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The Innsbruck court in the 17th century: identity and ceremonial of a court in flux

Astrid von Schlachta

Ceremonial issues, orders of precedence and rank, and various forms of representation are of increasing interest to researchers into Early Modern court history. The new Cultural History has, in particular, provided influences and impetus for attempts to interpret ceremony as a system of rules and norms that assigned symbolic meaning to specific acts. Ceremonial is given the character of a system of social signification; it enacted social order and was among the public actions of the ruler. Ceremonial acts might be addressed to a specific recipient, but were performed before an audience of courtiers and others who could be expected to interpret the acts they saw performed and respond accordingly. Furthermore, rulership found its legitimization and its legitimating expression in ceremonial. This interpretation of Early Modern court ceremonies has gained further relevance in the wake of the new research on Absolutism that indicates that during the period of full-blown Absolutism, or its early stages, rulership was by no means

1 For an overview, see Roger Chartier, “New Cultural History,” in Joachim Eibach and Günther Lottes (eds.), Kompass der Geschichtswissenschaft, UTB für Wissenschaft 2271 (Göttingen, 2002), 193-205.
self-evident and thus needed to be represented to the outer world. This was a fact already alluded to by Julius Bernhard von Rohr (1688-1742) in his *Einleitung zur Ceremoniel-Wissenschaft*.

In what follows we will examine the court of Innsbruck in the first half of the 17th century from the perspective of ceremonial structures, representation and the transfer of power. The question necessarily arises of whether ceremonial was given added importance in legitimizing rule by the fact that the person exercising power, and the manner in which they did so, changed several times over these decades. Innsbruck was a court in flux, and the sources show that with each new ruler, as different lines within the Habsburg family succeeded one another in the Upper Austrian lands, ceremonial and representation had to be altered or adjusted anew.

By looking at the Innsbruck court in the first half of the 17th century we are confronted with an Early Modern court which lay at the periphery of the Habsburg lands and which furthermore had lost the importance that it had held in the 16th century. Up to 1595 Innsbruck was the home to a Tyrolean branch of the Habsburgs – represented by Charles V’s brother, archduke Ferdinand I, and later by his son archduke Ferdinand II – whose vigorous court life took place in both the Hofburg and in Ambras Castle. The situation changed

---


after Ferdinand II’s death in 1595. Due to his morganatic union with Philippine Welser, daughter of a burgher of Augsburg, his two sons, Andreas and Karl, were not legitimate heirs. His second marriage, to Anna Catherina Gonzaga, had ‘only’ brought forth three daughters, among them the later empress Anna, wife of emperor Matthias.

This dynastic rupture was the starting point for the decades with which we will be concerned. The break in the continuity of rulership at the Innsbruck court was to lead to the existence of three differently structured courts which can be characterized as follows: the court of a ‘spiritual’ governor exercising power on behalf of an absent sovereign, the court of a sovereign ruler with gradually growing competences culminating in the foundation of a new line of sovereignty, and at last the court of a noble widow exercising power on behalf of her under-aged son. The new line of sovereignty which started with archduke Leopold V and culminated in the hereditary transmission of the Upper Austrian lands in 1630, lasted only for two generations. In 1665 it came to an end when the last sovereign, archduke Sigismund Franz, a son of Leopold V and Claudia de’Medici, died without heirs. Upper Austria reverted to emperor Leopold I.

We will consider this versatile court from two angles: that of sovereign power, law and governance, and that of representation. The underlying themes include the relationship between Innsbruck and Vienna, and the integration of the Innsbruck court and the Upper Austrian lands into the whole edifice of Habsburg power.

**The sovereign power and governance**

Taking 1595 as our starting point, we are confronted with the unsettled succession after archduke Ferdinand II’s death, leaving behind two sons, neither of them a legitimate successor, three daughters from his second marriage, and a widow. The years up to 1602 were characterized by negotiations about the general structure of the Habsburg lands and the succession in Upper and Outer Austria. In these years of interregnum, as well as in the ensuing period of rule by archduke Maximilian, the dependence of the Innsbruck court upon Vienna was pronounced. This was true not only with regard to the Innsbruck court’s ability to set a political agenda, but also in taking initiatives in representation and self-portrayal, as exemplified in the building program, where what little was done had a heavily spiritual emphasis.
The epoch of interregnum was marked by negotiations between the line of the emperor, the brothers Rudolf, Matthias, Maximilian, Ernst and Albrecht, who wanted to keep the territories undivided, and the Styrian line, represented by Charles of Styria’s widow, archduchess Maria, who pushed for a division between Tyrol and Vorlande. Increasingly, from the beginning of 1596 onwards, the dividing line seems to have been more between the brothers Matthias, Maximilian and their sister-in-law Maria on the one side, and emperor Rudolf on the other. One of the main concerns was the formula to be followed for the act of homage in the Upper Austrian lands. Finally, in August 1596, Matthias, acting as Rudolf’s delegate, accepted the act of hereditary homage from the Tyrolean Estates; and, as was the tradition, the Estates put forward their request for the confirmation of their privileges combined with the request of indivisibility of the country. Passing over the details, it finally took until 1630 before the Upper and Outer Austrian Lands were fully reunited under the sovereignty of an archduke who again had the power and the right to bequeath these countries to his own heir.

After much discussion between the cousins concerning the Upper and Outer Austrian Lands, the transfer of the various shares to Rudolf (Erbvergleichung), and the finalization of the form of government, the emperor issued the Prager Rezeß (Prague Disposition) on February 5, 1602, empowering his brother Maximilian to govern the lands of Upper and Outer Austria. Interestingly, in the course of these discussions a deputy of the Styrian line, Karl Schurff, who became a privy councilor under Maximilian III, suggested that archduchess Maria of Inner Austria should send her daughter Eleonore into the Haller Damenstift in order to keep and increase her influence in Tyrol.

---

6 On the case made by the Styrian line, see Josef Hirn, “Tirols Erbtheilung und Zwischenreich 1595-1602,” Archiv für österreichische Geschichte 29 (1903), 271-361, esp. 316f. Also his Die ersten Versuche Kaiser Rudolfs II. um in den Alleinbesitz der Grafschaft Tirol zu gelangen (Vienna, 1898).


