In most transactions, property was exchanged for public debt bonds. These confiscations resulted in a double confiscation of property: on the one hand, the property of the Church was exchanged for public debt bonds; on the other hand, the property that was owned by the Church and brought under its direct authority. Indeed, in his report of June 12th 1767, Pietro Franceschi, the secretary of the Deputazione ad Pias Causas, wrote that:

« The ultimate public object is to present the extermination of the Laity, just as the object of the Clergy is to present their own »

This rebalancing also enabled to reduce the public debt (redemption of the debt through the exchange of land) and to obtain liquidity for investments (profit from sales) as well as infrastructures through the reuse of ecclesiastical monuments (hospitals, schools). These sales coincided with the transformation of the relationship to solidarity and the disqualification of charity in favour of state intervention.

Previous reforms
It was not the first attempt to limit ecclesiastical property for fiscal reasons and to prevent too many possessions from leaving families without hope of return. Two previous laws promulgated in 1536 and 1605 stipulated that property bequeathed to pious institutions of the city and duchy, and then of all Venetian territories, had to be sold within two years. These restrictions were very poorly applied in view of the growth of ecclesiastical property during the Counter-Reform period.

Related literature
This episode has been discussed in the Venetian historiography in three ways: first, as one element among others of the reforms policy (Venturi, 1989); second, as a stage in a long process that saw the Church and the Venetian state clash on jurisdictional issues and on the becoming of mortmain property (Agostini, 2002). Finally, in a case study limited to Benedictine establishments, Dino Bre-san (2006) reconstituted the social profile of the buyers. This situation contrasts with the attention given in many studies to the modes of transmission and management of property and the disqualification of charity in favour of state intervention.