

Лебо К.*

Reshaping a tradition. Founding the Habsburg-Lorraine dynastic state in the 18th century

Аннотация: В статье исследуются компоненты власти в композитарной монархии Габсбургов и конструирование политической легитимности посредством управленческих практик, сочинений, речей и изображений. Монархия Габсбургов в XVIII в. не представляла собой однородного целого, объединяя территории с различной степенью интеграции. Выборность корон и их переходы от одной ветви рода к другой создавали сложную ситуацию, в которой Габсбургам удавалось утвердить свое господство, сочетая следование традиции и изменения. Административные реформы поддерживались символическим дискурсом. Династический дискурс пришел на смену истории правящего дома и стал способом утвердить принцип *государственного интереса*. Власть династии была основана на доминировании над территорией. Новые вертикальные связи исходили от Марии Терезии, распространяя ее господство за пределы владений Австрийского дома. На своих более чем двухстах портретах Мария Терезия всегда изображалась с регалиями, вид которых варьировался в зависимости от места, где картина должна была находиться, с тем, чтобы подчеркнуть своеобразие каждой территории и единство монархии, связь между правителем и подвластной территорией.

Ключевые слова: династическое государство, дом Габсбургов, империя, институциональные реформы, композитарная монархия, наследственная монархия, символический дискурс, фискально-военное государство

УДК 94(436).06

Abstract. The paper investigates the components of power in composite Habsburg monarchy and the construction of political legitimacy through practices, writings, speeches and pictures. The Habsburg monarchy in the 18th century was far from being a homogeneous whole, with a lot of different levels of integration. Elective crowns and jumps from a family tree branch to another build a complex frame, inside which this family succeeded in asserting its ruling power between tradition and change. The symbolic discourse came in support to the administrative reform. Dynastic discourse replaced the history of the *house* and became a way to assert the rule of the *Reason of State*. The dynasty derived its power from a territorial dominance. A new vertical link was coming from Maria Theresa, enlarging her domination beyond the House of Austria. At her more than two hundred portraits Maria Theresa was always painted with the *regalia*, which presentation

* Лебо Кристина – доктор исторических наук, профессор университета Париж (e-mail: christine.lebeau@univ-paris1.fr)

varied according to the place the painting was going to be shown, in order to recall the singularity of each territory and the unity of the monarchy, the bound between the ruler and the territories.

Key words: a composite monarchy, a dynastic state, an empire, a fiscal-military state, a hereditary monarchy, the House of Habsburg, institutional reforms, a symbolic discourse

«Dynasty» is often used to describe European reigning families and particularly the Habsburgs, but this noun has become the most used one only late, without suppressing or replacing the others¹. Indeed Voltaire wrote: «Since Charles V balance was leaning towards the House of Austria. This powerful house was, around the year 1630, ruling Spain, Portugal and the treasures of America; the Netherlands, Milanese, Kingdom of Naples, Bohemia, Hungary and even Germany (if one may write it) had become its patrimony and if so many States had been ruled together by the same head of this House, one could have easily believed that the whole of Europe had been brought under his commands»². At the cost of a few short cuts, Voltaire manages to give a hierarchy to the political action and scale of power: the House, the Prince and the territories. The royal Historiographer also takes into account the two meanings of the word «power», at first the one of the *Dictionnaire* of the French Academy (1694) where a sovereign State and its relative power («considerable power») or an Empire as a part of a territory, then also the ability to impose its will to the others or, as Johann Heinrich Zedler writes it in his *Lexikon* (1731-1754): «Power is nothing else than the possibility to apply one's decision»³. The questions posed are: how the Habsburg managed to secure their power? Which are the components of this power? To what extent is that power bound to the dynasty? Changing political contexts can focus more accurately what is at stake behind Habsburg history. Elective crowns, composite monarchies and jumps from a family tree branch to another build a complex frame inside which this family succeeds in asserting and maintains its ruling power – continuity by constant change⁴.

If the ends of power are the subjects of no discussion, measuring power, or how it is growing, are very discussed. Many patterns are thus available, but studying words used by power structures has long been

¹ For an extensive use of the dynastic scheme, Duindam, Jeroen. *Dynasties. A global history of power, 1300-1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.

² «Depuis Charles Quint la balance penchait du côté de la maison d'Autriche. Cette maison puissante, était, vers l'an 1630, maîtresse de l'Espagne, du Portugal et des trésors de l'Amérique ; les Pays-Bas, le Milanais, le royaume de Naples, la Bohême, la Hongrie, l'Allemagne même (si on peut le dire) étaient devenus son patrimoine et si tant d'Etats avaient été réunis sous un seul chef de cette maison, il est à croire que l'Europe lui aurait enfin été asservie» (Voltaire. *Le siècle de Louis XIV* (1753). T. II. Des États de l'Europe avant Louis XIV / René Pomeau ed. Paris: Gallimard, 1957. P. 621).

³ «Puissance. s. f. Pouvoir, autorité (...) *Puissance*, se prend aussi pour Domination, empire. *Cyrus sousmit à sa puissance la plus grande partie de l'Asie* (...) *Puissance*, se prend aussi pour Estat souverain. *La Republique de Venise est une Puissance considerable en Italie*» (Dictionnaire de l'Académie française. Paris, 1762. P. 302); «Macht, ist eine Krafft oder Vermögen das möglich würcklich zu machen. Oder Macht ist nichts anders, als die Möglichkeit auszurichten oder zu vollführen, was man beschlossen» (Johann Heinrich Zedler. *Grosses vollständiges Universal-Lexikon aller Wissenschaften und Künste*. Leipzig, 1731-1754. B. 19. S. 86-87).