9 See the corresponding documents in Tiroler Landesarchiv Innsbruck, Sammelakten, Reihe B, Abt. I, Lage 5; regarding the negotiations and the allocation of the territory, see also Hirn, “Tirols Erbtheilung und Zwischenreich,” 324-338; Hirn, Erzherzog Maximilian der Deutschmeister, 1:16-20.


female influence was not immediately sought – it was only some time later that Eleonore entered the Damenstift – but a special regulation, reflecting the compromise with the Styrian line, was included in the treaty, stipulating that the lands at issue should pass to them after Maximilian’s death. This finally took place in 1619, when the reign of Leopold V began. On May 31, 1602, an instruction was sent to Tyrol which repeated the most important details of the Prager Rezeß. The reason it gave for the transfer of territory was that it would serve the countries “zu mehrern trost und sicherheit” should an “ansehenlich fürstlich haubt” live within the country and preside over it as governor.

Maximilian, already in possession of “andere Landt mehr nuzlich vnd wolgeregier,” should reign in these lands as “vollkomenlicher Regent vnd Gubernator [. . .] das Ihrige was ainen Regierenden herren vnd Landtfürsten zuthuen gebürt vnd sowohl gemeinen Interessenten zu nuz und wolgart, als auch den gehorsamen landen vnd leuthen zu trost und retting, schutz, schirm und aufnehmben.” The time frame for the duration of Maximilian’s rule was expressed very vaguely as until “wir uns aines andern einhellig miteinander vergleichen.” The competences of the new governor were outlined and defined with great precision. Maximilian was, for instance, not allowed to summon or hold a Diet without Rudolf’s approval, nor could he allocate fiefs or make appointments to high office without consulting Rudolf.

During Maximilian’s rule his powers were twice considerably altered by two incisive regulations. In the wake of the Treaty of Lieben, Matthias as new sovereign in the archduchy of Austria and in the kingdom of Hungary transferred his distributive share of Tyrol and the Outer Austrian lands to Rudolf II. And in 1612, after Rudolf II’s death, a notable enlargement of Maximilian’s power took place. Although he

---

14 31 May 1602, [2r-3r]. See too Brigitte Steiger, “Erzherzog Leopold V. als Gubernator und Landesfürst von Tirol” (doctoral thesis, Innsbruck, 1970), 11; regarding the competences that were defined in the “Prager Rezeß,” see Hirn, “Tirols Erbtheilung und Zwischenreich,” esp. 350f.
did not gain the rank of an independent ruler in Innsbruck, Maximilian nevertheless dropped the title *Gubernator* and enjoyed much wider competences than formerly.\(^{16}\)

**THE RULERS IN INNSBRUCK – AN OVERVIEW**

Maximilian III, the *Deutschmeister*, was born in 1558 as the fourth son of emperor Maximilian II and the Spanish infanta Maria. He spent his childhood and youth at the humanistically oriented and confessionally diverse court of his father.\(^{17}\) After Maximilian II’s death, Rudolf II took over the duty of providing for his brothers as beffitted their rank; very soon it became clear that Maximilian was being steered towards an ecclesiastical career. After negotiations in various directions, he entered the Teutonic Order and was in time appointed to the office of Coadjutor of the Order with right of succession.\(^{18}\) From 1593 to 1595 Maximilian was governor of Inner Austria as guardian of the under-aged children of archduke Charles. At the same time, he was active as commander in chief during the Turkish Wars.\(^{19}\) Despite the wide range and geographical scope of his activities, Maximilian’s central residence remained in Mergentheim, the administrative centre of the Teutonic Knights. In 1602 Maximilian finally took up the government of Tyrol, in the circumstances already described.

After Maximilian’s death in 1618, archduke Leopold, of the Inner Austrian line of the family, took over the governance of Tyrol – a step that fulfilled the arrangements of the Prager Rezeß. He, too, had first held ecclesiastical office, as bishop of Passau and Regensburg. His residence was in Zabern, where he had established his court and his

\(^{16}\) Hirn, *Erzherzog Maximilian*, 1: 149.


\(^{18}\) Regarding Maximilian’s time as Coadjutor, see Noflatscher, “Erzherzog Maximilian,” 64-111.

\(^{19}\) His engagement in the Turkish war and his interest in warfare might explain his endeavours to reorganize the Tyrolean military system by issuing a new “Zuzugsordnung” in 1605. Compare Josef Egger, *Geschichte Tirols von den ältesten Zeiten bis in die Neuzeit* (Innsbruck, 1872), 2: 287f.
After having received the *Gubernament* of Tyrol, Leopold very soon endeavored to extend his power in the Upper Austrian lands – he too had been restrained in his competences and depended on the emperor in many political duties. A first success of his attempts dates from the year 1625, when a contract of inheritance between the brothers Ferdinand, Leopold and Charles settled that Leopold would get two thirds of the group of lands in Upper and Outer Austrian – not including Breisgau, Sundgau and Alsace, the four “Waldstädte am Rhein” (Rheinfelden, Säckingen, Laufenburg and Waldshut) and the Landvogteien Hagenau and Ortenau, where Leopold only held the office of a *Statthalter* (Lord Lieutenant). In the regions assigned to Leopold, the act of homage was done in May 1626. It was only in 1630 that Leopold V also became hereditary sovereign of the remaining third.

When Leopold V died in 1632, his wife Claudia de’Medici – together with the emperor – took up the reins of government as guardian for her still under-aged son Ferdinand Karl; she ruled until 1646. Her regency fell in the politically difficult time of the Thirty Years War. Although the Upper Austrian lands were spared direct devastation, they were of major importance for emperor Ferdinand II as the western outpost of the Habsburg Monarchy, and therefore indirectly involved in the war.

