

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, Evliya Çelebi: *Im Reiche der goldenen Äpfel*, tr. and ed. R. Kreurel (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 (1666-1695), 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 period¹—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; Balbin, *Miscellanea Historica*, i, bk. 3, 1-62. The 17th-century *kraje*, mostly named after towns, were: Boleslav, Koniggratz, Chrudim, Čáslav, Kouřim, Bechyně, Prácheň, Zatec, Litoměřice, Slaný, Rakovník, Podbrdsko, Vltavsko, and Pilsen; Bilek, *Dějiny konfiskací*, uses a slightly different list.

² J. Kalousek, *České ústředí 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. Macdrek, *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.

only two native dynasties survived: the Poděbrad dukes of Münsterberg, and the Piasts at Liegnitz, Brieg, and Wohlau; during the century both died out and their lands escheated to the crown. Even so, jurisdictions continued to be very jumbled and one territory, the county of Glatz, enjoyed some kind of separate status; a situation not simplified by the presence, beside a dominant German population, of many Poles (or quasi-Poles) and some Czechs.⁴ In truth Silesia, while sharing the essence of the Bohemian evolution, stands also a little apart from it; it forms a bridge to the rest of the German Empire, and I shall say more about it in chapter eight. The Lusatian duchies, occupied by Saxony as the price of her Habsburg alliance in 1620 and formally ceded fifteen years later by the Peace of Prague, do not belong here at all.

The seventeenth-century history of Bohemia and Moravia has often been made to appear, like their essential geography, simple and concentrated. After 1620, we are told, they experienced a political and social revolution; at their expense Counter-Reformation gained a classic victory. A Habsburg absolutism was imposed, Germanic and Viennese, alien to the Czechs, sullenly borne by the mass of a people ruined and denatured for the sake of imperial ambitions. That is a familiar tale in almost every text-book;⁵ but it is basically a nineteenth-century tale, contemporary events and attitudes heavily overlaid by the pathos of a later nationalism. From the days of C. A. Pescheck it has remained much better known, both at home and abroad, than the only serious rival interpretation, itself equally Czech-patriotic and nineteenth-century in spirit: the

⁴ It is difficult to be precise about the number of duchies in Silesia, since some had coalesced, or at least were normally ruled together, while others might be hived off as appanages for a limited period or sank to the level of a large *Herrschaft*. The 17th-century list appears to be, in Lower Silesia: Breslau and Neisse, Schweidnitz and Jauer, Münsterberg and Öls, Glogau and Sagan, Liegnitz, Brieg, and Wohlau; in Upper Silesia: Oppeln and Raubor, Troppau and Jägerndorf, Teschen. Cf. below, pp. 299 ff. Although the 'dukes of Münsterberg' lived on until 1647, they were by that time in fact only rulers of tiny Öls (having sold Münsterberg to pay their debts), a circumstance which confused even the peacemakers at Westphalia!

⁵ This presentation—while going back in some measure to the Protestant *émigrés*—really originated with Pescheck, *op. cit.* It was continued by—among others—Bilek, *Reformace katolícká*, etc.; Denis-Vancura, *op. cit.*; Prokeš in *Čeikoslovenská vlastivěda*, iv (Pr. 1932), 491–571; R. J. Kerner, *Bohemia in the Eighteenth Century* (New York 1932), 13 ff.; and it has been transmitted, with some modifications, into Marxist historiography. The latest summary, fair-minded but brief, is Richter in *Handbuch*, ed. Bosl, ii, 281–379.

Catholic apologia for the *res gestae* of the Bohemian Counter-Reformation.⁶ We must now examine, in the light of the larger Central European patterns already sketched, how far this very negative view of Bohemia's development can be sustained.

There is no doubt about imposition and upheaval in the 1620s. Transfer of property took place on a staggering scale, even by the standards of a modern land reform. Bilek's statistics show that slightly more than one-half of all estates changed hands, and an even higher proportion of large ones. This was not, except in the case of the ringleaders of rebellion, naked legal expropriation, but it amounted to something very similar: property would often be temporarily confiscated, then compulsorily alienated in a buyers' market, or else returned dilatorily, grudgingly, and only in part. Indeed, the assumption of guilt went very deep: minor offenders found their lands converted into crown fiefs; even those willing to convert and declared innocent by commissions of retribution had to make a pious contribution to the Jesuit university.⁷ Claims and counter-claims were still being haggled over at the end of the century. Individuals and whole communities which had played no part at all in the revolt were ruined. Many examples might be cited of a direct perversion of justice—Saxony could not protect the aristocrat Otto Heinrich Wartenberg from total loss, though he had express guarantees dating from before the White Mountain. Vengeance was largely wrought by a clique around Liechtenstein, including Wallenstein, Michna, the Jew Bassevi, and the Calvinist financier de Witte, which added financial swindle to its rapaciousness. The operation was, at best, only semi-Bohemian, and those who profited were foreign mercenaries and courtiers, while the long list of emigrants included names resonant throughout the country's Middle Ages and Renaissance.⁸

⁶ All the existing relevant Czech Catholic literature was listed by J. Tumpach and A. Podlaha, *Bibliografie české katolícké literatury náboženské, 1828–1913*, 1–v (Pr. 1912–1923), esp. 1210 ff. Between the Wars the school of Josef Pekař adopted a similar standpoint.

⁷ Bilek, *Dějiny konfiskací*, i, pp. cxlviii–cl and *passim*. E. Schebek, 'Die ferdinandische Fundation', *MYGDB* xviii (1880), 161–81.

⁸ Gindely, *Gegenreformation*, esp. 44–50 (on Wartenberg), and 327–64 (on the financial consortium); Bilek, *Reformace katolícká*, 169–228. But the members of the *commissio executionis* and *commissio confiscationis* (listed by Bilek, *Dějiny konfiskací*, i, pp. xxxiv, lxi) were very largely Bohemians.

The climax of this process was a 'renewed' constitution (*Obnovené zřízení zemské*; *Verneuerte Landesordnung*) decreed in 1627, over the heads of the estates and their once-powerful diet, the *sněm*, which had not been summoned since the fateful battle. To help him prepare it, Ferdinand II called on both Bohemian and non-Bohemian counsellors, and the latter's role was especially important: the eight-man committee of 1625 included the Austrian chancellor, Werdenberg, the imperial vice-chancellor, Stralendorf, and the high-flying intellectual convert, Otto Melander, as well as the naturalized Liechtenstein (a Moravian subject, of course) and Otto von Nostitz from Lusatia. That committee's findings were revised by a smaller, *ad hoc* body including the heir to the throne, Eggenberg, and Harrach (father of Prague's archbishop). Subdued *sněmy* ratified the document for Bohemia during the bleak autumn of 1627, then extended it to Moravia the following year. In 1640 certain modifications were introduced, largely to incorporate legal judgments of a Roman and imperial hue.⁹

The main provisions of the *Obnovené zřízení zemské* may be summarized under eight heads, as follows.¹⁰ Firstly, the principle of elective monarchy was abolished; the Bohemian-crown became hereditary in the house of Habsburg, and the venerable—and lucrative—office of burgrave of Karlstein (where the regalia were kept) was suppressed. Secondly, the clergy, politically impotent since the Hussite wars, recovered their position as the first estate of the realm. Thirdly, Rudolf's Letter of Majesty was abrogated and all non-Catholic religions, except the Jewish, were declared illegal. Fourthly, the sovereign was to be author of all legislation, a stipulation soon mitigated when the diets regained some powers of initiative in 1640. Fifthly, state functionaries, whether central or local, must henceforth swear an oath to the king alone, no longer to

⁹ Gindely, *Gegenreformation*, 467 ff.; Kalousek, op. cit. 391–434. On Melander cf. above, p. 106. The other members of the larger committee were Wallenstein and the lawyers Hillebrand (an aulic councillor, like Melander) and Hassolt (a Bohemian appeal judge); of the revision committee: Slavata, Werdenberg, and Nostitz. For the 1640 *deklaratoria* and *novelly* see Kalousek, op. cit. 459–61; Rezek, *Děje*, 45–55.

¹⁰ The text (Czech and German) was published by H. Jireček (ed.), *Constitutiones regni Bohemiae anno 1627 reformatae* (Pr.–V.–Leipzig 1888). Cf. Kalousek, op. cit. 434 ff.; Denis-Vautour, op. cit. i, 1, 124 ff. J. Čelakovský in *OSN VI* (1893) contrasts the pre-1620 situation (pp. 487–519) with the post-1627 one (519–39). The Moravian document was somewhat different and marginally less severe.

the 'commonwealth of Bohemia' (*obec království českého*) as well, and all, from grand burgrave of Prague and Moravian *hejman* downwards, could be replaced after five years. Sixthly, existing powers of the crown to hear appeals from any-law-court were strengthened. As a consequence of this and the previous point the Bohemian chancery, now operating from Vienna, gained added authority, and a new supreme tribunal was set up for Moravia with both administrative and judicial functions.¹¹ Seventhly, the king, not the estates, would in future control the *inkolát* and grant patents of Bohemian nobility, thus bypassing the reiterated requirement for his servants to be natives of the realm. Finally, the German language was raised to equality with Czech for all state purposes; and in fact only a German version of the new constitution appeared in print (though that was probably an accident).¹²

Like other key constitutional statements in Habsburg history: the *Privilegium Maius*, the Pragmatic Sanction, the *Ausgleich*—the *Obnovené zřízení zemské* by no means disposed of all issues in clear-cut fashion. It was not explicit about how to resolve possible conflicts between imperial Roman law and Bohemian common law; it adopted contradictory positions on the status of further, unmentioned aspects of the constitution: promises to confirm them may be set against the sovereign claim to 'extend, alter, and amend'. Yet, for all its involved language and its superficial adherence to the format of earlier *Landesordnungen*, it is a very severe document. It appears to change the whole character of public affairs in Bohemia and Moravia (Silesia was unaffected). Not totally, for the monarch had already been chief legislator, senior executive—nominating officers from a list presented to him, fount of justice, dispenser of nobility; but radically, since the dual system, whereby crown and estates balanced each other and perforce worked in partnership, seems to be destroyed.

¹¹ Fellner-Kretschmayr, op. cit. ii, 440–54, 474–98, for the Bohemian chancery; on the Moravian tribunal see below, n. 39. The grand burgrave (*Oberburggraf*, *nejvyšší purkrabí*) of Prague, despite his name, was a kind of royal vicegerent throughout Bohemia proper, and not to be confused with the *hejman* of Prague castle, a military appointment usually held by a knight.

¹² On the *inkolát*: A. Gindely, 'Die Entwicklung des böhmischen Adels und der Inkolatsverhältnisse seit dem 16. Jahrhundert', *Abhandlungen der k. böhmischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, ser. vii, 1, ph.-h. Kl. 3 (Pr. 1886). On the language: id., *Gegenreformation*, 484–7; Zibrť, *BOČ* iv, nos. 10338–60.

On paper the new *Landesordnung* came near to expressing what later Habsburg lawyers would call the principle of forfeiture (*Verwirkung*): the rebel province has lost all its rights, and what remains to it, remains by royal favour alone. The distinguished Czech historian, Anton Gindely, writing in the 1890s, certainly thought so; for him the Habsburgs now possessed the power freely to alter Bohemian public law, to abrogate all privileges not specifically confirmed, to drive a coach and horses through the country's traditional political arrangements. Ironically, most of his patriotic contemporaries took a different view: committed to their nineteenth-century assertion of the continuity of the Bohemian constitution, they were forced to argue that in theory the *Obnovené zřízení zemské* actually confirmed all privileges not abrogated.¹³ It was the subsequent *practice* of government which turned Bohemia (so they thought) into a mere dependency of Vienna. But that, as I shall hope to show, is to reverse the relation between the new forms and their implementation, to mistake coach for horses. The Bohemian state coach was now, indeed, heavily stacked with Habsburg luggage; but the ruling house provided no new equipage to draw it. In fact the decades of turmoil between 1620 and 1650 disguise an autonomous domestic development running beside, and interacting with, the military and political authority of the Habsburgs and the strategy of their Counter-Reformation. A further set of causative factors, beginning earlier and continuing later, validated and impressed their own seal on the whole evolution. Again, as with Austria, I shall consider in turn the role played by aristocracy and Catholic Church, and the relations of each to the dynasty.

The rise of magnates is especially clear within the Bohemian nobility. The land settlement after 1620 hastened the elimination of the knights, many of whom emigrated or fell into such penury that those who remained lacked any collective influence, and the collapse of the towns, especially the royal ones. Curiously, the last great

¹³ Gindely, *Gegenreformation*, esp. 471-3. Gindely had a German father and a Czech mother; his position lies close to that adopted—for more partisan reasons—by many Bohemian German historians. For the opposite view see (e.g.) Kalousek, loc. cit.; V. V. Tomek, *Sněmy české die obnověného zřízení zemského Ferdinand II* (Pr. 1868), 1-12 and *passim*; and—in modified form—Denis-Vancúra, loc. cit.

expression of Bohemia's pre-1620 social mobility was the chance to leave the country, and some 150,000 people trod the path into exile. By mid-century a much more closed caste occupied the summit of the new hierarchy.¹⁴

The first and most notorious beneficiary of Habsburg victory was the international *so/datěna*, which the dynasty paid off in estates for want of cash. Charles Bucquoy de Longueval (died in 1621), from Artois, was given lands in the south sequestered from the Švamberks (successors to the Rožmberks) even before the White Mountain. Baltazar Marradas (died in 1638), a Spanish soldier of fortune, descended with his mercenaries like leeches on the area around Pilsen, and gained the valuable castle of Hluboká, as did his fellow-countryman, Guillermo Verdugo, that at Doupov. Worst scourge of all, Martin Huerta (as he called himself, though really an impoverished petty noble from the Southern Netherlands) amassed extensive Bohemian properties. There were others during the 1620s: Julius Heinrich of Saxe-Lauenburg, who bought Ostrov (Schlackenwerth), with its rich mines; and a further convert from a north-German ruling family, Bruno von Mansfeld, who acquired Dobřis, having proved himself as devoted a supporter of the Habsburgs as his distant, lifelong Catholic cousin Ernst was their enemy; even the Rhenish clan of Metternich, whose new estate at Königswart, near Eger, would achieve fame only two centuries later.¹⁵ A few court *arrivistes* from abroad likewise staked their claim: among them Francesco de Magni, or Magnis, and the two Questenbergs, Hermann and Gerhard, who had influential brothers in the Counter-Reformation clergy.

