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‘All the King’s men.’  
*Maria Theresia, Charles III, Francis Stephen and the making of a King*

This paper will consider the relationships which Maria Theresia had with her father and husband in the period up to her coronation at St Martin’s Church, Pozsony in 1741. How did Maria Theresia prepare for her distinctive coronation as King of Hungary and Croatia, how did her father prepare her for her role, if at all, and how did she address Francis Stephen’s lack of popularity as *locum tenens* in the kingdom?
Military reform is an aspect of the Revolution in Military Affairs (RMA) that improves the combat method and the power of a particular state. Such reforms have an impact upon the strategy employed in war, the tactics deployed in battle, and the overall organization of the military in fulfilling the policy’s goals. Very often wars are studied without a corresponding study on the military reforms that were influenced and shaped by warfare, which reflects a neglect of cause and effect in military history. In the course of her reign, Empress Maria Theresia fought two dynastic wars, which were accompanied by significant military reforms. However, the mainstream scholarly literature on Maria’s wars appears to focus primarily on the strength of her feminine resistance in the face of a coalition of violent confrontation posed by the European powers of Prussia, France, and Bavaria – all intended to scramble for and partition the Habsburg territories. Maria’s determination to defend the Pragmatic Sanction of her father Charles IV and the multinational domination as a compact state was soon to be tested in battlefield. But as observed earlier on, Maria’s military reforms that accompanied such wars seem to remain in the background.

Beginning with the War of Austrian Succession (1740-1748) and until the Seven Years’ War (1754-1763), Queen Empress Maria Theresia carried out significant military reforms, which influenced the subsequent style and character of Austria’s armed forces in war. Although the War of Austrian Succession (1740-1748) resulted in the loss of Silesia to Prussia under Frederick II and the loss of three Italian territories to France, it made it necessary for Maria to invest effort in perfecting her army and reforming the domestic environment of the state, which greatly determined the outcome of the following dynastic wars. Such reforms bridged the existing military bandwidth problem and had a significant impact on both the organizational and the bureaucratic effectiveness of the military and the state at large. As a result, in the course of the second dynamic war, Prussia’s invasion of Bohemia under Frederick II was forestalled and eventually reversed at the war’s end.

This paper examines the components of such reforms in terms of relationship between policy reforms and strategic changes, which resulted in an efficient allocation of means to ends, capabilities to intentions, and resources to objectives – defining the overall essence of a grand strategy. Thus, military reforms carried out by Maria were spin-off components of economic, social, diplomatic, and political reforms, which helped the multinational empire prevent the threatening disintegration. However, the extent to which such reforms influenced the nature of war and warfare in Europe are beyond the scope this paper.

The establishment of border guard regiments in Transylvania, regardless of their ethnic background, was not only a military, but also a political, economic, and to a certain point religious decision, taken by the Crown towards the end of a long and costly war. It was probably also the main aspect for which Empress Maria Theresia was remembered by several generations of Transylvanians, and it remains up to this day one of the most highlighted acts of her reign in Romanian historical writing. My paper offers an overview of this process, analysing the mutual benefits these regiments brought to both the Empire and the local population, but also the difficulties and resistance encountered during their establishment, along with the short- and medium-term social implications.

From a military perspective, the small number of regular troops in Transylvania at the time (only three regiments), together with the province’s strategic position at the crossroads between the Ottoman and Russian empires, weighted heavy on the decision. Furthermore, the future military frontier lay in a province whose local elites were clinging to their late-medieval privileges and institutions, openly opposing the centralised views of the enlightened absolutism and its representatives. From this point of view, the new military force, together with the social and political standing of its commanders, was meant to help tip the balance in favour of the central authority, against the provincial Diet dominated by the local Hungarian aristocracy. From an economic perspective, the concept of self-sustainable units, even if irregular and of a lower expected quality, was most appealing to an Empire whose financial resources were always stretched. Finally, from a religious point of view, the establishment of a military frontier was expected to help the efforts of promoting Greek Catholicism among the Romanians (most of the Székely were Catholics already) while building a “sanitary cordon” between the tolerated Orthodox population in Transylvania and its main external prop: the Orthodox Church in the Romanian Principalities. Eventually, one should add the mindset and the governing ideas pertaining to the enlightened absolutism, since the new military frontier can be regarded, up to a point, as a small-scale experiment of intensive enlightened reforms in one of the most backward provinces of the Empire.

During the first decades after the establishment of regiments, positive results started to show, but never reached the expected amplitude – neither for the central authority, nor for the locals. The medium- and long-term effects, however, were much more deeply felt.
by both. Despite the recurrent social movements and endemic emigration over the Carpathians, the military frontier areas gradually prospered and their population reached an economic level and a social status that were above most other Romanian communities, while developing a particular mind-set and a sense of local patriotism which persists up to this day. In return, they also developed a strong feeling of dynastic loyalism, manifested throughout the nineteenth century.

