

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

PATRES PATRIAE OR PRODITORES PATRIAE?
LEGITIMIZING AND DE-LEGITIMIZING THE
AUTHORITY OF THE PROVINCIAL ESTATES IN
SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY BOHEMIA

Petr Maťa

This contribution is concerned with patriotic sentiment and language in Bohemia in the second half of the seventeenth century.¹ It aims primarily at providing greater historical context to what has been written on this topic. Here, I will introduce new evidence framed by a case study. Yet a case study might be exactly a good starting point given the current state of knowledge. Hitherto, interpretations have been built up on a markedly limited scrutiny of source material, and historians have usually overprivileged a few texts and figures at the expense of many others. Being interested primarily in tracing the lineage of a national consciousness, they have perpetuated the tendency, deep-rooted in the traditional master narrative of a Czech national history, to line up seventeenth- and eighteenth-century “patriots”—mostly authors of historiographical and hagiographical writings—in a chain of canonized witnesses of national awareness. This tendency has predetermined both the selective research interests and the interpretation of these texts as primarily manifestations of Czech national consciousness.

¹ In this article, I deliberately avoid the term “patriotism”. Beyond the general problematic nature of the “ism” terms, especially when applied to the premodern and early modern situations, it is precisely the notion of patriotic talk as primarily an expression of consistent patriotic positions or even a political doctrine that I intend to problematize here. The wide variety of possible uses of *patria* and related terms is documented in Robert von Friedeburg, ed., *Patria und Patrioten vor dem Patriotismus. Pflichten, Rechte, Glauben und die Rekonfigurierung Europäischer Gemeinwesen im 17. Jahrhundert* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2005) as well as in many papers of the present volume. On “ism” terms see H. M. Höpfl, “Isms,” *British Journal of Political Science*, 13 (1985): 1–17. My thanks to Howard Louthan for his help on linguistic revisions of this article.

For many generations, historians have focused on a few authors who were portrayed as representatives of the Czech national mission that faced up to the ominous changes in ethno-cultural patterns after the enforcement of the Habsburg hereditary rule over Bohemia in the decades after 1620. It has not been patriotic talk in general but only patriotic utterances compatible with the history of Czech national (language-based) awareness that has been regarded as worth studying. Thus patriotic identity (*vlastenectví*) and national identity have been linked closely together.² Marginally, an ethnically indifferent province-based patriotic identity has been recalled too. More often than not, however, this *Landespatriotismus* implied strong essentialist and reifying connotations. Instead of highlighting and differentiating by whom, in what situations and discourses, how and why *patria* was invoked, historians have tended to understand *Landespatriotismus* as a homogenous set of values rooted in a patriotic identity and professed by the inhabitants of early modern Bohemia regardless of ethnicity. Even recent attempts to open new perspective on the issue and to apply a more text-sensitive approach depart only with difficulties from this canon.³

² It is difficult to provide a concise reference here, for we lack a critical recapitulation of how nation and fatherland were conceptualized in modern Czech historiography dealing with the early modern period. The tendency to search mainly for national awareness seems to have been, on the other hand, omnipresent since the emergence of Czech historiography as a scientific discipline in the nineteenth century, entering major compendiums of both history and the history of literature as well as numerous articles on individuals, their works and their use of particular concepts such as *natio* and *patria*. Attempts to summarize the argument in distinct publications were made mostly on the eve of—and shortly after—the Second World War (though some of them were published much later), see Kamil Krofta, *Nesmrtelný národ. Od Bílé hory k Palackému* [Immortal nation. From White Mountain to Palacký] (Prague: Jan Laichter, 1940); Albert Pražák, *Národ se bránil. Obrany národa a jazyka českého od dob nejstarších po přítomnost* [The nation defended itself. Apologies of the Czech nation and language from the oldest times to the present] (Prague: Sfinx 1946); František Kutnar, *Obrozenecké vlastenectví a nacionalismus. Příspěvek k národnímu a společenskému obsahu češství doby obrozené* [Revivalist patriotism and nationalism. On the national and social content of Czechness in the revival period] (Prague: Karolinum, 2003). Though without doubt ratcheted up by the actual political situation, these texts seem to be fully consistent with the general approach to the subject in Czech historiographic discourse. For a more recent overview see Josef Petráň and Lydia Petráňová, “The White Mountain as a symbol in modern Czech history,” in Teich Mikuláš, ed., *Bohemia in History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 143–163.

³ Martin Svatoš, “Der Begriff *patria* und die patriotischen Tendenzen in der lateinischen Historiographie und Hagiographie in den böhmischen Ländern im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert,” in Gabriele Thome and Jens Holzhausen, eds., “*Es hat sich viel ereignet, Gutes wie Böses.*” *Lateinische Geschichtsschreibung der Spät- und Nachantike* (Munich-Leipzig: K. G. Saur, 2001), 203–213.

This customary way of thinking about patriotic sentiment in seventeenth-century Bohemia produced at the same time a special hierarchy within the group of renowned patriots, assigning the most prominent place (and thus the most attention) to Bohuslav Balbín (1621–1688). Balbín is without doubt an imposing personality—an erudite Jesuit historian, hagiographer, genealogist and poet, author of voluminous patriotic works published in Latin between the 1650s and 1680s. Though his literary, heuristic and collecting activity climaxed without doubt in his encyclopedic *Miscellanea historica regni Bohemiae* (the project remained however incomplete as Balbín finalized only 12 of 30 planned volumes),⁴ historians have usually paid the most attention to his defense of the Czech/Slavic language (“*Bohemica, seu Slauica lingua*”), that was published in print posthumously in 1775 and helped energize the national movement in the late eighteenth century.⁵

Other patriotic writers of the second half of the seventeenth century were most frequently portrayed in the shadow of Balbín, as his friends or belonging to “his circle.” Moreover, historians have tended to exclude tacitly others, who—because of their supposed national allegiance or simply because of the ideas they espoused—did not fit this image. Thus Christian Augustin Pfaltz von Ostritz (1629–1701), a German-speaking canon of the metropolitan chapter of Prague and author of a set of patriotic sermons on Bohemian saints (published in German in 1691), has been practically unknown to historians.⁶ Still

⁴ Two of them were published posthumously in the late eighteenth century. Historians sometimes mistakenly speak about only 20 planned volumes. Balbín himself, however, wrote 1678 to Christian Weise, commenting on his first three volumes of *Miscellanea*: “Alii deinde libri triginta numero (...) huiusmodi sequentur, ut tres historiarum decades compleantur.” See Adolf Patera, “Dopisy Bohuslava Balbína ke Kristianu Weisovi z l. 1678–1688” [Letters of Bohuslav Balbín to Christian Weise, 1678–1688], *Věstník královské české společnosti nauk, třída filos.-histor.-filologická*, 1887 (Prague, 1888), 72–117, here 73.

⁵ The significant body of literature on Balbín has been summarized by his most recent (and most judicious) biographers Jan Kučera and Jiří Rak, *Bohuslav Balbín a jeho místo v české kultuře* [Bohuslav Balbín and his place in Czech culture] (Prague: Vyšehrad, 1983). The important volume *Bohuslav Balbín a kultura jeho doby v Čechách* [Bohuslav Balbín and the culture of his time in Bohemia] (Prague: Památník národního písemnictví, 1992), eloquently demonstrates the central place Czech historians continue to assign to Balbín.

⁶ Christianus Aug(ustin) Pfaltz von Ostritz, *Theatrum Gloruae, Daß ist Schau=Platz der Ehren Oder Lob=Predigten Von denen heiligen außserwählten glorwürdigen Patronen des hochlöblichen Königreichs Böhmeim...* (Prague, 1691). Only recently, Pfaltz and his writings have been brought back to scholarly attention by Jiří M. Havlík, “Morová kázání Christiana Augustina Pfaltze (1629–1701)” [Sermons on the plague by Christian

more strikingly, Maximilian Rudolf von Schleinitz (1606–1675), a Counter-Reformation bishop of Litoměřice, who, in the early 1670s, wrote an extensive and challenging tract called *Vandalo-Bohemia*, discussing the ethnogenesis of the *natio bohémica* and the origins of the nobility of Bohemia (the social class he himself descended from), has only occasionally been mentioned. Ironically, the only reason why historians did find him worth mentioning was usually the fact that Balbín resolutely refuted his theories. The very structure of his remarkable work has never been analyzed and his argument has often been misunderstood.⁷

I am not going to provide an analysis or reclassification of these neglected authors and their literary works, important as that subject is. Rather I am interested in another aspect, namely in the local political background from which these texts emerged. While focusing narrowly on a few “established” figures, historians have not only underestimated the literary context of the patriotic writing of Balbín and others, excluding some important authors and texts from their focus. They have likewise oversimplified the political context in which these works were written, despite the fact that most of these texts—Balbín’s writings in

Augustin Pfaltz], *Listy filologické* 129 (2006): 145–160, and Radmila Pavlíčková, “‘Dobrá památka’, pohřební kázání a starší dějepisectví. Německé pohřební kázání nad kardinálem Harrachem z roku 1667” [“Good memory,” funeral sermons and old historiography. A German funeral sermon on Cardinal Harrach from 1667], *Theatrum historiae* 2 (2007): 137–155. A complex analysis of his work remains to be written.

⁷ Characteristically, Schleinitz was not discussed in the detailed history of Czech historiography by František Kutnar and Jaroslav Marek, *Přehledné dějiny českého a slovenského dějepisectví. Od počátků národní kultury až do sklonku třicátých let 20. století* [Overview of Czech and Slovak historiography. From the beginnings of national culture to the end of the 1930s] (Prague: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny, 1997). Basic facts on him can be found in Johann Evangelist Schlenz, *Geschichte des Bistums und der Diözese Leitmeritz*, vols. I–II (Warnsdorf: Opitz, 1912–1914); Kurt A. Huber, “Schleinitz, Maximilian Rudolf Freiherr von (1606–1675),” in Erwin Gatz, ed., *Die Bischöfe des Heiligen Römischen Reiches 1648 bis 1803. Ein biographisches Lexikon* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1990), 424–425. There exists no satisfactory information on the *Vandalo-Bohemia* in the literature up to this day despite the fact that this tract, as a handful of copies testifies, continued to be read in the eighteenth century. In his article, “Maximilián Šlejnic jako mecenáš Karla Škréty. (Ke vzájemným vztahům barokní historiografie a výtvarného umění)” [Maximilian Schleinitz as sponsor of Karel Škréta: On the relationship of Baroque historiography and visual arts], in *Bohuslav Balbín*, 136–145, Vít Vlnas, one of few who have ever displayed any interest in Schleinitz, mistakenly presents its main argument, as if the bishop derived the origin of the Bohemian nobility from the entourage of the mythical forefather *Čech*, thus failing to understand the main argument (Schleinitz denied the very existence of a forefather *Čech*).

particular—reflected a recognizable political dimension. Admittedly, this political dimension has never been actually denied. Rather it has been interpreted without a detailed knowledge of the political issues that were at stake. Thus instead of analyzing Balbín's patriotic texts and their literary context, I am going to highlight the political struggle within the ruling elite of Bohemia⁸ (that was supposedly the main target group of the majority of these patriotic texts) and the role patriotic reasoning played in it.

Towards this end I will focus my following discussion on the influential and controversial royal minister Bernhard Ignaz Count Martinitz (1615–1685), the dominant political figure in the Kingdom of Bohemia of the second half of the seventeenth century. I will begin by discussing how the power struggle within the Bohemian elite affected Balbín's texts, mostly with regard to his inflammatory polemic against Count Martinitz in the early 1670s. This quarrel, certainly not unimportant with respect to the development of Balbín's argument, has found some (though not fully satisfactory) attention in the literature. But I suggest it needs to be put in a broader context and analyzed with respect not only to the network of patriotic historians of late seventeenth-century Bohemia but to the political struggle within the ruling elite of Bohemia in order to be understood properly. Secondly, I will highlight the recurring rivalries within the Bohemian estates and raise the question of whether and how patriotic vocabulary was used by this elite to legitimize collective and particular goals and specifically how this was represented by Balbín in his writings.

⁸ In this contribution, I use the terms "ruling elite" and "estates" more or less as synonyms because, contrary to expectations, it seems hardly possible to distinguish royal officers ruling the kingdom on behalf of the monarch from those nobles who regularly attended the diet in the second half of the seventeenth century. Rather than to draw an artificial line of demarcation between a supposed royal party and an estates party, it seems reasonable to approach this group as a link between the court and the province—a group for which a double loyalty was typical, not exceptional. The situation was significantly different with the prelates for they were normally excluded from royal offices in Bohemia. But as the prelates entered the estates administration of the province, they can be subsumed under the term "ruling elite" to a certain extent too. The authority of royal towns remained, on the other hand, only symbolic, after the composition of the provincial estates in Bohemia had been redefined in the 1620s. See Petr Maťa, "Wer waren die Landstände? Betrachtungen zu den böhmischen und österreichischen 'Kernländern' der Habsburgermonarchie im 17. und frühen 18. Jahrhundert," in Gerhard Ammerer et al., eds., *Bündnispartner und Konkurrenten des Landesfürsten? Die Stände in der Habsburgermonarchie* (Vienna-Munich: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 2007), 68–89.