Yet the greatest court *arriviste* was local: Pavel Michna (died in

¹⁴ The basic sources for what follows are articles in *OSN* (many by A. Sedláček), s.v.; some entries in Wurzbach; and the genealogical summaries from a 19th-century perspective in R. J. Meraviglia-Crivelli, *Der böhmische Adel* (Nuremberg, 1886) and H. von Kadich, *Der mährische Adel* (ibid. 1887). Bilek, *Dějiny konfiskací*, contains much information, and there is good evidence of the state of land-holding by the 1650s in *Bernti ruda*, ed. K. Doskočil *et al.*, i-iii, 8-xiii, xviii-xix, xxiii, xxvi-xxviii, xxxi-xxxiii (Pr. 1950-5, n.m.p.), esp. i, 69-126 (by G. Čechová). Zibrť, *BCH* i, nos. 6068-23194, provides a vast bibliographical apparatus for noble families and their leading members, but very few have found serious historians, and some—especially those long-extinct—slip through the net entirely.

¹⁵ Königswart (Kynžvart) was only an outlying possession for the family, though one Philipp von Metternich (died in 1698), a direct ancestor of the chancellor, was burgrave of Eger in the mid-17th century.

1632), once a chancery secretary, then *éminence grise* behind the consortium which debauched the country's finances in 1623, who rose to be Count of Vacinov (Weizenhofen), wealthy landlord, and builder of a large palace on the Little Side of Prague. And the greatest freebooter came from the ranks of the native nobility: Albrecht von Waldstein, known to the world as Wallenstein. His dizzy ascent through the 1620s to become imperial generalissimo, Duke of Sagan in Silesia and of Mecklenburg in the *Reich*, was founded on immense acquisitions of land and resources in Bohemia: a conglomerate of estates named after the castle of Friedland, though actually centred on the little town of Jičín (Gitschin). Let us not forget that he could style himself Prince of Friedland by 1623, Duke of Friedland by 1625, before ever he wielded the general's baton. Carefully rounded-off, administered, and nurtured, the richest lands in the valley of the Elbe belonged by the early 1630s either to Wallenstein, or to his close confidants and fellow-countrymen, Adam Trčka and Vilém Kinský.¹⁶ So things might have remained, had not the 'accident' of Wallenstein's overweening ambition and suspicion of the court entailed the disgrace and murder of all three in 1634.

Only then did a second wave of rootless *condottieri* gain rich Bohemian pickings. They were led by two Italians: Octavio Piccolomini (1599-1656), Wallenstein's military successor, who took over the Trčka lands around Náchod; and Matthias Gallas (1584-1647), Habsburg war-chief by the 1640s, who settled at Friedland and Reichenberg (Liberec). Johann Aldringen (1588-1634), from Lorraine, one of the more gifted imperial commanders, received Teplitz as the price of his loyalty. And so it went on down to the Celtic fringe of actual assassins: John Gordon, garrison commandant at Eger on that fatal February day, Walter Butler, Walter Leslie, Walter Devereux.¹⁷ The end of the war saw some further grants and purchases: for General Werth and his deputy, Johann von Sporck; for the military architect Pieroni; for the Huguenot Louis de Souches, who gallantly defended Brno against his former paymasters, the Swedes, in 1645 and later converted. But

¹⁶ Bliek, *Dějiny konfiskací*, II, 732-832; A. Ernstberger, *Wallenstein als Volkswirt im Herzogtum Friedland* (Reichenberg 1929); Polišenský, *Thirty Years War*, 181 ff., 197-200; Mann, *op. cit.* esp. 160-6, 181-6, 222-40.

¹⁷ Bliek, *loc. cit.*; Mann, *op. cit.* 834-52, 865-9.

in sum the legend of vast acquisitions by a corps of cosmopolitan officers outstrips the reality. Moreover, their enjoyment of Bohemian possessions was rarely long-lived: the Souches lasted until 1736, Gallas, Piccolomini, and Qwestenberg until the mid-eighteenth century, Mansfeld until 1780, Leslie until 1802, Bucquoy and Sporck until the end of the Monarchy. But those families were the exceptions, and even they wielded little political influence; members, indeed, of the new ruling group, most proved inactive ones.¹⁸

The second category of aristocrats in seventeenth-century Bohemia was made up of loyal Catholic families, mostly established nobility, transplanted there from other parts of the Monarchy. Some of these were essentially soldiers of fortune, conspicuous among them the Tyrolean Christoph Simon von Thun, whose descendants dug themselves in for centuries around Tetschen and Klösterle, and several Friulian families: Colloredo and Collalto; the brothers Camillo and Paolo Morzin, who gained large holdings from the 1630s onwards; Francesco Clary and his son Geronimo, heir by marriage to the Aldringen fortune. We can find more evidence of overlap with the *condottieri* already discussed: Leslie had already settled in Styria; Aldringen's brother was bishop of Seckau; even the Gallases—though often taken for Spaniards—were actually rural nobility from the Habsburg Trentino. Yet, while such Central European immigrants may originally have settled in Bohemia by virtue of their military credentials, many others had little or no connection with the army. Their arrival was not necessarily bound to the events immediately after 1620 at all.

We have already encountered Liechtensteins and Dietrichsteins as major proprietors in pre-war Moravia. Their position was confirmed as outright dominance of the margravate by mid-century, and the Liechtensteins especially, given nearly limitless opportunities during Karl's governorship, made large purchases in Bohemia—more than had been bargained for even by the dynasty, which initiated lengthy (albeit half-hearted) litigation against his

¹⁸ Perhaps the only important exceptions are Johann Wenzel Gallas, diplomat and viceroy of Naples, who died in 1719 (see, most recently, E. Jarnut-Derbolav, *Die österreichische Gesandtschaft in London, 1701-11* (Bonn 1972), 171-529), and two Mansfelds who occupied high court positions simultaneously in the early 18th century; and even these were not really Bohemian politicians.

son.¹⁹ Similarly the Thurn-Valsassinas were a Bohemian family both before and after the white Mountain, though they had to ride the proscriptio of Heinrich Matthias's branch. Whereas one or two of Austria's rising magnate houses burst upon the Bohemian scene without any genteel preliminaries, notably the Eggenbergs at Krumlov and the Trautmannsdorfs at Litomyšl, others possessed longer links with the country: Harrachs and Althans gained the *inkolát* before 1600; the cosmopolitan Salm began amassing lands in Moravia from 1604, the Styrian Rottals from 1612. Hungarian aristocrats too moved into Moravia: Forgách, Erdődy, Apponyi, Dóczy, Pálffy, Illésházy, even the nephew of Cardinal Pázmány. The Barons Serényi, having established a foothold there in 1614, advanced so far as to provide the provincial *hejtman* between 1655 and 1664.²⁰

These families proved much more lasting and consequential than the footloose soldiery. They form the bulk of the foreigners who owned some two-fifths of Bohemia's peasantry in 1650, and their residence was often permanent.²¹ But they exercised little power in their adopted country, especially in Bohemia proper, and for that kind of influence we must look elsewhere. However ragged its colours, however decimated its ranks, the old nobility of Bohemia still provided political leadership in the state.

*

The Bohemian *šlechta*—to use the Czech word is not to deny a German element within it—underwent the transition to an élite of magnates in extreme degree.²² Again the process was in good

¹⁹ Karl Liechtenstein had 3,672 Moravian subject families in 1618 (already more than anyone else), his son Karl Eusebius 9,349 in the 1640s (and his two brothers 3,906 and 2,204); by the 1690s the family possessed more than 19,000 peasant families there, some 20 per cent of the total. The Dietrichsteins had 1,652 in 1618 (excluding the bishopric), 5,628 in the 1640s, and more than 6,000 in the 1690s (Matějek, 'Bílá Hora', 83–5, 92, 94). Gindely, *Gegenreformation*, 360 ff.

²⁰ Macúrek, *České země a Slovensko*, 40; Pázmány, *Levél*, nos. 535, 609, 674, 895, 907, 916, 935, 944, 994, 1009, 1032, 1056. On the Serényis: Matějek, art. cit. 93 f., Polišenský, op. cit. 247 ff.

Placht points out (*ibid.* 259 ff.), that immigrant lords tended to settle in German areas.

²² For what follows see—besides OSM, Würzbach, Zedler, and (marginally) Meraviglia-Crivelli, op. cit. and Kadich, op. cit.—F. Vlasák, *Der altböhmische Adel und seine Nachkommenschaft nach dem dreissigjährigen Kriege* (Pr. [1866]), who studies

measure an organic one, begun well before 1620: while certain powerful houses fell away through natural wastage (Hradec (Neuhaus) in 1604, Rožmberk in 1611, Smiřický in 1627, Pernstein in 1631, Wartenberg in 1632, Trčka in the Eger bloodbath of 1634), others entrenched themselves ever more firmly with the triple guarantee of latifundium, Catholic orthodoxy, and fairly unswerving dynastic loyalty. By the late seventeenth century the inner circle seems to have comprised a mere ten families, almost all of which had once been infected with Protestantism, if not involved in the rebellion itself.

Primi inter pares came to the Lobkovičes, a numerous clan which rode the disgrace of Jiří in the 1590s and the Lutheranism of its Hassenstein branch to emerge with unrivalled lustre through the intransigent Bohemian chancellor, Zdeněk Vojtěch, and his son, Václav Eusebius. Zdeněk Vojtěch (1568–1628), married to the vivacious and domineering heiress of the Pernsteins, was created prince in 1624 for his incalculable services to Ferdinand II. Václav Eusebius (1609–77), president of the War Council and chief minister to Leopold I, acquired the immediate county of Sternstein in the Empire in 1641, became Duke of Sagan in Silesia five years later (shades of Wallenstein!), and established an entail for the vast estates around Raudnitz on the Elbe. Though his fall from power briefly seemed to threaten sequestration and disaster, his son—a mediocre personality—retained all the family influence and married into the ruling houses of Nassau, Baden, and Schwarzenberg.²³

The Waldsteins survived still rougher upsets: not only the heady career of the generalissimo Albrecht, but the pugnacious Protestantism of several other members, like the printer Heník, who perished in exile. Yet four generations of seventeenth-century Waldsteins held the highest offices of state at Prague and Vienna.

the fate of the whole pre-1620 nobility and finds a surprising measure of survival; and R. Procházka, *Genealogisches Handbuch erlöschener Herrenstandsfamilien* (Neustadt a.d. Aisch 1973), with purely genealogical information about extinct families. Neither Vlasák nor Procházka includes Moravia. There are extensive family trees in Balbin, *Miscellanea Historica*, II (cf. below, p. 215).

²³ There is an extraordinary lack of serious literature on this most powerful of old-Czech families. See Vlasák, op. cit. 63–6; OSM, s.v., and Würzbach, s.v. 'Lobkowitz' (thorough). For Jiří and Zdeněk Vojtěch cf. above, p. 48; for Václav Eusebius, above, p. 144; and the life by A. Wolf cited there, and Z. Kalista, *Čechané, kteří roořili dějiny svéta* (Pr. 1939), 179–89.

Henik's cousin Adam (died in 1638), one of the leading Catholic advocates of political moderation both before and after 1620, became grand burgrave of the kingdom when that post re-emerged on Liechtenstein's death in 1627. His son Maximilian (who grew up under the wing of Albrecht) was master of the horse and high chamberlain to Ferdinand III; three of Maximilian's sons served Leopold, the youngest, Karl Ferdinand (1634-1702), likewise as high chamberlain and as major-domo to the young Empress Eleonora. He and his own son Karl Ernst (yet another high chamberlain) were also prominent diplomats. Meanwhile the fourth son of Maximilian ruled the archdiocese of Prague between 1676 and 1694.²⁴

Perhaps—after all—some significance lies in the fact that the Waldsteins, while retaining possession of Albrecht's magnificent palace on the Little Side (which people still often called the *Palais Friedland*), were rarely, after 1634, given high *Bohemian* posts, with all their opportunities for intrigue. The reverse was true of two ancient Czech families much more prominent in their own country than outside it, and now bound by the peculiar ties which unite fellow-defenestrates: Slavata and Martinic. The rebel action on 23 May 1618 has commonly been accounted a tactical mistake, a piece of misguided victimization; but perhaps it erred only in so far as Vilém Slavata and Jaroslav Martinic escaped with their lives, for they were indeed formidable men and rightly marked as the leaders of Catholic extremism. After 1620, invested with the halo of martyrdom divinely averted (and granted uncommonly long careers, perhaps through the same agency), they dominated Bohemian politics: Slavata as chancellor from 1628 to 1652, Martinic as grand burgrave from 1638 to 1649. Both placed the enhanced family possessions on a secure and ordered foundation: the Slavatas, who, as heirs to the lords of Hradec, were second in riches only to the Lobkovices, around Jindřichův Hradec in the south; the Martinices around Smečno and Slaný west of Prague. Whereas Slavata's sons died comparatively young, Bernard Ignác

²⁴ Vlasák, op. cit. 69 f., and comprehensive treatment in OSN s.v. 'Valdstein', and Wurzbach, s.v. On Henik, cf. above, pp. 102 f.; on Adam: Gindely, *Dreisigjähriger Krieg*, i, 382-6, 460 ff. *passim*. On Karl Ferdinand: Kalista, *Čechové, 167-76*. On Archbishop Johann Friedrich: M. Kinter in *ÖVjschr. f. Kath. Theol.* viii (1869), 525-72; ix (1870), 7-44, uncritical.