The guardianship of Claudia de’Medici was regulated by Leopold V’s testament, which contained exact specifications about the distribution of power after his death. Leopold bequeathed to emperor Ferdinand II, his brother, the “vollmächtigen Gewalttragen” as “Vormundten, vnd

---

23 Steiger, “Erzherzog Leopold V.,” 32f.
Gerhaben mitt angelegenen vœlis und sonderem hohen Verthrauen,”
while Claudia was named Mitgerhabin. Ferdinand II accepted these
arrangements, and since he was too pressingly engaged elsewhere to
give Tyrol his attention, he entrusted Claudia de’Medici both with
the exercise of sovereignty in the Upper Austrian lands, and with
guardianship of the heir to the throne, Ferdinand Karl. In March
1633, during the first Diet under the new regent, Claudia de’Medici’s
power was confirmed and announced to all authorities. Furthermore,
an imperial “Creditiu schreiben” was sent to all authorities, decreeing
that Claudia’s instructions and commands were to be obeyed because
she was authorized to rule on behalf of the emperor. This defined
Claudia’s installation as acting sovereign and the structure of her power
as Ferdinand II’s “Mit Vormundin vnnd contutricin” (co-guardian and
cotutrix).

In subsequent years, however, Ferdinand II did not take a passive
role as co-tutor. From the beginning he clearly emphasized his claim
to Tyrol and his supremacy in local and dynastic politics. The sources
show that he took a clear interest in the education of the heir to the
throne – with the aim of raising a ruler for the western parts of his
Hereditary Lands who would govern in his spirit and would adhere
to his political aims. At the same time, it proved no disadvantage for
Claudia de’Medici to have the backing of the emperor as guardian of
her son. The emperor proved to be a strong ally who also guaranteed
protection, a thing of no minor importance during the crises and
conflicts of the Thirty Years War.

25 Ferdinand II. and Claudia de’Medici, in: Tiroler Landesarchiv Innsbruck, Hs. 1097, 1r.
26 According to Grimm’s Wörterbuch, “Gerhabe” means “Vormund”; see Deutsches
Wörterbuch von Jacob und Wilhelm Grimm (Munich, 1984; reprint of Leipzig, 1897),
5: 2552f.
27 Tiroler Landesarchiv Innsbruck, Landschaftliches Archiv, Verhandlungen der
Landschaft, Bd. 18, 1633-1639, 56r-v.
28 Tiroler Landesarchiv Innsbruck, Landschaftliches Archiv, Verhandlungen der
Landschaft, Bd. 18, 1633-1639, 58r.
29 For further detail, see Astrid von Schlachta, “Herrschen und vorbereiten: Claudia
de’Medici und ihre europäischen verwitweten ‘Kolleginnen’,” Tiroler Heimat 69 (2005),
33f.
THE INNSBRUCK COURT IN THE 17TH CENTURY

CEREMONIAL, REPRESENTATION AND COURT LIFE

As already mentioned in the introduction, ceremonial and the diverse forms of representation at the court not only represented sovereignty but were also a major element of Early Modern political communication. In considering these forms of political communication at the Innsbruck court, it is first necessary to bear in mind that in the times of Maximilian III the institution was marked by three different courtly households whose relations to one another were not always harmonious: the household of the governor, the household of the last sovereign's widow, Anna Caterina Gonzaga, and the household of Karl von Burgau, son of Ferdinand II by Philippine Welser. Anna Caterina, the widow of Ferdinand II, initially lived in the summer palace Ruhelust, which was surrounded by large gardens of the same name. Court life in her residence seems to have continued to be very lively; for the year 1595 the sources record a household of 61 persons. This is roughly half the size of the household of empress Maria Anna in early 17th-century Vienna. But in subsequent years the court probably stagnated, in numbers as well as in importance. The same conclusion is suggested by the development of court music. From the first decade of the 17th century we know that the court musicians had to fulfill other duties besides their occupation in the Court Kapelle; for instance, the chapel singer Johann Kopp doubled as language tutor to Anna Caterina's oldest daughter Maria and as Pfennigmeister. In 1612 Anna Caterina, together with her oldest daughter Maria, joined

32 In 1612 approximately 110 persons belonged to Maria Anna's household. See Katrin Keller, Hofdamen: Amtsträgerinnen im Wiener Hofstaat (Vienna, 2005), 23; Taddei, “Anna Caterina,” 235, 239.
the Damenstift Regelhaus that she herself had founded. Twelve court ladies accompanied the former sovereign, as well as the courtly Kapelle, which was now again enlarged and also assumed musical duties in the new convent church.\footnote{Walter Senn, *Musik und Theater am Hof zu Innsbruck: Geschichte der Hofkapelle vom 15. Jahrhundert bis zu deren Auflösung im Jahre 1748* (Innsbruck, 1954), 198f; Kurt Drexel, “Klöster und Stifte als Musikzentren: Stams, Marienberg, Neustift, Serviten und ‘Versperrtes Kloster’ in Innsbruck, Damenstift Hall,” in Kurt Drexel and Monika Fink (eds.), *Musikgeschichte Tirols*, Schlern-Schriften 322 (Innsbruck, 2004), 2:153-157; see too Theophil Antonicek, “Die höfische Musik von Maximilian III. bis zur Auflösung der Hofkapelle,” in *Musikgeschichte Tirols*, 2:41f; Taddei, “Anna Caterina,” 235, 239.}

Besides the household of Maximilian III, which will be described below, and that of Anna Catherina, a third parallel household existed in Innsbruck. Karl von Burgau, son of Ferdinand II and his first wife Philippine Welser, had inherited Ambras Castle from his mother and established a household there, at least from time to time up to the year 1613. Furthermore, he possessed a palace in the town, the former armory (today the provincial parliament, or *Landhaus*).\footnote{See Hirn, *Erzherzog Maximilian*, 2:275-308; Franz C. Zoller, *Geschichte und Denkwürdigkeiten der Stadt Innsbruck und der umliegenden Umgebung* (Innsbruck, 1816), 1: 289.} The sources reveal some tensions between the various courts, with the political contacts between Maximilian and Karl von Burgau in particular being marked by issues arising from the dispersed constellation of land distribution. These show the scattered distribution of power in the area surrounding Innsbruck, and the difficulties of enforcing rulership downward. Karl von Burgau was not only entitled to Ambras Castle, but from the inheritance of his mother he also held the dominions of Petersberg, Sterzing, Stubai, Rottenburg and Hörtenberg.\footnote{Hirn, *Erzherzog Maximilian*, 1:96 (esp. footnote 2); see also: Zoller, *Geschichte und Denkwürdigkeiten*, 1:289f; Hirn, *Erzherzog Maximilian*, 2: 288f.}