Denouncing a royal minister: Bohuslav Balbín's polemic against the Grand Burgrave Martinitz

The controversy between Balbín and Count Martinitz is certainly a *cause célèbre* in the history of Bohemia in the second half of the seventeenth century. As such, it has been touched on by all historians who have ever dealt with Balbín. It arose when the printing of Balbín's major historical writing named *Epitome historica rerum Bohemicarum*, an outline of the history of Bohemia written in a patriotic tone, was interrupted in January 1671 after a denunciation had reached the Jesuit general in Rome suggesting the work contained passages prejudicial to the Habsburg dynasty and thus potentially dangerous to the Society of Jesus. This denouncement was undoubtedly inspired (and presumably written) by Count Martinitz. As grand burgrave (*nejvyšší purkrabí* or *Oberstburggraf*) from 1651, Martinitz headed the royal government in Bohemia—the so-called “vicegerency” (*místodržitelství* or *Statthaltere*)—composed of about a dozen nobles.⁹ Thus he enjoyed a highly influential position, often equated (though with some exaggeration) with the position of viceroys in the kingdoms of the Spanish monarchy. Besides being a royal minister, Count Martinitz accounted himself a learned intellectual and displayed many-sided interests (he had a lively correspondence with Athanasius Kircher for instance). In fact, the emergence of the enmity between the Jesuit historian and the royal officer might appear somewhat surprising, for in autumn 1668 Count Martinitz issued a recommendation to Balbín, who was visiting the court library in Vienna. But Martinitz was obviously a complicated personality, who radically changed his attitudes several times during his life.¹⁰

⁹ The members of the vicegerency held at the same time the highest provincial offices in the kingdom and were the most influential individuals at the diet. Being regularly appointed from the native or at least naturalized nobility, they embodied the overlap between royal authority and the high Bohemian nobility.

¹⁰ No biography of Martinitz exists and accounts on him have been brief and repetitive. Recently, however, Alessandro Catalano, *La Boemia e la riconquista delle coscienze. Ernst Adalbert von Harrach e la Controriforma in Europa centrale (1620–1667)* (Roma: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 2005), has collected valuable information on his early career. See also Id., “Příběh jednoho mýtu. Bernhard Ignác z Martinic—Kardinál Arnošt Vojtěch z Harrachu—Jezuité” [The history of a myth: Bernhard Ignaz of Martinitz—Cardinal Ernst Adalbert of Harrach—Jesuits], in *Slánské rozhovory 2005—Itálie a Čechy* (Slaný: Královské město Slaný, 2006), 25–34.

As a consequence of Martinitz's denunciation, Balbín's historical work became politicized and had to be read by additional censors. Monitoring the procedure, Martinitz himself compiled his own critical reservations about the subversive potential of Balbín's text. At the same time, however, the case became the focus of power struggle among the high nobility. Balbín found an effective supporter in Martinitz's rivals. In 1674, his noble patrons succeeded in convincing the Viennese court about the harmlessness of the work, after the emperor had received a positive assessment from the renowned court librarian Peter Lambeck. The *Epitome* was finally published in 1677.¹¹

In the meantime, however, Balbín wrote two passionate texts familiar to historians for both their patriotic zeal and damning critique of the grand burgrave. The first of these texts, *De Regni Bohemiae felici quondam, nunc calamitoso statu ac praecipue de Bohemicae, seu Slavae Linguae in Bohemia auctoritate, deque eius abolendae noxiis consiliis, aliisque rebus huc spectantibus brevis, sed accurata tractatio*, which was mentioned above, is well known. It is the most famous text Balbín ever wrote, and as such it has been often analyzed by historians. This Latin discourse praising the Czech/Slavic language and criticizing state affairs within Bohemia was launched against two opponents, both anonymous, but supposedly identifiable by informed readers. The first one, whom Balbín labeled as *Miso-Bohemus*, was a German author who questioned the linguistic maturity of the Slavic languages. His identity, however, remains unclear. Some historians have identified him as Melchior Goldast (1578–1635), the usual target of Balbín's critique, but this seems to be a rather unlikely, for Goldast, so far as I can determine, never devoted much attention to the Czech or Slavic language beyond his claim that "*Bohemos origine quidem esse Slavos*,

¹¹ Most records of this episode have been collected by Rafael Ungar, Ferdinand Menčík and Antonín Rejzek, whereas later authors generally paraphrased what had been written by them: *Bohuslav Balbini e S. I. Bohemia docta, opvs posthvmvm editvm, notisque illvstratum ab Raphaelē Vngar...*, pars I (Prague, 1776), 10–21; Ferdinand Menčík, "Petr Lambeck a Balbinova Epitome" [Peter Lambeck and Balbín's Epitome], *Věstník Královské české společnosti nauk, třída filosoficko-historicko-jazykozpytná 1889* (Prague, 1890), 182–202; Antonín Rejzek, *Bohuslav Balbín T. J. Jeho život a práce* [Bohuslav Balbín. His life and work] (Prague: Knihtiskárna Družstva Vlast, 1908), 205–234. See a call for further research on this issue by Josef Hejnic, "Balbínův spor s Bernardem Ignácem z Martinic ve světle korespondence Rudolfa Maximiliána ze Šlejnic s Tomášem Pešinou z Čechorodu" [Balbín's debate with Bernhard Ignaz of Martinitz in the light of the correspondence of Rudolf Maximilian of Schleinitz with Tomáš Pešina of Čechorod], *Bibliotheca Strahoviensis*, 1 (1995): 134–136.

sed situ & et regione Germanos; siue patriam suam a Teutonibus, linguam a Slauibus habere...)¹² The second target of Balbín's invective, on the other hand, can be easily identified as Bernhard Ignaz Count Martinitz. As the title of the tract suggests, Balbín linked two issues together: the decline of the Czech language in Bohemia and the perversion of domestic politics. Both in his eyes were a product of the influx of foreigners into Bohemia (mostly Germans, unwilling to adapt to the domestic language and habits), and the willingness of the governors of Bohemia (equated with Count Martinitz) to allow the Czech language to disappear, and then to prey upon and enslave the inhabitants of the kingdom.¹³

Balbín's second text, written in 1672, targeted Grand Burgrave Martinitz directly. It was a bitter Latin satire containing four fictive sepulchral inscriptions (*Trophaea sepulchralia*), each compiled as if dedicated to Martinitz by one of the estates or professional groups of the kingdom: clergy, nobility, royal towns and scholars. Here, Martinitz was boldly portrayed as a highly incompetent and evil-minded *oppressor* of his own fatherland (in both texts, the fatherland was equated with the Kingdom of Bohemia), systematically striving for the impoverishment of its inhabitants of all social classes. The question of language and ethnicity was not directly addressed in this text. Like the *Tractatio*, this latter text was not published during Balbín's lifetime.

¹² Melchior Goldast Heiminsfeldius, *De Bohemiae Regni, incorporatarumque provinciarum, iuribus, ac privilegiis; necnon de hereditaria Regiae Bohemorum familiae successione, Commentarii* (Francofordiae, 1627), 9 and passim. In spite of the great impact Goldast had on the interpretation of the history of Bohemia outside the kingdom, there has been surprisingly little research on this issue. Generally on Goldast see Heinz Schecker, "Das Prager Tagebuch des Melchior Goldast von Haiminsfeld," *Abhandlungen und Vorträge der Bremer wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft* 5 (1930), 217–280; Gerhard Knoll and Klaus Schmidt, "Die Erschließung der Bibliothek des Humanisten Melchior Goldast von Haiminsfeld (1576–1635) in Bremen," *Wolfenbütteler Notizen zur Buchgeschichte* 5 (1980): 203–223; Anne M. Baade, *Melchior Goldast von Haiminsfeld: Collector, commentator and editor* (New York: Peter Lang, 1992); Jiří Hrbek, "That feckless Bohemomastix.' The life and work of Melchior Goldast of Haiminsfeld," *Acta Comeniana* 22 (2008), forthcoming.

¹³ The first (and only) edition in Latin: *Bohuslai Balbini Dissertatio apologetica pro lingua Slavonica, praecipue Bohemica* (Prague, 1775). There are three editions in Czech translation from 1869, 1923 and 1988, see Milan Kopecký, "Literatura v Balbínově Rozpravě krátké ale pravdivé. (K 300. výročí smrti Bohuslava Balbína)" [Literature in Balbín's *Short but truthful discourse* (Dedicated to the 300th anniversary of Bohuslav Balbín's death)], *Studia Comeniana et historica* 18/35 (1988): 44–63.

In fact, it was rediscovered only a couple of years ago.¹⁴ Similarly, the reception of both texts remains rather obscure. Supposedly they were read only in a narrow circle of confidants, transmitted by Balbín's friend Tomáš Pešina of Čechorod, a canon of the metropolitan chapter in Prague and another patriotic historian, to whom the *Tractatio* was dedicated and among whose papers the *Trophaea sepulchralia* were rediscovered. No contemporary comment on any of these texts has been discovered to this point.

Balbín expressed his political ideas in many other texts. His political concern was rooted, as Josef Válka pointed out, in his very epistemology and methodology.¹⁵ His approach to the past and present was politically relevant for it was based on a notion of a crucial discontinuity in the Bohemian past in 1620, with the complex political and social upheaval in the wake of the rebellion of the Protestant estates. As a historian, Balbín paid nearly exclusive attention to what he defined as *vetus Bohemia*, ignoring more recent events. This approach implied an explicit disavowal of the state of affairs in his lifetime.¹⁶ Thus, in the *Tractatio* and *Trophaea sepulchralia* Balbín included not only his general idea about the Kingdom of Bohemia, its glorious history and less shining present, but he also included his direct comments on the current administration and the political quarrels within the ruling elite during his lifetime. In both texts, he presented examples of Count Martinitz's incompetence and a rich set of details on his misconduct

¹⁴ Josef Hejnic, ed., *Bohuslav Balbín. Pamětní nápis Bernardu Ignácovi z Martinic* [Bohuslav Balbín: Memorial inscription on Bernhard Ignaz of Martinitz] (Prague: Vyšehrad, 1988).

¹⁵ Josef Válka, "Politický smysl Balbínovy historiografie" [The political significance of Balbín's historiography], *Česká literatura*, 36 (1988), 385–399. This is, in my opinion, the finest analysis of Balbín's historical work. See also idem, "Balbínova 'Politica'" [Balbín's "Politica"], in *Bohuslav Balbín*, 33–39. On Balbín's reception of classical historical literature see Josef Hejnic, "Balbínova cesta za antikou" [Balbín's search for antiquity], *Listy filologické*, 97 (1974): 217–233.

¹⁶ Among many of Balbín's comments on this issue, one of his late remarks is particularly telling: "...ego (...) veterem Bohemiam, non hanc novam, neque hodiernum statum, sed Regnum et rem publicam unius sensus et voluntatis (pene etiam dixissem unius linguae) respexi, quod tempus usque ad Rudolphi II. Regnum a prima Czechorum origine per annos amplius mille protractum est", cited in Bohumil Ryba, *Soupis rukopisů Strahovské knihovny Památníku národního písemnictví v Praze*, [Register of manuscripts at the Strahov library of the Monument of national literature in Prague] vol. IV (Prague: Památník národního písemnictví, 1970), 31. In this respect, Balbín emulated the Protestant exile Pavel Stránský (1583–1657) who published his *Respublica Bojema*, a compendium on the geography, history, law and customs of Bohemia in 1634 omitting any reference to the changes after 1620.

in the administration of the kingdom. This suggests, in fact, that the controversy between the Jesuit scholar and the royal minister resulted not only from a personal animosity but was rather embedded in a broader political and social context. Many of his accusations refer to particular quarrels among the Bohemian estates, and they were without doubt comprehensible for informed contemporaries.¹⁷

Historians, however, have made little effort to examine this political background and the way Balbín represented it.¹⁸ Instead, Balbín's attitudes have been generally adopted by historians. Thus while Balbín has been portrayed as a defender of his fatherland, describing the political and social decline of the kingdom under the rule of the seventeenth-century Habsburgs, Count Martinitz has been regarded with less empathy. We may read that the grand burgrave "had no patriotic affection and even despised his mother tongue".¹⁹ He was considered a "Catholic in whom the last sparks of the Czech national feeling were suppressed by his affection towards the church"²⁰ or displaying "so little of Czech awareness that it is truly difficult to talk about it".²¹

¹⁷ Balbín's representation of the power struggle within the estates is not fully coherent. While his glamorous depiction of the ancient domestic nobility is obvious, Balbín's attitude towards the estates of the kingdom in his lifetime is less clear. The *Tractatio* contains a general critique against the nobility of his time and Balbín presents himself as swimming against the current. By contrast, the *Trophaea sepulchralia* suggest that Martinitz's domestic policy met a resistance among the estates, who were, however, repeatedly betrayed and terrorized by the grand burgrave. It even denounces several collaborators of Martinitz—his brother Maximilian Valentin, who, according to Balbín, used to simulate conflicts with the grand burgrave only to spy out the sentiments of his brother's opponents at the diet, or the archbishop Matouš Ferdinand Sobek of Bilenberk, who, unlike his predecessors, supported the policy of Martinitz. Far from displaying a general critique against the estates, Balbín in the second text rather attempts to match the estates against the grand burgrave.

¹⁸ The analysis has usually ended by a simple enumeration of Balbín's supporters within the nobility, Olga Květoňová-Klímová, "Styky Bohuslava Balbína s českou šlechtou pobělohorskou" [Contacts of Bohuslav Balbín with the nobility of Bohemia in the period after the Battle of White Mountain], *Český časopis historický*, 32 (1926): 497–541.

