

how these issues entered the public sphere and the individuals who were engaged with them. Berg demonstrates that the Vormärz was about more than Metternich's stranglehold on German intellectual and cultural life, and Metternich also shows up here as a more complex character. Berg's focus on Clement Mary Hofbauer is illustrative—the individual who goes from loathed persecuted Redemptorist to urban patron saint—and has so much to tell us about what happens to religious practice and policy in this period.

Berg's work underscores the reinterpretations of recent Habsburg history, in particular seeing how religious policies and attitudes, rather than being forces of reaction and retrenchment, gave the Habsburg state important tools, what he calls the “mechanisms of pluralism,” for facing internal divisions of various sorts. That he follows the dynamics to the borders of Habsburg space allows him to see how interreligious dynamics were at work at different levels of administration and popular contestation. Religion was part of the way that other identities were also defined and negotiated—politically and culturally. This is a new and very welcome way of understanding how the Habsburgs and their state negotiated difference. This rich account also places the Habsburg religious narrative into a wider dynamic of both modernization and religious revival in the nineteenth century. Beyond studies of war and diplomacy, there is often a tendency to see Habsburg history self-referentially, as a matter of internal Habsburg realities. Berg demonstrates how effective it is to instead plug Habsburg history back into Europe and beyond.

No book can do everything (though in its scope Berg's comes close). The book's greatest strengths are in the post-Napoleonic sections. Likely because he was in power so briefly, Leopold II is ephemeral here, but he was simultaneously an enlightened ruler and was faced with managing the various crises that Joseph's rule had unleashed. It would have been interesting to see in more detail how the individuals occupying Berg's narrative managed that brief period, not least because Leopold's time in Tuscany had burnished his reputation as a particularly tolerant and open ruler. Berg tends to treat the Enlightenment as a singular, uncontested thing and moves uncomplicatedly between the 1790s, the Napoleonic conflicts, and the restoration. This begs the question of whether treating this with greater nuance might yield a new understanding of what was at stake for reformers. Francis similarly raises some questions. Berg makes clear how he was swayed by Josephists around him (or by the papacy and its advocates), but I would have welcomed a more sustained discussion of Francis's attitudes, religious practices, and motivations.

Berg's volume is a tour-de-force of European religious history. It draws on extensive archival research and demonstrates a mastery of published sources. This book should be required reading for anyone interested in nineteenth-century Europe.

doi:10.1017/S0067237824000420

## **Bonazza, Marcello, Francesca Brunet, and Florian Huber, eds. *Il Paese sospeso: La costruzione della provincia tirolese (1813–1816)***

**Trento: Società di Studi Trentini di Scienze Storiche, 2020. Pp. 536.**

Marco Bellabarba

University of Trento, Trento, Italy  
 Email: [marco.bellarbarba@unitn.it](mailto:marco.bellarbarba@unitn.it)

The “suspended country”—or *das Land in der Schwebe*—referred to in this book has an official birth date. On 30 May 1816, during a lavish ceremony in the streets and squares of Innsbruck, Francis I of Habsburg celebrated the establishment of the *Kronland Tirol*. Among others, this new province of the

Austrian Empire comprised territories that had belonged to the Habsburg dynasty for hundreds of years (Nordtirol, Südtirol, Vorarlberg), as well as the ecclesiastical principalities of Trent and Brixen, which were part of the Holy Roman Empire but not subjected to the Habsburg's immediate authority. For a century, until 1918, Tyrol's borders were those set by Francis I with his *Staatsakt*. Despite its endurance, however, the decision made in 1816 was neither easy nor promptly accepted by all. Indeed, it was reached at the end of twenty years of wars, revolutions, and political and economic crises, during which the drawing of different borders had seemed possible.

The building of the Tyrolean province, as stated in the book's title, occurred over the course of three years, starting in the autumn of 1813, when the Austrian regiments occupied Tyrol during the final war against Napoleon, and ending late in the spring of 1816. In actual fact, as may be surmised upon reading the essays contained in the book—fourteen of them in Italian and seven of them in German, the result of a conference held in Trento in 2016—the transition phase stretched over a far longer period of time, beginning at the end of the eighteenth century, when the Army of Italy led by a young Napoleon Bonaparte reached Trento-Tyrol. After the winter of 1796, the territory was quickly divided up and reassembled. Following some months under the French Republic's government, in 1803, there was a first instance of Austrian domination (during which the ecclesiastical principalities were secularized). In 1805, after the victory at Austerlitz and the Peace of Pressburg, Napoleon surrendered the region to the allied Kingdom of Bavaria, which governed it until the rebellion led by Andreas Hofer famously broke out in 1809. Subsequently, with the Treaty of Schönbrunn, Napoleon decided to split Tyrol in two, and to assign the southern part (the so-called Department of Alto Adige) to the Kingdom of Italy, leaving the remaining part to the Kingdom of Bavaria.