Martinic—once ransomed with his aged father from Swedish custody in 1648—became the foremost domestic politician of the next generation, grand burgrave for a remarkable span of thirty-year years from 1651. At the end of the seventeenth century, Slavatas and Martinices held an unassailable position in Bohemian society, one confirmed by a special superior status at the diet. Only human mortality could intervene: ironically paired again, they proved the only two families in this group not to survive as powerful dynasties until the end of the Monarchy. The Martinices died out in 1789, their name and possessions (like those of Gallas) being inherited by the Upper Austrian Clams; the Slavatas expired as early as 1712, when not one of Vilém's four prominent grandsons could produce an heir. The most important Slavata estates passed to the related Czech magnate family of Černín.²⁵

The Černíns offer a classic paradigm of Reformation and Counter-Reformation vicissitudes: of three early seventeenth-century brothers, the eldest became major-domo to King Frederick and perished on the scaffold; the youngest, Hefman, an ambitious Catholic courtier, rose to be chief judge, high steward of Bohemia, and imperial diplomat, amassing a large fortune in lands (albeit lands devastated by war). His estates passed to the grandson of the middle, unadventurous brother. This grandson, Humprecht Jan (1628-82) was one of Leopold I's closest friends, a *grand seigneur* who commissioned the most monumental of all Prague's Baroque palaces; his own heir served as grand burgrave between 1704 and 1710. Similar success attended the Kinskýs, who in this period abandoned the original, less mellifluous form of their name: Vchynský. Of four Kinský brothers in the generation of 1618-20, two acted as rebel leaders, while a third, Vilém, was slaughtered with Wallenstein. But the eldest, Václav—although the arch-intriguer among them all—survived the crisis; his son married a

²⁵ OSN, s.v.; Wurzbach, s.v. 'Clam-Martinitz'; and Procházka, op. cit. 183-6, 281-6, are the only real sources. On Vilém Slavata and Jaroslav Martinic see also above, pp. 48, 63, 66 f.; *Rudolf II*, 69 and n.; and the correspondence between them printed by F. Tischer in *SbH (Rezek)*, i (1883), 305-22; ii (1884), 32-7, 92-8; iii (1885), 193-202, 253-92, 360-4. For their special rank at the *sněm* (immediately behind them came the Waldsteins and Trautmannsdorfs; the Lobkovices—being princes—were a different case) see Gindely, *Gegeuerreformation*, 476 f., 500-3. The ransom paid in 1648 for the two Martinices amounted to 60,000 guldens (Rezek, *Dějiny*, i, 34). On Bernard Ignác, see below, pp. 231 f.

Portia, and his grandson, Franz Ulrich (1634–99), became one of the most significant courtier-diplomats of the Leopoldine era. Thus by 1700 the Kinskýs too were confirmed as both mighty aristocrats and devoted Habsburg servants: between 1683 and 1745 no less than four of them held the office of Bohemian chancellor.²⁶

Four more families complete this select list. The Sternbergs—more Czech than German, despite the name—had produced in Adam (died in 1623) the chief Catholic conciliator of the years before 1618. Though his policies were outrun by events, his successors adapted themselves to changed circumstances. His son was made chief judge; his grandsons were characteristic representatives of the magnate culture of the Bohemian Baroque: Wenzel Adalbert builder of two elegant Prague palaces, on the Little Side and at Troya; Ignaz Karl a bibliophile and traveller. Adam's great nephew, Adolf Wratislav, was a confidant of Leopold I and grand burgrave between 1685 and 1703; another branch of the family intermarried closely with the Martinics.²⁷ Equally ramified were the Kolovrats: their Libsteinský line, with entailed estates centred on Reichenau in north-east Bohemia, conspicuous above all in the *Hofkammer* president and grand burgrave, Ulrich Franz (1609–50), and his nephews Franz Karl, long-serving *hejtmán* of Moravia, Ferdinand Ludwig, grand prior of the Maltese order, and Johann Wilhelm, postulated archbishop of Prague (who died before his consecration); the collateral line of Krakovský unfolded more fully in the eighteenth century. The Schlicks, long the chief landowners in north-west Bohemia and exploiters of the famous mines of

²⁶ Vlasák, op. cit. 50–5. The colourful 17th-century Cerrúns have attracted two outstanding Czech historians: Pekat, *Kost*, esp. I, 121–76; Z. Kalista, *Mládí Humprechta Jana Cerrúna z Chudenic, zrození barokního kavalíra* (Pr. 1932); id. (ed.), *Korespondence Zuzany Cerrúnové ... s jejím synem Humprechtem Janem Cerrúnem* (Pr. 1941); cf. id., *Čechové*, 203–11; and above, p. 144, n. 70. Heřman's mission to the Porte in 1644 is described by F. Tischer, *Die zweite Gesandtschaftsreise des Grafen Hermann Czermin nach Constantinopel* (Neuhaus 1879). The equally colourful 17th-century Kinskýs seem to have been passed by, except for Kalista, *Čechové*, 193–200, on Franz Ulrich.

²⁷ J. Tanner, *Geschichte derer Helden von Sternern oder des ... Geschlechts von Sternberg* (Pr. 1732), pt. 2, written in the 1670s, reaches only to 1576. See also Vlasák, op. cit. 67–9; OSN s.v. 'Sternberk'; and Wurzbach, s.v. On Ignaz Karl: UK, MSS. XVII A 25, IV D 11, VIII G 18 (travels); below, p. 314 (library). On Adolf Wratislav: above, p. 145, n. 71. For information about the lesser, Holic line (which produced two bishops): V. Schulz (ed.), *Korespondence hr. Václava Jřířiho Holického ze Sternberka* (Pr. 1898).

Joachimsthal, confirmed their position after the White Mountain, despite the arch-treason of Joachim Andreas, through his distant cousin Heinrich (died in 1650), field-marshal and president of the War Council. Heinrich initiated the usual process of founding a *Fideicommissum*; his grandson was Bohemian chancellor. Finally come the Nostitzes, a family of Lusatian and Silesian extraction, which spread across the Bohemian border both before and after 1620. The convert Otto enjoyed much royal favour as vice-chancellor of the kingdom from 1622 until his death in 1639. His nephews Otto and Johann Hartwig consolidated the advantage, the latter as chancellor from 1652 to 1683, constructing in the process one of Prague's most beautiful palaces and acquiring the sovereign county of Rieneck in Franconia.²⁸

In Moravia the caste of historic families grew even smaller. Beside the Liechtensteins and Dietrichsteins, who so vastly extended their land-holding from bases in the south as to own one-quarter of the margravate by 1700 and shared with the Habsburgs the perquisites of Olomouc, most spacious of all bishoprics inside the Monarchy,²⁹ only the Kounices showed a real advance. While Oldřich of Kounice, the lord of Austerlitz, had been a firm Protestant, his orphaned son Lev Vilém (1614–55), brother to two rebels but converted and guided by Cardinal Dietrichstein, restored the family fortunes. Lev Vilém's son was Dominik Andreas (1655–1705), diplomat and imperial vice-chancellor. The next generation produced a bishop and a Moravian *hejtmán*, and acquired the immediate county of Rietberg in the Empire. Then followed the famous chancellor, known to us in the German spelling of his name: Prince Wenzel Anton Kaunitz.³⁰

Alongside this inner élite in the lands of the Bohemian crown

²⁸ Vlasák, op. cit. 56–60, 66 f. There is little on the Kolovrats (Ger.: Kolowrat) or Schlicks (Cz.: Šlik) beyond OSN and Wurzbach, s.vv.; but the Nostitzes have also G. A. Nostitz, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Nostitz*, i–ii (Leipzig 1874–6); and lengthy treatment in V. Boetticher, *Geschichte des oberlausitzischen Adels*, ii (Oberlössnitz bei Dresden 1913), s.v. Cf. also Rudolf II, 232–6; unfortunately the official and family documents in *The Nostitz Papers*, ed. E. J. Labarre (Hilversum 1956), are examined only for their watermarks, and the result is useless for historical purposes.

²⁹ Franz Dietrichstein was bishop from 1599 until 1636, then Habsburg archdukes between 1637 and 1644 (above, p. 135, n. 47), and Karl Liechtenstein-Castelcorno (a collateral line) from 1664 until 1695. Dietrichstein's vicar-general, Jan Platejs (cf. below, p. 217) was elected in 1636 over the head of Archduke Leopold Wilhelm, but he died before his consecration.

³⁰ Vlasák, op. cit. 61–3; Procházka, op. cit. 137–43 (the Kaunitzes died out in (continued)

stood an outer circle of middling aristocrats, comprising hardly more than a further fifteen or twenty families.³¹ Some tended to decline during the period, like Berka of Dubá, one of the most powerful Moravian clans about 1600, and aggressively Catholic in two of its branches, but extinguished by 1706; Talberk and Říčanský; Vřesovec, sustained a little by the plunder of Vilém, master of the mint during the 1620s; even Vrba, which still provided a grand burgrave between 1712 and 1734. Others were gradually rising: Vrba (Johann Franz Vrba was Bohemian chancellor from 1700 to 1705); Vratislav of Mitrovic, one of whose number, the highly accomplished 'Count Vratislav' at the court of St. James's, arranged the diplomatic contacts between Marlborough and Prince Eugene; Lažanský and Hrzán, and—in a more modest way—Podstátský or Sedlnický. A few made startling recoveries from deep complicity in the events of 1618–20. The descendants of two executed noble ringleaders were readmitted to the establishment as counts (one of them headed the government of Vienna during the 1683 siege; another put down the revolt of the peasantry three years earlier with an equally iron hand).³² The Calvinist Žerotíns, greatest house in the whole of Moravia before the revolt, hung on through a single, subdued, Catholic branch. One or two major native families of Silesia, primarily Schaffgotsch and Oppersdorf, played a sufficient role in the kingdom at large to merit inclusion here and round off the picture.³³

1913); F. Hrubý, 'Český poutník v Assisi r. 1636', *CCH* xxii (1926), 283–98 (on Lev Vilém); G. Klungenstein, *Der Aufstieg des Hauses Kaunitz* (Göttingen 1975). On the Kaunitz estates see also J. Válka, 'Sociální poměry na uherskobrodském panství v 17. století', *ČMM* lxxi (1952), 217–47; on Rietberg: G. Benecke, *Society and politics in Germany, 1500–1750* (London 1974), 133–6.

³¹ A certain number of families ranked as counts for all or most of the period 1620–1720 appear to have had little or no public role: examples are Gutenstein, Hoditz, and Bubna.

³² On Kaspar Kaplitz, hero of the siege but grandson of a traitor, see F. Mareš, 'Hrabě Kaspar Zdeněk Kaplitz', *ČCM* lvii (1883), 3–45, 219–54; F. Houdek, 'Obráncé Vídne proti Turkům ... v lidovém podání', *ČL* xxii (1913), 209–20; Kalista, *Čechové*, 155–64. Christoph Wilhelm Harant, the hammer of the peasants (Kočel, *Boje*, 85–8; id., *Frydantsko*, ch. 3; Kašpar, *Novotříběžští pozstávání*, 77), was son of an emigré, Jan Jirfi (cf. above, p. 70, n. 70, and Mencič in *ČCM* lxi (1887), 488–95), and great-nephew of the arch-tyrant, Kryštof Harant (cf. *Rudolf II*, 191–2, 278), whose book of travels he had reissued in German translation (Nuremberg 1678), with a fulsome dedication to Leopold I.

³³ Johann Ernst Schaffgotsch became grand burgrave from 1734 to 1747. Cf. below, pp. 300 f.

*

This closely intermarried upper *šlechta*, as our genealogical sketches have already indicated, formed the political nation of Bohemia after 1620, as it had done on a far broader base before.³⁴ Its status was confirmed by the grant of titles from the Habsburgs, though again (compare the Austrian case) they were the gloss on a profounder evolution. Indeed, Bohemian aristocrats wielded conspicuous power, power out of proportion to their small numbers, in the imperial counsels at Vienna. For all Leopold's playful view of his 'rebellious Czechs', he numbered several of them among his closest friends. 'Bohemian' policies, tending to stress the interests of the Habsburg Monarchy rather than those of the *Reich*, even to the extent of a *rapprochement* with France, emerged during Lobkovic's presidency of the Privy Conference and culminated in the 1690s with the careers of Franz Ulrich Kinský and Dominik Andreas Kaunitz. They were then continued, in modified form, by Johann Wenzel Vratislav.³⁵

The old noble families did not, for the most part, approve of the *Obnovené zřízení zemské* (even Zdeněk Lobkovic lamented it);³⁶ but it could not work without them, and through them it was *de facto* amended. The Habsburgs compromised with an aristocracy which at court represented the country and in the country represented the court, exercising an almost complete monopoly over the senior dignities of state. Between the battle of the White Mountain and the reforms of Maria Theresa no outsider held either of the two key offices: those of grand burgrave in Prague, and of Bohemian chancellor, resident mainly at Vienna, where the grandiose new chancery built for him shortly after 1700 by Fischer von Erlach shows how thriving was the institution. Much the same is true of the other posts whose occupants jointly acted, in the permanent absence of the monarch, as a lieutenant council under the headship of the grand burgrave: high steward, high marshal,

³⁴ The point is taken, in a general way, by Placht, op. cit. 262 ff., and by Hassenpflug, art. cit.

