SHORT LOAN

THE MAKING OF THE HABSBURG MONARCHY 1550–1700

An Interpretation

R. J. W. Evans

CEU LIBRARY OF THE CENTRAL EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY BUDAPEST

CLARENDON PRESS · OXFORD

CHAPTER 5

Austria: the Habsburg heartland

Austria is not an easy term for the historian to handle. My use of it here as a synonym for the *Erblande*, the non-Bohemian and non-Hungarian lands ruled by the Habsburgs in direct sovereignty, represents only a convention, albeit one fortified by the latter-day creation of an Austrian Republic covering substantially the same area.[1] In one sense Austria was the whole Monarchy: it regularly meant the Habsburg dynasty, including the Spanish branch, and—loosely—the possessions of this 'house of Austria', which could be taken to embrace territories in northern Italy and the southern Netherlands. Thus in the apologetic works of Nicholas Vernulaeus, historiographer to the courts of both Madrid and Vienna.[2] Thus too, of course, in the commonplace, unthinking usage of later generations of foreigners. At the other extreme it signified a single duchy, which lay along the Danube between the eastern outliers of the Alpine chain, the forests of south Bohemia, and the foothills of the Carpathians, and which for all practical purposes became split into two along the line of the river Enns by the end of the Middle Ages. This duchy had acquired a distinct identity during the eleventh and twelfth centuries under the powerful family of Babenberg, who gained a series of privileges for it: full legal sovereignty, hereditary succession, freedom from most imperial obligations, and various ceremonial rights.

After the Habsburgs took over Danubian 'Österreich' about 1282, they gradually extended the meaning and privileges of Austria to embrace the other provinces they were acquiring in Central Europe:

[1] '*Erblande*' too was a fluid notion. After 1627 it became an open question whether the 'inherited lands' should include Bohemia; if they did, then the word corresponded more to the later 19th-century sense of 'Austria' as opposed to Hungary within the Dual Monarchy.

[2] N. Vernulaeus, *Apologia pro Augustissima ... Gente Austriaca* (Louvain 1635). This sort of Habsburg propaganda was particularly strong in the Spanish Low Countries. Glabotsnig's book (above, p. 152, n. 88) was also based on an earlier Louvain edition.

Styria, the Tyrol, and so forth. At the same time they began to grace members of the ruling house with the famous title of 'archduke', apparently to denote their collective ownership of several different duchies (interestingly enough, the term 'archduchy' never assumed the same significance[3]). The Habsburgs insisted on these claims with growing determination after the Golden Bull of 1356; denied the status of electors, they none the less became in fact the most independent rulers in the *Reich*. And they found documents to justify their actions: the so-called *Privilegium Maius*, which, though not acknowledged by Charles IV in the 1350s, was subsequently confirmed by an emperor from within the family, Frederick III.[4] There is one serious theoretical catch about the *Privilegium Maius*: it was forged. In practice that did not matter, since scarcely anyone suspected its authenticity, and anyway the Habsburgs as emperors after 1438 could always bring pressure to safeguard their own princely rights *vis-à-vis* the *Reich*. Much more important was the fact that archducal powers over the complex of the inherited lands remained thoroughly unconsolidated well into the modern period.

Austria was a patchwork of disparate territories, brought together in largely piecemeal fashion, and some of the obstacles to its unity are apparent from any map of Alpine Europe. Mountains blocked communication, not only between north and south, but between east and west as well. Worse still, the compact mass of the archbishopric of Salzburg could interpose an almost complete political barrier between the Tyrol and the provinces along the Danube. Let us survey it briefly, beginning in the east. Most prosperous, and quite populous for its size, was Lower Austria, administered from Vienna, though Vienna lay by no means centrally within it, and divided into four traditional districts (*Viertel*): two 'quarters' north of the Danube, on either side of the Manhartsberg; and two more to the south, separated by the forbidding wilderness of the Vienna Woods. Above the Enns, Upper Austria developed its separate character and institutions, with common law and estates

[3] The 'archduchy of Austria' should presumably have been the whole of the *Erblande*, or even the whole Monarchy, but it seems—certainly after 1500—rarely to have been used in that way. Zedler (xxv, cols. 774ff.) and others equate it simply with Lower and Upper Austria. The title of 'archduke' appears to have been employed first by the dukes of Carinthia.

[4] A. Lhotsky, *Privilegium Maius, die Geschichte einer Urkunde* (V. 1957).

based on Linz. But it was weaker, and its constitutional status was not entirely beyond dispute, the line of the Enns still representing only a rough convention. Upper Austria also fell into quarters, whose frontiers fluctuated somewhat: Mühlviertel and Machland towards Bohemia; Hausruck and Traunviertel covering the upland terrain traversed by the rivers Traun and Enns.[5]

The next group of lands is Styria, Carinthia, and Carniola: Inner Austria, as they were regularly designated by the later sixteenth century (though a confusing earlier nomenclature still reckoned them part of 'Lower Austria'). Styria, an extensive province acquired by the Habsburgs in 1282, was reasonably cohesive and centred on Graz. Like Lower Austria, it tended to dominate its neighbours, but Carinthia and Carniola, gained in 1335, remained for most purposes quite distinct territories, with capitals (at Klagenfurt and Laibach (Ljubljana)), strong local loyalties, separate laws, government, and customs. Again, administrative subdivisions existed: Carniola, for example, being divided into 'Upper', 'Lower', 'Middle', and 'Inner'.[6] In the south, oddments of land led down to the Adriatic: the county of Istria, around Pisino (Mitterburg), added in 1374, and not to be confused with the coastal margravate of Istria, which belonged to Venice; Trieste and Fiume, annexed in 1382 and 1466, but confirmed in their traditional autonomies; Gorizia (eastern Friuli), acquired between 1500 and 1518 on the death of its independent rulers and after war with Venice. To the west, the Tyrol formed from 1363 a more compact block of territory, with its capital at Innsbruck, the third main focus (after Vienna and Graz) for Austrian politics. But Tyrol was *sui generis* in two ways: it displayed extreme localism, even parochialism, with little contact between the north and the south of

[5] There are good historical surveys of the various provinces (*Länder*) in *Handbuch der historischen Stätten: Österreich*, ed. K. Lechner and F. Huter, i–ii (Stuttgart 1966–70). For Lower and Upper Austria: M. Vancsa, *Geschichte Nieder- und Oberösterreichs*, i–ii (Leipzig-V. 1905–27), reaching only to 1522; Gutkas, *Niederösterreich*. The Viertel ob and unter dem Manhartsberg gradually became known as Waldviertel and Weinviertel respectively.

[6] For Styria: Pirchegger, op. cit. For Carinthia: Braumüller, op. cit. and earlier J. W. von Valvasor, *Topographia Archiducatus Carinthiae* (Nuremberg 1688). For Carniola: Dimitz, op. cit., and earlier Valvasor, *Die Ehre des Hertzogthums Crain*, i–iv (Laibach 1689). It is curious that this most outstanding of all Austria's historical geographies should be devoted to one of her smallest provinces.

the province, and each valley commanding its own loyalties; but it was also in a way unusually international, controlling a vital route across the Alps, close to Italy and the rich south German cities.[7]

West again and north-west, we pass to Habsburg property in Europe's most variegated region, the Swabian corner of the Empire, an inextricable maze of sovereignties and territorial configurations. The dynasty had originated here, in the undulating lowlands of northern Switzerland. By the sixteenth century it was quite driven from the lands of the Swiss Confederation, but it gained a congeries of other possessions over the years, in the desultory attempt to revive a 'duchy of Swabia'. They came to be known as the *Vorlande*, or Further Austria (though there is no precision of usage, even among historians).[8] Tolerably clear units were formed at either edge: to the west, the Sundgau and rights of overlordship in Alsace (until 1648), with the Breisgau and the city of Freiburg on the other side of the Rhine; to the east, the valleys and forests of Vorarlberg, adjoining the Tyrol, controlled by the towns of Bregenz, Feldkirch, and Bludenz. Between them lay Swabian Austria, where only a detailed historical atlas can help: four 'forest towns' (Rheinfelden, Laufenburg, Säckingen, Waldshut) and some surrounding land; the city of Constance, taken over in 1548; pieces of the Black Forest, including Triberg; the counties of Hohenberg and Sigmaringen; the landgravate of Nellenburg (a jigsaw of enclaves and outliers); some half-dozen towns along the upper Danube, with the margravate of Burgau beyond them; finally, a bewildering mixture of seigneurial and property rights designated (untranslatably) as the *Landvogtei* of Upper and Lower Swabia.

[7] The Adriatic area later became the 19th-century Austrian province of *Küstenland*. For Friuli as a whole: P. Paschini, *Storia del Friuli*, i–ii (2nd edn. Udine 1953–4), ii. For the Tirol: J. Egger, *Geschichte Tirols von den ältesten Zeiten bis in die Neuzeit*, i–iii (Innsbruck 1872–80), ii.

[8] F. Metz (ed.), *Vorderösterreich, eine geschichtliche Landeskunde* (2nd edn. Freiburg 1967), 47–65 and *passim*, is very helpful, with chapters on individual territories. J. A. Vann, *The Swabian Kreis* (Brussels 1975), 135 ff. *passim*, gives some examples of the extraordinary intricacy of overlordship. 'Vorderösterreich' and 'Vorlande' seem to be interchangeable expressions; both are frequently confused with 'Vorarlberg' and 'Österreich-Schwaben' (which were merely parts of the whole, the former smaller but more clearly defined than the latter), and both could also include the Tyrol. Under the dispensation of Maximilian I whereby the Austrian duchies, Styria, Carinthia, and Carniola were lumped together as 'Lower Austria', the *Vorlande* with Tyrol were designated 'Upper Austria'.

This was fragmentation run riot, but the rest of Austria preserved recognizable traces of similar features. In general, frontiers still fluctuated and some acquisitions were very recent. The Tyrol only rounded off its borders in the early sixteenth century: Rattenberg, Kitzbühel, and Kufstein were won from Bavaria in 1504; the Pustertal and Lienz from Gorizia in 1500; the Ampezzo area from Venice in 1516. The frontier between Upper Austria and Bavaria was still disputed, Maximilian I gaining the Mondsee region in 1506 (thus Michael Pacher's famous altarpiece at St. Wolfgang began its life in a *Bavarian* pilgrimage church), while isolated pieces of Habsburg land lay beyond, like the fortress of Neuburg am Inn, to sustain designs on the 'Innviertel' (only annexed by Joseph II as late as 1779). Continued Bavarian interest in Upper Austria is evident from Duke Maximilian's occupation of it during the 1620s. The line of the Hungarian frontier likewise lacked clarity, especially after the wars between Frederick III and Matthias Corvinus, when part of the area of the modern Burgenland became pledged to Lower Austria for nearly 200 years.[9]

Moreover a large number of enclaves remained. A few were those of lords owing allegiance to the emperor alone (not to the Habsburgs *qua* territorial princes): Schaunberg (Upper Austria) until the 1550s; Hardegg (Lower Austria); the lands of the Hohenems in Vorarlberg, including Lustenau and Schellenberg-Vaduz from 1613. Seefeld in Lower Austria was an imperial fief in the gift of the Hohenzollern family until 1779.[10] But most were Church lands: for not only did Austria owe preponderant allegiance to foreign ecclesiastical overlords (Salzburg, Passau, Trent, Constance, Chur, the disputed Aquileia, even the Hungarian see of Győr in part of Lower Austria), the same foreign bishops held estates there in full sovereignty from the early Middle Ages. Salzburg owned Gröbming (Styria), Sachsenburg, Althofen, Hüttenberg, and Friesach (Carinthia); Freising owned Waidhofen an der Ybbs (Lower Austria),

[9] A. Ernst, 'Zur Frage der von Ungarn an Österreich verpfändeten Herrschaften', MOöLA v (1957), 387–412.

[10] These enclaves are described in *Handbuch der historischen Stätten*, ad loc. Cf., for the Schaunberg case: J. Stülz, 'Zur Geschichte der Herren und Grafen von Schaunberg', *Denkschriften der kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften, ph.-h. Kl.* xii (1862); O. Hageneder, 'Die Grafschaft Schaunberg', *MOöLA* v (1957), 189–264; P. Feldbauer, *Der Herrenstand in Oberösterreich* (Munich 1972) 123–8.