⁴ Evans, Robert J.W. *The Making of the Habsburg Monarchy, 1550-1700: An Interpretation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984. For the 19th century, Judson, Pieter. *The Habsburg Empire. A new History*. Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2016.

relegated backward by a historiography that felt bound to stress the strengthening of the state through administrative centralization⁵. Continuing Max Weber's analysis, Wolfgang Reinhard opposes the State and the monarchy, explaining that the construction process of the Modern State results in the monarchy ending up as one of its institution⁶. Going against those who consider that the construction was that of a Fiscal Military State and that the growth of expenditures and revenues was simultaneous, some preferred to insist on the consensus⁷. The pattern of the genesis of «the Modern State» was thus changed and the criteria of taxes acceptance became the mean to identify it⁸. However, was Maria Theresia's monarchy an absolutist construction, despite the loss or because of the loss of Silesia following the War of Austrian Succession and the story of consensus seems to lose in credibility with the reign of Charles VI (1711-1740)⁹? This kind of story-telling, typical of the end of 19th century, also appears as a rewriting of the Habsburg family history pointing Maria Theresia herself as a dynasty founder and a «Super-Mother» (Über-Mutter) in her own family. Metamorphoses of power are mainly those of the history of power.

This paper will emphasize Maria Theresia's reign (1740-1780), an Empress whose ascent, though contested, was made possible by a change in devolution laws¹⁰. It aims at showing the methods used to justify a ruling style. This will give an accurate picture of complex relations between logic of words and reforms, tradition and modernity.

The inherited house

«Dynasty», the most common word today to identify family power through time was not much used in the 18th century. Zedler's Dictionary identifies «dynastia» and «oligarchy» and gives a negative definition. In the 17th and 18th Century, the word «House» was much more common. At first a word that implies a place, but which also shows the continuity of a family power, as Johann Heinrich Boecler, influent lawyer in the Empire (1611-1672) writes it: «Familia...principalis intelligitur tota illa series, qua illustrissimarum Domuum Maiores & ab ii sorti a stirpe per ordinem successionis & propagationis ad proxima usque tempora

⁵ Nederveen Pieterse, Jan. Metamorphoses of Power: From Coercion to Cooperation? // Asian Journal of Social Science. Vol. 33-1. 2005. Special Focus: The Modern Prince and the Modern Sage: Transforming Power and Freedom. P. 4-22; Bourdieu, Pierre. De la maison du roi à la raison d'État. Un modèle de la genèse du champ bureaucratique // Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales. Vol. 118. 1997. Special Focus: Genèse de l'État modern. P. 55-68.

⁶ Reinhard, Wolfgang. Frühmoderner Staat-Moderner Staat // Die Entstehung des modernen Europa 1600-1900 / Olaf Mörke, Michael North ed. Cologne, Weimar and Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 1998. S. 1-9.

⁷ Brewer, John. The Sinews of power. War, money and the English State, 1688-1783. London: Unwin Hyman, 1989. Chapter 8. Public knowledge and private interest: the state, lobbies and the politics of information. P. 221-249; Bündnispartner und Konkurrenten der Landesfürsten? Die Stände in der Habsburger Monarchie / Gerhard Ammerer, William D. Godsey ed. Vienna-München: R. Oldenbourg, 2007.

⁸ Genet, Jean-Philippe. La genèse de l'État moderne // Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales. 118. Juin 1997. P. 3-18.

⁹ Dickson P.G.M. Finance and Government under Maria Theresia, 1740-1780. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.

¹⁰ Turba, Gustav. Geschichte des Thronfolgerechtes in allen habsburgischen Ländern bis zur pragmatischen Sanktion Kaiser Karls VI. 1156 bis 1732. Vienna / Leipzig: Fromme, 1903.

numerantur»¹¹. The Habsburg notice, which Johann Zedler added in his dictionary and focuses in part on the «origin of the House» (*Stammhaus*), is following for a big part the History of its time. The reign of Charles VI (1711-1740) indeed coincides with the historical affirmation of the superiority of the Habsburg and the development of the representation of the *domus inclita* or illustrious House¹². Under the reign of his daughter Maria Theresia, the power of the house still finds its roots in a symbolic way, but also receives a new legal legitimacy.

The history of the Habsburg's power starts with a prince patronage that is active since the 15th Century and which reached its peak under the reign of Maximilian I. The history of the kinship (*Sippe*) relied at first on the religious figures of Saint Leopold and Saint Stephen or on insignas, such as the eagle, the lion or the bull Apis, but rapidly took an imperial and mythological turn, referring not only to Charlemagne, but also to Trojan and Roman lineage¹³. However, the Benedictine erudition was given it another direction. The Benedictine monk Marquardt Herrgott (1694-1762) published in 1737 the results of his researches on the ancientness of the house¹⁴. By having different results from the mythological family trees, that made the Habsburgs the descendants of Aeneas, the historian put the emphasis on the virtues that belong to the family itself. Indeed, the Habsburg are an Alsatian lineage, located right at the centre of the historical Lotharingia, between the Rhine and the Alps, at the crossroads of Germany, Burgundy, France and Northern Italy. The Habsburg castle, built around 1020 by Werner, bishop of Strasburg, was then located in Burgundy and therefore outside the Ottonian Empire. A legend is attached to the castle and was revived in the 14th Century: Werner reproaches Radbod, first Habsburg to be identified with certainty, to have oversight building the castle's walls and towers; the latter promises to remedy this oversight by building them in one night and, on the next day, some loyal common people are building walls and the knights are building the towers. The Habsburgs are not protected by walls, but by the loyalty of their servants. Of course, the myth of the Golden Fleece still provides the family with the legitimacy of being the descendants of the founders of Rom, as show the solemn dynastical ceremonial painted by the court painter Meytens. But the stories attached to the Alsatian origins, that Marquardt Herrgott

¹¹ Zedler. Grosses vollständiges Universal-Lexikon. B. 12. S. 40; Boecler, Johann Heinrich. De Principalium Familiarum perpetuitate // Dissertationes Academicae. Editio secunda. Pars II. Strasburg, 1701. P. 872-899.

¹² Maximilian I. Triumph eines Kaisers. Herrscher mit europäischen Visionen. Katalog der Ausstellung in der kaiserlichen Hofburg zu Innsbruck 2005/06. Innsbruck, 2005.

¹³ Lhotsky, Alphons. Aufsätze und Verträge. I. Europäisches Mittelalter, Das Land Österreich. München: Oldenbourg, 1970; Wandruszka, Adam. Das Haus Habsburg. Die Geschichte einer europäischen Dynastie. Vienna: Verlag für Geschichte und Politik, 1984 (5th ed.); Tanner, Marie. The Last Descendents of Aeneas. The Habsburgs and the mythic image of the emperor. New Haven-London: Yale University Press, 1993.

