

4. ADEL, REGION, INTEGRATION

M. A. CHISHOLM

A QUESTION OF POWER: COUNT, ARISTOCRACY
AND BISHOP OF TRENT

THE PROGRESS OF ARCHDUKE FERDINAND II INTO
THE TYROL IN 1567¹

Following the death of Emperor Ferdinand I on 25 July, 1564, his son, Archduke Ferdinand II, succeeded him as Count of the Tyrol. The new prince wrote the Upper Austrian Privy Council (*Regierung*) in Innsbruck three days later from Prague, where he was still Governor of Bohemia.² He noted that his arrival would be delayed and or-

¹ I would like to take this opportunity to thank Dr. Manfred Rupert of the Tiroler Landesarchiv (TLA) for the many hours he has helped me to read and decipher Old German.

² The Privy Council was the head of the Upper Austrian government. Its authority extended over the territorial complex of the Tyrol and Further Austria. The Privy Council was centred in the Tyrolean capital, Innsbruck; the Further Austrian government, centred in the Alsatian town, Ensisheim, was administratively subordinate to the Privy Council. Hence, the archduke, as his father, corresponded with the Privy Council in regard to both Tyrolean and Further Austrian affairs. However, contemporaries also referred to the Council loosely as the "Tyrolean Privy Council", as for example, when the archduke addressed a letter to *unsern Tyrolischen Regierung*; TLA, Ferdinanda, Position 23, Carton 28, 19 November, 1566. The association of the Privy Council with the Tyrol was no doubt a habit of mind, as it was centred in the Tyrol, dominated by Tyroleans and almost two-thirds of its business was taken up by the Tyrol: TLA, An die Fürstliche Durchlaucht (AFD), 19 October, 1565, fol. 602r–607r. For an overview of the Upper Austrian government, see Otto STOLZ, *Geschichtliche Beschreibung der ober- und vorderösterreichischen Lande* (Karlsruhe 1943); Otto STOLZ, *Das Verhältnis der vorderösterreichischen Lande zu den landesfürstlichen Regierungen in Innsbruck und Wien*, in: Friedrich METZ (ed.) *Vorderösterreich: Eine geschichtliche Landeskunde. Mit einem einleitenden Beitrag von Franz QUARTHAL* (Freiburg i. Br. '2000) 81–85. R. J. W. EVANS provides an elegant synthesis of the

dered the councillors in the interim to carry on as under his father.³ Two weeks later he wrote from the Viennese court of his brother, Emperor Maximilian II. He regretted that he could not come at once to govern personally, but in deference to the emperor, who had asked him to stay back to tie up loose ends in Bohemia and the Empire, he must tarry a little while longer.⁴ The little while lasted two and a half years. With Ferdinand's announcement of his imminent arrival in late 1566, the Privy Council put the final touches on the preparations for his formal reception.

It is now commonplace theory that political ritual contained real meaning in Old Europe.⁵ Through the distribution of power it articulated, it served to legitimize that order; hence, control of the ritual message was power itself. Often an order was not in dispute. In such cases, the first entry of a prince into his land served essentially to validate the existing relations regulating the ruling class. But sometimes it was challenged. Typically, the prince jettisoned the old ideas of moral obligation and consensus in the pursuit of an absolute monarchy. Rather than a forum to confirm the *status quo*, he came to see his entry as medium to assert a new distribution of power, and he strove to stage-manage it.⁶ Now a redistribution of power may and

intricate political patchwork of Further Austria in his *The Making of the Habsburg Monarchy 1550–1700* (Oxford 1979) 159–162.

³ TLA, Von der Fürstlichen Durchlaucht (VFD), 1564, fol. 1r–2r.

⁴ TLA, VFD, 1564, fol. 6v–7v.

⁵ A large body of literature on the meaning and interpretation of medieval and early modern European political ritual exists. See, for example, Richard C. TREXLER, *Public Life in Renaissance Florence* (New York 1980) xxvi–xxv; Sean WILENTZ (ed.), *Rites of Power: Symbolism, Ritual, and Politics since the Middle Ages* (Philadelphia 1985) 1–10; David CANNADINE, Simon PRICE (eds.), *Rituals of Royalty: Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Societies* (Cambridge 1987) 1–19; John ADAMSON (ed.), *The Princely Courts of Europe: Ritual, Politics and Culture under the Ancien Régime 1500–1750* (London 1999) ch. 1.

⁶ Roy STRONG traces the evolution of the princely entry in Europe in his *Art and Power: Renaissance Festivals 1450–1650* (Woodbridge 1984). For an overview of the entry in the Empire see Winfried DOTZAUER, *Die Ankunft des Herrschers: Der fürstliche "Einzug" in die Stadt (bis zum Ende des Alten Reichs)*, in: *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 55 (1977) 245–288; Helen WATANABE-O'KELLY, *The Entry in the Empire*, in: Pierre BÉHAR, Helen WATANABE-O'KELLY (eds.), *Specta-*

usually does entail some element of consent, but it is not likely to be achieved by consent alone. Men do not easily surrender what they hold essential to the preservation of their status, especially when they feel capable of defending it. Under such circumstances, a power struggle may well result.⁷ This is precisely what happened on the occasion of Archduke Ferdinand's accession, for it engendered a fight pitting prince against bishops and aristocrats over the meaning of his entry and the extent of his (and their) authority: where the prince attempted to change the traditional ceremonial language, the bishops and aristocrats strove to uphold it. At bottom, the issue turned on taxation.

The root of the disagreement was as old as the Tyrol itself: the relationship of the county and the prince-bishoprics of Trent and Brixen.⁸ In the eleventh century, the emperors earmarked Trent and Brixen to follow the normative pattern of German territorial development: the bishops were made direct subjects (*reichsunmittelbar*), furnished with extensive lands, high and low justice (*hohe und niedere Gerichtsbarkeit*) and crown monopolies (*jura regalia*). That this eventuality did not transpire is above all attributable to Meinhard II, count of the Tyrol, named after the cliff-top castle overlooking Meran.⁹ He was

culum Europaeum: Theatre and Spectacle in Europe (1580–1750) (Wiesbaden 1999) 722–741.

⁷ General treatments of the early modern European relationship between prince and nobility are given by H. G. KOENIGSBERGER, *Dominium Regale or Dominium Politicum et Regale: Monarchies and Parliaments in Early Modern Europe*, in: id., *Politicians and virtuosi. Essays in early modern history* (History series 49, London 1986) 1–25; Jonathan DEWALD, *The European Nobility, 1400–1800* (Cambridge 1996); Michael A. R. GRAVES, *The Parliaments of Early Modern Europe* (London 2001).

⁸ A note on the nomenclature of Trent and Brixen: my use of the double designations of bishopric and prince-bishopric, and bishop and prince-bishop, follows the practice of the sixteenth century Tyrolean Privy Council and estates. With respect to the office, they normally referred to each as prince-bishopric (*Hochstift* or simply *Stift*), unless they emphasized their spiritual jurisdiction, in which case they employed the term, diocese (*Diözese*); with respect to the person, they normally referred to each as bishop (*Bischof*), unless they emphasized their temporal jurisdiction, in which case they employed the title, prince-bishop (*Fürst-Bischof*).

⁹ Josef RIEDMANN assesses this formative phase of Tyrolean history in: *Eines Fürsten Traum: Meinhard II., Das Werden Tirols* (Innsbruck 1995) 27–58.

the late thirteenth century advocate (*Vogt* or *advocatus*) of the bishops, that is to say he exercised their royal *Bann* (the power to command) and temporal justice; but instead of protecting them, he preyed upon them: their lands were seized, their temporal rights usurped, and their vassals destroyed, oppressed or bought out. Yet he never conquered them: before their territories were totally overrun, his push came to a halt.

The outcome was *sui generis*. On the one hand, Meinhard's seizure of the bishops' temporal powers gave birth to the county of the Tyrol, whose essential features were the *Landesfürst* (prince of the *Land*) and the *Landschaft*.¹⁰ Meanwhile, that which escaped his talons became the significantly reduced prince-bishoprics of Trent and Brixen.¹¹ On the other hand, Meinhard laid the foundation for something greater than the sum of these three parts: it too came to be called the *Land* (a German term for a political and legal entity), whose essential features were the count, nobles and bishops bound by complex ties of advocacy, homage and allegiance. Meinhard maintained the advocacy of the bishops; further, many of the fiefs which he had held as vassal, and which he annexed to the county, remained fiefs of the bishops. At the same time, although many of the bishops' vassals became subjects of the *Landesfürst* and lived under his law, the *Landrecht* (law of the *Land*), most remained the bishops' vassals. They had good reason: the economic and political rights which ecclesiastical service afforded provided leverage against the encroachments of the *Landesfürst*.

¹⁰ The *Landschaft* was a specialised term for *Landstände* (estates of the *Land*) in which country folk were represented: Peter BLICKLE, *Landschaften im Alten Reich. Die staatliche Funktion des gemeinen Mannes in Oberdeutschland* (Munich 1973); Volker PRESS, *The System of Estates in the Austrian Hereditary Lands and the Holy Roman Empire: A Comparison*, in: R. J. W. EVANS, Trevor THOMAS (eds.), *Crown, Church and Estates: Central European Politics in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (London 1991) 1–22.

¹¹ The history of Brixen has attracted considerable attention. Josef GELMI provides a detailed bibliography in *Geschichte der Kirche in Tirol: Nord-, Ost- und Südtirol* (Innsbruck-Wien 2001). The history of Trent has received substantially less attention, at least in German. See Marco BELLABARBA, *Il principato vescovile di Trento dagli inizi del XVI secolo alla guerra dei Trent'anni*, in: id., Giuseppe OLM (eds.), *Storia del Trentino*, vol. 4: *L'età moderna* (Bologna 2002) 15–70.

Meinhard's immediate successors, rather than complete the secularization of the prince-bishoprics, chose to make them their protectorates.¹² They expanded the old advocacies into mutual defensive alliances, but alliances which they dictated; in effect, the bishops forswore independent foreign policies. In order to assure their compliance, the counts set down the one-sided terms of the alliances in contracts – the so-called *Kompaktaten* – which the bishops were given to sign. Gaining the consent of the bishops of Brixen was a formality as evinced by the summary nature of their contracts. But the bishops of Trent were another matter; although the counts expected no more from them, the contracts which they were presented were distinguished by their length and precision – each condition was specifically spelled out: the count pledged to protect Trent from internal and external enemies; in turn, the bishop pledged to obey the count as his lord and advocate, to notify the count before he waged war, to give the count entry into his castles, to inform the count about his appointment of captains, to aid the count against his internal and external enemies, to authorize the count to administer the prince-bishopric during a *sede vacante*, and if the count and bishop came to blows, the cathedral canons and captains of Trent pledged to support the count.¹³

Nevertheless, the late medieval counts still endeavoured to extend their advocacy into outright overlordship over the prince-bishoprics, though always in vain.¹⁴ Already in 1363, Duchess Margarethe decreed that the southern border of the *Land* extended to the Verona Gap, inclusive of Trent, and ordered everyone within it to take an oath of allegiance. At the 1433 negotiations between the county and Trent, Duke Friedrich asserted that the bishop was a member of the *Land*. In

¹² Otto STOLZ, Politisch-historische Landesbeschreibung von Südtirol (Schlern-Schriften 40, Innsbruck 1937) 352.

¹³ J. HIRN, Der Temporalienstreit des Erzherzogs Ferdinand von Tirol mit dem Stifte Trient (1567–1578), in: AÖG 64 (1882) 355–498, esp. 356–60; Klaus BRANDSTÄTTER, Die Beziehungen zwischen Tirol und Trient im späten Mittelalter, in: Studi Trentini di Scienze Storiche 75 (1996) 3–30, esp. 15–19.

¹⁴ Jürgen BÜCKING, Frühabsolutismus und Kirchenreform in Tirol (1565–1665). Ein Beitrag zum Ringen zwischen „Staat“ und „Kirche“ in der frühen Neuzeit (Wiesbaden 1972) 11–15; BRANDSTÄTTER, Die Beziehungen 23–26.

1454 and 1468, Duke Sigmund tried to insert a clause into the *Kompaktaten* affirming the incorporation of Trent into the county. At the 1468 *Landtag* (diet of the *Land*), the mayor of Meran rebuked the bishop for quibbling about his *reichsunmittelbar* status: the duke, he declared, was his *Landesfürst* and Trent was part of the *Land*. By the latter century, the *Landesfürst* and *Landschaft* pressed the bishops to join the *Landschaft*, which they did for the first time at the 1474 *Landtag*. In 1486, Sigmund demanded that the subjects of Trent and Brixen take an oath of allegiance to him and that the bishop of Trent issue the *Landesordnung* (the comital charter of Tyrolean rights) in his territory. At the 1490 *Landtag*, he denounced the bishops as his “enemies” and fulminated against their presence in his court.¹⁵

IMPERIAL RULE

Archduke Sigmund’s three immediate successors – Counts Maximilian I (1490–1519), Charles I (1519–1522) and Ferdinand I (1522–1564) – could have stayed the course and sought to introduce the *Landesordnung* everywhere, universalize the right to representation in the estates, and make everyone their direct subjects. Instead they turned Tyrolean politics on its head. Not only did they affirm Trent’s temporal rights, but reinforced them. The reasons lay less with events inside as outside the Tyrol. For the first time, Counts who were at the same time Emperors – Maximilian I (1493–1519), Charles V (1519–1556/58) and Ferdinand I (vicar 1521–1531, king 1531–1556/58 and emperor 1556/58–1564) – acceded to the throne, and they ruled first as emperors and second as counts.

The very notion of empowering commoners at the expense of their betters was alien to these three Renaissance monarchs. For them, social stability required hierarchy. Maximilian’s comment about Archduke Sigmund’s rule could have just as well been uttered by his grandsons: “In the long run it is counter-productive to let the estates govern, since it incites the common man to disobedience against his superiors, and leads to the suppression of the nobility and high

¹⁵ Albert JÄGER, *Geschichte der landständischen Verfassung Tirols*, vols. 2 (Innsbruck 1881–1885), vol. 1, 335, 364.

clergy.”¹⁶ They were threatened neither by the existence nor the aggrandizement of the bishops or the nobility, as long as they could rely on them. Their priority was not territorial state-building, but rather the economic exploitation of their subjects for far-flung dynastic projects, and to this end they looked to the cooperation of the elite.

The emperors were not disappointed. Historians have often noted the enthusiasm with which the Tyrolean bishops and aristocracy – unique to the hereditary lands and Empire – backed Maximilian’s universal politics. With good reason he called the Tyrol the heart and shield of his monarchy. He turned Innsbruck into the unofficial capital of the hereditary lands and Empire, made the *Land* the administrative, military and financial pillar of the dynasty, and catapulted the Tyroleans onto the centre-stage of European politics. They formed the core of his court and gave his foreign policy a noticeably Tyrolean stamp.¹⁷ His three wars following his accession to the Tyrol were waged against its neighbours: the Swiss, Bavarians and Venetians. The last two brought the county territorial booty, and after the extinction of the Gorizian line in 1500, it acquired its western territories against the remonstrations of the Carinthian estates. Under Maximilian’s tutelage, the area of the county grew by a third. He even toyed with awarding it the prince electorship of the Rhineland-Palatinate.

The prime beneficiaries of Maximilian’s favour were the bishops, their cathedral chapters, and a handful of nobles – names like Arco, Annenberg, Brandis, Botsch, Boimont, Cles, Firmian, Friendsberg, Fuchs, Gresta, Khuen, Liechtenstein, Lodron, Madruzzo, Spaur, Thun, Trapp, Trautson, Völs, Welsberg, Wolkenstein – who secured an unrivalled place atop the Tyrolean power structure, above not only the common man, but the rest of the nobility. They were by German standards largely low nobility, whose lineage traced back to the unfree status of *Ministeriale* (servant) and whose late medieval social

¹⁶ Werner KÖFLER, *Land. Landschaft. Landtag. Geschichte der Tiroler Landtage von den Anfängen bis zur Aufhebung der landständischen Verfassung 1808* (Innsbruck 1985) 270.

¹⁷ See Heinz NOFLATSCHER, *Räte und Herrscher. Politische Eliten an den Habsburgerhöfen der österreichischen Länder 1480–1530* (Mainz 1999) 68–82, 137–152; Hermann WIESFLECKER, *Kaiser Maximilian I. Das Reich, Österreich und Europa an der Wende zur Neuzeit*, vol. 5 (Vienna 1986) 220–305.

ascension had followed a standard pattern of incremental accumulation of rights of *Herrschaft* (lordship) in the county and prince-bishoprics – rarely as allod, sometimes as fief, most often in pawn.¹⁸ With the exception of the Arcos and Lodrons, who were *Grafen* (counts), the rest were *Ritter* (knights); in fact, the Wolkensteins were the first to be elevated to *Freiherr* (baron) in 1488.¹⁹ Perhaps their relatively humble ancestry accounts for their conspicuous devotion to the house of Austria. They saw no fundamental contradiction between Habsburg interests and their own. Their ethos of service is captured by the *Landmann*²⁰ and imperial advisor, Sigmund Thun, in a speech to an audience of government lords: “It is to be remembered that we are the sworn servants of the late imperial Majesty, all of his heirs, lands and subjects, and bound to further their welfare, even more than the common man.”²¹

This special relationship paved the way for the dismantlement of the late medieval *Ständestaat*. Its central premise was the exclusion of the towns and *Gerichte*²² from the political process. Maximilian

¹⁸ See Hans v. VOLTELINI, *Das welsche Südtirol*, in: *Erläuterungen zum Historischen Atlas der österreichischen Geschichte* 1,3,2 (1919) passim; Otto STOLZ, *Politisch-historische Landesbeschreibung von Tirol: Nordtirol* (AÖG 107, Wien 1926) passim; id., *Landesbeschreibung von Südtirol*, passim.

¹⁹ Josef EGGER, *Die Tiroler und Vorarlberger* (Vienna-Děčín 1882) 97–101; NOFLATSCHER, *Räte und Herrscher 166–192*; Peter FELDBAUER, *Herren und Ritter* (*Herrschaftsstruktur und Ständebildung* 1, Vienna 1973) 197–243.

²⁰ A *Landmann* was a member of the noble estates of the *Land* (*Landleute* or *Landvolk*).

²¹ The draft is undated, but its contents indicate that he wrote it in early 1521: *So ist doch zu bedencken, daz wir der Ken. Mt. hoch Gedachtnus und allen seynen Erben verpflicht gelobt geschworen Diener seyn; und alles das Ihre, daz Irer Mt. irer Erben, auch Landen und Leyten zu frumen komen mocht, auff daz hochst zu bedencken und etwas mer dann der gemayn Mann schuldig*; Státní oblastní archiv v Litoměřicích, pobočka Děčín, Rodinný archiv Thun-Hohensteinů (SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín), Carton 132.

²² *Gericht* (the singular of *Gerichte*) is a confusing term. It was one of many Tyroleans terms – along with *Herrschaft*, *Grafschaft*, *Burgfrieden*, *Hofmark*, *Amt*, *Vikariat*, *iurisdicctio*, *giurisdizione*, *podestarie*, *dynastia* – denoting an administrative district: VOLTELINI, *Das welsche Südtirol* 31; Wilfried BEIMROHR, *Mit Brief und Siegel: Die Gerichte Tirols und ihr älteres Schriftgut im Tirolern Landesarchiv* (Innsbruck 1994) 27–86, esp. 53. It also referred to the community of a *Ge-*

further tilted rural power against the peasantry by pawning administrative districts – the few remaining prize pieces of the old county and a good part of the new – to Brixen and aristocrats until there were almost none left to sell.²³ Since the aristocracy formed a community of blood relations and its rights of *Herrschaft* (lordship) were in practice hereditary, a strong economic base for its long-term survival was secured. Hand-in-hand with the partial refeudalization of local government went the modernization of central government. The emperor replaced the princely-estates' governing council with a Privy Council, barred the towns and *Gerichte* and brought in German jurists, above all leading *Landleute* – the bishops of Trent and Brixen, canons of Trent and Brixen, Arco, Cles, Firmian, Freundsberg, Fuchs, Liechtenstein, Spaur, Thun, Völs, Wolkenstein.²⁴ By turning the leaders of the noble estates into his sworn servants, he laid a bridge between the *Landesfürst* and the *Landtag*, which he further stacked against the towns and *Gerichte* by permanently incorporating the bishops and their cathedral chapters into the prelatial estates.²⁵ No less crucial in winning a pliant clientele, however, was the emperor's attitude to taxation: he did not ask it to carry any inordinate burden, only to grant it.

richt. Further, and in the sense used here, it meant those country folk with estates' rights, whatever the administrative district was called. It is strictly speaking incorrect to refer to them as the peasantry, since many peasants were denied estates rights, while many country folk were not peasants. Adelina WALLNÖFER shows the heterogeneity of late medieval Tyrolean rural society in her *Die Bauern in der "Tiroler Landschaft" vor 1500. Politische Aktivität der Gerichte und deren Repräsentanten auf den Landtagen* (Diss. Innsbruck 1984).

²³ The contemporary Georg KIRCHMAIR observed in 1518: "It is obvious that in this land anything which generates income is mortgaged [...] in the whole county I can only think of four substantial districts which have not been." (trans.); id., *Denkwürdigkeiten 1519 bis 1553*, ed. Theodor G. von KARAJAN (*Fontes rerum Austriacarum* 1,1, Vienna 1855) 443.

²⁴ Theodor MAYER, *Verwaltungsorganisationen Maximilians I. Ihr Ursprung und ihre Bedeutung* (Innsbruck 1920) 36; BÜCKING, *Frühabsolutismus* 16; NOFLAT-SCHER, *Räte und Herrscher*, table 8.

²⁵ See Volker PRESS, *Herrschaft, Landschaft und 'Gemeiner Mann' in Oberdeutschland vom 15. bis zum frühen 19. Jahrhundert*, in: *Zeitschrift für die Geschichte des Oberrheins* 123 (1975) 169–214, esp. 186.

On the eve of Maximilian's accession, the Tyrolean fiscal system was one of the most undeveloped of Europe.²⁶ Where almost everywhere else extraordinary taxation was a fact of life, in the Tyrol it was still a novelty. The *Landschaft* had yet to grant a sales tax and had only begun to grant property and income taxes. The first time that the bishops, cathedral chapters and town of Trent contributed alongside the *Landschaft* was in 1474. The estates later commented that they could scarcely remember granting taxation under Sigmund.²⁷ This changed under Maximilian. In order for him to hold his own on the international stage, he needed large and regular contributions from his provincial estates – the Tyrolean included. As such, he repeatedly turned to them for aid. The heightened fiscal pressure induced intense inner-estates conflict. Each member – bishops, cathedral chapters, monasteries, nobles, towns and *Gerichte* – scrambled to stake out its claim against the other: the burning issue no longer was whether taxes should be granted or not, but their distribution. The result was a new social alignment in the diet pitting the upper estates – bishops, cathedral chapters, monasteries and nobility – against the lower estates – towns and *Gerichte*.

The kingpin in this contest was the upper estates of the *Landschaft*, for any motion to grant aid required the backing of two-thirds of the plenum diet – exactly their proportion of votes.²⁸ It met the emperor half-way. Unparalleled in the Habsburg lands, probably the Empire, perhaps even Christendom, was the Tyrolean custom of direct prelatial and noble taxation in common with the other subjects of

²⁶ For early modern Tyrolean taxation, see Tullius v. SARTORI-MONTECROCE, *Geschichte des Landschaftlichen Steuerwesens in Tirol* (Innsbruck 1902); KÖFLER, *Land* 112–196; BÜCKING, *Frühabsolutismus 155–171*; Marcello BONAZZA, *La nobiltà trentino-tirolese di fronte al prelievo fiscale tra politica di ceto e compartimenti individuali (secoli XV–XVII)*, in: *Geschichte und Region/Storia e regione* 4 (1995) 77–112.

²⁷ WIESFLECKER, *Kaiser Maximilian I.*, vol. 2, 181.

²⁸ SARTORI-MONTECROCE, *Geschichte des Landschaftlichen Steuerwesen* 58. With the addition of the prince-bishoprics, the distribution of estates' votes broke down in 1474 as follows: bishop of Trent and Brixen and their cathedral chapters (4), prelates (13), nobles (123), towns (including Trent's vote) (8), *Gerichte* (59); KÖFLER, *Land* 51.

the *Land*.²⁹ But its application was narrow: the *Landesfürst* could tax the lords only on their property income (*Rennt, Zyns und Einkommen*), and as a rule only for military purposes. While they were willing to give Maximilian a fairly wide scope to tax – over and above military purposes – they were unwilling to grant assessment on anything but their property income. The lower estates of the *Landschaft* held weaker bargaining power, for in the majoritarian plenum diet, they were in large part thrown back on noble discretion. They really had only one card to play, but it was one which neither Maximilian nor the nobility could ignore: old custom. Like the upper estates, they realized that taxation for reasons beyond military purposes was inescapable, but they insisted that the nobility contribute with them as in the past, in part to check its readiness to cede taxation, in part to spread the load; and in order to spread the load again, they insisted that the prince-bishoprics also contribute with them as in the past.

This is where things got complicated. The spanner in the works was Trent. Although it had contributed taxes before, the amount had

²⁹ A Tyrolean noble document from Ferdinand I's reign underscores the distinctiveness of the Tyrolean nobility: *Der Adel ist nit allain von gemainen geschreibnen rechten von Burgern und den gemainen Mann gesundert, sonnder auch alle ligende Guetter, so Sy haben oder zewegen bringen, die seind der gmain Beschwerung nit underwurffig. Und diß Recht wirdt also im hailigen Reich, in Welschland, in Franckland, und nachtet in der ganzen Christenhait gehalten. In Rö. Ku. Mt. Nidern und Vordern österreichischen Landen, als in Österreich, Sunckau, Ellsäs, und in den ubrigen österreichischen Landen wirdt der Adel nit gesteuert, allain wann der Landfürst uber sein Landtschafft ain Steuer anlegt, so ist der Adel fur sich selbs regulariter gefreyt; hat er aber Underthan auf dieselbigen, wirdt Allzeit ain Anschlag mit Vortail Irer Herrn angelegt. Das ist notorium. In simili, wird es im Reich auch gehalten, wann die Kayser ainicherlay Reichssteuer anlegen, so wirdt der Adel auch gesundert, also haltens die Curfursten und all Fursten dess Reichs. Der Adel in der Graffschafft Tyrol und in baiden Stifften Trient und Brichsen, die brauchen sich auch derselbigen gemainen Freyhait, das Sy mit Iren Hab, Leib und Gutern von Stetten, Gerichten und gemainen Mann gesundert sein. Allain in Steuern und Raisen hats zwischen den Edlen im Reich und Erblanden und der Edlen in Tyrol die Underscheid, das die vom Adel in Tyrol, ausserhalben Irer Underthann, neben den Herrn Prelaten ain gesunderten Anschlag von Iren Hab und Gueter oder Einkommen, wo die gelegen sein, auch darvon steuern und raisen muessen; SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, Carton 162, undated and unsigned.*

been modest. But now that the count demanded grants of unheard-of proportions, the stakes were higher. Like the count, the bishop was responsible for good government, and no different than the count, he depended on his subjects to pay him taxes to perform it. Thus, like the *Landschaft*, he invoked old custom and refused to budge one iota from the *Kompaktaten*: where his predecessors had hitherto played them down, he now quoted them loudly. Their central theme had always been the mutual defence of the *Land* and as long as it continued to govern the obligation of Trent to the county, the bishop had a water-tight case against spiralling Habsburg fiscal claims. Yet for the bishop, the issue was not simply economic; it was hugely constitutional: for to contribute along side the *Landschaft* was a slippery slope to actually joining it – if he was not careful, he could lose his right of taxation to the count.³⁰ Although the bishop had begun to attend the diets called by Sigmund, they had been infrequent; hence, no binding precedent had yet been established. But now that Maximilian called a diet virtually every year, an “old custom” was fast in the making. Before it was too late, the bishop needed to distinguish himself clearly from the *Landschaft*: accordingly, he refused, in contrast to the *Landschaft*, to take the *Erbhuldigung* (the hereditary oath of allegiance of the *Landschaft* to the *Landesfürst*); and to drive the wedge deeper, he refused, in contrast to the *Landschaft*, to contribute for any other reason than to defend the *Land*. Around 1500 then, the two issues – fiscal and constitutional – converged and reinforced each other in a way not previously seen. The *Kompaktaten* and the bishop’s *reichsunmittelbar* had never been directly related: the first defined the bishop’s relation to the count, the second his relation to the king. Henceforth, they formed flip sides of the same coin: Trent’s obligation to contribute no more than to the defence of the *Land* became a leading symbol, if not condition, of its political autonomy.

