

Michaela Žáková, Jakub Pátek, Jan Županič (Eds.)

NOBILITY

IN THE PRE-MODERN AND MODERN PERIOD



Michaela Žáková, Jakub Pátek, Jan Županič (Eds.)

Nobility in the Pre-Modern and Modern Period

BÖHLAU

The book has been published with the financial support of the Institute of History of the Czech Academy of Sciences and the financial courtesy of the institutional research funds of the Faculty of Arts of Jan Evangelista Purkyně University in Ústí nad Labem for the year 2024.



Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek:

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data available online: <https://dnb.de>.

© 2024 by Böhlau, Zeltgasse 1, 1080 Vienna, Austria, an Imprint der Brill-Gruppe (Koninklijke Brill BV, Leiden, Niederlande; Brill USA Inc., Boston MA, USA; Brill Asia Pte Ltd, Singapore; Brill Deutschland GmbH, Paderborn, Deutschland; Brill Österreich GmbH, Wien, Österreich)

Koninklijke Brill BV umfasst die Imprints Brill, Brill Nijhoff, Brill Schöningh, Brill Fink, Brill mentis, Brill Wageningen Academic, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Böhlau, und V&R unipress.

© Institute of History of the Czech Academy of Sciences, 2024.

© Faculty of Arts of Jan Evangelista Purkyně University in Ústí nad Labem, 2024.

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Cover design: Michael Haderer, Vienna

Proofreading: Bird und Hübner GbR, Berlin

Typesetting: le-tex publishing services, Leipzig

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht Verlage | www.vandenhoeck-ruprecht-verlage.com

ISBN 978-3-205-21963-7

Table of Contents

Introduction	7
<i>Jakub Pátek</i>	
Changes of the Nobility and Their Property Possessions in the Ústí nad Labem District During the Baroque Period	13
<i>Jiří Brňovják</i>	
Aristocracy on the Border. Notes on the Identity and Careers of Aristocracy in Austrian Silesia in the Second Half of the 18th Century	29
<i>Filip Binder</i>	
Count Franz Ernst Harrach and his Journeys to Great Britain	53
<i>Milena Lenderová</i>	
Europe through the Diaries of Melanie Metternich. Family, Salon, Politics	69
<i>Marcela Zemanová</i>	
A Nobleman in Retirement? The Estate and Family as New Challenges for the Count Karl Chotek	93
<i>Michaela Žáková</i>	
Devoutness – Society – Philanthropy. The Social Role of Unwed Noblewomen in the Long Nineteenth Century	105
<i>Jan Županič</i>	
Resignation from the Nobility in the Austrian Empire	119
<i>Jan Bouška</i>	
Aristocracy in the Changing World. Adaptation Strategies of Adalbert Wenzel Count of Sternberg in the Late Habsburg Monarchy.....	131
<i>Jan Zumn</i>	
Blue Blood in the SS: A Contribution Regarding the Attitude of the Nobility towards National Socialism.....	147

Berenika Zemanová

An Aristocrat against the Tide of Time: Ilka Lobkowitz 159

Ludmila Čiháková (Lambeinová)

Countess Therese Korff-Schmising-Kerssenbrock and her Brothers
in the 20th Century 173

Reference List 185

Resumé 207

Name Index 209

Notes on Contributors 219

Introduction

The nobility and noble culture remain an incompletely explored area of history. In the Czech lands, moreover, this topic has for many decades languished on the periphery of scholarly interest. After the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the new Czechoslovak state defined itself in a fundamental way against the old elites and tried to eliminate their influence on public affairs. As a result, this formerly privileged segment of society became a group first proscribed and then at best criticized. Moreover, after the Communist coup, the nobility was persecuted as a class and study of the history of the elites was heavily restricted, mainly for ideological reasons. Interestingly, the Communist Party's anti-noble rhetoric was based on arguments that radical Czech nationalists had already used against the nobility in the second half of the 19th century. As a result of these developments, very few objective studies of the nobility were published before 1990, this being especially true prior to 1948. At the same time, these contributions were unevenly distributed in terms of their temporal scope, with the nobility of the pre-modern and modern periods, in particular, remaining outside the scope of significant attention.

In European states, nobility was a legal institution that provided individuals or entire families with an entitlement to political privileges and the opportunity to participate in power, in return for certain services. However, it was not always associated with wealth. Only the highest segment of noble society, the so-called aristocracy, had real, titular and social capital, and therefore played an important and often crucial role in history over generations. At the other end of the noble spectrum were a range of small noble families without much wealth, which at best guaranteed them a middle-class standard of living, although in many cases their economic situation was comparable to that of the common peasantry.

The time frame of this collective monograph concentrates on the 19th century, when the situation of the nobility in the Czech lands, primarily Bohemia and Moravia, was in many ways singular. While in the Kingdom of Bohemia in the mid-19th century there was one nobleman for every 828 inhabitants, in Austrian lands the ratio was 1 to 350 and in the Italian provinces of the Empire, Lombardy-Venetia, 1 to 300. The situation was even more different in the east of the Monarchy. In Galicia, the southern part of Poland annexed by Austria, there was one nobleman for every 32 to 45 inhabitants, and in Hungary and Transylvania for as few as 17 inhabitants.¹

1 Originally, the proportion of nobility in the overall population of Poland was estimated to be around 10%. After the annexation of Galicia in 1772 the Viennese government attempted to reduce this num-

This situation was caused by a number of factors. Foremost among these were the Hussite wars, which in the 1520s and 1530s practically eliminated the property and influence of the Church in Bohemia and significantly reduced it in Moravia; its wealth was divided among the nobility and the royal boroughs, whose influence increased significantly for a time.² As a consequence of Hussitism, 30 to 40 percent of the land changed hands. The result of this process was an unprecedented concentration of noble property in the hands of a small group of individuals at the expense of the estates of the king, the clergy and the lesser nobility. In the other Czech lands, Silesia and Lusatia, where similar political conditions were absent, the noble estates remained dispersed for a long time and the largest of them consisted of only a few small villages. It was thanks to this development that the Bohemian and Moravian aristocracy eclipsed the nobility of all the surrounding countries in terms of the size of their estates in the Early Modern period. This is also why the political position of the knighthood gradually weakened, as their small estates, but more often only individual holdings or mere parts of them, were unable to compete economically with the often huge dominions of the peerage. Thus, the knights did not lose their status after the Battle of White Mountain, as is sometimes claimed, but rather their decline in property and power is apparent as early as the 16th century.³

The defeat of the first Estates' Uprising in 1547 brought a decrease in the influence of the urban estates and a reduction of their property, but the evolution of the Bohemian aristocratic community was fundamentally changed by the defeat of the 1620 Estates' Uprising and the associated legal changes. These were also part of a comprehensive reorganization of the elites in the Habsburg Empire. The abolition of the old Estates system also started the process of creating a social structure common to the entire nobility of the Danubian monarchy. In Bohemia, the model of the new noble hierarchy was the model of the imperial titular system, which was also used in the Austrian hereditary lands and was introduced into the Habsburg part of Hungary from the beginning of the 17th century.⁴ The confiscations that Ferdinand II undertook in Bohemia after 1620 enabled the establishment of new or expanded aristocratic domains, which in the centuries that followed were among the largest in the Habsburg monarchy. It was primarily landed property, owned and carefully tended for generations, that constituted the main distinguishing feature

ber, and required the local elites to provide evidence of their noble origins. Berthold WALDSTEIN-WARTENBERG, *Österreichisches Adelsrecht 1804–1918*, Mitteilungen des österreichischen Staatsarchivs 17/18, 1964/65, pp. 109–146, here p. 8; Sławomir GÓRZYŃSKI, *Arystokracja polska w Galicji. Studium heraldiczno-genealogyczne*, Warszawa 2009, pp. 20–36.