¹⁹ "...neměl citu vlasteneckého; pohrdal i mateřským jazykem..." Jan Jakubec, *Dějiny literatury české* [History of Czech Literature] vol. I.: Od nejstarších dob do probuzení politického (Prague: Jan Laichter, 1929), 890.

²⁰ "Katolík, v němž oddanost k církvi udusila poslední jiskry češství," Květoňová-Klímová, *Styky*, 511.

²¹ "...českého vědomí tak málo, že je opravdu těžko o něm mluvit..." Jan Muk, *Po stopách národního vědomí české šlechty pobělohorské* [Tracing the Czech national consciousness of the nobility in the post-White Mountain period] (Prague: Politický klub ČSND, 1931), 119.

More recently, a literary historian contended that Martinitz “in his function of the grand burgrave manifested a political incapacity and a fierce wrath against his own nation”.²²

Such judgments are disputable for several reasons. Far from being politically incapable, Count Martinitz was among the most powerful ministers of Leopold I. Known and feared for his belligerent nature, he was acknowledged as politically skillful and highly influential. After he succeeded his father in the office of grand burgrave in 1651, he dominated the public life of Bohemia for more than thirty years, mediating between the court and the estates and presiding over the diet with an iron hand. Though Catholic, his alleged affection towards the church must be revised, for he belonged to those who assisted princely power in limiting the authority of the Catholic church, and for this reason he was almost constantly at odds with the prelates.²³ In general, Martinitz was portrayed as a highly controversial figure by many of his contemporaries. It is, however, far from certain whether he simply displayed hatred towards the *natio bohémica*, whether he struggled to suppress the *lingua bohémica* or whether he infatuatedly patronized foreigners to the disadvantage of natives, as Balbín suggested.

A closer scrutiny of the records reveals a multi-faceted picture. On occasion, we may hear Count Martinitz encouraging an Austrian minister at the Imperial court that he urge his sons to learn the Czech language, not only for pragmatic reasons (administration of their property in Bohemia) but also as a language understandable in Hungary, Poland and even Russia, although Martinitz regarded this familiarity with the “Muscovite barbarians” as somewhat less worthy.²⁴ In 1661, Martinitz explained to another Austrian aristocrat that he could not support the promotion of Michael Oswald Count Thun (1631–1694), a second-generation “Bohemian” (his family was of Tyrolean origin) into the provincial administration as he does not know “our

²² “...ve funkci nejvyššího purkrabího (...) projevoval politickou neschopnost a zavlou zlobu proti vlastnímu národu,” Kopecký, *Literatura*, 59.

²³ Significant evidence has been gathered by Catalano, *Boemia*, passim.

²⁴ “Creda V. E. che è per servizio de’ Signori Conti ch’imparino nella gioventù la lingua Bohema perch’il saperla a chi ha beni in questo Regno porta pure seco questo Vantaggio al manco che nell’economia meno si resta ingannato, et è lingua ch’in Ongheria tutta s’intende ancho nella Polonia, sebbene non ci è gran lode, che ne sia tanto familiare a barbari sino moscoviti,” Martinitz to Ferdinand Bonaventura Count Harrach, Feb. 20, 1683, Österreichisches Staatsarchiv (Vienna), Allgemeines Verwaltungsarchiv, Familienarchiv Harrach (= FA Harrach), carton 283.

Czech language” well enough.²⁵ The Premonstratensian abbot Vincenz Macarius Franck recorded more often the grand burgrave’s complaints about the influence of foreigners in the matters of Bohemia. Thus Martinitz criticized the abbot’s protection of foreigners against the natives²⁶ or he denounced the abbot when he presented at the Bohemian diet the vote in German.²⁷ On another occasion, Martinitz compelled the archbishop (who preferred to confer important ecclesiastic benefices on foreigners as he saw them as more reliable than natives in matters of Catholic Reform) to allow a *Bohemus* to succeed Prague’s suffragan bishop, an ethnic Italian.²⁸

This evidence suggests that Count Martinitz’s attitude towards his mother tongue and fatherland was far more complex than what Balbín presented and what historians later have believed. A closer examination of patriotic language within the Bohemian ruling elite will provide further elucidation and place Balbín’s accounts in perspective.

²⁵ “Io un pezzo fa fui pregato dal Monsig. Arcivescovo di Salisburgo affine aggiustassi che nella prima vancanza [!] fosse promosso il suo Signor Frattello, risposi che esso s’ingegni un poco a sapere la nostra Cechica lingua, perché per altro gli sarà molto difficile a sodisfar ed al publico et alla sua propria coscienza sicche m’imagno facilmente che con questo sarà l’impegno di SMC e questo ci basta...,” Martinitz to Johann Maximilian Count Lamberg, June 15, 1661, Oberösterreichisches Landesarchiv (Linz), Herrschaftsarchiv Steyer, Akten, carton 1228. The word “Cechica” was inserted by Martinitz in addition. Symptomatically, he interceded in the same letter for his own son-in-law Count Wrba to be promoted at occasion, thus using the language issue to assert his own familial interests.

²⁶ “Sumpto prandio accessi Excellentissimum Dominum Burggraffium, qui audito negotio Siloensium retulit, sibi fuisse dictum, quod Siardum reprobaverim eo quod Bohemus,” *Diarium abbatibus Strahoviensis*, Knihovna kláštera premonstrátů na Strahově (Prague), DJ III 1, 114, Dec. 5, 1661; “Eidem Excellentissimo Domino Burggraffio causam Siloensem commendavi, qui ad male narrata informatus, me reprobasse Siloensem professum, eo quod nolim promovere Bohemum, quare iniuria cadat in nationis offensam,” *ibid.*, 140, Jan. 30, 1662.

²⁷ “Dominus Burggraffius ad odium suum prosequendum et manifestandum Domino Praeposito Metropolitano insinuavit, ut sibi unum Bohemum pro Referendario submitteret, esse moris, ut votum in Bohemica lingua proponeretur. Ubi per Camerarium de tabelis invitati, si ad relationem faciendam velimus descendere, annuentibus aliis ipsi responsum dedi, voluisse Dominum Burggraffium, ut aliquis Bohemus descenderet, cum vero nullus sit pro hoc dispositus, velle [?] rescire, utrum velit, ut differeretur, vel ut Germanus germanico idiomate relationem faceret,” *ibid.*, 899, Feb. 10, 1668.

²⁸ “Renunciatum Canonicum Cathedralium Nastopill natione Bohemum Pragensem promovente imprimis Burggraffio Suffraganeum declaratum. Ostendit haec Eminentissimi submissio et resolutio multos, quod nimium Burggraffio deferat, multa ac magna praepiudicia clero et ecclesiastico statui per hoc faciat,” *ibid.*, 449, June 1, 1664.

Defining true patriots: Prelates versus nobles

Bohuslav Balbín himself descended from the lower nobility of Bohemia, a group that was dramatically affected by the social changes of the 1620s. This fact seems to have both fuelled and limited his empathy towards the nobility administering the kingdom in the following decades for this group was largely composed of wealthy magnates (Martinitz for example), a class who sought to distinguish themselves from the lower nobility. Balbín's attitude to the prelates was also complex and at times difficult. Relations of the Bohemian Jesuits (not represented at the diet and closely collaborating with domestic barons) with the episcopate and other prelates entering the clerical estate were, as Alessandro Catalano recently demonstrated, highly competitive and even explosive for the most part of Balbín's life.²⁹ Thus being noble by origin and Jesuit by profession did not necessarily predetermine Balbín to share the values of these respective estates. On the one hand, Balbín assigned an important role to both the nobility and the prelates in his conception of *vetus Bohemia*, which was thus firmly estates-based even when bolstered by ethno-linguistic identification.³⁰ On the other hand, however, Balbín's attitude towards the representatives of the estates in his own time was critical even though prominent magnates commonly sponsored the publication of his writings and some members of the prelates supported his work or—like the canon Tomáš Pešina—belonged among his friends.

A comparison of the state of affairs within the ruling elite of the kingdom in Balbín's lifetime with how he represented it in his polemical writings reveals a substantial divergence, originating probably from both a lack of understanding for the policy of the respective estate and a tendentious misrepresentation of the domestic power struggle. Though Balbín recognized deep frictions within the Bohemian estates, he tended to interpret them as if there was a simple rupture between royal officers representing the *aula*, and patriots representing

²⁹ Catalano, *Boemia*, passim. In earlier studies on the patriotic attitudes of the Bohemian prelates, this crucial moment has been generally ignored. See Anna Skýbová, "Zur Problematik des Patriotismus der böhmischen Kirchenhierarchie am Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts," in Miloš Řezník and Ivana Slezáková, eds., *Nations—Identities—Historical Consciousness. Volume dedicated to Prof. Miroslav Hroch* (Prague: Filozofická fakulta UK, 1997), 203–228.

³⁰ Balbín wrote a number of patriotic genealogies of native noble families as well as a laudatory biography of the first archbishop of Prague.

the *patria*. Significantly, the crucial controversy between the nobility, especially the estate of barons,³¹ and the estate of prelates, that disturbed the inner politics of the kingdom from the 1620s until the end of the century, was successfully obscured by Balbín. He occasionally pointed to certain incidents but he misrepresented them at the same time as if they were only the result of the grand burgrave's hatred towards patriots.³²

The prelates, excluded from the political life of Bohemia during the Hussite wars in the fifteenth century, were installed as a political estate (even the first estate with a right of precedence over the barons) in the 1620s. From that time a deep hostility between the members of the two corporations emerged, fuelled by multiple conflicting claims. The prelates aspired to a large-scale restitution of church property alienated by the nobles from the fifteenth century. Further, they attempted to implement Tridentine reform at the local level—an objective that collided with the rights of patronage (*ius patronatus*) as well as with other powers traditionally exerted by the nobles but perceived as abuses by the prelates. Last but not least, the prelates strove to gain positions in the administration of the kingdom and thus to break the monopoly of the high nobility to govern Bohemia in the name of the king. Alessandro Catalano's revealing study of the Cardinal Ernst Adalbert of Harrach (1598–1667) has recently uncovered how deep and lasting this controversy was. The clash was significantly reinforced by the fact that the newly organized estate of prelates was headed for a long time by ambitious newcomers. Cardinal Harrach was a scion of an Austrian high noble family, and he was largely Italianized. Moreover, he built up a brain trust primarily composed of Italians (the central place belonging to the famous Capuchin Valeriano Magni) and other foreigners who became a target of the domestic nobles' hatred. Besides the episcopate, newcomers found influential positions among the superiors of Bohemian monasteries. The Premonstratensian abbot of the wealthy Strahov-monastery in Prague, Kaspar of Questenberg (1571–1640), is probably the most prominent example of this type of

³¹ The Bohemian nobility consisted of two estates. While the *panský stav/Herrenstand* (estate of barons or lords) embraced the magnates and well-to-do nobles, the *rytířský stav/Ritterstand* (estate of knights) was generally composed of the petty nobility.

³² The very fact that this crucial friction has been overlooked for such a long time reveals the extent to which Balbín's interpretation has influenced modern historians.

prelate embodying foreign origin, clerical ambition and assertiveness against the domestic nobility.³³

Catalano brought to our attention that the high nobility of Bohemia—for decades headed by Jaroslav Count Martinitz (1582–1649), father of Bernhard Ignaz—readily adopted patriotic rhetoric when opposing the pretensions of prelates in the 1630s and 1640s. The reference to the foreign origin of the prelates, their linguistic shortcomings and their ignorance of local laws and habits served to legitimize the noble estates' pretensions to the exclusive rule over the province on behalf of the king. Thus when Martinitz junior admonished Abbot Franck (successor of Questenberg) in 1668 for referring the prelates' vote at the diet in Czech rather than in German, he was echoing a long tradition.³⁴

Symptomatically, newcomer prelates struck back by appropriating the rhetoric of *patria* and turning it against the domestic barons. In 1628 Valeriano Magni referred to the *patria* when he criticized the barons for all the impediments they had laid in the way of Catholic reform and the reconstruction of the episcopate. In the course of negotiations with Grand Burgrave Adam of Waldstein, Magni warned that Archbishop Harrach would be compelled to resign his seat and leave his fatherland (“*prender bando dalla Patria*”) unless the native barons reappraised their attitude towards the claims of the prelates.³⁵ Certainly, this must have been perceived as a truly insolent argument in the eyes of the Bohemian nobility for Harrach was an Austrian and he was promoted to Bohemia only in 1623 with the decisive support of the court. But in the following decades, the deepening rupture between barons and prelates increasingly encouraged the self-perception of the latter as true defenders of the fatherland against the excessive power of local barons.

In 1634, as tensions were escalating, Abbot Questenberg and the Moravian canon Platejs (who belonged to a minority of natives among the influential prelates) composed a 76-page document—later entitled *Defensio Ecclesiasticae Dignitatis*—justifying the claims of prelates to be represented in provincial offices, along with the nobles and actually

³³ Catalano, *Boemia*. On Questenberg Cyrill Ant(onín) Straka, *Albrecht z Valdštejna a jeho doba. Na základě korespondence opata strahovského Kašpara z Questenberka* [Albrecht of Waldstein and his time. On the basis of the correspondence of the abbot of Strahov, Kaspar of Questenberg] (Prague: Rozpravy české akademie, 1911).

³⁴ See above.