Gross-Enzersdorf near Vienna, Innichen (Tyrol), and the substantial enclave of Bischoflack (Carniola); Bamberg possessed Villach, Wolfsberg, and Griffen (Carinthia). Oddest of all, the prince-bishopric of Brixen, though itself entirely surrounded by Austrian territory, consisted of eight different pieces of land in the southern Tyrol, some up to fifty miles from the cathedral city, as well as another substantial lump of Carniola (Veldes). Two villages in the Vorarlberg belonged as exempt jurisdictions to abbeys in Germany and Switzerland.[11]

All this diversity can be underlined by reference to racial and linguistic variations. Even among the German majority, long-standing differences of custom and dialect existed between the *Alemannen* west of the Arlberg and the descendants of Bavarian tribes east of it. To this day there are as many types of farmstead in Austria as provinces, some radically divergent in materials and design. While Teutons could be found in some numbers throughout the area—places as far south as Fiume (St. Veit am Flaum) boasted their distinctive German name—other peoples had their age-old settlements. French was spoken in Alsace, Romansch in remote corners of Vorarlberg, Ladin in south Tyrolese valleys, Slovene by a minority of Styrians and Carinthians and an overwhelming majority of Carniolans, Italian all around the southern periphery, from Bozen to Fiume, except in Friuli, whose population retained an unclassifiable local patois. Ethnographers could point to still further racial elements, such as the primitive, Romance-speaking Vlach tribesmen of Istria.

*

Vienna can hardly have known much about the Istro-Vlachs. Its central organs fought an unequal battle to give some cohesion to the *Erblande*. We have already met those two bodies which possessed an at least embryonic Austrian character: the Austrian chancery and the Court Chamber. Whereas the *Kanzler* and his staff really did little more than lend a certain Austrian dimension to supreme

[11] Blumenegg belonged to Weingarten between 1614 and 1802; St. Gerold belonged to Weingarten between 1614 and 1648, then to Einsiedeln until 1802. By the mid-16th century ecclesiastical rulers shared sovereignty over all these lands with the Habsburgs. The thorniest episcopal issue, unresolved for a further two hundred years, concerned the rights of the Venetian patriarch of Aquileia over Austria's southern confines (Paschini, op. cit. ii, 373–5, 384–9, 405 ff., 423 ff.).

decision-making, and a certain Habsburg dimension to the activities of provincial administrators and judges, the Chamber evolved a more far-reaching set of policies applicable to the whole region.[12] It managed a number of important industries. Salt for the domestic market was won from Hall in the Tyrol, the Istrian coast, and above all the crown preserve of the Salzkammergut (in Upper Austria and adjacent parts of Styria), where paternalist stewards regulated the lives of a workforce still tainted with Lutheranism, and special brine conduits supplied the boiling-pans at Ischl from the sombre fastnesses of Hallstatt and Aussee. Styrian iron production was handled, under official supervision, by a new and complicated holding enterprise called the *Innerberger Hauptgewerkschaft*. The rich mercury deposits at Idria, in Carniola, were taken in hand and exported throughout Europe. Wool manufacture, concentrated on Linz, had something approaching monopoly status from the 1670s, and employed over 4,000 workers in the earlier eighteenth century. Some of the royal forests were carefully husbanded, especially the Vienna Woods during the 1680s and 1690s.[13]

Behind this management lay increasingly the notion of commercial principle, mercantilism in a homespun Austrian guise. Its most influential spokesman was Philipp Wilhelm von Hörnigk, whose book *Österreich über alles, wenn es nur will* offered an overt manifesto for the economic self-sufficiency of the *Erblande*. A more imaginative apostle was Johann Joachim Becher, who set up silk farms in the Lower Austrian countryside and even a general house of trades in

[12] General surveys in K. and M. Uhlirz, *Handbuch der Geschichte Österreichs und seiner Nachbarländer Böhmen und Ungarn*, i–iv (Graz 1927–44), i, 295 ff.; Tremel, *Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte*, 230 ff.; Hoffmann, op. cit, 175–224; Gutkas, op. cit. 265 ff.; E. Zöllner, *Geschichte Österreichs* (2nd edn. V. 1962) 278 ff.

[13] C. Schraml, *Das oberösterreichische Salinenwesen vom Beginne des 16. bis zur Mitte des 18. Jahrhunderts* i–iii (V. 1932–6). A. von Pantz, *Die Innerberger Hauptgewerkschaft, 1625–1783* (Graz 1906); I have not seen the earlier study by one Franz von Ferro (*sic*); cf. Metz (ed.), op. cit. 139–94. H. von Srbik, *Der staatliche Exporthandel Österreichs von Leopold I bis Maria Theresia* (V.–Leipzig 1907), despite its title, covers only the mercury and Hungarian copper trades (but very thoroughly). On the Linz *Wollenzeugfabrik*: V. Hofmann, 'Beiträge zur neueren österreichischen Wirtschaftsgeschichte', *AÖG* cviii (1919–20), 345–776, at 356 ff; its employees were not, of course, factory workers in the modern sense. On the *Wienerwald*: A. Schachinger, 'Das kaiserliche Waldamt und die Herrschaft Purkersdorf im letzten Viertel des 17. Jahrhunderts', *Jb. f. Lk. v. NÖ* xxix (1944–8), 167–272, complete to the last log.

Vienna.[14] Becher's younger associate, Wilhelm von Schröder, gave theoretical and practical support to the same causes, while some enterprise could be attracted and capital raised by granting privileges to outsiders: immigrant artisans, a few Protestant merchants, and the occasional court Jew, notably Leopold I's principal factor and banker, Samuel Oppenheimer, and his successor, Samson Wertheimer.[15] Yet the overall government achievement must be accounted slight. Much trading remained in the grossly inefficient and grasping hands of concessionaries—this so-called *Appalt* system embraced items as varied as tobacco, scythes, oysters, and carnival masks. Even the *Innerberger Hauptgewerkschaft* was still a private company, while Idrian mercury fell by the end of the period into the clutches of Dutch middlemen. Becher's projects scarcely outlived him, and he can have done little to scare the sturdy beggars of the capital. The great age of cameralism came only later, reaching Austria from active bases in eighteenth-century Germany; and even then it did not prove the engine for any overnight economic unification of the *Erblande*.

There was thus no effective central imposition of an Austrian identity. In fact the dynasty did not take the most elementary steps towards it. Branches of the ruling house set up at Graz and Innsbruck were extinguished only by genealogical accident: Graz with Ferdinand II; Innsbruck, its autonomy prolonged under his younger brother, when the latter's sons died out in 1665 and no other males remained besides Emperor Leopold. The morganatic sons of Archduke Ferdinand and Philippine Welser received rich apanages: Andreas in the Church, Karl in Further Austria. Moreover, separate administrative machinery survived still later, with governments and privy councils in Graz and Innsbruck, the chambers for Inner Austria and the Tyrol, and the active, independent war council in Graz which maintained the south-western section of the military frontier.[16] In remote areas the writ

[14] H. Hassinger, *Johann Joachim Becher, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Merkantilismus* (V. 1951), 138 ff.; two further documents on sericulture in OSzK, MSS. 637 and 965 fol. germ. Cf. below, p. 297, on the careers of Hörnigk and Becher.

[15] M Grunwald, *Samuel Oppenheimer und sein Kreis* (V. 1913); S. Stern, *The Court Jew* (Philadelphia 1950), 17–31, 85–93.

[16] For Tyrol before 1618: J. Hirn, *Erzherzog Ferdinand II von Tirol*, i–ii (Innsbruck 1885–8), a detailed internal history (ibid. ii, 369–420, on Karl and Andreas); id., *Erzherzog Maximilian, der Deutschmeister*, i–ii (Innsbruck 1915–36). For the later

of regional capitals ran further, for most purposes, than that of Vienna: Graz sent instructions over the Karawanken into the barren Slovene karstlands; Innsbruck was responsible for the whole of the *Vorlande*. Only the Austrian duchies stood directly under imperial sway. We cannot even think of this as a 'trialist' arrangement; for officials served the Habsburgs day by day in a strictly local capacity which they were neither eager nor encouraged to exceed. Saving the occasional employment of a stadholder as immediate representative of the sovereign, each province, large or small, had its lord-lieutenant (*Landeshauptmann*; in Lower Austria: *Landmarschall*) appointed by the prince to transmit decrees, preside over courts, and maintain order with the help of a deputy (*Landesverweser*; in Lower Austria: *Landuntermarschall*), a number of counsellors (*Regierungsräte*), and the administrators of local regalia (*Vicedome*), who mainly managed crown estates, but also exercised protective rights over Church land, Jews, travellers, and others.[17]

Provincial governments formed bodies of authority which during the eighteenth century would come to be called *Gubernia* and be used under Maria Theresa and Joseph II to spread a reform programme through the Monarchy over the heads of sectional interests. Before 1740, however, their role was different. They *enshrined* sectional interests, in a constitutional arrangement which can be neither called 'absolutist' nor identified as merely one stage in the transition to more efficient *gubernial* control. Two traditional restraints on princely sovereignty help to account for the limited extent of Habsburg intervention in the Austrian regions. The first was the *Landrecht*, the 'law of the land', whose evolution through the later Middle Ages—as the work of Otto Brunner has so persuasively shown—served to distinguish each *Land*, or province,

17th century: Egger, op. cit. ii, 434 ff., *passim*. V. Thiel, 'Die innerösterreichische Zentralverwaltung 1564–1749', *AÖG* cv (1916), 1–209; cxi (1929–30), 497–644, is very thorough on the institutions at Graz, both before and after 1619. Until 1635 'Lower Austria' (in Maximilian I's sense) actually had a *separate* Chamber (O. Brunner, 'Das Archiv der niederösterreichischen Kammer und des Vizedoms in Österreich unter der Enns und seine Bedeutung für die Landesgeschichte', *Jb f Lk. v. NÖ* xxix (1944–8), 144–66).

[17] Luschin, *Reichsgeschichte*, 189–92, 436, etc.; Gutkas, op. cit. 179 f., 244, 263; Brunner, 'Archiv'. There appears to be no full study of this subject.

and demarcate it from its neighbours.[18] The *Landrecht*, being divinely appointed, was held binding on all, including the ruler, and reflected a complex hierarchy of powers and mutual obligations. And the second restraining influence belonged to the very guarantors of the *Landrecht*: the provincial estates, which have rarely been accorded the attention they deserve in the political history of seventeenth-century Central Europe.

The estates, though their composition differed somewhat from *Land* to *Land*, always included clergy, nobility, and towns. In the Tyrol, Vorarlberg, and parts of Further Austria, communities of peasants also elected representatives. In practice, since the prelates were largely assimilated, the towns largely ignored, and the peasants a marginal and incohesive force, it was nobles who dominated, either as a single, consolidated estate, or more often as separate estates of lords and knights. Throughout the period these *Landstände* remained a crucial focus of local identity; it is striking how the few territories, in Swabia, which had previously lacked them, now witnessed their belated emergence.[19] Provincial diets bargained with the crown by offer and counter-offer, alternately discussing the princely propositions and advancing their own grievances, haggling over taxes and approving recruits. Far from abolishing any of them, the dynasty actually seems to have encouraged their local patriotism, perhaps from a fear of any revival of the general *Landtage* which so suited Protestant activists during the sixteenth

[18] Brunner, *Land und Herrschaft*, with an appendix (pp. 441–63) specifically on the evolution of the Austrian *Länder*.

[19] For the earlier period: ibid. 394–440, and Luschin, *Reichsgeschichte*, 160–84. There is a good general survey in Hassinger, 'Landstände' (rather fuller than id., 'Ständische Vertretungen in den althabsburgischen Ländern und in Salzburg', *Ständische Vertretungen in Europa im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen 1969), 247–285). A. F. Pribram, 'Die niederösterreichischen Stände und die Krone in der Zeit Kaiser Leopold I', *MIÖG* xiv (1893), 589–652, is the only study set squarely in the later 17th century. A. Jäger, *Geschichte der landständischen Verfassung Tirols*, i–ii (Innsbruck 1881–5), ii, 1–2, covers the medieval evolution of the Tyrolean estates; Egger, op. cit. ii, *passim*, has much on the proceedings of 16th- and 17th-century diets there; N. Grass, 'Aus der Geschichte der Landstände Tirols', *Album H. M. Cam* i–ii (Louvain—Paris 1961), ii, 299–324, summarizes the Tyrolean evidence. N. Sapper, *Die schwäbisch-österreichischen Landstände und Landtage im 16. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart 1965). P. Blickle, *Landschaften im Alten Reich* (Munich 1973), on the question of peasant estates in Tyrol (pp. 54–9, 159–254), Vorarlberg (74 f., 255–315), Habsburg Swabia (96–108), and the rest of *Vorderösterreich* (128–39).

and early seventeenth centuries. After all, centralized government could easily generate centralized opposition.

