

CATHOLIC REVIVAL IN
THE AGE OF THE BAROQUE

Religious Identity in Southwest Germany, 1550–1750

MARC R. FORSTER



PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge, CB2 2RU, UK <http://www.cup.cam.ac.uk>
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA <http://www.cup.org>
10 Stamford Road, Oakleigh, Melbourne 3166, Australia
Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain

© Cambridge University Press 2001

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2001

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

Typeset in Baskerville 11/12.5pt [vN]

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data

Forster, Marc R.

Catholic revival in the age of the baroque: religious identity in southwest Germany, 1550-1570 / Marc R. Forster.

p. cm. – (New studies in European history

Includes bibliographical references (p. 245).

ISBN 0 521 78044 6

1. Catholic Church – Germany, Southern – History – 16th century. 2. Germany, Southern – Church history – 16th century. 3. Catholic Church – Germany, Southern – History – 17th century. 4. Germany, Southern – Church history – 17th century.
5. Catholic Church – Germany, Southern – History – 18th century. 6. Germany, Southern – Church history – 18th century. I. Title. II. Series.

BX1537.G3 F67 2001

282'.434'0903 – dc21 00-036305

ISBN 0 521 78044 6 hardback

Contents

<i>List of maps</i>	<i>page</i> ix
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xi
<i>List of abbreviations</i>	xiii
Introduction	I
1 The Counter-Reformation offensive, 1550–1650	18
Confessionalization under Austrian leadership	21
Tridentine reform in the Bishopric of Constance	36
Catholic reform under local leadership	50
Conclusion	58
2 The sacral landscape and pilgrimage piety	61
The sacral landscape	64
Pilgrimage piety	83
Conclusion	104
3 Religious practice	106
The liturgical year and everyday religious experience	106
The rise of individual devotion	131
4 Clericalism in the villages	152
Clericalism and communalism	152
Clericalism and anti-clericalism	157
The professionalization of the parish clergy	167
Conclusion	183
5 The communal church in German Catholicism	185
The communal church	187
The priest in the village	199
Conclusion	206

6	Reformers and intermediaries, 1650–1750	208
	Reform and confessionalization	210
	Intermediaries	228
	Popular Catholicism, local religion and regional patterns	233
	Conclusion	241
	<i>Bibliography</i>	245
	<i>Index</i>	257

Maps

1	Southwest Germany, 1550–1750: political	<i>page</i> 6
2	Southwest Germany, 1550–1750: ecclesiastical	8
3	Linzgau Rural Chapter, 1699: the sacral landscape	63
4	Southwest Germany, 1650–1750: Catholic regions or religious <i>Landschaften</i>	237

CHAPTER I

The Counter-Reformation offensive, 1550–1650

Southwest Germany, like the rest of Catholic Europe, experienced the Counter-Reformation in the form of measures taken by both the Church and Catholic states to combat the spread of Protestantism. Catholic leaders in this part of Germany also worked to implement the reforms of the Church, the clergy, and religious practice advocated by the Council of Trent.¹ Tridentine reforms came to the Southwest in the later sixteenth century as Catholic officials pursued reforms of the clergy and made tentative efforts to reform popular religious practice. Tridentine reform was slowed by the conservative and traditional nature of many powerful ecclesiastical institutions, especially the great monasteries, and by the relatively late arrival of the Jesuits in the region, but it left an indelible mark on the Church.²

The period from 1550 to the end of the Thirty Years' War was the era most marked by Tridentine reform and the related processes of Counter-Reformation and confessionalization, although the decrees of the Council of Trent remained a blueprint for church reform into the eighteenth century. Yet even during these decades of reform, an analysis of the successes and failures of reform measures does not do justice to the complex interplay of social groups that created Catholic religiosity and culture. As one moves back and forth between the "top-down" analysis of reforms and the reception of such measures at the local level, two characteristics of Southwest German Catholicism become apparent. Firstly, the Catholic elite instituted Tridentine reforms tentatively and in a limited way, and the reforms were not universally welcome, even within the clergy. Secondly, people at the local level, whether it

¹ For an overview of Catholicism in Germany, see R. Po-chia Hsia, *The World of Catholic Renewal, 1540–1770* (Cambridge, 1998), pp. 73–79.

² For a discussion of these issues and for extensive bibliography: Marc R. Forster, "With and Without Confessionalization: Varieties of Early Modern German Catholicism" *Journal of Early Modern History* 1,4 (1998), pp. 315–343.

was the local population, parish priests, or local officials, actively engaged these reform measures, supporting some, altering some, and rejecting others. For such measures to have any lasting impact on local religious practices, they had to be embraced at the local level.

Thus even at the height of the Counter-Reformation, religious change took place through a process of negotiation and exchange involving state officials, bishops and their officials, local clergy, city and village leaders, and the common people. Reformers could claim some successes. Most significantly, by the beginning of the seventeenth century, firm confessional boundaries had been created, clear norms of official Catholic practice put in place, and the most public abuses of the clergy, especially concubinage, eliminated. Popular religiosity, however, changed little, and there is little evidence of a revival of popular Catholicism; this revival would occur after 1650.³ Tridentine reform in the “Age of Confessionalism,” as the period from 1550 to 1650 is known, was a prelude to the full flowering of Baroque Catholicism, not its direct cause.

In the decades after the Council of Trent there were two groups of reformers active in Southwest Germany. The first was found among state officials, especially in the upper levels of the Austrian state. These men were “confessionalizers,” for they advocated a close cooperation between the state and the Catholic Church for the purpose of creating religious unity in the population. Within both the lay and the clerical Catholic elite were also many church reformers who, inspired by the decrees of the Council, pushed for an extensive reform of the clergy which, in their view, would lead to a full-scale popular religious renewal.

The Austrian Habsburgs, rulers of Outer Austria (*Vorderösterreich*), the largest state in the region, were the early leaders of the Catholic cause within this part of Germany. Beginning in the 1560s Austrian authorities moved aggressively to suppress Protestantism in their territories and advocated church reforms along the lines encouraged by the Council of Trent. Austrian religious policy emphasized obedience to state authorities, linking loyalty to the Catholic Church with loyalty to the Habsburgs. In practice, this policy led to a focus on the external markers of religious loyalty. Austrian officials moved rapidly to bring the clergy into line. In an effort to counter the most obvious abuses of the clergy, they favored monastic reform and efforts to eradicate clerical concubinage.