³⁵ Catalano, *Bohemia*, 133.

preceding them. By means of arguments drawn partially from world history, but mostly from the Bohemian and Moravian past, they argued for the legitimacy of the participation of clerics in the public sphere. Moreover, they established a close link between the welfare of the “*status ecclesiasticus*” and the welfare of the fatherland (“*patriae emolumentum*”). Anytime prelates were oppressed or put aside in the history of “*Boëmia nostra*”, bad things started to happen: “... *non aliunde hanc nobilissimi regni stragem, ruinam et perniciem profluxisse deprehendemus, quam e status Ecclesiastici oppressione*”. And it was usually nobles (“*proceres*”) who initiated quarrels if not tempered by prelates. Clerics, by contrast to nobles, were portrayed as generally more trustworthy. Their participation in public office was thus necessary for “*pax in Boëmia*” and to prevent “*patriae ruina*”. Certainly with respect to the actual composition of the estate of prelates, the authors argued that even the rule of neighboring and foreign prelates, in cases where the domestic prelates had been expelled, was better than an exclusion of prelates: “*Capisne iam o Boëmia (Morauia), sacerdotum semper tibi profuisse principatum, non domesticorum duntaxat, uerum etiam (quando expulisti tuos) vicinorum et extraneorum!*” And referring to the miserable state of the province they concluded: “*Nunquam, o infelix Patria, talia vidisti, quando sacerdotum utebatur consiliis.*”³⁶

Thus the talk of *patria* was used by both groups in order to de-legitimize the aspirations of the other, the prelates denounced as foreigners and violators of tradition and the barons as collaborators with the court at the expense of the kingdom’s welfare. According to the prelates, the welfare of the fatherland was much better entrusted in their hands regardless their origin and linguistic skills than to the *signori Bohemi* as this group was frequently referred to.

The issue of the Czech language seems to have played a secondary role in this struggle. The prelates of foreign origin usually did not hasten to learn it and the domestic magnates increasingly preferred to use other languages (German and Italian, later French) when communicating

³⁶ For the only copy of this document I have discovered see Národní archiv (Prague), Premonstráti Strahov, book 50, 1–76, here 18, 22, 32, 36, 39, 48, 75f. The text has already been cited in Petr Maťa, “‘O felix Bohemia, quando sacerdotum consiliis regebaris.’ Geschichte als Argument im politischen Denken des höheren Klerus Böhmens und Mährens im 17. und zu Beginn des 18. Jahrhunderts,” in Joachim Bahlcke and Arno Strohmeyer, eds., *Die Konstruktion der Vergangenheit. Geschichtsdenken, Traditionsbildung und Selbstdarstellung im frühneuzeitlichen Ostmitteleuropa*, Beiheft der Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung, 29 (2002), 307–322, here 320ff.

within their group. Though neither the barons, nor the prelates seem to have based their notion of *patria* on the Czech language, the linguistic issue might have become a subsidiary argument. This often happened at the diet where the Czech language continued to play the role of a symbolic code, even when the deliberations increasingly took place in German. In 1668, as mentioned above, Count Martinitz urged a prelate of German origin to cast his vote in Czech, but on another occasion, namely at the diet in 1652, it was the prelates who aspired to be—in the words of the Archbishop Harrach—the guardians of tradition (“*più puntuali osservatori dell’uso*”) with respect to language. After the curia of barons had reported to the prelates its collective vote in German, the prelates gave their answer in Czech, even though there was only one among them who was able to fulfil this task.³⁷

To further understand the *patria*-based self-image of the prelates, Vincenz Macarius Franck (1617–1669), abbot of the Strahov monastery in Prague from 1658, is a good example to explore. In his eloquent Latin diary he carefully kept from 1661 until his death,³⁸ he described the affairs of the Premonstratensian monasteries, the litigations in which he was involved, and his social contacts. Yet the prelate as a regular participant in the diet also displayed a systematic concern about what he commonly termed the *status publicus*, i.e. domestic political affairs.³⁹ The *patria* was often invoked in the diary. Franck frequently

³⁷ The case reported by Catalano, *Bohemia*, 425.

³⁸ *Diarium abbatis Strahoviensis*, see above. The diary has not been examined by historians yet. Beyond writing a personal diary, Abbot Franck significantly encouraged the annalist tradition in his monastery, see Pavel Křivský, “Strahovská analistika v době Balbínově” [The annals of Strahov in Balbín’s time], in *Bohuslav Balbín*, 83–88, here 86. On Franck see Dominik K(arel) Čermák, *Premonstráti v Čechách a na Moravě* [Premonstratensians in Bohemia and Moravia] (Prague: Cyrillo-Methodějská kněhtiskárna, 1877), 85–89.

³⁹ The role of the Bohemian diet deserves a few words for historians have tended to overlook its importance after the enforcement of the authoritarian monarchical system in Bohemia in 1620 and the years following. The Bohemian *sněm/Landtag* was in many respects a “tamed” institution when compared with the political practice of the sixteenth century. Most of the estates’ political prerogatives were annulled by the Crown, but the estates continued to exercise a great deal of administrative power given both their right to approve and administer taxes and their position as landlords. In this sense, Bohemia remained a consultative monarchy well into the eighteenth century. The time-consuming negotiation between the estates and the Crown at the diet was an integral part of the state functioning, and the diet was still an important point of contact for those of the estates who were involved in the administration of the kingdom. As such, it witnessed several lasting contradictions within the Bohemian ruling elite. See Petr Maťa, “Český zemský sněm v pobělohorské době (1620–1740). Relikt stavovského státu nebo nástroj absolutistické vlády?” [The diet of Bohemia in the post-White Mountain period (1620–1740).

complained about contemporaries who betray the fatherland⁴⁰ and, as in Balbín's writings, criticism was targeted at Grand Burgrave Martinitz and the Imperial court which, persuaded by the grand burgrave, "thirsted for the blood of poor subjects".⁴¹ Franck shared with Balbín the radically critical view of Martinitz as a promoter of a short-sighted fiscal policy in Bohemia. In the course of the 1660s, Franck even became one of the most passionate opponents of Martinitz at the diet. On the whole, his accounts of the *exactiones* and the *oppressio regni* due to the bad government of the grand burgrave closely resembled the critique of Balbín. Much like the latter's *Tractatio* and *Trophaea sepulchralia*, the abbot's diary can be read as an enumeration of multiple abuses of the burgrave's authority at the expense of the writer himself, the clerical estate and the Kingdom of Bohemia—Franck's fatherland.⁴²

Despite these similarities, no closer relationship between Franck and Balbín developed⁴³ and a careful look at their texts reveals that

A survival of the estatist state or an instrument of absolutist rule?], in Marian J. Ptak, ed., *Sejm czeski od czasów najdawniejszych do 1913 roku* [The Bohemian diet from the oldest times to 1913] (Opole: Uniwersytet Opolski, 2000), 49–67; Id., "Landstände und Landtage in den böhmischen und österreichischen Ländern (1620–1740). Von der Niedergangsgeschichte zur Interaktionsanalyse," in Petr Maťa, Thomas Winkelbauer, eds., *Die Habsburgermonarchie 1620 bis 1740. Leistungen und Grenzen des Absolutismusparadigmas* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2006), 345–400.

⁴⁰ See for instance: "Post prandium invisi Supremum Regni Praefectum, ubi diversa intellexi de statu publico et dolosas aliquorum machinationes, qui patriam produunt et proditorie evertunt," *Diarium abbatis Strahoviensis*, 499, Dec. 5, 1664; "Nonnemo Vienna mihi scripsit, vulgari ibidem, status seculares per Burggraffium esse territios, ecclesiasticorum conatus per Archiepiscopum, & sic patriam praedam dari, & relinqui," *ibid.*, 1050, March 19, 1669.

⁴¹ "Conclamata omnium querimonia, Burggraffium potenter regnum opprimere (...) quibus machinationibus et dolosis persuasionibus Caesarem lucratur & totam dementat aulam, quae alias exactionibus inhiat, & insatiabilis quoad sanguinem pauperum," *ibid.*, 653, Feb. 26, 1666.

⁴² See for instance: "Excellentissimus Regni Burggraffius Comes Bernhardus a Martinicz Viennam discessit, non pro patriae sublevatione, sed maiori oppressione, ad bonum publicum praegravandum, nullatenus sublevandum, & cum posset multa praeclara praestare, maluit, se et conatus suos perpetuo odio & execratione involvere," *ibid.*, 634, Jan. 1, 1666; "De Burggraffio mentio facta, quod expectet in se complendum *Ponam inimicos tuos scabellum pedum tuorum*, sic hostis patriae huius defensores inimicos suos reputat et ut tales prosequitur," *ibid.*, 636, Jan. 8, 1666; "Renunciatum mihi fuit, Excellentissimum D. Burggraffium triduanam suam devotionem de B. Virgine Dolorosa instituisse in gratiarum actionem, quod contra hostes suos in comitiis praevaluerit, hoc est, quod oppressionem regni et liberum possit imperium exercere contra omnes, quos oderit, & sic regni oppressionem in gloriam victoriae trahit," *ibid.*, 1060, Apr. 16., 1669.

⁴³ There is only one general remark on Father Balbín in Franck's diary, which in itself is evidence of the distance between them: "Inquisivi de vetustis documentis & et

even their perceptions of the ethnicity and language issue substantially diverged. Franck himself was a German born in Potsdam, son of a Lutheran pastor. He came to Bohemia only in 1636 and converted there to the Roman faith.⁴⁴ Rather than being the kind of model patriot Balbín depicted in his writings, he epitomized the abhorrent figure of a newcomer German, exploiting the hospitality of his new fatherland and refusing to assume its language and habits⁴⁵—exactly the type of figure Balbín so passionately criticized in his *Brevis sed accurata tractatio*.

Unlike Balbín, Franck did not link the oppression of the fatherland to the suppression of its language or the immigration of foreigners. Instead, he followed the tradition established by newcomer prelates who tended to regard the miserable state of affairs in Bohemia as caused by the hostility of secular authorities towards the clerical estate. Rather than *gens*, *natio* and *lingua*, as with Balbín, it was *status ecclesiasticus* that Abbot Franck identified with and as member of which he perceived himself being oppressed.⁴⁶ In June 1662, Franck noted that Archbishop Harrach had been reproached at the court for

inaudivi, Balbinum Iesuitam magnam rerum antiquarum copiam eruisse,” *ibid.*, 362, Oct. 5, 1663.

⁴⁴ “...natus sum Potstami in Marchia Anno 1617...,” *ibid.*, 909, March 6, 1668; “Dies hic est anniversarius, quo Anno 1636 Pragam veni ex patria et postmodum in festo S. Bartholomaei pleno ad fidem Catholicam conversus...,” *ibid.*, 71, July 20, 1661. Note the different usage of the term *patria* in this context, denoting the “home-land,” the place where Franck was born and brought up.

⁴⁵ Frequently, the abbot resolutely refused to accept a letter written in Czech and not in German: “Tabulae regiae communicarunt querelam Aulae-regiensis in Bohemico, quam submisi D. Zobell, [ut] conficeret protestationem, me in ignoto idiomate non posse causam suscipere litigatoriam,” *ibid.*, 141, Feb. 1, 1662; “Memoriale Milovicenses in causa sua Bohemicum obtulerunt, quod eisdem sine resolutione restitui, eo quod Bohemicum,” *ibid.*, 254, Dec. 13, 1662; “Ex Appellationis collegio scriptura praesentata fuit Bohemica, quam illico restitui excusans, me Bohemice non intelligere,” *ibid.*, 946, June 18, 1668. In September 1666, he rejected the nomination into the cadaster survey commission since “ich der böhmischen sprach unerfahren”, Národní archiv (Prague), Stará manipulace, sign. 15/4, carton 2037, undated deprecation (delivered to the vicegerency on Sept. 18, 1666).

⁴⁶ See for instance the abbot’s reaction against a decision of the vicegerency: “... respondi, [ut] mitius mecum agerent & me paratum esse ad insinuandam aulae, quod tam despotice tractarent statum ecclesiasticum,” *ibid.*, 33, March 28, 1661; “...invisi (...) Priorem Melitensium, ubi intellexi, quam dolose contra statum ecclesiasticum multi machinentur ad suppressionem ipsius...,” *ibid.*, 294, March 16, 1663; “Ad consessum comitalem ecclesiasticorum accessi, ubi variae quaerelae contra D. Burggraffium, qualiter nos ecclesiasticos traducat Viennae, per nos comitia protrahi, Suae Majestatis interesse impediri,” *ibid.*, 1037, Feb. 22, 1669. These examples might be easily multiplied.

“speaking together with the estate of prelates for the welfare of the fatherland”.⁴⁷ The prelates were, at least in his eyes, those who cared for the *patria* and thus the welfare of the prelates coincided with the welfare of the fatherland. One year later, he sympathetically noted a claim of the Moravian Jesuits that “*non superesse spem restituendae salutis publicae, nisi de statu ecclesiastico reassumerentur ad consilia et officia aulae. Tamdiu domum Austriacam floruisse, quamdiu hi consiliis interfuerint, illis eliminatis fortunam emigrasse*”.⁴⁸ These were much the same arguments Questenberg (Franck’s predecessor) articulated in 1634.⁴⁹

Yet Franck’s identification with the Bohemian *patria* was complicated, for he was a foreigner by origin. Despite his identification with the kingdom as a polity, for whose welfare he proclaimed he was ready to resign the abbey and leave the order,⁵⁰ he never depicted himself as a *Bohemus* in his diary. Any time he mentioned *Bohemi* in his diary, he portrayed them as the ethnic other (i.e. Czechs).⁵¹ Moreover, his attitude towards the *Bohemi* remained rather ambivalent. On one hand, he was affected by the negative image that *Bohemi* continued to have at the court as a result of the 1618 rebellion, and he readily recorded the gossip of his time.⁵² Thus he characterized the *Bohemi*

⁴⁷ “Eminentissimus in aula fuisse traductum, quod pro patriae bono cum statu ecclesiastico fuerit locutus,” *ibid.*, 183, June 2, 1662.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, June 21, 1663.