¹⁴ Herrgott, Marquardt. Genealogia diplomatica augustae Domus Hasburgicae. Sankt Blasien, 1737. Marquard Herrgott published in 1750 his Monumenta augustae domus Austriae (Kaliwoda, 1750 – 1773).

was revived change the Imperial perspective. Maria Theresia also defined in her *Political Testament* the house as the transmission of virtues (indulgence and grace / Milde und Gnad)¹⁵.

Mother of the peoples who also have these *virtutes regiae*, Maria Theresia's power also comes from divine right in order to insure her subjects' common good. The archbishop of Blois, who gave her eulogy in Notre-Dame Cathedral in Paris, was insisted on the symbol of the cross he brandished at her coronation and which opened the sky at the Cathedral of Aachen. The choice of the first names Leopold and Joseph for the Archdukes, respectively first and second heir to the Crowns, recalls both the bound with the predecessors of Maria Theresia for the eldest, with Joseph I and the persistence of a Maria Theresia's «fathers' faith», which resulted in the *pietas austriaca*, funded by the modesty of Saint Leopold and is reminded by the Plague column at the centre of Vienna, at the basis of which the Emperor Leopold is shown kneeling, devoted to the Christ.

Using the notion of House mainly has the advantage to create a separate legal sphere, distinct from that of the German Holy Roman Empire of which the Habsburgs are the elected sovereigns since 1446. The creation in 1749 of the *Geheimes Hausarchiv* shows how the house's Law (*Hausrecht*) becomes a State Law, not only for the Archduchy of Austria, but also for territories under «Austrian» domination. Dynastic rules became a part of Public Law and a ground for adapting them.

At first heirs to the Babenberg, then to the Kingdoms of Castilla and Aragon and their territories, the Habsburgs take over the inheritance of the Jagiellos, following the 1505 agreement between Maximilian I and Ladislaus Jagiello, King of Bohemia and Hungary and the death of the latter at the Battle of Mohács in 1526. Maximilian's will and testament according to which Carl and Ferdinand become entitled to be called «our natural inheritor», Worms Treaty (1521) and Brussels Treaty (1522) organised the patrimony between the two branches of the house by ending with the sharing between inheritors, and concentrating provinces inside primogeniture, according to «eldest child's right to inherit». Ferdinand I thus obtained the Archduchy of Austria, the County of Tyrol, the Kingdoms of Bohemia and Hungary, before being elected Emperor at the death of his Brother Charles V in 1558. It is however Ferdinand II who reunited the patrimony following the extinctions of the Tyrolean and Styrian branches. In his testimony in 1621, he established primogeniture without consulting the Estates of the different territories¹⁶.

The second phase of political construction consisted in transforming the Crown Lands for which the Habsburg had to be elected in hereditary crowns and to assert their domination on all the territories.

¹⁵ English translation: *The Habsburg and Hohenzollern Dynasties in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries. The Documentary History of Western Civilization* / C. A. Macartney, ed. New York: Evanston, 1970. P. 97-132. Original German text: *Kaiserin Maria Theresias Politisches Testament* / Josef Kallbrunner ed. Vienna: Verlag für Geschichte und Politik, 1952. S. 25-73.

¹⁶ Winkelbauer, Thomas. *Ständefreiheit und Fürstenmacht. Länder und Untertanen des Hauses Habsburg im konfessionalen Zeitalter*. Vienna: Carl Ueberreuter, 2003. S. 175.

Following the rebellion and defeat of the Estates of Bohemia the body of legislation known as the *Verneuerte Landesordnung* (Revised Land Ordinance) imposed by Ferdinand in 1627 created the new legal basis for justice and administration in the Bohemian lands. It reinforced royal authority to exercise power, curtailed the powers of the Estates, established Catholicism as the only legal faith and made the Bohemian Crown heritable only by the House of Habsburg. It marked the end of that process of political affirmation by the Habsburgs, which Ferdinand I had started¹⁷. The history of the Kingdom of Hungary is punctuated since 1526 by rebellions against the Habsburg, but the hereditary crown had been accepted in 1687 by the Parliament in a context of wars with the Ottoman Empire. The Emperor-King agreed that if the Habsburg male line became extinct, Hungary would once again have an elective monarchy. This was the rule in the Kingdom of Bohemia too. But the hereditary monarchy still remained contractual. In 1713 Emperor Charles VI issued an edict declaring the indivisibility of all Habsburg lands and that the succession was henceforth to be in the direct line, in particular that Charles's daughters were placed before those of his father and brother in the line of succession. The Hungarian Parliament voted it in 1723 and accepted hereby not only female inheritance until the extinction of the Habsburg family, both male and female, but also the inseparable aspect of the domination¹⁸.

Maria Theresia's power was still based on inherited practices: collective management or «joint ownership» of «family properties» (assets; ranks; rights; positions) with no personal appropriation by any member of the family, according to indivisibility; the increase of family property through weddings and inheritance; continuity derived from a particular official position associated with high symbolic power. The wedding with Francis, Duke of Lorraine first enabled in 1736 to create, by exchanging the Duchy of Lorraine, the secundogeniture of Toscana, then, at the expense of the War of the Austrian Succession, to retain the Holy Empire. Maria Theresia is still known for becoming the «mother-in-law of Europe» by multiplying political weddings for her daughters.

Temporal link between the different members of the family, the house is a sort of a roof for the different provinces that constitute the Composite monarchy. A letter from Archduke Ferdinand to his brother Carl in 1529 already suggested a transfer of the «five places» in Switzerland which should be attained and included «into our house of Austria»¹⁹. The metaphor of the house relates the ruling family to the realm which it rules: the monarch is the master of the house, ruling the dynasty as well as the subjects of his realm. The right to rule is inherited within the family, not anymore from chart falsification, such as the *Privilegium Maius*, a forgery that had permitted to create the Archduchy of Austria, but a one guaranteed by public law.

¹⁷ Panek, Jaroslav. Ferdinand I. Der Schöpfer des politischen Programms der österreichischen Habsburger? // Die Habsburgermonarchie 1620 bis 1740. Leistungen und Grenzen des Absolutismusparadigmas / Petr Mat'a and Thomas Winkelbauer eds. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2006. S. 63-72.