Yet diets as such did not form the real locus of estates' strength after 1620. Their meetings became irregular and thinly attended, their debates mediocre and mechanical. Rather, noble interests were protected by permanent provincial institutions and personnel. For continuous management of their affairs the diets elected well-paid delegates (*Verordnete*), responsible to themselves, who collected taxes, met the needs of defence, raised military levies, and so on. Moreover, candidates for the post of *Landeshauptmann*, whose duties included acting as princely commissioner to the diet, were nominated by the estates and answerable to them as well as to the ruler; thus they possessed a dual function in which local loyalties had full play. And the apparatus of seventeenth-century provincial control—the *Landschaft*, as it was loosely called—went much further: all kinds of experts (especially jurists), servants and concessionaries, customs and excise officials, teachers and doctors, printers and architects, even painters and cooks, were overseen and paid by the estates.[20] As administration grew more complex and taxation more ingenious, their share of government actually increased. At the same time the *Landrecht* found its active defenders, both among trained nobles and among the semi-autonomous legal officers attached to the *Landschaft*.[21]

This *modus vivendi* between court and country was no longer, of course, the organic medieval balance. Sixteenth-century contests left their mark: now the heritage of shared power gave way to a

[20] Luschin, op. cit. 440 ff. (a section which surely belies his view of estates' decline expressed ibid., 403–18); Pribram, 'Stände', 598 ff.; Thiel, art, cit. esp. 531 ff.; Hassinger, 'Landstände', 1019 ff. F. Popelka in F. Tremel (ed.), *Die Landeshauptleute im Herzogtume Steiermark* (Graz 1962), 30–2, is quite wrong to call the *Landeshauptmann* a mere '*Beamter*': in the 17th century his Carinthian equivalent was paid 2,000 gulden annually by the estates, only 500 by the crown, and the estates actually exercised legal control over his capital, Klagenfurt (Braumuller, op. cit. 302 f., 242 ff.). On the defensive function: W. Schulze, *Landesdefension und Staatsbildung, Studien zum Kriegswesen des innerösterreichischen Territorialstaates, 1564–1619* (V.–Cologne–Graz 1973).

[21] F. Wisnicki, 'Die Geschichte der Abfassung des Tractatus de Juribus incorporabilibus', *Jb. f. Lk. v. NÖ* xx (1926–7), 69–91; Luschin, op. cit. 351–64; cf. Thiel, art. cit. 588–95, on the office of the Inner Austrian *Kammerprokurator*. Estates' lawyers were basically conservative in their mentality; they shared common ground—though they might be in dispute—with spokesmen for more fully-fledged Habsburg positions (cf. above, pp. 105-7).

more conscious political alliance. The unspoken assumption behind the bargain was a firm maintenance of *Herrschaft*, that fundament of the Central European power structure whose consolidation in this period we have already observed. Although in Austria the manorial system still allowed some peasant self-government and self-respect, it meant a rock-like invulnerability to outside interference. Individual *Herrschaften* were the irreducible units of fragmentation, their boundaries the basic constitutents of regional geography. Between Feldsberg and Eisgrub, Liechtenstein lands straddled the Lower Austrian–Moravian frontier, taking next to no account of its existence. When Esterházys and Batthyánys acquired estates in the border region south-east of Vienna, they *ipso facto* took the area back under the sovereignty of the Hungarian crown.[22]

In such matters the Habsburgs readily acquiesced. Their own latifundia were run with full respect for the *genius loci*, *Vicedome* and bailiffs often being drawn from the local petty nobility, courts judging by common law, including a welter of particular jurisdictions: special tribunals for mines and wines, forests and rivers, soldiers and Jews.[23] More significantly, the dynasty encouraged private latifundia through the continuing alienation of crown lands. In Lower Austria the bulk of the *Kammergut* was sold off between 1575 and 1625, and most of the rest later passed to Prince Eugene. In Upper Austria crown estates—apart from the Salzkammergut—had effectively disappeared by 1650. The Hohenems in Vorarlberg were one powerful family among many who profited by this policy, or lack of policy. Thus fewer and fewer Austrian peasants were direct subjects of their sovereign, and the tentative measures taken to protect them counted for little compared with the favour shown towards landlords' interests. Divergent evolutions in Habsburg and Venetian Friuli after 1500 are particularly instructive: the one area dominated by a clique of so-called *strumieri* nobles, the other safeguarding the rights of townsmen and tenantry.[24]

[22] Forchtenstein and Kobersdorf passed to Hungary in 1626, Hornstein and Eisenstadt in 1647: Gutkas, op. cit. 244; *Handbuch der historischen Stätten*, i, 706

[23] Luschin, op. cit. 457–60; Metz (ed.), op. cit. 401–66.

[24] Tremel, *Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte*, 248 f. For Lower Austria (which still had a large extent of crown land in the early 16th century (Gutkas, op. cit. 151)): Brunner, 'Archiv', 153. For Upper Austria: Stieve, *Bauernaufstand*, i, 3, 16–18; Hoffmann, op. cit. 86. On the peasants see E. Patzelt, 'Bauernschutz in Österreich vor 1848', *MIÖG* lviii (1950), 637–55; and above, p. 90. Paschini, op. cit. ii, 379 ff.

*

It might appear odd that seventeenth-century Austria lacked both strong government and strong opposition. In fact neither was necessary, and the occasional conflicts between princely commissioners and refractory diets involved little more than shadow-boxing. Beneath the constitutional surface dynastic and noble interests were hammered together in a series of workmanlike compromises and sealed with the stamp of Counter-Reformation. In Austria, as in the rest of the Monarchy, the crucial link was a rising group, small and close-knit, of aristocratic families whose compact with the like-minded dynasty would remain stable so long as the ethos of Catholic Baroque prevailed. Most had been Protestant; often conversion assured not only their political fortune, but a claim on the possessions of less dexterous members of the same house. All founded their pre-eminence squarely on landed property, which allowed them to dominate provincial administration and justice. They enjoyed a near monopoly of posts as *Landeshauptmann*, as *Regierungsrat*, as *Landrat* advising on the management of regalia; they controlled the local *Landgericht*, with its capital powers (*Blutbann*), and supervised its sessions in their own castles by the seventeenth century.[25] The estates of the magnates extended within their native region and beyond it; they thus formed a prime factor in countervailing the extremely centrifugal tendencies of Habsburg Central Europe. Many aristocrats purchased lands in several provinces, including Bohemia and sometimes Hungary; or at least they gained the right of naturalization, called *Landstandschaft* in Austria, *inkolát* in Bohemia, *indigenatus* (or *honfiusitás*) in Hungary, necessary for office and influence there. Their arrangements would be confirmed with one or more *Fideicommissa*, usually for the eldest son, while other members of the clan could be provided for at court, in the Church, in the army or diplomatic service.

All this found favour with the emperors: indeed, it parallels the Habsburgs' view of their own patrimony, cementing together a familial inheritance and later explicitly entailing it by the device of Charles VI's Pragmatic Sanction. Sometimes the favour extended to large grants of money and land, but these were not decisive, any

[25] Cf. above, p. 92, n. 26. In 1801 (when precise figures are available) there were 216 *Landgerichte* in Lower Austria, 106 in Upper Austria, 136 in Styria, 63 in Carinthia, 74 in Carniola and Istria (Luschin, op. cit. 193 f.).

more than that most obvious evidence of grace, noble titles, created an aristocracy. Rather they crowned the success of a limited number of families, most of whom were long established in some part of Central Europe. And no real inflation of honours took place: while between 1620 and 1720 212 newcomers joined the ranks of the Lower Austrian *Herrenstand*,[26] the 103 from within the province were mainly established notables, while the 109 outsiders were often only formally naturalized. But what had earlier been a comparatively open society, with regular movement up and down the scale and genuine feudal obligations, now turned into a more and more exclusive caste, perpetuating a few dozen potent aristocratic names till the very end of the Monarchy.

There no more existed an 'Austrian' nobility than an 'Austrian' government. But the *Erblande* were a common denominator between the *Reich* and the rest of the Monarchy, and as such they occupy an important place in the development of this social élite. The grant of titles and predicates was a very complicated matter, with fine shades of meaning now difficult to grasp. Basically two kinds lay in the Habsburg gift: imperial; and domestic—Austrian, Bohemian, Hungarian. In fact the categories overlapped considerably, and even contemporaries might be uncertain where 'Austria' stopped and the others began. Traditional imperial nobility had been distinguished by the conferment of immediate status (*Reichsunmittelbarkeit*), which went with possession of a territory subject only to the emperor and a voice—however insignificant—in the imperial constitution. That criterion was no longer very strictly applied, and the more imperial titles became a mere courtesy, the more they were sought after by lesser ranks, though the ultimate cachet remained a full sovereign principality, margravate, county, or lordship situated within the *Reich*. High nobles in Austria were thus a hybrid group, undergoing an increasingly elaborate process of differentiation.[27]

[26] Gutkas, op. cit. 234. Such figures need careful interpretation; cf. the garbled information about some 200 'new' aristocrats in *Status Particularis Regiminis ... Ferdinandi II* (n. p. 1637), 203–13, often repeated by later writers. Cf. above, pp. 93 f.; below, pp. 200 ff., 240 ff.

[27] Older titles in the Holy Roman Empire were tied to territories and could not be multiplied. Thus there were only seven ancient dukedoms, such as Saxony, besides the separate case of the less prestigious Silesian duchies (Wallenstein's dukedom of Friedland and Eggenberg's of Krumlov, like the later (1780s) Lobkovic dukedom of Raudnitz, were *Bohemian* titles). No more margraves or landgraves or territorial palsgraves came into being (the courtly *comes palatinus* was a different, and lesser dignity). New creations were either as princes (*Fürsten*), counts (*Grafen*), or barons (*Freiherren*), with a subdivision among the princes according to whether other members of the family could call themselves prince (*Prinz*) or merely count. The new prince did not need to possess a principality; it sufficed to own (or acquire) a county, which the emperor could elevate, by a legal fiction, to quasi-princely status (as a *gefürstete Grafschaft*). By the later 17th century it became possible to be made imperial count without owning landed property outside Austria at all (the *Reichsgrafen* von Windischgrätz are an early example), and that continued in the 18th century (cf. H. Gollwitzer, *Die Standesherren* (Stuttgart 1957), 37–9).

Let us examine some paradigms of worldly success in seventeenth-century Austria.[28] The pinnacle of achievement was princely status, and before 1600 no Habsburg subject belonged in this category (except in so far as individual members of ruling houses from the *Reich* occasionally served and settled in Austria). The first to be elevated was Karl Liechtenstein (1569–1627). The Liechtensteins were a prominent family established in several of the Austrian lands, and although Karl's branch was not particularly well endowed, his father had already begun to consolidate a group of properties along the Lower Austrian–Moravian border. Karl's spectacular preferment displays three conspicuous features: marriage to a rich neighbouring heiress, conversion to Catholicism, and assiduous, unscrupulous service of both Rudolf and Matthias (a real feat of squaring the circle, since he did not entirely alienate either), as well as of Ferdinand II later. By 1608 he was a prince, then by 1613 Duke of Troppau in Silesia; during the 1620s, as governor of Bohemia, he made large acquisitions, including another Silesian duchy (Jägerndorf). His son, Karl Eusebius (1611–84), and grandson, Johann Adam (1656–1712), were both *primus inter pares* among the Austrian aristocracy of their time. Meanwhile Karl's brothers and fellow-converts, Maximilian and Gundakar, followed him in gaining the highest rank and riches through a politic dedication to the dynasty. One thing further was required to complete the panoply: the early eighteenth-century purchase by the Liechtensteins of Vaduz and

[28] This information is not easy to bring together. The essential source are the sixty volumes of Wurzbach, one of the most remarkable compendia ever written by one man: extremely well-informed and packed with detail, but diffuse, sometimes inaccurate or misleading, very much fuller of genealogical material in later than earlier volumes. Zedler likewise contains a mass of miscellaneous information, some of it almost contemporary. They may be supplemented, for certain families, by *OSN* (cf. below, p. 201, n. 14).