³ Hsia, *The World of Catholic Renewal*, p. 75: “the revival of popular Catholicism took off slowly in the 1660s and reached its climax between 1700 and 1760.”

Somewhat later, Austrian reformers attempted to require priests to perform more uniform religious services.

These state-sponsored reform policies brought the Austrian *Regierung* into a more intense relationship with the bishops of the region, particularly the Bishop of Constance. At times state and church authorities cooperated to institute and enforce reform measures, but at other times Austrian officials lamented the hesitancy and inefficiency of episcopal leaders.⁴ Reformist bishops and their officials supported Austrian policies that were intended to reform the clergy and they even took the lead in this endeavor in the non-Austrian parts of the region. The Bishops of Constance also gave considerable support to the Tridentine-inspired effort to strengthen episcopal authority, which on more than one occasion caused conflict with secular authorities and the great monasteries of the diocese. However, although several activist bishops attempted extensive reforms, the lack of unity among important Catholic powers in the region meant that Tridentine reform in the Bishopric of Constance proceeded sporadically, as it did elsewhere in Catholic Germany.

Tridentine reform and confessionalization were promoted not just by the Habsburgs and the bishops. Catholic cities, smaller principalities, and some monasteries also embraced elements of the reform agenda. The town councils of Catholic imperial cities such as Rottweil and Überlingen instituted important reforms, especially of the clergy. The monastery of Weingarten, notably under the leadership of Abbot Georg Wegelin (abbot from 1586 to 1627), was a powerful force for church reform, both among the many monasteries of the Southwest and in the villages governed by Weingarten.

The most effective reforms were often those that were embraced at the local level, by local officials, the local clergy, or the local people. If at times reformers could discipline the clergy and force public obedience to Catholicism, they could not force changes in religious practice on villagers and townspeople. Even in those areas, such as the Habsburg territories, where officials pursued an aggressive reform program, Catholic practice developed out of the interplay of popular and elite notions of the role of religion. This negotiation of Catholic practice can be seen in the story of the small Austrian town of Burkheim in the 1580s.

⁴ Austrian officials turned at times to papal nuncios when they pursued a more thoroughgoing reform of the clergy, for example in the city of Constance: Wolfgang Zimmermann, *Rekatholisierung, Konfessionalisierung und Ratsregiment. Der Prozeß des politischen und religiösen Wandels in der österreichischen Stadt Konstanz 1548–1637* (Sigmaringen, 1994), p. 132.

CONFESSIONALIZATION UNDER AUSTRIAN LEADERSHIP

The case of Burkheim, 1585–1587

In 1585 relations deteriorated between the city fathers of Burkheim and their priest, Jacob Hornstein.⁵ Trouble began with disputes over the tithe, escalated when the priest reported the presence of Protestants in the town, and ultimately led the townspeople to refuse to confess to their pastor. The bundle of issues that concerned the parties in this small Austrian town in the Kaiserstuhl, as well as the ways in which the disputes were resolved, reveals much about the way state-sponsored confessionalization played out at the local level.

There were several different actors in this little drama. The Burkheimer were represented by the *Obervogt*, the mayor, and the town council of the town. In this group the *Obervogt*, the representative of the Austrian state in the town, was the most important and most active. Although probably a local man, the *Obervogt* was the chief law enforcement officer and had considerable power, as well as direct access to Austrian officials in the capital Ensisheim, just across the Rhine. The *Obervogt* was not unwilling to use this authority and provoked some of the conflict by arresting the priest's servant and throwing him in jail.

Pfarrer Hornstein had come to Burkheim in 1583 and clearly considered himself a representative of a new kind of clergyman. "Out of duty to my priestly office, I will pay attention to their [the Burkheimer's] public violation of Christian Catholic [*Christlicher Catholischer*] ordinances, statutes, and practices, perhaps more diligently than has happened before."⁶ In addition to this enthusiasm for disciplining his parishioners, Hornstein was very concerned with his "clerical honor" (*Priesterliche Ehre*) which he could assert quite aggressively. "During this past Christmas time," he wrote in January 1586, "out of pressing need, I brought out and showed from the pulpit my investiture, the synod statutes, and all sorts of relevant Church ordinances. [I did this] with proper modesty."⁷ Hornstein's parishioners clearly did not find any modesty in this assertive display of authority and superiority.

The priest and the town leaders aired their grievances to the University of Freiburg, which held the patronage of the village. University officials had appointed Hornstein and considered him exemplary. In their view the *Pfarrer* was dedicated and especially good in theology. The university had, of course, little relationship with the inhabitants of

⁵ GLAK 229/16206.

⁶ GLAK 229/16206, p. 28r.

⁷ GLAK 229/16206, p. 27r.

Burkheim, and tended to side with Hornstein. The rector and regents of the university, however, did not approve of the kind of aggressiveness that led Hornstein to wave his documents from the pulpit. The university's letters to the priest regularly admonished him to "behave modestly" and to try to get along with his parishioners.⁸

Austrian officials in the Alsatian town of Ensisheim, the administrative capital of Outer Austria in this period, were the final arbitrators of the disputes in Burkheim. State officials initially responded to reports of conflicts in Burkheim by insisting that local officials enforce recent decrees forbidding Protestants from living in Austrian territory.⁹ Austrian officials also equated obedience to the priest with obedience to the state. In a letter in July 1585 they wrote to the inhabitants of Burkheim:

... In the name of His Majesty ... it is our earnest decision, opinion, and order that you, neither in word nor deed, plan, say, or act with impertinent arrogance [*ungeburtliches anmassen*] toward your pastor. Rather you should completely let all such things go and treat him according to Christian commandments and behave in such a way that you give no reason for more serious [investigation] ...¹⁰

Official concern about Protestants in Burkheim came from a May 1585 report from *Pfarrer* Hornstein.¹¹ The priest stated that the *Stadtschreiber* (town secretary) and his wife openly identified themselves as Lutherans and refused to take communion from him. Hornstein also denounced the local miller and several servants as Protestants. Hornstein's report goes even further, for he also claimed that the church was almost empty at Easter and that the *Obervogt*, the mayor, and the whole town council refused to confess to him or receive communion from him. The *Pfarrer* clearly implied that the whole town was suspiciously lukewarm toward Catholicism.