After decades of haggling, a settlement was reached at the 1511 *Landtag*. What came to known as the *Libell* (booklet) codified the levy, deployment and finance of troops inside or on the borders of the

³⁰ See BÜCKING, *Frühabsolutismus* 163.

Land.³¹ There were three identical copies, only the co-signatories varied: one between Maximilian and the bishop of Trent, one between Maximilian and the bishop of Brixen, and one between Maximilian, the bishops, *Landschaft* and recently acquired Bavarian territories (the so-called *Drei Herrschaften*: Kitzbühel, Kufstein and Rattenberg) and Gorizian territories (*Herrschaft* Lienz and parts of the Puster Valley). Its singularity rested not on its contents – they departed little from previous diet resolutions – but rather its promulgation: unlike previous diet resolutions, the emperor gave this resolution the most solemn and inviolable form possible by enshrining it in an imperial privilege. By all indications, he did so reluctantly: only after years of estates' pressure did he give in and none of his other lands received such a concession.³²

It was on the face of it an anomalous solution. Maximilian's policy was guided by the aim of tapping Tyrolean wealth in support of foreign wars, yet the *Libell* limited the estates' obligation to levy military aid to operations on Tyrolean soil. But it appears stranger still when its subsequent execution is considered. Having secured such far-reaching safeguards, the estates promptly waived them with no apparent compensation and almost as though the *Libell* did not exist. Although they divided the *Landsteuer* (tax of the *Land*) between them according to the quotas laid down in it, most of the taxes received by Maximilian were granted to raise troops to fight in Italy and a small proportion to expand government. Likewise, most of the taxes received by Ferdinand I were given to cover his war expenditures in Hungary and Germany, and a small proportion to pay for his burgeoning government and fifteen children.³³ In practice then, taxation was no more restricted in the Tyrol than in other Habsburg provinces. At the same time, and the third and final puzzle of the *Libell*, tax returns fell consistently and markedly below the level of taxation

³¹ It formed a bound eight-page document, hence the term *Libell* (from *libellus*): Martin P. SCHENNACH, *Tiroler Landesverteidigung 1600–1650. Landmiliz und Soldnertum* (Innsbruck, 2003) 139–152.

³² *Id.*, *Ritter, Landsknecht, Aufgebot. Quellen zum Tiroler Kriegswesen (14.–17. Jahrhundert)* (Tiroler Geschichtsquellen 49, Innsbruck 2004) 43–71, here 51–56.

³³ BLICKLE, *Landschaften im Alten Reich* 252.

promised: Maximilian and Ferdinand were lucky to see two-thirds of any grant.

What are we to make of all this? The answer, befitting much Tyrolean politics of the time, is deceptive. It lies as much in what the *Libell* contains as omits. In truth, the *Libell* was devised as a constitutional ruse to get round the lower estates' right to refuse taxation by buying the tax vote of the bishop of Trent and other Romance members of the upper estates. The main reason Maximilian called the 1511 *Landtag* was officially to commit the prince-bishoprics to extraordinary taxation, above all because the towns and *Gerichte* would not knuckle under unless the prince-bishoprics were seen to as well.³⁴ To this end he gave in to both conditions of Trent: he recognized the special estate's status of Trent (and Brixen);³⁵ he limited the liability of Trent to provide military aid to the defence of the *Land* (and Brixen and the *Landschaft*).³⁶ With the prince-bishoprics locked

³⁴ From a writing submitted by the delegates of the *Landschaft* and the government to Ferdinand: *Derhalben Kaiser Maximilian im funffzehnhundert unnd aindliffften Jar ainen Lanndtag halten lassen unnd fürnemblichen darumben, damit sein Majestät die bede Stifft Triennndt und Brixen auch zu ordennlichen unnd ungewigerter Rettung bringen mochte [...], welches Kaiser Maximilian, deßgleichen ain Regierung, so damals merer Tails von Lanndtleuten besetzt und etliche vertraute Lanndt Rett woll gewisst, darauf auch durch Kaiser Maximilian sonndere und zuvor wolberattschlagte Fursehung den obgeschriebenen Vertrag allain auf ainen Zuezug in ainer Lanndtsnott abgehandllt, ob also durch solchen Weeg des Stiffts Triennndt Unnderthanen und anndere Ungehorsamen in gemaine Steuern gebracht hetten mugen werden, wie dann etliche vom Adl im Stifft Triennndt gesessen auf solchen Vertrag unnd beschechne aindlif jarige Vergleichung zu Raichung aller Hilfen unnd Lanndtsteuern bewegt worden, die sunst sich mit gemaines Stiffts Triennndt Unnderthanen vorbehalten behelffen hetten mugen [...]* So dann als Kaiser Maximilian durch ain E[hrsame] T[firolische] L[andschafft] ain Gelltsteuer bewilligt worden, hat Kaiser Maximilian auf obermelts Stifft Triennndt Unnderthanen und die welschen Confinannten, die gleichwoll Ire Anschlag in die Zuezug unnd Lanndtsrettung gehebt, in gehaim und bey sich selbs kain Rechnung gemacht, sonnder allain auf Prelatten, Adl, Stett und Gericht im Lanndt und die Herrschafft Lienz auch daz Pussterthall und drey Herrschafften [...]; SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, Carton 92, 11 September, 1556. Cf. n. 101.

³⁵ The *Libell* clearly distinguished between the bishops and the *Landschaft*. See KÖFLER's edition of the *Libell* in his Land 118s.

³⁶ *Ibid.* 119.

in the *Libell* and the understanding that everyone was assessed according to the proportions laid down in it, the estates opened their coffers for reasons beyond defence. But in fact taxation was not shared by everyone: at the 1511 diet, Maximilian and the Privy Council “secretly” (that is unbeknown to the lower estates) exempted the subjects of Trent and the *welsche Konfinen* (Romance border region)³⁷ from all *Landsteuer*, excluding that which applied to home defence. The exemption amounted to a free ride. Thus, before the ink on the *Libell* was dry, its letter was compromised, and at subsequent diets Maximilian and the upper estates maintained the illusion of tax fairness by pretending that no exemption existed.

By the same token, the other prelates and the nobility obtained their sweetener. The grant which any plenum diet made was divided among the estates according to the fixed quotas such that the “rich compensate the poor”: the prince-bishops and upper estates assumed around 40 % of the total load and the lower estates assumed about 60 %. Following old custom, the upper and lower estates were assessed differently. The tax of the upper estates – which came to be called the “noble tax” – was based on total manorial (less demesne) income and assessed by the upper estates; hence the term “oath tax”. The tax of the lower estates – which came to be called the “common tax” – was based on property value and assessed by a mixed commission of government and estates’ officials, and recorded in official property registers. In other words, each estate was assigned a fixed portion of every grant, which was further divided down to the household level. But the noble tax – based as it was on income – fluctuated, which raises the question what was the relation between the amount which the upper estates granted and actually paid. It depended. When Ferdinand asked why the upper estates never managed to

³⁷ This expression had no precise definition. It could mean the whole Romance Tyrol or the southern border of the Tyrol, exclusive of the prince-bishopric of Trent. The approximate sense used here was narrower: the pocket of administrative districts nestled between the prince-bishopric of Trent and Italy over which the count claimed the right of taxation – like Arco, Penede, Lodron, Gresta, the *Vier Vikariate* (Ala, Avio, Brentonico, and Mori), Rovereto, Folgaria, Castel Pietra, Castelcorneo, Caldonazzo, Pergine, and Nomi: VOLTELINI, *Das welsche Südtirol*, passim.

meet their quota, the Privy Council pointed out that, according to the *Libell*, the *Landschaft* was exempt from taxation in excess of which impaired its standard of living.³⁸

Yet, notwithstanding its serious loopholes, the *Libell* served its immediate purpose. During Maximilian's reign, Tyrolean grants were no less than Upper and Lower Austria put together, and greater than the whole Empire.³⁹ The surviving tax records are incomplete, but at his last diet, in 1518, the Austrian estates granted 400,000 *Gulden* over four years: 120,000 by Upper and Lower Austria, 100,000 by Styria, 60,000 by Further Austria, and 120,000 by the Tyrol.⁴⁰ Hence, we can say that Tyrolean grants averaged somewhere around 30,000 *Gulden* per year.

Maximilian's reforms had the makings of a lasting solution. Although they brought increasing lower estates' restiveness at the end of his reign, particularly at the 1518 general diet, they were not fundamentally endangered. But after his death, they unravelled. What nobody bargained on was Martin Luther. The common man proved particularly receptive to the "Pure Word of God". The combination of festering grievances and the evangelical idea of Christian freedom translated into a powerful vehicle of social protest against the ruling class. Charles, whose reign lasted but three years, escaped the worst of it.⁴¹ Ferdinand bore the brunt.⁴² He witnessed three concerted at-

³⁸ *In Bedennckung, das das aindliffjt Jarig [1511] Libell lauter in sich halt, daz sich ain ersame Tyrolische Landschafft mit Kaiser Maximilian der Steuern halber vertragen, doch unbegeben Irer Freyhait und auch so lang die gemelten Stennd in dergleichen vermuglichen Wesen unverhört und ungeschmelert beleiben*; TLA, An die Römische Kaiserliche Majestät (AKM), 18 August, 1559, fol. 581v.

³⁹ WIESFLECKER, Kaiser Maximilian I., vol. 4, 290–305.

⁴⁰ KÖFLER, Land 145.

⁴¹ It was long enough to saddle the Tyroleans with 415,000 *Gulden* of his 829,189 *Gulden* imperial election debts: Josef MACEK, *Der Tiroler Bauernkrieg* und Michael Gaismair (Berlin 1965) 17. For Charles' reign see also Ferdinand HIRN, *Geschichte der Tiroler Landtage von 1518–1525. Ein Beitrag zur sozialpolitischen Bewegung des 16. Jahrhunderts (Erläuterungen und Ergänzungen zu Janssens Geschichte des deutschen Volkes 4,5, Freiburg i. Br. 1905)*; NOFLAT-SCHER, *Räte und Herrscher* 82–89.

⁴² There is no major work on Ferdinand's Tyrolean reign. See Rudolf PALME's *Frühe Neuzeit (1490–1665)*, in: Josef FONTANA, Peter W. HAIDER, Walter LEITNER,

tempts by the peasantry to overturn or opt out of the new order: the Peasants' War,⁴³ the Anabaptist movement,⁴⁴ and the Dosser conspiracy.⁴⁵ Each was met by brute force. Rebel peasants were cut down in battle, executed, and mutilated by the hundreds; Anabaptists were burned at the stake by the hundreds (to make sure everyone got the message, the corpses were sometimes hung along the roadsides); and 53 Dosser conspirators were executed (plus one who committed suicide) – five were quartered alive.

Still, as perilous as the Reformation was for the upper estates, it also confirmed them: afterwards the secularization of the Church was unthinkable and so the position of the nascent aristocracy confirmed. The impetus to preserve the prince-bishoprics came from several directions. One was Rome, which claimed a major stake in the fate of the Tyrol. The Central Alps suddenly took on acute politico-religious strategic importance for they commanded the Brenner Pass – the Italian “gateway” (*porte d'Italia*) – and formed the last bulwark against the Protestant advance into the Catholic heartland.⁴⁶ The result was direct papal interference in the Habsburg bailiwick and the meteoric rise of Trent's influence, such

Georg MÜHLBERGER, Rudolf PALME, Othmar PARTELI, Josef RIEDMANN, *Geschichte des Landes Tirol*, vol. 2 (Innsbruck-Vienna 1987) 39–89.

⁴³ MACEK, *Tiroler Bauernkrieg*; Peter BIERBRAUER, *Die unterdrückte Reformation: Der Kampf der Tiroler um eine neue Kirche (1521–1527)* (Zurich 1993).

⁴⁴ James M. STAYER, *The German Peasants' War and Anabaptist Community of Goods* (Montreal and Kingston 1991) 3 and *passim*; Werner O. PACKULL, *Hutterite Beginnings: Communitarian Experiments during the Reformation* (Baltimore-London 1995); Heinz NOFLATSCHER, *Häresie und Empörung: Die frühen Täufer in Tirol und Zürich*, in: *Der Schlern* 63 (1989) 619–639.

⁴⁵ Justinian LADURNER, *Barthlmä Dosser von Lüssen oder der projectirte Bauernrebell im Jahre 1561–62*, in: *Archiv für Geschichte und Alterthumskunde Tirols* 3 (1866) 261–310; Helmut GRITSCH, *Sozialrevolutionäre Unruhen im Vinschgau im 16. Jahrhundert*, in: Rainer LOOSE (ed.), *Der Vinschgau und seine Nachbarräume* (Bozen 1993) 181–194.

⁴⁶ So the Tyrol was described by Carlo Visconti, Bishop of Ventimilia and papal nuncio to Cardinal Carlo Borromeo: Samuel STEINHERZ (ed.), *Nuntiaturreportage aus Deutschland 1560–1572 nebst ergänzenden Aktenstücken*, vol. 4 (Vienna 1914), 19 October, 1564, 220. In 1620, Archduke Leopold referred to the prince-bishopric of Trent as “not alone a bulwark and excellent pass from the *Welschland* into the Tyrol, but also the whole of Germany”: BÜCKING, *Frühabsolutismus* 152.

that it became a moot point whether the actual *Landesfürst* was Ferdinand I or the bishop. Lest the Habsburgs gave way to Protestantism or reverted to their old anti-Trent stance, the Papacy took it upon itself to ensure the orthodoxy of the *Land* and actively patronized the aristocracy by raising four successive bishops – all Tyroleans – to the cardinalate,⁴⁷ pampered them with favours,⁴⁸ and dispensed with the traditional election of the bishop after the vacancy of the bishopric in favour of the election of a coadjutor with rights of succession to the incumbent bishop.⁴⁹

Meanwhile in Germany, the Habsburgs found themselves locked in a life and death struggle with the Protestant princes over the imperial Church.⁵⁰ To dissolve the prince-bishoprics would have deprived them of two safe votes and further weakened the Catholic princes. Especially after 1546, imperial authority hung by a thread, since the

⁴⁷ Bernhard Cles (1530), Cristoforo Madruzzo (1542), Ludovico Madruzzo (1561), Carlo Gaudenzio Madruzzo (1604). See Erwin GATZ (ed.), *Die Bischöfe des Heiligen Römischen Reiches 1448–1648: Ein biographisches Lexikon* (Berlin 1996) 108, 442, 443, 448.

⁴⁸ Bishop Cristoforo Madruzzo, for example, received from pope Pius IV the territories of Soriano and Gallese, and from Pius V the governorships of Spoleto and Gualdo Tadino: *ibid.* 445.

⁴⁹ Cristoforo was made coadjutor with rights of succession to Brixen in 1543, Ludovico to Trent in 1550, Johann Thomas Spaur to Brixen in 1565, Andreas of Austria to Brixen in 1580, Carlo Gaudenzio to Trent in 1595: *ibid.* 22, 441, 443, 447, 674. Imperial bishops – with the consensus of their chapter – could appoint up to two assistant bishops, or coadjutors, with or without rights of succession: Paul HINSCHIUS, *System des katholischen Kirchenrechts mit besonderer Rücksicht auf Deutschland*, vol. 2 (Graz 1959) 249–261. Beginning in the fifteenth and increasingly in sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the coadjutor gained significant political importance in inter-dynastic and/or inter-confessional struggles for control of a bishopric. Coadjutors often acquired rights of succession in order to avoid any surprises which the pressures of an impromptu election might throw up: Hans Erich FEINE, *Die Besetzung der Reichsbistümer vom Westfälischen Frieden bis zur Säkularisation 1648–1803* (Stuttgart 1921) 369–405.

⁵⁰ Heinrich LUTZ has provided insightful expositions of Habsburg *Reichspolitik* in his *Christianitas afflicta. Europa, das Reich und die päpstliche Politik im Niedergang der Hegemonie Kaiser Karls V. (1552–1556)* (Göttingen 1964); *id.*, *Das Ringen um deutsche Einheit und kirchliche Erneuerung: Von Maximilian I. bis zum Westfälischen Frieden 1490–1648* (Berlin 1983).

College of Prince Electors was evenly split along confessional lines: the prince-archbishops of Mainz, Cologne and Trier held three Catholic votes; the princes of Brandenburg, Saxony and the Rhineland-Palatinate held three Protestant votes. The loss of one more Catholic vote risked the very real possibility of a Habsburg deposition.⁵¹ Finally, as the most Catholic of the Habsburg lands, the Tyrol became the crucial counterweight to the wellnigh non-Catholic eastern Habsburg lands.⁵² The implications for the Tyrol were immediate. The emperors bent over backwards to indulge the bishops, especially the bishop of Trent.

Charles was the first count in centuries not to renew the *Kompaktaten*; in 1521, he transferred (exclusive of the right of taxation) Riva to Trent.⁵³ Ferdinand did not receive the traditional vow from Bishop Bernhard Cles of Trent either. Cles became Ferdinand's most influential advisor and President of the Aulic Council (1522–1539), and Ferdinand became the prince-bishopric's leading patron.⁵⁴ Additional administrative districts (exclusive of the right of taxation) came to Trent: Caldonazzo in 1523; Pergine in 1531; the *Vier Vikariate* in 1532.⁵⁵ After the debacle of the Peasants' War, Ferdinand – in stark contrast to Sigmund – gave in to Cles' demand and explicitly exempted Trent from the *Landesordnung*.⁵⁶ As a further sop to the aristocracy, but also to thwart papal intrusions

⁵¹ The uncertainty persisted until 1623, after which the Catholics always held a majority: Volker PRESS, *Kriege und Krisen: Deutschland 1600–1715* (Munich 1991) 84–88.

⁵² For an assessment of the religious state of the mid-sixteenth century Habsburg lands see EVANS' *Habsburg Monarchy* 3–40.

⁵³ HIRN, *Der Temporalienstreit* 361.

⁵⁴ He has been described as the most important bishop of Trent (1514–1539). He was also bishop of Brixen (1539). See Friedrich Wilhelm BAUTZ (ed.), *Biographisch-bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon*, vol. 20 = *Ergänzungen* vol. 7 (Nordhausen 2002) 313–346; GATZ, *Die Bischöfe* 106–109.

⁵⁵ VOLTELINI, *Das welsche Südtirol* 77–81, 83–87, 116–125.

⁵⁶ The *welsche Konfinen* and other Romance county administrative districts were also exempted from the 1532 revision – virtually the whole Romance Tyrol: Tullius R. v. SARTORI-MONTECROCE, *Über die Reception der fremden Rechte in Tirol und die Tiroler Landes-Ordnungen* (Innsbruck 1895) 24, 26; Hermann WOPFNER, *Bergbauernbuch*, vol. 1, pt. 3 (Innsbruck 1951) 469.

into Trent, Ferdinand reconfirmed, in 1532 and 1537, a previous ordinance that two-thirds of Trent's cathedral canons must be German from either the prince-bishopric or the Austrian lands, while the remainder Italian from the prince-bishopric.⁵⁷ Although Cles's successor, Cristoforo Madruzzo – also a royal advisor – was required to confirm the *Kompaktaten*, imperial preferment of the prince-bishopric and bishop did not for all that suffer.⁵⁸ In 1548, Ferdinand arranged that the imperial estates exempt Trent and Brixen from payment of the *Reichsteuer* (imperial tax) and alternatively place them on the roll of the Tyrolean *Landsteuer* – the subjects of Trent in consequence paid no Turk tax.⁵⁹ At the same time, Ferdinand was instrumental in uniting Trent and Brixen in a single person by postulating Christoforo to coadjutor, who became administrator in 1542,⁶⁰ and he did not oppose Cristoforo's pet project to see his nephew, Ludovico, succeed him.⁶¹ Nor was Ferdinand averse to Cristoforo's proposal to establish the first university of the Tyrol and

⁵⁷ BRANDSTÄTTER, *Die Beziehungen* 27.

⁵⁸ Ferdinand addressed Cristoforo as *unser Rat*; SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, Carton 145, 7 February, 1551. He was bishop of Trent (1539–1567), administrator of Brixen (1542–1578): GATZ, *Die Bischöfe* 443–446. For Cristoforo's tenure in Brixen see J. Chrysostomus GINER, *Die religiöse Lage im Bistum Brixen unter Fürstbischof und Kardinal Christoph von Madruzzo 1542–1578* (Brixen 1962).

⁵⁹ This did not in fact reduce the tax load of the prince-bishoprics as they had only been assessed the *Landsteuer*, but it did get them off the hook for imperial taxes: HIRN, *Der Temporalienstreit* 364.

⁶⁰ Imperial metropolitans, with papal confirmation, could appoint an administrator to administer a diocese if the bishop already confirmed could not fulfil his duties. Unless the pope decreed otherwise, the administrator held the same rights of the bishop and he stayed in office until the reigning bishop resumed his duties or a new bishop was elected. Beginning in the fifteenth century, the papacy frequently used the office to allow for the accumulation of bishoprics without actually uniting them: Hans Erich FEINE, *Kirchliche Rechtsgeschichte: Die katholische Kirche* (Cologne-Graz 1964) 367; *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, vol. 1 (Munich-Zurich 1980) 155.

⁶¹ Ludovico was bishop of Trent (1567–1600): GATZ, *Die Bischöfe* 443–450. For Ludovico's tenure in Trent, see Bernhard STEINHAUF, *Giovanni Ludovico Madruzzo (1532–1600): Katholische Reformation zwischen Kaiser and Papst: Das Konzept zur praktischen Gestaltung der Kirche der Neuzeit im Anschluß an das Konzil von Trient* (Münster 1993).

fourth university of the Habsburg lands (next to Prague, Vienna and Freiburg) in the town of Trent.⁶²

Then there was the *Libell*. Charles did not have to contend with it, since he never asked the estates for aid during his brief spell as count. Hence, it became Ferdinand's problem. He obviously doubted its merits. On no item during his reign did the exasperated king press the aristocracy more than how to obtain the full payment of the *Landsteuer*. At stake were two issues. The one was a fiscal imperative. The shortfalls cost him dearly. Too cash poor to forego arrears, he borrowed heavily with the hope that the bishops and *Landschaft* would "honour what they had pledged".⁶³ The other was tax equity. The lower estates raised it at nearly every diet.⁶⁴ At the 1551 diet of Bozen, the king's proxy, Maximilian II, admitted to the estates that "as a result of the shortfalls, the obedient must subsidize the disobedient."⁶⁵

The terms "obedient" and "disobedient" are significant, though less as measures of integrity. They originated in the Privy Council and noble estates, which construed them very subjectively, indeed so subjectively that it rendered them almost meaningless. They labelled Trent "disobedient". There was some truth to this. The bishop was a vassal of the emperor and therefore liable for the Turk tax, whether in the form of the *Reichsteuer* or *Landsteuer*.⁶⁶ However, as the Privy Council and "trusted" members of the upper estates well knew, Maximilian had limited his liability to the defence of the *Land*, while Ferdinand had exempted him from the *Reichsteuer*. Hence, his "disobedience" was not altogether unfounded. At the same time, they

⁶² Ferdinand, in 1553, tasked Innsbruck to assess its feasibility; for unknown reasons, it was shelved: SARTORI-MONTECROCE, *Über die Reception* 43.

⁶³ *Wir achtelten dafur nit, das unnsrer lieber Freundt unnd Furssten und gemainer Stenndt gemüett sey, unns vil in Lanndtagen zu bewilligen unnd hernach wenig zulaisten, sonnder vill mer die Bewilligung Ir vollkhumens Werckh erraichen zulasen*; SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, Carton 88, 8 December, 1551.

⁶⁴ Cf. n. 101.

⁶⁵ *Dan so khundten wir nit umbgeen [...], das yeder Zeitt in Erledigung bewilligten Hilffen ain merckhlicher grosser Abgang befunden, also das uns khaumb zwen Tailen erlegt wurde, daraus dan erfolgte, das die Gehorsamen der Ungehorsamen enndtgellten muessen [...]*; SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, Carton 88, 8 December, 1551.

⁶⁶ The Privy Council argued this position forcefully: TLA, AKM, 29 July, 1563, fol. 1107r–1147r.

claimed that the upper estates were “obedient”.⁶⁷ Ferdinand did not buy it.⁶⁸ After the Privy Council for the umpteenth time pinned the deficit on Trent and the *welsche Konfinen*, he retorted that they only accounted for one-fifth of the shortfall, yet it is at least one-third; thus, since the lower estates are by all accounts obedient, the nobles must be disobedient.⁶⁹

The real significance of the terms lies elsewhere: they reflected the ethnic dualism of the *Land*. Almost all of the German Tyrol was “obedient”: the count’s German subjects and Brixen’s German subjects.⁷⁰ Contrariwise, almost all of the Romance Tyrol was “disobedient”: Trent’s subjects, including the town of Trent; most notoriously the *welsche Konfinen*; many of the count’s Romance subjects; many of Brixen’s Romance subjects.⁷¹ In short, the criterion separating the “obedient” from the “disobedient” was less territorial than linguistic.

Straddling both sides of the central Alps, the Tyrol was both a melting pot and mosaic of German and Romance culture. The melting pot was the aristocracy. It held rights of *Herrschaft* in the German and Romance Tyrol; it maintained its ancestral seats (*Stammsitze*) in the German and Romance Tyrol; and its members married aristocrats from the German and Romance Tyrol. Hence it formed a mix of German and Romance elements. I reserve closer treatment of this

⁶⁷ SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, Carton 92, 11 September, 1556.

⁶⁸ SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, Carton 92, 2 November, 1556.

⁶⁹ He was right. Noble attitude to taxation varied: at one extreme were the likes of the Arcos and Lodrons, who rarely paid a single *Gulden* of any grant; at the other extreme were such families as the Spaur and Thuns, who though often in arrears, were good for them; between them fell the majority, but closer to the latter than former: BONAZZA, *La nobiltà trentino-tirolese* 92–100. The privy councillors later admitted that the prelates were also in arrears, but added if we collect their grants in full, then the *Land* will suffer from an even greater shortage of clerics, since they will be forced to abandon their parishes and benefices: AKM, 18 August, 1559, 583.

⁷⁰ The bishop of Chur’s houses in the Vintschgau were “disobedient”, but the bishop had sent no delegates to the 1511 diet and had not signed the *Landlibell*. Hence, he argued that Maximilian had no authority to assess his clergy the *Landsteuer*. Since their quotas were miniscule, they have been omitted here: TLA, AKM, 29 July, 1563, fol. 1126v.