Schellenberg, two remote and impoverished, but sovereign territories within the *Reich* which, having assumed the name of their new possessors, would—uniquely—outlive even the Habsburg Monarchy itself.[29]

Three, briefly four, families joined the Liechtensteins in the 1620s. The Lobkovices, Dukes of Sagan, princely counts of Sternstein, were, and remained, predominantly Bohemian; I shall discuss them—and the Waldstein case, so soon revoked—in the next chapter. The Dietrichsteins formed another ramified clan whose most notable branch, much advanced by Adam Dietrichstein as major-domo to Maximilian II, owned lands adjacent to the Liechtensteins' in southern Moravia, while other lines inhabited Lower Austria, Carinthia, and Styria. Adam's son Franz was the Cardinal Bishop of Olomouc we have already met. His princely title passed to a nephew, Maximilian, major-domo to Ferdinand III from 1650 to 1655, whose son, Ferdinand Joseph, performed the same office for Leopold I between 1683 and 1698. Meanwhile the Lower Austrian Dietrichsteins reached the same rank via Gundakar, imperial master of the horse and high chamberlain in the same period.[30] The Eggenbergs are a different story: burghers at Radkersburg in Southern Styria in the fifteenth century, leading citizens and financiers of Graz, but still bourgeois, in the sixteenth. Their status rose through Rupprecht (1546–1611), who commanded Habsburg armies in the Low Countries and Hungary, then more precipitately through Ferdinand II's close confidant and first minister, the convert Hans Ulrich, created prince in 1623 and Duke of Krumlov in Bohemia five years later. His son, Johann Anton, besides owning vast tracts in Bohemia, Styria, and Carniola, bought from Ferdinand III the county of Gradisca in Friuli, thus gaining the accolade of immediate imperial sovereignty. But the family made little use of it: Johann Anton died young and his two sons squabbled over their spoils. Between 1713 and 1717, by a Baroque gesture of fate, three generations of the house died out and the Eggenbergs were extinguished in the male line, leaving only Hans Ulrich's superb palace outside Graz as their memorial.[31]

[29] J. Falke, *Geschichte des fürstlichen Hauses Liechtenstein*, ii (V. 1877), is thorough, especially on Karl (pp. 127–242).

[30] Wurzbach is brief, Zedler rather confusing; best is *OSN*, s.v.

[31] W. E. Heydendorff, *Die Fürsten und Freiherren zu Eggenberg und ihre Vorfahren* (Graz 1965), a useful summary. H. Zwiedineck-Südenhorst, *Hans Ulrich Fürst von Eggenberg* (V. 1880), is a disappointing biography of an elusive figure; cf. id., 'Ruprecht von Eggenberg', *MHVSt* xxvi (1878), 79–163.

The rest of the seventeenth century brought four more princely elevations. The last of them, the Hungarian Esterházys (1687) will concern us later;[32] the other three: Auersperg (1653), Portia (1662), and Schwarzenberg (1670), illustrate some of the features we have already discerned. The Auersperg were venerable nobility of Carniola, important, but dispersed into several lines, advanced to a larger significance by Ferdinand III's and Leopold's formidable minister, Johann Weickard (1615–77), who became Duke of Münsterberg and Frankenstein in Silesia and princely count of the Empire as ruler of Thengen in Swabia. Though Johann Weickart eventually overreached himself and lost favour at court, the family sustained its initiative over the next generations. Not so the Friulian Portias, thrust into prominence through Leopold's boyhood favourite, Johann Ferdinand (1606–65), and sovereign counts of Tettensee (also in Swabia) from 1689. The Portias too had every opportunity to exert influence, but like the Eggenbergs they made no further attempt to advance beyond an inherited social prestige. They lived quietly on for centuries in the grand Renaissance *palazzo* at Spittal an der Drau (Carinthia), originally built for Ferdinand I's Spanish protégés, the Salamancas, and acquired by Johann Ferdinand; in all that time they added nothing to it but their coat-of-arms.[33]

The Schwarzenbergs represent a different case again. By origin a German family with possessions in Franconia, they gained Habsburg gratitude through Count Adolf (died 1600), like Rupprecht von Eggenberg a hero of the Ottoman wars, his son

[32] There were in fact two more princely creations in this period which have some reference to Austria: Piccolomini (1650), and Montecuccoli (1689)—the only military examples, besides Wallenstein (who was anyway a prince before he commanded in battle). But they only belong here marginally: neither was a Habsburg subject by birth, and neither family subsequently played any public role in the Monarchy. Piccolominis lived in Bohemia until the 1770s; the Montecuccoli princedom was established only for Raimondo's son, and it died with him in 1700.

[33] Cf. above, p. 144 and n. 69. I have found scarcely anything at all on the Auerspergs (they came too early in the alphabet for the mature Wurzbach); but cf. *OSN*, s.v. G. Probszt-Ohstorff, *Die Porcia, Aufstieg und Wirken eines Fürstenhauses* (Klagenfurt 1971), an interesting study, does not alter the impression of the Portias' profound lack of sparkle.

Adam (1584–1641), the imperial-minded confidant of the electors of Brandenburg, and their distant relation Georg Ludwig (1586–1646), a soldier and diplomat. Georg Ludwig acquired rich lands in Styria by a most remarkable marriage: in 1617, at the age of thirty-one, he became the sixth and last husband of Anna Neumann, then eighty-two years old, the immensely wealthy daughter of a mill-owner and aristocratic widow, a sort of Central European Bess of Hardwick. On his death these estates passed to the single surviving member of the family, Adam's son Johann Adolf (1614–83), president of the Aulic Council, major-domo, and prince of the Empire; then to two more only sons, Ferdinand (1652–1703) and Adam Franz (1680–1732). During this time the acquisitions continued through purchase and inheritance: by his death Adam Franz was ruler of three separate imperial counties (in Franconia, Swabia, and Westphalia), Duke of Krumlov as successor to the Eggenbergs, and owner of further Bohemian latifundia at Třeboň and Hluboká, not to speak of the Inner Austrian lands. He even approached a little too close to his sovereign, for Charles VI mortally wounded him with an accidental shot while they were hunting near Prague. 'It was ever my duty', Schwarzenberg exclaimed before expiring, 'to give my life for my sovereign.'[34]

*

The Schwarzenbergs (for all Adam Franz's death-bed deference) had evidently developed into a full-scale dynasty, and on that level these key elements in the Habsburg system of government deserve our attention. Like the ruling house they became centred on Vienna, but not narrowly 'Austrian'; they were poised between old provincial and new cosmopolitan ties. Much the same is true of the nobility which stood immediately below the princes on the ladder of preferment. There were perhaps 200 or so families of counts in the *Erblande* by the end of the seventeenth century. Almost all of them maintained some contact with the court and the Habsburg dynasty; most were designated honorary chamberlains in the imperial entourage. But a far smaller number played any active role

[34] A. E. Berger, *Felix Fürst zu Schwarzenberg* (Leipzig 1853), 3–150 (p. 134 for the story of Adam Franz's death); K. Schwarzenberg, *Geschichte des reichsständischen Hauses Schwarzenberg*, i(Neustadt a. d. Aisch 1963), 116 ff., on Johann Adolf and his heirs; A. Wolf, *Geschichtliche Bilder aus Österreich*, i–ii (V. 1878–80), ii, 146–97, on Ferdinand.

in the common affairs of Austria, and these would regularly be rewarded, during the eighteenth or early nineteenth century, by further grants of princely status.[35]

From the southernmost province of Carniola came the Lambergs, an extraordinarily prolific clan which spread into almost all the other crownlands, producing an archbishop of Prague at the beginning of the century, the young Joseph I's inseparable companion at the end, and an important imperial major-domo in between. Carinthia housed the Hochosterwitz branch of the Khevenhüllers, determined Protestants in their time, but restored to favour with the convert Ehrenreich (died in 1675), and the Orsini-Rosenbergs, one of whom was president of the *Hofkammer* during the 1680s. Friuli spawned the *strumieri* families of Colloredo, spreading to Bohemia in this period, and Thurn-Valsassina, whose tentacles reached throughout Inner Austria too (their more famous cousins of Thurn und Taxis remained primarily Italian and German-based).[36] Styria was dominated by (besides Eggenberg, Schwarzenberg, and a secondary Dietrichstein line) Stubenbergs, Herbersteins, Sauraus, Trautmannsdorfs, and Windischgrätzes. All had produced leading Protestants at the Reformation; all shed some members during the banishments of the 1620s; all recovered and flourished after their return to Roman Catholicism. The Herbersteins gave five lord-lieutenants to the province between 1556 and 1679, and their various lines gradually settled throughout the Monarchy. The Trautmannsdorfs used the leverage of Ferdinand III's intimate friend Maximilian to establish themselves northward in Austria and Bohemia, and produced a notable clutch of officers for the Habsburg armies. The Windischgrätzes had likewise expanded into Lower Austria: the convert Gottlieb (1630–95),

[35] Since these later princely elevations—like the 17th-century countly ones—usually reflect confirmation, in return for an appropriate money payment, of positions already acquired, I have included their dates in the index. All such pre-1806 creations were nominally extended to the Holy Roman Empire. Lists of chamberlains may be found in the *Hofstaaten*: e.g. *Status Particularis*, ch. 8; ÖNB, MS. 12388, fols. 11–20.

[36] Besides Wurzbach (who brings some order even into the near-impenetrable complexities of the Lamberg *Stammtafel*), there is B. Czerwenka, *Die Khevenhüller, Geschichte des Geschlechts* (V. 1867); cf., on Ehrenreich Khevenhüller's son, Sigismund Friedrich: Wolf, *Geschichtliche Bilder*, ii, 198–243; and M. Breunlich-Pawlik in *MÖStA* xxvi (1973), 235–53.

son of an *émigré*, became imperial vice-chancellor, and his son was president of the Aulic Council.[37] In the Tyrol and *Vorlande*, local empire-building bulked particularly large. Powerful families like Brandis, Spaur, and Wolkenstein looked to the perquisites of the Innsbruck administration and the Alpine bishoprics; while in Vorarlberg two sovereign imperial clans, Hohenems and Montfort, preserved and even (for a while) increased the autonomy of their miscellaneous territories and fiefs.[38]

Above all the duchies below and above the Enns, whose nobilities already overlapped greatly, even in the sixteenth century, threw up the families which consolidated their hold on Austria during the Counter-Reformation era. One of them was the Starhemberg, with its strong line in military heroes, above all the celebrated Ernst Rüdiger who defended Vienna in 1683, and Prince Eugene's deputy, Count Guido. Another was the Frankenburg branch of the Khevenhüllers, influential at court especially through the annalist and diplomat, Franz Christoph (1588–1650), and his grandson, Field Marshal Ludwig Andreas (1683–1744).[39] Both Starhembergs and Khevenhüllers had their fair share of Protestant rebels; so did the Sinzendorfs, whose generation of converts included Johann Joachim (died in 1665), Austrian chancellor between 1656 and 1665, and the notorious *Hofkammer* embezzler, Georg Ludwig, and—not to be confused with them!—the Zinzendorfs, who actually became more famous in their Saxon exile, though they also had a thriving Roman Catholic branch. In the case of the Kuefsteins, the

[37] Only Stubenbergs (J. Loserth, *Geschichte des altsteirischen Herren- und Grafenhauses Stubenberg* (Graz–Leipzig 1911)) and—less satisfactorily—Herbersteins (J. A. Kumar, *Geschichte der Burg und Familie Herberstein*, i–iii (V. 1817)) have found their historian, though Wurzbach is strong on them all. Cf. Wolf, *Geschichtliche Bilder*, ii, 89–145 for a Trautmannsdorf soldier (Sigismund Joachim); the absence of any biography of Maximilian Trautmannsdorf remains a great lacuna in the literature on Austria and the Thirty Years War.

[38] L. Welti, *Graf Kaspar von Hohenems 1573–1640* (Innsbruck 1963), mainly a family and cultural study; B. Lifka, 'Knižní dědictví Hohenembsů z Kunwaldu', *Str. Kn.* iv (1969), 152–81, is a pendant to it. See in general *Handbuch der historischen Stätten*, ii, 393–577, *passim*.

