricular confession, celibacy, and the study of the Church Fathers:

*Sofistische Spizfindigkeiten, Wortspiele, Allegorien bis ins Lächerliche getrieben, überspannte Moral, schiefe Bibelkommentarien, unsinnige Mönchsideen, leere Platttheiten, alberne Deklamationen; hie und da vorsezliche Ungereimtheiten und Verdrehungen, machen den größten Theil der patristischen Bücherschreiberei aus. Nebenbei flimmern einige gesunde Säze durch, die aber jene Masse von unbrauchbarem Gezeuge lange nicht aufwägen.*\(^{21}\)

Most of the patristic writings consist of sophistical subtleties, word-plays, allegories pushed to absurdity, over-precise morality, eccentric Bible commentaries, senseless monkish notions, empty platitudes, foolish declamations, and here and there deliberate incoherencies and distortions. A few sensible sentences flicker through as well, but not nearly enough to compensate for the mass of useless stuff.

Unusually for the Austrian Enlightenment, Pezzl advances to a general critique of the Bible from a position close to Deism. He cites not only Lessing as critic of the Gospels but also the radical Italian Enlightener Alberto Radicati, Count di Passerano (1698–1737), whose works included a comparison between Jesus and Lycurgus, *Nazarénu et Lycurgus mis en parallèle*\(^{22}\).

The Josephinist pamphleteers overlapped with the literati of the Austrian Enlightenment. Thus the poet Johann Baptist von Alxinger wrote several anticlerical poems which could only be published outside Austria, in Leipzig. Alxinger praises toleration, opposes the papacy’s pretensions to political and intellectual authority, and denounces celibacy and monasticism; the latter institution is said to withdraw able-bodied men and women from work and motherhood, encouraging pederasty and reserving unfortunate young women ‘fürs Serail von Gottes Sohn’.\(^{23}\)

Prominent among both groups was Aloys Blumauer, an ex-Jesuit who became a Freemason and a versatile man of letters, author of plays and many poems including his travesty of Virgil’s *Aeneid*. All the themes of anticlerical polemic are stuffed into this rollicking work. Aeneas is here pious in the sense of devout, and by founding Rome he is the ‘Urpapa’ of the Curia, i.e. the Papal Court.\(^{24}\)

Two examples of Blumauer’s satire will give the flavour. The Trojans are misled into surrendering their city by superstition. The hermit from Argos who corresponds to Virgil’s treacherous Greek Sinon tells them that the wooden horse was built in fulfilment of a vow to the mounted knight St George; he attests its sanctity by declaring that anyone who refuses to believe in its sanctity will be excommunicated. Finally convinced by two bats whose appearance they consider miraculous, the Trojans adopt the horse as their ‘Schutzpatron’ (patron saint) and take it into their city in a solemn procession. A mass is sung in the horse’s honour, and, since Blumauer’s satire is ecumenical, the sermon is delivered by ‘Herr Pastor Götz’ (Hauptpastor Goeze of Hamburg, who had recently conducted a controversy with Lessing about the biblical
criticism of H. A. Reimarus). Three hours later all the Trojans are dead drunk, an allusion to the disorder that was supposed to accompany religious processions.

My other example comes from Aeneas’ visit to the Underworld. It contains all the antagonists of the Enlightenment, some of them being roasted in hell’s kitchen, others fixed as living statues. The latter include Pachomius, the founder of monasticism:

\begin{verbatim}
In großer Glorie stand da
Mit seiner frommen Schwester
Pachomius, der Urpapa
Der Mönch- und Nonnenklöster,
Und trug, zur Erde tief gebückt,
Und wie vom schwersten Stein gedrückt,
Den Fluch von Millionen.\footnote{25}
\end{verbatim}