2 On this question cf. Josef MACEK, *Jagellonský věk v českých zemích 1471–1526*, Vol. 2, Praha 1994, pp. 43–89.

3 Petr MATĚA, *Svět české aristokracie (1500–1700)*, Praha 2004, pp. 124–125.

4 Ibid., p. 67.

of the Bohemian nobility. The family and the standard of living of its members were thus secured by a proper income, which enabled them to maintain a certain standard of living – and thus their position on the social ladder – for centuries.

However, it is an undeniable fact that the several waves of post-White Mountain confiscations significantly contributed to the concentration of noble property and permanently changed Bohemia and Moravia into a country of aristocratic estates. In the future, this would have interesting consequences for the development of modern Czech society. The very wealthy, but not very numerous, nobility constituted only a fraction of the total population of the country, but possessed enormous wealth. Their status and lifestyles often placed them on a par even with some of the princely dynasties of the Holy Roman Empire (to which some families indeed belonged), and almost every major aristocratic dynasty had its property secured through a fideicommissum guaranteeing its indivisibility.⁵ Most of the higher nobility with princely and countship titles also followed similar principles to those of the ruling dynasties, in particular the principle of equal marriage.

However, it was not only a significant restructuring of land tenure that took place in the post-White Mountain period. An important moment was the radical change in the confessional character of the Bohemian and Moravian nobility, the majority of whom had hitherto consisted of non-Catholics – Utraquists, Lutherans and Bohemian Brethren. This religious heterogeneity, which had been developing since the 15th century, was virtually eliminated in a single decade by the restrictive interventions of the victorious Ferdinand II and his advisors. This also predestined the Catholic orientation of this social stratum, which remained the majority even after the issuance of the Patent of Tolerance by Joseph II in 1781.

Equally important was the change in the origin of noble families. From the 15th century onwards, settlement and acquisition by families from neighbouring countries was a natural way for foreign elements to penetrate the relatively closed Czech noble society. Whether it was internal migration within the Lands of the Bohemian Crown or the arrival of families from neighbouring (and more rarely distant) countries, this was always a process controlled by the domestic noble community. This situation changed dramatically after the partial dismantling of the Estates system after 1620. The granting of incollates, along with the selling and giving away of confiscated and royal estates, moved almost exclusively into the hands of the monarch in the Czech lands. After the most wealthy ancient families (the Lords of Hradec, the Rožmberks, the Pernštejn family and the Smiřický family) coincidentally died out during the first third of the 17th century, their places in terms of wealth and influential capital were taken by members of new families coming

5 For an overview of noble fideicommissa in Bohemia cf. Aleš VALENTA, *Lesk a bída barokní aristokracie*, České Budějovice 2011, pp. 260–262.

from various parts of the Holy Roman Empire and elsewhere in Europe. Thus, the post-White Mountain form of the landed nobility, in addition to the traditional local families that managed to maintain their property and power position, was essentially co-created by members of newly arrived families with Austrian, German, and partly Italian roots. This cosmopolitanism in the Bohemian and Moravian nobility of the 17th century also strongly prefigured the shape of the local aristocracy in modern times.

Let us also not forget that the process of shaping the form of the Pre-Modern nobility of the Czech lands was made even more extraordinary by the Thirty Years' War itself, which generated an unusually large number of new "gentry", ennobled on the basis of their merits in the success of imperial arms. The aforementioned cosmopolitan mosaic of the domestic nobility was thus supplemented by Flemish, Irish, Scottish, Spanish and French elements. It was the natural and wide openness of the Bohemian and Moravian social elite towards Europe and its influences that made it fundamentally different from some other parts of the Habsburg monarchy.

At the same time, during the 17th and 18th centuries, marriage politics, and service at the imperial court or in the army strengthened the internal structure of the aristocracy throughout the western part of the Monarchy. Although it is possible to trace numerous elements of provincial patriotism in the behaviour of the higher nobility in Bohemia and Moravia, it was at this time that they became a kind of transnational society whose living space was no longer defined by individual provincial units, and often not even by the borders of the Habsburg monarchy.

In contrast to much of Europe, these changes in Bohemia and Moravia during the 17th and 18th centuries resulted in the near disappearance of the petty landed gentry, which at the social level formed a natural societal stepping stone and transition to the bourgeoisie. The ethnically Bohemian non-noble elites in their turn experienced a wealthy bourgeoisie breaking down social boundaries from the other side. Czech society in the Modern era thus consisted of two opposing poles, between which a deep chasm existed and which were growing farther apart. During the so-called National Revival, which began in the Czech lands in the second half of the 18th century, this fact was perceived as a major problem. Moreover, if we disregard the fact that for many contemporaries a nation without nobility was not a nation, but only a lawless mass, we cannot forget that the patriotic ideal was the creation of a nation with a complete social structure.⁶

The initially only ideological clashes between the nobility and the Czech nationalists grew into an open rupture in the spring of the revolutionary year 1848. The nobility was not represented and their members were not elected to either the

6 Jiří RAK, *Šlechta v optice moderního českého nacionalismu*, in: Zámek Loučeň, České Budějovice 2008, pp. 27–38, here pp. 27–28.

Czech or the Reich representative bodies at the 11 March meeting. The paths of the two social groups thus diverged definitively. The imaginary moat between the non-noble majority and the aristocratic minority was deepened from the outset by both sides, and the differences between them eventually proved insurmountable. From the late 1860s onwards, verbal opposition to the nobility even became one of the measures of the “progressiveness” of national politicians. Radicals of various political persuasions sought the abolition of noble titles and from time to time did not hesitate to declare the nobility to be national enemies and pests.