The relations between Maximilian and Anna Catherina, in contrast, seem not to have gone beyond regular visits. In this context there is a highly significant phrase in one of the letters that Maximilian sent to his sister, Margarete, in 1603: “Dennoch, unangesehen ichs nunmehr schier entwohnt und ohnedas nit sonders dazu geneigt, muß ich mich doch immer (wieder) einmal dem Frauenzimmer dahier, weil ich ihnen so nahend geraten, und sonderlich zu dieser Zeit mit Kurzweil erzeigen.”\footnote{Quoted from Hirn, *Erzherzog Maximilian*, 1: 95.}
Turning now to the household of the ruler, the issue to be placed first and foremost is that under Maximilian III, representation at the Innsbruck court has to be seen as embedded in the spiritual sphere, largely as a result of his position. Representation was strongly marked by spiritual symbolism and the display of piety. On the one side this reflects Maximilian’s ecclesiastical office and career, on the other side his limited competences as governor might also have shifted his priorities into the spiritual sphere. Interestingly, the emperor ensured that he too was represented in Tyrol, for instance on newly created coins. From 1602 the Tyrolean thaler bore on its face the portrait of emperor Rudolf and the inscription “Rvdolphvus II. Dei Gratia Romanorvm Imperator Semper Avgvstvs Ac Germaniae Hungariae Bohemiae Rex.” On the reverse were the Habsburg coat of arms with the chain of the Golden Fleece and the archducal crown, and an inscription reading “Necnon Archidvces Avstriae Dvces Bvrgvndiae Comites Tyrolis.”

If one follows Volker Bauer’s ideal typology, the Innsbruck court under Maximilian III could be characterized as a “householderly” court, rather than one that emphasized “princely glory.” The household of the sovereign was more to the foreground as well as the “gute zucht, tugend, gottesfurcht und erbarkeit.” Maximilian built up his image of a “pious monarch”; *repraesentatio* was showing piety and displaying it by the corresponding attributes and signs. Examining his inventory of assets, it becomes obvious that the Hofburg was filled with items of devotion, altars, pictures of saints, statues of Mary and other pious objects. This spiritual representation can also be traced in several illustrations that show Maximilian as Deutschmeister. Only in his later years was Maximilian portrayed with the insignia of temporal power, including the archducal crown.

---

37 See also the description in Egger, *Geschichte Tirols* 2: 296f, 314f.
Despite the elevation of his rank in 1612, and a slight change in representation, Maximilian’s spiritual office as Hochmeister of the Teutonic Knights continued to define his self-representation. This can be seen by, among other examples, his tomb, the design of which was planned by Maximilian as early as 1614. In his testament from that year he determined the exact location of the tomb in the parish church of Sankt Jakob in Innsbruck, as well as the symbols and signs that should adorn his final resting place. The gravestone was to be decorated only with the Prussian Cross of the Teutonic Order and an image of St George slaying the dragon. That Maximilian invested some energy in creating a representative tomb can also be seen in the fact that he was successful in getting the Dutch sculptor Hubert Gerhaert to execute his plans for the monument – a success that was not granted to his brother Albert, who also tried to bring Gerhaert to his court in Brussels.42

The sources show various pious foundations made by archduke Maximilian, underlying his piety. Substantial letters of foundation bear witness to the extent of the donor’s engagement with these institutions and his desire to provide exact regulations and requirements for the foundations.43 One of these foundations, for example, commemorated Maximilian’s majordomo Gregor Sobietzki, a convert from Russian Orthodoxy to Catholicism. His grave was located in front of the large Lady Altar in the parish church, very near to the gravesite that Maximilian chose for himself. Sobietzki’s sister, Potentiana, was also buried near her brother’s and later Maximilian’s grave.44 The financial arrangements for this foundation are revealing, for the endowment was deposited with the city of Innsbruck and not with the bishop of Brixen – a manner of proceeding that brought a protest from the bishop. The foundation seems to reflect the distance between the rulers of Tyrol and the bishopric, a distance that grew up in the last part of the 16th century due to disagreements concerning the political integration of the imperially immediate territories of Brixen and Trent into the Tyrolean Diet, and the financial duties this entailed. A controversy with Brixen

43 Among other works, see Dudik, “Erzherzog’s Maximilian I. Testament,” 243ff.
44 Compare Hirn, Erzherzog Maximilian, 2: v316; Nolfatscher, Glaube, Reich und Dynastie, 230.
concerning the local subjects’ act of homage also dates from the first half of the 17th century.\textsuperscript{45}

The representation of Maximilian III as a “pious monarch” in the style of early Baroque Catholicism is interestingly at odds with the relaxed confessional atmosphere of his court in Innsbruck, as well as with his generally conciliatory attitude towards Protestants.\textsuperscript{46} He was not only conciliatory, but pursued an active policy of non-discrimination against Protestants. Almost thirty years after the Council of Trent, a quite pronounced confessional openness prevailed in Maximilian’s household. Already in Mergentheim, Maximilian had Protestant nobles at his court, albeit mainly in minor functions rather than exercising high office. In 1602, when Maximilian took up the governance of Tyrol, Rudolf II advised him to dismiss all the Protestant servants from his household, as non-Catholic confessions were not tolerated in Tyrol. This advice was rather more than a mere suggestion, since the emperor had quite an extensive right to a say in the composition of the households of family members.\textsuperscript{47} But it is an advice that Maximilian appears not to have taken, for in Tyrol too, non-Catholics were among his closest counselors, including the aforementioned Gregor Sobietzki even before his conversion to Catholicism, as well as the “Reichspfennigmeister” Zacharias Geizkofler and the “Hofpfennigmeister” Ferdinand Grabner, both of whom were Protestants.\textsuperscript{48} Of major significance in this context seems to be a visitation report from the year 1610 in which it is


\textsuperscript{46} Noflatscher, Glaube, Reich und Dynastie, 226-229; see also Maximilian’s cautious approach in the case of Bobenhausen, described in Noflatscher, Maximilian der Deutschmeister, 234-238. Maximilian’s tolerance is also underlined by the fact that he employed a Hutterite (i.e. an Anabaptist) as personal physician. See Hirn, Erzherzog Maximilian, 1: 246.