The Rise of Croatian Generals – A Lesser Known Impact of the Military Reforms under Maria Theresia

During the last war against the Turks (1787-1791) and the French Wars (1792-1815), the body of generals in the Imperial-Royal Army of the Habsburg Monarchy consisted of 1246 persons, of which 958 served as active generals and 219 persons may be considered as having come from the lands of St Stephen’s Crown. A quarter of that group, numbering 54 generals, have been identified as Croats born in Civil Croatia, Slavonia, the Military Frontier area, or even in Hungary or elsewhere, but in a Croatian family. Considering the population and the size of these territories, this number is much higher than expected. This is clearly an impact of the military reforms of the Croatian Frontier and the regularisation of the Military Frontier Regiments during the reign of Maria Theresia. Croatian military leaders had reached the rank of higher generals and become an integral part of the corpus of generals in the Habsburg Monarchy.

The clearest sign of the great rise of Croatian officers, namely that 33 of the 54 generals came from the ranks of the Grenzer Regiments, can be attributed to the military reforms of Maria Theresia and the organisation of regular frontier regiments, the famous Grenzers as they are called in the Anglo-Saxon terminology. Considering the nationality of the 29 generals, only 4 seem not to have been Croats. The known disposal to the regular Grenzer regiments that one third of the officers should be foreigners seems not to been observed.

Among the remaining 21 persons, 5 from the staff, 5 from the line infantry, 2 from the engineers, 6 from the cavalry (4 hussars, 1 curassier, 1 chevaux léger), 1 from the artillery, 1 from the military transport and 1 from the Insurrection rose to generalship.

One of the most difficult problems is to identify the nationality of the officers. A part of the military leaders of the Grenzer units were foreigners and their descendants were born in the Military Frontier area without being Croatian or developing any aspect of bond to their homeland. Sometimes the foreign-born officers established such close connections to the Frontier area that they assimilated with the natives. During the long joint history of Croatia and Hungary, several families developed a double national identity or the family was divided into the Croatian and Hungarian branches (i.e. the Keglevich family). There is also a case of a native Hungarian assimilating in the Croatian Frontier area. According to these considerations, 8 of the 55 generals have been identified as Germans, 1 as a Spaniard, and 1
as a Hungarian. The remaining 45 generals were South Slavs, but 6 of these had been born in the Hungarian Kingdom. Religious affiliation is an aspect needing further research at this time, but two thirds seem to have been Roman Catholics. This number shows the effort of the government to convert the Orthodox population to Roman Catholicism.

The military merits of the Croatian generals were exceptional: 6 of the 55 generals reached the rank of Feldzeugmeister or General der Kavallerie, 18 rose to a Feldmarschalllieutenant, and the remaining 21 to a Generalmajor, which is far above the average among the 958 generals. The best indicator of military merits is the Military Order of Maria Theresia. The extraordinary number of 22 generals earned this highly esteemed medal as Knights and 5 of these earned the Commander’s Cross.

Owing to the military reforms of Maria Theresia, Croatian soldiers had an opportunity to establish themselves among the military elite of the Habsburg Monarchy. Their exceptional efforts at the turn of the 19th century created a solid fundament for the next century to develop the fame of the Croats not only as the bravest fighters, but also as generals with tremendous leadership skills.

Confronted with a formidable Prussian military force that had, seemingly unstoppable, overrun Silesia as one of her most precious possessions, Queen Maria Theresia was compelled to find a way to prevent further loss of territory and the dismemberment of the Monarchy she had just inherited. King Frederick’s unexpected and swift military attack forced her to save the day with measures that were unconventional, to say the least, and some of them could even be qualified as a desperate last resort. The mobilization of irregular troops from the Military Frontier and Slavonia certainly seem to have corresponded to that concept. Not even the highest Austrian military command was convinced that any lasting impact could be expected of these apparently undisciplined and unbridled soldiers. They were regarded as cannon fodder at best and altogether inferior to the regular German and Hungarian infantry of the line.

However, not only did the Grenzer troops from the lands bordering on the Ottoman Empire and the Pandurs led by the (in)famous Baron Trenck help save the Monarchy from imminent extinction, but their deployment in disproportionately large numbers on the battlefields in Silesia, Bohemia, Bavaria, Northern Italy, Alsace, and Flanders also proved a game-changing decision that permanently influenced the ancien régime type of warfare characterized by a line-ahead tactics. The decision to employ the Grenzer, first as irregular troops and then as light infantry, inevitably changed the course of Austrian military history and should be interpreted as yet another military innovation within the military revolution of the Early Modern period.