³⁵ Disparagement in (e.g.) Kalista (ed.), *Korrespondenz*, no. 16: '[Bohemians] ordinariamente ... sono hainbrukisch [i.e. sly, treacherous]'. For the influence: above, pp. 144 f.; Kalista, *Čechové*, 179–223, *passim*; Klungenstein, *Haas Kaunitz*, 49 ff. On Vratislav as diplomat: A. Arneth, 'Eigenhändige Correspondenz des Königs Karl III von Spanien ... mit ... Grafen Johann Wenzel Vratislav', *AÖG* xvi (1856), 3–224; Jarnut-Derbolav, op. cit. 36–170.

³⁶ Gindely, *Gegenreformation*, 449 ff., 504 f.

high chamberlain, chief justices of the realm and the court, president of the court of appeal, president of the Bohemian Chamber, the chief organ of economic policy. The only exceptions were a few lower offices still reserved to the knights—such as chief clerk or chamberlain of the royal boroughs—though here also old-established families had a stranglehold. Against them, the rise of the occasional bureaucrat like Johann Losy von Losimthal, Ferdinand III's controller of excise, cut very little ice, while the principle of royal appointment, and regular re-appointment, of state servants lost its force.³⁷ The statistics of royal commissioners to Bohemian diets between 1627 and 1698 tell their own story: in years of the full *sněm* two lords and one knight attended; in years of more limited assembly (*sjezd*) the grand burgrave alone represented the crown. In all a Martinic was present on twenty occasions, a Kolovrat on nineteen, a Sternberg on seventeen, Černín and Slavata on ten, Lobkovic on eight, Vrba on seven, Vrbna and Kinský on six, Berka on four, Waldstein and Lažanský on three, Talmbek, Vratislav and Schlick on two, Nostitz on one; whereas the grand total for individuals recently settled in Bohemia is eight.³⁸

These officers, with their attendant secretariats, formed the Habsburg administration in the Bohemian lands. Only one hesitant attempt was made to remove any part of it from native influence, in the shape of the new Moravian royal tribunal, which after 1636 sat under a *hejtman* regularly chosen from among families comparatively

³⁷ F. Roubík, 'Mistodržitelství v Čechách v letech 1577-1749', *SbA Pr* xvii (1967), 539-601, esp. 580-8, with lists of the holders of these eleven posts, and of the other three which carried the rank of stadholder: burgrave of the *kráj* of Koniggrätz (reserved to a knight or burgher), master of the horse (a sinecure), and grand prior of the knights of Malta (see below, p. 222). Stránský, op. cit., ch. 14, describes their traditional functions; cf. Auersperg, op. cit. i, 26-8, 70, 75 ff., on the personnel of the court of appeal. For Losy's activities: Rezek, *Dějiny*, i, 346-64; ii, 159 ff.; cf. Zibrť, *BČH* i, no. 14365.

³⁸ These statistics are derived from the printed title-pages of dietal resolutions (*archidukovní sněmovny*), reproduced in *Knihopis*, nos. 392-478. I have listed only the families already mentioned; for the sake of completeness we should add the semi-Polish Counts Rozdražov (four times), and the Bohemian Barons Hieserle (three times) and Laminger von Albenreuth (twice). The new arrivals were Thun (four times), Mansfeld, Colloredo, Trautmannsdorf, and Potting (once each). In one exceptional year (1677), the lords were represented by two 'foreigners': Johann Friedrich Trautmannsdorf (son of Maximilian) and Leopold's old friend, Franz Eusebius Potting, formerly ambassador in Madrid. The knightly commissioners—it need hardly be said—were still more solidly old-Bohemian.

newly introduced to the province. But that soon fell into confusion and inefficiency—and the man who did most to make it work was the thoroughly patriotic Maximilian Kaunitz.³⁹ If the high *šlechta* so dominated the Habsburg side of the constitutional equation, it is hardly surprising that they controlled the estates. As in Austria, these not only survived, but even increased their executive functions: diets met at least annually (fifty-nine times between 1648 and 1698), and their elected committees took the main responsibility for public order and tax-collection. A vast 'doomsday' survey of the country, known as the *berni rula* (1653-5), was actually commissioned and executed by the estates in order to safeguard their position *vis-à-vis* the royal Chamber.⁴⁰

Local autonomies certainly faded away in Bohemia, whose nineteenth-century historians so bemoaned the collapse of its regions by contrast with the sturdy county structure of Hungary. Again, however, the main beneficiary was not the crown, but the great latifundium, freed from the meddling of towns and petty nobility. District *hejtmanšips* tended to go to a penumbra of families on the edge of the highest society: Petřvaldský or Přebořovský, Deym of Střítež or Hieserle of Chodaw.⁴¹ Nor did the *šlechta* suffer

³⁹ On this tribunal see Chr. d'Elvert, *Zur österreichischen Verwaltungsgeschichte mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die böhmischen Länder* (Brunn 1880), 198-232; id., *Zur österreichischen Finanz-Geschichte mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die böhmischen Länder* (Brunn 1881), 209-550, *passim*; V. Vašků, *Studie o správních dějích a písemnostech moravského královského tribunálu z let 1636-1749* (Brno 1969); cf. J. Radimský, *Tribunál, sbírka normáljí z let 1628-1782* (Brno 1956), intro. On Kaunitz, cf. Klingenstein, *Haus Kaunitz*, 79 ff. After Franz Dietrichstein (1620-36) the *hejtmanšips* fell to a Salm (1637-40), then to a triumvirate of Liechtenstein, Rottal, and Francesco Magni (1640-3), and to Liechtenstein and Rottal alone (1643-55), then to Gabriel Serényi (1655-64), and—after a brief Dietrichstein interlude (1664)—to Franz Karl Kolovrat-Libštejnský (1664-1700), who was succeeded by a Thurn-Valsassina and an Oppersdorf.

⁴⁰ On the diets: Tomek, *Sněmy české*, mostly financial affairs; Rezek, *Děje*, and *Dějiny*, i-ii, with thorough discussion of their sessions. *Berňi rula*, i, 13-67, esp. 37 f.; Pekár, *Katastry*, 4-56. Even Denis-Vančura (i, 2, 56 ff. *passim*) have to admit that no real 'centralization' or 'absolutism' existed under Leopold I; cf. Kalousek, op. cit. 463 ff.; Grünberg, op. cit. i, 108 ff.

⁴¹ Every *kráj* had two *hejtmany* (hejtmans?), one a lord, the other a knight, who were traditionally confirmed in office each spring. B. Rieger, *Zřízení krájské v Čechách*, i-ii (Pr. 1889-92), i; Macek-Zátek, op. cit.; Rezek, *Děje*, 457-61. This development has often been misunderstood; E. C. Hellbling, *Österreichische Verfassungs- und Verwaltungsgeschichte* (V. 1956), 253, even speaks of the 17th-century *hejtman* as an 'intendant'.

from any serious economic dirigisme. Crown estates, few enough at the beginning of the seventeenth century, continued to be alienated throughout the period, and those that remained were almost all mortgaged. They brought ludicrously little return to the Bohemian *komora*, less still—after its mismanagement and corruption—to the treasury in Vienna.⁴² Early mercantilist entrepreneurship, where it began to develop before 1700, was almost exclusively the brainchild of large landowners and their protégé projectors.⁴³

With aristocratic management went aristocratic culture, full of opulence and display, and distinctly native in hue. By the 1650s, certainly by the 1700s, this was no longer substantially a Czech culture. The Czech language fell into decline, though it proved the casualty of a cosmopolitan atmosphere, not of official policy. Ferdinand III spoke it; Leopold made jocular efforts with it and insisted on sitting through sermons preached in it.⁴⁴ Czech continued to have precedence over German for proclamations and published decrees of the *sněm*; knowledge of it was still demanded for membership of the court of appeal. In Moravia it died of inanition: by the 1720s the Czech clerk to the tribunal simply had nothing to do. The aristocrats gradually abandoned it in favour of Italian and French, as well as German.⁴⁵ But to contemporaries linguistic considerations were secondary, and they remained consciously Bohemian. Genealogical studies enjoyed great vogue as a way of revealing ancient Slav ancestry, preferably royal, and links

⁴² E. Maur, *Český komorní velkostatek v 17. století* (Pr. 1976), is most detailed. See also Balbin, *Miscellanea Historica*, i, bk. 3, 64 f.; Tomek, *Sněmý české*, 61–4; Rezek, *Dějiny*, i, 431; Běrenger, *Finances*, 300 f. Cf., for Silesia, Grünhagen, *Geschichte*, ii, 361 f.; and Rachtáhl, op. cit. 264–6. Crown lands seem not to have yielded much over 1 per cent of the net royal revenue from Bohemia.

⁴³ Klíma, op. cit. 137 ff., 216 ff.; cf. below, p. 233 and n. 90. A little later, in 1715, the most famous of such magnate enterprises was founded, the Waldstein textile mill at Oberleutensdorf (Horní Litvínov). Some of the high nobles were also major creditors of the monarchy, especially the Černíns (Pekář, *Katastry*, 97 f.).

⁴⁴ Beckovský, op. cit., pt. 3, 440 f.; J. Muk, *Po stopách národního vědomí české šlechty pobělohorské* (Pr. 1931), 84 f.; Kalista (ed.), *Korespondence*, nos. 47, etc.; Placht, op. cit. 245.

⁴⁵ Klabouch, op. cit. 34; Vašků, op. cit. 29; Podlaha, *Dějiny*, 185; Pekář, *Kost*, i, 140–2, 164 f.; Muk, op. cit., esp. 103 ff. William O'Kelly, *Philosophia Aulica, iuxta veterum ac recentiorum philosophorum placita* (Pr. 1701, cf. below, pp. 326 f.), sig.)()(1^r–4^r, prints an anti-Aristotelean satire in its original French, 'eo lubentius, quod tota fere Nobilitas, in cuius gratiam hoc opus edidi, Gallicae linguae peritiam habeat'.

with the lustre of the medieval kingdom: the Jesuit Tanner's history of the Sternbergs is one example. A more celebrated Jesuit, Bohuslav Balbin, who had close links with the old nobility, prepared the project of a complete genealogy and anatomy of the *šlechta*, a grandiose, albeit unfinished enterprise. Balbin was quite ready to assimilate newer families to the old pantheon, including the Harrachs, for instance (who could, in fact, muster some distant relations among the local knightage), and even compiling spurious Czech origins for his patron, Count Lamberg.⁴⁶

One important aspect of this antiquarianism was the concept of an aristocratic lobby within the *Bohemia sancta*, the temple of Bohemian Catholic saintliness. Medieval magnates had long been associated with private religious foundations, and it suited both spiritual and familial piety to see a continuance of these into the Baroque age: thus the Černíns basked in their descent from the Blessed Hroznata, one of the founders of Bohemian monasticism. Balbin lists many cases of nobles who either rose high in the Church or displayed personal sanctity.⁴⁷ Some of his examples are modern, and the contemporary *šlechta* exhibited a distinct leaning towards the ecclesiastical vocation and support for new religious institutions: a number of Kolovrats joined the Jesuits; Zdislav Berka became a Benedictine abbot and Benno Martinic a touchy provost of Vyšehrad; the semi-Polish Count František Rozdražov was an important Capuchin devotional writer; Sternbergs and Černíns paid much money and respect to the clerical profession; the pious endowments of Ferdinand II's friend, Václav Bruntálský of Vrba would require a gargantuan footnote to enumerate.⁴⁸

⁴⁶ Above, n. 27 (Tanner). Balbin, *Miscellanea Historica*, ii, bks. 1–2; a further eight volumes were planned; cf. O. Květová-Klímová, 'Styky Bohuslava Balbina s českou šlechtou pobělohorskou', *ČCH* xxii (1926), 497–541; Muk, op. cit. 114 ff. Balbin came from a gentry family himself. On the Hřebenáři z Horochu (counts by 1706): Vlasák, op. cit. 85 f., and OSN, s.v. B. Balbin, *Epitome historica rerum Bohemicarum quam...Boleslavensem Historiam placuit appellare* (Pr. 1777), sig. (b) 2^r (Lamberg).

⁴⁷ Schlenz, *Kirchenpatronat*, pt. 1; and F. Seibt, 'Land und Herrschaft in Böhmen', *HZ* cc (1965), 284–315, for the Middle Ages. Balbin, *Miscellanea Historica*, i, bk. 4, pt. 1, 54–8 (on Hroznata), 75 f., 155 f.; pt. 2, 101–3, 113 f., 116 f., 127–30, 149–70; ii, bk. 1, 34–49. Cf. Albert Chanovský, *Vestigium Boemiae Piae...* (Pr. 1659), 119 ff.

⁴⁸ On Martinic: V. V. Zelený, 'Tomáš Pešina z Čechorodu', *ČČM* lviii (1894), 1–22, 250–69, 471–97; lix (1885), 90–108, 226–43; lx (1886), 102–21, 331–57, 554–82, (continued)

Evidently such things belonged to the style and career-structure of the age, but in Bohemia they were more than that. We can correlate them directly with a high sense of penitence for spectacular and frequently ill-gotten success. Wallenstein planted several religious orders on his lands and summoned Carthusian monks to solace him at his sylvan retreat of Valdice (a gesture beautifully evoked in a *Novelle* by Jaroslav Durych); flying high as usual, he even planned a bishopric for his duchy of Friedland, which would have allowed him to indulge in set-piece squabbles with the priesthood. Vilém Slavata turned by the end of his life into a mystic and spiritualist; it is a poetic accident that his family died out sixty years later with a general of the Carmelite order, Karel Felix, an intimate of Emperor Leopold who lived in Rome. The mood was easily captured by the new aristocracy, as by Franz Anton von Sporck (1662-1738), son of Johann, one of the most extraordinary noblemen of his time and donor of a bizarre Baroque foundation on his estate at Kuks. The sons of Johann Sigismund von Thun, nephew of Christoph Simon, included two archbishops of Salzburg and a bishop of Passau, as well as a Capuchin and a knight of Malta.⁴⁹

*

Thus we reach the second bastion of Bohemian society and the other focus for native sentiment: the Church. That statement may seem difficult to reconcile with what we already know of an imposed Counter-Reformation. But (as we saw in chapter two) the new spiritual current already possessed local roots before 1620; while after the White Mountain it revealed a diversity which proved the

at 226-8. On Rozdražov: *Knihopis*, nos. 15000-6, though most of his works were in Latin. Sternbergs: Schulz (ed.), *Korrespondence jesuitů*, nos. 43-7, 49-50, 52-3, 55, 59, 73, 75-6, 79; Černíns: Pekat, *Koší*, I, 166, etc.; V. Kottba, *Česká barokní gotika* (Pr. 1976), 53 f. On Vrbna: F. C. Khevenhüller, *Comerfet Kupfferstich*, I-II (Leipzig 1721-2), II, s.v.