⁷¹ The Privy Council explained this often in great detail. See for example n. 66.

theme further on. The rest of the Tyroleans – the vast majority – were the mosaic, which consisted of two relatively homogeneous ethnic blocks. The linguistic border formed a fairly clear and unbroken line, which ran from east to west along the Ortler Alps, down the right bank of the Adige (Etsch) Valley to around the Salurn Gap, then diagonally along the northern slope of the Dolomites. With the exception of a few Ladin settlements in the Upper Vinschgau, the German Tyrol lay to north of this frontier and included the largest parts of the county and Brixen, as well as Tramin (Trent). With the exception of a few German settlements south of Salurn, the Romance Tyrol lay to the south of this frontier and included Trent, the *welsche Konfinen*, and the broad band of Romance subjects in the comital Castelfondo, Flavon, Spaur, Belfort (Non Valley), Mezzocorona, Königsberg, Segonzano (Adige Valley), Primiero, Ivano, Telvana, Castellalto and San Pietro (Sugana Valley), and the small pocket of Ladins in the comital Gufidaun (Gardena Valley), Ampezzo and in Brixen – Thurn, Enneberg, Buchenstein (Badia Valley).

The mid-sixteenth century relationship of the Privy Council with the German and Romance Tyrol differed. It kept a tight grip on the former. Through the network of administrative districts which spanned the German county – Lower and Upper Inn Valleys, Puster Valley, the Vinschgau, Etsch and Eisack Valleys – a constant two-way flow of information connected the Council and the local bailiffs, who enforced high jurisdiction and religion everywhere and low jurisdiction most everywhere, save the towns, prelatial landed estates and tiny castellanies. Brixen was handled much like any other administrative district; judging by its desultory protestation, it was more or less resigned to the treatment. The Council corresponded regularly with it, knew and understood its political process well, and regularly interfered. It sent the *Hofrat* the same mandates – religious and secular – which it sent its own bailiffs and sometimes requested, sometimes ordered, them to be posted throughout its territory unaltered.⁷²

⁷² The Privy Council requested Brixen to post its religious mandate of 2 October, 1562 throughout the prince-bishopric, and ordered it to post its religious mandates of 16 March 1558, 18 February 1559, 2 March 1560, and 3 March 1561, throughout the prince-bishopric: DAB, 18214 and 18216.

The reasons for Brixen's weakness are not hard to find. The one was political. As a tiny and highly fragmented territory, whose outliers lay like islands in the much larger county, the prince-bishopric lacked the power to muster an effective defence of its rights. By the same token, it was overshadowed by Innsbruck's court. The bishop's mightiest vassals were loath to champion his independence, since they were at the same time subjects of the *Landesfürst*, whose attractions he could not match – Habsburg patronage, above all the rich pickings from county administrative districts. Nor was his metropolitan, the archbishop of Salzburg, a significant counterweight as he himself was under Habsburg influence. The other reason for the prince-bishopric's weakness was cultural affinity. Brixen and the county were predominantly German and belonged to the same German world, together with Salzburg, Carinthia and Bavaria. The legal systems of Innsbruck and Brixen were predominantly German, the language of their chancelleries was German, both of which obscured the differences between the two and facilitated a reasonable harmonization of administration.⁷³

The Romance Tyrol, in contrast, would not be cowed. The county administrative districts of the Non and Sole, Etsch and Sugana Valleys also appeared on the standard government address list, and were, like their counterparts in the German Tyrol, directly accountable to the Privy Council.⁷⁴ But where Innsbruck broke the tax resis-

⁷³ The *Landesordnung* officially applied everywhere in Brixen, with the exception of the small Ladin districts of Enneberg, Buchenstein, and Thurn. It applied everywhere in the county, except in the Romance parts, the previously Bavarian *Drei Herrschaften*, and only in part in the prelatie landed estates and religious houses of the bishop of Chur: BÜCKING, *Frühabsolutismus* 7, 18, 60.

⁷⁴ Below is a sample address list of a mandate forbidding communion *sub utraque*. The whole German Tyrol is comprehended and numerous Romance districts: Kitzbühel, Rattenberg, Friendsberg, Hall, Innsbruck, Sonnenburg, Hörtenberg, Ehrenberg, Landeck, Laudegg, Naudersberg, Matrei, Steinach, Kufstein, Rattenberg, Rottenburg, Thaur, Stubai, Ambras, Axams, Petersberg/Imst, Sterzing, Schöneck, St. Michelsberg, Rodenegg, Toblach, Kastelruth, Heinfels, Bozen, Meran, Uttenhaim, Taufers, Altrasen, Innichen, Lienz, Virgen, Kals, Lienzer Klause, Gufidaun, Villanders, Ritten, Völs, Tiers, Passeier, Kastelbell, Schländers, Ulten, Sarntheim, Neuhaus, Altenberg, Kaltern, Kurtatsch, Salurn, Glurns und Mals, Gargazon, Wangen, Burgstall und Mölten, Enn und Kaldiff, Neumarkt,

tance of the Germans, it did not the Italians. The peasants of the Non Valley – Castelfondo, Flavon, Belfort – refused to pay the *Landsteuer* because “their neighbours in the *Hochstift* of Trent” did not, though they belonged to the *Landschaft* and had for centuries.⁷⁵ It was no more successful with the Ladins in Brixen. The peasants of Thurn, Enneberg, Buchenstein refused to pay the *Landsteuer*, because “the other subjects of the *welsche Konfinen*” did not.⁷⁶ Meanwhile it did not even try to assert itself in the *welsche Konfinen* – Innsbruck had only a vague idea about what went on down there.⁷⁷ Trent was similarly removed from its orbit. While the Privy Council arrogated Trent’s spiritual authority in the county, it made no inroads on the authority – temporal or spiritual – of the prince-bishopric, for the bishop did not permit it. Cristoforo declared that he was a free prince and under no obligation to publish county mandates. Innsbruck countered that princely status was beside the point, since the county and Trent formed a “special kinship and confederation”, whose custom demanded that its mandates were posted unaltered in Trent; it did not pursue the matter.⁷⁸ Moreover there was the issue of Trent’s subjects.

Königsberg, Jenesien, Tisens, Stein unter Lebenberg, Deutschnofen, Steinegg, Welschnofen, Gramais, Ivano, Telvana, Primiero, Schenna: TLA, CD, 24 July, 1563, fol. 61rv. A similar address list was used to disseminate Archduke Ferdinand’s major religious mandate of 7 January, 1585: TLA, CD, fol. 123r–128r.

⁷⁵ The Privy Council to the emperor: [...] *diweil sie aber sehen, das Irer Nachpern, so dem Stift Triennndt underworffen, bißher zu kainer Steuer gebracht werden mugen, wellen Sy sich desselben auch behelffen und auch nit steuern*; TLA, AKM, 29 July, 1563, fol. 1116v–1117r.

⁷⁶ The Privy Council to the emperor: [...] *und noch alle weyl andere welsch Confinanten nit steuern, so wellen Sy auch nit steuern*. This despite the fact that the government had arrested the defiant peasants and confiscated everything they owned: TLA, AKM, 29 July, 1563, fol. 1120r.

⁷⁷ They do not appear on the government’s standard address list. Cf. n. 74.

⁷⁸ At the emperor’s request, the Privy Council responded to a list of grievances submitted by the bishop: *Auf den 5. Articl darynnen vermeldt wirdet, das der Cardinal kain Mandat, so in E. Mt. Namen gefertigt, im Stifft anschlagen oder publicieren, auch kain Berueffung in E. K. Mt. Namen ausgeen lassen, sonder ain freie Fürst sein und allain dem Reich gehorsamen well, geben wir E. Mt. wie gehorsamlich zu vernemen, das es bisher zwischen E. K. Mt. und dem Stift Triennndt in Publicierung der Mandaten, also gehalten worden, wann wir in E. Mt. Namen allenthalben im Landt Mandata ausgeen lassen, so werden jeder Zeit derselben Manndaten dem*

They were “disobedient” as much of their own choice as because they were not permitted to pay the *Landsteuer* – the bishop forbade them and taxed them himself.⁷⁹ In a note to Sigmund Thun, Cristoforo enclosed war tidings from Italy and asked: “Do you think now is the time to levy heavy taxes? We await your answer and you should come soonest to us for there is much to discuss with you.”⁸⁰

The reasons for Trent’s assertiveness were the opposite of Brixen’s biddability. It was further away from Innsbruck, which made communication more difficult; its territory was more than four times and its population (around 1600) six times larger; and it formed a relatively compact territory, which abutted the southern flank of the county. Moreover it was prosperous; as such, Trent’s court was vibrant and one which vied with Innsbruck for aristocratic favour. And Trent’s metropolitan, the patriarchy of Aquileia, offered Innsbruck little leverage,

Cardinal Madrutsch etliche undter E. K. Mt. Titl und Secret verfertigt zugeschickt, dieselben lasst er volgens wie Sy gestellt und gefertigt, allerdings unverändert in sein des Cardinals Namen, publicieren und anschlagen. Dessen ist er also dem Gebrauch nach befuegt, wann er aber aines oder mer Mandaten, wie Sy alhie gefertigt und Inen uberschickt werden, nit anschlagen oder darynnen ainiche Ennderung furnemen wollten, alsdann hetten sich E. K. Mt. dessen gegen dem Cardinal zubeschweren und dasselbig bei Ime abzustellen, sonst ist nit zuvernainen, daz er ain Furst des Reiches und auf den Reichstagen sein ordenliche Stim und Session, wie auch solches des Reiches Abschied anno 48 lauter mitbringt, doch steet er gegen diser E. K. Mt. furstlicher Grafschaft Tirol vermag derhalben aufgerichteten Vertrag in sonderer Verwontnus und Confederation [...] der Herr Cardinal [ist] ain Mitglid und Confederatus diser furstlichen Grafschaft Tyrol, der in allen des Lannds obligenden Beschwerden mit helffen, heben und legen soll; TLA, AKM, 1563, fol. 812r–814r.

⁷⁹ So the suggestion of the Privy Council: *Nun were wie obsteet, daz der erschiesslichste Weeg, daz der Herr Cardinal durch die Ku. Mt. ersuecht unnd mit seinen ffürstlichen] Gnaden] alles Ernnts gehandelt hette, sein Underthanen zue der gehorsame mit allem Ernst helffen zu bringen [...] Im Fall aber, daz die Ku. Mt. verursacht wurde, dem Herrn Cardinal seine Ursachen, damit er vermain mochte sich zuentschuldigen, daz er nit schuldig ware seine Unnderthanen zu der Ku. Mt. begerter Contribution zehalten, deßgleichen auch die Unnderthanen selbs zu contribuieren nit schuldig weren, abzulainen [...]; SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, Carton 92, 11 September, 1556.*

⁸⁰ *[...] Zeitungen aus Mantua [...] Du magst aus dem einen Schreiben abnemen, ob jetzt die Zeit sey, vil Steuer anzulegen oder nit [...], welches wir die gnediger Maynung nit wolten verhalten [...] du kumest selb pald zu uns allerlay mit dir haben zu reden; SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, Carton 15, 2 April, 1557.*

since it lay beyond the reach of Habsburg hegemony. But power alone does not explain Trent's relative independence; cultural heterogeneity goes far to explain why Innsbruck failed to bring the prince-bishopric's administration closer into line with its own. It was ultimately the only place on which the Habsburgs and the Papacy could agree to hold a Church council: as an imperial territory it met the letter of the Protestant demand for a German venue and as largely Italian it satisfied the papal condition of a partisan setting. Trent's dominant orientation was southwards: its valleys opened into Lombardy; its language was almost completely Italian; and its law (*Statutum Tridentinum*) was written and conducted in the Romance languages.

Under Ferdinand I, the Privy Council was not only his advisory body, but *Hofgericht* (supreme provincial court of law).⁸¹ The Council's Regulation and Procedure (*Regiments Ordnung und Instruktion*) stipulated that each case was to be judged by at least seven adjudicators (*Rechtssprecher*) according to majority rule.⁸² Their social make-up was split between nobles and jurists. But the nobles maintained the upper hand,⁸³ not least in order to thwart persistent juristic attempts to introduce new law into the *Landesordnung*.⁸⁴ As the

⁸¹ In 1527, he changed the name of the Council from *Hofrat* to *Regierung*. For the useful prosopographical studies of the Tyrolean government, see Renate SPECHTENHAUSER, *Behörden- und verwaltungsorganisation Tirols unter Ferdinand I. in den Jahren 1520–1540* (Diss. Innsbruck 1975) 31–35; Hansjörg RIZZOLI, *Behörden- und Verwaltungsorganisation Tirols unter Ferdinand I. in den Jahren 1540–1564* (Diss. Innsbruck 1975) 26–28.

⁸² The chancellor to Archduke Ferdinand: [...] *vermag unserer Regimentsordnung und Instruktion die gerichtlichen Sachen yeder Zeit aufs wenigst in gegenwürt unserer siben Regenten [privy councillors] beratschlagt und erledigt warden sollen [...]*; TLA, AKM, 19 October, 1565, fol. 603r.

⁸³ The chancellor wrote Ferdinand: *Die Regierung mit dem merern Thail, als den zway Thailen Lanndtleuten und allain den dritten Thail mit gelerten zu besetzen, wie die dann auch diser Zeit dermassen mit dem merern Thail von Landtleuten besetzt unnd nit mer als Ich Cannzler und noch vier doctores und die anndern all Lanndtleut seyen, und [...] so seyen unns doch die anndern Lanndtleut mit der Überstimmung yederzeit überlegen unnd mugen also zuerhaltung irer Freyhaiten unnd Lanndtsgebrauch allezeit das merer machen, darbey wir es dann auch bleiben lassen*; TLA, AKM, 27 May, 1563, fol. 807r

⁸⁴ In reference to the new written law, the Council observed: *Woverr es in den innländischen oder Lanndtsachen nit zuerhalten, wie es dann gleichwol wider diß*

estates would have it, there was no need for jurists to administer their law, since they understood it and could administer it themselves;⁸⁵ the only reason the estates tolerated juristic adjudicators at all was to allow the administration of law outside of the German Tyrol (strictly speaking those communities subject to the *Landesordnung*), where Roman law applied: "Although the Innsbruck Privy Council has always been comprised largely of persons knowledgeable in the old law of the *Land*, it has also retained some persons experienced in written law. This is scarcely attributable to this *Land*, but rather Further Austria and the *welsche Konfinen*, which are subject to the statutes of imperial written law, as well as the Empire itself, with which the *Landesfürst* has sundry business."⁸⁶ Nevertheless, the estates' attestations notwithstanding, the privy counsellors were hardly more willing to employ Roman law, or the languages of Romance or Latin, in the administration of the Romance than German Tyrol. In fact, the *Hofgericht* never administered cases in the Romance languages, even if both plaintiff and defendant were Romance-speakers; while proceedings were conducted in Latin only if both requested them. But if the *Landesfürst* himself was a legal party, then the case was always administered in the German language and judged under German law, even if the other party spoke a Romance tongue. The Privy Council justified its policy as follows: "It needs em-

Lanndtsgebrauch unnd ein ersame Tirolische Landdschafft solliches bisheer nit zuegeben wollen, das es doch in den auslendischen Hanndlungen unnd von denen die der Tyrolischen Lanndtordnung nit unnderworffen und da man nach gemainen geschribnen Rechten procediert [...]; TLA, AKM, 17 August, 1561, fol. 796r.

⁸⁵ *Er sey ye und alwegen in unfurdechtlichem Gebrauch und Stilo bei alhiegem E. K. Mt. furstlichem Hofgericht Herkomen, auch also gehalten worden, das man in Teutsch und nit Latein procediert; TLA, AKM, 11 September, 1554, fol. 187v.*

⁸⁶ *Nun ist aber die lanndtsfurstlichen Regierung zu Innsprugg zu allen Zeitten und merer Tail auf solche Personen die der Lanndtspreuch erfarnen gewidmet [...]. Das man aber etlich der geschriben rechkundige Personen auch in Regierungen gebraucht, das ist furnemblichen nit von dises Lanndts, sonnder von wegen der fordern Lannde, auch zum Tail der wellischen Confinen die nach den Stattuten leben, welche Stattut aus den Kay. Geschriebnen Rechten gezogen und Sy demselben unnderworffen sein von nöthen, und das darneben auch die Lanndtsfursten sich deren in allerlay Reichssachen zugebrauchen haben; SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, Carton 90, 24 June, 1554 diet resolution.*

phasis that your Majesty has much to lose as party to a civil suit, and since few of us are trained in the written law or Latin, it is advisable to administer the law in German and under German law."⁸⁷

Accordingly Innsbruck's legal influence in the Romance Tyrol was limited. It comes out clearly in the government's action against the Arcos' claim of *reichsunmittelbar* status, or more specifically, tax freedom.⁸⁸ The Arcos demanded that the case be heard in Latin, because they did not know German. The Council complained to Ferdinand that the Arcos could have hired a bilingual lawyer to represent them, and warned that the real reason for their stance was their knowledge that it could not adequately operate in Latin; thus, if they prevailed,

⁸⁷ This was explained by the Privy Council in reference to a case between the crown and the Italian commune of Thesin over forest rights. The Italians insisted that the case be heard under German law, which the Council supported. Against them, the *Kammerprokurator* (jurist of the Exchequer), Dr. Wilhelm Datler, insisted that the case be heard under Roman law. Thus, the Council called on the king to resolve the stand-off: *Allergnedigisten Kunig, nachdem offenbar und meniglichen bewist, das der alhiegen furstlichen Hofgericht, wann gleichwol Jura partium et merita cause in lateinisch oder welsch einkomen, nit weniger der Proceß in teutsch gehalten worden, sollichs auch in voriger Thesiner Rechtfertigung, deßgleichen mit Antoni Bordun gegen den Herrn v. Agreßt [Gresta] und vil andern Rechtsachen, nit allain da der ain, sonder baid Thail welsch gewesen, es were dann mit Ir baiden guetlichs zulassen in latein zu procedieren, gepflegen worden [...]. [Es ist] von nödten in Bedenckung, das E. Ku. Mt. an solliche Rechtfertigung vill gelegen sein will, etliche geschickhte Landrät oder verstandige Personen in Erledigung diser Sachen zu uns den ubrigen zuziehen und erfordern, die vielleicht zum Thail gleich so wenig als etliche aus unserem Mill, so urtlen sollen, der geschreiben Recht, und lateinische Sprach erfahren sind, etc. So ist unser Gutbeduncken, dieweil wir ye nit grundte Ursachen befunden, warumb doch der alt gewondlich und wolhergebracht Gebrauch des teutschen Proceß, so derselb hievor, gegen den Thesinern, auch andern Parteyen alhie gehalten worden, in jeziger Sachen E. Ku. Mt. nachtailig sein mocht, das E. Ku. Mt. Ir denselben gewondlichen teutschen Proceß ditzmals [...] auch gnediglich gefallen hat lassen ; TLA, AKM, 11 September, 1554, fol. 187v–188v. Ferdinand ordered the *Hofgericht* to conduct the case under German law, but to translate the paper work into Latin for the Italians: TLA, Von der Römischen Königlichen Majestät (VKM), 22 September, 1554. See also Josef HIRN, Erzherzog Ferdinand II. von Tirol. Geschichte seiner Regierung und seiner Länder, 2 vols. (Innsbruck 1885–1888) vol. 1, 469.*

⁸⁸ The government estimated that the Arcos total outstanding tax debt between 1529 and 1592 was almost 60,000 *Gulden*: Gerhard RILL, Geschichte der Grafen von Arco 1487–1614. Reichsvasallen und Landsassen (Horn 1975) 260.

the suit would have to be referred to the imperial court, which was precisely what they were after.⁸⁹ This, the Council advised, would set a dangerous precedent, for it supported the claim that the Arcos were subject to the emperor alone.⁹⁰ Nor was the bishop of Trent above employing such tactics, such as when he demanded that the crown suit against certain nobles took place in the Latin or Romance language.⁹¹ Cognizant of the problem, Ferdinand asked Sigmund Thun if he could recommend a learned jurist experienced in Tyrolean law and who knew Italian.⁹² The search proved fruitless and both suits fizzled out.⁹³

If government distinguished the German and Romance Tyrol, so did estates' representation. Most German commoners were represented by elected delegates, who according to old custom attended the diet and participated in the German proceedings. Far fewer Romance commoners enjoyed the same right. As one of the punishments of the rebellious Romance comital peasants (in the Non and

⁸⁹ As the Council argued: *ettliche E. Mt. Rät aus unnserm Mittel, so im Fellung der Urthn votieren muessen, der lateinischen Sprach nit kundig*; TLA, Ferdinanda, Carton 1, Position 1, 8 April, 1559.

⁹⁰ *[Es wurde] fur E. Kay. Mt ain Praejuditiun und ain ganz nachtailig Consequenz verursachen, als ob Sy [Arco] nit der Grafschafft Tyrol, sonnder allain Römischen Kayser unnderworffen [seien]*; *ibid.*

⁹¹ In the late 1550s, Ferdinand began a suit against 11 nobles with property in the town of Trent for alleged tax evasion: Botsch, Cles, Firmian, Gresta, Khuen, Madruzzo, Puchler, Spaur, Thun, Trapp, Trautmannsdorf, Welsberg, and Wolkenstein; SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, Cartons 95 (8 and 14 June, 1559), 152 (undated), 153 (undated).

⁹² SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, Carton 153, 9 February, 1559. Thun (1487–1569) himself had legal training. Whether he earned a doctorate of law is uncertain. His modern biographer, Edmund LANGER, cited a history of the Thun family which suggested the negative. Written in 1564, it stated that Sigmund studied the subject many years in Germany and Italy and gained such proficiency that, if he wanted, he could have acquired a doctorate in both kinds with little effort. However, Langer also cited several contemporary references which explicitly addressed him as a doctor of law and *hochgelert*, normally a predicate reserved for doctors: *Lebenskizze Sigmund's von Thun des kaiserlichen Orators in der letzten Periode des Concils von Trient* (Prague 1881) v–vi, 9–11.

⁹³ Thun's response appears to have been lost, but RIZZOLI shows that the number of lawyers (five) remained unchanged until the end of Ferdinand's reign: 94–101, 181–186.

Sole, Sugana, and Lagarina Valleys), the Privy Council in 1525 stripped them of their estates' rights forever. And in 1536, the Privy Council and estates ruled that the *welsche Konfinen*, because they were "disobedient", had forfeited their estates' rights. Therefore they ceased to be invited to the diet and in fact never attended again.⁹⁴ Thus, except for the town of Trent, few Romance commoners enjoyed estates nights.

This was the plenum diet; if we look at the attendance of the *Ausschuß* (estates' executive diet) quite a different picture emerges. Its origins have been traced back to the early fifteenth century, but it was only at the end of Maximilian's reign that it acquired a fixed structure. Under Ferdinand it grew in importance. As the handmaid of the plenum diet, the *Ausschuß* expedited its resolutions and the routine business which cropped up between its sessions. It met more often than the plenum diet, sometimes several times per year, such that it acquired its own budget to cover members' travel and living expenses.⁹⁵ The *Ausschuß* varied in size. The large *Ausschuß* was elected by the plenum diet, each estate of which elected 10 representatives from itself for a grand total of 40 members; the small *Ausschuß* was elected by the large *Ausschuß*, each estate of which elected two representatives from itself for a grand total of eight members. Obviously, limited membership entailed a certain element of selection. The 1563 plenum diet resolution is cited here, but other sixteenth century resolutions show that the lower estates' representation was standard. The urban estate appointed delegates from the following towns: Meran (Georg Zotl), Bozen (Ziprian Treibenreif), Innsbruck (Michael Hueber der alt), Hall (Christoph Puechhotzer), Sterzing (Andre Rauch), Lienz (Mathais Agalmaier), Glurns (Paul Hueber), Rattenberg (Hans Schilling), Kufstein (Daniel Hueber), Kitzbühel (Georg Dintl). The *Gerichte* appointed delegates from the following regions: Vinschgau (Christian Pitzeller), Etsch Valley (Georg Khuen), Eisack Valley (Matthias Gfriliter), Upper Inn Valley (Lienhard Jench), Lower Inn Valley (Jakob Saurwein), Wipp Valley (Rupricht Camerlander),

⁹⁴ SARTORI-MONTECROCE, *Geschichte des Landschaftlichen Steuerwesens* 60.

⁹⁵ At the 1563 plenum diet, the *Ausschuß* received 2,000 *Gulden*: Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv (BayHStA), Kurbayern Äußeres Archiv, 4458. For a brief history of the *Ausschuß*: KÖFLER, *Land* 514–518.

Drei Herrschaften (Kaspar Platzer), Puster Valley (Jakob Egger), and Ehrenberg (?). As is evident, Romance commoners did not normally attend the *Ausschuß*: the nucleus of the lower estates was German.⁹⁶

The German and Romance Tyrol reflected the relative degrees of territorial state-building achieved by the *Landesfürst*.⁹⁷ He was most successful in the German Tyrol: through a centralized network of administrative districts and a common legal system, he wielded a fairly effective instrument of social control, which the *Landschaft* legitimized. Not so in the Romance Tyrol: here there were two contending princes. South of the linguistic line, central governmental and estates' integrative powers ebbed – and the bishop of Trent filled the void. One noble referred to Ferdinand and Cristoforo indistinguishably as *domini temporales* of Trent.⁹⁸ Sigmund Thun told the Madruzzos that in the event of Habsburg negligence, you must save the *Land*, just as Bishop Cles did before.⁹⁹ Most Romance commoners one way or another eluded the full – real or putative – authority of the *Landesfürst*, while many invoked the bishop as a higher authority. But this is not to be understood as a nationalist or ideological stance, rather as a straightforward expedient: in playing one prince off against the other, they merely – as we shall see – took a page from the “Romance” nobles.

Rather than an instrument of state-building then the *Landsteuer* accentuated the distinct self-identities of the German and Romance Tyrol. When Ferdinand asked the Privy Council to explain the “disobedience” of so many Romance Tyroleans, it replied that it lay in the *Libell* itself:

⁹⁶ The prelatie members of the *Ausschuß* were also German. The eight monasteries were located in the county: Wilten (Premonstratensians), Georgenberg (Benedictines), Stams (Cistercians), Neustift (canons regular), Marienberg (Benedictines), St. Michael (Augustinian friars), Gries (Augustinian friars), Innichen (collegiate church): BayHStA, Kurbayern Äußeres Archiv, 4458, 1563 diet resolution.

⁹⁷ BONAZZA draws a similar conclusion: *La nobiltà trentino-tirolese* 112.

⁹⁸ HIRN, *Der Temporalienstreit* 363.

⁹⁹ The letter is unaddressed, but almost certainly was written to Gaudenzio Madruzzo: *Ich presupponier, die K. Mt. wiß oder vermaynt nit eyn Land ist pald zu verlieren [...] und die weyl vormals der Cardinal [Cles] allen Schwal und Pondus dits Lands hat tragen sullen, also acht ich jetz Ir zwen Herr [most probably also Cristoforo] solet die Sorg und Cur dits Lands trag. Ist dem Land geholffen, so ist niemants hocher dan Ir Mt. geholffen*; SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, Carton 162, September, 1545.