Of course, in reality, the absence of traditional elites was felt very keenly, as is evidenced by the apotheosis of the older Czech national nobility of the pre-White Mountain era (especially the non-Catholics) and the celebration of the so-called martyrs executed on Old Town Square in 1621.⁷ In the eyes of a significant part of the Czech population, the nobility, and especially its highest component, the aristocracy, turned during the second half of the 19th century from a welcome ally into a collaborator with the regime and the Viennese government, and was described as one of the main culprits of the Czech lands’ unequal status in the Habsburg monarchy. After the demise of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, this was to have serious consequences for it as a social group.

The new states were after all not created by the consensus of individual nations, but by the decision of the victorious parties. The calls for nation-states whose borders would follow the lines of ethnic settlement, advocated in particular by US President Woodrow Wilson, were not heeded. The reason for this was, among other things, that those of the successor states of the Empire that were on the winning side (Czechoslovakia, Poland, Romania and the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) had based their state concepts on the national idea, so it is not surprising that the position of the cosmopolitan and still pro-Habsburg minded aristocrats was not easy at this time.

It is surely no coincidence that in Czechoslovakia the treatment of the nobility was the most severe from the very beginning – both in property and symbolic terms. The symbol of property reckoning with the old elites was land reform, which significantly reduced the size of the great estates. Moreover, Law No. 61/1918 of 10 December 1918, adopted less than two months after the establishment of the Republic, already prohibited the use of noble titles and other attributes of such status, such as coats of arms. In the turbulent years following the end of the First World War, at the time of the so-called consummation of the national and social revolution, the nobility as a social group became the target of open criticism and of both overt and covert attacks. It was not, of course, open persecution as after 1948,

7 Cf. the closing chapter devoted to White Mountain myths in: Josef PETRÁŇ, *Staroměstská exekuce*, Praha 2004.

but members of this class were clearly shown that they were not to be trusted or counted on in the building of the state.

The present work by a team of authors aims to capture and present to readers some of the “white spaces” in the history of the nobility between the 17th and 20th centuries. On the basis of selected issues, especially in the field of social and economic history, it attempts to capture certain moments and problems in the nobility’s existence – from a regional probe of the development of noble tenure in the micro-region of Ústí nad Labem, through legal issues related to the identity and careers of the Silesian nobility in the 18th century, the influence of roads on the shaping and transformation of the landscape and noble estates, insights into the world of the nobility on the basis of egodocuments, issues of noble charity, the social positioning of unmarried noblewomen, family strategies and illegitimate children, and the abolition and withdrawal of noble titles, to the involvement of the nobility in the ranks of the SS during the Nazi Third Reich. This collaborative monograph thus offers entirely new perspectives on topics that have hitherto been reflected only marginally in the study of noble elites, contributing to a deeper knowledge and understanding of the meaning and function of the nobility as a social, economic, and cultural elite in society. At the same time, it opens up a number of new research topics and perspectives in the study of social elites in Pre-Modern and Modern times.

Michaela Žáková – Jakub Pátek – Jan Županič

Jakub Pátek

Changes of the Nobility and Their Property Possessions in the Ústí nad Labem District During the Baroque Period

The area of northwest Bohemia, roughly overlapping with the territory of today's Ústí nad Labem region, represents a traditional border region where the influences of the Prague centre were combining with cultural, economic and later religious impulses penetrating across the Saxony border as early as the Middle Ages.¹ This amalgamation was greatly enhanced and helped by the fact that German gradually became predominant in the area. It is not without interest that the northwestern border of our state is one of the oldest and still "functioning" state borders in Central Europe.² Its course in the Ore Mountains region was gradually shaped since the medieval period, when it had consisted of a difficult-to-penetrate belt of border forest separating Bohemia and the Margravate of Meissen. In the early modern period, a more precise delineation of the border line was necessitated by the progressive colonization of the higher altitudes of the mountain range and the development of ore mining, affecting also some disputed localities on the border of the two state formations. The present course of the border was established as early as the middle of the 16th century.³ In addition to Chomutov, Most, Teplice and Děčín districts, Ústí nad Labem is also part of the belt of today's districts adjacent to the border. Thanks to its exposed location on the periphery of the country, Ústí nad Labem has played a dramatic role in the Czech history.⁴

1 This contribution is dedicated to project: NAKI III – program na podporu aplikovaného výzkumu v oblasti národní a kulturní identity na léta 2023 až 2030: "FINIS CONFESSIONIS". Baroko východního Krušnohoří. Sakrální stavby a umělecká výzdoba architektury a krajiny. DH23P03OVV028.

2 Vilém ZÁBRANSKÝ, *Česko-saská hranice a její mapování v raném novověku*, in: T. Velímský – K. Kaiserová (eds.), *Region na hranici, Ústí nad Labem 2015*, p. 62. On the topic of border formation, cf. Lenka BOBKOVÁ, *Sasko v teritoriální politice českých králů do roku 1459*, *Acta universitatis Purkynianae, Philosophica et historica* 1, 1993, pp. 49–67; Erich BERLET, *Die sächsisch-böhmische Grenze im Erzgebirge*, Oschatz 1900.

3 Otto KAEMMEL, *Sächsische Geschichte*, Dresden 2003, p. 66.

4 Thanks to the penetration of invading armies through the Ore Mountains passes, the surroundings of the town of Ústí nad Labem repeatedly became a place of military clashes. Of the medieval battles we should mention the Battle of Chlumec in 1126 and the Battle of Běhání in 1426. The Ústí nad Labem district was also an operational area of foreign armies during the Thirty Years' War, the War of the Austrian Succession, the Seven Years' War, the Potato War and then again in 1813, when the two Napoleonic battles of Chlumec and Přestanov took place here. Martin VESELÝ, *Vojenské dějiny Ústecka*, Ústí nad Labem 2003, pp. 8–13.

The time frame of our contribution is the period from the Battle of White Mountain to the 1780s, when, especially in the first two thirds of the 17th century, the transformation of the local nobility shows considerable dynamics. Nobiliary land tenure played a dominant role in Ústí nad Labem district throughout the entire period under study. This form of tenure prevailed decisively over the land tenure of royal towns⁵ and of church nobility.⁶ The territorial delimitation of this contribution has been determined by the extent of the district of Ústí nad Labem within its current boundaries established in 1960. Let us add that this delimitation practically copies the older territorial division reflecting the situation established in the second half of the 19th century – with minor exceptions in a few localities it includes the territory of the former judicial districts of Ústí nad Labem and Chabařovice.