\textsuperscript{48} Noflatscher, Maximilian der Deutschmeister, 227, 229; Hirn, Erzherzog Maximilian, 1: 213 f.
mentioned that Geizkovler’s whole household and all his servants were suspect in terms of their faith.  
This tolerance or confessional openness is not only represented in Maximilian’s library, which contained a wide range of confessional and scientific titles, but can also be substantiated from the confessional politics in Tyrol, which around 1600 still involved the question of tolerating or expelling Protestants. On this issue the ruler came into conflict with the archbishops of Salzburg, in particular, who were given to demanding that Protestants be expelled from those areas of Tyrol that were parts of the archdiocese of Salzburg. Maximilian III’s tolerant and friendly disposition towards Protestants can be illustrated in the case of the Rosenberg family, a Protestant family that had mining rights in the Kitzbühel area. In the 1620s – by which time Leopold V was ruling – the Rosenbergs came under confessional pressure, with mandates requiring their expulsion. In a petition to Leopold V, the Rosenbergs pleaded for the right to stay, with an especially illuminating line of argument: they praise the “Religions tolleranz” that prevailed under Maximilian III. He had assured the family of their right to stay without molestation on religious grounds. Nevertheless, the petition was unsuccessful and the Rosenbergs were forced to leave Tyrol. Thus we get a picture of a pronouncedly pious court that at the same time showed tolerance and a willingness to integrate confessional dissenters, apparently sometimes going against the head of the family to do so.

Alongside, and perhaps in part because of, the spiritual emphasis of courtly representations, court life in Innsbruck under Maximilian III was rather quiet. The household contained only 163 persons, a fraction of the size of the imperial household in Vienna, which until the second half of the 17th century numbered around 1,200 persons,

or the household of the Medici in Florence, which around the year 1600 comprised 500 souls. It is recorded that the court music attained some renown, especially under Hofkapellmeister Johann Stadlmeyer. Regarding festivities, only one major event is recorded, moreover one that focused on the neighboring city of Hall and was also connected to the spiritual sphere. The archduchesses Maria Christina and Eleanor, daughters of Karl of Inner Austria, finally entered the Damenstift in Hall in 1607.

Major architectural changes in Innsbruck are not recorded from the times of Maximilian III, or rather the impetus for them did not come from him. Some changes in the appearance of the Innsbruck court go back to decisions taken by the former ruler, Anna Catherina Gonzaga. In 1607, she founded the cloister ensemble of the Versperrte Kloster and the Regelhaus. These architectonic changes were only marginal compared to the whole Hofburg complex, which suggests that archduke Maximilian had sparse ambitions to represent his power in buildings. Highly significant in this context is also the perception of the Hofburg itself, which was the central residence of the sovereign. The building was perceived as dark and depressing, gloomy and full of melancholy. A letter sent from Innsbruck to Vienna on December 12, 1619, describes the Hofburg as follows: “So gibt doch der augenschein mit sich, daß selbige gemach sonderß schwöchmüettig vnd kheines wehgs zurathen sein werde Jetziger Kay: Junge Herrschafft dahin zu

---


54 Theophil Antonicek, “Die höfische Musik von Maximilian III. bis zur Auflösung der Hofkapelle,” in Musikgeschichte Tirols [see n. 33], 2: 40f; Zoller, Geschichte und Denkwürdigkeiten, 1: 292.

Still in 1628, Philipp Hainhofer writes of the Hofburg: “Die Alte Burg ist ain sehr weitleuffes gebew von villem vnderkommen, aber gar melancholisch und altfränkhisch erbawet.” In contrast, the gardens of the Ruhelust, with the associated summer residence, were perceived as friendly and warm.

**Organization and structure**

Regarding the organization and form of his government, Maximilian fell back upon structures that had been passed down from the times of Ferdinand II and earlier. The two key administrative bodies were the *Regiment* and the *Kammer*, above them was the *Hofrat* as highest authority or tribunal of appeal. The Hofrat assembled the highest *Hofchargen* and gave advice to the sovereign on important matters. After Ferdinand II’s death a break within the administration occurred due to the interregnum. The Hofrat was liquidated and the positions of Hofchargen dissolved, with only the Hofkanzler remaining in office, and a new authority, the *Tirolische Departement* in Prague, was brought into being to replace it. After 1602, in line with the stipulations of the Prager Rezess, an assistant council (*Assistenzrat*) was established for Maximilian III, consisting of two delegates from the imperial line and two from the Styrian line. The Assistenzrat was to advise him on important political matters. One of the councilors was Hofkanzler

---

56 12 December 1619, Tiroler Landesarchiv Innsbruck, Kunstsachen, I, 994.
57 Oscar Doering, Des Augsburger Patriciers Philipp Hainhofer Reisen nach Innsbruck und Dresden, Quellenschriften für Kunstgeschichte und Kunsttechnik des Mittelalters und der Neuzzeit, N.F., 10 (Vienna, 1901), 39; see also the description of the Hofburg in Vienna from the 18th century and the conservative imperial program which is expressed in the Hofburg. The emperor symbolized the conservation of his power by keeping the Hofburg in the old style. See Andreas Pečar, “Symbolische Politik: Handlungsspielräume im politischen Umgang mit zeremoniellen Normen; Brandenburg-Preußen und der Kaiserkhof im Vergleich (1700–1740),” in Jürgen Luh (ed.), Preußen, Deutschland und Europa, 1701–2001, Baltic Studies 8 (Groningen, 2003), 284.
59 Regarding these developments, see: Hirn, Erzherzog Maximilian, 1:1.
Friedrich Altstätter, who had already been Regimentsrat since 1578 in the Upper Austrian government; this provided some continuity of personnel in high office between the last court under archduke Ferdinand II and the new court. Soon, the Assistenzrat developed into the Geheime Rat, which again became the highest court authority and stood above the Regiment and the Kammer.