The Military Frontier had come into existence long before Maria Theresia’s rise to power, during a period in which the military system of the Ottoman Empire was still the most sophisticated in Europe. The centuries-old struggle for survival in the territories bordering this empire transformed the Grenzer who inhabited them into hardened warriors that excelled at “small wars”. The Ottoman defeat at Vienna in 1683 was followed by a substantial territorial expansion of the Habsburg Monarchy, which made a large part of the Military Frontier obsolete. However, instead of demilitarizing the Frontier, the Court and the War Council in Vienna decided to expand and convert it into a “giant garrison”. The purpose of the Military Frontier changed only nominally: the Grenzer were still expected to defend the Monarchy with their small-war tactics – not at home, admittedly, but in the distant theatres of war. This paper discusses to what extent Maria Theresia’s wars justified that decision, whether the Monarchy profited from it, and whether it had a revolutionary impact.
Defending the Queen: Croatian Grenzer Regiments during the Seven Years War

The Croatian Grenzers (or just Grenzers) fought in the Seven Years’ War (1756-1763). Depending on the occasion and the needs of strategic warfare, they were known as the Karlsstädt-Likkaner, Ottochaner, Oguliner, men of Szluiner origin from the Karlovac Generality of the Military Frontier, and as Banalisten, Gradischaner, Breeder, Peterwardiener from the Varazdin Generality and the Slavonian part of the Military Frontier. These infantry regiments were incorporated into the battle corps led by many famous and promising Austrian officers.

Although they were organized as line infantry, the Grenzers were mainly used as elite light troops (similar to the Grenzer Hussar regiments and their battalions) for special tasks characteristic of small war (such as General Hadik’s famous raid on Berlin in October 1757, many attacks on enemy convoys, intrusions on the enemy territory, skirmishes). In the regular battlefield, Grenzers as the light infantry mostly held position in a specific location conditioned by the battlefield terrain (groves and forests, hills and plateaus) and specific tasks (forming a vanguard or rear guard, protecting the marching army flanks, performing reconnaissance patrols and skirmishes, intercepting enemy correspondence, and capturing or arresting deserters).

According to these specific duties and tasks that the Austrian military command assigned to them, the Grenzers were regarded as skilled, brave, and reliable soldiers and warriors. As many sources indicate and display, between gun smoke and the fire of artillery and line infantry, the Grenzers were successful, stubborn-in-defence and fierce-in-offence soldiers. According to the aforementioned indications, this paper presents and analyses the role of the Grenzer in several selected battles of the Seven Years’ War (the battle of Lobositz on October 1, 1756, the battles of Prague and Mays in 1757, the battle of Hochkirch in October 1758, the battles of Kunersdorf and Maxen in 1759, the battles of Landshut and Liegnitz in 1760). Additionally, the role of the Grenzers in a number of smaller encounters, skirmishes, intrusions, and raids in the domain of their characteristic conduction of small war will be presented and analysed (storming of the city and fortress Tetschen in October 1756, intrusion on the Prussian winter camp in Winter 1756/1757, storming the Prussian military depot at Gabel in July 1757, ambushes on Prussian convoys and trains at Kamnitz, Hassel, und Kaltenbach in July 1757, raid on Berlin in October 1757, and the storming of Schweidnitz in October 1761).
From a Conditional Queen to the Queen of Conditions: Maria Theresia and the so-called Croatian Pragmatic Sanction of 1712

In 1720, when Emperor Charles VI started the confirmation process of the Pragmatic Sanction within his lands, the Court in Vienna firmly insisted on one condition: all confirmations inside the Monarchy should be made unconditionally. And they all were, except in the case of the first recognition of Habsburg female succession within the Monarchy: the so-called Croatian Pragmatic Sanction or Art. 7, issued by the Croatian Diet (Sabor) on March 11, 1712.

The Croatian estates decided to recognize Habsburg female succession only if the future queen “should have as her possessions not only Austria, but also Styria, Carinthia, and Carniola, and if she should reside in Austria.” This condition announced what was going to be the main purpose or goal of the Pragmatic Sanction of Charles VI: a legally inseparable and indivisible Monarchy as the best possible political legacy for the future queen.

This paper analyses and offers two “interpretative paths“ in understanding the so-called Croatian Pragmatic Sanction:

1. The influence of this decision on the process of creating the inseparable and indivisible Monarchy in the context of the abovementioned condition;

2. Did Maria Theresia become the queen of conditions in Croatia so late in her reign due to Sabor’s decision of 1712?
The Croatian Pragmatic Sanction, Zagreb, 11 March 1712

The seventh article of the session of the Parliament of the Kingdom of Dalmatia, Croatia and Slavonia, in which the Parliament recognizes the right of inheritance of the throne to the female line of the Habsburg dynasty.

HR-NSD-1, Parliament of the Kingdom of Dalmatia, Croatia and Slavonia. Articles of Parliament, book 5

The charter by which Queen Maria Theresa covenants to the Seven Counties the title, i.e. the coat of arms, together with the right of using the red wax.

HR-NSD-30, Seven Counties. Congregational acts 1778
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Portrait of Baron Franz Trenck
the commander of the Slavonian Pandurs in Silesia in 1743
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Vienna, 1764
The insignia of the Knight’s Order of Saint Stephen founded by Queen Maria Theresa in 1764 as the highest civilian award.