[39] The Starhembergs have attracted several biographers: A. Thürheim, *Feldmarschall Ernst Rüdiger von Starhemberg* (V. 1882); A. Arneth, *Das Leben des Grafen Guido von Starhemberg* (V. 1853); B. Holl, *Hofkammerpräsident Gundaker T. Starhemberg und die österreichische Finanzpolitik der Barockzeit* (V. 1976). On the Khevenhüller-Frankenburgs: Czerwenka, op. cit.; and Wolf, *Geschichtliche Bilder*, i, 113–71.

same individual was both Lutheran and Catholic politician: Johann Ludwig (1587–1657) led the moderate opposition to Ferdinand II in Lower Austria, then converted after the White Mountain and served the emperor as *Landeshauptmann* of Upper Austria. His successors followed the familiar road to latifundium and *Fideicommissum* (at Greillenstein). Even the Jörgers, most militant members of the Lutheran estates, recovered their ground by mid-century, and the convert Johann Quintin, grandson of the insurgent generation, rose to be vice-president of the *Hofkammer* and stadholder in Lower Austria.[40] Genetical chance extinguished the Jörgers soon after 1700, as it did the Trautsons, originally Tyroleans, major holders of court office between Maximilian II and Charles VI, and the historic house of Puchheim, whose name—as it were a trade-mark of quality, though they had been heavily implicated in the revolt of 1620—was assumed by the purchaser of their lands, the German imperial vice-chancellor, Karl Friedrich von Schönborn. But most of these families built for a long-term ascendancy, in both Austria and the rest of the Monarchy. The Harrachs, who had long ago originated in Bohemia, spread back there in the decades when Ernst Adalbert (1598–1667) was archbishop of Prague. The Althans, especially Michael Adolf, a convert in 1636, followed the Liechtensteins into the borderlands of Moravia. Breuners and Wurmbrands maintained their historical links with Styria; Abensberg-Trauns bought an immediate county in Swabia as early as 1658.[41]

The magnates thus had one foot in the provinces, the other in court service. Sometimes that service proved highly remunerative. We have already seen some examples of fortunes furthered thereby, and shall meet others in Bohemia and Hungary: one or two outstanding individuals make it possible for their successors to participate (if they wish) at the highest levels of Habsburg government. They receive handsome favours, culminating in imperial immediate status, which suited both sides, for the

[40] For the Kuefsteins: K. Kuefstein, *Studien zur Familiengeschichte*, i–iii (V.–Leipzig 1908–15), ii–iii, ancestor-worship of the best kind; and, on Johann Ludwig: Wolf, *Geschichtliche Bilder*, i, 238–305; and Wiedemann, *Reformation*, i, 614–16. For the Jörgers: Wurm, op. cit. (198–205 on Johann Quintin).

[41] There is little about these families outside the pages of Wurzbach, but *OSN* has a good article on Harrach. The Puchheims (or Buchheims) must be sought in Zedler, s.v. 'Buchaim'.

Habsburgs gained—besides the fees for patents of higher nobility—a loyal voice in the *Reich*, even if they had to alienate Austrian territory to do so, as with Gradisca, or Thengen, or the Dietrichsteins' sovereign enclave of Tarasp in the Engadine. A further and curious case is that of the Counts Paar, organizers of the Austrian postal system and holders of the resonant title of *Obrist-Reichs-Hof- und General-Erblandpostmeister*.

Yet the basic unit was always the family, and the family did not suffer even if an individual fell from grace: witness the Auerspergs and Lobkovices in the 1670s, even the Waldsteins in Bohemia after 1634 and Nádasdys in Hungary after 1671.[42] The Thurns and Schlicks, suitably Catholicized, rose as high as the Martinices and Slavatas whom they had been largely instrumental in defenestrating. The Sinzendorfs easily survived the discomfiture of their arch-peculator, Georg Ludwig; indeed, his son served as court chancellor under Joseph I and Charles VI. Of course, families could be large or small, and accidents of heredity played their part, the Schwarzenberg, for example, prospering by extreme concentration (seven successive only sons), the Lamberg or Herberstein by an amoeboid process of subdivision. But overall it was the gradual accumulation from generation to generation of landed wealth and social prestige which permitted the high aristocrats their remarkable dominance. They alone could afford diplomatic missions and jobs at an often insolvent court. They had the means and the incentive to indulge a taste for conspicuous religion. They possessed the resources for palaces and gardens, for festivities and art, for the whole grand adventure of the Austrian Baroque.

There remained another nobility, regional and less conspicuous, consisting mostly of barons and mere knights of the shire. It was firmly entrenched, representing a (usually unarticulated) local patriotism and a traditional view of *Herrschaft*. Two men illustrate it at its best: Wolf Helmhard von Hohberg (1612–88), author of the *Georgica curiosa oder adeliges Landleben*, with its intimate picture of the customary landowner and his concerns; and Johann Weickard von Valvasor (1641–93), whose mammoth *Ehre des Hertzogthums*

[42] On whom see below, pp. 205 f., 242. Karl Marx was surely wrong to regard the entailed estate as destructive of family solidarity (see S. Avineri, *The social and political thought of Karl Marx* (Cambridge 1968), 27–9).

Crain is unsurpassed as a loving portrait of an Austrian countryside and its inhabitants.[43] This nobility was stronger in some areas, especially the *Vorlande*, than in others, but it generally appears subservient, disorganized, and decaying. The fate of Protestantism helped to break its back—even Hohberg ended his days as an exile in Regensburg—and its mobility tended to be downwards: an increasing gulf opened up between high and low, especially as the towns no longer generated much of a rising stratum to bridge it. Few parvenus penetrated the Austrian establishment after 1620 and most of them were foreigners. Some German officials, mainly lawyers by training, made good and married well; some noble families immigrated, normally via the imperial army. The latter, if they settled permanently at all, rarely played any public role: that is true of St. Julien and St. Hilier (whose troops saved Ferdinand II from capture by the Protestants in 1619), of Montecuccoli and Tilly, and we shall meet the phenomenon again, on a larger scale, in Bohemia. Even earlier arrivals, like the Spanish Hoyos and Salamanca-Ortenburg, the favourites of Ferdinand I, and some of the Friulians, like Collalto and Attems, stood aside from politics.[44]

So far as native commoners were concerned, the world of open opportunities closed about 1620 with a last generation of self-made men such as Johann Baptist Verda, Count of Werdenberg, secretary to Ferdinand II and the first Austrian court chancellor, or the Kisls, who transformed themselves from burghers of Laibach to Counts of Gottschee within thirty years. Thereafter the number who rose to full participation in public life could probably be counted on the fingers of one hand: one was Christoph Ignaz Abele (1628–85), a less than dynamic president of the *Hofkammer*; another was Johann Walderode (1593–1674), an influential chancery secretary. These were infinitesimal rifts in the hierarchy, as was the one noble rebel

[43] O. Brunner, *Adeliges Landleben und europäischer Geist* (Salzburg 1949), chs. 1 and 4, on Hohberg. For Valvasor: P. Radics, *Johann Weikhard Freiherr von Valvasor* (Laibach 1910); Dimitz, op. cit. pt. 4, 35 ff.; Coreth, *Geschichtschreibung*, 153–5; cf. above, n. 6.

[44] On Germans from the *Reich* see below pp. 292–5. On Montecuccoli, cf. above, n. 32; the nephew of Johann Tserclaes Tilly installed himself at 'Tillysburg', a castle near St. Florian in Upper Austria, but the family died out with his grandson in 1724. The Salamancas only survived until the 1630s, and their successors at Ortenburg in Carinthia, local merchants grown rich in Venice, proved equally inconspicuous (G. Probszt, *Hans Widmanns Erbe, ein Beitrag zur Familiengeschichte* (Klagenfurt 1961)).

of the period: Hans Erasmus, Count Tattenbach, who mounted a trivial and totally unsuccessful putsch in Styria to coincide with the Hungarian conspiracy of 1670.[45] Otherwise the essentially social bonds between regional and central authority in Austria were everywhere consolidated.

*

Consideration of Austria's nobility leads naturally to a discussion of the Austrian Church, which presents the same dominance and expansiveness of character. In their upper echelons the two bodies overlapped closely: prelates formed the primary estate at all the diets, working with nobles to distribute the tax burden as painlessly as possible, and nobles became the arch-Catholic social group. As we have seen, places existed for aristocratic scions in the episcopate, where the more prestigious sees were theirs without question, and religious communities welcomed them, while successful abbots might hope for a patent of nobility. Some nunneries were highly fashionable, like Goess, near Leoben, and Sonnenburg in the Pustertal, which served the needs of unmarriageable daughters of the Styrian and Tyrolean nobility respectively, or Hall, founded by an archduchess as a decorous institution for well-mannered spinsters.[46] Other religious foundations benefited profoundly from noble support, especially mendicants and Jesuits, and aristocrats often maintained parish priests out of their own pocket, as well as exercising the works of charity. Again this is *family* piety, a kind of spiritual *Fideicommissum*, with much commemoration of ancestors, even expiation of their misdeeds, as Joseph Jörger, whose father was a Protestant *émigré*, joined the Cistercians at Lilienfeld, or Anton

[45] On Abele: *ADB* and *NDB*, s.v.; Bérenger, *Finances*, 376–8. He was the son of a converted Catholic citizen of Steyr, and had a brother with some literary pretensions who served as a mining official there. On Walderode, son of a Netherlandish immigrant: Gross, op. cit. 420–4. On Tattenbach: F. Krones, 'Aktenmässige Beiträge zur Geschichte des Tattenbach'schen Prozesses', *MHVSt* xii (1863), 83–113; cf. below, p. 363.

[46] J. Wichner, 'Geschichte des Nonnenklosters Goess', *Stud. u. Mitt.* xiv (1893), 15–39, 181–200, 333–51, 510–30; *Stift Göss, Geschichte und Kunst* (Graz 1961). Others of these nominally Benedictine convents were at St. Georgen am Längsee (Carinthia), Säben (southern Tyrol, from 1685 and rather more austere), Fiume, and Salzburg (on the Nonnberg); M. T. von Bolschwing, 'Die benediktinischen Nonnenklöster in Österreich, in H. Tausch (ed.), *Benediktinisches Mönchtum in Österreich* (V. 1949), 264–94, deals mostly with the last. Hall im Tirol was an unenclosed *Damenstift*. Cf. above, p. 139, n. 58, and below, n. 77.

Tattenbach, son of the executed Hans Erasmus, spent his life with their brothers at Rein.[47]

But the body of the Church was not noble; indeed, it was basically peasant, and we must ask of it the same question which we have already asked of the upper classes: how far did Catholicism bring together the different *Erblande* and reinforce loyalty to Habsburg government there? How far did it genuinely enjoy popularity? The Church was not Austrian in its boundaries: diocesan and territorial frontiers rarely coincided, and other divisions bore little relation to them. Friars had their 'Tyrolean', 'Styrian', 'Austro-Bohemian', 'Austro-Hungarian', even 'Austro-Moravian' provinces. The Society of Jesus, after much learned debate, split into a wine-consuming Austrian province and a beer-consuming Bohemian one, on the apolitical grounds that its members should not mix their drinks.[48] And the activities of these orders were international, pan-Monarchical, with Austria again a kind of common denominator, tied to both German and Habsburg developments. More specific to the *Erblande* was the autochthonous role of the old monasteries, or *Stifte*.[49] We earlier saw some evidence of their sixteenth-century decay and early seventeenth-century recovery; now is the time to give a more composite picture of those powerful institutions whose influence has survived in some degree down to our own day.

The Benedictines had over twenty houses in the Austrian provinces (with two more in Salzburg), but their importance lay in individual size and wealth rather than weight of numbers. All were medieval foundations, most dating from the eleventh to the thirteenth centuries. In Lower Austria there were the so-called *Schottenstift*, originally a Celtic monastery, in Vienna; Altenburg, hidden in the forests of the Waldviertel; the twin fortresses of Melk and Göttweig, commanding at either end the narrow passage of the Danube known as the Wachau; Seitenstetten to the west; and a smaller community at Klein-Mariazell in the Vienna Woods. Upper Austria contained the celebrated abbey of Kremsmünster, established in the eighth century by the Bavarian Duke Tassilo, and an even older foundation at Mondsee; Lambach above the river Traun,

[47] Wurm, op. cit. 168–70; *Cisterzienserbuch*, 181, 372.