The internal organization of the courtly offices and of courtly representation fell back upon precedents that had been collected and summarized in a memorial by Carl von Wolkenstein, who had served as Regimentspräsident since 1591. The memorial compiled by Wolkenstein on December 24, 1602, shows the efforts to equip the single units with written instructions. It thus lay in the competence of the Regimentspräsident to elaborate on the responsibilities of the different offices at the court and to prepare the definition of limits and authoritative power. To fulfill his duty Wolkenstein – another repository of memories of the last court of Ferdinand II – went back to the instructions of the Regiment and the Kammerräte – “eltere, vnd neue” – “alles fleiß ersehen, berathschlaget,” so that in the “Räthen alls Canzleyen, allenthalben guete bestendige ordnung gepflanzet vnd erhalten werden mechte.”

The memorial also provides information about how a new Instruktion developed. First of all, all former Instruktionen from the time of emperor Ferdinand I (1536) up to those of archduke Ferdinand II – the last one from 1566 was only valid for the duration of the archduke’s expedition against the Turks – were read word for word. Then the compilers considered the old Instruktionen and deliberated on the new one and the current circumstances to which it should be adapted.

A phase of transition marks the time between the death of Maximilian in 1618 and Leopold’s definitive move to Innsbruck in 1621. Three committees installed by the emperor saw to the inventory of Maximilian’s possessions – the committees were staffed by members from each archducal line on equal terms. Delegates to these committees were dispatched by the emperor, by archduke Albert, and, as the new

---
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Grand Master of the Teutonic Order, by archduke Charles.\textsuperscript{62} A letter from archduke Albert to Leopold V, written from Brussels on January 4, 1619, proves that the work of the committee was by no means free of conflict, and that the cousins had strong and divergent interests in the matter. Albert, ruler of the Habsburg Netherlands,\textsuperscript{63} thanks Leopold in the letter that he had “vertreiblich communiciert” regarding the imperial\textsuperscript{1} Kammerdiener Joseph Preschel who had some – possibly not legitimate or rightful – involvement in the committee that was to inventorize Maximilian’s movables. Leopold’s expression of opposition to the Kammerdiener met with Albert’s approval. He assured Leopold of their ongoing “gesambten Intereses” regarding the matter and asks his cousin to continue to report to him “vertreiblich” in future.\textsuperscript{64}

Thus, the Innsbruck court saw a short intermezzo without a ruler after Maximilian III’s death in 1618. Though Leopold was appointed governor in January 1619, he decided that Innsbruck would not be his sole residence, and continued to keep his court in Zabern. In October 1619, after the death of Markus Sittikus von Hohenems, archbishop of Salzburg, he made attempts to gain the archiepiscopal throne – an attempt that ultimately failed.\textsuperscript{65}

In 1621 the Estates of Tyrol asked emperor Ferdinand II to urge his brother to relocate his residence to Innsbruck, as Leopold continued to reside at Zabern. He did, however, name the Tyrolean Landeshauptmann Jakob Andrä von Brandis – a Tyrolean subject – as Geheimer Rat; at the same time he confirmed the privileges of the city of Innsbruck.\textsuperscript{66} The request of the Tyrolean Estates to choose Innsbruck as sole residence shows that Leopold was still maintaining a double residence and household. Leopold kept a traveling household for the first years of his reign, as is shown by, among others, the court musicians. In 1619 his accession to power had led to the dismissal of most of Maximilian III’s musicians.\textsuperscript{67} The musicians in the traveling household were

\textsuperscript{62} Dudik, “Erzherzog’s Maximilians I. Testament,” 239f; on the conflicts between the Teutonic Order and the House Habsburg concerning the assets of Maximilian, see Noflatscher, “Erzherzog Maximilian,” 321 f.

\textsuperscript{63} See in general: Dudik, “Erzherzog’s Maximilian I. Testament”.

\textsuperscript{64} Albert to Leopold V, Brussels, 4 January 1619, Tiroler Landesarchiv Innsbruck, O.Ö. Geheimer Rat, Ferdinandea, Karton 221, Pos. 249-256, Pos. 253, [1r ]. On Albert, see Thomas and Duerloo,\textit{ Albert and Isabella.}

\textsuperscript{65} See Weiss, “Erzherzog Leopold V.,” 53-55.

\textsuperscript{66} Steiger, “Erzherzog Leopold V.,” 16.

\textsuperscript{67} Senn,\textit{ Musik und Theater am Hof zu Innsbruck,} 205, 207.
supplemented with musicians from Hall and Innsbruck. Not until his wedding with Claudia de’Medici did Leopold dissolve his household in Zabern; in January 1626 he was released from the clerical state and the bishoprics of Passau and Strasburg fell vacant.

The sources reveal that in the first half of the 17th century, the Innsbruck court was in a state of flux, with neither ceremonial nor rank securely fixed. This gave rise to a number of problems that required solution, precedence being one of the thorniest issues in Early Modern court life. Especially in the first years of Leopold’s reign, particular care had to be taken to organize the court, its procedures and ceremonial – to create order. At issue was which predecessor court would serve as exemplar for the reorganization. The sources make clear that the court of Ferdinand II was the main model for the new guidelines. There are documents from the 1620s that testify how backwards-looking the new order was, and how the court took its lead from “alten Herkommen,” from instructions inherited from the late 16th century, from historical traditions regarding ceremonial, rank and general procedures. The eruption of disputes over rank and precedence, which in Early Modern court life amounted to “symbolic, or rather cultural, capital,” made it clear that regulations and instructions regarding rank were needed, and especially concerning “precedence and subsequence.”