⁴⁹ A recognition of Franck’s patriotic attitude among the prelates is witnessed by an epitaph (“*Vincentio Macario Abbati Strahoviensi, de Religione, de Patria hac, et de sacro suo ordine optime merito*”) written by Bishop Schleinitz soon after Franck’s death. Here Franck’s “*Patriae mens Populoque studens*” was praised and sorrow of the “*Czechica tellus*” expressed, see *Knihovna kláštera premonstrátů na Strahově* (Prague), DH I 22, 269.

⁵⁰ “*Nonnemo suadere voluit, ut et me accommodarem, constanter reposui, me nihil habere nec movere contra Burggraffium, loqui pro regni incolumitate & conservatione, pro cuius libertate stando paratus sim non solum abbatiam, sed si opus sit habitum relinquere & cum gaudio recedere,*” *Diarium abbatis Strahoviensis*, 649, Feb. 14, 1666.

⁵¹ The term *Bohemi* and its equivalents in other languages could have two meanings. On one hand, it might have implied ethno-linguistic identification and thus point to what would today be called Czech. On the other hand, the term could be applied to the inhabitants of the Kingdom of Bohemia regardless their language and ethnicity. In order to distinguish both meanings, the adjective *czechicus* began to appear from the seventeenth century in Latin texts, albeit only occasionally.

⁵² See for instance: “*Adii eodem Dominum Priorem Melitensium, qui pluribus pudendam traditionem Neo-Castelli exposuit, clandestinam subesse conspirationem Ungarorum, qui malunt Turcis subesse quam Austriacis more Bohemorum subiacere,*” *Diarium abbatis Strahoviensis*, 362, Oct. 5, 1663.

as a target of mockery at the court because of their willingness to pay taxes.⁵³ Another time he recorded an influential aulic minister's satiric comment on the *gens Bohemorum*⁵⁴ and a secret strategy of the dynasty (*arcantum Austriacum*) to dominate the Bohemians.⁵⁵ Thus Franck was fully aware of the consequences of the negative image of the *Bohemi* in relation to increasing fiscal pressure and the oppression of the kingdom.⁵⁶ When he recorded in 1665 that the promotion of Wenzel Eusebius Prince of Lobkowitz, a Bohemian by origin, to an influential aulic office raised "new hopes for the reinforcement of the fatherland" among the *Bohemi*, he displayed a certain sense of solidarity with them.⁵⁷

On the other hand, Franck paid significant attention to the attitudes of the *Bohemi* towards foreigners. Thus he recorded in 1668 what Count Losy, a second generation newcomer, related to him about the displeasure aroused in the Bohemians by the great number of Germans and foreigners in Bohemia: Grand Chancellor Vilém Count Slavata (1572–1652) had purportedly invoked St. Wenceslas to exhume the bones of foreigners from graves and to scatter them, if contemporaries were not able to prevent further settlement of the newcomers in

⁵³ "...audivi lamentationes de oppressione miserorum subditorum, negotium statuum de modo contribuendi cessisse in risum aulicorum, Bohemos non sollicitos [?] de quanto contributionis sed de modo contribuendi," *ibid.*, March 6, 1663; "Post prandium Illustrissimus de Halbweil invisit et sub fiducia singulari miserrimum aulae statum exposuit, derideri Bohemos quod ultra vires cum iactura regni in postulas exactiones gravissimas consentiant," *ibid.*, 311, May 7, 1663.

⁵⁴ "Hostem gentis Bohemorum infensissimum esse Principem Portiam, qui vocet Bohemos canes & debere primo recte tangi," *ibid.*, 183, June 2, 1662.

⁵⁵ "Meminit quidam & pro arcanto Austriaco vulgavit opprimere [?] Bohemos ut praecisis alis consurgere aut respirare nequeant," *ibid.*, 292, March 8, 1663.

⁵⁶ On the odium of "rebels" and on the theory of collective blame applied to Bohemia after 1620 see Milan Šmerda, "České země a uherská stavovská povstání. K otázce 'kolektivní viny' a 'kolektivní odpovědnosti' v myšlení feudální společnosti" [The Bohemian lands and the revolts of the Hungarian estates. On "collective blame" and "collective responsibility" in feudal social thought], *Slovanský přehled* 71 (1985): 462–474; Jiří Mikulec, "Das Odium des Verrats und der Mythos der Loyalität. Die Böhmen in der Habsburgermonarchie in der ersten Hälfte des 18. Jahrhunderts," in Walter Leitsch and Stanisław Trawkowski, eds., *Polen und Österreich im 18. Jahrhundert* (Warsaw: Semper, 2000), 7–17.

⁵⁷ "Fama divulgata, Principem de Lobcowicz Supremum Praefectum Caesaris fuisse constitutum, unde Bohemis nova spes pro patriae incremento affulgere caepit," *Diarium abbatis Strahoviensis*, 525, Feb. 27, 1665. See Franck's account on the sudden death of the young archbishop Kolovrat: "In viro hoc multum habet Bohemia quod lugeat, perdidit patriotam, & pastorem zelosum, caetera cogitare, non autem exuerere licet," *ibid.*, 941, June 4, 1668.

the kingdom. Emperor Leopold I, on the other hand, revealed to Losy a secret strategy of the dynasty consisting in the continuous support of Germans and foreigners.⁵⁸ Moreover, many passages in the diary clearly identify *Bohemi* as “the other”. The diary contains numerous grievances against the *Bohemi* who detested Franck and other *Germani*. It was against Franck himself that Count Martinitz raised the complaint in 1668, urging the prelates to delegate another person who could present the vote in Czech, but finally the abbot, though *Germanus*, had to be accepted.⁵⁹ Franck realized that he was perceived as a foreigner (*externus*) and consequently calumniated by “malicious Bohemians”⁶⁰ and discriminated in his litigations by domestic judges because his clerical career was perceived as prejudicial to *patriotae*.⁶¹ To sum up, in the Kingdom of Bohemia, his *patria*, Franck perceived himself to be oppressed by both the court councillors and by the indigenuous *Bohemi*. It was in the person of Grand Burgrave Martinitz that both enmities coalesced.

The diary of Abbot Franck mirrors competing notions of *patria* and patriots, as they emerged from the discord between the high nobility and the prelates which began in the 1620s. It reveals that patriotic reasoning played a significant role in the self-perception of seventeenth-century Bohemian prelates. Indeed, the use of patriotic language by prelates and its employment against indigenous nobles in order to challenge their self-image as true patriots, to unmask their collaboration with the court and to de-legitimize their ambition to govern Bohemia might have been an important source of Balbín’s ideas. Thus Balbín’s belonging to the clergy and his friendly contacts with several

⁵⁸ “Eadem occasione conveni Illustrissimum Comitem a Losenthall, cum quo diversa de statu publico contuli, et inter alia occurrit, quam aegre ferant Bohemi, Germanos et externos in Regno admitti, adeo quod antiquus Comes Slawata, vir alias pientissimus, in haec eruperit lamenta, S. Wenceslaum aliquando gladio suo ossa exterorum effossurum & proiecturum de sepulchris, si vivos impedire non potuerit. Econtra Leopoldum Imperatorem sibi concedidisse, in secretis testamento a parente relictis pro arcano domus insertum, ut Germanos & externos semper foveat & protegat,” *ibid.*, 905, Feb. 26, 1668. Count Losy’s father, an Italian by origin, was a tax farmer and an influential social climber in Bohemia in the course of the Thirty Years’ War.

⁵⁹ See above.

⁶⁰ “In via plurima intellexi de malignantium Bohemorum conatibus contra me, qualiter actiones meas, & maxime Dominicus, traducant et calumniantur,” *ibid.*, 538, Apr. 19, 1665.

⁶¹ “Bonus quidam amicus renunciavit, Bohemos ex appellationis consilio repugnare et contrariari, eo quod sim externus et patriotis per abbatialem dignitatem bolus panis praeripiatur,” *ibid.*, 460, July 10, 1664.

prelates are by no means unimportant with respect to his critique of the domestic nobility as insufficiently patriotic. On the other hand, Balbín's notion of *patria* diverged in many respects from how it was represented in Franck's diary. Clearly, Balbín's simplistic identification of *gens*, *natio*, *lingua* and *patria* did not correspond with the complicated reality of the seventeenth century. It was hardly congenial for the prelates—Germans and newcomers for the greater part—who perceived themselves as being oppressed by the Bohemian nobility. It appears that the rhetoric of *patria* might have been used to legitimize very different claims. We may develop this argument by means of the following case.

*Governing the patria between the king and the estates:
Count Martinitz versus Count Kinsky*

Besides the rivalry between barons and prelates, historians have overlooked another important dispute within the ruling elite of Bohemia, though it was even more closely linked to the case of Father Balbín. In the course of the 1660s, Franz Ulrich Kinsky (1634–1699) became the principal rival of Count Martinitz in domestic politics. Kinsky descended from the old Bohemian nobility and belonged to the same social strata as Martinitz. Being a nephew of the influential Johann Ferdinand of Portia (1605–1665), the *Obersthofmeister* of Leopold I and the leading personality in the Emperor's entourage, Kinsky was among the great luminaries of the Imperial court in the first decade of Leopold's reign. The tension between him and Martinitz arose as late as in 1665, when Kinsky, by then a member of the *Reichshofrat* engaged in diplomatic missions to Poland, was appointed to the Bohemian Chancery in Vienna and began to criticize the fiscal policy of the grand burgrave. The animosity deepened after Portia's death, when Kinsky as the consequence of a court intrigue was installed as president of the *Appellationsgericht* in Prague in 1667, thus being moved away from the court against his will. In February 1668, open hostility broke out between the two royal officers as they entered upon a scandalous quarrel at the diet and refused to collaborate with each other. Subsequently, both struggled to gain protection at the court and submitted apologetic letters. Even after a formal reconciliation was arranged several months later, the antagonism did not disappear between the two ministers who were entering the vicegerency in Prague. Thus it is not

surprising to find that it was Count Kinsky who extended support and patronage to Bohuslav Balbín after Martinitz had attacked the Jesuit scholar in 1670. In fact, Kinsky became Balbín's most active protector, and it is far from certain whether the Jesuit would have won his struggle against the hostile censors had he not been backed by him.⁶²

Thus the case of Count Kinsky and that of Father Balbín became closely connected. Yet the struggle between Martinitz and Kinsky was politically much more relevant. Unlike the Jesuit Balbín, who was very much a harmless scholar, Kinsky as a royal minister, well positioned within social networks and a confidant of Leopold I, was a dangerous rival for the grand burgrave. The conflict also did not remain solely within the border of Bohemia. Both Martinitz and Kinsky repeatedly appealed to the Emperor, and their quarrel helped polarize the ministers at the court. Martinitz won the support of Leopold I's *Obersthofmeister* Wenzel Eusebius Prince Lobkowitz (1609–1677) who was himself frequently at odds with Kinsky, while Kinsky was effectively shadowed by Lobkowitz' rival, *Oberstkämmerer* Johann Maximilian Count Lamberg (1608–1682). Both were powerful personalities from the highest echelon of the court.⁶³ The defeat of one or another group might have easily resulted in a reconfiguration of patronage networks both at the court and in the province. No wonder to learn that it was Count Lamberg who helped push through Balbín's *Epitome* past the censors. Nor was it a coincidence that at this time Balbín wrote a short historical account of the house of Lamberg (a purely Austrian family) providing it with a prominent place within the medieval nobility of Bohemia.⁶⁴

⁶² On Kinsky's patronage of Balbín, Květoňová-Klímová, *Styky*, 511–521. On Kinsky's career Petr Maťa, *Svět české aristokracie (1500–1700)* [The world of the aristocracy of Bohemia] (Prague: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny, 2004), 360f., 422f., 432; Aleš Valenta, *Dějiny rodu Kinských* [The history of the Kinsky family] (České Budějovice: Veduta, 2004), 62–72. Balbín was one of Kinsky's teachers as he studied at the Jesuit college in Prague, but it is not clear enough whether their relationship was particularly close before 1670.

⁶³ Lamberg's daughter married Prince Portia's son in 1661. Thus he was closely related to Kinsky. Martinitz was distantly related to Lamberg too but the confidential correspondence between both ministers (see ft. 25) seems to have ended abruptly in 1661.