Next to him is Pope Gregory VII (1020–85), whose name Hildebrand is here altered to ‘Höllenbrand’ (brand of hell-fire), and who is being punished especially for his enforcement of clerical celibacy:

\begin{verbatim}
Herr Höllenbrand, der einst die Herrn
Im schwarzen Rock so plagte,
Und selbst der Liebe Predigern
Das Lieben untersagte:
Der lag auf einem Felsen hier,
Und ach, der Geyer der Begier
Frißt ewig ihm [am] Herzen.\footnote{26}
\end{verbatim}

To see the continuity of Josephinist anticlericalism, let us move forward rapidly to Nestroy. His personal anticlericalism is evident from his letters: in 1842, planning the funeral of one of his actresses, he stressed that he wanted a simple church ceremony: ‘Kirchliche Einsegnung einfach, denn ich stecke nicht gern den Pfaffen Geld in den Rachen’.\footnote{27} But he could not express it on stage until the removal of censorship in 1848. He then released his feelings by depicting the expulsion of the Redemptorists (the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer, also known as ‘Liguorians’ after St Alphonsus Liguori, who founded them at Scala, near Naples, in 1732) from Vienna in Freiheit in Krähwinkel (Freedom in Sleepy Hollow), with a warning also about the resurgent power of the Jesuits.\footnote{28} We may also suspect anticlericalism behind the High Priest Jojakim in Judith und Holofernes, when he affects to comfort his afflicted flock: ‘Der Zorn des Himmels fällt herab als feuriger Regen, auf die Häupter der Gottlosen, doch so wie der Arzt Balsam in die Wunden, so träufle mein Wort Erquickung in die verschmachtende Seele. Wehe! Weh! Dreymahl Wehe!!!’ (The wrath of heaven descends as fiery rain upon the heads of the godless, but, even as the physician drops balm into wounds, so may my words drop refreshment into the yearning soul. Woe! Woe! Thrice woe!!!)

Josephinist themes are even more apparent in the less-known play Höllenangst (Fear of Hell, 1849), where superstition is a major topic. The Nestroy figure, Wendelin Pfrim, and his old father, a cobbler who has lost his pension, resolve in their desperation to sell their souls to the Devil. Just as they summon him, the judge Thurming, dressed in a black cloak with red lining, climbs in through their window, having escaped over the roofs from a secret...
assignation with his lover. A series of doubles entendres, along with a coincidental thunderstorm, convince the Pfirms that they have entered on a pact with the Devil. They are not too worried, however, arguing that as the Devil’s contracts usually run for ten years, they can live at his expense for nine years and cheat him by undertaking a pilgrimage to Rome in the tenth, but, alarmed by a misunderstanding, they decide to go on pilgrimage early, so appear with cockle-shells in their hats. On the way Pfim is very anxious to stop at an inn: ‘Ah, eine Pilgerschaft ohne Einkehren, das is was Schreckliches’³⁰ (‘Ah, a pilgrimage without visiting the pub is something terrible’) – a reminder of the Josephinian association of pilgrimages with drunkenness. Superstition is finally cleared away, just as the town is illuminated to celebrate the election of a new Minister. It is made clear that superstition (complete with pilgrimages to Rome) and autocracy go hand in hand.

Before 1848, anticlerical utterances could only be published outside Austria, like the poem ‘Wohin?’ in Spaziergänge eines Wiener Poeten by Anton Graf Auersperg (‘Anastasius Grün’), published in Hamburg in 1830. Here Auersperg accuses the Pope of inheriting the Imperial sceptre and transforming it into a censer (political into clerical power), and typifies Catholic backwardness by the image of ‘ein heil’ger Mann’ (‘a holy man’) comfortably stretched out in front of ‘Sankt Liguori’s Kirche’.³¹ If not published abroad, such utterances had to be discreetly disguised in classical garb. Thus Grillparzer, whose father was a Josephinist, and who never went to church as a child, vents his anticlericalism by depicting the repressive Priest in Des Meeres und der Liebe Wellen (The Waves of Love and the Sea; it had its premiere in 1831).³² Grillparzer had earlier got into trouble with the authorities over his poem ‘Campo vaccino’ (1819) for which he was denounced, probably by the priestly convertite Zacharias Werner. His poem deplors the victory of Christianity over Rome. It contrasts the Arch of Titus with the ‘Siegensdom’, the metaphorical structure of ecclesiastical power, established first by the Emperor Constantine.