The problematics of nobility in the Ústí district in the Baroque period has not yet been comprehensively researched. In the first attempt to outline the basic development model, it is possible to rely mainly on older German works of topographical and local history provenance,⁷ inventory literature on aristocratic estates,⁸ archival

5 Two royal towns held land property in Ústí nad Labem district. Ústí nad Labem owned the villages of Stříbrníky, Vaňov and parts of Sovolusky and Kabát throughout the period under review. Litoměřice held the Keblice estate, which included parts of Sebužín, Církvice, Horní Zálezly and Babiny I (part). In 1621, the farm was confiscated from the town, but later on in the *Berní rula* (a tax register of 1654) and the Teresian Cadastre, Litoměřice is again listed as its owner. Tomáš V. BÍLEK, *Dějiny konfiskací v Čechách po roce 1618*, Vol. 1 and 2, Praha 1882–1883, p. 1244–1245; Karel DORAZIL, *Berní rula 2. Popis Čech r. 1654*, Praha 1953; p. 399; Aleš CHALUPA – Marie LIŠKOVÁ – Josef NUHLÍČEK – František RAJTORAL, *Tereziánský katastr český*, Vol. 2, Praha 1966, p. 100, 134.

6 From the localities in the Ústí nad Labem district, church nobility held only parts of Čeřeniště and Babiny I, which belonged to the Litoměřice Minorite monastery, and another part of Čeřeniště, which belonged to the Jesuit estate of Liběšice. After the dissolution of the respective monasteries, these manors became estates of the Chamber. Haslice, Homole u Panny (a part), Doubravice and Hlupice belonged to the estate of Velký Újezd, which was owned by the Dominicans of Litoměřice. Zubrnice, Homole u Panny (a part) and Leština belonged to the estate of Třeboutice, which belonged to the Litoměřice provostry and later to the bishop of Litoměřice.

7 E. g. Hermann HALLWICH, *Herrschaft Türmitz*, Prag 1863; Anton TSCHERNEY, *Schwaden a. d. Elbe, geographisch und geschichtlich dargestellt*, Vol. 1, Aussig 1894; Idem, *Schwaden a. d. Elbe, geographisch und geschichtlich dargestellt*, Vol. 2, Aussig 1900; Otto KAMSHOFF, *Prödlitz, einst und jetzt*, Aussig 1912; Konrad MOISSL, *Der politische Bezirk Aussig, umfassend die Gerichtsbezirke Aussig und Karbitz*, Aussig 1887; Franz Josef WÜNSCH, *Heimatkunde des Bezirkes Aussig*, Vol. 3, Geschichte des Bezirkes 1, Die älteste Zeit bis zum Ausbruche des Dreißigjährigen Krieges, Aussig 1931; Franz Josef WÜNSCH, *Heimatkunde des Bezirkes Aussig*, Vol. 3, Geschichte des Bezirkes 2, Vom Dreißigjährigen Kriege- bis zum Jahre 1850, Aussig 1932; contributions in periodicals *Beiträge zur Heimatkunde des Aussig-Karbitzer Bezirkes*, Aussig 1921–1938; *Beiträge zur Heimatkunde des Elbetal, Mitteilungsblatt des Landschaftsvereins "Elbetal" im Deutschen Heimatbund*, Aussig 1939–1944.

8 August SEDLÁČEK, *Hrady, zámky a tvrze Království českého*, Vol. 14, Praha 1923; Group of authors, *Hrady, zámky a tvrze v Čechách, na Moravě a ve Slezsku*, Vol. 3: Severní Čechy, Praha 1984; Jiří ÚLOVEC, *Hrady, zámky a tvrze na Ústecku*, Ústí nad Labem 2002.

inventories of large estates and a few modern historiographical works focused on a specific family or a history of some building.⁹ In addition, published statistical sources could be also used.

The initial view obtained in this way, so far without a deeper archival study, shows that the structure of the local noble society was completely transformed in the period under study, i. e. roughly between 1620 and the end of the 18th century, in terms of the families represented. A parallel analysis of the development of the form and changes of manors and estates, which in the past were spread over the territory of the district or overlapped in it from the neighbouring Teplice, Litoměřice and Děčín districts, in turn documents the gradual trend of merging smaller units into larger manors. From the fragmented tenure of individual estates or their parts, which was typical for the period after the Hussite wars, we can trace the growing effort to consolidate into larger estates: this effort culminated in the period after the Battle of White Mountain and in some cases continued in the second half of the 17th century. When comparing the model that can be constructed on the basis of the data in *Berní rula* (a tax register of 1654)¹⁰ and the situation depicted in Schaller's topography (1787),¹¹ it is evident that there were only minimal changes in terms of the affiliation of individual localities to manors and estates in the period under study. Some of the estates, which had still existed separately in the middle of the 17th century, disappeared by integration into larger units (see the table in the appendix). On the other hand, the division of some villages into parts, still reflecting the situation at the turn of the Middle Ages, persisted until the end of the feudal system.¹²

The nobility-owned manors and estates of Chlumec, Všebořice, Krásný Les, Krásné Březno, Střekov, Svádov, Velké Březno, Předlice, Řehlovice, Trmice, Hlíňany and Dubice were entirely or predominantly located in the territory of Ústí nad Labem district in 1654. The noble manors of Soběchleby, Dražkov, Světic, Děčín, Kamýk, Lovosice, Teplice, Ploskovice, Skalka, Zahořany and Velké Žernoseky were only partly situated in the Ústí district. In 1787 their number was reduced to fifteen.

9 Cited in another text.

10 K. DORAZIL, *Berní rula 2. Popis Čech r. 1654*, pp. 354–401.

11 Jaroslav SCHALLER, *Topographie des Königreichs Böhmen, Fünfter Theil, Leutmeritzer Kreis*, Prag und Wien 1787.

12 This fact is reflected, for example, in the area northeast of Ústí nad Labem, where individual villages were traditionally divided between the manors of Chlumec, Všebořice and Krásný Les.

Situation before the Battle of White Mountain

From the second half of the 15th century, the territory of Ústí nad Labem district itself attracted the attention of some imperial, mainly Saxon families, who gradually became the dominant component of the local nobility before the Battle of White Mountain. The Kölbels of Geising, owners of the Chlumec estate, are the first to be mentioned in written records in the Ústí district in 1486. Originally, they had been a burgher family from a small mining town on the Saxon side of the Ore Mountains and they had become rich from tin mining in Krupka. Its members gradually came into possession of several other estates in the Ústí district (Všebořice, Předlice, Hrbovice, Habrovice). Another Saxon family acquiring land ownership here were the Saalhausens. The family, originating from the Margravate of Meissen, appeared in North Bohemia in 1515 when the nephews of the Bishop of Meissen, Johann, acquired large manors here, including Děčín, Česká Kamenice and Schönstein (which included several localities in the northeastern part of the Ústí district).¹³ In 1548, they acquired the estates of Svádov and Velké Březno in the Ústí district.¹⁴ In 1606, a related family of Lusatian-Saxon origin, the Bocks of Bock (from Pollach), bought the Velké Březno estate from them.¹⁵ The Knights of Büнау, who owned large estates on the other side of the border, also came from neighbouring Saxony and in 1527 acquired the estates of Blansko and Krásné Březno. In 1534, they bought the Děčín manor from the Saalhausens. In 1604, Dolní Trmice was added to their large property as an inheritance. Another family coming to Bohemia from Saxony were the Knights of Sebottendorf, who in 1579 bought the estate of Krásný Les located right at the border.¹⁶ The Knights of Bílá, originating from Thuringia for a change, became the owners of Řehlovice in the first half of the 16th century.