The constant changes in sovereignty did not merely alter the borders between states but also left deep marks on the lives of the Tyroleans. The essays of Franco Cagnol, Mirko Saltori, and Ellinor Forster investigate the biographies of some of the people who lived through that eventful period. Bavarian domination was something of a point of no return. Within a few years, residues of the old regime were swept away: the *Landtag* was closed, the Bavarian legislation was adopted, and feudal jurisdictions were abolished and replaced with state officials answering exclusively to the court of Munich. This administrative rationalization had an impact on lay and ecclesiastical aristocratic elites, which had already suffered the secularization measures enacted by Joseph II (addressed in the essay of S. Rampanelli and J. Reich). At the same time, however, a space was opened for the social promotion of *homines novi* hailing from both Italian- and German-speaking areas (on the one hand, current Trentino; on the other, current Alto Adige/Südtirol and the Austrian Tyrol). Under the Bavarian government, the bourgeois Antonio Mazzetti and Andreas Dipauli started their successful legal careers, which continued during the subsequent Napoleonic period, and were ultimately enhanced once the Austrian rule was reinstated in 1813. Alongside them were representatives from the old eighteenth-century patriciate, who managed to secure posts from the French, the Bavarians, and finally, the Austrians; all in all, these were “decorative” positions, however, for the bureaucratic machine was run by people who could boast university degrees and a long apprenticeship in public offices (for example, the judges employed in the courts of law studied by Francesca Brunet).

The Bavarian and Napoleonic presence (1805–13) provoked different reactions throughout the Tyrolean province: generally hostile in areas where the Habsburgs had a firm footing (U. Pistoia), more favorable in areas once belonging to the ecclesiastical principality of Trent, the southern part of the *Land*, inhabited by the Italian-speaking population. In Trentoi, the small capital of the Italian Tyrol (*Welschtirol*), new forms of cultural sociability were experimented with (theaters, cafés, clubs, salons) that engaged members of the nobility and bourgeoisie appreciative of the value of art and its public communication (A. Carlini and R. Pancheri). Nevertheless, there were also those who resisted change, as in the fields of education and publishing: the former continued to be led by clergymen, whereas the latter saw few printshops active and only a small number of books going to press (Q. Antonelli, G. Zancanella).

Thus, at the end of 1813, the returning Habsburgs found Tyrol in the midst of transitioning from the old to the new regime. The creation of a single province, administratively homogeneous yet multilingual and extremely varied both economically and socially, forced the Austrian government not to

dismantle most of the measures introduced during the Napoleonic period. The “restoration” of old Tyrolean institutions, such as the *Landtag* or the feudal jurisdictions (addressed in the volume’s opening essays by F. Huber, S. Barbacetto, M. Nequiritto, and N. Zini), is not openly at odds with the French-Bavarian innovations. For example, while the reinstating of feudal jurisdictions or the *Landtag* of Innsbruck contributed to creating the image of Tyrol as a place “suspended” between old and new, following the Congress of Vienna their activity was in fact gradually hollowed out by the Austrian bureaucracy.

Each of the former Napoleonic territories once again annexed to the empire—Tyrol, Lombardy-Venetia, Vorarlberg, Salzburg, certain districts of the Illyrian provinces (addressed in M. Meriggi’s, W. Scheffknecht’s, M. Lanzinger’s, and J. Lahner’s essays)—is a case unto itself: the ease of transition in each depended on how deeply-rooted the Napoleonic institutions had been there. For this reason, the *Central-Organisirungs-Hofkommission* in Vienna, whose aim it was to organize the new provinces, proceeded with caution everywhere: sometimes showing itself to be more incisive, sometimes more uncertain, as if tending to put off thornier problems. One of the most obvious difficulties was the relationship between the Italian- and German-speaking populations, which many contemporaries perceived to be a pressing matter. Indeed, as early as 1813, the judge Andreas Dipauli had suggested carefully balancing out the presence of Italian and German Tyroleans in the *Landtag* of Innsbruck: “daß die beyden Charakter, der deutsche und italienische sich mehr, als ehemem geschehen konnte, einander das Gleichgewicht halten” (230). His proposal went unheeded, but the fact it was left “suspended” would later be the cause of continual conflict.

doi:10.1017/S0067237823000589

## Conde Pazos, Miguel. *La quiebra de un modelo dinástico. Relaciones entre la Casa de Austria y los Vasa de Polonia (1635–1668)*

Madrid: Ediciones Polifemo, 2022. Pp. 661.

Rafael E. Tarragó

University of Minnesota  
Email: [r-tarr@umn.edu](mailto:r-tarr@umn.edu)

Miguel Conde Pazos has written extensively about the diplomatic relations between Poland and Spain and the Holy Roman Empire under the House of Habsburg (Casa de Austria). The bibliography of the work reviewed includes ten of his articles on this subject. This work is the summation of many years of research on the dynamics and strategic interests that influenced the development of the diplomatic relations between the Polish Vasa and the Habsburgs from 1635 to 1668.

He analyzes in this monograph personal circumstances that affected those diplomatic relations, such as the interest of the Polish Vasa in keeping relations with the Spanish Habsburgs because of the position of the king of Spain as king of Naples, where they had landed properties, and rights to interest on a loan made to King Philip II of Spain (r. 1556–98) by their ancestor the Polish queen-consort Bona Sforza (1494–1557), grandmother of Sigismund III (1566–1632), the first Vasa who reigned in Poland. According to Conde Pazos, the relations between Poland and the Habsburgs in Spain were undermined by institutional obstacles as well as by distance. Foremost among those obstacles, he considers the electoral nature of the Polish monarchy. Spanish observers at the Polish court criticized the lack of authority of Polish monarchs, whose decisions could be discussed and abrogated