Über Romas Heldenrümmern
Hobst du deiner Kirche Thron,
In der Kirche magst du schimmern,
Die Geschichte spricht dir Hohn. (lines 85–88)

Over Rome’s heroic ruins you raised your Church’s throne;
you may shine in the Church, but history derides you.

This was too strong for the authorities, who insisted that it must be withdrawn from the yearbook Aglaja, and Grillparzer had to explain it away in a letter to Count Sedlnitzky, the chief of police. For many years afterwards, as he recounts in his autobiography, Grillparzer was haunted by what people called ‘die Geschichte mit dem Papst’ (‘the business with the Pope’).³⁴

In the later nineteenth century we find complex critiques of the Church by writers somewhat more sympathetic to it. The obvious names are Ludwig Anzengruber and Marie von Ebner-Eschenbach. Both were writing in the wake of the Concordat agreed between the Church and the Austrian state in 1855. The Concordat restored and indeed extended the power of the Church over education, over all questions relating to the faith, including marriage law, over clerical appointments and discipline, and over the censorship of books that the Church judged objectionable.³⁵ The Church came into conflict, however, with the liberal government which, after taking office in 1867, introduced laws permitting freedom of religious practice, state education, mixed marriages, and civil marriages in cases of emergency.³⁶ After the Vatican Council had proclaimed the infallibility of the Pope in 1870, the Austrian government formally revoked the Concordat.
This ‘Kulturkampf’ forms the background to Anzengruber’s play Der Pfarrer von Kirchfeld (The Priest of Kirchfeld, first performed 1870, published 1871), which contrasts the liberal priest Hell with the reactionary landowner Finsterberg. Hell continues the Josephinist tradition by forbidding his flock to go on pilgrimages and by supporting the state (‘das sich verjüngende Vaterland’ (I, ii)) against the Church, whereas Finsterberg is an ultramontanist who thinks that Catholics’ primary allegiance must be to Rome. The problem of clerical celibacy is also raised when Hell falls in love with his maid, but controls his feelings and marries her to a worthy young man. Der Meineidbauer (The Perjured Farmer, 1871) illustrates the trivializing and corrupting effects of the artificial morality inculcated by the clergy: Ferner wants his son to be a priest for inadequate reasons, and, after he thinks he has killed him, shows his perverted morality by saying, as he kneels before a ‘Marterl’ (an effigy of Christ): ‘Ich hab’s ja eh’nder g’wußt, du wurd’st mich nit verlassen in derer Not!’ (‘I always knew You wouldn’t abandon me in trouble!’) Superstition is satirized in Der G’wissenswurm (The Worm of Conscience, 1874), a comedy in which the farmer Grillhofer (a name suggesting ‘Grille’, whim) almost falls victim to his Tartuffe-like brother-in-law Dusterer. Many years ago Grillhofer had an affair with Magdalena Riesler. Dusterer, claiming to have seen Magdalena in Purgatory and playing on Grillhofer’s guilt, has persuaded the latter to transfer his farm to him. Just in time, however, Grillhofer learns that Magdalena is still alive, and visits her, only to be chased away.