In addition, we also encounter representatives of domestic knight families in the Ústí district in the period before the Battle of White Mountain. The family Štampach owned the Bukov estate,¹⁷ Hora of Ocelovice owned Otovice, and Hochhauzar of Hochhauz owned Habrovany and Hlíňany. In the 1560s, the estate of Encovany-Střekov, part of which was located in the southeastern part of the district, was

13 They sold Děčín to the Bünaus in 1534. Group of authors, *Hrady, zámky a tvrze v Čechách, na Moravě a ve Slezsku*, Vol. 3, p. 84.

14 Táňa ŠIMKOVÁ, "Hrad přepevný je Pánbůh náš". *Saská luterská šlechta severozápadních Čech ve světle raně novověké sakrální architektury*, Ústí nad Labem 2018, p. 95.

15 J. ÚLOVEC, *Hrady, zámky a tvrze na Ústecku*, p. 214. On this virtually unknown family, cf. Ernst Heinrich KNESCHKE, *Neues allgemeines deutsches Adels-lexicon*, Vol. 1, Leipzig 1859, p. 499.

16 Jan KILIÁN, *Zámek Krásný Les – majitelé a stavitelé*, Monumentorum custos 2020. *Časopis pro památky severozápadních Čech*, 2021, p. 7.

17 Throughout the paper, the Czech variant of personal names is chosen for consistency. For important families where there is a common form of the family name in English, this name is used.

acquired by and later became hereditary property of the Lobkowicz family. Other Bohemian families held manors which had their centres in the neighbouring districts, but overlapped with the territory of today's Ústí district with some localities. These were the families Kinsky of Vchynice (Teplice, Zahořany, Benešov n. Pl.), Kekule of Stradonice (Soběchleby), Wallenstein (Lovosice), Hrzán of Harasov (Skalka), Kamýcký of Lstiboř (Kamýk, Velké Žernoseky), Knights of Vřesovice (Ploskovice) and Kouč of Kouč (Horní Trmice). Regardless of whether the families were of Czech or foreign origin, in terms of religion they were, with the sole exception of the Sřekov Lobkowiczs, Protestant nobility of various denominations.¹⁸

Situation after the Battle of White Mountain and during the Thirty Years' War

In view of the above-mentioned varied composition of the nobility in the Ústí district, it is interesting to follow its fate after the Battle of White Mountain and the defeat of the Bohemian Revolt in more detail. Some of the members of the families were involved, to various degrees, in anti-Habsburg activities, which led to numerous punishments in the early 1620s. These are reflected especially in the land confiscations that took place in the Ústí district between 1622 and 1623. An exception to these was the worst punishment that befell Friedrich Sr. of Bílá on Řehlovice and Chotiměř. He was one of the most exposed of the estates' rebels. He was the only knight who voted for the election of the Elector of Saxony, John Georg I, as King of Bohemia after the deposition of Ferdinand II. As part of the trial of the leaders of the resistance, he was sentenced to loss of honour, decapitation and forfeiture of all property in May 1621 and beheaded in Old Town Square in Prague on 21 June. His property was seized by the royal financial institute, but Řehlovice was returned to his children in 1622 as their mother's share of the inheritance.

Others affected included the Kölbels of Geising, who lost all or parts of their estates (Bánov, Dělouš, Všebořice, Chlumec)¹⁹ depending on the degree of wrongdoing of particular members of the family. Among the "rebels" punished with confiscations were also Johann Nikolaus Hochhauzar of Hochhauz (Habrovany and Hlíňany), Wenzel of Štampach (Bukov),²⁰ Johann of Sebottendorf (Krásný Les), Friedrich Hora of Ocelovice (Otovice) and Albrecht Kekule of Stradonice

18 F. J. WÜNSCH, *Heimatkunde des Bezirkes Aussig*, Vol. 3 (Part 2), Aussig 1932, p. 131.

19 The situation regarding the members of this family is more complicated because of its considerable branching and the fact that its members owned a larger number of smaller estates or parts thereof. T. V. BÍLEK, *Dějiny konfiskací*, Vol. 1, pp. 259–263.

20 Wenzel of Štampach was sentenced to lose all his property. However, the Bukov estate was returned to his widow, Barbara Malesická, née of Poutnov. She died in 1628 and her son Erazim Jaroslav sold

(Soběchleby). Some estates were not directly confiscated, but their free tenure was changed to vassalage, often for many decades: the manor of Svádov or the estate of Horní Předlice are such examples. The manor of Ploskovice remained in the possession of Johann Habart of Vřesovice after the Battle of White Mountain, who opportunistically converted to Catholicism after the defeat of the revolt. In 1624, however, he decided to emigrate to Saxony and received permission to entrust the administration of the estate to his Catholic relatives.

The situation generally becomes less clear in the 1620s. A number of court cases emerge in which people affected by confiscations or their relatives or survivors try to overturn the verdicts and get their property or part of it back. Moreover, a considerable part of the estates, especially in the lower and therefore more fertile part of the Ústí district, were held in the form of shares: it was not at all unusual that some localities had three different owners.

In connection with the sale of confiscated estates that took place in the Ústí district in 1623, new owners of local estates include: the President of the Aulic Council, Peter Heinrich of Strahlendorf (Chlumec a Otovice),²¹ the Saxon Court Hofmeister, Johann Kaspar Kürbitz (Všebořice – a part of the estate, Hrbovice – a share), an imperial official, Salomon Freudenberg, later with a piece ‘of Havelsberg’ (Horní Předlice) and imperial officers, Franz Couriers (Dolní Předlice with Malé and Velké Chvojno and Krásný Les) and Alexander Regniers of Bleyleben (Soběchleby). The lord of Bílina, Wilhelm the younger Popel of Lobkowicz, acquired the estate of Hlíňany, which he leased to the original owner, Johann Nikolaus Hochhauzar of Hochhauz, in 1626 and after his death sold it to Otto of Nostitz in 1629.²²

Another important moment occurred in 1627 and 1628 in connection with the issuance of an imperial patent against non-Catholics, which, as a recatholicization instrument, also targeted the nobility.²³ The refusal of some families or their members to “*align themselves with the Emperor in faith*” triggered a series of forced sales of immovable property in the late 1620s. All branches of the Knights of Büнау left Bohemia for Saxony then. In the Ústí district, this fact was reflected in the sale of the Blansko-Krásné Březno manor to Christoph Simon (I.) von Thun, who also bought the Büнау estates in the neighbouring Děčín. Another Büнау estate, Dolní Trmice, was sold to Lorenz Maiderle of Mannsberg, who also acquired Horní

Bukov to Alexander Regniers of Bleyleben, who permanently attached the estate to Všebořice. Ibid., p. 625.