The root problem is the bishop of Trent, who refused to sign the *Libell* unless Maximilian exempted him from all *Landsteuer*, save in the defence of the *Land*. As long as he claims this freedom, we expect that other Romance Tyroleans – your Majesty’s included – shall too. However, we adamantly oppose tampering with the *Libell*, for the estates would refuse to surrender the rights which it confirms. Anyway, given the bad blood between them, it is doubtful that they would agree on a redistribution of the *Landsteuer*. Therefore, in our opinion, it is imperative that your Majesty come to terms with the *Libell* as it stands. Moreover, under no circumstances should your Majesty raise the issue of chronic tax shortfalls in the *Landtag*, for if the lower estates discover its real contents, they will refuse to pay anything more until it is corrected, which we believe is impracticable. It is for this reason that the nobility has always treated the tax issue in the *Landtag* with great discretion and otherwise has handled any questions concerning the taxation of the bishop of Trent, Arcos, Lodrons, Grestas, or others, exclusive of the lower estates. Only a specially selected committee of qualified nobles should handle this matter, of course, under the pretence of a diet of all estates, in order that none can dispute the constitutional validity of the committee, even if some suspicions may be raised. It is worth remembering that whatever taxes your Majesty has received are for the most part thanks to the efforts of the prelates and nobles, also the trusted and confidential advisors, who at their own expense have managed the *Libell* in your Majesty’s interest. Although this has necessitated some irregularities, it has nevertheless ensured that your Majesty has always received some taxes.¹⁰⁰

¹⁰⁰ This is the pith of the argument which the Privy Council and delegates of the *Landschaft* put to Ferdinand in the 1550s. Excerpts of two sources are cited here: *Dise Unrichtigkeit ist bey yetziger der Rö. Kü. Mt. Regierung vasst auf allen Landt Tagen angezogen worden, und Stett und Gericht annderst nit bewisst und noch, dann ermelte Stiffts Triennndt Unnderthanen sein schuldig, in allen Steuern und Raisen mit gemainer Lanndtschafft richtig anzulegen, aber die allt Regierung und etliche Landtratte haben des guett Wissen getragen und ist yeder Zeitt verheutt worden, daz die Sachen nit lautter an die Stennndt khumen, auß der Ursach, daz man Fuersorg getragen, so baldt Stett und Gericht in Erfahrung brachten, daz ermelte Triennndtnische Unnderthanen mit gemainer Lanndtschafft in allen Dingen nit gleich anligen wolten, wurden Sy der Kü. Mt. so lanng kaine Hilfen bewilligt noch gelaiss haben, biß dise Unrichtigkeit zu Richtigkeit gebracht worden wäre. Zu was Nachtaill und Schaden aber solches der Kü. Mt. in vill Weeg geraicht hette, daz haben die vom Adl, so der Sachen guett Wissen gehebt, in den Landtügen yeder Zeit woll erwege, und albeg mit Stetten und Gerichten, in disem Faal, mit grosser Fursichtigkait und Beschaidenhait geen muessen, dise aber zelte Hanndlungen sein bisher in grosser Geheim gehalten worden, wie daz noch biß zuglegner Zeit zubesehen fur hoch Notwendig angesehen*

In 1556, Ferdinand still did not know what to do about the *Libell*. But what he did know was that the *Landsteuer* must be raised. He

wirdet [...] Unnd so nachvolgendts der hochermelten Kü. Mt. ye ainicher Hilff von ainer Lanndtschafft gegen unnserrn Herrn dem Cardinal von Triendt, den Grafen von Arch, Lodron, Herrn von Agresst oder anndern von nöttten, so ist in albeg rüttlich, daz Ir Mt. darzue allain ainen Ausschuß von dem Stanndt des Adls, die hiezue taugenlich sein mochten, gebrauche, doch in albeg unnder dem Schein ainer gannzen Lanndtschafft, damit in albeg daz bey ainer gannzen Lanndtschafft verhuett werden muge, daz man bißher nit öffentlich an Sy khumen hett wellen lassen, wiewoll es ettliche wenig Persuspitionem merkhen mochten; SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, Carton 88, 10 July, 1551. The second source makes the same argument: *Die Ku. Mt. hat sich zuerinnern, woher seiner Ku. Mt. in allen Steuern der groß Abgannghumbt und daz solcher Abganng nit allain aller erst bey Regierung yeziger Ku. Mt. erwachsen, sonnder bey Kayser Maximilian Zeit gewesen und auß dem aindlifjarigen Vertrags Libell hergeflossen, sonnder hat Kaiser Maximilian solchem Abganng woll gewisst, dann vor Kaiser Maximilian ist in der Steuer ainiche Richtigkeit nie gewesen. So sein bißher alle Steuern, die durch ain Lanndtschafft hochermelter Kü. Mt. bewilligt worden, merretails durch die von Prelaten und Adl in daz Wergkh gericht unnd darneben durch die vertrauten und gehaimen Lanndträtt, die es der Kü. Mt. yederZeit zum pessten und getreulichsten auch mit Irem aigen Schaden gemaint, zum hochsten verhuett worden, daz Stett unnd Gericht des Inhalts des aindlifjarigen Libells oder Vertrags nit lautter erinnert, sonnder haben die Sachen bißher dahin dirigiert, ob woll ain Unrichtigkeit vorhanden, so richte doch die Kü. Mt. die Sachen dahin, daz immer mit derZeitt was eingebracht werde. Wo Sy aber in Erfahrung khomen solth, daz die im Stifft Triendt allain in Zuezugen unnd Lanndtsrettungen und sunst nit mit zuhelffen schuldig, unnd daz Inen ettwo umb anndere Ursachen willen, ain merere Purde auferlegt, daz mochte seiner Kü. Mt. zu kunfftigen Lanndtagen grossen unwiderbringlichen Schaden und Nachtaill bringen. Unnd wo sein Mt. vermainte die Sach in ain gewisse Richtigkeit zu dirigieren, ist auß vill beweglichen Ursachen zubesorgen, sein Mt. wurde aller erst alles Wesen zu hochster Zerrüttlichkheit verursachen und alsdann seiner Kü. Mt. ettwo derselben hochnottwendigs Begern gennzlichen abgeschlagen und dahin khumen, daz Sy so lanng Jar ainiche Hilff nit mer bewilligen wurden biß die gennzliche Richtigkeit gemacht, die unsers Erachtens, wie es die Kü. Mt. begert, unmöglichen zuerlanggen sein wierdet, sonnderlichen, so man ainer Lanndtschafft Privilegien unnd das aindlifjarig Vertrag Libell fur Augen nimbt, davon sich ain Lanndtschafft nit bringen lassen wierdet, noch vill weniger die Trienntnischen Unnderthanen; derhalben bißher durch der vertrauten von Adl allweeg fur ain hohe unvermeidliche Notturfft bedacht und angesehen worden, daz auf den Lanndtagen mit Stetten und Gerichten in diesem Fall mit grosser Fursichtigkheit unnd Beschaidenheit hat ganngen werden muessen; dise obgeschribne Hanndlungen sein bißher in grosser Gehaimb erhalten worden, wie daz noch zubeschechen fur hoch nottwendig angesehen wierdet; SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, Carton 92, 11 September, 1556.*

had, in 1551, reminded the Tyroleans that they of all imperial subjects were the least taxed and he saw no reason why they should be spared.¹⁰¹ The statistics seem to bear him out. During his first three decades tax grants averaged around 50,000 *Gulden* per annum (around 20,000 more than conceded under Maximilian).¹⁰² Yet Lower Austria alone granted an annual average of 72,000 *Gulden* between 1548 and 1551 (around 50,000 more than conceded under Maximilian) and 147,000 *Gulden* between 1552 and 1566.¹⁰³ Thus in the fall of 1556, he took the unusual step of summoning an estates' delegation to Vienna; in October, Sigmund Thun and Blasius Khuen met the monarch.¹⁰⁴ They compromised: the nobles agreed to hike taxation and Ferdinand accepted the *Libell* the way Maximilian had worked it. He indicated his change of heart by writing the Privy Council that it was "good and necessary" to keep the tax evasion under wraps; indeed, "we have already ordered our court to do so".¹⁰⁵ At the same time, he left the question of tax distribution to the nobles. Between 1552 and 1566, tax grants more than doubled to about 115,000 *Gulden* per annum, while tax returns continued to fall one-third short of the amount pledged. In effect, the German Tyrolean peasantry was double-taxed.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰¹ SARTORI-MONTECROCE, *Geschichte des Landschaftlichen Steuerwesen* 101; SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, Carton 88, 8 December, 1551.

¹⁰² For estates' tax grants under Ferdinand I: SARTORI-MONTECROCE, *Geschichte des Landschaftlichen Steuerwesen* 21–123; KÖFLER, *Land* 147–172.

¹⁰³ For a comparison of provincial contributions: Alfons HUBER, *Studien über die finanziellen Verhältnisse Oestreichs unter Ferdinand I.*, in: MIÖG, *Erg.* Bd. 4 (1893) 181–247, esp. 219.

¹⁰⁴ In response to the Privy Council's and Treasury's memo of 11 September, 1556, *Unnd weil wir, aus dem in bemeltem eurem Schreiben und Steuer Ratschlag, angedeutten Ursachen auch fur guet und ain Notturfft achten, das gedachten Steuer Ratschlag in der Gehaimb erhalten werde, so haben wir sollchs zu beschehen, schon albereit verordnet, also daz diß Orths, die Sachen in gehaimb erhaltten werden sollen*; SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, Carton 92, 2 November, 1556.

¹⁰⁵ SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, Carton 92, 2 November, 1556.

¹⁰⁶ It was an open secret: cf. n. 65, n. 101, and n. 113. I disagree with Tyrolean historiography's oft-cited claim that on account of constitutionally enshrined rights, the Tyrolean peasantry, unlike that of the eastern Habsburg lands, did not carry part of the noble tax burden. See, for example, SARTORI-MONTECROCE, *Ge-*

There were actually two versions of the *Landlibell* in the sixteenth century: the official version applied to the whole *Land*; the unofficial version applied very largely to the German towns and *Gerichte* to the benefit of the upper estates. We may well ask why the upper estates went to all this bother of fraud and subterfuge. Why did they not come clean by telling the common man that he will tax as he is told and what his superiors tax is none of his concern, and be done with it – like the neighbouring archbishop of Salzburg who simply displaced the *Gerichte* from his diet?¹⁰⁷ There is no evidence that the aristocrats even remotely entertained stripping the *Gerichte* of their estates' rights. Everything points to the opposite conclusion: the *Landschaft* was the most important moral sanction for their rule, the most important instrument of control of the German peasantry. Yet, though the aristocracy counted a fair number of tax evaders among it, it did not contest its obligation to tax and most aristocrats paid at least a part, many all of their share. Indeed Sigmund Thun's summary of noble taxation seems to exalt the distinction.¹⁰⁸ And aristocrats' pleas of poverty were scarcely credible given their ability to lay down 10,000 *Gulden* cash for rights of lordship. So why did the aristocracy jeopardize the integrity of the *Landschaft* for a principle which they anyway accepted and could afford? The answer must be to protect the bishop of Trent. The aristocracy was willing to go through fire for him, even at the price of reneging on its most sacred covenant with the lower estates.

The golden rule of the *Landschaft* had always been the common (*gemain*) representation of all estates. But with the introduction of

schichte des Landschaftlichen Steuerwesens 16; Otto STOLZ, Bauer und Landesfürst in Tirol und Vorarlberg, in: Theodor MAYER, Walter PLATZHOFF (eds.), *Das Reich und Europa* (Leipzig 1943) 199 s.; id., *Rechtsgeschichte des Bauernstandes* 325; id., *Das Land als politischer Körper*, in: *Tirol: Land und Natur, Volk und Geschichte, geistiges Leben* (Munich 1933) 368; BLICKLE, *Landschaften im Alten Reich* 249; Hermann WIESFLECKER, *Österreich im Zeitalter Maximilians I.* (Vienna 1999) 263.

¹⁰⁷ Herbert KLEIN, *Salzburg und seine Landstände von den Anfängen bis 1861*, in: id., *Beiträge zur Siedlungs-, Verfassungs- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte von Salzburg. Gesammelte Aufsätze. Festschrift zum 65. Geburtstag von Herbert Klein* (Salzburg 1965) 115–136.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. n. 29.

the *Libell*, it fell by the wayside. Already at the 1518 diet, the *Gerichte* protested against the arbitrary fashion in which the *Ausschüsse* were being called and attended, and demanded equal and full attendance. In response, the large and small *Ausschuß* were instituted.¹⁰⁹ But the lower estates distrusted the upper estates and the new *Ausschüsse* proved unworkable. At Ferdinand's first diet, in 1523, in response to the large deficits and the lower estates' mounting anger about the abuse of the *Libell*, he ordered the Privy Council to undertake "general equalization of taxation": a new distribution of the *Landsteuer* was not ruled out. But the reform foundered against lower estates' opposition: they charged that it was a ploy by the upper estates to weight them down yet more.¹¹⁰ At Ferdinand's next diet of March 1525, he told the estates that he tried to correct the tax problem, but they obstructed his efforts, so he ordered them to rectify it themselves. The diet resolved – since the upper and lower estates could not cooperate – to establish separate upper and lower estates' tax commissions. But with the onset of the Peasants' War, the reform was overtaken by events.¹¹¹

The war brought no relief to the tax controversy. Afterwards, Ferdinand continued to press the estates to resolve the dispute, but to no avail; finally, in 1544, the estates responded by holding the so-called tax revision diet (*Steuerrevisionslandtag*). Its mandate was as Maximilian II told the estates: to bring "parity between all estates so that no one is assessed beyond his means to the advantage of others".¹¹² The diet returned to the previous idea of separate tax com-

¹⁰⁹ JÄGER, *Landständische Verfassung*, vol. 2, pt. 2, 491–492.

¹¹⁰ SARTORI-MONTECROCE, *Geschichte des Landschaftlichen Steuerwesens* 24–26.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.* 32–33.

¹¹² From the royal propositions presented by Maximilian II to the 1551 diet: *Nun wisten sich sein lieb und gemaine Stenndt zu erinndern, das wir zu offtermal- len auf gehalltnen Lanndtagen angeregte Unrichtigkeit unnd Beschwerung furtragen und daneben begerrn lassen, auff Mittl unnd Weeg zgedencken wie die Sachen zu pesserer Richtigkeit zubringen, dardurch bey allen Stennden ain Gleichait gemacht unnd niemandts fur den anndern uber sein Vermugen belegt und beschwerdt wurde. Und wiewoll darauf ain Ersame Lanndschafft im verschinen 44 Jar zu solcher Richtigmachung und Vergleichung ettlich Personen verordnet, das*

missions and resolved that each estates' group should establish a tax compromise commission (*Steuerkompromißkommission*) from its own members to settle disputes over assessment: a noble commission of eight upper estates' representatives and a common commission of twelve members, including eight lower estates' representatives, two *Landleute* from the government and two *Landleute* outside of the government.¹¹³ But this too came to nothing.¹¹⁴ Seven years later, the Privy Council and Treasury explained to Ferdinand what happened at the tax revision diet. The estates "outside of Trent" were not invited for fear of the ensuing commotion had the *Landschaft*, above all the towns and *Gerichte*, been reminded about the bishop's tax exemption.¹¹⁵ Indeed the common tax commission likely was never formed, since resolutions of shortly following diets – like 1553, 1556 and 1563 – reveal the existence of only the noble commission. At the 1563 diet, the commission was expanded to accommodate the abbot of Stams and a Trent canon, Bartle Botsch. No doubt this only confirmed a long-standing practice: the upper estates had been holding separate diets with Trent since 1511; otherwise its exemption would not have been "secret". Over time these modifications became institutional-

doch solche Verordnung wenig bisher gewürckht, sonder die Steuern also in vorigen Unrichtigkhait bliben [...]; SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, Carton 88, 8 December.

¹¹³ SARTORI-MONTECROCE, *Geschichte des Landschaftlichen Steuerwesens* 70s.

¹¹⁴ Cf. n. 113.

¹¹⁵ *[...] im vorganggen 1544 Jar [...] in disem Lanndtag ist fürmenblich durch die Stenndt ausserhalb des Stiffts Triennndt Gesannnden, so damals auß der Ursach nit erfordert worden, damit ain Lanndtschafft, sunderlich von Stetten und Gerichten, des Stiffts Triennndt Gegenwurf nit erinndert und allerlai Ungereimbt einwerffen hatten mugen, auf die Ordnung und Vergleichung, so im 1511 Jar von wegen des Zuezugs in ainer Lanndsnott gemacht, gefuest worden. Nemblich dieweil damals eben die Unrichtigkhait mit des Stiffts Triennndt Unnderthanen und walschen Confinanten gewesen, ist durch ain sonndere Fursehung Kaiser Maximilians die Ordnung allain auf ain Zuezug in ainer Lanndtsnott abgehandlet, ob also durch dise Ordnung, darinnen auch Maß gegeben, wievill Feuerstett ainen Knecht halten sollen, des Stiffts Triennndt Unnderthanen und anndere Ungehorsamen mit der weil tacite, auch in gemaine Steuern gebracht hetten mugen werden, wie dann etliche vom Adl, im Stifft Triennndt gesessen, aufsolche Ordnung und Vergleichung zu Raichung aller Hilfen und Lanndtsteurn bewegt worden, die sonnst sich mit gmains Stiffts Triennndt Unnderthanen Exemption zubehelffen vermaint hetten;* SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, Carton 88, 10 July, 1551.

ized. Under the new estates' system an exclusive upper estates' tax commission was created to circumvent the lower estates' obstruction. Taxation still began in the plenum diet: in part in recognition of the lower estates' right to grant taxation; in part to ensure that they were liable for the taxation which the upper estates granted. But once authorized, upper estates' tax assessment was then routed outside of the plenum diet, well away from the lower estates.

This scheme was not Ferdinand's. Between 1536 and 1563 he only set foot in the Tyrol three times for a total of six weeks.¹¹⁶ Every indication suggests that the aristocracy hatched it itself. To be sure, Ferdinand approved it after meeting with Sigmund Thun and Belasi Khuen, but he never saw it as a permanent solution. He always tried to fix the *Libell*; yet other considerations somehow got in the way. During the Third Session of the Council of Trent, he met Cristoforo Madruzzo in Brixen to take up the tax issue. The Privy Council advised Ferdinand that, unless the cardinal changes his tune, then to threaten to redeem his mortgages on the *Vier Vikariate*, which it assured would "not a little affect" him. But Cristoforo demurred and Ferdinand relented. To incite a confrontation with the Church precisely at the moment when the Council was in session was in his judgement "unquestionably most inadvisable and inopportune".¹¹⁷ He died the following year. Yet for all the frustrations which the Tyroleans brought the emperor, he could not in the end reproach their efforts. With evident satisfaction he had told Archduke Ferdinand, in 1563, that the Tyrol "has now for many years in succession made very stately tax contributions, and this, notwithstanding reports of great hardship." But not to give his successor false expectations, he added that it is "unaccustomed" to contribute in the way of a province say like Lower Austria.¹¹⁸

THE ARCHDUCAL ENTRY

Historians have often compared the two Ferdinands.¹¹⁹ The younger was the father-favourite of the sons, they looked alike, they

¹¹⁶ Anton von GÉVAY, *Itinerar Kaiser Ferdinands I. 1521–1564* (Vienna 1843).

¹¹⁷ HIRN, *Der Temporalienstreit* 366.

¹¹⁸ SARTORI-MONTECROCE, *Geschichte des Landschaftlichen Steuerwesens* 117.

¹¹⁹ HIRN, *Erzherzog Ferdinand II.*, vol. 1, 16, 35, 45, 161; vol. 2, 505, 507.

were steadfast Catholics, and both tolerated Utraquism.¹²⁰ But the similarities end with their attitude to the Tyrol. For the emperor, the Tyrol was not the focal point of his politics. During his 43-year reign, he stopped in the *Land* just twelve times for a total of three years, two and a half before 1536.¹²¹ This rested as much on the greater priority he placed on the Empire and his eastern lands as the loyalty of the Tyrolean bishops and aristocracy. The two sides had an understanding, in which the Tyroleans supported Habsburg dynastic politics in return for free rein inside the *Land*. Their inordinate influence did not go unnoticed. A Venetian diplomat commented that the Tyrolean estates were so powerful that the *Landesfürst* could not be described as the actual ruler.¹²² Yet however much Ferdinand's reputation as *Landesfürst* suffered, the prestige which he derived from the imperial, Bohemian, and Hungarian Crowns more than compensated.

The archduke, on the other hand, lacked his father's dazzling array of imperial, royal and archducal titles and rulerships. He inherited the western Habsburg lands – Further Austria and the Tyrolean heartland – alone. For him, the Tyrol was not a means to a greater end, but the end itself. Rather than an emperor, he thought like a count: he aimed to be *Landesfürst* of the county and prince-bishops.¹²³ A few months after the archduke's accession, Cristoforo Madruzzo put to the archducal Bohemian *Obersthofmeister* and imperial orator in Venice, Franz Thurn, that it cannot be true that the archduke intended to move his court from Innsbruck to Trent, a town which after all is not his own. Thurn told him to give it no weight as it surely was a rumour.¹²⁴ A year later, the papal nuncio in Vienna, Cardinal Delfino, alerted Cristoforo that the archduke had told him that he intended to rule as “overlord and prince of his whole

¹²⁰ For the Utraquist policy of both, see Zdeněk V. DAVID, A Brief Honeymoon in 1564–1566: The Utraquist Consistory and the Archbishopric of Prague, in: *Bohemia* 39/2 (1998) 265–284.

¹²¹ GÉVAY, *Itinerar Kaiser Ferdinands I.*

¹²² KÖFLER, *Land* 163.

¹²³ See HIRN, *Der Temporalienstreit* 372; BÜCKING, *Frühabsolutismus* 20, 29, 223 s.

¹²⁴ HIRN, *Der Temporalienstreit* 371.

Land” (“dominus superior et princeps totius illius provinciae”).¹²⁵ Shortly after arriving in the Tyrol, Ferdinand’s envoys spelled out his grievance to the emperor: the present bishop of Trent (on the grounds of an ill-gotten imperial deposition, which the weaselling Bernhard Cles extracted from the king) refuses to recognize the archduke as his *Landesfürst*, prevents those nobles, who are at once his vassals and subjects of the *Landesfürst*, from paying the *Landsteuer*, and seeks to make them his exclusive subjects.¹²⁶ Here is revealed the full dimension of the conflict: behind the prince-bishoprics stood many aristocrats, indeed since the bishop of Trent and administrator of Brixen was himself aristocratic, they were for all intents and purposes one.

The princely entry marked the beginning of the archduke’s concerted and prolonged attempt to amend the terms of the bargain struck by his great-grandfather and aristocracy, and reconfirmed by his father. Because he kept extending his stay in Prague, planning began well ahead of his actual arrival, and because of his penchant for micromanagement, it finished only days before. As he instructed the Privy Council: I want my entry to proceed as efficiently as Maximilian’s entries into his lands; everything is to be consulted and recorded from A to Z.¹²⁷ In the summer of 1565, he got the ball rolling when he put four queries to it.¹²⁸ When he enters the Tyrol, where will the estates meet him in order to accompany him to Innsbruck? What kind of order and ceremony should the progress follow? How were previous diets conducted? Since the estates will anyway be gathered, why not, as a cost-saving measure, hold the *Erbhuldigung* at the same time? The Council seems to have been taken aback by this barrage of pointed and delicate questions. It wrote the archduke that since so many of them touched the estates, they should be consulted; hence it asked for permission to confer with the large *Ausschuß*, which he approved.

¹²⁵ Ibid., 373.

¹²⁶ Ibid., 442.

¹²⁷ TLA, Ferdinandea, Position 23, Carton 28, 19 November, 1566.

¹²⁸ TLA, Ferdinandea, Position 23, Carton 28, 17 July, 1565.

They met three times.¹²⁹ To the first two questions they answered that they could think of no more enjoyable or comfortable progress (*lusstiger noch bequemlicher Weg*) than for the *Landschaft* and government lords to meet the archduke at the Bavarian border near Kufstein and to accompany him to the outskirts of Innsbruck, where prelates, clergy, and priesthood awaited them; then, like his father upon his entry, the archduke should ride under a golden baldachin in a procession – including the *Landschaft*, government lords, prelates, clergy, and priesthood – into Innsbruck, and finally enter St. Jakob's parish church to a chorus of *Te Deum Laudamus* and other hymns; the diet, they suggested, could take place afterwards. In addition, they proposed that a commemorative golden penny worth about 15,000 *Gulden* be minted. To the third inquiry, they answered that scarcely anyone was old enough to remember the last diets – 1520, 1523–1526, and 1529 – at which oaths of allegiance were taken, but that they were combing their archives for records.¹³⁰ However the final suggestion concerning the diet caused them considerable consternation. Firstly, they stressed that if the archduke insisted on holding one, then only to render the *Erbhuldigung* and not to seek aid, for the collection of the last contribution granted earlier in the year had bogged down and even if the estates authorized further aid, which it was certain they would not, the returns would be negligible as the common man was financially exhausted. Secondly, although they agreed that holding an *Erbhuldigung* while the estates were assembled saved money, they feared that the cardinal would skip the diet, perhaps the entry itself, for they knew what happened in 1520: Bernhard Cles had attended the diet called to take the *Erbhuldigung*, but under protest; he had insisted that neither he nor his subjects were obligated to swear an oath of allegiance to the *Landesfürst*, and that he had not come to

¹²⁹ The Privy Council referred to these meetings – 29 June, 6 and 17 August – in detail in two letters: TLA, Ferdinandea, Position 23, Carton 28, 17 July, 1565 and 4 November, 1566.

¹³⁰ In 1520, a proxy received the oaths for Charles V; in 1523–6, Ferdinand I received the oaths in person, but only as governor, since Charles had not publicly handed over hereditary rights to the Tyrol; after Charles did cede them, Ferdinand, in 1529, received the oaths again in person.

the diet for that reason, only to uphold the traditional contracts between Trent and the county.¹³¹

Ludovico Madruzzo did not see the matter otherwise.¹³² The Privy Council had instructed him to send two delegates to the *Ausschuß* of 29 June, but none appeared. It took umbrage and reminded the cardinal that the bishops and the cathedral chapters were required to attend every *Landtag* “with and beside the *Landschaft*”, to pay their share of every granted *Landsteuer* “together with the *Landschaft*”, and it warned him that in case he intended “to separate from the *Landschaft*”, on the authority of the old custom, it was inadmissible.¹³³ Madruzzo replied that he planned to attend the entry ceremonies personally and to offer his “service” (*Dienstwilligkeit*) to the archduke. His delegates appeared at the next *Ausschuß*, where they gave a clearer idea of the meaning of “service”. They referred to the count as the “right and natural hereditary lord and *Landesfürst* of the *Landschaft*” (*ainer E[hrsamen] T[yrolischen] Lanndtschafft gnedigster rechter natürllicher Erbherr und Lanndtsfürst*) and the “advocate” (*Vogt, Schutz- und Schirmherr*) of the bishops. Although, they added, no bishop had attended the entry ceremonies of a *Landesfürst*

¹³¹ TLA, Ferdinanda, Position 23, Carton 28, 17 July 1565, 4 November 1566, 11 January 1567.

¹³² Since 1560, when Cristoforo moved to Rome, his nephew was the acting bishop and administrator.

¹³³ The Privy Council described its handling of Trent to Ferdinand: *Wie dann von Alters her, die Bischoff zu Triennndt unnd Brixen und dise beede Capittl, yederzeit mit unnd neben ainer Ersamen Tyrolischen Lanndtschafft auf alle Lanndtäg beschriben unnd ervordert, auch neben ainer Lanndtschafft erscheinen unnd sambt derselben die Lanndtags Handlungen unnd Obligen beschliessen unnd verrichten helffen; und was alda für Hilffen bewilligt sambt unnd neben der Lanndtschafft, iren unnderschiedlichen habenden Tax unnd Anschlag hat unnd in allerlay gemains Lanndts obligen, mit ainer Lanndtschafft, von beeder Stifft wegen, zuheben unnd zulegen schuldig ist. Unnd derothalben seinen Fürstlichen Gnaden, da dieselb sich ermelter beeder Stifft Triennndt und Brichsen halber, von ainer Ersamen Tyrolischen Lanndtschafft, des man doch nit verhofft, abzusündern vermainte, solcher Absünderrung zuerhaltung angeregts alten Herkhumen und ersessen Gebrauch, auch in crafft der sonndern waren aufgerichten Verträgen nit gestattet werden kann; TLA, Ferdinanda, Position 23, Carton 28, 17 July, 1565. The Privy Council explained the same almost word for word in its 4 November, 1566 letter: TLA, Ferdinanda, Position 23, Carton 28.*

before (*allain durch die anndern Stenndt ainer E. T. Lanndtschafft*), he would this time; however, since both prince-bishoprics received their temporal powers from the Empire, the *Erbhuldigung* applied not to them, but the *Landschaft*.¹³⁴

Around the end of the year the entry preparations were suspended as Ferdinand had agreed to join Maximilian on his military campaign against the Turks the next summer. In November of 1566, they resumed, but no longer with the input of the *Ausschuß*; Ferdinand dealt only with the Privy Council. Not coincidentally, the lower estates were dropped from the archduke's greeting party. In view of the poverty, famine, harsh winter conditions and recurring bouts of plague which afflicted the common man, the Privy Council saw fit to invite only nobles and government lords to meet the prince at the border of the *Land*.¹³⁵ From this point onwards, the lower estates were denied a voice in the entry preparations.