Anzengruber’s tragedy Das vierte Gebot (The Fourth Commandment, 1877) again presents a good priest, but one who, unlike Hell, is not quite good enough. This is Eduard Schön, who, when consulted by the heroine Hedwig as to whether she should enter on the marriage into which her parents are pressuring her, replies thoughtlessly that her duty is: ‘Gehorchen und das Glück Gott anheimstellen!’ (Obey, and trust to God for happiness!) When it is too late, he admits that he spoke thoughtlessly, to please his parents. By then, however, Hedwig has got divorced from her brutal and debauched husband; their sickly child (presumably having inherited venereal disease from his father) has died after living only a few months; Hedwig hopes soon to follow it. Here the moral authority of the Church, of its representatives, and of the Ten Commandments is exposed to critical scrutiny.

In the fiction of Marie von Ebner-Eschenbach, the moral standards of the official Church are repeatedly questioned by comparison either with those of laypeople or with those of unorthodox and rebellious priests. Ebner herself was a Catholic who seldom attended Mass and had serious reservations about the Church as an institution. Her doubts were strengthened by her husband’s strong anticlericalism and his view of Catholic dogma as superstition. In a notebook, she wrote: ‘Keine Kirche steht mit den Lehren ihres Stifters in solchem Widerspruch wie die katholische.’ (No Church is so contrary to its founder’s teachings as the Catholic one.) In her fiction, laypeople find little understanding or consolation in the formulae repeated even by truly pious priests, like the one in Unsühnbar (Inexpiable, 1890) who believes he has saved Marie Dornach from despair whereas in fact she has resolved never to confide in him again. The best priests are in conflict with the official Church. Thus in Glaubenslos? (Without Faith? 1893) the curate Leo Klinger, accused even by his kindly but weary superior of lacking faith, owes precisely to his inner struggles the spiritual strength that enables him to soften the heart of a brutal and bitter old farmer and overawe a young man who threatens to stab him. Ebner’s Josephinist standards are evident from an interlude in which Konsistorialrat Pinzer, representing the official Church, pays a visit, and rebukes the Priest for allowing a suicide to be buried in consecrated ground and for forbidding a procession to pray for rain.
The Priest explains that it would have taken day-labourers away from their work at a time when they were able to make unusually good earnings by rebuilding two burnt-down farms, and that Leo’s meteorological observations showed that it was soon going to rain anyway: “Sie wußten, daß ein Regen zu erwarten war, und unterließen deshalb den Bittgang um Regen? Sehr gut, Hochwürden.” Pater Pinzer lächelte etwas ironisch.4¹ (‘You knew that rain was coming, and that was why you did not hold the procession to pray for rain? Very good, Father.’ Father Pinzer gave a somewhat ironic smile.) The Priest’s objections are Josephinist in setting practical use and scientific knowledge against idleness and superstition. Pater Pinzer’s ironic response suggests that the Priest has lost an opportunity to impress ignorant laymen by a demonstration of the success of prayer, even though this demonstration would have been based on conscious fraud.

The critique of the Church by Anzengruber and Ebner is radicalized, from an external perspective, by Arthur Schnitzler. As with many of his Jewish contemporaries, Schnitzler’s interest in Jewish religious belief and practice was slight, and he was sharply aware of the Catholicism practised all round. Schnitzler was opposed to all dogmatic religion, including the Judaism imparted in his religious instruction at school, though the main target of his enmity was Christianity. In his autobiography he describes how, while still at school, he listened to a sermon in the church Maria am Gestade in the centre of Vienna and subjected the priest to a hostile stare: ‘Ich stand dem Priester gerade gegenüber und starrte ihm, da er mir Dinge von ganz besonderer Albernheit zu behaupten schien, mit absichtlichem Hohn ins Gesicht, worauf sich seine Augen so wuterfüllt auf mich richteten, daß es im Umkreise auffallen mußte.’4² (I stood directly opposite the priest, and, since he seemed to be saying extraordinarily silly things, I stared him in the face with deliberate scorn, whereupon he turned his eyes on me with such fury that those around could not help noticing.) His anticlericalism was strengthened by witnessing the open antisemitism of the priests Joseph Deckert and Heinrich Abel, the latter of whom was among the most influential figures in the Christian Social Party.4³

