Introduction

A source on the history of Vienna during Maria Theresa’s reign that has only rarely been considered is the description of the social and economic situation in the capital in the so-called Politische Anmerkungen (Political Comments) of the Hofkriegsrat (Aulic War Council) from 1771. These «political comments» were compiled during the so-called «conscription of souls» of 1770-71. The latter was a huge enlistment campaign, a population census combined with a numbering of houses. This campaign was implemented in the other Western provinces of the Monarchy at the same time; it constituted the preparatory steps to a new system of recruitment.

The house numbers, assigned to the houses to facilitate the implementation of the campaign, were thus not primarily introduced in order

---

* Translated by Brita Pohl; www.bricolangue.at.

1 Political comments, Hochedlinger, Tantner (eds.), 2005.

2 On this «conscription of souls» see: Tantner 2007a.
to help the population find their directions in everyday life, nor to assist travellers in finding an address, but their main motivation was military. Incidentally, the method of choice was numbering all the houses in Vienna, from number 1 – Hofburg Palace – up to number 1343, which can still be seen on the façade of Ballgasse 8, in today’s first district.  

What, then, are these Political Comments about? They consist of reports regarding the condition of the population in the conscripted lands,

---

which fell under the responsibility of the military members of each conscription commission. The population’s political representatives, who also had a part in these conscription commissions, were not supposed to know anything about this measure, because they were too close to the local population.

In the regions they travelled through, military officers were supposed to proceed according to a predetermined questionnaire to explore how the volck, the common people, reacted to conscription and whether local clerks were willing to cooperate. They focussed on finding adequate accommodation for future military billeting, possible diseases in the populace, inheritance laws, the situation of trade and commerce, emigration, the peasants’ willingness to work and the breeding of draught cattle; beyond that, the officers were required to report whether they had come across fallow fields in the course of conscription.

The Political Comments may therefore be regarded as a kind of qualitative addition to the quantitative results of conscription. The answers to these questions were summarized in country reports and presented to Maria Theresa or Joseph; they provided the Empress and her co-regent with a comprehensive scenario of the conditions in the Monarchy from a military perspective, which, in some cases, became the starting point for political measures. These reports may be considered to be an early form of socio-scientific survey; the officers travelled through villages and towns, questioning peasants – possibly women, too – from an ethnological point of view, and writing down their observations, no matter whether they concerned eating habits, the sanitary situation, the parish system, or an alleged disease like the Wichtelzopf, the «pixy or Polish plait» – Plica Polonica – prevalent in Silesia.4

The compilation of these reports had not been part of the initial plan; it seems that the military leaders in Vienna only realised in the course of the conscription that this mechanism, once put into motion, offered the possibility to establish information channels from the borders to the capital which had not existed until then. The voice of the peasant could thus ar-

---

4 On the issue of the plica polonica see: Tantner 2008. For an overview on the history of the military at the time of Maria Theresa, most recently: Hochedlinger 2017.
rive directly to the ear of the Empress, and in particular of her co-regent, without corporative or manorial interference hindering communication.

Political Comments were written down for Silesia, Gorizia and Gradisca, Carinthia, Styria, Carniola, Bohemia, Upper Austria, the Salzkammergut, Lower Austria, and Moravia. According to the social structure prevalent at the time, their main focus was the situation of the rural population; indeed, they recorded many complaints about manorial oppression. The report on Lower Austria, presented in October 1771, also contains some paragraphs on Vienna; the aim of this contribution is to prove the wealth of information hidden in this source: The military perspective that was applied by the officers did not prevent them from perceiving the deep division of society, although in some cases the report has to be read against the grain and to be checked with other sources so that it can be used as a starting point to introduce some of the main characteristics and developments of this city in the second half of the 18th century.