The Austrian state concentrated its attention on the threat of Protestantism, which was an issue of obedience to the state. Secondly, officials insisted that local people obey their priest, who was after all a kind of local official. The people of Burkheim denied the charge that they were Protestants and worked hard to show that they were loyal subjects, even if they disobeyed the priest. The town council insisted, for example, that "we will neglect nothing to uphold the ancient, true, Catholic religion." The mayor and the *Rat* assured Ensisheim that they had publicized all the church ordinances that had come

⁸ GLAK 229/16206, pp. 2r, 31r.

⁹ GLAK 229/16206, pp. 4r-v, 6r.

¹⁰ GLAK 229/16206, p. 16r.

¹¹ GLAK 229/16206, pp. 9r-v.

from the central authorities and that they would punish any transgressors.¹²

The tension between obedience to the Austrian state and obedience to the *Pfarrer* came into starker outline during Hornstein's sermon on Palm Sunday 1585. On this occasion the priest accused the Burkheimer of attending services in a neighboring town without permission, of eating meat during Lent, and of failing to properly pay the tithe.¹³ Here again, he implied that the townspeople who ate meat and those who went elsewhere for services were Protestants. The latter accusation was not unreasonable, since it was not uncommon in confessionally divided regions for people to travel to other towns and villages for Protestant services.¹⁴ The town council recognized which of these issues were most important in Ensisheim and denied that any Burkheimer were going to Protestant services. The council also repeated that it would keep an eye open for Protestants and would deal severely with anyone who did not tithe properly. The Burkheimer did not, however, admit that they must also obey Hornstein in the same way they obeyed the *Herrschaft*. In fact, they clearly considered him a servant of the village, not an authority figure.

The priest [*Pfaff*] must be gotten rid of. He has not yet been confirmed and the citizens must place him on the altar [*uff den altar setzen*], before it [his appointment] takes effect. It is not up to him to bring new practices into the church, the church is ours, not his. We deal with the church warden [about the tithe] and the sacristan [about church services], not with him . . .¹⁵

The relationship between Hornstein and local luminaries such as the *Obervogt* went downhill rapidly. During the Christmas season of 1585, the *Pfarrer* attacked town officials from the pulpit, stating that they had violated his clerical immunity by arresting his servant, who had been caught climbing the town walls after the gates had been closed and locked.¹⁶ Hornstein rejected a proposed compromise which would have released his servant from jail and then attacked his main opponent, the *Obervogt*, who reported:

He said that I had better pay good attention to him for he is certainly going to pay sharp enough attention to me. [He also] . . . said he wanted to have nothing

¹² GLAK 229/16206, pp. 17v–18r. ¹³ GLAK 229/16206, pp. 17r–v.

¹⁴ People who ate meat during Lent were also commonly accused of being secret Protestants. See below for a case in Rottenburg (TLA Ferd. 178(1), 178(3) (*Visitations Handlungen*)). Perhaps this issue was particularly important in Southwest Germany and Switzerland, since Zwingli began his attack on the Catholic Church by eating sausages during Lent.

¹⁵ GLAK 229/16206, p. 27v. ¹⁶ GLAK 229/16206, pp. 24r–v.

to do with me, which really was too much for me to take [*mir über die mass wehe gethan*] with the *Rat* right there witnessing. So I said to him, from now on I will do as a good Christian person should and go to church, and if he does not like to see me, that is too bad for him.¹⁷

When the town council made another effort to meet with Hornstein, he let them cool their heels for four hours in an unheated room of the parsonage. Such behavior led the town council to appeal to the university and to Ensisheim for the appointment of a new priest, with whom they hoped they would never fall into such conflict.¹⁸

During the Easter season of 1586 *Pfarrer* Hornstein continued to berate his parishioners from the pulpit. According to town officials, the things he said about the commune were so terrible that they could not be written down. By this time it was apparent to all parties that the disputes would erupt at each high point of the liturgical year, especially at Easter and Christmas. Furthermore, the issues had become clearer. Hornstein no longer accused the townspeople of being Protestants, and now focused his complaints on problems with the payment of the tithe. In rebuttal the Burkheimer referred to the priest's "stubborn stinginess" as the source of all their problems.¹⁹

At some point in the spring of 1586 Austrian officials sent a commission to investigate conditions in Burkheim. Already at the beginning of the conflict, both the university and officials in Ensisheim had written about the need for peace in Burkheim.²⁰ Austrian officials supported the idea of an agreement (*Vergleich*) or treaty (*Vertrag*) between *Pfarrer* Hornstein and the Burkheimer, and the 1586 commission managed to negotiate such an agreement. Although no copy of the *Vertrag* exists, the general outline of its provisions can be gleaned from the correspondence between Ensisheim and Burkheim.²¹ The town agreed to pay all tithes and fees properly and promised not to resist a "renovation" of parish income.²² In exchange, Hornstein gave up his insistence that the Burkheimer come to him at Easter for their annual confession and communion. At Easter 1586 the majority of the townspeople went to a nearby Catholic church in Rotweil to fulfill their annual obligations.

Austrian officials had engineered a solution to a difficult problem. Disputes over the tithe, exacerbated by the *Pfarrer's* attacks on the religious loyalty of the Burkheimer, and his abrasive sermons led

¹⁷ GLAK 229/16206, p. 25r. ¹⁸ GLAK 229/16206, pp. 25r, 26r.

¹⁹ GLAK 229/16206, pp. 34v–35v. ²⁰ GLAK 229/16206, pp. 13r–v, 20r, 21r, 31r–32r.

²¹ GLAK 229/16206, pp. 40r–41v, 43r, 44r–v, 49r, 52r–v, 56r–57r.

²² A renovation was a renewal of account books and probably a reassessment of property. It was, of course, a method of raising the income from church property.

prominent townspeople to refuse to confess their sins to him. Secular officials were not particularly interested in the problem of confession and saw no reason to force their subjects to confess to the parish priest. On this issue, the state did not support a key aspect of church reform. Allowing the parishioners to go elsewhere to confess clearly undermined the authority of the priest and hindered the development of the parochial conformity so central to Tridentine reform.²³ For episcopal officials, confession was a central way of reforming popular behavior. In 1570 they criticized Austrian officials for allowing unapproved priests to hear confessions, stating that “confession is nothing other than a court of souls and the confessor a judge of consciences.”²⁴ Austrian officials probably had little interest in giving Hornstein this sort of power, especially after he criticized the Burkheimer for appealing to secular authorities and not the bishop.²⁵

In Burkheim we can see the limits of confessionalization. The Austrian regime wanted a loyal Catholic population that would obey trustworthy, energetic, and celibate priests. Such a policy had an element of “social disciplining” and even cultural hegemony. Yet such concepts do not capture the day-to-day practice of *Herrschaft* or the relationship between the rulers and the ruled.²⁶ Austrian officials in Ensisheim wanted the people of Burkheim to demonstrate their obedience by attending church and paying the tithe; what happened during confession and communion was of much less concern. In fact, Hornstein was dangerously heavy-handed, perhaps arrogant, and certainly immodest. He even demonstrated a disturbing loyalty to episcopal authority and concern for his clerical rights and privileges. These various attitudes might have weakened Austrian rule in Burkheim. The university shared this practical view, fearing that conflicts could hurt its income from the tithe. There was cooperation between Church and state in Burkheim, but *Pfarrer* Hornstein did not receive the unconditional support of higher authorities. Ultimately, Austrian authorities could, and did, pick and choose from those parts of the Tridentine program that fit their needs, and resist those parts which threatened the state’s domination of the Church in Austrian territories.