With regard to the execution of the writ (*Ausschreiben*) to attend the diet, the Privy Council advised against any innovations. It had in the past issued a general notice when pressed for time, however because the old custom was to send individual writs to each bishop, the prelates, nobles, towns and *Gerichte*, it recommended the same procedure in order to avoid difficulties with the *Landstände*.¹³⁶ Ten days later, the families of the entire noble estate – *Grafen, Herren, Ritterschafft und Adel* – were sent their writs, in which their scions of age and retainers were ordered to meet the archduke at the border, accompany him to Innsbruck, and attend the diet.¹³⁷ Trent remained the thorny subject for the Council, though less because of the bishop's as the archduke's stance. It told Ferdinand that the bishop of Trent owed neither – for himself or his subjects – an *Erbhuldigung*, nor anything else contrary to the *Kompaktaten*, and likewise his cathedral chapter. Nonetheless it advised him to uphold tradition and

¹³⁴ TLA, Ferdinandea, Position 23, Carton 28, 17 July 1565, 8 August 1565.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, 4 November, 1566.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*

¹³⁷ To be of age meant 16 years of age or confirmed: TLA, Ferdinandea, Position 23, Carton 28, 17 July, 1565.

summon the bishop to the diet like the *Landschaft*. To omit this act, it warned, would only impair his reputation and the freedoms of the *Land*, not to mention sow confusion and dissension among the *Landstände*. Moreover it urged him as soon as possible to demand from Trent – its bishop, captains, office-holders, bailiffs, whatever order to which they belonged – its traditional oath, bearing in mind that neither the bishop nor his subjects understood it as an *Erbhuldigung*; for them it was merely a “confirmation” (*Becrefftigung*) of the *Kompaktaten*.¹³⁸

Up to mid-November, Ferdinand had let the Tyroleans dictate entry plans; hereafter he strove to make them his own and it reveals twin accents of his policy. The one was his claim of authority over the aristocracy.¹³⁹ He asked for a copy of the *Landesordnung*, which the Privy Council supplied. He asked what honorary hereditary county offices were bestowed on the eminent “Romance” nobles, who they were, and what their terms of office-holding were. Finally he wrote that on second thought it was unnecessary to invite the whole noble estate to meet and accompany him to Innsbruck. There were after all many encumbrances to think about: the narrow roads of the Lower Inn Valley, the unnecessary expense, the cold and snow, and the risk of infection. Rather he wished to meet what he dubbed “commissaries”, men of the “the most eminent and distinguished dynasties of the *Land* (*ansehelichen unnd furnemen Geschlechtern diß Lanndts*), and left their selection to the Privy Council. The councillors were dumbfounded. They had repeatedly warned the archduke to respect old custom; moreover the entry was only weeks away and the noble writs had already gone out.¹⁴⁰ Now they were hastily rescinded and 26 commissaries (24 families in all) appointed in their place: Wilhelm Wolkenstein; one member each of the Arcos and Lodrons; Lukas Römer; Niccolò Madruzzo; Christoph Völs; Georg Firmian; Balthasar Trautson; Christoph Welsberg; Bernhard Künigl; Ulrich Strein; Degen Fuchs; Jakob Boimont; Hans Khuen; Ferdinand Cles; Hans

¹³⁸ TLA, Ferdinandea, Position 23, Carton 28, 4 November, 1566.

¹³⁹ Ibid.

¹⁴⁰ The machine-printed writ to Sigmund Thun Jr. is held in the Thun's archive: SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, Carton 159, 13 November, 1566

Botsch; Hans Wolkenstein; Hildebrand Spaur; Veit Annenberg; Oswald Trapp; Anton Jakob Thun; Balthasar Liechtenstein; Franz Trautmannsdorf; Hans Heinrich Brandis; Hans Jakob Römer; Franz Hendl.¹⁴¹ The councillors added one reservation: they requested that the *Landeshauptmann* be permitted to represent the whole *Landschaft*; Ferdinand consented.

We meet again the “Romance” (*welsche*) epithet.¹⁴² Ferdinand singled out not only the aristocracy, but more particularly the “Romance” aristocracy. What was its significance? This question shall be revisited, but it is convenient to state here that it was more than merely an ethnic attribute. Ferdinand grew up in the Tyrol and was familiar with the “Romance” aristocrats (the “Romance” Gaudenzio Madruzzo, royal advisor, royal *Kämmerer*, *Hofmarschall* of Trent and father of his archrival, Cristoforo, had been the *Oberstkämmerer* of the king’s sons in Innsbruck).¹⁴³ He knew that the power bases of Trent and “Romance” aristocrats overlapped, that the bishop and “Romance” aristocrats were close-knit, and that the fate of the bishop was not a matter of indifference to the “Romance” aristocrats. We begin to see the complexity of the Tyrolean Gordian knot Ferdinand wished to cut: ethnicity was political.

The second related stress of his strategy turned on Trent.¹⁴⁴ Ferdinand heartily endorsed the Council’s advice that its bishop, captains, office-holders and bailiffs take an oath, but added that he did not see

¹⁴¹ The Freundsbergs constituted the twenty-fifth of the selected families, but were not invited as the house senior served in Hungary at the time: TLA, Ferdinanda, Position 23, Carton 28, 12 January, 1567.

¹⁴² *Welsche* in the early modern Tyrol denoted its two Romance languages. The large majority of Romance speakers spoke Italian; a tiny fraction spoke Ladin: Otto STOLZ, *Geschichte des Landes Tirol* (Innsbruck 1955) 321. The ethnic constitution has scarcely changed. Between 1860 and 1914, the proportion of German-speakers ranged between 55 and 58 percent, Italian-speakers ranged between 41 and 43 percent and Ladin-speakers made up around one percent of the total population: Laurence COLE, “Für Gott, Kaiser und Vaterland”: *Nationale Identität der deutschsprachigen Bevölkerung Tirols 1860–1914* (Frankfurt-New York 2000) 24–28.

¹⁴³ GATZ, *Die Bischöfe* 443; SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, II-152, 23 April, 1540.

¹⁴⁴ TLA, Ferdinanda, Position 23, Carton 28, 6 January, 1567; TLA, Ferdinanda, Position 23, Carton 28, 11 January, 1567.

why it should not take place at the same time as the *Erbhuldigung*. Therefore he asked the Council if there was not some way of getting them to attend the diet. Without saying no, it answered that while it was confident that the cardinal would attend the entry, it had no idea whether he would attend the diet, to say nothing of his subjects. Nevertheless in anticipation that the bishop would attend the diet, Ferdinand asked if he had a special rank and standing in the diet, and if he in any way conducted himself differently than the other estates. The Council, in response, described the protocol of the 1563 diet. The emperor took precedence. On his left, somewhat below him, sat the bishop on a bench covered with a velvet cloth, and somewhat below him, sat the cathedral chapters. The prelates sat on the right of the emperor and the rest of the estates stood before him. This was all in keeping with tradition, it added, for the bishops had always been separated from the other estates and had always taken precedence over the other estates, just as both in the old and new resolutions of the *Landtag*, the bishops had always been cited first and apart from the *Landschaft*. The Council's evident readiness to underscore the bishops' privileged status displeased Ferdinand, and he let his quite different point of view be known. He wrote the Council that it had clearly stated its position on the *Erbhuldigung* which, considering the shortness of time, he would have to live with. However, he deemed its handling of the prince-bishoprics – *unsere Verwondte* – unsatisfactory and indicated that he intended to take up the matter at a more opportune time.¹⁴⁵

The princely progress began on 14 January, 1567.¹⁴⁶ The commissaries (dressed in black velvet coats), with their servants (dressed in black) and up to 100 horses, and the government lords (dressed in black velvet coats) with 60 horses, met the prince with his Bohemian retinue and some 700 horses in a clearing in the *Herrschaft Kufstein*. The Chancellor, Christoph Klöckler,¹⁴⁷ made a short speech on behalf

¹⁴⁵ The term *Verwontnus* (kinship) is related to the modern *verwandt* (kindred).

¹⁴⁶ An entry description was written by the secretary of the Privy Council, Hans Ernstinger, which the following two paragraphs highlight: SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, Carton 160, 31 January, 1567.

¹⁴⁷ The Alsatian was a doctor of law who began his Habsburg service in Ensisheim in 1553. In 1560, he was promoted to chancellor of the Upper Austrian Privy Council and served in this capacity until his death in 1579: Manfred

the government, after which the archduke shook hands with each lord. Then he went over to the commissaries. The *Landeshauptmann* made a short speech on behalf of the *Landschaft*, after which the archduke shook hands with every commissary. Next the archducal counsellor and *Obristhofmarschall*, Nikolaus Pollweiler,¹⁴⁸ explained the order of the procession up the Inn Valley. Four groups were assembled in turn and in triple file: the commissaries with their servants, the Bohemian courtiers, the government and other Bohemian lords arranged by rank, and lastly their servants arranged by rank. Later that day the procession entered Kufstein, where the prince spent the night. On 15 January it entered the town of Rattenberg, on 16 January the town of Schwaz, in the morning of 17 January the town of Hall,¹⁴⁹ in the afternoon Innsbruck and finally St. Jakob's church. On 18 January, the festivities concluded with the *Erbhuldigung* – less Trent and Brixen – in the Innsbruck *Hofburg*.

The highlight of the progress took place on the Inn River Bridge leading into Innsbruck. After leaving Hall, the archduke set out for Innsbruck. Along the way he was received “in the appropriate manner” by the elected and confirmed bishop of Trent, Cardinal Ludovico Madruzzo, in the name of the bishop of Trent and administrator of Brixen, Cardinal Cristoforo Madruzzo, along with the coad-

SCHMID, Behörden- und Verwaltungsorganisation Tirols unter Erzherzog Ferdinand II. in den Jahren 1564–1585 (Diss. Innsbruck 1971) 96 and *passim*. An uncompromising Catholic and patron of the Jesuits, he was instrumental in the implementation of the Counter-Reformation and features prominently in HIRN's, *Erzherzog Ferdinand II.*, *passim*.

¹⁴⁸ He was a German-born noble who married a Tyrolean Liechtenstein and later, in 1551, joined the Tyrolean noble estates. He first appears in Habsburg service in 1544 as a royal advisor in the Upper Austrian Privy Council, later served as an imperial diplomat in Paris, and was pencilled in as an imperial orator at the Third Session of the Council of Trent, but because of previous commitments declined. He joined Archduke Ferdinand in the Hungarian campaign of 1566, appears to have then followed him to Prague, from where he accompanied him to Innsbruck. He retired in 1568: SCHMID, *Behörden- und Verwaltungsorganisation Tirols* 34

¹⁴⁹ A short description of Ferdinand's entry into Hall is contained in David SCHÖNHERR (ed.), *Franz Schwegger's Chronik der Stadt Hall 1303–1572* (Innsbruck 1867) 146.

jutor of Brixen, Johann Thomas Spaur, ecclesiastical nobles, Bohemian courtiers and about 100 horses.¹⁵⁰ At this point, the lesser Tyrolean nobles (exclusive of the commissaries) joined the party, which continued up the northern bank of the Inn River. Waiting on the bridge for the archduke was a cortege of clergy, priesthood and the *Weihbischof* (auxiliary bishop) of Trent and Brixen, who stood under a canopy adorned in the colours of the house of Austria and supported by eight aristocrats: on the right side, Ulrich Strein, Christoph Welsberg, Georg Firmian, Jakob Khuen and on the left, Fortunato Madruzzo, Melchior Wolkenstein, Jakob Boimont, Hans Botsch.¹⁵¹ As the archduke approached, the *Weihbischof* held up a crucifix containing a sliver of the Holy Cross. The archduke dismounted, walked under the canopy, removed his head-dress and kissed the crucifix, after which the *Weihbischof* held a Latin oration and blessed the archduke,¹⁵² who then remounted and riding under the canopy entered Innsbruck in a procession arranged in the following order: noble servants; nobles; government lords; commissaries' servants; commissaries; 20 archducal pages; archducal courtiers;

¹⁵⁰ In a letter to Maximilian, Ferdinand probably tells us what his secretary meant by "the appropriate manner". He wrote that while he stayed on his horse, Ludovico dismounted. Maximilian noted to himself dryly, the "younger" deferred to the older: Paula Sutter FICHTNER, *Emperor Maximilian II* (New Haven 2001) 106.

¹⁵¹ Historians have just begun to uncover the importance of this office (*episcopi auxiliares, episcopi suffraganei, viceregentes* or *vicarii in pontificalibus*) to the spiritual life of the imperial Church. Common since the fourteenth century, most prince-bishops delegated their pastoral duties to an auxiliary bishop, whether because they had no time, they were not themselves ordained, they resided outside the bishopric, or they simply were not interested in them. The *Weihbischof* cited here was the noble, Blasius Aliprandi (ca. 1561–1571). He was appointed by Cristoforo, and like him, was a native of the Non Valley. Aliprandi was instrumental to the Tyrolean Counter-Reformation: Karl WOLFSGRUBER, *Das Brixner Domkapitel in seiner persönlichen Zusammensetzung in der Neuzeit 1500–1803* (Innsbruck 1951) 132. For the nature of the office and office-holders in Brixen, see Josef GELMI, *Funktion und Bedeutung der Brixner Weihbischöfe in der Frühen Neuzeit*, in: Friedhelm JÜRGENSMEIER (ed.), *Beiträge zu reichskirchlichen Funktionsträgern der Frühen Neuzeit* (Frankfurt am Main 1995) 23–40.

¹⁵² Aliprandi could not speak German: WOLFSGRUBER, *Das Brixner Domkapitel* 133.

government officials; local clergy, priesthood, Franciscans, Jesuits, conventuals and their decan and provost;¹⁵³ four prelates;¹⁵⁴ the *Weihbischof* with the crucifix in hand; a trumpeter and 12 drummers; the *Landeshauptmann*, Wilhelm Wolkenstein; the Vice-governor, Christoph Wolkenstein; the herald; Balthasar Trautson;¹⁵⁵ Ferdinand and the eight aristocrats under the baldachin; Ludovico Madruzzo and Johann Thomas Spaur; Franz Thurn;¹⁵⁶ some of the cardinal's advisors from Trent and Brixen; finally, the archducal bodyguard.

THE MID-SIXTEENTH CENTURY ARISTOCRACY

Although the designation "commissaries of the estates" was not in keeping with tradition, its definition reflected the social reality: the commissaries were the most eminent and distinguished families of the *Land*, in short, the aristocrats. They were formidable in their own way. Of course they are not comparable to the overmighty magnates of the eastern Habsburg lands, but they were well placed to defend their interests, for they were vassals of the prince-bishops, en-

¹⁵³ The community in question probably was the cathedral chapter of Brixen, since Innsbruck belonged to the Brixen diocese. At this time, the dean was Leopold Trautmannsdorf and the provost was Johann Thomas Spaur: *ibid.* 202, 218.

¹⁵⁴ The prelates probably belonged to the prelatial estates as the plenum diet took place the following day.

¹⁵⁵ Ernstinger did not identify him by title; he was the oldest son of Hans Trautson, imperial *Obersthofmeister*: Constant WURZBACH, *Biographisches Lexikon des Kaisertums Oesterreich*, vol. 47 (Vienna 1889) 40–55.

¹⁵⁶ Founder of the older Bohemian Thurn-Valsassina line, imperial diplomat in Venice and Rome under Ferdinand I, and archducal *Obersthofmeister* since 1553, Count Thurn was one of the many Bohemians Ferdinand brought with him from Prague. He was a confidant of the archduke as he was related to Ferdinand's wife, Philippine (Franz was the cousin of Achaz Thurn, who married the Bohemian Barbara Schumberg, who was the sister of Eva, who married Karl Welser, brother of Philippine) and as procurator of their children, one of the few persons privy to their clandestine marriage. He was also an Utraquist with Lutheran leanings. After Ferdinand denied Thurn's request to retain an Utraquist chaplain in Innsbruck, he requested his release from service. The wish was granted in 1568, whereupon he returned to Bohemia the same year. Thurn nevertheless remained an important *Geheimer Rat*. He died in 1586 as *Landeshauptmann* of Moravia. HIRN, *Erzherzog Ferdinand II.*, vol. 1, 19, 134.; vol. 2, 320, 354, 364; SCHMID, *Behörden- und Verwaltungsorganisation Tirols* 30.

trenched in the major political forums of the *Land* and, more conspicuously, they had connections to many of the major political forums of Europe. Tyroleans themselves were princes: in the imperial diet, they held seats in the Princely College – Cristoforo and Ludovico held two votes and Johann Jakob Khuen, Archbishop of Salzburg (1560–1586), one.¹⁵⁷ Moreover, Tyroleans had friends in high places: Cristoforo was a leading member of the Curia and a favourite of pope Pius IV;¹⁵⁸ Ludovico was no less important a Cardinal and a favourite of Philipp II of Spain;¹⁵⁹ Hans Trautson had been the *Obersthofmarschall* (1544–1558), *Obersthofmeister* (1558–1564) and court favourite of Ferdinand I, and stayed on as *Obersthofmeister* (1567–1575) under Maximilian II and President of the Aulic Council (1575–1590) under Rudolf II;¹⁶⁰ Scipio Arco was *Oberstkämmerer* of Ferdinand I, *Obersthofmeister* of Archduke Charles, and served Ferdinand I and Maximilian II as an imperial diplomat;¹⁶¹ Prospero Arco, the younger brother of Scipio, served Ferdinand I and Maximilian II as imperial orator at three papal courts (1560–1572);¹⁶² and Sigmund Thun had been an imperial orator at the Council of Trent (1561–1563).¹⁶³

These families played a major role in comital governance. Of the rough 150 administrative districts which, in 1564, spanned the territory, they possessed around 60, or 40 % as allod, fief or in pawn.¹⁶⁴ They dominated the majoritarian Privy Council. In 1564, at least 13 of the some 20 councillors were Tyrolean nobles, at least eight of

¹⁵⁷ He was one of the leading counter-reforming archbishops of Salzburg. See Franz ORTNER, *Reformation, katholische Reform und Gegenreformation im Erzstift Salzburg* (Salzburg 1981) 74–102; GATZ, *Die Bischöfe* 388–390.

¹⁵⁸ He set up the marriage of his nephew, Fortunato, with the pope's niece, Margerita Hohenems in 1560: GATZ, *Die Bischöfe* 445, 447.

¹⁵⁹ BÜCKING, *Frühabsolutismus* 38.

¹⁶⁰ Helmut GOETZ, *Die geheimen Ratgeber Ferdinands I. (1503–1564): Ihre Persönlichkeit im Urteil der Nuntien und Gesandten*, in: *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken* 42/43 (1963) 453, 494.

¹⁶¹ RILL, *Geschichte der Grafen von Arco* 113–117.

¹⁶² *Ibid.*, 118–121; *id.*, *Prosper Graf von Arco, kaiserlicher Orator beim Hl. Stuhl 1560–1572*, in: *MÖSTA* 13 (1960) 1–106.

¹⁶³ Hubert JEDIN, *Geschichte des Konzils von Trient*, 4 vols. (Freiburg 1951–1975), esp. vol. 4,1–2, *passim*.

¹⁶⁴ See the table at the back for a list of aristocratic rights of *Herrschaft*.

which were aristocrats: Jakob Christoph Brandis, Hans Botsch, Christoph Wolkenstein, Kaspar Wolkenstein, Jakob Khuen, Sigmund Thun, Karl Welsberg and Wilhelm Wolkenstein.¹⁶⁵ They monopolized the noble *Ausschuß*. In 1564, its membership comprised Simon Botsch, Jakob Boimont, Jakob Brandis, Hans Khuen, Sigmund Thun, Jakob Trapp, Christoph Welsberg, Christoph Wolkenstein, and Wilhelm Wolkenstein.¹⁶⁶ At the same time, they monopolized the noble positions of the tax compromise commission; indeed, the commission was essentially the *Ausschuß* minus the lower estates: Simon Botsch, Jakob Boimont, Jakob Brandis, Blasi Khuen, Sigmund Thun, Jakob Trapp, Christoph Wolkenstein, Wilhelm Wolkenstein; the abbot of Stams represented the prelates and Trent's cathedral canon, Bartlme Botsch, represented the prince-bishoprics.¹⁶⁷ Hence, four individuals held all four offices: Jakob Brandis, Christoph and Wilhelm Wolkenstein, and Sigmund Thun, the latter of whom was simultaneously advisor to the bishop of Trent. There were many family combinations as well: Karl Welsberg was a counsellor and Christoph Welsberg sat in the *Ausschuß*; Christoph, Kaspar, and Wilhelm Wolkenstein were counsellors; Jakob Khuen was a counsellor and Hans Khuen a member of the *Ausschuß*; Hans Botsch was counsellor, Bartlme Botsch tax commissioner, while Simon Botsch member of the *Ausschuß* and advisor to the bishop of Trent.

By the same token, the aristocrats had a major stake in the prince-bishoprics, whose prestige and profits they claimed for themselves.¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁵ The chancellor reported that there were 15 official positions in total and that one juristic position was vacant; it appears that it still was vacant in 1564: TLA, AKM, 17 August, 1561, fol. 793r. All of the listed noble counsellors are taken from Schmid, *Behörden- und Verwaltungsorganisation Tirols*, except the last four. They attended the Council and were called *Räte*; TLA, AKM, 30 January, 1562, fol. 74v.

¹⁶⁶ Resolution of the 1563 plenum diet: BayHStA, Kurbayern Äußeres Archiv, 4458.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁶⁸ This is not to suggest that the aristocracy was purely materialistic. Ludovico Madruzzo has been compared to such famous Catholic reformers as Peter Canisius, Felician Ninguarda, and Carlo Borromeo: STEINHAUF, Giovanni Ludovico Madruzzo viii.

Like the nobles of the imperial Church generally, they were nepotistic.¹⁶⁹ Prebends might be hereditary or lent, as the sixteenth century history of a *Thunische* canonry in Brixen shows.¹⁷⁰ In 1509, Sigmund Thun acquired it, which he passed to his brother, Philip, in 1522. A year later Philip died and his brother Cyprian succeeded him. In 1530, Cyprian gave the office up to marry and transferred it to his nephew, Karl. In 1537, Karl left the cathedral chapter to make room for Cristoforo Madruzzo. After he became bishop of Brixen in 1543, he stepped down in favour of Sigmund's nephew, Simon. In 1579, Simon retired and his nephew, Johann Anton, took his place, which he held until 1602.¹⁷¹ Even bishoprics might be hereditary. Four Madruzzos in a row held Trent (1539–1658) until there were no nephews left: Cristoforo, Ludovico, Carlo Gaudenzio, Carlo Emanuele.

The aristocracy claimed a say in the appointment of canons and bishops. It shines through the correspondence of Sigmund Thun. The Madruzzos and he had some sort of agreement on the apportionment of ecclesiastical offices. At the 1542 Brixen election of the bishop, Sigmund appeared as a Trent delegate and lobbied for Cristoforo, whereupon the electors asked him, why he promoted others when he himself might be bishop.¹⁷² His older brother and house senior, Lukas, took a dimmer view. He reproached Sigmund for putting his own interests ahead of those of the family: “when our luck shone brightest and Sigmund for the second time could have become bishop, he declined like the first”.¹⁷³ Stung by the gibe, Sigmund blamed Cristoforo. In a bitter recrimination of his faithlessness, Sigmund recalled the “machinations” (*Practicken*) he had undertaken to bring him the bishopric and demanded that he requite by fulfilling his promise to appoint Lukas' son, Simon, as dean of Trent's cathedral chapter.¹⁷⁴ To this end he turned to the king for redress. Ferdinand wrote Sigmund

¹⁶⁹ See Karl Johannes GRAUER, *Paris Lodron, Erzbischof von Salzburg: Ein Staatsmann des Friedens* (Salzburg 1953) 34; PRESS, *Kriege und Krisen* 61.

¹⁷⁰ RILL observed that the Arcos practiced a similar policy: *Geschichte der Grafen von Arco* 131.

¹⁷¹ WOLFGRUBER, *Das Brixner Domkapitel* 213.

¹⁷² LANGER, *Lebensskizze* xvi, 17.

¹⁷³ In a 1543 letter to his younger brother, Cyprian: *ibid.* xvi.

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.* xv–xvi.

that he would gladly confer the deanery on Simon, but that Francesco Arco had also applied for it.¹⁷⁵ In the meantime Niccolò Madruzzo undertook “negotiations” (*Verhandlungen*) with Arco. Niccolò wrote Sigmund that if Arco became dean, he was only willing to make Simon coadjutor and advised Sigmund to meet Arco himself.¹⁷⁶ Thereafter Sigmund sent Nikolaus Trautmannsdorf to consult with Arco. Ferdinand finally ended the controversy. In a letter to Cristoforo, he reminded him of his debt to Sigmund and asked him to pay it.¹⁷⁷ On 24 December, 1553, Simon obtained the deanery.¹⁷⁸

The pivotal political institution of a prince-bishopric was the cathedral chapter. It elected the bishop, usually one of its own and so the canonry served as a stepping-stone to the bishopric. Further canonical prebends were substantial. In 1564, the Brixen cathedral chapter consisted of 19 members, 14 of which were Tyrolean, 10 of which were aristocrats: Khuen (2), Madruzzo (2), Spaur (2), Botsch, Thun, Trautmannsdorf and Wolkenstein.¹⁷⁹ It appears that this majority was maintained, since 13 of the 20 bishops elected between 1539 and 1803 were aristocrats: Spaur (5), Cles, Fuchs, Khuen, Kü-nigl, Lodron, Madruzzo, Thun, and Welsberg.¹⁸⁰ No corresponding studies of Trent’s cathedral chapter or governing council exist, but during the Council of Trent (1545–1563) at least nine of the 19 canonries were filled by aristocrats: Arco (2), Botsch, Khuen, Lodron, Madruzzo, Spaur, Thun and Trautmannsdorf.¹⁸¹ The high ratio of aristocrats who became bishop points to similar aristocratic representation in the chapters of Trent and Brixen. Of the 20 bishops of Trent

¹⁷⁵ SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, Carton 163, Sigmund to his brother, undated.

¹⁷⁶ SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, Carton 145, January 1551.

¹⁷⁷ SOA Ibid. Carton 145, 7 February, 1551.

¹⁷⁸ SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, Carton 147, 26 December, 1553.

¹⁷⁹ Of the five non-Tyroleans, three were from Salzburg, two from Germany. WOLFSGRUBER, *Das Brixner Domkapitel* 119.

¹⁸⁰ Josef GELMI, *Geschichte der Kirche in Tirol* (Innsbruck-Wien 2001) 567.