HR-HDA-750. The Ottomar family records

p.i. (18th century)
The portrait of the Military Frontier’s units in 1756.

HR-HDA-303. Graphic Collection.
inv no. 1189
Parallel with the extensive reforms that led to the formation of a proto-modern government in the Croatian-Slavonian Kingdom during the reign of Maria Theresia, a new type of civil servant was introduced. Still predominantly of a noble background, he was now receptive to reforms and loyal to the interests of the Court in Vienna; above all, he was competent to advise the King on the necessary improvements that would be in accordance with the principle of enlightened government, yet accepted by the estates as traditional political structures. Accordingly, the professional education of civil servants became one of the major goals of 18th-century educational reforms, with a range of state-controlled academies and university programmes established by Maria Theresia. Lectures in sciences serving the state and political economy were held there in order to teach the prospective civil servants the art of “good policy” (gute Polizei), or “wise governance”, which comprised a theoretical knowledge of public administration, education, health, economy, and security as the main postulates for incorporating the principles of common good and prosperity in public governance. One of such programmes, namely Political and Cameral Studies (Studium politico-camerale) was founded in 1769 in the Croatian city of Varaždin. It was closely linked to the newly established Croatian government and aimed to serve as a regional educational centre not only for the prospective civil servants, but also for officials already in service. Focusing on the programme in Varaždin as a regionally recognized institution of higher education in the period of developing a state-controlled educational system, this paper aims at analysing the educational policy of Maria Theresia in regard to her civil servants and at estimating the knowledge required for public service during the period of enlightened absolutism. The Varaždin programme will be compared with similar institutes in Austria and Hungary. Also, its success in Croatia, where it was supposed to function as the key institution for the educational strategies of local nobility, will be critically assessed.
Matrimonial Arrangements in the Service of Prestige, Social and Political Connections, Public and Military Services, and the Material Wellbeing of Croatian Noble Families during Maria Theresia’s Reign

This paper discusses the social and political importance of favourable familial arrangements and connections in the service of Queen Maria Theresia and her State with its administrative and military bodies.

The topic will be elaborated by using the example of the marital strategy of Suzana Matrinszky, one of several sisters born in a noble family of humble descent. Her favourable marriages, first with the count and general Ivan Kazimir Dražković and especially the second one with the Croatian ban Ferenc Nádasdy, enabled her to improve her family’s prosperity and position in the society, as well as to arrange advantageous marriages for her younger sisters. These marriages, and the family connections thus created between the noble families of Nádasdy, Dražković, and Vojkffy, affected especially the spouses of these women (some positively and others rather negatively) regarding their prestige, social status, and chances in public and military service.

The paper is based on eighteenth-century sources related to the Vojkffy family. It also uses Baltazar Adam Krčelić’s view of the everyday life of nobility in Civil Croatia in the mid-eighteenth century as described in his Annuae, as well as modern scholarship on the Early Modern European and Croatian nobility.

The “Militar Graenitz Rechten”: An 18th-Century Legal Reform of the Military Frontier

Empress Maria Theresia implemented her reforms throughout the Habsburg Monarchy – in its centre and, as much as possible, in its periphery as well. In terms of space and geography, the Croatian-Slavonian Military Frontier was the edge and frontier of the Monarchy, i.e. its actual and symbolic periphery. From the beginning of the 18th century, the policy of the Habsburg Monarchy at its south-eastern borders was carefully planned in many of its aspects. In a way, this transition period has been defined by the statistical experts and historians of the Military Frontier in the 19th century, who called it “the age of regulation.” One of the forms in which this process was taking place was social regulation by means of legal regulation. Among the acts that were used to introduce modernity into the realm of law, administration, and judiciary were the so-called  Krajška prava (Militar Gränz Rechten – MGR). Historiography has already acknowledged their importance, yet they have so far been only partially evaluated. The name of this legal act, which is conventionally used in Croatian historiography, implies that it is a list of rights granted to the soldiers-peasants in the Military Frontier area in accordance with their specific position and role in the society of the “old regime”, but in fact it is an example of exactly the opposite tendency. The MGR had far-reaching consequences for the frontier community in terms of abolishing their autonomy and bringing structural changes to the frontier society. The text was difficult to understand for people who were not legal professionals. Creating and declaring this legal act caused a clash between two different worlds, learned and illiterate, and also led to the professionalization and formalization of the entire legal system. This was a huge change, especially in relation to the hitherto applied jurisprudence, which was informal and observed the rules of common law. The legal reform of the frontier society – as manifested in the MGR – was made possible by the previous military and organizational reform, including the creation of regiments, and should therefore be seen as part of a whole set of military and social reforms. This paper presents the content of the legal act in question and analyses the implications it had on the frontier society as a whole. The legal reforms in the Military Frontier can be understood as introducing overall legal modernization, i.e. as a way of creating a modern state, which is evident in the process of codification, both in the centre of the monarchy and at its periphery.
Although the reforms of Maria Theresia in Croatia and Slavonia, as it was the case with Hungary as well, did not include a reform of the judicial system, it would be wrong to say that this system remained completely unchanged with regard to the form in which it had been introduced during the reign of her father, Charles VI.