[48] Duhr, op. cit. ii, 1, 315–17.

[49] *Stift* (plural *Stifte* or sometimes *Stifter*), 'a foundation', is the normal Austrian and south German word for a monastery (elsewhere *Kloster*).

and the twin houses of Garsten and Gleink. Styria had the large monasteries of Admont and St. Lambrecht; Carinthia the slightly smaller settlements at St. Paul, Arnoldstein, and the picturesque lakeside village of Ossiach. Tyrol had monasteries at Marienberg and St. Georgenberg (rebuilt in the eighteenth century at nearby Fiecht), while the most famous Benedictine communities in the *Vorlande* were Mehrerau beside Lake Constance, and St. Blasien in the Black Forest, which possessed imperial immediate status after 1613.[50]

From the twelfth century onwards the reforming zeal of the Cistercians had made an equally extensive contribution to the Austrian countryside, especially to the remoter and, as yet, unproductive upland areas. Their first foundation—nowadays the oldest of all surviving Cistercian monasteries—was at Rein in Styria. Thence the order spread, with its characteristic lines of filiation, to Heiligenkreuz, Zwettl, and Lilienfeld in Lower Austria; to Baumgartenberg and Wilhering in Upper Austria; to Sittich in Carniola; to Viktring in Carinthia. Later came the renowned house at Stams in the Tyrol, and further colonization of the provinces lying to the east: Landstrass (Carniola), Engelszell (Upper Austria), Neuberg (Styria), Säusenstein (Lower Austria), and an unusual town abbey (the *Neukloster*) founded in Wiener Neustadt by Emperor Frederick III. After 1620 the former Cistercian nunnery at Schlierbach (Upper Austria) was sequestered from its Protestant owners and given to male members of the order.[51]

Most distinctive of all were the numerous monasteries in Austria

[50] Details of the *Stifte* which survived Joseph II's secularization are very much easier to come by than those of dissolved monasteries, and most of the former have monograph histories. Outstanding treatments of Benedictine houses are Keiblinger, op. cit. on Melk, H. Burger on Altenburg (i–ii, 1862–9), and J. Wichner on Admont (i–iv, 1874–80). Convenient summaries in *Benediktinerbuch*, 10 ff. (dissolved houses), 40–83 (Admont and Altenburg), 117–217 (St. Georgenberg, Göttweig, Kremsmünster, Lambach, St. Lambrecht, Marienberg), 261–87 (Melk), 301–30 (St. Paul), 368–449 (*Schottenstift* and Seitenstetten); and Tausch (ed.), op. cit. 36–70, 98–116. There were Benedictines at Gloggnitz on the Semmering, which belonged to a Bavarian mother-house at Formbach. From 1636 there were also Spanish Benedictines (*Schwarzspanier*) in Vienna. I have not attempted here or in succeeding paragraphs to survey the *Vorlande*, most of whose abbeys were not subject to Habsburg territorial jurisdiction.

[51] *Cisterzienserbuch*, 15 ff. (dissolved houses), 52–113 (Heiligenkreuz), 138–205 (Lilienfeld), 220–79 (*Neukloster*), 354–402 (Rein), 414–52 (Schlierbach and Stams), 498–521 (Wilhering), 542–603 (Zwettl). Cf. A. Sartorius, *Cistercium Bis-Tertium seu*

belonging to the regular canons of the Augustinian rule. This somewhat looser association of coenobites seems to have proved particularly congenial in the eastern Alps. The oldest abbeys stood at St. Florian, near Linz in Upper Austria, and at St. Pölten in Lower Austria. Soon the order spread elsewhere in the duchies: to the great and wealthy house of Klosterneuburg on the Danube above Vienna; to Herzogenburg and St. Andrä on the Traisen; to Waldhausen near Grein, Dürnstein in the Wachau, and St. Dorothea in Vienna; with a further clutch of properties (Reichersberg, Ranshofen, Suben) just across the Bavarian border in the Innviertel. In Styria and Carinthia the Augustinian canons settled at Vorau, amid the rolling hills north-east of Graz, at Stainz, Rottenmann, and Pöllau (the last as late as 1505), and formed the episcopal chapters of Seckau, Gurk, and St. Andrä in the valley of Lavant. They had Tyrolean houses at Neustift (Novacella) near Brixen, Gries near Bozen, and Wälschmichel, all in the south of the province. The stricter Augustinian order of Premonstratensians also made some progress in Austria; but they were more a feature of Bohemian Catholicism, as we shall see. Indeed, their abbeys at Geras-Pernegg (Lower Austria) and Schlägl (Upper Austria) were actually settled from across the border and continued to belong to the Bohemian *circaria*, while those at Wilten, just south of Innsbruck, and Griffen, the Bamberg enclave in Carinthia, maintained strong links with Bavaria.[52]

All these monasteries, so prosperous during the Middle Ages—when Melk, St. Florian, Klosterneuburg, and others enjoyed a European reputation—flourished with renewed vigour in the seventeenth century, such that the desperate Reformation decades came to seem in retrospect no more than a subdued interlude. Their wealth rested on *Herrschaft*: careful management of estates and effective control over a subject peasantry, with, by the end of the period, fifty to one hundred monks in each case directing a much

Historia Elogialis . . . (Pr. 1700), 1091–1111, for a contemporary list; and Stülz, op. cit., for a detailed, but rambling study of Wilhering.

[52] *Chorherrenbuch*, 23–50 (St. Florian), 51–68 (dissolved houses), 200–63 (Herzogenburg), 271–366 (Klosterneuburg), 412–47 (Neustift), 638–80 (Vorau); *Benediktinerbuch*, 152–7 (Gries). For the Premonstratensians (whose houses, strictly speaking, are not 'abbeys', but 'canonries'): *Chorherrenbuch*, 91–413 (Geras), 496–511 (Schlägl), 681–715 (Wilten); Backmund, op. cit. i, 40 f., 53–5, 289–91, 305–10; iii, 517 f., 522 f., 585 f., 589 f.; and cf. below, pp. 220 f.

larger number of lay brothers and other employees. Monastic property tended to be more scattered than the aristocratic latifundium, but it represented an enterprise on a similar scale, capable of embracing industrial activity: sawmills, mining, brewing, and so on. Between 1623 and 1637 abbots of Kremsmünster and Lilienfeld were called by Ferdinand II to head the imperial *Hofkammer*. The exceptionally well-documented economic history of the Cisterian house of Velehrad in Moravia could serve for any of its Austrian counterparts. As late as the 1880s, Admont still owned ten castles and a wide variety of industrial concerns.[53]

Like the magnates, the *Stifte* strained even these ample resources to their limit—and sometimes beyond—by an orgy of conspicuous expense on architecture, art, and furnishings.[54] We tend today to associate this Baroque splendour above all with the earlier eighteenth century: we think of the grandeur of Prandtauer's Melk and the serenity of St. Florian; the imperial wing at Klosterneuburg and the monumental stairway of Göttweig; the exquisite libraries of Altenburg and Admont; the fishponds and observatory at Kremsmünster; the breathtaking Rococo of the churches at Wilhering and Neustift, Dürnstein and Ossiach. But often it is only a façade added to solid structures inherited from the years before 1700, like the princely titles liberally dispensed later to families already dominant by that date. Much rebuilding was completed in the seventeenth century: witness the work at Kremsmünster and Lambach; Geras and Schlägl; Lilienfeld, Schlierbach, and Zwettl; St. Lambrecht and St. Paul; the churches of the *Schottenstift*, Seitenstetten, Vorau, Garsten, Wilten. In many cases the existing fabric was simply remodelled in the spirit of later Baroque, or reconstructed following devastation, as at Heiligenkreuz after the Turkish ravages in 1683. All over Austria today such features as the florid stucco-work of the Carlones and other great *Comaschi* families

[53] Gutkas, op. cit. 216 f., 234. Hopf, *Wolfradt*, i, 15–31; the other prelate was Ignaz Kraft of Lilienfeld, made a baron by Ferdinand (*Cisterzienserbuch*, 172–5). R. Hurt, *Dějiny cisterciáckého kláštera na Velehradě*, i–ii (Olomouc 1934–8), a remarkably thorough account; *Benediktinerbuch*, 68 f. (Admont). Cf. A. Mell, 'Das Stift Seckau und dessen wirtschaftliche Verhältnisse im 16. Jahrhundert', *Stud. u. Mitt.* xiv (1893), 82–92, 255–65, 367–76; B. Gsell, 'Das Stift Heiligenkreuz und seine Besitzungen im Jahre 1683', ibid. iv (1883), 2, 284–94; 3, 81–9; 4, 330–43.

[54] There are useful brief surveys in F. Rohrig, *Alte Stifte in Österreich*, i–ii (V.–Munich 1966). Cf. below, p. 445, n. 63.

attest to the formation of a 'national' monastic style well before the end of the century.

The parallel between religious and aristocratic houses can be pursued a stage further. Of course, their points of departure were radically different. The monasteries tapped a great reservoir of talent and vocation throughout Austrian society: many of the leading abbots of the period came from peasant or artisan stock, and the ideal of contemplation was a thoroughly genuine spiritual response to the circumstances of the age. Moreover, there existed plenty of scope for neighbourly friction where a local lord claimed rights over the monks or coveted their possessions, as with the disputes between Eggenbergs and Cistercians across the border in Bohemia.[55] Yet both monastery and family were communities of interest, sustained by a sense of continuity, a pride in the past—especially in medieval achievements and respect for founders or ancestors—and a collective confidence in the future. Both were privileged corporations, their goods guaranteed by the sovereign and practically free from taxation. Above all the *Stifte*, no less than the magnates, had a public role to play, at the local and at the more national level.

This last point is worth developing. For all that the abbeys afforded a certain *centrum securitatis* to their inmates, they were far from pure asceticism.[56] They had strong local roots, the individual monastery being a more or less autonomous body, its identity moulded by place and tradition. They gave expression to the morality and piety of the day, displaying something of the earthiness as well as the simple faith of the rural population. Their role was anchored in pastoral activity. The continuing shortage and low calibre of secular clergy forced monks to run incorporated parishes

[55] F. Tadra (ed.), 'Regesten zur Geschichte des Cisterzienserstiftes Goldenkron, 1560–1660', *Stud. u. Mitt.* xiii (1892), 13–23, 237–44, 368–78; Kaindl, op. cit. 78ff. Cf. the three-cornered struggle between Batthyánys, Heiligenkreuz Cistercians, and Pázmány over the monastery lands at Szentgotthárd: Pázmány, *Levelei*, nos. 57, 317–18, 337–8, 342, 349, 413, 444, 467, 471, 499, 503–5, 507, 544–5, 552.

[56] Only three Carthusian monasteries survived the Middle Ages in Austria: Mauerbach, Gaming, and Aggsbach, all in Lower Austria (Gaming was the largest: cf. Friess, 'Soziale und wirtschaftliche Lage'); and there were not many more in the rest of the Monarchy, all of which formed part of the Upper German province of the order. None achieved prominence in this period, though the Austrian charterhouses gained ostentatious new buildings and (from 1670) representation among the Lower Austrian estates.

themselves, a very characteristic feature, not only of Austria's regular canons, but of its Benedictines and Cistercians since the Counter-Reformation.[57] More generally, regulars exercised greater influence than seculars; though clashing at times with bishops, monasteries tended to profit from the weakness of episcopal authority, since no major cathedral actually stood on Austrian soil. In Lower Austria the clerical estate consisted exclusively of heads of old monasteries (the few bishops being reckoned as lords), and usually the abbots co-operated reasonably harmoniously. Thus the *Stifte* grew into their larger political role: the Benedictines of Lower and Upper Austria, for example, formed themselves into a single congregation.[58] And they struck up an advantageous relationship with the Habsburgs too: despite some interference in capitular elections, the main impression is one of mutual aid. The monasteries assumed part of the mantle of dynastic mission, symbolized in their newly-built *Kaisersäle*, imperial suites, among which perhaps the most remarkable and extravagant example was to be at St. Florian, complete down to the preposterous bed for Prince Eugene in pseudo-Turkish Rococo. This was still no explicitly 'Austrian' solution. A large number of seventeenth-century monks, including more than half the abbots, came from abroad, mostly from the favourite Habsburg catchment area of southern Germany, like the cheerful and worldly Reginbald Möhner, who has left us a spirited account of the Benedictine houses where he stayed during the Thirty Years War.[59] But by 1700 monasteries had begun, semi-consciously at least, to wear a more native complexion in keeping with their key place in Austrian Baroque society.