⁴⁹ Mann, op. cit. 243-8; Schlenz, *Leitmeritz*, I, 37-44. On Vilém Slavata: Balbin, *Mistellanea Historica*, I, bk. 4, pt. 2, 130-4; cf. Mayer, op. cit. I, nos. 1272, 1315. On Karel Felix Slavata cf. *Listy účny a přátelský*, ed. J. Klík (Pr. 1941), noting fifty indecipherable German letters to him from the emperor. On Sporck: H. Benedikt, *Franz Anton Graf von Sporck* (V. 1923), and J. Hanzal in *SbH xxv* (1977), 45-83. Motives, of course, were very mixed: witness the last Baron Leskovec, who joined the Premonstratensians after six marriages had failed to present him with an heir (Procházka, op. cit. 163-5). And as in Austria the body of the Church was noble—to the extent of 82 per cent of its priests in 1741 (Hassenpflug, art. cit. 85).

source of strength as well as weakness: the many mansions inside Baroque Catholicism offered scope for a distinctive Bohemian profile. Dispute raged even over the nature of the Counter-Reformation. The hard line of Carafa in the 1620s and Caramuel in the 1650s, pressing more the externals of religion and leaning on such groups as the firmly orthodox Italian congregation in Prague, conflicted at times with the gentler approach of Harrach, Magni, and their missionaries, who attempted to speak softly to the masses of the Slavonic population where a shortage of priests was chronic.⁵⁰ The lines of opposition were not clear-cut: Caramuel prided himself on a partly Czech ancestry, while Magni—a Milanese by birth—could be thoroughly internationalist when he chose: at one point he tried to secure a Bohemian bishopric for an Italian who spoke neither Czech nor German! In Moravia, Dietrichstein tended to occupy a middle position, as did the important Czech prelate, Jan Arnošt Platejs.⁵¹

Both sides had to rely heavily on cosmopolitan orders, above all Jesuits, Observant Franciscans, and Capuchins. But there again they found no seamless web: friction developed between the rampant Jesuits and the newly-introduced Hibernians (who also managed to quarrel with the local Franciscans); between Jesuits and the Priarists, spreading on their Moravian base from the mid-century; between Jesuits and the older orders; above all between Jesuits and Valerian Magni. The gifted Capuchin's appeal to oecumenical longings; his unwillingness to insist on extreme Papal claims; his intellectual powers and wide influence: all this made for a dangerous rivalry and a bitter, protracted feud.⁵² Then came clashes between regulars and seculars. Secular prelates were

⁵⁰ Cf. above, pp. 118-21, and A. Rezek (ed.), 'Tak-zvaná 'Idea gubernationis ecclesiasticae' z času Kardinála Harracha', *VKČSN*, 1893, no. 3. The Italian congregation (which also formed a Bohemian branch) has its own historian: P. Rigetti, *Historische Nachricht sowohl von der Errichtung der Weltsichen Congregation ... als auch das dazu gehörigen Hospitals* (Pr. 1773).

⁵¹ Schlenz, *Leitmeritz*, I, 31 (Magni). For Platejs: Liva, art. cit.; Beckovský, op. cit., pt. 3, 13-24.

⁵² On the Hibernians: B. Millett, *The Irish Franciscans 1651-65* (Rome 1964), 134-66. V. Magni, *Apologia contra Imposturas Jesuitarum* (n.p. 1659), explains the substance of the quarrel. Cf. his persuasive missionary work: *Judicium de acatholicorum regula credendi* (?Pr. 1628?, I have used the edn. at Cologne 1631), translated into English as *A Censure about the Rule of Beatefe practised by the Protestants* (Douai 1634).

marginally stronger in Bohemia than in Austria—at least after the establishment of new bishoprics at Litoměřice (1655) and Königgrätz (1664)—but they stayed on the defensive, while payments to parish priests were always variable and usually meagre. During his long episcopate (1623–67) Harrach continually strove to assert his position, a task rendered no easier by squabbles about Prague's notional primacy over Olomouc. And wider animosities between clergy and laity only grew in intensity as outside threats declined: by the 1690s even the pious Černíns were in contention with the Jesuits, and wartime stringencies clouded the relation between ecclesiastical and royal authority.⁵³

Such oppositions could, in practice, act as a safety-valve. Often they involved a play of personalities rather than crucial issues of principle. At all events, the largest dualism, the polarity between universal and local Church, helped to strengthen the whole edifice. As in Austria, the old landed monasteries, with their incorporated parishes, had a great part in reconciling national with international. The Benedictines reassessed themselves so effectively that one of their abbots, Sobek of Bilenberk, having proved a very forceful tax commissioner for the estates during the 1650s, was chosen archbishop of Prague in 1668. Their activity emanated from Braunau (that *casus belli* of 1618), and led to the resettlement and rebuilding of historic houses at Rajhrad, near Brno—saved by Dietrichstein—and at Břevnov, outside Prague. Within the capital monks had been brought back to Charles IV's foundation called Emmaus as early as 1592 by Rudolf II; but Ferdinand II, characteristically finding their behaviour too lax, displaced the existing Benedictines into the Old Town and introduced the severe Spanish rule of Montserrat (the second abbot of these *Schwarzspanier* was the chameleon-figure of Caramuel, himself a former Cistercian). Both abbeys formed priories in the surrounding countryside, at Svätý Jan and Bezděz respectively. The list of Bohemia's Benedictine monasteries is completed by Kladruby, near Pilsen, and the ancient community revived on hallowed ground beside the river Sázava.⁵⁴

⁵³ At the diet the archbishop, bishops, provost and dean of St. Vitus, and provosts of Vyšehrad and Boleslav preceded the abbots. On priestly stipends and circumstances: Krásil, op. cit. 455–83 and *passim*; Podlaha, *Dějiny*, 465 ff. Placht, op. cit. 254 (Černíns), and cf. above, pp. 135–7, 139.

⁵⁴ *Benediktinerbuch*, 84–99 (Braunau and Břevnov), 100–16 (Emmaus), 350–67

The Cistercians likewise maintained nine houses in the Baroque period (with more in Silesia), and their recovery too moved from a few centres which had weathered the Hussite and Lutheran storms: from Vyšší Brod (Hohenfurt) and Zlatá Koruna (Goldenkron) hard against the Austrian border, from Plass in the German-speaking west, from Zbraslav (Königsaal) in the wooded defile upriver from Prague. Order and local pride were sufficiently reinstated at Sedlec by 1630 to yield a published Czech-language history of the monastery's vicissitudes; later its filial at Skalice was recolonized. Ossegg—whose lands provided the other *casus belli* of 1618—was returned to the Cistercians by Ferdinand II and developed gradually through the century into a focus for the culture of north-west Bohemia and the site of the country's first textile manufactory. In Moravia Velehrad and Žďár moved towards their most pompous age, with a conscious re-creation of the medieval splendour of Czech monasticism.⁵⁵

The regular Augustinians had canopies in the Bohemian lands, more modest imitations of those in Austria, none of them destined to avoid dissolution under Joseph II.⁵⁶ In Bohemia, on the other

(Rajhrad); Bilek, *Statky*, 174–9 (St. Nicholas in the Old Town), 180–7 (Kladruby); Podlaha, *Povázná mistra*, i, 117–26 (Sázava); ii, 47–61 (Svätý Jan); v, 10–21 (Břevnov); L. Helmling, 'Die literarische und künstlerische Tätigkeit im kgl. Stifte Emmaus in Prag', *Stud. u. Mitt.* xxv (1904), 655–75; Svátek, art. cit. 529–34. B. Dudík, *Geschichte des Benediktiner-Stiftes Raygern*, i–ii (V. 1849–68), ii, is a very detailed house chronicle of Rajhrad. Cf. also above, p. 49 n. 18 (Braunau and its filial at Police); below, pp. 225 f. (Svätý Jan, Sázava and Emmaus). There were also Benedictine nuns in a prominent convent within the royal castle (Bilek, *Statky*, 166–74; Svátek, art. cit. 591 f.). On Sobek, cf. *Berni náda*, i, 41, 46, 53 f.

Cisterzienserbuch, 125–37 (Vyšší Brod), 280–353 (Ossegg); Bilek, *Statky*, 191–213 (Sedlec, Zlatá Koruna, Plass, Zbraslav), 308–21 (Žďár, Velehrad; both among the richest monasteries dissolved in the 1780s); Podlaha, *Povázná mistra*, iii, 65–91 (Mähren), *Archiv für Kirchengeschichte von Böhmen-Mähren-Schlesien*, iii (1973), 185–220; J. G. Středovský, *Sacra Moraviae Historia sive Vita SS. Cyrilli et Methodii* (Sulzbach 1710), 608–23 (Velehrad); Klima, op. cit. 214–16 (Ossegg). Detailed works: Kaphorský, op. cit. (Sedlec); Kaindl, op. cit. (Vyšší Brod); Hurt, op. cit. (Velehrad); M. Zemek and A. Barůšek, *Dějiny Žďáru nad Sázavou*, i–iii (Havlíčkův Brod–Brno 1956–74), ii.; cf. S. Bredl, 'Eine Jubiläumsfeier im ehemaligen Cisterzienser-Stifte Saar', *Stud. u. Mitt.* xv (1894), 623–35.

⁵⁶ At Karlov (in the New Town of Prague); Třeboň (Wittingau) and Forbes (Borovany) in southern Bohemia, both recovered from the Jesuits in 1631; Olomouc, Moravský Sternberk, and Fulnek (all in Moravia). See Svátek, art. cit. 523–5; Bilek, *Statky*, 146–50 (Karlov).

hand, the stricter rule of St. Augustine, that conceived at twelfth-century Prémontré, gained a particular ascendancy. We have already discerned the first stirrings of Catholic revival at Tepl, then at Strahov under Lohelius. Lohelius's successor proved equally tough and single-minded: Caspar von Questenberg (died in 1640), whose brothers were rising in the court service of Ferdinand II, gave this 'mountain of Sion' (as the abbey was properly called) a new spiritual and political status to match its fairy-tale physical dominance over the city of Prague. He augmented the number of canons, hardened discipline, and pressed for the rights of his order at national and international level, achieving most of what he wanted, though not all (Questenberg led the protest against the salt treaty of 1630).⁵⁷ From Tepl and Strahov the Premonstratensian recovery spread: to Želiv, resettled after 1620, and Milevsko; to the Moravian houses of Bruck (Louka), already active before the White Mountain, and Nová Říše, Hradiště outside Olomouc and Zábřehovice outside Brno (both of which had to be rebuilt after the Swedish assault in 1645); to the semi-aristocratic convents of Chotěšov and Doksany; to Schlägl and Geras-Pernegg across the Austrian frontier, which maintained parishes within Bohemia and whose restorers, like Martin Greysing of Schlägl, studied there; to Silesia and the *Reich*.⁵⁸

Two things lent added impetus to this mission. One was the cult of the founder of the whole Premonstratensian order, St. Norbert, whose relics were translated from Magdeburg to Strahov in 1627 amid great celebrations. Henceforth Norbert was numbered among

the holy patrons of Bohemia, his name invoked in pilgrimage and baptismal register; and the fame of his new shrine spread as far as France, whose queen sought some dust from his bones, but received a polite refusal.⁵⁹ The second was the establishment of a seminary at Prague in 1637. This seminary of St. Norbert had its function as a focus for scholarly activity within the order; but it gained a larger importance in the context of Archbishop Harrach's campaign against the Jesuit monopoly of Bohemian education. Harrach used Premonstratensian teachers, along with some Cistercians (who also had their own college) and the hard-talking Hibernian fathers, as rivals to the Jesuit establishment, and thereby broadened the base of Counter-Reformation learning in the country. Thus Scotists were studied as well as Thomists, sceptics—even Jansenists—as well as realists, and the Premonstratensians developed a lively Baroque culture with a detectable patriotic flavour. Its greatest representative, whom we shall meet again, was Hieronymus Hirnhaim, abbot of Strahov between 1670 and 1681.⁶⁰

Premonstratensians could only display native features within an international matrix. One Augustinian order, however, was purely Bohemian: the Crusaders with a Red Star. In fact the evocatively-styled *Ordo militaris Crucigerorum cum rubea stella* had begun as an association of medieval hospitaliers ancillary to the Prague Franciscans, but it is characteristic of the aristocratic tendencies of the age that seventeenth-century Crusaders elaborated a legend of their chivalric origins in the Holy Land and neglected the commitment to healing in favour of monastic repose and the cure of souls. Before the Hussite wars the order grew to be one of the most significant ecclesiastical institutions in Bohemia, and it survived Protestant

⁵⁷ Čermák, op. cit. 1-128, esp. 67-77 (Strahov), 355-91 (Tepl); *Chorherrenbuch*, 548-637; cf. C. Straka, 'Nejstarší kniha výslechů na práve kláštera Strahovského na Pohorleci', *ČL*, xvii (1908), 65-7, 116-18, 165-8, 224-8. On Questenberg: id., *Albrecht z Valdštejna a jeho doba* (Pr. 1911), despite its title; Str. MS. DJ III 2, pp. 422-41 and *passim*; cf. Gross, op. cit. 418-20, on his brother Hermann. For the *Salzvertrag* see above p. 136.