21 His brother, Wolfgang Leopold of Strahlendorf, administered the estate in his stead. F. J. WÜNSCH, *Heimatkunde des Bezirkes Aussig*, Vol. 3, p. 242.

22 J. ÚLOVEC, *Hrady, zámky a tvrze na Ústecku*, p. 40.

23 For more details, cf. Jiří MIKULEC, *3.7.1627. Rekatolizace šlechty v Čechách*, Praha 2005; on the successive mandates J. B. PRÁŠEK – Antonín REZEK – Josef SVÁTEK – Ladislav PTÁČEK – Josef KORÁN, *Dějiny Čech a Moravy nové doby*, Vol. 3: Od roku 1622 do r. 1648, Praha 1941, pp. 395–400.

Trmice, previously confiscated from the Kouč family. The other noble exiles also headed mainly to Saxony. Johann Abraham Bock of Bock (Pollach) sold Velké Březno to Karl Glich of Miltice before his departure. Esther Kölbel, remarried to Rešova, sold Všebořice in 1628 to the baron Alexander Regniers of Bleyleben. In the same year, Bernard Kölbel sold the Hrbovice and Strážovice estates to Peter Heinrich of Strahlendorf, who annexed them to Chlumec.²⁴ The Dubice estate, which the Kouč family had managed to keep despite their participation in the Revolt, was sold to Maria Tretscher. The children of the executed Friedrich of Bílá were also forced to leave Bohemia for religious reasons. His son, Friedrich Jr., and daughter, Euphrosyne, sold Řehlovice to Otto of Nostitz in 1628. Kamýcký of Lstiboř sold Kamýk to Hermann Czernin of Chudenice and Velké Žernoseky was acquired by Johann of Vřesovice. It is more than evident from these sales that in the course of a decade the form of nobility in the Ústí district changed in a fundamental way.

In the long run, even the brief episode of the Saxon invasion of 1631–1632, when some of the exiles returned to their former estates, often on the grounds that the agreed purchase prices had not yet been fully settled, made no difference. Such examples include the return of Rudolf the elder of Bünau, members of family Kouč of Kouč, Kamýcký of Lstiboř or Johann Habart of Vřesovice. The case of Rudolf and Paul Kölbel of Geising, who returned with the Swedes in 1639 and forcibly took over their former estate of Chlumec, is also worth adding.²⁵ The Ústí district was, to some extent, also affected by the confiscations following the fall of Albrecht von Wallenstein and his confidants. The substantial possessions of Wilhelm Kinsky of Vchynice, who had been murdered in Cheb, were divided among those involved in Wallenstein's liquidation. The Benešov, Teplice and Zahořany manors thus went to new owners.²⁶ The first two were given to Johann of Aldringen, or more precisely to his heirs. In 1635, Zahořany was entrusted by the Emperor to Wenzel Zahrádecký of Zahrádky, who soon sold it to Count Heinrich Schlik of Bassano und Weißkirchen. His possession of the manor was changed to hereditary by an imperial resolution. At that time, the Lovosice manor remained in the hands of members of the Wallenstein family.

Situation in the second half of the 17th century

Further changes in the family composition of landowners in the Ústí district were subsequently brought about in more conventional ways, i. e. by sale, either voluntar-

24 F. J. WÜNSCH, *Heimatkunde des Bezirkes Aussig*, Vol. 3, p. 242.

25 T. V. BÍLEK, *Dějiny konfiskací*, Vol. 1, p. 263.

26 Ibid., pp. 863–866.

ily or for debt, or by inheritance from wives or daughters who brought the estates as a dowry to their new husbands. An example of the second means is the development in the largest manor in the district, Chlumec. In 1640, the widow of Peter Heinrich of Strahlendorf, Anna Katharina, née of Rozdražov, married Albrecht Wilhelm Krakowsky of Kolowrat. Her sons from her marriage with Strahlendorf were to inherit the Chlumec manor, but both had died prematurely. Thus, Chlumec eventually passed to her son from her second marriage, Johann Franz Krakowsky of Kolowrat. He held it until 1707, when he was forced to sell it due to high debt.

The neighbouring manor of Krásný Les, which had been acquired by the French lieutenant-colonel of the Imperial Army, Franz (de) Couries, during the confiscations after the Battle of White Mountain, fell to his widow Josina, née van den Heede, due to deaths of his sons. Josina, in the meantime married another imperial officer, this time of Lorraine origin, Nicolaus of Schönhofeld. The manor was taken over by his son, Rudolf Wenzel of Schönhofeld, in 1667 and after him it was administered by his brother, Josef Rudolf. Then, at the beginning of the 18th century, it passed to the daughter of the former, Anna Maria Viktoria. She married Franz Ignaz Wratisslaw of Mitrovce in 1689.²⁷

The vast manor of Všebořice belonged to the Regniers of Bleyleben until the 1660s. When Anna Maria, née of Pichelberg, the widow of the aforementioned Alexander Regniers, died in 1665, the manor was bequeathed to Maximilian Valentin of Martinic. However, in 1667 he sold it to Michael Franz Ferdinand of Althan Jr. through his guardians. After his death ten years later, the manor passed to his widow, Maria Elisabeth, née of Weissenwolf. She remarried in 1680 and transferred Všebořice to her husband, Karl Oktavian Cavriani, who administered it until his death in 1706.

Another of the large estates, Krásné Březno, passed from the Thuns to the Althans in a similar manner. This happened when Christoph Simon's (II.) widow,²⁸ Barbara Katharina, née of Trauttmansdorf, married Michael Franz Ferdinand of Althan Sr. The manor passed to their aforementioned son, Michael Franz Ferdinand Jr., and, like Všebořice, fell into the hands of the Cavriani family thanks to the remarriage of Maria Elisabeth, née of Weissenwolf. They were managed successively by her husband, Karl Oktavian, and after 1706, when he died, by their son, Johann Ludwig Richard Cavriani.

Another of the large manors, Velké Březno, was inherited in 1669 by Isabela Eleonora, daughter of Karl Glich of Miltice. Isabela had been married to Gottfried Konstantin of Saalhausen in 1647. In 1676, she sold it to Sophia Agnes of

²⁷ J. KILIÁN, *Zámek Krásný Les*, p. 13.

²⁸ This is not Christoph Simon Thun, who bought the estate from the Knights of Bünauf in 1628, but his great-nephew, to whom the estate was ceded after 1635.