²³ John Bossy, “The Counter-Reformation and the People of Catholic Europe” *Past and Present* 47 (1970), pp. 51–70. On confession, see W. David Myers, “Poor, Sinning Folk.” *Confession and Conscience in Counter-Reformation Germany* (Ithaca and London, 1996).

²⁴ TLA Ferd. 178(1), 1570, 24 July. ²⁵ GLAK 229/16206, p. 28v.

²⁶ David Sabean, *Power in the Blood. Popular Culture and Village Discourse in Early Modern Germany* (Cambridge, 1984), esp. Introduction.

The people of Burkheim, led by the town council, were not helpless victims of reform and confessionalization, nor did they simply resist outside forces. Like the Austrians, they supported some aspects of reform and rejected others. Most of all, they used the jurisdictional disputes among their various lords to hinder those aspects of church reform which they found most noxious, in this case the effort of *Pfarrer* Hornstein to use the sacrament of confession to discipline his parishioners. Church reforms could be implemented if villagers found them attractive; they could not be imposed against the opposition of an organized local community.

State-led reform

Protestantism had some appeal in Outer Austria in the early sixteenth century, as it did throughout Southwest Germany.²⁷ By the 1550s and 1560s, however, Austrian officials faced few serious threats to the Catholic Church in either the major towns of the region or the countryside. Urban elites in Habsburg-dominated areas found loyalty to the old Church a great benefit to their families. Because most of the nobility had *Reichsunmittelbar* status and were only subject to the emperor, there were no significant territorial nobility within *Vorderösterreich*. This situation left Protestantism weaker here than in Lower and Inner Austria where a self-conscious nobility led the Protestant party. Bavarian influence in Upper Swabia, together with the wealth and power of the great monasteries, was another force that helped stabilize Catholicism.

The vital social and political place of church institutions, particularly the patronage network they possessed and employed for the political benefit of the Habsburgs, helped prevent the growth of a widespread Protestant movement after the 1520s.²⁸ Repression was also important in the Habsburg lands. Already in the 1520s Austrian officials moved aggressively against Anabaptist communities, especially in the Hohenberg district around Horb and Rottenburg am Neckar. After the Schmalkaldic War (1546–1547) Habsburg officials instituted a thorough and mostly successful recatholicization of the imperial city of Gengen-

²⁷ Dieter Stievermann, "Österreichische Vorlande" in Anton Schindling and Walter Ziegler (eds.), *Die Territorien des Reichs im Zeitalter der Reformation und Konfessionalisierung. Land und Konfession*, Vol. V *Der Südwesten* (Münster, 1993), pp. 265–268.

²⁸ Volker Press has emphasized that Habsburg influence in the Southwest from the fifteenth century depended to a large extent on interlocking state and church clientage systems: Volker Press, "Vorderösterreich in der habsburgischen Reichspolitik des späten Mittelalters und der frühen Neuzeit" in Hans Maier and Volker Press (eds.), *Vorderösterreich in der frühen Neuzeit* (Sigmaringen, 1989), pp. 1–41, esp. p. 21.

bach and the surrounding *Reichslandvogtei* Ortenau, a region that had returned to Austrian rule after some twenty years under a Protestant prince.²⁹ By the 1560s confessional lines in Southwest Germany had stabilized and Outer Austria was firmly Catholic.

Despite the strength of Catholicism, the Austrian regime based at Ensisheim in Alsace and at Innsbruck in the Tyrol continued to stress the threat of Protestantism. In the later sixteenth century, officials focused their attention on those individuals who practiced Protestantism secretly or who took advantage of confessional fragmentation to visit Protestant services in neighboring jurisdictions. Officials in the headquarters of the *Regierung* reacted energetically to any sign of Protestant activity. In 1578 officials in Innsbruck, responding to a letter from several clergymen of Rottenburg am Neckar, wrote to local officials in the Austrian district of Hohenberg, insisting that they suppress “sectarian” activities in their jurisdiction. Officials in Innsbruck spoke of a group of non-Catholics who ate meat during Lent, possessed Protestant books, and were generally “suspect in their religion.” The regime told local officials to uphold the Catholic religion “diligently and not sleepily [*schläferig*].” They should do everything in their power to make sure that “the sectarian religion should not move in there (Rottenburg) and their area of administration,” and if necessary imprison people suspected of attending Protestant services.³⁰

Officials both at the regional level and in the town of Rottenburg had a different perspective and denied that there were any Protestants under their jurisdiction. The highest official in the area, the *Statthalter*, claimed that all the inhabitants were good Catholics. Although he admitted that “eight or nine years previously several people had somewhat suspiciously eaten [meat],” they had since proved themselves good Catholics. In the opinion of officials in Rottenburg, the whole issue stemmed from an old dispute between the parish priest and several citizens. The priest had refused to allow the eating of meat at a wedding feast held on the day of an official church holiday, an order the wedding party had publicly disobeyed. The *Pfarrer* was upset that only the innkeeper had been punished and that his punishment was not very severe since he served his prison term drinking wine with the local constable (the *Stadtknecht*).³¹

²⁹ Stievermann, “Österreichische Vorlande,” pp. 266–268; Wolfgang Müller, “Die kirchlichen Verhältnisse” in *Vorderösterreich. Eine geschichtliche Landeskunde* (Freiburg, 1967), p. 228.

³⁰ TLA Ferd. 178(1), esp. 1578, 30 April, Oberösterreichische Regierung in Innsbruck to Erzherzog Ferdinand; 1578, 30 June, Rottenburg to Innsbruck; 1578, 30 August, Oberösterreichische Regierung in Innsbruck to Erzherzog Ferdinand.