⁵⁸ On all these houses: Čermák, op. cit.; Backmund, op. cit. 1, 276-323; Svátek, art. cit. 525-8. *Chorherrenbuch*, 386-411 (Nová Říše), 512-47 (Želiv); Bilek, *Státek*, 275-84 (Doksany and Chotěšov), 348-62 (Bruck, Hradiště, Zábřehovice), indicates the great wealth of the Premonstratensian houses dissolved in the 1780s. Podlaha, *Posvátná místa*, ii, 278-84 (Chotěšov); there and at Doksany non-noble nuns were admitted from the 16th century (cf. Čermák, op. cit. 171-3, 432 f.). L. Schuster, 'Martin Greysing, der zweite Gründer Schlags, 1626-65', *Anal. Praem.* xxxiii (1957), 217-58. See also, in general, the provincial chapter records edited by J. B. Valveteus in supplements to *Anal. Praem.* xxxvi-xlii (1960-6).

⁵⁹ Str. MS. DJ III 2, pp. 350-69; Carafa, *Commentaria*, 275-7, 291-3; *Acta SS.* June, i, 871 ff.; C. Straka in *Anal. Praem.* iii (1927), 333-46.

⁶⁰ Str. MS. DJ III 2, *passim*; ibid. MS. DJ III 3, pp. 74-9, 166-70; ibid. MS. DJ IV 1: 'Annales Seminarii S. Norberti, 1637-1736'; F. Tadra, 'Počátkové semináře arcibiskupského v Praze', *SbH* (Rezek), ii (1884), 193-201, 270-9, 339-48; Krásl, op. cit. 158-98, 287-302, *passim*; Rezek, *Děj.* 87-121, 300-8; A. Soldát, 'Z dějin arcibiskupského semináře v Praze', *SbHKr* v (1896), 61-97; Flégl, art. cit. 240-2; Millet, op. cit. 142-4, 151-3. S. Bredl, 'Das Collegium St. Bernardi in Prag', *Stud. Mitt.* xiii (1892), 499-503; xiv (1893), 53-60, 212-21; xv (1894), 90-4, 297-306, describes the Cistercian college. Harrach also tried, less successfully, to assert his powers as chancellor of the Clementinum (Tórnock, *Geschichte, passim*; Krásl, op. cit. 364-412). Cf. V. Bitnar, *Postava a problémy českého baroku literárního* (Pr. 1939), pt. 3; and below, pp. 328 f. on Hirnhaim.

pressures with much of its extensive property intact. It probably benefited from the fact that between 1561 and 1694 its grand-master was also always archbishop of Prague: the expense of supporting him being balanced by an access of lustre and influence. Certainly Crusaders were prominent in the Counter-Reformation period: they controlled some hundred parishes on a network of scattered estates, more humanely managed than most; they built a stylish (suitably cruciform) Baroque church and residence in the very centre of Prague; under the leadership of Jiří Pospíchal (1634-99) they generated considerable local patriotism.⁶¹

The Crusaders with a Red Star were not the only representatives of their kind. Besides smaller-scale autochthonous offshoots from the same tradition of the medieval hospice, like the so-called Cyriacs, or Crusaders with a Red Heart, whose house at the church of St. Cross in Prague was revived by Ferdinand II and likewise attracted a largely Czech membership,⁶² the Maltese and Teutonic Knights established themselves firmly in Bohemia. Whereas the latter remained a foreign body—their Moravian latifundia gave rise to endless jurisdictional disputes—the Knights of Malta possessed a domestic dimension. Indeed, after the Reformation their whole Germanic province became concentrated on Prague, where the grand prior was senior regular prelate at the diet and a permanent stadholder of the kingdom. For generations Bohemian magnates occupied the position (four Vratislavs between 1626 and 1721) and their fine palace in its leafy square ranks among the most graceful on the Little Side.⁶³

⁶¹ V. Belohlávek and J. Hradec, *Dějiny českých křižovníků s červenou hvězdou*, 1-ii (Pr. 1930); W. Lorenz, *Die Kreuzherren mit dem roten Stern* (Königstein im Taunus 1964). ÖNB, MS. sn. 3338, lists (in Latin and Czech) the lands belonging to the Crusaders' hospital in 1610. On Pospíchal: A. Rezek, 'Paměti generála Tádů křižovníckého Jiřího Pospíchala z let 1661-80', *Zprávy o zasedání Královské České Společnosti Nauk*, 1886, 139-60, with extracts from his diaries; J. Hanzal, 'Jiří Ignác Pospíchal a jeho doba', *ČSCH* xix (1971), 229-57, a sympathetic study.

⁶² The history of the Crusaders with a Red Heart can be reconstructed from UK MSS. VII A 9-11: a general chronicle written in 1756; annals from 1628-1780; and list of members (the last dean of the Prague house was a Bohemian called Antony Hill). On their church see I. Kořán, 'Cyriacky klášter a chrám sv. Kříže Většho v baroku', *Umění* xvi (1968), 173-95. There were also Crusaders with a Red Cross on Zderaz in the New Town.

⁶³ R. Zuber, 'Der Streit um das Patronatsrecht zwischen dem Deutschen Orden und dem Olmützer Bistum im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert', *Acht Jahrhunderte Deutscher*

Orders, old and new, thus sustained much of the edifice of Counter-Reformation Catholicism in Bohemia. Many of its features obviously conform to the Austrian pattern: educational system, popular preachers, and the circulation of sermons and devotional tracts by contemporary foreign authors like Martin van Cochem, with translations into Czech.⁶⁴ Marian worship and respect for St. Joseph were widely cultivated and found expression in hundreds of local votive pictures and sanctuaries.⁶⁵ Most famous was the Madonna of Stará Boleslav (Altunzlau), whose remarkable peripatetic career during the war (stolen by a Saxon officer and returned in 1637; twice sent to Vienna and back again in the 1640s) enhanced its fame and won it the high esteem of Leopold I.⁶⁶

This kind of devotion seems to have reached its peak in the mid-eighteenth century—ironically at a time when the Habsburgs themselves began to discourage it.⁶⁷ It made slower progress in Bohemia, since there, far more than in the *Erblande*, the re-creation of Catholic piety depended on a conscious assertion of the continuity of faith: the two centuries from Hus to the White Mountain were henceforth deemed merely an aberration. The struggle to confirm that premise manifested itself in a variety of ways. It added frenzy and drama to the extirpation of Protestantism after 1620: churches were reconsecrated, even fumigated; pilgrimages were instigated to

Orden in Einzeldarstellungen, ed. K. Wieser (Bad Godesberg 1967), 441-54; K. Wieser, *Die Bedeutung des Zentralarchivs des Deutschen Ordens für die Geschichte Schlesiens und Mährens* (Würzburg 1967). A. Wienand (ed.), *Der Johanniter-Orden, der Malteser-Orden* (Cologne 1970), esp. 352-7, 412-41, 613.

⁶⁴ This literature in Czech is exhaustively catalogued in *Knihopis*. Cochem, the popular Capuchin, became a favourite in Bohemia by the 18th century; see, for example, his *Zivot Pána Nasseho Gezise Krysta*, tr. E. Nymburský (Pr. 1698, etc.). Ignatius Loyola's *Spiritual Exercises* appeared in Czech in 1692 (*Knihopis*, no. 3355).

⁶⁵ Marian examples in Podlaha, *Posvádná místa*, iii, 21-7; 295-9; vii, 29-32; and *passim*; Denis-Vančura, op. cit., i, 2, 35 f., 53 f., 169-71 (tinged with patriotism); *Knihopis*, nos. 943, 4308-9; P. Knauer, 'Die Entstehungszeit des Marienwallfahrtsortes Wartha in Schlesien', *ZVGAS* li (1917), 164-217; J. Herzogenberg in Seibr (ed.) op. cit. 465-74. V. Rýněš, '"Imagines Miraculosae" doby pobělohorské', *ČL* liv (1967), 182-93, uses interesting reports from parish priests; E. Wiegand, *Die böhmischen Gnadenbilder* (Göttingen 1936), is more technical. For Joseph. Beckovský, op. cit., pt. 3, 310; Rezek, *Dějiny*, i, 227 f.; *Knihopis*, nos. 1403, 9547.

⁶⁶ Beckovský, op. cit., pt. 3, 260-4, 267; 275 f., 281, 351, 402-4; Balbin, *Epitome*, bks. 6-7; Pekal, *Kost*, i, 1 f., 168; *Knihopis*, nos. 264-5; and cf. below, p. 408.

⁶⁷ *Knihopis*, nos. 5655-901, 7083-110, 7183 seqq., 7872 seqq., 9921 seqq. Cf. the list of books owned at Outěnice, near Prague, in 1758 (Podlaha, *Posvádná místa*, v, 88-91).

the wonder-working battlefield; Corpus Christi processions expunged the memory of Hus's name-day (so conveniently adjacent in the calendar). Ferdinand II was narrowly persuaded not to raze the rebel Carolinum to the ground and build a home there for the public executioner. Slavata organized a theatrical ceremony at which the burghers of Hradec abased themselves before the verities of the Church of Rome.⁶⁸ At the same time medieval ideals were reinstated, a process which culminated symbolically with the unique architectural style of Bohemian Baroque-Gothic: the work of Giovanni Santini-Aichel at Žďár, Sedlec, Želiv, and above all secretive Kladruby, with its rib-vaults and fantastic pinnacles.⁶⁹

Best prospects for the 'continuity thesis' lay in the notion of a *Bohemia sancta*. Here naturalized St. Norbert showed the way after 1620—as St. Vitus, whose relics gave the initial impulse to the construction of Prague cathedral, had done long before. But plenty of local talent was available too. There can be no question about the genuine patriotic sentiments attached to the name of St. Wenceslas, first Christian king of Bohemia. Wenceslas had been continuously venerated since his death in the year 923; his chapel in St. Vitus was the greatest jewel of the medieval kingdom. Feast-days for him and his mother Ludmila formed an established observance in the archdiocese of Prague, and Edmund Campion preached on the theme in the 1570s. One interesting example of sixteenth-century reverence for Wenceslas provides visual evidence that the charities attributed to the 'good king' by the Victorian hymn-writer were already valued then, although the historical Václav was no more than a golden youth at the time of his murder. After the White Mountain the cult of Wenceslas and Ludmila grew apace, formulated anew by the priesthood, encouraged by aristocracy and crown (Leopold gave the name to his eldest, short-lived son).⁷⁰ Not

⁶⁸ Pescheck, op. cit. ii, 12 ff.; Liva, art. cit. 48 f., 52, 64–6; Beckovský, op. cit., pt. 2, 313 f.; pt. 3, 7. Gindely, *Gegenreformation*, 181, 79–81 (Carolinum and Slavata).

⁶⁹ Imaginatively reinterpreted by Z. Kalista, *Česká barokní gotika a její zd'árské ohnisko* (Brno 1970), and thoroughly surveyed by Kotrba, op. cit., incorporating much earlier studies by Z. Wirth. Cf. A. Angyal, *Die slawische Barockwelt* (Leipzig 1961), 19 ff.

⁷⁰ *Calendarium et Index Fectorum et Feuniorum secundum usum Metropolitanæ Ecclesiæ Pragensis* (Pr. 1578), *passim*; Turner, *Posthumæ Orationes*, 259–74 (Campion). ÖNB, MS. s.n. 2633: 'Icones Historici, Vitam et Martyrium St. Venceslai . . . designantes', illustrated for Archduke Ferdinand of Tyrol by Matthias

surprisingly, royal blood added to their pious merits in the eyes of contemporaries. Did not the same Přemyslid line also produce the Blessed Agnes, patroness of the first Bohemian Franciscans and Crusaders, whose body was providentially rediscovered in the 1640s?⁷¹

The other old-Bohemian saints were also mainly aristocratic. They included Prince Vojtěch (known to Germans as Adalbert), second bishop of Prague, missionary, martyr in 997, founder of the abbey of Břevnov; together with his brother Gaudentius. Their near-contemporary Günther (Vintřf) was a diplomat turned hermit, who died in the odour of sanctity. During the Middle Ages veneration for him centred on his burial-place at Břevnov; in the seventeenth century it shifted to the spot traditionally identified as his cell in the remote Bohemian forest, and a new chapel was built there. Hroznata, the greatest early benefactor of the Premonstratensians, likewise came of exalted stock, as did Hedwig, chief patroness of Silesia, and Hyacinth and his brother Česlav, founders of the Dominicans there, whose cult flourished anew from about 1600 (Hyacinth was canonized in 1594).⁷² Such cults did not, however, just pander to the élite; they embodied real popular devotion, building after 1620 on traditions never entirely broken. One of the earliest of all Bohemian saints, Ivan—said to have been

Hurski of Křivoklát, 'artis pictoriæ Pragæ professor', is based on originals in the Wenceslas chapel of St. Vitus. J. Solimani, *S. Wenceslaus* (Pr. 1626), a tragedy; *Knihopis*, nos. 67, 4186, 13891, 16062–4 (Wenceslas); 3651, 13894 (Ludmila); *Pravobřevň*, nos. 143, 166; Muk, op. cit. 130 f.; Kotrba, op. cit. 69; *Acta SS. Sept.*, vii, 770–844 (Wenceslas); v, 339–63 (Ludmila). Cf. the literature in Tumpach-Podlaha, op. cit., nos. B 1311–85, 1049–55; and—on Bohemian saints in general—Charnovský, *Vestigium*, 37–69.