THE PANORAMA OF THE POLITICAL COMMENTS

THE LIMITS OF THE CITY

One of the first entries concerning Vienna in the Political Comments for Lower Austria – «Austria below the river Enns» – runs as follows:

Master craftsmen in the City of Vienna proper have sufficient earnings so, provided they are willing to work, they can gain their living, whereas in the Vorstädte, the outskirts, tradesmen lack work. Even industrious men, however much they strive, cannot find subsistence for themselves and their own families.5

5 A comparable report on the situation in Tyrolia in 1786 has been edited by Michael Hochedlinger (2003).

6 In der Stadt Wienn selbsten haben zwar die Handwerksmeistere so viellen Verdienst, daß [sie], wenn sie arbeiten wollen, sich ihren Unterhalt verschaffen können. In denen Vorstädten hingegen gebracht es denen Professionisten an Arbeit. Es können folgbahr auch
Apart from the comment on the situation of craftsmen, this passage emphasises the differentiation between the City proper and the Vorstädte, the outskirts. An important urban planning determinant for Vienna in the 18th century was the double ring of fortifications that surrounded the city: first the city walls around the City proper, today’s first district, and second the so-called Line Wall (Linienwall), which encircled the Vorstädte and had been built in 1703. Whoever wanted to enter Vienna therefore had to pass through two border posts, where toll and customs taxes had to be paid, where in times of pestilence health checks were conducted, and where travellers not only had to prove their identity but also had to submit their luggage for inspection, especially if they carried suspicious books. The fortifications were only demolished in the second half of the 19th century, but they continue to define the urban development and the socio-spatial structure of Vienna today.

Within the city walls, 1,340 houses were numbered in 1770; in the Vorstädte, there were nearly three times as many buildings, namely 3,615. The population of the city and its outskirts grew by roughly a third from the beginning to the end of Maria Theresa’s reign: during the first census in 1754, around 50,000 inhabitants were registered in the City and around 120,000 in the outskirts, for a total of 170,000. At the end of the 1780s, instead, Vienna proper counted around 230,000 inhabitants, while Greater Vienna – i.e. including the Vororte, the «suburbs» or villages outside the Line Wall – counted around a quarter of a million inhabitants.

\[\textit{fleissige Leute, so gerne sie auch wolten, sich und die Ihrige nicht auskommentlich nähren.}\]
Hochedlinger, Tantner (eds.) 2005, 102.

7 On Viennese craftsmen, see: Steidl 2003.

8 On the Viennese city walls see recently: „Österreichische Zeitschrift für Kunst und Denkmalpflege“, 64.2010, issue 1/2; on the line wall: Buchmann 1974; Buchmann 1976; Buchmann 1978; Mader, Gaisbauer, Chmelar 2012.

9 On entering early modern cities through the city gates: Jütte 2014; on defortification: Mintzker 2012.


Throughout the 18th century, Vienna was therefore not only the largest German-speaking city in Europe, well ahead of Hamburg or Berlin, but also the fourth-largest city in the Continent – only London, Paris and Naples had more inhabitants.

**City of the Court, City of Plebeians**

The following passage from the *Political Comments* provides an inkling of the social conflicts within the city:

In Vienna proper and on its outskirts [Vorstädte], the abominable upbringing of the youth is obvious to all, to our shame in the eyes of foreigners. Boys aged 5 to 10 and 12 run about in the streets with whips, especially on the outskirts, and not only insult without regard anyone they come across on foot, in carriages or on horseback, but also throw stones or dirt, and the grown-ups witnessing this sometimes even encourage them in this behaviour by showing their appreciation. Such ill manners show that the common people in general are very coarse and make it their main sport to insult civilized people in the most shocking ways.12

This passage raises questions about the actual level of education of children and young people – general obligatory schooling was introduced shortly after, in 1774.13 In addition to that, the extract underlines the social inequality at issue: the «common people» on the one hand, the «civi-

---


lized people» on the other. Of course, the encounter and close coexistence of different social classes is a characteristic feature of many cities, not only in the 18th century; but Vienna in particular, during that time, was a royal city, where court and nobility, bourgeoisie and plebeians coexisted.