Maria Theresia made some crucial changes in the administrative system, e.g. by renewing the system of counties in the "Lower Slavonia", which were now shaped in the same manner as the Hungarian counties, and by reforming three Croatian counties in the "Upper Slavonia" during the mid-18th century. Also, a new administrative institution was established – the Croatian Royal Council. Although the Council was not allowed to interfere with the courts, it played an important role, since its duty was, as in other administrative affairs, to collect information about the state of judicial affairs and send reports to the queen.

This paper aims at demonstrating and explaining the impact of Maria Theresia's reforms on the judicial system of county courts and their activities during this period. In addition, it describes some specific circumstances in which they were to deploy their competence and jurisdiction.

The Roma population settled in the Croatian lands during the second half of the 14th century and is thus one of the oldest minority groups in Croatia. Their coexistence with the local non-Romani population over the following six centuries led to various attempts by the European governments to resolve the "Gypsy problem". The enlightened rulers, such as the Prussian king Frederick and the Spanish Ferdinand VI, resorted to forcible assimilation measures. In the 18th century, Habsburg rulers Maria Theresia and Joseph II undertook a series of reforms aimed at modernizing the state and the society in accordance with their educational ideas. The comprehensive reform programme of Maria Theresia had a considerable impact on the situation of the Roma, as she issued a number of important legal provisions in the period from 1749 to 1767 seeking to assimilate and integrate them into the Habsburg state. Her reforms aimed at completely changing their ethnic and socio-economic status. Our research focuses on the Theresian reforms regarding the Roma in the Croatian territory during the second half of the 18th century. For a better understanding of this reform, we have added a comparison with similar reforms in other parts of the Habsburg Empire and in other European countries (especially Prussia).
Portraits of Queen Empress Maria Theresia in North-western Croatia

Museum collections in Zagreb and Varazdin hold a significant number of portraits of Queen and Empress Maria Theresia. The earlier, smaller portraits usually show her as the Austrian archduchess and heiress to the throne, and were probably intended for the homes of Croatian noblemen. Among these, some outstanding examples include the so-called engagement portraits of the young archduchess with her fiancé, Francis Stephen of Lorraine, possibly painted by the Viennese court artist Frans von Stampert (Antwerp, 1675 – Vienna, 1750), today preserved in the Collection of Paintings at the Croatian History Museum.

Portraits of Maria Theresia as queen and empress painted between 1740 and 1760 tend to be large, as they were intended for the Croatian Parliament, town halls, military headquarters, and other official venues, from which they were donated to the museums in Varazdin and Zagreb. Many of those are attributed to Martin van Meytens the Younger (Stockholm, 1695 – Vienna, 1770), a favourite court painter of Maria Theresia and her family. Together with his workshop, Meytens provided the entire Austrian Empire with numerous portraits of the queen and empress adorned with crowns symbolising her power over the countries she ruled. There are two outstanding portraits painted by Meytens himself: one depicting the queen in a pale blue dress, nowadays at the Varazdin City Museum, and another showing her in a dark blue dress, preserved at the Croatian History Museum. Although the Varazdin portrait has suffered from retouching the face in the second half of the 19th century, it reveals the hand of a skilled master, especially in the treatment of rich fabrics. The Zagreb portrait has retained its original splendour to the present day. An unsigned portrait at the Zagreb City Museum has been attributed to Martin van Meytens the Younger, same as the portraits of Maria Theresia and Francis I at the Varazdin City Museum.

A fairly large portrait of the empress, work of a lesser known artist called Johann Geibl, was painted in 1750 for the Varazdin Frontier Units and ended up in the 16th Infantry Regiment at Bjelovar, whence it came to the Croatian History Museum in 1919. This representative portrait shows all the elements indicating a skilled painter, possibly connected to the Meytens' workshop.

After the death of her husband in 1865, Maria Theresia was never again seen in any other attire but the mourning one. The preserved portraits from this period of her life preserved at the Varazdin City Museum – two large portraits donated by the empress herself to the local lyceum in 1779 and two smaller-scale ones – are coupled with portraits of Joseph II. All four portraits are work of excellent, probably Viennese artists.

Three small portraits showing Maria Theresia as a widow, her husband Francis Stephen, and the heir to the throne Joseph II are part of the Gallery of Hungarian and Croatian Kings, ending the line of 46 portraits starting with St Stephen. The names of two, possibly three painters of the Gallery have remained unknown to the present day. The Gallery was owned by the Kulmer family and donated to the Croatian History Museum in 1854.