*

Other aspects of the Counter-Reformation besides a revitalization of the *Stifte* strengthened 'Austrian' loyalties during the seventeenth

[57] Tausch (ed.), op. cit. 126–41.

[58] Gutkas, op. cit. 154; Hassinger, 'Landstände', 996–9; A. Dungel, 'Die österreichische Benediktiner-Congregation', *Stud. u. Mitt.* iv (1863), 1, 49–64; 2, 306–24; 3, 108–15; 4, 300–9. Premonstratensians tended to look more towards Prague.

[59] A. Czerny (ed.), *Ein Tourist in Österreich während der Schwedenzeit* (Linz 1874), prints Möhner's diary; G. Winner, 'Die niederösterreichischen Prälaten zwischen Reformation und Josephinismus', *Jb. d. St. Klnb.*, N. F. iv (1964), 111–27, esp. 126, on foreign abbots. Cf. Hopf, *Wolfradt*, for one of the most notable of them, born into a simple family at Cologne.

century. One was education, where the main Jesuit teaching system, which has already been described, created an enclosed structure, based on a series of university centres: Vienna, Graz, Innsbruck, Linz; and only magnates or those already committed to a religious life could cross frontiers for purposes of study. It was supplemented and to some extent rivalled by the schools of other orders. The Benedictines especially had renowned schools attached to some of their monasteries (Seitenstetten, Admont, Kremsmünster, Melk, and the *Schottenstift*), and even a university of their own at Salzburg, which proved increasingly attractive to clerics and nobles who sought a freer syllabus and an alternative set of authorities. Dominican pedagogues tried to re-establish their position at a local level, while the Piarists, first settled in Austria at Horn, north-west of Vienna, by Count Ferdinand Sigmund Kurz in 1657, began to lay the foundations for an impressive expansion in Central Europe.[60]

Such education, for all its attempts to woo the unprivileged, for all the fine distinctions between one theological tradition and the next, remained heavily conservative, suspicious of all influences from Protestant lands, and overwhelmingly Latinate. Its scheme left little scope for a German culture at all, let alone one attuned to the rich cadences of Austrian German. That was cultivated mostly by Protestant exiles like Katharina von Greiffenberg. But not entirely, for the Catholic establishment did bring forth some distinguished literary figures who wrote in both Latin and German, notably the Jesuit Jakob Balde, from Ensisheim, and the Benedictine Simon Rettenbacher at Kremsmünster.[61] Moreover, the Church fostered vernacular culture in one vital way: through popular preaching, which harnessed the resources of everyday speech, developed local motifs, and reflected local concerns. Sometimes entertainment dominated the pulpit, good stories rather than

[60] See, beyond the accounts of individual monasteries, A. Decker, 'Die benediktinischen Schulen in Österreich', in Tausch (ed.), op. cit. 117–25 (mostly about Seitenstetten); cf. below, pp. 279 f. for Salzburg University. Once again I leave out of account the *Vorlande* and Freiburg, with its semi-Jesuit university. On the Piarists see above, p. 133 and n. 43. Their major *Gymnasium* at Horn is chronicled by F. Endl, 'Geschichte des Gymnasiums der Piaristen zu Horn, 1657–1872', *Beiträge zur österreichischen Erziehungs- und Schulgeschichte*, ii (1899).

[61] For these figures, and literature on them, see W. Kosch, *Deutsches Literatur-Lexikon* (Bern–Munich 1963), s. vv. Cf. Brunner, *Adeliges Landleben*, 174 ff., on Hohberg and his friends; and Loserth, *Stubenberg*, 250–6, on Hans Wilhelm von Stubenberg, another literary exile.

Biblical texts. But a more purposeful tradition was also at work, at least since Scherer's powerful sermons at the chapel royal during the 1580s and 1590s.[62]

The leading later seventeenth-century preacher was the famous Abraham a Sancta Clara (1644–1709), born Ulrich Megerle, an innkeeper's son from Swabia. Sancta Clara's vivid sympathy for peasants, for lay communities and brotherhoods, drew on real experience of ordinary people and the nuances of their language. His sharp attacks on contemporary vices were mounted within a recognizably Viennese frame of reference.[63] Less well remembered is Procopius of Templin (1607–90), who converted to Catholicism in Prague, joined the Capuchins at Vienna in 1627, and worked throughout Central Europe, especially in the Austrian provinces. He preached incessantly, publishing his direct, pungent sermons in huge collections; less socially critical than those of Sancta Clara, they gain in poetic and visionary impact, and evidently struck an equally popular chord. Similar German homilies, with their fair share of dialect and local colour, must have resounded before congregations throughout Austria, to judge by the surviving literature in monastic libraries.[64]

Both Sancta Clara and Procopius encouraged local religious customs and popular observances. Thus the *international* devotional movement was realized in *particular* cults. Everywhere pilgrimages

[62] Baur, 'Passer', 329, for a typically droll preacher. Good examples of Scherer's style are the *Hofkapelle* sermons of 1594 entitled *Ein bewerte Kunst und Wundsegen . . . damit man im Krieg nicht unten lige* . . . (Ingolstadt 1595), reprinted with similar works in *Opera oder alle Bücher*, ii.

[63] Sancta Clara was actually born on Bavarian soil (cf. below, p. 292). His collected works were edited in 19 vols. (Passau–Lindau 1835–47); for a good sample of his style and themes see *Grammatica Religiosa quae piè docet declinare a malo, et facere bonum* . . . (Salzburg 1691). The best guide to him, beside the standard biography by T. G. von Karajan (V. 1867), is Loidl, *Menschen im Barock*; cf. K. Helleiner, 'Das Bild der Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft bei Abraham a Sancta Clara', *MIÖG* lx (1952), 251–64 (slight); R. A. Kann, *A Study in Austrian intellectual history* (London 1960), 50–115; and the literature in Kosch, op. cit. s.v. 'Abraham'.

[64] Procopius was also a German. He is terrifying on hell and the Day of Judgment: *Iudiciale, Purgatoriale et Infernale, Das ist . . . Discursen oder Predigen vom Jüngsten Tag und Gericht* . . . (Munich 1666); but he can also be very sweet, fresh, and naive: *Adventuale ac Natale Iesu Christi . . . Hertzens-Freud und Seelen-Lust im harten Winter* . . . (Munich 1666). He has attracted little literature: see the life by V. Gadient (Regensburg 1912); and A. H. Kober in *Die Kultur*, xiv (1913), Hefte 2–4, and *Euphorion*, xxi–xxii (1914–18), Heft 3. Further good examples of the genre in many monastery libraries; e.g. Heiligenkreuz, MSS. 421, 453–4.

were sponsored, often in association with monasteries, as St. Lambrecht managed the great votive church at Mariazell, and Seitenstetten that on the Sonntagberg, Lambach the extraordinary Trinitarian church built in the early years of the eighteenth century at Stadl-Paura, and Rein that at Strassengel. A vast number of shrines sprang up, from major edifices to wayside calvaries, most of them no older than the Counter-Reformation itself. The cult of the Virgin clearly predominated over all others (as it did for Procopius, and indeed for Ferdinand III and Leopold I) and Mary was celebrated as Austria's national patron at Maria-Taferl, Maria-Dreieichen, Maria-Rasing, and the rest.[65] Other cults were more distinctive: St. Joseph joined Mary in the national pantheon from 1675 and was invoked by Leopold before the birth of his eldest surviving son. St. Leopold, a twelfth-century Margrave of Babenberg, combined spiritual and political virtues: his *cultus*, originating at Klosterneuburg, which he founded, became identified by the later sixteenth century with a more generalized Austrian *Landespatriotismus* and was further developed under the Emperors Leopold and Charles VI.[66] St. Florian, the first Austrian martyr, would protect one's own house against fire, while burning down the neighbour's; St. Coloman, a medieval Irish pilgrim hanged as a vagrant near Vienna, buried at Melk, was revered for his intervention in everything from cattle-plague to marital troubles. Most curious of all, the totally spurious St. Domitian (!), patron of Carinthia, who helped men to avoid disease and to catch fish, had high masses sung in his memory at Vienna, though his *gesta* rested on a confused medieval fabrication.[67]

[65] G. Gugitz, *Österreichs Gnadenstätten in Kult und Brauch*, i–v (V. 1955–8), is a fascinating source (ii, 87 ff., 115 ff., 188 ff.; iv, 197 ff., for places mentioned in the text). Cf. Wiedemann, *Reformation*, v, 186 ff.; E. Tomek, op. cit. 645–7; Gutkas, op. cit. 253 f. A typical smaller shrine is described by A. Erdinger, 'Maria Rasing', *ÖVjschr. f. Kath. Theol.* ix (1870), 251–94. On Procopius: A. H. Kober, *Die Marienpredigten des Procopius von Templin* (Münster 1916); for Ferdinand and Leopold see above, p. 117. For major Austrian calvaries see M. Lehmann, 'Die Kalvarienberganlagen im Donauraum', *Festschrift F. Loidl*, i–ii (V. 1970), i, 113–59, esp. 141–7.

[66] On Joseph: Loidl, *Menschen im Barock*, 32–4; Coreth, *Pietas*, 74 f. On Leopold, sainted in 1485: G. Wacha, 'Reliquien und Reliquiare des hl. Leopold', *Jb. d. St. Klnb.*, N.F. iii (1963), 9–25; Wiedemann, *Reformation*, ii, 500–5; v, 264–8. Charles VI planned to turn Klosterneuburg into an Austrian Escorial, one of the most colossal uncompleted enterprises of the Baroque (cf. below, p. 446).

[67] Florian: *Acta Sanctorum*, ed. J. Bolland *et al.*, i– (Antwerp, etc. 1643– ,

(continued)

The cult of native saints was part of a larger identification of Catholicism with Austria. Had not Protestantism, as clerics claimed from the days of Scherer and Brenner onwards, always been a foreign body there? Like so many specious arguments, this one contained its grain of truth: around 1600, for example, two-thirds of Styria's ministers were immigrants. Certainly, the Counter-Reformation made a conscious attempt to purge all traces of the heretical past, though such cathartic rituals as mass processions to Hernals (once the bastion of Vienna's Lutherans) seem to have operated more on the level of popular orgy.[68] The notion of 'Catholic Austria' was partly an aspect of dynastic propaganda, celebrating the Habsburgs' achievements for the faith and stimulated by events in the 1680s; partly, though more fragilely, it tried to present the *Erblande* as the true, unsullied heart of the Holy Roman Empire. To this end German converts were paraded who had freely chosen to settle in Austria, and the arch-polemicist, Jodocus Kedd, doctored their *curricula vitae* to suit his apologetic purposes.[69] More effective was argumentation along historical lines, and by the end of the seventeenth century dozens of ecclesiastical chroniclers throughout the region cultivated a kind of *Catholicitas perennis*. Such historiography, among whose greatest exponents were the brothers Bernhard and Hieronymus Pez at Melk and Marcus Hansiz, author of the *Germania Sacra*, yielded many valuable studies of Austria's medieval Church. The Emperor Leopold, who fully shared its outlook, commissioned copies of the correspondence of Rudolf I, the founder of Habsburg power, in a spirit of family *pietas*.[70] In the process, however, the real Counter-Reformation development came to be turned on its head: Austria is depicted as the guardian of Catholic orthodoxy, whereas in fact it was Catholic orthodoxy which created Austria. And 'Austrianness', on that basis, necessarily remained a somewhat imponderable quality.[71] Ultimately the Church, like the nobles, while reinforcing dynastic loyalty and local conformity, created only social and cultural, not institutional bonds between the two.