¹⁸¹ Hubert JEDIN identified Madruzzo, Lodron, Thun and Trautmannsdorf as canons in his *Geschichte des Konzils von Trient*, vol. 1, 444; evidence for Botsch is held in SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, Cartons 89 and 159; B. BONELLI further identified Spaur, Arco (2), Khuen and Wolkenstein (since 1566) as canons in his *Notizie storico-critiche della chiesa di Trento*, vol. 3,2 (Trent 1765) 325.

elected between 1486 and 1803, 13 were aristocrats: Madruzzo (4), Thun (4), Cles, Freundsberg, Liechtenstein, Spaur, Wolkenstein.¹⁸²

The aristocratic flight into the Church needs to be put into proper perspective. It meant a significant increase in aristocratic power and its concentration in the south. The bishops of Trent and Brixen were imperial princes with rights of full sovereigns, which they exercised with their chapters inside their territories. The bishop of Brixen, for example, governed with his advisory council (*Hofrat*), which he appointed independent of the Habsburgs – but not independent of the cathedral chapter. Not only was he bound to cede at least two seats of the *Hofrat* to the chapter for canons of its choice, but during a *sede vacante*, the chapter assumed full control of both spiritual and temporal governance. In 1564, there were eight counsellors, three of whom were canons, two of whom were aristocrats: Leopold Trautmannsdorf and Johann Thomas Spaur.¹⁸³ In short, from 1539 to 1591, an aristocrat held both bishops' chairs and aristocrats controlled both cathedral chapters. Hence, a handful of related families, or more precisely an extended family, held princely authority over two-fifths of Tyroleans in the mid-sixteenth century – almost as many as the *Landesfürst* himself!¹⁸⁴

The aristocracy had always had a foot in the prince-bishoprics. During the Reformation – especially after Madruzzo donned the mitre – they became the aristocratic base. Of course the German capital remained a focal point. About 8 to 10 served as comital counsellors at

¹⁸² GELMI, *Geschichte der Kirche* 572.

¹⁸³ Since 1601, counsellors swore an oath of loyalty to the chapter; since the *Wahlkapitulation* (the electors' terms of the bishops' election) of 1641, the bishop could not appoint a counsellor without the approval of the chapter: JOSEF PASSLER, *Der Brixner Hofrat in der persönlichen Zusammensetzung von 1537 bis 1702*, 2 vols. (Diss. Innsbruck, 1969) vol. 1, 29–49, 125, 143.

¹⁸⁴ The population of the three territories in 1600 has been estimated as 170,000 in the county, a good 85,000 in Trent, and 15,000 in Brixen. The population of Brixen is exclusive of Veldes in Carinthia. NOFLATSCHER provides the figures in his *Räte und Herrscher* 146. Different figures have been given by THOMAS WINKELBAUER, *Ständefreiheit und Fürstenmacht. Länder und Untertanen des Hauses Habsburg im konfessionellen Zeitalter. Österreichische Geschichte 1522–1699*, 2 vols. (Vienna 2003) vol. 1, 14. He estimates the total population of the Tyrol to be 280,000 in 1500 and 390,000 in 1600; he gives no territorial breakdown.

any given time. Tyroleans filled the position of *Obersthofmeister* and *Obersthofmeisterin* at the court of Ferdinand's children in Innsbruck – for example, Gaudenzio Madruzzo,¹⁸⁵ Jakob Khuen,¹⁸⁶ Simon Botsch and his wife.¹⁸⁷ Tyrolean noblewomen belonged to the imperial daughter's *Frauenzimmer*, such as Barbara Spaur and daughters of Franz Trautmannsdorf and Paul Welsberg.¹⁸⁸ And they obtained properties in Innsbruck, such as the Trautsons and Wolkensteins.¹⁸⁹ But the town still lay beyond the main aristocratic sphere of operations; only one of the aristocratic families kept its ancestral seat north of the Brenner Pass: the Trautsons (and just on the other side). It is a telling detail that the prevalence of aristocratic rights of *Herrschaft* varied inversely with latitude. In the German Tyrol, north of the Brenner Pass, they held eight out of 50, or 16 % of the administrative districts; in the German Tyrol, south of the Brenner Pass, 44 out of 100, or 44 % of the administrative districts; in the Romance Tyrol, 34 out of 47, or 72 % of the administrative districts. All together, around 40 % of aristocratic districts lay in the Romance Tyrol. And without a resident prince, Innsbruck lost its greatest source of attraction. Just how dormant the Innsbruck court became is adduced by the Council's response to Archduke Ferdinand's query in 1566. When asked which eminent *welsche* nobles held honorary comital offices, it could answer neither what the offices were nor who held them.¹⁹⁰

Instead of three, there was in the mid-sixteenth century one princely court in the land: Castle Buonconsiglio in the town of Trent,

¹⁸⁵ GATZ, *Die Bischöfe* 443; SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, II-152, 23 April, 1540.

¹⁸⁶ He held it around 1560: TLA, AKM, 5 August, 1561, fol. 143r.

¹⁸⁷ He succeeded Jakob Khuen; at the same time his wife became *Obersthofmeisterin*: TLA, VKM, 26 March, 1562, fol. 309r.

¹⁸⁸ TLA, VKM, 14 November, 1560, fol. 656r; VKM, 18 January, 1561.

¹⁸⁹ SPECHTENHAUSER, *Behörden- und Verwaltungsorganisation Tirols* 118, 129.

¹⁹⁰ As so often the Council turned to Sigmund Thun for help. He replied that the *Lehenbriefe* (terms of enfeoffment) were no doubt in the archive of the Innsbruck chancellery, but wrote that Oswald Trapp was the *Hofmeister*, Hans Trautson the *Marschall*, Daniel Felix Spaur the *Erbschenck*, Simon Botsch the *Truchsess*, and Ferdinand Cles the *Kammer*. The government found the *Lehenbriefe*, which originated in the 1530s, and sent them to Ferdinand: TLA, Ferdinandea, Position 23, Carton 28, 20 November, 1566.

the residence of the bishop of Trent and administrator of Brixen. The bishop had many emoluments to bestow, for which he expected loyalty in return. In a letter to Sigmund Thun, he complained about one of his leading clients, Wilhelm Wolkenstein: although I maintain his sons at my court and have even granted his son Caspar the captaincy of Riva, he is still disobedient; in the future I shall know better and treat him differently.¹⁹¹ Trent was the magnet of aristocrats. They held there honorary court positions: for instance, Sigmund Thun was *Erbschenk* of Trent and Brixen;¹⁹² Bartholomäus Firmian was *Erbmarschall* of Trent;¹⁹³ Cristoforo conferred Sigmund Thun with the *Schenkenamt* of Brixen.¹⁹⁴ They served as advisors to the bishop, including Simon Botsch and Sigmund Thun.¹⁹⁵ They borrowed money from him¹⁹⁶ and held offices in his governments: for example, Christopher Thun, Gaudenzio and Niccolò Madruzzo, and Pankraz Khuen had served as captains of the city of Trent;¹⁹⁷ Hans Trautson¹⁹⁸ and Nikolaus Trautmannsdorf¹⁹⁹ had been captains of Rovereto; Ciprian Thun had been captain of Säben;²⁰⁰ Kaspar Thun had been bailiff of Heinfels.²⁰¹ Further, 19 – probably more – aristocratic families were vassals of Trent.²⁰² At least 12 were vassals of Brixen.²⁰³

¹⁹¹ SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, Carton, Carton 149, 3 February, 1555.

¹⁹² SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, Carton 160, 2 May, 1567.

¹⁹³ SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, I-120, 26 February, 1521.

¹⁹⁴ SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, I-300, 4 September, 1560: SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, Carton 155.

¹⁹⁵ SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, Carton 149, 22 April, 1555.

¹⁹⁶ For example, the Wolkensteins: SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, Carton 154, 22 January, 1560.

¹⁹⁷ SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, I-212, Cartons 146 and 155.

¹⁹⁸ SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, Carton 89, 4 February, 1552.

¹⁹⁹ SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, Carton 94, 19 January, 1558.

²⁰⁰ SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, Carton 146, 1551.

²⁰¹ LANGER, *Lebenskizze* 38.

²⁰² HIRN wrote that the greatest part of the Tyrolean nobility was enfeoffed to the bishop of Trent. He identified many, among them all of the 25 aristocratic families, except Trautson, Künigl, Hendl, Botsch, and Strein, of whom he made no mention: *Der Temporalienstreit* 430 and 458.

²⁰³ Liechtenstein, Trautson, Spaur, Wolkenstein (Rodenegg and Trostburg lines), Völs, Welsberg, Künigl, Thun, Annenberg, Fuchs, Trapp and Hendl. This list is based on a 1607 source, hence the *Freundsbergs*, who had been *Ministeria-*

Fiefdom was still an active institution: Trent held *Lehentage* (assemblies of lords and vassals) in 1537 and 1567.²⁰⁴ And they held properties in the town of Trent, as the Botschs, Cles, Firmians, Khuens, Madruzzos, Spaur, Thuns, Trapps, Trautmannsdorfs, Welsbergs, and Wolkensteins.²⁰⁵

Finally, aristocrats held rights of lordship in Trent. Of its 30 odd administrative districts, the aristocracy held about 15 – Thun (3), Madruzzo (6), Trapp (2), Firmian, Lodron, Liechtenstein, and Spaur. Brixen had 25 odd administrative districts of which the aristocracy held four – Völs (2) and Wolkenstein (2). There is no comparative economic study of the administrative districts – their populations varied greatly, from a few households to hundreds. But there are strong indications that the districts of the Romance Tyrol were the most lucrative: it was the most urbanized part of the *Land* and its predominant viniculture yielded a more marketable and profitable product than the mainly diary farming of the German Tyrol; the Romance peasantry had fewer rights than their German neighbours, which presumably translated into higher rents and dues; few Romance subjects paid the *Landsteuer*, which left room for their landlords to tax them themselves; the population density of Trent's administrative districts was the largest: around 1600, Trent's districts averaged about 4,000 subjects; the county's districts averaged about 1,000; Brixen's districts averaged about 600. The double lure of lordship and court is attested by Sigmund Thun. He wrote the king that although he had two brothers to assist him, they rendered little help in the management of their estates in the Non Valley or the fulfilment of his duties in Trent; hence, he requested his release from service as *Obersthofmeister* of Ferdinand's daughter, Katharina, in Mantua, in order to return to the Non Valley in the vicinity of Trent.²⁰⁶

les, but who died out in 1587, probably were also vassals: Rudolf GRANICHSTAEDTEN-CZERVA, Brixen: Fürstentum und Hofstaat (Vienna 1948) 76.

²⁰⁴ HIRN, Der Temporalienstreit 458; SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, Carton 99, 7 November, 1566.

²⁰⁵ SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, Cartons 152 and 153.

²⁰⁶ [...] *auß Ursach, das ich auff dem Nons oder zw Triendt wenig Hilf befind*; SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, Carton 162, undated but composed in the early 1550s.

What is especially striking about these families was their political and ethnic ambiguity. Most held most or all of their rights of *Herrschaft* from the *Landesfürst*; most were born in the county; and most maintained their ancestral seat in the county. However many of the richest held extensive rights of *Herrschaft* from the bishop of Trent: Arco, Cles, Khuen, Lodron, Madruzzo, Spaur, and Thun.²⁰⁷ In fact several aristocrats were native to the prince-bishopric: for instance, Bernhard Cles was born in the Non and Sole Valley²⁰⁸ (Trent) and his ancestral seat (Castle Cles) was a fief of the bishop;²⁰⁹ Cristoforo Madruzzo was born in the Non and Sole Valley (Trent) and his ancestral seat (Castle Nano) was a fief of the bishop;²¹⁰ Sigmund Thun was born in Non and Sole Valley (Trent) and his ancestral seat (Castle Belvesino-Thun) was a fief of the bishop.²¹¹

²⁰⁷ Both the Cles and Madruzzo became very rich during Bernhard's and Cristoforo's tenures: Carl AUSSERER, *Der Adel des Nonsberges: Sein Verhältnis zu den Bischöfen und zu den Landesfürsten, seine Schlösser, Burgen und Edelsitze, seine Organisation, Freiheiten und Rechte. Die 'Nobili rurali'*, in: *Jahrbuch der k. k. Heraldischen Gesellschaft "Adler"* 9 (1899) 13–252, here 115–120 and 148–150. Much *Thunische* property belonged to the count, but most of it was held as fief from the bishop: LANGER, *Lebensskizze* 26. The Khuens had a modest share of county property, but "many fiefs" from the bishop: AUSSERER, *Der Adel des Nonsberges* 155. The Spaur were well furnished with fiefs by the bishop: *ibid.* 166, 186. In reference to tax evasion, the government wrote Ferdinand that there is little punitive action that it can take against the Lodrons or Arcos, since most of their lands lay in the *Hochstift* of Trent: SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, Carton 88, 10 July, 1551.

²⁰⁸ This almost totally Italian-speaking region was bitterly contested in the late medieval feuds between the bishop of Trent and the count. Meinhard was able to alienate three large chunks – Castelfondo (Castelpfund), Flavon, and Sporo and Belfort – and the main Adige Valley entrance to the Non Valley – Mezzocorona (Kronmetz) and Mezza San Pietro (Altmetz) – from the bishop. Probably because of its border position between Trent and the county, many of the families of this region held lands in both. This goes far to explain why so many of them counted among the Tyrolean magnates: Madruzzo, Thun, Cles, Khuen, Spaur, Firmian. For a political history of this region and its influential aristocratic core, see AUSSERER, *Der Adel des Nonsberges*.

²⁰⁹ He was born in Cles: GATZ, *Die Bischöfe* 106; AUSSERER, *Der Adel des Nonsberges* 115–120.

²¹⁰ He was born in Caveaine: GATZ, *Die Bischöfe* 443.

²¹¹ He was probably born in his father's Castle *auf dem Rocken*, near Malé in the Sone Valley: LANGER, *Lebensskizze* 6; *id.*, *Die Anfänge der Geschichte der Fa-*

Moreover the aristocrats were multinational. Most were German as the pronounced German character of the Privy Council indicates; that at least some spoke no Italian is reinforced by the bishop's *Lehenstage*, to which he called a German-speaking jurist from Innsbruck to Trent.²¹² Then there were those families whom the archduke called "Romance". But as Sigmund Thun corrected him, there were "Romance" (*welsche*) or "Romance-German" (*welsche deutsche*) nobles, and the distinction appears to have been important.²¹³ When the question of a match for Sigmund's niece came up, his brothers, Georg and Jakob, came out against the "Romance counts" – probably they meant Lodron and Arco.²¹⁴ They did not say why, but it is doubtful that cultural prejudice played a part, for the Thuns themselves were part Italian. It more likely reveals a political prejudice. The Lodrons and Arcos were the exception to the aristocracy. They did not as a rule speak German;²¹⁵ they were not well represented in Innsbruck;²¹⁶ they held no hereditary offices of the count;²¹⁷ their status as *Landleute* was disputed, since they had for centuries claimed *reichsunmittelbar* status;²¹⁸ and they rarely attended the *Landtag* or paid the *Landsteuer*. By their own choice they were not full-fledged members

milie Thun, in: Jahrbuch der k. k. Heraldischen Gesellschaft "Adler" 14 (1904) 93–147, here 124.

²¹² HIRN, *Der Temporalienstreit* 458.

²¹³ When the Privy Council, in response to the archduke's query, asked Sigmund which *welsche* families held hereditary offices, he distinguished between *welsche* and *welsche deutsche* families: TLA, Ferdinandea, Position 23, Carton 28, 20 November, 1566.

²¹⁴ SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, Carton 149, 13 September, 1556. The feeling was reciprocated. Of the 43 male Arcos to marry between 1487 and 1614, 37 were with Italian-speakers, four with German-speakers: RILL, *Geschichte der Grafen von Arco* 13.

²¹⁵ *Ibid.*

²¹⁶ It does not appear that they held any Innsbruck government office under Ferdinand I. Under Archduke Ferdinand, Vinciguerra Arco served as *Hofrat* (1569–1576): SPECHTENHAUSER, *Behörden- und Verwaltungsorganisation*; RIZZOLI, *Behörden- und Verwaltungsorganisation*; SCHMID, *Behörden- und Verwaltungsorganisation* 48.

²¹⁷ Cf. n. 191.

²¹⁸ VOLTELINI, *Das welsche Südtirol* 134, 139.

of the aristocracy and they were not seen to be. This helps to explain why Sigmund reacted to the archducal “Romance” tag: he wanted neither to forgo the material advantages of dual nationality, nor be pigeon-holed as contumacious.

The Thuns, like the Cles, Firmians, Khuens, Madruzzo, Spaur, were Italian-German.²¹⁹ Cristoforo illustrates their fuzzy identity: Italian was his language of choice, but his mother tongue was German and – like Sigmund – he professed to be German.²²⁰ Sigmund was bilingual. Most of his correspondence is in German, but much is in Italian, and significantly, a large proportion of his familial letters – between him and his brothers – is in Italian. His collection also includes Italian writings with the Khuens, Firmians and Spaur.²²¹ And Bernhard Cles was bilingual.²²² Further illustrative are the variant contemporary spellings of aristocratic names: the Italian Madruzzo, Arco, Georgio Firmiano versus the German Madrutsch, Arch, and Firmian, and so on.²²³ But even the nationality of families which stemmed from the German Tyrol cannot be nailed down. The Wolkensteins, for example, who maintained their ancestral seats (both Rodenegg and Trostburg lines) in the German-speaking Puster Valley, married Italian-German and Italian Tyroleans;²²⁴ they held

²¹⁹ Perhaps also Botsch, since Simon was advisor to Cristoforo, Bartle was a canon in Trent, and they were late medieval Italian emigrants.

²²⁰ JEDIN, *Geschichte des Konzils von Trient*, vol. I, 451. The Arcos were no less keen to claim German ancestry. In an early seventeenth genealogy, they traced their origins to an ancient German imperial dynasty and in the eighteenth century all the way back to Charles Martell: RILL, *Geschichte der Grafen von Arco* 117.

²²¹ SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, Cartons 103, 159, 161. Jakob Christoph Brandis was also bilingual: TLA, AKM, 11 June, 1563, fol. 842r.

²²² NOFLATSCHER, *Räte und Herrscher* 99.

²²³ The Privy Council referred to the *Freiherren zu Madrutsch* and *Grafen zu Arch*: SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, Carton 160, 31 January, 1567. Sigmund Thun received an Italian letter signed by *Georgio Firmiano*, otherwise known as Georg Firmian: SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, Carton 161, 4 October, 1568.

²²⁴ It is a mark of their standing that Johann married Isabella, one Cristoforo's two nieces, in 1553. The match suited both families since others followed in 1586 and 1609. Other sixteenth century Italian-German consorts included the Spaur, Cles, Firmians and the second wife of Marx Sittich Wolkenstein (1563–

rights of *Herrschaft* in the Romance Tyrol; they maintained a *palazzo* in the town of Trent; they served as captains in the Romance Tyrol and were vassals of the bishop of Trent; they placed their sons at his court and borrowed heavily from him. All that can be said with certainty about the national character of these families is that they formed a spectrum of German and Italian influences.

The aristocracy kept its options open. They could be “German” and pursue a German politics: champions of noble freedoms (*Adelsrecht*), holders of county rights of *Herrschaft*, “German” canons, privy counsellors, imperial advisors. Or they could be “Italian” and pursue an Italian politics: defenders of Trent’s temporal rights, holders of rights of *Herrschaft* in the Romance Tyrol, “Italian” canons, office-holders of the bishop of Trent, papal servants – hence their notorious shiftiness. It is not always clear precisely whose interests they served at any given moment. Nor was it to contemporaries. The German advisors of Maximilian I harboured deep antipathies towards his “Romance” Tyrolean advisors for fear of betrayal to the Venetians. The Venetians were equally distrustful. Lorenzo Contarini remarked, in 1548, that those *mezzo tedeschi e mezzo italiani* (half German and half Italian) are more treacherous than any of our enemies. Either they back the Habsburgs to dispel their suspicions that they are crypto-Italians, or they plot against us of their own accord.²²⁵

THE *LAND* OF THE TYROL

The aristocracy identified neither solely with the *Landesfürst* or bishops, the emperor or pope, nor Germany or Italy, rather it identified with the *Land*, which at once subsumed and transcended territorial, political and cultural boundaries. We have already seen such derivatives as *Landsteuer*, *Landtag*, *Landsnot*, and *Landstände*. Another was *Vaterland* (fatherland). It was a staple of sixteenth century estates’ – particularly aristocratic – vocabulary. The sources do not explicitly indicate whether the *Vaterland* included the prince-bish-

1619) was the Italian, Margareta Arco: WURZBACH, *Biographisches Lexikon*, vol. 58, 52–71.

²²⁵ RILL, *Geschichte der Grafen von Arco* 14.

oprics or not, but Sigmund Thun and Cristoforo Madruzzo regularly used the term, and given that they were natives of Trent, it seems reasonable to assume that it did. Some illustrations follow. After the invasion of Duke Maurice of Saxony in 1546, Cristoforo wrote Innsbruck: “as a loyal *Landmann* of our beloved *Vaterland*”, I send you *Landsteuer* in its defence.²²⁶ In a letter to Cristoforo, Sigmund used the terms *Land*, “whole” (*gemaine*) *Land*, or *Vaterland*, 11 times.²²⁷ Two letters to the Privy Council may clinch the argument: for the sake of “uniformity in the *Land*” (*Gleichayt im Land*), Brixen’s *Hofrat* recommended that the county and prince-bishopric maintain the same religious policy; for the sake of “uniformity in the whole *Land*” (*daz im ganzen Land ain gleichhait gehalten werde*), the bishop of Trent and administrator of Brixen urged that the county and prince-bishoprics maintain the same religious policy.²²⁸

The idea of the *Land* – usually referred to alone, but sometimes as “the whole *Land*” – was intrinsic to aristocrats, because much more than the product of a series of bilateral contracts between princes, the *Land* was them. I refer to Otto Brunner’s model of *Land* and *Herrschaft*.²²⁹ To be sure, the Tyrol in several respects does not fit. He took it for granted that a *Land* was German, but the Tyrol was also Romance;²³⁰ he presupposed that a *Land* had one law, but the Tyrol had several,²³¹ and nowhere did he account for a *Land* with three princes. Yet in a way not even Brunner perceived, the Tyrol supports his central thesis: the essential feature of a *Land* was not the *Landesfürst*, rather a noble compact (*adelige Verband*), which held rights

²²⁶ Otto STOLZ, *Land und Volk von Tirol im Werden des eigenen Bewußtseins und im Urteil ältere Zeitgenossen*, in: *Tiroler Heimat* 3/4 (1923) 5–38, here 11.

²²⁷ SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, Carton 146, 6 July, 1552.

²²⁸ For Brixen, see DAB, *Registratura* 30, 175–176; the letter is also referred to by the Privy Council in TLA, CD, 23 January, 1565, fol. 217r. For Madruzzo, see TLA, *Ferdinanda*, Carton 130, Position 131, 21 July, 1565.

²²⁹ Otto BRUNNER, *Land und Herrschaft* (Vienna ⁵1965, reprint Darmstadt 1990). Also in English with a good critical appraisal: Howard KAMINSKY, Horn MELTON (trans.), *Land and Lordship: Structures of Governance in Medieval Austria* (Philadelphia 1984).

²³⁰ BRUNNER, *Land und Herrschaft* 180–196.

²³¹ *Ibid.* 182, 234.

of *Herrschaft* (as allod, fief or in pawn), lived in the area coextensive with those rights of *Herrschaft*, and under a common law.²³² Indeed, for Brunner, a *Landesfürst* was not even a necessary condition of a *Land*, the proof for which he adduced the *Länder* (the plural of *Land*) of the Swiss Confederacy and North Sea littoral.²³³ The Tyrol also lacked a *Landesfürst*, for the count was neither prince of Brixen – at least *de jure* – nor Trent – *de jure* or *de facto*. Still it too for all that was a *Land*: there was no clear division between the county and prince-bishoprics as they merged in some 20 noble families, which held rights of *Herrschaft* in them, lived in them, and under a common law.

Hence, since these rights stretched horizontally across all three territories beyond the reach of any single prince, the county and prince-bishoprics were parts of a *Land* rather than *Länder* themselves. Nevertheless, given the count's preponderance, power was in practice distributed similarly to any other central European *Land*: *Herrschaft* was exercised by the count, or who contemporaries called the *Landesfürst*, and the aristocracy, which called itself the *Landleute* – the bishops, their cathedral canons and leading vassals, who were at once the leading subjects of the count.²³⁴ *Herrschaft* was after all the bone of contention. Ferdinand dreamt Meinhard's dream of a centralized tax state, but the aristocracy balked.

THE OUTCOME

The archduke's policy suffered from two weaknesses. The one was ideological: it lacked credibility. He may have claimed royal status by appearing under a baldachin, but it failed to change the constitutional reality. As Ludovico Madruzzo asserted: the emperor himself had invested and declared him to be *verus et legitimus possessor et administrator regaliū et temporalis jurisdictionis* of Trent.²³⁵ Moreover, his genuine piety notwithstanding, the archduke was poorly placed to liquidate the political dividends of the new confessional at-

²³² Ibid. 233, 238, 255, 423 and passim.

²³³ Ibid. 181, 233, 235.

²³⁴ With the slight exception of the Lodrons and Arcos, who were aristocrats but not *Landleute*.

²³⁵ HIRN, *Der Temporalienstreit* 439.

mosphere. Medieval sovereignty had always rested on theological as well as political props, but this was at a time when Christendom was still whole. After the Reformation, the theological factor in the equation subtly but decisively changed. Dynasties – Catholic and Protestant – were now forced to stress their orthodoxy in contradistinction to the doctrinal errors of their enemies, and in the process gained an extra claim of loyalty, for they ruled not merely by divine sanction – as their medieval forebears – but as defenders of the true faith.²³⁶ But in this case confession was not at issue. The aristocracy, with few exceptions, was already Catholic, and while Ferdinand's worship of the relic may have endowed him with the stature of a holy man, his adversary's spiritual credentials were at least as good: not only was Ludovico an ordained priest, a bishop and cardinal, but he had just finished hosting the greatest reform Council of Church history.²³⁷

The second weakness of policy was practical: it clashed with the material interests of the aristocrats. Ferdinand expected them to surrender their near monopoly on the surplus production of the prince-bishoprics for little in return. What more could he reasonably offer? He already gave them protection, rights of *Herrschaft*, and patronage. As such his best argument was moral. Few men were as loyal to the house of Austria (*österreichisch*) and loyal to the bishop of Trent (*madruzisch* or *cardinalisch*) as Sigmund Thun. He epitomized the impossible dilemma in which the aristocracy found itself. He spent his whole adult life in the service of the Habsburgs (advisor to four in succession – from Maximilian I to Ferdinand II) and the bishops (canon and advisor) and now Ferdinand demanded that he choose between them. When the archduke asked his agents on whose side the octogenarian stood, they answered that he had said in the company of Ludovico that the archduke was in the right (at the *Lehentag?*). They did not explain why he affirmed the unjustness of the aristocratic stance, but we can infer: it did not pay the fair price for Habsburg favour. Nonetheless the agents cautioned Ferdinand not to put much store by aristocratic soul-searching as Thun undoubtedly

²³⁶ A point well taken by ADAMSON, *Princely Courts of Europe* 24.

²³⁷ Ludovico was ordained since at least 1565: GATZ, *Die Bischöfe* 448.

backed the cardinal.²³⁸ For him, as most aristocrats, self-interest turned the balance.