³¹ TLA Ferd. 178(1), 1578, 8 April, Statthalter zu Hohenberg (and others) to Erzherzog Ferdinand; 1578, 30 June, Rottenburg to Innsbruck.

This exchange between local officials and somewhat distant state officials indicates, on the one hand, how important religious unity, or even uniformity, was to the central government. On the other hand, local officials recognized a more complicated set of problems. In the first place, there was the sometimes fractious relationship between the clergy and the laity. Secondly, at the local level it was not always easy to distinguish between devout Catholics, loyal but traditional Catholics, and Protestant sympathizers. The definition of what it meant to be a “good Catholic” was not completely clear even in 1578, making it possible for some people to express loyalty to the Church without obeying all its rules and regulations.

Austrian religious policy toward the city of Constance is instructive.³² In 1548, after the Austrian army captured this predominantly Protestant imperial city, it was forcefully incorporated into the Habsburg territories. The Austrian policy of recatholicization proceeded slowly, but the regime showed no interest in a compromise with the Protestant population. Efforts in the 1550s by city leaders to negotiate a special religious status for Constance with the aim of separating loyalty to the prince from loyalty to Catholicism failed utterly. In 1555, King Ferdinand was explicit. He informed Constance that he would not tolerate Protestants in the city because such special standing would undermine the religious uniformity of his territories.³³ The Austrian regime was willing to risk difficulties with the large Protestant population of Constance; it had no toleration for the small numbers of Protestants in the rest of *Vorderösterreich*.

Beginning in the 1560s, the Austrian state made it even clearer that being a good Catholic was an essential characteristic of a loyal subject. In 1567 Archduke Ferdinand took control of the Tyrol and Outer Austria and began a forceful policy of Catholic confessionalization. In the Tyrol, Ferdinand’s regime required professions of faith from government officials, worked to install better educated priests and improve their incomes, and at the same time promulgated mandates against religious “innovations.”³⁴ The Habsburgs brought the Jesuits

³² Zimmermann, *Rekatholisierung, Konfessionalisierung und Ratsregiment*; Wolfgang Zimmermann, “Konstanz in den Jahren von 1548–1733” in Martin Burkhardt, Wolfgang Dobras, Wolfgang Zimmermann (eds.), *Konstanz in der frühen Neuzeit. Reformation, Verlust der Reichsfreiheit, Österreichische Zeit*, Vol. III *Geschichte der Stadt Konstanz* (Constance, 1991).

³³ Zimmermann, *Rekatholisierung, Konfessionalisierung und Ratsregiment*, pp. 87–95.

³⁴ On Tyrol, Jürgen Bücking, *Frühabsolutismus und Kirchenreform in Tirol (1565–1665). Ein Beitrag zum Ringen zwischen “Staat” und “Kirche” in der frühen Neuzeit* (Wiesbaden, 1972); Heinz Noflatscher, “Tirol, Brixen, Trient” in Anton Schindling and Walter Ziegler (eds.), *Die Territorien des Reichs*, Vol. I *Der Südsten* (Münster, 1989), pp. 86–101.

and later the Capuchins to the Tyrol and pressured the bishops to conduct visitations and reform the clergy.

Ferdinand's policies in the Austrian territories in Southwest Germany were similar to those in the Tyrol. The intense interest of the Habsburgs in church affairs is exemplified by the career of Andreas von Österreich (1558–1600), Ferdinand's son by his marriage to the commoner Philippine Welser. Ineligible for a princely inheritance, Andreas pursued an ecclesiastical career. Named cardinal in Rome at the age of twenty-two, Andreas became coadjutor in Brixen (1580, Bishop of Brixen 1591), abbot of several important monasteries, and in 1589 Bishop of Constance. In 1579 Ferdinand also made Andreas governor of Upper and Outer Austria, a job he tended to prefer to his episcopal duties. The accumulation of ecclesiastical and secular posts allowed Andreas to follow an intensive policy of strengthening the Catholic Church.³⁵

The Austrian state promulgated a series of ordinances designed to create religious uniformity. A 1585 mandate ordered all Protestants to emigrate and in 1586 an oath of loyalty to the Church was required of all government officials. Although the latter requirement ran into opposition from the nobility, it was effective in making Protestantism less attractive to urban elites.³⁶ These policies left no doubt about the close identification of the Austrian state with Catholicism. By the 1580s, there was no longer room for negotiation on this issue. These edicts were also important steps in a policy of confessionalization, that is, a cooperative effort by state and Church to create both religious uniformity and a wider popular identification with Catholic beliefs and practices.

Austrian officials agreed with Tridentine reformers that the most public failings of the Church should be corrected first. For this reason, initial efforts aimed at reforming the monasteries. Pressure from the Austrian regime on the Bishops of Constance led in 1571 to a visitation of monasteries and convents by a combined Austrian/episcopal commission.³⁷ Although this inspection can, in part, be traced to the episcopal synod of 1567, the impulse clearly came from the Austrians. Cardinal Mark Sittich von Hohenems's instructions to the episcopal visitors

³⁵ Like many aristocratic and princely bishops in Germany, Andreas never took higher clerical orders: Stievermann, "Österreichische Vorlande," pp. 269–271; Erwin Keller, "Bischöflich-konstanzer Erlasse und Hirtenbriefe. Ein Beitrag zur Seelsorgsgeschichte im Bistum Konstanz" *FDA* 102 (1982), p. 17.

³⁶ Stievermann, "Österreichische Vorlande," pp. 270–271. Protestant nobles with *Reichsunmittelbar* status had sometimes pursued careers in Habsburg service.