Dietrichstein, after whom her son, Philipp Sigismund, took over the manor a year later. The neighbouring manor of Svádov remained in the hands of the Saalhausens until 1675, when Gottfried Konstantin of Saalhausen died. The heirs were the widow, Isabela Eleonora, née Glich of Miltice, and her daughters. However, they refused to take over Svádov because of its heavy debt and the estate was sold a year later to Julius Franz of Saxe-Lauenburg by the lieutenantcy. After his death in 1689, his daughter Anna Marie Franziska, later known as the Grand Duchess of Tuscany,²⁹ followed in possession. The estate of Střekov continued to be held by the Roudnice branch of the Lobkowitz family. The estate of Horní Předlice was administered as vassalage until the early 1690s by the Freudenbergs of Havelsberg. At that time it was acquired by the owners of Dolní Předlice, the Schönfelds, who merged and integrated the two parts into the manor of Krásný Les.³⁰

The extensive Nostitz domain began to be built by successive purchases in the Ústí district soon after the Battle of White Mountain by Otto of Nostitz, who was followed in this work after 1630 by his nephew and heir, Johann Hartwig Nostitz, who added Trmice to his North Bohemian property in 1667, which he had purchased from the brothers Wenzel Adalbert and Johann Baptist Maiderle of Mannsberg, and Velké Žernoseky, which had belonged to Wilhelm of Vřesovice until then. In 1670, Johann Hartwig came into possession of the Roudníky estate and, at the end of the seventies, Dubice as well. After his death, his son, Anton Johann Nostitz, took over the property and managed it until 1736.

The situation regarding the manors whose centres lay outside the Ústí district was also quite dynamic at this time. Soběchleby was bequeathed to the Bohosudov Jesuits in 1665 by Anna Maria of Bleyleben.³¹ Děčín remained steadily in the hands of the Thuns and in 1671 became the basis of the Second Thun Fideicommissum. The Lovosice manor was acquired in 1653 by Sylvia Katharina Czernin of Chudenice, née Carretto-Millesimo, owner of the neighbouring Kamýk, which she then merged with the Lovosice estate. When she remarried in 1659 to the margrave and imperial general Leopold Wilhelm of Baden-Baden, Lovosice became the property of this family for a long time. The Teplice manor remained in the hands of the Aldringen family and their successors, the Clary-Aldringen family, from the 1630s. The Ploskovice manor, which had briefly belonged to Albrecht von Wallenstein, was donated to Heinrich Schlik after Albrecht's death. When Schlik died in 1650,

29 A. TSCHERNEY, *Schwaben*, Vol. 1, Aussig 1894, p. 307.

30 J. ÚLOVEC, *Hrady, zámky a tvrze na Ústecku*, p. 116.

31 Jan KILIÁN, *Plukovník, rebel a zbožná vdova*, Praha 2020, p. 181. The Ústí localities of Telnice and Větrov mentioned in the *Berní rula* (tax register 1654) were apparently previously attached to the Všebořice manor, to which they belonged at the time of the sale of the manor in 1628.

his daughter, Maria Sidonia, married to Otto Anton of Trauchburg,³² inherited the property. When this count died in 1663, the widow was forced to sell Ploskovice.³³ The purchaser was Julius Heinrich of Saxe-Lauenburg. He was followed in 1665 by his son, Julius Franz, who died in 1689. After him, his daughter, Anna Marie Franziska, held Ploskovice.³⁴ The Zahořany manor was sold in 1652 by Franz Anton Schlik to the imperial general Johann de La Croon. In 1665, it passed into the administration of his second wife, Margareta Blandina, née Söldenhofen, and in the early 1680s into the hands of her granddaughter, Franziska Blandina, married to Helfried Franz of Kaiserstein.³⁵ This family held Zahořany until the beginning of the 18th century. The Hrzán of Harasov family continued to hold the Skalka manor, Velké Žernoseky passed from the Vřesovec family to the Nostitz family.

Situation during the 18th century

The period of the 18th century, compared to the 17th century, seems to be more stable in terms of changes in the composition of tenure in the Ústí district. We are not witnessing anything dramatic and the changes in the structure of noble families are natural.

The over-indebted Chlumec manor was sold in 1707 to Norbert Leopold Libsteinsky of Kolowrat. His descendants then owned it until the second half of the 18th century. Norbert's granddaughter, Maria Anna, married Wenzel Josef Thun, the owner of Děčín, in 1768 and six years later took over the administration of the manor, which she held until her death in 1828.³⁶ After the death of Karl Oktavian Cavriani, the manor of Všebořice passed to his son, Johann Ludwig Richard. In 1724 he sold the indebted Všebořice to Philipp Kinsky. A year later, Všebořice again had a new owner, Ludwig Josef of Hartig. The neighbouring manor of Krásné Březno was owned by the Cavriani family until the middle of the 18th century. In 1751, Johann Ludwig Richard died childless. His widow, Maria Johanka, née Vlaschinová, sold the manor in 1754 to her neighbour, Adam Franz of Hartig. His

32 He is also listed as the owner of the manor in the *Berní rula* (tax register 1654).

33 Maria Sidonia, née Schlik, is connected with Ploskovice by a scandal that had preceded her second marriage to Gustav Adolf of Varensbach. Group of authors, *Hrady, zámky a tvrze v Čechách, na Moravě a ve Slezsku*, Vol. 3, p. 380.

34 She used Ploskovice castle as her favourite residence. *Ibid.*, p. 382.

35 Jakub PÁTEK, *Johann de La Croon – příslušník šlechtické společnosti*, in: J. Pátek (ed.), *Zahořany. Cesta časem a prostorem, Ústí nad Labem – Červený Kostelec*, pp. 89–103, here pp. 99–102; Jakub PÁTEK, *Držitelé Zahořan na přelomu 17. a 18. století*, in: J. Pátek (ed.), *Zahořany*, pp. 105–108.

36 J. ÚLOVEC, *Hrady, zámky a tvrze na Ústecku*, p. 55.

son, Johann Ludwig, later merged both manors.³⁷ The Hartig family owned Krásné Březno and Všebořice until the end of the 18th century. The manor of Krásný Les was acquired through his wife by Franz Ignaz Wratisslaw of Mitrovce, from whom it eventually passed to his son, Franz Karl Sr., and in 1759 to his son of the same name, Franz Karl Jr. He held it until 1793, when it was auctioned off for debts, and Franz Karl Jr. died.³⁸ Two years earlier, the existing part of the manor, Předlice, had been sold to Friedrich Moritz of Nostitz and joined to the neighbouring Trmice.³⁹

A very interesting development is recorded on the Svádov manor, which was owned by Anna Maria Franziska, Grand Duchess of Tuscany, until her death in 1741. Her universal heir was her daughter, Maria Anna Luisa Karolina, whose second marriage was to Prince Ferdinand of Bavaria, the son of Bavarian Elector Maximilian II Emanuel. From this union came a son, Prince Klemens Franz de Paula, who inherited Svádov in 1753. After his death in 1770, it passed to his cousin, the Bavarian Elector Maximilian Josef III. When he died childless seven years later, Karl II August Christian, Duke of Zweibrücken, came into possession of the manor.⁴⁰ In 1784, he sold his Bohemian possessions to his nephew, Christian August, Prince of Waldeck. In 1790, however, the Duke took the possessions back and in 1795 they passed as an inheritance to Maximilian Josef, Duke of Zweibrücken.⁴¹ In 1716, Philipp Sigismund of Dietrichstein bequeathed the neighbouring manor of Velké Březno to his daughter Ernestina, married to Ferdinand Bonaventura of Harrach. Ernestina bequeathed the manor to Ferdinand of Harrach in 1745, followed by the owners Ernst Quido and Johann Ernst.⁴² The Střekov manor remained in the possession of the Roudnice branch of the Lobkowitz family throughout the 18th century. Similarly, possession of the domain which had been gradually built up over the previous century by the Nostitz family, was passed down within the same family, divided into fideicommissum and allodial parts.