In addition to its role as centre of the great Central European Empire, which the Habsburg Monarchy had become in the course of the 18th century following decades of war and conquest against the no less aggressive Ottoman Empire, Vienna was also the seat of a huge royal household. Still a medieval city of burghers at the beginning of the early modern period, it had become a baroque royal city, a city of the court and of the nobility. Since the beginning of the Thirty Years’ War, it had become apparent that Vienna was to become the Habsburgs’ permanent seat, as was also epitomized by its architectural features, in particular after the Second Turkish Siege of 1683. According to estimates, in the first half of the 18th century, the royal household counted roughly 10,000 people, including family members, i.e. around 7-10 % of the population at the time.14 Under Maria Theresa’s reign, the number of court officials increased, but due to the general growth of the population, its share of the total population decreased.15

Space within the Hofburg palace had long been insufficient for accommodating the royal household and the growth of the latter contributed to exacerbating the general housing shortage in Vienna. To accommodate the court servants, the so-called Hofquartierspflicht (obligation to give accommodation to court employees) had already been introduced in the 16th century, obliging especially the bourgeoisie to provide quarters for members of the court. In particular, after the Second Turkish Siege, this practice contributed to the relegation of craftsmen on the city’s outskirts. Nobility and clergy were of course exempt from the Hofquartierspflicht. This burden still existed at the time of Maria Theresa and was only abolished shortly after her death.16

15 Weigl 2003a, 122.
16 Kallbrunner 1925; Maurer 2013. Only recently, a city map dated 1748 was discovered in the collections of the Wien Museum, which was made for the purposes of the quartermasters’ office. It shows the houses numbered, although the numbers correspond
Concerning the living conditions in Vienna’s homes, the Political Comments provide the following information:

In some houses within the Vienna proper, where the owner does not live himself and nobody is charged with supervising the house, much uncleanliness and disorder is said to be the rule, in some rooms it was even said to be impossible to bear the uncleanness and the stench while writing the report. On the outskirts, it is said that the practice of moving into newly-built houses too early led to illness.\(^\text{17}\)

This passage provides a contribution to the “history of the senses”, which has become a topic of research for historians over the last years, namely the sense of smell.\(^\text{18}\) Perhaps we better skirt the question whether the sketched representation is true, or whether the bourgeois noses of the conscription commissioners expressed their displeasure when confronted with plebeian housing conditions. Instead, we shall emphasise another marginal aspect concerning the living conditions in Theresian Vienna: i.e. the fact that, due to urban growth, an increasing number of Zinshäuser (tenements) were being built, and social relations became increasingly anonymous. In the year following Maria Theresa’s death, a famous traveler, the Northern German publicist, author and Enlightenment philosopher Friedrich Nicolai visited Vienna and proffered the following opinion in the account of his journey: «Who indeed is looking for someone in a large house only needs to ask for the concierge, who will know all tenants, neither to the numbers of 1770 nor with numbers used in other registers. Békési, Doppler (eds.), 156f.


\(^{18}\) Following the example of Corbin’s famous study The Foul and the Fragrant, Peter Payer published a study on Vienna (1997).
who often do not know each other.» At a time when there were no doorbell nameplates at the main door, the concierge was the person who knew all the tenants in the buildings he took care of, sometimes more than they would have liked. Often, he knew everything about the fortune and situation of a family even before they moved in. The concierges also took on tasks from the authorities, they not only cooperated with the landlords, but also with the police. It is therefore hardly surprising that quite a few people had little good to say about these spying associates of the authorities. One of them was the author Josef Richter, who, in his *Wiener Musterkarte (Patterns of Vienna)* published in 1785, called the concierges a regular «plague of houses»: «Concierges are the most unbearable and coarse individuals, who act as friends, advisors and spies of house inspectors and administrators...»

**City of Consumption**

Another passage from the *Political Comments* takes us into the world of traffic – and traffic jams:

> Although orders are in place that streets always have to be kept open, their execution is nowhere to be seen, and there will always be beer and flour carts, rented carriages and empty carts, too, in the narrowest of lanes. So hardly a day passes without the passage being blocked here and there, for hours on end, and without people wrangling to get ahead.21

---

19 *Wer also in einem grossen Haus jemand zu suchen hat, muß nur nach dem Hausmeister fragen, welcher alle Miethsleute kennet, die sich oft untereinander nicht kennen.* Nicolai 1994, 143.