¹⁸ Turba, Gustav. Die Grundlagen der pragmatischen Sanktion, I. Ungarn. Leipzig-Wien: F. Deuticke, 1911-1912.

¹⁹ Lhotsky, Alphons. Was heisst 'Haus Österreich'? // Aufsätze und Verträge. I. S. 344-366.

One however has to resist to the temptation of self-fashioning, exclusively organised around the point of view of the dynasty. To describe the political situation in the first half of the 17th century, Karen J. MacHardy uses the consensus theory of Michael Mann: the Habsburg would have thus evolved from a medieval patrimonial domination to a «Coordinating princely State»²⁰. If the monarchy was conferred by divine and hereditary right, Maria Theresia as her predecessors had first received homage from the members of the Estates of Austria (November 1740) then, while she was crowned Queen of Hungary (June 1741), then Queen of Bohemia (May 1743). The King was required to be present at the Coronation Diet. Joseph II significantly forwent a coronation ceremony, since being crowned would mean being bound by the oath to preserve the old constitution and the privileges of the estates, and this ran counter to the intentions of the «*kalapos királyi*», «the king in a hat». Indeed, the theory of the Holy Crown, which makes of the crown the State insignia was actively kept in Hungary, this was also brought up in Bohemia²¹. The sharing of power between the king – Maria Theresia was *Rex Hungariae* – and the members of the Estates, who are landlords, was regularly in question, with a changing geometry. Maria Theresia made herself in his *Political Testament* a denunciator of these minister-intruders who were putting at risk the ability to tax proportionally the different States of the Monarchy.

A fiscal-military state?

The biography of Maria Theresia the historian Alfred von Arneth, head of the House and State Archives, wrote has largely contributed to the understanding of Maria Theresia's reign²². Arneth was also the inspirer of the monumental statue of the queen inaugurated in 1888 between the two big museums of fine arts (*Kunsthistorisches Museum*) and natural history (*Naturhistorisches Museum*) in Vienna. The monument, which is the result of a long discussion displays the four main themes of the political decisions of Maria Theresia: war, foreign policy, the administrative reform and the intellectual reform, with the staging of the advisors and the generals. The order in which these themes were here quoted is arbitrary, as the monument was designed to be seen from all sides. Of course, this monument is in part anachronistic with the Hungarians being at the core of its message; this was a concession to the current political situation and the building of the double monarchy since the 1867 compromise. Nonetheless, this monument shows the dynamic of a monarchy fully transforming, as most of the historiography describes her reign²³.

²⁰ MacHardy, Karen J. *War, Religion and Court Patronage in Habsburg Austria. The Social and Cultural Dimensions of Political Interaction, 1521-1622*. Basingbroke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003. P. 213.

²¹ Begert, Alexander. *Böhmen, die böhmische Kur und das Reich vom Hochmittelalter bis zum Ende des Alten Reiches. Studien zur Kurwürde und staatsrechtlichen Stellung Böhmens*. Husum: Mattiesen Verlag, 2003.

²² Arneth, Alfred von. *Geschichte Maria Theresias*. Vienna: Braumüller, 1863-1879.

²³ Telesko, Werner. *Maria Theresia: ein europäischer Mythos*. Köln, Weimar und Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 2012; *Das «Kaiserforum» der Wiener Hofburg (1869) – neue Überlegungen zum imperialen Anspruch einer «politischen Architektur» // Bauforschung und Denkmalpflege. Festschrift für Mario Schwarz / Günther Buchinger, Friedmund Hueber ed.* Köln, Weimar und Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 2015. S. 439-455.

Even if the Weberian model remains the dominant one, other approaches developed in the German context have put the stress on the empowering (A. Holenstein) or on accepted domination (S. Brakensiek) which maintain a top to bottom link²⁴. However can we really say the Theresian State was modern?

The *Political Testament* was a strong case for the institutional reform, which was developed in two stages. To take back control of the kingdom of Bohemia, where the Bohemian estates voted for the prince-elect of Bavaria for king in 1741, minister Haugwitz became in 1748 the head of a Directorium, created after the Prussian pattern, brings together a newly created united chancery of Austria and Bohemia, the Aulic Chamber, the Imperial Council of War and a newly created Council of Trade. In 1761, in the middle of the Seven Years War, a new system was introduced on Chancellor Kaunitz's initiative and placed under the control of a State Council reduced to ten members the previous institutions, with an additional audit chamber controlling the finances²⁵. The political decision process cannot be reduced to a more or less commented *placet* of Maria Theresia. Despite an apparently fixed organization, ministerial areas were far from being distinct and most reforms were cooperatively decided in dedicated commissions, multiple and voluminous *vota* of which were kept by the Viennese Archives. Men are more stable than the institution. The «centre» appeared to be crossed by rivalries between court parties, following the pattern Wolfgang Reinhard proposed, individuals or «cliques» where can be found members of a same family or close people or even clienteles as well, but also on ideological criteria²⁶.

How the centre and the provincial administration are articulated is as much, if not even more, a crucial point of the reform²⁷. Since the reign of Ferdinand 1st, the administrations of the territories reflected that of the centre - chancellery, Aulic Chamber and even Trade Council since Charles VI. A most important officer (Statthalter for Lower-Austria, Lord of the Castle for Bohemia, Palatine for Hungary) proposed by the States, but nominated by the sovereign managed the contribution. But from the Netherlands and State of Milan, which depended from the State Chancellery to the Austro-Bohemian Chancellery, that so to say form the core of the Monarchy, and not forgetting the specific situation of Hungary, the Habsburg Monarchy was far from being a homogeneous whole, with a lot of different levels of integration, between aristocratic estates, privileged towns and Viennese centre, which homogeneity may even be doubted on the scale of one territory.

²⁴ Empowering interactions: political cultures and the emergence of the state in Europe, 1300-1900 / Wim Blockmans, André Holenstein, and Jon Mathieu eds., in collaboration with Daniel Schläppi. Farnham (GB)- Burlington: Vt. Ashgate, 2009; *Ergebene Diener ihrer Herren? Herrschaftsvermittlung im alten Europa* / Stefan Brakensiek and Heide Wunder eds. Köln, Weimar und Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 2005.