There are some clues about the discussion in a few documents surviving from the early years of court life under Leopold V. The anonymous writer of a document of May 14, 1622, refers to a decree, recently issued by Leopold, concerning the question of the relative precedence of the Hofkanzler and the Kammerherren. During Maximilian’s reign, the Hofkanzler was the head of the Hofkanzlei and belonged to the Geheime Rat as one of the four Geheime Räte. For the whole period from 1602 to 1619 the post was held by Friedrich Altstätter, who had been Regimentsrat since 1578. Leopold’s 1622 decree now determined that the Hofkanzler precede the Kammerherren in Actibus publicis. Nevertheless, at Leopold’s court the rank seems not to have been fixed
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71 Stollberg-Rilinger, “Zeremoniell als politisches Verfahren,” 107; also: Hahn/Schütte, Thesen zur Rekonstruktion, 22.
72 Tiroler Landesarchiv Innsbruck, Hofregistratur, Kanzlei Erzherzog Leopold, Sonderpositionen, 27-26, Karton 61, no. 34; on the importance of rank, see: Stollberg-Rilinger, “Zeremoniell als politisches Verfahren,” 103-108.
and the decree caused some turmoil. The writer of the document of May 1622 states on the one hand that he understands that special honor was due to the Hofkanzler, as the “fürnemst vnd lebendig Archivum eines Botentaten,” and that he had a special reputation to maintain, but on the other hand he mentions an earlier discussion about the competences of Hofkanzler Hans Ulrich Hemmerle – a discussion that must have taken place in Outer Austria, where Hemmerle had been Hofkanzler in Ensisheim before 1620. At that time the dispute had been decided in favor of the Kammerherren. The writer is afraid that Leopold’s new decision would upset the longer-serving Kammerherren, who upon returning from the current wars would unload their vexation upon the writer. He therefore requested that Leopold issue regulations that would fully clarify the situation.

The Tyrolean court can here be seen looking back to developments in Outer Austria, where Hemmerle had been Hofkanzler, and the writer of the document of May 1622 includes Hemmerle’s letter of appointment as Hofkanzler, dated February 2, 1616. According to that letter, Hans Ulrich Hemmerle had started his career under cardinal Andreas, then took service with Rudolf II, and finally went to Passau in 1613, where he served archduke Leopold as Camer Praesident. A short time later Hemmerle moved to Ensisheim and became a member of Leopold’s household as Hofkanzler and Geheimer Rat. He therefore held an intermediate position between Leopold and the Geheime Rat, and he became one of Leopold’s closest confidants. Hemmerle was also occupied with restructuring the finances, a weighty task insofar as Leopold had run into debt after his attempt on Jülich and the levying of an army that had failed to seize Prague in 1611. Later, Hemmerle’s experience in financial matters enabled him to encourage reforms of the coinage in Tyrol.

The changes in the ceremonial regulation of precedence and subsequence, and the right of precedence of the Kammerherren over the Hofkanzler, reveal the lack of consistency of ceremonial structures at the court in Innsbruck and the need for regulations. Looking at the
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developments in Innsbruck alongside those at the court in Vienna, we can see that the ceremonial of the imperial court had also not yet taken a fixed form in the first half of the 17th century. The first order of precedence dates only from 1637, and the allocation of rank that it provided was not accepted by all groups at the imperial court until the reigns of Joseph I and Charles VI. Andreas Pečar furthermore emphasizes the primacy of the courtly office-holders over the hereditary nobility. Thus, at least in the late 17th century, the Kämmerer and the Geheime Räte at the imperial court were more privileged ceremonially than the hereditary noble ranks.

The document just discussed concerning precedence and degree possibly also fits into another discussion that dates from the latter period of Maximilian III’s reign. An “Extract” about how in the times of the deceased Ferdinand II “mit dero hochen Officiern undn Räthen, des Vorgangs halber vngeuehrlich gehalten worden,” passes down the practices of the “Vorgehen” of the times of Ferdinand II, as well as for the times before and after 1612. The significant changes concern the Geheime Räte, who after 1612 collectively had the first place after Maximilian. Then followed the Kammerherren, and then the Regierung and Kammer. Under Ferdinand II and before 1612, the Obrist-Hofmeister and the Obrist-Kämmerer had the first place, immediately behind the sovereign; then followed the Hofkanzler, and behind him the Regimentspräsident of Upper Austria and the Kanzler of Tyrol. In 1602 the order changed somewhat, since Carl von Wolkenstein, Regimentspräsident of Upper Austria, had to cede precedence to the Obrist-Hofmeister and was followed by the Hofkanzler.

80 As Maximilian is not referred to as “the late” but the changes of 1612 are mentioned, it must be from the final phase of Maximilian’s reign.
81 Tiroler Landesarchiv Innsbruck, Hofregistratur, Kanzlei Erzherzog Leopold, Sonderpositionen, 27-36, Karton 61.
Important for all questions of rank and ceremonial at the court were those, such as Carl von Wolkenstein (mentioned above), who could provide a living witness to how things had been done at the court of Ferdinand II. Another figure consulted early on in Leopold’s reign was Schatzregistrator Hans Finck, who had held this post since 1589. Although he could not recall exactly how Ferdinand II had handled Vorgehen and Nachgehen in the case of the government, the Statthalter, and the Präsident, he did send a list with the names of those Statthalter who presided over the government from 1557 to 1589 – the last name given being that of Carl von Wolkenstein. For details regarding precedence and subsequence, Finck indicated that the information sought should be available from the old Hofkanzlei. As sources for the information about the Obristkämmerer, Küchenmeister and Hofmarschalek, Finck mentions the “gewesten Hoffpfennigmaister Ambts Schrifften und Raittungen.” In his written reply Finck includes another list from 1577 that records the money disbursed to the Hofchargen when Ferdinand II received imperial fiefs from emperor Maximilian II.