Numerous preserved portraits of Maria Theresia in north-western Croatia show the empress in different stages of life – as a young archduchess and heiress to the throne, as the queen and empress, and finally as a ruler and a grieving widow – painted by court painters or by anonymous skilled and less skilled artists. They remain a reminder of her greatness as the ruler of a multi-ethnic empire, and a source for research on multiple layers of cultural and political history.
The Coronation of Maria Theresia as the “King” of Hungary in 1741

Medals tend to be conveniently sized, easy to reproduce, very robust, and made of precious metal. In the eighteenth century, they were a popular means of conveying a person's image to the world. The famous reverse side of a medal often included a place for political statements, dynastic propaganda, or the staging of power. Medals were used to perpetuate one's image — their distribution was hence a kind of eighteenth-century marketing. Maria Theresia knew how to masterfully use this advertising surface for her own ends.

Maria Theresia's coronation as the "King" of Hungary took place during the Wars of Succession. During this uncertain period, such a ceremony was of enormous significance for the consolidation of her power. In order not to threaten her legal position, the archduchess was crowned a "king" despite her sex. Had she been made a queen, there would have been no Hungarian king, and the government affairs and decrees of law were reserved for the king alone. Numerous medals were produced on the occasion of this coronation. Their distribution to honored guests and to the public was part of the traditional coronation ritual.

As Maria Theresia proceeded over the Pressburg town-hall square following the coronation in St. Martin's cathedral — surrounded by her guards and subjects — the Hungarian chamber president rode through the crowd and threw gold and silver tokens to the assembled people. More than 16 thousand of these "jetons" were produced and distributed especially for the coronation day. Maria Theresia's first interaction with her people was through this act of giving. With this staged gesture, she demonstrated her generosity as a magnanimous sovereign.

The small format demanded compressed, symbolic representations. The design of these messages was an important task — after all, the images were to be preserved eternally and contribute to the myth of the ruler.

The significance given to medals was remarkable. There was no other visual medium for which Maria Theresia gave so many personal instructions as for the medals. This made them a unique medium of sovereign representation and today they offer glimpses into the monarch's self-image and the way her likeness was distributed in the public.

The Thaler of Maria Theresia – the World’s Most Famous Silver Coin

The thaler was a type of large silver coin used throughout Europe for almost four hundred years. In the late 15th century, with the discovery of silver deposits, the rulers of Central European fiefdoms started minting Guldenroschen (a golden groat made of silver, yet equal in value to a Goldgulden). In the kingdom of Bohemia, ruled at that time by Louis II of Hungary, a guldener (nickname for a Guldengrosche) was minted under the name of Joachimsthaler, after Joachimsthal (St Joachim's Valley, Jáchymov, now in the Czech Republic), where silver was mined by the Counts of Schlick. Similar coins began to be minted in the neighbouring silver-rich valleys, each named after that particular valley (thal). There were soon so many of them that these silver coins began to be known more widely as "thaler" in German. It is from these early thaler coins that the Reichsthaler (the imperial thaler) evolved, becoming a standard for trade between the regions of Europe. The Reichsthaler was introduced at a Leipzig convention of 1566 and contained 1/9 of a mark of silver. In 1754, it was replaced by the Conventionsthaler (convention thaler) as a standard coin in the Holy Roman Empire. The Conventionsthaler contained 1/10 of a Cologne mark of silver and had a variety of subdivisions including the Reichsthaler (Prussian), the Austrian Gulden, the South German Gulden, the Groschen, the Pfennig, and the Heller. During the early 19th century, the Conventionsthaler was superseded by a thaler containing 1/14 of a Cologne mark of silver, based on the Prussian Thaler (Reichsthaler). In 1857, the Prussian Thaler was replaced by the Vereinsthaler (union thaler). The Vereinsthaler contained 16.23 grams of silver, and was used as the base for several different currencies. In Prussia and other northern German states, it was the standard unit of account. In South German states that used the Gulden as a standard unit of account, the ratio was set at 1 ½ Gulden to 1 Vereinsthaler. In the Austrian Empire (and later in Austro-Hungary), a different Gulden (also known as the Florin) was the unit of account, with 1½ Gulden to 1 Vereinsthaler. German unification saw the introduction of the Goldmark at a rate of 3 marks to 1 Vereinsthaler. The Vereinsthaler coins continued to circulate as 3 mark coins until 1908, when they were replaced with 3 mark coins. The name Thaler for 3 marks persisted until the 1930s. Austria stopped issuing Vereinsthaler coins in 1867, following the Austro-Prussian War.