Schnitzler of course expresses his anticlericalism drastically in Professor Bernhardi. At first glance, the play appears to make an unequivocal moral point by opposing the liberal Jewish man of science and the Enlightenment, Bernhardi, to the Catholic priest (whose name, Franz Reder, we only learn from the dramatis personae). In trying to deny the priest access to the woman who is dying in euphoria, Bernhardi seems to be acting with simple human kindness in seeking to ensure that she dies happy. But another view is possible. Bernhardi wants the woman to be happily deceived; the priest bringing the sacrament is treating her as an adult by aiming to tell her the truth and help her to face it. Moreover, one wonders how far Bernhardi was prepared to go. He says later that he asked the priest to leave the woman alone, but in Act I he expressly forbade the priest to approach her. Would he have kept the priest back by force? Bernhardi is going far beyond the medical remit of a doctor and taking responsibility for the woman as a moral being. Ironically, the priest could be seen as treating her as an autonomous person in the spirit of the Enlightenment, whereas Bernhardi, in leaving her deluded, could be seen as acting in the paternalistic, overweening manner attributed to the priesthood.4⁴

More than he perhaps realized, Schnitzler is exploring in the play the moral complexities that arise when the doctor, accredited by science and by the compassion associated with his profession, takes over the responsibilities that are increasingly being vacated by the priesthood. Kafka addresses this topic in ‘Ein Landarzt’, where the doctor complains: ‘So sind die Leute in meiner Gegend. Immer das Umnöglich vom Arzt verlangen. Den alten Glauben haben sie verloren; der Pfarrer sitzt zu Hause und zerzupft die Meßgewänder,
illegitimate niece Vikerl to watch her disgrace as a warning of the consequences of yielding to the ‘böse Lust’ which, he believes, God has given us only to torture us into purity. However, they witness Drut being stoned to death by an enraged crowd. The novel sets sexual freedom against Catholic repression of sexuality, and makes Zingerl, despite his apparent liberalism, a firm spokesman for the latter. By Die Rotte Korahs, however, Zingerl has become a figure of spiritual authority whose attachment to St Stephen’s Cathedral in Vienna also places him at the physical centre of Catholic Austria. Bahr’s presentation of him illustrates another possible development of anticlericalism. A critical attitude to the Church does not rule out a fascination with the person of eminent priests. A cleric such as Zingerl bridges the social classes, seeming both a farmer and an intellectual, while his submission to Church discipline is rewarded by an indefinable but probably extensive social and political influence.

Meanwhile, another group of intellectuals, centring on Hofmannsthal and Hermann Bahr, were intent on reviving the supposed spirit of Baroque Austria, that of the Counter-Reformation. Hermann Bahr returned to the Catholic faith in 1916, and his series of interlinked Austrian novels from Die Rahl (1908) and Drut (1909) to Die Rotte Korahs (1919) features a Catholic cleric, the Domherr Zingerl. His portrayal in the earlier novels of the series is tinged with anticlericalism. Zingerl initially appears as a rather ambivalent and inscrutable figure, described as ‘undurchsichtig’, with the appearance of a peasant and the reputation of a Jesuit. Occasionally he sounds almost Josephinist, as when he affirms that the Church’s kingdom is not of this world, and expresses even qualified sympathy with Modernism, agreeing that the Church, being eternal, should not be bound to the historical past. But he is also a repressive figure. The novel Drut turns on sexuality – notoriously a difficult issue for the Churches. Its protagonist, a young Austrian bureaucrat, falls in love with a German Baroness whom he meets in the woods and calls ‘Drut’ (the name of a supernatural being). ‘Drut’ has a dubious reputation. For illegally marrying her, the protagonist is dismissed from office and shoots himself. Drut is carried to prison on suspicion of bigamy. Zingerl takes his illegitimate niece Vikerl to watch her disgrace as a warning of the consequences of yielding to the ‘böse Lust’ which, he believes, God has given us only to torture us into purity. However, they witness Drut being stoned to death by an enraged crowd. The novel sets sexual freedom against Catholic repression of sexuality, and makes Zingerl, despite his apparent liberalism, a firm spokesman for the latter. By Die Rotte Korahs, however, Zingerl has become a figure of spiritual authority whose attachment to St Stephen’s Cathedral in Vienna also places him at the physical centre of Catholic Austria. Bahr’s presentation of him illustrates another possible development of anticlericalism. A critical attitude to the Church does not rule out a fascination with the person of eminent priests. A cleric such as Zingerl bridges the social classes, seeming both a farmer and an intellectual, while his submission to Church discipline is rewarded by an indefinable but probably extensive social and political influence.