Ferdinand would not be a bona fide *Landesfürst*. Right from his arrival at the Tyrolean border, the aristocracy served him notice that it was ill-disposed to his constitutional novelties. In the opening address of the *Landeshauptmann*, he welcomed the archduke in the name of the *Landschaft* and all its estates – the aristocracy, in other words, rejected his new-fangled commissary designation and its dangerous implications for estates' rights.²³⁹ His entry made no notable impression on it either. After months of fruitless wrangles with Ludovico, he resorted to intimidation and sent an armed delegation to Trent in October, 1567, which presented the bishop a new contract to regulate relations between the county and prince-bishopric. Ferdinand pledged to continue to protect him and to prejudice neither his imperial status nor his temporal authority, but the attached conditions amounted to the secularization of his territory: the bishop shall accept the count as his *Landesfürst* and renounce the title of "prince" of Trent; canonical appointments shall be conditional upon the approval of the *Landesfürst*; subjects of Trent shall have the right of legal appeal to the *Landesfürst*; the *Landesfürst* shall confirm town privileges and resolve disputes between the bishop and towns; the bishop, cathedral chapter, officeholders and subjects shall swear the traditional oath to uphold the contract. Under duress, Ludovico capitulated.²⁴⁰

When the bishop took the agreement to his canons for confirmation, they countered that they were not subjects of the *Landesfürst* and rejected it outright. Stiffened by the chapter, Ludovico disavowed it. In May, 1568, he fled to his uncle in Rome and appealed to the pope, the emperor and the imperial estates for restitution. Many aristocrats – actively or passively – backed the cardinal in the struggle: the Khuens, Madruzzos, Thuns, Trautmannsdorfs, Trautsons, canons of Brixen, to name a few; one out of 19 canons of Trent endorsed the *Landesfürst*, the rest fled to Mantua, Verona and the bishop's

²³⁸ HIRN, *Der Temporalienstreit* 405.

²³⁹ SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, Carton 160, 31 January, 1567.

²⁴⁰ HIRN, *Der Temporalienstreit* 385; BÜCKING, *Frühabsolutismus* 36.

town of Riva, where the chapter re-established itself.²⁴¹ In September, the archduke occupied the town of Trent with a garrison and appropriated the bishop's income. But once the Tyroleans turned the dispute from a purely internal to an international affair, his cause was essentially lost. The pope and imperial estates championed the bishop: the first invoked canon law, the second imperial law; squeezed between them, the emperor sought a compromise. The prince-bishopric was placed under imperial sequestration pending a resolution by the imperial court; at the diets of Speyer (1571) and Regensburg (1576), the case was heard. In 1578, an out-of-court settlement was reached. The Papacy confirmed Ferdinand's morganatic marriage and raised his son to the cardinalate, and Trent recognized the medieval contracts, but its sovereignty was restored. In 1579, Ludovico was invested with his old temporal rights by Emperor Rudolf.²⁴²

This episode tends to mislead. Formally it was a legal dispute between two princes over rights and title. But it turned on their aristocrats: they were in the final analysis the determining factor and they threw their weight behind the bishop. We have already indicated why they did so; the question which remains to be considered is why Ferdinand failed to persuade them otherwise. As *Landesfürst* he wielded two sticks. The one was revindication. He redeemed 11 mortgages, six of which belonged to the aristocracy. In 1570, he stripped Brixen of its four administrative districts in the Puster Valley (Heinfels, Schöneck, St. Michelsburg, Uttenheim), but the first condition which the cathedral chapter made to its election of Ferdinand's son, Andreas of Austria, to coadjutor with the right of succession was the repurchase of the districts: in 1580, Andreas became coadjutor; in 1581, Brixen reacquired the districts.²⁴³ The Thuns lost Königsberg in 1572, but three years later Ferdinand sold it to the Khuens.²⁴⁴ Only the re-

²⁴¹ Dr. Franz Gallus: HIRN, *Der Temporalienstreit* 399 and passim.

²⁴² Against HIRN, *Erzherzog Ferdinand II.*, vol. 1, 305, I concur with BÜCKING that the *Landesfürst* failed to mediatize Trent: *Frühabsolutismus* 46.

²⁴³ HIRN, *Erzherzog Ferdinand II.*, vol. 1, 314, 627s.

²⁴⁴ VOLTELLINI, *Das welsche Südtirol* 44. The Thuns were not in the Archduke's good books. They attempted to foil him by calling on the intervention of the emperor. On 14 July, 1569, Maximilian wrote Ferdinand and asked him to leave the

vindication of Salurn from the Völs was permanent. Altogether, the aristocracy lost only one of its some comital administrative districts. The other stick was the Habsburg claim to influence the appointment of bishops and canons. Bishops were not normally elected without Habsburg consent. At the Brixen elections of 1525 and 1539, for example, Habsburg envoys attended the election and in each case Habsburg will prevailed.²⁴⁵ Ferdinand saw just one bishopric come up for grabs, in 1580, which he managed to secure for his son, but not, as we saw, without a price. However, the cathedral chapters remained aristocratic domains. Where at the beginning of the archduke's reign there were ten aristocratic canons of Brixen, at the end, in 1595, there were nine.²⁴⁶ After Andreas of Austria died and with Ferdinand out of the way, the aristocrat and canon, Christoph Andreas Spaur, succeeded him. Trent tells a similar story. Although Ludovico had been bishop since 1567, the chapter elected no successor during the reign of the archduke. Seven months after he died, his successor, Rudolf II, recommended Carlo Gaudenzio to succeed his uncle, which was promptly confirmed.²⁴⁷

Continuity, not discontinuity, marked the sixteenth century Tyrolean power structure. It is true that the number of aristocrats who attended the Privy Council noticeably fell under the archduke, but less because they were uninvited as many declined their services.²⁴⁸ For all of his sabre-rattling, Ferdinand dealt them no telling blow. Put simply he was too dependent on them, above all financially: the aristocrats not only controlled the estates, which granted his taxes, but as holders of rights of *Herrschaft*, they held a major portion of his colossal 1,467,000 *Gulden* debt.²⁴⁹ Even if he wanted to redeem their

Thuns in the possession of Königsberg and Castelfondo. After Ferdinand nevertheless redeemed Königsberg, Maximilian forbade the revindication of Castelfondo on 14 January 1574: SOA Litoměřice, pob. Děčín, Cartons 101 and 103.

²⁴⁵ FEINE, *Die Besetzung der Reichsbistümer* 97.

²⁴⁶ Spaur (3), Wolkenstein (2), Firmian, Khuen, Madruzzo, Thun: WOLFSGRUBER, *Das Brixner Domkapitel* 120.

²⁴⁷ GATZ, *Die Bischöfe* 441.

²⁴⁸ HIRN, *Erzherzog Ferdinand II.*, vol. 1, 469; vol. 2, 2–4.

²⁴⁹ This figure includes the Tyrol and Further Austrian: HIRN, *Erzherzog Ferdinand II.*, vol. 1, 627; vol. 2, 2.

mortgages, he lacked the wherewithal.²⁵⁰ And lest he thought about diverting tax monies to do so, the nobility inserted a clause in diet resolutions forbidding it.²⁵¹ Maybe he should have taken the cue from his late medieval predecessors and renewed the political partnership with the peasantry – it was his natural ally against the aristocracy.²⁵² But he was too much of a Counter-Reformation prince to turn back the clock; thus he lacked a compelling argument why it should not back the bishop.

The Habsburgs never solved the Romance Tyrolean problem. Granted they achieved political centralisation in the nineteenth century, but it was forced and artificial, for in phasing out the *Land* – with the secularization of the prince-bishoprics and the abolishment of *Herrschaft* – they perforce sacrificed the aristocracy, the traditional link binding the Romance to the German Tyrol, and foremost check to middle class driven irredentism. Having failed to create an early modern Tyrolean territorial state, the Habsburgs failed to create a modern Tyrolean nation state.

SYNOPSIS

This paper was originally intended as a short contribution on the theme of the Innsbruck court under Archduke Ferdinand II. I intended to edit the official description of the Archduke's progress through the Tyrol in 1567, which appears never to have been cited by historians before. However, in investigating the general background to the event, I found that it was not just a joyful celebration of the arrival of the new prince. Behind the scenes waged the age-old political conflict between count and bishop of Trent. A little more research revealed that a third party was in the middle, namely the bishop's pro-

²⁵⁰ The value of administrative districts reached up to tens of thousands of *Gulden*. For example, Ferdinand II owed the Welsbergs 48,000 *Gulden* for Telve, the Wolkensteins 60,000 *Gulden* for Lienz, and the Bishop of Brixen 98,000 *Gulden* for the four Puster Valley districts: *ibid*.

²⁵¹ HIRN, *Erzherzog Ferdinand II.*, vol. 1, 628.

²⁵² In the 1573 *Landesordnung* revision, Ferdinand did however remove his father's clause exempting Trent and other Romance areas. Hence the *Landesordnung* once again theoretically applied to the whole *Land*: SARTORI-MONTECROCE, *Über die Reception* 27.

tectors – the aristocracy. And after exploring further still, I discovered that the underlying issue was taxation, more specifically the 1511 *Libell*. The explication of this complex scenario led me on a circuitous tour through various aspects of the Tyrolean past, whose explication became so involved that I decided to leave the editing job for another day and focus on two main political issues. What was relationship between the bishop of Trent and aristocracy? Why was taxation contested?

The research yields five tentative conclusions:

1. At Archduke Ferdinand's entry, the prince attempted to override two tenets of old custom: he wished that the bishop of Trent and his servants take the *Erbhuldigung* along with the *Landschaft* at the closing diet of his entry; rather than the whole noble estate, he invited only "the most eminent and distinguished dynasties of the land" to meet him at the border and join his progress to Innsbruck. He failed in the former and succeeded in the latter.
2. There was such a thing as a Tyrolean aristocracy. Habsburg historians have traditionally reserved the predicate for the nobility of the eastern lands, but if aristocracy means political elite, then the mid-sixteenth century Tyrolean bishops, cathedral canons and leading nobles were aristocratic. They were entrenched in the major political forums of the *Land*; more conspicuously, they had connections to many of the major political forums of Europe – in the Empire, Vienna (Prague), Rome, Madrid and Salzburg.
3. The aristocratic centre of the mid-sixteenth century was Trent, for Trent was the major attraction of aristocracy, among other reasons because almost all aristocrats were vassals of the bishop, the bishop of Trent was also administrator of Brixen, many aristocrats were canons in Trent and Brixen, the Romance Tyrol was comparatively prosperous, and last but not least the *Landesfürst* was largely absent.
4. The age-old principle of common representation by all four estates was subverted under imperial rule. We can thus speak of a crisis of the *Landschaft*. Perhaps this helps explain why Michael Gaismair, Jakob Huter, Barthlmä Dosser and their followers sought a political solution outside of the diet.

5. The mid-sixteenth century *Land* of the Tyrol was paradoxical: it formed a strong politico-religious unity, reinforced by the aristocracy's fierce sense of self-identity, yet it was one of the least consolidated and most bicultural lands of central Europe.

Table: Main Aristocratic rights of *Herrschaft* in 1564²⁵³

Nr.	Holder	Administrative District (Italian in bold)	Owner
1	Arco	Arco	Imperial fief
2	Arco	Penede	Imperial fief
3	Botsch	Stein unter Lebenberg	Tyrol
4	Brandis	Niederlana	Tyrol
5	Brandis	Vorst	Tyrol
6	Cles	Cles	Trent
7	Firmian	Mezzocorona	Tyrol
8	Firmian	Pergine	Trent
9	Freundsberg	Petersberg	Tyrol
10	Freundsberg	Sterzing	Tyrol
11	Fuchs	Hocheppan	Tyrol
12	Fuchs	Kufstein	Tyrol
13	Fuchs	Passeier	Tyrol
14	Hendl	Kastelbell	Tyrol
15	Hendl	Schlanders	Tyrol
16	Khuen	Belasi (Castellany)	Tyrol
17	Khuen	Altenberg zu Eppan	Tyrol
18	Khuen	Jenesien	Tyrol
19	Khuen	Naudersberg	Tyrol
20	Künigl	Welsberg	Tyrol
21	Liechtenstein	Castelcorneo	Trent
22	Liechtenstein/ Niedertor	Deutschnofen	Tyrol
23	Liechtenstein	Kaltern	Tyrol
24	Liechtenstein	Rattenberg	Tyrol
25	Liechtenstein	Schenna	Tyrol

²⁵³ The table is a collation of the material collected by VOLTELINI, *Das welsche Südtirol*; STOLZ, *Landesbeschreibung von Tirol: Nordtirol*; id., *Landesbeschreibung von Südtirol*; AUSSERER, *Der Adel des Nonsberges*.

Nr.	Holder	Administrative District (Italian in bold)	Owner
26	Liechtenstein	Staben, Prad und Tschengls	Tyrol
27	Liechtenstein	Steinegg und Karneid	Tyrol
28	Lodron	Lodron	Trent
29	Madruzzo	Nano	Trent
30	Madruzzo	Tenno (?) ²⁶³	Trent
31	Madruzzo	Vier Vikariate – Ala Avio Brentonico Mori	Trent
32			
33			
34			
35	Spaur	Fai und Zambana	Trent
36	Spaur	Flavon	Tyrol
37	Spaur	Freundsberg	Tyrol
38	Spaur	Sporo	Tyrol
39	Spaur	Valer (castellany)	Tyrol
40	Thun	Arsio	Tyrol
41	Thun	Castelfondo	Tyrol
42	Thun	Cembra	Tyrol
43	Thun	Königsberg	Tyrol
44	Thun	Masi di Vigo	Trent
45	Thun	Rabbi	Trent
46	Thun	Tuenetto	Trent
47	Thun	Unterfennberg ²⁶⁴	Tyrol
48	Trapp	Beseno	Trent
49	Trapp	Caldonazzo	Trent
50	Trapp	Folgaria	Tyrol
51	Trapp	Glurn und Mals	Tyrol
52	Trapp	Matsch	Trapp
53	Trapp	Ulten	Tyrol
54	Trautmannsdorf	Castellalto	Tyrol
55	Trautson	Castel Pietra	Tyrol
56	Trautson	Enn und Caldifff	Tyrol
57	Trautson	Gufidaun	Tyrol
58	Trautson	Matrei und Altenstadt (castellany)	Tyrol
59	Trautson	Neuhaus	Tyrol
60	Trautson	Schroffenstein (castellany)	Tyrol
61	Trautson	Sprechenstein (castellany)	Tyrol
62	Trautson	Stein auf dem Ritten	Tyrol

Nr.	Holder	Administrative District (Italian in bold)	Owner
63	Trautson	Villanders	Tyrol
64	Völs	Aichach (castellany)	Tyrol
65	Völs	Salurn	Tyrol
66	Völs	Schenkenberg	Brixen
67	Völs	Sigmundskron (castellany)	Tyrol
68	Völs	Tiers	Brixen
69	Völs	Völs	Tyrol
70	Welsberg	Altrasen	Tyrol
71	Welsberg	Primiero	Tyrol
72	Welsberg	San Pietro	Tyrol
73	Welsberg	Telvana	Tyrol
74	Welsberg	Welsbergische Freisassen	Welsberg
75	Wolkenstein	Hauenstein (castellany)	Brixen
76	Wolkenstein	Ivano	Tyrol
77	Wolkenstein	Kals	Tyrol
78	Wolkenstein	Kastelruth	Tyrol
79	Wolkenstein	Lienz	Tyrol
80	Wolkenstein	Lienzer Klause	Tyrol
81	Wolkenstein	Rettenberg	Tyrol
82	Wolkenstein	Rodenegg ²⁶⁵	Wolkenstein
83	Wolkenstein	Salegg (castellany)	Brixen
84	Wolkenstein	Trostburg (castellany)	Tyrol
85	Wolkenstein	Virgen	Tyrol
86	Wolkenstein	Wolkenstein	Tyrol

²⁵⁴ I assume here that the Madruzzos still held Tenno, since it was enfeoffed to them in 1555, but it is not confirmed: VOLTELLINI, *Das welsche Südtirol* 146.

²⁵⁵ The bailiff of Königsberg was responsible only for the management of the estates (*Urbar*); the subjects administered lower justice themselves: STOLZ, *Landesbeschreibung von Südtirol* 221.

²⁵⁶ Maximilian I, who held Rodenegg as a fief from Brixen, sold it to Wolkensteins as free property (“freies Eigentum”) in 1491. Brixen disputed the legality of the transaction and claimed it as its fief: STOLZ, *Landesbeschreibung von Südtirol* 431.

VÁCLAV BŮŽEK

DER BÖHMISCHE UND MÄHRISCHE ADEL AM HOF FERDINANDS VON TIROL IN INNSBRUCK UND AMBRAS

Jakob von Boimont und Pairsberg, einer der einflußreichsten Höflinge Erzherzog Ferdinands von Tirol, widmete im Februar 1574 in seinem Tagebuch der Ankunft des böhmischen Magnaten Wilhelm von Rosenberg in Innsbruck große Aufmerksamkeit¹. Der oberste Burggraf des Königreichs Böhmen reiste in die Metropole Tirols mit einer vielköpfigen Begleitung böhmischer Adelige, um an Faschingsfeiern teilzunehmen. Die Reise der fünfzig Kutschen und vieler Reiter von Wittingau in Südböhmen über Bischofteinitz, Furth im Wald, Straubing, Landshut, Rosenheim, Kufstein und Hall bis nach Innsbruck dauerte zwei Wochen. In der Residenz Ferdinands von Tirol traf Wilhelm von Rosenberg die Elite des mitteleuropäischen Adels. Die Habsburger, Wittelsbacher, Gonzaga und Este kamen nach Innsbruck von München, Mantua und Ferrara. Der gesellschaftliche Gipfel ihres zwölfzügigen Aufenthalts waren Wettkämpfe im Scheibenschießen und Wildhetze².

Ferdinand von Tirol verheimlichte nicht, daß er den zum zweiten Mal verwitweten Wilhelm von Rosenberg nach Innsbruck auch deshalb einlud³, um ihm Anna Maria Markgräfin von Baden vorzustel-

¹ Max STRAGANZ, Beiträge zur Geschichte Tirols II. Die Autobiographie des Freiherrn Jakob v. Boimont zu Pairsberg (1527–1581), in: Programm des k. k. Ober-Gymnasiums der Franciscaner zu Hall 1895–1896 (Innsbruck 1896) 3–105, hier 59. Zur Autobiographie näher bei Harald TERSCH, Österreichische Selbstzeugnisse des Spätmittelalters und der Frühen Neuzeit (1400–1650). Eine Darstellung in Einzelbeiträgen (Wien-Köln-Weimar 1998) 256–267.

² STRAGANZ, Beiträge, 59; ausführlicher bei Václav BŘEZAN (ed. Jaroslav PÁNEK), Životy posledních Rožmberků [Die Viten der letzten Rosenberger] 2 Bde. (Praha 1985), hier Bd. 1, 262–263.

³ Jaroslav PÁNEK, Der böhmische Vizekönig Wilhelm von Rosenberg und sei-

len⁴. Die junge Adelige wurde als Waise am katholischen Hof Albrechts V. in München erzogen. Die Konfession der jungen Edelfrau spielte in den Überlegungen Ferdinands von Tirol über die künftige Heiratsallianz eine wichtige Rolle. Obwohl Wilhelm von Rosenberg katholisch war, bekannten sich seine beiden ersten Gemahlinnen, die auch aus dem Römisch-deutschen Reich stammten, zum Luthertum. Die Heirat mit einer katholisch gesinnten Edelfrau schuf verwandtschaftliche Voraussetzungen zur Stärkung der politischen und religiösen Achse zwischen Innsbruck, München und der Residenz des obersten Burggrafen des Königreichs Böhmen in Krumau. Die beabsichtigte Allianz war aber Kaiser Maximilian II. ein Dorn im Auge, weil er die Stärkung des Einflusses Wilhelms von Rosenberg in Bayern fürchtete. Dieser wartete mit den Verhandlungen über die Eheschließung bis zur Mitte des Jahres 1577, als er die Unterstützung des neuen Kaisers Rudolf II. gewann⁵.

Obwohl Ferdinand von Tirol an der Hochzeit in Krumau zu Beginn des Jahres 1578 nicht teilnahm, übersandte Georg Popel von Lobkowitz, der ihn vertrat, dem Erzherzog Berichte über deren Verlauf. Gerade dieser Adelige war einer der vielen böhmischen und mährischen Herren und Ritter, die von den sechziger bis zur Mitte der neunziger Jahre des 16. Jahrhunderts zeitweilig am Hofe Ferdinands von Tirol weilten und sich zwischen Innsbruck, Wien und Prag bewegten⁶. Eine nähere Erforschung der Kommunikationsnetze und Integrationsprozesse am Hofe Ferdinands von Tirol ermöglichen be-

ne deutschen Ehen, in: Sabine TANZ (Hg.), *Mentalität und Gesellschaft im Mittelalter. Gedenkschrift für Ernst Werner* (Frankfurt/Main u. a. 1994) 271–300.

⁴ BŘEZAN (ed. PÁNEK), *Životy*, Bd. 1, 262; Václav BŮŽEK, Josef HRDLIČKA u. a., *Dvory velmožů s erbem růže. Všední a sváteční dny posledních Rožmberků a pánů z Hradce* [Höfe der Magnaten mit dem Wappen der Rose. Die All- und Festtage der letzten Rosenberger und der Herren von Neuhaus] (Praha 1997) 80–90.

⁵ PÁNEK, *Der böhmische Vizekönig*; BŮŽEK, HRDLIČKA u. a., *Dvory velmožů* 9f.

⁶ Václav BŮŽEK, *Ferdinand II. Tyrolský a česká šlechta (K otázce integračních procesů v habsburské monarchii)* [Ferdinand II. von Tirol und der böhmische Adel (Zur Frage der Integrationsprozesse in der Habsburgermonarchie)], in: *Český časopis historický* 98 (2000) 261–291, hier 274; BŮŽEK, HRDLIČKA u. a., *Dvory velmožů* 89.

sonders die Quellen bohemikaler Provenienz, die im Tiroler Landesarchiv Innsbruck und auf Schloß Ambras aufbewahrt sind⁷.

Die primäre Bemühung um die Integration⁸ des böhmischen und mährischen Adels an seinen Hof entwickelte Ferdinand von Tirol in der Zeit seines Wirkens als Statthalter in Böhmen (1547–1567)⁹. Die Stützen seiner zentralistischen Macht suchte er zuerst in den Residenzen der obersten Landesbeamten auf dem Lande. An erster Stelle gehörte zu ihnen die Residenz des obersten Burggrafen Johann des Jüngeren Popel von Lobkowitz in Bischofteinitz. In derselben Zeit wuchs die Bedeutung der Residenz des obersten Kanzlers Joachim von Neuhaus auf dem Schloß in Neuhaus und der Residenz des obersten Kämmerers Wilhelm von Rosenberg in Krumau. Die Herren von Lobkowitz, Neuhaus und Rosenberg, die sich zum gemäßigten Katholizismus bekannten, waren verschwägert. Die Kommunikationsnetze zielten nicht nur ins natürliche Hinterland dieser regionalen Machtzentren im Inland, sondern mündeten auch in die Machtzentren im anliegenden Ausland (Augsburg, Nürnberg, Wien)¹⁰.

Gleichzeitig mit dem Aufbau der angeführten Stützpfeiler des Machtsystems in den Regionen des Königreichs Böhmen band Ferdinand von Tirol den böhmischen und mährischen Adel an seinen Hofstaat in Prag, indem er sie in seinen Dienst nahm. Die Stellen der Höflinge und Leibdiener des Statthalters nahmen Herren und Ritter ein, die sich in der Mitte des 16. Jahrhunderts zu verschiedenen Konfessionen bekannten. Die Angehörigen des Hofstaats stellen

⁷ Auch mit Quellenangaben ausführlicher bei Václav BŮŽEK, Ferdinand II. von Tirol als Statthalter von Böhmen und die höfische Gesellschaft in Prag. Ein Projektbericht, in: *Frühneuzeit-Info* 12 (2001) Heft 2, 65–70, hier 66 f.

⁸ Vgl. Mark HENGERER, Adelsintegration am Kaiserhof (1618–1665): Zeremoniell, Personal, Finanzen, Netzwerke. Ein Dissertationsprojekt, in: *Frühneuzeit-Info* 9 (1998) Heft 2, 274–279; Mark HENGERER, Rudolf SCHLÖGL, Politische und soziale Integration am Wiener Hof. Adelige Bestattung als Teil der höfischen Symbol- und Kommunikationsordnung, in: *Mitteilungen der Residenzenkommission der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen* 10 (2000) Nr. 1, 15–35.

⁹ Dazu Václav BŮŽEK, Erzherzog Ferdinand als Statthalter von Böhmen – Residenz, Hof, Alltagsleben und Politik in: Wilfried SEIPEL (Hg.), *Kaiser Ferdinand I. 1503–1564. Das Werden der Habsburgermonarchie* (Wien-Milano 2003) 283–295.

¹⁰ BŮŽEK, Ferdinand II. Tyrolský 265 f.

aber nur einen Teil der Adeligen dar, die Ferdinand von Tirol an den Hof in Prag lockte. Durch Turniere, Ritterkurzweil mit Tanz und Gesang, Jagden und Hetzen schloß sich dem Statthalter und dessen Hof eine vielköpfige Gruppe weiterer Personen an. Diese Herren und Ritter verbanden mit Ferdinand von Tirol keine direkten Verpflichtungen des Hofdienstes. Da sie nicht zu seinem Hofstaat gehörten, verlangte der Statthalter ihre alltägliche Anwesenheit in seiner Residenz nicht. In ihrer Zusammensetzung änderte sich die adelige Gesellschaft, die Ferdinand von Tirol umgab, nicht sehr viel. An Turnieren und Hetzjagden nahmen einige Herren und Ritter sozusagen ununterbrochen die ganzen zwanzig Jahre seines Wirkens als Statthalter über teil¹¹.

Die adelige Gesellschaft in der Umgebung Ferdinands von Tirol war nicht ausschließlich an die Prager Burg gebunden. Hinsichtlich ihrer Mobilität breitete sie sich in die Regionen aus. Mit dieser Gesellschaft drangen in die Residenzen des Adels auf dem Lande politische Interessen der Habsburger sowie Elemente der höfischen Feierlichkeiten, Unterhaltungen und des Lebensstils durch. Im Denken und im Alltagsleben des 16. Jahrhunderts spielte diese Gesellschaft in der Umgebung des Statthalters dieselbe Rolle wie die „Herren und Freunde“ im Hinterland der Adelssitze. Sie war eine öffentliche Kulisse des gesamten Geschehens, ein Instrument für die Bestätigung der Macht und ein Mittel zur Durchsetzung persönlicher und dynastischer Interessen der Habsburger¹².

¹¹ Mit Quellenangaben ausführlicher bei BŮŽEK, Erzherzog Ferdinand.

¹² Vgl. Otto Gerhard OEXLE, Soziale Gruppen in der Ständegesellschaft: Lebensformen des Mittelalters und ihre historischen Wirkungen, in: Otto Gerhard OEXLE, Andrea von HÜLSEN-ESCH (Hgg.), Die Repräsentation der Gruppen. Texte – Bilder – Objekte (Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte 141, Göttingen 1998) 9–44; Wolfgang REINHARD, Freunde und Kreaturen. „Verflechtung“ als Konzept zur Erforschung historischer Führungsgruppen. Römische Oligarchie um 1600 (München 1979), besonders 32–41; DERS., Freunde und Kreaturen. Historische Anthropologie von Patronage-Klientel-Beziehungen, in: Freiburger Universitätsblätter 139 (1998) 127–141; Václav BŮŽEK, „Páni a přátelé“ v myšlení a každodenním životě české a moravské šlechty na prahu novověku [„Die Herren und Freunde“ im Denken und Alltagsleben des böhmischen und mährischen Adels zu Beginn der Neuzeit], in: Český časopis historický 100 (2002) 229–264, hier besonders 258–262.

Als Ferdinand von Tirol im Januar 1567 von Prag nach Innsbruck übersiedelte, kamen nach Tirol Hofkünstler¹³ und besonders einige Herren und Ritter, die die Stellen der Höflinge und Diener an seinem Prager Hof eingenommen hatten. Aus den bisher bekannten Quellen ist die Gruppe des böhmischen und mährischen Adels am Hofe Ferdinands von Tirol in Innsbruck nicht zuverlässig zu erfassen¹⁴. Die bisherigen Kenntnisse ermöglichten es nur, strategische Wege anzudeuten, die böhmische und mährische Adelige wählten, wenn sie zum Hof Ferdinands vordringen und den Aufenthalt in Innsbruck zur Beeinflussung ihrer künftigen persönlichen Karriere verwenden wollten. Durch die Analyse der Quellen wurden auch einige Methoden entdeckt, die der Erzherzog zur Integration des Adels an seinem Hof nutzte.