The Maria Theresia thaler is a silver bullion coin that was used in world trade continuously from its first minting in 1741, at which time the Reichsthaler standard was used. Coins minted after 1780 were always dated as 1780. The thaler is 39.5-41 mm in diameter and 2.5 mm thick; it weighs 28.0668 grams and contains 23.3890 grams of fine silver. It has the silver content of .833 and a copper content of .166 of its total millisemal fineness. On the obverse, there is a portrait of the Empress circled by an inscription in Latin containing her titles. On the reverse, there is an image of the imperial double eagle, likewise circled by an inscription in Latin. Along the rim of the coin, there is the motto of the Empress's reign: "Justitia et Clementia".
The Maria Theresia thaler quickly became a standard trade coin and several nations began striking these coins. Beside the Habsburg mints in Günzburg, Hall, Karlsburg, Kremsmica, Milan, Prague, and Vienna, mints in Birmingham, Bombay, Brussels, London, Paris, Rome and Utrecht also struck the coin. Between 1741 and 2000, some 389 million coins of that type were minted. In 1935, Italy gained a 25 year concession over the production of the Maria Theresia thaler. The Italians blocked non-Italian banks and bullion traders from obtaining the coin and thus France, Belgium, and the UK started producing the coin so as to support their economic interests in the Red Sea, Persian Gulf, and the East Coast of Africa. In 1961, when the concession ended, Austria made diplomatic approaches to the relevant governments requesting that they cease producing the coin. The UK was the last government to formally agree to this request in February 1962.

The Maria Theresia thaler came to be used as currency in large parts of Africa until after World War II. It was common from North Africa to Somalia, Ethiopia, Kenya, and down the coast of Tanzania to Mozambique. Its popularity in the Red Sea region was such that the merchants would not accept any other type of currency. The Maria Theresia thaler was also formally the currency of the Hejaz, Yemen, the Aden Protectorate, as well as Muscat and Oman in the Arabian Peninsula. The coin remains popular in North Africa and the Middle East to this day.

The Maria Theresia thaler is first recorded as circulating in Ethiopia from the reign of Emperor Iyasu II (1730-1755). According to traveller James Bruce, the coin, not debased as some other currencies, was dominating the areas that he visited in 1768. In their work on Abessinien: Afrikas Unruhe Herd (1935), Joseph Kalmer and Ludwig Hyun estimated that over 20% of the 245 million coins minted before 1931 ended in Ethiopia. In 1868, a British military expedition led by Field Marshal Robert Napier to Magdala, the capital of Emperor Tewodros II, took the Maria Theresia thalers with them to pay local expenses. Starting with 1935, the Italians minted the Maria Theresia thaler at the Roman mint in order to use it during their conquest of Ethiopia. During World War II, the British minted some 18 million Maria Theresia thalers in Bombay to use in their campaign of driving the Italians out of Ethiopia.

The Maria Theresia thaler bearing the date of 1780 is a “protected coin” according to the British Forgery and Counterfeiting Act of 1881. The Maria Theresia thaler continues to be produced by the Austrian Mint, and is available in both proof and uncirculated conditions.

In Maria Theresia’s reign, specific guidelines had to be observed in order to produce the most representative as well as most archetypical baroque flags. Instead of embroidery work, flag iconographies were painted because of financial and time constraints. The collection of flags and streamers preserved at the Croatian History Museum witnesses the military reforms carried out by Maria Theresia, in conjunction with her reorganization of state governance. In particular, there are three representative flags that, on the one hand, show the practice of exhibiting the statehood status with dynastic symbols on battalion standards, and on the other indicate the iconographic significance of saints and beatified kings on ceremonial and commemorative banners. These guidelines are all influenced by the baroque style, the Age of Enlightenment and the turbulent times of conflict during Maria Theresia’s reign.
According to the testimony of Joseph Voltić, an eyewitness, the city of Vienna in the 1780s was “flooded” with various publications of worthless content. Voltić pointed out the lack of erudition as well as the ignorance and mockery of Latin language, as well as derision of abbots – but most of all he drew attention to the fact that anyone could comment on anything. The problem escalated to the point where Voltić suggested that a committee should be established with the purpose of controlling the writings and of selecting what should be allowed or not allowed for publication. Nevertheless, in the same letter Voltić underlined that in the contemporary Vienna there were many wise and educated writers, among them a “Josephus Kereszturj Hungarius – a royal agent, poet, educated layer and historian.”

Joseph Keresztúri (Croatia Stridonensis) gained his education in a Jesuit ratio studiorum. In those circumstances, this meant that Keresztúri was educated in an institution that aimed at a constant improvement of linguistic expression in Latin, a practice heavily criticized and ironized by his contemporary, Balthasar Adam Krčil. Keresztúri’s writings – including comments of a two-volume collection of legal provisions, a detailed historical and juridical discussion on insurrection, and various literary writings in the form of dialogues in which he commented on the socio-political constellation following the death of Joseph II – definitely testify that he was a widely educated humanist author.