Although Bahr was not – or not at first – quite the Catholic bigot that people imagine, his ostentatious Catholicism irritated many. Among them was Karl Kraus, himself a Catholic convert, who particularly objected to the commercialism of the Salzburg Festival, and was provoked by it into announcing his departure from the Church. His polemic ‘Vom großen Welttheaterschwindel’ denounced the Church’s support for the First World War and also the degradation of theatre into a commercial enterprise with religious trappings. He attacked the organizers of the Festival as a ‘holy trinity’, ‘die heilige Dreieinigkeit der Herren Reinhardt, Moissi und Hofmannsthal’. He announced his departure from the Church, ‘aus der Gott schon ausgetreten sein dürfte’ (which God seems already to have left).

Kraus’s reputation has been clouded by his support for the Corporate State. Although it suppressed the workers’ insurrection of February 1934, banned Socialism, dissolved Parliament, and
Church assets were expropriated. 1,417 parish schools were closed down. Catholic symbols and holidays were attacked. The Rosary Festival of October 1938, a special Rosary Mass held on Friday 7 October 1938 in St Stephen’s Cathedral, attracted between six and eight thousand young celebrants who followed the service with, in effect, an anti-Nazi rally on the square outside the cathedral. According to Bukey, this was ‘the largest anti-Nazi demonstration ever staged in the history of the Third Reich’. On the evening of Saturday 8 October the Nazis staged a counter-demonstration. Gangs of Hitler Youth stormed the Archbishop’s palace, smashing crucifixes and window-panes, breaking furniture, and slashing paintings. The Cathedral curate was thrown out of a third-floor window, and broke both his thighs.

The violent anticlericalism of the Third Reich must cast doubt on the ready equation of Catholicism and Nazism by Thomas Bernhard. Born in 1931, Bernhard spent most of his childhood in the Third Reich, first in Bavaria, then, after an interlude in an orphanage in Thuringia, in various boarding-schools in Salzburg. After a brief apprenticeship he was obliged to spend over a year in Grafenhof, the sanatorium for tuberculosis sufferers at St. Veit in the Salzburg area. In his autobiography he describes his experience of institutions as uniform. All were authoritarian, all aimed at the psychic destruction of their inmates, and all were both Nazi and Catholic in spirit. The tyranny of the Nazi headmaster Grünkranz, as described in Die Ursache, led smoothly into that of his arch-Catholic successor ‘Onkel Franz’:

Jetzt pilgerten wir ganz einfach nach der ebenso wie in der Nazizeit ungründlichen Reinigungsprozedur in die Kapelle, um die Messe zu hören und um die Heilige Kommunion zu empfangen, genauso wie in der Nazizeit in den Tagraum, um die Nachrichten und die Instruktionen des Grünkranz zu hören, sangen jetzt
Now, after the process of purification, which was as perfunctory as under Nazism, we simply made our pilgrimage to the chapel, to hear Mass and to receive Holy Communion, just as under Nazism we had marched to the ‘day-room’ to hear Grünkranz’s news and instructions; we now sang hymns, just as previously we had sung Nazi songs, and the Catholic daily round was the same mechanism of chastisement, basically hostile to humanity, as the National Socialist one had been.)