⁶⁴ Oberösterreichisches Landesarchiv (Linz), Herrschaftsarchiv Steyer, Akten, carton 1238. In this (hitherto unnoticed) account sent to Lamberg on Dec. 20, 1670, at the very beginning of his controversy with Martinitz, Balbín traced the question, whether "prosapia dicta a Lamberg (...) in Bohemia habitavit aliquando, et an in Bohemia nobilitate sit censa". Having established a connection between the Austrian Lambergs

If we look into papers Martinitz and Kinsky produced in the course of their dispute,⁶⁵ we find the term “fatherland” employed on both sides. Neither for Martinitz, nor for Kinsky however, was *patria* the key term they used to define themselves. Both ministers relied primarily on the language of merits and service to the king. In doing so, they both emphasized their individual career whereas fatherland was mostly invoked—besides the prince—as the goal towards which service should be performed.⁶⁶ In general, this rhetorical usage of the term “fatherland” appears to have been broadly shared within the noble society of the Habsburg monarchy. Moreover, it was commonly invoked by the Bohemian Court Chancery as well, usually linking prince, fatherland and *bonum commune* together without specifying which body politic (whether the Kingdom of Bohemia or all Habsburg possessions) was meant.⁶⁷ It was a usage that emphasized the duties

and an extinct Bohemian noble family of similar name, he concluded: “Lambergios in Regno Bohemiae pro extraneis haberi non posse” because “Lambergios (hoc nomine) non modo in Nobilitate nostra, sed etiam inter maximos Regni Procures sedisse, imo adeo ductasse Exercitus, quod dubio procul nulli, nisi homino patrio (...) datum fuisset”. Contrary to the keen critique of the great influx of foreigners to Bohemia reflected in his other texts, Balbín proclaimed here sympathies for the immigration of the foreign nobility: “Nihil Majores nostri optabant magis, quam ut sibi quam plurimos ex Styria, Austria, Carinthia etc. atque etiam ex Ungaria adjungerent, ut exempla nos docent. Ita Serinius, Stubenbergios, Ungnadios seu Weissenvolffios, Hoffmannos, Hardekios, Turnios, Windissgratzios, de Arcu, Botianos, Salmianos, Banffios, Starembergios, Althamios, Rogendorffios, Harrachios, Towarios, de Eitzing, Sswendios, Trautsonios, Hoiios, Sebottendorffios, Poppios, innumerosque alios in Nobilitate Bohemica numerabant.” Balbín retraced his argument on the alleged Bohemian ancestry of Lambergs in the dedication of his *Epitome* to Lamberg in 1677. According to him the family was banished from Bohemia in the middle of the thirteenth century. On Lamberg’s support towards Balbín see Květoňová-Klímová, *Styky*, 514–521.

⁶⁵ There is a rich evidence about the quarrel in various archives, though the greatest number can be found in the papers of Wenzel Eusebius Prince Lobkowitz and Count Czernin as well as in Kinsky’s private diary (see below). There is however no study to date on the dispute.

⁶⁶ “...in dießer Euer Kay. unndt Könnig. Mt. dienst unndt deß vatterlandts wolfahrt,” Kinsky’s memorial from February 1668 (without name and date), Státní oblastní archiv v Třeboni, pracoviště Jindřichův Hradec, Rodinný archiv Černínů (= RA Černín), carton 183; “ex zelo erga bonum publicum Suae Maiestatis et Patriae incolumitatem,” *Consilium Theopoliticum* written by Martinitz against Kinsky 1668 (without date), Státní oblastní archiv v Litoměřicích, pracoviště Žitenice, Lobkovicové roduičtí—rodinný archiv (= LRRRA), Q 16/28, f. 164–169.

⁶⁷ Thus the Emperor officially thanked the diet commissioner Czernin for his acting at the diet 1668 “k prospěchu a fedrunku obecného dobrého, milé vlasti, neměně i milostivému zalíbení našemu,” Aug. 8, 1668, RA Černín (see ft. 66), carton 185. Only in the course of the first half of the eighteenth century did the term *Staat* begin to enter royal rescripts. Unfortunately, the governmental usage of the terms *patria* or *Vaterland* for the legitimization of royal goals has never been examined.

towards a polity without defining its specifics. Leopold I himself used this kind of patriotic reasoning in his famous autographic letters and *Handschriften*.⁶⁸ Thus in a letter to the royal commissioner to the Bohemian diet written in 1672, Leopold expressed his hope that not only the leading figures in each estate, but even “*ogni altro buon et prudente patriota, che ben facilmente può cognoscere per il publico et per il privato l’urgentissimo bisogno del presente stato*” will consent to the king’s financial demands.⁶⁹ In 1692, the emperor asked an Austrian aristocrat to support his financial claims at the diet arguing that “*ein jeder treüer Patriot zu allgemeiner undt seiner aignen conservation sein eüßeristes beyzutragen von selbst schuldig ist...*”⁷⁰

On the other hand, we find *patria* employed by both opponents, Kinsky and Martinitz, in more specific meanings as well. In Kinsky’s private diary (1663–1671), patriotic vocabulary was occasionally employed when he criticized the government in Bohemia and opposed the politics of the grand burgrave. Thus he denounced Martinitz in 1665 by means of a memorial, claiming that the grand burgrave “deceives the court’s ministers and oppresses the kingdom”.⁷¹ Similarly, he complained in 1669 of having been delegated, together with two other opponents of the grand burgrave, to the diet in the role of commissioner, so that they were kept away from deliberations and hampered in promoting the interests of the king, the fatherland and their own.⁷²

⁶⁸ On Leopold I’s autographic correspondence (written “privately”, outside the chanceries) see Petr Maťa and Stefan Siennell, “Die Privatkorrespondenzen Kaiser Leopolds I.,” in Josef Pauser, Martin Scheutz and Thomas Winkelbauer, eds., *Quellenkunde der Habsburgermonarchie (16.–18. Jahrhundert). Ein exemplarisches Handbuch*, in MIOG Ergänzungsband 44, (Vienna-Munich: Oldenbourg, 2004), 838–848. *Handschriften* or *Handbriefl* were less formal letters written by an amanuensis and subscribed by the Emperor who sometimes appended an autographic postscript. They were used as special appeals on specific occasions (for instance during the diets or if a loan was requested).

⁶⁹ Leopold I to Czernin, Oct. 30, 1672, RA Černín (see ft. 66), carton 248.

⁷⁰ Leopold I. to Franz Josef Count Lamberg, Jan. 2, 1692, Oberösterreichisches Landesarchiv (Linz), Herrschaftsarchiv Steyer, Akten, carton 2.

⁷¹ “... ipsum aulae ministros fallere et regnum opprimere...,” Kinsky’s diary, Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv, Handschriften, B 220, 109.

⁷² “Comes Slabatha Imus, ego 2dus, Scheidleren 3us Commissarius ad Comitia hoc anno in Patria Regno Bohemiae habita creati et facti fuimus, non alio quam Burgraviae gratificationis fine, et ut Regi, Patriae et nobis deesse cogemur,” *ibid.*, 112. Royal commissioners normally did not take part in the diet deliberations.

By contrast, Martinitz talked about the fatherland mostly with respect to the “laws of the fatherland” (*leges patriae*).⁷³ By doing so, he pointed to the *Verneuerte Landesordnung*, the famous constitution that was imposed on Bohemia by Ferdinand II in 1627 after the defeat of the Protestant estates in order to guarantee the hereditary succession and to circumscribe and set narrow limits to the rights of the estates. The language Martinitz used in order to disqualify his opponents is very much a language of loyalty towards the ruler, elaborated with the help of the classical Aristotelian forms of government (monarchy being preferable against its variants). Thus he depicted the *patria* as a monarchy run by law, defined himself as the guardian of the monarchical order in Bohemia, and interpreted any challenge against him as an affront to majesty and as a subversion of the monarchical state. He denounced Count Kinsky, for instance, as if the latter aimed to transform the political structure of the monarchy⁷⁴ or he sarcastically referred to Kinsky as a “*tribunus plebis*”.⁷⁵

Although the political thought of Count Martinitz has yet to be examined, sporadic comments in his correspondence and memorials suggest that he may well have sought to legitimize an authoritative government in Bohemia in collaboration with Melchior Goldast, who saw the *natio bohémica* as rebellious by nature, and thus requiring a strong government.⁷⁶ This would also explain the grand burgrave’s attack upon Father Balbín, who passionately refuted Goldast in his

⁷³ “...non esserne riuscita al Chinski la sua attentata oppositione (...) contra il giuramento sopra le leggi Patriae...,” Martinitz to Humprecht Johann Czernin, Feb. 24, 1668, RA Černín (see ft. 66), carton 183; Martinitz denounced Kinsky as not observing the *leges patriae* on other occasions as well, thus in 1674: “...non frequenta la Cancelleria, con che dichiara publica la competenzaa contro l’ordine prescritto nelle legi patrie,” Martinitz to Ferdinand Bonaventura Harrach, Jan. 6, 1674, FA Harrach (see ft. 24), carton 283. In 1684, it were prelates who did not observe *leges patriae*, Martinitz to Harrach, Sept. 30, 1684 (“...domandargli si dichiarino se vogliono tenerla coll’uso antico e delle leggi patriae et dipender da SMCR nelle contributioni secondo le leggi Patrie”), *ibid.*

⁷⁴ Quoted by Petr Maťa, “Monarchia / Monarchy / da einer allein herrschet.: The Making of State Power and Reflection on the State in Bohemia and Moravia between the Estates’ Rebellion and Enlightenment Reforms,” in Halina Manikowska and Jaroslav Pánek, eds., *Political Culture in Central Europe (10th–20th Century)* (Prague: Historický ústav AV ČR, 2005), 349–367, here 349–367.

⁷⁵ Martinitz to Czernin, Feb. 18, 1668, RA Černín (see ft. 66), carton 183.

⁷⁶ Goldast developed this argument in the second book of his *De Bohemiae Regni Commentarii*, 105–258. The argument was based on his interpretation of the Kingdom of Bohemia not as an independent polity defending its autonomy from the Holy Roman Empire, but as a rebellious member of the Empire that had to be subjugated.

Epitome and many later writings. Martinitz' critical comments on the *Epitome* (in the literature on Balbín hitherto neglected)⁷⁷ reveal that the issue of Goldast's credibility played a significant role in the dispute. Martinitz interpreted Balbín's frequent attacks on Goldast as potentially subversive, especially with regard to the hereditary succession of Habsburgs in Bohemia: "*Nam si totus Goldasti liber scateret mendaciis, mendacium etiam foret haereditaria successio Austriacae Domus in Regno Bohemiae, quam sane solidissime, etsi haereticus, demonstrat Goldastus...*"⁷⁸

Be it as it may, Martinitz declared in his memorials against Count Kinsky in 1668 that "*Regnum Bohemiae semper fuit novitatibus obnoxium*" and he defended a strong government that alone would prevent any "*violatio legis*". He even drew parallels between Bohemia and the troublesome provinces of other composite monarchies such as Portugal and Naples, equating Kinsky with Bragança and Masaniello. These were rather fantastic claims, for such separatist notions were certainly not widespread in Bohemia any longer, but they could certainly discredit his rival.⁷⁹ Likewise, Martinitz pointed several times to Kinsky's relatives who had taken part in the rebellion of the Protestant estates and in Wallenstein's conspiracy some decades earlier and who had given "*non levem (...) impulsus ruinae propriae patriae*".⁸⁰

Thus the reference to *patria* by means of *leges patriae* was employed not to de-legitimize the authorities or to defend the privileges of the province, but to sustain the monarchical order of the polity. Martinitz,

⁷⁷ Anonymous and undated comments entitled laconically "Notae" were transcribed by Balbín in 1675 "ex ipso autographo D[omini] B[urgrav]ii" (according to his concluding remark), *Knihovna kláštera premonstrátů na Strahově* (Prague), DH I 23, 494–506. Martinitz' authorship is beyond doubt as he mentions his brother, provost of the Vyšehrad-chapter, at one place in the text.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 504.

⁷⁹ See a short Latin dialogue containing six objections against the grand burgrave (with regard to his quarrel with Kinsky) and refuted by him, *LRRRA*, Q 16/28, f. 150–154.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.* Similarly: "...nissuno meno ch'il C. Chinski haveva da muover questo; la razza pero et la natura difficilmente si cuopre, perché et nella prima rebellione uno di quella casa gettò al mio Padre, et nella Fridlandica fu amazzato col Terschka et altri..." Martinitz to Humprecht Johann Count Czernin, Feb. 11, 1668, RA Černín (see ft. 66), carton 183; "V. E. la prego non si scandalizi, che l'ho scritto dell'Avo del Chinski, bandito dal Regno, dell'altro che buttò dalle finestre al mio Padre, et del terzo che col Fridlando cercò disradicare quest'Augustissima Linea (...), il quarto viddi portar prigionie a Ratisbona preso col Schlang un Kinski, che servì contro la propria persona Augustissima del S. Padre del nostro Clementissimo Padrone," Feb. 24, 1668, *ibid.*

repeatedly reprovved for an unpatriotic administration and misrule of Bohemia, employed the term *patria* against his critics. His usage of *patria* aimed at de-legitimizing the emerging opposition against his style of government and at portraying his opponents as violators of the laws of the fatherland. At the same time, Martinitz emphatically declared himself to be ready to “leave this fatherland” and to serve the emperor in another capacity rather than to collaborate with Kinsky and “to watch arise from Kinsky’s seed a fruit pernicious for the lord and the fatherland.”⁸¹ Under such circumstances, he unambiguously preferred to “*obedire in aula quam dirigere in patria*”.⁸²

Yet the position of Martinitz as the middle-figure between the court and the province was a complex one, and it allowed different roles to be performed in different situations. We saw already that he skillfully employed patriotic rhetoric against the newcomer prelates. This can be further illustrated by a situation when he addressed himself as a *patriota* referring unambiguously to the welfare of the kingdom on one occasion. In 1684 he reported from the diet to the court that he had to play the role of patriot for a while in order to prevent the overburdening of tax-payers.⁸³ This understanding of a patriot as a situational role of a royal officer that could be played in the course of a negotiation rather than as a principal position, amply demonstrates the general dilemma of many of the seventeenth-century Bohemian magnates.