³⁷ Moritz Gmelin, "Aus Visitationsprotokollen der Diözese Konstanz von 1571–1586" *ZGO* 25 (1873), pp. 154–173; Hugo Ott, "Die Benediktinerabtei St. Blasien in den Reformbestrebungen seit 1567, besonders unter Abt Kaspar II. (1571–1596)" *FDA* 84 (1964), pp. 151–155.

reflected the leading role of the secular authorities. In this document, the cardinal reminds his representatives to uphold episcopal rights, but accepts the participation of Austrian commissioners in the visitation and even instructs the visitors to turn to secular authorities for advice and protection when episcopal authority is too weak. The Austrian commissioners were indispensable to the 1571 visitation. In Villingen, for example, the town council did not want to allow episcopal visitors to inspect the monasteries there, claiming that town officials had recently inspected the several monasteries. The visitors' argument that "the Council of Trent has given their lord [the bishop] the duty of visiting all monasteries once a year" did nothing to convince the city fathers to change their view. Instead, they stated "because their lord and territorial prince [*herr und landsfürst*] has said so, they will allow it [the visitation] to happen and will no longer oppose it."³⁸

The 1571 visitation of the monasteries in Austrian territories began in August in Villingen, where the combined Austrian and episcopal visitors inspected the *Vettersammlung*, a convent affiliated with the Dominicans, the St. Clara convent, and the Franciscan monastery. The visitors also investigated the secular clergy in Villingen, although almost as an afterthought.³⁹ The rest of their work was exclusively in monasteries and convents, and proceeded slowly. In the fall of 1571 several more monasteries were visited, followed in 1572 by the monastic establishments in Freiburg and the monastery of St. Trudpert in 1573.⁴⁰ Monastic reform was a goal of episcopal as well as Austrian officials, but no such visitations took place outside the Austrian territories. Without Austrian initiative, the bishops were in no position to enforce Tridentine decrees about monastic reform.

Austrian influence over monasteries was most important in cities and towns such as Villingen and Freiburg. Habsburg officials could put considerable pressure on the smaller and poorer urban establishments of the Franciscans and Dominicans, especially since many of these had suffered severe recruitment problems in the aftermath of the Reformation. The large and wealthy rural abbeys in Austrian territories, the most prominent being the Benedictine house of St. Blasien, had stronger defenses against state interference. Nevertheless, from the 1560s on even the monks at St. Blasien felt the influence of the Austrian regime. Abbot

³⁸ Gmelin, "Aus Visitationsprotokollen der Diözese Konstanz," pp. 155–156, 162.

³⁹ Gmelin, "Aus Visitationsprotokollen der Diözese Konstanz," pp. 166–170.

⁴⁰ Gmelin, "Aus Visitationsprotokollen der Diözese Konstanz," pp. 136–139; Ott, "Die Benediktinerabtei St. Blasien," p. 155.

Kaspar I was appointed one of the episcopal visitors for the Austrian-dominated visitation of 1571–1573 and the visitation may have come to St. Blasien at some point.⁴¹ Extensive reforms both within the abbey and in the parishes it governed would, however, have to wait until the 1590s.

Clerical concubinage was a further focus of the Austrian regime. The Habsburgs took the lead on this issue because they believed that episcopal authorities, who had ultimate responsibility for disciplining priests, moved too slowly. In a letter of 1588, the *Regierung* in Innsbruck complained to the Bishop of Constance that there were many priests with concubines in the Austrian county of Hohenberg and that “such unpriestly lifestyle and behavior [both] takes place and is permitted . . .”⁴² In the name of Archduke Ferdinand, the regime demanded that priests who “were stained with such attachments [*anhengen*]” should be removed from their posts immediately. By the 1580s the effort to end concubinage had been underway for several decades, although with limited success.

Some Austrian parish priests defended concubinage, even in the immediate aftermath of the Council of Trent and the episcopal synod of 1567 in Constance, both of which expressly forbade such a lifestyle. In a 1568 letter, the clergy of the Breisgau, a predominantly Austrian region, “tacitly criticized the prohibition against concubines,” as a marginal comment by an episcopal official put it.⁴³ According to the priests, the poor incomes of their benefices made celibacy financially impossible. In order to perform their clerical duties and maintain a proper house, priests needed the help of loyal servants, presumably ones who worked without having to be paid. Other priests in Southwest Germany made similar arguments, claiming they needed “maids” to take care of the cattle.⁴⁴ The Breisgauer clergy defended concubinage as financially necessary, trying to use a practical argument that church reformers and state officials would have a hard time countering. In the long run they failed and the moralizing discourse of the Tridentine Church carried the day.

There were practical problems in identifying and expelling concubines, but this “abuse” was susceptible to reform from above. Episcopal visitors quite easily located those priests who had concubines and listed

⁴¹ Ott, “Die Benediktinerabtei St. Blasien,” pp. 151–156.

⁴² GLAK 82a/273. ⁴³ EAF A1/684.

⁴⁴ Jörn Sieglerschmidt, “Der niedere Klerus um 1600. Eine vergleichende Untersuchung am Beispiel des Landdekanats Engen” in Elmar Kuhn, Eva Moses, Rudolf Reinhardt and Petra Sachs (eds.) *Die Bischöfe von Konstanz*, Vol. I *Geschichte* (Friederichshafen, 1988), pp. 116–117.

them in their reports. These visitation reports show a steady decline in concubinage by the 1590s. In 1590 in the Rural Chapter of Stockach, an area where Austrian authorities had considerable power, only two priests are identified as *concupinari*, and several others are listed as suspect.⁴⁵ The vast majority of *Pfarrer* had mothers, sisters, or other family members managing their households. The transition to a celibate clergy was clearly underway. Johann Helderlein, the priest in Liggaringen, like several colleagues, explained that he had “sent his family away” and was living honestly. In the area around Freiburg, where Austrian officials were very active, the visitors in 1590 found only one concubine, which was considerably fewer than the eight concubines identified a decade earlier.⁴⁶

The success of the attack on concubinage was uneven. Because it was led, at least in the last decades of the sixteenth century, by Austrian officials, this effort succeeded in areas where Austrian authority was relatively undisputed. These areas were few. In the district around Stockach, Austrian influence over appointments was strong, but even here the emperor appointed only seven of the twenty-seven priests.⁴⁷ Patronage rights reflected the fact that this part of Germany was the heartland of the *Eigenkirche*, the privately owned and founded churches of the Middle Ages, together with the political fragmentation of the region. As if the scattered nature of the Austrian territories was not sufficient problem, confessionalization was further hindered by the fact that the Habsburg emperor actually held the patronage of only a small percentage of the parishes in his territories.⁴⁸

When Austrian officials could control appointments, they put celibacy at the top of their list of attributes for a good priest. Officials in far-away Innsbruck kept close track of appointments in the small town of Binsdorf, where the town council had the *jus nominandi*, the right to nominate the parish priest. In 1568 their primary concern was that the suggested priest be Catholic and “not stained with any sect.”⁴⁹ By 1587 the regime was only interested in concubinage. The town had

⁴⁵ EAF A1/725.