Bernhard’s autobiography is in part a savage critique of all institutions as deforming and stultifying the sensitive human beings forced into them. Kafka, with his sharp eye for the oppressive effects of institutions, would have agreed. But in his equation of Austrian Nazism and Catholicism, Bernhard anticipates the investigation of Austrian history that he was to undertake a few years later in his biggest novel, Auslöschung (Obliteration, 1986). This novel contains many tirades against the ‘niederträchtige katholisch-nationalsozialistische Gesinnung’ (base Catholic-Nazi mindset) which is illustrated by the family of the narrator, Franz-Josef Murau. Murau’s parents were committed Nazis, who flew the swastika flag on Hitler’s birthday and concealed Nazis on their estate after the war. Both represent the intellectual stultification imposed, in Bernhard’s view, by Catholicism: ‘Die katholische Kirche macht aus Menschen Katholiken, stumpfsinnige Kreaturen, die das selbständige Denken vergessen und für die katholische Religion verraten haben.’ (The Catholic Church turns people into Catholics, dull-witted creatures, who have forgotten independent thought and betrayed it for the Catholic religion.) Murau’s father was an unimaginative bureaucrat, his mother so ignorant that she thought Kafka and Jean Paul were figures invented by her son.

When we bear in mind Hitler’s assault on the Catholic Church, we can see that Bernhard’s equation of Nazism and Catholicism is a polemical oversimplification. But a more complex attitude towards the Catholic church is apparent within the novel. Murau has assembled round him a small group of free spirits who live in Rome, a city he considers, for unclear reasons, to be the centre of the world. And one of his associates in Rome is Archbishop Spadolini, who, it appears, was his mother’s lover. Spadolini is a charismatic figure, a ‘great personality’ in Murau’s eyes; he is elegant, widely travelled, well read, and speaks many languages; having been Papal nuncio in numerous countries, from Austria to Peru, he is now an intimate of the Pope. Spadolini was based on the real figure of Archbishop Cesare Zacchi (1914–91), a friend of Bernhard’s from the early 1970s, who has given his name to another character in the novel. The real Zacchi had done a skilled diplomatic job as papal nuncio in Cuba (corresponding to Spadolini’s Peru), where he had become a trusted friend of Fidel Castro. After returning to Rome he became President of the Pontifical Ecclesiastical Academy at the Roman Curia. On this basis Bernhard has created a fascinating figure who links the international intellectual world that Murau longs to inhabit with the repressive world of Wolfsegg. Behind this priest, diplomat, and lover, we can discern other charismatic figures from the past. In particular, Spadolini seems to be an avatar of the Napoleonic diplomat, bishop of Autun and lover of the comtesse de Flahaut, Charles-Maurice de Talleyrand (1754–1838).

At the same time, by his sexual relationship with Murau’s mother, Spadolini ignores the moral restrictions which he ought to enforce. Murau objects less to the relationship than to the hypocrisy and concealment surrounding it. As his mother’s lover,
Spadolini is a kind of father-substitute, embodying far more attractive qualities than Murau’s own father. Though superficially a figure of anticlerical satire, Spadolini is really a fantasy-figure, a free spirit who has bought his freedom by making a bargain with the authoritarian institution of the Catholic Church. As with Bahr, Bernhard’s anticlericalism is tempered by his fascination with the idealized figure of the cleric.

It would seem then that while anticlericalism as a principled position must necessarily be complex and qualified, if it is to get beyond mere polemic, the literary presentation of anticlericalism reveals further subtleties. Literature, with unnerving honesty, reveals not only what we think, but also what we feel. Ostensibly expressing ideologies, it discloses also the emotions that underpin, qualify, or even contradict those ideologies. The literature of anticlericalism enables us to see how attachment or opposition to the Church, as to any object of emotion, are alike rooted in (though not reducible) to our desires and our fantasies.
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