²⁵ Dickson P.G.M. Op. cit. Ch. 9: Central Government. P. 207-256.

²⁶ Reinhard, Wolfgang. *Freunde und Kreaturen. «Verflechtung» als Konzept zur Erforschung historischer Führungsgruppen. Römische Oligarchie um 1600.* München: Ernst Vogel, 1979; Lebeau, Christine. *Aristocrates et grands commis à la Cour de Vienne (1748-1791). Le modèle français.* Paris: CNRS Éditions, 1996.

²⁷ *Verwaltungsgeschichte der Habsburgermonarchie in der Frühen Neuzeit. 2: Die Länder* / Michael Hochedlinger und Thomas Winkelbauer eds. (is being published).

Has the Haugwitz reform modified this balance? By examining only the institutional changes, P.G.M. Dickson notes an affirmed will from Vienna to take over control of the institutions the Estates managed alone before, at least in the Archduchy of Austria and in the Kingdom of Bohemia. Do these transformation mean there really is a shift from governance to «public» administration²⁸? The integrated monarchy theme (*Gesamtstaat*) finds its whole meaning here. At the margins of the attempt to make a comprehensive history of the «central administration», Friedrich Walter published a crossed biography of the different ministers of Maria Theresia, who are sculpted in full at the basis of the monument in front of the Natural Science Museum in Vienna²⁹. As did the Chotek brothers, respectively president of the Council of Trade in Vienna and Lord of the Castle in Prague, who organised between Vienna and Prague a representation of the Bohemian nobility during the election of Charles Emmanuel of Bavaria as King of Bohemia and then head the Haugwitz commissions in Styria and Carinthia, which were responsible for improving the return of the contribution, we clearly can establish a switch from vertical top-down leadership inside the Crown lands to horizontal networks structures of organization, which tighten the power around the monarch and the Court nobility (*Gesamtadel*)³⁰.

However, despite the iterative process of reform, which also highlights the difficulties to adapt the political system to the new exercise of monarchy, one can not deny that Vienna manages to balance its finances at the end of two wars and to develop its productions and trades, not only to the outside through the free port of Trieste, but also between the States of the Monarchy, especially between the Archduchy of Austria and the Kingdom of Hungary or between the State of Milan and the Archduchy of Austria.

Through recess the annual amount for contribution was fixed for ten years. This tax paid by the peasants, set and collected by the Estates, was used to finance war. The end of preliminary negotiations, which still took place every year at the beginning of the 18th century, may have appeared as a victory of the ruler over the Estates³¹. The impact of setting the taxes level can not be underestimated in a period of war, at a time the ruler could be tempted to significantly put the fiscal pressure up. Indeed the resources that belonged the Emperor himself (*Camerale*), that is to say customs, excise and salt duties were not sufficient to have a balanced budget. At the same time, the Diplomatic Revolution, which created an, at first defensive, but later offensive, alliance between Austria and France, had deprived the Austrian monarchy of the English subsidies. Financial innovation, such as the wealth tax (*Vermögensteuer*) or on financial revenues tax (*Interessensteuer*), lotteries or other forms

²⁸ Nederveen Pieterse, Jan. Op. cit. P. 4-22.

²⁹ Walter, Friedrich. Männer um Marie Theresia. Vienna: Holzhausen, 1951.

³⁰ Lebeau, Christine. Les identités multiples de la noblesse habsbourgeoise au XVIII^e siècle // Adel und Nation in der Neuzeit. Hierarchie, Egalität und Loyalität / Martin Wrede and Laurent Bourquin eds. Ostfildern: Jan Thorbecke, 2016. S. 143-161.

³¹ See: Iwasaki, Shuichi. Grabmal der ständischen Freiheiten? Die Steuerrezessverhandlung von 1748 in Niederösterreich und die Etablierung eines komplementärenverhältnisses von Krone und Ständen // Bündnispartner und Konkurrenten der Landesfürsten? S. 323-345 and Cerman, Ivo. Opposition oder Kooperation? Der Staat und die Stände in Böhmen 1749-1789. Ibid. S. 374-393.

of savings collection had not been as successful as it was expected to be. Therefore, the Estates were, more than ever, financial partners for the Emperor, guarantying a large amount of the State's loans.

Statistics were a much more favourable innovation ground: Michel Foucault made it one of the signifiers of the « biopower ». In the 1770's, the Council of War managed to give a number to every single house in all the territories of the Monarchy: this was an essential work, because it allowed the assessment of the military capacities of the various territories, by identifying for each house the number of men able to fight. On top of that, censuses were organized: at first they were only for certain categories, such as the census of the Turks, but they then became general³². The President of the Aulic Chamber also ordered the inventory of the wealth of the Monarchy in 1761, that is to say, the list of all offices, of their employees and the state of credits and cash.

If the Estates are by now perceived as partners, tax acceptance, which according to Jean-Philippe Genet is an essential criteria of the modern State, nonetheless remains ambiguous³³. The cadastre indeed had been revised under Maria Theresia, but it retained a declarative fiscal vocation without a lot or map basis, excepted for the State of Milan³⁴. The Estates refused any fiscal reform, not only in Hungary, but also in the Austro-Bohemian ensemble, where the introduction of a progressive tax on lands paid by the landlords remained a project until the end of Joseph II's reign.

Back to the dynastic state?

While the political contract between the Habsburg ruler and the states remain uncertain, the new dynastic storytelling, which replaces the history of the house, shows towards yet another perspective. In Greek as in Latin, as in several modern languages, the word «house» was aimed at describing a kind of power transmitted inside a same ruling family. Otherwise, the word «Dynasty» leads to a broader set of situations, all of them being linked to the idea of power or to a power frame or to a persuading web of individuals linked to a family. The celebrations around the 1886 family Jubilee thus were at the origin of numerous articles and books. In this context, stress is put on the change from the Habsburg dynasty to the Habsburg-Lorraine dynasty, but is discontinuity or continuity the main issue? As a matter of fact, continuity and dynastic ways of thinking progressively became a way to assert the rule of the Reason of State, even if coronation and ovation were led toward only one person.