⁴⁶ 1590: EAF A1/684. 1581: Gmelin, “Aus Visitationsprotokollen der Diözese Konstanz,” pp. 181–86. Concubinage was eradicated rather later in non-Austrian territories. See Siegler-Schmidt, “Der niedere Klerus um 1600,” pp. 122–123. After 1600 there was “. . . eine sichtbare Verbesserung gegenüber der Zeit vor 1600 . . .”

⁴⁷ EAF A1/725. Parish patrons in the Rural Chapter of Stockach: Austria, seven parishes; nobles (four different ones), eight parishes; the city of Überlingen, two parishes; the Teutonic Knights, four parishes; the Cathedral Chapter in Constance, five parishes; the Knights of St. John, one parish.

⁴⁸ GLAK 79/828. ⁴⁹ TLA Ferd. 10(1) (*Benefiziä*).

nominated Jacob Armbruster, who, they admitted, had a concubine, but who was otherwise good at his duties and a fine singer.⁵⁰ Officials in Innsbruck demanded that he get rid of his concubine and made no reference to his other qualifications. Armbruster served for three years. In 1590 Johan Hurmann was appointed, a young man who had studied in Freiburg and lived with his parents. He had no concubine and, according to the Binsdorfer, was good at “preaching, singing, and other church services.” The clergy of Binsdorf, as elsewhere in Catholic Germany, were transformed in the 1580s and 1590s. A priest such as Armbruster, who openly admitted to concubinage, could still be appointed, but the future belonged to Hurmann and his generation. The difference between the two priests had nothing to do with commitment to the duties of their position; it was purely a matter of celibacy.

Concubinage was the decisive factor in the appointment in 1588 of Matthias Schreiber to the parish of Deilingen.⁵¹ The other candidate for this position, Christopf Bregenzer, had the support of the commune of Deilingen, who said that he had performed well as chaplain in a nearby village. Officials of the Austrian district of Hohenberg confirmed that Bregenzer was an experienced priest and was “not stained with any other sect and is well enough qualified to serve such a parish.” This was faint praise, however, since they also reported that Bregenzer was a former monk who had left his monastery because of his concubine. He continued to live with this woman and their two children and over the previous years had bounced from post to post. The Austrian state was too well organized to appoint such a priest; instead Schreiber, who had studied with the Jesuits and had no concubine, became *Pfarrer* in Deilingen. Bregenzer passed the “loyalty to Catholicism” test, which would have been sufficient for appointment to an Austrian parish in the middle decades of the sixteenth century. In the last decades of the century, however, celibacy defined a clergyman’s commitment to the true Church.

Both the local priests and the state authorities understood that the crusade against concubinage had several aims. The primary goal, of course, was to enforce celibacy and emphasize the special sexual status of the clergy. A secondary, but important goal was to change the way of life of the peasant-priest. The Council of Trent had endeavored to create a better-trained and morally upright clergy. Parish priests were supposed to stand apart from local society, in their behavior and their

⁵⁰ HStASt. B37a/134. See a similar case in Hirrlingen (1594): HStASt. B37a/288.

⁵¹ HStASt. B37a/147.

lifestyle.⁵² Austrian officials agreed, at least implicitly, with the priests who argued that their meager incomes did not allow them to live in a proper priestly manner. An effort to improve clerical incomes was thus an integral part of the Austrian-led church reform.

There were relatively few ways to improve clerical incomes. One option was to convince patrons to turn over larger portions of the tithes and property of a parish to the clergymen who served it. This alternative was of course difficult to implement, given both the independence and the legal protections enjoyed by patrons, especially wealthy monasteries.⁵³ A second method, and the one Austrian officials turned to in the late sixteenth century, was to give smaller additional benefices (chaplaincies, primissaries, etc.) to parish priests.⁵⁴ This solution led to pluralism, something Tridentine reformers sought to prevent, but it could be justified as a necessary expedient. Parish priests needed sufficient income in order to provide proper pastoral services.

The idea of combining benefices for the purposes of improving the income of parish priests appears to have come from local officials, rather than from state officials in Innsbruck and Ensisheim. Episcopal officials resisted such endeavors. As early as 1565 officials in Stockach proposed hiring only one priest for the neighboring parishes of Schwandorf and Holzach.⁵⁵ Episcopal officials did not like the idea, but accepted it, citing their great respect for the Habsburgs. Austrian officials may have taken this 1565 agreement as an opening to “unite” more benefices. In 1570 there were further discussions between officials of the Austrian *Landvogtei* Nellenburg (the district around Stockach) and representatives of the Bishop of Constance about a broad effort to combine clerical posts.⁵⁶ In these discussions, episcopal officials argued that combining benefices in this way was only a stop-gap solution to a problem caused by the siphoning off of resources to monasteries and lay church patrons. They further pointed out that more benefices might be good for pastoral care, a viewpoint that was almost prophetic. In the century after 1650, communities would need and demand more priests and would put considerable effort into reviving secondary bene-

⁵² Hsia, *The World of Catholic Renewal*, pp. 114–121.

⁵³ Sieglerschmidt, “Der niedere Klerus um 1600,” pp. 120–121.

⁵⁴ Similar strategies were used in the Bishopric of Speyer: Marc R. Forster, *The Counter-Reformation in the Villages. Religion and Reform in the Bishopric of Speyer, 1560–1720* (Ithaca and London, 1992), pp. 87–89.

⁵⁵ TLA Ferd. 178(1) (*Visitations Handlungen*), 1565, 20 December.

⁵⁶ TLA Ferd. 178(1) (*Visitations Handlungen*), 1570, 20 July, letter from Constance officials to Archduke Ferdinand in Innsbruck; subsequent letter from *Amtleute* in Stockach to regime in Innsbruck.

fices which had been absorbed into parishes in the later sixteenth century.⁵⁷

By the 1590s, however, church and state officials were working together to improve clerical incomes. Tridentine reform focused on creating a rational and orderly benefice system, particularly by strengthening parishes at the expense of other structures.⁵⁸ In 1590, Johann Pistorius, vicar general of the Bishop of Constance, investigated vacant benefices in the county of Hohenberg.⁵⁹ It is a sign of the congruence of state and church interests that he submitted his final report both to the bishop and to Archduke Ferdinand. Pistorius tried to balance the interests of the bishop, such as a concern for the conditions of the original endowment and the maintenance of episcopal authority, with the pastoral needs of the people, which secular officials tended to emphasize. The vicar general recommended combining several benefices and suggested giving some chaplaincies to parish priests. At the same time, he favored “renovations,” that is, the renewal of accounts, hoping to mobilize more money for the poorer benefices. Pistorius was reluctant, for example, to allow organist benefices to disappear. He pointed out that communes had created these positions and that “since having an organ is most necessary for praising and honoring God, they should be improved and built for the beautification of churches.” In the first decades of the seventeenth century, all indications were that clerical incomes had improved, even if there remained pockets of impoverished priests.