¹³ Joseph HIRN, *Erzherzog Ferdinand II. von Tirol. Geschichte seiner Regierung und seiner Länder*, 2 Bde. (Innsbruck 1885–1888), hier Bd. 1, 382; Christian GRIES, *Erzherzog Ferdinand von Tirol. Konturen einer Sammelpersönlichkeit*, in: *Frühneuzeit-Info* 4 (1993), Heft 2, 162–173, hier 164 f.; Jiří KROPÁČEK, *Malíř Francesco Terzio. Okolnosti jeho příchodu do Prahy* [Maler Francesco Terzio. Umstände seiner Ankunft nach Prag], in: Vít VLNÁŠ, Tomáš SEKYRKA (eds.), *Ars baculum vitae. Sborník studií z dějin umění a kultury k 70. narozeninám prof. PhDr. Pavla Preisse, DrSc.* [Ars baculum vitae. Sammelband der Studien aus der Kunstgeschichte und Kultur zum 70. Geburtstag von Prof. PhDr. Pavel Preiss, DrSc.] (Praha 1996) 92–97; Zdeněk UHLÍŘ, *Die Legende des Matthias Hutský aus Krivoklát über den heiligen Wenzel als ein Werk der Renaissance-Hagiographie*, in: Lubomír KONEČNÝ, Beka BUKOVINSKÁ, Ivan MUCHKA (eds.), *Rudolf II, Prague and the World* (Praha 1998) 281–285; Elisabeth SCHEICHER, *Ein „böhmisches“ Schloß in Tirol. Zu den Fassadenmalereien des Ambrasers Hochschlosses*, in: *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Kunst und Denkmalpflege* 56 (1992) 4–18.

¹⁴ Zur Präsenz des böhmischen und mährischen Adels am Hof des Erzherzogs Ferdinand von Tirol vgl. besonders die Quellen im Tiroler Landesarchiv Innsbruck (künftig TLA), *Ferdinanda*, Kart. 8–10. Weitere Forschungsmöglichkeiten dieses Themas bieten auch die Hofstaatsverzeichnisse von Ferdinands Söhnen an, und zwar Bischofs Andreas und Karls Markgraf von Burgau, die in der Sammlung *Ferdinanda*, Kart. 49, 77 usw. (Repertorium 17 a) aufbewahrt sind. Für den freundlichen Hinweis bedanke ich mich bei Herrn Dr. Andreas Faistenberger (Hall).

VERWANDTSCHAFT UND FREUNDSCHAFT – INSTRUMENTE DER
POLITISCHEN INTEGRATION

Bedeutendere Stellen am Hofe Ferdinands von Tirol nahmen in Innsbruck Adelige aus miteinander verwandten böhmischen Familien der Herren von Sternberg, Lobkowitz, Kolowrat, Lokschan und Thurn ein. Obwohl sie sich zu verschiedenen Konfessionen bekannten, übten sie am Hof wichtige Funktionen als Hofmeister und Kammerdiener aus beziehungsweise nahmen Stellen als Schenken oder andere Leibdiener ein¹⁵.

Ein durchdachtes Instrument der Integration des böhmischen, mährischen und tirolischen Adels wurde die Schließung von Heiratsallianzen mit einer tirolischen oder anderen adeligen Frau aus dem Haushalt von Ferdinands Gemahlin Philippine Welser. Im Hintergrund einiger Heiraten der adeligen Würdenträger aus den böhmischen Ländern mit Edeldamen vom Frauenzimmer seiner Gemahlin versteckte sich ein offenes Interesse des Tiroler Landesherrn, der auf diese Weise die Bildung erwünschter Verwandtschafts- und Klientelstrukturen an seinem Hof beeinflussen konnte. Die tatsächliche Machtbedeutung solcher Allianzen überschritt die Grenzen Tirols und zielte zu weiteren Machtzentren in der Habsburgermonarchie – an den Kaiserhof und in die Residenzen der selbstständig regierenden habsburgischen Erzherzöge¹⁶.

¹⁵ TLA Innsbruck, Ferdinanda, Kart. 49; HIRN, Erzherzog Ferdinand II., Bd. 2, 316 ff.

¹⁶ Zum politischen Einfluß der Heiratsallianzen Karl VOCELKA, *Habsburgische Hochzeiten 1550–1600. Kulturgeschichtliche Studien zum manieristischen Repräsentationsfest* (Wien-Köln-Graz 1976); Beatrix BASTL, Gernot HEISS, *Hofdamen und Höflinge zur Zeit Kaiser Leopolds I. Zur Geschichte eines vergessenen Berufsstandes*, in: *Opera historica (Editio Universitatis Bohemiae Meridionalis)* 5 (1996) 187–265; Thomas WINKELBAUER, *Fürst und Fürstendiener. Gundaker von Liechtenstein, ein österreichischer Aristokrat des konfessionellen Zeitalters* (Wien-München 1999) 255–287; Václav BŮŽEK, Petr MAŘA, *Wandlungen des Adels in Böhmen und Mähren im Zeitalter des Absolutismus (1620–1740)*, in: Ronald G. ASCH (Hg.), *Der europäische Adel im Ancien Régime. Von der Krise der ständischen Monarchien bis zur Revolution (ca. 1600–1789)* (Köln-Weimar-Wien 2001) 287–321, hier 295–296; Václav BŮŽEK, *Der böhmische und mährische Adel zwischen Land und Hof unter der Regierung Ferdinands I.*, in: SEIPEL (Hg.), *Kaiser Ferdinand I. 181–189*, hier 182 f.

Der Einfluß Ferdinands von Tirol war bei der Hochzeit seines Kammerdieners und Stallmeisters Georg Popel von Lobkowitz mit Katharina von Sternberg, geborener von Lokschan, im Jahre 1575 ersichtlich. Die Braut war Kusine Philippine Welsers und gehörte in Innsbruck zu ihrem Frauenzimmer. Das neue Ehepaar zog nach der Heirat nach Prag. Georg Popel von Lobkowitz vermittelte zwischen Prag und Innsbruck die Beziehungen Ferdinands von Tirol zu Kaiser Rudolf II.¹⁷ Noch offensichtlicher war Ferdinand von Tirol an der Heirat seines Leibkammerdieners und Schenks Johann Libštejnský von Kolowrat mit der vermögenden Hofdame Katharina von Boimont und Pairsberg gelegen. Im Hintergrund der Heirat ist auch das Interesse des Bräutigamsvaters Albrecht Libštejnský von Kolowrat zu erahnen, der die Schwester Philippine Welsers Regina heiratete. Der Bruder des Bräutigams, Jaroslav, war in dieser Zeit zudem als Kämmerer in Innsbruck. Die Hochzeit fand unter Teilnahme des tirolischen, bayrischen und böhmischen Adels zu Fasching 1580 in Innsbruck statt und dauerte zehn Tage¹⁸.

Die geschlossenen Heiratsallianzen symbolisierten nicht nur die Bande zwischen dem böhmischen und tirolischen Adel am Innsbrucker Hof, sondern sie zeichneten auch eine der vielen personalen Verbindungen der Höflinge und Hofdamen Ferdinands von Tirol mit weiteren Machtzentren der Habsburgermonarchie vor (Johann Libštejnský von Kolowrat kam nach dem Tode Ferdinands von Innsbruck nach Prag und wurde Stallmeister am Kaiserhof)¹⁹. Zu den

¹⁷ HIRN, *Erzherzog Ferdinand II.*, Bd. 2, 346–348; BŘEZAN (ed. PÁNEK), *Životy*, Bd. 1, 227, 230; Staatliches Regionalarchiv Třeboň, *Historica Třeboň*, Sign. 4900, 5039.

¹⁸ Elisabeth SCHEICHER, *Ein Fest am Hofe Erzherzog Ferdinands II.*, in: *Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Sammlungen in Wien* 77 (1981) 119–153; Veronika SANDBICHLER, *In nuptias Ferdinandi. Der Hochzeitskodex Erzherzog Ferdinands II.*, in: Václav BŮŽEK, Pavel KRÁL (eds.), *Slavnosti a zábavy na aristokratických dvorech a v rezidenčních městech raného novověku* [Feste und Unterhaltungen an den aristokratischen Höfen und in den Residenzstädten der frühen Neuzeit] (*Opera historica* 8, České Budějovice 2000) 281–292. Vgl. auch den Beitrag von Veronika Sandbichler in diesem Band.

¹⁹ Österreichisches Staatsarchiv Wien, Hofkammerarchiv, Hofzahlamtsbücher Nr. 55 (1604).

Machtstrukturen des Hofes Ferdinands von Tirol gehörten Personen, die hier nur gelegentlich verweilten, mit dem Hof durch Verwandtschafts- oder Titularbande verbunden waren, eine gewisse Zeit lang Interessen des Patrons „auf die Ferne“ vertraten und eher zu dessen „virtuellem Hof“ gehörten²⁰.

HÖFISCHE ERZIEHUNG – EINE BESONDERE FORM ZUR BILDUNG DER NEUEN FREUNDSCHAFT

Ein bedeutendes Instrument für die Integration des böhmischen und mährischen Adels in den Hof Ferdinands von Tirol war die höfische Erziehung. Junge Herren und Ritter aus den böhmischen Ländern gehörten zur Gruppe adeliger Pagen Ferdinands von Tirol und einige von ihnen wirkten ein ganzes Jahrzehnt lang an der Seite des Erzherzogs. Sie waren bereits vor der Mitte der sechziger Jahre im Gefolge Ferdinands in Prag und blieben dort noch zu Beginn der siebziger Jahre. Die Adelige, die Ferdinand von Tirol während seiner Amtszeit als Statthalter in Böhmen persönlich kennengelernt hatte, empfahlen ihre heranwachsenden Söhne zur Aufnahme in den Hofdienst in Innsbruck. Die Zugehörigkeit zur Gesellschaft, die den Erzherzog umgab, konnte vom Vater auf den Sohn vererbt werden. Das die Generationen übergreifende Denken der Adelige spiegelte die eingelebte Vorstellung über die Hofkarriere wider²¹. Junge Adelige aus den böhmischen Ländern nützten das kosmopolitische Milieu von Innsbruck und Ambras zur Aufnahme persönlicher Bindungen zu adeligen Altergenossen aus dem Ausland und zum Kennenlernen des Lebensstils der Residenzen der Spätrenaissance und des Manie-

²⁰ Dazu besonders HENGERER, Adelsintegration 277. Ein solcher „virtueller Höfling“ war nach dem Jahr 1575 zum Beispiel Georg Popel von Lobkowitz, der zu Beginn der achtziger Jahre des 16. Jahrhunderts als Kammerdiener am Hof Rudolfs II. tätig war. Vgl. Jaroslava HAUSENBLASOVÁ, Vztahy mezi císařským dvorem a nejvyššími správními úřady Českého království v době vlády Rudolfa II. [Beziehungen zwischen dem Kaiserhof und den obersten Verwaltungsbehörden des Königreichs Böhmen in der Zeit der Regierung Rudolfs II.], in: Sborník archivních prací 52 (2002) Nr. 2, 279–294, hier 288.

²¹ Mit Quellenbelegen BŮŽEK, Ferdinand II. Tyrolský, besonders 276f. und TLA Innsbruck, Ferdinandea, Kart. 8–10.

rismus. Beim Aufenthalt in Tirol verloren sie die Bindungen zum böhmischen Milieu nicht, in das sie nach gewisser Zeit zurückkehrten, um dann oftmals einflußreiche Stellen im politischen System des Landes einzunehmen. Nach der Rückkehr gehörten einige von ihnen zu den Stützen der habsburgischen Interessen (Adam von Sternberg, Hertvik Žejdlíc von Schönfeld) oder ragten später als Organisatoren großzügiger gesellschaftlicher Unterhaltungen im rudolfinischen Prag hervor (Adam Gallus Popel von Lobkowicz)²². Wenn sie in Böhmen heirateten, luden sie Ferdinand von Tirol zu ihren Hochzeiten und noch öfter zur Taufe ihrer Kinder ein²³.

Der Hof Ferdinands von Tirol in Innsbruck wurde im Bewußtsein des böhmischen und mährischen Adels als Ort zur Vermittlung der Kavaliereisen auf die Apenninenhalbinsel und in ein breiteres Gebiet des Mittelmeerraumes berühmt. Die zeitgenössischen Ansichten über die Nützlichkeit einer Kavaliereise böhmischer adeliger Jünglinge nach Italien waren nicht einhellig. In den sechziger Jahren des 16. Jahrhunderts schwankten sie zwischen der Bewunderung von allem Italienischen bis zur vereinzelt Verdammung solcher Reisen. In den Überlegungen der böhmischen und mährischen Gegner der Kavaliereisen nach Italien spielten die konfessionellen Gesichtspunkte und die Unfähigkeit, sich mit der unterschiedlichen Mentalität der Italiener auseinanderzusetzen, eine wichtige Rolle²⁴. Die Adligen zogen mit einer Empfehlung Ferdinands von Tirol an italienische Universitäten. Direkt von Innsbruck führten ihre Wege jedoch

²² Zu den Karrieren Adams von Sternberg, Hertviks Žejdlíc und Adams Gallus Popel von Lobkowicz vgl. František PALACKÝ, *Přehled současný nejvyšších důstojníků a úředníků* [Übersicht der zeitgenössischen obersten Würdenträger], in: Jaroslav CHARVÁT (ed.), *Dílo Františka Palackého I* [Werk von František Palacký I] (Praha 1941) 371–383; Josef JANÁČEK, *Ženy české renesance* [Die Frauen der böhmischen Renaissance] (Praha 1977) 262.

²³ Einladungen sind im TLA Innsbruck, Ferdinanda, Kart. 8–10 aufbewahrt.

²⁴ Zur Kritik des italienischen Einflusses auf die Bildung der jungen Adligen vgl. den Brief Johanns Popel von Lobkowicz an Wilhelm von Rosenberg (22. April 1563) im Staatlichen Regionalarchiv Třeboň, Fremde Familien – Registratur, von Lobkowicz, unsign. Vgl. auch den Brief Wenzels Budovec von Budov an Jakob Grynaeus (14. August 1607) bei Julius GLÜCKLICH (ed.), *Václava Budovce z Budova korespondence z let 1579–1619* [Die Korrespondenz Wenzels Budovec von Budov aus den Jahren 1579–1619] (Praha 1908) 47–49.

auch an den Gonzagahof in Mantua, an den Hof der Este in Ferrara und auf die Mittelmeerinseln (Malta)²⁵. Adelige Jugendliche verbanden ihre Kavalleriereise nach Italien nach eigenen Zeugnissen in der Korrespondenz mit dem Kennenlernen fremder Gegenden und mit dem „Erlernen“. Unter diesem Begriff sind im Kontext ihrer Aussagen der Erwerb von Erfahrungen aus dem Alltagsleben an den Höfen italienischer Magnaten und vor allem die praktische Aneignung der lateinischen und italienischen Sprache zu verstehen²⁶.

In den sechziger und siebziger Jahren des 16. Jahrhunderts bildete sich in den böhmischen Ländern eine zahlenmäßig nicht große Gruppe von Herren und Rittern, die über Erfahrungen eines längeren Aufenthalts an einem ausländischen Fürstenhof verfügten. Adelige von einigen Familien wirkten unter den Höflingen und Dienern am Hofe in Wien sowie in Innsbruck (die Herren von Dohna, Kolowrat, Lobkowitz; die Ritter von Kaplíř, Vřesovec, Žejdlie). Es läßt sich nachweisen, daß einige Adelige Stellen am Wiener Hof einnahmen und zugleich persönliche Kontakte mit Ferdinand von Tirol aufrechterhielten, indem sie sich zwischen Wien und Innsbruck bewegten (die Herren von Kolowrat, Pruskovský, Vchynský). Nach der Rückkehr ins Land setzte sich ihre Karriere in der Regel unter den Beisitzern des Landesgerichts und bei einigen Herren später im Korps der Landesbeamten fort²⁷.

²⁵ TLA Innsbruck, Ferdinanda, Kart. 10; über Beziehungen Erzherzog Ferdinands zu Mantua und Ferrara: Alfred AUER, Margot RAUCH, Veronika SANDBICHLER, Katharina SEIDL, Philippine Welser und Anna Caterina Gonzaga. Die Gemahlinnen Erzherzog Ferdinands II. (Innsbruck 1998), besonders 41 f.

²⁶ Sehr treffend im Brief Wilhelms von Rosenberg an Erzherzog Ferdinand (4. April 1574) im TLA Innsbruck, Ferdinanda, Kart. 10.

²⁷ Näher BŮŽEK, Ferdinand II. Tyrolský 281; im breiterem Kontext vgl. DERS., Šlechta ze zemí Koruny české na habsburských dvorech v předbělohorském století [Der Adel aus den Ländern der Böhmisches Krone an den Habsburgerhöfen im Jahrhundert vor der Schlacht am Weißen Berg], in: Václav BŮŽEK, Pavel KRÁL (eds.), Šlechta v habsburské monarchii a císařský dvůr (1526–1740) [Der Adel in der Habsburgermonarchie und der Kaiserhof (1526–1740)] (Opera historica 10, České Budějovice 2002) 153–189.

FEIERLICHKEITEN UND UNTERHALTUNGEN – INSTRUMENTE DER
KULTURELLEN INTEGRATION

Eine kurzfristige persönliche Erfahrung mit dem Leben in Innsbruck und Ambras erwarb der böhmische und mährische Adel beim Besuch höfischer Feierlichkeiten. Solche Festivitäten stellten ein wirksames Instrument für die kulturelle Integration innerhalb der Habsburgermonarchie und eine Form der symbolischen Kommunikation der adeligen Gesellschaft dar²⁸. Die vereinzelt erhaltenen Beschreibungen der Reisen in die Residenz in Innsbruck aus den siebziger Jahren des 16. Jahrhunderts zeigen Ambras in einer wunderschönen Naturszenerie am Fuß der Alpen²⁹. Böhmisches und mährisches Adelige kannten zwar die Höhe der Berge über dem Meeresspiegel, aber die bisher bekannten Zeugnisse über die Wahrnehmung der Alpen zeugen nicht davon, daß die hohen Berge in ihren Gemütern Angstgefühle hervorriefen. „Widerliche Berge“, wie sie die Alpenhügel in der Umgebung von Innsbruck in der Korrespondenz nannten, strengten sie physisch an, denn sie mußten sie beim Reisen oder bei Jagden überwinden³⁰.

Besondere Aufmerksamkeit widmeten die adeligen Gäste dem Garten in Ambras, mit dessen Milieu die berühmten Trinkunterhaltungen verbunden waren. Die Gäste der Trinkunterhaltungen waren verpflichtet, einen Becher Wein in einem Zug zu leeren. Solcher Weinkonsum hatte nach zeitgenössischen Zeugnissen auf Ambras im Prin-

²⁸ Vgl. in der theoretischen Ebene besonders Jeroen DUINDAM, *Ceremony et court. Reflections on an elusive subject*, in: *Francia. Forschungen zur westeuropäischen Geschichte* 26 (1999) Heft 2, 131–140; ders., *Vienna and Versailles. A comparative approach*, in: *Frühneuzeit-Info* 12 (2001) Nr. 2, 10–20, hier besonders 12–14; mit Zusammenfassung der Literatur: Sigrid FREISLEBEN, Elisabeth HILSCHER, Christine OTTNER, Stefan SIENELL, *Die Wiener Hofgesellschaft während der Regierungszeit Kaiser Leopolds I. (1657–1705). Eine Projektvorschau*, in: *Mitteilungen der Residenzenkommission der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen* 12 (2002) Nr. 1, 30–39.

²⁹ Beschreibung von Ambras vom Jahre 1574, des Prinzen Karl Fridrich von Cleve Reise nach Italien, in: Alois PRIMISSER (Hg.), *Die kaiserlich-königliche Ambraser-Sammlung. Mit neuen Registern von Manfred Kramer* (Graz 1972) 33–38.

³⁰ Vgl. den Brief Heinrichs Počepický von Počepice an Erzherzog Ferdinand (7. August 1568) im TLA Innsbruck, Ferdinanda, Kart. 10.

zip zweierlei symbolische Bedeutung. Erstens bedeutete er ein häufig verbreitetes Ritual des Willkommenstrunks („Vilkum“). Gleichzeitig berechtigte er Ferdinands Gäste, sich in die Trinkbücher einzutragen und in der Regel auch einen beliebigen Spruch anzufügen. Nach der Ableistung dieses Rituals wurden die Gäste noch dazu in der Bacchusgrotte im Garten, wo die öffentliche Zeremonie ablief, in die Bacchusgemeinschaft der erfolgreichen Weintrinker aufgenommen³¹.

Die Eintragungen in den Trinkbüchern des Schlosses Ambras bezeugen, daß Ferdinand von Tirol zu Trinkunterhaltungen den deutschen, österreichischen, italienischen, spanischen, französischen, ungarischen und polnischen Adel einlud. Eine vielköpfige Gruppe in dieser international, kulturell, religiös und sprachlich bunten Gemeinschaft stellten Herren und Ritter aus Böhmen und Mähren dar. Der böhmische und mährische Adel traf auf Ambras die Blüte der europäischen Aristokratie. In den Jahren 1567–1595 nahmen 149 Adelige (einschließlich 4 Frauen) von 26 Herren- und 78 Ritterfamilien des Königreichs Böhmen die Einladung Ferdinands von Tirol zu einer einmaligen oder wiederholten Reise zu Trinkunterhaltungen auf Ambras an. Tatsächlich war ihre Anzahl noch höher, denn in die Trinkbücher schrieben sich nur die Gäste ein, die nach einem erfolgreichen Ausleeren des Bechers Wein in die Bacchusgemeinschaft aufgenommen worden waren³².

An den Trinkunterhaltungen nahmen die böhmischen Adligen teil, die am Hofe Ferdinands in Prag als Höflinge und Diener gewirkt hatten und mit ihm später nach Innsbruck gekommen waren. Ferdinand von Tirol lud zu den Trinkunterhaltungen auch seine adeligen Altergenossen von den Landesbehörden des Königreichs Böhmen, die er während seiner Statthalterschaft in Prag kennengelernt hatte. Vielleicht die beachtenswerteste Gruppe unter den Teilnehmern an den Trinkunterhaltungen stellten Höflinge und Diener der letzten

³¹ Trinkbücher des Schlosses Ambras sind im Kunsthistorischen Museum Wien, Sammlungen Schloß Ambras, Kunstkammer, Inv.-Nr. KK 5262, KK 5328, P 5251 aufbewahrt.

³² Eine ausführlichere Analyse bei Václav BŮŽEK, *Pijácké zábavy na dvorech renesančních velmožů (Ambras-Bechyně)* [Trinkunterhaltungen an den Höfen der Renaissancemagnaten (Ambras-Bechyně)], in: BŮŽEK, KRÁL (eds.), *Slavnosti a zábavy* 37–61.

Rosenberger dar, die in den Jahren 1567–1595 aus mehr als zwanzig böhmischen Ritterfamilien stammten. Manche von ihnen nahmen auf Einladung Peter Woks von Rosenberg in der Mitte der siebziger Jahre des 16. Jahrhunderts auch an den Trinkunterhaltungen auf dem südböhmischen Schloß Bechyně teil³³.

KOMMUNIKATIONSNETZE INNSBRUCK – BÖHMEN

Während seiner Amtszeit als Statthalter arbeitete sich Erzherzog Ferdinand zu einem Kenner der inneren Verhältnisse in den böhmischen Ländern empor. Das Interesse für die Situation in Böhmen sank bei ihm nach seiner Ankunft nach Tirol nicht, da er genügend Kommunikationsnetze und Informationskanäle aufgebaut hatte. Die Berichte über das politische und religiöse Geschehen in den böhmischen Ländern brachten ihm nach Innsbruck die in den Diensten seines Hofes „auf die Ferne“ wirkenden Adeligen („virtuelle Höflinge“). Die Informationen wurden ihm auch von adeligen Freunden und einigen obersten Landesbeamten des Königreichs Böhmen geschickt (Johann von Waldstein, Wilhelm von Rosenberg, Wratislaw von Pernstein)³⁴. Von Böhmen nach Tirol gingen Lieferungen von lebenden Rebhühnern, Fasanen und Auerhähnen in die Wildgehege der Umgebung Innsbrucks, von Fischen aus Wittingauer Teichen, Jagdhunden, eingepökeltm Wild, Getreide und Flinten. Von Tirol nach Böhmen wurden Salz und Fässer tirolischen Weins geschickt³⁵.

³³ Ebd.; weiters BŮŽEK, Ferdinand II. Tyrolský 284–286.

³⁴ Vgl. den Brief Johanns von Waldstein an Erzherzog Ferdinand (28. Jänner 1568) im TLA Innsbruck, Ferdinandea, Kart. 10; viele Belege enthalten Briefe, die Erzherzog Ferdinand von Tirol an Wilhelm von Rosenberg adressierte (Staatliches Regionalarchiv Treboň, Historica Treboň, Sign. 5369, 5926, 6082 usw.).

³⁵ Vgl. die Briefe an Erzherzog Ferdinand, die Wilhelm von Rosenberg (15. August 1567, 1. Oktober 1571), Johann von Waldstein (18. Juli 1567, 30. Juli 1567, 24. Oktober 1567), Wenzel Valkoun von Adlar (15. Dezember 1571), Heinrich Počepický von Počepice (7. August 1568, 1. November 1572, 31. August 1573) schrieben (TLA Innsbruck, Ferdinandea, Kart. 10). Viele Belege bringt auch die Korrespondenz im Staatlichen Regionalarchiv Treboň, Historica Treboň, Sign. 4777a, 4785a, 4793, 4928.

Über gesellschaftliche Verhältnisse überzeugte sich Ferdinand von Tirol mit eigenen Augen auch während seiner Reisen von Innsbruck nach Böhmen. Es lockten ihn Hetzjagden, Abfischen von Teichen, Turniere und Unterhaltungen³⁶. Mit Böhmen verbanden Ferdinand von Tirol auch Machtinteressen der Habsburger in Mitteleuropa – Nachfolgerschaft auf dem Kaiserthron, Wahl des Königs in der Polnisch-Litauischen Union und die drohende Türkengefahr³⁷. Als Vertreter des spanischen Königs Philipp II. überreichte er im Jahr 1585 in Prag den Orden des Goldenen Vlieses dreien Habsburgern, Wilhelm von Rosenberg und Leonhard von Harrach³⁸. Am Ende seines Lebens bereicherte Ferdinand von Tirol die Sammlungen in der Kunstkammer in Ambras um Geschenke illuminiert mittelalterlicher Handschriften aus dem Milieu des rosenbergischen Hofes³⁹.

³⁶ Dazu besonders BŘEZAN (ed. PÁNEK), *Životy*, Bd. 1, 236, 268, 320–322, 348–349, 378, 412, 419, 431–432, 479, 496.

³⁷ Über die kritische Reflexion der inneren Verhältnisse in der Polnisch-Litauischen Union nach dem Aussterben der Jagiellonen spricht besonders „Zrcadlo království polského“ [„Der Spiegel des polnischen Königstums“] im TLA Innsbruck, Ferdinandea, Kart. 8 aus.

³⁸ BŘEZAN (ed. PÁNEK), *Životy*, Bd. 1, 320–322; Jaroslav PÁNEK, *Poslední Rožmberkové – velmoži české renesance* [Die letzten Rosenberger – die Magnaten der böhmischen Renaissance] (Praha 1989) 222.

³⁹ BŘEZAN (ed. PÁNEK), *Životy*, Bd. 2, 496, 713.