⁷¹ Balbin, *Miscellanea Historica*, ii, bk. 1, 7 ff. (who turns even the legendary ploughman Přemysl into a noble). Beckovský, op. cit., pt. 3, 313–17; cf. Hanzal, 'Pospichal', 243; and Tumpach-Podlaha, op. cit., nos. B 78–115. But Rome was not prepared to confirm the genuineness of Agnes's relics.

⁷² Vojtěch: Matthias Boleucký, *Rosa Boëmica sive Vita Sancti Woytichi agnomine Adalberti* (Pr. 1668); *Knihopis*, no. 2094; *Acta SS.* Apr., iii, 174–205; Tumpach-Podlaha, op. cit. nos. B 1419–78. Günther: Charnovský, op. cit. 91 ff.; B. Píter, *Thesaurus absconditus* [i.e.] *S. Guntherus . . . Vita et Miraculis . . . illustratus* (Brunn 1762); G. Lang, 'Günther, der Eremit in Geschichte, Sage, und Kult', *Stud. u. Mitt.* lix (1941–2), 3–83, esp. 69 ff.; *Knihopis*, no. 1819; ÖNB, MS. s.n. 40. Hroznata: above, n. 47. Hedwig: *Acta SS.* Oct., viii, 198–270 (thorough). Hyacinth: A. Bzovius, *Propago D. Hyacinthi Thauraurgi Poloni . . .* (n.p. 1606); *Acta SS.* Aug., iii, 309–79 (likewise thorough). Česlav: Bzovius, *Tuclari Silesiae, seu De vita . . . B. Ceslai Odronarsii commentarius* (Cracow 1608).

the son of a Croatian duke, though his life is very obscure—set up as an anchorite in a rocky cleft beside the Berounka, west of Prague. His shrine was taken over by Benedictines and visited by many leading Counter-Reformation figures. In the climate of Baroque spirituality his example inspired imitation: Joseph II suppressed no less than seventy-three (one source suggests eighty-three) hermits following the rule of St. Ivan.⁷³

Another grass-roots Slavonic saint was Prokop (died in 1053), founder of the monastery at Sázava. The rehabilitation of Prokop represents an early act of Catholic revival: his relics were transferred in 1588 to Prague castle, apparently at the instigation of Rudolf II's sister Elizabeth.⁷⁴ Moreover, reverence of Prokop involved some sympathy for the whole idea of a Slavonic (rather than a Latin) liturgy, which he, as abbot of Sázava, had sought to propagate, and thus for the legacy of those misty apostles of the ancient Czechs and Moravians, Saints Cyril and Methodius. Though the message of Cyril and Methodius might appear dangerously schismatic when viewed from Rome—they had been ninth-century envoys of Constantinople—it was not entirely beyond the pale, especially in an age confident enough to believe that Catholicism might regain the loyalty of the Eastern Churches. The prospects of a recovery based on the Emmaus monastery in the New Town of Prague, established by Charles IV in direct continuation of Prokop's ideals, were blighted when the Benedictines of Montserrat took over its buildings, a clear case of the national aspect of religion defeated by the international. But the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition was cultivated at the Cistercian house of Velehrad, which supposedly stood on the site of their original activities, and whose abbot was senior regular prelate in Moravia. It found enthusiastic, if rough-hewn support from such writers as K. B. Hirschmentzel and J. J. Středovský.⁷⁵

⁷³ C. Hostlovský, 'Memoria Subrupensis', ed. D. Kozler and L. J. Winters, *Stud. u. Mú. i* (1880), 4, 110-42; xi (1890), 296-306, 448-63, 613-32; Z. Kalista, 'Bedřich Bridel', *Annali dell' Istituto Universitario Orientale*, sezzone slava, xiv (1971), 13-46, at 28-30. Lists of hermitages in Frind, *Erzbischöffe*, appendix 5; Blleik, *Stácky*, 415-418; Svátek, art. cit. 587 f. One typical example in Podlaha, *Posvátná místa*, ii, 17-19.

⁷⁴ OSN, s.v. 'Prokop'; Kalista, 'Bridel', 37 f.; *Acta SS.* July, ii, 136-48; Tumpach-Podlaha, op. cit., nos. B 1198-1231.
⁷⁵ Středovský, op. cit. (with marvellously inappropriate illustrations). On Emmaus: L. Helmig, *Kurzgefaßte Geschichte ... der Klöster Emmaus* (Pr. 1903);

Seventeenth-century Bohemia produced no saints of its own: the somewhat dubious dean of Holešov, Jan Sarkander, who died at the hands of the Moravian rebels in 1620, is an exception who proves the rule.⁷⁶ It did, however, transform in the most celebrated and controversial fashion the memory of an earlier martyr: Jan of Nepomuk. There is no space here for details about 'Jan Nepomucký' or the furious debate which has raged about him for over two centuries. Suffice it to say that the saint was a real person, a fourteenth-century churchman who became vicar-general to the archbishop of Prague and was murdered by the king, either as a too-faithful keeper of the queen's confession or, more probably, as a turbulent priest. In the seventeenth century Catholics advanced Nepomuk as an orthodox antipole to his heretical contemporary fellow-Jan, Jan of Husinec; his canonization process began in 1675 and ended successfully in 1729, amid scenes of great festivity.⁷⁷

Was Nepomuk, as many have believed, the perfect symbol of an imposed Counter-Reformation: an artificial counterweight to Jan Hus, even literally a non-person, foisted on a reluctant population by foreign authorities? The obvious Baroque enthusiasm for the saint should make us suspicious of this argument. Certainly Nepomuk was a counterweight to Hus: the search for continuity created that emotional need (and Hus himself, after all, had acquired the attributes of sainthood in the eyes of many Czechs); but his cult was a native product, resting on a veneration of the

W. Pfeifer, 'Das Prager Emmaus-Kloster—Schicksal einer Idee', *Archiv für Kirchengeschichte von Böhmen-Mähren-Schlesien*, ii (1971), 9-35; esp. 28 ff. A recent collective work: [J. Petr and S. Sabouk] (eds.), *Z tradic slovanské kultury v Sázava a Emmauz* ... (Pr. 1975), adds nothing new for this period. On Velehrad: Machilek, art. cit. 192; B. Zlámal, 'Cyrilometodějstvi K. B. Hirschmentzla', *Slezský Sborník* xlviii (=viii) (1950), 57-67; and above, n. 55. Cf. below, pp. 421-4, on the Uniate Churches.

⁷⁶ Balbin, *Miscellanea Historica*, i, bk. 4, pt. 1, 206-8; bibliography in Zibr, *BCH* iv, nos. 6024-71; and Tumpach-Podlaha, op. cit., nos. B 858-82. A controversial figure, Sarkander has not always been admired.

⁷⁷ The argument about Nepomuk extends even to his name (Jan of Pomuk seems to be the proper form) and to his historical existence, though much of the confusion was introduced by a 16th-century Catholic writer who actually invented two different 'Nepomuks'. The man sainted for his death in 1393 (*rozé 1383*) as a martyr to the sacrament of confession is largely fictional. J. Pekař, 'Tři kapitoly z boje sv. Jana Nepomuckého', *Z duchovních dějin českých* (Pr. 1941), 141-77, is very balanced. See, most recently, J. V. Polc and V. Ryněš, *Sv. Jan Nepomucký*, 1-11 (Rome 1972), and the literature in Tumpach-Podlaha, op. cit., nos. B 734-853.

martyr's true or supposed virtues which dated back to the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The time taken before his final canonization may point to the limited extent of that original *cultus*; but it also shows Rome's hesitation about approving it. Hagiography by Balbin and others came first, even the poignant statue on the Charles bridge in Prague which marks the presumed site of Nepomuk's drowning. It need not matter to us whether the tongue of the faithful confessor was really found uncorrupted when his tomb was opened in 1719, so long as we respect the sincerity of those who believed so.⁷⁸

*

The story of Nepomuk—the rewriting of a Gothic legend—affords the most fascinating case of interaction between new forces and old roots in Bohemia, between Counter-Reformation propaganda and spontaneous credence. The same admixture appears in Baroque historiography as a whole: honest and serious, thorough but quite uncritical, relating miracles with the same gusto as military exploits of the old aristocracy, perceiving no difference between contemporary and medieval values. Its greatest writer was Balbin (1621–88), who has left us in his unfinished *Miscellanea Historica* a piece of outstanding scholarship, according to the standards of the time, and also a remarkable source for the mentality of the period.⁷⁹ Lesser Jesuits, like the brothers Tanner and Fr. Kruger, cultivated the same interests. So did Balbin's friends in other orders, like Alois Hackenschmidt, a Premonstratensian at Tepl, the Crusader Jan Jiří Beckovský, author of a picturesque chronicle of Bohemia, and Beckovský's superior, Pospíchal, who kept valuable diaries. Among the secular clergy the leading figure was the tenacious and shrewd

⁷⁸ Perhaps the first printed work devoted to Nepomuk was by Jiří Plachý in 1641 (*Knihopis*, no. 13900), but monuments existed earlier (cf. F. Morýson, *An Itinerary* (London 1617), i, 16). Balbin, *Miscellanea Historica*, i, bk. 4, pt. 1, 94–113; cf. *Knihopis*, nos. 945–7. Good points are made by Kalista, *Barokní gotika*, 85 ff.; and—on the cult of Hus—by J. Macek, *Jean Hus et les traditions husites* (Paris 1973), 328 ff.

⁷⁹ The ninth book of the first *décades* of the *Miscellanea* was later published separately as *Bohemia Docta*, ed. R. Ungar, i–ii (Pr. 1776–80). There is an uncritical life by A. Rejzek, *Bohuslav Balbin, jeho život a práce* (Pr. 1908). It is characteristic of Balbin's sense of nearness to the medieval past that he thought an obscure moralizing work by a 14th-century Bohemian Carthusian worth publishing as a tract for his own times (W. G. Storey, *The De Quatuor Virtutibus Cardinalibus ... of Michael the Carthusian of Prague* (Salzburg 1972), 11 and n.).

Tomáš Pešina (1629–80), who devoted himself to writing the history of his native Moravia and his adopted domicile, the cathedral chapter of St. Vitus in Prague. Rather less ambitious were such parish priests as Sřtedovský, who rose to the dignity of count palatine; Maryáš Bolelucky, the biographer of St. Vojtěch; and Jan Florián Hammerschmid, rector of the Týn church in Prague.⁸⁰ In the work of all these clerical intellectuals, study of the past overlapped with topography and a breathless receptivity to the wonders of creation. As we shall see, their view of human history is inseparable from their view of natural history, and divine intervention links the two.

Not only were Bohemia's intellectuals mostly priests. They were also mostly Czechs, and the Czech language evidently contributed to their patriotism. They sought a continued place for it, even went so far as to approve Protestant public figures who had cultivated it.⁸¹ In fact the Counter-Reformation Church exercised no discrimination against Czech: there were many translations of improving works, and literature in the vernacular ranged from hagiography to the intense devotional poetry of Bedřich Bridel and the so-called St. Wenceslas Bible.⁸² Some Dominican churches were instructed always to preach in Czech, and others must keep Czech-speakers available; candidates for the Crusaders with a Red Star had to know both languages; Jesuits rejected the suggestion that they favoured German; Sobek of Bilenberk while archbishop wrote pungent letters in Czech. The Prague consistory would only authorize priests who understood the language of their parish and,

⁸⁰ Hackenschmidt: A. Patera (ed.), 'Dopisy B. A. Balbina k opatu teplskému ... a knězi téhož klátera Aloisovi Hackenschmidtů z l. 1664–7', *VKČSN*, 1888, 143–226; Schulz (ed.), *Korespondence jesuitů*, nos. 82–3. Beckovský: op. cit., and the life of him by Rezek, *ibid.* pt. 3, pp. vii–xxxii. Pospíchal: above, n. 61. Pešina: Zelený, art. cit. Sřtedovský: op. cit., and *Knihopis*, nos. 15766–7. Bolelucky: above, n. 72. Hammerschmid's main work: *Prodromus gloriose Pragense* (Pr. 1723), abounds in fond information about all the monuments, especially ecclesiastical, of the city; cf. his *Historie Klattovská* (Pr. 1699), with much on the Marian cult.

⁸¹ e.g. Balbin, *Bohemia Docta*, i, bk. 2, 314–17, 351–3, 364–7; and *passim*; Sřtedovský, op. cit. 6f. The remarks are very guarded, of course.

⁸² Selections in Z. Kalista (ed.), *České baroko* (Pr. 1940). On Bridel see also Kalista, 'Bridel'; and A. Skarža, *Fridrich Bridel nový a neznámý* (Pr. 1968). The Catholic Czech Bible—urged much earlier by Dietrichstein (Dudík, *Biblioteké*, 18)—finally appeared in 1677 and 1715, thanks to endowments collected by one of its translators, the Jesuit writer Matěj Václav Steyer (on whom see *Knihopis*, nos. 15935–51, and J. Vlček, *Dějiny české literatury*, i–ii (3rd edn. Pr. 1940), i, 740 ff.).

if anything, was hesitant to recognize the needs of towns (like Budweis) where German grew steadily more popular. Many clerics still used both tongues: what a cruel irony for the Hussite tradition that such men were now described as 'utraqists'!⁸³

But Czech was under pressure, and intellectuals rallied to its defence. Sřtedovský condemned its detractors, as did Peřina, whose first book appeared in the vernacular and had little success. Hammerschmid rejected a demand from the cobblers to have a German sermon on their patronal festival. Grammarians, above all the advocate Václav Jan Rosa, stressed the 'majestas et venustas linguae nostrae' and refurbished commonplaces—true or spurious—about the merits of the Slavonic tongues: they had been praised by Alexander the Great, urged on the sons of the German electors by Charles IV, used as a *lingua franca* in Constantinople; they combined great flexibility of expression with great geographical extension.⁸⁴ Prague even showed interest in the language of the Wendish peasants in Lusatia, and a grammar of it was produced by a Jesuit there. Most famous is the polemical apologia of Balbin in favour of Czech, suppressed by his superiors, and only published at the beginning of the national revival a century later.⁸⁵

Nevertheless we should beware about dragging this debate (as the nineteenth century was apt to do) right out of its context. The apologia, uncharacteristic of most of Balbin's *œuvre*, represents no kind of 'narodník' manifesto. It simply laments the decline of one aspect of Bohemia's richness, mainly through neglect, a sentiment echoed in practical terms by the considerable numbers of burghers

⁸³ UK, MS. XI A 1/b, fol. 94^r; Lorenz, op. cit. 80; Rejzek, op. cit. 429–36; Schulz (ed.), *Korrespondence Václava ... ze Sternberka*, nos. 89–160 (Sobek); Podlaha, *Dějiny*, 264–7, 292–5. Cf. Denis-Vantura, 1, 2, 167; and A. Mlka, 'K národnostním poměrům v Čechách po třicetileté válce', *ČSČH* xxiv (1976), 535–60, at 550 ff.