Moreover, Count Kinsky had to solve much the same dilemma as Martinitz. Although the coalition between him and Balbín against Martinitz rested partially on a similar conceptual basis (the grand

⁸¹ “Jo son risolutissimo o di ceder da questa Patria in servizio di SMC...”; “Jo perciò non voglio assolutamente restar a veder crescer da semi Kinskiani un frutto sì pernicioso al Padrone et alla Patria, voglio naturalmente uscire per la porta della Cancelleria et non per la finestra...” [= allusion to the defenestration of Catholic ministers in 1618 when Martinitz’ father was thrown out of the window together with two other colleagues], Martinitz to Humprecht Johann Czernin, Feb. 29, 1668, RA Černín (see ft. 66), carton 183; “...et sendo questa cosa a me sì importante, dalla quale dipende di pigliar un perpetuo esilio dalla Patria...,” March 6, 1668, *ibid.* Besides an office at the court, Martinitz suggested for himself a diplomatic mission to Spain or Venice as possibilities, or a position in the administration of the Tyrol (probably having the governorship of the province in mind).

⁸² In his six objections (see ft. 79), where he declared in addition, “quod velit deserere patriam potius quam perdere clementissimam Suae Maiestatis erga se confidentiam,” because he esteems His Majesty “*pluris...quam totum Regnum.*”

⁸³ “Nella dieta già si cominciava a dire che non ci è chi se n’appigli de’poveri gravati, onde dovetti sta volta far un poco il Patriota...,” Aug. 2, 1684, Martinitz to Ferdinand Bonaventura Count Harrach, FA Harrach (see ft. 24), carton 283.

burgrave as *oppressor regni*), it does not seem it was energized by a basic agreement in the attitude towards the princely service and the court. Kinsky, it seems to me, adhered to the very same institutional culture as Martinitz did. He was firmly integrated into the networks at the court of Vienna—a place Balbín displayed no sympathy for at all. His influential uncle Portia enjoyed in Bohemia a reputation of being “the most hateful foe of the Bohemian nation, who calls Bohemians dogs.”⁸⁴ Kinsky himself married an Austrian noblewoman and he aspired to reestablish his position at the court after he had been relegated to the province in 1667. His opposition against the grand burgrave seems to have been primarily situational. As late as 1683, when Kinsky became the grand chancellor of Bohemia, thus moving from Prague back to Vienna, he pursued a similar political agenda as Martinitz before him, aiming at the stabilization of the monarchical rule of the Austrian Habsburgs. Under Kinsky as grand chancellor, the tax burden in Bohemia resulting from the expansion of the fiscal-military state continued to rise significantly. Much like Martinitz in the early 1670s, Kinsky belonged to those aulic ministers who pursued the establishment of a strong royal government in Hungary in the 1680s and 1690s. And in 1694, Kinsky effectively assisted in suppressing the emerging opposition of the Bohemian prelates against fiscal pressure and to diminish their prerogatives.⁸⁵ Again, we may see that the question of who appealed to *patria* and why was much more complex than Balbín’s polemical writings might suggest.

⁸⁴ Testimony of Abbot Franck, see above (ft. 54).

⁸⁵ The role of Kinsky as royal minister in Vienna, however, has not been illuminated significantly. For his integration in the offices see Stefan Sienell, *Die Geheime Konferenz unter Kaiser Leopold I. Personelle Strukturen und Methoden zur politischen Entscheidungsfindung am Wiener Hof* (Frankfurt am Main e. a.: Peter Lang, 2001). For the fiscal pressure in Bohemia see Josef Pekař, *České katastry 1654–1789* [Czech cadastres, 1654–1789] (Prague: Historický klub, 1932); Jean Béranger, *Finances et absolutisme autrichien dans la seconde moitié du XVII^e siècle* (Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1975). For Kinsky’s involvement in the question of Hungary see Gustav Turba, *Die Grundlagen der Pragmatischen Sanktion*, vol. I.: Ungarn (Leipzig-Vienna: Deuticke, 1911), 9–11, 52; Oswald Redlich, *Österreichs Großmachtbildung in der Zeit Kaiser Leopolds I.* (Gotha: Perthers, 1921), 528, 535, 537. On the suppression of the opposition of the Bohemian prelates in the early 1690s see Václav Bartůněk, *Stručné dějiny kollegiální kapituly a královské kaple Všech svatých na Pražském hradě. Pražský arcibiskup Jan Bedřich z Valdštejna* [Short history of the chapter and the royal chapel of All Saints in the Prague Castle. Johann Friedrich of Waldstein, the archbishop of Prague] (Litoměřice: Římskokatolická cyrilometodějská bohoslovecká fakulta v Litoměřicích, 1979).

Last, but not least, Balbín himself used different arguments when writing about Count Martinitz in another context and genre. In a genealogical account of the Martinitz family the Jesuit compiled sometime between 1685 and 1688, a few months after the grand burgrave's death and soon before he himself died,⁸⁶ he described Bernhard Ignaz in very flattering terms. Referring to him and his father Jaroslav in the office of the grand burgrave of Prague, Balbín reported: "...*diese beede verdienen ein grosses lob und bringen ihren geschlecht ein sonderbahres ansehen.*" Contrary to the *Trophaea sepulchralia*, where the ostentatious and superficial piety of the grand burgrave (described by Balbín as atheist) became the target of ironic comments as simulated for only secular purposes, Balbín spent many words in this genealogical account describing the pious character of the grand burgrave and concluding: "...*ja ich wurde zu keinen end gelangen, da fern ich alle fueßstapfen der freygebig- und großmüthigkeith in göttlichen sachen, welche oft benandter Graff Bernardus hinter sich gelassen, aufführen wolte...*" The Jesuit even revised his original argument concerning the family's origins. Instead of tracing its beginnings to the lower and newer ranks of the nobility, this time he claimed that the family could trace its lineage back to the forefather Čech and thus the best possible pedigree within the ancient domestic nobility, while vociferously contradicting those who would stand for other opinions.⁸⁷

Naturally, the genealogical genre conformed to different rules of logic and followed different arguments.⁸⁸ Moreover, Balbín was now

⁸⁶ I found only an anonymous German translation, although the original version was obviously written in Latin: *Genealogische Beschreibung der hochgräflichen Famili von Martinitz in welcher das herkommen und alter deren Martinitz enthalten wird. Mit sonderbahren fleiß aus geschriebenen büchern und anderen alten geschichten treulich zusammen getragen und verzeichnet. Ihro hochgräflichen Excellenz dem Hoch- und Wohlgebohrnen herrn herrn Georgio Adamo Grafen von Martinitz zugeschriben*, Archiv Národního muzea (Prague), H 39. Due to references to his prior writings, Balbín's authorship is undisputable. Though the literature on Balbín occasionally mentions that he wrote a genealogy of the Martinitz family (Rejzek, *Balbín*, 440), this text has been considered lost. Supposedly, this account was intended for Balbín's *Stemmatographia* projected as the second decade of his *Miscellanea historica*. Balbín, however, managed to finalize only the first two volumes (*Liber Proemialis ad Stemmatographiam* and *Tabularium stemmatographicum seu Genealogicae tabulae*). Other genealogical accounts (usually called *Syntagma*) of Bohemian families by Balbín have been found in his papers. Few were published posthumously.

⁸⁷ "...die Martinitzen alte böhmische Inwohner seynd, die da Czechus mit sich anhero gebracht hat..." *ibid.*

⁸⁸ By 1665 Balbín elaborated a frame for this type of historiographical writing, applying it to various families in following decades, see Zdeněk Kalista, *Mládi*

writing for a different audience as well. Here, he was exhorting the nephews of the deceased minister to use the glory of their family “zum nutzen, heyl und glori des vatterlands”, because it is true “daß unsere erste lieb auf das vatterland müsse gerichtet seyn und daß in solcher alle liebs-beziehungen enthalten werden”. Thus in one of his last writings, the Jesuit—admitting he had not written enough about the Martinitz family in his texts⁸⁹—attempted to embed the hated minister in his own patriotic vision of the past. Balbín the pamphleteer now receded and gave way to Balbín the historian and genealogist.

Fathers of Fatherland

By linking early modern patriotic discussion with national identity, historians have often misunderstood the term *patria* in its seventeenth-century meaning as they supposed it denoted primarily a particular space, area or territory. In the early modern understanding, however, the term seems to have referred (beyond completely specific meanings as *patria coelestis* or birthplace) to a body politic in the first place. Given the composite and fragmented character typical of the early modern monarchical states, many polities and administrative entities emerged that could be perceived as *patria*—kingdom, province (*Land*) and urban community in particular. The early modern Habsburg monarchy, recently labeled as a “monarchische Union monarchischer Unionen von Ständestaaten”,⁹⁰ was by no means an exception. While it still needs to be examined at what time and how effectively the dynasty attempted to extend the term *patria* to their entire possessions, the persistence of traditional representations is without doubt.⁹¹

Humprechta Jana Černína z Chudenic. Zrození barokního kavalíra, I–II [The youth of Humprecht Johann Czernin of Chudenice. The birth of a Baroque cavalier] (Prague: Zdeněk Kalista, 1932).

⁸⁹ The preface begins with following words: “Eines großen fehlers förchtend ich mich schuldig zu machen, dafern in meiner stammen beschreibung der Martinitzischen nahmen nicht gelesen wurden und ich das vatterland der wissenschaftt dieser uralten famili berauben solte...,” *Genealogische Beschreibung*.

⁹⁰ Thomas Winkelbauer, *Ständefreiheit und Fürstenmacht. Länder und Untertanen des Hauses Habsburg im konfessionellen Zeitalter*, I–II (Vienna: Ueberreuter, 2003), here I, 25.

⁹¹ Grete Klingenstein, “The meanings of ‘Austria’ and ‘Austrian’ in the eighteenth century,” in Robert Oresko, G. C. Gibbs and H. M. Scott, eds., *Royal and Republican*

Given this coexistence of various meanings, the usage of the phrase *Pater Patriae* seems to be relevant when we examine the seventeenth-century patriotic discussion within the ruling elite of Bohemia. Originally a honorific title conferred by the Roman Senate, it belonged to a set of rhetorical tools to glorify the prince and it contributed to the overall patriarchal legitimization of the monarchic government.⁹² In the Bohemian context with its distinct royal tradition, the phrase was traditionally associated with Charles IV. The confessional re-evaluation of his reign (1347–1378) in seventeenth and eighteenth-century Bohemian historiography emphasized the tendency to portray him as *the father of the fatherland*⁹³—a tendency whose repercussions remain vital even in today’s historical consciousness. Balbín himself, for instance, developed this accentuation of Charles IV’s exclusivity by feminizing his attitude towards Bohemia. For Balbín, the title *Pater Patriae* seemed to have been insufficient for expressing Charles IV’s motherlike care of the kingdom’s welfare. He, thus, repeatedly suggested to re-title him as *Mater Patriae*.⁹⁴

It was, however, not only—and maybe even not primarily—Habsburg rulers who were honoured by this title in the seventeenth-century Bohemia. At the same time, it was not only the Kingdom of Bohemia that was associated with this phrase. Canon Christian Augustin Pfaltz announced in a sermon dedicated to St. Wenceslas and published in 1691 that the saint admonished the nobles they should not be *poplivori*

Sovereignty in Early Modern Europe: Essays in memory of Ragnhild Hatton (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 423–478.

⁹² Paul Münch, “Die ‘Obrigkeit im Vaterstand’—zu Definition und Kritik des ‘Landesvaters’ während der Frühen Neuzeit,” *Daphnis* 11 (1982): 15–40.

⁹³ Zdeněk Kalista, *Česká barokní gotika a její žďárské ohnisko* [Czech Baroque Gothic and its center in Žďár] (Brno: Blok, 1970); Helmut Slapnicka, “Karl IV. als Gesetzgeber in der Legende des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts,” in Ferdinand Seibt, ed., *Kaiser Karl IV. Staatsmann und Mäzen* (Munich: Prestel, 1978), 404–407; Jiří Mikulec, “Tradice a symbolika české státnosti u barokních vlastenců” [The tradition and the symbolism of Czech statehood in the works of Baroque patriots], in Karel Malý and Ladislav Soukup, eds., *Vývoj české ústavnosti v letech 1618–1918* [The development of Czech constitutionalism, 1618–1918] (Prague: Nakladatelství Karolinum, 2006), 171–191.

⁹⁴ “...Carolus Imperator & Bohemiae Rex invictus, Patriae pater, ac verius Mater, morbis senilibus confectus Pragae moritur...”, Balbín, *Epitome*, 380; “Caroli IV. Imperatoris ac Regis in Bohemiam tanta sunt merita, ut Patriae Pater, & quod saepius dixi, Patriae Mater debeat appellari...”, idem, *Miscellanea historica Regni Bohemiae*, dec. I, vol. 7 (Prague, 1687), 151. Though early modern princesses were often addressed as *Mater Patriae*, I was unable to find any other example of extension of the title to male rulers.

or „*Volckfrässige Wölffe*“, but rather „*gute Hirten, Patres patriae, Väter ihrer Lande und Leute*“, thus extending the title on noble landlords in general.⁹⁵ Similarly, the burial of Adam Pavel Count Slavata (1603–1657), a wealthy Bohemian magnate, in his residential town took place (at least according to a Jesuit chronicle) “with sorrow of all burghers, as if they bewailed the father of the fatherland”.⁹⁶ On another occasion, the mayor and councillors of the royal town of Plzeň were addressed as *Patres Patriae* in the dedication of a speech delivered at the University of Prague by a student whose family apparently came from the town.⁹⁷ This usage might have been no exception, for the term *patria* was quite frequently related to the urban communities.