Such scenes are typical for most cities in the early modern period. As for Vienna, the reference to «beer and flour carts» is reminiscent of the fact that the Imperial residence was particularly notorious as a city of consumption. According to a widespread cliché, since the 15th century, Vienna had been a «City of Phaeacians» devouring the produce of the surrounding land.\textsuperscript{22} Incidentally, a contemporary report states that the main import goods were «countless herds of oxen» from Hungary, «venison and pheasants» from Bohemia and Moravia, «cheese and silks» from Milan, and «oysters and turtles» from Trieste.\textsuperscript{23} The enormous increase in consumption mirrored the growth of the nobility and of the royal household with their demand for luxury goods. In the 18th century, the per capita consumption of meat and beer rose in the rest of the population as well and reached comparatively high levels. At the beginning of Maria Theresa’s reign, the annual per capita consumption of meat, poultry and fish is estimated at 70 kg, around 1784 at 86 kg.\textsuperscript{24}

\textbf{City of Poverty, City of Deportation}

Another observation made by the conscription commissioners is the following:

While students are forbidden to sing at night and begging in general is prohibited, it nevertheless happens without the least timidity, mostly in houses, and it is said that it is mostly the wives, children and relatives of the day watchmen or whoever receives their protection who beg in the lanes and churches.\textsuperscript{25}

\hrule

\textsuperscript{22} Melichar 1996; Bruckmüller 2003, 117-119.

\textsuperscript{23} Pezzl 1923, 346.

\textsuperscript{24} Weigl 2003b, 138f.

\textsuperscript{25} \textit{Das Singen der Studenten zur Nachtszeit und das Bettlen überhaupt ist zwar verbitten. Es beschihet aber dennoch forderist in Häußern gantz ungescheuet, und heist es, daß meistens die Weiber, Kinder und Anverwandte der Tagwächteren, oder weme diese sonstens dazu die Protection geben, am Tage auf denen Gassen und in denen Kirchen betleten.} Hochedlinger, Tantner (eds.), 2005, 105.
The brutal persecution of beggars is characteristic for the early modern period; in Vienna, most such measures are recorded during the 16th and 17th centuries. In particular, foreign beggars were fought, while local beggars were accepted and deemed «worthy»; even begging insignia were introduced. From the 1660s, beggars’ visitations were regular occurrences, and in the 1690s, the Great Poorhouse opened its doors: Joseph II would convert it into the General Hospital in 1784; today, it accommodates part of the University.26

At the time of Maria Theresa, however, a particularly cruel measure was introduced in Vienna, namely the so-called Temesvarer Wasserschub (Timișoara water deportation).

In this water deportation, undesirables were shipped from Vienna to Temesvar (Timișoara) in today Romania via the Danube (to be exact via the Tisza and the Bega channels, hence the toponym), a journey of 20 days ending with incarceration or forced settlement in the Banat region. The first known such campaign took place in 1744, and initially, it only concerned women; we have no information about the precise charges that led to their deportation from Vienna, but this measure targeted liederliche Weibspersonen (wanton women) in general, who clashed with the rigid moral concepts of the authorities, and of Maria Theresa in particular.

In the following years, men, too, were handed sentences of water deportation. The reasons for this judgement varied. In 1746, for example, three «state prisoners» were deported, an affair so secret that not even their names are on record. Otherwise, charges of indecency and sexual offences, theft, blasphemy, tobacco smuggling, procuring, or desertion could lead to this sentence. In the case of a student, it was due to his «criminal speeches». Those deported were mostly members of the lower classes: a bankrupted tradesman who had caught the attention of the authorities as a troublemaker, and an alchemist remained exceptions to the rule. In the case of Roma, it was simply the affiliation to this group that provided sufficient grounds for deportation. A separate category were poachers and their families: the authorities seemed to have considered wildpräd-

*schützen* (poachers of venison) morally and physically suitable to settle in the Banat; all the more so as they were allowed to hunt there. Infants, too, suffered water deportation: in autumn 1766, even two babies, one six months old, the other only eleven weeks, were not spared and were deported alongside their mothers.

Deportations usually took place twice a year, in spring and in autumn, and involved roughly 100 individuals. The deportees were mostly apprehended in Vienna, Lower or Upper Austria, and sometimes Hungary, and were incarcerated in Viennese penitentiaries and workhouses before being imprisoned in the fortress of Temesvar in terrible conditions, often without clothing and subject to illnesses. The mortality rate was exorbitant and even those accompanying the prisoners were in danger: once, a priest, a feldsher and several guards fell ill and died.