*

One more possible binding force within the *Erblande* has still to be considered: Vienna. Yet Vienna was not properly equipped to be an Austrian, rather than a Habsburg capital: history had linked it almost exclusively with its own province of Lower Austria, while its site, though strategic, was awkward. Surrounded by forests to the west and swamps to the east, it possessed only limited importance within the high-medieval Empire, becoming a—very minute—bishopric as late as 1469. During the decades around 1500 it enjoyed an age of prosperity and Humanist self-confidence, but wars against Hungary and the Ottomans posed a continual threat, and then, in 1522, the Habsburgs finally extinguished its independence.[72]

Thereafter Vienna, its administration packed with creatures and agents of the dynasty, fell totally under the domination of the Habsburg court.[73] The evolution was gradual and fairly accidental. During the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries several other cities, notably Prague, rivalled Vienna as imperial residences. After 1612 it came into its own, though Matthias still liked Linz better and even Ferdinand II, who had cause to be grateful for the loyalty of Viennese burghers in 1619, was buried at Graz. Now, with a retinue so large and pompous as almost to preclude lengthy travels (Leopold

---

hereafter *Acta SS* and cited by month (of the feast-day) and vol.), May, i, 461–7. Coloman; ibid. Oct., vi, 342–57; cf. H. Pez, *Acta S. Colomanni* (Krems 1913). On 'Domitian', whose cause was taken up by the Jesuits at Millstatt, see R. Eisler, 'Die Legende vom heiligen Karantanerherzog Domitianus', *MIÖG* xxviii (1907), 52–116, esp. 105 ff.

[68] Schuster, op. cit. 202 f. C. Musart, *Nova Viennensium peregrinatio ... ad S. Sepulchrum in Hernals* (V. 1642); but cf. Freschot, op. cit. 48–51, for a jaundiced view of the marches to Hernals, a former Jörger castle made over to the cathedral chapter after 1620.

[69] On Kedd, who died at Vienna in 1657: Duhr, op. cit. ii, 2, 79 f., 413 f.; iii, 550 f.; Sommervogel, iv, cols. 958–77; and many examples of his influence in Räss, op. cit. (cf. above p. 112, n. 76). See also below, ch. 8, *passim*.

[70] M. Kropff, *Bibliotheca Mellicensis* (V. 1747), 515 ff.; Coreth, *Geschichtschreibung*, esp. 91 ff. Hansiz's *Germania Sacra* did not advance beyond the two Austrian dioceses of Passau and Salzburg and a *prodromus* to the description of Regensburg; he also edited the important reissue of Franz Christoph Khevenhüller's monument to the deeds of Ferdinand II, the *Annales Ferdinandei*, i–xii in 7 vols. (Leipzig 1721–6). ÖNB, MSS. 9351, 9720 (Rudolf I); cf. above, pp. 72 f. and n. 77.

[71] The interesting essay by A. Tibal, *L'Autrichien, essais sur la formation d'une individualité nationale* (Paris 1936), ch. 2, makes rather too strong a case.

[72] The definitive history, from the origins to 1740, is *Geschichte der Stadt Wien*, i–iv in 8 huge volumes. Ibid. ii, 2, 577–91 on the revolt and suppression of 1522. Cf. Tibal, op. cit., ch. 1.

[73] For the administration: *Geschichte der Stadt Wien*, v, 100–59; there were twelve senators, twelve magistrates (*Stadtgerichtsbeisitzer*), and seventy-six members of the plenary or 'outer' council (*Äusserer Rat*). Its workings were dominated, not by the figurehead mayor, but by the princely *Stadtanwalt*.

undertook thirty-nine, mostly short progresses during his long reign), the Habsburgs lived a sedentary life, and after the Turks had been repelled in 1683 their city assumed all the trappings of a proud *kaiserliche Haupt- und Residenzstadt*. That meant a further loss of true urban character, as a conservative patrician oligarchy mediated orders from above, and the common citizenry groaned under the standing obligation to find quarter for an ever-growing army of imperial servants.[74]

Thus the dynasty ruled—but again largely through aristocracy and Church. The imperial Hofburg was not very spacious; quite neglected for nearly a century between the 1570s and 1660s, it remained modest even into the eighteenth century, before the building of the new library, chancery, and riding school.[75] The aristocrats had two sources of influence: the court, and the government of Lower Austria (situated, aptly enough, in the Herrengasse), and their great power in the city was strengthened by the purchase of tax-free property there. Some large-scale construction began before 1683, like the old Starhemberg *Palais* on the Minoritenplatz—though earlier even Hans Ulrich von Eggenberg had possessed no regular house. After the siege came a wave of fine mansions: Dietrichstein and Herberstein, Strattmann and Questenberg, Liechtenstein and Schwarzenberg, Esterházy and Harrach, Batthyány and Batthyány-Schönborn, and others, none more spectacular than Prince Eugene's in the Himmelpfortgasse, begun about 1690. Meanwhile the first summer palaces, aping imperial *Lustschlösser*, were built just outside the walls in newly-respectable suburbs: Liechtenstein and Schwarzenberg again, Trautson and Paar, Schönborn and Althan, then Prince Eugene's monumental Lower and Upper Belvedere, completed in 1722.[76] And ecclesiastical

[74] On court progresses: R. Miller, 'Die Hofreisen Kaiser Leopolds I', *MIÖG* lxxv (1967), 66–103; cf. R. Lorenz, 'Reisen des Kaisers Leopold I und des Kurfursten Max Emanuel im Turkenjahr 1683', *MIÖG* lii (1938), 295–312, at 306–12. J. Kallbrunner. 'Das Wiener Hofquartierwesen und die Massnahmen gegen die Quartiersnot im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert', *MVGStW* v (1925), 24–36.

[75] Many travellers remark on the lack of pretension of the imperial palace: e.g. Freschot, op. cit. 5 f. (but contrast Browne, *Account*, 76); cf. *Geschichte der Stadt Wien*, iv, 386 f., 407–9; and earlier, *Particular State*, sig. C3ᵛ.

[76] *Geschichte der Stadt Wien*, iv, 375–410, *passim*, esp. 401 f. On Eggenberg: Heydendorff, op. cit. 150–2. Many of these palaces survive, some under different names (thus the Dietrichstein later became Lobkovic).

architecture dominated the townscape no less, with St. Stephen's and its episcopal palace (archiepiscopal by the 1730s) right in the centre of Vienna. The Jesuits had three houses, at the university, Am Hof, and in the Annagasse, with some 270 priests in the 1660s, while other orders were ubiquitous: Discalced Augustinians, Minorites, and Barnabites beside the Hofburg; Benedictines, canons regular, Dominicans, Franciscans, Capuchins, Teutonic and Maltese knights elsewhere in the old town; Brothers of Mercy and barefoot Carmelites in the Leopoldstadt and Piarists in the Josefstadt, Calced Augustinians on the Landstrasse and Trinitarians on the Alserstrasse, Servites in the Rossau, Minims in Wieden, and sandalled Carmelites 'in the limepit'. Add to these the convents, including three houses of unregulated canonesses, two of Franciscans, Carmelites, and Ursulines, and the property owned by *Stifte* like Heiligenkreuz, Klosterneuburg, and Göttweig, and clerical hegemony is evident. Its ultimate symbol was visible on top of the Kahlenberg: the monastery of Camaldulensians, least profitable of orders, established by imperial fiat in 1628.[77]

From the slopes of the Kahlenberg the Christian armies surged down to relieve Vienna in 1683: and it is interesting that the last tiny loophole in Catholicism's domestic defences was finally closed that same year, when Protestant services at embassies were declared out-of-bounds to Austrian subjects.[78] But if the capital's 100,000 people shared one religion they displayed little uniformity in other ways. Vienna's population included men from all over the *Reich*, Bohemia, and Hungary; *émigrés* from the Balkans and Eastern Europe; soldiers, priests, and artists from the whole Mediterranean area and Catholic Western Europe. The variegated, polyglot city certainly associated itself with the Habsburgs, and the Habsburgs returned the compliment, learning to speak the local dialect with

[77] See, in general, *Geschichte der Stadt Wien*, iv, 247–53, 264 f. (estimates of numbers ibid. 258 and 264 n.); and Czerny, *Tourist*, 123–8 (for 1650). My list is roughly complete for the year 1700 or thereabouts. On the extensive urban possessions of the wealthy *Stifte* see, most recently, F. Röhrig, 'Die Klosterneuburger Stiftshöfe in Wien', *Jb. d. St. Klnb.*, N. F. ix (1975), 21–65. The canonesses (at Himmelpforten, St. Laurenz, and St. Jakob auf der Hulben) were likewise wealthy and had a strongly aristocratic tinge.

[78] Loesche, *Protestantismus*, 123. Today's Kahlenberg was actually called 'Sauberg' in the 17th century, while the modern Leopoldsberg next to it, with its church dating from the 1670s, went by the name of 'Kahlenberg'.

notorious relish. Yet growth as a multinational capital turned Vienna away from any purely Austrian circumstances; to the very end of the Monarchy, even beyond (and this is a political fact of first importance), it remained in some measure estranged from its hinterland.[79]

Seventeenth-century Austria, we may conclude, was neither a nation, nor a political entity, but a working balance between the international and the sub-national, between the cosmopolitan and the provincial. Its Counter-Reformation establishment, while still welcoming immigrants to fill the gap created by the expulsion of heretics, became increasingly immobile and intolerant. None the less, the new system possessed real roots in society and culture at home, and it was not threatened from abroad, despite the 100,000 or so Protestant exiles who adopted a range of oppositional poses from the religious revivalists around Count Zinzendorf at Herrnhut to the Prussian Field Marshal Derfflinger.[80] The edifice of social control and spiritual absolutism erected in the hereditary lands affords a yardstick against which we can measure the less complete solutions achieved elsewhere in Central Europe.

[79] One of the best-known, though not the best, descriptions of the imperial city is by Mary Wortley Montagu, *Letters*, ed. R. Brimley Johnson (London 1906), 64 ff. The bizarrest is definitely that by the Turkish traveller and tall-story teller, Evliyā Çelebi: *Im Reiche des goldenen Apfels*, tr. and ed. R. Kreutel (Graz 1957).

[80] Nikolaus Ludwig Zinzendorf, chief founder of the Moravian Brethren, was a third-generation *émigré* in Saxony; but his two nephews, Ludwig Friedrich (1721–80), and Karl (1739–1813), the last of his family, both converted to Catholicism, returned to Austria, and became leading reformist politicians. Derfflinger (1606–1695), born in Upper Austria of peasant stock, was a key figure in the creation of the Prussian army (see *ADB* and *NDB*, s.v.).

CHAPTER 6

Bohemia: limited acceptance

The lands of St. Wenceslas were a simpler, more concentrated entity than the *Erblande*. Bohemia proper had been a single geographical unit since the ninth century with Prague as its natural centre, and subdivision into districts (*kraje*)—fourteen of them in this period[1]—bespoke little more than administrative convenience. Moravia formed a self-contained historical margravate, looking to its chief towns of Olomouc (Olmütz) and Brno (Brünn), the clerical and secular poles of its public life. There, as in Bohemia, two nationalities lived in reasonably well-demarcated juxtaposition: the Czech majority over most of the countryside, the German minority in towns and frontier regions. Certain institutions and customary practices progressively helped to bind together Bohemia, Moravia, and the other constituent parts of the kingdom: Silesia and the two Lusatias, Upper and Lower.[2] Nevertheless the basic political and ethnographical picture does not lack complexity: in western Bohemia, the region around Eger was ecclesiastically part of the diocese of Regensburg and constitutionally peculiar; in eastern Moravia, the boundary with Hungary ran across wild and ill-defined tracts and the upland settlers remained strongly idiosyncratic in their dialects and traditions.[3] Diversity was all the more characteristic of Silesia, which comprised a patchwork of some sixteen duchies, some controlled by the king, others by native princes who owed him merely a distant feudal vassalage. By 1600

[1] Pavel Stránský, *Respublica Bojema* (Leiden 1643), ch. 2; Balbín, *Miscellanea Historica*, i, bk. 3, 1–62. The 17th-century *kraje*, mostly named after towns, were: Boleslav, Königgrätz, Chrudim, Čáslav, Kouřim, Bechyně, Prácheň, Žatec, Litoměřice, Slaný, Rakovník, Podbrdsko, Vltavsko, and Pilsen; Bílek, *Dějiny konfiskací*, uses a slightly different list.

[2] J. Kalousek, *České státní právo* (2nd edn. Pr. 1892), 100 ff., 275 ff.; Rachfahl. op. cit. 134 ff.; and see the literature on Prague's court of appeal, above, p. 105, n. 62.

[3] For Eger see below, p. 299. J. Macůrek, *České země a Slovensko, 1620–1750* (Brno 1969), esp. 21 ff. Vlachs (Wallachians, on whom cf. above, pp. 76, 99), Lachs, and Hanáks were felt to be distinct racial communities.