Despite these efforts, the complexity of the benefice system throughout this part of Germany made it difficult to improve clerical incomes. Even the relatively powerful Austrians had trouble mobilizing resources in their territories. The Rhine valley village of Herbolzheim provides a good example of the complexity that could confuse efforts to find money for priests. There were eight different parties that contributed to some aspect of the local church.⁶⁰ When local officials tried to assemble funds in 1624 to build a new parsonage, they faced, not surprisingly, an administrative nightmare. While officials could itemize the legal obligations of the different parties, actual practice might be different. In 1580

⁵⁷ See below, chapters 4 and 5.

⁵⁸ Bossy, “The Counter-Reformation and the People of Catholic Europe.”

⁵⁹ HStASt. B37a/15. On Pistorius: Konstantin Meyer, “Zu den Generalvikaren in der Neuzeit” in Kuhn et al. (eds.), *Die Bischöfe von Konstanz*, Vol. I *Geschichte*, p. 86.

⁶⁰ GLAK 229/42370, GLAK 229/42371. The eight parties were Austria, the Bishop of Strasburg, *Junker* Philip Jacob von Seebach, the Monastery of Schuttern, the Monastery of Eppenheimmünster, the parish priest, the parish church endowment, and the Commune of Herbolzheim.

an effort to improve the income of the priest in Herbolzheim ran into the opposition, not of monasteries or noblemen, but of local peasants, some of whom had leased tithes from the titheholders. On this occasion the commune protested the attempt by the *Pfarrer* to collect tithes on calves and pigs, which the villagers considered an “innovation.” This conflict was of course a typical one between a priest who felt his legal rights had been either frittered away by incompetent predecessors or chipped away by unscrupulous peasants. This situation was repeated across Southwest Germany in the four decades after 1580.

As a result of the financial reforms favored by Austrian officials, by the 1620s there were fewer clergymen overall in the countryside, but parish priests were better paid. In fact, by the middle of the seventeenth century many benefices were forgotten, the result of course of the destruction of the Thirty Years’ War as well as the reorganization brought about by the reformers. In 1588 episcopal visitors identified fifty-five benefices served by thirty-seven priests in the Rural Chapter of Breisach. In 1666, visitors listed thirty-seven benefices, held by thirty-seven priests.⁶¹ Later seventeenth-century visitors tended to think in terms of priests, not benefices, which explains the absence from their reports of vacant or incorporated benefices. It also appears that secondary benefices, once absorbed into parishes, were forgotten. The priest in Wasenweiler in 1666, perhaps hoping for help serving his parish, commented that there once had been a chaplaincy in his village.⁶² Church reform had certainly helped bring about a simplification of the benefice system in Southwest Germany. The trend toward a plainer and more basic ecclesiastical structure would be reversed after 1650.

TRIDENTINE REFORM IN THE BISHOPRIC OF CONSTANCE

The Bishops of Constance and their officials enacted a reform program inspired by the Council of Trent. Episcopal reform began in 1567 with a diocesan synod, and then continued with visitations of rural parishes and the creation of a Clerical Council (*Geistliche Rat*) in 1594. Tridentine reformers of course understood church reform as a top-down process, in which their leadership would result in a reform of the clergy and eventually a reform of popular religion.

Conditions in the Bishopric of Constance caused bishops and their officials to emphasize the jurisdictional reforms of the Council of Trent.

⁶¹ EAF Ha 63, pp. 431–451, 583–756. ⁶² EAF Ha 63, p. 625.

In the middle of the sixteenth century, important practical and political problems undermined the authority of the bishops. Although the vast majority of the diocese remained Catholic after the Reformation, Protestantism had captured several important states, especially Württemberg, and influential cities such as Ulm and Zurich. The existence of strong Protestant states hindered Tridentine reformers, especially when Protestant states had jurisdictional rights in Catholic territories. The vast size of the diocese of Constance caused further practical problems and made it impossible for the impoverished bishops to create an effective episcopal bureaucracy. Most dramatically, by the late sixteenth century the Swiss part of the diocese had basically broken away from the authority of the bishops, a development favored by the papal nuncio in Lucerne, who acted in effect as bishop for Catholic Switzerland.⁶³

Even within the staunchly Catholic parts of Southwest Germany, privileges and exemptions held by both secular princes and church institutions limited episcopal authority. Secular princes, such as the Habsburgs, were not inclined to give authority to bishops, and bishops were not in a good position to assert such power. The Church so needed the support of the Habsburgs in the confessionally divided empire that bishops tolerated considerable Austrian interference in their jurisdiction. Smaller Catholic states followed the Austrian lead and refused to recognize episcopal authority.⁶⁴

Monasteries and military orders claimed extensive exemptions from episcopal jurisdiction and tenaciously defended their privileges against any new episcopal claims based on the decrees of the Council of Trent. These institutions had an ambiguous attitude toward Trent. On the one hand, they opposed the decrees that increased episcopal authority over monasteries. On the other hand, the leading monasteries of the region, such as the Benedictine houses of Weingarten and St. Blasien and the Cistercian house of Salem, responded positively to the call for reform of order, discipline, and morality within monastic walls. The most important monasteries supported Tridentine reform, at least where it promised a moral and religious renewal of the Church. However, since the bishops

⁶³ Rudolf Reinhardt, "Frühe Neuzeit" in Kuhn et al. (eds.), *Die Bischöfe von Konstanz*, Vol. I *Geschichte*, pp. 34–35; Beat Bühler, "Hochstift und Diözese Konstanz im Jahre 1587" *FDA* 107 (1987), pp. 35–44.

⁶⁴ Rudolf Reinhardt argues that episcopal authorities asserted "clerical immunity, the idea of the freedom of the Church, and the independence of the clergy" more aggressively in the eighteenth century than in the period directly after the Council of Trent. Rudolf Reinhardt, *Die Beziehungen von Hochstift und Diözese Konstanz zu Habsburg-Österreich in der Neuzeit: Zugleich ein Beitrag zur archivalischen Erforschung des Problems "Kirche und Staat."* *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Reichskirche in der Neuzeit*, Vol. II (Wiesbaden, 1966), esp. Introduction.