It did not escape the attention of the central authorities in Vienna that the deportation via Danube often equalled a death sentence, and soon they realised that the demographic goals it was supposed to serve were far from being reached. However, authorities changed policy only a quarter of a century later, in particular after the co-regent Joseph II had travelled to the Banat in 1768 and called the results of the deportations a «great misery» (*grosse miserie*). In October 1768, after one more «water deportation» had been sent off from Vienna, the «longest institutionalized deportation measure [...] ever to have taken place in Central Europe», according to Stephan Steiner, was abolished: overall, it had affected more than 3,000 individuals.\(^\text{27}\)

Therefore, we can state that the Vienna of Maria Theresa was not only a city of poverty, but also a city of deportation.

---

\(^{27}\) Steiner 2008, citation 218; Steiner 2014.
Cruel leisure activities were common in Maria Theresa's Vienna: apart from shooting at birds, which was mentioned in the previous passage, animal-baiting was one of the most popular forms of entertainment, at least until it was criticised by some enlightened observers. In 1755, Carl Defraine had opened the *k.k. privil. Hetzamphitheater* (imperial and royal baiting amphitheatre), a round building with an open roof in which all sorts of animals – bears, hyenas, lions, wolves, horses and pigs – were set at each other’s throats or hunted down by men or hounds to entertain audiences of up to 3,000 people. This bloodthirsty spectacle was embedded into theatre-like forms, and in fact, the imperial court’s theatre director was responsible for it. Moreover, this extremely lucrative enterprise fed on the pockets of the poor. After a destructive fire in 1796, animal-baiting was finally prohibited.29

While animal-baiting channelled the anger of the poorer classes, nobility was able to channel their murderous instincts hunting in the surroundings of Vienna. However, some hunting grounds were sold under Maria Theresa, and other areas that had so far been reserved for the use of the court, like Augarten and Prater, were opened to the public, which is why in 1772 in the woods surrounding Vienna, a *Saugarten* (boar garden) was built especially for boar hunting. The garden was originally surrounded by a wooden palisade, but under Joseph II a wall was built around the area, which later was known as the *Lainzer Tiergarten*.30

---


30 Gergely 1993; Prossinagg 2005.
Less bloody, but all the more ostentatious, were the great court festivities, which sometimes hosted several thousand people for dancing, carousels, sleigh rides and masquerades. In particular, on the occasion of Habsburg wedding celebrations, no cost was spared: the wedding between the successor Joseph and Isabella of Parma was accompanied by festivities lasting several days, a pompous carriage parade and sumptuous dinners which ignored the fact that the monarchy was in the midst of the Seven Years’ War. However, after the death of Maria Theresa’s husband, Francis I, such festivities were drastically reduced, Joseph II not having much interest in such amusements.\(^\text{31}\)

Concerning the forbidden fireworks mentioned in the quoted passage of the *Political Comments*, these were legalised in the form of mass spectacles around the same time: fireworks took place at the Prater, which had been opened to the public in 1766. From 1771 on, firework-makers like Pietro Paolo Girandolini, Johann Georg Stuwer and Giuseppe Mellina demonstrated their skills to audiences of as many as 40,000 spectators. Connoisseurs could marvel at fireworks shows with poetic titles like «The Spanish Wall in the Chinese Taste» or «The Temple of Peace», and debated which fireworks were the best, whether the «German» or the *welsch* (Italian). The knowledgeable audience was disgusted when a certain Tobias Heim showed them a Chinese *lustfeuerwerk* (amusement fireworks) which, in their eyes, was supremely «miserable».\(^\text{32}\)

**City of Counter-Reformation**

No account of baroque Vienna would be complete without addressing the religious situation:

In the churches, people are not considerate enough to keep out the dogs, which is a particular nuisance and distraction from worship. Often, you will

\[^{31}\text{Vocelka 2001, 184-195; Grossegger 1987; Iby 2015.}\]

\[^{32}\text{Pemmer, Lackner 1974, 50-72; Barth 1982, 2-8; on the history of fireworks before Maria Theresa’s reign: Bastl 1996, 205-216; Salge 2007, 400-411.}\]
meet a number of dogs, because not only are they allowed in, but many people take not only their small lapdogs with them, but also large and atrocious hunting dogs or poodles, which will then start to bark and fight in the Lord’s house, not mentioning other inconveniences they cause to people. It would also be good if underage children were not allowed into churches, since they cause considerable distraction during the devotions with their skittish behaviour, running around and screaming.\cite{Hochedlinger, Tantner (eds.) 2005, 105}

This amusing passage refers to the religious life of the city, and to the fact that the Vienna of Maria Theresa was also a city of religion, namely of baroque Catholicism and Counter-Reformation. In Vienna, Reformation had been extremely successful, and the city had even boasted a Protestant mayor in the mid-16th century. However, in the 17th century during Counter-Reformation, religious orders continually increased the number of their followers, new churches and monasteries were built, pilgrimages and processions had become characteristic features of the city’s daily life and interrupted the normal hustle of the streets.\cite{Leeb et al. 2017; Vocelka 2003} Whoever passed by one of the nearly daily processions in a carriage and did not stop to get down and kneel, still risked being dragged from the carriage and forced to kneel by a fanatic crowd in Maria Theresa’s time.\cite{Sander 1783-1784, vol. 2, 575} Enlightenment spread slowly, and moral arguments were put forward for a limitation of religious holidays and pilgrimages; the Jesuit Order was abolished in 1773,
following a European trend. The actual struggle against religious orders and popular religious feeling came out only under Joseph II.

**City of Migration**

The snapshot of the *Political Comments* keeps silent on an important aspect of Vienna’s urban history at the time of Maria Theresa, i.e. migration. The marked growth of Vienna at the time was indeed caused by immigrants. Vienna already was a city of migration then, this is not only true since the 19th century or since the end of the 20th century.³⁶

Its main attraction was first of all the central role of the city. In fact, since the victories over the Ottoman troops and the conquest of Hungary, Vienna no longer laid at the Eastern limits of Christian Europe. In addition to that, it was residence of a royal household and seat of an imperial court, whose byproducts could benefit craftsmen, servants and beggars. As for the geographic origins of the immigrants at the time of Maria Theresa, in the first place, they came from the regions surrounding Vienna and from Southern German territories, as well as from the German- and Czech-speaking regions of Bohemia and Moravia.³⁷

Contemporary observers saw Vienna as a multi-cultural city. The city topographer Pezzl described the situation in the 1780s, shortly after Maria Theresa’s death, using these words, which will also serve as a conclusion to this contribution:

> Concerning the less noticeable differences among the inhabitants of Vienna, it is true that no family can trace its local descent for more than three generations. Hungarians, Bohemians, Moravians, Transylvanians, Styrians, Tyroleans, Dutch, Italians, French, Bavarians, Swabians, Silesians, Rhinelanders, Swiss, Westphalians, Lotharingians etc., they incessantly arrive in Vienna to find some happiness. Sometimes they succeed and become naturalized. The original Viennese have disappeared.

³⁶ John, Lichtblau 1990; Steidl 2015.

³⁷ Weigl 2003a, 122-126.
It is this mixture of so many nations which produces the endless confusion of languages that makes Vienna stand out in the crowd of European cities.\footnote{Was die innere unmerkbarere Verschiedenheit der Bewohner Wiens betrifft, in dieser Rücksicht ist es wahr, daß keine Familie ihre einheimische Abstammung mehr bis in die dritte Generation hinaufführen kann. Ungarn, Böhmen, Mährer, Siebenbürger, Steiermärker, Tiroler, Niederländer, Italiener, Franzosen, Bayern, Schwaben, Sachsen, Schlesier, Rheinländer, Schweizer, Westfälern, Lothringer usw. usw. wandern unaufhörlich in Menge nach Wien, suchen dort ihr Glück, finden es zum Teil und naturalisieren sich. Die originalen Wiener sind verschwunden. [Absatz] Eben diese Mischung so vieler Nationen erzeugt hier jene unendliche Sprachenverwirrung, die Wien vor allen europäischen Plätzen auszeichnet. Pezsl 1923, 22.}
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