⁸⁴ Sřtedovský, op. cit. 5 f.: 'Sermo patrius Moravius ... multum ab ætate hac Patriae nostrae injuriosa supprimitur'; Zelený, art. cit. 257 ff., 101 ff.; OSN, s.v. 'Hammerschmid'. V. J. Rosa, *Čžeťhořčnosť, seu Grammatica linguae Bohemicae* (Pr. [1672]), preface. Earlier spokesmen for such views included Thomas Reschellus (*Dictionarium Latinobohemicum* (Olomouc 1560)); Matthias Benešovský, Utraquist 'abbot' of Emmaus (1582–9), whose *Grammatica Bohemica* (Pr. 1577, copy in Bod.), preface, stresses the usefulness to the Habsburgs of the Czech language; and Peter Loderecker, Benedictine abbot of the same monastery (deposed in 1611).

⁸⁵ [J. Tichon?], *Principia linguae Wendicae, quam aliqui Wandalicam vocant* (Pr. 1679). B. Balbin, *Dissertatio apologetica pro lingua slavonica, praecipue bohemiae*, ed. F. M. Pelz (Pr. 1775); cf. Vitek, op. cit. 1, 720–7.

and lawyers who manifested an equal unwillingness to abandon Czech. Support for one language did not necessarily involve any direct clash with the other: no serious racial tension can be found between Czechs and Germans in Bohemia either before or after 1620—the people's distaste for their new landlords is quite a different matter; nor were patterns of settlement significantly changed, as scholars have now belatedly come to recognize.⁸⁶ Still less did the Baroque intellectual's essentially Latinate world (of which Balbin was a fully-fledged member) countenance any kind of nationalist *ressentiment*. Rather, this intellectual patriotism rested heavily on the idea of a *Bohemia docta* (to adopt the title of another of Balbin's posthumous works) and went with infectious enthusiasm for the merits of the native land. Balbin lovingly describes its whistling fish, its beautiful gems, even a certain *avis Bohemica*; he is almost as proud of the gardens of the immigrant Saxe-Lauenburgs as of the historic royal fortress of Karlstein.⁸⁷

Learned Bohemia thus comprised a national culture, subtly accommodated through *šlechta* and Church to the requirements of Habsburg rule. Bernard Ignác Martinic embodied it exactly, and he is an excellent symbol of it, especially since Martinic, although perhaps the most powerful political figure in the country during the decades after the Peace of Westphalia, has been remembered only as an enemy of Balbin. That issue was ultimately trivial: Martinic, a touchy character, indeed resisted the publication of Balbin's *Epitome Historica*, probably because (a good Baroque reason) he detected in it a slight to his own family; but he backed several of Balbin's colleagues, like Tomáš Peřina. In fact Martinic was devoted to the Church—a major patron of Franciscans, Servites, Theatines, Piarists—and to its culture. Well-educated and quite erudite, he corresponded with Caramuel, with the imperial librarian Lambeck, with Jesuits such as Athanasius Kircher; a great respecter of books, he wrote a history of Ferdinand III's campaigns, even (apparently)

⁸⁶ For the towns: Placht, op. cit. 204–11; and the documents printed in Macůrek, *České země a Slovensko*. For lawyers: Klabouch, op. cit. 36 f., 45–7. On nationalities see the two sensible revision articles by A. Mlka, 'Národnostní poměry v českých zemích před třicetiletou válkou', *ČSČH* xx (1972), 207–29, and 'K národnostním poměrům ...'

⁸⁷ Above, n. 79. Balbin, *Miscellanea Historica*, 1, bks. 1 and 3, *passim*. On Balbin's Latin interests cf. above, pp. 114f.

a general history of his own time. Friend, adviser, and wholehearted admirer of Leopold I, his base of operations and mental frame of reference yet remained firmly Bohemian.⁸⁸

Martinic and his kind stand for a dual political and cultural loyalty: to the Habsburgs, whose apotheosis was regularly celebrated in both the visual arts and literature, even in such things as disputation-placards and legal textbooks;⁸⁹ and to native inspiration, which lent the Bohemian Baroque an increasing popular content. We can discern the same duality in Prague, now half-way between capital city and provincial town. The face of Prague was ruled by the shadow of the Habsburgs in their sombre, monumental castle with its lieutenant administration, whither Ferdinand III and Leopold paid only occasional visits. It was also ruled by the reality of its magnates' grand palaces, which, dotted on the slopes of their superb quarters above the left bank of the Vltava, scarcely have a visual equal in Europe, and its pompous churches, where hundreds of priests in every imaginable habit and several different languages ministered to a population still hardly smaller than that of Vienna.

*

This balance, achieved at Prague and in the countryside, between an international movement and its local manifestations, assured comparative stability to the Counter-Reformation society constructed in Bohemia by 1700. But it left weaknesses. The first follows directly from the nature of the bargain struck with the dynasty. Ruling groups in the kingdom had not really surrendered power and would resent any serious interference, whereas the Habsburgs were gradually being driven to assert their authority more effectively. For all the foot-dragging of the estates, the Bohemian

⁸⁸ I have found no literature at all on Martinic, beyond casual mentions; cf. Zibr, *BCH* I, no. 14732. On his touchiness: Schulz (ed.), *Korrespondence jesuitů*, nos. 63-5. On his dispute with Balbin: Květňová-Klímová, art. cit. 504-11; Vitek, op. cit. I, 725 f. On his patronage: Frind, *Erzbischöfe*, 216, 218; Zelený, art. cit. 107, 577; Podlaha, *Forováni míra*, vii, 143 ff., 181 ff.; Květňová-Klímová, loc. cit.; Kotrba, op. cit. 58; B. de Monconys, *Journal des Voyages*, i-ii (Lyons 1665-6), ii, 250 ff. On his learned interests: below, pp. 317 f. 325, 331, n. 49, pp. 336, 438. His work about Ferdinand III is in UK, MS. XI D 13, fols. 1-90, a copy, ?1630s; cf. F. Mareš in *MTÖG* vi (1885), 310 f. Placht, op. cit. 244, 251 f. (Martinic and Leopold).

⁸⁹ O. J. Biazček (ed.), *Theses in Universitate Carolina Pragensi disputatae*, i- (Pr. 1967-), pt. 1, fols. 1, 3; pt. 4, fols. 1-2, 4; pt. 5, fol. 2, etc.; [J. J. Weingarten], *Speculum Cicerium* (Pr. [1675]), 37 ff.

lands still paid over 50 per cent of the Monarchy's total tax contribution. At the beginning of the eighteenth century the treasury's appetite was even more voracious, while the first signs appeared of a crude mercantilist planning of the economy.⁹⁰ Moreover, neither Bohemia's ancient nobles nor its prelates were quite treated as the equal of their Austrian counterparts. It is a small, but telling commentary that only Lobkovices, Kinsky's, and Kauniz were ever admitted to princely rank, while after 1695 the sees of Prague and Olomouc were as often filled with foreign clerics as with domestic.⁹¹ The disloyalty of some aristocrats during the early 1740s, when Bavarian troops occupied the country, is directly proportionate to Habsburg disregard for their privileged position—and Bohemian patriotism, when under attack, could prove surprisingly attractive to more recently-settled families.

The second weakness was a more obviously grave one: the pressure exerted from without upon a system which served such limited social and intellectual élites. The deprived orders in Bohemia could only respond, not initiate, and their discontent, very massively demonstrated in 1680, was perforce directed against the establishment as a whole. Maybe they protested most of all against their new foreign landlords (it is curious that the most eloquent defence of the servile oppressed was penned by a Belgian Jesuit against an upstart Belgian estate-owner), but the combined impositions of dynasty, nobility, and Church formed their ultimate target, together with the immobile, hierarchical system which accompanied them. And Bohemia's peasants received even less practical consideration from

⁹⁰ But Pekar's argument (cf. above, p. 91, n. 25), that state taxation represented a worse burden for the peasantry than landlords' exactions has generally been thought exaggerated. Elements of early Habsburg economic centralization in Bohemia are discussed by A. F. Pribram, *Das böhmische Commerzkollegium und seine Tätigkeit* (Pr. 1898), and Klíma, op. cit. 116 ff., 166 ff.; though such 'governmental' schemes of course had influential local supporters too.

⁹¹ I omit the 18th-century princely elevations for two Bohemian-based, but immigrant families: Clary-Aldringen and Colloredo-Mansfeld (as well as for Liechtensteins, Dietrichsteins, etc.). The 18th-century archbishops of Prague (careers in Frind, *Erzbischöfe*, 231 ff.) were a Breuner, Kuenburg, Daniel Josef Mayer (a brief bourgeois episode, 1732-3), a Vratislav nominated but never consecrated, Manderscheid, Přichovský (ancient, but impoverished Czech nobility), and Salm-Salm. The bishops of Olomouc were Karl of Lorraine, then a Schratzenbach and Liechtenstein, two obscure figures (Troyer and Egkh-Hungersbach), followed by a Hamilton and Colloredo-Wallisee.

the ruler than did their Austrian equivalents.⁹² Meanwhile the army of resentful *émigrés*, though hardly more numerous than the Austrian exiles, lurked much closer at hand—many lived immediately across the Saxon border—and were less quickly assimilated into their foreign surroundings.

Bohemia on the threshold of the eighteenth century had almost healed the scars of the 1620s. The new edifice betrayed only minor internal divisions, and it exerted a real, albeit somewhat inscrutable, authority. But it was a more fragile solution than the Austrian one and might succumb to long-term threats. The issue of a major reconstruction had been side-stepped—no progress had even been made towards the institutional unity of Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia—and old antagonisms could gradually revive in these, the richest of Habsburg possessions. Two pieces of symbolic evidence may clinch the argument: the pilgrimage church of the Servites on the White Mountain, begun shortly after the battle in 1620, took a full hundred years to complete;⁹³ while the Baroque décor in the Franciscan church of Our Lady of the Snows, though impressive, never quite reached to the top of its towering Gothic vault.

⁹² The Jesuit was Jacques des Hayes, the tyrannical noble Count Guillaume Lamboy: Rezek, 'Dva pftispěvký', 15–28. Some (e.g. Grünberg, *op. cit.* i, 127 ff.) have viewed Leopold's *robot* patent issued in 1680 (and printed *ibid.* ii, 3–10) as a significant step towards reducing peasant burdens, but Marxist historians (e.g. Klíma, *op. cit.* 66–71) are surely right to question this interpretation. Cf. above, p. 168.

⁹³ Beckovský, *op. cit.*, pt. 3, 62 f.; Podlaha, *Posvátná místa*, v, 21–9.

CHAPTER 7

Hungary: limited rejection

Hungary was at once very simple and very complicated: a kingdom long established and distinctive, with well-defined historical frontiers (mainly mountains or rivers), but also widely divergent forms of settlement and culture; a notion to any contemporary and a separate entry in his reference books, but a blurred notion and usually a second-hand entry.¹ Provisionally after 1526, firmly after 1541, the country split into three parts: Habsburg territories in the west and north; Turkish vilayers in a great wedge through the centre; and to the east, Transylvania, earlier governed by a voivode, now a more-or-less independent principality. The arrangement was never an entirely settled one, as boundaries continued to fluctuate and some areas lived under dual sovereignty or no effective sovereignty at all. Nominally, perhaps, the dynasty could claim that it exercised a single kingship, held in trust for a happier future; it—or rather the indigenous nobility—enforced some rights over subjects under Turkish rule. But in practical terms the Habsburgs controlled, for most of our period, not more than 30 per cent of the total area; indeed a declining proportion, since Ottoman advance only reached its fullest extent in 1664 with the capture of Nagyvárad and Neuhäusel, while seven counties were ceded to Transylvania in the 1620s and again in the 1640s, on top of the substantial districts—known in quaint lawyers' Latin as the *Partium*—pledged to the principality since 1570.²

¹ Information would have been found (for example) in Martin Schödel, *Disquisitio historico-politica de Regno Hungariae* (Strasbourg 1629); *Respublica et status regni Hungariae* (Leiden 1634), a well-known but feeble compendium; P. Heylin, *Cosmographie*, i–ii (London 1653), ii, 182–90.

² The seven north-eastern counties (Abauj, Zemplén, Borsod, Bérég, Szabolcs, Szatmár, Ugocsa) passed for life to Bethlen Gábor (1621–9), and to György I Rákóczi (1645–8). The term *Partium* derives from the title assumed by the Transylvanian prince in respect of them: *Dominus Partium Regni Hungariae*. Few Western historical atlases have enough accuracy or detail to cope with Hungary; cf. *Történelmi atlasz*, pp. 12 f., 16 f.