³² «... Der grösste Teil der Untertanen lebt elend und mühselig»: die Berichte des Hofkriegsrates zur sozialen und wirtschaftlichen Lage der Habsburgermonarchie 1770-1771 / Michael Hochedlinger, Anton Tantner eds. Vienna: Studien Verlag, 2005.

³³ «... un État moderne, c'est un État dont la base matérielle repose sur une fiscalité publique acceptée par la société politique (et ce dans une dimension territoriale supérieure à celle de la cité), et dont tous les sujets sont concernés» (Genèse de l'État moderne. P. 3).

³⁴ Lebeau, Christine. Regional Exchanges and Patterns of Taxation in Eighteenth Century Europe: the case of the Italian Cadastres // Global Debates about Taxation / Holger Nehring et Florian Schui eds. Basingstoke, 2007. P. 21-35 ; Vers la construction d'une science administrative au XVIIIe siècle. l'exemple du cadastre de Milan // L'illuminismo delle riforme civili: il contributo degli economisti lombardi / Pier Luigi Porta et Roberto Scazzieri eds. Milan, 2014 <http://www.ilasl.org/index.php/Incontri/article/view/106> .

The link between the Lorraine and the Habsburg houses is in fact much older than the wedding that is made about. It is only at the 17th century that the «etichonid» genealogy, based on the work of Jérôme Vignier starts to compete with the mythological Roman descent that had been developed under Rudolf I (died in 1291) and Albert I (died in 1308) and still with the Trojan variant, in which the Habsburgs are the Colonna's descent, and which had a regular success until the reign of the father of Maria Theresia, Charles VI³⁵. Habsburg and Lorraine families could have had common origins as far as in the 10th or 11th century: Etichon I, duke of Alsace would be the common ancestor of the two houses. In 1306, Ferri of Lorraine marries Elisabeth, daughter of the King Albert of Austria. Their son receives the first name of his grandfather Rudolf, first king of the house Habsburg. Rudolf himself married Isabella of Burgundy in 1284 at the Remiremont Abbey and made the abbess Princess of the Empire. During the 17th century, this common origin was used to argue from the Habsburg inferiority to the Capetian dynasty «since that family came from the first Counsellor of one of our Kings». This common origin had given a further motivation to the wedding of Maria Theresia with Francis-Stephen of Lorraine: both houses were the only ones by blood «comme deux ruisseaux qui partent de la même source» and have always been faithful to each other³⁶. This also justified the double wedding, since Maria Theresia's sister has wedded Charles of Lorraine.

The genealogical motivation rapidly was taken over by the real political motivation: keeping the control of the Holy Roman Empire, where no woman could be elected. The double portrait of Maria Theresia and Francis Stephen of Lorraine was the time to recall the imperial vocation of the wedding, by showing the imperial crown and the Golden Fleece order, in the council hall of Saint-Florian Abbey. The double tomb installed in the Imperial Crypt not only is the most monumental and the most baroque of the crypt, it synthesises the big events of the double reign and allows for the imperial dignity to be kept within the house, pictured by the burial places of its members, even though only the younger branch uses the Capuchin Crypt since the beginning of the 17th century³⁷. The council room in Schönbrunn also was redecorated with, on the one side the portrait of Francis-Stephen as science patron, his hand designating the allegory of science, but also a balance, symbolizing the equilibrium, and wearing the Golden Fleece, and on the other side, the double portrait of the Archdukes Joseph and Leopold, the first with the hand on the *Esprit des lois* and the imperial city of Rome in background. One shared characteristic of these representations was to showcase the fusion of two houses,

³⁵ La véritable origine des très illustres maisons d'Alsace, de Lorraine, d'Autriche, de Bade et de quantité d'autres. Paris, 1649; Quantin, Jean-Louis. Jérôme Vignier (1606-1661), critique et faussaire janséniste? // Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes, 1998. 156. P. 451-479; Bizzocchi, Roberto. Genealogie incredibili. Bologna: Il mulino, 1995.

³⁶ «La maison de Lorraine est la seule en Europe... qui soit unie par conjonction du sang avec l'Auguste Maison d'Autriche... [les deux maisons] descendent constamment de la même tige comme deux ruisseaux qui partent de la même source... Et il n'y a point de maison dans l'Europe qui ayt été si attaché par une constante et inviolable fidélité aux intérêts de l'Auguste maison». Lothringen Hausakten 182. 3. 182-184. 1715. Haus- Hof- und Staatsarchiv, Vienna. Cit.: Zedinger, Renate. Franz Stephan von Lothringen (1708-1765): Monarch, Manager, Mäzen. Köln, Weimar und Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 2008. S. 27.

³⁷ Telesko, Werner. Le sarcophage de François-Étienne et de Marie-Thérèse par Balthasar Moll dans la crypte des Capucins à Vienne (1754) // Les Funérailles princières en Europe XVIIe-XVIIIe siècle. 2: Apothéoses monumentale / Juliusz Chrościcki, Mark Hengerer, Gérard Sabatier eds., Rennes-Versailles: Presses universitaires, 2013. P. 117-134.

in which one exchanged its Lorraine patrimony against the Grand-Duchy of Tuscany and thus contributed to strengthen the Italian, that is to say imperial, vocation of the dynasty, both in the present and the future.

If the ruler's portrait gives power by representing him (L. Marin), one should take a closer look at this intensive use of Maria Theresia's image in spaces used by the court and beyond³⁸.

The use of the triple portrait inside the Giant Room of the Innsbruck's Hofburg staged yet again this both vertical and horizontal dynastic continuity. The room therefore not only shows the portraits of the three rulers and co-regents, Francis-Stephen, Maria Theresia and Joseph, the father and the son in crowning clothes and the insigmas of the Holy Roman Empire, but also the portraits of the children of Maria Theresia and their spouses. Initiated by the Diplomatic Revolution in 1756 the alliance with the Bourbons was strengthened by the wedding of the archdukes with princesses of Parma and Spain and of the archduchesses with the future kings of France and Naples. This program, organised following the sudden death of Francis-Stephen during the wedding of his son Leopold in Innsbruck in 1765, mainly emphasised on Maria Theresia as a «Übermutter». Maria Theresia's own duty was described as bearing the renewed Habsburg Monarchy³⁹.