Outlook and summary

Finally, a short view of court life under Leopold V and Claudia de’Medici will illustrate the on-going changes of the court in Innsbruck up to the middle of the 17th century. Regarding representation and its general bias, from 1619 onwards, and especially after Leopold and Claudia’s marriage, the court completely changed its image – a fairly lively court life returned to Innsbruck, and a small Baroque court developed. From the beginning, Leopold tried to legitimize and consolidate the power of his line – attempts that seem to be symptomatic for the beginning of new lines of succession. The household of Leopold and Claudia encompassed about 300 persons, some residing in the Hofburg and some in the nearby Castle Ruhelust.
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We have records of several festivities that were extensively celebrated and which were characterized by significant Italian influences.\textsuperscript{85} Not only the opera flourished, but also other festivities; the \textit{Roßballett}, for example, was danced in the Florentine style and apparently reached Vienna from Innsbruck.\textsuperscript{86} The sovereign also initiated some significant architectural changes to Innsbruck’s urban aspect. Endeavors to express the presence and the power of the sovereign were more ambitious than any undertaken by Maximilian III. In 1619 the foundation stone of the new Jesuit church was laid; the church was consecrated in 1646, and became the mausoleum for the territory’s new line of rulers, the burial place of Leopold, Claudia, and their children. Furthermore, Leopold built the Court Theatre, and replaced the summer palace Ruhelust, which had burnt down in 1636, with the newly built Neue Residenz.\textsuperscript{87} Under Leopold and Claudia there was also a flowering of courtly panegyric, reflecting the desire for a greater public profile and the social importance of events at court.\textsuperscript{88}

As we have seen, in contrast to other Habsburg courts, and especially relative to Vienna, the Innsbruck court passed through considerable changes during the first half of the 17th century, in its representation, ceremonial and household. Tyrol’s political-strategic significance, on the other hand, was largely derived from its geographical location in the system of the Habsburg lands, and was predicated with great consistency. In the 16th century the country already played an important defensive role as the western outpost of the Habsburg hereditary lands. Thus, Maximilian I had called the country a “heart of the Roman Empire” and “a bridge into Italy,” and Charles V is quoted by the Tyrolean estates as having said, “that if Tyrol were lost, the hereditary lands in Germany could no longer be maintained,” but as long as Tyrol was among the hereditary lands, it would be hard for enemies to “conquer the rest.” Up to the 18th century the Tyrolean Estates used these statements to
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bolster their case for the importance of their territory. An interesting antithesis, though, is a remark made by archduchess Maria of Styria in a letter written to Rudolf II in 1595, setting out her views on Tyrol and on the political situation in the land. She perceived Tyrol as being different from the other Habsburg territories. Maria's remark originates from the discussion after Ferdinand II's death concerning the future form of governance in Tyrol, and thus has to be contextualized. The archduchess positions her Inner Austrian opinion by saying that Tyrol would not need an independent sovereign, as the territory would not be threatened by outer enemies and the country furthermore was not troubled by religious conflicts. Although the remark clearly has Maria's political agenda behind it regarding governance and the installation of a governor, it nevertheless shows a view different from the Upper Austrian perspective as put forward, for example, by the Estates.

One can conclude from the aforementioned facts that the installation of a governor or sovereign in Tyrol was by no means insignificant, but dependent on weighty strategic considerations. It was also important to the imperial line that the branch of the family ruling in Tyrol would not become too independent, but be committed to the wider interests of the House of Habsburg. The Viennese influences can be seen in the example of the guardianship of Claudia de'Medici after the death of Leopold V, when the emperor intervened decisively in the upbringing of Ferdinand Karl in order to avoid any possibility that the heir develop “alienations of sympathy from His Imperial Majesty.”

To sum up, one has to say that the Innsbruck court in the first half of the 17th century was marked by political constellations that showed it only slightly independent from Vienna and closely related to wider

89 See Astrid von Schlachta, “Identität und Selbstverständnis: Die Landstände in Tirol in der ersten Hälfte des 18. Jahrhunderts im Vergleich mit Ostfriesland,” in Gerhard Ammerer and others (eds.), Bündnispartner und Konkurrenten der Landesfürsten? Die Stände in der Habsburgermonarchie, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung 49 (Vienna, 2007), 394-419; with regard to these arguments, see also Martin Schennach, “Der wehrhafte Tiroler: Zu Entstehung, Wandlung und Funktion eines Mythos,” Geschichte und Region / Storia e Regione 14, no. 2 (2005), 85f. He remarks that the statements about the importance of Tyrol were only made to remind the Tyroleans to pay the requested taxes.
Habsburg politics. This was especially the case under Maximilian III, who focused on conveying an image of piety and showed very few signs of initiative in representation and self-portrayal. The building program of court architecture in Innsbruck was, if anything, a spiritual program. With regard to the role of the Innsbruck residence and its household, research has shown that for Maximilian his residence in Mergentheim, where he was a sovereign in his own right, continued to play an important role throughout his reign. The court of the Teutonic Order was in large part staffed by nobles from the Habsburg lands. Heinz Noflatscher has pointed out that during his time in Innsbruck, Maximilian’s “imperial range of action” unfolded through Mergentheim, his network into the Empire established mostly via the Teutonic Order.\textsuperscript{92}

Under Leopold V, the Innsbruck court became somewhat more independent of Vienna, but this development was reversed under Claudia de’Medici. The fact that when Leopold’s court was established in Innsbruck his court officials had to go back to the times of Ferdinand II to find models on which to order ceremonial and political structures shows the extent to which Maximilian’s period of rule had represented a gap in the development of the Innsbruck court. In the early days of Leopold’s sovereignty, court life was focused on his residence in Zabern, but it moved to Innsbruck only a few years later. Thereafter we can discern the development and expansion of an institution that could be classified as a “ceremonial court.”\textsuperscript{93} The evolution of a new line of sovereignty was legitimized and anchored by representation and memorial, by ceremonial acts and written specification. Thus, Hofstaatsverzeichnisse and ceremonial protocols emerged that gave norms for the life of the court and which were modeled on those of late 16th-century Innsbruck. This underpinned the rise of the new line and enabled the growth of their households, both Leopold’s and Claudia de’Medici’s. Nevertheless, this ‘revival’ came to an end when Sigismund Franz died in 1665 and the Upper Austrian countries came to be governed from Vienna in full.
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