The same situation prevailed in the case of the Děčín manor, which was a fixed part of the second Thun fideicommissum. The Teplice manor also remained in the possession of the Clary-Aldringen family throughout the 18th century. The Lovosice manor was in the hands of the Margraves of Baden-Baden, who were replaced by the Schwarzenbergs at the end of the 18th century. A more interesting development can be observed with the Zahořany manor. After a rapid change of owners in the first decade of the 18th century, this relatively large but at the same time highly fragmented manor came into the hands of the Ogilvy family thanks

37 Ibid., p. 230.

38 F. J. WÜNSCH, *Heimatkunde des Bezirkes Aussig*, Vol. 3, p. 15.

39 O. KAMSHOFF, *Prödlitz, einst und jetzt*, p. 25.

40 A. TSCHERNEY, *Schwaden*, Vol. 2, pp. 420–422.

41 Ibid., p. 441.

42 J. ÚLOVEC, *Hrady, zámky a tvrze na Ústecku*, pp. 215–216.

to the General Georg Benedikt. His son Hermann Karl and grandson Karl Josef succeeded him.⁴³ The last owner in this family was the widow of Hermann Karl, Anna Esther, née of Weltz, who sold the manor to the Court Chamber in 1781.⁴⁴ The Ploskovice manor was in the hands of the same owners as the above described Svádov throughout the 18th century.⁴⁵ The Skalka manor was still owned by the family of Hrzán of Harasov.⁴⁶ Johann Leopold was followed in 1718 by his son Ferdinand Maximilian.⁴⁷

Thanks to this basic and necessarily simplified outline, we can trace the familial aspects of the transformation of local property tenure. However, a number of questions for further research emerge. For example, to what extent can we talk about nobility in the Ústí district, or rather about nobility that was only connected with the region by a part of its property possessions. One of the clues for future in-depth analysis is, for example, the activity of local nobles in the office of regional governors. During the years 1631–1751, Wilhelm of Vřesovice in Libochovany and Velké Žernoseky (1632), Christoph Simon (II.) of Thun in Krásné Březno (1642), Maxmilian of Aldringen in Teplice (1645–1649), Johann Adam Hrzán of Harasov in Skalka (1657), Gottfried Konstantin of Saalhausen (1662–1674) in Svádov, Johann Franz Krakowsky of Kolowrat in Chlumec (1675–1680), Ferdinand Hrzán of Harasov in Skalka (1720–1721) and Johann Nepomuk Vincenz Libsteinsky of Kolowrat in Chlumec (1749–1750) held this office on behalf of the noble estates. Friedrich Konstantin of Saalhausen (1645–1650) and Wenzel Adalbert Maiderle of Mannsberg in Horní and Dolní Trmice (1651–1652) held this office on behalf of knight estates.

Residential strategy may be another indicator, and deeper research reveals that there was the expected shift in this regard between the early 17th and late 18th centuries. While the nobility before the Battle of White Mountain had been, with the exception of the Lobkowiczs, firmly connected to their estates in a residential way and made intensive use of the local fortresses and castle buildings, in later times this function of most estate centres and manors was weakened. With the gradual concentration of the manors in the Ústí district in the hands of more important

43 Jakub PÁTEK, *Ogilvyové*, in: J. Pátek (ed.), *Zahořany*, pp. 109–116.

44 Václav ZEMAN, *Zahořany v 19. století*, in: J. Pátek (ed.), *Zahořany*, p. 121.

45 In 1805, Bavaria bought all the Wittelsbach estates in Bohemia. Ploskovice belonged to Archduke Ferdinand, Grand Duke of Tuscany from 1814. Group of authors, *Hrady, zámky a tvrze v Čechách, na Moravě a ve Slezsku*, Vol. 3, pp. 382–383.

46 They lost contact with Ústí district in 1722 when their only local village Sulečice was separated and sold to the Velké Březno manor. K. DORAZIL, *Berní rula 2. Popis Čech r. 1654*, p. 381.

47 Jakub PÁTEK – Martin BARUS – Eva UBLOVÁ, *Milešov a Hrzánové z Harasova*, in: J. Pátek (ed.), *Milešov ve středověku a raném novověku, Ústí nad Labem 2018*, p. 76.

families with “all-land” influence, such as the Nostitzs, Kolowrats, Hartigs, Harrachs, or even imperial sovereigns, we see that the local manor houses are losing their residential and representative function. They are used either by officials or as residences of “minor” members of great families. Notable exceptions in this respect are the castles in Chlumec, Krásné Březno and Krásný Les, which can be described (with varying degrees of interpretation) as residential even in the 18th century. This fact is also reflected in the construction activities of their owners. This phenomenon, however, deserves further elaboration, quite beyond the scope and possibilities of this chapter.

*

In conclusion, the development of the composition of noble landowners in the territory of today's district of Ústí nad Labem in the 1620s was influenced by the punishment of the Bohemian Revolt and the expulsion of non-Catholic nobility from the country. By the end of this decade, the existing Protestant nobility, in no small part connected by origin and property with neighbouring Saxony, virtually disappears. During the turbulent period of the Thirty Years' War, there were a number of rapid changes of ownership and at the same time the process of consolidation of individual estates into larger manors was started. In the Ústí district, big players on the confiscate market (the Thuns, the Nostitzs) established themselves at this time, along with representatives of the new military nobility (the Couriers, the Bleylebens, the Aldringens, later the Schönfelds, the de La Croons, the Ogilvies). Other important families appear here thanks to their marriage policy (the Cavrianis, the Wratislaws of Mitrovice, the Libsteinsky of Kolowrat, the Althans, the Hartigs, the Harrachs) or profitable purchases of often indebted manors (the Dietrichsteins, the Hartigs). In the second half of the 17th century and in the 18th century, even some imperial sovereigns (the Badens, the Saxe-Lauenburgs, the Wittelsbachs) appeared among the local landowners. The Lobkowicz family is an exceptional phenomenon, who, as part of the Roudnice branch of the family, held the Střekov manor throughout the entire period under review.