This symbolic discourse in fact comes in support to the administrative reform. More than two hundred portraits of Maria Theresia are painted during her life⁴⁰. Produced by Meytens's workshop at the Viennese academy of fine arts, these portraits were offered to important lords and sent to the various institutions of the monarchy and beyond⁴¹. Maria Theresia was always painted with the *regalia*, but the crowns' presentation varied according to the place the painting was going to be shown: the singularity of each of the territories and the unity of the Monarchy were thus systematically recalled. The portrait as a gift is both a symbol for the transaction and the bound and actually relates to the territories and Estates.

The program of the Great Gallery of Schönbrunn reconsiders this bound between the ruler and the territories. The provinces bring their art and craft as an homage to the emperor and empress: their parade displays an uninterrupted stream of wealth, creating a new Universal monarchy relying on the circulation of wealth⁴². A new vertical link is coming from Maria Theresia, enlarging her domination beyond the House of Austria.

The house's places were only secondary. On the contrary, the dynasty derives its power from a territorial dominance, which creates streams of people and wealth. Institutional reforms, symbolic discourse and economy-oriented reflection were thus tightly mixed in what still appeared in the end of the 18th century as both a dynastic State and an empire. (*Kaisertum*).

³⁸ Marin, Louis. Le portrait de roi. Paris, 1981.

³⁹ Telesko, Werner. Maria Theresias «Familia Augusta». Zur Programmatik des «Riesensaals» in der Innsbrucker Hofburg // Innsbruck 1765. Prunkvolle Hochzeit, fröhliche Feste, tragischer Ausklang / Renate Zedinger ed. Winkler: Bochum, 2015. S. 349-362.

⁴⁰ Burke, Peter. The fabrication of Louis XIV. New Haven-London, 1992; Ghermani, Naïma. Le prince et son portrait: incarner le pouvoir dans l'Allemagne du XVIe siècle. Rennes, 2009; Bodart, Diane H. Pouvoirs du portrait sous les Habsbourg d'Espagne. Paris, 2011.

⁴¹ Banakas, Anne-Sophie. Les portraits de Marie-Thérèse: échange et pouvoir entre la souveraine et les élites politiques de la Monarchie. Phil. Diss. Paris I Panthéon-Sorbonne, janvier 2016.

⁴² Telesko, Werner. Die Erbin so vieler Länder und Reiche // Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung, 2016. 124-1. S. 82-103.

Dynasty representation and power of state are tightly bound together, but the monarchy remains a polymorphous space, that one could not sum up to a unique pattern of government. The old and the new coexist in different spaces and timelines. The modern state is ultimately only a mode of the complex bound between rulers and territories. The metamorphoses of power have to be understood and analysed through practices and writings, speeches and pictures. Institutional history and symbolic history are to be convoked in the same area if we want to see how intertwined discourses contribute to build political legitimacy.

БИБЛИОГРАФИЯ (BIBLIOGRAPHY):

1. Arneth A. von. Geschichte Maria Theresias. Vienna: Braumüller, 1863-1879.
2. Banakas A.-S. Les portraits de Marie-Thérèse: échange et pouvoir entre la souveraine et les élites politiques de la Monarchie. Phil. Diss. Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne, janvier 2016.
3. Begert A. Böhmen, die böhmische Kur und das Reich vom Hochmittelalter bis zum Ende des Alten Reiches. Studien zur Kurwürde und staatsrechtlichen Stellung Böhmens. Husum: Mattiesen Verlag, 2003.
4. Bizzocchi R. Genealogie incredibili. Bologna: Il mulino, 1995.
5. Bodart D.H. Pouvoirs du portrait sous les Habsbourg d'Espagne. Paris, 2011.
6. Boecler J.H. De Principium Familiarum perpetuitate // Dissertationes Academicae. Editio secunda. Pars II. Strasburg, 1701.
7. Bourdieu P. De la maison du roi à la raison d'État. Un modèle de la genèse du champ bureaucratique // Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales. 118. Juin 1997. Genèse de l'État moderne. P. 55-68.
8. Brewer J. The Sinews of power. War, money and the English State, 1688-1783. London: Unwin Hyman, 1989.
9. Bündnispartner und Konkurrenten der Landesfürsten? Die Stände in der Habsburger Monarchie / G. Ammerer, W.D. Godsey ed. Vienna-München: R. Oldenbourg, 2007.
10. Burke P. The fabrication of Louis XIV. New Haven-London, 1992.
11. Dickson P.G.M. Finance and Government under Maria Theresia, 1740-1780. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.
12. Dictionnaire de l'Académie française. Paris, 1762.
13. Duindam J. Dynasties. A global history of power, 1300-1800. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.
14. Empowering interactions: political cultures and the emergence of the state in Europe, 1300-1900 / W. Blockmans, A. Holenstein, J. Mathieu eds., in collaboration with D. Schläppi. Farnham (GB)-Burlington: Vt. Ashgate, 2009.
15. Ergebnisse Diener ihrer Herren? Herrschaftsvermittlung im alten Europa / S. Brakensiek, H. Wunder eds. Köln, Weimar und Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 2005.
16. Evans R.J.W. The Making of the Habsburg Monarchy, 1550-1700: An Interpretation. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984.
17. Genet J.-Ph. La genèse de l'État moderne // Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales. 118. Juin 1997.
18. Ghermani N. Le prince et son portrait: incarner le pouvoir dans l'Allemagne du XVIe siècle. Rennes, 2009.
19. «... Der grösste Teil der Untertanen lebt elend und mühselig»: die Berichte des Hofkriegsrates zur sozialen und wirtschaftlichen Lage der Habsburgermonarchie 1770-1771 / M. Hochedlinger, A. Tantner eds. Vienna: Studien Verlag, 2005.
20. The Habsburg and Hohenzollern Dynasties in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries. The Documentary History of Western Civilization / C. A. Macartney, ed. New York: Evanston, 1970