Having left the Jesuit order, Keresztúri first completed his legal studies. His first appointment was to the office of an ordinarius notarius in Varaždin at the time when the Croatian Royal Chamber (Consilium regionum Croaticum) was being established. As a member of various committees, Keresztúri had an opportunity to get acquainted with the reforms introduced by the Royal Court in Vienna as well as the political elites of his time. In 1771, he became an agent aulicus at the Hungarian Royal Chamber (Cancellaria Hungarico-Aulica) in Vienna, and he stayed in that office for the next twenty years. Since the Hungarian Royal Chamber mediated between the Royal Court in Vienna and the lands of the Crown of St Stephen, Keresztúri was very well acquainted with the royal policy towards Hungary – he was in medias res, so to say. During that period, which lasted for twenty years, he was the editor of Ephemeredes Vindobonenses, a journal published twice per week in Latin. This journal brought political, cultural, economic, and various other news from the Monarchy (especially from Croatia) and Europe, as well as reports on the royal reforms and other activities undertaken by Maria Teresa and Joseph II.

Immediatly after the death of Joseph II in 1790, Keresztúri published a work of literary and political fiction entitled Josephus II in Campis Elysii. Somnium Eleutherii Panonii, under the pseudonym of Eleutherius Panonius (“the free Hungarian”). In his foreword to this work, Keresztúri presented his hypothesis and concept, but he also vividly depicted the bitterness of the Hungarian Estates resulting from the reforms introduced by Joseph II and the tensions in the Hungarian society after the Emperor’s death. Furthermore, Keresztúri presented himself as Hungarius Author in order to emphasize the fact that he himself was a member of the Hungarian Estates, and also recommended to the readers to think before their final verdict concerning the Emperor’s intentions and deeds. Emperor Joseph’s reign is explored via his dialogues with his mother (Colloquium I – IV), all symbolically taking place under the shadow of the late Hungarian kings in the Elysian Fields. The fifth chapter presents a debate among the late Hungarian kings, some accepting and praising the Emperor’s policy towards Hungary, others rejecting and condemning it. Keresztúri decided to use the form of dialogue between Emperor Joseph II and his mother Maria Teresa “in order that the truth should be better illuminated when contrasted to the discussion of shadows” (quod mutuis umbrae colloquuis veritas magis illustrari). The ideal starting point for estimating the character of Maria Teresa is the actual perspective of the Hungarian Estates. Thus, she becomes an advocata Hungarise and, although her discords are not unambiguous, Keresztúri presents them in opposition to Joseph’s reforms, which makes Maria Teresa a queen who had idyllic relations with the Hungarian Estates. Therefore, it is obvious that the wording of his title primarily serves to communicate the message that Emperor Joseph’s intentions towards Hungary were not to be condemned.
Anna G. Pietrowska  
Institute of Musicology, Jagiellonian University in Kraków

The Gypsy Baron (1885) as a Musical Monument Remembering Maria Theresia? Facts, Issues, Controversies

In this paper, Maria Theresia’s legacy is discussed as remembered and already mythologized in the late nineteenth century within the realm of musical culture. The focus of the presentation is on the operetta The Gypsy Baron (1885) as a work both directly and indirectly referring to the Empress.

Considered as a “musical monument to the Austro-Hungarian Empire”, The Gypsy Baron (original German title: Der Zigeunerbaron) was composed by Johann Strauss II (1825-1899). I argue that – although in a veiled manner – the operetta ultimately reveals the position that the “King” Maria Theresia enjoyed in the nineteenth-century Empire and is, at the same time, a fine example of the legacy of her politics.

Three aspects will be examined in particular detail: the omnipresent references to the real wars fought in order to establish Maria Theresia’s royal position; innuendos to her wars against superstitions and irrational beliefs; and, finally, the haunting parallelism between the fate of Maria Theresia and one of the heroines in the operetta – Saffi.

The pillars of the operetta’s plot are wars fought by the Austrians: there is a mention of the Battle at Belgrade, where one of the chief heroes of the operetta was supposedly killed. Even more important for the dramaturgy is the War of the Austrian Succession. The audience is indirectly told that, when Maria Theresia was believed to be ineligible to inherit the Habsburg throne, it was the multi-ethnic army (including the Gypsies) that fought to help her claim her position. The irony of the portrayed situation – alas, never brought up in the course of the operetta – is the fact that once Maria Theresia actually became the Empress, she introduced several reforms that (often negatively) affected the Gypsies.

Not only the real wars are crucial for the plot of the operetta, but also the educational campaigns pursued in the times of Maria Theresia. The Gypsy Baron features several Gypsy heroes as surrounded by the aura of mysticism and mystery. However, at the end of the day, they turn out to be loyal and trustworthy citizens of the Empire. In that respect, the operetta can serve as a memento of yet another “war” fought by Maria Theresia and her ministers: against ignorance and superstitions. Although initially the Gypsies symbolize an unknown and uncanny world, it turns out that they can be respected and are not to be feared.

Finally, I would like to argue that the situation of Saffi – the supposedly Gypsy heroine of the operetta – can be compared with Maria Theresia’s struggles to claim her position. Ignored and even disregarded by others, Saffi turns out to be of aristocratic ancestry and capable of proving all her prerogatives.

Overall, treating The Gypsy Baron as a specific, musical case study, the paper reflects on the function of propaganda and the issue of collective memory in the late nineteenth-century view of Maria Theresia’s role.
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