At other times, the phrase clearly referred neither to towns, nor to manors (as in the case of Adam Paul Slavata), but to the kingdom. If so, it was mostly high dignitaries, secular as well as clerical, among the ruling elite of the kingdom, who were honoured—in different contexts and by different authors—as *Patres Patriae*. My evidence has been by no means collected systematically, but it includes one archbishop (Johann Friedrich Count Waldstein, d.1694),⁹⁸ one grand chancellor (Vilém Count Slavata, d.1652),⁹⁹ four grand burgraves (Adam of Waldstein, d.1638;¹⁰⁰ Bernhard Ignaz Count Martinitz, d.1685;¹⁰¹ Hermann Jakob Count Czernin, d.1710,¹⁰² Johann Ernst Anton Count Schaffgotsch

⁹⁵ Pfaltz, *Theatrum Glorae*, 87.

⁹⁶ “*Elatu est (...) communi Civium luctu, quasi Patriae Patri parentaretur,*” *Historia Collegii Novodomensis*, 189, Státní oblastní archiv v Treboni, pracoviště Jindřichův Hradec, Velkostatek Jindřichův Hradec, sign. IIIKb, inv. num. 84.

⁹⁷ Josephus Mathias de Hana, *Filia Gratiarum Cui Pallas Lucina, Virtus Nutrix, Caelum Hymenaeus Diva Parthenosopha Catharina Coram Senatu Populoque Academico (...) Universitatis (...) Pragensis (...) Panegyrico adumbrata* (Prague, 1722).

⁹⁸ *Chronici Plassensis privati “Tilia Plassensis” inscripti, a F. Mauritio Vogt, S. O. Cist. Plassii professo exarati pars tertia*, ed. Ant(onín) Podlaha (Prague, 1909), 98.

⁹⁹ Bohuslaus Balbinus, *Miscellanea historica Regni Bohemiae*, dec. I, vol. 4 (Prague, 1682), 132: “*Patriam comendare Regi suo nunquam desistebat Wilhelmus, & cum aliquando ab Oratore in Collegio Novodomensi Pater Patriae appellatus esset, grantanter accepit, responditque: unum hunc titulum se ambitiose expetere, licet ab ipsis Patriotis, ut ajebat, impediretur, qui ob sua privata commoda, & commendationem ad Principem, nescirent, aut scire nollent: Patriam longe Patribus & Matribus cariorem esse nobis oportere.*”

¹⁰⁰ Georgius Crugerius, *Sacri Pulveres Incltyti Regni Bohemiae...* (Litomislii, 1761), 122 (the text dates back to mid-seventeenth century); Johann Jakob Weingarten, *Fürsten-Spiegel Oder Monarchia Deß Hochlöblichen Ertz-Hauses Oesterreich...* (Prag, 1673), 98.

¹⁰¹ See below.

¹⁰² *Supremus Honorum Gradus In Scala Jakob (...) Piis Manibus (...) Hermanni Jacobi S.R.I. Comitis Czernin (...) Pompa Funebri adornatus...* (Pragae, 1710).

d.1747),¹⁰³ and one *Obersthofmeister* of Leopold I (Wenzel Eusebius Prince Lobkowitz, d.1677).¹⁰⁴ One *Landeshauptmann* in the neighboring Moravia (Ferdinand Prince Dietrichstein, d.1698)¹⁰⁵ might be mentioned in addition. It seems, then, that it was not uncommon to associate the term *Pater Patriae* not only with the royal family but with the prominent members of the ruling elite in the Habsburg hereditary lands or even with the clerical and noble estates in general.¹⁰⁶ Despite the significant changes in the political system after the defeat of the Protestant estates in 1620, this trend mirrors eloquently the continuing ambition and the self-image of the Bohemian high nobility.

But we may notice the opposite strategy as well—criticizing and mocking important dignitaries or groups within the estates as traitors of fatherland. This rhetoric was frequent in the course of the contest between the Catholic dynasty and the Protestant estates in the decades around 1600, and it was used on both sides. In 1619, the rebelling Protestant estates of Bohemia employed the phrase “the betraying sons of the fatherland” against the Catholic pro-Habsburg nobles and clergymen who were subsequently proscribed and exiled.¹⁰⁷ One year later, Ferdinand II declared those members of the Austrian estates

¹⁰³ *Fides et Constantia a Constantino Choro Romanorum Imperatore In aulae suae probata; In (...) Joanne Ernesto Antonio Schaffgotsch (...) Supremo Burgravio...* (Prague, 1735).

¹⁰⁴ Weingarten, *Fürsten-Spiegel*, 47.

¹⁰⁵ Aug(ustin) Neumann, “Z paměti preláta Hufnagla” [From the memoirs of prelate Hufnagel], *Sborník Historického kroužku*, 20 (1919), 26–56, here 54.

¹⁰⁶ In a dedication of 1664, Bohuslav Balbín extended the title *Patres Patriae* on the entire estates of the county of Glatz (a largely autonomous district incorporated into the Kingdom of Bohemia): “Illustrissimis Sac. Rom. Imp. Comitibus, Dominis Dominis, Illustrissimis Liberis Baronibus, Perillustribus et Generosis Equitibus, Patriae Patribus; Amplissimis, Ornatisissisque Civitatum Primoribus ac Civibus; Totiusque adeo Comitatus Glacensi Dominis et Patronis meis praecipua veneratione collendis.” Note the significant distinction: the title “Fathers of Fatherland” should not appertain to the burghers but only to nobles (counts, barons and knights) whose names were specified further in the preface. Bohuslav Balbín, *Vita Venerabilis Arnesti (vulgo Ernesti), Primi Archiepiscopi Pragensis...* (Prague, 1664), preface (unpag.).

¹⁰⁷ “...neupřímých synů vlasti...”, Pavel Skála ze Zhoře, *Historie Česká*, ed. Josef Janáček (Prague: Svoboda, 1984), 124. “...jsouce přirození Čechové a obyvatelové země, vlasti se zpronevěřili...”, *Apologie (první i druhá) stavův království Českého, tělo a krev Pána Ježíše Krista pod obojí způsobou přijímajících, která roku 1618 na ospravedlnění Čechův před Evropou (...) na světlo vyšla*, [First and second apology of the estates of the Bohemian kingdom...] ed. Václav Šubert (Prague: Tisk a sklad K. Seyfrieda, 1863), 66.

who collaborated with the Bohemians as “*Rebellen und Feind des Vatterlands*”.¹⁰⁸

As the disputes in the 1660s and 1670s demonstrate, the tendency to de-legitimize authority by means of patriotic language did not cease after the defeat of the estates in the 1620s. In his *Tractatio*, Balbín ironically addressed “[i]idem optimi scilicet Patres Patriae” and derisively mocked Count Martinitz “*o te verum Patriae Patrem*” for his “merits” in persuading the king to distrust Czechs.¹⁰⁹ Characteristically, it was the controversial Grand Burgrave Bernhard Ignaz Martinitz again who became subject of a debate of whether he was father or rather traitor of his fatherland. A eulogy, published shortly after his death in 1685, contained a chronogram “*PrIMa Die soLIIs hVIVs annI obIIIt VICe ReX RegnI et Pater PatrIae*”.¹¹⁰ Another eulogy, whose author used the pseudonym “Philomusus Bernardophilus”, referred to him as a “*Medicus Regni*”.¹¹¹ Martinitz’ rivals used less gentle terms to describe the grand burgrave’s attitude towards the kingdom. In 1664, for instance, Abbot Franck, after he had received the grand burgrave’s proposal of reconciliation, answered, “I wish no reconciliation with the enemy of the fatherland”.¹¹² Four years later, Franck reported to be himself held in esteem as “*Pater Patriae*” in public since he dared to challenge Count Martinitz’ projects at the diet.¹¹³ And Father Balbín, though less publicly, had addressed Martinitz as “*Patriae proditor*,” “*Patriae suae hostis*,” “*Parricida Patria*,” “*Pestis Patriae*” and even “*Patriae Carnifex*.”¹¹⁴

¹⁰⁸ Arno Strohmeier, *Konfessionskonflikt und Herrschaftsordnung. Widerstandsrecht bei den österreichischen Ständen (1550–1650)* (Mainz: Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 2006), 342.

¹⁰⁹ Balbín, *Tractatio*, 30, 37. See *Trophaea sepulchralia* for similar irony, Id., *Pamětní nápis*, 28, 54, 64.

¹¹⁰ Knihovna kláštera premonstrátů na Strahově (Prague), DG II 6, 275f.

¹¹¹ *Philomusus Bernardophilus, In solatium Illustrissimorum et Excellentissimorum Dominorum, Dominorum amicorum Excellentissimi et Illustrissimi Domini D. Bernardi Ignatii S. R. I. Comitis De Martinitz...* (Neo-Prague, 1685).

¹¹² “... rescivi, Dominum Burggraffium velle mecum reconciliari; respondi, me nihil cum illo differentiae aut offensae habere; si pro bono publico et Regni incolumitate constanter egerim, haec ipsi promovere ex officio et conscientia incumbere, quod si negligat, mihi non debere imputare, quod cum hoste patriae nullam reconciliationem admittam,” *Diarium abbatis Strahoviensis*, 496, Nov. 25, 1664.

¹¹³ “Satis notabiliter aversionem D. Burggraffii notavi, qui ex hoc, quod in comitiis Regni conatibus ipsius obsistam, implacabile odium fovit, quod aliorum favor et affectus mitigant, qui palam pro Patre Patriae venerantur et extollunt,” *ibid.*, 900, Feb. 12, 1668.

¹¹⁴ Balbín, *Pamětní nápis*, 18, 32, 34, 48. See *Idem.*, *Tractatio*, 119.

Conclusion

Historians have usually treated Bohuslav Balbín as either a mouthpiece of a patriotic opposition within the estates or a lone voice. While reading and analyzing only literary texts produced by Balbín and “his circle”, historians have on the other hand largely underestimated the political background against which they were written. A closer look into other evidence, including private papers, indicates that matters were much more complex. Rather than being an exclusive and constitutive sign of a cohesive group of patriots and thus a manifestation of their patriotic identity, the *patria* (having been mostly identified with the Kingdom of Bohemia in the sense of polity—*regnum*) was invoked by different individuals, in different situations and—most importantly—to legitimize very different and sometimes contradictory goals.

In the course of the 1660s and 1670s, there was a lively debate concerning legitimacy and authority within Bohemia’s ruling elite. While the politically dominant and controversial figure of the Grand Burgrave Bernhard Ignaz Martinitz (who frequently supported the unpopular measures resulting from the emergence of the fiscal-military state) certainly helped to galvanize this debate, it is less certain whether it can be explained as simply a dispute between the patriotic-minded estates and the central power. Neither the estates nor the court can be clearly defined by a homogenous policy or even clearly separated one from another. Within the estate of barons, the corporation both Martinitz and his rival Kinsky belonged to, both spheres overlapped to a great extent. The double identity of many magnates as both members of the estates and holders of royal offices (or even court councillors) let them play a special role as mediators between the king and the province. Since they were expected to serve the fatherland as well as the king, while group solidarities and familial interests were at stake in addition, conflicting loyalties and at times seemingly contradictory behaviour was a result. Moreover, the rivalry between the prelates and the aristocrats placed the debate about the nature of a true patriot in Bohemia on a different level. Both groups used patriotic language to buttress their antagonistic aspirations. Even Count Martinitz, treated by many as his fatherland’s traitor, was able to turn the patriotic talk against his opponents. If we focus on the estates and not their alleged spokesmen (Father Balbín), the friction between court councillors on

the one side and Bohemian patriots on the other, a friction historians usually took for granted, appears much less clear and the supposed patriotic wing within the estates remains rather elusive indeed.

Though the dual scheme “court versus patria” did not always correspond with reality, the very argument of *patria* certainly had great importance for political negotiation in seventeenth-century Bohemia. The quarrels—between distinct corporations (barons and prelates) as well as between individuals (Martinitz and Kinsky)—were fuelled by patriotic reasoning. The welfare of *patria* appears to be a relevant argument within the Habsburg composite monarchy, but it was at the same time an argument that could be employed for different reasons.

Through his patriotic works and especially his polemic against the grand burgrave beginning in the early 1670s, the Jesuit Balbín entered this debate. He collected many of the objections against Martinitz that circulated in public discourse, but he linked them with the issue of language and foreigners. With regard to Martinitz, this appears as a skilful manipulation because the issue of language and foreigners was normally employed by indigenous aristocrats to de-legitimize the aspirations of the newcomer prelates, and it was exactly the newcomer or German-speaking prelates who mostly fought against the fiscal policy of the court at the Bohemian diet and opposed the grand burgrave. And it was exactly Martinitz who, emulating his father, repeatedly admonished the prelates to use the Czech language in appropriate situations. Thus Balbín’s simplifying equation of *oppressio regni, lingua germanica* and *alieni* simply did not fit the real situation within the ruling elite of the kingdom. Although the Jesuit Balbín, Abbot Franck and Count Kinsky faced the same enemy, their ideas of how and by whom the fatherland should be governed diverged substantially. We still have much to learn and understand concerning the ethnically, culturally and politically complicated situation that emerged in Bohemia in the seventeenth century. Illuminating the process of appropriation and re-definition of patriotic values and embedding the talk of *patria* into the contemporaneous context may help us to understand it a little bit better.