- (Kaiserin Maria Theresias Politisches Testament / Josef Kallbrunner ed. Vienna: Verlag für Geschichte und Politik, 1952).
21. Herrgott M. *Genealogia diplomatica augustae Domus Hasburgicae*. Sankt Blasien, 1737.
 22. Judson P. *The Habsburg Empire. A new History*. Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2016.
 23. Das «Kaiserforum» der Wiener Hofburg (1869) – neue Überlegungen zum imperialen Anspruch einer «politischen Architektur» // *Bauforschung und Denkmalpflege. Festschrift für Mario Schwarz / G. Buchinger, F. Hueber ed. Köln, Weimar und Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 2015. S. 439-455.*
 24. Lebeau C. *Aristocrates et grands commis à la Cour de Vienne (1748-1791). Le modèle français*. Paris: CNRS Éditions, 1996.
 25. Idea. *Les identités multiples de la noblesse habsbourgeoise au XVIIIe siècle // Adel und Nation in der Neuzeit. Hierarchie, Egalität und Loyalität / M. Wrede und L. Bourquin eds. Ostfildern: Jan Thorbecke, 2016. S. 143-161.*
 26. Idea. *Regional Exchanges and Patterns of Taxation in Eighteenth Century Europe: the case of the Italian Cadastres // Global Debates about Taxation / H. Nehring and F. Schui eds. Basingstoke, 2007. P. 21-35.*
 27. Lhotsky A. *Aufsätze und Verträge. I. Europäisches Mittelalter. Das Land Österreich*. München: Oldenbourg, 1970.
 28. MacHardy K.J. *War, Religion and Court Patronage in Habsburg Austria. The Social and Cultural Dimensions of Political Interaction, 1521-1622*. Basingbroke-New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
 29. Marin L. *Le portrait de roi*. Paris, 1981.
 30. Maximilian I. *Triumph eines Kaisers. Herrscher mit europäischen Visionen. Katalog der Ausstellung in der kaiserlichen Hofburg zu Innsbruck 2005/06*. Innsbruck, 2005.
 31. Nederveen Pieterse J. *Metamorphoses of Power: From Coercion to Cooperation? // Asian Journal of Social Science. Vol. 33-1. 2005. Special Focus: The Modern Prince and the Modern Sage: Transforming Power and Freedom.*
 32. Panek J. *Ferdinand I. Der Schöpfer des politischen Programms der österreichischen Habsburger? // Die Habsburgermonarchie 1620 bis 1740. Leistungen und Grenzen des Absolutismusparadigmas / P. Mat'a and Th. Winkelbauer eds. Suttgart: Franz Steiner, 2006. S. 63-72.*
 33. Quantin J.-L. *Jérôme Vignier (1606-1661), critique et faussaire janséniste? // Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes, 1998. 156. P. 451-479.*
 34. Reinhard W. *Freunde und Kreaturen. «Verflechtung» als Konzept zur Erforschung historischer Führungsgruppen. Römische Oligarchie um 1600*. München: Ernst Vogel, 1979.
 35. Idem. *Frühmoderner Staat-Moderner Staat // Die Entstehung des modernen Europa 1600-1900 / O. Mörke, M. North ed. Köln, Weimar und Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 1998.*
 36. Tanner M. *The Last Descendents of Aeneas. The Habsburgs and the mythic image of the emperor*. New Haven-London: Yale University Press, 1993.
 37. Telesko W. *Die Erbin so vieler Länder und Reiche // Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung, 2016. 124-1. S. 82-103.*
 38. Idem. *Maria Theresia: ein europäischer Mythos*. Köln, Weimar und Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 2012.
 39. Idem. *Maria Theresias «Familia Augusta». Zur Programmatik des «Riesensaals» in der Innsbrucker Hofburg // Innsbruck 1765. Prunkvolle Hochzeit, fröhliche Feste, tragischer Ausklang / R. Zedinger ed. Winkler: Bochum, 2015. S. 349-362.*
 40. Idem. *Le sarcophage de François-Étienne et de Marie-Thérèse par Balthasar Moll dans la crypte des Capucins à Vienne (1754) // Les Funérailles princières en Europe XVIIe-XVIIIe siècle. 2: Apothéoses*

- monumentale / J. Chrościcki, M. Hengerer, G. Sabatier eds., Rennes-Versailles: Presses universitaires, 2013. P. 117–134.
41. Turba G. Geschichte des Thronfolgerechtes in allen habsburgischen Ländern bis zur pragmatischen Sanktion Kaiser Karls VI. 1156 bis 1732. Vienna / Leipzig: Fromme, 1903.
 42. Idem. Die Grundlagen der pragmatischen Sanktion. I. Ungarn. Leipzig-Wien: F. Deuticke, 1911-1912.
 43. La véritable origine des très illustres maisons d'Alsace, de Lorraine, d'Autriche, de Bade et de quantité d'autres. Paris, 1649.
 44. Vers la construction d'une science administrative au XVIIIe siècle. l'exemple du cadastre de Milan // L'illuminismo delle riforme civili: il contributo degli economisti lombardi / P.L. Porta et R. Scazzieri eds. Milan, 2014 <http://www.ilasl.org/index.php/Incontri/article/view/106> .
 45. *Verwaltungsgeschichte* der Habsburgermonarchie in der Frühen Neuzeit. 2: Die Länder / M. Hochedlinger und Th. Winkelbauer eds. (is being published).
 46. Voltaire. Le siècle de Louis XIV (1753). T. II. Des États de l'Europe avant Louis XIV / R. Pomeau ed. Paris: Gallimard, 1957.
 47. Walter F. Männer um Marie Theresia. Vienna: Holzhausen, 1951.
 48. Wandruszka A. Das Haus Habsburg. Die Geschichte einer europäischen Dynastie. Vienna: Verlag für Geschichte und Politik, 1984 (5th ed.).
 49. Winkelbauer Th. Ständefreiheit und Fürstenmacht. Länder und Untertanen des Hauses Habsburg im konfessionalen Zeitalter. Vienna: Carl Ueberreuter, 2003.
 50. Zedinger R. Franz Stephan von Lothringen (1708-1765): Monarch, Manager, Mäzen. Köln, Weimar und Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 2008.
 51. Zedler J.H. Grosses vollständiges Universal-Lexikon aller Wissenschaften und Künste. Leipzig, 1731-1754. Bd. 12, 19.